M^R BAYLE's
Hiſtorical and Critical
DICTIONARY

THE SECOND EDITION,

To which is prefixed,

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

BY

M^R DES MAIZEAUX,

Fellow of the Royal Society.

VOLUME THE THIRD.

F—L.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE DICTIONARY Hiſtorical and Critical OF Mr PETER BAYLE.

THE SECOND EDITION,

Carefully collated with the ſeveral Editions of the Original; in which many Paſſages are reſtored, and the whole greatly augmented, particularly with a Tranſlation of the Quotations from eminent Writers in various Languages.

To which is prefixed,

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED,

BY

Mr DES MAIZEAUX,

Fellow of the Royal Society.

VOLUME THE THIRD.

F—L.

LONDON:

Printed for J. J. and P. Knapton; D. Midwinter; J. Brotherton;
A. Betteſworth and C. Hitch: J. Hazard; W. Innys and
R. Manby; T. Ward and E. Wicksteed; W. Meadows;
T. Woodward; B. Motte; W. Hinchliffe; J. Walthoe, *jun.*
E. Symon; T. Cox; A. Ward; D. Browne; T. Longman; S. Birt;
W. Bickerton; T. Astley; S. Austen; L. Gilliver;
H. Lintot; H. Whitridge; R. Willock; J. and R. Tonson.

MDCCXXXVI.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

Mr BAYLE's

Hiſtorical and Critical

DICTIONARY.

F.

10.

FABRICIUS LUSCINUS (Caïus) a Roman captain, as commendable for his probity and frugality [*A*] as for his valour, gave ſignal proofs of all thoſe accompliſhments during the war with Pyrrhus. He was conſul for the firſt time in the year of Rome 471, and gained (*a*) ſignal victories over the Samnites, the Brutians, and the Lucanians [*B*]. He raiſed the ſiege of Thurium, and got ſo conſiderable a booty, that after having given a large donative to his ſoldiers, and reimburſed all the citizens of Rome for what each of them had contributed towards the war, he had ſtill four hundred talents left, which were carried into the treaſury on the day of his triumph. He was the only man who had not his ſhare of thoſe rich ſpoils. His colleague was Quintus Æmilius Papus, with whom he was conſul a ſecond time in the year 475 (*b*); but between thoſe two conſulſhips we muſt place his embaſſy to Pyrrhus [*C*]. He was ſent to that prince, to treat about the ranſom of the priſoners made at the battle which the conſul Lævinus had loſt in the year 473. Pyrrhus, being informed that Fabricius was very poor, offered him a ſum of money (*c*): which Fabricius refuſed, tho' they proteſted, that the king preſented it to him, not with deſign to bribe him to any thing diſhonourable, but only as a mark of his friendſhip. The reflexion Fabricius made at that prince's table, upon what Cineas ſaid concerning the Epicureans, that they made

[*A*] *He was commendable for his frugality.*] He refuſed not only the preſents of Pyrrhus, but likewiſe thoſe of the Samnites. The thing deſerves to be related (1). The ambaſſadors they ſent to him, having enlarged upon the good offices he had done their nation ſince the peace, deſired him to accept a good ſum of money, which they were ordered to offer him; urging, he wanted a great many neceſſary things to furniſh his houſe and table, and that he had not ſuch an equipage as became his rank and merit. Thereupon Fabricius extended his hands from his ears to his eyes, and then laid them on his noſe and mouth, and afterwards on his boſom, and ſo down to his belly, and ſaid to the embaſſadors, *As long as I can command all the parts I have touched, I ſhall want nothing: Therefore, having no occaſion for money, I will be ſure not to recieve any from thoſe who I know want it.* All the plate he had conſiſted in a ſilver cup and ſaltſeller; and he would not allow generals to have any more: (2) *Bellicoſos imperatores plus quam pateram & ſalinum ex argento habere vetabat.* He lived upon herbs, which he plucked and cultivated himſelf (3).

[*B*] *He gained ſignal victories over the Samnites, Brutians, and Lucanians.*] Sigonius (4) had not groped in the dark, as he has done as to this conſulſhip, and would not have ſaid that Fabricius triumphed over the Tuſcans and Gauls, if he had known what I have quoted out of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus. He is to be blamed for applying to the ſecond conſulſhip of Fabricius, what Valerius Maximus relates of the raiſing of the ſiege of Thurium (5); in which action the Romans pretended the god Mars had viſibly fought for them (6). Compare that with the St George of our Croyſades. The raiſing of that ſiege happened under the firſt conſulſhip of Fabricius (7). The city of Thurium raiſed a ſtatue to it's deliverer (8).

[*C*] *We muſt place between thoſe two conſulſhips his embaſſy to Pyrrhus.*] Authors diſagree as to the time of that embaſſy: ſome will have it, that Fabricius was ſent to Pyrrhus before the arrival of Cineas at Rome (9); others

BRITISH MUSEUM

(*a*) Dionyſ. Halicarn. Excerpt. de Legat.

(*b*) Cicero, de Amicitia, c. xi.

(*c*) Plutarc. in Pyrrho. Dionyſius, ubi ſupra.

(1) Julius Higinus, de Vita Rebuſque illuſtr. Virorum, lib. vi, apud A. Gellium lib. i, cap. xiv. *See alſo* Valer. Maxim. lib. iv, cap. iii.

(2) Plinius, lib. xxxiii, cap. xii. *See alſo* Valer. Maxim. lib. iv, cap. iv.

(3) Seneca, de Provid. cap. iii.

(4) Comment. in Faſt. ad annum 471.

(5) Val. Maxim. lib. i, cap. viii, n. 6.

(6) Idem, ibid. Amm. Marcell. lib. xxiv, cap. iv.

(7) *Ex* Dionyſ. Halicarn.

(8) Plin. lib. xxxiv, cap. vi, ſub fin.

(9) *Vide* Sigonium in Faſt. ad ann. 473. & Eutrop. lib. ii.

made the ſupreme good to conſiſt in a voluptuous life, altogether free from public affairs, and did not believe that the gods troubled themſelves with the government of the world; the reflexion, I ſay, which Fabricius made thereupon, crying out, Heaven grant Pyrrhus and the Samnites may reliſh that philoſophy as long as they are in war with us (d)! was not the leaſt thing which made Pyrrhus conceive a great opinion of the Romans. He liked Fabricius to that degree, that he offered him the firſt place in his council and his armies, if he would go along with him after the peace (e). The Roman, with his uſual plainneſs, anſwered him, It is by no means for your intereſt to have me near you; for thoſe who honour and admire you now, would rather chuſe me for their king, if they knew what I can do. Tho' this anſwer was not very obliging, yet Pyrrhus did not ſeem offended at it; nor did it hinder Fabricius from obtaining ſatisfaction about the ſubject matter of his embaſſy. During his conſulſhip in the year 475, he gave Pyrrhus a great inſtance of his probity, by giving him notice, that his own phyſician offered to poiſon him [D], provided he was ſure of a recompence. It is in this year we ought to place the battle of Aſculum, which was the ſecond againſt Pyrrhus [E]. The moſt probable opinion is, that the Romans loſt it [F]; but that it coſt the conqueror ſo many brave men, that he hoped no advantage from the continuation of the war; ſo that he was very glad to ſee himſelf called to the aſſiſtance of the Sicilians. Fabricius was cenſor in the year 478; and his colleague (f) was the ſame Æmilius Papus, with whom he had twice been conſul. Both of them gave an inſtance of ſevere regularity, by degrading (g) a ſenator, named Cornelius Rufinus, who had been dictator, and twice conſul, only becauſe they found in his houſe ſilver plate for the uſe of his table, to the weight of ten pounds. Fabricius had long hated that man; and nevertheleſs he ſerved him, towards the obtaining the conſulſhip, at a time when he thought him more capable than

his

(d) Plutarch. ubi ſupra. Val. Max. lib. iv, cap. iii. *See alſo* Cicero, de Seneɛt. cap. xii.

(e) Idem. Plut. ibid. Eutropius *ſays, That Pyrrhus offered the fourth part of his kingdom to Fabricius.*

(f) Cicero, de Amicitia, cap. xi.

(g) Gellius, de Legibus, lib. iv, cap. viii. & lib. xvii, cap. ult.

others put it back till after the return of Cineas to his maſter. Plutarch (10) is of this laſt opinion. What is moſt certain is, that Pyrrhus did nothing conſiderable during the ſecond campaign; for the two firſt battles were fought, the one during the firſt campaign, the other during the third; the year between being ſpent in propoſals of peace.

Now it was in the interval that Fabricius went to Pyrrhus, and that Cineas was ſent to the Romans: but which of the two ſet out firſt, is what cannot be determined with any certainty. *Adhuc ſub judice lis eſt.*

[D] *He gave Pyrrhus notice, that his own phyſician offered to poiſon him.*] Authors differ extreamly concerning this fact: ſome (11) ſay, that an unknown man brought to Fabricius a letter from Pyrrhus's phyſician, by which he promiſed to poiſon his maſter if they would give him a good recompence for it; and that Fabricius, abhorring ſuch a propoſal, wrote, jointly with his colleague, to Pyrrhus, and ſent him the phyſician's letter. The ſubſtance of the letter written by the two conſuls is in Plutarch, who afterwards deſcribes the battle of Aſculum as a paſſage poſterior to that. Others ſay (12), that after the two firſt battles won by Pyrrhus, one Timochares came ſecretly to the conſul Fabricius, and promiſed him, that, provided they could agree upon the reward, he would poiſon Pyrrhus; which he might do eaſily, becauſe his two ſons were cup-bearers to that monarch. Fabricius informed the ſenate of it, who ſent embaſſadors to Pyrrhus, to warn him, in general, to be upon his guard againſt his domeſtics; but who were not to mention any thing of Timochares. They had a mind to ſhew ſome regard to a man who had been willing to do them ſervice, and at the ſame time to be generous towards the king. 'Timocharis 'nomen ſuppreſſit, utroque modo æquitatem amplexus, quia nec hoſtem malo exemplo tollere, neque 'eum qui bene mereri paratus fuerat prodere voluit (13). '—— *They ſuppreſſed the name of Timochares, maintaining a ſtrict regard for juſtice to both; for neither 'would they take off an enemy by any unwarrantable 'practices, nor betray the man that offered to do them 'ſervice.*' Others (14) affirm, that he who came to Pyrrhus was named Nicias; and that he was ſent by the two conſuls, and not by the ſenate. They quote the conſul's letter word by word; but it is not the ſame with that whoſe ſubſtance we find in Plutarch. Some will have it (15), that the name of Pyrrhus's phyſician was Cineas; that he wrote to the ſenate of Rome; and that the ſenate, rejecting his propoſal, communicated it to Pyrrhus. Others (16) ſay, that Fabricius ſent back to Pyrrhus the deſerter who offered to poiſon him, and that the ſenate approved what Fabricius had done. There are ſome (17) who pretend, that Pyrrhus's phyſician went himſelf to Fabricius, and that the latter ſent him bound hand and foot to his maſter. Florus (18) robs Fabricius entirely of the honour of this action, to give it to Curius, *Medicum venale regis Pyrrhi caput afferentem Curius remiſit: —— Curius ſent back the phyſician who profered to ſell the life of his maſter Pyrrhus.* Wherein he was not ſo good a judge as Pyrrhus, who by thoſe actions knew Fabricius again, and cried out, That it was he, and no other, whom it would be more difficult to divert from the accuſtomed road of virtue, than the ſun from it's ordinary courſe (19). Among ſo many different opinions of the ancients, it is no wonder to me if thoſe who cite theſe paſſages ſometimes miſtake the one for the other. See Frienſhemius upon Florus, and you will find he relates altogether wrong what Aulus Gellius had taken from Valerius Antias, and Quadrigarius. I will make no reflexions upon that great variety of accounts, but ſhall leave it to every one's judgment, and content myſelf to ſay, that we ſhould not have facts tranſmitted to us with ſuch a medley of circumſtances, if authors could cure themſelves of theſe two faults: firſt, the truſting too much to their memory; ſecondly, the liberty they take to give great examples ſuch a turn as beſt fits the ſubject they treat of. As for moral reflexions upon the probity of the ancient Romans, ſo much ſuperior to that of our times, they are obvious to every body, without my mentioning them. See the 120th epiſtle of Seneca.

[E] *The battle of Aſculum .... was the ſecond againſt Pyrrhus.*] They reckon generally but three battles between that prince and the Romans; the two firſt of which preceded his journey into Sicily, and the other was fought after his return into Italy. But thoſe who ſay, that the conſul P. Decius was killed in a battle againſt Pyrrhus (20), muſt of neceſſity ſuppoſe, either that there have been four battles (21), or that there was none fought between Pyrrhus and Fabricius: for it is certain, that the conſulſhip of P. Decius preceded the ſecond conſulſhip of Fabricius, and followed that of Lævinus, under which the firſt battle was fought. Eutropius, who places the ſecond under the conſulſhip of Decius, ſays, that Pyrrhus went into Sicily the following year; and that the conſul Fabricius had only to do with the Samnites and the Lucanians, over whom he triumphed. Plutarch and Florus poſitively affirm, that the ſecond battle was fought between Pyrrhus and Fabricius. How can we truſt old hiſtorians in things little remarkable, ſince the years of the moſt deciſive battles are not certain?

[F] *The moſt probable opinion is, that the Romans loſt it.*] The ancients had, as well as we, ſome Senef battles, of which each party claimed the victory, and for which they returned thanks to heaven with ſolemn pomp. See what is ſaid concerning the battle of Aſculum, in the remark [M] of the article PYRRHUS. In ſome reſpects, nothing is more eaſy than for providence to pleaſe every body. When people are in war, they ſeldom own that fortune has been favourable

to

(10) *In* Pyrrho, pag. 395.

(11) Id. ibid. pag. 396.

(12) Val. Antias, apud Gellium, lib. iii, cap viii. *See alſo* Valer. Max. lib. vi, cap. v.

(13) Val. Max. ibid.

(14) Quadrigarius apud Gellium, ubi ſupra.

(15) Ælian. Div. Hiſt. lib. xii, cap. xxxiii. *It ſeems we muſt read* Nicias, *and not* Cineas, *as* Andrew Schottus *has remarked,* lib. iii, Obſerv. Hiſt. cap xxxiv. Scheff rus *is miſtaken on this place of* Ælian, *by ſaying, that* Valerius Antias *gives the name of* Nicias *to the Phyſician.*

(16) Cicero, de Offic. lib. iii, cap. xxii.

(17) Eutrop. lib. ii. Aurel. Vict. de Viris illuſtr.

(18) Lib. i, cap. xviii.

(19) Suidas, in ἀποςυγῦντες & in Φαβρίκιος. *See alſo* Eutrop. lib. ii. *and* Aurel. Victor, ubi ſupra.

(20) Quod quidem ejus factum niſi eſſet jure laudatum, non eſſet imitatus quarto ſuo conſulatu filius; neque porro ex eo natus cum Pyrrho bellum gerens Conſul cecidiſſet in prælio, ſeque è continenti genere tertiam victimam reipublicæ præbuiſſet. *Which action of his, had it not been juſtly applauded, would never have been followed by his ſon-in-law in his fourth conſulſhip, nor again would the ſon of the latter, when conſul, have offered himſelf the third ſucceſſive victim to the republic when he fought againſt Pyrrhus.* Cicero, lib. ii, de Finib. cap. xix.

(21) *Father* Labbe, Chronol. Fra c *and* La Faiole, Hiſt. de la Republ. Romaine, *acknowledge four; but the firſt places before the conſulſhip of Fabricius that wherein Decius was killed: the ſecond places it afterwards.*

his competitors to diſcharge that office for the good of the commonwealth. He had a fine ſaying about it, which is related by Cicero [*G*]. It is no wonder that ſuch a man died ſo poor, that the public was obliged to give his daughter a portion to marry her [*H*]. I find in no author what Moreri relates, *that the ſenate were at the charge of his funeral.* I only knew, that, to honour his virtue (*b*), they made an exception, in his favour, to the law of the twelve tables, which allowed no body to be buried within the city of Rome.

(*b*) Cicero, de Legibus, lib. iii.

to the enemy; they generally give out he has been beaten, and has a thouſand reaſons to be uneaſy. If the enemy has had any ſucceſs, they inſult over him for not improving it better: they ſuppoſe he had formed a hundred great deſigns; and that being ſo far out in his reckoning, he ought to be the object of public laughter. There are no men that want ſo little to be exhorted to celebrate and rehearſe the bleſſings of GOD, as public news-writers: they might well be excepted out of a canticle that may be made after the pattern of that of the three Hebrew children. They admirably well obey the precept, *rejoice evermore* (22).

[*G*] *He had a fine ſaying about it.*] This P. Cornelius Rufinus was a brave man and a great commander, but prodigiouſly covetous and rapacious (23). He ſtood for the conſulſhip at a time when the commonwealth was in danger; and his competitors were men who did not underſtand the war, and who had no merit. Fabricius, though he hated him, did nevertheleſs uſe all his intereſt in his favour. Some, who very much wondered at it, asking him the reaſon why he did ſo, *Becauſe*, anſwered he, *I had rather be plundered than ſold. Nihil eſt quod miremini ſi malui compilari quam venire* (24). Cicero pretends, that Fabricius made this anſwer to Rufinus himſelf, who rerurned him thanks for his good offices: *Nihil eſt quod mihi gratias, agas inquit, ſi malui compilari quam venire* (25).

[*H*] *The public was obliged to give his daughter a portion.*] I ſhall quote two authors for it. ‘Senatus Fabricii Luſcini, Scipioniſque filias ab indotatis nuptiis liberalitate ſua vindicavit quoniam paternæ hæreditati præter opimam gloriam nihil erat quod acceptum referrent (26). —— *The ſenate, by their liberality, ſupplied the want of fortunes to the daughters of Fabricius Luſcinus, and Scipio; the only patrimony which they could boaſt of being honour.*’ That is the firſt. The ſecond is Apuleius; ‘Quod ſi modo judices de cauſa iſta ſederent C. Fabricius, Cn. Scipio, Manius Curius, quorum filiæ ob paupertatem de publico dotibus donatæ ad maritos ierunt, portantes gloriam domeſticam pecuniam publicam (27). —— *Were C. Fabricius, Cn. Scipio, Manius Curius, whoſe daughters had fortunes allowed them out of the treaſury, by reaſon of their poverty, and brought their husbands private glory, and public money, to be judges in this cauſe.*’

(22) 1 Theſſ. v, 16.

(23) Aul. Gell. lib. iv, cap. viii.

(24) Id. ibid. *See alſo* Quintil. lib. xii, cap. i, pag. m 558.

(25) Cicero, lib. ii, de Oratore.

(26) Val. Max. lib. iv, cap. iv.

(27) Apuleius, Apol. i, p. m. 286.

FABRICIUS (VINCENT), a native of Hamburgh, in the XVIIth century, has been famous by his wit and learning, and the political employments he has diſcharged. He was both a good poet and phyſician, an able orator, and a learned lawyer. He gained the eſteem of the moſt learned men in Holland, whilſt he ſtudied at Leyden; and they liked his Latin poems ſo well, that they adviſed him to print them; which he did in the year 1632. That edition was followed by ſome others [*A*]. He was, for ſome time, counſellor to the biſhop of Lubec, and afterwards ſyndic of the town of Dantzic: which town honoured him with the dignity of burgomaſter, and ſent him thirteen times as it's deputy into Poland. He died at Warſaw, during the diet of the kingdom, on the eleventh of April 1667, being fifty four years old. A collection of his works was printed in 1685, by the care of Frederic Fabricius his ſon (*a*). See the remark.

(*a*) *Taken from the* Journal of Leipſic, *for the month of* June 1686, *pag.* 278, 279.

[*A*] *That edition of his poems was followed by ſome others.*] I muſt not forget that he was principally encouraged by the famous Daniel Heinſius, at whoſe houſe he lodged, to print his Latin verſes. He was not very well pleaſed with that firſt edition, and therefore he put out another, corrected and improved, in the year 1638. He added to it a ſatire in proſe, which he dedicated to Salmaſius, and is intituled, *Pranſus paratus:* wherein the makers of anagrams, and of leud and extemporary verſes, and ſuch as deſpiſe the poets, are moſt bitterly railed at. Note, that he made a poem, which a phyſician of Geneva (1) inſerted in the ſecond part of his *Medicina ſeptentrionalis collatitia*. Here follows what was ſaid of it in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, when an abſtract of that phyſician's book was given. ‘That is perhaps leſs ſurpriſing than the adventure of the Dutch maid, who was confined to a garden as ſoon as three plague-ſores appeared on her body, during the horrible peſtilence in the year 1636. She thought on nothing but on her journey to the other world, when a young man, who loved her, beſtowed no other remedy upon her than the moſt amorous embraces he was capable of; and perceiving they were of ſome virtue, and the better to repeat the doſe, he went and lay every night with his infected miſtreſs. She perfectly recovered, and he got no harm by it. This occaſioned a fine Latin poem, which Vincent Fabricius dedicated to Salmaſius, and which was ſoon after printed at Hamburgh. It is inſerted here at large, p. 210 (2).’ The ſubject was as favourable as a poet could wiſh, and I am ſure Mr la Fontaine would have made a very diverting tale of it: which might have been intituled, *Love the beſt Phyſician*. Let us leave to the diſciples of Hippocrates and Galen, to make inquiries into the natural cauſe of that little prodigy. What triumph of love is here! If that paſſion makes the dulleſt witty, it alſo gives courage to the moſt timorous; for in all probability, the gallant of that maid had run away like a hunted hare from the encounter of a fellow infected with the plague; but becauſe he was in love with the infected woman, and had a fair opportunity to ſatisfy his paſſion, he dared and laughed at the danger, and was ſo lucky as to find, by experience, that fortune favours the bold (3).

The moſt compleat edition of our Fabricius's poems, is that of Leipſic (1685; for beſides the verſes contained in the edition of Leyden 1638, it contains many others never before printed. It alſo comprehends many adopted pieces; and both the ſpeeches the author made to the kings of Poland, and that he pronounced at Leyden in 1632, *De obſidione & liberatione urbis Leidenſis*, beſides the theſes of phyſic which he defended in the ſame city in 1634, &c (4).

(1) Theophilus Bonnet.

(2) Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres, Febr. 1687, pag. 176.

(3) Audaces fortuna juvat.

(4) *Taken from the* Journal of Leipſic, ubi ſupra.

FAKREDDIN (*a*), prince of the Druſians in Syria, *was driven out of his dominions by the Turks, and fled to Malta, then to Florence, and afterwards to Rome, about the year* 1620 (*b*). He pretended to be related to the duke of Lorrain. ‘The deſire of reigning made him return to mount Libanus. He gave freſh jealouſy to the Turks, who made war upon him. He was perſuaded to go to Conſtantinople to vindicate himſelf, and had his head cut off in that city. Mir Ali, his ſon, ſucceeded him,

(*a*) He is named FACHRADDIN in a paſſage I have mentioned, above, in the remark [*B*] of the article ECCHELLENSIS.

(*b*) Journal des Savans *of the 12th of March* 1703, *pag.* 170, *Paris Edit.*

' him, and was ſucceeded by his ſon Mir Achmed Bin Mahan ; and it is the ſon of ' this laſt who reigns at preſent (*c*)'. Theſe people *had formerly ſeveral emirs ; but Ibrahim, baſha of Cairo, ſubdued them all in* 1584, *under Amurath III. Thirty or forty years after this Fakreddin ſeized ſeveral fortreſſes* (*d*). The French Mercury (*e*) mentions his arrival at Florence under the year 1613, and relates ſome circumſtances of it ; but whoever would know his hiſtory exactly, and without the trouble of much reading, ſhould have recourſe to a work of Mr de la Croix (*f*) : there it appears, that this prince, *whom the Arabians called merely Eben Maan, the ſon of Maan, took the name of Fecred-din,* which ſignifies *flambeau,* or *light of the faith* ; that he ſet up for a conqueror, that he oppreſſed the people he had conquered : that having continued five years in Italy, he returned into his own country in 1618, with vaſt deſigns in his head ; but not being able to put them in execution he was forced to ſubmit to ſultan Amurath, who ordered him to be ſtrangled in his own preſence the fourteenth of March 1633.

(*c*) Idem, pag. 174.

(*d*) Ibidem.

(*e*) Pag. 243 *of the IIId Vol.*

(*f*) *Intituled* Etat preſent des Nations & Egliſes Greque, Armenienne, & Maronite, en Turquie. *See the IV, V, and VI chapters of the IIId book, p.* 174, *and following, Edit. Holl.* 1695.

FANNIA, wife to Caïus Titinius (*a*) a citizen of Minturnæ, dealt very generouſly with Marius, tho' ſhe was not ſatisfied with the judgment he had given in a law-ſuit wherein ſhe was very much concerned. That Woman had loſt her Reputation by her leud life ; but nevertheleſs Titinius married her : nay, her very leudneſs was the chief motive that made him take her to wife, becauſe he expected he might put her away when he would, and keep her portion, if ſhe could be convicted of adultery. He did not fail of an opportunity to put his project in execution ; but Fannia ſtood upon her defence, and had recourſe to law. Marius was to be judge, who, as ſoon as he had been acquainted with the caſe, took Titinius aſide, and adviſed him to reſtore Fannia her portion ; but not being able to perſuade him to it, by a peremptory ſentence he adjudged Titinius to give back the portion [*A*] ; and that Fannia ſhould be deemed fully convicted of impudicity, and ſhould pay a fine of a groat (*b*). Some time after, Marius was obliged to fly from Rome, and was declared an enemy to the commonwealth. He hid himſelf in the moraſſes of Minturnæ, from whence he was taken and put under the guard of the magiſtrates, who provided him a lodging in Fannia's houſe, becauſe they concluded ſhe would reſent the defamatory ſentence he had pronounced againſt her. But they were miſtaken : Fannia did herſelf juſtice [*B*], and took all the care imaginable of her gueſt (*c*).

(*a*) Plutarch. in Mario, pag 427, *E. calls him* Tinius.

(*b*) Plut. ibid. Valer. Maxim. lib. viii, cap. ii, n. 3, *ſays ſhe was fined* Seſtercio nummo.

(*c*) *Taken from* Valer. Maxim. ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *Marius . . . . adjudged Titinius to give back the portion.*] Nothing could be more juſt than to force him to it, becauſe he was not unacquainted with Fannia's leud life when he married her. If he had taken her for an honeſt woman, and deſired ſhe ſhould have lived as ſuch, the caſe had been altered ; but in order to ſeize upon Fannia's great fortune (1), he was well enough contented to be her cuckold for ſome time. It was not therefore reaſonable that he ſhould ceaſe to be ſo, and have all the benefit of it : And ſo Marius's ſentence was moſt judicious. ' Mulierem impudicitiæ ' ream ſeſtertio nummo, Titinium ſumma totius dotis ' damnavit, præfatus idcirco ſe hunc judicandi modum ſecutum, quod liqueret ſibi Titinium patrimonio ' Fanniæ inſidias ſtruentem impudicæ conjugium expetiſſe (2). —— *The lady being convicted of the acc'uſation, he fined her a ſeſterce, and condemned Titinius ' to reſtore the whole of her fortune, declaring that he ' had followed this form of judgment, becauſe it appeared to him, that he had married Fannia to ſecure her ' fortune, ſince he knew of her leud practices before.*' Plutarch touches upon the ground of the ſentence. Ἐφαίνετο καὶ τὴν Φαννίαν ἀκόλαςον γεγονέναι, καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα τοιαύτην εἰδότα λαβεῖν, καὶ συμβιῶσαι πολὺν χρόνον. Quum Fanniam conſtaret impudicam fuiſſe, & virum qui talem ſciret eſſe eam duxiſſe, diuque cum ea in matrimonio vixiſſe (3). —— *It was publickly known that Fannia had been a leud woman, and that her husband who knew it married her, and lived a conſiderable time with her.*

[*B*] *Fannia did herſelf juſtice.*] She knew in her conſcience, that ſhe deſerved all the infamy Marius had laid upon her ; and conſequently that he deſerved all the eſteem one ought to have for a juſt judge. She had recovered her fortune by Marius's ſentence, which was a greater advantage for ſuch a woman as ſhe, than if Marius, in full court, had declared her an honeſt woman ; for he could not thereby have made up the flaws which her amours had made in her reputation. Her neighbours, and in general all her acquaintance, would ſtill have had the ſame opinion of her virtue as before : And therefore Marius did more ſenſibly oblige her, by declaring her a whore, and by reſtoring her her portion, than if he had proclaimed her honeſt, without allowing her her fortune. When a woman's leud life has once made a noiſe, ſhe is no longer concerned for her reputation, but ſhe deſires then as much or more than ever to have riches, and to enjoy them. We muſt not therefore wonder, that Fannia behaved herſelf towards Marius as towards a juſt judge. See Valerius Maximus, whom I quote in the margin (4). However, we muſt not doubt but ſeveral perſons, in the like circumſtances, would have abuſed Marius.

(1) Τȣ́τȣ διαςᾶσα τὴν φερνὴν ἀπήτει λαμπρὰν ȣ῏σαν. Divortio facto dotem quæ lauta erat repetebat. *Plut. in Mario,* pag. 427, E.

(2) Valer. Max. lib. viii, cap. ii, num. 3.

(3) Plutarch. ubi ſupra.

(4) Fannia autem hæc eſt, quæ poſtea Marium, hoſtem a ſenatu judicatum, cœnoque paludis, qua extractus erat, oblitum, etiam in domum ſuam cuſtodiendum Minturnis deductum, ope quantacunque potuit, adjuvit : memor, quòd impudica judicata eſſet, ſuis moribus ; quod dotem ſervaſſet, illius religioni acceptum ferri debere. *Valerius Max. Lib. VIII, Cap. II, num.* 3.

FANNIA, an illuſtrious Roman lady, the worthy daughter of the famous Pœtus Thraſea, and worthy grand-daughter of Arria, was ſo eminently magnanimous and virtuous, that ſhe might not only be a pattern to other women, but likewiſe be propoſed as an example of reſolution to men. She followed her huſband Helvidius twice into baniſhment, and was afterwards exiled herſelf upon his account, that is, becauſe ſhe had deſired Senecio to write Helvidius's life, and had furniſhed him with memoirs. She confeſſed it openly before the judges [*A*], and only denied that her mother was privy

to

[*A*] *She had furniſhed memoirs for the life of Helvidius : ſhe confeſſed it openly before the judges.*] Metius Carus, a famous informer, accuſed Senecio of having compoſed Helvidius's life. The accuſed defended himſelf, by ſaying, he could not deny that ſmall ſervice to Fannia's entreaty ; whereupon Fannia being asked with a threatening tone, whether what Senecio ſaid was true, anſwered, it was. But it is better to hear Pliny ſpeak. ' Bis maritum ſequuta in exſilium eſt, ' tertio ipſa propter maritum relegata. Nam cum Senecio reus eſſet, quod de vita Helvidii libros compoſuiſſet, rogatumque ſe à Fannia in defenſione dixiſſet, quærente minaciter Metio Caro, an rogaſſet, ' reſpondit ; Rogavi : an commentarios ſcripturo de-

' diſſet ;

to it (*a*). This happened in the reign of Domitian. That greatneſs of ſoul was joined with that ſweetneſs of temper and good humour, that Fannia was no leſs loved than reſpected (*b*).

(*a*) *Taken from* Pliny *junior, Epiſt. XIX, lib.* vii.

(*b*) Eadem quam jucunda, quam comis, quam denique (quod paucis datum eſt) non minus amabilis quam veneranda. *Plinius, ibid.*

diſſet; Dedi: an ſciente matre; Neſciente. Poſtremo nullam vocem, cedentem periculo, emiſit. Quin etiam illos ipſos libros, quanquam ex neceſſitate & metu temporum abolitos, S C. publicatis bonis, ſervavit, habuit, tulitque in exſilium, exſilii cauſſam (1). —— *She twice followed her husband in his exile, and was baniſhed a third time on his account; for Senecio being accuſed of compoſing ſome books concerning the life of Helvidius, and alledging in his defence that it was done at the requeſt of Fannia; Metius Carus, with an angry tone, asked whether ſhe had deſired him to do it: ſhe anſwered, yes. Whether ſhe had furniſhed him with memoirs: ſhe anſwered, ſhe had. Whether with the knowledge of her mother: no, replied ſhe. In ſhort ſhe let fall no expreſſion, but what was attended with danger. And notwithſtanding the books had been ſuppreſſed, and her goods confiſcated, ſhe made them the companions, as they had been the cauſe, of her baniſhment.*' If on the one hand, it raiſes our indignation to ſee the cringing adulations of an infinite number of Romans, who ſued for preferments under the firſt emperors; we are on the other hand ſtruck with admiration, to ſee not a few great ſouls, who preſerved the old Roman ſpirit amidſt the public corruption. The author, whoſe words I have quoted, beſtows a thouſand praiſes on Fannia; and acquaints us with one paſſage, which the curious will be glad to ſee. It was the cuſtom for the high-prieſts to appoint certain ladies to take care of the Veſtal virgins, who were by ſickneſs obliged to leave their convent; and Fannia being named for that ſervice, ſhe contracted a diſeaſe by the extraordinary care ſhe took of one of thoſe Veſtal virgins. 'Angit me Fanniæ valetudo. Contraxit hanc dum adſidet Juniæ, virgini Veſtali, ſponte primum, (eſt enim adfinis) deinde etiam ex auctoritate pontificum. Nam virgines, quum vi morbi atrio Veſtæ coguntur excedere, matronarum curæ cuſtodiæque mandantur. Quo munere Fannia dum ſedulo ſungitur, hoc diſcrimine implicita eſt (2). —— *I am concerned for Fannia's indiſpoſition, which ſhe contracted by attending Junia, a Veſtal virgin, and her relation; her attendance was at firſt voluntary, and afterwards enjoined by the authority of the high-prieſts. For when the virgins are by ſickneſs obliged to be removed from their apartments, they are committed to the care and inſpection of the matrons. Which ſervice whilſt Fannia was diſcharging with the greateſt fidelity, ſhe was unhappily ſeized with a fit of ſickneſs.*'

(1) Plinius, ubi ſupra.

(2) Id. ibid.

FANNIUS, a Roman family. We are going to mention ſome perſons that belong to it; and we ſhall not forget Moreri's faults [*A*].

[*A*] *We ſhall not forget Moreri's faults.*] I. He places the queſtorſhip of Caius Fannius under the conſulſhip of *C. Calpurnius* (1) *Piſo & M. Popilius Lænas*, and in the year of Rome 611. Here are two miſtakes; for that Fannius was queſtor in the year 614, and that conſulſhip does not fall in the year 611, but in the year 614 of Rome. II. Fannius Strabo was not twice conſul, but only once; the conſulſhip of the year 632, which is aſcribed to him by Moreri, belongs to Caius Fannius, ſon to the other. III. Theſe words, *perhaps* this Fannius, conſul in the year 632, *was ſon to the firſt*, are abſurd; for there is no body but will explain them thus, *perhaps he was ſon to the firſt Fannius, of whom I* (*Moreri*) *have ſpoken.* Now that firſt Fannius is the annaliſt, who, far from being Fannius Strabo's father, is only his nephew. If to excuſe Moreri, you ſuppoſe that his firſt Fannius is Fannius Strabo, you will expoſe him to three reproaches: his pitiful way of expreſſing himſelf; his affirming a thing, of which he ſpeaks doubtfully ſome lines after; and his being ignorant of a known truth. There is no reaſon to doubt, that Domitius Enobarbus's colleague, in the conſulſhip of the year 632, was ſon to the conſul of the year 592 (2). Let us paſs on to other faults. IV. Fannius, Pliny the younger's friend, did not compoſe *a hiſtory that was loſt*. Indeed it was loſt in proceſs of time, with an infinite number of other books; but there is no doubt but it was extant a long time: and after all, it is very falſe that Pliny mentions the loſs of that hiſtory. Moreri, who affirms it, ſhews he did not underſtand the Latin of Voſſius, who having related Pliny's lamentations (3), becauſe Fannius's death had overthrown the preparations of a great work, makes this ſad reflexion (4). 'Ita profecto eſt, nam ut alibi de alio loquitur Plinius (5), *omnia illa cum ipſo ſine fructu poſteritatis obierunt.* —— *It is indeed ſo, as Pliny ſpeaks on a like occaſion in another place,* all thoſe labours died with him, without any advantage to poſterity.' Moreri did not underſtand that this paſſage of Pliny does not relate to Fannius's works, but to another man's, as Voſſius expreſsly remarks. It is true, Voſſius has made uſe of the words of Pliny, to expreſs what became, in time, of thoſe works of Fannius. That is the leaſt privilege of the art of applications: the ſame words, which would be moſt falſe in the book of the firſt author, are moſt true when, a thouſand years after, they are applied to other matters. Moreri was ſo well ſatisfied that Pliny ſpoke of his Fannius in the ninth letter of the fifth book, that he has quoted it at the bottom of the article. V. He ſhould not have ſaid, that Fannius's poems were placed with his picture in the temple of Apollo and the Muſes, and in a public library. This is beyond hyperbole: this is not to magnify an object, but to give a quite different idea. It is almoſt as much as to ſay, that Fannius's image became an idol, an object of people's devotions in the temple of falſe gods; than which nothing can be more falſe: For the moſt that can be ſaid, is, that the poems and picture of Fannius were put in Auguſtus's library. I own, that that library was put in a temple of Apollo (6); but that ought to be taken in the ſame ſenſe, as when we ſay now, that there is a fine library in the cathedral church of ſuch a place; and it is no leſs abſurd to confound thoſe two phraſes, *To put a picture in the cathedral church, to put a picture in the library of a cathedral church*; than to take for the ſame thing, *to put the picture of a poet in the temple of Apollo, to put the picture of a poet in the library of the temple of Apollo.* Let us therefore confeſs, that Voſſius has ill expreſſed himſelf in relation to Fannius (7): his negligence has deceived Moreri; but however, the latter ſhould have taken notice of the disjunctive *aliamve*; which if he had done, he would not have ſaid, that Fannius's works *were placed with his picture in the temple of Apollo and the Muſes, and in a public library.* The copulative *and*, inſtead of the disjunctive *or*, and the omiſſion of *aliam*, are in this place a prodigious fault: for it not only multiplies things without neceſſity, but gives us alſo to underſtand, that the honour which was done to Fannius, when his picture was placed in a public library, was of another nature than that which was done him when his image was placed in the temple of Apollo. If it was of another nature, what could it be leſs than a kind of conſecration, and a ſort of idolatry? Moreri cannot be excuſed, by ſaying, that by the temple of Apollo he meant the library of that temple; for the particle *and*, of which he has made uſe, robs him of that ſubterfuge. Was not that library public?

(1) *He ſhould have ſaid Cn. Calpurnius.*

(2) *I have followed* Sigonius: Moreri *ſays* 593:

(3) Quod me recordantem miſeratio ſubit quantum vigilarum quantum laboris exhauſerit fruſtra. *It is not without the greateſt concern I reflect what infinite pains he took, which his death rendered fruitleſs.* Plinius, Epiſt. v, lib. v.

(4) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. p. 161.

(5) Lib. v, Epiſt. ix.

(6) Sueton. in Auguſto, c. 29.

(7) Cujus poëmata in ædem Apollinis & Muſarum aliamve bibliothecam publicam cum imagine fuerunt delata. *Voſſ. de Poët. Latin. pag.* 34.

FANNIUS STRABO (CAÏUS) a Roman conſul with Valerius Meſſala in the year of Rome 592. That conſulſhip is remakable for two things: I. For the regulations made by the ſenate concerning the expence of feaſts; II. For a decree of the ſenate, authorizing the pretor (*a*) to expel the rhetoricians and philoſophers from Rome [*A*]. They were not ſatisfied with the regulations which the ſenate made to reſtrain the profuſeneſs of feaſts, there was alſo a law made about it, which from the conſul Fannius was called Fannia [*B*]. We ſhall mention elſewhere (*b*) the exceſſes which made way for it. I find nothing

[*A*] *To expel the rhetoricians and philoſophers from Rome.*] Suetonius (1) and Aulus Gellius acquaint us with it. Theſe are Aulus Gellius's words. ‘ C. Fannio Strabone, M. Valerio Meſſala Coss. Senatusconſultum de Philoſophis & de Rhetoribus Latinis factum eſt. M. Pomponius Prætor Senatum conſuluit. Quod verba facta ſunt de Philoſophis & de Rhetoribus, de ea re ita cenſuerunt. Uti M. Pomponius Prætor animadverteret, curaretque uti ei è republica fideque ſua videretur, uti Romæ ne eſſent (2). —— *In the conſulſhip of C. Fannius Strabo, and Marcus Valerius Meſſala, a decree was made concerning the philoſophers and rhetoricians of Rome. M. Pomponius, the pretor, asked the opinion of the ſenate. The affair of the philoſophers and rhetoricians was diſcuſſed, and they came to this determination; that M. Pomponius the pretor ſhould take effectual care, agreably to the intereſt of the republic, and his own duty, to clear the city of them.*’

[*B*] *A law which . . . . was called Fannia.*] Aulus Gellius ſpeaks diſtinctly of that law, and of the ſenate's decree, as of two things which followed one another. The ſenate's decree was firſt made, and the law afterwards. ‘ Legi adeò nuper in Capitonis Atei conjectaneis ſenatus decretum vetus C. Fannio & M. Valerio Meſſala Coss. factum; in quo jubentur principes civitatis, qui ludis Megalenſibus antiquo ritu mutitarent, id eſt, mutua convivia agitarent, jurare apud Conſules verbis conceptis, non amplius in ſingulas cœnas ſumptus eſſe facturos, quam centenos vicenoſque æris, præter olus & far & vinum; neque vino alienigena, ſed patrio, uſuros; neque argenti in convivio plus pondo, quàm libras centum illaturos. Sed poſt id Senatus-conſultum lex Fannia lata eſt, quæ ludis Romanis, item ludis plebeiis & Saturnalibus, & aliis quibuſdam diebus, in ſingulos dies centenos æris inſumi conceſſit, decemque aliis diebus in ſingulis menſibus tricenos; cæteris autem omnibus diebus denos (3). —— *I have read lately in Capito Ateus's conjectures, that an old decree of the ſenate was made in the conſulſhip of C. Fannius, and M. Val. Meſſala; whereby the magiſtrates, who according to cuſtom gave mutual entertainments during the Megalenſian games, were obliged to ſwear in form before the conſuls, not to expend above a hundred and twenty pieces of braſs money, beſides bread, herbs and wine, upon every feaſt, and not to uſe foreign wines, but of their own growth, nor to bring to table above one hundred weight of plate. But after that decree the Fannian law was enacted, which allowed one hundred pieces of braſs to be expended at a time, during the Roman, Plebeian, and Saturnalian games, and on ſome other particular days; and on ten other days in every month thirty, but on all other days only ten.*’ This was a marvellous frugality, and ſuch as put a great conſtraint upon people. What rich nation would now-a-days undergo ſuch a yoke? but paſſing by all moral criticiſms, let us enquire under which Fannius the law Fannia was made; for ſome people think, it was not made under him whom Aulus Gellius mentions.

Glandorp (4), conſidering the diſtinction which Aulus Gellius has obſerved between the ſenate's decree and the law, is perſuaded that the law was made a long time after the ſenate's decree; that is, under the conſulſhip of Caïus Fannius, ſon to our Caïus Fannius Strabo, in the year of Rome 632. But that opinion can never agree with what we read in Pliny, that the law Fannia was made eleven years before the third Punic war. I ſhall quote the whole paſſage, becauſe it contains ſome curious particulars. There you will ſee that the inhabitants of Delos were the firſt that crammed hens, which introduced the cuſtom of eating no fowls but what were crammed. In order to reſtrain that piece of luxury, the law Fannia ordained, that no manner of fowl ſhould be ſerved up at table, except a hen uncrammed. But this law was ſoon after eluded, under pretence that it did not prohibit crammed chickens. ‘ Gallinas ſaginare Deliaci cœpere: unde peſtis exorta opimas aves & ſuopte corpore unctas devorandi. Hoc primum antiquis cœnarum interdictis exceptum invenio jam lege C. Fannii Coſſ. XI. annis ante tertium Punicum bellum, ne quid volucre poneretur præter unam gallinam quæ non eſſet altilis: quod deinde caput tranſlatum per omnes leges ambulavit. Inventumque diverticulum eſt in fraude earum gallinaceos quoque paſcendi lacte madidis cibis: multo ita gratiores approbantur (5).’ Macrobius would furniſh us with very good weapons againſt Glandorp, if his Computations were not ſomewhat intricate. He enumerates, one after another, the laws of the ancient Romans againſt expences in eating, and this is the order he obſerves. The firſt law was made at the requeſt of C. Orchius, tribune of the people; the ſecond, which was the law Fannia, was made twenty two years after the firſt. ‘ Prima omnium de cœnis lex ad populum Orchia pervenit, quam tulit C. Orchius tribunus plebis de ſenatus ſententia, tertio anno quam Cato cenſor fuerat. Cujus verba quia prolixa ſunt prætereo. Summa autem ejus præſcribebat numerum convivarum. Et hæc eſt lex Orchia, de qua Cato in orationibus ſuis vociferabatur, quod plures quam præſcripto ejus cavebatur ad cœnam vocarentur. Cumque auctoritatem novæ legis aucta neceſſitas imploraret: poſt annum viceſimum ſecundum legis Orchiæ Fannia lex lata eſt, anno poſt Romam conditam, ſecundum Gellii opinionem, quingenteſimo octogeſimo octavo (6). —— *The Orchian law was the firſt which was publiſhed concerning entertainments. C. Orchius tribune of the people enacted it with the approbation of the ſenate three years before Cato was cenſor. As it is very tedious I ſhall not tranſcribe it. The principal thing which it regarded was the number of gueſts. This is the Orchian law on which Cato declamed with ſo much warmth; becauſe more were invited than were allowed by that law. And as the exigency ſtill encreaſing called for the authority of a new decree; twenty two years after, the Fannian law was enacted, &c.*’ The firſt was made three years before Cato obtained the cenſorſhip; and therefore the law Fannia was made nineteen years after he was raiſed to that office. Now he was created cenſor in the year 569 of Rome, and ſo the law Fannia muſt have been made in the year 588. This concluſion rightly drawn from Macrobius's Words, joined with the Faſti Conſulares, is agreeable to the text itſelf of Macrobius. ‘ Poſt annum viceſimum ſecundum legis Orchiæ Fannia lex lata eſt anno poſt Romam conditam, ſecundum Gelli opinionem, quingenteſimo octogeſimo octavo (7). —— *Twenty two years after the Orchian law had been enacted, the Fannian law was paſſed, in the year of Rome, according to Gellius, five hundred eighty eight.*’ But here we find this inconveniency, that, according to Aulus Gellius, the law Fannia was made in the 588th year of Rome. Now look as long as you pleaſe in Aulus Gellius, and you will not find there that point of chronology; but only, that after the decree made by the ſenate, under the conſulſhip of C. Fannius, and Valerius Meſſala, the law Fannia was enacted. Macrobius cannot ſay, that, according to Aulus Gellius's opinion, that law was made in the year 588, without ſuppoſing that Aulus Gellius affirms, that the law Fannia was made under the conſulſhip of Fannius and Meſſala, and that that conſulſhip falls in the year 588. But it is certain that Aulus Gellius has neither of thoſe two aſſertions, and that he rather ſpeaks like one that rejects the firſt, than like one that deſigns to maintain it. *Poſt id ſenatuſconſultum lex Fannia lata eſt* (8). I know very well that it cannot be concluded from that Latin, that the ſenate's decree and the law were not made the ſame Year, and this is what I oppoſe to Glandorp's reaſoning: for there is time enough in one year, both for the ſenate to make a decree, and afterwards for the people either to confirm, correct, or amplify by an authentic law, that decree of the ſenate. Aulus Gellius might therefore have expreſſed himſelf as he does, although he had been ſure that the ſenate's decree and the law were made the ſame year; but it is moſt certain that his words do rather lead to another ſenſe, and that therefore Macrobius is not exact, in pretending that Aulus Gellius has placed both the ſenate's decree and the law under the ſame conſulſhip. As for the other aſſertion, Macrobius is yet more to blame: for Aulus Gellius would

(*a*) *He was called* Marcus Pomponius.

(*b*) In the remark [*B*] of the article TITIUS (CAÏUS).

(1) Sueton. de clar. Rhetorib. cap. i.

(2) Aul. Gell. lib. xv, cap. xi.

(3) Idem, lib. ii, cap. xxiv.

(4) Gland. Onomaſtic. p. 333.

(5) Plin. lib. x, cap. l.

(6) Macrob. Saturnal. lib. ii, cap. xiii.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) Aul. Gell. lib. ii, cap. xxiv.

nothing worth mentioning touching Marcus **Fannius**, brother to him who is the ſubject of this article. Thoſe two brothers left each of them a ſon named Caïus, as we ſhall ſee preſently.

would advance a very groſs lye, if he placed the conſulſhip of Fannius and Meſſala under the year 588. Theſe intricacies in Macrobius will not allow us to make uſe of his teſtimony towards a chronological exactneſs; but here are others which will ſuffer it yet leſs.

According to his ſuppoſition, it is moſt certain that the law Fannia was made in the 588th year of Rome; for he places an interval of twenty two years between that law, and that which was called Orchia, and pretends that the later was made three Years before Cato was created Cenſor. Now that office was beſtowed on Cato in the 569th year of Rome (9); and ſo the law Orchia was made in the Year 566, to which number if you add twenty two years, you will come to the 588th year of Rome. It is therefore unneceſſary to correct Macrobius's words (10); for if they are not right, it is the author's fault, and not the tranſcriber's. Father Hardouin, by ſuppoſing that they have adulterated the numbers in Macrobius's text, aſſigns a very probable cauſe of that alteration. ‘Hinc Macrobium emendamus, lib. 2. Saturn. cap. 13. pag 367. apud quem corruptus annorum numerus legitur. *Fannia lex*, inquit, *lata eſt anno poſt Romam conditam, ſecundum Gellii opinionem, quingenteſimo octogeſimo octavo.* Scriptum erat per litterarum compendium, DLXXXXIII. Librarii deinde, ut alias ſæpe advertimus, denarii nota poſtrema in quinarium verſa, DLXXXVIII, perperam reſcripſerunt (11). —— *Hence I correct Macrobius, lib. 2. Saturn. c. 13. p. 365, where the number of years is corrupted.* The Fannian law, *ſays he*, was paſſed in the year of Rome, according to Gellius's opinion, five hundred eighty eight. *It was wrote in numerals DLXXXXIII. The tranſcribers, as I have often obſerved in other places, by changing the laſt X into V corruptly wrote it DLXXXVIII.*’ But that ſuppoſition happens unluckily to be falſe; for if Macrobius had not ſet down the year 588, but either the year 592 or 593, he had confuted himſelf by his own calculations. Turn the thing which way you pleaſe, and you will never find him exact: and if you ſhould maintain, that according to him the law Orchia was enacted three Years after Cato was made cenſor (12), you would but increaſe the confuſion. See the article TITIUS (13), wherein I examine, whether what Macrobius ſays concerning that Man, can any ways back Glandorp's opinion.

(9) *See* Sigonius, in Faſtis.

(10) Pighius, *inſtead of* Quingenteſimo octavo, *would have us read* Quingenteſimo nonageſimo ſecundo. *Father Hardouin would have it* Quingenteſimo nonageſimo tertio. *See the following Quotation.*

(11) Harduinus in Plinium, lib. x, pag. 482, Tom. II.

(12) *One might maintain that the ellipſis of theſe words of Macrobius*, Tertio anno quam Cato Cenſor fuerat, *is not* ante *but* poſt.

(13) *Rem.* [*B*].

FANNIUS (Caïus) ſon of the fore-mentioned, diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his eloquence [*A*]. He was conſul with Cn. Domitius Ænobarbus, in the year of Rome 632, and oppoſed the factious attempts of Caïus Gracchus, tho' he was indebted to him for the conſulſhip (*a*). He publiſhed an oration againſt him, which Cicero has commended [*B*].

(*a*) Plut. in vitâ Gracch.

[*A*] *Diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his eloquence.*] Leſt my reader's fancy ſhould go too far, I muſt acquaint him, that the orator I ſpeak of in this place was never of the firſt rank, but always paſſed for one of the middle claſs. *Fannius in mediocribus oratoribus habitus eſſet* (1); however, the following remark will ſhew you that I might ſpeak of him, as I have done, without hyperbole. Does not Paterculus place him among the moſt famous orators (2)?

[*B*] *He publiſhed againſt C. Gracchus an oration which Cicero has commended.*] Theſe are his words. ‘Horum ætatibus adjuncti duo C. Fannii, Caii & Marci filii fuerunt, quorum Caii filius qui Conſul cum Domitio fuit unam Orationem de ſociis, & nomine Latino contra Gracchum reliquit, ſane & bonam & nobilem (3). —— *Cotemporary with theſe were the two C. Fannius, ſons of Caïus and Marcus; the former, who was conſul with Domitius, has left an oration againſt Gracchus, which is truly good and noble.*’ That oration was thought ſo good by nice judges, that ſome fathered it upon Perſius (4), and others ſaid, that ſeveral men of quality had a hand in it; becauſe they found in it more beauties than they thought could proceed from a mean orator, ſuch as Fannius was accounted to be. Cicero confutes that opinion among other reaſons, by this, that Fannius had always excelled in his language, and had rendered himſelf illuſtrious in his tribuneſhip. ‘Eam ſuſpicionem propter hanc cauſam credo fuiſſe, quod Fannius in mediocribus oratoribus habitus eſſet, oratio autem vel optima eſſet illo quidem tempore orationum omnium: ſed nec ejuſmodi eſt, ut à pluribus confuſa videatur: unus enim ſonus eſt totius orationis, & idem ſtylus, nec de Perſio reticuiſſet Gracchus, quum & Fannius de Menelao Maratheno, & de ceteris objeciſſet, præſertim quum Fannius nunquam ſit habitus elinguis: nam & cauſas defenſitavit, & tribunatus ejus arbitrio & autoritate Publii Africani geſtus, non obſcurus fuit (5). —— *I imagine this ſuſpicion took it's riſe from hence, that Fannius was only eſteemed a ſecond rate orator: but that oration even excelled any of that time. It is not however ſuch as may argue it to be the compoſition of a club; for the periods have all the ſame turn, and the ſame ſtile runs thro' the whole; nor would Gracchus have paſſed Perſius in ſilence, when Fannius had made objections concerning Menelaus Marathenus, and the reſt, eſpecially as Fannius was never accounted a man that wanted elocution, for he pleaded at the bar, and his tribuneſhip, which he obtained by the intereſt of Publius Africanus, was not inglorious.*’ This paſſage acquaints us, that Fannius was of a Plebeian family. Cicero is taxed with beſtowing elſewhere upon Fannius, the ſon of Marcus, the tribuneſhip, which he aſcribes in this place to Fannius, the ſon of Caïus. ‘In præſentia mihi velim ſcribas quibus Censs. C. Fannius M. F. Tribunus pl. fuerit. Videor mihi audiſſe P. Africano, L. Mummio (6). —— *I wiſh you would inform me as ſpeedily as may be, who were* Censors *when C. Fannius, ſon of Marcus, was tribune of the people. If I miſtake not, I have* [illegible] *been told, that P. Africanus, and L. Mummius were.*’ But I do not find that that criticiſm (7) is well grounded; for it is very poſſible that Fannius, the ſon of Marcus, was tribune during the cenſorſhip of Scipio Africanus, and that Fannius, the ſon of Caïus, followed Scipio Africanus's counſels in the diſcharge of his tribuneſhip. Now if theſe two things are very poſſible, why may not we ſay, that Cicero has ſpoken of the one in this place, and of the other in his letters to Atticus? I find more difficulty in the word *cenſoribus*, which has been put inſtead of *conſulibus*, in the paſſage of his letter to Atticus; for as Cicero chiefly wanted to know in what year ſuch and ſuch had been either tribunes of the people, or pretors, *&c* (8), without doubt he enquired under what conſulſhip they had exerciſed thoſe offices. The cenſors were renewed but every fifth Year, and ſo he could not have known the year of a tribuneſhip, if he had only known under what cenſor ſuch or ſuch a man had been tribune of the People.

(1) Cicero in Bruto, cap. xxvi.

(2) Paterc. lib. ii, cap. ix.

(3) Cicero, in Bruto, cap. xxvi.

(4) He was one of the moſt learned men of that age. See the article PERSIUS (Caius).

(5) Cicero, in Bruto, cap. xxvi.

(6) Cicero, epiſt. xiii, ad Attic. lib. xvi.

(7) *It is made by Corradus. Theſe are his words in Brutum Ciceron. pag.* 187. Videbatur Cicero audiviſſe tunc Fannium Tribunum plebis fuiſſe: quanquam libro decimo ſexto ad Atticum de C. Fannio M. F. hoc ipſum ſcribit: ſed quum poſtea nihil infra ſuo loco ea de re dicat, videtur errorem, ſuo Attico fortaſſe monente, cognoviſſe, & hunc pro illo repoſuiſſe.

(8) See the fifth letter of the ſecond book to Atticus.

FANNIUS, (Caïus) ſon to Marcus, and couſin-german to the fore-going, was queſtor in the year of Rome 614, and pretor two years after. He bore arms in Africa under Scipio Africanus the younger (*a*), and in Spain under Fabius Maximus Servilianus (*b*). He was diſciple of Panætius (*c*) a great Philoſopher of the ſect of the Stoics, and married the younger daughter of Lælius. He compoſed annals which were in eſteem

(*a*) Ipſe Fannius apud Plutarch. in vita Gracch. pag. 826. *A.*

(*b*) Appian. in Iberic. pag. m. 476.

(*c*) Cicero, in Bruto, cap. xxvi.

eſteem [*A*]. He reſented his father-in-law Lælius's beſtowing the office of Augur upon Quintus Mutius Scævola his other ſon-in-law; nor would he admit of Lælius's excuſes [*B*]. It will not be amiſs to obſerve, that Cicero having ſaid that Fannius the hiſtorian was ſon-in-law to Lælius, he was confuted by Pomponius Atticus in a demonſtrative manner [*C*], tho' at the ſame time he was not miſtaken. The Reader will ſee, in one ſingle remark, the miſtakes of ſome authors in relation to the Fannii [*D*].

[*A*] *He compoſed annals which were in eſteem.*] Cicero ſpeaks pretty honourably of them (1): 'Ejus omnis in dicendo facultas ex hiſtoria ipſius non inelеganter ſcripta perſpici poteſt, quæ neque nimis eſt infans neque perfecte diſerta. —— *All his skill in oratory may be ſeen in his hiſtory which is not ill wrote, being neither too puerile, nor altogether elaborate.*' Brutus made an abridgment of them, as we learn from one of Cicero's letters to Atticus (2), where we read theſe words. *Conturbat me epitome Bruti Fanniana, an Bruti epitoma Fannianorum.* Voſſius (3) obſerves, that Manutius has ill explained that Latin in his commentary. He thought, ſays he, that that work of Brutus was either a ſhort hiſtory of the Fannian family, or of the memorable actions done by the Fannii. Manutius ſays no ſuch thing in his commentary, but has underſtood the thing rightly. 'In Bruti epitoma Fannianorum, *that is according to him*, quam confecit Brutus annalium Fannianorum, id eſt hiſtoriæ à Fannio conſcriptæ (4) —— *In Brutus's epitome of Fannius*, that is, according to him, *of the annals of Fannius, or the hiſtory which Fannius wrote.*' Inſtead of accuſing Manutius of that fault, it ought to have been laid upon *Corradus* (5). As for the reſt, if Fannius's annals came ſhort of being a maſterpiece of eloquence, they had however an excellence better than a fine ſtile, which was ſincerity; for that is the character Salluſt gives of Fannius. 'Cum aliis Hiſtoriographis ſingula tradidiſſet (Salluſtius) in libro primo hiſtoriarum, Catoni brevitatem, Romani generis diſertiſſimus paucis abſolvit; Fannio vero veritatem (6). —— *Saluſt, in his firſt book of hiſtory, gives each hiſtorian his particular characteriſtic; to Cato brevity, to Fannius's truth.*'

[*B*] *Nor would he admit of Lælius's excuſes.*] He had married Lælius's younger daughter: the elder was married to Scævola. But Scævola being younger than Fannius, the latter pretended that his birthright ought to incline Lælius to prefer him before the other in the diſpoſal of the augurſhip. Lælius excuſed himſelf, by ſaying, that he had not preferred the younger of his ſons-in-law to the elder, but the elder of his daughters to the younger: but Fannius would not be ſatisfied with that diſtinction. 'Is ſocerum quia cooptatus in Augurum collegium non erat, non admodum diligebat, præſertim cum ille Q. Scævolam ſibi minorem natu generum prætuliſſet, cui tamen Lælius ſe excuſans non genero minori dixit ſe illud, ſed majori filiæ detuliſſe (7).' This paſſage of Cicero does not altogether agree with his dialogue of friendſhip, wherein he introduces Fannius ſpeaking to his father-in-law, as if he was very well pleaſed with him, and as being his colleague in his dignity of augur.

[*C*] *Cicero ..... was confuted in a demonſtrative manner.*] I do but tranſlate Cicero's words, *Sed tu me* γεωμετρικῶς *refelleras* (8). I am miſtaken if there be not ſome irony in it. Cicero would inſinuate to his friend, who was a man conſummate in the knowledge of families, that we ought not always to truſt our memory; and that we may ſometimes take for invincible reaſons, what at bottom is but a meer illuſion. You proved geometrically to me, that I had falſly advanced that Fannius was ſon-in-law to Lælius. This I had from Hortenſius, who is very credible in thoſe things; however, I was fain to yield to your geometrical proofs: But here is Brutus, who confutes you in the abridgment he has made of Fannius's hiſtory; get you out of that plunge as well as you can. 'Scripſi quod erat in extremo: idque ego ſecutus hunc Fannium qui ſcripſit hiſtoriam, generum eſſe ſcripſeram Lælii: ſed tu me γεωμετρικῶς refelleras: te autem nunc Brutus & Fannius. Ego tamen de bono auctore Hortenſio ſic acceperam, ut apud Brutum eſt. Hunc igitur locum expedies (9).' Thus Cicero ſpeaks to his friend Atticus. It is viſible he is upon the jeering ſtrain, when he gives the name of geometrical demonſtrations, to the pretended reaſons of Atticus. Note, that Cicero's words prove, 1. that Fannius had ſaid in his hiſtory, that he was ſon-in-law to Lælius. 2. That Cicero learned only, from the abridgment of that hiſtory publiſhed by Brutus, that Fannius had ſaid ſuch a thing; for if he had known it otherwiſe, he would not have alledged, as his only proof, the ſingle authority of Hortenſius. If Mezerai had ſaid in his hiſtory, that he had married the daughter of ſuch one, thoſe who ſhould mention that marriage, and ſhould remember what the hiſtorian had ſaid about it, would not quote an hear-ſay; or if they did, they would deſerve to be laughed at.

[*D*] *See the miſtakes of ſome authors in relation to the Fannii.*] Let us begin with Mr Lloyd. I. He places in the 508th year of Rome, the paſſing of the law Fannia, and quotes the fourteenth chapter of the ſecond book of Aulus Gellius, inſtead of quoting the twenty fourth. He alſo quotes the ſeventeenth chapter of the third book of Macrobius's Saturnalia, inſtead of quoting the twelfth chapter of the ſecond Book. II. He ſays, that Caïus Fannius, ſon to Marcus, and ſon-in-law to Lælius, was more famous than Fannius his couſin, both by his morals and his eloquence, *moribus & ipſo dicendi genere clarior.* That is a notorious falſhood; for Cicero, to whom he refers us, is very far from ſaying any ſuch thing (10). III. As for the poet Fannius, he ſays, that his poems were carried with his image into the temple of Apollo and the Muſes, or into ſome other library: which fault he has copied from Voſſius (11). IV. He applies to Fannius Cepio an epigram of Martial (12), which he does not tranſcribe right; for he ſays,

Hoſtem cum peteret (13) *ſe Fannius ipſe peremit,*
Hic rogo non furor eſt ne moriare mori?

Theſe two verſes have no manner of ſenſe. The word *peteret*, put inſtead of *fugeret*, blunts the point of the epigram; and if you leave *fugeret* in it, it will not hit upon Fannius Cepio, the head in a conſpiracy againſt Auguſtus. I do not quote Macrobius (14), who relates the great fidelity of one of that Fannius's ſlaves towards his maſter, and who acquaints us, that Fannius ſhunned death with all the caution imaginable: I do not quote, I ſay, Macrobius, who does not ſay, that Fannius was at laſt weary of ſhunning death; but I quote Dion, who ſays poſitively that Fannius was killed (15), and betrayed by one of his ſervants (16). Is not this a proof that he did not kill himſelf. Let us paſs on to Mr Hofman. He has committed the four faults of Lloyd, and ſome of thoſe of Moreri. He has quoted the ninth letter of the fifth book of Pliny, which has no reference to any of the Fannii. He ſays, that Fannius Strabo was twice conſul; firſt with Valerius Meſſala, and then with Domitius Ænobarbus. He adds, that the law Fannia was made under the firſt conſulſhip of Fannius; and refers us, for that matter, to his article Fannia, where we find that that law was made in the year 508. He therefore places the firſt conſulſhip of Fannius Strabo, in the year 508, whereas it ought to have been placed in the year 592 or 593. Before he ſpoke of Fannius Strabo, he had made an article of Caïus Fannius, conſul with Domitius; and ſo of one man he has made two.

(1) In Bruto, cap. xxvi.

(2) The fifth of the twelfth book.

(3) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. p. 28.

(4) *See* Grævius's *edition, Tom. II, pag.* 75, 76, *of* Manutius's *Commentary.*

(5) *See* Grævius's *edition, Tom. II, pag.* 296, *col.* 1.

(6) Marius Victorinus in primum Ciceronis de Inventione apud Voſſium de Hiſt. Lat. pag. 28, 29.

(7) Cicero, in Bruto, cap. xxvi.

(8) Idem, Epiſt. *V*, ad Atticum, lib. xii.

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) *He ſays,* Moribus & ipſo genere dicendi durior. *Idem, in Bruto, pag.* 185.

(11) See, above, the faults of Moreri, remark [*A*] of the article *FANNIUS*, (the Family) num. 5.

(12) *It is the* 80*th of the* 2*d book.*

(13) *There ſhould have been* fugeret.

(14) Saturn. lib. i, cap. xi.

(15) Καὶ (οὐ γὰρ ὑπέμειναν τὸ δικαςήριον) ἐρήμην μὲν ὡς καὶ φευξόμενοι ἥλωσαν, ἀπεσφάγησαν δὲ οὐ πολλῷ ὕςερον. Hi quum die dicta in judicio non comparuiſſent, abſentes exilio damnati ſunt & paulo poſt necati. *Dio, lib.* 54, *pag. m.* 508, *ad ann.* 732.

(16) Τινὰ δὲ ἕτερον (τῶν δούλων) τὸν προδόντα αὐτόν. Alterum (*ſervorum*) qui herum prodidiſſet. *Id. ibid.*

FANNIUS QUADRATUS, a Latin poet, whoſe poems, though ridiculous, were placed, with his picture, in the library which Auguſtus had erected [*A*]. Horace, cotemporary

[*A*] *His poems ...... were placed in the library which Auguſtus had erected.*] It was in the temple of Apollo Palatinus. See what Horace ſays of Fannius:

- - - - - beatus Fannius ultro
Delatis capſis & imagine: quum mea nemo
Scripta legat, vulgo recitare timentis (1).

Mr Dacier

(1) Horat. Sat iv, lib. i, ver. 21.

cotemporary of that Fannius, has ſpoken of him with much contempt, and has reflected on him as a paraſite (*a*). That is the common character of bad poets.

(*a*) Aut crucier quod Vellicet ab ſentem Demetrius, aut quod ineptus Fannius Hermogenis lædat conviva Tigelli. *Horat. Sat. x, lib. i, ver.* 78.

Mr Dacier underſtands theſe words in the following manner: ‘ That Fannius, *ſays he*, though a bad poet, ‘ made a ſhift, by his intrigues, and by a ſort of cabal ‘ he had raiſed by reading his poems in all places, and ‘ to all comers, to get leave, againſt all manner of ‘ juſtice, that he himſelf ſhould be permitted to carry ‘ both his compoſures and his picture into the library ‘ which Auguſtus had dedicated: and this is what Horace ridicules very wittily .... Fannius, by making ‘ daily aſſemblies where he read his works, had got ‘ a vaſt number of admirers, who cried up his verſes, ‘ and diſperſed copies of them every where; whereas ‘ the verſes of Horace, who would be indebted ‘ to no body but himſelf for his reputation, and who ‘ communicated them but very ſeldom, to very few ‘ people, were almoſt unknown, and did not make a ‘ quarter part of the noiſe the fooliſh works of Fannius ‘ did: for at that time, as well as now-adays, faction often prevailed over merit. This is the true ſenſe of that ‘ paſſage, which has not been well underſtood: for what ‘ Acron ſays, that the ſenate had done that honour to ‘ Fannius, to be rid of his importunities; or that ſome ‘ people that hankered after the eſtate of Fannius, who ‘ was childleſs, in order to curry favour with him, and ‘ become his heirs, had carried his writings and his ‘ picture into the public library; all that, I ſay, is a ‘ meer fancy, which has no manner of ground. I put in the margin (2) the words of the old interpreter, which Mr Dacier condemns. I have ſaid ſomewhere (3), that ſatires want to be commented upon, either by the author himſelf, or by ſome cotemporary writer. Here is a paſſage of Horace which confirms my opinion. We know not the true meaning of it, we only gueſs at it; and how happy ſoever our conjectures be, there are ſtill ſome doubts behind. We ſhould not be at that loſs if Horace had commented upon his own ſatires, or if ſome writer of Auguſtus's age had writ commentaries upon them: but becauſe one of the perfections of that kind of compoſures conſiſts in a thouſand ſtrokes of raillery, expreſſed by obſcure hints, and which allude to ſome adventures not known to every body, I believe a ſatirical author does not much care for commentaries. The modern Theophraſtus (4) was not pleaſed, to ſee that people made him enemies by applying his characters to ſuch and ſuch perſons.

(2) Fannius Quadratus Poëta loquaciſſimus & ineptiſſimus fuit, cui ſenatus audiendi faſtidio ultro capſas & imaginem obtulit, ut libros ſuos mitteret, & in auctoritatem reciperetur tanquam optimus Poëta: vel, ut alii referunt, Fannius Poëta malus cum liberos non haberet, hæredipetæ ſine ejus cura & ſtudio libros ejus & imaginem in publicas bibliothecas referebant, nullo tamen merito ſcriptoris.

(3) See, above, remark [*A*] of the article ABELLY; and remark [*C*] of D'ASSOUCI, at the end.

(4) La Bruyere.

FANNIUS (CAÏUS), a Latin author, who lived in Trajan's time, and had a great ſhare in the eſteem and friendſhip of Pliny the younger. Though he was buſy in pleading cauſes, yet he found time to make a collection of Nero's cruelties; that is, he compoſed the laſt dying words of thoſe whom that wicked prince had either put to death, or baniſhed. He had publiſhed three very exact and polite books upon that ſubject [*A*]; and he beſtowed the more pains upon the ſequel, becauſe he ſaw that the firſt parts were read with applauſe: but death prevented the finiſhing of that work. He had himſelf a fore-ſight, occaſioned by a certain dream, that he ſhould die before the publiſhing of the fourth book (*a*).

(*a*) Taken from Pliny the younger, *Epiſt. v, lib. v.*

[*A*] *He had publiſhed three very exact and polite books upon that ſubject.*] Nothing was more proper than a work of that nature, to render the memory of Nero odious: for it was a kind of martyrology; and it is well known, that ſatires, though moſt nicely written, do much leſs prejudice to a tyrant than a martyrology unskillfully compiled. The laſt dying words of the perſecuted recommend them by two powerful reaſons: the one is, the miſerable condition to which they are generally reduced; and the other, the patience and fine diſcourſes that uſually accompany their conflicts, at leaſt in relations: which make us forget thoſe paſſages of their lives which might hinder the effects of compaſſion and veneration. Judge you what coals of fire all theſe things heap upon the head of the perſecutor and tyrant: and I leave you to think, whether that work of Fannius was not very proper to make Nero's memory deteſted; for it contained the laſt dying words of a great many illuſtrious perſecuted perſons, written with great clearneſs. Let us hear Pliny ſpeak: ‘ Pulcherrimum opus ‘ imperfectum reliquit. Quamvis enim agendis cauſſis ‘ diſtringeretur, ſcribebat tamen exitus occiſorum aut ‘ relegatorum à Nerone: & jam tres libros abſolverat, ‘ ſubtiles, & diligentes, & Latinos, atque inter ſermonem hiſtoriamque medios. Ac tanto magis reliquos ‘ perficere cupiebat, quanto frequentius hi lectitabantur (1). —— *He left a moſt beautiful work imperfect. For though he was engaged to attend almoſt ‘ conſtantly at the bar, yet he wrote the laſt words of ‘ thoſe who were either put to death, or baniſhed by ‘ Nero, and had already finiſhed three books, wrote ‘ with the greateſt art, elegance, and purity, keeping ‘ a mean between hiſtory and familiar ſtile. He was ſo ‘ much the more deſirous to have compleated the reſt, ‘ as he found that thoſe which he had done were greatly ‘ admired.*’

(1) Plin. Epiſt. v, lib. v.

FAREL (WILLIAM), one of the moſt eminent miniſters of the reformed church, was ſon of a gentleman of Dauphiné, and was born at Gap, in the year 1489 (*a*). He ſtudied at Paris with great ſucceſs: he learnt there philoſophy (*b*), the Greek and Hebrew languages (*c*), and was ſome time a teacher in the college of cardinal le Moine (*d*). James Faber Stapulenſis procured him that employment (*e*), and, as I believe, alſo the invitation which William Briçonnet, biſhop of Meaux, ſent to him. That biſhop was a little inclined to the reformation, and upon that account he invited into his dioceſe, ſome perſons who had reliſhed the new opinions. Farel, among the reſt, was called to preach to them there in 1521 (*f*). The perſecution which was begun at Meaux, in the year 1523, againſt thoſe they called heretics, *obliged him to provide for his ſafety elſewhere than in* France (*g*): whereupon he retired to Straſburg [*A*], where he received the *hand of fellowſhip* from Bucer and Capito (*h*), as he did afterwards from Zuinglius at

(*a*) Ancillon vie de Guillaume Farel, pag. 1.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. 10.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 18, & 28.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 29.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 110, & 193.

(*g*) Ibid. pag. 110.

(*h*) Ibid. pag. 197.

[*A*] *He retired to Straſburgh.*] I thought I ought to follow the account of a man (1) who tells us he has *Farel's Diary in his poſſeſſion.* I have therefore ſaid, upon the faith of this voucher, that our William, flying from Meaux, retreated to Strasburg; but I ought not to conceal, that another miniſter (2), who to me ſeems to have written after good memoirs, relates the thing a little otherwiſe. He ſays, that Farel, being conſtrained to quit Meaux, went to Gap, and endeavoured to ſet up the Reformation there; which deſign had no ſucceſs, and did but expoſe him to the hatred and ill offices of his countrymen. Thereupon he retired to Baſil, where he publickly defended a theſis; which having expoſed him to great dangers, he retired to Strasburg, where he was received with open arms by Bucer and Capito, and where he preached the truth to the refugees from France, till, in the year 1527, he removed to Montbeliard in order to promote the reformation (3). This laſt aſſertion is very falſe; for we ſhall ſhew preſently, that Farel preached the goſpel in the country of Montbeliard in 1524.

(1) Ancillon, miniſter of Metz before the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and ſince of Berlin. See his life of Farel, publiſhed at Amſterdam, in 1691, pag. 202.

(2) Frederic Spanheim.

(3) Taken out of the oration of Frederic Spanheim, intituled, *Geneva reſtituta*, pag 39, 40.

at Zurich, from Haller at Berne, and from Oecolampadius at Baſil (*i*) [*B*]. Being found very proper to gain proſelytes, he was adviſed to undertake the reformation of Montbeliard; in which enterprize he had very great ſucceſs, through the favour of the duke of Wirtemberg, the lord of that place (*k*). He abated ſomewhat of his zeal, according to Oecolampadius's advice [*C*]. He had the like ſucceſs in the year 1528, in

[*B*] *He received the hand of fellowſhip . . . . . from Oecolampadius at Baſil.*] I add the name of that city to the account of my author, becauſe that omiſſion is illuſory, and ſeems to intimate that Oecolampadius was miniſter of Bern. Theſe are Mr Ancillon's words: 'In 'the year 1524 Zuinglius, the burning and ſhining 'candle at Zurich: Haller, the veſſel of election at 'Bern; Oecolampadius, the lamp of the houſe of 'GOD, embraced Farel (4).' I find in his narrative another omiſſion of more conſequence; for he ſays nothing of a famous diſpute which Farel maintained at Baſil in the year 1524. I know very well that he has mentioned it in another place (5); but beſides that he has not rightly ſet down the time of it (6), he has not mentioned it in the right place, that is, when he related (7) hiſtorically, and according to the order of chronology, all the labours of Farel. Let us therefore ſupply what he has omitted. Farel being arrived at Baſil, in the year 1524, addreſſed himſelf to the faculty of divinity, to whom he declared, he deſired to defend a theſis publickly. The divines of Baſil, particularly Lewis Berus, provoſt of St Peter, refuſed him their permiſſion for it, under pretence that his poſitions were agreeable to the new doctrine. The ſenate having notice of that refuſal, gave leave to Farel to maintain his aſſertions; which Farel cauſed to be poſted up at the gate of the college. The grand vicar, the rector of the univerſity, and the profeſſors, publiſhed a prohibition to be preſent at that diſputation, under pain of excommunication: which the ſenate looking upon as a manifeſt encroachment upon their authority, ordered all divines, curates, and ſcholars, to aſſiſt at that diſputation, upon the forfeiture of the uſe of mills and ovens, and of the liberty of buying their neceſſaries in the market (8). By that means Farel had all the advantage he could have wiſhed, and defended his theſis in the preſence of an infinite number of perſons, both eccleſiaſtics and laics, on the fifteenth of February 1524: but nevertheleſs the popiſh faction was ſo prevalent, that he was ſoon after obliged to quit Baſil (9).

[*C*] *He abated ſomewhat of his zeal, according to Oecolampadius's advice.*] Theſe are Mr Ancillon's words: 'Farel, according to the caution given him 'by Oecolampadius, moderated his ardour, managed 'his zeal, and proportioned it to the temper of his 'hearers, whom he drew all to the communion of 'JESUS CHRIST (10).' This relates to Montbeliard. Others ſay, that having ſhewed too much paſſion in thoſe parts, he was adviſed by Oecolampadius to join prudence with zeal in another place, whither he went to preach the goſpel. 'Baſilea exactus in *monte Bel*'*licardi* Evangelium Chriſti aliquandiu docuit: poſt & 'in aliis Gallici idiomatis peritis viciniſque locis: tanta 'animi contentione tantoque ardore, ut divinitus illum 'ad munus ejuſmodi excitatum res demonſtraret: 'quanquam alicubi moderationem in eo quidam de'ſiderarint, ut dicemus. Circa annum *viceſimum ſep*'*timum* iterum annunciandi verbi locum invenit, in 'quodam oppido, cui *Ælin* nomen: ubi ut fortiter '& prudenter ageret, Oecolampadius ſubmonuit †. '—— *Being obliged to quit Baſil, he preached the* '*goſpel for ſome time at Montbeliard, and after that in* '*other places which lay near France, whoſe Inhabi*'*tants ſpoke French, where he behaved himſelf* '*with ſuch zeal and reſolution, that he appeared to* '*have been commiſſioned by heaven for that purpoſe:* '*though ſome, as I ſhall hereafter obſerve, complained* '*of his want of moderation. About the year twenty* '*ſeven he found another place to preach the goſpel in,* '*namely a town named Ælis, where Oecolampadius* '*adviſed him to mix prudence with his zeal.*' The author, from whom I borrowed this Latin, recites (12) the words which Oecolampadius made uſe of when he exhorted his friend not to be ſo violent. 'Ita Oeco'lampadius alicubi ǂ: *Qui hic tibi & evangelio favent,* '*ne quid ardore zeli inter initia attentes, timent. De* '*quo ſatis monui antè, quàm abires: nunc non item.* '*Neque enim excidiſſe animo crediderim, quomodo in*'*ter nos convenerit: nempe ut quantò propenſior es ad* '*violentiam, tantò magis te ad lenitatem exerceas;* '*leoninamque magnanimitatem columbina modeſtia fran*'*gas, Duci, non trahi, volunt homines. Unum ſpecte*'*mus; quomodo lucrifaciamus animas Chriſto: & quo*'*modo ipſi doceri vellemus, ſiquidem adhuc teneremur* '*in tenebris & captivitate Antichriſti. Vide ut Chri*'*ſtum etiam vita exprimas, exemplo inquam docendi.* 'Et alibi ‡ apertius: *Rogavi ex N. ſuper manſuetudine* '*tua: qua nihil magis Chriſtianum, nedum Apoſtolum* '*decet. Is cum mire extuliſſet ſedulitatem infatiga*'*bilem, ardoremque inextinguibilem, & ſatis felicem* '*ſucceſſum, ſubdidit, quod in ſacrificos imbres effundas* '*convitiorum. Non ignoro, quid illi mereantur, &* '*quibus coloribus depingi debeant: pace tamen tua* '*dixerim, amicus & frater fatri: non videris per om*'*nia officii tui reminiſci. Evangelizatum, non male*'*dictum miſſus es. Condono, imo laudo zelum: modo* '*ne deſideretur manſuetudo. Da operam, mi frater, ut* '*ſpiritum meum exhilares etiam hoc nuncio: quod in* '*tempore ſuo vinum & oleum infundas: quod Evange*'*liſtam, non tyrannicum legiſlatorem præſtes.*' —— '*Thus Oecolampadius in one of his letters:* Thoſe here 'who wiſh well to you and the goſpel, are under 'ſome apprehenſions leaſt your zeal ſhould, at your 'ſetting out, tranſport you too far; on which head 'I gave you my advice in full before your departure; 'and for that reaſon ſhall be as brief as poſſible. For 'I can by no means imagine you ſhould have forgot 'our agreement: that the more prone you are to paſ'ſion, the more you ſhould compoſe yourſelf to mild'neſs, and temper the lion's courage with the meek'neſs of the dove. Men may be lead, but will not 'be driven by force. Let us have this only in view, 'how to win ſouls to CHRIST, and how we ourſelves 'ſhould chuſe to be inſtructed, if we were ſtill in dark'neſs and ſlaves to Antichriſt. Let your converſation 'and method of doctrine be an imitation of CHRIST. '*And in another of his epiſtles more openly:* I enquired 'of N. concerning your meekneſs, than which nothing 'is more becoming to a chriſtian or an apoſtle. He 'wonderfully extolled your unwearied induſtry, your 'boundleſs zeal, and happy ſucceſs, but added that 'you were apt to pour an inundation of the bittereſt 'expreſſions on the prieſts. I am not ignorant what 'they deſerve, and in what colours they ought to be 'expoſed: but give me leave, as a friend, and as a 'brother to a brother, to ſay, you do not ſeem in 'every reſpect to remember your duty: you were ſent 'to preach and not to rail. I excuſe, nay I commend 'your zeal, ſo that it be not without meekneſs. En'deavour, my brother, that this advice may have it's 'deſired effect, and I have reaſon to rejoice that I 'gave it. Pour on wine and oil in due ſeaſon, and 'demean yourſelf as an evangeliſt, and not as tyran'nical legiſlator.'

Here follows an inſtance of his too paſſionate zeal: upon a proceſſion-day Farel wreſted from the hands of a prieſt the image of St Antony, and threw it from the bridge into the river. He would have been knocked down dead, if GOD had not prevented it by ſtriking a panic terror among the populace. It is thus, at leaſt, a miniſter I quote ſaves Farel: 'Cum vero 'Farellus noſter aliquando, publica occaſione gloriæ 'divinæ aſſerendæ oblata, Antonii idolum, magna cum 'pompa per urbem circumgeſtatum, ſacrificulorum 'manibus excuſſum in ſubjectum flumen è ponte 'præcipitaſſet, Pentheus alter haud dubiè futurus erat, 'ni mira Dei providentia furibundæ plebis ora & manus 'injecto terrore panico præter ſpem compeſcuiſſet (13).' Eraſmus very much diſapproved Farel's humour: 'Ha'betis iſthic in propinquo, *ſays he, in a letter to the* '*official of Beſançon,* novum evangeliſtam Pharellum, 'quo nihil vidi unquam mendacius virulentius aut ſedi'tioſius (14). —— *You have, in your neighbourhood, a new* '*evangeliſt, one Farel, a moſt virulent, defamatory, and* '*ſeditious perſon.*' He makes a hideous picture of him in another place; but we muſt remember, that he thought himſelf injured in ſome writings of Farel: 'Supereſt Pharellus, bone Chriſte, quam pius, quam 'innocens vir! In quem quid ſcripſerim non referunt.

'Si

(*i*) Ibid.

(*k*) Ib. pag. 204.

(4) Ancillon, ubi ſupra, pag. 197, 198.

(5) In the 43d page, where the buſineſs is not to relate the labours of that miniſter in a chronological order.

(6) He has placed it on the 15th of Febr. 1520.

(7) In the 13th chapter, pag. 191, & *ſeq.*

(8) Secus facturis uſu molendinorum furnorum & mercatus interdicit. *Melch. Adam. in Theol. exter. pag.* 114.

(9) *Taken from Melch. Adam,* ubi ſupra, pag. 113, 114.

(10) Ancillon, ubi ſupra, pag. 204.

(11) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra, pag. 114.

† In Epiſt. lib. iv.

(12) Id. ibid. pag. 115, 116.

ǂ Lib. iv, Epiſt. pag. 916.

‡ Lib. iv, Epiſt. pag. 956.

(13) Fredericus Spanhemius, in Geneva reſtituta, pag. 40, 41.

(14) *Eraſm. Epiſt. xxx, lib. xviii, pag.* 791. It is dated the 29th of Decemb. 1524. From whence it appears that Farel went that year into the country of Montbeliard. See alſo the 14th letter of the 30th book; but correct the date of it, putting 1525, inſtead of 1515.

in the town of Aigle, and ſoon after in the bailiwic of Morat (*l*) [*D*]. He went afterwards to Neufchatel, in the year 1529, and there combated the Romiſh party with ſo much vigour and efficacy, that this city eſtabliſhed the reformed religion the fourth of November, 1530 (*m*). He was (*n*) deputed to the ſynod of the Vaudois, in the valley of Angrogne, and came afterwards to Geneva, where he diſputed againſt Popery; but the great vicar, and other eccleſiaſtics, oppoſed him with ſo much violence, that he was forced to retreat from thence. He was recalled thither in the year 1534, by the inhabitants, who had renounced the Romiſh church, and was the principal inſtrument of the entire ſuppreſſion of Popery, which happened in that city the next year. He was baniſhed from thence, with Calvin, in the year 1538 (*o*), and retired to Baſil, and afterwards to Neufchatel (*p*), where he exerciſed his miniſtry till 1542; at which time he went to Mentz (*q*), where there was a hopeful appearance of a ſpiritual harveſt.

Si nunc eſt converſus ad meliorem frugem, gratulor homini. Qualis olim erat, mihi valde diſplicuit, ſeditioſus, acidæ linguæ, & vaniſſimus. Sic rem geſſit in monte Pellicardi ut bis inde profugerit. Baſilienſis ſenatus, quum cuperet civitatem eſſe tutam à ſeditione, juſſit Pharellum ire exulatum. Oecolampadius cujus menſâ tum utebatur non ſemel objurgavit hominem, quòd obtrectandi nullum faceret finem, teſtatus ſe non poſſe ferre in convivio tam amarulentas obtrectationes. Id mihi narravit qui in eadem menſa accumbebat, vir integritatis rariſſimæ. Appellarat me Balaam, hac de cauſa cum illo expoſtulanti, nihil certi reſpondit, ſed ſic elapſus eſt, ut diceret negotiatorem quendam Dupletum hoc dixiſſe, is enim jam abierat; & fieri poteſt ut dixerit, ſed à Pharello doctus. De colloquio noſtro ſcripſit epiſtolam ad fratres Conſtantiam, in qua ſæpe in decem verſibus non erat unum verbum verum. Omitto jam leviora. Talem expertus, ſi talem depinxi, nihil mirum. Nunc qualis ſit neſcio (15). —— *There remains ſtill one Farel, O heavens, how religious and innocent a perſon is he! They do not ſay what I have wrote againſt him. I ſhould be well pleaſed to hear of his reformation. As he was formerly I could by no means admire him, conceited, virulent, and ſeditious. He behaved himſelf at Montbeliard in ſuch a manner that he was twice obliged to quit the town. The magiſtrates of Baſil, to prevent ſedition, expelled him the city. Oecolampadius, at whoſe table he was then fed, more than once reprimanded him for his endleſs inſolence, declaring he could no longer bear ſuch ill manners in his company. This I know from a perſon of uncommon integrity, who ſat with him. He had called me Balaam. When I expoſtulated with him on this head, inſtead of giving an anſwer he had recourſe to a mean ſubterfuge, and ſaid he had it from one Duplet, a correſpondent of his, who was dead. It is poſſible he might have ſaid it, but he had it from Farel. He wrote an epiſtle concerning our conference, in ſeveral parts of which there was not one word of truth for ten ſentences together. I paſs over things of leſs moment. It is no wonder I ſhould repreſent him ſuch as I found him. What he may be now, I know not.*' Since Eraſmus was perſonally offended, we are not obliged to believe, that he has here drawn Farel's character to the life: but, however, we may reſt perſuaded, that our Farel was one of thoſe who have more need of the bridle than the ſpur. The natural temper is almoſt always the firſt and principal ſpring, even in perſons who are God's inſtruments. Some pretend, that it was neceſſary for Luther, Calvin, Farel, and ſome others, to be hot, paſſionate, and violent; elſe, ſay they, they could not have overcome all oppoſition. The church was then in the ſame circumſtances, as when Jesus Christ ſaid, *The kingdom of heaven ſuffers violence, and the violent take it by force* (16). See Mr Claude's thought, in remark [*T*], of the article LUTHER.

[*D*] *He ſucceeded . . . . . in the town of Aigle, and ſoon after in the bailiwic of Morat.*] According to Mr Ancillon, he did not go to Neufchatel till after he had reformed the town of Aigle and the bailiwic of Morat; but Mr Spanheim, the father, makes him go from Montbeliard to Neufchatel, and then to Aigle, *&c.* His narrative is curious enough, to deſerve being cited at length: the reader will find in it the undauntedneſs of the reformer, and with what vigour he ſurmounted the oppoſition of the prieſts, who cauſed the bells to be rung to drown his voice: they alſo practiſed the wile of which Ulyſſes made uſe, to prevent the ill effects of the ſyrens ſongs; that is, they ſtopped their ears with flakes of ſilk. This is what they oppoſed to Farel's thundering eloquence; tho' at laſt they hearkened to reaſon, and heard him favourably. 'Inde, *that is, from Montbeliard*, Neocomum delatus Farellus, ſed & ibi duriter habitus Aquileiam Bernatum oppidum Valeſiis conterminum incolere cœpit, & ludum aperire erudiendæ juventuti in ſpeciem, revera docendæ veritati. Turbatum hic etiam à ſacrificulis, & Farello quærenda ſedes alia. Delecta Moratum, Helveticæ gentis fortitudine & victoria nobile municipium. Sed nec ibi Farello noſtro quies. Extruſus itaque in agrum Biellenſem divina providentia totum illum tractum ingenti ſucceſſu Evangelii prædicatione implevit, eumque inter ludibria, verbera, & contumelias innumeras, Diaboli & Cleri ingratiis, Chriſto vindicavit. Acceſſêre mox Orba & Granſonium, quicquid fremeret Satan, quicquid ſacrificuli in Farelli & evangelii perniciem molirentur. Imperterritus hominis animus omnes in ſtuporem dabat, cùm viderent animum ſimul ac vocem illi ad ſtrictos enſes conſtare, adeò quidem, ut & illi ex clero, qui continuo campanarum clangore, & aura bombycina lanugine oppleta, conciones ejus eludere diu ſategerant, poſtmodùm patulas aures & faventes animos ad Farelli auditorium adferrent (17). —— *From thence*, namely, from Montbeliard, *Farel came to Neufchatel, but meeting there with a rough reception, he removed to Aigle, a town of the canton of Bern, bordering on the Valois, and opened a ſchool, under a pretence of inſtructing the youth, but in reality to teach the goſpel. But here he was moleſted by the prieſts, and obliged to move his quarters. He choſe Morat, a town famous for the battle won there by the bravery of the Swiſſes. But neither could Farel there be at quiet; being driven therefore to the diſtrict of Biel, by the providence of GOD he entirely converted it, and notwithſtanding the difficulties he met with, and the ſeverities which were practiſed to deter him, he baffled all the arts of the devil, and the prieſts, and eſtabliſhed the reformed religion. Orbe and Granſon ſoon followed. Farel's undaunted courage deſpiſed the roarings of ſatan, and the attempts of the prieſts. At laſt when they ſaw his heroic ſoul was proof even againſt drawn ſwords, terror and amazement ſeized them to that degree, that the very clergy, who by continual ringing of bells, and ſtopping their ears with ſilk, had endeavoured to fruſtrate his preaching, came afterwards to hear him, with open ears, and more favourable ſentiments.*' You do not find Lauſanne in this catalogue of the towns wherein Farel planted the reformation; though he planted it at Lauſanne alſo, if we may believe Theodore Beza (18), and the inſcription of his picture. Note, I beſeech you, that, during the firſt ſermon he preached at Metz, the Dominicans had recourſe to their bells, as a ſovereign remedy; but their peals were not able to interrupt the zealous preacher. He contended with the bells who ſhould beſt be heard, nor did he ſuffer himſelf to be overcome. 'Primam concionem in cœmeterio Dominicanorum habuit. Qui cùm aliud non poſſent, campani æris impulſu impedire concionem conati ſunt. Ibi tum Farellus contra ad ravim uſque vocem intendit: nec vinci ſe à ſtrepitu ullo paſſus eſt (19). —— *He preached his firſt ſermon in the church-yard of the Dominicans, where, when all other attempts had proved ineffectual, they endeavoured to hinder him from proceeding by ringing of bells. Then Farel ſtrained his voice, till he was hoarſe, being reſolved to vanquiſh.*' His voice was like thunder; and it may be applied to him what Frederic Spanheim has ſaid of a monk who preached againſt Lutheraniſm. 'Dominicanæ familiæ Monachus, qui pro concione in Palatii cœnobio ſtentoreâ declamatione Cornua quæ vin-

catque

(*l*) Ibid. pag. 206, 207.

(*m*) Ibid. pag. 207, 209.

(*n*) Spanheim. in Geneva reſtituta. pag. 42, 43.

(*o*) Beza, in vitâ Calvini.

(*p*) Ancillon, ubi ſupra, pag. 170.

(*q*) Ancillon, pag. 210.

(15) Eraſm. in epiſtola ad fratres Germaniæ inferioris, pag. 2128, 2129. *It is the 59th of the 31ſt book, and was written in* 1530. I have corrected ſome faults in the London edition. Compare what I ſhall quote from Eraſmus in the remark [*L*].

(16) Matth xi, 12.

(17) Spanheim. ubi ſupra, pag. 41, 42.

(18) Beza, in Iconibus.

(19) *Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra, pag.* 114. See a letter from Bucer to Calvin. It is the 37th among thoſe of Calvin, dated Octob. 6, 1541; which date does not agree with Theod. Beza's Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. xvi, p. 433, who places Farel's journey in 1542.

harveſt. Some months before, he had received a great affront at Neufchatel, for which he had ſuch ſatisfaction made him [*E*], that it cannot be ſaid he was forced to go to Metz. He had a thouſand difficulties to ſtruggle with in that new-born church, and was forced to retire, with the faithful, into the abbey of Gorze (*r*) [*F*], where the count of Furſtemberg ſheltered them under his protection; but they could not be ſecure there; they were beſieged, and forced, at laſt, to ſurrender upon terms (*ſ*). Farel happily made his eſcape [*G*], and endeavoured to procure their reſtoration by the means of the proteſtant princes, and ſtates of Germany (*t*). He went and reſumed his ancient poſt of miniſter of Neufchatel, from whence ſometimes he took a journey to Geneva. In the journey he made thither, in the year 1553, he was informed that he was very odious to ſome perſons in that City [*H*]. He aſſiſted then at the execution

of

(*r*) Ib. pag. 211.

(*ſ*) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. lib. xvi, pag. 434.

(*t*) Ancillon, ubi ſupra, pag. 99, 100.

'catque tubas, in Lutheranum nomen invehebatur, à Petro Roberto Olivetano . . . . publicè increpitus & correptus (20). ——— *A monk of the Dominican order, who in his ſermon in the Palatine monaſtery, declaimed moſt furiouſly againſt Luther, in a tone that would have drowned the trumpet and the clarion, was ſharply and publickly reprimanded by Peter Robert Olivetanus.*'

(20) Spanheim. ubi ſupra, p. 56.

[*E*] *He received a great affront at Neufchatel, for which he had ſatisfaction made him.*] 'Farel having made it his buſineſs to eſtabliſh order and decency in the church of Neufchatel, was conſtantly employed in reforming manners, correcting abuſes, removing ſcandals, and oppoſing vice with all his might. This ſtrictneſs, in cauſing diſcipline to be obſerved, rendered him odious, and even inſupportable to the vicious and libertines. It happening one day, that a woman of noble extraction went away from her huſband, Farel exhorted her not to put aſunder what God had joined together, and alledged other powerful reaſons to bring her back to her duty. But that woman refuſing to hearken either to private admonitions, or the remonſtrances of the conſiſtory, or even the ſollicitations of the magiſtrates of Neufchatel, Farel thought himſelf obliged to blame and condemn that diſobedience in another manner, and that from the pulpit he ought to remove that ſcandal: Therefore upon a Sunday morning, being the laſt day of July, he ſpoke with his uſual heat, both againſt that contumacious woman, and againſt thoſe who encouraged her in her perverſe humour. The perſons who intereſted themſelves for the guilty lady, took his public reprehenſion very ill, and that very day formed a party againſt Farel, and prevailed ſo far with the people, that they got together, at two of the clock in the afternoon, in the field near the church and the caſtle, to conſult what they ſhould do with Farel. The people were divided; ſome being for Farel, ſome againſt him: But at laſt it was carried by the majority, that in two months he ſhould quit Neufchatel. The prudence of the governour, and of the council of ſtate, as they call it, was ſuch, as prevented any ſedition, or effuſion of blood. Farel having no other motive or aim but the glory of God, and the honour of his church, was neither ſurprized at, nor ſhaken by that popular emotion, but continued the exerciſe of his office without any remiſſneſs. The magnificent lords of Bern were no ſooner informed of the tumult raiſed by the friends of that lady, than they wrote about it to the governour and council of Neufchatel, that they might prevent the miſchief, and ſtifle it in it's birth. This letter they ſent by two eminent members of their council, who being arrived at Neufchatel, remonſtrated both to the four miniſters, to the council, and to the burghers, the great wrong they did to Farel; and how ill they acknowledged the great ſervices he had done, and the graces of God which had made him the inſtrument towards them. Whereupon the twenty eighth of November the council made a decree, ordaining, that all miſunderſtandings ſhould be removed, all factions ſtifled, all jealouſies terminated, and all feuds extinguiſhed: that Farel ſhould continue the exerciſe of his function, as being blameleſs both in his doctrine and morals, and one to whom the church was very much beholden: that whoever ſhould ſpeak againſt Farel, ſhould pay a great fine; Farel being truly the bulwark and ornament of Neufchatel, by his piety, probity, and capacity. The fourth of January, 1542, according to the advice of the lords of Bern, by the majority of votes of the burghers of Neufchatel, Farel was continued, to the great comfort of all good men, and confuſion of his enemies, whoſe mouths were ſtopped, and their hands and feet tied; whereas Farel with new vigour thundered more fiercely than ever againſt the depravation of manners (21).' We muſt obſerve, that this miniſter maintained with ſo much zeal and vigour the ſeverity of church-diſcipline, that he ſubjected to public penance thoſe ſinners that had given ſcandal. Here follows the ſubſtance of a letter written to the claſs of Neufchatel, by the miniſters of Baſil, the twenty eighth of July, 1554. 'They ſay, they commend the zeal of Farel, who made it his buſineſs to cauſe the church-diſcipline to be religiouſly obſerved, vice ſuppreſſed, and the ſacraments devoutly received: adding, that they approved Farel's opinion, that thoſe, who by their open ſinning gave offence to the church, ſhould make a ſolemn confeſſion of their faults, give a public teſtimony of their repentance, and by an extraordinary humiliation make reparation for the ſcandal they had given (22).'

(21) Ancillon, ubi ſupra, pag. 176, & ſeq.

(22) Id. ibid. pag. 153.

[*F*] *He was forced . . . . . to retire into the abbey of Gorze.*] The women were like to have pulled him to pieces, if we believe Mr Madaure (§ α). 'He accuſes him of having confidently affirmed, that it is falſe that the virgin Mary remained a virgin after ſhe was brought-to-bed (23): the women of Gorze, adds he, aſtoniſhed at that blaſphemy and impudence, ruſhed upon him with their nails, and plucked off his hair and beard; and worried him in ſuch a manner, that he could never have eſcaped from their hands with his life, if captain Henry Frank had not reſcued him.' Mr Ancillon ſhews that this is but a fable.

(23) *Madaure, in the book intituled,* La naiſſance & la decadence de l'hereſie à Metz, *apud Ancillon. ubi ſupra, pag.* 66.

[(§ α) Mr Bayle is miſtaken in this and the following remark, by taking the name of a city, of which the perſon he means was titular biſhop, for the name of a man. This man was called Martin Meurisse: he was a Franciſcan, *biſhop of Madaur, ſuffragan, and adminiſtrator of the biſhopric of Metz.* Theſe are the titles he takes at the head of his works, and particularly at the head of that which is here quoted by Mr Bayle, which is intituled *Hiſtoire de la Naiſſance, du Progrès, & de la Décadence de l'Héréſie dans la Ville de Metz & Païs Meſſin:* a title which ſeems to have been copied from that of the hiſtory of Florimond of Remond. Probably what deceived Mr Bayle was the manner of Mr Ancillon's quoting this author in the life of Farel: he commonly calls him the *Sieur de Madaur* †; and that expreſſion is as inaccurate, as if one quoted *Coeffeteau* by the name of *Sieur de Dardanie* or *de Marſeille,* or cardinal *du Perron* by the name of *Sieur d'Ereux* or *de Sens.* Meuriſſe's book, which occaſioned this note, was printed at Metz, by J. Antoine, in 1642, in 4to. His other works may be ſeen in *Waddingi Scriptores Ord. Minorum,* and in the *Bibliotheca Telleriana,* page 115, 192, and 294. Rem. Crit.]

† *See the* Mêlange Critiq. *of Mr Ancillon, Tom. II, pag.* 271.

[*G*] *Farel happily made his eſcape.*] Theodore Beza having related (24), that this abbey *was beſieged, and at laſt ſurrendered upon articles,* adds, *and though a ſtrict enquiry was made after Farel, yet he eſcaped their hands, having been put in a waggon among the lepers.* Mr Madaure pretends, that Farel was ſaved *by being put in a waggon full of lepers, having his face daubed with meal, with a lazar's clicket in his hands* (25). But Mr Ancillon has anſwered, that *his being daubed with meal, and the clicket, are both of Mr Madaure's invention.* He grounds himſelf on Theodore Beza's ſilence, which ground is not very ſolid; for Beza's buſineſs was not to relate the circumſtances, but only the material part of that adventure.

(24) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. xvi, pag. 434.

(25) Madaure, ubi ſupra, apud. Ancillon. pag. 95.

[*H*] *He was very odious to ſome perſons at Geneva.*] They indicted him as a criminal, and he was obliged

to

of Servetus (*u*). He took another journey to Geneva, in the year 1564 (*x*); to take his laſt leave of Calvin, who lay dangerouſly ill. He married at ſixty nine years of age [*I*]. He went a ſecond time to Metz, in 1565, *being invited by his old flock to*

to appear before the judges; for the ſenate of Geneva wrote to the magiſtrates of Neufchatel, to deſire them to order that the accuſed perſon might come to anſwer to the charge that was brought againſt him. As ſoon as the ſenate had notice that Farel was arrived, they let Calvin know that he ſhould not be ſuffered to aſcend the pulpit. Calvin does not acquaint us with the ſequel of this affair, but contents himſelf to ſay, that he wiſhed he could with his own blood wipe off the diſgrace thoſe of Geneva had caſt upon themſelves by that ungrateful proceeding. Here is the whole paſſage: 'Nunc ad ſummum pervenit nequitia, ut omni pudore excuſſo, templum Domini in lupanar convertere obſtinate cupiant. Atque ut ſciatis, quam fœda ſit deformitas, cum hic nuper eſſet frater noſter Farellus, cui ſe totos debent, ut ſatis noſtis, & pro jure ſuo eos libere moneret, tantus in eum furor exarſit, ut capitale judicium in eum intentare non ſint veriti. Scio equidem non debere novum videri, ſi reperiantur in urbe libera factioſi homines, qui turbas concitent. Sed deploranda eſt Senatus noſtri cæcitas, quod libertatis ſuæ patrem, & patrem hujus Eccleſiæ ſibi reum cauſſæ capitalis mitti a Neocomenſibus popoſcit. Dedecus hujus urbis proferre cogor, quod ſanguine meo delere cuperem. Venit Farellus: antequam urbem ingreſſus eſſet, denuntiavit domi meæ Apparitor Senatus, ne ſuggeſtum conſcenderet. Reliqua non perſequor: quia ſatis eſt ejus ingratitudinis guſtum dediſſe, quæ bonis omnibus, & ingenuis merito ſtomachum movebit. Sed quoniam me complures cauſæ impediunt, ne mala noſtra aperte deplorem, ſic breviter habete, niſi per vos cohibeatur ſatan, habenas ei laxatum iri (26). —— *Vice has now reached it's meridian, and men, devoid of all ſhame, obſtinately endeavour to convert the temple of the Lord into a brothel-houſe. That ye may have a juſt idea of this monſtrous baſeneſs, know then, that our fellow-labourer, Farel, one, to whom they owe even themſelves, as ye are not ignorant, being here lately, and agreeably to his character, taking the freedom to admoniſh them without reſerve, their fury againſt him was kindled to that degree, that they ſcrupled not to proſecute him for capital offences. I allow, it ought not to ſeem ſtrange, if in a free city there ſhould be perſons that delight in faction, and raiſing tumults. But the blindneſs of our ſenate is ſurprizing, in demanding the inhabitants of Neufchatel to deliver up the father of their liberty, and father of this church as guilty of a capital crime. I am obliged to proclaim the diſhonour of this city, which I could wiſh to wipe away with my blood. Farel came; before he entered the city, the marſhal of the court delivered orders at my houſe not to permit him to mount the pulpit. I ſhall proceed no farther; let it ſuffice to give you a taſte of their ingratitude, which will raiſe a juſt averſion in all men of probity and honour. But becauſe I have many reaſons which hinder me from publickly deploring our calamity, take it briefly thus. Unleſs ſatan be chained up by you, he muſt be let looſe.*'

[*I*] *He married, being ſixty nine years old.*] 'It appears by a writing under Farel's hand, that he married a maid advanced in years, named Mary, the daughter of Alexander Torel, of the city of Roan; that that maid having retired to Neufchatel, upon the account of religion, had been brought up in the diſcipline of the Lord by her mother, who was a true widow, and who feared and ſerved God: that this maid was wiſe and virtuous, and her life and converſation regular and edifying. The bans of marriage between Farel and Mary Torel are found written with great plainneſs by Farel's own hand. They were publiſhed the eleventh and twenty firſt of September, and the ſecond of October, 1558 (27).' Let us ſee how Mr Ancillon juſtifies that marriage (28): 'Farel did not marry till he was ſixty nine years old, and, as his friends ſaid, till he had already one foot in the grave. Farel's friends thought his marriage very ſtrange, and unſeaſonable; but nevertheleſs he convinced them of the reaſons he had to ingage in a conjugal ſociety in an age ſo very much advanced. The general opinion has hitherto been, that Farel was prompted to marry by a ſecret inſpiration and extraordinary impulſe. Whatever it be, it is well known, that, by marrying, he meant to provide for the infirmities of old age by the means God himſelf has ordained, and taking a help to piety to entertain himſelf in it; a help to civil ſociety, that it might not grow tedious to him; a help to husbandry, to eaſe himſelf of the cares of this life; and laſtly, a help for infirmity, to poſſeſs his own veſſel in ſanctification and honour. It is well known that Farel married to ſhew, that, contrary to the opinion of thoſe of the Romiſh church, celibacy is neither meritorious nor ſatisfactory; and to juſtify, that the gift of perpetual continence is neither given to all, nor for ever *.' The end of this apology will ſurprize all ſuperficial wits, and many others alſo; for they will not eaſily conceive how the gift of continence, preſerved till the age of fixty nine years, can diſappear and vaniſh on the ſudden. The moſt ſenſual and laſcivious do generally loſe at that age, and even before, their incontinence; and even thoſe who have not abuſed the exceſſive heat of their conſtitution, find their ſtrength exhauſted before they reach the ſixty ninth year of their age; and here is a man who begins then to be incontinent. The thing is undoubtedly very ſingular, but nevertheleſs let us not look upon it as a fable. Let us conſider, that the impreſſion of ſome objects upon our brain are independent upon our ſoul. It is not becauſe we would have it ſo, that certain objects pleaſe us; but becauſe they move, in a certain manner, the fibres of our brain; and open ſome valves that were ſhut. This alteration produces others, almoſt *ad infinitum*, in our machine; and from thence ſpring deſires, and prelibations of pleaſure, and an hundred other innovations, which deſtroy continence. Thus Mary Torel altered the courſe of animal ſpirits in that good old man: ſhe pleaſed him; ſhe had that proportion of the object to the faculty which excites ſentiments of love, *&c.* And that was enough. Do not tell me, *that maid was not young, ſhe is not repreſented as handſome:* No matter for that. The proportion here in queſtion, that great ſpring, that great mover, neither conſiſts in youth, nor in beauty: It is ſomething, I know not what, which lies in ſome inſenſible particles, whoſe efficacy we feel without being acquainted with the manner of their acting (29). There is many a man, who for twenty years has converſed with an infinite number of women, without having a mind to marry: the ſame man will meet by chance, either in a boat, at a feaſt, or viſit, a woman, with whoſe beauty he ſhall be ſo ſmitten, that he will be ready to marry her inſtantly. She is, perhaps, neither ſo young nor ſo handſome as thoſe that could not pleaſe him; and, on the other hand, ſhe has converſed with men more ſuſceptible of love than he, without wounding their hearts. The proportion of the object to the faculty was wanting; which being found in this particular caſe, a match is ſoon concluded. It may alſo be affirmed, that a man advanced in years, who, after a long train of reaſonings, concludes that he ought to renounce celibacy, does thereby diſpoſe himſelf to incontinence: he grows eaſy to be ſtruck in that part of the brain which ſtirs up love; the object which ſtrikes him in that place pleaſes and charms him, he continually thinks upon it, he has a mind to enjoy it. This robs him of that fine gift of continence which nature had given him; he finds himſelf in a burning condition, and ſo marries, according to St Paul's advice. Therefore there is nothing improbable in the apology I have made for the marriage of our old man; and we rather find in it a remarkable inſtance, to prove, that there is nothing more raſh than the vow of celibacy. The gift of continence is not a thing on which a man may depend. He has, you will ſay, been proof againſt a thouſand moſt lovely objects for a great many years: well, does it follow that he will be ſo eternally? Can you anſwer that at laſt you will not ſee ſome other object better proportioned to the fibres of your brain? Love comes as a thief in the night, when you leaſt expect him. Keep therefore your liberty always; poſſeſs your gift as not poſſeſſing it; think that you may loſe it, and that you will loſe it, perhaps, when you leaſt

(*u*) Ib. pag. 228.

(*x*) Melch. Adam. in vitis Theolog. exter. pag. 115.

(26) Calvinus, Epiſtola ad Tigurinos Miniſtros. *It is the 16th, dated from Geneva the 26th of Novemb.* 1553.

* Chryſoſt. *Hom.* 47, *upon St Matthew.*

(27) Ancillon, ubi ſupra, pag. 242, 243.

(28) Id. ibid. pag. 240, 241.

(29) *See the* Nouvelles Lettres contre le Calviniſme de Maimbourg, pag. 557.

to come and reap the fruit of the ſeed he had ſown in their hearts (y). The next day after his arrival (z), *he preached in the church of the retrenchment.* He was not then ſo old as it is reported [K]. He returned to Neufchatel, and died there the thirteenth of September, the ſame year (aa). He left a ſon who was but a year old, and who died three years after (bb). Though his talent lay rather in preaching, than writing books, yet he commenced author [L]. Let us not forget that he laid the foundation of

think on it: It is but meeting a perſon who may create love in you. This will be the ſpunge of your continence. .

Yet, after all, it is ſomewhat ſurprizing that our Farel remained a bachelor to his old age. One would think, that his conſtitution, which was ſo briſk and vigorous, that at the age of ſeventy five years (30) he got a ſon, tho' his wiſe was then old, ſhould have induced him to marry before. The efficacious eloquence, with which he oppoſed the validity of monaſtical vows, required no leſs his marriage; ſince at that time, to avoid being ſuſpected of heterodoxy, a man was obliged to preach by example (31). Eraſmus, ſpeaking of the progreſs which the reformers made, ſays, among other things, that many friars and nuns married. He had ſaid, but juſt before, that Farel preached in the country of Montbeliard: ‘In montem Bellicardi vocatus eſt Pharellus ad prædicandum Evangelium hoc novum, cujus hic mirus eſt ſucceſſus. Jam multi repudiârunt Baptiſmum, & revocârunt Circumciſionem. Miſſam abominantur plurimi: ſunt qui publicè doceant in Euchariſtia nihil eſſe niſi panem & vinum: Velum & Cuculla deponitur paſſim. Nubunt & ducunt uxores monachæ & monachi (32). —— *Farel was called to Montbeliard to preach this new goſpel, the ſucceſs of which is ſurprizing here. Multitudes have now renounced baptiſm, and recalled circumciſion. Great numbers abhor the maſs; there are ſome who publickly teach that there is nothing in the euchariſt but bread and wine. The veil and the cowl are diſcarded by many. Monks and nuns marry, and are given in marriage.*’ Mr Maimburg obſerves, that Farel's ſermon to the nuns of Geneva was full of exhortations to marriage. ‘The ſiſters of St Clare, who were the only nuns of Geneva, were obliged to go from thence, tho' no violence was offered to thoſe holy virgins, ſave only, that the moſt prevailing arguments were uſed to perſuade them to quit their veils, and to accept of ſuch as offered to marry them: and they were compelled to hear a tedious and ridiculous ſermon, which the miniſter Farel preached in their monaſtery, in the preſence of their ſyndics, on this text of the goſpel, *Exurgens Maria abiit in Montana,* to prove to them, that, in imitation of the virgin Mary, who went to viſit her couſin Elizabeth on the mountains of Judæa, they ought not to be recluſe, and were obliged to live in the world, and to marry like other people (33).’ I ſhall ſay, by the way, that thoſe who think that the reformed miniſters laboured too much at that time, to ſhew the excellence of marriage, and to thunder againſt vows of continence, do not conſider the circumſtances of the time. It muſt be remembered, that the celibacy of prieſts had been for ſome ages an unexhauſted ſource of ſcandalous impurities which diſhonoured the chriſtian name. It was therefore neceſſary to put the ax to the root of the tree, and to drain that ſource by the abolition of vows. It was neceſſary manfully to confute that pernicious tenet, that a whoring prieſt committed a leſs ſin than a prieſt that married. That tenet is a neceſſary conſequence of the law of celibacy: for, according to the principles of the Romaniſts, a clerk, who marries after the vows of continence, engages himſelf by oath to violate all his life-time an inviolable law; and therefore he is more guilty than if he ſhould fall ſometimes into the ſin of fornication. This is but a tranſient fault, and does not hinder him from acknowledging his fall, and repenting of it, or from returning to the obſervation of his vow; but if he marries, he runs himſelf into the neceſſity of violating it without remorſe, and without return. It was therefore neceſſary vigorouſly to preach up the honeſty and dignity of marriage, and againſt the audaciouſneſs of thoſe who diſparaged it ſo far as to prefer fornication to it. Beſides, it was to be feared, that if the prieſts and monks who renounced popery ſhould abſtain from marriage, the ſame impurities might ſoon creep into the reformed church, which had expoſed the Romiſh clergy to the deteſtation and contempt of honeſt men. In order therefore, to prevent that great diſorder, it was neceſſary to encourage thoſe gentlemen to marry, in caſe they wanted encouragement; and ſo the moſt eminent men were obliged to ſhew them the way, and ſerved for an example. We muſt do the great men of the primitive church the juſtice to own, that they were led by excellent motives to recommend celibacy; for nothing is more proper to make the goſpel ſpread and fructify, than the belief, that thoſe who preach it have mortified their fleſh, and debar themſelves even of thoſe pleaſures which worldly men may enjoy without ſin. They conſidered that marriage was attended with a thouſand earthly and ſenſual cares, which made too much diverſion from the ſacerdotal functions; and, in ſhort, being dazzled by the fair outſides of celibacy, they went ſo far, at laſt, as to turn it into a law. But it may be ſaid, that the promoters of ſuch a law had not ſufficiently ſtudied human nature; for if they had been thoroughly acquainted with it, they would never have impoſed ſo heavy a yoke on the necks of the miniſters of the altar. Every one of them ought to have ſaid to the other, we go no deeper than the bark; the ſhining ſuperficies deceives us.

Maxima pars vatum, pater & juvenes patre digni,
Decipimur ſpecie recti (34).

Moſt poets fall into the groſſeſt faults,
Deluded by a ſeeming excellence.

ROSCOMMON.

If they had foreſeen the conſequences of that law, they would, in all probability, have looked upon their fine notions as a ſnare of the tempter.

Note, that Florimond de Remond affirms, that Farel had had a former wife, when he married ſo old. Theſe are his words: ‘Farel having quitted his place to him, to make himſelf miniſter at Neufchatel, where at a decrepit age of ſeventy years, having the ſtone and gout, (the uſual lot of old age) he married again with the daughter of his houſe-keeper, full of luſt, like an old ſtag; lamenting in vain his youthful vigour, more idle and unprofitable in her arms than among his books (35).’

[K] *He was not at that time ſo old as it is reported.*] Beza affirms that Farel went to Metz in the year 1565, *notwithſtanding his extream old age, which was above fourſcore years* (36). But he has better ſet down Farel's age in another book (37), where he allows him only ſeventy ſix years. Mr Ancillon ſhould not have copied this miſtake of Theodore Beza, ſince he had placed the birth of Farel in the year 1489 (38). Thus you ſee how authors forget in one place of the ſame book what they have ſaid in another. *God,* ſays he (39), *put it into the heart of Farel, who was then above eighty years old, to take a journey to Metz . . . . . . where he arrived the twelfth of May,* 1565.

[L] *He commenced Author.*] He publiſhed in Latin an account of a diſputation he maintained at Bern in the year 1528 (40). Mr Ancillon does not ſpeak of it, but only of the *ſubſtance and brief declaration, neceſſary for all chriſtians, printed in the year* 1552; and of the book *of the bleſſed ſacrament of the Lord, and of his teſtament, printed in the year* 1553 (41); and of another book, intituled, *the ſword of the ſpirit* (42), printed at Geneva in 1550, and levelled againſt libertines. Eraſmus mentions ſome anonymous writings of Farel in theſe words (43): ‘Cum Phallico fuit mihi congreſſiuncula perbrevis. Ejus hiſtoriam ſcripſit cuidam Conſtantienſi. Exemplum clàm ad me perlatum eſt. Nihil vidi vanius, nihil glorioſius, nihil virulentius. Sunt ibì interdum decem verſus in quibus nè ſyllaba quidem vera eſt. Idem edidit libellum de *Pariſienſibus & Pontifice.* Quantum illic inſicetiarum, quantum ineptæ virulentiæ, quàm mul-

‘ ti

WHY the miniſters in the beginning of the reformation inſiſted on the neceſſity of marriage.

(y) Ancillon, ibid. pag. 263.

(z) *That is the 13th of May.*

(aa) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra,

(bb) Ancillon, ubi ſupra, pag. 272.

(30) He lived 76 years, and left a ſon who was but a year old. See *Ancillon, ubi ſupra, pag.* 272.

(31) *See the article* BUCER, *remark* [E].

(32) Eraſmus, Epiſt. xiv, lib. xxx, pag. 1907. *It is dated from Baſil, the 10th of February,* 1515, *but it ſhould be* 1525.

(33) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Calviniſme, lib. i, pag. m. 48.

(34) Horat. de Arte Poët. ver. 24.

(35) Flor. de Remond. Hiſt. de l'Héréſie, lib. vii, cap. xviii, pag. m. 929.

(36) Beza, ubi ſupra, lib. xvi, pag. 456.

(37) Beza, in Iconibus.

(38) Ancillon, ubi ſupra, pag. 1.

(39) Id. ibid. pag. 263.

(40) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra, pag. 116.

(41) Ancillon, ubi ſupra, pag. 44.

(42) Id. pag. 212.

(43) Eraſm. Epiſt. cxiii, lib. xix, pag. 951. *It is dated the 6th of Septemb.* 1524.

of the church of Grenoble, during a journey he took to Gap (*cc*). By marking the miſtakes of Moreri, we ſhall ſhew the errors of ſome other writers [*M*]. Note, That

ti nominatim traducti? & tamen ipſe ſolus non apponit nomen ſuum. Idem ut audio auxit ſtolidum Alberi judicium, quod nondum videre licuit. Viſi ſunt Conſtantiæ & alii duo libelli quos in me ſcripſit. Et profitetur novum dogma, ſic traducendos qui obſiſtunt Evangelio, inter quos me numerat, & Balaam paſſim appellat. ——— *I have had a ſhort rencounter with Farel: he wrote his life to a correſpondent at Conſtance: a copy was privately conveyed to me. I never ſaw any thing more vain, or virulent. There are ſometimes ten ſentences together without one ſyllable of truth. He publiſhed a treatiſe* de Pariſienſibus & Pontifice. *What a heap of unmeaning traſh, and inſipid malice is there. How many has he expreſsly traduced? He does not however put his name to it. He has, as I am informed, enlarged Alber's fooliſh judgment which I have not yet had an opportunity to ſee. Two other pamphlets have appeared at Conſtance which he wrote againſt me. He has therein broached a new doctrine, that all ſhould be uſed after the ſame baſe manner, who oppoſe the goſpel, of which number he makes me to be one, and often compliments me with the name of Balaam.*’

[*M*] *By marking the miſtakes of Moreri, we ſhall ſhew the errors of ſome other writers.*] I. Moreri ſays, that by *Farel's means hereſy made alſo the greateſt progreſs in Dauphiné.* He is miſtaken; for all the ſhare Farel had in the converſion of that province, is contained in theſe words of Beza (44): ‘It happened in the mean time, that William Farel going from his church of Neufchatel in Swiſſerland to Gap, his native place, and paſſing through Grenoble, he made a lively and ardent exhortation; he being a man full of zeal for God beyond any in our days, and having diſpoſed them to do well, he left there, for their miniſter, Aynard Pichon, to encourage them.’ II. Farel, I confeſs, was miniſter at Neufchatel after he went from Geneva; but before he had been miniſter at Geneva, he had exerciſed the ſame office at Neufchatel; and conſequently Moreri has not followed chronology. III. He falls into the like error, when he ſays, that this miniſter, having been ſomewhat hardly uſed by thoſe of Geneva, *taught his doctrine afterwards at Metz, Montbelliard, Lauſanne, and elſewhere.* After his baniſhment from Geneva, he only taught it at Neufchatel and Metz. His firſt feats at arms, if I may ſo ſpeak, was the reformation of Montbelliard; and what he did at Lauſanne preceded his miniſtry at Geneva. IV. He ſhould not have quoted the annals of Sleidan; for the hiſtory of that author is not ſo called. V. According to Moreri, Farel was charged with reviving the hereſy of Paulus Samoſatenus, *and thoſe of the Elceſaïtes; which appears by a letter he wrote to Calvin, which begins thus:* Literas tuas quæque eſt, &c (45). *and which is the ſeventy eighth among Calvin's letters.* I could not yet find out the ground of all this: I have only diſcovered (46), that one Peter Caroli, formerly a doctor of the Sorbonne, retired to Geneva about the year 1535; and being known to be a trimmer in matters of religion, and too great a lover of women and good chear, it was not eaſy for him to find a good church: he aimed at being miniſter of Neufchatel, but could not compaſs it. Farel was undoubtedly the cauſe of it, and Calvin and Viret were alſo againſt him; which, in all appearance, is the true reaſon that prompted that Caroli to accuſe them ſometimes of Arianiſm, and ſometimes of Sabellianiſm. A ſynod was thereupon called at Lauſanne, where he produced all the proofs he could poſſibly get together to maintain his accuſation. But the accuſed defended themſelves ſo well, that his proofs were declared null, and they obtained a ſentence declaring them orthodox; and as for him, the ſynod adjudged him unworthy of the miniſtry (47). Caroli was not thereby diſheartned: he appeared with his bag full of accuſations, ſwelled with new pieces, in a ſynod of Bern, and endeavoured to obtain a declaration, that the accuſed had at leaſt given occaſion to ſuſpicions. They confuted him fully as to that, and were abſolved in that particular, as well as in relation to hereſy (48). ‘Ubi à nobis excuſſa omnia fuerunt quibus ſuſpicionem aliquam de tempore præterito injicere conabatur ...... atque hac ratione, cui non ſatisfaceret, nemo præter ipſum repertus eſt. Fratres ut dignum erat fidis Chriſti Miniſtris nos iniquiſſime in ſuſpicionem aliquam (49) adductos ſibi videri pronuntiarunt. —— *Having refuted all his arguments, by which he endeavoured to ſhew there had been ſufficient room for ſuſpicion formerly, there was none beſides himſelf who were not ſatisfied with the anſwer. Our brethren, as became faithful miniſters of* CHRIST, *declared we had been moſt iniquitouſly proſecuted upon groundleſs ſurmiſes.*’ By Calvin's letter, out of which I borrow thoſe words, it appears, that the abſtracts of Caroli's accuſations being ſpread every where, had cauſed very ill impreſſions againſt thoſe accuſed miniſters: ſo true it is, that man is apt to be wrought upon by the aſſurance of an impudent calumniator! Caroli would not yield to the authority of the ſynod, but perſiſted alone in maintaining his accuſation (50). It is the character of pragmatical, proud and revengeful ſpirits, never to own they have raſhly defamed their brethren. ‘Dum hæc geruntur, afferuntur à Myconio literæ publice ad conventum ſcriptæ. Aliæ rurſum à Capitone ad Farellum generatim miſſæ, quibus utriſque intellectum eſt, horrendum longe lateque rumorem de noſtra controverſia pervagatum eſſe. Denique ad excitandam erga nos gentium omnium invidiam malicioſe à certis hominibus fabrefactum. Quod autem homo nihili futiliſſima ſua vanitate tantum proficere potuerit, ut tot eccleſiis ſiniſtram de nobis opinionem injiceret: id vero eſt, quod nos vehementer perturbavit. —— *Whilſt theſe things were carrying on, a letter came from Myconius to the ſynod, another from Capito to Farel; from both of which it appeared, that a dreadful rumour had been ſpread far and near concerning our controverſy, and that certain perſons laboured to draw upon us the hatred of all people. That a worthleſs man by his ridiculous vanity ſhould be able to effect this, made us really uneaſy.*’ Calvin obſerves, that Caroli was condemned to baniſhment (51). Note, that by all this it does not appear that William Farel was charged with Samoſatenianiſm. I know very well what Lindanus obſerves, that this miniſter taught, that the HOLY GHOST was nothing but the motion God imprinted upon the creatures (52). I know alſo, that, to make good his aſſertion, Lindanus quotes a letter from Caroli to the cardinal of Lorrain (53), but I am certain there are here a great many frauds. He falls into a blunder, which I ſhall not paſs over in ſilence. Thoſe of Baſil, ſays he (54), dreaded ſo much Farel's mutinous ſpirit, that, having been informed of his two eſcapes from Montbelliard, they baniſhed him. He quotes *Eraſm. epiſt. ad Prin. Infer. Germ.* It is eaſy to convict him that he examined very ſlightly the authors he quoted: for Eraſmus's letter, on which he grounds himſelf, is not directed *ad Principes*, but *ad Fratres inferioris Germaniæ*; neither does Eraſmus ſay, that thoſe of Baſil did baniſh Farel ſince his two flights from Montbelliard, well knowing that Farel did not go to Montbelliard till after his baniſhment from Baſil. Prateolus (55) adopts all the faults and phraſes of Lindanus: and they talk both of a chimerical ſect of Farelliſts, which never exiſted but in the fancy of the impertinent makers of catalogues of heretics. Gaultier the jeſuit brings that ſame ſect upon the ſtage, and quotes Prateolus. He ſays, that Farel (56) revived the whole hereſy of Paulus Samoſatenus, and renewed the doctrine of the Elceſaïtes. He pretends to prove it by a letter, wherein he ſuppoſes, that this miniſter does not declare thoſe to be damned who diſſemble their faith in time of danger, provided they do not openly profeſs idolatry. ‘Dicens nolle ſe eos damnare qui periculorum formidine adducti fidem ſuam diſſimulant modo idololatriam exterius non profiteantur (57). He quotes *Farell. ep. ad Calv. cujus initium, Literas tuas, quæque eſt* 78. *inter epiſtolas Calvini* (58). We have ſeen before, that Moreri founds himſelf on the ſame quotation. I have Calvin's letters, printed at Hanaw in the year 1597. The ſeventy eighth is from Bucer to Calvin. None of thoſe of our Farel begins with *Literas tuas*, nor favours the Nicodemites; and I find in his life, compoſed by Mr Ancillon (59), that

---

(*cc*) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. v, pag. 891. *See the laſt remark.*

(44) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. v, pag. 890, 891.

(45) See, below, citat. (58) of Father Gaultier, where you will learn that *quæque eſt* is not in the text of the letter.

(46) Beza, ubi ſupra, lib. xvi, pag. 435.

(47) Nos ſynodi ſententia fuimus abſoluti, ille indignus judicatus qui miniſterio fungeretur. *Calvinus, Epiſt. ad Grynæum.* It is the fifth in the Edition of *Hanaw*, 1597.

(48) Id. ibid.

(49) Sycophanta ille ſenatus conſulto in exilium actus eſt, nos plane abſoluti non à crimine modo, ſed ab omni quoque ſuſpicione. *Id. ibid.*

(50) *See quotation* (47).

(51) *See quotation* (49).

(52) Hic præter ſacramentariſmum etiam Samoſateni renovavit hæreſim, Spiritum Sanctum affirmans motum in rebus creatum. *Lindanus in Dubitantio, Dial. ii, pag. m.* 147.

(53) Ita in Summa Gallicana Scripturæ, teſte Petro Carolo epiſt. ad Card. Lotharingum. *Id. ibid.*

(54) Hunc adeo ſeditioſum metuebant Baſilienſes, ut cum bis monte Pellicardo profugiſſet eum in exilium abire juſſerint. *Id. ibid. pag.* 146.

(55) Prateol. in Elencho Hæreſ. pag. m. 180. *See alſo pag.* 290.

(56) Pauli Samoſateni hæreſim in integrum reſtituit docens Spiritum Sanctum eſſe quendam motum creatum. *Jacobus Gaulterius, in tabula Chronograph. pag. m.* 757.

(57) Id. ibid.

(58) *See, above, citat.* (45).

(59) Ancillon, ubi ſupra, pag. 212.

That he was ſuppoſed to be the author of ſome papers poſted up in ſeveral ſtreets of Paris, and even on the gates of the Louvre, in the year 1543 (dd), which did the whole party a great deal of prejudice in the kingdom.

(dd) Florim. de Remond, Hiſtoire de l'Héréſie, *Livr. VII, cap. v, pag. m.* 859.

‘ that it is to the letter he wrote to Calvin, the ſecond of November 1544, we owe that excellent work of Calvin againſt the Nicodemites, which we have in his Opuſcula from page 789 to 803. Here follows an evident lie of father Gualtier. He ſuppoſes that Calvin took Geneva from Farel, *qui tamen eam (Genevam) illi poſtea eripuit, adeo ut deinde Neocomenſis miniſter creatus ſit* (60). It is moſt certain that thoſe two miniſters were driven out of Geneva at the ſame time, and for the ſame cauſe; and that when Calvin was recalled, they would alſo have recalled Farel, who notwithſtanding Calvin's earneſt intreaties (61) would never comply to this new invitation of thoſe of Geneva.

This lye of father Gualtier is more pardonable than that in Prateolus, who aſſures us that the archers ſurprized Farel at Baſil, in a houſe of proſtitution, upon a Holy Friday (62)

(60) Gualt. Tab. Chronogr. pag. 737.

(61) *See Calvin's 40th letter.*

(62) Prateolus, in Elencho Hæreſ. pag. 290.

FARNABY (THOMAS) was a learned philologer of the XVIIth century. His notes upon the greateſt part of the Latin poets have been of great ſervice to the youth. They are ſhort, and full of learning, tending chiefly to explain the text. He lived at London (*a*), and applied himſelf to teach children of figure and quality, and found a good account in it for the maintenance of his family (*b*). I believe alſo his epiſtles dedicatory brought him in ſome profit, tho' he ſays, ſomewhere, that the time was over for making much that way [*A*]. He dedicated his Horace to prince Henry, eldeſt ſon to king James I, and afterwards his Juvenal and Perſius. He was very graciouſly received by the young prince (*c*), when he had the honour to preſent the latter book to him, and he gave him a kind of order to make a like commentary upon all the Latin poets; but he was ſo ſenſibly touched at certain criticiſms made upon him, that he reſolved out of indignation and againſt the bent of his own genius to diſcontinue his work. Some time after he was perſwaded to change his mind (*d*). He had a country houſe twenty miles from London, whither he retired in the year 1636 (*e*). Charles I commanded him to compoſe a Latin grammar for the uſe of all the ſchools; he received, I ſay, this order when there was a neceſſity to reform that grammar which had been eſtabliſhed by authority, and which had been very much complained of (*f*). He died in the year 1647 (*g*). A French Dominican has beſtowed great encomiums upon the writings of this author [*B*]. See alſo what is ſaid concerning his notes upon Martial, in a book of the jeſuit Vavaſſeur *de Epigrammate* (*b*).

(*a*) Barlæus, Epiſt. cxix, pag. 292.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) See the epiſtle dedicatory of his Lucan.

(*d*) Taken from the ſame epiſtle dedicatory.

(*e*) Farnab. Epiſt. ad Voſſium, pag. 303. Epiſtolarum ad Voſſium ſcriptarum.

(*f*) Id. ibid. pag. 302.

(*g*) Witte, in Diar. Biograph.

(*b*) Pag. 270, & ſeq.

[*A*] *He ſays ſomewhere that the time was over to get much by epiſtles dedicatory.*] He applies to this purpoſe a particular related by Valerius Maximus, which is, that though they did not conſult, as formerly, the flight of birds at marriages, yet they invited to the wedding the perſons appointed to take thoſe obſervations, retaining, at leaſt in name, ſome footſteps of the ancient ceremony. ‘ Quod antiquis, apud quos nihil niſi auſpicio prius ſumpto gerebatur factitatum, ut ex more, nuptiis auſpices interpoſiti, quamvis auſpicia deſiiſſent (Val. Max. lib. 2. cap. 1.) ipſo tamen nomine veteris conſuetudinis veſtigia uſurparent: hoc pleriſque noſtrum quos vexat inſanabile hoc ſcribendi cacoëthes, uſu venit ut quamvis patronorum exoleverit cum autoritas tum benignitas, non citra ambitionem tamen ſummis & gravibus viris perituræ chartæ tutelam obtrudamus (1). —— *As the antients never engaged in any enterprize, without firſt conſulting the omens, for which reaſon the ſoothſayers were applied to in marriage, and tho' that cuſtom was laid aſide, there ſtill remained ſome marks of it; ſo moſt of us moderns are infected with an incurable itch of ſcribbling, though the authority and benevolence of patrons is out of date, and ſtill obtrude our ſhortlived labours on perſons of the greateſt merit and diſtinction.*’ His meaning is, that though the real benefits of epiſtles dedicatory is loſt, yet the cuſtom of dedicating is not given over.

[*B*] *A French Dominican has beſtowed great encomiums upon the works of this author.*] It is in the place where he undertakes to ſhew that the jeſuits are inferior to abundance of other writers, who have ſhone in polite learning (§*α*). ‘ Doleo, *continues he* (2), meo tempore, cùm literis humanioribus ſtuderem, defuiſſe nobis illud ſubſidium ad rem litterariam maximum, quod ſuppeditarunt à paucis annis Farnabius & alii; Poëtis omnibus commentariis marginalibus ita clarè explicatis, ut mediocris grammaticus poſſit etiam difficillimos inoffenſo pede locos decurrere. Hæc non poſſunt expectari aut parari adjumenta, ad auctorum peritiam, ab iis, qui per tres aut quatuor annos literas humaniores docent, & ad Theologiæ conſcendunt vel philoſophiæ cathedram, ſed ab his, qui conſeneſcunt & immoriuntur Grammaticæ, aut rhetoricæ ſcholis; quales non dubito fuiſſe illos, qui adeò utilem & neceſſariam opem contulerunt bonarum litterarum ſtudioſis, Commentatores marginales. —— *I am ſorry that during the time of my ſtudy we had not thoſe helps to learning, which Farnaby and others have of late years given. All the poets are ſo clearly iluſtrated with marginal notes, that a mean grammarian may with eaſe get over the greateſt difficulties. Such helps as theſe cannot come from thoſe, who teach polite learning for three or four years, and then ſtep into the chair of divinity or philoſophy, but from thoſe who grow old in the ſchools of grammar or rhetoric. Such I do not queſtion thoſe to have been, who by their marginal comments have beſtowed on all lovers of learning, a moſt uſeful and neceſſary work.*’

[(§*α*) I believe the author of this obſervation is Cæſar Cremoninus, in his harangue pronounced in 1591, for the univerſity of Padua, againſt the jeſuits. Mr Antony Arnaud quotes the place, page 6, and 7, of his *Franc & veritable diſcours, &c.* edition of 1662, and the piece itſelf is to be found in page 445, of the *Mercure jéſuite,* edition of 1626. REM. CRIT.]

(1) Thomas Farnabius, Epiſt. Dedicatoria Tragœdiar. Senecæ.

(2) Vincent Baronius, Apolog. lib. iv, ſect. i, pag. 316.

FATIMA, daughter of Mahomet, and wife of Ali. Some accounts ſay, ſhe is the great ſaint they worſhip with ſo much devotion at Com (*a*) [*A*]; but moſt travellers

(*a*) A city of Perſia.

[*A*] *Some accounts ſay ſhe is the great ſaint . . . . . at Com.*] Herbert, in his Perſian travels, having ſaid that the moſque at Com is magnificent, adds (1): *The devotion they have for this place has inriched it with many great preſents brought to the ſepulchre of Fatima the wife of Mortis Ali, and daughter of Mahomet, the great prophet of all the Muſſulmen, who is buried here. The building of the moſque is round, and made after the Epirotic manner. The tomb of the pretended ſaint is raiſed twelve feet from the ground,* and

(1) *Pag.* 339, *cited by Beſpier,* Remarques ſur l'etat preſent de l' Empire Ottoman par Ricaut, Tom. I, pag. 24.

lers are of another opinion. Some ſay the ſaint at Com is the daughter of Ali and Fatima [*B*]. According to Peter della Valle ſhe is their grand-daughter [*C*]. Others ſay, ſhe is the daughter of Mouſa the ſon of Dgafer. This latter opinion is ſupported by one authentic Proof, *viz.* the titles they give the ſaint at Com in the ſolemn prayers the pilgrims direct to her [*D*]. Theſe are forms of prayers, and conſequently they furniſh us with a good proof how little exact travellers are, ſince ſome of the moſt celebrated of them relate ſo ill the titles of ſuch a ſaint. It appears by this formulary of prayers that Fatima, the daughter of Mahomet, the wife of Ali, and mother of ſome children, is nevertheleſs venerated as a virgin [*E*].

and is covered with white velvet: you go up to it by ſteps of ſolid ſilver.

[*B*] *Some ſay ſhe is the daughter of Ali and Fatima.*] This appears in Figueroa's narrative: they informed me, *ſays he* (2), *that at Com there was a famous moſque, dedicated to the memory of a great ſaint named Lela, grand-daughter of Mahomet, and the daughter of Ali and Fatima.* The Sieur Beſpier advances a conjecture which is very probable: *The name of Lela,* ſays he (3), *is commonly given to the great ladies of Africa, and it is alſo the title of honour which they give there to the Bleſſed Virgin, mother of our Lord JESUS, for whom the Mahometans have a great deal of reſpect and veneration, as well as for her ſon.* He cites Diego de Torres, who aſſures us (4) *that they call the Holy Virgin, Lela Mariam, which ſignifies, the Lady Mary, and that* (5) *all the daughters of the cherif took the title of Lela, and he names them all four, viz.* Lela Mariam, Lela Aya, Lela Fatima, *and* Lela Lu. After this Beſpier adds, that *he is inclined to think that* Lela *was not the proper name* of the ſaint mentioned by Figueroa, *but only the title of honour preceding it, and that ſhe had another name which Figueroa has omitted, or was not informed of. The inhabitants of Com, who held that maid for a ſaint, were content with calling her* Lela, *or* The Lady *by way of excellence: much after the ſame manner, as moſt chriſtians now call the Virgin Mary* Our Lady.

[*C*] *According to Peter della Valle, ſhe is their grand-daughter.*] ' There is a fine bridge at Com, and near ' the bridge a magnificent moſque, in which they told ' me that a ſiſter of Iman Riza, whom they have a veneration for, and who was one of the moſt eſteemed ' ſucceſſors of Mahomet, is buried, whom alſo they ' look upon as a ſaint in their way; ſo that they have ' a great reſpect and veneration for the place of her burial (6).' Iman Riza was the ſon of Hoſſein, who was Fatima's ſon (7): let us ſay therefore that the ſiſter of Iman Riza is the grand-daughter of Fatima. Tavernier's relation agrees here with that of Peter della Valle. ' What is moſt remarkable at Com is a great ' moſque . . . where are ſeen the ſepulchres of Cha-' Sefi and Cha-Abas the ſecond, and that of *Sidi-Fatima* the daughter of *Iman-Hocen,* who was the ſon ' of Ali, and of Fatima Zurha, Mahomet's daughter (8).'

[*D*] *The ſolemn prayers which the pilgrims direct to her.*] Mr Chardin (9) has copied *the two chief prayers they make the pilgrims repeat at Com.* The firſt begins thus: *I viſit my lady and miſtreſs* Fathmé, *the daughter of* Mouſa, *ſon of* Dgafer, *upon whom be ſalvation and peace for ever.* There is one remarkable thing in theſe prayers, which is, that therein they recommend themſelves to the interceſſion of this ſaint, and make vows for her. We have ſeen already that they wiſh her peace and eternal ſalvation: here is another part of that formulary: *I wiſh thee eternal ſalvation, O Fathmé daughter of Mouſa, virgin, holy, virtuous, juſt, directrix of truth, pious, ſanctified, worthy of all our praiſes, who ſupreamly loveſt the faithful, and art ſupreamly beloved by them: Virgin without ſpot, and free from all impurity. May GOD take his greateſt delight in thee, be always well pleaſed with thee, and eſtabliſh thee in paradiſe, which is thy eternal refuge and abode* (10). But immediately they recommend themſelves to her prayers in the following manner (11): *I am come to ſeek thee, O lady and miſtreſs of my ſoul, with a view of approaching by this pious act to the moſt high GOD, and to his apoſtle and his children. May the mercy of GOD be upon him, and them for ever. I deteſt and abhor my ſins, the load of which miſerably oppreſſes me, and I do my endeavour to break the yoke of hell. Vouchſafe me thy interceſſion, O holy Virgin, in that day when the righteous ſhall be ſeparated from the wicked. Be then propitious to me; for thou are deſcended from parents who will ſuffer none of thoſe that love them to fall into trouble, who refuſe nothing to thoſe that pray to them, who divert all kinds of evil from thoſe that cheriſh them, and whoſe enemies on the contrary can never proſper.* Chardin informs us (12) that the tomb of this Fathmé has been three times rebuilt: *Her father,* continues he, *carried her to Com on account of the perſecution which the califs of Bagdat raiſed againſt his family, and all that held Ali and his deſcendants for the only lawful ſucceſſors of Mahomet. She built ſeveral fine houſes in this city, and died there. The people believe that GOD took her up into heaven, and that her tomb has nothing in it, being only a repreſentation.* The Romiſh church then is not the only one that honours the aſſumption of virgins. We have ſeen that the immaculate conception, and the virginity of a mother, ſeem to be two doctrines of the Mahometan religion. One thing is wanting in Mr Chardin's narrative. He ſhould have told us in what time Mouſa the father of Fathmé lived.

[*E*] *Though the wife of Ali, and mother of ſeveral children, ſhe is nevertheleſs venerated as a virgin.*] The pilgrims are obliged, according to the formulary of prayers, among other things, to ſay thus: ' I wiſh thee ' eternal ſalvation, O virgin moſt pure, moſt juſt, and ' immaculate, glorious *Fatima,* daughter of *Mahomet* ' *the elect,* wife of *Ali the well beloved,* mother of ' twelve true vicars of GOD, of illuſtrious birth (13).'

(2) Ambaſſade, pag. 220, *cited by Beſpier,* ibid.

(3) Id. pag. 22.

(4) Hiſtoire des Cherifs, cap. lxxiv.

(5) Id. cap. cvii.

(6) Pietro della Valle, pag. 58, *of the ſecond volume of his* Travels, *cited by Beſpier,* ubi ſupra, p. 23, 24.

(7) Beſpier, ibid. pag. 24.

(8) Tavernier, Voiages, lib. i, pag. 75. Dutch Edit. 1679.

(9) Journal de Voiage de Perſe, pag. 464, *of Wolfgang's Edit. of Amſterdam,* 1686.

(10) Journal du Voiage de Perſe, pag. 465.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Ibid. pag. 468.

(13) Ibid. pag. 464.

FAUCHET (CLAUDE) a Pariſian, and firſt preſident of the court of the mint at Paris, publiſhed ſome books which gained him the reputation of a learned man [*A*]. He died very old in the year 1601. Lewis XIII was not pleaſed with his way of writing (*a*). The Sieur Sorel, in his French Bibliotheque, makes a parallel between him and Scipio du Pleix (*b*). It deſerves to be read.

(*a*) See the remark [*O*] of the article LEWIS XIII.

(*b*) Pag. 377, of the ſecond edition.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books, which gained him the reputation of a learned man.*] ' He has tranſlated with ' great labour and learning the hiſtory of Cor. Tacitus, ' printed at Paris by Abel l'Angelier in 1582, 1583, ' 1584, in folio, in 4to, and 8vo, without putting ' his name to it, no more than to his book of Gallic Antiquities . . . . . . ſo little does he thirſt after ' fame, only deſiring to benefit the public (1).' Thus la Croix du Maine ſpoke in the year 1584. Mr Baillet does not mention this tranſlation as an anonymous work. ' Claude Fauchet, *ſays he* (2), has tranſlated ' into our language the works of Tacitus, which were ' printed under his name in divers forms, but the firſt ' five books are tranſlated by Stephen de la Planche ' (3).' Fauchet publiſhed a Collection of Gallic and French antiquities in two books, in the year 1579, in 4to. Twenty years after he gave a ſecond edition of it in 8vo, and carried it down to the end of the firſt race of the kings of France. He publiſhed the ſequel of it, in 1601, in 8vo: it is intituled, *Fleur de la maiſon de Charlemagne . . . . contenant les faits de Pepin & ſes ſucceſſeurs depuis l'an 751, juſques à l'an 840 de JESUS CHRIST.* He died while they were printing, *Declin de la maiſon de Charlemagne . . . . . contenant les faits de Charles le Chauve & ſes ſucceſſeurs depuis l'an 840, juſques à l'an 987 de JESUS CHRIST & entrée du regne de Hugues Capet.* This volume came out in 1620, in 8vo. As to the work *des Origines des Chevaliers, Armoiries, & Heraux, enſemble de l'ordonnance, armes & inſtrumens deſquels les François ont anciennement uſé en leurs guerres,* it was printed at Paris in the year 1600, in 8vo. His

(1) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Franç. pag. 57.

(2) Baillet, Jugement des Sçavans, Tom. IV, n. 939, pag. 535.

(3) Du Verdier calls him Plance.

Recueil de l'origine de la langue & poëſie Françoiſe, Rhyme & Romans; plus les noms & ſommaire des Oeuvres de 127 poëtes François, vivans avant l'an 1300, was printed at Paris in 4to, in the year 1581. The edition of his works done at Paris in 1610 (4), which Moreri mentions, was reprinted at Geneva the year following.

(4) It is in 4to.

(a) I have ſeen him cited in Latin Falcarius

FAUCHEUR (a) **MICHAEL LE**) was an illuſtrious miniſter among the proteſtants of France in the XVIIth century. Preaching was his great talent [*A*], in which indeed he excelled. He made himſelf admired in this way in the church of Montpellier [*B*]; and as his reputation increaſed, and the church of Paris uſed to appropriate to herſelf the greateſt preachers of the provinces, he was called up thither. He was not ſorry of an opportunity to undeceive thoſe who thought his capacity was confined to the making a good ſermon and delivering it well. Wherefore he engaged in a larger work upon the euchariſt againſt cardinal Perron. They were agreeably ſurprized to ſee a large folio come from his pen, full of Greek and Latin quotations, and all ſorts of erudition relating to that controverſy. His other works are ſeveral volumes of ſermons, and a treatiſe of the action of an orator [*C*], which was lately reprinted in Holland. I have ſeen a latin manuſcript letter of his, in which he gave very good advice to the great du Moulin upon his book of the Salmurian controverſies. Le Faucher died at Paris the firſt of April 1657 (*b*).

(b) Witte, in Dario Biograph. *See alſo* la Vie de Mr Daillé, pag. 44.

[*A*] *His talent was preaching.*] I have heard that one day he preached with ſo much eloquence againſt duelling, that the marſhal de la Force, who was preſent at the ſermon, proteſted before ſome men of the ſword, that if a challenge was ſent him, he would not accept it.

[*B*] *He made himſelf admired in the church at Montpellier.*] The ſermon, he preached there upon a faſt-day in the year 1618, was ſeveral times reprinted. It is a moſt ſolid and pathetic piece.

[*C*] *He wrote a treatiſe of the action of an orator.*] It was printed at Leyden the year 1686, and falſely attributed to Mr Conrart; whether they believed he was the author, or deſigned to make the book ſell the better, by putting the name of a man to it who was celebrated for his politeneſs. The journaliſts of Leipſic give a very exact abſtract of it, in their Journal of the month of January 1687 (1). They did not forget the place where the author ſpeaks of a preacher, who made himſelf a rule to cough exactly at ſuch and ſuch a period; and leaſt he ſhould forget, he made marks in his notes wherever he propoſed to cough. In thoſe places he wrote *hem, hem*, as was ſeen in the original after his death. The advice given by theſe journaliſts was followed by a profeſſor of Helmſtadt (2), who tranſlated that treatiſe into Latin. This tranſlation was publiſhed in the ſame city in 1690. They make mention of it (3), informing the public that the tranſlator had reſtored that work to it's true author. Their ſuppoſition that this book, having been printed at Lyons without the author's name in 1676, was publiſhed at Paris ten years after under Mr Conrart's name, and that the Holland edition, in imitation of that of Paris, alſo aſcribes it to Mr Conrart, wants to be corrected. I. The anonymous edition of Lyons in 1679 is not the firſt. I remember to have ſeen this book ever ſince 1666. II. They did not print it at Paris in 1686, with Mr Conrart's name to it. Thoſe words *ad exemplar Pariſ.* 1686, which thoſe gentlemen quote (4), ſignify, not that it was printed from the edition which came out at Paris in 1686, but that it was printed in 1686 according to the Paris edition. And ſo they do not give the date of the Paris edition.

(1) *Pag.* 17, 18.

(2) Melchior Smidius.

(3) At the month of July 1690, pag. 368.

(4) Pag. 17, Ann. 1687.

FAUNO (**LUCIO**) in Latin Faunus, an Italian author, who lived about the middle of the XVIth century (*a*), compoſed a book of the antiquities of Rome *delle antichita della città di Roma*, which has been printed in Italian and Latin [*A*]. He tranſlated alſo into Italian certain works of Flavius Blondus (*b*).

(*a*) Quem ætate Pauli IV (*it ſhould be* Pauli III) Romani Pontificis, anno Chriſti M.D.XL, vixiſſe conſtat. *Hankius, de Scriptoribus Rerum Romanarum, Tom. II, pag.* 134. (*b*) Epitome Bibliothecæ Geſneri, pag. m. 552.

[*A*] *His book of the antiquities of Rome, has been printed in Italian, and in Latin.*] In the catalogue of the Bibliotheca Thuana, the Italian edition of Venice is placed in the year 1558, in 8vo. It is ſaid (1) there was another edition of it in the ſame city in 1553. The Latin edition, if we believe Geſner's abridgment, came out at Venice in the year 1546. Others take notice of none but the Venice edition in 1549 (2).

(1) *See Mr Teiſſier*, in Catalogor. &c. pag. 550.

(2) Hank. de Scriptor. Rer. Roman. p. 134.

FAUSTA, daughter of Maximian Herculeus (*a*), was wife to the emperor Conſtantine. She was beſtowed upon him with a deſign to deceive him (*b*); but ſhe diſcovered Maximian's treachery to her huſband (*c*). They ſay that Conſtantine ſuſpecting that Criſpus, a ſon he had (*d*) by a concubine (*e*), had an unlawful commerce with Fauſta, cauſed him to be put to death; and to comfort his mother Helena, who was infinitely grieved at the death of that young man, he ordered Fauſta to be ſmothered in a very hot bath. This is affirmed by Zoſimus (*f*). Some ſay that Fauſta, falling in love with Criſpus, diſcovered her paſſion to him; but not being able to prevail upon him, ſhe complained to Conſtantine that he would have attempted her virtue. They add, that Conſtantine believing Fauſta's calumny, put Criſpus to death; but afterwards, being convinced of his ſon's innocence, he ordered her to be executed [*A*]. Cardinal Ba-

ronius

(*a*) Zoſimus, lib. ii, pag. m. 81.

(*b*) Id. ibid. pag. 82.

(*c*) Idem ibid. *See alſo* Eutropius, lib. x.

(*d*) Id. Zoſim. ibid. pag. 93.

(*e*) *Her name was Minervina.* Zoſimus, lib. ii, pag. 93.

(*f*) Id. ibid. pag. 103, 104.

[*A*] *Some ſay that Fauſta falling in love with Criſpus ..... Conſtantine put Criſpus ..... and that woman to death.*] This tragical event is related a thouſand different ways by authors, and almoſt always curtailed of ſome of the moſt eſſential circumſtances. Zoſimus (1) pretends that Conſtantine ſuſpected Criſpus had to do with Fauſta; and yet he aſſures us that the emperor put Criſpus to death without inflicting any puniſhment upon the empreſs; for he ſays ſhe was ſtifled in the bath, only becauſe it was found neceſſary to do ſo, to comfort Conſtantine's mother. Such a relation deſerves much to be cenſured. Criſpus could not be ſuſpected as guilty of inceſt with Fauſta, without Fauſta's being ſuſpected of the ſame crime. How comes it to paſs then that Conſtantine puniſhed none but Criſpus? this is an objection Zoſimus ought to have foreſeen and obviated, and yet he has taken no manner of precaution againſt it: therefore he has not given an exact account of Conſtantine's behaviour in this affair. According to the latter part of his narrative, it ſhould have

been

(1) Zoſim. lib. ii, pag. m. 103, 104.

ronius (g) juſtly complains of the writers of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, who have either ſuppreſſed

been ſaid in the firſt, that Criſpus was ſuſpected, not of committing inceſt with Fauſta, but of having attempted her chaſtity in vain. Then the conſequence would have been natural, and every body would have eaſily conceived that Conſtantine ſacrificed the innocence of his wife to his mother's grief, or that by certain artifices they had perſuaded him that the empreſs's conduct had not been faultleſs. To have a full account of this event we muſt have recourſe to Metaphraſtus: I confeſs he is not an author very worthy of credit; but yet he leaves the feweſt chaſms, he is one that puts the circumſtances into good order. Criſpus accuſed by his mother-in-law is puniſhed: his father looks upon him as the only criminal. No wonder then that Fauſta ſuffers nothing. Afterwards ſhe is convicted of being a falſe accuſer, and is puniſhed on that ſcore. Note, Metaphraſtus ſuppoſes that Artemius the martyr relates this to juſtify Conſtantine, and anſwer the objections of Julian the apoſtate. Read the following paſſage of Baronius (2): ‘ Artemius præfectus Auguſtalis, idemque martyr, cum chriſtianitatis reus cauſam ageret coram Juliano Apoſtata, deroganti illi Conſtantino, multaque in eum objicienti, ac præſertim propinquorum necem, hæc tunc in eum pro Conſtantino reſpondit *: *Ille autem* (inquit) *uxorem Fauſtam juſte admodum interfecit, ut quæ priſcam Phædram eſſet imitata, ejuſque filium Criſpum calumniata, quòd ejus amore captus eſſet, & vim ei conatus eſſet afferre, ſicut etiam illa Hippolytum Theſei filium. Atque primùm quidem qui ſic in matrem inſanierat* (*ut volebant ejus verba*) *ille cùm eſſet maritus, punivit. Poſtea autem cum ſciviſſet eſſe mentitam, ipſam quoque occidit, in eam ferens ſententiam omnium juſtiſſimam.* Hæc Artemius ad Julianum. —— *Artemius the emperor's lieutenant, and a martyr, being accuſed of chriſtianity, and obliged to appear on his trial before Julian the apoſtate, who inveighed againſt Conſtantine, laying ſeveral heavy things to his charge, but more particularly the murder of his neareſt relations, made this anſwer in defence of Conſtantine.* He killed, *ſays he*, and that moſt juſtly his wife Fauſta, becauſe like another Phædra ſhe had falſly accuſed his ſon Criſpus of having fallen in love with her, and attempted her honour, as the firſt had done to Hippolytus ſon of Theſeus. In the perſon of a huſband he puniſhed the ſon, who, according to his wife's inſinuation, had been tranſported with ſo unjuſtifiable a paſſion. But when he was afterwards convinced of his wife's perfidy: he put her likewiſe to death, making her undergo a ſentence, than which none could be more juſt. *Thus Artemius replied to Julian.*’ Sidonius Apollinaris tells us, that Ablavius the conſul made a diſtich which was fixed upon the palace gates, containing a ſtinging ſatire upon Conſtantine's cruelty. ‘ Ut mihi non figuratius Conſtantini domum vitamque videatur vel pupugiſſe verſu gemello conſul Ablavius, vel momordiſſe diſticho tali clam palatinis foribus appenſo:

Saturni aurea ſæcla quis requirat?
Sunt hæc gemmea (3), ſed Neroniana.

The age of ſaturn was an age of gold;
But this, like Nero's, is an age of gems.

‘ Quia ſcilicet prædictus Auguſtus iiſdem ferè temporibus extinxerat conjugem Fauſtam calore balnei, filium Criſpum frigore veneni (4).’ Theſe words of Sidonius Apollinaris ſay nothing of the cauſe of Conſtantine's proceeding; they only inform us that this prince put his wife Fauſta to death by the heat of a bath, and his ſon Criſpus by the deadly cold of poiſon. Moſt writers ſay that Criſpus was killed, not poiſoned. ‘ Ad Iſtriam duxit prope oppidum Polam, ubi quondam PEREMPTUM Conſtantini filium accepimus Criſpum (5). —— *To Iſtria near the town of Pola, where, it is ſaid, Criſpus the ſon of Conſtantine was killed.*’ St Jerom's expreſſion is: ‘ Hic (Lactantius) extrema ſenectute magiſter Cæſaris Criſpi, filii Conſtantini in Gallia fuit, qui poſtea à patre INTERFECTUS eſt (6). —— *Lactantius in his old age was preceptor to Criſpus, ſon to Conſtantine, in Gaul, who was afterwards ſlain by his father.*’ We read in Euſebius's chronicle, that Criſpus the ſon of Conſtantine, and young Licinius the ſon of Conſtantine's ſiſter, were barbarouſly murdered, *crudeliſſimè* INTERFICIUNTUR, the firſt year of the CCLXXVIth Olympiad, that is in the year 325; and that Conſtantine put his wife Fauſta to death the fourth year of the ſame Olympiad. Oroſius ſays nothing of Fauſta; but he ſays that Conſtantine, about the time that the Arian hereſy was condemned in the council of Nice, put to death Criſpus his own ſon, and Licinius his nephew, without any body's knowing the reaſons of his being thus exaſperated againſt his own blood. ‘ Sed inter hæc latent cauſæ, cur vindicem gladium & deſtinatam in impios punitionem Conſtantinus imperator etiam in proprios egit affectus. Nam Criſpum filium ſuum, & Licinium, ſororis filium INTERFECIT (7). —— *It is not well known what ſhould induce Conſtantine to draw his vindictive ſword, and to inflict the puniſhment deſtined for heathens on his own family; for he put to death his own ſon Criſpus, and his ſiſter's ſon Licinius.*’ It is very ſtrange this hiſtorian ſhould never have heard what is atteſted by ſo many others, that Criſpus was put to death upon ſuſpicion of a criminal love to his mother-in law; but perhaps Oroſius had heard that, and other reaſons alſo, but judged from the diverſity of opinions that the true cauſes of it were concealed. Aurelius Victor, who ſays that it was believed Conſtantine made away with Criſpus at Fauſta's inſtigation, does not add the motive which ſhe ſuggeſted to her huſband. But he however agrees with Zoſimus concerning the cauſe of Fauſta's death; he ſays that Conſtantine ordered her to be put to death in a bath, becauſe his mother Helena, exceedingly afflicted with grief for the death of Criſpus, reproached him with it. ‘ Fauſta conjuge, ut putant, ſuggerente Criſpum filium NECARI jubet. Dehinc uxorem ſuam Fauſtam in balneas ardentes conjectam interemit, cum eum mater Helena dolore nimio nepotis increparet (8). —— *He cauſed his ſon Criſpus to be put to death upon the ſuggeſtions, as it is believed, of his wife Fauſta. Afterwards he put her alſo to death in a hot bath, moved thereto by the complaints of his mother Helena, who extremely regretted the loſs of her grandſon.*’ Nothing is more ſurprizing to me than that Eutropius ſhould enlarge upon Conſtantine's cruelty, without touching upon the death of Criſpus, though he did not forget to mention particularly that of young Licinius, and Fauſta (9). It is pretended that St Chryſoſtome, without naming any body, has related this action of Conſtantine; but he ſuppoſes that this prince, ſuſpecting his wife of adultery, ordered her to be bound upon the top of a mountain, to be devoured by wild beaſts. He adds that the ſon of that prince was killed by his own father, or rather by his brother (10). Gregorius Turonenſis affirms that Conſtantine put his ſon Criſpus, and his wife Fauſta to death, for high-treaſon (11). Philoſtorgius ſays that Conſtantine being prepoſſeſſed by the calumnies of his wife, Criſpus's mother-in-law, ordered him to be killed, and afterwards having diſcovered that ſhe committed adultery with a courier, he cauſed her to be ſtifled in the bath (12). Beſides the authors I have named, the reader will do well to conſult Suidas (13) and Zonaras.

I have produced all theſe authorities, that the reader may ſee the defects, variations, and want of exactneſs, in ancient hiſtorians. Note alſo, that having ſo many authors to cite upon this ſubject, it is ſtrange that no body ſhould be quoted in Moreri but Ammianus Marcellinus, who ſays nothing, either of Fauſta, or of the reaſon why Criſpus was put to death. We have ſeen before (14) all that is to be met with in this writer concerning this matter.

I cannot omit the liberty Cauſſin the Jeſuit has taken to add abundance of things of his own invention to the account of this adventure. This would be tolerable in a piece of poetry, or a romance; but in a ſerious work, and which is intituled *The holy court*, ſuch rhetorical decorations are not to be allowed. Nothing is more delightful than this to young ſcholars, or more inſipid to perſons advanced in age, and judgment. They cannot behold without indignation a long deſcription of the beauty of Criſpus, the riſe and progreſs of Fauſta's paſſion, the manner ſhe made her paſſion known, her rage to be denied, her contrivance to be revenged, her ſorrow for the death of Criſpus, *&c*; they cannot bear, I ſay, the repreſentation of all preſſed theſe facts, or have even endeavoured to confute them [*B*]. He places the marriage of Conſtantine with Fauſta in the year 307 (*b*), and the death of Criſpus and that empreſs in 324. Nothing could have been more dangerous to this ſon of Conſtantine, than to have his mother-in-law in love with him, for which way ſoever he acted, he was ſure to be ruined by it. A compliance had expoſed him to the wrath of God; and beſides, if it had been known, he could hope for no favour from Conſtantine; his refuſal was no leſs fatal, for this was what expoſed him to the indignation and rage of an empreſs [*C*]. Some ſay that (*i*) Fauſta brought back Conſtantine to worſhip falſe deities,

---

(g) Baron, ad Ann. 324, n. 5, & ſeq.

(2) Baronius, ad ad. ann. 324, n. xi, pag. m 295.

* Ex Metaphr. apud Sur. die 20 Octob. Tom. V.

(3) *Savaro makes this note upon that word*, ſcilicet quod Criſpus . . . veneno gemmæ id eſt gemmatæ pateræ infuſo potionatus occubuit. —— *Becauſe Criſpus had been poiſoned with a liquor preſented in a cup ſet round with* GEMS.

(4) Sidon. Apollinar. Epiſt. viii, lib. v, pag. m. 338.

(5) Ammianus Marcellin. lib. xiv, cap. ult. pag. m. 57, 58.

(6) Hieronym. de Script. Eccleſ. in in Lactantio.

(7) Oroſius, lib. vii, cap. xxviii, fol. m. 321, verſo.

(8) Aurel. Victor. in Epitome, pag. m. 224.

(9) Primum neceſſitudines perſecutus, egregium virum, & ſororis filium, commodæ indolis juvenem interfecit, mox uxorem, poſt numeroſos amicos. *Eutrop. lib. x, pag. m.* 117.

(10) Chryſoſt. Homil. XV in Philippenſes. *See* Henr. Valois, in Ammian. Marcell. lib. xiv, pag. m. 58.

(11) Greg. Turon. Hiſtor. Franç. lib i, cap. xxxiv.

(12) Philoſtorg. Hiſt. Eccleſ lib. ii, cap. iv.

(13) Suidas, voce Κρίσκης.

(14) *Citat.* (5).

all theſe things, though they are not derived from any hiſtory. As to the laſt particular, the author ſays as follows. ‘ As ſoon as this news (15) arrived at court, ‘ the wicked Fauſta knowing it to be the effect of her ‘ own perfidy, and having before her eyes the image ‘ of the poor prince whom ſhe had ſo paſſionately ‘ loved before, but now baſely butchered in the bloom of ‘ beauty, and at an age, moſt to be lamented, and of ‘ ſo ſweet a temper as would have excited compaſſion ‘ in lions and tigers; all her paſſion and hatred was ‘ turned into outragious grief, which forced her to ‘ cry and howl at her huſband's feet, confeſſing ſhe ‘ had murdered the chaſte Criſpus by her abominable ‘ calumnies; that ſhe had ſollicited him to wickedneſs; but had found him, like Joſeph, armed with invincible chaſtity, abhorring her ſin to the degree it ‘ deſerved; whereupon, ſtung with rage, and fearing ‘ to be prevented, ſhe had invented that calumny againſt him; for which reaſon ſhe was unworthy to ‘ live any longer, after having deſtroyed the moſt innocent prince in the world, and ſtained his own father with his blood (16).’ What boldneſs this! An author of the XVIIth century pretends to give us the particulars of a thing which happened in the IVth, and all out of his own head. No ancient author has informed us how Conſtantine came to know his ſon's innocence, much leſs that it was Fauſta herſelf who diſcovered it to the emperor.

[*B*] *Cardinal Baronius juſtly complains of the writers . . . . who have ſuppreſſed theſe facts, or who have even endeavoured to confute them.*] He attacks on this head three hiſtorians; Euſebius, Sozomen, and Evagrius. The firſt is ſilent: the other two diſpute againſt thoſe who have ſpoken. Euſebius keeps a profound ſilence concerning this matter in his life of Conſtantine, but not in his chronicle. Sozomen durſt neither poſitively acknowledge, nor deny the death of Criſpus; he (17) is content to refute the Pagan authors, who had ſaid that Conſtantine finding no way in Paganiſm to expiate ſuch execrable murders, but finding a method to do it in the chriſtian religion, forſook the religion of his fathers, and turned chriſtian. Evagrius (18) abſolutely denies theſe two things; firſt, that Conſtantine put Criſpus and Fauſta to death; and ſecondly, that he embraced chriſtianity for that reaſon. Baronius (19) having condemned the ſilence of the firſt of theſe three hiſtorians, as a baſe flattery, charges (20) Sozomen with incredible ſtupidity, who, to ſhew that Conſtantine did not put Criſpus to death, only makes uſe, ſays he, of this argument: Criſpus lived to the twentieth year of Conſtantine's reign, and enacted ſeveral laws with him. Baronius (21) ſtill wonders more at Evagrius's behaviour: he refers him to the chronicle of Euſebius, to Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Oroſius, Sidonius Apollinaris, *&c.* Afterwards he confutes the arguments that Sozomen and Evagrius have oppoſed, the former to the Pagan authors in general, the latter to Zoſimus in particular. I. We may obſerve in the firſt place that he mutilates their arguments, and that he ſhould not have affirmed that Sozomen denied the death of Criſpus (22); for that hiſtorian is ſatisfied with leaving the matter doubtful, and only confutes the conſequences which the Pagans would infer from it. The argument, he urges againſt them, is much better than Baronius makes it; for if Conſtantine and Criſpus had jointly enacted laws in favour of chriſtianity, as Sozomen ſuppoſes, it follows that Conſtantine had abjured the Pagan religion before the death of Criſpus; therefore he did not abjure it, becauſe he could not find in it the neceſſary expiations, ſtained as he was with the blood of his ſon, as the Pagans pretended. This is Sozomen's argument: the annaliſt deſtroys the force of it, by ſuppoſing that this author only ſaid, that Criſpus had made laws together with Conſtantine (23). His obſervation was not ſo indefinite: he ſaid thoſe laws were in favour of the chriſtians (24). Baronius does not deal more fairly with Evagrius: he charges him (25) with urging againſt Zoſimus, Euſebius's ſilence; but it is certain that Evagrius goes farther: he relates (26) three paſſages in Euſebius's eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, which teſtify, that the emperor Conſtantine was always zealous for the true faith, and that his ſon Criſpus, beloved of God, was like his father. II. In the ſecond place let us ſay, that Sozomen's other arguments have been well anſwered by the annaliſt (27), who has plainly made it appear that Soſipater the philoſopher was acquainted with Conſtantine, and ought to have told him, according to the Platonic hypotheſis, that the parricides of that emperor could never be expiated: and Zoſimus aſſures us that this was the anſwer that philoſopher did give Conſtantine. But he has been confuted (28) among other reaſons by this: that Soſipater could not be ignorant that the religion of the Greeks had expiatory ceremonies for the moſt heinous murders; witneſs Hercules who killed his ſons, and his hoſt, and yet found means to expiate it. Baronius (29) refutes theſe anſwers of Sozomen excellently well, by ſhewing a capital difference between the parricides of Conſtantine, and thoſe of Hercules. The former were committed by a prince in his ſenſes, and the latter by a madman, whoſe actions could not be deemed voluntary.

No doubt it will be asked, why this annaliſt undertakes to confirm the ſlanders of the Pagan authors, and confutes the eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians, who have anſwered them as well as they could. Does it become a cardinal to declare in a manner for infidels, who have affected to vilify Conſtantine's converſion, as if that emperor had only abjured Paganiſm, becauſe the diſcipline of it was ſo ſevere, that there was no remedy againſt the terrors of his own conſcience, whereas the chriſtians offered him an eaſy method to waſh away his guilt in the waters of baptiſm? we muſt not think Baronius does all this for nothing: he does it only to ſupport certain traditions which are favourable to the Roman ſee; he (30) makes uſe of this to confirm the acts of pope Silveſter, and to prove that Conſtantine received baptiſm at Rome, from that pope, a little before the celebration of the council of Nice. The annals of Idatius are not in his favour; for they place the death of Criſpus in the year 326. Father Pagi (31) places the third conſulſhip of Criſpus in the year 324. Conſult Godefroy's notes upon Philoſtorgius (32). After all, it is hard to imagine that, one year before or after the council of Nice, Conſtantine ſhould conſult a heathen philoſopher upon the expiatory ceremonies for murder. Could he be ſtill immerſed in Pagan ſuperſtition after ſo long a profeſſion of the true faith? note, that even to this day there are ſome people (33) who queſtion whether he put his wife Fauſta to death; and forgot not to compare the pagans with thoſe who have publiſhed, and do ſtill publiſh, that the reformers of the church in the XVIth century, did not leave the Romiſh communion, for any other cauſe but to free themſelves from the rigours of celibacy, and abſtinences, and that the liberty of living without auricular confeſſion, and without any auſterities, procured them a crowd of followers.

[*C*] *His refuſal . . . expoſed him to the indignation, and rage of an empreſs.*] Thoſe, who are beſt acquainted with affairs of gallantry, ſay that it is very imprudent to play the part of a tempter, when their deſign is nothing more than to try the virtue of a woman; for they run a very great hazard, if they go ſo far as to gain her conſent. The affront they do her, by neglecting the favourable diſpoſition ſhe is in, fills her with reſentment, which puts her upon inventing a thouſand ways to revenge herſelf: ſhe cannot bear to remember that ſhe has been deceived, and that the weakneſs ſhe diſcovered, has produced nothing; ſhe cannot, I ſay, think upon this without violent tranſports of rage, which her deceiver has reaſon to dread,

(*b*) *Mr Baluze,* in Lactant. de Morte Perſec. cap. xxvii, *proves that this chronology is right.*

(*i*) Michel Glycas, lib. iv, apud Baronium, ad ann. 324, n. 35.

(15) Of the death of Criſpus.

(16) Cauſſin, *Holy Court*, Tom. II, pag. m. 56.

(17) Sozomen. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. i, cap. v, pag. m. 406, 407.

(18) Evagrius, Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. iii, cap. xli, pag. m. 371.

(19) Baron. ad ann. 324, n. 5, pag. m. 293.

(20) Idem. ibid. n. 7, pag. 294.

(21) Ibid. n. 8.

(22) Ut neget Criſpum occiſum à patre. *Baron. ibid. n. 7.* Non admittens omnino Criſpum à Conſtantino juſſum occidi. *Id. ibid. n. 20. James Godefroi,* Notis in Philoſt. pag. 50, *makes the ſame miſtake.*

(23) Eo uno utitur argumento quod Criſpus vivens ad vigeſimum uſque patris imperii annum pervenerit, multas interea leges cum eo ſtatuens. *Baron. ad ann.* 324, *n.* 7.

(24) Πολλοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ θέμενος νόμους ὑπὲρ Χριςιανῶν. Multas una cum patre leges pro Chriſtianis tulerat. *Sozom. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. i, cap. v, pag.* 406, 407.

(25) Baron. ad ann. 324, n. 8.

(26) Evagr. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. iii, cap. xli, p. 372.

(27) Baron ad ann. 324, n. 22, & ſeq.

(28) Sozom. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. i, cap v, pag. 407.

(29) Baron. ad ann. 324, n. 25.

(30) Baron. n. 29, & ſeq. ad ann. 324.

(31) Pagi, Diſſer. Hypat. pag. 249.

(32) Jac. Gothofredus, in Philoſtorg. pag. 51.

(33) *See* Cellarius in Eutrop. lib. X.

deities, and that God ſent the leproſy upon him to reclaim him.

it is much worſe when a woman has declared herſelf firſt, and made advances which have met with ill ſucceſs. Wo to the man ſhe has tried in vain: ſhe meditates nothing but his ruin. The patriarch Joſeph is a proof of this (34): and beſides this great example in holy writ, the hiſtory of the heroic times will furniſh no leſs ſhining inſtances of the ſame: read the adventures of Bellerophon, and thoſe of the chaſte Hippolytus. The hiſtory of the following ages will alſo ſupply us with ſomething of the like, were it only in our Fauſta the falſe accuſer of Criſpus, who would not gratify her luſt. Juvenal has well obſerved, that if the ſhame of ſuch a denial inflames hatred, in that caſe a woman ſhews the greateſt cruelty.

(34) Gen. xxix.

Sed caſto quid forma nocet? quid profuit olim
Hippolyto grave propoſitum? quid Bellerophonti?
Erubuit nempe hæc ceu faſtidita repulſa:
Nec Stenobœa minus quam Creſſa excanduit, & ſe
Concuſſere ambæ, *mulier ſæviſſima tunc eſt,*
Cum ſtimulos odio pudor admovet (35).

(35) Juvenal, Sat. x, v. 324.

She may be handſome, yet be chaſte you ſay,
Good obſervator not ſo faſt away.
Did it not coſt one modeſt youth his life,
Who ſhunn'd th' embraces of his father's wife?
And was not t'other ſtrippling forc'd to fly,
Who coldly did his patron's queen deny?
The ladies charg'd them home, and turn'd the tale,
With ſhame they redden'd, and with ſpight grew pale.

'Tis dangerous to deny the longing dame,
She loſes pity who has loſt her ſhame.

Dryden.

An empreſs, a queen, and in general, ladies of the higheſt rank, are eſpecially to be dreaded when their enticements are ſlighted: their quality makes them more ſenſible of the injury, and gives them greater opportunities of revenge. To them may be well applied theſe words of Juno in Virgil (36):

(36) Virgil. Æneid. lib. 1, ver. 37.

Mene incepto deſiſtere victam?

Muſt I then vanquiſh'd quit the form'd deſign!

Upon ſuch occaſions a contempt of beauty is an offence which ſinks deep into the heart.

Manet alta mente repoſtum
Judicium Paridis ſpretæque injuria formæ (37).

(37) Id. ibid. ver. 26.

Deep graven in her heart the doom remain'd
Of partial Paris, and her form diſdain'd.

Dryden.

I know not whether Lactantius had made his diſciple (38) read the hiſtory of Phædra: it might have been of ſome ſervice to him.

(38) Criſpus the ſon of Conſtantine.

FEITHIUS (Everard) was born at Elburg in Guelderland, in the XVIth century. He ſpent ſome years in the ſtudy of philoſophy, after which he devoted himſelf entirely to polite learning, and made a great progreſs therein. He made himſelf maſter of the Greek, and even of the Hebrew tongue. The profeſſors of the Academy, which the French proteſtants had in Berne, gave an ample teſtimony of it. Having been abroad a long time, he returned into his own country, where he found every body in a conſternation on account of the Spaniſh expedition under Spinola. This made him reſolve to leave his native country. He retired into France, where he taught the Greek tongue, and was honoured with the friendſhip of Caſaubon, Meſſieurs du Puy, and Thuanus. As he was walking in Rochelle, attended with a ſervant, he was deſired to go into a certain citizens houſe (*a*). It could never be known ſince what became of him, tho' the magiſtrates made the moſt ſtrict inquiry. It was great pity; for if this young man had arrived to old age, he would have wonderfully improved literature. This opinion is founded upon the manuſcripts he left behind him (*b*); one of which was publiſhed at Leyden in 1677 [*A*].

(*a*) In civis Rupellani ædes vocatur. *Brumanus, ubi infra.*

(*b*) *Taken from Brumanus*, Epiſt. Dedicat. Antiquitatum Homericarum.

[*A*] *One of his works was publiſhed at Leyden in* 1677.] It is a volume in 12ves conſiſting of 350 pages, intituled *Antiquitatum Homericarum libri quatuor.* It contains a great deal of curious and uſeful learning. Henry Bruman rector of the college of Swol, great nephew to the author (1), took care to publiſh it. He promiſed alſo to collect Feithius's other writings which were diſperſed through the negligence of his heirs. I am well informed, that they are not all loſt, and that the tract *De Athenienſium Republica*, and that *De Antiquitatibus Atticis*, are in the hands of a moſt learned antiquary (2).

(1) Avo meo materno frater fuit (Feithius). *Bruman. Epiſt. Dedic. Antiquit. Homer.*

(2) Mr Cuper.

‘FELIBIEN (Andrew) Sieur des Avaux and de Javercy, counſellor, hiſtoriographer to the king, *&c.* made himſelf remarkable by his knowledge of the polite arts. He was of Chartres, where no ſooner had he finiſhed his claſſic learning at fourteen years of age, but he was ſent to Paris to learn the ſciences and fit himſelf for buſineſs. But his inclination for the muſes ſoon diſcovered itſelf. The firſt eſſays of his pen ſhewed the happineſs of his genius, and the gracefulneſs of his ſtyle. The Marquis de Fontenay-Mareüil being nominated a ſecond time ambaſſador extraordinary to Rome in 1647, Mr Felibien was appointed ſecretary to the embaſſy, and anſwered all the expectations of that worthy miniſter towards him. During his ſtay at Rome, his natural paſſion for the polite arts made him willingly ſacrifice all his leiſure time in viſiting perſons who excelled in them, and eſpecially the famous Mr Pouſſin, in whoſe converſation he became acquainted with the greateſt beauties which were in the ſtatues and paintings. From the ſublime ideas he then formed of the excellence and perfection of painting, he afterwards compoſed thoſe learned works which have gained him ſo much reputation. Upon his return from Italy he went to Chartres, and as his deſign was to ſettle, he married Mrs Marguerite le Maire, daughter to the king's advocate in the Preſidial, related as well as he to the beſt families in the city, and among others to the illuſtrious houſe of Aligre originally of Chartres. Afterwards his friends preſented him to Mr Foucquet, who would have given greater marks of 'his favour if he had not too ſoon fallen under diſgrace. But Mr Colbert, who loved the arts and ſciences, did not neglect him. After he had made him draw certain plans for his majeſty, that he might proceed upon the other works he had begun, he got for him a brevet to be hiſtoriographer to the king, to his buildings, and the arts and manufactures of France, which was diſpatched the 10th of March 1666. The royal academy of architecture being erected in 1671, he was choſen their ſecretary. After this his majeſty made him keeper of his cabinet of antiquities, and gave him an apartment in the Brion palace. He had alſo one of the firſt places in the royal academy of inſcriptions and medals. Monſ. le Pelletier ſucceeding Monſ. Colbert in the direction of the finances, appointed Mr Felibien by commiſſion to be comptroller-general of the bridges and cauſeways of the kingdom. Tho' he had buſineſs enough upon his hands, he did not refuſe his aſſiſtance to the poor, being many years adminiſtrator of the hoſpital of the Quinzes-vingts at Paris .... He died the 11th of June 1695, at the Age of ſeventy ſix years. He left five children (*a*) [*A*].' We ſhall ſee, below, the catalogue of his principal works, with the abridgment of the encomium upon them, and the character of his heart [*B*]. See the *journal des Savans* of the 28th of November 1695.

(*a*) Taken word for word from a memoir received from Paris.

[*A*] *He left five children.*] 'Three ſons and two daughters: the eldeſt ſon, formerly dean of the cathedral church of Bourges, is now vicar-general in that archbiſhopric. The ſecond ſucceded him in the office of hiſtoriographer to the king, and keeper of his majeſty's antiquities. We have of his an hiſtorical collection of the lives and works of the moſt celebrated architects. The third is a monk, Dom Michael Felibien of the congregation of St Maur (1).'

[*B*] *We ſhall ſee the catalogue of his principal works, with the abridgment of the encomium upon them, and the character of his heart.*] 'His chief books are the conferences upon the lives and works of the moſt excellent painters, ancient and modern, in two volumes in 4to, the ſecond edition. The principles of architecture, ſculpture, and painting, with a dictionary of the proper terms in thoſe arts in 4to. Of the origin of painting together with ſeveral miſcellaneous pieces in 4to. Several deſcriptions either of Verſailles, or of the diverſions given by the king, or of pictures, collected into one volume in 12ves. The conferences of the royal academy of painting in one volume in 4to. The deſcription of the abbey de la Trappe in 12ves; and he alſo left ſome tranſlations, as an account of what paſſed in Spain at the diſgrace of the count duke of Olivares; tranſlated from the Italian; the caſtle of the ſoul of St Thereſa tranſlated from the Spaniſh. The life of pope Pius V tranſlated from the Italian. There appears in whatever he wrote, a ſolid judgment, an exquiſite taſte, great politeneſs and perſpicuity. His ſtile is pure, natural, noble, and elegant. The variety of things he has mixed together, eſpecially in his dialogues, and the beautiful ſtrokes he has interſperſed with a ſuitable decorum to his Subject, makes the reading of them exceedingly delightful. But however great his talents were, it was not from thence alone that he gained ſo much eſteem. It was partly owing to the reputation of his integrity; and the honour to be employed by five miniſters ſucceſſively, who were excellent judges of men, is an authentic proof of their approving his conduct. The king himſelf more than once commended his knowledge and virtue. Had he been ambitious or leſs moderate than he was, he might eaſily have advanced himſelf more in the world, being always welcome to the great men at court, but he could never bring himſelf to handle other people's money; which was his great conſolation at his death. Between eight and nine thouſand livres which he annually received from the king's favours, together with his own paternal eſtate, ſeemed to him a ſufficient reward for a man of letters, who ought rather to be a friend to virtue, than a ſlave to fortune. He always preſerved a great ſenſe of honour and religion. Though he was naturally of a grave and ſerious temper, nay, haſty and ſevere, yet his converſation was very agreeable, and upon occaſion gay and ſprightly. He had a heart full of ſincerity and regard to truth, to which he excited himſelf by theſe words, *benefacere & dicere vera*, which he had cauſed to be engraven upon his ſeal, and which they put in the exerge of his medal. He lived in the practice of theſe two duties, which make the honeſt man, and the true chriſtian (2).' You may find all this more particularly in the *journal des Savans* (3).

(1) Taken word for word from a memoir received from Paris.

(2) Taken from the ſame memoir.

(3) Of the 28th of November, 1695, pag. 695, *& ſeq. Dutch Edit.*

FENOILLET (Peter) biſhop of Montpellier in the XVIIth century, was of Annecy in Savoy. He applied himſelf to ſtudy with great diligence, and after receiving his doctor's degree in divinity, he applied himſelf to preaching, and became very famous in it. He was much eſteemed by Francis de Sales biſhop of Geneva, who gave him a benefice in his dioceſe, after which he was made canon of the cathedral of Annecy. Being invited to Paris to preach during Lent, he was ſo much applauded, that Henry IV honoured him with the title of his preacher, and at the end of three years nominated him to the biſhopric of Montpellier (*a*).

(*a*) Taken from the fourth letter of the firſt book of Francis de Sales, pag. 24, 25, Paris edit. 1662, in 8vo.

FERNELIUS (John) phyſician to Henry II, king of France, was born in Picardy [*A*]. He was ſent ſomething late to Paris to learn rhetoric and philoſophy; but he made ſo ſwift a progreſs, that commencing maſter of arts at the end of two years, the heads of the college unanimouſly offered him to be teacher of Logic, with a very conſiderable ſalary. He refuſed theſe offers, chuſing rather by private ſtudy, and lectures, to fit himſelf for a public profeſſion. He followed his ſtudies with ſuch application,

[*A*] *He was born in Picardy.*] I confine my ſelf to this general expreſſion, to be more ſecure; for I ſee on one hand that he ſtiles himſelf *Ambianus, a native of Amiens*, and on the other that we are aſſured in his life, that he was born at Clermont, twenty miles from Paris, and that he took the ſirname of Ambianus, becauſe his father was of Amiens. *Claromontio oppidulo (quod viginti duntaxat milliaribus à Lutetia diſtat) natus atque ingenue educatus, Ambianum in operibus idcirco ſe prædicat, quod patrem inde habuerit* (1). By Clermont is to be underſtood here Clermont in Beauvaiſis. Dom Peter de St Romuald alledges another reaſon why Fernelius was named Ambianus. 'He was born, *ſays he* (2), at Clermont in Beauvaiſis, in a houſe in the ſuburbs, where to this day hangs the ſign of the ſwan. Some have called him Ambianois, becauſe the ſuburb he was born in is called the ſuburb of Amiens. *Mezerai affirms* (3) *that Fernelius was a* native of Montdidier in the dioceſe of Amiens.

(1) G. Plantius, in vita Fernelii, initio.

(2) Abrégé du Threſ. Chronol. Tom. III, *at the year* 1558.

(3) Hiſtoire de France, Tom. II, pag. 1558.

tion, that he denied himſelf the moſt innocent pleaſures of life which might deprive him of his Cicero, his Plato, or his Ariſtotle (*a*). He got this advantage by reading Cicero, that his philoſophical lectures were as eloquent as thoſe of other maſters were barbarous at that time. He alſo applied himſelf much to the mathematics; this hard ſtudy threw him into a long fit of ſickneſs, which forced him to leave Paris. Returning thither after the recovery of his health, he reſolved to ſtudy Phyſic; but before he entered upon it, he taught a courſe of philoſophy in St Barbe's college. After this he ſpent four years in the ſtudy of phyſic, and taking his doctor's degree, he confined himſelf entirely to his cloſet in order to read the beſt authors, and cultivate the knowledge of the mathematics. He had an intimate friendſhip with an excellent rhetorician (*b*), who taught him polite learning, and whom he inſtructed in the mathematics. The inſtruments he invented, and ordered to be made in this ſcience, were very expenſive to him, which the wife, he had juſt married, not approving of, it breaking in upon her fortune, ſhe murmured, wept, and complained to her father (*c*), and incenſed him againſt Fernelius; at length he deſiſted, diſmiſſed all his inſtrument-makers, and applied himſelf wholly to the practice of phyſic; but becauſe viſiting the ſick could not take up all the time of a man, who, like him, allowed very little to eating and ſleeping [*B*], he reſumed an occupation which he had followed before he was doctor in phyſic; I mean he read public lectures upon Hippocrates and Galen. This ſoon acquired him a very great reputation through all France, and in foreign countries. He was forced at the end of ſix years to break off theſe lectures; for the eſteem he was in drew ſuch multitudes of patients to him, that he had not time to aſſiſt all thoſe that came to conſult him; but as nothing could make him leave his private ſtudies, he employed all his leiſure hours in compoſing a book of phyſic (*d*), which was publiſhed ſome time after. His diſciples preſſed him ſo warmly to read lectures upon this work, that he reſolved to do it notwithſtanding the oppoſition of his wife [*C*], and the advice of his friends. He ſpent three years in theſe lectures, and as during that time he undertook another work, which he alſo made public (*e*), he laid himſelf in a manner under a neceſſity of reading publickly ſome years longer, for they paſſionately deſired him to explain that ſecond book to the youth

(*a*) See the Remark [*B*].

(*b*) James Strebæus.

(*c*) He was a counſellor at Paris. But it is not ſaid in what court.

(*d*) This is the book which he intituled *Phyſiologia*.

(*e*) De venæ ſectione.

[*B*] *He allowed little time to eating and ſleep.*] Every other pleaſure but that of learning was inſipid to to him; he valued neither play, nor walking, nor entertainments, nor converſations. I ſpeak of the time when he was yet only a ſcholar. 'Ludos, jocos, 'compotationes, & comeſſationes, ſermones etiam omnium pene condiſcipulorum, ac familiarium, fugere 'ſtatuit, non cibi, non ſomni, non corporis, non valetudinis, non rei familiaris rationem habere, omnia 'perpeti, dum liberalium artium cognitionem aſſequeretur: omne in eis ſtudium, diligentiam, curam, induſtriam adhibere, nullam præterquam ex diſcendo 'voluptatem capere: arbitratus omnem horam perire 'quæ in bonorum authorum lectione & ſtudiis non 'collocaretur: tanta in illius animo inſita erat diſcendi cupiditas, tantus cognitionis amor & ſcientiæ '(4).—— *He ſhunned all plays, diverſions, clubs, entertainments, the converſation of his companions, and 'friends, and payed no regard to feaſting, ſleeping, dreſs, 'exerciſe, health, or fortune, but devoted himſelf entirely to ſtudy; laying out all his application, induſtry, 'and care in the ſearch of learning, in which was his 'ſole delight. He imagined every hour was loſt that was 'not dedicated to the reading of good Authors, ſuch was 'his deſire for learning, ſuch was his love for knowledge and improvement.*' The ſequel of his life did not contradict ſuch a beginning; never man was more active than he. He roſe at four a clock in the morning, and ſtudied till the time came on to read the public lectures, or to viſit the ſick. Then he examined the urines that were brought to him, and preſcribed medicines according to the conjectures he could form (5). When he returned home to dinner, he ſhut himſelf up with his books till he was called to ſit down to table, from table went into his cloſet again, which he did not leave till he was called to go abroad upon buſineſs. When he returned in the evening, he did as at noon, attended his books till called to ſupper; after ſupper he reſumed them again till eleven at night, when he lay down to reſt. When he had invited any friend to eat with him, he made no ſcruple to leave them as ſoon as the entertainment was over, and go to his books again. 'Omnia animi & corporis oblectamenta præ literarum ſtudiis, & medicæ artis exercitatione, pro nihilo ducens: ut nulla vitæ pars neque publicis, neque privatis, neque medicis, neque domeſticis in rebus vacaſſe officio videretur. Si quem fortè ad cœnam vel 'prandium aliquando invitaret, ab eo neque turpe, 'neque inhoneſtum ducebat, aliquantò poſt ſumptum 'cibum ſtudiorum cauſa ſe ſurripere (6).'

Some years before his death, at his wife's requeſt, he bought a country houſe (7): but he never went to it but once or twice a year to refreſh himſelf. He found more pleaſure in an active life, and in the exerciſe of his profeſſion than in retirement. 'Erat 'hoc robore animi, atque hac indole virtutis, & continentiæ, ut reſpueret omnes voluptates, omnemque 'vitæ ſuæ curſum in labore corporis atque in animi 'contentione conficeret; quem non quies, non remiſſio, non æqualium ſtudia, non ludi, non convivia delectarent, nihil in vita expetendum putaret, 'niſi quod eſſet cum laude, & honore, & cum dignitate conjunctum (8). —— *He was of that ſtrength 'of mind, of ſuch a diſpoſition to virtue and continence, 'that he rejected all manner of pleaſures, and ſpent his 'whole time in the labour of his body, and the application of his mind. Neither reſt, relaxation, the company of his equals, plays, nor feaſts, had any charms 'for him. He thought nothing in the world was 'worthy his deſires, except what was attended with 'dignity and honour.*' He never ſent away the ſick that came to implore his aſſiſtance, how poor ſoever they were; and, they came in ſuch great numbers to him in ſummer time, that he had not leiſure to ſit down to table, but dined ſtanding. 'Tantus ægrorum numerus ad eum confugiebat, ut per totam fere 'æſtatem ſtans prandere cogeretur: neminem quantumlibet pauperem à ſe abire dimittebat morbi quo 'angeretur ignarum, remediiſque ad eum profligandum 'deſtitutum (9).' When he was adviſed to give himſelf a little relaxation, his anſwer was that death would give him time enough to reſt in. 'Quod ſi illum 'nonnunquam de curanda corporis ſui valetudine, deque nocturnis ſtudiis intermittendis, commonefacerem, '& ad quieſcendum cohortarer, (erat enim ſomni 'parciſſimus) reſponſum in promptu habere ſolebat, '*Longa quieſcendi tempora fata dabunt.*

The wives of ſuch phyſicians are much to be pitied, when they love their husbands, and are not of a covetous temper; for indifference and avarice can find relief in ſuch an abſence of the Husband.

[*C*] *Notwithſtanding the oppoſition of his wife.*] It is not hard to gueſs why his wife would not conſent to ſuch kinds of lectures: they hindered him from ſeing his patients, and ſo conſiderably diminiſhed the daily profit of his practice. His hiſtorian is not ſilent upon this damage: 'Quod onus . . . uxore, a'micis

(4) Plantius, in vita Fernelii.

(5) It was the method of the common people in thoſe times. They did not call a phyſician, but ſent the patient's urine to him, and he preſcribed for them. *See Plantius, in vita Fernelii.*

(6) Plantius, ibid.

(7) Ibid.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Ibid.

youth alſo. He had not gone thro' this when he was called to court, to ſee if he could cure a lady, whoſe cure was deſpaired of [*D*]: he happily ſucceeded, and this was the firſt cauſe of the eſteem which king Henry II, who was then only dauphin, and tenderly love that lady, had for him. That prince offered him the place of his firſt phyſician; but Fernelius, who preferred his ſtudies to the tumult of a court, refuſed the offer, and even made uſe of ſome artifice to get leave to return to Paris [*E*]. He obtained it without any diminution of the penſion that had been promiſed him (*f*). Having finiſhed the explication of his book, he was continually ſollicited to read upon ſomething elſe; but the multitudes of patients, who ſent for him, hindered him from engaging in it (*g*). However, he did not ceaſe from being ſerviceable to the public, otherwiſe than by his practice. In his ſpare time he compoſed a work *de abditis rerum cauſis*, which was followed by ſeven books of pathology; after which he treated of medicines [*F*]. Before he had finiſhed this laſt work, he was forced to obey the orders of Henry II: that prince would have him with him as his firſt phyſician, and it happened juſt contrary to what Fernelius had dreaded; for he found more quiet and leiſure at court than he had had at Paris, and had it

(*f*) It was of ſix hundred livres.

(*g*) Hoc perfunctus munere alia quædam Hippocratis & Galeni interpretari ſcripta cogitabat, idque ab eo quotidianis precibus & acclamationibus contendebant philiatri omnes, ſed præ ægrorum qui undique ad eum opis cauſa quotidie confugiebant turba, id muneris aggredi non potuit. *G. Plantius, in vita Fernelii.*

micis omnibus, & ægrorum curis reclamantibus, vel magno rei domeſticæ diſpendio ſuſcepit (10). —— *This laborious employ he undertook, notwithſtanding the inſtances of his wife and friends, and the inconvenience which would attend his practice.*'

[*D*] *He was called to court, to ſee if he could cure a lady whoſe cure was deſpaired of.*] Thoſe who imagine that the hiſtorian had a view to the barrenneſs of Catherine de Medicis, would be groſsly deceived, and this will be eaſily granted me if his manner of expreſſion be conſidered (11): ‘Nec abſolverat ejus commentationis explicationem, cùm in graviſſimo mulieris nobiliſſimæ (12) caſu ad aulicos quaſi edicto regio rapitur. Pervagabatur enim incredibilis ad hujus imperii proceres de Fernelii eruditione fama & perſuaſio, quaſi unus eſſet è Galliæ Medicis calamitoſi illius morbi perſtrenuus oppugnator, & impendentis mortis fortiſſimus vindex, malorumque depulſor, quaſi Hercules Alexicacus: quam ille opinionem de ſe ſtrenuè ſuſtinuit, ut non tam ſit creditus mulierem in vita retinuiſſe, quàm jam profligata ſalute ex inferorum faucibus revocaſſe. —— *Before he had finiſhed the explication of his commentary, he was ſent for to court, as it were by a mandate from the king, on a moſt dangerous caſe of a lady of great quality: for the nobles of this kingdom, from the incredible reputation which had ſpread itſelf of him, had entertained a belief, that he was the only phyſician in France that could combat with ſucceſs that deplorable diſtemper, the braveſt champion againſt impending death, and a very Hercules at deſtroying and driving away diſtempers; which opinion of him he bravely kept up, it being believed, that he did not ſo much keep the lady alive, as reſcue her from the moſt deſperate circumſtances, and the cloſing jaws of death.*' Firſt it is a queſtion whether Catherine de Medicis is intended here at all: in the ſecond place, no doubt nothing leſs than her barrenneſs was deſigned. If the author meant to ſpeak of that princeſs who was then dauphineſs, is it not ſtrange that he ſhould deſcribe her by the general name of *a lady of great quality?* Is it not ſtrange that he ſhould ſay ſhe was moſt tenderly beloved by the dauphin (13)? if it was not the dauphineſs, the expreſſion is good and proper: it might be a miſtreſs: it might be a lady for whom the dauphin had a particular friendſhip; but if it was his wife, the hiſtorian explains himſelf impertinently. It is always ſuppoſed in relations of this kind that a husband loves his wife, that he is extreamly concerned for his wife's cure, and is exceedingly grateful to the phyſicians who cure her. It is ſufficient then to obſerve that the patient is his wife; and if they will uſe the word *chariſſima, tenerrima*, it ſhould be brought in after the term *uxor*, or *conjux*, is employed. From whence I conclude, that that author, having wrote with eloquence and judgment, would not have expreſſed himſelf as he has done, if he had deſigned to ſpeak of a diſtemper of the dauphineſs. Add to this another reaſon. It would have been an additional glory to John Fernelius, if the lady he cured had been the dauphineſs: why then ſhould his hiſtorian, who ſeeks to load him with honour and encomium, have concealed the principal title of that lady? ſo much for the firſt point: the ſecond is ſtill clearer. Catherine de Medicis was very healthy while ſhe was barren; ſhe tired her horſe, ſhe rode a hunting with the the king (14), and neither her life nor health ſeemed to be in any danger from her continuing without having children. Therefore ſhe was not cured of a mortal diſtemper, when he gave her medicines againſt barrenneſs; ſo that it cannot be meant of her, ſince the queſtion here is of a *morbus calamitoſus*, of *mors impendens*, of *profligata ſalus*, of an *ex inferorum faucibus revocatio*.

I do not inſiſt on all theſe obſervations without reaſon; it is to draw from thence a ſtrong proof againſt thoſe who ſay Fernelius cured the barrenneſs of the dauphineſs. This is a fact which appears very dubious to me, ſince his beloved diſciple ſays nothing of it, and yet ſpeaks of another cure leſs important than this would have been. It is not at all probable that he ſhould be ignorant of ſo ſhining a circumſtance in Fernelius's life, or that knowing it he ſhould paſs it by in ſilence in the hiſtory of that phyſician. Who ſhould know this adventure, if Plantius was ignorant of it? Plantius, I ſay, bred up ſo long at the feet of this Gamaliel, and admitted to his greateſt confidence? and who was fitter to publiſh a thing ſo glorious to the memory of his good maſter than this diſciple? he forgot it, may ſome ſay, when he reſolved to write the hiſtory of John Fernelius: but would he not have recollected it when he was giving an account of his maſter's firſt journey to court? could this lady, abandoned by her Phyſicians, ſo dear to the dauphin Henry, come into his mind without exciting the idea of a dauphineſs, rendered fruitful by Fernelius's remedies? *Credat Judæus Apella.*

[*E*] *He made uſe of ſome artifice to get leave to return to Paris.*] They were not ſatisfied with the reaſons he alledged that he was not skillful enough to be truſted with the health of princes, but if they would let him return to Paris, he would uſe the utmoſt diligence to make himſelf more fit and worthy to ſerve the dauphin. When he found theſe arguments would not ſerve his turn, he pretended to be ſick, and got a ſurgeon who could ſpeak familiarly to the prince, to tell him that he had a pleuriſy, which grief would infallibly render mortal, and that his grief proceeded from ſeeing himſelf ſeparated from his books, lectures, and family and engaged in a life of hurry and tumult. ‘Simulata pleuritide & conficta ementitaque à Chirurgo qui principi familiaris erat periculi magnitudine, per eum nuntiari jubet tanti mali cauſam ab animi ægritudine & mœrore proficiſci, quod à ſtudiis eſſet abductus, &c (15). The prince believing this lye gave Fernelius leave to retire. Muſt not a man be ſtrangely in love with ſtudy, and a philoſophic life, to employ ſo many machines not to be a court phyſician, that is, to avoid an employment that others endeavour to obtain by all manner of ways? when Henry II ſucceeded to the throne, he renewed his inſtances; but Fernelius repreſented that the honour offered him was due upon many accounts, and as an hereditary right, to the late king's phyſician, and alſo that he wanted ſome time to make experiments on ſeveral things which he had diſcovered in phyſic. A time was granted him acordingly; but when the phyſician of Francis I was dead, Fernelius was obliged to go and ſupply his place to Henry II.

[*F*] *He treated of medicines.*] He had finiſhed his book of compound remedies, and was working upon ſimple remedies, of which he had diſcovered ſome virtues unknown to the ancients. He communicated them to no body; he deſired the world might know to whom the honour of the diſcovery was due; he therefore deſigned not to make them known till the publication of his book. The neceſſity he was under of following

(10) Ibid.

(11) Ibid.

(12) No regard ought to be had to this ſummary in the margin, *reginam curavit*, for probably the bookſellers cauſed it to be put there.

(13) Henrico Galliarum regi deſignato cui illa chariſſima erat.

(14) Brantome's diſcourſe on that queen.

(15) Plantius, in vita Fernelii.

it not been for the journies that prince was obliged to take by the breaking out again of the war, his phyſician could have looked upon the court as a pleaſant retreat. Returning from the Calais expedition, he ſent his wife to Fontainbleau; the good woman was ſo grieved to be ſeparated from her family, that ſhe fell ſick and died of a phrenzy ſhortly after. This afflicted him ſo deeply, that twelve days after his wife's funeral he fell ſick, and died the eighteenth day of his illneſs (*b*) [*G*]. I ſhall make a remark upon the number of his years [*H*]. He got a great deal of money

ing the court, hindered him from ſetting his laſt hand to this work. The greateſt concern he had upon his death-bed, was, that he could not finiſh it. 'Hic dolor hominem præcipue angebat, hæc cura ſollicitabat quod therapeuticæ poſtremæ Medicinæ parti in qua multum diuque verſatus erat, quamque ſuis inventis plurimum locupletare poterat, extremam manum non addidiſſet (16). —— *His greateſt concern was, that he could not put the laſt hand to the laſt part of his diſcourſes on Phyſic, namely the Therapeutic, about which he had been a long time employed, and which he could have greatly enriched with diſcoveries of his own.*' This is the reaſon that in his works there is an excellent pathology to be found, and but little therapeutic. See the *Journal des Savans* for the month of April 1666.

[*G*] *He was ſo grieved at the death of his wife ..... that he died the eighteenth day of his diſtemper.*] Conſidering Plantius's narrative, it may be ſaid that divers cauſes concurred to Fernelius's death. His ſpleen was diſtempered: and grief coming on made it worſe, from whence iſſued a continual fever. He would not have died ſo ſoon, neither with his diſtemper of the ſpleen without his grief, nor of grief without the diſtemper of the ſpleen. It is true his grief did not ariſe wholly from the loſs of his wife, many other things before that having extreamly afflicted him. 'Quum cauſæ quædam externæ hæque graves admodum acerbiſſimum mœrorem attuliſſent, ſuperveniente uxoris obitu quo omnia exaſperata ſunt, humor in liene collectus tandem incaleſcens atque putreſcens, inflammationem ejus viſceris peperit, unde & febris accenſa eſt continua (17). —— *Some external cauſes of a very bad nature having thrown him into a ſtate of melancholy, his condition was rendered ſtill worſe by the death of his wife. A humour being collected in his ſpleen, which fermented at length and putrified cauſed an inflammation in his bowels, which ended in a continual fever.*' But tho' no notice ſhould be taken of theſe circumſtances, yet it would plainly appear that the abbot Des Landes is ſtrangely miſtaken. 'John Fernelius, *ſays he* (18), having been called to court by a princeſs who was diſconſolate at her barrenneſs, and hearing of his Wife's death, fell down at the princeſs's feet, from whence they carrried him to his grave in the church of St James de la Boucherie.' This princeſs no doubt is Catherine de Medicis who was rid of her barrenneſs in the year 1543. Now Fernelius and his wife did not die till the year 1558, and beſides it is not true that this phyſician died a ſudden death. He did not fall ſick till ten or twelve days after he had buried his wife, and did not die till the eighteenth day of his diſtemper.

[*H*] *I ſhall make a remark upon the number of his years*] If we believe Plantius, his hiſtorian, he died in the ſeventy ſecond year of his life, in 1557, a little after the taking of Calais. That city was ſubdued by Henry II, in the month of January 1557, according to the way of reckoning at that time, that is if the year is not begun in the month of January; but if it begun as we begin it, it was in 1558 that the town of Calais was taken. Plantius obſerves, that it had been a hundred years in the hands of the Engliſh. He ſhould have ſaid two hundred and eleven years. Fernelius's epitaph places his death on the twenty ſixth of April. If the day is right in the epitaph, it muſt be concluded that Plantius is wrong in the year; for the twenty ſixth of *April*, which follows the reduction of Calais, belongs to the year 1558, even according to the old way of reckoning. If Thuanus places the day right on the twenty ſeventh of March (19), then Plantius may be right in the year. But this is not the chief point. The epitaph gives Fernelius only a life of fifty two years. Plantius gives him ſeventy two. It muſt not be thought that the printers have put 72 inſtead of 52; for we find in that ſame life of Fernelius: 1. That he was about ſixty years of age when he was made firſt phyſician to the King. 2. That he practiſed phyſic at Paris thirty years. 3. That he did ſeveral things before he applied himſelf to viſit the ſick; ſo that we may be very ſure that Plantius aſſigned him ſeventy two years; and yet the epitaph, which is drawn up by the ſon-in-law of Fernelius, gives him but fifty two years. Let us ſet down a paſſage of Guy Patin (20): 'Since you are printing Fernelius's works, I would deſire you to correct a fault which thoſe of Utrecht made in their impreſſion (21), when they ſay, in his life, that he died in the ſeventy ſecond year of his age; which is falſe, for I can aſſure you that it was only in the fifty ſecond. I had it from the late Mr de Villeray, maſter of the requeſts, ſon to a daughter of Fernelius, who died but in 1642. I had it alſo from other relations of his, and it is a conſtant tradition in his family. But, without taking notice of tradition, which is not always to be depended upon, I have two poſitive proofs of it. One is taken from the regiſter of our Faculty, which I had when I was dean; where it is expreſsly ſaid, that Fernelius died the twenty ſixth of April, 1558, *anno ætatis* 52. The other argument is taken from his epitaph at St James de la Boucherie, which I have ſhewed to a great many: where it is alſo ſaid, that he died at the age of fifty two years. The author of this epitaph is there called *Philippus* (22) *Barjotius, Fernelii gener*, who was maſter of the requeſts, and preſident of the great council, and married his eldeſt daughter; Mr Giles de Riant, preſident *au Mortier*, married the ſecond, and died in the year 1597; his widow lived forty five years after him.' Theſe arguments of Guy Patin can hardly be anſwered. Had he alledged only the epitaph, his argument had not been ſo deciſive as he pretended: for who is ſure that the engraver did not omit two XX, which would reduce ſeventy two to fifty two? He might more eaſily be miſtaken, if he made uſe of figures inſtead of letters, for a 5 is ſoon put for a 7. Thoſe that know that an author, when he corrects his proofs, doth not ſometimes perceive that his printers have prodigiouſly altered his figures and numerical letters (23), will not find it ſtrange that Fernelius's ſon-in-law did not perceive the engraver's miſtake. But, as I have already ſaid, Guy Patin's arguments do not wholly depend on the epitaph. However, I will object two things againſt him: 1. I cannot well conceive, that one of Fernelius's diſciples, who was ten years his confident, ſhould be ſo ſtrangely miſtaken in his maſter's age; what, could he be miſtaken twenty years, and would he compoſe his life without informing himſelf a little better of the age he was to aſſign him? 2. If this diſciple errs with reſpect to the age, he muſt needs err in many other particulars. He is wrong when he relates, that Fernelius began his ſtudies late (24); and it is not true, that Fernelius ſtudied two years in St Barbe's college, and afterwards with ſo much application in private, that he contracted a quartan-ague, which obliged him to go into the country. 'Febre quartana TANDEM corripitur, qua crudeliter ac DIU conflictatus cœptum ſtudiorum curſum interrumpere, utque ſalubriore aëre frueretur ſolum vertere cogitur (25). —— *He was at length ſeized with a quartan-ague, which having afflicted him a long time very cruelly, he was obliged to break off the courſe of his ſtudies, and retire into the country, in order to enjoy the benefit of a more wholeſome air.*' How is it poſſible, that after his recovery, being returned to Paris, and having deliberated what profeſſion to chooſe, he could have been two years regent in St Barbe's college? How can, I ſay, theſe things be, ſince we know that he printed ſome books of mathematics in 1526 (26): now taking things at worſt, it cannot be ſuppoſed that thoſe books appeared at any other time but while he was regent. Where ſhall we then find the time that he publiſhed them in, according to Plantius's relation, if it be true that Fernelius died at the age of fifty two years? He muſt then have been author of a book of aſtronomy

---

(*b*) Taken from his life, written by William Plantius, his diſciple, native of Mans. It is prefixed to Fernelius's works in all the editions.

(*i*) See the remark [*I*].

(16) Id. ibid.

(17) Id. ibid. *See* Thevet. Tom. VII, pag. 331.

(18) In a letter inſerted in the *Mercure Galant*, of November, 1693, pag. 197. See, above, remark [*C*], of the article CHARNACE.

(19) Thuanus, Hiſt. lib. xxi, pag. 431.

(20) Patin, letter cxvii, of the firſt tome.

(21) Patin is in the wrong to impute this to the authors of the edition of Utrecht; for they only printed the life of Fernelius writ by William Plantius.

(22) It ſhould have been *Philibertus*.

(23) I know it by experience.

(24) Jam natu grandis quum ſub triviali magiſtro grammaticam didiciſſet, etiamſi mater rebus eum curiſque domeſticis potius quam literis TAM SERO deſtinandum contenderet. - - - *Being now grown up, he had learned grammar from a petty maſter, tho' his mother, at that advanced age, had rather intended him for buſineſs than for books.* Plantius, in vita Fernelii, init.

(25) Id. ibid.

(26) Geſner. in Biblioth.

money [*I*], and married his two daughters very advantageouſly (*i*). It is a common opinion that he cured Catherine de Medicis of her barrenneſs [*K*], and was magnificently rewarded by her for it [*L*]. We ſhall collect together in one remark the faults

at the age of twenty (27). But how doth this ſuit with his beginning late his grammar and rhetoric? We muſt take notice, that, in Fernelius's time, a ſcholar, that learned philoſophy before he was twenty, was thought very forward. A country youth, who was ſent to Paris at fifteen or ſixteen years of age, to go through his ſchool-learning, was not reckoned to begin his ſtudies too late. I lay no ſtreſs on Thevet's authority (28), becauſe he only copied Plantius both with reſpect to the ſeventy two years, he aſcribes to Fernelius, and every thing elſe.

[*I*] *He got a great deal of money.*] Plantius (29) ſays, that for the ſpace of ten years that he was with Fernelius, this phyſician often got above twelve thouſand livres, and rarely or never under ten thouſand livres a year. Here is a paſſage of an author, whom I have already quoted: 'They found thirty thouſand crowns of gold in his ſtudy, for he died very rich: he left, beſides that, thirty ſix thouſand livres a year to be divided between his two only daughters (30).' If we believe his hiſtory, he was kind to his family, but a lover of gain: *Attentus quidem ad rem familiarem, ſed in ſuos beneficus & liberalis* (31). Scaliger ſays on this account, and on another more tender point, ſome things very offenſive. *Fernelius Get-penny, who came in repute for having facilitated the queen-mother's delivery.* 'Habuit ſalaciſſimam filiam, cui dedit decem millia aureorum pro dote (32). —— *He had a moſt leud daughter with whom he gave ten thouſand crowns in marriage.*' Thoſe who will know ſomething of Fernelius's Poſterity, may read this paſſage of Guy Patin (33).' In the nunnery of The Viſitation at Lyons, there is a gentlewoman, daughter to Mr de Riant counſellor of ſtate. Her mother is Mary des Prez, niece to Mr Narbonne. This pretty nun, who hath not as yet taken the veil, among other good qualities, is conſiderable for her birth, being deſcended from our great Fernelius, who was truly an incomparable phyſician. He left two daughters: the firſt was married to Mr Barjot, preſident of the great council, and maſter of the requeſts; from whom is deſcended Mr d' Annœuil, now ſteward to the king. Annœuil is a country-ſeat of twelve thouſand livres a year in our province of Picardy, near Beauvais, two leagues from my native country. Fernelius's youngeſt daughter was married to Giles de Riant, preſident *au Mortier*, who died in the year 1597. Her name was Magdalen, and ſhe died in the year 1642, in the month of March, aged ninety four. *Et generatio rectorum benedicetur.* I am ſorry that I did not go formerly to Villeray au Perche (where ſhe died), on purpoſe to have the honour of ſeeing her, and kiſſing her hands. They make us kiſs relics which do not ſo well deſerve it; ſo that your pretty nun may boaſt, that ſhe is ſprung from the greateſt man in our profeſſion ſince Galen, Fernelius being her great-great-grandfather.'

[*K*] *It is a common opinion, that he cured Catherine de Medicis of her barrenneſs.*] They pretend, that Henry II propoſed this affair to him in very odd terms: *Mr Doctor, can you get my wife with child?* And they will have, that Fernelius anſwered, very prudently, *It is GOD, Sir, who muſt give you children by his bleſſing: It is your buſineſs to beget them, and mine to apply thoſe remedies of phyſic, which GOD hath ordained for human infirmities* (34). Mr Varillas tells us what expedient Fernelius made uſe of: 'The people, *ſays he* (35), were perſuaded, that the queen-mother, after ten years barrenneſs, had conceived the king, only becauſe the firſt phyſician (36) Fernelius had adviſed Henry II to lie with her during her courſes; and that thoſe, that were got ſo, were liable to this ſhameful diſeaſe (37).' According to Mezerai (38), *Francis* II *was from his infancy very ſickly, being the firſt child of a mother who had her courſes but late.* And indeed ſeveral pretend that Catherine de Medicis became fruitful, meerly becauſe a remedy was found againſt the ſuppreſſion of her flowers (39). This expedient is very different from that which Varillas relates. We have ſeen, that Scaliger talks of another ſervice performed by Fernelius: He inſinuates, that this phyſician was called whilſt the queen was in labour, and gave ſome proper remedies for her eaſy delivery. This would better agree with the cure of a great lady mentioned by Plantius. But as there ſeems to be no reaſon that could induce him to conceal from the public, that Fernelius procured a happy delivery to the dauphineſs, who was in danger of dying; I perſiſt in my opinion, that he did not mean Catherine de Medicis, and to draw from his ſilence a very cogent argument to doubt of what is contained in the text of this remark. According to Brantome, *They ſaid at court, that it was not ſo much the fault of the dauphineſs, as of the dauphin, that he had no children* (40). And upon that, he relates the jeſt of a lady. Here was a fine opportunity to relate what is ſaid of Fernelius, and yet he ſays nothing of it. Doth his ſilence ſignify but little? Had Thuanus in Fernelius's encomium forgot ſo conſiderable an event, if he had known or believed it? I believe then that it is a fact, of which we ought to ſay *non liquet*, notwithſtanding this Affirmation of Scœvola Sammarthanus. 'Ab Henrico ſecundo in regiam accerſitus, principem inter ejus archiatros locum tenuit. Eo felicis operæ proventu ut quod à natura negatum eſſe videbatur, artis beneficio conſecutus inviſam ſterilitatem à domo regia repelleret (41). —— *Being called to court by Henry II, he was made his firſt phyſician, where he happily, by art, effected what nature ſeemed to have denied, and delivered the royal houſe from the miſery of barrenneſs.*' I believe that all theſe doubts might be eaſily cleared, had we the diſſertation which Varillas hath quoted. 'Dr Fernelius, *ſays he* (42), having obſerved the conſtitution of the dauphineſs, reſolved to relieve her; and whether the medicines which he preſcribed had any operation, or whether all his ſecret was to inform the dauphin at what time his wife was capable of conceiving, the court obſerved ſome months after, that the dauphineſs was big with child.' You will find this place, word for word, in *The Gallantries of the Kings of France* (43). Mr Menjot, a learned phyſician of Paris, hath thought, that Fernelius conjectured that Catherine de Medicis was barren, by reaſon of the too great drineſs of the *uterus*, or becauſe it was too much contracted. In the firſt caſe, the ſeed, finding too dry a ſoil, could not fructify: In the ſecond, it did not reach as far as it ought to do. Now becauſe in her courſes the part was moiſtened and dilated more than ordinary, Fernelius thought that the dauphin ought to make uſe of that time, and that it was the happy minute for him to get his ſpouſe with child. Mr Menjot adds, that Hippocrates might give very good hints for this advice. This author expreſſes himſelf with ſo much energy, that I ſhould do him wrong did not I relate all that he ſays upon it: 'Referunt Catharinam Medicæam Galliarum reginam ætate licet integra, cum velut quinta luna nata progeniem deſperaret, importunam alvi ſterilitatem votiva fœcunditate commutaſſe, dulcique liberorum propagine ditatam fuiſſe, quòd contra Moſis edictum ἐν τῇ καθόδῳ τῶν καταμηνίων quibus ſemen alias eluitur, à rege ſubagitata eſſet, ex conſilio Fernelii ſagaciter conjicientis exuperantem uteri ariditatem benigni ſanguinis aſpergine rigandam eſſe, vel etiam ſtomachum matricis naturaliter, perinde ac ex eventu in gravidis, arctiſſimum nonniſi menſium tranſitu reſerari. Idque edoctus fuerat Fernelius ab Hippocrate * jubente mulierem ἱμερȣ̃σθαι τȣ̃ ἀνδρὸς inchoante menſtruo profluvio, ſed maximè eo deſinente, verùm profluente adhuc potiùs quàm areſacto (44).'

[*L*] *She rewarded him largely.*] Let us hear Mr Patin (45): 'Some ſpeak of the king of England, who hath married the princeſs of Portugal: he would willingly have divorced her, becauſe ſhe is barren; as Henry II would have done to his wife Catherine de Medicis, if Fernelius had not happily prevented it; from whom, out of an unparallelled liberality, he received every time that ſhe was delivered of a child ten thouſand crowns, as Lewis d'Orleans ſays in his *Human Plant* (46).' The *as* of this Author is truer than he thought; for what he ſays of Charles II king of England's deſign, is a whim of newſmongers without any ground: And we learn from Brantome, that Catherine de Medicis 'ingratiated herſelf ſo much into the king her father-in-law's and king Henry her huſband's affections, that remaining ten years without children

---

(*i*) See the remark [*I*].

(27) The book which, according to Geſner, was printed at Paris in the year 1526, was intituled, *Monaloſpharium*.

(28) In Fernelius's elegy, Tom. VII, pag. 325, edit. of 1671, in 12mo.

(29) Plantius, in vita Fernelii, in fine.

(30) St Romauld, ubi ſupra.

(31) Plantius, ubi ſupra, ſub fin.

(32) Scaligerana prima, pag. 82.

(33) Letter 100, pag. 394, of the firſt tome. This letter is dated the 25th of September, 1655.

(34) Bullart, Academy of Sciences, Tom. II, pag. 84. He quotes Dupleix.

(35) Varill. Hiſtory of Francis II, lib. i, pag. m. 76.

(36) Fernelius was firſt phyſician only after the death of Francis I. Francis II, eldeſt ſon to Catherine de Medicis, was born four years before the death of Francis I.

(37) He ſpeaks of the Leproſy.

(38) Mezerai, Hiſt. of France, Tom. III, pag. 42.

(39) See the remark [*M*], citat. (53).

(40) Brantome, Dames illuſtres, pag. m. 42.

(41) Sammarth. in elogiis, lib. i, pag. m. 33.

(42) Hiſt. of Francis I, lib. xi, pag. m. 99. *He puts in the margin*, In the Latin diſſertation preſented to the king on that ſubject.

(43) Tom. I, pag. 225, of the edition of 1694; and pag. 207, of the edition of 1695.

* Lib. i, de Morb. Mul.

(44) Antonius Menjotius, diſſertat. Pathologicar. Part. III, pag. m. 23.

(45) Patin, letter 515, pag. 520, of the third tome.

(46) Naudé de antiquitate Scholæ Medicæ Pariſienſis, pag. 75, *quoting the ſame book of Lewis d' Orleans, ſays, that this preſent was made four times:* Fernelius ab Henrico ſecundo qui quater illi decem aureorum millia pro quatuor filiis ejus ope & conſilio ſuſceptis obtulit. *It is certain that Catherine de Medicis's ten children were all born before Fernelius's death.*

faults of ſome authors [*M*].

‘ children, abundance of people perſuaded the king and ‘ the dauphin to put her away, becauſe France wanted ‘ an offspring from them; but that they loved her ‘ ſo much, that neither of them would conſent to ‘ it (47).’ See in the margin what I have obſerved on the paſſage of Gabriel Naudé: It ſhews that Lewis d’Orleans ſpoke of a thing whereof he was not well informed. This is what I ſaid in the firſt edition: I ſhall now add two amendments; the one is, that there are ſome books which make mention of this deſign of Charles II. The other, that Catherine de Medicis was ſometimes in terrible frights: from whence we may conclude, that her father-in-law and her husband were not always very far from thinking of a divorce (48). See the remark [*O*] of the article MAROT.

[*M*] *We will gather the faults of ſome authors.*] There are but few of Moreri. He ſays, that Fernelius ſaw, ‘ that the books which he had publiſhed ‘ were the only books that were expounded to the ‘ ſtudents of phyſic in all univerſities, and preferred to ‘ all others.’ This is one of the greateſt lies that hath ever appeared in a book. What Sammarthanus affirms hardly deſerves credit: what muſt we judge then of thoſe monſtrous hyperboles which Moreri hath beſtowed upon him. Theſe are Sammarthanus’s words (49): ‘ Cujus (Fernelii) admirabili genio id contigit, quod à ‘ multis ſeculis nulli quamlibet erudito contigiſſe me‘ mini, ut ipſo vivo atque vidente opera quæ de uni‘ verſa medicina ſcripſit in ſcholis publice legerentur: ‘ ejuſque auctoritas veterum ſcriptorum inſtar apud op‘ timum quemque rei medicæ magiſtrum graviſſimi ‘ eſſet ponderis & momenti.’ —— *To Fernelius’s ad‘ mirable genius that honour was paid, which I do not ‘ remember to have happened to any other learned man ‘ for many ages paſt, that in his life-time and in his ‘ preſence, the treatiſes which he wrote on all the parts ‘ of phyſic were publickly read in the ſchools, and his ‘ authority, like that of the ancients, was allowed by ‘ all eminent profeſſors of that ſcience to be of the ‘ greateſt weight and moment.*’ Mr Bullart’s faults are in greater number: he ſays, that Fernelius reſolved *but late to put himſelf under the diſcipline of James Strebæus, to learn the principles of the Sciences* (50). This ſignifies two things: one, that Fernelius began his ſtudies late; the other, that he begun them under James Strebæus. The firſt is very true, according to Plantius in his life of Fernelius; but the ſecond is very falſe, becauſe Fernelius had already taught philoſophy in the college of St Barbe, and was received doctor of phyſic when he became acquainted with Strebæus. Their acquaintance was a reciprocal inſtruction; for they taught one another. Fernelius taught Strebæus the mathematics, and learned of him to write good Latin. ‘ Dum Strebæus ‘ à Fernelio mathematicarum diſciplinarum, Ferne‘ lius viciſſim à Strebæo politioris literaturæ cogni‘ tionem & gravem plenumque orationis ſtylum acci‘ pit, integrum biennium exigitur (51).’ Mr Bullart is in the wrong, to believe that Henry II, was king of France whilſt his wife was barren. Had he conſulted Brantome, he had not ſaid, that this prince *had ſome thoughts of putting her away:* neither, if he had conſulted Lewis d’Orleans, had he ſaid, that the queen gave ten times to Fernelius a preſent of ten thouſand crowns (52). Let us quote Mr Bullart’s words (53). *This French Æſculapius made ſo happy an uſe of the knowledge of her diſtemper, and of a proper remedy, that he made the queen fruitful by removing the ſuppreſſion of her monthly courſes: after which ſhe had five ſons, and five daughters; and at the birth of every one of them, ſhe preſented this learned man with ten thouſand crowns.* He falſely ſuppoſes (54), that Henry II, after he had kept *him near his perſon, as his firſt phyſician, and carried him every where with him, as the preſerver of his health . . . . gave him time to put in order thoſe works of phyſic which he had writ, and means to get them printed.* Read the life of this learned man, and you will find that he compoſed but a treatiſe of fevers after he was Henry the ſecond’s firſt phyſician, and even that he died before he had finiſhed it.

(47) Brantome, ubi ſupra, p. 41.

(48) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Febr. 1700, pag. 196.

(49) In Elogiis, lib. i, p. m. 32.

(50) Bullart’s Academy of Sciences, Tom. II, pag. 83.

(51) Plantius, in vita Fernelii.

(52) See, above, the remark [*L*], citat. (46).

(53) Bullart, ubi ſupra.

(54) Ibid.

FERON (John le) Advocate in the parliament of Paris, was of Compiegne: he was above ſixty years of age in the year 1564, and died in the reign of Charles IX. *He was one of the moſt diligent and moſt curious men in France, in ſearching and diſcovering noble houſes and coats of arms* (*a*), as he ſhewed by many volumes; ſome of which were printed [*A*]. Perſons of a good taſte deſpiſed them, becauſe of an infinite number of fictions and puerilities they were filled with [*B*]. Mr le Feron, antient prevoſt of the merchants at Paris, and preſident of the court of inqueſts in the XVIIth century, was of this family (*b*).

(*a*) Taken from *La Croix du Maine, pag.* 221, 222.

(*b*) Mercure Galant, Febr. 1703, pag. 38.

[*A*] *Many volumes, ſome of which were printed.*] He publiſhed at Paris, in 1555, by Vaſcoſan, *a catalogue of the conſtables, chancellors, great maſters, admirals, and marſhals of France, and prevoſts of Paris, containing their inſtitutions and eſtabliſhments, the time and exerciſe of their offices, the changes and alterations in them, their names, ſirnames, lordſhips, and coats blazoned: alſo an abridgment of their actions*; in folio (1). The ſame year he publiſhed his *treatiſe of the primitive inſtitution of kings, heralds, and purſuivants at arms*, at Paris, with Maurice Menier, in 4to. As to his *hiſtory of heraldry in two volumes, containing the eſcutcheons, blazons, names, ſirnames, titles, and perpetual memorials, of kings, princes, lords, gentlemen, and nobles of ſeveral kingdoms, chriſtian and infidel, and particularly of the kingdom of France*; and many other collections of the ſame nature; la Croix du Maine obſerves, that they were never printed (2).

[*B*] *Perſons of good taſte deſpiſed them, becauſe of an infinite number of fictions they were filled with.*] We have ſhewed in another place (3) what Mr le Laboureur thought of them, and I ſhall now quote a paſſage of Stephen Paſquier, out of a letter he wrote to an advocate (4), who was about a work of arms and eſcutcheons. ‘ I muſt tell you, that among thoſe who ‘ have pretended to meddle with it, le Feron, whom ‘ you write about, ſet himſelf above all others. I ‘ ſhall mention him as a man I was formerly acquaint‘ ted with in my middle age. He was an antient ad‘ vocate in our court, but never made much of his ‘ buſineſs (5), only employing himſelf in blazoning ‘ arms and eſcutcheons, as you may have ſeen by ‘ ſome books he hath publiſhed upon that ſubject; ‘ and yet he was more unconfined than ſome that have ‘ ſucceeded him: for to tell you the truth, he derived ‘ the uſe of arms, and war, and nobility, from the ‘ beginning of the world, aſſigning even to our father ‘ Adam his eſcutcheon. If you ask me what he bore? ‘ I anſwer, three fig-leaves. And upon my asking ‘ of him why he did ſo; he replied, becauſe after ‘ eating of the forbidden fruit, Adam covered his pu‘ denda with a fig-leaf: and upon this foot he compo‘ ſed four or five large volumes, drawn up according ‘ to his own fancy; an inexcuſable, as well as inexhau‘ ſtible curioſity (6).’

(1) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bibliotheque Françoiſe, pag. 690.

(2) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Françoiſe, pag. 222.

(3) In remark [*C*] of the article PINET.

(4) Mr Moreaux, advocate in the parliament of Bourdeaux.

(5) *See the* Opuſcules de Loiſel, pag. 525.

(6) Paſquier Lettres, liv. xix, pag. 455, *of the ſecond tome.*

FERRAND (James), doctor of phyſic, born at Agen, compoſed a book, *of the Diſeaſe of Love*, printed at Paris in the year 1622. The hiſtorians of the phyſicians have as yet made no mention of it: It deſerved however to be taken notice of better than many others which they have mentioned [*A*].

[*A*] *It deſerved however to be taken notice of better than many others which they have mentioned.*] Although James Ferrand’s deſign be only to conſider love, as it ſometimes degenerates into a bodily diſeaſe, as fury and melancholy, nevertheleſs he ſays many things which may be referred to love in general. I take here the word love in that ſenſe which is given to it by way of excellency, I mean that paſſion which one of the ſexes hath for the other; a paſſion which hath been honoured by the heathens with a divine worſhip, under the name of Venus, and is one of the moſt profound myſteries of nature. The epiſtle dedicatory of James Ferrand's book is full of learning, and ſhews, that the heathen poets philoſophized upon nothing ſo profoundly as upon love. The verſes of Lucretius, which I have quoted in another place (1), were forgotten there. I ſaid, then, that if this paſſion came into the world by ſin, we muſt conſider it as a plank after a ſhipwreck, and as a ſecond principle of life granted to mankind; it was a new ſpring very neceſſary to give motion to nature. But I ſhould have ſaid, that this ſecond liberality of the author of all things was marked with the general ſtamp of this maxim, *that the preſents of fortune are always attended with ſome inconveniency: Fortuna nunquam ſimpliciter indulget* (2). Thoſe that do not know by experience what bitterneſs is mixed with the pleaſures of love (3) need but read Ferrand's book, and they will learn what to think of this paſſion from the ſentences of ſeveral grave authors: for, according to the method of thoſe times, this phyſician is full of quotations: and he ſcarce ſays any thing, but what is ſtrengthened with the authority of ſome Greek or Latin poet, or ſome antient or modern philoſopher. This method is now laid aſide: however, thoſe authors who have followed it are not the leſs inſtructive; and after all, I am ſurprized that Lindenius Renovatus (4) hath ſaid nothing of the author who is the ſubject of this article. This is not the only ſin of omiſſion that he is guilty of. See the remark [B], of the article VANDERLINDEN.

(1) In the remark [*F*], of the article EVE.

(2) Q. Curtius, lib. iv, cap. xiv.

(3) See the article SELEMNUS. Was there nothing elſe but jealouſy, it would be enough to make at leaſt the miſery that attends love equal to the ſatisfaction of it.

(4) Thus the *Bibliotheque de Scriptis Medicis* is called in the laſt edition, which is that of 1686, in 4to.

FERRARA (RENATA OF FRANCE, DUCHESSE OF) celebrated for her virtue and attachment to the reformed church, was daughter to Lewis XII, and of Anne of Bretagne [*A*]. She was born at Blois (*a*) the 25th of October 1510 (*b*), and was engaged to Charles of Auſtria (*c*) in the year 1513, and in the year 1515, and afterwards was alſo promiſed to Joachim Marquis of Brandenburg; but in 1527 ſhe was married to Hercules d'Eſt, the ſecond of that name, duke of Ferrara and Modena (*d*). Others reckon the 28th of June 1528 to be her wedding-day (*e*). A modern hiſtorian affirms, that ſhe was very learned [*B*]. He relates ſeveral things, whereof ſome are abominably falſe, others doubtful, concerning Calvin's journey to this princeſs's court [*C*]. What

(*a*) Father Anſelm's Genealog. Hiſtory, p. 132.

(*b*) See the remark [*A*].

(*c*) Who was afterwards the Emperor Charles V.

(*d*) Anſelm, ubi ſupra.

(*e*) Father du Londel's *Faſti of the Kings*, &c. pag. 32.

[*A*] *She was daughter of Lewis XII, and Anne of Bretagne.*] I ſhall relate here a particular which deſerves to be more known: ‘This queen was brought to bed, in the year 1510, of a ſecond daughter, whom ſhe named Renata, as if by this birth ſhe had ſeen her hopes revive of having children, which ſhe had almoſt wholly loſt: but the ignorant midwives uſed her then ſo ill, that ſhe was afterwards incapable of having any more; and ſhe remained ſo infirm, that ſhe died three years after, in the caſtle of Blois, the thirteenth day of February, 1513 . . (1).’ The author of the notes on Rabelais's letters, is probably miſtaken, when he ſaid (2), that Renata was born the fifteenth of October 1509, &c.

[*B*] *A modern hiſtorian affirms that ſhe was very learned.*] Mr Varillas is the hiſtorian I mean. Theſe are his words: ‘Renata of France, daughter to Lewis XII, was married to Hercules d'Eſte, duke of Ferrara, and made him father of five of the handſomeſt children in Chriſtendom, tho' ſhe had the moſt disfigured body of any princeſs of her age. It is true, that what was wanting in her ſtature and Beauty, was ſo abundantly ſupplied by her mind, that, all things conſidered, ſhe had more reaſon to be thankful, than to complain of nature. She had a more refined and delicate wit than had been obſerved in any woman, even in the Italian ladies, who pretended moſt to it; and it was but a diverſion to her, to learn what was moſt difficult in the moſt ſublime ſciences. She had dived with eaſe into the moſt abſtruſe points of philoſophy and divinity; and no woman ſpoke more gracefully of them, or rather with more eaſe. She excelled in all the parts of the mathematics, but eſpecially in aſtronomy. Although ſhe contemned judicial aſtrology, yet ſhe would have the famous Luke Gauric ſhew her all the ſecrets of it (3).’ He ſays in another place (4), in ſtronger terms, ‘That none exceeded her in the knowledge of the moſt abſtruſe points of philoſophy, mathematics, and aſtrology.’ This is romantic. Mr Varillas, inſtead of mollifying the expreſſions of Brantome, a Gaſcon author, who gave but too often way to hyperbole, eſpecially when he ſpoke of princeſſes, refines upon him. We may be convinced of it by what follows: ‘Madam Renata had as fine and piercing a wit as can be imagined; ſhe had ſtudied much: and I have ſeen her very learned, plainly, and gravely, talk of all ſciences, even of aſtrology, and the knowledge of the ſtars; wherewith I ſaw her once entertain the queen-mother, who hearing her ſpeak ſo well, ſaid, that the greateſt philoſopher in the world could not talk more pertinently (5).’ Obſerve the abatement. According to Varillas, the equality of knowledge between this princeſs, and all learned men, relates *to the knowledge of the moſt abſtruſe points of philoſophy, mathematics, and aſtrology*: But according to Brantome, it only relates to ſome diſcourſes of aſtrology, and this only in the judgment of Catherine de Medicis. It is of more importance than is imagined, to give the readers a parallel of the original with the copy, as I do here. Conſult the margin (6).

[*C*] *He tells ſeveral things, whereof ſome are abominably falſe, others very doubtful, concerning Calvin's journey to the court of that princeſs.*] Mr Varillas relates (7) in the year 1535, that Calvin, having pitched upon *Strasburg for the place of his abode*, drew there *thoſe of his ſect, who had voluntarily baniſhed themſelves out of France*. ‘Calvin, continues he, having gathered a great number of diſciples to form a congregation, by Bucer's advice preſented a petition to the magiſtrates of Strasburg to obtain the ſpiritual direction of thoſe Frenchmen, who, on account of religion, had tranſplanted themſelves from France into Alſatia . . . . . The magiſtrates, perſuaded by Stunius (8), ... granted his requeſt; and thus Calvin had the opportunity to found a church after his own way. . . . . As his deſign was to make the college of Strasburg famous, he was not ſatisfied to draw thither the fineſt wits, and the moſt learned men of the univerſities of France, whom he had corrupted, but he alſo endeavoured that this college ſhould chiefly be obliged to him for it's reputation, and he taught there with a more conſtant application, than either Luther or Melancthon had done in the college of Wittemberg: and truly the number of his auditors became, without compariſon, greater than theirs had been, although no ſovereign prince was concerned in it. He taught divinity in that college, and none of the profeſſors aſſiſted more readily than he at the public diſputations. He reviſed his Inſtitution alſo, and added a fourth and laſt book to it. He ſpent two years in this painful employ; and nothing had been capable to have drawn him thence, had he not hoped to make a greater progreſs ſomewhere elſe: but he was deceived by the vain hope, which was given him, of ſpreading his doctrine in Italy; and he fancied it ſo glorious and pleaſing an attempt, to penetrate into a climate which had been inacceſſible to Luther and Zuinglius, and to withdraw from the pope's obedience a people that was neareſt to the holy ſee, that he could not withſtand the temptation.’ Mr Varillas makes here a digreſſion, in praiſe of the ducheſs of Ferrara (9), after which he ſays (10), that Calvin, knowing the diſpoſition of this princeſs, went diſguiſed from Strasburg to Ferrara. He ſuppoſes, that Calvin, having acquired by his Parts the friendſhip of Renata, diſpoſed her to the doctrine of Luther, Zuinglius, and Melancthon; and that the princeſs, who (11) *had only a mind to change her religion to be revenged* of the court of Rome, rejected Calvin's maxims at firſt, but that it was not long before ſhe became a Calviniſt . . . . ‘He preached in her chamber

(1) Mezerai's Hiſt. of France, Tom. II, pag. 890.

(2) Pag. 83.

(3) Varil. Hiſt. of Hereſy, lib. x, pag. 354. Dutch Edit.

(4) Hiſt. of Charles IX, Tom. I, p. 176. Dutch edit.

(5) Brantome's Lives of Illuſtrious Ladies, pag. m. 300.

(6) Frantome, *ubi ſupra*, ſays, That tho' Renata *was ugly*, yet ſhe brought a very handſome offſpring: *And pag.* 306, That although ſhe ſeemed to make no great figure, by reaſon of the deformity of her body, yet ſhe had a great deal of majeſty. *Whereas Varillas ſays*, That, as for her body, ſhe was the moſt disfigured princeſs of her time.

(7) Varill. Hiſt. of Hereſy, lib. x, pag. 352, & *ſeq.*

(8) It ſhould be *Sturmius*.

(9) We have ſeen it in the preceding remark.

(10) Varillas, ubi ſupra, pag. 355.

(11) Ibid. pag. 356.

What he ſays of the motives, which engaged her to embrace the new religion, has very little probability [*D*]. As ſoon as her huſband was dead, ſhe left Italy on the account of

'chamber, that it might be more private, becauſe her 'ſervants, out of reſpect, were not to enquire too 'curiouſly what was done there. But it is not ſo 'eaſy for ladies of quality, as for others, to hide their 'religion from their huſbands. The duke of Ferrara 'came to know his ducheſs's religion; and this prince 'was the more exaſperated, becauſe nothing was more 'contrary to his temporal intereſt. He held of the 'holy ſee; and he knew that the popes would not 'want forces to diſpoſſeſs him, if they had any pre-'tence for it. His fear encreaſed, when he conſi-'dered that duke Alphonſus his father had been a 'long time an exile, vagabond, poor, and a ſoldier 'in the pay of a foreign nation, only becauſe he 'had diſobliged the pope; and that, to make his 'peace, he had been obliged to beg pardon of pope 'Alexander VI, and to marry Lucretia Borgia. Theſe 'conſiderations immediately altered the duke, who had 'hitherto been very complaiſant to the ducheſs: he 'forced her to return to the exerciſe of the new re-'ligion (12), and all that ſhe could obtain of him, in 'favour of Calvin, was, that he ſhould return as he 'came.'

There are abundance of lyes in this narrative. I. When Calvin, in 1534, went out of France, he choſe the city of Baſil (13), and not that of Straſburg, for the place of his retreat; and he remained in Baſil as obſcure as poſſible (14), till he undertook his journey into Italy, after he had publiſhed his *Chriſtian inſtitution* (15). II. It is falſe then, that he erected at that time a church at Straſburg, and made the college of that city more famous than that of Wittemberg. III. Let us rectify this as well as we can, by referring it to it's true time, and yet we ſhall find it full of lyes. Calvin, being expelled out of Geneva in the year 1538, went into Swiſſerland, whence he was called by the magiſtrates of Straſburg to be profeſſor in divinity. He accepted of the employ, and acquitted himſelf with the applauſe of the learned (16): But, IV. he drew not into this college *the fineſt wits and the moſt learned men of the univerſities of France*: And, V. *the number of his auditors became not, without compariſon, greater than that of Luther and Melancthon at Wittemberg*, I cannot imagine where Varillas could find a foundation for theſe romantic hyperboles. It is true, that Calvin, with the conſent of the magiſtrates, founded a French church at Straſburg, and that he ſubmitted it to the formulary of his diſcipline (17): But, VI. it is not true, that he began by that his labours in that city. Seeing himſelf called by the magiſtrates, he went thither to teach divinity, and afterwards deſired leave of them to erect a French church. VII. He left not this painful employment in hopes of making a greater progreſs in Italy; for he took his leave of thoſe of Straſburg, only to return to Geneva (18), where he was recalled with great earneſtneſs. It is abſurd to ſuppoſe, as Mr Varillas doth, that Calvin went to ſee the ducheſs of Ferrara in the year 1535, after he had for two years performed at Straſburg the office of profeſſor in divinity, and of miniſter; and after he had there reviſed his Inſtitution, and had augmented it with a *fourth and laſt book*: for, VIII. he left France in the year 1534, and went to Ferrara towards the end of the year 1535: and, IX. when he undertook that journey, his Chriſtian Inſtitution had but once been publiſhed. He only reviſed and augmented it after his return from Italy (19). X. It was not divided into books, till the edition of one thouſand five hundred and fifty nine. XI. I acknowledge that the ducheſs of Ferrara was mother of five children, but they were not all born when Calvin went to her. When ſhe was delivered of a daughter in the year 1536, Rabelais obſerves that ſhe had already a daughter and a ſon (20).

An hiſtorian, who is guilty of ſo many falſhoods in things ſo eaſy to be told with certainty, doth not deſerve much credit in what he ſays of the private converſations which he ſuppoſes between the ducheſs of Ferrara and Calvin. This is what I call doubtful; for I have no good proofs to aver, whether Calvin inſinuated, or did not inſinuate, to the ducheſs ſuch and ſuch things againſt Zuinglius, Luther, and Melancthon. I might eaſily be perſuaded, that Calvin contributed but little to the converſion of this princeſs. I believe he found her pretty well cured of the Romiſh belief; and that Marot, who was a refugee before him in that court, had a greater ſhare than he in Renata's changing her religion (21).

[*D*] *That which Varillas ſays of the motives, which engaged her to embrace the new religion, has very little probability.*] 'The injuries which ſhe pretended that 'the king her father had received from pope Julius II, 'had inſpired in her an averſion for the court of Rome '(22).' This is, according to Mr Varillas, the motive 'that diſpoſed her to lend a favourable attention to the new ſectaries. 'She did not change her religion, but 'to revenge herſelf: ſhe fancied for that purpoſe, that 'it was enough to attack the ſpiritual and temporal 'authority of the popes, without meddling with the 'ſacraments, and eſpecially with religious orders, which 'would infallibly cauſe a great deal of diſorder in the 'beſt eſtabliſhed ſtates (23).' It muſt be confeſſed, that, generally ſpeaking, a deſire of revenge may produce in mens minds a ſtrong inclination for a ſect. If a party appears againſt thoſe who have done us a conſiderable prejudice, we are very much diſpoſed to maintain that party: we wiſh it may have juſtice on it's ſide; and, eagerly wiſhing, we at laſt believe it to be in the right. This is ſeen, not only in ſtate and academical cabals, but alſo in religious diſputes: ſo that we muſt not doubt, but a perſonal hatred againſt a pope may induce a prince to favour thoſe divines who preach againſt that pope. But was this the caſe of the ducheſs? She was ſcarce out of her ſwaddling-cloaths when Julius II died. The court of Rome was reconciled with Lewis XII, when this prince went out of the world: ſo that our Renata was more like to hear of the peace between her father and Leo X, than of the outrages of Julius II. It is not probable that ſhe conceived againſt this pope's memory a hatred that included all his ſucceſſors. When we are informed of a quarrel, after it is ended, thoſe paſſions which it excites are not ſo lively: for it is the ſight of thoſe evils, wherein it involves us, that kindles in our minds a violent hatred againſt the author of them. I do not deny, but thoſe who at the time of the troubles, and even of the pacification, were as yet in the cradle, may harbour a very deep reſentment againſt the author of thoſe troubles when they come of age, and feel the fatal conſequences of his turbulent temper. But was this the ducheſs of Ferrara's caſe? By the Salic law ſhe was excluded from ſucceeding her father; and ſo the miſchiefs which Julius II had done to Lewis XII had not affected her, even though they had continued in the reign of Francis I.

It is certain that true matters of fact are ſometimes deſtitute of probability; and thus, without determining whether the princeſs had, or had not, any reſentment, I only ſay, that it is not likely that the remembrance of Julius the ſecond's injuſtice ſhould breed in her a ſtrong deſire to be revenged of the court of Rome, by adopting the Lutheran religion. Nevertheleſs I ought not to conceal what I have read in Brantome. 'Perhaps, *ſays he* (24,) reſenting the ill offices which 'the popes had on ſo many occaſions done to the 'king her father, ſhe withdrew from their obedience; 'not being able to do them more miſchief, becauſe 'ſhe was a woman. I have it from good hands, that 'ſhe often ſaid as much.' Mr le Laboureur (25) quotes an elegy of Clement Marot on her being with child the third time, wherein the child is congratulated *for his being conceived in ſo happy a time. Marot promiſes him the pope's and the holy ſee's ruin, whom he uſes injuriouſly, and ſays, that he was an enemy to his family.* That ſhews that this poet brought domeſtic quarrels upon the ſtage, to alienate the ducheſs of Ferrara from the court of Rome. Obſerve, that he alſo employed good omens and favourable predictions, whereof poets are ſo laviſh, and which ſo often convict them that they are falſe prophets (26) He of her religion [*E*], and went into France, where ſhe had leave to profeſs the doctrine of Calvin. She reſided at Montargis, and there protected many that were perſecuted, till ſhe was forced to deſiſt. Mezerai, I am afraid, doth not ſet down the exact time that this happened [*F*]. She complied with this hardſhip with much reluctancy. She ſhewed in that juncture both her courage and charity [*G*]. This virtuous Lady had always expreſſed a ſtrong Inclination to relieve the diſtreſſed [*H*]. She interceded ſtrong-

---

(12) The Printers have blundered here: we muſt read either *renounce* inſtead of *return to*, or *ancient* inſtead of *new*.

THIS paſſage of Varillas cenſured.

(13) See, above, remark [*F*] of the article *CALVIN*.

(14) Ubi ſupra, *remark* [*U*].

(15) He publiſhed it at Baſil, in 1535. See, above, remark [*U*] of the article *CALVIN*.

(16) Theologiam ibi docuit magno cum doctorum omnium applauſu. *Beza in vita Calvini ad ann.* 1538.

(17) Ex ſenatus conſenſu Gallicam eccleſiam conſtituta etiam eccleſiaſtica diſciplina plantavit. *Id. ibid.*

(18) He returned thither in the year 1541. See his life by Beza.

(19) Mr Varillas, *Hiſt. of Charles IX, Tom. I*, ſays, That Calvin had compoſed, at the ducheſs of Ferrara's court, the books of his Inſtitution. In the tenth book of his *Hiſtory of Hereſy, pag.* 350, he ſays, That Calvin being gone to Nerac, to confer with le Fevre and Roſſel, read to them his *Inſtitution*. You muſt take notice, that Calvin conferred with le Fevre at Nerac in the year 1533, or thereabouts.

(20) Rabelais, Epiſt. xiv, p. 59.

(21) See le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau, Tom. I, pag. 746, 747.

(22) Varillas, Hiſt. of Hereſy, lib. x, pag. 355.

(23) Id. ibid. pag. 356.

(24) Brantome, vie des Dames illuſtres, pag. 300.

(25) Addit. to Caſtelnau's Memoires, Tom. I, pag. 747: he obſerves that this elegy was ſuppreſſed.

(26) See remark [*C*] of the article FONTARABIA.

ly

He proved ſo in this particular; but bluſhed no more for it than his brethren are uſed to do in the like caſes.

[*E*] *She left Italy on account of her religion.*] I have this from Thuanus. ‘ Sub idem tempus, *ſays he* (27), Renata Ferrarienſis Guiſii ſocrus, quæ ex Italia in Galliam ob religionis cauſſam migraverat, Aurelianum Regis ſalutandi gratia venit. —— *Renata ducheſs of Ferrara, and mother-in-law to the duke of Guiſe, who, on account of religion, had retired from Italy into France, came to Orleans to pay her compliments to the king.*’ He ſays this under the year 1560. The duke of Ferrara, this princeſs's huſband, died in 1559.

[*F*] *Mezerai, I am afraid, doth not ſet down the exact time that this happened.*] Giving an account of the cruel hardſhips which the reformed ſuffered in divers places in 1562, he ſays (28), ‘ That the ducheſs of Ferrara's authority ſaved a great many, who came from all parts to Montargis for her protection. The duke of Guiſe, her ſon in-law (29), not able to bring her into the right way, ſent thither John de Sourches-Milicorne with four troops of horſe, who, having ſummoned her to deliver him the chiefs of the factious who had to fled her caſtle, threatning withal to bring cannon before the place to get them out by force, received an anſwer worthy of ſuch a princeſs. *Have a care of what you do* (ſays ſhe to him); *know that no body hath a right to command me but the king himſelf; and that if you puſh things to this extremity, I will put my ſelf at the breach, where I will try whether you will have the inſolence to murder a king's daughter, whoſe death heaven and earth would be obliged to revenge upon you, and all your poſterity, even upon babes in the cradle.* Theſe reſolute words a little cooled his heat; and the duke of Guiſe's death happening at that time, he wholly left off his deſign.’ Mr Varillas telling the ſame ſtory, and according to his uſual cuſtom amplifying it, applies it to the year 1562 (30). But I ſhould be mightily miſtaken, if the proteſtant authors, who apply it to 1569, deſerved not more credit. We are going to ſee Mr d'Aubigné's words.

[*G*] *She ſhewed in that juncture both her courage and charity.*] Her anſwer to Malicorne was not ſo nobly expreſſed by d'Aubigné as by Mezerai; but I doubt the phraſes muſt rather be aſcribed to the hiſtorian, than to the princeſs. Be it how it will, let us quote d'Aubigné. ‘ This (31) was the cauſe, that from the towns and villages of the flat country all fled to Montargis, where many had been preſerved the firſt war, under the protection of the ducheſs, who being of the royal blood, and related to the Guiſes, had a particular privilege allowed her. She and her miniſters blamed thoſe, that took up arms, in ſuch a manner, as ſet her and the prince of Condé at variance, and this quarrel was a cloak to the civilities which were ſhewed her. But this laſt crowding of the proteſtants into her houſe, ſtirred up the preachers of Paris, and they the king, to force her to turn out 460 perſons, two thirds women and young children in the cradle. This princeſs, all in tears, told Malicorne, who had brought her this harſh news, that if ſhe had on her chin what he had on his (32), ſhe would kill him with her own hands, as a meſſenger of death. She furniſhed this diſtreſſed multitude with one hundred and fifty carts, eight travelling coaches, and a great many horſes (33).’ There is ſomething very particular in theſe poor peoples eſcape, whom Malicorne endeavoured to deſtroy upon the road. D'Aubigné relates it. Another Huguenot hiſtorian (34) gives us alſo an account of it, but without mentioning Malicorne; and as for the ducheſs, this he ſays of her under the year 1569 (35). ‘ At that time the duke of Alençon gave the ducheſs of Ferrara to underſtand, that Montargis (her place of abode) was a harbour for proteſtants, and where plots were daily contrived againſt his majeſty. Therefore he deſired her to drive them and their miniſters out, to leave off the exerciſe of the proteſtant religion which ſhe profeſſed, or to remove ſomewhere elſe. She anſwered, that ſhe was too near related to the crown to have ſo little regard for it: beſides, that there was in the town but a poor harmleſs people, who meddled with nothing that might in the leaſt prejudice the king. In a word, that ſhe could not go out of a place that belonged to her, and wherein ſhe was reſolved to live and die, and even in the exerciſe of that religion which the king had permitted her to profeſs, and in which ſhe had been hitherto brought up. However, about the end of September ſhe was forced, for fear of having immediately a garriſon in her town, to diſmiſs moſt of thoſe who had retired thither: and becauſe there were ſeveral families, many women, and a great number of young and old people, who were not able to go thoſe long journies, which they were obliged either to go, or to be at the mercy of thoſe who only waited for an opportunity to deſtroy them, ſhe lent them her coaches, carts, and waggons to aſſiſt them, anſwering for the waggoners, who took care of the reſt of their baggage.’

When I conſider, that Thuanus (36) hath ſupplied Mezerai, and Varillas, with what they ſay of Malicorne's fooliſh attempt in the year 1562, and of the brave anſwer of that princeſs, and that he puts the ſame event in the ſame year, I cannot tell which way to turn myſelf; and perhaps it muſt be ſaid, that the ducheſs was diſturbed twice at Montargis, in the year 1562, and in the year 1569. Malicorne was not perhaps ſent thither the ſecond time, although d'Aubigné ſays it.

[*H*] *This virtuous lady had always expreſſed a ſtrong inclination to relieve the diſtreſſed.*] I will make uſe of Brantome's words. ‘ This princeſs, *ſays he* (37), was not only ingenious, wiſe, witty, and virtuous, but alſo full of goodneſs, which ſhe expreſſed ſo well to her huſband's ſubjects, that I never ſaw any one in Ferrara but was ſatisfied with, and extolled her to the skies: for they had chiefly a deep ſenſe of her charity which ſhe ſhewed, eſpecially to the French; for ſhe had this good Quality, that ſhe never forgot her country; and altho' ſhe was very far from it, yet ſhe always loved it. Never a Frenchman going through Ferrara, if he was in want, and made it known to her, went away without a large relief, and money to carry him to his country and houſe; and if he was ſick and could not travel, ſhe ordered him to be taken care of and cured, and then gave him money to return into France. Brantome *had heard*, that when the duke of Guiſe went into Italy, ſhe ſaved after his return above ten thouſand poor French ſouls, as well ſoldiers as others, who had died of hunger and want, had not ſhe aſſiſted them; for when they went through Ferrara, ſhe ſupplied them all with phyſic and money as much as ſhe was capable to do; *and when her ſtewards repreſented to her her exorbitant expences*, ſhe only anſwered, what will you have me do, they are my poor country-men, whom, if God had given me a beard, and I was a man, would now be all my ſubjects, and even ſhould be ſo, was not that wicked Salic law ſo hard upon me (38).’ Brantome was not unacquainted with her charity at Montargis. Let us hear him further (39). ‘ I have heard ſome of her ſervants ſay, that being returned in France, and retired into her city, and houſe of Montargis, as long as ſhe lived, ſhe received there in the civil-wars a great number of people, and eſpecially the proteſtants, who were driven and baniſhed from their eſtates and houſes, and aſſiſted, helped, and entertained them as well as ſhe could. I my ſelf ſaw, in the time of the ſecond troubles, when the forces of Gaſcogne, headed by Meſſieurs de Terrides and de Monſales, conſiſting of about eight thou-

ſand

---

(27) Thuan. lib. xxvi, pag. 521.

(28) Hiſt. of France, Tom. III, pag. 86.

(29) Ann d'Eſt, Renata's daughter, married firſt Francis of Lorrain duke of Guiſe, and afterwards the duke of Nemours. She was Mother to the duke of Guiſe killed at Blois, and who did ſo much miſchief in favour of the League againſt Henry III and Henry IV. She was then called the ducheſs of Nemours. See the laſt remark, towards the end.

(30) Varill. Hiſt. of Charles IX, Tom. I, p. 175.

(31) That is to ſay, the maſſacre of the proteſtants at Orleans, in the year 1569.

(32) See, hereafter, Brantome's words, remark [*H*], citat. (38).

(33) D'Aubigné, Hiſt Univerſelle, Tom, I, lib. v, cap. xiii.

(34) *His book is intituled*, The true and compleat Hiſtory of the Troubles and remarkable Accidents that happened in France, Flanders, and the neighbouring countries, ſince the year 1562. *It was printed at Rochel*, 1573, *in* 8*vo*.

(35) Lib. viii, fol. 253.

(36) Thuan. Hiſt. lib. xxx, pag. 608.

(37) Brantome's Lives of Illuſtrious Ladies, pag. 302.

(38) Ib. p. 303.

(39) Ib. p. 305.

ly for the prince of Condé, when he was put in priſon [*I*]; but ſhe afterwards fell out with him, becauſe neither ſhe nor her miniſters approved of the proteſtants taking arms (*f*). We cannot too much admire with what ſteadineſs ſhe oppoſed the machines made uſe of by Henry II, and her huſband, to draw her from what they call hereſy [*K*]. She died at Montargis the 12th of June 1575 (*g*), in the profeſſion of the reformed religion. It is therefore through groſs ignorance that a jeſuit . . . . (*h*) hath put her into the liſt of thoſe who abjured the errors of the proteſtants. Her bearing with her huſband's galantries ſhewed her miſtreſs of a great deal of temper. It is pretended, that after ſhe had brought him three ſons and three daughters, ſhe voluntarily retired to a private houſe, that ſhe might not ſee, nor thwart thoſe Diverſions which he took with other ladies. Nay, they add, that this *good princeſs* expreſſed ſome kindneſs for her huſband's miſtreſſes (*i*).

‘ſand men were marching towards the king, and we the chiefs and principal captains and gentlemen paſſed by Montargis, as we were in duty bound, to pay our reſpects to her; I believe that we ſaw in the caſtle above three hundred proteſtants, who had fled thither from all the parts of the country. An old ſteward of her's, a very honeſt gentleman, whom I had known at Ferrara and in France, proteſted to me, that ſhe fed every day above three hundred of thoſe poor perſons who had retired thither.

[*I*] *She interceded ſtrongly for the prince of Condé.*] I will ſtill draw my proof from the ſame author. ‘I have heard ſay, and have it from good hands, that when the prince of Condé was put in priſon at Orleans, in young king Francis's time, ſhe came from Ferrara two days after, and I ſaw her arrive: the king and all the court went to meet her, and ſhe was received with all the honour that ſhe deſerved. She was mightily concerned at his impriſonment, and repreſented to the duke of Guiſe, her ſon-in-law, that whoſoever had adviſed the king to do this, was mightily in the wrong, and that it was not a ſmall matter to uſe a prince of the blood after this manner (40).’ Thuanus makes her yet ſpeak in a more lofty ſtile. ‘Aurelianum regis ſalutandi gratia venit, deploratoque præſenti rerum ſtatu generum acerbè increpuit, & ſiquidem ante captum Condæum adveniſſet id ſe impedituram teſtata monuit, ut ab injuria erga regiæ ſtirpis principes in poſterum temperaret, nam plagam eam diu ſanguinem miſſuram, nec cuiquam unquam bene vertiſſe qui regis conſanguineos principes prior laceſſiviſſet (41). —— *She came to Orleans to pay her compliments to the king, and having deplored the miſerable ſtate of affairs, ſhe very warmly reprimanded her ſon-in-law, and declared that had ſhe arrived before the prince of Condé had been made priſoner, ſhe would have prevented it. She adviſed him for the future to uſe more moderation towards princes of royal blood, ſince this wound would bleed a long time, and no man had been crowned with happineſs that, unprovoked, had offered violence to princes allied to the king.*’

[*K*] *We cannot too much admire with what ſteadineſs ſhe oppoſed the machines made uſe of by Henry II, and her huſband, to draw her from . . . . . hereſy.*] Mr le Laboureur hath publiſhed (42) a very curious piece. It is Henry the ſecond's inſtructions to Dr Oriz, when he went to Ferrara. This doctor was one of the pope's penitentiaries, and performed the office of inquiſitor in France. He was ſent to Ferrara on purpoſe to convert the ducheſs. He was ordered to tell her, I. That the king had, to his inexpreſſible grief, *been informed, that ſhe had ſuffered herſelf to be entangled in the labyrinth of thoſe wicked and damnable opinions, which are contrary and repugnant to our holy faith. II. That when he ſhall hear that ſhe is reconciled with, and reduced to the true obedience of the church, that it will give him as much joy and ſatisfaction as if he was to ſee her raiſed from death to life. III. That if inſtead of treading in the ſteps of her progenitors, who, by an exemplary zeal, have always protected our holy catholic faith, the ſaid lady would remain ſtubborn and obſtinate, nothing in the world could more diſpleaſe the king, and would oblige him to forget wholly the reſpect, friendſhip, and duties of a good nephew; nothing being ſo odious to him as thoſe reprobate ſects, whereof he is a mortal enemy.* If theſe remonſtrances produced nothing, then Dr Oriz was to preach ſome polemical ſermons which the ducheſs ſhould be obliged to hear, *with all her houſhould, though ſhe ſhould obſtinately refuſe it. After he had done this for ſome days, and ſaw that he made no impreſſion on the ſaid lady, he was to declare, before the duke her huſband, that his majeſty wills and underſtands, and actually deſires and exhorts, with earneſtneſs, the ſaid lord duke, to cauſe the ſaid lady to be put in a place ſeparated from all company and converſation, and where ſhe may no more ſpoil any body but herſelf; taking wholly away from her, her own children, and all her ſervants, of what nation ſoever they may be, who are accuſed, or ſtrongly ſuſpected of the ſaid errors and falſe doctrines, to have them brought to juſtice. . . . And after ſentence paſſed againſt them, that the delinquents may receive exemplary puniſhments.* All this was to no purpoſe. Read Mr le Laboureur's words (43). The duke of Ferrara had not ſkill enough to prevent Anne d'Eſt, his daughter, from being imbued with the new opinions. Her mother, who cauſed her to be inſtructed in the ſciences, gave her, for a fellow ſtudent, Olympia Fulvia Morata, a young woman of great parts, and who was afterwards a good Lutheran. ‘Cum Anna Herculis Eſtenſis Ferrarienſium Principis filia iiſdem literis à Joanne Sinapio, viro ſummo, inſtitueretur, ut haberet quicum honeſta æmulatione certaret, viſum matri eſt . . . ut Olympia in aulam, in qua aliquot annos magna cum laude fuit, advocaretur (44). ——— *Whilſt Anne daughter of Hercules d'Eſt, duke of Ferrara, was under the tuition of John Sinapius a very eminent man, her mother, to excite an honourable emulation, cauſed Olympia to be ſent for to court, where ſhe lived for ſeveral years in the higheſt eſteem.*’ This young lady's converſation gave the princeſs Anne a great inſight into religion: Therefore it is reported, that ſhe was ſenſibly grieved at the puniſhments which were inflicted on the reformed after the buſineſs of Amboiſe, and that ſhe exhorted Catherine de Medicis not to ſpill innocent blood. It is Thuanus who reports it. ‘Sola Anna Ateſtina Guiſii uxor miti ingenio femina, & quæ à teneris annis Ferrariæ ſub Renata parente ei doctrinæ quæ tunc exagitabatur inutrita fuerat, Olympiæ Moratæ lectiſſimæ & eruditiſſimæ feminæ conſuetudine ad id uſa lacrimas non tenuiſſe dicitur, ultroque Catharinam monuiſſe ut ſi regem ac regnum ſalvum vellet, ab innocentum ſuppliciis abſtineri juberet (45). —— *Anne d'Eſt, wife to the duke of Guiſe, a woman of a mild temper, who from her infancy had been trained up by her mother at Ferrara in that religion, which then lay under perſecution, and had enjoyed the inſtructive converſation of Olympia Morata, a lady of diſtinguiſhed merit and abilities, is ſaid to have burſt into tears, and begged of Catharine, as ſhe tendered the welfare of his majeſty, and the kingdom, to divert him from the ſhedding of innocent blood.*’ At the time of the league, ſhe was very zealous againſt the proteſtants. Family intereſt, and the remembrance of Poltrot (46), perhaps altered her opinion. For the reſt, the duke of Ferrara was at variance with Renata before the reign of Henry II: for Rabelais wrote this from Rome in the year 1536. ‘Madam Renata is in danger of ſuffering for it: the ſaid duke hath taken Madam de Soubiſe her governante from her, and allows but Italian women to wait upon her, *which is no good ſign* (47).’

(*f*) See remark [*G*].

(*g*) Le Laboureur, *Additions to* Caſtelnau, *Tom. I, pag.* 749.

(*h*) Joannes Franciſcus Hacki, *in libro cui titulus* Via Regia, &c.

(*i*) *See* Lewis Guyon's Various Readings, *Tom. III, pag.* 136.

(40) Ib. p. 306.

(41) Thuan. lib. xxvi, pag. 521, 522, ad ann. 1560.

(42) In the additions to Caſtelnau, Tom. I, pag. 747.

(43) She obſtinately endured the effects of theſe threats, for which Brantome obſerves, that there was for ſome time a miſunderſtanding between her and her huſband, who could do no more than take from her the education of her children. *Le Laboureur, ubi ſupra, pag.* 749.

(44) Cœlius Secundus Curio in Epiſtola ad Betuleium inter Epiſtolas Olympiæ Fulviæ Moratæ, pag. m. 97.

(45) Thuan. Hiſt. lib. xxiv, pag. 496, 497, ad ann. 1560.

(46) Who aſſaſſinated the duke of Guiſe, her huſband.

(47) Rabelais, Epiſt. pag. 18.

FERRARIENSIS, a ſcholaſtic philoſopher, who is commonly quoted by this name, tho' his true Name was Francis Sylveſter [*A*]. He was a native of Ferrara, and made himſelf ſo much conſidered in his order (*a*), that he was choſen their general in a chapter held at Rome in the year 1525. His corpulence did not hinder him from viſiting the provinces of his order, to reſtore it's diſcipline as much as could be (*b*). He died at Rennes in Bretagne the twenty fourth of September 1528. Father Ives Mayeuc, a Dominican, who was biſhop of Rennes ever ſince the twenty ninth of January 1506, and had been confeſſor to queen Anne of Bretagne, to Charles VIII, and Lewis XII, attended him at his death, and adminiſtred the ſacraments to him (*c*).

I add, that, according to Leander Alberti (*d*), he died the ninteenth of September 1528, aged fifty four years. This hiſtorian agrees with Altamura as to the place of his death; but his Latin tranſlator hath not well rendered theſe words, *Nella città di Renes*; for he ſays, *in urbe Reneſiâ*, whereas he ſhould have ſaid, *Redonibus*, or *in civitate Redonenſi*. D'Argentré aſſerts (*e*), that Franciſco Sylveſtro, general of the Jacobins, died at Rennes the twentieth of October 1528. He was very much miſtaken, when he thought that he was called Prieras; confounding him with Sylveſter Prieras, maſter of the ſacred palace under Leo X.

(a) It was the order of the Dominicans.

(b) Licet corpore gravis Provincias tamen Ordinis viſitando luſtravit ex officio, reſtituendæ vitæ regulari . . . pro viribus intendens. *Altamura, ubi infra.*

(c) *Taken from Altamura's* Bibliotheque of the Dominicans, pag 253.

(d) In Deſcript. Italiæ, fol. 350, verſo, *of the Italian edition of Venice* 1561, *and pag.* 540, *of the Latin edition of Colen*, 1567.

(e) D'Argentré, Hiſt. de Bretagne, lib. xii, cap. lxix, pag. m. 718.

[*A*] *Who is commonly quoted by this name, though his true name was Francis Silveſter.*] His commentary on the four books of Thomas Aquinas againſt the heathens, is chiefly quoted. He hath alſo wrote ſome commentaries on Ariſtotle's philoſophy and the life of bleſſed Oſanna, in ſix volumes. This is a ſaint, whoſe confeſſor he had been, and who is held in great veneration at Mantua, by reaſon of her holineſs and miracles (1).

(1) Ex Altamura, in Biblioth. Dominic. pag. 253.

FERRETUS (ÆMILIUS) [*A*], one of the ableſt civilians of the XVIth century, was born at Caſtello Franco in Tuſcany [*B*] the fourteenth of November 1489. As ſoon as he was twelve years of age, he was ſent to Piſa, where he ſtudied the canon and civil laws for three years: After that, he ſpent two more in the univerſity of Siena, and then went to Rome, and was ſecretary to Cardinal Salviata. He was received Advocate at the age of nineteen, having defended ſome Theſes before a numerous aſſembly of cardinals and biſhops. He then left off his chriſtian name of Dominic, to take that of Æmilius. Having accepted the profeſſorſhip in the civil law, he explained ſo learnedly the title *De rebus creditis*, that he was for that promoted to be ſecretary to Leo X. He was ſome years in that office, which he voluntarily left, and retired into his own country. Two years after he came from thence, where his father had been killed, and went to Tridino in the Montferrat. He married there [*C*]; and after four years ſtay, he followed to Rome and Naples the marquis of Montferrat, who commanded part of the French army. This expedition of the French proving very unhappy, he endeavoured to return again into his own country; but he fell into the hands of the Spaniards, who made him pay his ranſom for his liberty. He went into France, and taught the civil law at Valence with ſo much reputation, that Francis I made him a counſellor in the parliament of Paris [*D*], and ſent him with a public character to the Venetians and Florentines. He acquitted himſelf in theſe employs with ſo much ſkill, that the marquis of Montferrat, having obtained Francis the firſt's leave, ſent him to Charles the fifth's court. Ferretus followed the emperor in his African expedition; and after his return into France, the king ſent him to the Florentines during the war which they had with the emperor. After they were conquered, he went back into France, and

[*A*] *Æmilius Ferretus.*] Mr Graverol the advocate is miſtaken, to think that this profeſſor of the civil-law was called Æmilius Perrotus. He will not enquire whether ſome have erroneouſly called him Æmilius Ferretus (1); however, he affirms, that Æmilius Perrotus, to whom Bunel wrote ſome letters, is the ſame civilian as Æmilius Ferretus. It is a miſtake. This was an Italian, the other a Frenchman, as Mr Graverol might have been informed by Bunel (2). I do not diſtinguiſh him from that counſellor of the parliament, honourably mentioned by Thuanus, and whoſe ſon was killed at the maſſacre on St Bartholomew's day. 'Dionyſius item Perrotus 'Æmilii Senatoris Pariſienſis non minus integritate 'quam juris ſcientia clari F. tanto patre digniſſimus 'eandem fortunam ſubiit (3). —— *Dionyſius Perrotus,* '*ſon to Æmilius, a counſellor of the parliament of Pa*'*ris, a man no leſs famed for his integrity, than for* '*his knowledge in law; who, as he inherited his great* '*father's virtues, ſo he likewiſe underwent the ſame* '*fate.*' The epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheca hath deceived Mr Graverol; wherein are theſe words, *Æmilius Ferretus ſeu Perrotus juriſconſultus ſcripſit, &c.* (4). The author aſcribes to him the commentary *in legem Gallus*, which belongs to none but Perrotus.

[*B*] *Was born at Caſtello Franco in Tuſcany.*] His anceſtors, who were originally of Ravenna, ſettled in that town of Tuſcany (5). Obſerve here one or two miſtakes of Mr Allard. Æmilius Ferretus, *ſays he* (6), *was at Languedoc, but he taught with applauſe in the univerſity of Valence in Henry the ſecond's reign.* He ſhould have ſaid Francis I. It might have been ſaid after Panzirolus (7), that he was appointed counſellor in the parliament of Grenoble; by that, he would have had a new relation to Mr Allard's work.

[*C*] *He married there.*] His wife was of a very good family, *ex ſplendida familia* (8). He had by her ſix ſons and one daughter (9), and yet he died without children, and his nephew became his heir (10); which is another proof, that Æmilius Perrotus, father to a ſon who was killed in the year 1572, is not the ſame Æmilius Ferretus who died without children in the year 1552.

[*D*] *Francis I made him a counſellor in the parliament of Paris.*] It was in 1536, if we believe Panzirolus; but if he be in the right in that, he is ſoon after groſsly miſtaken, when he ſuppoſes that Ferretus, ſince his promotion to that office, was ſent by Francis I to Venice and Florence, and by the marquis of Montferrat into Spain, about the time that Charles the firſt was preparing himſelf for his expedition into Africa. This expedition was in the year 1535.

(1) Æmilius Perrotus, qui & aliis Æmilius Ferretus dicitur (an errore id factum non eſt hic diſquirendi locus) juriſconſultus fuit magni nominis. *Franciſcus Graverol, notis in Epiſt. ii, Bunelli, pag.* 7.

(2) See the 7th letter of Bunel, pag. 33.

(3) Thuan. Hiſt. lib. lii, pag. 1077, ad. ann. 1572.

(4) Epit. Bibl. Geſn. p. m. 12.

(5) Panzirolus de claris legum interpret. lib. ii, cap. clxvii, pag. m. 348.

(6) Allard, Bibl. de Dauphiné, pag. 103.

(7) Panzir. ubi ſupra, pag. 350.

(8) Ib. pag. 349.

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Uxore ac liberis amiſſis Marcum Nicolai fratris filium hæredem ſcripſit. *Id. ib. pag.* 350.

and followed the court to Nice, at the time of the Pope's, and Charles the fifth's, and the King's enterview ; then, having parted with his place of counſellor in the parliament, he retired to Lyons, whence he went to Florence, and obtained the freedom of that city. He was called to teach the civil law at Avignon. His ſtipend immediately roſe to 550 crowns, then to 800, and at laſt to 1000 *per annum*, a ſum which had never been given to any profeſſor in that univerſity. He gained the love both of the inhabitants and ſtudents, as it appeared after his death [*E*], as may be ſeen in the remarks. He died at Avignon the 15th of July 1552. He wrote ſeveral books (*a*) [*F*]. One of his letters is ſeen before the old French tranſlation of Boccace's Decameron [*G*].

[*E*] *He gained the love both of the inhabitants and ſtudents, as it appeared after his death.*] Simon Craveta, his ſucceſſor in the chair of the civil law, daring to blame him in his firſt lecture, was hiſſed by all his auditory, and expelled out of the city. 'Unicè tam 'à civibus, quam auditoribus dilectus (Ferrettus) in'gens ſui deſiderium reliquit, quod Simonis Cravetæ 'exemplum oſtendit, qui Æmilii Cathedræ ſubroga'tus, cum in prima oratione eum perſtrinxiſſet, ab 'omnibus exploſus, & urbe ejectus, coactus eſt diſce'dere (11). ——— *He was beloved in ſo ſingular a 'manner, both by the citizens and ſtudents, that his 'loſs was extremely regretted, and his memory had in 'the higheſt eſteem, which is manifeſt in the caſe of Simon Craveta, who, ſucceeding him in the chair, cenſu'red him in his firſt harangue, which ſo exaſperated 'the whole audience, that they turned him out of the 'city, and obliged him to retire.*'

[*F*] *He wrote ſeveral books.*] Panzirolus ſays this (12). 'Plura in jus civile ſcripſit, & librum de Signo, '& Ratione inſcriptum, in quo multas leges interpre'tatus eſt, & alterum Bartoli Everriculum nuncupa'tum, in quo ejus errores congerit; notas in Inſtitu'tiones, opinionum volumen, reſponſa, nec paucas 'epiſtolas edidit. Opus etiam de armorum ratione 'lingua Hetruſca compoſuit. ——— *He wrote ſeveral 'tracts on the civil-law, and a treatiſe intituled*, de 'Signo & Ratione, *wherein he explained a great num'ber of laws, and another intituled* Bartoli Everricu'lum, *in which he makes a collection of Bartolus's er'rors ; he publiſhed alſo annotations on the Inſtitutes, a 'volume of caſes, replies, and ſeveral letters. He com'poſed likewiſe in Italian a treatiſe upon the law of 'arms.*' We muſt add to this a commentary on Tacitus.

[*G*] *One of his letters is ſeen before the old French tranſlation of Boccace's Decameron.*] This letter is in Italian, and dated from Lyons the firſt of May 1545. He wrote it to the queen of Navarre. It is a very good encomium on the Decameron, and on the French tranſlation, which Antony le Maçon had made by order of that princeſs. Emilio Ferretti (thus he ſubſcribes his name) declares, that he had not believed that the tranſlator, though a man of parts, a diligent and good writer, and ſkillful in the Italian tongue, could ſucceed well in tranſlating the Decameron ; but that he had been convinced of the contrary, by reading his tranſlation. Le Maçon's application to husbandry and building, and his diſtractions occaſioned by the cares of his family, being incumbered with a wife and a great number of children, made Ferrettus deſpair of ſeeing a good tranſlation from him. I am ſure that you will not be diſpleaſed to ſee here his own words. *Per la moltitudine & varietà de le cure, ne lequali egli ha reſo ſingular conto di ſe, o per eſſer deditiſſimo à la agricoltura, & à l'edificare, ſecondo che dimoſtrano le ville & le caſe ſue, o per haver moglie & buon numero di figluoli & maſchi & femine, à quali è ſtato meſtieri di altro aiuto che di teſſer favole, à ogni altra coſa aſpettavo che mi riuſciſſi che à tradur novelle, almeno in ſi gran numero & di ſi gran varietà: ma la bellezza de l'ingegno ſuo, & il compartimento, per il quale egli ha ſaputo coſi ben diſpenſar il tempo, ha vinte & tante ſue difficultà, & l'imagination mia.* Here is, by the by, a ſmall account of the character of the old tranſlator of the Decameron.

(*a*) Taken from Panzirolus, lib. ii, cap. clxvii, de claris legum Interpretibus.

(11) Id. ibid.

(12) Id. ibid.

FERRI (Paul) in Latin Ferrius, was a very learned divine in the XVIIth Century. He was born the twenty fourth of February 1591, at Metz, where his family made a good figure [*A*]. He improved himſelf ſo much at Montauban, where he had been to ſtudy divinity, that he was received miniſter at Metz in the year 1610, at the age of nineteen. He had already publiſhed a book [*B*]. The quality of ſtudent of divinity, and that of author, were found united in him at the ſame time. Thoſe which he afterwards publiſhed at ſeveral times, acquired him great reputation [*C*]. He had excellent talents for

[*A*] *He was born .... at Metz* (1), *where his family made a good figure.*] James Ferri's father was forty one years ſucceſſively going through all the degrees of the ancient magiſtracy of this city, and was not out of employment till the ſuppreſſion, which was made in the year 1643, of the juriſdiction of the judges which were called the thirteen. Elizabeth Jolli, his wife, our Paul Ferri's mother, was ſiſter to the famous Peter Jolli the king's attorney at Metz, Toul, and Verdun, to whom Mr le Bey-de-Batilli, and Mr Boiſſard, addreſſed ſeveral epigrams in their Latin poems.

[*B*] *At nineteen years of age, he had publiſhed a book.*] This is the title of it : *Les premieres Oeuvres poëtiques de Paul Ferri Meſſin, où ſous la douce diverſité de ſes conceptions ſe rencontrent les honeſtes libertez d'une jeuneſſe.* He got it printed at Montauban in 1610. He was as yet but a ſtudent of divinity ; but as he prepared himſelf to be ſhortly promoted to the miniſtry, he ended his advertiſement to the reader with theſe words, *Sat ludo nugiſque datum.* —— *Thus much for mirth and trifles.* If this collection of poems was in Latin, it would be called, *Juvenilia Pauli Ferrii.* Here is a new author to be added to the famous youths, if Mr Baillet prints that book again. The firſt piece that is found among his poems, is a paſtoral, intituled, *Iſabelle ou le dedain de l'amour.* The next pieces are ſeveral ſonnets and ſtanza's, under the title of *Les gloires d'Iſabelle* ; and laſtly, many ſtanza's and ſonnets for ſome miniſters and other perſons of Montauban, Metz, and Rochelle.

[*C*] *Thoſe that he afterwards publiſhed at ſeveral times, acquired him great reputation.*] That which he publiſhed in 1616, under the title of *Scholaſtici orthodoxi ſpecimen* (2), ſhews that the doctrine of the Proteſtants, upon the ſubject of grace, hath been taught by the ſchoolmen. This treatiſe got him the eſteem of the illuſtrious Mr du Pleſſis Mornai, who writ him a letter (3), wherein he gave his thoughts on another work which he had heard Ferri was about. That other performance was printed at Sedan by John Jannon in the year 1618, and is intituled, *Le dernier deſeſpoir de la tradition contre l'Ecriture, ou Refutation du livre de François Veron.* Here is the title of a book publiſhed at Leyden in 1630. *Pauli Ferrii Vindiciæ pro Scholaſtico orthodoxo adverſus Leonardum Perinum Jeſuitam, doctorem theologum, & univerſitatis Muſſipontanæ Cancellarium, juſtæ, plenæ, amicæ, in quibus agitur de prædeſtinatione & annexis, de gratia & libero arbitrio, de cauſa peccati, & juſtificatione.* This jeſuit had put out a book in 1619. intituled, *Thraſonica Pauli Ferrii Calviniſtæ* (4). Mr Ferri made a general catechiſm in 1654, to ſhew that it was neceſſary to reform the Romiſh church. He publiſhed it the ſame year, under the title of *Catéchiſme général de la réformation.* Mr Boſſuet, who was then canon and arch-deacon of Metz, and who hath been ſo famous, under the name of biſhop of Condom and Meaux, writ againſt this treatiſe

(1) The Oxford Catalogue ſhould have called him *Metenſis*, and not *Metrenſis.*

(2) It is an octavo of 569 pages. The title ſays, that is was printed at *Gotſtad, Gotſtadii.* It is in all likelihood a ſuppoſed name which ſignifies in High Dutch *God's Town*, meaning by that Geneva.

(3) Dated June 10, 1617. It is found in the third tome of *Du Pleſſis's Memoirs, p.* 1158.

(4) Alegambe, Biblioth. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 305. *His Continuator hath ſaid* Verrii *inſtead of* Ferii.

for the pulpit. He was the moſt eloquent man of his province, and whoſe diſcourſes were the moſt moving. His tall ſtature, his venerable face, and his graceful geſture, added much to his eloquence. His enemies ſpread a falſe report, that he was one of thoſe miniſters, whom cardinal Richelieu had prevailed upon to attempt the union of both religions. Guy Patin's Letters contain this falſity [*D*]. What is certain is, that he lamented the diviſion of the Proteſtants, and that he hoped to be able to contribute ſomething towards an union among them. It was, no doubt, for that reaſon, that he kept a great correſpondence by letters with Mr Dury (*a*) [*E*], who negotiated in Germany the agreement of the Proteſtants, and who was a good man, full of piety and zeal; but at laſt he became a ſort of viſionary [*F*]. Paul Ferri died the 27th of December 1669. He continued

(*a*) See his article.

treatiſe of Mr Ferri. I muſt not forget, that this miniſter was choſen to preach Lewis the thirteenth's, and the queen mother Anne of Auſtria's funeral ſermons. Theſe two ſermons are printed. He made alſo, on certain occaſions, ſome prayers for their majeſties recovery. Theſe prayers were printed, and are very good.

Let us add to all this a paſſage of Mr Ancillon (5). ‘Mr Ferri hath alſo writ another book (6), intituled, *Le dernier deſeſpoir de la tradition*, which is an excellent book in it's kind. He writ alſo, in 1624, a ſmall book, intituled, *Remarques d'Hiſtoires ſur le diſcours de la vie & de la mort de St Livier, & le reçit de ſes miracles nouvellement publiés par le Sieur de Ramberviller lieutenant-général au bailliage de l'evêche de Metz, avec diverſes approbations des docteurs*. Mr Ferri would not be known to be the author of this ſmall piece, becauſe he had writ it againſt a perſon of note, and his countryman, with whom he would have no difference; but he hath made me a preſent of this ſmall book ſince I have been his colleague, and I actually have it by me, under whoſe title he writ with his own hand, *by Paul Ferri*.’

[*D*] *Guy Patin's letters contain this falſity.*] Theſe are his words (7). ‘Mr Ferri, miniſter of Metz, died there a month ago. He was one of the moſt learned of his rank. If cardinal Richelieu had not died ſo ſoon, he had reconciled both religions. Several miniſters were gained over to this project. This Mr Ferri was of that number, and had for it a penſion of five hundred crowns every year. Thus the Huguenots ſpeak of it here.’ His enemies renewed this falſe report on account of his general catechiſm, wherein they pretended he gave his adverſary a great advantage; I mean, the abbot Boſſuet, archdeacon of Metz, who writ againſt him.

[*E*] *He kept a great correſpondence by letters with Mr Dury.*] This correſpondence laſted above five and twenty or ſix and twenty years. I will relate on this ſubject a ſtory that has been communicated to me. Dury, being at the fair of Francfort in April 1662, expreſſed to ſome gentlemen of Metz a ſtrong deſire to ſee Mr Ferri. When they were ready to go home, they asked him whether or no he would go along with them; they preſſed him to undertake the journey, and offered to ſtay for him till the next day. He could have wiſhed to have had more time to reſolve upon this journey; but he was obliged to determine immediately. He then reſolved to go to Metz; but met with two obſtacles in his way: the firſt, that he muſt dreſs himſelf in the habit of a French peaſant, and to cut off a large white and ſquare beard which he then wore. He had an averſion to the firſt of theſe two things; and could not, without mortification, comply with the ſecond. But the deſire to ſee Mr Ferri overcame theſe difficulties. They arrived at Metz ſo late, that Dury was obliged to delay his viſit till the next day. But one of thoſe that came along with him, very early in the morning, told Mr Ferri, that Mr Dury was arrived the day before, and that it was reaſonable that he ſhould prevent his viſit. Mr Ferri beſtirred himſelf ſo much at this news, and was tranſported with ſo much joy, upon his going to embrace this good doctor, that he forgot to tie the ſtrings of his drawers, and went out half dreſſed. Their interview was attended with a thouſand edifying marks of zeal and reciprocal eſteem. It is thought that, as a conſequence of their conferences, Mr Ferri writ a paper, which he addreſſed to the divines of Strasburg. One of them, who in all probability did not like Syncretiſm, writ againſt Mr Ferri. Obſerve, by the by, that Mr Amyraut was miſtaken, when, in 1647, he ſpoke of Mr Dury, as of a man that was already dead (8).

Let us place here what Mr Ancillon, Mr Ferri's colleague, hath ſaid of Dury (9). ‘He came to Metz, and conferred at a gentleman's houſe with Mr Ferri and me upon this ſubject. He told us as a ſecret whatever he had hitherto done, and what he deſigned to do for the future, and asked our opinion. We obſerved him to be a good man, learned, and every way capable to negotiate a buſineſs of that importance: he had then put it on a good foot; for he had already a promiſe of all the princes of Germany, and the northern kings: he told us, that he found no oppoſition from the princes, but only from ſome miniſters who oppoſed this great and deſired work. He was well ſatisfied with the charity of the gentlemen of Zurich, who had ſupplyed him with conſiderable ſums of money to defray the expences of his journies, and to ſupply what he wanted over and above what the protector (10) did give him. We earneſtly exhorted him not to leave off his deſign till he had executed it.’

In the firſt edition of this work, I gave an account what the memoir contained that was communicated to me; which is, that after Dury and Ferri's conferences, the latter compoſed a diſcourſe, which obliged a divine of Strasburg to write againſt him. This divine cannot be Dorſcheus, becauſe he died in 1659, and ſo his book, *De gratiâ adverſus Calviniſtam Ferrium*, cannot be referred to any thing that followed this conference of the peace-maker Dury, and the miniſter of Metz. What Dury ſaid, that *he found no obſtacle but from ſome miniſters* who oppoſed the re-union of the parties, is worth our notice, and confirms what ſhall be ſaid hereafter (11). Hulſeman, a profeſſor of divinity, publiſhed at Wittemberg, in 1644, a book againſt this project of Dury, and intituled it, *Calviniſmus irreconciliabilis*.

[*F*] *Dury at laſt became a ſort of viſionary.*] This appears from what I have ſaid in another place (12) concerning his apocalyptical deſigns, and much more from the great hopes which he had conceived of his new explanation of the apocalypſe. I could not join this laſt fact with the preceeding, becauſe I was then at the laſt page of the firſt volume of this Dictionary. I therefore referred it to this place. Pray obſerve Dury's plan. It is a ‘method of meditation to obtain the true ſenſe of the holy ſcriptures by one's ſelf, and to prevent all occaſions of diſpute concerning what may be doubtful; for in every doubtful caſe, we ſhall have nothing to do, but immediately to have recourſe to one or ſeveral texts, which ſpeak of the ſubject in hand, and having found the true ſenſe of the ſcripture by the rule of common interpretation, the deciſion will be found, if people are previouſly agreed to acquieſce in the ſenſe of the holy ſcripture (13)’. He adds, that to give an eſſay of his method, ‘he hath pitched upon the book of the Revelation, which, without doubt, he looked upon as the moſt obſcure book of all the whole Bible; that by the deſcription of the means whereby we come to underſtand it, we may be convinced that the ſame rule may diſcover the ſenſe, and lead us to the underſtanding of other leſs obſcure books and texts of holy writ (14).’ He believes, that, *with God's help, this battery againſt the powers of darkneſs will be ſo raiſed, that the Lord's hand ſhall be lifted up according to Iſaiah's prophecy*, chap. xxvi. ver. 9, 10, 11, 12. *which begins to be now fullfilled. We muſt therefore ſurround them with ſuch a light, that they ſhall have no place where to hide themſelves any more* (15). What dreams! what chimeras! how weak muſt a man be, to fancy that he can draw from ſuch a method ſo great an evidence

(5) Ancillon, Mêlange Critique Tom. II, p. 269.

(6) He had juſt before ſpoken of the *Scholaſticus Orthodoxus*.

(7) Patin, *Letter DIX, dated the 19th of March* 1670, *Tom. III, pag.* 499, *Edit. Genev.* 1691.

(8) Andrew Rivetus *obſerved this miſtake*: Scripſit in ſua præfatione (*that is to ſay, in his preface* Speciminis Animadverſionum *againſt Mr Spanheim*) Rever. Duræum piæ memoriæ non depoſuiſſe niſi cum vita ſtudium concordiæ inter Reformatos & Lutheranos ſarciendæ, qui etiamnum vivit Dei gratia & valet. *Andr. Rivetus, Epiſt. Apologet. ad Guill. Fratrem*, dated July 14, 1648, *Oper. Tom. III, pag.* 886, 887.

(9) Ancillon, Mêlange Critique Tom. II, pag. 244, 245.

(10) Oliver Cromwell.

(11) In Remark [*D*] of the article *HOTTINGER*.

(12) In Remark [*C*] of the article *DURY*.

(13) Dury, Intelligence de l'Apocalypſe, p. 24.

(14) Ibid. p. 25.

(15) Idem, Epiſt. dedicat. p. 9, 10.

continued his preaching. Above eighty ſtones were found in his bladder, which was the cauſe of his death. He had a very fine library, and to the laſt took a pleaſure in writing ſeveral remarks on the blank-paper, which is commonly at the beginning and end of books; and becauſe he writ ſmall and plain, he ſet down upon theſe leaves abundance of things, which may eaſily be read. We ſee in the inſcription of his picture in print the words *Verbi divini miniſter* [G]; which

dence, that it will be able to clear all the doubts which are raiſed on ſuch and ſuch places of ſcripture? This great pacificator ſounded the horn in Sion; for he joined to his book, a Latin piece, of four pages in 4to, with this title *Celeuſma ad pios Evangelii Miniſtros. An exhortation to the devout miniſters of the goſpel.*

> Vos qui per vada ſancta navigantes
> Lentos figitis ad mandata remos
> Audite hoc monitum, ut celeuſma miſſum
> Nomine CHRISTI.
>
> *Attend ye ſailors on the ſacred deep,*
> *Whoſe oars the meaſures of God's mandates keep,*
> *The chearful ſignal catch, aud think it came*
> *From heav'n itſelf, with your great maſter's name.*

The owner of the copy, which came to my hands, faſtened to it the original of the letter, which Dury wrote to the conſiſtories of the province of Groningen, when he ſent them his new project and his *Celeuſma*. This letter is dated from Caſſel the 22d of June 1674, and ſhews, that he was concerned for nothing ſo much as for his new method.

Obſerve, that to excuſe him, and to ſhew that he fed not on whims, one would think it might be ſaid, that one of his chief deſigns was to attack the conſciences of thoſe who foment diviſion. This appears by his words: *What perplexes the minds, and ſeparates the affections of chriſtians, is nothing elſe but a deſign that men have to maintain the principles and method of their particular faction, againſt the intereſt of the common edification, which is taught and recommended to us by the apoſtle St Paul,* 1 Cor. ix. 19, ... *I have therefore in view an enquiry after a truly evangelical and ſpiritual remedy, which may be applied to the conſcience of thoſe who foment a ſpirit of Party among chriſtians, for a temporal intereſt: this is the foundation and aim of my new deſign* (16). It may be ſaid, that this was to go to the ſpring of the evil, and of the remedy; and ſo it ought not to ſeem ſtrange that he appeared ſo confident of ſucceſs. 'He had a mind to 'ſhew by what means thoſe obſtacles might be removed, which hinder the Proteſtants from proceeding 'to a more perfect reformation, which ought to be 'introduced both in the ſchools and in the church, and 'from whence, by the bleſſing of God, the fruit will 'redound to the government of the ſtate (17).' People may ſay what they pleaſe; his chimeras will ſtill ſubſiſt; for the attacks, which he deſigned to give to the conſcience of the chiefs, were not leſs unlikely to ſucceed, than thoſe which he levelled againſt their underſtanding.

[G] *We ſee in the inſcription of his picture in print the words* Verbi Divini Miniſter.] It will be a ſatisfaction for many to find here the diſtich which is at the bottom of that picture:

> *Tales ſi multos ferrent hæc ſæcula Ferri,*
> *In Ferri ſæclis aurea ſæcla forent.*

The firſt print of a miniſter, which the Proteſtants of Metz publiſhed after his, was that of Mr Ancillon. Wherein was put *Verbi divini Miniſter*, but they were obliged to blot it out (18).

A COMPLAINT of Mr Ancillon the Son.

This Mr Ancillon was miniſter of Metz, and a man of great merit. See his article (19). His ſon was mightily offended at what hath been ſaid in this remark [G]; and he hath publiſhed his complaints of it. I. He pretends (20), that to ſhew *the value that people had for Mr Ferri*, I have ſaid, *that it was allowed that he ſhould be called miniſter of the R. R.* * *and that thoſe who engraved Mr Ancillon's copper-plate, having given him alſo the ſame quality, the magiſtrates oppoſed it, and had it razed out, becauſe they had not the ſame regard for the one as they had for the other. What,* continues he (21), *was there no way to make the illuſtrious Mr Ferri as great as he was, without leſſening Mr Ancillon? Or could not he be raiſed but* on the ruins of his colleague? This *diſtinction* ſeems to him (22) *odious and affected*: he ſays, *that I prepoſterouſly endeavour to blacken* Mr Ancillon's memory (23). II. He is angry (24) with the perſon who furniſhed me with ſome memoirs, and he hath been ſurprized (25) at my *credulity*, and at the *manner of my making uſe of them.* He ſuppoſes, that having *been a long while in the neighbourhood of Metz, I muſt be pretty well acquainted with the tranſactions there, and that I could not but know the univerſal eſteem, and unexpreſſible affection, which people had for Mr Ancillon.* III. He ſpeaks (26) of the correſpondence by letters that had been between Mr Ancillon and me for ſeveral years. IV. He doth not believe (27) that his father, or any of his family, hath ever diſobliged me. V. But he finds (28), that I *ſhould have done well* for my credit *to forbear ..... placing with ſo much care the name of* Ancillon, *in the body and index of my book, ſince I would afford him but a rank unworthy of ſo great a man.* VI. Coming to the fact, he pretends, that what I ſay is falſe; and informs the world (29), that *Mr Philippe engraved Mr Ferri's picture ſome time after his death, and named him miniſter of the R. R. that the king's attorney took fire immediately at this title, and proceeded againſt the Engraver;* That Mr Ferri's heirs unwilling to meddle in that affair, the Engraver (30) *was diſpleaſed with his work, and that if ſome perſons of note had not hindered him, he would have broke his plate to pieces, being vexed that no perſon appeared for him, who, by his work, had had no other aim, than to honour the memory of Mr Ferri; that therefore he was contented to correct the title, and, to ſtop the king's attorney's and the Roman Catholics mouths, he put a P. between the two R. to ſignify pretended reformed; That* (13) *the ſame Philippe engraved afterwards Mr Ancillon's picture; and that, to avoid the ſame inconveniency that had happened to him on account of Mr Ferri's picture, he put theſe words,* David Ancillon, Miniſtrorum Metenſium Decanus. *That no body ever found fault with them; that they remained without contradiction; that the world hath always ſeen them in this print; that he hath actually the plate in his hands, and* (32) *that he is ready to ſhew it to whoſoever will deſire to be convinced that there is at leaſt one miſtake in my large work.*

I never was more ſurprized, than when I read this part of Mr Ancillon's ſon's book. I immediately did two things: one was to write to him, that he might be in the right as to the fact, but that he could not be ſo with reference to the deſign which he accuſes me of. I gave him ſome explanations, and begged of him to rectify theſe things in the firſt work that he ſhould publiſh; and I told him, that, on my ſide, I would clear this buſineſs in my ſecond edition. He returned a very obliging anſwer, and aſſured me, that he hoped to print ſhortly a book, wherein all this ſhould be reviſed and corrected. The other thing that I did was to write to the perſon who had furniſhed me with the memoirs concerning Mr Ferri: I deſired him to tell me, whether the two facts which I had related, and received from him, could be well proved? or whether I muſt confeſs myſelf in the wrong, ſince the public had ſeen a book, wherein Mr Ancillon the ſon maintained, that Mr Ferri's print was called in queſtion, but that of his father had never been ſo? We ſhall ſee hereunder what anſwer I received. But before that, let us make ſome notes on the five heads of this complaint.

REFUTATION of this Complaint.

I. I can proteſt, with all the ſincerity in the world, that I have had no deſign of giving my readers an idea of ſuperiority or inferiority, with reference to theſe two miniſters of Metz, Mr Ferri and Mr Ancillon; neither do I believe, that the gentleman, who ſent me theſe memoirs, had any ſuch deſign. I have read them over ſince I have known the complaint, and I have found in them no ground to ſuſpect it. The thing is told in a plain manner, as I have related it; and it plainly appears, that he only deſigned to ſhew the which were not allowed to be uſed ſince for his colleagues. He left ſome children

---

(16) Ibid. p. 17.

(17) Ibid. pag. 25, 26.

(18) This hath been found to be falſe. See, below, num. VI.

(19) Article *ANCILLON* (DAVID).

(20) Diſcourſe on the late Mr Ancillon's Life, *pag.* 307.

* Reformed Religion.

(21) Ibid. p. 308.

(22) Ibid.

(23) Ibid.

(24) Ibid. pag. 312.

(25) Ibid. pag. 313.

(26) Ibid.

(27) Ibid. pag. 314.

(28) Ibid.

(29) Ibid. pag. 308.

(30) Ibid. pag. 309.

(31) Ibid. pag. 310.

(32) Ibid. pag. 311.

the epocha of one of the chicaneries of the miſſionaries againſt the Proteſtants. There was a time when only thoſe miniſters, who took upon them the title of paſtors, were put to ſome trouble for it, but were not diſturbed for ſtyling themſelves miniſters of the word of GOD; but at laſt it was thought fit to vex them on this account. This is all that I believed, that the perſon who ſent me thoſe memoirs, deſigned to ſhew with reference to the affairs of Metz; and it was wholly with that view that I made that remark which concerned Mr Ferri's picture. Had I been told, that any body would have pretended, that I deſigned, by that, to have put Mr Ferri above Mr Ancillon; I had anſwered, that it had been impoſſible. I at leaſt remember, that it never then came into my mind that any one would underſtand me ſo; and had I ſuſpected it, I would have poſitively ſet down the deſign of my remark. Judge then what was my ſurprize, when I ſaw that there was a public complaint againſt me, that I had aimed to villify and blacken Mr Ancillon; and that I ſaid, that the title of miniſter of GOD's word was blotted out of his picture, *becauſe they had not the ſame regard for him as for the other.* This is not only to impute to me a deſign which I never had, but alſo ſome words which can never be found in my dictionary. I have ſeveral times obſerved, that thoſe who write either the life, or encomium of great men, are pleaſed to ſay, that ſuch or ſuch a cuſtom hath begun, or ceaſed, by ſuch or ſuch a profeſſor, *&c.* Theſe are epocha's or particulars which are thought remarkable; and therefore the author of the memoirs ought to have informed me when the permiſſion to put *verbi divini miniſter* to the copper-plates of the miniſters ended, and when it began to be forbidden. But had he had a deſign to have heightened Mr Ferri's character, he ſhould have entered into particulars, and ſhewed how they warranted ſuch a diſtinction; otherwiſe he could not have made it appear that Mr Ferri was preferred to his colleague. To explain myſelf: Thoſe who ſay in general, *That ſuch a one was the laſt who had that permiſſion, ſuch a one was the firſt that had it not allowed him,* ſhew plainly and preciſely a period of time; but they ſay nothing which proves that the firſt was more deſerving than the laſt: the event, which they relate, is a very equivocal ſign. Some factions may ſpring up, which may endeavour to aboliſh a cuſtom, and for the firſt three or four years have not authority enough to aboliſh it: in the mean time a profeſſor is promoted to the chair, and of courſe enjoys the privileges of that cuſtom. If in the fifth year the faction is potent enough, another profeſſor, that happens to be elected at that time, ſhall be debarred this privilege. Doth this prove him leſs deſerving than the other? not at all. It proves only, that the cabal was more able to carry their point the fifth year than they had been before. It may even happen, that a faction will not employ their whole ſtrength, becauſe they deſpiſe certain perſons; and that they wait to eſtabliſh their innovation, till a profeſſor of extraordinary worth is choſen, becauſe the alteration of a cuſtom is of much more weight when it begins by a very eminent perſon. There are a thouſand caſes wherein the epochas, which the author of the memoir pointed out to me, would be a proof of Mr Ancillon's ſuperiority over Mr Ferri: but the truth of it is, that there was no deſign in this buſineſs to decide who was the greateſt man of the two. It was only intended to ſhew by what ſteps miniſters were wronged and vexed. Obſerve, that the judges, exaſperated by the miſſionaries, or carried on by their own ambition (33), did ſooner vex a miniſter of great parts and learning, than one of leſs note. They imagined, that by perſecuting one, who was reckoned as a pillar of a Calviniſtical church, they could better carry on the ruin of the whole party, than if they perſecuted a miniſter of an inferior rank. So that, inſtead of pretending, as Mr Ancillon, the ſon, hath done, that there was a deſign to leſſen his father, it had been more excuſable to have fancied, that there was rather a deſign to extol him: for what can be more honourable for a miniſter, not only according to the opinion of the refugees, but alſo of all the Proteſtants, to have been the firſt example of the perſecutions of the miſſionaries (34)? Did not ſuch a choice of the perſecutors imply, that they did deſpiſe thoſe upon whom they had not begun their attacks, and that they thought it a maſter-piece to affront thoſe upon whom they begun them? you may remember, that the agents of the clergy, who took no notice that ſome country miniſters, or ſome indifferent writers, ſtiled themſelves paſtors, made a great buſtle when they ſaw the Paris miniſters take upon them that title in an excellent book compoſed by Aubertin, one of the miniſters of that church (35). After all, it will appear, that if the author of the memoir and I had had the odd deſign which is fathered upon us, we ſhould have been the moſt unſkillful of all men: we ſhould have ſo concealed our deſign, that we ſhould have made it inviſible to all unprejudiced readers, and that many might eaſily have concluded from our words juſt the contrary to our intention. This is what concerns the firſt part of the complaint: I will not enlarge ſo much on the others.

II. The credit that I gave to the memoir is not an unlawful credulity. I was obliged to believe, that a man that had lately taken the pains to inform himſelf upon the ſpot, as exactly as he could, of all the particulars of that ſtory of the prints of Mr Ferri and Mr Ancillon, could not be miſtaken: and as I had lived ſome years in the neighbourhood of Metz, and had never heard any thing of what concerns theſe prints, it induced me the more to think ſo. I came to Sedan about the end of Auguſt, 1675, and I found that the Proteſtants there enjoyed a greater liberty than the other churches: but I found that things grew worſe with them every day, and I ſaw the cavil that aroſe concerning the *verbi divini miniſter*. A ſtudent (36) of divinity was to maintain ſome theſes which he had dedicated to ſome of the miniſters of that place. He gave them the title of *verbi divini miniſter*, according to the cuſtom that had been always practiſed, and never oppoſed; but the prieſts of Sedan made a buſtle about it, and got this title ſtruck out. When I remembered this, could I doubt but ſuch another innovation had happened ſome time after Mr Ferri's death? The particular eſteem which the magiſtrates might have for a miniſter (37) did not hinder them to give way to the peeviſh temper of the miſſionaries who applied to them. It was the bent of the court, and conſequently the ſpring that gave motion to all. III. I was very well pleaſed, and thought myſelf honoured, to have an intercourſe of letters with Mr Ancillon. We writ to one another what we knew concerning the news of the republic of learning. I had a deſign to ſpeak of him in my book, and to boaſt of his friendſhip; but I expected ſome memoirs, or at leaſt till the article of Farel, whoſe life he has written, ſhould give me occaſion to do it: but this article was referred to the Supplement to the two volumes of my Dictionary, as I have referred to it ſeveral important articles. IV. None that knows me will ever do me ſo much injuſtice as to ſuſpect, that, under pretence I had been diſobliged by any one's relations, I would revenge myſelf on his memory (38). I freely here confeſs, that I have no reaſon to complain of the late Mr Ancillon, or of any of his family. V. If I thought it not fit to go from my memoir concerning Mr Ferri, to ſpeak of the worth of his colleague, it was becauſe I was very ſure that I ſhould not want a more proper opportunity to do it. I gave the public notice, that I did not make the Index to my Dictionary: It was done by a miniſter, and a refugee, who no doubt put there Mr Ancillon, becauſe he had a mind to ſhew the epocha of the particular quarrel againſt the title *verbi divini miniſter*, it being a remarkable thing.

VI. Let us at laſt come to the chief point. The author of the memoir hath acquainted me, that he was miſtaken in one thing; that it is not true that *Verbi divini Miniſter* was put in Mr Ancillon's print, and therefore that they were not obliged to raze out this clauſe. However he was in the right to ſay, that this clauſe was allowed in Mr Ferri's print. He has ſent me a copy, where I read theſe words: PAULUS FERRI V. D. MINISTER ECCLES. P. R. METENSIS OBIIT ANNO 1669. ÆTAT. ANNO 79. The inſcription was at firſt MINISTER ECCLES. REF. METENSIS; but they were obliged to raze out REF. as repugnant to the edicts of pacification, and to put in the room of thoſe three letters P. R. which are ſeen in all the prints.

---

(33) It was in France a ſhort and ſure way to pleaſe the court, and to obtain from thence ſome favour and preferment, to ſhew a great zeal to harraſs the miniſters, *&c.*

(34) It is a glory to be the firſt victim of a perſecution: It is the brighteſt gem in St Stephen's crown. Proteſilaus's death became famous on that account in the renowned Trojan war. *Hectorea* PRIMUS *fataliter haſta Proteſilaë cadis.* Ovid. Metam. lib. xii, ver. 67.

(35) See remark [*B*] of the article AUBERTIN.

(36) Born at Sedan. He is miniſter of the Walloon church at Dort. He is yet alive, and may witneſs to what I advance here.

(37) The author of the complaint ought to acknowledge it, ſince he confeſſes that the engraver of Mr Ferri's picture was ſued, and that this miniſter was very much eſteemed.

(38) See in it's place the article *ANCILLON.* It was compoſed ſince the unkind complaint of this miniſter's ſon; and notwithſtanding that, I have ſpoken very advantageouſly of the miniſter, without minding this unjuſt and ill grounded complaint.

children [*H*], and ſome manuſcripts (*b*) [*I*]. I know not whether we ſhall ever ſee his poſthumous works.

(*b*) This, and moſt of the things which you will find in the remarks, have been taken from a memorial which the kind, learned, and curious author of the *Remarks on the Catholic Confeſſion of Sancy*, printed at Amſterdam in the year 1693, hath imparted to me.

prints. Mr Ancillon is miſtaken when he ſays, that Mr Ferri's plate had originally R. R. in whoſe room, when they came to correct it, they were only obliged to put a P between thoſe two letters. The concluſion of all this will be, I. That it is ſtrictly true, that the title of *V. D. Miniſter* appeared at firſt on Mr Ferri's print, and that it remained there even after the Engraver was ſued for it. II. That it was never ſeen, after that, on the print of any miniſter of Metz, and that the Engraver durſt not put it on that of Mr Ancillon. This is what the author of the memoir anſwered me. I omit ſeveral conſiderations which tend to diſtinguiſh the pretence from the true cauſe of the affront that was put upon him and me: there is no neceſſity to trouble the world with it.

[*H*] *He left ſome children.*] He was twice married, and had by his firſt wiſe one ſon and one daughter. The daughter is at Metz, with all her family. The ſon's family conſiſts of one ſon and ſeveral daughters: theſe, except the eldeſt, have taken ſanctuary in Berlin, and the ſon is in England. The eldeſt daughter is at the Hague with Mr du Vivier her huſband, who is miniſter there. He had by his ſecond wife one daughter, married to Mr Bancelin, heretofore miniſter of Metz, and now of Berlin.

[*I*] *And ſome manuſcripts.*] As, the anſwer to *The hiſtory of the birth and decay of hereſy in the city of Metz.* Mr de Madaure, ſuffragan of the biſhopric of Metz, is the author of that hiſtory. Mr Ferri, by his laſt will, deſired his heirs to print his anſwer to this book, yet it hath not as yet appeared (39). They keep ſome other treatiſes of the deceaſed, beſides a vaſt number of ſermons, and among them eleven hundred only on the *Epiſtle to the Hebrews.*

(39) Compare with this the *Mélange Critique* of Mr Ancillon, *Tom. II, pag.* 271.

FERRIER (Arnaud, or Arnoul du) preſident of the parliament of Paris in Henry II's reign, was employed by Charles IX in ſeveral embaſſies. See upon this Mr Moreri; for my deſign is only to inſiſt on a thing which he hath taken no notice of, which is, that du Ferrier was along while a good Huguenot in his heart, and that at laſt he publickly owned himſelf one [*A*]. Had not he made his eſcape, he had been put in priſon, (as being ſuſpected of hereſy) after the famous *Mercuriale* of the year 1559 (*a*). This ſtorm againſt him ceaſed ſome time after; and he was choſen for an embaſſy, which gave him occaſion, in ſome meaſure, to ſpeak his mind. He harangued (*b*) in the council of Trent, as ambaſſador of the moſt chriſtian king; and expreſſed himſelf with ſo much vigour, that he offended the ſtanch Papiſts. After that, he went to Venice in the ſame quality of ambaſſador, and remained there ſeveral years without having an opportunity to diſcover his ſentiments. At laſt Mr du Pleſſis Mornai, who was not ignorant of them, preſſed him ſo warmly, at his return from his embaſſy, to give glory to truth, that he obliged him to declare himſelf publickly (*c*). The king of Navarre made him his chancellor [*B*]. The Ultramontanes have accuſed du Ferrier of a certain plot,

(*a*) Mezerai, Epitom. Chron. Tom. IV, pag. m. 721.

(*b*) In the year 1562.

(*c*) See the rem. [*A*].

[*A*] *At laſt he publickly owned himſelf a good Huguenot.*] This circumſtance, which many learned men have not known (1), deſerves to be proved here. The place that I will quote is ſomething long; but I quote it intire, becauſe I found in it nothing but what is uſeful to give us an inſight into the hiſtory of this famous man. Mr du Pleſſis Mornai going to Guienne (2), ‘meets with Mr Ferrier, at Artenay, as he returned from his embaſſy at Venice, where he had been particularly acquainted with him in the year 1570. After they had embraced one another, they retired into a private place, and talking of the good diſpoſition which God gave him at his age, he happened to ſay, that it bordered on the ſeventy ſixth year: Whereupon Mr du Pleſſis took occaſion to tell him, *Is it not then high time to look to your conſcience, and to remember thoſe edifying diſcourſes which we have had together formerly at Venice, and that reſolution which you have ſo many times repeated to me, both by word of mouth and by letters, of making an open profeſſion of the truth, which you have known ſo long, and ſo long concealed?* And he preſſed him ſo warmly, that he got a promiſe from him, that he would declare himſelf; not without ſaying however, that he would be glad to be firſt paid off fourteen thouſand crowns, which were due to him for his embaſſy. Mr du Pleſſis wrote to his friends at Paris, to keep him in this good reſolution; and, to take off all manner of excuſe, as ſoon as he was with the king of Navarre, he perſuaded him to make du Ferrier his chancellor. Whereupon laying aſide all other buſineſs, he went to meet him, and then made a public profeſſion of the reformed religion. He was a great man, acquainted with all the parts of ſound learning; an excellent civilian, honoured with ſeveral embaſſies, and even with that to the council of Trent, and who in his old age confined his ſtudies to the ſcriptures and the holy tongue: and for that reaſon, Mr du Pleſſis, as may be ſeen by ſeveral of his letters, exhorted him to make a more ſolemn declaration (3); whereby the ſtates, wherein he had lived, might know, why a man, ſo much valued, had forſaken the Romiſh religion at that age. But he could not obtain that of a man who had grown old in the reſpect for the court, and in the fear of the world. Truly Mr Montagne could not forbear ſaying often to Mr du Pleſſis, *You have gained a victory over us by getting this man, and honouring in him a virtue which we ſlighted.*’

(1) See the remark [*C*].

(2) Du Pleſſis Mornai's Life, pag. 65, ad ann. 1582.

(3) See, in Du Pleſſis's Memoirs, *Tom. I, pag.* 104 *and* 106, the model of the abjuration which was propoſed to him. They would have had him publiſh the motives that induced him to change his religion, and they would take care to diſperſe them every where in different languages.

[*B*] *The king of Navarre made him his chancellor.*] Believing that the affairs, du Ferrier negociated at the court of France, would not give him leave to reſide near his perſon, he was pleaſed to give him an employment, which ſhould oblige him to ſtay at Paris: he deſigned Pibrac's place for him, that is to ſay, the ſuperintendance of the affairs which he had in that city (4). This prince had a council at Paris at Toulouſe, and at Bourdeaux. The law-ſuits which he had in every one of thoſe parliaments required it. But let us make uſe of Mr du Pleſſis's own words (5). *Becauſe the ſaid eſtates are under three parliaments, namely, Paris, Toulouſe, and Bourdeaux, to whoſe cognizance ſeveral affairs and law-ſuits ariſing concerning them belong, he retains and pays in every one of theſe parliaments a council, over which one of the chief of the parliament preſides. As for that of Paris, he hath choſen Mr du Ferrier, lately embaſſador for the king at Venice, one of the greateſt men of Europe, and whom the late chancellor de l'Hôpital had judged the only man worthy to ſucceed him in the place of chancellor for his integrity and capacity. We are afraid that he dares not accept of it, becauſe he deſires hereafter to make an open profeſſion of the Proteſtant religion, and therefore he would live in a more ſecure and free place for the exerciſe it.* Indeed I believe that he did not accept of that poſt. He went to the king of Navarre to be his chancellor; for here is what I find in du Pleſſis's memoirs (6): ‘I have not known all this while but two chancellors of the king of Navarre; the late Mr Ferrier, a very great man, the ſecond Cato of France, who died a year

(4) Du Pleſſis's Memoirs, Tom. I, pag. 158, & 165.

(5) Ibid. pag. 187, *in a writing dated in May*, 1583.

(6) Ibid. pag. 644.

plot, that might have been either wholly or partly true [*C*]. This learned man died in the year 1585, aged about ſeventy nine years [*D*]. Brantome ſays a remarkable thing of him [*E*]. I ſhall mention it, and will not forget cardinal Palavicini [*F*].

I lengthen a little this article in the ſecond edition; to obſerve that du Ferrier took his degree of doctor of the civil law at Padua; and that from a profeſſor in the univerſity of Toulouſe, he was promoted to be counſellor of the parliament of that city *(d)*. Read on this ſubject a letter of Bunel (*e*), where he obſerves, that cardinal de Tournon had contributed very much to this honourable recompence of the merit of this learned civilian; and that the liberality of Francis I appeared on that occaſion. This letter is without date; but we find in it, that Caſtellanus was then biſhop of Mâcon. We muſt thence conclude that du Ferrier got that employ between 1543, and 1548. He had been one of the learned men whom cardinal de Tournon carried along with him, and with whom he familiarly converſed (*f*). Thuanus ſays on this head what redounds much to this cardinal's glory (*g*). Du Ferrier's elogium is found among thoſe of Sammarthanus [*G*]. Beſides that, conſult the notes on the Catholic confeſſion of Sanci *(h)*.

'a year ago of grief for the war of the league; and Mr de Glateins, Mr Pibrac's eldeſt brother, who fills up that place with ſo much applauſe.' The writing, where theſe words are ſeen, is dated in the month of October, 1586.

[*C*] *The Ultramontanes have accuſed him of a certain plot, that might have been either wholly or partly true.*] The author of the *Journal des Savans* is angry with Raynaldus the annaliſt, who attributes this plot to chancellor de l'Hôpital, and to preſident Ferrier. A certain project of the pope's legates, 'occaſioned the remonſtrances made by the emperor, the king of Spain, and other princes, and the famous proteſtation pronounced by preſident du Ferrier, Charles the ninth's embaſſador, which was ſo diſpleaſing to the court of Rome. Nothing could be invented more injurious to the memory of this famous magiſtrate, than what Raynaldus raſhly advances, that he had conſpired with the chancellor de l'Hôpital to withdraw the moſt chriſtian king from the holy ſee, to aſſemble a national council, where the French king, in imitation of the king of England, ſhould have been declared head of the Gallican church, and to uſurp all the church lands of France (7).' If preſident Couſin had remembred that du Ferrier was a good Proteſtant at that time, and that he died in an open profeſſion of the reformed religion, would he have denied what Raynaldus ſuppoſes? can any thing be more probable than ſuch a project (8). And was it poſſible to have the ability of thoſe two excellent perſons, to be ſo convinced of the abuſes in vogue, ſo zealous for the true grandeur of the French monarchy, and not think of a reformation, which would render France formidable to all it's neighbours, and free it from a dependance which to this day is ſo prejudicial to it?

Authors who knew not that du Ferrier died a Proteſtant.

A great many other learned men have not known that du Ferrier died a Proteſtant. Here is what Davila ſays of a conference that the duke of Eſpernon had with the king of Navarre, whereupon Roquelaure, one of this prince's favourites, adviſed him to comply with Henry the third's intentions. *Contendeva in contrario Arnoldo Monſignore di Ferrier ſuo Cancelliere, il quale huomo di finiſſimo ingegno, e di eccellente dottrina dopò la legatione di Venetia, nella quale era ſtato molti anni, tornato in Francia, e poco riconoſciuto alla corte, s'era ritirato appreſſo il Rè di Navarra. Queſto temendo, ſe il Padrone ſi riduceſſe alla concordia, & alla ubbidienza del Rè di rimanere abjetto, & abbandonato, s'era* BENCHE CATTOLICO accoſtato *all' opinione di Filippo di Mornè Signore di Pleſſis* (9). Mr de Beauvais-Nangis (10) hath taken notice of this Miſtake of Davila. I believe that cardinal Palavicini would have thanked any one that had informed him of what I relate in the remark [*A*]. This would have given great weight, among thoſe of his party, to the reaſon he alledges (11) againſt Fra-Paolo, taken from the great intimacy which was between that friar and the embaſſador du Ferrier. It is moſt certain that the converſion of the latter was not known to this cardinal, ſince it is not alledged in the place which I have quoted. See the remark [*F*].

[*D*] *He died in the year* 1585, *aged about ſeventy nine years.*] Two places of Mr du Pleſſis Mornai, above quoted, are a proof of this. One ſays, that in 1582, preſident du Ferrier bordered on his ſeventy ſixth year (12), and the other, that he died in the year 1585 (13).

[*E*] *Brantome ſays a remarkable thing of him.*] 'I ſhould as well like preſident du Ferrier, ſo long kept embaſſador at Venice, who ſometimes would go and read public lectures at Padua; which was a thing unbecoming his employ and the king's authority, who took it ill of him, and gave him no kind reception at his return, as well on that account, as for the religion he profeſſed. He was afterwards chancellor to the king of Navarre (14).'

[*F*] *I will not forget cardinal Palavicini.*] He quotes (15) the life of father Paul, wherein is ſeen that this father had been very intimate with du Ferrier, and that du Ferrier had made a large collection of memoirs and letters. Hence the cardinal concludes, that father Paul had taken his materials from ill hands: for you muſt know, *ſays he*, that du Ferrier was one of thoſe embaſſadors which the court of France ſent to Trent (16), when, in the time of king Charles's infancy, moſt of thoſe that governed the royal council were imbued with new hereſies. Du Ferrier ſhewed himſelf ſo plainly, that three perſons of note (17) teſtified, by their writings, that he paſſed for a Huguenot. The third of theſe witneſſes is the embaſſador of Venice, who affirms, in the account which he gave the ſenate, that du Ferrier, ſuſpected of being a Huguenot, read Lucian as he was at maſs. The cardinal adds, that du Ferrier, deſigned to enrich himſelf by a traffic of religion, and that he treated ſecretly for that purpoſe with the Pope, by the means of Baſtian Gualtieri biſhop of Viterbo. He endeavoured to perſuade his holineſs to diſſolve the council, and call a particular aſſembly of the Gallican church; whereof the Pope was to be the head, and where he hoped to aſſiſt on the king's behalf. As he expected wonders from the Pope's favour, he promiſed all manner of good offices to the court of Rome, and proteſted that he was perſuaded of the Pope's authority on thoſe points upon which the Sorbonne were conteſting. Seeing that the Pope would not follow this project, he changed his ambition into rage; and taking advantage of the abſence of the cardinals of Lorrain, and of Lanſac, chief of the embaſſy, as alſo of the conditional power which the court of France had given it's miniſters to proteſt, and knowing that his colleague would applaud him (18), he made, before all the council, a ſatirical harangue againſt the Popes, and againſt the members of the aſſembly, and aſcribed to the king his maſter the ſame authority over the Gallican church that the ſchiſmatic kings of England aſcribe to themſelves over the church of that kingdom. He appeared no more at the council, becauſe he knew that he had made himſelf odious there, but he went ſome time after to Venice, from whence he wrote to the king as maliciouſly as he could, and ſhewed, by the moſt cunning reaſons of ſtate that he could deviſe, that his majeſty ought not to ſend any more embaſſadors to Trent, nor receive the decrees of that council, ſince they were ſo prejudicial to the royal authority. From hence father Paul hath drawn his droſs, which he vends for pure gold. Thus Palavicini concludes this ſubject.

[*G*] *Du Ferrier's panegyric is found among thoſe of Sammarthanus.*] This elogiſt hath very well expreſſed what he hath ſaid, but he hath not enlarged enough on the liſe of this great man. For the reſt he hath been hitherto quoted (19) in Moreri's dictionary *in Annal.* Which will make many believe, that Sammarthanus hath written annals, and may oblige them to ſeek for this pretended book. This gives me occaſion to obſerve an error

of

(*d*) Sammarth. In Elogior. lib. i, pag. pag. m. 90.

(*e*) It is the 42d.

(*f*) Thuan. de vita ſua, lib. ii, pag. m. 1185.

(*g*) Id. ibid.

(*h*) At page 391 of the edition of 1699.

(7) Couſin, Journal des Sçav. Febr. 28, 1680, pag. m. 118.

(8) *Confer.* quæ infra, *Rem.* [*F*].

(9) Davila, delle guerre civili di Francia, lib. vii, ad ann. 1585, pag. m. 377.

(10) In the remarks on Davila, at the end of his *Hiſtory of Favourites.*

(11) Palavic. Iſtoria del Concilio di Trento, Introduzione, cap. iv.

(12) Life of du Pleſſis, pag. 65.

(13) Memoirs *of the ſame*, Tom. I, pag. 644.

(14) Brantome, Memoirs, Tom. I, *in the Elogy on Francis I*, pag. 248.

(15) Palavic. ubi ſupra, cap. 4.

(16) Three were ſent; Lanſac, Ferrier, and Pibrac.

(17) Conſalvo di Mendoza, biſhop of Salamanca: Muzio Callino, archbiſhop of Zara: Nicolo da Ponte, ambaſſador of Venice at the council of Trent, and afterward doge of the republic.

(18) Eſſendo rimaſto per Collega al Ferrier ſolo Guido Fabri paleſe Ugonotto in quel tempo, come il nomina la mentovata Relazione dell' Orator Veneziano. *Palavic. ubi ſupra.*

(19) That is to ſay, till the edition of Paris, 1699, incluſively.

of this nature, which hath not been corrected, even in the Paris edition of 1699. In Moreri, at the end of the article of Eugene IV, is quoted *Eneas Silvius, Eutrop. c.* 58. This is enough to perſuade ſeveral readers, that this Eneas Silvius, who was Pope under the name of Pius II, had wrote a Book intituled, *Eutropius,* or a Commentary on the Hiſtorian Eutropius. Theſe faults, and many more of this nature, have been made not by Mr Moreri himſelf, but by his printers. I do not queſtion but that he had wrote *Ste. Marthe, in Elogiis. Eneas Silvius in Europa.* At leaſt ſo he ought to have written.

FERRIER (JEREMIAH) *(a)* was a miniſter and profeſſor in divinity at Niſmes, about the beginning of the XVIIth century: He afterwards changed his religion, and was made counſellor of ſtate. He had maintained, in a public diſputation in the year 1602, that *Pope Clement VIII was properly Antichriſt (b).* This cauſed a great diſturbance [*A*]. Who would have thought that a man, who made ſo bold a ſtep, would not always continue a hot man, and an enemy to moderate divines? Yet, he was one of the firſt that grew faint and ſlack [*B*] in the political aſſemblies of the Proteſtants: For he did not ſecond thoſe who were for appearing bold and daring; on the contrary, he oppoſed, as much as he could, all the vigorous and couragious reſolutions which ſeveral zealous perſons propoſed. This made him ſo ſuſpected, that they looked upon him as a court penſioner, a falſe brother, and a betrayer of the church *(c)*. The national ſynod of Privas in 1612, forbad him to preach at Niſmes *(d)* [*C*]. Whereupon Ferrier got a place of counſellor in the preſidial of that city; but a popular tumult was raiſed againſt him, which occaſioned his change of religion [*D*]. After which he ſettled at Paris, where he endeavoured

[*A*] *This cauſed a great deal of diſturbance.*] The parliament of Toulouſe ordered, that he ſhould be taken into cuſtody for this theſis. At Caſtres the chamber was divided about the form of proceeding. At laſt Henry IV made an arrêt, *forbidding all manner of perſons to diſturb this miniſter for that propoſition* (1). The provincial and national ſynods uſed all their intereſt for Ferrier (2), who had induſtriouſly concerned the whole body in this affair; inſomuch that the national ſynod of Gap, where he was aſſiſtant to the moderator (3), ordered, in the year 1603, that a new article ſhould be inſerted in the confeſſion of faith, importing, that the Pope *is properly Antichriſt, and the ſon of perdition, foretold in God's word.* See in Mr du Pleſſis Mornai's life (4), how ill Henry IV. took this innovation; and obſerve how the intrigues and intereſt of a private member may influence the whole body.

[*B*] *Yet he was one of the firſt that that grew faint and ſlack.*] We are told, in the *hiſtory of the edict of Nantes* (5), *that he was corrupted by the cajoling of the court; and that the Jeſuits boaſt, that in the year* 1600, *their father Cotton being at Niſmes . . . got Ferrier's acquaintance, whom he diſpoſed at that time to betray his brethren. Let the matter be how it will,* continues this hiſtorian, *he embroiled every thing in the political aſſemblies, where he was preſent, which obliged the ſynods to forbid him appearing there any more.* The French Mercury (6) informs us, that ſome jealouſies aroſe between the deputies of the aſſembly of Saumur in the year 1611; and that *alſo Ferrier the miniſter took occaſion to go home upon his ſon and wife's ſickneſs.* There were two opinions in this aſſembly (7): *Some maintaining, that they ought to enjoy the edict of pacification as it was drawn up; and others, (among whom Ferrier was) that they ought to acquieſce (conformably to the king's pleaſure) to the terms of the edict, as it had been verified in the parliaments.*

[*C*] *The ſynod of Privas forbad him to preach at Niſmes.*] The hiſtorian of the edict of Nantes gives a large account of this affair: ‘It was on Ferrier's account, *ſays he* (8), *that in the ſynod of Privas* an act was made, whereby the divinity-profeſſors were excluded out of the political aſſemblies; but, with relation to him, they were not contented with general terms, for he was arraigned after a very mortifying manner. *The means which he had deviſed* to ward off the blow, ſeemed only to draw it upon him: he took ſome ſuſpected journies to court, without acquainting his church. *He at firſt accepted the place that was offered him in the church of Paris,* and even ſhewed a great deal of ſorrow when he was upbraided with his faults: but after he had promiſed not to abandon his profeſſion, and to exerciſe it at Paris, he very diſhonourably broke his word, *and returned into his province* without taking his leave of the miniſters of Paris. All this was conſidered at Privas; and du Moulin, who gave there an account of what had paſſed at Paris, where Ferrier had ſhewed himſelf of a temper equally haughty, inconſtant, and unſincere, proved his deportment very irregular. Several accuſations concerning his former behaviour, which was rigorouſly ſearched into, were added to this. He was charged with neglect of his duty as divinity-profeſſor; with preaching ſome doctrines not very orthodox; with meddling with the management of money; with having kept a conſiderable ſum which he would not account for; with having forged, or conſented to the forging of, certain letters, which had engaged him in ſome ſhameful broils and diſhoneſt diſguiſes. He was ſeverely cenſured on all theſe heads: but beſides the verbal cenſure, the ſynod ordered him to write to the church of Paris, and to make them ſatisfaction: forbad him appearing in the political aſſemblies for ten years; and enjoined him to exerciſe his miniſtry out of the province of Languedoc. *The church and city of Niſmes ſent ſome deputies to the ſynod, who omitted nothing* to get this decree cancelled, but to no purpoſe. The ſynod even declared to them that they took it ill, to ſee ſo conſiderable a deputation in the behalf of a man who betrayed the common cauſe. The miniſters, who had ſided with him, were cenſured for their complaiſance; and the memorials, which they had taken along with them to juſtify him, were voted ſlanderous. But becauſe they ſaw that Ferrier would not ſtop there, and that having the magiſtrates for him, he would continue the exerciſe of his miniſtry, whereof he was not ſuſpended; they declared, that he was already ſuſpended, if he did not obey.’ Neverthleſs, becauſe they would not carry things to the utmoſt extremity againſt him, the ſynod ſent him to Montelimar, in the room of Chamier, who was going to be divinity-profeſſor at Montauban. Ferrier then took other meaſures (9): he got a place of counſellor of the preſidial of Niſmes, and was there inſtalled, notwitſtanding the oppoſitions of the conſiſtory, which, after many proceedings, excommunicated him on the fourteenth of July, 1613. We ſhall ſee, in the following remark, the diſorders that happened by a popular commotion.

[*D*] *But a popular tumult was raiſed againſt him which occaſioned his change of religion.*] The author of the French Mercury has deſcribed the circumſtances of this tumult. Ferrier's adverſaries, ſays he (10), ſeeing him a counſellor of the preſidial, *excommunicated him after their way, and incited the populace to fall upon him as he went to the preſidial, or returned from it.* Though Ferrier was informed of this deſign, yet he went with the provoſt to the preſidial the fourteenth of July, 1613. *As he went thither, he met with no body; but as he came out, deſigning to go home, he found his adverſaries with the populace, who, pointing at him with their hands, ſaid to one another, ſee, ſee, that traitor Judas! then they begun to throw ſtones at him,* and to purſue him, *with a deſign to ſeize him;* but he eſcaped into Lieutenant Rozel's houſe. *Mad that he had made his eſcape, they went to his houſe, ranſacked it, and burned before his door a great deal of his goods and books,* The

---

(a) And not Benjamin, as St Romauld calls him, *apud David l'Enfant, month of Septemb. pag.* 174.

(b) Ferrier's preface to the treatiſe of Antichriſt.

(c) See the remarks [*D*] and [*L*].

(d) French Mercury, Tom. III, pag. 156.

(1) Ferrier's preface to the *Treatiſe of Antichriſt.*

(2) Ibid.

(3) Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantz, Tom. I, pag. 396.

(4) Pag. 296, & ſeq.

(5) Tom. I, pag. pag. 395.

(6) French Mercury, Tom. II, pag. 203. Cologne Edit.

(7) Ibid. Tom. III, pag. 156. *See alſo* Tom. XII, pag. 406, *where it is ſaid,* That Chamier was head of the firſt opinion, which was that of the Party-huguenots; and Ferrier head of the ſecond opinion, which was that of the State-huguenots.

(8) Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantz, Tom. II, pag. 84, & ſeq.

(9) Ibid. pag. 122.

(10) French Mercury, Tom. II, pag. 156, 157.

endeavoured to raiſe himſelf. He publiſhed, in 1614 (*e*), a book of controverſy, concerning Antichriſt. The king employed him in *many affairs of importance*; and in the year 1626, he commanded him *to follow his majeſty* in his progreſs to Bretagne, and there honoured him with *the place of privy-counſellor of ſtate* (*f*). Cardinal Richelieu honoured him with a particular eſteem (*g*). At his return from this journey he was attacked with a lingering fever, which grew worſe every day. He died of it the 26th of September 1626 [*E*], and was buried in St Sulpice's church, which was his pariſh-church (*h*). He gave great proofs of his catholiciſm on his death-bed [*F*], and made all his children promiſe that they would live and die in the ſame faith [*G*]. I cannot well

The fifteenth and fixteenth of July, *they went alſo to ranſack what he had in the country, and to pluck up his vines; which having performed, they returned to Niſmes, every one of them having in their hands vines and young trees out of Ferrier's incloſure.* He found means to eſcape to Beaucaire, after he had been ſhut up for three days in a tomb (11). Ferrier ſays, (12) that 'he was half killed with ſtones; and that *he eſcaped* by a miracle out of the hands of thirty of the conſiſtory's partiſans, who had bound themſelves by an oath to kill him: that his mother, aged ſixty years, widow and daughter of a miniſter, died with horror at this ſad ſpectacle; and that ſhe was ſeveral times threatened by theſe murderers to be burned alive: that two little children were miraculouſly ſnatched from the flames by the prudent management of the magiſtrates, whom theſe enraged zealots threatened to kill: that his poor wife, nine months gone with child, was ſtruck with a halbard: that his mother-in-law, being almoſt eighty years old, was treated with the ſame cruelty: that all his houſhold-ſtuff was burned before their temple; the greateſt part of his books and papers pillaged or burned; all the beſt of his goods carried away, or ſpoiled: that the ſentence of the chamber of the edict of Caſtres, and the opinion of all the judges of the pretended reformed religion, condemned to the gallows ſeventeen of theſe wretches, whom they (13) had perſuaded to kill him on account of religion, by promiſing them heaven for ſo deteſtable an action.' This laſt circumſtance hath all the air of an impoſture and black calumny. By this means the reſt may be ſuſpected (14): but, at worſt, this cannot be brought as a conſequence of the doctrine and temper of the whole party. It is well known, that in all countries, and in all religions, the mobile, when in a mutiny, knows no bounds. Ferrier himſelf acknowledges, that the Proteſtant judges voted ſeventeen of theſe mutineers to be puniſhed. All that I have to do, to make an end of the commentary of my text, is only to ſay, that Ferrier pretends that all theſe outrages conquered the obſtinacy wherewith he reſiſted the light: *It is*, ſays he (15), *the common reproach of the enemies of my ſalvation*, That I am a catholic by force. *It is true; I confeſs it. God granted me this favour againſt my will, when I oppoſed him, when I fled from him, and abhorred the ſalvation which he offered me. My calling was violent, becauſe my obſtinacy in hereſy was very great. Thus, to ſave the greateſt perſecutors, and the moſt virulent enemies of the church, God hath been obliged to thunder and lighten, to pull them down to the ground, and blind them by his powerful hand.* He therefore pretends, that the injuries he received broke the tyes by which he was attached to hereſy, and conducted him to another Ananias, that is to ſay, cardinal du Perron, who introduced him into the boſom of the church: for this cardinal was the great converter of that time.

REFLEXION on the maxim, *Compelle intrare, —— compel them to come in.*

I ſhall obſerve here, without having any particular event in view, that as there is a *compelle intrare*, COMPEL THEM TO COME IN, there is alſo a *compelle exire*, COMPEL THEM TO GO OUT. Suppoſe a clergyman, who hath a potent enemy among his brethren. It may happen, that in ſpite of himſelf he may be made a heretic, and forced to fly to another communion: firſt, he ſhall ſee himſelf accuſed of heterodoxy; after that, it ſhall be objected, that he keeps a ſecret correſpondence with the enemy; that he is a penſioner, ill affected to the government, and capable to infect the church: he ſhall be made ſo odious, that even his relations dare not ſee him: he ſhall be forced, ſeeing his miniſtry can no more edify, to ſeek imployment elſewhere. But where ſhall he go? his adverſaries letters move faſter than a family; he can go no where, but he ſhall find himſelf already defamed (16). Thus, after he hath removed his tents into ſeveral places, without being able to remove prepoſſeſſing and raſh judgments, almoſt reduced to the laſt penny, and not knowing how to ſubſiſt, and beſides full of indignation, that it is ſo eaſy for two or three bawlers to prepoſſeſs ſo many againſt him, and conceiving an ill opinion of a party which can ſo eaſily be ſtartled, he flies into the arms of another church. And this is what his enemies wanted; they are arrived to the height of their deſires. Nothing torments them more, than to ſee that thoſe, whom they have accuſed and calumniated, do not confirm their ſuggeſtions by their deſertion (17). This is a kind of dragooning, not to compel to come in, but to compel to go out.

[*E*] *He died the twenty ſixth of September*, 1626.] Thoſe who ſay (18), that he died the twenty ſeventh of September, 1626, are but little miſtaken; thoſe (19) who place it in the year 1625, are a little further from truth.

[*F*] *He gave very great proofs of his catholiciſm on his death bed.*] A book was publiſhed intituled, *The happy death of the Sieur Ferrier*; wherein is related what he ſaid when the prieſt brought him the ſacrament and extream unction, *&c.* The French Mercury (20) mentions a great many things contained in this little book; I refer the reader to it. But I will here take notice of two of them, becauſe they are of uſe to rectify ſome miſtakes. 'The holy ſacrament coming into his houſe, Mrs du Ferrier his wife being on her knees, pretty near his bed, cryed out, *Ah, Lord, I am not worthy that you ſhould come into my houſe*: he, being ſenſibly affected with theſe words, ſaid to her, *Alas, my dear, I wiſh that he who put theſe words in your mouth, will ever hereafter imprint his love and belief in your heart* (21).' This ſhews plainly, that this ex-miniſter's Wife was no more a Proteſtant; and therefore, that St Romuald the Feüillant, and after him David l'Enfant the Dominican, are miſtaken, when they ſay (22), *That du Ferrier could not perſuade his wife to follow his ſteps, which did not hinder them from living lovingly together.* A little before his death, he dictated his epitaph in theſe words (23): 'Hic jacet Hieremias Ferrier, qui anno Domini 1613. Catholicam Apoſtolicam & Romanam fidem firmiter amplexus ad extremum uſque vitæ ſpiritum firmiter retinuit. —— *Here lies Jeremia Ferrier, who, in the year of our lord* 1613, *embraced the Catholic, Apoſtolic, and Roman faith, which he ſtedfaſtly retained to his lateſt breath.*' This will ſerve to confute Mr Moreri.

[*G*] *He made all his children promiſe that they . . . . . would die in the ſame faith.*] As he ſays in the preface to the treatiſe of *Antichriſt, that he hath a great family upon his hands*; we muſt believe that he had many children: among them, he had but one daughter. And this is what he ſaid to her, when he exhorted them all to perſevere in the Romiſh faith; *And you, my daughter, who have had this great privilege over your brothers, to have been baptized in the church, do you not promiſe it me alſo* (24)? Mr Patin alſo mentions this daughter: *The lieutenant-criminal is here very ſick. His wife, who is a ſhrew, hath beaten and ſhut him in the cellar. She is a devil, worſe than Pilate's wife; ſhe is the daughter of Jeremiah Ferrier, formerly miniſter of Niſmes, who abjured.* Thus he ſpeaks in a letter dated the twenty fifth of Auguſt, 1660 (25). In all likelihood he ſpeaks alſo of her, when he ſays in another place (26), 'There is here no other talk, but of the murther of Mr Tardieu lieutenant-criminal, and his wife: the two aſſaſſins were immediately taken . . . . . All the people go as it were in proceſſion to St Bartholomew's Church,

' to

(*e*) The epiſtle dedicatory to the king is dated from Paris, the firſt of September 1614.

(*f*) French Mercury, Tom. XII, pag. 496, 497.

(*g*) Ibid.

(*h*) Ib. pag 499. His houſe was in the ſuburbs of St Germain.

(11) Ibid. Tom. XII, pag. 495, 496. *Ferrier ſays it alſo in his preface to his* Treatiſe of Antichriſt: I have been buried three whole days, and truly put in the grave.

(12) Ferrier, ibid.

(13) He means the miniſters and their abettors.

(14) The hiſtorian of the *Edict of Nantz, Tom. II, pag.* 123, 124, acknowledges that the populace, without any regard to the conſuls, judges, or paſtors, broke open Ferrier's houſe, embezzelled or burned all his goods, and forgot no outrage, which an exaſperated crowd can do; ravaged every thing in his country-houſe, and broke open the goals, to ſet at liberty ſome mutineers whom the judges had committed.

(15) Ferrier, ubi ſupra.

(16) See, above, remark [*E*] of the article ALCIAT (JOHN PAUL).

(17) See, above, remark [*K*] of the article ARNAULD (ANTONY) doctor of Sorbonne.

(18) Peter de St Romuald, Father l'Enfant, Mr Moreri, *&c.*

(19) Father Jacob, Biblioth. Pontificia, pag. 349. Konig, Biblioth. vet. & nova. Henninges Witte, in Diario biographico.

(20) French Mercury, Tom. XII, pag. 496, & ſeq.

(21) Ibid pag. 497.

(22) See the *General Hiſtory of all Ages.* by Father David l' Enfant, in the month of September, pag. 174.

(23) French Mercury, ubi ſupra, pag. 498.

(24) Ibid. pag. 498.

(25) It is the cxcvith. at page 165, of Tom. II.

(26) Letter ccclxvi, pag. 95 of Tom. III, dated the 26th of Auguſt, 1665.

well ſay how old he was [*H*]. They gave him ſome hopes of being ſent ambaſſador to Holland, if we believe Mr Moreri [*I*]. I dare not poſitively ſay, that it was he, who writ the *State Catholic* [*K*], a book that was mightily valued in it's time. The Proteſtants have given a very bad character of Jeremiah Ferrier [*L*]. He could hardly avoid that. Cardinal

‘to pray to God for the ſoul of this unhappy lieutenant-criminal, and his wretched wife, who was ſo prodigiouſly covetous, that ſhe had neither footman, coachman, nor maid. She had rather be her own ſervant to ſave a penny. . . . ſolemn prayers were made, at St Bartholomew's, for the late lieutenent-criminal, and his wife: but if ſhe had no ſoul, what ſignify theſe prayers? As for the wax-tapers, they are burned and conſumed (27).’ A ſon of *Jeremiah Ferrier was killed by ſome footmen, whom he would have hindered from ſtriking his ſervant.* Dom Peter de St Romuald (28) ſays, that his death happened on the twenty third of February 1638. Here is a very unhappy Family. I do not doubt but Mr Tardieu's wife, who was ſo noted for her covetouſneſs (29), and who ſo tragically ended her days with her huſband, was daughter to Ferrier the ex-miniſter.

[*H*] *I cannot well ſay how old he was.*] He doth not explain himſelf conſiſtently on that ſubject; for in a place of his preface, he acknowledges, *That he is mighty afflicted* that he had not employed for the Catholic church *twenty whole years, which,* he ſays, *he hath wretchedly loſt to ſerve a bad and ungrateful cauſe.* This ſhews, that he was received a miniſter about the year 1593, ſince he changed his religion in 1613; but he had ſaid two pages before, that he was but twenty four years of age, when he maintained, that Clement VIII was Antichriſt. This I find in the words which I am going to quote, and which ſerve for an anſwer to the reproaches caſt upon him, that he had impudently engaged in this hypotheſis to diſturb the ſtate, and to enrich himſelf by the war. ‘He therefore, *that is to ſay Mr du Pleſſis,* is more concerned than I am in their accuſations, that I deſigned by this means to raiſe a war. I had then never gone out of my ſtudy, being only twenty four years of age; had never been verſed in buſineſs, nor in martial cabals, and thought of nothing elſe but my books, and to further the religion wherein I was born.’ Let us remember, that he maintained his theſis in the year 1602. Now if he was then but twenty four years of age, he could not have been received miniſter in 1593. The miniſtry is not conferred on a ſcholar of fifteen years of age: we cannot therefore depend upon what he ſays. According to the French Mercury (30), he had preached for ſixteen years the Proteſtant religion. Taking it then for granted, that he was twenty four years of age when he maintained, in 1602, the theſis of Antichriſt, he had been received miniſter at the age of nineteen in 1597, and had died at the age of forty eight years. But who will rather believe the French Mercury, than Jeremiah Ferrier himſelf, on the duration of his miniſtry? The beſt way then is to decide nothing.

[*I*] *They gave him ſome hopes of being ſent embaſſador to Holland, if we believe Mr Moreri.*] I think he is not here to be relied on; for he did not know that Jeremiah Ferrier lived thirteen years after his journey to Paris; he thought that this ex-miniſter died a little while after he arrived in that city. He did not know, that his book of antichriſt was in French; for had he known it, he had not noted it in Latin, *de Antichriſto.* He believed, without reaſon, that Ferrier was the author of a book, intituled, *Reſponſio ad lib. admonitio ad Beg. Lugd. XIII. &c.* The printers have horribly diſfigured this title: it ſhould be *Reſponſio ad libellum cui titulus, admonitio ad Reg. Ludovicum XIII.* Thoſe who have aſcribed ſuch a book to our Ferrier, are undoubtedly ſome Latin authors, who have thus deſcribed a French book which is fathered upon him. I am going to ſpeak of it.

[*K*] *I dare not poſitively ſay, that Ferrier writ the* State-Catholic.] There are ſome arguments pro and con. This book appeared in print in the year 1625, under the name of the Sieur du Ferrier (31). It was immediately aſcribed to Jeremiah Ferrier; for the author of a little book, intituled, *The happy death of the Sieur du Ferrier,* obſerves (32) that *two things* may be inferred *from this death; one againſt the Proteſtants, the other againſt the publiſhers of libels in Flanders. The Proteſtants or party Huguenots had given out, that his converſion was feigned . . . . . and that his end would make it appear. They were anſwered, that the declaration, which he had made at his death, could not be called in queſtion, or thought forced, or the effect of a delirium, ſince ſeveral Proteſtants themſelves had viſited him in his ſickneſs, who might teſtify, that he continued in his ſenſes, and that he kept a ſound judgment to the laſt. As to the foreign writers, who ſaid in their libels, that* Simia ſit ſemper Simia, it was replied, that *this declaration of faith made by the Sieur du Ferrier at his death, and the relation of his happy deceaſe, ought to have ſtopped their mouths, and expoſed their ſcandalous writings.* We muſt know, that the *State Catholic* was an anſwer to ſome libels, which ſome ſticklers for the king of Spain had publiſhed againſt France (33), becauſe it made an alliance with the Proteſtants to the prejudice of Catholiciſm. The author of the *State-Catholic* could not anſwer without venting many things againſt the houſe of Auſtria. The writers of the Spaniſh party replied (34), and reproached him, that he always acted the part of an ape; which ſhews plainly, that they took him for the ex-miniſter and ex-profeſſor of Niſmes; and this is the reaſon why, in the account of his death, the reflexion I have related is made. Several famous authors, and very well verſed in books, have thought Jeremiah Ferrier to be the author of the *State-Catholic* (35). I would not ſtick to do it, did not I know that Mr Baillet (36) aſcribes this work to John Sirmond (37), who was one of thoſe writers, whom cardinal Richelieu employed to anſwer the libels that came out by ſhoals againſt him in the Spaniſh Netherlands. John Sirmond was uſed to give himſelf a falſe name in the pieces which he publiſhed againſt theſe libels; but it would be very odd, had he taken upon him the name of a living author, and ſo well known as Mr Jeremiah Ferrier was: beſides, Mr Pelliſſon (38), who mentions many anonymous or pſeudonymous pieces of this writer, doth not aſcribe the *State-Catholic* to him, which is one of the beſt pieces in Mr Chatelet's collection. Notwithſtanding all theſe reaſons, I will not decide it, till I have ſeen what proofs Mr Baillet will alledge to maintain his opinion.

[*L*] *The Proteſtants have given a very bad character of Jeremiah Ferrier.*] He himſelf tells us that he ſuffered two violent perſecutions; one before he was a Catholic, and the other after (39). The firſt when he was ſtoned, and had his houſe ſacked, &c. and the ſecond was a ſhower of invectives that were publiſhed againſt him (40). He was accuſed *of having been the king's penſioner, a traytor to the churches, and of having ſown diſſention in the aſſemblies, and diſputes among the nobility; of deſigning to ſtay at Niſmes, to ruin all the churches; of having been gratifyed by their majeſties for ſecret ſervites, and ſecured ſeveral ways to ruin and exterminate the churches; of being an atheiſt, and of having maintained many execrable propoſitions againſt the myſtery of the incarnation; and of having deſerved to be caſt out of the ſynagogue as a ſon of Belial.* See in the hiſtory of the edict of Nantes, at the 124th page of the ſecond tome, the ſubſtance of the accuſations againſt Ferrier; and here is what is found concerning him, page 395, of the firſt volume of the ſame hiſtory. ‘He confounded every thing in the political aſſemblies where he was preſent, which obliged the ſynods to forbid him to appear there. He created to himſelf ſome trouble in his church and province, which occaſioned his expulſion from thence; and being weary of being a miniſter, he got a place of counſellor of the preſidial of Niſmes, though he had promiſed at Paris to continue ſomewhere elſe the exerciſe of his function. He was afterwards depoſed as a deſerter. At laſt he turned Papiſt, and died ſome few years after (41), as hated by the people as he had been beloved in his youth. He was ſelfiſh, deceitful, ambitious, fickle, turbulent, void of judgment, and unfit for thoſe intrigues wherein he had the imprudence to engage. But he was pretty bold, of quick parts, of a fiery temper, and a fluent tongue, having an imperious tone, and vehemence of action and diſcourſe; which impoſed on his hearers, and did not allow them the liberty of contradicting him. Wherefore the multitude,

---

(27) Letter ccclxvii, pag. 99, dated the tenth of September, 1665.

(28) Chronological and Hiſtorical Journal.

(29) See the tenth ſatire of Boileau, where this marriage, and the ſequel of it, makes a curious epiſode.

(30) Tom. III, pag. 158.

(31) It was afterwards inſerted in the collection of ſeveral pieces uſeful to hiſtory.

(32) French Mercury, Tom. XII, pag. 499.

(33) See, above, remark [*B*], of the article CARTHAGENA.

(34) The *French Mercury, Tom. XII, pag.* 500, 501, gives a liſt of ſeveral libels, written by the Spaniards, among which is one intituled, *Scopa Ferreriana.*

(35) Voëtius, Polit. Eccleſ. Tom. II, pag. 531. Spizelius, Scrut. Atheiſmi, pag. 32.

(36) See the table of his *Authors diſguiſed.*

(37) He was of the French academy, and nephew to Father Sirmond the Jeſuit. See the *Hiſtory of the French Academy, pag. m.* 304.

(38) Hiſtory of the French Academy, pag. 306, 307.

(39) Preface to his Treatiſe of Antichriſt.

(40) He ſays, that of all the books that were publiſhed againſt him, he never read but two, one writ by S. Ceſari, the other compoſed by the ſynod of the Lower Languedoc.

(41) I have already ſaid, above, againſt Moreri, that he lived thirteen years after his abjuration. The author, whom I quote, hath acknowleged it in his ſecond Tome, pag. 125. *Ferrier lived yet a great while,* ſays he, *after the Commotion of Niſmes.*

Cardinal du Perron has ſaid a very invidious thing of the excuſes which he pretended the Proteſtants made for the commotion at Niſmes [*M*].

'tude, which is eaſily dazzled by theſe qualities, was always for him: and he often carried it, even in ſynods, againſt Chauve his competitor. This Chauve had a great deal more integrity and judgment, and eſpecially an agreeable gravity; which made him very conſiderable in the aſſemblies. But the heat of the one did prevail over the moderation of the other; and Ferrier's vivacity obſcured Chauve's ſolidity.' I have no reaſon to doubt of the truth of this character. But I will ſay in general, without making any application, that it is eaſy at ſome certain times to paſs for a falſe brother, though one be not ſo. It is enough to have other notions of things, than ſome men of a hot temper, and of a great and contagious imagination. Theſe men have but little knowledge of others, or even of themſelves. For the moſt part, they imagine that they act for the advancement of religion, when they are only acted by heat and pride. Their temper makes them averſe to all counſels of moderation and patience; nothing pleaſes them but vigorous proceedings, and which they think fit to preſerve the credit and worldly intereſt of the party; and this they call a zeal for God's cauſe. But this is no great matter; for they ſometimes unaccountably injure their neighbour; they believe that he cannot be of another opinion than theirs, but out of treachery. However, there are ſome caſes wherein a man may be fully convinced, that even for temporal intereſt we ought not to be ſo ſtiff. But what do theſe fiery men? They earneſtly ſtrive to get moderate men ſuſpected; and then thoſe, who will not be ſuſpected, give way to the greater number; and thoſe, who continue to oppoſe them, run the riſk to draw upon themſelves all the miſchiefs of the *compelle exire*. Thus two or three powerful men, in a pretty numerous aſſembly, are enough to obtain a decree. It is only terrifying thoſe that are of a quiet diſpoſition, that they will be made odious to the party, and ſuſpected of a baſe prevarication. What would not one do to avoid a thing which renders his pains and parts uſeleſs?

How apt hot-headed men are to judge raſhly.

As this reflexion may diſpleaſe ſome perſons, I will ſtrengthen it with the opinion of a very zealous writer. He acknowledges, 'that there have been ſome very honeſt men, who loved their religion, and thought it purely evangelical, who nevertheleſs made no ſcruple to receive penſions, becauſe they looked upon them rather as rewards for their affection for the public tranquility, than as a tie to engage them to attempt any thing to the prejudice of their churches. To tell the truth, *continues he*, in thoſe places, where the people, who were hot and overhaſty, might eaſily be engaged in raſh and ſeditious attempts, it was requiſite that the miniſters ſhould be diſcreet and moderate, that by their diſcourſes and examples they might beget in their flocks a peaceable diſpoſition; but it had been better to have done it for the reaſonableneſs of the thing, without taking the gratifications of the court, than to receive theſe ſuſpected rewards, which might call in queſtion their innocence and integrity. Du Moulin hath ſeveral times been tempted by the court emiſſaries, who offered him a very large penſion, without requiring any thing elſe of him but to engage his people to peace and obedience. He always proteſted, that it was a duty that he would diſcharge as long as he lived; but that he would have the honour to do it of himſelf, and for conſcience ſake, and not as if he was hired to do it: ſo that he would not accept of any thing that was offered him. It had been glorious, if all thoſe, who were expoſed to the ſame temptation, had repelled it with as much courage (42).' Nothing can be ſaid more judicious and reaſonable. Du Moulin's behaviour ought to have been a pattern for all his brethren: none of them ſhould have received a reward for what they did purſuant to their duty. But let the thing be how it will, we ſee here the condemnation of thoſe raſh perſons, who, carried away by the impetuoſity of their temper, were always ready to diſgrace all thoſe who preached patience, as falſe brethren, traytors, and prevaricators. The author acknowledges, that *ſome very honeſt men* were penſioners to the court of France, without any deſign to do any thing to the prejudice of the churches, and without propoſing any thing elſe to themſelves but receiving a gratification, which they believed due to the care which they took to oppoſe warlike ſpirits: but he hath indeed more reaſon to acknowledge, that thoſe, who preached patience gratis, might be honeſt men. As for the miſſionaries, who upon account of theſe penſions would malicioſly and odiouſly ſay, that the religious wars had put the French monarchy in the ſame condition whence Lewis XI had reſcued it (43), they deſerve no notice. Henry IV, and Lewis XIII, had no need to buy any mediators of peace between them and their proteſtant ſubjects, in order to avoid religious wars. Had they obſerved the edict, it had not coſt them one farthing to maintain the public tranquillity. Mr Jurieu will, I hope, forgive me, if I do not acquieſce in his conceſſion, that the Huguenots, in Lewis the thirteenth's time, undermined the ſupream authority. 'Cardinal Richelieu, *ſays he* (44), took from them their towns of ſecurity, but it was rather out of policy, than a zeal for religion. He ſaw that it was a ſtate within a ſtate, and that theſe cities were only harbours for rebels and malecontents.'

[*M*] *Cardinal du Perron ſaid a very invidious thing upon the excuſes concerning the commotion at Niſmes.*] 'The Proteſtants have writ a book to palliate their outrages againſt Ferrier, and make uſe of ſome places of the fathers, and among the reſt of St Bernard, to prove that they were in the right to uſe him ſo, ſince he was excommunicated; and that a judge excommunicated was ſuſpended from his office. Afterwards he ſays in jeſt, St Bernard ſpeaks of excommunication as he ought to do, but St Bernard ſaid maſs every day; they will make uſe of our laws when they think it for their turn, otherwiſe they will not regard them, which is an unjuſt proceeding; did they believe themſelves ſtrong enough, and by excommunication think that they could be maſters of the realm, and diſpoſſeſs the king, I cannot tell what they would not do (45).' Here is an inſtance of the injuſtice commonly done to thoſe ſects which are tolerated: their affection to the government is ſuſpected, and they are looked upon as a ſort of people that would alter the conſtitution, if it was in their power, and who only condemn the furious maxims of perſecution, and the power of excommunication, whilſt they cannot uſe them at their pleaſure.

(42) Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantz, Tom. II, pag. 101.

(43) It hath been ſaid of him, that he ſet the French kings free; and ſome miſſionaries ſay, that Cardinal Richelieu, finding they were relapſed into their former ſtate, freed them by the taking of Rochel.

(44) Politique du Clergé, pag. m. 20.

(45) Perroniana, at the word Ferrier, pag. m. 141.

FERRIER (JOHN) a French Jeſuit, born at Roüergue, ſucceeded father Annat in the poſt of confeſſor to the king of France in 1670. He was born in the year 1614, and became a Jeſuit in 1632. He taught philoſophy four years, divinity twelve years, and ethics two years. He had been Rector of the college of Thoulouſe, and had behaved himſelf well in that employment (*a*). Without doubt he paſſed among the Jeſuits for a conſiderable perſon, ſince they appointed him to ſupply the place of confeſſor to his majeſty. It was thought by many that he was much fitter for buſineſs and intrigues than father Annat. He died in the houſe of his order at Paris the twenty ninth of October 1674 (*b*). He publiſhed ſeveral books [*A*], and was one of the beſt antagoniſts

(*a*) Southwell, Biblioth. Script. Soc. Jeſu, pag. 449.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] An anſwer in Latin to father Baron's objections againſt the *Scientia media*. This book is intituled, *Reſponſio ad objectiones Vincentianas*, and was printed at Toulouſe in 1668, in 8vo. Father Ferrier deſigned to publiſh a courſe of divinity; but the firſt volume has only appeared, which treats *de Deo uno juxta ſancti Auguſtini & ſancti Thomæ principia*. His other works are in French, and chiefly antagoniſts of the followers of Janſenius. His Theſis upon Probability made a great noiſe. He defended it at Toulouſe the eighth and eleventh of June 1659. See Thomas Anglus at page 51, and 52, of the *Monumetham excantatus*. See alſo the remark [*B*] of the Article MAIMBOURG.

chiefly relate to Janſeniſm. He wrote againſt Mr Arnauld's two letters, and made a narrative of all that had paſſed in the year 1663 upon the affair of Janſeniſm (1). I muſt not forget, that, according to the Jeſuit's hiſtorian, he wrote a book upon the immortality of the ſoul, in 1668, and another concerning the beauty of JESUS CHRIST, in the year 1657; but theſe two books are wrongfully aſcribed to him: they ſhould he attributed to John Fevrier, a Jeſuit of Guienne, known to Mr Balſac (2).

(1) Taken from Father Southwell, *Bibl. Script. Soc. Jeſu*, pag. 449.

(2) See the Journal of Trevoux, November, 1704, pag. 1860, French Edit.

FERVAUX (JOHN) is the true author of the Annals of Bavaria, which were publiſhed under the name of John Adlſreitterus [*A*]. He was of Lorrain. This is all I can ſay of him for the preſent.

[*A*] *He is the true author of the Annals of Bavaria, which were publiſhed under the name of John Adlſreitterus.*] Here is my warrant. 'Joh. Adlſreitterus (vel 'ſi mavis, P. Joh. Fervaux, Lotharingus, in cujus no'mine ob certas cauſſas annales illos prudentiores ap'parere noluerunt) in præfatione ad lectorem tomi 'primi annalium Boicæ gentis minime ſibi ait, &c (1). '—— *John Adlſreitterus (or rather John Fervaux, 'a native of Lorrain, in whoſe name, for certain rea'ſons, men of judgment thought it improper thoſe Annals 'ſhould appear) in his preface to the reader before the 'firſt volume of his annals of Bavaria, ſays, &c.*'

(1) Chriſtoph. Arnoldus, de vita Marci Velſeri, pag. 46.

FERUS (*a*) (JOHN) warden of the Franciſcans of Mentz, was one of the greateſt preachers of the XVIth century. He is author of ſeveral commentaries upon the ſcripture, which ſhew not only that he was learned, but alſo that he was not one of thoſe opinionated Monks who will yield nothing, nor will conſent to the reforming of any abuſes. There are few writers of the Romiſh communion more eſteemed by the Proteſtants than Ferus [*A*]. The reaſon of which is, that he wrote with a great deal of moderation upon the controverſies that divided Germany in his time, and becauſe in ſome things he favoured the tenets of the reformers (*b*) [*B*]. He was attacked upon this ſubject by a Spaniſh Jacobine [*C*]; but his cauſe found apologiſts, even in that country. They could

(*a*) This is a name latinized. This monk was named *Wild*, a German word ſignifying *ſavage*. Therefore Moreri ſpeaks of Ferus under the word *Sauvage*.

(*b*) See Thuan. lib xiii, pag. 271.

[*A*] *There are few writers of the Romiſh communion more eſteemed than Ferus by the Proteſtants.*] Bucholcer ſays of him (1). 'Fuit vir doctiſſimus, ejuſque 'ſcripta non ſolum apud Catholicos, ſed etiam apud 'Evangelicos quoſdam in ſummo habentur pretio. —— '*He was a man of great learning, and his writings 'were held in the higheſt eſteem, not only by the Ca'tholics, but alſo by ſome Proteſtants.*' Quenſtedt, a Lutheran author, quotes theſe words without finding fault with them. He alſo cites another paſſage which I ſhall ſet down for the reader's information. 'Johan'nes Ferus, aliàs Wild, Franciſcanus, eccleſiaſtes Mo'guntinus, vir doctus & eloquentia ſingulari præditus. 'Scripſit latino & culto ſermone pias & eruditas lucu'brationes, (ſcil. annotationes in Pentateuchum, in Job, 'Eccleſiaſten, Threnos, Jonam, Matthæum, Johan'nem, Acta Apoſtolorum, Epiſtolam ad Romanos) in 'quibus tam veterum, quam recentium expoſitorum 'labores veluti in compendium redegit, teſte Sixto 'Senenſe lib. iv. Bibl. S. (2). —— *John Ferus, or 'Wild, a Franciſcan, an eccleſiaſtic of Mentz, a 'man of great learning, and uncommon eloquence, 'wrote, in pure and elegant Latin, his pious and 'elaborate lucubrations, viz. Annotations on the Pen'tateuch, Job, Eccleſiaſtes, the Lamentations, Jo'nah, St Matthew, John, the Acts of the Apoſtles, 'and the Epiſtle to the Romans,) wherein he has given 'us an ingenious compendium of the labours both of an'tient and modern expoſitors, as Sixtus Senenſis ſhews 'in the fourth book of his Bibliotheca ſacra.*' It muſt not be thought that Quenſtedt has given an exact liſt of all Ferus's works. They conſiſt of ſeveral other books. Conſult the Oxford catalogue, and Mr Teiſſier, at page 85 of the firſt volume of additions to the elogies taken from Thuanus.

[*B*] *In certain things he favoured the tenets of the reformers.*] They deſigned to ſhew the corruption of mankind, and the neceſſity of having recourſe to the divine mercy, without relying on good works. Their forms of prayer are full of this ſpirit; and this is ſo little conſiſtent with the maxims of the Romiſh church, that the French miſſionaries have a hundred and a hundred times cavilled at the proteſtant ritual on this account. But in anſwer to this Mr Drelincourt, among other things, ſhewed them (3) that John Ferus had compoſed prayers full of the ſentiments they condemned. There are innumerable quotations out of this Franciſcan in the books of that miniſter. Mr Colomiés (4) cites a paſſage of Ferus (5) which I ſhall quote after him. 'How many things are there which 'were inſtituted by the ſaints with a good intention, 'which we now ſee changed partly into abuſes, and 'partly into ſuperſtition? As for inſtance, ſaints days, 'ceremonies, images, the maſs, monaſteries, &c. 'none of which were inſtituted as they are held now'a-days. And nevertheleſs our Gideons are ſilent; 'they do not remove the abuſe, or reform the ſuper'ſtition.' He ſays in another place (6) that *thoſe who would have in their libraries a good edition of Ferus's commentary upon St John, ought to get that of Louvain* 1559, *which is preferable to all others: for beſides that it is in folio, it has the epiſtle dedicatory of that pious and eloquent Franciſcan to Sebaſtian, archbiſhop of Mentz, which the other editions have not. In that epiſtle Ferus ingenuouſly confeſſes, that he has made uſe in ſome places of the commentaries of Brentius, and Oecolampadius, Proteſtants; but, he adds,* Ea tantum tranſtuli quæ bona, Eccleſiaſticæque doctrinæ conſona videbantur, & quæ viri illi non in ſchiſmate, ſed in Catholica Eccleſia didicerant. —— *I only (ſays he), took from them the things that were good, and ſeemed agreeable to the doctrine of the church. and which thoſe men had learned, not in their ſchiſm, but in the Catholic church.*

[*C*] *He was attacked ..... by a Spaniſh Jacobine.*] The famous Dominicus à Soto publiſhed a book (7) which he called, *Annotationes in commentarios Joannis Feri Moguntinenſis ſuper evangelium Joannis*, and dedicated it to Ferdinand Valdes inquiſitor general. He charges Ferus with having taught Lutheraniſm in ſixty ſeven places of his commentary upon St John. If Ferus did not defend himſelf, it was not for the reaſon which Nicholas Antonio inſinuates (8): it was becauſe he was dead, and not becauſe that he either in his conſcience knew the charge to be true, or would pretend not to know what Soto had publiſhed. But he found an advocate in the very ſame country where he was attacked. Michael Medina, a learned monk of the order of St Francis, publiſhed a book intituled (9), 'Apologia Joannis Feri in qua ſeptem & ſexaginta loca 'commentariorum in Joannem, quæ antea Dominicus 'Soto Segovienſis Lutherana traduxerat, ex ſancta 'ſcriptura, ſanctorumque doctrina, reſtituuntur. —— '*A defence of John Ferus, wherein the ſixty ſeven paſ'ſages in his commentaries on St John, which have 'been reflected upon by Dominicus à Soto, as favouring 'Lutheraniſm, are explained and vindicated from the 'holy ſcriptures and doctrine of the Apoſtles.*' This apology

(1) In Indice Chronolog. ad ann. 1554.

(2) Quenſtedt de Patr. Viror. illuſtr. pag. 244, 245.

(3) See the firſt of the nine dialogues againſt the miſſionaries upon the ſervice of the reformed churches, pag. 12, & *ſeq.*

(4) Colomiés, Rome Proteſtante, pag. 59.

(5) He takes it from the Commentary upon the book of Judges, chap. viii.

(6) Bibl. Choiſie, pag. 78.

(7) At Salamanca, in 1554.

(8) Fero ipſo ſeu perſuaſo, ſeu diſſimulante. *Nic. Ant. Bibliot. Script. Hiſpan. Tom. I, pag.* 257.

(9) At Compluтum, in 1558.

could find no better expedient to ſave Ferus's Catholiciſm, than by ſuppoſing that the heretics had added ſeveral things to his writings which were not in the original [*D*]. This honeſt Franciſcan died the eighth of September 1554 (*c*). He was very near of the ſame opinion as the Anabaptiſts, with reſpect to going to war [*E*]. Salmeron has been his plagiary [*F*].

(*c*) Id. ibid.

pology was condemned by the congregation of the index (10), and the author was obliged to give an account of his faith. 'Aliquando quod Joannem Ferum ſuæ ſectæ Franciſcanæ ſodalem ab impetu Dominici Soti apologetico libro defendiſſet, cauſam religionis dixit, in qua tamen ſuam innocentiam probavit (11). —— *Having wrote a defence of John Ferus, a brother of the Franciſcan order, in anſwer to Dominicus à Soto, he was obliged to give an account of his faith, wherein however he proved his innocence.*' From whence we may conclude that Ferus's orthodoxy was a point much doubted of by the inquiſitors, to ſay no worſe of it.

(10) Nic. Antonio, Biblioth. Hiſpan. Tom. II, pag. 112.

(11) Ibid. pag. 111.

[*D*] *They ſuppoſed that the heretics had added to his writings many things which were not in the original.*] The ſame Medina, aſſiſted by ſome others, retrenched what they thought proper from Ferus's commentary upon St Matthew's goſpel; and reprinted it at Complutum in 1562. He ſuppoſed that the places which were ſuppreſſed had crept into that work by the artifice of the ſectaries, after the author's death. 'Purgavit etiam, ne id ignores, lector, Michaël noſter ejuſdem Feri ſermones, ſeu commentaria in Matthæum, quæ inedita ab eo relicta hæreticorum inter manus tabis quidquam contraxerant: quod & agnovit Sixtus Senenſis lib. vi. Bibliothecæ ſanctæ annotatione LXXII. Operas autem cum Medina Rodericus Vadillus Benedictinus, & Petrus Carolus Prior Ucleſienſis Ordinis Sancti Jacobi reſtituendi his mancipaverunt, Complutique edi correctiora curaverunt anno 1562, in 4to. —— *The reader ought likewiſe to be informed that our own countryman, Michael Medina, lopped off ſeveral ſurreptitious branches from Ferus's diſcourſes or commentaries on St Matthew, which being left by him unpubliſhed had been corrupted by heretics, as Sixtus Senenſis has acknowledged. In the execution of this work, Medina was aſſiſted by Rodericus Vadillus, a Benedictin, and Peter Charles, prior of Ucleſia, of the order of St James, who cauſed a more correct edition to be publiſhed at Complutum, in the year* 1562, *in 4to.*' The Oxford catalogue makes mention, 1. of Ferus's commentary upon the goſpel of St John, and upon the firſt epiſtle of the ſame Apoſtle; that commentary, I ſay, corrected by Michael Medina, and printed at Complutum (12): 2. of an Engliſh book (13) wherein complaint is made that thoſe of the Romiſh church falſify authors; and for an inſtance they give the commentary of Ferus upon the firſt epiſtle of St John.

(12) In 1569, and 1578.

(13) Printed at London in 1606, compoſed by W. Craſhaw.

[*E*] *He was almoſt an Anabaptiſt .... with reſpect to going to war.*] This I have read in Grotius, in the place wherein he obſerves that a great number of good men, conſidering the barbarities that are committed in war, have been of opinion that a chriſtian ought never to liſt himſelf a ſoldier. 'Cujus immanitatis conſpectu multi homines minime mali eo venerunt, ut Chriſtiano, cujus diſciplina in omnibus hominibus diligendis præcipue conſiſtit, omnia arma interdicerent: ad quos accedere interdum videntur & Joannes Ferus & Eraſmus noſtras (14), viri pacis & eccleſiaſticæ & civilis amantiſſimi (15). —— *In regard to the enormities which are incident to war, many valuable men have proceeded ſo far as to pronounce all war repugnant to the diſtinguiſhing principle of chriſtianity, namely, univerſal benevolence, of which number we ſometimes find Ferus, and our countryman Eraſmus, men who pay the greateſt regard to peace both civil and eccleſiaſtical.*'

(14) See the remark [*U*] of the article ERASMUS.

(15) Grotius, in Prolegomenis de Jure Belli & Pacis, n. 29.

[*F*] *Salmeron has been his plagiary.*] At leaſt he is charged with this by John Gerhard a famous Lutheran doctor. 'Salmeron, *ſays he* (16), ex fontibus Feri areolas ſuas ita irrigavit, ut pagellas integras in commentarios ſuos ex eo tranſtulerit. —— *Salmeron,* ſays he, *has ſo far made free with the treaſures of Ferus to enrich his little ſtock, as to transfer whole pages from him into his commentaries.*' I wonder Thomaſius makes no mention of it; but another collector of plagiariſms (17) has not omitted this.

(16) Confeſ. Cathol. Parte I, general. pag. 23, apud Quenſtedt, de Patr. Viror. illuſtr. pag. 245.

(17) Joh. Albert. Faber, in Decade Decadum, n. 70.

FEUARDENT (FRANCIS) a famous Franciſcan, was born at Coutance in lower Normandy (*a*) in the year 1541 (*b*), and might have inherited a great eſtate if he had not preferred a Monk's habit to the ſword (*c*). He took the Franciſcan habit in the monaſtery of Baieux (*d*), and obtained infinitely more fame in that dreſs than he would have done in that of a cavalier. He became doctor of the Sorbonne, preacher, and controverſiſt. His temper was ſo agreeable to his name [*A*], that never was the old maxim, *Conveniunt rebus nomina ſæpe ſuis.* —— *Oft does the name the thing exactly fit,* more true than in his perſon. He was one of the moſt furious adverſaries, and cruelleſt perſecutors the Proteſtants ever had to deal with, if we only reckon churchmen. And yet he boaſts of having been ill uſed by the heretics [*B*]. He wrote commentaries upon ſome books of the ſcripture, and tranſlated into French ſome works of the fathers. He publiſhed an edition of Irenæus with notes [*C*], and ſome books of controverſy in which the

(*a*) Feuardent Epiſt. Dedicat. Theomach.

(*b*) Konig, pag. 302.

(*c*) Botereius, Commentarior. de Rebus in Gallia geſtis, lib. xvii, pag. 590.

(*d*) Idem. ibid.

[*A*] *His temper was agreeable to his name.*] Mr Daillé makes this remark. 'Feuardentius, *ſays he* (1), homo nomine ſuo digniſſimus, quem cœci irarum, odiorum ac furiarum ignes ſic exagitabant ut raro apud ſe eſſet. —— *Feuardent (a raging fire) a man whoſe morals perfectly anſwered his name, was ſo tranſported with paſſion, malice, and fury, that he was ſeldom maſter of himſelf.*' I have always very much wondered that families, who have an odious or ridiculous name, do not quit it (2). Why, for inſtance, do they not leave that burleſque, or ſavage name, of Feuardent? One might inſtance a hundred more.

(1) De Pœn. & Satisfact. pag. 462, apud Konig. Bibl. vet. & nova, pag. 302.

(2) Some of theſe families have quitted their names. See the *Origines Françoiſes*, of Mr Menage, at the word *Hauteclair*. See the laſt remark of the article REGIUS.

[*B*] *He boaſted of having been ill uſed by the heretics.*] If one will believe him (3), one day he received a box on the ear; he was often abuſed in the ſtreets, accuſed before the magiſtrates, and ſued for his life. They ſtole from him the horſe he made uſe of in his old age, to go from place to place and preach the goſpel. One of his brothers received a ſhot from a gun. He forgot not what his brother monks ſuffered: but he ought alſo to tell what they made others ſuffer. But this is the conſtant fraud of theſe paſſionate people. They tire the patience of all mankind, and at laſt they meet with impatient enemies who handle them ſeverely. Have they not upon this the face to complain of ill treatment? Do they not make catalogues of the hardſhips they have endured, and paſs over in ſilence the injuries they had before committed? thus Mr Moreri has been deceived in favour of this perſon. 'Perkius, Cocus, Rivet, and ſome other Calviniſts, ſays he (4), exclaim againſt father Francis Feuardent in an unchriſtian manner: but theſe authors are not commonly conſulted by honeſt men.' Did that Franciſcan treat the miniſters in a chriſtian manner? Let any one anſwer for Mr Moreri.

(3) Theomachia Calviniſt. lib. xiii, pag. m. 160.

(4) In the article FEUARDENT.

[*C*] *He publiſhed an edition of Irenæus with notes.*] Mr du Pin has made the following judgment of it (5). 'At laſt Feuardent, a Franciſcan doctor of divinity of the faculty of Paris, a learned man for his time, ſet himſelf about this work, and printed at Paris, by Nivelle, in the years 1575 and 1576, the five books of Irenæus, reviſed and corrected in many places from an ancient manuſcript, and enlarged with five whole chapters which were found in his manuſcript, at the end of the fifth book. He has added annotations to the end of each chapter, which he thought neceſſary for the underſtanding

(5) Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ. Tom. I, pag. 73, 74. Edit. Amſterdam.

of

the Catholics themſelves confeſs he has been too virulent [*D*]. The Jeſuits have had reaſon to complain of his proceedings towards Suarés [*E*]. I forgot to obſerve that he was one of the moſt ſeditious preachers who taught in Paris Buchanan's principles againſt Henry III, and Henry IV (*e*). He did not even ſpare the head of the League himſelf, when he thought him the author of ſomething which might prejudice the intereſt

‘of his author. They are for the moſt part uſeful and learned, but ſome of them exceed the bounds of a commentator, who ought not to aim at being thought learned, or treat of matters of controverſy, but meerly to explain his author. Feuardent's ſecond edition, printed at Cologn, in 1596, and afterwards in 1630, and at Paris in 1639, is better than the firſt, becauſe it contains the Greek paſſages of Irenæus, which are found in St Epiphanius, and ſome other ancient authors.' This is very moderate. Father Labbe, exaſperated by ſome hard things which he found a Proteſtant had publiſhed againſt the edition of Feuardent, is not ſo reſerved. ‘Plura nos quoque, *ſays he* (6), adverſus Centuriatores Magdeburgenſes, Nicolaum Gallaſium . . . . . ſed præcipue Rivetum bipedum nequiſſimum, qui priſtinæ Apoſtolorum Patrumque doctrinæ retinentiſſimos Baronium & Poſſevinum hæreticos appellare, & de Catholicæ fidei fortiſſimo vindice hæc auſus eſt effutire, Caveant (7) ab illis editionibus, quas impudentiſſimus ille Monachus Feuardentius homo projectæ audaciæ & nullius fidei, fœde in multis corrupit & annotationibus impiis & mendacibus (ſic Chriſtianas & Catholicas vocant deſperatiſſimæ cauſæ infelices patroni) conſpurcavit. Verum quid facias homini impudentiam ubique profeſſo, nec Deum nec homines reverito, *κυνώπῃ καὶ κυνογλώσσῳ*, cui totidem hærent infixæ cordi ſagittæ, quot pro veritate Euchariſtiæ, hujus oblatione à Chriſto Domino inſtituta, libero arbitrio, fide & operibus, principalitate Romanæ eccleſiæ, ac ſimilibus Catholicæ religionis aſſertis, ex Irenæi lucubrationibus depromuntur apertiſſima teſtimonia, quæ allegatis aliorum patrum locis firmavit, & diſcuſſa Novatorum caligine illuſtravit Feuardentius, nunquam non à laudatis viris laudandus. —— *We might*, ſays he, *object many other things to the centuriators of Magdeburg, to Nicolas Gallaſius . . . . . . but in a more particular manner to that infamous Rivet, who had the aſſurance to call Baronius and Poſſevin, who moſt religiouſly maintained the ancient doctrine of the apoſtles and fathers, heretics, and thus to defame the greateſt champion of the Catholic faith.* Beware, *ſays he*, of thoſe editions which that moſt impudent monk Feuardent, a fellow of a moſt profligate aſſurance, and no credit, has, in many places, notoriouſly corrupted, and with impious and lying annotations (for ſo theſe wretched patrons of a deſperate cauſe call thoſe which are truly chriſtian and catholic) beſpattered. *But what is to be done with a perſon, who ſeems to pride himſelf in his impudence, who reveres neither GOD nor man, but ſhews his teeth, and barks at all, and whoſe heart is tranſfixed with as many arrows, as there are convincing teſtimonies for the truth of the euchariſt, it's inſtitution by our Lord CHRIST, free-will, faith, and works, the ſupremacy of the church of Rome, and ſuch like doctrines of the Catholic religion, which Feuardent has drawn from the labours of Iræneus, confirmed with the authorities of other fathers, illuſtrated by diſpelling thoſe clouds which noveliſts would ſpread over them, and muſt command the admiration of all men of merit.*'

[*D*] *He wrote ſome books of controverſy in which the Catholics themſelves confeſs he has been too virulent.*] Moreri will furniſh me with the proofs of this. ‘Perhaps, *ſays he* (8), Father Gautier exaggerates matters in the hundred hereſies he charges upon the Calviniſts in his chronology, and that they might be reduced to a leſs number. We may alſo paſs the ſame judgment upon what is written by Father Francis Feuardent a Franciſcan, a doctor of Paris, who has mentioned a thouſand four hundred errors of the Calviniſts, in the work he calls *Theomachia Calviniſtica*.' Theſe are Moreri's words. This book of Feuardent was reprinted at Cologn, in 1629 (9). He has intituled one of his books *Les Entre-mangeries & Guerres miniſtrales* (10), the moſt conſiderable part whereof, in every reſpect, is what he has pillaged from other authors.

Some days ago I caſt my eyes upon his *Examination of the Confeſſions, Prayers, Sacraments and Catechiſms of the Calviniſts: with the refutation of a miniſter's anſwer, wherein they are convicted of ſix hundred and ſixty ſix contradictions, errors, and blaſphemies, contained in them. The ſecond edition reviſed and enlarged by the author.* This book was printed at Paris in 8vo, in 1601. Feuardent's uſual fury appears in this book, and in ſome places (11) he relates in a prophane and impudent manner I know not what ſtories of miniſters wives and Maids. There is no gravity in his ſtile: it is full of puns and burleſque phraſes. An anonymous author anſwered the firſt edition of this book. This anſwer, printed by Nicholas Froit-d'eau, at Rochel (12), was ſent to Feuardent at Nantes, towards the end of the year 1599 (13). He obſerves that it was thought to be the work of Anthony de la Faye (14). Here are his boaſts. ‘Feuardent, in the beſt cities and moſt famous churches of France, Brabant, Flanders, and Lorrain, where he has preached by GOD's grace, has reclaimed above ſix hundred ſouls from thy errors to the true faith and Catholic religion: and has confirmed above a hundred thouſand good chriſtians (15).'

[*E*] *The Jeſuits had reaſon to complain of his proceeding with Suarés.*] The caſe is this. Feuardent had cited, as a paſſage of St Cyril, the words of Maſter Joſſe Clichthou, to prove the immaculate conception of the Bleſſed Virgin. This Maſter Joſſe, finding St Cyril's work upon the goſpel of St John imperfect, ſupplied the four books that were wanting, and publiſhed them with thoſe of St Cyril. There is one place in the ſupplements which is as clear as noonday, and perfectly deciſive for the immaculate conception. Feuardent cited it with an air of triumph, and attributed it to St Cyril. He was informed of this miſtake by Suarés, who obſerves that the paſſage ought to be reſtored to Joſſe Clichthou, inſtead of being aſcribed to St Cyril. Feuardent was not at all pleaſed with this advice: he was ſo provoked that he collected together all the faults he could find in Suarés, concerning the miſtakes in figures, and pretended to convict him of a like error. But thoſe things are by no means the ſame. To put one figure for another is no great matter. Moſt commonly it is the fault of the preſs, which ought not to be charged upon the author; but to aſcribe to St Cyril what comes from a man of our own age, and to do this in order to have an unexceptionable man to produce againſt his adverſary in a cauſe of importance, is no ſlight miſtake in a writer. Theophilus Raynaud determines poſitively that Feuardent did not do this out of ignorance but with a premeditated deſign. ‘Feuardentius *ad lib.* 3. *S. Irenæi cap.* 23. intentus in aſtruendum nitorem conceptionis prædictæ, allegavit locum pro ea, ipſis Solis radiis ſcriptum, ex *lib.* 6. S. Cyrilli *in Joannem cap.* 15. At non eſſe eum librum S. Cyrilli, ſed Clichtovei, qui lacunam quatuor intermediorum librorum in eo Cyrilli opere ſupplere voluit, in confeſſo eſt. Neque id ignoraſſe Feuardentium, comperta ejus eruditio dubitare non ſinit. Sed (ut dixi) ſerviens cauſæ quam tractabat, locum ex lucubratione nuperi ſcriptoris, operi S. Cyrilli intexta, meditatò ſuppoſuit S. Cyrillo, & tanquam tanti Patris dictum, protulit. Monuit de hoc loco per Feuardentium minùs aptè citato, & ad Clichtoveum, non ad S. Cyrillum referendo, Suarez *tom.* 2, 3. *part. d.* 3. *ſ.* 5. qui eam à Feuardentio gratiam retulit in poſteriore editione commentariorum in Irenæum, ut quotquot congerere potuit menda, in numeros typographicos illapſa in Suaris operibus, ad eum ſimilis lapſus inſimulandum intorſerit. Sed eſt profectò ſumma diſparitas. Nam autorum allegationes quoad numerum arithmeticum, quo à typographo exhibentur, nullus author præſtare queat indemnes à multis mendis, in tanta operarum oſcitantia, & emaculatorum indiligentia. At plagulæ Clitchtovei prolatio nomine S. Cyrilli, ad conciliandam majorem fidem placito pro quo pugnes, non eſt erratum, vel mendum typographicum, quod in oſcitantes operas, vel in dormitantem emaculatorem poſſit referri (16).' —— *Feuardent, in his* Annotations upon Irenæus, lib. 3. cap. 23. *paſſio-*

(e) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de la Ligue, pag. 295.

(6) Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ. Tom. I, p. 630.

(7) *Rivetus ſays this in* Critico Sacro, lib. ii, cap. vi, Oper. Tom. III, pag. 1091.

(8) In the article *CALVIN*.

(9) I uſe the quarto edition.

(10) I have ſeen the third edition, which is of Paris, by Sebaſtian Nivelle, 1604, in 8vo.

(11) Pag. 180, verſo, & ſeq.

(12) It was not printed there.

(13) Feuardent, Examen des Confeſſions, folio 1, verſo.

(14) Idem, folio 3, verſo.

(15) Id. fol. 63.

(16) Theoph. Raynaud. Erotemat. X de bonis ac malis Libris, n. 289.

tereſt of the rebels [*F*]. He died at Paris the firſt of January 1610 (*f*). See in Moreri the title of ſeveral of his works, and add thereto *L'Hiſtoire de la fondation de l'Egliſe & Abbaye du Mont Saint Michel, au peril de la Mer, & des Miracles, Reliques, & Indulgences données en icelle* (*g*).

(*f*) Boterelus, ubi ſupra.

(*g*) Du Cheſne, Biblioth. des Hiſt. de France, pag. m. 141, *quotes the Edition of Conſtance*, 1611, *in* 24.

nately labouring to give a gloſs to the ſaid notion, quoted a very clear paſſage to that purpoſe, from the ſixth book of St Cyril, upon the fifteenth chapter of St John. But it is owned on all hands that that book is not St Cyril's, but Clichthou's, who propoſed to ſupply the deficiency of four intermediate books in the works of St Cyril. Nor will Feuardent's known great reading permit us to call his knowlege of this matter in queſtion. But to ſerve, as I ſaid, the cauſe wherein he had engaged, he induſtriouſly quotes a paſſage in a modern writer's works, interwoven with thoſe of St Cyril, and would put it off for the authority of ſo eminent a father. Suarez took notice of this paſſage being improperly alledged by Feuardent, as belonging to Clichthou, and not to St Cyril. Feuardent returned Suarez the favour of this information, in the ſecond edition of his Commentaries on Irenæus, by collecting all the errors which the printers had made in the figures in the works of Suarez, to convict him of an offence of the ſame nature. But the difference is certainly very wide. For ſuch is the ſupine negligence of compoſitors, and the overſight of correctors, that no author can warrant his quotations entirely free from errors in the figures; but the producing a paſſage of Clichthou under the name of St Cyril, in order to give the greater credit to the cauſe in which you are enliſted, is not a ſlip or error of the preſs, that ought to be aſcribed to a ſluggiſh compoſitor, or a ſleepy corrector.’

[*F*] *He did not ſpare even the head of the League when he thought him the author of ſomething which might prejudice the rebels.*] The duke of Nemours, a great leaguer, having made himſelf unacceptable to the duke of Maienne, his brother by the mother's ſide, was arreſted, and people were perſuaded that this was done by the intrigues of the duke of Maienne. Paſquier having related this, adds, ‘Feuardent, a Franciſcan, one of the moſt ſeditious preachers in Paris, did not ſtick to charge the duke with it in the pulpit. He ſent for him with a reſolution to puniſh him, to teach him to govern his tongue. But hearing he was a Savoyard by nation, he excuſed him immediately as one he ſaw favoured a prince of Savoy (17).’ Paſquier is miſtaken concerning that Franciſcan's native country.

(17) Paſquier, Lett. lib. xvi, pag. 234.

FEUILLANT (THE LITTLE) a preacher of the League. Look for MONGAILLARD.

FEVRE of Etaples (*a*) (JAMES) in Latin, *Faber Stapulenſis*, was one of thoſe who began to expel the groſs ignorance that prevailed in the univerſity of Paris. He was a very little man and of mean extraction (*b*); but of great learning and parts. He made himſelf ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm, and was forced to give way to the perſecutions of certain ignorant and enraged zealots, who gave him no reſt (*c*). He quitted the field to them and retired from Paris to Meaux, were there was a biſhop (*d*), who loved the Sciences and men of true learning. The perſecution raiſed at Meaux by the Franciſcans obliged the biſhop to be a good Catholic (*e*). Le Fevre was then forced to retire firſt to Blois, and from thence into Guienne. Margaret, queen of Navarre, ſiſter to Francis I, honoured him with her protection, ſo that he enjoyed full liberty at Nerac, even to his death, which happened in 1537 (*f*). They tell very remarkable particulars of his laſt moments [*A*]. The parliament of Paris received an order from Francis I to come to no reſolution againſt le Fevre; but to wait for his majeſty's reſolution

(*a*) Etaples in Picardy is the name of his country.

(*b*) Verheiden. in Effig. & Elog. pag. 104, Jovius, Elog. cap. cxxi.

(*c*) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. liv. i, pag. 2.

(*d*) Named William Briçonnet.

(*e*) Beza, ubi ſupra.

(*f*) Id. pag. 14.

[*A*] *They tell ſome very remarkable circumſtances concerning his laſt moments.*] Thomas Hubert, counſellor of the elector Palatine, Frederic II, whom he accompanied in his journey to Spain, wrote an account of that journey, which was printed at Franckfort, in 1624. He relates (1), that the elector, his maſter, returning from Spain, paſſed through France, in 1358, and fell ſick at Paris, where Francis I, and the queen of Navarre, often viſited him. It was at one of theſe viſits that this princeſs gave an account in what manner le Fevre of Etaples ended his life. He and ſome other learned men, with whoſe converſation the queen was greatly pleaſed, dined one day with her (2). In the midſt of the entertainment, le Fevre fell a weeping, and when the queen asked him the reaſon of it, he anſwered that the heinouſneſs of his crimes occaſioned that pungent ſorrow. That it was not the remembrance of a lewd life that afflicted him, ſince at the age of one hundred and one years (§ *α*) he had been utterly a ſtranger to women. That with reſpect to other paſſions, which precipitate men into vice, he felt his conſcience eaſy enough, but he reckoned it as a very great crime, that, having known the truth and taught it to ſeveral perſons who had ſealed it with their blood, he ſhould have the weakneſs to keep in a place of ſecurity, far from the places where the crowns of martyrdom were diſtributed. The queen, who was very eloquent, endeavoured to comfort him. He made his will by word of mouth, then laid himſelf down upon a bed, and ſome few hours after was found dead there. The queen cauſed him to be honourably buried in the ſame tomb ſhe deſigned for herſelf: *Honorifice tumulari fecit & marmore quod pro ſe exſcindi fecerat contegi voluit.* He bequeathed his books to Gerard Rouſſel, and his other goods to the poor.

It is hard to doubt of this ſtory, and yet hard to believe it. If the fact had been falſe, would the queen have told it to the elector? If ſhe did not tell it him, would Thomas Hubert have dared to have put it into his hiſtory? Theſe are the motives not to doubt of it. But, on the other hand, how can it be thought that a thing of this nature, moſt glorious to James le Fevre in particular, and to the whole body in general, ſhould be ſuppreſſed by all the miniſters if it had been true? How comes it to paſs that Theodore Beza ſays nothing of it, neither in his Hiſtory of the Churches, where he mentions the death of James le Fevre, nor in the particular elogy he has made of that doctor (3), nor in any other place in his books, where he had frequently an opportunity to have told this wonder? Whence comes the ſilence of Sleidan, the ſilence of Verheiden, and a million other authors, who ought, if they had had common ſenſe, to have told this particular, if they had any knowlege of it? One cannot anſwer theſe difficulties but by ſuppoſing this adventure was entirely unknown to them. But this is removing one difficulty by another. The court of the king of Navarre was the ſcene where this fact happened: ſeveral learned men, who dined with the queen, were witneſſes to it, the moſt part of whom were Proteſtants: by what ſtrange combination were they engaged not to ſpeak of it all their lives? By what fatality ſhould the tongues of a whole court be tied up for more than fifty years, upon ſo public an accident, and of ſuch a nature? It has been known, that when the good man was dying, he ſaid he left his goods to the poor, and they have not failed to record this circumſtance in verſe (4). How then ſhould it happen, that the reſt, more worthy to be declared, ſhould not have been known alſo? Add to this, that it is by no means probable that le Fevre lived a whole century; for if he had been one hundred and one years old when he died, he muſt have been born in the year 1436. He would have been above eighty ſix years old,

(1) Mr Rivet has inſerted this account in his letter *de Senectute bona*, *Oper. Tom. II, pag.* 1266. Mr Colomiés relates it in his *Mêlanges Hiſtoriq. pag.* 2, *& ſeq.* Mr Jurieu mentions it alſo, *Apol. pour les Reform. chap. ii, pag.* 70, *&* 71. I only give the ſubſtance of it.

(2) *Mr Colomiés pretends that the queen went to dine with him. Thomas Hubert's Latin will not bear that meaning.* Quadam autem die miſit ad eum regina, & ſe velle cum eo prandere dixit, convocatis aliquot doctis, quorum confabulationibus mirum in modum delectaretur.

(§ *α*) James le Fevre was not quite one hundred years old, when he died, but he did not want much of it, witneſs theſe verſes of Macrinus, *Ævi peracto jam prope ſeculo*, &c. quoted *Tom. I, pag.* 362, of the new *Menagiana, Paris Edit.* 1715.
REM. CRIT.]

(3) In Iconibus.

(4) Corpus humo, mentemque Deo, bona cuncta relinquo Pauperibus: Faber hæc cum moreretur, ait. *Verheiden, pag.* 105. *We ſhall ſay below, in citat.* (27), *that that was his epitaph.*

ſolution. That prince was then priſoner: the ſubſtance of his letter may be ſeen in Sleidan [*B*]. This was probably at the time when the Sorbonne degraded le Fevre from his doctor's degree; but he did not go out of France, as Sleidan affirms. I confeſs he made a journey to Straſburg; but it was by the queen of Navarre's order, to confer with Bucer about the reformation of the church [*C*]. His natural moderation left him when he wrote againſt Eraſmus, his old friend [*D*]. This conteſt did not turn in his favour.

We have ſaid elſewhere (*g*), that he was expoſed to the clamours of the monks, for+ having maintained that St Anne was but once married. He was no leſs oppoſed in the opinion he advanced, that the woman who was a ſinner, of whom St Luke ſpeaks in his ſeventh chapter, and Mary Magdalen, mentioned in the eighth chapter of the ſame Evangeliſt, and Mary, the ſiſter of Lazarus, ſpoken of in the eleventh chapter of St John, are three different women. This diſpute was lately revived [*E*]. We muſt not forget that he tranſlated the four goſpels into French, and St Paul's epiſtles into

+ in the 7th Chapr of St Luk
she is distinguished by
the Appellation of a Wo
& a Sinner—not Mary
in ye 8th Chapr of St Luke &
is wrote Mary called
Magdalene out of whom
went seven Devils, tho
donot in any wise se
to be the same person
St John in ye 11th Chapt. say
plainly of the woman
was a Sinner mention
in ye 7th of St Luke & sa
she is Sister to Lazaru
& Martha—

old, when he fled from Meaux, and almoſt ninety ſix when Calvin made him a viſit at Nerac. Could ſuch a circumſtance be forgot? Are they contented to uſe for ſuch very aged men the term of old age, which Beza, Verheiden, and other writers of that party, make uſe of, with reſpect to that doctor? In a word, there is no inſtance, in theſe latter ages, that a celebrated man ſhould live above a hundred years, and yet no author, that ſpeaks of him, ſhould take any notice of it.

[*B*] *The ſubſtance of that letter may be ſeen in Sleidan.*] It is, according to his cuſtom, very elegantly written (5): but he did not know that le Fevre was retired to Nerac (6). Spondanus (7) ſpeaks but in very few words of this doctor, and of his degradation.

[*C*] *He took a journey to Strasburg . . . . to confer with Bucer.*] I learned this particular in the life of Capito. 'Tanta ſtatim Capitonis & Buceri fama 'fuit, ut Jacobus Faber Stapulenſis, & Gerardus Rufus 'clam è Gallia profecti, Capitonem & Bucerum audierint, atque de omnibus doctrinæ præcipuis locis 'cum ipſis diſſeruerint, miſſi à Margaretha Franciſci 'Regis ſorore Navarræ regina (8). —— *Such immediately was the fame of Capito and Bucer, that 'James Faber of Etaples, and Gerard Rufus, went 'privately from France to hear them, and held conferences with them upon all the principal points of 'learning, being ſent by Margaret, queen of Navarre, 'ſiſter to king Francis.*' Eraſmus, who did not know this laſt circumſtance, imagined that le Fevre was at Strasburg as a refugee. 'Faber Stapulenſis Gallia 'profugus, *ſays he* (9), agit Argentorati, ſed mutato 'nomine quemadmodum Comicus ille ſenex, *Athenis 'Chremes erat, in Lemno Stilpho.* —— *Faber Stapulenſis, who did fly from France, is,* ſays he, *at Straſburg, but under a borrowed name, like the old man 'in the play,* At Athens Chremes, in Lemnos Stilpho.' In another letter, dated from Baſil, the ſeventeenth of May 1527, he ſays, that le Fevre had been honourably recalled into France. 'Hinc honorifice revocatus eſt in Galliam, ceſſerat enim metu & eſt regi 'chariſſimus (10). —— *He was honourably recalled 'into France, whence he had retired out of fear, and is 'highly careſſed by the king.*' This is ſtill the conſequence of the falſe ſuppoſition, that that doctor had fled towards the Rhine. Every body did not know the true cauſe of that journey, the ſecret deputation of the queen of Navarre.

[*D*] *His natural moderation left him when he wrote againſt Eraſmus, his old friend.*] He was the aggreſſor, without any other reaſon than that Eraſmus, when he publiſhed his notes upon the New Teſtament, did not adopt all his opinions upon certain paſſages of ſcripture (11). He rudely attacked Eraſmus, and charged him with advancing impieties (12). Eraſmus defended himſelf; but after having provided for his own honour, he intreated his adverſary to continue his friendſhip to him, aſſuring him he ſhould always continue to love and eſteem him (13). He was not pleaſed with the complements which were made him upon this victory, and deſired his Friends not to alter their opinion of le Fevre on account of this difference. 'Quæ ſcribis 'de noſtra ad Fabrum apologia, quanquam ſcio animo 'abs te ſcribi amiciſſimo, mihi tamen bis moleſta 'fuerunt, vel quod veterem animi dolorem refricant, 'vel quod tu hac occaſione minus aliquanto quam vellem videris tribuere Fabro, viro quo vix in multis millibus reperias vel integriorem vel humaniorem. Hac 'una in re ſui diſſimulis fuit, quod amicum immerentem tam atrociter impetiit. Quis autem omnibus 'horis ſapuit unquam? Atque utinam mihi licuiſſet 'adverſario parcere. Nunc duobus crucior nominibus, '& quod cum tali amico coactus ſim manus conſerere, & quod intelligam quoſdam de Fabro minus candide ſentire, de quo cupiam omnes quam optime ſentire (14). —— *Though I am convinced that what you 'have wrote to me concerning my anſwer to Faber proceeds from the ſincere reſpect of a friend, yet to me 'it was doubly unwelcome, as it revives in my breaſt 'an old pain, and as you on this occaſion ſeem to aſcribe 'leſs than I could wiſh to Faber, a man who, for his 'integrity and humanity, has not his equal amongſt 'thouſands. In this one inſtance he has not acted like 'himſelf, in attacking, without provocation, a friend 'with ſo much violence. But what man was ever always wiſe? And I wiſh I might ſpare my adverſary, 'but I labour under a double anxiety; I am reduced to 'a neceſſity to enter the liſts with a valuable friend; 'and find likewiſe, that ſome have conceived a leſs 'favourable opinion of Faber, of whom I wiſh that 'all mankind would conceive the moſt favourable ſentiments.*' Can any ſentiments be more heroic than theſe? Le Fevre repented of his attack (15), and made no reply.

[*E*] *He maintained that the woman who was a ſinner, ... Mary Magdalen . . . and Mary the ſiſter of Lazarus, are three differeut women: this diſpute was lately revived.*] When James le Fevre publiſhed a book upon this ſubject about the beginning of the XVIth century, the unlearned and the learned, the populace and the doctors, agreed in ſaying that Mary, the ſiſter to Martha and Lazarus, did not differ from the woman which was a ſinner, mentioned in the 7th chapter of St Luke, nor from her out of whom JESUS CHRIST caſt ſeven devils. The hymns and office of St Mary Magdalen, in the Roman breviary, are agreable to this opinion. This did not hinder our le Fevre from combating it. His book was reprinted in 1518 and 1519, by the care of Joſſe Clichthou, who embraced his opinion, and defended it twice againſt the attacks of Mark Grandival, canon of St Victor. The book that John Fiſher, biſhop of Rocheſter, wrote againſt le Fevre in defence of the common opinion concerning the unity of thoſe three women, was printed at Paris in 1519. This diſpute cauſed a great deal of heat, both becauſe the leaſt innovations alarmed the Catholics in the beginning of Lutheraniſm, and becauſe they were but little ſatisfied of James le Fevre's orthodoxy. But when theſe perſonal animoſities ceaſed, they began to reliſh his ſentiment, ſo that at the end of the XVIth century, and long after, it was looked upon as conſiſtent with reaſon and faith. It was allowed to be publickly maintained in the Sorbonne, provided a ſmall diſtinction was added to it, which really deſtroyed the whole decree in favour of which it was invented. They were obliged to ſay, that they did not acknowledge a triple woman, which would have been to affirm, what the decree of the Faculty had condemned; but three different women, one of whom was named Magdalen (16). The thing went ſo far that the moſt learned men would have been aſhamed to have continued in the common opinion, and the correctors of the breviaries of Paris, Orleans, and Vienne, put a diſtinction between Lazarus's ſiſter, the ſinner, and Mary Magdalen. Things being in this ſtate, ſome doctors took pity of the doctrine they ſaw forſaken, and which had been led in triumph by what appeared ſo falſe, when James le Fevre ventured to

---

(*g*) See citat. (o) of the article *AGRIPPA*.

(5) Sleid. lib. v, ſub fin.

(6) Per abſentiam quoque regis captivi Pariſienſes Theologi Jacobum Fabrum Stapulenſem . . . exagitabant, ita quidem ut ille deſerta Gallia migraret alio. —— *During the captive king's abſence, the divines of Paris perſecuted Faber of Etaples, ſo that he left France, and retired elſewhere.* Id. ibid.

(7) Ad ann. 1523 (*and not* 1525, *as Moreri has it*) n. 15.

(8) Melch. Adam in vita Capitonis, pag. 90. *He quotes* Johannes Sturmius, Antipapo 4, pag. 8.

(9) In a letter dated in March, 1526: it is the xxvith of the xviiith book.

(10) Eraſm. Epiſt. xiii, lib. xix, pag. 830.

(11) Eraſm. Epiſt. li, lib. iii, pag. 213, & 216.

(12) Eraſm. Epiſt. xxxiii, lib. iii.

(13) See the letter he wrote to him in April 1517. It is the ninth of the third book. He wrote him another in September following: it is the xxxiiid of the ſame book.

(14) *Eraſm. Epiſt. iii, lib. iii, pag.* 174. He writ it to Tonſtal, the Engliſh embaſſador at Paris, in 1517. There are many like paſſages in his letters.

(15) Eraſm. Epiſt. xxviii, lib. vii, pag. 398.

(16) Negabant à ſe agnoſci triplicem ſed tres diverſas mulieres quarum una diceretur Magdalena *Lami. ubi infra.*

into latin, with critical notes and a commentary in which he often cenſures the vulgar tranſlation [*F*]. He made a like commentary and notes upon the goſpels and the epiſtles of the other apoſtles. All this ſerved only to increaſe the ill humour of the Sorbonne againſt him, and he ſaw himſelf alſo attacked by the formidable Noel Beda. He did not externally ſeparate from the church of Rome, and he diſapproved in certain points of the too warm conduct of thoſe who ſettled the reformation in Germany [*G*]; but in the bottom

ſwim againſt the ſtream (17). Father Alexander, *who afterwards publiſhed the reformation of the office of Paris, after having weighed . . . the authorities and reaſons of both parties,* has concluded * *in favour of the opinion which makes them but one ſingle perſon. After this,* father Lamy, prieſt of the Oratory, *not content with having endeavoured to re-eſtabliſh this opinion in his new* Evangelical Concord, *which he wrote in Latin in* 1689, *has publiſhed a particular diſſertation upon it in a French treatiſe, by way of letter, printed in* 1691. . . . . *Since which,* father Mauduit †, *alſo a prieſt of the Oratory, and* Dom Pezron ‡ . . . . *have each of them wrote a diſſertation in a work they publiſhed in French upon the goſpel, wherein they defend the common opinion* . . . . . *Mr du Hamel* † *of the Academy of Sciences* retains the ſame opinion. I borrow this from a book printed at Roan, in 1699, by Mr Anquetin, curate of Lyons, under the title of a *Diſſertation upon St Mary Magdalen, to prove that Mary Magdalen, Mary the ſiſter of Lazarus, and the woman who was a ſinner, are three different women.* Note, that Eraſmus wrote to the biſhop of Rocheſter, that all the world gave him the victory; but that there were ſome people who were ſorry he had treated ſo ſeverely a perſon, who had done ſo much ſervice to the ſciences as James le Fevre (18). We find in the ſame letter of Eraſmus, that Stephen Poncher, biſhop of Paris, had excited the Engliſh biſhop to write againſt that doctor.

[*F*] *He tranſlated the four Goſpels into French, and St Paul's Epiſtles into Latin, with notes . . . . in which he cenſures . . . . the vulgar tranſlation.*] This French tranſlation was printed with the royal licence, in 1523, by Simon de Colines. The author did not put his name to it; but ‘we learn from a letter of Eraſmus, written to Billibaldus in 1526, that it is James le Fevre's, who was obliged to fly for having publiſhed it, as if it had then been a crime at Paris to tranſlate the ſacred books into French, on account of the troubles, thoſe new tranſlations cauſed in Europe. *James le Fevre* (ſays Eraſmus * in that place) *who had fled for fear, for no other reaſon but that he had tranſlated the Goſpels into French, was recalled to court.* Jacobus Faber qui metu profugerat non ob aliud niſi quòd verterat Evangelia Gallicè, revocatus eſt in aulam (19).’ Mr Simon, from whom I borrow theſe words, cites ſeveral places of this verſion and gives his judgment of it. What he takes *from the life of Capito, compiled by Melchior Adam* (20), is not at all proper to confirm what Eraſmus ſays, that *James le Fevre fled from Paris on account of his new French tranſlation*; for it appears by that paſſage of Melchior Adam, that this doctor was at Baſil, as the deputy of Queen Margaret. See, above, remark [*C*].

‘(21) He publiſhed in the year 1512 a tranſlation of St Paul's Epiſtles with a commentary. This firſt edition is in the king's library written upon a fine vellom. He durſt not totally reject the vulgar, which he has inſerted intire in his work, ſetting over againſt it his new verſion, where he does not much vary from the ancient: but he has added critical obſervations to his commentary, intituled, *Examinatio nonnullorum circa literam*; and it is chiefly in theſe obſervations that he has taken the liberty to examine and correct the ancient Latin interpreter. Tho' he ſhews a great deal of learning in this work, and keeps as far as poſſible from the barbariſms of the divines of his time, yet he diſcovers throughout the whole great ſigns of weakneſs, both in the interpretation and in the Latin. Eraſmus and Stunica have learnedly obſerved ſome of his miſtakes, having proved by many inſtances that he was but a half Grammarian, and had but an indifferent knowledge of the Greek tongue. Natalis Bedda, a divine of Paris, cenſured his divinity as well as that of Eraſmus. Laſtly, the inquiſitors of Rome under Clement VIII have placed his commentary on all the new teſtament among the number of prohibited books, till it was reviſed, and purged of it's errors . . . . Bedda charged him with many errors, and among others with having wrote, upon the ninth chapter of the Epiſtle to the Romans, that it did not depend upon the will of man to ſave himſelf †, *poſſe ſalvari non eſt in hominis voluntate, poteſtate, aut operibus.* . . . The learned father Taumaſſin (22) of the Oratory has inſerted, in his memoirs concerning grace, this cenſure of Bedda, adding that the doctrine of that divine was in ſome meaſure the doctrine of the faculty of divinity at Paris, ſince it had approved of that cenſure. Be that as it will, Bedda preſſes him warmly upon this head, as if he had denied univerſal grace . . . . . (23). I have ſeen but one edition of his commentary upon the goſpels, which did not appear till 1522, having been printed at Meaux at the charge of Simon de Colines . . . . (24). He has alſo wrote upon the canonical epiſtles. This laſt work he dedicated to Antony du Prat, chancellor of France, thanking him for the protection he had given to his explication of the goſpels; which might induce one to believe that the books of that author did not even at that time pleaſe ſome divines at Paris. . . . . He has followed the ſame method in that laſt commentary as upon the goſpels, only he has placed his corrections in the margin, over againſt the text, which is more convenient. He obſerves in a letter written from Meaux in 1525, which is placed in the beginning, that the original Greek of the goſpels, and St Paul's epiſtles is more exact than the old Latin edition: that on the contrary that edition is more exact than the Greek in ſome places of the canonical epiſtles.’ Mr Simon relates ſeveral other things to ſhew the character of that work, and concludes that James le Fevre *ought to be ranked among the beſt commentators of his age. But Eraſmus, who wrote at the ſame time, and was much more polite, leſſened his reputation conſiderably. The works of that Paris divine are now ſcarcely read, whereas thoſe of Eraſmus . . . . are ſtill greatly valued* (25).

[*G*] *He did not externally ſeparate from the church of Rome, and diſapproved of the hot behaviour of thoſe who ſettled the reformation in Germany.*] The ſecond of theſe two facts is contained in theſe words of Eraſmus: ‘De regno quod ſcripſi, plebem lingua temperare, magiſtratum nihil gerere, niſi ex ipſorum ſententia, ſenatu movere, qui à doctrina ipſorum diſſentiunt; conjicere in carcerem, qui verbo ipſos tetigerit, fœderibus ſeſe communire, an non hoc eſt regnare? Damnavit hoc in illis egregius ille vir Jacobus Faber, quum metu ceſſerat Galliis, & in Germaniam conceſſerat (26). —— *As to what I wrote concerning their affecting a ſovereignty, what elſe can be the meaning of all this! to keep the common people in a ſtate of ſlavery, and the magiſtrates in ſuch ſubjection, as to determine nothing without their approbation, to expel from the ſenate all thoſe who differ from them in opinion, to impriſon thoſe who complain of their behaviour, and to ſtrengthen themſelves with alliances? This the great Faber condemned in them, when he left France out of fear, and retired into Germany.*’ For the firſt particular I ſhall cite a paſſage of Florimond de Remond: ‘Le Fevre who took the ſirname of Etaples, the village of his birth, a poor boy, without friends, lived a long time in the territories of the king of Navarre, raiſing ſundry doubts and ſcruples in the conſciences of thoſe that would hearken to him, yet always appearing a Catholic. I remember to have ſeen formerly, when the church of Nerac was ſtanding, his tomb with this inſcription.

Corpus humo, mentemque Deo, bona cuncta relinquo
Pauperibus, Faber hæc dum moreretur, ait.

His duſt to duſt, his ſoul to him that lives,
To th' poor the reſt, the dying Faber gives.

---

(17) Taken from the Diſſertation of Father Lami, *de unica Maria Magdalena.* It is in the appendix of his Commentary *in Harmoniam quatuor Evangeliſtarum,* printed at Paris, 1699. See the Journal of Utrecht, for July and Auguſt, 1699, pag. 448, *& ſeq.*

* Natalis Alexander, Hiſtor. Eccleſ. . . . I Sæculi, Tom. II, fol. 120.

† Mauduit, Analiſe de l'Evangile, *printed in* 1696.

are but two differen wom
Mary the
der of Lazarus
sinner are
Mag. another
as Tom

‡ Dom Pezron, Hiſtoire Evangelique. . . . *printed in* 1696.

† Theol. Cleric. Fund. Tom. II, lib. iv.

(18) Eraſm. Epiſt. viii, lib. vi, *dated from Antwerp, the ſecond of April,* 1519.

* Eraſm. Epiſt. lib. xxx, Epiſt. xliv.

(19) Simon Nouvelles, Obſervat. ſur le Texte & ſur les Verſions du N. T, pag. 146.

(20) Simon, ibid. pag. 150.

(21) Simon, Hiſt. Critique des Commentateurs du N. T. chap. xxxiv, pag. 488.

† Jac. Fab. apud Bedd. in Cenſ. C. 9. Epiſt. ad Rom. Prop. 59. Edit. Pariſ. in fol. ann. 1525.

(22) He ſhould have ſaid Thomaſſin.

(23) Hiſt. Crit. des Comment. du N. Teſt. pag. 496.

(24) Ibid. pag. 502.

(25) Ibid. pag. 503.

(26) Eraſm. Epiſt. at Fratres Germaniæ infer. fol. m. Q 4, verſo.

bottom he was much a Papiſt.

> 'At that time no alterations were made in religion, or the church ceremonies. The king and queen of Navarre, though their devotion was obſerved to be cooled after their intimacy with theſe fugitives of Meaux, continued to live in the ſame manner as uſual (27).'

(27) Flor. de Remond, Hiſt. of the Birth of Hereſy, lib. vii, cap. iii, pag. 846, 847.

FEVRET *(a)*. Mr Charles Fevret, ſon of Mr James Fevret, counſellor of the king in the parliament of Dijon, was born at Semur in Auxois in 1583.

(a) See the advertiſement to the ſecond edition of this Dictionary.

The famous Genebrard, archbiſhop of Aix and prior of our Lady of Semur, was an intimate friend of James Fevret, whom he calls in his works *Patronum rebus omnibus ornatum*. He deſired of him his ſon Charles to accompany him in his journey to Rome; but that prelate was found dead in his bed at Semur by his ſervants, who went to call him up the morning he deſigned to ſet out.

Bongars, ſo well known by men of learning, and by his works, was alſo the friend of James Fevret. He wrote to him for his ſon Charles, who went to meet him at Metz in 1602, and accompanied him in his journey to Germany, whither king Henry IV ſent him in quality of Reſident of France to the Electors and Princes of the Empire.

Charles left him to go and ſtudy the Civil-Law at Heidelberg, a famous univerſity of Germany. Godefroy * taught the Civil-Law there at that time. He took a particular care of Charles Fevret, who was recommended to him by a great many perſons of quality and merit, lodged him in his houſe, and made him maintain public theſes with applauſe.

* Gothofredus.

In the year 1607 Charles Fevret returned to Dijon, where he married Anne Brunet de Beaulne, by whom he had nineteen children. They brought up fourteen of them together for eight years. After the death of his wife which happened in 1637, he cut his bed in two and married no more.

He acquired a great reputation at the bar at Dijon, where he pleaded a long time with great eloquence and force, and did ſeveral public actions which procured him a general eſteem.

He was choſen counſel to the three eſtates of the province.

In the year 1629, Lewis XIII coming to Dijon to puniſh the authors of a popular ſedition, he was pitched upon to implore his majeſty's pardon for the guilty: he ſpoke for all the ſeveral bodies, and made ſo eloquent a ſpeech, that the king ordered him to print it, and ſend it to him to Lyons. His majeſty pardoned the authors of the tumult, and made Charles Fevret a counſellor in the parliament of Dijon by a new creation; but the execution of the wills of princes often depending upon their miniſters, Charles Fevret was given to underſtand that the king expected he ſhould exerciſe himſelf the office of counſellor, which his majeſty had beſtowed upon him. This he refuſed, not caring to part with his profeſſion of advocate, which he managed with ſo much eſteem and reputation. He was therefore forced to be contented with the poſt of the king's counſel, ſecretary of the court, with a penſion of 900 livres, which was granted him gratis.

His frequent deputations to court brought him acquainted with Mr de Marillac, keeper of the ſeals of France, who honoured him with his friendſhip.

In the years 1626, and 1627, the king's brother nominated him for his counſel in ordinary in all his affairs, and the prince of Condé made him Intendant of his houſe and buſineſs in Burgundy.

He was continued in the ſame poſt by Lewis de Bourbon, his ſon, prince of Condé, and honoured during the life of thoſe two princes in a particular manner with their favour. He was alſo nominated by Frederic Caſimir, prince palatine of the Rhine, and by his lady Amelia Antwerpia, born princeſs of Orange, for counſellor and intendant of their affairs in Burgundy.

Charles Fevret had an intimate acquaintance with all the learned Civilians of his time.

In 1654 he publiſhed a ſmall Latin treatiſe, *de Claris Fori Burgundici Oratoribus*.

The firſt impreſſion of this learned treatiſe, intituled *de l'Abus & du vrai ſujet des Appellations qualifiées de ce nom d'Abus*, appeared in 1653. He enlarged it one half, which gave birth to a ſecond edition in 1667, after his deceaſe. The ſame tract was printed a third time in 1677.

He alſo made an excellent tranſlation of Pybrac's ſtanzas into Latin verſe, printed at Lyons in 1667, with a commentary under the title *De Officiis Vitæ Humanæ ſive in Pybraci Tetraſticha Commentarius*.

Several authors have made honourable mention of him and his works.

His device was, *Conſcientia virtuti ſatis amplum Theatrum eſt.*

He died at Dijon in 1661, at the age of ſeventy ſeven years, and left two ſons counſellors in the parliament of Dijon, and two grandſons, one of which is a counſellor in the ſame parliament, and the other counſellor in the parliament of Metz.

FINÆUS (ORONTIUS) in French *Oronce Finé*, profeſſor of mathematics in the royal college of Paris, was a phyſician's ſon, and born at Briançon in Dauphiné in the year 1494 *(a)*. Being very young when his father died, he went to Paris, where he applied himſelf with the utmoſt diligence to his ſtudies. Anthony Silveſter, who was

(a) Thevet, Eloges des Hommes Illuſtres, Tom. VII, pag. m. 313.

of Briançon (*b*), and taught the *belles lettres* in Montague college, was a kind patron to him, and had him entered in the college of Navarre. The young man went through his claſſical learning, and a courſe of philoſophy there (*c*). He carefully ſtudied all that the profeſſors taught him; but was particularly attached to the mathematics, for which he had naturally a ſtrong inclination (*d*). Nor was he diſcouraged by the conſideration of the contempt thoſe ſciences then lay under, or of the neceſſity he was in of maſtering them by himſelf, and without the aſſiſtance of another; but notwithſtanding theſe obſtacles he made a very great progreſs in them (*e*). He acquired great ſkill in mechanics, and as he had a head to invent inſtruments as well as a hand to make them (*f*) he got much reputation by the firſt eſſays of his induſtry. The firſt work that made him known was his correcting and publiſhing the arithmetic of John Martin Siliceus, and the *Margareta Philoſophica* [*A*]. Afterwards he read private lectures in the mathematics, and then taught that ſcience publickly in the college of Maſter Gervais (*g*). He performed it ſo excellently well, that he was propoſed to Francis I, as the fitteſt perſon to teach the mathematics in the new college that prince had founded at Paris (*h*). He forgot nothing that might give credit to his profeſſion, and notwithſtanding his conſtant application to the public lectures, yet he publiſhed ſeveral books (*i*) upon almoſt all the parts of the mathematics. He boaſted to have found out the ſquaring of the circle [*B*]. What they ſay concerning this, in his elogy, will furniſh matter for a remark. I am very much miſtaken if it is not he that is mentioned in Agrippa's letters, as a man that was a long time impriſoned for having foretold ſome diſagreeable things to the court of France [*C*]; for at that time there were few Aſtronomers or Geometricians who did not pretend to judicial Aſtrology. The clock he invented in 1553, the deſcription of which may be ſeen in the Amſterdam journal of the twenty ninth of March 1694, is a proof his capacity in mechanics; but neither his genius, his labour, his inventions, nor the eſteem which an infinite number of perſons expreſſed for him, could ſecure him from the fate ſo common to men of letters. He was forced all his life to ſtruggle with grievous poverty [*D*], and, when he died, left a numerous family loaded with debts. It is true, the remembrance of his merit did for his children what it could not

(*b*) Launoius, Hiſt. Gymnaſ. Navarr. pag. 646.

(*c*) Id. ibid. pag. 678.

(*d*) Thevet, Eloges, Tom. VII, pag. 314.

(*e*) Idem.

(*f*) Ib. pag. 315.

(*g*) Launoi, ubi ſupra, pag. 679.

(*h*) Thevet, Eloges, pag. 314, 315. Launoius, Hiſt. Gymnaſ. Navarr. pag. 679.

(*i*) See the liſt of them in Mr Teiſſier's *Addit. to Thuanus's Elogies, Tom. I, pag.* 110.

[*A*] *The firſt work that made him known was his correcting . . . . the* Margareta Philoſophica.] Dr de Launoi informs me of this. ‘Et primo quidem, *ſays he* (1), nomen ſuum ab edendis corrigendiſque aliorum operibus illuſtre fecit. Nam anno 1519 è Navarra ſua Joannis Martini Silicei Hiſpani Arithmeticam typis commiſit, mendiſque pluribus expurgavit, & anno 1523 dum adhuc in Navarra cum Antonio Silveſtro degeret, Philoſophicam Margaretam quæ rationalis ac Moralis Philoſophiæ principia duodecim libris complectitur, recognovit & prælo mandari curavit. —— *He firſt made his name famous by publiſhing and correcting the works of other men. For in the year* 1519 *he publiſhed, during his reſidence in the college of Navarre, the arithmetic of John Martin Siliceus, which he rendered much more correct; and in the year* 1523, *whilſt he ſtill lived in the college of Navarre, with Antony Sylveſter, he reviſed and publiſhed the* Margareta Philoſophica, *which contains the principles of rational and moral philoſophy in twelve books.*

[*B*] *He boaſted that he had found out the ſquaring of the circle.*] Sammarthanus aſſures us that Orontius Finæus was in the wrong to boaſt that he had found it out, and that providence had reſerved that honour for Joſeph Scaliger: ‘Cum . . . inter cætera volumina peculiari quodam libro quadraturam illam circuli à multis fruſtra quæſitam ſe tandem aliquando reperiſſe gloriaretur. Hoc enim de ſe facile credebat homo ſummæ doctrinæ ſibi conſci[illegible] cùm tamen verum hujus admirabilis inventi gloriam uni Joſepho Scaligero faciliora numina reſervarent (2). —— *He boaſted in a particular treatiſe, that he had at laſt found the method of ſquaring the circle which multitudes had ſo long in vain ſought for. This a man, conſcious of his own great learning, might eaſily believe of himſelf, tho' the true glory of this admirable invention was reſerved by the favour of heaven for Joſeph Scaliger.*’ He juſtly ſays that Orontius Finæus wrongfully aſſumed to himſelf the invention of the quadrature of the circle; but he is ſtrangely miſtaken in making Scaliger the only one that diſcovered this myſtery; for this honour was ſo far from being reſerved for Scaliger alone, that it may be affirmed that great man came not ſo near to it as many others.

[C] *I believe that, according to Agrippa, he was a long time impriſoned for having foretold ſome diſagreeable things to the court of France.*] The words of Agrippa which I ſhall quote are taken from a letter, wherein he complains of his diſgrace, which he attributes to a ſcheme of a nativity, wherein he found that the conſtable of Bourbon would be ſtill victorious in the year 1526. The Queen-regent was incenſed againſt the Aſtrologer on this account, who thereupon ſaid his deſign was not to proſtitute his art to lies, and that he had not timely remembered the fate of a great mathematician. I ſuppoſe he means Orontius Finæus. ‘Sed & neſciebam me prædario Aſtrologum conductum, quodque mihi, quod ars illa dictat, monendi dicendique jus relictum non eſſet, occurritque extemplò Orintius Parrhiſiorum inſignis Mathematicus & Aſtrologus, qui dum veriora, quàm poterat, vaticinaverat, iniquiſſima captivitate diutinè vexatus eſt (3).’ I believe this particular is but little known.

[*D*] *He was forced to ſtruggle all his life with grievous poverty.*] He had gone through his ſtudies without receiving thoſe ſupplies from his family, which are neceſſary to ſtudents: his father was dead, and his relations neglected him (4). It may be eaſily imagined what ſtraits he was in. Thevet (5) aſſures us that Orontius Finæus ‘had ſo well freed himſelf from covetouſneſs, that by philoſophizing he ſatisfied his mind, but he did not fill his purſe. I cannot ſay this was his fault, for he often complained to ſeveral lords of the great neceſſities, he was under, which they took ſo little notice of, that honeſt Oronce's eſtate at his death was only a great load of debts, which, to his ſorrow, he left his dear ſpouſe Deniſe Blanche incumbered with, and five ſons and a daughter to provide for. Some orators, philoſophers, and learned men, have been highly valued, whereof ſome were rich, others threw their riches into the ſea, as if they had been only a hindrance to philoſophy. The learned Finé was among none of theſe (6), unleſs it were partaking with the laſt in this, that, after they had thrown away their eſtates, they found themſelves poor, with reſpect to wealth.’ Let us add to this what the ſame Thevet obſerves in the elogy of Peter Danes. ‘I cannot forbear ſaying that I complain of the ingratitude and unthankfulneſs of many cardinals, abbots, and other prelates, who have ſeen, heard, and been informed, of the miſery of ſeveral poor, but virtuous and learned men, ſuch as were Iodelle, Orontius Finæus, Poſtel, Regius, Belle Foreſt, and a great many more, who after their death left not enough to bury them; and yet they would not vouchſafe to open their bowels of compaſſion to offer them one farthing (7).’

(1) Laun. Hiſt. Gymnaſ. Navarr. pag. 678, 679.

(2) Sammarth. Elog. lib. i, pag. m. 28.

(3) Agrippa, Epiſt. lxii, lib. iv, pag. 881. *The letter is dated from Lyons the third of November*, 1526.

(4) I take no notice of the honours he received from his anceſtors, but of what he acquired himſelf, without any help, or aſſiſtance, from his relations, which the good man complains of ſomewhere in his works. *Thevet, Eloges, Tom. VII, pag.* 314.

(5) Ib. pag. 319.

(6) This is the third time that Thevet confutes in this paſſage what he had ſaid, that Orontius had wonderfully freed himſelf from covetouſneſs. A man does not free himſelf from it by being poor when he cannot help it.

(7) Thevet. Tom. VIII, pag. 22.

not do for himſelf. Some generous Mecænas's were found, who, for his ſake, relieved his indigent family [E]. I ſhall cite an author who charges him with being a plagiary [F]. According to Moreri he died the ſixth of October 1555. The abbot de Brianville, who invented the heraldry cards, and was the author of certain books for the uſe of the dauphin of France in the reign of Lewis XIV, was of the ſame country and family with Orontius Finæus (k).

(k) Allard, Bibl. de Dauphiné, pag. 106.

[E] *Mecænas's were found, who . . . . relieved his indigent family.*] Let us ſtill hear Thevet. ‘ He had ‘ a great many children, who, tho' without father or ‘ eſtate, yet were not deſtitute of all aſſiſtance; for after his death, ſeveral good lords extended their charity to maintain and protect the children of a man ‘ they had ſo much valued during his life. Two of ‘ them not only followed the ſtudy of the mathematics, but alſo one of them divinity, and the other the ‘ civil-law, and were graduates in their reſpective ‘ faculties (8).’ Thevet in page 312 ſpeaks of Maſter John Finæus, doctor of divinity, the ſon of Orontius: ‘ I have been aſſiſted, *ſays he*, with ſome memoirs by ‘ his ſon Maſter John Finæus, doctor of divinity, who, ‘ having been informed that I was writing an abridgment of the lives of illuſtrious men, earneſtly deſired ‘ that his father ſhould be put among them.’ In another place he ſays: ‘ Although his ſons have compoſed ‘ excellents epitaphs, I durſt not inſert them here, ‘ fearing, however exact and true they may be, they ‘ ſhould be leſſened by this conſideration, that they ‘ are not ſufficient evidences of their father's merit ‘ (9).’ Dr de Launoi informs me (10) that this John Finæus ſtudied in the college of Navarre, that he taught philoſophy ſome years in the college of Harcour, that he was made doctor of divinity in 1565, that he was afterwards canon of Meaux, and in the year 1608 was dean of the faculty of divinity.

(8) Idem, Tom. VII, pag. 320.

(9) Id. pag. 321.

(10) Laun. Hiſt. Gymnaſ. Navarr. pag. 679.

[E] *I ſhall cite an author that charges him with being a plagiary.*] John Baptiſta Benedictus in the preface of his book of dialling declares, that he has touched upon nothing which others had well explained, and that he has confined himſelf to that, that he might not appropriate to himſelf the labours of another, or hinder any body from reading other books. He adds, that all authors are not ſo ſcrupulous, and names Munſter and Finæus. ‘ Quis enim Sebaſtiani Munſteri, & ‘ Orontii Phinei horologiographias legit qui non animadverterit quam multa præter neceſſitatem de verbo ‘ ad verbum in poſterioris opere ſint tranſlata quæ ‘ poterant majori cum utriuſque laude apud priorem ‘ videnda relinqui, aut potius ab utroque prætermitti, ‘ cum alter alterius imprudens calcaverit veſtigia, & ‘ quandoque eodem errore ambo ducti cœcutientes in ‘ eandem foveam ſeſe præcipites egerint, ut factum eſt ‘ præcipue ubi agunt de deſcriptione horarii ſuper globo aut ſphærica ſuperficie convexa (11). —— *For ‘ who that has read Sebaſtian Munſter's, and Orontius ‘ Finæus's treatiſes of Dialling, has not obſerved what ‘ a multitude of things there are unneceſſarily inſerted ‘ word for word in the works of the latter, which ‘ might with more honour to both have continued in the ‘ former, or rather might have been omitted by both; ‘ whilſt the one imprudently followed the ſteps of the ‘ other, and both, miſled by the ſame error, blindly fell ‘ down the ſame precipice; and more partitularly where ‘ they treat of projecting a dial upon a globe, or convex ‘ ſpherical ſuperficies.*’ Here are two things to be conſidered: one is a matter of fact, *viz.* that Finæus's book contains word for word ſeveral of Munſter's obſervations, the other is the reaſoning of Benedictus. He ſuppoſes that if Finæus had not ſtolen them from Munſter, the honour of both of them had been greater. He is right in ſome reſpects; but in others his reaſoning is falſe, and upon the whole he ought to have explained himſelf better. He ſuppoſes afterwards that one of them copied the other without knowing it. Therefore he ſhould have ſaid that Munſter was a plagiary of the ſame authors who were afterwards pillaged by Finæus: and he ought to have told us who thoſe authors were.

(11) Joannes Baptiſta Benedictus, Patricius Venetus, in Præfatione Libri de Gnomonum Umbratumque ſolatium Uſu. *This book was printed at Turin*, 1574, *in folio*.

FLACIUS (MATTHIAS). Look for ILLYRICUS.

FLAMINIUS (MARC ANTHONY) was one of the beſt Latin poets of the XVIth century, and alſo a good humaniſt. He was born at Imola in Italy, the ſon and grandſon of learned men (a). See the account of him in Mr Teiſſier (b), and more at large in Moreri. I ſhall only obſerve one thing which they have omitted. The Pope choſe him for ſecretary to the council in 1545 (c); but Flaminius refuſed that great office, becauſe, finding himſelf imbued with the new opinions, he would not employ his pen in the ſervice of an aſſembly that would anathematize them. This is cardinal Palavicini's conjecture. That cardinal, ſpeaking of the honour the Pope deſigned for Flaminius, has not forgot to criticiſe Fra-Paolo [A]. He adds, that after that, Flaminius had the happineſs to acknowledge his errors by his acquaintance with cardinal Pole, and to write and die a good Catholic. Thuanus was not ignorant, that in ſome points Flaminius inclined to the party of the reformers. But among other articles he excepts that of the Lord's-Supper, and I do not find that Simler contradicts him in this reſpect [B]. Longolius has ſpoken very honourably

(a) See the remark [C].

(b) Elogies, taken from Thuanus, Vol. I, pag. 36, *& ſeq.*

(c) See the remark [A].

[A] *Cardinal Palavicini . . . . ſpeaking of Flaminius, has not forgot to criticize Fra-Paolo.*] He charges him (1) with falſely giving out that the Pope let his legates know, that it was not neceſſary to diſpatch letters in the name of the council, and that thoſe which he ſhould write himſelf, or which the legates ſhould write in their own names, would be ſufficient. To prove that this is falſe, cardinal Palavicini obſerves that the Pope preſcribed diſtinctly to the legates the form of ſigning, and directing the letters that ſhould be writ in the name of the council. He adds, that it belonged to the ſecretary of the council, to draw up thoſe letters, and the decrees of the council, and that the Pope deſigned Marc Antony Flaminius for that employment (2). ‘ Adunque il papa fè proporre al concilio per Segretario Marcantonio Flaminio, chiarò ‘ frà gli Scrittori Latini di quell' età, come dimoſtrano ‘ i ſuoi verſi. Ma egli ſeuſoſſi dal peſo, forſe perche ‘ gia covava (3) nella mente l'affezione à quelle dottrine in condannazion delle quali gli ſarebbe convenuto d'eſercitar quivi la penna; auvenga che * in ‘ fine de gli anni ſuoi la ſalutevol converſazione del ‘ cardinal Polo in Viterbo lo faceſſe rauvedere, e ſcriver' e morir cattolicamente.’ But what makes moſt againſt father Paul, in this chapter of the cardinal, is, that the fathers of the council complaining that the Pope choſe himſelf the officers of the aſſembly, he gave them full liberty to chuſe their own ſecretary: upon which they made choice of Angelo Maſſarelli proviſionally (4), and afterwards abſolutely (5).

(1) Hiſtory of the Council of Trent, lib. vi, cap. i, n. 4.

(2) Ibid. n. 5.

(3) This expreſſion ſeems to me to be falſe; for Flaminius rather declined than advanced in Lutheraniſm, from 1545, to his death, in 1551.

* Sta nella vita del Polo ſcritta dal Beccatello.

[B] *I do not find that Simler contradicts him in this reſpect.*] In the manner that Thuanus ſpeaks of Flaminius, he makes him rather a Janſeniſt, than a Proteſtant. He ſays that, among thoſe in Italy who thought a reformation was neceſſary, there aroſe private diſputes concerning faith, good works, grace, free-will, election, vocation, and glorification; and that the greateſt part of them formed a judgment of theſe matters very different from the then received opinion, and fortified themſelves with the authority of St Auguſtin. For this reaſon, adds Thuanus, Auguſtin Fregoſa Soſteneo printed at Venice in 1545 ſome ſmall pieces

(4) That is to ſay, 'till Priuli, choſen perpetual ſecretary, ſhould take poſſeſſion of that office; but he refuſed it.

(5) Palavicini's Hiſtory of the Council of Trent, *lib. vi, cap. i, n.* 6.

nourably of Flaminius [C]. The piety of the latter did not hinder him, though a clergyman, *from making a great number of amorous and paſſionate Verſes* (*d*).

The ill ſtate of his health obliged him to ſuch a regular way of living that he refuſed to ſup with Corradus, out of fear that others alſo were invited (*e*).

pieces taken from the works of that father. Flaminius embraced this opinion, and as to other things he did not follow the doctrines that were diſperſed in Germany: he plainly declares in a letter, that with reſpect to the euchariſt, his opinion was the ſame with that of the church, and he did not leave his country as ſome others did, with whom he had lived in a ſtrict friendſhip, on account of religion. Galeazzo Carraccioli marquis of Vico was one of this number (6). Mr Teiſſier contradicts this narrative. ‘ If we believe Joſiah Simler, *ſays he* (7), Thuanus was miſtaken when he wrote that Flaminius did not approve of the doctrine which Luther taught in Germany; for Simler (8) places Flaminius among thoſe who, having embraced the Proteſtant religion, forced Peter Martyr Vermilio, who was afterwards miniſter at Zurich, to follow their example, and renounce the communion of the church of Rome.’ I have run over Peter Martyr's life in Melchior Adam's volume (9), and I find nothing in it concerning Flaminius; but that Peter Martyr, being ſuperior of a monaſtery at Naples, came to the knowledge of the truth by reading certain books, and conferring often upon religious points with perſons of piety and zeal for the true religion. Martyr chiefly conferred with Marc Anthony Flaminius upon theſe things. I ſee nothing in all this contrary to Thuanus's account, and at moſt Simler would be more to blame than that great hiſtorian, ſince the letter of Flaminius is authentic, and his abode and death in Italy are inconteſtable matters of fact. I have ſaid it a thouſand times: a man might diſcover a thouſand abuſes and diſorders in the Romiſh communion, and many excellent truths in Luther's books, without thinking himſelf neceſſarily obliged to take a journey into Germany, and without pretending that the Romiſh church was wrong in all that the Lutherans found fault with (10). Mr Teiſſier oppoſes to Thuanus, Flaminius's epigram upon the death of Savanarola: but that proves nothing; an infinite number of Dominicans who were good Papiſts would not ſcruple publickly to put their names to that epigram. The letter inſerted in the life of Galeazzo Caraccioli ſhews a great deal of piety, but there is nothing in it particularly declaring the profeſſion or approbation of Lutheraniſm.

[C] *Longolius has ſpoken very honourably of Flaminius.*] Mr Teiſſier has quoted the following words of Longolius (11): ‘ Know that for many ages none has equalled Flaminius for parts, learning, virtue, and probity. Truly I am uſed to ſay, ſpeaking of him, that at this day I know no body that has more merit, or who is more unhappy than he.’ In other places (12) Longolius expreſſes a very particular eſteem and friendſhip for Flaminius. Here is a paſſage which has ſome relation to that of Mr Teiſſier. ‘ Ego nihil ad Flaminium ſcripſi, quod neque ſcirem ut cum ipſo ageretur, neque certi quicquam haberem, ad quod literas meas accommodarem. Quin ingenio, induſtria, virtute æquales ſuos omneis longe ſuperarit, plane non dubito: ne fortuna tantæ indoli maligne reſponderit, etiam atque etiam timeo. Sed tamen velim ut animo maximo ſit, optetque ſemper ſecunda, cogitet adverſa, ferat qualiacunque acciderint, neque ſibi præſtandum quicquam præter culpam exiſtimet: à qua ſane tam longe abeſt quam ab ea ætate quæ vel culpam adhuc præſtare debeat (13). ——— *I have never wrote to Flaminius, as being a ſtranger to his circumſtances, and having no particular occurrence on which I might communicate my ſentiments. But I queſtion not his having far ſurpaſſed all his equals in genius, application and virtue, and am much afraid that fortune has but ill rewarded ſuch ſuperior qualifications. I wiſh however that he would keep up a greatneſs of ſoul, and ſtill hope for happier days, and bear with reſolution whatever may happen, and not to think he is to anſwer for more than his faults: from which he is as free, as he is remote from that age which ought to be anſwerable for them.*’ Flaminius was yet but a young ſtudent, and conſequently could not be ſaid to be the moſt unhappy of all men. A man ought to have tried every thing, and ſtill have had an ill fate, before this could be properly ſaid of him. However this paſſage diſcovers the unlucky circumſtances of Flaminius, a young man under ſuch hardſhips, that his friends were forced to contribute to his relief, and endeavoured by letters of recommendation to procure him cloaths. ‘ De Flaminio quod benigne polliceris, reſpondes illi omnino, quam de prolixa iſta tua atque benefica in ſtudioſos omnes natura ſemper habui, opinioni: ſed nihil eo quod oſtendis etiam nunc eſt opus. Inita eſt enim à nobis ratio, quemadmodum hic adoleſcentem tueamur. In veſtiario tantum laboramus: in quo ſi adjutus à te fuerit, ocium ejus liberalitate tua conſtitutum eſſe judicabo (14). —— *The generous promiſes which you made concerning Flaminius, you perfectly anſwer from that open beneficent nature, with which I have obſerved you conſtantly treat all lovers of learning. But there is now no occaſion for what you propoſe, we have contrived a method to maintain the young man amongſt us. We want only to equip him with cloaths, wherein if he ſhould meet with aſſiſtance from you, he will by your liberality be made eaſy.*’ By a certain letter he wrote, he made himſelf an enemy, who, ſpeaking to Longolius, reviled him extremely, and in the ſame converſation affirmed, that as Flaminius was the ſon and grandſon of a pedant, and a pedant himſelf, he could find in him neither virtue or wit. ‘ Erras, inquit, Longoli, erras, ſi quod te vel ingenii vel virtutis lumen in eo perſpèxiſſe putas qui & ipſe pædagogus ſit, & pædagogo patre avoque natus (15). ——— *You are miſtaken, Longolius, you are ſtrangely miſtaken, if you imagine to have diſcovered in him either abilities or virtue; he is a pedant himſelf, and ſuch were both his father and grandfather.*’ As to the father of our Flaminius, he is not unknown to me: his name was JOHN ANTHONY FLAMINIUS. He taught polite literature at Bologna for many years (16), and died there in the year 1536, after having publiſhed ſome books (17). Moreri has ſpoken of him. As to his grandfather, I do not know him, and perhaps he is the ſame with one SEBASTIAN FLAMINIUS, a native of Imola (18), author of the life of Ambroſe of Sienna, a beatified Jacobine.

FLAMMINIUS (ANTHONY) a learned profeſſor of polite literature in the college of Rome about the beinning of the XVIth century, was a Sicilian by birth. He was ſo fond of ſolitude, that he took no pleaſure in converſing either with the learned or unlearned. He never invited any body to eat with him, nor would accept of any invitation from others. He had neither man nor maid ſervant. He uſed to buy every day his proviſions at an inn in the neighbourhood; but the landlord, obſerving that for three days paſt he had not come for any thing, nor had ſhewed himſelf as uſual, entered his chamber through the garden window, and found him dead among his books. He ſtudied, lying along upon the ground (*a*) [*A*].

[*A*] *He ſtudied lying along upon the ground.*] This was not the leaſt ſign of his fantaſtical temper. ‘ Is inopinata præventus morte à caupone viciniæ qui quotidiana edulia homini venditabat, contentionem admirante quod jam triduum non apparuiſſet, & per hortuli feneſtellam quandam ingreſſo inter libros quos ſtratos, ſtratus & ipſe lectitare conſuerat, ſempiterno oppreſſus ſomno repertus eſt (1).’ He had taught a long time in Rome with profound learning. ‘ Cujus prælectionibus Roma longa annorum ſerie nihil habuit eruditius (2).

(*d*) Menage, Anti-Baillet, Tom. II, pag. 337.

(*e*) Sebaſt. Corradus in Brutum Ciceronis, pag. 43

(6) Cui ſententiæ accedebat Flaminius, cum in ceteris fidei capitibus doctrinæ per Germaniam tunc diſſeminatæ minime adſtipularetur. Nam & luculentum ipſius exſtat inter vulgareis clarorum virorum epiſtolas de ſacroſancto Euchariſtiæ myſterio ex eccleſiæ ſenſu ſcriptis mandatum teſtimonium, itaque cum aliis, quibuſcum religionis cauſa amicitiam coluerat, atque in primis Galeacius Caraciolus Vici Marchio patriam reliquiſſent, *&c.* *Thuan. lib* ix, *pag. m.* 177.

(7) *Elogies taken from Thuanus*, Tom. I, pag. 39.

(8) In vita P. Martyr.

(9) He makes uſe of that compoſed by Simler.

(10) See among other places the remark [*Q*] of the article *CASTELLAN.*

(11) *He cites* Longolius, Epiſt. lib. iii. *See his Additions*, Tom. II, pag. 395.

(12) *See* lib. ii, folio 190, *and* lib. iii, folio 240.

(13) Ibid. lib. ii, folio 183.

(14) Ibid. lib. iv, folio 271.

(15) Ibid. lib. ii, fol. 202, *verſo.*

(16) Leandr. Albert. Deſcript. Italiæ, pag. m. 493.

(17) *See* Voſſius de Hiſt. Lat. pag. 682.

(18) Id. ibid. pag. 678.

(*a*) *Taken from* Pierius Valerianus, de Litteratorum Infelicitate, lib. i, pag. m. 23.

(1) Pierius Valerianus, ubi ſupra.

(2) Id. ibid.

FLAVIGNY (**Valerian de**) doctor of divinity of the houſe and ſociety of the Sorbonne, counſellor and king's profeſſor of the Hebrew tongue in the univerſity of Paris, and dean of the king's profeſſors in the royal college of France (*a*). Add to what has been ſaid of him in Moreri, and elſewhere (*b*), that he had a great diſpute with ſome divines of the faculty of Paris, for having proved the Theſis which Lewis de Cleves, bachelor in divinity, had maintained concerning epiſcopacy in his public act, the fourth of November 1667. Complaint was made of two propoſitions in this Theſis [*A*], and they hindered that bachelor, 'who had gone through his licentiate's de-
'gree, who had been preſented to the chancellor of the church and univerſity of Paris by
'the faculty of divinity, who had been harangued and aſſigned, by the ſaid chancellor,
'to the place, rank, and apoſtolical benediction of the degrees, the third of February
'laſt, as well as others of the ſame degree, from receiving the ſaid benediction, which
'is a reward for ſtudy, and a proof of capacity (*c*).' Flavigny adviſed him, meerly *for the ſake of peace, and to avoid the ſcandal which might ariſe from ſuch a diſſention, to ſign the declaration and explication of the ſaid two propoſitions which were required of him* [*B*]. And he compiled a long apology, which was printed at Tournay in 1668, under the title of *Ad Theſim Cleveſianam ubi de Epiſcopatu expectatæ Vindiciæ*. It is a quarto of 128 pages, wherein he cites an infinite number of authors who have advanced the ſame doctrine with Lewis de Cleves, *viz.* that epiſcopacy, as diſtinct from the prieſthood, is no ſacrament. Some letters were prefixed to this apology, in one of which it is ſaid, that Valerian de Flavigny, *Preſbyter Laudunenſis*, had been reader of the Sorbonne for forty years.

[*A*] *Complaint was made of two propoſitions in that theſis.*] The firſt propoſition was, 'Presbyteratum
'veſtiri ratione ſacramenti certum: Epiſcopatum ea
'decorari quicunque negat, probabiliorem tenet ſen-
'tentiam. II. Ad Epiſcopatum præviuſne Preſ-
'byteratus? Aliquando negatum videtur. —— *I. That*
'*prieſthood is a ſacrament, is certain; that epiſcopacy is*
'*not, is probable. II. Whether prieſthood be previous*
'*to epiſcopacy? It appears to have been ſometimes*
'*denied.*'

[*B*] *Flavigny adviſed de Cleves to ſign the declaration, and explanation . . . . . they required of him.*] This clauſe is added to the act from whence I take theſe words, 'reſerving to himſelf the liberty to ſay,
'and cauſe to be regiſtered in the office of the ſaid
'faculty in the aſſembly of the firſt of March follow-
'ing,' that the ſaid explanation ſhould be no prejudice to the probability or ſeeming truth of the doctrine contained in them; as alſo to *remonſtrate, &c.* The declaration they extorted from that bachelor was this:
'Non intendo negare abſolutè epiſcopatum eſſe ſa-
'cramentum; imò agnoſco in collatione epiſcopatus
'dari gratiam ſanctificantem. *Ad ſecundam propoſitio-*
'*nem.* Cum dixi, *Aliquandò negatum videri presby-*
'*teratum prævium eſſe debere ad epiſcopatum*, non in-
'tendi, *epiſcopatum conferri poſſe per ſaltum*; imo exi-
'ſtimo *non poſſe epiſcopum conſecrari, niſi ſit presbyter.*
'—— *I do not intend to deny abſolutely that epiſcopacy*
'*is a ſacrament, nay, I acknowledge that a ſanctifying*
'*grace is conveyed to the perſon inaugurated.* As to
'the ſecond propoſition. *When I ſaid*, that it appears
'to have been denied that prieſthood ought to be
'previous to epiſcopacy, *I did not mean*, that epiſco-
'pacy could be conferred all at once; *nay I think*
'that no biſhop can be conſecrated unleſs he be a
'prieſt.'

FLORA, if we believe Lactantius, was a courtezan [*A*], who, having got large ſums of money by proſtituting herſelf, made the Roman people her heirs, and ordered that the income of a certain fund, which ſhe ſpecified, ſhould be employed in celebrating her birth-day. She would have that day remarkable by the games that were to be exhibited to the people, and were to be named Floral. They were celebrated in a very ſcandalous manner [*B*], and were in ſome ſort the courtezans feaſt

[*A*] *If we believe Lactantius, ſhe was a courtezan.*] Reproaching the Pagans with the enormous abuſes of their deification, he ſays: 'Jam quanta iſta immor-
'talitas putanda ſit, quam etiam meretrices aſſequan-
'tur? Flora (cum magnas opes ex arte meretricia
'quæſiviſſet) populum ſcripſit hæredem, certamque
'pecuniam reliquit, cujus ex annuo fœnore ſuus nata-
'lis dies celebraretur editione ludorum, quos appellant
'Floralia (1). —— *How great then muſt that immor-*
'*tality be imagined, which the leudeſt women have ob-*
'*tained? Flora, having raiſed an immenſe fortune by*
'*her leud arts, left the people her heir, and ſet apart*
'*a certain ſum, out of the yearly produce of which her*
'*birth-day might be ſolemnized with public games,*
'*which they call Floralia.*' Neither Arnobius (2), nor St Auguſtin (3), ſay any thing like this of Flora, though they reproach the heathens with the impurities of the Floral games: but ſhe is treated as a courtezan in the dialogue of Minutius Felix (4). No doubt St Auguſtin was ſenſible this ſtory of Lactantius was without foundation. I have read in the ſcholiaſt upon Juvenal (5), that the Floral games were inſtituted in honour of the goddeſs Flora, by Flora the courtezan. This makes nothing for Lactantius. We ſhall ſee in the following article, that there was a famous proſtitute named Flora; but it is not true that ſhe was the founder of thoſe games. The ſcholiaſt upon Juvenal is miſtaken, and at moſt he does not ſay, as Lactantius, that Flora the courtezan founded the Floral games for herſelf.

[*B*] *The Floral games . . . . were celebrated in a very ſcandalous manner.*] Here Lactantius is in the right.
'Celebrantur ergo illi ludi cum omni laſcivia conve-
'nientes memoriæ meretricis. Nam præter verborum
'licentiam, quibus obſcœnitas omnis effunditur, exu-
'untur etiam veſtibus populo flagitante Meretrices,
'quæ tunc mimorum funguntur officio, & in conſpe-
'ctu populi uſque ad ſatietatem impudicorum lumi-
'num cum pudendis motibus detinentur (6). ——
'*Theſe games are therefore celebrated with all the*
'*leudneſs imaginable, and in a manner that perfectly an-*
'*ſwers the memory of a proſtitute. For beſides the extra-*
'*vagant licence whereby obſcene talking is encouraged,*
'*the courtezans, at the inſtance of the people, are*
'*ſtripped naked, and play their monkey gambols in the*
'*ſight of the people, 'till the eyes of the moſt abandoned*
'*ſpectators are tired with their abominable behaviour.*'
St Auguſtin thunders, as he ought to do, in divers places, againſt this impudence. I ſhall only relate the following paſſage (7): 'Horum planè florum non
'terra fertilis, non aliqua opulens virtus; ſed illa dea
'Flora digna mater inventa eſt, cujus ludi ſcenici tam
'effuſiore & licentiore turpitudine celebrantur, ut qui-
'vis intelligat, quale dæmonium ſit, quod placari ali-
'ter non poteſt; niſi illic, non aves, non quadrupe-
'des, non denique ſanguis humanus; ſed multo ſcele-
'ſtius pudor humanus tanquam immolatus intereat.
'—— *Of theſe flowers neither is the earth produ-*
'*ctive, nor any fertile virtue; but Flora, the goddeſs*
'*Flora, muſt be made the worthy parent of them, whoſe*
'*games*

(*a*) Theſe are his titles in an inſtrument by a Public Notary, ſigned by him the thirteenth of Auguſt, 1668, and which is printed before the *Vindiciæ ad Theſim Cleveſianam.*

(*b*) In the remark [*F*] of the article *ECCHELLENSIS.*

(*c*) See the ſame act.

(1) Lactant. Divin. Inſtit. lib. i, cap. xx, pag. m. 60.

(20) Arnob. lib. iii, pag. m. 113, & lib. vii, pag. 238.

(3) Auguſt. de Civitate Dei, lib. ii, cap. xxvii, & alibi paſſim. *See Coquæus's notes* in hunc locum.

(4) Pag. m. 233, 234.

(5) In Sat. vi, ver. 249.

(6) Lactant. Div. Inſtitut. lib. i, cap. xx, pag m. 60.

(7) Auguſt Epiſt. ccii, pag. m. 865.

feaſt [*C*]. Lactantius adds, that the ſenate found a way to hide from the public the original of ſo infamous an inſtitution [*D*]; but, taking the advantage of the courtezan's name, they made them believe that Flora was the goddeſs preſiding over flowers; and that, in order to have a good harveſt, it was neceſſary to honour that goddeſs every year, and render her propitious to them. It may be queſtioned whether Lactantius affirmed that upon good authority; for ſince the worſhip of Flora was inſtituted in Rome by Tatius, king of the Sabins (*a*), and colleague with Romulus, that goddeſs muſt have been worſhipped by the Sabins before the building of Rome: therefore it was not a courtezan who had choſen the Roman people for her heirs. They did not begin to celebrate the Floral games till the year of Rome 513 [*E*]. The way of paying the charges of them is a new proof againſt Lactantius

(*a*) *Varro affirms this*, lib. iv, de Lingua Latina. *See* Voſſius, de Orig. Idolol. lib. i, cap. xii, pag. m. 93.

' *games are celebrated with ſuch profligate licence and* ' *obſcenity, that any one may underſtand, what dæmon* ' *it is that cannot be otherwiſe appeaſed. There no* ' *birds, no beaſts, nor even human blood, but human* ' *modeſty is butchered, and moſt impiouſly ſacrificed.*' Pagan authors do not deny that naked women appeared before all the people at the Floral games, and they ſay that once Cato aſſiſting at thoſe games, and perceiving that his preſence hindered the people from demanding thoſe naked ſpectacles as uſual, retired that he might not interrupt the feaſt: the people, at the ſight of this condeſcenſion, followed him with repeated acclamations, and afterwards they did according to cuſtom. ' Eodem (Marco Catone) Ludos Florales, quos Meſſius ' ædilis faciebat, ſpectante, populus, ut Mimæ nudarentur, poſtulare erubuit: quod cum ex Favonio, ' amiciſſimo ſibi, una ſedente, cognoviſſet, diſceſſit è ' theatro, ne præſentia ſua ſpectaculi conſuetudinem ' impediret. Quem abeuntem ingenti plauſu populus ' proſecutus, priſcum morem jocorum in ſcenam revocavit; confeſſus, plus ſe majeſtatis uni tribuere, ' quàm univerſo ſibi vindicare (8). ——— *The ſame* ' *Cato, being preſent at the Floral games, which Meſſius the edile exhibited, the people had ſo much modeſty as not to require that the courtezans ſhould be ſtripped: which when he underſtood from Favonius, his intimate friend who ſat by him, he left the theatre, leſt* ' *his preſence might be a hindrance to the uſual ſpectacle.* ' *The people followed him with loud acclamations, and* ' *then proceeded according to cuſtom, declaring they had* ' *a greater regard for the majeſty of that one man, than* ' *for that of the whole aſſembly.*' Martial juſtly laughs at this behaviour of Cato. Why did he go to thoſe games, ſince he knew what was practiſed there? Did he go there only to go out again? This is what the poet reproaches him with. But he forgot the moſt material part, which is, that Cato ought not to have withdrawn, ſince he obſerved that his preſence was ſo neceſſary to correct an ill cuſtom.

Noſſes jocoſæ dulce cum ſacrum Floræ
Feſtoſque luſus & licentiam vulgi,
Cur in theatrum Cato ſevere veniſti?
An ideo tantum veneras ut exires (9)?

Why cam'ſt thou, Cato, 'midſt that gameſome crowd,
No ſtranger to the revels there allow'd?
Thou knew'ſt 'twas Flora's feaſt; why cam'ſt thou
then?
Was it for this — ſay — to go out again?

Juvenal in a few words gives a frightful idea of the leudneſs of the Floral games,

- - - - - digniſſima prorſus
Florali matrona tuba (10).

For Flora's ſcenes a dame exactly form'd.

[*C*] *They were . . . the courtezans feaſt.*] Though this is clear enough from the paſſages I have cited in the preceding remark, yet I ſhall add the following verſes out of Ovid:

Turba quidem cur hos celebrent meretricia ludos,
  Non ex difficili cauſſa petenda ſubeſt.
Non eſt de tetricis, non eſt de magna profeſſis,
  Vult ſua plebeio ſacra patere choro.
Et monet ætatis ſpecie, dum floreat, uti,
  Contemni ſpinam cum cecidere roſæ (11).

But why ſhould Flora chuſe that motley train
Her ſacred ſcenes to tread? the reaſon's plain.
No ſtiffneſs ſhe, no rigid rules admires,
But calls her vot'ries to plebeian choirs.
Their charms ſhe bids them uſe, e'er they decay:
The roſe once fall'n, the ſtalk is caſt away.

Fine morality this! The goddeſs Flora would have courtezans celebrate her feſtival, becauſe it is fit to let women know they are to make the moſt of their beauty while it is in the bloom; for if they ſuffer their prime to ſlip away, they will be deſpiſed like a roſe which has nothing left but it's thorns: but how abominable ſoever this morality is, it is publickly taught among chriſtians in aſſemblies that are honoured with the protection of the ſupream power (12).

[*D*] *The ſenate found a way to hide from the public the knowledge of ſo infamous an inſtitution.*] I ſhall cite Lactantius's words (13): ' Quod quia Senatui flagitioſum videbatur, ab ipſo nomine argumentum ſumi placuit, ut pudendæ rei quædam dignitas adderetur. Deam finxerunt eſſe, quæ floribus præſit, eamque oportere placari, ut fruges cum arboribus, aut vitibus benè, proſpereque floreſcerent. Eum colorem ' ſecutus in Faſtis poëta non ignobilem Nympham fuiſſe narravit, quæ ſit Chloris vocitata, eamque Zephyro ' nuptam quaſi dotis loco id accepiſſe muneris à marito, ut haberet omnium florum poteſtatem. —— *And* ' *becauſe it ſeemed ſhameful to the ſenate, to give an* ' *appearance of dignity to that infamous practice, they* ' *took advantage of the name, and pretended ſhe was* ' *goddeſs of flowers, that ſhe ought to be appeaſed, that* ' *the fruits, trees, and vines, might flouriſh and proſper. The poet, following this fiction in his Faſti, ſays* ' *ſhe was a celebrated nymph, named Chloris, who married Zephyrus, by whom ſhe was preſented with a* ' *ſovereign power over all flowers.*'

[*E*] *They did not begin to celebrate the Floral games till the year of Rome* 513.] This is Voſſius's opinion (14): Pliny, corrected by father Hardouin, confirms the ſame. Before that Jeſuit's edition, we read in Pliny, ' Floralia quarto Kalendas ejuſdem (Maii) inſtituerunt ' urbis anno DXVI. ex oraculis Sibyllæ, ut omnia bene defloreſcerent (15). —— *The Floral games were* ' *inſtituted by direction of the Sibylline oracles, the* ' *twenty eighth of April in the year of Rome* 516, *that* ' *all things might flouriſh and proſper.*' But father Hardouin, either by the help of manuſcripts, or for chronological reaſons, hath reſtored in this paſſage the year 514 (16). The following place in Velleius Paterculus was very ſerviceable to him: ' Proximo ' anno Torquato Sempronioque Coſſ. Brundiſium (colonis occupatum) & poſt triennium Spoletium: quo ' anno Floralium ludorum factum eſt initium (17). ' —— *The next year, Torquatus and Sempronius being* ' *conſuls, a colony was ſent to Brundiſium; and three* ' *years after another to Spoletium, in which year the Floral games were inſtituted.*' According to Titus Livius and Pliny's chronology, the conſulſhip of Torquatus and Sempronius falls out in the year of Rome 510. ' Incidit prior ille conſulatus in annum Urbis DX. ex ' Liviana Plinianaque Chronologia, quo fit ut triennio ' interjecto Floralium celebritas ludorum incurrat in ' annum DXIV (18). ——— *The firſt conſulate was* ' *in the year of the city* 510, *as appears from the chronology of Livy and Pliny; whence it follows, that the* ' *inſtitution of the Floral games, which happened three* ' *years after, falls upon the year* 514.' Since therefore the Floral games began three years after, the beginning of them muſt be placed in the year 513. Father Hardouin chuſes rather to put it to the year 514, becauſe no doubt he imagines there were three whole years from the end of that conſulſhip to the founding of the colony of Spoletium. According to this account, it would be true that the Floral games began the

---

(8) Val. Maxim. lib. ii, cap. x, n. 8. Senec. Epiſt. xlvii, *mentions the ſame thing.* Catonem illum quo ſedente negatur populus permiſiſſe ſibi poſtulare florales jocos nudandarum meretricum.

(9) Mart. Epigr. iii, lib. i.

(16) Juven. Sat. vi, ver. 249.

(11) Ovid. Faſtor. lib. v, ver. 349.

(12) Comedies and Operas are full of ſuch doctrine.

(13) Lactant. Divin. Inſtitut. lib. i. cap. xx, pag. 60.

(14) Voſſius, de Orig. Idolol. lib. i, cap. xii, pag. 93.

(15) Plin. lib. xviii, cap. xxix, pag. m. 527.

(16) Prius DXVI permutatis annorum numeris legebatur: nos tum ex veſtigiis veterum codicum, tum ex indubitata temporum ratione locum eum ſanavimus. *Harduin. in Emendat. lib. xviii. Plin.* n. 40.

(17) Paterc. lib. i, cap. xiv.

(18) Harduinus, in Emendat. Lib. xviii Plinii, n. 40.

…lo as a Heathen might think it a
…y in him to attend the Ceremony
…d when he found the People
…d so great a respect to his
modesty, it was likewise a
…y incumbent on him not
…prevent the whole of the
ceremony from being perform'd
…his presence [illegible] when
…[illegible] not think it
…him to break
…of his Modesty, &c.
…fore I must beg Martial's
…on I do not see so much
…[illegible]
…laugh [illegible]
…[illegible] be said on
…of Cato.

Lactantius [*F*]. From that time to the year 580 they were not annually celebrated, but only in caſe the intemperature of the ſeaſons required it, or the books of the Sybils appointed it (*b*). This is another proof againſt Lactantius. At laſt, in the year of Rome 580, it was found proper to make an edict, ordering that thoſe games ſhould be annually celebrated [*G*.] This decree was cauſed by the irregularity of the ſpring, which had often produced pernicious effects. Voſſius's reflection upon Lactantius's objection is not reliſhed by every body [*H*]. He did not underſtand a paſſage of this father [*I*]. Moreri's miſtakes may be ſeen below, [*K*].

the fourth year after that conſulſhip, that is to ſay, in the year 514. In my opinion, it is more natural to ſay that a thing, which happened three years after the year 510, fell out in the year 513. Note, that according to Pliny the Floral games began by order of the Sybil. Therefore it was not in execution of a courtezan's laſt will. Father Hardouin ſaw medals of the Servilian family with this inſcription, FLORA. PRIMUS, that is, according to him, *Floralia primus edidit* (19): from whence he concludes, that the firſt that exhibited thoſe games was one of that family. But if the leaſt credit is given to Ovid (20), it is certain the firſt that celebrated them were two ediles of the Publician family. This is confirmed by the medals (21), and Tacitus gives no little weight to the ſame, when he ſays that Lucius and Marcus Publicius cauſed the temple of Flora to be built in their edileſhip (22).

[*F*] *The way they paid the charges of them is a new proof againſt Lactantius.*] They fined thoſe who had appropriated to their own uſe any lands belonging to the common-wealth, and out of thoſe fines they defrayed the expences of the Floral games. ‘ Non ex ‘ Floræ vel meretricis cujuſquam hæreditate, ſed ex pe‘ cunia multaticia eorum qui peculatus damnati forent ‘ quia publicum populi Romani agrum occupaſſent ‘ (23). —— *Not out of the inheritance of Flora, or of ‘ any courtezan, but out of the fines of thoſe who had ‘ been condemned for male-adminiſtration as having ‘ appropriated to themſelves the lands of the public.*’

[*G*] *In the year of Rome* 580, *a decree was made for celebrating thoſe games annually.*] Ovid proves this; for he introduces the goddeſs Flora, who relates that having ſuffered the bloſſoms of the trees and vines to periſh, to be revenged of the Romans for not celebrating the Floral games every year, ſhe forced the ſenate to make a decree concerning that anniverſary, if there was a good harveſt. It proved good, and thus the decree began to be put in execution under the conſulſhip of Poſthumius and Lænas.

Convenere Patres, & ſi bene floreat annus,
  Numinibus noſtris annua feſta vovent.
Annuimus voto. Conſul cum conſule ludos
  Poſtumio Lænas perſoluëre mihi (24).

To me the fathers annual feaſts decreed,
If the year flouriſh, and the crops ſucceed.
Their vows I heard ; thanks for the friendly aid,
The conſuls, Lænas and Poſthumius, paid.

[*H*] *Voſſius's reflexion upon the objection of Lactantius is not liked by every body.*] After having diſplayed the proofs which overthrow that objection, he adds, that truth has no need to beg the aſſiſtance of falſehood, and therefore all that the fathers have written againſt the Gentiles is not to be depended upon. *Cum veritas falſi minime ſit indiga, non omnia alba ſignari linea oportere quæ veteres adverſus pago deditos ediſſerunt* (25). Blondel has freely inlarged upon this thought. ‘ We ought not, *ſays he* (26), to defend a ‘ good cauſe by ill choſen arguments, nor take up ‘ whatever ſeems to make for us, wherever it comes ‘ from. Yet this has been the practice of the fathers: ‘ for the deſire of making an advantage of every thing, ‘ of forcing truth even from the mouth itſelf of falſe‘ hood, and of being like torrents which impetu‘ ouſly drive down their ſtream whatever comes in ‘ their way, has been the cauſe that many among ‘ them, that they might ſeem to let nothing eſcape ‘ their memory, have loſt the beſt opportunities of ‘ giving proofs of their judgment, and have not on‘ ly endeavoured to make all the thoughts of the ‘ Pagans, both ſolid and groundleſs, ſubſervient to ‘ them, like great rivers that roll in their beds ſands ‘ of gold mixed with mire, but have alſo gloried in ‘ this conduct, which has ſometimes been fraudulent ‘ enough, as if they were allowed to ſay with Æneas ‘ in Virgil,

Dolus an virtus quis in hoſte requirat?

In war, or ſtrength or ſtratagem's allow'd.

‘ From hence it was that St Jerome * giving way to ‘ this ſtrange prejudice, has made no ſcruple to alledge ‘ in his own vindication, that the fathers have been ‘ forced to ſay, not what was their own opinion, ‘ but what was neceſſary to refute what the Pagans ‘ believe. Nay he endeavours to juſtify them by ×St Paul's example, but without reaſon, ſince the a‘ poſtle never authorized this abuſe by his own example, ‘ nor believed all methods indifferent, nay praiſe worthy, ‘ provided they ſerved to the overthrow of error, &c.

× but the Papists do thi
any method justifiable t
make Converts Sword or
fire — if that be Xtianit
it contradicts St Pauls Doct
who was of the first Xtian

[*I*] *Voſſius did not underſtand a paſſage of this father.*] This father (27) upbraids the Romans with the apotheoſis of a courtezan, whoſe feſtival was called *Larentinalia*. He adds that they paid divine honours to another proſtitute, *viz.* to Faula, who, according to Verrius, was Hercules's whore. Afterwards he ſpeaks of Flora in the terms above mentioned. Voſſius pretends that Lactantius has not diſtinguiſhed Faula from Flora, but that inſtead of Faula it ſhould be read Flaura. Now Flaura was the ancient way of writing Flora: thus *caudex* was changed into *codex*, and many other words in like manner (28). All this comes to nothing, when it is conſidered that the Faula of Lactantius was Hercules's concubine, and that the Flora, he ſpeaks of, left all her eſtate to the Roman people. Thus the moſt celebrated authors for want of attention fall into groſs miſtakes.

[*K*] *Moreri's miſtakes may be ſeen below.*] I. He ſays they made feaſts to Flora the beginning of May. This is to underſtand the 4 *Kalendas Maii* in another ſenſe than any body elſe, that knows the elements of learning. The fourth of the Kalends of May is the twenty eighth of April. It muſt not be ſaid theſe feaſts extended to the beginning of May; for the laws of a narration do not allow that the time of a feſtival ſhould be deſcribed by the laſt days of it rather than the firſt. Good Roſinus (29) fancied that at firſt the Floral games were celebrated in the month of April, and afterwards transferred to the following month. The verſes of Ovid, which he alledges, were beyond his reach, and yet they clearly ſignify, that thoſe games took in the laſt days of April, and the firſt days of May.

Incipis Aprili, tranſis in tempora Maii,
  Alter te fugiens, cum venit alter, habet.
Cum tua ſint cedantque tibi confinia menſum,
  Convenit in laudes ille vel iſte tuas (30).

In April you commence, thence paſs to May,
And changing thus enjoy a double ſway;
To you the confines of both months belong,
And either this or that may ſuit your ſong.

II. None of the authors, cited by Moreri, ſay that during the Floral games, *the ediles ſtrowed the way with bloſſoms of peas and beans*. He has got this from ſome modern, perhaps from the Jeſuit Pomey, who ſays that during that ſolemnity the ediles diſtributed to the people peas and beans and ſuch like pulſe (31). He cites Valerius Maximus *l.* 2. *c.* 5. But look for it there as long you pleaſe, you will find no ſuch thing. No doubt Pomey truſted to Tiraqueau's commentary upon Alexander ab Alexandro (32), where this falſe quotation is to be found. I believe he has not been more lucky in citing Plutarch: he ſays, by a ſtrange and unpardonable way of quoting (33), that that author informs us that the image of the goddeſs Flora, in the temple of Caſtor and Pollux, was dreſſed in a tunic, and carried bloſſoms of beans and peas in her right hand (34). I am very much miſtaken if Plutarch has ſaid any thing more, than that Cecilius Metellus conſecrated in the temple of Caſtor and Pollux the picture of Flora, the miſtreſs of Pompey the great, who was one of the fineſt women in Rome. III. All the authors Moreri cites are wrong cited (35).

(*b*) Voſſius, ibid.

(19) Id. p. 557.

(20) Faſtor. lib. v.

(21) *See* Voſſius, de Orig. Idolol. lib. i, cap. xii, pag. 93.

(22) Tacit. Ann. lib. ii, cap. xlix.

(23) Voſſius, de Orig. Idolol. lib. i, cap. xii, ex Ovidio, Faſt. lib. v.

(24) Ovid. Faſt. lib. v, ver. 327.

(25) Voſſius, de Orig. Idolol. lib. i, cap. xii, pag. 94.

(26) Blondel *of the Sybils*, lib. i, cap. xxvi.

* Apolog. ad Pammachium pro libris adv. Jovinian.

(27) Lactant. lib. i, cap. xx.

(28) Suſpicor priſco more Flauram ſcripſiſſe (Lactantium) id eſt Floram, quod ex altero factum. *Voſſius, de Orig. Idolol. lib. i, cap. xii, pag.* 92.

(29) Roſin. Antiquit. Rom. lib. v, cap. xv.

(30) Ovid. Faſt. lib. v, ver. 185. *Roſinus has not quoted the two laſt.*

(31) Pomey, Panth. Mythic. pag. 218, 219.

(32) Libro vi, cap. viii, pag. m. 513.

(33) I mean without citing any volume, or book, or any thing.

(34) Pomey, ubi ſupra, pag. 218, 219.

(35) He cites Lactantius, without mentioning the book, and Valerius Maximus, *lib. ii, cap. v*, where he ſays nothing of the Floral Games; and Ovid in the fourth *Faſto* inſtead of the fifth.

F L O R A.

FLORA, a famous courtezan of Rome, was paſſionately loved by Pompey, and had ſo great value for him, that ſhe would never ſubmit to the preſſing ſolicitations of another gallant (*a*), till Pompey himſelf interceded for him. Pompey did this, becauſe that other gallant, who was one of his intimate friends, begged a word of recommendation from him to Flora (*b*). From that time Pompey, vexed no doubt at his great intereſt with her, and that he had found ſo much complaiſance, went no more to viſit that miſtreſs, which threw her into ſo deep a melancholly, that ſhe continued a long time ſick of it (*c*). When ſhe grew old, ſhe took a particular pleaſure in telling of the happy hours ſhe had ſpent with Pompey, and even would obſerve that ſhe never left his arms without being bit by him [*A*]. Plutarch obſerves, that Pompey had

(*a*) His name was Geminius.

(*b*) Plutarch. in Pompeio, init. pag. 619.

(*c*) Τοῦτο δὲ αὐτὴν οὐχ ἑταιρικῶς ἐνεγκεῖν ἀλλὰ πολὺν ὑπὸ λύπης καὶ πόθου χρόνον νοσῆσαι. Id ſe non meretricia levitate tuliſſe, verum ex mœrore & deſiderio perdiu ægrotaſſe. *Plutarch. in Pomp. pag.* 619.

[*A*] *Without being bit by him.*] Girac affirms that Amiot did not underſtand this Greek of Plutarch, Φλώραν δὲ τὴν ἑταίραν ἔφασαν ἤδη πρεσβυτέραν οὖσαν ἐπιεικῶς ἀεὶ μνημονεύειν τῆς γενομένης αὐτῇ πρὸς τὸν Πομπήϊον ὁμιλίας, λέγουσαν ὡς οὐκ ἦν ἐκείνῳ συναναπαυσαμένην, ἀδήκτως ἀπελθεῖν. Amiot's tranſlation amounts to this: *It is alſo reported that Flora the courtezan, when ſhe grew old, took a great deal of pleaſure to ſpeak frequently of the familiarity ſhe had in her younger days with Pompey, ſaying it was impoſſible when ſhe lay with him to leave him without biting him.* This is not the ſenſe of the original. The Latin tranſlator has not been more exact. *Floram meretricem ajunt natu jam grandiorem fere ſemper commemorantem ſuam cum Pompejo conſuetudinem, dicere ſolitam non potuiſſe ſe ab illius concubitu ſine aculeo diſcedere.* I am not the firſt who made this remark againſt Amiot; I have read the ſame in Girac's reply, where he cenſures his antagoniſt for having compared *his teeth to thoſe of the fair Roman lady, who loved Pompey, and who never left him without fondly biting of him.* He cenſures Coſtar in the following manner. ‘This application betrays a great deal of ignorance; for it was not Flora who bit Pompey, but Pompey who bit Flora, as the Greek text has it in very preciſe and intelligible words. If Mr Coſtar does not underſtand that language, and if his Amiot has deceived him, ſhould not the ſequel of the diſcourſe have ſet him right; for what reaſon would ſo judicious an author as Plutarch have obſerved, in the perſon of Flora, a laſciviouſneſs common to women of her profeſſion? his buſineſs was only to draw Pompey's charecter, to enter into his private life, and give poſterity an account of the moſt ſecret motions of ſo illuſtrious a commander (1).’ Mr de Girac was not ſatisfied with this criticiſm only, and he was in the right of it; it was more neceſſary to ſhew the moral fault his adverſary was guilty of. Therefore he ſharply reproaches him *with not being aſhamed to compare himſelf with a courtezan ſo famous in the Roman hiſtory for her proſtitutions.* He thinks it ſtrange that an archdeacon and prieſt ſhould *have learned from that leud woman, the fine art of biting gallantly.* As for him he congratulates himſelf, *that he was not under the ſlavery of love, ſince he is a maſter full of rage and fury* (2). *Which rage,* continues he, *as Lucretius ſays, never appears with more tranſport than in the enjoyment of the vileſt pleaſures; it urges them on to wound, and bite thoſe they love moſt. The poets often mention theſe bitings.*

Quod petiere premunt arcte, faciuntque dolorem
Corporis, & dentes inlidunt ſæpe labellis,
Oſculaque adfigunt, quia non eſt pura voluptas:
Et ſtimuli ſubſunt, qui inſtigant lædere id ipſum
Quodcumque eſt, rabies unde illæ hæc germina ſurgunt. *

He ſtrains at all, and faſt'ning where he ſtrains,
Too cloſely preſſes with his frantic pains:
With biting kiſſes hurts the twining fair,
Which ſhews his joys imperfect, unſincere;
For ſtung with inward rage he flings around,
And ſtrives to avenge the ſmart on that which gave the wound.

Immediately after he ſpeaks of Flora and Pompey.

The poets are not the only perſons who mention theſe bitings. Cicero entertained the court with them in one of his pleadings againſt Verres. He affirmed that, if the accuſed would ſhow his breaſt, there would appear, not thoſe glorious ſcars which brave men receive in the wars, but ſuch as leud perſons get in the exerciſe of infamous pleaſures. ‘Hic ſcilicet eſt metuendum ne ad exitum defenſionis tuæ (3), vetus illa Antoniana dicendi ratio atque autoritas proferatur, ne excitetur Verres, ne denudetur à pectore, ne cicatrices populus Romanus aſpiciat ex mulierum morſu veſtigia libidinis atque nequitiæ (4). —— *Here it is to be dreaded, leſt, at the cloſe of your defence, the Antonian method and authority of ſpeaking ſhould be introduced, leſt his breaſt ſhould be laid bare, leſt the Roman people ſhould behold thoſe ſcars, the marks of female teeth, received in leud embraces, and the war of luſt.*’ Thoſe who have a mind to ſee ſeveral paſſages of the poets concerning theſe bitings, may conſult Dionyſius Lambinus's commentary upon the following words in the XIIIth ode of the firſt book of Horace.

Sive puer furens
Impreſſit memorem dente labris notam.
Non, ſi me ſatis audias,
Speres perpetuum, dulcia barbarè
Lædentem oſcula, quæ Venus
Quinta parte ſui nectaris imbuit.

When on thoſe paſſive lips the marks I find
Of frantic boiling kiſſes left behind,
How fond's the hope, how fooliſh and how vain,
Of laſting love from the ungrateful ſwain!
Who that ſoft lip ſo roughly can invade,
And hurt with cruel joy the tender maid.
Quickly they 're glutted who ſo fierce devour;
They ſuck the nectar, and throw by the flower.

GLANVILLE.

Not that this author has collected together all that the poets have ſaid of this matter: perhaps he has omitted more than he has quoted. I have obſerved that among other paſſages he forgot that of Auſonius, concerning the amorous fury of certain Eunuchs. The Jeſuit Theophilus Raynaud remembered it well (5): ‘S. Baſilius l. de vera virgin. *ſub finem* diſtinguit duplicem eunuchiſmum factitium. Unum quo exſcinditur tota virilitas . . . . alium quo ſoli didymi auferuntur. Priores Eunuchos negat S. Baſilius (6) . . De poſterioribus ait, eos acrius atque ardentius inflammari libidine, & impatientiſſimè ferri ad complexum. Et cum obſtructis per exciſionem ſuperioribus meatibus, non poſſint humorem in lumbis inflammatum emittere: non alleviantur per complexum, ut ii quibus vaſa ſunt integra & expedita; & emiſſione concupiſcentiæ flagrantis remittunt ardorem; ſed pruritu aſſiduo ſtimulati, aguntur in rabiem, nec deſiſtunt donec fatigatio caſſos conatus diſturbet. Probat hoc S. Baſilius, gemino ſuæ ætatis exemplo, quorum alterum eſt de faſſa ingenuè Virgine ſacra, ſpurcum Eunuchum totum toti affuſum, cum non haberet, qui œſtrum concupiſcentiæ ſedaret, ardentem rabiem morſibus ac infixis dentibus indicaſſe. Annuit Auſonius epigr. 160 (7) ſic canens.

Deſectos ſic fama viros, ubi caſſa libido
Fœmineos cœtus, & non ſua bella laceſcit
Irrita vexato conſumere gaudia lecto;
Titillata brevi cum jam ſub fine voluptas
Fervet, & ingeſto peragit ludibria morſu.

See what is ſaid upon this ſubject in the remark [*D*] of the article ADONIS; and the remark [*A*] of the article LAMIA the courtezan.

---

(1) Girac, Replique, Sect. viii, pag. m. 73.

(2) Id. pag. 72.

* Lucret. lib. iv, ver. 1072.

(3) Cicero directs his ſpeech to Hortenſius, the advocate of Verres.

(4) Cicero, in Verrem, lib. v, cap. xiii.

(5) In Tractatu de Eunuchis, cap. v, paragr. ii, n. 12, pag. m. 143.

(6) You may find matter wherewith to fill up this chaſm in citat. (14 of the article *COMBABUS*.

(7) In my edition of Auſonius, which is that of Amſterdam, 1671, theſe verſes are in the 108th Epigram.

had a particular talent of obtaining the love of women [*B*], and that Flora was ſo beautiful, that Cecilius Metellus got her picture drawn, in order to conſecrate it with ſome others in the temple of Caſtor and Pollux (*d*). This was neither the firſt nor the laſt time that the picture of a courtezan has had the like honour [*C*]. I know not whether this action of Cecilius Metellus did not contribute to the error mentioned in the preceeding article, in which I ſhewed that Lactantius was in the wrong to ſay the Floral games were celebrated in honour of a courtezan. A modern author, who no doubt was not ignorant of Lactantius's error, has not however totally avoided the ſame [*D*]. I ſhall obſerve whence Montagne had been informed *that Flora the courtezan yielded herſelf to none leſs than a Dictator, or Conſul, or Cenſor, and* that *her pleaſure aroſe*

A phyſician of Paris, much better ſkilled in the Greek tongue than Coſtar, is miſtaken no leſs than he in the paſſage in Plutarch. ' Sic Flora, *ſays he* (8), ' nobile apud Romanos ſcortum, & forma egregia, ' cum ardentius Pompeium Magnum tum adoleſcentem deperiret, dicere ſolebat (ut quidem refert Plutarchus) nunquam ſe ab ejus amplexibus diſcedere potuiſſe niſi corpore ejuſdem demorſo. —— *So Flora,* ' ſays he, *a renowned courtezan of Rome of exquiſite* ' *beauty, and paſſionately enamoured of Pompey, who* ' *was then young, uſed, as Plutarch informs us, to ſay,* ' *that ſhe did never quit his embraces without leaving* ' *the mark of her teeth upon his body.*' Note, he obſerves ſome very curious things upon the brutality of love, and inſinuates that it urges not only to bite the beloved object, but alſo to deſire to eat it. He applies to this a paſſage in Plato, where love is compared to hunger, and to the eagerneſs wherewith wolves hunt after lambs. Τὴν ἐραςȣ̃ φιλίαν, ὅτι ȣ̓ μετ' εὐνοίας γίγνεται, ἀλλὰ σιτίȣ τρόπον, χάριν ϖλησμονῆς, *&c.* Amatoris amicitiam, non benevolentia ulla, ſed aviditate quadam expletionis velut cibi conſtare, *&c* (9). —— *The affection of a lover conſiſts not in benevolence, but, like hunger, in the gratification of the ſenſes.*

[*B*] *Pompey had a particular talent of obtaining the love of Women.*] He proves it both by the teſtimony of Flora, and the behaviour of his wife Julia. She was a young woman married to a Man, not young, and yet loved him paſſionately. Pompey ſecured this affection both by his ſtrict adherence to his conjugal faith and by his engaging manner towards the fair ſex. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ τȣ̃το λέγεται, καὶ περιϐόητον ἦν τῆς κόρης τὸ φίλανδρον, ȣ̓ καθ' ὥραν ϖοθȣ́σης τὸν Πομπήϊον. ἀλλ' αἴτιον ἔοικεν ἥτε σωφροσύνη τȣ̃ ἀνδρὸς εἶναι, μόνην γινώσκοντος τὴν γεγαμημένην, ἥτε σεμνότης, ȣ̓κ ἄκριτον ἀλλ' εὔχαριν ἔχȣσα τὴν ὁμιλίαν καὶ μάλιςα γυναικῶν ἀγωγὸν, εἰ δεῖ μηδὲ Φλῶραν ἁλῶναι τὴν ἑταίραν ψευδομαρτυριῶν. Nam ea quoque fama eſt, celebratuſque fuit illius in virum amor: non quòd propter ætatis florem Pompeji deſiderio flagraret, verùm in cauſa videtur illius continentia fuiſſe unam cognoſcentis uxorem: & ſeveritas non cum auſtera ſed jucunda conjuncta converſatione, quæ duceret imprimis mulieres: niſi meretrix damnanda Flora falſi teſtimonii ſit (10). —— *Her affection for her huſband was greatly extolled, not that ſhe was captivated by his youth; the cauſe appears to be his conjugal fidelity, and the winning complaiſance of his converſation, which had a mixture of majeſty and ſweetneſs, if the teſtimony of Flora, his miſtreſs, may be credited.*

[*C*] *This was not the only time that the picture of a courtezan has had the like honour.*] Venus riſing out of the ſea was the picture of Campaſpe, miſtreſs to Alexander the great (11), or elſe that of the courtezan Phryné (12). See the article APELLES (13). Whilſt Phryné was young, ſhe ſerved for an original to all thoſe who drew the goddeſs Venus (14). The Venus of Cnidus was copied from the face of a courtezan, whom Praxiteles was paſſionately fond of (15). Pliny mentions a painter, who always drew the goddeſſes after ſome or other of his miſtreſſes. ' Fuit ' Arellius, *ſays he* (16), Romæ celeber, paulo ante divum Auguſtum, niſi flagitio inſigni corrupiſſet artem ' ſemper alicujus fœminæ amore flagrans, & ob id ' Deas pingens, ſed dilectarum imagine. —— *Arellius,* ſays he, *was eminent at Rome, a little before* ' *the time of Auguſtus Cæſar; but he baſely proſtituted* ' *his art, being always mad after one woman or other,* ' *and for that reaſon painting goddeſſes in the form* ' *of his favourites.*' Nor are the chriſtians free from this licentiouſneſs. See the theſis of Voetius (17), where you have theſe words. ' Quid factum ſit aperit Molanus (18) *in libro de Picturis ſacris, cap.* ' 29. . . . . Viſæ inquit quandoque in locis ubi non ' decuit divorum imagines viventium adhuc hominum ' ora vultuſque referre, ut hoc umbratico velamento ' illorum quos amabant effigie *paſcerent oculos.* Ad quas ' ſelectas & procaciter venuſtas formas pingi ſolere ' imagines deïparæ Virginis probe norunt pictores. ' —— *Molanus, in his* Treatiſe of holy Paintings, *ſhews* ' *what practices have been uſed. Pictures, ſays he,* ' *have been ſeen in very improper places, repreſenting* ' *ſaints, whoſe features have exactly anſwered to thoſe* ' *of perſons ſtill living, that under this ſymbolical dreſs* ' *they might feed their eyes with the effigies of thoſe* ' *they loved. From what ſelect and beautiful, but diſhoneſt originals, the pictures of the virgin mother have* ' *been drawn, painters well know.*' I ſhall conclude with a paſſage out of the News from the Republic of Letters. ' The author (19) . . . . explains a medal of ' Julian the apoſtate, upon which on one ſide is ſeen ' Serapis, perfectly reſembling Julian, and on the other ' the figure of an *Hermanubis.* It was no unuſual ' thing to ſee ſtatues of men altogether like thoſe of ' ſome God. Flattery or vanity has often been the ' cauſe of this diſorder. Pliny mentions a painter ' who always drew the goddeſſes like the miſtreſſes, ' he was in love with. This might give Juſtin Martyr occaſion to ſay, laughing at the pagans, that ' they worſhipped their painters miſtreſſes. But I ' know not whether it is very fair to make the heathens ' reſponſable for the fancies of a Zeuxis, or a Lyſippus. What would be ſaid of a man that ſhould pretend, that thoſe, who believe they worſhip the image ' of St Charles Borromeo, worſhip nothing but a ' picture made at pleaſure, and the caprice of a painter? I ſay this becauſe, tho' that ſaint was very homely, he is painted very handſome †. This is an unavoidable thing in all religions where images are uſed: ' you muſt ſubmit to the licence of workmen, and ' muſt depend upon them for the air and ſhape of the ' objects of devotion ‡. *Deos ea facie novimus quâ* ' *pictores & fictores voluerunt. We know the gods* ' *only by ſuch faces as the painters and ſculptors pleaſe* ' *to give them,* ſaid the men of ſenſe among the pagans. Yet this ought not to encourage ſuch abuſes: ' for inſtance, it was not to be born, that the image ' of the Virgin ſhould be made at Rome from the ' picture and reſemblance of a ſiſter to Pope Alexander VI ‡, who was indeed very beautiful, but ' not very virtuous (20).' See the remark [*E*] of the article DURER.

[*D*] *A modern author . . . . has not wholly avoided Lactantius's error.*] This modern is la Mothe le Vayer. Theſe are his words which tend to ſhow, that all things are but opinion, and that it is by this, and not by a natural and immutable law, that vice differs from virtue. ' None, *ſays he* (21), but common ' whores and Hortacio's wenches are infamous among ' us; a Laïs, a Rhodope, an Acca Laurentia, who ' leaves money enough to make the Roman people her ' heirs, a Flora, a Fauſtina, deſerve temples and altars. ' The moſt celebrated of the Egyptian pyramids was ' built in honour of a king's daughter, who deſired ' only one ſtone of each of thoſe who lay with her, ' with which notwithſtanding ſhe built that prodigious ' edifice, after ſhe had inriched her father Ethiops by ' that pretty paſtime,' It is plain he did not believe, that the courtezan Flora made the Roman people her heirs, for he aſcribes this action only to Laurentia. Yet he ſuppoſes that Flora, one of the goddeſſes of Rome, had been a famous courtezan: but this is a miſtake: This is endeavouring to ſupport the building when the foundation is ruined. There is no other courtezan Flora, but that mentioned by Lactantius, and ſhe who loved

---

(*d*) Plutarch. ibid.

(8) Petrus Petitus, de Natura & Morib. Anthropophag. pag. 107.

(19) Plato, in Phædro, apud Petitum, ibid. pag. 108.

(10) Plutarch. in Pompeio, pag. 647. B.

(11) Plin. lib. xxxv, cap. x.

(12) Athen. lib. xiii.

(13) Remarks [*C*] and [*G*].

(14) Arnob. lib. vi, pag. 199.

(15) Id. ibid. pag. 198.

(16) Lib. xxxv, cap. x.

(17) Vol. IV, pag 429. I know not whether this whole paſſage is Molanus's, but I ſuſpect that all that is after *paſcerent oculos* is Voetius's.

(18) *He cites in the margin, as Voëtius ſays,* Fredericus Scenckius à Tautenburch ultimus Epiſcopus Ultrajectinus libro de Imaginibus, cap. xii, xiii.

(19) *Viz.* Dr Spon. See his *Miſcellanea Erudita Antiquitatis,* pag. 13.

† Vavaſſor, de Forma Chriſti, pag. 200.

‡ Cicero, de Nat. Deor. I.

‡ Rabelais, Epitre xv.

(20) Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, Septemb. 1685, art. x, pag. 1028.

(21) Dialog. I, of Oraſius Tubero, pag. m. 46, 47.

aroſe from the dignity of her lovers (e) [*E*]. Brantome has refined upon Montagne, and ſaid many things without foundation [*F*].

loved Pompey. The latter did not come into the world till after the inſtitution of the Floral games, and we have ſeen (22) that the other did not inſtitute them. Our modern author did not pretend that ſhe left her eſtate to the Roman commonwealth. Where then did he find the apotheoſis of a courtezan named Flora?

[*E*] *I ſhall obſerve whence Montagne had it .... that her pleaſure aroſe from the dignity of her lovers.*] Horace cenſures certain debauchees for following the ſame maxims (23). See alſo Perſeus's *Patriciæ immeiat vulvæ*, towards the end of the laſt ſatire. We ſhall ſee, in the following remark, that a very late writer (24) furniſhed Montagne with this fine particular.

[*F*] *Brantome has ..... ſaid many things without any foundation.*] He ſays (25) that the courtezan Flora 'was of a good family and extraction, and in this 'was more commendable than Laïs, who, like a common ſtrumpet, abandoned herſelf to every body; 'but Flora only to the great, ſo that ſhe wrote over 'her door, let none but kings, princes, dictators, 'conſuls, cenſors, pontiffs, queſtors, embaſſadors, and 'other great lords come in. Laïs would always be paid 'before hand, but Flora not; ſaying ſhe behaved thus 'to great men, that they might alſo act by her as 'great and illuſtrious perſons; and that thus a woman 'of great beauty and high birth will always be eſteemed according to the value ſhe ſets upon herſelf. 'She took only what was freely given her, ſaying 'that a well bred lady ought to oblige her lovers out 'of pure love, and not avarice, becauſe every thing 'had a price upon it but love. In a word, ſhe 'made love genteely in her time, and was ſo gallantly ſerved, that when ſhe went abroad ſometimes to 'take a walk in the city, ſhe furniſhed diſcourſe for 'a month, both for her beauty, her fine and rich 'dreſs, her majeſtic air, her grace, and for the train 'of courtiers, admirers, and great lords, who were following her as true ſlaves, all which ſhe endured very 'patiently; and foreign embaſſadors, when they returned to their country, took more pleaſure in telling 'of the beauty and charms of the lovely Flora, than of 'the grandeur of the Roman commonwealth, and particularly of her great liberality, contrary to the common temper of ſuch ladies; but ſhe was ſomething 'extraordinary, being nobly deſcended. In fine, ſhe 'died ſo rich, that her eſtate in money, rich goods, 'and jewels, was enough to rebuild the walls of Rome, 'and pay the public debts. She made the Roman people her chief heirs, for which cauſe a ſtately temple 'was erected to her at Rome, which from Flora was 'called Florian.' Theſe are meer fictions, and come from the mint of Don Antonio de Guevara, an author more guilty this way than our new romance writers, how great ſoever their faults may be that way.

FLORIMONT (GALEACIUS) Diſciple of Auguſtin Niphus, lived a long time at Paris in the quality of agent to Anthony Colonna, and made himſelf known to the learned men, who at that time were formed in the ſchool of James Faber Stapulenſis. He publiſhed in Italian a treatiſe of morality, and was made biſhop of Seſſa (*a*). Fracaſtor dedicates one of his poetical pieces to Marc Antony Flaminius, and to Galeacius Florimont, and thereby ſhews that they applied themſelves to the ſtudy of divinity.

[*A*] *Fracaſtor .... ſhews that M. A. Flaminius and Florimont applied themſelves to the ſtudy of divinity.*] Thus the poem begins:

Dum vos fatidicos vates, arcanaque ſenſa
Volvitis, atque animum cœleſti nectare alentes,
Alloquiis, magnoque Dei conſueſcitis ori,
Fælices Duce Gibberto, Campenſe Magiſtro:
Quid dicam miſerum me agere, & quam ducere
vitam, &c. (1)

Whilſt you revolve each ſage by heaven inſpir'd,
And, their myſterious ſenſe exploring, feed
Your ſouls with Nectar, from the ſacred page:
Whilſt you, by Gibbert and Campenſis taught,
To heav'n aſpiring, with your God converſe,
What ſhall I ſay, I do? how paſs my days!

FONTARABIA, a city of Spain on the river of Bidaſſo, near the ſea, was built, they ſay, by king Suintilla [*A*]. Alphonſus IX, king of Caſtile, took it from Sanchez, king of Navarre (*a*), and granted the inhabitants the ſame privileges that king Sanchez his father had granted to the city of St Sebaſtian. Some pretend that Fontarabia was formerly a city of Guienne under the viſcount of Bayonne (*b*). It's ſituation on this ſide of the Pyrenean mountains favours their opinion: Beſides that, in eccleſiaſtical matters, it was under the biſhop of Bayonne till the year 1571 (*c*). See in Moreri an account of the taking this town by the French in the reign of Francis I, the ſuccours they threw into it, and the cowardice of the governor, who ſurrendered it to the Spaniards. Moreri ſhould not have omitted the diſgrace the French ſuffered before this place in the year 1638, two days after the birth of Lewis XIV [*B*]; which no doubt

[*A*] *It was built they ſay by Suintilla.*] Beuterus affirms this, but Oihenhart will not believe it. 'A 'Suintilla Rege Gotho conditam fuiſſe affirmat Beuterus lib. 3. cap. 27. Sed quis credat Beutero ſine 'teſte loquenti in re adeo antiqua, & à noſtro ævo 'remota? mihi certe nulla ſuppetunt argumenta quæ 'huic oppido tantæ vetuſtatis decus concilient (1). '——— *Beuterus affirms, that this town was built 'by Suintilla king of the Goths. But who can 'give credit to Beuterus when he ſpeaks without any authority of a fact ſo remote from our times? at leaſt I 'can meet with no arguments which can induce me to 'believe it has that antiquity.*'

[*B*] *The diſgrace the French ſuffered before this place in 1638, two days after the birth of Lewis XIV.*] This was one of the greateſt diſgraces of the reign of Lewis the juſt, and the miniſtry of cardinal Richlieu. Hear Balzac on this (2): 'Let us never ſpeak 'a word of * * * *. It is the ſhame and ignominy of the French name; it is a day which the Romans would have called *Scelerata*, and we ought to 'call *curſed*. Poſterity muſt abhor it, or rather ſhould 'be kept from the knowledge of it, and we ſhould 'if poſſible efface it from the year one thou'ſand. . . .

Que ce jour ſoit rayé des choſes avenuës
Jupiter le commande aux trois Filles chenuës
Qui tiennent Regiſtre des Temps.

Jove commands the fatal day to be razed out of the records of time.

(e) Montagne, Eſſais, liv iii, chap. iii, pag. m. 71.

(22) In the remarks of the preceding article.

(23) Huic ſi Mutonis verbis mala tanta videntis
Diceret hæc animus, quid vis tibi? nunquid ego à te
Magno prognatum depoſco conſule cunnum,
Velatumque ſtola, mea cum conferbuit ira?
Hor. Sat. II, lib. i, ver. 68.

(24) Antoine de Guevara.

(25) Vie des Dames Galantes, Tom. I, pag. 313, & ſeq.

(*a*) *Taken from* Naudé, in Judicio de Auguſt. Nipho, pag. 41.

(1) Fracaſtor. pag. 68, Carmin. *Edit. Genev.* 1637.

(*a*) Oihenart, Notitia Vaſconiæ, pag. 168.

(*b*) Baudrand, Geograph. pag. 397.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

(1) Oihenart, Notitia Vaſconiæ, pag. 168.

(2) It is a letter he wrote to Chapelain, the eleventh of the third book. He has put aſteriſks in ſeveral places to leave the reader in the dark. I am confident, for the ſame reaſon, he has put a falſe date at the bottom of the letter. He has made it the 8th of May, inſtead of the 8th of October, 1638, becauſe he would not offend a prince of the blood: it was the prince of Condé, who commanded at the ſiege.

doubt was looked upon as a wonderful omen by the Spaniards [*C*]. Lewis the juſt, and cardinal Richlieu, were exceedingly exaſperated againſt the ſuppoſed authors of that diſgrace [*D*].

Joſeph Moret, a Spaniſh Jeſuit, has written a large account in Latin of this ſiege of Fontarabia. I do not find in the copy I make uſe of (*d*) the year of the impreſſion; but the epiſtle dedicatory being dated from Segovia the twelfth of April 1654, and the approbation of the provincial of the Jeſuits, bearing date the fifth of March 1655, it may be ſuppoſed this work was publiſhed ſoon after the defeat of the French.

‘ There are ſome people to whom fortune owes a grudge, and in whoſe hands the faireſt opportunities miſcarry. When the deſign is to raiſe ſieges and loſe armies, none are fitter to be employed: immediately, all places become Acro-corinths, and all enemies meer Alexanders.’ It is plain that by *the people to whom fortune owes a grudge*, he deſigns to hint at the prince of Condé (3). This was ſaying gravely and reſpectfully the jeſt of the ſong. *He will take Fontarabia, Zeſt, juſt as he took Dole* (4).

[*C*] *Which no doubt was looked upon as a wonderful omen by the Spaniards.*] Without doubt their poets and orators ſet off the circumſtance of the time with all poſſible pomp: a ſignal triumph, a compleat victory, two days after (5) the birth of a Dauphin, France had been ſo many years waiting for. What auſpicious omen this for Spain! what may ſhe not expect under the reign of a French prince, the firſt days of whoſe life are made memorable by a battle moſt glorious to the Spaniards, moſt ſhameful to France? perhaps the firſt courier that arrived at the court of France, after the Dauphin's birth, was he that brought the fatal news of the ſiege of Fontarabia being raiſed: what a horoſcope! O happy preſage for the Spaniſh monarchy! I am ſure that all the poetic ſallies of the Spaniſh writers on this ſubject might fill a volume, and after all what has been the iſſue of all theſe good omens? like the Sybilline oracles written upon leaves, the wind has carried them away (6). All poetical pens, whether they write in proſe or verſe, ſhould know that it is not their buſineſs to prophecy. The queen of France was delivered of a prince, juſt at the time when expreſs after expreſs brought an account of the progreſs of Lewis XIVth's arms in Holland in 1672. Upon which what did not the French poets ſay? what triumphs did they not promiſe a prince who was born in the midſt of ſo much good news? and yet he lived but a little while.

For the reſt, a certain Jeſuit (7) makes uſe of the thought of a heathen author to excuſe the ſiege of Fontarabia being raiſed. *The king's good genius*, ſays he (8), *was ſo buſy at St Germain's that ſhe could not be at Fontarabia.* He meant that that good genius was wholly employed upon the birth of the Dauphin. Plutarch ridicules this thought. ‘ Alexander, *ſays he* (9), was born the ſixth of June, the very day when Diana's temple at Epheſus was burnt, as Hegeſias, the Magneſian, relates, who makes an exclamation upon it, and a witticiſm cold enough to have quenched the conflagration of that temple. For no wonder, *ſays he*, Diana let her temple be burnt, being ſufficiently buſy to midwife Alexander into the world.’ Plutarch's taſte here is very different from Cicero's: ‘ Concinnè ut multa Timæus, qui cum in hiſtoria dixiſſet qua nocte natus Alexander eſſet eadem Dianæ Epheſiæ templum deflagraviſſe adjunxit, minimè id eſſe mirandum quod Diana cum in partu Olympiadis adeſſe voluiſſet, abfuiſſet domo (10) —— *Timæus, on this occaſion as on many others, ſpeaks very pertinently, who having told us in his hiſtory, that Alexander was born the ſame night that the temple of Diana at Epheſus was burnt, adds, that it was no wonder the goddeſs ſhould be abſent from home, when the labour of Olympias called for her preſence.*’

[*D*] *Lewis XIII and Richlieu were extreamly exaſperated againſt the ſuppoſed authors of that diſgrace.*] The duke de la Valette, eldeſt ſon to the duke d'Epernon, was looked upon as the chief author of that miſcarriage. He durſt not ſurrender himſelf whilſt his conduct was inquired into, but fled into England. The council of ſtate declared him ‘ convict of high treaſon for having baſely and perfidiouſly deſerted the king's ſervice at the ſiege of Fontarabia, and of felony, for going out of the kingdom contrary to the king's orders, and for this he was condemned to loſe his head at the Greve, if he could be taken, or in effigy if he could not, to loſe all his employments, and his eſtate to be confiſcated (11).’ I obſerve that the king cleared him from the charge of cowardice. ‘ The queſtion is not, *ſaid he* (12), either of the cowardice or unskillfulneſs of the duke de la Valette, for I know he wants neither bravery nor capacity, but he would not take Fontarabia.’ Every body was not of Lewis XIIIth's opinion. See the following words of the Menagiana (13). ‘ At the time that Mr d'Eſpernon retired into England, being charged with running away in a fight, Monſ. Peireſc wrote to the great Bignon, and asked him if a man could be condemned to death for want of courage. Monſ. Bignon anſwered that there was no law upon which ſuch a ſentence could be founded. The laws at moſt only condemn to death the firſt that flies, to make an example for the reſt.’ Mr Menage's memory, as good as it was, failed him here; for Mr Peireſc died fifteen months (14) before the defeat at Fontarabia more or leſs: and it is certain the duke de la Valette retired into England meerly on account of that defeat. After all, what the king ſaid is more probable, and it was not upon this occaſion alone, that hatred to the cardinal had coſt that monarch the loſs of a battle. There was no criminal attempt, the enemies of that prelate did not practiſe. They wiſhed ſucceſs to the Spaniards, and ſometimes procured it for them, purely with a view to ruin the cardinal, who could never have maintained his credit unleſs the king's arms had been ſucceſsful. But here is another fault. His creatures ſometimes loſt a battle out of complaiſance to him; at leaſt it was ſuſpected the marſhal de Grammont ſuffered himſelf to be routed at Honnecour, in order to do him ſervice (15). The cardinal was retired from court: what could be more for his intereſt, than to put the affairs of the kingdom into confuſion? was not this the way to have it ſaid, that as ſoon as he quitted the helm, every thing went ill? and was not this the means to have him recalled, that he might remedy what had happened amiſs in his abſence? thus the happineſs of a whole people, and even the honour of princes, are ſacrificed to the intereſt of a miniſter.

FONTE (MODERATA). Under this name a Venetian lady has publiſhed her works. Her true name was *Modeſto Pozzo* (*a*). She is author of a poem intituled *il Floridoro*, and of another Italian poem upon the paſſion and reſurrection of JESUS CHRIST. Beſides this poem, and divers others, ſhe publiſhed in proſe a book *de Meriti delle Donne*, in which ſhe maintains, that the female ſex is not inferior to the male ſex. I have taken this from a book intituled *Le Coſe notabili & maraviglioſe della Città di Venetia, gia riformate & accommodate da Leonico Goldioni, & hora grandemente ampliate da Zuanne Zittio.* See there page 311 of the Venice edition 1655. I was ſurprized that there is no mention of the year of the birth or death of this lady, nor any other circumſtance of her life; but I have found elſewhere ſomething to ſupply this defect [*A*]. See

[*A*] *There is no circumſtance of her life in the* Coſe notabili . . . . di Venetia . . . . *but this defect is ſupplied elſewhere.*] Father Hilarion de Coſte informs me that this lady (1) was born at Venice in 1555;

(*d*) It is a book in 16mo, of 467 pages.

(3) He was grand father to the prince of Condé, living this preſent year, 1695.

(4) See Richelet's dictionary, at the word *Zeſt.*

(5) The ſeventh of September, 1638.

(6) Foliis tantum ne carmina manda
Ne turbata volent rapidis ludibria ventis.
Virgil. Æneid. lib. vi, ver. 74.

(7) Named Joſſet. See the letter Balzac wrote to him. It is the fifteenth of the third book, of the *Lettres choiſies.*

(8) Balzac mentions this in the ſaid letter. See *Coſtar's Apology, pag.* 92.

(9) In the life of Alexander, near the beginning.

(10) Cicero, de Nat. Deorum, lib. ii, cap. xxvii.

(11) Hiſtory of Cardinal Richelieu, printed at Amſterdam, 1694, *Tom. II, pag.* 364, 365.

(12) Id. p. 364.

(13) Pag. 259, of the firſt Dutch Edition.

(14) The 24th of June, 1637. See Gaſſendus, in his Life, pag. m. 347, 349.

(15) Whoever reads the *Memoires de Puyſégur*, where this battle of Honnecour is deſcribed (It is pag. m. 234, & *ſeq.*), cannot help thinking the marſhal Grammont had orders to loſe the day.

(*a*) She preſerved the ſenſe of her name under the word *Fonte*, which anſwers to *Pozzo*, and that of *moderata*, which anſwers to *modeſta*.

(1) *He calls her* Modeſta Pozzo di Zorzi.

See the remark. Mr Moreri, under the word *Puy*, relates ſomething concerning this illuſtrious woman.

1555; *that ſhe loſt her father and mother, the firſt year of her life; that in her youth ſhe was put into the nunnery of St Martha of Venice; that ſhe learned with great eaſe poetry and the Latin tongue; that ſhe had ſo excellent a memory, that when ſhe had heard a ſermon ſhe could repeat it word by word; that her book* of the merit of women *was publiſhed preſently after her death; that ſhe was honourably married to* Philip de Georgiis, and *lived twenty years with him in great harmony, after which ſhe died in childbed the firſt of November* 1592; that her husband *erected a monument to her upon which was engraved this epitaph:* ‘Modeſtæ à Puteo fœminæ doctiſſimæ, quæ varios virtutis partus Moderatæ Fontis nominæ rhytmis Etruſcis (quibus memoranda cecinit) & ſermone continuo feliciter enixa, naturæ partum dum ederet, puellæ vitam, ſibi verò mortem (proh dolor) aſcivit. Philippus de Georgiis Petri in officio ſuper aquis, pro ſereniſſ. Do. publici jura defendens, amantiſſimæ conjugi P. obiit anno Domini 1592 Kal. Novemb.’ *That John Nicholas Doglioni has written the life of this lady in Italian in* 1593; *that father Peter Paul Ribera made a panegyric upon this learned heroine in his* theatre of learned women; and that *N. di Zorzi her daughter wrote a preface to her works* (z).

FONTEVRAUD, or rather **FRONTEVAUX** [*A*], a famous abbey in the dioceſe of Poitiers and province of Anjou, acknowledges for it's founder **ROBERT D'ARBRISSEL**. We promiſed to ſay ſomething here of this perſon, and ſhall now perform it. He was born about the year 1047, in the village of Arbriſſel (*a*), ſeven leagues from Rennes. In 1074 he went to Paris, where he was made doctor of divinity. A certain biſhop of Rennes, who, though he was not learned, yet was a lover of learned men [*B*], and beſtowed upon them employments, called him back into Bretagny, about the year 1085, and conferred upon him the dignity of Arch-Prieſt and Official, and had the pleaſure to ſee him oppoſe the licentiouſneſs which infeſted his dioceſe. The quarrels, ſimony, and fornication of the clergy, had introduced ſtrange confuſion there. After labouring four years to extirpate theſe diſorders, Robert, finding himſelf expoſed by the death of his biſhop, to the ill will of the Canons, who were not at all pleaſed with his reforming ſpirit (*b*), bent his thoughts another way. He went to teach divinity at Angers; but he grew ſo weary of the world, on account of the corruption of manners, which he found prevailed every where, that he retired into a deſert (*c*). The auſtere life he led there was ſoon known, and many perſons reſorted to him, both to hear, and ſee a ſaint. Some of theſe he kept with him, and, about the year 1094, began to form a ſort of a college of regular canons. Urban II, being in France two years after, heard ſo good a character of him that he ſent for him, and, being deſirous to hear him preach, ordered him to pronounce a ſermon at the dedication of a church (*d*). He was ſo edified by it, that he created him apoſtolical preacher. The baron de Craon was ſo moved with the ſermon, that the next day he founded an abbey, and gave it to Robert (*e*). The new abbot diſcharged the functions of that office till the year 1098. Then he conſidered that his character of apoſtolical preacher did not allow him to be always confined to the ſame place with his regular canons; wherefore he renounced his abbey and travelled from place to place in order to exerciſe his talent of preaching. Having done this for two years, followed by a great multitude of men and women, he reſolved to reſt, and to fix his tabernacles in the foreſt of Frontevaux. In this place he wanted nothing; people from all ſides zealouſly ſupplying all manner of neceſſaries for the ſubſiſtance of the devout ſouls he had about him. So that he was very ſoon in a condition to give alms of what was over and above what he wanted. We muſt not forget that, at the ſame time, there were two other famous preachers who agreed with him to divide the two

ſexes

[*A*] *Or rather* FRONTEVAUX] The Latin name in all the ancient charters is *Fons-Ebraldi* (1). According to that original, it ſhould be called *Fontevraux*, and ſome call it ſo. But Mr Menage affirms *it ſhould be called* Frontevaux, *as the inhabitants of Anjou and Poitou call it.* The letter *r* has been inſerted here as in the word *fronde* derived from the Latin *funda*, and in the word *fromage* derived from *formaticum*. It is long ſince this letter was inſerted; for we find in Sivigni's chronicle, page 317: ‘Anno Domini 1189 obiit Henricus Rex Angliæ, octavis Apoſtolorum Petri & Pauli, & ſepultus eſt apud Fronteval (2). —— *In the year* 1189 *died Henry king of England, on the octaves of St Peter and Paul, and was interred at Frontevaux.*

[*B*] *A biſhop of Rennes . . . . not learned, but a lover of learned men.*] His name was Silveſter de la Guerche, and he had carried arms againſt Conan duke of Bretagny (3). Here is what is ſaid of him in the hiſtory of Robert d'Arbriſſel. ‘Licet non litteratus litteratos tamen inhianter complexabatur . . convocabat igitur aliunde ſi quos poterat litteratos, quod hominum genus Britannia tunc habebat rariſſimum (4). —— *Tho' not a man of learning himſelf, he had a great affection for learned men: he therefore got together all the eminent men he could from all parts, which at that time were very ſcarce in Bretagne.*’ Upon the report of this Robert's merit, he invited him into his dioceſe, and made this ingenuous confeſſion to him; ‘Evectione præparata, venerandus Pontifex dirigit Pariſius, & accerſitum taliter alloquitur. Vides inquit, Frater chariſſime, quomodo ſancta Redonenſis Eccleſia mater tua ſine regimine vacillat, hoc præſertim tempore cum me pene Laïcum ei contigerit præeſſe. Eſto igitur, quæſo in reſponſis Eccleſiaſticis noſter interpres, audiam te, & loqueris in me. Poteris procul dubio Dei populo prodeſſe, ſi zelum Dei habens, volueris nobiſcum aliquantulum militare. —— *The venerable prelate having cauſed him to be ſent for, and brought from Paris, ſpoke to him in the following manner. You ſee, ſays he, my dear brother, how the holy church of Rennes, your mother, totters for want of regimen, and more eſpecially at this time when I, almoſt a layman, am placed at the head of it. Be therefore, I entreat you, my interpreter in eccleſiaſtic affairs: I will liſten to your directions, and you ſhall ſpeak by me; you are able, no doubt, to ſerve God's people, if, out of a zeal for his ſervice, you would enliſt for a while under his banner.*’

[*C*] *Two*

(z) *Taken from* Hilarion de Coſte, Eloges des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. II. pag. 717, & *ſeq.*

(*a*) It is now called *Arbreſec.*

(*b*) Baldricus, in vita Rob. Arbriſſ. cap i, n. 10, apud Joann. de la Mainferme, in Clypeo naſcentis Fontebraldenſis Ordinis, Tom. I, p. 317.

(*c*) Corruptiſſimi ſeculi faſtidioſus Robertus in Credonenſe deſertum abſcondit ſe. *Mainferme, ibid.* Tom. II, *pag.* 498.

(*d*) That of St Nicholas at Angers.

(*e*) Mirabili ejus facundia captus illius regionis princeps Baro Credonenſis Abbatiam beatiſſimæ Virgini conſtruxit, cui de Rota cognominatæ Robertum præfecit Abbatem. —— *The baron of Craon, governour of the country, was ſo charmed with his wonderful eloquence, that he founded an abbey to the bleſſed Virgin, which he named* de Rota, *and made Robert abbot of it.* Jo. de la Mainferme, Clypei, Tom. I, pag. 28.

(1) In St Bernard's 200th letter, this place is called *Fons Eberandi.* Menage, Orig de la Langue Françoiſe, pag. 336. Edit. 1694.

(2) Cited by Menage, *ibid.* See alſo his *Hiſtory of Sablé*, *pag.* 89, 90.

(3) Mainferme, in Clypeo naſcentis Fontebraldenſis Ordinis, Tom. II, pag. 47.

(4) Albricus, in vita Roberti Arbriſſ. cap, ii, n. 8, apud Joann. de la Mainferme, ibid. pag. 48.

ſexes, leaving him the care of the women, whilſt they undertook that of the men [C]. No ſooner had he eſtabliſhed good laws in his monaſtery of Frontevaux; but he reſumed his office of itinerant preacher. He ran over ſeveral provinces of France, and particularly Bretagny and Normandy. He did at Roan the greateſt exploit that any man of his profeſſion could poſſibly do; for, by one ſingle exhortation, he converted all the women of pleaſure who were in a place of proſtitution [D], where he entered on purpoſe to preach. In 1104 he aſſiſted at the council of Beaugenci, and ſate among the prelates. During the years 1107, and 1108, he went over the provinces of Anjou, Poitou, and Touraine, diſcharging his office of apoſtolical preacher. Theſe travels, at leaſt, produced this good effect, that the order of Frontevaux was ſpread in all thoſe provinces [E], and found how powerful Pope Paſchal IId's exhortations were. The biſhop of Poitiers went to Rome in 1106, to deſire of his holineſs the confirmation of that order. He obtained a bull of Paſchal II, by which that pontiff declared he would take a particular care of, and put it immediately under the juriſdiction of the holy ſee, and earneſtly exhorted all people to promote this new inſtitution. He confirmed all their privileges by a new bull in the year 1113. The order was already grown pretty numerous; for the founder, as he went preaching through the other provinces of France, did not fail to eſtabliſh convents there (*f*). He perſuaded queen Bertrade

[C] *Two other preachers . . . . agreed . . . . to leave him the care of the women while they took the charge of the men.*] This is an admirable partition, and not to be compared to that of the circumciſion and uncircumciſion, I mean that of St Peter and St Paul, when it was ſaid that St Peter ſhould apply himſelf to the converſion of the Jews, and St Paul to the converſion of the gentiles (5). The three preachers I mention here were Robert d'Arbriſſel, Bernard of Tiron, and Vitalis of Moriton. Let us hear the words of an ancient Hiſtorian. ‘ In tranſmarinis partibus, ſicut à majoribus accepi, tres memorabiles viri uno tempore fuere: ſcilicet Robertus cognominatus de Arbruſculo, Bernardus, & Vitalis. Hi non ignobiliter eruditi, & ſpiritu ferventes, circuibant per caſtella & vicos, ſeminanteſque ſecundum Iſaiam ſuper omnes aquas, de converſione multorum fructus colligebant, pio inter ſe placito conſtituto: quòd Robertus quidem fœminarum communi labore ad meliora converſarum ſollicitudinem gereret; Bernardus vero & Vitalis maribus propenſius providerent. Robertus igitur famoſiſſimum illud Monaſterium fœminarum de Fonte-Ebraldi conſtruxit, & regularibus diſciplinis informavit. Bernardus verò apud Tirocinum, & Vitalis apud Saviniacum Monachis regularitur inſtitutis, ſuos quiſque ab aliis per quaſdam præceptorum proprietates diſtinxit (6). —— *In the tranſmarine parts, as I have been informed, there were at the ſame time three men of diſtinguiſhed characters, namely, Robert ſirnamed d'Arbriſſel, Bernard, and Vitalis, all perſons of great learning, and glowing with zeal; who traverſed the country, ſowing, according to Eſaias, upon all waters; and from the numerous converſions which they made, gathered fruit in abundance; having entered into this pious contract amongſt themſelves; that Robert ſhould take upon himſelf the charge of their female converts, that Bernard and Vitalis ſhould take care of the men. Whereupon Robert founded that famous nunnery at Frontevaux, in which he inſtituted the moſt regular diſcipline. Bernard and Vitalis each inſtituted a regular order of Monks, the firſt at Tiron, the other at Savigny, which they diſtinguiſhed from each other by ſome peculiarities in their precepts.*’ In vain did they repreſent to our Robert the hazard he would run by his zeal to inſtruct the fair ſex: he rejected that advice as an artifice of the devil, and fortified himſelf with the example of St Jerome. ‘ Deſpexit ergo tentatorem, irriſit ejus fallaciam, nec fœminarum abjecit moderationem . . . . divum Hieronymum imitatus, cui inſulſi obloquebantur Ariſtarchi, quòd ſcriberet ad mulieres, eaſque viris anteponeret: quorum cavillationes venuſtiſſimâ & copioſiſſimâ retundit devoti ſexus celebratione ſacris ex literis deductâ (7). —— *He deſpiſed the tempter, bad defiance to his cunning, and perſevered in his female charge . . . . imitating therein St Jerome, who was reviled by certain dealers in defamation, for writing to the women, and preferring them to men, whoſe cavils he refuted in a beautiful and copious encomium upon the fair ſex.*’

[D] *By a ſingle exhortation he converted all the women of pleaſure who were in a place of proſtitution.*] They aſcribe to him a very particular talent for this; and ſince the direction of women was fallen to his lot, it was neceſſary he ſhould chiefly look after the ſcabby ſheep. He went barefoot into the ſtreets and ſquares to exhort women of ill repute to repentance, and he entered into the very ſtews to preſs his admonitions upon them. One day he went into one of thoſe houſes in Roan, and ſat down by the fire to warm his feet. He was preſently ſurrounded by women who imagined he came thither to ſatisfy his luſt; but he immediately began to talk with them of very different things: he preached the word of life to them, and the mercy of the ſon of God. The chiefeſt of them, ſurprized at ſuch language, told him that for five and twenty years that ſhe had frequented that houſe, ſhe had never ſeen any body come in there that had ſpoke of God, or given them any hope of mercy; but that if ſhe could depend upon what he ſaid, ſhe would certainly change her courſe of life; and upon his repeated aſſurances of mercy, ſhe and her companions threw themſelves at Robert's feet, and promiſed to repent. He laid hold of that happy moment, and led them all out of the city into his deſert (8). ‘ In Vita beati Roberti de Arbriſſello legitur, quod Ordinem Sanctimonialium Fontis-Ebraldi inſtituit: & quod nudipes per plateas & vicos ire conſueverat, ut fornicarias ac peccatrices ad medicamentum pœnitentiæ poſſet adducere. Quadam ergo die, cùm veniſſet Rotomagum, Lupanar eſt ingreſſus, ſedenſque ad focum pedes calefacturus, à meretricibus circumdatur, æſtimantes eum causâ fornicandi eſſe ingreſſum. Sed prædicante eo verba vitæ, ac miſericordiam Chriſti eis promittente, una ex meretricibus, quæ cæteris præerat, dixit ei: quis es tu, qui talia loqueris? Scias pro certo, quia per viginti quinque annos, quibus hanc domum ad perpetranda ſcelera ſum ingreſſa, nunquam aliquis huc advenit, qui de Deo loqueretur, vel de ejus miſericordia præſumere nos faceret: tamen ſi ſcirem vera eſſe, *&c* (9).’ It is obſerved in the hiſtory of the works of the learned (10): ‘ That ſeveral other women of this ſort being alſo converted, Robert was forced to make a particular cloiſter for them, which he dedicated to St Mary Magdalen, whilſt he aſſigned another, dedicated to the bleſſed Virgin, to women of virtue and reputation.’ This ſhews the particular talent he had to gain this ſort of creatures (11), and his attachment to the ancient diſpline; for there are ſome fathers who were of opinion that thoſe Nuns, which had been violated, ought to be ſeparated from thoſe who never had that miſfortune (12).

[E] *The order of Frontevaux was ſpread in thoſe provinces.*] During his travels through Anjou, Poitou, and Touraine, in 1107, and 1108, he founded the monaſteries of *Chamſournois*, *Lapuie*, *Loges*, *Relai*, *Gaine*, and *Gironde*. In the year 1110 he went through Berry, and Bretagny, and founded the monaſtery of Orſan, in the dioceſe of Bourges. In the year 1112 he founded three in the dioceſes of Orleans and Poitiers, *la Lande en Beauchene*, *Turon*, and *la Madelaine d'Orleans*. In the year 1114 he preached in the Limoſin, Angoumois, and Perigort, and in the dioceſe of Toulouſe, and founded four monaſteries, *Bourbon*, *la Gaſconiere*, *Cadouin*, and *l'Epinaſſe*. It was at this time

---

(*f*) See the remark [*F*].

(5) *See the* Epiſt. to the Galatians, chap. ii, ver. 7, 8.

(6) Guilelmus Neubrigenſis, lib. i, de Rebus Anglicis, cap. xv, apud Joan. de la Mainferme, Tom. I, pag. 117.

(7) Joan. de la Mainferme, Clypei, Tom. I, pag. 118.

(8) Statim eas de civitate eduxit, & ad eremum cum eis gaudens perrexit, ibique peracta pœnitentia Chriſto fœliciter tranſmiſit. —— *He immediately lead them out of the city, and brought them with joy to his ſolitude, where having fully performed their penitence, he happ ly led them to* CHRIST. Id. ibid pag. 133, ex Codice manuſcripto (anno 1210) Abbatiæ de Vallibus Cernaii (*l'Abbaïe des Vaux de Cernai*) Ordinis Ciſtercienſis Diœceſis Pariſienſis.

(9) Idem, ex eodem Codice.

(10) Month of Auguſt, 1690, pag. 527, in the extracts of the ſecond Tome of the *Clypeus*.

(11) Quæ quidem omnia liquido oſtendunt Robertum ardenti zelo æſtuaſſe, dono ſpeciali præditum fuiſſe ad convertendas mulieres impuras, meretrices, & publicæ libidinis victimas imo de facto plurimas convertiſſe. *Jo. de la Mainferme. Clyp. Tom. I, pag.* 133.

(12) See Pope Leo the Firſt's 85th Letter, cap. ii and v.

Bertrade to take the habit of the order [*F*]; but ſhe did not wear it long; the auſterity of the order ſoon coſt her her life [*G*]. In the year 1115 he found in himſelf a ſenſible decay, and by the advice of ſeveral prelates, abbots, and monks, whom he had aſſembled together, he conferred the generalſhip of the order upon a woman (*g*). This diſpoſition has been very much cenſured [*H*]. The following year he recovered his ſtrength, and went through the dioceſe of Chartres, performing his uſual office of a preacher. He put an end to a diſpute, which ſeveral other perſons had attempted in vain, between Ives, biſhop of Chartres, and Bernard, abbot of Bonneval. He was no leſs ſucceſsful in a difference which happened between the count de Chartres and the canons, concerning the choice of a biſhop after the death of Ives. He fell ſick as he was preaching in the dioceſe of Bourges in 1117, and cauſed himſelf to be carried to the monaſtery of Orſan, where he died a few days after. The archbiſhop of Bourges, attended by his clergy, and a great number of gentlemen and plebeians, accompanied the body to the monaſtery of Frontevaux, where he ſolemnized his funeral twelve days after his deceaſe. The earl of Anjou, the archbiſhop of Tours, the biſhop of Angers, ſeveral abbots, and an incredible number of clergy and people went to meet the body before it came out of the dioceſe of Tours (*b*). Father de la Mainferme (*i*), a monk of Frontevaux, has publiſhed three apolegetical volumes, in which

time that having gone over Languedoc and Guienne, he went into Auvergne, where he had religious conferences with the bleſſed Raingarda the mother of Peter the venerable (13).

[F] *He perſuaded queen Bertrade to take the habit of the order.*] This BERTRADE was the daughter of Simon de Montfort, and ſiſter of Amauri de Montfort earl of Evreux, and of William de Montfort biſhop of Paris. She was brought up in Normandy with her aunt, the counteſs d'Evreux, where Fulk Rechin, earl of Anjou, ſaw her, and fell in love with her. He married her in 1089. In 1092 or 1093, ſhe left him, to marry Philip I, king of France, with whom ſhe had had a *private interview upon Whitſunday eve in the church of* St John de Tours, while the canons of St Martin were bleſſing the fonts of the church. She went to Orleans where the king received her (14), and afterwards married her at Paris. The Pope excommunicated him by his legate in 1094, at the council of Autun, and he himſelf excommunicated him the following year at the council of Clermont. Philip put away Bertrade in 1096, and took her again in 1100: he was excommunicated a-freſh; but both he and ſhe obtained abſolution in 1105, having ‘ ſworn upon the ‘ holy goſpels not to cohabit carnally together, and ‘ never to ſee or ſpeak to one another but in the pre- ‘ ſence of unſuſpected perſons (15).’ The regiſter book of St Nicholas of Angers ſays, ‘ that in 1106, the ‘ ſixth of the ides of October, Philip was at Angers ‘ with Bertrade, and that Rechin received him there ‘ magnificently. No doubt it was at this time that ‘ Bertrade reconciled her two husbands, and made ‘ them a great entertainment, at which ſhe ſerved at ta- ‘ ble, as Orderic writes, who adds that Bertrade con- ‘ tinued with Philip to his death (16).’ It is very probable the Pope approved of their marriage; for their two ſons ‘ were declared capable of ſucceeding to ‘ the crown, as we are informed by Suger in the life ‘ of Lewis the burly. Bertrade had a dowry upon ‘ the demeſnes of the crown . . . . which dowry was ‘ the eſtate of Hautbruiere in the neighbourhood of ‘ Montfort, and in the dioceſe of Chartres, which is ‘ the place where ſhe founded a priory, having been ‘ received a nun at Fronteveaux by R. d'Arbriſſel, and ‘ in this retirement ſhe led an exemplary life to her ‘ death.’ She lived in Anjou after the death of king *Philip, which happened in* 1108. Mr Menage, from whom I borrow this (17), has corrected a prodigious number of faults which he had obſerved in ſeveral hiſtorians concerning this Bertrade. He does not ſay whether or no ſhe lived long after ſhe entered into a religious life; but we learn from William of Malmſbury that ſhe died ſoon after. ‘ Philippus, *ſays he* (18), ‘ in extremo vitæ, tactus morbo monachicum apud ‘ Floriacum accepit habitum (19). Pulchrius & fortu- ‘ natius illa (Bertrada), quod ætate & ſanitate integra, ‘ nec ſpecie rugata apud Fontem Evraldi Sanctimonia- ‘ lium appetiit velum. Nec multò poſt præſenti vitæ ‘ vale fecit: Deo forſitan providente, non poſſe deli- ‘ catæ mulieris corpus religionis laboribus inſervire ‘ —— *Philip*, ſays he, *being in a bad ſtate of health,* ‘ *and near his end, took the monk's habit at Fleury.* ‘ *Bertrade took the veil at Frontevaux with more ho-* ‘ *nour and better fortune, as ſhe did it in full health,* ‘ *and the flower of her age, e'er her charms were im-* ‘ *paired by age. She died ſoon after; the providence of* ‘ *GOD perhaps being mindful, that a woman of ſo de-* ‘ *licate a frame could not ſuſtain the auſterities of a reli-* ‘ *gious life.*’ The converſion of this laſcivious queen did a great deal of honour to Robert. She was ſo artful a woman that ſhe did what ſhe would with the king, and her firſt husband was frequently ſeen at her feet after ſhe had left him, ſaying a thouſand ſubmiſſive things. A baſeneſs equal at leaſt to the abject behaviour of Menelaus. ‘ Amore ejus ita captus eſt ‘ (Philippus) ut illa ſibi in omnibus imperaret, cum ‘ ipſe omnibus imperare cuperet (20). Bertrada vira- ‘ go faceta, & eruditiſſima illius admirandi muliebris ‘ artificii, quo conſueverunt audaces ſuis etiam laceſ- ‘ ſitos injuriis maritos ſuppeditare, Andegavenſem prio- ‘ rem maritum, licet thoro omnino repudiatum, ita ‘ mollificaverat, ut eam tanquam Dominam venerare- ‘ tur, & ſcabello pedum ejus ſæpius reſidens, ac ſi ‘ præſtigio fieret, voluntati ejus omnino obſequeretur ‘ (21). —— *Philip was ſo paſſionately enamoured of* ‘ *her, that ſhe enjoyed an abſolute power over him, tho'* ‘ *he affected an univerſal power over others. Bertrade* ‘ *was a woman of great wit, and ſo exquiſitely skilled in* ‘ *that ſpecies of female cunning, by which the bold are* ‘ *uſed to work upon their husbands when they have un-* ‘ *juſtly provoked them, that ſhe ſo far mollified the duke* ‘ *of Anjou, though ſhe had entirely abandoned his bed,* ‘ *that he revered her as his ſovereign, and often ſitting* ‘ *on her footſtool, as if conſtrained by magic force, en-* ‘ *tirely ſubmitted himſelf to her pleaſure.*’ It is thought ſhe took the veil at Frontevaux about the year 1115.

[G] *The auſterity of the order ſoon coſt her her life.*] We have already ſeen (22) that William of Malmsbury conjectured that the providence of GOD ſo ordered it, that the delicate body of this queen was unable to undergo the toils of religion. It was better perhaps that ſhe ſhould ſoon ſink under them; for if they had only emaciated her body, it were to have been feared that a tedious languiſhing ſtate would have given her a diſtaſte for a monaſtic liſe, and made her regret the flattering pleaſures ſhe had forſaken. However that be, here is the proof of my text. ‘ Anno 1115 aut cir- ‘ citer Bertradam Reginam ad inſtitutum Font-Ebral- ‘ denſe tandem pellectam Robertus in monaſterio Al- ‘ ta-Brueria dicto collocavit. Victu cultuque in primis ‘ aſpero atque horrido utens, vita ſtatim privata eſt ‘ (23).’ Upon this occaſion was verified the maxim, *Nullum violentum durabile.*

[H] *This diſpoſition has been very much cenſured.*] There is nothing more ſingular in the monaſtic world (24), than to ſee a large order of monks and nuns acknowledge a woman for their head and general; as the monks and nuns of the order of Frontevaux are obliged by their inſtitution to do. Robert d'Arbriſſel their founder would have it ſo. He made a law diametrically oppoſite to the Salic law: he was not ſatisfied with allowing that the order might fall to the diſtaff, but appointed that a woman ſhould always ſucceed a woman in the dignity of head and general of the order. Father de la Mainferme ſets apart the third volume of his work to vindicate this conduct of the founder. He anſwers all the common objections that

(*g*) Abbatiſſam toti ſuo Ordini Petronillam de Camilliaco præpoſuit. *Clyp. naſcentis Ord. Fontebraldenſis*, *Tom. II, p.* 502.

(*b*) Taken from the ſecond Tome of the *Clypeus naſcentis Fontebraldenſis Ordinis*, at the end, where there is a chronological Abridgment of the life of Robert d'Arbriſſel, with references to the places where every thing is related more at large.

(*i*) The firſt volume of his *Clypeus* was printed in 1684, the ſecond in 1688, the third in 1692.

(13) *Taken from the* Clypeus naſcentis *of Father Mainſerme*, Tom. II, pag. 500, 501.

(14) Rex libidinoſus Philippus Turonis venit, & cum uxore Fulconis locutus eam fieri Reginam conſtituit. Peſſima illa, Conſule dimiſſo, nocte ſequenti Regem ſequitur, qui Mindraico prope pontem Bevronis milites dimiſerat, qui eam Aurelianis duxerunt. *Menage, Hiſt. de Sablé, liv. iii, chap. xvi, pag.* 85, 86, *ex Geſtis Conſulum Andegavenſium.*

(15) Id. ibid. pag. 89.

(16) Ibid.

(17) Ibid.

(18) Lib. v, de Geſtis Regum Anglorum, apud La Mainferme, Clyp. Tom. II, pag. 137.

(19) Father de la Mainferme, *ibid. pag.* 138, 139, ſhews this to be falſe.

(20) Vincentius Bellovacus, Spec. lib. xxvi, cap. lxxxviii, apud La Mainferme, Clyp. Tom. II, pag. 141.

(21) Sugerius, in vita Ludovici Groſſi, cap. xvii, apud eundem, ibid.

(22) Above, at the end of citat. (18).

(23) La Mainferme, Tom. II, pag. 502.

(24) See, in the remark [*P*], at citat. ‡, the words of Charles du Moulin.

which he takes abundance of pains to juſtify his patriarch, who had been charged by ſome with going to bed to his nuns [*I*], not indeed with a deſign to enjoy them, but in order to expoſe himſelf to greater temptations. This ſcene has been repreſented in the *News from the republic of letters* [*K*]. That monk's vivacity and zeal againſt the authors

that are made, and inſiſts very much upon this, that the Bleſſed Virgin commanded GOD himſelf; for it is ſaid in ſcripture that JESUS CHRIST was ſubject to his mother. If GOD, the eternal being, the creator of all things, made no difficulty to obey a woman, ſhall we men, inconſiderable creatures as we are, dare to refuſe it? If ever the church of Rome did willfully what it is pretended ſhe did without knowing it under the reign of Pope Joan, ſhe would find her apology ready drawn up in father Mainferme's book; and I do not ſee, if the apology of Frontevaux paſſes muſter, why they ſhould make any ſcruple of creating a ſhe-Pope, Add to this, that, according to the hypotheſis of the votaries of the church of Rome, GOD has given the empire of the world to the holy Virgin: nothing is more common in the writings of thoſe men than the titles of *queen of heaven, queen of the angels*, when they ſpeak of the Virgin; and this is alſo the language of their public worſhip, I mean of the church hymns. A monk of Frontevaux one day made uſe of this reaſon: father Mainferme relates it without finding any fault with it (25). 'It happened once 'that a monk who ſhall be nameleſs, who could hard'ly digeſt that part of our inſtitution, ſpeaking of this 'matter, told me, *that our kingdom was under petticoat 'government*. In which indeed he ſpoke better than 'he thought, and did us a great deal of honour contra'ry to his intention. For it is true, it is under *petti'coat government*, as is alſo the whole kingdom of the 'univerſe of heaven and earth, *under female govern'ment*, in as much as it is governed by the power and 'ſovereign authority of her, who, like a virtuous wo'man, *manum ſuam miſit ad fortia*; *& digiti ejus ap'prehenderant fuſum*. Pr. 31. v. 19.'

[*I*] *Some have charged him with going to bed to his nuns.*] The accuſation is founded upon a letter of Geoffry abbot of Vendôme. That abbot's letters were publiſhed by father Sirmond, in 1610, from a manuſcript in the abbey of la Couture. One of thoſe letters was written to our Robert, to inform him of the ſcandalous report that was ſpread concerning his conduct, and of the inconveniences which might ariſe from it. Let us hear the words of the letter (26): 'Fœminarum quaſdam, ut dicitur, nimis fami'liariter tecum habitare permittis, & cum ipſis etiam, '& inter ipſas, noctu frequenter cubare non erube'ſcis. Hoc ſi modò agis, vel aliquando egiſti, no'vum, & inauditum ſed infructuoſum martyrii genus 'inveniſti . . . . . . Mulierum quibuſdam, ſicut fama 'ſparſit, & nos ante diximus, ſæpe privatim loqueris, '& earum accubitu novo martyrii genere cruciaris. '—— *It is ſaid, you ſuffer ſome of the women to live 'with you in too great familiarity, and ſcruple not to 'lie with them and amongſt them frequently in the 'night. If this be or has been your practice, you have 'found indeed a new and unheard of, but a fruitleſs 'kind of martyrdom? It is reported, as I ſaid before, 'that you converſe in private with ſome of the women, 'and inflict upon yourſelf a new kind of martyrdom by 'lying with them*.' There is another letter which is aſcribed to Marbodus biſhop of Rennes, containing the ſame informations (27): 'Mulierum cohabitatio'nem diceris plus amare. Has ergo non ſolum com'muni menſa per diem, ſed & communi accubitu per 'noctem dignaris, ut referunt. —— *It is reported that 'you are too fond of living with women, and that you 'do not only admit them at your table by day, but into 'your bed at night*.' He blames Robert for making young girls take the habit too raſhly, and repreſents to him the ill ſucceſs of ſuch a proceeding. Some of them, perceiving the ninth month draw on, had broke out of the cloiſter to lye-in elſewhere, and others had been brought to bed in the middle of their cells. 'Taceo 'de juvenculis, quas ſine examine religionem profeſ'ſas mutata veſte per diverſas cellulas protinus incluſi'ſti. Hujus igitur facti temeritatem miſerabilis exitus 'probat. Aliæ enim urgente partu, fractis ergaſtulis 'elapſæ ſunt, aliæ in ipſis ergaſtulis pepererunt (28).' Note, I. that in the letter to Geoffry of Vendôme, Robert d'Arbriſſel is accuſed with having a reſpect to perſons. There are ſome women, ſays he, with whom you are always in a good humour, briſk, active, free, ſo complaiſant, that you take all occaſions to expreſs your civility; but for others, if at any time you condeſcend to ſpeak to them, it is to reproach them; you treat them with great rigour, and leave them expoſed to hunger, thirſt, and cold. 'Illis ſiquidem te ſemper 'ſermone jocundum oſtendis, & alacrem actione, om'neque genus humanitatis exhibes, nulla ſervata par'citate. Et iterùm. Aliis verò, ſi quando cum ipſis 'loqueris, ſemper locutione nimis durus appares, ni'mis diſtrictus correctione: illas etiam fame, & ſiti ac 'nuditate crucias omni relicta pietate (29).' This is inſinuating what Theophilus Raynaud affirms (30), I mean that Robert choſe out the pretirieſt, when he had a mind to expoſe himſelf to temptation by lying with a woman. Note, in the ſecond place, that Father Mainferme does not quote the whole paſſage in Marbodus's pretended letter. I have ſeen it much more compleat in Mr Menage (31), and there I find that they put Robert in mind of his having formerly been faulty with reſpect to women. I find alſo another reflexion upon him, which I ſhall hereafter mention (32).

[*K*] *This ſcene has been repreſented in the news from the commonwealth of letters.*] See the ſecond article of the month of April 1686: it is an abſtract of the firſt volume of the *Clypeus naſcentis Fontebraldenſis Ordinis*. The author of the abſtract has compared to Tantalus a man that ſhould pitch upon ſuch a kind of mortification as that imputed to our Robert. But as there is no compariſon but what is lame, this of Tantalus in ſome reſpects would not agree to the director of theſe nuns. He would ſuffer hunger and thirſt in ſight of a remedy, but he could not be certain that the remedy would retire from him in proportion as he advanced towards it. The compariſon with thoſe curious phyſicians, who ſtudy ſo attentively the cauſes of phænomena, would only be true in ſome reſpects. Their meditations, their ſearches are only glancing upon nature; the ſecret they look for is in a veſſel which they can only touch the brim of; in vain do they turn and wind about, they find no more than the circumference of the circle, without ever arriving at the centre of it. This is an emblem of Robert, with this difference, that he was not deſirous as they are of penetrating to the bottom of the myſtery (33). I am far from affirming what they ſay of him; for I find a great ſtrength in his apologiſt's arguments; but it cannot be imagined how many heretics there have been, who, profeſſing to abſtain from marriage, and the full enjoyment of the fair ſex, yet would lie with women, embrace them, and omit no manner of præludia. See the proceedings of the inquiſition of Toulouſe (34) printed at Amſterdam 1692: I ſhall quote ſomething out of it in the article GUILLEMETE. See alſo what the biſhop of Meaux reports from St Bernard againſt the Henricians, at the ſixty ninth paragraph of the eleventh book of the hiſtory of Variations. It is a ſign that there is no deluſion or chimera, which does not enter into the heart of man. The greateſt danger they can fall into, who are under vows of continence, is to think upon the objects they have renounced, or to ſee them in certain circumſtances. Witneſs the Hermit who ſaw Brandimart in the arms of his dear Fleurdelis (35):

Hor ſtando inginochiato in oratione,
Vide far' à color quel gioco ſtrano:
E vennegli ſi fatta tentatione,
Ch'il Breviario gli cade di mano.

Whilſt the holy hermit is on his knees, he ſpies the ſtrange tranſaction between the two lovers, which raiſes ſuch a ferment in his breaſt, that he lets his breviary fall out of his hand.

What would have become of him in a preludium: *Admiſſus circum præcordia ludens* (36)? Would he have had the reſolution of St Aldhelme? But not to be too tedious, I ſhall ſpeak of this ſaint in the remark [*C*] of the article FRANCIS of ASSISE.

[*L*] *That*

---

(25) Tom. III, pag. 21. *He cites brother E. Martin, author of a book intituled*, Le Sejour du Verbe incarne dans les entrailles immaculées de la Vierge.

(26) *See the* Clypeus naſcentis, ubi ſupra, Tom. I, Diſſert. I, pag. 38.

(27) Id. pag. 41.

(28) Id. pag. 69.

(29) Id. pag. 66

(30) See. below, remark [*L*], citat. (42).

(31) See, the remark [*P*], at citat. †.

(32) Rem. [*P*].

(33) Ἡ θέμις ἀνθρώπων πέλει ἀνδρῶν ἠδὲ γυναικῶν Πώποτε τῆς εὐνῆς ἐπιβήμεναι ἠδὲ μιγῆναι.
To male and female juſtice this commands,
To fly the folds of love, and Hymen's luſtful bands.

(34) Pag. 380, & ſeq.

(35) See Marigni's letters.

(36) *Apply here theſe two verſes:*
Omne vafer vitium ridenti Flaccus amico
Tangit, & admiſſus circum præcordia ludit.
To touch the ſoul the way ſly Horace found,
And pleas'd the patient while he prob'd his wound.
Perſius, Sat. I, ver. 116.

authors of ſuch a charge is not to be wondered at [*L*]: He had a delicate point to manage [*M*], and the utmoſt art was neceſſary to vindicate his hero. He denies the fact, which was the only method to apologize for him; for nothing is more inconſiſtent either with internal or external purity, than the pretended mortification of reſiſting temptations raiſed by one's ſelf. The trueſt triumph is to keep as far as poſſible from

[*L*] *That monk's vivacity and zeal againſt the authors of ſuch a charge is not to be wondered at.*] He takes ſeveral methods to do this: he denies the genuineneſs of the two letters; he maintains that Geoffry of Vendôme did not write that which goes under his name; and thinks it very ſtrange that the Jeſuit Sirmond ſhould publiſh it as genuine, and ſhould put in the index, *mira Roberti ſimplicitas & confidentia*. He diſputes againſt father Alexander, who maintained that it was Geoffry of Vendôme's letter, and lays hold of that Dominican's confeſſion that the letter aſcribed to Marbodus is ſuppoſititious (37). He pretends (38) that the heretic Roſcelin, condemned as a tritheiſt in a council, is the author of a letter that Sirmond has publiſhed among thoſe of Geoffry of Vendôme. This is the opinion of cardinal Bona, and of the jeſuits Bollandus and Henſchenius, as he does not forget to obſerve (39). He adds, that father Sirmond, having conſidered all things, came into the ſame ſentiment (40). He quotes Theophilus Raynaud, who was of the ſame opinion (41). He blames father Alexander for denying that Sirmond had retracted and deſigned to have left out this letter in a new edition. He complains that this Jeſuit did a great injury to the bleſſed Robert d'Arbriſſel, and he alledges a paſſage out of father Theophilus Raynaud (42), which is founded only upon the letter publiſhed by father Sirmond. Theſe are the words he quotes. 'Feciſſe hoc Robertum de Arbruſcellis legitur cum omni deteſtatione apud Goffridum Vindocinenſem; nec ſane poteſt ulla par eſſe deteſtatio inconſultiſſimi facti quo dicitur (43) cum ſpecioſiſſima quaque ſacrarum Virginum, cum nuda nudus in eodem lecto cubuiſſe, ut nequicquam frendentem & adhinnientem appetitum in tam illecebroſi objecti præſentia novo martyrii genere afficeret. —— *We read with the utmoſt deteſtation in Geoffry of Vendôme that Robert d'Arbriſſel did it. Nor can any averſion be equal to that of a moſt unaccountable fact; for a man to lie naked with the moſt beautiful of the ſacred virgins naked likewiſe, in order to martyr his appetite by ſtifling his furious deſires, and luſtful emotions, ariſing from the preſence of ſo powerful a tempter.*' He ſhews that the time cannot be aſſigned when Geoffry of Vendôme could write ſuch a letter, and he urges a great many reaſons to prove that that abbot never thought Robert deſerved ſuch a reproof. He maintains that the other is neither Marbodus's, biſhop of Rennes, nor Hilderbert's, biſhop of Mans (44), and afterwards archbiſhop of Tours; but that it was forged, either by Roſcelin, or ſome other wicked prieſt (45). I forgot to ſay that he cites (46) a certificate importing that the manuſcript of the works of Geoffry of Vendôme, which is kept as an original in the monaſtery of the holy Trinity at Vendôme does not contain the letter in diſpute. The prior (47) of that monaſtery gave this certificate the third of Febr. 1652. Laſtly, father Mainferme produces a great number of proofs, taken from the elogies and favours which Robert received from the moſt eminent perſons at that time, both ſecular and eccleſiaſtical, and he clears him from all aſperſions which might be laid to his charge. I ſhall only take notice of one which cometh up neareſt to the imputation in hand.

It is pretended that when he went abroad to preach, he carried a great many women with him. This, father de la Mainferme denies. He confeſſes only that this holy man ſometimes took with him in his travels Petronilla Abbeſs of the order, and Angardis prioreſs of Frontevaux, which was no ſcandal to pious ſouls: on the contrary, they were once received with the utmoſt hoſpitality in the abbey of Dol; the fathers of the monaſtery omitted nothing that might do honour to their gueſts. 'Cùm jam cœptum iter ageret conſociatâ ſibi Petronillâ, aliiſque nonnullis, quadam die apud Dolenſem Abbatiam hoſpitalitatis gratiâ pervenit. Quem monachi ejuſdem cœnobii læti ſuſcipientes, hoſpitalitatis jura ei honorificè præbuerunt, ut eorum animas prædicationis ſanctæ pabulo reficere dignaretur, humillimè poſtulaverunt (48). —— *Having begun his progreſs, attended by Petronilla and ſome others, he came one day to the abbey of Dol. The monks of the convent received him with joy, and treated him with the greateſt honour and hoſpitality, moſt humbly intreating him to refreſh their ſouls with the food of his holy preaching.*' The paſſage in Marbodus's letter, cited by Mr Menage, and which may be ſeen below in remark [*P*], citation †, teſtifies that Robert was reproached with taking a great many women with him in his travels, and diſperſing great numbers of them in divers provinces in the inns and hoſpitals promiſcuouſly with the men, under pretence of ſerving the poor and ſtrangers. It is added that this fine management had produced a ſufficient number of children, to put it beyond all doubt that Robert had expoſed the honour of his ſhe-followers to very great danger.

[*M*] *It is certainly a delicate point.*] Sins of uncleanneſs are not of the ſame nature with thoſe that are to be vanquiſhed by attacking, by preventing, and falling upon them. The ſureſt way to obtain the victory is by a running fight, or rather a downright flight. Is it not then ſtrange raſhneſs, and a criminal contempt of that wiſe advice, *Quiſquis amat periculum peribit in illo, He that ſeeks danger will periſh in it*, to go and provoke ſo dangerous an enemy, and to attack him even in his ſtrong holds. Arbriſſel ought ſcarce to have looked him in the face, and he was raſh enough to take him by the neck, as it is reported, in order to wreſtle with him:

Cervi, luporum præda rapacium,
  Sectamus ultro, quos opimus
    Fallere & effugere eſt triumphus (49).

We feeble ſtags the rav'nous wolf defy,
And madly follow what we ought to fly:
To ſcape from ſuch a foe is victory.

Thoſe who make a vow of chaſtity, if they are wiſe, ought ardently to ſeek the gift of forgetfulneſs, and expel the images of impurity at their very entrance, ſo far from being allowed to lie near the living objects. Though they were ſure of ſucceſs, yet are they obliged to avoid ſuch a combat like the plague: charity to one's neighbour enjoins ſuch a flight. Are they ſure of their ſhe-companion? Is it not morally certain that a woman, who ſuffers a man to lie by her, is very much inclined to refuſe him nothing? Is ſhe not fortified in this diſpoſition by the nearneſs of a man's body to her? and does not this neighbourhood raiſe thoughts and deſires in her, which ſhe would be free from if ſhe was left to ſleep alone (50)? See what Montagne ſays of women married to old men. 'They are, *ſays he* (51), in full wedlock in a worſe condition than maids and widows. We think them well provided, becauſe they have a man lying by them . . . But on the contrary, they are therefore the more diſtreſſed, becauſe the contact and company of a male excites that warmth which would be leſs moved if they were alone.' So that theſe devout adventurers, theſe ſeekers of alluring opportunities, theſe anchorites, who, to ſignalize the bravery of their continency, creep into bed with a young girl, only throw oil upon a fire hid under the aſhes. Are they not anſwerable for the laſcivious deſires they kindle there? It is very probable that moſt of them do not deſire a compleat victory. If they do not fully ſatisfy, at leaſt they amuſe their filthy luſt. They put themſelves upon the ſame foot with thoſe who ſay, *Amare liceat, ſi potiri non licet. Eſt quodam prodire tenus, ſi non datur ultra.* Let us have a little morſel: let us enjoy the foretaſtes. They do as thoſe husbands mentioned in Seneca's controverſies. 'Novimus, inquit, iſtam maritorum abſtinentiam, qui etiamſi primam virginibus timidis remiſere noctem, vicinis tamen locis ludunt (52). —— *I know, ſays he, that ſome husbands have had ſo much abſtinence as to indulge the maid's fears the firſt night, yet they play about the confines.*' It is therefore a nice point, and father de la Mainferme is to be commended for attempting the apology of the founder of his order.

[*N*] *The*

---

(37). See the eighth ſection of the firſt Diſſertation.

(38) Tom. I. Diſſert. I, pag. 4, 5.

(39) Id. pag. 14.

(40) Bollandus aſſures it upon a hearſay. *Idem. pag.* 15.

(41) In Triade fortium David. pag. 46.

(42) Taken from pag. 132, of his treatiſe *de Sobria alterius ſexus frequentatione.*

(43) Here Father Mainferme makes this note, *Falſo ſcribit Theophilus id legi apud Gotfridum, Epiſt. xlvii, lib. iv.* See upon this falſe quotation of Theoph. Raynaud, the *News from the Common-wealth of Learning, for April,* 1686, *pag.* 391.

(44) It is found among Hildebert's letters in the manuſcript of St Victor's library at Paris. See *Clypeum, Diſſert. I, pag.* 61.

(45) Ubi ſupra, pag. 91.

(46) Ib. pag. 59.

(47) Vincent Marſolle. He was general of the congregation of St Maur.

(48) De la Mainferme, Clyp. Diſſert. I, pag. 161.

(49) Horat. Ode iv, lib. iv, ver. 50.

(50) *She might ſay,* Qui me commôrit, melius non tangere clamo. *Whoe're provokes me may his raſhneſs rue.* Horat. Sat i, lib. ii, ver. 45.

(51) Montagne, Eſſais, liv. iii, chap. v, pag. m. 123, 124.

(52) Seneca, Controver II, lib. i, pag. m. 59.

from ſuch an enemy [*N*], and never to think on him, and it would be the groſſeſt folly, as well as the moſt intolerable impertinence, to ſay, that, as there have been ſecular

[*N*] *The trueſt triumph is to keep as far as poſſible from ſuch an enemy.*] I have already touched upon this in the beginning of the preceding remark; but I reaſſume it, in order to fortify this ſalutary advice with good authorities. Firſt let us ſee what Socrates adviſed his diſciples. ‘ Thinkeſt thou, fool! *ſays he* (53), that amorous kiſſes are not poiſoned, becauſe thou doſt not ſee the poiſon of them? know that a beautiful woman is a more dangerous animal than a ſcorpion, becauſe that cannot wound us unleſs it touch us, but beauty ſtrikes us at a diſtance; on what ſide ſoever we perceive it, it darts it's venom upon us, and overthrows our reaſon. It is perhaps for this cauſe that love is repreſented with a bow and arrows, becauſe a fine face wounds us from afar. Wherefore I adviſe thee, Xenophon, when thou ſpieſt a beauty, to fly from it without looking behind thee, and as for thee, Critobulus, I believe it will be proper thou ſhouldeſt be abſent a whole year, nor will that be too long a time to cure thee of thy wound.’ Add to this what Jerom ſaid to thoſe who did not approve of a retirement into the deſert, and who pretended that this was not to combat vice, but to fly from it, and that only thoſe who combated and overcame deſerved the crown. He anſwered among other things, that the ſafeſt way was always to be choſen, and that therefore it were better to fly than to remain in the field of battle, where, if on the one ſide we may be victorious, on the other we may alſo be overcome. We are not ſafe, added he, when we ſleep near a ſerpent: it may happen that he will not bite us, and it may happen that he will. He expreſſes himſelf ſo well upon this head that I cannot forbear tranſcribing his own words, which are ſo many thunder-bolts, with reſpect to the conduct attributed to d'Arbriſſel. ‘ Qui ſciens imbecillitatem ſuam, & vas fragile, quod portat, timet offendere, ne impingat, corruat, atque frangatur. Unde & mulierum, maximeque adoleſcentularum vitat aſpectum & in tantum caſtigator ſui eſt, ut etiam quæ tuta ſunt, pertimeſcat. Cur, inquies, pergis ad eremum? videlicet ut te non audiam, non videam, ut tuo furore non movear, ut tua bella non patiar, nè me capiat oculus meretricis; ne me forma pulcherrima ad illicitos ducat amplexus. Reſpondebis: hoc non eſt pugnare, ſed fugere; ſta in acie: adverſariis armatus obſiſte: ut poſtquam viceris, coroneris. Fateor imbecillitatem meam. Nolo ſpe pugnare victoriæ, nè perdam aliquando victoriam. Si fugero, gladium devitavi; ſi ſtetero, aut vincendum mihi, aut cadendum. Quid autem neceſſe eſt certa dimittere, & incerta ſectari? Aut ſcuto, aut pedibus mors vitanda eſt. Tu, qui pugnas, & ſuperari potes, & vincere; ego cùm fugero, non vinco in eo, quod fugio: ſed ideò fugio, nè vincar. Nulla ſecuritas eſt, vicino ſerpente, dormire. Poteſt fieri, ut me non mordeat: tamen fieri poteſt ut aliquando me mordeat (54). —— *Who being conſcious of his own infirmity, and ſenſible that the veſſel which he carries is brittle, is afraid to make a falſe ſtep, leſt he ſhould fall, and break it. For which reaſon he ſhuns the ſight of women, eſpecially of the younger ſort, and keeps ſo ſtrict a guard over himſelf as to be afraid in the midſt of ſecurity. you will ask the reaſon of my retiring into ſolitude. It is that I may not hear, or ſee you, that I may not be moved with your fury, that I may not be expoſed to a war with you, that no leud eye may enſlave me, that no raviſhing beauty lead me to forbidden embraces. You will anſwer, this is not to fight but to fly; keep your rank, ſtand to your arms, that when you have conquered you may receive the crown. I own my weakneſs. I would not fight in hopes of victory, leſt I ſhould fail in the ſucceſs. If I fly, I eſcape the ſword. If I encounter, I muſt conquer or fall. But where is the neceſſity of quitting certainty and following uncertainty. Death may be avoided either by fighting or by flying. You who fight may be either conquered or a conqueror. I, who fly, do not conquer in that I fly; but I fly that I may not be conquered. No man can ſleep in ſafety when a ſerpent's near him. It is poſſible it may not bite, and it is poſſible it ſometimes may.*’ The author of a book, printed at Paris in 1630, intituled *Le Miroir des Chanoines*, has collected together a great number of ſentences which loudly condemn the raſh behaviour of thoſe who come as near danger as they can. Joſeph, ſays he (55), *left his mantle without ſtaying to contend with* Potiphar's wife, *becauſe the touch of a woman is contagious and venemous, and ought to be as much dreaded as the bite of a mad dog. This is* St Jerome's compariſon. *Ipſe mulieris contactus quaſi contagioſus & venenatus eſt, viro fugiendus, non minus quàm rabidiſſimi canis morſus* (56). Our author adds *that St Jordan, in St Antoninus* †, *ſeverely chides a monk for only touching a woman's hand. Why, ſaid the monk, ſhe is a devout woman. No matter for that, replied St Jordan, the earth is good, and water is good: but if thoſe two elements are mixed, from thence proceeds nothing but dirt . . . . .* ⸸. ‘ St Jerome knowing what prejudice the converſation of Women, though free from ſuſpicion and ſcandal, did to clergymen; *Hoſpitiolum tuum* (ſays he) *aut raro, aut nunquam mulierum pedes terant: quia non poteſt toto corde cum Deo habitare, qui fœminarum acceſſibus copulatur: fœmina ſecum pariter habitantis conſcientiam exurit, fœminæ nomen tuum noverint, vultum neſciant.* Let the feet of women ſeldom or never tread thy chamber floor, becauſe he that delights in the converſation of women cannot devote his heart entirely to God. A woman burns the conſcience of him ſhe dwells with, let women know thy name, not thy face . . . . nor do thou know theirs . . . . . ‡ St Cyprian ſubtilly and learnedly confutes thoſe daring ſpirits, who preſume upon their own integrity ſo much, that they fear nothing from women, generouſly hoping to come off clear without engaging in the leaſt their holy affections. His words are as follow: It is impoſſible to be ſurrounded with flames and not to be burnt; it is more expedient to fear well than to preſume ill. It is better for a man to confeſs himſelf weak, that he may become ſtrong, than to pretend to be ſtrong and prove weak. He deceives himſelf, who thinks himſelf to be ſomething and really is nothing. Who can carry fire in his boſom, and his cloaths not be burnt? true, but I would conquer that I may triumph. Haſt thou not thy own fleſh to contend with and overcome? why ſhouldſt thou deſire laurels from another climate? the fleſh luſteth againſt the ſpirit, and the ſpirit againſt the fleſh. Let it be ſaid once for all. The converſation of women is the devil's bird-lime to catch and enſlave men . . . (57) Horrid blindneſs! to chuſe to live in a place where we muſt every day neceſſarily either periſh or overcome, and to imagine to ſleep ſafely near a viper. * *Quid tibi neceſſe* (ſays St Jerome) *in ea verſari domo, in qua neceſſe habeas quotidie aut perire, aut vincere? quis unquam mortalium, juxta viperam ſecuros ſomnos capit?*’ Our author afterwards giving, ſome preſcriptions againſt the motions of the fleſh, places abſtinence in the firſt place, frequenting good company in the ſecond, and then he ſays (58), that the third *will be never to come near women, but to ſee them afar off, as Lacides, in Laërtius, told king Attalus he ſhould look at pictures. . . .* ** *St Auſtin upon theſe words of St Paul,* fly fornication, *obſerves that St Paul does not ſay reſiſt but fly, becauſe victory is ſurer by flight than by reſiſtance*: Contra libidinis impetum apprehende fugam, ſi vis obtinere victoriam, nec tibi verecundum ſit fugere, ſi caſtitatis palmam deſideras obtinere.

Tu fugiendo fuga, quem fuga ſola fugat.

Defeat by flight, what flight alone defeats,

Theſe maxims, ſo true and ſo important in themſelves, and beſides ſo conſiderable on account of the veneration that is paid to thoſe great ſaints, who have laid them down in their writings, are very often inculcated into the minds of thoſe who have moſt need of them. The ſame things are preached every day to them; they are preſſed in an infinite number of books; and yet thoſe perſons continue in the cuſtom of willingly expoſing themſelves to danger. One would think they ſet up for bravery, and that flight ſeems to them as ignominious an act of cowardice as

---

(53) Xenophon's remarkable things of Socrates, lib. i, p. 58.

(54) Hieronym. Epiſt. adver. Vigilant. *It is the 13th of the third book, in the edition I uſe, pag.* 563.

(55) Vital Bernard, Canon of the cathedral church of Puy. *Miroir des Chanoines, pag.* 240.

(56) Hieronym. lib. i, contra Jovinian. *cited by* Vital Bernard, ibid.

† D. Antonin. 3, p. tit. 23, c. 9, §. 5.

⸸ D Hieron. Ep. ad Nepot. ſub. fin.

‡ D. Cypr. de ſingul. Cler.

(57) *The ſame* Vital Bernard, Miroir des Chanoines, pag. 252.

* D. Hieron. lib. ii, Ep. ix.

(58) Vital. ubi ſupra, pag. 273.

** D. Aug. Ser. 250, de tem.

lar men, who have paſſed whole nights in bed with women without enjoying them [*O*], with much more reaſon it ought to be ſuppoſed that a monk ſhould be able to refrain upon ſuch occaſions. Mr Menage deſerves to be conſulted upon the proofs father de la Mainferme has rejected [*P*]. But more particularly ſhould we conſult the *Apologetical*

it does to military men. They advance to the combat with boldneſs and chearfulneſs. The fair ſex, in whom courage is not required, yet ſhew a great deal of intrepidity upon this account: they are as ready to receive viſits in their cloiſters as the others are to pay them: both parties behave themſelves as if neither feared to be vanquiſhed, and it is very probable this ſecurity is not ſo much founded upon a knowledge of their own ſtrength, as upon an unwillingneſs to come off victorious in this conflict; and at the worſt the conflict itſelf, whatever may be the event of it, is not without it's charms: if a victory follows, it is ſo much gained upon nature; if they are foiled, it is ſo much gained for her. Let this be ſaid without prejudice to thoſe, who ſincerely keep the vows of chaſtity they have made, and who without doubt, if they do not happen to follow St Jerome's advice, are ſure their viſits, their long converſations, &c. will not excite ill deſires in them. But they would infallibly condemn that exceſs of raſhneſs which ſome have thought the founder of Frontevaux guilty of.

[*O*] *There have been men, who have paſſed whole nights in bed with women without enjoying them.*] Montagne affirms this. 'I do not look upon it, *ſays he* (59), as a miracle, as the queen of Navarre does in one of the tales of her Heptameron, (a diverting book in it's kind) nor a very difficult thing, to ſpend whole nights with the utmoſt freedom with a miſtreſs long courted, and keep a promiſe of going no farther than meer kiſſing.' He ſays in another place (60), that his father would 'tell of ſtrange intimacies, that he had had with very honeſt women without any ſuſpicions. And as to himſelf, he ſwore (61) ſolemnly that he had known no woman before his wife, tho' he did not marry till he was thirty three years of age, and had been a long time in the Italian wars.' If we may credit leud men, the caſe mentioned by this writer is nothing extraordinary. When theſe people are to tell their adventures, they proteſt they have ſometimes been forced to proceed gradually, and have not been allowed the laſt favour, till they have been proved whether they would keep their promiſe of being contented with leſſer ones. Some tell, without naming perſons, they could have done what they would, but they have abſtained, that they might not be embaraſſed with ill conſequences, or would not expoſe the woman to the diſhonour ſhe was afraid of. Let us grant to thoſe, who would make uſe of ſuch adventures, to make it probable that ſome Monks have been victorious over the moſt alluring opportunities; let us grant them, I ſay, that the paſſion of leud men is not always ſo impetuous, but that ſometimes it will ſtop of itſelf by the conſideration of certain circumſtances: what uſe will they make of this to juſtify thoſe Monks? do theſe debauchees refrain, without committing impurities, which in the judgment of moderate caſuiſts come up to mortal ſin, and ſometimes in the opinion of other caſuiſts to a ſin exceeding that of enjoyment? if the pretended victory of theſe Monks was ſomething of this nature, would it not really be the triumph of luſt, and not of chaſtity? and in proceeding thus againſt them, we muſt not ſpare their ſhe-companions: their raſhneſs was ſtill more unwarrantable than that of the men. Nor can the prudence of women, who thus expoſe themſelves, be better defended than their chaſtity. Common prudence would tell them, that neither promiſes nor oaths are to be depended upon, but that they ought to ſecure themſelves in a better way. This puts me in mind of an adventure I have read in a little book which was printed at Paris and in Holland in 1682. The ſtory is this: the adventurer ſpeaks; his name is Pontignan. 'I was in the country, *ſays he* (62), with two amiable ladies, and I loved them both after my manner. I had declared to each of them ſingly my kindneſs for them, and had no reaſon to be diſſatisfied with their anſwer. One evening, as I was alone in my apartment, and in my night-gown, in came the two ladies, and told me that, to put a trick upon a gentleman, who was with us, they muſt ſwaddle me up. They told me what the trick was. I was pleaſed with the conceit, and conſented very merrily to be ſwaddled. They took me in my night-gown juſt as I was, and wrapped me about with I believe more than a hundred ells of linnen, cut like ſwathes. I was juſt like an Egyptian mummy . . . . when I was thus equipped like a mummy, they told me, well, Pontignan, a well bred gentleman does not refuſe to lie with ladies when they deſire him. We have both of us promiſed thee favours, which we are ready to grant. Ah! wicked creatures, cried I, take away theſe ſwathes, and do what you will with me. No, no, ſaid they, thoſe will be no hinderance: and upon that they ordered me to be carried to one of their houſes, and put to bed all ſwaddled as I was, and the two gypſies placed themſelves on each ſide of me. The chamber was full of lights, and I could ſee them in fine and alluring night dreſſes. I had neither hands, legs, nor any thing in the world at liberty. I was buried in linnen, and had only my eyes out, which made me mad. You may eaſily imagine the condition I was in: ſometimes I begged them to let me have an arm, or hand, or only one finger. Sometimes I ſtruggled hard to get free from my bands; ſo that once the ladies thought I had broke them, and jumped out of bed, crying out both of them, *we are undone*. They were in the right of it; for truly if I had been in a condition to have been revenged, I ſhould have forced them to have cried for mercy. Sometimes I threatned to diſgrace them by falling aſleep by them, which yet I ſhould have found it hard to have done. They only anſwered me by inſulting me for the good fortune I loſt, and by little careſſes, for which I could freely have beaten them. I never paſſed ſuch a night in my life.' This was a well contrived caution (63): thoſe ladies, as immodeſt as they may be repreſented, were more prudent than the devout women of Frontevaux (64).

[*P*] *Mr Menage deſerves to be conſulted concerning the proofs that father de la Mainferme has rejected.*] 'Bollandus, in his annotations on the life of R. d'Arbriſſel, ſays, that father Sirmond, who publiſhed Geoffry of Vendôme's letters, repented he had made that public which we have mentioned, judging it ſpurious after a ſtrict examination, and that he deſigned to give notice of the ſame in a ſecond edition. But I can aſſure you, that father Sirmond never had any ſuch deſign, nor ever repented the publiſhing the ſaid letter. I knew him intimately and long, even to his death . . . . Mr Pavillon in the preface to his hiſtory of R. d'Arbriſſel, ſays that this letter of Geoffry of Vendôme, not being to be found in the manuſcript of the monaſtery of Vendôme, as father Sirmond knew well, and plainly inſinuates, it ought to be ſuſpected (65).' Mr Menage, having mentioned ſome other things, and particularly the certificate of Vincent Marſole, goes on thus: 'Since he affirms that letter was not in the manuſcript, I am perſuaded it was not there when he affirmed it. But on the other hand, as father Sirmond, who is a man of the utmoſt ſincerity, and who had ſeen that manuſcript, has not obſerved in his notes upon that letter, that it was not in the manuſcript, and never told me ſo, tho' I have talked with him more than once upon the letter, I am alſo firmly perſuaded that it was there, when father Sirmond printed his Geoffry of Vendôme. Therefore it muſt have been torn out afterwards at the requeſt of Joanna Baptiſta de Bourbon, legitimate daughter of France, abbeſs of Frontevaux; at whoſe deſire alſo Theophilus Raynaud retracted in his *Trias fortium David*, what he had wrote concerning R. d'Arbriſſel in his *De ſobria utriuſque ſexus converſatione*: this was told me by father Commire the Jeſuit. And what ſerves to convince me, that it was torn out, is, that they no longer ſhew the ſaid manuſcript, but tell you, in the abbey of Vendôme, that they know not what is become of it. But what ſufficiently refutes the opinion

(59) Montagne, Eſſais, lib. ii, cap. xi, pag. m. 172, 173.

(60) Id. ibid. cap. ii, pag. 21.

(61) That is Montagne's father.

(62) Academie Galante, pag. 160. Holland Edit.

(63) One might apply to this a parody of theſe two verſes in Horace, *lib. i, Epiſt. ii*, Ira furor brevis eſt: animum rege: qui, niſi paret, Imperat: hunc frænis, hunc tu compeſce catena. *Paſſion's a frenzy, which, not rul'd, will rule: With chains confine it, and with curbs controul.* Ver. 62, & 63.

(64) Suppoſing what is ſaid of them was true. In which caſe one might apply here the words of St Luke, chap. xvi, ver. 8, *The children of this world are wiſer in their generation than the children of light.*

(65) Menage, Hiſt. de Sablé, liv. iii, cap. xix, pag. 106, & ſeq.

Apologetical diſſertation for the bleſſed Robert d'Arbriſſelles .... concerning what I have ſaid of him in the firſt edition of this work. It is an apology ſo well turned, and ſo ſolid [*Q*], that every reaſonable man ought to acquieſce in it; and though I have ſufficiently ſhewed, that I did not give any credit to the common reports of ſharing a bed, *&c.* I declare here, that wherever I mention it, without adding my own opinion, I deſire to be ſo underſtood. They reckon thirty two, or thirty three abbeſſes of Frontevaux, from Petronilla de Chemille, who was the firſt, to the preſent abbeſs (*k*) [*R*]. The order is divided into four provinces [*S*], in each of which they have ſeveral priories.

‘ opinion of Bollandus, Theophilus Renaud, Coſnier, Pavillon, and father de la Mainſerme, is, that Marbodus, a man of great virtue, who, from a ſchoolmaſter of the church of Angers, was made biſhop of Rennes, and afterwards became a Monk of St Aubin of Angers, wrote ſuch a letter to Robert d'Arbriſſel †. This letter is to be ſeen in the collection of Marbodus's letters printed at Rennes. It is true that, in a manuſcript of the letters of Ildebert, biſhop of Mans, and archbiſhop of Tours, which is in the library of St Victor at Paris, the ſame letter is attributed to Ildebert. And Mr Baluze, who has promiſed us an edition of Ildebert's works, thinks it is rather Ildebert's than Marbodus's. But in this I am not of his opinion, hardly believing that Ildebert, who was charged himſelf with loving women, ſhould accuſe Robert d'Arbriſſel of the ſame thing. .... But tho' the letter ſhould be Ildebert's, yet it would prove what I intended it to prove, which is, that Arbriſſel was looked upon as a man fond of women. And this I prove alſo by one *Petrus Salmurienſis*. This Peter of Saumur, who was a Monk of St Florant, wrote ſomething like Geoffry of Vendôme's letter. This piece was in our time in the hands of father Vignier of the Oratory; who ſuppreſſed it at the requeſt of Joanna Baptiſta de Bourbon, abbeſs of Frontevaux. This I had from Mr de Herouval, Dom Luke d'Acheri, and Mr de St Beuve; all men worthy of credit, to whom father Vignier told theſe particulars ⸸. But let all this be ſaid without any prejudice to the memory of Rob. de Arbriſſel, for which I have a great veneration, being perſuaded that the report concerning him, and on account of which Geoffry, the abbot of Vendôme, Marbodus biſhop of Rennes, and Peter the monk of St Florant, had written the things abovementioned, is without any true foundation. As Robert d'Arbriſſel had inſtituted a monaſtery of women, to whom he had ſubjected the men; which du Moulin, in his notes upon the decree, has expreſſed in this manner ‡: ‘ In Monaſterio Fontis Ebraldi, adhuc præpoſterè Monachi ſunt infernè, Monachæ verò ſunt supernè: —— *In the monaſtery of Frontevaux, the Monks are prepoſterouſly placed under, and the Nuns above*. And as this inſtitution ſeemed contrary to St. Paul's words, that women are not to rule over men, it was thought he loved women; and this gave birth to certain jeſts upon him, and from thoſe jeſts aroſe the ſcandalous report.’ Mr Menage in his additions (66) informs the public, that the ‘ letter of Geoffry abbot of Vendôme to Robert d'Arbriſſel is found in the manuſcript of the letters of that abbot, which is in the Franciſcans library of S. Croix of Florence. This puts it paſt all doubt, that it is that author's: for it is alſo in the manuſcript of the abbey of la Couture at Mans, but in a different order from that of Florence.’ It is the firſt in the latter manuſcript, and the forty ſeventh of the fourth Book in the other. Mr Menage adds to the authority of theſe manuſcripts two arguments from the letter itſelf. Mr Magliabechi informed him of what concerned the manuſcript of Florence.

The reader need not be told what reflexions he ought to make upon the complaiſance ſhewn to an abbeſs of Frontevaux, who was a legitimate daughter of France. At her deſire an original piece is torn out of an old manuſcript. How many other pieces have been ſuppreſſed to gratify ſeveral people? on the other hand, how many have been forged? how many words have been razed out of manuſcripts to ſubſtitute others in their ſtead? ſee a book printed in 1699, and intituled *Lettres Critiques où l'on voit les Sentimens de Monſieur Simon ſur pluſieurs Ouvrages nouveaux publiées par un Gentilhomme Alleman*. Have not ſeveral facts by this means been turned into meer problems, and made matter of diſpute without being ever determined.

[*Q*] *It is an apology* (67) *ſo well turned and ſo ſolid.*] It is in the form of a letter, which they have done me the honour to addreſs to me, and contains 315 pages in 12ves. The civility, politeneſs, wit, and learning, of the author ſhine with great ſplendor in it, and I am very ſorry I am ſo little worthy of the encomiums ſo ingenious a writer compliments me with. His work conſiſts of nine articles, which he has proved in a manner, as I am informed, very much to the ſatisfaction of the world. ‘ I. That Geoffry's conteſted letter is really his, and is even in the manuſcript of Vendôme (68). II. That the letter imputed to Marbodus, biſhop of Rennes, or to Ildebert, biſhop of Mans, and afterwards archbiſhop of Tours, belongs to neither of thoſe two authors, and is more probably Roſcelin's. III. That at the worſt it is evidently proved, that thoſe three prelates had always a conſtant and uninterrupted eſteem for that holy founder, and believed the quite contrary to that report ſpread of him by obſcure and unknown people. IV. That the letter ſaid to be written by Peter de Saumur, let it be what it will, concludes nothing to his diſadvantage, no more than a fragment of a council of Albi, againſt the Albigenſes. V. That all thoſe writings were founded upon meer HEARSAY, without any ſhadow of proof, or even probability; that every conſiderate reader ought to deſpiſe uncertain rumours, which were ſpread abroad, when compared with an infinite number of poſitive evidences which can be brought to the contrary. VI. That the boldneſs with which Robert preached and exclaimed againſt the vices of the great men and eccleſiaſtics, together with his actions at the councils of Poitiers and Baugency, are a triumphant proof of his innocence and purity. VII. That even thoſe, who are pretended to be his enemies, may be brought as witneſſes in his behalf. VIII. That it would be very ſurprizing that a man, who openly bad defiance to ſo many ſinners, ſhould not at leaſt have made them murmur; and that, being ſo generally eſteemed, it is impoſſible but ſome muſt envy him: but he forced even envy itſelf to reſpect him. IX. That his death, as well as his piety, at laſt crowns all theſe proofs. That from all together reſults a plain evidence of the falſehood of the *new kind of martyrdom* imputed to him; and is ſufficient abſolutely to deſtroy the leaſt ſuſpicions in all judicious and conſidering minds.’

[*R*] *They reckon thirty two or thirty three abbeſſes of Frontevaux .... to the preſent abbeſs.*] (69) She is Mary Magdalen Gabriele Adelaide de Rochechoüart, daughter of the duke of Mortemar, and ſiſter to the marſhal de Vivonne. She was made abbeſs of the order in 1670 (70). She is a lady of extraordinary merit. I am aſſured by ſeveral perſons, who have had the honour to ſee, and converſe with her, that ſhe is univerſally admired for the agreeableneſs, the ſtrength, and ſolidity of her diſcourſe. Her virtue and knowledge (71), and other ſhining qualities, give her a place among the moſt illuſtrious perſons of the age. Read, in the third volume of the *Clypeus naſcentis Font-Ebraldenſis Ordinis*, page 192 and 193, the encomiums which are given her in the dedication of a dramatic piece.

She died the fifteenth of Auguſt 1704. See her elogy in the Memoirs of Trevoux, December 1704, page 2118, and following.

[*S*] *The order is divided into four provinces.*] Which are thoſe of France, Aquitaine, Auvergne, and Bretagny. There are fifteen priories in the firſt, fourteen in the ſecond, fifteen in the third, and thirteen in the fourth (72).

(*k*) La Mainſerme, Tom. III, pag. 172.

† Mulierum cohabitationem, in quo genere quondam peccaſti, diceris plus amare: ut quaſi antiquæ iniquitatis contagium, novæ religionis exemplo, circa eamdem materiam ſtudeas expiare. Has ergo, non ſolum communi menſa per diem, ſed & communi habitu per noctem, dignaris, ut referunt: accubante ſimul & diſcipulorum grege, ut inter utroſque medius jacens, utrique ſexui vigiliarum & ſomni leges præfigas. Has peregrinationis tuæ loquuntur eſſe pediſſequas: & diſputanti tibi jugiter aſſidere. Sed & diverſis locis & diverſis regionibus, non parum te aſſerunt habere numerum feminarum per xenodochia & diverſoria diviſarum, quas maribus non impune permixtas quaſi ad pauperum & peregrinorum obſequia, deputaſti. Quod quam periculoſe ſit factum, vagitus infantium prodiderunt.

⸸ Father Vignier ſaid alſo that there was a council held at Albi against the Albigenſes; in which it was ſaid, that thoſe heretics being charged with carrying women along with them, juſtified themſelves by ſaying. *Sic nos docuit Chriſtus Dominus: ſic nos docuerunt magiſter noſter Robertus, qui nuper Conventum Virginum inſtituit.*

‡ *At the word* in nullo loco, 18, Queſt. 2.

(66) Pag. 66.

(67) Printed at Antwerp, as the title ſays, for Henry Deſbordes, bookſeller at Amſterdam, 1701. Mr Bernard ſpeaks of it in his *Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres, July* 1701, *pag.* 79, *& ſeq.*

(68) *That is to ſay, that* it is there yet in part, *for it* is at preſent without a title: the firſt leaf, which contains the beginning, is cut out; but the three next pages are enough to ſhew to whom it is directed, and agrees with what we have ſeen printed. *Diſſert. Apologet. pag.* 34, 35.

(69) This is written in the year 1699.

(70) La Mainſerme, Tom. III, pag. 182.

(71) *See the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, April 1686, art. ii, *at the beginning.*

(72) La Mainſerme, Tom. III, pag 357.

FONTIUS,

FONTIUS (BARTHOLOMEW) born at Florence, was one of the learned men of the XVth century. He wrote ſome books which are printed [*A*]. Matthias Corvinus, king of Hungary, honoured him with his friendſhip, and gave him the direction of the famous library of Buda. Picus Mirandula, Marſilius Ficinus, Jerome Donatus, Robert Salviati, and other learned men of that age, had a reſpect for him, if we may credit the two verſes of Verin, which I have inſerted in the remark. He taught rhetoric ſucceſsfully in his own country.

To aſſign the time when he taught rhetoric in his own country, I ſhould have ſaid that he was Politian's colleague in 1488. Gaddi gives a good proof of this (*a*).

(*a*) Gaddi, Tom. II, de Scriptor. pag 139, apud Angelicum Aproſium, in Biblioth. Aproſiana, pag. 3.

[*A*] *He wrote ſome books which are printed.*] Among Picus Mirandula's letters there is one written by Fontius to Robert Salviati (1), to thank him for a book (2) he had ſent him. One of Fontius's chief works is his *Commentary upon Perſius*, printed at Venice, in 1491. The abbreviators of Geſner's Bibliotheque, only mention this Commentary as a manuſcript kept in the emperor's library; but, as Gaſpar Maſſa (3) upbraids them with it, they did not know that it had been printed about a hundred years before. The public were better pleaſed with Fontius's harangues than with his Commentary (4). A collection of his works was printed at Franckfort in 1621, in which is inſerted the life of Paul Ghiaccetti. The two verſes I mentioned are as follow:

Fontius eſt Rhetor pubis moderator Hetruſcæ,
Judicio & nulli morum pietate ſecundus.

Fontius, preceptor to the Tuſcan youth,
For rhet'ric fam'd, for judgment, and for truth.

(1) It is the 17th of the ſecond book.

(2) L'Heptaple de Pic de la Mirandole.

(3) Della Vita, Origine, e patria di Aulo Perſio, pag. 17.

(4) Fontius & ipſe non parum in Perſio meruit, ſed illius orationes majore quodam favore excipiuntur *Autor. Dialogi de Latinæ Linguæ reparat. pag.* 412.

FORBES (PATRIC) in Latin *Forbeſius*, a Scotch Gentleman in the XVIIth century, devoted himſelf to an eccleſiaſtical life. By the perſuaſions of his biſhop he was prevailed upon *to undertake the ſervice of a private cure in the country* (*a*). He was then forty eight years of age. *He diſcharged his duty ſo worthily, that a few years afterwards he was promoted to the biſhopric of Aberdeen, which he held about ſeventeen years. It was with great difficulty that king James made him accept of that dignity, and for ſeveral months he refuſed it, having propoſed to himſelf to live in a leſs conſpicuous ſtate. It was ſoon ſeen how much he deſerved to be a biſhop; and that his refuſal was not counterfeit, but the real effect of his humility. In all his behaviour he has diſplayed the character of a truly apoſtolical man* (*b*). We ſhall ſee this more particularly here-under [*A*]. He died in 1635, at the age of ſeventy one years (*c*). He wrote ſomething upon the apocalypſe (*d*).

(*a*) Burnet's Preface to William Bedell's Life.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Konig, Bibl. pag. 312.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

[*A*] *We ſhall ſee this more particularly hereunder.*] 'He viſited his dioceſe without pomp and noiſe, attended only by one ſervant, that he might more eaſily be informed of what belonged to his care. When he was told of the negligence or weakneſs of any his clergy, he would go and lodge near his church upon Saturday in the evening, without making himſelf known, and the next day, when he was in the pulpit, he would go and hear him, that by this he might be able to judge what his common ſermons were, and as they appeared to him he encouraged or admoniſhed him. He took ſo much care of two colleges he had in his dioceſe, that they ſoon diſtinguiſhed themſelves, and became famous all over Scotland: and when the church was involved in troubles, it appeared by the writings that came out againſt the covenant, that none but the doctors of thoſe colleges were able to defend her cauſe; and though they were the firſt that entered the liſts in that famous controverſy, yet hitherto we have ſeen nothing that has eclipſed or excelled their writings. Their exemplary piety, and profound erudition, were equally beneficial and honourable to that dioceſe. . . . . . He commonly aſſembled his clergy twice a year, and before he entered upon any buſineſs, he made them a ſhort ſpeech to excuſe his own infirmities, and told them, that if they obſerved any defect in his conduct, if his errors were ſecret, they might privately reprove him, or before the whole aſſembly, if they were public, in the manner they ſhould think proper. Then he retired a little, leſt his preſence ſhould hinder particular perſons from ſpeaking. There never was but one turbulent fellow that abuſed this liberty, for which he was reprimanded by every body, except the biſhop, who treated him with that civility his character required (1).' This I have taken from the famous Dr Burnet now biſhop of Salisbury's preface to the Life of William Bedell.

(1) Burnet's Preface to William Bedell's Life.

FORBES (JOHN) ſon of the preceeding, was 'of a much more extenſive learning than his father, in which perhaps he was excelled by none of that age: Thoſe who ſhall read his book of hiſtorical and theological inſtitutions, will not diſpute this title with him; for it is ſo excellent a work, that if he had been left in quiet in the retirement he had choſe, to apply himſelf to his ſtudies, and could have finiſhed it by a ſecond volume, it would perhaps have been the moſt valuable treatiſe of divinity that has yet appeared in the world. He filled the profeſſor's chair (*a*) which his father had founded (*b*) when the covenanters expelled him, and forced him to fly beyond ſea.' The letter he wrote to Voſſius, dated from Amſterdam the ſeventeenth of January 1645, and that which Voſſius wrote to him ſome months after, are worth conſidering [*A*]. Note, there was one **FORBES**, a Scotchman, and a great puritan, who was expelled his country in the beginning of the XVIIth century, and took ſhelter in Holland, where he hotly oppoſed the Arminians (*c*).

I add, that having continued in Holland a little above two years, he returned to his country, where he ſpent the remainder of his life upon his eſtate of Corſe, and died there the twenty ninth of April 1648 (*d*). There was an edition of all his works in two

(*a*) Burnet's Preface to Bedell's Life.

(*b*) In the univerſity of Aberdeen.

(*c*) See Grevinchovius, in the preface of his book againſt Ameſius.

(*d*) Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres, Feb. 1704, pag. 181.

[*A*] *The letter he wrote to Voſſius . . . . and Voſſius's letter to him, are worth conſidering.*] The letter he wrote to Voſſius (1) accompanied a copy of a Latin treatiſe he preſented to him, which he had publiſhed, wherein he ſhewed, that the doctrine of St Auguſtin, concerning grace, was agreeable to the conſtant doctrine of the Catholic church. He excuſed himſelf to Voſſius, that he was not of his opinion. I never ſaw the anſwer to it; but Voſſius's letter (2), that I mentioned, is in the collection printed at London.

(1) It is the 402d among thoſe written to Voſſius.

(2) It is the 560th among Voſſius's letters.

[*A*] *The*

two volumes in folio publiſhed at Amſterdam 1703, to which is added his life written by George Garden. An abridgment of the ſame, together, with a general idea of his writings, is to be found in the journaliſts (e): for which reaſon I ſhall not enlarge upon them.

FORBES (WILLIAM) biſhop of Edinburgh in the XVIIth century, was born at Aberdeen in Scotland, where he went through his claſſical learning and philoſophy. At ſixteen years of age he was maſter of arts, and preſently after profeſſor of logic, which office he diſcharged for four years with great ſucceſs. He applied himſelf ſtrenuouſly to defend Ariſtotle's logic againſt the cavils of the Ramiſts. Afterwards he travelled, and made a prodigious progreſs in divinity and Hebrew in the univerſities of Germany, during the four years he continued in that country. After this he viſited the univerſity of Leyden, and got the eſteem of all the great men who flouriſhed there. The ill ſtate of his health not permitting him to undertake a journey into France and Italy as he deſigned, he went over to England. The fame of his learning ſoon ſpreading there, the univerſity of Oxford offered him a profeſſorſhip in the Hebrew tongue. He did not accept of it, for the phyſicians adviſed him to return to his native country. The magiſtrates of Aberdeen expreſſed a particular eſteem for him. He recovered his health and accepted the cure of Alford in the dioceſe of Aberdeen. His ſtay in this pariſh was but ſhort; his great learning, eloquence, and piety, requiring a more conſpicuous ſtation. Being called to preach in his own country, he accepted the call, and diſcharged the duty of a true miniſter of the goſpel. He was admitted doctor of divinity, when king James, among other things, had agreed with the deputies of the clergy (a), that the academical dignities and degrees ſhould be reſtored to their antient courſe. The miniſterial functions, and preaching, impairing his health, they aſſigned him a leſs toilſome employment, by making him principal of Marſhal college. He read lectures three times a week, as the ſtatutes required, and was afterwards declared dean of the faculty of divinity, and then rector of the univerſity; a poſt immediately next to the chancellor. The city of Edinburgh invited him to be their paſtor: he humbly thanked them for this mark of their eſteem, but at length was forced to accept of it, the ſupream council, and the provincial ſynod, having ordered him to do ſo. He was received at Edinburgh with all poſſible ſigns of friendſhip; but the tempers of men being afterwards altered [*A*], he withdrew from that flock, and returned into his own country, where he was paſſionately deſired. Some years after he was ſent for by king Charles I, who had been crowned with great pomp at Edinburgh in 1633. He preached before this prince with ſo much eloquence and learning, that he was admired by the whole auditory. The king, having founded an epiſcopal church at Edinburgh, found no body ſo worthy to fill the new ſee as our Forbes. He was conſecrated with the uſual ceremonies, and applied himſelf entirely to the functions of his dignity; but he fell ſick ſoon after, and died the firſt of April 1634, having enjoyed his biſhopric only three months. He was forty nine years of age (*b*). He had printed nothing, and compoſed but very little. He wrote a tract tending to pacify controverſies [*B*], which was printed in 1658, and reprinted at Helmſtad in 1704

[*A*] *The tempers of men being altered.*] The difference of opinions concerning epiſcopacy was the cauſe of this alteration. The paſtor taught, that biſhops are above prieſts: the people did not believe this epiſcopal primacy, being violently attached to the diſcipline of Geneva, and zealous for the equality of miniſters. Forbes maintained modeſtly and ſolidly in his ſermons, that the primacy of biſhops is not a humane inſtitution, but founded upon the word of GOD, the practice of the apoſtles, and the cuſtom of the primitive church. His auditors rejected this doctrine, reproaching their paſtor, and charging him with Popery (1). When he found that his labours were unprofitable to his flock, and that it was only ſeed ſown upon a barren ground, he reſolved to lay down his charge, and the rather becauſe his lean and macerated body could hardly bear the ſmoak of Edinburgh, without great danger (2). I act herein only the part of a tranſlator, without interpoſing my judgment in the diſpute between the Epiſcoparians and Presbyterians.

[*B*] *He compoſed little: he wrote a tract tending to pacify controverſies.*] The title of this book is, *Conſiderationes modeſtæ & pacificæ controverſiarum de juſtificatione, purgatorio, invocatione ſanctorum,* & CHRISTO *mediatore, Euchariſtia* (3). It will not be unacceptable to inſert here the character the author of his Life has given of it: 'Opus hoc poſthumum, quod jam 'in lucem prodit, eſt pacati ingenii & moderati animi 'ingens ſpecimen & indicium: in quo tanquam alter 'Caſſander & Catholicus moderator, rigidas & auſteras, utriuſque tam reformatæ quam pontificiæ partis, 'opiniones in quibuſdam religionis controverſiis, componere, ſaltem mitigare ſatagit. Quanti moderationem fecerit oſtendens dicto illo frequenter ab ipſo 'uſurpato: Si plures fuiſſent Caſſandri & Wicelii, non 'opus fuiſſet Luthero aut Calvino (4). ——— *This 'poſthumous work, which now appears in public, is an 'extraordinary proof and ſpecimen of moderation, and 'a pacific temper, wherein, like a ſecond Caſſander 'and Catholic moderator, he ſtrenuouſly labours to compoſe, or at leaſt to mitigate, the rigid and auſtere opinions, both of the reformed and romaniſts. The great 'regard he had for moderation ſufficiently appears by 'that common ſaying of his; that had there been more 'Caſſander's and Wicelius's, there would have been no 'occaſion for a Luther or a Calvin.*' Theſe laſt words are not reliſhed by zealous and hot men: they are a tacit cenſure upon Luther and Calvin; they ſeem to blame them for having carried a thouſand things to extremities, which moderate men, ſuch as Caſſander and Wicelius, would have tolerated for the ſake of peace. Obſerve that he had filled the margin of Bellarmin's four volumes with notes. Theſe notes were ſo well liked by Robert Baron, profeſſor in divinity in William Forbes's place, that he preferred them to all that had been publiſhed againſt that Jeſuit. He would have publiſhed them if death had not prevented him. For the reſt, the reſolution our prelate took not to write much was very good, and as ſolid as the advice he gave to one who uſed a great deal of paper. *Read more*, ſaid he, and *write leſs. Pauca ſcripſit, ſcire enim maluit quam ſcribere, & hoc dicterium ſcripturienti cuidam, & ei magnos labores oſtentanti, lepide ſed ſolide uſurpavit; Lege plura, & ſcribe pauciora* (5). The number of excellent writers would not be ſo ſmall as it is, if thoſe, who at length acquire a talent

---

(e) Ibid. pag. 176, & *ſeq.* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, July 1703, pag. 291, & *ſeq.*

(*a*) He held an eccleſiaſtical aſſembly at St Andrew's in Scotland, to conſider of the affairs of the church of that kingdom.

(*b*) Taken from his life, at the beginning of a book mentioned in the rem. [*B*].

(1) Forbeſii ſanam doctrinam de Epiſcoporum primatu, multis convitiis inceſſere, ipſumque Pontificiæ profeſſionis reum inſimulare non verebantur. *Elench. Vitæ Gul. Forbeſii.*

(2) Ibid.

(3) It is in 8vo, and contains 466 pages. It was printed at London.

(4) Elench Vitæ Gul. Forbeſii, pag. penult.

(5) Id ibid.

1704 (c). We ſhall ſee below what the biſhop of Saliſbury ſays of the merit of this prelate [C]. Mr le Fevre, doctor of the Sorbonne, made an ill choice of his witneſſes, when he quoted the opinion of William Forbes, to prove that the Calviniſts do not adhere to the deciſions of the ſynod of Dort. Monſ. Arnauld knew how to make the moſt of his advantage on this occaſion [D].

(c) See the fifth volume of the *Bibliotheque Choiſie, pag.* 396, *& ſeq.*

of writing well, could bring themſelves to a reſolution of publiſhing but once in four years; but they abuſe the facility of writing they have obtained, and injure their reputation, by heaping volume upon volume: they will not be at the trouble of reviſing and poliſhing, and therefore do nothing that is good, or that comes near the merit of their firſt performances. To conclude, I believe that, if the man who wrote ſo much had come ſome time after, and told William Forbes, *I have followed your advice, I have read ſuch and ſuch a number of books*, he would have given him this farther advice, *for the future, read leſs and meditate more.* I have heard ſay that Mr Claude adviſed a very learned perſon, who had been a prodigious reader, to be three or four years without reading any thing, and to do nothing but meditate: as if he had ſaid, *you have eat enough, now digeſt.* Thoſe who are called *helluones librorum* have need of this advice.

[C] *We ſhall ſee below what the biſhop of Saliſbury has ſaid of the merit of this prelate.*] 'William Forbes was alſo one of the doctors of Aberdeen*: while king Charles was in Scotland, he was promoted to the biſhopric of Edinburgh, which that prince had then founded, and this gave him occaſion to ſay that he had met ſo excellent a clergyman, that he deſerved to have a new epiſcopal ſee erected for him, and indeed he was a great and ſublime divine ..... He preached with ſo much zeal and ardour, that frequently forgetting the meaſure of time, he continued his ſermons for two or three hours: this toil greatly diminiſhed his ſtrength, together with his faſting and aſcetic way of life, which he carried to ſuch a height, that he took no more nouriſhment than was juſt ſufficient to retard his death, which happened one year after his promotion to a biſhopric. He enjoyed this dignity long enough to exhibit the virtues of an excellent miniſter in his perſon, but too little a while to perform what might have been expected from a longer life. The few books he publiſhed are a ſufficient proof of his great and extenſive learning, though his ardent deſire after peace and unity among Chriſtians, made him too favourable to a great many corruptions in the church of Rome: Thus an unlimited charity engages great men to entertain imprudent opinions; but when the principle or motive they act by is truly good, they ought to be excuſed, or at leaſt cenſured with moderation (6).'

* In 1633.

(6) Burnet's Preface to the Life of Will. Bedell.

[D] *Mr Arnauld knew how to make the moſt of his advantage on this occaſion.*] He had mantained in his great book of the overthrow of morality, that the inamiſſibility of grace, or impoſſibility of falling from grace, was an article of faith among the Calviniſts determined by the ſynod of Dort. Mr le Fevre oppoſed this aſſertion, and endeavoured to prove that the Calviniſts were at liberty to believe what they pleaſed concerning it. He cited ſeveral Proteſtant writers who did not hold the inamiſſibility of grace, and particularly William Forbes. Let us ſee what Mr Arnauld replied to this (7): 'The very title of William Forbes's book ought to have convinced Mr le Fevre that he was not a fit perſon to be objected to me. For he was the moſt moderate and equitable of thoſe pacific epiſcopalians, who, deſiring a union between the Catholics and Proteſtants, made no difficulty to declare for the Catholics againſt the Calviniſts, when they believed the Calviniſts were in the wrong, as he himſelf believed they were in ſeveral points of controverſy he has handled. Therefore in the abridgment of his life, in the beginning of his book, he is called another Caſſander ..... His friends durſt not publiſh his book till 1658, twenty years after his death: and yet, long before it appeared, he was hated by the Calviniſts, as one that maintained againſt them the Arminian doctrine of the amiſſibility of faith, probably becauſe he could not forbear ſaying in his ſermons, that, when the presbyterians undertook the ruin of epiſcopacy, being ſupported by the parliament rebels, one of the reproaches they threw upon Laud, the unhappy archbiſhop of Canterbury, was, that he encouraged Arminianiſm; and the proof they brought of it is, that he perſuaded the king to promote to the biſhoprics of Scotland, men who had hardly any thing to diſtinguiſh them, but being known to be zealous Arminians, ſuch, ſaid they, as was Forbes promoted by that king to the ſee of Edinburgh. This liberty which he took to diſlike the Geneva opinions made him ſo obnoxious to Calvin's party, that, having been called to Edinburgh, to be paſtor there, before it was erected into a biſhopric, thoſe who were the moſt powerful in that city could not bear him, and branded him with the name of Papiſt.' This, and other things ſpecified by Mr Arnauld, ſhew ſo evidently that our Forbes's private ſentiments, concerning the inamiſſibility of grace, cannot be brought as a proof that the Calviniſts are at liberty to reject that doctrine, that it is unneceſſary to inquire what Mr le Fevre anſwered; for it may eaſily be ſuppoſed that it could not be to the purpoſe. And indeed his reply is ſo weak that I will not relate it (8).

(7) Arnauld, Calviniſme convaincu de nouveau, pag. 120.

(8) See chap. xvii of his Reply to Mr Arnauld.

FOULQUES, prior of Deuil in the XIIth century, was an intimate friend of Peter Abelard. He is little known, I believe, but by the conſolatory* letter (a) he wrote to that friend upon the loſs of his privities. We have given an account in another place (b) of the violence done to Abelard, who, inſtead of well inſtructing his pupil, had got her with child. This young woman's relations, to be more compleatly revenged, went to the very root of the evil, and plucked it up ſo well, that they put it out of the power of the criminal ever to relapſe. Foulques, knowing that Abelard was inconſolable on account of this mutilation, wrote him a letter, wherein he ſet out all the advantages that might accrue to him from ſuch a misfortune. He repreſented to him, that his great gifts, the ſubtilty of his wit, his eloquence and learning, which drew an admirable number of auditors to him from all parts [A], had filled

(a) It is in Abelard's works, pag. 217. Paris edit. 1616.

(b) In the articles of ABELARD and HELOISA.

[A] *Abelard's great gifts drew an incredible number of auditors to him.*] They came from Rome, Spain, England, Germany, the Netherlands, and the remoteſt provinces of France. Our Foulques expreſſes this in a very lively manner, though his ſtile ſavours a little of the bombaſt of the barbarous ages. 'Roma ſuos tibi docendos tranſmittebat alumnos, & quæ olim omnium artium ſcientiam auditoribus ſolebat infundere, ſapientiorem te ſe ſapiente tranſmiſſis ſcholaribus monſtrabat. Nulla terrarum ſpatia, nulla montium cacumina, nulla concava vallium, nulla via difficili licet obſita periculo & latrone quominus ad te properarent retinebat. Anglorum turbam juvenum mare interjacens, & undarum procella terribilis non terrebat, ſed omni periculo contempto, audito tuo nomine ad te confluebat. Remota Britannia ſua animalia erudienda deſtinabat. Andegavenſis eorum edomita feritate tibi famulabantur in ſuis. Pictavi, Waſcones, & Hiberi: Normannia, Flandria, Theutonicus & Suevius tuum colere ingenium, laudare & prædicare aſſiduè ſtudebat. Præterea cunctos Pariſiorum civitatem habitantes, & intra Galliarum proximas & remotiſſimas partes qui ſic à te docere ſitiebant, ac ſi nihil diſciplinæ non apud te inveniri potuiſſet. —— *Rome tranſmitted her ſons to your tuition, and ſhe, who formerly infuſed into her pupils the knowledge* of filled him with unſufferable vanity. He gently touches upon another thing that had not a little contributed to make him ſo proud, which was, that the women ran after him [*B*], and gloried in making a conqueſt of him. He told him, the loſs he had ſuſtained would cure him of his pride, and deliver him from the ſnares of women, which had reduced him to very great want [*C*], though his profeſſion was worth a great deal of

of all arts, did, by committing her ſcholars to your care, own the ſuperiority of your wiſdom. No diſtance of climate, no height of mountains, no depth of vallies, no ways however difficult or dangerous to travellers have prevented them from haſtening to you. The interpoſition of ſeas, the threats of ſtorms and tempeſts, could not deter the Britiſh youth, when they had once heard your name, from crouding to you. Remote Bretagne determined to ſhake off her ſavage ignorance. Anjou having ſoftened her native fierceneſs learned from you to obey. Poictou, Gaſcoin, and Spain; Normandy, Flanders, and Germany, owned, courted, and continually extolled the greatneſs of your genius. All the inhabitants of Paris, all the people in France, whether neighbouring or remote, had ſuch an inſatiable deſire of being inſtructed by you, that they ſeemed to think all diſcipline was engroſſed by you.' Foulques is not the only one that mentions this great affluence of ſcholars. There is a chronicle writer (1) who affirms they came from almoſt all the Latin countries: ‘Petrus Abailardus monachus & abbas, vir erat religioſus, excellentiſſimarum Rector ſcholarum ad quas pene de tota Latinitate viri litterati confluebant. —— *Peter Abelard, monk and abbot, was a man of great piety, and a maſter of excellent ſchools, which were crouded by learned men, from almoſt all parts of the Latin world.'* It cannot be denied they came ſome of them from beyond the Alps, ſince St Bernard writes that Peter Abelard had nothing to fear, becauſe he believed he had protectors at the court of Rome among the cardinals, and other eccleſiaſtics that had ſtudied under him. *Securus tamen eſt quoniam cardinales & clericos curiæ ſe diſcipulos habuiſſe gloriatur* (2). Cardinal Gui du Chatel, who was afterwards Pope Celeſtine II (3), was one of theſe patrons. If you conſult Abelard himſelf upon the number of his diſciples, you will find, that when he retired into the country, he was followed by ſuch crouds of ſcholars, that they could get neither lodgings nor proviſions enough for them: *Ad quas (ſcholas) tanta ſcholarium multitudo confluxit, ut nec locus hoſpitiis, nec terra ſufficeret alimentis* (4).

[*B*] *Women ran after him.*] Theſe are Foulques's own words: where it muſt be obſerved he ſpeaks only by hearſay. ‘Nam illud quod ſic te, ut ajunt, præcipitem dedit, ſingularum ſcilicet fœminarum amorem & laqueos libidinis earum quibus ſuos capiunt ſcortatores, melius mihi videor præterire quam aliquid dicere quod ordini noſtro & regulæ noſtræ religionis non concordet. —— *As to that which, the world ſays, plunged you into misfortune, namely the love of women, and the ſnares of luſt in which they catch thoughtleſs wretches, I think it more proper to be paſſed over in ſilence, than to mention a thing which does not agree with our order, and the rules of our religion.'*

[*C*] . . . . *Women reduced him to very great want.*] Foulques, who had heard ſay that Abelard was ſo poor, when this misfortune happened to him, that he had nothing but rags to cover him, begs him to conſider what great damage that little part of his body, which was cut off, had been to him, and how much he would ſave and get by loſing it. You ruined yourſelf, ſays he, by your leud intrigues; all your eſtate was ſwallowed up by that abominable gulf. ‘Hæc corporis particula quam omnipotentis Dei judicio & beneficio perdidiſti, quantum tibi nocuerat ac nocere quamdiu permanſit non deſiſtebat, melius tuarum diminutio rerum quam mea poſſit monſtrare oratio, docet. Quicquid verè ſcientiæ tuæ venditione perorando præter cotidianum victum & uſum neceſſarium, ſicut relatione didici, adquirere poteras, in voraginem fornicariæ conſumptionis demergere non ceſſabas. Avara meretricum rapacitas cuncta tibi rapuerat. Nulla audierunt ſecula meretricem velle alteri miſereri, vel peperciſſe rebus appetitorum quas quoquo modo auferre potuerunt. Videtur hoc probare tua profunda paupertas, qui nihil, ut dicitur, præter pannos ex tanto quæſtu habebas, cum his primum caſibus ſubjacuiſti fortunæ . . . . . Adde quod pecunia tua ſi quam tibi habere licuerit (non enim eſt monachorum ſine licentia proprium quid habere) vexationi diſtrahentium non erit obnoxia. A modo incipies poſſidere quod multis paulo ante diſtrahebatur eviſcerationibus. —— *The diminution of your fortune is a more ample teſtimony, than any thing I can ſay, of the miſchiefs continually brought upon you by that troubleſome member, which by GOD's good will and favour you have now loſt. All the fruits of your labours, and the produce of your knowledge, except what was laid out on a bare ſubſiſtence, was perpetually ſunk in the all-craving gulf of fornication. The rapacious avarice of leud women ſtripped you of all. No age ever heard of a whore that knew compaſſion, or that ſpared the fortune of her followers, if ſhe could get it into her power. Your extream poverty ſeems to be a proof of what I advance; ſince, if report be true, you had nothing to ſhew of all your vaſt income, except a few old cloaths, when you lay under thoſe circumſtances. . . . . Beſides all this, your money, if you be allowed to have any (for the monks without permiſſion cannot call any their own) will no longer be ſubject to the depredations of thoſe rovers. From hence forward you will begin to enjoy what lately was embezzeled by the moſt laviſh profuſion.'* No doubt common report had amplified things: I cannot think that Abelard at the time of his diſaſter was reduced to the condition of the prodigal ſon, who, having ſpent his living among harlots (5), was ready to periſh with hunger (6). I confeſs his comforter does not repreſent him as actually reduced to a bit of bread; but only in general as brought to rags. Nay it may be objected that it is more probable a leud fellow ſhould ruin himſelf to ſuch a degree, as to want cloaths rather than food; for the ſame leeches, that ſuck out his money, are glad he ſhould be luſty: it is their intereſt that he feeds well; but his cloaths are nothing to them; it is to their damage if he is not vigorous, and they would rather ſupply him with food, than let him ſtarve. Yet I believe Foulques had heard that Abelard was ſo ruined by women, that he wanted both nouriſhment and cloaths: I do not ſuppoſe Foulques minded thoſe ſubtle diſtinctions between diet and cloaths (7); but I am ſure he gave too much credit to fabulous ſtories; for though it ſhould not be ſuppoſed that Abelard's profeſſion, and marriage with Heloiſa, kept him within bounds, yet it is hard to think that a handſome man as he was, a fine ſpeaker, a ſubtle logician, in great repute, loved by the women, ſhould have ſpent upon them the laſt penny. A man of wit in his place, and acquainted with the world, would perhaps have got more money than he ſpent in ſuch a way. But here was Abelard's miſtake: he knew nothing of the practices of the looſe world, he was a ſcholar: and therefore, though he returned the ladies love for love, he knew not how to increaſe his income by it. He was a man to be fleeced on all hands.

I fancy it may be affirmed without raſhneſs, that our Foulques was but little acquainted with the old poet Archilochus, and little verſed in Ælian: yet he makes uſe of a thought ſomething like an expreſſion in Archilochus quoted by Ælian. Πολλάκις τὰ κατ' ὀβολὸν μετὰ πολλῶν πόνων συναχθέντα χρήματα, κατὰ τὸν Ἀρχίλοχον, εἰς πόρνης γυναικὸς ἔντερον καταιρουσιν (8). The tranſlator has not fully hit upon the meaning of the Greek poet: the word ἔντερον there ſignifies a purſe only in a metaphorical ſenſe: the learned Kuhnius ſaw it very well: κακέμφατον, ſays he (9), *& ſenſus turpiculus ſubeſt voci* ἔντερον. *Ita Stoici* τὴν συνουσίαν *pro ſua* εὐθυῤῥημοσύνῃ *definiunt* ἐντερίου παράτριψιν, *&c.* Nicetas Choniates applies this thought of Archilochus to the reign of Alexis Manuel Comnenus (10): Τὸ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου ἄντικρυς ἐπεραίνετο, ὅ φησιν, εἰς ἔντερον πορνης πολλάκις μεταῤῥυΐσκεσθαι τὰ χρόνῳ συλλεγέντα μακρῷ. Ut plane id fieret quod Archilochus ſcribit ea ſæpe in ſcorti pudenda confluere quæ longo labore & tempore ſint congeſta. —— *That ſaying of Archilochus was entirely verified, namely that the produce of many years hard labour is often ſunk in a whore's lap.* Foulques's expreſſion, *in voraginem fornicariæ conſumptionis demergere non*

ceſſabas

---

(1) Autor Chronici Moriniacenſis, apud And. du Cheſne, Not. in Hiſtor. Calamit. Abælardi, pag. 1155.

(2) Epiſt cxciii.

(3) See St Bernard's letter to him, in Abelard's works, pag. 299

(4) Abelardi, Oper. pag. 19.

(5) Ὁ καταφαγών σου τὸν βίον μετὰ πορνῶν. Qui abligurivit victum ſuum cum meretricibus. *Luca cap. xv, ver.* 30.

(6) Ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῷ ἀπόλλυμαι. Ego vero fame pereo. *Ib. ver.* 17.

(7) Theſe diſtinctions might do, ſuppoſing that a woman could not get another gallant; but Abelard was at Paris, where if a gallant has not money, he is neglected, and others looked for, who can maintain a miſtreſs, and then the diet of the firſt is as little minded as his cloaths.

(8) Ælian, Hiſt. Div. lib. iv, cap. xiv, pag. m. 276. *Here follows the verſion of Vulteius:* Sæpe pecuniæ, quas multo cum labore quis ſigillatim per obolos vix comparſerit, juxta Archilochum, univerſæ ſemel in ſcorti marſupium effunduntur.

(9) Kuhnius in Ælian. ibid.

(10) Nicetas Choniates, in Alexi Man. Comneno, pag. 253. Genev. edit. 1593, in 4to.

of money to him. He aſſured him the loſs of thoſe parts, he had made an ill uſe of, would ſtifle ſeveral paſſions in him that torment other men. That he would now be at liberty to keep his thoughts collected within himſelf, inſtead of ſuffering them to wander upon a thouſand laſcivious ſubjects. He adds, that his meditations being no longer interrupted by the emotions of the fleſh, he would be better able to diſcover the ſecrets of nature, and the reaſons of things; beſides, that he would not now ruin himſelf by intrigues, nor his purſe be again the prey of thoſe vile and voracious courtezans, who knew ſo well how to fleece him (*c*). He reckons it as a great advantage to him, that for the future he would not be the terror of any huſband [*D*], but might ſafely lodge any where; for being out of the reach of ſuſpicion from his landlord, he would be a welcome gueſt in all houſes, and ſkreened from jealouſy. He does not forget to tell him, that he might go in and out among the beſt dreſſed ladies, and view the moſt beautiful maids, without the leaſt danger or fear of thoſe criminal temptations, with which the ſight of ſuch objects can fire even the breaſts of old men themſelves. He congratulates him upon being freed from thoſe impure illuſions which invade our ſleep [*E*]; an

(*c*) See the remark [*C*].

ceſſabas, may alſo be compared with a paſſage in Sidonius Appollinaris, where the like extravagance is called *ſumptuoſitas domeſticæ Charybdis*. The paſſage is good, and deſcribes the behaviour of a young man, who, after having ruined himſelf by profligate women, at length opened his eyes, and forſaking his infamous intrigues married a good fortune. The author would have had his change more holy, and that from debauchery he ſhould have paſſed to continence; but, ſays he, few men can go ſuch lengths at firſt, and immediately deny themſelves every thing, who have been accuſtomed to the moſt abandoned liberties.
‘ Hic proximè abrupto contubernio ancillæ propudio-
‘ ſiſſimæ, cui ſe totum conſuetudine obſcœna junctus
‘ addixerat, patrimonio, poſteris, famæ ſubitâ ſui cor-
‘ rectione conſuluit. Namque per rei familiaris damna
‘ vacuatus, ut primum intelligere cœpit, & retractare
‘ quantum de bonuſculis avitis paterniſque ſumptuoſi-
‘ tas domeſticæ charybdis abliguriſſet, quamquam ſerò
‘ reſipiſcens, attamen tandem veluti frænos momordit,
‘ excuſſitque cervices, atque Ulyxeas (ut ferunt) ceras
‘ auribus figens, fugit adverſum vitia ſurdus, meretri-
‘ cii blandimenta naufragii: puellamque (prout decuit)
‘ intactam vir laudandus in matrimonium aſſumpſit,
‘ tam moribus natalibuſque ſummatem, quàm facultatis
‘ principalis. Eſſet quidem gloria, ſi voluptates ſic re-
‘ liquiſſet, ut nec uxori conjugaretur: ſed etſi forte
‘ contingat ad bonos mores ab errore migrare, pauco-
‘ rum eſt incipere de maximis: & eos qui diu totum
‘ indulſerint ſibi, protinus totum & pariter incidere
‘ (11). —— *Having broke off all commerce with his*
‘ *infamous maid, to whoſe leud embraces he had before*
‘ *abandoned himſelf, by this ſudden and happy change he*
‘ *conſulted his intereſt, his reputation, and the ho-*
‘ *nour of his family; for being reduced by the frequent*
‘ *damages which his fortune had ſuſtained, no ſooner did*
‘ *he begin to conſider what ſums had been ſwallowed up*
‘ *by this domeſtic Charybdis, though his repentance was*
‘ *late, yet, having at laſt broke his rein, and diſenga-*
‘ *ged himſelf, like Ulyſſes, he filled his ears with wax,*
‘ *became deaf to the muſic of vice, and the charms of a*
‘ *wanton ſyren. Having gained ſo noble a conqueſt over*
‘ *himſelf, he then married, and, as prudence directed,*
‘ *choſe a maid of ſpotleſs virtue, whoſe family and for-*
‘ *tune might claim the higheſt regard. The conqueſt*
‘ *however had ſtill been more glorious, had he ſo far*
‘ *ſubdued his deſires as not to have married; but tho'*
‘ *it ſometimes happens that a man may bid adieu to his*
‘ *error, yet very few at the firſt ſpring riſe to the*
‘ *heights of virtue, and, after they have allowed them-*
‘ *ſelves an unlimited indulgence, cut it entirely ſhort at*
‘ *once.*’ See Rigaltius, and Gudius's notes upon a paſſage of Phædrus (12), where you will find a great many ſentences concerning the adddreſs with which a leud woman reduces her gallants to beggary. Foulques was not ignorant of this truth, and he believed Abelard had experienced the ſame. He could not have expreſſed himſelf more ſtrongly, even though he had been in a condition to profit by reading Signor Stefano Guazzo, who has the following words. ‘ So-
‘ no piu damnoſe le donne vecchie che le giovani, per-
‘ che ſecondo il volgar detto, la capra giovane mangia
‘ il ſale, & la vecchia mangia il ſale, e'l ſacco . . . .
‘ coſi alla fine vi riſolverete, che ſiamo poſti al mondo
‘ dalle donne, per eſſer ruinati dalle donne: Et perciò
‘ diceva un meſchino, che ſe ne moriva di mal fran-
‘ ceſe: Donna m'ha fatto, & donna m'ha disfatto.
‘ Et certo che disfanno in due modi, ſe crediamo à
‘ quel gentil poeta, che diſſe. —— *Old women are*
‘ *more pernicious than the young; for according to the*
‘ *proverb, the young kid eats the ſalt, the old goat eats*
‘ *ſalt, and bag and all . . . . . So that it muſt be con-*
‘ *feſſed, as by women we are brought into the world,*
‘ *by women we are ruined. This made a poor ſinner*
‘ *juſt ready to die of the pox cry out: a woman gave*
‘ *me life, and by a woman I am deprived of life: and*
‘ *it is certain they deſtroy us two ways, if we may believe*
‘ *the poet, who has ſaid,*

Succia Lesbia la borſo, & ſucca il core,
Pazzo è chi compra con due ſangui amore (13).

Lesbia ſucks the purſe as well as heart. Woe to the man that purchaſes love at ſo dear a rate.

[*D*] *The terror of any husbands.*] I have not tranſlated literally, for fear of falling into an expreſſion a little two comical; for Foulques's words are: ‘ Hoc
‘ quoque magni exiſtimare debes quod nulli ſuſpectus
‘ ab omni hoſpite hoſpes tutiſſime recipiaris. Maritus
‘ uxoris violationem ex te vel lectuli concuſſionem
‘ minimè formidabit.’

[*E*] *And view the moſt beautiful maids without danger . . . . free from thoſe impure illuſions which invade our ſleep.*] That I may not be thought to amplify things, here I ſhall produce the author's own words.
‘ Decentiſſime ornatarum turmas matronarum inviola-
‘ biliter pertranſibis, virginum choros flore juventutis
‘ ſplendentium, quæ etiam ſenes jam calore carnis de-
‘ ſtitutos ſuis motibus in fervorem libidinis inflammare
‘ conſueverunt, non timens earum inceſſus & laqueos,
‘ ſecurus & ſine peccato miraberis . . . . . Omnino poſt
‘ hos hujus fragiliſſimæ fragilitatis fluxus, quod mag-
‘ num Dei gratiæ munus in hoc ordine æſtimo, no-
‘ cturnas ſomniorum illuſiones te minime ſentire ita
‘ certum eſt, ſicut certum eſt quoniam voluntatem ſi
‘ forte aderit, nullus ſequetur effectus. —— *You will*
‘ *now run no riſques amidſt the aſſemblies of ladies, how-*
‘ *ever their charms may be ſet off to advantage; you*
‘ *may now ſecurely, and without danger of falling, fre-*
‘ *quent the balls, and gaze on the nymphs that are a-*
‘ *dorned with all the pride of beauty, and who by their*
‘ *air have often inflamed old age itſelf, deſtitute of the*
‘ *warmth of the fleſh, with the fervour of deſire . . . .*
‘ *After this deprivation of the moſt frail of all frail-*
‘ *ties, which I look on as a ſignal mark of divine fa-*
‘ *vour in this order, 'tis as certain you will no longer be*
‘ *ſubject to the nocturnal illuſions of dreams, as it is, that*
‘ *no effect can be produced by the will if ever ſuch ſhould*
‘ *happen to be your caſe.*’ It is needleſs to prove that Foulques rightly places this among the greateſt advantages of a clergyman's life. It is certain a man devoted to continency muſt think it happy to have a heart proof againſt love and beauty: he ought to wiſh to have the ſame qualities with reſpect to that fire, as the Hirpes had for common fire (14). It is not only the eaſieſt but the ſureſt way to be chaſte; for thoſe, who cannot perſevere in this way without frequent conflicts, are much to be pitied: they live in continual agitation and trouble; their ſtate is always doubtful; victory is ſometimes wavering (15), and even ſometimes goes againſt them: they are too often convinced that ſucceſs is uncertain, nor do they ſcarce ever come off conquerors in thoſe conteſts without being covered with wounds. We juſtly conclude that thoſe are miſerable, who are never out of the phyſician's hands (16). This is no leſs true of thoſe

(11) Sidon. Apollinar. Epiſt. vi, lib. ix, pag. m. 571.

(12) *See theſe words of the ſecond Fable of the ſecond book:* A fœminis utcunque ſpoliari viros
Ament, amentur, nempe exemplis diſcimus.
Loving or lov'd, we by example find,
That women are the rooks that ſtrip mankind.

(13) Stefano Guazzo, la civil Converſatione, lib. ii, pag. m. 261.

(14) See the remark [*M*] of the article LOYOLA.

(25) See the remark [*N*] of the article FONTEVRAUD.

(16) Vivere medice eſt miſere vivere.

an exemption, ſays he, that is a great gift from God. The matrimonial functions; continues he, and the care of a family, will not hinder you from applying to pleaſe God (*d*); and what a happineſs is it to be placed out of danger, and aſſured of ſinning no more: He urges the example of Origen, and ſome holy martyrs, who are now rejoicing in heaven, that they were on earth in the ſame condition, which Abelard was lamenting. He repreſents to him, that his loſs is irreparable [*F*], and therefore he ought

(*d*) Blanditiæ uxoris corporumque contactus, ſine quo uxor haberi non poteſt, ac liberorum cura ſingularis quominus Deo placeas minime retardabunt.

thoſe who are always forced to combat with a ſanguine conſtitution, and be in a conſtant oppoſition to the irruptions of the fleſh. This is a lamentable ſtate: a man is often beat back to his intrenchments; his conſcience ſighing and groaning for the defeat: what progreſs would he not make towards perfection, could he walk without thoſe obſtacles, and without fighting the enemy at every ſtep? As to the other point, I mean the impurities of ſleep, St Auſtin will tell us what the happineſs is, that Foulques congratulates his friend for; St Auſtin, I ſay, who begs of God the grace of being delivered from the inconvenience he felt on that account. He ſubmitted in ſleep to what he would not have done when awake, and laments that remainder of infirmity in him. ‘Adhuc vivunt in memoria mea, *ſays he* (17), talium rerum imagines, quas ibi conſuetudo mea fixit: & occurſant mihi vigilanti quidem carentes viribus, in ſomnis autem non ſolum uſque ad delectationem, ſed etiam uſque ad conſenſionem factumque ſimillimum. Et tantum valet imaginis illuſio in anima mea & in carne mea, ut dormienti falſa viſa perſuadeant, quod vigilanti vera non poſſunt . . . . . Numquid non potens eſt manus tua, Deus omnipotens, ſanare omnes languores animæ meæ, atque abundantiore gratia tua laſcivos motus etiam mei ſoporis extinguere? Augebis, Domine, magis magiſque in me munera tua, ut anima mea ſequatur mea ad te, concupiſcentiæ viſco expedita, ut non ſit rebellis ſibi: atque ut in ſomnis etiam, non ſolum non perpetret iſtas corruptelarum turpitudines per imagines animales uſque ad carnis fluxum, ſed ne conſentiat quidem. —— *The images of ſuch things*, ſays he, *as cuſtom had left in my memory, are ſtill freſh therein; and tho' whilſt I wake they preſent themſelves without making any impreſſion, yet in ſleep they not only excite a pleaſure, but a conſent, and the reſemblance of an act. Such moreover is the power of theſe illuſions on my ſoul, and my fleſh, that falſe appearances in a dream have a greater influence upon me, than the real objects whilſt I wake. Is not thy hand, O almighty GOD, able to heal all the infirmities of my ſoul, and by thy more abundant grace to extinguiſh all the wanton emotions of my ſlumbers? Pour down, O Lord, more and more thy mercies upon me, that my ſoul being freed from the power of concupiſcence, may no longer riſe in rebellion againſt itſelf, but be directed to thee, and that even in ſleep it may not only be free from pollution, and the illuſion of animal images, but alſo from a conſent.*’

[*F*] *He tells Abelard that his loſs is irreparable.*] This is moſt certain: it does not happen here as to the Sybil's tree; that when one golden branch was cut off, another preſently ſprouts up in the room of it.

- - - - - Primo avulſo non deficit alter
Aureus; & ſimili frondeſcit virga metallo (18).

When one is pluck'd, behold a ſecond riſe
And glitter on the tree.

He who, ſpeaking of a maidenhead, ſaid it could be loſt but once, and that no artifice could repair it, was right in the main:

. . . . nulla reparabilis arte
Læſa pudicitia eſt, deperit illa ſemel (19).

No arts, no means, can honour loſt reſtore,
When that once ſinks it never riſes more.

But probably he knew that, though the original is not to be recovered by any contrivance, yet ſometimes a copy of it at leaſt may be recovered (20). But it is not ſo with Abelard's wound: it is incurable; there are no reſtorers of that kind, no falſe pieces to be had for money; it is a cypreſs tree (21). The inference Foulques draws is not ſo certain: grieve not, ſays he, for the loſs of your member; for it will never grow again, nature will not allow it to be reſtored. ‘Ergo, frater, ne doleas, nec contriſteris, nec perturbatione hujus incommodi quatiaris, præſertim cum hoc tam plures, ut dictum eſt, utilitatis afferat fructus, & quod hoc modo factum eſt ſemper & irreparabile permaneat & evulſum. Sic hoc tibi ſolamen aſſiduè quod redintegrari natura non patitur, levius poteſt tolerari. —— *Grieve not therefore, my brother, be not dejected, torment not your ſelf with the thoughts of a diſaſter, eſpecially ſince, as I have before obſerved, it will be attended with ſo far larger a train of advantages; beſides, whatever is affected in this manner remains for ever diſunited and irreparable. This therefore may be a perpetual conſolation, that as nature will never ſuffer what is thus loſt to be retrieved, ſo the loſs may the more eaſily be ſupported.*’ One would think that in theſe laſt words Foulques had a view to this ſentence in Horace,

Levius fit patientiâ quidquid corrigere eſt nefas (22).

The worſt of ills by patience milder grows.

But he does not well expreſs the ſenſe of it: the poet does not mean that an irreparable loſs is eaſier to be born than a reparable one; he only ſays that the weight of an irreparable loſs becomes lighter, by a reſolution to bear it patiently.

EXAMINATION of ſome common-places of conſolation.

It muſt be confeſſed that moſt of the common-place conſolations have two faces, and two handles. They have this defect that they may be retorted: for inſtance, what can be more reaſonable than to do nothing in vain? Upon this foot you argue well with a mother, mourning for the loſs of her dear ſon, when you tell her, that her tears are to no purpoſe, and let her ſay or do what ſhe will, ſhe can never reſtore her ſon to life: but ſhe may anſwer, that is the very thing that makes me inconſolable; for if I could repair my loſs, I ſhould bear it patiently: if I could hope, as they do in trade, to regain upon one ſhip what I had loſt upon another, I ſhould have little want of conſolation. I doubt not but Foulques would have had more ſucceſs in comforting Abelard, if the latter had only loſt his beard: what are you grieved for? would he have ſaid: they have robbed you of your beard: a great misfortune that: ſtay a month or two and you will have another. No doubt this would have been a great ground of comfort; but the ſingle thought that his wound was incurable, and ſubject as much or more than any thing to that ſevere philoſophic rule, *à privatione ad habitum non datur regreſſus*; this thought alone, I ſay, which his comforter urged as a ſtrong argument for patience, was the chief cauſe of his deſpair: nor would it mend the matter to tell him that at laſt that rule would prove falſe, *viz. in the reſurrection at the laſt day* (23); for then he might anſwer, that then he ſhould have no need of ſuch things, ſince *at the reſurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of GOD in heaven* (24).

Note, what I have ſaid above concerning an irreparable loſs may be confirmed by the teſtimony of the chief of the ſeven wiſe men of Greece, that it renders men more inconſolable. Solon was lamenting the death of his ſon: his friends repreſented to him that his tears could be of no ſervice; for that very reaſon, ſays he, I weep. Αὐτόν φησι Διοσκουρίδης ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν ἐπειδὴ δακρύοι τὸν παῖδα τελευτήσαντα . . . . . πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲν ἀνύτεις, εἰπεῖν, δι᾽ αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο δακρύω, ὅτι οὐδὲν ἀνύτω. *Ipſum refert Dioſcorides in commentariis cum lacrymaretur ac lugeret defunctum filium . . . . . diceretur que à quodam, at nihil proficis, reſpondiſſe, & propter hoc ipſum illacrymor quia nihil proficio* (25). See in the remark [*K*] of the article AMPHIARAUS how Carneades confuted certain common-places of conſolation.

(17) Auguſt. Confeſſ. lib. x, cap. xxx, pag. m. 217, 218.

(18) Virgil Æn. lib. vi, ver. 143.

(19) Ovid. Epiſt. v, ver. 103. Heroid.

(20) There are cheating women who pretend to reſtore maidenheads. *Furetiere, at the word* Pucelage.

(21) Cupreſſi mortuorum domibus ponebantur ideo quia hujus generis arbor exciſa non renaſcitur, ſicut ex mortuo nihil eſt jam ſperandum. *Feſtus.*

(22) Horat. Od. xxiv, lib. i, ver. 19, 20.

(23) John xi, 24.

(24) Matth. xxii, 30.

(25) Diog. Laërt. in Solone, lib. i, n. 63.

ought to bear it patiently. That he did not receive the wound in an ill action [*G*], ſince he was alone in bed, faſt aſleep, and deſigning miſchief to no body. Then he comforts him by other arguments; ſhews how greatly the biſhop, canons, and clergy of Paris were concerned at his diſgrace [*H*]: How much he was pitied by the inhabitants,

[*G*] . . . . *That he did not receive his wound in an ill action.*] He means that he was not taken in the fact with a woman, which has coſt ſome people the ſame parts he loſt. ‘Fer & hæc, ut ait ille, ſolatia ‘tecum, quoniam tempore hujus diminutionis vel ‘thorum violando, vel in aliquo fornicationis veneno ‘minimè deprehenſus es.’ This conſolation was better than the former, though it muſt be owned Abelard had drawn this diſgrace upon himſelf, by a crime no leſs ſinful than adultery. So that he could not ſay with the ſame confidence as that other Eunuch:

Quid fortunæ, ſtulte, delictum arguis?
Id demum eſt homini turpe, quod meruit pati (26).

Why doſt thou, ſot, the crimes of fortune trace?
That only, which a man deſerves, is baſe.

However, the crime was over, and when he was mutilated he had no thoughts of injuring any body. Generally ſpeaking the rule is true, *Quæ venit ex merito pœna, dolenda venit*, whether Abelard could or could not make the application of it to himſelf. Beſides, there are good authorities, which prove that thoſe who were taken in the very fact leave the inſtrument of their crime behind them. Thus Plautus (27) brings in his Synceraſtus ſaying:

- - - SYN. Facio quod manifeſto hi mœchi haud ferme ſolent.
MI. Quid id eſt? SYN. Refero vaſa ſalva.

That is, *I have done what adulterers ſeldom do.* MI. *What's that?* SYN. *I have brought away my tackle ſafe and ſound.* I make uſe of Mr Dacier's tranſlation, who quotes this paſſage in his note upon a place in Horace, where that kind of puniſhment is mentioned (28). Periplectomenes in the ſame Plautus (29) will not only uſe the hectoring ſpark in the ſame manner, but alſo hang his members, when they are cut off, about his neck for a child's play-thing.

Vide, ut tibi iſtic ſit acutus, CARIO, culter probe.
CA. Quin jamdudum geſtit mœcho hoc abdomen adimere
Ut faciam quaſi puero, in collo pendeant crepundia
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
PE. Cur es auſus ſubagitare alienam uxorem? impudens!

Look to it, CARIO, *that your blade carry a good edge.* CAR. *Fear not, ſir, 'tis keen ſet, and longs to be about his what-do-ye-call-ums. I'll make a boy of him again, and hang a new faſhioned coral and bells about his neck.*

Terence only ſays (30) that the criminal was bound and they were juſt going to inflict on him the puniſhment of adulterers; but, either becauſe he was more modeſt than Plautus, or becauſe it is a ſervant maid that ſpeaks, he does not ſay what the puniſhment was. It was well enough underſtood.

- - - Ut ne viderem, miſera huc effugi foras
Quæ futura exempla dicunt in eum indigna - - - .
- - - Colligavit primum eum miſeris modis - - - -
- - - - Nunc minatur porro ſeſe id quod mœchis ſolet
Quod ego nunquam vidi fieri neque velim.

Dear heart! I left the houſe in haſte to get out of the ſight on't. What a dreadful example do they ſay they'll make of him! . . . . He firſt bound him hand and foot, 'twould grieve your heart to ſee it . . . . . And now he threatens to ſerve him like a common adulterer, a ſight I ne'er ſaw, nor would I for the world.

See in Valerius Maximus (31) two examples of this puniſhment. By the Egyptian laws (32) it was inflicted on thoſe who violated a woman. Zonaras ſays that the emperor Juſtinian condemned all Sodomites to this puniſhment. ‘In eos Juſtinianus pœnam planè ‘convenientem ſtatuit. Nam qua parte erant tam ignominioſi, hac eos privari imperabat, ut Zonaras prodidit. Quid enim? (ajebat) ſi ſacrilegium commiſiſſent, nonne eis manus amputaſſem (33)?’ What, ſaid he, if they had committed ſacrilege, ſhould not I have condemned them to loſe their hands? the puniſhment was well proportioned to the crime, and was a means to prevent it for the future: a gallant who eſcaped with his members might charge again; as a ſoldier that runs away may rally again. To prevent this they proceeded to amputation (34).

One of the authors I have cited (35) quotes a ſhort epigram of Martial, in which he laughs at a husband that cut off the noſe of his wife's gallant. She loſes nothing by that, ſays he; that is not the part that had offended you.

Quis tibi perſuaſit nares abſcindere mœcho?
Non hac peccatum eſt parte, marite, tibi.
Stulte quid egiſti? nihil hic tua perdidit uxor,
Cum ſit ſalva ſui mentula Deiphobi (36).

What could, my friend, your barb'rous blade engage,
On your wife's lover's guiltleſs noſe to rage?
Fool that thou art! thy ſpouſe no loſs ſuſtains,
The guilty part, that injur'd thee, remains.

A poet of the XVIth century, exerciſed his muſe upon the like thought; but he changed the circumſtances of the fact. This is his epigram:

De marito, cujus mœcha erat conjux.

Cum mœcha ſenſit mœchum dormire maritus,
Extemplò uxori conſtruit ille dolos.
Nocte ſemel media repetens ſua limina, mœchum
Cum mœcha in tepido conſpicit eſſe toro.
Diſtringit gladium, mœchæ duo brachia ſcindit,
Atque duos mœchi diſſecat enſe pedes.
Non ſic debuerat facinus punire nephandum:
Pars, qua peccatum eſt, hæc reſecanda fuit (37).

On a husband, whoſe wife uſed to cuckold him.

The husband found his ſpouſe leud pranks had play'd,
And for the wanton dame a trap he laid:
Returning late one night, with ſilent pace,
He found a ſtranger had uſurp'd his place;
His ſword he drew, of arms bereft his wife,
Her minion's legs compounded for his life.
But why this rage on guiltleſs members ſhewn?
The part that injur'd ſhould the crime attone.

[*H*] *He repreſents to Abelard how much the clergy of Paris were concerned at his diſgrace.*] Nothing ſhews better the great eſteem they had for that philoſopher. No doubt our Foulques exaggerates things in his letter; for one would imagine by what he writes that almoſt the whole city of Paris was afflicted and diſmayed for the loſs of Abelard's members. From hence the comforter draws one of his beſt arguments: as if this ſignal mark of the affection of the Pariſians was worth more than all that Abelard had loſt (38). I do not believe the ſufferer would acquieſce in this valuation, and would without doubt rather have been ignorant all his life of the friendſhip they had for him, than to have known it upon ſuch terms. This might have been ſaid to people who made no uſe of what they had; but Abelard uſed his talent ſtoutly, and drew a good income from it, and always pretended to make the moſt of it: be this as it will, let us hear the comforter's own words. ‘Plangit hoc ‘tuum

[illegible] with the Rotmarl. C—
where he is said to be impoverished by y^e women

---

(26) Phædr. Fab. xi, lib. iii.

(27) In Pænul. Sc. II, Act. IV, ver. 40.

(28) Quin etiam illud Accidit, ut cuidam teſtes, caudamque ſalacem Demeteret ferrum. *Horat. Sat. ii, lib. i, ver.* 44.

(29) In Milit. Gloſ. Scen. ult. ver. 5.

(30) Eunuchus, Act. V, Scen. V, ver. 3.

(31) Lib. vi, cap. i, n. 13.

(32) Diod. Sicul. lib. i, cap. lxxviii.

(33) Salmuth in Pancirollum Rerum Memorabil. Part. II, pag. m. 86.

(34) Ἀνὴρ ὁ φεύγων καὶ πάλιν μαχήσεται. *Vir qui fugit rurſum integrabit prælium.* Demoſthenes quoted this verſe when he was reproached with running away. *See Aul. Gellius, lib. xvii, cap. xxi.*

(35) Salmuth in Pancir. Rerum Memor. Part. II, pag. 86.

(36) Mart. Epigr. lxxxv, lib. iii.

(37) Jo. Vulteius, Epigram. lib. ii, pag. m. 136.

(38) Tantus omnium luctus extitit, ut melius mihi videaris te debere velle periiſſe quam ſervaſſe quod periit: Felix ſe neſcit amari. Pene tota civitas in tuo dolore contabuit. Habes arram veræ dilectionis in te quam ſi prius agnoviſſes nullas, meo judicio, divitias illi comparabiles æſtimares.

tants, and lamented by the women [*I*]. He deſcribes the whole in a very lively manner; but in touching upon the laſt head of conſolation, he does not ſay a word of Heloiſa [*K*]. As he ſeemed inclined to fly to the Pope for juſtice, he deſires him to lay

'tuum vulnus & damnum venerabilis Epiſcopi benignitas, qui quantum licuit vacare juſtitiæ ſtuduit. Plangit liberalium Canonicorum ac nobilium Clericorum multitudo. Plangunt cives civitatis hoc dedecus reputantes, & dolentes ſuam urbem tui ſanguinis effuſione violari. —— *Your loſs has been deplored by the venerable prelate, who ſought to do you juſtice as far as poſſible. It is deplored by the canons, and the dignified clergy. It is deplored by the citizens: with ſorrow they reflect on your misfortune, and think it a diſgrace to their town, that it ſhould be ſtained with your blood.*' See the remainder, either in the margin, or in the following remark. See alſo the remark [*N*] of the article HELOISA; where I have quoted what Abelard ſaid himſelf of the grief his misfortune cauſed him.

[*I*] *Lamented by the women.*] They wept as bitterly for him as if each had loſt her huſband, or lover, in the field of battle; it is true no man's life was loſt, but yet they had loſt their champion. Theſe are Foulques's words (39). They had loſt their Adonis; therefore their ſorrow for him muſt have been more ſincere than that of thoſe women of old, who annually celebrated the memory of Venus's mourning for Adonis (40), *Plangentes Adonidem* (41). Methinks the comforter ſhould not have touched this ſtring; it was by no means proper to his deſign, and could only exaſperate the grief of the unhappy Abelard for two invincible reaſons; for firſt, he ſaw by that, in a very particular manner, the importance of the good he had loſt; ſecondly, he was made ſenſible of a favour which he found himſelf utterly unable ever to make a grateful acknowledgement of. I cannot therefore but ſay it over and over again, that our Foulques was too bombaſt an Orator who confounds two things that ought to be diſtinguiſhed. He will have the tears of all the women, *ſingularum feminarum*, to proceed from their having loſt their champion, *militem ſuum*; but this could only be true of a few that Abelard was intimate with, or who hoped one day to partake of his favour. Therefore he ſhould have ſaid, either that the others did not lament him, or, if they did, it was leſs out of love to Abelard, than fear of the conſequences. I mean, they were under apprehenſions that that barbarous manner of puniſhing leudneſs ſhould be introduced in the world, and the example of the canon be practiſed upon others. So that ſome wept for being deprived of their happineſs, and others for fear they ſhould alſo be deprived of theirs (42). This is a diſtinction improperly neglected by our Foulques. There is in the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* a ſtory ſo ſuitable to this remark, that I muſt either have been ignorant of it, or been very negligent not to inſert it here. The ſtory is this. 'The Greeks made war upon the duke of Benevento, and made him very uneaſy. Thedbald, marquis of Spoleto, his ally, marching to his aſſiſtance, and having taken ſome priſoners, ordered them to be caſtrated, and in that condition, ſent them back to the Greek general, with orders to tell him, that he had done it to oblige the emperor, whom he knew to be a lover of eunuchs, and he would endeavour to ſend him in a ſhort time a much greater number of them. The marquis was preparing to be as good as his word, when one day a woman, whoſe huſband had been taken priſoner, came all in tears to the camp, and begged to ſpeak with Thedbald. The marquis having asked her the cauſe of her grief, my lord, ſaid ſhe, I wonder that ſuch a valiant hero as you ſhould trifle away your time in warring with women, when men are unable to reſiſt you. Thedbald replied, that, ſince the days of the Amazons, he had never heard, that ever war had been made upon women. My lord, anſwered the Greek woman, can a crueller war be made upon us, than to deprive our huſbands of what gives us health, pleaſure, and children. When you make eunuchs of them, it is mutilating us, not them: you have lately taken away our cattle and goods, without any complaint from me: but this being an irreparable loſs to ſeveral of my neighbours, I could not avoid imploring the compaſſion of the conqueror. The whole army was ſo pleaſed with this woman's ingenuous declaration, that they reſtored her huſband to her, and all they had taken from her. As ſhe was going away, Thedbald asked her what ſhe would be willing ſhould be done to her huſband, if he was found in arms again. He has eyes, ſaid ſhe, a noſe, hands, and feet: theſe are his own, which you may take from him if he deſerves it; but leave him, if you pleaſe, what belongs to me (43).'

Note, that, in all probabillty, this woman had rather they ſhould have taken away her huſband's life, than ſee him an eunuch, a condition in which ſhe would have known all the evils without the conveniencies of widowhood: ſhe would have had neither liberty to marry again, nor right to diſſolve her marriage on account of impotence: for the courts of juſtice would not have admitted her plea: they take no notice of impotence that comes from ſuch accidents. Obſerve, by the way, that the Romans would not have cenſured this woman's taſte. They would rather chuſe to loſe their lives than their virility. This Cæſar repreſented to the embaſſadors of Pharnaces, when he complained of the cruel treatment the Roman merchants underwent in the kingdom of Pontus. 'Se magnas & graves injurias civium Romanorum qui in Ponto negotiati eſſent, quoniam in integrum reſtituere non poſſet, concedere Pharnaci. Nam neque interfectis amiſſam vitam, neque exectis virilitatem reſtituere poſſe, quod quidem ſupplicium GRAVIUS MORTE cives Romani ſubiiſſent (44).'

[*K*] *Without ſaying a word of Heloiſa.*] This is not to be wondered at; for as ſhe was the moſt injured of all, her grief was ſufficiently known, and it would have been no news to her huſband to have been told how bitterly ſhe lamented his loſs. It is true, ſhe was then in a convent, but had only the dreſs of a nun: the ſecret viſits ſhe received from her huſband were for ſomething more than meer chat; they had the ſkill to withdraw into ſome corner to be free and eaſy (45); and ſhe had long enjoyed theſe converſations under the habit of a nun (46). So that ſhe had not renounced what her huſband was deprived of. To judge of the grief which pierced her ſoul, when ſhe heard this news, I will not confine myſelf to the new tranſlation of her letters (47). *How cruel were they* (thus the tranſlation has it) *when their blind fury incited an aſſaſſin to ſurprize you in your ſleep! had I been with you, I would have defended you at the expence of my own life; my very cries would have ſtopped his arm. But here love itſelf is wounded, and my modeſty, joined to my deſpair, render me ſpeechleſs. It is not lawful for me to ſay all I think about it, and if it were I could not poſſibly do it. And indeed there is an eloquence in ſilence, when the greatneſs of a calamity is beyond all expreſſion.* How ſignificant is this! nature herſelf ſpeaks; one would think it not the language of the fancy, but the voice of ſenſation and experience, and of one that really was in Heloiſa's place (48). I wiſh theſe were her own words, and am ſorry not to ſee, in the original Latin, what I read in the French paraphraſe. But if ſhe did not ſay ſhe would have ventured her own life to have ſaved her huſband's virility, and that her outcries would have preſerved that ineſtimable jewel from the murderer's hands, at leaſt ſhe ought to have ſaid it, and the tranſlator is not to be blamed for lending her a thought ſo natural. Nevertheleſs, I ſhall not make this my rule to judge of Heloiſa's ſorrow. Her own Latin is enough. Her murmurs againſt the divine providence come little ſhort of blaſphemy, ſuch as never fell from the lips of Job, when he had loſt his wealth and children, and was miſerably tormented in his own body. Heloiſa thought her loſs greater than his, though ſhe and her huſbund were both well; after all, ſays ſhe, the only comfort that remains, is, that I know he is not dead, being for ever debarred from all other joys coming from him (49). Whereupon ſhe utters bitter complaints againſt the divine providence. God, ſays ſhe, has diſcharged upon me all the arrows in his quiver, ſo that other ſinners may now reſt ſecure. Death is the only puniſhment he has not inflicted, which would have put an end to my miſery, but he will not ſuffer me

to

HELOISA's extream grief for the caſtration of her huſband.

---

(39) Quid ſingularum feminarum referam planctum quæ, ſic hoc audito, lachrymis, more fœmineo, ora rigarunt propter te MILITEM SUUM, quem amiſerant, ac ſi ſingulæ virum ſuum aut amicum forte belli repeririſſent extinctum?

(40) That is, according to ſome, for a diſaſter which befel poor Adonis, like that of Abelard. See the remark [*L*] of the article ADONIS.

(41) Ezekiel, viii, 14.

(42) *This is much like what Horace ſays*, Epiſt. i, lib. ii, *with reſpect to ſatire*, Doluêre cruento Dente laceſſiti: fuit intactis quoque cura Conditione ſuper communi. *Ver.* 150.

(43) Bibliotheque Univerſelle, Tom. XI, pag. 10.

(44) Hirtius, de Bello Alexandrino, pag. m. 411.

(45) See the remark [*E*] of the article HELOISA.

(46) She diſguiſed herſelf in that habit, when ſhe went to lye-in at Abelard's ſiſter's houſe. See her article, citat. (*b*).

(47) Printed at the Hague, by John Alberts, 1693.

(48) I have been told that a woman is the author of that tranſlation.

(49) Ubi nullum niſi te remedium habeam, & nullum aliud in te niſi hoc ipſum quod vivis omnibus de te mihi aliis voluptatibus interdictis, cui nec præſentia tua conceſſum eſt frui, ut quandoque mihi reddi valeam.

lay aſide all thoughts of it, ſince it would require too much money to ſucceed there [*L*]; that the authors of the injury had been puniſhed [*M*]; that he was to blame to complain of the cathedral church, and that being a Monk, he ought to renounce all deſire of revenge, leaving it entirely to Almighty GOD, and love even his worſt enemies. To conclude, he exhorts him not to lament the happineſs he had loſt, ſince that pretended happineſs is always accompanied with a thouſand inconveniencies: And he aſſures him, that if he perſeveres to the end, he ſhall recover at the day of judgment what had

to die, tho' daily expiring. 'O ſi fas ſit dici crudelem 'mihi per omnia Deum! ô inclementem clementiam! ô 'infortunatam fortunam! quæ jam in me univerſi conaminis ſui tela in tantum conſumpſit, ut quibus in alios 'ſæviat jam non habeat. Plenam in me pharetram exhauſit, ut fruſtra jam alii bella ejus formident. Nec ſi ei adhuc telum aliquod ſupereſſet, locum in me vulneris 'inveniret. Unum inter tot vulnera metuit ne morte 'ſupplicia finiam, & cum interimere non ceſſet interitum tamen quem accelerat timet.' All the reſt of her diſcourſe ſhews that her horrible murmurings were founded upon nothing elſe but the loſs of her husband's converſation, as appears from her own confeſſion, page 59 (50). She takes an unbounded liberty to arraign providence, as if God had chaſtiſed them, when they did not deſerve it, and bore with them, when they deſerved puniſhment. God, ſays ſhe, ſpared us when our pleaſures were criminal, delaying our puniſhment till marriage had made them innocent; 'Et ut ex injuria major indignatio ſurgeret, omnia in nobis æquitatis jura pariter ſunt perverſa. 'Dum enim ſolliciti amoris gaudiis frueremur, & ut 'turpiore, ſed expreſſiore vocabulo utar, fornicatione 'vacaremus, divina nobis ſeveritas pepercit. Ut autem illicita licitis correximus, & honore conjugii 'turpitudinem fornicationis operuimus, ira Domini 'manum ſuam ſuper nos vehementer aggravavit, & 'immaculatum non pertulit thorum qui diu ante ſubſtinuerat pollutum (51).' This poor woman was ſtrangely deluded, if ſhe imagined her love was pure becauſe ſhe did not ceaſe loving her husband after he was made impotent. She upbraids him for having only had a laſcivious paſſion for her, ſince he neglected her, when he could no longer enjoy carnal pleaſures with her (52): but does ſhe not confeſs (53) that ſhe laments paſt pleaſures, that ſhe thinks night and day on their mutual enjoyments? does ſhe not own a deſire after their continuance (54)? if this is not a luſtful love, a love of fleſh and blood, what can be ſo? Abelard was ſenſible of this, and exhorted his wife to entertain other thoughts, leaſt ſhe ſhould be juſtly charged with impure love. 'Cave obſecro '*ſays he to her* (55), ne quod dixit Pompeius mœrenti Corneliæ tibi improperetur turpiſſimè,

- - - vivit poſt prælia Magnus
Sed fortuna perit, quod defles illud amaſti *.

'Attende, precor, id & erubeſce, niſi admiſſas turpitudines impudentiſſimas commendes. —— *Take care,* 'ſays he to her, *I entreat you, leſt what Pompey ſaid* '*to the diſconſolate Cornelia ſhould be maliciouſly turned upon you.*

- - - 'Tis true my fortune's loſt;
Who grieve for that, no love for me can boaſt,
But mourn the loſs of what they valu'd moſt.

'*Be circumſpect, I beſeech you, let modeſty reſtrain you,* '*and ſeem not to juſtify the moſt ſhameful and impudent practices.*

[*L*] *He told Abelard it would require too much money to be able to ſucceed there.*] Our Foulques ſpeaks ſo much to the diſadvantage of the court of Rome, that if they have not placed him in the catalogue of the witneſſes of truth, it it not his fault. He ſays, the avarice of the Romans is inſatiable, and that if Peter Abelard viſits the Pope without good ſtore of money, his journey will turn to no account. Let us hear his own words; the language he ſpeaks in will bear the harſheſt terms better than ours. 'Nunquid 'non audiſti aliquando de Romanorum avaritia & 'impuritate? quis unquam ſuis potuit opibus meretricum voraginem ſatiare? quis potuit ſacculis cupiditatis earum ſufficere crumenis?..... Subſtantia tuæ rei ad viſitationem Romani Pontificis cum 'aut modica ſit aut nulla, minime ſufficit. Quid 'Palatinis morſibus objectabis?.... ſi defecerit (*pecunia*) & iter tamen impleveris incaſſum te ſudaſſe 'nulli dubitare fas eſt: quotquot enim noſtris temporibus ad illam ſedem ſine pondere pecuniæ acceſſerunt, perdita cauſa, confuſi & reprobi abſceſſerunt. —— *Have you never heard of the avarice and* '*corruption of the chiefs at Rome? who ever could* '*glut a whore's all-craving appetite with his ſubſtance? or who from his purſe could fill the bags* '*of their reſtleſs deſires?.... Your ſtock of wealth,* '*which cannot be great, and may be nothing, is far* '*from being ſufficient to defray the expences of a* '*viſit to the Roman Pontif. Wherewith will you anſwer the cravings of the Papal court?.. If money ſhould* '*fail when you come to your journey's end, every body* '*knows what ſucceſs you will meet with. Whoever* '*in our times has undertaken ſuch an expedition, before he has laid in an immenſe ſtore, has had the* '*mortification to ſee himſelf baffled, and his ſuit rejected.*' This miſchief continues to this very day, if we may believe Mr Hallier, in his letter from Rome to father Dinet, the Jeſuit, dated the 16th of June 1653. Mr Hallier was one of the deputies that ſollicited the condemnation of Janſeniſm. 'It would be very juſt, '*ſays he* (56), that they ſhould have a greater 'regard for us, after the extraordinary charge we 'have been at on this occaſion. You cannot imagine how much money goes away in preſents and 'bribes. Every little ſaint muſt have his fee... 'The Janſeniſts have ſpent here above a hundred 'thouſand livres, and perhaps above a hundred and 'fifty thouſand.'

[*M*] *The authors of the injury had been puniſhed.*] Only two of them were taken, one of which was Peter Abelard's footman. They were not only diſmembered by way of retaliation, but alſo had their eyes put out. Abelard ſays (57): 'Quibus mox converſis in fugam qui comprehendi potuerunt oculis '& genitalibus privati ſunt, quorum alter ille fuit ſupradictus ſerviens qui cum in obſequio meo mecum 'maneret, cupiditate ad proditionem ductus eſt. —— '*Who being immediately put to flight, two of them,* '*whom we ſeized, were deprived of their eyes and* '*genitals, one of which was my ſervant before mentioned, who, altho' he lived in my houſe, and was* '*bound by the moſt ſolemn ties of duty, was perverted by the love of money to that perfidious act.*' Foulques ſays in general, that ſome of the villains were condemned to be caſtrated and loſe their eyes, and that the canon himſelf was deprived of his whole eſtate, tho' he denied he had any concern in the action (58). Abelard was not pleaſed with this ſentence; he complained of the biſhop, and the canons, and had a mind to implore the juſtice of the court of Rome. '(59) Totum meæ pondus injuriæ Romanis auribus 'intimare ſtudebo, & tam Epiſcopum quam Canonicos quoniam primum judicium de illo qui in me malus extitit mutare machinati ſunt, quantum potero 'perturbabo, ac tum demum intelligent quàm ſit 'contrarium honeſtati à rigore juſtitiæ deviaſſe.... '(60). Noli Canonicos vel Epiſcopum tui ſanguinis effuſores vel perditores vocare, qui propter te '& propter ſe quantum potuerunt juſtitiæ intenderunt. —— *I will endeavour to make my appeal to* '*his holineſs, and lay before him the whole weight* '*of my injuries. I will, to the utmoſt of my power,* '*purſue both the biſhop and the canons, ſince they* '*firſt contrived the ſentence againſt the author of my* '*misfortunes, that they may at length be ſenſible* '*how repugnant it is to honour, to deviate from the* '*rigour of juſtice... Call not the biſhop or the* '*canons the ſpillers of your blood, who for you, and* '*for themſelves, have, to the utmoſt of their power, laboured for juſtice.*' It is pity we have not the trial of Abelard's aſſaſſins, and of him that ſet them on; and I wonder that among the great number of pieces, that have been brought out of obſcurity for theſe hundred years, we have ſeen nothing concerning had been taken from him, and that then that maxim in dialectics *in habitum nunquam poteſt redire privatio* would prove to be falſe. It is pity we have not Abelard's anſwer to this conſolatory letter. It is probable we ſhould have ſeen there a kind of picture of Job's diſpute with his friends; I mean, that Abelard would have found anſwers and replies, and Foulques, in ſome things, would have been a miſerable comforter.

---

(50) Si vere miſerrimi mei animi profiteor infirmitatem qua pœnitentia Deum placere valeam non invenio, quem SUPER HAC SEMPER INJURIA ſummæ crudelitatis arguo, & ejus diſpenſationi contraria magis eum ex indignatione offendo quam ex pœnitentiæ ſatisfactione mitigo.

(51) Pag. 57.

(52) Concupiſcentia te mihi potius quam amicitia ſociavit, libidinis ardor potius quam amor. Ubi igitur quod deſiderabas ceſſavit, quicquid propter hoc exhibebas pariter evanuit. *Pag.* 47.

(53) See the remarks of her article.

(54) Quomodo etiam pœnitentia peccatorum dicitur quantacunque ſit corporis afflictio ſi mens adhuc ipſam peccandi retinet voluntatem, & priſtinis æſtuat deſideriis? *Pag.* 59.

(55) Pag. 75.

* Lucan lib. viii.

(56) See the pieces concerning the New Teſtament of Mons, *Tom. I, pag.* 405.

(57) Pag. 17.

(58) Quidam illorum qui tibi nocuerunt oculorum privatione & genitalium abſciſione mutilati ſunt. Ille autem (*He ſpeaks no doubt of Fulbert, Heloiſa's uncle,*) qui per ſe factum abnegat jam ab omni poſſeſſione ſua bonorum comportatione exturbatus eſt.

(59) Foulques introduces him ſpeaking thus.

(60) It is Foulques who ſpeaks.

For the reſt, the priory of Deuil, poſſeſſed by our Foulques, is ſituated near Montmorenci, three leagues from Paris. See upon this father Chifflet (the Jeſuit)'s *Genus illuſtre D. Bernardi aſſertum*, where he mentions one Eudo of Deuil, and Velaſius, in his *Notitia Galliarum*, at the word *Pariſii* (e).

(e) Taken from a manuſcript which I received from the Mazarin library.

ing this affair. I think they were too favorable to the canon; who ought to have had the *Lex Talionis* inflicted upon him. Mr du Cange (61) having told us, that the Salic law condemned to caſtration ſlaves taken in adultery and theft, that the law of the Wiſigoths condemned ſodomites to the ſame puniſhment, and that the laws of William the conqueror inflicted the ſame upon thoſe who raviſhed a woman, adds that Sugerius, in page 308 of the life of Lewis VI, makes mention of a traytor who was condemned to have his eyes put out, and his privy members cut off. Mr Hofman (62) has not copied Mr du Cange aright; for inſtead of theſe words *apud Sugerium in Ludovico VI. page* 308, he has made it *apud Eugenium in Ludovico VI page* 1308. The traytor Sugerius ſpeaks of was a man that the king of England had heaped favours upon, and yet he entered into a conſpiracy againſt his maſter: he came off with the loſs of his privy-members and eyes, and was not hanged as he well deſerved. *Tam horribili factione deprehenſus oculorum & genitalium amiſſione, cum laqueum ſuffocantem meruiſſet, miſericorditer eſt damnatus* (63). Father Theophilus Raynaud, who had read ſo much, yet was ignorant that Abelard's aſſaſſins had been puniſhed by order of juſtice, which plainly appears by Foulques's letter. This Jeſuit had therefore forgot that letter, ſince he affirms, that to puniſh thoſe who mutilated Abelard, without public authority, was as criminal as their action. 'Petrus Abelardus..... privata auctoritate eſt eviratus, quam fuiſſe vindictam illicitam eſt manifeſtum. Et æque nefaria fuit, ſi privata autoritate facta eſt, repenſa executoribus trucis illius ultionis exoculatio ſimul & exectio (64). —— *Peter Abelard was caſtrated by the contrivance of ſome private perſons, and it is plain that action was illegal. Nor was the privation of ſight, and caſtration, executed on tho authors of that bararous revenge leſs to be condemned, if it was only founded on private authority.*' I ſhall perhaps ſpeak in another place of the puniſhment inflicted upon the gallants of Philip the fair's three daughters in law (65).

(61) Gloſſar. Ling. Latinæ Voce Caſtratio.

(62) Lexic. Tom. III, pag. 389.

(63) Suger, Tom IV. Hiſt. Francor. Script. pag. 308.

(64) Theophil. Raynaudus, de Eunuchis, pag. m. 75.

(65) They cut off their privy-parts, and flead them alive. See *Guaguin. lib. vii, folio, m.* 129.

FRACHETTA (JEROME) native of Rovigo in Italy, made himſelf famous by ſome political works [*A*]. He ſpent many years at Rome, very much eſteemed by the duke of Seſſa, ambaſſador of Philip II, and Philip III, kings of Spain, and was employed in affairs of ſtate as well as war, in all which he behaved well. But notwithſtanding all this, he had like to have been overcome, even to have been in danger of his life in the perſecutions that were raiſed againſt him. He retired to Naples, and being not altogether void of friends, he made his innocence appear to the court of Spain, who ordered the count de Benevento, viceroy of Naples, to employ him as a faithful ſervant whenever an opportunity ſhould offer. This was put in execution, ſo that Frachetta lived honourably at Naples with a ſuitable penſion (*a*). I know not what grounds Moreri goes upon, when he ſays, *his indiſcreet zeal involved him in a troubleſome affair.* For Ghilini, the only author he cites, inſinuates no ſuch thing.

(*a*) *Taken from* Ghilini, Tom. I, pag. 120, 121.

[*A*] *He made himſelf famous by ſome political works.*] The moſt conſiderable of all, is that intituled *il Seminario de' Governi di Stato, & di Guerra.* He has collected together in 110 chapters about eight thouſand ſtate and military maxims, taken from the beſt authors; and has added to each chapter a diſcourſe by way of commentary. This work was printed at leaſt twice by the author. It was reprinted at Venice in 1647, and at Genoa in 1648, in 4to, to which was added, *il Principe nel quale ſi conſidera il Principe & quanto al Governo dello Stato, & quanto al manegio della Guerra*, of the ſame author. This laſt treatiſe was reprinted at Venice by *John Baptiſta Ciotti*, in 1599, in 8vo, and it was an edition corrected and enlarged by the author. The firſt edition was certainly done in 1597; for the epiſtle dedicatory is dated from Rome the ſeventh of November in that year. It informs us that the occaſion of Frachetti's compoſing that book was a converſation, in which the duke of Seſſa had ſaid, among other things, that it was his opinion, it was no leſs neceſſary than difficult to let princes know the truth of what paſſes in their own dominions. Note that, before he publiſhed his *il Seminario de' Governi*, he publiſhed a general idea of it in 1592. His other writings are *Diſcorſo della Ragione di Stato: Diſcorſo della Ragione di Guerra: Eſpoſizione di tutta l'Opera di Lucrezio* (1).

(1) *See* Ghilini's Theatre, Part. I, pag. 121.

FRANC (MARTIN) provoſt and canon of Lauſanne, and ſecretary to the Popes Felix V, and Nicholas V, flouriſhed about the middle of the XVth century. He was one of the beſt French poets of that time. He wrote a poem againſt the *Romance of the Roſe*, and intituled it *Le Champion des dames*, or the *Ladies Champion*, in which are ſeveral Verſes concerning Pope Joan [*A*]. I do not think that David Blondel

[*A*] *In his* Champion des Dames *are ſeveral verſes about Pope Joan.*] I ſhall here inſert ſome of them, being well aſſured that ſeveral readers will be pleaſed with them. But it muſt be obſerved, that the book is a dialogue between the ladies adverſary, and their champion. What follows is an objection ſtarted by the adverſary, taken from the hiſtory of the female Pope.

> Tu ſcais qu'elle ſceut tant de lettres,
> Que pour ſon ſens on la crea
> Papeſſe & Preſtreſſe des Preſtres.
> O comme bien eſtudia!
> O grande loüange ſi a!
> Femme ſe diſſimula homme
> Et ſa nature regnia,
> Pour devenir Pape de Rome.
>
> O benoiſt Dieu comme oſa femme
> Veſtir chaſuble & chanter Meſſe:
> O femme oultrageuſe & infame;

del has put this author into the liſt he has made of writers, who have affirmed the ſtory of that ſhe-Pope. But this would not be the only author he has omitted [*B*]. The learned

Comment euſt elle la hardieſſe,
De ſe faire Pape & Papeſſe ?
Comment endura Dieu, comment,
Que femme ribaulde & Preſtreſſe
Euſt l' Egliſe en gouvernement ?

Lors le monde eſtoit bien nouvel:
Dire l'on peut qu'il ne tenoit
Sinon à la queuë d'un vel,
Puis que femme le gouvernoit.
Merveille eſtoit que ne tournoit
Le ciel, & que pour vengement
Dieu ſur la terre ne venoit
Tenir ſon cruel jugement.

Mais il eſt tardif à punir
En attendant que l'on s'amende,
Et quand on ne peut revenir
A raiſon, combien qu'il attende,
Certes c'eſt force qu'il entende,
A donner ſa punition,
Et qu'à juſtice ſon droit rende
Sans plus longue remiſſion.

Ainſi touſjours pas n'endura
Que l'Egliſe fuſt abuſée
De celle qui trop y dura,
Car ſa fraude fut encuſée ;
O vengeance bien adviſée!
La ſaincte Papeſſe enfanta,
Nonques plus la putain ruſée
A l'autel Sainct Pierre chanta.

Entre le Mouſtier Saint Clement
Et Colliſée chacun vit
Le feminin enchantement.
Si fut tantoſt fait un edict
Que jamais Pape ne ſe fiſt,
Tant euſt il de ſcience au nas,
S'il ne montroit le doy petit
Enharnachié de ſon harnas.

O Dames Dames couronnez
Voſtre Pape & Voſtre Papeſſe,
Deſſus les quatre couronnez
Elle acreut moult voſtre nobleſſe.
Alors le Champion ſe dreſſe,
Et en jettant le dextre bras
Dit, temps eſt que ce parler ceſſe,
De ce mal tu te remembras (1).

Her ſenſe and learning wond'rous were:
Prieſteſs of prieſts ſhe ſoon became;
She counterfeited well the man,
And mounted to the papal chair.

Heav'ns ! that a woman ſhould preſume
To wear the cope, and chant high maſs !
Why did God ſuffer it to paſs,
And let a whore be pope of Rome ?

The world was in it's infancy,
Thus to be govern'd by a woman:
'Tis ſtrange, ſuch practices uncommon
Did not draw vengeance from the ſky.

Tho' heav'n to puniſh guilt is ſlow,
In hopes the ſinner will repent;
Yet puniſhment at laſt is ſent,
And juſtice, mock'd, inflicts the blow.

Thus, by her pregnancy betray'd,
(O well conſidered vengeance !) Joan
Deſcended from the papal throne,
And from abuſe the church was freed.

From the like cheat to keep her free,
Without examination, none
Sat, after, on St Peter's throne;
Such was the church's wiſe decree.

Ye fair, whoſe heads ſupport a crown,
Pope Joan advances high your glory:
And, proud of ſuch a lucky ſtory,
Your champion throws his gauntlet down.

I ſhall not here ſet down the champion's reply, who excuſes Pope Joan as well as he can, by recriminating on ſeveral Popes. Here is a ſhort ſpecimen of his diſcourſe:

Or laiſſons les pechez diſans
Qu'elle eſtoit Clergeſſe lettrée,
Quand devant les plus ſouffiſans
De Rome eut l'iſſuë & l'entrée.
Encor te peut eſtre monſtrée
Mainte Préface que dicta
Bien & ſainctement accouſtrée
Où en la foi point n'heſita.

Let us forget her crimes, and ſay
She was a learned ſhe-divine;
Fix'd in the faith, whoſe conſtancy
In many a preface ſtill doth ſhine.

A BOOK intituled *L'Arbre des Batailles.*

[*B*] *He would not be the only author he has omitted.*] Mareſius obſerves, that Blondel, in his catalogue, has omitted a certain author of a book, intituled, *L'Arbre des Batailles* (the tree of battles). ‘Eſt quoque mihi, *ſays he* (2), vetus Manuſcriptum Gallicum, compoſitum ante 300 annos, quod inſcribitur, *L'Arbre des batailles*, —— *I have by me an antient French manuſcript, written* 300 *years ago, intituled,* the tree of battles; compoſed by Honoratus Bonet, doctor of the canon-law, and prior of Challon, to the honour of God, and in the behalf of king charles VI, ſurnamed the beloved. Illius *libri, p.* 1. *c.* 7. author explicans quo ſenſu in Apocalypſi tertia pars Solis dicatur obſcurata ad tubam Angeli quarti, idque intelligens de multis qui circa illa tempora ſedem Pontificiam illegitimè occupaverant, ſic inter alia ſuo ſtylo loquitur. —— *In part* 1, *cap.* 7. *of that book, the author explaining, in what ſenſe the ſun is ſaid, in the apocalypſe, to be a third part eclipſed, upon the fourth Angel's ſounding his trumpet; and underſtanding it of many, who, about that time, had unlawfully uſurped the popedom, among other things, ſpeaks thus, after his manner;* and at that very time, it happened, that the Pope died, and a woman was choſen to ſucceed him, whom no body ſuſpected to have been one. She came from England; and it was no ſmall affliction for people to think, they had a woman for a Pope. Eam ex Anglia fuiſſe dicit, quod fortè ſe curaſſet nominari Johannem Anglicum, vel, ut habet vetus Fragmentum apud Wolphium, *Johannem de Anglia*, cum tamen natione Moguntina eſſet. Et credo quod ſi hoc Catalaunenſis Prioris teſtimonium vidiſſet Rev. & Cel. Blondellus, qui etiam Catalaunenſis fuit, minus impendiſſet operæ in veritate iſtius hiſtoriæ oppugnanda. —— *He ſays, ſhe was of England; perhaps becauſe ſhe had taken care to be called* Engliſh John, *or, as an old fragment in Wolphius has it,* John of England; *tho' ſhe was born at Mentz. And I believe, that, if the reverend and celebrated Blondel had ſeen the teſtimony of the prior of Challon, his country-man, he would have taken leſs pains in oppoſing the truth of that ſtory.*’ A little further, he likewiſe obſerves, that Egbert-Grim, an Engliſhman, licentiate of divinity (3), had publiſhed a Flemiſh book concerning Pope Joan, wherein he quotes, for the affirmative, the teſtimony of one hundred thirty five writers. Blondel mentions not many more than ſeventy.

But, ſince we have occaſion to ſpeak of this Honoratus BONET (4), it will not be amiſs here to ſet forth, for the better information of the reader, the errors learned differ about the place where he was born [*C*]. His *Eſtrif de fortune & de vertu*, ſtrife between fortune and vertue (*a*), publiſhed at Paris in 1505 (*b*), is a mixture of proſe and verſe.

---

(1) *The Ladies Champion*, printed at Paris by Galliot Dupré, in the year 1530, folio 335. This work was dedicated to Philip II, Duke of Burgundy, ſirnamed *The Good*.

(2) Samuel Mareſius, in Joanna Papiſſa reſtituta, pag. 11.

(3) He was profeſſor at Weſel, and died in 1636, aged twenty eight years. *Mareſius, ibid. pag.* 12.

(4) Spondanus ſpeaks of him, *ad annum* 1395, *n.* 10, and ſays, he was of the order of the Auguſtins, and that he compoſed a dream againſt the ſchiſm.

(*a*) La Croix du Maine, pag. 314.

(*b*) Du Verdier Vau-Privas makes it 1519.

errors of ſome men in reſpect of this writer. I ſay then, firſt of all, that he is called, by Du Verdier Vau-privas, Honoratus Bonnor, prior of Salon, who ſuppoſes him to have been the author of a book, containing 165 chapters, intituled, *L'Arbre des Batailles*, and dedicated to Charles V. He further adds, that this book was printed at Paris by John Dupré, in the year 1495. Here we find three ſeveral variations between Du Verdier and Mareſius: I. As to the name of the author; II. As to the name of his priory; and, III. As to the name of the prince, who was the hero of the book. For my own part, I take Mareſius's teſtimony, as to the firſt and laſt article, to be of better authority than du Verdier's, becauſe father Labbe does not cenſure him in this particular. The epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque has ſtill a greater blunder than all this, in metamorphoſing the title of a book into an author. You will find there, page 534, theſe words; L'Arbre *Batailles de bello & duello*. Page 360, it is ſaid, *Honoratus Bonhor, ſcripſit de bello & duello*. You find then already three different names (5) given to the author of that book. But let us now paſs on to father Labbe's criticiſm upon Mareſius (6). 'In Honorato Boneto, auctore libri vernaculi, qui inſcribitur *l'Arbre des Batailles*, multa peccat: I. Priorem *de Challon* vocat, cùm fuerit *de Salon*. II. Compoſitum librum dicit ante annos 300, cùm tamen Carolus VI, cui dicatus fuit, regnarit dumtaxat ab anno 1388, ad 1422. III. *Challon* reddit Catalaunenſem, id eſt *Chaalons*, cùm appellare Cabillonenſem debuiſſet. Ita enim diſcriminantur illæ Civitates: hæc Matronæ in Campania, illa Arari in Burgundia impoſita, utraque Epiſcopalis. IV. Atque hinc longè abſurdior apparet alluſio, alioquin Alpina nive frigidior: *Quòd ſi illius teſtimonium vidiſſet Blondellus qui Catalaunenſis fuit, minus impendiſſet operæ in fabula illa expugnanda.* ——— *He commits many miſtakes, in relation to Honoratus Bonetus, author of a book in our mother tongue, intituled* the Tree of Battles: *Firſt, he calls him prior of Challon, whereas he was of Salon. Secondly, he ſays the book was written three hundred years ago; whereas Charles VI, to whom it was dedicated, reigned only from the year* 1388 *to* 1422. *Thirdly, he tranſlates Challon Catalaunenſis, that is Chaalons, when he ought to have called it Cabillonenſis: for ſo thoſe cities are diſtinguiſhed; the one ſituated on the Marne in Champagne, the other upon the Soane in Burgundy; and both biſhops ſees. Fourthly, and hence the alluſion, otherwiſe more cold than Alpine ſnow, appears far more abſurd.* Had Blondel, who was himſelf of Challon, ſeen his teſtimony, he would have taken leſs pains in oppoſing the truth of that ſtory.'

[*C*] *The learned differ about the place where he was born.*] Preſident Fauchet (7) aſſures us, that he was a native of the county of Aumale in Normandy. But, according to John le Maire de Belges, he was born in the city of Arras (8).

(5) Bonet, Bonnor, Bonhor.

(6) In Joannæ Papiſſæ Cenotaphio everſo, ad calcem Diſſertat. de Scriptoribus Eccleſ. Tom. I, pag. 922.

(7) Des anciens Poëtes François, liv. ii, pag. 205.

(8) Jean le Maire, Couronne Margaritique, pag. m. 57.

FRANCIS of Aſſiſi, a great ſaint of the Romiſh church, and founder of one of the four orders of the Mendicants, was born at Aſſiſi in Italy, about the year 1181. His father was a merchant, whoſe profeſſion he followed till the year 1206, when, being ſtrongly moved with the precepts of the goſpel, he reſolved to forſake the world (*a*). And, devoting himſelf to ſolitude and mortifications, he acquired ſuch a ghaſtly countenance, as made all the inhabitants of Aſſiſi believe, that he was mad (*b*). His father reſolved to bring him back to his profeſſion; and, the better to effect it by his ſeverity, confined him to a cloſe priſon: But finding his endeavours unſucceſsful, he brought his ſon before the biſhop of Aſſiſi, where, on this occaſion, he not only renounced his right to all his paternal eſtate, but pulled off his very cloaths, his ſhirt not excepted [*A*]. Thus, by his example, he induced a great many people to devote themſelves to an evangelical poverty; and he drew up for them an inſtitute, which the Popes did approve. To quench the fire of luſt, he would lie upon ice and ſnow [*B*]. But

(*a*) Spondanus, ad ann. 1228, n. 7.

(*b*) Bonaventura, in vita St Franciſci.

[*A*] *He pulled off his cloaths, his ſhirt not excepted.*] Let us ſee after what manner Mr Ferrand has endeavoured to juſtify this new ſaint, at the expence of the prophet David: '*Michal*, ſays he (1), *the wife of David, perceiving, through the window, her husband, who, tranſported with a holy zeal, was leaping and dancing before the ark of the lord, deſpiſed him in her heart, and* .... *ſaid to him in deriſion*; how glorious was the king of Iſrael to day, who uncovered himſelf in the eyes of the handmaids of his ſervants, as one of the vain fellows ſhameleſsly uncovereth himſelf! Now theſe laſt words of holy writ ſeem to imply, as if David had ſtripped himſelf ſtark naked. Nevertheleſs, becauſe the ſame ſcripture (ver 14.) ſpeaking of David's dancing before the ark, ſays, that he had a linnen ephod on; I cannot think that he ſtripped himſelf ſtark naked. But he ſtripped himſelf ſo as to look as if he had been naked; which therefore was cenſured, and accounted by all unbecoming the majeſty and gravity of a king, and the more becauſe it was done publickly, and before a great concourſe of people. David's behaviour, conſidered with all it's circumſtances, is not more becoming than that of St Francis, who was ſeen but by very few; ſo that, if the behaviour of the one ought to be blamed, the other muſt be ſo too; and therefore we read, that Michal laughed at it. But let us ſee whether the HOLY GHOST derided it; and we may gueſs by that, whether St Francis's behaviour is an object of laughter.' He relates afterwards what David anſwered to Michal, and what the ſcripture obſerves concerning the barenneſs of that woman. I will make uſe of Mr Ferrand's words, to expoſe Francis's nakedneſs; and thus I ſhall not be afraid of thoſe reproaches, wherewith he loaded his adverſary (2). '(3) As for what the apologiſt ſpecifies concerning St Francis's ſtripping himſelf ſtark naked, I will relate the ſtory as St Bonaventure hath written it .... This tereſtrial and carnal father (ſays † St Bonaventure, ſpeaking of St Francis's father) after he had deprived this ſon of grace of money, brought him before the biſhop of the city, that he might quit all right and title to his father's eſtate, and return what was in his hands. Francis did it, and reſtored to his father even all his cloaths, under which was found a hair cloth, wherewith he macerated his fleſh: afterwards ┼, moved by a wonderful fervour of zeal, wherewith he was tranſported, he ſtripped himſelf ſtark naked before all thoſe that were preſent, and thus addreſſed himſelf to his Father. Hitherto I have called you my father on earth; but hereafter I may certainly ſay ‡ *our father which art in heaven*, ſince I have put all my treaſure and confidence in him. The biſhop, ſeeing this, and admiring ſo excellent a fervency in the man of God, roſe from his ſeat, and, as he was a devout and kind man, he, with tears in his eyes, took up Francis in his arms, and covered him with his cloak.'

[*B*] *To quench the fire of luſt, he would lie upon the ice and ſnow.*] Let us go on with Mr Ferrand's tranſlation. 'Bleſſed Francis (ſays St Bonaventure), at the beginning of his converſion, would often, in winter, throw himſelf into a ditch full of Ice, that he might get a compleat victory over his domeſtic enemy, and to preſerve the robe of chaſtity from the conflagration of pleaſure. He aſſerted, that a ſpiritual man would rather chuſe to ſuffer great cold in his fleſh, than to feel the leaſt heat of carnal pleaſure in his ſoul. Being one day ſtrongly preſſed

'by

(1) Ferrand's Anſwer to the Apology for the Reformation, pag. 364, 365.

(2) He accuſes Mr Jurieu of having not acted fairly, when he related the actions of Francis of Aſſiſi; and he quotes ſome of his falſhoods, beſides thoſe two, which are in the remark [*H*]. *Ferrand's Anſwer to the Apology for the Reformation, pag.* 361.

(3) Id. ibid. pag. 362, 363.

† Tentabat deinde pater carnis, &c. *ibid.*

┼ Inſuper ex admirando fervore, &c. *ibid.*

‡ Matth. vi, 9.

But that was all he thought fit to imitate of St Aldhelme. He durſt not come near women, in the height of his eager deſires [C]; and perhaps he acted prudently; for he was not ſure, that he could have withſtood temptation, as St Aldhelme did. Let us ſpeak more poſitively, and ſay, that his behaviour was, without compariſon, more diſcreet than that of the other ſaint. It is a mad raſhneſs for people, who aſpire to the greateſt purity, to come ſo near the borders of a condition, which, according to the doctrine

---

'by a temptation of the fleſh, he pulled off his cloaths, and ſcourged himſelf ſoundly. Then, warmed with an admirable fervency of zeal, he opened his cell; and, coming out of it, he went into a garden, where, having thrown himſelf naked into a great heap of ſnow, he made of it ſeven balls, and laying them before him, he thus ſpoke to his external man: the largeſt of theſe balls is thy wife; the other four are thy two ſons and two daughters; and the remaining two are thy man and maid ſervants, which thou muſt keep. Make haſte then to cloath them, for they are ſtarved with cold. But, if the trouble, they put thee to, is uneaſy to thee, ſerve carefully one only God. The devil, who then tempted St Francis, being baulked, immediately left him, and this holy man returned victorious into his cell. For the cold, which he endured externally, ſo extinguiſhed the internal flames of his concupiſcence, that he was never after troubled with them (4).'

(4) Ferrand, ubi ſupra, pag. 368.

[C] *He durſt not (like St Aldhelme) come near women in the height of his eager deſires.*] Aldhelme, who, from a monk, became a biſhop in England, towards the end of the VIIth century, dipped himſelf in water in the middle of winter, as high as his ſhoulders, to quell the rebellion of the fleſh. However, he would upon ſome occaſions expoſe himſelf to danger; he did not avoid women, when he found himſelf tempted; on the contrary he would get one, and lie by her till the temptation was over, and nature was quiet. He made the devil mad by his great triumph; for this did not hinder him from ſinging pſalms; and he diſmiſſed the woman as unpolluted as ſhe came to him. This is a coarſe tranſlation of the Latin, which I inſert in the margin (5); but here is a paraphraſe of it full of inimitable ornaments. 'St Aldhelme was an Engliſh monk of the VIIIth century, who was raiſed to a biſhopric for his learning and piety. But the moſt ſhining part of his holineſs was an invincible chaſtity, which was more to be valued, becauſe it had coſt him a great many ſharp conflicts. For the author of his life relates, that he would dive into cold water, or ſnow, to extinguiſh the flames of concupiſcence. He was, no doubt, preſſed very hard, ſince he applied ſuch violent remedies. Nevertheleſs, he got ſo perfect a maſtery over his fleſh, that the fineſt woman made no impreſſion upon him. Nay, he proceeded further; for he went to bed to a young maid, that he might triumph over the moſt dangerous temptations, and which would perhaps embaraſs the greateſt ſaints. Any other, but he, would have had his mind very much taken up in ſo nice a circumſtance; but he repeated the whole Pſalter, and the motions of his heart tended only to heaven. They ſay here, that the devil fretted and fumed, ſeeing him look danger ſo unconcernedly in the face, and his virtue ſtrengthen, where it commonly ſinks. Father Henſchenius would not however adviſe the preſent ſaints, of either ſex, to expoſe themſelves to ſuch trials of virtue. He thinks this an example, which ought rather to be admired, than imitated; and that there is a great deal of raſhneſs in preſuming ſo much on one's ſelf (6).' I wonder, that father de la Mainſerme hath not mentioned this adventure, becauſe it might have admirably helped him out at a dead lift. Although Aldhelme lay by a woman, and there rehearſed the praiſes of God, in ſpite of temptation, and triumphed over nature in the midſt of ſo imminent a danger; yet he hath been ranked among the ſaints, and deſerved that honour by a great many miracles. Why then ſhould it be thought ſtrange, that the bleſſed Robert d'Arbriſſel went to bed to one of his nuns, to obtain a victory ſo much the more meritorious becauſe it was hard to be obtained? If people will blame this, as indeed it is very much to be condemned; at leaſt it muſt be acknowledged, from the example of the Engliſh biſhop, that it doth not hinder the gift of miracles.

(5) Ut vim rebelli corpori conciſſeret, fonti, qui proximus Monaſterio, ſe humero tenus immergebat. Ibi nec glacialem in hyeme rigorem, nec æſtate nebulas ex locis paluſtribus halantes curans, noctes durabat inoffenſus. Finis duntaxat percantati Pſalterii terminum imponebat labori. . . Inter hæc præclaram hominis conſcientiam deſcribere penè verecundaretur oratio; niſi eſſet in facto glorioſæ victoriæ occaſio. Si quando enim ſtimulo corporis amoveretur; non ſolum illecebræ denegabat effectum ſed aliàs inſolitum reportabat triumphum. Neque tunc conſortium fœminarum repudiabat ut cæteri, qui ex opportunitate timent prolabi. Immò verò vel aſſidens vel cubitans aliquam detinebat; quoad carnis tepeſcente lubrico, quieto & immoto diſcederet animo. Derideri ſe videtur Diabolus, cernens adhærentem fœminam virumque alias avocato animo inſiſtentem cantando Pſalterio. Valefaciebat ille mulieri ſalvo pudore, illæſa caſtitate. Reſidebat carnis incommodum: dolebat nequam ſpiritus de ſe agitari ludibrium. *Wilhelmus Malmesbur. in vita Aldhelmi apud Angliam Sacram. Part. II, pag.* 13.

(6) Beauval's Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, *for the month of April*, 1689, *pag.* 164, 165, *giving the abſtract of the* Acta Sanctorum Maii, Tom. VI & VII.

I have ſpoken, in another place (7), of an honeſt hermit, who let fall his breviary at the ſight of a couple, who were diverting themſelves at the ſport of love. This had not happened to him, had he been as ſtrong as St Aldhelme. This ſaint, though he had by his ſide a pretty woman, yet did not loſe one word of either breviary, or pſalmody; and I do not queſtion, but that, if he had had the caſe of conſcience, which Peter Damianus examined, propoſed to him, he had anſwered as Peter Damianus did. You may find this in La Mothe le Vayer. *Agnes*, ſays he, (8), *Widow to Henry II* (9), *asked, by a biſhop, this pretty queſtion of Peter Damianus, one of the moſt underſtanding churchmen of his age,* 'Utrum liceret homini inter ipſum debiti naturalis egerium aliquid ruminare Pſalmorum (§α)? —— *Whether it was lawful for a man, during the performance of matrimonial duty, to repeat to himſelf any part of the pſalms. It was decided in the affirmative, as Baronius informs us, upon the authority of the text of St Paul, in the firſt epiſtle to Timothy *, which ſays, that God may be prayed to every where.*' Is it poſſible, that there has been an empreſs ſo weak, as to propoſe ſuch queſtions? and if the curioſity of a woman extended ſo far, ought any grave Caſuiſts to have examined them? It is a true ſaying, that a man's mind will leave nothing unſtirred: the moſt gloomy and dark receſſes are not without it's reach; and, againſt all the rules of decency, it will carry thither a torch. I will obſerve, by the way, that one of the moſt celebrated of Ariſtotle's commentators would have anſwered the empreſs's queſtion quite otherwiſe than Peter Damianus did. He had maintained, that the public welfare requires, that, in this action, as much as in any other, *hoc age*, and nothing elſe, ſhould be remembered: for he pretends, that the reaſon, why the children of ingenious and learned men are commonly dull and ſtupid, is, becauſe their fathers let their thoughts wander when they ſhould be thinking on what they are doing, when they beget them. On the contrary, *ſays he*, you ſee ſome blockheads, who get children of admirable parts, becauſe they get them in earneſt, and not for faſhion-ſake: they mind what they are about, and nothing elſe, and wholly apply themſelves to the buſineſs in hand. Read this Latin: 'Alexander Aphrodiſæus magno ſe labore conficit, dum cauſam conatur inveſtigare & tradere, cur non rarò contingat, ut craſſus quiſpiam, tardus ac propemodum hebes, liberos gignat ſolertes, prudentes & acutos. Cujus rei cauſam hanc tandem ſtatuit, quòd qui tardiore eſt ingenio, is in ipſo coitu ita ſe totum præſenti voluptati percipiendæ addicit, ut nihil aliud animo cogitet, quem totum corpori immerſum detinet. Itaque ex eo corpore ductum & hauſtum ſemen, cui ſpiritus admixti ſunt, multum habet ipſius facultatis intelligendi: quo fit ut liberi naſcantur ipſo patre prudentiores. E diverſo, qui ingenio ſunt acuto, aut etiam eruditione præſtant, quia eorum animus in perpetua quadam cogitatione verſatur, in ipſo venereo complexu alias res agunt. Quare ſemen quod tunc profluit, quum nihil niſi corporeum habeat (animo nempe tum peregrinante) non multum illius præſtantiſſimæ facultatis habet (10).' A great many phyſicians have vented this fine doctrine. Read only Gaſpar à Reies, in his ſeventy ſixth queſtion, where he ſays, among other

(7) In citat. (35) of the article FONTEVRAUD.

(8) In the twentieth Academical Homily, *Tom. XIV*, of his Works, pag. 291.

(9) It ſhould have been Henry III.

* Chap. ii.

(10) Corraſius, Not. 5. in Areſtum Parliamenti Tholoſ. pag. m. 21. *He quotes* Alex. Aphrod. Prob. lib. xxix.

doctrine of the greateſt philoſophers, far from leaving room for pious ejaculations, allows not the ſoul a freedom of thought [*D*]. What is moſt extraordinary in St Francis, is, that it is pretended, that JESUS CHRIST ſtamped upon him the marks of his five wounds. The Monks of his order relate a thouſand wonderful things on this ſubject.

other things, that wiſe and thoughtful men, who perform matrimonial duties not ſo much to gratify their inclination, as to keep peace at home, and who, even in the very performance, have their mind taken up with philoſophical notions, ſee their children degenerate. He adds, that, for a contrary reaſon, baſtards are generally ſtrong, and ingenious: ‘ Nec ipſo quidem venereo congreſſu, omnino à rerum ſtudio, & contemplatione deſiſtunt prudentes, à quibus cerebrum debile redditur, quo fit ut plerumque tales minus ſalaces, minuſque fervidi ſint, & qui non magnopere hanc monomachiam ardentius expetant, imo detrectent potius, & velut inviti accedant, tantummodo ut uxoribus gratificentur, eaſque pacatiores experiantur, ſicque ad concubitus debitum ſolvendum magis videntur accedere, quàm avidè expetere (11).’ His advice is very wide of the deciſion ſent to the empreſs Agnes (12), and of the doctrine of the Rabbins (13).

[§ (*α*) The caſuiſts, building on the canon law, have declared for the negative. John Neviſan, l. 1. n. 25. of his *Forêt Nuptiale:* ‘ In actu coitus ſemper impeditur ratio ab actu ſuo, & in omni illo actu Prophetæ non habebant influxum ſpiritus Prophetici, ſecundum Tabienam in verbo *Matrimonium* iii. §. j. imo etiam in actu matrimonii quod eſt tantum Sacramentum, Spiritus Sanctus adeſt uſque quo venitur ad copulum, quia tunc recedit. Cap. Connubia xxxij. quæſt. ij. —— *In the act of copulation reaſon is always hindered from exerting itſelf, and in all that act the prophets had not the influx of the prophetic ſpirit, according to Tabiena on the word* Matrimonium, 3. *ſect.* 1. *nay, even in the act of matrimony, which is ſo great a ſacrament, the HOLY GHOST is preſent no longer than till they come to copulation, becauſe then he retreats. See his chapter* Connubia, 32. *quæſt.* 2.’ See the new Menagiana, edit. of Paris, 1715, tom. 1. p. 367. REM. CRIT.]

Cicero would have laughed at this pretended cauſe of the dulneſs of children; for he ſays, that the ſoul is ſo abſorbed, that it is not capable of any reaſonable act: ‘ Cujus (*voluptatis*) motus ut quiſque eſt maximus, ita eſt inimiciſſimus philoſophiæ, congruere enim cum cogitatione magna voluptas corporis non poteſt. Quis enim cum utatur voluptate ea qua nulla poſſit eſſe major attendere animo, inire rationem, cogitare omnino quidquam poteſt (14)?’ He has confirmed this, in another book, by the authority of a great Pythagorean philoſopher (15). ‘ Cumque homini ſive natura ſive quis Deus nihil mente præſtabilius dediſſet: huic divino muneri ac dono nihil eſſe tam inimicum, quam voluptatem. Nec enim libidine dominante temperantiæ locum eſſe, neque omnino in voluptatis regno virtutem poſſe conſiſtere; quod quo magis intelligi poſſet, fingere animo jubebat, tanta incitatum aliquem voluptate corporis, quanta percipi poſſet maxima. Nemini cenſebat ſore dubium, quin tamdiu dum ita gauderet, nihil agitare mente, nihil ratione, nihil cogitatione conſequi poſſet; quocirca nihil eſſe tam deteſtabile, tamque peſtiferum, quam voluptatem: ſiquidem ea, cum major eſſet atque longior, omne animi lumen extingueret (16). —— *And, as the mind is the moſt excellent gift of nature, or ſome God, nothing, he ſaid, is more pernicious to this divine preſent, than ſenſual pleaſure. For, under the dominion of luſt, there is no room for temperance; nor, indeed, can virtue conſiſt, where pleaſure reigns. The better to prove this, he bid us ſuppoſe a man excited as ſtrongly as poſſible by corporeal pleaſure: and no one, he thought, could doubt, but that, during ſuch an enjoyment, he could have no room for thought and reflexion: for which reaſon nothing is ſo deteſtable and contagious as pleaſure; ſince if we ſuppoſe it to riſe higher, and continue longer, it would extinguiſh the whole light of the mind.*’ See the following remark.

[*D*] *A condition . . . . which, according to the doctrine of the greateſt philoſophers, allows not the ſoul a freedom of thought.*] You have juſt now ſeen Cicero's opinion, which is agreeable to that of the greateſt men of antiquity. We have already ſeen (17) that Hippocrates and Democritus called the venereal act, a little epilepſy. What can be added to this definition? doth it not emphatically expreſs what is contained in our text? but let us not here forget the divine Plato. It is reported, ſays he, that the gods forgive falſe oaths to the pleaſures of love, as if they were children void of underſtanding: Ἡδονὴ μὲν γὰρ ἁπάντων ἀλαζονέστατον, ὡς δὲ λόγος, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ταῖς περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια (αἳ δὲ μέγισται δοκοῦσιν εἶναι) καὶ τὸ ἐπιορκεῖν συγγνώμην εἴληφε παρὰ Θεῶν· ὡς, καθάπερ παίδων, τῶν ἡδονῶν νοῦν οὐδὲ τὸν ὀλίγιστον κεκτημένων. *Voluptas enim maxime omnium temeraria: fertur enim de venereis voluptatibus, quæ ingentiſſimæ omnium æſtimantur, quòd pejerantibus illis Dii prorſus ignoſcunt, quaſi pueri quidam voluptates ſint, nullius intelligentiæ compotes* (18). Ariſtotle obſerves, that pleaſures are obſtacles to the faculty of thinking well; and that thoſe of love give not the ſoul leave to meditate, or examine any one thing: Ἔτι ἐμπόδιον τῷ φρονεῖν αἱ ἡδοναί· καὶ ὅσῳ μᾶλλον χαίρει, μᾶλλον· οἷον τὴν τῶν ἀφροδισίων· οὐδένα γὰρ ἂν δύνασθαι νοῆσαί τι ἐν αὐτῇ. *Deinde prudenter ſentiendi facultatem impediunt voluptates, eoque magis quo quiſque magis delectatur: qualis eſt ea quæ ex rebus venereis percipitur. In ea voluptate enim neminem quicquam animo agitare, aut ratione explicare poſſe* (19). Montagne was not altogether of this opinion, and he went upon his own experience. Here are his words (20): ‘ Thoſe, who cry down ſenſuality, gladly make uſe of this argument, to ſhew that it is intirely vicious, and unreaſonable, and that, when it is at it's height, it maſters us ſo much, that reaſon is ſhut out of doors; and they alledge the experience we find of this in the converſation of women,

> - - - * Cum jam præſagit gaudia corpus
> Atque in eo eſt Venus, ut muliebria conſerat arva.

> *When now the limbs preſage approaching joys,*
> *And the whole man for the attack prepares.*

‘ Where it appears to them, that pleaſure tranſports us ſo much beſide our ſelves, that our reaſon, being charmed and captivated, cannot exert itſelf. I know that it may happen otherwiſe, and that, if a man will, he may arrive, at that very inſtant, at bending his thoughts on ſomething elſe; but they muſt be purpoſely forced and ſtretched. I know that the effort of this pleaſure may be checked, and I have ſome inſight into it; for I have not found Venus ſo imperious a goddeſs, as many, and more moderate, men than I, pretend.’ This would be a ſlender excuſe for thoſe monks, whom we attack here: the obſervation, which an Italian phyſician has made, would better teach them their duty. The very thought, ſays he (21), of ſuch an action overſets reaſon, and inſpires a ſort of fury. ‘ Atque utinam in ipſo Veneris actu duntaxat mente privaremur, non etiam in previa meditatione ad eundem, quam furorem & rabiem dixit & deſcripſit Virgilius, lib. 3. Georg. hiſce carminibus (22). . . . . . . Tranſimus conſulto carminis majeſtatem, leporem, poſſuntne apertioribus argumentis phyſice comprobari, quas furias addat ſola meditatio Veneris non homini tantum, ſed & brutis quoque cæteris (23). Pudenda itaque, vel partes reprehenſibiles exiſtunt, quod animalia omnia in rabiem agant, naturæ cancellis propriis amoveant, in homine verò maximè omnium jugulent ipſam rationalem animam. —— *And I could wiſh we were deprived of reaſon only in the very act of venery, and not driven, even by the previous meditation on it, to that madneſs, and rage, deſcribed by Virgil . . . . I purpoſely take no notice of the grandeur and elegance of the verſes, and whether the truth of them may not be phyſically proved by plainer arguments, as alſo what that kind of madneſs is, which the meditation alone on venereal pleaſure raiſes, not only in man, but in the brute creation. Thoſe parts therefore are deſervedly termed* Pudenda, (*or what we may be aſhamed of*), *ſince they drive all animals to madneſs, break down the proper fences of nature, and, in man particularly, deſtroy the very rational ſoul.*’ We ſhall ſee in ano-

(11) Gaſpar à Reies in Jucundo Elyſiar. Quæſt. Campo. *Quæſt. LXXVI, pag.* 1035.

(12) Igitur qui optimæ & ſimilis prolis deſiderio tenentur, non ſecus ac bruta, totos ſe Veneri tradere debent, & illius illecebris cum uxoribus attentos eſſe neceſſe eſt, alioquin ſi aliter imaginationem occupatam habeant, vel conceptus impedietur, vel propoſito optimæ prolis fine minimè potientur. *Id. ibid. pag.* 1036.

(13) See the remark of the article *ARODON*.

(14) Cicero, in Hortenſio, apud Auguſtin. contra Pelagium, lib. iv.

(15) Architas Tarentinus.

(16) Cicero, de Senectute, cap. xii.

(17) In remark [*S*] of the article *DEMOCRITUS*.

(18) Plato, in Philebo, *pag. m.* 405, C.

(19) Ariſtot. Ethic. Nicomach. lib. vii, cap. xii, pag. m. 72. C.

(20) Montagne's Eſſays, book ii, chap. xi, pag. m. 172.

* Lucret. lib. iv, ver. 1099.

(21) Marcus Antonius Ulmus. Phyſiologiæ Barbæ humanæ, Sect. II, cap. iii, pag. 128.

(22) He inſerts here 24 verſes of Virgil.

(23) It muſt be obſerved, that he enquires into the reaſon why the parts, deſigned for generation, are called the *Pudenda*.

ſubject. They have obtained a permiſſion to conſecrate a feſtival in honour of theſe holy marks, and to recite the office of it (c) [E]. They have reported ſo many things of their patriarch, and with ſo little judgment, that they have expoſed him to many bitter invectives and jeſts [F]. Some of thoſe jeſts are, without doubt, too biting, and malicious [G]: But one can hardly forbear imitating Democritus, or Heraclitus, when one reflects, that Francis of Aſſiſi receives divine honours after his death; he, who was guilty

ther place (24) a paſſage of Melanchthon, which has ſome affinity with this. But we muſt not refer St Auguſtin's fine maxim to another place. He concludes, that, ſince the ſoul is affected with ſuch an exceſs of pleaſure, as to be incapable of any intellectual function, every man, who is truly wiſe, and ſenſible of holy pleaſures, had rather that the conjugal duty were ſeparated, if poſſible, from the voluptuous ſenſation, which accompanies it (25). 'Hæc autem (libido) ſibi non ſolùm totum corpus, nec ſolùm extrinſecus, verum etiam intrinſecus vendicat, totumque commovet hominem, animi ſimul affectu cum carnis appetitu conjuncto atque permixto, ut ea voluptas ſequatur, qua major in corporis voluptatibus nulla eſt: ita ut momento ipſo temporis, quo ad ejus perveniatur extremum, penè omnis acies & quaſi vigilia cogitationis obruatur. Quis autem amicus ſapientiæ ſanctorumque gaudiorum, conjugalem agens vitam, & ſicut apoſtolus monuit *, *Sciens vas ſuum poſſidere in ſanctificatione & honore, non in morbo deſiderii, ſicut & gentes quæ ignorant Deum*, non mallet, ſi poſſet, ſine hac libidine filios procreare; ut etiam in hoc ſerendæ prolis officio, ſic ejus menti, ea quæ ad hoc opus creata ſunt, quemadmodum cætera: ſuis quæque operibus diſtributa membra ſervirent, nutu voluntatis acta non æſtu libidinis incitata? —— *But luſt governs the whole man, the affection of the mind being united with the carnal appetite, whence follows that pleaſure, which is the greateſt of all corporeal enjoyments; inſomuch that, at that inſtant of time, when it is raiſed to the higheſt pitch, all thought and reflexion is taken away. Who therefore, that is a friend to wiſdom and heavenly joys, leading a married life, and, as the apoſtle adviſes,* Knowing how to poſſeſs his veſſel in ſanctification and honour, not in the luſt of concupiſcence, as the Gentiles, which know not God, *would not rather, if he could, get children without this luſt; and wiſh, that, in the very act of propagating his ſpecies, the faculties of his mind, no leſs than his body, were ſubſervient to his will, not under the government of luſt.*'

[E] *The monks of his order obtained a feſtival in honour of theſe holy marks, and leave to recite the office of it.*] See Alcoran des Cordeliers (26), and you will find there a marginal note, very ſatirical, in theſe words: *As for the marks of this idol, the Jacobins ſay, that it was St Dominic, who made them with a ſpit, as he was hid under the bed, upon a quarrel between them. And thus theſe abominable ſects worry one another.* The author of this note is at leaſt guilty of a very great omiſſion; for he quotes no body, who relates, that the Jacobins ſay this. Now it is ſo unlikely, that they have ever reported it, that twenty witneſſes would not be too much to make them ſuſpected of it.

Obſerve, that Faber Stapulenſis very freely condemned, as ſuperſtitious, the feaſt of the holy marks of Francis of Aſſiſi. See his comment on the ſeventeenth verſe of the ſixth chapter of the epiſtle of St Paul to the Galatians (27). The ſuperſtition of this feſtival is very contagious, and able to delude devout minds; for the preachers on that day are ſo pathetical, and full of high flights, that they ſow enthuſiaſm and extaſies in many weak brains; and, when ſome certain incidents chance to concur, theſe ſeeds never fail to ſpring up. I remember a paſſage of Balzac, which is worth inſerting here. 'There was ſome time ago, in a town of Spain, a ſociety of devout women, who meditated for many hours in the day, and who forſook the care of mean concerns, to live, as they pretended, a more ſublime life. But what think you was the event of this? a thouſand domeſtic diſorders, and a thouſand public extravagancies. The leſs credulous miſtook the pricks of pins for holy marks; the moſt humble thought their husbands profane; and the wiſeſt talked to themſelves, and were continually making grimaces. In fine, when only three or four of them run mad in the month of May, it was thought a good year (28).'

[F] *They have publiſhed ſo many things of their patriarch, and with ſo litle judgment, that they have expoſed him to many invectives.*] See the book, intituled, *Liber Conformitatum Divi Franciſci ad vitam* JESU CHRISTI, and you will need no arguments to prove the text of this remark. Thoſe, who compiled, in the XVIth century, the Alcoran of the Franciſcans, took their materials from thence, and only publiſhed ſome abſtracts of this book, with marginal notes. They made uſe of the edition of Milan, 1510. In all likelihood, the Franciſcans would have beeen a little wiſer, had they foreſeen what happened by the means of Luther and Calvin. But thoſe, who dared exclaim againſt the Romiſh church, were, for ſo long a time, cruſhed by the ſecular power, that they eaſily believed thoſe, who ſhould follow their ſteps, would meet with the ſame fate. But they were miſtaken. A large body of a church aroſe before the middle of the XVIth century; and this large body as yet maintains itſelf, ſubſiſts, and is ſtill in a capacity to make itſelf dreaded. It has had abundance of writers of all ſorts, who have taken notice of the impertinencies of former authors. Therefore, as the impreſſion of the book, intituled, *Liber Conformitatum*, &c. was imprudently allowed, the Franciſcans have been obliged to ſmart for it. This is not a blow, that is ſoon over, as when a whole ſect is extirpated, with all it's books. But thoſe, who gave this blow, have a great many authors among them, and a great many libraries, and printing houſes.

[G] *Some of thoſe jeſts are, without doubt, too biting and malicious.*] I reckon among them what I have already ſaid concerning the marks of Francis. Thoſe blows with a ſpit, which he received from St Dominic, muſt be looked upon as a ridiculous and malicious ſtory. Some body framed to himſelf a comical notion of the two founders of theſe orders, and fancied, that, one day, they quarelled, and came to blows; and that, St Francis hiding himſelf under a bed, his antagoniſt, armed with a ſpit, thruſt it five or ſix times into his body: whereupon another carried the jeſt ſo far, as to ſay, that St Francis's marks proceeded from this quarrel. I alſo rank, among theſe jeſts, this raillery of d'Aubigné (29): 'If any biſhop, or cardinal, falls in love with his page, let him comfort himſelf after the example of St Francis, who calls his love to brother Maceus, ſacred. And, in truth, they expreſſed their luſt even at the altar; for, as the ſaid book ſays, St Francis was all in a flame, when he looked upon brother Maceus, and would often cry out, as he did one day, when he held the chalice, and Maceus the burette or cruet, as if he had been tranſported with fury, *Præbe mihi te ipſum!*' Laſtly I reckon, among thoſe malicious jeſts, Conrad Badius's gloſſes, which I am going to relate. I put them, as he does, in the margin. As for the text, taken from the book intituled, *Liber Conformitatum*, &c. here it is in the body of this column. 'We muſt know how St Clara † was dedicated and conſecrated to CHRIST. The night after Palm-Sunday, being in honeſt company, ſhe went out of the town of Aſſiſi, and came to St Mary of the angels, in the convent of the brethren, where St Francis and his companions ſtayed for her; where, being honourably received by St Francis, and his companions, ſhe was conducted to the altar of the virgin Mary; and there, in the firſt place, ſhe was ſhaved; then her worldly cloaths were pulled off, and the habit of the order put on her: which being done, St Francis, and his companions, conducted her to the monaſtery of Panzo, which is now of his order, and was before of that of St Benedict.... One time, St Clara told St Francis, that ſhe had a mind to eat with him; but he would by no means agree to it; for which he was blamed by his guilty of ſo many extravagancies during his life [*H*]. He died the fourth of October 1226 *(d)*, and was canonized by Pope Gregory IX, the ſixth of May, 1230. His feſtival was appointed to be on the fourth day of October. The moſt violent ſatire, that hath appeared againſt him, is one intituled, *Alcoranus Franciſcanorum*. A Monk of his order has endeavoured to refute it [*I*].

(c) Spondan. ad ann. 1223, n. 11.

(24) In remark [*B*] of the article FRANCES, citat. (9).

(25) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. xiv, cap. xvi, pag. m. 129.

* 1 Theſſ. iv.

(26) *Lib. i, pag.* 4, of the edit. of Geneva, 1560, in 8vo, ſold by Conrad Badius; and *pag.* 5, of the edit. of Geneva, 1578, in 12mo, ſold by William de Laimarie.

(27) *Mr Simon's* Critical Hiſtory of the Commentators on the New Taſtament, *chap. xxxiv, pag.* 494, *and* 495. *He quotes Faber's Words.*

(28) *Balzac, in the third book of his Letters.*

(29) Confeſſ. Catholique de Sancy, lib. i, cap. ii.

† Here is the ſhe-wolf that has brought forth ſo many others. Now we may very well think, that this laſs had been very familiar with this ruffian Francis, who (as they themſelves ſay in their book) was a thorough debauchee, delighting in all ſort of diſſoluteneſs, in dancing, gaming, junketting; and I leave you to judge whether he abſtained from fornication, before Satan had choſen him to compleat that diſaſter, which has overturned chriſtianity. For what ſort of behaviour is it, for a young woman, of an honourable family, to go out, in the night-time, without any attendants, or the knowledge of her parents, to meet certain Monks, hotter than bulls, and be ſo familiar with them, as to ſuffer them to do what they will with her, to ſhave her, ſtrip her naked, cloath her again, and then carry her where they pleaſe, and all under pretence of holineſs? *Alcoran des Cordeliers, liv. ii, pag.* 220. *Geneva edit.* 1560.

The

‘ his brethren, and therefore at laſt he conſented ‡. Thus having with her a ſhe-friend, and two of St Francis's companions, ſhe came to St Mary of the angels; and, after ſhe had bowed before the altar of the virgin, where ſhe had married Christ, ſhe went to eat the dinner, which St Francis had ordered to be laid on the ground. For the firſt courſe, St Francis began to ſpeak of God ſo ſweetly and holily, and ſo divinely and ſublimely, that the good ſaint himſelf, St Clara, and her friend, with the other brothers, were charmed with it: and, on a ſudden, as they were thus tranſported, having their hands and eyes lifted up to heaven, a great fire appeared over the convent of the brethren, ſo that the place and the foreſt ſeemed all in a flame. The inhabitants of Aſſiſi, ſeeing this, made all the haſte they could to the convent, to put out the fire: but they ſaw that nothing had been damaged, and that the brethren, and St Clara, were in extaſies; and then they perceived, that the fire was a divine fire, which had viſibly appeared to comfort thoſe, who were there aſſembled, wherewith they were mightily edified. Now when they came to themſelves, not caring for any other victuals, St Clara and her friend returned to her monaſtery (30). Nothing can be more dull and impertinent, than what Badius ſays in his laſt gloſs: *A great fire appeared upon the convent*; that is to ſay, *it was reported abroad, that the monks diverted themſelves there with ſome nuns*. What ſort of interpretation is this? Is not this to transfer Anaxagoras's principles of phyſics into morality (31). At this rate, one may find any thing any where.

[*H*] *He gave ſo many marks of extravagancy during his life.*] ‘ He, who had a wiſe, and daughters, of ſnow, might very well have ſwallows, and graſhoppers, for his ſiſters, and hares and lambs for his brothers; for thus he called theſe animals. *Swallows, my ſiſters, you have chattered enough: my brother leveret, haſt thou let thyſelf be thus deceived? Graſhopper, my ſiſter, ſing and praiſe the creator.* He told a countryman, who carried two lambs upon his ſhoulders, *why doſt thou thus torment my brothers?* his mercy extended even to lice and worms; for he would not ſuffer them to be killed; becauſe it is ſaid, in the twenty firſt pſalm, *I am a worm, and not a man* .... He himſelf killed the eldeſt ſon of a phyſician, in a place, called Nuceria, to have the pleaſure of raiſing him again from the dead (32).’ Compare this paſſage of Mr Jurieu with that of Mr Ferrand, which I am going to quote, and you will ſee what facts cannot be diſputed: they are thoſe, which Mr Ferrand durſt not deny. ‘ I omit here, (*Mr Ferrand ſpeaks* (33) thoſe things, which are either of no moment, or which are notoriouſly falſe; as is, for inſtance, St Francis's clemency to lice and worms, which he would not ſuffer to be killed; and the murder, which the apologiſt ſays this ſaint committed on the eldeſt ſon of a phyſician, to have the pleaſure of raiſing him from the dead. This is either ſo weak, or ſo evidently falſe, that we ought not to inſiſt upon it. The bare propoſing of it is it's refutation.’ Theſe are the only falſities which Mr Ferrand upbraids his adverſary with; he therefore grants the reſt; and that is enough to ſhew, that Francis had unhinged his mind by ſome very falſe notions of devotion. I pity Mr Ferrand, for having engaged to apologize for theſe fine fraternities. ‘ If the apologiſt, *ſays he* (34), was like St Bonaventura, he would take care (35) not to cenſure the name of ſiſter and brother; which St Francis gave to animals. He would admire that, as well as St Bonaventura. Whoſe interpreter I cannot forbear to be here again.’ ‘ St Francis, conſidering the firſt origin of all things, and being full of an abundant charity, called, by the name of brother and ſiſter, the minuteſt creatures. He did it, becauſe he knew, that theſe animals came from the ſame principle, as he, that is, that God was their creator: but he embraced, with more tenderneſs and friendſhip, thoſe animals, which, both by their own nature, and by the application, which the ſcripture made of them, repreſented the meekneſs of Jesus Christ; as, for inſtance, lambs. As he was one day at Santa Maria della Portiuncula, there was a graſhopper on a fig-tree, near the cell of the man of God. This graſhopper invited often, by her notes, the ſervant of God to praiſe him; for he had learned to admire the magnificence of the creator, even in the ſmalleſt beings. He called her one day, and, as if ſhe had been inſpired from above, ſhe flew upon Francis's hand. This ſaint ſaid to her; ſiſter graſhopper, ſing, and praiſe God by your tunes. The graſhopper obeyed immediately, and fell a ſinging.’ If it be true, that St Francis placed himſelf ſtark naked in the room of a crucifix, we cannot doubt, but that he was mad. I do not affirm it poſitively, becauſe I have only read it in the Confeſſion of Sancy. Let us ſee the paſſage, and fetch it a little higher. ‘ When we read of St Francis cohabiting with his wife of ſnow, it muſt be ſaid, that it was an antidote againſt his own natural heat, and that which appears in his poſterity. When he preached to fiſhes, it implies, that, when his poſterity preaches, they want dumb hearers. When he preached to them, as a miracle, that God preſerved them from drowning at the flood; it means, according to Richeome, that the miracles of the Romiſh church are to proceed from natural cauſes. When he called wolves his brothers, and gave them his hand, it was to foretel, that the Franciſcans would be a ravenous crew, who would endeavour to ſurprize innocent ſheep. He called ſwallows his ſiſters, becauſe his brothers, as well as they, in the time of matins, neſtle in the boors houſes. When the angel told him, in his prayers, that Antichriſt would come out of his order, it was, that the Franciſcans might not be thought unworthy of being Popes. And, when he laid aſide his ſhirt, to ſtand naked before the ladies, in the place of a crucifix, it was to ſhew the beauties of nature, as not having eaten of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, and to repreſent, if not the knowledge, at leaſt the nakedneſs of father Adam (36).’ I conclude with this obſervation; none have done more prejudice to St Francis, than his own children. If, when they publiſhed his hiſtory, they had expunged ſeveral things, which were not fit to be rehearſed, they had not given the Proteſtants occaſion to laugh at him. What grief was it not for the Iriſh Capuchins, when they came to ſettle at Sedan, to find themſelves entertained with three ſermons from Mr du Moulin (37) full of the ridiculous paſſages of their patriarch's legend, which that miniſter, who naturally loved bantering, ſeaſoned pretty high?

[*I*] *A Franciſcan monk has endeavoured to refute the Alcoranus Franciſcanorum.*] The author of this refutation is a Franciſcan of the Low-Countries, called Henry Sedulius. He publiſhed his book (38) at Antwerp, in the year 1607. He obſerves, 1. that the book intituled, *Liber Conformitatum*, &c. was compoſed by brother Bartholomew de Piſis in the year 1389; and that in the year 1513, a book intituled, *The Alcoran of the Franciſcans*, appeared, in High-Dutch, againſt it, without the name either of the author or bookſeller. 2. That this Alcoran, enlarged by half, appeared at Geneva, in Latin and French, in the year 1578, and that it was printed in Dutch at Dort in the year 1589 (39). He obſerves, 3. that the author of this Alcoran is called Eraſmus Alberus, and ſtiles himſelf miniſter of the church in the country of Brandenburgh. Now as, in the year 1513, Luther had not yet declared againſt the Pope, Sedulius fancies, that the date of the impreſſion is ſuppoſititious; for before Luther, the title of *Eccleſiæ miniſter* was not in uſe. In the 4th place, he obſerves, that it is a calumny to affirm, as Alberus does, that the *Liber Conformitatum*, &c. hath as much authority among the Franciſcans, as the Alcoran among the Turks. 5. He denies, what Conrad Badius aſſerts (40), that, ſince the reformation, this *Liber Conformitatum*, &c. which was often reprinted before that time, is as much ſuppreſſed as can be. He ſets, upon that account, Badius in oppoſition to Luther (41), and obſerves, that this book was printed at

Bologne

‡ He has ſaid before, that ſhe was 42 years ſhut up, without ſtirring out of the monaſtery. Reconcile theſe two things, if you can. In the mean time remember what I have already obſerved, That, if theſe things are true, it may well be conjectured, that leudneſs was mixed with his holineſs. For what decency is it, for two maids to go along with two monks, from one place to another, for a dinner? Moreover, whence came this Inclination in this holy nun, to feaſt with the holineſs of this fine father? unleſs that ſhe had a mind to rump, and to renew their former acquaintance? *Ibid. pag.* 223.

(d) Spondan. ad ann. 1226, n. 11.

(30) Ibid. pag. 224.

(31) Quodlibet ex quolibet, quia quidlibet in quolibet.

(32) Jurieu's Apology for the Reformers, chap. i, pag. 52, 53. Edit. in 4to.

(33) Ferrand's Anſwer to the Apology for the Reformation, pag. 356, 357.

(34) Ibid. pag. 369, 370.

(35) What a thought is this! It is as if I ſhould ſay, *If the biſhop of Meaux was like Mr Claude, he would take care not to blame the reformation.*

(36) Confeſſion Cathol. de Sancy, lib. i, cap. ii.

(37) They were printed in the year 1641. Father Joſeph wrote againſt theſe ſermons; but du Moulin replied by a book, intituled, *The Capuchin*, which he publiſhed at Sedan, in the ſame year 1641. See the remark [*M*].

(38) *Intituled*, Apologeticus adverſus Alcoranum Franciſcanorum, pro Libro Conformitatum, libri tres, in 4to.

(39) He knew nothing of the edition 1556, cited by du Verdier, *Bibl. pag.* 858, nor of the Geneva edition, 1590, in 8vo, by Conrad Badius. Note, That Voëtius, *Deſper. Cauſa Papatus, pag.* 619, knew only the Dutch edition of that *Alcoran*.

(40) In the preface to the *Alcoran des Cordeliers*, of the Geneva edition.

(41) Tam hoc eſt falſum *(pudere nos libri conformitatum)* quam quod ſcribit Lutherus verum, nos hæc abominatione necdum pœnitentiam agere, hanc non recantare. *Sedulius in Prolegom.*

The method he has taken will rather pleaſe, than diſpleaſe, his enemies (*e*); for, inſtead of condemning what is evidently blameable, in the *Liber Conformitatum*, he has attempted either to juſtify, or excuſe, it all. It was impoſſible to ſucceed in this; and therefore his book is only fit to inſpire theſe thoughts into the minds of the Proteſtants, *viz.* that the monks, unwilling to abate any thing, do ſtill approve the greateſt exceſs of ſuperſtition, which was occaſioned by the gloomy ages of ignorance. Would they but abandon the cauſe of Bartholomew de Piſis (*f*), they might, in ſome meaſure, ſtop the mouths of thoſe, who lay a great ſtreſs upon the Alcoran of the Franciſcans; but with might and main to defend it, is to put new arms into their hands, and to give them the ſatisfaction of ſeeing that this ſatire was reaſonable, and that it attacked an inveterate Diſeaſe, againſt which the moſt cauſtic remedies were not too ſtrong. I know, that the Franciſcans might have feared ſomething, had they confeſſed themſelves in the wrong: And this gives me occaſion to ſay, that thoſe are under very unhappy circumſtances, who, being aſſaulted by their enemies, afford them matter of triumph, whatever courſe they may take [*K*]. The Franciſcans find themſelves in this plunge, when they are reproached with the extravagant and ſcandalous propoſitions of the book of Conformities. They are not the only people, that are reſolved, right or wrong, to acknowlege

(e) *See the paſſage of Rivetus in the remark* [*G*], *citat.* (43).

(f) *Author of the book, intituled,* Liber Conformitatum, &c, *which is the ground and foundation of the Satire, intituled,* Alcoranus Franciſcanorum.

Bologne in the year 1590. Laſtly, he obſerves, that the names of the compilers of this Alcoran appear neither in the German, nor in the French and Dutch editions; and that he will not anſwer the marginal obſervations, but only the objections that are grounded on the words of Bartholomew de Piſis.

The notes on the *Confeſſion Catholique* of Sancy (42) inform us, that the Alcoran of the Franciſcans was printed with this title, *De ſtygmatiſato Idolo, quod Franciſcum vocant, blaſphemiarum & nugarum lerna, ſeu Alcoranus Franciſcanorum,* in 1543; and that it was only a tranſlation from the High-Dutch, *which was publiſhed in* 1513 *, *or rather in* 1531; *for, in* 1513, *there were as yet no Proteſtants; and that this year,* 1531, *which is only a tranſpoſition of the two preceding numbers, is ſet down* † *for the epoch of the life of Dr Eraſmus Alberus, who at firſt wrote, in High-Dutch, the Franciſcans Alcoran.* Let us ſee Andrew Rivet's judgment upon this work of Sedulius. *A certain Franciſcan, called Henry Sedulius,* ſays he (43), *who attempted to mimic Lipſius, hath endeavoured to defend all theſe idle tales and ſcandalous propoſitions, heaping together ſeveral ſentences out of eccleſiaſtical authors, and others, which only ſwell his book, and perplex the ſubject: and, though, at the beginning, he grants,* that there is ſomething too free in this book, by reaſon of the ſimple age it was writ in, *yet there is no freedom of expreſſion there, but he ſtrives to juſtify: and therefore he compares them* to ſome few drops of water, which do not alter the nature of wine, *inſtead of acknowledging them a rank poiſon, that choaks the underſtanding of thoſe, who delight to drink of it. This book is approved by the cenſors of Antwerp, as* very uſeful againſt heretics. *Truly, it is ſo uſeful to us, that I could wiſh, for the glory of God, that there was not one Papiſt of ſenſe, but what had one, and read it with attention, that he might ſay to the author, and thoſe like him,* thou haſt a whore's forehead, and thou refuſedſt to be aſhamed ‡. *To make this appear, requires a larger volume than his; but his is ſufficient.*

[*K*] *Thoſe are under very unhappy circumſtances, who, being aſſaulted by their enemies, afford them matter of triumph every way.*] Thoſe authors, who are expoſed to ſuch attacks, are like the Roman army, who ſuffered themſelves to be hemmed in *ad furculas caudinas* (44). They could not get out, but by ſubmitting to great ignominy. They could neither reſiſt, nor capitulate, but at a great diſadvantage. There are ſome controverſies, which have the ſame fate. Peace cannot be ſued for, nor war continued, but to one's confuſion. This was the caſe of the Franciſcans in the XVIth century, when the Proteſtants attacked them, concerning the book of Bartholomew de Piſis. To acknowledge, that this work contained many blaſphemies, many ridiculous, extravagant, and impious propoſitions, &c. was to ſacrifice the glory of the order, ſcandalize devout ſouls, and acknowledge that the heretics were obliged to teach them how to think and ſpeak better. Beſides, it was to make thoſe heretics proud, to give them a large ſcope to inſult the Franciſcans, and to prepare them the way to overthrow many other things, by acknowledging, that they were miſtaken in ſome, and that they had left the world, for ſo long a time, in a groſs ſuperſtition. They thought it better neither to give way, nor to capitulate, but to defend themſelves as well as they could, though their poſt was not well fortified. They then ſaw themſelves within the reach of the ancient proverb, *A fronte præcipitium, à tergo lupi; Go forward and fall, go backward and mar all.* There was a neceſſity to chooſe one of two evils, and they thought the worſt was to confeſs themſelves vanquiſhed: they hoped, ſome apologies might be made, which would ſatisfy devout ſouls; and that their adverſaries replies, though never ſo ſtrong, would not ſtagger the faith of good Romaniſts. In a word, they found, that, if it was diſhonourable to contend, it was much more ſo not to reſiſt (45). Generally ſpeaking, it is true, that, in a diſpute, he, who attacks, has more advantage, and can better maintain his ground, than he, who is attacked: but this was more particularly true, with reference to thoſe, who declared war againſt the book of Conformities. They fought, ſure of the victory; they run no riſque; and they were certain to get the better, which way ſoever the enemy turned. If he holds his peace, they might have ſaid, he will acknowledge our objections unanſwerable: if he ſuppreſſes the book of Conformities, he will grant the ſame thing; for he will confeſs himſelf aſhamed of the extravagancies of his predeceſſors, and confirm our charge againſt them. If he pretends to juſtify this book, he will as much confirm our accuſation: his anſwers will be wretched, and only ſhew his obſtinacy, and give us a fair opportunity to inſult over him, and tell him, that he does not innocently ſuffer for the faults of his anceſtors (46), but rather as an accomplice, ſince he adopts them, and endeavours to juſtify them as well as he can. Note, that Sedulius, the apologiſt of Bartholomew de Piſis, obſerves, that there were ſome heretics, who charged the Franciſcans with being aſhamed of this book, and that others upbraid them with not being aſhamed of it (47). Were not they like to expoſe themſelves, whether they approved, or diſapproved, the book of Conformities?

Such muſt always be the fate of thoſe who are to defend poſts of this nature. Mr le Camus, the famous biſhop of Bellai, did not foreſee, when he began a controverſy with Mr Drelincourt about the worſhip of the virgin Mary, that he would be drawn into this defile. Mr Drelincourt made a large collection of the moſt extravagant expreſſions, that he found in the writings of the Roman Catholics, concerning the power of the holy virgin, and deſired Monſieur le Camus to give him his opinion about them. This prelate was hampered; he racked his invention and fancy, and anſwered, that he was in the country, and could not come to verify the paſſages alledged by the miniſter; he drolled, and gave himſelf merry airs; but, in the main, he formally condemned nothing: he durſt neither ſwallow, nor caſt out the bit; he only chewed it, and even recurred to a mean and comical recrimination (48). All which proves how much he was puzzled. This recrimination, how bad ſoever it be, is more tolerable than that, which the Franciſcan Feuardentius made uſe of in a like caſe. It came into his head to reproach the miniſters, that Theodore Beza had invoked his Candida as a goddeſs. Theſe are his words: 'But what will you ſay, if I ſhew you, by 'the writings of your chief miniſters and preachers, '*that they invoke and adore their whores as Goddeſſes?*

' In

(42) Pag. 91, 92, of the edition of 169..

* Henry Sedulius *ſays ſo.*

† Theatre Hiſt. de Helvic. Table xxxvii.

(43) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Reſponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, Part. II, pag. 352.

‡ Jerem. iii, 3.

(44) *See* Florus, lib. i, cap. xvi.

(45) Turpe quidem contendere erat, ſed cedere viſum Turpius. *Ovid. Metam. lib. v, ver.* 315.

(46) What Horace. *Od. iv, lib. iii,* ſaid to the Romans, *Delicta majorum immeritus lues Romane,* could not therefore have been applied to them.

(47) See the remark [*I*].

(48) See it above, at the end of the remark [*A*], of the article ARODON.

acknowledge nothing; for the Jeſuits alſo undertake to defend the book of Bartholomew de Piſis, when they ſee it attacked by the Proteſtants [*L*]. Some laymen have been ſeen to take pen in hand in a like cauſe, againſt the miniſter du Moulin [*M*], and have met with the fate they deſerved. However, the Franciſcans continue to preach up many abſurd things concerning their founder; and the world would be better informed of

‘Is not that to deny the only living and true God? Theſe are Beza's own verſes concerning his whore Candida.’

Et tamen hanc audes maculare, & dicere nigram?
Deſine, habet certè Numen & iſta ſuum.
Quæ niſi ſit precibus noſtris lenita, veremur
Ne diſcas læſæ quàm gravis ira deæ.

Dare you to blacken and prophane the fair?
Deſiſt; for, O! divinity is in her.
If ſhe relent not at our prayer, expect
To feel the vengeance of an angry goddeſs.

‘And a little after,

Parce, rogo, quæcunque dea es.

Thy humble ſupplicant in mercy ſpare,
Whate'er divinity reſides within thee.

‘And again,

Ecce fugam fateor, veniam ne, Diva, negabo.

Goddeſs, I own my flight, and ſue for pardon.

‘After that, he gives and conſecrates his ſoul to her, as to a goddeſs:

‘Ipſam nempe animam tibi dicatam, Amoriſque tui ignibus peruſtam, Quæ pridem tua ſit licet, ſuamque Te pridem Dominam vocetque ametque, Se rurſus tibi datque dedicatque. —— *My very ſoul, dedicated to thee, and burnt up with the fires of your love; which, though it has been long your's, and has long called you it's miſtreſs, and loved you, again devotes and dedicates itſelf to you.*

‘And again,

Ergo fas alium te, Candida, dicere Solem,
Utpotè quæ facias æſtum hyememque mihi.

Thou art, my Candida, another ſun,
Since from thy kind, or angry, eyes alone
My ſummer and my winter I derive.

‘Doth it become your authors, and arch-preachers, to call their ſluts, *Ladies*, *Miſtreſſes*, *Suns*, and *Goddeſſes*; and is it idolatry for the Catholics to call the moſt holy Virgin, and mother of God, ſtar of the ſea, advocate of ſinners, life, ſweetneſs, and queen of mercy (49)?’ Any body may ſee how ridiculous this parallel is: for, 1. there is a vaſt difference between a poetical expreſſion, and a phraſe of devotion. Thoſe are only witty conceits, which are not ſerious; but theſe are ſeriouſly uſed, as an act of religion. In the 2d place, Beza was not a miniſter, when he made thoſe verſes. 3. He diſowned, and abhorred, them as ſoon as he made public profeſſion of the Proteſtant religion.

[*L*] *The jeſuits alſo undertake to defend the book of Bartholomew de Piſis, when they ſee it attacked by the Proteſtants.*] Du Pleſſis Mornai, in one of his books (50), diſplayed the compariſons, which the author of the Conformities has made between Jesus Christ, and the founder of the Franciſcans. Gretſerus, the jeſuit, anſwered (51), ‘that there is nothing in that work, but what a pious ſoul may make a good uſe of; and that there are a great many things in it, which a wicked ſoul may wrongfully explain; that, before candor and ſimplicity had forſaken the earth, many things were ſaid ſimply and candidly, which now men of deceitful hearts cavil at and revile.’ After this manner, this is Andrew Rivet's reflexion (52), any one may defend Mahomet's Alcoran; and there is not a blaſphemous expreſſion, but may be turned into a divine ſentence by thoſe, who can ſo eaſily ſatisfy thus their pious ſouls, little zealous for the honour of Christ.’ Coëffeteau, who was a Dominican, did not ſtand up ſo much in vindication of this book of Bartholomew de Piſis, when he anſwered this work of du Pleſſis. ‘As for the book of the Conformities between St Francis and Jesus Christ, the Romiſh church has never approved it. It is the work of a private man, who, tranſported with an indiſcreet zeal for his patriarch, may very well be blamed for want of judgment; becauſe, being willing to ſtretch too far his encomium, he has written ſome things, which may be explained in a bad ſenſe. Thoſe of his order, who approved it in their general chapter, did not imagine that his words would be ſo ſeverely conſtrued; and I am ſure, that not one of them believed, for all that, that St Francis equaled, or was above, Jesus Christ, though they looked upon him as one of the great ſaints of heaven (53).’ Let us conclude with Rivet's reply: ‘If the Romiſh church doth not approve theſe blaſphemies, why has it born with them ſo long? why have the cenſors of books, the maſters of the palace of Rome, and all the inquiſitors, been as it were aſleep, with relation to them? have not they approved, by their ſilence, of two hundred years ſtanding, what the infamous Bartholomew de Piſis hath written? have not they, of late years *, given leave that it ſhould be printed at Bologna, without any cenſure or preſervative? can Coëffeteau, then, throw it upon *a private man, who, tranſported with an ardent zeal* .... He comes off very cheap, if this will ſerve his turn. What, was his general, and the chapter, a private man? *they did not believe*, ſays he, *that his words would be ſo ſeverely conſtrued.* But could they ſay, with a good conſcience, *that, after they had thoroughly examined it, they had not found in it any thing that wanted to be corrected?* is it not at leaſt a proof of palpable ſtupidity and ignorance (54)?’ I wanted this to prove what I have already ſaid, concerning the inextricable labyrinths, into which the Proteſtants have driven their adverſaries, when they attacked the author of the Conformities. And thus far the influence of the folly of a private man extends: it expoſes a whole ſociety to ſtorms, as formerly Ajax's crime expoſed the Grecian fleet (55). If you would rather have another compariſon, ſee the margin (56).

[*M*] *Some laymen have been ſeen to take pen in hand in a like caſe againſt the miniſter du Moulin.*] William Cacherat, advocate, the king's attorney in the admiralty of France, in the juriſdiction of Quillebœuf, wrote a book, printed at Paris in the year 1642, intituled, *The Capuchin vindicated againſt the calumnies of Mr Peter du Moulin, miniſter; or, an apologetic treatiſe, containing the juſt reaſons, why the parliament of Bourdeaux hath cauſed to be burned, by the executioner of criminal ſentences, the defamatory libel againſt the Capuchins, written and publiſhed at Sedan by this miniſter, and diſperſed in this kingdom, contrary to the edicts of pacification: with a ſummary refutation of the calumnies and impieties, which are contained in it.* I have already ſpoken (57) of this work of du Moulin; and I add here, that Cacherat ſhewed as much zeal to vindicate the Capuchins, as if he had been of their order; but his apology is good for nothing. He reckons (58) this paſſage the ninth calumny of that miniſter: ‘The Capuchins, who profeſs *to obſerve entirely St Francis's rule, do not obſerve it; for his rule commands, that the Franciſcans ſhould work with their hands, which the Capuchins do not.*’ Let us ſee how he ſtrains, to prove that it is a calumny: ‘The generals of the order, *ſays he* (59), who are to give an account of the actions of all their monks to the cardinal their patron, and he to the Pope, and who have the greateſt intereſt, that the rule be punctually obſerved, and who watch carefully, that it ſhould be ſo, do not complain, that it is neglected: and the miniſter du Moulin, having no authority to enquire into it, nor having ever been in the convents of this order, of this, were all prelates as vigilant and ſteady as the archbiſhop of Rheims [*N*]. Let us ſpeak of another matter of fact. Francis founded an order, which, in a ſhort time, grew very conſiderable, and has been a main prop of Popery. Some Popes, ſeveral Cardinals, a great many Prelates, and famous Authors have been of that order. Some particulars concerning this may be ſeen in the commentary of Henry Sedulius, a Flemiſh Franciſcan, on the life of St Francis, compoſed by St Bonaventura (*g*); and a great many particulars in the annals of the order, written in ſeveral volumes by Lucas Wadding, an Iriſh Franciſcan, who writ alſo a volume concerning the Franciſcan authors. This order is divided into ſeveral bodies, ſome more rigid than others, but all true heirs of that old emulation, which ſoon appeared between the children of St Francis, and thoſe of St Dominic. This emulation hath divided them, not only in religious matters,

---

(49) Feuardent, Examination of the Confeſſions, Prayers, Sacraments, and Catechiſms, of the Calviniſts, *p.* 95. *He quotes* Elegia 6, quæ eſt de ſua Candida, ad quendam Lodoicum. *I have an edition of the* Juvenilia Poëmata *of* Theodore Beza, *wherein the place, and time, it was printed, is not ſpecified, and without the name of any Printer. The ſix firſt verſes, which* Feuardentius *quotes, are in the fifth elegy. The following, which this monk confounds together as if they were proſe, are in an epigram, intituled,* Xenium Candidæ. *The two laſt verſes are in another epigram. Judge by that, whether* Feuardentius *knew how to quote.*

(50) *In the* Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 334, *and more fully in his* Traité de l'Euchariſtie, lib. iii, cap. xvii. *Note, That* Henry Stephens *took notice of it in the 25th chapter of his Apology for* Herodotus.

(51) Gretſer. Exam. Myſter. cap. 53. apud Rivet. remarques ſur la Rêponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, Tom. II, pag. 351.

(52) Rivet. ibid. pag. 352.

(53) Coëffeteau, Rêponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 870.

* Anno 1590.

(54) Rivet, ubi ſupra, pag. 351.

(55) Unius ob noxam & furias Ajacis Oilei. *Virgil. Æneid. lib. i, ver.* 41.

(56) Sicut grex totus in agris Unius ſcabie cadit & porrigine porci. —— *One tainted ſwine doth the whole herd infect.* Juven. Sat. II, ver. 79.

(57) In remark [*H*].

(58) Cacherat, Capuchin vindicated, *pag.* 72.

(59) Id. ibid.

to ſee whether it be punctually obſerved, ought to be looked upon as a ſlanderer, and ignorant of what St Francis meant by theſe words, *to work with their own hands*; which ought not to be underſtood as this miniſter will have it, but as the church and the ſuperiors of the order underſtood them, and explain them now.’ It is evident, that to prove a calumny after this manner is very little to the purpoſe; and that it is rather a calumny, than a refutation of a calumny. This pretended proof amounts to this; *The church diſpenſes the Capuchins from the literal obſervation of their rule*: but that very thing proves, that they do not obſerve it, and that du Moulin's accuſation is juſt. Had he accuſed them of infringing the orders of their founder, without being warranted by ſome diſpenſations, or allegorical gloſſes, he might have been ſtiled a calumniator; but he only ſaid, that they did not obſerve St Francis's rule. Their vindication, grounded on the diſpenſations of Popes, and on the interpretation of their ſuperiors, would not have puzzled this miniſter; it would have afforded him new arguments againſt him. And indeed it is a very great abuſe, to profeſs a very auſtere rule, aud afterwards to obtain a diſpenſation to infringe it. And this the Franciſcans did, with relation to their vow of poverty: they got the Pope to give them leave to handle money, which gave birth to a diſpute, that made a great noiſe in England, of which Eraſmus gives a very diverting deſcription (60). Read it, and you will ſee, that the motive, which obliged Standiſh, the ringleader of the Franciſcans in that country, to make ſuch a ſtir, was, that he might hinder the Auguſtins from purſuing their traffic, becauſe their gain diminiſhed that of the Franciſcans. Some mendicant fryars, famous for their writings, might be named, who had leave from their ſuperiors to bargain with bookſellers. The latter give them a good price for their copies, and for the trouble of correcting the proofs: they give the author both money and copies, and the author himſelf ſells for ready money the copies that are given him. Do they then obſerve their vow? not at all. But they have leave to break it; and that very thing proves, that they do not obſerve it. This diſpenſation ſuppoſes, and proves, that they do infringe it.

[*N*] *The public would be better informed of the abſurd things which the Franciſcans continue to preach concerning their founder, were all prelates as vigilant and ſteady as the archbiſhop of Rheims.*] (61) A Franciſcan, a Capuchin, and a Benedictin, had preached, in his dioceſe, the ſecond of Auguſt, 1694, *the panegyric of St Francis, at the ſolemnity of the Portiuncula.* ‘ (62) He gave them himſelf their recantation in writing, to undeceive the people, whom they had deceived, to make them for the future more circumſpect in the exerciſe of their functions, and to give the people a preſervative againſt ſuch extravagancies. The three preachers humbly complied with his orders; and the Franciſcan declared in the pulpit, that the text, which he had taken for the ſubject of his ſermon, *Tres ſunt qui teſtimonium dant in Cœlo, Pater, Verbum, & Spiritus Sanctus, & hi tres unum ſunt*, had no relation to what he had undertaken to diſcourſe upon, and could not be applied to it, without evidently wreſting the word of God: that, having a wrong notion of the merits of St Francis, though he was a great ſaint before God and men, he had raſhly affirmed, that St Francis, in the Portiuncula, had done, by his tears, what JESUS CHRIST did for ſinners, in the manger of Bethlehem, by his; that St Francis had done, in the Portiuncula, by the blood of his wounds, what JESUS CHRIST did by his on Calvary; and that St Francis had done, in his heart, for ſinners, what JESUS CHRIST did in his upon the croſs . . . . (63) The Capuchin recanted likewiſe ſome propoſitions, contrary to ſound doctrine, which he had aſſerted in a ſermon the ſame day. The firſt, that St Francis, proſtrating himſelf on the ground, made the ſon of God come a ſecond time upon earth. The ſecond, that the Portiuncula is ſo entire and perfect an amneſty, that it may be ſaid, that, in all former ages, God never ſhewed himſelf more indulgent to ſinners, than at that ſolemnity: that, when he had ſaid, that St Francis, like St Paul, may boaſt, to have compleated what was wanting in our Saviour's paſſion, he had made a raſh application of this apoſtle's words, and contrary to their true meaning: that he had alſo advanced a raſh and falſe propoſition, when he made St Francis ſay, my GOD, if it be neceſſary, that your juſtice ſhould be ſatisfied, pardon, mercy, mercy to ſinners; I offer to be alone the victim, and to ſatisfy your juſtice for them . . . . (64) He acknowledges further, that, in a parallel . . . . which is falſe, raſh, and erroneous, as well as what he had affirmed, that the indulgence of the Portiuncula is an image of the immenſity, infinity, and eternity of God, becauſe it is gained in all St Francis's churches, becauſe it expiates the puniſhment of ſin, and will endure to the end of the world.’ Theſe are the propoſitions which the Benedictin was obliged to retract: ‘ (95) The firſt is that, wherein it is ſaid, that he did not know which to admire moſt, the divine word coming down into the chaſte boſom of Mary, or the ſame JESUS coming down into the chapel of the Angels. The ſecond, that he did not know which to admire moſt, St Francis's charity for ſinners, or JESUS CHRIST's love for St Francis. The third, which he has repeated often, that St Francis made himſelf a victim for ſinners, and hath taken upon him the ſins of the world. The fourth, that JESUS CHRIST hath given to St Francis the fulneſs of his graces. The fifth is that, wherein he ſaid, in many places of his ſermon, that the holy Virgin hath an abſolute power over her ſon, by reaſon of the authority of father and mother, which ſhe hath over him. The ſixth, that the cry of St Francis was more favourably heard, than that of Moſes and St Paul. The ſeventh, that the Bleſſed Virgin gave St Francis the life of grace, as ſhe gave our Saviour that of nature. The eighth, that St Francis makes up what is wanting to our Lord's paſſion in the behalf of ſinners, by co-operating with him in his victories over ſin and hell. He likewiſe retracts ſeveral other propoſitions, and dangerous expreſſions, as the following are: that the Franciſcans are uterine brothers to JESUS CHRIST, the children of Mary, the companions of the bleſſed ſpirits; that, like them, they draw their origin from the midſt of the ſplendors of grace and glory: that the plenary indulgence of the Portiuncula is irrevocable and eternal, ſanctified by the HOLY GHOST, who deſcended into the chapel of the Portiuncula, in the ſhape of a dove, as he appeared at the river Jordan, to make this indulgence as it were a baptiſm of ſalvation: that the indulgence of the Portiuncula doth not only remit the puniſhment due to ſin, but in ſome manner the guilt of it, ſince it is JESUS CHRIST, who grants it; he, who never, during his mortal life, remitted ſin, but he remitted both: that JESUS CHRIST himſelf grants the indulgence of the Portiuncula independently from the Popes: that it was a ſeraphim who drew up the bull of it: that St Francis asks either a fulneſs of grace for ſinners, or a want of mercy for himſelf.’

To

(*g*) *Printed at Antwerp*, 1597, *in 8vo.*

(60) Eraſm. Adag. chil. ii, cent. v, n. 98, pag. m. 511, & ſeq.

(61) *See the* Journal des Savans, *of Apr.* 11, 1695, *pag.* 241, *Dutch Edit.*

(62) Ibid. pag. 242.

(63) Ibid. pag. 244.

(64) Ibid. pag. 245.

(65) Ibid. pag. 246.

matters, as that about the immaculate conception of the holy virgin, but alſo about a great many queſtions of philoſophy. The Scotiſts and Thomiſts, thoſe Franciſcans, and theſe Dominicans, differ as much now, as formerly the Platoniſts and Peripatetics did. I take no notice of a controverſy, that laſted a long while among the monks of St Francis, and which created a great deal of trouble to their ſuperiors and to the Popes, tho' it was only about a trifle; for the thing in diſpute was only the ſhape of a hood, *&c.* Gentillet relates this very pleaſantly (*b*). Mr Nicolle ſpeaks of it in one of his imaginary letters. Obſerve, that the ſaint, of whom I ſpeak, was called Francis, becauſe his father had traded in France (*i*).

(*b*) In the Preface to the 2d book of his Political Diſcourſes againſt Nicolas Machiavel.

(*i*) Volaterr. lib. xxi, p. m. 761.

Reflexions on what has been ſaid.

To avoid prolixity, I will not make all the obſervations, which might be made upon what I have juſt now related. I will confine my ſelf to three. The firſt is, that the ſame propoſitions, which the archbiſhop of Rheims obliged theſe fryars to diſown, the ſame propoſitions, I ſay, or ſome equivalent to them, are every year preached, not only in Spain, Italy, Germany, &c. but alſo in France. The greateſt part of the prelates do not mind it, or are not ſcandalized at it: And this is the reaſon, why theſe doctrines, meeting with no oppoſition, go on quietly; and it is never known in foreign countries, that they have been vented. Should we ever have known, that they were delivered from the pulpit in the dioceſe of Rheims, in the year 1694, if the archbiſhop had not taken exception at them, and obliged the three preachers to make public reparation for their faults? let this ſuffice to ſhew that the empire of the monkiſh fancies concerning the credit of certain ſaints, and the prerogatives of certain indulgences, is very little leſſened; although the time of ignorance, which gave it birth, is vaniſhed, and has been ſucceeded by a return of learning and knowledge, which have laſted a great while. My ſecond obſervation is, that the Benedictin's hyperboles, concerning the indulgences of the Portiuncula, and the greatneſs of St Francis, exceeded thoſe of the Franciſcan, or Capuchin. This is a good office, which the monks mutually do one another. The Franciſcans imagine, that the praiſes of their founder will not be ſo much ſuſpected in the mouth of a monk of another order; and therefore they deſire either a Benedictin, or a Carmelite, &c. to preach in their churches at their great feſtivals. He, whom they employ to preach, is ſure to have his mind and body handſomely entertained; for he never returns to his convent, before he has been plentifully treated, and ſufficiently praiſed, and largely thanked, for his eloquence. Beſides, they are ready to requite him upon occaſion; for his order hath alſo it's feſtivals. A Franciſcan's ſermon is requiſite there, and is more effectual than one of the ſame order. He often is more extravagant in his encomium on the efficacy of the ſcapulary, than a Carmelite. This is a mutual intercourſe of good offices. It is not long ago, that an ingenious man, and who is now a Proteſtant, told me, that, when he was a Benedictin, he was deſired to preach in a convent of Franciſcans, at the feſtival of the Portiuncula. They ſpecified on what they would have him chiefly inſiſt. He partly complied with their deſire; but he gave his ſubject a certain turn, which did not pleaſe them. Some of them artfully let him know it: he excuſed himſelf, and then asked them, as among friends, whether it was reaſonable to affirm in the pulpit ſo many things which are not true? what then will you have us do? replied they. Will you have us ſtarve? which leads me to the third obſervation. There are ſeveral abuſes in the Romiſh church, which, in all likelihood, will laſt as long as that church. It will be to no purpoſe to go from a learned age to one more learned; thoſe things will not alter. It is true, they ſprung up in the times of ignorance; but ignorance was not the only cauſe, nor even the principal cauſe, of their birth. The wants of a ſociety, as well thoſe of food, as commodious lodging; the intereſt they had in ſhewing the people an altar well ſet off, and rich church ornaments; all this required ſome wonderful deſcriptions, to exalt the privileges of a certain ſaint, or of a certain chapel, or of ſome particular feſtival. It was a daily fund of ſubſiſtence; and, when the anniverſary feaſt came, then the order had it's harveſt and vintage. Now the wants, that I ſpeak of, are not ſubject to the viciſſitude of light and darkneſs; they are the ſame at all times, in an ignorant, as well as in a learned age. Therefore, tho' knowledge is greater, and more common, yet they produce ſtill the ſame effects. Philoſophical heads are puzzled, whether they ſhall admire, in this, the long forbearance, or the long anger, of heaven. And ſome would willingly apply here the *tantæne animis cæleſtibus iræ*, which an Engliſh doctor applies to the errors in which the hiſtory of nations have been plunged for ſo many ages (66).

(66) See, above, citat. (55) of the article *BRACHMANES.*

FRANCIS I, king of France, was one of thoſe great princes, whoſe extraordinary qualities were mixed with many faults. The French hiſtorians (*a*) very ſincerely acknowledge this mixture; and even ſome complain, that the Spaniſh writers, inſtead of acknowledging it, affect to repreſent this king as an accompliſhed prince [*A*]. There may be a great deal of deſign in both their proceedings; however there ſeems to be leſs in the French, than in the Spaniſh writers. For a man muſt be blind, not clearly to perceive, in Francis the firſt's reign, a long ſeries of faults and imprudence. This prince had like to have deprived himſelf of the right of ſucceeding Lewis XII. He took the

ready

(*a*) Beaucaire, Spondanus, Mezerai, Varillas, &c.

[*A*] *The French hiſtorians .... complain, that the Spaniſh writers ... affect to repreſent this king as an accompliſhed prince.*] Some of Mr Varillas's critics would have had him *imitate the .... Italian and Spaniſh hiſtorians who have not been contented to exaggerate Francis the firſt's noble actions, but have moreover concealed thoſe, that were not praiſe-worthy* (1). Among other things, he anſwers, *that they did it not to oblige Francis I, but that they wrote favourably of him, by a refined policy, which it is neceſſary to unfold*; and he unfolds it thus: ‘ They were jealous of the growth of France, and they were afraid, leſt the French ſhould carry their conqueſts even into their country, after they were free from thoſe civil wars, they had been involved in for forty years. There was no better way to prevent it, than to perſuade the French, that they would not, for the future, have better ſucceſs againſt Spain, Germany, and the Low Countries, than they had under Francis I; and, to effect it, they were to be accuſtomed to read, in the hiſtory of this prince, that he had done what mortal man could do againſt the houſe of Auſtria, and that he was not able to ſhake it: that he had made no falſe ſteps: that the faults, which were aſcribed to him, belonged rather to the monarchy, than to the monarch; that is to ſay, that Francis I had, for his part, done what ought to be done, to overcome Charles V, but that France could not make ſufficient efforts, nor raiſe men and money enough for ſo great a victory: that what was imputed to Francis I, as a misfortune, ought to be aſcribed only to the weakneſs of his kingdom; and that, if the greateſt generals and politicians, that ever were, had commanded the ſame armies, and had been in the ſame circumſtances, they had been overcome at the battle of Pavia, and, like him, had diſintangled themſelves by the ſhameful treaties of Madrid, Cambray, and Crepy. The French hiſtorians might have eaſily refuted ſo palpable an er-

‘ ror,

(1) Varillas's *Preface to his Hiſtory of Francis I.*

ready way to it, by the tender careſſes, wherewith he charmed the young queen (*b*) [*B*], when he was informed of the danger he expoſed himſelf to. Altho' this ſtory is variouſly told [*C*], yet it is not agreed on all hands, that he made a good uſe of this wholeſome

ror, by laying open, as I have done, the naked truth, and by ſhewing, by authentic pieces, that Francis Iſt did not do, by far, what he might have done againſt Charles V, and that it was ſeveral times in his power to beat him: that his moſt chriſtian majeſty's negligence, and prepoſterous management in ſome things, cannot be excuſed: that theſe irregularities proceeded always from the monarch, and not from the monarchy: that weakneſs had no ſhare in it, and misfortune the leaſt; that theſe miſcarriages were chiefly occaſioned by the miſunderſtanding, ſo common, in the hiſtory of France, between the ſovereigns of former times, and their miniſters: and that ſome better generals, and more vigilant politicians, would one day mend what Francis Iſt had ſpoiled.'

[*B*] *The tender careſſes, wherewith he charmed the young queen.*] Lewis XII, who had married the king of England's ſiſter, in the month of November, 1514, died the firſt of January following; and *many thought that his too great careſſes of the young queen were the cauſe of his death* (2). Theſe careſſes, exceſſive for ſo tender a prince as he was, were not ſo for his ſpouſe, who was but eighteen years of age. She hearkened to amorous tales both in French and Engliſh. A gentleman of her own country loved her, and had followed her into France. She married him afterwards. On the other hand, ſhe appeared charming to the preſumptive heir of the crown. He then was called the duke of Valois. Let us ſee what Mezerai ſays: 'The young duke of Valois, who was a great admirer of fine ladies, was ſoon ſmitten with the young queen; and Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, who loved her before this marriage, and followed the court of France as embaſſador of England, had not extinguiſhed his firſt flame: but Arthur de Gouffier-Boiſy, who had been governor to the duke of Valois, repreſenting to him, that he run the riſque of getting a maſter, and that he ought to fear the ſame thing from the duke of Suffolk; he cured himſelf of this folly, and had this duke narrowly watched (3).' Varillas has very much enlarged upon this: he ſpeaks thus, after having ſaid that the count of Angouleſme (4) was ordered to go and marry, at Bologne, the princeſs of England for the king. 'He could not forbear being ſmitten with her, whom he married for his father-in-law (5), as ſhe could not forbear wiſhing, that heaven had given her the count for her huſband. Perhaps, the conveniency, which they had of ſeeing one another, might have made them carry things too far, if the protonotary du Prat (6), who was ſent with the count to check the violent motions of his youth, had not made him conſider, that it was the new queen's intereſt not to be chaſt; becauſe going to a huſband, by whom every body told her ſhe ſhould have no children, it was to be feared ſhe would give way to the temptation of having a ſon, who ſhould ſupport her in her rank in France, when ſhe became a widow, and exempt her from returning into England under her brother's government: but that, as for him, he had the greateſt intereſt in the world to take care, that the queen ſhould be chaſt, ſo far ought he to be from debauching her; ſince, if ſhe had a ſon, tho' by him, this ſon would hinder him from coming to the crown, and force him to be ſatisfied with the duchy of Bretagne, which he had by his wife: beſides, he would be obliged, againſt the order of nature, to pay homage for it to his own baſtard. This reaſon ſlackened the count of Angouleſme's eagerneſs, who, ever after, only looked on the queen with a jealous eye. He obſerved her ſo narrowly, that he diſcovered at laſt her inclination for Suffolk (7).' Varillas relates afterwards ſome very curious things concerning the precautions taken againſt Suffolk. See the following remark.

[*C*] *This ſtory is variouſly told.*] Brantome does not give the glory of this prudent advice, either to Gouffier-Boiſy, or Du Prat, but to a gentleman of his province. I am ſure, that his words will be more acceptable than mine, and therefore I will tranſcribe them (8). 'They ſay, that queen Mary of England, third wife to king Lewis XII, did not do the ſame thing (9); for, being diſpleaſed with, and diffident of, the king her huſband's ſtrength, ſhe had a mind to ſound the ford, taking the count of Angouleſme for her guide, who was afterwards king Francis, and then a very beautiful and agreeable prince, whom ſhe made very much of, calling him always *Monſieur mon beau-fils*; *(my ſon-in-law)* and ſo he was; for he had already married the lady Claudia, king Lewis's daughter. She was truly very much ſmitten with him, and he with her; ſo that they would have proceeded too far, had it not been for the late Mr de Grignaux, a gentleman of Perigord, who had been knight of honour to queen Anne, as we have ſaid, and was ſo ſtill to queen Mary. This gentleman, being informed of the intrigue, that was then carried on, repreſented to the ſaid count of Angouleſme the fault that he was going to commit, and angrily told him; how now! what will you do? do not you ſee, that this cunning and ſubtle woman would draw you in to get her with child; and, if ſhe comes to have a ſon, you will be ſtill count of Angouleſme, and never king of France, as you expect? the king her huſband is old, and cannot get her with child; and you will meddle with her, and do it ſo well, you that are young and hot, and ſhe young and hot too, that it will take like wild-fire; ſhe will bring you a child, and then you are very well helped up. You may then indeed ſay, adieu my ſhare to the kingdom of France; therefore think on it. This queen had a mind to put in practice the Spaniſh proverb, which ſays, that *nunca muger aguda murio ſin herederos*; an ingenuous woman never dies without heirs: that is to ſay, that, if her huſband does not get her ſome, ſhe employs a ſecond to perform that office. The count of Angouleſme thought ſeriouſly upon it, and proteſted, that he would be wiſe, and quiet his deſign; but, being inticed over and over by the careſſes and allurements of this beautiful Engliſh woman, he was more ſmitten than ever. How furious is love! that, for the ſake of ſuch a little piece of fleſh, which a man longs for, he abandons, nay loſes kingdoms and empires? and you may ſee frequent inſtances of this in hiſtory. At laſt, Mr de Grignaux, ſeeing this young man run headlong to his ruin, and that he went on with his intrigue, told it to the counteſs of Angouleſme his mother; who curbed his love, and chid him for it, ſo that he left it off.' Compare theſe three relations, and you will find they vary a little; but Brantome chiefly differs from Mezerai and Varillas in this, that the young queen, being a widow, endeavoured to ſuppoſe a child, to ſupplant Francis I. The two other hiſtorians clear her from that crime. *After Lewis the twelfth's death, Mary of England was thought to be with child; but the contrary was ſoon known, by her own acknoledging ſhe was not.* They are Mezerai's words (10). Theſe are Varillas's (11). *The queen was as narrowly watched as before, whilſt there was room left to doubt whether ſhe was with child; but after ſhe had declared that ſhe was not, and that there were ſufficient proofs that what ſhe ſaid was true, the count of Angouleſme, coming to the Crown*, &c. Brantome ſpeaks after a very different manner (12). 'They report however, that the ſaid queen did what ſhe could, to live and reign as queen mother, a little before, and after the king her huſband's death: but he died too ſoon, and ſhe had too little time to compleat her deſign; and yet ſhe reported, every day after the death of the king her huſband, that ſhe was with child; ſo that, being not ſo inwardly, they ſay, ſhe ſwelled herſelf outwardly, by little and little, with linnen cloths; and, the term being come, ſhe had a ſuppoſed child, which another big bellied woman was to have, and to produce at the pretended time of her delivery. But the lady regent, who was a Savoyard, and knew what it was to have children, and who ſaw, that her's and her ſon's intereſt was too much concerned in this affair, had her well examined and ſearched by

' phyſicians

(*b*) Lewis the twelfth's wife.

(2) Mezerai's *Hiſtory of France*, Tom. II, p. 872.

(3) *Ibid.* Abregé Chronologique, Tom. IV, pag. 470, ad Ann. 1514.

(4) So he names the prince, whom *Mezerai* calls the Duke de Valois.

(5) The princeſs Claudia, daughter to Lewis XII, was married to Francis I.

(6) *Mr Varillas puts in the margin the following words*, Some relations mention Gouffier de Boiſy *inſtead of* Duprat.

(7) Varillas's Hiſtory of Francis I, lib. i, p. 17.

(8) Brantome, Dames Galantes, Tom. II, p. 117.

(9) He had been ſaying, that Queen Louiſa, wife to Henry III, rejected the advice, that was given her, of being got with child by ſomebody elſe, ſince ſhe could hope for none from her huſband.

(10) Hiſtory of France, Tom. II, pag. 895.

(11) Hiſtory of Francis I, lib. i, pag. 20.

(12) Brantome, ubi ſupra, pag. 118, 119.

wholſome advice; but he was not circumſpect with regard to other women (c); and ſome pretend, that it coſt him his life [D]. I have ſaid elſewhere (d), that the chief of his miſtreſſes had like to have made him loſe his whole kingdom. He did not ſuſpect that black deſign; and, ſeeing how ill his affairs went, he let fall ſome complaints againſt divine providence [E]. It was during a war, which was ſooner ended, than

'ſicians and midwives, and, by the ſight and diſcovery of the linnen and clouts, ſhe was found out, and ſo miſcarried in her deſign; and, inſtead of being queen-mother, ſhe was ſent back into her own country.' This irrefragably confutes thoſe, who ſay, in behalf of king James (13), that it cannot come into any one's thought, who is in the midſt of a numerous court, always ſurrounded with a vaſt number of domeſtics, to ſuppoſe a child. Here is Brantome, who underſtood the world as well as another, and knew the court extreamly well; here is he, I ſay, relating ſuch another project actually carried on at the court of France. It is an argument, that there are ſome men of ſenſe, who fancy, that it may be done.

[D] *Some pretend, that it coſt him his life.*] The French authors ſpeak very freely of this. One of them, mentioning an abſceſs, *which reduced this prince to a very low condition* (14), adds; *I have ſometimes heard ſay, that he had got this diſtemper of the handſome Ferronniere, one of his miſtreſſes, whoſe picture is ſtill to be ſeen in ſome cloſets of the curious; and that her husband, out of a ſtrange and ſilly ſort of revenge, went into a ſcandalous houſe, on purpoſe to get this infectious diſtemper, that he might infect them both. Tho' the danger was over, yet did he ſuffer for a long while after* (15). Thus Mezerai ſpeaks, under the year 1539. Let us ſee what he ſays concerning the king's laſt ſickneſs. *That malignant ulcer, which happened to him in the year* 1539, *not being cured by his phyſicians, becauſe they durſt not treat him with that ſevere method, which ought to be uſed in thoſe diſtempers, crept as far as the neck of the bladder, and began to corrode it with intolerable heats; ſo that this pain and infection, which was ſpread all over his body, cauſed in him a ſlow fever, and a ſullen peeviſhneſs, which made him incapable of any great deſign* (16). This ſlow fever was ſoon converted into a continual fever, which carried him off the thirtieth of March 1547. Although this author, in his chronological abridgment, has ſaid moſt of the things, which we have juſt now ſeen, I will ſet down here what he repeats, becauſe ſomething new will be found in it. 'Three months after, the king was grievouſly ſick of an ulcer, which affected that part, which the phyſicians call the *Perinæum*. This diſtemper was reported to be the reſult of a ſcandalous intrigue, which he had with the handſome Ferronniere, one of his miſtreſſes. This woman's husband enraged at an affront, which courtiers call only gallantry, bethought himſelf to go to a bawdy-houſe, to infect himſelf, that he might infect his wife, and ſo extend his revenge to his rival. The unhappy woman died of it; her husband was cured by ſome ſpeedy remedies, and the king had all the troubleſome ſymptoms of it. And, as his phyſicians took care of him more according to his quality than his diſtemper, ſomething of it ſtuck by him ever after, whoſe malignity altered very much the ſweetneſs of his temper, and made him peeviſh, ſuſpicious, and hard to pleaſe (17).' Tho' Mr Varillas, contrary to his cuſtom on ſuch ſort of ſubjects, is ſhort, yet he expreſſes himſelf fully enough, not to put his reader upon a neceſſity of ſupplying any thing by his imagination (18). I have read, in Brantome, that the king gave queen Claudia the diſtemper he had got. See father l'Enfant's Calendar (19), and you will find in it this pox of Francis I, which he had got with the handſome Ferronniere. This author quotes du Verdier in this king's life.

I have heard ſay, that this miſtreſs was called LA FERONNIERE, only becauſe her husband was an ironmonger. I ſhould leſs ſuſpect this, had not I read in Lewis Guion, that ſhe, who was infected by her husband, and infected the king, was the wife of an advocate. Theſe are this writer's words (20). 'Francis I, courted the wife of an advocate at Paris, who was a very handſome and genteel woman; I will not name him, becauſe he has left ſome children, who are very rich, and in good repute. This Lady would not comply with him; which grieved the king extreamly. This coming to be known by ſome courtiers, and royal pimps, they told him, by virtue of his royal authority and power, he might take her away. Purſuant to this advice, one of them went and told it to the lady, and the lady to her husband. The advocate ſaw very well, that his wife and he muſt quit the kingdom, which yet he was not ſure they could do, if they did not obey. At laſt, the husband gives his wive leave to comply with the king's deſires; and, to be no hindrance, he pretended to go into the country for eight or ten days about buſineſs. In the mean time, he kept himſelf private in Paris, and frequented bawdy-houſes, that he might get the pox, to give it his wife, that the king might get it from her: he ſoon found what he ſought, and infected his wife, and ſhe afterwards the king, who gave it to ſeveral other women, which he kept; and himſelf could never be well cured of it; for he was ſickly the remainder of his life, and became peeviſh, troubleſome, and inacceſſible.' I wonder that Brantome does not particularize any woman in the paſſage, which I am going to quote, where he ſpeaks of this pox. King Francis, *ſays he* (21), loved 'much, and too much; for, being young and free, he indifferently embraced, ſometimes one, ſometimes another, as, at that time, he was not a gallant man, who did not whore indifferently every where, and by it got a ſwinging pox, which haſtened his end: for, when he died, he was then but fifty three years of age, which ſhews that he was not a very old man. Having been racked by this diſtemper, he conſidered, that, if he continued his looſe intrigues, he might be again caught, and, being grown wiſe by woful experience, he reſolved to make love gallantly; and for that purpoſe made his fine court to be frequented by beautiful and modeſt princeſſes, great ladies, and gentlewomen. And this he did that he might preſerve himſelf from that naſty diſtemper, and be no more defiled by it, and to ſuit himſelf not to a looſe, but to a genteel, clean, and pure love.' He then immediately ſpeaks of this prince's love to madam de Helli; and this is in effect to pretend, that his pox preceded his impriſonment. It cannot be doubted, but this writer pretends it, ſince he ſays in another place (22), that the king gave queen *Claudia the pox, which haſtened her death*. Now this queen died in the month of July, 1524.

[E] *He let fall ſome complaints againſt divine providence.*] Brantome (23) affords me a comment upon this text. 'I have heard a lady of that time ſay, that of all the blows, that the king had received of Charles V, none affected him ſo much, as when he heard of the taking of St Diſier (24), and that the emperor was coming directly to Paris, to beſiege it with ſo numerous an army, that he ſaw it already ſhaken; he was then ſomething indiſpoſed, and kept his chamber: the late queen of Navarre his ſiſter, and a great many other ladies, were then with him. Crying ſomewhat loud, he ſaid, ah! my God, thou ſelleſt me very dear a kingdom, which I thought thou hadſt freely given me; thy will however be done. Then he told the ſaid queen, my darling, (for ſo he called her) go to church, and there pray to God for me, that ſince ſuch is his will to love and favour the emperor more than me, that he will do it ſo, that I may at leaſt never ſee him encamped before the principal city of my kingdom, and that it may not be ſaid, one day, that my rebel vaſſal is come as far to ſee me, as his grandfather the duke of Burgundy did to king Lewis XI, who gave him battle ſo near: however, I am reſolved to go and meet him, to prevent and fight him; and I pray God, that I may ſooner die in battle, than undergo a ſecond impriſonment. *He might then have ſaid,* O crown! if thy weight was known, &c (25).

(c) He undertook his journey to Milan, among other reaſons, to lie with a fine woman. See the *Penſées ſur les Cometes, p.* 715.

(d) In the article *ETAMPES*, remark [*E*].

(13) James II, late King of England.

(14) In 1539.

(15) Mezerai's Hiſt. of France, Tom. II, pag. 1005.

(16) Id. ibid. pag. 1039, ad Ann. 1546.

(17) Abrégé Chronol. Tom. IV, pag. 606, ad annum 1538.

(18) *It could not be doubted, but the amorous exceſſes of Henry VIII (king of England) had ſhortened his days, and Francis perceived his end approaching, occaſioned by a diſtemper ſpoken of in the fourth book.* Varillas's Hiſt. of Francis I, lib. xii, pag. 264. *I think that inſtead of* fourth *it muſt be* eighth, *and that Mr Varillas meant this place of the eighth book, pag.* 359. Two famous accidents ended the year 1538. One was the king's long ſickneſs at Compiegne, occaſioned by an ulcer in thoſe parts, which modeſty forbids naming: his Majeſty was then cured, but died of it nine years after.

(19) Under the 31ſt of March, pag. 197.

(20) Tom. II *of his* Diverſes Leçons, n. 1, p. 109.

(21) *In* Eloge de Henri II, Tom. II, *of his* Memoires, *pag.* 5.

(22) *In the* Memoirs of illuſtrious Ladies, *pag. m.* 298, *where ſpeaking of queen* Claudia, *he ſays, That, if queen Anne her mother* had lived, king Francis had never married her; for ſhe well foreſaw how ill ſhe was like to be uſed by him; for the king her husband gave her the pox, which haſtened her death.

(23) Francis I, Elogium, *at Tom. I, of his* Memoires, *pag. m.* 318.

(24) *Mr* Varillas, *inſerting a tranſlation of this place of* Brantome *in the* Hiſt. of Francis I, lib. xi, pag. 102, *applies this to the taking* Chateau-Thierri, *and not to that of St Diſier.*

(25) *See* Valerius Maximus, lib. vii, cap. ii. n. 5. Ext. Stobæus, Serm. xlvii, *aſcribes this ſentence to king Antigonus.*

than thoſe, who knew not the bottom of things, had believed [*F*]. He ſaw too late, that he had for his favourites two or three perſons, who were very unworthy of it, and had done him a great deal of prejudice, by their evil counſels. Had he removed from him the conſtable of Montmorency (*e*) twelve years ſooner, he had never found himſelf in ſo great ſtreights. Beſides, there was ſomething ſo prepoſterous in his deſtiny, that, even when he acted according to the rules of prudence, yet he wanted ſucceſs. All theſe things, duly conſidered, make his reign very wonderful; for who would not be ſurprized, to ſee this Prince, frowned upon by fortune, ill ſerved by his own mother [*G*], in the hands of imprudent favourites, betrayed by thoſe, whom he honoured with his ſtricteſt confidence, ſo glorioully reſiſt the emperor Charles V; that is to ſay, an enemy, whoſe dominions were much larger than France, who had more money and forces than he, who was a very great warriour, and a very able politician, who was faithfully and well ſerved by his generals and miniſters, and who had generally the aſſiſtance either of England, or of other potent princes, againſt him alone? After all, it is a greater glory for Francis I to have preſerved his kingdom under thoſe circumſtances, than for Charles V not to have been able to conquer it. I believe it may be ſaid of theſe two princes, that, had not the one been oppoſed by the other, either of them might have graſped the univerſal monarchy; and that, ſince there were oftner leagues made in favour of Charles V, than of Francis I, this king of France was more dreaded than that king of Spain. I believe farther, that, if the liberty of Europe was not oppreſſed by Charles V, it is almoſt wholly owing to the valour of Francis I (*f*). I cannot tell whether the ill fortune of this monarch has any where appeared more than in the alliance, which he made with Soliman. He never could gain any real advantage by it, and gave his enemies occaſion to declaim againſt him, and make him odious, which did him more harm than ever the Ottoman Porte did him good. The lies, that were ſpread on this occaſion over all Europe, cannot be excuſed, but by the maxims of a very pernicious morality [*H*]. They diſperſed the

(*e*) See the article of *HENRY II.*

(*f*) See, above, remark [*A*] of the article *CHARLES V.*

[*F*] *This war was at an end ſooner than thoſe, who knew not the bottom of things, had believed.*] Moſt people thought, that Charles V, having made ſo great a progreſs in Champagne, would not hearken to any terms of peace, but what would be too ignominious for his enemy to accept. They had then no good opinion of the ſucceſs of the negociation on foot; but thoſe, who knew very well, that he would be very glad to end this war, were full of good hopes. Among theſe, was an Italian poet who had ſheltered himſelf at Paris. Read this paſſage: *When king Francis I, and the emperor Charles V, came in ſight of each other, in France, in the year* 1544, *with each a potent army, both weary of making war againſt one another, ſome great men interpoſed to make that peace, which was then concluded between theſe two great monarchs. Some asked Lewis Alamani, a Florentine, whether he believed that thoſe perſons could make this peace. He anſwered in this Italian diſtich:*

Com' eſſer può ch'a noi pace ſi toglia,
S'un n'ha neceſſita, l'altro n'ha voglia (26)?

How can we have otherwiſe than peace, ſeeing the one deſires it, and the other ſtands in need of it?

Nothing could be more juſt than this reaſoning; for there is no better prognoſtic (27) of a peace near at hand, than the neceſſity, wherein both parties find themſelves to end the war. Want of money tires as much as a ſurfeit. People then do, as the emperor Claudius's wife did (28); they retire, not glutted, but fatigued. Before this, the mediators were not heard; but then they are intreated to act, or rather they are laid aſide; becauſe both parties treat directly with each other, agree upon the main points, and then conclude without them; or if they are made uſe of, it is only *pro formà*. We read this in an hiſtorian of the peace of the Pyrenées (29). *This peace was concluded, without the intervention of thoſe, who had a long while mediated it, and gave occaſion to remember what Pope Innocent ſaid, one day, that he was at a window of his palace on the Piazza Navona: he ſaw two men, of an inferior rank, boxing one another furiouſly, and he forbad that they ſhould be parted, adding,* you will ſee that, when they are weary, they will leave off of themſelves; *which happening a little while after*: thus, (continued he) the French and Spaniards will do, when they are tired of waging war againſt one another; for then they will make peace without any body's mediation.

[*G*] *He was ill ſerved by his own mother.*] She was of the houſe of Savoy. I will only ſpeak of two things, which ſhe did to the prejudice of France. She got the money, which had been promiſed to Lautrec, governor of the Milaneze, which occaſioned the loſs of that country: and, when ſhe ſaw Francis I, in a rage for this loſs, ask his treaſurer (30), what was become of that money, ſhe point-black denied, that it was ever repreſented to her for what uſe it was deſigned. The lie, that ſhe gave this poor treaſurer, was the cauſe that he was hanged (31). What miſchief did ſhe not do to France, becauſe ſhe had a mind to marry Charles de Bourbon? Mad, that her advances were ſlighted, ſhe perſecuted that prince by a thouſand vexatious law-ſuits; which exaſperated him ſo much, that he went over to the emperor, and commanded his armies in Italy againſt France; and even againſt Francis the firſt himſelf, at the battle of Pavia (32).

[*H*] *The lies, that were ſpread over all Europe, on this alliance with the Turk, cannot be excuſed.*] I have mentioned, in another place (33), the ſpeech, which Charles V made at Rome, in the year 1536. Let us add here, that the copies of it, which he ſent to the princes of the empire, and the imperial towns, *were different, and even contrary to one another* (34). He left out in the copies, which he ſent to the Proteſtants, what might diſpleaſe them, and added ſomething elſe, which was likely to be acceptable to them. He ſent emiſſaries into all the circles of the empire, to give out, ‘ That the king of France had barbarouſly treated all the ſubjects of the empire that were found in his kingdom, either to trade or to travel, and all the French who had lived in Germany: That he had made an offenſive and defenſive league with the Turks: That it was in concert with them, that he had uſurped Savoy and Piedmont, to draw into theſe two provinces all the forces of Chriſtendom, and to give Soliman an opportunity to fall upon Germany, whilſt the emperor ſhould be employed towards the Alps. Theſe calumnies, which were at firſt only whiſpered, became afterwards the ſubject of ſermons, and were authorized by libels, licenced by the eccleſiaſtical and civil magiſtrates. Though this ſlander was very groſs, yet it produced a prodigious effect; for all Germany was prepoſſeſſed againſt him in leſs than a fortnight. The moſt famous of all theſe libels was that, which was vended at Nuremberg, with the emperor's licence. It had, for it's device, a ſword ſurrounded with flames, and contained a challenge from the emperor to the king, and threatned the French with fire and ſword, if, within fifteen days, they did not

‘ renounce

---

(26) Meynier, pag. 589, *of his* Curious Queſtions and free Anſwers. *I have corrected ſome errors of the preſs. He has taken this from* Conſiderationi Civili di Remigio Fiorentino, cap. 97, fol. m. 123, verſo.

(27) Such was that of all knowing men at the beginning of the conferences of Ryſwic, in 1697.

(28) Et laſſata viris nondum ſatiata receſſit. *Juven. Sat.* vi, *ver.* 129.

(29) Galeazzo Gualdo Priorato, Hiſtory of the Peace, *pag.* 124, 125. *Edit.* 1667.

(30) His name was James de Beaune, lord of Samblançai. *See the article* SAMBLANÇAI.

(31) Varillas's Hiſtory of Francis I, *lib. iii, pag.* 215, 216, *ad ann.* 1522.

(32) Id. ibid. lib. iv, pag. 247, & ſeq.

(33) In remark [*E*] of the article *CHARLES V.*

(34) Varillas, ib. lib viii, p. 310, ad ann. 1536.

the form of the oath, which they ſuppoſed that prince had taken to the Grand Signior. Nothing can be more horrid, impious and abominable, than this oath [*I*]; and this, with ſome other circumſtances, ſhews plainly, that it is an improbable Impoſture. However, this formulary was inſerted as an authentic piece in a pamphlet that appeared, in the laſt war, againſt France (*g*). There was another lie ſpread, as abſurd as this, concerning

‘renounce their alliance with the Turks. This libel was followed by another of the ſame nature, which particularized the day, that this pretended challenge was made, the name of the herald, with ſome circumſtances, ſaid to have been taken from his verbal proceſs: And, as no body went about to diſcover the impoſture, it produced it's deſired effect; ſince it excited a hatred in people's minds againſt France, which laſted even after they ſaw the cheat..... Langey, at his arrival at Francfort, found there theſe libels, and writ two anſwers to them, one in High Dutch, and the other in Latin. He made an excellent uſe of the time, that the merchants of all the circles of the empire returned from the fair of Lyons; for he had them before the magiſtrates of Strasburg, and took their depoſitions, which were printed, and ſent every where. They imported, that the deponents had been very civilly treated in France; that the emperor's challenge was a fable; and that the French, far from inſulting the Germans without cauſe, did not ſo much as queſtion them about their religion. Thus the impoſture gave way to truth (35).’ Here is yet a ſtranger cheat. ‘Fregoſa (36) and Rincon (37), at the inſtigation of Langey, had parted with their papers; ſo that thoſe, who killed them (38) chiefly for theſe papers, were mightily ſurprized to find none. They had not, however, been much concerned at it, had the murder been kept ſecret; but, after Langey had proved, as clear as the day, that they were murdered, the emperor's council in Italy foreſaw, that, unleſs they found a way to prevent it, this aſſaſſination would turn much to the advantage of the French in all the courts of Europe, eſpecially in Germany, where the public faith was more regarded than any where elſe: and therefore they pretended, that ſome fiſhermen had found, in the Po, the cloaths and trunks of theſe embaſſadors, and they forged ſome inſtructions and cyphers, which they publiſhed, as if they had been collated with the originals. The inſtructions, which were aſcribed to Fregoſa, contained all the means, that policy could invent, to engage the ſenate of Venice to forſake the emperor's intereſt. It was propoſed, in it, to divide the duchy of Milan between the French and Venetians; and there was not one word in it of preſerving the ſovereignty of that ſtate to the emperor: on the contrary, the cities, with their dependencies, were diſpoſed of, to be intirely incorporated with that republic, and the French monarchy. The inſtructions, imputed to Rincon, were yet worſe, becauſe there was not only malice, but alſo impiety therein. It was propoſed to Soliman to concert with France to attack the houſe of Auſtria in two places at the ſame time: and, to ſhew him the neceſſity of this correſpondence, he was privately informed, that Hungary, which he had juſt then conquered, would undoubtedly be wreſted, the next ſummer, out of his hands, if he gave the emperor time to draw his forces from Naples, Sicily, Milan, and the Low Countries, to be joined with the formidable army, which the diet of Ratisbon would not fail to grant him: whereas, if his highneſs would agree to invade Germany in the ſpring, at the head of 300000 men, the king would enter the duchy of Milan with 50000 men, and thus give a diverſion to the emperor's forces, whilſt his highneſs, unexpectedly attacking the Germans, and finding them divided in matters of religion, would as eaſily conquer them, as he had done the Hungarians, the year before. But the Imperialiſts artifice was ſo groſs, that any man of common ſenſe might eaſily diſcover it; not only becauſe they did not offer to produce the originals, but alſo becauſe they gave occaſion to ſuſpect, that they had committed the murder, by acknowledging, in ſo nice a juncture, that they had made advantage of it. Nevertheleſs, it produced the deſired effect in the diet of Ratisbon: for Francis I was there looked upon as a prince, who was ready to renounce his religion and honour, provided he was aſſiſted to diſmember the duchy of Milan from the empire. Olivier, his embaſſador, was heard with ſo much prepoſſeſſion, that whatever he ſaid was underſtood in a contrary ſenſe; and that miniſter was obliged to retire, after he had ſeen, to his ſorrow, the diet grant the emperor near fourſcore thouſand men, to be employed as he ſhould think fit (39).’

I refer all thoſe, who will learn to make a true judgment of this affair, to Mr de Wicquefort (40); but I do not know to whom I ſhall refer thoſe, who will be diſpoſed to grieve, when they conſider, that ſuch plain and diabolical calumnies have turned ſo much to the advantage of their authors. It muſt be confeſſed, that it is a thing that gives great offence; but ſuch is the way of the world; and we muſt adore thoſe great and profound myſteries of providence without murmuring. I ſhall conclude with this reflexion; our age does not afford us inſtances of ſuch impoſtures, as Mr Varillas relates: for, among ſo many libels, wherein anonymous authors invent what they pleaſe, we ſee no forgeries inveſted with the public authority, as were thoſe, which Charles the fifth's court knew how to invent.

[*I*] *Nothing can be more horrid .... than the oath, which it was ſuppoſed Francis I took to Soliman II.*] Every body yet remembers the harangue, which the marquis de Rebenac made to the Pope in 1692, to repreſent what miſchiefs might enſue to the Catholic religion from the alliance, which the emperor and the king of Spain has made with Proteſtant princes. The anonymous author, who made an anſwer to this harangue, did not forget to object, that Francis I combined with the Turks againſt Charles V. ‘It will not, perhaps, be unacceptable to the public, *adds he* (41), to inſert here the formulary of an oath, which this prince took to ſultan Soliman, to confirm that infamous alliance, which as yet ſubſiſts, and which ſeems to be knit ſo faſt by Lewis XIV, that it is not to be broke. I know that you will not bluſh at it: for, if there were none then, but chancellor du Prat, who were honeſt enough to diſapprove it; it may be now preſumed, that your court, which hath got over all divine and humane laws, cannot abhor any ſacrilege or impiety. Give me only leave to deſire the reader here to pardon me, if I lay before his eyes an object, which he cannot ſee without horrour, and which ſhould never have come to the knowledge of the Chriſtians. This is it: *Per Deum Magnum & Altum, Miſericordem & Benignum, formatorem Cœli & Terræ, & omnium quæ in eis ſunt: & per Sancta hæc Evangelia: per Sanctum Baptiſma, per Sanctum Joannem Baptiſtam, & per Fidem Chriſtianorum, Promitto & Juro, quòd omnia quæ novero, aperta erunt Altiſſimo Domino Sultano Solimano, cujus Regnum Deus fortificet. Ero Amicus ſuorum unicus, & Inimicus Inimicorum. Ero Redemptor Captivorum Turcarum ex Vinculis Hoſtium ejus: nihil in mea parte fraudulentum erit. Quòd ſi hoc neglexerim ero Apoſtata, & mandatorum Sancti Evangelii Chriſtianæque Fidei Prævaricator. Dicam Evangelium falſum eſſe; Negabo Chriſtum vivere, & Matrem ejus Virginem fuiſſe; ſuper Fontem Baptiſmatis porcum interficiam, & Altaris Presbyteros maledicam; ſuper Altare fornicabor cum Luxuria; & Sanctorum Patrum maledictiones in me recipiam. Ita me Deus reſpiciat ex alto.* I believe I need not enlarge on the enormity of this oath.’

I find fault with two things in the proceedings of this Writer: One, that he quotes no body; and the other, that he hath not tranſlated into the vulgar tongue the form of the oath, which he relates. When there was only occaſion to ſay, in general, that Francis I had made an alliance with the Ottoman Porte, our anonymous author (42) did not omit quoting Ribier's memoirs. How comes it then to paſs, that when he ſpeaks of a more heinous circumſtance he quotes no author? He ought to have quoted either a French author, or one wholly indifferent to France, or to the houſe of Auſtria; at leaſt, he ought to have told us, that ſuch a Spaniſh, Flemiſh, or German author, hath inſerted this oath in his book, and ſhewed which way this myſtery was diſcovered. But our anonymous author, having

(*g*) See remark [*I*].

(35) Ibid.

(36) He was a Genoeſe, whom Francis I was ſending to Venice as his embaſſador in ordinary. *Varillas, ibid. lib. ix, pag.* 403.

(37) He was born a ſubject to the king of Spain, and had negotiated privately with Soliman for Francis I, and was then going to the Porte as embaſſador of France. *Id. ibid.*

(38) The Marquis du Guaſt cauſed them to be murdered on the Po, as Langey proved it. *Id. ibid. p.* 407, &c. ad ann. 1541.

(39) Id. ibid. pag. 409, & ſeq.

(40) Above, remark [*G*] of the article *BRUN* (ANTONY LE).

(41) Anſwer to a ſpeech made to his Holineſs by the Marquis de Rebenac, *pag.* 18, 19.

(42) Ubi ſupra, pag. 18.

concerning a pretended deſign of recovering the hoſtages, that Francis I. had given [*K*]. I have read another, and a very groſs one, which relates to the trouble, wherein this prince

ving done nothing of all this, ſhews, that he durſt not declare whence he hath taken this formulary; and that he knew, that, if he declared it, he would diſcredit his authority. He ſeems to have artificially omitted the French tranſlation of this formulary, fearing, perhaps, to expoſe the forgery to too many: Be it how it will, here is the tranſlation of the Latin that he hath printed. 'By the great and high GOD, merciful and gracious, author of heaven and earth, and of all things therein; and by theſe holy Goſpels, by the holy baptiſm, by St John the Baptiſt, and by the faith of Chriſtians, I promiſe and ſwear, that whatever comes to my knowlege ſhall be made known to the moſt high lord ſultan Soliman, whoſe reign may GOD ſtrengthen. I will be the only friend of his friends, and an enemy to his enemies. I will redeem the Turkiſh priſoners out of the bonds of his enemies. There ſhall be no fraud on my ſide. If I neglect theſe things, I will be an apoſtate, and a prevaricator of the precepts of the holy goſpel, and the chriſtian faith. I will ſay, that the goſpel is falſe; I will deny that CHRIST is alive, and that his mother was a virgin; I will kill a hog on the font, and I will curſe the prieſts of the altar; I will luxuriouſly commit whoredom on the altar, and may the curſes of the holy fathers fall on my head. Thus may GOD look upon me from on high.' I queſtion whether any ſenſible and reaſonable man can ever imagine, that the form of this oath was ever contrived between the miniſters of France and thoſe of the Porte (43). Every thing in it ſhocks probability, and there is nothing in it worthy either of the gravity of Soliman, or that of Francis I. The ſultan had been well enough ſatisfied with the common form of oaths, and he was too wiſe a man not to perceive what advantages he might expect from ſo potent an ally.

Perhaps it may be objected, that it is the cuſtom of the Turks to preſcribe this form of an oath; and I confeſs, that the Venetians were charged with having taken ſuch an one in the perſon of the baſtard of Cyprus: but this would ſerve at the moſt to elude the acceſſory obſervation, which I have juſt now incidentally propoſed. Beſides, it is a queſtion, whether the Venetians acquieſced in that form, and whether a good proof can be brought for it. However, becauſe the book, in which that reproach was caſt on them, during the war with Lewis XII, is grown ſcarce, I ſhall here recite the tenor of the oath. 'The ſaid baſtard took an horrible, execrable, and moſt damnable oath to the ſaid ſultan; which was afterwards tranſlated from Arabic into Latin, and brought to Pope Pius by ſome knights of Rhodes; for which reaſon he would never receive the embaſſadors of the ſaid James as the embaſſadors of a chriſtian king; but reprimanded them very ſeverely. Since, then, the Venetians are his heirs, is it not neceſſary that they ſhould take ſuch an oath as the ſaid James did, in the following manner?

'Firſt, He invoked the name of Almighty GOD forty times, and then ſaid: By the great and high GOD, merciful and gracious, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things that are therein; by theſe holy goſpels, by the holy baptiſm, by St John the Baptiſt, and all the ſaints, and by the chriſtian faith; I promiſe and ſwear, that whatever I ſhall know, ſhall be diſcovered to my ſovereign lord Alleſeraph Aſnal, ſultan of Egypt, and emperor of all Arabia, whom GOD ſtrengthen in his kingdom; and I will always be a friend of his friends, and an enemy of his enemies, and conceal nothing from him: I will ſuffer no pirates in my kingdom, nor furniſh them, or aſſiſt them, with any proviſions: All the Egyptians, who are ſlaves in my kingdom, I will redeem and ſet at liberty: I will offer every year, on the firſt day of October or November, by way of tribute to the ſovereign temples of Jeruſalem and Mecca, the ſum of five thouſand ducats of gold: I will take care, that the Rhodians furniſh the pirates with no arms: Whatever ſhall come to my knowledge, that deſerves to be known, I will communicate to the ſultan truly, and without fraud. If I fail in any of the aboveſaid matters, I will be an apoſtate from the chriſtian faith, and the commands of the goſpel: I will deny that JESUS CHRIST lives, and that his mother is a virgin: I will kill on the font a camel, and curſe the prieſts of the church: I will deny the divinity, and adore the humanity: I will commit fornication on the high altar with a Jeweſs, and receive on myſelf all the curſes of the holy fathers. Was not Mark Corrario, a Venetian (whoſe daughter the ſaid baſtard king afterwards married to his detriment), preſent at the adminiſtring of the ſaid oath and homage? Therefore it is moſt likely, that they are in poſſeſſion of Cyprus upon the ſame terms, ſince they have uſurped that title (44).'

[*K*] *A lie was ſpread .... concerning a pretended deſign of recovering the hoſtages that Francis I. had given.*] Francis I, coming out of priſon, delivered his ſons to the Spaniards: He could not have them again but on diſadvantageous conditions; for the Spaniards would keep them till the treaty of Madrid was executed. Some people were ſo fooliſh, or ſo malicious, as to ſpread a report, that he had ſent for a German magician, who ſhould tranſport from Spain into France theſe two hoſtages, ſo as that no body ſhould perceive it, and do a great many other miracles. You will find this abſurdity in one of Agrippa's letters; for he is the author of that letter, although it is intituled, in the edition in 8vo, *Amicus ad Agrippam*. But this is a tranſpoſition of words; it muſt be read, *Agrippa ad Amicum*. It was printed under this title, with the three books of his occult philoſophy, in the year 1533, as Gabriel Naudé obſerves at the 410th page of his apology for great men. Theſe are Agrippa's words: 'Accerſitus eſt è Germania non modicis ſumptibus vir quidam dæmoniorum, hoc eſt magus, in quo poteſtas dæmonum inhabitat, ut, ſicut Jamnes & Mambres reſtiterunt Moyſi, ſic iſte reſiſtat Cæſari. Perſuaſum enim eſt illis à patre mendaciorum, illum futurorum omnium præſcium, arcanorum quorumcunque conſiliorum conſcium, ac deliberatarum cogitationum interpretem: tanta præterea præditum poteſtate, ut poſſit regios pueros reducere per aëra, quemadmodum legitur Abakuk cum ſuo pulmento traductus ad lacum leonum, poſſetque, ſicut Heliſæus obſeſſus in Dothaim, oſtendere montes plenos equorum & curruum igneorum, exercitumque plurimum: inſuper & revelare ac transferre theſauros terræ, quaſque volet, coget nuptias amoreſque, aut dirimet, deploratos quoque curabit morbos ſtygio pharmaco (45). —— *There was ſent for out of Germany, at a great expence, a certain magician, endued with a diabolical power, that, as Jannes and Mambres reſiſted Moſes, ſo might he reſiſt the emperor: for they were perſuaded by the father of lies, that this man knew before-hand all future events, was privy to the moſt ſecret counſels, and an interpreter of the intentions of the mind; moreover, that he was endued with ſuch power, that he could bring back the king's children through the air, as we read that Habakkuk was tranſported with his pottage to the lake of Lions, and that he could, like Eliſha beſieged in Dothaim, ſhew the mountains full of fiery horſes and chariots, and a numerous army; and farther, that he could diſcover and convey away hidden treaſures, and make, or break, what matches and love-affairs he pleaſed, and cure deſperate diſeaſes by an infernal medicine.*' This letter was written from Paris the twenty third of February, 1528. He even obſerves, that the cardinals and biſhops conſented, that this magician ſhould be ſent for, and contributed to defray his expences: 'Huic tam nefario idololatriæ & ſacrilegorum artifici audaciam præſtat, quæ iſtis tam impenſè favet orthodoxa illa mater, & Chriſtianiſſimi filii accommodatur autoritas, & è ſacris pecuniis largiuntur munera, conniventibus etiam atque tam nefariam operam conducentibus columnis eccleſiæ, epiſcopis & cardinalibus, & impietatis miniſtro impii applaudunt proceres, quemadmodum operibus lupi congratulantur corvi (46). —— *The moſt orthodox mother herſelf, and her moſt chriſtian ſons by their authority, greatly encourage ſo wicked an artificer of idolatry and ſacrilege; and the church's money is employed for this purpoſe, by the connivance, and even contribution of thoſe pillars of the church, the biſhops and cardinals; and the impious nobles applaud this miniſter of impiety, as the crows congratulate the actions of the wolf.*'

---

(43) It ſeems as if they would have required ſuch an oath from Lewis IX. See *Paulus Æmilius*, lib. vii, fol. 271, verſo.

(44) John le Maire de Belges, Legende des Venitiens, *pag.* 75. *Edit. Lyons* 1549.

(45) Agrippa, Epiſt. xxvi, lib. v, pag. 913.

(46) Ibid. pag. 914.

Prince found himſelf in the year 1544 [*L*]. I ſpeak, in another place (*b*), of a Fable, which is told of the emperor's journey through France, when he went to chaſtize the city of Ghent. It is not the only one that hath been ſpread, in reference to that time [*M*]. Francis I was the author of ſome innovations, among which we muſt chiefly reckon the cuſtom of womens going to court [*N*]; which did not alter that article of the Salic law, which excludes women from the crown of France: However, it may be ſaid, that, since that time, till the end of the XVIth century, more or leſs, France hath been governed by women (*i*). Francis Iſt hath been wrongfully accuſed of having too much indulged the Lutherans of his kingdom [*O*]. It is one of thoſe lies, which

John Wierus, Agrippa's diſciple, tells part of theſe fine ſtories; I mean, what relates to the carrying away of the hoſtages. 'Quemadmodum dicitur, quo tempore Franciſci primi regis Galliæ filii detinebantur obſides in Hiſpania, magum in Galliam evocatum è Germania fuiſſe, qui tanta credebatur præditus poteſtate, ut poſſet regios pueros per aëra reducere, theſauroſque inveſtigare & transferre (47). ——— *As it is reported, that, when the ſons of Francis I, king of France, were detained as hoſtages in Spain, a magician was ſent for from Germany into France, who was thought to be endued with ſuch power, that he could bring back the king's ſons thro' the air, and diſcover and convey away treaſures.*' The count de la Rocca (48) knew this paſſage of John Wierus; not that he had read the books of this author; he had only ſeen this paſſage quoted by Bodin: but he was in the wrong to ſay only, that Bodin ſpeaks of it; he ſhould have added, that Bodin rejects it as a fable. 'It is enough for me, *theſe are that French civilian's words* (49), to refute Wierus by his own words and books. For he himſelf * writes, that he hath ſeen men carried through the air by devils, and that there is no abſurdity in it; and, in the ſame place, he writes this lie, *viz.* that a magician was ſent for from Germany, who promiſed to get out of the caſtle of Madrid king Francis's ſons, and to have them tranſported through the air from Spain into France; but that this was not done, becauſe it was feared they ſhould break their necks.' I have not found this laſt particular in John Wierus's book. I make uſe of the Amſterdam edition, 1660.

[*L*] *I have read another very groſs lie, which relates to .... the year* 1544] John Saxon, rector of the univerſity of Wittemberg, cauſed a *Programma* to be affixed the twelfth of October, 1544, and therein declared, among other things, that it was not by chance, but by the juſt judgment of GOD, that France was overwhelmed with calamities. The emperor, ſays he, came near Paris, and the queen of France and the dauphin went to meet him as humble ſupplicants. 'Non caſu jam Gallia miſerabiliter vaſtatur, & rex potens venit in tantum diſcrimen ut cum Carolus imperator acceſſerit ad Lutetiam uſque, ſupplices occurrerint regina & delphinus, ut ante paucos annos ad Carolum Burgundum venit ſupplex rex Franciæ Ludovicus cui induit dux Carolus Burgundicum Thoracem cui confeſſio victoriæ inſcripta erat, VIVAT DUX BURGUNDIÆ (50). —— *In like manner as, a few years before, Lewis, king of France, met, as a ſupplicant, the duke of Burgundy, whom duke Charles inveſted with the Burgundian breaſt-plate, inſcribed with this confeſſion of victory,* LONG LIVE THE DUKE OF BURGUNDY.' Theſe two facts, compared together, are falſe. The firſt is ſo abſolutely, and without any mixture of truth; and the other, in it's principal circumſtances: for, when Lewis XI was forced to follow the duke of Burgundy to Leige, he did not go to meet him as a ſupplicant, but to have a conference with him, hoping to bubble him. It is a ſhame, that the rector of a famous univerſity ſhould publiſh, in a *Programma*, a lie unworthy the Gazette.

[*M*] *It is not the only fable, that hath been ſpread in reference to that time.*] 'How many romances have been made of Francis I? Hath it not even been reported, that he fought a duel with the emperor; and that this prince going through France, the king, with an unparallelled generoſity, offered him his kingdom? That Charles had one day ſate on Francis's throne; that he had ordered a criminal to be condemned, and had afterwards granted him his pardon, to ſhew his authority (51).'

[*N*] *He was author of ..... the cuſtom of womens going to court.*] What I am going to quote, will, no doubt, be read with pleaſure. 'One day, *it is Brantome ſpeaks* (52), as I was diſcourſing with a great prince about the great virtues of Francis I.... He ſpoke very much in his praiſe; but he blamed him very much for two things, which had done the court and France a great deal of miſchief, not only during his own reign, but alſo during thoſe of his ſucceſſors: to wit, for having introduced into the court the great aſſemblies, reſort, and ordinary reſidence of ladies; and for having invited thither, and entertained ſo many eccleſiaſtics: as for the ladies, it muſt be confeſſed, that, before his time, they ſeldom came there, and but ſew of them too. It is true, that queen Anne began to bring to her court more ladies than the other preceding queens; and, had it not been for her, the king her husband had not much regarded them. But, when the ſaid king Francis came to the throne, he conſidered, that the ladies were the ſole decoration of the court, and therefore peopled it with them, more than was formerly uſual.' Brantome tells us the reaſons, which this critical prince made uſe of. 'If the court ladies only, *ſaid he* (53), had grown looſe, it had been no great matter; but they ſet ſuch a bad example to all the other ladies of France, that, following their way of dreſſing, genteel carriage, faſhions, dances, and way of living, they would alſo imitate them in their intrigues and whoring; for, ſaid they, at court, they are thus dreſſed, they dance after this manner, and whore, and we may do ſo too.' Concerning the prelates, he ſaid (54), 'That, then beginning to be debauched and looſe, they ſet an ill example to others in France to do the ſame thing; and that it had been better, if they had kept in their dioceſes, to preach to their flocks (55).' Brantome refutes all theſe reaſons: he maintains, that, before the reign of Francis I, there was as much corruption among women, and clergymen (56); and that *nothing but troubles and hereſies had been ſeen in France*, ſince preaching had been ſo frequent (57). See Mr Jurieu's reflexions on all this (58).

[*O*] *He is wrongfully accuſed of having too much indulged the Lutherans.*] You may ſee this accuſation ſtrongly refuted by theſe words of Mezerai. 'The infection of errors increaſing, the king cauſed the the fire to be re-kindled, to purge France of them. There were ſtill ſome remains of them in the city of Meaux, after biſhop Briçonnet had received there le Fevre, and the Rouſſels. Above ſixty were taken there, and brought to Paris, whereof fourteen were burned, others hanged, and the reſt whipped and baniſhed. Which proceedings, and others like theſe, palpably convict that Italian author of falſity, who hath written the hiſtory of our civil wars of religion, and of the League (59), who, through groſs forgetfulneſs, or egregious malice, ſaid, in his firſt book, *That Calvin's belief began to ſpread in this king's reign, whether he allowed it, or took no notice of it; and that it was rather received with indignation and ſcorn, than feared, or carefully ſuppreſſed.* What! To make ſix or ſeven ſevere edicts to ſtifle it, to convoke the clergy ſeveral times, to aſſemble a provincial council, to be continually ſending embaſſadors to all the princes of Chriſtendom, in order to have a general one called, to burn heretics by dozens, to ſend them to the gallies by hundreds, and to baniſh them by thouſands; Can this be ſaid to allow, or to take no notice of it? Are theſe bare *reſolutions*, or real performances? This ought to engage you, judicious reader, to read this foreign author with a great deal of caution, and will perhaps give you occaſion to obſerve a great many faults, which the curious ought not to forgive him, ſince he hath ſpoken thus of the father of learning (60).' It were to be wiſhed, for the honour of this king, that

---

(*b*) In the remark [*I*] of the article CHARLES V.

(*i*) See, in the remark [*Z*], Mezerai's words.

(47) Jo. Wierus, de Lamiis, lib. iii, cap xii, n. 7, pag. m. 195.

(48) See his *Hiſtory of Charles V*, pag. 171, Bruſſels edit. 1663.

(49) Bodin's Refutation of John Wier's Opinions, pag. m. 513.

* Lib. ii, cap. xii, de Præſtigiis, pag. 6.

(50) *See the book, intituled*, Scriptorum publice propoſitorum à Profeſſoribus in Academia Witebergenſi ab anno 1540, ad ann. 1553, Tom I, fol. 96, verſo.

(51) Chapuzeau, Project of a new Hiſtorical Dictionary, pag. 11.

(52) Brantome, Memoires, Tom. I, pag. 277.

(53) Ib pag. 280.

(54) Ib. pag. 282.

(55) Ib. pag. 285.

(56) I never heard, nor read, that they were better men before, or lived more regularly; for they were as debauched in their biſhoprics and abbies, as ſoldiers. *Ibid. pag.* 282.

(57) Id. pag. 285.

(58) Jurieu's Apology for the Reformers, cap. vii, pag. 121, *& ſeq.*

(59) *Mezerai means Davila. Theſe are the words of that Italian, pag. m.* 32, *of the firſt book.* Comincio l'origine di queſta diſſentione inſino al tempo del Rè Franceſco il Primo, il quale benche faceſſe tal volta qualche ſevera riſolutione, occupato nondimeno del continuo nel travaglio delle guerre ſtraniere ò permeſſe, ò non ſi avidde, che andaſſero all' hora ſerpendo i principii di queſta piu toſto diſpregiata & odiata che temuta ò avertita credenza.

(60) Mezerai's Hiſtory of France, Tom. II, pag. 1038.

which our dictionary ought to cenſure. Had it been ſaid, that this prince was very uſeful to the Proteſtants [*P*] of Germany, it would not have been a miſtake. I have obſerved, in another place (*k*), what trifling excuſes he made uſe of, to juſtify himſelf to them for putting ſome Lutherans to death. Mr Varillas is here guilty of an anachroniſm [*Q*]. The laſt part of Francis the firſt's life was calamitous to him. The effects of his incontinency (*l*), and the remembrance of the unhappy circumſtances, wherein the miſmanagement of his miniſters had engaged him, ſo overwhelmed him with grief, that he was incapable of conſulting his true intereſt; for he was ſenſibly affected with an accident, which he ſhould have looked upon as very lucky to him; I mean, the death of Henry VIII, king of England (§ *α*;) a prince, who had ſo often acted againſt France, and who would have always been inclined to ruin it, provided he might have ſhared it with Charles V. The diſquietude, which Francis the firſt 's children gave him, encreaſed the anxieties of his mind [*R*]. I do not relate the ſeries of his actions, becauſe

[(§ *α*) This death of a prince, a few years older than himſelf, put him in mind of his own approaching end, and this reflexion, among others, quite ſunk him. See the *Memoirs du Bellai*, towards the end of book x, and Thuanus, *Tom. I, pag.* 85. *B. C.* of the edition 1626. REM. CRIT.]

Mezerai's cauſe were not ſo good. An unprejudiced hiſtorian, who hath a true notion of uprightneſs, and of the univerſal laws of order, would wiſh, that Davila's reproaches were well grounded: *Juvat*, would he ſay, *hæc opprobria nobis, & dici potuiſſe, & non potuiſſe refelli* (61): But I have unluckily too many reaſons to call Davila a calumniator: Why am I able to prove him one by ſo many arguments (62)? Whoſoever hath a true notion of true glory, and a value for Francis the firſt's memory, whether he be a Proteſtant or Roman Catholic, will ſpeak after this manner; for nothing can be more abominable, than to put to death thoſe, who ſeparate from a communion, only becauſe they are afraid of offending GOD, and who behave themſelves in all other reſpects as very good ſubjects: nothing is more conſonant to reaſon, than to leave the empire of conſcience to GOD alone.

Let us oppoſe to Davila this paſſage of Brantome: 'The Lutherans, and thoſe of the new religion, have 'been mightily incenſed againſt Francis I; which 'hath perhaps made both thoſe of his time, and of 'this too, ſpeak ſo ill of him, as they have done; 'for he burnt a great many of them, and ſpared 'none of thoſe that he could diſcover. He is ſaid 'to have been the firſt, who brought thoſe burnings into vogue, ſince they were ſcarce ſpoken of in 'his predeceſſor's time: GOD be thanked, that Luther 'was not as yet come, who was the firſt and new 'heretic (although there were ſome few before him) 'who drew ſo great a part of Chriſtendom after him. 'I leave this to thoſe, that know it better than I. 'This great king, notwithſtanding theſe fires and burnings, took Geneva under his protection, when Charles, 'duke of Savoy, would beſiege it; which occaſioned the 'loſs of part of his territories, which thoſe of Bern 'took from him: His ſaid majeſty was blamed for it, as 'alſo for having ſent into that city the bands of the lord 'Rance de Lore to it's aſſiſtance. Reconcile, I beſeech 'ye, if you can, theſe fires with that protection (63).

[*P*] *Francis I. was very uſeful to the Proteſtants.*] We have juſt now ſeen, that he ſaved the republic of Geneva, the metropolis of the reformed, their mother-church, which ſent her apoſtles and books into France, and her advice every where to maintain their cauſe. This behaviour of Francis I. enlarged the canton of Bern, of which the reformation ſtill feels the benefit. He did directly many good ſervices to the league of Smalcalde, but many more indirectly; for he was the cauſe that Charles V had, on many occaſions, a great regard for the Proteſtants of Germany, to draw them off from the intereſt of France. As it is more agreeable to the principles of religion and piety, to acknowledge the hand of GOD, I mean a particular influence of providence, in the eſtabliſhment of the reformation, I approve thoſe that judge of it in that manner: but I cannot forbear ſaying, that ſome underſtanding perſons believe, that the rivalſhip between Charles V, and the king of France, was more than ſufficient to afford the Proteſtants the means of diſputing the ground; and that, if Luther made a greater progreſs than ſo many other reformers that lived before him, it is becauſe he appeared in a favourable time, when Francis I and Charles V were competitors, who, to thwart one another, favoured this new ſect by turns; and, when it was once ſettled in Germany, it ſent the Calviniſts of France ſufficient ſupplies to keep their poſts, &c. Brantome's queſtion, upon the little relation there is between burning a hundred heretics, and protecting their neſt, centre, and metropolis, will puzzle thoſe, who do not obſerve, that this is one of the moſt common ſcenes of the great comedy of the world. Sovereign princes have in all ages thus played with religion; and they play this game ſtill; for they perſecute at home a religion which they ſupport abroad. You muſt not infer from hence, that they have no religion: for the inference would be falſe; they are often religious, even to bigottry. What then can be the reaſon of this? They have a greater regard for the temporal intereſt of their dominions, than for the kingdom of JESUS CHRIST (64). I do not except the Pope himſelf. I believe that he was no better pleaſed with the emperor's progreſs againſt the league of the Proteſtants, than Francis I. was. Let us quote Mezerai. 'The noiſe of the emperor's arms frightned 'all Chriſtendom; the Pope himſelf quaked for fear, 'leſt, after having conquered Germany, he ſhould 'come into Italy. When Francis had duly weighed 'the conſequences of the ruin of the Proteſtants, he altered his opinion, made a league with them, and obliged himſelf to receive the duke of Saxony's eldeſt 'ſon in France, and to allow him the private exerciſe of 'his religion, and promiſed to ſend one hundred thouſand crowns to his father, and as many to the landgrave of Heſſe, till he ſent them ſome forces (65).' Had not he a great deal of zeal for his religion? He condemned to the flames ſome poor private perſons, becauſe they did not go to maſs; and ſent a powerful aſſiſtance to princes who had aboliſhed the maſs in their territories. This was to attack the party by the weather-cocks; to take ſome tiles and ſtones, or plunder ſome huts, while they build for them ſtrong forts and places of arms (66). Add to this the remark [*AA*] of the article HENRY II, and the remark of the article SERGIER.

How uſeful the emulation of Charles V and Francis I proved to the Proteſtants.

[*Q*] *Mr Varillas is here guilty of an anachroniſm.*] For he ſuppoſes (67), that, when Francis I. put ſix Lutherans to death on the nineteenth of January, 1535, the French monarchy was more dangerouſly ſhaken by Calvin's *Inſtitution*, than it had ever been by either the Engliſh, or the houſe of Auſtria. We have already ſhewed (68), that Calvin reſolved to publiſh this book, in order to refute the calumnies, that were ſpread againſt thoſe, whom Francis I. put to death; that were ſpread, I ſay, to appeaſe thereby the Proteſtants of Germany, who were very much exaſperated at the laſt execution of thoſe ſix Lutherans.

[*R*] *The diſquietude his children gave him, encreaſed the anxieties of his mind.*] The eldeſt was called Francis. He was born at the caſtle of Amboiſe, the twenty eighth of February, 1518 (69). He was poiſoned with a cup of freſh water by Sebaſtian Montecuculi, and died at the caſtle of Tournon the tenth of Auguſt, 1536 (70). 'The king, his father, was ſo afflicted at 'his death, that he was a long time before he could 'recover himſelf; for he conceived mighty hopes, and a 'great opinion of this ſon. Mr de Bellai relates this very well in his memoirs (71).' Francis the firſt's ſecond ſon reigned after him, and was called Henry II. Without doubt he gave his father a great deal of trouble, by keeping a correſpondence with Montmorency, who was out of favour, and by making a cabal againſt the ducheſs of Etampes, his father's favourite. He combined againſt her, with his own miſtreſs, Diana of Poi-

'ctiers;

(*k*) See, above, remark [*E*] of the article BELLAI (WILLIAM DU).

(*l*) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. II, pag. 1039.

(61) Ovid. Metamor. lib. i, ver. 758, *but, inſtead of* juvat, *he ſays* pudet.

(62) O utinam arguerem ſic, ut non vincere poſſem. Me miſerum! quare tam bona cauſa mea eſt? *Id. Amor. lib. ii, Eleg. v, ver.* 7.

(63) Brant. Life of Francis I, in the firſt Tome of his Memoirs, pag. 231.

(64) See, above, remark [*H*] of the article AGESILAUS II.

(65) Mezer. Abrégé Chronol. Tom. IV, pag. 637, ad ann. 1547.

(66) *Francis I. preſerved Geneva, where the duke of Savoy would have deſtroyed the reformation, if that king had not prevented it. The following words may be applied to thoſe who make uſe of ſuch a policy:* Urbem (philoſophiæ) mihi crede proditis, dum caſtella defenditis. — *Believe me, you betray the city, while you defend the citadel.* Cicero de Divin. lib. ii, cap. xvi.

(67) Hiſt. de François I, lib. vii, pag. 248.

(68) In remark [*F*] of the article CALVIN, towards the beginning.

(69) *Father* Anſelme, Hiſtoire de la Maiſon Roiale, pag. 136.

(70) Id. ibid. *He ſays*, that he was poiſoned at Valence; *but Brantome ſays more truly*, Tom. I, pag. 336, that he was poiſoned at Lyons.

(71) Brantome, ibid. pag. 338.

cauſe it would oblige me to repeat what is ſufficiently expreſſed in other dictionaries. The ſirname of GREAT, which was given him after his death, was of no long continuance [S]. He deſerved it in certain reſpects, but eſpecially for his courage, and that free, open, and generous temper, which is ſo rare in perſons of his rank. His undauntedneſs failed him ſometimes; for it flagged in his priſon, where he was like to die of grief; and he betrayed too great a fear when he returned into France [T]. What I have read in a ſmall book, lately publiſhed (m), I take to be a fabulous ſtory; which is, that he killed, at Madrid, a great lord, who had been wanting in his reſpect to him, and that the emperor did not take it ill.

Here follow the additions I make to this article in this ſecond edition. It hath been falſly reported, that Francis Iſt was born after his mother had been a long time barren [U]. He hath been reckoned among thoſe princes, who, when they came to the throne, did not revenge the affronts, which they received, when they were private men. It is reported, that, under the reign of Lewis XII, he ſent Charles de Bourbon a challenge, who had endeavoured, by ſome reports, to ſet the king againſt him; and that, when he came to the crown, he took ſo little notice of the hatred he had conceived againſt Charles de Bourbon, that he promoted him to the office of conſtable (n). Every body knows

(m) It is intituled, *Avis à l'Auteur du Mercure Hiſtorique & Politique.* It was printed, if I am not miſtaken, in the year 1689, againſt ſome things which the author of the *Mercure* had ſaid of Chriſtina, queen of Sweden. I have not been able to find this *Advice* again.

(n) *See* Camerarius, Meditat. Hiſtor. Tom. II, cap. xlv, ſub fin. pag. m 194. *He quotes* du Ferron, in Vita Franciſci I.

ctiers; and it cannot be imagined what miſchief theſe two womens jealouſies cauſed (72), If the jarring of the father's and ſon's miſtreſſes gave the king a great deal of trouble, the diſagreement of the dauphin, and his brother the duke of Orleans, gave him no leſs, and was no leſs prejudicial to him. The ducheſs of Etampes's faction was for the duke of Orleans; and that of Diana of Poictiers thwarted this prince, and poiſoned him at laſt. Let us ſee what Mezerai ſays of it: 'The 'duke of Orleans, a prince of great hopes, died at 'Foreſt-Mouſtier, the eighth of September, either of 'the plague, or of poiſon, which it was ſuſpected his 'brother's creatures gave him; becauſe they could not 'endure that the king ſhould be ſo fond of him as he 'was, and that he ſhould be angry, that the dauphin, 'contrary to his orders, held a correſpondence with 'the conſtable of Montmorency, whoſe return they 'wiſhed, becauſe their maſter earneſtly deſired it (73).' What grief was it for Francis I to ſee, that his ſon, by meddling more than he ought to do with ſtate-affairs, obliged him to take thoſe meaſures, which were neither agreeable nor advantageous to him! The dauphin's faction was the cauſe, that the king ſigned the treaty of Creſpy. The dauphin had written 'to 'his father, with the conſent of the general officers of 'his army, to beg that his majeſty would be pleaſed 'to ſend again the conſtable to the army, to perform 'his office, and that nothing but this general was 'wanting to make his forces invincible . . . . The 'king never expreſſed ſo much reſentment as he did 'at the reading of *this letter*. He complained, that 'his ſon encroached upon his authority, and that his 'officers preſumed to preſcribe him laws. He declared his indignation to all that approached his perſon, 'and ſeverely checked all thoſe, who had exaſperated 'him. He reſolutely told the dauphin, that it was 'his duty to ſet his ſubjects a pattern of perfect obedience, and not to find fault with his conduct, by 'propoſing to him to reſtore a favourite, whom he 'had diſgraced upon good grounds. He threatened 'the reſt with his diſpleaſure, if they perſiſted in their 'indiſcretion; and the ducheſs of Etampes's cabal, 'laying hold of his paſſion, ſo powerfully repreſented, 'that the only way to be free from all the importunate 'petitions, that might be made in behalf of the conſtable, was to conclude a ſudden peace, that his majeſty ordered admiral Annebaut to do it, *&c* (74).' 'This peace being more advantageous to the duke of 'Orleans, than to France, the dauphin, who could 'endure neither the aggrandizing of his brother, nor 'the prejudice done to the kingdom, proteſted againſt 'it in the caſtle of Fontainebleau, in the preſence 'of the duke of Vendoſme, the count d'Enghien 'his brother, and Francis d'Aumale, the ſecond day 'of December (75).' It may be eaſily imagined, that the king of France underwent the ſame fate, that many other princes undergo; which was, to be unhappy in his family, and to have occaſion to be jealous of him, who was to be his ſucceſſor. Thoſe, who poiſoned the duke of Orleans, ſaved, perhaps, the lives of two hundred thouſand men, and, perhaps, prevented the order of ſucceſſion in France from being ſhamefully diſturbed (76).

[S] *The ſirname of GREAT, which was given him after his death, was of no long continuance.*] Theodore Beza informs me (77), that this ſirname was given him after his death; but I conclude, that it did not continue long, becauſe every body ſays, and writes, Francis the Firſt, and not Francis the Great. They ſay, and write, Henry the Fourth, or Henry the Great, which is the ſame thing; and it would be the ſame thing too, with reference to Francis the Firſt, and Francis the Great, had not that title been laid aſide almoſt as ſoon as it was given. There is no need to put you in mind, that the great king Francis the Firſt, and Francis the Great, do not ſignify the ſame thing.

[T] *He betrayed too great a fear, when he returned into France.*] I will make uſe of Mezerai's words: 'As ſoon as the king was on this ſide of the river, he 'immediately got upon a Turkiſh horſe, as if he had 'been afraid of ſome ambuſh, and put on to St John 'de Luz, which is four leagues from thence; and, 'having refreſhed himſelf for half an hour, he ſpurred 'on as faſt to Bayonne (78).' Sure he had been very baſely treated in his confinement, ſince he charged his children to revenge him, on pain of his curſe. I have read this in a letter of admiral Chabot's ſecretary (79), which Mr le Laboureur hath publiſhed. It was written from London, the fifth of February, 1535, and contains, among other things which Henry VIII told this ſecretary, 'that he remembered very well, 'when they were laſt together, that the ſaid king '(80), ſpeaking one day to the dauphin, the duke of 'Orleans, and the duke of Angouleſme, his children, 'ſaid to them theſe words: that, if he knew that 'they ſhould ever forget the injuries and barbarous 'uſage, which he and they had received from the 'ſaid emperor, or did not revenge him, in caſe he 'could not do it himſelf, from that time he gave them 'his curſe (81).'

[U] *It has been falſely reported, that Francis I. was born after his mother had been a long time barren.*] Many of thoſe, who have publiſhed Francis de Paula's life, ſay, that the princeſs Loüiſa of Savoy, wife to Charles de Valois, lamented, to this holy man, her unhappy barrenneſs; and ſhe had been, add they, a long while ſenſible (82) of this imperfection. Francis de Paula, by his prayers, cured her of it; and therefore, being delivered of a boy, ſhe had him called Francis. This they relate. Theophilus Raynaud, upon the credit of theſe authors, reported the ſame thing in his *Trinitas Patriarcharum*; a book, wherein he makes the panegyric of St Bruno, the patriarch of the Carthuſians, of St Ignatius, the patriarch of the Jeſuits, and of St Francis de Paula, the patriarch of the Minimes; but he was informed afterwards, that it was a great falſity, ſince Loüiſa of Savoy became a widow at nineteen years of age, and was then mother to the princeſs Margaret, and prince Francis; which irrefragably ſhews, that ſhe could not deplore her long barrenneſs to Francis de Paula. 'Hoc correctione indiget, *ſays* '*he* (83), neque enim longam ſterilitatem ſuam deplorare potuit Ludovica, quæ anno ætatis undeviceſimo 'vidua relicta, duplicem jam prolem enixa erat, Margaritam filiam natam Engoliſmæ XI. Aprilis anno '1492, & Franciſcum, Cognaci editum anno 1494, '12. Septembris.' He adds, that Hilarion de Coſta, who wrote afterwards, had obſerved this in the life of the founder of the Minimes, and that the brothers Sammarthanus

(72) See the article *ETAMPES*.

(73) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. IV. pag. 635, ad ann. 1545.

(74) Varillas, Hiſt. de François I, liv. xi, pag. 108, ad ann. 1544.

(75) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. IV, pag. 631, ad ann. 1544.

(76) See the article HENRY II, rem. [S].

(77) Hiſtoire des Egliſes Reform. liv. i, *at the end*, *pag.* 66.

(78) Hiſtoire de France, Tom. II, pag. 950, ad ann. 1526.

(79) His name was Palamedes Gontier.

(80) That is, Francis I.

(81) Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtelnau, Tom. I, pag. 420.

(82) Diu ſterili. *Theoph. Raynaud. Syntagm. de libris Propriis, Art. lv, pag.* 639 *Apopompæi.*

(83) Id. ibid.

knows his love to learning; but few are informed of a particular, which may be ſeen, in relation to that, in a letter of Andreas Alciatus, which was not publiſhed till the year 1697 [*X*]. There is another thing remarkable, and of greater moment, which hath been lately known, *viz.* that the Duke of Orleans, Francis the firſt's ſecond ſon, offered to the Proteſtant princes of Germany, to allow them the exerciſe of their religion [*Y*]; and it is conjectured, that he did it with his father's conſent *(o)*. I have ſpoken, in the remark [*N*], of the diſorders, which were cauſed in France by the new cuſtom, that Francis Iſt introduced into his court, when he brought the ladies there. Theſe diſorders cannot be better repreſented, than they are by Mezerai, and therefore I will make uſe of his words [*Z*]. The author *(p)* of ſome dialogues, printed at the Hague in the year 1700, hath judiciouſly obſerved this king's faults. It is in the dialogue between this

(o) See the end of the remark [*I*].

(p) He is reported to be the ſame, who has publiſhed the *Adventures of Telemachus*: that is, the archbiſhop of Cambray.

Sammarthanus had confirmed it (84), ſince they ſay, that Loüiſa of Savoy was born in the year 1477, and that ſhe was married to Charles of Orleans, count of Angouleſme, in the year 1488; and that ſhe was delivered of Francis the twelfth of September, 1494, and loſt her huſband the firſt of January, 1496. Here is then a falſhood demonſtratively confuted: beſides, here is an inſtance of the precipitation, wherewith miracles upon miracles are crowded in the legend of a ſaint, without ever conſulting genealogical and chronological tables. Had they been conſulted by thoſe writers, they would not have ſaid, that a woman, who at the age of fifteen is delivered of a girl, and of a boy at ſeventeen, had grieved at her long barrenneſs, and had not been cured of it, but by the prayers of a holy man. GOD grant there may be nothing elſe but ſimplicity and credulity in this ſtory, and that the wants and intereſt of a ſociety, whereof I have ſaid ſomething in another place (85), may not have engaged the Minimes to adorn the life of their patriarch with this falſe glory.

[*X*] *Few are informed of a particular, which may be ſeen in a letter of Andreas Alciatus, which was not publiſhed till the year* 1697.] This letter was written from Bourges, the third of September, 1530. Alciatus ſays in it, that one Julius Camillus, a learned man, had offered to Francis I. to teach him, in a month's time, to ſpeak Greek and Latin, in proſe and verſe, with as much elegancy, as Demoſthenes and Cicero, Homer and Virgil. He required the king to be with him but one hour a day: but Camillus would be alone with him, becauſe he thought, that ſo extraordinary a ſecret was not to be imparted, but to crowned heads (86). He alſo demanded an income of two thouſand crowns a year in good benefices. He ſpoke with ſo much aſſurance, that Francis I. believed there was ſomething in theſe extraordinary promiſes. But, after he had been twice with Camillus, he diſmiſſed him with a preſent of ſix hundred crowns (87).

[*Y*] *The duke of Orleans, Francis the firſt's ſecond ſon, offered to the Proteſtant princes of Germany, to allow the exerciſe of their religion.*] We are obliged to Mr le Vaſſor for the diſcovery of this ſingularity. He hath publiſhed it in the ſecond edition of Vargas's letters, which he hath tranſlated from the Spaniſh, and adorned with ſeveral very ſolid remarks. He found (88), among cardinal de Granvelle's papers, the inſtruction, which the duke of Orleans gave to his *ſecretary and valet de chambre*, when he ſent him to *the dukes of Saxony, the landgrave of Heſſe, and other Proteſtant princes*, who were to meet at Francfort (89). It is dated from Rheims the eighth day of September, 1543, and begins thus: 'He ſhall declare to them 'the great deſire, which, by the grace of God, we 'have, that the holy goſpel be preached all over the 'kingdom of France, where we would ſee already a 'beginning of it. And becauſe the filial reverence, 'and fraternal honour, which we have for our moſt 'honoured lord and father, the moſt chriſtian king, 'and for the dauphin, our eldeſt brother, hinder us 'from having it freely preached in our duchy of Orleans, which is under the juriſdiction and in the 'poſſeſſion of our ſaid lord and father; beſides that 'the Pope, Emperor, and other princes, might oppoſe us; and other reaſonable cauſes, which we reſerve to be urged by us in a fit time; we have faithfully applied ourſelves to the moſt illuſtrious and excellent princes, the duke of Saxony, the landgrave of 'Heſſe, and other Proteſtant princes, to give them 'notice, that we are reſolved, and promiſe to them 'expreſsly, and without any regard, to have it preached in the duchy of Luxemburg, whereof we hope 'our ſaid lord the king will leave us in quiet poſſeſſion, and of other territories, which belong to us by 'the laws of arms. But we would have the ſaid Proteſtant princes to receive us into an offenſive and 'defenſive alliance and confederacy: and we earneſtly 'require them not to refuſe ſo juſt and reaſonable a demand; not to aſſiſt us with their protection, forces, 'or aid, againſt any particular prince, but only in 'what concerns the affairs of the Chriſtian religion, 'whoſe encreaſe we chiefly deſire, which by theſe 'means may the more eaſily be known in our other 'territories, and in the ſaid kingdom, when my ſaid 'lord, the king, comes to ſee me allied with the ſaid 'princes, who will be the cauſe, that he will declare 'his good zeal in this buſineſs, and we ſhall be able 'to excuſe ourſelves to him, and defend ourſelves againſt our adverſaries. Therefore, may it pleaſe the 'ſaid princes, that, as ſoon as we begin to have the 'ſaid goſpel preached in the ſaid duchy of Luxemburg, 'at that very time our alliance and confederacy with 'them may begin (90).' This is Mr le Vaſſor's reflexion: 'It is very likely, that the duke of Orleans did 'not make this ſtep without his father's knowledge. 'He ſpeaks too confidently of Francis the firſt's *good 'zeal*; he too freely offers *all* this king's power; he 'gives too great hopes of what will be done, as ſoon 'as the Proteſtants have admitted him into their 'league. All this ſuppoſes, that the father and ſon 'acted in concert (91).' Thoſe who ſay, that the ducheſs d'Etampes was a Lutheran in her heart, and that ſhe caballed, in favour of the duke of Orleans, againſt the dauphin (92), will not fail to ſay, that, without the king's knowledge, ſhe engaged this young duke to link himſelf with the princes of the league of Smalcalde; and that afterwards ſhe induced him to court the emperor (93), when ſhe ſaw, that fortune was likely to be more favourable that way. Perhaps ſome will think, that the king came clandeſtinely into this plot of his ſon, without any real deſign of favouring the new religion in France, but only to make a better advantage of the aſſiſtance of Germany, by giving theſe Lutheran princes hopes, that he would declare, at a proper time, for the reformation, if he found it his intereſt. I believe, that this diſcovery of Mr le Vaſſor will induce the curious to ſift out the bottom and drift of this negociation, and they will find ſome papers, that will clear this affair.

[Z] *I will make uſe of Mezerai's words.*] 'King 'Francis I, who had a noble paſſion for what was 'great, took great delight in magnificence, believing 'that nothing could better diſplay his grandeur: and, 'as he thought, that the beauty of the ladies would 'heighten the glory of his pomp, and, as he was of 'an amorous diſpoſition, he was the firſt who accuſtomed the fair ſex to frequent the court. It had at 'firſt a very good effect; this lovely ſex having introduced there politeneſs and civility, and inſpiring 'noble ſouls with principles of generoſity. But, when 'impurity crept in, and the example of great men authorized corruption; what was before a fine ſpring 'of honour and virtue, became the ſink of all vices: 'infamy became in credit; proſtitution was the way to 'favour; and none was a favourite, and continued ſo, 'but by theſe baſe means: in a word, offices and employments were at the ſole diſpoſal of women. And 'becauſe, when they are diſorderly, they are more 'eaſily induced to injuſtice, fraud, vengeance, malice, 'and impudence, than men; they were the cauſe, 'that ſeveral very ill maxims were introduced into 'the government, and that the ancient candour of 'the Gauls was baniſhed yet farther than chaſtity. 'This

---

(84) Aſtipulantur F. F. Sammarthani, Tom. I, lib. x, pag. 627. *Id. ibid.*

(85) In the remark [*N*] of the article FRANCIS of Aſſiſi.

(86) Nolle enim ea arcana cuiquam inferiori à Regè patefieri. *Alciat. Epiſt. xxiii, inter Gudianas, pag.* 109.

(87) Ex Alciato, ibid.

(88) Le Vaſſor. Lettres & Memoires de Vargas, pag. 24, edit. 1700.

(89) Ib. pag. 25.

(90) Ibid.

(91) Ib. pag. 29.

(92) See, above, rem. [*H*] of the article *ETAMPES.*

(93) Ibid. *remark* [*F*].

this prince and Lewis XII. It is pity that this dialogue is ſo ſhort; this is perhaps it's only fault. Francis I made a regulation, which deſerves a remark; I mean, that he aboliſhed the cuſtom of drawing up all public acts in Latin [*AA*]. Naudé (*q*) mentions this, and ſeveral other particulars, which concern the learning of this prince, his writings, and love to learned men. The laſt thing I ſhall ſay of him is pretty remarkable: It is pretended (*r*), that Francis de Paula, the day before he died, ſpoke after this manner to Loüiſa of Savoy; *Your ſon ſhall be king of France, and will exceed in glory, riches, and happineſs, all the princes of his age, provided he applies himſelf to the reformation of the church; but, if he doth not mind it, he will be very unhappy.* Obſerve, that Francis de Paula died the ſecond of April 1507; and that Lewis XII, who then ſwayed the ſceptre, lived almoſt eight years after, and that his wife was not barren (*s*).

Here are ſome things which I have collected ſince the ſecond edition. It has been falſely ſaid, that, after he was taken priſoner at the battle of Pavia, he was conveyed to the caſtle of Ambres, near Inſpruc [*BB*]. Among the praiſes beſtowed on him for his encouraging learning, we muſt not forget, that the learned acknowlege themſelves indebted to him for ſome excellent editions [*CC*]. The Paſſage he cauſed to be through a mountain is very ſurprizing [*DD*]. I have ſomething more to ſay concerning the oath, which

‘This corruption began under the reign of Francis I, and was almoſt univerſal under Henry II, and at laſt came to it's height under Charles IX, and Henry III (94).’

[*AA*] *He aboliſhed the cuſtom of drawing up all public acts in Latin.*] Let us make uſe of Varillas's words: ‘Juſtice had, till that time, been adminiſtered in Latin, throughout the French monarchy, or at leaſt in the greateſt part of it; and that tongue had been ſo corrupted, that it was ſcarce known, but by the termination of words; whether it was thro' ignorance, or that the judges endeavoured by that to be better underſtood. This abuſe was not to be born with at the time that they ſo ſucceſsfully ſtrove to reſtore the ancient politeneſs; and ſince the French monarchy had never any dependance on the empire of Rome, it was not fit, that it's moſt authentic acts ſhould be in that tongue. It had been ridiculous to have put them in good Latin, becauſe moſt people would not have underſtood them; and the king was of opinion, that they would be better in good French, than in bad Latin. Thus this order was made in the year 1539; and, of all thoſe of Francis I, none hath been more univerſally and conſtantly obſerved than this (95).’ This hiſtorian had but juſt before obſerved, that chancellor Poyet had procured this reformation, a little before his fall. Germany had reformed this abuſe almoſt three hundred years before. What follows is found in the hiſtorical meditations of Camerarius. ‘The emperor Rodolphus I . . . . moved by the complaints of the German nation, and ſeeing himſelf, as it were, under the yoke of foreign ſecretaries, who underſtood Latin, and whom he was obliged to make uſe of, to the great prejudice of his affairs, becauſe ſuch perſons often betrayed him, held a diet at Nuremberg in the year 1252; wherein it was ordered, with the common conſent of all the ſtates of the empire, that, from thence forward, the German tongue ſhould be uſed in the chanceries, and public contracts. This occaſioned the Germans to improve their language; and it is arrived to ſuch a perfection, that now any hiſtory or ſcience may be elegantly, and clearly expreſſed in it, either in print, or manuſcript (96).’ Obſerve, that it has been ſaid, that the king of France was induced to baniſh the Latin tongue from all public acts of juſtice, becauſe he was told, that the firſt preſident of the parliament of Paris, had uſed a very barbarous term, when he pronounced ſentence. ‘Scripſerat morem Galliæ fuiſſe, leges regni ſemper Latino ſermone ſcribi, donec Franciſcus Rex ejus nominis primus id vetuit anno 1539. Sed debuerat Matharellus cauſam addere: quoniam videlicet Præſes Curiæ Parliamenti in arreſto pronuntiando dixerat, debotamus & debotavimus: quod Gallice jam pronunciatur. *Avons debouté & deboutons* (*we have diſmiſſed, and do diſmiſs*). De quo Rex Franciſcus (ut quidam dicunt) multum reſerat: ut alii, multum iratus fuerat (97).

[*BB*] *It has been falſely ſaid . . . . . that he was conveyed to the caſtle of Ambres near Inſpruc.*] Let us quote the Hiſtorical Mercury of March 1702. ‘By letters from Vienna of the fourth of this month, we are informed, that, by order of the emperor, the marêchal de Villeroi (98) has been carried from Inſpruc to the caſtle of Ambres, at a leagues diſtance, and that he is in the ſame chamber, in which Charles V confined king Francis I, after he had taken him priſoner before Pavia.’ Some of the Dutch Gazettes had already ſaid the ſame thing. I could wiſh, the author of the Mercury had refuted, inſtead of followed, them. It is certain, that Francis I. was not carried into Germany, but into Spain. Bouchet obſerves, that the viceroy of Naples (99) *gave the charge of the perſon of the king of France to the lord Alarcon, governor of Apulia and Calabria, whom he carried to the caſtle of Piſqueton* (100). Paradin, Mezerai, and ſeveral other hiſtorians give the name of Piſqueton to the caſtle, in which this prince was detained, before he was carried into Spain. This caſtle is on the river Adda in the Milaneſe, and is called in Italian Picighitone. See Leander Alberti in his deſcription of Italy (101).

[*CC*] *The learned are indebted to him for ſome excellent editions.*] We need only read theſe words of Peter Victorius (102): ‘Veritas quoque non patitur, ut reticeam egregiam voluntatem atque operam, inferioribus temporibus in hac re poſitam à Franciſco primo Gallorum rege, qui ut erat omnibus in rebus magno animo, ac vere regio præditus, proclivisque in humanum genus juvandum, rectaque ſtudia ſumma ope augenda, curavit, ut quidquid antiquorum ingenii monimentorum reſtaret in afflicta Græcia, ad ſe mitteretur: cui beneficio magno addidit alterum, & ipſum valde utile ad hanc ipſam honeſtam artem ornandam: ſtuduit enim, magnis præmiis propoſitis, ut lepidæ admodum formæ litterarum, & Græcarum, & Latinarum, fingerentur: in quo etiam felix fuit: ita enim pulchræ atque politæ fabricatæ fuere, ut non videantur ab humano ingenio venuſtiores, & exquiſitiores ullo pacto conformari poſſe: librique ipſis excuſi, non invitent tantum, ſed etiam aliquo modo rapiant ad ſe legendos. —— *Truth will not allow me to diſſemble the obligations we are under of late years in this reſpect, to Francis I, king of France, who, as he diſcovered a greatneſs of mind in every thing, and a truly royal diſpoſition, in promoting the good of mankind, and encouraging uſeful learning, to the utmoſt of his power, ſo he took care to have the ancient monuments of wit, remaining in deſolated Greece, tranſmitted to him; to which great piece of ſervice he added another, of great uſe towards the carrying on this deſign; for, by propoſing large rewards, he encouraged the founding of beautiful Greek and Latin Types; in which he met with ſucceſs; for ſuch beautiful and elegant ones were founded, as were not to be ſurpaſſed by the ſkill of man, and the books, which were printed with them, not only invited, but even forced men to read them.*’ To this we may add, what I relate in the article **VERGERIUS** (**ANGELUS**) (103), and this paſſage of the Antiquities of Paris: ‘It appears, that, in the year 1541, Angelus Vergerius, Greek ſecretary to the king, had a penſion of 450 French livres, charged on the Exchequer (104).’

[*DD*] *The paſſage he cauſed to be made through a mountain is very ſurprizing.*] Mr Leger affirms (105), that

---

(*q*) Naudé, Add. à l'Hiſtoire de Loüis XI, pag. 369.

(*r*) *See* Richer. Hiſtor. Concil. lib. iv, pag. 101.

(*s*) See the article FERRARA, rem. [*A*].

(94) Mezerai, Hiſt. of France, *under Henry III.* Tom. III, pag. 446, 447.

(95) Varillas, Hiſt. de François I, livr ix, pag. m. 381.

(96) Camerarius's Hiſtorical Meditations, Vol. III, lib. iv, cap. v, pag. 271, 272, *of Simon Goulart's Tranſlation.*

(97) Matagonis de Matagonibus adverſus Italogalliam Antonii Matharelli, pag. m. 226.

(98) He was taken priſoner in Cremona, the firſt of Febr. 1702.

(99) It was Charles de Lanoi.

(100) Bouchet, Annal. d'Aquitaine, fol. m. 217.

(101) Folio 407, verſo, Edit. Venice, 1561.

(102) P. Victor. Præfat. Comment. in VIII Libros Ariſtot. de optimo Statu Civitatis.

(103) Citat. (*b*).

(104) Jacq. du Breui, Antiq. de Paris, pag. m. 568.

(105) Jo. Leger, Hiſt. des Egliſes Vaudoiſes, Part. I, pag. 2.

which certain ſatirical writers pretend he made to the Turk [*EE*], and which I have ſet down in the very terms (*t*).

that *Mount Viſol which is eſteemed the higheſt in all Europe*, and where the Po riſes, *is a mountain, of which hiſtory informs us . . . . that Francis I. cauſed it to be dug quite through to open a paſſage into Italy.* But (adds this author) ‘ ſince the French have found ‘ the ſecret of opening the paſſage of Mount Genevre, ‘ which is much ſhorter and more convenient, they ‘ make no farther uſe of this hole; which yet ſubſiſts, being cut thro’ a rock, and requiring two ‘ hours to paſs it, which may be done with loaded ‘ mules; and the only inconvenience attending it is, that ‘ it is ſo dark, travellers are obliged to carry torches.’ This author not having given us the date of this ſurpriſing piece of work, nor told us where he met with the relation. I have made inquiries which induce me to believe, that the expedition of Francis I into Italy, in the year 1515, is the epocha of this. I thought, that Martin du Bellai had very fully deſcribed the difficulties to be ſurmounted in paſſing the Alps; but I found, that he ſpeaks of it very ſuccinctly (106), and without giving any idea of the prodigious labour in accompliſhing it. I conſulted Guicciardin (107), who gave me more ſatisfaction. Mr Varillas gave me no leſs: theſe are his words (108): ‘ Lautrec and Navarre, with the choice men ‘ of the French army, left Geneva (109) on the left ‘ hand, forded the river Durence, and entered the ‘ Argentaires (110), by a place called Gilleſtre: ‘ from thence they penetrated as far as the rock ‘ St Paul, which they were forced to open with iron ‘ tools and fire. The two following days, the pioneers were for the moſt part uſeleſs; for, as each ‘ mountain was ſeparated from the reſt by abyſſes, ‘ the mine and ſap were of no uſe, and they had recourſe to bridges of communication, to tranſport ‘ the artillery. The ſoldiers and pioneers dragged it ‘ along in places inacceſſible to beaſts of burthen; ‘ they filled with faſcines places, which would admit ‘ of it, and if they were too large, the void ſpace ‘ was ſupplied with props and great trees. After this ‘ manner, they reached mount Pied-de-Porc; which ‘ they deſpaired of penetrating, becauſe it conſiſted ‘ of but one ſolid rock, ſteep on all ſides: but Navarre, who examined it thoroughly, diſcovered one ‘ vein more ſoft than the reſt, and followed it ſo ‘ exactly, that he made himſelf a way through the ‘ middle. Thus, by the induſtry of engineers, by ‘ the labour of the ſoldiers, and by the perſeverance ‘ of their leaders, the French army arrived, about ‘ the evening of the eighth day, in the marquiſate ‘ of Saluces *.’ But, good as this deſcription is, it will be found cold and inſipid, when compared with that of Paul Jovius (111). There is an obſervable difference between him and Varillas. This latter takes no notice of Trivulcio, to whom Paul Jovius gives the honour of diſcovering this new paſſage, and being the principal director of the execution.

[*EE*] *I have ſomething more to ſay concerning the pretended oath . . . . . he took to the Turk.*] We have ſeen (112) what John le Maire de Belges reproached the Venetians with. I add, that the Saracens, who had the king St Lewis in their power, propoſed to him the form of an oath, much ſhorter than that which the baſtard of Cyprus is ſuppoſed to have made no ſcruple of taking, and which is the ſame Francis I is ſuppoſed to have taken. It is plain, that the one was copied from the other; but St Lewis would not ſubmit to this hard condition.

(*t*) See remark [*I*].

(106) Martin du Bellai, Memoir. livr. i, ad ann. 1515, pag. m. 28.

(107) Guicc. livr. xii, fol. m. 356.

(108) Varill. Hiſt. de François I, livr. i, pag. 43. *Edit. of the Hague*, 1690.

(109) It ſhould Mount Genevre.

(110) It ſhould be *(Le col de l'Argentire) The defile of Argentiere.*

* In the relation of the paſſage ſent to the king's mother by the count de Morette.

(111) Jovius, Hiſt. ſui Temp. lib. xv, fol. m. 301, *&c.*

(112) In remark [*I*].

FRANCISCA, a devout lady canonized in the year 1608, was born at Rome, about the year 1384. She ſhewed from her infancy, that her heart was turned towards heaven, for ſhe loved prayers and ſolitary places, and had an averſion for the pleaſures and diverſions of that age. At eleven years of age, ſhe reſolved to become a Nun; but her father would not agree to it; on the contrary, he married her to a rich Gentleman (*a*). Her ſolitary and devout temper did not alter with her condition; for ſhe was alone, and prayed as often as the buſineſs of her family gave her time. She frequented neither public ſhews, nor banquets, nor weddings; nay, ſhe did not viſit her relations; but all her delight was to go to the churches and hoſpitals. She perſuaded a great many maids to forſake the world, and founded for them a convent in Rome, according to the rule of St Benedict. They were called Oblates, and were of the congregation of the Olivetans. Having loſt her huſband, ſhe very humbly petitioned to be admitted into that ſociety, where ſhe profeſſed herſelf a Nun, and was wonderfully punctual in the performance of all her duties. She died the ninth of May 1440. She wrought a great many miracles during her life, and ſoon after her death; ſo that, ſome months after her deceaſe, the preliminaries of her canonization were begun (*b*). This buſineſs was re-aſſumed ſeveral times, at the earneſt requeſt of the citizens of Rome, but it was not ended before the pontificate of Pope Paul V in the Year 1608 [*A*]. I have found, in a book of Nicolas Vignier, a very ſtrange ſtory [*B*], and of which I have in vain ſought the original.

I have

(*a*) Called Laurence Pontiani.

(*b*) Taken from the bull of her canonization, inſerted by Bzovius in the 16th Vol. of the *Eccleſiaſtical Annals, pag.* 730, *& ſeq. ad ann.* 1440.

[*A*] *This buſineſs was re-aſſumed at ſeveral times. . . . . but it was not ended before . . . . . . the year* 1608.] The proceedings were begun under Pope Eugenius IV, in the 1440. A biſhop and a prior of the Carthuſians were appointed commiſſioners, to examine the witneſſes of the life and miracles of Franciſca. After two years and ſome months, this buſineſs was put into the hands of cardinal Alberti; thirty witneſſes were heard upon eighty articles. Nicolas V, ſucceſſor to Eugenius IV, ordered theſe informations to be renewed by two biſhops, who judicially received the depoſitions of 132 witneſſes. There the buſineſs ſtood, till the pontificate of Clement VIII; in the mean while the devotion for the deceaſed did not cool, and the day of her death was kept at Rome. Clement VIII, at the ſollicitation of the inhabitants of Rome, ordered, that this affair ſhould be expedited out of hand. He named commiſſioners, who examined the former proceedings from the beginning, and made ſome new informations to the year 1604. The Pope, dying in the mean time, could not ſatisfy the deſires of the Roman people. Paul V, his ſucceſſor, being urged to make an end of it, ordered, that it ſhould be diſpatched; and, at laſt, after the formalities required in the like caſe, he canonized our Franciſca, the twenty ninth of May 1608, and appointed the ninth of March for her feſtival (1). The people of Rome took upon them the expence of this great ceremony, and laid out upon it above a hundred thouſand crowns (2).

[*B*] *We find in a book of Nicolas Vignier, a very ſtrange ſtory.* Theſe are his words; for I make no alteration in them, nor indeed ought I to do it (3). *A Roman matron, called Franciſca, was ranked among the ſaints by the Pope, becauſe ſhe was wont to curb her carnal affections, by diſtilling burning Bacon upon her* Pudenda. *Volaterranus.* You ſee he quotes Volaterran after a very indeterminate manner, without mentioning either the title, or number of the book, or chapter, or ſection. This is uſual enough with him; but I think he ſhould not have done it here, conſidering the oddneſs of the thing, and that he ſhould have made the verification of that paſſage as

eaſy

(1) Taken from the bull of her canonization, inſerted by Bzovius, in the 16th Vol. of the *Eccleſiaſtical Annals, pag.* 730, *& ſeq.*

(2) Continuat. Hiſtor. Thuani, lib. i, pag. 30, ad ann. 1608, in fine.

(3) Nicolas Vignier, Recueil de l'Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe, pag. 626, ad ann. 1505.

I have at length found in Volaterran the words, which gave Vignier room to mention this ſtrange fact. The public has been informed of it, and may be ſenſible, that this ſcarce excuſes that writer [C].

eaſy as poſſible. I have ſearched in Volaterran (4). Wherever the table of matters, which is not good, and the diſtribution of the ſubjects might ſerve me as guide; but I have not been able to meet with it. A learned man had already informed me, that he had met with no ſuch thing in the volume of Volaterran. This is not the only thing I have to ſay againſt Vignier. I cannot comprehend, why he mentions this Roman matron under the year 1505. It is not the time when ſhe lived, nor that of her death, nor that of her canonization. Bzovius, under the year 1505, ſpeaks of two perſons of the fair ſex, who died in the odour of ſanctity, the one at Bourges, the other at Ravenna; but they were not the ſame with our Franciſca: the one was Joan of France, foundreſs of the religious of the Annunciade; the other was called Margaret. Laſtly, I obſerve that I can never be perſuaded, unleſs I ſee the expreſs words of Volaterran, that the quotation of Vignier is faithful. It is contrary to all probability, that Volaterran ſhould ſay, that Franciſca was canonized in the year 1505; for it was not till 1608; and it is yet leſs probable, that he ſhould affirm, that her canonization was founded only on the reaſon aſſigned by Vignier. He was too well acquainted with the ſtyle of the court of Rome, to advance a thing ſo diſtant as this is from the practice of canonizations. They are never grounded meerly on the virtues of the perſons, tho' never ſo eminent: miracles true or falſe muſt come in; I mean, witneſſes muſt be examined, which depoſe, that the interceſſion, relics, &c. of the perſon to be canonized, have done miraculous cures, &c. I would not alledge againſt Vignier the ſilence of the bull of Paul V; for I very well conceive, that, although it had been proved, that Franciſca, made uſe of that ſevere mortification, yet it would not have been expreſsly inſerted in the canonizing bull. I own, that ſome particular acts of auſterity, leſs ſurprizing than this, have been inſerted in it; but they had no relation to obſcene images which are not to be inſerted in a bull. 'Nec minori virtute in Chriſto JESU, *(theſe are Paul the fifth's own words,)* cum hoſte domeſtico pugnavit, ſed exemplo electorum Dei, admirabilem in modum caſtigavit corpus ſuum, & in ſervitutem redegit. Cibum illi ſemel in die herbæ, & legumina, aqua potum præbuerunt, ſive vigilaret, ſive dormiret, aſperum lancum induſium non exuebat, duroque cilicio, ac ferreo cingulo ſuper nudum membra mortificabat; accedebant flagella ferreis aculeis aſpera, quibus corpuſculum, quamquam aliunde attritum ſeveriſſime atterebat (5).' Theſe Latin words ſay, that ſhe eat nothing but greens and pulſe, and drank nothing but water; that, day and night, ſhe wore a woollen ſhift, a hair cloth, and an iron girdle next to her ſkin; and that ſhe unmercifully whipped herſelf. Whoever doth this, hath no need of the lard mentioned by Vignier, eſpecially when, after the example of Franciſca, a woman avoids the company of worldly perſons, their viſits, weddings, banquets their profane diverſions, &c. Let us add that ſhe became a widow but a few years before her death (6), and ſhe died in the fifty ſixth year of her life. Theſe are ſufficient reaſons why this ſaint ſtood in no need of this violent cure of immodeſty.

After all, had our Francis made uſe of ſuch a violent remedy, ſhe would deſerve, not only the praiſes but alſo the admiration of all good people. She would have ſhewed a love for chaſtity incomparably ſtronger and livelier, than if ſhe had followed the example of St Aldhelme (7), and ſuch other raſh votaries, who excited concupiſcence, in order to have greater merit in curbing it. A bad victory, not only dangerous, but alſo not to be gained, but at the peril of the virtue, for which they contended. The thought alone, the imagination, a burning got the better of, are a ſtate of impurity, and an object which muſt be diſpleaſing in the ſight of the lawgiver and his holy angels. St Paul's words (8), which, according to moſt tranſlations, ſignify, that the widow, that *lives in pleaſure, is dead while ſhe liveth*, ought to be otherwiſe explained, if we believe Melanchthon. The apoſtle doth not mean, according to him, that a widow, who loveth junketing, gaming, going abroad, ſuch worldly pleaſures, hath loſt the HOLY GHOST, and the life of grace; but he means, that this ſpiritual death belongs to thoſe widows, who are expoſed to the burnings of the fleſh; and he doth not underſtand a temptation, which ſatisfies their criminal deſires, but a temptation, which hinders the ſoul from thinking on heavenly things, and makes it dwell on laſcivious thoughts. Theſe are Melanchthon's words: 'Accuſat Paulus illas mulieres non levibus verbis: Pruriens viva mortua eſt. Nam vocabulum σπαταλῶσα propriè ſignificat prurientem; quod plus eſt quàm appetere delitias ciborum, ſed eſt habere incendia libidinum, σπάτος cutem ſignificat, σπατίζειν, σπάτος τίλλειν, vellicare cutem, ſeu titillare, σπατάλη pruritus ſeu titillatio cutis. Deinde καταςρηνιᾶν, ſignificat turgere ſeu diſtendi ſaginatum & tumefactum eſſe contra Chriſtum. His inſignibus verbis multi turpes motus pugnantes cum Caſtitate ſignificantur. Hac ſalacitate dicit veram fidem expulſo Spiritu ſancto extingui. Hæc eſt nativa ſignificatio verborum Pauli (9).' What is it to reſiſt theſe temptations? it is to wiſh to have no lewd deſires or motions: but ſtill you have them. The ſafeſt way, then, is to put one's ſelf in a ſtate of never having theſe deſires. And this our Franciſca did, if Vignier's ſtory be true (10).

[C] *I have found in Volaterran, the words which gave Vignier room to mention this ſtrange fact . . . this ſcarce excuſes that writer.*] The public has ſeen, in a letter, which I wrote the ſixth of May 1702, this whole affair cleared up. *Obſerve, I beſeech you, Sir,* theſe are the words of my letter (11), *that I have not accuſed Vignier of citing Volaterran falſely; I have only ſaid, that, having* ſearched in Volaterran, wherever the table of matters, which is not good, and the diſtribution of the ſubjects, might ſerve me as a guide, *I could not meet with this paſſage. You your ſelf acknowledge, that you have in vain turned over this author's bulky volume; but you add, that you cannot forbear thinking, that Vignier had read in it what he mentions. You are in the right, generally ſpeaking, and I am well pleaſed, both for your ſatisfaction, and that of my readers, to inform the public here, that, in ſearching, two days ago, for ſomethiug elſe, in Volaterran, I light upon this. It is to be found in the twenty ſecond book, at page* 810 *of the edition of Francfort,* 1603, *at the place, where he mentions Pope Urban V. There we meet with theſe words:* Quam (*Catharinam Virginem filiam Brigidæ*) Julius jamjam in Catalogum referre una cum Franciſca Romana Matrona ſtatuit, quæ & ipſa ſub Eugenio claruit prodigiis & ſanctitate: voluptatem inviti coitus ardente ſupra vulvam larido reprimebat. *I have ſet down, in my dictionary* (12), *Vignier's tranſlation of this paſſage. Examine carefully my criticiſm, and you will find it juſt: for it is true, that Volaterran obſerves, that Julius II deſigned to canonize this lady, but not that he did canonize her,* &c.

(4) That is, in the work, intituled, *Commentariorum Urbanorum libri octo & triginta.* I have at laſt found the paſſage. See the remark [C].

(5) Literæ decretales Canonizationis S. Franciſcæ, apud Bzovium, ubi ſupra, pag. 732.

(6) Defuncto marito, paucis annis ante ſuam dormitionem. *Ibid. pag.* 731.

(7) See the article of FRANCIS of Aſſiſi, remarks [*G*] and [*D*]. See alſo the article *FONTEVRAUD*, remarks [*M*] and [*N*].

(8) Ἡ δὲ σπαταλῶσα ζῶσα τέθνηκε. Nam quæ in deliciiis eſt, vivens mortua eſt. *Epiſt. ad Timoth. I, cap. v, ver.* 8.

(9) Melanchth. Reſponſ. ad impios Articulos Bavaricæ Inquiſitionis, Art. xxvi. fol. m. H. 2.

(10) Confer quæ ſupra, *rem.* [*A*] *of the article CORONEL* (ALPHONSUS).

(11) Journal de Trevoux. May 1702. Amſterdam Edit. pag. 380, 381.

(12) Above, citat. (3).

FRANCUS (SEBASTIAN), an Anabaptiſt of the XVIth century, who publiſhed ſeveral books full of errors, which the Lutherans confuted. He was a true fanatic. He taught, that all ſins are equal, and undermined the authority of ſcripture; for he maintained, that men were to ſeek for the ſuggeſtions of the Holy-Ghoſt, without minding the words revealed. He alſo believed, that the true church was an aggregate of ſeveral ſects, wherein the Papiſts were no leſs comprehended than the Proteſtants. The divines of the confeſſion of Auſburg, aſſembled at Smalcalde in the year 1540, deſired Melanchthon to refute this man's conceits, and thoſe of ſome other fanatics

natics (*a*). The ſame Francus publiſhed a very ſatirical book againſt women, which was refuted by John Freder, and by Luther [*A*].

Let us add, that he drew very ſtrange conſequences from an axiom of Servetus concerning the preſence of God; for he pretended, that not only beaſts, but the inanimate creation likewiſe partook of a general ſoul, that was divine. The ſieur de Saint Aldegonde, who informs me of this, wiſhed that ſome one would examine to the bottom the principle, whence theſe conſequences were drawn [*B*]. Obſerve, that he ſays, Francus was a German; but others make him of Woerden, a town of Holland (*b*); they ſirname him Werdenſis in the abridgment of Geſner's Bibliotheque (*c*), and give the titles of ſeveral of his works, among which we muſt not forget a German chronicle, in which he intermixes many wonderful things (*d*). Some, writing even in Latin, call him Franc. Mr Moreri has mentioned him under this name: He ſays ſcarce any thing of him, though Spondanus, whom he cites, might have furniſhed him with ſome particulars, and among others this, that Francus was expelled from Straſburg, that his chronicle was there condemned, and that he is the firſt, who aſſerted, that Anabaptiſm was divided into more than forty four ſects (*e*).

[*A*] *He publiſhed a very ſatirical book againſt women, which was refuted by John Freder and Luther.*] John Freder wrote a dialogue concerning marriage, in anſwer to this ſatire of Francus, and dedicated it to Dorothy queen of Denmark (1), upon whom he beſtowed a very noble encomium. Luther prefixed a preface before this work, and exclaimed bitterly againſt Francus: he ſaid, among other things, that he was a ſlanderer, who raked together all the filth of mankind, and impudently publiſhed it. He compared him to flies, *&c.* But it is better to ſet down the author's own words, whence I have all this: ‘ Oppoſitus ille *(Dialogus de conjugio)* eſt maledicentiæ *Sebaſtiana Franci* .... qua fœmininum ſexum edito libello proterve inſectatus eſt..... Lutherus in præfatione fatetur, ſe Francum hominem peſſimum reſponſo indignum judicaſſe, certum, quod ſcripta ejus lucem haud diu ſint latura, cum non niſi ſatiris & convitiis indulgeat, & aliorum detegat & exagitet vitia, illitaſque turpitudinum illarum inverecunda relatione chartas mundo obtrudat; Comparat eum cum muſcis & veſpis, quæ fœdiſſima quæque pervolitantes & perrepentes, poſtea inquinatæ & fœtentes, naſo, oculis, genis & labiis hominum impudenter inſidere velint. Taxari quidem mereto vitia etiam a piis doctoribus, ſed non cum petulantia aut inſultatione, aut quod delectentur in eorum enarratione, ſed ut odium flagitiorum excitent, & viam ad emendationem oſtendant (2). —— *The dialogue concerning marriage is oppoſed to the calumny of Sebaſtian Francus ..... who libelled the female ſex in a book that he publiſhed .... Luther, in the preface, confeſſes, that he had thought Francus, the worſt of men, unworthy of a reply, being well aſſured, that his writings were ſhort-lived, ſince he indulges himſelf in nothing but ſatire and calumny, and detects and cenſures the vices of others, and obtrudes his books on the world, ſtuffed with immodeſt accounts of filthy actions. He compares him to flies and waſps, which flying and creeping thro' the naſtieſt things, afterward, defiled and ſtinking as they are, impudently endeavour to ſit on the noſe, cheeks, and lips of men. Vice is deſervedly cenſured by the moſt pious teachers, but not with petulancy and inſult, or to ſhew that they are delighted with the narrative, but to raiſe an hatred to vice, and to print out the path of amendment.*’

[*B*] *St Aldegonde .... wiſhed that ſome one would examine to the bottom the principle, whence theſe conſequences are drawn.*] Read a letter, which he wrote to Theodore Beza in the year 1566, where you will find theſe words: ‘ Sebaſtianus Francus homo Germanus qui mirifica hujuſmodi portenta congeſſit in ſuas farragines, ac in primis in eum, quem Paradoxa inſcripſit, librum, Axioma illud Serveti de Dei reali vel eſſentiali in omnibus & rebus & locis præſentia ita urget, ut ex eo colligat non modo brutas pecudes, ſed ipſa etiam corpora inanima, tamen anima quadam communi atque divina vel cœleſti vegetari, quæ niſi fallor à Virgilio mundi ſpiritus, ab hoc verbum internum, ſermo, ſpiritus, lux, potentia, vis, ac denique Filius ipſe Dei nominatur. Eam cùm hominum omnium animus communi quadam vi fovere, tum præſertim in piis viris facultatem quandam præcipuam ac ſingularem exerere. Eòque rectè illos vel Deos vel certè deificatos appellari. Quo ſenſu vult Chriſtum ipſum dici Filium Dei, cui Socratem ac Mercurium Triſmegiſtum, alioſque hujus farinæ nonnullos, tanquam æquales ac ſocios adjungit. Ejus infinitas blaſphemias ſtatuerunt quidam refutare, ſed hoc unum eos remoratur, quod haud ſatis illis conſtare poſſit quid de primo illo axiomate Servetico ex quo cætera omnia manant, ſit judicandum. Mihi certè haud dubium ſit, quin ex eo multa non modo falſa, ſed prorſus etiam impia conſequantur. Tamen neque Joannes Calvinus neque ex veteribus (quod quidem ſciam) quiſpiam argumenta ad illius ipſius refutationem ſuppeditat. Quinimò verò veteres illi Theologi videntur mihi præſentiam illam realem Divinæ eſſentiæ in immenſum plerunque extendiſſe (3). —— *Sabaſtian Francus, a German, who heaped together in his miſcellaneous collections wonderful portents of this kind particularly in that book, which he entituled* Paradoxes; *wherein he urges that axiom of Servetus, concerning the real or eſſential preſence of* GOD *in all things and places, in ſuch a manner, as to gather from it, that not only brute beaſts, but even inanimate bodies, are vegetated by a certain common and divine or celeſtial ſoul; which, if I miſtake not is called, by Virgil, the ſpirit of the world, by him the internal word, the ſpeech, breath, light, power, force, and, laſtly, the ſon of* GOD *himſelf. He aſſerts, that this ſoul not only cheriſhes the minds of all men by a certain common energy, but exerts a particular force in good men: and that therefore they are rightly ſtyled* Gods, *or deified men: In which ſenſe he pretends, that Chriſt himſelf is called the ſon of* GOD, *with whom he joins, as equals and companions, Socrates, Mercurius Triſmegiſtus, and others of that ſtamp. Some perſons have reſolved to refute his many blaſphemies; but this one thing has hitherto ſtopped them, that they know not what to think of that firſt axiom of Servetus, from whence all the reſt flow. For my own part, I am convinced, that it is attended with many, not only falſe, but even impious conſequences. However, neither Calvin, nor any of the old writers (as far as I know) furniſh us with arguments for the confutation it. Nay, thoſe old divines ſeem to me for the moſt part, to have immenſely extended that real preſence of the divine eſſence.*’ I omit what he ſays afterwards, and which ſhews, that the received opinion of the immenſity of God puzzled him, and ſeemed to him productive of many vain and empty notions. I paſs by likewiſe Beza's anſwers to him (4); but I will obſerve, by the by, that the opinions of the divines, which import, that the eſſence and ſubſtance of God is extended thro' all bodies, is liable to a thouſand difficulties. The Carteſians ſhew this very plainly. See what Mr Wittichius (5) obſerves againſt Suarez, who has endeavoured to explain how God may be preſent in imaginary ſpace. Mr Arnauld cenſured alſo a miniſter, who had made uſe of the received opinion, to prove, by an argument, *ad hominem*, that one might worſhip marble (6). The miniſter in his reply, ſaid ſeveral things, and among others this (7); that the divinity of Vaſques, according to which *all inanimate and irrational things may be worſhipped, becauſe* GOD *is in all creatures by his eſſence, and*

ſuſtains

(*a*) Taken from Seckendorf, *Lutheran. Hiſt. lib. iii, pag.* 268, 269.

(*b*) Crenius, Animadv. Part. II, pag. 92.

(*c*) Pag. m. 746.

(*d*) Quia homo fuit deditus Swenckfeldii, phantaſiis, ideo mira ſubinde admiſcet. *Keckerm de Hiſt. pag.* 209.

(*e*) Spondan. Annal. ad ann. 1529, n. 9.

(1) King Chriſtiern the third's queen.

(2) Seckendorf. Hiſt. Lutheran. lib. ii, pag. 593, col. 1. ad ann. 1545.

(3) Epiſt. vi, Theod. Bezæ, Tom. III. Oper. pag. 206, 207.

(4) Ibid. Epiſt. vii, pag. 208, 209.

(5) Wittich. in Conſenſu Verit. pag. 86, &c. Edit. 1682.

(6) Arnauld, Reflexions ſur le Preſervatif, pag. 69, &c.

(7) The Janſeniſt convicted of vain ſophiſtry, pag. 194.

ſuſtains them, is ſhocking, but that *it is by no means irrational, nor ill connected with his principles* . . . . that ‘Vaſques* reaſons divinely on the ſubject of man according to the tenets of his church, in order to prove, that man, who is the lively image of the divinity, may be worſhiped with the act of adoration, by which we worſhip God (8).’ We ought not to wonder after this, that the Sieur St Aldegonde (9) feared the ill conſequences of the doctrine of Servetus, adopted by Sebaſtian Francus.

FRANGIPANI, a very antient Roman family, related to the beſt families of Europe [*A*], owes it's name to ſome extraordinary acts of charity to the poor in a famine [*B*]. It is long ago, ſince a branch of this illuſtrious family ſettled glorioūſly in Hungary [*C*]. Mutio **FRANGIPANI** ſerved in France, in the Pope's troops in the

[*A*] *A Roman family ... related to the beſt families of Europe.*] Mr le Laboureur (1) ſays, that the marquis Frangipani, whom he had ſeen at Rome, *reckoned, among the younger brothers of his family, the arch-dukes of Auſtria, and the kings of Spain, grounded on the opinion of Raphael Volterranus, which opinion he would have been ſorry to have been undeceived in; and that he was perpetually troubleſome to the new princes of Rome, by pretending to be of ſo ancient a family, that none could preſume to compare with his.* This author, having deſcribed the equipage of the ſame marquis in a great ceremony (2), adds (3), that *it gave him notions quite contrary to the eſteem, which is due to the firſt and moſt ancient name of Rome, and to the moſt illuſtrious family of Dalmatia and Frioul, ſince about the year* 1120, *when one of that houſe married the daughter of Engilbert marquis of Frioul, ſiſter to Mahaut, wife to Thibaut IV, earl of Champagne and Brie, aunt to Alice of Champagne, wife to Lewis the younger, and mother to Philip Auguſtus king of France. Zazzera, who hath written an hiſtory of ſeveral families of Italy, and who knew nothing of this alliance, adds another, which he proves, namely, with a niece of the emperor of Conſtantinople, who, in the year* 1170, *was ſent in great pomp, attended by ſeveral biſhops and great lords of Greece, to marry Eudo Frangipani. It appears by the hiſtory of this illuſtrious family, written by him, that it was the moſt powerful in Rome, and that they have ſeen there the riſe of the grandeur of all the others, whom the abuſes of the times engaged to take upon them the quality of princes.* We ſhall ſee below (4), that the Frangipani pretend to be related to St Gregory.

[*B*] . . . . *Owes it's name to ſome extraordinary acts of charity to the poor in a famine.*] ‘Frangipani in Italy, bears azure, two hands argent, holding a loaf, or, cut into halves; becauſe one of his predeceſſors, in a time of dearth, relieved a vaſt number of indigent perſons.’ Thus father Gilbert de Varenne ſpeaks in his *Theatre of Arms*, and atchievements (5). They were at firſt called Fricapani, as it appears by theſe words of Geoffry of Vendoſme: ‘Primo anno, quo, deo volente vel permittente, nomen abbatis ſuſcepi, audivi piæ recordationis Dominum Papam Urbanum in domo Joannis *Fricapanem* latitare (6). ——— *The firſt year, in which, by the will or permiſſion of* GOD, *I took upon me the name of abbot, I heard, that Pope Urban of pious memory lay concealed in the houſe of John Fricapani.*’ See father Sirmond's note on this place (7). The name of Frangipani was already in vogue in the XIIth century; for theſe words are found in the chronicle of the monaſtery of Anchin (8): ‘Schiſmatici quietem non ferentes eccleſiæ, iterum quemdam Clericum de progenie illorum quos Frangipanes Romani vocant contra Papam Alexandrum, Antipapam ſtatuunt, quem mutato nomine, Innocentem III vocitarunt. —— *The ſchiſmatics, not enduring the repoſe of the church, again ſet up, againſt Pope Alexander, an Anti-Pope, a certain eccleſiaſtic, of the race of thoſe, whom the people of Rome call Frangipani.*’ Conrad, abbot of Urſperg, makes uſe of the word *Frangentes panem*. He ſpeaks thus: ‘Imperator convocavit ad ſe de civibus Romanis potentiſſimos & nobiliſſimos de familia eorum qui dicuntur *Frangentes panem*, & aliis ad quos præcipue habebat reſpectum populus Romanus (9). —— *The emperor ſent for the moſt powerful and noble of the Roman citizens, of the family of the* Frangentes panem, *and of thoſe, to whom the people of Rome paid a particular regard*’

[C] *It is long ago, ſince a branch of this family ſettled glorioūſly in Hungary.*] Scioppius produces an act, or deed, dated in the year 1260, whereby Bela, king of Hungary, acknowledges, that, when his country was laid waſte by the Tartars, he was aſſiſted and comforted by Frederic and Bartholomew Frangipani, who, with their relations, went into his ſervice, and aſſiſted him with a large ſum of money. And, for an acknowledgment, he tranſferred to them the poſſeſſion of a maritime town, with all the rights and lands that belonged to him. See page 215 of the book intituled, *Oporini Grubinii Amphotides Scioppianæ*. Scioppius affirms (10), that this act was communicated to him by George Antigonus Frangipani, gentleman of the bed-chamber, and great maſter of the horſe to the arch-duke Maximilian Erneſtus. Let us quote ſomething of it (11): ‘Deus totius conſolationis, qui conſolatur ſuos in omni tribulatione, etiam nobis fontem aperire dignatus eſt, & ad conſolandum nos Feldericum & Bartolomæum illuſtres & ſtrenuos viros de Frangipanibus, nobiles de Weglia quaſi de cœlo projecit, qui nobis cum omni parentela adhærentes inter actus promiſcuos, fideles exhibuerunt famulatus & non modicam pecuniam eorum, quæ ultra XX. marcarum millia tranſcendunt, in vaſis aureis & argenteis atque aliis rebus pretioſis nobis de bonis eorum præſentaverunt, & præſentando donaverunt. Demum nos, cum à nobis Deus ſuam indignationem amoverit, recompenſantes eorum ſervitia & dona, de conſilio dominæ Mariæ, chariſſimæ conſortis noſtræ, & Baronum noſtrorum fidelium, quandam civitatem noſtram, circa littus maris exiſtentem, Segniam vocatam, cum omnibus ſuis utilitatibus & pertinentiis univerſis, ſimul cum tributo ſeu Telonio, & aliis circumferentiis, & in eadem libertate, ſicut nobis ſervire conſueverant, dedimus & donavimus, & contulimus ipſis Felderico & Bartolomæo in filios filiorum perpetuo & irrevocabiliter poſſidendum. —— *The* GOD *of all conſolation, who comforts his people in every diſtreſs, has vouchſafed to open a fountain even to us, and has ſent, as it were from heaven, to comfort us, Felderic and Bartholomew, illuſtrious and brave men, of the family of the Frangipani; nobles of Weglia, who, adhering to us with all kind of fatherly affection, have ſerved us faithfully, and given us no ſmall ſhare of their wealth, amounting to above* 20,000 *marks, in gold and ſilver veſſels, and other valuable things. In recompence for which ſervices and preſents, we, being reſtored to the favour of heaven, do, by the advice of our deareſt conſort Mary, and our faithful barons, give and beſtow, and have given and beſtowed, on Felderic and Bartholomew, and their heirs for ever, the poſſeſſion of one of our maritime towns, named* SEGNIA, *with all it's profits and appurtenances, together with the tribute or toll, as hitherto paid to us.*’ This prince, by another deed, granted them ſeveral privileges and immunities, and gave ſome reaſons for it, that are very honourable; which obliges me to quote his words. They are ſo many hiſtorical facts, fit to be inſerted in this place: ‘Deus ad refulciendum & corroborandum nos, Feldericum & Bartholomæum de Frangipanibus, illuſtres & ſtrenuos viros, nobiles de Weglia alta ex proſapia urbis Romanæ ſenatorum ortos, tanquam angelos protectionis de arce polorum miſit, qui nobis cum eorum parentela & familiarium caterva armigera in opem & noſtræ perſonæ ſaluberrimam tutelam adhærendo, per eorum ſtrenua certamina, quoſdam ductores ipſorum Tartarorum, ſequaceſque eorum diræ necis exterminio necari, & quoſdam captos nobis offerre, ubi etiam crebra ſtigmata & gravia ſuſtulere & multos ex eorum charis proximos & familiares amittere, ſupraque omnibus prænarratis copioſam pecuniarum ipſorum in auro etiam & argento ac rebus pretioſis quantitatem ad XX. millia marcarum ſe extendentem nobis pro aſſumendis ſtipendiariis & expeditionibus variis offerre maluerunt, &c (12). —— *GOD, in order to reſtore and ſtrengthen us, ſent from heaven, as guardian angels, Felderic and Bartholomew Frangipani, illuſtrious and brave men, nobles of Weglia,* in the reign of Charles IX [*D*]. One of his grand-children had ſome employments in the ſame kingdom in Lewis XIIIth's time (*a*). One of his jeſts was made uſe of, and, he who uſed it, was ſeverely cenſured for it [*E*]. This grand-child of Mutio Frangipani invented *the compoſition for perfume and ſcents, which yet retain the name of Frangipane* (*b*) [*F*]. *He thought it an honour to be the laſt of that illuſtrious name, and did not ſtick to ſay, that he kept himſelf ſingle out of neceſſity, becauſe his quality did not allow him to mix his blood with upſtarts, wherewith the ancient majeſty of Rome had been diſhonoured* (*c*). The equipage, wherein he appeared at Rome in a ſolemn cavalcade, was remarkable [*G*].

---

* In iii Thom. Diſp. cx, Quæſt. xxv, cap. iii.

(8) Janſeniſt convicted, &c. pag. 195.

(9) Epiſt vi, Theod. Bezæ, pag. 207.

(1) Additions to the Memoires of Caſtelnau, Tom. II, pag. 704.

(2) See the remark [*G*].

(3) Ibid. pag. 705.

(4) In remark [*F*].

(5) Apud Menagium, Origini della Lingua Italiana, pag. 231.

(6) Godefrid. Vindocinenſis, lib. i, epiſt. viii, apud Menagium *ibid.*

(7) Vetuſtiſſimæ ac nobiliſſimæ apud Romanos familiæ nomen nunc paululum inflexum; *Frangipanes* enim dicuntur. *Sirmondus, Not. in epiſt. viii, lib. i. Godefr. Vindoc.* *apud Menag. ibid.*

(8) Ad. ann. 1179, apud Menag. *Ibid.*

(9) Conrad. Abbas Urſperg. ad ann. 1227, apud Menag. *Ib.*

(10) Scioppius, Amphot. pag. 214.

(11) Ib. pag. 218.

(12) Apud Scioppium, Amphotid. pag. 217, 218.

‘ *lia, deſcended from the high anceſtry of Roman ſenators; who, ſtanding by us with their protection, and an armed force of their friends, fought bravely in our defence, killed ſome of the Tartar generals, ſlaughtered part of their army, and brought us others priſoners; in which actions, they were not only often and dangerouſly wounded, but loſt many of their neareſt relations and friends; and, beſides the abovementioned ſervices, preſented us, for the hire of troops, and for various expeditions, a large ſum of money, in gold and ſilver, and other valuable things, amounting to 20,000 marcs, &c.*’ See, in the ſupplement to Moreri's dictionary, the tragical end of a great lord of Hungary, called Frangipani, who had plotted againſt the emperor, in the year 1671.

[*D*] *Mutio Frangipani ſerved in France . . . . in the reign of Charles IX.*] ‘The Pope concerning himſelf mightily in the wars about religion in France, ſeveral great Italian lords paſſed the Alps: ſome were officers of the forces, which he ſent; others, to ſhew their reſpect to that crown, ſerved as volunteers. The lord Mutio Frangipani thought, that he was the more obliged to engage himſelf in that expedition, becauſe he was a partizan of France, and had there a great many relations by his wife Julia Strozzi, ſiſter to the counteſs of Fieſque, who had beſides the honour of being related to the queen. He gave ſome proofs of his bravery in the battle of Jarnac, where he was wounded; and afterwards he returned home, to enjoy quietly the glory, which he had acquired in that war (13).’

[*E*] *One of his jeſts was made uſe of, and he, who uſed it, was ſeverely cenſured for it.*] Coſtar, writing to Mr Colbert (14), made uſe of the following expreſſions: ‘How would you have me go to court? I have been almoſt theſe five years in the country, becauſe I am not ſtrong enough to bear the fatigue of Paris, and to repair to thoſe places, where one muſt ſhew a great deal of reſpect, and where one muſt continually be in that troubleſome poſture, which ſeemed intolerable to the marquis de Frangipani, when he was at the French court; which made him ſay pleaſantly, *Star ſempre dritto è ſcapellato*: — You know the reſt, Sir; or, if you do not know it, you muſt not expect to be informed of it by an archdeacon (15).' Let us ſee how he was cenſured for this. ‘Theſe words need no explanation, ſince every body underſtands them. It is an old jeſt, which all thoſe, who glory in their leudneſs, do often repeat; and, if my antagoniſt hath been aſhamed to explain it, who will undertake it (16)?’

[*F*] *He invented the perfume and ſcents, which yet retain the name of Frangipane.*] Here follows what Menage ſays of it (17). ‘*Da uno di que' Signori Frangipani, (l'abbiam veduto qui in Parigi) furono chiamati certi guanti porfumati, Guanti di Frangipani. Ludovico Balzacio in una ſua lettera à madama Deſloges*: yeſterday he ſaw himſelf willingly your tributary, and engaged to ſend you every year a pretty good quantity of his paſtils. If you find them good, they will be in more repute than the gloves of Frangipani. But, becauſe your people of Limouſin might here miſtake, pray give them notice, that this Perfumer is worth above thirty thouſand livres a year, and hath the firſt dignity of this province; and that his Glover is a Roman lord, who is mareſchal de camp of the king's armies, and related to St Gregory the great; and, what I value more than all this, he is one of the honeſteſt men in the world.’ Menage quotes afterwards theſe Latin verſes of Ceriſantes, which are very pretty.

Amice, nil me, ſicut antea, juvat
Pulvere vel Cyprio Comam nitentem pectere,
Vel quas Britannus texuit ſubtiliter,
Mille modis varias jactare ventis tœnias:
Vel quam perunxit Frangipanes ipſemet,
Pelle manum gracilem coram puellis promere (18).

Whilom a fop, thoſe arts I now give o'er,
The powder fetch'd from Cyprus' diſtant ſhore,
The various fillet, pendent from behind,
By Britons wove, and floating in the wind,
The lady-hand, ſo ſmooth, ſo white, and ſpare,
From glove drawn off produc'd to court the fair,
And breathing Frangipane his ſcented air.

[*G*] *The equipage, wherein he appeared at Rome . . . was remarkable.*] Mr le Laboureur, an eye-witneſs, ſpeaks of it after this manner: ‘I cannot forbear adding concerning this laſt marquis of Frangipani, that I ſaw him once at the cavalcade, which is performed on St Peter's day, to conduct the Pope from the Vatican to Montecavallo, very well mounted, and gracefully ſitting on horſeback, but not in a garb ſuitable to this ſolemnity, which is altogether warlike, and which was celebrated by firing all the guns of the caſtle of St Angelo. He was cloathed in black taffety, with a cloak upon his ſhoulders, tucked up under his arm, his cloaths of the ſame ſtuff, with hanging ſleeves to his doublet, ſitting on a deep ſaddle, with ſilk ſtockings, and garters roſe-wiſe, and a ſwitch in his hand. I made it my buſineſs to be ſure, that it was he, though I knew him; becauſe I thought it ſtrange, that he ſhould publickly appear ſo like a citizen on ſo ſolemn an occaſion (19).’

FRATRICELLI, heretics, who appeared in Italy towards the end of the XIIIth century. They performed their devotions in private places, where they met in the night-time; and, after they had ſung ſome hymns, they put out the candles, and every one laid hold of a woman, as he was directed by chance (*a*). The children, that were begot by this commerce, were brought into the aſſembly, and handed round about till they expired. He, in whoſe hands they expired, was choſen high-prieſt. They burned one of thoſe children, and put the aſhes in a veſſel, in which they poured wine, which they gave to drink to thoſe they initiated into their brotherhood. They exclaimed againſt the property of goods; and maintained, that the faithful ought not to meddle with magiſtracy, and that the ſouls of the bleſſed ſhall not ſee GOD till after the reſurrection (*b*). Madam des Jardins traces this Sect to a very probable origin [*A*]; for 'tis hard to believe, but that moſt of thoſe religious hypocrites, who ſet

[*A*] *Madam des Jardins traces this ſect to a very probable origin.*] She ſuppoſes (1), ‘that the report of their amorous atchievements having given the alarm to jealous huſbands, they encreaſed the number of their ſpies, ſo that this commerce was abſolutely interrupted. Some young people were extremely concerned at this reformation. . . . . Seeing therefore, that the noiſe their public gallantry made was the cauſe

---

(*a*) See, in the remark [*F*], Balzac's words.

(*b*) Le Laboureur, *Addition to the Memoirs of Caſtelnau, Tom. II, pag.* 705, wherein the marquis of Frangipani, his own brother, is ſaid to have been a partner in this invention.

(*c*) Id. ib. pag. 704.

(13) Le Laboureur, Addit. à Caſtelnau, Tom. II, pag. 704.

(14) He was then only ſteward of cardinal Mazarin's houſe.

(15) Coſtar, cited by Girac, Reply, pag. 27.

(16) Girac. ibid.

(17) Origini della Ling. Italiana. pag 231.

(18) Taken from an ode which he addreſſed to Voiture, and which has been printed at the end of Balzac's Letters.

(19) Le Laboureur, ubi ſupra, pag. 705.

(*a*) Noctu in abditis locis ſacra operari ſoliti, poſt quoſdam hymnos ſeu cantilenas, extinctis luminibus promiſcuis ac fortuitis coïtibus ſeſe inquinabant. *Spondanus, ad ann.* 1297, *n.* 9. *He quotes* Sabellic. 9, *en.* 7. Prateolus, Sanderus, Gualtier.

(*b*) Idem Spondanus, ibid.

(1) Annales Galantes, III Part. Hiſt. VII, pag. 156. *Holl. Edit.* 1677.

ſet up conventicles under pretence of reformation, have a deſign upon women. They perſuade themſelves, that the fair ſex will eaſily fall into the ſnare, and that their inclination to the outward exerciſes of religion, as well as to thoſe of nature, which maintains an admirable correſpondence with the other, will furniſh them with means to bend women to whatſoever they ſhall pleaſe.

In order to obſerve the rule, that we ought to hear both parties, *Audi & alteram partem*, I ought to note in this place, that an illuſtrious Proteſtant gives us to underſtand, that the Fratricelli were not guilty of the enormities, that were laid to their charge [*B*]; but that the true reaſon, both of the calumnies, that were ſpread abroad againſt them, and of the rigour, with which they were perſecuted, was, becauſe they taught tenets, which claſhed with Popery. The anſwer, which has been made to that Proteſtant, will inform us, that, according to ſome authors, the Fratricelli did not lie with women, to enjoy them, but only to render their continence more meritorious [*C*]. We muſt not forget, that ſeveral of them called themſelves Friars of the order

‘ cauſe of that diſorder, they reſolved to make love by ſtealth, and, to ſave the appearances, which alarmed huſbands, they affected to live in retirement; they ſtudied a mortified outſide, and, forming a new religious order, under the name of Fratricelli, or Little brethren, they quickly gained ſo much reverence by the piety they ſeemed to practiſe, that they were looked upon as new anchorets. Some of the moſt ſuſpicious huſbands, and whoſe ſpouſes were none of the chaſteſt, had the curioſity to ſee thoſe devout men. People, diſtracted with domeſtic cares, make great uſe of conferences; and ſo, finding the converſation of the Fratricelli very edifying, there was none of them but hoped, from their charitable remonſtrances, the entire converſion of the moſt coquetiſh wives. They were impatient to return home, to cry up the new order; and the women, looking upon all the pretences of viſits as ſo many ſteps towards liberty, ſhewed as great a deſire to ſee the Fratricelli, as the huſbands had they ſhould go to them. Thus our Fratricelli received agreeable viſits, with which the huſbands were very well pleaſed; for, in order to eſtabliſh their new dominion, they preached up nothing but the keeping conjugal faith, the bounden obedience of wives towards their huſbands, and many other wholſome precepts, all very neceſſary towards domeſtic peace, and very edifying to married men: but, becauſe what was proper to be ſaid to the one, was not agreeable to the other, they exhorted the ladies to come and ſee them in private: *In order*, ſaid they, *that we may put the axe to the root of the tree, and work effectually their entire converſion.* They found no difficulty in obtaining from the wives that mark of their deference; they had much rather come to their ſermons, than be confined at home; and, finding the ſecret inſtructions of the Fratricelli not ſo hard to be practiſed, as thoſe of common ghoſtly fathers, they received them with docility, and ſubmitted to them without reluctancy.’

An Inquiry into the cauſes, which draw ſo many women to fraternities of auſtere devotion.

It is a truth, confirmed by the experience of all ages, that one of the ſureſt means to draw the ſex, and make them run after men, is to ſet up fraternities of an auſtere reformation, and to make a great ſhew of ſtrict devotion in certain conventicles. Thoſe, who trace events to their cauſes, have not forgot to meditate on the reaſons of this. They divide into two principal claſſes thoſe female ſcholars. Some go to that ſchool out of a good principle; being led by devotion, which is innate to the ſex: others have heard a thouſand times, that there is a great deal of hypocriſy in theſe religious founders, that they are men like the reſt, and that they play the hypocrites, only to make love without ſcandal, and under the cloak of ſecrecy. Without doubt, the following ſong has a long time been ſung all over the world, though in other terms.

. . . Bourgeois de Sodome,
Voyant Dom Côme
Dit en courroux,
Ces bigots ſont tous en priere,
Ils ſont tous au ciel les yeux doux,
L'oraiſon ne leur ſert de guiere,
En amour ils ſont tous
Moins bêtes & plus fripons que nous.

A burgher of Sodom, ſeeing Dom Côme, ſaid in a paſſion; theſe bigots are all at their prayers; they ſweetly look upon heaven; but their praying is to little purpoſe; for in love they are more politic, and leſs ſcrupulous than we.

This is the reaſon a woman hopes to find a lucky hour among thoſe pretenders to devotion, and is eager to put herſelf under their direction, with whom ſhe may loſe nothing with regard to pleaſure, and get a great deal as to her reputation. Women even hope, that, in caſe ſuch men ſhould not be hypocrites, they may have the addreſs powerſully and victoriouſly to tempt them; for, of all vices, none is more untameable and ungovernable than concupiſcence (2). As for the ſhe-ſcholars of the other claſs, they conceive ſo great a veneration, and even ſo great an affection for the pretended man of GOD, that they blind themſelves in his favour. If he finds it neceſſary to perſuade them that there is no ſin in doing ſome things, he inſenſibly turns them that way, and at worſt their tenderneſs does not ſuffer them to reſiſt his deſires. However it be, there never was a head of a ſect, nor a founder of a conventicle, let the things practiſed there be never ſo abominable, but found very tractable diſciples among the other ſex (3): and when we ſee how ſollicitous theſe men are to draw in women, one muſt have a great deal of charity not to believe, that the ſcope of their devotion rather centres in the body, which they have received from nature, than in the ſalvation of their ſoul.

[*B*] *An illuſtrious Proteſtant gives us to underſtand, that the Fratricelli were not guilty of the enormities laid to their charge.*] Mr du Pleſſis looks upon them as a branch of the Vaudois: *But beſides*, ſays he (4), *that the Vaudois continued in France, we trace them into Italy and Germany, by their own blood, which was ſpilt by the inquiſitors. In Italy, where Boniface exterminated, by all manner of ſeverities, thoſe they called Fratricelli, brethren, whoſe teachers were Gerard Sagarelli of Parma, and Dulcino of Novarra, diſciples of Herman, who was eſteemed a ſaint in Italy, and was afterwards dug up by Boniface at Ferrara. Thoſe poor people, to whom, according to cuſtom, they impute a thouſand infamous enormities, but who, in truth, taught, that the Pope was Antichriſt, and the church of Rome the Babylon of the Revelations; thoſe pretended inſpired men reproved ſeveral Romiſh abuſes and traditions; and their being perſecuted by Boniface, one of the moſt leud and prophane Popes that ever was, ought to make us preſume that it was not on account of leudneſs. We find them alſo at the ſame time in Germany.*

[*C*] *The Fratricelli did not lie with women, to enjoy them, but only to render their continence more meritorious.*] Coëffeteau, anſwering that paſſage of the *Myſtery of Iniquity*, affirms (5), ‘ that the very favourers of the Waldenſes and Albigenſes, and even of theſe Fratricelli, relate ſome things of them, which render the depoſitions of others probable:’ Let us hear how Vigniere ſpeaks of them. ‘ *Pope Clement* (ſays he) * *being informed, that the aſſemblies and congregations of thoſe they called Fratricelli, who dwelled in the mountains of Piedmont and Lombardy, and even in the neighbourhood of Verceil and Novara, increaſed more and more, inſomuch that they could not be diſperſed, cauſed the Jacobins and Franciſcans to preach a cruſade againſt them: ſo that a great number of croyſes went in queſt of them in their mountains, where they deſtroyed, that year, either by the ſword, hunger, or cold, above 400, and burnt 140 of them; among whom was found their principal miniſter Dul-* ‘ *cin*, order of St Francis. Bzovius, who affected to make that remark, was cenſured for it by the Franciſcans. We ſhall ſee part of what has been ſaid in his juſtification [*D*]. Neither muſt we paſs over in ſilence, that Prateolus, who warmly affirms all the ill reports, that have been ſpread againſt the Fratricelli, confeſſes, that they oppoſed the court of Rome, and the papal authority [*E*].

---

(2) *What Seneca ſays in general,* Nunquam bona fide vitia manſueſcunt, *is applicable in a particular manner to this.*

(3) See the remark [*A*] of the article GUILLELMA.

(4) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 412. *He quotes* Guido Perpinia. de Hereſib. Blond. dec. ii, lib. ix, Guillau. de Nangis.

(5) Coëffeteau, Rêponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 1015, 1016.

* Vig. pag. 3, *of the Biblioth. Hiſt. in the year* 1308.

cin, and his wife Margaret, who were alſo put to death. Some call them Dulcins, becauſe of the ſaid Dulcin; others, Fratricelli, becauſe they called one another brethren; and the women, who accompanied them, ſiſters in JESUS CHRIST; with whom, Platina and other hiſtorians ſay, they cohabited, and whored promiſcuouſly, in their conventicles, after the manner of thoſe called Adamites and Nicolaites, putting out the candles: but the Mer des Hiſtoires *ſays only, that they did not ſcruple to lie together, without knowing one another carnally, eſteeming ſuch a continence as meritorious, as the raiſing one from the dead, &c.* Does not this lying together, and beſtial indifference, make their leudneſs more than probable, unleſs we ſuppoſe them to have been marble? but Vignier flatters them as well as du Pleſſis. The common opinion is, that they defiled themſelves with a thouſand infamous impurities, for which they deſerved to be exterminated as monſters, that diſhonoured the chriſtian religion. Maſſeus, ſo often quoted by du Pleſſis, ſpeaks of them in theſe words: † *In* 1308, *in Lent, were taken above* 400 *Dulcins, in the mountains of Novara, and the neighbourhood of Verceil. Now theſe were the remains of thoſe, whom St Bernard mentions, on the Song of Solomon. They mingled promiſcuouſly, men and women lying in the ſame bed: the men ſaying, that they kept women company in order to make their own continence more meritorious, by paſſing by thoſe occaſions of ſinning, and leaving them virgins, &c.*' I omit ſome faults, which have been taken notice of. Rivet, replying to Coëffeteau, declares himſelf the apologiſt of the Fratricelli: he does not confeſs, that they endeavoured to ſignalize their continence by lying near a woman, without going further; he owns, that, if they had done ſo, they had been to blame; but however, he does in ſome meaſure extenuate the fault. Theſe are his words (6): '*The witneſſes againſt the Fratricelli agree like the witneſſes of Suſanna: what Vignier writes, and what Coëffeteau takes from him, is a proof of it: for what Platina imputes to them is more than what the* Mer des Hiſtoires *ſays of them. And, though I will not approve, that men and women ſhould lie together without ſcruple, to make their continence more painful, and conſequently more commendable; yet Coëffeteau might have found ſuch a proceeding warranted in antiquity by ſeveral eccleſiaſtics, againſt whom Cyprian and Jerome exclaimed: for they had their Agapetæ, and companions of celibacy, with whom they lay, as we have ſaid elſewhere: however, we do not own what is ſaid of them in that* Mer des Hiſtoires, *which is often a ſink of lies.*' Obſerve by the bye, that the miſconduct imputed to Robert d'Arbriſſel is very antient, and that it would be common to him with many, who have lived both before and after him.

[*D*] *We ſhall ſee part of what has been ſaid in Bzovius's juſtification.*] The complaints of the Franciſcans, together with their anſwers and apologies, are found (7) in the book intituled, *Nitela Franciſcanorum contra Bzovium*; and in Wadding, in the third tome of the Annals of the Friars Minors (8). The reply for Bzovius is found in the writings of a dominican, called Nicolas Janſenius; to which I refer my readers; contenting myſelf to ſay, that father Vincent Baron has ſhewn, by the teſtimony of Oderic Raynaldus, the continuator of Baronius, that the Fratricelli had obtained confirmations and privileges of Pope Celeſtine V, in the quality of monks of the order of St Francis. '*Illi* (*Bzovio*) *aſſentitur* . . . . . *Odericus Raynaldus tomo quinto decimo ſuorum annalium ad ann.* 1317. *n.* 56. *&* *ſequent. ita habet: variæ fuerunt fratricellorum ſectæ; & certum eſt ex extravag. Joannis XXII.* Sancta Rom. de Relig. Domib. fratricellorum alios prætexuiſſe, habitum ſe, & vitæ ritum ab epiſcopis, aut eccleſiarum prælatis accepiſſe; alios jactaſſe ſe tertii ordinis ſancti Franciſci, pœnitentium vocati, habitum induiſſe; finxiſſe alios ordinem fratrum Minorum profiteri, & ſancti Franciſci regulam ad literam obſervare, & objecto eo fuco, ipſos à Cæleſtino quinto hujuſmodi vitæ, & ſtatus privilegium obtinuiſſe: quamvis ea ratio non valeat; cum Bonifacius octavus conceſſa à Cæleſtino reſciderit, ac poſteriori decreto ſtandum eſſet. *Hæc Odericus* (9). —— With Bzovius agrees . . . . Odericus Raynaldus, in the fifteenth tome of his Annals, under the year 1317, n. 56. &c. he has theſe words: *There were many ſects of the Fratricelli; and it is certain from the Extravagant of John XXII, that, of the Fratricelli, ſome pretended to have received their habit and manner of life from the biſhops or prelates of the church; others boaſt, that they have taken upon them the habit of the third order of St Frantis, called the Penitents; others pretended to profeſs the order of Friars Minors, and to obſerve punctually the rule of St Francis; and, by this pretence, they obtained of Pope Celeſtine V their privileges; although this reaſon is of no avail, ſince Boniface VIII annulled the grant of Celeſtine, and they were obliged to abide by the latter decree.*' He quotes alſo this paſſage of Alvares Pelagius, a Franciſcan monk. *Multi ſæculares & Fratres Minores pro iſto carnali ſpiritu libertatis, per inquiſitores hæreticæ pravitatis incarcerati fuerunt* (10). Note, that this paſſage of Raynaldus confirms what Hoſpinian obſerves, that the Popes have varied in their judgments about the Fratricelli: 'De Fratricellis à Johanne XXII. condemnatis, à Gregorio XI. & Eugenio approbatis, refert Hoſpinianus de Monachis, lib. 6. cap. 32. Vides judiciorum Papalium auctoritatem (11). —— *Hoſpinian, de Monachis, lib.* 6. *c.* 32. *gives an account of the Fratricelli, condemned by John XXII, and approved by Gregory XI, and Eugenius. You ſee the authority of Papal decrees.*'

[*E*] *Prateolus, who warmly affirms all the ill reports . . . . againſt the Fratricelli, confeſſes that they oppoſed the court of Rome, and the Papal authority.*] What he relates is intermixed with ſeveral things, that are not mentioned in our preceding remarks; wherefore I think I ought to copy it, the better to ſhew what has been ſaid of theſe heretics. 'Some, who would be thought of the third order of St Francis's inſtitution, and who were called by the Italians, in the kingdom of Sicily, and province of Narbonne, *Fratriculi*, or *Fratricelli*, or *Fratres de paupere vita*, or *Biſochi*, or *Beguini*, and other names, were at that time accuſed and condemned of hereſy, by Pope Boniface VIII; though ſome ſay they were ſo firſt by Pope John XXII. They contemned the ſacraments of the church; and ſaid, that it was not lawful for chriſtians to hold any thing in property, nor to meddle with the adminiſtration and government of commonwealths; and that the ſouls of the bleſſed did not enjoy the ſight of God till the laſt day. In their aſſemblies, (like the Adamites now-a-days, who ſay that all women are common) after the celebration of their myſteries, they indulged carnal luſt, contrary to conjugal chaſtity, with the next woman that came to hand; which they did by night, after having put out the candles. The chroniclers relate, how thoſe, who were of that ſect, were diſcovered, to wit, by a merchant of Milan, named Conrad; who, ſeeing, that his wife often roſe in the night, had a mind to know whither ſhe went, and why ſhe got up. He therefore followed her once ſecretly, and went into their ſynagogue; where, after their myſteries were performed, and the candles put out, holding her cloſe, he enjoyed her, and took a ring off her finger for a token, and afterwards declared it to the reſt, and informed the inquiſitor of the faith of it. All the women, who were of that ſect, had a crown like the clerks and monks, and thereby were all diſcovered. See the ſupplement to the Chronicles. They ſaid alſo, that the power of the church, by reaſon of the ill morals of the eccleſiaſtics, had been a long time made void and extinguiſhed; that they were the only church of God; that they imitated the apoſtles; that the church of Rome was a whore; and that the Popes, from Sylveſter, the firſt of that name, had all been wicked, as not having lived in poverty; and that therefore people ought not to pay tithes to them. They were ſo impudent, that they ſaid, that one Margaret, concubine to one of their principal preachers and miniſters, named Dulcinus, had conceived by the Holy Ghoſt (12).'

---

† Maſſæ. Ch. Mund. lib. xvii.

(6) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Rêponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, Part. II, pag. 478.

(7) Ad. ann. 1317.

(8) Ad ann. 1317.

(9) Vincent. Baronius, Apologet. lib iv, ſect. iii, art ii, pag. 107.

(10) Alvar. Pelagius, de Planctu Eccleſiæ, lib. ii, cap lii, apud Vinc. Baron. ibid. pag. 108.

(11) Giſb. Voëtius, deſperata cauſa Papatus, pag. 211.

(12) Du Preau (*or* Prateolus), Hiſt. de l'Eſtat & Succés de l'Egliſe, Tom. II, fol. 2, verſo, & fol. 3, ad ann. 1303.

FRAUWENLOB (Henry), a German author, who died at Mentz, in 1317. His funeral was very ſingular. The women carried his corps from his houſe to the great church, filled the ſtreets with their lamentable cries and complaints, and poured ſo great a quantity of wine on his grave, that it over-flowed the church: All which they did in acknowlegment of the praiſes he had beſtowed on their ſex in his books. See the remark [*A*].

[*A*] *See the remark.*] This article is taken from Albertus Argentinenſis, one of the writers of the hiſtory of Germany (1), whoſe words I am ſure the reader will not be diſpleaſed to ſee here: ‘Anno Domini 1317. ‘ſepultus eſt Henricus dictus Frauwenlob in Moguntia ‘in ambitu majoris eccleſiæ . . . . qui deportatus fuit ‘à mulieribus ex hoſpitio uſque ad locum ſepulturæ, ‘& lamentationes & querelæ maximæ auditæ fuerunt ‘ab eis propter laudes infinitas quas impoſuit omni ‘generi fœmineo in dictaminibus ſuis. Tanta etiam ibi ‘copia fuit vini fuſa in ſepulcrum ſuum quod circumfluebat per totum ambitum eccleſiæ.’

(1) *He is in the collection of the* Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum, *by* Urſtiſius.

FREIGIUS (John Thomas) grand-ſon of a peaſant, and ſon of a civilian [*A*], lived in the XVIth century. He was born at Friburg in the Briſgaw, and acquired great reputation by his learned works. He ſtudied the law in his own country under the famous Zaſius, and he had likewiſe for maſters Henry Glarean, and Peter Ramus. He addicted himſelf extremely to the principles and method of the latter. He taught firſt at Friburg, and afterwards at Baſil; but meeting with ill ſucceſs, he was near breaking with the Muſes, and retiring into the country. He was revolving this deſign in his thoughts, when the ſenate of Nuremberg, at the inſtigation of Jerom Wolfius, offered him the rectorſhip of the new college of Altorf. This poſt became vacant by the death of Valentine Erythreus the firſt who had enjoyed it. He took poſſeſſion of this employment the thirtieth of November 1575. He diſcharged his duty in it zealouſly, in explaining the hiſtorians, the poets, and the inſtitutes of Juſtinian, &c. He returned to Baſil, and died there of the plague in the year 1583 (*a*) [*B*]. This contagious diſtemper had a little before deprived him of a ſon of great hopes, and two daughters, one of whom had already made ſome progreſs in learning [*C*]. He publiſhed

(*a*) *Taken from* Melchior Adam, *in* Vitis Juriſcon. pag. 252, & ſeq.

[*A*] *He was grandſon of a peaſant, and ſon of a civilian.*] This civilian's name was Nicolas Freigius: his father was an honeſt countryman, or husbandman, who lived near Baſil.

Me pater agreſti genuit ſub rure colonus,
  Hic ubi Rauriacos Rhenus adurget agros (1).

A cottage gave me birth, my ſire a clown,
Where the Rhine rolls it's rapid waters down.

His inclination to ſtudy lead him on as far as the degree of doctor in law. He married at Friburg in the Briſgaw; he made himſelf known to the public, by procuring editions of ſome of the works of Zaſius. He exerciſed the profeſſion of an advocate at Enſheim in Alſace, and from thence went with his family to Ulm, and was there one of the counſellors of the town. He died there of a dropſy in the year 1550: his wife buried him in a convent of nuns at Sefflingen near Ulm. Melchior Adam recites the Latin verſes of John Thomas Freigius (2), which contain the aforeſaid particulars; yet he had juſt before ſaid, that Nicolas Freigius ſurvived his wife, who died in the year 1564 (3); & *matrem quidem primo amiſit* (Jo. Thomas Freigius) *peſte ſublatam cum duabus ſororibus* (4) *anno Chriſti* milleſimo, quingenteſimo, ſexageſimo, quarto. *Has ſubſecutus eſt pater.* If he had conſidered the following verſes, he would have known, that they were written in the year 1564, fourteen years after the death of Nicolas Freigius.

Hic jam namque, pater, bis ſeptimus ingruit annus,
  Ex quo te triſti fata tulere nece (5).

Now twice ſeven years their mournful courſe have
  run,
Since death, my father, tore thee from thy ſon.

Moreri has committed ſeveral faults: for he ſays, I. that Nicolas Freigius died of the plague: II. that it was in the year 1564: III. that it was with his wife, IV. and with two of his daughters (6); V. that he had made *great diſcoveries in both civil and canon-law*; VI. that his ſon *ſtudied law under the greateſt men of his time.* This is falſely to ſuppoſe, that Glareanus and Ramus taught him law. VII. He gives him the chriſtian name Thomas; whereas he ought to call him John Thomas.

(1) Jo. Th. Freigius, Triſtium Libro, Eleg. iv, pag. m. 366. *He introduces his father ſpeaking. Taken from* Melc. Adam, ubi ſupra.

(2) *Taken from* Elegy *IV*, *which I have juſt now cited.*

(3) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra.

(4) *It ſhould be* cum tribus. *See the third Elegy of* John Thomas Freigius.

(5) Joh. Thomas Freigius, Eleg. 4, *Libri* Triſtium, pag. 365.

(6) Three died with the mother.

[*B*] *He died of the plague, in* 1583.] On the ſixteenth of January, if we believe Melchior Adam, who adds, that, according to others, it was in 1582. The epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque (7) affirms, that he died in the college of Altorf, in the year 1582. I believe Melchior Adam is not miſtaken, and that there is a fault in the date of the epiſtle dedicatory of *Joan. Thomæ Freigii Quæſtiones Geometricæ & Stereometricæ.* The author himſelf dedicates this work to ſix mathematicians his good friends. It is a book, which was printed at Baſil, by Sebaſtian Henricpetri, in the month of March 1583. The epiſtle dedicatory is dated from Baſil the firſt of March of the ſame year. This cannot agree with an advertiſement at the end of the book. This advertiſement relates to the elegies, which Freigius publiſhed in the year 1564, and of which he made a new edition, which was added to the *Quæſtiones Geometricæ, &c.* He dedicates this new edition to his two ſons, and dates his epiſtle dedicatory at Baſil the laſt of December 1582. The advertiſement informs us, that, during the re-printing theſe elegies, the author was ſeized with the plague, and that it carried him off at the end of forty hours, on the ſixteenth of January. It adds, that the two ſons, to whom the work was dedicated, died of the ſame diſtemper eight days after. The date of the impreſſion at the bottom of the page is this month of March 1583.

[*C*] *The plague had deprived him of a ſon, of great hopes, and two daughters, one of whom had already made ſome progreſs in learning.*] He tells us this in the epiſtle dedicatory of the ſecond edition of his elegies. ‘Cum hoc anno, *ſays he, to his two ſons,* ſorores duas veſtras Urſulam & Barbaram, ac fratrem ‘Matthiam peſte acerba nobis ex oculis eripuiſſet (*fatum meum*) &c . . . . amiſi ego in Barbara noſtra ‘Oeconomiæ meæ fidelem adminiſtram & diſpenſatricem: amiſiſtis vos in eadem ſtudiorum veſtrorum ‘ſociam: quæ ſi diutius hujus lucis uſura frui potuiſſet, ‘aliam Cæliam (8), aliam Fulviam Moratam habuiſſemus. Jam enim puella XII ferè annorum Latinæ & ‘Græcæ Grammaticæ, aliarumque artium rudimenta ‘ita peragraverat, ut Latinè quædam ex vernaculo ‘ſermone convertere, Græce declinare & conjugare, ‘precationem Dominicam Hebraicè recitare, poëtarum ‘verſus ſcandere, Arithmeticos numeros addere & ſubducere, Muſicas melodias artificioſè canere, teſtudinem tractare poſſet. Hanc Matthias frater, puer ſeptem annorum non longe ſecutus eſt, qui qua fuit naturali indole præditus, ſororem paucis annis ſupe-

(7) Pag. m. 503.

(8) See remark [*C*] of the article *CURION.*

liſhed many books [*D*]. Mr Moreri has committed ſome faults (*b*).

‘raſſet. Is mane quamprimum è ſomno experrectus erat ſtatim ad libros ultro ſe transferebat, & aut Geographicas tabulas aut urbes, homines, *animalia tam ſolerter, tamque graphicè depingebat: in abaco Pythagoræ tam ſtudioſe ſe exercebat, ut vos ad laudem puerilis & præcocis ingenii, ejus manuum monumenta conſervare ſoliti ſitis, ego vero mihi omnia ſumma polliceri* de eo auſus fuerim. — *When I had the ill fortune this year, to loſe, by the plague, your two ſiſters Urſula and Barbara, and your brother Matthias, &c . . . . I loſt in my daughter Barbara a faithful manager of my family concerns; and you both loſt, in her, a companion of your ſtudies, whom if heaven had thought fit to ſpare, we ſhould have had in her another Cælia, and an other Fulvia Morata. For, though but a girl of twelve years of age, ſhe had made ſuch a progreſs in Latin and Greek, and other ſciences, that ſhe could tranſlate ſome things out of the vulgar tongue into Latin, decline and conjugate Greek, repeat the Lord's prayer in Hebrew, ſcan poetry, add and ſubſtract in arithmetic, ſing according to the rules of muſic, and handle the lyre. Her brother Matthias, a boy of ſeven years of age, came not far behind her, who had ſo great a genius, that, in a few years, he would have ſurpaſſed his ſiſter. The moment he waked in a morning, he went of his own accord to his books, and ſkillfully drew either maps, or towns, or men, or animals: he ſo ſtudiouſly exerciſed himſelf in the tables of Pythagoras, that you were wont, in commendation of his youthful and forward genius, to preſerve his handy-work; whilſt I promiſed myſelf every thing from his growing wit.*’ It would be injuſtice, and a kind of inhumanity, to reproach this good father with weakneſs, in ſeeking conſolation by informing the public of theſe little particulars of his family.

[*D*] *He publiſhed many books.*] The firſt of all was his *Liber Triſtium*, or the elegies, which I have mentioned above (9). Among the reſt, I ſhall only point out his ſupplement to the hiſtory of Paulus Emilius and Ferron down to the year 1569; his *Logica Juriſconſultorum*; a Latin tranſlation of the travels of Forbiſſer, and of the African war, in which Don Sebaſtian, king of Portugal, was killed; his orations of Cicero *perpetuis Notis Logicis, Arithmeticis, Ethicis, Politicis, Hiſtoricis, Antiquitatis illuſtratæ*, in three volumes 8vo, at Baſil, 1583. See the reſt in the abridgment of Geſner, and in Melchior Adam.

FROISSARD (JOHN), born at Valenciennes, canon and treaſurer of Chimai in Hainault, flouriſhed in the XIVth century [*A*]. His chief work is a hiſtory, which reaches from the year 1326 to the year 1399 (*a*). He took care to be well informed of things, and for that purpoſe went to the courts of ſeveral princes (*b*), either to collect memoirs, or to hear thoſe diſcourſe, who had had the management of affairs. He deſerved no leſs fame in quality of a poet, than in that of a hiſtorian; yet few people know his poems. Mr Menage was unacquainted with them; he, whoſe memory was filled with that ſort of works, and with an infinite number of other things. If he had known, that Froiſſard had made a great number of love verſes, he would have put him in the liſt he has publiſhed of the eccleſiaſtics, who have employed their wit in that kind of poeſy [*B*]. Mr Moreri ſhould not have affirmed, that John Sleidan has tranſlated Froiſſard into Latin [*C*]. He has committed ſome faults, which ſhall be mentioned in the firſt remark.

[*A*] *He flouriſhed in the XIVth century.*] I cannot imagine how Voſſius could miſtake here: he owns, that Froiſſard ſtayed a long while in the court of the princeſs Philippa, daughter of the earl of Hainault, and wife of Edward III, king of England (1). Should he not then have looked upon him as an old man in the beginning of the XVth century (2)? why then does he ſay, that Froiſſard began to be famous under the reign of the emperor Rupert, that is, after the year 1400? we muſt take notice, that Froiſſard went to preſent the firſt books of his hiſtory to the princeſs Philippa, wife of Edward III. Mr Moreri, deceived by Voſſius, places this hiſtorian in the XVth century. La Croix du Maine is in the other extream, in making him flouriſh in the year 1326, ſeven years before he was born (3). Mr Moreri is the more inexcuſable, in that he ſays, that this author dedicated *his chronicle to Edward III, king of England*: for every body knows, that that monarch died an old man, in the year 1377. Beſides, as Mr Moreri himſelf acknowledges, that this chronicle reaches to the year 1400, it is plain, that he does not expreſs himſelf right, as to that dedication.

[*B*] *Mr Menage would have put him in the liſt he has publiſhed of eccleſiaſtics, who have written love verſes.*] For the very title of Froiſſard's poems would have informed him, that they were very proper to be inſerted in that liſt. Here is what we find in Paſquier (4). *He who, I find, did greatly advance that new poeſy* (5), *was John Froiſſard, who did alſo preſent us with that long hiſtory, we have of his, from Philip de Valois to the year* 1400. *And I wonder he hath not been commended for this quality of poet: for I have formerly ſeen, in the library of the great king Francis, at Fontainbleau, a great volume of his poems, whoſe title was this.* ‘You are to know, that in this book are contained ſeveral ſayings or treatiſes of love and morality, which the Sieur John Froiſſard, prieſt and canon of Canay, and native of the town of Valentianes, in the county of Hainault, has dictated and compoſed, with the help of God and love, for the contemplation of ſeveral nobles and worthies, and began to make them in the year of grace 1362, and cloſed them in the year of grace 1394. The Paradiſe of Love, The Temple of Honour, A Treatiſe in Praiſe of the Month of May, The Dazie, Several amorous Lays, Paſtorals, The Amorous Priſon, Royal Songs to the Honour of our Lady, The Dictate of the Amorous Spinnet, Ballad, Virelaix, and Rondeaux, The Plea of the Roſe, and of the Violet.’ *I thought fit to quote, word for word, this title; becauſe ſince that time, our poeſy conſiſted moſtly in that kind of delicacies.* The liſt of Mr Menage is in the ſecond tome of the Anti Baillet (6).

[*C*] *Mr Moreri ſhould not have affirmed that Sleidan tranſlated Froiſſard into Latin.*] Sleidan contented himſelf with abridging Froiſſard; and, becauſe that hiſtorian is very prolix, and full of unneceſſary circumſtances, it happened, that Sleidan, having picked out only uſeful things, reduced a large volume into a pocket-book. I have not at preſent in my hands that Latin abridgment; wherefore I ſhall make uſe of the French tranſlation, to quote a paſſage out of the preface which will acquaint my reader with Froiſſard's method. ‘It is true, the French volume is very large; but I dare affirm, that, in this abridgment, I have left out no paſſage, contained in the ſaid volume, that deſerves to be related, or known. The reaſon is, becauſe the author recounts at large every thing: and, to ſpeak the truth, he dwells ſometimes too long, and is very redundant when he deſcribes the preparations of war, ſkirmiſhes, ſingle combats, the ſtorming of places, the diſcourſes and converſations of princes. Now becauſe the recital of ſuch things is of no great moment, I thought there was no need to inſert them, dwelling only on what is moſt material, and in which lies the advantage, which we ought to expect from that reading.’

(*b*) See the end of the remark [*A*].

(9) In remark [*B*].

(*a*) Voſſius de Hiſtor. Lat. pag. 543. Valerius Andreas, Bibl. Belg. p. 503, *is miſtaken in making that hiſtory begin in the year* 1355. La Popeliniere Hiſtoire des Hiſtoires, p. 434, *makes it begin in* 1335.

(*b*) *See ſome curious particulars about it in* Bullart, Academ. des Arts & des Sciences, *Tom. I, pag.* 125.

(1) Diu ſectatus eſt regum principumque familias, imprimis Philippæ .... Edvardi III, Anglorum regis, uxoris. *Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. pag.* 543, 544.

(2) Bullart, Academ. des Sciences, *Tom. I. pag.* 126, *makes him then* 67 *years old.*

(3) *He was born about the year* 1333, *as appears by his writings.* Bullart, ibid.

(4) Paſquier, Recherches de la France, livr. vii, cap. v, pag. 612.

(5) *That is,* Royal Cantos, Ballads, Rondeaux, *and* Paſtorals.

(6) Pag. 334, & ſeq.

La Popeliniere accuſes Froiſſard of beſtowing too many praiſes on the Engliſh (§ *a*), and too few on the French ; becauſe the latter did not pay for his labours, whereas he received a good ſalary from the former (*c*).

[(§*a*) I have not obſerved, that the Gothic editions of this hiſtorian, Paris, for John Petit, without date, and for Antony Verard, Paris likewiſe, and alſo without date, are at bottom different from thoſe of Denys Saulvage, Lyons 1559, and Paris 1574; but theſe latter are neither faithful, nor exact, the plain language of the author not even appearing in it *. As the French accuſe Froiſſard of partiality for the Engliſh nation, they have here and there maimed his hiſtory; notwithſtanding which, an entire manuſcript of it, adorned with beautiful miniatures, is preſerved in the library of St Elizabeth in the town of Breſlaw. ‘ Non nego magnam pi-‘ cturarum elegantiam eſſe: *(ſays a learned man, ſpeaking of this manuſcript)* Sed majora hic ſunt, quæ ani-‘ mum meum afficiunt. Putat Orbis eruditus ſe textum Froiſſardi egregie poſſidere, quem Dionyſius Salvagius ‘ Regis Henrici II. juſſu quinquageſimo nono ſuperioris ſeculi anno Lugduni publicavit; ſed fœde decipitur, ‘ dum codex hic impoſturam detegit, & Salvagii manu omnia quæ Aulæ Gallicæ diſplicebant, deleta, vixque ‘ decimam hiſtoriæ partem integram relictam eſſe manifeſtum reddit †. —— *I do not deny, that the miniatures ‘ are elegant; but there is ſomething of more importance, which I am concerned at. The learned world think they ‘ are in poſſeſſion of the text of Froiſſard, which Denys Saulvage, by order of Henry II, publiſhed at Lyons in* ‘ 1559; *but they are ſhamefully impoſed upon, ſince this manuſcript detects the fraud, and makes it plainly appear, ‘ that the paſſages, which diſpleaſed the French court, were ſtruck out by Saulvage himſelf, and ſcarce an entire ‘ tenth part of the hiſtory left.*’ REM. CRIT.]

FRONTO (MARCUS CORNELIUS) (*a*), a great orator, was choſen, by reaſon of his eloquence, to teach the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus rhetoric (*b*). This procured him the honour of the conſulſhip, and the erection of a ſtatue [*A*]. Gravity was the character of his eloquence [*B*]. He had a vaſt erudition, and a great maſtery of the Latin Tongue (*c*). There was a ſect of thoſe, who took him for the pattern of perfect eloquence, and who were called Frontoniani (*d*). It may be proved, by an inſcription (*e*), that his deſcendants were honoured with the conſulſhip: Neither is it improbable, that the civilians, of the name of Fronto (*f*), mentioned in the Pandects, deſcended from him: But there is no proof, that the orators of the ſame name belonged to Aquitain, and in particular to Auvergne [*C*]. Some pretend

[*A*] *The honour of the conſulſhip, and the erection of a ſtatue.*] Here is a paſſage of Auſonius in relation to the conſulſhip (1): ‘ Unica mihi amplectenda eſt ‘ Frontonis imitatio, quem tamen Auguſti magiſtrum ‘ ſic Conſulatus ornavit ut præfectura non cingeret. ‘ Sed Conſulatus ille cujuſmodi? Ordinario ſuffectus, ‘ bimeſtri ſpatio interpoſitus, in ſexta anni parte con-‘ ſumtus: querendum ut reliquerit tantus orator quibus ‘ conſulibus geſſerit conſulatum (2). Theſe words inform us, that Fronto was conſul only for two months; that is, that he was only ſubſtituted to the conſulſhip, in the place of one of the ordinary conſuls, who either died, or was put out, two months before the year expired. Which made a great difference between the favour of Marcus Aurelius, and that of Gratian; for Auſonius was made ordinary conſul by Gratian his diſciple. That poet was afraid, leſt, by his taking notice of this, in his acknowledgement to Gratian, he ſhould give way to the accuſation of comparing himſelf to Fronto; wherefore he ingeniouſly obviated that objection. I quote his own words, becauſe they are a proof both of Marcus Aurelius's gratitude towards Fronto, his tutor, and of the great eſteem Fronto was in. ‘ Ecce aliud quod aliquis opponat. In tan-‘ ti te ergo oratoris faſtigium glorioſus attollis? Cui ‘ talia requirenti reſpondebo breviter. Non ego me ‘ contendo Frontoni, ſed Antonino præfero Gratianum ‘ (3). —— *Some one may farther object. What! do ‘ you pretend to rival ſo great an orator? to ſuch ‘ a queſtion I briefly reply: I do not cope with Fronto, ‘ but prefer Gratian to Antoninus.*’ Let us give another proof of that gratitude. ‘ Multum ex his Fron-‘ toni detulit, cui & ſtatuam in Senatu petiit, (*here ‘ is the erection of the ſtatue*) Proculum vero uſque ‘ ad Proconſulatum provexit (4). —— *He aſcribed much ‘ of this to Fronto, for whom he demanded of the ſe-‘ nate a ſtatue: as for Proculus, he raiſed him to the ‘ proconſulate.*’ Since Captiolinus takes notice, that Proculus, one of the Grammarians, who had inſtructed Marcus Aurelius, was raiſed to the proconſulſhip, and does not mention Fronto's being advanced to the conſular dignity, he muſt have been ignorant of this laſt paſſage: and therefore we may charge him with a fault of omiſſion. Soſipater Chariſius quotes a letter which teſtifies Marcus Aurelius's gratitude: *Mihi ſatis abundeque honorum eſt quos mihi cotidiane tribuis.* —— *I am thoroughly ſatisfied with the honours you daily confer upon me.* Fronto writes this to the emperor.

[*B*] *Gravity was the character of his eloquence.*] This we learn from St Jerome (5): ‘ Ut poſt Quin-‘ tiliani acumina, Ciceronis fluvios, GRAVITATEM ‘ Frontonis, & lenitatem Plinii alphabetum diſcerem. ‘ —— *That, after the wit of Quintilian, the flowing ‘ periods of Cicero, the* GRAVITY *of Fronto, and the ſoft-‘ neſs of Pliny, I might learn the alphabet.* Macrobius ſays almoſt as much, though in not ſo obliging a manner, with reſpect to Fronto; for he allots him a dry eloquence: ‘ Quatuor ſunt genera dicendi, ‘ *ſays he*, copioſum, in quo Cicero dominatur: breve ‘ in quo Salluſtius regnat: ſiccum quod Frontoni ad-‘ ſcribitur: pingue & floridum in quo Plinius ſecun-‘ dus quondam, & nunc nullo veterum minor noſter ‘ Symmachus luxuriatur (6). —— *There are four kinds ‘ of Oratory, the copious, in which Cicero excels; ‘ the conciſe, in which Saluſt is chief; the dry, which ‘ is aſcribed to Fronto; the luxuriant and florid, in ‘ which formerly Pliny the younger, and now our ‘ Symmachus, inferior to none of the ancients, abounds.*’ Sidonius Apollinaris gives a very great Idea of Fronto's grave ſtyle: ‘ Nec Frontonianæ gravitatis aut pon-‘ deris Apuleiani fulmen æquiparem (7). —— *Nor do I ‘ pretend to equal the thunder of Fronto's gravity, and ‘ Apuleius's weight.*

[*C*] *There is no proof, that the Orators of the ſame name belonged to Aquitain, and . . . . . . Auvergne.*] Sidonius Apollinaris, in a letter (8) to Leo, counſellor to a king of the Goths (9), ſpeaks thus: ‘ Suſpende ‘ perorandi illud quoque celeberrimum flumen quod ‘ non ſolum gentilitium ſed domeſticum tibi, quod-‘ que in tuum pectus per ſucciduas ætates ab ata-‘ vo Frontone transfunditur. —— *Suſpend that well-‘ known flow of oratory, ſo peculiar, not only to your ‘ country, but family, and which is transfuſed into ‘ your breaſt, through ſucceſſive ages, from your anceſtor ‘ Fronto.*’ This proves nothing touching the Fronto's of Auvergne, tho' Savaro pretends the contrary; for upon theſe words of the twenty firſt letter of the fourth book, *Hinc avus Fronto blandus tibi, ſibi ſeverus,* he gives us this remark: ‘ Fronto ex ‘ veteri illa Frontonum familia qui in arte Rhetorica ‘ principem locum tenuere, quos ſibi ſuos Aquitania ‘ jure vendicat, quantum ex lib. 2. C. de Municip. ‘ & Originariis licet colligere, & *ex Epiſt.* 3. *lib.* 8. ‘ *Sidonii Apollinaris.* —— *Fronto, of that ancient fa-‘ mily of the Fronto's, who excelled in the art of ‘ rhetoric, and whom Aquitain juſtly claims as her ‘ own; as far as we can collect from lib.* 2. *C. de ‘ Municip. & Originariis, and from epiſt.* 3. *lib.* 8. *of ‘ Sidonius Apollinaris.*’ Tho' it might be proved, that he, to whom that third letter of the eighth book was written, was a native of Auvergne, there would be no reaſon to conclude, that the orator Fronto, his fourth grand father, was of the ſame country.

(*c*) La Popeliniere. Hiſtoire des Hiſtoires, livre viii, pag. 434. *See alſo* Bodin, Meth. Hiſt. cap. iv pag. m. 58.

* Sorel, Bibl. Fr. cap. xi, pag. 198. *Edit. of* 1664.

† Gotleb Krantz, *in his* Memorabilia Bibliothecæ Eliſabethanæ Wratiſlavienſis. Breſlau, 1699.

(*a*) I know not whence Mr *Moreri* has taken the pretended prænomen *Priſcus*, which he gives him.

(*b*) Capitolin. in M. Aurelio, cap. ii, & in L. Vero, cap. ii.

(*c*) *See* Aulus Gellius, lib. ii, cap. xxvi; lib. xix, cap. viii, x, & xiii.

(*d*) *Frontoniani.* Sidon. Apollinaris, *Epiſt. I, Libr. I.*

(*e*) Apud Gruterum, pag. 369.

(*f*) *See* Bertrand, de Juriſperitis, lib. ii. pag. m. 290.

(1) Auſon. in Gratiarum Actione, pag. 714.

(2) See a like thought above, citation (39) of the article *BALBUS.*

(3) Auſonius, ubi ſupra.

(4) Capitol. in Marco Aurelio, cap. ii.

(5) Epiſt. ad Ruſticum Monachum.

(6) Saturnal. lib. v, cap. i.

(7) Sidon. Apoll. Epiſt. iii, lib. iv, p. m. 235. *See alſo* Epiſt. x. lib. viii, pag. 523.

(8) The third of the 8th book.

(9) *He was called Evarix.*

pretend, that our Fronto is the ſame, whom Pliny junior mentions, or who is ſpoken of in the fifty ſixth epigram of the firſt book of Martial. This is attended with ſome difficulty [*D*]. One would be greatly to blame not to diſtinguiſh him from
FRONTO,

One of our moſt curious antiquaries, for whom I have an infinite eſteem, ſtops me here for ſome moments. He aſſures us (10), *that Sidonius Apollinaris makes M. Cornelius Fronto, the greateſt orator of his age, deſcend from the illuſtrious family of the Fronto's of Aquitain .... Sidonius,* (continues he), *writing to Aper, (in the twenty firſt epiſtle of the fourth book) acquaints him, that Fronto, his grand-father by the mother-ſide, was of Auvergne, and that he might have ſerved for a pattern to thoſe that are propoſed to our imitation ..... He writes in another letter, which is the third of the eighth book, to another perſon, and gives him for great-grand-father that ſame Fronto; and tells him, he not only bears his name, but has alſo inherited his eloquence, which is natural to him, and comes to him, by lineal ſucceſſion, from that excellent orator.* The author adds, I. *That there was in Aquitain, in the time of the emperor Gordian, a family of the name of Fronto, as we learn* from the ſecond law *of the code* de municip. & origin. lib. 10. *where a certain* A. FRONTO, *having, by a feoffment of truſt, been made free by a woman, who was originally of Aquitain, and aſking whether he ſhould follow the origin of her, who made him a freeman, or of the teſtator; the emperor anſwered in favour of her, who made him free,* II. That if Æmilius Fronto, who has dedicated the monument, of which he gives us the explanation, be not the ſame Fronto that was made free, we may well ſuppoſe, that he is the ſecond great-grandſon of M. Cornelius Fronto, *who lived under Antoninus the philoſopher, and who was his maſter of rhetoric.*

The reader may have ſeen, in the preface to my project, that there are no writers, on whom I do more freely adventure to make obſervations, than thoſe, for whom I have a particular eſteem: for if I ſhould be ſhy of propoſing my little difficulties to them, it would be a ſign that I thought them full of prejudice, which I account a very great fault. I repeat here this caution, which I deſire may ſerve for all other occaſions, when the ſame caſe ſhall happen.

In the firſt place, I ſhall be very glad, if any body would prove, that the illuſtrious Cornelius Fronto was of Aquitain; for that would be a great honour to ancient Gaul, and an ornament to the catalogue of the learned men that are come from thence. But I do not ſee how this can be proved by the two letters of Sidonius Apollinaris, which have been quoted. One of thoſe letters was written to Aper; and the other to Leo, counſellor to a king. The firſt ſhews only, that there had been, in Auvergne, a very honeſt man, called Fronto, whoſe daughter was mother of him, to whom Sidonius wrote. The other letter, as far as I can apprehend, doth not ſay, that that ſame Fronto of Auvergne, had been the great-grandfather of him, to whom Sidonius ſpeaks. Sidonius makes uſe of the word *atavus*, which ſignifies the father of a grand-father's grand-father; and from thence we may perceive, that the Fronto of the firſt letter is not the Fronto of the ſecond; for it can hardly happen, that a man ſhould correſpond by letter with two friends, the grand-father of one of which is *atavus* to the other. Beſides, it is manifeſt to me, that the Fronto of the firſt letter had been dead but a few years: he had had a ſhare in the education of his grand-ſon (11), and perhaps Sidonius Apollinaris had been acquainted with him. The ſame cannot be ſuppoſed with relation to the Fronto of the other letter; with relation, I mean, to Marcus Cornelius Fronto, tutor to Marcus Aurelius, for it is of him Sidonius ſpeaks. Now Sidonius lived in the Vth century, and Marcus Aurelius in the ſecond. This is my firſt obſervation. Here is another: I do not ſee how Æmilius Fronto, who dedicated the monument, could be at the ſame time A Fronto, made free by a woman of Aquitain, and have for his great-great-grandfather, M. Cornelius Fronto; for that orator, on whom his diſciple heaped ſo many benefits, and who was honoured with the conſulſhip, left his family in very good circumſtances. His ſon, grandſon, and great grandſon, enjoyed the firſt dignities in Rome (12); and it does not appear how any of his deſcendants could have been a ſlave to a woman of Aquitain, which was a province of the Roman empire.

[*D*] *This is not without ſome difficulty.*] He, whom Pliny ſpeaks of, was called FRONTO Catius: He pleaded for Marius Priſcus, accuſed by the Africans. The cauſe was great and noble, but difficult to maintain; both becauſe Marius was guilty, and becauſe Pliny and Tacitus pleaded againſt him. Marius's advocate made uſe of his uſual talent, which was, to move compaſſion in the judges. 'Reſpondit Fronto Catius deprecatuſque eſt, ne quid ultra repetundarum legem quæreretur, omniaque actionis ſuæ vela vir movendarum lacrymarum peritiſſimus, quodam velut vento miſerationis implevit .... (13). ——— *Fronto Catius replied, and humbly beſought the judges to enquire no farther than the law againſt bribery, and as he had the art of raiſing compaſſion, he moved the court to pity the client's cauſe.* Dixit pro Mario rurſus Fronto Catius inſigniter, utque jam locus ille poſcebat, plus in precibus temporis, quam in defenſione conſumpſit (14). ——— *Fronto Catius again ſpoke admirably for Marius, and, as the nature of the cauſe required, ſpent more time in drawing the court to pity his client, than in defending him.*' This cauſe was tried under Trajan: now our Cornelius Fronto muſt have reached an extream old age, if he be the ſame Fronto Catius, whom we juſt now mentioned: for there is a ſpace of above forty years between the death of Trajan, and the beginning of Marcus Aurelius's reign, and it cannot be ſuppoſed, that Marius's advocate was a young man. Undoubtedly he was one of the moſt famous orators of that time, when he maintained that cauſe. Add to this, that his pathetic character does not well agree with the dry and grave eloquence, which diſtinguiſhed Cornelius Fronto. I believe therefore, that Catanæus is miſtaken (15), in affirming, that the Fronto Catius of Pliny is the ſame Cornelius Fronto, who was Marcus Aurelius's tutor, and whom Juvenal has mentioned in his firſt ſatire. Catanæus, I ſuppoſe, had in view this verſe of Juvenal:

Frontonis platani convulſaque marmora clamant;

Which ſhews, that that Fronto had a fine houſe, and that he lent it to thoſe poets, who had a mind to recite their poems. Now, ſince Juvenal flouriſhed under the reign of Domitian, let the reader judge, if it be likely, that he could ſpeak ſo of a man, who was raiſed to the conſulſhip by Marcus Aurelius. According to the moſt common opinion, this verſe of Martial (16),

Clarum militiæ Fronto togæque decus,

Fronto the ornament of war and peace,

is addreſſed to the ſame Fronto, to whoſe houſe the poets repaired to read their verſes. Now, in this caſe, methinks it cannot be ſaid, that Martial mentioned our Cornelius Fronto; for I do not find any where, that that orator ſignalized himſelf in the army. Some believe, that he, of whom Martial has given ſo great a character in two words, is the ſame Fronto, who was conſul with Trajan in the hundredth year of JESUS CHRIST (17). He is not therefore the tutor of Marcus Aurelius, ſince that prince's tutor enjoyed the conſulſhip only through his pupil's favour. Take notice, that Trajan's colleague in the conſulſhip, the hundredth year of JESUS CHRIST, was conſul for the third time; and that, according to Euſebius's chronicle, Marcus Aurelius's tutor flouriſhed in the year of grace 164. Therefore theſe are two different perſons according to all appearance, let the Jeſuit, who has commented upon A. Gellius, *in uſum Delphini* (18), ſay what he pleaſes to the contrary. How came he not to perceive, that Auſonius would not have looked upon the conſulſhip of two months, beſtowed by Marcus Aurelius on his tutor, as a ſignal favour, if that tutor had been ordinary conſul a long time before, and that

(10) The abbot Nicaiſe, in the explication of an antient monument found in Guienne, printed at Paris 1689, pag. 14, 15.

(11) Hinc avus Fronto blandus tibi.

(12) See the inſcription, in Gruterus, pag. 369, *and* Bertrand, de Juriſperitis, lib. ii, pag. 291. *Some believe, that the father of the grandſon was only ſon-in-law to our Fronto.*

(13) Plinius, lib. ii. Epiſt. 11, pag. m. 98.

(14) Ibid. pag. 105.

(15) Fuit igitur Cornelius Fronto Catius orator nobiliſſimus, Romanæ eloquentiæ non ſecundum ſed alterum decus (quamquam illi Macrobius ſiccum dicendi genus aſcribat) Antonini Philoſophi præceptor. *Catanæus, in Plin. Epiſt. xi. lib. ii, pag. 98. Theſe words,* Fronto Romanæ facundiæ non ſecundum ſed alterum decus, *are quoted by Savaro, in Sidon. Apoll. Epiſt. x. lib. viii, p. 524, as taken out of a panegyric upon Maximian.*

(16) Epigr. lvi, lib. i.

(17) This opinion does not agree with *Pliny*, who ſays, *in Panegyr. p. m.* 116, that *Trajan*, in his third conſulſhip, (it is that of the year 100) choſe a colleague, who was not a warrior. *See Tillemont, Tom. II. pag. m.* 896.

(18) In caput xxvi, lib. iii.

FRONTO, a Roman conſul, under the emperor Nerva. He uttered a very ſolid apophthegm [*E*]. Some pretend, that our Cornelius Fronto made a ſpeech againſt the chriſtians [*F*]. He was not contented to teach Marcus Aurelius rhetoric, but gave him

that too with a great emperor? I obſerve, that our Fronto out-lived his conſulſhip; which appears by Aulus Gellius (19), who mentions him as a conſular man, ſpeaking of the viſit he made him with Favorinus. The Delphin ſcholiaſt ſuppoſes, that Aulus Gellius, in the eighth chapter of the nineteenth book, ſpeaks of that Fronto, who ſignalized himſelf, both in war, and at the bar, under Domitian; that is, of the ſame Fronto, mentioned by Martial. I do not think ſo: I believe Aulus Gellius ſpeaks ſtill of him, who taught M. Aurelius rhetoric, and conſequently that he does not ſpeak of a Fronto, who from Domitian's time was a great ſoldier, and a great ſcholar. William Grotius believes, that he, whom Favorinus and Aulus Gellius went to ſee, is the tutor of Marcus Aurelius; but he makes him conſul in the ſixth year of Severus (20), that is, the year of grace 199. Which error is very groſs, ſince that conſulſhip was a favour from M. Aurelius; and beſides, it is moſt falſe, that our Fronto was alive in the year 199. Was he not the firſt and moſt famous orator at Rome in the reign of Hadrian? Ἀμέλει καὶ Κορνήλιος Φρόντων, ὁ τὰ πρῶτα τῶν τότε Ῥωμαίων ἐν δίκαις φερόμενος, ἑσπέρας ποτὲ βαθείας ἀπὸ δείπνου οἴκαδε ἐπανιὼν καὶ μαθὼν παρά τινος ᾧ συνηγορήσειν ὑπέσχετο, δικάζειν αὐτὸν, ἔν τε τῇ στολῇ τῇ δειπνίτιδι ὥσπερ εἶχε ἐς τὸ δικαστήριον αὐτοῦ ἐσῆλθε. Fuit & Cornelius Fronto magnæ autoritatis, qui in agendis cauſis Romæ primum locum obtinebat. Hic cùm veſperi à cœna ſerò domum rediiſſet, intellexiſſetque ex eo cui patrocinium pollicitus erat, principem jus reddere, veſte cœnatoria indutus, ut erat, in jus venit (21). ——— *Cornelius Fronto was likewiſe of great authority, who was the moſt famous orator at Rome. This man, returning home late from an entertainment, and, being informed by one of his clients, that the emperor was ſitting upon cauſes, went into court, juſt as he was then dreſſed.* He was, then, at leaſt forty years old, when that prince died, in 138.

[*E*] *He uttered a very ſolid apophthegm.*] It is a great misfortune, ſaid he, to live under an emperor, who will ſuffer no body to do any thing, but it is ſtill a greater misfortune to be under a prince, who allows every body to do what they pleaſe. The abridger of Dion has preſerved us this ſentence (22); but he has ſo interrupted the thread of the narration, that one muſt divine to know to what purpoſe the conſul Fronto ſpoke ſo. It was, in all appearance, when he ſaw, that, to remedy the diſorders, which informers had cauſed under Domitian, other exceſſes were committed, which occaſioned a greater confuſion. It is probable the thing happened thus: informers were ſtrictly called to an account, and ſeverely puniſhed as they deſerved. But, under pretence of exterminating that deteſtable race of men, and thoſe public banes, every one, to get rid of his enemies, accuſed them of having been informers. The eaſy temper of Nerva, together with the hatred the people had conceived againſt the creatures of Domitian, made way for a thouſand unjuſt proceedings; inſomuch that Fronto, comparing Nerva's reign with that of Domitian, found it worſe than the other. His apophthegm did ſome good; for the emperor put a ſtop to ſeveral informations and proceedings (23).

[*F*] *He made a ſpeech againſt the chriſtians.*] This is the ground they go upon. The heathen Cæcilius, in the dialogue of Minucius Felix, charges the chriſtians with ſeveral abominations, and quotes the teſtimony of an orator, who was born at Cirtha, a town of Afric; *Et de convivio notum eſt: paſſim omnes loquuntur: id etiam Cirtenſis noſtri teſtatur oratio.* — *It is well known what is practiſed in their feaſts: every one talks of it: our orator of Cirtha likewiſe teſtifies it.* They accuſed the chriſtians of aſſembling upon certain days to eat together: every one came there without diſtinction of age or ſex; and, when they were elevated with drinking, they flung a morſel of bread to a dog, that was tied to a candleſtic. The dog, ruſhing to the bread, overturned the candleſtic, and then, the candle being put out, the two ſexes mingled according to the caprice of chance, every man indulging his luſt with the firſt woman he met with in the dark, whether his ſiſter, daughter, or mother. 'Ad epulas ſolemni die coëunt, cum omnibus liberis, 'ſororibus, matribus, ſexûs omnis homines, & omnis 'ætatis. Illic poſt multas epulas, ubi convivium caluit, & inceſtæ libidinis fervor ebrietate exarſit, canis qui candelabro nexus eſt, jactu offulæ ultra ſpatium lineæ, qua vinctus eſt, ad impetum & ſaltum 'provocatur: ſic everſo & extincto conſcio lumine 'impudentibus tenebris nexus infandæ cupiditatis involvunt per incertum ſortis: &, ſi non omnes opera, conſcientia tamen pariter inceſti; quoniam voto 'univerſorum appetitur, quidquid accidere poteſt in 'actu ſingulorum (24).' When, in the ſame dialogue of Minucius Felix, the chriſtian Octavius confutes this impudent calumny; he obſerves, that the witneſs, whoſe teſtimony had been alledged, was called Fronto; and that he ought not to be quoted as a witneſs who depoſes, but as an orator who inveighs. *Sic de iſto & tuus Fronto non ut affirmator teſtimonium fecit, ſed convitium ut orator aſperſit* (25). There is therefore no room to doubt, that an orator, named Fronto, made a bitter invective againſt the chriſtians; but the queſtion is, whether that Fronto, and he who taught Marcus Aurelius rhetoric, are the ſame. The civilian Francis Baudouin (26) inclines to that opinion, and chuſes rather to aſcribe that ſpeech to the orator Cornelius Fronto, and tutor of Marcus Aurelius, than to the civilian Papyrius Fronto, mentioned in the Pandects. Rigaltius (27) approves Baudouin's ſentiment. Some other commentators, as Wower and Elmenhorſt, poſitively affirm, that the orator Cornelius Fronto, Marcus Aurelius's preceptor, is he who is ſpoken of in Minucius's dialogue. Mr Daillé affirms the ſame thing without the leaſt heſitation; whereby he ſettles the true age of Minucius, and clears himſelf from the anachroniſm, that was laid to his charge; becauſe, in his narration, he had placed Minucius Felix before Irenæus and Clemens Alexandrinus. 'I am not ignorant, *ſays he* (28), that your 'Bellarmin places him after Tertullian; and that the 'late Rigaltius, not to mention others, is of the ſame 'opinion: But I had my reaſons to be of another opi-'nion. For that author ſpeaks * of the orator Fronto, 'a native of Cirtha in Africa, as a man of his time, 'and a friend to that heathen Cæcilius, whom Octa-'vius, in the ſame dialogue, converts to chriſtianity. 'Now it is certain, that Fronto was already living 'under the firſt Antoninus, who died in the 161ſt year 'of our Saviour; and that he was tutor to Antoni-'nus Verus †, and to Marcus Aurelius ‡, who ſuc-'ceeded the firſt Antoninus; and lived, one till the '170th year, and the other till the 180th year of 'our Saviour. I ſhall obſerve three things upon all this: I. That it is not certain, that Minucius has ſpoken of the orator Fronto, *as of a man of his time, and a friend to the heathen Cæcilius*; for the words, *Cirtenſis noſtri*, may only ſignify, that Cæcilius, and he to whom he ſpoke, were of the ſame country with that orator. A Norman, born ſixty years after the death of Malherbe, will make no ſcruple to quote him, thus; *our countryman Malherbe*. It is uſual for an Engliſhman or a German, and ſo of other nations, to quote an author of their reſpective countries, thus; *our ſuch a one*; although that *ſuch a one* has been dead for ſeveral ages. When Mr Daillé, in the paſſage I have quoted, ſays to Father Adam *your Bellarmin*, he he does not mean, that theſe two Jeſuits lived at the ſame time. II. That the expreſſion of Mr Daillé, *it is certain, that Fronto was already living, under the firſt Antoninus*, does not become a man, who ſhould have remembered, that Fronto held the firſt rank among the Roman advocates, under the reign of Hadrian (29). III. After all, I embrace Mr Daillé's opinion: And I believe, that our Cornelius Fronto is the ſame, whom Minucius Felix has quoted, and ſo we know, that he was of Cirtha in Numidia. Let no body object to me, that there is no likelihood, that ſo able a man, ſo famous an orator, ſhould have adopted, in a book, the ſilly ſtories, and impudent calumnies, which ſome paſſionate and ignorant men of that time ſpread againſt the chriſtians. Let us judge of thoſe ages by the XVIth and XVIIth centuries. Where are thoſe, who raiſe with more fury the moſt falſe and moſt

(19) *Lib. ii, cap. xxvi.* Note, that he, whom he calls here M. Fronto, and he, whom he calls Fronto Cornelius, in the eighth and tenth chapter of the nineteenth book, are the ſame perſons. He of the twenty ſixth chapter of the ſecond book has ſore feet; and ſo has he of the tenth chapter of the nineteenth book.

(20) Cujus conſulatum in annum ſextum Severi rejiciendum puto. *Grotius de vitis Juriſconſ. pag.* 188.

(21) Xiphilin. in Hadriano, pag. m. 265.

(22) Id. in Nerva, pag. m. 240.

(23) Ibid.

(24) Minucius Felix, pag. m. 89, 90.

(25) Ibid. pag. 503.

(26) In Prolegomenis ad Minuc. Felicem.

(27) In notis ad Minuc. Felicem, pag. m. 89. *He quotes Lampridius inſtead of Capitolinus; for it is Capitolinus, and not Lampridius, who relates, that Cornelius Fronto taught M. Aurelius rhetoric.*

(28) Replique à Adam & à Cottiby, Part. III, cap. viii, pag. m. 187. *I tranſcribe his quotations without any alteration: I only obſerve, that that of Marc Aurel.* de vita ſua, lib. xii, *is not right. He ſhould have quoted* lib. i, cap. viii.

* Minut. in Octav. pag. 23, & 92.

† Hier. in Melit. lib. de Scrip. Eccleſ.

‡ Marc. Aurel. de vita ſua, lib. xii.

(29) See, above, citat. (21).

him alſo very good precepts of morality (g), which had great relation to the duties of kings.

(g) M. Aurel. de Seipſo, lib. i. n. 8.

moſt heinous accuſations againſt the contrary party, than thoſe who are in the poſſeſſion of the kingdom of declamation? Was it not they, who, in the XVIth century, moſt boldly calumniated the Proteſtants? Let this inſtance ſerve for all: *Sit unum inſtar omnium.*

FUGGER (HULDRIC), born at Augſburg, of a family conſiderable both for it's antiquity and riches [*A*], deſerves a place here, by reaſon of the inclination he ſhewed to learning, and his affection for learned men. He had been chamberlain to Pope Paul III, and afterwards embraced the Proteſtant religion. He ſpent a great deal of money in collecting the good manuſcripts of the ancients, and cauſed them to be printed; and for that purpoſe he allowed, for ſome time, a ſalary to the learned Henry Stephens. His relations were ſo incenſed againſt him for ſpending his eſtate that way, that they brought an action againſt him for it, and cauſed him to be declared incapable of managing his affairs. There are ſome, who, without taking notice of the repealing of that ſentence, obſerve, that the judgment pronounced againſt him caſt him into ſuch a melancholy, as accompanied him almoſt to his grave (*a*). But his epitaph teſtifies, that he was unſhaken at that heavy blow; that he was reſtored to the enjoyment of his eſtate; and that he inherited that of his brother [*B*]. He had fixed his abode at Heidelberg, where he died, being fifty eight years old, in the month of June 1584, bequeathing his library, which was very conſiderable (*b*), to the elector Palatine; and a fund for the ſubſiſtence of ſix ſcholars. He made alſo ſome foundations for the poor, as may be ſeen in his epitaph. He had bought the library of a phyſician, called Achilles Gaſſarus, which proved a good bargain; for that phyſician was a true *helluo librorum*, if we may believe Melchior Adam (*c*). Huldric Fugger was not the firſt of his family, who had a fine library: For we read, in Melchior Adam (*d*), that Jerom Wolfius, being gone to Augſburg, was there very civilly entertained by ANTONY FUGGER, and that the famous library of JOHN JAMES FUGGER was committed to his care [*C*]. This JOHN JAMES FUGGER had been a great lover of learning, and cauſed ſome writings of James Ziegler to be printed (*e*). He was particularly eſteemed by the cardinal de Granvelle, and wrote often to him. A letter, which he wrote to him in Italian, dated the twenty firſt of July 1564, was publiſhed in 1692 (*f*).

Beatus Rhenanus gives us a great idea of the magnificence, and good taſte of ANTONY and RAYMOND FUGGER. He deſcribes the beauty of their houſes, and gardens; where excellent pictures were ſeen, the moſt conſiderable plants that were

(*a*) Patrimonii aviti ampliſſimi adminiſtratione dejectus eſt, unde mœrore contracto in melancholiæ morbum incidit, quo fere tota vita conflictatus eſt. *Thuan. lib. lxxx, ſub fin.*

(*b*) Inſignem Bibliothecam mille aliquot voluminibus manuſcriptis Græcis, Latinis, Hebraïcis ſpectatiſſimam. *Gruterus, Chron. Eccleſ. lib. ii, pag.* 1306.

(*c*) Melch. Adam. in vitis Medicor. pag. 234.

(*d*) Id. in vitis Philoſ. pag. 305.

(*e*) Thuan. lib. 71. pag. 118.

(*f*) See Mr Pelliſſon's Treatiſe of Toleration of Religions, pag. 96, of the additions; and below, remark [*A*].

[*A*] *He was of a family conſiderable for it's antiquity and riches.*] See the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary, in the article FOUCKERS, and above, the remark [*EE*] of the article CHARLES V. Thuanus relates (1), that, when that emperor changed the government of Augſburg, in the year 1548, he marked the family of the Fuggers among thoſe, which, for the future, ſhould enjoy the dignity of a ſenator. Here is what the abbot Boiſot wrote to Mr Pelliſon, when he ſent him the copy of a letter taken out of the memoirs of the cardinal de Granvelle: 'He, who 'wrote it, was one of thoſe Fuggers, illuſtrious and 'famous merchants of Augſburg, who little differed 'in credit and ſplendor from thoſe, whom an univerſal commerce, which was altogether noble, and 'the great riches that attended it, have ſometimes 'raiſed to the higheſt employments in republics: He 'kept a great correſpondence with the cardinal, and 'frequently gave him ſome very good advice (2).' Rabelais, writing from Rome, in the year 1536, to the biſhop of Maillezais, tells him, *That, next to the Fourques of Ausburg, Philip Stroſſi is accounted the richeſt merchant of Chriſtendom* (3). Now the following hiſtorical note has been made upon thoſe words of Rabelais. 'The family of the Fouckres, or Fuggers, '*Fuggerana*, is now pretty conſiderable in Germany, 'in the dioceſe of Conſtance, where they poſſeſs the 'baronies of Kirchberg and Weiſſenhorn. Their firſt 'reſidence was in the city of Augſburg; and it is about 'one hundred and fifty years ago that they were the 'richeſt merchants in Germany. By the emperor's 'gratification they were honoured with the dignity of 'barons, in the year MDX, in the perſons of Raymond 'Foucre, baron of Kirchberg and Weiſſenhorn, and 'of Antony Fugger, whoſe grandſon was James, 'biſhop and prince of Conſtance, in the year 1604. 'That which gives the greateſt luſtre to that houſe, is, 'that it is allied with the beſt families in Germany, '*viz.* with the counts of Zollern, Schwartzemberg, 'Eberſteyn, Koningſeck, Montfort, Ottingen, and 'Truceſes, with the barons of Madruce, the counts of 'Lodron, and others, the moſt illuſtrious in Bavaria.' Hippolitus à Lapidè (4) obſerves, that the Fuggers were honoured with the quality of counts, but that they never were inſerted in the rolls of the empire till the year 1582. I have ſeen a book in High-Dutch, printed in the year 1560, containing the prints of thoſe of that family, both men and women, with a little diſcourſe upon every one of them. The firſt mentioned there is JAMES FUGGER, called the Old, who died the fourteenth of March 1469. All the genealogies of Germany mention this illuſtrious family; tho' they do not ſcruple to own, that it is deſcended from a weaver, who, in the year 1370 (5), obtained the freedom of Augſburg, and was of the village of Geggingen, within half a league of that city (6).

[*B*] *His epitaph teſtifies, that he was unſhaken —— and that he ſucceeded to his brother's eſtate.*] The reader may believe as much of it as he pleaſes; for the friends of a deceaſed perſon generally make no great ſcruple of an officious lie. Here is what they affirm in it. *Apud Fridericum III. electorem Palatinum fortunam conſtantia & æquanimitate ſuperavit. Suis interea reſtitutus, fraternis quinetiam bonis auctior, eundem in re lauta quem afflicta vultum animumque retinuit.* See Mr Teiſſier (7).

[*C*] *Wolfius was intruſted with the care of the famous library of J. J. FUGGER.*] Wolfius made ſome Greek verſes, wherein he teſtifies, that that library, furniſhed with as many books as there are ſtars in the firmament, was a place, where he ſpent whole days, gathering flowers and fruits, diverting and inſtructing himſelf; and that he preferred it to every other:

Ἀντὶ μὲν οὖν πάντων αἱρεῦμαι βιβλιοθήκων
Φουκκαρίνην, εὐχῆς κρείττονα τήνδε φιλῶ.

O Fuggere tuam, præ cunctis, Bibliothecam
Hanc amo, nam votis major & illa meis (8).

Pleas'd, I thy copious library ſurvey,
And through the various walks of learning ſtray.

[*D*] *They*

(1) Thuan. lib. v, pag. m. 99.

(2) Pelliſſon, Traité de la Tolerance des Religions, pag. 95, *of the Additions.*

(3) Rabel. Epiſt. pag. 9.

(4) De Rat. Stat. in Imp. Germ. Part. II, cap. vii, ſect. viii, pag. m. 458.

(5) See Hoffman's Dictionary, *Tom. III, pag.* 773. I cannot reconcile with the book in German, what he ſays of James Fugger, a weaver's ſon. He makes him counſellor to Maximilian I. The book in German places his death in the year 1469. Maximilian began his reign in the year 1493.

(6) Cruſ. Part. III, Annal. Suev. lib. v, cap. ix, apud Magirum Eponym. pag. 366.

(7) Elog. Tom. II, pag. 4.

(8) Script. Publ. Academ. Witteb. Tom. III, fol. 121, apud Lomeïer de Bibl. pag. 398.

were in Italy, and many monuments of antiquity [*D*]. See the letter, which he wrote to the phyſician of the elector of Mentz, the ſixth of March 1531. It is the fiftieth of the century of philological letters, collected and publiſhed by Goldaſtus.

[*D*] *They had many monuments of antiquity.*] Raymond Fugger ſpared no coſt to make a good collection of them: for he was both a ſcholar, and a lover of antiquity. ‘ Narrabatur vero nobis ex toto propemodum ‘ orbe convecta fuiſſe ea vetuſtatis monumenta, præcipue tamen ex Græcia atque Sicilia. Adeo nullius ‘ ſumptus Raimundum pœnitet ob amorem, quem literarum minime expers erga antiquitatem gerit, modo ‘ poſſit talibus rebus potiri. Id quod vere nobilem & ‘ generoſum hominis animum oſtendit (9). —— *We* ‘ *are told, that he procured thoſe monuments of antiquity from almoſt all parts of the world, particularly from Greece and Sicily. And ſo great an admirer* ‘ *was the learned Raymund of antiquity, that he ſpared* ‘ *for no expence in purchaſing them. Which ſhews the* ‘ *truly noble and generous ſpirit of the man.*’

(9) Beat. Rhenan. apud Goldaſt. Cent. Epiſt. Philolog. pag. m. 212.

FULGINAS, or **DE FULGINEO** (SIGISMUND), is reckoned among the learned men of the XVth century. He has written the hiſtory of what paſſed in his time. Felinus (*a*) refers his readers to it, concerning the differences of Sixtus IV. with Ferdinand king of Naples. Voſſius might have known better, than by that quotation, in what time Fulginas lived, if he had minded the firſt chapter of the ſixth book of the *Geniales Dies* of *Alexander ab Alexandro*; where we learn, that the latter had, from his youth, contracted a great friendſhip with Fulginas, a learned man, very much employed by the Popes, and who ſtole as much time as he could from his buſineſs, either to read good books, or to write the annals of his time. The idea which is given us of his riches, and of his table, is very mean [*A*], and very much inferior to that of his wit and learning. He made ſome Latin verſes upon the death of Bartholomew Platina, wherein he takes the title of Apoſtolic Secretary: They were publiſhed at the end of the works of Platina, who died in the year 1481. I only take notice of this, that my reader may the better know in what time Fulginas lived. He is little known by Bibliographers.

(*a*) Epitom. de Sicil. & Apul. Regib cap xxix, *and not* xxxix, *as Voſſius*, de Hiſt. Lat. pag. 661, *has quoted.*

He was ſtill alive in the year 1511, which appears by a letter that Bembus wrote to him. It is the third of the fifth book. The preceding letter, written the twenty fifth of November 1510, ſhews that Fulginas was in the ſervice of Julius II, and that he is one of the chief interlocutors in Bembus's dialogue *de Urbini ducibus*.

[*A*] *The idea which is given us of his riches, and of his table, is very mean.*] Judge of it by theſe words of Alexander ab Alexandro (1). ‘ Nonnunquam in ſuo ‘ prædiolo in monte Janiculo, miro proſpectu & collibus amœno, ubi ædiculas habebat, cum amicis ſe ‘ recipiebat, ibique lepidis jucundiſque ſermonibus, id ‘ quod erat laxamenti, una familiariſſime conferebat. ‘ Præſtabat nonnunquam nobis ipſe cœnulam, ut non ‘ nimis inſolentem, ſic profecto ſobriam & modeſtam, ‘ ac temporibus conſentaneam: & ut erat ipſe comis, ‘ faciliſque natura, ita facilem nobis victum, non exquiſitis valde obſoniis apparabat, ſiquidem aſparagos ‘ altiles acido vino & pipere conditos cum juſculo tepidulo, ac ferculum cucurbitæ, cum immatura uva ‘ ibidem expreſſa, & decocta largo ſucco, quibus perlibenter veſcebatur, obſonia nobis exhibebat: addebat ‘ etiam pyrum pomumque perſicum miro odore fragrantia. Poſt cœnulam, &c. —— *He ſometimes* ‘ *retired with his friends to his little eſtate on mount* ‘ *Janiculum, where he had a beautiful proſpect, and a* ‘ *ſmall ſeat; where they unbent their minds, and diverted themſelves with chearful converſation. I have* ‘ *ſometimes ſupped with him there, at a ſober and moderate repaſt, and agreeable to the times; and, as he* ‘ *was himſelf of a courteous and eaſy diſpoſition, ſo he* ‘ *gave us an eaſy entertainment, not conſiſting of delicacies; for the bill of fare was, aſparagus dreſſed* ‘ *with vinegar and pepper, and warm ſauce, and a meſs* ‘ *of gourd, with the juice of unripe grapes, and ſwimming in ſauce; on which he fed very freely: he added* ‘ *likewiſe pears and peaches, of wonderful fragrance.* ‘ *After this light meal, &c.*’

(1) Alex. ab Alexandro, Genial. Dier. lib. vi, cap. i, pag. m. 391, 392.

FULVIA, a Roman lady, who diſcovered Catiline's conſpiracy. See the remark [*D*], of the following article.

FULVIA, wife of Marc Anthony, had nothing of her ſex but the body (*a*); for her ſpirit and courage led her to war, and public affairs. After the battle of Philippi, wherein Brutus and Caſſius were defeated by Octavius and Marc Anthony, the latter paſſed into Aſia to ſettle the affairs of the Eaſt. Octavius returned to Rome, and ſoon fell out with Fulvia: Nor could the quarrel be decided but by the ſword. That woman took up arms, and cauſed Lucius Antonius, her huſband's brother, to take them up too [*A*]. This prepoſterous ſtep was only favourable to Octavius, who gained a full

(*a*) Nihil muliebre præter corpus ferens. *Paterculus, lib. ii, cap. lxxiv. See the remark* [*A*].

[*A*] *That woman took up arms, and cauſed Lucius Antonius, her huſband's brother, to take them up too.*] This ought to be underſtood in the moſt literal ſenſe, ſince it is certain that ſhe was ſeen with a ſword by her ſide. She was not contented to retire to Præneſte, and to make it her place of arms; ſhe not only called thither the ſenators, and knights of her party, held councils with them, and publiſhed ſeveral proclamations, according to the exigency of affairs, but ſhe likewiſe armed herſelf perſonally; ſhe gave the word to the ſoldiers, and harangued them on ſeveral occaſions: Καὶ τί ταῦτα θαυμάσειεν ἄν τὶς ὁπότε καὶ ξίφος παρεζώννυτο, καὶ συνθήματα τοῖς στρατιώταις ἐδίδου, ἐδημηγόρει τε ἐν αὐτοῖς πολλάκις. *Id quidem mirandum adeo non eſt quum gladio etiam ſe accinxerit ipſa, teſſeram militibus dederit, ſæpenumero concionem apud eos habuerit* (1). The Hiſtorian, who tells us theſe things, ſays, that, in the year 713, Publius Servilius and Lucius Antonius had the name of conſuls, and that the latter and Fulvia were ſo in effect. He gives us afterwards to underſtand, that Lucius Antonius had no authority, but through Fulvia's means; and that it was ſhe, who procured him the honour of the triumph: for he could not obtain the ſame, till he had engaged her, by his ſubmiſſion and cringing, to ſtir in his favour. And indeed ſhe took more pride in that triumph, than the triumpher himſelf (2). It is not amiſs to ſee what Plutarch ſays of Fulvia (3): Φουλβίαν ἀγάμενος τὴν Κλωδίῳ τῷ δημαγωγῷ συνοικήσασαν, οὐ ταλασίαν, οὐδὲ οἰκουρίαν φρονοῦν γύναιον, οὐδὲ ἀνδρὸς ἰδιώτου κρατεῖν ἀξιοῦν, ἀλλὰ ἄρχοντος ἄρχειν. καὶ στρατηγοῦντος στρατηγεῖν βουλόμενον· ὥς τε Κλεοπάτραν διδασκάλια Φουλβίᾳ τῆς Ἀντωνίου γυναικοκρασίας

(1) Dio, lib. xlviii, pag. m. 414.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 409, 410.

(3) Plutarch in Antonio. pag. 920. D.

a full victory over his enemies; whereupon Fulvia retired into Greece, and there died of a ſickneſs, occaſioned by her grief [*B*]. She left two ſons (*b*). Womaniſh paſſions had a ſhare in the war ſhe raiſed againſt Octavius [*C*]. She had two huſbands before ſhe married Marc Antony: The firſt was Clodius, that great and mortal enemy of Cicero; the ſecond was Curio, who was killed in Africa, in Cæſar's cauſe, before the battle of Pharſalia. It is not true, that ſhe had been married to Catiline [*D*].

She

γυναικοκρατίας ὀφείλειν, πάνυ χειροήθη καὶ πεπαιδαγωγημένον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀκροᾶσθαι γυναικῶν, παραλαβοῦσαν αὐτόν. *Fulviam Clodii, plebis concitatoris, viduam* (4) *uxorem duxit, mulierem non ad lanificium aut ad rei familiaris adminiſtrationem factam, neque in virum contentam dominari privatum, ſed quæ imperanti imperare & ducem volebat ducere: ut mercedem Fulviæ, quod ancillari Antonium docuiſſet fœminis, debuerit Cleopatra, quæ plane cicurem atque à tyrocinio inſtitutum ad obtemperandum mulieribus recepit.* Here is a woman, who, bating chaſtity, was not unlike the Camilla of Virgil.

> - - - non illa colo, calathiſve Minervæ
> Femineas aſſueta manus (5).

> *With manlier fires her female boſom burns,*
> *Nor e're her hand th' unwarlike ſpindle turns.*

The diſtaff, and domeſtic cares, were none of her buſineſs; neither was ſhe contented to domineer over her husband at home; ſhe was alſo ambitious to lord it over him abroad, that is, with reſpect to his great public employments. Cleopatra found no great difficulty in reducing him under obedience to a woman; for he had learned that ſubmiſſion in a good ſchool.

[*B*] *She died in Greece of a ſickneſs, occaſioned by her grief.*] Marc Antony, being informed of the diſorders in Italy, ſet forward thither, to remedy them; and, being arrived at Àthens, he found there his wife, who had been forced to fly out of Italy. He blamed extreamly the authors of that war, that is, Lucius Antonius, Fulvia, and Manius (6). When he continued his journey, he left Fulvia ſick at Sicyon (7), where ſhe died ſome time after. The news of it was brought to her husband, during the ſiege of Brunduſium, in the year 714, and it is likely he received it with joy, for he had been extreamly incenſed againſt her; and though he knew, at his departure from Sicyon, that ſhe was fallen ſick, becauſe he had chid her, he would never go to ſee her, which haſtened the death of that proud woman (8).

[*C*] *Womaniſh paſſions had a ſhare in the war ſhe raiſed againſt Octavius.*] The daughter, that ſhe had by Clodius, was married to Octavius, who ſoon after put her away, ſwearing he had not conſummated the marriage; which oath was enough to incenſe Fulvia. A mother's fondneſs ſuffers very much by the thought that her daughter bears the name of wife, without the reality; wherefore Fulvia could not think on the divorce of her dear child without grief: ſhe ſaw her deprived of the ſubſtantial pleaſures of marriage, which was a ſign of extream contempt; for Octavius was of a very amorous conſtitution. She was not ignorant, that few people would give credit to Octavius's oath; and therefore, that her daughter, thus deſpiſed by her husband, ſo far as to preſerve her virginity for ſome time, would nevertheleſs paſs for a perſon, that could afford nothing but the leavings of a firſt huſband. Fulvia might alſo conſider, that Octavius was come into her alliance with a ſpirit of diſtruſt, which had made him forbear enjoying his wiſe, that, according to what courſe affairs ſhould take, he might be at liberty to ſend her away, and to affirm, upon oath, that he had not touched her. Dion (9) obſerves, that, when Octavius made this oath, he was little concerned, whether the people would believe, that he had kept ſo long this young lady at his houſe, without meddling with her, or whether they would think, that he had abſtained from her, to make way for his divorce. Theſe captious and political precautions are not pleaſing to a mother, and conſequently a womaniſh paſſion may well have had a ſhare in the deſign, which Fulvia formed, of making war upon Octavius. Here is another paſſion of the ſame kind. Fulvia knew her husband to be enſlaved to the fair Cleopatra; jealouſy prompted her to draw Marc Antony from that new engagement; and ſhe eaſily believed thoſe who told her, that her unfaithful husband would never return to her whilſt Italy was quiet (10), but that a war in Italy would ſoon oblige him to return. Whereupon Fulvia carried things to extremity againſt Octavius (11). But if Auguſtus's epigram, which is among thoſe of Martial, were an hiſtorical account (12), we might then boldly affirm, that womaniſh paſſions engaged Fulvia in that war.

[*D*] *It is not true, that ſhe had been married to Catiline.*] The reaſon Glandorpius uſes to confute this (13), ſeems to me very good. He borrows it from the ſecond Philippic of Cicero. *Cujus* (P. Clodii) *quidem te fatum ſicuti C. Curionem manet, quoniam id domi tuæ eſt, quod fuit illorum utrique fatale.* Cicero means, that Marc Antony, having at home the ſame wife, which had been fatal to Clodius and to Curio, would not fail to have a fatal end, as they had had. He repeats the ſame thought at the end of the oration: ‘Eripiet & extorquebit tibi iſta populus Romanus: utinam ſalvis nobis: ſed quoque modo nobiſcum egeris, dum iſtis conſiliis uteris non potes (mihi crede) eſſe diuturnus. Etenim iſta tua minime avara conjux, quam ego ſine contumelia deſcribo, nimium debet diu populo Romano tertiam penſionem (14). —— *The Roman people will ſnatch and extort this from you: I wiſh, with our ſafety: but deal how you will with us, whilſt you purſue theſe councils, believe me, you cannot long hold it. For that wife of your's, a woman not at all greedy after wealth, whom I deſcribe without contumely, is too long indebted a third payment to the Roman people.*’ It is plain to every body, that, if Fulvia had been married to Catiline, the tragical death of that husband would have been joined, in Cicero's oration, with that of the other two: both general and particular reaſons would have engaged the orator not to forget Catiline upon that occaſion. The error, Glandorpius confutes, may proceed from not attending to the circumſtances of a narrative, which is in Salluſt. That hiſtorian informs us, that a great lady, (15), named **FULVIA**, diſcovered Catiline's conſpiracy. One of the accomplices, who had for a long time had a criminal commerce with her, had, by his freaks and rhodomontades, given her occaſion to find out the plot. He had, it ſeems, ſpent all he had, and thereupon the lady grew extream cold towards him. To warm her again, he boaſted, on the ſudden, of what he would do for her; promiſed her mountains of gold; adding ſwaggering to his boaſting, and threatening to kill her, if ſhe did not comply with his deſires. She penetrated into the cauſes of theſe new bravadoes, and informed ſeveral perſons of what ſhe had learned touching Catiline's deſigns. ‘Erat ei (*Q. Curio*) cum Fulvia, muliere nobili, ſtupri vetus conſuetudo, cui cum minus gratus eſſet, quod inopia minus largiri poterat, repente glorians, maria, monteiſque polliceri cœpit, minari interdum ferro, ni ſibi obnoxia foret: poſtremo, ferocius agitare, quam ſolitus erat. At Fulvia, inſolentiæ Curii cauſſa cognita, tale periculum reipublicæ haud occultum habuit; ſed, ſublato auctore, de Catilinæ conjuratione, quæ quo modo audierat, compluribus narravit (16).’ It is probable ſeveral readers have miſtaken here one for the other, and believed, that it was Catiline, who kept Fulvia (17). After this miſtake, nothing was more natural than to ſay, that Catiline was betrayed by Fulvia his miſtreſs, or his concubine; and afterwards it was not difficult to proceed ſo far, as to give out, that his wiſe Fulvia diſcovered the conſpiracy. Thoſe, who were acquainted with the wickedneſs of Marc Antony's wife, may eaſily have imagined, that ſhe was capable of all that is aſcribed to the other Fulvia, and ſo they may have reduced thoſe two Fulvia's into one. I muſt add in this place, the better to make the miſtreſs of Curius known, that ſhe had ſo much diſcretion and faithfulneſs towards her gallant, as not to reveal, that he was one of the accomplices, or that ſhe had learned from him what was contriving againſt the republic; neither did ſhe

break

(*b*) See the remark [*L*] towards the end.

(4) Fulvia had loſt another huſband ſince Clodius; and ſo Plutarch is not exact enough.

(5) Æneid. lib. vii, ver. 805.

(6) Appian. lib. v, Bell. Civil. pag. m. 409.

(7) Ib. pag. 411.

(8) Ib. pag. 414. *See alſo* Dio, lib xlvii, pag. 427.

(9) Dio, lib. xlvii, pag. 410.

(10) Manius, Marc Antony's Steward. *Appian*, lib. v, Bell. Civ. pag. m. 395, *ſays this to Fulvia*, id. pag. 397.

(11) Appian. ib.

(12) See the remark [*C*] of the article of the firſt *GLAPHYRA*.

(13) Gland. Onomaſt. pag. 84.

(14) Cicero, Philipp. II, cap. xliv.

(15) Mulier nobilis, γυνὴ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν, *according to Plutarch*, in Cicer. pag. 868. C. *From whence it appears, that Florus, who, in the firſt chapter of the fourth book, calls her* Viliſſimum ſcortum, *did not know her well.*

(16) Salluſtius, in Bello Catil. pag. m. 63.

(17) *He who made the Index of* Salluſt Variorum *has committed the Fault.* Fulvia, *ſays he,* nobilis mulier cum qua Catilinæ vetus ſtupri conſuetudo fuerat, conjurationem ejus clam noctu profecta Ciceroni detexit.

She had the pleaſure of gratifying her revenge on Cicero's tongue [*E*], which had ſo much abuſed her huſband in the Philippics. They, who ſay ſhe was Marc Antony's firſt wife, are miſtaken [*F*]. If they had had the patience to examine things exactly, they

break with him; but, on the contrary, it ſeems ſhe was more intimate with him than before. They made uſe of her, to win her gallant by a thouſand fair promiſes (18); and Curius employed her to diſcover to Cicero the deſigns of the conſpirators: *Curius ubi intelligit quantum periculum Conſuli impendeat, propere per Fulviam Ciceroni dolum qui parabatur enunciat* (19). So true it is, that every thing is of uſe in a government; and that, in particular, courtezans and ladies of intrigue ſometimes do the public great ſervice by their addreſs of ſearching out the moſt important ſecrets. It is true, that by this means they ſometimes ruin the affairs of their country, by revealing the ſecrets of the cabinet to a liberal enemy. But ſuch is the condition of human things, that what may be hurtful, may alſo be uſeful. I cannot tell whether the Fulvia, mentioned by Valerius Maximus, is the ſame that Salluſt ſpeaks of. Glandorpius is not far from that opinion; but others rather aſcribe this adventure to our Fulvia, ſo much are they inclined to believe her capable of all manner of diſorders. However it be, here is the whole ſtory. An officer of the tribunes of the people gave a feaſt to his maſters, and to the conſul Metellus Scipio, and entertained them with an infamous diverſion: he brought into their company two Roman ladies, who had each of them fathers and husbands; one of them was called Mucia, and the other Fulvia. ‘ Æque flagitioſum illud convivium ‘ quod Gemellus tribunicius viator ingenui ſanguinis ‘ ſed officii intra ſervilem habitum deformis, Metello ‘ Scipioni conſuli ac tribunis plebis magno cum rubore civitatis comparavit. Lupanari enim domi ſuæ ‘ inſtituto Muciam & Fulviam, tum à patre tum à ‘ viro utramque abductam, & nobilem puerum Saturninum in eo proſtituit (20). Metellus Scipio's conſulſhip falls in the year 701 of Rome, eleven years after Catiline's conſpiracy: now how is it likely, that Salluſt's Fulvia ſhould have, at that time, both father and husband? our Fulvia was then proſecuting the revenge of Clodius; and Milo, who had murthered Clodius, was tried for it in the year 701. How is it then likely, that his widow ſhould be married again under that conſul? we know beſides, that, in 696, her father was dead, and her mother married again to Murena (21).

[*E*] *She had the pleaſure of gratifying her revenge on Cicero's tongue.*] She ſtrangely ſeconded her cruel husband, during the maſſacres of the triumvirate; and, of her own head, either through avarice, or a ſpirit of revenge, ſhe cauſed to be put to death ſeveral perſons, ſome of whom were not ſo much as known to her huſband. Marc Antony cauſed the heads of thoſe, he had proſcribed, to be brought to him, while he was at table, and entertained his eyes a long while with that ſad ſpectacle. Cicero's head being one of thoſe, that were brought to him, he ordered it to be placed on the very pulpit, where Cicero had made ſo many ſpeeches againſt him. But, before this order was put in execution, Fulvia took that head, ſpit upon it, and, putting it in her lap, drew it's tongue, which ſhe pricked ſeveral times with her bodkin, and at the ſame time uttered a thouſand bitter invectives againſt Cicero. Ἡ δὲ δὴ Φουλβία ἔς τε τὰς χεῖρας αὐτὴν πρὶν ἀποκομισθῆναι, ἐδέξατο καὶ ἐμπικραναμένη οἱ καὶ ἐμπτύσασα ἐπί τε τὰ γόνατα ἐπέθηκε, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς διοίξασα τήν τε γλῶσσαν ἐξείλκυσε, καὶ ταῖς βελόναις αἷς ἐς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐχρῆτο κατεκέντησε πολλὰ ἅμα καὶ μιαρὰ προσεπισκώπτουσα. *Fulvia autem id caput acceptum priuſquam auferretur, inſultanſque amarulentis verbis & conſpuens, genibus ſuis impoſuit: oriquc ejus aperto linguam extractam acubus (quales ſecum comendi capitis cauſa mulieres ferunt) compunxit, additis crebris ac turpibus opprobriis* (22). Here is a ſtrange ſort of a wicked woman! there are ſome villains, whom we are in a manner forced to admire, becauſe they ſhew a kind of greatneſs of ſoul in their very crimes; but here we ſee nothing but brutality, meanneſs, and baſeneſs, and we cannot but be moved with indignation and contempt. Neverthleleſs Mr Moreri acquaints his readers, *that it is affirmed, that Fulvia had ſome generoſity.*

[*F*] *They, who ſay ſhe was Marc Antony's firſt wife, are miſtaken.*] Mr Moreri and Mr Chevreau have committed this fault; the firſt in the article of Marc Antony, and the other in his *Hiſtory of the World*, page 105 of the ſecond tome of the edition of Holland. Marc Antony's firſt wife was called Fadia, whom he married, becauſe ſhe was a fortune, without regarding, that her father was as contemptible by the blemiſhes of his perſon, as by the meanneſs of his extraction. ‘ Tuæ conjugis bonæ feminæ, locu- ‘ pletis quidem certe, Bambalio quidam pater, homo ‘ nullo numero. Nihil illo contemptius, qui propter ‘ hæſitantiam linguæ, ſtuporemque cordis, cognomen ‘ ex contumelia traxerit. At avus nobilis, Tuditanus ‘ nempe ille qui cum palla & cothurnis nummos po- ‘ pulo de roſtris ſpargere ſolebat. Vellem hanc con- ‘ temptionem pecuniæ ſuis reliquiſſet. —— *One Bam- ‘ balio, a man of no account, is father of your wife, ‘ a very good woman, at leaſt a rich one. Nothing ‘ can be more deſpicable than that man, who, by rea- ‘ ſon of an heſitation of ſpeech, and ſtupidity, owes his ‘ very name to contempt. But his grandfather was no- ‘ ble, to wit, that Tuditanus, who, in his robes and ‘ buskins, uſed to fling money from the roſtra among ‘ the people. I wiſh his poſterity inherited this con- ‘ tempt of money.* This is what Cicero advances in his third Philippic, at page 782 of my edition *cap. VI.* A little after he affirms, that this wife of Marc Antony was daughter to a freedman (23): *Ipſe ex libertini filia ſuſceperit liberos.* He had ſaid the ſame thing towards the beginning of the ſecond Philippic: ‘ Hoc idcirco commemoratum à te puto, ut te in- ‘ fimo ordini commendares: cum te omnes recorda- ‘ rentur libertini generum, & liberos tuos, nepotes ‘ Q. Fadii (24) libertini hominis fuiſſe. —— ‘ *This I ſuppoſe you mentioned, to ingratiate yourſelf ‘ with the mob; ſince every one remembers, that you ‘ are ſon-in-law to a freedman, and that your ſons are ‘ grandſons of Q. Fadius, a freedman.*’ Glandorpius (25) has reaſon to ſuſpect, that Marc Antony and Fadia's children were not long-lived, ſince neither Cicero, nor any other writer, mention them by their names. We only know, that the hoſtage, ſent by Marc Antony to Cæſar's murtherers, was ſon of Marc Antony and Fadia; for Cicero will not ſuffer us to doubt of it: *Pacem haberemus quæ erat facta per obſidem puerum nobilem Marci Antonii filium, M. Bambalionis nepotem* (26). Glandorpius has been ſtrangely miſtaken, in believing, that Bambalio was Fulvia's father, and that the paſſage of the third Philippic does not wholly relate to Fadia. This falſe conceit has occaſioned his raſh cenſuring Maturantius, for not having divided between two wives of Marc Antony the words of Cicero: ‘ Ex iis quæ retulimus quivis fa- ‘ cile perſpexerit quam probe Franciſcus Maturantius, ‘ vir alioquin doctiſſimus, Fadiæ Bambalionem patrem ‘ tribuat, eamque fuiſſe Tuſculanam aſſerat. Deinde ‘ quæ Ciceroni Philipp. 3. de Fulvia ſeorſim & Fa- ‘ dia dicuntur, ipſe cuncta miſcens ad unam Fadiam ‘ omnia referat (27). —— *From what I have related ‘ it is manifeſt with how little ground Francis Ma- ‘ turantius, otherwiſe a very learned man, makes Bam- ‘ balio the father of Fadia, and aſſerts, that ſhe was ‘ of Tuſculum. Laſtly, what Cicero, in his third Phi- ‘ lippic, ſays of Fulvia and Fadia diſtinctly, he con- ‘ founds, and applies wholly to Fadia.*’ Maturantius is in the right in all this; and I cannot ſufficiently wonder how Paulus Manucius could believe, that theſe words of the third Philippic, *at avus nobilis*, &c. relate to Fulvia. If they did, there would be reaſon to ſay, that Cicero has put his words and thoughts in a very ill order: But if we conſider it never ſo little, we ſhall plainly ſee, that Cicero reproaches Marc Antony only with his marriage with Fadia. He obſerves I. That that woman's father was a man of the meaneſt extraction: II. He raiſes an objection to himſelf, *viz.* that that woman's grand-father was nobly born: III. He relates the public extravagancies and follies of that grand-father. There had been nothing more ridiculous, than to ſuppoſe, with relation to the marriage with Fulvia, that, if Marc Antony did not marry beneath himſelf, it was becauſe Fulvia's grandfather,

(18) Neque Ciceroni ad cavendum dolus aut aſtutiæ deerant, namque à principio conſulatus ſui multa per Fulviam pollicendo effecerat, ut Q. Curius de quo paulo ante memoravi conſilia Catilinæ ſibi proderet. *Salluſt. ubi ſupra, pag.* 70.

(19) Id. ibid. pag. 75.

(20) Valer. Maximus, lib. ix, cap. i, n. 8.

(21) *See* Cicero, Orat. pro domo ſua.

(22) Dio, lib. xlvii, pag. 378.

(23) Or grand-daughter; for the word *libertinus*, which properly ſignified only the ſon of a bondman made free, was afterwards indifferently given to the man himſelf, who was made free, through the ill cuſtom people have of ſtretching honourable titles, and of being civil at the expence of words.

(24) He calls him Caïus Fadius, *epiſt. xi, ad Attic. lib xvi. Vidi ibi Corradum*, who conjectures, that the tranſcribers have changed the *C* into Q, or *vice verſa*. But what ſhall we ſay, when we ſee, that Cicero, below, citat. (26), calls him M. Bambalio? There are Manuſcripts which, inſtead of Q. Fadii, have M. Fundi.

(25) Gland. Onomaſt. pag. 83.

(26) Cicero, Philipp. II.

(27) Gland. ubi ſupra.

they would have known, that, when he married her, he had had as many wives, as ſhe huſbands [G], and that he had put away Antonia, his ſecond wife, under pretence of adultery, without having the leaſt regard to his uncle, who was Antonia's father. Neither

grandfather, by the mother's ſide, was nobly born. Now it is plain, that, if the objection, which Cicero propoſes to himſelf, relates to the marriage with Fulvia, the proof of Marc Antony's not having married beneath himſelf, would be grounded on the noble extraction of the maternal grand-father of his wife (28): and therefore it is not credible, that the objection relates to that marriage. I have ſaid, that it had been very ridiculous to have had recourſe to the nobility of Fulvia's maternal grand-father, to clear Marc Antony from marrying beneath himſelf, which I thus eaſily prove. Fulvia was of one of the moſt ancient and illuſtrious families of Rome. The Fulvii traced their origin to a diſciple of Hercules in matters of religion. This was Fulvia's nobility. Glandorpius ſhould not have thruſt her father out of the family of the Fulvii: that woman had a brother, who was really of that ancient family, and who was made high-prieſt by the intereſt of Clodius his ſiſter's huſband (29), and whoſe wife was married again to Murena (30). It is from Cicero we learn all this: ' Te ad ' tuum affinem non delectum à te, ſed relictum à ' cæteris contuliſti, quem ego tamen credo, ſi eſt ortus ab illis, quos memoriæ proditum eſt, ab ipſo Hercule perfuncto jam laboribus ſacra didiciſſe, in viri ' fortis ærumnis, non ita crudelem fuiſſe, ut &c (31). ' —— *You had recourſe to your kinſman, not choſen ' by you, but abandoned by the reſt; who, if he be ' deſcended from thoſe, who are ſaid to have learned ' religious rites from Hercules, after his toils were ' over, would not, I am perſuaded, have been ſo cruel, ' as to, &c.* Muſt he not have been out of his wits, if he had pretended, that Marc Antony could not have alledged Fulvia's paternal nobility of extraction to thoſe who ſhould have accuſed him of having married beneath himſelf?

There remains a conſiderable difficulty. Aſconius Pedianus relates, that the laſt witneſſes that were examined againſt Milo, the murderer of Clodius, were Sempronia Tuditana, and Fulvia; the latter the widow of Clodius; the other, Fulvia's mother. *Ultimæ teſtimonium dixerunt Sempronia Tuditani filia, ſocrus P. Clodii, & uxor Fulvia, & fletu ſuo magnopere eos qui adſtabant, commoverunt* (32). I anſwer, that this difficulty, how great ſoever it be, cannot ſupport Manucius's opinion againſt my objections. Why could not Fadia and Fulvia both deſcend from one Sempronius Tuditanus? there might be ſeveral brothers, and ſeveral couſin-germans, who were all called Sempronius Tuditanus; being diſtinguiſhed only by their fore-names. Fadia's mother might be the daughter of one of them, and Fulvia's mother deſcend from another. At the worſt, I had rather ſay, that Cicero confounded the maternal grandfather of Fulvia with Fadia's maternal grandfather, than to ſay, that he looked upon Fulvia as an under-match for Marc Antony. I ſhall not omit ſaying, that Glandorpius condemns what he himſelf is guilty of. He finds fault, that one ſhould underſtand, of one ſingle wife of Marc Antony, the whole paſſage of the third Philippic; and yet he applies it entirely to Fulvia; for he pretends, that ſhe was Bambalio's daughter, and Tuditanus's grand-daughter; and ſo he leaves nothing in Cicero's words, that may ſuit with Fadia. For the reſt, it is a great abſurdity to pretend, that Bambalio, a man of the meaneſt condition (33), ſhould be Fulvia's father. This is no leſs than to aſcribe to Cicero the greateſt faults which a writer can commit. For thereby he muſt have retorted the reproach of an under-match (34), by accuſing Marc Antony of having married a lady of the firſt quality; for that is the character he gives of the family Fulvia (35), when he enquires into an action of Clodius's brother-in-law. This is to ſay, that he could draw no advantage from the meanneſs and folly of the father, to form prejudices againſt the conduct of the ſon; and that, among ſo many invectives, which he has uttered againſt Clodius, he has never reproached him with an alliance, which afforded ſo much room for ſatire. Let us conclude from all this, that Glandorpius did not rightly cenſure Maturantius; and here are new proofs of it. He hath not taken notice of three groſs errors of Maturantius on theſe words of Cicero, *At avus nobilis, Tuditanus nempe ille.* Maturantius fancies, in the firſt place, that that grand-father is Bambalio's grand father (36): 2. that that grand-father was like Tuditanus, but not Tuditanus himſelf (37): 3. that he was the grand-father of Marc Antony's wife. The laſt of theſe three faults is but a few lines diſtant from the firſt: ſo true it is, that authors are apt to contradict themſelves in the ſame page. The reaſon of it is, becauſe they ſometimes beſtow all their attention upon each period, ſo that they cannot think on what goes before.

I am much more concerned for an error, which I have found in Dion. That hiſtorian has inſerted in his work, a direct ſpeech of Cicero againſt Marc Antony; of which none can deny but he is himſelf the author, ſince we have ſtill Cicero's Philippics, and may convince ourſelves, by comparing them with Dion's words, that the ſpeech of the latter is not the tranſlation of any of the Philippics. It is therefore Dion, who has forged the ſpeech. I grant him that liberty; but, at leaſt, he ought to have ſaid nothing that was not taken from Cicero's Latin. Now here are two things, which he has manifeſtly falſified; I have not examined the reſt. He ſuppoſes, that Cicero reproached Marc Antony with not having recalled his uncle, neither during Cæſar's life, nor after Cæſar's death; and with loving Bambalio, a man ſufficiently defamed by his very name. Τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδε ταῦθ' ὅτι πολλοὺς φεύγοντας καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Καίσαρος, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν γραμμάτων δὴ τῶν ἐκείνου ἀγαγών, οὐκ ἐπεκούρησε τῷ θείῳ . . . . καὶ τὸν Βαμβαλίωνα τὸν καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἐπωνυμίας ἐπίβοητον ἀγαπᾷ. *Id vero neminem latet, quod quum multos in exilium miſſos non Cæſare modo ſuperſtite, ſed defuncto etiam, ex libellis ſcilicet ejus in urbem reduxerit, patruo ſuo non ſubvenerit . . . . Bambalionem etiam ipſius cognomenti ratione infamem diligit* (38). Cicero objected no ſuch thing to his adverſary. Does he not expreſsly ſay, that Caius Antonius was in the ſenate, when his nephew made a ſpeech againſt Dolabella? Cæſar was then alive. Neither did Cicero reproach Marc Antony with being a friend to Bambalio, who, in all probability, was dead. He contented himſelf to ſay, that he, who had married the daughter of an inhabitant of Tuſculum, the daughter, I ſay, of Bambalio, ſo called in contempt, was much in the wrong to alledge, that Octavius's mother was a native of Aricia. Should not theſe two falſifications make us ſuſpect the truth of a thouſand things, which Dion has related, and of which we have not the originals?

[G] *Marc Antony had had as many wives, as ſhe huſbands.*] We are going to ſee, that thoſe, who have ſaid, that Fulvia was Marc Antony's ſecond wife (39), have committed an error not much leſs than that of Mr Chevreau. Marc Antony's ſecond wife was called Antonia; ſhe was his couſin-german, and daughter of Caius Antonius, Cicero's colleague in the conſulſhip. He did not keep her long: for, upon pretence that ſhe had an amorous intrigue with Dolabella, he put her away. He was not aſhamed to publiſh himſelf before the ſenate, and before his father-in-law, the affront his wife had done him; and he mentioned that injury among the reaſons, for which he had broke with Dolabella. We muſt ſee how Cicero inveighs againſt him upon that account: Cicero, I ſay, who pretends, that Antonia was not guilty. ' Omnibus eum (Caium ' Antonium) contumeliis oneraſti, quem patris loco, ' ſi ulla in te pietas eſſet, colere debebas: filiam ejus, ' ſororem tuam, ejeciſti, alia conditione quæſita, & ' ante perſpecta. Non eſt ſatis, probri inſimulaſti pudiciſſimam feminam: quid eſt, quod addi poſſit? ' contentus eo non fuiſti: frequentiſſimo ſenatu Kalendis Jan. ſedente patruo, hanc tibi eſſe cum Dolabella cauſſam odii dicere auſus es, quod ab eo ſorori, ' & uxori tuæ ſtuprum eſſe oblatum comperiſſes. Quis ' interpretari poteſt, impudentiorne, qui in ſenatu; ' an improbior, qui in Dolabellam; an impurior, qui ' patre audiente; an crudelior, qui in illam miſeram ' tam ſpurce tam impie dixeris (40)? —— *You have ' loaded him* (*Caius Antonius*) *with all kinds of reproach, ' whom, if you had any piety in you, you ought to regard as a father: you have divorced his daughter, ' your ſiſter, having before had another match in view.*

' Nor

---

(28) Manucius and Glandorpius pretend, that Sempronia, daughter of Tuditanus, was Fulvia's mother.

(29) Cicero, pro domo ſua, fol. 180. A.

(30) Ibid. fol. 180. A.

(31) *Id. ibid.* He ſpeaks to Clodius: he had ſaid, *fol.* 180. *A*, how Clodius had employed his wife's brother, whom he had made high-prieſt. He ſays, in the oration *pro Murena, fol.* 148. *A.* That the ſon of Murena's wife is *ſummo loco adoleſcens.*

(32) Aſc. Pedian. Argum. Orat. pro Milone, pag. m. 192.

(33) Homo nullo numero: nihil illo contemptius.

(34) Cicero, in this paſſage of the third Philippic, confutes what M. Antony reproached Octavius with, *viz.* the being a country-woman's ſon, *Aricinam Matrem.*

(35) In Orat. pro domo ſua.

(36) Occurrit dicens Bambalionis hujus avum nobilem fuiſſe. Reſpondet, ſtultumque fuiſſe dicit, Tuditano illi ſimilem de quo Valerius Maximus. *Maturantius, in Philipp. III, fol. m.* 101.

A Reflexion on a falſity of Dion.

(37) Vellem ita contemneretis & vos pecuniam, ſicut ille contempſit uxoris tuæ avus. *Ibid.*

(38) Dion lib. xlv, ſub fin.

(39) Glandorp. Onom. pag. 83, *affirms it.*

(40) Philipp. II, cap. xxxviii.

Neither did he ſhew much regard to him upon other occaſions [*H*]. As brave, violent, and brutiſh as he was, yet he found his maſter in Fulvia; who made him ſerve ſo ſevere an apprenticeſhip of obedience (*c*), that Cleopatra, who found him ready broke and tamed, had no great trouble to keep him under. He had at laſt the reſolution to be terribly angry with Fulvia, and to ſhew her ſo plainly either his contempt or his hatred, that ſhe fell ſick, and died upon it (*d*). A rhetorician, who had rallied her upon her having one cheek bigger than the other, became thereby more acceptable to Marc Antony than he was before (*e*); which is a ſhrewd ſign, that ſhe had no great ſhare in her huſband's tenderneſs. She had merited it, if the imitating her huſband's eagerneſs

'*Nor is this enough; you have wounded the reputation of a moſt modeſt lady. What can be added? This did not ſatisfy you: in full ſenate, and in preſence of your uncle, on the Kalends of January, you had the aſſurance to ſay, that the reaſon of your hatred to Dolabella was, that you had diſcovered an intrigue between him, and your ſiſter and wife. Shall I charge you moſt with impudence, in publiſhing your fancied diſgrace in the ſenate; with injuſtice, in imputing it to Dolabella; with immodeſty in doing it in the hearing of your father in-law; or with cruelty, in expoſing the character of an unfortunate lady?*' Plutarch will help us to diſcover at what time Marc Antony was divorced from his wiſe Antonia. He ſays (41), that Dolabella, a tribune of the people, deſiring to get ſome laws enacted, intreated Marc Antony his friend to ſecond him. Marc Antony not only refuſed it; but, upon ſuſpicion that his wife Antonia had ſuffered herſelf to be debauched by Dolabella, he put her away, and took part with the enemies of that tribune, to ruin all his projects. Cæſar returned to Rome, pardoned Dolabella; and, having been made conſul for the third time, he aſſociated to himſelf, in that dignity, Lepidus, and not Marc Antony (42). From this we learn, that Dolabella's troubles happened before the year 707 of Rome (43); and therefore we may place them a year after the battle of Pharſalia, which is alſo the year of Antonia's divorce. Now Marc Antony having another match in view, before he put away Antonia (44), it is very probable, that his deſire of marrying Fulvia was one of the reaſons, which occaſioned that divorce. If we believe Plutarch, that marriage was contracted whilſt Cæſar made war in Afric in the year 707; and ſo Fulvia is Marc Antony's third wiſe. It is without any ground, that Glandorpius (45) affirms, that Marc Antony, having put her away, married Antonia; and that, being ſoon diſguſted with the latter, he was divorced from her, and then retook Fulvia.

[*H*] *Neither did he ſhew much regard to him upon other occaſions.*] I make this remark, to diſcharge my promiſe (46). We have heard Cicero reproaching Marc Antony with having been ſo barbarous as to ſet forth Antonia's leudneſs in a full ſenate, that lady's father being preſent. This was a great mortification for that poor father; but this was not the firſt time his nephew had uſed that poor man ill. Had he not left him in baniſhment, when he recalled a great number of exiles? Cicero did not forget to reproach him with it (47): 'Omnia perfecit quæ Senatus ſalva repub. ne fieri poſſent perfecerat: cujus tamen ſcelus in ſcelere cognoſcite: reſtituebat multos calamitoſos, in his patrui nulla mentio. Si ſeverus, cur non in omnes? Si miſericors, cur non in ſuos? —— *He did every thing, which the ſenate, before the commonwealth was overturned, had taken care ſhould not be done: yet one vile action, which ſurpaſſed the reſt, deſerves mentioning: he recalled ſeveral miſerable exiles; but, among theſe, took no notice of his uncle. If he muſt be ſevere, why not towards all; if compaſſionate, why not towards thoſe of his own family?*' There are other unſeemly things; Cicero ſets them forth, when he mentions a law for recalling exiles, which was publiſhed after Cæſar's death, and ſuppoſed to be made by him. Cicero asks, among other things, why three or four perſons were ſtill left in baniſhment (48)? 'Cur tua miſericordia ſimili non fruuntur? Cur eos habes in loco patrui, de quo ferre, cum de reliquis ferres, noluiſti? Quem etiam ad cenſuram petendam impuliſti, eamque petitionem comparaſti quæ & riſus hominum & querelas moveret. Cur autem ea comitia non habuiſti? An quia tribunus plebis fulmen ſiniſtrum nunciabat? Cum tuâ quid intereſt, nulla auſpicia ſunt, cum tuorum, tum ſis religioſus. Quid! eundem in ſeptemviratu nonne deſtituiſti? Intervenit enim: Quid metuiſti credo? ne ſalvo capite negare non poſſes. Omnibus eum contumeliis oneraſti quem patris loco, &c. —— *Why do they not meet with the ſame compaſſion from you? Why do you deal with them as you did with your uncle, whom you excepted out of the general law? whom likewiſe you perſuaded to demand the cenſorſhip, and procured him ſuch competitors, as excited the laughter and complaint of the people. But why did you not hold that election? Was it becauſe the tribune of the people denounced an unlucky omen? when your own intereſt is concerned, you diſregard omens; when that of your relations, you are then ſuperſtitious. What! did you not forſake him likewiſe as to the ſeptemvirate? you loaded him with all kind of injuries, whom, as a father, &c.*' You will find above (49) the ſequel of this paſſage. Manucius has found this full of obſcurity. 'Hic mihi, quod aiunt, tenebræ ſunt. Non enim video, quo modo C. Antonius Kalendis Jan. vivo Cæſare in ſenatu eſſe potuerit: cum eum poſt Cæſaris interitum, id eſt, poſt latam ab Antonio de exſulibus legem, exſulare, ex iis verbis intelligatur; *cur eos habes in loco patrui? De quo ferre, cum de reliquis ferres, noluiſti* (50). —— *This is to me very obſcure: for I cannot ſee how Caius Antonius could be in the ſenate, during Cæſar's life, on the kalends of January; when we underſtand by theſe words,* cur eos habes, &c. *that, after Cæſar's death, that is after Antony's law concerning exiles, he was in baniſhment.*' There is, on one ſide, Caius Antonius neglected by his nephew, when, after Cæſar's death, all the exiles, excepting three or four, are recalled; and, on the other ſide, he is among the ſenators, when Marc Antony makes a ſpeech againſt Dolabella, before Julius Cæſar's death. It is thus Manucius conceives the thing, and therefore it is no wonder he finds ſome contradictions in it: but it is eaſy to remove them, by ſhewing him the cauſe of his pretended obſcurity. He fancies, that, when Marc Antony, after Julius Cæſar's death, alledged a pretended law of that emperor for recalling the exiles, Caius Antonius was left in baniſhment. This is not what Cicero means; but only that Marc Antony had excluded from the benefit of that pretended law, three or four wretches. Cicero asks him the reaſon of it: and, to remind him of other faults, he maliciouſly compares the exception of theſe three or four perſons, with the exception which he, Marc Antony, had made of his uncle during his tribuneſhip. *Why do you uſe thoſe three or four perſons,* ſays he to him, *as you did your uncle, whom you did not offer to recal, when you propoſed the recalling of others?* This ought to be referred to Marc Antony's tribuneſhip, which he exerciſed, whilſt Cæſar was in Spain, againſt Pompey's lieutenants, before the battle of Pharſalia. In a word, this is the ſame thing with what we have ſeen above in theſe words of Cicero; *Reliquæ partes Tribunatus principiis ſimiles . . . . reſtituebat multos calamitoſos: in his patrui nulla mentio.* We muſt not therefore wonder that the ſame Cicero ſhould ſay, that Caius Antonius heard in the ſenate-houſe his nephew's invectives againſt Dolabella, in which his daughter was ſo invidiouſly mentioned. I own that this is a proof of his being returned from baniſhment before Cæſar's death, ſince that invective was publickly ſpoken, to hinder the deſign Cæſar had formed of reſigning his fifth conſulſhip to Dolabella. 'Επεὶ δὲ τὸ πέμπτον ἀπεδείχθη Καῖσαρ ὕπατος, προσείλετο μὲν εὐθὺς συνάρχοντα τὸν 'Αντώνιον, ἐβούλετο δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπειπάμενος Δολοβέλλα παρεγγυῆσαι. καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον ἐξήνεγκεν. 'Αντωνίου δὲ τραχέως ἀντιπεσόντος, καὶ πολλὰ μὲν εἰπόντος κακὰ Δολοβέλλαν, οὐκ ἐλάττονα δὲ ἀκούσαντος, τότε μὲν αἰσχυνθεὶς τὴν ἀκοσμίαν ὁ Καῖσαρ ἀπηλλάγη. *Creatus Cæſar quintum conſul, illico cooptavit*

(*c*) See the remark [*B*].

(*d*) See the remark [*B*].

(*e*) Ejuſdem uxorem Fulviam cui altera bucca inflatior erat, acumen ſtili tentare dixit, nec eo minus, immo vel magis ob hoc Antonio gratus. *Sueton. de claris Rhetor. cap. v.*

(41) Plut. in Anton. pag. 919.

(42) Ibid. pag. 920.

(43) It is the year of Cæſar's third conſulſhip.

(44) Alia conditione quæſita & ante perſpecta Cicero, *ubi ſupra*.

(45) Gland. ubi ſupra, pag. 86.

(46) See, above, remark [*A*] of the article ANTONIUS (CAÏUS the firſt).

(47) Philipp. II, cap. xxii.

(48) Ibid. cap. xxxviii.

(49) In citat. (40).

(50) Manucius, in Philipp. II, pag. 761.

eagerneſs to get money, by the moſt unjuſt means, could have made her worthy of it. It was in Fulvia's chamber that kingdoms and provinces were ſold by auction [*I*]. Some think that ſhe perſuaded Marc Antony to put away his ſecond wife [*K*]; nevertheleſs, it does

tavit collegam Antonium. Intendit autem abdicare ſe magiſtratu, & cedere Dolabellæ, idque ad ſenatum retulit: verum repugnante aſpere Antonio, multaque maledicta in Dolabellam congerente, nec pauciora audiente, illius indignitatis Cæſar pudore rem in præſentia omiſit (51). But there does not reſult from thence any juſt reaſon to cenſure Cicero; for there is nothing in his Philippics which imports, that Marc Antony left his uncle in baniſhment after Cæſar's death. That which is certain, is, that Caïus Antonius muſt have been recalled in the time which elapſed between the beginning of Cæſar's dictatorſhip, and his fifth conſulſhip, which fell in the year 709; and he was made dictator, upon his return to Rome, after the defeat of Pompey's lieutenants. He began the functions of his dictatorſhip with recalling the exiles (52): I know not whether Caïus Antonius was at that time comprehended amongſt them; but I know that Dion (53) affirms, that Milo alone was not recalled. Glandorpius ſays, that Caïus Antonius, after Julius Cæſar's death, was reſtored by Marc Antony his nephew, who was conſul. This is not true, with relation to Caïus Antonius's return to Rome, and his privilege of going to the ſenate-houſe, ſince he ſat with the ſenators, and heard his nephew's invective againſt Dolabella, during the life of Julius Cæſar. We learn from Strabo, that that exile remained in the iſland of Cephalonia, and kept it under his obedience. He was building there a city, but had not time to finiſh it; for, having obtained leave to return home, he formed greater deſigns, and died before he put them in execution (54).

I have read a French tranſlation of the ſecond Philippic (55), where the author has ſomewhat confounded the paſſage I have cleared in this place. He ſays, in the 166th page, *that Caïus Antonius was among thoſe three or four wretches*, whom his nephew had left in baniſhment; and yet, in the 168th, he affirms, that he was preſent at the ſpeech, which Marc Antony made in a full ſenate upon the firſt of January. It is needleſs to ſhew, that theſe two things are contradictory: every body is ſenſible of it; and I have already ſaid how this difficulty may be removed. Maturantius (56) is guilty of more faults than that tranſlator. Firſt, he believes, that Caïus Antonius was exiled by Julius Cæſar, for having followed Pompey's party: than which nothing is more falſe. Caïus Antonius was accuſed, in 694, of two crimes, *viz.* of being Catiline's accomplice, and of extortion (57). Cicero, who pleaded for him, loſt his cauſe. Secondly, Maturantius affirms, that Marc Antony, when he recalled the exiles after Cæſar's death, did not endeavour to get Caïus Antonius recalled. Thirdly, he affirms, that Marc Antony, having at laſt recalled his uncle, perſuaded him to ſtand candidate for the cenſorſhip, and raiſed againſt him very mean competitors, in order to expoſe him to laughter. This is to aſcribe a nonſenſical impertinence to Cicero: for if he had ſaid, that Caïus Antonius was not recalled from baniſhment, when his nephew, after Cæſar's death, recalled moſt exiles, he had ſaid two contradictory things in the ſame harangue, *viz.* I. that, at the time he ſpoke, Marc Antony had not yet recalled his uncle; for it is plain, that the three or four wretches, whom Marc Antony had deprived of the benefit of the pretended law of Julius Cæſar, were actually in exile, when Cicero pronounced the ſecond Philippic. II. That Marc Antony, having recalled his uncle ſome time before, had faudulently engaged him him to ſue for the cenſorſhip. If I was not convinced of it by experience, I could never have believed, that thoſe, who have commented upon claſſic authors, ſhould not perceive the contradictory abſurdities, which they ſometimes put together.

[*I*] *It was in Fulvia's chamber, that kingdoms were ſold by auction.*] Every one knows what revolutions happened among the Romans upon Cæſar's death. At firſt, Marc Antony did not think himſelf ſafe in Rome; and, not many days after, it was he who was dreaded there; it was for fear of him, that Cæſar's murtherers fled. It cannot be expreſſed how many unjuſt things he did to heap up money, under the falſe pretence, that Cæſar had ordered ſuch and things to be done. He forged theſe orders, and took care to be well paid for it: It was in that manner he cheated Dejotarus's embaſſadors. He forged a pretended order of Cæſar, by virtue of which Dejotarus was to be reſtored: but he cauſed the embaſſadors to ſign, in his wife's chamber, a bond for a great ſum (58). *Cicero* has deſcribed, with his uſual eloquence, the prodigious venality, which Marc Antony and his wife introduced into the commonwealth: and, when we know beſides, Fulvia's character, we are apt to fancy, upon reading Cicero's words, that we ſee her ſelling, in her chamber, provinces and kingdoms, with the ſame greedineſs of gain, which is natural to women, that ſell, in a ſhop, ribbons, or cloth by the yard. ‘ Quid illi immanes quæſtus? ſerendi ne? quos M. Antonii tota exhauſit domus. Decreta falſa vendebat: regna, civitates, immunitates in æs accepta pecunia jubebat incidi. Hæc ſe ex commentariis Cæſaris, quorum ipſe auctor erat, agere dicebat. Calebant in interiore ædium parte totius reipubl. nundinæ: mulier ſibi felicior, quam viris, auctionem provinciarum, regnorumque faciebat (59). —— *Can we bear with the extravagant gains of Marc Antony's whole family? He ſold unjuſt decrees: he bartered kingdoms, ſtates, and immunities for money. All this he pretended to do by virtue of Cæſar's brief inſtructions, which he himſelf had forged. In the innermoſt apartments of his houſe was held a general mart of the commonwealth; where his wife, more ſucceſsful for herſelf, than her husbands, put up kingdoms and provinces to auction.*’ I think that both husband and wife were equally, like Catiline, *Alieni appetens, ſui profuſus* (60); and knew as well how to ſquander away money, as to get it. Fulvia was not worth a groat, a year after thoſe rich auctions: ſo that Pomponius Atticus was obliged to paſs his word for her every where, and to lend her great ſums (61).

[*K*] *Some think, that Fulvia perſuaded Marc Antony to put away his ſecond wife.*] They ground their opinion on theſe words of Cicero; *Filiam ejus ſororem tuam ejeciſti alia conditione quæſita & ante perſpecta.* Which ſignifies, that, before Antonia's divorce, her husband had ſo well concerted meaſures, that he was well acquainted with the woman he was to marry next. It is, at leaſt, very likely, that Cicero had ſome ſhrewd meaning in his *ante perſpecta*; and that, when he mentioned a certain deſign, contrived by Marc Antony in the houſe of Clodius (62), he meaned, that he had endeavoured to lie with Fulvia, Clodius's wife. Nevertheleſs, I reject Manucius's thought about the word *conditio*, employed by Cicero. That learned commentator believes, that Cicero meant, that Marc Antony had viewed, or cauſed another to view for him, all the parts of the body of the woman he deſigned to marry. He thinks, that the Latin phraſe, *quærere conditionem*, does not only ſignify to look for a match, but likewiſe to inſpect the moſt ſecret parts, which are the object of love, and make a ſtrict review of them, in order to avoid the ſurprize of miſreckoning, to which they may be expoſed, who *buy a pig in a poke*, if I may uſe that proverbial expreſſion. How long ſoever Manucius's paſſage is, I think myſelf obliged to tranſcribe it, that my reader may not object to me, that it is eaſy to reject and confute a man's opinion, when we either ſuppreſs or enervate his reaſons. ‘ Invenio apud veteres uſurpari ſolitum hoc loquendi genus, condiciones quærere, de iis, qui mulieres ad concubitum appetentes, prius vel ipſi, vel per amicos inſpiciebant quales eſſent, num candor in corpore, num lævitas, num ſucci plenæ; denique num appetentis libidini reſponderent, ut eas ne acciperent, aut admitterent, niſi prius hoc tanquam experimentum cepiſſent. Id, ut dixi, vocabant, condiciones quærere. Itaque exprobravit Antonius Auguſto, id, quod Suetonius litteris prodidit, condiciones quæſitas per amicos, qui matres familias, & adultas virgines denudarent, atque perſpicerent, tamquam Thoranio mangone vendente. Et, quod apud eundem Suetonium ſcriptum eſt, Cæſar ad retinendam Pompeii neceſſitudinem, ac voluntatem, Octaviam, ſororis ſuæ neptem, condicione ei detulit: facta ſcilicet inſpiciendi poteſtate, ut niſi probatam, non acciperet. Arnobius quoque, ſcriptor in primis eruditus & reconditarum rerum notitia refertus, libro iv, adverſus

REFUTATION of Manucius's opinion about the phraſe, *quærere conditiones.*

---

(51) Plutarch, in Antonio, pag. 921. A.

(52) Id. in Cæſare, pag. 725. D.

(53) Lib. xli, pag. 191.

(54) Strabo, lib. x, pag. 314.

(55) Made by F. P. G. an advocate in the parliament of Paris; and printed at Paris, in 1685.

(56) In Philipp. II, fol. 82.

(57) *See* Dion, lib. xxxviii, pag. 71, & Cicero, in Orat. pro Cœlio & in Vatinium.

(58) Syngrapha H S centies per legatos viros bonos, ſed timidos & imperitos, ſine Sexti, ſine reliquorum hoſpitum regis ſententia facta in Gynæceo: quo in loco plurimæ res venierunt & veneunt. *Cicero, Philipp. II, cap. xxxvii.* See alſo *Ep. ad Att. xii, lib. xiv.*

(59) Id. Philipp. v, cap. iv.

(60) Salluſt. in Catilin.

(61) Corn. Nepos in vita Attici, cap. ix.

(62) Intimus eſt in tribunatu Clodio . . . . cujus etiam domi jam tum quiddam molitus eſt: quid dicam ipſe optime intelligit. *Philipp II, cap. xix. Maturantius ſays thereupon,* Fulviam credo Clodii uxorem de coitu appellavit, aut eam adulteravit. *Manucius ſays,* De ſtupranda ejus uxore.

does not ſeem probable, that he married her immediately after his divorce: It is rather apparent,

‘ adverſus gentes, Dei uxores, inquit, ducunt condicionibus ante quæſitis. Sic de Fauſtina quærente ſibi condiciones in viris, ut cum iis, quorum condiciones probaſſet, concumberet, dixit Capitolinus in Antonino Philoſ. multi ferunt, Commodum omnino ex adulterio natum: ſiquidem Fauſtinam, ſatis conſtet, apud Cajetam condiciones ſibi & nauticas, & gladiatorias elegiſſe. Et Lampridius in Heliogabalo: Romæ denique nihil egit aliud, niſi ut emiſſarios haberet, qui bene vaſatos (ſic. n. lego, non naſatos) perquirerent, eoſque ad aulam perducerent, ut eorum condicionibus frui poſſet. Nec multo poſt: Lavacrum publicum in ædibus aulicis fecit, ſimul & palam populo exhibuit, ut ex eo condiciones bene vaſatorum hominum colligeret. Nec alio ſenſu accipiendum illud pro Cœlio: habes hortos ad Tiberim: ac diligenter eo loco præparaſti, quo omnis juventus natandi cauſſa venit, hinc licet condiciones quotidie legas. Quibus adductus exemplis, Quæſita, & Perſpecta, ad condicionem malo, quam ad mulierem referre: ut ſit: quæſiviſti, & ante perſpexiſti aliam condicionem, non contentus ea, quam in ſorore tua jam perſpexeras. Jam enim conſtat, condicionem eſſe partem corporis, quam vel in muliere vir, vel in viro mulier explendæ libidinis cauſſa quærit, & qua inventa fruitur (63). —— *The ancients, I find, applied this phraſe* Condiciones quærere *to thoſe, who, before marriage, examine, either in perſon, or by their friends, the beauties or defects of their intended wife; as, whether ſhe be fair, of a ſmooth skin, or juicy; in ſhort, whether ſhe anſwers the deſires of the lover; refuſing to have any thing to ſay to her without this previous experiment. This, as I ſaid, they termed* Condiciones quærere. *Thus Antony, as Suetonius informs us, reproached Auguſtus, that he did, by his friends,* Condiciones quærere, *that is, that he employed them to ſtrip matrons and young women naked, and thoroughly examine them, as if they were expoſed to ſale by the bawd Thoranius. And we read in the ſame Suetonius, that Cæſar, to keep up his relation and friendſhip with Pompey, offered him Octavia, his ſiſter's neice,* condicione, *that is, with liberty to examine her, and, if not approved of, to reject her. Arnobius likewiſe, a very learned writer, and well verſed in antiquity, in his fourth book* adverſus Gentes, *ſays, the gods marry* condicionibus ante quæſitis, *having firſt examined their miſtreſſes. So likewiſe Capitolinus, in the life of Antoninus the philoſopher, ſpeaking of Fauſtina, who examined the men,* (condiciones quærebat) *with whom ſhe had a mind to lie, ſays, it is reported by many, that Commodus was the offspring of an adulterous bed; ſince it is ſufficiently known, that Fauſtina, at Cajeta, made choice of Sailors and Gladiators, having firſt examined them* —— condiciones nauticas & gladiatorias elegiſſe. *And Lampridius, in the life of Heliogabalus ſays; all he did at Rome, was, to keep emiſſaries, who looked out for proper perſons, and brought them to court, that he might examine whether they were for his purpoſe* —— eorum condicionibus frui. *And a little farther he ſays; he built a public bath in the palace, and admitted the people in general to it, that he might have an opportunity of examining, and ſelecting thoſe, whom he liked beſt* —— condiciones colligeret. *Nor are we otherwiſe to underſtand thoſe words of Cicero, in his oration* pro M. Cœlio: *you have gardens on the banks of the Tyber, whither all the young men repair to ſwim, and where you may every day make your choice* —— condiciones legas. *From which inſtances I am induced to refer the words* Quæſita *and* Perſpecta *rather to* condicio, *than* mulier: *ſo that it will be; you have made a freſh examination,* (quæſiviſti & perſpexiſti aliam condicionem), *not ſatisfied with what you had already found in your ſiſter. For now it is plain, that* condicio *means a part of the body, which a man looks for in a woman, and a woman in a man, and which both enjoy when found.*’ Among all theſe paſſages, I ſee none that hinders me from being fully perſuaded, that the words *Quærere condiciones* ſignified the ſame thing, and no more, with our phraſes, *to look out for, to chuſe a match, a lover, a miſtreſs.* The firſt example Manucius alledges plainly ſhews it; for if his opinion took place, it had not been neceſſary for Suetonius (64) to add to *conditiones quæſitas per amicos,* theſe other words, *qui matres familias & adultas virgines denudarent atque perſpicerent tanquam Thoranio mangone vendente.* This addition ſhews, that the preceding words imported no more than this, *he charged his friends to look out for miſtreſſes for him*; and becauſe that did not expreſs the beaſtlineſs Suetonius had a mind to reproach, it was neceſſary to deſcend to the particular explanation of the enquiries, which Auguſtus impoſed upon his friends. Thus, to repreſent the cuſtom of Moſcovy, with relation to the choice of the maid, whom the Czar is to marry, it would not be enough to ſay, that people are ſent into all the provinces, with orders to look out the moſt charming and moſt lovely maids; but it would be neceſſary to go further, and to ſay how thoſe maids are viewed, ſearched, and examined. ‘ Solent autem Moſchovitæ, quum de uxore ducenda deliberant, omnium toto regno puellarum Virginum delectum habere, ac forma virtuteque, animi præſtantiores ad ſe perduci jubere, quas demum per idoneos homines fideleſque Matronas inſpiciunt, ita diligenter, ut ſecretiora quoque ab iis contrectari explorarique fas ſit. Ex iis vero, magna atque ſolicita parentum expectatione, quæ Principi ad animum reſponderit, Regiis Nuptiis digna pronunciatur. Cæteræ vero, quæ de formæ pudicitiæque & morum dignitate contenderant, ſæpe eadem die in gratiam Principum, proceribus atque militibus nubunt; ſic ut mediocri loco natæ plerumque, dum principes regiæ ſtirpis clara ſtemmata contemnunt, ad ſummum Regalis thori faſtidium, uti & Turcas Ottomannos ſolitos eſſe videmus, pulchritudinis auſpiciis evehantur (65). —— *The Moſcovites, when they think of marrying, ſelect the moſt beautiful and virtuous maids, whom, by proper men and matrons, they examine ſo carefully, that they are allowed to handle and inſpect the moſt ſecret parts. She of theſe, who pleaſes the prince moſt, is declared worthy of the royal nuptials. Her competitors, in complaiſance to the prince, are often married, on the ſame day, to the grandees and officers. Thus a maid of mean extraction is often raiſed, by her beauty, to the monarch's bed, who deſpiſes high birth.*’ I cannot ſufficiently wonder that Manucius ſhould have paraphraſed his ſecond example as he has done: how could he think that Cæſar ever had ſo little ſpirit, or ſo little honour? for, without mentioning the violence, which muſt have been offered to Octavia's modeſty, would it not have been a baſe condeſcention in Cæſar, and ſuch as would have expoſed him to contempt, to give Pompey, when he offered him his grand-niece, the liberty to refuſe her, if he did not like her, after he had ſeen her ſtark naked? but, to ſhew how very abſurd Manucius's opinion is, I need but refer him to theſe words of Suetonius in the ſixty third chapter of the life of Auguſtus: ‘ Hoc (*Agrippa*) quoque defuncto, multis ac diu etiam ex equeſtri ordine CIRCUMSPECTIS CONDITIONIBUS, Tiberium privignum ſuum elegit. —— *Agrippa being dead, after conſidering of many matches among thoſe of Equeſtrian rank, he made choice of Tiberius for his ſon-in-law.*’ We ought to ſay, according to Manucius, that Auguſtus, having a mind to marry again his daughter Julia, Agrippa's widow, ſpent a conſiderable time in cauſing ſeveral Roman knights to be ſtripped and examined quite naked, and that at laſt he choſe Tiberius. I ſhall not take the trouble to ſhew the extravagance of ſuch a ſuppoſition; neither ſhall I relate a hundred paſſages of good writers, which prove, that *Conditio,* in matter of marriage, ſignified nothing but what we call a match: *Bona Conditio,* a good match. I ſhall only quote ſome words out of the 257th declamation of Quintilian, which are as good as a definitive ſentence againſt Manucius: ‘ Sed neque in me ille (*ſocer*) probabit aliud quam pietatem; vidit fletus meos, vidit totius animi atque etiam corporis defectionem: ſic homini inter principes noſtræ civitatis numerando cœpi bona eſſe CONDITIO.—*He will approve of nothing in me but my piety; he ſaw my tears, he ſaw my extreme grief: thus I began to be thought a good match by one, who is deſervedly ranked among the principal perſons of our city.*’ See Gronovius's obſervations, in the ſixth chapter of the firſt book,

(63) Paulus Manucius, in II Philipp. pag. m. 759, 760.

(64) In Auguſt. cap. lxix.

(65) Paulus Jovi. in Moſchovia, pag. m. 32, 33.

apparent, that he continued for ſome time in love with a concubine [*L*]. Several dictionaries (*f*) have affirmed, that he put away Fulvia in the beginning of the triumvirate, in

book, *pag.* 62 and 65. It muſt be confeſſed, that Manucius aſcribes a very obſcene form to the ancient ſtyle of lawyers, who, in matter of divorce, uſed this phraſe, *Conditione tua non utor.* Conſult Torrentius's commentary upon Suetonius, in the twenty ſeventh chapter of Cæſar's life. I am very much ſurprized, that a learned Jeſuit did not find the falſity of that criticiſm of Manucius, after he had given us ſo many examples of the ſignification of the word *Conditio.* ‘Quid ſit autem ante perſpicere conditionem, malo te ex Pauli Manucii in hunc locum quam ex meis verbis addiſcere. —— *What the meaning of* ante perſpicere conditionem *is, I had rather you ſhould learn from Paulus Manucius on this paſſage, than from my words.* Thus ſpeaks father Abram, in his commentary on the ſecond Philippic of Cicero, *pag.* 725.

But, to come to the point, are we to believe, that Cicero means, that Marc Antony caſt his eyes upon Fulvia before he put away Antonia? I am inclined to be of that opinion, tho' there ſeems to be no ſmall diſtance between Fulvia's wedding and Antonia's divorce. That is the ſubject matter of the following remark. Maturantius and Lambinus are both miſtaken here: the firſt fancying, that Marc Antony had a deſign upon Calpurnia; and the other, that he had Octavia in view. I know not who that Calpurnia may be: but, as for Octavia, I know, that ſhe was Auguſtus's ſiſter; and that ſhe did not marry Marc Antony till after Fulvia's death.

[*L*] . . . *Marc Antony continued ſome time in love with a concubine.*] That concubine was a player. Cicero calls her Cytheris, and obſerves that Marc Antony carried her with him in an open litter. ‘Hic tamen Cytheridem ſecum lectica aperta portat, altera uxorem: ſeptem præterea conjunctæ lecticæ amicarum ſunt, an amicorum? vide quam turpi leto pereamus (66). —— *Yet here he carries Cytheris with him in an open litter, and his wife in another: with theſe are joined ſeven litters, carrying his miſtreſſes, or ſhall I call them his friends? behold how ſhamefully we periſh.*’ Cicero wrote this whilſt Cæſar went into Spain againſt Pompey's lieutenants, that is, the firſt year of the war. Marc Antony was then tribune of the people, and had been left at Rome to keep Italy in awe, and in Cæſar's intereſt. This is the equipage, with which he travelled. Theſe are the men, to whom God thought fit to deliver up, as a prey, the moſt illuſtrious perſons in the Roman commonwealth. But that is not the queſtion. This equipage of Marc Antony was objected to him, to his very face, in the ſecond Philippic, *cap.* 23, *and* 24, in theſe fine words: ‘Ecquid enim unquam in terris tantum flagitium exſtitiſſe auditum eſt? tantam turpitudinem? tantum dedecus? vehebatur in eſſedo tribunus plebis: lictores laureati antecedebant: inter quos aperta lectica mima portabatur: quam, ex oppidis municipales homines honeſti obviam neceſſario prodeuntes, non noto illo, & mimico nomine, ſed volumniam conſalutabant. Sequebatur rheda cum lenonibus (67), comites nequiſſimi: rejecta mater amicam impuri filii, tamquam nurum, ſequebatur. O miſeræ mulieris fœcunditatem calamitoſam. Horum flagitiorum iſte veſtigiis omnia municipia, præfecturas, colonias, totam denique Italiam impreſſit. ——— *Was there ever heard of ſo ſhameful a behaviour? ſuch baſeneſs? ſuch diſgrace? a tribune of the people was carried in a chariot: Lictors, crowned with lawrel, marched before him; among whom an actreſs was carried in an open litter, who was ſaluted, by the honeſt burghers of the ſeveral towns, who were obliged to come out and meet her, not by her well-known theatrical name, but by that of Volumnia, forſooth. A chariot followed with a ſcandalous retinue of cock-bawds: the poor neglected mother followed her ſon's miſtreſs, as if ſhe had been her daughter-in-law. O the unfortunate fruitfulneſs of the wretched lady! ſuch marks as theſe of his villany did he leave in every Borough, Prefecture, and Colony, in ſhort over all Italy.*’ Note, that, among other indignities, Marc Antony is here reproached with having obliged his mother to follow the litter of Cytheris. In the letter I have quoted, Cicero ſays this not of Marc Antony's mother, but of his wife (68). It is hard to conceive, why Cicero ſhould ſay nothing of the indignities done to the wife, in an oration, wherein he made it his buſineſs to load his adverſary with ſhame. He might have ſaid in three words, that Marc Antony allowed no place in his own coach, either to his mother, or his wife; and that he had confined them to other coaches, which followed the litter, in which he had put his concubine. The treatment of the wife ſerved no leſs, than that of the mother, to render Marc Antony's behaviour odious; and therefore all that can be ſaid in favour of the orator's ſilence, is, that Marc Antony's wife did not accompany him in his progreſs; and that, inſtead of reading, in the letter to *Atticus*, *altera uxorem*, we muſt read, *alteram uxorem:* and ſo the ſenſe will be, that that tribune carried Cytheris with him, as if ſhe had been his wife; as if ſhe had been his ſecond wife. Boſius (69) and Lipſius (70) have adopted this correction. Popma maintains the contrary (71): and pretends, not only that Cytheris, and the lawful wife, were in different litters or coaches; but alſo that the lawful wife was Fulvia; which is alſo Manucius's opinion. They quote to no purpoſe (72) the ſecond Philippic, ſince the orator does not inform us, that Marc Antony placed his wife among the attendants of Cytheris. Mr Grævius has preferred Popma's opinion to that of Lipſius (73). It is certain, that Fulvia was not then Marc Antony's wife: for I have already ſhewn, that he did not marry her till after Antonia's divorce. Now Antonia was ſo far from being divorced, when Marc Antony went his progreſs through the towns of Italy with his Cytheris, that it is very likely, that ſhe was not yet his wife. He put her away when he oppoſed the deſigns of Dolabella; that is, ſome time after he was returned to Rome, after the battle of Pharſalia (74). Now the progreſs he made with Cytheris was before that return to Rome; and therefore it is probable, that, when he went upon that progreſs, he was not yet married to his couſin Antonia; for he did not keep her long. We may add, that Fulvia was not a woman that would bear, that a concubine ſhould have the honours, due to a lawful wife, paid her, during her huſband's progreſs. She had too much pride to follow, in a coach, alone, the litter of the favourite Cytheris. Let us confirm the conjecture of Boſius and Lipſius. If it had been ſaid, in the letter to Atticus, *Cytheridem portat alteram uxorem*, this would agree with other expreſſions, which are found in the ſecond Philippic. ‘At etiam quodam loco facetus eſſe voluiſti: quàm id te, dii boni, non decebat: in quo eſt tua culpa nonnulla, aliquid enim ſalis ab Uxore Mima trahere potuiſti (75). ——*Once you endeavoured to be witty; good GOD! how ill it became you? in which you are ſomething to blame, ſince you might have borrowed a little wit from your* theatrical wife.’ When Cicero relates, that, at laſt, Marc Antony broke with Cytheris, he uſes the terms, that were employed in putting away one's wife (76). Therefore it is probable, that we ought to read *alteram uxorem* in the letter to Atticus. Let us not forget, that the diſmiſſing of Cytheris was poſterior, not only to the battle of Pharſalia, but alſo to the war of Alexandria. Marc Antony, after the battle of Pharſalia, was ſent back into Italy, to keep the people under the yoke of the conqueror, whilſt Cæſar was in purſuit of Pompey. The actreſs Cytheris went to meet her gallant as far as Brunduſium, and returned with him to Rome, with much the ſame equipage, which Cicero has above deſcribed. ‘Veniſti Brunduſium, in ſinum quidem, & in complexum tuæ mimulæ: quid eſt? num mentior? quam miſerum eſt, id negare non poſſe, quod ſit turpiſſimum confiteri. Si te municipiorum non pudebat, ne veterani quidem exercitus? Quis enim miles fuit qui Brunduſii illam non viderit? Quis qui neſcierit veniſſe eam tibi tot dierum viam gratulatum, quis, qui non indoluerit tam ſero ſe, quam nequam hominem ſecutus eſſet, cognoſcere? Italiæ rurſus percurſatio, eadem comite mima (77). —— *You arrived at Brunduſium, to throw yourſelf into the very arms of your actreſs: what! do I belie you? how wretched is it, that you cannot deny what it is*

‘*the*

(*f*) *That of Charles Stephens, that of Lloyd, that of Hofman, and that of Calepinus.*

(66) Cicero, Epiſt. xi. lib. x, ad Atticum. *In the ſixteenth letter of the ſame book, he ſpeaks thus:* Hoc quidem melius quam collega noſter Antonius, cujus inter lictores lectica mima portatur. *See alſo the twenty ſecond letter of the fifteenth book, where* hic autem noſter Cytherius, *is Marc Antony, according to the interpreters.*

(67) Some famous critics pretend, that we ought to read *Leonibus*, becauſe it is certain, that, in that progreſs, Marc Antony had a chaiſe drawn by lions. *See the article* LYCORIS, *rem.* [*C*].

(68) Cytheridem ſecum lectica aperta portat, altera uxorem. *Cicero, Epiſt. xi, lib. x, ad Atticum.*

(69) In Epiſt. ſupra dictam Ciceronis ad Attic.

(70) Epiſtolicar. quæſt. xi, lib. iv.

(71) In eam Epiſtolam Ciceronis.

(72) It is Popma that quotes it.

(73) Sed rectius Popma cui adſtipulantur, &c. *In Cicer. ad Atticum, Tom. II, pag.* 164.

(74) *This is plain,* ex Plutarcho, in Antonio, pag. 919.

(75) Philipp. II, cap. viii.

(76) Frugifactus eſt: illam ſuam ſuas res ſibi habere juſſit ex duodecim tabulis: claves ademit: exegit. Quam porro ſpectatus civis, quam probatus, cujus ex omni vita nihil eſt honeſtius, quam quod cum mima fecit divortium. *Ibid. cap. xxviii.*

(77) Ib. cap xxv.

in order to marry Octavia. Which is falſe; for he did not marry the latter till after the death of Fulvia. It is not true, that Joſephus ſpeaks of this Fulvia [*M*].

'*the greateſt diſgrace to confeſs? if you were not aſhamed of your behaviour before the corporation towns, did not your veteran forces put you to the bluſh? for what ſoldier was not a witneſs of this at Bruncuſium? which of them knew not, how many days journey ſhe came to congratulate you? which of them was not, at laſt, aſhamed of following ſo ſcandalous a leader? you traverſed Italy again, in company with the ſame actreſs.*' Whilſt Cæſar was at Alexandria, inveſted the ſecond time with the dictatorſhip, Marc Antony, who was made general of the horſe, committed a thouſand extorſions at Rome: and by degrees proceeded to the audaciouſneſs of ſelling Pompey's goods by inch of candle. By that means he purchaſed the houſe and furniture of that great man, and ſoon waſted, in that very houſe, the money he got by that ſale; for he abandoned himſelf daily to the moſt expenſive debaucheries. He had ſtill his Cytheris: and he had already lodged in Pompey's houſe, when he diſmiſſed that ſtrumpet (78). Which I obſerve, to ſhew, that it is very probable that he kept her ſome time after Antonia's divorce; for Pompey's goods were not ſold, till after Cæſar was gone from Alexandria (79). Plutarch, deſcribing Marc Antony's debaucheries, his paſſion for Cytheris, &c. manifeſtly inſinuates, that thoſe diſorders continued after the battle of Pharſalia: and, becauſe he tells us, that Cæſar, being returned to Rome, ſhewed Marc Antony a great diſcontent, which produced two notable effects; he gives us room to believe, that ſome time paſſed between Antonia's divorce, and Fulvia's marriage. For, the two effects I ſpeak of, are, firſt, that Marc Antony would not follow Cæſar in his expedition into Africa; and ſecondly, that he renounced his debaucheries, changed his courſe of life, reſolved to marry, and made choice of Fulvia. Ἔοικε μέντοι τὸ πολὺ τῆς ἀβελτηρίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀσωτείας ἀφελεῖν ὁ Καῖσαρ, οὐκ ἀναισθήτως τὰ πλημμελήματα δεξάμενος, ἀπαλλαγεὶς γὰρ ἐκείνου τοῦ βίου, γάμῳ προσέσχε, Φουλβίαν ἀγάμενος. *Apparet tamen multum de Antonii amentia & intemperantia Cæſarem, peccata ejus non diſſimulando, detraxiſſe. Siquidem explicuit ſe illa vita, animoque ad nuptias applicato Fulviam duxit* (80). However, I would not deny, that, when he put away his ſecond wife, he had not already taken meaſures to marry the third; for an engagement with a courtezan does not hinder great lords from marrying: but it is probable, he made no great haſte towards that match, till Cæſar's diſcontent ſpurred him to it. Therefore I do not cenſure thoſe, who apply to Fulvia theſe words of Cicero. *Sororem tuam* (i. e. Antonia) *ejeciſti, alia conditione quæſita & ante perſpecta.*

I know ſome learned men, who apply them to Cytheris. But they are miſtaken; for there is no likelihood, that Marc Antony ever thought of marrying that woman. They were both contented to do all that married folks do, *eat, drink, and lie together*: and, as for concubinage, and all the exceſſes of complaiſance, which a gallant may ſhew to a miſtreſs, Marc Antony could add nothing, after Antonia's divorce, to what he had already practiſed before the battle of Pharſalia. Father Abram has ſtumbled in that place: Marc Antony, according to his opinion, when he put away his ſecond wife, had a mind to marry Cytheris, and married her in effect; and afterwards put her away, and then married Fulvia. *Certe cum, ut ex Plutarcho & Cicerone conſtat, ſtatim poſt repudiatam Antoniam, Italiæ Oppida obierit cum illa mimula, non videtur adhuc de Fulviæ nuptiis cogitaſſe, ne recentem uxorem iis flagitiis offenderet. Quare nihil obſtat quo minus ille Cytheridem vere tum uxorem acceperit, ut loquitur orator, à qua tamen paulo poſt fecit divortium, & Fulviam duxit uxorem* (81). Father Abram's proofs are very bad. He pretends, that Cicero and Plutarch affirm, that Marc Antony, ſoon after Antonia's divorce, went upon a progreſs, with Cytheris, through the towns of Italy; and concludes from thence, that he had not yet married Fulvia, it being improbable that he would have given, ſo ſoon, ſuch a mortification to his new bride. But he ſhould have taken notice, that Cicero gives us clearly to underſtand, that Marc Antony's progreſs with Cytheris, through the towns of Italy, preceded Antonia's divorce. Cicero obſerves, that that miſtreſs went twice upon ſuch a progreſs with her gallant: firſt, before the battle of Pharſalia; ſecondly, when Marc Antony, being returned to Rome, after that memorable action, met at Brunduſium his concubine Cytheris, who was come there to receive him. It is certain, that the quarrels of Marc Antony and Dolabella did not break out till after that ſecond progreſs of Cytheris through the towns of Italy: and it is likewiſe certain, that Antonia's divorce, and her huſband's quarrel with Dolabella, happened in the ſame time. The author, whom I confute, ought not to have laid a ſtreſs upon the word *uxor*, employed by Cicero with reſpect to Cytheris; for the words, we find a little after in Cicero, *Rejecta mater AMICAM impuri filii TANQUAM nurum ſequebatur*, evidently ſhew, that this was not a true marriage.

I do not doubt, but the reaſon, which obliged Marc Antony to diſmiſs Cytheris, was, becauſe he ſaw, that, without that, he could not conclude his marriage with Fulvia. I place that marriage in the 707th year of Rome, when Cæſar was in Africa. Two years after there was reaſon to ſuſpect, that Marc Antony continued to be in love with Cytheris; for the letter, he delivered himſelf to Fulvia, and which he pretended to bring as a meſſenger from Marc Antony, contained little elſe beſides aſſurances and proteſtations, that he was no more in love with that player, and that all the paſſion he had had for her was now turned towards Fulvia. 'Confeſtim ad eam, cujus cauſſa venerat, deducitur, eique epiſtolam tranſdidit, quam cum illa legeret flens, (erat enim amatoriè ſcripta: caput autem literarum, ſibi cum illa mima poſthac nihil futurum, omnem ſe amorem abjeciſſe illinc, atque in hanc transfudiſſe) cum mulier fleret uberius, homo miſericors ferre non potuit, caput aperuit, in collum invaſit (82). —— *He is immediately introduced to her, upon whoſe account he came, and delivered her the letter; which when ſhe read with tears (for it was written in very affectionate terms, and chiefly imported, that he had quite abandoned that actreſs, and had transferred all his love to her); when, I ſay, the lady could not forbear tears, my gentleman took pity on her, diſcovered himſelf, and fell upon her neck.*' He was then returning from Narbonne, whither he was gone to meet Julius Cæſar, who had defeated Pompey's ſons in Spain. *Cæſari ex Hiſpania redeunti obviam longiſſime proceſſiſti* (83). We ſhall ſee in the article LYCORIS, that he little remembered his promiſe. What Plutarch obſerves, touching the time of Marc Antony's marriage with Fulvia, is confirmed by the obſervation Dion has made, that Antyllus, their eldeſt ſon, received the virile gown, after his father, who was defeated at Actium, was returned into Egypt (84). According to Plutarch, the marriage was concluded in the year 707; and Dion affirms, that Antyllus received the virile gown in the year 724, when he might be ſixteen years old. He had been betrothed to Auguſtus's daughter (85); but they cauſed him to be murdered: and it was his virile gown, which expoſed him to that fatal misfortune (86). Auguſtus thought he ought not to ſuffer him to live, ſince the Egyptians might look upon him as grown to man's eſtate. Marc Antony had by Fulvia another ſon, whom I have mentioned in another place (87).

[*M*] *It is not true that Joſephus ſpeaks of this Fulvia.*] Glandorpius (88) has committed two faults in this: he refers us to the fifth chapter of the eighteenth book of the Jewiſh Antiquities, to be informed concerning Fulvia, Marc Antony's wife: and he ſays, in the ſame page, that Joſephus ſpeaks, in that place, of one Fulvia, who lived in Tiberius's time. This is a double impoſition upon the reader, by making him believe, that the Jewiſh hiſtorian has ſpoken of two Fulvia's in the ſame chapter; and that the one is ſhe, who was married to Marc Antony. The truth is, he ſpeaks but of one Fulvia, a Roman lady, married to Saturninus, who had embraced the Jewiſh religion, at the ſollicitation of four villains. She gave them all they aſked of her under the fair pretence of religion; but, when her huſband was informed, that they had kept for themſelves all the preſents, which ſhe intended ſhould be ſent to the temple of Jeruſalem, he complained of it to Tiberius; who, without diſtinguiſhing the innocent from the guilty, commanded all the Jews to depart from Rome.

---

(78) *See* Cicer. Philipp. II, cap. xxv, & *ſeq.*

(79) Cæſar Alexandria ſe recepit . . . haſta poſita pro æde Jovis Statoris, bona Cn. Pompeii . . . voci acerbiſſimæ ſubjecta præconis. *Ibid. cap. xxvi.*

(80) Plut. in Antonio, pag. 920. C.

(81) Abram, in Cicer. Oration. Tom. II, pag. 553.

(82) Cicer. Philipp. II, cap. xxxi. *See alſo* Plutarch. in Antonio, pag. 920.

(83) Cicero, Ibid. cap. xxxii.

(84) Dio, lib. li, pag. 511.

(85) Ibid. pag. 519.

(86) Ibid. pag. 511.

(87) *Article ANTONY* (MARC JULIUS).

(88) Onomaſt. pag. 358.

FUNCCIUS (JOHN), a Lutheran preacher, ſon-in-law to Oſiander, and his ſecond in the diſputes about Imputative Juſtice, took upon him to diſturb the public repoſe another way, that is, by politic cabals; which at laſt brought him to the ſcaffold, at Konigſberg in Pruſſia, the twenty eighth of October 1566 (*a*); being then in the forty ninth year of his age (*b*). See, in Moreri, the two verſes, which he is ſaid to have compoſed the day that he died. They contain a Greek word, which Mr Moreri has put into French (*c*); but, having tranſlated that word only, he has made nothing of it but perfect nonſenſe. He ſhould therefore have ſaid, that thoſe two verſes contained an exhortation to all men to grow wiſe by Funccius's example, and to avoid, as one would the plague, the curſed itch of meddling with too many things. Mr Moreri has committed another fault [*A*]. Voſſius is miſtaken as to the age of Funccius [*B*].

(*a*) Melchior. Adam. in Vitis Theolog. pag. 412.

(*b*) *See the remark* [*B*].

(*c*) Πολυπραγμοσύνη, de qua voce vide A. Gellium, *lib. xi, cap. xvi.*

[*A*] *Mr Moreri has committed another fault.*] He ſays, that Funccius carried down his chronology as far as 1352, and then to 1560. He ſhould have ſaid, that, in the year 1544, Funccius printed the firſt part of his chronology, which reached from Adam to the birth of JESUS CHRIST (1); and that, in the year 1554, his whole chronology was publiſhed, which began with the creation of the world, and ended with the year of grace 1552. In a new edition, reviſed and corrected, he went down as far as the year 1560.

[*B*] *Voſſius is miſtaken as to the age of Funccius.*] He ſays, that Funccius was beheaded in the fortieth year of his age (2). But let us rather lay the fault on his printers, and content ourſelves to cenſure his having ſent to them a very needleſs addition. He had ſaid, in the 231ſt page, that Funccius, born in the year 1518, loſt his life, being forty eight years old; and he ordered, that, in the 454th page, they ſhould print an addition, which ſhould inform us, that Funccius was beheaded in the year 1566. Could any thing be more needleſs than that? did not all his readers plainly ſee, by the 231ſt page, that Funccius died in the year 1566? the only way to excuſe him, would be to ſay, that he had a mind to ſhew, by his addition, that Funccius was beheaded in the forty ninth year of his age; but that the printers put 40 inſtead of 49. It is certain, that Melchior Adam is not exact. For, having placed the birth of Funccius in the month of February 1518, and his execution the twenty eighth of October 1566, he ſhould have placed his death in the forty ninth, and not in the forty eighth year of his age.

(1) See the epiſtle dedicatory of that chronology.

(2) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathemat. pag. 454.

FURIUS (FREDERIC) ſirnamed Cæriolanus, becauſe he was born at Valentia in Spain [*A*], flouriſhed in the XVIth century. He ſtudied at Paris under Audomarus Talceus, Hadrian Turnebus, and Peter Ramus (*a*); and afterwards came to Louvain, where he publiſhed a treatiſe of rhetoric, and maintained, againſt a doctor of divinity (*b*), that the holy Scripture ought to be tranſlated into the vulgar tongue (*c*). He wrote thereupon a very fine treatiſe [*B*] in the ſame city, and went to print it in Germany. This brought him into trouble (*d*); but his learning, piety and candour, being made known to the emperor Charles V, he was preſerved from the ſtorm. That prince ſent him back into the Low-Countries, and placed him near Philip his ſon (*e*), where he had the character of hiſtorian (*f*). Furius devoted himſelf all the reſt of his life to the ſervice of that maſter; and, having accompanied him to the ſtates of Arragon, he died at Valladolid, in the year 1592 (*g*). I cannot ſet down his age exactly [*C*]. He endeavoured heartily to pacify the troubles of the Low-Countries (*h*) [*D*]. He was never married (*i*). Neither was he ever chancellor to the king

(*a*) Andreas Schottus, Bibl. Hiſpan. pag. 615.

(*b*) He was a Sicilian, called Bononia, who was divinity-profeſſor at Louvain. *Thuan. lib. civ, pag.* 486. I have made an article concerning him.

(*c*) Idem. Schottus, ubi ſupra.

(*d*) Thuan. ubi ſupra.

(*e*) Id. ibid.

(*f*) Schottus, ubi ſupra.

(*g*) Id. ibid.

(*h*) Thuan. ubi ſupra.

(*i*) Ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *Sirnamed Cæriolanus, becauſe he was born at Valentia in Spain.*] Nicolas Antonius (1) ſays, that the inhabitants of the kingdom of Valentia are vulgarly called Seriols; and that, for this reaſon, our Furius has the ſirname of Seriolanus. He does not ſpell that word ſo, at the beginning of his book, intituled, *Bononia*, where he writes Cæriolanus. In the catalogue of Thuanus's library (2), he is miſcalled Coriolanus.

[*B*] *He wrote thereupon a very fine treatiſe.*] It is intituled, *Bononia, ſive de libris ſacris in vernaculam linguam convertendis, libri duo ad Franciſcum Bovadillium Mendozium, Cardinalem Burgenſem*, and which was printed at Baſil by John Oporinus, in the year 1556, in 8vo. It contains 365 pages. The reading of it was forbid by the *Index Expurgatorius* of the council of Trent.

[*C*] *I cannot ſet down his age exactly.*] Theſe words of Thuanus are not preciſe: *Ad meliorem vitam haud paullum Montano ſenior hoc anno migravit* (3). For they only inform us, that Furius died much older than Montagne, who lived but ſixty years (4). Thoſe words were not underſtood in the elogies of Mr Teiſſier, where it is ſaid, that Furius was *about ſixty years old*, when he died.

[*D*] *He endeavoured . . . . to pacify the troubles of the Low-Countries.*] You will find, in Thuanus, the ſubſtance of a project of peace, which Furius publiſhed in the year 1575. The conditions, he propoſed to the provinces that had revolted, ſeemed very reaſonable; but the prince of Orange anſwered, that they came too late, and could not be depended upon: and ſo he preferred war to ſo ſuſpicious a peace (5).

Note, that Furius aſſured them, that the king of Spain would ratify the conditions, contained in his project; and that, if it was thought neceſſary to bind more ſtrongly that monarch to the obſervation of the treaty, he would cauſe it to be ſigned by the grandees of Spain, both eccleſiaſtical and ſecular, by the princes of the empire, and by ſome of the moſt conſiderable cities in the Low-Countries. The author of the project promiſed, that the inquiſition ſhould not be eſtabliſhed; that the impoſition of the tenth-penny ſhould be taken away; that the edicts againſt the new religion ſhould be mitigated by certain proviſo's, as ſhould be amicably agreed on by both parties; and that ſuch as would not be contented with thoſe mitigations, ſhould be at full liberty to go and ſettle elſewhere, without forfeiting any of their goods; that foreign ſoldiers ſhould be disbanded, and ſent out of the Low-Countries, if the malecontents did deſire it, &c. Furius offered to go poſt, to carry immediately to the king of Spain the acceptance of theſe propoſals of peace: but there was no need that he ſhould take that trouble upon him; for the propoſals were rejected. ‘ Ad ea Arauſionenſis, quoniam jam conventus ‘ delegatorum diſſolutus erat, pridie Non. Maias re‘ſpondet, quæ in pacis formula proponantur, de ‘ promiſſis ſervandis cautiones, qua in re totius negotii ‘ cardo vertitur, eas non ita prudenti viro tutas videri, ‘ quin P. R. ſi non ſerventur, diſpenſare poſſint, & ‘ violatores abſolvere: ea diffidentia fieri, & quoniam ‘ formula hæc ſerius tranſmiſſa ſit, ut ipſe abjecta om‘ni meliori ſpe certum licet dubii eventus bellum in‘certæ atque adeo inſidioſæ paci præferendum duxe‘rit (6). —— *The prince of Orange, becauſe the aſſem‘bly of the delegates was diſſolved, anſwered, on the ‘ ſixth*

(1) Nicol. Antonius, Biblioth. Hiſpan. Tom. I, pag. 277.

(2) In the 500th page of the firſt part.

(3) Thuan. lib. civ, pag. 486.

(4) Montanus haud ſexagenario major vitæ ultimum diem clauſit. *Id. ibid.*

(5) Ex Thuano, lib. lx. pag. m. 108, 109, ad ann. 1575.

(6) Id ibid. pag. 109. C.

king of Poland, as ſome pretend (*k*). His *Treatiſe of the Counſellor* has been much eſteemed [*E*].

'*ſixth of May, that a prudent man could not depend on the promiſes in the plan of peace, on which the hinge of the whole affair turned, ſince the Pope could diſpenſe with the obſervance of them; beſides, that the project was tranſmitted too late; ſo that, rejecting all better hopes, he thought a certain war, tho' of doubtful event, preferable to an uncertain and therefore treacherous peace.*'

It fares with hiſtorians as with travellers: they meet now and then with certain matters, ſome of which are like mires, or like an even, broad, well paved road, *&c.* Furius's project is a favourable paſſage for the hiſtorians, that write on the ſide of Spain; and diſadvantageous to the hiſtorians of the other party. It is bright and fair for the firſt, and dull and ſad for the latter: for after all, what finer field can a hiſtorian deſire, to diſplay the clemency of a prince, and to caſt an odium on the ſtubbornneſs of his revolted ſubjects, than that ſtep of Furius, and what followed thereupon? what greater perplexity, than for people to be obliged to ſay, that they cannot truſt a maſter, who promiſes to redreſs all their grievances, and to ſuppreſs whatever forced them to take up arms? Nevertheleſs, in this caſe, the prince of Orange had good reaſons for not truſting the king of Spain: for things were come to that paſs, that he was compelled to practiſe, as he did, the maxim, that *whoever draws his ſword againſt his prince muſt throw away the ſcabbard.*

[*E*] *His* Treatiſe of the Counſellor *has been much eſteemed.*] He intituled it, *Del conſeio y conſeiro.* Simon Schardius was the firſt that tranſlated it into Latin; and his tranſlation was publiſhed at Cologne by Andreas Schottus, in the year 1618, with the treatiſes of Peter Magnus, and Hippolytus à Collibus, on the ſame ſubject. Chriſtopher Warſevicius made another Latin verſion of it, and publiſhed it with his treatiſe *De Legato & Legatione.* It was publiſhed at Dantzic in the year 1646, if we believe Nicolas Antonius. But undoubtedly he is miſtaken: for Warſevicius was not then alive; and we have ſome things of his printed in the year 1582, and an edition of his treatiſe *De Legato & Legatione* in 1595. Nicolas Antonius has miſtaken, for an edition procured by that Pole, that which was made after his death. However it be, this is the praiſe which Warſevicius has given to Furius's book. 'Hoc opus multis multorum vel longiſſimis commentationibus eſt præferendum. Sic enim reſpondet acumen ingenii pectoris candori, & diſputandi ſubtilitas ſententiarum gravitati, ut tales Ceriolæ Conſiliarii omni ævo optari quam ſperari videantur mihi magis potuiſſe (7). —— *This work is preferable to all comments whatever, even the longeſt. For the author's wit is ſo anſwerable to his candor, and the ſubtilty of his reaſoning to the gravity of his ſtile, that ſuch counſellors are rather to be wiſhed for, than expected, in every age.*' There is a Latin tranſlation of that work, printed at Baſil in the year 1563, in 8vo, and at Straſburg in 12mo (8). For the reſt, Gaſpar Eſcolanus, who has ſaid, in his hiſtory of Valencia, that Furius had the dignity of chancellor to the king of Poland (9), has, perhaps, been led into this miſtake by ſome book, that contained both the Treatiſe of the Counſellor, and ſome other diſſertation, dedicated to the chancellor of Poland.

(*k*) See the laſt remark.

(7) Warſevicius apud Nicol. Antonium, ubi ſupra.

(8) See the Catalogue of Thuanus's library, *pag.* 500, *Tom.* I.

(9) *See* Nicolas Antonius, ubi ſupra.

G.

GABRIEL (GILES) licentiate of the univerſity of Louvain, prieſt, monk of the third order of St Francis, definer general, and apoſtolical commiſſary in the Low-Countries, is a Liegeois, who publiſhed, at Bruſſels, in 1675, a book intituled, *Specimina Moralis Chriſtianæ & Moralis Diabolicæ*. This title *alarmed the court of Rome, and obliged the author to go thither, to juſtify his doctrine, which being found to be ſound, he thought he ought to communicate it to the public again, reforming a little the title* (a). He therefore got his work reprinted, intitling it *Specimina Moralia*. This ſecond edition is of Rome, 1680. There was a third in French, reviſed, corrected, and augmented. It is intituled, *Les Eſſais de la Theologie Morale* .... *Eſſays of Moral Divinity*, and contains 316 pages, in 12mo. This author approaches infinitely nearer to ſevere, than relaxed morality. I believe he is no friend to the Jeſuits, nor, conſequently, is beloved by them.

(a) Journal. des Sçavans, April. 14, 1681, pag. 139. Edit. Holl. *See alſo Mr Baillet*, Jugem. des Sçavans, Tom. I, pag. 506.

GAFFAREL (JAMES), one of the learned men, who has been much talked of in the XVIIth century, was a Provençal (a). He underſtood the oriental languages, and ſeveral others; and pretended to know almoſt every thing, but principally the occult and cabaliſtic ſciences. Cardinal Richelieu choſe him for his library-keeper (b), and ſent *him into Italy, to collect the beſt manuſcripts and printed books that could be found* (c). Mr de la Thuillerie, Ambaſſador of France to Venice, deſired to have him near him, as a learned companion [*A*]. Gaffarel publiſhed a book, intituled, *Curioſitez Inouïes*, (unheard of curioſities) which made a great noiſe, and which the Sorbonne cenſured [*B*]. He was obliged to retract it; for being poſſeſſed of eccleſiaſtical benefices [*C*], he could not with impunity bring his orthodoxy into queſtion. Before that time, he had been expoſed to many untoward ſuſpicions [*D*], and it is very likely he held particular opinions. It is pretended, that cardinal Richelieu intended to employ him in his grand deſign

(a) He was born at Mannes, in Provence. *Mercure Gallant, January*, 1682, *pag.* 159.

(b) Ib. pag. 160.

(c) Father Jacob, *Traité des Biblioth. pag.* 479. See alſo pag. 704, where he quotes what Gaffarel has ſaid, in the preface to the Hiſtory of the War of Conſtantinople, of Paul Ramnuſio.

[*A*] *Mr de la Thuillerie .... deſired to have him near him as a learned companion.*] Gaffarel did not pretend to be in the embaſſador's houſe (1) upon the foot of a man, that was only proper to divert him at his leiſure hours by his learned converſation. He did not believe politics to be out of his ſphere; but thought he might be uſeful to Mr de la Thuillerie, even in the buſineſs of his embaſſy: wherefore he deſired Mr Naudé, his good friend, to ſend him a catalogue of the authors, that have written on politics. That is the occaſion, that gave birth to the *Bibliographia Politica* of Gabriel Naudé, which has been printed ſo often. In order to prove it, let us quote the beginning of that book: ‘ Quæris à me, mi Gaffarelle eruditiſſime, atque etiam ‘ frequentibus literis vehementius urges, ut pro ea, ‘ quam in me non ſemel deprehendiſti, diverſorum li‘ brorum ac ſcriptorum cognitione, eorum nomencla‘ turam aut potius œconomiam ad te tranſmittam, quos ‘ inſtituendis tractandiſque cum recta ratione & me‘ thodo politicæ ſtudiis, non inutiles fore cenſeo. Quan‘ doquidem ipſa tibi in præſentiarum maximopere eſſe ‘ neceſſaria, vel te ipſo tacente cæteri omnes facilè ‘ intelligunt, quos minimè fugit, te unum præ multis, ‘ non ut liberalibus modo diſciplinis excultum, im‘ butumque ſanctioris linguæ facultate præclariſſima, ‘ ſed tanquam ad reliquas omnes diſciplinas factum à ‘ naturâ, & diligenti arte expolitum, ab illuſtriſſimo, ‘ ſapientiſſimoque viro domino THUILLERIO, ‘ chriſtianiſſimi noſtri regis, ad ſereniſſimam rempub‘ licam Venetam oratore excellentiſſimo, ſelectum ‘ fuiſſe; quo cum de rebus graviſſimis communicare, ‘ & ſubciſivis horis ſermones literarios miſcere poſſet (2). ‘ —— *You deſire of me, my learned friend Gaffarel,* ‘ *and earneſtly requeſt of me by repeated letters, that,* ‘ *as you have often found me acquainted with a great* ‘ *variety of books and authors, I would tranſmit to you* ‘ *a catalogue, or rather compleat ſeries, of thoſe whom* ‘ *I think will be uſeful in rightly purſuing and me*‘*thodizing the ſtudies of politics. How very ſervice*‘*able they will be at preſent to you, every one knows,* ‘ *without your confeſſion, who are apprized, that the* ‘ *illuſtrious and wiſe Mr de la Thuillerie, embaſſador* ‘ *to the Serene Republic of Venice, has made choice of* ‘ *you, not only only on account of your great knowledge* ‘ *in liberal arts, and acquaintance with the Hebrew* ‘ *tongue, but as being formed by nature, and cultivated* ‘ *by art, for all other kinds of knowledge; with whom* ‘ *he may communicate the moſt important affairs, and* ‘ *fill up his leiſure hours with learned converſation.*’

[*B*] *He publiſhed a book ..... which the Sorbonne cenſured.*] Here is the whole title: *Curioſites inoüies ſur la Sculpture Taliſmanique des Perſans, Horoſcope des Patriarches, & Lecture des Eſtoiles.* That is, *Unheard of Curioſities about the Taliſmanic Sculpture of the Perſians, Horoſcope of the Patriarchs, and Reading of the Stars.* The author ‘ pretended to ſhew, that the ‘ Taliſmans, or conſtellated figures, had the efficacy ‘ to make a man rich and fortunate; to free a houſe ‘ and a whole country from certain inſects and venc‘ mous creatures, and from all the injuries of the ‘ air (3).’ Sorel, diſguiſed under the name of the Sieur de l'Iſle, confuted Gaffarel's work; and his confutation was well received. You will find in it (4) Gaffarel's recantation. The firſt edition of the *Unheard-of Curioſities* was printed at Paris in 1629. There was another printed at Roan in 1631; and two others, without the printer's name, or the place where they were printed, in the year 1637 and 1650, in 8vo. The laſt has additions to it. This work was printed in Latin, at Hamburg, in 1676, with Gregory Michael's notes.

[*C*] *Being poſſeſſed of eccleſiaſtical benefices.*] I ſhall ſet down, in this remark, all the titles, which I find were given him. He was doctor of divinity and canon-law, protonotary of the holy apoſtolic ſee, and prior, *in commendam*, of St Giles's (5). When he died, he was dean of the canon-law in the univerſity of Paris, prior of Reveſt de Brouſſe, in the dioceſe of Ciſteron, and commander of St Omeil (6). Konig calls him, *Sigonciæ apud Gallos Abbas*.

[*D*] *Before that time, he had been expoſed to many untoward ſuſpicions.*] This appears by the preface to the *Unheard-of Curioſities*. ‘ A perſon of quality, *ſays he* ‘ whoſe

(1) It appears by Peireſc's Life, that Gaffarel was at Venice in the year 1633.

(2) Naudæus, in Bibliographia Politica, init.

(3) *See Sorel's* Bibliotheque Françoiſe, pag. 415.

(4) *In page* 3, teſte Colomeſio, Gall. Orient. pag 154.

(5) *See Father Jacob's* Traité des Biblioth. pag. 704, 705.

(6) Mercure Galant, *for January*, 1682, pag 159.

ſign of re-uniting religions; and that, in order to feel the pulſe of the Proteſtants, he authorized him to preach againſt the doctrine of purgatory [*E*]. Gaffarel died at Sigonce in the year 1681, being eighty years old (*d*). He had almoſt finiſhed the work, which he had been upon a good many years [*F*]: I know not whether his friends will publiſh it. I ſhall not give an exact liſt of his works [*G*].

(*d*) Mercure Galant, ubi ſupra, pag. 160.

' whoſe deſires cannot be refuſed without a crime, has ' drawn them out of my cloſet, where they ſhould have ' always remained, ſince I had taken the reſolution, ' after I had undergone ſo many calumnies, never to ' expoſe any thing more to the public: having a thouſand times breathed out theſe words, formerly familiar ' to a Roman prince, *Utinam neſciſſem literas*.' How many authors are there, who would make the ſame wiſh, but that they have ſo much ſpirit as to deſpiſe the unjuſt cenſures of certain people.

[*E*] *It is pretended, that cardinal Richelieu . . . . . authorized him to preach againſt the doctrine of purgatory.*] ' When, in one of the cities of Languedoc, ' the miniſters of the place had the honour to wait ' upon him (7), and being fallen into diſcourſe about ' a re-union in matters of religion, which he ſeemed ' to wiſh, ſince it had been happily reſtored in matters of ſtate; they told him, that they ſaw but little ' probability of effecting it, ſo long as the Pope would ' ſo ſtiffly maintain his infallible authority. To which ' he anſwered mildly, that means would be found ' to bring the Pope to reaſon. And, as the Gazettes ' publiſhed then what the Sieur Gaffarel, a man of ' known erudition and reputation, authorized by his ' Eminence, had publickly preached in Dauphiné againſt ' purgatory; ſo we knew, in it's proper time, the ' ſecret negociations, which, by his order, were entered upon by Father Audebert, a famous Jeſuit, ' with ſome of our moſt celebrated miniſters, to agree ' upon ſome propoſitions, which might be adjuſted ' between both parties, about their chief differences.' This I extract out of a preface of Samuel Des-Marets (8).' I know, that Gaffarel publiſhed a book about the pacification of religions.

(7) That is, cardinal Richelieu.

(8) Prefixed to the *Summary Anſwer to the method of cardinal Richelieu.* That anſwer was printed at Groningen in 1564. A new convert, couſin to Father Maimbourg, was the author of it. He takes, in it, the name of the Sieur R. de la Ruelle.

[*F*] *He had almoſt finiſhed his work, which he had been upon a great many years.*] ' He had for many ' years been buſy about a Hiſtory of the Subterranean ' World, wherein he treated of caves, grottos, mines, ' vaults, and catacombs, which he had obſerved for ' thirty years in his travels through all the parts of the ' world. He had almoſt finiſhed that work; the plates ' were already engraven, and it was going to the ' preſs, when death prevented the execution of his ' deſign. . . . . We are put in hopes, that thoſe two ' learned friends (9) who out-live Gaffarel, and with ' whom he entruſted his deſires, will not deprive the ' public of ſo rare and curious a piece (10).'

(9) That is, the abbot Pecoil, a great traveller, and Mr Chorier, advocate at Grenoble.

(10) Mercure Galant, ubi ſupra, pag. 161, 163.

[*G*] *I ſhall not give an exact liſt of his works.*] Here is only the title of ſome; *Abdita divinæ cabalæ myſteria contra Sophiſtarum logomachiam defenſa*, Paris 1623, in 4to. *Ars nova & perquam facilis legendi Rabbinos ſine punctis. De muſica Hebræorum ſtupenda libellus. In voces derelictas V. T. centuriæ duæ. De ſtellis cadentibus opinio nova. Quæſtio Hebraico-Philoſophica, utrum à principio mare ſalſum exſtiterit.* Mr Colomiés (11) refers us to the *Apes Urbanæ* of Allatius, from whence he has taken thoſe titles, and where he has left many others. The *Widow of Sarepta*, and a *Treatiſe of the Good and Evil Genius's* are alſo two pieces of Gaffarel (12).

(11) Colomeſ. Gallia Orient. pag. 260, 261.

(12) Mercure Galant, ubi ſupra, pag. 161.

GAIGNEUR (WILLIAM LE)

GAIGNEUR (WILLIAM LE) was of Angers (*a*), and lived at the beginning of the XVIIth century. We have ſeen his name (*b*) among thoſe, who have excelled in the art of writing. I have read, in a deſcription of France, that he was the *firſt of all the writers of the kingdom*, and that *he paved the way for an infinite number of perſons, who* at that time *profeſſed the art of writing* (*c*). There are ſome verſes in his praiſe, in the poems of Peter le Loyer, who ſtyles him *ſecretary to monſieur the king's brother* (*d*).

(*a*) François des Rues, Deſcript. de la France, pag. 283, Edit. of Conſtance, 1608.

(*b*) In the remark of the article ROCCO.

(*c*) Fr. des Rues, ubi ſupra.

(*d*) See the works and poetical miſcellanies of P. le Loyer, *fol.* 248, *verſo*, *Edit of Paris*, 1579.

GALÉS (PETER)

GALÉS (PETER), in Latin *Galeſius*, a learned Spaniard [*A*], ' who having ' been put to the rack in Rome, upon ſuſpicion of being a Proteſtant, loſt one of his ' eyes. Being afterwards come to Geneva, he taught philoſophy there, and was ſome ' time after rector of the college of Guienne at Bourdeaux. Being gone from thence, ' by reaſon of the envy they bore to him, he left France, to go into Flanders; where, ' having been diſcovered to be a Proteſtant, and put into the hands of the Spaniards, ' his countrymen, the moſt favourable treatment he received was, to be burnt by virtue ' of a decree of the Inquiſition. This Galés had good books, and alſo ſome manu' ſcripts (*a*) [*B*].' It was the Leaguers that took him, and delivered him up to the Spaniards. See Meurſius (*b*).

(*a*) Tranſcribed from Colomiés, *Melanges Hiſtoriques*, *pag.* 73, 74, who, without doubt, had copied Meurſius, *Athenæ Batav.* *pag.* 333.

(*b*) Meurſius, ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *A learned Spaniard.*] Florimond de Remond (1) makes him an Italian; but he is miſtaken.

(1) Traité de l'Antechriſt, cap. xviii, apud Colomiés, Mêlanges Hiſtoriques, pag. 73.

[*B*] *He had ſome manuſcripts.*] ' Caſaubon, who had ' known him at Geneva, ſpeaks, in his writings (2), ' of ſome, which he had communicated to him, and ' likewiſe commends his conjectures. Cujacius, in his ' obſervations (3), calls him, *Doctiſſimum & acutiſſimum virum*, upon occaſion of a privilege of the em' peror Juſtinian, which he had furniſhed him with: ' and Father Labbé, in his *Bibliotheque* of manuſcripts, ' quotes (4) *Orientii Monita in Bibliotheca Galeſiana* ' *reperta* (5).'

(3) Lib. x, cap. xi, apud Colomiés, ibid.

(4) Pag. 63, apud eumdem ibid.

(5) Colom. ibid.

(2) *On Theocritus, of the Geneva edition. On Diogenes Laërtius, pag.* 59 93, 105, 118 *and* 119, *of the edition of* 1594. *On Suetonius, pag.* 9, *and in his preface to Athenæus*, apud Colomiés, ibid *In his preface to Athenæus we muſt read*, Ejus etiam codicem vidimus nos inter alios neutiquam vulgares Petri Galeſii Hiſpani libros, *and not* Gelaſii.

GALLARS (NICOLAS DES)

GALLARS (NICOLAS DES), in Latin *Gallaſius*, a miniſter of Geneva, was one of thoſe, who aſſiſted at the conference of Poiſſy. Thoſe of Geneva lent him to the church of Paris, when they were deſired to give them a miniſter in the year 1557. The deputy (*a*), who conducted him, was ſtopped at Auſſonne with him, and ſome ſuſpicious and prohibited books having been found in his portmanteau, he was carried to Dijon, where he ſuffered martyrdom. Des Gallars was permitted to purſue his journey, becauſe they found neither books nor letters about him, that might render him ſuſpected (*b*). He is the author of ſome works [*A*], and of an edition of St Irenæus

(*a*) He was called Nicolas du Rouſſeau. *Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. ii, pag.* 137.

(*b*) Beza, ibid. *See alſo the* Hiſtory of Martyrs, lib. vii, fol. 412. *verſo.*

[*A*] *He is the author of ſome works.*] He publiſhed, at Geneva, in the year 1545, an Apology for Farel, and his colleagues, againſt Peter Charles. He tranſlated into Latin ſeveral treatiſes of Calvin. His book of the divinity of JESUS CHRIST, againſt the new Arians, was printed at Orleans in the year 1565. Calvin's næus [*B*]. He was miniſter at Orleans in 1564 (*c*). We ſhall ſee, below, the date of ſome of his works [*C*]. Calvin had a great eſteem for him, and was ſo much eſteemed by him, that he found in him a tranſcriber of what he wrote (*d*). La Croix du Maine ſpeaks of another N. DES GALLARS [*D*], who was miniſter of the French church in London, in the year 1561.

(*c*) Beza's preface to Calvin's Commentary on Joſhua, pag. m. 10.

(*d*) See the remark [*D*], citat. (11).

vin's commentary upon Iſaiah is but an abſtract of the lectures and ſermons of Calvin upon that prophet, which was made by des Gallars. He has alſo made a Commentary upon the book of Exodus, and an Apology for Calvin againſt Cochleus. The abridgment of Geſner's *Bibliotheque*, where we learn this, does not mention the years, wherein thoſe works were printed; which fault is too frequent in that abridgment of Geſner, and, in moſt compilations of that nature. *Note*, That the commentary upon Iſaiah was afterwards reviſed by Calvin, and therefore that des Gallars's edition is not the beſt. I prove this by Theodore Beza, who, having ſaid, That Calvin, though ſick in the year 1558, had not, for all that, given over working, goes on thus: ‘Ejus rei teſtes ſunt ultima Chriſtianæ inſtitutionis editio tum Latina tum Gallica, & Commentarii in Eſaïam ab eo non tam emendati (quales illos Galaſius ex ore prælegentis exceptos ediderat) quam novi prorſus emiſſi (1). —— *Witneſs the laſt edition of his Chriſtian Inſtitute, both Latin and French, and the Commentary on Iſaiah, not ſo much corrected (as thoſe, which Gallars had publiſhed from his mouth) as new drawn up.*’ Some believe (2) that des Gallars compoſed, with Beza, the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches; but I believe they are miſtaken (§ *α*).

[(§ *α*) They aſcribe to him the ſhort prayers at the end of each Pſalm of Marot and Beza, in ſeveral old editions. REM. CRIT.]

(1) Beza, in vita Calvini, ad ann. 1558.

(2) *See* Placcius de Anonymis, n. 429, pag. 102.

[*B*] *And of an edition of St Irenæus.*] Geſner's abridgment is very good in this particular; for we find there, not only where, and in what year (3), the miniſter des Gallars publiſhed that edition, but alſo wherein it differs from others.

(3) At Geneva, 1570.

[*C*] *We ſhall ſee, below, the date of ſome of his works.*] In the year 1545, he tranſlated into Latin a ſmall treatiſe, which Calvin had publiſhed in 1540, on the Lord's-Supper. Des Gallars was then miniſter of the church of Geneva (4). Some time after, he made a Latin tranſlation of what Calvin had publiſhed, in 1544, againſt the Anabaptiſts and Libertines (5). He made, in 1548, a Latin verſion of the inventory of relics, publiſhed by Calvin in 1546 (6). He publiſhed, in 1551, the commentary, which he had extracted from the lectures and ſermons of Calvin on the prophet Iſaiah (7).

(4) Beza, Pref. of Calvin's Commentary on Joſhua, pag. m. 10.

(5) Ibid. pag. 15.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ibid. pag. 18.

[*D*] *La Croix du Maine ſpeaks of another N. Des Gallars.*] Nicolas des Gallars, whom he mentions in the 344th page, and N. des Gallars, of whom he ſpeaks in the 363d page, are the ſame miniſter, and therefore he makes two authors of one. *He has written in Latin,* (thus he ſpeaks touching the latter) *and ſince tranſlated into French, the form of the eccleſiaſtical government, ſettled in the French church in London, printed in the year* 1561, *at which time he reſided in the ſaid city of London* (8). It may be objected, that, if La Croix du Maine is not miſtaken as to the time, it is probable, that there are here two miniſters; for Nicolas des Gallars was at Geneva in the year 1560 (9), and in France in 1561, at the time of the conference of Poiſſy. I anſwer, that this proves nothing. That miniſter was ſent to London in the year 1560, to ſettle there a French church; that is certain: but at the ſame time, that does not hinder, that a year after des Gallars might have been in France at the conference of Poiſſy (10). ‘Eodem tempore quum non pauci pii Galli poſt Mariæ reginæ mortem ſingulari Sereniſſimæ reginæ Elizabethæ pietate & humanitate freti in Angliam refugerent, peterentque reverendi viri Edmundi Grindalli epiſcopi Londinenſis aſſenſu ut Geneva mitteretur qui eccleſiam Gallicam illic conſtitueret, miſſus eſt eo Nicolaus Galaſius familiariſſimus à multis jam annis Calvini collega, & cujus plurimum opera in excipiendis dictatis utebatur. Sed Calvino nihil antiquius eccleſiarum ædificatione fuit (11). —— *At the ſame time, when not a few pious Frenchmen, after the death of queen Mary, depending on the ſingular piety and humanity of the moſt ſerene queen Elizabeth, fled into England, and petitioned, with the aſſent of Edmund Grindall, biſhop of London, that ſome one might be ſent from Geneva, to eſtabliſh a French church there, Nicolas Gallars was ſent thither, an intimate acquaintance and colleague for many years of Calvin, and whom he chiefly employed in taking down what he dictated. But Calvin had nothing more at heart than the edification of the churches.*’

(8) He had ſaid, that N. des Gallars was miniſter of the French church in the city of London, in England.

(9) The epiſtle dedicatory of his Commentary on Exodus, is dated that year from Geneva.

(10) Beza, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. iv, pag.* 490, puts him among the miniſters who were at that conference.

(11) Beza, in vita Calvini, ad ann. 1560.

GALLIGAI (LEONORA),

wife to the marſhal d'Ancre, was daughter of a Joiner, and of Mary de Medicis's nurſe (*a*). That princeſs lov'd her tenderly, and brought her into France, when ſhe came there to be married to Henry IV. Galligai, under the title of bedchamber-woman to that Princeſs, governed her entirely. She was extremely ugly, but had an infinite deal of wit. She married Concino Concini, a domeſtic of the ſame queen, and raiſed with him a prodigious fortune. They were more united by intereſt, than by affection [*A*]. They had fomented the diviſion between Henry IV, and the queen (*b*); for their artifices and falſe reports occaſioned the domeſtic jars, which made that great prince weary of his life. After his death, they found it ſtill more eaſy to govern their miſtreſs, and engroſs all the riches and beſt places of the kingdom [*B*], and were puffed up with unheard-of and monſtrous pride

(*a*) Le Grain, Decade de Loüis le Juſte, lib. iv, pag. 154. *Hilarion de Coſte,* Tom. II, des Dames Illuſtres, pag. 477, *denies that ſhe was that nurſe's daughter.*

(*b*) *See Mr de Perefixe,* Hiſtoire de Henry le Grand, pag. m. 399, ad. ann. 1603, *and Mezerai,* Abrégé Chronol. Tom. VI, pag. m. 301, 367.

[*A*] *They were more united by intereſt, than by affection.*] The marſhal d'Ancre's wife heard, without ſhedding tears, that her huſband was murdered; and her firſt care was to ſave her jewels, which ſhe put *in the ſtraw of her bed, and, cauſing herſelf to be undreſſed, ſhe went to bed* (1). The provoſtmen, that went into her chamber, not finding the jewels, made her (2) *riſe, to ſearch her bed, where they were found* (3). *She ſaid afterwards to thoſe, who guarded her,* well, they have killed my huſband; is not this enough to ſatisfy them? Let them ſuffer me to go out of the kingdom (4). When they told her, they had hanged the corps of the mareſchal, ſhe ſeemed very much moved at it, ‘without weeping however; but yet ſhe ſaid, that he was a proud, inſolent, man: that he had nothing but what he deſerved: that ſhe had not lain with him for three whole years laſt paſt: that he was an ill man; and that, to part from him, ſhe had reſolved to retire into Italy this ſpring, and had made every thing ready for her journey; which ſhe offered to juſtify (5).’ When meſſieurs Aubri and le Bailleul went to interrogate her *about her rings and other goods,* ſhe ſpoke to them *with as much aſſurance, as if ſhe had no manner of fear* (6); and even told them, ſhe hoped to come again into favour.

(1) Relation of the death of the mareſchal d'Ancre, in the ſequel of *The Hiſtory of Favourites,* by Mr du Puy, *pag. m.* 28.

(2) Ibid. pag. 30, 31.

(3) She meant, without doubt, thoſe jewels, when ſhe ſaid to meſſieurs Aubri and le Bailleul, *That ſhe had ſent to the king, the day before, a ſtrong box, wherein were jewels to the value of two hundred thouſand livres.* Ib. p. 61.

(4) Ib. pag. 31.

(5) Ib. pag. 55.

(6) Ib. pag. 61.

[*B*] *They engroſſed all the riches and beſt places.*] See, above, the article CONCINI, and conſider only, that they found in the mareſchal's pockets (7), in aſſignments from the treaſury, in notes of receivers, or in bonds, the ſum of 1985000 livres. They found in his houſe good aſſignments for 2500000 livres more (8). His wife ſaid to the commiſſaries, that *ſhe had ſtill her pearls, to wit, a necklace of* 40 *pearls of* 2000 *livres a-piece, and a chain of five turns of pearls of* 50 *livres a-piece, and that in all they amounted to above* 120000 *crowns* (9). She had already ſent jewels to the king, to the value of 200000 livres. The provoſtmen had not ſo well ſearched, but that ſhe had ſtill a box of jewels left: for, when they carried her to the Baſtile, they asked her ‘before they went . . . if ſhe had no more rings? She ſhewed a box, that had not been taken from her, wherein there were

‘drawers

(7) Ib. pag. 48.

(8) Ib. pag. 62.

(9) Ib. pag. 61.

pride [*C*]. But the end of this was extreamly tragical. I have ſaid elſewhere how the huſband was uſed, and now I am going to relate what was done to the wife. She was committed to the Baſtile, and afterwards to the priſon of the parliament. She was tried by the parliament, and ſentenced to be beheaded and burnt; which was executed the eighth of July 1617. She took up at laſt a good reſolution, and died with conſtancy enough, and like a chriſtian (*c*). She was convicted, among other crimes, of having not only judaized [*D*], but likewiſe of having uſed magical arts [*E*] to compaſs her ends. She was condemned for high-treaſon againſt God and the

only ſome chains of amber: and being asked, if ſhe had none about her, ſhe took up her coats, and ſhewed as high as near her breaſts, having on drawers of red Florence friſe. They told her, laughing, that then they muſt put their hands to her drawers. She anſwered, that, at another time, ſhe would not have ſuffered it, but now all was permitted; and ſo du Hallier (10) felt a little about the drawers (11).’ This great wealth was a ſufficient proof of their crimes.

[*C*] *They were puffed up with unheard-of and monſtrous pride.*] ‘ She would not even allow the princes, princeſſes, and the greateſt perſons of the kingdom, to come into her chamber, nor ſuffer people ſo much as to look her in the face; ſaying, *that ſhe was frighted when people looked upon her, and that they might bewitch her by looking upon her*: Which was the reaſon that ſhe would no longer ſee ſeveral of her ſervants, only for having looked on her; and, towards the end of her favour, ſhe had even baniſhed from her chamber, on that account, Mr de Luſſon, and Faydeau, who had been the laſt in her favour (12).’ Her ſuperſtition, as to witchcraft, and her uglineſs, were the reaſon of this, more than her vanity.

[*D*] *She was convicted of having not only judaized.*] This was alſo laid to her husband's charge. It was proved,

I. By the care they took to bring into France a Jew, famous for fortune-telling, being a phyſician called Montalto. They employed Vincencio Ludovici, their ſecretary, in this negociation. This was verified ‘ by letters, written from Venice to the ſaid Vincencio, the twenty ſixth of April, 1611, by which they give him hopes of the ſaid Montalto's coming into France (13); and by letters of the ſaid Montalto himſelf, written, the ſixth of May following, to the ſaid Leonora Galligai, by which he aſſures her, that he is ready to come, *by the means of ſo gracious and ſingular a protectreſs*; *not meaning however to diſguiſe or conceal his profeſſion, but freely to exerciſe his Jewiſh religion, ſince he had refuſed great offers made him from Bologna, Meſſina, Piſa, and even to ſucceed the great phyſician Mercurialis, under the moſt gracious protection of the great duke Ferdinand; and that the firſt profeſſorſhip of Padua had alſo been offered him*; adding, that by one ſingle act they might know his intention, to wit, *that he ſhall receive no money on the day he is uſed to obſerve*, that is, the Sabbath-day. Theſe letters have been ſeen in the proceſs in the literal production againſt the ſaid Galligai, under the letter K: and it is to be obſerved hereupon that la Place, gentleman of the horſe to the ſaid Galligai, maintained to her, in the the confrontation, that, ſince the coming of the ſaid Montalto, ſhe went no more, either to church, or confeſſion, but ſpent her time in making little wax balls, which ſhe put in her mouth (14).’

II. It was alledged (15), *that by their converſation with that Montalto, the priſoners diſuſed the obſervation and practice of the chriſtian religion, and accuſtomed themſelves to judaiſm*; and that it was the reaſon, that there were found in their houſe two books, one of which is intituled *CHEINUC*, that is, in Hebrew, *Cuſtom, which is a kind of catechiſm*; the other is intituled *Machazor*, that is, *Revolution of the annual ſervice*, for the uſe of the Jews of Spain, printed at Venice.

III. It was alledged (16), that ‘ from that converſation and catechiſing followed their apoſtacy and deſertion of the chriſtian religion, to embrace, as they did, judaiſm, practiſing the ſacrifices, oblations, and exorciſms, uſed among the Jews. This is verified in the proceſs, both by the teſtimonial and vocal proof, and by the confeſſion of the ſaid Galligai; and among other depoſitions, that of her coachman is obſervable, by which it appears how they made uſe of ſeveral churches in Paris, to commit, in them, in the night, thoſe impieties, found out by the cries and howlings heard in the ſame, when the ſaid Galligai ſacrificed a cock, which is an oblation uſed by the Jews in the feaſt of reconciliation, offering a cock for their ſins. And that this oblation of a cock is Jewiſh, and that the Jews are uſed to practiſe the ſame in the places, where they are ſuffered to reſide, appears by two books, produced by the king's attorney-general, when the trial was depending; the one inſcribed *Baal Hatturim*, that is, *the chief and patron of orders*; in the firſt part of which, intituled *Grachchaüm*, that is, *The way and path of life*, or *The way of living which one ought to obſerve*, or, *The way of ſpending this life*, that oblation is mentioned; and of which book, Rabbi Jacob, who pretends to be a Gaul, is the author. Aud the other, intituled *The Jewiſh ſynagogue* *; in the twentieth chapter whereof is written what is done in that feaſt of reconciliation during ten penitential days: and that, on the ninth, the Jews riſe very early, frequent the ſchool, ſing, and rehearſe ſeveral prayers; and as ſoon as they return home, each male, both young and old, takes a cock in his hand, and the female a hen, and the big-bellied women a cock and a hen together, and rehearſe theſe words out of the pſalm of David: † *The fooliſh, by reaſon of their prevarication, and for their iniquities, are afflicted, ſo that their ſoul loaths all meat, and they are come even to death's door.* This oblation of a cock does not only argue judaiſm, but heatheniſm alſo, and declares the accuſed to be apoſtates, and conſequently ſacrilegious; for an apoſtate is accounted guilty of ſacrilege by the imperial conſtitutions ‡, which puniſh ſuch capital crimes with forfeiture of all their eſtate. As to what the ſaid Galligai has ſaid in her excuſe, *That ſhe had made that oblation of a cock for her health, and to be cured of a diſeaſe ſhe laboured with*; it was anſwered to her, *that ſuch an impiety is puniſhed with death, although it be practiſed by way of remedy* *.’

IV. They alledged, as a proof of their affection to judaiſm, *the endeavours they uſed to bring Jews into France, having ſent to Amſterdam in Holland, where there are many of them, to invite ſome of them to Paris* (17).

[*E*] .... *but likewiſe of having uſed magical arts.*] This accuſation affected alſo both the husband and wife. It was proved (18),

I. ‘ By a letter of a woman called Gondy, and others of the ſaid Galligai, the priſoner, to the lady Iſabella, a reputed witch; by which ſhe deſires her to ſend her word, if ſhe knows any thing BY HER ART which regards any way her perſon, or the intereſt of her houſe.

II. ‘ By three books of characters, with another little character, found in the room of the ſaid Galligai, and a box, wherein are five round pieces of velvet, of which characters the priſoners made uſe to get an aſcendant over the WILLS OF THE GREAT ONES: which is verified by the depoſitions of Melon, Charton, and Nicolas Viart, confronted to the ſaid Galligai. And as for the books of characters, found in her houſe, they are mentioned in the verbal proceſs of Meſſieurs de Maupeou, and Arnauld, intendants of the Finances, containing the deſcription of the moveables and papers found in the ſaid houſe.

III. ‘ By the depoſition of Philip Dacquin, formerly a Jew, and at preſent a Chriſtian, who ſays, that he being at Molins, in the lieutenant-criminal's houſe, the priſoners ſent him word, *that they had made uſe of the Cabala, and of the books of the Jews*, which ſerves againſt judaiſm and witchcraft; it being to be obſerved what Dacquin depoſes, *that*

(*c*) Le Grain, lib. x, pag. 419.

(10) He was captain of the guards.

(11) Ubi ſupra, pag. 65.

(12) Ibid. pag. 83, 84.

(13) He died in the year 1616, and foretold that Galligai ſhould die the next year. *Le Grain, Decade de Louïs le Juſte, lib. x, pag.* 419.

(14) Ibid. pag. 404.

(15) Id. ibid. pag. 405.

(16) Id. ibid.

* Synagoga Judaica, edita Hanoviæ, anno 1514.

† Pſalm cv.

‡ Tot. tit. C. de Apoſtatis.

* Novel. Conſt. Leonis Imp. 65.

(17) Le Grain, ibid. pag. 406.

(18) Id ibid. pag. 406.

the king, and for ſeveral other particular crimes. There was alſo in her proceſs an article, by which ſhe was charged with high-treaſon both againſt God and the king [*F*]. Her mouth was ſoon ſtopped, when, to prolong her life, ſhe pleaded her belly [*G*].

‘ *Concini, in the preſence of his wife, had removed out of his chamber an urinal, by reaſon of it's uncleanneſs, and carried out of the ſaid chamber the image of the crucifix, for fear they ſhould hinder the effects, which Concini and his wife expected from the reading of ſome verſes of the fifty firſt Pſalm in Hebrew: which reading they deſigned ſhould be performed by Dacquin, in the ſame way it had formerly been performed before them by Montalto.*’

IV. Becauſe ‘ they ſent for ſome ſorcerers, who pretended to be monks, called Ambroſians, from Nancy in Lorrain, who aſſiſted the mareſchal's wife in the offering of the cock.’

V. Becauſe there were found ‘ in their houſe divers things, which they uſed to hang about their necks (19) after the manner of the preſervatives, called by the Jews, *Kamea*; by the Greeks, *Philacteria*, and *Periapta*; and by the Latins, *Amuleta*, and *Ligaturæ*; which are things condemned by the holy councils, particularly by the ſixty firſt canon of the ſixth ſynod *in Trullo*, and by a Roman council under Pope Gregory III, and by another of Agatho, quoted by Gratian *, and by Yvo biſhop of Chartres †, quoting a council of Arles, cap. v, which condemns *Philacteria diabolica*, and *Caracteres diabolicos*.’

VI. It was proved againſt them, that they made uſe of images of wax, and kept them in coffins.

VII. And that they conſulted magicians, and employed aſtrologers, who profeſſed judicial mathematics; and that, among the reſt, they made uſe of the diabolical ſcience of Coſmo Ruger, an Italian.

VIII. ‘ (20) But, above all, it is to be obſerved, that the ſaid Galligai invited to Paris one Matthew de Montenay, as a greater and more experienced magician than the ſaid Ambroſians; by whom ſhe cauſed her ſelf to be exorciſed in the church of the Auguſtins, in the chapel of the Epiſames, and in the night, as has been depoſed by ſeveral monks of the ſaid monaſtery, moſt of whom have been confronted to her, without being excepted againſt by her. It being to be noted, that the exorciſm was performed in another manner than among chriſtians; which was alſo done in the churches of St Sulpice in the ſuburb St Germain, and in the little St Antony in the city. She anſwered to that, that her cauſing herſelf to be thus exorciſed in the night, was, leſt it ſhould be known for what diſtemper ſhe did it; ſaying, that ſhe was ſometimes poſſeſſed. But this ought to have been done by men having the true character, as either by the biſhop, or his vicar, that is, the curate of her pariſh, and not by unknown, griſly, men, who have diſappeared, and were no more ſeen; ſuch as were thoſe pretended Ambroſians.

IX. ‘ It is alſo to be noted, that, when theſe Ambroſians had a mind to perform any ceremonies of their art in the houſe of the ſaid Galligai, they cauſed all the ſervants to go out, burnt frankincenſe in the garden, and made ſeveral things in form of benedictions upon the earth; and the ſaid Galligai did eat, then, only cocks combs, and rams kidneys, which ſhe cauſed to be bleſſed; of which there is a teſtimonial proof in the proceſs.

X. ‘ It is alſo to be noted, that, every year, on the eve of the Epiphany, or Twelfth-day, ſhe cauſed father Roger to bleſs the water, which ſhe uſed, for luſtral, or holy-water; which was not without ſome myſtery and deſign. And, being asked for what reaſon ſhe did it, ſhe would give no anſwer.’

[*F*] *She was charged with high-treaſon both againſt GOD and the king.*] For both huſband and wiſe *enquired after the king's life and health from ſome perſons, who profeſſed judicial aſtrology.* This was proved by *the depoſition of John du Chatel, called Cæſar, who was a ſoothſayer and fortune-teller, confronted to the priſoners*, &c. (21)

[*G*] *She pleaded her belly.*] Having heard her condemnation read to her, ſhe ſaid, *I am big with child.* But it was anſwered to her, *that ſhe had ſaid, being a priſoner, and during her tryal, that ſhe had not had her huſband's company for two years before; ſo that this could not be, but to the prejudice of her honour: to which ſhe anſwered nothing, and inſiſted no more thereupon* (22).

(19) Ibid. pag. 407.

* Si quis ariolos, 26, q. 5.

† Part XI, cap. i, liv, and lviii.

(20) Le Grain, ubi ſupra, pag. 407.

(21) Id. ibid. pag 408.

(22) Ibid pag. 418.

GALLONIUS (Antony), a prieſt of the Oratory at Rome, hath compoſed, among other works, a treatiſe *de Martyrum Cruciatibus*, which is very curious. There is to be ſeen in it the figure of the inſtruments uſed by the heathens againſt the martyrs of the primitive church. He died in the year 1605 (*a*). I give the titles of ſome other works he compoſed [*A*].

A little book, printed in Holland in the year 1699, informs me of a thing, which, I think, deſerves to be inſerted in this Dictionary. It relates to the diſpute, wherein Gallonius made himſelf a party, to defend Baronius againſt the monks of mount Caſſin [*B*].

(*a*) Ludovicus Jacob in Bibliotheca Pontificia, pag. 263.

[*A*] *I give the title of ſome other of his works.*] He wrote the life of Philip Neri, the founder of the prieſts of the Oratory, and an apology *pro aſſertis in annalibus Eccleſiaſticis Baronianis de monachatu ſancti Gregorii Papæ adverſus D. Conſtantinum Bellottum Monachum Caſinatem*, Rome, 1604. *in* 4to. *ex typographia Vaticana.* See the *Bibliotheque* of Proſper Mandoſio; wherein he has not forgot Gallonius, who was a native of Rome.

[*B*] *He defended Baronius againſt the monks of mount Caſſin.*] The little book, which furniſhes me here with a commentary, is intituled, *Critique du livre publié par les Moines Benedictins de la Congregation de S. Maur, ſous le titre de* Bibliotheque divine de St Jerome. It contains but ſixty ſix pages in 12mo. The advertiſement of the bookſeller informs us, *that we are beholden for that criticiſm to Mr Simon's nephew, who wrote it from his uncle's Latin Memoirs.* What I am going to copy from that book, is not the leaſt curious paſſage in it (1). The monks of mount Caſſin, ‘ are ſo liberal of their habit, that, having beſtowed it on St Gregory the Great, they could not endure what that cardinal (2) had advanced in his annals, that it was falſe, that St Gregory had been a Benedictin monk; and publiſhed thereupon a book with this title, *Gregorius magnus inſtituto Sanctiſſimi Patris Benedicti reſtitutus.* But Antony Gallon, a prieſt of the Oratory at Rome, eſpouſing the cauſe of his brother Baronius, wrote a very ſmart anſwer to them; and becauſe it is grown very ſcarce, I ſhall ſend you ſome paſſages out of it, which may ſerve you till the whole be reprinted, with ſome other pieces on the ſame ſubject. It is printed at Rome, in 4to, with this title *Apologeticus Liber*... (3) I confeſs to you, that, if father Gallon's piety, as well as that of Baronius, were not otherwiſe known, one would be apt to think, that there is a great deal of paſſion in that anſwer; wherein the monks are charged with producing, to maintain their cauſe, ſome pieces, whoſe authors deſerve the ſame puniſhment as Cicarella. Strange compariſon! that Cicarella was hanged for his forgeries, by the order of Pope Pius V. It is true that the ſame Gallon owns, that he reveals things, which ought never to have come to the knowledge of the public; but he adds at the ſame time, that the extream impudence of thoſe monks had engaged him to publiſh them. He reproaches them with a great number of donations, which had been forged in mount Caſſin under the names of Popes and Princes. All thoſe deeds were printed at Venice, in 4to, in 1513, at the end of the chronicle of that monaſtery. By

‘ theſe

(1) Critique de la Biblioth. divine de St Jerome, pag. 64. & ſeq. *See alſo Mr Simon's* Critical Letters, *publiſhed by a German gentleman, pag.* 118, & ſeq.

(2) That is, Baronius.

(3) See the ſequel of that title in the remark [*A*]

'theſe falſe donations ſeveral poſſeſſions, and even whole towns, are given to the monks of mount Caſſin. It is true, that the monk Conſtantine, in defence of his monaſtery, produces records, which were found in his library, written in Lombardic characters, and which, by conſequence, could not have been newly forged. But Gallon, who knew to the bottom the practices of the Benedictin monks, anſwers, that all the papers they have, written in in thoſe ancient characters, ought not to be credited, as if they were ſealed with the ſeal of the Revelation; it being well known that they do not want writers, who have a hand good enough to imitate Lombardic characters: *Ac ſi quidquid eo caractere* (Longobardico) *exaratum invenitur tanquam ſigillo Apocalypſis ſit conſignatum in dubitationem non liceat revocare, & deſint hodie quoque ſcriptores qui eorumdem formam elementorum valeant imitari, ut plus apud te probat genus caracteris, quàm veritas manifeſtis rationibus confirmata.*'

I have not ſeen the anſwer, which has been made to that little book of Mr Simon's nephew, by the Benedictins of Paris. If I had ſeen it, I would have extracted out of it all that could ſerve towards the clearing of this diſpute, and I would have faithfully related what both parties have alledged.

GALLUTIUS (JOHN PAUL), a learned Italian aſtronomer, lived in the XVIth century. He invented an inſtrument to obſerve the celeſtial Phœnomena (*a*); and publiſhed ſeveral books of aſtronomy, and ſome of phyſic [*A*]. He was a fellow of the academy at Venice.

(*a*) Quo inſtrumento nove excogitato cuncta cœli phænomena una cum horis omnis generis obſervantur ex ſole, luna, ac ſtellis, non longe ab ecliptica diſtantibus. *Voſſius de Scient. Mathem. pag.* 386.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] The following are thoſe that are come to my knowledge: *Della fabrica & uſo di diverſi ſtromenti di Aſtronomia & Coſmografia, Venice,* 1597. *Speculum Uranicum, Venice,* 1593. *Cœleſtium corporum & rerum ab ipſis pendentium explicatio, Venice,* 1605. This work has been wrongfully fathered upon Paulus Galvicius, in the catalogue of Thuanus's library (1). *Theatrum mundi & temporis, Venice,* 1589. *De Themate erigendo, parte fortunæ, diviſione Zodiaci, dignitatibus Planetarum & temporibus ad medicandum accommodatis. Extat cum Job. Haſfurto de cognoſcendis & medendis morbis ex corporum cœleſtium poſitione, cui argumenta & explicationem inſcripſit, Venice,* 1584.

(1) Part. II, pag. 113.

GALLUTIUS (TARQUIN), born in Italy in 1574, entered himſelf in the order of the Jeſuits in the year 1590, and became very famous among them. He taught rhetoric in the Roman college for ten years, and morals for four. He died at Rome, the twenty eighth of July 1649, in the Grecian college, of which he had been director for eighteen years (*a*). He is the author of ſeveral works [*A*].

(*a*) Nathan. Sotuel. in Bibl. Scriptor. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 753.

[*A*] *He is the author of ſeveral works.*] He pronounced ſome orations before the Pope, that were printed. It was he, who made cardinal Bellarmin's funeral oration, which was alſo printed. Several other orations of his, collected into two volumes, and ſeveral of his poems, in three books, have been publiſhed. We have alſo of his two volumes of commentaries on Ariſtotle's Morals, printed (1) at Paris for Sebaſtian Cramoiſi, in Folio. His book, intituled, *Vindicationes Virgilianæ, & Commentarii tres de Tragœdia, de Comœdia, de Elegia*, printed at Rome in the year 1621 (2), is very curious. His deſign 'was to juſtify Virgil at any rate. In order to that, he ſets down all the objections, which he thought could be made to ſeveral places of that poet: but there are ſeveral, which he has not propoſed with all their force, leſt he ſhould have found too much difficulty in anſwering them. Nevertheleſs, among ſome weak arguments, there are others rational enough, attended with a great deal of literature, and ſeveral fine maxims concerning the art of poetry (3).' Mr Baillet ſhews here a piece of cunning, which is but too common in all ſorts of diſputes, but eſpecially with controverſiſts about religion. When they find themſelves unable to anſwer an objection, they leave out of it the principal difficulty; that is, they diſarm their adverſary before they attack him. Father Gallutius publiſhed, at Rome, in the year 1633, the revival of the ancient tragedy, and Criſpus's defence; which work is in Italian (4).

This JESUIT is, without doubt, the ſame author whom Balzac commends in the words you are going to read: *I had learned in Italy*, ſays he (5), *that for a man to write well, he muſt propoſe good patterns to himſelf; and that good patterns were contained in a certain circle of years, out of which every thing was either in the imperfection of infancy, or in the corruption of old age. With this principle I happened to aſſiſt at cardinal Bellarmin's funeral oration, and I conſidered that great and admirable Jeſuit, who, with the dignity of his geſtures, the graces of his pronunciation, and the eloquence of his whole body, which accompanied that of his mouth, tranſported my ſoul into the ancient republic.*

(1) The firſt in the Year 1632, and the other in 1645.

(2) Nath. Sotuel. ubi ſupra.

(3) Baillet, Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, Tom. I, n. 1067, pag. 51.

(4) Sotuel, ubi ſupra.

(5) Balzac, OEuvr. Diverſes, pag. m. 404.

GALLUTIUS (ANGELUS), a native of Macerata in Italy, became a Jeſuit in the year 1606, being thirteen years old, and got a reputation by his eloquence and poetry. He taught rhetoric in the Roman college for twenty four years, and died at Rome the twenty eighth of February, 1674, being above eighty years old (*a*). He is the author of ſome works [*A*].

(*a*) Sotuel, Bibl. Script. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 61.

[*A*] *He is the author of ſome works.*] To wit, of ſome Latin orations, and of a Hiſtory of the wars in the Low-Countries, from the year 1593, till the truce concluded in 1609. This hiſtory is in Latin, and was printed at Rome in 1671, in two volumes in folio; and reprinted in Germany, in 4to, in the year 1677.

GAMACHE (PHILIP), in Latin *Gamachæus*, doctor of the Sorbonne, and profeſſor of divinity in the univerſity of Paris, was accounted one of the moſt learned divines of the XVIIth century. He was born in the year 1586, and died the twenty firſt of July 1625 (*a*). His commentaries upon Thomas Aquinas, intituled *Summa Theologica* (*b*), are very much eſteemed. See above (*c*) what he ſaid of St Auguſtin.

(*a*) Paulus Freherus, in Theat. pag. 423.

(*b*) Printed at Paris. in 1627, in three Volumes, in *folio*.

(*c*) Remark [*C*] of the article *ADAM* (JOHN).

GAMBARA (LAURENCE), a native of Breſcia in Italy, was one of the good Latin poets of the XVIth century. He lived a long while at Rome, in cardinal Alexander Farneſe's houſe (*a*). He publiſhed in the ſame city a collection of poems, of which

(*a*) Thuan. lib. lxxxiv, p. m. 76.

which Giraldus, who was a good judge, and a ſevere critic, gives a great character [*A*]. Manucius has commended yet more fully Gambara's poems [*B*], but we muſt remember, that he beſtows thoſe great praiſes in the letters he writes to the author. Muret went into another extream [*C*]; for he ſpoke of that poet's works with the utmoſt contempt. It is reported (*b*), that Gambara had made ſome verſes too free, and ſomewhat obſcene; but that, being raiſed to the prieſthood, he committed them to the flames in the preſence of ſeveral perſons, though the public was extreamly impatient to ſee them. He compoſed a work, wherein he lays a heavy yoke upon poets [*D*]; for he will not allow them to meddle with heatheniſh fables. He tranſlated into Latin verſe ſome Idylls of Bion; but did not ſucceed well in it, if we rely upon Barthius's judgment (*c*). He died at Rome, towards the end of the year 1586, being ninety years old (*d*).

(*b*) See Mr Teiſſier, *Elog. Tom. II, pag.* 71. He quotes Poſſevin's *Apparatus*.

(*c*) Barth. in Statium, Tom. III, pag. 1635.

(*d*) Thuan. ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *He publiſhed a collection of poems, of which Giraldus .... gives a great character.*] Let us quote his words: ‘Vivit adhuc Laurentius Gambara Riulanus ex Brixia, cujus poëmata nuper legi Romæ excuſa, non indigna illa quidem lectione bonorum, nam & numeris poëticis, ac figuris, & varia eruditione habetur inſignis. Romæ verſatur Baſilio noſtro Zancho cariſſimus amicus, ut ex ejus carmine facile cognoſcimus, & Zanchi ipſius epiſtolis (1). —— *There is ſtill living Laurentius Gambara Riulanus of Breſcia, whoſe poems, printed at Rome, I lately read; indeed they deſerve the reading, the author being famous for poetical numbers and figures, and variety of learning. At Rome, he is in great friendſhip with our Baſil Zanchius, as we eaſily perceive by his poetry, and Zanchius's letters.*’ You ſhall ſee, in the following remark, the confirmation of what you have juſt now read, touching the friendſhip of Gambara and Baſil Zanchius.

[*B*] *Manucius has commended yet more fully Gambara's poems.*] He wrote to him a letter (2), ſoon after the death of Baſil Zanchius, at which he ſuppoſes him to be much afflicted, conſidering the intimacy that was between them. He takes notice, that they were looked upon as the two firſt poets of that time; but it was ſtill undecided which of the two carried the prize: ‘Fuit uterque veſtrûm ad poeticam facultatem natura propenſus, ac mirè factus, ingenio verò ita pares, ut, cum nemo tam bonus poeta ſit, quin vobis primas in componendis verſibus partes tribuat, quam confeſſionem etiam ab invitis exprimit poematum comparatio, uter tamen utri præſtet, nondum ſatis judicare quiſquam poſſit (3). —— *Nature formed you both for poetry, but ſo equal in genius, that, when all other poets, how good ſoever, give place to you both, which confeſſion a compariſon between your poems and theirs extorts from them, whether they will or no, no one can determine which of you both deſerves the pre-eminence.*’ In another letter he exhorts him to continue the poem, of which he had ſeen the beginning with extream admiration: ‘Patavii dum eras, habebas in manibus egregium illud poëma de novis inſulis à Columbo inventis: cujus ego cùm exordium, multis præſentibus, legiſſem, admiratus gravitatem, & elegantiam carminis, exclamavi, Cedite Romani, in quo, adhuc qui à me diſſentiret, inveni neminem, quo magis te hortor, quamquam, ut ſperò, currentem, ut approperes, habeaſque rationem non exſpectationis modò noſtræ, verùm etiam gloriæ tuæ, cujus habes à natura præclarum ſeminarium, quod etiam ſtudio excolis, ingenium tuum. Urge igitur, nec inſtitutum dimitte (4). —— *When you were at Pavia, you had in hand that excellent poem concerning the new Iſlands diſcovered by Columbus; the beginning of which when I had read in the preſence of many, admiring the dignity and elegance of the poetry, I cried out, give place, ye Roman authors: in which I have yet found no one, who diſſents from me. Wherefore I exhort you to make haſte, and conſider, not only our expectation, but your own glory, of which nature has furniſhed you with an excellent ſeminary, which you even improve by ſtudy, I mean, your wit.*’ Mr Teiſſier affirms that Gambara has publiſhed this *Deſcription of the Diſcovery of the New World* (5). If that be true, Manucius's exhortation was not fruitleſs.

[*C*] *Muret went into another extream.*] There is, without doubt, a blameable hyperbole in Paulus Manucius's flatteries; but the oppoſite exaggeration of Muret is ſtill more faulty. He wrote theſe two verſes *at the head of his book of Gambara's poems:*

Brixia, veſtratis merdoſa volumina vatis
 Non ſunt noſtrates tergere digna nates (6).

Breſcia, the ſh — n volumes of your poet are not worthy to wipe my br — h.

Father Sirmond had ſeen that book in the library of the Jeſuits at Rome (7). Mr Menage oppoſes, to that Judgment of Muret, the praiſes Thuanus has given to Gambara (8). If he had thought on Giraldus and Manucius, he would have made uſe alſo of their authority againſt the diſtich he has quoted.

[*D*] *He compoſed a work, wherein he lays a heavy yoke upon poets.*] Read theſe words of Mr Baillet: ‘he has wrote a Latin treatiſe, concerning the method of advancing poetry to perfection, printed at Rome, in 4to, the year he died. He pretends to ſhew in that work, that there lies an indiſpenſible obligation upon all poets, or all verſifiers and rhimers pretending to poetry, to retrench, not only all that is obſcene, wanton, and free in verſes, but likewiſe all that belongs to fables, and the worſhip of falſe deities (9).’ I refer you to the reflexion, which Mr Menage makes hereupon (10).

(1) Gyrald. de Poët. ſuor. Tempor. Dial. III, pag. m. 573. E.

(2) It is the 28th of the 4th book.

(3) Paulus Manucius, Epiſt. xxviii, lib. iv, pag. m. 226.

(4) Id. Epiſt. xlviii, lib. iv, pag. 261.

(5) Teiſſier, Elog. Tom. II, pag. 71. *He only quotes Manucius's letter.*

(6) Menage, Anti-Baillet, Tom. II, pag. 9.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) Id. ibid.

(9) Baillet, Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, Tom. I, n. 1091, pag. 112.

(10) Menage, ubi ſupra, pag. 4, & ſeq.

GAMON (CHRISTOPHER DE) is no otherwiſe known to me than by a work, which he publiſhed in 1609, entituled *La Semaine ou Création du Monde, contre celle du Sieur du Bartas.* —— *The Week or Creation of the World againſt that of du Bartas.* See the remark [*A*].

[*A*] *See the remark.*] Mr Bullart, after having much commended du Bartas's *Week*, adds this: ‘but becauſe men's opinions are various, Chriſtopher Gamon, a perſon famous for his learning, pretended to ſhew faults in that book, and to leſſen it's merit by another he compoſed on the ſame ſubject, and which he publiſhed ſome time after du Bartas's death. However he contended for the prize with him with ſome reſpect; nor could he, after all, refuſe to the memory of that great man the praiſes, which he acknowledged to be ſo juſtly due to him (1).’

(1) Bullart, Academie des Arts & des Sciences, Tom. II, pag. 354.

GANYMEDE, ſon to a king of Troy [*A*], was the fineſt boy in the world. Jupiter was charmed with him; and, having carried him away, made him his cup-bearer, in

[*A*] *Son to a king of Troy.*] Tros, ſon of Erichthonius, and grand-ſon of Dardanus, was father of Ilus, Aſſaracus, and Ganymede. Here are ſome Greek verſes, which inform us of it, and which deſerve to be quoted, ſince they are a teſtimony both of the beauty of this boy, his rape, and of his office of cup-bearer to Jupiter.

Δάρδανος

in the room of Hebe (*a*), and employ'd him to other criminal uſes [*B*]. Some ſay, he cauſed him to be carried away by an eagle; others affirm, that he ſtole him away himſelf,

---

(*a*) *You will ſee, in the remark* [*D*], *the accident which was the pretence of Hebe's being turned out. Charles Stephens relates it, and quotes Servius:* Cum Jove, *ſays he*, apud Æthiopas cœnante, Hebe pocula illi adminiſtrans, perque lubricum minus cautè incedens, cecidiſſet, revolutiſque veſtibus obſcœna ſuperis nudaſſet, ab officio eſt amota, ejuſque loco Ganymedes ſubrogatus. Hæc Servius. - - - - *As Jupiter was feaſting with the Æthiopians, Hebe, his cup-bearer, happening to ſtumble, diſcovered her nakedneſs to the gods; for which ſhe was turned out of her office, and Ganymede put in her place. This Servius tells us.*

Δάρδανος αὖ τέκεθ' ὑιὸν 'Εριχθόνιον βασιλῆα (1).
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Τρῶα δ' 'Εριχθόνιος τέκετο Τρώεσσιν ἄνακτα·
Τρωὸς δ' αὖ τρεῖς παῖδες ἀμύμονες ἐξεγένοντο,
Ιλος τ', Ασσάρακός τε, καὶ ἀντίθεος Γανυμήδης,
Ος δὴ κάλλιςος γένετο θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων,
Τὸν καὶ ἀνηρείψαντο θεοὶ Διῒ οἰνοχοεύειν,
Κάλλεος εἵνεκα οἷο, ἵν' ἀθανάτοισι μετείῃ (2).

Dardanus rurſus genuit filium Erichthonium regem
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Troem autem Erichthonius genuit Trojanis regem,
Ex Troe vero rurſum tres filiĭ inculpati nati ſunt,
Iluſque Aſſaracuſque & divinus Ganymedes,
Qui ſane pulcherrimus fuit mortalium hominum:
Quem etiam rapuerunt dii, Jovi ut pocillator eſſet,
Pulchritudinem ob ſuam, ut immortalibus intereſſet.

- - - - - *From Erichthonius came*
The ſacred Tros, of whom the Trojan name.
Three ſons renown'd adorn'd his nuptial bed,
Ilus, Aſſaracus, and Ganymede:
The matchleſs Ganymede, divinely fair,
Whom heav'n enamour'd ſnatch'd to upper air,
To bear the cup of Jove (etherial gueſt)
The grace and glory of th'ambroſial feaſt.

POPE.

Note, that, in theſe verſes, Homer does not ſay, as he does elſewhere (3), that Jupiter carried away Ganymede; but that the gods carried him away, to make him cup-bearer to Jupiter. He adds, that Ilus, Ganymede's eldeſt brother, begot Laomedon, who was Priamus's father. I obſerve this, becauſe it is neceſſary to examine whether Cicero be juſtly cenſured by thoſe, who charge him with a ſlip of memory, when he ſays, that the boy, who was carried away, was ſon to Laomedon: 'Trois igitur fuit filius Ganymedes non Laomedontis, ut videtur ſenſiſſe Cicero 1. Tuſcul. lapſus videlicet memoria (quo nomine ſolent magni viri laborare, qui gravioribus impediti curis, cùm citant vel autores, vel autorum teſtimonia, toto, quod aiunt, cœlo aberrant: id quod diligens lector ſæpe in Ariſtotelis deprehendet libris, preſertim de moribus). Verba Ciceronis hæc ſunt: Nec Homerum audio, qui Ganymedem à Diis raptum ait propter formam, ut Jovi pocula miniſtraret: non juſta cauſa, cur Laomedonti tanta fieret injuria. Fingebat hæc Homerus & humana ad deos transferebat, divina mallem ad nos (4). —— *Ganymede therefore was the ſon of Tros, not of Laomedon, as Cicero ſeems to have thought, I. Tuſcul. plainly by a ſlip of memory, to which great men are very ſubject, who, being taken up with affairs of importance, when they quote authors, or the teſtimonies of authors, err very widely: which the careful reader will often diſcover in Ariſtotle's books, eſpecially his Ethics. Cicero's words are theſe: nor do I regard Homer, who ſays that Ganymede was carried away by the gods, becauſe of his beauty, to be Jupiter's cup-bearer. This great injury is unjuſtly offerred to Laomedon: Homer feigned the ſtory and transferred human things to the gods; I had rather he had transferred divine things to us.*' Tanaquillus Faber pretends, that that cenſure is unjuſt; and, to prove it, he alledges (5) a paſſage of Euripides's Scholiaſt, wherein an ancient writers teſtifies, that Ganymede was Laomedon's ſon. This ſhews, that, there being different opinions about the matter, Cicero might enjoy the liberty, either to follow Homer, or not to follow him; and therefore, that it is not thro' inadvertency or forgetfulneſs, but by choice, that he ſaid, that Ganymede was Laomedon's ſon. With the apologiſt's leave, methinks the cenſure is very well grounded; for Cicero relates in that place a tradition, which came from Homer, whom he alſo quotes. Therefore it is not likely, that he meant to contradict him, with reſpect to the father of the fine boy, who had been taken away; and ſo we may ſay, he believed that Homer made him the ſon of Laomedon, and conclude that his memory failed him.

Note, that, when I uſed the indefinite expreſſion, *ſon to a king of Troy*, I had in view the variations, which are to be found in authors, as to this matter. Hyginus affirms, in the 224th chapter, that Ganymede was ſon of Aſſaracus; and in the 271ſt, that he was ſon to Erichthonius. Some (6) make him Laomedon's brother, and conſequently Ilus's ſon: others (7) make him the ſon of Dardanus. Homer's opinion is the moſt common.

[*B*] *Jupiter . . . . made him his cup-bearer, ... and employed him to other criminal uſes.*] The verſes of Homer, which I have quoted in the preceding remark, do not intimate, that Ganymede was ſtolen away out of any laſcivious motive. They only ſhew, that the beauty of that young man prompted the gods to tranſlate him into heaven, that he might be Jupiter's cup-bearer, and live among immortal beings. It is as much as if we ſhould ſay, that they thought him ſo handſome, that he ought to be an ornament to the celeſtial court, and that, the earth not deſerving to poſſeſs ſo great a treaſure, they ought to procure him an habitation more worthy of him; that is, a good place in the country of immortal bleſſedneſs. All this denotes no laſciviouſneſs: and Homer keeps exactly within the ſame bounds, when he ſpeaks of Ganymede in the hymn to Venus. He changes indeed ſome other circumſtances; for he ſuppoſes, that Jupiter carried him away, in order to make him cup-bearer to the gods; but he does not alter the reſt.

Η τοι μὲν ξανθὸν Γανυμήδεα μητίετα Ζεὺς
Ηρπασ' ἑὸν διὰ κάλλος, ἵν' ἀθανάτοισι μετείῃ,
Καί τε Διὸς κατὰ δῶμα θεοῖς ἐπιοινοχοεύοι,
Θαῦμα ἰδεῖν, πάντεσσι τετιμένος ἀθανάτοισι,
Χρυσέυ ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσων νέκταρ ἐρυθρόν.

Hic quidem flavum Ganymedem conſultor Jupiter
Rapuit ſuam propter pulchritudinem, ut cum diis converſaretur,
Et Jovis in domo Diis vinum effunderet,
Mirabile viſu, ab omnibus honoratus immortalibus,
Aureo ex cratere hauriens nectar rubrum.

The thunderer, ſmit with Ganymede the fair,
Snatch'd the lov'd Phrygian boy to upper air,
Preferr'd with deities to dwell above,
And fill the goblet to the gueſts of Jove.

Apollonius follows the ſame notion: and it would argue too ſuſpicious a temper to think otherwiſe, under pretence of the laſt words he has made uſe of; ſince they are reducible to the ſame ſenſe which Homer had expreſſed:

Μετὰ καὶ Γανυμήδεα, τόν ῥά ποτε Ζεὺς
Οὐρανῷ ἐγκατένασσεν ἐφέστιον ἀθανατοῖσιν,
Κάλλεος ἱμερθείς.

Sed cum Ganymede, quem aliquando Jupiter
In cœlo locarat, & deorum fecerat contubernalem
Pulchritudinis cupidus (8).

(1) Homer. Iliad. lib. xx, ver. 219.

(2) Id. ibid. ver. 230.

(3) In the Hymn for Venus. See the following remark.

(4) Commentar. in Emblemata Alciati, pag. m. 20, col. 1. *Claudius du Verdier*, Cenſ. in Author. pag. 105, *has criticized on that fault of Cicero.*

(5) Hinc animadvertere potes ſatis improſpere Ciceronem à multis reprehenſum fuiſſe, qui Ganymedem Laomedontis filium faciat. *Tan. Faber. Epiſt. lviii, lib. ii, pag.* 153.

(6) Tzetzes ad Lycophron. pag. 10.

(7) Lucian. in Charidemo, Oper. Tom. II, pag. 1019.

(8) Apollon. Rhodius, Argonaut. lib. iii, ver. 115, pag. m. 278.

himſelf, in the ſhape of that bird [*C*]. He deified that young boy, and made a very fine preſent to his father [*D*]. There are different opinions as to the place, from whence Ganymede

With Ganymede, the thunderer's beauteous prize,
Preferr'd to grace the banquet of the skies.

The other poets have not been ſo cautious: for they have frankly told us, that Jupiter fell in love with Ganymede, and ſtole him away, to gratify his pederaſty. See the two verſes of Plautus, which I have cited above (9), and the tenth book (10) of Ovid's Metamorphoſis. If we believe the grammarian Servius, *rapti Ganymedis*, in Virgil, is the ſame thing with *ſtuprati, corrupti* (11). I omit ſeveral places in Martial, and particularly theſe four verſes.

Deprenſum in puero tetricis me vocibus uxor
Corripis, & . . . . te quoque habere refers.
Dixit idem quoties laſcivo Juno tonanti?
Ille tamen gracili cum Ganymede jacet (12).

Caught with a boy, you chide me, rage, and ſwell,
And vow, that you can pleaſe me full as well.
Juno the ſame to wanton Jove may ſwear,
Yet Jove ſtill lies with Ganymede the fair.

I lay no ſmall ſtreſs on Lucian's authority; for though he was a libertine, whoſe greateſt delight was to turn religion into ridicule, yet his banters and jeſts muſt have had ſome foundation; elſe he had made himſelf ridiculous, if he had jeſted upon opinions and ceremonies forged in his own brain, and calumniouſly fathered them upon the pagans. He therefore took out of the traditions, and worſhip of the Gentiles, the ſubject matter of his ſatires, and ſo, ſince he has ſuppoſed, that Ganymede was both the cup-bearer and darling of Jupiter (13), we muſt conclude, that this opinion was pretty common among the heathens. But we have no need of his authority, as long as that of Plato alone is ſufficient. That great philoſopher has condemned the fiction, the Cretans had broached about Ganymede, that they might have a great example to countenance their pederaſty. Now the fable of Ganymede was very proper for their purpoſe, becauſe their laws were thought to proceed from Jupiter (14). And therefore they taught, that that deity made uſe of Ganymede, to indulge his infamous paſſion. I cannot forbear quoting here Seneca, who has ranked this action of Jupiter among the extravagances, ſung by the poets, about that god, and which ſerved only to remove all ſhame of ſin from thoſe, who ſhould entertain ſuch an idea of the divine nature. 'Sic veſtras hallucinationes fero, *ſays he* (15), quemadmodum Jupiter optimus maximus ineptias poëtarum: quorum alius . . . . adulterum ipſum induxit . . . . alius raptorem ingenuorum corruptoremque & cognatorum quidem . . . . quibus nihil aliud actum eſt quàm ut pudor hominibus peccandi demeretur ſi tales deos credidiſſent. —— *I ſuffer by your miſtaken notions, juſt as the great Jupiter does by the impertinence of the poets . . . . of whom one . . . . . makes him an adulterer . . . another, a raviſher and debaucher of youth, even of thoſe related to him . . . . by which they have no other deſign than to free thoſe from all ſhame of offending, who entertain ſuch notions of the gods.*' There is no doubt but he had in view the fiction of Ganymede's rape, which was the more injurious to Jupiter, in that he was great-great-grandfather to that youth. This conſanguinity made ſome ſay, that Dardanus, Ganymede's great-grandfather, was not ſon of Jupiter; for, if he had been ſo, how could Jupiter have committed ſuch an inceſtuous action? 'Sed authores quidam tradunt, Dardanum, & Jaſium Coriti filios fuiſſe, non Jovis; nec enim (ſi ita fuiſſet) ad uſus impudicos Ganymedem pronepotem ſuum habere potuiſſet (16).'

This juſtifies the fathers of the church, who have reproached the heathens with this villany of the greateſt of their gods (17). This point admits of no controverſy; nor can Clemens Alexandrinus, Arnobius, Lactantius, and others, be ſuſpected of having uſed any artifice or calumny againſt the heathens. They have objected againſt a tradition well eſtabliſhed, and which extended to public worſhip: for the ſame Jupiter, who was adored in the temples, was repreſented there with Ganymede, and with the eagle, which carried away that young boy. Read theſe words of Lactantius (18): 'Nam quod aliud argumentum habet imago catamiti, & effigies aquilæ, cum ante pedes Jovis ponuntur in templis, & cum ipſo pariter adorantur, niſi ut nefandi ſceleris, ac ſtupri memoria maneat in æternum? —— *For what elſe can we think of the image of the catamite, and the eagle, placed at the foot of Jupiter in temples, and adored together with him, but that it is deſigned to perpetuate the memory of a ſcandalous action and rape?*' Conſult alſo Tatian (19). I have ſeen ſomething in Juvenal, which ſignifies, that there was, in Rome, either a temple of Ganymede, or a temple which contained the ſtatue of that cup-bearer of Jupiter. The commentators do not well clear that paſſage:

Nuper enim, ut repeto, fanum Iſidis & Ganymedem
Pacis, & advectæ ſecreta palatia matris,
Et Cererem (nam quo non proſtat fœmina templo?)
Notior Aufidio mœchus celebrare ſolebas (20).

Thy luſt, more ſhameleſs than Aufidius', dares
Pollute each fane; nor Iſis' temple ſpares,
Nor Ganymede, nor Berecynthia's ſhrine,
Nor, Peace, thy temple, nor even, Ceres, thine.
For where's the place ſo ſacred, as to be
From wanton, proſtituted, women free?

Pauſanias mentions a ſtatue of Jupiter and Ganymede, which a certain man of Theſſaly, named Gnothis, dedicated in the famous temple of Olympia (21).

[*C*] *Some ſay, he cauſed him to be carried away by an eagle . . . . others, that he ſtole him away himſelf in the ſhape of that bird.*] Horace and Hyginus (22) are of the firſt opinion; Ovid and Lucian of the ſecond. Theſe are Horace's words:

Qualem miniſtrum fulminis alitem,
Cui Rex Deorum regnum in aveis vagas
Permiſit, expertus fidelem
Jupiter in Ganymede flavo (23).

The royal bird, to whom the king of heav'n
The empire of the feather'd race has given,
For ſervices already done,
The rape of Priam's ſon.

As for Ovid, he has expreſſed himſelf thus:

- - - - Nulla tamen alite verti
Dignatur, niſi quæ portat ſua fulmina terræ.
Nec mora: percuſſo mendacibus aëre pennis
Arripit Iliadem, qui nunc quoque pocula miſcet,
Invitaque Jovi nectar Junone miniſtrat (24).

No other feather'd ſhape he deigns to wear,
Than his, who bears his thunder thro' the air.
He darts, in borrow'd plumage, from the skies,
And bears from earth to heav'n his Trojan prize;
Who now the cup nectareous fills, above,
And miniſters, tho' Juno frown, to Jove.

You will find Lucian's words in the dialogue of Jupiter and Ganymede (25).

[*D*] *He deified that young boy, and made a very fine preſent to his father.*] Tros was inconſolable upon the loſs of that dear ſon; but, after having received ſome compenſation, and upon the news, that he, for whom he mourned, ſhould ever live amongſt the gods, and ſhould never grow old, he took comfort at laſt. Jupiter preſented him with ſome very ſwift race-horſes, which were ſome of thoſe that the gods mounted (26). Note, that Laomedon, ſon of Tros, promiſed to Hercules the horſes, which Jupiter had given by way of compenſation (27); but, not having performed his promiſe, he was beſieged in Troy, and there loſt his life. Hercules had demanded thoſe horſes as a recompence

---

(9) Citat. (8) of the Article ADONIS.

(10) Verſu 155, & ſeq.

(11) Servius in hæc verba, Æneid. lib. i, ver. 28, *& rapti Ganymedis honores.*

(12) Martial. Epig. xliv, lib. xi. *See alſo the 27th Epigram of the ſame book.*

(13) See his Dialogue of Juno and Jupiter, *Oper. Tom. I, pag. m.* 128. I quote a paſſage out of it in the remark [*D*] of the article LONGUS.

(14) Plato de Legib. lib. i, pag. m. 776. *E.*

(15) Seneca, de Vita Beata, cap. xxvi, pag. m. 639.

(16) Lactant. lib. i, ſub fin.

(17) *See, above, remark* [*B*] *of the article CHRYSIPPUS, natural ſon of Pelops. And St Auguſtin,* de Civitate Dei, lib. vii, cap. xxvi.

(18) Lactan Div. Inſtitut. lib. i, cap. xi, pag. m. 34.

(19) *See the remark* [*G*], *in the Margin, citat.* (59).

(20) Juven. Sat. IX, ver. 22.

(21) Pauſan. lib. v, cap. xxiv, pag. m. 440.

(22) Hygin. Poët. Aſtron. lib. ii, cap. xvi. *See alſo* Apollod. lib. iii, pag. m. 221.

(23) Horat. Od. iv, lib. iv.

(24) Ovid. Metamor. lib x, ver. 157.

(25) Lucian. Oper. Tom I, pag. 124, & ſeq.

(26) *Taken out of Homer's hymn,* in Venerem.

(27) Δῶχ' υἷος ποινὴν Γανυμήδεος. Dedit pro filio compenſationem Ganymede. *Homer, Iliad. lib.* v, *ver.* 266.

Ganymede was carried away, and what he was then doing [*E*]. Some ſay, he was on mount Ida; others place him elſewhere: Some pretend he was a hunting; and others, that he kept a flock. I ſhall not loſe time in relating the allegorical explanations that have been given (*b*): For thoſe are only conceits, which may be multiplied *in infinitum*, and by the help of which one finds in every thing whatever he pleaſes: But I ſhall not paſs over in ſilence, that ſome writers have related this as hiſtorical matter of fact. They pretend, that Ganymede was really ſtolen away by a prince, who was in love with him [*F*]. Thoſe Painters, who repreſent him as carried away on the back of an eagle,

(*b*) See the commentators upon the fourth emblem of Alciatus.

compence for the ſervice performed by him in delivering Heſione, Laomedon's daughter, who was expoſed to a ſea-monſter (28). Note alſo, that, unknown to Laomedon, Anchiſes was ſo cunning as to get of theſe horſes a breed (29). Laſtly, note, that, according to ſome authors (30), the preſent, which Jupiter made to Ganymede's father, was a golden vine, wrought by Vulcan. For the reſt, if the authorities before-mentioned (31), touching this young man's deification, ſhould not ſuffice, we might add to them the teſtimony of Pindar (32), and that of Lucian (33), beſides this commentary of Servius: 'Honores dixit, 'vel propter miniſterium poculorum, ad quod receptus 'eſt, remota Hebe filia Junonis, quæ Jovi bibere miniſtrabat, vel ob hoc quod inter ſydera collocatus, 'aquarii nomen accepit, & non ob hoc tantum iraſcitur Juno, ſed quod violatus ſit ut divinos honores 'conſequeretur (34).' You ſee, in theſe words of Servius, two remarkable things: firſt, that Hebe, whoſe office it was to fill drink to the gods, was deprived of that employment, and that Ganymede was preferred to her place: ſecondly, that he was placed among the ſtars, and was that ſign of the zodiac, which is called Aquarius. This is obſerved by Hyginus (35). What a mortification was it for poor Juno, to ſee her husband's darling fill the place from which her daughter Hebe was turned out! The miſhap, which had befallen Hebe, was indeed the pretence, for which ſhe was turned out, but not the true cauſe. She happened to fall, and ſhew all ſhe had, whilſt the gods were at table (36): whereupon Jupiter, who deſired paſſionately to make Ganymede his cup-bearer, improved this opportunity to turn away that unfortunate maid.

[*E*] *There are different opinions as to the place, from whence Ganymede was carried away, and what he was then doing.*] Lucian (37) ſuppoſes, that Ganymede was a ſhepherd on mount Ida, when Jupiter ſtole him away. Virgil ſuppoſes, that he was a hunting there:

Intextuſque puer frondoſâ regius Idâ
Veloces jaculo cervos, curſuque fatigat,
Acer, anhelanti ſimilis: quem præpes ab Idâ
Sublimem pedibus rapuit Jovis armiger uncis (38).

There, interwov'n, the royal youth is ſeen:
He hunts the flying ſtag along the green,
On Ida's ſhady top: with eager pace
He ſeems to run, and pant along the chace:
Whom the wing'd herald of his maſter's love
Snatch'd from th' Idean hill, and bore to Jove.

Valerius Flaccus (39), and Statius (40), have imitated this paſſage of the Æneid. But Strabo (41) affirms, that it was reported, that Ganymede had been carried away from a place called Harpageia, and which was ſeated on the borders of the territory of the town of Priapos, and of the town of Cyzicus; and that, according to others, he had been carried away from the promontory of Dardanium. The Chalcidians (42) maintained, that this rape happened amongſt them; that is, in the iſland of Eubœa; and they ſhewed the place, where Jupiter had committed that rape. It was a place full of myrtle-ſhrubs, and called Harpagium. Note, that they were people immoderately inclined to the ſin againſt nature. Περὶ τὰ παιδικὰ δαιμονίως ἐπτόηνται. *Prodigioſe in amore puerorum flagrant* (43). It is therefore very likely, that they broached this tradition, the better to countenance their brutality by the authority and example of the greateſt of the gods. This is what Plato thought of the inhabitants of the iſle of Crete, as I have ſaid before (44). Suidas has preſerved to us another hypotheſis touching the place, where the rape was committed: ſee the following remark.

[*F*] *Some writers pretend, that Ganymede was really ſtolen away, by a prince who was in love with him.*] Herodian relates, that the place called Peſſinus in Phrygia, was ſo called, either becauſe the image of the mother of the gods was dropt down there from heaven; or becauſe the combat, which was fought there between Ilus and Tantalus, coſt many people their lives. Thoſe two princes, the one a Phrygian, the other a Lydian, made war upon one another, either becauſe they could not agree about the boundaries of their dominions (45), or rather becauſe Tantalus had ſtolen away Ganymede. The latter loſt his life in the field of battle, in the hands of his brother, and thoſe of his raviſher, the one pulling him one way, the other another. His body not being found, his adventure was repreſented as ſomething marvellous and divine; and from thence was framed the fable of his being carried away by Jupiter (46). We read in Euſebius's chronicle (47), that, upon the account of Ganymede's rape, there aroſe a war between Tros, the father of that young boy, and Tantalus: which is affirmed upon the credit of a writer named Phanocles. He was an Erotical author (48), or, to explain myſelf, a compiler of amorous adventures. Oroſius has ſpoken of that action of Tantalus in theſe words (49): 'Nec 'mihi nunc enumerare opus eſt Tantali & Pelopis facta 'turpia, & fabulas turpiores: quorum Tantalus rex 'Phrygiorum Ganymedem Trois Dardaniorum regis 'filium cum flagitioſiſſimè rapuiſſet, majore concerti 'certaminis fœditate detinuit, ſicut Phanocles poeta 'confirmat, qui maximum bellum excitatum ob hoc 'fuiſſe commemorat: ſive quia hunc ipſum Tantalum, 'utpote aſſeclam deorum, videri vult raptum puerum 'ad libidinem Jovis familiari lenocinio præparaſſe, qui 'ipſum quoque filium Pelopem epulis ejus non dubitarit impendere. —— *Nor need I mention the ſcandalous actions, and more ſcandalous ſtories, of Tantalus and Pelops, of whom Tantalus, king of the Phrygians, having moſt wickedly raviſhed Ganymede, ſon of Tros, king of the Dardanians, detained him for a more ſhameful purpoſe, as is confirmed by Phanocles the poet, who relates that this was the occaſion of a very great war; becauſe, perhaps, he thought, that Tantalus, as being an attendant on the gods, might have prepared the boy for Jupiter's luſt, ſince he made no ſcruple to ſerve up his own ſon Pelops at that god's table.*' Euſtathius (50) having ſaid, that, according to ſome authors, Tantalus had raviſhed Ganymede, adds, that others charged Minos with that rape. If we conſult Suidas, we ſhall learn many circumſtances of that attempt of Minos. There we ſhall ſee, that that king of Crete went to pay a viſit to Tros; and, being informed, that that prince's three ſons were a hunting, he declared, he had a mind to hunt with them. He had no ſooner ſeen Ganymede, than he conceived a moſt violent paſſion for him; and, having cauſed him to be carried away, he put him on board one of the ſhips he had ſent before into the Granicus, and returned into Crete. Ganymede was ſo concerned at his misfortune, that he ran himſelf through with his own ſword. Minos buried him in a temple; and for that reaſon it was given out, that this young man converſed with the gods (51). Euſtathius (52) relates the particulars in another manner. He ſays, that Ganymede, having been raviſhed, hanged himſelf; and that they made his father believe, that a whirlwind and a cloud had carried him away, to be Jupiter's cup-bearer. You will find, in Athenæus, that Echemenes, who wrote a book touching what concerned the iſle of Crete, affirmed, that Ganymede was not raviſhed by Jupiter, but by king Minos. Ludovicus Vives affirms, that Tantalus, having ſtolen that young boy, tranſported him into the iſle of Crete, and gave him to Jupiter

(28) Ex Apollod. lib. ii, pag. m. 123, 137.

(29) Homer. ubi ſupra.

(30) See Tanaq. Faber, *ubi ſupra*. He quotes the ſcholiaſt upon Euripides in Oreſt.

(31) In the remark [*B*], and in the preſent remark, citat. (26).

(32) Pindar. Od. X, Olymp.

(33) Lucian. in Jove Tragœdo, Oper. Tom. II, pag. 205, & in Charidemo, Ibid. pag. 1019.

(34) Servius, in Virg. Æneid. lib. i, ver. 28.

(35) Hygin. cap. 224, & Poët. Aſtron. lib. ii, cap. xvi, & xxix.

(36) See, above, citation (*a*).

(37) Lucian. in Dialog. Jovis & Ganym. Oper. Tom. I, pag. 124.

(38) Virgil. Æneid. lib. v, ver. 252.

(39) Valer. Flaccus, Argon. lib. ii, ver. 414.

(40) Statius, Theb. lib. i, ver. 548.

(41) Strabo, lib. xiii, pag. 404. *See alſo* Stephan. Byzant. voce Ἁρπαγία.

(42) Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 601.

(43) Id. ibid.

(44) In remark [*B*], citat. (14).

(45) *There is in Herodian* περὶ ὁδῶν de viis, *but according to Meziriac's conjecture*, Comment. on Ovid's Epiſt. pag. 884, *we muſt read* περὶ ὅρων de finibus.

(46) Herodian. lib. i, cap. xi. *See alſo Lycophron's ſcholiaſt*, *pag.* 50.

(47) Euſeb. n. 654.

(48) *See* Scaliger, in Euſebium, pag. 41. *He quotes* Plutarch, lib. iv, cap. v, Συμπος.

(49) Oroſius, lib. i, cap. xii, pag. m. 4, 45.

(50) Euſtath. in lib. xx. Iliad.

(51) Taken out of Suidas, in Μίνως.

(52) Euſtath. ubi ſupra.

eagle, are miſtaken, and do not conſult antient authors [*G*]. Some pretend, that Cicero was not well acquainted with Ganymede's father (*c*). Time out of mind, the Phliaſians paid a particular worſhip to a deity, which at firſt they called GANYMEDA, and afterwards Hebe: This Pauſanias tells us, in his ſecond book, page 140.

ter (53). Which is a meer paraphraſe of Oroſius. But St Auguſtin (54) has acknowledged, that the fable only ſuited with Jupiter, and that the reality belonged to Tantalus. *Suidas on the Word* Ἴλιον, *and Cedrenus alſo, relate, that king Tros, having ſubdued ſeveral princes, his neighbours, ſent his ſon Ganymede, attended by fifty men, to make a ſacrifice of thankſgiving, in a certain temple of Jupiter, which was in the dominions of Tantalus. But Tantalus, ſuppoſing that Ganymede came as a ſpy, to view the ſtrength of his kingdom, made him priſoner; whereupon Ganymede fell ſick and died* (55).

[*G*] *The painters, who repreſent him as carried away on the back of an eagle, are miſtaken, and do not conſult ancient authors.*] Salmaſius (56) has cenſured that miſtake: for he ſays, that, according to the ancient poets, the eagle took up Ganymede by the hair between his talons. The author whom he explains (57) ſays the ſame. Note, that Martial ſuppoſes, that the eagle was afraid of hurting Ganymede.

Ætherias aquila puerum portante per auras
 Illæſum timidis unguibus hæſit onus (58).

As with the boy Jove's eagle ſoar'd away,
His cautious talons bore, unhurt, the prey.

An ancient carver repreſented this wonderfully well (59). A learned Engliſhman has followed the common error of painters, in a book, whoſe French tranſlation was printed at Roan in the year 1656, with the title of, *Le Monde dans la Lune*; that is, *the world in the Moon*. This is what he obſerves (60): If there ‘ be ſo great a bird in Madagaſcar, as Paulus Venetus ‘ relates *, the feathers of whoſe wings are twelve foot ‘ long, and which can take up into the air a horſe ‘ with his rider, as eaſily as one of our kites could ‘ take up a little mouſe; it were then but inſtructing ‘ one of theſe birds to carry a man, and he might ‘ ride as far on his back as Ganymede did on an ‘ eagle.’

(*c*) See the remark [*A*].

(53) Lud. Vives, in Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. vii, cap. 26, & lib. xviii, cap. xiii.

(54) Auguſt. ibid. lib. xviii, cap. xiii.

(55) Meziriac. Comment. on Ovid's Epiſtles, pag. 885.

(56) Salmaſ. Not. in Achill. Tatium, pag. 583.

(57) Achill. Tatius, pag. m. 144.

(58) Mart. Epig. vii, lib. i.

(59) Leochares aquilam ſentientem quid rapiat in Ganymede, & cui ferat parcentem unguibus etiam per veſtem. *Plin. lib. xxxiv, cap. viii, pag. m. 125.* That piece of work was much eſteemed. Τίνος δὲ χάριν διὰ Λεωχάρȣς, Γανυμήδη τὸν ἀνδρόγυνον, ὡς τι σπȣδαῖον ἔχοντες κτῆμα, τετιμήκατε. Cur propter Leocharis ſculptoris artificium Ganymedem illom effœminatum, tanquam eximium aliquid habentes, colitis? *Tatian. Orat. ad Græc. pag. 170.*

(60) Le Monde dans la Lune, Part. I, pag. 267.

* Lib. iii, cap. 40.

GARASSE, (FRANCIS), a native of Angouleſme, became a Jeſuit in the year 1601 (*a*). He made himſelf much talked of by the zeal he ſhewed againſt libertine wits, and againſt the enemies of his ſociety: But he inveighed principally againſt the poet Theophile, and againſt Paſquier. He wanted neither genius, nor reading; and having a great deal of fire, a fruitful imagination, and good lungs, he paſſed for a great preacher. He was very proper to maintain a cauſe in the pulpit; for his turns of wit, and his way of delivery, made very ſtrong impreſſions, conſidering the taſte of that age: But he ought not to have meddled with writing; or, if he could not renounce the title of author, he ought to have made only Latin verſes, or have exerciſed himſelf on ſome ſubject of little importance: For, having adventured to write on the moſt ſublime truths, which libertines may call in queſtion, he has contributed leſs to convert that ſort of people, than to confirm them in their errors [*A*]; becauſe, he perpetually departed from the gravity, which becomes ſuch matters, and becauſe he made uſe of bad proofs, and falſe quotations. He found himſelf expoſed to the criticiſm of ſeveral formidable pens. Paſquier's ſons vindicated their father with great ſtatelineſs [*B*]. But he, who wrote with moſt vehemence againſt this Jeſuit, was the abbot

(*a*) Alegambe, in Biblioth. Script. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 124.

[*A*] *He contributed leſs to convert the Libertines, than to confirm them in their errors.*] This is the title of a book he publiſhed at Paris, in the year 1623. *The curious doctrine of the wits, or would be ſuch, of this age; containing ſeveral maxims pernicious to the ſtate, religion, and good manners; confuted and overthrown by father Francis Garaſſus, of the ſociety of JESUS.* He thought he had quite confounded thoſe libertines; but he was ſoon acquainted, that, according to the judgment of the public, his book was much more proper to foment atheiſm, than to deſtroy it. The judgment and cenſure of that work was addreſſed to the Jeſuits (1); and the author tells them, that people could not believe, that they, *who were the firſt and ſtrongeſt champions of truth*, ſhould have choſen father Garaſſe to *defend it*. That man, *being better qualified for a ſatirical poet, or a farce-writer, than for a catholic doctor, has lately written a book, which carries a ſpecious title, againſt Atheiſts; but which, to ſpeak ſincerely, and as it were in the preſence of GOD, is a ſink of impiety, a common ſewer of prophanations, a collection of buffoonries and facetious jeſts, a malicious and ſlanderous ſatire againſt many men of probity and merit* (2). After having ſaid ſeveral things, in the ſame ſtrain, to characteriſe that book, he asked the Jeſuits, *whether thoſe be the means to defend the venerable truths of our religion; whether thoſe be the true weapons to combate atheiſm; or whether thoſe be not rather the inſtruments of the ruin of ſouls, and the inventions of the father of lies, to render truth ridiculous and more contemptible amongſt his wretched ſupporters*. The ſame year 1624, Naudé publiſhed a book (3), wherein we find theſe words (4): *As for father Garaſſe, it is true, he has taken ſome of their articles out of father Robert, which he has ſo aptly brought into a parallel with the ways of the libertines of our days, that, both upon that ſcore, and for the induſtriouſneſs of his wit, and variety of his learning, I am ſorry he ſhould undergo the cenſure, which is paſſed upon all thoſe, who have ſhewn their learning in that matter: that is, that no body ever wrote better againſt the atheiſts, than the recorders, who draw up the ſentence of their condemnation: if, however, according to the ſaying of Tertullian, the church, full of mercy*, Non quærat potius pudorem ſuffundere, quam ſanguinem effundere. He returns to the charge in the laſt chapter of his book, in this manner: ‘ I have ‘ *ſome monſters to encounter*, ſays he (5), ... who, ‘ through an abominable induſtry, draw impiety out ‘ of the book of the *Curious Doctrine*; which, by an ‘ unparallelled impudence and temerity, they brand ‘ with the moſt pernicious title of *the Art of Atheiſm*: ‘ which gives me occaſion to deplore the misfortune ‘ of our age, which has attained to that degree of ‘ malice, that it deprives us even of the liberty of ‘ oppoſing the greateſt impieties, and of confuting ‘ them by the moſt common and lawful means; ‘ ſince corruption is ſo very great, that, when a reli‘gious ſociety, jealous of the honour and integrity ‘ of their religion, *Voluerunt*, as Lactantius ſays, ‘ †, *poſteris etiam approbare, quanta pietate defende‘rint religiones, auctoritatem religionum ipſarum teſtan‘do minuerunt*.’

[*B*] *Paſquier's ſons* (6) *vindicated their father with great ſtatelineſs.*] They made no noiſe, till Garaſſe had ſhewn his obſtinacy in falling foul upon him (7). He had written a book (8) againſt his Recherches in the year 1622. The next year, he abuſed him in a hundred places of his *Curious Doctrine*; and went on in the ſame ſtrain, in the year 1624, in his anſwer to the prior Ogier. Thereupon they loſt all patience, and publiſhed a very violent book againſt that Jeſuit, which they addreſſed to him, wherever he might be. The reaſon of this addreſs was, becauſe *Francis Garaſſe* had dedicated his book to the *late Stephen Paſquier, wherever he might be; for,* (ſaid he) *having never been able to know your religion, I was at a loſs which way you were gone at your departure from this*

(1) *The prior Ogier is the author of the book, that came out in the year 1623, under the title of* Jugement & Cenſure du livre de la Doctrine Curieuſe de François Garaſſe. — *A Judgment and Cenſure of the book of the* Curious Doctrine *of Francis Garaſſe.*

(2) *In the epiſtle dedicatory.*

(3) *Intituled,* Inſtructions à la France ſur la verité de l'Hiſtoire des Freres de la Roze-Croix.

(4) Cap. vi, pag. 60.

(5) Ibid. page 113, 114.

† Lib. i, de falſa religione.

(6) The one was called Nicolas Paſquier, Sieur de Minxe, and had been Maſter of the Requeſts: the other was called Guy Paſquier, Sieur de Buſſy, and was Auditor of Accounts. See the licence of their book.

(7) See the epiſtle dedicatory of the book intituled, *Defenſe pour Etienne Paſquier*, printed at Paris, in 1624.

(8) *Intituled,* Les Recherches des Recherches & autres Oeuvres d'Etienne Paſquier.

abbot of St Cyran [C]. Some pretend, that, upon that ſcore, father Garaſſe was the Helen of the war between the Jeſuits and Janſeniſts [D]. The laſt action of his life was very fine. He preſſingly aſked leave of his ſuperiors to tend upon the infected with the plague, during a diſmal peſtilence, which raged in Poictiers; and, having obtained it, and contracted the diſeaſe in that charitable office, he died at the hoſpital, among the infected [E], the fourteenth of June 1631, being forty ſix years old (b). He had reconciled himſelf with a good grace to the prior Ogier [F], and to Balzac [G]. Placcius has been led into a miſtake by the title of his *Rabelais Reformed* [H].

He

this life, and therefore I am conſtrained to write to you at a venture, and to direct this packet, WHEREEVER YOU BE. To pay him in the ſame coin, they accoſted him thus (9). *This has made me uſe the ſame freedom with you, and has forced me to direct this packet to you,* IN WHAT PLACE SOEVER YOU MAY BE: *for, not knowing whether you be at the ſervice-tree, (which you call a tavern of honour, and where you own you have had many a belly-full at free-coſt) or at the town of Clamar, in the ſuburb of St Germains, (where your name is written in ſo fair characters on all the mantle-trees of the chimnies) or in ſome other place of that nature; I am conſtrained to ſend you this book at a venture, and to addreſs it to you,* in what place ſoever you be.

[C] *He who wrote with moſt vehemence againſt this Jeſuit, was the abbot of St Cyran.*] He attacked the volume in Folio, which Garaſſe had publiſhed, in 1625, with the title of, *La Somme Theologique des Veritez capitales de la Religion Chreſtienne*: His criticiſm (10) is intituled, *La Somme des Fautes & Fauſſetez capitales contenues en la Somme Theologique du Pere François Garaſſe.* It was to contain four volumes: I have only ſeen the two firſt, and an abridgment of the fourth, and, if I am not miſtaken, that is all that was printed. The firſt tome contains the faults, which Garaſſe had committed in quoting the ſcripture, St Auſtin, and St Baſil of Selucia. The ſecond contains the faults in the quotations of the other fathers, and ſecular authors. The third was to contain the faults in divinity, philoſophy, chronology, coſmography, *&c.* The fourth was to contain ſeveral *hereſies, errors, impieties, irreverences, buffoonries, and inſupportable boaſtings.* The author dedicates his book to cardinal Richelieu, and ſays, in his epiſtle dedicatory, that he honours the ſociety of the Jeſuits, as *one of the ſtrongeſt companies of the ſon of God's army, and which ſurpaſſes in courage, on days of battle, both the invincible ſquadron of Macedonia, and the inſeparable band of lovers, who died together for the public good in Lacedæmon* (11). He gives himſelf, in the king's licence, the name of Alexander de l'Excluſſe (12). I do not think it eaſy to find ſo good a criticiſm as that is. We ſee in it an exact and profound learning, a ſolid judgment, and a wonderful ſagacity in diſcovering the faults of a writer. It is the moſt uſeful book a man can read, eſpecially if he deſigns to ſet up for an author, that ſupports his reaſonings by authorities, alluſions, compariſons, *&c.*

[D] *It is pretended, that . . . . father Garaſſe was the Helen of the war between the Jeſuits and Janſeniſts.*] It is what the Janſeniſts pretend: for here is what one of them has publiſhed (13). ‘In the year 1626, it (14) began with the book of a Jeſuit called Garaſſe, intituled, *Somme des Veritez capitales de la Religion Chrêtienne.* The late abbot of St Cyran, having found in it a prodigious number of falſifications of the ſcripture, and of the fathers, and of heretical and impious opinions, thought that the honour of the church required of him, that he ſhould take upon him to confute it, tho' at the ſame time his modeſty made him reſolve to conceal his name as he always did in his other books. The firſt part of that work being in the preſs, the noiſe it made every where gave occaſion to people to examine more nicely Garaſſe's book. The rector of the univerſity made complaints about it to the Faculty, who named commiſſioners to examine that book. But this noiſe having given the alarm to the Jeſuits, they made it appear, that it is no eaſy undertaking to cenſure the book of a Jeſuit: for their cabal prevailed ſo far with the magiſtrates, that the book of St Cyran was a long time ſtopped.’ The author adds, that Garaſſe picked out himſelf *fifty three propoſitions in his book, the moſt eaſy to maintain that he could find, and of which not three of them were of the number of thoſe, which the abbot of St Cyran found fault with in his work; and, having afterwards formed a cenſure to his fancy, he confuted it at his eaſe; and by that artifice he dazzled, for ſome time, the eyes of the world, and perplexed the examination of his book, on which the Sorbonne was intent.* So that ‘the abbot of St Cyran had much ado to remove the ſtop, which the Jeſuits had put to the publication of his confutation, and to undeceive the world, who had ſuffered themſelves to be impoſed upon by the artifice of Garaſſe. However, he compaſſed it at laſt, and, in ſpite of all the cabal of the ſociety, and the long delays, which were granted to father Garaſſe, to retract what he had advanced, his book was cenſured, *as containing ſeveral heretical, erroneous, ſcandalous, and raſh propoſitions; ſeveral falſifications of paſſages of ſcripture, and of the holy fathers, falſly quoted, and wreſted from their true ſenſe; and an infinite number of expreſſions unworthy to be written and read by chriſtians and divines.* The Jeſuits ſhewed . . . . ſome ſort of prudence in this affair . . . . they were not obſtinate in ſupporting their father Garaſſe, but confined him far from Paris to one of their houſes, where he was no more heard of; and ſo they terminated that affair. And happy had they been, if, by ſtifling that difference, they had alſo ſtifled in their hearts the reſentment they conceived thereupon againſt the abbot of St Cyran, which has ſince engaged them in ſo many horrible and violent proceedings.’

[E] *He died among the infected.*] ‘Cum Pictavii ſæva lues graſſaretur, multis precibus exoravit Moderatores ſuos, ut ſibi liceret tabe infectis inſervire; quod cùm obtinuiſſet, in iis demum piis officiis in hoſpitali domo inter infectos, quos verbo & exemplo etiam moriens hortabatur, ſanctiſſimè & religioſiſſimè conſumptus eſt (15).

[F] *He was reconciled . . . to the prior Ogier.*] As ſoon as Garaſſe's apology was publiſhed, the prior prepared himſelf to reply; but there were mediators of peace, who terminated the diſpute. The Jeſuit prevented his antagoniſt by a letter full of civilities: Which Ogier anſwered in the ſame ſtrain. The public was preſented with thoſe letters, as ſoon as they were written (16). Father Alegambe has committed here a fault; for which Monſieur Ogier would have demanded reparation, if he had been as nice as Janſenius's relations (17); for it plainly reſults from Alegambe's narrative (18) that Ogier had been an heretic, and was converted to the church of Rome. Southwell has not corrected Alegambe's fault.

[G] . . . . *and to Balzac.*] The account of their reconciliation, and the letters they wrote one to another, are to be ſeen at the beginning of the *Somme Theologique* of father Garaſſe.

[H] *Placcius has been led into a miſtake by the title of his* Rabelais Reformed.] That author has wrote a book, *de Scriptis & Scriptoribus anonymis atque pſeudonymis.* He had reaſon to put Francis Garaſſe among the anonymous authors; for there are ſeveral works of that Jeſuit, to which he did not put his ~~his~~ name. Such was the book he intituled, *Rabelais Reformed.* Mr Placcius fancies, that Garaſſe did by Rabelais, what many have done by Martial and Catullus, which they have publiſhed, after they had expunged all obſcene expreſſions from them. The works of Rabelais, *ſays he* (19), *Ut ut jucunda, ſic obſcœnis aliiſque ſcandaloſis plena,* caſtigata, *imo caſtrata, titulo* Rabeleſii Reformati, *Pictavii & Bruxellis, in* 8vo, *nomine reformantis* Franciſci Garaſſi, *ſcriptis aliis notiſſimi* Jeſuitæ Galli, *non adjecto prodiere, docente* Alegambe, *pag.* 124. The truth is, that the *Rebelais Reformed* of father Garaſſe is a book of controverſy; wherein he ſpeaks ſatirically of ſeveral miniſters,

---

(b) Alegambe, ubi ſupra.

(9) *Epiſtle dedicatory of the* Defence pour Etienne Paſquier.

(10) It is in quarto, and printed at Paris in 1626.

(11) I think he ought to have ſaid *Thebes*, and not *Lacedaemon. See Plutarch in the Life of Pelopidas.*

(12) *See* Colomiés, Mêlanges Hiſtoriques, pag. 26.

(13) *The author of the* Imaginaires, *letter iii, pag. m.* 47.

(14) That is, the war between the Jeſuits and Janſeniſts.

(15) Alegambe, ubi ſupra, pag. 124. *See alſo* Leſcalopier, in Cicer. de Nat. Deor. lib. i, n. 64.

(16) In the year 1624.

(17) See their caſes againſt the Jeſuit Hazart.

(18) *He reckons among the books of Father Garaſſe,* Litteræ ad Dominum Ogier, & hujus ad illum de ſua cum Eccleſia reconciliatione. *Alegambe, pag.* 124.

(19) Placcius, de Anonymis, cap. xiv, n. 463, pag. 111.

He employ'd againſt poets a maxim which is very good at the bottom, but which was turned againſt himſelf [*I*]. He pretended, that it is not a good excuſe for prophane thoughts, to ſay, that they are not written in proſe, but in verſe.

I ſhould have ſaid, that he is author of a *diffamatory libel, intituled*, The Banquet of of the wiſe Men, *compoſed againſt the honour of one of the firſt magiſtrates of France* (*c*). He, did not put his name to it; but however, he was diſcovered to be the author of it: Alegambe does not deny it (*d*). He was ſharply cenſured for publiſhing the tale of the tapeſtry of Joan d'Albret, which I have related in the article of that queen (*e*). It was pretended, that his calumny in that reſpect was an injury done to Henry the great, and Lewis XIII (*f*). They affirmed, that he had called that princeſs *libertine, prophane, ridiculous, a wanton*, and that *he had loaded her with a thouſand other calumnies* (*g*). The accuſation was groundleſs, and he ſufficiently juſtified himſelf (*h*). He was

miniſters, particular of Peter du Moulin, whom he accuſes of being an imitator of Rabelais, and a Rabelais riſen from the dead. See what a man expoſes himſelf to, when he ſpeaks of a book, which he knows only by it's title.

[*I*] *He employed againſt poets a maxim, which is very good at the bottom, but which was turned againſt himſelf.*] See how he begins in the confutation of a ſonnet of Theophile: ‘To anſwer theſe impieties, I muſt, by way of anticipation, enervate a fooliſh and weak defence, which many have in their mouths, touching the impieties of that writer; for, provided they may ſay, that ſuch things are ſaid in verſe, they think the crime is advantageouſly palliated, becauſe it is not in proſe; as if rhime could blot out all impieties, and authorize wits to pronounce blaſphemies. It is true, thoſe impieties and impertinences, which I am to confute, are in verſe; I am ſenſible of it: but, for that very reaſon, I look upon them to be more criminal, than if they were written in bare proſe; for they are thereby the more ſtudied, enquired after, and conſequently delivered in more efficacious, forcible, and elaborate terms, which make a greater impreſſion on the minds of the readers. Was not Cleanthes uſed to ſay, that the voice, which comes out of a flute, and a trumpet, hath a greater force, than that, which comes barely out of one's mouth; and that the thoughts, which are darted by a well turned verſe, are more forcible, more durable, and ſtronger, than thoſe, which are expreſſed by a period in proſe, wherein the words are generally languiſhing. I have fully anſwered this ridiculous objection, in the twentieth chapter of my apology; wherein I have ſhewn, that an impiety in verſe is the more pernicious (20).’ Pray obſerve, that I have ſaid, that, at the bottom, that maxim is very good: for I do not pretend to adopt it in ſo great a latitude as that Jeſuit has done, nor for all the reaſons which he alledges. I am thoroughly perſuaded, that, upon a thouſand occaſions, it is not ſo great a ſin to broach looſe maxims of morality in verſe, as to propoſe them in proſe, and that we ought to abate much of the weight of our cenſures, when it is a poet who ſpeaks. A man, who ſhould maintain dogmatically heretical propoſitions, would be a thouſand times more criminal, than if he ſhould convey them in a piece of poetry. There is many a poem, wherein the author advances a thouſand things, which he does not believe, and which he would never reduce into a formal diſputation, and would not even ſay in verſe, if he thought, that his readers would look upon them, not as witty conceits, but as tenets, and articles of faith. He takes more pains, I confeſs, in turning and poliſhing them, than if he wrote them in proſe; his mind is therefore more intent upon them; he meditates more deeply upon them; but yet, after all, this is not always the true picture of what paſſes in his heart; he does not pretend to give either his confeſſion of faith, or a model of belief to thoſe that read him: and it muſt be acknowledged, that men are not ſuch fools, as to let themſelves be as eaſily perſuaded of an hereſy delivered by a poet, as of an hereſy delivered in a pulpit, or in a dogmatical work. Therefore I do not adopt father Garaſſe's reaſons, though I agree with him in the main part and bottom of his hypotheſis, that an ill maxim, either againſt ſound morals, or againſt ſpeculative doctrines of faith, is very criminal, in what ſort of poetry ſoever it be propoſed. I own alſo, that the licentiouſneſs of a poet, in advancing ſeveral thoughts againſt morality and religion, may produce ill effects. And I even acknowledge, that the beauties and charms of poetry ſometimes render a poiſon more pernicious than it would be in proſe. One cannot too much lament the miſchiefs, which the poetical impieties of Homer, and his imitators, introduced among the heathens. Men of ſenſe and penetration were ſenſible of it, and loudly complained of it. They murmured with reaſon againſt the poet's aſcribing to the gods the ſame crimes, which are committed upon earth (21). I have quoted elſewhere (22) a paſſage of Plato; and here is a fine one out of Cicero: ‘Nec enim multo abſurdiora ſunt ea, quæ poëtarum vocibus fuſa, ipſa ſuavitate nocuerunt, qui & ira inflammatos, & libidine furentes induxerunt deos, feceruntque ut eorum bella, prælia, pugnas, vulnera videremus: odia præterea, diſſidia, diſcordias, ortus, interitus, querelas, lamentationes, effuſas in omni intemperantia libidines, adulteria, vincula, cum humano genere concubitus, mortaleſque ex immortali procreatos (23). —— *Nor are thoſe things much more abſurd, which, uttered by the poets, have done miſchief by the very pleaſingneſs of the fiction; ſuch as introducing the gods inflamed with anger, or raging with luſt, and deſcribing to us their wars, combats, and wounds; as alſo their enmities, diſſenſions, quarrels, births, deaths, lamentations, intemperate luſts, adulteries, bonds, intercourſe with women, and mortals ſprung from an immortal ſire.*’ The dramatic pieces, wherein the gods were ſo unworthily repreſented, excited a thouſand irregular paſſions. Cicero confeſſed it; and St Auguſtin made uſe of his teſtimony. ‘Quomodo tanta animi & morum mala, bonis præceptis & legibus, vel imminentia prohiberent, vel inſita extirpanda curarent Dii tales: qui etiam ſeminanda & augenda flagitia curaverunt, talia vel ſua, vel quaſi ſua facta per theatricas celebritates populis innoteſcere cupientes: ut tanquam autoritate divina ſua ſponte nequiſſima libido accenderetur humana: fruſtra hoc exclamante Cicerone, qui cùm de poetis ageret, ad quos cùm acceſſiſſet, inquit: Clamor & approbatio populi, quaſi magni cujuſdam & ſapientis magiſtri, quas illi obducunt tenebras? quos invehunt metus? quas inflammant cupiditates (24)? —— *How can ſuch gods prohibit, or extirpate, ſuch great vices by wholeſome precepts or laws, who take care even to implant and propagate them, deſiring to have their own vices repreſented on the theatre to the people: ſo that human luſts are ſpontaneouſly ſet on fire, as it were by divine authority; Cicero exclaiming after this manner to no purpoſe, when he is ſpeaking of the poets; what darkneſs do the applauſe and approbation of the people induce? what fears do they excite? what luſts do they inflame?*’ Cicero complains, in one of his books, that the reading of the poets effeminates the heart, and weakens all the nerves of virtue. ‘Videſne poëtæ quid mali afferant? Lamentantes inducunt fortiſſimos viros. Molliunt animos noſtros; ita ſunt deinde dulces, ut non legantur modo ſed etiam ediſcantur. Sic ad malam domeſticam diſciplinam, vitamque umbratilem, & delicatam quum acceſſerunt etiam poëtæ, nervos omnis virtutis elidunt. Recte igitur à Platone educuntur ex ea civitate, quam finxit ille, quum mores optimos, & optimum reip. ſtatum exquireret (25). —— *Do you ſee the miſchiefs ariſing from poets? They introduce whining heroes: they effeminate our minds: beſides they are ſo pleaſing, that they are not only read, but learned by heart. Thus when to bad domeſtic diſcipline, and a luxurious life, the reading of the poets is added, there is an end of all virtue. Juſtly therefore has Plato baniſhed them from that ſtate, which he formed, when in ſearch of the beſt manners,*

---

c) Ogier, Jugem. du Livre de la Doctrine Curieuſe, pag. 23.

(*d*) He reckons among his works *Septem Sapientes.*

(*e*) See rem. [*R*] of the article *NAVARRE* (*Joan d'Albret, queen of*).

(*f*) Ogier, ubi ſupra, cap. xi, pag. 143, & ſeq.

(*g*) Defence pour Etienne Paſquier, livr. iv. §. i, pag. 644.

(*h*) *See the xxth chapter of the A*pology for Garaſſe, p. m. 17, &c.

(20) Garaſſe, Somme Theol. pag. 370.

(21) *See, in the* Anti-Baillet *of Mr Menage, pag.* 227, *of the firſt Tome, ſome verſes of Xenophanes, quoted by Sextus Empiricus, pag.* 57, *and* 341, adverſ. Mathematicos *See alſo* Forcatulus de Gallorum Imperio & Philoſophia, lib. iv, pag. m. 537.

(22) In the remark [*I*] of the article JUNO.

(23) Cicero de Natura Deorum, lib. i, cap. xvi.

(24) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. ii, cap. xiv, pag. m. 188. *What Cicero ſays here, is not to be found in the works of his that are extant; but ſee what he ſays againſt dramatic pieces*, Tuſcul. Quæſt. lib. iv, cap. xxxii.

(25) Cicero, Tuſcul. Quæſt. lib. ii, cap. xi.

was likewiſe very highly cenſured for having quoted indecent paſſages [*K*]. We ſhall ſee how

'*manners, and the beſt form of government.*' Preſently after, he obſerves, as a great abuſe, the cuſtom of cauſing ſuch authors to be learnt by heart by the Roman youth. 'At vero nos, docti ſcilicet è Græcia, 'hæc à pueritia legimus & diſcimus; Hanc eruditionem liberalem & doctrinam putamus (26). ——— '*Greece has taught us to read and learn theſe from 'our childhood, and this we call a liberal education 'and learning.*' Plutarch was of another opinion: he thought, that reading of the poets might be very uſeful (27); but he is forced to own, that it is only becauſe they contradict themſelves (28). Their tenets, ſays he, are ſometimes good, and ſometimes bad; ſometimes impious, and ſometimes pious: that is the reaſon why their authority is doubtful, and has not weight enough to do harm; and it is our duty to pick out what they advance for the good cauſe. Αἱ δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν ὑπεναντιώσεις πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀνταναφέρουσαι τὴν πίστιν, οὐκ ἐῶσιν ἰσχυρὰν ῥοπὴν γενέσθαι πρὸς τὸ βλάπτον· ὅπου μὲν οὖν αὐτοῖς τὸ τιθέναι συνέγγυς ἐκφανεῖς ποιεῖ τὰς ἀντιλογίας, δεῖ τῷ βελτίονι συνηγορεῖν. *Poëtarum quoque contradictiones quibus fidem dictorum dubiam faciant, non ſinunt ea ad nocendum ſatis momenti habere. Ubi ergo juxta ſe poſita contraria dicta apud illos evidenter ſunt, meliori parti adſtipulandum eſt* (29). This expedient of Plutarch is not a very good remedy: for the depravity of our nature prompts us rather to chuſe what the poets advance in favour of vice, than to pick out what they ſay in praiſe of virtue. Beſides, their contradictions lead us to believe, that their graveſt and moſt devout maxims are only ſtarts of fancy, of which they themſelves are not perſuaded. We imagine that they deliver them only becauſe they have found them ſuſceptible of all the beauties and majeſty of poetry. And, indeed, there are poets, who, having no piety, or belief, have nevertheleſs made magnificent and admirable verſes on the moſt ſublime truths of religion. They choſe that ſubject, becauſe it gave them an opportunity to diſplay the fineſt phraſes, and the moſt ſhining figures of their art. Another time, they would chuſe a ſubject quite oppoſite, provided it ſhould favour the enthuſiaſms of their fancy; that is, provided it ſhould furniſh them with ſuch Ideas, as they ſhould think themſelves capable to expreſs well. Now what weight can the ſound doctrine have, which we find in authors, whom we believe to be of that temper?

Let us take notice, by the way, that modern poetry has excited many murmurings. I have related elſewhere (30) the complaints, which Thuanus and Mezerai have made againſt the poets of Henry the ſecond's court. I might alſo have quoted the Sieur de la-Planche; for here is a fine paſſage out of his book: 'What aggravated, in that matter, the wrath of God 'was, that the knowledge of humane learning (a 'ſingular means, ordained by GOD to teach us to 'know him rightly, and conſequently for the preſervation of human kind), having been brought again 'into France by king Francis, more famous for that, 'than for any other thing done in his reign, was turned, by malicious and curious wits, into an occaſion 'of all manner of wickedneſs; which was found principally in certain great wits addicted to French 'poetry, who, at that time, appeared in ſhoals; 'whoſe writings, impure and obſcene, and full of 'blaſphemies, are the more deteſtable, as they carry 'with them ſuch ſoft allurements, as may entice, not 'only to all manner of laſciviouſneſs, but alſo to all 'manner of horrible impiety, all thoſe, who have 'them in their hands (31).' Add to all this, the bitter complaints of Gabriel de Puy Herbeau (32); and the reaſons, which engaged Pope Hadrian VI not to favour poets (33). If you would have inſtances of their prophanations, do but read Sorel's commentary on the Extravagant Shepherd (34).

Let us now ſee how father Garaſſe's principle was made uſe of againſt him. He was cenſured (35) for having made verſes, which contained an impiety; and he was put in mind of his own words: *That rhime does not blot out impieties .... and that an impiety in verſe is thereby the more pernicious.* St Cyran (36) blames the Latin verſes, which he made in praiſe of the ſun, and wherein he had uſed the moſt idolatrous expreſſions: neither does he ſpare the verſes, wherein he addreſſes himſelf to Neptune and Thetis, whom he calls Numina, and where he addreſſes himſelf to nature as to a goddeſs. The ſame author refers him to his own maxim, and to St Auſtin's retractations. That great ſaint was ſorry (37) that he had given to the muſes the name of goddeſſes, though he did it only as a witticiſm. The ſame Garaſſe is cenſured for having excited *heatheniſh* and *laſcivious* ideas, in the poem he had made, in the form of an Epithalamium, on the divine and humane nature of CHRIST. I omit that he was cenſured for his prayers in proſe; wherein he ſpoke of the wanderings of Ulyſſes, of the laurels of Thrace, and of his talent for poetry.

[*K*] *He was cenſured .... for having quoted indecent paſſages.*] He pardoned no obſcenities, ſays an author (38), *which he could not ſo perfectly know without having practiſed them.* He replied (39), that this was to reaſon wrong, and ſhewed it, among other inſtances, by that of the lawyers, *who write down at length robberies, that have been judged and condemned by the court* (40), and neither approve, nor practiſe them; and by that of the caſuiſts, *who write down minutely all kinds of immodeſty, from ſimple thoughts to inceſt and beaſtiality: which they know only by theory, and by the report of the guilty* (41). 'It was urged 'againſt him (42), that St Auſtin ſays very elegantly, 'that *de pudendis rebus, cogit neceſſitas loqui; boneſtas, 'circumloqui*: That the weakneſs and neceſſity of man 'often oblige him to ſpeak of leud and immodeſt 'things, but that decency requires him to ſpeak of 'them with circumlocution and periphraſis.' Here is his apology (43): 'To ſay nothing of an hundred inſtances of this incomparable doctor, in which he 'ſpeaks of the god Stercutius and his relation Cloacina, 'he expreſſes himſelf in terms much more material than 'thoſe they reprehend in me, who never dreamed 'of any impurity in them. Let them anſwer me as 'to this obſervation of St Auſtin, in the fourteenth 'book of his *Civitas Dei, cap. xxiv. Non nulli ab 'imo ſine pudore ullo tam numeroſos edunt ſonitus, ut 'etiam ex illa parte cantare videantur*: And thoſe, 'who relate the pretty obſervations of Vives concerning the aſs, who had drank the moon, to ſhew me 'my pretended impertinence, let them take the pains to 'read what Vives ſays on this head, concerning the 'young German, who did wonders that way.' He had ſaid, in his book (44), that, *publiſhing theſe impious maxims, he had done nothing but what had been practiſed by the ſaints and fathers of the primitive church* againſt the Gnoſtics and Carpocratians (45). His cenſor (46) found three diſparities in this compariſon: the firſt is, that the Gnoſtics and Carpocratians taught, as articles of faith, what the fathers attribute to them. It was therefore neceſſary to refute, and conſequently to relate, thoſe impious doctrines. But the prophanations, recited by Garaſſe, are barely *actions and words of wicked and debauched minds, who never affirmed they had either ſaid or committed them* (47). The ſecond is, that the fathers never relate, but with regret, the impure hereſies, which they are obliged to refute. Garaſſe, on the contrary, *has raked together an heap of ordure* (48). In the third place, the fathers wrote for learned men (49). St Irenæus, biſhop of Lyons, wrote in Greek, *which was neither the language of the weſtern empire, nor that of Gaul in particular* (50). At that time, books *could not be communicated ſo eaſily as they are at preſent, through the convenience of printing* (51), and *the Chriſtians and Catholics led an angelical life..... They would have ſeen and heard theſe impieties and prophanations with an incredible deteſtation and averſion* (52). None of theſe circumſtances could excuſe Garaſſe. He did not reply with exactneſs: he ſuppoſed, that the firſt diſparity conſiſted in this, that the fathers *were under a neceſſity of publiſhing theſe abominations; inaſmuch as they were public, and as it were authorized by the world* (53); and he replied, that 'the immodeſt actions of Carpocras were never ſo known in the towns of Greece, 'as the impudences of Theophile, the blaſphemies of 'Vannini, and the impieties of Charron, are known 'by France (54).' You ſee, he forgets the principal point of the difference; for the impieties and obſcenities of Theophile were by no one maintained as tenets of religion. This did not take away a right to refute them, and I wonder Garaſſe did not ſay, that a faction how he defended himſelf (i).

---

(26) Id. ibid.

(27) *See Plutarch's treatiſe*, De audiendis Poëtis.

(28) This calls to my mind what Mr Saurin has ſaid, pag. 372, of his *Examen de la Theologie de Mr Jurieu*, viz. There is nothing, for which Mr Jurieu ought to congratulate himſelf more heartily, than for his perpetual contradictions, by the favour of which only he is orthodox.

(29) Plut. ubi ſupra, pag. 20. C.

(30) *In the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, n. 126, pag. 366.

(31) Hiſtoire de l'Eſtat de France, tant de la Republique que de la Religion, ſous le Regne de François II, pag. 7, Edit. 1576, in 8vo.

(32) Gabriel Putherbeus in Theotimo, ſive de tollendis & expurgandis malis libris, lib. i, pag. 77. Edit. Pariſ. 1549, in 8vo. *See* Voëtius Diſputat. Theol. Tom. II, pag. 1274.

(33) See the remark [*D*] of the article HADRIAN VI.

(34) Pag. 644, 732, & alibi.

(35) *By the abbot of St Cyran, in his* Sommes des Fauſſetez capitales, contenues en la Somme de Garaſſe, Tom. IV, pag. 34.

(36) Ib. pag. 102.

(37) Auguſt. Retractat. lib. i, cap. iii.

(38) Jugem. de la Doctrine Curieuſe, *in the extract of the letter of L. R. L.*

(39) Garaſſe, Apol. cap viii, pag. m 90.

(40) Ib. pag. 92.

(41) Ibid.

(42) Jugem. de la Doctrine Curieuſe, cap. iv, pag. 39, 40.

(43) Garaſſe, Apol. cap ix, pag. 109, 110.

(44) *See the* Doctr. Curieuſe, liv. ii, §. xv.

(45) Apol. de Garaſſe, chap. xii, pag. 151.

(46) Jugem. de la Doctrine Curieuſe, chap. ix, pag. 106, &c.

(47) Ib. pag. 108.

(48) Ib pag. 112.

(49) Ib. pag. 114.

(50) Ibid. pag. 115.

(51) Ibid. pag. 117.

(52) Ibid. pag. 118.

(53) Garaſſe, Apology, chap. xii, pag. 151.

(54) Ibid. pag. 152.

(i) In the remark [K].

a faction of debauchees, who impudently publiſh prophane and impure maxims, to corrupt youth, do not deſerve more countenance, than dogmatizing heretics; that therefore the books of theſe debauchees ought to be cried down, and the paſſages cited, to avoid the imputation of calumniating them. He has ſaid nothing upon the ſecond diſparity, and he even affirms (55), that his cenſor has alledged but two. Nevertheleſs, he might defend himſelf two ways, by denying, that, purpoſely, he had raked together an heap of filth, and by maintaining, that the reluctance, with which the ancient fathers diſplayed them, could not free them from blame, if, at the bottom, it was a pernicious and ſinful thing. He ſtrongly attacked the third diſparity: it is there he triumphs. It is falſe and ridiculous, ſays he (56); for the cenſor 'ſays, that the ancient fathers, 'who have made public, by their writings, the abominable and ſcandalous actions of the Carpocratians, 'did it, not in their mother-tongue, but in a language 'unknown and little uſed in the world, and that it 'was only for the learned: and of his reaſon he gives 'us a wonderful inſtance, ſince, ſays he, St Irenæus, 'biſhop of Lyons, did not write in Latin, which was 'the language then known in France; but he wrote 'in Greek, that he might not be underſtood by the 'vulgar, nor expoſe the vileneſs of heretics to the 'knowledge of all the world. Now that St Irenæus 'wrote in Greek I will not diſpute; I know it very 'well, thank God: but I ſay, it was not for the reaſon 'alledged by our prior, but becauſe he was a Greek 'born, as his name witneſſes, and that he was better 'acquainted with this language than the Latin: for, if 'the reaſon, alledged by our prior, were admitted, it 'would follow, that St Epiphanius and Theodoret, who 'were Greeks by nation, and who wrote, among the 'Greeks, the impieties and turpitudes of the atheiſts 'and heretics of their time, ought to have written in 'Latin or in German, not to have been underſtood by 'the vulgar: yet, for all this, they wrote in Greek, 'a language familiar to all the people of that country, 'more abominations, than there are in fifteen volumes 'as large as mine. But what would my gentleman 'ſay to doctor Cochleus, who has written, in German, 'a book intituled, *Luther with ſeven Heads*, which was 'afterwards tranſlated into Latin, in which he relates, 'like an honeſt German, ſpeaking to Germans, all the 'impurities, which Luther had ſowed in Germany, 'ſo far as to produce infamous proverbs, and horrible 'ſayings, which the immodeſt women had in their 'mouths; nay, he goes ſo far as to ſay, that in all the 'towns of Germany they now only talked a certain 'Jargon peculiar to bawds and pimps; the particulars 'of which he cites, which I ſorbear to produce, tho' 'I am not ignorant of them, having read them in the 'book of this doctor, not without horror, ſo prophane are they and filthy.'

(55) Ibid. pag. 151.

(56) Ibid. pag. 153, &c.

Note, He denies that he has made uſe of the word *lavement* in a new ſenſe (57). 'At this word, *ſays he* (58), my enemies write, that I have indecent 'words in my mouth, and that I am void of ſhame; 'to whom I reply . . . . in juſtification of myſelf, that 'they make me more knowing and leſs innocent than 'I am; for they imagine, that I am converſant in the 'language of phyſicians and apothecaries; but thank 'God I know no more of it than the vulgar. By the 'word *lavement* I underſtand only what I have learned 'groſly from vulgar uſage, and ancient books of 'phyſic, which are not ſo delicate as the modern; for, 'in the old French verſions of Leonardus Fuſchius, I 'ſee, that the word *lavement* ſignifies only *gargles*; as 'when he ſays in the fifth, that, for the tooth-ach, 'we ſhould take a *gargle of water of plantain, and 'gargle our mouth with it*. That, if the modern 'apothecaries be ſo finical to have prophaned this word, 'I am not obliged to make uſe of it in their indecent ſenſe: for, otherwiſe, when I talk of *hypoſtaſis*, 'in divinity, I muſt be cautious how I uſe this term, 'ſince the apothecaries have prophaned it, applying 'it diſhononrably to the urine of their patients; and, 'conſequently, if I borrow a compariſon from the *hypoſtaſis*, I ought to be accuſed of expreſſing myſelf 'with impurity.' This is to pretend great delicacy and innocence, to deny that we underſtand the modern ſenſe of the word *lavement*; a word invented only to ſucceed other terms too groſs. It has been a long time in faſhion among the moſt polite perſons. They begin not to be ſo fond of it (59).

(57) We do not find the word *lavement* in the ſenſe of *clyſter* in Nicod, nor in Monet, of whom I have the edition of 1635.

(58) Garaſſe, Apolog. cap. ix, pag. 106, 107.

(59) See at the end of the fourth volume, the explanation concerning obſcenities, *paragr. IX.*

GARDIE (PONTUS DE LA), great marſhal of the armies of Sweden, under king John III, was a French gentleman, of a more illuſtrious birth than ſome authors have ſaid [*A*]. He (*a*) was deſtined by his father to the church, in the monaſtery of Montoliou,

---

(*a*) Mezerai, apud Claudium Arrhenium Oernhielm, in Vita Ponti de la Gardie, pag. 11.

[*A*] *He was of a more illuſtrious birth than ſome authors have ſaid.*] It may be proved for certain, that he was deſcended from RORERT DE LA GARDIE, lord of Ruſſol and la Gardie, who, in 1382, married Anne de l'Eſtandart. The ſucceſſors of that Robert, down to JAMES DE LA GARDIE, father to our Pontus, and huſband of Catherine de Sainte Colombe (1), were married into very noble and ancient families; and namely into that of Bellegarde, from which, by the woman's ſide, ſprung the marſhal de Bellegarde, governour of the marquiſate of Saluces under Henry III (2). You will find the particular circumſtances of all this in the life of Pontus de la Gardie, compoſed by Mr Oernhielm, hiſtoriographer of Sweden, and publiſhed in the year 1690. He quotes Thuanus, who ſays, *Pontus Gardius nobili loco apud nos in Petrocoriis natus* (3); and Mezerai, whoſe words he tranſlates thus: *Pater ejus (Ponti de la Gardie) illuſtri domo ortus prope Rueſium in Septimania.* He believes, without reaſon, that the *Petricorii* of Thuanus are now a part of Languedoc (4): He had done better to cenſure that famous hiſtorian, who, without doubt, meant, that Pontus de la Gardie was born in Perigord, which is not true. Perhaps his miſtake proceeds from his having heard, that Pontus was born at Peiregoux; which is a lordſhip in the dioceſe of Caſtres, that belonged to the family of la Gardie, *and was always the ſhare of the eldeſt ſon* (5). Mr Oernhielm takes notice of it (5); and adds, that la Gardie is ſituate between Caſtres and the Albigeois. This is an error, pardonable in one, who is ſo far diſtant from that country. Caſtres is in the Albigeois; and ſo the ſituation of la Gardie was not well marked; and it ought to have been placed in the dioceſe of Carcaſſonne. However this be, it cannot be denied, that this author quotes two very illuſtrious French hiſtorians, who aver, that Pontus de la Gardie was of a good family. It is alſo moſt certain, that he juſtly cenſures Father Maimbourg, who has ſaid, *That fortune took pleaſure in raiſing Pontus de la Gardie, from a mean birth, to the firſt employments of the kingdom of Sweden: for, having left the village, where he was born, near Rieux in Languedoc, he followed arms, to which his inclination led him, and went as a common ſoldier into Scotland, under the lord d'Orſel, lieutenant of Francis II* (6). There is no body, who, from theſe words, will not imagine, that our Pontus was at the moſt the ſon of a tradeſman, or country attorney: for there is nothing intimating that his father was a gentleman. Therefore we may ſay, that Maimbourg is guilty of a groſs fault; which is not the only one he has committed. Mezerai affirms, that Pontus commanded ſome companies of horſe in Scotland; and therefore he was not there as a common ſoldier. His general was called Oyſel, not Orſel; and, becauſe Oyſel was ſent into Scotland by Henry II, Maimbourg had done well not to have mentioned Francis II; for that makes one loſe the true thread of chronology. *Note*, that all theſe faults have been blindly copied out of Florimond de Remond (7). If Mr Varillas had copied them with the ſame exactneſs, he had not encreaſed the number of them; but adventuring to walk ſome ſteps without a guide, he has loſt his way. 'La Gardie, *ſays he* (8), was a French'man, born in the province of Languedoc, and in a 'village of the biſhopric of Rieux, near that little 'town. He had dedicated himſelf very young to the 'profeſſion of arms, and had ſerved a long time as a 'common ſoldier. He was ſtill in that condition,

(1) He married her in 1511.

(2) Monſieur Oernhielm, *in vita Ponti de la Gardie, pag.* 8, ſays, that he had been ſo before under Francis I, and Henry II, and that he obtained from Henry III, the office of great maſter of the horſe. I believe he is miſtaken; and that, as to the laſt point, he takes the ſon for the father.

(3) Thuan. lib. lxxxiii, pag. m. 57.

(4) Nunc partem facientibus Septimaniæ vulgo Languedociæ. *Oernhielm, ubi ſupra, pag.* 11.

(5) Id. ibid. pag 10.

(6) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Luther. lib. vi, pag. 251. Edit. Holl.

(7) Pontus de la Gardie, a native of a village near Rieux, in Languedoc, a poor ſoldier of fortune, being deſirous to ſee the world, went into Scotland, under the command of the Sieur d'Orſel, lieutenant for king Francis II. *Flor. de Remond, Naiſſance & Progrez de l'Hereſie, lib. iv, cap. xvi, pag. m.* 495.

(8) Varillas, Hiſt. de l'Hereſie. liv. xxx, pag. 265. Dutch Edit.

Montolieu, in the dioceſe of Carcaſſonne; but the ardour of his courage did not ſuffer him to live long in that cloiſter; he ſoon left it to go to the wars. He bore arms firſt in Piedmont, under the marſhal de Briſſac; afterwards he went into Scotland, with the troops, which Henry II ſent thither, under the conduct of Henry Clutin d'Oyſel, to ſuccour the queen-mother againſt her ſubjects. That Scotch war being at an end, he went into Denmark, and ſignalized himſelf in the armies of king Frederic II, againſt Eric king of Sweden. He changed his maſter ſome time after; for, having obtained a very honourable diſcharge from the king of Denmark, he betook himſelf to the ſervice of the king of Sweden (b). This happened in the year 1565. He was ſent into France the following year, with another ambaſſador, to aſk of Charles IX leave to raiſe men in his kingdom; which negociation was ſo well managed, that they carried into Sweden three thouſand foot, and as many horſe (c). They found at their return the affairs of that kingdom in a very ill ſituation, both on account of the war, which the Danes, the Poles, and the city of Lubec, had declared againſt Sweden, and by reaſon of the miſunderſtanding between the king, and John duke of Finland, his brother. This fire, having been concealed for ſome time, broke out at laſt. The duke, and his wife, ſiſter to Sigiſmund Auguſtus, king of Poland, had been committed to priſon; ſeveral perſons were ill uſed upon ſuſpicion of favouring them: The king flew into great exceſſes of cruelty; but, being informed, that people began to ſay, that, of right, he had forfeited the crown (d), he affected to give a great inſtance of clemency, by reſtoring his brother to his former ſtate, and by placing near him a lord, who was a man of ſenſe and courage [B], and who, upon all occaſions, might be ſerviceable to him. This lord was our Pontus de la Gardie. Some time after, it was thought, that the king deſigned to make away with all his brothers during the ſolemnity of his nuptials: Wherefore they were exhorted not to aſſiſt there, and to free the kingdom from oppreſſion [C]. They followed that advice, took a progreſs into

(b) Oernhielm, ibid.

(c) Id. ibid. pag. 14, 15.

(d) Certe, poſt patratas innocentium multorum cædes, jam non obſcuræ ferebantur voces populi, regnandi jure excidiſſe immitem principem. *Id. ibid. pag.* 26.

'when d'Oyſel, whom king Francis II ſent into Scot-'land with troops, carried him thither. He ſtayed 'there till the peace of Caſteau-Cambreſis, by which 'being disbanded, he was reduced to liſt himſelf, with 'twenty of his comrades, under a captain, who car-'ried them into Denmark.' It is an untruth to ſay, that he was born in a village near the epiſcopal city of Rieux. Thoſe hiſtorians, who ſay, that he was born at Rieux, or thereabouts, do not mean that city, but a place in the dioceſe of Narbonne, or ſome other. Varillas ſhould not have ſaid, that Francis II ſent troops into Scotland before the peace of Caſteau-Cambreſis; for Henry II, his father, ſurvived that peace, and it was properly he, who ſent Clutin d'Oyſel to the queen-regent of Scotland, mother-in-law to the dauphin, who had married the heireſs of Scotland. Beſides, the peace of Caſteau-Cambreſis did not put an end to the diviſions of Scotland; for ſome new troops were ſent to the regent, ſoon after the concluſion of that peace.

All the proofs of Mr Oernhielm againſt father Maimbourg are not good. If Pontus de la Gardie, ſays he (9), had not been nobly deſcended; or had *been born in a village*, Charles IX, and Henry IV, would not have uſed the ſtyle they employed, when they wrote to him. The ambaſſadors of France, not to mention the emperor Rodolphus, Mary his mother, Frederic king of Denmark, Radziwill, or Zamoyski, would not have paid him all the honours which appear in their letters, with extream eagerneſs to cultivate his friendſhip. This reaſon is frivolous; for, as ſoon as a man enjoys the greateſt employments in a ſtate, and the favour of his maſter, every body reſpects him: foreign princes do all they can to gain him; his extraction is not regarded, but only his preſent condition, and his ability to ſerve or hurt. Who is ignorant of the flatteries of Charles V towards cardinal Wolſey, the ſon of a butcher?

(9) Oernhielm, ubi ſupra, pag. 23.

Let us conclude, by ſaying, that moſt of the gentlemen in France come from a village: they are born in ſome caſtle, ſeated near ſome ſmall lordſhip belonging to their father. And there are ſeveral families without a title, and who never appeared at court, nor ever had any conſiderable employment in their province, who nevertheleſs are of a moſt ancient nobility, can produce pedigrees of three or four hundred years ſtanding, and are related, tho' perhaps at a great diſtance to houſes, that bear the moſt magnificent titles. This is what might be ſuppoſed of that of our Pontus. I take notice, that neither the place, nor the time, wherein he was born, could be marked by Mr Oernhielm; which is very ſurprizing.

[B] *By placing near him a lord, who was a man of ſenſe and courage.*] Theſe are Mr Oernhielm's words (10): 'Hujus (*populi*) iram ut mulceret inſigni aliquo ſpecimine clementiæ, fratrem Johannem Ducem, deterſo carceris ſqualore, libertati dignitatique priſtinæ reſtituit. 'Eidemque, præter cætera argumenta duraturæ in poſterum benevolentiæ PONTUM DE LA GARDIUM concedit, virum in negotiis pacis ac belli 'ſpectatæ induſtriæ, ut ejus uteretur opera, ubicunque rerum magnitudo poſceret.' Soon after he quotes this paſſage out of a hiſtory of Sweden in manuſcript (11). 'Duke John, a prince prudent and wiſe, 'who was well acquainted with the humour, temper, 'and infirmities of the king his brother, yielded at laſt 'to his commands, and accepted the burthen of that 'great and painful office; to wit, of viceroy, lieutenant-general, and governor of Sweden, and of both 'the Gothlands. But he ſincerely remonſtrated to 'him, that his long confinement had made him loſe, 'not only all his faithful ſervants, but likewiſe the 'good and ancient acquaintance he had at court; and 'therefore he moſt earneſtly beſought his majeſty to 'give him ſome truſty counſellor, and worthy ſecond, 'in whom his majeſty might entirely confide, and 'who might be an illuſtrious witneſs and companion 'of his actions and behaviour. His requeſt being juſt, 'Eric readily gave him Pontus de la Gardie, or de 'la Garde, a French gentleman, whom he loved exceedingly, both for his wit and courage, and had raiſed him ſo high in his dominions, that he followed 'his wholſome counſels in all great and important 'affairs.' Florimond de Remond relates the ſame thing, tho' with a circumſtance, which Jolivet has omitted. 'The king, ſays he (12), who, during this 'diſcourſe, ſaw, that the duke kept his eyes fixed upon a Frenchman, whom he loved, called Pontus 'de la Gardie, told him, through the ſuggeſtion of 'his evil genius, (for Pontus was the author of his 'ruin) brother, I give you Pontus, make uſe of him, 'and truſt to his courage and loyalty, of which I 'have had many proofs.'

(10) Id ibid. pag. 16.

(11) *Id. pag.* 17. He quotes Jolivet, author of a Hiſtory of Sweden.

(12) Florimond de Remond, ubi ſupra, pag. 495.

[C] *They were exhorted ...... to free the kingdom from oppreſſion.*] They could not uſe a more preſſing motive to prompt them to it, than that which they employed: for they had intelligence ſent them from all parts, that the king deſigned to deſtroy them: 'Adferuntur ad principes amicorum ab omni parte literæ, 'monentes, caverent ſibi à futuris inaugurandæ Reginæ 'elocandæque ſororis ſolemnibus epulis, quibus haud 'aliter uſurus ſit rex quam retibus, capturis everſuriſque haud dubiè ſuſpectos fratres Regnique Proceres, operoſâ aliàs conquirendos indagine. Ad hæc 'adjungunt ſe Ducibus aliquot, de ſuâ ipſorumque jam 'ſalute ſolliciti, decretam adſerentes omnium necem, 'certumque debere opprimi, ni opprimant. Fruſtra 'adhiberi fidem promiſſis totiens juratis violatiſque

into all the provinces, raiſed men up and down, and put themſelves in a condition to dethrone the king. They marched directly to Stockholm, entered the city, and, after ſome parleys, and ſkirmiſhes, wherein la Gardie, one of the commanders of the troops of John duke of Finland was wounded in the arm, they brought their deſign about. King Eric was dethroned, and committed to priſon in the year 1568. John, his brother being choſen to ſucceed him, gave immediately to la Gardie the place of high-ſteward of his houſhold, and committed to him all the care of his coronation, which was not performed till the tenth of July 1569. No man had more contributed than la Gardie to the ſucceſs of this revolution; wherein his vigilance, addreſs, and reſolution, ſhone wonderfully. The new king, not having been able to conclude an honourable peace with the king of Denmark, marched againſt him. A battle was fought, wherein la Gardie, having received a great wound, was made priſoner: He did not recover his liberty, till the treaty of peace, ratified the ſixteenth of March 1571. He had been made a knight *(e)* on the coronation day; and he had a new title conferred on him the twenty ſeventh of July 1571, to wit, that of baron of Eckholm, to which a great eſtate was annexed. At the ſame time, he was ſent *(f)* upon an embaſſy, with two others, to ſome imperial cities, to the biſhop of Munſter, the count of Eaſt-Frieſland, the duke of Alva, the king of France, the king of Navarre, and the king of Spain: And, ſoon after his return, he was employed in military affairs; for he was ſent into Livonia in the month of Auguſt 1573, to ſtop the progreſs of the great duke of Muſcovy *(g)*. He was recalled three years after, to be entruſted with an embaſſy of great importance, which he diſcharged very well. He negotiated at firſt with ſome imperial cities, *&c.* and afterwards at the court of Rodolphus, lately made emperor. Afterwards he paſſed the Alps, to go to Rome, where he had ſeveral audiences of Pope Gregory XIII, and then went to Naples, to receive what was due to his maſter *(h)* for his ſhare of the eſtate of Bonna Sforza, mother to the queen of Sweden. He came back to Rome, and there had ſome conferences with cardinal

‘Erici, ludentis jam perjuriis, ut ſolent pueri aſtragalis (13). —— *The princes received friendly admonitions, from all hands, to beware of the enſuing inauguration of the queen, which the king would certainly make uſe of as a ſnare, to entrap and deſtroy his brothers, and the nobles of the kingdom, whom he ſuſpected, whom it would be difficult otherwiſe to draw into his net. They join themſelves likewiſe to certain leaders, already ſollicitous for their own and their ſafety, affirming that they deſerved to be oppreſſed, unleſs they prevented it by firſt deſtroying the oppreſſor: that it was in vain to truſt to the promiſes, ſo often ſworn to, and yet broken, of king Eric, who played with perjuries, as children at cockall.*’ Upon theſe occaſions, people muſt do nothing by halves: the diſcontented ought not to ſay only, *that there is ſome danger*; they muſt poſitively aſſure a preſumptive heir, that he is undone without recovery, unleſs he gets his adverſary out of the way; and that he has no other reſource, than to be beforehand with the tyrant, with out regarding the fair promiſes, or ſubmiſſions, which danger might extort from him. You ſee, that the managers of that intrigue in Sweden made uſe of this machine. Our Pontus, who was the principal director, bethought himſelf of a fine ſtratagem, which was, to ſtir up to that enterprize the ducheſs, who was to be queen, in caſe it ſhould ſucceed; well knowing, that ambition cauſes more violent motions in the heart of a woman, than in a man. See in what manner he ſpoke to her. ‘Madam, all the court wonders, that my lord your husband does not pity this miſerable kingdom, where every body, being infinitely offended at, and weary of, the inſolent cruelties and tyranny of the king his brother, he alone can eaſily remedy them. I do aſſure you, that all, both great and ſmall, caſt their eyes upon him, to put the crown upon his head, if he pleaſes to accept of it. He deſerves it as juſtly as that barbarous prince, who, in the judgment of all, is unworthy of it. If my lord your husband pleaſes, it is eaſy to make him maſter of this kingdom, and to render him a great prince from a duke, as he is now, who undoubtedly cannot avoid either death or perpetual impriſonment; from which, both he and you have already been freed, as it were by a miracle, when you leaſt expected it. I know for certain, from all the captains, that the ſix thouſand Scotchmen, whom Eric keeps in his pay, are diſcontented, and deſire no better than to change their maſter, for want of pay. Beſides, it is certain, that the dukes Magnus and Charles, his brothers, with the greateſt men in the kingdom, are extreamly offended and grieved, that ſo great a king, as their brother, ſhould have married the daughter of a man, whoſe profeſſion is odious, a wretched bum-bailiff. Therefore, madam, take this favourable occaſion, which preſents itſelf, by the forelock, for the good of the ſtate, the quiet of the people and provinces, and the advancement of your dear husband and family (14).’ Mr Oernhielm, who relates this diſcourſe, confeſſes, that he finds nothing like it in the hiſtory of that nation; but he might have read them in Florimond de Remond, with the anſwer of the ducheſs: *Theſe are fine diſcourſes, Pontus,* ſaid ſhe, *but difficult to be put in execution: however, be wiſe and diſcreet; I'll ſpeak of it to the duke my husband* (15). Florimond declares (16), that he found theſe words in the manuſcript memoirs of the embaſſador of France, ſent into Sweden in the year 1566, *who was eye-witneſs of the ſtrange changes which happened in that country* (17). We muſt not forget the circumſtance. Whilſt all things were preparing to celebrate the nuptials, a report was ſpread among the people, that the deſtruction of the king's brothers, and of the grandees of the kingdom, was reſolved upon. It was not known at firſt, whether that report was chimerical or well-grounded; but it became likely enough ſome time after, through the king's mad freaks; and, at laſt, the letters, which were written from all parts to his brothers, put it out of all queſtion (18). ‘Dum hæc parantur, manat in vulgus ſtruendarum in Principes fratres Proceresque Regni inſidiarum rumor, verus an vanus, ab initio non ſatis ſciebatur: Quem tamen ſimilimum vero mox fecerunt, ingenium Erici ſuſpicax, infidum, in modum Euripi æſtuans, & mobili ſemper ad obſequia pravè conſulentium..... (19) Tot rebus adſtructâ primo rumori fide.’

Theſe are commonly the preparatives towards revolutions; at firſt, news and reports are ſpread, and handed about from ſtreet to ſtreet, from town to town. There are ſpeculative men at hand to lay a ſtreſs upon them; and at laſt, grave men to confirm them by their letters. I do not pretend to ſay, however, that this is always done with a deſign; for it ſometimes happens, that ſuch reports are both true, and confirmed by a laudable zeal for the public good: and I do even obſerve that it is ſo in the preſent caſe. Florimond de Remond was concerned in king Eric's juſtification, to render more odious the behaviour of Pontus de la Gardie, whom he treats very ill, becauſe he looks upon him as one, who hindred Sweden from returning to the obedience of the Pope; yet, nevertheleleſs, he relates a thouſand abominable crimes committed by that king, and affirms that he advances nothing but what he had from very good hands (20). He quotes particularly (21) the letter, which

(e) Eques auratus. *Id. pag.* 19.

(f) Id. ibid. pag. 23.

(g) Id. ibid. pag. 111.

(h) Id. ibid. pag. 164.

(13) Oernhielm, ubi ſupra, pag. 16, 17.

(14) *Id. ibid. pag.* 17. He quotes an Hiſtory of Sweden, in manuſcript, written by Jolivet, advocate in the parliament, and bought of the author's ſon by count Magnus de la Gardie: It is in the library of Upſal.

(15) Florimond de Remond, ubi ſupra, pag. 497.

(16) Id. ibid. pag. 496.

(17) Id. ibid. pag. 494.

(18) Oernhielm, ibid. pag. 16.

(19) Id. ibid. pag. 17, 18.

(20) Florimond de Remond, ubi ſupra, pag. 499.

(21) Ibid. pag. 499.

cardinal Hoſius; but it is not known what affairs he treated on with the Pope (*i*) [*D*]. Nineteen months paſſed before he returned to Stockholm. He married, in January 1580, a natural daughter of the king of Sweden; and he was ordered, not many months after, to make an inroad into the dominions of the great duke of Muſcovy, with all the troops he ſhould find in Finland, and in the neighbouring provinces. He went upon this expedition in the quality of general (*k*); and his inſtructions were, among other things (*l*), to do no hurt to ſuch Muſcovites as ſhould ſubmit; and to allow the monks and nuns full liberty of conſcience, without taking from them their images or other religious utenſils [*E*]. He made himſelf maſter of the province of Carelia in a very little time (*m*). He was made (*n*) governor of Livonia and Ingria the following year, and continued his conqueſts upon the Muſcovites with great ſucceſs and prudence. He took from them the important place of Nerva, and ſeveral others, and (*o*) obliged them, in 1583, to agree to a truce of three years, without recovering any of the towns they had loſt. During this truce, he beſtowed his thoughts on the moſt effectual means to make his government proſperous. He was alſo (*p*) the ſecond plenipotentiary of Sweden, in the conferences held at Pernaw, in the year 1585,

(*i*) Id. ibid. pag. 165.

(*k*) Summi militiæ præfecti titulo. *Id. ibid. pag.* 174.

(*l*) Id. ibid. pag. 175.

(*m*) Id. ibid. pag. 176.

(*n*) Ibid. pag. 178.

(*o*) Id. ibid. pag. 190.

(*p*) Id. ibid. pag. 196.

---

which the new king wrote to Charles IX. Now after that, does he not make himſelf ridiculous by concluding with theſe words? *But oftentimes falſe reports are raiſed againſt princes, to make them odious to their ſubjects, and ſtir up the latter to rebellion, as was done againſt Eric, who died miſerably in priſon* (22).

Mr Oernhielm has made a good reflexion: to wit, that a prince, who follows nothing but the dictates of his paſſions, without regarding what is due to GOD, and his ſubjects, deprives himſelf of the moſt neceſſary ſupports of his greatneſs: for he does not find in his people that loyalty, which might check thoſe that attack him. ‘ Prævenit adventum Ducum fama collecti in Regem exercitus, ad quam ille excitus, implorat opem civium, quorum plerique pertæſi acerbi regiminis, ſurdas obvertunt aures precanti, hilares, adveniſſe tempus, quo jugi in dies ingraveſcentis leventur onere, antequam ſuccumbant penitus interituri. Itaque ſubnixus ope paucorum, in quorum animis nondum obſoleverat Majeſtas ſui Principis, congreſſuſque eum pluribus ac fortioribus, non poterat non redigi ad anguſtias. Atque tum præferoci Regi adparuit, & favore civium, & ſucceſſu fulciendæ potentiæ deſtitui potentes rerum, cum exutâ reverentiâ Numinis, ex amplâ poteſtate uſurpant nil præter trucem quidvis in ſubjectos agendi licentiam. Id Erico Regi accidit. Quem ſolio ſublimem vidit ſol oriens, eundem occidens vidit provolutum ad aliena genua (23). —— *The king received news of the arms raiſed againſt him, before the arrival of the dukes; at which being alarmed, he implores the aid of the citizens; moſt of whom, weary of his tyranny, turn a deaf ear to his entreaties, rejoicing that the time was come, in which they ſhould be eaſed of a burthen, which grew every day more heavy before they quite ſunk under it. Relying therefore on the aſſiſtance of a few, who ſtill preſerved ſome loyalty towards their prince, and engaging with men ſuperior in number and courage, he could not but be reduced to ſtraits. The haughty monarch then became ſenſible, that kings deprive themſelves of the only ſupport of their royalty, the favour of their ſubjects, when, throwing off all regard to the deity, they employ their power only in oppreſſing their ſubjects. This was the fate of king Eric: the ſame perſon, whom the riſing ſun ſaw ſeated on a throne, the ſetting beheld groveling at another's feet.*’ The number of princes, that have been either aſſaſſinated or impriſoned for their tyranny, is ſo great; and, on the other hand, the number of thoſe, that have been able to maintain their male-adminiſtration, and have not haſtened the coronation either of a ſon, a brother, *&c.* by their violent conduct, is ſo very ſmall, that one cannot ſufficiently wonder, how there can be any, who do not take warning by thoſe examples.

Ad generum Cereris ſine cæde & ſanguine pauci
Deſcendunt reges & ſicca morte tyranni.

Few tyrants without blood reſign their breath,
Or ſink maturely in the arms of death.

As for the reſt, the revolutions of ſtates, whereby crowns are transferred from one head to another, have always been ſo frequent, that it is matter of wonder they have not been more ſo: for, after all, the worſt that, can happen, is to miſs one's aim; whereas, if a man ſucceeds, he will find a thouſand ways to defend himſelf againſt all imputations of injuſtice; and he will never want approvers, or alliances.

[*D*] *It is not known what affairs he treated on with the Pope.*] Mr Oernhielm owns, that he could not find it out. *Quid Regis nomine cum Pontifice egerit non perinde liquet, cum regiorum mandatorum nihil ea de re videre contigerit* (25). He looks upon as a fable what father Maimbourg relates (26); *that Pontus de la Gardie was inſtructed to treat with Pope Gregory XIII, about the reduction of Sweden to the obedience of the church, upon certain conditions*; which where (27), I. *That the nobility ſhould freely enjoy the church-lands they were poſſeſſed of*: II. *That the biſhops and prieſts ſhould keep the wives they married*: III. *That the laity ſhould be admitted to receive the ſacrament in both kinds*: IV. *That divine ſervice ſhould be performed in the vulgar tongue.* This is taken out of Florimond de Remond; who adds (28), *that la Gardie, at his return, found the king alarmed being apprehenſive, leſt, by meddling with religion, theſe very men ſhould take the crown, from off his head, who had placed it there: that poor king, not being able, or not daring, to reſtore intirely the catholic church, compounded with the Lutheran archbiſhops and biſhops, who were the principal lords, by leaving them, during their lives, their wives, the communion in two kinds, and the maſs in the vulgar tongue. The eccleſiaſtics might have been gained, ſince they were allowed their bedfellows; but thoſe, who wore a ſword by their ſides, would not let go their holds. Thus that deſign came to nothing; not without ſuſpicion, that la Gardie himſelf had put a ſtop to it, being particularly concerned, by reaſon of the great eſtate he enjoyed, through the favour of his maſter, whom he governed entirely.*

[*E*] *Without taking from them their images, or other religious utenſils.*] This prohibition was neceſſary; for it had been ill obſerved before. ‘ Omninò autem vis omnis ac injuria abeſſe deberet à corporibus ac bonis ipſorum, qui ſe ritè huic Regno ſubmitterent, præcipuè verò ab his, qui peculiari ſolitoque ei genti ritu, etiamſi à ſacris penes nos receptis nonnuſquam recederent, ſexu utroque incolerent monaſteria, quorum ornamenta, imagines, cæteramque ſacram ſuppellectilem intacta inviolataque eis linqui præcipit, SECUS QUAM FACTUM HACTENUS (29).’ However, this order of the king's was not regarded; for they took out of the church of Carelgrod the images, ſtatues, and prieſtly veſtments, and tranſported them into Finland, for the uſe of the pariſhes there. The king was diſpleaſed with it, and threatened to puniſh with death, for the future, ſuch as ſhould violate his prohibition. Let us hear once more the Swediſh hiſtorian. ‘ Utcunque non probârit, quod, privato auſu, ſculptas pictaſque tabulas aris impoſitas, ſtolaſque, quibus ſacra peracturi ſacerdotes amiciuntur, templo arcis Kexholmenſis detractas, nonnulli in vicinam Finlandiam, ad earum, in quibus habitârunt, parœciarum templa iis exornanda, avehi curaverint, quas reductas in ſacrario templi arcis Viburgenſis locari præcepit, donec ipſe de eis aliter conſtitueret: interminatione mortis prohibens, ne quis regno ſe ſubmittens ex hoſtibus, ulla adficeretur injuria, aut horum devictorum templis ac monaſteriis ulla vel minima vis fieret (30).’

[*F*] *He*

(22) Ibid.

(23) Oernhielm, ubi ſupra, pag. 18.

(24) Juvenal. Sat. X, ver. 112.

(25) Oernhielm, ubi ſupra, pag. 165.

(26) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra.

(27) Id. ibid. pag. 253.

(28) Flor. de Remond, ubi ſupra, cap. xvii, pag. 502.

(29) Oernhielm, pag. 175.

(30) Id. ibid. pag. 176.

1585, with the ambaſſadors of Poland, about the peace between the two kingdoms. Theſe conferences were ſoon broken up: After which, a negotiation was ſet on foot with the ambaſſadors of Muſcovy, either for the prolonging the truce, or for a treaty of peace. He periſhed unfortunately in a river [*F*], during the courſe of theſe negociations, the fifth of November 1585 (*q*). He was interred at Revel, where four years after they erected to him a marble tomb (*r*). His poſterity is ſtill very flouriſhing in Sweden [*G*]. I ſhall ſay, in another place (*s*), ſomething relating to this Article.

(*q*) Id. ibid. pag. 213.

(*r*) Id. ibid. pag. 214.

(*s*) In the article TYPOT, remark [*A*].

[*F*] *He periſhed unfortunately in a river.*] He and his colleagues had parted with the embaſſadors of Muſcovy, without having agreed upon any thing, ſave only a truce of fifteen days. He embarked on the river for Nerva; but, when the ſhip was come within half a league of that city, ſome pieces of cannon being diſcharged, a plank happened to ſtart, and, the water getting in through that hole, the moſt timorous threw themſelves on the other ſide, ſo that the ſhip was over-ſet: La Gardie was one of thoſe, who were drowned (31). This is the account Mr Oernhielm gives of that accident. There is in that part of his book a marginal note, wherein the narrative of Father Maimbourg is cenſured. *As Pontus de la Gardie*, theſe are that father's words (32), *returning from his embaſſy of Muſcovy, was ready to enter into the port of Revel, the capital city of the Swediſh Livonia, of which he was viceroy, the bark, in the ſtern whereof he ſat in an arm-chair, having ſtruck with great force againſt a rock, the head was lifted up ſo high with the blow, that two of his gentlemen, who ſtood up before him, being thrown down, and falling on his chair, cauſed the ſtern to ſink yet lower, ſo that they fell all three together in an inſtant into the ſea, and were no more ſeen.* Florimond de Remond, the original author of this account, has added to it two falſities, which Maimbourg has not copied: 1. That la Gardie had a conference with the great duke: 2. That, having ended his negociation, he put to ſea with his ſhips. In the marginal note, Father Maimbourg is accuſed of not underſtanding geography: for he ſuppoſes, that, on the frontiers of Muſcovy, there is a river, that goes down to Revel; which is falſe. He is blamed for ſaying, that Revel is the capital city of Livonia; he ſhould have ſaid, of Eſthonia: and he is blamed likewiſe for ſaying, that Pontus was governour of Livonia: for, ſays Mr Oernhielm, that province did not then belong to Sweden, having been conquered ſince by Guſtavus Adolphus. Methinks this laſt cenſure is not reaſonable, ſince Mr Oernhielm ſays expreſly, that Pontus de la Gardie was made governour of Livonia and Ingria in the year 1581 (33). I ſhould have been contented with cenſuring the word viceroy, which Maimbourg has borrowed from Florimond de Remond.

n Odd sort of a Bank
t three man child —
er ballance, sideways
rely full as small
that represented
Raphael in his
rtoon of the Miraculous
aught of Fishes —

The article GARDIE, in the Supplement to Moreri, being taken out of Father Maimbourg, you will eaſily find in theſe remarks, wherein that is defective.

(31) Id. ibid. pag. 213. Confer Thuanum, lib. lxxxiii, pag. 57, & Jolivet, apud Oernhielm, pag. 214.

(33) Maimb. Hiſtoire du Lutheran. Tom. II, pag. 260, 261.

(33) Etiam auſpicio novo ſupremi per Ingriam ac Livoniam Gubernatoris titulo ac munere loca priora repetiit. *Oernhielm, ubi ſupra, pag.* 178.

[*G*] *His poſterity is ſtill very flouriſhing in Sweden.*] He left two ſons and one daughter. JOHN DE LA GARDIE, the eldeſt ſon had none but daughters, who were very advantageouſly married. JAMES DE LA GARDIE, the younger brother, was made count (34), ſenator, and great conſtable of the kingdom, preſident of the council of war, *&c.* His eldeſt ſon, MAGNUS GABRIEL DE LA GARDIE, married the ſiſter of Charles Guſtavus, king of Sweden, and was father to GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS DE LA GARDIE, ſenator of the kingdom, and preſident of the ſupream council of Sweden. Gabriel Magnus's brothers had alſo great employments, and left children behind them. See the pedigree of that family at the beginning of our Pontus's life. The latter left two brothers in France, who were married; but their male iſſue is extinct (35).

(34) Maimbourg, and, after him, the author of the Supplement to Moreri, are miſtaken in giving that quality to Pontus de la Gardie.

(35) Oernhielm, pag. 5.

GARISSOLES, (ANTONY) paſtor and profeſſor of divinity at Montauban, his birth-place, was a very eminent divine. He was born about the year 1587, admitted into the miniſterial function at the age of twenty three, or twenty four, years, and appointed one of the miniſters of the church of Puylaurens. He was ſettled in the profeſſorſhip of divinity at Montauban in the year 1627, after having been appointed for that employment by ſeveral ſynods of his province, and charged particularly by a national ſynod, held at Caſtres, to go and exerciſe that function; which he diſcharged glorioufly 'till the year 1650, in which he died. He compoſed a great many books, ſome of which have been publiſhed [*A*], and the others have moſt of them periſhed in the late perſecution. He took a great delight in Latin poetry, and had the ſatiſfaction to ſee in print the epic poem he had made, to ſing the great exploits of Guſtavus Adolphus [*B*]. I ſhall ſpeak of it below (*a*). He was moderator in the national ſynod held at Charenton in the year 1645 (*b*) (§ *α*).

(*a*) In the remark [*B*].

(*b*) Taken from a manuſcript memoir.

[(§ *α*) On that occaſion, they ſay, upon ſome miſconduct of the famous Milletiere, Gariſſoles the moderator rebuffed that falſe brother with theſe terrible words of our Saviour: *That thou do'ſt do quickly.* You take me then for a Judas, ſaid Milletiere to him. Not entirely ſo, replied Gariſſoles; for Judas *had* the purſe, but you ſeek for it. REM. CRIT.]

[*A*] *He compoſed many books, ſome of which have been publiſhed.*] He publiſhed a volume of ſermons, intituled, *La Voye de Salut — The way to Salvation.* His other printed books are in Latin; ſome theſes of divinity; a treatiſe *De Imputatione primi peccati Adæ*; another, *De Chriſto Mediatore*; *The Explanation of the Catechiſm.* This laſt work was begun by Mr Charlés, Mr Gariſſoles's colleague. It is to be obſerved concerning the book, *De Imputatione primi peccati Adæ*, that the author compoſed it by order of his ſynod, after he had had an amicable conference upon that ſubject with Mr Amyrault, in the preſence of the national ſynod held at Charenton. Mr Amyrault did not defend his own opinions, but only thoſe of Mr de la Place (1), who had deſired him to ſtand proxy for him, and to explain and defend his ſentiments before the aſſembly. Mr Gariſſoles, having dedicated his book to the four evangelical cantons, cauſed it to be preſented to them by his eldeſt ſon, who was honourably received every where. A year after, they made a fine preſent to the father; to whom they ſent four great ſilver gilt cups, exquiſitely wrought, accompanied with a letter in Latin, full of encomiums, and ſigned by the four ſyndics of the four cantons (2).

(1) See the article AMYRAULT, between citations (*g*) and (*h*).

(2) Taken from a manuſcript memoir.

[*B*] *He ſaw printed the epic poem he had made for . . . . Guſtavus.*] It is called *Adolphis.* The author had dedicated it to queen Chriſtina, and to the five grandees of the kingdom; but he was obliged to alter the epiſtle dedicatory, becauſe his eldeſt ſon wrote to him from Stockholm, that it would not be poſſible to preſent that work, unleſs it were dedicated to the queen alone. He therefore made a new epiſtle, addreſſed only to that princeſs, and ſo the poem was preſented. *The queen received it in a moſt gracious and obliging manner*, and ſhewed a great deal of civility to the author's ſon. She told him, that certain people had endeavoured, more than once, to give her an ill opinion of the poem, and of the poet: *But that, having peruſed it, ſhe was extreamly pleaſed with it, and was filled with veneration and admiration for it's author. Theſe were her very words. Grotius was ſuſpected* *of having endeavoured to do that ill office; though, having been desired to give his opinion of that piece, even before it was printed, he had given a great character of it, as wanting little of being perfect. However, the book was greatly commended by the queen; the author was honoured with a fine gold medal; and his eldest son had the expences of his journey largely repaid him* (3). Note, that Mr Gariſſoles made a poem on the coronation of that queen.

GARNACHE (Francis de Rohan, Lady de la), was daughter of Renatus de Rohan, firſt of the name, and of Iſabella d'Albret, daughter of John d'Albret, king of Navarre. She was conſequently couſin-german to Joan d'Albret (*a*), mother of Henry the great. Neither ſuch powerful and illuſtrious relations, nor the moſt ancient nobility of the houſe of Rohan, were able to ſecure her againſt the moſt grievous injuſtice, that can be done to a perſon of her ſex. The duke of Nemours had promiſed her marriage, and thereupon had obtained all the favours he could expect from her: To be plain, he got her with child. When he was called upon to perform his promiſe, he laughed at it with the greater confidence, in that he ſaw, that Antony, king of Navarre, though firſt prince of the blood, had neither courage nor authority enough to force him to repair the honour of the lady. It was ſtill worſe, after the king of Navarre, who had ſome ſort of credit during the triumvirate, was killed. The duke of Nemours, who had left France at the beginning of the troubles, becauſe it had been diſcovered, that he had a mind to ſteal away the duke of Anjou, brother of king Charles IX (*b*), was ſoon recalled, and ſerved ſucceſsfully againſt thoſe of the reformed religion: This, together with the death of the king of Navarre, encouraged him to preſs the court of Rome to declare his engagement void. He obtained all he deſired (*c*): The juſt right of the lady Rohan was entirely oppreſſed, becauſe ſhe had declared herſelf for the Huguenot party [*A*]; ſo that ſhe was forced to undergo the diſgrace of being a mother, without being married, and the grief of ſeeing her faithleſs gallant enter into wedlock with the widow of the duke of Guiſe, and as much reſpected every where, and careſſed by the ladies, as if he had been the honeſteſt man in the world. All the comfort ſhe had left, was the title of prince of Genevois, which ſhe gave her ſon [*B*]; and as for herſelf, ſhe was called the lady de la Garnache (*d*), or the ducheſs of Loudunois (*e*). She maintained herſelf dexterouſly in her eſtate during the civil-wars [*C*]. It is likely that Brantome ſpeaks of her adventure

[*A*] *She declared for the Huguenot party.*] If you will not truſt d'Aubigné, we muſt ſtrengthen his teſtimony by that of Thuanus. 'The clandeſtine marriage between the duke of Nemours, and Frances de Rohan, was again mentioned, but only with a deſign to caſt the plantiff, in hatred of her religion, and to put the other in a capacity to marry the dowager of Guiſe (1).' Let us now hear Thuanus. 'Eodem tempore, *that is, in* 1566, lis olim agitata inter Franciſcam Roanam & Jacobum Sabaudum Nemoroſium, & ſuperſtite Navarro qui Roanæ cognatæ patrocinabatur intermiſſa demum renovata, & prævalente hinc Nemoroſii gratia, inde ODIO RELIGIONIS PROTESTANTIUM cui Roana addicta erat, prægravante, interventu Pontificis deciſa eſt, ſchedula Nemoroſii de matrimonio præſentibus verbis contracto irrita pronunciata (2). —— *At the same time, the cause between Frances de Rohan, and the duke de Nemours, which lay dormant during the life of the king of Navarre, who favoured his kinſwoman de Rohan, was again ſet on foot, and, through the duke's intereſt on one ſide, and* HATRED OF THE PROTESTANT RELIGION, *to which the lady de Rohan was addicted, on the other, was decided by the intervention of the Pope, who diſannulled the duke's promiſe of marriage.*'

[*B*] *All the conſolation, ſhe had left, was the title of prince of Genevois, which ſhe gave to her ſon.*] If I had followed Virgil's notions, I ſhould have ſaid, that that lady's grief for the infidelity of her gallant was alleviated by the ſon he left her; but it is a long time ſince our ladies are no more of the ſame temper with the Dido of that great Roman poet. That good princeſs's greateſt ſorrow was, that her perfidious lover went from her without leaving one of his race behind him; and, if ſhe had had a little babe, or at leaſt had found her ſelf with child by him, her affliction had been a great deal leſs.

Saltem ſi qua mihi de te ſuſcepta fuiſſet
Ante fugam ſoboles, ſi quis mihi parvulus aulâ
Luderet Æneas, qui te tantum ore referret;
Non equidem omnino capta aut deſerta viderer (3).

Oh! that ——
E'er from my ſight for ever thou wer't gone,
Thy kind embrace had bleſs'd me with a ſon;
Some young Æneas, in whoſe lovely face
His father's features fondly I might trace.
Some comfort in thy abſence this would be,
Nor were poor Dido quite undone by thee.

Such a tender ſentiment would now-a-days be exploded, even in a romance, it is ſo contrary to cuſtom. The greateſt ſorrow of thoſe kind-hearted ladies, to whom a gallant breaks his promiſe, is, not for having granted him more than they ought, but for not having been able to prevent the conſequences. A big-belly, or a child, are ſuch convictions of diſhonour, as no chicanry can elude: they are ſpeaking proofs, & *luce meridiana clariores*: they are witneſſes without reproach, & *omni exceptione majores*. That is therefore the principal ſource of a lady's misfortune and deſpair, *Queſto e quel che piu inaſpri i miei martiri*. *And indeed, I believe*, thus Brantôme ſpeaks (4) of the ladies he had ſeen at court, *that the beſt time they ever had, (I put it to their conſciences) was, when they were maids; for they had their free will to be nuns, and votaries, as well of Venus, as of Diana; provided they could have been ſo wiſe and cunning as to know how to preſerve their bellies from ſwelling*. In ſome reſpects, it muſt be confeſſed, that the fate of the lady Garnache was pretty like that of Dido: for her gallant pretended, as well as Æneas, that he never intended to marry.

- - - Nec conjugis unquam
Prætendi tædas, aut hæc in fœdera veni (5).

I never dreamt of marriage, witneſs heav'n!
Nor for ſuch purpoſe to theſe ſhores was driven.

[*C*] *She maintained herſelf dexterouſly . . . during the civil-wars.*]. I ſhall quote here no other author than d'Aubigné. 'We muſt add, *ſays he* (6), that the lady de la Garnache, ſiſter to the duke of Rohan, held the town of la Garnache, and the caſtle of Beauvois on the ſea, in neutrality, preſerving her ſelf by the ſubmiſſions and artifices, which cannot be adventure [*D*]. Mr Varillas has mentioned it at large, not without committing many faults [*E*]; ſome of which are ſo very groſs, that one cannot but wonder at it.

---

(3) Taken from the ſame memoir.

(*a*) Henry d'Albret, king of Navarre, ſon of John, and brother of Iſabella d'Albret, was father of that Joan d'Albret.

(*b*) Le Laboureur, Addit à Caſtelnau, Tom. I, pag. 808, Tom. II, pag. 34.

(*c*) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, Tom. II, pag 34, ex Thuano, lib. xxxix.

(*d*) It is the name of a town in Poictou.

(*e*) This duchy was erected in 1579.

(1) D'Aubigné, Tom. I, lib. iv, cap vi, ad ann. 1566.

(2) Thuan. lib. xxxix, pag. m. 795.

(3) Virgil. Æn. lib. iv, ver. 327.

(4) Diſcours de Cather. de Medicis, pag. 100.

(5) Virgil. Æn. lib. iv, ver. 338.

(6) D'Aubigné, Tom. III, cap. xiii, ad ann. 1587, pag. 65.

‘ be blamed in her ſex and condition. Her ſon (called the prince of Genevois, upon pretence of his mother's marriage with the duke of Nemours) having made himſelf maſter of la Garnache, by the help and contrivance of the ſervants, that depended upon him, hoped to make it a place of arms for his party, and thereby to provide for his own neceſſities. He attempted alſo upon Beauvois, by intelligence; but his mother, being an artful woman, he found himſelf her priſoner. The iſſue of all this was, that the king of Navarre, ſolliciting his liberty, obtained it, and, by the ſame means, the town, when the lady of the place, who was alſo called the ducheſs of Loudunois, ſaw the affairs of the country pretty favourable for the religion ſhe profeſſed; becauſe, by this time, there were reckoned eight places, that held for the reformed.’ He ſpeaks at large of the ſiege of la Garnache (7); the Proteſtant garriſon whereof was at laſt forced to ſurrender to the duke of Nevers. One may confidently reckon, among the *ſubmiſſions and artifices* of that lady, the letters ſhe wrote to her brother, when beſieged in Luſignan (8). She did all ſhe could to perſuade him to accept of the honourable terms, which the duke of Montpenſier offerred him; but all in vain.

[*D*] *It is likely that Brantôme ſpeaks of her adventure.*] He ſays, that he has ‘ known a gentlewoman of high degree, who happened to be with child by a very brave and gallant prince . . . King Henry was the firſt who knew it, and was extreamly troubled at it; for ſhe was ſomewhat related to him . . . . One night, at a ball, he danced with her the dance of the Torch, and afterwards made her dance, with another, the Gaillard, and other dances, wherein ſhe ſhewed her diſpoſition and dexterity better than ever, with her ſhape, which was very fine, and which ſhe fitted ſo well that day, that her big-belly did not in the leaſt appear; inſomuch that the king . . . . . came and whiſpered to one of his moſt intimate familiars, thoſe people are very wicked, and wretched, that have invented the report, that that poor lady was big with child . . . . They have reported a falſehood, and are much to blame. Thus that good prince excuſed that fair and honourable lady, and ſaid as much to the queen that night, being in bed with her: but the queen, not truſting to that, cauſed her to be ſearched the next morning, in her own preſence, and found her to have gone ſix months with child; the lady confeſſing that all this had been done upon a promiſe of marriage. Therefore the king, who was very good-natured, cauſed the whole myſtery to be kept as ſecret as could be, without expoſing the lady, though the queen was very angry at it. They ſent her, without noiſe, to her neareſt relations, where ſhe was brought to bed of a fine boy, who nevertheleſs was ſo unhappy as never to be owned by his ſuppoſed father; and the law-ſuit about it was long depending, but the mother never got any thing by it (9).’ It is eaſy to know, by this account, the lady de la Garnache, who was maid of honour to Catherine de Medicis, when that accident befel her (10). She was not the only lady, who got a big-belly in that queen's ſervice.

[*E*] *Mr Varillas . . . . has committed many faults.*] Theſe are his words (11): ‘ James, firſt duke of Nemours, ſirnamed the fair and gallant knight, by way of excellence, had been in love with Frances de Rohan, who appeared at court under the name of Mademoiſelle de Leon . . . . He had given her a promiſe of marriage in due form. That lady added, that he had pronounced the matrimonial vow, and that the marriage had been conſummated. No iſſue was come from it; and things ſtill remained in an uncertainty, when Poltrot killed the duke of Guiſe. *The duke of Nemours's paſſion for the ducheſs of Guiſe was preſently rekindled, as ſoon* as ſhe was a widow, *and he married her before Mademoiſelle de Leon* had taken all her meaſures to put a ſtop to it. Her relations, who had but indifferently aſſiſted her before the infidelity of the duke of Nemours, grew incenſed when they ſaw him married; and the king of Navarre, her ſecond couſin, thoſe of the houſe of Rohan, and all the other lords of the kingdom, that were related to them, let the duke of Nemours know, that, unleſs he gave ſatisfaction to Mademoiſelle de Leon, he muſt fight them all in a ſingle combat, one after another. This was a terrible extremity. And, tho' the duke of Nemours was one of the moſt valiant men in the world, it was not poſſible for him to ſatisfy ſo many perſons, without loſing his life at laſt in the quarrel. This made him uſe precautions, which for ſome years exempted him from fighting. . . . . The ducheſs of Nemours was brought to bed of two ſons . . . . and the lady Leon took upon her to prove, that they were not legitimate. Things were prepared for a trial with great ſolemnity. The moſt famous profeſſors of the civil-law in Europe were conſulted, as well as the moſt celebrated lawyers of the parliaments of France; and the majority of them anſwered, that the queſtion appeared difficult, and that the beſt way was to accommodate the matter. The quarrel about religion, which immediately followed the other about marriage, did but inflame it; for, on one ſide, the houſe of Rohan turned Calviniſt. . . . . . The lady Leon was a younger ſiſter of Bretagne, and by conſequence had but a ſmall portion. She loved expence; and it was by furniſhing her wherewithal to maintain it, that the duke of Nemours had gained her eſteem. They attacked her on that weak ſide; and the queen-mother offerred her, that, provided ſhe did not inſiſt upon her pretenſions, the town of Loudun, and it's juriſdiction, ſhould be diſmembered from the royal demeſne; and, if the whole was not worth fifty thouſand livres a year, the adjacent lands ſhould be bought, and added to it, to make up that ſum; that the whole together ſhould be erected into a duchy and peerdom: and that the patent ſhould import, in expreſs terms, that that duchy and peerdom ſhould paſs from the lady Leon to her iſſue, male and and female for ever, ſuppoſing ſhe had any: and, in caſe ſhe had none, to all the males and females of the houſe of Rohan alſo for ever. Mademoiſelle de Leon rejected at firſt the propoſal of the queen-mother . . . . She was ſo teazed by her relations, that ſhe durſt no more openly oppoſe an accommodation. But freſh obſtacles were ſtill raiſed, when they thought they had overcome the former. The parliament of Paris, who were to regiſter the patent for erecting Loudun into a duchy and peerdom, made a ſcruple of it, alledging, that, to make a lawful ſettlement of a duchy and peerdom, there muſt be found an eſtate, of which the future duke and peer be incommutable lord; that is, that he ſhould be ſo abſolutely poſſeſſed of it, that none ſhould have a right to deprive him of it; which could not be with reſpect to the lordſhip of Loudun, ſince it was of the royal demeſne; and that whatſoever precautions ſhould be taken to divide it from it, it would ſtill be lawful for the king to re-unite it; and though his majeſty ſhould neglect it, he being but uſufructuary of his kingdom, his ſucceſſors would nevertheleſs be in a capacity to do it. It was difficult to confute this reaſon by an oppoſite one of equal ſtrength: but the queen-mother would have over-ruled it by all her credit, and the authority of the king her ſon, if the change, which happened in the perſon of the duke of Nemours, had not hindered her. That prince . . . . . was afflicted with the palſy . . . . and died, after having languiſhed in his bed for two whole years (12). Every body compaſſionating his indiſpoſition, the lady Leon ſuperſeded her proſecution, and the judges would never hear it mentioned, after the death of him, who had given ground for it. The king was extreamly glad he had no more occaſion to alienate his demeſne, and to create a new duchy and peerdom upon ſo unworthy an occaſion . . . And, having conſented to the alienation of Loudun, out of meer complaiſance to the queen-mother, he was glad he was diſpenſed with the performance of his promiſe by the death of the duke of Nemours.’

CENSURE of that paſſage of Varillas.

In the firſt place, I take notice, that the lady in queſtion is called by Brantôme *Mademoiſelle de Rohan* (13), not *Mademoiſelle de Leon*. II. I have ſhewn (14) by the teſtimony of Thuanus, that the law-ſuit of the lady was definitively determined, to her prejudice, in

(7) Ibid. lib. ii, cap. xii, & xvi.

(8) Thuan. lib. lix, ad ann. 1574, pag. 99.

(9) Brant. Dames Gal. Tom. II, pag. m. 370.

(10) Brantome, in the diſcourſe of Catherine de Medicis, puts the lady de Rhoan at the head of the maids of honour, whom he had ſeen at the court of France.

(11) Varill. Hiſt. de Henry III, lib. v, pag 18, & ſeq. Dutch Edit.

(12) *He died at Anneſſi, in the county of Foucigny, the nineteenth of June*, 1583. Hilarion de Coſte, Elog. des Dames, Tom. I, pag. 79.

(13) Diſcours de Catherine de Medicis, pag. m. 100.

(14) In the remark [*A*].

in the year 1566. The promiſe of marriage, which ſhe produced, was declared void. Mr Varillas knew it well enough, when he compoſed his hiſtory of Charles IX. See the words, which I quote in the margin (15), they poſitively declare, that the duke of Nemours's marriage with the ducheſs of Guiſe was preceded by the ſentence, which made void the pretenſions of the lady Rohan (16). Why then does he ſay, in this place, that, before this lady *had taken all her meaſures to put a ſtop to it*, the duke of Nemours had married the widow of the duke of Guiſe? III. How is it likely, that that lady renewed her proſecution after the birth of the two ſons of the duke of Nemours by that widow? That marriage was concluded after the definitive ſentence, which ruined the pretenſions of the lady Rohan, and therefore nothing could be alledged againſt the iſſue of that marriage. IV. And therefore thoſe conſultations of profeſſors in civil-law, and of lawyers, thoſe ſolemn *Preparations for a trial*, touching the quality of the duke of Nemours's two ſons, are meer chimeras. V. The quarrel about religion was not ſubſequent to the birth of thoſe two children; for that duke did not marry the dowager of Guiſe till after the law-ſuit with the lady Rohan had been determined in the year 1566, before which time there had been a moſt bloody war about religion. VI. The houſe of Rohan did not turn Calviniſt after the birth of the duke of Nemours's two ſons; for Mr Varillas remarks (17), that, in the year 1562, the viſcount de Rohan embraced Calviniſm, in hopes of marrying the heireſs of Soubize. VII. That compaſſion, which, we are told, prevailed with the lady Rohan to ſuperſede her proſecution againſt the duke of Nemours, who was ſick of the palſy, is alſo another chimera. VIII. According to Mr Varillas, king Henry III did not erect Loudun into a duchy; the duke of Nemours's death exempted him from the performance of his promiſe. Nevertheleſs it is certain, that that erection was made in favour of the lady Rohan. IX. The moſt enormous fault of that author, is, his ſaying, that the duke of Nemours had no children by that lady. See, above (18), the paſſage of the Sieur d'Aubigné (19).

(15) *As ſoon as* the definitive ſentence was ſignified *to the lady Rohan*, the duke of Nemours married the dowager of Guiſe. *Varillas, Hiſtoire de Charles IX, Tom. II, pag. 34, ad ann.* 1566.

(16) *See* Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, pag. 76.

(17) Hiſtoire de Charles IX, lib. iii, *at the beginning.*

(18) In the remark [*C*].

(19) *See alſo* Le Laboureur, Additions aux Memoires de Caſtelnau, Tom. I, pag. 808.

GARONNE, in Latin *Garumna*, one of the four great rivers of France. Papyrius Maſſo (*a*) will furniſh you with ſeveral paſſages of the poets concerning this river. Add to that, the pretty and pleaſant fiction of Meſſieurs Chapelle, and Bachaumont (*b*), about it's flux and reflux. I content myſelf to mark ſome faults of Moreri [*A*].

(*a*) In Deſcriptione Franciæ per Flumina.

(*b*) In the relation of their travels.

[*A*] *I content myſelf to mark ſome faults of Moreri.*] I. He ſays, that the Garonne croſſes the plain of Aran, in the county of Comminges. This ſhews he did not underſtand the Latin he copied; for theſe are the words of Mr Baudrand, whom Mr Moreri has falſely tranſlated: *Oritur (Garumna) in montibus Auræ in Arania valle Hiſpanicæ ditionis in confinio Aragonicæ.* Mr Baudrand does not ſpeak of the plain of Aran, but of the valley of Aran, and ſays, that it belongs to Spain, in the borders of Arragon; but not that it is a part of the country of Comminges. II. He ſhould not have ſaid, that the Garonne paſſes through Rieux, but near Rieux. The Sieur Coulon has avoided that fault, by ſaying, that it runs along the *biſhopric of Rieux in the county of Foix* (1). Theſe laſt words are falſe, ſince the city of Rieux is not of the county of Foix; and that part of the dioceſe of Rieux, along which the Garonne runs, is not in the county of Foix. III. It is not true, that the Garonne receives, at Toulouſe, the Little Lers, which runs into it far below that city. IV. He ſhould not have forgot, that, a league above Touloule, it receives a river much more conſiderable than the Little Lers, I mean the river Ariege. *Inde patentes & fertiles campos rigans duobus milliaribus à Tholoſa in vinculo* (2) *S. Crucis* Aurigeram (3) *fluvium excipiens, arenulis aureis intermicantem, jam ſuis aquis & externis valentior* Tholoſam *Tectoſagum Metropolim alluit*: Theſe are Papyrius Maſſo's words (4). V. To ſay, as Mr Moreri does, that the Garonne comes near Bourdeaux, ſhews as if he would have the readers fancy, that it does not waſh the walls of that city; which would be a moſt falſe imagination. VI. He ſays, *the Garonne and the Dordogne form one ſingle channel of the Garonne, which paſſes by Blaye*: Which is a phraſe ſo barbarous, that the moſt ignorant Walloon would have expreſſed the thing better. VII. He ſhould not have ſaid, that there is on the right ſide of the Garonne, and on the ſhore of Xaintonge, a town called *Marmande*, but a town called *Mortagne.* VIII. Inſtead of *Pavillac* and of *Soulac*, he ſhould have ſaid *Paulliac* and *Souillac.* The ſecond and fifth faults are found in Mr Baudrand's Geographical Dictionary.

(1) Traité des Rivieres de France, Part. I, pag. 475.

(2) It ſhould be *vinculo*, a little village.

(3) The author does not well tranſlate this word by that of *La Riege.*

(4) In Deſcriptione Franciæ per Flumina, pag. 433. Edit. Pariſ. 1685.

GEDDICCUS (SIMON), doctor of divinity, and miniſter at Magdeburg, is only known to me by the anſwer, he publiſhed, in the year 1595, to a little book, wherein the author pretended to prove, that women do not belong to human kind, *Mulieres non eſſe homines* [*A*]. This is much more happily expreſſed in Latin, than in

[*A*] *The author pretended to prove* ..... mulieres non eſſe homines.] I have ſpoken elſewhere (1) of the great noiſe and ſtorms, that were raiſed againſt poor Acidalius, who had given his bookſeller a copy of that diſſertation; and I have advertiſed my reader in that place, that I ſhould ſpeak here of that little book. I queſtion very much, if Gediccus has underſtood the true intention of the author. He has beſtowed great pains in making a formal apology for the fair ſex; which ſhews he thought he confuted a book, the principal deſign of which was to abuſe the women: wherein, in my opinion, he has ſhewn no great penetration. The author of the Diſſertation does not principally aim at the women; and it is only by accident, and very indirectly, that he abuſes them. His principal deſign is to turn into ridicule the ſyſtem of the Socinians, and their method of playing with the moſt formal and expreſs texts of the word of GOD, touching the divinity of Chriſt. This has been obſerved long ago by a Journaliſt. Theſe are his words (2): 'Why ſhould not every body be allowed to convince themſelves, that the Socinians make uſe of trifling and wretched cavils; and that it has been proved, that, by their gloſſes, one might elude all the paſſages of ſcripture, which prove that women are human creatures, I mean, of the ſame ſpecies with men. This was the ſubject-matter of a little book, which was publiſhed towards the end of the laſt century, *mulieres homines non eſſe*; to which one Simon Gediccus, a miniſter in the country of Brandenburgh, made a very ſerious anſwer, not being aware of the deſign of the author, which was to write a violent ſatire againſt the Socinians: For how can one turn them into ridicule, or mortify them more effectually, than by letting them ſee, that the gloſſes, whereby they combate the conſubſtantiality of the ſon of GOD, are ſufficient to hinder us from proving by ſcripture, that women are humane creatures?' Cochleus made uſe of the ſame machine, but to very little purpoſe, againſt Luther. He wrote ſome books, wherein, after the Lutheran way, he pretended to prove, by paſſages of ſcripture, that JESUS CHRIST is not GOD; that GOD ought to obey the devil; and that the Bleſſed Virgin did not preſerve her virginity. 'Cùm Lutherani ſcripturis ad ſuas nugas aptatis luderent, Cocherus (3) in actis Lutheri anno 1527, ſe librum ex Scripturis malè conſertis conſarcinaſſe teſtatur, ad probandum, quòd Chriſtus non ſit Deus, additque anno 1528 ſe item ſimili arte ac ſcopo, ſcripſiſſe de obedientia Diabolo debita à Deo, & de B. Virginis integritate violata. Unde liquere volebat, nihil eſſe adeò ſanctum, ad quod impugnandum non poſſent obtorqueri Scripturæ (4). —— *It being uſual with the Lutherans to quote*

(1) Above, in remark [*G*] of the article ACIDALIUS.

(2) Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, July, 1685, pag. 802.

(3) It is an error of the preſs, marked in the *Errata.* We muſt read Cocleus, or Cochleus. Mr Baillet, *Jugem. des Sçavans, Tom. I, pag.* 103, not having perceived this error of the preſs, thought that Theophilus Raynaud had quoted one Cocher.

(4) Theoph. Raynaudus, de bonis ac malis Libris, Part. III, Erotem. III, n. 528, pag. m. 296.

in Engliſh ; for as it is very ridiculous to maintain in Latin, *Mulieres non eſſe homines*, it is no leſs ridiculous, in our tongue, to aver, *That women are men.* That little book has been reprinted ſeveral times [*B*], and ſome people have maintained, in earneſt, the poſition, which is to be ſeen in the title page [*C*]. I could not find queen Elizabeth mentioned in that book [*D*].

There are thoſe who believe, that the author of the Eccleſiaſticus has confuted the paradox, *That women have no ſouls.* If they were in the right, we muſt conclude, that the Italian Author, who has maintained that paradox, has revived a very obſolete chimera [*E*]. To make, in that ſenſe, an old decrepit young again, is no very difficult

‘ *quote the ſcriptures in proof of their chimerical notions, Cochleus, in the acts of Luther, ann.* 1527, *confeſſes, that he patched up a book with ſcraps of the ſcripture ill put together, to prove, that* CHRIST *is not* GOD; *and he adds, ann* 1528, *that, with the ſame artifice and deſign, he had written concerning the obedience due from* GOD *to the devil, and of the violated honour of the Bleſſed Virgin. Whence he would make it plain, that nothing is ſo ſacred, but the ſcriptures may be wreſted to overthrow it.*’ The author, from whom I borrow theſe words, had juſt before given a great inſtance of the power of chicanry and cavilling: for he had ſhewn, that, if one ſhould ſcan the creed, according to the principles of ſome critics, not one of it's articles could ſtand the teſt. He complains, that Petrus Aurelius had lately cenſured that example of chicanry (5); but I cannot approve his complaint, after having read in Mr Baillet what follows. ‘ Father Theophilus Raynaud . . . . ſhews, that there is no book, how perfect and pious ſoever it may be, wherein a man may not find ſomething to cenſure, right or wrong, when once he has undertaken to pervert all, and to find fault with every thing. But it was not very neceſſary, that he ſhould give ſuch ſenſible and effectual proofs, by endeavouring to perſuade us that he underſtood, as well as any other, the art of tricking and cavilling, when he has publiſhed a looſe and impious cenſure of the Apoſtles Creed; wherein, either himſelf, or he to whom he aſcribes it, and whom he calls *a moſt Catholic and moſt learned man*, wreſts, in effect, the ſenſe of all the words of that Creed, to ſhew that every one of them is in ſome ſenſe ſuſpicious, dangerous, captious, impious, and heretical. That is indeed a ſpecimen of what chicanry may produce: but I cannot well ſee what game that *moſt catholic* author had a mind to play, by playing thus with our profeſſion of faith. I know not whether it was for the ſimple, and ſuch as are eaſily offended, or for the pretended Eſprits-forts (wits), that he wrote that piece; and whether he had a mind to ſerve the Socinians, or Deiſts (6).’ Conſult the article POZA.

[*B*] *That little book has been reprinted ſeveral times.*] The edition I make uſe of is of the Hague, 1638, in 12mo. I do not mark the others. I cannot poſitively tell whether the work, condemned by the congregation of the Index, at Rome, the eighteenth of June, 1651, is a tranſlation of this. That work is intituled, *Che le donne non ſiano della ſpecie de gl'huomini: Diſcorſo piacevole, tradotto da Horatio Plata, Romano* (7).

[*C*] *Some have maintained in earneſt the poſition in the title.*] You will ſee the proof of it in this remark; tho' all the examples, I ſhall inſtance in, are not proper to ſhew, that that poſition was maintained in earneſt. I believe with Voſſius that Cujacius affirmed it only by way of jeſt (8): *Eoque cum Cujacius contenderet, mulieres non eſſe homines, credo à ſeriis animum remittens* (*prope* amittens *in tali negotio dixerim*) *pauxillum voluit nugari, quod poſt magnum virum aliis etiam nugandi præbuit occaſionem.* That queſtion was much debated in Holland, whilſt Sorbiere was there. Mr Beverovic, ſays he, has written ‘ a book of *the excellency of women*, upon occaſion of a diſpute about a theſis, advanced, in form of a paradox, by a ſtudent, who had a mind to exerciſe his wit; *mulieres non eſſe homines.* That diſpute has paſſed from the ſchools into the converſation of the beſt companies, and much has already been written *pro* and *con* about it. At laſt Monſieur de Beverovic has entred the liſt, and has given us as genteel and learned a piece as can be written upon that ſubject. He has forgot nothing that could be ſaid to the advantage of the fair ſex; and he has verified, by a thouſand examples, what he has endeavoured to prove methodically, and by good reaſons, *that women were not inferior to men in any qualities, either of mind or body* (9).’ I wiſh Voſſius had made as ſound a judgment of Ariſtotle's opinion, as of that, which Cujacius undertook to maintain: but ſuch a thing was not to be expected from him; for Ariſtotle's authority was yet too much reſpected. That great philoſopher has maintained a ſtrange doctrine; that nature made no women, but when, through the imperfection of matter, it could not arrive at the ſex which is perfect. Voſſius (10) commends Cajetan for having owned this with reſpect to particular nature, and for having denied it with reſpect to univerſal nature. Therefore, in the judgment of thoſe two doctors, human nature aims not at engendering women; it's deſign is always to get males: but becauſe, if it ſhould always compaſs that end, the univerſe would ſuffer too much by it, there is an univerſal nature, which remedies it. What a pitiful jargon! what an odd idea of wiſdom! what ſtrange philoſophy here is! human nature would labour to preſerve itſelf; and yet it ſhould not aim at producing that being, without which it cannot be preſerved. This is the groſſeſt of abſurdities, and neverthele∫s, there is an infinite number of phyſicians and philoſophers, who have aſſerted, that nature makes females only when it is out of it's road; and ſo that it produces none, but by chance, by accident, by force. Let us hear this foolery in Italian: ‘ Huomini ſapientiſſimi hanno laſciato ſcritto, che la natura, percio che ſempre intende, & diſegna far le coſe piu perfette, ſe poteſſe, produrria continuamente huomini: & quando naſce una Donna, è difetto, o error della natura, & contra quello, ch'eſſa vorrebe fare: come ſi vede ancor d'uno, che naſce cieco, zoppo, o con qualche altro mancamento, & ne gli arbori molti frutti, che non maturano mai. Coſi la Donna ſi puo dire animal produtto à ſorte, & per caſo (11). —— *The moſt learned men have left in writing, that nature, which ever aims at perfection, would always produce men; and that, when a woman is born, it is, as it were, by miſtake, and an error of nature; as when any one is born blind or lame, or with any other natural defect, or like the fruit of ſome trees, which never ripen. Thus a woman is an animal produced by accident.*’ What I find moſt ſtrange, is, to ſee, that, in a council (12), the queſtion was gravely put, whether the women were human creatures, and that it was not carried in the affirmative, but after a long debate.

[*D*] *I could not find queen Elizabeth mentioned in that book.*] Here is what we find in the life of that queen, publiſhed by Mr Leti. ‘ I always looked with indignation, *ſays he* (13), upon a wretched book, intituled, *That Women are not of the ſame ſpecies with men*; wherein the author has the boldneſs to mention the example of that great queen, to laugh at thoſe, who have commended her capacity for the management of affairs; and to ſay, that, during her reign, her favourites, her council, and the parliament, managed all the buſineſs, and that ſhe only lent them her name.’ It being likely, that there are other diſſertations upon the theſis *mulieres non eſſe homines*, beſides the treatiſe, which Gediccus has given himſelf the trouble to confute, it would be very raſh in me to deny what Mr Leti ſays; for I own I have read nothing concerning that ſubject, except the book Gediccus has confuted. However I may ſay, that Mr Leti would have obliged his readers, if he had deſcribed the book (14), wherein he had read that ſlander againſt queen Elizabeth.

[*E*] *That the Italian author, who has maintained that paradox, has revived a very obſolete chimera.*] ‘ A Spaniard cult piece of work, and ſuch as can be done without the help of Medea's art. However, this new author, not having been in a capacity to make uſe of the arguments of thoſe, that are confuted in Eccleſiaſticus, he may claim the honour of invention, in ſome reſpects. You will find below (*a*) a paſſage out of the *Mêlanges d'Hiſtoire & de Littérature*, by Mr de Vigneul-Marville.

---

(5) Non me latet nuper Petrum Aurelium in hanc ſcriptionem vomuiſſe pleraque virulenta, quaſi id ſit illudere verbo Dei. Sed hæc eſt planè frivola criminatio, hujuſmodi enim ad hominem recriminationes à viris piis in non diſſimili materia ſunt adhibitæ. Sic cum Lutherani, &c. *The Sequel is in the body of this remark.*

(6) Jugemens des Sçavans, Tom. I, pag. 202, 203.

(7) See the Index of Alexander VII, n. 55, pag. 255.

(8) Voſſius, de Orig. Idolol. lib. iii, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 984.

(9) Sorbiere, in a letter to Guy Patin, written from Leyden about the year 1650. It is the ſixty third. See page 437, of his letters in 4to.

(10) Ubi ſupra.

(11) Count Balthaſſar Caſtiglione, in his *Corteggiano, lib.* iii, *pag. m.* 382.

(12) *Held at Mâcon. See* Polygamia Triumphatrix, pag. 123, *where you will find theſe words:* Cum inter tot ſanctos patres Epiſcopus quidam . . . ſtatueret non poſſe nec debere mulieres vocari homines, res tanti eſt habita, ut in timore Dei publice ibi ventilaretur, & tandem poſt multas vexatæ hujus quæſtionis diſceptationes concluderetur quod mulieres ſint homines.

(13) Tom. I, pag. 6.

(14) He ſhould have marked in what language, country, and time, that book was printed.

(*a*) In remark [*E*].

' A Spaniard has ſaid, that beaſts have no ſoul: a Frenchman has ſaid it alſo: but an Italian is gone beyond them, by maintaining, that women have no ſouls, and are not of the ſame ſpecies with the men: *Che le donne non habbino anima, & che non ſiino della ſpetie de gli huomini, e vienne comprobato da molti luoghi della Scrittura ſanta*: Which the author endeavours to prove by ſeveral paſſages of the holy ſcripture, which he adapts to his fancy. As long as this book was printed only in Latin, the Inquiſition was ſilent; but, as ſoon as it was tranſlated into Italian, they cenſured, and prohibited it. The ladies of Italy put various conſtructions upon that ſyſtem: ſome were ſorry for having no ſouls, and for being ranked ſo much below men, who, for the future, would uſe them little better than apes: others were indifferent upon the matter; and, looking now upon themſelves as meer machines, deſigned to move their wheels ſo well, as to make the men mad. It was very reaſonable to ſtop the courſe of that hereſy, which is ſo very ancient, that the preacher ſeems to have confuted it, when he ſays, *that God had created for Adam a companion like unto him; and had given them both a tongue, eyes, ears, and, over and above all that, a ſoul, to think and govern themſelves*. The author of the commentary upon St Paul's epiſtles, falſly aſcribed to St Ambroſe, ſays plainly, upon the eleventh chapter of the firſt to the Corinthians, that the women are not made after the image and likeneſs of GOD: *Fœminas ad ad imaginem Dei factas non eſſe* (15). Touching this laſt queſtion, ſee Giſbert Voëtius, in the third tome of the *Politica eccleſiaſtica* (16). He proves in few words, by three reaſons, that the woman was made after the image of GOD; and anſwers the objection, which might be grounded upon a paſſage of St Paul (17). He confutes alſo (18) as briefly the falſe poſition, *mulieres non eſſe homines*; and obſerves that Ariſtotle's opinion, mentioned here above (19), was adopted by Thomas Aquinas, and by ſeveral other ſchoolmen, with the ſame modification, that we have ſeen (20) that Cajetan added to it. *An mulier ſit ἁμάρτημα erratum naturæ & mas occaſionatus, & per accidens generetur, atque adeo ſit monſtrum? Reſp.* Talè quid excidit *Ariſtoteli lib. 2. de generat. animalium cap. 3. & lib. 4. cap. 2.* Hànc opinionem adoptavit *Thomas part. 1. qu. 92, art. & lib. 3. c. Gentes cap 94.* Ejuſque ſequaces, *Viguerius Inſtitut. cap. 21. §. 2. v. 4.* Et Commentatores ad Thomæ Summam *Cajetanus, Medices, Alagona, & Ferrarienſis ad 3. c. Gentes cap. 94.* Inſuper ex ſententiariis *Bonaventura, Ægidius, Richardus ad 2. diſt. 20.* Sed panacæâ diſtinctionis emolliri putant crudam hanc opinionem, quod fœmina ſit occaſionativè, non per ſe, reſpectu agentis particularis .... ſed quod ..... ſit per ſe ex intentione agentis univerſalis, & naturæ (21).

(15) Mêlanges d'Hiſt. & de Literat. recueillis par Monſ. de Vigneul Marville, pag. 16, & ſeq. Roan Edit. 1699.

(16) Giſb Voëtius, Politicæ Eccleſiaſticæ, *Parte II, Lib I, pag.* 185, 186.

(17) 1 Cor. xi, 7.

(18) Voëtius, ib. pag. 179, 180.

(19) In remark [*C*].

(20) Ibid.

(21) Voëtius, ib. pag. 181.

GELDENHAUR (GERARD), in Latin *Geldenhaurius*, a native of Nimeguen [*A*], held a conſiderable rank among the learned men of the XVIth century. He ſtudied claſſic learning at Deventer, under very good maſters (*a*), and went through his courſe of philoſophy at Louvain ſo ſucceſsfully, that he became qualified to teach that ſcience there. It was in that illuſtrious univerſity that he contracted a very ſtrict friendſhip with ſeveral learned men, and particularly with Eraſmus. He ſtayed ſome time at Antwerp, from whence he was called to the court of Charles of Auſtria, to be reader and hiſtorian to that prince (*b*): But, becauſe he did not like to change often his habitation, and did not think it convenient to accompany him into Spain, he diſ-engaged himſelf from him, and betook himſelf to the ſervice of Philip of Burgundy, biſhop of Utrecht. He was his reader and ſecretary for twelve years [*B*], that is, till the year 1524, when that prelate died; after which he performed the ſame functions with Maximilian of Burgundy. He was ſent to Wittemberg in the year 1526, to examine the ſtate of the ſchools, and the church. He reported ingenuouſly what he had obſerved there; and owned, he could not diſapprove a doctrine ſo conformable to the prophets and apoſtles, as that he had heard there: Therefore he renounced Popery, and retired towards the Upper Rhine. He married at Worms, and taught there the youth for ſome time: Afterwards he was called to Augſburg [*C*], for the ſame employment; and at laſt, in the year 1534, he went to Marpurg,

(*a*) Alexander Hegius, *and* John Oſtendorp.

(*b*) See remark [*B*] towards the end.

[*A*] *He was a native of Nimeguen.*] He was better known by the name of his country, than by that of his family; for he was commonly called *Gerardus Noviomagus*: nor does Eraſmus call him otherwiſe in the letters he wrote to him. Konig (1) mentions him only under the word *Noviomagus*. Some other Bibliographers (2), for want of examining things, have ſplit one author into two, and diſtinguiſhed Gerardus Geldenhaurius from Gerardus Noviomagus. La Popeliniere's error is not leſs groſs; *Gerard de Noyon Noviomagun*, ſays he (3), *has written the hiſtory of Holland*, 1530. Does he not ſeem to make *Noviomagun* his family-name? It is certain, at leaſt, that he believes him to be a native of Noion in Picardy. We find a like miſtake in the firſt tome of the Bibliotheque Univerſelle. *Mr Matthæus ſhews, that Eligius had already preached the goſpel to the Frieſlanders .... and that he was the firſt biſhop of Nimeguen* (4). There are three errors in theſe words. The Latin word *Eligius* out to have been tranſlated by that of *Eloi*; and the term of *Noviomagus*, by that of *Noion*; for it was of Noion that St Eloi was biſhop. Nimeguen never was an epiſcopal ſee.

(1) In Bibliotheca veteri & nova.

(2) The abbreviators of Geſner and Draudius.

(3) Hiſtoire des Hiſtoires, lib. ix, pag. 483.

(4) Biblioth. Univerſ. Tom. I, pag. 89.

[*B*] *His reader and ſecretary for twelve years.*] Theſe are the words of the author, who has furniſhed me with this article (5); *Se ad* Philippum Ultrajectinum *præſulem contulit, eique à Secretis in Latina lingua, & in cubiculo à lectionibus fuit per annos XII.* I wonder Paul Freherus does not ſay, that Geldenhaur was employed in religious functions by that biſhop, as we are aſſured by Valerius Andreas (6); *Philippo Burgundo, Epiſcopo Ultrajectino a ſacris.* This is Valerius Andreas's expreſſion, which Mr Moreri has tranſlated by chaplain to Philip of Burgundy: and indeed there is no doubt but Geldenhaur, who was a monk, aſſiſted his prelate in his devotions. Valerius Andreas is not the only author, that informs us of the monaſtical profeſſion of Geldenhaur (7): for I find it in one of Eraſmus's letters. *Quod ſi vera prædicas mea ſententia nec aula dignus es, nec cucullá* (8): that is, *if it be true that you are of ſo baſhful a temper* (9), *you are neither fit for the court, nor for the cowl.* Note, that this monk was alſo chaplain to Charles of Auſtria, if we may believe Voſſius (10).

[*C*] *He was called to Augsburg.*] Melchior Adam (11) relates, that, in 1531, the magiſtrates of that city having erected a ſchool, which they called St Ann's, ſent

(5) Paul Freher. in Theatro, pag. 114.

(6) Valer. Andr. in Biblioth. Belgic. pag. 273.

(7) Ordinis Cruciferorum Monachus. *Id. ibid.*

(8) Eraſm. Epiſt. xlii, lib. iii.

(9) *Eraſmus had ſaid juſt before*, Sed heus tu, rem oppido novam ex tuis literis accipio. Neſciebam te tam virgineo pudore præditum ut ad me non auſis ſcribere. - - *Your letter informs me of a new thing. I knew not, that you were ſo baſhful that you had not the courage to write to me.*

(10) Cæſari Carolo V à ſacris fuit. *Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. pag.* 654.

(11) In vitis Theologor. Germanorum, pag. 92.

purg, where he taught hiſtory two years, and then divinity, 'till his death. He died of the plague, the tenth of January, 1542, being ſixty years of age (c). He had been a Monk (d). His changing his religion, and ſome writings he publiſhed againſt the church of Rome, made him fall out with Eraſmus [D], who ſpeaks very ill of him; and who, inſtead of aſſiſting him in his poverty, jeſted upon it [E], and called him a man of a ſeditious ſpirit: A reproach, which deſerves no leſs to be taken notice of, than the

ſent for Geldenhaur to be the maſter of it. See what I quote out of Eraſmus, towards the end of the following remark.

[D] *His changing his religion and ſome writings made him fall out with Eraſmus.*] Read Eraſmus's letter *in Pſeudevangelicos* (12), which he wrote to Geldenhaur, whoſe name he changed into that of Vulturius. He blames him for having publiſhed ſcoffing books, which did but exaſperate princes againſt Luther's followers. 'Parum erat evulgaſſe epiſtolam ad *Spirenſe* Concilium; non magno intervallo proſiliit nobis ridiculus ille *Cometes Carolo Cæſari* dicatus. Quum iterum te meis ſcriptis admonuiſſem, ut à talibus jocis temperares, qui & Principum animos ad ſævitiam irritarent, & adeo nihil juvarent cauſam, à cujus victoria veſtra pendet incolumitas, ut etiam graviſſimè lædant, placidè quidem reſpondiſti: ſed perinde quaſi te fuiſſem hortatus, ut ſimile quiddam iterum deſignares, ita rurſus ad concilium Spirenſe, cui tum rex Ferdinandus præſidebat, miſſus eſt libellus, nomen Eraſmi literis bene magnis præſerens (13). —— *It was not enough that the letter was made public at the council of Spires; ſoon after came out that ridiculous* Comet *dedicated to* The Emperor Charles. *When I again admoniſhed you, by letter, to avoid ſuch jeſting, which might exaſperate the minds of princes, and, inſtead of ſerving, greatly injure the cauſe, upon whoſe ſucceſs your own ſafty depends, you returned indeed a civil anſwer; yet, as if I had exhorted you to attempt the like again, another writing was ſent to the council of Spires, in which king Ferdinand then preſided, ſigned with the name of Eraſmus in pretty large characters.*' He blames him alſo for having prefixed the name, and ſome notes of Eraſmus to ſome letters, the drift of which was to prove, that heretics ought not to be puniſhed: which expoſed Eraſmus to the hatred of the court of Rome, and to the indignation of ſuch princes as perſecuted Lutheraniſm; for it was as good as to ſay, that Eraſmus furniſhed the innovators with weapons to fight their enemies. That learned man could not bear, that any ſhould do him that ill office; for age had made him a coward in that reſpect. His complaints againſt Geldenhaur, and the Lutherans, are very bitter, and were anſwered in writings, which he thought very violent. He took Geldenhaur to have been the chief promoter of them, and therefore he ſticks not to compare him to the treacherous Judas (14). 'Sed nondum commigrarat Argentoratum, ille (15) mirabilis concitandæ ſeditionis, & mox turbatis rebus, alioque profugiendi artifex: ille qui loca ex omnibus epiſtolis meis ad calumniam idonea enotaret, moxque fingeret ſibi librum à fratribus clam ereptum. Qui adeò flagrabat impotenti odio, ut hunc librum è mendaciis & conviciis non aliter contextum, quàm cento contexitur ex pannis, non potuerit expectare, ſed furtim emiſit inſulſiſſima ſcholia, & interim mihi ſcribebat blandas epiſtolas: Eram dominus ac præceptor, à quo libenter admoneretur, qui ſine imagine mei non poterat vivere, qui proximis ad me literis etiam conſolatus eſt me, hortans ut læto eſſem animo, contemnens rabulas loquaces & ſcribaces: denique jamdudum editâ epiſtolâ meâ, quòd me facturum ſcripſeram, in ſuis ad amanuenſem meum literis volebat mihi commendari, & interim hæc parabantur, tantâ arte mordacia, ut magis lædar laudatus, quàm convitiis affectus. Et hi ſe cum apoſtolorum ſanctimonia conferunt, quum hoc Vulturii factum propiùs accedat ad exemplum Judæ proditoris, quàm CHRISTI. —— *This artiſt at raiſing ſedition, and afterwards ſlipping his neck out of the collar, was not yet gone to Strasburg: He, I ſay, who marked the paſſages in all my letters, which might give a handle to calumny, and afterwards pretended that the book was ſtolen from him by his brothers: who was ſo maliciouſly ſet againſt me, that he could not wait for that book, that patch-work of calumny and lies, but publiſhed, underhand, moſt ſtupid comments; and, in the mean time, wrote complaiſant letters to me: I was, forſooth, his maſter and preceptor, whoſe admonitions he willingly received, he could not live without my picture, and, in his very next letter to me, he endeavoured to comfort me, adviſing me to be chearful, and expreſſing a contempt both for talking and ſcribling brawlers: laſtly, after my letter was already publiſhed, he wrote to my amanuenſis, recommending to me what I had declared in writing I intended to do; in the mean time all theſe things were carry'd on with ſuch malicious cunning, that I was more injured by praiſes, than affected by calumnies. And theſe are the men, who pretend to apoſtolical ſanctity, when this action of Vulturius comes nearer to the example of the traitor Judas, than of CHRIST.*' By this we learn, that Geldenhaur was at Strasburg in the year 1530, where he ſhewed a very turbulent ſpirit; which however neither Melchior Adam nor Paul Freherus mention. Eraſmus ſays in another place, that no man in Strasburg attempted any thing againſt him before Geldenhaur came there. He wrote this when Geldenhaur was profeſſor of poetry at Augſburg: 'Argentorati nemo quicquam in mea molitus eſt, priuſquam eò commigrâſſet Noviomagus, qui nunc agit Auguſtæ, profiteturque poëticam ſalario, ut aiunt, ſexaginta florenorum (16).'

[E] .... *who inſtead of aſſiſting him in his poverty, jeſted upon it.*] After having repreſented to him ſeveral things, which hindered him from relieving his friends in their indigence, he tells him, that poverty is no misfortune to thoſe, who devote themſelves to the purity of the goſpel; that they ought to relieve one another; and that, by being contented with little, and reducing themſelves to bread and water, they will always find wherewithal to live: 'Porrò, quod ſignificas tibi moleſtam egeſtatem, equidem nec tam ſum inops, ut non poſſim; nec tam parcus, ut graver amiculo aureos aliquot impartiri; ſed hæc benignitas quantulum haberet momenti ad tuam egeſtatem ſublevandam? Res mihi ſanè mediocris eſt, minimumque ſupereſt meis neceſſitatibus: multum impendii requirit hoc corpuſculum .... jam bona pars mihi deciditur in famulos, &c. ..... Verùm poſtquam, mi *Vulturi*, induxiſti in animum Evangelicam vitam profiteri, miror paupertatem eſſe moleſtam, quum beatus *Hilarion*, ubi non inveniret quod pro naulo ſolveret, gloriandum duxerit, quòd inſciens ad tantam Evangelii perfectionem perveniſſet. Gloriatur & *Paulus*, quod ſciat abundare, & penuriam pati, quòd nihil habens omnia poſſideat. Idem collaudat *Hebræos* quoſdam Evangelium amplexos, quòd rapinam bonorum ſuorum cum gaudio ſuſcepiſſent .... Adde ſi *Judæi* non patiuntur inter ipſos eſſe pauperes, quanto magis convenit ut qui jactant Evangelium, fratrum inopiam mutua benignitate ſublevent: præſertim cum Evangelica frugalitas minimo ſit contenta. Si panis cibarius adſit & aqua, non deſiderant *Attica* bellaria qui ſpiritu vivunt. Neſciunt luxum, jejunio paſcuntur. Ipſi Apoſtoli confrictis manu ariſtis famem ſedâſſe leguntur. ..... Fortaſſis hic tibi videbor cavillis ludere, at aliis non idem videtur (17). —— *As to what you hint, that poverty is become burthenſome to you, I am not ſo poor, that I cannot, nor ſo ſtingy, that I grudge to beſtow a few pieces on my dear friend: but what will this bounty avail towards relieving your wants? My circumſtances are but narrow, and I can ſpare but very little from my neceſſities: I am at no ſmall expence in maintaining this body of mine .... Then a good part goes in ſervants wages, &c. ... But, my dear Vulturius, ſince you have reſolved to profeſs an evangelical life, I wonder you ſhould complain of poverty, when St Hilarion, not being able to pay the hire of a boat, valued himſelf upon arriving unexpectedly to ſo much goſpel perfection. St Paul likewiſe boaſts, that he knew how to abound and how to want, and that, having nothing, he poſſeſſed all things. The ſame apoſtle commends certain Hebrews, who had embraced the goſpel, that they took the ſpoiling of their goods with joy .... Add, that if the Jews ſuffer no poor among them how much more is it the duty of thoſe, who profeſs the goſpel, mutually*

(c) *Taken from* Paul Freherus's Theatrum, pag. 114, *where the manuſcripts of the univerſity of Marpurg are quoted.*

(d) See remark [B].

(12) It is the 47th of the 31ſt book, dated Novemb. 4, 1529.

(13) Eraſ. Epiſt. xlvii, lib. xxxi.

(14) Id. Epiſt. ultima Libri ultimi, pag. 2137, *dated Auguſt* 1, 1530.

(15) *The following words teſtify ſufficiently that he ſpeaks of Geldenhaur, which is confirmed by this paſſage out of the 52d letter of the 30th book:* Quidam G. N. è Brabantia profugus & ex amiciſſimo ſubito factus capitalis hoſtis novam tragœdiam movit Argentorati, nebulo ſeditioni natus. Is eſt ficto nomine Vulturius. *He ſpeaks again of him in the 56th letter of the ſame book:* Jam & Evangelici quidam, quorum magiſter ſceleroſus ille Gelrius, miris technis hoc agunt, ut Cæſaris ac Ferdinandi animum in me irritent.

(16) Id. Epiſt. lxvi, lib xxx, pag. 1941, *dated the fourteenth of December*, 1531.

(17) Id. Epiſt. xlvii, lib. xxxi, pag. 2049, 2050.

the care Eraſmus took to deny, that he condemned the puniſhment of heretics [*F*]. Mr Moreri has committed ſome conſiderable faults [*G*]. Paul Freherus has not been ſo

to relieve the wants of their brethren; eſpecially ſince the goſpel-frugality is content with a little. Thoſe, who live by the ſpirit, if they have bread and water, want not delicacies. They are ſtrangers to luxury; they feed on faſting. We read, that the apoſtles themſelves ſatisfied their hunger with ears of corn rubbed in their hands . . . . . Perhaps you may take all this for jeſt; but others will think I am in earneſt.'

[*F*] *A reproach, which deſerves no leſs to be taken notice of, than the care Eraſmus took, to deny, that he condemned the puniſhment of heretics.*] Eraſmus's diſpute with Geldenhaur has made me take notice of two things with ſome ſurprize.

The firſt is, that, according to Eraſmus, the exhorting princes, and men in power, to take away from the monks the great eſtates they poſſeſſed, and not to reſiſt the goſpel, was ſeditious and ſcandalous: 'Niſi forte non videtur ſeditioſum hortari Principes, ut facultates ſacerdotibus ac Monachis adimant, & in bonos veſtri ſimiles conferant: aut non offenduntur illorum animi, quum audiunt, *Noli occidere innocentes, Noli tuo periculo recalcitrare Evangelio, Sine verbum Dei in tua ditione prædicari.* Hæc quid aliud ſunt quàm atrociſſima convitia nondum perſuaſis, imò in diverſum perſuaſis. Quos tu vocas innocentes, illi habent pro ſeditioſis & hæreticis; & quod tu vocas Evangelium, illis perſuaſum eſt eſſe doctrinam Satanæ. Priùs igitur erat illis perſuadendum: Quod ſi non potes, aliis rationibus tractandus erat illorum animus (18). —— *Unleſs, perhaps, you do not think it ſeditious to exhort princes to rob the prieſts and monks of their goods, and beſtow them on good men like yourſelves; or that their minds are not offended, when they hear,* Kill not the innocent; ſpurn not at the goſpel to your own peril; ſuffer the word of God to be preached in your juriſdiction. *What are theſe but the keeneſt reproaches on thoſe, who are not yet brought over, nay are perſuaded of the contrary? Thoſe, whom you call innocent, they conſider as ſeditious and heretical; and what you call the goſpel, they are perſuaded is the doctrine of ſatan. The firſt ſtep therefore ſhould have been to convince ſuch perſons themſelves: if you failed of this, they ſhould have been treated after another manner.*' It is what he repreſents to Geldenhaur, who had publiſhed ſome letters addreſſed to princes, and written in that ſtrain, which is cenſured in this place. This diſcourſe of Eraſmus is a true Janus, with a double face; for it is reaſonable in ſome reſpects, but it appears unjuſt, when one views it another way. Thoſe, who believe, that it is neceſſary to convert the world to a new doctrine, and to deſtroy reigning errors, muſt needs deſire to be heard, and beg to have no violence offerred them: and therefore they are unreaſonable to demand, that thoſe of another opinion be perſecuted, diſpoſſeſſed of their goods, and hindered from ſpeaking and appearing in public. It ſeems therefore, that Geldenhaur went too faſt, in asking, that the eſtates of the monks ſhould be taken from them; and that Eraſmus had reaſon to tax him with raſhneſs. We muſt ſuffer that to be granted to others, which we ask for ourſelves; for every one pretends to maintain truth. To ſay to princes, who perſecute us, that they oppreſs the kingdom of God, is certainly very abuſive: It ſeems therefore, it would be better to ſoften one's ſtile, and not to ſuppoſe ſo poſitively the very thing, which is in queſtion. We ſhould, in the firſt place, make people reliſh our maxims and proofs; and if we could compaſs that, we might afterwards qualify our opinions, and thoſe of our adverſaries. Thus far Eraſmus's obſervations appear very judicious: But when we conſider on the other hand, that, unleſs we repreſent to the world, that they are undone without recovery, unleſs they reform, unleſs they ceaſe to make war ~~againſt~~ againſt God by oppoſing the reformers, we make no great progreſs, nor ſufficiently excite the attention of the public; when, I ſay, we conſider this, we find, that Eraſmus acted too much the philoſopher, and was ignorant of the ſmall efficacy of reaſon, when weakly aſſiſted by the paſſions. However it be, it does not ſeem very poſſible, that great revolutions in religion may be accompliſhed, unleſs people ask at firſt for themſelves a toleration, which they are ready to refuſe to their neighbours as ſoon as they ſhall be able to force them. *Non aliter hæc ſacra conſtant.*

Reflexion on puniſhment of heretics.

The ſecond thing I was ſurprized at, is to ſee, that Eraſmus looked upon it as a black and odious calumny, to impute to him, that he had taught, *that heretics ought not to be put to death.* He confeſſes, indeed, that he has exhorted princes not to hearken raſhly to the complaints of all ſorts of divines and monks (19), and to diſtinguiſh errors; but he denies he ever maintained that heretics ought not to be puniſhed with death, and complains (20), that thoſe, who accuſe him of that falſe doctrine, expoſe him to the reſentment of princes, as if he had deſigned to take from them the ſword, which God has put into their hands (21). 'Hoc atrocius eſt, quòd nuſquam id doceo, non eſſe ſumendum capitis ſupplicium de hæreticis, nec uſquam adimo gladii jus Principibus, quod illis non ademit Chriſtus nec apoſtoli . . . . (22) ut peccant qui ob quemvis errorem pertrahunt homines ad ignem: ita peccant qui in nullos hæreticos arbitrantur prophano magiſtratui jus eſſe occidendi . . . . nec ulla res erat quæ poterat illos magis alienare, quàm ſi illis gladium excutiam è manibus, eaſque ſectas defendam, quas illi velut execrabiles radicitùs evulſas cupiunt, & facerent, niſi rerum motus aliò vocaret illorum animos. ——— *This is the more flagrant, in that I no where teach, that heretics are not to be put to death, nor do I any where deprive princes of the right of the ſword, which neither* CHRIST *nor his apoſtles have taken from them . . . . . As they are to blame, who drag men to the flames for every kind of error, they are no leſs, who think the civil magiſtrate has no power to put any ſort of heretics to death . . . . nor could any thing more incenſe them againſt me, than to ſtrike the ſword out of their hands, and to defend thoſe ſects, which they wiſh to extirpate as execrable, and would do it, did not the unſettled ſtate of affairs call off their attention to other things.*' I wonder, that Eraſmus, who was ſo well read in the fathers, did not know, that, during the three firſt centuries, they did loudly maintain the poſition, from which he is ſo ſollicitous to purge himſelf. They did not pretend, by that, to take from princes the power of the ſword, which they hold from God; but meant only, that that power does not reach the errors of one's conſcience, and that ſovereigns have no commiſſion from God to perſecute religions. This is the true ſtate of the queſtion. All princes in the world own, that they have not the power of the ſword againſt the true ſervants of God, or againſt orthodoxy, but only againſt the enemies of truth. It is upon this foundation that the heathen emperors puniſhed the ancient chriſtians, and that now-a-days the inquiſition puts Proteſtants to death. It is therefore altogether needleſs to prove to perſecutors, that they ought not to put the faithful to death; for it is what they do not pretend to, and they are not ſuch fools as to believe, that, by being deprived of that power, they loſe any thing of their own. The only queſtion therefore is to know, whether they may puniſh thoſe who ſerve God according to the dictates of their conſciences? The fathers of the three firſt centuries have denied it: why then did not Eraſmus dare to imitate them? And, what is ſtill more ſurprizing (23), what is the reaſon that, within theſe few years, a miniſter of Holland has endeavoured to render thoſe that are for toleration odious, becauſe they rob ſovereigns of one of their greateſt prerogatives (24)? Does not this argue more malice and injuſtice than the heathens ſhewed againſt the fathers of the primitive church, whom they did not charge with that pretended attempt againſt the ſtate? But, to ſhew the illuſion of that miniſter, it is ſufficient to ask him, why he takes from Catholic princes the power of the ſword, with relation to Proteſtants? Why does he think that to be lawful in himſelf, which he condemns in others as high-treaſon? *I ſpeak in behalf of truth*, will he anſwer: But it is what every body pretends to.

[*G*] *Mr Moreri has committed ſome conſiderable faults.*] I. He ſhould not have given to Philip of Burgundy the title of archbiſhop of Utrecht, but that of biſhop; for Utrecht was not yet an archbiſhopric.

II. Marpurg

---

(18) Idem Epiſt. in Pſeudevangelicos, pag. 2051. *See alſo Epiſt. LIX. lib xxxi, pag.* 2107.

(19) Tantum admoneo locis aliquot, ne ſit hîc præceps Principum ſeveritas, nec facile præbeant aures quorumlibet Theologorum aut Monachorum delationibus. *Eraſm. Epiſt. xlvii, lib. xxxi, p.* 2051.

(20) Ut lector parum exiſtimaret meam eſſe ſententiam, non eſſe fas in quenquam hæreticum pœna capitis animadvertere: eaque res Cæſarem *Ferdinandum*, alioſque Principes, atque etiam *Romanum* Pontificem in meum caput irritaret. *Id. ibid.*

(21) Id ibid.

(22) Ibid. pag. 2052.

(23) We muſt ſuppoſe, that in Eraſmus's time they did not know as people have known ſince, the force of the proofs againſt perſecution.

(24) *See the* Tableau du Socinianiſme, *Lett. viii.*

ſo exact as he ſhould have been [*H*]. I ſhall ſet down the title of ſome works of Geldenhaur [*I*]. He underſtood well poetry and oratory (*e*).

The emperor Maximilian judged him worthy of the bays, in the year 1517. This was after he had read with attention about twenty Latin verſes made in his praiſe by Geldenhaur (*f*). Note, that this writer ſuppreſſed a truth in one of his hiſtories [*K*]. The conditions, on which he was made hiſtoriographer, may ſometimes be an occaſion of lying [*L*].

There is, in the theatrum of Freherus a ſmall contradiction, which I muſt not paſs in ſilence. I have obſerved, that we find there, that Geldenhaur was not called to Marpurg till the year 1534; but I have not ſaid, that we find there, in another place, that he taught at Marpurg from the year 1526 [*M*].

II. Marpurg is not the firſt town of Germany, wherein Geldenhaur taught. III. He never taught at Wittemberg. IV. Nor was he *murdered by robbers in* 1542. Valerius Andreas has furniſhed Mr Moreri with half of theſe falſities. Theſe are his words: ‘ Turpi ‘ Apoſtaſia à Catholicis Belgis ad Germanos Marpurgenſes transfugit: ubi poſtquam annos aliquot hiſtoriam explanaſſet, dum Wittembergam verſus iter inſtituit à latronibus fiſſo ſecuri capite miſere periit, An. ſalutis CIϽ. IϽ. XLII. die X. Januarii, ut refert Reinhardus Lorichius Hadamarius, ſcholiis ad Aphthonii Progymnaſmata. ——— *By a ſcandalous apoſtacy, he went over from the Catholics of Holland to the Germans at Marpurg; where after he had explained hiſtory for ſome years, as he was journying towards Wittemberg, he died miſerably by the hands of robbers, his head being ſplit with an ax, on the tenth of January* 1542; *as we learn from Reinhardus Lorichius Hadamarius, in his comment on the Progymnaſmata of Aphthonius.*’ There are ſeveral faults in theſe words: 1. Geldenhaur did not retire to Marpurg, when he abjured the Romiſh religion; for he did not go thither ’till after he had reſided at Worms, Strasburg, and Augsburg; ſee nevertheleſs the remark [*M*]. 2. He did not take a journey to Wittemberg, after he had taught hiſtory for ſome years at Marpurg; for he went upon that journey in the year 1526, whilſt he was yet a Roman Catholic, and in the ſervice of Maximilian of Burgundy. 3. He did did not die of the wounds he received from aſſaſſins, but of the plague, ſixteen years after he had been ſet upon. 4. The author, whom Valerius Andreas quotes, ſays expreſsly, that Geldenhaur recovered of his wounds. If the words he has made uſe of (25) had been known, theſe falſities had been avoided; which ſhews how much it imports to conſult the authors one has a mind to quote. Swertius (26) relates only this falſity, that Geldenhaur, going from Marpurg to Wittemberg, was killed by highwaymen, the tenth of January 1542.

[*H*] *Freherus has not been ſo exact as he ſhould have been*.] He ought not to have ſaid, that Geldenhaur retired from the imperial court, *relicta imperatoria aula*, and betook himſelf to the ſervice of Philip of Burgundy, in the year 1512; for the court of Charles of Auſtria, which he left, was not yet an imperial court. It is a groſs error in reckoning, to ſay, that a man, who goes to Marpurg in the year 1534, and dies there the tenth of January 1542, taught there hiſtory two years, and afterwards divinity nine years. *Hiſtoriam primùm biennium, ac poſtmodum novennium ſacras literas . . . . . interpretatus eſt.* This would be falſe, though we ſhould ſuppoſe, that he began to teach divinity the firſt year.

[*I*] *I ſhall ſet down the titles of ſome works of Geldenhaur.*] I take them from Valerius Andreas. *Hiſtoria Batavica cum Appendice de vetuſta Batavorum nobilitate,* Strasburg, 1533. But Voſſius mentions an edition of the year 1520 (27). *De Batavorum Inſula. Germaniæ inferioris Hiſtoriæ,* Strasburg, 1532. *Vita Philippi à Burgundia Epiſcopi Ultrajectini.* See the following remark. *Catalogus Epiſcoporum Ultrajectinorum. Epiſtola ad Guilielmum Geldriæ principem gratulatoria de principatuum ſuorum adeptione. Epiſtola de Zelandia. Satiræ octo,* printed at Louvain, 1515 (28).

[*K*] *He ſuppreſſed a truth in one of his hiſtories.*] This he did in the hiſtory of Philip of Burgundy, natural ſon of duke Philip the good. He did not forget to relate, that that baſtard was ſo handſome in his youth, and ſo capable to fire a woman’s heart, that ſome of that ſex were ſo luſtful and ſhameleſs as to run after him: but, inſtead of adding, that ſome of them found him ſo kind, as to have had three baſtards by him; he repreſents him as endowed with a maiden modeſty, which was like to coſt him his life. ‘ Moribus ‘ & converſatione ita compoſitus ut magis Parthenius quam Philippus adpellari potuiſſet. Quare non tam amabat quam amabatur, laſciviores enim quædam matronæ in tantum eum, ſepoſita omni verecundia, deperibant ut harum cauſa fere in vitæ periculum incidiſſet, niſi is qui ei mortem intentaturus putabatur, occiſus fuiſſet (29). ——— *He was of ſo modeſt a behaviour, that he deſerved the name of Parthenius, rather than that of Philip. Wherefore he was not ſo much a lover, as an object of love; for ſome luſtful matrons, laying aſide all modeſty, were ſo fond of him, that upon their account he ran a risk of his life, had not the perſon, who threatened him with death, been killed.*’ Here follows the note Mr Matthæus makes thereupon: ‘ Nec exemplo deſtitutus, præſertim patris Philippi, ſuſcepit ſpurios non paucos. Tres etiam ex una Philippum, Joannem, & Oliverium, ut obſervavi ex adverſariis Gisberti Lappii à Waveren (30). —— *After the example of his father Philip, he had ſeveral baſtards; three by one woman, Philip, John, and Oliver, as I have learned from the* Adverſaria *of Gisbert Lappius à Waveren.*’ Let us learn from hence not to truſt hiſtories, written by domeſtics, that have received great favours. They ſuppreſs what is injurious to the memory of their maſters. Let us confeſs nevertheleſs, that Geldenhaur does not pretend, that the chaſtity of his Philip was of long continuance; for he owns, that that biſhop of Utrecht loved the fair ſex; and that he treated with greater rigour drunken prieſts, than thoſe that were laſcivious (31). Note, that he was openly a Proteſtant, when he publiſhed that hiſtory (32), and that is altogether heretical, if we believe Valerius Andreas (33). Note alſo, that Suffridus Petri, who has taken from it the life of Philip of Burgundy, which he has inſerted in his appendix of Beka, has left out all that was not favourable to the church of Rome. Mr Matthæus (34) makes this obſervation in the notes he has added to the new edition of that little book of Geldenhaur, inſerted in his *Veteris ævi Analecta* (35).

[*L*] *The conditions on which he was made hiſtoriographer, may ſometimes be an occaſion of lying.*] Philip of Burgundy charged Geldenhaur to make a collection of all the memorable things, that ſhould happen, either in the dioceſe of Utrecht, or in the neighbouring countries, and to read both to him, and his counſellors, his collections every month. Geldenhaur obeyed that order, and was warned to alter every thing that was amiſs in his narrative; which caution reached not only falſities, but alſo indiſcretions: that is, if he happened to mention any thing in ſuch a manner as did not ſeem diſcreet to the prince’s council, he was ordered to change it. Now how many truths are comprehended in that claſs of things? it muſt be owned indeed, that an hiſtorian may rectify a great many paſſages, when ſtateſmen take the trouble to examine his writings; but, at the ſame time, there are ſome paſſages, whoſe publication they blame, only becauſe they are true. ‘ Voluit ille (*Philippus Burgundus*) per me notari ſi quid in ſua ditione aut in finitimis regionibus memoratu dignum actum eſſet, ſed ea conditione ut ſingulis menſibus quæ annotaram, ipſi & à conſiliis prælegerem: quod cum facerem, admonebant ſi quid perperam, ſi quid parum conſiderate ſcriptum audiſſent, id mutarem. (36).’

[*M*] *Freherus ſays, that he taught at Marpurg from the year* 1526.] Freherus relates (37), that the univerſity of Marpurg was opened the firſt of July 1526, when profeſſor Johannes Ferrarius Montanus was made the firſt rector, and aſſociated among other

colleagues

(*e*) Celebris Poëta, celebrior Orator, celeberrimus Theologus (*Lovanii*) ſalutatus. *Reinh. Lorichius, Scholiis in Aphthon. pag. m.* 302.

(*f*) Geldenhaur, in Vita Philippi à Burgundia, circa fin. *You will find that little poem there.*

(25) Quænam verba Gerhardus Noviomagus ex lipothymia ad ſeſe rediens, olim potuiſſet dicere, cujus Witebergam profecturi caput latrones ſecuri diffiderant, ipſum apud Brunonis vicum humi ſtratum ſpoliaverant, & fugitivi mortuum credentes in ſylva reliquerant. *R Lorich. Scholiis in Aphthon. pag. m.* 300.

(26) Athen. Belg. pag. 279.

(27) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. p. 654.

(28) *Taken from* Val. Andreas, Biblioth. Belg. pag. 273, 274.

(29) Geldenhaur, in Philippo Burgundo, *pag. m.* 220. *I make uſe of* Matthæus’s *edition.*

(30) Antonius Matthæus veteris ævi Analect. pag. 243, 244.

(31) Ebrioſos præſertim qui cereviſia ſe ingurgitare ſolent, deteſtabatur, ſcortationibus minus infeſtus. Ipſe enim in Venerem propenſior inque adoleſcentularum amoribus ardentior erat. *Geldenh. in Philippo Burgundo, pag.* 230.

(32) At Straſburg, 1529.

(33) Libellus hic totus hæreticus eſt. *Val Andr. Biblioth. Belg. pag.* 273.

(34) Matthæus, ubi ſupra, pag. 247.

(35) Printed at Leyden in 1697, tho’ the title bears 1698.

(36) Geldenhaur, in Præfat. Opuſc. illuſtratæ Germaniæ, apud Voſſium de Hiſt. Lat pag. 654.

(37) Freher. in Theatro, p. 104.

colleagues with Francis Lambert and Gerardus Noviomagus. This Francis Lambert died in the year 1530, as I have ſaid in his article. This circumſtance alone would ſuffice to ſhew the contradiction of Freherus; for Geldenhaur could not be profeſſor at Marpurg at the ſame time with Lambert, if he begun only to be ſo in the year 1534. But on what narrative of Freherus can we depend? I believe we ought to ſay that Geldenhaur was profeſſor at Marpurg in the year 1529, that he quitted his poſt to go to Worms, that he went afterwards to Strasburg, and next to Augsburg, and that laſtly, through this profeſſorial inconſtancy, of which I have ſpoken elſewhere (38), he returned to Marpurg in the year 1534. On this footing, my firſt critical note (39) againſt Valerius Andreas Deſſelius is not good; but who would not have thought it ſo, ſince I founded it on a writer (40), who has cited the manuſcript regiſter of the univerſity of Marpurg? he has cited them likewiſe, where he ſays, that Geldenhaur was profeſſor at Marpurg in the year 1526. Is this to know how to make uſe of a book? note, that Melchior Adam knew nothing of this firſt profeſſorſhip of Geldenhaur.

(38) In remark [*G*] of the article *ALCIATUS* (Andrew).

(39) See the remark [*G*].

(40) *i. e.* Paul Freherus.

GELENIUS (Sigismund), born of a very good family at Prague [*A*], was one of the learned men of the XVIth century. He began very early to travel in Germany, France, and Italy, and learned eaſily the languages of thoſe three countries. He confirmed himſelf, in Italy, in the knowledge of the Latin tongue, and learned Greek there under Marc Muſurus. As he returned to Germany, he paſſed through Baſil, and made himſelf known to Eraſmus, who conceived an eſteem for him, and adviſed John Frobenius to make him corrector of his printing-houſe. Gelenius accepted the place, as troubleſome and painful as it was; for he had many Hebrew, Greek, and Latin books to correct, which Frobenius printed. He diſcharged well that employment till his death, that is, during thirty years; and did not content himſelf with correcting the work of the Printers, but ſet up for a tranſlator and a critic. Few learned men have tranſlated ſo many works out of Greek into Latin as he [*B*]. He was a tall, bulky man. He had a good memory, a ready and ſubtle wit; was very ſeldom

[*A*] *He was of a very good family.*] Let us ſee what Curio ſays about it: ‘ Gelenia familia antiqua ‘ & honeſta, à cervis nomen traxit, quos ipſi Gelenos ‘ vocant, ita ut Latina lingua cervina dici poſſit. Patrem habuit ſummo apud regem loco & honore, ‘ hominem minimè illiteratum, nam & Moriam Eraſmi in patriam linguam convertit, & lepidum ſalſumque opus cum ſuis communicavit. Matre ejus fœmina primaria & nobili, propter mulieris prudentiam ‘ & probatos mores, regina plurimum & familiariter ‘ utebatur. Talibus parentibus ortus Gelenius, parem ‘ quoque, hoc eſt, ingenuam & liberalem habuit educationem (1). —— *The Gelenian family, an ancient ‘ and honourable one, took it's name from Stags* (Cervi) ‘ *which they call* Geleni; *ſo that in Latin it may be ‘ called* Cervina. *His father had a poſt of great honour under the king, a man by no means illiterate, ‘ for he tranſlated Eraſmus's* Praiſe of Folly *into his ‘ native tongue, and communicated that witty and ſatirical work to his countrymen. His mother, a ‘ lady of high birth, was in great favour with the ‘ queen, on account of her prudent conduct. Gelenius, ‘ ſprung from ſuch parents, had an education anſwerable ‘ to his birth, that is, an ingenuous and liberal ‘ one.*’

[*B*] *Few learned men have tranſlated ſo many works out of Greek into Latin as he.*] After having publiſhed a dictionary in four languages (2), he made notes upon Pliny and Livy, and publiſhed them. He tranſlated the Jewiſh antiquities of Joſephus, and corrected the other works of that author, by collating together ſeveral manuſcripts. Afterwards he turned into Latin ſome homilies of St Chryſoſtom, and then the Roman hiſtory of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus; the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of Evagrius; Origen's work againſt Celſus; the works of Philo, and thoſe of Appian. After that he undertook the tranſlation of the works of Juſtin Martyr, and had tranſlated moſt of them when he died. This is what I find in the preface of Curio before Appian. I do not find there any mention of what Gelenius had done upon Ammianus Marcellinus, a work, which Henry Valeſius has much commended; theſe are his words (3): ‘ Erat quidem ‘ in utroque horum virorum (4) magna doctrina, ut ‘ ſcripta utriuſque teſtantur. Sed in Gelenio major ‘ quædam ingenii vis, & judicium acrius fuit. Quod ‘ cùm multi præclari labores illius viri teſtantur, tum ‘ maximè interpretationes Latinæ Dionyſii Halicarnaſſenſis, Appiani, Philonis item ac Joſephi, Origenis ‘ & aliorum. Ex quibus apparet eum excellenti ‘ ingenio & ſingulari doctrina præditum fuiſſe. Sed ‘ & Ammiani Marcellini hiſtoriæ ab eo editæ id ipſum abunde teſtantur. In quibus plurima acutè & ‘ ingenioſe emendavit; & inſignem paginarum tranſpoſitionem, quæ in Mſſ. omnibus codicibus reperitur, & in Editione exſtat Accurſii, mira dexteritate ‘ reſtituit. Quamobrem ejus viri nomini libenter hoc ‘ laudis teſtimonium impertimus, neminem adhuc extitiſſe, qui de hiſtoria Marcellini melius meritus ſit. ‘ —— *Both theſe men were very learned, as appears ‘ from their writings. But Gelenius had a greater ‘ force of genius, and a more diſcerning judgment. This ‘ appears from many labours of that great man, but ‘ particularly from his Latin verſions of Dionyſius ‘ Halicarnaſſenſis, Appian, Philo, Joſephus, Origen, ‘ and others. All theſe diſcover his uncommon abilities and learning. As does likewiſe his edition of ‘ Ammianus Marcellinus; in whom he has made ſeveral ingenious emendations, and, with wonderful dexterity, reſtored the remarkable tranſpoſition of pages, ‘ which is to be found in all the manuſcript copies, ‘ and is extant in the edition of Accurſius. Wherefore I willingly give this teſtimony of applauſe to ‘ ſo great a man, that no one has deſerved better of ‘ Marcellinus's hiſtory.*’ Eraſmus does not ſpeak ſo well of Gelenius's performance upon Pliny; for, on the contrary, he gives a very ill character of it: ‘ Sigiſmundus Gelenius tuo nomini (5) dicavit *Annotationes in Plinium* jam tertiò ab ipſo caſtigatum. Sed ‘ mire impoſuit illi codex manu deſcriptus, in quo ‘ ſciolus aliquis è ſuo capite mutavit quicquid libuit, ‘ & quodam modo novum *Plinium* nobis dedit. Admonui, nè fideret illi exemplari, ſed auditus non ſum. ‘ *Hermolaus* non auſus eſt mutare lectionem *Plinianam*. ‘ *Gelenius* ſe putavit rem mirificam præſtitiſſe, ego ‘ cenſeo crimen eſſe inexpiabile (6). —— *Sigiſmund ‘ Gelenius inſcribed to you his notes upon Pliny, now ‘ a third time corrected by him. But he was ſtrangely impoſed upon by a manuſcript copy, in which ſome ‘ ſmatterer had made what alterations he thought proper, and given us as it were a new Pliny. I adviſed him not to truſt to that copy, but he had no ‘ regard to my advice. Hermolaus would not venture ‘ to alter the text of Pliny. Gelenius thought he had ‘ done a wonderful thing; but I think it an unpardonable crime.*’ Here follows Mr Huet's judgment (7): ‘ In iis quoque numeratur Sigiſmundus Gelenius ‘ Bohemus, quo vix quiſquam pluribus hanc artem ‘ monumentis ditavit: diſertus imprimis habitus eſt ‘ & elegans; audax in conſtringendis pluribus in unum ‘ periodis, vel disjungendis, ſenſus ſibi non ſemper intellectos ad libitum recoquit. —— *Among theſe likewiſe is reckoned Sigiſmund Gelenius, a Bohemian, ‘ than whom no one has left more monuments of his ‘ skill in this ſcience; he is eſteemed particularly eloquent and beautiful; bold in connecting ſeveral periods ‘ into one, or in diſuniting them, he makes alterations, ‘ where the ſenſe is not clear to him.*’

(1) Cælius Secundus Curio, Præfat. in Appianum Alexandrin.

(2) Linguarum quatuor Symphonum Lexicum, Græcis videlicet, Latinis, Germanicis & Dalmaticis vocibus ordine diſpoſitis concinnavit. *Id. ibid.*

(3) Henricus Valeſius, in Præfat. Amm. Marcellini.

(4) That is, Mariangelus Accurſius, and Sigiſmundus Gelenius.

(5) That is, to Damian de Goes.

(6) Eraſm. Epiſt. lxix. lib xxx, pag. 1957. *It is dated the 21ſt of May, 1535.*

(7) Huetius, de claris Interpret. pag. m. 225.

ſeldom in a paſſion [*C*]; and cared neither for honours, nor riches [*D*]. He preferred, before the employments that were offered him elſewhere, the peaceful place he had at Baſil (*a*), where he died [*E*] like a good chriſtian, being fifty ſeven years old. He married in that city, and left behind him two ſons and one daughter (*b*), of whoſe deſtiny I am ignorant. Some place his death in the year 1554 (*c*), others in the year 1555 (*d*). His edition of Arnobius has been much cenſured [*F*].

(*a*) See the remark [*D*].

(*b*) Taken out of the preface, which Cælius Secundus Curio has put before the tranſlation of Appian.

(*c*) Thuanus, Bucholcerus.

(*d*) Pantaleon apud Bucholcer. Ind. Chron.

[*C*] *He was very ſeldom in a paſſion.*] Curio expreſſes this in theſe words (8): ‘Erat in eo animi lenitas mira, naturæque bonitas quædam, ut vix iraſci poſſet etiam irritatus . . . . cum nemine unquam ſimultatem geſſit: rerum alienarum minimè curioſus, minime ſuſpicax: ſed antiqua non tamen ſtulta ſimplicitate præditus. ——— *He had a wonderful mildneſs of temper, and a certain good-nature, which ſcarce ſuffered him to be angry, even tho' provoked . . . he had no reſentment to any one; was by no means inquiſitive into other mens affairs, nor at all ſuſpicious; but endued with an ancient, but not weak, ſimplicity of manners.*’ This is the true character of a good man; which will appear yet more by the following remark.

(8) Curio, ubi ſupra.

[*D*] *He cared neither for honours, nor riches.*] I uſe Curio's words (9): ‘Quanta vero continentia atque abſtinentia fuerit, quarum illa in iis quæ abſunt non expetendis, altera in iis quæ adſunt, in noſtraque poteſtate ſunt, abſtinendo, illa declarant, quòd cùm per tot annos tantopere in re literaria elaboravit, ex quo magnorum virorum gratiam eſt conſecutus, nullas tamen divitias congeſſit, nullas reliquit, ſuppellectile domeſtica, victuque contentus. Bonis & doctis, ſi quos egere animadvertebat, largiebatur: felicibus & fortunatis non invidebat: calamitatibus aliorum afficiebatur: neminem contemnebat. Illud verò maximum continentiæ ſignum fuit: quod in Regis Bohemiæ aulam magnis præmiis, & honoribus, quibuſque vel cupidus & ambitioſus aliquis contentus eſſe poteſt, allectus renuit, hanc quietam & moderatam vitam ambitioſis illis & turbulentis dignitatibus anteponens. Omitto provincias bonas & literas & artes profitendi oblatas, quas nunquam ut ſuſciperet adduci potuit, adeò tenax propoſiti, vitæque generis ſemel honeſtè ſuſcepti, ſemper fuit. ——— *How great his continence and abſtinence were, the former of which virtues conſiſts in not deſiring what we have not, the latter in abſtaining from what is in our power, appears in this, that, notwithſtanding his many years learned labours, during which he acquired the friendſhip of great men, he heaped up no riches, nor left any behind him, being ſatisfied with his private fortunes. He was bountiful to good and learned men, whom he obſerved to be in want: he envied not the happy and ſucceſsful: he ſympathized with the calamities of others; he deſpiſed no body. But the greateſt inſtance of his continence, was, his refuſing the great rewards and honours, ſuch as were ſufficient to ſatisfy avarice and ambition, by which he was invited to the court of Bohemia, preferring this quiet and humble life to ambitious and turbulent dignities. I omit the profeſſorſhips he refuſed, ſo tenacious was he of his purpoſe, and the kind of life he had once made choice of.*’ Though Eraſmus thought Gelenius worthy of a better fortune, yet he durſt not wiſh him riches; being apprehenſive leſt plenty ſhould cool that zeal, with which he ſaw him labour for the good of the commonwealth of learning (10). Gelenius, according to Thuanus, ſtruggled with poverty all his life-time (11).

(9) Id. ibid.

[*E*] *He died at Baſil.*] Mr Moreri has here made a notorious tranſpoſition. Sigiſmund de Ghelen, (thus he makes Thuanus ſpeak) *a native of Baſil, died in Bohemia.* Thuanus had ſaid, that he was born in Bohemia, and died at Baſil (12). Mr Moreri is in the wrong to ſay, that Gelenius has *tranſlated ſome homilies of Origen*; he ſhould have ſaid, of St Chryſoſtom. Mr Teiſſier is to blame not to mention it: he has been led into an error by thoſe that have abridged Geſner (13). *He has alſo corrected ſeveral homilies of St Chryſoſtom*: theſe are Mr Teiſſier's words (14), which import as if he had tranſlated none: but if you do but look into father Labbe (15), you will find there ſeveral homilies of St Chryſoſtom turned into Latin by Gelenius.

FAULTS of Mr Moreri.

[*F*] *His edition of Arnobius has been much cenſured.*] Here is what Barthius ſays of it (16): ‘Ingenioſiſſimus ſed audaciſſimus, & nil prorſus ſibi negans, Arnobii corrector Sigiſmundus Gelenius in eam editionem quam totam ad ſuum captum reformavit, aut transformavit potius, teſtatus neminem ſibi unquam auctorem tantum negotii exhibuiſſe. ——— *A moſt ingenious, but moſt bold, man, and who denied himſelf nothing; I mean Sigiſmund Gelenius, the corrector of Arnobius, in that edition of his, which he entirely reformed, or rather transformed to his own genius, aſſuring us, that no author had given him ſo much trouble.*’ Add to this paſſage that of the preface to Arnobius, of the Leyden edition, 1651. ‘Arnobium quidem hunc primus Romæ vulgaverat Franciſcus Priſcianenſis Florentius, ſed una cum veteris manuſcripti, quo uſus fuerat, fœdis admodum erroribus. Sigiſmundus poſtea Gelenius editionem hanc corruptam ſolo ingenio, uti potuit, reſtituit. Sed ingenii ille fiducia malo exemplo uſus, conjecturas ſuas textui inſeruit, antiquas lectiones ſuo imperio ejecit, & Arnobium nobis effinxit, qui Arnobii ſpeciem non referret. Hanc audaciam merito reprehendit Canterus. ——— *Franciſcus Priſcianenſis, of Florence, firſt publiſhed Arnobius at Rome, but together with the foul errors of the ancient manuſcript he made uſe of. Afterwards Sigiſmund Gelenius reſtored this faulty edition by his own genius, as well as he could. But, depending too much on his own abilities, he inſerted his conjectures in the text, rejected the old readings by his ſole authority, and dreſſed up for us an Arnobius, but very unlike Arnobius. Canterus juſtly cenſures this raſhneſs.*’

(10) Gelenius pro ſua doctrina non vulgari, proque morum ſinceritate dignus eſt lautiore fortunâ, divitias vix auſim illi optare. Quid periculi inquis? Ne ſegnior fiat ad provehendam rem literariam. Multos πενια ad induſtriam ſtimulat. *Eraſmus, Epiſt. xxxviii, lib. xxvii, pag.* 1555.

(11) Cum egeſtate tota vita conflictatus. *Thuan. lib. xiii, pag.* 271, *ad ann.* 1554.

(12) In Boëmia natus Baſiliæ deceſſit. *Id. ibid.*

(13) Chryſoſtomi homilias aliquot cum manuſcriptis Græcis exemplaribus contulit, emendavit, ſupplevit. *Epit. Biblioth. Geſner. pag.* 753.

(14) Teiſſier, Elog. Tom. I, pag. 90. *Sir Thomas-Pope Blount,* Cenſura Autorum, pag. 459, *is in the ſame error.*

(15) De Script. Eccleſ. Tom. I, pag. 531, & ſeq.

(16) Adverſar. lib. xliv, cap. i, apud Blount, ibid. pag. 460.

GENTILIS DE BECHIS, a native of Urbino, and canon of Florence, was preferred to the biſhopric of Arezzo the twenty firſt of October, 1473. The Florentines were very glad of it, and ſent him often upon embaſſies to the courts of princes; particularly to Charles VIII, king of France, to condole with him upon the death of the king his father, and to congratulate his acceſſion to the crown (*a*). He got a reputation by his eloquence, which he ſhewed in the Latin orations he pronounced in ſeveral places of Italy. He had a ſhare in the education of Leo X. He applied himſelf alſo to poetry. Some critics ſpeak of his productions with contempt, and cannot forgive him the barbarous Latin words that crept into his works, nor bear, that the beſt of his pieces ſhould contain the phraſe *præſtare obedientiam*. We ſhall ſee the proof all this in a paſſage of Alcyonius [*A*]. The ſpeech, in which

that

(*a*) *Taken out of Ughelli,* Tom. I, *of the* Italia ſacra, pag. 790.

[*A*] *The proof of all this is in a paſſage of Alcyonius.*] I take it out of a dialogue, wherein Julius de Medicis, one of the interlocutors, ſpeaks thus to the legate John de Medicis, who was afterwards Pope Leo X. ‘Memini etiam operam te dare Gentili præſuli Aretino homini, ut ſuis temporibus politioris humanitatis laude florentiſſimo. Sed nihil etiam melior ille fuit quam Politianus, id quod cum ex aliis monimentis ejus perſpici poteſt, tum ex orationibus quas in diverſis Italiæ locis complures habuit. In illis enim multa verba ex trivio arrepta viſuntur, multæ quoque elocutiones barbaræ & agreſtes occurrunt, ſententiæ autem multæ pueriles ac imprudentes ſunt. Nonnulli tamen eam in primis orationem honorifica laude proſequuntur, quam habuit apud Alexandrum VI. Pontif. Max. Legatus populi

Florentini

that phraſe is found, is that, which he made to Pope Alexander VI, upon his embaſſy of obedience. Some pretend, that the great deſire he had to harangue upon that occaſion, was one of the reaſons, which obliged Peter de Medicis to hinder the people of Italy from paying that duty to the new Pope all together, and by a ſingle deputation [*B*]. Gentilis was ſent to Charles VIII (*b*), at the time of the expedition of Naples, and ſettled the conditions, which the Florentines were to obſerve in that nice ſituation of the affairs of Italy.

(*b*) Ughelli, ubi ſupra.

‘Florentini paulo poſt quam ille ſacris Chriſtianis publice præfectus eſt. Verum hanc quoque non ſatis dignam video quæ iterum legatur; in ea enim minus eleganter expreſſit id quod homini exprimendum erat elegantiſſime, hoc eſt cauſſam cur Romam veniſſet, quæ erat ut per illum populus Florentinus ſe conferret ad auctoritatem Pontificis Maximi. Ille autem in hoc ſenſu reddendo plebeiam elocutionem uſurpavit, quæ eſt obedientiam præſtare, quam ob rem id genus orationes tempus, ut alias multorum oblivione obruet. Feruntur quoque ejuſdem verſiculi faciliore quidem muſa facti, ſed ſine cultu & Latinæ puritatis nitore (1). —— *I remember that you ſtudy Gentilis, a Florentine, and a biſhop, a man of polite learning for his times. But he was nothing better than Politian, as appears both from his other remains, and from the orations, which he pronounced in ſeveral parts of Italy; for we find in them many vulgar words, many barbarous and ruſtic phraſes, and many childiſh and weak ſentiments. Some however particularly extol that, which he ſpoke before Pope Alexander VI, a little after his election. But even that, I think, is hardly worthy a ſecond reading; for in that, he has not elegantly enough expreſſed what ought to have been expreſſed with the greateſt elegance, to wit, the reaſon of his coming to Rome, which was to acknowledge, in the name of the people of Florence, the Pope's authority. In expreſſing this, he made uſe of the vulgar phraſe,* obedientiam præſtare, *for which reaſon theſe kind of orations, as well as many others, will periſh by time. He was more happy in poetry, but without attaining to the elegance and purity of the Latin tongue.*’ Theſe words contain a prediction, which time has verified; for the orations of that *Gentilis* are no more talked of, than if they had never been extant.

[*B*] *The great deſire he had to harangue, at the time of the embaſſy of obedience to Alexander VI, was one of the reaſons why this duty was not paid .... by a ſingle deputation.*] Lewis Sforza had cauſed a reſolution to be taken, that the ſtates of Italy ſhould ſend to the Pope only one embaſſy of obedience, ‘wherein the deputies of each prince and republic ſhould be together, march each in his rank, have but one orator, and ſo well concert meaſures, that, if the new Pope had purpoſed to divide them, he might be diſappointed in his hopes .... (2). But Peter de Medicis, who had not dared to oppoſe that reſolution, becauſe he alone was of a contrary opinion, forgot nothing that he thought proper to hinder the execution of it. He had procured himſelf to be named chief of the deputation of the Florentines; his equipage was almoſt all compleated; and, becauſe none in Italy, except the republic of Venice, had more money than he, of which he was very profuſe upon ſuch pompous occaſions, he was ſure of making a greater figure alone, than all the other embaſſadors and deputies together ..... He conceived, that, if his train marched with that of the other embaſſadors, it would be eclipſed by the great number, and that none but critical eyes would diſtinguiſh it amidſt that confuſion: whereas, if he entered Rome, and went to his audience alone, both the good judges, and ſuch as were but indifferently ſuch, would equally do him juſtice. However it had not been impoſſible to work him out of that prepoſſeſſion, if his friends had undertaken to do it. But one of them, that was moſt intimate with him, confirmed him, by another conceit, in his error, inſtead of curing him of it. This was one Scipio Gentile, a Florentine gentleman (3), and biſhop of Arezzo, who had made himſelf very famous by polite literature, and his agreeable converſation. His birth and great eſtate did not make him proud, or leſs tractable; and his too great paſſion for eloquence was almoſt the only fault he had. He was but a mean orator; and yet he had ſo great a conceit of himſelf in that particular, that he would ſcarce yield to the matchleſs Savanarola. He had obtained, by his intereſt, from the republic of Florence, that he ſhould harangue the Pope for them; and had afterwards compoſed his ſpeech with all the application he was capable of. He had communicated it to John Picus Mirandula, Angelus Politianus, Marcellus Ficinus, and other wits of Italy, who, by their approbation, confirmed him in the opinion that it was a maſter-piece; ſo that nothing could vex him more, than being hindered from pronouncing it; which however muſt of neceſſity happen, if there was but one orator for all Italy, becauſe the king of Naples, as the higheſt in degree of all the princes, would have the right to name him. That prince, who had in his capital city the moſt flouriſhing academy in Europe for the Belles Lettres, and of which the famous Sannazar was director, would not chooſe a perſon, that was not of that body to harangue his holineſs. Whereupon Gentile, animated by his own intereſt, ſtirred up Peter de Medicis to that degree, that he made him ſollicit the king of Naples, for reviving the cuſtom, that each particular prince and ſtate of Italy ſhould pay their duty by themſelves to the Pope (4). This ſucceeded: the ceremony of obedience was performed by each prince and republic of Italy in particular, and the two Florentines found their account in it. The equipage of Peter de Medicis out-did all the reſt in magnificence; and the ſpeech of Scipio Gentile was ſo much eſteemed, that it was prefixed to the collection of ſuch ſort of pieces (5).’

This quotation may ſeem too long to ſome; but I do not doubt that ſeveral others will be glad to find here a full account of ſo curious a thing as this is.

(1) Petrus Alcyonius in Medice Legato Poſteriore, circa fin.

(2) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles VIII, lib. ii, pag. 162. Dutch Edit.

(3) Ughelli does not give him that chriſtian name: he only calls him Gentilis de Bechis; and ſays, he was a native of Urbino, and not a gentleman of Florence.

(4) Varill. ubi ſupra, pag. 163.

(5) Id. ibid. pag. 165, 166.

GENTILIS (JOHN VALENTINUS) (*a*), a native of Coſenza [*A*] in the kingdom of Naples, left his country for his religion, towards the middle of the XVIth century, and retired to Geneva, where ſeveral Italian families had already formed a congregation. There happened to be among thoſe refugees of Italy ſome wits, who ſubtilized upon the myſtery of the Trinity, on the words Eſſence, Perſon, Co-eſſential *&c.* George Blandrata, a Phyſician, and John Paul Alciatus, a Milaneze, were the chief of thoſe innovators, with an advocate called Matthew Gribaud. The thing was treated without noiſe, and by private writings. Gentilis would have a ſhare in thoſe diſputes, and contributed not a little to embolden thoſe new Arians. This gave occaſion to the Articles of Faith, which were drawn up in the

(*a*) See the remark [*D*] of the article GENTILIS (SCIPIO) towards the end.

[*A*] *He was a native of Coſenza.*] Some (1) have ſaid, that he was not born in that town; others (2) make him a Neapolitan. Nicodemo confutes them invincibly, by the teſtimony of ſeveral grave authors, and by the ſubſcription of Valentinus Gentilis; but he is miſtaken, when he fathers upon Theodore Beza the hiſtory of the puniſhment of that heretic. To be entirely in the right, he ſhould have aſcribed that work to Benedictus Aretius, after having cenſured Quattromani, who aſcribed it to Calvin.

[*B*] *This*

(1) Sertorio Quattromani, in Epiſtola ad Celſum Mollum, apud Leonardum Nicodemum, addizioni alla Bibliotheca Napoletana, pag. 243.

(2) Lindanus in Dubitantio, Dial. ii, pag. 149, & ex eo Prateolus in Elench. Hæret. pag. 510, apud Nicodemum, ibid. pag. 244.

the Italian conſiſtory, the eighteenth of May 1558 [*B*]. They contained the moſt pure orthodoxy concerning that myſtery, and exacted a promiſe in expreſs terms, and upon pain of being accounted guilty of perjury, never to do any thing directly, or indirectly, that ſhould oppoſe it. Gentilis ſubſcribed thoſe articles, and yet continued to ſpread his errors clandeſtinely: Whereupon the magiſtrates took cognizance of the thing, and committed him to priſon. He was convicted of having violated his ſubſcription, which he endeavoured to excuſe from the ſuggeſtions of his conſcience. He preſented ſeveral writings, firſt to endeavour to palliate and maintain his opinions, and then to pacify Calvin, and to acknowledge and abjure his errors: In conſideration of which, the magiſtrates of Geneva ſentenced him only to undergo an *Amende honorable*, to throw his writings into the fire, and to promiſe not to go out of the city without leave. This ſentence was executed the ſecond of September, 1558. He was ſet at liberty a few days after; and, upon his petition, ſhewing his incapacity to give bail, he was excuſed from it; but they made him ſwear not to go out of Geneva without the conſent of the magiſtrates. Neverthelеſs he ſoon fled away, and retired into the country, to Matthew Gribaud [*C*], his companion in hereſy. He went afterwards to Lyons, and then wandered from place to place in Dauphiné and Savoy; and being ſafe no where, he returned to the village, whither he retired firſt, in the territory of the canton of Bern. He was ſoon known there, and put in priſon; but he was ſet at liberty not many days after, and publiſhed a confeſſion of Faith, attended with ſome proofs and ſome invectives againſt St Athanaſius. He dedicated it to the bailiff, who had committed him, and made him very uneaſy by ſuch a dedication [*D*]. About the ſame time, he was impriſoned at Lyons for his doctrine; but, having had the cunning to ſhew, that he only oppoſed Calvin, and not the myſtery of the Trinity, he was ſet at liberty. Blandrata and Alciatus, who left no ſtone unturned, in Poland, to plant their hereſies, invited him to come to them, to be their fellow-labourer. They would have done more miſchief than they did, if they had not differed among themſelves, and if the king of Poland had not publiſhed, in 1566, an edict, by which he baniſhed all ſtrangers, who taught their new tenets [*E*]. Gentilis retired into Moravia, from whence, being gone to Vienna in Auſtria, he reſolved to return into Savoy, where he hoped to find ſtill his friend Gribaud; not to mention, that death had

[*B*] *This gave occaſion to the articles of faith which were drawn up in the Italian conſiſtory, the* 18*th of May* 1558.] The author (3) of the book I have quoted, and Calvin againſt Gentilis, ſpeak only of the articles of faith of the Italian conſiſtory, and name only five perſons that ſigned them. They ſay, indeed, that Gentilis and five more, refuſing to ſign at firſt, ſigned afterwards, when they were called in private (4); but they do not ſay, that he was one of the ſeven, who choſe rather to leave Geneva, than to ſet their hands to the articles, 'till the powerful ſollicitations of their countrymen had obliged them to return, and ſubſcribe. It is Mr Leti (5), who, without mentioning the articles drawn up by the Italian conſiſtory, mentions others much longer, which, according to him, were propoſed to be ſubſcribed before the council. Theſe articles were only the confeſſion of faith, which Calvin had lately drawn up, and which had been approved by the miniſters, the ſyndics, the council of XXV, and that of CC, and the general aſſembly of the people. He names ſeveral that ſubſcribed them; and, among the reſt, *Galeazzo Caracciolo, Celſo Conte Martinengo, Maſſimiliano ſuo fratello Miniſtro della Chieſa.* But as to the firſt, the account of his life informs us, that he was abſent from Geneva, from the ſeventh of March to the fourth of October, 1558, in which interval the articles were ſubſcribed, Gentilis impriſoned, *&c.* As for the two others, the ſame account informs us, that we muſt reduce them to one, that is to the miniſter. Now this Martinengo was dead before the ſubſcribing of the articles was thought of. See the 262d letter of Calvin. Mr. Leti adds, that ſeven perſons refuſed to ſubſcribe, and went out of the city: *Che in fatti ſi ritirarono della citta e tra queſti Andrea Oſſellani, Marco Pizzi, e Valentino Gentile: quali vinti poi in breve dalle perſuaſive de loro compatrioti, ſi riduſſero à ſotto ſcrivere* (6). What he ſays might be true: but if it be ſo, are not the authors of other accounts much to blame, for having ſuppreſſed things ſo eſſential to this hiſtory? Dr Spon (7) does but partly agree with them: He ſays, that the council cauſed the ſuſpected Italians to ſubſcribe the general confeſſion of the church: he owns that ſome of them left the city, but not that they returned to ſubſcribe; nor does he put Gentilis among thoſe that went out of Geneva. How comes hiſtory to be ſo full of variations? Is it becauſe people delight to falſify the memoirs they copy? Or is it becauſe they do not take notice of the alterations they make in them?

(3) Benedictus Aretius. *See concerning his book, citation (b), in the margin of the text of this article.*

(4) See Beza, in the Life of Calvin.

(5) Hiſtor. Genevrina, Tom. III, pag. 104.

(6) Ibid. pag. 117.

(7) Hiſt. de Geneve, ad ann. 1558.

[*C*] *He retired into the country, to Matthew Gribaud.*] Aretius ſays, that he retired *in Pagum Fargiarum*; and that that village is in the country of Gex, *in præfectura Gajenſi.* Which makes me believe, that there is an error in the paſſage of Lubieniecius (8), where it is ſaid, that *Matthæus Gribaldus celeberrimus Juriſconſultus Patavinus* was *pagi Turgiarum dominus.* Inſtead of *Turgiarum*, I would ſay *Fargiarum.* The country of Gex was then poſſeſſed by the canton of Bern.

(8) Hiſt. Reformat. Polonicæ, pag. 108.

[*D*] *He dedicated to the bailiff of Gex a Confeſſion of Faith, and made him very uneaſy by ſuch a dedication.*] That bailiff of Gex had demanded a Confeſſion of Faith of Gentilis, that he might cauſe it to be examined by ſome miniſters, and ſent to Bern: Whereupon Gentilis got it printed, as if by the bailiff's order, and dedicated it to him (9). The *Bibliotheque* of the Anti Trinitarians (10) ſays, that that bailiff, who had ſet Gentilis at liberty, at the deſire of John Paul Alciatus, became ſuſpected of hereſy at Bern, becauſe that Confeſſion was dedicated to him; and that therefore he ſecured Gentilis as ſoon as he came within his reach: which he did, to remove thoſe ſuſpicions. Whether that be true or no, yet it is moſt certain, nothing more powerfully influences thoſe, who would preſerve or enlarge their dignities, than the deſire not to be accounted heretics. If one ſhould write the hiſtory of all the unjuſt proceedings, and hypocritical tricks, which ſpring from that ſource, how many ſtrange things would be brought to light? Gentilis's Confeſſion, and the pieces annexed to it, were printed at Lyons, though the title page bore Antwerp; and the bookſeller was made to ſpeak, in the preface, under the name of *Theophilus ad filios Eccleſiæ.* In Gentilis's indictment, his lies were mentioned before his cheats (11). They found about him ſome other works of his own writing, when he was ſeized; but theſe were not printed. Aretius (12), and the *Bibliotheque* of the Anti-Trinitarians (13), mention them.

(9) Aretius, pag. 9, & 46.

(10) Pag. 27. Vide etiam Hiſtor. Reform. Polon. pag. 107.

(11) Aretius, pag. 46.

(12) Ibid pag. 11, 12.

(13) Pag. 26, 27.

FAULTS of Moreri.

[*E*] *The king of Poland publiſhed, in* 1566, *an edict of baniſhment againſt all ſtrangers, who taught new doctrines.*] Moreri has committed ſome faults in this place: I. He pretends, that Valentinus Gentilis was driven out of Poland towards the year 1562. II. That the edict, then publiſhed by king Sigiſmund Auguſtus, baniſhed all heretics. All which is falſe. The had delivered him from the moſt dreadful adverſary he had in thoſe parts, I mean Calvin. But he brought himſelf into a ſnare; for the bailiff of the canton of Bern, who before impriſoned him, happened to be ſtill in office, and did not fail to lay hands on him the eleventh of June 1566 [*F*]. The cauſe was carried before the magiſtrates of Bern, where it was under examination from the fifth of Auguſt to the ninth of September. Gentilis, being duly convicted of having obſtinately, and againſt his own oath, oppugned the myſtery of the Trinity, was ſentenced to loſe his head. He gloried in ſuffering for the honour of GOD the Father [*G*], and taxed his adverſaries with Sabellianiſm (*b*). He held a particular opinion; for he believed, that, during the extent of eternity, GOD had created a moſt excellent ſpirit, which was incarnate, when the fulneſs of the times was come (*c*). I do not think, that this is the opinion of a Tritheiſt (*d*): But, no doubt, he held different opinions at different times.

(*b*) This article is extracted out of a Latin book, printed at Geneva by Francis Perrin, in 1567, in 4to. It contains, beſides divers dogmatical treatiſes, the Hiſtory of Gentilis's condemnation, by Benedictus Aretius, a divine of Bern.

(*c*) See the remark [*G*], towards the end.

(*d*) He is ſo called in the Moreri, printed in Holland, in the article of John Paul Alciatus.

The edict was publiſhed in a diet called the fifth of March 1566 (14), and did not concern the Calviniſts. Aretius would not have commended the king of Poland upon it, as he has done, if the reformed had been comprehended in it; and they were ſo far from being ſo, that they are accuſed of having promoted the publiſhing of that edict: 'Inſtigantibus adverſariis Romano '& Lemano ſpiritu ductis rex Auguſtus in Comitio 'Lublinenſi anno 1566. legem horrendi carminis in 'Anabaptiſtas, & Trideitas latam promulgari curavit, 'qua ii intra menſem regni finibus excedere juſſi. —— '*At the inſtigation of their adverſaries, actuated by* '*the ſpirit of Rome and Geneva, king Auguſtus, in the* '*diet of Lublin, in* 1566, *publiſhed a ſevere edict againſt* '*the Anabaptiſts and Tritheiſts, ordering them to leave* '*the kingdom within a month.*' Thus ſpeaks Lubieniecius, in the 194th page of his *Reformation of Poland*. III. There is no exactneſs in ſaying, in general terms, *that Gentilis, going through Bern, had his head cut off there, about the year* 1565. Father Maimbourg (15) has not entirely avoided an anachroniſm, with reſpect to Gentilis; for he makes him diſpute at the conference of Petricow in 1566; whereas it was held in 1565.

[*F*] *The bailiff, who had formerly impriſoned him, happened to be ſtill in office, and did not fail to lay hands on him, the eleventh of June* 1566.] It was at Gex, that Gentilis was arreſted, and not at Bern. He was gone thither (16), to deſire the bailiff to permit a public diſputation, of which the ſcheme and conditions were found among the papers of that fugitive. He propoſed, that the bailiff ſhould give notice to the miniſters and conſiſtories in the neighbourhood, that if any one had a mind to maintain Calvin's doctrine againſt Gentilis, he ſhould come to Gex within eight days, to diſpute with him; on this condition, that he, who ſhould not be able to prove his own opinion by the pure word of GOD, ſhould be put to death, as a notorious impoſtor, and a maintainer of a falſe religion: and that, if no body accepted the challenge, the bailiff and all the town-council ſhould proclaim, that Gentilis's ſentiments, touching the moſt high GOD, and his ſon JESUS CHRIST, were orthodox. The anſwer, that was made to the firſt overture of this diſpute, was the impriſoning of the heretic (17).

[*G*] *He gloried in ſuffering for the honour of GOD the Father.*] Aretius does not mention any other remarkable thing he ſaid on his dying-day; but he relates elſewhere (18) the particulars I am going to ſet down: 'Gentilis de ſe ita & ſcripſit & loquutus eſt 'quod eſſet patronus ſummi patris eminentiæ, & aſ'ſertor gloriæ patris. Nec dubitavit etiam dicere, ne'minem adhuc (quod ipſe quidem ſciret) pro gloria '& eminentia patris mortuum eſſe; prophetas, apoſto'los, pioſque martyres pro filii gloria perſecutiones, 'mortem & extrema quæque paſſos eſſe; eminentiam 'autem Dei patris nullos adhuc martyres habere. —— '*Gentilis wrote and ſpoke of himſelf as a patron and* '*aſſertor of the ſupremacy and glory of the Father. Nor* '*did he ſcruple ſaying, that no one yet (as he knew)* '*had died in defence of the glory and ſupremacy of* '*the Father; that the prophets, apoſtles, and pious* '*martyrs, had ſuffered perſecutions, death, and ex*'*treameſt tortures for the glory of the Son; but that* '*the ſuperiority of GOD the Father had as yet produced* '*no martyrs.*' Let us mention here the opinion he profeſſed in a ſynod of Poland: 'Sententia ejus quam 'in Polonia in Synodo Pinczoviæ ann. 1562, die 4. 'Novembris celebrata propoſuerat, hæc fuit, *Deum* '*creaviſſe in latitudine æternitatis Spiritum quemdam* '*excellentiſſimum, qui poſtea in plenitudine temporis in*'*carnatus eſt* (19). —— *The opinion, which he pro*'*poſed in Poland, in the Synod of Pinczovia, held* '*Novem.* 4, 1562, *was this*; That GOD, in the 'extent of eternity, had created a moſt excellent ſpirit, 'which afterwards, in the fulneſs of time, was incar'nate.'

he should have left out the Prophets who were all persecuted by the Jews a people who neither could nor would comprehend farther [illegible] the law [illegible] not kill the Prophets on account of their Prop[illegible] of the Messiah as for presuming [illegible]

(14) In Comitiis Pinſovienſibus, anno 1566, 5, Martii celebratis. Aretius, pag. 10. *The Hiſtory of the Reformation of Poland, pag.* 195, *ſays, that it was* in Comitio Lublinenſi, anno 1566.

(15) Hiſt. de l'Arrianiſme, Tom, III, pag. 356. Dutch Edit.

(16) Aretius, pag. 47, 48.

(17) *Ab præfecto Gaienſi* petit publicam diſputationem: reſpondit ille, fiat quod juſtum eſt, & ad carceres duci juſſit. *Id. pag.* 10.

(18) Pag. 27.

(19) Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar. pag. 26. Hiſtor. Ref. Polon. pag. 107.

GENTILIS (ALBERIC), profeſſor of the civil-law at Oxford, was the ſon of Matthew Gentilis, an Italian phyſician [*A*], deſcended from an ancient and noble family of the march of Ancona. That phyſician, having found ſome abuſes in the church of Rome, and reliſhed the good ſeed of the reformation, left his country, and retired into Carniola, with Alberic his eldeſt ſon, and Scipio the youngeſt but one of his ſeven children. Alberic was ſent into England, where his great capacity procured him a good ſettlement, I mean, the place of profeſſor of the civil-law in the Univerſity of Oxford, in the year 1582. He had taken his degree of doctor at Perugia, being twenty one years old; and, ſoon after, he was made a judge in the town of Aſcoli; which employment he quitted, to follow his father in his voluntary baniſhment, and the dictates of his conſcience. He compoſed ſeveral works [*B*], which gained him a great reputation. In ſome of his writings he does not entirely embrace the hypotheſes of the

[*A*] *He was ſon of Matthew Gentilis, an Italian phyſician.*] I have found ſomething concerning him in a work of Scipio Gentilis. 'An vero Dæmones morborum cauſſa 'ſint, hanc quæſtionem cum parens meus Matthæus 'Gentilis optimus & clariſſimus, Matth. Duraſtanti, 'Med. & Philoſ. præſtantiſſimo propoſuiſſet, edito libro 'ei reſpondit (1). —— *Whether devils are the cauſe* '*of diſeaſes; which queſtion when my father Matthew* '*Gentilis, a good and great man, had propoſed to Mat*'*thew Duraſtantes, phyſician and philoſopher, he anſwer* '*him by publiſhing a book on that ſubject.*' Note, by the way, that the phyſician, who anſwered that queſtion, was miſnamed Duraſtanes by Mr Konig. He was called Duraſtantes (2).

[*B*] *He compoſed ſeveral works.*] He wrote three books *de Jure Belli*, which have done Grotius no diſſervice. He wrote alſo three others *de Legationibus*. His diſputes about the abſolute power of kings, the union of the kingdoms of Great-Britain, and the injuſtice inſeparable from reſiſtance to kings, *De vi civium in Regem ſemper injuſta*, ſhewed yet more clearly, that he was not for republican principles, than the ten diſputes, of which he made a preſent to his ſon, that he might dedicate them, in the year 1607, to the earl of Pembroke, his patron. They are upon the titles of the Code, *Si quis Imperatori maledixerit, ad legem Juliam de majeſtate*. His books, *De Juris interpretibus, & De Advocatione Hiſpanica* (3), are not the leaſt

(1) Scipio Gentilis, in Comment. in Apolog. Apuleii, pag. 260.

(2) *See* Lindenius renovatus, pag. 504.

(3) To apprehend the reaſon of that title, it is to be noted, that Alberic Gentilis was made perpetual advocate of all the cauſes which the ſubjects of Spain ſhould have depending in England. See his epitaph in Konig's *Bibliotheca*.

the proteſtants [C]; for his diſpute, touching the firſt book of the Maccabees, comes but little ſhort of an indirect apology for thoſe, who hold it for canonical. The ſame judgment may almoſt be made of the treatiſe he compoſed againſt thoſe, who blame the Latin of the vulgar tranſlation of the Bible. See the remark [C]. He died at London, the nineteenth of June, 1608, being fifty eight years old. He loved to that degree to improve in the ſciences, that he did not ſeek leſs to inſtruct himſelf by converſation, than reading; and he has acquainted us in print, that his collections were full of a thouſand things he had heard, as he talked familiarly with perſons, who did not imagine, that what they ſaid would be ſo honoured. The paſſage, wherein he ſpeaks of this, deſerves a place in our remarks [D]. See Mr Konig's Bibliotheque, and the funeral oration of Scipio Gentilis.

leaſt of his works. I paſs over the titles of ſeveral others.

[C] *He does not entirely embrace the hypotheſes of the Proteſtants.*] Voëtius was very ſenſible of it. He relates, that John Howſon, an Oxford divine, maintained, in a public diſputation, the opinion of the Roman Catholics about the indiſſolubleneſs of marriage; that is, that adultery may indeed be a lawful reaſon to part with one's wife, but not ſuch a reaſon as may juſtify the marrying of another. An Engliſh divine, called Thomas Pye, wrote againſt that tenet of John Howſon, who defended himſelf, and compoſed an apology, printed at Oxford, in 4to, in 1606, with the diſputation, and two letters, one from John Raynolds to Thomas Pye, the other from Alberic Gentilis to John Howſon. Note, that Raynolds cenſured Pye, for having publiſhed certain things, which were not exact; but he perſiſted in the doctrine he had already maintained againſt Bellarmin, in an Engliſh book concerning divorce. Gentilis ſhuffled, and gave to underſtand, he knew not what to think about that queſtion: though in his work, *de Nuptiis*, he had declared himſelf for the common opinion of the Proteſtants. Voëtius, having related all this, adds to it a reflexion, which highly deſerves to be here inſerted: 'Iſte (Alb. Gentilis) in hâc epiſtolâ haut obſcurè fatetur ſe fluctuare, quamvis antea in libro de Nuptiis affirmantem ſententiam tradidiſſet. Sed neſcio quomodo Albericus Gentilis vaſtæ eruditionis Raynoldianæ, & theologiæ ipſius tanquam nimis puræ & reformatæ in dogmatibus & in practicis, ſi non æmulum (de quo quidem ex ſingularium factorum gnaris, aliquid audiſſe memini) ſe oſtendere, ſaltem ſuſpectum ſe reddidiſſe videatur diatribis ſuis de vulgatâ verſione, de actoribus fabularum, de abuſu mendacii, &c. In quibus tam longè ac diſciplina reformata, à moribus antiquis Academiæ Peruſinæ, ubi antea Jus profeſſus erat, non abibat. Sed hæc in tantâ omnium imperfectione miſeriæ humanæ pars non minima (4). —— *In this letter Gentilis plainly confeſſes, that he doubts; though before, in his book concerning marriage, he had laid down an affirmative opinion. But, I know not how, Alberic Gentilis, in his diſſertations concerning the Vulgate, the actors of plays, and the abuſe of lying, if he does not openly rival, at leaſt gives room to ſuſpect that he emulates the extenſive learning of Raynolds, and his divinity, as too pure and reformed both in doctrine and practice; and indeed I remember to have heard ſo from perſons acquainted with the particular facts. But, in thoſe pieces, he did not depart ſo much, as the reformed diſcipline did, from the ancient manners of the univerſity of Altdorf, where he had before profeſſed the civil-law. But this is not the leaſt among ſo many inſtances of human weakneſs.*'

[D] *The paſſage, wherein he ſpeaks of this, deſerves a place in our remarks.*] Here is what we read in one of his books (5): 'Quid de Oxonienſibus meis? vel repertoria mea teſtantur ſatis quantum ego capiam fructus ex eorum virorum & juvenum colloquiis, nam in illis ego deſcripſi non pauca, quæ dum minus id ipſi cogitant, diſco tamen & aſſervo ex ſermonibus familiaribus. —— *How much I profited by my acquaintance at Oxford, is plain from my table-books, in which I wrote down many things, which paſſed in converſation unknown to thoſe, with whom I converſed.*' He adds, what he had heard from his father, who had ſtudied the civil-law under the profeſſor Argenterius. That profeſſor never ſlighted any thing he heard in converſation, but ſet down all that occurred, even from the meaneſt perſons, in a book for that purpoſe. *Tu non audiſti aliquando à Patre de illuſtri præceptore ſuo Argenterio, qui ab unius cujuſque ore ſolebat pendere, ſi forte aliud agendo excidiſſet homini aliud quod ipſe diſceret, nam & dicta homuncionum curabat reponi in ſua quædam volumina, ſi quæ audiſſet non inepta?* Laſtly, Gentilis relates, that Alciatus learned, by the action of a peaſant, the ſenſe of a paſſage of Plautus, which he had not underſtood till then. *Refert Alciatus * ex facto ſui cujuſdam villici ſe locum Plauti intellexiſſe quem non potuerat antea.* God preſerve us from ſuch hearers, who would be deteſted by all companies, if they were found out: for there are thoſe, who, freely advancing whatever their memory ſuggeſts, would be very uneaſy, if they knew, that, at parting, ſome of the company would go and write down in their collections all they have heard. A man finds a great miſreckoning, both as to proper names, and circumſtances of times and place, when he compares, with the books in his cloſet, the converſation of perſons that have the largeſt memory, and ſpeak without a premeditated deſign (6). Every one may know this by experience, and therefore ought to wiſh, that what he delivers in familiar diſcourſe may not be writ down. Thoſe, who wiſh the contrary, ought never to ſpeak unprepared.

Thoſe who write what is ſaid in company, are dangerous perſons.

GENTILIS (Scipio), brother to Alberic, and as famous a civilian as he, was born at Caſtello di Sangeneſio, in Italy, in the year 1563. He was yet a child, when his father left his country and his wife to go elſewhere, to make open profeſſion of the proteſtant religion. He did not go out of the houſe with his father; but, ſoon after, means was found to ſteal him from his mother, and under pretence of a walk, to carry him to his father, who had ſtopped to wait for him, as ſoon as he came to a ſafe place. We have already ſaid, that he retired into Carniola, and ſent his eldeſt ſon into England. As for Scipio, whom he loved very tenderly, he ſent him to ſtudy in the univerſity of Tubingen. He had wherewithal to anſwer thoſe expences; for he had in Carniola the title of phyſician of that province, with a ſalary (*a*). The young man improved very much at Tubingen. He learned the Greek tongue under the famous Martin Cruſius; and his wit was ſo happily turned to poetry, that Meliſſus, who was one of the beſt poets of Germany, acknowledged himſelf his inferior. He went afterwards to ſtudy at Wittemberg, and then to Leyden, that he might be nearer his father, who, having been obliged to leave Carniola for his religion, was retired into England to his eldeſt ſon. Scipio Gentilis improved much at Leyden under Hugo Donellus, and Juſtus Lipſius; after which he went to Baſil, and there took his degree of doctor of the civil-law in the year 1589. He went to Heidelberg ſome time after, where Julius Pacius, an Italian like himſelf, taught the civil-law. There aroſe a kind of

---

(4) Giſbert. Voëtius, Politica Eccleſ. Tom. II, pag. 171.

(5) Dial. iii, de Juris Interpret. fol. 36.

* Lib. i, Pareg. cap. xxi.

(6) The *Scaligerana*, the *Menagiana*, &c. not to mention Guy Patin's letters, confirm this truth.

(*a*) Provinciæ proceres .... conſtituerunt illum Archiatron propoſitis iis conditionibus, & ea erga ipſum munificentia uſi quam ipſe nec aſpernari vellet, nec repudiare ulla ratione poſſet. *Orat. funeb. Scip. Gentil. See alſo* Alberic Gentilis, lib. iii, de Jure belli, cap. xiii, & lib. iii, de Legatis, cap. xiv.

emulation between them, which made Scipio reſolve to go from thence to Altdorf, where, by the care of Donellus, who was there profeſſor of the civil-law, he became his colleague in the year 1590; and when Peter Wenſenbecius was called into Saxony, our Gentilis filled his place of firſt profeſſor. He was alſo made counſellor of the city of Nuremberg. All which places he diſcharged glorioully 'till his death, which happened in the year 1616. His method of teaching with clearneſs and brevity, and of mixing, with the thorns of the law, the flowers of polite literature; (for he was a great humaniſt) that method, I ſay, having been known, both by his lectures and the books he publiſhed, procured him the invitation of ſeveral famous univerſities [*A*]. But he preferred the poſt, he had in the univerſity of Altdorf, to all the offers that were made him. He had lived in celibacy 'till the year 1612; but at laſt he underwent the conjugal yoke. The beauty and merit of a gentlewoman, originally come from Lucca, and daughter of Cæſar Calandrini, having captivated his liberty, he demanded her in marriage, obtained her, and had by her a ſon [*B*] and a daughter (*b*). I give the titles of his principal writings [*C*]. He is mentioned in the letters of Bongars [*D*].

(*b*) Taken from his funeral oration, pronounced by Michael Piccart, profeſſor of logic and metaphyſics, at Altdorf It is in the collection of Mr Witte.

[*A*] *His method of teaching procured him the invitation of ſeveral famous univerſities.*] He was offered a profeſſorſhip in France, at Heidelberg, and at Leyden; and what is more remarkable and extraordinary, Pope Clement VIII, to incline him to accept of a profeſſor's place at Bologna, promiſed him liberty of conſcience (1).

(1) Piccart, in Orat. Funebri Scip. Gentilis.

[*B*] *He had a ſon.*] We find in a letter of Voſſius (2) to William Laud archbiſhop of Canterbury, that that boy's mother, not being in a condition to maintain him at the univerſity, becauſe of the loſſes ſhe had ſuſtained in the wars of Germany, endeavoured to get him a place in a college, either at Oxford or Cambridge. His friends were to preſent a petition for that purpoſe, and hoped that the memory of Alberic Gentilis would do his nephew ſome ſervice. Voſſius prepared the way for that petition; but I know not what became of it, or of that only ſon of Scipio Gentilis. I take notice, that it is the hardeſt thing in the world to find a lineal ſucceſſion of moſt of the heroes of the commonwealth of learning. Generally things go well enough for the firſt generation. The ſecond begins to grow obſcure; the curious want ſome time to find it out: but the third or fourth are ſo confounded in the croud, that they are no more diſtinguiſhed. Therefore it could not be ſaid of the poſterity of thoſe great men, what a Roman ſatiriſt has ſaid touching his anceſtors, and which he would have ſeveral noblemen ſay of theirs.

(2) It is the 266th: It was written in 1635.

Reflexion upon the poſterity of learned men.

- - - - Quære ex me quis mihi quartus
Sit pater, haud prompte, dicam tamen: adde etiam unum
Unum etiam, terræ eſt jam filius (3).

(3) Perſ. Sat. VI, ver. 57.

The fourth degree downwards is already in the dark. What ſhall I ſay of ſo many men illuſtrious by their learning, whoſe family is as obſcure in the firſt degree downwards, as in the degree juſt before them? May not we ſay, that they are fires, which we ſee ſhine afar off in the middle of a dark night, without diſcovering any thing near them, by reaſon of the obſcurity round them? See the remark [*B*] of the article BENSERADE.

[*C*] *I give the titles of his principal writings.*] Here they are: *De Jure publico populi Romani. De conjurationibus libri duo. De Donationibus inter virum & uxorem libri IV. De Bonis maternis & ſecundis Nuptiis libri duo. In Apulei Apologiam Commentarius. De Juriſdictione libri tres. Commentarius in Pauli Epiſtolam ad Philemonem. De erroribus Teſtamentorum.* His funeral oration, with the catalogue of his works, is in the collection of Mr Witte; but it is to be noted, that ſome writings are attributed to him in that catalogue, which belong to his brother; as, the treatiſe *De Jure Belli*, and that *De Legationibus*; and that there is no mention made of his book, *De antiquis Italiæ Linguis*, nor of his notes upon Tacitus, nor of his *Quæſtiones ad Africanum Juriſconſultum*. Theſe three works are mentioned in his commentary on Apuleius's apology.

[*D*] *He is mentioned in the letters of Bongars.*] If I remember well, he is generally denoted there by the terms of *Scipio noſter*, or the like. The Latin tongue allows and approves of that expreſſion; but the French tranſlator is to blame in rendering it by *Monſieur Scipion*. This is owing to his ignorance; for, if he had known that the perſon meant was Scipio Gentilis, he had ſaid *Monſieur Gentilis*, and not *Monſieur Scipion* (4).

(4) This fault is found in the edition of the Hague, 1695.

Note, that the cuſtom of naming people, in Latin, as well by their chriſtian-name, as by their family-name, occaſions many miſtakes; and I fancy it has led Mr Konig into an error, touching Gentilis the Arian: for he ſpeaks twice of him, without perceiving, that it is ſtill the ſame heretic. He ſpeaks of him under the word *Gentilis*, and under the word *Valentinus*. In the firſt place (5), he only gives him the chriſtian-name of *Johannes*; and ſuppoſes, that Valentinus is his country-firname. In the ſecond place (6), he beſtows upon him *Valentinus* as his family-name, and *Johannes* as his chriſtian-name. The firſt occaſion of this miſtake probably proceeded from this, that there are books, wherein Gentilis is ſimply and barely called *Valentinus*, which was but one half of his chriſtian-name.

(5) Konig. Biblioth. pag. 341.

(6) Id. ibid. pag. 825.

GENTILLET (INNOCENT),

a native of Vienne in Dauphiné (*a*), flouriſhed in the XVIth century. He publiſhed ſome books of controverſy, which made him eſteemed by the Proteſtants [*A*]; for he exerted his learning, and ſhewed a great zeal againſt Popery. He was a civilian by profeſſion; and ſome ſay, he was advocate in the

(*a*) Allard. Biblioth. de Dauphiné, pag. 114.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books of controverſy, which made him eſteemed by the Proteſtants.*] He did for them, what Quadratus, Ariſtides, Juſtin Martyr, Melito, Tertullian, and ſome others, had done for the chriſtians of the primitive ages; I mean he wrote an apology: which he dedicated to the king of Navarre, who was afterwards king of France. The epiſtle dedicatory is dated the fifteenth of February 1578. The edition, which he publiſhed ten years after, was much improved, and well corrected: and it is to be noted, that he publiſhed that work both in Latin and French. This is the Latin title: *Apologia pro Chriſtianis Gallis Religionis Evangelicæ ſeu Reformatæ, Qua docetur hujus Religionis fundamenta in ſacra Scriptura jacta eſſe, ipſamque tum ratione, tum antiquis Canonibus, comprobari.* The edition, which I make uſe of, is the ſecond, printed at Geneva by James Stoer, 1588, in 8vo. He is there deſcribed thus, *Authore* INNOCENTIO GENTILLETO *Juriſconſulto clariſſimo, & ampliſſimi Senatus Provinciæ Delphinenſis præſide.* The work, which he intituled, *Le Bureau du Concile de Trente: auquel eſt monſtré qu'en plusieurs poincts iceluy Concile eſt contraire aux anciens Conciles & Canons, & à l'autorité du* ROY, was printed in the year 1586, in 8vo. He dedicated it to the ſame king of Navarre, and dated the epiſtle the twelfth of July 1586. He names himſelf barely *Innocent Gentillet, a civilian of Dauphiné.* He publiſhed the ſame book in Latin, the ſame year, with the title of, *Examen Concilii Tridentini: in quo demonſtratur, &c.* There have been ſeveral editions of that work: the laſt, if I am not miſtaken, is that of Gorcum in Holland in 1678. Mark theſe the parliament of Toulouſe (*b*). I have ſeen in the title of one of his books, that he calls himſelf preſident in the parliament of Grenoble (*c*). He tells us in a preface (*d*), that he was in exile, by reaſon of the edicts that had been publiſhed in France againſt thoſe of the reformed religion. Some affirm, that he had been Syndic of the republic of Geneva; and that he diſguiſed himſelf under the name of Joachimus Urſinus Anti-Jeſuita [*B*], in the title of ſeveral books which he publiſhed. I believe Mr Allard is miſtaken, when he affirms (*e*), that Vincent Gentillet [*C*], *his ſon, Counſellor, and then Preſident in the Chamber of the Edict of Grenoble, wrote the Antimachiavel in* 1573, *a Remonſtrance to King Henry III, ſeveral Rules about Polity*; *and that he tranſlated the book of the Republic of Switzerland of Joſias Simlerus.* I wonder we have ſo few particulars about the life of a perſon, who diſtinguiſhed himſelf both by his writings and employments; and I cannot ſufficiently admire, how it came to paſs, that thoſe, who

these words of the epiſtle dedicatory (1): *Seeing therefore, great SIR, that thoſe, who carp at your declaration, ground altogether their opinion upon that council of Trent; I thought my duty for your ſervice, and for my country, did ſufficiently command me to employ the leiſure, which the edict, called of Re-union, makes me enjoy in my exile, in ſhaking that foundation of theirs.* The declaration he ſpeaks of, is that, which the king of Navarre *had cauſed to be publiſhed every where, that he would ſtand to the deciſion of a free council, about the differences in religion that were in France* (2). That declaration was publiſhed in 1585, the ſame year, in which the edict of Re-union was made. From whence we may conclude, that Gentillet did not ſet about that work before that year; and conſequently that Voëtius is miſtaken, when he ſays (3), that that book was publiſhed in Latin in 1556, under the title of, *Hiſtorica relatio & nullitas Concilii Tridentini.* He adds, that it was publiſhed at Amberg in the year 1615. Note, that, in 1556, the council of Trent was not concluded.

[*B*] *Some affirm, that he had been ſyndic of the rebuplic of Geneva; and that he diſguiſed himſelf under the name of* Joachimus Urſinus Anti-Jeſuita.] Pray, conſider theſe words of Mr Placcius (4): ‘Antimachiavelli *nomine vulgo inſigniuntur* commentariorum de regno .... libri tres ... *qui citantur ſub nomine* Innocentii Gentileti *JCti Delphinatis olim Toloſanæ curiæ Advocati, dein Genevenſis Reip. Syndici.* ——— The three books of the commentaries De Regno .... cited under the name of Innocent Gentillet, of Dauphiné, formerly advocate in the parliament of Toulouſe, and afterwards ſyndic of the republic of Geneva, bear the title of Antimachiavel.’ To prove this, he quotes Draudius, pag. 1169, and 1144, of the *Bibliotheca Claſſica*; Voëtius, pag. 124, 209, 211, 218, of the firſt volume of the Theological Theſes; Pellerus, pag. 505, of the *Politicus ſceleratus impugnatus*; Conringius, in the preface to his edition of the Prince of Machiavel; and Keckerman, in the firſt chapter to the *Conſilium de locis communibus.* Of theſe five authors, I have been able to conſult only the three firſt; and I find nothing in them, that ſays, that Gentillet ever pleaded in the parliament of Toulouſe, or had any employment in the republic of Geneva. It is even to be noted, that Pellerus calls him, *Juriſconſultus Delphenſis*; which may make one believe, that Gentillet was a native of Holland, not of Dauphiné. Mr Baillet obſerves (5), *that it is the common opinion*, that the author of the Antimachiavel *was an Huguenot of Dauphiné, named Innocent Gentillet, who was at firſt a pleading advocate in the parliament of Toulouſe, and afterwards ſyndic of the republic of Geneva* (§ *α*).

[(§ *α*) At page 43. of the *Citadin de Geneve*, we find among the famous civilians, who *have delivered their oracles* in Geneva, Innocent Gentillet; but it is not ſaid, that he had any poſt there. Rem. Crit.]

As for *Joachimus Urſinus Anti-Jeſuita*, Mr Placcius (6) mentions five books, which have been publiſhed under that falſe name. The firſt is intituled, *Concilii Tridentini Hiſtorica Relatio, & nullitas ſolidè & ex fundamento demonſtrata*, and was printed at Amberg, in the year 1615, in 8vo. The ſecond is intituled, *Apologia pro Chriſtianis Gallis Religionis Reformatæ*, at Geneva, 1598, in 8vo. The third, *Stupenda Templi Jeſuitici*: divided into three parts, and printed at Francfort, and at Amberg, in the year 1610, in 8vo. The title of the fourth is, *Floſculi blaſphemiarum Jeſuiticarum, ex tribus Concionibus ſuper beatificatione Ignatii Loyolæ habitis decerpti, unà cum Sorbonnæ Pariſienſis Cenſura.* Which was printed in 1612, in 4to. The fifth was printed at Amberg in 1611, in 8vo, and is intituled, *Hiſpanicæ Inquiſitionis, & carnificinæ ſecretiora, ubi præter illius originem .... exemplis illuſtrioribus tum Martyrum, tum articulorum, & regularum inquiſitoriarum in fine adjectis per* Joachimum Urſinum Anti-Jeſuitam *de Jeſuitis qui Inquiſitionem Hiſpanicam in Germaniam & Bohemiam vicinam introducere moliuntur, prefantem.* Vincent Mollerus, burgomaſter of Hamburgh, and great-grand-father of Mr Placcius, had marked with his own hand the name of Innocent Gentillet in the firſt of thoſe five books; which, together with ſome other reaſons, inclined Mr Placcius to believe, that it was the true name of the pretended Joachim Urſinus (7). Mr Baillet (8) has followed that opinion, and (9) aſcribes to the ſame Gentillet a work, which was printed at Francfort in 1612, under the title of, *Antiſocinus*, hoc eſt *ſolida confutatio errorum quos olim Arriani, &c.* I have not a ſufficient number of books to clear all this.

[*C*] *I believe that Mr Allard is miſtaken, when he affirms, that VINCENT GENTILLET &c.*] He remarks (10) in the firſt place, that the examination of the council of Trent is a work of Innocent Gentillet; an author, ſays he, who lived under Henry III; and then he adds, that *Vincent Gentillet, his ſon .... wrote the Antimachiavel, in* 1573. This claſhes with the cuſtom of chronologers, who, when they mark the ages of illuſtrious men, put ſome diſtance between the fathers and the ſons, the maſters and diſciples; tho' it frequently happens, that the time of the reputation of the one concurs with the flouriſhing ſtate of the other. The writer of the Bibliotheque of Dauphiné has not followed that rule: for he puts the father under Henry III, and places higher, under Charles IX, the writing of the principal book of the ſon. This error is leſs than that I am going to mark. It ſhould have been ſaid, according to the general opinion, that the Antimachiavel was the production of Innocent Gentillet, and not the production of his ſon. I do not find any bibliographer, who has mentioned this Vincent Gentillet, ſon of Innocent; and it is certain, that la Croix du Maine (11) aſcribes to Innocent Gentillet all the works, which Mr Allard ſpecifies as the writings of Vincent. It is true, La Croix du Maine is miſtaken in the chriſtian name; for he has put Francis inſtead of Innocent (12). The office of *preſident in the chamber of the edict of Grenoble*, which he beſtows upon that writer, confirms me in the belief, that he had in view our Innocent Gentillet, who, as we have already ſeen (13), took the title, at the head of the apology for the reformed, of *ampliſſimi Senatus Provinciæ Delphinenſis Præſes.* I conjecture, that he was made preſident of the chamber of the edict at Grenoble, when thoſe ſort of courts were granted to the Huguenots, *in each parliament* in 1576 (14): which intituled him to the quality of preſident in the parliament of his province. We have ſeen (15), that the edict of Re-union occaſioned his exile; and I add here, that Poſſevin (16) has obſerved, that the Calviniſt author, who had writ againſt Machiavel, had taken ſanctuary at Geneva: which is another proof that Mr Allard is miſtaken, in aſcribing, not to the father, but to the ſon, the work againſt Machiavel. The French tranſlator's preface before the book of Joſiah Simler, about the republic of the Swiſſes, ſays nothing that may incline us to conjecture, that he might be our Gentillet: and yet I could eaſily believe him to be the author of that verſion. Some aſcribe

(*b*) See the remark [*B*].

(*c*) See the remark [*A*].

(*d*) See the ſame remark.

(*e*) Allard, ubi ſupra, pag. 115.

(1) Gentillet, epiſtle dedicatory prefixed to the *Bureau du Concile de Trente.*

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Voëtius, Polit Eccleſ. Tom. IV, pag. 271.

(4) Placcius de Anonymis, pag. 60.

(5) Baillet, Tom. II, *of the* Anti, pag. 131.

(6) Placcius de Pſeudonymis, pag 275.

(7) Id. ibid. pag. 276.

(8) Baillet, Tom. I, *of the* Anti, pag. 197.

(9) Id. Tom. II, pag. 31.

(10) Allard. Bibl. de Dauph. pag. 114, 115.

(11) *In the* Biblioth. Franç. pag. 97.

(12) Keckerman, apud Placcium, de Pſeudonymis, pag. 60, *has committed the ſame fault.*

(13) In the remark [*A*].

(14) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. V, pag. 212.

(15) In the remark [*A*].

(16) Poſſev. Bibl. lib. xvi, cap. v.

who have given us an account of the authors of his province, could not fill up ſix lines concerning him, without committing ſeveral faults.

aſcribed it to him, according to La Croix du Maine. It was printed at Paris, in the year 1578 (17) (§β), for James du Puis, with the king's licence, dated the ſixteenth of Auguſt 1577, and at Antwerp in 1580 in 8vo. Simler had publiſhed that work in Latin in 1576, and died ſome months after.

I will ſpeak elſewhere (18) at large of the Antimachiavel of Gentillet.

[(§β) From an edition in 8vo, of the year 1577, without the name of the place, for Antony Chupin, and Francis le Preux. REM. CRIT.]

(17) See the tranſlator's preface.

(18) In the remark [*E*] of the article **MACHIAVEL.**

GERGENTI, a town of Sicily, formerly Agrigentum, or Acragas. I only mention it, in order to correct Mr Moreri's faults [*A*]. His omiſſions would require a long

[*A*] *I mention it only to correct Mr Moreri's faults.*] I. It is not true, that *that town took it's name from mount Agragas.* Stephanus Byzantinus, who relates three other etymologies, makes no manner of mention of that. Several towns of Sicily were named from their rivers (1); and this was one of them, according to the firſt of the three opinions (2) mentioned by that author. It is certain, that it was built upon the river Acragas (3); but, according to the third opinion (4), both that river and the town were ſo called by reaſon of the goodneſs of the ſoil. I omit the ſecond opinion, according to which the town owed it's name to Acragas, ſon of Jupiter and Aſterope. II. It is not true, that Virgil mentions the mountain Acragas; for the two verſes, quoted by Moreri, ſignify viſibly no more than a town ſeated on a hill.

The verſes are,

Arduus inde Acragas oſtendit maxima longe
Mœnia, magnanimûm quondam generator equorum (5).

High Acragas at diſtance thence appears,
With wide extended walls; famed for the breed
(In ancient annals) of the generous ſteed.

III. It had been neceſſary to have named the author, who has ſaid, that *the Ionians, led by Gellus, or Gelo, laid the firſt foundation of Agrigentum*; for that author muſt be an apocryphal one, ſince Cluverius was not acquainted with him, or did not think him worthy to be quoted. It had been better to have let alone that Gellus, or Gelo, and have ſaid, with Thucydides, that the inhabitants of Gela ſent a colony to Acragas one hundred and eight years after the foundation of Gela (6). Now, ſince Gela was built, jointly, by Antiphemus the chief of a company of Rhodians, and by Entimus the leader of a company of Cretans; and ſince they ſettled there the laws of the Dorians (7); I had rather take Agrigentum for a Doric colony, than for an Ionian colony. Thucydides, who marks the time and names of the founders, is, in this place, to be a little more credited than Strabo, who contented himſelf to ſay, in a looſe manner, that Agrigentum belonged to the Ionians (8). I do not think he has ſaid it above once, and I am certain he has ſeldom mentioned that town: and therefore I reckon for the fourth fault, theſe words of Moreri; *it is for that reaſon that Strabo commonly calls it the Ionian Agrigentum.* Before we go further, I take notice, that Polybius mentions Agrigentum as a colony of the Rhodians (9). A groſs fault has crept into Cluverius, which his abridger has not mended. We find in that author (10), that the inhabitants of Gela founded Agrigentum in the XCIXth olympiad. He ſhould have ſaid XLIX, not XCIX. For this is Cluverius's computation: he places the foundation of Syracuſe in the ſecond year of the XIth olympiad. Forty five years after, according to Thucydides (11), Gela was founded by the Rhodians and Cretans; and, according to the ſame author, thoſe of Gela ſent a colony to Agrigentum, one hundred and eight years after their town had been founded; therefore they ſent it in the XLIXth olympiad. V. He ſhould not have quoted Ælian touching the luxury of the Agrigentines in their houſes and meals, without ſaying that he quotes Plato: for a witty ſaying from Plato (12) has, without compariſon, more weight, than from Ælian. VI. It is not true, that Diodorus Siculus informs us, that Alcamon ruled at Agrigentum after Phalaris, and that Alcander, Theron, and Thraſideus, were the ſucceſſors of Alcamon. VII Nothing claſhes more with the rule of an exact narrative, than to join together the time, when the town of Agrigentum was taken by the Carthaginians, and the time, when it became a part of the Roman commonwealth; for the ſtate of the Agrigentines underwent many conſiderable changes after the Carthagnians had plundered them in the fourth year of the XCIIId olympiad, till the Romans got poſſeſſion of that town. They became maſters of it during the ſecond Punic war; but they were not ſo, when they took Syracuſe: for, even after the taking of that city, the Carthaginians, who were maſters of Agrigentum, cut out work enough for them (13). VIII. He ſhould not have applied to the time, when it was ſubdued by the Romans, the *magnificent deſcription,* which *Diodorus Siculus has left us of it:* for that deſcription concerns the flouriſhing ſtate of the Agrigentines, when the Carthaginians attacked them in the XCIIId olympiad. The town recovered from the diſmal condition, into which that war had reduced it: nay, we find, that it's forces were formidable at ſeveral times (14), after the ſacking it underwent, when it fell into the hands of the Carthaginians in the year that I have marked before; but it is confounding the times, to ſay with Moreri, *that it was one of the moſt flouriſhing cities of the Roman empire, being large, fair, and extreamly populous, when the Romans drove from thence the Carthaginians, and ſettled there themſelves.* IX. Empedocles the philoſopher, and Empedocles the poet, are but one and the ſame man; and therefore Moreri ſhould not have made of them two illuſtrious Agrigentines. X. Cicero did not *mention the temple and ſtatue of Hercules, that were to be ſeen at Agrigentum, as one of the fineſt works of antiquity.* At moſt, he only ſpeaks ſo as to the ſtatue; and as for the temple, he contents himſelf to ſay, that the Agrigentines look upon it as a very holy place. *Herculis templum eſt apud Agrigentinos non longè à foro ſane ſanctum apud illos & religioſum* (15). As to the ſtatue, he ſays, that it was one of the fineſt he ever ſaw in his life; but he owns he was no good judge, and that, in that matter, he had much more employed his eyes, than his underſtanding (16). If Mr Moreri had had any diſcernment, with reſpect to things that ſtrike a reader moſt, he would have added a very ſingular circumſtance concerning that ſtatue; to wit, that it had been ſo often devoutly kiſſed, that it's lips and chin were ſomewhat worn out by it. *Rictus ejus ac mentum paulo ſit attritius, quod in precibus & gratulationibus non ſolum id venerari, verum etiam oſculari ſolent* (17). XI. Pliny has not ſaid, touching the ſalt of Agrigentum, what Mr Moreri aſcribes to him; but only, that it bears the fire, and flies out of the water. Mr Moreri has forgot the latter of theſe two properties, and has but ill related the firſt; for he pretends, that Pliny ſays, that *that ſalt melted in the fire.* If he had a mind to mention that, he ſhould have had other vouchers than Pliny; for the words of that writer (18), *Agrigentinus* (ſal) *ignium patiens* (19) *ex aqua exilit,* ſignify only, that that ſalt crackled in, and flew from the water; but that it bore the fire without crackling in it. If Mr Moreri had quoted either Solinus, or St Auguſtin, he needed not have feared any cenſure. Theſe are Solinus's words: ‘ Salem Agrigentinum ſi igni ‘ junxeris, diſſolvitur uſtione: cui ſi liquor aquæ pro‘ ximaverit, crepitat veluti torreatur (20). — *If you* ‘ *apply Agrigentine ſalt to the fire, it melts by the* ‘ *heat; if to water, it crackles as if in the fire.* St Auguſtin alledges that Phænomenon to the incredulous, who rejected all miracles in religion, as ſoon

(1) Duris apud Steph. Byzantin.

(2) Thucydides, lib. v, *and* Ariſtarchus, apud Scholiaſten Pindari in Od. ii, Olymp. *are of that opinion.*

(3) *See* Polybius, lib. ix, cap. vii; Ælian. Var. Hiſt. lib. ii, cap. xxxiii; *The ſcholiaſt upon* Pindar ex Ariſtarcho, ubi ſupra; Thucydides. *Ibid.*

(4) Polybius, apud Stephanum Byzant.

(5) Virg. Æn. lib. iii, ver. 704.

(6) Thucyd. lib. vi, circa init.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) Strabo, lib. vi, pag. 187.

(9) Polyb. lib. ix, cap. vii.

(10) Sicil. Antiq. lib. i, cap. xv, pag. m. 108.

(11) Ubi ſupra.

(12) Diogen. Laërtius, *lib. viii, in Empedocle,* aſcribes to Empedocles what Ælian attributes to Plato.

(13) *See* Cluverius, ubi ſupra, pag. 112, *quoting* Livy. lib. xxiv, & xxv.

(14) *See* Cluverius, ibid. *quoting* Diodorus Siculus, lib. xvi, & xix.

(15) Cicero, in Verrem, Act. vi, cap. xliii.

(16) Ibi eſt ex ære ſimulacrum ipſius Herculis quo non facile quicquam dixerim me vidiſſe pulcrius: tametſi non tam multum in iſtis rebus intelligo quam multa vidi. *Id. ibid.*

(17) Id. ibid.

(18) Plin. lib. xxxi, cap. vii, pag. m. 807.

(19) *Meurſius,* in Antigon. pag. 188, *conjectures that we muſt read* impatiens. *Father Hardouin,* in hunc locum Plinii, *rejects that conjecture.*

(20) Solin. cap. v.

a long diſcourſe; for he has forgot the moſt curious things that might have been ſaid of Agrigentum [*B*].

as divines could not explain them. He alledges to thoſe unbelievers ſeveral natural things, of which the philoſophers could give no reaſon; and he begins with the ſingularities of the ſalt of Agrigentum. ‘ Agrigentinum Siciliæ ſalem perhibent cum fuerit admotus ‘ igni velut in aqua flueſcere; cùm vero aquæ velut ‘ in igne crepitare (21). - - - - *It is reported of the* ‘ *Agrigentine ſalt, that when it is held to fire it* ‘ *melts as if in water, and, when put in water, crac-* ‘ *kles as if in fire.*’ Note, againſt thoſe that would apologize for Mr Moreri, that there is a great difference between melting in the fire, and bearing the fire, without crackling in it. I ſay nothing of his falſe quotations (22): I ſhall only obſerve, to conclude this remark, that there are a vaſt number of other articles in Moreri's dictionary, which are no leſs faulty than this.

[*B*] *He has forgot the moſt curious things that might have been ſaid of Agrigentum.*] I have already reproached him with paſſing over in ſilence, both thoſe devout kiſſes, which had thinned the lips of the brazen Hercules of the Agrigentines, and one of the wonderful properties of the ſalt of Agrigentum. He is no leſs to blame, for ſaying nothing of the properties of the lakes, that were near the town, whoſe water was as ſalt as that of the ſea; but men did not ſink in it, and even thoſe, that could not ſwim, did float upon it like wood. Περὶ Ἀκράγαντα δὲ λίμναι, τὴν μὲν γεῦσιν ἔχουσι θαλάττης, τὴν δὲ φύσιν διάφορον· οὐδὲ γάρ τοῖς ἀκολύμβοις βαπτίζεσθαι συμβαίνει, ξύλων τρόπον ἐπιπολάζουσιν. *Apud Agrigentum lacus ſunt guſtu marino, natura planè diverſa: nam & natandi inſcii in iis lignorum in morem ſupernatant* (23). How many ſingular things might he not have taken out of the thirteenth book of Diodorus Siculus, concerning the luxury of the Agrigentines, their riches, and the expence one of them was at for the entertainment of ſtrangers? he ſhould not have forgot, that that part of the city, which ſerved for a fortreſs, was built before the taking of Troy: that it was built, I ſay, by Dædalus the moſt able engineer of all antiquity. He fortified the place ſo well, that three or four men were able to defend it: which made king Cocalus reſolve to reſide there, and to lodge there all his treaſures (24). I would not have omitted the violent zeal of the Agrigentines againſt thoſe, whom the prætor Verres had ſent to the temple of Hercules, with orders to carry away the ſtatue. They forced the guards of the temple, and were a whole hour in removing that Hercules by ſtrength of arms and machines. But, notwithſtanding the darkneſs of the night, the Agrigentines had time to arm themſelves, and to drive the ſatellites of Verres out of the temple. As ſoon as the alarm was given, every body got up; and even old men, and infirm people, found ſtrength enough to go to the reſcue of Hercules. ‘ Ex clamore fama tota urbe percrebuit, expugnari deos pa- ‘ trios, non hoſtium adventu, neque repentino prædo- ‘ num impetu: ſed ex domo atque cohorte prætoria ‘ manum fugitivorum inſtructam, armatamque veniſſe. ‘ Nemo Agrigenti neque ætate tam affecta, neque ‘ viribus tam infirmis fuit, qui non illa nocte eo nun- ‘ cio excitatus, ſurrexerit, telumque, quod cuique ‘ ſors offerebat, arripuerit (25). This great zeal did not hinder the inhabitants from turning that adventure into a jeſt: for they ſaid, it ought to be added to the other labours of that God. ‘ Nunquam tan- ‘ tum mali eſt Siculis quin aliquid facete & commo- ‘ de dicant, velut in hac re: aiebant in labores Her- ‘ culis non minus hunc immaniſſimum Verrem, quam ‘ illum aprum Erymanthium inferre oportere (26).

GIFANIUS (Obertus), was a learned humaniſt, and a great civilian. He was a native of Buren in Gelderland. He ſtudied at Louvain and at Paris, and was the firſt that ſettled the German library at Orleans. He took, in that city, his degree of doctor of civil-law, in the year 1567, and went into Italy in the retinue of the ambaſſador of France; after which he removed into Germany, where he taught the civil-law with ſo much capacity, that he gained a great reputation. He taught it firſt at Straſburg, where he was firſt profeſſor of Philoſophy: Afterwards in the univerſity of Altdorf, and at laſt at Ingolſtadt. He renounced the Proteſtant religion to embrace the Romiſh. He was invited to the Imperial court, and honoured with the office of counſellor, and referendary to the emperor Rodolphus. He died at Prague the twenty ſixth of July 1609 [*A*], being above ſeventy (*a*) years old (*b*), if we may believe ſome authors; but ſome others, who are better informed, place his death in the year 1604 (*c*). He had acquired an eſtate; for he was a good œconomiſt [*B*]. He is accuſed of a notorious breach of truſt, with reſpect to Fruterius's manuſcripts [*C*]; and he, placed in the catalogue of plagiary writers

[*A*] *He died at Prague the twenty ſixth* (1) *of July, 1609.*] Swertius (2) and Valerius Andreas (3) ſay ſo; but I know not how to reconcile it with the Scaligerana, where Gifanius's death is mentioned. *An Italian Jeſuit was preſent at his death; and, having plundered ſeveral of his papers, is gone to Rome* (4). Now how could Scaliger ſay this, when he died the twenty firſt of January, 1609? To remove this difficulty, it may indeed be ſuppoſed, that a falſe report was raiſed of Gifanius's death, upon which Scaliger went; or that the compilers of the Scaligerana have inſerted in it ſeveral things, which they never heard Scaliger ſay; which may be obſerved in other places of that compilation. But the ſureſt way was to ſay that Swertius and Valerius Andreas are miſtaken, having not followed Thuanus, who has placed Gifanius's death in the year 1604.

[*B*] *He was a good œconomiſt.*] I have no other proof for it than theſe words of Scaliger (5). ‘ He ‘ was counſellor to the emperor; and, becauſe a mar- ‘ ried man muſt keep houſe, he ſent his wiſe back ‘ to Nuremberg. He was worth 25000 ducats, and yet ‘ lived in a garret. *Liberis utebatur ut ſervis.*’ This is beyond good husbandry: it is downright ſtingineſs.

[*C*] *He is accuſed of a notorious breach of truſt, with reſpect to Fruterius's manuſcripts.*] Fruterius, one of the great wits of his age, was at Paris, in the year 1566, with ſome other Flemings, Janus Douza, Obertus Gifanius, Janus Lernutius, &c. and died there the ſame year, being twenty five years of age (6). He had already collected a good number of critical obſervations, which, at his death, he recommended to Gifanius: who acted fraudulently, and ſuppreſſed them as much as he could; nor did he reſtore part of that truſt till after the complaints of Janus Douza. Read theſe words of Thuanus (7): ‘ Is (*Fruterius*) in puriore literatura cum excelleret, ‘ & jam multa commentatus eſſet, properata morte ‘ præpeditus omnia ea Gifanii judicio ac fidei com- ‘ miſit, qui pari fide minime uſus creditur, vixque ‘ lite à Jano Duza mota exorari potuit, ut paucula ‘ quæ ex tanta jactura, velut ex magno naufragio ‘ exiguæ tabulæ ſupererant, ſint publicata. Read alſo theſe verſes of Douza:

Adſuit ille quidem, fateor, lectique reſedit
Ante pedes, ſed non ut amici impendere, verum
Vulturis officium valido male poſſet amico:
Ut vel continuo patuit, cum Fruterius jam
Deficiens illi manuum monumenta ſuarum
Subjicienda operis prælorum traderet, atque,
Hæc mea ſint, Fanni, tibi, diceret, ut tua, curæ (8).

Cloſe by the bed, where ſick Fruterius lay,
Sat Fannius, watching, vultur-like, his prey.

---

(21) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. xxi, cap. v. *See alſo* cap. vii.

(22) He cites Pliny, *lib. xxxi, c.* He ſhould have ſaid, *cap. vii.* He ſhould have cited Thucydides, at *lib. vi*, and not at *lib. v*, and Cluverius, *in Sicilia Antiqua*, and not *in Deſcr. Ital.*

(23) Strabo, lib. vi, pag. 189.

(24) Diodor. Sicul. lib. iv.

(25) Cicero, in Verrem, Orat. VI, cap. xliii.

(26) Id. ibid.

(*a*) *Seventy five, according to* de Witte, in Diar. Biograph.

(*b*) *Taken from* Valer. Andreas, Biblioth. Belg. pag. 703.

(*c*) Thuan. lib. cxxxi, pag. m. 1041.

(1) The twenty fifth according to the *Diarium Biographicum* of Witte.

(2) Athen. Belg. pag. 587.

(3) Bibl. Belg. pag. 703.

(4) Scaligerana, pag. m. 94.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Thuan. Hiſt. lib. xxxviii, ad ann. 1566.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) Douza, Sat. II, pag. 339. Edit. 1609.

writers [*D*]. His quarrels with Lambinus made a noiſe in the republic of letters

The ſage, as fainting he approach'd his end,
Entruſts his papers with this faithleſs friend:
Preſerve my works, he cried, when I am gone,
And guard theſe labours, Fannius, as your own.

Douza was ſo angry with Gifanius, upon the account of that diſhoneſty, that he forgot nothing to bring him to reaſon; and even implored the aſſiſtance of Giſelinus, to oblige the thief to reſtore the manuſcripts.

Quid tamen hæc, Giſeline, juvant, ſi Fannius hæres
Se premere æterna tot bona nocte cupit?
Ille cupit: ſed tu genio communis amici
Aſſertor venias, injiciaſque manus.
Tunc ego damnatus voti, de more ſacrabo
Prima quidem Nemeſi dona, ſecunda tibi.
Scis etenim quàm me mendaci læſerit ore,
Dum pia pro caris Manibus arma gero (9).

Yet what avails, my Giſelin, our care,
If Fannius, faithleſs Fannius, is his heir?
Who fain would bury in eternal night
Works, worthy of the day, and everlaſting light.
But thou, prevent ſo undeſerv'd an end,
And from oblivion ſnatch our common friend.
My ſolemn vow, perform'd, ſhall ſet me free,
And altars riſe to Nemeſis, and thee.
His ſlanderous tongue no longer ſhall prevail,
Nor, in our friend's defence, our pious warfare fail.

The *tamen* of the firſt verſe relates to a place, where Douza ſays, that Giſelinus was the firſt that had exclaimed againſt Gifanius's diſhoneſty.

At quota virtutum pars eſt tamen iſta tuarum?
Majus opus Fannî non tacuiſſe dolos,
Verbaque Frutericæ prima injeciſſe favillæ,
Nec dubiam factis exhibuiſſe fidem.
Non mihi Fruterium reddendo plura dediſſes:
Hoc quoque Fruterium reddere pæne fuit (10).

Small credit from ſuch acts to virtue ſprings;
Fannius expos'd more laſting honour brings.
Scarce had you merited a nobler prize,
(Such glory in detecting falſehood lies)
Reſtoring loſt Fruterius to our eyes.

He relates, in his ſecond ſatire, what he had done for the memory of the deceaſed, and againſt Gifanius.

Suſpectum ex illo cœpi obſervare, quid eſſet
Demum acturus, at ille vaſer malè diſſimulare,
Nec de ſe quicquam promittere, donec aperto
Spes mutata metu nos extorquere ſubegit
Editionis opus. mirum, quas perfidus hîc ſe
Verterit in facies, primùm civilia jura
Cauſſari: mox commentaria ſeſquipedali
Cæſaris ingeminare ſono, & cui nomen Agellî
Ipſe adeo primus vult reſtituiſſe videri.
Poſtremò, ipſe meas poſtponere res alienis
Nec volo, nec poſſum, nec debeo, dicere. quid te
Longa ambage moror? ceſſi inde, nec ulterius mî
Ceſſandum ratus, Haud falles tamen improbe, dixi.
Nec mora, & archetypum exemplar clam nactus, & apta
Tempora, dum ſeſe miratur Fannius, & ſpe
Creſcentem tumida inflat utrem, præeunte fideli
Verba Syro, à capite ad calcem loca quæque notando
Deſcripſi ſapiens. hinc tempeſtatis origo,
Hinc illæ lachrymæ (11).

Suſpected once, I kept him in my eye;
But he nor promiſe made, nor wou'd deny.
What ſhapes he, Proteus-like, at firſt put on,
The publication of the work to ſhun?
He quoted Codes, the comment and the text,
With lofty tone; th' Imperial Edicts next,
And laſt Agellius; ſo he wou'd reſtore
The name, which Aulus Gellius was before.
Shall I neglect my own affairs, he cry'd?
Then, peremptory, our requeſt deny'd.
What's to be done? Repuls'd, I took my leave,
Reſolv'd he ſhou'd not thus our hopes deceive,
And, whilſt elate with pride he ſwell'd, I brib'd
His ſervant, and the manuſcript tranſcrib'd.

[*D*] *He is placed in the catalogue of plagiary writers.*] See the collection of the learned Thomaſius about that ſort of people. You will find in it (12) Gifanius loaded with all the reproaches you have juſt now read, and with ſeveral others. You will ſee there alſo theſe verſes of Douza:

Tu præter omnes alpha legulejorum
Burene quem inter buſtuarios Verres,
Plumis adornatum & colore furtivo,
Autumnitas Pontana nobilem fecit,
Notiſque Tranſrhenana inuſta frons Gallis (13).

You, before all, chief of the gowned tribe,
Burenus, whom amidſt funereal ſwords-men,
Adorn'd with plumes, and colours not your own,
Fruterius' Autumn render'd eminent,
And the French brand on the Tranſrhenane front.

You will ſee them, I ſay, accompanied with this note. ‘Autumnitas *Pontana* idem eſt quod *Fruteriana*, ſumebat enim Fruterius nomen *Pontani*, ut ſe *Brugis* (Pont, Bruke) natum ſignificaret: vide Reliquias ejus pag. 134. Notæ autem *Gallæ* ſunt quas Dionyſius Lambinus *Gallus* Giphanio quamquam ſuam potius quam Fruterii cauſam agens, tum initio coram auditoribus ſuis, tum poſtea in præfat. ad lectorem Lucretii tertium editi inuſſit. ——— *The* Autumnitas Pontana *is the ſame as* Fruteriana; *for Fruterius took the name of* Pontanus, *to ſignify, that he was born at Bruges* (*Pont, Brucke*): *ſee his* Remains, *p.* 134. *As for the* Notæ Gallæ, *they ſignify the brand, which Dionyſius Lambinus, a Frenchman, fixed on Gifanius, both at firſt before his auditors, and afterwards in his preface to the reader of the third edition of his Lucretius; in which he vindicated himſelf, rather than Fruterius.*’ You will find there likewiſe, that Giſelinus repented his having lent his Prudentius to Gifanius; who ſtole from Giſelinus the beſt things he found in it.

Atque utinam tantùm ſcires mea vulnera, nec te
Luſiſſet plagiis improbus ille ſuis.
Illa dies nocuit, qua te ſibi credere primùm
Nobile Prudenti nomine ſuaſit opus.
Te quoque tunc animos vafra ſub vulpe latentes
Suſpicor, & Geldram perdidiciſſe fidem (14).

O! that my inj'ries had prevented thine,
And thou eſcap'd the plagiary's mine.
That day, when, unſuſpicious of a ſnare,
You truſted your Prudentius to his care;
That fatal day, his practis'd cunning gave
My friend the ſad experience of a knave.

When Douza writes in proſe, he is more moderate, and even ſpares the name of his adverſary: but however, he ſays, that Gifanius had adorned his Lucretius with the ſpoils of Fruterius: ‘Nec dubium quin de Giphanio intelligendum ſit, quod lego apud Valer. Andræam, pag. 629. Bibl. Belg. *notaviſſe Janum Douſam ad Triumviros amoris, quæ in Lucretium adfecta Fruterius habuerit, iis non parùm adjutos fuiſſe, qui poſt Lambinum auctorem illum Collectaneis illuſtrârunt.* Utique enim in Lucretium habentur collectanea Giphanii (15). —— *Nor do I doubt, that Gifanius is meant in what I read in Valerius Andreas, Bibl. Belg. p.* 629. that Janus Douza gave notice to the letters [*E*]. The occaſion of his falling out with the formidable Scioppius, was a puniſhment,

---

(9) Id. Epiſt. iii, pag. 412.

(10) Id. ibid. pag. 411.

(11) Id. Sat. II, pag. 339.

(12) Num. 445, & ſeq.

(13) Douza, Ode in Felles Literarias, pag. 619.

(14) Douza, Epiſt. iii, pag. 412.

(15) Thomaſius de Plagio Literario, pag. 196.

'the triumvirs of love, that they, who, after Lambinus, adorned Lucretius with miſcellaneous notes, were not a little aſſiſted by what Fruterius wrote on that author. *For we have the collections of Gifanius on Lucretius* (15).'

[*E*] *His quarrels with Lambinus made a noiſe in the Republic of Letters.*] Lambinus did not content himſelf with complaining in his public lectures, that Gifanius had robbed him; but ſhewed his reſentment upon it, in his preface to his Lucretius, when he printed it the third time. Here follow the verſes concerning the invectives he made in his reading-deſk.

Nec libet antiquam plagii renovare querelam:
Quod te, felicem quondam, Lambine, cerebri,
Et vidi & pleno memini poſuiſſe theatro
Pariſiis, tunc cùm miſerandus & hoſtibus ipſis
Fannius introrſum detractâ pelle pateret.
Indignum ſcelus, & nullo ſatis igne piandum (16).

No more of that: already Fannius ſtands
Convict, and puniſh'd, Lambin, by thy hands;
When publickly, at Paris, you expos'd
His plagiariſm, and all his frauds diſclos'd.

Read theſe verſes of the ſecond ſatire:

- - - - Non ut ineptus
Fannius hic Fidentini genus, & plagii olim
Convictus, Lambine, tibi, cum fronte retecta
Furtivis riſum movit cornicula plumis (17).

Not like this Fannius, plagiary convict;
When, like the daw, her borrow'd feathers gone,
He ſtood unmask'd, the laughter of the town.

Gifanius, without being named in the preface (18), is treated there like a dog: the moſt abuſive language is there given him. '*Pag. xxvi. ipſi Giphanius eſt* quidam omnium mortalium, qui unquam fuerunt, qui ſunt, qui erunt injuſtiſſimus, audaciſſimus, impudentiſſimus. *p. xxx.* audacem *vocat*, arrogantem, impudentem, ingratum, petulantem, inſidioſum, fallacem, infidum, nigrum. *pag. ſeq.* unum ex omnibus mortalibus nulla re magis, quàm feritate, importunitate, contumacia, ſuperbia, audacia, confidentia & impudentia excellentem (19). —— Pag. 26. *Gifanius is to him, of all men, that ever were, are, or will be, the moſt unjuſt, moſt daring, and moſt impudent.* pag. 30. he calls him *impudent, arrogant, ungrateful, ſawcy, treacherous, deceitful, unfaithful, black.* page the following, *the man of all others excellent in nothing more than in ſavageneſs, importunity, contumacy, pride, confidence, and impudence.*' The foundation of this abuſive language, is, that Gifanius had plundered, in the Lucretius of Dionyſius Lambinus, what he thought beſt in it, and had condemned the reſt, without acknowledging from whom he had borrowed what he had. 'Omnia fere, quæ in eo Lucretio recta ſunt, mea ſunt: quæ tamen iſte aut ſilentio prætermittit, aut maligne laudat, aut ſibi impudenter arrogat. Sic unde reprehendendi anſam arripere poteſt, ibi mihi petulantiſſimè inſultat, in eo me improbiſſimè inſectatur (20). —— *Almoſt every thing in that Lucretius, that is right, is mine; which yet he either takes no notice of, or praiſes like an enemy, or impudently arrogates to himſelf. Thus, wherever he can have a handle for reproof, there he moſt ſaucily inſults me, and moſt unreaſonably inveighs againſt me.*' Nevertheleſs, it is true, he acknowledged in his preface, that Lambinus's commentary had been very uſeful to him: 'Dionyſio autem Lambino & Adriano Turnebo duobus Franciæ ornamentis quantum debeatur præmii, quippe qui de hoc graviſſimo ſcriptore optimè ſint meriti, oratione mea quidem nequeam adſequi. Neque ſanè viri illi præſtantiſſimi à me id ut faciam expectant aut volunt, ſatis inclaruit eorum induſtria & eruditio incredibilis. Hoc tantum vereque teſtatum relinquere poſſum ac debeo, illorum maximè laboribus & ſolertia adjutum eſſe in his cujuſquemodi Emendationibus ac Notis comparandis (21). —— *I cannot expreſs how much I am indebted to thoſe two ornaments of France, Dionyſius Lambinus, and Adrianus Turnebus, who have deſerved the beſt of this moſt excellent writer. Nor do thoſe worthy men expect or deſire it of me; their own induſtry and incredible learning are too well known. This alone I can and ought to acknowledge, that I was chiefly aſſiſted by their ſkillful labours in compiling theſe emendations and notes.*' Here are a great many commendations; but they came too late, and could not cure the wound made in the preceding page; wherein it was ſaid, that the public was now preſented with a Lucretius much better than that of Lambinus; and that, for all Lambinus's erudition, the public had not yet the true Lucretius. Gild that pill with encomiums as long as you pleaſe, and you will never take away it's bitterneſs. It will ever preſerve it's ill taſte, and ſet choler, and all other bad humours, in motion. Here is the whole paſſage, which, taken altogether, is diſobliging. 'Tandem Dionyſius Lambinus libros manu deſcriptos complures feliciſſimè nactus; adjutus etiam doctiſſ. virorum, in iis præcipuè Adriani Turnebi, & Joh. etiam Aurati opera, ipſe incredibili diligentia & eruditione præditus, à pluribus iiſque turpiſſimis mendis Lucretium liberavit. Sed quia tam fœdè eſſet contaminatus, uti adhuc præſtantiſſimus poeta nomine tantùm fuerit notus; illi recuſantibus medicinam adhibere eruditis viris, ut ſi deſperatus eſſet ac depoſitus: efficere ille quamvis doctus & diligens (quod pace viri doctiſſ. dictum velim) non potuit, ut purum ac merum haberemus Titum. Nos igitur etſi id quoque præſtare non potuimus, ſpero tamen id nos conſecutos, ut multis jam partibus melior & emendatior in hominum manibus eſſe poſſit optimus Romani ſermonis auctor (22). —— *At length, Dionyſius Lambinus, having luckily met with ſeveral manuſcripts, and being aſſiſted by ſome learned men, particularly Adrian Turnebus, and John Auratus, being himſelf likewiſe a perſon of incredible diligence and learning, corrected many ſhameful errors in Lucretius. But, as that author was ſo very incorrect, that he was known to be a moſt excellent poet only by name, the learned refuſing to adminiſter phyſic to one given over, as it were, and buried, this critic, with all his learning and diligence, could not give us a true and genuine Lucretius. Therefore, though the ſame was out of my power likewiſe, yet I hope I have given the world a much better and more correct edition of this beſt of Latin poets.*' I know not, any more than Thomaſius, whether Gifanius defended himſelf againſt Lambinus (23); I only know that he complained of it to Muret (24), and had recourſe to recrimination. He pretended, that his corrections upon Cicero and Cornelius Nepos had been pirated by Lambinus, whom he alſo accuſed of a ſhameful lie. Lambinus, ſays he, boaſted of the friendſhip of all the Flemings, who ſtudied at Paris, except Gifanius, and named a dozen of them, whoſe very names he had not known, had he not uſed an artifice. Theſe are Gifanius's words: 'De Lambino, φεῦ τῆς ἀναιδείας! in quem ut omnia pulchrè conveniant, accipe & aliud ejus ſtratagema. Cùm Lutetiæ thyrſum, non Lucretianum illum, ſed ſuum in me quatere inſtituiſſet, (ego interim domi virgam tàm pueriliter peccanti minitabar,) primâ concione dixit, cum Belgis omnibus familiaritatem ſibi eſſe, me unum ſibi malè cupere: protulitque duodecim ferè Belgarum nomina, qui tùm ibi agerent ſtudiorum cauſa, (*conferenda ſunt cum his, quæ ſcribit Lambin. ad Lect. tertiæ ed. Lucret. p. xxxi, xxxii.*) Multi ex his admirari hanc publicam teſtationem & citationem, quod illum ne ſalutaſſent quidem, me autem uterentur familiariſſimè; imo eo ipſo tempore epigrammata in illum partim proſcripſiſſent, ad me accurrerunt, & acumen Lambini, arteſque ejus oratorias mihi expoſuerunt. Mirantibus omnibus, unde eorum nomina collegiſſet, intervenit mox ejus convictor Bruxellenſis, qui ſcrupulum illum nobis exemit: ſe namque rogatum & coactum fuiſſe Lambino petenti domi aliquot Belgarum nomina dictare, cauſæ ignarum. Atque ita res in riſum abiit (25). —— *To ſhew you, that Lambinus is conſiſtent with himſelf, here is another of his ſtratagems. Being at Paris, and reſolving to ſhake the Thyrſus, not Lucretius's, but his own, againſt me; (in the mean time I threatened this childiſh offender with the rod, at my own houſe) the firſt harangue he made,*

(15) Thomaſius, de Plagio Literario, pag. 196.

(16) Douza, Sat. I, pag. 336.

(17) Id. pag. 338.

(18) Ego autem nunquam abducar ut eum nominatim deſcribam. *Lambinus, Præf. tertiæ edit. Lucretii, pag. xxviii, apud Thomaſium, pag.* 197.

(19) Thomaſius, ibid.

(20) Lambinus, pag. xxix, apud Thomaſ. ibid. *Note, That I have verified the quotations of Lambinus's preface alledged by Thomaſius.*

(21) Gifan. Præf. in Lucret. fol. m. * * 2.

(22) Id. ibid. fol. * * verſo.

(23) Quid Douzæ, quid Lambino ipſi ad iſtas accuſationes reſponderit Giphanius, fateor ignorare me *Thomaſ. pag.* 198.

(24) Thomaſius, pag. 199, 200, ſets down all the paſſages of the letters from Gifanius to Muret, and Muret's anſwers.

(25) Gifanius ad Muretum, Epiſt. lxxviii, lib. i, inter Epiſtolas Mureti apud Thomaſium, pag. 200.

puniſhment, which he deſerved by *Lex Talionis* [F]. That affair is curious enough. You will find the title of moſt of his works in Moreri's dictionary, where, by a ridiculous miſtake, Hubert Giphani, and Obertus Giphanius, are mentioned as two diſtinct perſons.

‘*made, he ſaid, that all the Dutch, except myſelf, wiſhed him well; upon which he produced the names of about twelve Hollanders, who then ſtudied there; many of them were ſurprized at this public appeal, ſince they had not ſo much as ſaluted him, but had been intimately converſant with me; nay, at that very time, they had partly written epigrams againſt him, and had run to me, and ſhewed me the wit and oratory of Lambinus. While they were all wondering, whence he had their names, comes in one, who had boarded with him at Bruſſels, and informed us, that Lambinus had preſſed him, he knew not why, to dictate to him the names of ſome Hollanders, and ſo the whole was turned into laughter.*' It is a melancholy conſideration, that polite learning cannot keep thoſe, who profeſs it, from the diſorder of paſſions!

Muret was not the only man, whom Gifanius made the confident of his complaints: for there was lately publiſhed a letter, which Gifanius wrote to Theodore Canterus in the year 1567, wherein we find theſe words (26): ‘Præterea noſti quemadmodum mea compilarit, meque tractarit Lambinus in Æmilium Probum, cujus rei teſtes habeo epiſtolas Mureti, quas & tu jam divulgatas videre potuiſti, & Puteani cujus auctoritate Lambinus abutitur inviti, &c. — *You know beſides, how Lambinus, in his comment on Æmilius Probus, plundered me; for the truth of which I appeal to the letters of Muretus, which you may have ſeen in print, and thoſe of Puteanus, whoſe authority Lambinus abuſes, againſt his will.*' Gifanius wrote to the ſame Canterus, in the year 1567, what follows (27): ‘Ille qui ea fulmina in me jacit anne ut divinavi eſt Ludovicus Carrion, quem mihi nomen amiciſſimum putavi. Certe eum eſſe indicavit Dn. Bombergus. Sic Lucretiana mea ubique vapulant, ſed tua & tui ſimilium amicitia fretus vana illa fulmina eſſe judico. —— *He, who darts this thunder at me, is he not, as I gueſſed, Lewis Carrion, whom I looked upon as my friend. Bombergus has plainly ſhewn, that this is he. Thus my labours on Lucretius ſuffer on all ſides; but relying on the friendſhip of you, and ſuch as yourſelf, I deſpiſe their thunder.*'

I ſhall ſay, by the way, that Scaliger is not very proper to make us believe, that Gifanius was not a plagiary. *Gifanius*, ſays he (28), *was learned; his Lucretius is very good: I ſent him ſince ſome good remarks upon Lucretius, which he has kept, and ſays, he has not received them, and deſigns to publiſh them as his own . . . . He had ſtolen from L. Fruterius his Agellius, which was ready for the preſs.*

[F] *The occaſion of his falling out with the formidable Scioppius, was a puniſhment, which he deſerved by* Lex Talionis.] Scioppius, having obtained from Conradus Ritterſhuſius, at whoſe houſe he lodged at Altdorf, a letter of recommendation to Obertus Gifanius, profeſſor at Ingolſtadt, inſinuated himſelf into the favour of that profeſſor; and, having free acceſs to his houſe, he found means, upon a certain day, to viſit the library, during the abſence of it's maſter, and to take out of it a manuſcript of Symmachus. He copied alſo as much as he pleaſed out of a work in manuſcript of Gifanius, and found in it materials to ſet up for a critic; and, when Gifanius loudly complained of it, the plagiary called him a thouſand names. This is what Scaliger's friends relate againſt Scioppius. ‘In ædes primum, mox in animum, poſtea in Bibliothecam abſentis penetravit Giphanii, cui MS. Symmachi codicem ſubduxit: libros vero obſervationum linguæ Latinæ, invito domino percurrit, & ex iis quæ voluit furtim ſublegit. E quibus partim, emendationibus Plautinis, quas è Camerarii membranis deſcriptas in ſuo Ritterſhuſius codice adnotarat, partim etiam reliquiis ſchedarum Modii, quas ab ampliſſimo Velſero, ſummo literarum patrono acceperat; duos illos, quibus primum innotuit, libellos corraſit . . . . Quod quidem plagium cum paſſim voce paſſim literis teſtaretur Giphanius, in præceptorem ſuum & doctiſſimum hominem erupit hæc vipera, & quæcunque undique poterat convitia in eum contorſit (29).' Here is what Scioppius anſwers: I. He quotes two paſſages in his works (30), wherein he acknowledges his obligations to Gifanius, for the communication of Symmachus's manuſcript. II. He confeſſes, that thoſe two paſſages were but a jeſt (31); for, adds he, Gifanius never let me ſee but once that manuſcript; and when I deſired it of him a ſecond time, he anſwered me: *Sir, for a man to aſk of me my Symmachus, is the ſame as if he ſhould aſk my leave to lie with my wife: Symmachum à me petere perinde eſt atque uxorem meam utendam poſtulare* (32). III. That Gifanius, who had ſtolen that manuſcript at Venice, out of the library of cardinal Beſſarion, would neither publiſh it himſelf, nor ſuffer others to publiſh it. ‘Erat autem liber ille Symmachi ex Beſſarionis Bibliotheca Venetiis furto Gifanii ſublatus (velut Wolfgangus Zundelinus indicium Scioppio fecit) quem ille neque ut ederet, neque ut Ritterſhuſio id petenti edendum daret, ullis precibus aut muneribus induci potuit (33).' IV. That Scioppius, leaſt the public ſhould be ſo long deprived of that treaſure, was extreamly kind to Gifanius, and invited him often to ſupper; but that all this was to no purpoſe, though that profeſſor loved mightily to eat and drink at his friend's houſe. ‘Scioppius ne literarum ſtudioſis liber ejuſmodi diutius deberetur, Giphanium creberrime ad cœnam vocando demulcere (vix enim ullam diem toto anno elabi ſibi Gifanius ſinebat, quin foris cœnaret, ac plerumque Menelai Homerici exemplo invocatus amicis condiceret) & Symmachi copiam ab eo impetrare ſtuduit, ſed fruſtra (34).' V. That, ſeeing this obſtinacy, he aſſociated himſelf with three civilians, to get ſecretly that manuſcript; and that, having made uſe of it, he put it in it's place again the next day. VI. That the ſubtilty, with which he gueſſed where that manuſcript lay hid, ſurpaſſes all the cunning of the critics that have commented upon Symmachus. ‘Unica illa conjectura ſua quo loco Symmachi codex in Gifanii Bibliotheca ſitus foret, omnium Criticorum quotquot ei ſcriptori operam navarunt ingenium & acumen longè ſuperavit (35).' VII. That it is falſe that he ſtole that manuſcript, ſince he kept it but one night, that others might have the benefit of it. ‘Rem quoque malo furto acquiſitam poſſeſſori ſuo nequaquam ſubduxerit (velut tu mentiris) ſed uſum ejus unius noctis lucubratione cum aliis communicavit (36).' VIII. As for the other manuſcript, he owns, he had it in his hands, through the means of Gifanius's *Amanuenſis*; and that he took the beſt things out of it, tho' not with a deſign to arrogate them to himſelf, ſince he ſuffered ſeveral lovers of fine Latin to write out copies of it (37). IX. He pretends he has publickly acknowledged the benefit he received from that work. ‘*De obſervationibus Grammaticis fateri puta Scioppium cum præfatione diſputationis de injuriis ita Giphanium alloquitur,* Ego multa ex te quamvis inſcio & invito didici.' I do not wonder Gifanius fell into ſuch a paſſion; for who could bear ſuch tricks? Scioppius owns enough to perſuade his readers, that he was not an honeſt man. The worſt of all for Gifanius was, that people laughed at his anger. *Hoc ut reſcivit Giphanius, tantum non in furorem redactus eſt, omnibuſque viris doctis etiam amicis ſuis deridiculo fuit* (38).

I have heard the illuſtrious Mr Grævius ſay, that he had ſeen, in the hands of Frederic Gronovius, a letter from Philip Pareus, by which Gronovius was informed, that the manuſcript of Gifanius's obſervations on the Latin tongue had been found again, and that it would thereby be eaſy to diſcover Scioppius's plagiariſms.

GILLES (Peter) miniſter of the reformed church of la Tour in the Vale of Luſerne, compoſed, by order of his ſuperiors, an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Churches of the Vaudois, and publiſhed it at Geneva, in 1644, in 4to. He was then ſeventy three years old. He had already publiſhed other works [*A*].

---

(26) See the letters, which Mr Matthæus, profeſſor of civil-law at Leyden, has publiſhed there in 1695, pag. 97.

(27) Ibid.

(28) Scaligerana, pag. 93.

(29) *See the ſatire,* Hercules tuam fidem, *where there is an appendix, intituled,* Vita & Parentes Gaſpar. Scioppii, pag. 145, 146.

(30) *The preface to his* Veriſimilia, *and the fifteenth letter of his* Suſpectæ Lectiones.

(31) Iſta Scioppium non ſerio ſed joco tantum ſcripſiſſe *Oporinus Grubinius Amphot. Sciopp. pag.* 130.

(32) Ibid.

(33) Ibid.

(34) Ib. pag. 140.

(35) Ibid.

(36) Ib. pag. 141.

(37) Cum ei Giphanii amanuenſis librum illum obſervationum attuliſſet, cum iiſdem Juriſconſultis, amicis ſuis, operas partitus intra paucos dies quidquid in eo minus pervulgatum eſſe videretur, deſcripſit, & paſſim poſtea aliis linguæ Latinæ ſtudioſis, etiam ſacrilego illi Guldinaſto deſcribendi copiam fecit. *Ibid.*

(38) Ibid.

[*A*] *He had already publiſhed other works.*] I have ſaid elſewhere (1), that the prior Marco Aurelio Rorenco publiſhed, in 1634, an apology for a piece he had written in 1632. Our Peter Gilles refuted this apology by a work, intituled, *Conſiderations on the Apologetical Letters of the Sieurs Marco Aurelio Rorenco, prior of Luſerne, and Theodorus Belvederenſis, Prefect of the monks* (2). The other replied by a Latin work, intituled, *Turris contra Damaſcum, id eſt Tutela Eccleſiæ Romanæ contra Calviniſtarum incurſiones objecta conſiderationibus cujuſdam Miniſtri P. Gillio ſubſcripti ædificata cum propugnaculis à Fr. Theodoro Belvederenſi, &c.* This work was printed at Turin, in 1636, and refuted ſoon after by the Sieur Gilles, who replied likewiſe to another book, which the ſame monk had publiſhed in Italian, under the title of *Lucerna della Chriſtiana Verita per conoſcer la vera Chieſa e la falſa preteſa Reformata*; he replied to it, I ſay, by an Italian work, intituled, *Torre Evangelica*, divided into forty eight chapters, the contents of which he gives in his Hiſtory of the Vaudois (3). He does the ſame with regard to his anſwer to another Italian book, which Belvederenſis dedicated to *Meſſ. de la propaganda*, to inform them of the ſtate of the reformed churches of the Vaudois, *and of their order, doctrine, and ceremonies, inſinuating obliquely at the end, that they ought to be exterminated* (4).

(1) In the article RORENCO.

(2) See his Hiſtory of the Vaudois, pag. 540.

(3) Ibid. pag. 542, & ſeq.

(4) Ibid. pag. 545, & ſeq.

GIOACHINO GRECO, known under the name of the **CALABRIAN**, played at Cheſs ſo ſkillfully, that it cannot be thought ſtrange, that I conſecrate to him a little article. All thoſe, who excel in their profeſſion, to a certain degree, deſerve that diſtinction. This gameſter did not find his match any where: He went to all the courts of Europe, and ſignalized himſelf there at Cheſs in a moſt ſurprizing manner. He found famous gameſters at the court of France, ſuch as the duke of Nemours, Mr Arnaud, colonel of the Carabineers, Chaumont, and La Salle; but, though they pretended to know more than others, none of them was able to play with him; nor could they cope with him all together. *He was at Cheſs a bravo; who ſought in all countries ſome famous knight, with whom he might fight, and break a lance; and he found none whom he did not overcome.* A wit made ſome Verſes upon that ſubject (*a*) [*A*]. See above, the article BOI.

(*a*) Taken from a letter, inſerted in the *Mercure Galant* for the month of Decem. 1693.

[*A*] *A wit made ſome verſes upon that ſubject.*] Moſt readers would be angry with me, if I ſhould acquaint them with this, without producing the verſes themſelves. I muſt therefore tranſcribe them.

A peine dans la carriere
Contre moi tu fais un pas
Que par ta demarche fiere
Tous mes projets ſont à bas.
Je vois dès que tu t'avances
Ceder toutes mes defenſes,
Tomber tous mes champions,
Dans ma reſiſtance vaine
Roi, Chevalier, Roc, & Reine
Sont moindres que des Pions (1).

As ſoon as in the field thou mov'ſt a ſtep,
Thy haughty march confounds my whole deſign:
I ſee, at thy approach, my men diſmay'd;
My knights and biſhops make but faint reſiſtance;
My rock, and even the queen, forſake their king.

(1) From the letter inſerted in the *Mercure Galant*, *Dec.* 1693.

GIRAC (Paul Thomas Sieur de): See **THOMAS**.

GLAPHYRA, wife to Archelaus, high-prieſt of Bellona, at Comana in Cappadocia, procured kingdoms for her two ſons by her beauty. She flouriſhed at the ſame time with Marc Antony. There are hiſtorians, who do not expreſsly ſay, that ſhe was diſhoneſt, but content themſelves to give us implicitly to underſtand it [*A*] by relating what Marc Antony did for her ſake: But Dion, without any ſoftening calls her a leud woman [*B*]. It is indeed very probable, conſidering the temper of Marc Antony, that he did not give crowns for the bare ſatisfaction of obliging a handſome woman; and that he received from Glaphyra all the acknowledgments, which a voluptuous man is capable to wiſh and exact. The noiſe of this intrigue ſpread as far as Rome; and Fulvia, Marc Antony's wife, would fain have engaged Auguſtus to revenge the infidelity of her huſband. Her deſires in this matter were ſo violent, that ſhe threatened Auguſtus with a declaration of war, if he did not uſe her, as her huſband uſed Glaphyra: But Auguſtus ſlighted that threatening, and choſe rather to expoſe himſelf to an open war, than to be Fulvia's gallant. This is at leaſt what he would have the world think of him: For he compoſed upon it an epigram, which Martial has inſerted in his poems [*C*]. I know not by what fatality Glaphyra's huſband did not find

[*A*] *There are hiſtorians, who do not expreſsly ſay that ſhe was diſhoneſt; but content themſelves to give us implicitly to underſtand it.*] Appian is the man I have in view: ſee how he ſpeaks, when he relates what Marc Antony did in Aſia, after the defeat of Brutus and Caſſius: *Diſceptationes quoque civitatum ac regum ex arbitrio ſuo compoſuit, Siſinnæ Ariarathiſque in Cappadocia, prælato Siſinna in Glaphyræ matris formoſæ gratiam* (1). It was in the 713th year of Rome, that Siſinna was made king of Cappadocia, upon the excluſion of Ariarathes. He did not long enjoy that crown; for we are going to ſee, that, in 718, Ariarathes reigned in Cappadocia.

[*B*] *Dion . . . . . calls her a leud woman.*] It is when he ſpeaks of the change of government, which was made by Marc Antony in ſeveral provinces of Aſia, in the year 718. Amyntas, who had been ſecretary to Dejotarus, was put in poſſeſſion of Galatia, and of ſome parts of Lycaonia and Pamphylia. Ariarathes was turned out of Cappadocia, and Archelaus put in his place: Archelaus, I ſay, who was deſcended from the Archelai, who had made war againſt the Romans, and ſon to the courtezan Glaphyra. Ὁ δ᾽ Ἀρχέλαος οὗτος, πρὸς μὲν πατρὸς, ἐκ τῶν Ἀρχελάων ἐκείνων τῶν τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ἀντιπολεμησάντων ἦν, ἐκ δὲ μητρὸς ἑταίρας Γλαφύρας ἐγεγέννετο. Archelai vero hujus genus paternum deducebatur ab Archelais qui contra Romanos belligeraverant, mater autem ei erat ſcortum Glaphyra (2).

[*C*] *Auguſtus compoſed upon it an epigram, which Martial has inſerted in his poems.*] If I inſert it here, it is only after I have taken out of it the moſt ſcandalous words (3).

(1) Appian. lib. v, de Bell. Civil. pag. m. 392.

(2) Dio, lib xlix, pag. 469. *D.*

(3) Martial. Epig. xxi, lib xi. *See the remark* [*F*] *of the article* *LYCORIS.*

find in Cæſar the ſame ſupport, which her ſons had in Marc Antony. I have already ſaid, that he was high-prieſt of Bellona, which was a conſiderable dignity. Cæſar beſtowed it upon a great lord, named Lycomedes [*D*], who founded his pretenſions upon good titles. Where was Glaphyra at that time? If ſhe had pleaded her huſband's cauſe before Cæſar, ſhe had made it appear, that Lycomedes's pretenſions were ill grounded: And the judge, I ſuppoſe, had been too well bred, not to declare himſelf for a prieſt, who had ſo handſome a wife. I ſhould be glad to know, what reaſon a wit had for ſaying (*a*), that the Glaphyra of Auguſtus's epigram was the player Cytheris. We ſhall ſee, in the following article, that Glaphyra pretended to be deſcended from the kings of Perſia.

Cæſaris Auguſti laſcivos livide verſus
Sex lege, qui triſtis verba Latina legis.

Quod . . . Glaphyram Antonius, hanc mihi pœnam
Fulvia conſtituit, ſe quoque uti . .
Fulviam ego ut . . . quid ſi me Manius oret
Pædicem, faciam? non puto ſi ſapiam.
Aut . . . aut pugnemus ait. Quid quæ mihi vita
Carior eſt ipſa mentula? ſigna canant.

Abſolvis lepidos nimirum Auguſte libellos
Qui ſcis Romana ſimplicitate loqui.

Father Noris imagined that Auguſtus made that epigram againſt Marc Antony, and with an intent to reproach him with that unlawful commerce (4): but the blow is not at all levelled againſt Marc Antony, but againſt his wife Fulvia; and, indeed, it is the crueleſt blow that ſatire can ſtrike againſt a woman. I make the leſs ſcruple of taking the liberty to mark that ſmall miſtake of the learned library-keeper of the Vatican, becauſe he would be glad to ſay, that he has not examined that ſort of verſes, and takes a pride in miſtaking them. His error is infinitely leſs, than that of Farnaby, who has found, in thoſe verſes, a proteſtation of Auguſtus, that he preferred chaſtity before life. We ſhall ſee, in the article LYCORIS, that ſome people pretend, that the courtezan Cytheris is meant in Auguſtus's epigram.

[*D*] *Cæſar conferred her husband's dignity upon a great lord, named Lycomedes.*] I have already ſaid, in another place (5), that Hirtius calls him Nicomedes: let us quote his words; 'Id (*Bellonæ templum*) homini 'nobiliſſimo Nicomedi Bithynio adjudicavit, qui regio 'Cappadocum genere ortus propter adverſam fortunam 'majorum ſuorum mutationemque generis jure minime 'dubio, vetuſtate tamen intermiſſo, Sacerdotium id 'repetebat (6). —— *He adjudged the temple of Bellona to Nicomedes, a noble Bithynian, who, being deſcended from the kings of Cappadocia, claimed that prieſthood, by an undoubted right, which, thro' the misfortunes of his anceſtors, had lain long dormant.*' Theſe words intimate, that there were ſome diſputes, before Cæſar, touching the poſſeſſion of that benefice. Now ſince Strabo affirms, that Lycomedes enjoyed it after Archelaus, it may ſeem, that the diſpute was between them two. This is the opinion, of Father Noris, who made no difficulty to affirm (7), that Archelaus enjoyed the pontificate of Bellona, till Cæſar took it from him, in the year 707, to beſtow it upon Lycomedes. According to this ſuppoſition, it may be asked, where were, then, Glaphyra's charms, and why did ſhe not make uſe of them againſt Lycomedes's demands? her beauty was undoubtedly more powerful at that time, than in 713; for that is not a fruit, that grows better by coming to maturity. Did her husband hide her, and rather chuſe to loſe his prieſthood, than expoſe his wife to the dangerous courtſhip of Cæſar? it is what I know nothing of.

(*a*) Nouveaux Dialogues des Morts, Part. II, Dial. iv, pag. m. 28.

(4) Hinc (*that is from what has been quoted out of Appian*) argumentum obſcœni Epigrammatis Auguſtus poſtea ſumpſit, quod Antonio objicit apud Martialem. *Noris, Cenotaph. Piſan. pag.* 225.

(5) See the remark [*D*] of the article ARCHELAUS, king of Cappadocia.

(6) Hirtius de Bello Alexandr.

(7) In Cenotaph. Piſan. pag. 225.

GLAPHYRA, grand-child to the former, was the daughter of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia. Her firſt huſband was Alexander, the ſon of Herod and Mariamne; and being proud and infatuated with her nobility, ſhe no way contributed to maintain an union in the family, into which ſhe was married: A family, whoſe diviſions rendered Herod the moſt unhappy and moſt criminal of all fathers. Glaphyra boaſted at every turn, that her father traced his origin to Temenus (*a*); that her mother deſcended from Darius, the ſon of Hyſtaſpes; and that therefore her noble birth ſet her above the reſt of the ladies at court. She looked down with contempt upon the ſiſters and wives of Herod; and reproached theſe, that their beauty, not their birth, had raiſed them to the rank they held. Nothing was more apt, than ſuch diſcourſes, to ſet Herod's family in a flame: And it is certain that this pride of Glaphyra was one of the firſt cauſes of her huſband's death. She rendered him odious, and encreaſed the deſire they had to deſtroy him by calumnies and artifices (*b*). When Herod cauſed Alexander to be tried for his life, Glaphyra was examined as an evidence: Her anſwer deſerves to be related [*A*]. After Alexander's execution, Herod ſent back Glaphyra to her father Archelaus, and kept with him the two ſons Alexander had by that woman (*c*). Joſephus pretends, that ſhe was married again to Juba king of Libya; and that, after the death of this ſecond huſband, ſhe returned to her father; but it is eaſy to prove that to be falſe [*B*], if it be meant of Juba king of Mauritania. It is certain, that Archelaus,

[*A*] *Her anſwer deſerves to be related.*] She underwent the interrogatory before her husband, who was faſt bound, like a ſon, who had conſpired againſt his father's life. That ſpectacle grieved her extremely, and made her fetch moſt lamentable groans. Her husband being preſſed to confeſs, whether his wife was an accomplice in the attempt, anſwered, that he was not the man, that would keep any thing ſecret from a wife, by whom he had children, and who was dearer to him than his own life. Thereupon ſhe proteſted her innocence, and declared, ſhe would not ſcruple to tell a lie, if thereby ſhe could contribute to ſave her husband's life though with the loſs of her own; but that otherwiſe ſhe would confeſs all. The husband made then his confeſſion, and ſaid, they had both no other deſign, than to go to Archelaus's court, and from thence to Rome (1).

[*B*] *It is eaſy to prove that to be falſe.*] Joſephus mentions that marriage of Glaphyra with Juba king of Libya, as a thing certain (2); adding, that Juba was dead, when Glaphyra was married to Archelaus. Here is a demonſtration, that this cannot be underſtood of the king of Mauritania. Juba, king of Mauritania, was not dead (3), when Strabo compoſed his ſixth book. Now Strabo compoſed it in the reign of Tiberius (4); therefore Juba was not dead, when Archelaus, Herod's ſon, married Glaphyra, ſince he married her during his proſperity, and conſequently before the year of Rome 759, which was that of his diſgrace: for it was then, that Auguſtus confined him to Vienna. Auguſtus lived ſeven or eight years after that. It may be proved, that Strabo wrote his ſixth book about the fifth year of Tiberius? for in the fourth book (5), he takes notice, that Tiberius and Druſus

(*a*) I ſuppoſe ſhe meant him, who was one of the three chiefs of the Heraclidæ, on their return into Peloponneſus; ſo that ſhe pretended, that her father deſcended from Hercules.

(*b*) Ex Joſepho de Bello Jud. lib. i, cap. xvii.

(*c*) Id. ibid. cap. xviii, & Antiq. lib. xvii, cap. i.

(1) Ex Joſepho Antiquit. lib. xvi, cap. xvi.

(2) Antiquit. lib. xvii, cap. xv, de Bell. Jud. lib. ii, cap. xi.

(3) Strabo, lib. vi, pag. 198.

(4) Ibid. pag. 199, quæ eſt ultima lib. vi.

(5) Pag. 142, ſub fin.

laus, the ſon of Herod, fell ſo paſſionately in love with her, that in order to marry her, he put away his own wife (*d*). It is ſaid, that, Glaphyra lived not long after her return into Judæa, by reaſon of a marriage ſo oppoſite to the Jewiſh laws; and hiſtory mentions a dream, which preſaged her death [*C*]. The two ſons ſhe had by Alexander, her firſt huſband, renounced betimes the Jewiſh religion (*e*); becauſe, I ſuppoſe, Archelaus, their grand-father by their mother's ſide, ſent for, and took care of them. One of them was called Alexander, and the other Tigranes: I ſhall ſay ſomething of their adventures in the remarks [*D*]. If we may truſt the chronology of ſome modern authors [*E*], we muſt rank the two Glaphyra's amongſt the women, who preſerved their beauty to old age.

Druſus had ſubdued the Norici thirty three years before (6). It would be needleſs to remark after this, that Dion (7) mentions king Juba as a prince, that was alive the ſame year, in which he places Archelaus's baniſhment. It may be gathered from the fourth book of Tacitus's Annals, that Juba died about the tenth year of Tiberius; for that hiſtorian mentions him (8) as a man who was living in the 776th year of Rome; but, in the following year, he ſpeaks of the reign of Ptolemy, ſon of Juba (9). The ſeventeenth book of Strabo was compoſed ſoon after the death of the ſame Juba (10); and therefore it is plain, that Joſephus would be groſsly miſtaken, if by the king of Libya, whom he mentions as ſecond husband of Glaphyra, he had meant the king of Mauritania. Father Noris (11) would clear Joſephus but from part of his miſtake, ſuppoſing he had reaſon to conjecture, that Glaphyra was put away by Juba. What Joſephus declares concerning the death of the ſecond husband, as antecedent to the marriage of Archelaus and Glaphyra, would ſtill be falſe: but after all, this divorce is nothing but a meer ſuppoſition. Noldius (12) ſuppoſes a thing, which is, perhaps, leſs uncertain, to wit, that Joſephus meant, by Juba king of Libya, a king, who had nothing to do with the Romans, and whoſe widow Glaphyra was, when Archelaus fell in love with her. That author maintains (13), that Libya is taken for all Africa in general, or for certain parts of Africa in particular; but that, in this laſt ſignification, it never comprehends Mauritania: from whence he takes occaſion to cenſure (14) Sigiſmundus Gelenius, who has tranſlated *Regem Mauritaniæ*, the words uſed by Joſephus in ſpeaking of Juba king of Libya, *Τῶν Διϐύων*. He cenſures yet more ſtrongly father Salian, who thought that Juba was killed in the fight, mentioned by Dion (15) in his fifty fifth book. It is the battle, in which the Getuli, who had revolted, and refuſed obedience to Juba, gained the victory. That Jeſuit obſerves, in order to ſupport his opinion, that Juba was then dead; that his widow was returned to her father's houſe, and that ſhe had married a third husband, *viz.* Archelaus, ethnarch of Judæa. He quotes Joſephus, but he ſhould have remembred, that the ſame year, wherein the Getuli gained the victory, mentioned by Dion, Archelaus was baniſhed by Auguſtus. It is therefore true, that Juba was ſtill alive, the year, wherein Archelaus was baniſhed beyond the Alps; and conſequently it is falſe, that his widow was Archelaus's wife: for it would be abſurd to ſuppoſe, that he married her but a few days before his diſgrace, which happened in the ninth or tenth year of his ethnarchy: So that the very paſſage, which father Salian has quoted out of Dion, ſuffices to convince him of a blunder.

[*C*] *Mention is made of a dream which preſaged her death.*] I mention it with the moral reflexions, which the hiſtorian has added to it (16). 'As ſhe was with her laſt husband Archelaus, ſhe dreamed, that Alexander came to her, and that ſhe embraced him for joy. But Alexander reproached her, ſaying; Glaphyra, thou haſt made good the common proverb, *that women are not to be truſted.* I married thee a virgin; I have made thee a mother to our common children: and now, having quite forgot our love, thou haſt been taken with the deſire to marry a ſecond husband. Nor haſt thou been contented with putting ſuch an affront upon me, but haſt dared to lie with a third husband, creeping baſely and imprudently into my family: and can'ſt thou now bear my brother Archelaus to be thy husband? As for me, I ſhall never forget thy former love; and I ſhall free thee from ſuch a reproach, by making thee mine, as thou waſt before. Having declared this dream to ſome women her familiar acquaintance, ſhe died ſoon after. I thought this ſtory deſerved to be recited, and that it was not impertinent in this place, wherein I ſpeak of thoſe kings: and, beſides, this example is particularly remarkable, ſince it contains a moſt certain proof of the immortality of the ſoul, and of divine providence. If theſe things ſeem incredible to any man, let him enjoy his own opinion: but at the ſame time, let him not endeavour to make thoſe diſbelieve it, who, by ſuch examples, are incited to the ſtudy and practice of virtue.'

[*D*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of the adventures of her two ſons in the remarks.*] Tigranes was king of Armenia, and died without iſſue (17). Joſephus ſays only, that the Romans accuſed him: he ſhould have added, that Tiberius cauſed him to be put to death (18). Alexander, Tigranes's brother, had a ſon called Tigranes, on whom Tiberius beſtowed the kingdom of Armenia. This Tigranes had a ſon, named Alexander, who married Jotapa, daughter of Antiochus, king of Comagene, and who obtained from Veſpaſian a kingdom in Cilicia. Let us add, to this narrative of Joſephus, the ſupplement which Tacitus furniſhes us with. "Advenit Tigranes à Nerone ad capeſſendum imperium delectus, Cappadocum ex nobilitate, regis Archelai nepos, ſed quod diu obſes apud urbem fuerat uſque ad ſervilem patientiam demiſſus (19). - - - - *Tigranes arrived, being pitched upon by Nero to aſſume the crown: he was of the Cappadocian nobility, grandſon of king Archelaus, but, through his long continuance at Rome as an hoſtage, ſunk to the patience of a ſlave.*' There is reaſon to believe, that the Romans did not ſupport Tigranes againſt the Parthians, who demanded Armenia for Tiridates. Tacitus does not mark preciſely the degree of conſanguinity of that Tigranes, with reſpect to Archelaus, king of Cappadocia (20). This Archelaus was not his grand-father, but his great grand-father, ſince that Tigranes was ſon to one Alexander, whoſe father was another Alexander, and his mother Glaphyra daughter of Archelaus.

[*E*] *If we may truſt the chronology of ſome modern authors.*] Noldius proves againſt Tacitus, that Archelaus was not the grand-father, but the great grand-father of that Tigranes on whom Nero beſtowed Armenia: He proves it (21), I ſay, firſt, by the teſtimony of Joſephus; and ſecondly, by the decrepit age, wherein that Tigranes muſt have been, if he had been Archelaus's ſon; for, in ſuch a caſe, he he had been ſon of Alexander. Now Herod put to death his ſon Alexander ſoon after the battle of Actium, and conſequently Tigranes muſt have been born towards the 724th year of Rome, and muſt have been near ninety years old, when he was ſent into Armenia. This is the conſequence Noldius ought to have drawn from his hypotheſis, which however he has not done, chooſing rather to reaſon thus: ſince Tigranes's father was put to death ſoon after the battle of Actium, Tigranes muſt have been born towards the middle of the age of Auguſtus, and ſo he could not have been fit for buſineſs in the reign of Nero. The firſt conſequence is not according to the rules of exact chronology. Auguſtus died in the 766th year of Rome, being ſeventy ſix years old; the middle of his age was, therefore, the year 728. Now can an exact chronologer ſay, that a man, born about the year 728, is the ſon of a father, that was put to death ſoon after the battle of Actium? The other conſequence is much better: Armenia was given to Tigranes by Nero, in the year 813. Therefore, if Tigranes was born in the year 728, he muſt have been eighty five years old when he went to Armenia. But let us ſhew Noldius, that he has built upon a falſe ſuppoſition. The death of Alexander, ſon of Herod, could not happen ſoon after the battle of Actium; for that unfortunate prince left two ſons. It may therefore be ſuppoſed, that his wife was twenty years old, when he died: ſhe muſt then have been born about the 704th year of Rome, and Archelaus her father's birth muſt fall towards the

year

(*d*) Id. Antiq. lib. xvii, cap xv, & de Bell. Jud. lib. ii, cap xi.

(*e*) Id. Antiq. lib. xvii, cap. vii.

(6) Calviſius places that expedition in the 738th year of Rome; and Auguſtus's death in the year 766.

(7) Dio, lib. lv, ad ann. 759.

(8) Tacit. Ann. lib. iv, cap. v.

(9) Ibid. cap. xxiii.

(10) *See* Strabo, lib. xvii, pag. 570.

(11) Cenotaph. Piſan. pag. 238.

(12) Noldius de vita & geſtis Herodum, pag. 190.

(13) Pag. 185, *& ſeq.*

(14) Pag. 185.

(15) Ad ann. 759.

(16) Joſeph. Antiq. lib xvii, cap. ult. *See alſo* de Bello Jud. lib. ii, cap. xi.

(17) Joſeph. Antiq. lib. xviii, cap. vii.

(18) Ne Tigranes quidem Armeniæ quondam potitus, ac tunc reus nomine regio ſupplicia civium effugit. *Tacit. Annal. lib. vi, cap. xl, ad ann.* 788.

(19) Id. ibid. lib. xiv, cap. xxvi.

(20) See the remark [*E*].

(21) Eum *pronepotem* fuiſſe præter Joſephum. *Ant. xix, cap. vii*, ipſa rerum ſeries oſtendit. Quo pacto enim *Tigranes, nepos* circa tempus medium Auguſti natus (pater non multo poſt *victoriam ad Actium* ab Herode interfectus) ſub Nerone agere aut pati potuit? quo profecto tempore natura eum *aut* morte *aut* ſenio ita multaverat, ut rebus gerendis aptus tum haud eſſe potuerit, nedum ita arduis & perturbatis. *Noldius, ubi ſupra, pag.* 367.

year 684; and ſo he would have been eighty five years old when he died. Now this is not at all likely, becauſe the hiſtorians, that have mentioned his death, have deſigned, thereby, to caſt an odium upon Tiberius; and yet they have not mentioned the circumſtance of Archelaus's old age, which circumſtance was very proper to render the emperor's cruelty yet more horrid. Add, that, if Archelaus was born in the year 684, his mother muſt have been near fifty years old, when ſhe raiſed ſuch a violent paſſion in Marc Antony. The proof of this is eaſy: Archelaus was not her eldeſt ſon, and therefore we may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that ſhe was about twenty years old, when he was born. Now it was in the year 713, that Marc Antony gave the kingdom of Cappadocia to Siſinna ſon of Glaphyra. It would have been an uncommon ſight indeed to ſee a grand-mother, whoſe grand-daughter was already nine or ten years old, hold in her chains, by the charms of her beauty, the ſovereign diſpoſer of crowns and ſceptres (22). Auguſtus would have had here a fair occaſion to write ſatirical epigrams upon Marc Antony, and to turn him into ridicule. On the other hand, ſince Glaphyra, Archelaus's daughter, was not married to Archelaus, Herod's ſon, till after Herod was dead, ſhe might have been able to kindle a violent love, when ſhe was fifty years old. Let us therefore rectify Noldius's chronology, by ſaying, with father Noris (23), that Alexander, husband to the laſt Glaphyra, was not put to death till after the 742d year of Rome.

(23) Cenotaph. Piſan. pag. 153, & *ſeq.*

(22) The reader will find, in this Dictionary, remark [*G*] of the article ARAGON (JOAN of); and remark [*F*] of the article CYRUS, ſome inſtances of women, whoſe beauty has laſted long: but nevertheleſs he muſt not draw from thence conſequences to maintain chronological hypotheſes, which are otherwiſe uncertain.

GLEICHEN. A very ſingular adventure is related concerning a German count of this name. He was taken in a fight againſt the Turks, and carried into Turkey, where he ſuffered a hard and long captivity, being put upon ploughing the ground, &c. But thus happened his deliverance: Upon a certain day, the daughter of the king (*a*) his maſter came up to him, and aſked him ſeveral queſtions, whilſt ſhe was a walking. His good mien and dexterity ſo pleaſed that princeſs, that ſhe promiſed to ſet him free, and to follow him, provided he would marry her. He anſwered, *I have a Wife and Children. That is no Argument*, replied ſhe, *the Cuſtom of the Turks allow one Man ſeveral Wives.* The count was not ſtubborn, but acquieſced to theſe reaſons, and gave his word. The princeſs employed herſelf ſo induſtriouſly to get him out of bondage, that they were ſoon in a readineſs to go on board a veſſel. They arrived happily at Venice. The count found there one of his men, who travelled every where to hear of him. He told him, that his wife and children were in good health: Whereupon he preſently went to Rome; and, after he had ingenuouſly related what he had done, the Pope granted him a ſolemn diſpenſation to keep his two wives (*b*). If the court of Rome ſhewed itſelf ſo eaſy on this occaſion, the count's wife was not leſs ſo; for ſhe received very kindly the Turkiſh lady, by whoſe means ſhe recovered her dear huſband, and had for this concubine a particular kindneſs (*c*). The Turkiſh princeſs anſwered very handſomely thoſe civilities; and though ſhe proved barren, yet ſhe loved tenderly the children, which the other wife bore in abundance. There is ſtill at Erford a monument of this ſtory to be ſeen (*d*) [*A*]. A very worthy gentleman (*e*), who told me this ſtory in the year 1697, ſeemed very much ſurprized, that the Proteſtant writers, when they are obliged to anſwer the reproaches touching the permiſſion the reformers gave to a Landgrave of Heſſe, do not inſtance in the diſpenſation granted by the Pope to count de Gleichen, and deſired to know my thoughts thereupon [*B*]. He told me, That du Val has mentioned this adventure in his deſcription of *Germany* (*f*). *In the year* 1227, ſays *du Val*, *a count of Gleichen obtained leave from the Pope to have two wives at once.* If this ſtory be true, we have in it a great inſtance of the triumph and power of love [*C*]. An abbot, who kept a correſpondence by letters with count Buſſy,

(*a*) Filia Regis ſub quo ſerviebat Comes. *Hondorf. ubi infra.*

(*b*) Re ordine narrata literas à Pontifice impetrat, quibus ei concederetur *utramque fovere conjugem.* Id. ibid.

(*c*) Summo amore pellicem, cujus opera cariſſimum maritum recepiſſet, proſequitur. *Id. ibid.*

(*d*) Taken from the *Theatrum Hiſtoricum* of Andrew Hondorf, pag. 535, of the fifth Edition, printed at Francfort, 1633, in 8vo.

(*e*) Mr Pallary, a French miniſter at Delft.

(*f*) Pag. 205, Paris Edit 1668. The author of the *Polygamia Triumphatrix*, *pag.* 556, ſays, that this count Gleichen was of the cruſade of Frederic II, in 1217. But this expedition was in 1228.

[*A*] *There is ſtill at Erford a monument of this ſtory to be ſeen.*] Theſe are Hondorf's words: ' Hujus rei monimentum Erphordiæ etiamnum exſtat: ' in quo ex utroque latere Comiti uxores adſtant. Regina marmoreâ coronâ ornata: Comitiſſa ſculpta eſt ' nuda & infantes ad ejus pedes reptantes (1). - - - ' *There is ſtill at Erford a monument of this ſtory;* ' *in which the count is placed between two wives.* ' *The queen is adorned with a marble crown: the* ' *counteſs is engraved naked, with children at her* ' *feet.*'

[*B*] *And deſired to know my thoughts thereupon.*] If my memory fails me not, my anſwer amounted to this: firſt, that this paſſage was ſomewhat obſcure, and uncertain; and ſecondly, that it would ſignify nothing to alledge it, unleſs either the Pope's brief, or the teſtimony of ſome cotemporary author, or the conſent of the Romiſh writers, could be produced. Hondorf is almoſt the only author that vouches for this ſtory (2): now he quoting no body, and being but a compiler, whom the learned never much eſteemed, and alſo a Proteſtant, the Roman Catholics would not fail to reject his teſtimony. They would aſk, out of what records or annals he has taken that paſſage? and ſince he quotes nothing, they would pretend, that he has no other ground for it but an hearſay, or uncertain and even fabulous traditions; ſuch as many illuſtrious families induſtriouſly propagate, concerning the manner how their anceſtors were freed from bondage in the times of the cruſades. In ſhort if they denied the fact, what could one anſwer to them? the monument at Erford can prove nothing: for after all, does the figure of a man between two figures of women clearly ſignify polygamy? May it not as well ſignify, among other things, two ſucceſſive marriages, or two marriages contracted betwen a huſband and two living wives, but the latter of which marriages was declared void? are there not abundance of ridiculous ſtories, which people endeavour to prove by monuments of ſtone? thus ſome pretend to prove, that a certain counteſs of Holland was delivered of 365 children at once: a thing, which all good hiſtorians make a jeſt of, and evince to be a falſity.

[*C*] *We have here a great inſtance of the triumph and power of love.*] That is, the daughter of a king, ready not only to renounce the ſublime advantages of her condition, to follow a ſlave to the world's end, but actually a fugitive, after having overlooked dangers, to which her deſign expoſed both her own life, and that of the priſoner, with whom ſhe was in love. She did not engage her ſelf by degrees in a flight ſo ſurrounded with dangers, ſo diſadvantageous, ſo ſcandalous; no, ſhe fully reſolves upon it the very firſt time ſhe ſees the ſlave. *Ut vidi ut perii, ut me malus abſtulit error* (3), might ſhe have ſaid, like many others. How true is what is ſaid in an opera;

Bacchus revient vainqueur des climats de l'Aurore,
Il traine apres ſont char mille peuples vaincus;
Il mepriſoit l'amour, mais l'amour eſt encore
Un vainqueur mille fois plus puiſſant que Bacchus.

Bacchus returns victorious from the Eaſt.
A thouſand conquer'd nations grace his triumphs;

(1) Hondorf. Theat. Exempl. pag. 535. Edit. 1633.

(2) Simon Goulart, who has inſerted this ſtory in his tranſlation of Camerarius's *Hiſtorical Meditations, Tom. II, lib. ii, cap. xiv, pag. m.* 152, quotes only Hondorf's *Theatrum.* The author of the *Polygamia Triumphatrix*, *pag.* 556, hath quoted *Dreſſer. Millen.* 6. *Zeiler. Contin. Itineris Germ. Peccenſteinius in Theatr. Saxon.* But theſe three authors, or a thouſand more of that ſtamp, can give no weight to this ſtory.

(3) Virgil. Eclog. viii, ver. 41.

Buſſy, had heard ſomething of this ſtory, but was ignorant of the true ſtate of the caſe [*D*]. For the reſt, the author of the fifteen comforts of matrimony ſeems to ſuppoſe, that it happens pretty often, that a woman marries again, upon the falſe ſuppoſition of her huſband's death [*E*]. The Journal of Hamburgh will furniſh me with a good ſupplement to this article [*F*].

Which makes him ſlight the power of Cupid's darts:
But ſoon he feels the greater force of love.

I know not whether the lady de Ville-Dieu has romanized the ſtory of our count de Gleichen. This had been a fine ſubject for her pen; and as dry as Hondorf's narrative may ſeem to be, ſhe would have made ſomething very pretty of it. Note, that the triumph of love, in this particular, regards only the fair ſex; for certainly the count did not marry another wife upon the ſcore of love, but becauſe, being a gentleman, he was weary of being a ſlave, and of tilling the ground. But let us obſerve alſo, that the action of that Ottoman princeſs is not by much ſo black as that of Niſus's daughter, or that of the daughter of Pterelaus (4). Nay, perhaps, it is ſomewhat more excuſable, than that of Minos's daughter. And indeed it was much more proſperous than the treaſon of theſe three princeſſes, and of ſeveral other like victims of love, ornaments of Venus's triumphant chariot. Neverthelefs, do not allow the advantage to the male ſex; for certainly there are a great many more men, that marry their maids, than women that marry their footmen.

[*D*] *An abbot had heard ſomething of this ſtory, but was ignorant of the true ſtate of the caſe*]. This is what he wrote to the count de Buſſy Rabutin, the twelfth of June, 1674 (5). ‘I was the other day with Madam de ——, and as they talked of Mr de —— who preſented a petition to the Pope, praying he might be allowed to marry another wife; they ſaid that the holy ſee had once done that favour to a German count, who, not having enough of one wife, was permitted, for the ſalvation of his ſoul, to marry a ſecond. Madam de —, who was before nodding and falling aſleep, awaked at the hearing of this, and ſaid, ſighing, *that there were no ſuch husbands now-a-days.*’ It manifeſtly appears that he confounds things, and that of two adventures he makes but one: he blends together what concerns the count of Gleichen, and what regards a landgrave of Heſſe, and knows not the circumſtances of either. The permiſſion, which he pretends was granted by the holy ſee to a German count, was not grounded on the inſufficiency of the wife; nor was that, granted to a landgrave of Heſſe, founded on the ſame reaſon (6), tho' Thuanus ſays ſo. I would not warrant that the abbot has better obſerved the rules of hiſtory, as to the jeſt and ſighing of Madam de ——, than the reſt. He invented, perhaps, that reflexion himſelf, and wrote it nevertheleſs as an hiſtorical paſſage to count Rabutin, to end his letter with a diverting ſtroke. However it be, I happened the other day to be in company with a gentleman, who has been married theſe five or ſix years, and I took notice, that, after he had been told that part of the abbot's letter, he ſaid, almoſt ſighing, *that if there were no ſuch husbands now-a-days, there were yet fewer wives like that of the count.* I wiſh he had made another reflexion, *viz.* that that lady ſuppoſed without reaſon, that our age falls ſhort of the former times: which is falſe. Husbands of that ſtamp were always very ſcarce, and as ſcarce in preceding ages as in the preſent.

[*E*] *The author of the fifteen comforts of matrimony ſeems to ſuppoſe, that it happens pretty often, that a woman marries again on the falſe ſuppoſition of the death of her husband.*] For this is the thirteenth comfort of matrimony. ‘A gentleman, ſays he (7), who has lived with his wiſe *in great delight and ſports* five, or ſix, or eight years, more or leſs, has now a mind to acquire honour, by feats of arms . . . . it happens that he goes beyond ſea to follow chivalry . . . . having firſt, with deep regret, taken leave of his wife, who expreſſes all the ſorrow imaginable; but he is a man that loves honour, and ſo nothing can detain him . . . . Away he goes, and recomends his wife and children, (whom, next to honour, he loves beyond any thing in the world) to his intimate friends. Now it happens, that, as he croſſes the ſea, he is taken by the enemy, where, by ill fortune, or otherwiſe, he continues three or four years, or more, ſo that he cannot return home. His lady, all the while, is in great affliction; and now ſhe happens to hear, that he is dead, whereupon ſhe is wondrous ſorrowful: but ſhe cannot always weep; and, by God's bleſſing, her grief is ſo allayed, that ſhe marries again to another, with whom ſhe takes her delight, and has ſoon forgot her husband, whom ſhe loved ſo well, and her dear children. The dalliances, kiſſes, and embraces, ſhe had with her husband, are paſſed and forgotten; and who ſhould ſee her ſport with this laſt husband, would ſay, that ſhe loves him more than ſhe ever did the other, who is a priſoner, or in ſome other ſtreight, for his proweſs. Her children, which the good man loved, are diſcarded, and their eſtate ſpoiled and waſted; and ſo they dally and ſport together. But fortune ſo orders it, that the good gentleman her husband returns, being grown old and decayed; for he was not at eaſe, for two, or three, or four years, that he was a priſoner; and, when he comes near his country, he enquires after his wife and children: for he is greatly afraid leſt they be dead, or in any other great ſtreight. And you may well imagine how many times the good man has thought of them amidſt the anguiſh of his confinement; and has often been uneaſy about them, whilſt his wife made herſelf merry: and perhaps, at that very time that the good man was thinking of her, and praying God to preſerve her, he, whom ſhe had lately married, held her in his arms, out of harm's reach. Now he is told that ſhe is married, and ſo you may imagine how concerned he is at ſuch a piece of news. . . . . And, being come into his own country, and finding the thing to be true, if he be a man of honour, he will never take his wife again; and the other, who had married her, and has ſported with her, will leave her. And ſo ſhe has loſt her honour, and perchance will loſe her ſenſes to boot. The good man ſhall ever live in ſorrow; his children ſhall in ſome meaſure be diſgraced for the fault of their mother: It ſhall not be lawful for either of them to marry again, as long as the other is alive.

[*F*] *The journal of Hamburgh will furniſh me with a good ſupplement to this article.*] Mr Dartis, ſpeaking (8) of a novel of Mr le Noble, intituled, *Zulima*, or, *Pure Love*, obſerves, that the firſt notion of this romance ‘was taken from a memoir among the archives of the houſe of Gleichen, which deſcends from a prince of Weſtphalia, the chief hero of this hiſtorical novel. He was called Eberard, and, having been taken in the battel of Joppa, which the Sultan Noradin gained over the Chriſtians of the cruſade, he was ſo happy as to inſpire with love the daughter of that Sultan. She helped him to break the chains of his ſlavery, went with him into Europe, and was his ſecond wife after the death of her, whom he had married ſome time before the cruſade. Mr le Noble cites, as an indiſputable witneſs of the truth of this ſtory, the tomb, where lie the aſhes of this prince, and his two wives. It is ſtill to be ſeen, ſays he, at Herford in Weſtphalia, where he reſided. On this foundation it is that he has built a pious love-intrigue, which aimed firſt at the converſion of a Sultaneſs, and afterwards ended in her marriage with the Weſtphalian prince.’ He ſays in another place (9), that the writers of romances are obliged to follow hiſtory, when they tell in a preface the foundation of their fictions. *Yet this*, adds he, *is what Mr le Noble has not done, in the advertiſement, which he has prefixed to his* Zulima, *as will appear by the extract of a letter, which I have received from a good hand on this ſubject*. It is this. ‘It appears evidently from what you have ſaid of Mr le Noble's little book, that he has confounded all. Eberard, duke of Weſtphalia, is a perſonage abſolutely unknown to hiſtory; and, if he lived in the time of Noradin, a Saracen prince of the XIIth century, how could he be author of the counts of Gleichen, who pretend to have received their earldom from Charlemagne, and who at

(4) See the article AMPHITRYON, in the text, between citations (*c*) and (*d*).

(5) Lettres du Comte de Buſſi Rabutin, Tom. I, pag. 114, 115, Dutch Edit.

(6) See the remark [Q] of the article LUTHER.

(7) Les quinze Joyes du Mariage, pag. 154, & ſeq. Roan Edit. 1596. *The title ſays, that this book was extracted from an old manuſcript copy written four hundred years before.*

(8) Journal de Hamburgh, Aug. 26, 1695, pag. 142.

(9) Journ. de Hamburgh, Sept. 30, 1695, pag. 219, 220, 221.

‘ leaſt are older than the wars beyond ſea ? The family of the counts of Gleichen is extinct, and I believe, what they pretend to fetch from their archives ‘ is as fabulous as the reſt of the little romance. It is ‘ true, however, there is a tradition, confirmed by ſome ‘ modern chronicles, which imports, that a count of ‘ Gleichen, bringing with him from beyond ſea the ‘ lady that freed him, and meeting again his firſt wife, ‘ found the means of keeping them both in good underſtanding with each other, and with the conſent ‘ (they ſay) of the church ; which is not very probable. We may hold it for certain, that there is no ‘ monument of a duke Eberhard of Weſtphalia, neither at Erford, nor at Hervorde. The counts of ‘ Gleichen were neighbours of Erford in Thuringia, ‘ and had nothing common with Hervorde in Weſtphalia.’

GOLDAST (*a*) (MELCHIOR HAIMINSFELD), a native of Biſchoff-zell (*b*) in Switzerland, and a Proteſtant according to the confeſſion of faith of Geneva, was a very learned man in the XVIIth century. His family was not rich [*A*], and he never raiſed himſelf; ſo that he made himſelf more known by the great number of books he either compoſed, or of which he was the editor, than by his public employments. A collection of letters, printed in the year 1688 [*B*], ſhews that, in the year 1598, he lived at Biſchoff-zell. That, the following year, he lodged at St Gall, in an honeſt man's houſe, named Schobingerus, who declared himſelf his patron. That the ſame year he went to Geneva, and lodged in Lectius's houſe [*C*], with the ſons of Vaſſan, whoſe preceptor he was. That he was ſtill at Geneva in the year 1602, where he complained of his miſerable condition. That the ſame year he went to Lauſanne, becauſe he could live cheaper there than at Geneva. That he returned ſoon after to Geneva. That, upon Lectius's recommendation, he was preferred to be ſecretary to the duke of Bouillon. That he was not long in that place; for he was at Franckfort in February 1603. That he was tutor in a private family, at Forſteg, in the year 1604; That, in the year 1605, he lived at Biſchoff-zell; where he complained he was not ſafe [*D*] by reaſon of his religion, which rendered him very odious, even to his relations. That he was at Franckfort in the year 1606. That

(*a*) By the Latin letters, that were written to him, it appears, that he was indifferently called *Goldaſtus*, or *Goldinaſtus*, or *Guldinaſtus*. His fore names were latinized, *Melchior*, or *Mel or Heiminſfeldius*, or *Haiminſfeldius*, or *Hamenveltus*, or *Hamenvelto*, or *Hamenevelto*.

(*b*) In Latin, *Epiſcopo-Cella*. Moreri is much miſtaken, in making him a native of Heminsfeldt.

[*A*] *His family was not rich.*] This appears by ſome letters of Conradus Ritterſhuſius, at whoſe houſe Goldaſt had boarded. Goldaſt was gone from thence without paying his landlord; and, after his return into his own country, a long time paſſed before he diſcharged that debt. Ritterſhuſius complained of it (1), and repreſented, that the butchers, bakers, and brewers, had preſſed him ſo hard, that he had been forced to take up money at intereſt, to be rid of their perſecutions. He added, he hoped that Goldaſt would remit to him both the principal and intereſt; and that Taurellus, and ſome others, did the ſame by ſuch of their boarders as went upon truſt. His letter is dated the twenty fourth of Auguſt, 1598. The following year, Stuckius (2) wrote to Goldaſt, that Ritterſhuſius complained that he had not received the fifty two florins of gold, which were due to him; wherefore he exhorted the debtor to diſcharge that debt ſpeedily; which if he failed to do, his mother ſhould be acquainted with it. A letter of Ritterſhuſius (3), dated the eighth of September, 1599, informs us, that he was paid, and did forgive the intereſt; but that Goldaſt having left ſeveral debts unpaid at Altdorf, ſeveral ſcandalous ſtories were handed about concerning him. However, this is not an argument that Goldaſt was not nobly born; which, as Scaliger tells us, he pretended to be (4): for a man may be a gentleman, and yet not have wherewithal to pay for his board. Scioppius obſerves, that Goldaſt put before his name a particle, which was peculiar to the nobility: ‘ Fratribus ‘ quidem certe hoc uno nomine nobilior, quod illi ſe ‘ tantum Heiminsfeld, hic autem Heros noſter pro ‘ conſuetudine pleræque nobilitatis *ab Heiminſfeld* cognominat (5) —— *In this alone more noble than his* ‘ *brothers, that, whereas they called themſelves barely* ‘ Heiminsfeld, *this our hero, after the manner of the* ‘ *nobility, aſſumes the ſtile of* ab Heiminsfeld.’ But here is a pregnant proof of Goldaſt's poverty. When he printed any books, he ſent copies of them to the magiſtrates of cities, and to the conſiſtories, who commonly ſent him a preſent ſomewhat above the value of the book; and his friends thought they did him no ſmall ſervice, when they procured him ſuch ſorry rewards: however, that mean commerce helped him to ſubſiſt. A miniſter, called David Lange, wrote to him from Memmingen, that the magiſtrates of the place ſent him, in the encloſed, *unum nummum aureum*, and the conſiſtory another, for his book (6).

[*B*] *A collection of letters.*] Here is the title of them: *Virorum clariſſimorum & doctorum ad Melchiorem Goldaſtum epiſtolæ, ex Bibliotheca Henrici Guntheri Thulemarii J. C. editæ. Francofurti & Spiræ* 1688. *in 4to.*

[*C*] *He lodged in Lectius's houſe at Geneva.*] He was one of the profeſſors of the academy. The collection of letters, I have mentioned, contains one (7) very ſharp againſt him. Lectius complained, that when Goldaſt and his pupils left his houſe, they had not made him a handſome preſent: but Goldaſt complained on the other hand, that they had been obliged to pay for a hundred things without any manner of juſtice; ſuch as ſtoves, benches, locks, keys, &c. It muſt be owned, that thoſe, who keep boarders in univerſities, are too often guilty of ſordid avarice. When they are not profeſſors, there is no great harm; but what a diſgrace to learning, what a ſhame for the character of profeſſors, when they are ſo fond of filthy lucre!

[*D*] *In* 1605, *he reſided at Biſchoff-zell, where he complained* (8) *he was not ſafe.*] Scioppius ſays, that Jodocus Mezlerus, vicar to the abbot of St Gall, had told him, that Goldaſt was committed to priſon at St Gall, upon account of theft. He added, that Goldaſt had asked leave to buy a ſmall eſtate near St Gall, where the Lutheran gentlewoman he deſigned to marry might have liberty of conſcience; and that, as for himſelf, he would not ſtick to be a Roman Catholic. ‘ Commodum eas literas legeram cum officii cauſa viſum ad me venit D. Jodocus Mezlerus illuſtriſſimi ‘ Principis & Abbatis S. Galli vicarius, iſtumque Melchiorem adhuc vivum probeque ſibi notum eſſe affirmavit. Idque ut credibilius faceret præter alia hoc ‘ quoque de eodem narravit, expoſuiſſe eum ſibi in ſermone, in quanto apud Sangallenſes periculo ſemel ‘ verſatus fuerit cum illi furti nomine in carcerem ſe ‘ compegiſſent: petiiſſe etiam ut prædioli cujuſdam in ‘ Sangallenſi territorio emendi ab Abbate poteſtas ſibi ‘ fieret, ita tamen ut uxori, quam ducere in animo haberet, Lutheranæ religionis libertas ſalva eſſet: nam ‘ ſeipſum quidem Catholicum facilè futurum. His ego ‘ auditis cæpi de ipſo non deſperare futurum ut fato ‘ aliquando fratris utatur, & *ſublime potius quàm humi* ‘ *putiſcat*, cum preſertim nemo, qui faciem ejus viderit, non confeſtim patibulo dignum judicet. *Interim nos* velut Ciceronem Vatinii morte nunciata, cujus parum certus dicebatur auctor, reſpondiſſe legimus, *uſura fruemur* (9). —— *I had juſt read thoſe* ‘ *letters, when Jodocus Mezlerus, vicar of the moſt illuſtrious prince and abbot of St Gall, came to pay me* ‘ *a viſit, and affirmed, that that Melchior was ſtill* ‘ *alive, and well known to him. And to convince me* ‘ *farther of it, he gave me this account of him, that* ‘ *he had heard him ſay in converſation, in what great* ‘ *danger he once was at St Gall, being impriſoned there* ‘ *for theft; that he had petitioned the abbot for leave* ‘ *to purchaſe a ſmall ſeat in the territory of St Gall,* ‘ *yet ſo as that the wife, he intended to marry, might* ‘ *have*

(1) His letter is the third, in the collection printed in 1688.

(2) His letter is the ninth of the ſame collection.

(3) It is the eleventh of the ſame collection.

(4) Goldaſtus pretends to be nobly born, and names his houſe near St Gall. *Scaligerana*, *pag. m.* 95.

(5) Oporini Grubinii, Amphot. Scioppian. pag. 111.

(6) See the 131ſt letter of the collection.

(7) It is the 56th.

(8) See the 10th letter of the collection.

(9) Scioppius in Oporini Grubini Amphot. Sciopp. pag. 108.

That he married, and ſtaid there till the year 1610, in miſerable circumſtances [*E*], being diſappointed in the hopes his friends gave him of a good ſettlement [*F*]. The collection, I ſpeak of, ends there. Goldaſt had already publiſhed many books, which he continued to do till his death [*G*], which happened on the eleventh of Auguſt, 1635 (*c*). Sciοppius had ordered, that they ſhould publiſh, in his *Scaliger Hypobolimæus*, that Goldaſt had been broke upon the wheel; but, finding that to be falſe, he cauſed it to be left out. We ſhall ſee, in the remarks, how he gets off [*H*], though not

'*have liberty to profeſs Lutheraniſm, but that himſelf* '*ſhould make no difficulty of being a Catholic. When I* '*heard this, I began not to be out of hopes, that he* '*might, one time or other, meet with his brother's fate,* '*and* rot on high rather than on the ground; *eſpecially* '*ſince every one that ſees him muſt preſently judge him* '*worthy of a gibbet. In the mean time, let us, as Ci*'*cero is ſaid to have replied, upon the uncertain news* '*of the death of Vatinius,* enjoy the uſury.' Scioppius is exceptionable in this particular; both becauſe he was a very ſlanderous, abuſive, man, and becauſe he looked upon Goldaſt as one, who had furniſhed Scaliger with materials to write the ſatire, intituled, *Munſterus Hypobolimæus* (10). Apply this to the remark [*H*].

[*E*] *He continued till* 1610, *at Francfort, in miſerable circumſtances.*] This appears by a letter (11), which was written by Quirinus Reuterus, director of the college of Wiſdom at Heidelberg; wherein he exhorts him to come and board in that college.

[*F*] . . . . . *diſappointed in the hopes his friends gave hime of ſome good ſettlement.*] They negotiated at the court of the elector Palatine, to procure him the office of counſellor to his electoral highneſs in the year 1608. The 191ſt letter mentions this as concluded, but, in the 194th letter, Lingelſheim ſays, that that buſineſs went backwards; and, in the 209th, he informs us, that it had abſolutely miſcarried. The elector of Mentz offered, then, an employment to our Goldaſt. The latter asked Lingelſheim's advice (12), who, knowing him to be in great neceſſity, and having nothing to offer to him, did not abſolutely diſſuade him from accepting thoſe offers; but only repreſented to him in what ſlavery he would infallibly be, in a place, where the jeſuits were maſters.

[*G*] *He continued* to publiſh books '*till his death.*] Let us give here a catalogue of his principal works. *Alamannicarum Rerum Scriptores vetuſti*, three volumes in folio. *Monarchia Imperii Romani, ſeu de Juriſdictione & Poteſtate Imperatoris & Papæ per varios Autores*, three volumes in folio. *Conſtitutionum Imperialium tomi quatuor*, in folio. *Suevicarum Rerum Scriptores veteres*, at Francfort 1605 in 4to. *De Juribus ac Privilegiis Regni Bohemiæ, & hæreditaria Regiæ familiæ ſucceſſione, libri 6. cum appendice, in folio. Conſultatio de officio & jure Electoris Bohemiæ in conventibus Electorum Romani Imperii. Rationale Conſtitutionum Imperialium. Statuta & Reſcripta Imperialia. Politica Imperialia. Catholicon rei monetariæ ſeu Leges monarchicæ generales de rebus nummariis & pecuniariis. Digeſta regia ſeu Conſtitutiones Imperiales de SS. Euchariſtia. Apologiæ Principum Germaniæ pro Henrico IV Imperatore contra criminationes Gregorii VII. Replicatio pro Cæſarea & Regia Francorum Majeſtate & Ordinibus Imperii contra Gretſerum* (13). *Imperialia Decreta de cultu Imaginum. Paradoxon de honore Medicorum, & obiter de honore Theologorum, & Jureconſultorum. Sibylla Francica, ſeu de admirabili Puella Joanna Lotharinga exercitus Francorum ductrice ſub Carolo VII. Dialogi duo de querelis Franciæ & Angliæ, & de jure ſucceſſionis utrorumque Regum in regno Franciæ. Centuria Epiſtolarum Philologicarum diverſorum hominum*, at Francfort 1610 in 8vo. *Emendationes in Petronium. Notæ ad parænetices Scriptores veteres.*

This laſt work was not much eſteemed by Scaliger. *He quotes old authors in his Perenetics*, ſays he, ſpeaking of Goldaſt (14). *He has trifled too long with theſe old words. There is nothing that is good for any thing in theſe Parenætici Melchioris. It were well, indeed, if he had publiſhed thoſe old records; for thereby one might learn ſomething relating to gentlemens houſes. Melchior has ſome manuſcripts, ſed infimi ævi. I did proſtitute my ſelf by writing to Melchior, ſince he is ſuch a man* (15). It is not neceſſary to advertiſe the reader, that moſt of the works, which Goldaſt publiſhed, are productions, of which he was not the author; for the titles of them ſufficiently ſhew, that he did but reduce them into one body, or took them from the libraries, where they were only in manuſcript: wherein he ſhewed himſelf the moſt indefatigable man in the world. Conringius gives him great commendations. 'Vir, *ſays he* (16), editis antiquis Germaniæ monumentis tam bene de patria 'meritus, ut abſque dubio Athenienſes illum in Prytanæo aluiſſent, ſi quidem illud in ævum incidiſſet. Cum (17) primis in Germania certius meliuſque 'hoc ſtudiorum genus (*de jure publico Imp. Germ. agit*) incenſum fuit initio hujus ſæculi auctore 'MELCHIORE GOLDASTO, cui nemo Germaniæ rebus illuſtrandis par fuit, nec forte erit quiſpiam, '& vero illius ductu paulatim cœpit apud nos ſolito 'exquiſitior Reip. cognitio. - - - - *A man, who deſerved ſo well of his country by publiſhing the antiquities of Germany, that the Athenians would certainly have maintained him at the public expence, if he had lived at that time. This kind of ſtudy* '(viz. of the public law of Germany) *was chiefly* '*encouraged in the beginning of this century, from* '*the example of* MELCHIOR GOLDAST, '*who exceeded every body in illuſtrating the affairs* '*of Germany, and who taught us a more accurate* '*knowledge of the conſtitution.*' However, he charges him with unfair dealing, in certain reſpects (18): 'Sunt hæc omnia (*examinat nonnulla ex libro III.* '*Conſtitutionum Imperialium*) illaudabili facinore perquam tamen GOLDASTO familiari effic̄ta, quo nomine 'eum ex merito acerrime increpavit Wendelinus, c. 2. 'de l. Salica. - - - *All theſe* (ſome things in the third 'book of the Imperial Conſtitutions) *are counterfeited, by an uncommendable fraud, but very much practiſed* '*by Goldaſt; for which Wendelinus, in his ſecond* '*chapter of the Salic law, cenſures him as he deſerves.* He is not the only man, that complains of Goldaſt on that account. 'Qui noverit quam multas ſuſpectæ 'fidei merces pro veris erudito orbi obtruſerit GOLDASTUS, cui cæteroquin diligentiæ laudem non negamus, in re cui aliunde fides fieri non poteſt, vix 'ejus ſolius auctoritate ſibi aliquid plane perſuaderi 'patietur (19). - - - - *Whoever is acquainted with the* '*many pieces, of doubtful credit, which* GOLDAST '*has impoſed upon the learned world* (*a man, who* '*otherwiſe deſerves the praiſe of diligence*), *will* '*ſcarce depend upon his ſingle authority in a matter* '*which is capable of no other confirmation.*

[*H*] *We ſhall ſee . . . . how Scioppius gets off.*] Two gentlemen of Franconia, who had boarded with him at Altorf, at Conradus Ritterſhuſius's houſe, payed him a viſit during their ſtay at Rome. He enquired after their common friends, and, among the reſt, after Goldaſt, one of their fellow-boarders at Altorf: whereupon they told him, that that wretch had been broke upon the wheel, and afterwards burned, for having committed a horrid murder. 'Eum 'videlicet ſuperiori anno cum Bullionio Duce, cui 'interpretis operam dederit, Geneva in Germaniam 'profectum, cum Argentinæ in familiaritatem Centurionis cujuſdam perveniſſet, qui in contuburnio ſuo 'puellam nobilem, domo paterna abductam pro ſecutuleia muliere & concubina circumducebat, audito 'eum jam ſatietate illius captum mille aureos ei, 'qui ab illa ſe liberaret, polliceri, avidè conditionem 'quod pretio inhiaret, arripuiſſe, & ita digreſſo Centurione non procul ab urbe in ipſa via regia . . . . 'miſellam obtruncaſſe (20).' He had contracted a friendſhip, *ſaid they*, with a certain captain, who began to be weary of a gentlewoman he had carried away from her relations, and who promiſed a thouſand crowns to any one that ſhould rid him of her. Goldaſt accepted the offer; and, ſoon after, he murdered that woman in the middle of the high-way near Straſburg, and, having ſtripped her, returned into the city. He was ſeized in the inn where he lodged, as he was unripping the cloaths of that woman, and clapped in Goal; and, within ſeven days, he was ſentenced to be broke alive upon the wheel, and burnt.

(*c*) Witte, in Diario Biographico.

(10) Hem qui tibi omnium illorum, quæ de Scioppii natalibus, vita, ſtudiis ac fortuna in Satyram & confutationem tuam conjeciſti, auctor fuit. *Id. Ibid. pag.* 111. *See alſo pag.* 332.

(11) It is the 278th of the collection.

(12) See the 214th and 217th letter of the collection.

(13) A German Jeſuit, who wrote ſeveral books againſt Goldaſt.

(14) Scaligerana, pag. 95.

(15) Ibid. pag. 154, *at the word Melchior.*

(16) In Præfat. ad Tacitum de moribus Germanorum, apud Magirum Eponymolog. pag. 393.

(17) Id. in Dedicat. Exercitationibus de Rep. Imp. Germ. præmiſſ. apud eundem Magirum, *Ibid.*

(18) Idem, cap. vii, de O. J. G. apud eundem, *Ibid. pag.* 394.

(19) Maurit. de Matricula Imperii, n. 2. apud eumdem Magirum, *Ibid.*

(20) Oporinus Grubinius in Amphotidibus Scioppian. pag. 104.

not without ſpeaking very ill of Goldaſt. The conduct of the latter, with reſpect to Juſtus Lipſius, cannot be approved [*I*]; for he publiſhed under his name an oration, of

burnt. ‘Septimo tandem poſt die capitis condemnatum & ſummo ſupplicio, tanquam parricidam affectum, hoc eſt membratim pæne rota contuſum & comminutum, & inde lignis infelicibus uſtulatum conflagraſſe (21).’ Scioppius immediately wrote down this ſtory, that it might be inſerted in the work, which he was then printing in Germany againſt Scaliger; and he thought he wanted no other apology of revenge againſt Goldaſt (22), with reſpect to the ill office he thought he had received from him: for he pretended, that Goldaſt had publiſhed, under the name of Scioppius, a commentary upon the Priapeia, of which he, Scioppius, was not the author. The letter he wrote, touching that pretended tragical end of Goldaſt, was followed by another five months after (23), wherein he acquainted his friend, that the ſtory, which the two german gentlemen had told him, concerned a brother of Melchior Goldaſt. The Sieur Charles Fugger, preſident of the imperial chamber at Spire, had ſent to Scioppius an account of the barbarous action and puniſhment of that brother of Goldaſt. This is what he wrote to him: ‘Sebaſtianus Heiminsfeld, dictus Guldenaſt, natus Cellæ Epiſcopi in Turgovia die ſexta Junii anno 1603, propterea in carcerem conjectus fuit, quod pridie ſeminam quandam, Dorotheam de Gries, Bambergæ aut Herbipoli, quemadmodum ipſe retulit, natam, quam diebus aliquot hac illac circumduxerat, bene mane non longe ab hac civitate priuſquam patefacta eſſent portæ, Satanæ inſtinctu cultro immaniter obtruncaſſet, & omni veſtitu uſque ad lineam interulam ſpoliaſſet, ac poſtquam aliquantum de via regia eam provolverat, in civitatem portis commodum apertis ingreſſus in hoſpitium publicum divertiſſet, ubi & captus mox, factumque quæſtioni ſubjectus, & ſponte etiam ſua confeſſus die 10. ejuſdem menſis Rotæ ſupplicio affectus fuit (24). ——— *Sebaſtian Heiminsfeld, called Guldenaſt, born at Biſchoffzel in Turgow the ſixth day of June in the year* 1603, *was impriſoned for the murther of one Dorothea de Gries, born, as he himſelf ſaid, at Baimberg or Wurtzburg, whom he had carried up and down with him for ſome days; whoſe throat he cut, early in the morning, not far from the city before the gates were opened, and ſtripping her to her ſhift, and throwing her a little out of the road, returned into the city, and went to an inn, where he was taken, and, having confeſſed the fact, was broke on the wheel, the tenth day of the ſame month.*’ Scioppius learned, not long after, from Jodocus Mezler, vicar to the abbot of St Gall (25), that Melchior Goldaſt was alive; whereupon he wrote to his friend, that he muſt not print what he had ſent him, concerning the puniſhment of that man: ‘Hoc à te pro amicitia noſtra peto, ut ſi adhuc eſt integrum illa ſupplicii de monſtro iſto ſumpti mentio ex Scaligero meo Hypobolymæo circumſcribatur. Sin autem, quod vereor, hac ipſa mea epiſtola ad calcem libri illius adjuncta totius geſtæ rei ordinem palam omnibus declarari cupio (26). ——— *I beg of you, by our friendſhip, if the mention of the puniſhment of that monſter be not yet put to the preſs, that you would ſtrike it out of my Scaliger Hypobolymæus: but if it be, as I fear it is, I deſire that this letter of mine, added at the end of the book, may clear up the whole matter to every body.*’ This ſecond letter is dated the third of March, 1607, and thereby we may convict the two gentlemen of having miſtaken the time: for in the beginning of November 1606 (27), Scioppius wrote to his friend that they had told him, that Goldaſt had been executed the year before, *ſuperiori anno.* Now Goldaſt's brother was broke upon the wheel the tenth of June 1603 (28). They reported alſo, that, when Goldaſt murdered the gentlewoman near Strasburg, he travelled through Germany with the duke of Bouillon, whoſe ſecretary he was. This does not agree with a letter, which Goldaſt wrote to Mr Schobinger, his patron, in February 1603 (29). He was no longer with the duke of Bouillon; and yet the murderer of the gentlewoman, being interrogated by his judges in the month of June, 1603, ſaid that Melchior Goldaſt, his brother, was in the duke of Bouillon's ſervice (30).

[*I*] *Goldaſt's conduct, with reſpect to Juſtus Lipſius, cannot be approved.*] Scioppius, who was a great amplifier, was not aſhamed to ſay, at the time he thought that Goldaſt had been broke upon the wheel, that the principal crime, which had brought that horrid puniſhment upon him, was his having ſathered upon Juſtus Lipſius a ſpeech, of which he was not the author. ‘Hujus ego non minus facti, quam ſupplicii atrocitatem cum animo meo recogitans, nullius magis ſceleris, quam quod orationem illam, de qua Lipſius Cent IV. Epiſt. LXVIII. ad conſules ac ſenatum Imperialis oppidi Francofurtenſis ſcribit, ejuſdem Lipſii nomine præſcriptam minime Helvetica ſimplicitate, ſed actu pluſquam Punico & vere Genevenſi malitia Tiguri edendam curaſſet, pœnas ab eo expeditas & ſumptas eſſe judicavi (31).’ That ſpeech was intituled, *De duplici concordia Literarum & Religionis*, and was publiſhed in 1600. It was pretended, that Juſtus Lipſius had pronounced it at Iena, the thirty firſt of July, 1574. It was not printed at Leyden, as the title has it, but at Zurich, by John James Friſius (32). A hundred printed copies of it, being ſent to the ſair of Francfort, were all bought up by Plantin, who denied that piece to be of Lipſius, and threatned, that both the printer and the true author ſhould repent it (33). The bookſeller of Zurich ſent an account of theſe things to Goldaſt, and deſired him to prove, that the ſpeech was made by him, whoſe name it bore. A profeſſor of Zurich gave Goldaſt notice of Juſtus Lipſius's threats, and told him, that the contexture and thread of the ſpeech ſhewed Lipſius to be the author of it: *Nos quidem ex filo orationis conjicimus omnino ejus eſſe* (34). This was the judgment of the learned of Zurich: the taſte of thoſe of Paris was quite different; for they did not find in it Lipſius's ſtyle. *Lipſii oratio nova nobis viſa fuit, nec in ea Lipſii ſtylum ſine monitione tua unquam agnoviſſemus* (35). Juſtus Lipſius's threats were not vain; for he applied himſelf to the magiſtrates of Francfort, who ordered that ſpeech to be ſtruck out of the catalogue of their Fair (36). He thanked them for it, and ſhewed them, by many reaſons, the impoſture of thoſe who had fathered it upon him. He maintained, among other things, that he was not at Iena the thirty firſt of July, 1574, and that he was gone from thence the firſt of March (37). Goldaſt was covered with ſhame; for there were few equitable men, who were not perſuaded of Lipſius's innocence in that reſpect. ‘Inſulſam illam, & vix latialem orationem *de duplici concordia literarum & religionis* Jenæ, ut volunt, habitam, jam olim falſimoniam eſſe meram, edita epiſtola ipſe oſtendit, & nuper ſuppoſititii iſtius ſœtus parens *Melchior Haiminsfeldus Goldaſtus* ſe prodidit (38). *In a late letter, he plainly ſhewed, that the inſipid, and ſcarce Latin, oration* on the double agreement of learning and religion, *ſaid to be delivered at Iena, was a mere cheat; and not long ago Melchior Haiminsfeld Goldaſt diſcovered himſelf to be the true father of the foundling.*’ But there are men ſo obſtinate, that they will never own themſelves to be in an error, and are proof againſt the moſt pregnant reaſons. Some men of that temper did obſtinately maintain, that Lipſius had pronounced the oration, which Goldaſt aſcribed to him. Read what follows: ‘Juſti Lipſii nomine (39), *de duplici concordia literarum & religionis*, editas *Orationes* (40), non eſſe ipſius, ſed *Melchioris Goldaſti*, *Miræus* in vita Lipſii pag. m. 67. refert. Carolus etiam Scribanius Jeſuita, cap. ult. defenſionis poſthumæ, Lipſii operibus in folio præfixæ, aliquot jam ante menſibus, quam Orationes iſtæ habitæ perhibentur, Lipſium Jena diſceſſiſſe, audacter ſcribit: ſed vide refutationem hujuſce mendacii factam à *Sagittario* in *Lipſio Proteo*, Francofurti 1614. edito. ——— *Miræus, in the life of Lipſius, page* 67, *relates, that the orations on* the double agreement of learning and religion *publiſhed under the name of Juſtus Lipſius, were not his, but written by Melchior Goldaſt. Alſo Carolus Scribanius, the Jeſuit, in the laſt chapter of his Poſthumous defence, prefixed to the works of Lipſius in folio, confidently writes, that Lipſius had left Iena, ſome months before thoſe orations were ſaid to be delivered: but ſee a confutation of this falſehood by Sagittarius,* of which he himſelf was the author. It appears, that people complained of his capricious humour [*K*], and of his diſhoneſty *(d)*.

---

(21) Id. ibid.

(22) Ibid. pag. 106.

(23) Ibid.

(24) Ibid. pag. 109, 110.

(25) See the remark [*D*].

(26) Opor. Grubin. pag. 109.

(27) The ſecond letter of Scioppius was written five months after the firſt, *Ibid. pag.* 106.

(28) Sebaſtianus Melchioris *frater germanus* is fuerit qui Argentinæ anno 1603 a. d. 10 Junii ob crudeliſſimum homicidium & latrocinium affectus, nunc quoque ſuperbus & cæſus in rota, velut in radiato diſco, quotidiano prandio aſſo, inquam, bene ad ſolem toſto corvos accipiat. *Ibid. pag.* 107. *See, above, citation* (24).

(29) See the collection of letters written to Goldaſt, printed in Germany in the year 1688.

(30) Amphotides Scioppian. pag. 110.

(31) Ibid. pag. 105.

(32) See Stuckius's letter to Goldaſt, in the collection before mentioned, citation (29): It is the 18th. See alſo *Lipſius, Epiſt. lxviii. Centur. ad Germ. & Gallos.*

(33) John James Friſius gave Goldaſt notice of all this. His letter is in the collection.

(34) Waſerus, Epiſt. ad Goldaſtum. *It is the 38th of the collection.*

(35) Vaſſan, in the thirty firſt letter of the collection, written from Paris to Goldaſt, the 23d of Septemb. 1600.

(36) See the 68th letter of Lipſius, *Centur. ad Germanos & Gallos, pag. m.* 700.

(37) Ibid. pag. 702.

(38) Miræus, in vita Lipſii, circa finem, pag. m. 35.

(39) Placcius de Pſeudonymis, pag. 219.

(40) The plural number ſhould not be uſed; for there was but one oration.

(*d*) See the remark [G], citations (9) and (10).

‘ *in his Lipſius Proteus, Francfort*, 1614.’ I do not pretend to deny Juſtus Lipſius's inconſtancy in point of religion.

[*K*] *Complaint was made of his capricious humour.*] When his patron Schobinger adviſes him to go to Lauſanne, if he could live cheaper there than at Geneva, he adds this reſtriction: ‘ Modo à crebris migrationibus in poſterum abſtineas, quæ neque è re, neque pro exiſtimatione tua moroſitatis neſcio cujus ſuſpectum te apud nonnullos fecere, qui id mihi Tiguri nuper objecerunt (41). —— *So that for the future you abſtain from frequent change of place, which, to the prejudice of your character, hath rendered you ſuſpected of a kind of churliſhneſs in the opinion of ſome, who have made this objection to me at Zurich.*

(41) See the 58th letter of the collection printed in 1688. It is dated from St Gall, Feb. 16[illegible].

GOLIUS (JAMES), Mathematic and Arabic profeſſor in the univerſity of Leyden, was born at the Hague in the year 1596, of an ancient and conſiderable family [*A*]. He had a ſtrong inclination for learning, and a vaſt genius; for he not only ſtudied the languages, philoſophy, the Greek and Roman antiquities, divinity and phyſic, but he alſo ſtudied the mathematics with great application. When he was twenty years of age, he left the univerſity of Leyden, where he had made a great proficiency, and retired to a country-houſe (*a*), being reſolved to ſpend two years there, without minding any thing but his ſtudies; but, following them too hard, he ſoon fell ſick, and was obliged to deſiſt. He was ſo taken with the works and lectures of the learned Erpenius (*b*), that he followed him entirely. He took a journey into France with the ducheſs de la Trimouille, which occaſioned his being called to Rochelle to teach Greek. He did not long enjoy (*c*) that employment; for the civil-wars, which ended in the taking of that town, made Golius deſirous to return to Holland. Not long after *(d)* he followed the embaſſador, whom the States ſent to the king of Morocco; and made a good uſe of the advice given him by Erpenius [*B*], to get an entire knowledge of the Arabic tongue. He ſeemed ſo curious and well-informed of the ſciences and cuſtoms of the Arabians, that he rendered himſelf very acceptable to the learned and courtiers. He alſo received ſeveral marks of favour from Muley Zidas, king of Morocco [*C*]. He furniſhed himſelf with ſeveral books unknown to the Europeans; and, amongſt others, with the annals of the kingdom of Fez and Morocco, which he reſolved to tranſlate. He alſo made a great many collections concerning the hiſtory of the Serifs. By theſe means he brought to Erpenius a thouſand valuable things, which had been of great uſe to that learned profeſſor, had not a contagious diſeaſe ſwept him away a ſhort time after. Golius, not conſidering the danger to which he expoſed himſelf, did his dear maſter all the good offices imaginable during his ſickneſs, and attended him till he expired. He was choſen his ſucceſſor in the profeſſorſhip of the Arabic (*e*), according to the advice, which the deceaſed had given ſome time before his death; and he ſo learnedly diſcharged his employment, that the incomparable Erpenius was not miſſed (*f*). But, whilſt he ſo well ſatisfied others, he was not ſatisfied with himſelf; for he thought many things were wanting in him, which he could never acquire but in viſiting ſuch places as were near the fountain-head. He therefore asked his ſuperiours leave

(*a*) Situate near Naaldwijk. It belonged to his father.

(*b*) He was Arabic profeſſor at Leyden.

(*c*) One year only.

(*d*) In the year 1622.

(*e*) In the year 1624.

(*f*) Hac in Sparta ornanda jam ſatisfaciebat omnibus, haudquaquam ſibi: nemo non renatum in Golio Erpenium, & corpus tantum hominis, non virtutem Profeſſoris mutatam credere: ipſe non credulus illis omnia in ſeſe requirere, & licet haudquaquam arrogaret ſibi magiſtri ſummam, tamen ne hac quidem contentus eſſe. *Joh. Fridericus Gronovius in Orat. Funebri Jac. Golii, pag.* 15.

[*A*] *He was of an ancient and conſiderable family.*] It came originally from Leyden, where FRANCIS GOLIUS, great-great-grandfather of him we now ſpeak of, was an alderman, about the year 1458. CORNELIUS and GILBERT GOLIUS, his grandſons, were ſenators of the ſame city. They were ſons of THEODORIC GOLIUS, who, having married two or three wives, procured to his deſcendants ſeveral degrees of relation with a great many good families. Another THEODORIC GOLIUS, ſon to the former, was father of our James. He enjoyed a conſiderable employment (1), and was one of the burghers of Leyden, who contributed moſt to preſerve the city, during the ſiege ſo famous in hiſtory. His wife, the mother of our profeſſor, was called Anne Hemelar (2), and had a brother, for whom I deſign an article (3), wherein I ſhall ſpeak of PETER GOLIUS, brother of James.

[*B*] *He made good uſe of the advice given him by Erpenius.*] He charged him, amongſt other things, to enquire into the origin of certain proverbs, and upon what cuſtom, or inclination of the people, were grounded ſeveral Arabic words or expreſſions, which he underſtood only by conjecture; and which he thought he might have got well explained, if he had been in the country, where that language is ſpoken. But let us make uſe of the deſcription, which we find of all this, in the book I quote: ‘ Intellexerat (*Erpenius*) unum ſibi deeſſe quod terras, in quibus viget atque in uſu habetur Arabiſmus, non incoluiſſet, non acceſſiſſet. Quum enim multa in promptu haberet verba, proverbia, vocabula, quæ quid ſignificarent, divinabat magis & ſuſpicabatur quam noverat, quod de rerum formis, hominum actionibus, locorum habitu, unde & ubi illa nata eſſent nunquam oculis judicaſſet, hoc præcepit, inculcavit, infixit noſtro, ut quicquid ejuſmodi ſive natura illic, ſive ars, ſive conſuetudo nobis ignarum peperiſſet, aut introduxiſſet, diligentiſſime obſervaret, accurate deſcriberet, annotaretque una cum ſignato cujuſque nomine, & ſi noſcerentur, cauſis nominum (4).’

[*C*] *He received ſeveral marks of favour from* Muley Zidan, *king of Morocco.*] He had brought to him a letter from Erpenius, very well written, and had very luckily recommended himſelf by his agreeable carriage. *Nec privata tantum humanitate, ſed & Imperatoris ipſius Mulei Zidani, (quam & literis Erpenii puriſſimo ſermone ſcriptis, & ſuo lepore atque honeſtate promeruerat) clementia, cumulatiſſime præſtitit* (5). This is all we find thereupon in his funeral oration. We may add to it a very curious ſupplement, taken out of a relation in manuſcript, which Colomiés had peruſed, and of which he has publiſhed ſomething that concerns Golius. I tranſcribe the whole paſſage, tho' thereby I fall into the troubleſome neceſſity of repeating ſomething of what is to be ſeen in Moreri's dictionary. ‘ Mr Golius, whom I ſaw at Leyden, where he was an Arabic profeſſor in the room of Mr Erpenius, was very learned in the languages, and in the mathematics; but his wit was ſuperiour to his learning. He got great credit by the voyage he made into the Levant in the year 1622, and particularly to Morocco, with an ambaſſador from the States, and a gentleman of the horſe belonging to the prince of Orange. Being come to that city, they went to pay their reſpects to the king, who was called Mouly Zidam, and who received them, with their preſents, very graciouſly.

---

(1) Feudorum Hollandiæ actuarius. *Gronovius in Orat. Funebri Jacobi Golii, pag.* 6.

(2) Ex oratione funebri Golii habita à Gronovio.

(3) Look for HEMELAR (JOHN).

(4) Gronovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 13, 14.

(5) Ibid. pag. 14.

leave to make a voyage into the Levant (g). He ſtayed a year and a half at Aleppo; after which he travelled into Arabia and Meſopotamia, and came by land to Conſtantinople. His learning and prudence procured him, every where, both friends, and what was neceſſary to make his travels amongſt thoſe barbarous nations turn to account. He met with Turks, who gave him leave to ſearch into fine libraries [D]. In a word, he left ſo good a name behind him, that it was very uſeful to his brother (h), who ſome time after undertook the ſame voyage. Our Golius returned four years after to Leyden, with a fine collection of manuſcripts, and the remembrance of many curious things (i). Having re-aſſumed the thread of his former lectures, he ſoon ſaw himſelf called to make ſome of another nature [E]; for he was made profeſſor of the mathematics, in the room of Willibrord Snellius. He very worthily filled theſe two employments during forty years. And, although they might take up the whole time of a laborious man, yet he found leiſure to compoſe ſome valuable works, which have been publiſhed [F]; and to undertake others, which would not have come ſhort of

'graciouſly. He ſhewed himſelf particularly well pleaſed with the preſent, which Mr Erpenius had ſent him, and which was a great Atlas, and a New Teſtament in Arabic, in which he read often afterwards. The ambaſſador of the States happening to be uneaſy, becauſe he was not diſpatched, was adviſed to preſent a petition to the king, which Mr Golius drew up in the Arabic character and language, but in the ſtyle of the Chriſtians; a thing extraordinary in that country. The king was much ſurprized at the beauty of that petition, both as to the character, the language, and the ſtyle; and having ſent for the Taliphs or writers, he ſhewed them that petition, which they admired. He called immediately for the ambaſſador, whom he asked who had drawn up that petition. The ambaſſador having told him, that it was Mr Golius, diſciple and envoy of Mr Erpenius, he had a deſire to ſee him, and ſpoke to him in Arabic. Mr Golius anſwered him in Spaniſh, that he undeſtood very well what he ſaid to him, but that he could not anſwer him in Arabic, becauſe he could not pronounce the gutturals. The king, who underſtood Spaniſh, received his excuſe, and having granted the ambaſſador's petition, cauſed him to be ſpeedily diſpatched. I owe all theſe particulars to the Relation of the late Mr le Gendre, a merchant of Roan, who happened to be then at Morocco. Mr Briot keeps a copy of it, which he did me the favour to communicate to me at Paris. Let us add one word more concerning Mr Golius. He was brother to Peter Golius, who was alſo very learned in the oriental languages; who tranſlated from Latin into Arabic the treatiſe of *The Imitation of* JESUS CHRIST of Thomas à Kempis; and who, being turned friar of the order of the bare footed Carmelites, took the name of father Celeſtine of St Lidwine. Theſe two worthy brothers were nephews to a canon of Antwerp, named Hemelar, who has publiſhed a fine book of medals, which is very ſcarce (6).' I wiſh the *Mêlanges Hiſtoriques* of Colomiés were a volume in Folio.

[D] *He met with Turks, who gave him leave to ſearch into fine libraries.*] The Turks are not ſo deſtitute of books as people imagine. See what Dr Spon has related (7), and add to it this paſſage of Gronovius: 'Simul cum Legato (8) in Aſiam tranſiit (Golius) Præfecto oræ propontidos amæniſſimos hortos cum ampliſſima Bibliotheca eis cedente: in quo ſeceſſu in Hiſtoricorum & Geographorum Arabum ſcripta aut ignorata adhuc, aut inevoluta ſe ingurgitavit. Ut rediit, & memoriam lectorum per occaſiones in ſermonibus apud Megiſtanas oſtendit, ita obſtupefecit audientes, ut purpuratorum principi dignatione proximus cum eo egerit, Imperatoris diplomate ornatus ac tutus omne Imperium obiret, ac ſitus locorum rectius quam vulgo fit in tabulis depingeret: ille gratiam fecit prætexto Sacramento quod Ordinibus dixiſſet, ſed & periculi magnitudinem cogitans (9). —— *He paſſed over with the embaſſador into Aſia, the governour of the Propontic coaſt giving them the liberty of very fine gardens, and a well-furniſhed library: in which retirement he buried himſelf in the ſtudy of the Arabian geographers and hiſtorians, hitherto unheard of, or never peruſed. Upon his return, recollecting what he had read, occaſionally in converſation with the great men, he ſo aſtoniſhed his hearers, that he was offered the emperor's commiſſion and ſafe-guard to travel over the whole empire, and take a more exact, geographical, ſurvey of it than had hitherto been done. He declined the offer on the pretence of the oath he had taken to the States, but, in reality, in conſideration of the dangers he muſt have run.*' This paſſage deſerves to be quoted, ſince it may acquaint my readers with the particular eſteem the Turks had for Golius at Conſtantinople, and the offers they made him of an authentic commiſſion, whereby he ſhould have been created geographer to the Grand Seignior. The skill Golius had in phyſic, and the remedies he gave, without taking any money for them, procured him many preſents and friends. They offered him great advantages, to engage him to ſettle in the Levant. 'Philarchi & reguli Arabum admiſerunt eum familiariter, & ob Medicinæ experimenta ſuſpexerunt, quodque mercedes recuſaret donis plurimis & pretioſis affecerunt; majoribus, ut ſecum maneret, ſollicitatum (10) —— *The princes and governours of the Arabians converſed freely with him, and greatly reſpected him for his skill in phyſic; and, as he refuſed all rewards, they loaded him with many valuable preſents, and tempted him with greater to ſtay among them*'. Theſe are very glorious things for a Chriſtian.

[E] *He ſoon ſaw himſelf called to make ſome lectures of another nature.*] I have purpoſely followed Gronovius's narrative, to convince my readers by an inſtance how nicely a man ought to examine things, if he would be throughly acquainted with what is neceſſary to clear a fact. This is related in ſuch a manner in the funeral oration, that there is no body but will conclude, that Snellius died after Golius's return; and that Golius was not made profeſſor of mathematics, till after he had diſcharged for ſome time the functions of his other employment after his return to Leyden. But whoever believes that, will be in an error. Snellius died in the year 1626, and Golius returned from the Levant in the year 1629, and during his voyage was choſen to ſucceed Snellius; of which he received the news at Conſtantinople.

[F] *He compoſed ſome valuable works, which have been publiſhed.*] He publiſhed the Hiſtory of the Saracens, written by Elmacinus: a work which is partly owing to Erpenius, who had begun the tranſlation of that hiſtory. Golius compleated what was wanting. He publiſhed the life of Tamerlane, compoſed in Arabic by a famous author; as alſo the *Aſtronomical Elements* of Alſerganus, to which he added a new verſion, and learned commentaries. His *Lexicon Arabicum* is a moſt exact work (11). He illuſtrated with notes and additions the Arabic grammar of Erpenius, and added to it ſeveral pieces of poetry, taken out of Arabic poets, and chiefly out of Tograi and Ababolla. Tho' he was 54 years old when he began to ſtudy the Perſian language in good earneſt, yet he got ſuch a maſtery of it, that he compoſed a very ample dictionary of it, which was printed at London (12). He could have compoſed another of the Turkiſh language. He had ſuch a genius for languages, that, having begun late to learn that of the Chineſe, he made ſuch a progreſs in it, as to be able to read and underſtand their books. It is no ſmall matter even to know the figures they make uſe of in writing; for they have near eight thouſand of them (13). The Chineſe Atlas, to which he made ſome additions, ſhews the progreſs he had made in that language.

[G] . . . . *and*

(g) The letters patents, which Frederic Henry prince of Orange granted him, are dated the 30th of Nov. 1625.

(h) He was a monk. See the article HEMELAR.

(i) Quadriennio circumacto cum inæſtimabili quo bibliotheca publica ſuperbit, rariſſimorum librorum theſauro quem mente ac pectore condiderat, huc regreſſus intermiſſa docendi munia repetiit. *Gronovius, ubi ſupra, pag.* 19. The catalogue of the manuſcripts he brought, has been printed more than once.

(6) Colomiés, Mêlanges Hiſt. *printed at Orange*, 1675, *pag.* 75, &c.

(7) In the firſt Tome of his Voyage, pag. 193, Dutch Edit. See alſo Sir George Wheeler's Voyage, pag. 362.

(8) He means Cornelius Haga, embaſſador from Holland to Conſtantinople.

(9) Gronovius, in orat. funebri, pag. 18.

(10) Id. ibid. pag. 17.

(11) Non parvæ molis, ſed immenſæ atque infinitæ curæ & induſtriæ. *Id. ibid. pag.* 20.

(12) It is inſerted in the *Lexicon Heptaglotton* of Caſtellus.

(13) Quod rariſſimum, annis jam vergentibus Sinenſi etiam linguæ difficillimæ, & niſi quis inter ipſos ætatem exigat, ingenio humano inexſuperabili attenderat, & ad octo millibus ſignorum quibus pro vocibus utuntur ſatis aſſuerat, ut libros illorum non ægre legere atque intelligere poſſet. *Gronovius, ubi ſupra, pag.* 20.

of thoſe, if he had lived to put the laſt hand to them [*G*]. What is moſt commendable in his works, is the zeal, with which he applied himſelf to make his knowledge of the tongues ſubſervient to the propagation of the faith among the infidels [*H*], and to the comfort of the Chriſtians, who groan under the tyranny of the Mahometans. He had an intercourſe of letters with the moſt learned men of Europe (*k*); and was very much eſteemed by his ſovereigns (*l*). His conſtitution was ſo very ſtrong [*I*], that he always enjoyed a perfect health. He died the twenty eighth of September 1667, after having gone through all the degrees of the univerſity, and being as much eſteemed for his virtue and piety, as for his learning. He made a right judgment of things; for he deplored the method, with which diſputes about religion are commonly managed [*K*]. He left two ſons, of whom I ſhall ſay ſomething in the remarks [*L*].

[*G*] .... *and undertook others, which would not have come ſhort of the former if he had put the laſt hand to them.*] He deſigned to have publiſhed a ſecond edition of the life of Tamerlane, the text of which would have been printed with the vowels; and he would have added to it a tranſlation, and a commentary, full of illuſtrations on ſeveral intricate paſſages of the oriental hiſtory. This work wanted but little of being delivered to the printer. He had begun a geographical and hiſtorical dictionary, relating to the countries in the Levant, *in quo omnia locorum & hominum per Orientem nomina explicarentur.* He had promiſed a long time a new edition of the Alcoran, with a tranſlation, and a confutation of it. He deſigned to give a catalogue of all the Perſian books, that are in Europe, and a treatiſe of the dialects of the Perſian language. He would chiefly have examined the dialect, which is accounted the beſt, and which has obtained that title by the moſt authentic ſentence that can be required in that kind of privileges. See the margin (14), where you will find a remarkable paſſage. Never did the Greeks or Romans, or any of the nations, that have moſt cultivated learning and eloquence, do ſo much for their languages, as the kings of Perſia: neither the academy della Cruſca, and ſuch like it, nor that, of which cardinal Richelieu was the founder, come near that aſſembly of ſages, whom the kings of Perſia called together, for the admiſſion or excluſion of words.

[*H*] *He applied himſelf to make his knowledge of the tongues ſubſervient to the propagation of the faith among the infidels.*] We may reckon, for a proof of his zeal, the particular care he took to cauſe the New Teſtament to be printed both in literal and and vulgar Greek. The States were pleaſed to be at that expence in favour of the Grecians. *Nemo tanto ſtudio, labore, gratia ob conſulatus & præturas & imperia contendit omnemque lapidem movit, quam ille ut Novi Fœderis ſacratiſſimæ tabulæ, ſimul uti ſcriptæ ſunt, ſimul ut in* ῥωμαικὸν *(ut appellant) ſeu Græcam linguam vulgarem traductæ, formis vulgarentur: atque id magnificum atque divinum munus Potentiſſimorum Liberi Belgii Ordinum beneficio, gemens ſub barbariæ intolerabili jugo gens libertatis & elegantiæ inventrix acciperet* (15). He took care to diſperſe, among the Chriſtians of the Levant, an Arabic tranſlation of the confeſſion of faith of the reformed, and of their Catechiſm and Liturgy; for there are Chriſtians in thoſe countries, who make uſe of the Arabic tongue in divine ſervice. He employed in this tranſlation an Armenian, who underſtood vulgar Arabic, and ſuch phraſes as are conſecrated to religion, and who knew how to adapt Golius's ſtyle to the capacity of every body: for if Golius alone had made that tranſlation, his expreſſions might have been too ſublime and learned. He entertained that Armenian at his houſe two years and a half, and promiſed him the ſame penſion, which the States had granted to the Archimandrite, who turned the New Teſtament into vulgar Greek. However he did not know whether the States would be at that expence, neither did he propoſe the thing to them till the work was compleated: and then they not only made good his promiſe, but likewiſe made him a fine preſent (16). I ſhall not defer mentioning what I have to ſay concerning another preſent. He was their interpreter in ordinary for the Arabic, Turkiſh, Perſian, &c. tongues; which was worth an annual penſion to him. I ſuppoſe the functions of that employment gave no great interruption to his other labours; but, as often as they had occaſion for him in that capacity, they treated him with great civility, and upon a time preſented him with a gold chain, and a very fine medal (17).

[*I*] *His conſtituion was very ſtrong.*] He had preſerved himſelf ſound by a conſtant temperance, and forbearance of voluptuouſneſs (18). At the age of ſeventy years, he walked on foot all the ſpace of ground, which is between the Maeſe and the Wahal, at a place, where he was forced to march fourteen hours (19).

[*K*] *He deplored the method, with which diſputes about religion are commonly managed.*] Theſe are the expreſſions of the author of his funeral oration: 'Religionem, perinde ut rempublicam, factionibus 'geri dolebat. Speciem quandam externam ſibi circumdediſſe multis ſufficere, quam vita & actiones 'confutarent. Inter diſſentientes, de mediis quoque 'rebus atque indifferentibus, nullam turpem rationem 'vincendi: calumnias, artes malas, pias fraudes vigere. 'Nuſquam moderata conſilia, zelum, qui furor ſit, 'vocari. Partim Scripturam S. tractare potius ut 'ingenium inde quam ſalutis curam nutriant. Theologicen præferre, ut nomen ſcientiæ atque auctoritatis. Ergo miſſa in diſcrimen veritate, quamvis ſatis '& excellenter doctos eſſe conſtet, tam ſecure de illa 'tranſigere. Hos in Theologia philoſophari, ad diſputandum modo, atque ut magni & conſpecti ſint, 'Theologos (20) —— *He was grieved, that religion,* '*no leſs than the ſtate, was carried on by factions, that* '*many were ſatisfied with an outward ſhew, which* '*their lives and actions confuted; that, among diſputants, even about indifferent matters, no way of obtaining the victory was thought ſcandalous; that* '*calumny, baſe arts, and pious frauds flouriſhed; that* '*moderate counſels were no where to be found, and that* '*what is rage was called zeal; that the ſcripture* '*was handled more to exerciſe the wit, than to provide for ſalvation; that divinity was profeſſed only* '*as carrying the name of ſcience and authority; that* '*truth was in danger whilſt it's advocates, however* '*learned, were careleſs of it's intereſts; and that they* '*philoſophized in religion chiefly for the ſake of diſputation, and acquiring the reputation of eminent divines.*' This is one of the five or ſix reflexions, that Gronovius has ſelected, among many others, which Golius was heard to make during his laſt ſickneſs (21). All men of ſenſe will agree, that his choice is judicious; for, of all things in the world, the abuſes here in queſtion deſerve moſt to be deplored: yet, nevertheleſs, people are ſo hardened, and ſo ſo little affected with that diſorder, that we ought to conclude, that none but perſons of an exquiſite judgment can think, in that matter, as our profeſſor did. The church is divided into factions and cabals, juſt like commonwealths: into factions, I ſay, which either triumph, or are oppreſſed, juſt as in commonwealths: not in proportion to the goodneſs or badneſs of the cauſe, but in proportion to the great or little uſe people can make of all manner of devices (22). Such a church is certainly an object of compaſſion, and a matter of affliction. Another thing, which Gronovius has collected, is, in my opinion, very judicious. Golius, who had lived ſo long, ſeen ſo much, travelled ſo far, had found nothing more ſcarce than a Chriſtian worthy of that name. He had ſeen mankind every where plunged in vice, every where in diſguiſe, (23). Travellers obſerve an infinite variety amongſt men: in a day they are tranſported into another country, where they find another language, other habits, other cuſtoms; but notwithſtanding thoſe infinite variations, all nations are alike, and agree in this, that there are but few honeſt men every where, and that forbidden pleaſures are commonly practiſed.

[*L*] *He left two ſons, of whom I ſhall ſay ſomething in the remarks.*] They both ſtudied the civil-law, and were admitted advocates. The elder was called Theodore,

(*k*) Gronovius names ſeveral, and, among the reſt, Carteſius. See in the life of that philoſopher by Mr Baillet, Golius's friendſhip for him.

(*l*) Taken from his funeral oration, pronounced by J. Frid. Gronovius. The dates were wanting in it every where; I have been obliged to ſupply them in the margin.

(14) Et libellus de variis linguæ Perſicæ dialectis, præſertim de omnium puriſſima, quam juſſu magnorum regum omnibus ex partibus regni concilio coacto ſapientes moroſo verborum delectu probarunt, & aula recepit. *Ibid. pag.* 21.

(15) Ibid.

(16) Gronovius, ibid. pag. 22, 23.

(17) Id. ibid.

(18) Idem. pag. 28.

(19) Septuaginta natus annos continenti quatuordecim horarum Vahalim inter & Moſam ambulatione iter pedes confecit. *Ibid.*

(20) Ib. pag. 30.

(21) Ib. pag. 28.

(22) Nullam turpem rationem vincendi; calumnias, artes malas, pias fraudes vigere. *Ibid. pag.* 30.

(23) Vana eſſe omnia, & fucata, totumque orbem inundatum & immerſum vitiis. *Ibid. pag.* 29.

dore, and was admitted into the council of Leyden in the year 1669. He was choſen burgomaſter of the ſame city three times, and exerciſed there once the office of great bailiff, which is the firſt in the cities of Holland. He was alſo deputed to the college of the admiralty at Amſterdam. He died in the year 1679, being then burgomaſter. His brother MATTHEW GOLIUS, a very honeſt and moſt learned gentleman, dean of the court of Holland, died at the Hague in Sept. 1702. Their mother was of a very good family (24). She lived twenty four years very lovingly with her husband (25).

(24) Gronovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 24, & ſeq.

(25) Idem. pag. 29.

GOLIUS (THEOPHILUS) profeſſor of Ethics at Straſburg, where he was born in the year 1528 (*a*), and died in the year 1600 (*b*). He compoſed in Latin an Abridgment of Ethics, taken from the ten books of Ariſtotle *ad Nichomachum*, and an Abridgment of Politics, taken from the ſame Ariſtotle. He dedicated the firſt of theſe two works to Baron de Tanberg, the firſt of September 1592. My edition of them both is of Straſburg, *typis Joſiæ Ribelii hæredum* 1621 *in* 8°. I have not ſeen his Greek Grammar. Mr Konig mentions it (*c*).

(*a*) Konig. Bibl. pag. 352.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

GOMARUS (FRANCIS), profeſſor of divinity, was born at Bruges the thirtieth of January, 1563. His father and mother, who had embraced the Proteſtant religion, retired into the Palatinate, in the year 1578, in order to profeſs it quietly, and cauſed him to ſtudy at Straſburg under the famous John Sturmius. He was under the diſcipline of that good old man about three years; after which, he went to purſue his ſtudies at *Newſtad*, whither the profeſſors of Heidelberg were retired (*a*). He took a journey into England towards the end of the year 1582, and heard, at Oxford, the lectures in divinity of John Raynolds, and, at Cambridge, thoſe of William Whitaker. He took his bachelor's degree in the month of June 1584. He ſpent the two following years at Heidelberg (*b*), where the univerſity had been reſtored. The Dutch congregation at Francfort called him to be their paſtor in the year 1587, and enjoyed his miniſtry from that time till 1593, when they were entirely diſperſed by perſecution. He was called to Leyden, to be profeſſor of divinity, in the year 1594. He accepted that offer; but before he went to take poſſeſſion of his place, he went to Heidelberg, to take his doctor's degree. He exerciſed quietly that profeſſorſhip, till he had for his colleague James Arminius, in the year 1603, a man, who ſoon broached his Pelagian tenets [*A*], and made himſelf the head of a party in the univerſity. Gomarus ſtood up againſt him with great zeal, not only in the ſchools of Leyden, but alſo in the preſence of the ſtates of the province. They two diſputed twice in the aſſembly of the ſtates of Holland, in the year 1608, which was continued by five againſt five the following year. The ſucceſs of theſe diſputes was not ſuch as the churches wiſhed (*c*); but nevertheleſs it ſerved for ſomething, to wit, to diſcover Arminius's Pelagianiſm. That profeſſor, who was ſick, made uſe of that excuſe to break off the conferences, and died ſome time after. His adverſaries employed all their induſtry to hinder Vorſtius from ſucceeding him; but not being able to effect it, it happened that Gomarus, to avoid having ſuch a colleague, reſigned his poſt, and retired to Middleburg, in the year 1611. He was miniſter there, and made public lectures, till the year 1614, when he was called by the academy of Saumur to be profeſſor of divinity. He exerciſed that employment four years; after which he retired to Groningen, to be, there, firſt divinity and Hebrew profeſſor. Here he found a fixed ſtation, to which he firmly ſtuck till his death, that is, till the eleventh of January 1641. If he abſented himſelf twice, it was not to allow himſelf any relaxation, but to be one of the judges of Arminius's cauſe in the ſynod of Dort (*d*), and to reviſe the tranſlation of the Old Teſtament (*e*). He married three wives, and had children only by the ſecond [*B*]. He was a very learned man, particularly in the oriental languages. His works were printed at Amſterdam, in folio, in the year 1645 (*f*) [*C*]. If it be true, that he anſwered Barnevelt,

(*a*) The elector Palatine had driven them away, becauſe they were not Lutherans.

(*b*) The elector Lewis, perſecutor of the Reformed, being dead, in 1583, prince Caſimir his brother had the adminiſtration of the electorate, and reſtored the Reformed.

(*c*) See the remark [*A*], citation (1).

(*d*) In the year 1618.

(*e*) At Leyden, in 1633.

(*f*) Taken from his life in the collection of thoſe of the profeſſors of Groningen.

[*A*] *It was not long before Arminius ſpread his Pelagian tenets.*] I advance this, as a tranſlator of him, who compoſed Gomarus's life (1); though, for the reſt, I do not pretend to warrant he is in the right: for I know, that Arminius did not own his opinions to be like thoſe of Pelagius, nor even like thoſe of the Semi-Pelagians. See Grotius's treatiſe, intituled, *Diſquiſitio an Pelagiana ſint ea dogmata quæ nunc ſub eo nomine traducuntur?* It is in the third volume of his theological works. See alſo one of his letters (2). When therefore you read, in Gomarus's life, that this advantage, at leaſt, reſulted from the conferences held with the Arminians, that they were manifeſtly convicted of teaching Pelagius's tenets (3), do not preſently believe, that they were forced to own that, and that the judges of the conference pronounced, that they had been ſufficiently convicted of it. The terms of that author ought to ſignify no more, than that Gomarus pretended he had produced good proofs for his charge againſt Arminius.

[*B*] *He had children only by his ſecond wife.*] She was called Mary Leremite, and was a gentlewoman both by her father's and mother's ſide. He married her at Francfort (4), and had by her one ſon, and two daughters. The ſon died before his father, and left children behind him. The younger daughter was married to David de la Haie, miniſter of a Walloon church. This remark, and ſeveral others of this nature, which will be found in this dictionary, are made in favour of many good ſouls, which are known to be very inquiſitive about the relations of paſtors and learned men. If there be readers, that care little for theſe things, as undoubtedly there are but too many, they are deſired to remember, that an author is not obliged to ſay nothing but what they like; for, in a work like this, a man is obliged to pleaſe, ſometimes one ſort of people, ſometimes another. Let this be ſaid once for all.

[*C*] *His works were printed at Amſterdam, in folio, in the year* 1645.] That is, ſeveral treatiſes, which had been publiſhed at divers times, were collected into one volume. His *Anti-Coſterus* was printed in the year 1599, and in 1600. His *Lyra Davidis* was publiſhed a long while before his death. Lewis Capel wrote againſt that work. 'Non ita pridem vir Cl. & 'Doctiſſ. *thus Rivet ſpeaks* (5), Franciſcus Gomarus 'edidit

(1) Dogmata Pelagiana clam, palam, voce, ſcripto ſpargere cœpit, ac familiam in Academia ducere. *Vita Gomari inter Profeſſ. Groningenſ. Vitas*, pag. 76.

(2) The 10th of the ſecond part.

(3) Succeſſu quidem non eo quem eccleſiæ optabant, ut profligatis erroribus ac ſchiſmate orthodoxa veritas & concordia in arce collocaretur: non tamen nullo, cum detracta larva Adverſarii Pelagianiſmus palam evictus fuerit. *Vita Gomari*, pag. 77.

(4) He had alſo married his firſt wife in the ſame city. He married the third at Middleburg; wherefore it ſhould not have been ſaid, in the firſt Tome of the *Anti*, *pag.* 128, that he married at Leyden, before he went to Middleburg.

(5) Prolegom. in Pſalmos.

velt, as Grotius relates, one cannot excuſe his great prepoſſeſſion [*D*]: of which thoſe who know how to judge of things, may be eaſily convinced. Meurſius has led Moreri into ſome miſtakes [*E*]; but the faults, which Moreri has committed of himſelf, are ſhameful

'edidit *Lyram Davidis*, in qua putavit ſe ad metra Horatiana & ſimilia Davidis Pſalmorum verſus ita exegiſſe, ut veram poëſeos Hebraicæ rationem invenerit. 'Sed Ludovicus Capellus animadverſionum libello totum illud D. Gomari opus obelo transfigere conatus 'eſt, ut inde lector diſcat vix inter doctos de eo poſſe 'convenire, neque labore parum utili ſe ultra fatiget. '—— *Not long ago, Francis Gomarus publiſhed his* 'Lyra Davidis, *in which he had ſo reduced the verſes 'of David's Pſalms to the metres of Horace and others, 'that he thought he had found out the true meaſure of 'the Hebrew poetry. But Lewis Capel, in a book of 'remarks, endeavoured to overthrow that whole work of 'Gomarus; whence the reader may ſee, that even 'learned men cannot agree among themſelves in that 'point, and may learn not to tire himſelf with a fruitleſs labour.*'

[*D*] *If it be true that he anſwered Barnevelt, as Grotius relates, one cannot excuſe his great prepoſſeſſion.*] Barnevelt made a ſhort ſpeech to thoſe two antagoniſts before the ſtates of Holland, wherein he declared, he thanked GOD, that thoſe controverſies did not concern the fundamental articles of the Chriſtian religion. Whereupon Gomarus, having obtained leave to ſpeak, proteſted, *that he would not appear before the throne of GOD with Arminius's errors.* We find this particular in Grotius's letters (6). It is alſo to be found in the preface, that was printed before the acts of the ſynod of Dort. I queſtion whether there be, now-a-days, any ſticklers for Gomarus, ſo paſſionate, as to maintain, that he had reaſon to anſwer Barnevelt as he did. The heat of diſpute, and the untoward influence of profeſſorial emulation, made him ſtrain things too high, and confounded his judgment. For now-a-days the moſt rigid Calviniſts do not ſcruple to own, that the five articles of the Remonſtrants are no fundamental hereſies; and they give ſufficiently to underſtand, that the ſchiſm might ſoon be made up, if the ſect of Arminius was not fallen into new errors, a thouſand times more pernicious than thoſe, which ſet Gomarus and Arminius againſt one another. Therefore thoſe, whoſe heads have not been heated by the perſonal quarrels, which exaſperated Gomarus, do not believe, like him, that a man ſhall eternally be damned for believing the five articles of the Arminians. It is therefore to a perſonal animoſity that we muſt impute the untoward opinion of that adverſary of Arminius.

That no body may contradict what I advance, I am going to produce a proof, which, though founded only upon a ſingle witneſs, has yet all the force of a good demonſtration; ſince that witneſs is no other than Mr Jurieu, the moſt intractable man in the world, with reſpect to the Arminians. Mr Arnauld thought he had wrote an unanſwerable book againſt the Proteſtant miniſters, when he publiſhed his *Renverſement de la Morale.* He grounded all his proofs on the tenets of the ſynod of Dort, and ſuppoſed, that ſo great an aſſembly would not have enforced the profeſſion of thoſe tenets upon pain of excommunication, if they had not looked upon them as fundamental. Mr Jurieu anſwered him a hundred good things, and confounded him, by maintaining to him, that that ſynod had never looked upon, as articles neceſſary to ſalvation, the tenets in queſtion in the diſputes of the Remonſtrants (7). He ſaid, in particular, touching that of Inamiſſible Grace, one of the chief points of the diſpute, that, ſince the deciſion of the ſynod, *the Lutherans, or any other communion, are free, either to defend, or not to admit that tenet. I ſay, they are free to do it: not but that men always ſin, when they reject a truth ſo ſacred, important, and clearly eſtabliſhed by ſcripture, as that is. But we do not hold it to be ſuch a ſin, as excludes from grace, and deſtroys faith* (8). Nay, he ſays, that thoſe, who live in the communion of the Anti-Remonſtrants, are at liberty not *to ſubmit themſelves to the deciſion of the ſynod of Dort in that reſpect*, and to have *particular ſentiments about that*, provided *they do not take upon them to dogmatize and make diſciples:* and that, though *ſuch miniſters, as go about to deny the perſeverance of true ſaints, are not ſuffered to aſcend the pulpit*, and are even driven from among the Calviniſts, yet the latter do not therefore pretend to *baniſh them from the body of JESUS CHRIST* (9).

For the reſt, if we may credit the Engliſh author of ſome letters publiſhed by the Arminians, Gomarus was a very paſſionate man. See the letters of thoſe gentlemen, in the pages 548, 565, *&c.* This emboldens me the more to reject the temerity and malicious conjecture of thoſe, who would pretend, that he did not believe, that Arminius's tenets did lead to hell; tho' he affirmed it, to juſtify the oppoſition he made againſt thoſe tenets: for he had reaſon to fear, that the ſtates of Holland would tell him, that it was not worth the while to make ſuch a noiſe, if Arminius's opinions did not hinder people from being ſaved. The beſt anſwer, that could be made to that objection, was, to ſay, that one could not ſtir too much, nor implore with too much ardour the authority of the magiſtrates, againſt thoſe doctrines, ſince they were ſufficient to caſt into hell all ſuch, as ſhould ſuffer themſelves to be infected with them. Grotius obſerves, that Gomarus, in a converſation they had together about the Arminian controverſies, called Arminius's opinions profane and impious, and inveighed againſt him, but without ſaying any thing about predeſtination. 'Cum multa acriter in Arminium diceret, impiaſque & profanas vocaret ipſius opiniones, tamen de prædeſtinatione vix 'quicquam locutus eſt. Sed primum in illam maxime 'ſententiam invectus eſt, quæ juſtificationis objectum 'aut materiam ſtatuit fidem, juſtitiam autem Chriſti 'cauſam meritoriam juſtificationis ejus quæ eſt ex fide '(10).' He principally inſiſted on the matter of juſtification; though moſt members of the ſtates of Holland had determined, that, as to that point, the diſpute of Gomarus and Arminius was almoſt nothing but a diſpute of words (11). If there was artifice in not inſiſting much upon predeſtination, it was alſo an artifice to inſiſt upon it; which ſecond artifice was that of Arminius. He took notice, that the tenet of abſolute reprobation might eaſily bear an odious conſtruction; and that his doctrine, as to that point, was more plauſible and popular; wherefore he ſhewed himſelf on that fair ſide (12). It is the general cuſtom of pleaders; they always ſhow the fair ſide of the cauſe. Mark well what Grotius relates, at the end of that letter. Uyttenbogard had foreſeen, even from the year 1608, the ſucceſs of thoſe diſputes, (*viz.*) that Calvin's doctrine ſhould triumph in Holland, as it triumphed at Geneva in the time of Caſtalio, a man, who was ſo ſeverely perſecuted, and reduced to ſuch ſtreights, as to be obliged to turn wood-cleaver to get a livelihood. 'Cum tantis præjudiciis res agatur, & 'ſingulares Doctorum opiniones, in mentes diſcipulorum ſenſim irrepentes, atque auctu temporis, & altius inquirendi negligentia ac ſpecie, tacito Eccleſiarum conſenſu receptæ, liberam magnorum ingeniorum ſedulitatem autoritate ſua jugulent, neque minus 'in Eccleſiis, quam in aliis conſeſſibus vincat major 'pars meliorem, non alium ſe eventum rerum Arminii 'ſperare, quam Caſtellionis fuerit, qui preſſus impotentia adverſariorum eo redactus ſit, ut vir non indoctus & perpetuæ famæ lignando ſibi victum quæreret (13). —— *When parties run ſo high, and the 'particular opinions of doctors, inſenſibly creeping into 'the minds of the ſcholars, and, through length of 'time, and a neglect of inquiring further, being received with a tacit conſent of the church, baffle, by 'their authority, the free enquiries of learned men; and 'when, no leſs in the church, than in other aſſemblies, 'the greater part conquers the better, the Arminians 'can expect no other event of things, than was Caſtellio's, who, through the perſecution of his adverſaries, was reduced, though a learned man, and 'of perpetual fame, to get his living by cleaving wood.*'

[*E*] *Meurſius has led Moreri into ſome miſtakes.*] He has placed (14) Gomarus's birth in the year 1562 (15), and ſaid, he went into England before he went into Germany. Theſe two faults are eaſily perceived, if one reads the narrative I have given, which is, without compariſon, better than that, which Mr Moreri has followed; ſince it is taken out of a book, written at Groningen, where Gomarus was a profeſſor twenty two years: out of a book, I ſay, compoſed after Gomarus's death, and with the help of more copious memoirs, than thoſe, which John Meurſius made uſe of.

[*F*] *The*

---

(6) Cum D. Oldenbarneveldius, brevi, quam ad profeſſores habebat, oratione inter alia gratias ſe habere Deo diceret, quod de Chriſtianæ religionis capitibus nulla eſſet diſputatio; reſpondit Gomarus, poſtulata dicendi venia, ejuſmodi eſſe collegæ ſui opiniones in articulis inter ipſos controverſis, ut ipſe, ita ſentiens, nolit coram Deo Judice conſiſtere. *Grotius, Epiſt. xi, Part. I, pag.* 3.

(7) I have alledged the reaſons, which made the ſynod of Dort inſert this in their deciſions. It is . . . in the third place, to pacify differences by terminating a controverſy, about which people were divided. But I deny once more, that the ſynod ever intended to make that new deciſion a fundamental article of our faith. *Jurieu, Juſtification de la Morale des Reformez, Part. II, lib. vi, cap. iii, pag.* 216.

(8) Id. ibid. cap ii, pag. 207.

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Grotius, Epiſt. xi, Part. I, pag. 3.

(11) Plerique ex Senatu judicaverant hoc non multo plus eſſe quam λογομαχίαν (*verborum pugnam*) . . . . ille contra rem magnam agi putabat. *Grotius, ibid.*

(12) At Arminius dicebat, non ita graves eſſe controverſias, ſed maxime circa prædeſtinationem ambigi, quod ideo in conventu dixiſſe videbatur aut credebatur, quia in iſto argumento, popularis ac plauſibilis eſt novitas. *Id. ibid.*

(13) Ibid. pag. 4.

(14) Athen. Batav. pag. 176.

(15) Mr Baillet, Tome I, of the *Anti, pag.* 127, having followed Meurſius in this, ought to have ſaid, by a neceſſary conſequence, that Gomarus died ſeventy nine years old, ſince he died in the year 1641. The truth is, he wanted a few days of ſeventy eight years, the day of his death.

ſhameful [*F*]. They have moſt of them been marked in the edition of Holland. I forgot to ſay, that Scaliger had no great eſteem for our Gomarus [*G*].

[*F*] *The faults Moreri has committed of himſelf are ſhameful.*] He ſays, that Gomarus's father carried him into England. Meurſius ſays no ſuch thing; and the author of the lives of the profeſſors of Groningen ſays expreſsly the contrary: to wit, that Gomarus's father retired into the Palatinate, and ſent his ſon to Straſburg. Moreri pretends, that Arminius taught a particular doctrine at Leyden, when Gomarus was called thither; which is a great anachroniſm: for Gomarus had been ten years a profeſſor at Leyden, when Arminius began to teach there. But the moſt ſtrange miſtake of our author, and the moſt inexcuſable in a French prieſt, who ought to think himſelf called to the converſion of the Huguenots, is, the having believed, that the tenet of *Irreſiſtible and Inamiſſible Grace*, was an error, into which Gomarus fell, *by being carried ſomewhat too far by his paſſion.* What a profound ignorance is this! Is it not a doctrine, which has ever obtained in the communion of Geneva, from Calvin to this preſent time? If Gomarus differed from the reſt, it was in his explaining himſelf harſhly, according to the hypotheſis of the Supralapſarians. See the advice that Voſſius gave him (16).

(16) Voſſius, Epiſt. cccxcvi, pag. 362. Edit. Londinenſis, 1693.

[*G*] *Scaliger had no great eſteem for our Gomarus.*] Read this paſſage of the Scaligerana. ‘ If any body ‘ ſhould aſk Gomarus and Snellius, whether this age ‘ will produce greater men than the preceding, they ‘ will undoubtedly anſwer, yes; becauſe they think ‘ themſelves to be the moſt learned. Gomarus is of ‘ Bruges: that is the reaſon he is learned. He has a ‘ fine library, and a great many Ramiſts: for he is a ‘ great analytic, which is the mark of a Ramiſt. He ‘ thinks himſelf the moſt learned divine. He has no ‘ more skill in chronology, than I in coining falſe ‘ money (17).’

(17) Pag. m. 95.

GOMBAULD (JOHN OGIER DE), one of the beſt French Poets of the XVIIth century, was born in Xaintonge, at St Juſt de Luſſac, near Broüage (*a*). One may ſee in Moreri's Dictionary, that he not only was admitted into the French academy, from the beginning of the inſtitution of that ſociety, but likewiſe that he was one of the little aſſembly of wits, which preceded that inſtitution, and occaſioned the foundation of that illuſtrious academy. One may ſee, in the ſame dictionary, ſome other curious things concerning Mr Gombauld, which I ſhall not repeat, contenting myſelf to mention ſuch paſſages as are not to be found there. Therefore I ſhall ſay, that he was a Proteſtant [*A*], *a gentleman, and a younger ſon by a fourth marriage, as he uſed to ſay in jeſt, to excuſe himſelf for not being rich. That he was tall, well ſhaped, and looked like a man of quality. That his piety was ſincere, his probity above ſlander, and his life unblameable. That he had a noble and upright ſoul, a lofty mind, leſs fruitful than judicious; a quick, fiery, and paſſionate temper, tho' he ſeemed to be grave and compoſed. That, after he had ſtudied moſt ſciences at Bourdeaux, under the beſt maſters, he came to Paris, about the latter end of the reign of Henry the great, where he was ſoon known and eſteemed* (*b*). He *was none of the laſt, nor the meaneſt of thoſe*, who made verſes on the death *of that great monarch* (*c*). He was very much eſteemed by *Mary de Medicis, and no man of his condition had a freer acceſs to, or was more kindly received by her. She allowed him a penſion of twelve hundred Crowns.* ‘ And, being as great an enemy to needleſs expences, as ‘ he loved to live handſomely, and to ſpend what was neceſſary, he raiſed a pretty ‘ conſiderable ſtock out of what he ſaved, whilſt he was in plenty; which proved very ‘ beneficial to him, when the civil and foreign wars leſſened, and at laſt dried up, the ‘ ſprings,

(*a*) Peliſſon. Hiſt. de l'Acad. Françoiſe, pag. m. 339.

(*b*) Preface to the treatiſes and letters of Mr Gombaud, concerning religion. Mr Colomiés, in his *Bibliotheque Choiſie*, pag. 155, of the ſecond edition, obſerves, that Mr Conrart is the author of this preface.

(*c*) Ibid.

[*A*] *He was a Proteſtant.*] This is what the continuators of Moreri have not mentioned: perhaps they were ignorant of it: but perhaps alſo they would not have mentioned it, though they had known it. However it be, ſuch an omiſſion is a fault; for, unleſs we ſee in an hiſtorical dictionary, printed in France, and compoſed by Roman Catholics, that an author did not profeſs the eſtabliſhed religion, we are apt to ſuppoſe, that he did profeſs it, eſpecially if we find (1), that he was in honourable poſts, ſuch as to be a member of an academy of wits, founded by a cardinal, who was firſt miniſter of ſtate: that he was appointed to examine and ſettle the ſtatutes of that new ſociety; and that he furniſhed memoirs concerning them. Therefore, to prevent the reader's imagining, that Gombauld was a Roman Catholic, it ſhould have been expreſsly ſaid, that he was not ſo, but a Huguenot; though, if they pleaſed, they might have added their reflexions as to his misfortune in that reſpect. The books, that author publiſhed, were little proper to let the world know, that he was a good Proteſtant; but this has ſufficiently appeared by ſome poſthumous treatiſes, printed in Holland, in the year 1678. They are, *Diſcourſes about religion; and theſe Gombauld eſteemed more than any of his other works. He had compoſed them out of a meer motive of charity, with a deſign to make the truth known to thoſe, that were in an error, and to confirm, in the ſound belief, thoſe that were born in it, or had embraced it. He commonly complained of two things: firſt, that the generality of thoſe, that wrote about theſe matters, made too voluminous books, wherein they heaped proofs upon proofs, and authorities upon authorities, without much minding either order or clearneſs. And ſecondly, that they perſuaded themſelves, that learning and elegance were incompatible. To ſhew, that they were miſtaken in that, he compoſed his conſiderations on the Chriſtian religion, when he was yet in the vigour of his age; and ſhewed indeed, that a man may be at once nervous and clear, conciſe and full, ſolid and elegant: Having communicated that piece to ſeveral of his friends, and even to ſome of the Romiſh communion, it was approved and valued by all, which encouraged him to write afterwards the treatiſe of the Euchariſt; and another, which he addreſſes to one of his friends, under the name of Ariſtander. As for the letters, he wrote them when he was more advanced in years, except that to a ſtudent of divinity, which bears almoſt the ſame date with the conſiderations on the Chriſtian religion . . . His greateſt paſſion was* to publiſh theſe writings, *becauſe he was perſuaded, that they would be uſeful; and perhaps few lay-men expreſſed ſo much zeal for the glory of GOD, and ſo much love for their neighbours, as he did. The fervency of his zeal appears by his books; but, if it be conſidered that he had ſcarce any thing to live upon but what he received from the court, it will be no wonder, if he did not publiſh them in his life-time. In order to prevent the loſs of them after his death, if they ſhould fall into the hands of perſons of a different religion from his, he put them, in his latter years, into the hands of one of his old friends, whoſe faithfulneſs and affection were well known to him, and made him promiſe not to part with them, and to get them printed as ſoon as he ſhould find an occaſion for it* (2). One may eaſily perceive, by the reading of thoſe books, that Gombauld was as averſe to the Roman communion, as a miniſter; but he may be compared to thoſe men, who do no good to their heirs but after their death. Not that they want affection, and would be unwilling to ſhew their liberality while alive, if they could do it without any inconveniency; but they think they have not too much for themſelves. Perhaps, if any one ſhould blame this conduct of Gombauld, he would be thought overzealous.

(1) This is found in Moreri.

(2) Preface to Gombauld's treatiſes and letters.

‘ ſprings, which afforded him a plentiful maintenance. At firſt, his penſion was brought
‘ down from twelve hundred crowns to eight hundred, and from eight hundred to four
‘ hundred, where it reſted till his death; nor was he paid, ever ſince the war of Paris,
‘ but by the good offices of ſome potent and generous perſons [*B*], to whom he had
‘ the honour to be known, and by whom he was protected, among whom the duke and
‘ ducheſs of Montauſier ought to be firſt named. He was alſo for ſome years gratified
‘ with a penſion by Mr Seguier, chancellor of France. He always enjoyed a good
‘ health, to which his frugality and oeconomy did very much contribute. But, one day,
‘ as he was walking in his chamber, which he uſed to do, he fell, and got ſuch a hurt
‘ in his hip, that, ever after this accident, he was forced to keep his bed the greateſt
‘ part of the time, till he died, being almoſt an hundred years old, if a date, written
‘ with his own hand in one of the books of his cloſet, was the true time of his birth; as
‘ he told one, who never ſaid any thing of it till after his death, becauſe Gombauld had
‘ imparted his age to him as a ſecret [*C*].’ None had *more conſtantly attended the drawing-room*

zealous. Gombauld had nothing to maintain himſelf, but the penſion he received from the court of France; nor could he be paid, but by uſing the intereſt of a great man to overcome a thouſand difficulties. That great man's credit would have been ineffectual, if Gombauld had publiſhed books of controverſy; and conſequently the publiſhing of them would have reduced the author to great ſtraits. Were it not therefore too rigid a thing, to condemn his cautious prudence, and to think it ſtrange, that he ſhould put off the impreſſion of thoſe books till after after his death? How many people would have laughed at him, if he had loſt his penſion for having publiſhed his controverſial treatiſes? They would have ſaid, that he ſtrained charity; and that, ſince he wanted his penſion more than his brethren wanted his books, he ſhould have moderated his zeal, and contented himſelf with being a poſthumous author. This ingenuous epigram of the poet Gomes is very judicious.

Plaiſe au Roi me donner cent Livres,
Pour acheter Livres & vivres:
De Livres je m'en paſſerois,
Mais de vivres je ne ſçaurois (3).

Give me, great monarch, pounds five ſcore,
For meat and books . . . . I ask no more.
Or . . . . keep the books, and give me meat . . .
For ſome folks read, but all folks eat.

[*B*] *His penſion was brought down . . . . . to eight hundred crowns, and then to four hundred . . . nor was he paid . . . but by the good offices of ſome generous perſons.*] There were two inconveniencies in it; for ſuch a ſucceſſive decreaſe of a penſion muſt needs very much diſtreſs and vex a wit: beſides, Gombauld was obliged to make many viſits, and to be troubleſome to others, and fatigue himſelf to get that ſmall part he was reduced to. How often was he obliged to have recourſe to the interceſſion of the Muſes, and to extort ſome verſes from them, in order to ſoften the intendants of the Finances, or to beg recommendations, or to thank thoſe, who had been moved at laſt with the pathetical deſcription of his neceſſity? If you read the beſt poets, you will find in them many ſuch verſes. But, though Gombauld was in very ſad circumſtances, his condition was ſtill leſs deplorable than that of many other wits, who were always ſent away with empty hands. No man was ever more liberal to them, than cardinal Richelieu; his miniſtry was a golden age for the French Muſes: but his death was like a dreadful ſtorm of hail, that falls upon a plentiful crop; which is rather to be aſcribed to the confuſions, in which the kingdom happened to be involved, than to the different genius and inclinations of thoſe, who ſucceeded him. The penſions were ſuppreſſed, leſſened, or ill paid; which made many people murmur and ſigh. I ſhall only mention Scudery's complaints, which are to be found in the verſes he compoſed upon Scarron's Virgil Traveſty.

Quand tu ſouffres qu'on te voye,
Tu reſſuſcites ma joye;
Tu rétablis ma raiſon:
De l'humeur qui m'aſſaſſine,
Ton livre eſt la medecine,
Et le ſeul contre-poiſon.
Je te jure par Hercule,
(Serment de l'antiquité)
Que ton Heros ridicule
M'a preſque reſſuſcité.
Auſſi pour ſes aſſiſtances,
J'appends comme des potences,
Et mes chagrins, & mes ſoins:
Et tout ce qu'un miſerable
De l'Eſpargne inexorable,
Endure & ſouffre le moins.
J'appends (dis-je) dans le Temple
De VIRGILE TRAVESTY,
Mille chagrins ſans exemple,
Dont je me trouve inveſty:
Oüy, par ce croteſque Ænée,
J'incague la Deſtinée
Qui me met à l'abandon:
Et j'offre mon Ordonnance,
Et mes Brevets ſans finance
A la burleſque Didon (4).

When you appear, again I live,
Reaſon returns, my joys revive:
Thy book's my humour's ſole relief,
The counter poiſon of my grief.
By Hercules, renown'd in war,
(Oath of antiquity) I ſwear,
Thy hero traveſty'd has ſtole
The ſecret anguiſh of my ſoul.
For this I'll hang up all my cares,
My diſappointed hopes, and fears,
All that I feel of grief and mis'ry
From an inexorable treas'ry.
I' th' temple I will hang 'em high,
Off'rings to VIRGIL TRAVESTY,
Be but groteſque Æneas by,
My deſtiny I dare defy.
My unpaid penſion freely I do
Here dedicate to burleſque Dido.

We may therefore conclude, that Gombauld was none of thoſe, who were in the worſt circumſtances: he only loſt two thirds of his penſion, and he received the third part for a great many years, by taking care to implore the aſſiſtance of his patrons. He died a Jubilate penſioner, and more than a Jubilate one (5); for the yearly gratifications he received laſted about fifty years. A very remarkable circumſtance: for if the court of France does readily grant penſions, and pays them punctually during the firſt years; it is as ready to take them off, and to convert the funds, upon which they are aſſigned, into more preſſing uſes. New-comers croud in daily, and the court is willing to ſatisfy them without new expences; that is, by applying to them what has already ſerved for others, who are ſuppoſed to have enjoyed it long enough. The old penſioners are the moſt odious; they are obliged to ask with the greateſt and moſt ſubmiſſive patience, and are denied with the leaſt ſcruple.

[*C*] *He died, being almoſt an hundred years old . . . he had imparted his age to a friend as a ſecret.*] What an odd thing is this! A man of good morals, and

(3) *See* Gueret, pag. m. 171, *of* La Guerre des Auteurs.

(4) Scudery, in his ode to Scarron, prefixed to the *Virgil Traveſty*.

(5) See the article BENSERADE, remark [*O*].

drawing-room of Mary de Medicis, and Anne of Auſtria, during the regency of thoſe two princeſſes. *But he was ſtill more careful to go to Rambouillet-houſe* (*d*) [*D*], *and he did it with more pleaſure.* He died in the year 1666. I ſhall put in one ſingle remark what I have to ſay concerning his writings, and what the beſt judges have thought of them [*E*].

zealous for his religion, makes a myſtery of the year of his birth: he reveals, with much ado, this great ſecret to a friend; but, at the ſame time, he ſo earneſtly intreats him to ſay nothing of it, that his friend thinks himſelf obliged to be ſilent about it, till after the death of his confident. One could ſcarce bear this in a maid or a widow, though no body takes it ill, that they ſhould be deſirous to conceal their age (6). But this, and a thouſand other inſtances ſhew, that what ſeems to be a meer oddneſs, an extravagant weakneſs, and an old woman's childiſhneſs, is nevertheleſs grounded upon a reaſon, that is ſpecious, and has a kind of ſolidity. Gombauld was not a ſorry rhimer, or a meer verſifier: he was an excellent poet, and had been very much eſteemed by perſons of the greateſt quality (7). He had conſtantly attended the aſſemblies of the ladies, and conſequently he had got the habit of gallant converſation. When he happened to be among women, he ſtill remembered the ſtile he uſed in his youth; he praiſed them, he flattered them. He could ſtill act the part of a wit, and of a galant; but, to perform that part with a greater decorum, it was neceſſary, that they ſhould know nothing of his great age. He printed a large collection of epigrams in 1657; and therefore he might have feared, that, if people ſhould come to know that he was ninety years old, they would think it ſtrange, that he ſhould deſire a licence for ſuch a book, and preſent his friends with it. He might have feared, that Mr Daillé, and the other miniſters of Paris, would cenſure him for minding ſtill ſuch trifling things at an age ſo far advanced. However, he is not the only man, who has been guilty of ſuch a weakneſs: we ſhall ſee hereafter (8) another inſtance of it in a grammarian, ſtuffed with Greek, who ſhould have been more free from it than a court-poet.

[*D*] *He went carefully to Rambouillet-houſe.*] The author of the preface calls it, *The charming place, whither all the perſons of quality and merit of that time uſed to reſort* (9). It was, ſays he, *a kind of a contracted and choice court, leſs numerous, but, if I dare ſay ſo, more exquiſite than that of the Louvre; becauſe none was allowed to come near that temple of honour, where virtue was reverenced under the name of the incomparable Artenice, but ſuch as deſerved her approbation and eſteem.*

[*E*] *I ſhall put in one remark what I have to ſay concerning his writings, and what the beſt judges have thought of them.*] The hiſtory of the French Academy (10) informs us, that, in 1652, Gombauld had not yet publiſhed the tragedy, intituled, The Danaides, nor the tragi-comedy, intituled, Cydippe, nor three books of epigrams, nor many other poems, and letters and diſcourſes in proſe; but that his Endymion, and his Amarante a paſtoral, and a volume of poems, and a volume of letters, were printed. The abbot de Marolles obſerves, in a book he publiſhed in the year 1657, that *Mr Gombauld had lately put out an excellent collection of epigrams* (11); and (12) that *his Aconce* (13), *and his immortal Danaides, wherein there are ſuch fine verſes,* were not as yet printed. We find, in the preface to the poſthumous treatiſes, that the tragedy of the Danaides has been printed, and that the author left not only *a tragi-comedy of Cydippe,* but alſo *wherewithal to make a new collection of verſes, eſpecially of ſonnets and epigrams, which have not yet ſeen the light, becauſe they are in the hands of ſome perſons, who have little knowledge of theſe ſorts of things.* Note, that the Endymion is written in proſe: It was printed in 1624, and reprinted in 1626. It is a kind of a romance.

The critics are divided in their opinions about his poetry. Some pretend, that he excelled in the making of ſonnets; and that it was his lot and the ſhare of Parnaſſus which fell to him. *Let us mind ſuch things as we have a natural genius for* (they are Gueret's words (14); *let us keep to that kind of work, for which we have a talent: we muſt not envy the glory of thoſe, whom we cannot imitate. Let Deſportes write elegies, Theophile ſtanzas, Gombauld ſonnets, and Maynard epigrams:* others extend Gombauld's dominion farther: they will have it, not only that he reigned over the ſonnets, but alſo that he conquered the empire of the epigrams over Maynard. ‘ Gombauld, ‘ the great Caſuiſt, and law-giver of the country, cauſ‘ed very pretty ſonnets to come from the iſland of ‘ the ſame name. He drew alſo from the Epigram‘matic Mountains three troops of light-horſe of a ‘ ſmall ſize; but which fought with a wonderful quick‘neſs, and had very dangerous darts, which they ‘ ſhot with an admirable dexterity. He had made uſe ‘ of them to diſmember the principality, which pre‘ſident Menard had uſurped before (15).’ The abbot de Marolles is contented to place *Menard, Bautru, and Gombauld, among the French poets, with whom our Neighbours cannot diſpute the pre-eminence,* as to epigrams, *and who are little inferior to the ancients* (16). Mr Boileau does not at all value the ſonnets of our poet.

Un Sonnet ſans defauts vaut ſeul un long Poëme.
Mais en vain mille Auteurs y penſent arriver,
Et cet heureux Phenix eſt encore à trouver.
A peine dans Gombaut, Maynard, & Malleville
En peut-on admirer deux ou trois entre mille.
Le reſte auſſi peu lû que ceux de Pelletier,
N'a fait de chez Sercy qu'un ſaut chez l'Epicier (17).

A faultleſs ſonnet is a perfect piece.
In vain a thouſand authors hunt this ground;
The happy Phenix yet is to be found.
In Gombaut, Maynard, Malleville, ... who you
pleaſe . . . .
Scarce two or three, amidſt a thouſand, pleaſe:
The reſt as little read as Pelletier,
From Serty make one leap to the Grocer.

Here follows the judgment of another critic, which I ſhall ſet down in M. Baillet's own words (18). ‘ M. Roſteau ſays *, that few poets have, in their ‘ latter days, applied themſelves to epigrams, which ‘ are commonly made up of ſuch turns and flaſhes of ‘ wit, as become rather a young man than a poet worn ‘ out, and far advanced in years. But he adds, that ‘ Mr Gombauld may be excuſed for having done it ‘ in the latter part of his life, becauſe moſt of his e‘pigrams are rather a cenſure upon the lives and cor‘rupt manners of his time, than gallant verſes made ‘ for the ladies.’ Mr Roſteau ſuppoſes what is very uncertain, that Gombauld's epigrams were the laſt work that he applied himſelf to. It is a very doubtful thing, to ſay no worſe; for, though they are the laſt book of poetry publiſhed by Gombauld (19), he might have compoſed them in his youth (20).

(*d*) Taken from the above-quoted preface.

(6) See the new letters againſt Maimbourg, pag. 762, 763, where the author quotes a very pretty paſſage out of the letters of the Chevalier d'Her * *.

(7) See citation (17), and Mr Menage's obſervations upon Malherbe's poems, wherein Gombauld is praiſed, and quoted in ſeveral places.

(8) See the article GUYET, remark [*B*].

(9) Preface to Gombauld's treatiſes and letters.

(10) Pag. 339, of the Paris Edit 1672, in 12mo.

(11) Marolles, Suite des Memoires, pag. 246.

(12) Id. ibid. pag. 242.

(13) It is the ſame piece, which Mr Pelliſſon calls *Cydippe.*

(14) Gueret, ubi ſupra, pag. 138, 139.

(15) Furetiere, Nouvelle Allegorique, pag. 56, 57. Paris, 1658, in 8vo.

(16) The abbot de Marolles, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 246.

(17) Boileau, Art. Poëtique, Canto ii, ver. 94.

(18) Baillet, Jugem. ſur les Poët. Tom. V, pag. 25, 26.

* Roſteau, Sentim. ſur quelques livres qu'il a lûs, pag. 74.

(19) This I ſay, not knowing exactly in what year the Danaides were publiſhed.

(20) I mean, that he began early to make ſome, to which he added others every year, as occaſion offered.

GONET (John Baptist), a Dominican frier, born at Beziers, was a doctor of the univerſity of Bourdeaux, where he taught divinity. He cauſed the famous Provincial Letters of Montalte (*a*) to be approved there, whereby he incurred the indignation and hatred of the Jeſuits. He publiſhed ſeveral works [*A*], wherein he ſhews, that

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral works.*] His theology, intituled, *Clypeus Doctrinæ Thomiſticæ,* was firſt printed at Bourdeaux, in ſixteen volumes in 12mo, in the year 1666, and then at Paris, in five volumes, in folio, in the year 1669. This laſt edition was enlarged with ſeveral prefaces and diſſertations, and is much more correct than the firſt. The Spaniards ſay it is too ſhort, and call it *a very pretty Compendium of Divi-*

(*a*) That is Mr Paſcal.

that he excelled in School-Divinity, and that he was but indifferently verſed in what we call Poſitive Theology. He retired to Beziers about the latter end of his life, and died there the twenty fourth of January, 1681 (*b*). Mr de Rocolles, who had praiſed him in one of his books (*c*), prefixed to a new edition a letter of thanks, which he had received from that frier, who aſſured him that he would return the compliment upon the firſt occaſion.

nity. He publiſhed, at Bourdeaux, in 1664, a little book, intitled, *Diſſertatio Theologica de probabilitate* (1). His *Manuale Thomiſtarum*, printed at Beziers, in 1680, in ſix volumes, in 12mo, is his laſt work. He left a courſe of philoſophy to be printed; but it is thought to be too prolix, and not ſuited to the genius of our age (2).

GONTAUT (ARMAND DE) baron de Biron (§ *a*), was made a marſhal of France in the year 1577. He had been great maſter of the ordonance from the fifth of November 1569; and, before that, he had gone through all the military offices (*a*). Of all the noble actions, that made him ſo illuſtrious, there is none, for which he deſerves ſo many praiſes, as his conſtant fidelity to king Henry III, who did not love him [*A*], and to Henry IV, who had openly ſeparated from the Romiſh communion. After the death of Henry III, none did ſo much contribute to ſecure the crown for Henry IV [*B*], and therefore he was very much lamented by that prince, when he was killed at the ſiege of a town in Champagne (*b*), before the League had been ſubdued. He diſſuaded the king

[(§ *a*) Mr Bayle might have added, that Biron, the father, followed the duke of Anjou into the Low-Countries; that he was at Antwerp, when that prince endeavoured to take the town, and that he was preſently ſuſpected to be one of the chief authors of the deſign; but that afterwards, after the retreat of the duke of Anjou, a letter from Biron to the duke, in which he diſſuaded and even deteſted the enterprize, being found in the cloaths of that duke, brought the citizens of Antwerp, from hating Biron, to eſteem and love him. This is what Busbequius tells us, in the nineteenth letter of his French Embaſſy. REM. CRIT.]

[*A*] *Henry III, who did not love him.*] He incurred his indignation (1) becauſe he oppoſed the peace that was made before Rochelle in the year 1573. Henry III, who was then but duke of Anjou, had beſieged that place ſeveral months, and found no better expedient to retire with honour, than to make a a treaty of peace; for the continuation of the ſiege was dangerous, and contrary both to the queen-mother's deſire to ſee again the duke of Anjou, and to the deſign he himſelf had to go and take poſſeſſion of the kingdom of Poland: and therefore his mother, and he, were very willing, that the beſieged ſhould be brought to an accommodation. ‘Biron did whatever he could to diſſuade the king and queen from hearkening to any compoſition, and engaged upon his life to take the town within a month, or five weeks at fartheſt, without loſing or venturing any thing but making a good blockade: but his advices and letters proved ineffectual at that time. . . . . When Biron ſaw, that he could not prevail with the king and queen, and the king of Poland, he took another courſe: He wrote to the cardinal of Lorrain, and to ſome of the chief members of the council, and deſired them to prevent the raiſing of the ſiege, and the making of a peace; aſſuring them that, if they would but let him act, the city of Rochelle would be more ſubject to the king in ſix weeks time, than ever it had been. The cardinal, who was a ſhuffling man, began to carry on ſecret practices, and to tamper with the council, in order to diſſuade the king and queen from ſuch a capitulation and peace. They importuned their majeſties, and particularly the queen, to ſuch a degree, that ſhe found no other way to put an end to their ſollicitations but to write to the king of Poland by the abbot de Gadagne, whom ſhe truſted entirely, and to inform him of the ſecret practices of Biron, adviſing him to talk big to him. The king of Poland, being informed of this, wrote ſome haughty and threatning letters to the cardinal, and other members of the council, who adviſed ſuch a thing. Thoſe letters, written with his own hand, were ſo ſevere, that they were all amazed at it, and proceeded no farther. As for Biron, one morning, as he attended the king in his wardrobe, where the council met that day, the king of Poland took him to taſk, and ſaid him as ſoon as he ſaw him, come hither, ſpark, I am informed of your doings: you take upon you to carry on ſecret practices againſt me, and to write to the court: I have almoſt a mind to run you through the body, and to kill you upon the ſpot; or rather to appoint ſome commiſſioners to enquire into your life, and examine what you have done againſt me, the king, and his dominions, in order to have your head cut off. How dare you oppoſe my will? I know who you are. Were it not for the king, and for me, you would be a very inconſiderable man. How come you to forget your ſelf? you ſet up for a pretending man. You will take Rochelle, ſay you, within a month or ſix weeks, and are reſolved to have the glory of it, to my prejudice. You have already too much expoſed my honour . . . . You made me ſtay five months here; and now that I may retire with honour, you oppoſe me; and you are for ſtaying longer, to triumph over me. I will teach you to ſet up for a great captain at my coſt (2).’ Biron excuſed himſelf in a ſubmiſſive manner (3), and ‘ever after the king of Poland carried himſelf very coldly towards him, even at his return from Poland (4).’ But ‘he gave him a kind reception (5)’ when Biron waited upon him in Auguſt, 1575, being ſent for by the queen-mother, at the requeſt of the duke of Guiſe, ‘who would have no other captain with him but Biron, and Strozza, to maul Thore (6), and all his reiſters.’ Biron behaved himſelf very well in that war; and though it has been ſaid, that he would have ſided with the league, if the thirty thouſand crowns that ‘were offered to him,’ had been put into his hands, it is more probable, that he rejected all thoſe propoſals (7). ‘However it be the king had no better and more faithful ſervant than he, during that war. . . . The duke of Guiſe being dead, he waited upon the king very ſeaſonably, who was very glad to ſee him. He aſſiſted his maſter in a very critical time; for the greateſt part of the kingdom was bent againſt him, by reaſon of the duke of Guiſe's murder (8).’

[*B*] *None did ſo much contribute to ſecure the crown for Henry IV.*] Let us hear Brantome again (9). ‘After the king's death, having had a long time a great intereſt with the ſoldiers, both French and foreigners, who all loved and reſpected him, he drew them over in ſuch a manner, that the king of Navarre ſucceeded the late king with an unanimous conſent, which was the nobleſt exploit that ever he did. . . . . So that every body believes, that the marſhal made him king, as he told him once in a reproachful manner: for the Catholics would have forſaken him, becauſe he was a Huguenot, and the Huguenots were not ſtrong enough to ſet him on the throne. But by the induſtry of the ſaid marſhal, they were brought to obey the new king, though a Huguenot, if not out of a good will, at leaſt to revenge the death of the late king, who had been unjuſtly murthered. But this was not all; for there was a neceſſity to maintain him, and to conquer the towns, wherein he was but

---

(*b*) Taken from a memoir, ſent from Paris.

(*c*) I think it was his Introduction to Hiſtory.

(1) The *Journal des Sçavans* of March 30, 1665, contains a very good extract of it.

(2) Taken from a memoir ſent from Paris.

(*a*) See the particulars of it in Brantome's *Memoirs, Tom. III, pag.* 326, *& ſeq.* Father Anſelme, whom Moreri tranſcribes, has only abridged Brantome.

(*b*) At Epernai, the 26th of July, 1592.

(1) Note, That Brantome had already ſaid, that this prince fell into a violent paſſion againſt Biron, and threatened him with his dagger, during the third civil-war, and before the battle of Moncontour. See, below, the remark [*D*].

(2) Brantome, Elog de Mareſchal de Biron, *in the third Tom of his Memoirs, pag.* 340.

(3) Id. ibid. pag. 344.

(4) Ib. pag 345.

(5) Ib. pag. 346.

(6) The ſon of the conſtable of Montmorency.

(7) Others, who are the wiſeſt, ſay, that he was at that entertainment, and heard their diſcourſes and deſigns, which he diſapproved. They grounded their deſigns upon religion, and were for extirpating hereſy; but he laughed at it. *Brantome, ibid. pag.* 353, 354.

(8) Ib. pag. 354.

(9) Ibid.

king from following the opinion of thoſe, who adviſed him to retire to a ſafe place by ſea [C]; and had he done nothing elſe, he would deſerve very great praiſes. He was a man of little religion; but he was rather a Proteſtant than a Catholic [D]. He was ſo much ſuſpected by the inquiſitors, that he was put in the liſt of thoſe that were to be maſſacred on St Bartholomew's day [E]; but as he lodged in the Baſtile, being great

' but half a king; which the marſhal did ſo effectually, that he helped him to recover ſome good and ſtrong towns, to win the battle of Yvry, and to get out of Arques and Dieppe, as I ſhall ſhew in the king's life. Afterwards, as he was taking a view of the town of Eſpernay, his head was ſhot off by a cannon-ball.' There was a blot in his fidelity to Henry IV; but it was of no long continuance. He looked upon himſelf as the moſt neceſſary man, and was really ſo after the death of Henry III, and ' thinking, that, in ſuch a confuſion, the kingdom would be torn to pieces, he came to fancy, that he might get one of them; and, entring into the cabinet, and hearing ſeveral people murmur, he took Sancy aſide, and told him, that he deſired to be made ſovereign of the county of Perigord, as a reward for his ſervices. Sancy, being unwilling to diſcourage him, went immediately to the king, and acquainted him with it. The king charged him to give Biron all the encouragement imaginable; and Sancy managed him with ſo much addreſs and dexterity, that, working upon his generoſity, he obliged him not only to deſiſt from his pretenſion, but alſo to proteſt never to ſuffer, that any part of the kingdom ſhould be diſmembered for any body whatſoever (10).'

[C] *He diſſuaded the king from following the advice of thoſe who perſuaded him to retire to a ſafe place by ſea.*] The duke of Mayenne, having obliged that prince to raiſe the ſiege of Rouen, and to retire towards Dieppe, endeavoured to follow him ſo cloſe, that he might have no way to eſcape but by ſea. The king's captains, ' and even the Proteſtants (11), ... knew not well how to get out of the danger they were in, and were very much concerned for the king's ſafety, on which the welfare of the kingdom depended: ſo that in a council held the fifth of September (12), moſt of them were of opinion, that he ſhould leave his troops intrenched in good poſts, ... and take ſhipping immediately, in order to retire into England, or to Rochelle, leſt he ſhould be inveſted both by ſea and land. . . . . Their opinion was ſupported by ſo many ſtrong reaſons, that the king himſelf began to waver, when marſhal de Biron, who had heard this diſcourſe with contempt, being ſorry that it made a greater impreſſion, than it ſhould have done, ſpoke with an angry tone, and told the king, *&c.*' I do not ſet down his ſpeech, which may be found in Mezerai: It is ſo well turned, and ſo full of ſtrong arguments, that it is no wonder it had the deſired effect. Henry IV, having heard it, reſolved to hold out in his poſt. He was attacked in it, and the enemies were gloriouſly repulſed. Biron was in the right to ſay, ' that as things ſtood then, to go out of France, only for twenty four hours, was to leave it for ever.' A prince muſt not expect to ſucceed in ſuch a concurrence, if he tells his generals, ' take care of my crown, and I will take care of my ſelf.'

[D] *He was rather a Proteſtant than a Catholic.*] His being ſuſpected of being a Proteſtant was the reaſon why he was not made a knight of the order, in the beginning of the civil-wars. ' It is to be obſerved, ſays Brantome (13), that the chief reaſon why that honour was not conferred upon him, and why they made no great account of him, was, that he was looked upon as a great Huguenot: nay, it was ſaid at court, that he had got two of his children baptized by Proteſtant miniſters, which was then abhorred by the great captains, ſuch as the king of Navarre, meſſieurs de Guiſe, the conſtable, and the marſhal de Saint Andre, and by every body. For this reaſon Biron was looked upon with an evil eye; ſo that he reſolved to quit the court, and to retire to his houſe.' He would have done it, had not du Perron, afterwards marſhal de Rets, ſpoke for him to the queen. They made him ſtay and he went to the army without any employment; but, they having quickly diſcovered his merit, he was made an aſſiſtant to the great marſhals de camp. ' The duke of Guiſe began to like him, though he dropt now and then ſome words that ſavoured of a Huguenot. He had much ado to forbear it; but he took care not to diſcover openly his affection to that party. He acquired at laſt ſo great a capacity in his poſt, that there was a neceſſity to make uſe of him (14).' He was twice unfortunate in the third civil-war, and very much blamed by the king's brother, who was the general; ' and it was ſaid in the army, (they are Brantome's words) (15), that he had threatened to run him through with his dagger. Biron was obliged to excuſe himſelf as modeſtly as he could; for if he had raiſed his voice never ſo little, the king's brother would have run him through, ſo great was his paſſion againſt him. He reproached him with being a Huguenot, and a favourer of that party; and told him, that he had been wanting to his duty, on purpoſe to bring a diſreputation upon him, and to have him and his whole army deſtroyed. Tavannes, who was a very haughty man, ſpoke alſo to him, and told him, that he was a pretending man, who would meddle with every thing, and a Huguenot; and that he ſeldom went to maſs and when he did, it was only for a ſhew. Biron was upbraided with all theſe things in council, and obliged to buckle to, and hold his tongue.' After the Paris maſſacre, the king ſent him into Xaintonge (16), to bring Rochelle to his obediece either willingly or by force. The town was beſieged. Biron was (17) ' unfortunate in that ſiege; for, though he performed the duty of a great captain, and of an excellent maſter of the artillery, and received a muſket ſhot, yet the greateſt part of the beſiegers were of opinion, that he kept correſpondence with the beſieged, and that he, and his creatures, acquainted them with every thing that paſſed out of the town. This is a great miſtake; for, if he had taken that town, he would have been made governor of it, and put in poſſeſſion of the moſt important place of France. He was an ambitious man; and therefore I leave you to judge whether he would have miſſed the opportunity of taking ſuch a town. Beſides, it is certain, that, if his advice and that of Strozza, had been followed, that town would have been taken gradually, as we have done at laſt (18).' He was, doubtleſs, ſuſpected of keeping intelligence with the Rochellers, becauſe they looked upon him as a Huguenot; and therefore I have added this paſſage of Brantome to thoſe, which you have ſeen before. I ſhall confirm all thoſe paſſages by theſe words of Mezerai taken from the elogy of our Biron (19). ' As for his religion, he was a little inclined to the new reformation. A tutor, whom he had in his younger years, imbued him with thoſe principles; and his wife, who made an open profeſſion of the Proteſtant religion, kept him up in thoſe opinions (20): ſo that he favoured the Proteſtants underhand, except when the king's ſervice required the contrary; and, his heart ſpeaking through his mouth, he often dropt ſome ſatirical jeſts againſt the ceremonies of the church of Rome: which made ſeveral people ſuſpect, that he kept off the king's converſion; for the king, by reaſon of the great ſervices he had done him, after the death of Henry III, relied entirely on him, and was wholly directed by his counſels, though ſometimes he was offended at his haughtineſs.'

[E] *He was put in the liſt of thoſe, that were to be maſſacred on St Bartholomew's day.*] Biron had been made uſe of, to bring the queen of Navarre to the court of France, with the prince her ſon, who was to be married to Charles the ninth's ſiſter. Biron brought that prince, ' attended with the flower of the Huguenots, who, thinking to domineer and govern the world, met there with a tragical end. Thoſe, who eſcaped, blamed Biron, and laid the whole fault on him, ſaying, that he had wheedled and amuſed them, to bring them to the ſlaughter . . . But, notwithſtanding all thoſe ſuſpicions and calumnies, it is certain, that he was in great trouble, during that maſſacre; and it was well for him, that he

had

---

(10) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom III, pag. 829.

(11) Mezerai, ibid. pag. 842.

(12) 1589.

(13) Brantome, ubi ſupra, pag. 328.

(14) Ib. pag. 330.

(15) Ibid. pag. 332.

(16) *Biron was governor of it, and of the country of Aunix.*

(17) Brant ubi ſupra, pag. 328.

(18) *Add to the misfortunes, to be had in that ſiege, the ſevere reprimand, which he received from the king of Poland, above, in remark* [*A*], *citat.* (2).

(19) Mezerai, Hiſtoire de France, Tom. III, pag. 1026.

(20) *I wonder he ſaid nothing of his mother, who, according to Thuanus ſheltered the Reformed.* Denique in Aginnenſi agro apud Annam Bonvalliam, Armani Bironi famoſi illius ducis matrem, toto eo tempore tutus receptus fuit. *Thuan. lib. xxxiii, pag. 671, ad ann. 1562.*

great maſter of the ordonance, he knew how to defeat the ill deſigns of the murderers. The reaſon, why he was ſuſpected to favour the Huguenots, is very glorious to him [*F*]. There never was a man of his quality, who had a more univerſal knowledge [*G*]. He was well qualified, not only for all ſorts of military offices, but alſo for negotiation. He loved books, and the converſation of learned men; and uſed to write down in his table-book whatever he thought worthy the taking notice of. He was too paſſionate, and too much given to drinking [*H*]. He had another fault greater than thoſe two, and which often proves very prejudicial to princes; for he neglected the opportunities to give the enemy a deciſive blow [*I*]. He was afraid, that the war would be too ſoon ended, and that the court would ſend him home without any employment. It is ſaid, that, after he had laughed at the predictions of thoſe who calculate nativities, a thing, with which the court of France was then infatuated, he became ſo credulous, as to believe, what thoſe men told him, concerning the kind of death

had a great deal of courage and bravery; for he immediately retired into his arſenal, and planted ſeveral guns at the gate and other avenues, and was ready to make a brave defence: ſo that, ſome troops of Pariſians, who never had any thing to do with ſuch a warlike man, coming near the gate, he ſpoke to them boldly, and threatened to fire at them, if they did not retire. They immediately went away, and durſt no more come near him, nor do any thing againſt him. He was certainly put in the black liſt, as well as the reſt; and he told me ſo himſelf, at his return from Brouage; for he was my friend, and related to me, and we had a long talk about the maſſacre. It was ſaid, that Tavannes, and the count de Rets, who did not love him, had him put in the liſt of thoſe, that were to be maſſacred (21).' Mezerai informs us, that Biron ſheltered ſome of his friends in the Baſtile. Theſe are his words (22): 'The Montmorency's, Coſſé, and Biron, had been put in the liſt; but the abſence of the marſhal de Montmorency, who was at Chantilly, ſaved the life of his three brothers. The intreaties of the fair Chateau-neuf, miſtreſs to the king's brother, ſaved Coſſé, who was her relation; and Biron, great maſter of the artillery, having planted ſome culverins over the gate of the arſenal, ſtopt the fury of the murderers, and ſheltered ſome of his friends; amongſt others James, ſecond ſon of the lord de la Force, who being then but 10 or 12 years of age, had cunningly hid himſelf betwixt the bodies of his father and his eldeſt brother, who had been killed in bed, where they three lay.'

[*F*] *The reaſon, why he was ſuſpected to favour the Huguenots, is very glorious to him.*] I ſhall uſe the words of one of our beſt hiſtorians (23). 'Biron ſeemed to have been inclined to the new opinions, ever ſince he had been in eſteem with the late king of Navarre. Nevertheleſs he ſhewed himſelf a good Catholic all the reſt of his life; and whenever the war broke out againſt the Huguenots, he behaved himſelf with as much courage and fidelity as any body elſe. But the reaſon why they thought he did not hate the Huguenots, was becauſe he could not approve, that they ſhould break the faith that was given them; and becauſe, when the laſt Edict of Pacification was patched up, he gave the queen to underſtand at ſeveral times, that it had been more becoming the king's majeſty to carry things to the laſt extremity (24), than to make a treaty, which he knew was not to be obſerved. For this reaſon, and becauſe he was a man of a ſincere probity, the queen-mother, and the Guiſes, put him in the black liſt: at leaſt he believed it, and always kept a lively remembrance of it.'

[*G*] *There never was a man of his quality who had a more univerſal knowledge.*] 'He had an univerſal knowledge of the art of war, and of ſtate-affairs: he underſtood and managed them as well as any lord in France; and therefore the queen-mother, upon any important occaſion, never failed to ſend for him, whether he was at home, or elſewhere, and intirely depended upon him. He himſelf uſed to ſay, in a drolling way, that he was a clever fellow, conſulted upon all occaſions. He ſaid nothing but what was true; and the queen and he agreed very well in all things relating to war or peace. He had been a great lover of books, and continued to love them ever ſince his younger years. He was very curious and inquiſitive, and had always a table-book about him, in which he writ down whatever he ſaw, or heard, that deſerved to be taken notice of: which occaſioned a kind of a proverb at court; for when any body ſaid any thing, he was told, you ha e found that in Biron's table-book. Nay, king Henry's jeſter would ſometimes ſwear by the divine table-book of Biron . . . . . And I have ſeen ſeveral people wonder, that, tho' he had never been employed in great affairs with any foreign ſtate, or ſent upon an embaſſy, as Lanſac, Rambouillet, the marſhal de Rets, and others, had been; yet he knew more than they, and might have taught them many things relating both to foreign and domeſtic affairs (25).' Let us add to this paſſage ſome lines out of the encomium, which Mezerai beſtows upon him. 'He had a quick and penetrating wit, a ready Elocution, a perſuaſive diſcourſe, and a noble and warlike ſoul. He was quick, laborious, and bold, deſirous to learn, very exact, and no leſs ſkilled in the intrigues of the court and among the ladies, than brave and valiant in war . . . . . He gloried in having an univerſal knowledge, and to underſtand negotiations as well as the art of war. He meddled with every thing, and kept himſelf buſy, when they gave him nothing to do. He pretended to be a perfect maſter of geography and hiſtory, and delineated plans and maps with his own hand; ſaying, that it was one of the things that belong to a great captain, to ſhew upon paper what he can do in the field (26).

[*H*] *He was too much given to drinking.*] Mezerai ſays only (27), 'that he loved jeſting and good chear; that he ſlept but little; and ſate a long time at table, drinking till he was merry.' But there is a repartee, aſcribed to Henry IV, which carries the thing further. 'One day the duke of Savoy was praiſing the noble actions and great ſervices, which the two Birons, father and ſon, had done him. The king anſwered, that, indeed, they had ſerved him well; but that he had much ado to moderate the drunkenneſs of the father, and to reſtrain the mad fits of the ſon (28)'

[*I*] *He neglected . . . . to give the enemy a deciſive blow*] Brantome relates (29), that it was ſaid, that, if Biron 'had been willing to puſh on,' he would have done more miſchief to the king of Navarre. This belongs to the time, when Biron commanded in Guienne under Henry III. Upon another occaſion, that is, when the duke of Parma was at Caudebec, Biron reproved his ſon for repreſenting to the king, that, if his majeſty would give him four thouſand arquebuſiers, and two thouſand horſe, he would hinder the enemy from paſſing 'Hereupon (they are Brantome's words) the marſhal gave a ſevere reprimand to his ſon in the king's preſence, and told him, that he was a fine ſpark to do ſuch a thing, and found ſo many difficulties in it, that the deſign was broke off. Afterwards he told his ſon in the evening, that he knew very well he would have ſucceeded, or have been killed in it; but that ſuch an enemy of the French nation muſt not be routed all at once. For, ſaid he, when they are overcome and undone, kings make no account of their captains and military men; and therefore the war ought to be kept up, and cultivated like a piece of ground; otherwiſe thoſe who have ploughed it will ſtarve, if they let it lie waſte (30).' Mezerai expreſſes this in a ſtile more nervous and polite. 'Marſhal Biron was looked upon as a man, who raiſed factions, to ſhew his ability,

(21) Brantome, ubi ſupra, pag. 335.

(22) Mezerai, Abreg. Chronol. Tom. V, pag. 157, 158.

(23) Id. Hiſt. de France, Tom. II, pag. 267, ad ann. 1572.

(24) *Some wonder, that none of the miniſters of ſtate of Lewis XIV durſt tell him the ſame thing, when he went about to publiſh ſo many arrêts againſt the Proteſtants. They were obliged at laſt to come to open force. To what purpoſe then ſo many lawchicanes. See the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, Novemb. 1685, pag. 1263, *about the method of perſecuting, which Mary queen of England made uſe of.*

(25) Brantome, ubi ſupra, pag. 356.

(26) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. III, pag. 1026.

(27) Id. ibid.

(28) Perefixe, Hiſt. de Henri le Grand, ad ann. 160[illegible], pag. m. 320.

(29) Ubi ſupra, pag. 3[illegible]0.

(30) Ibid. pag. 368.

death with which they threatened him [*K*]. Notwithſtanding his fatigues, his wounds, and his great age, he was ſtill a very vigorous man; and we are told a remarkable thing of the ſtrength of his ſtomach [*L*]. He left many children; the eldeſt of which ſhall be the ſubject of the following article.

‘to keep up his intereſt, and to prolong the war; not out of a deſire of plunder, but to have the whole diſpoſal and managment of affairs (31).’ A like ambition does ſometimes prevail among divines. See (32) how theſe maxims of marſhal de Biron have been applied to a certain divine.

[*K*] *He became ſo credulous as to believe the kind of death, which the* Calculators of Nativities *threatened him with.*] The following paſſage is to be found in the large hiſtory of Mezerai. ‘A certain perſon, who was very well acquainted with Biron, told me a remarkable thing of him. That marſhal had all along laughed at the predictions of the aſtrologers, whom the great curioſity of queen Catherine de Medicis had brought in great requeſt at court; but, ſome time before he died, ſome of thoſe predictions having had their accompliſhment, he gave as much credit to them, and became as ſuperſtitious in that reſpect, as he had been incredulous before, ſo far as conſult the fortune-tellers. One of thoſe men having foretold him, half a year before that ſiege, that he ſhould be killed by a cannon-ball, it made ſuch an impreſſion upon him, that he confeſſed to his friends, whenever he heard a gun go off, he could not forbear trembling for fear, and bending his head. At that time (33), hearing a bullet whiſtle, he ſtept aſide to avoid it; but it fell out unluckily that he went to meet it, and ſo he fulfilled a prediction, which perhaps had not come to paſs, if he had laughed at it (34).’ This hiſtorian is more exact, than I thought, in relating ſuch things.

[*L*] *They tell a remarkable thing of the ſtrength of his ſtomach.*] ‘Let us hear Mezerai once more (35). ‘He had been in many ſieges and bloody actions, and commanded as general in ſeven battles, wherein he received as many wounds: and though he was broken with fatigue and wounds, and above ſixty eight years old (36), yet he enjoyed ſuch a vigorous health, that the chirurgeons, who opened his body, to embalm it, found no meat in his ſtomach, though he had been killed but an hour after ſupper; which ſhews, that he had a great deal of natural heat, ſince the digeſtion was ſo quickly made (37).

GONTAUT (CHARLES DE) duke of Biron, the ſon of the foregoing, was one of the greateſt captains of his time; but he had the fault to ſpeak of his own exploits with an intolerable pride. He learned the art of war early, under marſhal de Biron his father, who omitted nothing to raiſe him, or make him appear worthy of preferment [*A*]. He was made admiral of France in the year 1592, and, having reſigned that office in 1594, he was made marſhal of France, and governor of Burgundy. The king erected the barony of Biron into a duchy and peerdom in the year 1598, and immediately ſent the new duke to Bruſſels upon a magnificent embaſſy, to make the archduke ſwear to the peace of Vervins. He was ſent into Swiſſerland in January 1602 [*B*], to renew the alliance with the cantons. He had been in England the year before, to compliment queen Elizabeth in the king's name; and he received extraordinary honours from that great queen. What ſhe did upon this occaſion has not been faithfully related [*C*]. Every body knows the tragical end of the marſhal and duke of Biron. He

[*A*] *His father omitted nothing to raiſe him, or to make him appear worthy of preferment.*] In 1580 (1), he broke his thigh in two places by a fall from his horſe, whereby he was lame; ſo that he was obliged to leave the conduct of his army to others: and, to prevent jealouſy, he deſired thoſe, who had a right to command, to chooſe their leader. They choſe his ſon, who was but fifteen years of age (2). Other hiſtorians (3) affirm, that this ſon of his ‘was colonel of the Swiſs in Flanders at 14 years of age, and ſoon after marſhal de camp, and then marſhal-general.’ But this cannot be reconciled with what is ſaid by others, that his father, after the death of his eldeſt ſon, ‘had him called baron de Biron, and brought him to court, where he quickly had a quarrel with Carency, eldeſt ſon of the count de la Vauguyon, which ended in a combat of three againſt three, in the year 1585. Biron, Loignac, and Janiſſac, on the one ſide, killed Carency, d'Eſtiſſac, and la Baſtie ..... The duke of Eſpernon obtained his pardon (4). He carried him to Pau, when he went to the king of Navarre (5). Afterwards, the father of young Biron was lieutenant-general in the army of Poictou, at the ſiege of Marans, and gave him the command of his houſehold, and of his company of Gens d'Armes; and from that time he became extreamly imperious and free in his words (6).’ Note, that, according to Victor Cayet, he was ſixteen years of age, when marſhal de Biron, his father, took him from his tutor (7). Note alſo, that this marſhal loſt a ſon in the year 1583, at the Antwerp maſſacre. It was, without doubt, his eldeſt ſon, ſince he had already ſome children (8); and the duke of Biron was not yet forty years old (9) when he was beheaded in 1602. Tis very likely, that Dupleix and Peter Matthieu aſcribe to Charles de Gontaut what belongs to his brother.

What follows will afford me a better proof. Mareſchal de Biron, finding himſelf inveſted with great authority, after the death of Henry III, ‘made it his chief buſineſs to raiſe his ſon, who was a young man without experience: in order to it, he picked a quarrel with Dampierre, mareſchal de camp, made him quit his poſt, and procured it for his ſon, who enjoyed it in the quality of mareſchal de camp general: and, becauſe the young man knew not how to diſcharge the duties of that poſt, his father laboured for him day and night, and gave him all the glory of it; which brought the ſaid baron into ſuch a credit and reputation in the army, that the mareſchal his father having been killed with a cannon-ball at the ſiege of Epernai, the king made him admiral. When Mr de Villars came into the king's ſervice, he reſigned his place of admiral, and was made mareſchal of France (10).’ I ſhall conclude this remark with a paſſage of Mezerai (11). ‘The Catholics were not ſo ſorry for the death of mareſchal de Biron, as the king was, who expreſſed more grief for it, than for any other loſs, that he had ſuſtained; and his grief would have laſted longer, had he not believed, that the baron his ſon, being bred up by him, would be able to do him as great ſervices; ſo much the more, becauſe he had all the experience of his father; but he had not yet his cunning and his ill maxims.’

[*B*] *He was ſent into Swiſſerland ..... in* 1602.] De Vic and Silleri had much ado to renew the alliance; and, when they thought they had overcome all obſtacles, they perceived, that *all was ſpoiled by the emiſſaries of Spain and Savoy:* but mareſchal de Biron, who arrived at Soleurre, ‘with a great retinue and a magnificent equipage, brought the treaty to a happy concluſion. His ſumptuoſity, his martial diſcourſe, and the glory of his noble exploits, which the Swiſs had been often witneſſes of, made no ſmall impreſſion upon ſuch a warlike people; and the great ſums that came after him made an end of the work ..... That ſolemnity was concluded with a noble entertainment, wherein he preached up the king's grandeur, and the power of France. This was not the leaſt of his ſervices (12).’

[*C*] *What queen Elizabeth did upon this occaſion has not been faithfully related.*] A great many hiſtorians ſay, that queen Elizabeth affected to ſhew him the head

---

(31) Mezerai, ubi ſupra. *See alſo Davila*, lib. xiii, pag. m. 806.

(32) *In the* Entretiens ſur la Cabale chimerique, pag 191.

(33) That is, when he was killed by a cannon ball at the ſiege of Epernai.

(34) Mezerai, Tom. III, pag. 1024.

(35) Ibid.

(36) Davila, *ubi ſupra*, ſays, that he was juſt entering upon his ſixty fifth year. D'Aubigné, *Tom. III, pag.* 358, makes him ſixty five years old.

(37) Dupleix, *Hiſt. de Henry IV, pag.* 93, ſays, that it was an hour after he had got a good dinner, and that he was fifty eight years of age.

(1) He was leading his army towards L'Iſle en Jourdain, four leagues from Toulouſe. *Dupleix, Hiſt. de Hen. III, pag.* 82.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Pierre Matthieu, Hiſt. de la Paix, livr. v, pag. 218.

(4) Cayet, Chronol. Septenaire, fol. 319, verſo.

(5) Ibid. fol. 320, verſo.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ib. fol. 319.

(8) *Father* Anſelme, pag. 197.

(9) Matthieu, Hiſt. de la Paix, lib. v, pag. m. 218.

(10) Diſcours Hiſtorique de la Fortune & Diſgrace des Favoris, depuis François I, juſques à Louis XIII, *inſerted in Le Laboureur's Additions to Caſtelnau's Memoirs, Tom. II. pag.* 134. *It has been ſince reprinted by itſelf with this title*, Memoires de Mr de Beauvais Nangis.

(11) Hiſt. de France, Tom. III, pag. 1026.

(12) Mezerai, Abiégé, Chronolog. Tom. VI, pag. 257, ad ann. 1602.

He was beheaded the thirty firſt of July, 1602, for joining with the duke of Savoy in a horrid conſpiracy againſt the ſtate [*D*]. He behaved like a madman upon the ſcaffold [*E*]. He was not yet forty years of age (*a*). He was a man of a boundleſs ambition; and, tho' he had no religion [*F*], he appeared ſuperſtitious, in order to re-

vive

head of the earl of Eſſex, to have an opportunity to tell him by what motive ſhe had been induced to puniſh ſo ſeverely the rebellion of that ungrateful man. They add, that ſhe told him, the king of France would do well to puniſh traitors in the ſame manner (13). Some ſay, that ſhe ſhewed him the earl's head from the windows of her palace; others will have it, that ſhe did it, going over London-bridge. But this cannot be true, ſince the queen was at a country-houſe all the time mareſchal de Biron was in England. Dupleix (14) made uſe of this obſervation to confute what has been ſaid by ſo many other hiſtorians; and Leti has done it likewiſe (15): but he is miſtaken, when he ſays, that Henry IV did not ſend Biron to London, till after his return to Paris (16); for he ſent him thither from Calais.

I do not pretend to deny, that the queen diſcourſed in ſuch a manner about the earl of Eſſex; but, inſtead of ſaying that ſhe did it, ſhewing the earl's head to the duke of Biron, thoſe hiſtorians ſhould have ſaid, as le Grain does (17), that ſhe ſpoke thoſe words in her cloſet, ſhewing him the picture of that lord. It is a ſhameful thing, that the French relations, and even thoſe that were written by the beſt hiſtorians of thoſe times, ſhould be ſtuffed with ſo many fables. Camden has all the reaſon in the world to laugh at them for ſaying, that the queen ſhewed the head of the earl of Eſſex to the mareſchal de Biron; for it was buried with the body. *Quod quidam Gallici ſcriptores prodiderunt eam cranium Eſſexii inter plura damnatorum, in intimo Larario, vel (ut alii ſcribunt) palo affixum, Bironio & Gallis oſtentaſſe, ridicule vanum eſt. Illud enim una cum corpore conſepultum* (18). He ſays the queen was then at a country-houſe, which he calls Baſingum. Baſſompierre (19), who accompanied mareſchal de Biron, calls it Baſing; correct therefore Dupleix, who calls it Vignes. He has committed many other faults, for which Baſſompierre takes him up. Here is one of them. The queen *gave the French a royal entertainment, played upon the ſpinnet in their preſence, and ſung along with it.* Baſſompierre refutes this in theſe words (20): ‘She gave no royal entertainment to the French; only ſhe defrayed the expences of mareſchal de Biron and his company, all the time he was at Laning (21); and one day, mareſchal de Biron being at Baſing, my lord Corbain brought him, with four or five of us, into her chamber through a back-door, to ſurpriſe her when ſhe was ſinging.’

[*D*] *He was beheaded for joining with the duke of Savoy in a horrid conſpiracy againſt the ſtate.*] This was none of thoſe petty conſpiracies deſigned only to keep a king buſy, that he may not diſturb his neighbours. It is affirmed, that the duke of Savoy and Biron had agreed ‘to diſmember the kingdom, to erect as many ſovereignties in it, as there were provinces, and to put all thoſe petty princes under the protection of Spain. The duke of Savoy was to have for his ſhare the Lyonnois, Dauphiné, and Provence, and Biron the duchy of Burgundy, to which the Spaniards were to add Franche Comtê, as a portion for a daughter of their king, or for a daughter of the duke of Savoy, whom they promiſed to marry to him (22).’ I ſhall take occaſion from hence to obſerve a great difference between the paſſions of ſovereign princes and thoſe of private men. Any gentleman would certainly take it as a great affront, if one of his neighbours ſhould offer to corrupt his ſervants, and engage them to betray their maſter. He would quickly ſend him a challenge, or at leaſt ſeek an opportunity to end the difference ſword in hand. But princes are contented to puniſh the traitors, and continue to keep correſpondence with the ſeducer. Henry IV bore very patiently this hoſtility of the duke of Savoy; no rupture enſued upon it, and they remained, in all outward appearance, as good friends as they were before. See hereafter (23) a paſſage of Brantôme concerning the quarrels of great men (24).

[*E*] *He behaved like a madman upon the ſcaffold.*] All the hiſtorians of that time tell us at large what he did and what he ſaid, during his trial, till he was executed. I ſhall only ſet down what I find in a letter of Mr Gillot to Scaliger (25). ‘You have heard of the mareſchal's death, who has been executed in the court of the Baſtille, by the king's favour, and not in the Greve. He has all along refuſed to diſcover his accomplices, and has ſaid nothing but what is in his proceſs. He is dead, very ill affected to the king and his country; which he ſhewed, by praying to GOD, that he would have mercy upon his ſoul, and the king's: and then he ſaid, quick, quick, make haſte, and would not ſuffer himſelf to be bound, ſwearing, that he would ſtrangle the executioner with his teeth. The executioner did not come near him: he himſelf tied his handkerchief about his head, and then untied it, ſwearing moſt horribly, that they ſhould take care not to put him into a fury, and that he would ſpoil one half of thoſe that were there; and deſiring the muſqueteers, that were in the court, to ſhoot him. Is there no honeſt fellow among you, ſaid he, that will ſhoot mareſchal de Biron, that he may not die by the hands of theſe raſcals? He complained to the chancellor himſelf of the ſeverity of that ſentence. You may well believe, that his death was neceſſary to France. I can aſſure you, that he is dead, like the man ſpoken of by an Italian poet:

Biaſtemando ſe ne fuge l'alma con grand cordoglio,
Come nel mondo viſſe pieno d'ira & d'orgoglio.

The ſoul, where rage and madneſs wont to dwell,
Furious, breaks looſe, and ſeeks the ſhades of hell.

Theſe two verſes are very like thoſe, that are to be found at the end of *Orlando furioſo*:

Beſtemmiando fuggi l'alma ſdegnoſa,
Che fu ſi altera al mondo, e ſi orgoglioſa (26).

See the proud ſoul, which boil'd with vengeful ire,
Indignant quit the limbs, and to the ſhades retire.

When he was told, that he could expect no pardon, he did ſo furiouſly inveigh againſt the king, that the hiſtorians durſt not mention the words that he made uſe of. ‘The duke of Biron . . . . . having given up himſelf to grief and fury, ſpoke firſt, and ſaid whatever a man, overcome with grief, can utter, telling the chancellor in a reproachful manner, that he had been all along more inclined to condemn him, than to ſave him: and, upon this occaſion, he added ſome words, the memory whereof is forbidden, and which cannot be mentioned with impunity. But princes are little concerned for the ſatirical ſtrokes of their ſubjects, who ſeldom fail to ſuffer for it (27).’

[*F*] *Though he had no religion.*] I will quote hereupon this paſſage of Victor Cayet (28). ‘He often laughed at all religion. One day, the baron de Lux, his truſty friend, told him, that a capuchin, attending his uncle, archbiſhop of Paris, when he was dying, had made uſe of theſe words: When GOD ſees, that a ſinner will not repent, and rejects his grace, he brings him into proſperity; every thing falls out according to his wiſhes; he fills him with the joys of this world. To which the mareſchal anſwered, I ſhould be glad to be thus forſaken. There are a great many ſuch ſayings related of him, which ſhews that he had little religion; but I omit them, not to caſt a blot upon his memory.’ This hiſtorian had ſaid a thing in the foregoing page, which deſerves ſo much the more to be mentioned in this place, becauſe we learn from it, that Biron was brought up in the reformed religion. The paſſage runs thus: ‘He often laughed at the maſs, and at thoſe of the pretended reformed religion, with whom he had been bred up from his younger years. For when he was eight years of age, Madam de Briſambourg (29), his aunt by the father's ſide, who was of the pretended reformed religion, conceived ſuch an affection for him, by reaſon of his briſkneſs and pleaſant humour, that ſhe begged him of his mother, who granted her requeſt, for they were both of the ſaid

---

(*a*) Matthieu, Hiſt. de la Paix, lib. iv, pag. 218.

(13) Peter Matthieu, Gayet, &c. *Mezerai*, Abrégé Chronolog. Tom. VI, pag. 240, *ſays, that ſhe ſhewed him deſignedly the head of the earl of Eſſex. Thuanus*, lib. cxxvi, pag. 943, *ſays, that ſhe ſpoke thoſe words, as they were looking upon the heads, ſet upon the Tower of London.*

(14) Hiſt. de Henry IV, pag. 300.

(15) Hiſtoire d'Elizabeth, Tom. II, pag. 495.

(16) Ibid. pag. 485.

(17) Le Grain, Decade de Henri le Grand, pag. m. 782.

(18) Camb. Hiſt. Eliz. Part. IV, pag. m. 820, ad ann. 1601.

(19) Baſſompierre, Obſervat. ſur Dupleix, pag. 82.

(20) Id. ibid. pag. 83.

(21) A houſe near Baſing.

(22) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 237.

(23) In the remark [*I*] of the article POITIERS.

(24) It is to be found in the 329th page of the ſecond Tome of his *Dames Galantes*.

(25) Epitres Françoiſes à Scaliger, pag. 248.

(26) *Compare with this the words of Virgil:* Illi ſolvuntur frigore membra, Vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata ſub umbras. *The hero with a groan expir'd, His ſoul, indignant, to the ſhades retir'd.* Æneid. lib. ult. ver. 951.

(27) Matthieu, ibid. lib. v, pag. 340.

(28) Chronologie Septenaire, fol. 319.

(29) Briſambourg is near St John d'Angely.

vive the league [*G*]. He did not forget what his father told him, that a general ought to keep up the war as long as he can, becauſe in time of peace he is no neceſſary man, and muſt live in his country-houſe (*b*). This was the reaſon why he did not give the neceſſary orders, during the ſiege of Amiens, to hinder the arch-duke from throwing ſuccours into that place. He would not have been ſorry it had been relieved, becauſe it would have retarded the peace. He could hardly bear, that Henry IV ſhould have a ſhare in the glory of good ſucceſs; and he threatened the hiſtorians who did not indulge his vanity [*H*]. I can ſcarce believe what is ſaid of his learning [*I*]. What is reported of

‘ religion. His mother gave him willingly to his ‘ aunt, to have him brought up in that religion, ‘ which was done accordingly: and from that time his ‘ aunt Briſambourg made him her only heir. She ‘ had a vaſt eſtate; for ſhe had been married thrice, ‘ and had no children by any of her husbands; and ‘ they left her great jointures and legacies, which ‘ were all adjuged to her, ſo far as to diſpoſe of ‘ them as ſhe ſhould think fit.’ Camden ſays, that mareſchal de Biron laughed at the earl of Eſſex for ſuffering death with a Chriſtian diſpoſition: as if ſuch a reſignation became only a parſon, and not a ſoldier (30).

[*G*] *He appeared ſuperſtitious* (§ α), *in order to revive the league.*] Mezerai obſerves (31), ‘ that, ‘ after the loſs of Dourlens and Cambray, the nobility ‘ and the army looked upon him as the only deliverer ‘ of the ſtate. At his return from the ſiege of Amiens, he grew fond of the love of the inhabitants of ‘ Paris; and, when he went into Flanders, to make ‘ the arch-duke ſwear to the peace, the Spaniards, ‘ knowing his vanity and ill diſpoſition, beſtowed ſuch ‘ great encomiums upon him, that they filled his head ‘ with wind, and his mind with ill deſigns. From ‘ that time, and even before, he endeavoured to ingratiate himſelf with the people, and affected to appear zealous for the Catholic religion, ſo far as to ‘ uſe beads, and to be admitted into fraternities, as if ‘ he had deſigned to revive the league, which he had ‘ deſtroyed with the ſword.’ He had not forgot how far the city of Paris had ſupported the duke of Guiſe in his ambition; and he was not ignorant, that the chief reaſon of their great fondneſs for that duke, was, becauſe he made it his buſineſs to extirpate the Proteſtants. He thought therefore, that there was a neceſſity for him to make a ſhew of bigotry, in order to ſtrengthen the impreſſions his valour had made upon the inhabitants of that populous city. It was with this proſpect that he affected to hate the Huguenots. Here is the ſequel of the paſſage which I have quoted out of Mr Gillot's letter (32). ‘ I muſt tell you, that ‘ his whole conduct ſavoured of the ſpirit of the ‘ league. He had promiſed and ſworn not to ſpeak ‘ with any Huguenot, and to ſhun their converſation; ‘ and that he might keep his oath, he would not ſee his ‘ mother, when he went into his province; and he ‘ turned out his old ſervants, and thoſe of his father, ‘ *Sacramento illo obligatus*, (*to keep his oath*), to the ‘ count de Fuentes.’

[(§ α) The facetious narrative concerning Monſieur Saint Biron. B. ii. ch. 8. of the *Confeſſion of Sancy*, might have been brought in here. Rem. Crit.]

[*H*] *He could ſcarce ſuffer that Henry IV ſhould have a ſhare in the glory of good ſucceſs, and he threatened the hiſtorians who did not flatter his vanity.*] The king and the mareſchal were jealous of one another. The king was not always willing to acknowledge, that the mareſchal deſerved the glory, which he aſcribed to himſelf, and ſpoke freely about it to the duke of Savoy (33), who, through a very malicious craft, put him upon that ſubject, to report ſome things to the mareſchal that might exaſperate him (34). When the mareſchal was told of them, *he uttered the moſt abuſive words, that his reſentment would afford him, againſt the reſpect he owed to the king . . . . He made very blunt and inconſiderate repartees; for he could not bear the leaſt reflexion upon his valour, which he valued above all things. And, when he happened to give an account of his life, he mixed with it malicious ſtories of every body, without ſo much as ſparing the king* (35). He told him ſometimes (36), *that he would not have any French hiſtorian to ſay, that any body had done ſuch or ſuch a thing but he* (37). Having ſeen a diſcourſe of Peter Matthieu, about the cauſes and conſequences *of the long wars between the houſe of France and the houſe of Auſtria*; and, fancying that the author did not ſpeak *of him ſo often, nor ſo glorioufly, as he wiſhed*, he complained of it *to chancellor de Bellievre; and diſcovered his reſentment more openly to de Vic, embaſſador in Swiſſerland, with hard words and great threatenings* againſt the author (38).

Note, that he had a kind of ambition like that of Achilles. This hero would not ſuffer, that any other Greek ſhould kill Hector; he would have all the glory of it.

Λαοῖσιν δ' ἀνένευε καρήατι δῖος Ἀχιλλεὺς,
Οὐδ' εἴα ἔμεναι ἐπὶ Ἕκτορι πικρὰ βέλεμνα,
Μήτις κῦδος ἄροιτο βαλὼν, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος
ἔλθοι.

Populis autem innuebat capite nobilis Achilles,
Neque ſinebat mittere in Hectorem acerba tela,
Ne quis gloriam auſerret jaculatus, ipſe vero poſterior
veniret (39).

Notwithſtanding the great authority of Homer, the ancients did not approve this character of Achilles. This we learn from Plutarch (40): ‘ Achilles himſelf ‘ is blamed with great reaſon, as not behaving himſelf ‘ like a wiſe man, but like a hardy young fool, tranſported with an eager deſire of glory; for in the ‘ heat of the battle he made ſigns to the Greeks not ‘ to meddle with Hector, as Homer ſays:

Leſt that their darts his glory ſhould abate,
And, when the blow was given, himſelf ſhould come
too late.

[*I*] *I can ſcarce believe what is ſaid of his learning.*] Balzac tells us a very curious thing (41). ‘ Beſides the two Frenchmen, ſays he, whom I have ‘ alledged (42), I muſt mention a third, whom I had ‘ forgot, and you will never think of; I mean the late ‘ mareſchal de Biron, a man, who breathed nothing ‘ but fire and ſlaughter, and of whom Torquato Taſſo ‘ ſaid, in the perſon of Argante,

Impatiente, ineſſorabil, fiero,
Ne l'arme inſaticabile & invitto, &c,

Impatient, fierce, inexorable,
Untired in arms, unconquerable.

‘ One of our friends, who knew him, gives us the ‘ following account of him. The king ſent mareſchal ‘ de Biron to queen Elizabeth, calling him in his ‘ credential letters, *The moſt cutting inſtrument of his ‘ victories.* The mareſchal acquitted himſelf worthily of that employment; for his parts anſwered his ‘ great courage. It has been ſaid elſewhere, that he ‘ had a mind to be accounted a brutiſh man, ‘ in order to comply with the fooliſhneſs of the age: ‘ but it is certain, that, beſides his natural endowments, he had a great deal of knowledge. He gave an ‘ inſtance of it at Freſne; where the king walking ‘ in a gallery, and asking of ſome maſters of the requeſts the meaning of a Greek verſe engraved upon ‘ a piece of marble, he explained it immediately, ‘ and then went away, being aſhamed to be a more ‘ knowing man than the maſters of the requeſts of ‘ that time.’ I am apt to believe, that this paſſage does not belong to the ſon, but to the father; for the father loved learning, and learned converſations, and uſed to write down in his table-book whatever he heard that deſerved to be taken notice of; and therefore it is likely, that he found the explication of that Greek verſe in his pocket-book. However, I will not be poſitive: You will ſee, in the following remark, a paſſage, which is the cauſe of my uncertainty. Mr de Pereſixe (43) ſays, that Biron, the ſon, *was very ignorant, and extreamly fond of the predictions of*

(*b*) See a diſcourſe concerning favourites, in Le Laboureur's Additions to Caſtelnau's Memoirs, Tom. II, pag. 135.

(30) Licet hanc pietatem ut miniſtello quam viro bellicoſo digniorem Bironus & alii prophani ſubſannarent. *Camdenus in Annal. Part. IV*, *pag.* 805.

(31) Abrégé Chronolog. Tom. VI, pag. 209, ad ann. 1599.

(32) Epitres Françoiſes à Scaliger, pag. 249.

(33) Whilſt that duke was at the court of France in the year 1600.

(34) Peter Matthieu, Hiſt. de la Paix, livr. iii, pag. m. 449.

(35) Ibid.

(36) Theſe words were ſpoken and heard at the ſiege of Amiens. *Id. ibid. pag.* 452.

(37) Ibid.

(38) Idem. lib. iv, pag. 388.

(39) Homer, Iliad. lib xxii, ver. 205.

(40) Plut. in Pompeio, pag. 634.

(41) Balzac, Entretien IV, *towards the end*, pag. m. 72, 73.

(42) He had been ſpeaking, *pag.* 71, of Mr de Givry and Mr d'Urfé, who were two eloquent and learned men, and knew how to write in proſe and verſe.

(43) Hiſtoire de Henry le Grand, pag. m. 374.

of his reminiſcence deſerves to be mentioned [*K*]. He was at firſt brought up in the Proteſtant religion (*c*). He was a great gameſter (*d*); but little given to women, and other bodily pleaſures (*e*). Henry IV had a mind to make him his ſon-in-law [*L*]; and it is ſaid, he boaſted, that he had ſaved his life [*M*]. I ſhall only take notice of two faults of Moreri [*N*].

of aſtrologers, diviners, geomancers, and ſuch like cheats. For the reſt Balzac's dealing upon this occaſion is ſomewhat unfair: he uſes one of the tricks of proud writers: he dares not name his author, hoping that the readers will think he has found this paſſage in a book unknown to every body elſe; and yet it is to be found in a common book, *viz.* in d'Aubigné's hiſtory (44). I have made, elſewhere (45), the like remark.

[*K*] *What is reported of his reminiſcence deſerves to be mentioned.*] I have already ſaid, that he was brought up by his aunt, the lady Briſambourg: to which I add here, ‘ that he had no inclination for learning, but only for war: wherefore mareſchal de Biron, his father, who was a Catholic and a very warlike man, took him from his aunt, carried him for ſome time along with him into the provinces of Xaintonge, Aunis, and Angoumois, and had him inſtructed in the Catholic religion . . . thus Charles de Biron, being unqualified for learning till he was ſixteen years of age, got ſuch a skill in the art of war, that he found nothing impoſſible. His father was well pleaſed with it. What I am going to mention is very wonderful. Whilſt he was at Briſambourg, he was taught hiſtory by one Manduca, a learned man of Malta; and though he made no progreſs in it, yet he has ſince alledged many hiſtorical facts admirably well, though naturally he was no great talker (46).

[*L*] *Henry IV had a mind to make him his ſon-in-law.*] This I have read in the additions to Caſtelnau's memoirs; and I think the reader will not be diſpleaſed to find, here, the following paſſage, which is full of curious things (47). ‘ If the duke of Biron did not conſpire againſt his perſon (48), it cannot be denied, that he conſpired againſt his ſtate, and deſigned to divide it into ſeveral parts, and to deliver it up to the king of Spain, and the duke of Savoy, his pretended father-in-law. The king was the more exaſperated at him, becauſe he loved him ſo well, that he intended to make him his ſon-in-law, by marrying him to Catherine Henrietta his daughter, who was afterwards ducheſs of Elbœuf; the better to ſecure the crown to the duke of Vendoſme, whom he deſigned to legitimate by his marriage with the ducheſs of Beaufort. A few days after the death of that lady, his miſtreſs, he diſcovered this deſign of his at Fontainbleau to the Sieur du Vair, counſellor of ſtate, in a private conference; and having imparted his grief to him, he deſired to know what he thought of it. S I R, ſaid du Vair, *if your majeſty was duke of Tuſcany, of Mantua, or of Urbino,* (Italy affords many inſtances of cruelty, eſpecially in the eſtabliſhment of ſovereignties, which generally have been tyrannical in the beginning) *I ſhould think, that, by deſtroying all your relations, and their friends, you might ſet illegitimate children upon the throne; but being a gracious king of France, and careful to tread in the ſteps of your predeceſſors, your majeſty would have run the hazard of loſing your kingdom, and even your life. You are miſtaken,* replied the king; *The French nation uſe themſelves to every thing.* The king, having loſt the opportunity of placing the duke of Vendoſme upon the throne, had a mind to make him the greateſt man in the kingdom; and was ſtill reſolved to marry this duke's ſiſter to the duke of Biron. But the latter, either becauſe he did not think the match good enough for him, or becauſe he was unwilling to be engaged by authority in a marriage which could not ſatisfy his ambition as before, ſuffered himſelf to be fooliſhly flattered with the hopes of marrying the daughter of the duke of Savoy, who was deſcended by her father and mother from Francis I, and the emperor Charles V. . . . The ſame Mr du Vair, in his return from the court to Provence, by the way of Dijon, had a long conference with the duke of Biron's ſecretary; and having intimated to him, that he was a little ſurprized, that a lord of his age, who was ſo great a man, and had ſo great an intereſt, did not marry, the ſecretary gave him a hint of his deſign by this anſwer: theſe great men ſuffer themſelves to be brought into ſuch high enterprizes, that they hardly know themſelves. Indeed, this duke of Biron, who was a proud and haughty man, and of a very untractable temper, was only pleaſed with difficult and almoſt impoſſible things. He envied the grandeur of other men; and his jealouſy of the duke of Montmorency, by reaſon of his office of conſtable, reached Louiſe de Budos, his wife. Thinking to ſucceed the conſtable, he propoſed to marry his wife (49), and the thing was agreed upon between that lady and him, if their fate had permitted it; but they died both of them in the flower of their age, and the conſtable ſurvived them.’

[*M*] . . . . *and boaſted that he had ſaved his life.*] I have read this in a hiſtory of Henry IV, written by G. Soſſi. That author (50) brings in this prince, ſaying; *though I am a king, I have ſaved the life of one of my ſoldiers: had it not been for me, he had been killed before my eyes: I have ſeen that great warriour turning his back to the enemy.* What the king ſaid was true enough. *As Biron was purſuing Farneſe in the frontiers, there happened an accidental fight on horſeback, in which the enemy, having recovered their ſtrength, attacked Biron, and run his horſe thro' with a lance. At Fontaine Françoiſe, he received ſeveral wounds in a rencounter, and his eyes were almoſt blinded with the blood that iſſued from a wound in his head.* The king brought him off from thoſe two dangers. Peter Matthieu gives us a clearer account of that matter. *He has ſerved me well,* ſaid the king; *but he cannot deny that I have ſaved his life three times. I brought him off from the enemy at Fontaine Françoiſe, ſo wounded, and ſo ſtunned with his wounds, that, as I had acted the part of a ſoldier to ſave his life, I acted that of a mareſchal, in order to make a retreat; for he told me he was not in a condition to think of it, and to ſerve me* (51). The following words are to be found in the margin of that hiſtorian. ‘ At the fight of Fontaine-Françoiſe, the king reſcued mareſchal de Biron from the middle. One of his majeſty's ſervants told him, that he expoſed himſelf too much by running thus among the enemies. It is true, anſwered the king; but if I do not do it, marſhal Biron will take advantage of it as long as he lives.’

[*N*] *I ſhall only take notice of two faults of Moreri.*] He ſays, that the barony of Biron was erected into a dutchy and peerdom, after the mareſchal's return from his embaſſy in England, which is falſe (52); for the erection was made three years before that embaſſy. He adds, that Biron, having *loſt his office of admiral, and having ſome ſmall reaſons to be diſcontented,* plotted againſt the ſtate. This is likewiſe falſe; for he voluntarily laid down the poſt of admiral in 1549, and was amply rewarded for it.

GONZAGA, (**Cecilia de**) was one of the moſt virtuous and learned women that lived in the XVth century. She was inſtructed in polite learning by Victorinus of Feltri, and made a wonderful progreſs; for, if I am not miſtaken, what we read in a book of Ambroſius Camaldulenſis ought to be underſtood of her [*A*]. Her mother,

[*A*] *What we read in . . . Ambroſius Camaldulenſis ought to be underſtood of her.*] If you read his Hodœporicon, you will find (1), that Victorinus Feltrius taught polite learning at Mantua, with great reputation, and inſtructed the children of the lord of that place: This was John-Francis Gonzaga. He had a daughter about eight years old, who underſtood the declenſions and conjugations of the Greek tongue,

---

(*c*) *See the remark* [*F*].

(*d*) *He loſt above five hundred thouſand crowns in one year.* Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. VI, pag. 270, ad ann. 1602.

(*e*) Cayet, Chronolog. Septenaire, fol. 317.

(44) In the third volume, book v, chap. xii, pag. 668, 669.

(45) In the remark [C] of the article CAVALCANTE, at the end.

(46) Cayet, ubi ſupra, fol. 319.

(47) Le Laboureur's Additions to Caſtelnau's Memoirs, Tom. II, pag. 132.

(48) That is, againſt the perſon of Henry IV.

(49) The author of the *Diſcours Hiſt. de la Fortune & Diſgrace des Favoris*, inſerted in the Additions to Caſtelnau's Memoirs, has theſe words: *The king, to reward the ſaid marêchal for his ſervices, made him a duke and peer, gave him great penſions, and waited only for the conſtable's death, who was very old, to give him his place.*

(50) *Book iv, pag. m.* 462.

(51) Matthieu, Hiſt. de la Paix, lib. iv, pag. m. 286.

(52) *This fault is in Father Anſelme*, Hiſt. des Grands Officiers, pag. 211.

(1) Pag. 34.

mother, Paula Malateſta, a lady moſt eminent for her virtue, learning, and beauty, inſpired her with a contempt of the world [*B*], and made her deſire to be a nun. This deſire was too ſtrong to yield to any oppoſitions. Cecilia harangued her father, who was againſt her renouncing matrimony, and with ſubſtantial reaſons demonſtrated to him the juſtice of her deſign (*a*). I have ſaid elſewhere (*b*) what books ſhe was adviſed to read, when ſhe was engaged in a religious life. Mr Joly has been guilty of ſome miſtakes [*C*].

tongue, whereof ſhe gave a proof before the moſt learned Ambroſius, general of the Camaldoli, when he paſſed by the city of Mantua in the year 1432. *Principis filiam octo ferme annorum ita imbuerat* (Victorinus Feltrius) *ut legeret jam & ſcriberet, Græcaque & nomina & verba inoffenſe declinaret non ſine admiratione noſtrâ.* Theſe are Ambroſe's words in the account of his travels, that is, of the viſits he made to many houſes of the order, of which he was general. What follows, muſt, I think, relate to a later journey. I take it from Mr Joly (2) : *What is ſaid of another girl,* in the life of Ambroſius * general of the order of the Camaldoli, *is much more remarkable : Ambroſe, being ſent by Pope Eugenius IV to the council of Baſil, came to a caſtle called Gorda, in the territory of Mantua, where he found two children, one a boy of fourteen years of age, who repeated before him two hundred verſes he had compoſed, with ſuch a grace* †, *that he did not believe Virgil pronounced the ſixth book of his Æneid before Auguſtus with a better : It is not ſaid who this youth was : but as to the girl, we have the following account of her* ‡. He ſaw alſo the prince's daughter, (*that is the duke* (3) *of Mantua's*) about ten years of age, who wrote Greek ſo elegantly, that Ambroſe would have deſired no more in any learned man.

I believe the ſame young lady is meant in both theſe journies, and that it is ſhe, who is the ſubject of this article.

Note, that Victorinus Feltrius was a very famous man. This is what Leander Albertus ſays of him in his deſcription of Italy (4) : ‘ Illuſtrarunt Feltriam ingenia quædam nobilia, nominatim Victorinus memoria noſtrorum avorum linguæ Latinæ, quæ tam diu perierat, reductor ac inſtaurator. —— *Feltria was famous for ſome great wits, particularly Victorinus, in the memory of our grand-fathers, the reſtorer of the Latin tongue, ſo long loſt.*’

[*B*] *Paula Malateſta . . . eminent for her virtue . . . inſpired her with a contempt of the world.*] Leander Albertus praiſes her very much, and declares, ſhe was celebrated by all the authors of the time. ‘ Paula, Franciſci primi Gonzagæ Mantuani Marchionis conjux, non ſolum excellenti formæ pulchritudine (venuſtiſſima quippe totius Italiæ habebatur) ſed etiam multis virtutibus, literis, prudentia, ſanctitateque decorata (5). —— *Paula, wife of the firſt Francis Gonzaga, marquis of Mantua, a lady not only of an excellent beauty* (*for ſhe was eſteemed the handſomeſt woman in Italy*) *but of many virtues, learning, prudence, and ſanctity.*’ Speaking elſewhere of the ſame Francis Gonzaga, promoted to the marquiſate of Mantua by the emperor Sigiſmund, the twenty ſecond of September, 1433, he ſays, ‘ Uxorem habuit lectiſſimam fœminam, religione, ſapientia, pudicitia, literiſque decoratam Paulam Malateſtam, ab omnibus illorum temporum ſcriptoribus ob ſingulares virtutes mirificè laudatam (6). - - - - - *His wife was a moſt extraordinary lady, for religion, wiſdom, chaſtity, and learning : her name was Paula Malateſta, praiſed for her ſingular virtues by all the writers of that time.*’ Who could chuſe but praiſe ſo incomparable a woman ? She paſſed for the handſomeſt in all Italy, and yet ſhe deſpiſed all the ornaments of the body, and omitting expences upon jewls and finery, ſhe laid out a great deal upon building and repairing of churches, feeding the poor, and marrying young women, *&c.* She inſpired our Cecilia with the ſame ſpirit, as Matthew Boſſus informs us (7). ‘ Habuit Mantua Paulam Gonzagam illuſtrem fœminam univerſa Italia celeberrimam ; quam ſi dixero, corporis cultum contempſiſſe, omnem ſuam rem in ædificandis inſtaurandiſque delubris, in pauperum Chriſti neceſſitatibus, in locandis nuptuique tradendis virginibus, quæ quidem maxima ſunt, erogaſſe, ſi nihil unquam illam omiſiſſe, quod ad veram humilitatem culmenque virtutis conducat, ſi omnis denique ingenioli mei vires in ejus laudibus expendam, parum dixiſſe me profecto ſemper agnoſcam. Primam Paulam, cujus modo mentionem fecimus (8), imitata Cæciliam virginem ſuam filiam literarum peritiſſimam ſuo educatu, ſuaque imitatione ad tantam ſæcularium ornamentorum, ut ita dixerim, nauſeam perduxit, & ad religionem inflammavit, ut apud patrem primum Mantuæ Marchionem vincere ejus propoſitum cupientem, cauſam conſtantiſſimè agere non ſit verita. —— *Mantua had Paula Gonzaga, an illuſtrious lady, famed over all Italy ; of whom if I ſhall relate, that ſhe deſpiſed dreſs ; that ſhe ſpent her eſtate in building and repairing churches, in ſupplying the neceſſities of Chriſt's poor, in placing out and marrying virgins ; that ſhe omitted nothing, which can conduce to true humility and conſummate virtue ; if, laſtly, I ſhould exert the whole force of my little abilities in her praiſes, I ſhall always acknowledge that I fall ſhort of her deſert. In imitation of the firſt Paula, whom I have juſt mentioned, ſhe inſpired her virgin daughter Cecilia, a very learned maid, by the force of education and example, with ſuch a diſreliſh of worldly ornaments, and ſuch a religious zeal, that ſhe was not afraid to plead her cauſe ſtrenuouſly to her father, the firſt marquis of Mantua.*’ Theſe words are taken from a diſcourſe, that Matthew Boſſus (9) inſcribed to cardinal Beſſarion, exhorting him not to ſuffer the women of Bologna to re-aſſume their ornaments.

[*C*] *Mr Joly has been guilty of ſome miſtakes.*] I will not abridge his diſcourſe, becauſe many will be glad to learn what I ſhould leave out. *Upon a due conſideration of thoſe times,* ſays he (10), *we way ſay, they were more fruitful in learned women, than others, though ignorance was then very great among the men. For in the end of the XVth century, we hear of a Paula Gonzaga, daughter of the marquis of Mantua, a nun ; of a Baptiſta, widow of the lord of Arimini ; of the daughters of John Feruſſini, a Milaneze civilian, whom Margaret their mother took as much care to have inſtructed in the Greek and Latin tongue, as ſince Sir Thomas More has done with his ; of Iſota Nogarola of Verona, whither cardinal Beſſarion going on purpoſe to viſit her, ſaid,* She was a virgin more divine than human * ; *of Violanta, widow to the prince of Ceſena, and afterwards a nun of the order of St Francis, all mentioned by Matthew Boſſus* ⸸ *alſo a Veroneſe, and regular canon of St Auſtin.* This is committing more than one fault, to ſay, that the learned woman, named Paula, mentioned by Matthew Boſſus, lived at the end of the XVth century, and that ſhe was the daughter of the marquis of Mantua, and a nun. She was of the houſe of Malateſta ; and ſince her husband was the firſt marquis of Mantua (11), ſhe cannot be placed at the end of the XVth century ; for this marquis died in the year 1444 (12), having had many children by her. If it were true, that he married her in the year 1410, as Mr de Marolles (13) affirms, Mr Joly's error would be more manifeſt. Add to this, that Matthew Boſſus obſerves, that ſhe diſpoſed her daughter Cecilia to a religious life : he does not ſay, that ſhe entered upon it, finding herſelf a widow. I have not this author's letters, and ſo I cannot ſay, whether the learned Baptiſta be there found to have been married to the lord of Arimini. I only know, that he does not ſay it in the other work, cited by Mr Joly. I know moreover, that ſhe was of the family of Malateſta, which governed at Arimini (14). However, I am very certain, that this lady had a great credit throughout the whole city ; for her example, her exhortations, and her orders, obliged the women of Arimini to modeſty of dreſs, and to leave off their long trains. Such a reformation is not the work of a lady of an indifferent authority and merit. It is one of the moſt difficult enterpriſes that can be undertaken. However, let us ſee at large the noble elogy, that Matthew Boſſus has given this Chriſtian heroine. ‘ Baptiſtam inſignem Ariminenſe ſolum habuit ſingulari humilitate, pariter & literarum ſtudiis præditam, quæ adeo animi ornamenta corporalibus prætulit, ut

---

(*a*) See the remark [*B*], citation (7).

(*b*) In the article CONRARUS.

(2) Joly, Avis Chrétiens & Moraux pour l'Inſtitution des Enfans, pag. 347, 348.

* Lib. iii, Hiſtoriar. Camaldulenſ. cap xxiv, Autore Auguſtino Florentino Monacho Camaldulenſi, Edit. Florentiæ, 1575, in 4to.

† The author of that hiſtory ſays, that Ambroſe had mentioned this in the thirty fifth of his epiſtles.

‡ Adfuit puella quoque Principis filia, decennis fermè, Græcè adeò ſcribens eleganter, ut tantundem in quolibet à ſe erudito homine Ambroſius deſideraverit.

(3) The lords of Mantua were not yet dukes: they had not had that title till the year 1530.

(4) Pag. m. 749.

(5) Leand. Albert. Deſcript. Italiæ, pag. 456.

(6) Id. ibid. pag. 608.

(7) Matthæus Boſſus de immoderato mulierum cultu, pag. m. 327.

(8) A little before he had mentioned Paula, the mother of Bleſilla and Euſtochium, ſo famous in the writings of St Jerome.

(9) He was of Verona, and a regular canon. I have given his article.

(10) Joly, Voiage de Hollande, pag. 163, 164.

* *See* Dames Illuſtres de la Coſte, pag. 721.

⸸ In Recuperationib. Fœſulanis, ad Beſſarion. Card. de honeſto Cultu Fœminarum. *It. Ep. iii, & cii.*

(11) Boſſus affirms it in the words before quoted, citation ( ).

(12) Volater. lib. iv, pag. 113. Leand. Albertus, ubi ſupra, pag. 608. *The latter is miſtaken in his calculation : He mentions an Inſcription, which ſhews, that this marquis was above twelve years of age in March* 1407. (Volaterranus, ubi ſupra, *ſays he was* 14.) *and then places his death on the twenty third of October,* 1444, *and ſays, he lived fifty four years. The abbot de Marolles,* Memoirs, Tom. I, pag. 427, *agrees with him in theſe two numbers.*

(13) Marolles, ibid. Tom. I, pag. 427.

(14) Fuit & Baptiſta ſingularis formæ, ſapientiæ, honeſtatis ac eruditionis mulier. *Leand. Albert. ubi ſupra, pag.* 456.

‘ nihil unquam prætermiſiſſe viſa ſit, quod ad principis aut præſentis, aut futuræ decus & ornamentum ullo pacto potuerit attinere. At cæteris ſuis rebus geſtis omiſſis, invenio illam etiam vivente viro nedum humili habitu inceſſiſſe, verùm cæteras concives & populares hortatu ſuo imperioque temperatiſſimis ornamentis, breviſſimiſque veſtium caudis uſas fuiſſe (15). —— *Arimini produced the famous Baptiſta, a lady of ſingular humility as well as learning; who ſo far preferred the ornaments of the mind to thoſe of the body, that ſhe ſeemed never to have omitted any thing, which might in the leaſt contribute to the honour and credit of a preſent or future princeſs. But, omitting her other actions, I find, that, even during the life of her husband, though ſhe herſelf appeared in no mean garb, yet the reſt of her fellow-citizens and country-women, by her advice and authority, wore the moſt moderate ornaments, and the ſhorteſt tails to their gowns.*’ Volaterranus (16) has mentioned the learning of this lady, and obſerved, that Leonard Aretin, and many other authors, dedicated ſome books to her. Let it be obſerved, that I do not deny, that there was a nun named Paula Gonzaga; I only ſay, that it is not ſhe that Matthew Boſſus has ſpoken of: he was dead, before ſhe took the habit of a nun. She lived but in the XVIth century, and I do not find, that any author praiſes her, but on the account of her being a moſt devout nun. See Hilarion de Coſte, at the 707th page of the firſt tome of the Elogies of illuſtrious ladies, where he ſays, there was a deſign to canonize her.

(15) Matth. Boſſus, de immoder. Cultu Fœmin. pag. 327.

(16) Volater. Commentar. Urban. lib vi, pag. 203.

GONZAGA (ELEONORA), daughter of Francis II, marquis of Mantua, and wife to Francis Maria de la Rovere, duke of Urbino [*A*], in the XVIth century, made herſelf famous by her excellent qualities. She diſcovered a great conſtancy in her ill fortune, and a great moderation in her proſperity. She always loved her huſband, and was his faithful companion in his diſgraces [*B*]. But, *above all virtues ſhe cheriſhed chaſtity*, which ſhe made very apparent by her ſeverity againſt women of a bad life [*C*]. She had five children, two ſons and three daughters. Guido Ubaldo de la Rovere, her eldeſt ſon, was duke of Urbino; the younger was duke of Sora, and cardinal. Hippolyta, the eldeſt of the daughters, was married to Antony of Arragon, duke of Montalto. Julia, the ſecond, married Alfonſo d'Eſt, marquis of Montecchio. Iſabella, the youngeſt, was married to Alberic Cibo, prince of Maleſpina, and marquis of Maſſa *(a)*.

(*a*) *Taken from* Hilarion de Coſte, Eloges des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. I, pag. 544, & *ſeq*.

[*A*] *She was wife to Francis Maria de la Rovere, duke of Urbino.*] He was nephew to Julius II, and ſon to that John de la Rovere, to whom Sixtus IV gave the principality of Sora and Senegaglia, and who married Joan de Montefeltro, daughter of Frederic de Montefeltro, duke of Urbino. Our Francis Maria, the iſſue of this marriage, became duke of Urbino after the death of Guidobaldo de Montefeltro, his uncle by the mother's ſide, who left no iſſue (1).

[*B*] . . . . . *and was his faithful companion in his diſgraces.*] Leo X, having made Laurence de Medicis his nephew, duke of Urbino, diveſted Francis Maria de la Rovere of this duchy. This was the misfortune, in which *Eleonora ſhewed a great conſtancy in adverſity, under the injurious blows of fortune, which her husband received, whilſt for ſome time he was deprived of dominions; which never made her abate of her uſual generoſity, or entire fidelity to her husband, keeping him company, and comforting him in his misfortune, in which, as a woman of honour, ſhe would always bear a ſhare* (2). They were reſtored to their duchy after the death of Laurence de Medicis (3). The husband died in the year 1538 (4). Paul Jovius greatly praiſes him (5).

[*C*] *She ſhewed her love for chaſtity by her ſeverity againſt women of a bad life.*] ‘ For ſhe would neither ſee at her houſe, nor have any ſamiliarity with women of quality, who were the leaſt ſuſpected or reported to have defiled the honour of their ſex by the diſorder of their conduct; and ſhe was a mortal enemy to all thoſe, who gave themſelves up to the infamous pleaſures of debauchery, baniſhing many from her dominions, and ſeverely puniſhing thoſe wretched old women, who, after having loſt, in their youth, ſhame and honour, conſcience and reputation, think of nothing continually, at the end of their days, but how to ruin and deſtroy young, ſilly, and unadviſed maids. And therefore ſhe is worthy of an eternal remembrance, for never being ſparing of her money in reſcuing all the innocent abuſed doves out of the talons of the hawks, and conſecrating them to the altars, where afterwards they have done wonders in point of virtue (6).’ This was filling up all the duties of a virtuous princeſs, which ſhe could not be ſaid to have done, had ſhe contented herſelf with an exact obſervation of her conjugal loyalty. This may ſuffice for the generality of women, but not for thoſe women, who are of the firſt rank. They are indiſpenſably obliged to ſtamp a mark of infamy on intriguing women, by manifeſt teſtimonies of their indignation. This ſtain is a more effectual leſſon, than the moſt eloquent ſermons of a pious preacher; and it is certain, that the corruption of a court, that proceeds from womens galantry, is a blot upon the life of a ſovereign princeſs, though ſhe be never ſo chaſte and virtuous; for if ſhe excluded from her familiarity women of ill fame, if ſhe denied them admittance to her palace, if at leaſt ſhe mortified them by marks of coldneſs and cenſures, whilſt ſhe expreſſes her eſteem and affection for chaſte women, ſhe would infallibly produce a reformation of manners. Whence we may conclude, that, if galantry walks barefaced, it is a ſign, that the chief lady makes but little outward diſtinction betwixt thoſe that give occaſion to ſcandal, and others of an unblameable conduct. See what has been ſaid in another place (7). If it be ſaid, that this connivance is not to be attributed to want of zeal for the propagation of chaſtity, but to a certain good nature, that will not ſuffer the torrent to be oppoſed with the neceſſary vigour; I will ſtill maintain, that this ſoftneſs of temper, or good nature, is a great fault on the like occaſions.

(1) *See* Leander Albertus, Deſcript. Ital. pag. m. 445.

(2) Hilarion de Coſte, Eloges des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. I, pag. 545.

(3) Leand. Albert. ubi ſupra.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) Paulus Jovius, Elog. Bellica Virt. Illuſtr. lib. vi, pag. m. 497.

(6) Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, pag. 546, 547.

(7) In the remark [*M*] of the article LOUIS XIII.

GONZAGA (ISABELLA DE), the wife of Guido Ubaldo de Montefeltro (*a*), duke of Urbino, deſerves to be reckoned amongſt the moſt illuſtrious ladies. One of her panegyriſts calls her *a woman, for her goodneſs, integrity, courage, and nobleneſs, more divine than humane* (*b*). She had ſuch a chaſtity, as deſerves to be admired: but ſome circumſtances are told of it, that appear fabulous; for it is ſaid, that, after ſhe had lain two years with her huſband, though he had done nothing of what they call conjugal duty, ſhe remained fully perſuaded that nothing was wanting to her marriage [*A*], and that

(*a*) And not de la Rovere, as Hilarion de Coſte ſays, pag. 697, of the firſt Tome of his *Eloges des Dames Illuſtres*.

(*b*) Joſeph Betuſſi, delle Donne illuſtre, apud Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra. *See alſo* Chriſtofano Bronzini della dignita, è nobilta delle Donne, Giornata quinta, pag. 116.

[*A*] *After having lain two years with her husband, though he had never performed the conjugal duty, ſhe was fully perſuaded, that nothing was wanting to her marriage.*] I will uſe the words of Hilarion de Coſte the Minime: ‘ She was one of thoſe, the apoſtle ſpeaks of, who are married, as if they were not; for either by reaſon of her tender age, or the ſimplicity of her temper, ſhe lived for two years together in ſo profound an ignorance of the ſacrament ſhe was engaged in, as to think other married womens caſe was like her's: in this reſembling the wiſe of the antient Hiero, who complained not of her husband's ſtinking breath, thinking that the breath of all other men was as ſtrong. But age, by a ſecret and not inſenſible that all other huſbands were like her's. At laſt ſhe was undeceived, and her huſband himſelf confeſſed his infirmity to her, when he perceived ſhe underſtood the nature of it [*B*]; but ſhe nevertheleſs continued her tender affection to him; ſhe comforted him, and never complained, nor revealed the ſtate of her marriage to any body. Nevertheleſs, this ſecret came to be publickly known [*C*], and then ſhe was ſtrongly ſollicited to think of another match: it was made appear to her, that ſhe might very eaſily get her marriage declared null; and they repreſented many other forcible conſiderations to her: but nothing moved her [*D*]. She was troubled, that her huſband's impotency was known, and nothing but the death of the duke could part them. His death caſt her almoſt

ble leſſon, having taught her what neither the moſt barbarous nations nor the moſt ſtupid women are ignorant of, our corrupt nature being but too much inclined to ſenſual pleaſures, or whether the free company ſhe kept, as a married woman, with women in the ſame ſtate, taught her things ſhe did not know, her ignorance went off (1).' It is not probable, ſhe had been ſo long ignorant in ſuch an affair as this. Moſt of this monk's readers have doubtleſs ſaid, that a maid of ſo great innocence, as to the theory, muſt be taken for one that is but five or ſix years old. Indeed there reigns a very bad cuſtom in families, whether it cannot be prevented, or whether it is hoped it will be of ſome uſe, or whether a ſecret providence ſuffers it for the temporal good of the univerſe. When children come to a certain age, they are told of nothing but miſtreſſes and ſparks. Little girls, are told, that, if they do not mend their faults, they ſhall never have a huſband. They are promiſed the conqueſt of a galant, provided they do ſuch or ſuch a thing (2). An hundred promiſes and threats of this kind are continually offered them. The houſe-maids, landreſſes, ſeamſtreſſes, and chamber-maids, &c. go much farther: they whiſper to them the meaning of all this. A thouſand occaſions naturally offer themſelves. Marriages are made from time to time amongſt their neighbours and relations. There is a curioſity to go to church to hear the ceremony of the nuptial benediction, which frequently happens: and this affords an ample ſubject of converſation, both aloud, and with a low voice, for the myſterious inſtruction of the little female novices. This inſtruction is eſpecially given in the interval of the preliminaries to the wedding, or rather between the contract and the wedding-day. By this means the theory of matrimony comes to be well known before a woman be marriageable. But put the caſe, that a maid could be ſecured from ſecret converſations, in which the ſervants and other women love to ſatisfy, or even prevent the curioſity of nature: put the caſe, I ſay, that a maid ſhould be delivered to an huſband, as ignorant in the theory, as in the practice, could ſhe long remain ſo? Is there not another univerſally prevailing cuſtom? Are not the new brides asked a thouſand queſtions the next day? If their mothers, out of decency, forbear to queſtion them, do they not employ other women? Can the aunts, couſins, friends, &c. forbear to be inquiſitive? It cannot therefore be imagined, that our ducheſs of Urbino ſhould have been two years after her marriage in the ignorance, that this Minime imputes to her.

[*B*] *Her huſband himſelf confeſſed his infirmity to her when he perceived that ſhe knew the nature of it.*] We will go on in the words of the ſame Minime (3): ‘The duke her huſband, perceiving, that the ducheſs Iſabella had diſcovered his infirmity, was forced to declare to her his impotency in very modeſt terms, teſtifying by his diſcourſe the great affliction it was to him to ſee himſelf incapacitated to leave heirs to his dominions; and that, if this came to the knowledge of his ſubjects, he ſhould be leſs beloved. Upon this melancholy diſcourſe, the prudent and virtuous Iſabella, with a joyful and ſerene countenance, began to comfort him, exhorting him to bear this diſgrace with a perfect reſignation to the will of GOD: that many kings and great princes had been, and were at preſent, under that affliction; and that it is commonly better to have no children, than to have wicked and vicious ones; the old proverb being generally true, *Filii Heroum noxæ*, that is, Heroes beget nothing but monſters, ungrateful and unnatural children, fatal incendiaries, and the ruin of their families, eſtates, commonwealths, and fathers that begot them: that, for her part, ſhe would not be concerned for it, and that it would not in the leaſt abate her love and affection: that ſhe would preſerve her virginity to the grave, that, whilſt a defect of nature hindered him from enjoying what was deſigned him, no body elſe ſhould ever poſſeſs it, and that no body ſhould ever know any thing of the matter.’

[*C*] *Nevertheleſs this ſecret came to be publickly known.*] Hilarion de Coſte (4) having made an exclamation againſt thoſe, who ſay, *that women cannot keep a ſecret*, adds, ‘that the ducheſs of Urbino more faithfully kept her ſecret and promiſe to her huſband than he did, having lived fourteen years with him without ever diſcovering the defect of her marriage by any complaint: for the firſt years, ſhe concealed it through youth and ignorance, and afterwards out of honour and virtue, and the obligation of ſecrecy. Not only the people of the duchy of Urbino, and the inhabitants of the fine city of Peſaro, but even the moſt intimate and familiar domeſtics, and the principal lords of their court, were ignorant, that this defect and barrenneſs proceeded from the duke; on the contrary, they rather attributed it to the ducheſs. Nor had it ever been known, if the duke himſelf had not told it, when, being driven out of his dominions by Cæſar Borgia, duke of Valentinois, he came to wait on our king Lewis XII, who was then in his duchy of the Milaneze, and city of Milan, to whom he had recourſe to be reſtored to his dominions; but not obtaining his deſires, becauſe the king was in league with Pope Alexander VI, father of the duke of Valentinois, and feared the hatred of the houſe of Borgia againſt him and his family, he gave them hopes of parting with his wife, and becoming an eccleſiaſtic; affirming he had never conſummated the marriage, by reaſon of his impotency; and, being asked by the king, he certified the truth of it. Thus this ſecret, being revealed by the huſband, was divulged through all the territories of Urbino and Italy, where the meaneſt people knew, that Ubaldo de la Rovere (5), duke of Urbino, was only a man in face, or that if he was a man, he could not be ranked among huſbands; and all the world admired the conſtancy and modeſty of his prudent and chaſte princeſs Iſabella Gonzaga: her conſtancy, becauſe, tho' ſhe might have had her marriage declared null, yet ſhe would not, chuſing rather to be ſilent, than to pollute her lips: her modeſty, by that heroical act of it, having lived above twenty years, without being aſhamed of having ſuch a huſband.’

[*D*] *She was ſtrongly ſollicited to think of another match. But nothing moved her.*] Here the monk ſtrains his throat, and lifts up his voice like a trumpet (6). ‘What a wonderful chaſtity of a woman! what an incredible conſtancy! what a perfect and unparallelled virtue! thus to live twenty years with an huſband in the ſame houſe in the ſame palace! here is a true pattern of chaſtity, and a demonſtrative proof, that the ſpirit and virtue have more power than the fleſh and ſenſuality; and that conjugal faith and affection prevail over the inferior luſt, and the brutiſh part. How few others would have thus concealed the ſecret, I do not ſay for fourteen years, but for fourteen months, which ſhe kept, not twenty months, but twenty years, and even to the death of her huſband, without voiding the marriage; when, being intreated, importuned, and almoſt forced by all ſorts of powerful perſons, that were her relations, to ſeparate from her huſband, for a thouſand urgent conſiderations they laid before her, ſhe would never hearken to them; but, on the contrary, conſtantly maintained, that the fault lay not in him, taking it ill to have it ſaid otherwiſe; and ſhe was much concerned when the truth of the ſtory came to light. O moſt faithful and chaſte princeſs! let thy example dazzle the eyes of thoſe women, who, led by almoſt into deſpair, and her affliction had like to have proved truly mortal [*E*]. Note, that ſhe was married twenty years (*c*). The exclamations of a Minime, who has praiſed her, are pardonable conſidering the rarity of the thing; but he might have been a little more moderate without tranſgreſſing the rules of a good Rhetorician. Our Iſabella ſpent the reſt of her days in a glorious widowhood. She was aunt to Eleonora Gonzaga, whom ſhe married to a nephew of Julius II, that is, to Francis Maria de la Rovere, who ſucceeded her huſband in the duchy of Urbino. By that you will ſee at what time ſhe lived; and, if you read *Il Cortegiano* of Balthaſar Caſtiglione, you will ſee her very much praiſed; and you will ſee, that the court of Urbino was then very polite. I will mention what Peter Bembus ſaid of this ducheſs [*F*].

---

(1) Hilarion de Coſte, Elog. des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. I, pag. 697, 698.

(2) See the New Letters againſt Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm, pag. 663, 664.

(3) Id. ibid. pag. 698.

(4) Id. ibid. pag. 699.

(5) He was not of the houſe de la Rovere, but of that of Feltri, or Montefeltro.

(6) Id. ibid. pag. 700.

‘ by the ſpirit of ſenſuality, without grounds, or with ‘ the leaſt pretence and frivolous reaſon, break a marriage concerted by the conſent of relations, and celebrated in the face of the church, procuring I know ‘ not what diſpenſations under pretence of miſunderſtandings, which will only ſerve as a chain to drag ‘ them to damnation; whilſt you, a young, beautiful, ‘ and noble lady, who might have lawfully procured ‘ a divorce, have ſhewn your marriage to be rather ‘ a match of the mind than of the body.’ After this he obſerves four great ſubjects of admiration in her *victory over herſelf* (7). 1. *Through abundance of courage and virtue, ſhe never ſeparated from her huſband, tho' ſhe might lawfully do it.* 2. *The affection ſhe had for her husband made her renounce the common and reaſonable deſire of all married people of leaving children behind them . . . . which ought to be the more admired in this great princeſs*, becauſe ſhe ſaw the direct line of a ſovereign houſe *end in her huſband.* 3. She had the prudence to accompany him every where, *that ſhe might not manifeſt this prince's imperfection.* The *fourth* wonder is, *that, conſidering the liberty of a perſon of quality, and the numbers of men ſhe converſed with, ſhe preſerved her virginity entire.* The circumſtances of the fourth point are confirmed by Balthaſar Caſtiglione, who ſays, that the court of Urbino was full of gentlemen accompliſhed in body and mind, who ſpent all the day in exerciſes ſuitable to their condition, and, after ſupper, met at the ducheſs's chamber, whilſt the duke, who went early to his repoſe, by reaſon of his diſtempers, was in bed. *Erano adunque tutte l'hore del giorno diviſe honorevoli & piacevoli eſſercitii, coſi del corpo, come dell' animo: ma perche il S. Duca continuamente per la infirmità, dopo cena aſſai per tempo ſe n' andava a dormire, ogn'uno per ordinario dove era la S. Ducheſſa Eliſabetta Gonzaga, a quell'hora ſi riduceva* (8). I will relate what he obſerves of the duke's infirmity, which gives reaſon to believe, that Hilarion de Coſte has followed ſome writers who have too much exaggerated things. Obſerve well what I am going to ſay. The duke was very well made, vigorous, and nimble (9); but, at twenty years of age (10), he grew ſo prodigious gouty, that he could not move himſelf. He married, doubtleſs, before he was reduced to that condition; which makes it highly probable that he conſummated the marriage. Tis true, the ſame author informs us, that the ducheſs was ſollicited to ſeparate from her husband, ſince her marriage was a ſtate of widowhood; which is a ſign ſhe was taken for a maid; for an impotency, ſucceeding the accompliſhment of marriage, is no juſt cauſe of divorce. ‘ Non ‘ poſſo piu tacere una parola della Signora Ducheſſa ‘ noſtra, la quale eſſendo vivuta xv. anni in compagnia del marito, comme vedoa, non ſolamente è ‘ ſtata conſtante di non paleſar mai queſto a perſona ‘ del mondo, ma eſſendo da ſuoi proprii ſtimulata da ‘ uſcir di queſta viduità, eleſſie piu preſto patir eſſilio, ‘ poverta, & ogni altra ſorte d'infelicità, che accettar ‘ quello, che a tutti gli altri parea gran gratia, & ‘ proſperità di fortuna: & ſequitando pur Meſſer ‘ Ceſare circa queſto, diſſe la Signora Ducheſſa, Parlate d'altro, & non intrate piu in tal propoſito, che ‘ aſſai d'altre coſe havete che dire (11.) —— *I cannot omit* ‘ *a ſaying of our ducheſs, who, having lived fifteen* ‘ *years in the company of her husband, as a widow,* ‘ *not only perſiſted in not declaring this to any perſon in the world, but, being ſollicited by her relations* ‘ *to take advantage of this widowhood, choſe rather* ‘ *to ſuffer exile, poverty, and every other misfortune,* ‘ *than to embrace this, which to every one elſe appeared great good luck: and, being ſollicited upon this* ‘ *head by Mr Ceſar, ſhe bid him ſay no more of it,* ‘ *but talk of ſomething elſe.*’ You ſee in theſe words an admirable inſtance of that lady's modeſty; ſhe would not be praiſed; ſhe turned off the converſation, whenever any body went about to ſhew the merit of her continence.

Note, that Chriſtoforo Bronzini, who made this lady's encomium, ſays the ſame things, and with the ſame exclamations as this Minime. See the *Giornata quinta* of his dialogues *della dignita e nobilta delle Donne* (12).

[*E*] *Her affliction had like to have proved truly mortal.*] Father Hilarion de Coſte *finds himſelf at a loſs how to give proofs of the love and prudence ſhe expreſſed in mourning for her husband*; *for . . . . . as long as he was alive ſhe never gave way to her tears . . . leaſt her affliction expreſſed by them ſhould cauſe another in him*; *but, as ſoon as ever he was dead, ſhe indulged her grief, which made her fall upon him, crying out,* O my dear husband, why will you leave me thus, and whither do you go? *Having ſpoken thoſe words, ſhe fainted away, and loſt her ſpeech, and remained as it were half dead: ſome believed her truly dead, having much ado to recover her ſpirits*; *ſo that they lamented at once the death of both. But GOD was pleaſed, that ſhe ſhould come to herſelf again, by degrees, opening her eyes and lifting them up towards heaven: afterwards ſhe caſt them upon thoſe about her, and by way of complaint and reproach told them*; how troubleſome you are to me? why do you uſe me ſo cruelly, as to hinder me from following my moſt honoured lord and husband? why will you not ſuffer me to be his companion in death; with whom I have ſpent the beſt of my life? what a wretched creature am I; he muſt go, and I muſt ſtay behind! No, no, I can never be perſuaded to it, I muſt follow him. *As ſoon as ſhe had uttered theſe complaints, her eyes, like two fountains, guſhed out with tears, and no other anſwer could be got from her for two days together, refuſing to ſleep or eat, but that ſhe could not ſurvive her husband* (13).

[*F*] *I will mention what Peter Bembus ſaid of this ducheſs.*] The author of the tract, entituled, *De Matrimonio Literati, an cœlibem eſſe an verò nubere conveniat* (14), alledges the great merit of ſome women, and does not forget this. ‘ Quid de Elizabetha ‘ Gonzaga? *ſays he,* quam Bembus ita laudat ut lapideum eum eſſe dicat qui non unam ejus ſeſſiunculam omnibus Philoſophorum ambulationibus & ‘ diſputationibus anteponat. —— *What ſhall we ſay of* ‘ *Elizabetha Gonzaga? whom Bembus ſo far commends* ‘ *as to ſay, he muſt be as ſtupid as a ſtone, who does* ‘ *not prefer one* ſitting *of her to all the* walkings *and* ‘ *diſputations of the philoſophers.*

(*c*) *Taken from* Hilarion de Coſte, Eloges des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. I, pag. 697, & *ſeq.*

(7) Eloges des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. I, pag. 701.

(8) The count Balthaſar Caſtiglione, in his *Cortegiano, B. i, pag. m.* 10.

(9) Non eſſendo ancora il Duca Guido giunto alli xx anni, s'infermo di podagre, lequali con atrociſſimi dolori procedendo, in poco ſpatio di tempo talmente tutti i membri gli impedirono che ne ſtare in piedi ne mover ſi potea: & coſi reſtò un de i piu belli, & diſpoſti corpi del mondo deformato & guaſto nella ſua verde età. *Balt. Caſtiglione, il Cortegiano, B. i, pag.* 8.

(10) Odaxius, in this prince's Funeral Oration, ſays, that it was at twenty one years of age.

(11) Id. Balth. Caſtig. Ib. lib. iii, pag. 46

(12) That book was printed at Florence in 1625, in 4to.

(13) Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, pag. 703, 704.

(14) It has been printed ſeveral times: It is in a collection of ſuch like pieces, printed at Urſellis in the year 1606. It is alſo to be found in the book, intituled, *Baudii Amores.*

GONZAGA (Julia), ducheſs of Traietta, and counteſs of Fondi, was the wife of Veſpaſian Colonna. After the death of her huſband, ſhe took for her device, ‘ an ‘ amaranth, which the Botaniſts call *Love-flower*, with this motto, *non moritura*, deſigning to expreſs, that her firſt love ſhould be immortal. The wonder is, that her ‘ huſband was old; that ſhe was in the flower of her age, and in ſo great a reputation ‘ for her beauty, that Soliman, emperor of the Turks, had a deſire to ſee her. To this ‘ end, he ſent Barbaroſſa, king of Algiers (*a*), and his lieutenant-general, with a powerful army, to Fondi, where ſhe made her uſual reſidence: but he ſucceeded not in his deſign;

(*a*) This excuſes me from ſaying, that ſhe lived in the XVIth century.

‘ deſign ; for, tho’ this general arrived by night, and took the town by ſtorm, the fair ‘ and chaſte Julia fell not into the hands of the Barbarian. Whether ſhe had notice ‘ given her of the danger that threatened her, or whether ſhe was divinely inſpired, ſhe ‘ fled barefooted upon the firſt noiſe ſhe heard ; and, to ſave her honour, expoſed her ‘ life to a thouſand dangers (*b*).’ This lady was ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm (*c*). *Thuanus, Francis Billon, and other authors, praiſe her for her learning, which made her eſteemed by the moſt learned men in Italy* (*d*). The reaſon why ſhe did not marry again is conſiderable [*A*]. One may very well queſtion, whether ſhe acted the part of a ſtep-mother without retaining ſome faults of it [*B*]. We ſhall ſee how Brantome has related Barbaroſſa’s adventure [*C*].

(*b*) *Taken from the* Entretiens d’Ariſte & d’Eugene, pag. m. 458, 459. *See alſo* Hilarion de Coſte, Tom. II, *of his* Dames Illuſtres, pag. 96, 97.

(*c*) Convictuſque quod cum ſectariis in Germania, & in Italia cum Victoria Columna Marchionis Piſcarii vidua, & Julia Gonzaga, lectiſſimis alioqui feminis, de pravitate ſectaria ſuſpectis, amicitiam coluiſſet. *Thuanus, lib. xxxix, circa init.*

(*d*) Hilarion de Coſte, Vies des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. II, pag. 97.

[*A*] *The reaſon why ſhe did not marry again is conſiderable.*] ‘ After her huſband’s death, ſhe was ‘ courted by the greateſt lords of Italy, who could ‘ not induce her to a ſecond marriage ; becauſe ſhe ‘ ſaid, that, if her ſecond huſband ſhould prove good, ‘ ſhe ſhould be in perpetual fear of loſing him ; and ‘ if he ſhould prove bad, it would be a grievous ‘ thing to bear ; and that, having had a good one, ‘ ſhe would never remove from her heart the af‘ fection ſhe bore him (1).’ She was very fortunate in not having her eyes tempted by a charming object ; for in that caſe her dilemma would have been quickly deſtroyed. In vain did Dido ſay :

(1) Hilarion de Coſte, Vies des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. II, pag. 97.

Sed mihi vel tellus optem priùs ima dehiſcat,
Vel pater omnipotens adigat me fulmine ad umbras,
Pallentes umbras Erebi, noctemque profundam ;
Ante, pudor, quàm te violo, aut tua jura reſolvo.
Ille meos, primus qui me ſibi junxit, amores
Abſtulit ; ille habeat ſecum, ſervetque ſepulchro (2).

Let earth, diſparting, ſnatch me from the light,
Or thunder drive me to the ſhades of night ;
Immediate death be wretched Dido’s fate,
E’re, modeſty, thy laws I violate.
My love, which one dear object only knew,
Is ſtill to my Sichæus’ memory true.

(2) Virgil. Æn. lib. iv, ver. 24.

The noble carriage (3) and the merit of Æneas had already made an impreſſion and renewed the traces (4). She could not withſtand a ſecond match, and forgot her fine reſolutions. Generally ſpeaking, Julia Gonzaga’s dilemma may be turned another way ; for it may be ſaid, *if my ſecond huſband be an ill one, I ſhall not be afraid of loſing him ; if he be good, he will make me very happy* ; beſides, they, who have loſt a good huſband, may alledge this argument ; *I have ſped ſo well in marriage, that I am willing to re-enter into the ſtate I have ſo much reaſon to commend.* They, who have loſt a bad huſband, may ſay ; *there is reaſon I ſhould try whether I ſhall be more happy in a ſecond choice than in the firſt : I ought not to die without endeavouring to mend my ſelf.*

(3) Quam ſeſe ore ferens ! quam forti pectore & armis !
What dignity of ſoul his aſpect bears !
How all the hero in his mien appears !
Ibid. ver. 11.

(4) Agnoſco veteris veſtigia flammæ.
’Tis love ; the tyrant paſſion ſtands confeſs’d,
It’s well-known fires rekindling in my breaſt.
Ibid. ver. 23.

[*B*] *There is room to doubt, whether ſhe acted the part of a ſtep-mother, without retaining ſome of the faults of it.*] It is a very difficult part ; the wiſeſt heads find it a hard taſk to come off well ; there is a certain fate, that poſſeſſes mothers-in-law with a great deal of ill humour. Be that how it will, the monk I have cited informs us (5), that *Veſpaſian Colonna had by his firſt wife* (6) *a daughter named Iſabella, whom our Julia, her mother-in-law, deſigning to marry to Lewis Gonzaga her brother, oppoſed Pope Clement VII (who had a mind to marry her to Dom. Hippolito his nephew, who was afterwards cardinal) and the emperor Charles V, who had ſeized on her, to marry her to Dom-Ferdinand Gonzaga ; and by her courage and induſtry, ſhe accompliſhed her deſign.* × But did ſhe conſult the inclinations of the young lady ? that is the queſtion. Perhaps Iſabella Colonna would have rather choſen the match propoſed by Clement VII, or by the emperor, than her ſtep-mother’s. Is not this to act like a ſtep-mother, to force the inclination in ſuch a point as this ?

× this may be answer’d as well in ye affirmative as not [illegible] but it do not resolve.

(5) Hilarion de Coſte, ibid. pag. 96.

(6) Beatrix, daughter of the lord of Piombino. *Sanſovino, delle Caſe d’Italia, fol.* 93.

[*C*] *We ſhall ſee how Brantome has related Barbaroſſa’s adventure.*] ‘ There is ſuch another ſtory, ‘ which was told me in the town of Fondi, near ‘ Naples, and which is in every body’s mouth in ‘ that country, about Signora Livia (7) Gonzaga who ‘ had married Aſcanio (8) Colonna : ſhe was reckoned ‘ the fineſt woman in Italy of her time, and was in ‘ ſuch repute, that the fame of her beauty reached ‘ the Levant, (I have often ſeen her picture as a ‘ widow, which confirms it), and Conſtantinople ; for ‘ which reaſon Ariadan Barbaroſſa, who was gene‘ ral of the Grand Signor’s ſea-forces, having firſt, ‘ with a very ſolemn pomp, (as it is written) paſſed ‘ the ſtreights of Meſſina, and coaſted along Calabria, ‘ committed great ravages there, and about Naples, ‘ and made an attempt upon the town of Fondi, ‘ and came there by night ſo opportunely and unex‘ pectedly, that, landing two thouſand Turks, they ‘ ſcaled the walls, and took the town, and ſeized ‘ upon the caſtle, where the lady Livia Gonzaga ‘ was aſleep in bed ; who, hearing the alarm, was ‘ ſo ſurprized, as to ſtart up in the fright, and had ‘ only time to leap out of the window in her ſhift ; ‘ which ſhe did ſo ſeaſonably, eſcaping through the ‘ mountains, that the Turks entered her chamber juſt ‘ as ſhe was eſcaped out of it. They ſay, that Bar‘ baroſſa deſigned her for a preſent to the Grand ‘ Signor, and that the enterprize was made on that ‘ account ; and that, when he found he had miſſed ‘ of her, he was like to run mad : but the lady’s ‘ ill fortune would have it, that, ſhunning Scylla, ſhe ‘ fell into Charybdis, falling in her flight amongſt the ‘ banditti of the kingdom ; and ſhe was known by ‘ ſome and not by others. I therefore leave you ‘ to judge, whether ſuch a dainty bit, when in the ‘ power of thoſe famiſhed wretches, was not actually ‘ taſted by them : ſome believe it, and ſome not. ‘ But whatever oaths ſhe made, ſhe could not be be‘ lieved, ſince ſo noble a morſel could never eſcape ‘ ſuch people without being polluted. The moſt clear‘ ſighted, and who underſtand theſe matters, and have ‘ had a taſte of them, can but too well ſpeak of ‘ them : thus you ſee how eaſily men and women ‘ damn themſelves by their oaths ; for even the fineſt ‘ queens and princeſſes, if they ſhould fall into ſuch ‘ hazards, would be no more ſpared than others, ſince ‘ a great beauty carries no paſſport along with it, and ‘ love in that caſe uſes it’s authority without reſpect ‘ of perſons ; and yet they will proteſt and ſwear, ‘ that their greatneſs daſhed the inſolence of thoſe ‘ who would attempt them, and GOD knows (9).’

(7) It ſhould be Julia.

(8) I call him Veſpaſian in the text of this article : it was his true name.

Varillas (10) has taken from this book of Brantome all that he has ſaid of the adventures of Julia Gonzaga.

He is miſtaken as to the time : he places this in the year 1537, whereas he ſhould have followed Paulus Jovius (11) who ſpeaks of it under the year 1534.

(9) Brantome, Vies des Dames Illuſtres, pag. 282.

(10) Varill. Hiſt. de François I, lib. viii, pag. m. 347, ad ann. 1537.

(11) Paul. Jovius, Hiſt. lib. xxxiii, fol. m. 255.

GONZAGA (LUCRETIA) is one of the moſt illuſtrious women of the XVIth century. She heightened the nobility of her extraction by the brightneſs of her parts, and by her learning [*A*] and the delicacy of her pen. The wits of that time failed not to

[*A*] *She heightened the nobility of her birth by her learning.*] There is no learning in her letters ; but yet we may perceive by them that ſhe was a learned woman : for, writing to Robertel, ſhe declared that his commentary had made her underſtand many obſcure paſſages of Ariſtotle, and the poet Æſchylus. *Egli è gran tempo, che vi ſono affettionata per i beneficii che mi ſento haver ricevuto dai voſtri divini componimenti, i quali m’hanno illuminato l’intelletto in molti oſcuri luoghi, & di Ariſtotile, & di Eſchilo dove il voſtro nobil ingegno s’è molto affaticato* (1). She laughed at doctor Lewis Picco, her couſin, becauſe

(1) Lettere della Signora Lucretia Gonzaga da Gazuolo pag. 78.

to praiſe her [*B*]. She wrote ſuch fine letters, that they were eagerly collected for the preſs. I have ſeen the collection of them, which was publiſhed at Venice in 1552. They inform us, that her marriage with John Paul Manfrone was very unfortunate. He was a man who did not deſerve her by his wealth; ſhe married him againſt her will, being but fourteen years of age (*a*). She eaſily comforted herſelf for not living with him in all the figure her quality required. We cannot ſee a finer piece of morality, than what is to be found in a letter ſhe writ to a monk (*b*), who lamented her being married to ſuch a mean country 'ſquire [*C*]; but ſhe was very much concerned and diſconſolate

cauſe he taught his daughter aſtrology; but underſtanding the great ſervice, that Sulpitius Gallus had done to the Romans, and Pericles to the Greeks, by their skill in aſtrology, ſhe had a mind to learn it, and intreated Lewis Picco to inſtruct her in that ſcience (2). One of the things ſhe ſtudied moſt was rhetoric (3). It appears alſo, that ſhe learned a great deal of logic from Bandel her maſter (4), and that he read Euripides to her (5).

[*B*] *The wits of that time failed not to praiſe her.*] Hortenſio Lando was her moſt zealous and beſt panegyriſt. He made a very fine encomium on this lady. See the letter (6), in which ſhe modeſtly thanked him and repreſented to him (7), that it had been better for him to keep his ingenious thoughts, and his fine expreſſions, for a panegyric upon the Signora Marcheſana (8). I ſay this to make known the name of another very famous lady of that age. The ſame author dedicated to our Lucretia his dialogue, *Del temperar gli affetti d'ell' animo* (9). There was a great correſpondence by way of letters betwixt her and him: ſhe wrote to him above thirty that have been printed. To ſay ſomething of that in the 215th page, we find there Hortenſio Lando a little cenſured for his violent diſcontent at his poverty. She blames him for being afflicted at a thing, the advantages whereof ſhe reckons up to him. 'Eſſendo voi perſona 'dotta; & tanto bene eſperta nei mondani caſi; 'mi maraviglio che di ſi ſtrana maniera vi attriſtiate 'per la poverta; quaſi non ſappiate la vita dei po'veri eſſer ſimile ad una navigatione preſſo il lito: & 'quella de ricchi, non eſſer differente da coloro che 'ſi ritrovano in alto mare: à gli uni è facile gittar 'la fune in terra, & condur la nave à ſicuro luogo; & 'à gli altri è ſommamente difficile, &c (10). —— *When 'I conſider your learning, and experience in worldly af'fairs, I am ſurprized to ſee you ſo dejected with 'poverty, as tho' you knew not, that the life of the 'poor was like ſailing near the ſhore, and that of 'the rich like tempting the deep: the one eaſily gets 'ſafe to land, the other with great difficulty &c.*' Jerome Ruſcelli was one of this lady's panegyriſts. This appears by a letter ſhe wrote to him, which begins thus: 'Inſieme col panegirico fatto da non ſo 'cui; in mia commendatione, hò ancho letto la bella '& proliſſa lettera che per voi vi ſi è aggiunta; 'nella quale, m'havete ritratta col penello della voſtra 'facondia, tale, quale io doveri eſſere per haver quel'la perfettione che non hò (11). —— *Together with 'a panegyric by an unknown hand: I have this day 'read the fine, long, letter you have added to it, in 'my praiſe; in which your eloquent pen has drawn 'me ſuch, as I ought to be, to be miſtreſs of this 'perfection, which I have not.*' Read alſo the other letter ſhe wrote to him (12). A memoir which I have from good hands, informs me, 'that Bandel de'dicated to her one of his novels, *viz.* the twenty 'firſt of the ſecond part. He tells her towards the 'end; Spero ben toſto darvi del mio il libro de le 'mie Stanze tutto compoſto in voſtra lode, ove ve'derete come io mi sforzo à farvi immortale; —— '*I hope very ſoon to preſent you with my book of 'ſtanzas, wholly compoſed entirely to your praiſe, 'in which you will ſee the pains I take to render 'you immortal.* And it is upon thoſe ſtanzas that 'Julius Cæſar Scaliger, a great friend to Bandel, made 'a ſorry epigram, intituled, *de Bandelli amoribus Thuſ'ca lingua decantatis* (31).' Perhaps the reader will not be diſpleaſed to find it here.

Maxime Phœbigenum, cui Thuſco æqualis Homero
  Lydia Mæonio nectare vena fluit:
Unde tibi ætherios immenſi numinis hauſtus
  Largus opum pleno pectore ſpirat amor?
Tantus eras vates, tanta eſt Lucretia. An ipſum
  Hoc illi dederas: an dedit illa tibi?
Dum cœlo imponis, tranſcendes ſidera. Sic te
  Dat Dea, tam rari carminis eſſe Deum (14).

Greateſt of Phæbus's ſons, whoſe numbers flow
With Nectar, ſuch as Homer's only know,
Say, how is thy exalted fancy fir'd,
By love's ſoft influence alone inſpir'd?
So bright a nymph we in thy numbers ſee,
Mad'ſt thou her fair, or ſhe a poet thee?
Thy verſe, that bids to heav'n thy miſtreſs riſe,
Lifts thy own fame above the ſtarry skies;
And fair Lucretia, deiſy'd by thee,
Repays her poet with divinity.

See, in the nymphs of the ſame author, the piece intituled, *Pro Diva Lucretia Gonzaga Pyrrhi filia canit Talariſca* (15), and, in the Heroids the epigram intituled, *Lucretia Pyrrhi Gonzagæ* F (16). But eſpecialſee the *Rime di diverſi autori in lode di donna Lucretia Gonzaga*, printed at Bologna in the year 1565, in 4to. Here is another paſſage of Matthew Bandel (17), from which we may learn the name of Lucretia's mother, and ſome other particulars. Thus he ſpeaks: 'A la molto illuſt. e vertuoſa Heroina la S. Iſabella 'Gonzaga di Poccino, *dedicating to her the* 57th *novel 'of the firſt part.* Eſſendo troppo al mondo mani'feſto il debito e obligo che io ho a la felice e ho'norata memoria del valoroſo S. Pirro Gonzaga, e 'de la gentiliſſima S. Camilla Bentivoglia, voſtri ho'noratiſſimi padre e madre che tanto m'amavano, e 'tutto il di con nuovi beneficii m'obligavano, e men'tre viſſero, furono da me (ſecondo le deboliſſime for'ze mie) ſempre tenuti in quella riverenza che io 'ſeppi la maggiore, come ne le Stanze mie ſi vederà 'che io in lode ho compoſte de la voſtra nobiliſſima 'Sorella dal mondo riverita e da me ſantiſſimamente 'amata, la Signora Lucretia, le quali in breve ſaranno 'publicate, ove ancora vederete il nome voſtro eſſere 'celebrato. —— *To the illuſtrious and virtuous he'roine, Iſabella Gonzaga di Poccizno* .... *It 'being too manifeſt to the world how much I am 'indebted to the happy and honourable memory of the 'brave Peter Gonzaga, and the moſt noble lady Camilla 'Bentivoglia, your very honoured father and mother, 'who ſhewed me ſuch repeated marks of their favour, 'and whom I ſhall always hold in the utmoſt reve'verence, as my ſtanzas teſtify, which I compoſed in 'honour of the moſt noble Lucretia, your ſiſter revered 'by the world, and whom I moſt affectionately loved; 'which ſtanzas I will ſoon publiſh, once more to cele'brate your name.*'

[*C*] *A monk .... who lamented her being married to ſuch a mean country 'ſquire.*] Thus I think I may tranſlate theſe Italian words: 'Ho inteſo che la rive'renza voſtra molto ſi è maravigliata che i miei mag'giori mi maritaſſero mai in huomo di ſi poche fa'cultà, il quale m'haveſſe à condurre in una poco 'amena villuccia, & farmi habitare in una torre poco 'degna degli Avoli onde ne ſono ſecondo la carne 'diſceſa; & per quanto appare dalle voſtre ſcritte à 'mia ſorella, aſſai ve ne doleſte (18). —— *I am in'formed that your reverence is ſurprized at my mar'riage with a man ſo much beneath me, who may 'conduct me to a place unworthy my birth and ance'ſtors; and by what appears in your letter to my ſiſter 'you cannot ſufficiently lament it.*' But, leſt the reader ſhould have wrong notions of John Paul Manfrone, I muſt obſerve, that he was a much more conſiderable man than this monk thought. A letter of his wife's informs us, that he had had good poſts in the Venetian army, and that he had built magnificent palaces. The following paſſage contains ſome other circumſtances of his life. 'Ve ne ſupplica tutto il 'territorio Vicentino, donde egli ne trahe l'origine: 've ne priega la Città di Padoua, dove egli fanci'ullo

---

(*a*) See her letters, pag. 151, 214.

(*b*) It written to Father Bandel; and it is to be found in the 61ſt page.

(2) The letter ſhe writ to him is in the 50th page.

(3) Ibid. pag. 53.

(4) Ibid. pag. 52.

(5) Ibid. pag. 61.

(6) It is in the 30th page. See alſo page 161.

(7) Molto meglio havreſte voi fatto trapportando nel Panegirico della Sig. Marcheſana tutti i bei concetti, & tutte le ſcelte parole che deſtinaſte al Panegirico compoſto per illuſtrare il mio nome oſcuro. *Ibid. pag.* 30.

(8) It was the marchioneſs de Padula, of the houſe of Cardonna. *Ib. pag.* 31.

(9) Ib. pag. 140.

(10) Ibid. pag. 215.

(11) Ib. pag. 76.

(12) Ibid. pag. 131.

(13) A memoir imparted to me by Mr de la Monnoie.

(14) Jul. Cæſar. Scaliger in Farragine, pag 174, primæ partis Poëmatum, Edit. 1591.

(15) *It is in the 278th page of the firſt part.*

(16) *It is in the 377th page of the ſame part.*

(17) *It was imparted to me by Mr de la Monnoie.*

(18) *Letters of Lucretia Gonzaga, pag.* 61.

conſolate for the conduct of her huſband. He was very brave and haughty (*c*), and did ſome actions that went not unpuniſhed. The duke of Ferrara had him carried away, and detained him many years in a ſevere priſon (*d*). By the proceſs he formed againſt him, he found him worthy of a capital puniſhment; but he was merciful, and would not put him to death (*e*). Our Lucretia laboured as much as poſſible to procure his liberty. She endeavoured to ſoften the duke of Ferrara by a very moving letter (*f*). She implored the interceſſion of Paul III (*g*), of Julius III (*h*), of the ſacred college, of the emperor, of the king of France, and of all the other potentates of Chriſtendom. She had recourſe to the aſſiſtance of the court of heaven by her prayers, and thoſe ſhe cauſed to be put up in all the convents and churches; and, when ſhe ſaw that nothing would do, ſhe formed a reſolution of addreſſing the great Turk (*i*), and writ to him a flattering and reſpectful letter (*k*), beſeeching him to ſeize the fortreſs, in which her huſband was confined, and to do no other prejudice to the Chriſtian ſtates. She moſt humbly thanked the duke of Ferrara (*l*) for ſparing the life of a priſoner whom the judges found worthy of death [*D*]. But ſhe was deſirous to have his clemency carried farther. Her huſband was not ſet at liberty; nor was ſhe permitted to viſit him: they could only write to one another (*m*); which did not ſatisfy her: and therefore ſhe uſed her utmoſt endeavours to obtain his enlargement; but all her pains proved ineffectual. He died in priſon (*n*), having expreſſed in his diſgrace ſo great an impatience, that people thought he was beſide himſelf (*o*). The anſwer his widow made to thoſe, who propoſed another match to her, deſerves our admiration [*E*]. Of four children ſhe had (*p*), there remained only two daughters (*q*), whom ſhe put into convents (*r*). All the productions

‘ ullo eſſendo diligentemente ſtudiò: ve ne priega il Poleſino, dove molti anni pratticò, & palazzi, & giardini con grande arte edificò: ve ne priega tutto il diſtretto Mantouano, dove ſpoſandomi ben fanciulla, ſi imparentò: ve ne priega finalmente tutto il Senato Vinitiano, il qual hà ſin dalle faſcie per condottiere & fedelmente, & honoratamente ſempre ſervito (19). —— *The whole territory of Vicenza, whence he drew his birth, petitions your holineſs in his behalf; as does the city of Padua, in which, when a youth, he diligently ſtudied: the Poleſin, in which he practiſed many years, and built palaces and gardens with great art, joins in the the petition; ſo does the diſtrich of Mantua, in which being very young, I was contracted in marriage to him: laſtly, the whole ſenate of Venice, in whoſe armies he ſerved faithfully and honourably, becomes a petitioner to your holineſs in his favour.*’ Theſe are the reaſons his wife made uſe of to engage Paul III to intercede for him.

[*D*] *She thanked the duke of Ferrara for ſparing the life of a priſoner, whom the judges had found worthy of death.*] To underſtand perfectly the circumſtances of this trial, we muſt ſee the hiſtory that Antony Braſavolus (20) has publiſhed of it. We find, in the epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque, that the three firſt books of a volume of phyſic, written by Braſavolus, contained ‘ Hiſtoriam capti & ſupplicio afficiendi Pauli Manfroni propter inſidias adverſus ducem & quomodo dux ei vitam donaverit, ſed in carcere retinuerit (21). —— *The hiſtory of Paul Manfrone, taken, and to be puniſhed, for plotting againſt the duke, and how the duke gave him his life, but kept him in priſon.*’

[*E*] *The anſwer of his widow to thoſe, who propoſed another match to her, deſerves our admiration.*] I confeſs they did not obſerve decorum; they made too much haſte; for they propoſed the thing within leſs than a month after the burial of her huſband. Widows, never ſo wanton and fond of marriage, would expreſs ſome reſentment againſt thoſe, who ſhould talk to them ſo ſuddenly of a ſecond huſband. Decency, cuſtom, the formulary of the ſtyle of converſations, require an appearance of affliction for ſome time, and a ſeeming averſeneſs to a ſecond marriage; and, as thoſe, who ſhould think to ingratiate themſelves by two early advices of matrimony, would have but an ill opinion of a widow's continence, it is requiſite, that they ſhould be anſwered with airs of indignation. I confeſs therefore, that thoſe, who ſo haſtily adviſed our Lucretia Gonzaga to a ſecond huſband, did not well obſerve the ceremonial. But I find, in her anſwer, I know not what that does her a great honour, and which does not reſemble the artificial language of la Fontaine's *young widow* (22). ‘ Appena hò raſciutto le lagrime che giorno è notte mi ſono con larghiſſima vena piovute da gli occhi: à fatica hò poſto termine ai ſinghiozzi & ai ſoſpiri: ne anche è compiuto il meſe che l'infelice mio conſorte è ſtato ſepolto, & voi già mi parlate di rimaritare? non ſapete voi caſta non eſſer mai ſtata iſtimata, chi due fiate ſi è maritata? Didone anchora preſſo di Virgilio, chiama ſotte nome di colpa le ſeconde nozze, & voi con tanta inſtanza mi ci invitate? nò nò, io non voglio piu ſentire de ſi fatti cordagli; ne altro marito intendo piu di volere che Giesu Christo (23). —— *Scarce have I dried up the tears, which have, day and night, trickled plentifully from my eyes; with difficulty have I put an end to my ſighs and groans; nor is it yet a full month, ſince my unhappy huſband was buried; and do you already talk to me of marrying again? Know you not, that ſecond marriages are deemed unchaſte? Dido, in Virgil, calls ſuch matches by the name of A Crime; and do you ſo earneſtly invite me to it? No, no, I will think no more of ſuch troubleſome matters, nor will I have any other huſband than JESUS CHRIST.*’ The remaining part of the letter turns upon the deſign of devoting herſelf for the future only to Jesus Christ as her huſband. Our Lucretia goes too far in affirming, that a womam was never reckoned chaſte that married again: but it is certain, that thoſe, who would never marry again, and who lived in an unblameable widowhood, have always been more admired. We have ſeen our widow's anſwer to Orſola Pellegrini, who adviſed her to think of a ſecond match, and that within the firſt month of her mourning. Let us ſee now how ſhe anſwered Andriana Trivulcio, who did much better obſerve decorum; for he gave her not his advice till towards the end of the firſt year of her widowhood. Lucretia declared to him, that ſhe wondered, when ſhe had been ſo unhappy with her huſband, that any one ſhould propoſe to her to come again under the conjugal yoke, from which God had delivered her. Know, ſaid ſhe, that I would not do it, though I could meet with a huſband wiſer than Lælius, handſomer than Nireus, and as rich as Craſſus. It is better to hear her in her own language (24). ‘ Non mi poſſo veramente penſare che fantaſia vi ſia venuta in capo, di procacciarmi marito, non eſſendo anchora conſunto il cadavero di chi già prima à ſe di legittimo nodo mi legò, ilquale, mi hà fatto ſentire tanti affanni, che ſe divina forza non mi haveſſe aiutata, non haurei potuto mai reſiſtere à tanti guai. Iddio finalmente mi hà reſtituito quella libertà, che m'era ſtata occupata dalla fraterna voluntà, dandomi marito contra mia voglia: & voi, non ſo da qual ſpirito guidata, cercate di condurmi un'altra fiata ſotto'l marital giogo: ponete pur il voſtro core in pace, & penſate ad altro: che non ritoglierei marito s'egli fuſſe piu ſavio di quel Lelio, che hebbe el titolo del ſavio, s'egli fuſſe piu bello di Nireo, & s'egli poſſedeſſe le facultà di Craſſo. —— *I cannot imagine how it came into your head to propoſe another huſband to me, before the dead body of him, to whom I was firſt lawfully joined, be conſumed; in whoſe lifetime, I underwent ſo much anxiety, that had I not been ſupported by heaven, I could never have born up againſt ſo great misfortunes: GOD, at laſt, has re-*

‘ *ſtored*

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 57, 105.

(*d*) See the 59th page.

(*e*) Ib pag. 158.

(*f*) It is in the 16th page.

(*g*) Pag. 99.

(*h*) Pag. 101.

(*i*) See her letters, page 104.

(*k*) It is in the 257th page.

(*l*) Ibid. pag. 158, 159.

(*m*) Ib. pag. 156.

(*n*) Ibid. pag. 221, & *ſeq.*

(*o*) Ib. pag. 208.

(*p*) Ibid. pag. 100, & 151.

(*q*) Ib. pag. 151.

(*r*) Ib pag. 141.

(19) Ibid. pag. 100, 101.

(20) *An eminent phyſician of Ferrara.*

(21) Epitome Bibl. Geſneri, pag. 65.

(22) *It is the title, which Mr de la Fontaine gave to the 21ſt fable of the ſixth book, pag. 227, of the ſecond Tome. Edit. of Paris,* 1678.

(23) Lucretia Gonzaga, ubi ſupra, pag. 213.

(24) Ibid. pag. 214.

productions of her pen were ſo much eſteemed, that the very notes ſhe writ to her domeſtics

‘ ſtored me to liberty; yet you, guided by I know not ‘ what ſpirit, would once more put me under the marriage yoke: ſet your heart at reſt, and think of ſomething elſe; for I will never take another husband, be ‘ be wiſer than Lelius, who was ſirnamed the wiſe, be ‘ be handſomer than Nireus, or richer than Craſſus.’ Thus you ſee a widow very different from that of la Fontaine. She talks at the end of the year as if it were the firſt day; and therefore theſe four verſes cannot be applied to her:

Entre la veuve d'une année
Et la veuve d'une journée
La difference eſt grande. On ne croiroit jamais
Que ce fuſt la même perſonne (25).

The difference is full great, I ween,
Betwixt a widow of a day,
And her, whoſe widow-hood has ſeen
Twelve moons of mourning waſte away.

Collections relating to ſecond marriages.

I think myſelf obliged a little to ſoften the criticiſm I have made on this lady's thoughts, when I have ſaid that there was an exceſs in her expreſſions. This exceſs may be excuſed by ſuppoſing, that our Lucretia had a little too reſpectfully eſpouſed the maxims of St Jerome. The wiſeſt critics obſerve, that this great ſaint has carried this matter too far. Here is a paſſage of Mr Daillé (26). *I omit what at every turn he ſpeaks reproachfully, both againſt marriage in general, and againſt ſecond marriages in particular, uſing ſometimes ſuch harſh expreſſions, that, though he uſed all the cautions to explain them, that are to be found in his epiſtle to Pammachius upon this ſubject, yet it ſeems impoſſible to free them from the ſenſe of Tertullian, condemned by the church as contrary to the honour of marriage, and the authority of ſcripture. For example, how is it poſſible to mollify what he writ to a lady named Furia* *, That ſhe will not be ſo commendable for remaining a widow, as ſhe will be execrable by marrying again, not obſerving, though a Chriſtian, what many women of her family had obſerved, being heathens: *a thing which he repeats in the following epiſtle, exhorting Ageruchia to the ſame deſign* †; *and he brings ſome ſcandalous compariſons, applying to thoſe, that marry again, the proverb St Peter uſes to another purpoſe,* a dog returning to his vomit, and a ſwine to her wallowing in the mire. *Is not this clearly to reckon ſecond marriages amongſt filthy and polluted things?* If you deſire to know farther what relates to the modeſty, which St Jerome aſcribes to the female anceſtors of Furia, read the article CAMILLA (27). I add, that the virtuous Lucretia Gonzaga was dazzled with the glory that ſurrounded, even among the heathens, the women that did not marry again. And ſo ſhe concluded, that thoſe women were not reputed chaſte, that took a ſecond husband. She had, doubtleſs, read the words I ſhall preſently quote out of a heathen writer; from which we learn, that a crown of chaſtity was decreed to the women, who had been married but once, and that repeated marriages were looked upon as a ſort of corruption. ‘ Quæ uno contentæ matrimonio fuerant, coronâ pudicitiæ honorabantur. Exiſtimabant enim eum præcipuè matronæ ſincera fide incorruptum eſſe animum, qui poſt depoſitæ virginitatis cubile in publicum egredi neſciret: multorum matrimoniorum experientiam, quaſi illegitimæ (28) cujuſdam intemperantiæ ſignum eſſe credentes (29). I believe alſo ſhe had read, in Tertullian, what privileges the heathens granted to women who had married but once. ‘ Monogamia apud Ethnicos in ſummo honore eſt: ut & virginibus nubentibus univira pronuba adhibeatur, & ſic auſpicii initium eſt. Item in quibuſdam ſollemnibus & auſpiciis, ut prior ſit univiræ locus. Certe Flaminia non niſi univira eſt. —— ‘ *Monogamy is in high eſteem among the antients; inſomuch, that, when a virgin is married, they aſſign her a woman, that has been but once married, to perform the ceremony of bringing her home to the bridegroom's houſe. Likewiſe, on ſome ſolemn occaſions, the precedency is given to the once-married woman. Flaminia is certainly of that number.*’ Lipſius alledges this paſſage of Tertullian in commenting on the place, where Tacitus obſerves, that Pollio's daughter was preferred to the daughter of Fonteius Agrippa, for this reaſon alone, that her mother had never any more than one husband. The queſtion was about the election of a veſtal. *Prælata eſt Pollionis filia non ob aliud quam quod mater ejus in eodem conjugio manebat. Nam Agrippa diſcidio domum imminuerat* (30). Lipſius does not mention all the privileges ſpoken of by Tertullian: he does not ſay, that no women, but thoſe who had obſerved monogamy (31), were permitted to put a crown on the head of *Fortuna Muliebris* (32). I ſay nothing of the epitaphs, whereon the epithet Univira was carefully remembered, in honour of the women, that did not marry twice; which ſhews, that this conduct was looked upon as a thing deſerving immortality. Libanius's exclamation informs us, that this conduct was admired, amongſt other reaſons, becauſe few inſtances of it were to be ſeen. This ſophiſt, hearing, that St Chryſoſtome's mother was forty years old, and had been a widow twenty, cried out, *Good GOD! what women are there among chriſtians* (33)!

The author of the news from the Republic of letters, ſays ſomewhere, that a certain encomium, which had been lately beſtowed upon marriage, was built upon reaſons that prove too much; ‘ and which deſtroy a notion that has been very common even amongſt thoſe, who, for political reaſons, caſt a kind of blot upon celibacy. This notion is, that a widow, who marries not again, is more eſteemed, all other things being equal, than one that does. If we had not a vaſt number of authorities for this, the bare words of Virgil, which he makes Dido ſpeak, would teach us what was the judgment of the ancients: (Æneid. IV. 28.)

Ille meos primus qui me ſibi junxit, amores
Abſtulit. Ille habeat ſecum ſervetque ſepulchro.

My love, which one dear object only knew,
Is ſtill to my Sichæus' mem'ry true.

‘ It muſt be granted, that the ideas of virtue are more favourable to the men, who marry a ſecond time; yet it is certain, that ſuch marriages have been ſubject formerly, and are ſtill, to canonical penalties; and if we believe the learned civilian, who has written the *Rights of the queen*, the devolution, which takes place in ſome countries, was eſtabliſhed only to bridle the incontinence of widowers, and to hinder them from marrying again, to the great prejudice of their children by the firſt wife (34).’ What he ſays of Dido was not unknown to the illuſtrious lady, who makes the ſubject of this article. I do not know whether ſhe ever read the paſſage of Pauſanias, which I have cited in the article GORGOPHONE, or the reaſons alledged by Plutarch, why the nuptials of virgins at Rome were never celebrated on feſtival-days, nor thoſe of widows on work-days. According to Varro, the reaſon of this cuſtom was, becauſe nothing was to be done unwillingly on feſtival-days. Ἑορτῇ μηθὲν λυπουμένους ποιεῖν μηδὲ πρὸς ἀνάγκην. *Feſto die nihil cum moleſtia & coactione agendum* (35). Now, added he, a widow marries again with pleaſure, but a maid with reluctancy. Λυπούμεναι μὲν αἱ παρθένοι γαμοῦνται, χαίρουσαι δὲ αἱ γυναῖκες. *Virgines nubere triſtes, mulieres autem cum lætitia* (36). This thought would be unworthy of this learned man, if we took it literally; we muſt ſay therefore, that he ſpoke only of appearances. His meaning, no doubt, is, that feſtival-days, being deſigned for public rejoicings, mirth ought to appear in every face during thoſe ſolemnities. Since then the laws of decorum oblige maids to appear ſerious and penſive on their wedding-day (37), and widows are diſpenſed with that affected grimace, maids are not married on feſtival-days, &c. Let us mention another reaſon alledged by Plutarch. He ſays, that marriage being honourable to maids, and ſcandalous to widows, the marriage of the former ought to be celebrated in the preſence of many people; but, on the contrary, widows ought to deſire to be married in the preſence of few people; and for that reaſon they chuſe a day, when the people mind other ſhews. Ἢ μᾶλλον ὅτι ταῖς μὲν παρθένοις, καλὸν μὴ ὀλίγων, meſtics were collected [*F*]: you will find many of them in the edition of her letters; and you will find likewiſe many marks of her virtue and piety. Her reprimands to ſome leud, covetous, or proud women, are very fine [*G*], and deſerve to be read, as well

---

(25) La Fontaine, ubi ſupra.

(26) Daillé, de l'emploi des Peres, livr. ii, cap. iv, pag. m. 381.

* *Id. Epiſt.* x, *ad Furiam, Tom. I, pag.* 89. *D.* & 101. *C.* Ut non tam laudanda ſis, ſi vidua perſeveres, quàm execranda ſi id Chriſtiana non ſerves, quod per tanta ſæcula Gentiles fœminæ cuſtodierunt. *mox, pag.* 90. *C.* Canis revertens ad vomitum & ſus lota ad volutabrum luti.

† *Id. Epiſt. xi, ad Ageruch. Tom. I, pag.* 101, *C. tot.* Hæc brevi ſermone perſtrinxi, ut oſtendam adoleſcentulam meam non præſtare monogamiam generi ſuo, ſed reddere, nec tam laudandam eſſe ſi tribuat, quam omnibus execrandam ſi negare tentaverit.

(27) *Remark* [*E*].

(28) *It is* legitimæ *in the beſt manuſcripts.*

(29) Valerius Maximus, lib. ii, cap. i, n. 3.

(30) Tacit. Ann. lib. ii, cap. lxxxvi.

(31) *That is, who had had but one husband.*

(32) Fortunæ muliebri coronam non imponebat niſi univira. *Tertull.*

(33) Βαβαὶ, ἔφη, οἷαι παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς γυναῖκες εἰσι. *Chryſoſt. Orat. I, ad viduam juniorem.*

(34) Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres, Sept. 1685, Art. III, pag. 968, 969.

(35) Plut. in Quæſt. Roman. pag. 289, *A.*

(36) Id. ibid.

(37) *It was without doubt the cuſtom of Rome; and the ſame thing is ſtill practiſed in ſeveral countries.*

γων, ταῖς δὲ χήραις αἰσχρὸν πολλῶν ὄντων γαμεῖσθαι; ζηλωτὸς γὰρ ὁ πρῶτος γάμος, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος ἀπευκταῖος· αἰσχύνονται γὰρ ἂν ζώντων τῶν προτέρων ἑτέρους λαμβάνωσιν, ὀδύρονται δὲ ἂν ἀποθανόντων· ὅθεν ἡσυχίᾳ χαίρουσι μᾶλλον ἢ θορύβοις καὶ προπομπαῖς· αἱ δὲ ἑορταὶ περισπῶσι τοὺς πολλούς, ὥστε τοῖς τοιούτοις μὴ σχολάζειν. Aut quia decori eſt virginibus nuptias earum multis præſentibus peragi, idemque viduis dedecori? primæ enim nuptiæ optandæ ſunt & in precio: ſecundæ votis recuſandæ, quòd vel cum turpitudine nubunt vivente priore marito, vel cum luctu, ſi is ſit mortuus. Itaque viduæ ad ſuas nuptias quiete magis gaudent quàm frequentia hominum & tumultu: feſtivitates porrò multitudinem ad ſe trahunt, neque nuptiis vacare patiuntur (38). —— *Or is it becauſe it is an honour to virgins to be married in the preſence of many, but to widows a diſgrace? For the firſt kind of marriages are deſireable and eſteemed: the ſecond to be ſhunned, becauſe, if the firſt husband be alive, they marry with diſgrace; if dead, with grief. For this reaſon, widows, when they marry, chuſe privacy rather than a concourſe of ſpectators: now feſtival-ſhows draw the multitude to them, and ſuffer them not to attend on weddings.* I thought it requiſite to cite the whole paſſage of Plutarch, becauſe, in the ſubſtance which I have given of it, I have not repreſented the whole force of the expreſſions and circumſtances, whereby he ſhews how little thoſe women were eſteemed, who married a ſecond time. If you add to this the anſwers that were made by ſome illuſtrious ladies, when they were told of marrying again (39), you will excuſe the ſtrained expreſſions of our Lucretia.

Call to mind the anſwer of another lady of the houſe of Gonzaga (40).

[*F*] *The very notes ſhe wrote to her domeſtics were collected.*] They have even inſerted what ſhe wrote to her footman, to chide him for not readily obeying dame Lucia, who was her houſe-keeper (41); and what ſhe wrote to this Lucia, forbidding her to be ſo parſimonious, and commanding her to laſh a diſobedient ſervant-maid till the blood came. *Se Livia non vi è obediente alzatele in capo i drappi & datelene tante che le carni ſi facciano livide & il ſangue le ſcorra fino alle calcagna* (42). I do not know whether Mr Montreuil followed this example, when he inſerted in the collection of his letters, what he wrote to his butcher (43); but I think this kind of notes might have been omitted without any prejudice to our Lucretia. I am of another opinion as to thoſe, which acquaint us how carefully ſhe applied herſelf to marry her ſervants. This is very glorious to her memory. It is one of the good qualities a great lady ought to be miſtreſs of, and at the ſame time it is a virtue ſeldom practiſed among great people: for if a lady is ill ſerved, ſhe turns away her maids and waiting women, *&c.* without rewarding them; and if ſhe is well ſerved, ſhe keeps them as long as ſhe can, without procuring them a marriage, that might deprive her of the good ſervices they do her. None are more inexcuſable in this reſpect, than the ladies of great retinue and equipage; for they may eaſily know, by the familiarity between their domeſtics of different ſexes, that to marry them would be to do them a great pleaſure. The greateſt watchfulneſs of miſtreſſes, their ſeverity, exhortations, cenſures, cannot prevent the familiarity and private correſpondence of ſervants, and other ſtronger engagements, the ſcandalous conſequences whereof do but too often appear. This moſt evidently ſhews what ought to be done to recompence the ſervice they have received. We may therefore juſtly blame the ladies, who do not imitate our Lucretia, and praiſe her for her affection and generoſity to thoſe of her ſex, who ſerved her. She was ſo kind as to write to Cornelia Giannotti, that ſhe had found her a young, rich, prudent and handſome husband. She exactly deſcribed to her his perfections; that he had a great deal of wit, was modeſt in his diſcourſe (44), polite in his carriage, induſtrious, grave, civil, *&c.* Thus much for the ſoul. She forgot not what concerned the body: ſhe is very particular in her deſcription of it. 'Vengo hora alle qualità corporali, *ſays ſhe*, lequai ſonomi parute degne di contemplatione, percioche egli 'è piu toſto robuſto, che delicato, non molto grande 'ma thoroſo, d'occhio vivaciſſimo; di largo petto; 'di fianco rotundo; di gamba ſuelta, di fronte ampia; 'di capo tondo, & ricciuto, ne aggiugne al venteſimo 'anno (per quanto ſi dice) (45). —— *I come now to 'his bodily perfections, which ſeem to me worthy of 'conſideration, becauſe he is rather robuſt, than delicate, not very large but brawny, of moſt lively eyes, 'of a wide cheſt, round hips, a fine leg, a broad forehead, with a curled head of hair, and, they ſay, ſcarce 'twenty years old.*' This ſhews that ſhe made a choice like a good miſtreſs, and a good friend. At another time, having found an advantageous match for one of her women, ſhe immediately wrote to her the happy news; and adviſed her in the firſt place to give thanks to God, and in the next place to keep herſelf neat, that, when the galant came to viſit her, he might not take her for the kitchen-maid. 'Rallegrati Giulia, & alza le mani al cielo, poi che mentre ſon ſtata alla fera di Rovigo, ti hò trovato un 'marito di tal qualita che ogn'uno che lo conoſce 'lo giudica laborioſo . . . . ponti adunque in ordine, 'percioche io penſo ch'egli ſe ne verra con noi alla 'Fratta; fa che non ti ritrovi con i capegli ſcarmigliati, col viſo tinto, ò con le mani impaſtricciate 'come ſe tu fuſſi la cuoca (46). - - - - *Rejoice, Julia, and return thanks to heaven: I have found 'you ſuch a husband, that whoever ſees him will 'judge him to be a pains-taking man. . . . . Put 'your ſelf therefore in order againſt he viſits you, 'and take care he does not find you with your hair 'about your ears, and your face and hands greaſy, 'like any cook-wench.*' She did ſuch another piece of ſervice to one of her ſiſter's women (47).

[G] *Her reprimands to ſome leud, covetous, or proud women are very fine.*] Read what ſhe wrote to a woman, who, to excuſe her wanton life, urged, that her reſiſtance was to no purpoſe (48). Amongſt other counſels, ſhe adviſed her to eat and ſleep but little, to avoid idleneſs and laſcivious diſcourſes, to abſtain from lawful pleaſures, to ſtudy the holy ſcriptures, and to apply herſelf to prayer. I do not wonder, ſays ſhe, that you have not the power to reſiſt ſenſual pleaſures, ſince I do not perceive that you are ſufficiently cautious of avoiding thoſe things, that prompt you to luxury. The temptations of the fleſh are like the Sirens. We muſt keep at a diſtance from them, if we would not be caught by them (49): *Non ti vego porre alcuna diligenza per ſchivar quelle coſe che alla libidine incitar ti poſſono, & è ben ragione che* CHI AMA IL PERICOLO PERISCA NEL PERICOLO. *Sono le tentatione carnali ſimili alle Sirene, dalle quali pochi ne ſcampano ſe non ſi allontanano* (50). This, by the bye, is a very common illuſion. People complain, that they cannot withſtand ſome temptations, though they oppoſe them with all their ſtrength, as they ſay. But can they be ſaid to oppoſe them, who feed upon the fineſt diſhes, who make all ſorts of viſits, who ſeek for the moſt agreeable converſations, *&c*? It is ſo eaſy a tranſition from lawful to unlawful pleaſures, that he cannot be thought to deſign a good life in earneſt, who does not renounce many innocent conveniencies. *Raffrenati etiandio dai leciti piaceri* (51). - - - *Refrain even from lawful pleaſures*, is what ſhould be ſaid to the voluptuous, as our Lucretia ſaid to the leud woman here mentioned. This leud woman had a ſiſter, who led the ſame life: Lucretia wrote to her a long letter (52), full of reaſons moſt likely to convert this creature. She expreſſes herſelf with admirable life and eloquence againſt the brutiſhneſs of this vice. Nor is ſhe leſs eloquent in cenſuring an old ſinner, whom ſhe turns into ridicule: 'Oh bella coſa, che 'per tutta la città voſtra ſi dica, che non vi poſſiate 'per vecchiezza che vi habbia ſouragiunto diſtogliere 'dalle libidinoſe ſchifezze . . . . Fra tutti i moſtri, 'niuna coſa è piu moſtruoſa di un vecchio libidinoſo. Contemplate almeno allo ſpecchio i canuti capegli, la canuta barba, la fronte rugoſa, & la faccia 'ſimigliante ad un cadavero (53). —— *What a fine 'thing it is, for the whole town to cry out, that 'old age itſelf cannot cure you of luſt . . . . Of all 'monſters a libidinous old man is the greateſt. Do 'but look in the glaſs, and contemplate thoſe grey 'hairs,* well as thoſe, which ſhe wrote to a prieſt who addicted himſelf to venereal pleaſures [*H*]. It is likewiſe edifying to read what ſhe wrote to a mother, who wanted to be comforted for not having been able to perſuade her daughter to chooſe a cloyſter rather than marriage (*s*). She, in a few words, diſplays the moſt excellent common places the Proteſtants make uſe of to exalt the dignity and ſanctity of marriage. Let us not forget, that ſhe was daughter of Pyrrhus Gonzaga, and that ſhe had brothers and ſiſters (*t*).

---

(38) Idem. Plut. *ibid.*

(39) *See the remark* [*F*], *of the article* PORCIA.

(40) *See* GONZAGA (JULIA), *citat.* (1).

(41) *That letter is at page* 226. *See alſo what ſhe writ to her butler, page* 222.

(42) Ibid. pag. 227.

(43) *See the article* PAYS, *remark* [*B*].

(44) Dalla ſua bocca non uſci mai parola (non dico vergognoſa) ma ne pur leggiera ò licentioſa. — *He never uttered (I do not ſay an impudent) but even a light or wanton expreſſion.* Letter, &c. pag. 221.

(45) Ibid.

(46) Ibid. pag. 143.

(47) Ibid.

(48) Ibid. pag. 292, 293.

(49) *See what is ſaid in the article* FONTEVRAUD, *remarks* [*M*] *and* [*N*].

(50) Ibid. pag. 293.

(51) Ibid.

(52) Ibid. pag. 294, & ſeq. *See alſo what ſhe writ to ſome other leud women, pag.* 128, 166.

(53) Ibid pag. 298.

(*s*) Ibid. pag. 34, 35.

(*t*) Ibid. pag. 87.

'*hairs, white beard, wrinkled forehead, and complexion* '*of a dead man.*' What ſhe writ to a man, who, far from finding the cure of his diſorders by marriage, grew more laſcivious by it, is no leſs forcible. 'Io 'mi credevo, che voi vi foſte maritato, perche il 'matrimonio vi haveſſe ad eſſere il rifuggio della voſtra incontinenza: ma per quanto s'intende, gli vi 'è piu toſto ſtato un ſprone, & uno incitamento alla 'luſſuria (54). —— '*I thought you had married* '*to avoid incontinence; but I find marriage has proved* '*to you rather a ſpur and incitement to wantonneſs.*' If ſhe would have cenſured all thoſe, whom neither old age nor marriage cure of that vice, ſhe muſt have written more letters than would have made two volumes in folio. As to covetous or proud perſons, whom ſhe endeavours to reclaim, ſee the pages which I quote (55).

(54) Ibid. pag. 299.

(55) Ibid. pag. 29, 129, 174, 232, 104.

[*H*]. . . . *Nor do thoſe leſs deſerve reading, which ſhe wrote to a prieſt, who addicted himſelf to venereal pleaſures.*] See in what manner ſhe talks to him (56): 'Egli è pur forza che poſpoſto ogni riſpetto, io vi 'ſcriva, io vi ammoniſca, & vi faccia rauvedere dei 'voſtri ſporchi falli, voi ſacerdote d'Iddio, tutto con'ſacrato alle coſe divine, non vi vergognerete toccare 'la putrida carne di una meretrice, con quella bocca, 'con laquale, ricevete il corpo del noſtro Signore; '& non vi vergognerete trattare ſi odioſe brutture 'con quelle iſteſſe mani, con lequali celebrate quello 'ineffabile miſterio miniſtrandovi gli agnoli? Oh come 'non ſi patono inſieme, farſi quel medeſimo corpo, '& ſpirito con Iddio, & un medeſimo corpo con la 'malvagia femina. — *I cannot forbear writing to you,* '*and admoniſhing you, concerning your leud behaviour:* '*you, who art one of* GOD'*s prieſts, wholly dedi*'*cated to divine things; are you not aſhamed to touch* '*the rotten fleſh of an harlot, with that mouth, with* '*which you receive the body of our Lord; and are you* '*not aſhamed to handle ſuch odious filth with thoſe* '*very hands, with which you celebrate the ineffable* '*myſtery, in adminiſtring to your flock? Oh! how* '*can the ſame body and ſpirit ſerve* GOD *and an* '*harlot?*'

(56) Ibid. pag. 297.

GORGOPHONE, daughter of Perſeus and Andromeda, was the wife of Perieres, ſon of Æolus, and king of the Meſſenians in Peloponneſus. Out-living her huſband, ſhe married Oebalus, and was the firſt woman that took a ſecond huſband; for, before her, her ſex religiouſly abſtained from ſecond marriages (*a*). This innovation cannot be ſo great a blot on her memory, as that of Lamech was, who married two wives at the ſame time. Yet it is a blot, whenever hiſtory obſerves, that a perſon was the firſt, who introduced a relaxation in the practice of rigid morality. The relaxation of Gorgophone's children was much more to be condemned; for they fell into inceſt. She had two ſons by her firſt marriage, *viz.* Aphareus and Leucippus. By the ſecond venter, ſhe had a daughter called Arena, who was Aphareus's wife. This Aphareus permitted his ſon to reign with him jointly at Meſſena; but he reſerved the chief authority to himſelf. He built a city, which he called Arena, from his wife (*b*). Gorgophone was buried at Argos, her native country (*c*). She had by her ſecond marriage a ſon called Tyndarus, the father of Helena (*d*). I believe Plautus took her for the grand-mother, and not the aunt, of Amphitryon [*A*].

(*a*) Πρότερον δὲ καθεστήκει ταῖς γυναιξὶν ἐπὶ ἀνδρὶ ἀποθανόντι χηρεύειν. Cum ante ſanctum & ſolemne fœminis fuiſſet, *priore* viro mortuo, ſecundis nuptiis abſtinere. *Pauſanias, ex verſione Romuli Amaſæi, lib. ii, pag.* 64.

(*b*) Id. lib. iv, pag. 112.

(*c*) Id. lib. ii, pag. 64.

(*d*) Id. ibid. pag. 81.

[*A*] *Plautus took her for the grand-mother . . . of Amphitryon.*] His words are theſe (1). *Ego idem ille ſum Amphitruo, Gorgophones nepos, imperator Thebanorum.* Madam Dacier makes this note upon it. 'I have never obſerved, that the word *nepos*, a'mong the ancients, ſignifies *nephew*, but always '*grand-ſon*: yet I believe, that Ovid uſed it in the 'ſame ſenſe as Plautus does here; for Gorgophone 'was the daughter of Perſeus, and ſiſter of Alcæus, 'and conſequently Amphitryon's aunt.' For my part, I cannot be perſuaded, that Plautus uſed the word *nepos* in any other ſenſe than that of grand-ſon. We do not certainly find, that this word had any other ſignification before the decline of the Latin tongue; and therefore all the ſpectators and readers of the Amphitryon directly underſtood a grand-ſon by the word *nepos*. What probability is there, that the poet would thus impoſe upon them, in making him Gorgophone's grand-ſon, who was only her nephew? I know indeed, that, according to Apollodorus's genealogy (2), Amphitryon is but the nephew of Gorgophone; but I know likewiſe, that all the genealogies of the fabulous ages have been differently related: and it is very likely, that Plautus had read ſome authors, who made Amphitryon Gorgophone's grand-ſon. Let us remember, that ſhe had two huſbands, and children by each: perhaps it has been ſaid, that ſhe had a daughter, who was Alcæus's wife, and Amphitryon's mother; which would not be more ſtrange, than what we read in Apollodorus (3), *viz.* that Electryon married Anaxo his niece, daughter of Alcæus. If Electryon married his brother Alcæus's daughter, Alcæus might have married the daughter of his ſiſter Gorgophone. Add to this, that the authors, that remain, are not agreed about Alcæus's wife, who was Amphitryon's mother. Some (4) will have her to be Menœceus's daughter, and that her name was Hipponome. Others (5) ſay, that ſhe was called Lyſidice, and that ſhe was Pelops's daughter. Others (6), laſtly, make her the daughter of Guneus, who was of Pheneum in Arcadia, and call her Laonome. What hinders but other writers, who were not loſt in Plautus's time, might ſay ſhe was Gorgophone's daughter (7)? To conclude, we need not wonder, that Amphitryon gloried on the ſtage in this genealogy; for the bare name of Gorgophone raiſed the idea of Perſeus, the conqueror of the Gorgones from which action his daughter took her name (8).

(1) Amphitr. Act. IV, Scen. IV, ver. 49.

(2) Apollodorus, lib. ii, p. m. 97.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) Pauſan. lib. viii, pag 248.

(6) Id. ibid.

(7) Confer quæ infra, *in the remark* [*F*] *of the article* TELEBOES.

(8) Pauſan. lib. ii, pag. 64.

GORLÆUS, (Abraham) born at Antwerp in the year 1549, became famous by his curioſity in collecting medals, and other like monuments. He was particularly fond of the rings and ſeals of the ancients. He collected a prodigious quantity of them, as appears by the book he publiſhed in 1601 [*A*]. Seven years after, he

[*A*] *The work he publiſhed in* 1601.] The title of it is: *Dactyliotheca, ſeu Annulorum ſigillarium quorum apud priſcos tam Græcos quam Romanos uſus ex ferro, ære, argento & auro Promptuarium.* This was the firſt part of the work: the ſecond was intituled, *Variarum Gemmarum quibus Antiquitas in ſignando uti ſolita Sculpturæ.* What makes me ſay, that this work was printed in the year 1601, though I know that

Swertius

he publiſhed a collection of ſeveral medals. He pitched upon the town of Delft for the place of his reſidence, and he died there the fifteenth of April 1609. It is not true that he had a place in the mint [*B*]. Some ſay, that he never ſtudied the Latin tongue; and that the learned preface, prefixed to his Dactyliotheca, was written by another man [*D*]. His executors ſold his cabinet to the prince of Wales (*a*). It is not always ſafe to depend on his medals, if we may believe the Scaligerana [*E*].

(*a*) *See* Swertius, Athen. Belg. pag. 87.

Swertius (1) and Valerius Andreas (2) ſay it was printed at Nuremberg in the year 1600, is the date of the epiſtle dedicatory. The author dedicated his book to the elector of Cologne, the firſt of October 1601. Beſides, the print of the author, prefixed to the book, is of the ſame year (3). Laſtly, Mr Gronovius, who has publiſhed a new edition of it (4), obſerves (5), that it was printed the firſt year of this century. The edition of this book in Thuanus's library is of Leyden 1605. In that of Mr le Tellier, archbiſhop of Rheims, it is of Antwerp, 1609. Father Labbé (6) mentions the edition of Leyden 1650: perhaps his printers have made 1650 of 1605, by tranſpoſing figures: however, the Leyden edition exceeds all the reſt, as containing not only a greater number of figures, but alſo a ſhort and very learned explication, which Mr Gronovius has added to it.

[*B*] *It is not true, that he had a place in the mint at Delft.*] Valerius Andreas has here made a very notable blunder. *Abrahamus Gorlæus*, ſays he (7), *Antverpiæ natus, celebri emporio, Delphis Batavorum vixit in Collegio III. virorum monetalium.* He affirms two things: one is, that there is at Delft a body compoſed of three directors of the mint: the other is, that Gorlæus was one of thoſe three men: neither of which is true. This error was occaſioned by theſe words of Gorlæus (8). ‘Neſcio quo fato in antiquorum numiſmatum θεωρίαν delapſus, reique dulcedine allectus totum me trado huic contemplationi; & tanquam in Collegium III. virorum Monetalium cooptatus, nihil præter nummos veteres ſomnio —— *Falling, I know not how, into the ſtudy of ancient coins, and being pleaſed with the thing, I give my ſelf wholly up to that contemplation; and, as if I were one of the three mint-maſters, I dream of nothing but ancient coins.*’ Swertius (9) underſtood very well the meaning of theſe words, and has quoted them in the author's ſenſe; but Valerius Andreas has perverted them: he does not ſay, that Gorlæus applied himſelf to the ſearch of ancient coins, like a man who had been one of the Triumviri of the mint; but he repreſents him as being actually poſſeſſed of that employment. Mr Gronovius enquired into the reaſons that induced this antiquarian to leave his own country, and to retire into Holland for the reſt of his days, and what employ the magiſtrates of Delft gave him, but could find out nothing about it. ‘Ipſum Gorlæum cognoſcere familiarius cupivi, & quæ cauſa illum induxiſſet patriam Batavia mutare, præſertim quum diſſona de eo memorarentur, ſic ut ibi quoque mori & ſepeliri novem annis poſt voluerit. Ipſe in præfatione poſtrema videtur ſe deſcribere eum qui publicis quotidie diſtringeretur muneribus, & qualia iſta fuerint reſciſcere non magis potui, quam id ipſum quod modo dixi (10). —— *I deſire to be better acquainted with Gorlæus, and to know what induced him to leave his native land for Holland, eſpecially ſince there are ſuch different reports concerning him, inſomuch that, nine years after, he deſired to die and be buried there. In his laſt preface, he ſeems to deſcribe himſelf as one, who was daily embarraſſed with public affairs; but of what kind they were, I could never learn.*’ What is certain, is, that Gorlæus deſcribes himſelf as a man whom public employments hindered from ſtudying as much as he deſired. ‘Cæterum *ſays he* (11), cum illud præſtare quod à nobis ipſi exigimus, ejus ſit verius qui in umbratica rerum contemplatione & deſidie literarum torpeſcit, quam qui publicis quotidie diſtringitur muneribus, aliis relinquemus quod optari poſſit, nobis quod ad nominis noſtri exiſtimationem publicamque utilitatem ſufficiet reſervabimus. —— *But ſince the performance of what I require of my ſelf demands leiſure and literary indolence, but is inconſiſtent with the daily avocations of public buſineſs, I leave that to others, and reſerve my ſelf for the care of my own reputation and the public good.*

[*C*] *Some ſay that never ſtudied the latin tongue.*] Peireskius ſaid this, ſpeaking of the converſation he had with Gorlæus at Delft. The words of his hiſtorian deſerve to be ſet down. ‘Quo loco narrare ſolebat rem memoratu non indignam, nempe Gorlæum, cùm aliàs Latinæ linguæ non ſtuduiſſet, intellexiſſe tamen libros omnes circa rem nummariam Latinè conſcriptos; eodem modo, quo Forcatulus omnes circa rem Mathematicam: tantum valet improbus labor ex deſiderio quidpiam noſcendi vehementiſſimo profectus (12). —— *Upon which occaſion, he uſed to relate a memorable thing, to wit, that Gorlæus, tho' he had never ſtudied the Latin tongue, yet underſtood all the books of coins written in that language; in the ſame manner as Forcatulus underſtood all books of Mathematics: ſuch is the force of induſtry, ariſing from an eager deſire of knowledge.*’ This would be a thing ſomewhat ſingular, and perhaps it would be more to Gorlæus's glory, than his want of ſcholarſhip would be ſhameful to him. Is it not a ſign of a great genius, to be able to underſtand a latin book, meerly by being skilled in the ſubjects it treats of? Plutarch ſays ſomewhere, that, having ſtudied the Roman hiſtory in Greek books, he thereby underſtood the language of the Latin hiſtorians. Gorlæus might have ſaid, that the knowledge of medals, which he had acquired, let him into the notions of the Latin authors, who had written upon that ſcience. But this ſtory of Peireskius cannot be reconciled with what Swertius ſays, who was intimately acquainted with Gorlæus (13). A ſchool-fellow of Andrew Schottus went, no doubt, to the college. Mr Gronovius (14) urges this argument againſt what Gaſſendus ſays.

[*D*] *The learned preface at the head of his Dactyliotheca was written by another.*] Cunæus ſays, that Ælius Everhard Vorſtius was the author of it: this he ſays in Vorſtius's funeral oration. A learned German (15), who has written concerning rings, affirms the ſame thing.

[*E*] *It is not always ſafe to depend on his medals, if we believe the Scaligerana.*] There we find theſe words (16): *Gorlæus caſts medals: he has ſometimes ſhewn me ſome of them; but I diſcovered, that they were not ancient; ever ſince he has ſhewed me none but what were true: he is a good man.* This, and the reſt of the paſſage, ſhews, that Scaliger reckoned Gorlæus among the forgers of falſe medals.

(1) Swertius, Athen. Belgic. pag. 87.

(2) Val. Andr. Biblioth. Belg. pag. 1.

(3) *It ſays, that he was then in his fifty ſecond year.*

(4) *At Leyden, for Vander Aa,* 1695.

(5) In Præfat.

(6) Biblioth. Bibliothec. in Mantiſſa antiquariæ Supellectilis, pag. m. 341.

(7) Biblioth. Belgic pag. 1.

(8) In alloquio ad Lectorem.

(9) Ubi ſupra, pag. 87.

(10) Gronovius, in Præfat.

(11) In 2. Monito ad Lectorem.

(12) Gaſſendus in Vita Peireſkii, lib. ii, ad ann. 1606, pag. m. 265.

(13) Mihi familiaris; liberalibus ſtudiis à primis adoleſcentiæ annis delectatus, condiſcipulum habuit Andream Schottum Soc. Jeſu Preſbyt. *Swert. ubi ſupra.*

(14) In Præfatione.

(15) Kirchmannus, cap. iii, de Annulis, pag. 13. Edit. Ludg. Bat. 1672.

(16) *At pag.* 97.

GORLÆUS, (DAVID) a native of Utrecht, lived in the XVIIth century. He publiſhed ſome books of Philoſophy (*a*), in which he departed from the common opinion of the ſchools. Regius, a diſciple of Deſcartes, being brought into trouble for a theſis concerning the union of the ſoul and body, alledged that he had uſed Gorlæus's own words. This did him no ſervice; and gave an opportunity to Voëtius, profeſſor of divinity, to blaſt as much as poſſible Gorlæus's opinions [*A*].

(*a*) Exercitat. Philoſophicæ, anno 1620, in 8vo. Item Idea Phyſices. *Konig. Biblioth. Vet. & Nov. pag.* 355. *See Sorel, pag.* 248, *of his book, intituled,* la Perfection de l'Homme.

[*A*] *Voëtius ..... blaſted as much as poſſible Gorlæus's opinions.*] You will find the hiſtory of all this in Mr Baillet (1). He tells us, that Regius had maintained, amongſt other things: * ‘That from the union of the ſoul and body there reſults, not a real, but only an accidental being .... it was enough for Voëtius, that this was not agreeable to the uſual language of the ſchools, to declare Regius an heretic, and to proceed to the degrading of him. It was in vain for Regius to excuſe himſelf, by ſaying, he was not the author of this way of ſpeaking, but Gorlæus, in whoſe writings he had found it ‘in

(1) Vie de Deſcartes, Tom. II, pag. 145, 146. ad ann. 1641.

* Ex mente & corpore non fit unum per ſe, ſed per accidens.

‘ in the very words uſed in the diſputations. ‘ Voëtius had it decreed, in the name of the faculty of divinity . . . . That the ſtudents ſhould ‘ avoid Regius's lectures, as doctrines pernicious ‘ to religion. A few days after, Voëtius printed ‘ ſome theſes; to which he added three corollaries. ‘ *The firſt wereof was this*: the opinion of the atheiſt ‘ Taurellus, and of David Gorlæus, teaching, that ‘ man, made up of a body and a ſoul, is a being *per* ‘ *accidens*, and not *per ſe*, is abſurd and erroneous. ‘ *The third was this*: the philoſophy, that rejects the ‘ ſubſtantial forms of things, with their proper and ‘ ſpecific faculties, or their active qualities, and conſequently the diſtinct and ſpecific natures of things, ‘ ſuch as Taurellus, Gorlæus, and Baſſon, have endeavoured to introduce in our days, is inconſiſtent ‘ with Moſes's phyſics and all that the ſcripture ‘ teaches us. This philoſophy is dangerous, favourable to ſcepticiſm, proper to deſtroy our belief concerning the rational ſoul, the proceſſion of the ‘ divine perſons in the Trinity, the incarnation of ‘ Jesus Christ, original ſin, miracles, prophecies, ‘ the grace of our regeneration, and the real poſſeſſion of devils.’

This manifeſtly ſhews the power of cuſtom and prejudices. It is a weight that drags us whither the intereſt of our cauſe forbids us to go. For what can be ſaid more contrary to the intereſt of thoſe fundamental doctrines of religion (2), than to maintain, that they ſtand in need of the doctrine of the ſchools, concerning the diſtinction of *ens per ſe*, and *ens per accidens*, and the nature of forms that conſtitutes the ſpecies of bodies? *Ens per ſe*, and *ens per accidens*, are inexplicable phraſes, a meer jargon of the Spaniſh logicians, which ſignifies nothing: and as to ſubſtantial forms, what is ſaid of their nature, and the way of their production and deſtruction, is ſo abſurd and incomprehenſible, that they cannot be ſet up for doctrines neceſſary to religion, without dangerouſly expoſing the ſublimeſt truths of the goſpel, and filling the general courſe of nature with ſo many myſteries, that religion will have no prerogative over nature. It is certain, that the moſt profound myſteries of the goſpel are at leaſt as eaſy to comprehend, as the doctrine of forms, and the nature of the *ens per ſe* of the ſchools.

This reflexion affects Voëtius but in a remote and indirect manner; for if we read his whole corollary, we ſee, that the reaſon of his apprehending ſo much danger to the doctrines of the goſpel, from the rejection of forms, is not that rejection itſelf, but the motive of it (3). He obſerves, that the principal reaſon of thoſe, who deny them, is the inexplicable manner of their production; and then he ſhews, that, upon the like foundation, it is to be feared the mind of man will proceed to deny myſteries, *&c.* This alters the ſtate of the queſtion, and puts the diſpute in a capacity of being more eaſily ended. It is but explaining the miſunderſtanding, and ſhewing the diſparity. As for thoſe, who condemn the rejection of forms in it ſelf as prejudical to religion, I repeat it, they deſerve to be made acquainted with what I have ſaid before.

You will find in the remark [*E*] of the article HEIDANUS, ſomething concerning the inexplicable difficulties of the peripatetic doctrine about ſubſtantial forms. But, to ſee this in it's whole extent, you need only read the firſt volume of Hadrian Heereboord's theſes, from the 125th page to the 148th; where he enforces the profound and ſubtil reaſonings of William Pemble, who has written in Engliſh upon this ſubject.

(2) *I mean thoſe that are ſpecified in the third corollary.*

(3) Quidquid ſit de ſumma rei, quam Philoſophorum diſquiſitioni relinquimus, hoc unum ſaltem hyponema ſtudioſis noſtris ſubjicimus: Achillei argumenti iſtius, quo formas explodere conantur, conſequentiam ſuſpectam habeant; quæ eſt hæc, negatur eſſentia & exiſtentia formarum, quia earum origo ſeu modus originis incertus eſt, aut explicari non poteſt, ſic ut patroni formarum & ſibi & aliis in eo ſatisfaciant. Hoc periculoſo axiomate ſemel hauſto proclive erit vanitati, ſcepticiſmo & petulantiæ humani ingenii, diſputare, non dari animam rationalem, *&c.*

GOSELINI (Julian), born at Rome in the year 1525, was, at ſeventeen years of age, ſecretary to Ferdinand Gonzaga, viceroy of Sicily. He continued ſo when that viceroy was made governor of Milan. He had the ſame poſt under the dukes of Alba and Seſſa, who were ſucceſſively governors of that ſtate after the death of Gonzaga. The duke of Seſſa took him with him to the court of Spain, where Goſelini made himſelf ſo acceptable by his addreſs and prudence, that the duke was told he would do well to employ only this negociator in his affairs with the king. Goſelini was gratified at the ſame time with a penſion for life of 200 crowns *per annum*. The marquis of Peſcara, who ſucceeded the duke of Seſſa, had the ſame conſideration for Goſelini, and the ſame confidence in him as his predeceſſors: but things altered ſtrangely under this marquis's ſucceſſor, the duke of Albuquerque. He treated Goſelini in ſuch an odd and barbarous manner, as had like to have coſt him his life and honour at once. However, the end of this perſecution was honourable to this ſecretary. He dexterouſly warded off the blow, and managed himſelf with that prudence during all this heavy ſtorm, as to make it turn to his honour. He got again into that employment under the marquis of Aimonte, and the duke of Terranova, who were governors of the Milaneze, and whoſe ſecretary he was, to their great ſatisfaction. Amongſt many good qualities, he is ſaid to have been a pacifier of quarrels, and to have had a very particular talent for it. The thing deſerved to be obſerved on his epitaph, *Titulo res digna ſepulchri*: nor has it been forgotten (*a*). The affairs of the ſecretaryſhip, which took him up above forty years, hindered him not from publiſhing ſeveral books [*A*]. He died at Milan the twelfth of February 1587, being near ſixty two years of age (*b*).

(*a*) Componendis diſcordiis nato.

(*b*) *Taken from* Ghilini, Teatro d' Huomini Letterati, Part. I, pag. 134. *See alſo* Proſp. Mandoſio Bibl. Roman. pag. 26.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] Theſe are the titles of ſome of them: *Rime: Diſcorſi: Lettere: Ragionamento ſopra i Componimenti del Borgheſi: Dichiarazione di alcuni Componimenti: Vita di Don Ferdinando Gonzaga: Trè Congiure, cioè de Pazzi e Salviati contra i Medici, del Conte Giouan Luigi de' Fieſchi contra la Republica di Genoua, & d'alcuni Piacentini contra il loro Duca Pietro Luigi Farneſe.* He alſo wrote Latin verſes and letters, and tranſlated into Italian a French book, intituled, *A true account of things that happened in the Netherlands ſince the arrival of Don Juan of Auſtria, &c.* Varillas, doubtleſs, did not know, that Goſelini had written the conſpiracy of the count of Fieſque, ſince, in giving the reaſon of his treating of this conſpiracy, he names (1) but four authors, who have publiſhed the hiſtory of it, Hubertus Folietta, Agoſtino Maſcardi, Madam de Scuderi, and cardinal de Rets. He acknowledges, that they are *incomparable each in their kind*; but that the two firſt aſcribe too much to France in that project, and the two latter do not aſcribe enough to it.

(1) *In the preface to the Hiſtory of Francis I.*

GOSSELIN. I know three authors of Normandy, who have born this name. WILLIAM GOSSELIN, a native of Caen, lived in the XVIth century, and ſtudied mathematics [*A*]. JOHN GOSSELIN lived in the ſame century. He was

[*A*] *WILLIAM GOSSELIN applied himſelf to the mathematics.*] This appears by the work, he publiſhed at Paris in 1577, with this title: *De Arte magna, ſeu de occulta parte numerorum quæ & Algebra & Almucabala vulgo dicitur libri quatuor, in quibus explicantur æquationes Diophantis, & regulæ quantita-* tis was of Vire, and was the king's library-keeper. He applied himſelf very much to aſtrology [*B*], and died very old by an extraordinary accident. We ſhall ſee what Scaliger ſaid of him [*C*]. ANTONY GOSSELIN was of Caen, where he was Regius Profeſſor of hiſtory and eloquence, and principal of the college du Bois. He publiſhed the hiſtory of the ancient Gauls in Latin, in 1636. He was miſtaken in a great many things, as Mr Bochart ſhewed in ſome obſervations he compoſed upon that work; but he would not publiſh them, fearing to diſpleaſe the friends and relations of the author. They have been inſerted in the laſt edition of his works.

tis ſimplicis & quantitatis ſurdæ. He added ſome demonſtrations and inventions of his own to his French tranſlation of the arithmetic of Nicolas Tartaglia, an Italian author. This verſion was printed at Paris in 1577 (1), and at Antwerp by Plantin, the year following (2).

[*B*] *JOHN GOSSELIN applied himſelf very much to aſtrology.*] Witneſs the book he publiſhed at Paris, in 1577, intituled, *Hiſtoria imaginum cœleſtium noſtro ſæculo accommodata in qua earum vicinitates ſeu habitudines inter ſe atque ſtellarum fixarum ſitus & magnitudines explicantur.* Six years before, he had publiſhed, *La Main harmonique, ou les Principes de Muſique antique & moderne, & les proprietez que la moderne reçoit des ſept Planetes*; as alſo, *Ephemerides, ou Almanach du jour & de la nuict pour cent ans commençans en l'an* 1571 (3). He printed, at Paris, in 1582, a table of the reformation of the year, and a French verſion of the Gregorian calender (4). Note, that Voſſius (5) has made no mention of theſe two authors. It is a ſign he had not heard of them.

[*C*] *He died very old ..... We ſhall ſee what Scaliger has ſaid of him.*] ‘Goſſelin the king's library-keeper is dead, being burnt to death: he fell into the fire, and, being alone, by reaſon of his age, could not get up again, which is a common fate to old people. Mr Caſaubon will ſucceed him. Goſſelin ſuffered no body to go into the library; ſo that Mr Caſaubon finds unexpected treaſures there (6).’

From this paſſage two things may be inferred: one is, that John Goſſelin died about the beginning of the XVIIth century: the other, that his place was given to Caſaubon.

(1) *Taken from* Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bibl. Franç. pag. 478.

(2) La Croix du Maine, pag. 147.

(3) *Taken from* Du Verdier Vau-Privas, ubi ſupra, pag. 708.

(4) La Croix du Maine, pag. 230.

(5) *In his book* De Scientiis Mathematicis.

(6) Scaligerana, pag. m. 97.

GOUDIMEL (CLAUDIUS), one of the moſt excellent muſicians of the XVIth century, was maſſacred at Lyons in 1572, becauſe he was a Proteſtant. The Proteſtant Martyrology makes mention of him [*A*]. D'Aubigné is miſtaken in placing him amongſt thoſe, who were murdered at Paris on St Bartholomew's day [*B*]. Varillas has not committed this fault; but he is to blame for believing, that Goudimel and Claudin the younger were one and the ſame perſon [*C*]. He makes a curious obſervation againſt thoſe who excepted not ſo ſkillful a muſician out of the maſſacre [*D*]. If notice had

[*A*] *The Proteſtant martyrology makes mention of him.*] In theſe words (1): ‘Claudius Goudimel, an excellent muſician, and whoſe memory will live for ever, for what he has ſo well done upon David's Pſalms in French, the greateſt part whereof he has ſet to muſic, in the form of motets, of four, five, ſix, and eight parts; and had not death prevented it, he would have quickly compleated the whole work. But the enemies of GOD's glory, and ſome wicked perſons, who envied the honour he had acquired, have deprived the lovers of Chriſtian muſic of ſuch an happineſs.’

[*B*] *D'Aubigné is miſtaken in placing him among thoſe, who were murdered in the maſſacre of Paris on St Bartholomew's day.*] After having named many eminent perſons killed in the Paris maſſacre, he adds: ‘Goudimel, an excellent muſician, and Perrot a civilian, were all thrown out at the windows, and dragged along the ſtreets, and caſt into the river, at the inſtance of the duke of Montpenſier, who had joined with thoſe we have ſpoken of, to cry out, kill, and that they had attempted upon the king's life (2).’ If he had conſulted Thuanus, as he has in other caſes, he would have avoided this miſtake. For this is what Thuanus ſays in that place of his hiſtory, wherein he mentions the maſſacre of Lyons. ‘Eandem fortunam expertus eſt Claudius Goudimelus, excellens noſtra ætate Muſicus, qui Pſalmos Davidicos vernaculis verſibus à Clemente Maroto & Theodora Beza expreſſos ad varios & jucundiſſimos modulationum numeros aptavit, quibus & hodie publice in concionibus proteſtantium ac privatim decantantur (3). ——— *The ſame fate attended Claudius Goudimel, an excellent muſician of our time, who ſet the Pſalms of David, tranſlated into metre by Clement Marot and Theodore Beza, to various and moſt pleaſing tunes, which at this time are ſung both publickly and privately by the Proteſtants.*’

[*C*] *Mr Varillas ... is to blame for believing, that Goudimel and Claudin the younger were one and the ſame perſon.*] We ſhall ſee in the following remark, that he has done it. To confute him, I muſt alledge here a notable fact concerning this Claudin, which will inform us, that he was alive nine years after the Paris maſſacre. I have found this fact in the commentary, that has been printed with the life of Apollonius Tyaneus, tranſlated into French. I ſhall ſet down the words of the commentator (4): ‘It was alſo by theſe two Phrygian and Subphrygian tunes, that Timotheus made an experiment of his skill in the perſon of Alexander, by the former making him run to arms, as he was at table, and by the latter bringing him back to his former tranquillity. I have ſometimes heard the Sieur Claudin the younger ſay (5), who, without diſreſpect to any one, far exceeded all the muſicians of the preceding ages; that an air, which he had compoſed with it's parts, was ſung at the ſolemnity of the late duke of Joyeuſe's marriage (6), in the time of Henry III, king of France and Poland, of happy memory, whom GOD abſolve; which, as it was ſung, made a gentleman take his ſword in hand, and ſwear aloud, that it was impoſſible for him to forbear fighting with ſome body. Whereupon they began to ſing another air of the Subphrygian mode, which made him as peaceable as before; which I have had ſince confirmed by ſome that were preſent: ſuch power and force have the modulation, motion, and management of the voice, when joined together, upon the minds of men (7). ...... To conclude this long annotation: If one would have an excellent experiment of theſe twelve modes, let him ſing, or hear ſung, the Dodecachorde of Mr Claudin the younger, of whom I have ſpoken above; and I aſſure myſelf he will find in it all thoſe figures and variations managed with ſo much art, harmony, and skill, as to confeſs, that nothing can be added to this maſter-piece, but the praiſes that all the lovers of this ſcience ought to beſtow upon this rare and excellent man, who was capable of carrying muſic to the utmoſt degree of it's perfection, if death had not fruſtrated the execution of his noble and profound deſigns upon this ſubject.’

[*D*] ... *he makes a curious obſervation upon thoſe, who excepted not ſo excellent a muſician out of the maſſacre.*] Theſe are his words: ‘Mandelot (8) vainly attempted to prevent the maſſacre of thirteen hundred Calviniſts at Lyons, and eſpecially the incomparable muſician Goudimel (9), ſo well known by the name of Claudin the younger. His greateſt crime was the compoſing the nobleſt airs to Marot's and Beza's Pſalms, which were ſung in the Proteſtant congregations; and in his puniſhment no regard was had to the Roman law, which indulged thoſe that were eminent in their profeſſion, becauſe the public, by taking them off, loſt incomparably more than it gained by the example of their puniſhment (10).’

(1) Book x, fol. 727, ad ann. 1572.

(2) Hiſt. Univerſelle, Tom. II, livr. i, chap. iv, ad ann. 1572.

(3) Thuan. Hiſtor. lib. lii, pag. m. 1084.

(4) Artus Thomas Sieur d'Embry, Comment. ſur la Vie d'Apollonius, livr. i, chap. xvi, p. 282.

(5) The author puts here this marginal ſummary: *The elogium of Claudin the younger, the honour of all the muſicians.*

(6) He married in 1581.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) He commanded at Lyons. See Thuanus, *ubi ſupra, pag* 1083, who taxes Mandelot with baſe hypocriſy in pretending to diſapprove the maſſacre, and to puniſh the authors of it.

(9) I defy Varillas to cite any author, who ſays, that Mandelot was particularly deſirous to ſave this muſician's life.

(10) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, lib. ix, pag. 471, 472, *of the Paris edition, in* 12mo, 1684.

had been taken how Goudimel wrote his name, it had not been ſo diſguiſed, as it has been [*E*]. There are ſome of his letters (*a*) printed amongſt the poems of Meliſſus, his intimate friend. He there writes himſelf Goudimel. Meliſſus made ſome verſes upon the ſad deſtiny of his friend. I ſhall ſet down the epigram, in which it is obſerved, that Goudimel would have found more humanity amongſt the waves of the Ægean ſea, as heretofore Arion, than he found in his native country [*F*]. I believe this muſician was of Franche Comté [*G*].

(*a*) They are in Latin, and well written.

The indulgence of the Roman law, which Varillas ſpeaks of, will excite the curioſity of a great many readers. They will look upon it as a very remarkable particular: but as they know he has impoſed much, even in point of hiſtory, the principal object of his ſtudies, they will not think him very worthy of credit in a matter of civil-law, which was not his province. Wherefore, to ſet them at eaſe, I will give them a better authority, that is, the teſtimony of a man of much more learning, who has cited two very grave authors. See then what Girac has obſerved againſt Coſtar (11). 'Our doctor offends a-new againſt the rules of the 'civil-law, he who pretends ſometimes to diſcuſs mat'ters of right. It is abſolutely falſe, that an artiſt de'ſerves ſo much the more to be puniſhed, as *his work* '*ſhall be admired, and charm the beholders*.' All the 'interpreters of the civil-law maintain the contrary; 'and it is a practice frequently obſerved by princes 'and ſovereign courts, to give thoſe their life, who 'excel in any art, though they deſerve to loſe it for 'the crimes they have committed *.'

(11) Girac, Replique à Coſtar, §. xxvi, pag. m. 235.

* Hinc apparet ratio ejus quod paſſim juris utriuſque Interpretes adnotarunt, ſcilicet, pœnam eſſe vel remittendam vel minuendam delinquenti ob inſignem ejus peritiam, ſeu ex eo quod artifex ſit celebris magnique nominis, &c. *Covarr. lib. ii. Var. Reſol. cap. ix, n.* 6. *Vide Jul. Clar. Sent. lib. v, §. fin. qu.* 60, *n.* 26, *& alios.*

[*E*] *If notice had been taken how Goudimel ſubſcribed, his name had not been ſo diſguiſed as it has been.*] Thuanus calls him *Gaudimelus:* Gisbert Voëtius (12), *Gaudimellus:* Varillas, *Gaudinel:* Jeremiah de Pours, *Guidomel.* 'The ſame Guidomel ſet to muſic the 'Pſalms of David, printed at Paris by Adrian le Roy 'and Robert Balaard, in the year 1565. He alſo 'compoſed nineteen ſpiritual hymns, printed at Paris 'by Nicholas du Chemin, in the year 1555 (13).'

(12) Polit. Eccleſ. Tom. I, pag. 534.

(13) Jeremiah de Pours, Divine Melodie du St Pſalmiſte, liv. ii, cap. xli, pag. 581.

[*F*] *I ſhall ſet down the epigram, in which it is obſerved, that he would have found more humanity among the waves, than . . . in his own country.*] It is at the ſeventy ninth page of a book, intituled, *Meliſſi Schediaſmatum Reliquiæ*, and was printed in 1575, in 8vo. It contains ſeveral pieces of poetry upon Goudimel, which are not Meliſſus's.

Prenſus ab externo ſi Goudimel hoſte fuiſſes
  Vector in Ionio Muſice clare mari;
Ille tibi vitam vel non voluiſſet ademtam,
  Lenitus cithara carminibuſque tuis;
In tutos aliquis vel, ſicut Ariona, Delphin
  Tergore portaſſet te quaſi nave locos.
Audivere tuos Galli moduloſque probarunt
  Indigenæ, decori queis tua Muſa fuit:
At datus es letho, licet inſons, inque cruenti
  Stagnanteis Araris præcipitatus aquas.
Proh ſcelus indigenûm! nam barbarus hoſtes in
    hoſtem
  Barbaricum LANIIS mitior eſſe ſolet.

Had'ſt thou been ta'en by foreign foes a prey,
Sweet lyriſt, ſailing in th' Ionian ſea,
Thy ſong had given thee life and liberty.
Or, like the fam'd Arion heretofore,
A dolphin's back had born thee ſafe to ſhore.
France rank'd thy muſe her ornaments among,
Each Gallic ear delighted with thy ſong.
Yet thou to death, unmerited, waſt ſent,
Thrown into Arar's ſtream, thy puniſhment.
From Frenchmen this . . . . thy countrymen . . . . to
  bear!
Barbarians to their foes leſs cruel are.

I would forgive the Latin poets, what cannot be excuſed in the hiſtorians, *viz.* the leaving out, changing, or adding, of ſome letters to Goudimel's name, it being a very harſh word in Latin poetry.

[*G*] *I believe that this muſician was of Franche Comté.*] I gueſs ſo, becauſe his birth-place was ſituated upon the Doux, a river that runs by Bezançon.

Goudimel ille meus, meus (eheu!) Goudimel
    ille eſt
  Occiſus. Teſtes vos Arar & Rhodane,
Semineces vivoſque ſimul violenter utriſque
  Abſorptos viſi plangere gurgitibus.
Sequana cum Ligeri flevit, flevitque Garumna;
  Præcipuè patrius flevit amara Dubis.

My friend, my Goudimel, is dead and gone:
Witneſs ye ſtreams of Arar and the Rhone!
Faſt as ye roll'd the carnage to the deep,
I ſaw ye both the cruel ſlaughter weep.
The Dubis, Loire, Garumna, and the Seine,
Were ſeen in mournful murmurs to complain.

I have found theſe verſes at the ſeventy ninth page of the *Meliſſi Schediaſmatum Reliquiæ.*

GOVEA (ANDREW) (*a*), in Latin *Goveanus*, a native of Beia in Portugal, was principal of the college of St Barbara [*A*], at Paris, in the XVIth century, where he educated three nephews, who became famous for their learning. The king of Portugal allowed them wherewithal to maintain themſelves at Paris. **MARTIAL GOVEA**, the eldeſt of the three, became a good Latin poet, and publiſhed a Latin grammar at Paris. **ANDREW GOVEA**, his younger brother, taught, firſt grammar, and then philoſophy, in the college of St Barbara, and was at laſt made principal of this college in the room of his uncle: and, becauſe he acquitted himſelf well of that employment, he was invited to Bourdeaux, to exerciſe the like function in the college of Guienne. He went thither in the year 1534, where he diſcharged his duties with an exactneſs very advantageous to youth [*B*]: this engaged John III, king of Portugal, to ſend for him back into his kingdom, to ſet up a college at Coimbra, like that of Guienne. Govea left Bourdeaux in the year 1547, and took with him ſome learned men fit to inſtruct

(*a*) *So Thuanus calls him*, lib. xxxviii, pag. 769; *but Andreas Schottus*, Biblioth. Hiſpan. pag. 309, *and Ribadeneira*, Vita Ignatii, lib. i, cap. iii, *call him James. It was he who had a mind to whip Ignatius Loyola.*

[*A*] *He was principal of the college of St Barbara.*] This is the right tranſlating of Andrew Schottus's *Collegii Barbarani præfectus* (1), and not *principal of the college of Barbarini*, as Mr Teiſſier renders it (2).'

(1) Biblioth. Hiſpan. pag. 300.

(2) Teiſſ. Elog. Tom. I, pag. 291.

[*B*] *ANDREW GOVEA . . . . diſcharged his duties with an exactneſs which was very uſeful to youth.*] This may be ſeen in Buſinus's preface prefixed to Gelida's letters, printed at Rochelle in 1571. 'Ubi 'quamdiu egerit, quem ſe geſſerit (Andreas Goveanus) '& quomodo ab rege ſuo in patriam ſit revocatus, Co'nimbricenſis ſcholæ inſtituendæ gratia, quæ ſimilis 'eſſet Burdigalenſi, in præfatione Buſini in epiſtolas 'Gelidæ cognoſci poteſt (3). —— *Where, during his* '*abode, how he* (*Andrew Govea*) *behaved, and how, he* '*was recalled by his king into his own country, in order* '*to regulate the ſchool of Coimbra after the example* '*of that of Bourdeaux, may be ſeen in Buſinus's preface* '*to the epiſtles of Gelida.*'

(3) Elias Vinetus, Epiſt. ad Schottum, in Biblioth. Hiſpan. pag. 475.

ſtruct youth [*C*]. He exerciſed the ſame office at Coimbra, as he did at Bourdeaux (*b*). He deſigned to return to Bourdeaux, after having ſpent two years in putting the college of Coimbra in a good method; but he died before that time (*c*) in June 1548, being fifty years of age, or upwards (*d*). He was a prieſt and a preacher [*D*], and never printed any thing (*e*). ANTONY GOVEA, the youngeſt of the three brothers, was the moſt famous of them all. See, in Moreri, what Thuanus (*f*) ſays of him: it would be needleſs to repeat it. I ſhall only obſerve, that if it be true, as Thuanus affirms, that Govea read the civil-law at Grenoble (*g*) [*E*] to a numerous auditory, the author of the *Bibliotheque of Dauphiné* ſhould not have ſaid, *he practiſed in Grenoble, and read in the univerſity of Valence.* There is another reflexion to be made upon Thuanus's narrative [*F*]. By way of ſupplement to Moreri, I ſhall ſay, that Govea ſtudied the civil-law at Touloufe in 1539; that he had before that been a teacher at Bourdeaux, in the college,

[*C*] *He took with him ſome learned men fit to inſtruct youth.*] George Buchanan, and Patrick Buchanan his brother were of the number; and ſo were Nicolas Grouchi, William Guerente, Elias Vinet, Arnoul Fabricius, John la Coſte, James Tevius, and Antony Mendez (4).

[*D*] *He was a prieſt and a preacher.*] I do not know whether Beza deſerves credit, when he makes him doctor of the Sorbonne: I do not believe it: however, it will not be improper to ſet down his words. 'It came to nothing at laſt, *ſays he* (5), except that a 'poor ſervitor was delivered into the hands of An'drew Govea, a Portugeſe, principal of the college, 'doctor of the Sorbonne, (commonly ſirnamed *Sina'pivorus*, that is, Muſtard-Eater) to be laſhed.' Beza had been ſpeaking of Aymon de la Voye, a Proteſtant martyr, burnt at Bourdeaux, in the year 1541, and of ſome ſcholars who were taken the next day, *being ſuſpected of having ſtuck up a paper, which was found faſtened to the poſt.*

[*E*] *If it be true . . . that ANTONY GOVEA taught . . . . at Grenoble.*] Having not the books I want, I leave abundance of things in uncertainty: they, who have left them ſo, having all ſorts of libraries at hand, are more to be blamed than I am: however, the uncertainty I am in will move ſome readers to make a full enquiry into the matter. I do not ſcruple to repeat this remark, becauſe I am perſuaded, that this dictionary will be read by piece-meal; and therefore it is neceſſary to mention this more than once.

Andreas Schottus might ſatisfy me concerning what I have read in Thuanus about Govea's being a profeſſor at Grenoble, were it not that, in the very place, where he declares, that Govea taught in that city, he writes inaccurately. Here is the whole paſſage (6). 'Cadurci jus annos aliquot magno concurſu docuit, & 'Valentiæ Delphinatus anno à Chriſto nato 1555. ad 'tit. *de vulgari & pupillari ſubſtitutione* dictabat. 'Toloſæ 6. antea anno Andreæ natura atque animo 'fratri, beneficiis vero parenti librum *de jure accre'ſcendi* inſcripſit. Gratianopoli ad *legem Falcidiam* 'quæ perdifficilis eſt dictabat anno 1566 (7). Quarto 'poſt anno uxorem ibi domum duxit, ex eaque libe'ros ſuſtulit Petrum & Manfredum, quorum illum Pe'trus Bertrandus Cadurcorum Epiſcopus in baptiſmatis 'fonte ſuſceperat.' The natural meaning of theſe words, is, 1. that Govea taught the civil-law at Cahors, before he taught it at Valence; that is, before the year 1555. 2. That he taught at Grenoble in the year 1566, and married there in 1570. 3. That the biſhop of Cahors was godfather to the eldeſt of his ſons. Theſe three things appear ſo diſordered, that they offend an exact reader. Good ſenſe teaches, that Govea was profeſſor at Cahors, when he deſired the biſhop of the place to be godfather to his ſon: but, according to this account, he taught at Cahors before the year 1555; and therefore what does Schottus mean, when he ſays, that Govea was a profeſſor at Grenoble in 1566, and married there in 1570; and that the biſhop of Cahors was godfather to his eldeſt ſon? have not I reaſon to diſtruſt Father Schottus? a German civilian, who has reprinted at Leipſic the lives of ſome civilians, increaſes my miſtruſt; for he makes a very ſolid objection againſt theſe words of that Jeſuit, *Gratianopoli ad* legem Falcidiam . . . . *dictabat* 1566. The objection is this: 'Videtur hic Schottus temporis 'rationem minus rectè obſervaſſe, fieri enim non po'tuit ut prælectiones ſuas ad L. Falcidiam anno de'mum 1566 habuerit Goveanus Gratianopoli, qui 'eaſdem jam an. 1560. Michaëli Hoſpitalio Franciæ 'Cancellario inſcripſerat (8). —— *This Schottus ſeems 'to have been miſtaken as to the time; for Govea could 'not have read his* Prælectiones ad L. Falcidiam *in 'the year* 1566, *at Grenoble, having inſcribed them 'long before, in* 1560, *to Michaël Hoſpital, chancellor 'of France.*'

Note, that Stephen Paſquier affirms (9), that Antonius Goveanus taught the civil-law at Grenoble, and died there. He is out at leaſt as to the laſt fact. I have juſt read, in the twelfth letter of the ſecond book of 1560, that Govea was profeſſor at Grenoble. 'Ei '(Cujacio) Valentiæ ſuccedet Gribaldus, pulchrum 'ſane par, ubi ipſe & Loriotus conjuncti fuerint, & 'habuerint Gratianopoli vicinum Goveanum, qui 'utroque eſt longe ſceleratior. —— *Gribaldus will ſuc'ceed Cujas at Valentia, where he and Loriot will be 'colleagues, and have Govea for their neighbour at Gre'noble, who is wickeder than them both.*'

[*F*] *There is another reflexion to be made upon Thuanus's narrative.*] Theſe are his words (10): 'Ab 'Æmilio Ferreto qui Avenione jus civile docebat, 'cum Lugduni privatis ſtudiis intentus deſideret (An'tonius Goveanus) ad illius perplexæ ſcientiæ profeſ'ſionem evocatus eſt. —— *Antony Govea, being intent 'upon his private ſtudies at Leyden, was called from 'thence by Æmilius Ferretus, who taught the civil'law at Avignon, to be profeſſor of that intri'cate ſcience.*' The ſequel of the diſcourſe ſhews, that Ferretus did not adviſe Govea to ſtudy the civil-law, but to teach it: and this is clear enough from the words I have quoted. According to thoſe words of Thuanus, Govea was invited to Avignon by Ferretus, to teach the civil-law. Upon this, two difficulties ariſe; one is taken from this, *viz.* That Thuanus, having ſaid, that Govea quickly got the true way of explaining the civil-law, for which he was ſo admired, as to provoke the jealouſy of Cujas, adds, *Igitur Goveanus Toloſæ primum, dein Divione Cadurcorum, poſt Valentiæ & Gratianopoli jus civile magna auditorum frequentia profeſſus eſt.* The ſubſtance of which narrative is therefore this: Govea, being invited by Ferretus to Avignon to teach there the civil-law, quickly became an excellent interpreter of it, ſo far as to raiſe the jealouſy of the great Cujas. He therefore taught the law firſt at Toulouſe, then at Cahors, afterwards at Valence and Grenoble. May not one aſk this great hiſtorian where he has left Avignon? does he not manifeſtly contradict himſelf? ſhould he not have ſaid, that Govea taught firſt in that city? the ſecond difficulty lies in this; that, in the Bibliotheque of the Spaniſh writers, where there is an abridgement of Govea's life taken from his own writings, it is ſaid indeed, that he taught the civil-law at Cahors, Valence, and Grenoble; but as to Avignon and Toulouſe, it is only ſaid, that he ſtudied the law in thoſe two places with great application. 'Juvenis natu grandior tres 'fere annos in Juris civilis ſtudio operam dedit 'Æmilio Feretto Avenione profitenti, ſuæ memoriæ 'facile principi; quemque parentem alterum appellare 'lib. 2 de Juris dictione non dubitat: neque ex eo 'tempore à Juriſconſultorum libris longius unquam 'oculos dimovit. Toloſæ mox tanta in ſtudio aſſi'duitate, tantaque eſt uſus contentione, ut majore non 'poſſet (11). —— *When he grew to manhood, he 'ſtudied the civil-law almoſt three years under Fe'rettus, profeſſor at Avignon, a man of the greateſt 'abilities, and whom he does not ſcruple to call an'other father in his ſecond book De Juris Dictione; 'and from that time he diligently ſtudied the civilians. 'Afterwards he purſued his ſtudies at Toulouſe with the*

(*b*) Ex Elia Vineto, Epiſt. ad Schottum, in Biblioth. Hiſpan. pag. 475.

(*c*) Schottus, in Biblioth. Hiſpan. pag. 618. *See alſo Thuanus,* lib. xvii, ſub fin.

(*d*) Vinetus, ubi ſupra.

(*e*) Id. ibid.

(*f*) Lib. xxxviii, pag. 769, 770. ad ann. 1565.

(*g*) Gratianopoli jus civile magna auditorum frequentia profeſſus eſt.

(4) Schottus, Bibl. Hiſpan. pag. 617.

(5) Hiſt. Eccleſ. des Egliſes, lib. i, pag. 28.

(6) Andr. Schottus, Bibl. Hiſpan. pag. 401.

(7) *Paul Freberus, tranſcribing this in his* Theatrum, pag. 849, *ſays,* anno 1555, *and makes it the beginning of a paragraph. They are two groſs miſtakes.*

(8) Frider. Jac. Leickherus, in Not. ad Vitas Clariſſ. Juriſconſultorum, pag. 202, 233. Edit. Lipſ. 1686.

(9) Paſquier, Recherch. livr. ix, chap. xxxvii, pag. m. 898.

(10) Thuan. lib. xxxviii, pag. 769.

(11) Bibl Hiſp. Schotti, pag. 300.

college, whereof his brother was principal; that, in 1542, he taught at Paris under his uncle [*G*]; that, ſome time after, he returned to Bourdeaux to his brother; that he continued his abode in that city after his brother was gone to Coimbra (*h*); that he was reckoned an atheiſt by ſome people [*H*]; and that it is not probable he died in 1565, as Thuanus affirms (*i*); nor in 1595, as Nicolas Antonio ſays. This laſt author has not been perfectly exact [*I*]. Nothing can be ſaid more glorious to Antony Govea, than what

'*the greateſt application.*' A famous hiſtoriographer of Savoy (12) would confute the narrative of many writers, if what he ſays was true, that, in the year 1559, the duke of Savoy ſet up an univerſity at Mondevis, and, amongſt other learned men, made Antony Govea profeſſor there.

[*G*] *In* 1542, *he taught at Paris under his uncle.*] When Andrew Govea the nephew went to Bourdeaux, in 1534, he had been for ſome time principal of the college of St Barbara at Paris, in the room of Andrew Govea his uncle (13). And therefore, ſince the latter was principal at Paris in 1542 (14), we muſt conclude, that he reſumed his poſt, when his nephew went to Bourdeaux; which Elias Vinetus ſhould have obſerved in expreſs words, to make his relation more intelligible.

[*H*] *He was reckoned an atheiſt by ſome people.*] 'He was a counſellor at Grenoble: he read lectures 'in the univerſity of Valence, and wrote ſome 'books in thoſe two towns; where (15) he was accuſed of having ſpoken ill of the deity; and he 'was obliged to vindicate himſelf, which he did in 'an excellent diſcourſe, that was formerly in manuſcript in the library of Ennemond de Rabot d'Illins, firſt preſident in this parliament; upon which 'de Gordes, the king's lieutenant in this province, 'took occaſion to become his protector. This liberty of ſpeaking made Calvin call him an atheiſt in 'one of his works (16).' If the work, out of which I have taken this paſſage, contained two or three volumes in folio, the author might be excuſed for uſing a looſe citation; but it is a book of 224 pages in 12mo. The author might therefore have taken the pains to look for the place, where Calvin ſpeaks ſo ill of Govea, and he would have given great ſatisfaction to his readers by citing it; for he would have ſaved them the trouble of peruſing eight or nine volumes in folio. I will not be guilty of that fault, as large as my work is; but I ſhall quote Calvin's words, and mark the page where they are to be found. 'Agrippam, Villanovanum, Doletum, & ſimiles vulgò 'notum eſt tanquam Cyclopas quoſpiam Evangelium 'ſemper faſtuoſe ſpreviſſe: Tandem eo prolapſi ſunt 'amentiæ & furoris, ut non modò in Filium Dei 'execrabiles blaſphemias evomerent, ſed quantum ad 'animæ vitam attinet, nihil à canibus & porcis putarent 'ſe differre. Alii (ut Rabelæſus, Deperius, & Goveanus) guſtato Evangelio, eadem cœcitate ſunt percuſſi. 'Cur iſtud? niſi qui ſacrum illud vitæ æternæ pignus, ſacrilega ludendi aut ridendi audacia antè profanarant (17)? - - - - *It is notorious, that Agrippa,* '*Servetus, Doletus, and ſuch like, always treated the* '*goſpel with the utmoſt contempt. At length they* '*came to ſuch a pitch of madneſs, that they not only* '*poured forth execrable blaſphemies againſt the ſon of* '*GOD, but thought themſelves, as to the life of the* '*ſoul, upon a level with dogs and ſwine. Others* (*as* '*Rabelais, Deſperiers, and Goveanus*) *having taſted of* '*the goſpel, were ſtruck with the ſame blindneſs. Why* '*ſo? unleſs becauſe they had before ſacrilegiouſly and* '*contemptuouſly profaned that ſacred pledge of eternal* '*life?*' We learn from theſe words, that Govea was a ſcoffer, and that at firſt he approved the reformation. This matter of fact is little known. See here the two verſes againſt Govea, concerning his want of faith.

Antoni Goveane, tua hæc Marrana propago,
In cœlo & cellis non putat eſſe Deum.

Govea, thy Jewiſh race a GOD deny
Both in the cellar, and the ſky.

They ſerved for an anſwer to this diſtich, which he had made againſt a counſellor (18):

Dum tonat, in cellas propero pede Vallius imas
Confugit: in cellis non putat eſſe Deum.

When thunder rumbles in the skies,
Down to the cellar Vallius flies.
There, to be ſure, he's ſafe: why ſo?
He thinks there is no GOD below.

You will find theſe four verſes in the firſt Scaligerana, with ſome other things that are to Govea's honour. 'Goveanus doctus erat vir, & valens dialecticus, optimus poëta Gallicus, nec enim Hiſpanum 'judicaveris, adeo bene Gallice loquebatur. - - - - *Govea was a learned man, an able Logician, and a good* '*French poet; for you would not take him for a Spaniard, he ſpoke French ſo well.*' In the ſecond Scaligerana, the atheiſm, of which Calvin accuſes Govea, is called a calumny: 'Goveanus fuit doctus Luſitanus. Calvinus vocat illum Atheum cum non fuerit; 'debebat illum melius noſſe. ——— *Govea was a* '*learned Portugueſe. Calvin calls him an atheiſt,* '*when he was not one: he ought to have known him* '*better.*

[*I*] *Nicolas Antonio has not been perfectly exact.*] He affirms (19), that Antony Govea taught the civil-law at Toulouſe, about the year 1539; but Elias Vinet deſerves more credit, who had a moſt intimate acquaintance with Andrew and Antony Govea, and was deſired by Andrew Schottus to ſend him the hiſtory of them. He only ſays, that, in the year 1539, Antony Govea ſtudied the civil-law at Toulouſe (20). Every one ſees the difference between ſtudying, and teaching the civil-law. Nicolas Antonio adds, that Govea was profeſſor a little after at Paris, and at Bourdeaux, and that at laſt he fixed at Cahors, where he taught the civil-law with a wonderful reputation; which, reaching as far as Turin, moved the duke of Savoy to invite him into his ſervice, offering to make him maſter of the requeſts and his counſellor. *Cadurci demum ſubſtitit juris civilis anteceſſor in ſummo laudis atque exiſtimationis loco poſitus. Quod cum proſpexiſſet ab ipſa Auguſta Taurinorum Sabaudiæ Dux, &c* (21). There are many miſtakes in this account. Govea's fame was heard of from a nearer place, after he had left Cahors: he read in the duke of Savoy's neighbourhood, at Valence in Dauphiné; and it was not in Quercy that this prince's offers were made to him. Beſides, the princeſs Margaret (22), ſiſter to Henry II, and wife to the duke of Savoy, recommended him to her huſband. Now, as ſhe was a learned woman, ſhe always deſired to know, who they were that diſtinguiſhed themſelves in France by their parts and learning. Nicolas Antonio pretends, that Govea was ſtill alive in the year 1595; for, ſays he, Teſauro, the younger, makes an honourable mention of him under this year, in the nineteenth *quæſtio forenſis*. If I had that book, I ſhould perhaps diſcover, that this commendation was not beſtowed upon that Govea I am ſpeaking of, but upon his ſon; and, though I could not diſcover it, I ſhould however believe, that Govea did not live till 1595; for Vinetus, who died in 1587 (23), ſpeaks of him as of a man that was dead (24). Nicolas Antonio, having falſely ſuppoſed, that Govea was alive in 1595, cenſures Elias Vinetus (25), who believed that he died at ſixty years of age. This cenſurer's reaſon is, that Govea taught the civil-law at Toulouſe in 1539. He is in the right to infer from thence, that Govea, being alive in 1595, died older than Vinetus believed. This conſequence is not ſo ſtrong, if we ſuppoſe, that Govea ſtudied the civil-law in 1539; yet it is ſtrong enough, becauſe Vinetus obſerves that Govea had been a teacher at Bourdeaux, before he ſtudied the civil-law at Toulouſe. A teacher of a claſs is commonly above twenty years old; and ſo Govea would have been at leaſt ſeventy ſeven years old in 1595. You will aſk me, what I have then to ſay againſt Nicolas Antonio? Is not Vinetus juſtly beaten at his own weapons? I anſwer, no; for ſince he died in 1587, he could not ſuppoſe that Govea was alive in 1595, and it is only upon this ſuppoſition that Nicolas

(*h*) Ex Epiſt. Eliæ Vineti, ubi ſupra.

(*i*) *See the remark* [*I*].

(12) Guichenon, Hiſt. de Savoye, Tom. I, pag. 678.

(13) Andreas apud patruum Grammaticam primum, mox Philoſophiam profeſſus, ab eodem ſcholæ illi tandem præfectus fuit. *Vinetus, in Bibl. Hiſpan. pag.* 475.

(14) Illic (Lutetiæ) Antonium Goveanum vidi primum an. à Chriſto nato 1542, quum doceret apud patruum. *Id. ibid.*

(15) *The plain meaning of this is, that he was accuſed at Grenoble, and at Valence; but it is not at all likely, that this accuſation ſhould have been renewed in another place. It ſeems the author expreſſed himſelf wrong. He meant, that Govea was accuſed in one of theſe two towns. He ſhould have expreſſed himſelf without any equivocation; and he ſhould have told us, whether he was proſecuted at Grenoble or at Valence.*

(16) Allard, Bibliotheque de Dauphiné, pag. 118, 119.

(17) Calvinus in Tractatu de Scandalis, in Volumine Tractatuum Theologicorum, pag. 90. col. 1. Edit. Genev. 1611.

(18) *In the parliament of Bourdeaux, and not of Toulouſe, as it is affirmed in the* Prima Scaligerana, pag. 86. *See Mr Menage's* Anti-Baillet, Tom I, p. 262, *wherein he ſhews, that this counſellor's name was Brian de Vallée.*

(19) Nic. Anton. Biblioth. Hiſpan. Tom. I, pag. 97.

(20) Literas ante profeſſus eſt quam ego qui veni an. Chriſt. 1539 quo tempore Toloſæ jam operam juri dabat. *Vinetus, Epiſt. ad Schott. in Bibl. Hiſpan. pag.* 475.

(21) Nic. Anton. ubi ſupra.

(22) Thuanus, lib. xxxviii, pag. 770.

(23) Thuanus, lib. xxxviii, pag. 137.

(24) Qui Taurinis deceſſiſſe fertur libellorum ſupplicum magiſter. *Vinetus, ubi ſupra.*

(25) *He calls him wrong,* Elias Venetus: *Schottus's* Bibliotheca Hiſpanica *contains the ſame fault.*

what Ronſard ſaid of him (k). Several of Govea's writings have been publiſhed both upon philology and the civil-law. Some maintain that he excelled the great Cujas in parts [K]. I will ſay ſomething of MAINFROI GOVEA, his ſon [L].

cholas Antonio's cenſure can be well grounded. It is certain he did not know when Vinetus died; his cenſure is an undoubted teſtimony of it: nor did he know, that Thuanus has beſtowed an encomium upon Govea; for had he known it, he would have cited that place, and not another, wherein that great hiſtorian ſpeaks of him only occaſionally (26). Beſides, Thuanus having placed Govea's death in the year 1565, Nicolas Antonio would not have failed to take notice of that miſtake, which, according to him, is an egregious one. Many people, and amongſt others Mr Allard, at the 119th page of the Bibliotheque of Dauphiné, and Mr Konig, at the 356th page of the *Bibliotheca vetus & nova*, follow Thuanus therein; but Andrew Schottus is none of them, ſince he affirms, at the 301ſt page of the *Bibliotheca Hiſpanica*, that Govea taught at Grenoble in the year 1566, and got children there after the year 1570.

[K] *Some maintain that he exceeded the great Cujas in parts.*] Antony Faber pretends, that Govea and Cujas were the two moſt excellent civilians of their age; but with this difference, that Govea had a happier genius, and, that, truſting too much to his parts, he did not think that labour was either honourable or neceſſary; whereas Cujas, of a leſs penetrating genius, laboured like a man, who was perſuaded, that, by dint of application, thoſe things might be diſcovered, which nothing can conquer but the ſtrength of wit. They that underſtand Latin will be pleaſed to ſee in what manner Antony Faber has pronounced this judgment. *Tulit ætas noſtra maximos in Juriſprudentia viros non paucos, ſed præcipuos, ſi quid mei ingenii eſt, (cæterorum pace dixerim) Anton. Goveanum & Jac. Cujacium. Illum ut mihi quidem videtur, multo feliciore ingenio ad Juriſprudentiam natum: ſed qui naturæ viribus tam conſideret, ut diligentiæ laudem ſibi non neceſſariam, minus etiam fortaſſe honorificam putare videretur. Hunc contra, minus lucido præſtantique ingenii acumine, ſed qui aſſiduo labore ea quoque ſe adſequi poſſe crederet, quæ ſolis ingenii nervis parari queunt* (27). Cujas himſelf was much of this mind: he would have given Govea the precedence, if he had obſerved him to be as ſtudious, as he was ingenious. *Adoleſcens* (Cujacius) *Antonii Goveani Juriſconſulti ingenium admirabatur, ſed indiligentia hominis notata, nihil deterritus eſt, deterritum iri ſe dicens à jure tractando, ſi homo Luſitanus tanto ingenio, tamque ſubtili, labores civilium ſtudiorum ſeriò ſuſcipere ac ſubire voluiſſet* (28).

Paſquier gives the pre-eminence to Cujas above Govea. ‘Taking a review, ſays he (29), of the three claſſes of thoſe that have written upon the civil-law; in the firſt, I highly value Accurſius amongſt the gloſſators; in the ſecond Bartolus . . . . and amongſt thoſe of the laſt, which I call humaniſts, I give the firſt place to our Cujas, who, according to my judgment, never had, nor has, nor perhaps ever will have, his equal. And, in the midſt of the latter, I ſee none that has written in more elegant language than Govea and Duarenus, for the little they have left of their works; and of theſe two, I give the precedence to Govea.’ I do not underſtand how Duarenus can be ſaid to have written little, when his works make a large folio (§ α).

[(§ α) Duaren has not written near ſo much as Cujas. This is what Paſquier would ſay, not in lib. 9. ch. 10. p. 902. but lib. 9. ch. 39. p. 902. of the edition of 1643. Rem. Crit.]

[L] *I will ſay ſomething of MAINFROI GOVEA, his ſon.*] He was born at Turin, and got a good faculty of writing both in proſe and verſe. He underſtood polite literature well, and the civil and canon law; and got the eſteem of the duke of Savoy, his maſter, who honoured him with a counſellor's place in the ſenate of Turin, and in the council of ſtate. He died in 1613. We have his *Conſilia: Notæ & Animadverſiones in Opera Julii Clari: Carmina: Orazione funebre nelle morte di Filippo II Rè di Spagna* (30).

(k) *See, below, citat.* (26).

(26) I grant, that in that place he beſtows a more exquiſite encomium upon him occaſionally, than when he ſpeaks of him *ex profeſſo*; for he reckons him among thoſe learned men who live in colleges, and are ſo happy as to have no manner of pedantry. Buchanan, Turnebus, and Muret, are the three others whom he places in that number, according to Ronſard's opinion. *See, above, citat.* (29) *of the article* BUCHANAN.

(27) Antonius Faber, in Præfat. lib. vii, & ſeq. Conjectur ad Petrum Fabrum apud Leickherum in Not. ad Vitas Clariſſ. Juriſconſultorum, pag. 200.

(28) Papyr. Maſſo in vita Cujacii, pag. 300, 301.

(29) Paſquier, Recherch, livr. ix, chap x, pag. 902.

(30) *Taken from* Ghilini, Teatro, part. II, pag. 189.

GOULART (Simon), a native of Senlis, and miniſter of Geneva, was one of the moſt indefatigable writers of theſe latter times [A]. When he did not put his name to a book, he denoted it by theſe three initial letters, S. G. S., which mean *Simon Goulart Senliſien* (a). It is by this mark father *Labbe* (b) believes with reaſon that he diſcovered him to be the author of the marginal notes, and ſummaries, in Nicetas Choniates's Annals, of the Geneva edition, in 1593. Goulart died at Geneva very old, in 1628 [B]. The ordinary date of his epiſtles dedicatory is *from St Gervais*, which is the name of part of Geneva. If we did not know, that he dated in the ſame manner the letters that he did not deſign for the public (c), we ſhould doubtleſs believe, that he did it, becauſe this date did not make his compoſures ſuſpected by the Catholics, as the name of Geneva would have done. He had a very extenſive knowledge of books; for which reaſon Henry III deſiring to know the author, who diſguiſed himſelf under the name of Stephanus Junius Brutus, to vent a very republican doctrine, ſent a man on purpoſe to Simon Goulart, to be informed of it; but Goulart, who knew all the myſtery, would not diſcover it, for fear of expoſing thoſe that were concerned (d). Scaliger

[A] *He was one of the moſt indefatigable writers of theſe latter times.*] This appears by the multitude of books he adorned with notes and ſummaries (1), or comments, or which he turned into French, or wrote of his own. Du Bartas's weeks are one of the books, upon which he has commented. He did not content himſelf to tranſlate Camerarius's hiſtorical meditations into French, but added many thing to them. He made a great collection of admirable and memorable ſtories. La Croix du Maine will inform you of many French tranſlations written by Simon Goulart; that of the hiſtory of Portugal (2); of the chronicle of Carion; of ſome tracts of Theodoret; of John Wierus's books concerning the impoſture of devils. Add to this the verſion of all the works of Seneca, publiſhed at Paris, in two volumes, in 4to in the year 1590. The ſame author writ ſeveral tracts of devotion and morality, and upon the affairs of his time. D'Aubigné praiſes the latter; for, giving the titles of ſome books of this kind, he goes on thus: ‘To which I will add the ſeveral learned, pathetic, and cogent writings, which Simon Goulart, of Senlis, has written on ſeveral occaſions; a writer fit to write hiſtory, if his profeſſion had permitted him to write without judging (3).’

I have obſerved in the margin, that Simon Goulart added notes and ſummaries to Amiot's Plutarch. I muſt farther ſay, that he added to them ſome parallels, upon which Varillas paſſes no favourable judgment. ‘As ingenious, *ſays he* (4), as was Simon Goulart, of Senlis, miniſter of Geneva in our father's time; and as diligent as he was to add to the French Plutarch the compariſons that are wanting in the Greek, there is but one that is good, which is that of Alexander the Great with Julius Cæſar.’

[B] *He died very old, in* 1628 (§ α).] We learn from a letter that he wrote to Scaliger, the ſeventeenth of October 1606 (5), that he was then *at the end* of his ſixty third year. There are few that have been in the miniſtry ſo long as he: for he ſucceeded Calvin in the year 1564 (6).

[(§ α) Simon Goulart died at the age of eighty ſix years, and had preached ſeven days before his death. This is what d'Aubigné ſays, in the laſt page of his *Opuſcula Miſcellanea*, where we find the elogy of this miniſter. Rem. Crit.]

(a) In the catalogue of the Bodleian library, he is called *Simon Goulartius Sanliſienſis Sylvanectinus*. The word *five* ſhould have been put between the two laſt words.

(b) De Sciptorib. Eccleſ. Tom. II, pag. 765.

(c) See the letters he wrote to Scaliger, in the collection publiſhed by James de Reves, at Harderwyc, 1624.

(d) See his funeral oration, pronounced by Mr Tronchin, profeſſor of divinity.

(1) This he did to all Plutarch's works, tranſlated by Amiot.

(2) Written by Oſorius.

(3) D'Aubigné, Hiſt. Univerſ. Tom. III, lib. iii, cap. xxiii, pag. m. 401.

(4) Varillas, Hiſt. de Louis XI, livr. xi, *at the beginning, pag. m.* 358, 359.

(5) It is the 52d of the third book in the collection of James de Reves.

(6) Spon, Hiſt. de Geneve, pag. m. 263.

liger eſteemed him much [C]. A ſon of Simon Goulart was miniſter of the Walloon church at Amſterdam, and earneſtly eſpouſed the Arminian intereſt [D].

[C] *Scaliger eſteemed him much.*] 'Mr Goulart ... 'has ſucceeded well upon his Cyprian. He is a fine 'man, who has learned every thing of himſelf; and 'who began the Latin tongue late, when I was at 'Geneva. It is ſaid, that his ſon pleaſes his church. 'I like Mr Goulart's performance upon his Cyprian: 'I have read it throughout. His ſermons were very 'perſpicuous. He has caſtrated Montagne's works; '*Quæ audacia in ſcripta aliena! Non putaſſem Goulartium, quod ſerius incæpit, tam bene poſſe ſcribere,* '*ut fecit* (7).' I ſhall now ſpeak of his ſon.

[D] *One of his ſons eſpouſed the Arminian intereſt.*] Being provoked by a young miniſter, his colleague, he preached one day againſt thoſe, who ſay, that, by virtue of the decrees of reprobation, ſome children, who die at the breaſt, or in their mothers womb, are damned eternally. He was ſuſpended for it in 1615 (8). He was one of the Remonſtrant miniſters, who, for refuſing to ſubſcribe to the ſynod of Dort, were turned out of their places, and expelled the country. He retired to Antwerp; from whence he wrote ſome letters, that have been inſerted in the collection, which I cite in the margin. He wrote one to his father in March, 1620 (9), in which he mentions a book, which he had printed two years before, with this title: *Examen des opinions de M. F. Baſſecourt* (10) *contenues en ſon livre de diſputes, intitulé, Election éternelle & ſes dependances.* He retired into France after the end of the truce between the Dutch and the Spaniards, and ſtaid ſome years at Calais, from whence he went into the country of Holſtein. There is one of his letters (11), which gives no good teſtimony to the miniſters, with reſpect to the wars of religion, which prevailed in France at that time. According to Mr Witte, he was born at Senlis (12), and died at Fredericſtadt in 1628, at fifty two years of age. Mr Mollerus, who thought he was of Geneva, before his reading the ſecond Tome of the *Diarium Biographicum*, changed his notion, when he knew that Mr Witte made him a native of Senlis: *Senliſienſem Silvanectinum eſſe rectius forte tradit vir clariſſimus Henn. Wittenius* (13). I think Mr Mollerus's firſt opinion the more probable of the two; and as he obſerves, that Mr Witte aſcribes to Goulart the ſon, the works he ſhould have aſcribed to Goulart the father; he might have ſaid, that probably the time of the death of the one has been confounded with that of the other (14). See what he afterwards obſerved in his book *De ſcriptoribus homonymis*, at the 678th and 679th pages.

(7) In Scaligeranis, pag m. 97, 98.

(8) *See the* Epiſtolæ Eccleſiaſticæ & Theologicæ, pag. 414, Edit in fol.

(9) *It is the 274th of the ſame* Epiſtolæ Eccleſiaſticæ, &c.

(10) He was a miniſter, who had been a monk.

(11) It is the 424th. See page 696.

(12) Senliſienſis; Silvanectinus, *Witte, Diar. Biograph. Tom. II, pag.* 35. There ſhould be *ſite* between thoſe two words. Mr Mollerus, *ubi infra*, quotes them without a comma.

(13) Mollerus, Iſagoge ad Hiſtor. Cherſ. Cimbr. part. II, pag. 223.

(14) Witte places the death of Goulart, the ſon, on the nineteenth of March, 1628.

GOULU (NICOLAS), in Latin *Gulonius*, the ſon of a Vine-Dreſſer near Chartres [A], was made Regius Profeſſor of the Greek tongue in the univerſity of Paris, in the year 1567 (a), in the place of John Daurat, whoſe daughter he had married. He tranſlated from Greek into Latin, Gregentius's diſpute againſt Herbanus the Jew (b), which Giles de Noailles, ambaſſador of France in Turkey, brought from Conſtantinople. This verſion, together with ſome notes of Nicolas Goulu, was printed with the Greek text at Paris in the year 1586. A collection of ſeveral pieces of this profeſſor had already been printed in the ſame city, in 1580 [B]. He had two ſons, John and Jerom, of whom I ſhall ſpeak hereafter. Magdalen Daurat, his wife, was a learned woman. Her epitaph ſhews, that ſhe underſtood the Greek, Latin, Italian, and Spaniſh tongues. Mr Menage (c) affords me all theſe particulars. We ſhall ſee in the articles of Nicholas Goulu's ſons, or in the remarks of this article, what remains to be obſerved concerning his works. It is ſomewhat probable, that d'Aubigné meant him in the eighth chapter of the firſt book of his *Baron de Fæneſte*. The place is very ſatirical [C]. Some wonder, that Daurat did not oblige his ſon-in-law to change his name of Goulu [D].

(a) Du Breul, Antiq. de Paris, pag. 565.

(b) Menage, Rem ſur la Vie d'Ayraut, pag. 252, & 501.

(c) Ibid.

[A] *He was the ſon of a vine-dreſſer near Chartres.*] William du Val, who, in his catalogue of the royal profeſſors, ſays that Nicolas Goulu was of Limouſin, has commited a fault; and perhaps has done it by conſidering, that Daurat, who had given Nicolas Goulu one of his daughters, and his place, was of that country. Goulu himſelf declares, before ſome Latin poems, which he publiſhed, that he was of Chartres (1).

[B] *A collection of ſeveral pieces of this profeſſor had been already publiſhed.*] Namely, the tranſlation of Apollinaris's Greek paraphraſe upon the Pſalms: a paraphraſe in Greek verſe upon the *Magnificat*, the *Nunc Dimittis*, the Song of Zachary; an hymn of JESUS CHRIST; and a preface in Greek verſe upon Apollinaris's paraphraſe. This book was unknown to the laſt continuator of Geſner's epitome, and to Du Verdier Vau-Privas, who made ſome additions to that epitome. And it does not appear in the catalogues of Draudius, nor in that of Oxford, nor in that of Thuanus, nor in that of the archbiſhop of Reims.

[C] *The place is very ſatirical.*] For the honour of the learned Magdalen Daurat, I could wiſh, that either Nicolas Goulu had been married twice, and that the four following lines concerned his other wife; or that d'Aubigné was not miſtaken about the country of him he mentions: for this would prove, that this ſatire does not concern Nicolas Goulu. However it be, it is thus he ſpeaks: 'There was, at 'Paris, a native of Loudun, and a learned man, 'called le Goulu: he was mad, when his wife took 'to board thoſe that ſtudied the law: he would 'only have little boys: upon this, four verſes were 'made, the ſenſe whereof is well worth the rhime.' They are theſe:

Du Goulu ſavant ne prend gueres
Les barbus pour Penſionnaries;
Il choiſit les petits enfans,
Mais la Gouluë les veut grands.

Goulu to board will ne're take in
Youths with a beard upon their chin;
Children alone he'll entertain;
But Madam Goulu will have men.

That which might make one ſuſpect, than John Daurat's ſon-in-law is not here meant, is, to ſee, that he is not ſtyled profeſſor, or Greek reader; which probably d'Aubigné was not ignorant of; and he was not a man, who on ſuch an occaſion would be wanting to characterize a man. Let us therefore leave the thing undecided. Du Verdier Vau-Privas did not know this man's chriſtian name. 'Daurat '*ſays he* (2), had a daughter, whom he married to 'G. Goulu, a public reader of the Greek tongue, 'with whom he had ſome debate; and, ſpeaking of 'him, he called him *mon Goulu*, (my glutton.)'

[D] *Some wonder that Daurat did not oblige him to change his name of Goulu.*] I borrow this remark from Mr Baillet. 'This ſame Daurat, *ſays he* (3), 'who ſeemed to be aſhamed of, and diſguſted with, 'the name of *Diſnemandi* (dine-early), made no 'ſcruple to marry his daughter to another learned 'man, named Goulu (glutton); which name denotes 'ſomething ſtill baſer than that of *Diſnemandi*, and 'which is not much better than *lurco* among the 'Latins. After what he had done for his own name, 'there is reaſon to wonder he did not make it an 'article in the contract of his daughter's marriage, 'that Goulu ſhould change his name; and that he 'was willing, that not only his ſon-in-law, but alſo 'his grand-children, ſhould preſerve that name, and 'render it immortal to poſterity, without taking any 'farther liberty than that of changing it into Latin 'by the word *Gulonius*.' Doubtleſs there is reaſon to wonder at it: for on one hand, the practice

of

(1) Menage, Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayraut, pag. 251, 252.

(2) Proſopographie, Tom. III, pag. 2576.

(3) Auteurs déguiſez, pag. 156.

of metamorphoſing one's name was common at that time amongſt the learned; and, on the other, it muſt needs be ſomewhat unpleaſant to bear a name, which excites certain ideas, and occaſions a thouſand ſilly alluſions. It is very probable, that, when families began to diſtinguiſh themſelves by proper names, ſome perſons were called by a name that ſuited them for certain defects. (a) This is in all likelihood the reaſon why, in all countries, ſome families bear the name of blind, crooked, and black. Upon this ſcore, Daurat ſhould have been diſpleaſed with a name that made people think he was deſcended from a ſtarveling, and that his ſon-in-law had not a better original. (b) I omit the ſcurvy jeſts, that the poets of Balzac's party grounded upon the name of his adverſary Father Goulu. See the *Vaticinium Galateæ de exitio Pantophagi*, prefixed to Mr de la Motte-Aigron's anſwer (4).

(4) Compare with this what you find in remark [*A*] of the article FEU-ARDENTIUS.

(a) it was certainly so among the Romans & many instances may be produced of great familys

(b). Nothing is meaner lower lived than to Joke upon a mans Na[me] Puns upon Name seldom shew wit or Learning —

GOULU (JOHN), ſon of him I have been mentioning, had not perhaps more merit than his father, though he made more noiſe. He was born at Paris the twenty fifth of Auguſt 1576 (*a*), and, being admitted an advocate, he deſigned to exerciſe that profeſſion in the parliament of that city; but he had the misfortune to be at a ſtand the very firſt time he pleaded a cauſe [*A*]; and it is thought, that this diſgrace made him reſolve to leave the world, and turn monk. He choſe the order of the Feuillants, and was admitted into it in 1604. He was ſo much eſteemed in his order, that he had always ſome office in it, and at laſt was made general [*B*]. His religious name was that of Dom John of St Francis. As he underſtood Greek, he applied himſelf to tranſlate into French Epictetus's Enchiridion, Arrianus's Diſſertations, ſome tracts of St Baſil, and the works of Dionyſius the Areopagite [*C*]. He added to this laſt tranſlation an apology for the works of this Dionyſius. He alſo reviſed the Latin verſion his father had made of the tracts of St Gregory Nyſſen againſt Eunomius, and publiſhed it. It is in the edition of St Gregory Nyſſen (*b*), procured by Fronto Ducæus (*c*). Father Goulu, not contented with making tranſlations, engaged alſo in controverſy, and wrote a book againſt that, which Du Moulin had publiſhed concerning the call of paſtors [*D*]. We have alſo his life of Francis de Sales, biſhop of Geneva; and his funeral oration of Nicolas

(*a*) St Romuald. Theſaur. Chron. ad ann. 1629.

(*b*) Labbe, de Script. Eccleſ. Tom. I, pag. 382.

(*c*) At Paris, 1615.

[*A*] *He had the misfortune to be at a ſtand, the firſt cauſe he pleaded.*] My voucher is one of Father Goulu's enemies, *viz.* Mr de la Motte-Aigron, (1) who relates the adventure in ſuch a manner, that it manifeſtly appears by a great number of circumſtances, that John Goulu had the misfortune to be at a ſtand the firſt time of his pleading. La Motte-Aigron dares not affirm, that, having ventured upon a ſecond tryal, he had the ſame ill luck; but he tells us (2), that ſome have ſaid it; and he inſinuates (3), that Goulu never pretended to preach after he turned Feuillant. But Balzac gives us to underſtand the contrary, in theſe words: 'His picture, *ſays he* '(4), is ſhewn as a rarity in an apartment of the 'galleries of the Louvre: it was drawn by the 'painter of the heroes and heroines, and ſo much 'to the life, that it wants nothing but ſpeech. Some 'ſay, that this ſilence is not ſo much an imperfec'tion of art, as one of the properties of my adver'ſary; and that, when he pleaded in parliament, and 'PREACHED before the chapter, (for he has been 'an advocate and a PREACHER) he was uſed thus 'to keep gravity, and frequently to conclude 'without ſaying a word. The ill tongues are pleaſ'ed to make themſelves merry upon it; and al'ledge, amongſt other inſtances, the mute Rhetori'cian, ſo ill treated by the poet Auſonius (5), upon 'whoſe picture he thus plays at the end of an epi'gram: *what is Rufus doing in his chair? the ſame* '*thing as in his picture.*'

I am going to cite another paſſage, not becauſe it makes mention of that adventure, but becauſe it may ſerve to undeceive thoſe, who believe it no great crime to prevaricate with the words of an author, in order to render him odious. I maintain, that this baſeneſs differs not from that of notaries, who falſify a contract: let us hear a man upon this, whoſe eloquence has a great deal of majeſty. 'You 'muſt confeſs, *ſays he* (6), that it is no ſmall effect 'of the providence of GOD, that ſo dangerous a man 'ſhould have been thwarted in the firſt profeſſion 'he had choſen, and expelled from the bar by ſo 'notable a diſgrace as happened to him in a full au'ditory. The fatal blow, his tongue was ſtruck 'with, has been the preſervation of many families: It 'has been a bleſſing to the widows and orphans, that 'might have fallen into his hands; and on that day 'probably GOD ſecured this poor kingdom from 'many volumes of falſe contracts, and wills of the 'ſame nature, wherewith his fine wit threatened it '(7).' For the reſt, Father Goulu's elogy, which I ſhall quote in the following remarks, ſpeaks of him as a man, who might have ſignalized himſelf amongſt the moſt famous advocates. *Foro jam aſſuetus, ubi celeberrimus inter Juriſconſultos tunc temporis eminere poſſet.* We muſt not deprive an elogy of the privilege of being *ſubreptitious*, but we ſhould not extend it ſo far as to make it *obreptitious*.

[*B*] *He choſe the order of the Feuillants . . . . . He was made general.*] They, who ſay he was twice general (8), did not conſult his elogy in the ſecond edition of his Dionyſius the Areopagite (9). This elogy informs us, that, from the time of his noviciate, he had always ſome employments in the order; and that at laſt he was raiſed to the firſt, which he exerciſed for ſix years; after which he was made counſellor, and aſſiſtant to him that ſucceeded him. From whence it appears, that la Motte-Aigron is miſtaken, when he ſays (10), that Dom John Goulu *has been theſe three years general of his order*. He wrote this in 1627, or in 1628. Father Goulu died in the beginning of 1629, being no longer in the office of general, which he had exerciſed ſix years: the concluſion is evident. An author of Livonia (11) ſays, that this father was *general of the congregation of the order of Citeaux*: he ſhould have ſaid, *of the congregation of the Feuillants, which is a branch of the order of Citeaux.*

[*C*] *He applied himſelf to tranſlate into French Epictetus's Enchiridion . . . . . and the works of Dionyſius the Areopagite.*] I have not named each tranſlation according to it's time; but here they are in better order. The firſt was that of Dionyſius the Areopagite, which was printed in 1608, and reprinted in 1629, and in 1642. The ſecond was that of Epictetus: it came out in 1609, and it appears by the licence, that he undertook it for queen Mary de Medicis. The third was that of St Baſil's homilies upon the Hexameron, which was printed in 1616 (12).

[*D*] *He wrote a book againſt that, which Du Moulin publiſhed concerning the call of paſtors.*] I find a great difference betwixt the monk St Romuald, and la Motte-Aigron; not only with reſpect to the quality of this anſwer, which the latter deſpiſes, as much as the other commends it; but alſo with reſpect to the time, in which it was written. It was in the life-time of Francis de Sales, if we believe the monk: who tells us (13), that this prelate, having read the book of the Call of Paſtors againſt Du Moulin, judged, that Father Goulu was the only perſon fit to ſucceed in the labours of cardinal du Perron againſt Hereſy. But la Motte-Aigron pretends (14), that this father officiouſly undertook this anſwer *after the death of Coëffeteau; and he admires how he ſhould preſume to think himſelf a proper combatant to ſucceed the great Coëffeteau againſt Du Moulin.* Francis de Sales died ſome months before Coëffeteau; and therefore he had not ſeen Father Goulu's anſwer, if

(1) Réponſe à Phyllarque, pag. 74, & ſeq.

(2) Ibid. pag. 75.

(3) Ibid. pag. 80, 83.

(4) Relation à Menandre, part. I, pag. m. 309.

(5) In the 47th epigram.

REFLEXION on the crime of falſe quotations.

(6) Balzac, Oeuvres diverſes, Diſc. xiv, pag. m. 377.

(7) This is grounded upon a conceit, that Goulu falſified and altered what he cited out of Balzac. See, concerning that fault, the *Avis au petit Auteurs des petits livrets*, which came out during the controverſy about the chimerical cabal of Rotterdam, in 1691, and 1692.

(8) Mr Menage is one of them, *Remarq ſur la Vie d'Ayraut, pag.* 252.

(9) It came out in the year 1629, in 4to. Father de Viſch has inſerted that encomium in his Bibliotheca Scriptorum ſacri Ordinis Ciſtercienſis, pag. 220.

(10) Pag. 72.

(11) Witte, Diar. Biographic. in Append.

(12) Ex Biblioth. Ciſtercienſ. Caroli de Viſch.

(13) Theſaur. Chronol. ad ann. 1627.

(14) Pag. 91, 92.

Nicolas le Fevre, preceptor to Lewis XIII: but it is ſaid he never recited it [E]. To ſpeak the truth, he got no great reputation by thoſe pieces; but he was engaged in an affair in the year 1627, that made him extreamly talked of [F]. A Feuillant, who went only by the name of Brother Andrew (d), had made a ſmall collection of thoughts, whereof he believed Balzac had only been the tranſcriber. Thoſe, who envied Balzac's glory, ſo mightily cried up this piece, which was only handed about in manuſcript, that it gave occaſion to the Apology, which Ogier, his good friend, publiſhed, in which Brother Andrew was very ſeverely treated. The copy that was ſent to Father Goulu, who was then general of the order, was taken for a challenge, which put him into a furious paſſion. He publiſhed two volumes of letters againſt Balzac, wherein he horribly inveighs againſt him. He gave himſelf the name of Phyllarchus, that is to ſay, *Prince des feuilles*, *Prince of the leaves*, as his adverſaries rendered it; and it is not to be doubted, that he had in view his quality of general of the Feuillants, when he diſguiſed himſelf under this falſe name. To have a right notion of his animoſity, one need only conſider, that he did all that lay in him to engage the whole world in the ruin of Balzac, and gave him up to all the rigour of the ſecular power: nay, he attempted to engage the women in the puniſhment of this adverſary. He directed his ſpeech to them, uſing the flattering words of *handſome ladies* (e); and declared, *That if they had never ſo little courage, they were obliged to put out Balzac's eyes with the points of their needles*; or, in caſe of mercy, *to ſubmit him to the ſame puniſhment the court ladies deſigned to inflict on John de Meun*; which was that of the laſh. The zeal of Father Goulu, who thus, in a book, raiſed all the world againſt an author, whoſe whole fault conſiſted in uſing ſome thoughts, that were inſipid, too free, and too immodeſt, and in not repreſſing the heat and exaggeration of a growing imagination; this zeal, I ſay, that came from the preſs, was not the moſt miſchievous. That of his emiſſaries, who as far as his juriſdiction reached, and wherever they could ſet foot, vented, in converſation, a thouſand diſadvantageous things againſt Mr de Balzac [G], according to the cuſtom of bigots [H], was much more dangerous. Then it was that Father Goulu's

(d) It is he, whom Balzac calls Dom André de St Denys, in the letters he wrote to him after they were reconciled. *See the remark* [C] *of the article* BALZAC (JOHN, &c.)

(e) The fifteenth letter of the firſt Tome.

if it was undertaken at the time ſpecified by la Motte-Aigron. But that you may know on which ſide the miſtake lies, I ought to inform you, that Father Goulu's book againſt Du Moulin came out in 1620, and Coeffeteau did not die till 1623.

[E] *We have .... his funeral oration of Nicolas le Fevre .... but it is pretended, that he never recited it.*] La Motte-Aigron poſitively affirms it; and therefore we muſt read with ſome caution what is ſaid in Moreri's dictionary, in the article of Nicolas le Fevre, that John de St François, a Feuillant, *made his funeral oration*. Mr Balzac (15) cites a paſſage of it, which is in a very high-flown ſtyle, and ſomewhat harſh. It was printed the firſt time in 1612. The author put his name only to the ſecond edition in 1616. The third edition was enlarged with two tracts (16).

(15) Relat. à Menandre, part. III.

(16) Bibliot. Ciſtercienſ. Caroli de Viſch.

[F] *He was engaged in an affair in the year 1627 that made him extremely talked of*] This is the epoch of Balzac's and Father Goulu's difference; for that which incenſed the latter, was, the apology publiſhed for the former, and printed off the eighth of April 1627. The firſt volume of Phyllarchus's letters, which came out the ſame year, is chiefly levelled at Mr Balzac; but the apologiſt is alſo attacked in it from time to time. This ſhews, that Menage and Peter Borel are miſtaken, in ſaying, the one (17), *that prior Ogier anſwered Father Goulu's books againſt Mr Balzac, in a book, intituled,* Mr Balzac's apology; the other (18), that Des Cartes very ſeaſonably recommended Mr Balzac, in oppoſition to Father Goulu, in the year 1625, to cardinal Barberini, legate in France. It is certain, that prior Ogier's book was publiſhed before Phyllarchus's letters, and that, in 1625, Balzac had no controverſy with Father Goulu.

(17) Remarques ſur la vie d'Ayraut, pag. 252.

(18) Vitæ Carteſii Compend.

Richelet has committed the ſame fault as Mr Menage. 'Father Goulu, *ſays he* (19), inveighed more 'againſt Balzac; for he wrote a very ſevere criticiſm 'upon his writings, which might have given ſome 'trouble to that eloquent man, if Mr Ogier, a young 'eccleſiaſtic, had not writ an apology, wherein he 'ſhewed, that the good father was in the wrong.' We ſhould, in matters of fact, follow the advice, which Des Cartes gives with reſpect to philoſophical ſpeculations, examine every thing afreſh without any regard to what others have written concerning it: but it is infinitely more convenient to ſtand to the teſtimony of others, and this is what prodigiouſly multiplies the aſſertors of falſities.

(19) Richelet, vie des Auteurs François, *prefixed to a collection of letters, pag.* 42.

[G] *His emiſſaries .... vented in converſation a thouſand diſadvantageous things againſt Mr Balzac.*] The proof of this is to be found in the Relations to Menandre. You there ſee (20), that, in all the places ſubject to the general of the Feuillants juriſdiction, Balzac was now called the monſter; and that he was known to the novices and lay-brothers only by that name. You there find Balzac's complaints againſt the inventions and artifices of calumny. 'Nothing has 'been omitted, *ſays he* (21), to give credit to my ad'verſary, and to deſtroy my reputation. A ſchool 'difference is become an affair of ſtate; and a ſport 'about ſyllables and words is grown into a general 'war of wits. Many ſtories have been ſpread to my 'prejudice, and many more to the advantage of my 'enemy. All voices have been canvaſſed; all France 'has been ſollicited for him. He has neither wanted 'orators, nor poets, nor paraſites, who have preached 'him up, and ſung him, and drank to his victory in 'good companies.... (22) Not to ſpeak of the practi'ces carried on out of the kingdom, and of the mon'ſtrous picture that has been made of me in all the 'courts of chriſtendom; you need only know what 'happened at Paris in the firſt heat of the war. For 'three months together, ſeveral men of his faction 'went out every morning, two and two, being or'dered to do me ill offices in all the diſtricts of the 'vulgar, and every where to ſpread their ſlanders, 'with a deſign to raiſe the populace upon me, and 'move them to treat my perſon, as their ſuperior has 'treated my book...... To ſtrengthen their crew, 'they have been in queſt of men, condemned by the 'public voice; men, famous for their debaucheries 'and ſcandalous lives; known all over the kingdom by 'the ill opinion they entertain of the Chriſtian faith, 'and the contempt they profeſs of our holy myſte'ries. They have offered to this ſet of people; who 'can believe it? but it is true, however, that they have 'offerred them their protection againſt the Jeſuits; and 'that they have emboldened them againſt the alarms 'of their conſcience, and the threatenings of the laws: 'It is true, that they promiſed them their favour and 'teſtimony, in caſe they ſhould be accuſed of impiety, 'or of any other capital crime, provided they would 'join with them on this occaſion, and declare war 'againſt me, under the banner of my adverſary.'

(20) Balzac, Oeuvres diverſes, pag. 310. Rouen, 1658, in 8vo.

(21) Ibid. pag. 336.

(22) Ibid. pag. 339.

[H] .... *according to the cuſtom of bigots.*] This is their method. Some of them write libels, which others ſet off in converſation; and there are no cavils, but by this means they convert into good reaſons with abundance of people. It is a ſcene that is acted in all countries: ſuch people are ſo well known, that it has been no difficult thing to paint them to the

Goulu's fame ſpread far and near [*I*]. He had for his partiſans, on one hand, almoſt all the monks [*K*], becauſe Balzac had ſpoken of their learning with a little too much contempt; and, on the other, all thoſe, who envied the great reputation of this young author. A great many writings were publiſhed *pro* and *con* (*f*), and they even came to ſword and piſtol; which probably ſilenced ſome writers, who did not care to come to blows. Father Goulu did not long enjoy the pleaſure of raiſing ſo great a diſorder in the Republic of Letters; for he died the fifth of January 1629 (*g*) [*L*]. He was buried in the choir of the Feuillants at Paris. It was ſaid among other things, in his epitaph, that he had reſtored, by his writings, the purity of the French tongue (*b*). Balzac exclaimed againſt it [*M*]. La Motte-Aigron, one of his defenders, publiſhed ſome things concerning Father Goulu, that are ſomewhat ſingular [*N*].

(*f*) *See Sorel's* Bibliotheque Françoiſe, chap. vii.

(*g*) Menage, Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayraut, pag. 252. St Romuald, Journ. Chronol. Tom. I, pag. 24.

(*b*) Scriptis ſuis mirum quantum adulteratam eloquentiæ puritatem revocaverit, conſervaverit, illuſtraverit.

the life. This has been lately done by ſome wits of Paris (23): but what does it ſignify to draw their pictures? Are their artifices and contrivances ever the leſs formidable?

(23) Madam. des Houlieres Mr de la Bruyere, the abbot de Villiers, &c.

[*I*] *Then it was that Father Goulu's fame ſpread far and near.*] Beſides what I have juſt now quoted out of the Relation to Menandre, here is another extract of it, which admirably proves, that this quarrel made Father Goulu's name fly into all parts (24). 'Some of 'his partiſans have affirmed, that he had received a 'brief from our holy father the Pope .... Others 'have ſaid, that the aſſembly of the clergy ſent deputies to him, to congratulate him on the proſperity of 'his arms ...... There is no prince or princeſs, no 'lord or lady, to whom he has not made a preſent of 'his books, moſt of them bound like a common-prayer-book, or devout prayers. They have paſſed 'the Rhine, the Danube, and the ocean; they are 'gone over the Alps, and Pyrennees: they are the 'ſubject of all converſations, and get into every 'cloſet. Whole carts have been loaded with them 'to be ſent to the ſiege of Rochelle. ..... (25) 'His picture is ſhewn as a curioſity in an apartment 'of the galleries of the Louvre ..... A man muſt 'be a ſtranger to the court, or have no noble curioſity, who has not ſeen the picture of this dreadful 'prince.'

(24) Balzac, ubi ſupra, pag. 337, 338.

(25) Ibid. pag. pag. 309.

[*K*] *He had, for his partiſans, on one hand, almoſt all the monks.*] It is not without reaſon, that I make this exception, ſince Balzac declares (26), 'that many 'honeſt monks had publickly blamed Father Goulu's 'fault.' Entire orders, continues he, that is, as he he himſelf informs us a little lower, 'the principal 'men of their ſocieties, have given teſtimony to my 'innocence, and proteſted againſt the inſincerity of 'my enemy .. Amongſt his own monks there are ſome, 'who are not very well ſatisfied with what he has 'done ... He has not received, from the old and 'ſevere monks, the praiſes, that have been given 'him by the young and jovial ones ..... Beſides, 'things are not ſo well united in his ſtate, but there 'is ſome diſunited part that ſuffers, or makes others 'ſuffer. That venerable body has it's wounds, and 'it's ſecret infirmities; and, if I was willing to take 'advantage of the diviſion I have diſcovered, and to 'improve the diſcontents of uneaſy minds, I could 'make a notable diverſion. It is certain, that ſome 'have offered to ſerve me in it, even in Italy, and 'that I might have been furniſhed with memoirs for 'that purpoſe, but I would not make uſe of them.' He ſhews in another place (27), that, if he did not uſe all his ſtrength againſt a monk, the reaſon was, that he would not give the Huguenots the pleaſure of laughing. Perhaps this was the reaſon why la Motte-Aigron, his ſecond, did not publiſh the Latin book, wherewith he had threatened (28) Father Goulu, which was to reveal a great many myſteries. You ſee what it is to be ingaged in the ſervice of the church; there is no venturing to expoſe you, and you go unpuniſhed, for fear of affording other religions matter of laughter. I have ſpoken in another place (29) of a man, who, being deſirous to diſſuade his ſon from the bar, in order to make him a clergyman, alledged a very good reaſon to him; but he forgot another, which is ſtill better, that is, the impunity I have juſt now mentioned.

(26) Ibid. pag. 342, 343.

(27) Ibid. pag. 316.

(28) Réponſe à Phyllarque, pag. 71, 322.

(29) Above, in remark [*L*] of the article ACCIUS.

[*L*] *He died the fifth of January* 1629.] The author of the Elogy of Father Goulu, and Peter de St Romuald, who mentions this date, add, that Father Goulu died, being fifty four years old. I could not keep to this, having adopted the birth-day, which I have found in St Romuald, *viz.* the twenty fifth of Auguſt 1576. I know not whether I have followed a good guide; for though, as a Feuillant, it ſeems he could not be miſtaken about ſuch a fact, yet it cannot be denied that he has confuted himſelf, ſince he ſays, in the Abridgment of his Theſaurus, and in his Chronological Journal, that Father Goulu died fifty four years old. It is a wretched thing to be forced to make uſe of unexact authors; one had better have to do with writers, whoſe faults have ſome coherence. At leaſt, a man ſhould give notice, when he uſes different calculations, in which of them he has been miſtaken. However it be, la Motte-Aigron may be taxed with great negligence, who, writing againſt Father Goulu in 1628, made him ſixty years old (30) and above, and about forty years older than the Samaritane (31).

(30) Pag. 101.

(31) Pag 72.

[*M*] *Balzac exclaimed againſt it.*] See his Latin poem, intituled, *Crudelis Umbra*, and the Latin letter (32), in which he ſo ingeniouſly applied theſe two verſes of Ovid to his enemy.

(32) It is at page 243, of the Paris Edit. 1651, in 12mo.

Ergo & adhuc metuendus erat: Cinis ipſe ſepulti
In caput hoc ſævit: tumulo quoque ſenſimus hoſtem (33).

Still formidable, tho' in earth laid low,
Dreadful in death, and in the grave a foe.

(33) Thus Ovid, *Metamorph. lib. xiii, ver.* 503, brings in Hecuba ſpeaking of Achilles, who deſires, that Polexena may be ſacrificed.

Peter de St Romauld ſays in his *Theſaurus Chronologicus* (34), that Father Goulu's epitaph is of Mr Corneille's making. Note, that the duke of Vendome, natural ſon to Henry IV, and Francis of Lorrain, his wife, cauſed to be put on Father Goulu's tomb, the epitaph which is to be ſeen there. Mr Menage affirms it in the 252d page of his remarks on the life of Peter Ayrault.

(34) Ad ann. 1629.

[*N*] *La Motte-Aigron has publiſhed ſome things concerning Father Goulu, that are ſomewhat ſingular.*] Father Goulu (35) being as yet but tutor in a gentleman's houſe, who lived at Paris, went with him into the country of Angoumois, and lodged with him in the houſe of la Motte-Aigron's father. He was there tormented with ſuch an exceſſive thirſt, as forced him to drink in all ſorts of companies, and even when he was in bed; and yet he was very well. By good fortune he happened to be in a plentiful country for wine; but, in the midſt of that plenty, the moderate ſize of the glaſſes ſerved only to provoke his thirſt. They looked for ſome in the houſe, and amongſt the neighbours, and not finding any large enough, they had one made on purpoſe, which was preſerved in the family in memory of Phyllarchus; for ſo it was called. *It was large indeed, but not comparable to Neſtor's cup*; for there was no occaſion for three men, to lift it; any one might *eaſily take it up with both his hands.* This indiſpoſition of Father Goulu (36) is more remarkable than that, which obliged him, a long time after (whilſt he lodged in the ſame houſe, in his generalſhip) to eat nothing but fleſh, though (37) *he had ſo freſh a complexion, and was in ſo very good caſe, that no body thought he ſtood in need of* a diſpenſation.

(35) Réponſe à Phyllarque, pag. 318.

(36) Ibid. pag. 322, 324.

(37) Ibid. pag. 330.

I do not know where la Motte-Aigron learnt, that Neſtor's cup required the ſtrength of three men to lift it: Homer does not ſay ſo; but only that, when it was full, another could hardly take it from the table; but, that Neſtor did it with eaſe.

Ἄλλος μὲν μογέων ἀποκινήσασκε τραπέζης
Πλεῖον ἐόν· Νέστωρ δ' ὁ γέρων ἀμογητὶ ἄειρεν·

Alius quidem non ſine labore ſubmoviſſet à menſa
Plenum exiſtens: Neſtor vero ſenex ſine labore tollebat (38).

(38) Homer. Iliad. lib. xi, ver. 635.

Neſtor (what others wou'd effect with pains)
Alone, with eaſe, the goblet's weight ſuſtains.

We find, in the eleventh book of Athenæus, a long explication of Homer's verſes relating to this cup; but, far from meeting with any thing in it that favours la Motte-Aigron, I have found in that author, that the thing is not to be underſtood as if no Greek could have lifted the cup, but that no old man like Neſtor could have done it. Hercules, who was a great drinker (39), had a very great cup; but I do not obſerve, that it required three men to carry it. Statius allows but two.

Huic pretium palmæ gemini cratera ferebant
Herculeum juvenes. Illum Tyrinthius Heros
Ferre manu ſola, ſpumantemque ore ſupino
Vertere ſeu monſtri victor, ſeu Marte, ſolebat (40).

An huge Herculean cup, the victor's mead,
Two youths bring forth, and ſweat beneath the
weight.
This erſt Alcides, when from toilſome war,
Or ſlaughter'd monſter, he return'd, was wont
Singly to lift, and quaff the liquor off.

Many things might be ſaid concerning Hercules's cup, which was of that prodigious capacity, according to ſome, as to have ſerved him for a veſſel upon the ſea (41); but all this would be foreign to the purpoſe (42).

GOULU (Jerome), younger brother of the foregoing, was Regius Profeſſor of the Greek tongue in his father's place; whom he ſucceeded at eighteen years of age (*a*), in the year 1595 (*b*). He was afterwards phyſician of the faculty of Paris. I ſpeak of his children in a remark [*A*]. It has been ſaid in the elogy of the general of the Feuillants, that he reſigned the profeſſorſhip of the Greek tongue to his younger brother [*B*].

[*A*] *I ſpeak of his children in a remark.*] His wife was Charlote de Monantheuil, daughter to Henry de Monantheuil, dean of the faculty of phyſic at Paris, and Regius Profeſſor of mathematics. From this marriage proceeded, amongſt other children, NICOLAS GOULU, who wrote a book of elogies on the Goulu's; JAMES, ſteward of the king's houſhould, known by the name of Mr de Monantheuil, and Martha wife to Renatus Labitte, advocate in the parliament, grand-nephew to that James Labitte, judge of Maienne, who made an index to the books of the civilians, and who has been honourably mentioned by Cujas, in the firſt chapter of the fourth book, and in the fifteenth chapter of the fifth book of his obſervations (1).

[*B*] *The general of the Feuillants reſigned the profeſſorſhip of the Greek tongue to his younger brother.*] Theſe are the firſt words of that elogium (2). ‘Inter Gallos doctrina illuſtres Joannes Gulonius annumerari meretur, quem Nicolaus pater (Joannis Aurati gener ac in regia Græcæ linguæ profeſſione ſucceſſor) ſingulari naturæ bonitate præditum adoleſcentem non vulgariter & adeo felici ſucceſſu inſtituit, ut ab Academiæ Pariſienſis curatoribus digniſſimus ſit judicatus, qui ſublato è vivis parente literariam ejus profeſſionem ſuſciperet: ſed in fratrem ſe minorem muneris iſtius functionem paterna pietate tranſmiſit. - - - - *John Goulu deſerves to be ranked among the learned men of the French nation, whom his father Nicholas (ſon-in-law of Joannes Auratus, and ſucceſſor in the royal profeſſorſhip of the Greek tongue) educated with ſuch ſucceſs, by reaſon of his uncommon genius, that the curators of the univerſity of Paris thought him the moſt fit perſon to ſucceed his father in his profeſſorſhip: but he, with a paternal piety, delivered over that employment to his younger brother.*

GOURNAI (Mary de Jars, de), adopted by Michael de Montagne [*A*], and famous for her learning. See, in Moreri, what family ſhe was of, and ſeveral other circumſtances of her life. I have not much to add to it. We find in the Perroniana, a very diſobliging touch upon this gentlewoman [*B*]: The occaſion of it was a ſatire,

[*A*] *She was adopted by Michael de Montagne.*] She expreſſed no leſs reſpect and zeal for this father by adoption, than for her true one. You will acknowledge this, if you conſider well what ſhe ſays in the preface to Montagne's eſſays. She cauſed this book to be printed in the year 1635, and dedicated it to cardinal de Richelieu. The preface ſhe added to it deſerves to be read, and will particularly pleaſe thoſe, who love the hiſtory of books, and editions. *The judgment ſhe made of Montagne's firſt eſſays, and the affection ſhe expreſſed for Montagne, upon the bare eſteem ſhe conceived for him long before ſhe ſaw him,* put that author upon many reflexions, and occaſioned the adoption. He eſteemed her from that time and foretold *ſhe would be capable of the fineſt things* (1).

Paſquier acquaints us with ſome circumſtances of this kind of adoption. ‘Michael Montagne, *ſays he* (2), left two daughters; one that came from his marriage, heireſs to all his eſtate, who is well married: the other his daughter by adoption, heireſs of his ſtudies; both of them moſt virtuous ladies: but I cannot conclude my letter without ſpeaking more particularly of the ſecond. She is Madam de Jars, related to many great and noble families of Paris. She never intended to have any other huſband than her honour, inriched with the reading of good books, eſpecially the Lord Montagne's eſſays; who, in 1558, making a long ſtay at Paris, ſhe came on purpoſe to viſit him, to be perſonally acquainted with him. Beſides, Madam de Gournai, her mother, and ſhe, brought him to their houſe at Gournai, where he was three months, in two or three ſeveral journies, with all the civil treatment that could be deſired. At laſt, this virtuous lady, hearing of his death, croſſed almoſt all France, by the help of paſſports, as well by her own deſire, as that of the widow and daughter of the deceaſed, who invited her to come and join her tears and lamentations with theirs. The ſtory is truly memorable.’

[*B*] *We find in the Perroniana, a very diſobliging touch upon this lady.*] I ſet down the paſſage at length. As Mr Pelletier was telling him (3) one day, ‘that he had met Mademoiſelle de Gournai, going to petition the lieutenant-criminal (4), to prohibit *La Defence des Beurrieres,* (*a Vindication of the Butter-women*) becauſe therein ſhe is called a ſtroller, and one that has ſerved the public; he ſaid, I do not believe the lieutenant will order any one to ſeize her body; for few would take that pains; and as for what is ſaid, that ſhe has ſerved the public, ſhe has done it ſo privately, that it is only gueſſed at. To ſhew the contrary, ſhe needs only put her picture to her book; which is the anſwer I once made to Mademoiſelle de Surgeres, who deſired me, at Mr Rets's, to prefix an epiſtle to Ronſard's works, to ſhew that he did not love her in a diſhonourable way. I told her, inſtead of this epiſtle, you need only prefix your picture to them.’ I am certain, Mrs de Gournai would have taken this raillery for the greateſt affront: for, though nature had amply made amends for the faults of her face, by the perfections of her mind; ſo that, if ſhe had been deſpiſed for her body, ſhe had a ready and glorious conſolation, yet there is no probability, that ſhe was ever ſo humble as to renounce the eſteem of her bodily agreeableneſs, ſo much as reaſon required. I queſtion whether the virtue of the greateſt ſaints would be proof againſt ſo deſperate an affront as this.

viz.

---

(39) Macrob. Saturn. lib. v, cap. xxi.

(40) Stat. Theb. lib. vi.

(41) Macrobius, ubi ſupra.

(42) I ſpeak of it in the remark [*D*] of the article HERCULES

(*a*) Menage, Remarques ſur la Vie de Ayrault, pag. 254.

(*b*) Du Breul, Antiq de Paris, pag. 565.

(1) Menage, Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayrault. pag. 254.

(2) Apud Carol. de Viſch, Bibl. Ciſterc. pag. 220.

(1) See Montagne's Eſſays, lib. ii, cap. xvii, at the end, pag. m. 606.

(2) Paſquier, in the ſecond volume of his letters, book xviii, pag. m. 384, 385.

(3) That is cardinal du Perron.

(4) Methinks the prohibition of books belongs to the lieutenant-civil.

ſatire, wherein ſhe was brought in, and which was one of the ſequels of the Anti-Coton [*C*]. There was alſo a libel publiſhed under the title of Anti-Gournai (*a*). Notwithſtanding cardinal du Perron's biting raillery, he had an eſteem for this learned gentlewoman. He is in the liſt of thoſe, who have praiſed her [*D*]. She was regularly paid the little penſion granted her by the court (*b*); and ſhe always lived unmarried. She was very well received, when ſhe waited upon the princeſſes [*E*]. She had done well not to write againſt the partiſans of the Anti-Coton. A perſon of her ſex ought carefully to avoid ſuch quarrels. Satiriſts are a ſort of ruſtics, who obſerve no meaſures (*c*): They attack women in the moſt ſenſible part. She was repreſented, not only as older than ſhe was [*F*], but alſo as a woman of a bad life (*d*). There were publiſhed much at the ſame time two ſtories, which are but little alike, concerning Mr de Racan, and Mrs de Gournai [*G*]. I wonder Moreri ſhould ſay, that her books did not come out till after her death (*e*).

(*a*) See the remark [*C*], at the end.

(*b*) See the remark [*D*].

(*c*) Ruſtica progenies neſcit habere modum.

(*d*) See the remark [*C*].

(*e*) See the remark [*D*].

viz. To ſilence the calumny of thoſe ſatirical wits, who ſay you have not preſerved an exact continence, you need only ſhew your ſelf or your picture. It is certain, that cardinal Perron carried the inſult beyond all bounds; and I believe the gentlewoman would have been more willing to have had no learning, and very little wit, than to paſs for a perſon ſo void of handſomneſs, as to preſerve her virginity, only becauſe ſhe could find none that would take it.

[*C*]. . *Occaſioned by a ſatire, wherein ſhe was brought in, and which was one of the ſequels of the Anti-Coton.*] This ſatire, in the *Perroniana*, is called *La Defenſe des Beurrieres* (*the Defence of the Butter-women*). I could eaſily believe this was not the true title, and and that it ſhould be called *Le Remerciment des Beurrieres (the Thanks of the Butter-women)*; for I have read a ſatire (5) intituled, *Le Remerciment des Beurrieres de Paris au Sieur de Courbouzon Montgommery*, in which are theſe words at the beginning (6): *And particularly by the noble defence of the Fathers Jeſuits, which, following the ſteps and memoirs of Mrs Gournai, who has always well ſerved the public, you have publiſhed a week ago.* Some pages after, we read this (7): *Not long ago* (it is a butter-woman, who ſpeaks to the Sieur de Courbouzon) *ſome aukward people went about to interlope upon your market, and to rob you of your cuſtom, as one Peletier, and Mrs Gournai, a maid of fifty five years of age, who have pretended to publiſh defences for the Jeſuits, as having an intereſt in the cauſe, under pretence they have been recalled and re-eſtabliſhed at the requeſt and ſollicitation of the poſtilion-general of Venus.* To which if we add a paſſage which I put in the margin (8), I think it will be manifeſt, that all the complaints Mrs Gournai deſigned to make to the judges, concerned the *Remerciment des Beurrieres.* For the reſt, what I have cited from this ſatire ſhews, that Mrs de Gournai (9) publiſhed ſome pieces for the Jeſuits, and againſt the Anti-Coton. Here is the title of the piece, that is ridiculed in the *Remerciment des Beurrieres: le Fleau d'Ariſtogiton, ou contra le Calomniateur des Peres Jeſuïtes, ſous le titre d'*ANTI-COTON, *par Louïs de Montgommery Sieur de Courbouzon.* We may affirm a thing, which Mr Baillet does not affirm (10), *viz.* that the author of the *Fleau d'Ariſtogiton* appeared under his true name. Mr Baillet thinks, that Courbouzon's piece came out after the *Fleau d'Ariſtogiton* (11), whereas they are both one and the ſame. The adverſaries of the Jeſuits were not contented with inſulting our maid in the *Remerciment des Beurrieres*, but they writ a book againſt her, which they intituled, *Anti-Gournai.* Mr Baillet ſpeaks of it, but not in giving the liſt of the pieces that came out on occaſion of the Anti-Coton (12): nay, he does not ſeem to have known, that this gentlewoman was concerned in that Anti.

[*D*] *Cardinal du Perron . . . is in the liſt of thoſe who have praiſed her*] To prove this, I will ſet down a very long paſſage, which concerns her, in the memoirs of the abbot de Marolles. They, who ſhall think I might have been contented to tranſcribe part of it, are ſuch as are not curious to know the particulars of the lives of illuſtrious perſons. It is not for ſuch readers that I write. I make this declaration once for all. ' This honeſt maid, (*thus it is the ' abbot de Marolles ſpeaks concerning our Mrs Gournai*) ' whom I have always very much eſteemed, and ' whom I have frequently viſited, had a candid and ' generous ſoul. The beauty of her mind was greater ' than that of her body; and ſhe knew abundance ' of things, which are not common to perſons of her ' ſex. We have ſeveral books of her writing, both ' in proſe and verſe, that are collected into one volume, which ſhe printed in her life-time, and intituled, *Preſens de la Demoiſelle de Gournai.* They, ' who attempted to jeſt upon her, had no reaſon to ' boaſt of it. Many great perſons have praiſed her, ' both in her life-time, and ſince her death; and, amongſt others, Michael de Montagne, Juſtus Lipſius, cardinal du Perron, cardinal Richelieu, Mr Coſpean biſhop of Nantes, Mr de Rochepoſai biſhop of ' Poitiers, Mr Seguier chancellor of France, and the ' ſuperintendants, who always carefully paid her a ' little penſion, which the king allowed her; and ' ſhe refuſed a larger, for the keeping a coach, which ' I know was offered her by cardinal Richelieu. Many learned men did alſo frequently viſit her; and the ' good lady reckoned, in the number of her beſt ' friends, Mr de la Mothe le Vayer, the prior Ogier, ' and his brother, and Meſſieurs Haberts, Ceriſai, Leſtoile, Boiſrobert, de Revol, Colletet, Malleville, all ' well known in the republic of learning; and, if I ' miſtake not, ſhe did me the honour to place me ' among them (13).'

[*E*] *She was very well received, when ſhe waited upon the princeſſes.*] The ſame abbot de Marolles ſays ſo, ſpeaking of the duke of Retelois, eldeſt ſon to the duke of Nevers. ' Mrs Gournai, ' *ſays he* (14), was one of his great diverſions, ' and though he was of a galanting temper, yet there ' was no lady but he would leave to diſcourſe with ' her, whether he ſaw her at his ſiſter's, or whether ' he found her at Madam de Longueville's, his aunt, or ' at the counteſs of Soiſſon's, whom ſhe viſited ſometimes.

[*F*] *She was repreſented as older than ſhe was.*] See, in the remark [*C*], the paſſage of the *Remerciment des Beurrieres*, where ſhe is ſaid to be fifty five years old, when ſhe was but forty five. She died in 1545, at eighty years of age; ſhe was therefore but forty five in 1610.

[*G*] *There were publiſhed two ſtories, which are but little alike concerning Mr de Racan and Mrs Gournai.*] The firſt is to be found in the Menagiana (15), and the other in the *Recueil des bons mots* (16). The firſt repreſents Mr de Racan and Mrs de Gournai, as two perſons, who very frequently viſited each other, and ſpoke their mind very freely, when they diſliked each other's verſes; which, amongſt authors that are friends, is the very top of familiarity. But, on the contrary, the ſecond ſtory is wholly adapted to perſuade us, that there was an ill underſtanding betwixt them. It goes under the name of one of Boiſrobert's good ſtories, and is called, *the three Racans.* It is pretended, that this gentlewoman deſiring to know the marquis de Racan, there was a wit, who perſuaded him to give her a viſit; but, when he knew the day and the hour, he *had the malice* to ſend to this gentlewoman, *ſome time before, a perſon of the court, pretending to be the marquis de Racan.* When this viſit was over, he went himſelf to Mrs de Gournai, and called himſelf the marquis de Racan. He was received, and expreſſed to the lady a great ſurprize, that any one ſhould have the confidence to aſſume his name, to pay her a viſit. As ſoon as he was gone, the true Racan arrived. ' Mrs de Gournai had immediately notice of it: ſhe ' was a Gaſcon (17), and ſomething choleric in her ' temper; ſhe flew into a paſſion at the ſight of this ' third Racan, and, without waiting till he ſpoke to ' her, *Muſt I ſee nothing but Racans all the days of ' my life?* ſaid ſhe in a rage; and arming herſelf ' with a ſlipper, ſhe vigorouſly charged him, and drove ' him out of her chamber, without hearing him ſpeak, ' giving him all the ill language her anger could ſug-

(5) Printed at Niort in the year 1610.

(6) Pag. 3.

(7) Pag. 8.

(8) Father Coton . . . firſt addreſſed himſelf to a *Damoiſelle Carabineer*, who, in defence of this Venerable, had ſoon ſpent the powder of her flaſk, and having ſhewn to the Sieur de Courbouzon the merchant, from whom ſhe had this ammunition, they made him play the Forlorn Hope. *Ibid. pag.* 11, 12.

(9) It is ſhe whom Father Richeome calls an Amazon. *See Mr Baillet's* Anti, Tom. I, pag. 146.

(10) Tom. I, *of the* Anti, pag. 146.

(11) Ibid. pag. 145.

(12) See the firſt Tome of the *Anti, pag.* 176.

(13) Memoires de l'Abbé de Marolles, pag. 58. ad ann. 1623. *See alſo what he ſays,* pag. 105, ad ann. 1636. *He ſays, that he took lodgings in the Ruë de St Honore, in that gentlewoman's neighbourhood, and that* ſhe was then printing the firſt edition of her works.

(14) Ib pag. 58.

(15) Printed at Paris in 1693.

(16) Printed at Paris, in 1693.

(17) I do not think this is true. I wonder that Hilarion de Coſte, who ſpeaks ſo much of her, *Vies des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. II, pag.* 658, *& ſeq.* does not ſay what place ſhe was of. The paſſage of Paſquier, above, in the remark [*A*], ſeems to me to prove, that ſhe was not a Gaſcon.

When Mr Menage ſuppoſes, in his *Requeſte des Dictionaires*, that Mrs de Gournai was extraordinarily concerned for the diſgrace of the old words, which the gentlemen of the French academy ſuppreſſed, he did not make uſe of a fiction; for it is very true, that this lady was very angry at this change of language [*H*]. I do not know whether any verſes

‘ geſt: which ſo ſurprized the poor marquis de Racan, that he could not anſwer a word, but got away in haſte, thinking that this learned lady was run mad (18).’ I could eaſily believe this to be a fable; and I chiefly judge ſo, becauſe of the aſſault of the ſlipper. Probably it was either a meer invention, or a flouriſh of Boiſrobert, to make a jeſt both of Racan and this learned lady. However, this adventure is very inconſiſtent with the great intimacy, mentioned by Menage, between that learned lady and the marquis de Racan. The following paſſage is to be found in the Menagiana (19). ‘ The marquis de Racan one day viſited Mrs de Gournai, who ſhewed him ſome epigrams ſhe had made, and aſked his opinion of them. Mr de Racan told her, they had nothing good in them, and were without any wit. She anſwered, he ought not to take notice of that, becauſe they were epigrams after the Greek faſhion. They went afterwards to dine together at Mr de Lorme's, a phyſician. A diſh of ſoop being brought in, that was not very good, ſhe, turning to Mr de Racan, told him, Sir, this is a bad ſoop: madam, ſaid he, it is a ſoop after the Greek faſhion.’ I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that this ſtory has undergone the alterations uſual to ſtories of this nature: the circumſtances of it are prodigiouſly diverſified. Read this paſſage of the *defence of Voiture* (20). ‘ Some body tranſlated once, for one of our poets (21), who did not underſtand Greek, *ſome epigrams of the Anthologia* . . . . He found them ſo flat and inſipid, that, dining the next day at a prince's table, where a ſoop was brought in, that taſted of nothing but water, turning to one of his friends, who had ſeen thoſe epigrams with him, *here is*, ſaid he, *a true ſoop after the Greek faſhion*.’

Note, that the ſtory of the three Racans has been inſerted in the continuation of the Menagiana (22); and ſo it is ſuppoſed, that Mr Menage contradicted himſelf ſometimes in his converſations.

[*H*] *She was very angry at this change of language.*] Here follows a paſſage, in which Sorel takes notice of an omiſſion of Father Bouhours. ‘ To ſpeak of a perſon, who was very angry at that time with this ſuppreſſion of words, he ſhould have mentioned good Mrs de Gournai, whom Ariſtus, one of the interlocutors in the dialogues in queſtion, places amongſt the illuſtrious and ingenious women. Certainly ſhe well deſerved it. But I would ſtill place, above her learning, her generoſity, goodneſs, and other incomparable virtues. It muſt however be owned, that ſhe always kept ſome reſentment againſt the new authors of her time; but ſhe had reaſon for it; for ſome of them took a particular delight in expoſing her. Thoſe, who formerly ſaw her, know that ſhe was in a violent paſſion, when ſhe mentioned the new band, or the new cabal, and that it was her foible. She might afford matter enough for diſcourſe about the language, both on account of what ſhe was heard to ſay, and of what ſhe has written about it. Thoſe, who are not old enough to have converſed with her, muſt have recourſe to her book, intituled, *Les Avis & les Preſens de la Demoiſelle de Gournai*. There are in it many chapters concerning the French language, and amongſt others, the chapter of Diminutives, and ſome about poetry, in which ſhe would revive the words compounded in imitation of the Greeks, and keep up Ronſard's language, without any exception (23).’ Let us ſee how Menage has deſcribed the paſſion of this lady. He at firſt mentions the proſcription of theſe noble words:

. . . . *Moult, ains, jaçoit,*
Ores, adonc, maint, ainſi-ſoit,
A-tant, ſi que, piteux, icelle,
Trop plus, trop mieux, blandice, iſnelle,
Pieça, tollir, illic, ainçois.
As being bad French:

And then he feigns, that the dictionaries declare, in their requeſt, that

. . . . Bien que telle outrecuidance
(Soit dit ſauf vôtre reverence)
Fiſt préjudice aux Suppliants
Vos bons & fideles Clients;
Et que de GOURNAY la Pucelle,
Cette ſavante Demoiſelle,
En faveur de l'Antiquité
Euſt nôtre Corps ſollicité
De faire ſes plaintes publiques
Du décri de ces mots antiques:
Toutefois, &c.

Though ſuch preſumption (with reverence be it ſpoken) does a prejudice to your petitioners, your good and faithful clients; and that the learned Madam Gournay, in favour of antiquity, has ſollicited our body to make it's public complaints againſt the decrying theſe ancient words: Nevertheleſs, &c.

Doubtleſs, many perſons ſaid, that Mrs de Gournai, being affected with the diſtemper of old people, condemned the reformation of the language, only becauſe it was the production of young authors; or becauſe ſhe could not approve of it, without owning, that, at her great age, ſhe wanted to go to ſchool again. Doubtleſs, they applied to her what Horace ſaid of ſome people, who fancy that their taſte is the only rule of what is good, or that it were a ſhameful thing for them to yield to new-comers, and to confeſs, in their old age, the vanity of the ſtudies of their youth.

Vel quia nil rectum, niſi quod placuit ſibi, ducunt;
Vel quia turpe putant parere minoribus, & quæ
Imberbes didicêre ſenes perdenda fateri (34).

Or that they like their own opinions beſt;
Or that they ſcorn, when aged, to ſubmit
To greener years, and leſs experienc'd youth.

But, all things duly conſidered, this gentlewoman was not ſo much in the wrong as is imagined; and it were to be wiſhed, that the beſt authors of that time had vigorouſly withſtood the proſcription of many words, which have nothing of harſhneſs in them, and would ſerve to vary the expreſſion, to avoid verſes, conſonancies, and ambiguities. A falſe delicacy, which was too much indulged, has very much impoveriſhed the French language. The beſt writers complain of it; even thoſe, who are leaſt in want of words, and whoſe fruitful genius is able to ſupply that defect. See the reflexions of Mr de la Bruyere (25). Some of them beſtow a thouſand bleſſings on the biſhop of Meaux, the biſhop of Niſmes, and ſuch other authors of the firſt rank, when they ſee them uſe words beginning to grow obſolete. This re-inſtates, and makes them young again; at leaſt it is a barrier againſt preſcription, and may be oppoſed to the cavils of the Puriſts. *Our language is very much indebted to the writers, who ſay* certes *in proſe, and expoſe themſelves for that word in their works* (26). The ſame obſervation might be made with reſpect to other very convenient words, which the falſe delicacy of ſome wits, or the caprice of cuſtom, have deprived, and daily deprive us of. The cauſe of the evil does not wholly lie in the inconſtancy of living languages, which the antients have experienced, and very well deſcribed.

- - - - Mortalia facta peribunt;
Nedum ſermonum ſtet honos & gratia vivax:
Multa renaſcentur quæ jam cecidere, cadentque,
Quæ nunc ſunt in honore vocabula, ſi volet uſus,
Quem penes arbitrium eſt & jus & norma loquendi (27).

When mortal labours fall a prey to time,
Can language plead exemption from decay?

(18) Recueil des bons Contes & des bons Mots, pag. 158, Dutch Edit.

(19) Pag. 138 of the firſt Dutch Edition.

(20) Coſtar, défenſe de Voiture, pag. 274.

(21) It was Racan.

(22) Printed at Paris in the year 1695.

(23) Sorel, de la connoiſſance des bons livres, pag. m. 418, 419.

(24) Horat. Epiſt. i, lib. ii, ver. 83.

(25) La Bruyere, Caracteres de ce Siecle, *in the chapter concerning ſome uſages*, pag. 635, & ſeq. *of the eighth edition of Paris*.

(26) La Bruyere, ubi ſupra.

(27) Horat. de Arte Poet. ver. 68.

verſes were made in praiſe of her cat; but I am perſuaded, that the wits would have made many poems upon that ſubject, if her miſtreſs had been young and handſome. It was a cat, whoſe fidelity has been immortalized by the abbot de Marolles [*I*].

Cuſtom, the ſovereign arbitreſs of ſpeech,
Old words revives, and antiquates the new.

There is I know not what conſpiracy in the matter, which proceeds, not ſo much from the readers, that are authors, as from thoſe, that are not. The latter give themſelves the pleaſure of criticiſing, without knowing what trouble there is in compoſing. Thoſe, that are ſenſible of it, are more indulgent to words. I except two ſorts of authors: the young, and thoſe who write but a little piece in two or three years. A young author, who hardly reads any books but ſuch as are the neweſt, calls fine language only the terms and expreſſions he finds in them. Wo to every word, and phraſe, which he finds elſewhere: this is a word of the old court, ſays he; it begins to grow obſolete. As for a writer of half a page a day, he has not time to be ſenſible of the trouble occaſioned by the ſuppreſſion of abundance of expreſſions, which were good in the reign of Henry IV, and Lewis XIII. For which reaſon he pretends to be diſguſted at all the words, that are ſuſpected of being old. But, if he were to compoſe a long work, and at a quicker rate, he would not be ſo ſqueamiſh: the difficulties of the task, the intricacy of the repetitions, the almoſt unavoidable neceſſity of rhiming in proſe, &c. would diſcover to him the prejudice that is done to authors by impoveriſhing the language they make uſe of.

[*I*] *She had a cat, whoſe fidelity has been immortalized by the abbot de Marolles.*] He did the ſame ſervice to a linnet of his landlady. ‘ A linnet, *ſays he* ‘ (28), that did belong to the moſt worthy and moſt ‘ virtuous Mrs Belleville, in whoſe houſe I lodge at ‘ Paris, lived with her above fourteen years; and, tho’ ‘ it were never ſo fine weather, this little bird never ‘ attempted to fly away, when it's good miſtreſs put ‘ him out of his cage on her chamber-window. Mrs ‘ de Gournai's Piaillon (which was the name of her ‘ cat), for the ſpace of twelve years that ſhe lived with ‘ her, never went out of her chamber one night, ‘ to run upon the gutters and tiles, like other cats.’ If this gentlewoman had had ſuch galants as Catullus, her cat would have been celebrated as much as Lesbia's ſparrow. Note, that the abbot de Marolles forgets not this ſparrow, nor Melior's parrot (29), nor Stella's pigeon (30). To theſe examples we may add Madam des Houlieres's ſpaniel (31).

(28) Marolles, Suite des Memoires, pag. 98, 99.

(29) *See* Statius, Silv. iv, lib. ii.

(30) *See* Martial, Epigr. viii, lib. i.

(31) *See the firſt Tome of the* Mercure Galant, 1672, pag. m. 83, 103.

GRAIN (**BAPTIST LE**), maſter of the requeſts in ordinary to Mary de Medicis, queen of France, has writ ſome pretty good hiſtories [*A*]. He was born about the Year 1563 (*a*). He does not expreſs any bitterneſs againſt the Proteſtants; on the contrary, he declares ſtrongly for the edict that was granted them [*B*].

(*a*) *See his* Decad of Henry IV, lib. i, pag. 80. Edit. of Rouen, 1633, in 4to.

[*A*] *He wrote ſome pretty good hiſtories.*] We have two decads of his. The firſt is the hiſtory of Henry the great: the ſecond is the hiſtory of Lewis XIII, from the beginning of his reign to the death of the mareſchal d'Ancre in 1617. ‘ In ſome parts of it, he ‘ has given us ſome particulars, that are not to be ‘ found elſewhere; and it is thought this hiſtory was ‘ impartially written, as by a true Frenchman.’ This is what Sorel (1) ſays concerning the firſt decad. As to the ſecond, he ſays (2), ‘ that this hiſtory having ‘ been publiſhed in the time, and during the credit of ‘ thoſe, whom the hiſtorian ſpeaks of, what happened ‘ before is very much cried down. The mareſchal ‘ d'Ancre, and thoſe of his party, are very ill treated. ‘ Even the good ſervants of the queen-mother are not ‘ ſpared, which formerly made this book ſought for, ‘ by ſome out of curioſity, and by others with a de‘ ſign to ſuppreſs it. It is eſpecially obſerved, that ‘ as to what concerns the biſhop of Luſſon, who ‘ was afterwards cardinal de Richelieu, this author ‘ mentions a letter of his directed to the mareſchal ‘ d'Ancre, which is ſaid to be written in very ſub‘ miſſive terms.’ There is good reaſon for ſaying ſo (3).

[*B*] *He declared ſtrongly for the edict that was granted to the Proteſtants.*] See the ſeventh book (4) of the decad of Henry IV, where you will find a fine apology for this prince, on account of the edict of Nantes; an apology, I ſay, ſupported with examples and reaſons. D'Aubigné took care to inſert the ſubſtance of it in his hiſtory (5). Le Grain had not changed his principles, when he writ his decad of Lewis XIII; for he there (6) apologizes for the letters patents (7), wherein his majeſty declared, *that he meant not to comprehend his ſubjects of the pretended Reformed religion in the oath and proteſtation made at his coronation*, OF EMPLOYING HIS SWORD AND POWER FOR THE EXTIRPATION OF HERESIES. Theſe two fine paſſages in favour of toleration are found in a book of Colomiés (8).

(1) Bibliotheque Françoiſe, pag. m. 352.

(2) Ibid. pag. 353, 354.

(3) *See* Le Grain, liv x, pag. 411, ad ann. 1617.

(4) Pag. m. 704.

(5) Tom. III, livr. v, chap ii, pag. m. 631.

(6) *In the eighth book, pag.* 299.

(7) *They were regiſtred in the parliament the fourth of Auguſt,* 1616.

(8) *Intituled,* Rome Proteſtante, pag. 65, & ſeq.

GRAMMONT (**GABRIEL DE**), a French cardinal, in the XVIth century. I ſpeak of him only to correct ſome faults of Mr Moreri [*A*].

[*A*] *I ſpeak of him, only to correct ſome faults of Mr Moreri.*] I. The interview of Clement VII, and Francis I, at Marſeilles, was not in 1552, but in 1532. II. Cardinal Grammont was not rewarded with the biſhopric of Poitiers, for having perſuaded the Pope to that interview; for he was poſſeſſed of that biſhopric, when he left France, to go and negotiate with Clement VII. III. Theſe words, *the king gave him the archbiſhopric of Bourdeaux and Toulouſe, which he was going to take poſſeſſion of*, ought to be cenſured, ſince they naturally ſignify, that both theſe biſhoprics were beſtowed at the ſame time upon this cardinal. But this is falſe. Beſides, we know not which of thoſe two archbiſhoprics he was going to take poſſeſſion of. Mr Moreri's phraſe does not determine it. IV. It is not true, that this cardinal died before he took poſſeſſion of the archbiſhopric of Toulouſe: for he did it by proxy, the twenty ſeventh of October 1533, and in perſon, the fifteenth of March following. V. The caſtle of Balura is a chimera; he ſhould have ſaid the caſtle of Balma: the cardinal died there, the twenty ſixth of March (1) 1534, according to du Bouchet. This caſtle belongs to the archbiſhops of Toulouſe, and is but half a league diſtant from the city. VI. If the cardinal was ſeized with a hectic fever, it was not when he went to take poſſeſſion of the archbiſhopric: Moreri ſhould have ſaid, that his journey to Rome brought upon him a long diſtemper, of which he died, eleven days after his taking poſſeſſion. Does a man die of a hectic fever in ſo few days? What ſurpriſes me is, that Catel (2), one of the authors quoted by Moreri, ſupplies me with the correction of all the faults before-mentioned. What is this man thinking of, to quote authors whom he never ſaw? Catel corrects a fault of John du Bouchet, concerning the name of the caſtle (3); and therefore Moreri might have certainly known it's true name.

(1) Moreri ſays. the twenty fourth of March.

(2) Memoires de l'Hiſtoire du Languedoc, livr. v, pag. 945.

(3) Du Bouchet ſays, that the cardinal died at Abalme, a place belonging to the archbiſhopric, two leagues from Toulouſe.

GRAMOND (**GABRIEL BARTHOLOMEW DE**), in Latin *Gramondus*, preſident in the parliament of Toulouſe, and ſon to the dean of that parliament [*A*], compoſed

[*A*] *He was ſon to the dean of the counſellors of the parliament of Toulouſe.*] The name of the dean of the counſellors was BARTHOLOMEW DE GRAMOND. He was a man of great probity, and perfect poſed an hiſtory, that is eſteemed [*B*]. I have read, in a German author, a remarkable fact, which I very much doubt of [*C*]; but, if it were true, it would be very much to preſident de Gramond's glory. Patin's letters do not confirm what the German author ſays [*D*].

fect integrity. His ſon gives him this character, in relating an action, more becoming a courtier, than a ſenator zealous for good diſcipline. He ſays (1), that Mr de Montmorency, governour of Languedoc, would have his wife to be received, in all the towns of his government, with ſuch honours as had never been uſed. He deſired in particular, that the magiſtrates of Toulouſe would ſend armed men to meet her. His propoſal was often rejected; and it was repreſented to him, that plays, dances, and muſic, are a proper pomp for a woman's reception; but the military honours ought to be reſerved for thoſe, who have a juriſdiction over arms. Bartholomew de Gramond was of another opinion, *viz.* that the ducheſs of Montmorency ſhould be received in the way that her husband deſired; he was deputed to the Capitouls (2) from the parliament, and perſuaded them to comply with the deſire of the governour of the province. This happened in 1619. We find here no footſtepts of the antient Roman gravity. Our hiſtorian had done more for his father's glory, if he could have ſaid, that the deputy of the parliament confirmed the Capitouls in their reſolution to reject the innovations, which the duke of Montmorency required of them for his ducheſs. This conduct had beſpoke him a man, who had made good uſe of Tiberius's counſel *moderandos fœminarum honores* (3), and of the ſpeech of Severus Cæcina, a Roman ſenator, in the reign of that emperor. It was rejected, but is it to be wondered at? Rome had loſt all it's fine maxims. Note, that this ſenator gave his vote, for not ſuffering the governours of provinces to bring their wives with them (4). He gave very ſolid reaſons for it.

[*B*] *He compoſed an hiſtory that is eſteemed.*] It contains, in eighteen books, the tranſactions of France, from Henry the fourth's death, to the year 1629 (5). It was printed at Toulouſe in the year 1643. Foreigners have thought it worthy of their preſſes both in Holland and Germany (6). I make uſe of the edition of Mentz in 1673, in 8vo. This author's ſtile is a little too conciſe, and not natural enough; but it ſhews, that preſident de Gramond was maſter of the Latin tongue. He had publiſhed, at Toulouſe, in the year 1623, the particular hiſtory of the war, that Lewis XIII made with his Proteſtant ſubjects.

[*C*] *I have read, in a German author, a remarkable fact, which I very much doubt of.*] Chriſtian Funccius ſays, that the preſident de Gramond, following Thuanus's footſteps, in his boldneſs to ſpeak the truth, and diſcover the faults of the government and of great men, got many enemies, and was not ſafe in his own country. ‘In eo Thuano par quod intrepide dicat, quid ‘ſentiat, non diſſimulans graviſſima aulæ & magnatum ‘peccata, indeque idem quod Thuanus, fatum expertus. Simul enim ac prima pars hiſtoriæ prodiit, ‘multorum incurrit odia: ita ut vix Tholoſæ tuto vivere potuerit. Quare non prodiit tenus hac, niſi ‘pars prima: ſi altera ſuccederet, opus eſſet incomparabile, vel non niſi cum ipſa antiquitate comparandum. Arcaniſſima enim reip. Gallicæ autor penetraverat (7).’ Mr Graverol, advocate of Nîmes, who was very much acquainted at Toulouſe, and whom I conſulted upon this particular, anſwered me ſeveral things, but nothing, whereby it appeared that he had ever heard of ſuch a thing.

[*D*] *Patin's letters do not confirm what the German author ſays.*] Guy Patin is ſo far from repreſenting Mr de Gramond as a martyr for the truth, that he calls him a baſe flatterer. I believe he ſtrains things, and that at the worſt, the German writer's extream would be leſs vicious than Patin's. However, here are Patin's words: ‘I have the hiſtory of Mr de Gramond, preſident of Toulouſe, ‘that you ſpeak of. I have often diſcourſed with him, ‘whilſt he was in this city. He was a good old ‘man, but he had a weak and bigotted ſoul. He ‘was very deſirous to get ſome memoirs, in order ‘to carry on his hiſtory to the late king's death: ‘but cardinal Mazarin would not give him that employment. He is lately dead at Toulouſe (8). His ‘book is very indifferent, and infinitely below Thuanus's hiſtory. It is full of falſities and flatteries ‘unworthy of a man of honour. When it was ‘printed off, and ready for ſale, Mr de Gramond ‘cauſed fifteen leaves to be reprinted, the better to ‘flatter cardinal Richelieu, who was then at the ‘higheſt pitch of favour. This good man thought ‘there were no words ſtrong enough to praiſe him: ‘but he got nothing by it; for the cardinal died ‘ſoon after (9).’

(1) Gramond. Hiſtor. Galliæ, lib. iii, pag. 213, ad ann. 1619.

(2) It is the name of thoſe, who preſide in the town-houſe of Toulouſe.

(3) Tacit. Ann. lib. i, cap. xiv.

(4) Id. ibid. lib. vi, cap. xxxiii.

(5) And not to the year 1639, as Moreri ſays.

(6) Note, that it is very much quoted by the German authors. See, among others, Pellerus in his *Politicus ſceleratus impugnatus.*

(7) Chr. Funccius, Tom. I, Orbis Imper. pag. 443, apud Konig, Bibl. pag. 358.

(8) We may conclude from thence, that Konig, who places his death in the year 1672, is miſtaken; for that letter of Patin is dated the fifteenth of September, 1654.

(9) Patin, letter xc, Tom. I, pag. 365.

GRAMONT (Scipio de) lord of St Germain, and ſecretary of the king's chamber, was a native of Provence. I have ſaid elſewhere (*a*) that he ſaw at Rome the funeral honours of Mr de Peireſc, and that he died at Venice ſome time after. He wrote ſome Books [*A*], and, among others, one intituled *Le Denier Royal: Traitté curieux de l'Or & de l'Argent.* Naudé ſpeaks of this work with praiſe [*B*]. It is in 8vo, printed at Paris in the year 1620.

[*A*] *He wrote ſome books.*] He publiſhed at Paris, the Art of Conſequences, in 8vo, in 1614; of the nature, quality, and wonderful prerogatives of the Point in 8vo, 1619. His Abridgment of Artifices, treating of ſeveral new inventions, and eſpecially of a ſecret and exquiſite means of underſtanding and learning any language whatever, even Latin and Greek, in one year, was printed at Aix in Provence, in 1640, in 8vo.

[*B*] *Naudé ſpeaks of his* Denier Royal *with praiſe.*] Theſe are his words: ‘Quoniam res ipſa (*vectigalium ‘impoſitiones*) plerumque à neceſſitate dependet, aut ‘Principum voluntate, quæ leges non admittunt, inde ‘eſt, quòd pauci admodùm reperti ſunt, qui de illis ‘Politicum quidquam monere voluerint. Quare unicum tantummodò proferam *Scipionem Gramontium*; ‘ex cujus Nummo Regio, Gallicè quidem edito, ‘plurima depromi poſſunt, quæ rem ipſam præclarè ‘illuſtrent, ſimúlque legentium animos reficiant ‘dulci pabulô variæ lectionis, & graviſſimâ diverſarum obſervationum varietate (1). —— *Becauſe ‘the thing itſelf* (the impoſition of taxes) *often depends on neceſſity, or the will of princes, which admit not of law; thence it is, that but few political ‘writers are found on that ſubject. I ſhall therefore ‘produce only one,* viz. *Scipio Gramont; from whoſe* ‘Denier Royal, *publiſhed in French, many things may ‘be taken, which excellently illuſtrate the matter, ‘and at the ſame time refreſh the minds of the ‘readers with a great variety of learning and obſervations of different ſorts.*

(*a*) In remark [*C*] of the article PEIRESC.

(1) Naudé, Bibl. Politic. cap. xiii, pag. 543, Edit. Crenianæ.

GRANDIER (Urban), curate and canon of Loudon, burnt alive as a magician, was the ſon of a royal notary of Sablé, and was born at Bovére near Sablé. He was a good preacher, which made the monks of Loudon envy him at firſt, and at laſt hate him, when he preſſed the obligation of confeſſing to one's curate at Eaſter. He was a handſome man, agreeable in converſation, and neat in his cloaths, which made him ſuſpected of being beloved by the women, and of loving them [*A*]. He was accuſed, in 1629, of having lain with women in his own church. The official of Poitiers condemned him to reſign his benefices, and to live a penitent. He appealed from that ſentence; and, by a decree of the parliament of Paris, he was referred to the preſidial of Poitiers, which declared him innocent. Three years after, ſome Urſuline nuns of Loudon were thought by the common people to be poſſeſſed [*B*]. Grandier's enemies immediately ſpread the report, that it was by his means, and accuſed him of magic: Which ſeems very odd; for if they believed he could ſend the devil into peoples bodies, they ſhould have been afraid of provoking him [*C*]; they ſhould have uſed him kindly

---

[*A*] *He was ſuſpected of being beloved by the women, and of loving them.*] *The Mercure François* (1) ſays that *Urban Grandier was a majeſtic and ſtately man, who had ſome reading and good parts, and beſides was endowed with ſome natural and acquired perfections; but that, by a reduplication of extraordinary vices, particularly whoring and lewdneſs, he had ..... proſtituted the honour of his character*; and that his intention was, in canvaſſing for the place of ghoſtly father of the Urſulines, *to make a diſhoneſt ſeraglio of their convent, and as many filthy concubines as there were handſome virgins.* The letter of Dr Seguin, a phyſician of Tours, ſays (2), that *even Grandier's partiſans acknowledged, that he lived in a debauchery, that was a downright impiety, profaning the moſt holy things, and openly abuſing the religion he preached with great reputation.* I have ſaid, in the text of this article, that he was accuſed of having lain with ſome women in his own church. Mr Menage, who relates it, ſays only, in the notes, that he was accuſed of adultery; he does not ſay, that it was with the wife of a magiſtrate of Loudun. It is Monconis (3), who ſays this, upon the credit of the ſuperior of the Urſulines. The relation, publiſhed in Holland, in the year 1693, does not permit us to doubt of the lewdneſs and pride of this prieſt.

(1) Tom. XX, pag. 748.

(2) Ibid. pag. 777.

(3) Voiages, Part. I, pag. 9.

[*B*] *Some nuns of Loudun were thought by the common people to be poſſeſſed.*] Mr Menage (4), not contented with this clauſe, adds: *as to the learned, the greateſt part of them maintained, that thoſe nuns were only diſtempered, not finding in them, whatever has been ſaid to the contrary, any of the three ſymptoms that the Roman ritual requires, as a ſign of being truly poſſeſſed by the devil; which are divination, the underſtanding of languages which the perſon has not learned, and a ſupernatural ſtrength of body.* He quotes two books that were written againſt this pretended poſſeſſion; one by Duncan, a famous Scotchman, phyſician of Saumur; the other by James Boutreux, Sieur d'Etiau, a learned man of Angers: And he relates what Claudius Menard, lieutenant of the provoſtſhip of Angers, ſays of James Boutreux's book, in his catalogue of the writers of Angers. ‘Laudunenſis theatri ſcenam aggreſſus, Parochi Granderii tepidatas ſilentio longo favillas memoriamque ſcripto vindicare auſus, dubiæ quæſtionis thema renovavit, ut triſtes virginum malè tractarum pœnas, vel exercitæ potius trophæa virtutis ad ſcurrilia planorum ludibria, vindicandique & ſuppoſiti in Granderium, ut credi vult, maleficii miniſteria perſonata traduceret, grandi certè mentis fiducia, calami ſcriptique libertate, neſcio an ceſſura feliciter. —— *Meddling with the farce of Loudon, and undertaking to vindicate the memory of the curate Grandier, he revived a doubtful queſtion, and with great confidence, how ſucceſsfully I cannot ſay, juſtified the puniſhment of the nuns, and cleared Grandier from the imputation of magic.*’ See the remark [*I*]. Now, as to what Mr Menage obſerves, that the underſtanding of tongues, which is one of the *three ſigns of a true poſſeſſion*, was not found in thoſe nuns, it is fit to obſerve what Dr Seguin, a phyſician of Tours, ſays, that they *anſwered in the Taupinanboux language, in which Mr de Launai Razilli ſpoke to them, whom I believe*, ſays he, *more than my ſelf, and whom I alledge to you, becauſe you know him to be a credible man* (5). But ſince Menage, who was not ignorant of the contents of this letter, nor of the other ſtories publiſhed about the underſtanding of tongues attributed to theſe nuns, does nevertheleſs affirm, that they did not ſhew thereby that it was a true poſſeſſion, it is plain, that relations are not much to be depended on in ſuch caſes. What Balzac ſays in his Entretiens, deſerves a place here. *If*, ſays he (6), *for divination, he was accuſed of magic .... the devils he correſponded with muſt needs have been meer black-guards in Lucifer's troops. They muſt have been leſs learned than thoſe of Loudun, who had not ſtudied ſo far as the third claſs, as one of cardinal Richelieu's courtiers ſaid. They muſt needs be of the order of thoſe ignorant devils, who, in Theodoret's orations, commit faults in the number, and the language, and offend againſt the meaſures of verſe, and the rules of ſyntax* (7). Here follow ſome proofs of the ignorance of the devils of Loudun. *Maſs being ended, Barré came up to the mother ſuperiour, to give her the communion, and to exorciſe her, and, holding the ſacrament in his hand, ſpoke to her in theſe words*; Adora Deum tuum, Creatorem tuum; worſhip thy GOD, thy Creator: *being preſſed ſhe anſwered*, Adoro te, I worſhip thee. Quem adoras, whom doſt thou worſhip? *ſaid the exorciſt to her ſeveral times.* JESUS CHRISTUS, *replied ſhe, making motions as if ſhe had ſuffered violence. Daniel Drouïn, aſſeſſor in the provoſtſhip, could not forbear ſaying ſomewhat loud*, here is a devil, who does not underſtand concord. *Barré, changing the phraſe, asked her*, Quis eſt iſte quem adoras? who is he, whom thou worſhippeſt? *he hoped ſhe would ſay ſtill* JESUS CHRISTUS; *but ſhe anſwered*, JESU CHRISTE. *Upon which many preſent cried out*, this is bad Latin. *Barré confidently maintained ſhe had ſaid*, Adoro te JESU CHRISTE; I adore thee, O JESUS CHRIST (8).

Here is a very ſharp raillery againſt the Capuchin director of Martha, who was ſaid to be poſſeſſed. It was reported, that ſhe had two devils in her body, one called Belzebub, and the other Aſhtaroth. The judges of Angers examined them in Greek and Latin. Belzebub, in a paſſion anſwered, ‘that if he pleaſed, he could anſwer as well in Greek as in Latin. The Capuchin, to afford him an excuſe, ſaid, Belzebub, my friend, there are ſome heretics here, and that is the reaſon why you will not ſpeak. They ſpoke Latin to Aſhtaroth, who excuſed himſelf upon his youth (§α). Belzebub excuſed himſelf, ſaying, he was a poor devil. Hereupon there was a great diſpute betwixt thoſe on the bench, whether devils were bound to go to ſchool. The civilians maintained, that it was the *proprium in quarto modo* of demoniacs, to ſpeak all languages, as he of Cartigni in Savoy, who was tried in ſixteen languages; by the ſame token, that the miniſters of Geneva durſt not exorciſe him. Thoſe of Angers were bolder. They begun thus: *Commando tibi ut exeas Belzebut & Aſtarot, aut ego augmentabo veſtras pœnas, & vobis dabo acriores.* The ſecond time he ſaid; *Jubeo exeatis ſuper pœnam excommunicationis majoris & minoris.* And at laſt being in a great paſſion he added; *Niſi vox exeatis, vos relego & confino in infernum centum annos magis quàm Deus ordinavit* (9).’ I doubt not but this is an invention of the author.

[(§α) An alluſion to theſe words of Lucifer to Aſhtaroth, fol. 45. verſo, of the *Conception à Perſonages*.

Aſtaroth, ne parle jamais:
Tu es encore trop novice.

Aſhtaroth ſay nothing;
You are yet too young. REM CRIT.]

(4) Remarques ſur la Vie de Guillaume Menage, pag. 340.

An obſervation upon the knowledge of tongues in thoſe that are poſſeſſed.

(5) Merc. Franç. Tom. XX, pag. 777.

(6) Entretien xvii.

(7) *See the* Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres, March 1684, pag. 10, *of the ſecond edition.*

(8) Hiſtoires des Diables de Loudun, *printed at Amſterdam* 1693, pag. 57.

(9) Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy, livr. i, chap. vi.

[*C*] *If they believed he could ſend the devil into peoples bodies, they ſhould have been afraid of provoking him.*] Mr Menage was ſo fond of this thought, that, after he had uſed it in the life of William Menage (10), he inſerted it in his notes upon that life. *They accuſed Grandier*, ſays he, *of magic, the ordinary crime of thoſe who have none, and which,*

(10) De Malincio fingit ſe aſſentiri (Armandus Richelius) nam ut verè Apuleius & ipſe maleficii reus poſtulatus, id genus crimen non eſt ejus accuſare qui credit, accuſare enim eo crimine is eum timeret, quem vi cantaminum poſſe tantum fateretur. *Menag. in Vita Guillelmi Menagii*, pag. 83.

kindly, for fear he ſhould poſſeſs them with a legion of devils. However they accuſed him of magic. The Capuchins of Loudun, his great enemies, thought it expedient, in order to ſucceed in their accuſation, to ſtrengthen themſelves with the powerful authority of cardinal Richelieu. To this purpoſe, they wrote to Father Joſeph, one of their fraternity, who had a great intereſt with his eminence, that Grandier was the author of a libel, intituled, *La Cordonniere de Loudun* [*D*] (the ſhoemaker's wife of Loudun), which was very injurious to the perſon and birth of cardinal Richelieu. This great miniſter, amongſt many perfections, had the fault to proſecute with the utmoſt rigour the authors of the libels printed againſt him: So that, ſuffering himſelf to be perſuaded [*E*] by Father Joſeph, that Grandier was the author of *La Cordonniere de Loudun*, he writ immediately to Mr de Laubardemont, counſellor of ſtate, his creature, who was commiſſioned by the king to demoliſh the fortifications of Loudun, to inform himſelf carefully of the affair of the nuns; and gave him ſufficient intimations, that he wiſhed the deſtruction of Grandier. Mr Laubardemont made him a priſoner in December 1633, and, having taken ample information of the matter, he went to concert the buſineſs with the cardinal. Letters patents were iſſued out, the eighth of July 1634, to bring Grandier to his trial. Theſe letters were directed to Mr Laubardemont, and to twelve judges of the courts in the neighbourhood of Loudun, all indeed honeſt men, but all credulous perſons, and for that reaſon choſen by Grandier's enemies [*F*]. The eighteenth (*a*) of Auguſt 1634, upon the depoſition of Aſhtaroth [*G*], a devil of the order of the Seraphins, and the chief of the poſſeſſing devils; and of Eaſas, Celſus, Acaos, Cedon, Aſmodæus, of the order of the thrones; and of Alex, Zabulon, Nepthalim, Cham, Uriel, and Achas, of the order of the principalities; that is, upon the depoſitions of the nuns, who pretended to be poſſeſſed with thoſe devils; the commiſſioners gave judgment, by which Urban Grandier, prieſt, curate of the church of St Peter in Loudun, and canon of the church of the Holy Croſs, was declared *duly attainted and convicted of the*

(*a*) *Mr Menage,* Remarques ſur la Vie de Guill. Menage, pag. 342, *is miſtaken in ſaying the 8th.*

which, according to the excellent thought of Apuleius, who was formerly accuſed of the ſame crime, is not believed by the accuſers themſelves; for if a man was truly perſuaded, that another could kill him by magic, he would be afraid of provoking him by accuſing him of that abominable crime. But tho' this argument ſeems to be very ſolid, I am of opinion, that there have been ſome people, at all times, who believed thoſe guilty, whom they accuſed of magic: for, in the firſt place, we muſt not too much rely on men's acting conſequentially; beſides, it is generally believed, that, when the judges have laid hold on a magician's cauſe, he can do no more miſchief. Laſtly, it is believed, that a magician will not venture to attempt any thing againſt his accuſers, ſince this would be furniſhing proofs againſt himſelf.

[*D*] *They wrote to Father Joſeph .... that Grandier was author of a libel, entituled* La Cordonniere de Loudun.] This libel is ſo intituled, becauſe a ſhoemaker's wife was introduced ſpeaking in it. Mr Menage takes the fooleries, that this ſatire is ſtuffed with, for a ſtrong proof, that Grandier did not make it (11): and he heard Mr Bouillaud ſay, that it was certain Grandier was not the author of that libel (12). Mr Bouillaud, a native of Loudun, had been familiarly acquainted with him (13). See, in the relation printed at Amſterdam (14), with what artifice this ſatire was made uſe of, to deſtroy Grandier.

[*E*] .... *Cardinal Richelieu ſuffering himſelf to be perſuaded.*] I have read ſomewhere, that he promoted this farce, in order to intimidate Lewis XIII, and keep him more ſubſervient to his deſigns, by theſe ſtories of ſorcery, with which they ſtunned his ears. This is not probable, tho' it muſt be confeſſed, that the ſublimeſt Genius's are commonly ſuch as leaſt neglect the occaſions, that ſeem moſt ridiculous and abſurd. I ſpeak of thoſe great genius's, who govern a ſtate. Their great penetration makes them diſcover ſecret ſprings, where one would think there are none; becauſe they know better than other men what uſe may be made of a trifle; becauſe they are better acquainted with the weakneſs of mankind, and know better what the ignorance and weakneſs of ſome, and the malice of others, can produce. We muſt not therefore argue thus upon all occaſions: ſuch a thing is ſo abſurd, ſo mean, ſo extravagant, that a man of ſenſe and judgment would never mind it; and conſequently it is falſe, that ſuch a miniſter of ſtate made uſe of it, invented, or ſupported it. The author of the hiſtory of the edict of Nantes obſerves (15), *that many people looked upon the comedy, that was played for many years by the Urſulines of Loudun, to be an affair of religion.* I believe he means, that thoſe people fancied this farce was acted in order to undermine the edict of Nantes. He pleaſantly relates the ridiculous anſwers made by thoſe nuns. Note, that he ſays, that Grandier governed the convent of the Urſulines; but, in the errata, he corrects it, by ſaying, that he ſometimes viſited the nuns. This laſt fact is no more conſiſtent, than the other, with the relation publiſhed in 1693. In the 25th page of it you will find theſe words: *It is at leaſt certain, that thoſe nuns had lived ſeven or eight years at Loudun, without ever being viſited by him: and, in the year* 1634, *when they were confronted with him, it appeared that they had never ſeen him. Father Tranquille has alſo maintained it in one of his books, and that the curate never meddled with their affairs.*

At this very moment I call to mind, that it is in the Sorberiana that I read what I ſaid at the begining of this remark. The paſſage is curious. We there find, that Mr Quillet challenged the devil of thoſe nuns, and nonpluſſed him, *and that all the devil's-craft was confounded; that Mr Lobardèmont* (16) *was offended at it, and iſſued out a warrant againſt Quillet, who, perceiving, that this mummery was carried on by cardinal Richelieu, to intimidate the late king* (17), *who was naturally very fearful of the devil, thought it was not ſafe for him to be at Loudun, or in France, and went into Italy* (18).

Naudé confirms what concerns the diſgrace of this challenger. Theſe are his words: 'Duncan and 'Quillet having oppoſed the impoſture of the nuns of 'Loudun, the former was reprimanded for it, and ſeverely threatened by cardinal Richelieu; and the latter was forced to go and ſerve the marquis de Cœuvre 'at Rome (19).'

[*F*] *The judges were all choſen by Grandier's enemies.*] The reflexion, that Mr Menage makes upon this, deſerves to be ſet down: *It is to be obſerved,* ſays he (20), *that no innocence can be proof againſt the choice of judges: let an accuſer chuſe the judges, and he will cauſe all the Janſeniſt biſhops to be burnt by Moliniſt judges, and all the Moliniſt biſhops by Janſeniſt judges.* Here is a ſubject for reflections (21). The attorney of the commiſſion, called Deniau, counſellor in the preſidial of la Fleche, wrote a tract concerning the devils of the nuns of Loudun (22), to vindicate the ſentence of the commiſſioners.

[*G*] *Upon the depoſition of Aſhtaroth.*] This appears from the ſecond verbal proceſs of the exorciſt (23). There were three poſſeſſions: during the firſt, the devils, except one, refuſed to tell their names: they only anſwered that they were enemies of GOD. During the ſecond and third, they diſcovered their names

(11) Granderii non eſſe tot ineptiæ quibus ſcatet arguunt. *Id. ibid.*

(12) Menage, Remarques ſur la Vie de Guillaume Menage, pag. 343.

(13) Ibid. pag. 341.

(14) Pag. 99.

(15) Tom. II, livr. x, pag. 538, ad ann. 1634.

(16) It ſhould be Laubardemont.

(17) This expreſſion is bad: it ſignifies Henry IV; and the intention of the author is to ſpeak of Lewis XIII.

(18) Sorberiana, voce Quillet, pag. m. 172.

(19) Naudé, Dial. de Maſcurat, pag. 310.

(20) Menage, ubi ſupra, pag. 342.

(21) See ſomething like it in the remark [*F*] of the article MONTAIGU (JOHN).

(22) Menage, ubi ſupra.

(23) In the twentieth volume of the *Mercure Franç.* pag. 760, 762.

the crime of magic, ſorcery, and poſſeſſion happening by his means in the perſons of ſome of the Urſuline nuns of Loudun, and other ſecular women mentioned in the proceſs: For the reparation of which crimes he was condemned to an *amende honourable*, and to *be burnt alive, with the magical pacts and characters being in the rolls, together with the manuſcript book, by him written againſt the celibacy of prieſts* [*H*], *and his aſhes to be ſcattered in the air (b).* Grandier, having heard this terrible ſentence without any commotion, deſired to have the guardian of the Franciſcans of Loudun for his confeſſor: He was doctor of divinity of the faculty of Paris. They refuſed him, and offered him a Recollect, whom he would not make uſe of; ſaying, that he was his enemy, and one of thoſe, who had moſt contributed to his ruin. They perſiſted in their reſolution to give him no other confeſſor than this Recollect, and he perſiſted in his refuſal; and ſo he made only a mental confeſſion to God: After which, he went to the place of execution, and died very conſtantly and chriſtianly. As he was upon the pile, a great fly (a kind of a drone) happened to buz about his head. A monk, preſent at the execution, who had read in the council of Quieres (*c*), that the devils are always at hand, when men are dying, to tempt them (*d*), and who had heard ſay, that Belzebub ſignifies in Hebrew the god of flies, cried out immediately, that it was the devil Belzebub that flew about Grandier, to carry his ſoul to hell; upon which a very pleaſant ſong was made. The devil's-craft of Loudun laſted a Year longer after the death of Grandier. Theophraſtus Renaudot, a famous phyſician, and inventor of the French-Gazette, made an encomium on Grandier, which was printed at Paris in looſe ſheets. This is taken from Menage (*e*), who vindicates our Grandier, and calls the poſſeſſion of thoſe nuns a chimæra [*I*]. Nay, one would think that he deſigned to deny in general

names and dignities, and accuſed Grandier by name. It is remarkable that they anſwered in French, though the exorciſts ſpoke to them in Latin But it is much more remarkable, that their teſtimony ſhould have been admitted in a court of juſtice, and made a proof in a tryal, wherein a man was condemned to be burnt alive. Were they ignorant of what our Saviour ſays of the devil (24)? Seguin's thoughts are very ſingular. *It ſeems*, ſays he (25), *that it is not ſo much the judgment of men, as of GOD, who ſent the devils from hell for the confuſion of this wretch: for it is a wonderful thing how the devils roſe up againſt him, and forced him to acknowledge, that they were his accuſers. I leave it to the Sorbonne to determine, whether any exceptions ſhould have been admitted againſt them, ſpeaking from GOD and giving evident proofs of the truth, which they were forced to utter.* It aſtoniſhes one to think, that Chriſtian judges ſhould reject the exceptions made againſt ſuch witneſſes; for it is matter of faith, that they are the fathers of lies. It were in vain to ſay, that the force of exorciſms hindred them from lying; for the experience of the contrary had been lately ſeen. The ſecond verbal proceſs imports (26), *That ſo many exorciſms had been practiſed, and indefatigably continued, ſo many faſts, oraiſons, and prayers had been made, that the maſter-devil and his aſſociates having promiſed to ſtrike the magician ſo violently, and in ſuch a part of his body, that it would be as viſible as painful; and moreover, having acknowledged that he yielded to the almighty power of GOD, and declared that he would retire from this monaſtery for ever; at laſt, on the thirteenth day of October* 1632, *he departed from the body of the ſaid mother ſuperior, and notified his departure by ſeven phlegms which ſhe ſpit a great way: likewiſe the devil of ſiſter Clara departed from her body; and afterwards all the nuns remained undiſturbed, every thing was quiet, and the whole nunnery enjoyed a holy peace.* But they kept not their promiſe; they impoſed upon the exorciſts: *from the twentieth of November, of the ſame year* 1632, *moſt of the nuns found themſelves moleſted and diſturbed by evil ſpirits* (27).

[*H*] *The manuſcript written by him againſt the celibacy of prieſts.*] Mr Menage, who *heard Mr Bouillaud ſay, that there was no proof, that Grandier was the author of this book* (28), does not diſown, that it was found among his papers (29). He adds, that this book was not ill written, that it was dedicated to a woman, and that it ended with theſe verſes:

Si ton gentil eſprit prend bien cette ſcience
Tu mettras en repos ta bonne conſcience.

If your fine ſenſe takes this ſcience right, you will lull your good conſcience to reſt.

Doubtleſs he had this from Seguin's letter, inſerted in the Mercure François; but, perhaps, he ſhould not have concealed what is added there, that Grandier confeſſed, upon the rack, that he writ this little book. This phyſician is not to blame for ſaying (30), that this little book makes *one ſuſpect* that *Grandier was married. Note*, he goes on, *That it is dedicated to his deareſt concubine, whoſe name is every where omitted as well as in the title . . . I cannot forbear telling you*, continues he, *that this tract ſeems to me very well done, and very coherent as far as the concluſion, which is wrong, and diſcovers it's venom. There is nothing in it tending to magic; it ſeems rather, that the contrary might be inferred from it, if we had not otherwiſe ſufficient proofs of.* He had been ſaying a little before: *As for the reſt, he was a man of a very reſolute and ſtrong mind; and Mr Preſident told me, he admired him at his tryal, and regretted his loſs.* The funeral oration of Scævola Sammarthanus, made at Loudun by Grandier, is printed amongſt the works of Sammarthanus (31).

[*I*] *Mr Menage . . . calls the poſſeſſion of thoſe nuns a chimera.*] He thinks it very probable (32) that they were only tormented with the ſuffocation of the matrix; and he ſays (33), that *Grandier deſerves to be added to Gabriel Naudé's catalogue of great men unjuſtly accuſed of magic.* However, he confeſſes (34), that he heard the ſuperior of the Urſulines of Loudun ſay: ‘ that, when ſhe was delivered from the devils that tormented her, an angel engraved upon ‘ her hand JESUS MARIA JOSEPH F. DE SALLES, ‘ and that ſhe ſhewed him her hand, on which thoſe ‘ words were really engraved, but lightly, and like thoſe ‘ croſſes * we ſee on the arms of the pilgrims, who ‘ have been in the Holy Land. He heard her ſay farther, that the angel engraved firſt, on the upper part ‘ of her hand, the name of Francis de Salles; that this ‘ word removed lower to give the precedence to thoſe ‘ of Joſeph and Maria, and that all three removed lower ‘ ſtill to make room for that of JESUS.’ He has done well not to ſay in expreſs words, that he took this for an impoſture; the reader underſtands it well enough. But Monconis (35) leaves no room to doubt of the cheat; for which reaſon it will not be amiſs to relate here what he ſays of it. He went to viſit this ſuperior of the Urſulines, the eighth of May 1645, and becauſe ſhe made him wait to ſpeak with her above half an hour, he ſuſpected ſome artifice. He deſired her to ſhew him the characters, which the devil ſhe was poſſeſſed with had imprinted upon her hand, when he was exorciſed (36); ſhe did it: ‘ he ſaw, ‘ in letters of a blood-colour upon the back *of her left* ‘ hand, beginning from the wriſt to the little finger, ‘ JESUS; below, drawing towards the ſhoulder, Maria; ‘ lower, Joſeph; and lower ſtill in the fourth line, ‘ F. de Salles. She told him all the villanies of the ‘ prieſt Grandier, who had been burnt for ſending ‘ the devils into the convent; and how a magiſtrate ‘ of the town, whoſe wife he had debauched, had ‘ complained of it to her, and that they agreed to

(*b*) *See the twentieth Tome of the* Mercure Franç. pag. 771.

(*c*) Apud Cariſiacum.

(*d*) Certum eſt quia ad omnes homines quando egrediuntur de corpore, veniunt Diaboli & ad juſtos & ad peccatores. *A letter of the fathers of that council to Lewis king of Germany.*

(*e*) In vita Guillelmi Menagii, *in the remarks upon that life.*

(24) St John, viii, 44.

(25) Mercure François, ibid. pag. 777, 778.

(26) Mercure François, ibid. pag. 761.

(27) Ibid. pag. 762.

(28) Remarques, pag. 343.

(29) *The author of the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes*, ubi ſupra, *inſinuates, that Grandier had publiſhed that piece.*

(30) Mercure François, ibid. pag. 779.

(31) Menage, Remarques, pag. 346.

(32) In Vita Guill. Menagii, pag 82.

(33) Remarques, pag. 339.

(34) Ibid. pag. 344.

* *See Thevenot, chap xlvi, of his Travels in the Levant.*

(35) Voiages, Part. I, pag. 8, & 9.

(36) *According to Menage, it was an angel who imprinted thoſe characters, when the poſſeſſion was over.*

neral all that is ſaid of magicians [*K*]. This were to get out of one difficulty by another [*L*]. Since the compoſition of this article, *the Hiſtory of the Devils of Loudun* has been printed in Holland (*f*); and it appears manifeſtly by that book, that the pretended poſſeſſion of the Urſulines was a horrid contrivance againſt the life of Grandier. This relation is extreamly curious, and attended with all the pieces relating to that trial. I found one thing in it, at which I was a little ſurprized, with reſpect to the great outcries that were made againſt Father Coton [*M*].

We

‘ impeach him, notwithſtanding the ſtrong inclinations this miſcreant gave her by his conjurations, from which the mercy of God preſerved her. At laſt, Mr de Monconis took leave of her, and deſired to ſee her hand again, which ſhe very civilly gave him through the grate: he obſerved to her, that the letters were not ſo red as when ſhe came, and that thoſe letters ſeemed to peel off, and all the skin of her hand to riſe, as if it had been a thin skin of ſtarch-water dried up: with the end of his nail, by a gentle touch, he took off part of a leg of the M; at which ſhe was very much ſurpriſed, though the place remained as fair as the other parts of the hand. He was ſatisfied with this.’ I do not in the leaſt queſtion it. The diſcovery of ſuch a notable forgery, which had infatuated ſo many people, was an ineſtimable treaſure to ſuch a man as he. The new hiſtory of the devils of Loudun will inform you; ‘ that, when the wrinkles of old age had made the hand dry and lean, the drugs, that were uſed to mark *thoſe names* anew, being no longer able to imprint them; the good mother ſaid then, that God had granted her prayers, and ſuffered thoſe names to be defaced, which were the occaſion of abundance of people coming to trouble and importune her, and withdraw her frequently from her acts of devotion (37).’ You will there find alſo, that Ceriſantes had the art of marking a name upon his hand (38), and that the queen's maids, in 1652, laughed at the engravings of the Urſulines (39).

[*K*] *Nay, one would think that he deſigned to deny in general all that is ſaid of magicians.*] In effect, he laughs at the firſt ſcene of this horrible tragedy, and draws from it ſome proofs for Grandier's juſtification. That firſt ſcene conſiſted in this, that one of the nuns, *being by night in her little, but moſt chaſte, bed* (40), perceived a ſpectre reſembling their deceaſed confeſſor, and which owned, that it was he himſelf, and that he was returned to impart very extraordinary things. The ſpectre ſaid, it would appear to her the ſame hour the night following; it failed not to appear, and received the ſame anſwer as at firſt, that ſhe could not treat with it without the privity of her ſuperior. Hereupon this ſpectre took Grandier's perfect ſhape. ‘ He talked *to this nun* of love-affairs, ſollicited her with addreſſes equally inſolent and laſcivious . . . . She ſtruggles, no body aſſiſts her; ſhe torments herſelf, no body comforts her; ſhe calls, no body anſwers; ſhe cries out, no body comes; ſhe trembles, ſhe ſweats, ſhe faints, ſhe invokes the holy name of Jesus; at laſt the ſpectre diſappeared.’ I own, with Mr Menage, that this is proper enough to clear Urban Grandier as to magic; but not to juſtify him in other reſpects. Could not he, without being obliged to the devil Cedon for opening the door (41), gain the door-keeper and get into this nun's chamber, pretending to be a ghoſt and diſguiſing himſelf with a mask reſembling their late ghoſtly father. This nun's ſtory ſeems to intimate the accompliſhment of the venereal act. Mr Menage ſays alſo (42), that no man of ſenſe will believe, that Grandier *had the power of diſpoſing of devils at his pleaſure, to ſend them to torment innocent virgins conſecrated to GOD.* In fine, he praiſes the prudence and juſtice of Lewis XIV, ‘ who has ſtopped the courſe of the proceedings againſt thoſe, who are accuſed of magic and witchcraft, having commuted the penalty of death into baniſhment, with reſpect to many perſons condemned, by a decree of the parliament of Roüen, to be burnt, as guilty of this crime; and having afterwards, by a decree of his council of ſtate, the twenty ſixth of April 1672, ordained, that, through all the province of Normandy, the priſons ſhould be opened to all perſons, that were detained for the ſame crimes; and that, for the future, ſuch as ſhould be accuſed of it ſhould be judged according to the declaration, which his majeſty promiſes, by this decree, to ſend into all the juriſdictions of France, to regulate the proceedings that are to be obſerved by the judges in the trials of magic and witchcraft.’

[*L*] . . . . *It is to get out of one difficulty by another.*] It is certain, that the moſt incredulous and ſubtile philoſophers muſt needs be puzzled with the phænomena relating to witchcraft. But, as to Grandier, I do not know but we might apply to him what Olympias ſaid upon the ſight of a miſtreſs of her husband, whom ſhe found extreamly handſome and witty: *let no body ſuſpect her any longer of witchcraft, for all her enchantments are in her perſon* (43). The curate of Loudun was a handſome genteel man, and a fine ſpeaker; and this probably was the magic, with which he tempted the ſuperior of the Urſulines (44), and *ſubjected the nuns to violent and laſcivious ardors* (45). The vow of continence and devotion not being ſufficient to remove this diſorder, it was believed to be ſupernatural. This imagination ſpared ſelf-love the ſhame of cheriſhing ſo long a criminal paſſion. They therefore believed themſelves bewitched; all the machine was out of order: and, for the honour of that ſociety, the firſt advances were not to be retracted. There is nothing more dangerous for people, that believe their good reputation to be neceſſary to the church, than to make a falſe ſtep. This mother-ſuperior of the Urſulines might perhaps be ſincere at firſt; but ſhe was not ſo, when ſhe received Monconis's viſit; and yet ſhe muſt carry on the farce to ſalve what was paſt. Thoſe, who perfectly knew the little town of Loudun, when thoſe devil-crafts firſt began, might have explained them better than can be done at preſent.

Within a few months after I had compoſed what I have now ſaid, I heard, that a man of that country was printing an exact relation of this adventure, at Amſterdam. I have found in it the confirmation of what I had conjectured, with an explication of the particular and perſonal paſſions, which occaſioned this ſtrange mummery; and if we believe the author of the relation, the ſuperior was never in earneſt.

[*M*] . . . . . *great outcries againſt Father Coton.*] He ſet down upon a piece of paper ſeveral queſtions he meant to propoſe to a woman poſſeſſed with the devil. Amongſt other queſtions, this was one: *what is the moſt proper paſſage of ſcripture to prove purgatory* (46)? The Proteſtants joined with a great number of Catholics in crying out againſt this impious curioſity, and inſulting both the father confeſſor of Henry IV, and the whole order of the Jeſuits. Yet it is certain, that this confeſſor did but follow herein the practice of his church, excepting ſome queſtions he would have offered concerning political affairs. Did not the exorciſt of Loudun ask the devil (47), *Which was the beſt means, by which a creature departed from GOD might return to him?* Did he not ask him (48), *whether ſince his fall he had ever taſted the pleaſures of divine love?* . . . . . . *And which is the ſtrongeſt bond that faſtens men to the creatures?* . . . (49) *Whether there was any body in hell, who had had a great reliſh of the divine love upon earth?* The devil anſwered at large theſe queſtions, and even diſcovered many ſecrets of his politics, and the means to overthrow them. Theſe things have been not only practiſed at Loudun, but are the current ſtyle of the exorciſts, as the Proteſtant divines object to the Roman Catholics. ‘ Si quis attente legerit nupera exorciſtarum ſcripta, ut Monachi Michaelis hiſtoriam Ludovici Gaufridi & obſeſſarum mulierum, non ſatis mirari poterit impietatem & ſtoliditatem hominum, qui judicium controverſiarum fidei à dæmonibus expoſcunt, eos fingunt pœnitentiæ prædicatores, eos adigunt, ut preces ad Deum fundant, & omnia religionis & pietatis externa munia obeant (50).’ So that the particular hatred againſt the Jeſuits was the reaſon of declaiming againſt the conduct of

Father

(*f*) *At Amſterdam,* 1693, *in* 12mo. *It has been tranſlated into Dutch.*

(37) Hiſtoire des Diables de Loudun, pag. 469.

(38) Ibid. pag. 394.

(39) Ibid.

(40) Mercure François, ubi ſupra, pag. 749.

(41) *It is ſaid, that the third time the nuns were poſſeſſed, he came in, in the night, through a door, which the devil opened to him.* Mercure François, ubi ſupra, pag. 762.

(42) Remarques, pag. 341.

(43) *See the remark* [*I*] *in the article* APULEIUS, *where I have ſet down the Greek words of Plutarch.*

(44) Monconis, ubi ſupra.

(45) Mercure François, pag. 761.

(46) Thuan. Hiſtor. lib. cxxxii, pag. 1053, ad ann. 1604.

(47) Hiſtoire des Diables de Loudun, pag. 371.

(48) Ibid. pag. 372.

(49) Ibid. pag. 373.

(50) Heidegg. Diſſert. Selectar. Triacade, pag. 98. *See alſo Voëtius,* Diſput. Tom. III, pag. 622, 623.

We find in the life of a Jeſuit, who was one of the exorciſts of the nuns of Loudun, ſeveral particulars upon this ſubject. I will mention two things out of it, one of which is very ſurprizing [*N*].

Father Coton, which is not cenſured when others make uſe of it. I do not ſpeak of the Proteſtants. A reſpect of perſons will always prevail among men.

[*N*] *I will mention two things, one of which is very ſurprizing.*] I know them only from Mr Couſin's extracts. Here is what I have read in his *Journal des Sçavans*, in the place where he mentions the life of Father Seurin (51). ' Upon occaſion of this father's conflict with the devils, *the author of his life* (52) proves at large the truth of the nuns of Loudun being poſſeſſed by the devil, eſpecially by the teſtimony of two of the greateſt wits of this age. The one is cardinal Richelieu, who ſent exorciſts to Loudun, maintained at the king's expence; and the other my lord Mountagu, who, having ſeen the devils go out of the body of the mother of the Angels, was perfectly convinced of it, and diſcourſed of it with Urban VIII, when he abjured his hereſy, and made profeſſion of the Catholic faith before him.' What I am going to ſay is much more extraordinary. You will ſee there a man, who redeemed JESUS CHRIST; that is, who, to reſcue him from the hands of the devil, gave up himſelf to the devil. Read theſe words of the journaliſt (53). ' When Father Seurin exorcized the nuns of Loudun, the devils declared, that two magicians had ſeized three hoſts, to prophane them. Father Seurin fell to prayers, to obtain the deliverance of his maſter's body, and conſented, that his own body ſhould be ſubmitted to the power of the devils, in order to redeem it. The offers were accepted, and the exchange performed. The devils took the three hoſts out of the hands of their agents, and put them at the foot of the Pyx of the holy ſacrament that was then expoſed; and one of them entered into the body of the father, who remained poſſeſſed, or obſeſſed, the greateſt part of his life.'

(51) Journal des Sçavans, May 9, 1689, pag. 311, Dutch Edit.

(52) *His name is Henry-Maria Boudon.*

(53) Journal des Sçavans, ubi ſupra.

GRAPALDUS (FRANCIS MARIUS), a learned man, lived in the XVIth century. He was of Parma; and, when his country, being freed from the French yoke, was reſtored to the obedience of Julius II, he was choſen chief of the embaſſy that was ſent to that Pope (*a*). His eloquence and fine ſhape recommended him to that employment (*b*). He excellently harangued Julius II, and publiſhed ſome verſes upon the ſubject of his ſpeech. The Pope crowned him with his own hand, with great ſolemnity, in the Vatican. Grapaldus, encouraged by this poetical crown, put himſelf upon writing a great many verſes, which have been printed (*c*). The work, in which he ſhewed his learning moſt, is that, wherein he deſcribes all the parts of a houſe [*A*]. He died of a retention of urine, being above fifty years of age (*d*).

(*a*) Jovius, in Elogiis, cap. lxii.

(*b*) A præſtanti facundia & inſigni corporis proceritate legationis princeps. *Id. ib.*

(*c*) Ex eodem, ibid.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

[*A*] *The work, in which he ſhewed his learning moſt, is that, wherein he deſcribes all the parts of a houſe.*] Paul Jovius paſſes this ſound judgment on it. ' Sed multo uberius, *ſays he* (1), & latius ingenii famam propagavit, edito libro de partibus ædium, quo per optimas diſciplinas perornatum diligenti cultura ingenium demonſtravit. —— *But he acquired a much greater and more extenſive character by the book he publiſhed on the parts of a houſe, in which he diſcovered a fine genius improved by learning.*' This book has been often printed. The firſt edition is that of Parma by Antony Quintianus. I do not know the year, but only that the author put out a ſecond ſeven years after: it was larger than the firſt (2). Geſner mentions only the editions of Baſil in 1533, and 1541, in 4to. That which I uſe is of Dort in 1618, in 8vo.

(1) Jovius, in Elog. cap. lxii.

(2) *See the advertiſement to the reader.*

GRASSIS (PARIS DE) is very much to be blamed for a cheat he put upon the public. He compoſed an epitaph upon a mule [*A*], which he cauſed to be engraved on a piece of marble, and afterwards hid it in the earth in his vineyard. Some time after, he ordered ſome trees to be planted in the place where this marble was buried; and when they came to tell him of the diſcovery of this inſcription, he gave it out for a thing that had been foretold concerning his mule. The thing was only laughed at for ſome time, and the marble was little taken notice of; but ſome years after it grew conſiderable, and paſſed for an antique with abundance of people [*B*]: Inſomuch that Thomas Porcacchi inſerted this epitaph in a book, as a genuine piece of antiquity (*a*). Paris de Graſſis is not the only perſon, that laid ſuch ſnares for antiquarians [*C*]. I believe,

(*a*) Ex Muſeo Italico Mabillonii, Tom. I, pag. 176.

[*A*] *He compoſed an epitaph upon a mule.*] He pretended, that one Publius Craſſus had erected this monument to his mule. DIS PEDIBUS SAXUM is the beginning of that inſcription.

[*B*] *This epitaph paſſed for an antique with abundance of people.*] Father Mabillon affirms it. ' Viris eruditis non nullis fucum fecit, *ſays he* (1), opinantibus id eſſe antiquum ..... Thomas Porcacchius inter alios hoc epitaphium pro genuino, & antiquo habuit in libro Funeralium: immo Alexander VII in Adverſariis ſuis notat id repertum fuiſſe prope ſanctum Petrum. —— *Several learned men were deceived by it, taking it for an antique ..... Among others, Thomas Porcacchi took it for genuine and antient in his book* De Funeralibus. *Even Alexander VII, in his* Adverſaria, *obſerves, that it was found near St Peters.*' He tells us, that Sebaſtian Maccius relates the ſtory of this impoſture in his collection of antient inſcriptions, which is in manuſcript in cardinal Chigi's library. Maccius had this from Annibal de Graſſis, biſhop of Jaccentia (2).

[*C*] *He is not the only perſon, that laid ſuch ſnares for antiquarians.*] I will give but one inſtance of the like impoſtures, though it were eaſy to compile a great number of them. The ninth of Auguſt 1505, three ſtones were found near the cape of Roco de Sintra in Portugal. There was upon thoſe ſtones a Latin inſcription in old characters, containing this prophecy:

Sibylla vaticinium occiduis decretum,
Volventur ſaxa literis, & ordine rectis,
Cum videas Occidens Orientis opes.
Ganges, Indus, Tagus, erit mirabile viſu,
Merces commutabit ſuas, uterque ſibi.
Soli æterno, ac Lunæ decretum.

This was taken for a Sybilline oracle (3), and ſome learned men tried their ſkill in explaining thoſe verſes; but at laſt it was diſcovered, that Cajado, a Portugueſe poet, was the author of them, and that it was he, who had buried thoſe ſtones, and taken his opportunity to have them dug out. ' Fraudem detexit Caſpar Varrerius: Scilicet, quo tempore Emmanuel Luſitaniæ Rex, per Vaſcum Gamam, navigationes in Indiam Orientalem feliciter tentaſſet: Ulyſſepone vixit Hermicus Cajadus, poeta celebris, Angeli Politiani diſcipulus (4): hic tria marmora literis antiquis, hoc vaticinium continentibus, incidi, & clam ' circa

(1) Mabillon. in Muſeo Italico, Tom. I, pag. 176.

(2) Ut Maccius refert ex Annibale de Graſſis Bononienſi Jaccentiæ Epiſcopo. *Id. ibid.*

(3) Hos verſus Sibyllinos eſſe Valentinus Moranus, Jacobus Navarch, Ferdinandus Lopez in ſuis Hiſtoriis Indiæ Orientalis, ſibi & aliis perſuaſerant. *Jo. Euſebius Nierenbergius de Origine Sacræ Scripturæ, lib. iii, cap. iii, apud Voëtium, Diſput. Tom. IV, pag.* 696.

(4) *Nicolas Antonio*, Biblioth. Hiſpan. Tom. I, pag. 433, *ſays, that Cajadus, at his arrival in Italy, found, that Politian was dead.*

believe, to ſay by the by, that this is the ſame man, who, in the beginning of the XVIth century, was maſter of the ceremonies under many popes, and biſhop of Peſaro, and brother to cardinal Achilles de GRASSIS. His journal was cited in the writings on the diſpute concerning the precedence between the republic of Venice and the duke of Savoy (*b*). His *Ceremoniale* is printed and eſteemed (*c*). He expreſſed a great zeal againſt a plagiary; for it is he whom preſident Couſin ſpeaks of, in a paſſage which I ſhall ſet down [*D*].

circa oppidum Syntra, leviter terrâ tegi curavit. Poſtquam verò, tractu temporis, aliquam antiquitatis ſpeciem contraxiſſent, amicos quoſdam, in villâ ſuâ, circa quam hæc marmora occultata erant, convivio excipit; quibus ſtrenuè epulantibus nunciat villicus, foſſores marmora, ignotis literis inſcripta, inveniſſe, procul dubio theſaurum eo loco defoſſum eſſe. Advolant omnes, inveniunt lapides, mirantur vaticinium, non ſanè foliis inſcriptum: Rex, hujus fraudis conſcius, ſtuporem tamen ſimulat, verſus aulicis deſcribendos tradit, ipſa verò marmora, tanquam ſanctiora κειμήλια, in gazophylacio religiosè ſervat (5). —— *Caſpar Varrerius detected the fraud: For, at the time when Emanuel, king of Portugal, ſent Vaſcus Gama, with ſucceſs, on a voyage to the Eaſt-Indies, there lived at Lisbon one Hermicus Cajado, a famous poet, and a diſciple of Angelus Politianus: this man got three marbles engraved with antient characters, containing this prophecy, and had them privately buried a little way under ground, near the city Syntra. But after that, through length of time, they had contracted an appearance of antiquity, he invited ſome friends to his country-houſe, near which theſe marbles were hidden; and, during the banquet, his ſteward brought word, that certain marbles, inſcribed with unknown characters, had been dug up, and that there was certainly ſome treaſure buried there. Away run the company, find the ſtones, and wonder at the prophecy, not written indeed on leaves. The king, who knew this cheat, yet ſeemed aſtoniſhed, orders his attendants to copy the verſes, and lays up the marbles as great curioſities in his Muſæum.*' There are thoſe, who ſay, that Cajado hoped by this trick to inſinuate himſelf into the favour of his king, and ſqueeze ſome money out of him. 'Poſtea tamen compertum eoſdem confictos & impoſitos fuiſſe à quodam Hermo Charado Luſitano, qui illos marmori inſcripſerat, defoderatque ut ſitu humoreque terræ aliquantulum deformati, vetuſtatis indicium exhiberent: rurſuſque per mercenarias operas refoderat, ut hoc tam nobili atque peregregio antiquitatis monumento, Regis (Luſitaniæ, Emanuelis) gratiam, avidè in Orientis opes intenti, pecuniamque aucuparetur: ut teſtantur Cæſar Orlandius & Gaſpar Barrerius, quos refert Ortelius in theatro magno Tab. 5. novi orbis, & ab eo mutuatus Malvenda lib. 3, de Antichriſto cap. 16. Torniellus in annalibus 2. tom. anno mundi 3043. num. 7. pag. 48. (6). —— *It was afterwards diſcovered that they were not genuine, but the contrivance of one Hermus Charadus a Portugueſe, who had inſcribed them on marble, and buried them, that, being a little deformed by lying in the moiſt earth, they might paſs for antiques; and that he had afterwards dug them up, that, by ſo noble a monument of antiquity, he might gain the favour of Emanuel, king of Portugal, who was then eagerly intent on the riches of the Eaſt, and might ſqueeze ſome money out of him; as we learn from Cæſar Orlandius, & Gaſpar Barrerius, &c.*'

[*D*] *It is he, whom preſident Couſin ſpeaks of, in a paſſage, which I ſhall ſet down.*] 'Chriſtopher Marcel, nominated to the archbiſhopric of Corfu, having recovered a copy of a book written by Auguſtin Patricius, under the pontificate of Innocent VIII, concerning the rites of the Romiſh church, printed it at Venice in 1516, and dedicated it to Leo X, without mentioning Auguſtin Patricius the true author of it, who had been maſter of the ceremonies at Rome from the time of the pontificate of Pius II, his uncle, who gave him the ſirname of Picolomini, to that of Innocent VIII, under which he corrected the Roman pontifical, and compoſed that *Ceremoniale*. Paris de Craſſis, who was maſter of the ceremonies under Leo X, had no ſooner ſeen this Venice edition, but he made his complaint of it to his holineſs, as of a crime that could not be expiated but by fire, that ſhould conſume the author and the copies. The Pope, who had licenſed that edition, pretended to take fire upon the remonſtrance of this zealous maſter of the ceremonies, and ordered a congregation to examine the affair, But notwithſtanding the diligence of Paris de Craſſis, many new editions of that book came out ſoon after, at Cologne, and elſewhere (7).'

This is what we find in Mr Couſin's extract of the ſecond volume of the *Muſæum Italicum*. I have conſulted this ſecond volume ſince the firſt edition of my dictionary, which convinces me, that Ovid had a great deal of reaſon to ſay, that it is beſt drinking at the fountain-head,

Gratius ex ipſo fonte bibuntur aquæ (8).

I have found, that Paris de Graſſis's paſſion againſt the archbiſhop of Corfu proceeded not ſo much from his aſcribing to himſelf a book written by another man, as from his divulging, even with alterations, ſuch ceremonies as ought to remain concealed. He remonſtrates in a letter to Leo X (9), that he has been maſter of the ceremonies near ſixteen years; and that he ſhould think himſelf inexcuſable, if he ſhould quietly ſuffer them to be corrupted, and publiſhed, and his predeceſſors robbed of their due praiſes. He does not diſſemble, that one of his grievances conſiſts in this, that the publication of thoſe things leſſens their veneration, and expoſes to contempt, what the veil of ſecrecy and myſteriouſneſs made venerable. 'Quemadmodum juſti cujuſque principis eſt curare, ne quiſquam ſuo jure fraudetur: ita, ſi diligenter inſpexerimus, ad quempiam alium non magis ſpectat quam ad Romanum Pontificem, ne ſacræ ſuæ ceremoniæ maculentur, neve aliqua in parte alterentur, ac præſertim ne corrumpantur: ſed & quod omnium principum eſt, ne prolatæ in vulgus velut proſtitutæ pontificalium ſacrorum exiſtimationem minuant, flocci faciant, & contemnantur (10). —— *As it is the duty of every juſt prince to take care, that no one be deprived of his right, ſo, if we carefully conſider it, no one is more concerned, than the Pope, to ſee that religion be not prophaned, nor it's ceremonies in any reſpect altered, or corrupted: but, which is incumbent on all princes, to take eſpecial care, that, by being made public, they do not expoſe the ceremonies of the pontificate to the contempt of the vulgar.*' He alledges the example of the ancient Heathens, who would not ſuffer the myſteries of the gods to come to the knowledge of prophane men. He inſtances particularly in the conduct of the old Romans, and king Tarquin, who cauſed Marcus Tullius to be thrown into the ſea, as a puniſhment for giving the book of the ſacred ceremonies to be tranſcribed. Our de Graſſis deſired, that the archbiſhop of Corfu's book ſhould be burnt with the author, or at leaſt that the author ſhould be puniſhed as ſhould be thought proper. The Pope thought it a reaſonable demand, and promiſed to have it examined in the next conſiſtory. 'Hanc epiſtolam cum in manibus Papæ dediſſem, legiſſetque libenter & avide, & acceptaſſet rationes & argumenta in ea per me allegata; verſus ad cardinales aliquos, qui ſibi forte adhærebant, dixit me rationem habere ſuper petitionibus meis: & librum ceremoniarum nuper impreſſum omnino comburi ſimul cum falſo auctore, ſicut poſtulaſſem, aut ſaltem ipſum auctorem corrigi & caſtigari omnino debere prout præſentibus videretur. Itaque ad primum conſiſtorium rem & cauſam differre (11). —— *The Pope, having received from me this letter, and having eagerly read it, and approved the reaſons and arguments alledged by me in it; he turned to ſome cardinals, who ſtood near him, and ſaid to them, that my petition was reaſonable, and that the book of ceremonies lately printed, together with their counterfeit author, deſerved to be burnt, as I had deſired; at leaſt that the author ought to be corrected and chaſtiſed, as ſhould ſeem proper to thoſe preſent: he therefore referred the matter to the next conſiſtory.*' We do not know what was the iſſue of this affair, there being ſome ſheets wanting in de Graſſis's *Ceremoniale*, in the

---

(*b*) *See* Graſwinckel, de jure Præcedentiæ, pag. 263, 320, 329.

(*c*) *See* Naudæus, Bibliograph. Polit. pag. m. 42.

(5) Montan. Legat. Belg. ad Japan. pag. 15, apud Lomeierum de Biblioth. pag. 366, 367.

(6) Neirembergius, ubi ſupra.

(7) Journal des Sçavans, March 7, 1689, pag. 141, 142, Dutch Edit.

(8) Ovid. in Epiſt. ex Ponto, Epiſt. v, ver. 8.

(9) *Written in the year* 1517.

(10) Muſæum Italic. Tom. II, in Appendice, pag. 588.

(11) Id. ibid. pag. 592.

place where the narration was to be continued (12). Father Mabillon can hardly forbear laughing at de Graſſis's great zeal; and it is with ſome pleaſure that he obſerves (13), that the book of the archbiſhop of Corfu was not burnt. He ſays, that the judicious Catholics do not build their veneration for the Pope upon thoſe occult ceremonies, but upon his quality of head of the church. However, it muſt be confeſſed, that this zealot for ſecrecy had reaſon to ſay, that it was to be feared, that, if the myſteries of the Roman *Ceremoniale* came to be divulged, the people would not have ſo right a notion of them (14). For it is uſual to admire much more what is not known, than what is. Nay, he ſeems to be ſorry that the pontifical is made public; which, ſays he, is the cauſe that, to the contempt of the prieſthood, the ceremonies contained in that book fall daily into the hands of the profane; and the ſectaries make uſe of it to ridicule our religion. *Sed utinam etiam & illa quæ dixi, ſecretiora forent & magis recondita. Non enim ea quotidie ad profanas manus in ſacerdotii contemptum, nec ad alienas ſectas in noſtræ religionis irriſionem devenire videremus* (15). Be it how it will, we may very well ſay, that he is too angry with the prelate of Corfu. He vilifies him at ſuch a rate, that I queſtion whether he conceived not as great an averſion for him, as they formerly incurred, that divulged the myſterious ceremonies of Ceres; a ſort of people, that others were afraid to embark with in the ſame veſſel, for fear of being involved in their deſerved puniſhment.

Eſt & fideli tuta ſilentio
Merces. Vetabo, qui Cereris ſacrum
  Vulgarit arcanæ, ſub iiſdem
  Sit trabibus, fragilemque mecum
Solvat phaſelum: ſæpè Dieſpiter
Neglectus, inceſto addidit integrum (16).

And ſilence has it's ſure reward . . . .
O may I never ſpread my ſails
With him, who myſteries reveals!
For oft neglected Jove has ſent,
Without diſtinction, puniſhment
On the prophane and innocent.

(12) Ibid. in Commentar. pag. 6.

(13) Ibid. pag. 7.

(14) Quod ſi ſacrorum arcana pandantur, & ſacræ publicentur ceremoniæ, illico futurum eſt, ut omnis opinio minuatur, ut pontificia auctoritas elangueſcat neceſſe eſt Ibid. in *Append.* pag. 589.

(15) Ibid pag. 588.

(16) Horat. Od. ii, lib. iii.

GRASWINCKEL (Theodore), a native of Delft, was a very learned civilian in the XVIIth century, which he made appear by ſeveral works [*A*]. He was not only well verſed in matters of law, but alſo in the *belles lettres*, and Latin poetry. His merit was acknowledged; for he had good preferments at the Hague [*B*]. The republic of Venice made him knight of St Mark. He died of an apoplexy at Mechlen, the 12th of October 1666, at ſixty ſix years of age, and was buried in the great church of the Hague, where his epitaph is to be ſeen, which is very glorious to him.

[*A*] *He made it appear by ſeveral works.*] He publiſhed a book, at the Hague, in 1642, intituled, *De jure majeſtatis*, which he dedicated to the queen of Sweden. In which he lays down the principles moſt favourable to monarchs, and the moſt oppoſite to Buchanan's republican maxims. He took the part of the republic of Venice againſt the duke of Savoy, in the diſpute of precedency: For he publiſhed a book in 1644, *De jure præcedentiæ inter ſereniſſimam Venetam rempubl. & ſereniſſ. Sabaudiæ ducem*, in which he confutes the diſſertation publiſhed upon that ſubject in favour of the duke of Savoy. He had for a long time given proofs of his zeal for the republic of Venice. In the year 1634, he wrote an anſwer to the *Squittinio*, which he intituled, *Libertas Veneta, ſeu Venetorum in ſe ac ſuos imperandi jus.* In 1652, he wrote againſt one Burgus, a Genoeſe, who, as well as Selden, pretended, that the ſea, no leſs than the earth, was ſubject to the dominion of ſome ſtates. *Maris liberi vindiciæ adverſus Petrum Baptiſtam Burgum Liguſtici maritimi dominii aſſertorem*, is the title of Graſwinckel's work (1); who, the year following, publiſhed a like tract againſt Welwood. I have alſo ſeen a treatiſe of his *De præludiis juſtitiæ & juris*, printed in 1660, in which he refutes a Portugueſe Jeſuit (2). He added a diſſertation to it, *De fide hæreticis & rebellibus ſervanda.* I will not forget his *Stricturæ adverſus Felden*, nor his commentary upon Salluſt, and upon a Spaniſh author, *De vita & nece Caſſii* (3) *& Bruti*, nor his tranſlation of David's pſalms into heroic verſe, nor his verſion of Thomas à Kempis (4) in elegiac verſe, nor his poem in hexameter verſe, in which he deſcribes the life of Andrew Canterus, a native of Groningen, who was a prodigy of learning in his younger years. He alſo wrote ſome books in Dutch; The art of living well; a commentary upon the edicts *de Annonis*; and two volumes in 4to (5), concerning the ſovereignty of the ſtates of Holland.

[*B*] *He had good preferments at the Hague.*] He was advocate fiſcal of the demeſnes of the ſtates of Holland, and recorder and ſecretary to the bipartite court, for the ſtates-general.

(1) Soprani, in his collection of the writers of Liguria, ſpeaking of Burgus, ſays, that Thomaſo Graſeninckelio wrote againſt him in 1652. Oldoini has tranſcribed this fault in his *Athenæum Liguſticum*. This is a falſification of our Graſwinckel's name and ſirname.

(2) Called Ferdinand Rebellus.

(3) See citation (51) of the article BRUTUS (Marcus Junius).

(4) De imitatione Jeſu Chriſti.

(5) They were printed after his death; one in 1667, and the other in 1674.

GRATAROLUS (*William*) a learned phyſician, lived in the XVIth century. He was born at Bergamo in Italy; and he left his country, to go into Germany, in order to profeſs the Proteſtant religion. After ſome ſtay at Baſil, he was invited to Marpurg, to be profeſſor of phyſic. But he ſtaid there only a year; whether it be, that the Heſſian air did not agree with him, or that he regretted the loſs of the pleaſures he had enjoyed at Baſil (*a*). He returned to that town ſome time after [*A*], where he died at fifty two years of age. He wrote ſeveral good books [*B*]. It is ſaid, that

(*a*) Nobilis hunc miſit Cattis Baſilea, ſed anno Vix ſemel exacto rurſus eò rediit, Sive quod Haſſiaco non poſſet vivere cælo, Sive quod in votis urbs Baſilea foret. *Petrus Nigidius, apud Freber. Theatr. p.* 1252.

[*A*] *He died at Baſil ſome time after.*] It is affirmed in the *Theatrum* of Paul Freherus, that he died the ſixth of May 1562, for which the fourth part of John James Boiſſard's *Icones virorum illuſtrium* is quoted: they might alſo have quoted the *Diarium Hiſtoricum* of Reuſnerus. The new edition of Vander Linden (1) places this phyſician's death in 1562. Konig places it in 1566, and Thuanus (2), and Bucholcer (3), on the 16th of April 1568. Two prefaces (4), with ſome little pieces, which Gratarolus, being at Marpurg, dedicated, the 25th of Auguſt 1562, to the Landgrave of Heſſe, prove that he did not die at Baſil the 6th of May of the ſame year. It is a ſad thing to find ſuch a diſagreement among authors about a thing of this nature, which might ſo eaſily be exactly known. I have obſerved the like variations about Giſanius. See the remark [*A*] of his article.

[*B*] *He wrote ſeveral good books.*] Theſe are the titles of ſome of them; *de Memoria reparanda, augenda, conſervanda, ac de Reminiſcentia.* The firſt edition, which is of the year 1554, has been followed by many others (5). *De prædictione morum, naturarumque hominum facili, & inſpectione partium corporis. Prognoſtica naturalia de temporum mutatione perpetua, ordine literarum. De literatorum & eorum qui magiſtratibus funguntur conſervanda præſervandaque valetudine. De vini natura, artificio, & uſu, deque omni re potabili. De regimine iter agentium, vel equitum, vel peditum, vel navi, vel curru, ſeu rheda, &c. viatoribus quibuſque utiliſſimi libri duo.* He publiſhed ſome books of other authors, and added to them ſomething of his own. *Petri Pomponatii liber de cauſis occultorum affectuum, ſeu de incantatione, cum præfatione & gloſſulis. Petri Aponenſis libellus de venenis ad manuſcriptum exemplar correctus, cui adjecit multa ejus argumenti utilia. Correctiones & additiones in librum Italicum falſo attributum Gabrieli Fallopio, cui titulus eſt ſecreta Fallopii.* He made a collection of ſeveral tracts concerning the ſweating diſeaſe in England, and concerning baths, and a compilation of ſeveral books of alchimy (6). It cannot be denied that he was a public ſpirited man, ſince he not only ſought remedies, that might be uſeful to magiſtrates,

(1) De Script. Medic. pag. 376.

(2) Thuan. lib. xliii, ſub fin.

(3) Bucholcer. in Indice Chron. pag. m. 622.

(4) Printed at Straſburg, in 1563, 8vo.

(5) Vide Lindenium renovatum, pag. 376, 377.

(6) Id. pag. 377, & Paul Freher. in Theatro, pag. 1252.

that he excelled in the art of phyſiognomy (*b*). Beza wrote ſome letters to him, which are printed (*c*).

(*b*) *Taken from Paul Freberus,* ibid.

(*c*) *The 42d, and 46th.*

magiſtrates, but alſo thoſe that are proper for all ſorts of travellers. He did not forget ſtudious men; for he endeavoured to enable them to preſerve their health, and ſtrengthen their memory. A man, who could ſupply their neceſſities on this account, would deſerve divine honours in the republic of letters, in which memory is almoſt as neceſſary as life.

GRAWERUS (ALBERT),

GRAWERUS (ALBERT), born at Meſecow in the March of Brandenburg, in the year 1575, was in great eſteem with the divines of the confeſſion of Ausburg. He may be compared to thoſe ſoldiers of fortune, who, going through all the military degrees, at laſt are advanced to the firſt poſts. At firſt, he only taught ſchool in Hungary (*a*) [*A*]; but, when Agria was taken (*b*) the Ottomans, he retired to Wittemberg, from whence he went to Iſleben, to direct the ſchool there: After this he was made dean of Mansfield (*c*); then he was admitted doctor of divinity in the univerſity of Iëna (*d*), and, two years after, he was profeſſor there in the ſame faculty. At laſt, in 1616, he obtained the ſuperintendency of the churches of the country of Weimar (*e*). He died the 30th of November 1617 (*f*). He was the hotteſt divine imaginable; and never any man wrote with greater paſſion againſt thoſe of the confeſſion of Geneva. It is to him chiefly that the miſſionaries have recourſe [*B*], when they deſign to ſhew the feuds, that reign betwixt the two Proteſtant communions. He was furious, not only in verbal diſputes, but alſo in his writings [*C*]. They are numerous [*D*]; and moſt of them againſt the Calviniſts. He alſo writ againſt the Socinians and the Romiſh church.

(*a*) Firſt at Scepuz. and then in 1597, at Caſſovia.

(*b*) In the year 1599.

(*c*) In the year 1607.

(*d*) In the year 1609.

(*e*) Ex Spizelio, in Templo Honoris reſerato, pag. 39. *See alſo Freberus's* Theatrum, pag. 394, 395.

(*f*) Freher pag. 395. *Spizelius ſays*, 1616.

[*A*] *At firſt he only taught ſchool in Hungary*] This is the idea we ſhould form, by conſulting only Spizelius; but, if you read the funeral oration (1), you will find, that the baron Gregory Horwath, having ſet up a new college at Scepuz (2), made Grawerus rector of it, on the recommendation of Giles Hunnius, and that Grawerus taught there both philoſophy and divinity.

(1) Apud Freherum, in Theatro, pag. 394, 395.

(2) In the year 1595.

[*B*] *It is to him the miſſionaries have recourſe.*] Father Adam, writing a book againſt Mr Daillé, produced *I know not how many Germans, one Giles Hunnius, one Zephyrius, one Gibelin, one Philip Nicholas, and one Granverus* (3), who are full of invectives againſt the Calviniſts. He chiefly inſiſted upon a treatiſe of Grawerus, intituled, *The moſt abſurd abſurdities of the Calviniſtical abſurdities* (4). Here follows the prudent anſwer of Mr Daillé, but ſomewhat diſobliging to the author I ſpeak of in this article. 'They are angry brethren; we muſt excuſe their paſſion, and comfort ourſelves with the teſtimony that even their virulence gives to the goodneſs of our cauſe, in our controverſies with them. Were they not in the wrong, they would not come to injurious language. It is certainly error that diſcompoſes them. Truth has more gentleneſs and reſerve, and is not uſed to fly out into ſuch outrage. For, that Luther and his diſciples were in a rage, when they writ thoſe ſhameful and horrible things you have collected, is evident by the extravagance of their very words; as, to omit the reſt, by this ridiculous title of one of their books, which you fail not to repreſent: *The moſt abſurd abſurdities of the Calviniſtical abſurdities.* A learned man would not ſpeak ſo fooliſhly if he was in his right ſenſes.' He concludes that chapter with theſe words: *Thanks be to* GOD, *they are not all ſo paſſionate as your Gibelins and Granveres. Some of them are more gentle and tractable; and the late Dr Calixtus, a divine of Helmſtadt, the moſt learned of all the Lutherans of his time, has ſufficiently ſhewn it in two or three books* (*), *which he publiſhed upon this ſubject* (5).

Note, That Mr Daillé might have taxed the jeſuit Adam with ill tranſlating the title of our Grawerus's book. This is the true tranſlation of it: *The Calviniſtical abſurdities more abſurd than all other abſurdities.*

(3) So it is in Mr Daillé's Reply, part II, pag. 86; but it ſhould be Grawerus.

(4) *The Latin title is,* Abſurda abſurdorum abſurdiſſima, Calviniſtica abſurda, hoc eſt invicta demonſtratio Logica & Theologica aliquot horrendorum paradoxorum Calviniani dogmatis in articulis de perſona Chriſti, Cœna Domini, baptiſmo, & prædeſtinatione. *Jenæ*, 1612, *in 4to. It is the ſecond edition.*

* Judicium de Controv. Luther. & Ref. ann. 1650. Deſiderium & ſtudium Concord. Eccleſ. ann. 1651.

(5) Daillé, Replique à Adam, part. II, chap. xiv, pag. m. 86.

[*C*] *He was furious .... in verbal diſputes ... and in his writings.*] He had a conference with Amling, in the year 1604, in the caſtle of Schochwiz; and he printed it with notes, which breathed nothing but his zeal for Lutheraniſm: *Veritatis Lutheranæ amore notulis quibuſdam aſperſis evulgatum* (colloquium cum Amlingo). He never made ſuch efforts in favour of his party as on that occaſion. 'Singulari zelo & fervore ſpiritus ſancti motus ſtrenuè & maſculè adverſus hoſtium quorumvis cohortes depugnavit, nec quicquam omiſit quo veritatis cœleſtis doctrina aſſeri propugnarique queat, CUM PRIMIS in graviſſimo illo colloquio cum Amlingo habito (6).—— *Being moved by an extraordinary zeal, and the fervor of the holy ſpirit, he ſtrenuouſly, and with manly courage, oppoſed whole legions of foes, and omitted nothing, which might aſſert and defend the heavenly doctrine of truth;* ESPECIALLY *in the conference he had with Amling.*' Judge how much he inveighed againſt Sebaſtian Lamius, whom he convicted of Calviniſm in a ſynod. *Quemadmodum etiam in ſynodo Hungarico-Keyſmarcenſi anno* 95 *habita Sebaſtianum Lamium heterodoxiæ Calvinianæ convicit* (7). No doubt he accuſed him as a falſe brother, who, under the name of a Lutheran miniſter, hatched Calviniſtical errors; which alone was ſufficient to heat a man of a ſedate mind: Beſides, he diſputed againſt him in a ſynod. The circumſtance of the place was enough of itſelf to move his ſpleen. I muſt not forget, that he was called, *the ſword and the ſhield of Lutheraniſm* (8).

(6) Spizelius, in Templo Honoris reſerato, pag. 43.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) Id. pag. 40.

[*D*] His writings *are numerous.*] The bare titles will manifeſt the exceſs of his zeal. *Bellum Calvini & Jeſu Chriſti*, at Magdeburg 1605. *Harmonia præcipuorum Calvinianorum & Photinianorum*, at Jena 1612, in 4to. I have already mentioned the *Abſurda abſurdorum*, &c. His *Anti-Lubinus, hoc eſt Elenchus paradoxorum & emblematum Calviniſticorum D. Eilhardi Lubini, de prima cauſa & natura mali*, at Magdeburg 1606, in 4to, is a book againſt the Calviniſts, though Eilhard Lubin lived and died a Lutheran, as Mr Baillet affirms (9); for doubtleſs Grawerus ſuſpected him to be of Calvin's opinion in ſome things. I omit the titles of his other books. You will find them in Spizelius (10), and in Paul Freherus (11).

(9) In the firſt Tome of the *Anti*, pag. 351.

(10) Ubi ſupra, pag. 40.

(11) Theatrum Viror. illuſtr. pag. 395.

GREGORY I,

GREGORY I, ſurnamed the Great, born at Rome of a patrician family, diſcovered ſo much ability in the exerciſe of the ſenatorial office, that the emperor Juſtin the younger made him prefect of Rome (*a*). He laid down this dignity, when he found, that it made him too fond of the world, and ſhut himſelf up in a convent [*A*], under the

(*a*) Maimbourg, Hiſtoire du Pontificat de St Gregoire.

[*A*] *He ſhut himſelf up in a convent.*] It was in that of St Andrew. He had founded it at Rome in his paternal houſe (1), and had given the government of it to Valentius, whom he took from a country monaſtery (2). He founded ſix other convents in Sicily, *and ſold the reſt of his eſtate, and gave the price of it to the poor* (3).

(1) Maimbourg, Hiſtoire du Pontificat de St Gregoire le Grand, pag. 7, Dutch Edit.

(2) Monaſterio ſuo urbano Valentium ex Monaſterio S. Equitii in provincia Valeria accitum præfecit. *Cave, Hiſt. Literar. Scriptor. Eccleſ.* pag. 430.

(3) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra.

the diſcipline of the abbot Valentius (*b*). He was quickly taken out of it by Pope Pelagius II, who made him his ſeventh deacon, and ſent him nuncio to Conſtantinople, to demand ſuccours againſt the Lombards. He returned to Rome after the death of the emperor [*B*], and was for ſome time ſecretary to Pope Pelagius; after which he obtained leave to retire into his monaſtery (*c*). When he thought to enjoy there a quiet life, he was elected Pope by the clergy, the ſenate, and people of Rome; and, after uſing all imaginable means to avoid this dignity [*C*], he was obliged to accept it (*d*). It appeared by his conduct, that they could not have elected a more deſerving perſon for that great poſt; for, beſides that he was learned, and inſtructed the church by writing and preaching, he knew very well how to manage the tempers of princes for the temporal and ſpiritual intereſts of religion. The particulars of his conduct in this reſpect would carry me too far; and I am the more willing not to enlarge upon it, becauſe every body may inform himſelf of it in a modern writer (*e*). But I ſhall obſerve, that our Pope undertook the converſion of the Engliſh [*D*], and happily effected it, by the aſſiſtance

(*b*) Others call him Valentinus.

(*c*) Maimbourg, pag. 7, & 8.

(*d*) He was inſtalled the third of September, 590.

(*e*) Maimbourg, in the above quoted book.

[*B*] *He returned to Rome after the death of the emperor.*] This emperor's name was Tiberius: He died the 14th of Auguſt 582 (4); which manifeſts a great fault of Mr Maimbourg. He ſays (5), that, though Gregory could obtain no ſuccour, *yet he proved very uſeful and ſerviceable to the church*, ſince he compoſed, at Conſtantinople, his *excellent book of morals upon Job, and by his learned conferences obliged the patriarch Eutychius to retract his errors* concerning the reſurrection. *After which*, continues he, *his nunciature ending by the emperor Tiberius's deceaſe, who died at that time .... he returned to Rome.* He places theſe conferences in the year 586; he muſt therefore believe, that Tiberius did not die before this year, which is a groſs error in chronology. Dr Cave places the ſame conferences and the death of this emperor in the year 586 (6). He has therefore committed the ſame fault. Baronius (7) places likewiſe this emperor's death in the ſame year: His falſe chronology was not known to Mr du Pin (8).

(4) Chron. Alexandr. *See Father Pagi*, Diſſert. Hypatica, pag. 336, & Denys de Sainte Marthe, pag. 100, 101, *of St Gregory's Hiſtory*.

(5) Ubi ſupra, pag. 8.

(6) Ubi ſupra, pag. 430.

(7) In Annal.

(8) Nouv. Bibl. des Auteurs Eccleſiaſt. Tom. V, pag. 102. Dutch Edit.

[*C*] *He uſed all imaginable means to avoid this dignity.*] He wrote to the emperor a moſt preſſing letter, in which *he intreats him not to confirm his election, and to give orders for the immediate choice of another man of a greater capacity, ſtrength, and holineſs, than he* (9); and, when he underſtood, that his letter had been intercepted by the governor of Rome, being perſuaded that his election would be confirmed at the imperial court, he betook himſelf to flight, and *went and hid himſelf in a cave in the midſt of a foreſt, being reſolved to live there ...... till, not knowing where to find him, they ſhould proceed to a new election* (10). He could never reſolve to accept the papal dignity, till he underſtood from ſome heavenly ſigns, that it was GOD's will he ſhould be Pope. It is ſaid (11), that *a dove flying before thoſe that looked for him, led them the way they were to go*; or, *that a miraculous light diſcovered to them the place of his retreat.* This very much reſembles the adventure of the Magi who went to worſhip the new born Meſſiah. Mr Maimbourg's exclamation upon St Gregory's reluctancy, is very judicious. 'A great example, ſays he (12), which ought to confound the furious ambition of thoſe, who, having nothing comparable to the holineſs, learning, and ability of this great man, who buried himſelf alive in the earth, to avoid the pontificate as a thunderbolt, do, by their ſcandalous intriguing, a kind of violence to the Holy Ghoſt, to raiſe themſelves, againſt his orders, by ways purely human and uncanonical, to the higheſt place in the church'. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (13), in the extract of a book, intituled, *De Clerico renitente*. I ought not to forget another paſſage of Maimbourg, concerning St Gregory's anſwers to the letters he received from all parts (14), 'To let him know how much they ſhared in the joy, which every body expreſſed for his exaltation ..... He anſwered, that he was extreamly ſorry he had been taken from his ſolitude, to be engaged anew in worldly affairs. But, becauſe experience has ſhewn in all ages (it is Maimbourg's reflexion) that the fine things, which a man of parts can ſpeak and write, are not always a good proof of his integrity and virtue; and that many think and act quite contrary to what they preach and write; I ſhall not inſert here what this great pontiff ſaid of himſelf upon this ſubject in his writings.' But there is one thing, which equity will not allow me to omit: It is a fault of the famous Peter du Moulin, animadverted upon by Mr Maimbourg. That no body may complain of my extenuating or amplifying the thing, I will uſe the animadverter's own words (15).

(9) Maimb. ibid. pag. 13.

(10) Id. ibid. pag. 10.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Pag. 14.

(13) For the month of February, 1685, pag. 179.

(14) Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 14.

'The miniſter du Moulin, in a little piece he has written, under the falſe title of *The life of St Gregory* I, *ſurnamed the Great* .... would make us believe .... that this Roman pontiff was of a religion contrary to ours. But, not to give myſelf the trouble of confuting ſo wretched a libel, I ſhall only ſhew, to evince what credit he deſerves, that he begins with the moſt horrible and groſſeſt impoſture that ever was. For thus he ſpeaks, in the ſecond chapter, pag. 9, to prove, againſt the teſtimony of Gregory of Tours, that St Gregory did not oppoſe his being created biſhop. *Thoſe, ſays he, who have written St Gregory's life, particularly Gregory of Tours, ſay, that he made ſome reſiſtance; but this does not agree with what St Gregory himſelf ſays, in the fourth epiſtle of the firſt book, where he ſays, that he did not oppoſe his being made a biſhop, and he cites in the margin theſe words*; Sibi ut imponeretur epiſcopatus non reſtitiſſe. Let any one read that epiſtle, and he will find the quite contrary. St Gregory complains to his friend John, patriarch of Conſtantinople, that he had not, by his good offices, which he ſhould have done him with the emperor, hindered the confirmation of his election; and he ſpeaks in this manner: *If we are commanded to love our neighbour as ourſelves; why do not you love me as yourſelf? For I know with what earneſtneſs you have declined epiſcopacy; and yet you did not interpoſe againſt the laying this ſame burden upon me.* St Gregory here complains in expreſs words, that the patriarch did not oppoſe his being made biſhop of Rome; and the miniſter du Moulin will have it, that St Gregory confeſſes in this place, *that he made no reſiſtance*, aſcribing to that holy Pope, what he himſelf ſays of the patriarch of Conſtantinople by way of complaint.'

(15) Maimbourg, *in the preface to his* Hiſtoire du Pontificat de St Gregoire.

[*D*] *He undertook the converſion of the Engliſh.*] He ſent into England ſome monks of his monaſtery (16), under the conduct of Auguſtin their abbot (17), *whom the biſhops of France conſecrated firſt biſhop of the Engliſh nation, according to the power they had from St Gregory* (18). Etheldred reigned then in England, and had married Aldeberga, or Bertha, daughter to Charibert king of France, *a young princeſs of much wit, inſtructed in good learning, and very zealous for the Catholic faith* (19). She diſpoſed him to hearken to the Pope's miſſionaries. 'He ordered them to come into his preſence, and would not hear them but in the open field, according to an ancient ſuperſtition of the people, that if they had a mind to uſe any charm, or ſecret enchantment, to deceive him, it might vaniſh away, and loſe all it's force in the open air .... He heard them very calmly, and told them, that he was extreamly well pleaſed with what they ſaid; but that thoſe fine things, eſpecially the magnificent promiſes they had made him of an eternal life, not appearing to him very certain, he did not think it expedient to forſake what he had learned from his anceſtors, to run after uncertainties (20).' He permitted them to preach in his kingdom, and ſuffered all thoſe, who liked their doctrine, to embrace it. He himſelf was converted (21.) 'And, becauſe the example of kings is commonly very powerful, either in good or ill things, moſt of the Engliſh embraced the Chriſtian faith after him. And that, which compleated their converſion, was his gentleneſs and moderation. For he

'did

(16) Viz *Of the monaſtery which he had founded at Rome, in his own houſe.*

(17) Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 201.

(18) Id. ibid. pag. 206.

(19) Ibid. pag. 207.

(20) Ibid. pag. 208, ad ann. 597.

(21) Ibid. pag. 212, ad ann. 600.

aſſiſtance of a woman (*f*), according to the uſual courſe of revolutions of religion. His maxims concerning the conſtraint of conſcience were not uniform, and he ſometimes was very remiſs [*E*]. And indeed it is very difficult to have rules for a thing ſo contrary to

did not force any body to renounce their ancient ſuperſtitions, having learnt from his teachers, that the ſervice that is done to JESUS CHRIST ought to be voluntary (22).' The queen mightily contributed to theſe converſions; for ſhe not only diſpoſed the king her huſband to uſe the miſſionaries kindly, but alſo to become a convert. There have been few revolutions of religion, either for the better or worſe, which women have not chiefly influenced. Maimbourg gives us ſome examples of it (23). 'We may ſay, that, as the devil formerly made uſe of the artifices of three empreſſes *, the wives of Licinius, Conſtantius, and Valens, to eſtabliſh the Arian hereſy in the eaſt; ſo God, to aſſault his enemy with his own weapons, was pleaſed to employ three glorious queens, Clotilda, wiſe of Clovis; Ingonda, wiſe of Ermenigildus; and Theodelinda, wiſe of Agilulphus, to ſanctify the weſt, by converting the French from Heatheniſm, and exterminating Arianiſm out of Spain and Italy, by the converſion of the weſtern Goths and Lombards.' In another work, he had only mentioned the ſervices done by women to bad cauſes. 'As if it was the fate of every hereſy, ſays he (24), as has been verified by an hundred examples, ſtill to find it's protection, and, if I may ſo expreſs myſelf, it's ſtrength in the weakneſs of ſome princeſs, who, either out of vanity to procure herſelf honour, or out of illuſion, thinking perhaps to merit by it, deſires to become the head of a party, which, not being able to maintain itſelf, falls, and, at laſt, overwhelms her miſerably under it's ruins.'

[*E*] *He ſometimes was very remiſs.*] The inconſiſtency of his maxims manifeſtly appears in his not approving, that the Jews ſhould be forced to be baptized, and approving the conſtraining of heretics to return to the church. 'St Avitus, biſhop of Clermont in Auvergne . . . . going after his clergy, in a proceſſion through the city, all the people that followed him . . . . . fell ſuddenly upon a ſynagogue of the Jews, and pulled it down, ſo that there remained nothing of it but the place all levelled, without ſo much as one ſtone upon another (25). The prelate, *deſigning to make uſe of ſo favourable an occaſion*, ordered the Jews to be told, that they muſt either be converted, or depart out of his dioceſe. Three hundred of them were converted, and the reſt obliged to depart. 'This example was quickly after followed in Spain and Italy, and eſpecially in Provence, where more ſtill was done than he did. For, without endeavouring to bring them over to the Chriſtian faith by holy inſtructions and good examples, they forced them to be baptized whether they would or not; which cauſed as many profanations of ſo ſacred a thing, and as many ſacrileges, as there were baptized Jews. St Gregory, to prevent ſo great a miſchief, wrote † to Virgilius archbiſhop of Arles, and to Theodorus biſhop of Marſeilles, two very good men, commanding them to ſee, that the Jews ſhould not be forced to receive baptiſm, for fear the ſacred fonts, in which men are regenerated to a divine liſe by baptiſm, ſhould be to them an occaſion of a ſecond death, more fatal to them than the firſt by apoſtacy. He had written, a little before, the ſame thing to the biſhop of Terracina (26).' He commanded him to leave the Jews *the entire liberty of aſſembling in the place that was granted them for the celebration of their feaſts* (27). This is what he wrote ſome time after to the biſhop of Cagliari in Sardinia. 'The laws, *ſays he to him*, indeed forbid the Jews to build new ſynagogues; but they permit them to poſſeſs the old ones without any moleſtation ‡. And he adds, what he ſaid alſo upon occaſion of the Jews of Marſeilles, that they are to be won to the faith by preaching, and not by violence; that GOD will have the ſacrifice of the mind and heart to be voluntary; and he adds, that ſuch as are converted by force and neceſſity, return to their vomit, when they can (28).' So far all goes very right; but here follows a ſtrange diſtinction, which makes a monſtrous medley in his ſyſtem. '(29) Not but that, according to him, there is in this a great difference betwixt infidels and heretics, eſpecially at the beginning of hereſies. For the latter ought to be treated as rebels, traytors, and perjured people, who have violated their faith to GOD and the Catholic church, from which they are departed, by revolting againſt her, and attempting as much as in them lies, to deſtroy her. They may be forced to return to their obedience and duty; and, if they will not do it, they ought to be puniſhed, according to the imperial laws, the holy fathers, and Calvin himſelf, who wrote a treatiſe upon this ſubject, to juſtify his conduct, with reſpect to Servetus, whom he cauſed to be condemned to the flames at Geneva. It is otherwiſe with Heathens, Jews, and Mahometans; and even with thoſe heretics, who, being born in hereſy, which they have received from their anceſtors, have not been bred up in the church any more than thoſe infidels. They ought not to be conſtrained directly and by main force, eſpecially when they have been tolerated for ſome time. But St Gregory teaches us, both by his doctrine and example, that it is good to conſtrain them indirectly, according to the goſpel, which ſays, *Compelle intrare*;' *which may be done two ways*; by a rigorous treatment of the obſtinate; and by doing good to thoſe that are converted. 'It is thus St Gregory will have the Manichees to be perſecuted who are obſtinate in their hereſy: and that he orders the biſhop of Cagliari to raiſe the taxes of the peaſants, and of thoſe among the Heathens that belong to the church, and hold her lands, and ſtill poſitively refuſe to embrace Chriſtianity: but, on the contrary, he will have the converted Jews to be eaſed of one third of what they are obliged to pay to the Roman church for the lands of her patrimony, which they cultivate in Sicily, that the others, being allured by the hopes of a like abatement, may more eaſily turn Chriſtians; and to ſuch as might ſuſpect theſe intereſted converſions, he ſays *, that, if theſe people are hypocrites, and not true converts, yet much will be got by it, in that their children at leaſt will become good Catholics.'

This might afford matter for a long diſcourſe; but I ſhall content myſelf with ſome few notes. I. It is certain, that the alternative of converſion or baniſhment is very hard, and moſt proper to make hypocrites. For what will not people of an indifferent piety do, not to loſe the delights of their native country? In a word, all thoſe, who propoſe this alternative, condemn it as a tyrannical action, wherever they are expoſed to it themſelves; an evident ſign, that they only judge of the juſtice of an action by the rule of their intereſt, *Quod volumus ſanctum eſt*. II. This is giving the church a power, which ſhe has not, to pretend, ſhe can treat all thoſe, that leave her, as temporal ſtates treat rebels. The church can have none but voluntary ſubjects, and can never require an oath derogatory to the law of order, which will have us, at all times, and in all places, to follow the light of conſcience; and conſequently thoſe who, to obey this light, break the faith, which they have given her, ought to be compared to thoſe, who prefer primitive and abſolute oaths, before poſterior and conditional ones; for it would be an impious thing to engage in a formulary of faith, without preſuppoſing it to be good: and thus all the oaths, by which men are engaged to the church, are conditional; but the obligation to the light of conſcience is natural, eſſential, and abſolute. What may be ſaid of thoſe, who, to obey their conſcience, break their oaths to the church, is, that from underſtanding men they are grown ignorant. But is there any well governed ſtate, that enacts any puniſhment againſt ſuch as forget their learning, and againſt thoſe who get new notions, whereby they are perſuaded, that what they took to be an error is a truth? We may therefore ſay, that, if the church had the power to puniſh, as rebels, ſuch as forſake her, ſhe would have a greater power than is exerciſed by the moſt deſpotic princes (30). She might puniſh as a capital crime the change of ſome ideas. III. It is no difficult thing to apprehend, that this is a chimerical diſtinction; for a man, who has been bred up in the church, could never renounce the power of leaving it, whenever his conſcience ſhould prompt him to ſide with another communion: and therefore he has as much

SOME Reflexions upon the maxims of St Gregory, concerning the conſtraint of conſcience.

(*f*) See the remark [*D*].

(22) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres *for February* 1686, *pag.* 193, 201, *againſt Maimbourg's compariſon between the converting method of Ethelred, and that of Lewis XIV.*

(23) Ubi ſupra, pag. 69.

* Conſtantia, Euſebia, Dominica.

(24) Hiſt. du grand Schiſme d'Occident, livr. ii, pag. m. 183, *ſpeaking of the princeſs of Wales, who protected Wicliffe See alſo what he ſays in the ſame work, livr. iv, pag.* 79.

(25) Maimb. Hiſt. du Pontific. de St Gregoire, pag. 239.

† Dum quiſpiam ad baptiſmatis fontem non prædicatione, ſed neceſſitate pervenerit, ad priſtinam ſuperſtitionem remeans inde deterius moritur, unde renatus eſſe videbatur. *Lib. i, Epiſt. xlv.*

(26) Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 240.

(27) Ibid. pag. 241.

‡ Quia ſicut legalis definitio Judæos novas non patitur erigere Synagogas. Ita quoque eos ſine inquietudine veteres habere permittit.

(28) Ibid. pag. 242.

(29) Ibid. pag. 243, 244.

* Etſi ipſi minus fideliter veniunt: hi tamen qui de iis nati fuerint jam fidelius baptiſantur Aut ipſos ergo, aut eorum filios lucramur. *Lib. ix, Epiſt. vi.*

(30) That is, being conſidered only as ſovereigns; for it is to be obſerved, that the ſovereigns, who puniſh what they call hereſy, do it only by virtue of their religion; and therefore, properly ſpeaking, it is their religion that inflicts the puniſhment: QUOD NOTANDUM.

to reaſon. But, to make amends for it, his morals concerning the chaſtity of eccleſiaſtics were very rigid [*F*]: For he pretended, that a man, who had loſt his virginity, ought not to be admitted to the prieſthood; and he ordered the candidates to be examined upon that point. He excepted widowers from that neceſſity, provided they had been regular in their marriage, and had lived for a long time continent. He was alſo very ſevere with reſpect to calumny [*G*]. All things duly conſidered, he deſerves the ſirname

much right to follow that communion, as thoſe that have been bred in it; for all the right of the latter conſiſts in being perſuaded that their religion is good. IV. My maxims are ſo certain, that each party acknowledges the truth of them, when they do not ſuppoſe their own principle. A Jew is ſo far from calling a man, who forſakes Chriſtianity to embrace Judaiſm, a traytor and a rebel, that he calls him a man faithful to GOD, to the truth, and to the true church: he calls none perfidious men, but ſuch as renounce the Jewiſh religion. This is the way of all religions. V. As for the two methods of the *Compelle intrare*, I refer the reader to the Philoſophical Commentary. I ſhall only obſerve, that the epithet of *Merchants of the word of GOD* (31) belongs peculiarly to thoſe who uſe theſe two ways of converting (32); and that it is morally impoſſible but that ſovereigns, who authorize them, muſt be put upon unjuſt and baſe meaſures (33). VI. The reaſon why St Gregory would not have the Jews to be converted by force, is very good; becauſe, ſaid he, thoſe, that are converted in that manner, return to their vomit, when they can ſafely do it. He was therefore very much in the wrong, to order that they ſhould be converted, by over-rating the obſtinate, and diſcharging thoſe, that turned Chriſtians, from a third part of the tax; for it is manifeſt, that they, who are converted in that manner, return to their vomit, when they have it in their power. VII. And, if his reaſon for converting the Jews, by raiſing the taxes of the obſtinate, and moderating thoſe of the converted, be good, he is to blame for diſapproving the forcing them to baptiſm; for conſider his reaſon: If they are not true converts, *yet much will be got by it, in that their children at leaſt will be good Catholics*. May not the ſame thing be ſaid with reſpect to thoſe that are baptized by force? He cannot therefore be excuſed from a pitiful contradiction.

[*F*] *His morals concerning the chaſtity of eccleſiaſtics were very rigid.*] In the buſineſs of chooſing a biſhop, he principally recommended it to the electors to inform themſelves, whether the perſon propoſed was guilty of adultery, or meer fornication. ‘Nay, he would have them to aſk him in private whether he had been guilty of that ſin, admoniſhing him, that, if he was guilty of it, tho' no body knew it, and there was no proof to convict him, yet he could not in conſcience receive orders; that, nevertheleſs, they ſhould be given him, if he proteſted that he was free from that vice; but, if he confeſſed it, it ſhould be gently repreſented to him, that he ought rather to think of a cloiſter to do penance, than of the prieſthood, of which his crime, tho' ſecret, made him unworthy (34). This great pontiff underſtanding (35), ‘That ſome eccleſiaſtics of Sardinia had committed that ſin, after they had received orders, ordered not only that they ſhould be depoſed, without any hopes of being ever reſtored to the functions of their miniſtry; but alſo that, to prevent ſo great an evil, none ſhould be admitted * to ſacred orders, and eſpecially to epiſcopacy, without aſſurance, that they had always lived chaſtly, and even preſerved their continency many years after they were ſeparated from their wives, in order to be admitted to the prieſthood.’ The ſuffrages being divided at Naples in the election of a biſhop, this Pope, without more ado, declared plainly that he could not approve John the Deacon (36), ‘(37) becauſe he had been well informed he had a very little daughter. What preſumption, added he, is this in him, to aſpire to epiſcopacy, when he is manifeſtly convicted, by this little child, of the ſmall ſpace of time he has preſerved his continence †?’ He cauſed it to be inviolably obſerved, according to the canons, ‘that every eccleſiaſtic and beneficed man, whether ſub-deacon, deacon, prieſt, abbot, or biſhop, who ſhould be guilty of impurity, if there were proofs of his crime, ſhould be depoſed, and put to penance in a monaſtery, and incapacitated to be ever reſtored to his order and dignity . . . . . . Hearing ⸸ that the abbot Secundinus, who was a very wicked man, had committed horrible crimes, he ſaid, that, without ſeeking proofs for a judicial conviction, it ſufficed that he himſelf, perhaps boaſting of what this ſort of debauchees call a good fortune, had confeſſed, ‡ that he had ſported with women, which had not hindered him from being an abbot; whereupon he cauſed him to be depoſed (38).’ He treated in the ſame manner the *biſhop of Docleatina, a city of Illyricum, at preſent called Cataro*; and he gave order to his metropolitan, ‘that, if this wicked man, who had been juſtly depoſed for having ſtained his character by this infamous vice, durſt ever pretend, or even intimate by a ſingle word, that he had ſtill ſome thoughts of being a biſhop, he ſhould be confined to a monaſtery to do penance all his life time, and be deprived of the communion till his death **. What is very obſervable herein, is, that the biſhop of Tarentum being not accuſed, but only ſuſpected, of keeping a concubine ſince he was a biſhop, he adviſes him very ſeriouſly, that, if he is conſcious of this crime, tho' it were in ſecret, and he denied it, and there was no convincing proof againſt him, yet he is obliged in conſcience to depoſe himſelf, and to forbear all ſacerdotal functions. This will ſeem the more ſtrange, becauſe this biſhop having committed another crime, which in the eyes of the world ſeems to be much greater, he inflicted a much leſſer puniſhment on him. For this angry prelate having been diſobliged by one of the poor old women, that were kept at the expence of the church, cauſed her to be beaten at ſuch a rate, that ſhe remained half dead. It is certain, that, if ſhe had died a few days after ſhe had been ſo cruelly beaten, he had been moſt ſeverly puniſhed, according to the rigour of the canons, as guilty of murther: however, becauſe ſhe died not till eight months after, St Gregory did not think, that her death was to be aſcribed to the blows ſhe had received, and contented himſelf with ſuſpending him for two months. But for the ſin of incontinence, which, by the laws of human juſtice, ſhould be puniſhed leſs rigorouſly than that other action ſo unworthy of a biſhop, he declared to him, that, if he had committed it, tho' it could not be proved, it was abſolutely neceſſary, for the ſatiſfaction of his conſcience, that he ſhould leave his biſhopric (39).’

Mr Maimbourg does not leave this ſubject without ſaying, ‘that the rigour of the canons upon this point is not at preſent in uſe, and that a man is not obliged to follow St Gregory's opinion upon this caſe of conſcience (40).’

[*G*] *He was very ſevere with reſpect to calumny.*] All that Mr Maimbourg ſays upon this ſubject ſeems ſo good to me, that, finding nothing uſeleſs in it, I ſhall not abridge it. He obſerves (41) firſt, that there is a very ſubtile oppreſſion, †† *and the more dangerous, becauſe it is moſt difficult to be diſcovered*, viz. *Calumny, which the wiſeſt of men, and even thoſe, who glory in ſuffering joyfully the firſt* (42), *find ſo barbarous and intolerable, that they cannot hinder their conſtancy from being ſhaken, be their minds ever ſo ſtrong.* After which, he goes on thus: ‘I know that the ⸸⸸ civil and canon laws appoint puniſhments for this crime, ſo much complained of in the world; but they are not always well obſerved with reſpect to eccleſiaſtics, as St Gregory teſtifies, and eſpecially in the communities, where calumny hardly meets with any rebuke, under pretence that the puniſhing of a falſe accuſation would take away the liberty of bringing true ones, and diſcovering puniſhable faults to the ſuperiors. Now this is what St Gregory could in no wiſe bear with, as appears by many of his letters. In effect, Epiphanius ‡‡, prieſt of the church of Cagliari, having been falſely accuſed of ſome great crime by other Sardinian eccleſiaſtics, who had even brought the accuſation before the Pope; he himſelf, ſurname of Great: But he cannot be excuſed for proſtituting his praiſes, to inſinuate himſelf into the favour of an uſurper [*H*], who had lately committed the moſt execrable parricide that hiſtory affords. It is a very remarkable inſtance of the ſlavery a man falls into, when he will maintain himſelf in great poſts. If we compare his flatteries of the emperor Phocas, with thoſe, wherewith he careſſed a moſt wicked queen of France [*I*], we muſt acknowledge, that they, who forced him to be Pope, knew him

---

(31) 2 Cor. ii, 17.

(32) *This puts me in mind of theſe two verſes of Ennius:* Nec mi aurum poſco, nec mi pretium dederitis,
Nec cauponantes bellum, ſed belligerantes.
Give me nor gold, nor baſe reward, but thoſe,
Who fight to conquer, not to trade in, foes.
Cicero, de Offic. lib i, cap. xii.

(33) *See the* New Letters againſt Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm, Tom. I, pag. 205, & ſeq. *and what is ſaid of queen Mary's way of converting people in England.* Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres, Novemb. 1685, pag. 1283.

(34) Maimb. ibid. pag. 351.

(35) Id. ibid.

* Sed ne unquam ii qui ordinati ſunt pereant, provideri debet quales ordinantur, ut prius aſpiciatur ſi vita illorum continens in annis plurimis fuerit, &c. *Lib. iii, Epiſt. xxvi.*

(36) *One of the two, who had been elected.*

(37) Maimbourg, ibid. pag. 353.

† Nam quâ præſumptione ad epiſcopatum audet accedere, qui adhuc longam corporis ſui continentiam, filiola teſte, convincitur non habere. *Lib. viii, Ep. xi.*

⸸ Qui poſt acceptum ſacrum ordinem lapſus in peccatum carnis fuerit, ſacro ordine ita careat ut ad altaris miniſterium ulterius non accedat. *Lib. iii, Epiſt. xxvi.* Si Clericus fuerit à ſuo remotus officio, pro ſuis continuo lugendis exceſſibus in monaſterium detrudatur. *Lib. iii, Ep. ix. Lib. i, Ep. xviii, xlii.*

‡ Hoc ſolum ad ejus damnationem poteſt ſufficere, quod etiam ipſe de ſe dicitur fuiſſe confeſſus quod à ſtatu habitus ſui in lapſum corporis ceciderit. *Lib ii, Ep. xxiii, Ind.* 11.

(38) Maimb. ibid. pag. 354.

** Si forte poſt depoſitionem ſuam inverecunde ac mente perverſa aliquid de epiſcopatu loqui, atque rurſus ad hoc qualibet aſpirare præſumptione tentaverit *Lib. x, Ep. xxxiv.*

(39) Maimb. ibid. pag. 355, & ſeq.

(40) Maimb. ibid.

(41) Id. ibid. pag. 460.

†† Calumnia conturbat ſapientem. *Eccl. cap. vii, ver.* 8.

(42) *That is, the unhappineſs of being oppreſſed by the violence of thoſe who govern.*

⸸⸸ Digeſt. lib. iii, tit. 2, Grat. cap. v, q. 6, cauſ. 6, q. 1.

‡‡ Lib. iii, Ind. 12, Epiſt. xxiv.

better

‘ ſelf had a mind to hear the cauſe thoroughly. And, as he found it was nothing but a meer calumny, wherewith they deſigned to oppreſs this prieſt's innocence, he ſent him back fully abſolved to his biſhop, enjoining him to reſtore him to his order, and to deprive the accuſer of the communion, unleſs he was ready to ſhew, by canonical and moſt evident proofs, the truth of his allegations. This is what the law * requires, which adds, that the falſe accuſer of his brother ought to undergo the ſame puniſhment the accuſed would deſerve, if he was found guilty. Here is ſomething farther. Hilary, ſub-deacon of the church of Naples, having brought a falſe accuſation againſt John, deacon of the ſame church, which could not be maintained againſt many witneſſes, who atteſted the deacon's innocence; the holy pontiff was very much offended, that Paſchaſius, their biſhop, had not as yet puniſhed the ſlanderer. Whereupon he gave order to the defender, Anthemius, to tell him from him, that he would have him firſt deprived of his office of ſub-deacon (†), of which he was unworthy: ſecondly, that he ſhould be publickly whipped; for this ſort of correction was in uſe at that time to chaſtiſe clerks, as may be ſeen in St Auſtin (⸸), tho' this cuſtom has been ſince aboliſhed: and laſtly, that, having been thus chaſtiſed, he be ſent into exile, that is, either into a monaſtery to do penance, or by the order of the magiſtrate, to whom alone it belonged to puniſh a criminal with baniſhment by the law of the ſtate. And as he manifeſted his abhorrence of calumny, by puniſhing it ſo ſeverely; ſo he kept ſtrictly upon his guard, that he might not be overreached; and never believed any informer, till having examined the leaſt circumſtances of the accuſation, and exactly heard both ſides, he could not in the leaſt doubt of the truth of it. He was moreover ſo much afraid of being deceived by the artifices of calumniators, that, when he could, he forbore giving his judgment about an accuſation, referring himſelf to ſome other perſon, on whoſe ſufficiency and probity he intirely depended.’

[*H*] *He cannot be excuſed for proſtituting his praiſes, to inſinuate himſelf into the favour of an uſurper.*] The emperor Maurice's army, being revolted againſt him at the inſtigation of Phocas, marched towards Conſtantinople, and took it without any difficulty. The emperor was delivered to Phocas, *who by an unheard of cruelty, cauſed five little princes, Maurice's children, to be murdered in his preſence, before their father's eyes, whom that unfortunate father could not ſave* (43). The nurſe of the youngeſt had cunningly withdrawn him from the maſſacre, and ſubſtituted her own in his place; but Maurice, who perceived it, cauſed his own child to be returned to the executioners. (44). ‘After this, the tyrant, more cruel than the wildeſt beaſts, being no ways moved with ſo brave and generous an action, which melted all the aſſiſtants into tears, commanded this poor little innocent to be killed, and the bloody ſacrifice of his cruelty to be perfected, by laying Maurice upon the bodies of his five children, as upon an altar, where he was inhumanly butchered.’ The eldeſt ſon of Maurice had been a *little before ſent to the king of Perſia*; but he was taken at Nicæa, and beheaded. ‘The cruel Phocas put alſo to death almoſt all the relations and friends of the emperor Maurice, and even the empreſs Conſtantina, and her three daughters, contrary to the promiſe he had made to the patriarch Cyriacus, that he would ſuffer them quietly to live in a monaſtery where they were. In fine, there was never ſo much innocent blood ſhed, nor ſo many miſeries and misfortunes, as in his reign . . . . (45). And indeed there never was a more infamous tyrant than this wretched man, without virtue, birth, honour, and merit, horribly ill-ſhaped, abominably ugly, of a frightful aſpect, appearing always in a fury when he ſpoke, drunken, laſcivious, brutiſh, ſanguinary, without any ſenſe of humanity, being wholly a wild beaſt in his look and humour, and having nothing of a man, but a very deformed ſhape; in a word, having all the ill qualities, which may be ſet in oppoſition to thoſe, which the hiſtorians have extreamly praiſed in Maurice (46).’ I have uſed Maimbourg's words, that nobody may ſay I have aggravated Phocas's crimes, to caſt a greater blot upon St Gregory; and I will ſtill uſe the ſame author's expreſſions, as to this Pope's flatteries, that I may not be accuſed of repreſenting thing to his diſadvantage. *I confeſs*, ſays that hiſtorian (47), *that what I have been ſaying may offend thoſe, who, after this, ſhall read the three epiſtles* (‡) *which this holy Pope wrote to Phocas, and to Leontia his wife, when they knew at Rome what had been done at Conſtantinople, when he was crowned emperor there. For he ſeems in thoſe three letters to rejoice, and to thank GOD, for his coming to the crown, as for the greateſt advantage that could happen to the empire, and to ſpeak of him in the moſt advantageous terms, as of an admirable prince, who would make it flouriſh again, by delivering it from all miſeries wherewith it had hitherto been afflicted. And he thanks GOD, that the world, being delivered from ſo hard and uneaſy a yoke, began to enjoy the ſweets of liberty under his reign.* Maimbourg gives the beſt colour he can to this ſtrange flattery (48): he alledges ſeveral reaſons for it; but he ſays nothing of the true one; which is, that Maurice had declared for the patriarch of Conſtantinople againſt Pope Gregory (49), in very nice diſputes, ſuch as are always the differences about authority, or ſuperiority. The pope, overjoyed to be delivered from an emperor, who favoured the patriarch of Conſtantinople, loaded this new prince with praiſes, in order to obtain from him what he deſired againſt his rival (50). There are hardly any examples of a virtue, that has been proof againſt the jealouſy of authority, or the intereſt of a party. Tho' a prince be endowed with the nobleſt qualities, if he is withal contrary to a certain church, and is baniſhed, or killed, ſhe looks upon this as a heavenly favour, and reſpectfully kiſſes the human hand, that procures it, eſpecially when this hand acts contrary to the other prince. In ſuch a juncture, two contradictory propoſitions are found in the mouths of the clergy: the party, that loſes it's patron, conſiders this loſs as a horrid conſpiracy of infernal powers; it cites both divine and human laws againſt the revolution: but the other ſide ſpeaks of nothing but the wonderful ways of providence, the paternal care of heaven, and runs into political doctrines. But I queſtion whether this prepoſſeſſion was ever carried to ſuch infamies, as thoſe of St Gregory. What a fall! what blindneſs! what baſe condeſcenſion! a Pope, who is ſo ſevere to a poor fornificating clergyman, and ſo terrible in his ſentences thereupon, writes to Phocas, without ſo much as expreſſing his wiſh, that Maurice and his children had not ſuffered death. There are no men, that make greater outcries againſt the Sceptics than the clergy, and yet no men are more uſed to turn the rules of morality like a noſe of wax, according to the reciprocal intereſt of their cauſe: which at the bottom is a moſt dangerous Scepticiſm.

[*I*] *A moſt wicked queen of France.*] It was queen Brunehaut. In all the letters this Pope writ to her, he beſtowed upon her (51) *all the praiſes that can be given to one of the moſt perfect princeſſes in the world, ſo far as to make no difficulty to ſay, in a very affirmative manner, that the French nation was the moſt happy in the world, ſince they deſerved ſuch a queen, endowed with all ſorts of virtues and good qualities* (**). The following paſſage on this ſubject is to be found in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (52). We ought to *make more account* of this Pope's good intentions, *than of his exceſſive complaiſance for queen Brunehauld, the moſt wicked woman in the world, as almoſt all hiſtorians ſay, but at the ſame time the moſt artful at gaining the clergy, becauſe in the midſt of her heinous crimes, ſhe ſhewed an extraordinary munificence towards churchmen* (53), *and in her foundations of churches and con-*

vents,

---

* Cod. l. iv, & ix, tit. de probat. leg. finali. Cum calumniantes ad vindictam poſcat ſimilitudo ſupplicii. *Cauſ.* 2, *q.* 8, *c.* 3.

† *Lib. ix, Ind.* 4, *Ep. lxvi.* Ut eundem Hilarium prius ſubdiaconatus quo indignus fungitur privet officio atque verberibus publicè caſtigatum faciat in exilium deportari, ut unius pœna multorum poſſit eſſe correctio.

⸸ Qui modus coërcitionis, & à magiſtris liberalium artium, & ab ipſis parentibus, & ſæpe etiam, injudiciis ab epiſcopis ſolet uſurpari. *Aug. Ep. clix.*

(43) *See* Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 179.

(44) Ibid. pag. 180.

(45) Ibid. pag. 181.

(46) Ibid. pag. 182, ex Cedreno.

(47) Pag. 183.

‡ L. xi, Ep. xxxviii, Ind. 6, & 45, 46.

(48) *See how Dr Cave,* Hiſt. Liter. Scriptor. Eccleſ. pag. 431, *expreſſes himſelf:* Anno 603, datis ad Phocam tyrannum literis imperium illi peſſimis flagitiis arreptum gratulatus eſt: quin & ſi verum fateri fas ſit adeo turpiter in hac re lapſus eſt Gregorius, ut ſceleſtiſſimo parricidæ excogitatiſſimis adulandi artibus blandiri, & in piiſſimi principis Mauricii manes acerrime debacchari non erubeſceret.

(49) *Maimbourg owns it, pag.* 124.

(50) *Phocas favoured the court of Rome, and made a law, whereby he forbad the biſhop of Conſtantinople to ſtile himſelf Oecumenical Patriarch, declaring that this title did only belong to the biſhop of ancient Rome.* See Maimbourg, pag. 126.

(51) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, pag. 313.

** Præ aliis gentibus gentem Francorum aſſerimus felicem, quæ ſic bonis omnibus prædictam meruit habere reginam. *L. xi, Ep. viii.*

(52) Nouvelles de la republique des Lettres, Febr. 1686, pag. 196.

(53) *See* Maimbourg, ibid. pag. 236.

better than he knew himſelf. They perceived, that he had all the policy and addreſs, that are requiſite to get powerful protectors, and to draw earthly bleſſings upon the church. It is very probable, that the zeal he expreſſed againſt the ambition of the patriarch of Conſtantinople, was ill governed [*K*]. It is not certain, that he cauſed the noble monuments of the old Roman magnificence to be deſtroyed [*L*], leſt thoſe, who came to Rome, ſhould give more attention to the triumphal arches, &c. than to holy things. The ſame ought to be ſaid of what is reported, that he cauſed a vaſt number of Heathen books [*M*], and particularly Livy, to

vents, not forgetting to make a devout requeſt for relics to the holy Father ...... Maimbourg proves the exemptions, *which are ſaid to have been granted by this Pope to the pious queen Brunehauld, to be fictitious; for it is this virtue St Gregory praiſes in her, and the like will ever be done to any one that is liberal to the church, the cully of thoſe people, who ſometimes are cullies in their turn.* This puts me in mind of the anſwer that was given by a Carthuſian to Philip de Comines. ‘*The body of John Galeazzo,* a great and wicked tyrant ..... is in the Carthuſian monaſtery at Pavia, near the park, higher than the great altar, and the Carthuſians ſhewed it me, at leaſt his bones, which ſmell as nature requires: a native of Bourges called him *ſaint*, and I aſked him in his ear, why he called him *ſaint*, when he might ſee painted about him the arms of many towns he had uſurped, to which he had no right? ..... he anſwered me ſoftly, *in this country, we call ſaints all thoſe that are our benefactors* (54).’ This rule of theſe good monks is of all times and countries.

[*K*] *The zeal he expreſſed againſt the ambition of the patriarch of Conſtantinople was ill governed.*] This patriarch is honoured as a ſaint in the Greek church. He was called *John the Faſter. The ſurname, Faſter, was given him, becauſe he was a man of incredible abſtinence, and prodigious auſterity of life* ..... (55). *He did all that was poſſible to prevent his exaltation to the patriarchal throne* (56). Pope Gregory gave him this teſtimony, *Quo ardore, quo ſtudio Beatitudo veſtra Epiſcopatus pondus fugere voluerit ſcio* (57). But when this great faſter had ſat for ſome time upon that fine throne, he was no longer maſter of his pride. Perhaps, he was tainted with this vice before he was made a patriarch: for it frequently happens, that, when corrupt nature cannot plunge men into pleaſures, ſhe makes it up by other faults, eſpecially by the ſpirit of pride. Perhaps, the patriarchal dignity, by I know not what contagious fatality, inſpired *John the Faſter* with ambition. Be it how it will, this great dignity enabled him to give himſelf a free ſcope: he might colour his ambitions with the pretence of the rights of his patriarchate. Thoſe, who pretend to an auſtere devotion, may more eaſily conceal their faults, when they are not in a poſt, which permits them to alledge the intereſts of the church, the glory of GOD, charity to one's neighbour, &c. But, when they are in poſſeſſion of ſuch poſts, they may let looſe many paſſions, and fully indulged them, under the ſacred auſpices I have mentioned. To return to *John the Faſter*: he aſſumed the title of Oecumenical Patriarch: the Pope ſo reſented it, that he forbad him, under pain of excommunication, to call himſelf ſo any more. *John the Faſter* was ſo little moved with his threats, that he ſtill retained that title. *And he did it with that haughtineſs, or rather affectation, that, in the acts of a ſynod, which he ſent to Rome ..... he ſtyled himſelf almoſt in every line Oecumenical Patriarch* (58). This was the orgin of a very great quarrel betwixt St Gregory and him. Many pretend this was only a diſpute about words, and Maimbourg ſeems to prove it well enough. But he cannot do this without affording a terrible ſatire againſt the two principal prelates of that time, the biſhop of Rome, and the patriarch of Conſtantinople: for can any thing be more ridiculous than the ſtorms they raiſed, if it be true, that their diſpute was only a vain queſtion about a name (59)?

[*L*] *It is not certain that he cauſed the noble monuments of the Romans to be deſtroyed.*] It is certain he has been accuſed of it, as it appears from theſe words of Platina, who rejects this accuſation. ‘Neque eſt cur patiamur Gregorium hac in re à quibuſdam literarum ignaris potiſſimum carpi, quod ſuo mandato veterum ædificia ſint dirupta, ne peregrini & advenæ (ut ipſi fingunt) ad urbem religionis cauſa venientes poſthabitis locis ſacris, arcus triumphales & monumenta veterum cum admiratione inſpicerent. Abſit hæc calumnia a tanto Pontifice Romano præſertim: cui certe poſt Deum patria quam vita charior fuit (60). —— *Nor ought we, in this matter, to let Gregory be cenſured by the ignorant and illiterate, for ordering the buildings of the ancients to be demoliſhed, leſt travellers and ſtrangers (as they pretend) coming to Rome on a religious account, ſhould neglect places of devotion, and view with admiration the triumphal arches and monuments of the ancients. Be this reproach far from ſo great a Pope, who, certainly next to GOD, valued his country dearer than his life.*’ The ſame hiſtorian obſerves, that Sabinian, who ſucceeded Gregory, expreſſed a violent reſentment againſt his predeceſſor, ſo far as almoſt to burn his books. Some inhabitants of Rome excited the new Pope to this, becauſe, ſaid they, St Gregory had mangled, or thrown down, the ſtatues of the ancient Romans. Platina rejects alſo this accuſation. *Paululum etiam abfuit quin libri ejus comburerentur, adeo in Gregorium irâ & invidiâ exarſerat homo malevolus. Sunt qui ſcribant Sabinianum inſtigantibus quibuſdam Romanis hoc in Gregorium molitum eſſe, quod veterum ſtatuas tota urbe dum viveret, & obtruncaverit & disjecerit: quod quidem ita vero diſſonum eſt, ut illud quod de abolendis ædificiis majorum in vita ejus diximus* (61).

[*M*] *He is accuſed of cauſing a vaſt number of heathen books to be burnt.*] It is ſaid, that the Palatine library, founded by Auguſtus, was reduced to aſhes by St Gregory. I have read this no where but in Joannes Sariſberienſis, and therefore I give no great credit to it: theſe are his words. ‘Si vero mathematicorum via eſſet uſquequaque laudabilis, non tantopere pœnituiſſet magnum Auguſtinum ſe eorum conſultationibus inclinaſſe. Ad hæc doctor ſanctiſſimus ille Gregorius qui melleo prædicationis imbre totam rigavit & inebriavit eccleſiam, non modo matheſin juſſit ab aula, ſed ut traditur à majoribus, incendio dedit probatæ lectionis ſcripta, Palatinus

Quæcunque tenebat Apollo,

In quibus erant præcipua, quæ cœleſtium mentem, & ſuperiorum oracula videbantur hominibus revelare (62). —— *But if the method of the aſtrologers were every way commendable, the great St Auguſtin would not have been ſo ſorry that he had conſulted them. Beſides, the moſt holy doctor St Gregory, he who edifyed the church with the eloquence of his preaching, not only baniſhed aſtrology from court, but, as the tradition ſays, burnt the moſt valuable books of that ſcience in the Palatine library; among which were thoſe, which ſeemed to reveal the will of heaven to men.*’ He ſays in another place, that St Gregory ſuppreſſed profane books, to raiſe a greater eſteem for the ſacred ones. *Fertur beatus Gregorius bibliothecam combuſſiſſe gentilem, quo divinæ paginæ gratior eſſet locus & major autoritas, & diligentia ſtudioſior* (63). What is certain, is, that this Pope had conceived a great averſion for heathen books, as it appears from this paſſage of his hiſtory. Deſiderius, archbiſhop of Vienna, ‘was a man of an extraordinary merit, of admirable learning, and a ſhining virtue, to whom St Gregory writ more than once with great commendations of him; and yet he found fault with his conduct, and ſharply reproved him, as being guilty of a great crime, for ſpending his time in teaching ſome of his friends grammar and literature, and explaining the poets to them. He aſſures him, that this unlucky piece of news had given him ſo much trouble, that all the joy he had conceived, upon hearing the ſucceſs of his ſtudies, and his great capacity, was changed into ſorrow: *Becauſe*, ſays he ††, *the praiſes of Jupiter and of CHRIST cannot* ‘*be* to be burnt [*N*]. He died the tenth of March 1604. I will make no obſervation concerning his works, referring my reader to Mr du Pin, whoſe work is more common than this dictionary will be. I had almoſt forgot this Pope's zeal for the pſalmody of the church [*O*].

---

(54) Philip. de Comines, Memoires, livr. vii, pag. m. 451.

(55) Maimb. ibid. pag. 103.

(56) Ibid. pag. 106.

(57) Gregor lib. i, Epiſt. iv, Ind. 9, apud Maimb. pag 106.

(58) Maimb. ibid. pag. 109.

(59) *See* Nouv. de la Repub. des Lettres, Febr. 1686, pag. 189.

(60) Platina, in Gregorio I.

(61) Id. in vita Sabiniani.

(62) Joan. Sariſberienſis de nugis Curialium, lib. ii, cap. xxvi, pag. m. 104.

(63) Id. ibid. lib. viii, cap. xix, pag. 557.

†† Quia in uno ſe ore cum Jovis laudibus Chriſti laudes non capiunt. Et quem grave nefandumque ſit epiſcopis canere quod nec Laico religioſo conveniat ipſe conſidera. Quantò execrabile eſt hoc de ſacerdote enarrari, tantò utrum ita nec ne ſit diſtrictâ & veraci oportet ſatisfactione cognoſci.

The book which Dom Denys de Sainte Marthe (g) has publiſhed (*h*), intituled, *The Hiſtory of St Gregory the Great*, was not come out, when I wrote this article. I have juſt now peruſed that hiſtory; and I ſhould take it for a continual panegyric on this great Pope, if the author had not frequently interrupted his praiſes by many obſervations, wherein he explains things, illuſtrates matters of fact, or confutes ſome other writers. In his preface, he gives a catalogue of thoſe, who have writ the life of St Gregory, in which he cenſures ſome faults of the miniſter Peter du Moulin, beſides that, which we have ſeen in the remark [*C*]. He does not ſeem well pleaſed with Maimbourg [*P*]. He confutes cardinal Baronius as to what concerns St Gregory's having been a monk, and he oppoſes ſome notions of Mr Gouſſainville (*i*). What he obſerves againſt the centuriators of Magdeburg, is intermixed with falſe criticiſms; we ſhall ſee it below [*Q*]. I do not find, that he blames Pope Gregory for any thing; he acts the

' *be in the ſame mouth: conſider what an unworthy and abominable thing it is for a biſhop to ſing ſuch verſes, as a devout and religious layman could not repeat with decency, and without doing injury to his profeſſion.* He adds, that tho' he has been informed from other hands, that it was not ſo, yet he cannot but lay it much to heart, and that he will make a more exact enquiry into the truth of it, becauſe it is a horrid, and even execrable thing, to hear ſuch a report of a prieſt and a biſhop. *But* ⸸⸸ *if*, ſays he, at laſt, to comfort him, *I can be fully ſatisfied that this report againſt you is falſe, and that you do not amuſe your ſelf with theſe fooleries of human learning, and worldly ſciences, I ſhall give thanks to GOD for not ſuffering your heart to be defiled with the praiſes full of blaſphemies, which thoſe profane authors beſtow on the moſt wicked men* (64).' Maimbourg did not fail to reflect upon himſelf after this narrative. See his words in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* for September 1686, pag. 1034, and in Mr Seckendorf, pag. 4. of the firſt book of the Hiſtory of Lutheraniſm.

[*N*] . . . *And particularly Livy.*] Antonius, archbiſhop of Florence, is the moſt ancient author cited for this by Voſſius. It is ſaid, that Livy was thus treated, becauſe he inſiſts too much on the ſuperſtitious rites of the heathens. *At mirificus zelus fuit S. Gregorii, qui ut S. Antoninus, & ex eo Jo. Heſſelius, ex utroque Raderus ad Martialem tradit, Livium propterea combuſſit*, quod in ſuperſtitionibus & ſacris Romanorum perpetuo verſetur (65).

[*O*] *I had almoſt forgot this pope's zeal for the pſalmody of the church.*] ' (66) He eſpecially applied himſelf to regulate the office, and the ſinging of the church: to which end he compoſed his Antiphonary . . . . (67). Nothing can be more admirable than what he did on this occaſion. Though he had upon his hands all the affairs of the univerſal church, and was ſtill more burthened with diſtempers, than with that multitude of buſineſs, which he was neceſſarily to take care of, in all parts of the world; yet he took time to examine with what tunes the pſalms, hymns, oraiſons, verſes, reſponſes, canticles, leſſons, epiſtles, the goſpel, the prefaces, and the Lord's prayer, were to be ſung; what were the tones, meaſures, notes, moods, moſt ſuitable to the majeſty of the church, and moſt proper to inſpire devotion: and he formed that eccleſiaſtical muſic ſo grave and edifying, which at preſent is called the Gregorian muſic. He moreover inſtituted an academy of ſingers ‡‡, for all the clerks to the deaconſhip excluſively, becauſe the deacons were only to be employed in preaching the goſpel, and diſtributing the alms of the church to the poor; and he would have the ſingers to perfect themſelves in the art of true ſinging, according to the notes of his muſic, and to bring their voices to ſing ſweetly and devoutly, which, according to St Iſidore *, is not to be obtained but by faſting and abſtinence. For, ſays he, the ancients faſted the day before they were to ſing, and lived, for their ordinary diet, upon pulſe, ** to make their voice clearer and finer; whence it is that the Heathens called thoſe ſingers, bean-eaters. I queſtion whether, at preſent, the ſingers would willingly ſubmit to that method, to which they are not uſed. However, St Gregory took care to inſtruct them himſelf, as much a Pope as he was, and to teach them to ſing well. Joannes † Diaconus ſays, that, in his time, this Pope's bed was preſerved with great veneration in the palace of St John of Lateran, in which he ſung, tho' ſick, to teach the ſingers; as alſo the whip, wherewith he threatened the young clerks and the ſinging boys, when they were out, and failed in the notes.' Here I muſt make an obſervation, againſt thoſe, who cite authors without examining circumſtances. The Walloon miniſter, who publiſhed a large book concerning the *Divine Melody of the Holy Pſalmiſt*, in the year 1644, did not trouble his head whether things were changed, or not, ſince Joannes Diaconus, who writ the hiſtory of St Gregory. Joannes Diaconus lived in the IXth century. He ſays, that the whip was ſtill preſerved, wherewith this Pope threatened the muſic ſcholars. But it does not follow, that we may uſe the preſent tenſe as he does, in relating this particular, and therefore the Walloon miniſter juſtly deſerves cenſure. His words are theſe (68): *Gregory the Great, before cited, inſtituted a ſchool of ſingers, and built them colleges, with a ſuitable revenue. His bed is* ſtill *ſhewn at Rome,* to this day, *upon which he lay and ſung, and the whip, wherewith he corrected his diſciples, and the authentic antiphonary.* Naucl. 94.

[*P*] *Denys de Ste Marthe does not ſeem well pleaſed with Maimbourg.*] He ſays, that the *Hiſtory of St Gregory's Pontificate*, publiſhed by this author, does not comprehend the whole life of that ſaint (69). He adds, that *Mr Maimbourg mentions only ſome paſſages of his pontificate, which ſuited with his deſigns and views, neglecting all the reſt, which nevertheleſs deſerves to be known.* I know, ſays he, in another place (70), ' that a famous writer, who has publiſhed the hiſtory of St Gregory's pontificate, and pretends to great impartiality, has blamed him for being ſo warm in a *trifling matter*. And yet I doubt not, but that, if St Gregory, or any other Pope, had pretended to ſtyle himſelf oecumenical patriarch; and if John, patriarch of Conſtantinople, or any other biſhop, had oppoſed him in it, the ſame writer would have cenſured the Pope for it, as being an intolerable preſumption and uſurpation, and praiſed the generoſity of the patriarch, of the biſhop, and, in general, of any one, who would have oppoſed him: ſo dangerous it is to write a hiſtory with a prepoſſeſſed mind, which makes a writer as eager to intermix his opinions with the things he relates as to relate thoſe things with a perfect ſincerity.' This gives an ill idea of Maimbourg's probity.

[*Q*] *What he obſerves againſt the centuriators of Magdebourg is intermixed with falſe criticiſm.*] Every body knows, that there is a great diſpute betwixt the Proteſtants and the Roman Catholics, concerning the vows of celibacy; and one of the arguments alledged by the Proteſtants, is, that theſe vows are attended with many diſorders, and *works of darkneſs* (71), unfruitful if you pleaſe in the goſpel-ſenſe, but moſt fruitful in another ſenſe, ſince they give life to a vaſt number of human creatures. It is true, theſe are fruits that are not ſuffered to ripen: they are ſtifled as much as poſſible before their birth; which is done to conceal the firſt crime, but not without a ſecond ſin ſtill more enormous than the firſt. This is what is ſaid by the controverſiſts; and they add, that the diſcovery of theſe diſorders has ſometimes occaſioned the revocation of the ſevere law of celibacy. Here follows the part of an apologiſt every where, in the praiſes beſtowed upon Phocas and queen Brunehauld,

---

(g) *A Benedictin of the congregation of St Maur.*

(h) *At Roüen, 1697, in 4to.*

(i) *Who put out an edition of St Gregory's works, in 1675.*

⸸⸸ Si poſthæc evidenter ea quæ ad nos perlata ſunt falſa eſſe claruerint, nec vos nugis & ſæcularibus literis ſtudere conſtiterit; Deo noſtro gratias agimus, qui cor veſtrum maculari blaſphemis nefandorum laudibus non permiſit.

(64) Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 263, 264.

(65) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Lat. pag. 98.

(66) Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 327.

(67) Ibid. pag. 330, & ſeq.

‡‡ Scholam quoque Cantorum quæ hactenus, eiſdem inſtitutionibus in S. R. Eccl. modulatur conſtruit. *L. iv, Ep. xliv.*

* Iſid. de Eccl. Offic. lib. ii, cap. 12. Pridie quam cantandum erat cibis abſtinebant pſallentes, legumine in cauſâ vocis aſſidue utebantur, unde & cantores apud gentiles Fabarii dicti ſunt.

† Uſque hodie lectum ejus in quo recubans modulabatur, & flagellum ejus quo pueris minabatur, veneratione congruâ cum authentico Antiphonario reſervatur. *Jo. Diac. lib. ii, cap. vi.*

(68) Jeremiah de Pours, Divine Melodie, pag. 1070.

(60) Denys de Sainte Marthe, *in his preface.*

(70) Idem, Hiſt. de St Gregoire, livr. iii, chap. i, pag. 336, 337.

(71) *See* Epheſians, v, 11.

follows a long paſſage of Denys de Ste Marthe. *I will not undertake to confute a ſtory, mentioned by the centuriators of Magdebourg* *, *which deſtroys itſelf. They pretend, that St Gregory the Great, having made a decree to ſeparate prieſts from their wives, was obliged to revoke it, becauſe of the enſuing conſequences. A little after this regulation,* (*ſay they*) *the Pope having ſent ſome people to fiſh in a pond that belonged to him, inſtead of fiſh, they drew out ſix thouſand heads of little children. Gregory therefore, knowing that theſe children were the fruits of the prieſts incontinence, whom he had deprived of their wives, revoked his decree, and did penance for the ſin he had committed in occaſioning ſo many crimes. They add, that St Udalric, archbiſhop of Augsburg, writ this to Pope Nicolas. This whole ſtory is a confuſed heap of ſilly falſities. For what reaſon did they chuſe the Pope's fiſh-pond, rather than the Tiber, or other public places, to throw thoſe ſix thouſand heads of children in? What became of their bodies, which are not mentioned? Is it credible, that thoſe, who killed them, and whoſe intereſt it was to conceal them, would have cut off their heads, and carried them within the precincts of the Pope's palace, to have their crimes quickly diſcovered? Were they not afraid they would float upon the water? How were they all agreed to carry thoſe heads to the ſame place? For it is not ſaid that any were found elſewhere* (72). Theſe are difficulties, which Baronius and Bellarmin do not offer in confuting this ſtory of the Magdeburg centuriators. I know not whether they may have been invented by Denys de Sainte Marthe: he will give me leave to tell him, that if they may ſeem ſpecious to thoſe, who go no farther than the firſt impreſſions, they will appear deſtitute of ſolidity to thoſe, who examine things attentively. It will be granted me, that, in matters of fact, thoſe, who undertake to confute an adverſary, ought to raiſe objections contrary to his deſign. Now let us ſee whether the objections of Father de Sainte Marthe are ſuch. I think they would be ſolid, if Udalric, and thoſe, who alledge his letter, pretended, that the murtherers of thoſe baſtards cut off their heads, and threw them only into the Pope's pond. This aſſertion would be liable to the inconveniencies mentioned by the author; and it were a moſt difficult thing to alledge any probable reaſon againſt his ſeveral queſtions. But this was not the meaning of the centuriators, who only deſigned to relate what had been diſcovered in St Gregory's pond: and, if they ſaid nothing of the Tyber, or other public places, it is not becauſe they did not believe, that any baſtards of the clergy had been thrown into them, but becauſe they knew not, that the ſame crimes had been likewiſe diſcovered in thoſe places, or becauſe they were contented with the conſequences, that might be drawn from what had been ſeen in the pond. They ſuppoſed it was an eaſy thing to draw this inference: ſix thouſand children have been found in the Pope's Pond only; therefore the number of the children, who have been ſtifled, to prevent the infamy of their fathers and mothers, is almoſt infinite: for how many have been thrown into the Tyber, and into wells, and common ſhores? How many have been buried, *&c*? When a man ſays, that many medals or bones have been found in digging up the foundations of a palace, does he pretend, that it is the only place, where ſuch things might be found? and becauſe he ſays nothing of the other places, may one deny what he affirms? It is to be obſerved, that there was a particular reaſon to mention that pond, rather than the Tyber, *&c.* Rivers do not uſe to be drained, but ponds are drained from time to time, in order to take all the fiſh out of them; and then one may know whether any children have been thrown into them. To know the number of them, it is ſufficient to count the heads, which are ſingle parts of a child, and may be eaſily diſtinguiſhed: which is the reaſon, why it was ſufficient to mention the heads, in Udalric's epiſtle. Father de Sainte Marthe ought not to think it ſtrange, that no mention ſhould be made of the bodies. If commiſſioners had been appointed to inſpect the pond, they might be blamed, if their verbal proceſs did not contain more circumſtances than Udalric's letter. It had been their duty to obſerve, whether any bones had been found, beſides the heads; whether all the bodies were without fleſh; whether ſome were only half rotten, or half eaten, by the fiſh, and ſuch like particulars: but an author, who alledges this diſcovery as an argument againſt the law of celibacy, need not inſiſt upon ſo many circumſtances; it is enough for him to ſay, in general, that ſix thouſand heads were found. If what Father de Sainte Marthe affirms concerning the ſituation of that pond was true, it would be a conſiderable objection: but who told him, that this pond was in the incloſure of the palace? Would Baronius have omitted this reaſon, if it had been well-grounded? Would he have ſaid only, that fiſh-ponds were not public, and that they were ſtrictly looked after (73)? This is but a weak reaſon; for centinels are not placed in the night about a pond; care is only taken, that no fiſherman may get into it without the owner's leave; but this will not prevent the throwing of a child into it.

Perhaps many controverſiſts, engaged in the defence of the centuriators againſt Father de Sainte Marthe, would perhaps be contented with this apology. I know ſome, who would look no farther, and who, in a moſt inſulting manner, would boaſt of having obtained a compleat victory over the monk, who undertook to confute this paſſage of thoſe German authors. As for me, who think it an honour not to imitate (74) a conduct ſo contrary to ſincerity, I declare, that Denys de Sainte Marthe has alledged ſome other arguments incomparably more ſolid than thoſe, which I have refuted: for he adds (75), *but how can they have the impudence to ſay, that St Gregory grew remiſs, in proceſs of time, as to the continence of prieſts? Did ever any Pope expreſs a greater zeal for the obſervation of it? One may know what he thought of the matter, by the anſwer he made to St Auguſtin, who propoſed ſeveral difficulties to him: for, when he anſwers the ſecond article, he excludes, in expreſs words, the clerks, promoted to ſacred orders, from the number of thoſe, who are allowed to marry. The better to confound the heretical writers, who give credit to this fabulous ſtory, I have already ſhewn, that Pope Nicolas I was dead before St Udalric was born, and that this holy man had been dead a long time before Nicolas II was made Pope.* Here are two good arguments againſt the centuriators: Baronius (76) and Bellarmin (77) made uſe of them with great advantage. The benedictin ſhould have been contented with them; for mixing falſe reaſons with good ones is the right way of multiplying replies and rejoinders *in infinitum*: an adverſary, who meets with falſe proofs in his way, may eaſily keep up a diſpute; and many perſons of his party, who never read the works of the contrary party, will think that he has got a compleat victory. Which is the reaſon why things are never cleared with reſpect to many people, and why many others conſider as matters problematical, ſuch facts as moſt deſerve to be rejected. It ſeems to me, that the ſtory mentioned by the centuriators, and their Udalric, is altogether groundleſs; for, on the one ſide, there is no footſtep to be found, any where elſe, of the law of celibacy being revoked by St Gregory, and of his doing penance for it; and, on the other, it plainly appears from the writings of that Pope, that he never permitted prieſts to marry. His whole remiſſneſs conſiſted in not requiring that the ſub-deacons, who had been ordained before the decretal (78) of his predeceſſor, ſhould be obliged to part with their wives; but he forbad their being promoted to ſuperior orders; and commanded, that *the biſhops ſhould ordain no new ſubdeacons till they had made them promiſe to live in celibacy* (79). Therefore unleſs it be clearly made out, that St Gregory revoked the law of celibacy and did penance for it, and moreover if it be not clearly proved that there was an Udalric, biſhop of Augsburg, cotemporary with a Pope called Nicolas, thoſe, who alledge the letter of one Udalric, and the ſix thouſand heads found in St Gregory's fiſh pond, will never deſerve any credit.

I ſhall make two or three obſervations more. I. The centuriators do not give a good turn to this ſtory. Theſe are their words: *Beatus Gregorius Magnus Papa primus aliquando ſuo quodam decreto uxores ſacerdotibus ademit. Deinde paulo poſt cum idem Gregorius juſſiſſet ex piſcina ſua piſces aliquot capi, piſcatores pro piſcibus ſex millia capitum infantium ſuffocatorum repererunt,*

* Centur. vi, cap. vii.

(72) Denys de Sainte Marthe, ubi ſupra, liv. ii, chap. iv, pag. 206.

(73) Cum certum ſit piſcinas illas in quibus piſces aſſervari ſolent, non fuiſſe omnibus publicas, ſed optime cuſtoditas. *Baron. ad ann.* 591, *n.* 21, *pag. m.* 29.

(74) Longe mea diſcrepat iſtis Et vox & ratio. *My voice and judgment differ wide from theſe.* Horat. Sat. vi, lib. i, ver. 92.

(75) Sainte Marthe, ubi ſupra, pag. 207.

(76) Baron. ubi ſupra, n. 19, 20, 21.

(77) Bellarmin. de Clericis, lib. i, cap. xxii, pag. m. 1124, 1125.

(78) *The decretal, whereby Pelagius II ordered, that all the ſubdeacons of Sicily ſhould part with their wives.*

(79) *See* Sainte Marthe, ubi ſupra, pag. 205, 206.

Brunehauld, the many fabulous miracles related by that Pope in his dialogues [*R*], and his unſettled principles about perſecution for religion, *&c.* He is one of thoſe, who deny, that St Gregory delivered the ſoul of the emperor Trajan from hell (*k*). If it were true, that part of this Pope's books was burnt after his death, and that they would have

repererunt. Quam cædem infantium cum intelligeret S. Gregorius ex occultis fornicationibus vel adulteriis ſacerdotum natam eſſe; continuo revocavit decretum, & peccatum ſuum dignis pœnitentiæ fructibus purgavit (80). They ſuppoſe, that Pope Gregory made a decree againſt the marriage of prieſts, and that, not long after, he ordered ſome fiſh to be taken out of his pond, but that the fiſhermen found in it ſix thouſand heads of children, inſtead of fiſh; whereupon the pontiff revoked his decree, and amended his fault by fruits worthy of repentance, being ſenſible that the murther of ſo many children proceeded from the prieſts incontinency. I repeat it again, this narrative is ill turned. It is ſuppoſed, that ſix thouſand children were thrown into the Pope's pond in a very little time, and that the fiſhermen, who found the ſix thouſand heads of thoſe poor creatures, took no fiſh. This account is very abſurd: ſo great number of children, drowned in the ſame place, requires many years (81), and would rather increaſe fiſh, than wholly deſtroy them. This ſtory would look more probable, if it had been ſaid, that St Gregory abrogated celibacy, which had been eſtabliſhed a long time; and that he permitted the clergy to marry, becauſe, having ordered his pond to be cleared, which had not been cleared for many years, ſix thouſand heads of children were found in it. This account affords as many years as one can deſire. I conclude, (which is my ſecond obſervation) that the ill placing of circumſtances (82) makes a matter of fact doubtful, unlikely, ridiculous, and abſurd, tho' it be never ſo certain and true in itſelf; for, ſuppoſing it to be true, that ſix thouſand heads of children were found in that place, Udalric, and the centuriators, relate the thing ſo careleſsly, as to make one doubt of it. I obſerve in the third place, that Theophilus Raynaud ſuppoſes, in a paſſage quoted by me in another place (83), that the heads were found in the well of Pope Gregory II; ſo that he miſtakes both the place and the Pope. Bellarmin asks (84) how it came to be known, that the ſix thouſand children were baſtards of the clergy, and not of laymen; which is indeed an objection, but no perplexing difficulty. For, tho' Pope Gregory might think, that laymen had a ſhare in the procreation of thoſe children, he would have been ſenſible, that celibacy impoſed upon the clergy occaſioned a greater debauchery. It is certain, that lay-people deſtroy abundance of children to conceal their fault (85). Take notice, that Udalric, biſhop of Augsburg, lived in the Xth century, and that the letter in queſtion was printed in the book, intituled, *Orthodoxologia Sanctorum Patrum*, at Baſil, in the XVIth century.

[*R*] *The many fabulous miracles related by this Pope in his dialogues.*] ' Some learned men, who do not ' approve the recital of ſo many miracles, doubt ' whether St Gregrory is the author of thoſe dia' logues, becauſe they do not appear to them wor' thy of ſo great a doctor (86).' Denys de Sainte Marthe, who ſpeaks thus, ſolves the doubts of thoſe learned men with very ſolid reaſons, and ſhews that thoſe dialogues are the works of St Gregory. Mr du Pin is of the ſame opinion (87); but he owns at the ſame time, that they do not ſeem to be worthy *of the gravity and judgment of that holy Pope*, being full *of extraordinary Miracles, and almoſt incredible ſtories. It is true, he relates them upon the credit of others; but he ſhould not have been ſo credulous as to believe them, and afterwards to publiſh them as matters of fact . . . . The ſtories mentioned* in thoſe dialogues, *are frequently grounded upon a bare relation of ſome ignorant old men, or upon common reports. The miracles, are ſo frequent, ſo extraordinary, and often wrought for ſo inconſiderable reaſons, that it is a difficult thing to believe them all. He tells ſome ſtories which can hardly be reconciled with the lives of thoſe he ſpeaks of; as the voluntary impriſonment of St Paulinus in Africa, under the king of the Vandals. Viſions, apparitions, and dreams, are more frequently to be met with in the dialogues of that Pope, than in any other author. Hence it is, that he owns about the latter end of his work, that more diſcoveries had been made in his time about the other world, than in all the foregoing ages. But I do not think that any body will warrant the truth of all thoſe relations.* Father Denys de Sainte Marthe acknowledges (88), ' that he would not warrant all the mi' racles and viſions contained in thoſe dialogues.' Nevertheleſs he does not blame that Pope. *That holy man,* ſays he, *might relate ſome upon the teſtimony of perſons a little too credulous. He thought they were not to be ſlighted by reaſon of the edifying things he obſerved in them. The prudent reader ought to examine what degree of certainty he allows them, and who are his authors.* This monk plainly ſets up for an apologiſt, who thinks, that St Gregory is not in the leaſt to be blamed. But the worſt is, that the reaſons he alledges to prove it are not ſolid; for if one may be allowed to publiſh a relation, becauſe it contains ſome things that are edifying, how many fables may not one give out as true and pious hiſtories? tho' a writer does not ſay in expreſs words, *this is matter of fact, no body ought to doubt of it*; yet if he does not quote cotemporary and grave authors, but only an ancient tradition, he cannot be juſtified, and does not afford a ſufficient preſervative. He ought expreſsly and formally to ſay, *I relate this as a thing doubtful, you are free to believe it or not, I have not a good authority for it*: I ſay, he ought to expreſs himſelf thus, that one may be ſure he is not perſuaded of the truth of what he ſays, and does not eagerly deſire, that others ſhould believe it. Any one, who relates a miraculous event, without intimating any thing, whereby it may appear that he doubts, or is willing others ſhould doubt of it, does plainly ſhew, that he mentions it as matter of fact. It were in vain to ſay, that an hiſtorian is not allowed to ſuppreſs whatever ſeems to him to be falſe, and that it is his duty to mention thoſe which are well atteſted, tho' he does not believe them to be true; I ſay, ſuch an objection would be inſignificant, for it is no confutation of what I have laid down. What I aſſert concerns an hiſtorian, who does not intimate in the leaſt, that he doubts of what he relates, or that he allows every body to disbelieve it. A good hiſtorian who mentions a thing, which he takes to be falſe, adds to it, *it is ſaid*, or ſome other clauſe, which ſhews more clearly ſtill what he thinks of it (89); and therefore when he adds no ſuch thing, it is a ſign he believes what he ſays, and is willing that his reader ſhould give credit to it. This is the general aim of all thoſe, who relate things, of which they are perſuaded; they deſire others ſhould believe them, and, if any one ſhould tell them, that he does not believe them, they would take it as an affront, and a piece of contempt. Now if theſe maxims are true, with reſpect to the writers of hiſtory, they are much more ſo with reſpect to a divine, who relates miraculous events in a moral book, or in a treatiſe of devotion, or, in general, in ſuch a work of that of St Gregory. It ought to be ſuppoſed, not only that this Pope believed all the miracles he mentions, but alſo that he deſired all his readers ſhould likewiſe believe them. He was therefore too credulous, he wanted judgment; and it was not his fault if he did not inſpire his readers with his credulity. For if a prudent reader rejects part of what he relates, he does it without any hints from him. If any one ſhould ſay in his vindication, that he did not believe every thing that he relates; I will ask, whether he was willing that his readers ſhould give credit to every thing, or not? if he was, he is an impoſtor: if he was not, why did he give himſelf the trouble to write ſuch things? The beſt apology that can be made for him, is to ſay, that he was too credulous, and wanted judgment.

This is what may be ſaid in oppoſition to Father de Sainte Marthe's apology for the miracles, about which St Gregory might be miſtaken. The apologiſt does not ſay, whether he believes, that there are many miracles of this ſort in the dialogues of that Pope; but one may eaſily gueſs, that he does not

(*k*) *See the remark* [*A*] *of the article* TRAJAN.

(80) Magdeburgenſ. apud Baronium, ubi ſupra, n. 19, pag. m. 27.

(81) Baron. ubi ſupra, n. 21, *alledges this reaſon.*

(82) *Apply here theſe words.* Nihil eſt, *Antipho,* Quin male narrando poſſit depravarier. *The beſt ſtory may be ſpoilt in the telling.* Terent. in Phorm. Act. iv, Sc. iv, ver. 16.

(83) *In the article* BELLARMIN, *remark* [*E*].

(84) Bellarmin. ubi ſupr, pag. 1125.

(85) *Confer* quæ infra *in the remark* [*C*] *of the article* PATIN.

(86) Sainte Marthe, ubi ſupra, pag. 273.

(87) Du Pin, Bibl. des Auteurs Eccleſ. Tom. V, pag. 138, Dutch Edit.

(88) Ubi ſupra, pag. 275, 276.

(89) Equidem plura tranſcribo quam credo: nam nec adfirmare ſuſtineo de quibus dubito, nec ſubducere quæ accepi. — *Indeed I tranſcribe more than I believe: for I will not affirm what I doubt of, nor ſuppreſs what I have received.* Q. Curtius, lib. ix, cap. i. *See hereupon Frienſhemius's commentary, where you will find many ſuch paſſages out of other hiſtorians. See alſo Tacitus's Annals,* lib. iv, cap. xi, *and* Maimbourg, livr. v, *of the* Hiſtoire des Croiſades, *quoted in the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, pag. 203. *La Mothe le Vayer,* Diſc. ſur l'Hiſtoire, *mentions ſeveral paſſages of Livy, whereby it appears, that he uſes caution in relating prodigies.*

have been all deſtroyed, had it not been for an incident [S] much the ſame with that, which, in former times, prevented the Romans putting to death the ſenators, as having murdered Romulus (*l*), ſome perſons would infer from it, that the glory of that Pope, and of ſome other ancient fathers, is like rivers, which, being very ſmall at their ſpring, grow very large at a great diſtance from it. Something might be ſaid againſt this compariſon; but it is certain, generally ſpeaking, that the objects of memory are of a very different nature from the objects of ſight. The latter leſſens in proportion to their diſtance, whereas the former do commonly increaſe, according as we are remote from their time and place *(m)*.

not believe it. He very much enlarges, to ſhew, that the extraordinary things, related in thoſe dialogues, were very frequent at that time. One of his reaſons for it is, that there were many heretics to be converted, and many Catholics, who did not believe *the immortality of the ſoul and the reſurrection of the dead* (90). It is an undeniable matter of fact, ‘that, in St Gregory's time, many chriſtians wavered in the belief of thoſe two fundamental doctrines of our religion. He † is ſo humble as to confeſs, that he himſelf had formerly doubted of the reſurrection: and therefore he makes it is buſineſs, in many of his homilies, to inculcate thoſe truths into them. As there have been, at all times, many libertines, even within the pale of the Catholic church, there have always been many people whoſe intereſt it was, that there ſhould be no future life, no reſurrection and judgment, and therefore they eaſily believed it; for a corrupt heart will ſoon be attended with an erroneous mind. However it be, it is certain, that Italy, and particularly Rome, was full of ſuch unbelievers in St Grery's time. It were needleſs to prove it, after what has been ſaid upon this ſubject by the laſt tranſlator of dialogues, in his excellent preface. Gregory of Tours ⸸ mentions a diſpute he had with one of the prieſts of his church, who maintained, that there was no reſurrection to be expected. He alſo ſpeaks of a deacon of the church of Paris, who pretended to be a man of great parts, and who fell into that error, diſputing about it with great eagerneſs: from whence it may be inferred, that many others in France were engaged in that dangerous hereſy. If any one reads the dialogues, he will find, that Peter, the deacon, knew many chriſtians, who doubted of the immortality of the ſoul ‡. Was it not therefore becoming the mercy of GOD, that he ſhould work miracles at that time, to help the weakneſs of thoſe poor infidels? and is St Gregory to blame becauſe he collected them?’ I ſhall only make two ſhort obſervations upon this: One is, that, if thoſe unbelieving Catholics queſtioned only whether the ſoul was immortal, and whether the bodies ſhould be raiſed out of their graves, they argued very pitifully; for the truth of the goſpel being once admitted, it is a ridiculous thing to raiſe any doubts about thoſe two points. The other is, that perhaps there never were ſo many unbelievers, as in the XVIth and XVIIth centuries; I mean ſuch unbelievers, as are not contented to reject the building, without deſtroying the foundation, but who reject both the foundation and the building. Beſides, there were in thoſe two centuries a great many heretics (9), who wanted to be converted. Miracles ſhould therefore at leaſt have been as frequent in theſe ages, as in that of St Gregory. From whence we may conclude, that the argument of Father Denys de Sainte Marthe proves nothing, becauſe it proves too much.

[S] *If it be true that part of that Pope's books was burnt . . . . and that they would have been all deſtroyed, had it not been for an incident.*] Joannes Diaconus, in the 69th chapter of the fourth book of St Gregory's life, ſays (92), *that Italy was afflicted with a horrid famine the ſame year* that Pope died. ‘The poor, who had been partakers of the liberalities of that common father of the faithful, not receiving the ſame aſſiſtance from Sabinian, his ſucceſſor, becauſe it was ſaid, Gregory had conſumed the wealth of the church by his prodigality, ſome perſons were ſo paſſionate as to diſcharge their fury upon the works of that holy doctor, not being able to do it upon him, and burnt a great part of them. But as they were ready to burn the reſt, Peter the deacon, a diſciple of that holy man, repreſented to them, that it was to no purpoſe to throw thoſe books into the fire, in order to eclipſe the memory of that Pope, whom they hated, becauſe they had been already diſperſed all over the world. He added, that it was a ſacrilege to treat ſo unworthily the writings of that holy father, over whoſe head he had often ſeen a dove, * repreſenting the Holy Ghoſt, and familiarly converſing with him. Peter, in order to confirm the truth of what he ſaid, went up to the lobby, holding the goſpel in his hand; upon which he ſwore, that what he had been ſaying was true; adding, that he had begged of GOD to make him die on the ſpot, if he had ſpoken the truth. The thing happened according to his wiſhes; for he expired at that very moment without any pain, and was buried under the lobby, where this ſurpriſing thing came to paſs.’ The author, who furniſhes me with this paſſage, cannot believe, that *any one would have ſhewed ſuch a rage againſt the works* of ſuch a biſhop of Rome; and he obſerves, that cardinal *Baronius rejects this ſtory as a meer fable, grounded only upon a falſe tradition, becauſe no author more ancient than Joannes Diaconus makes mention of it* (93). Theophilus Raynaud oppoſes this opinion of Baronius in the following manner. He obſerves, in the firſt place, that the ſilence of Paterius, Iſidorus, and Ildephonſus, is a negative argument, and that the ſtrength of ſuch arguments is inſufficient, and weak, as every body acknowledges (94). In the ſecond place, that the authority of Sigebert, alledged by Baronius, cannot ſerve for a proof againſt Joannes Diaconus. That cardinal ſays, that Sigebert poſitively denies, that any work of St Gregory was deſtroyed on ſuch an occaſion, all of them having been preſerved at the requeſt of Peter the deacon. The Jeſuit Raynaud affirms, that Sigebert ſays the quite contrary, in the 41ſt and 43d chapters of his book *De Viris illuſtribus*. He obſerves in the third place, that St Gregory had written ſome books, of which nothing remains. ‘Præſertim cum idem Joannes *ſequenti capite* 70. ex ipſiſmet Sancti Gregorii Epiſt. ad Joannem Ravennæ Subdaiconum, demonſtret, pleroſque libros à Sancto Gregorio fuiſſe conſcriptos, quorum nullibi extant veſtigia; ut expoſitionis in Proverbia, & in Prophetas, & in libros Regum, neque enim pauca quæ habemus *in* 1. *Regum, & Ezechielem*, menſuram implent titulorum illorum (95). —— *Eſpecially ſince the ſame John in the ſeventieth chapter which follows, demonſtrates, from the letter of the ſame St Gregory to John ſub-deacon of Ravenna, that Gregory wrote many books, of which there remain no traces; as, an Expoſition on the Proverbs, the prophets, and the books of Kings; nor do the few we have left, on Kings* 1. *and Ezekiel, come up to the title of them.*’ He makes uſe, in the fourth place, of an argument *ad hominem*, grounded upon Baronius's confeſſing, that the writings of that great Pope run a great hazard; and that the mutineers not being able to vent their fury upon Gregory, who was dead, diſcharged it upon his books in the middle of the great place of Rome. It is certain, that Baronius, by owning ſuch a thing, deſtroys his own aſſertion: for, then, what does it ſignify to ſay, no book of Gregory's was burnt? have we not a ſtrong proof of the contempt or hatred of the Romans againſt that pontiff, ſince they reſolved to burn his books publickly, which they were ſo obſtinately bent upon, that nothing but a great miracle could prevent it (96).

(*l*) *See Plutarch, in the life of Romulus, pag.* 35.

(*m*) Omnia poſt obitum fingit majora vetuſtas.

(90) Sainte Marthe, ubi ſupra, pag. 274.

† Multi enim de reſurrectione dubitantes, ſicut & nos aliquando fuimus. *Hom.* 26, *in Evang.*

⸸ Hiſt. lib. x, cap. xiii, & xiv.

‡ Lib. iii, cap. xxxviii, & lib. iv, cap. iv.

(91) *That is, according to the definition of Dom Denys de Sainte Marthe.*

(92) Sainte Marthe, ubi ſupra, livr. iv, cap vii, pag. 613.

* *St Ephrem, deacon of the church of Edeſſa, declared, that he had ſeen a white dove on the ſhoulder of the great St Baſil, which ſeemed to ſuggeſt to him what he told the people.* Ephrem. Orat. in Baſil. apud Coteler. Tom. III, Monum. Græc. pag. 59.

(93) Id. Sainte Marthe, ibid. pag. 614.

(94) Quod (*argumentum ab autoritate negativa*) omnes agnoſcunt eſſe inſufficiens & enerve. *Theoph. Raynaud. de bonis ac malis libris, n* 582, *pag. m.* 327.

(95) Id. ibid.

(96) *Note, That John Rubeus, in the life of Boniface VIII, pag.* 246, *affirms, quoting Joannes Diaconus, that Pope Gregory was accuſed of hereſy:* Accuſatus fuit effuſi ſanguinis & Malchi epiſcopi in cuſtodia occiſi, theſauri eccleſiæ dilapidati, doctrinæ non ſanæ, contendentibus, æmulis illius libros, tanquam reos hæreticorum dogmatum, Vulcano debere tradi.

GREGORY VII.

GREGORY VII, called Hildebrand before he was raiſed to the papal ſee. Of all the Popes, who went about to increaſe the pontifical power, none has been ſo bold and ſucceſsful in it as he (a). He was without doubt a wicked man; but it cannot be denied that he had the qualities of a great man [A], as well as ſome conquerors, who are otherwiſe guilty of many crimes [B]. He was born at Soana, a ſmall town of Tuſcany, and rendered himſelf ſo conſiderable in the monaſtery of Clugny, that he was made prior of it. He negotiated ſeveral affairs with, and for the Popes, and was at laſt raiſed to the pontificate in the year 1073. He reſolved, without any loſs of time, to deprive the emperors of their right of giving the inveſtiture to the biſhops; but, being afraid of meeting at firſt with unſurmountable obſtacles, if it could be objected to him, that he had acted as a Pope, before his election had been approved by the emperor (b), he wrote to that prince in very ſubmiſſive terms, and declared to him, that he would not be conſecrated nor crowned, till he knew his will about it. The German biſhops adviſed the emperor to diſapprove that election; but the only thing they could obtain was, that he would get himſelf informed of the manner how it was made; and he approved of it, as ſoon as he heard the good anſwers his envoy received from Hildebrand. He had quickly occaſion to repent of it; for the new Pope, in the firſt council he held at Rome, renewed the ancient decrees againſt Simoniſts, and ſuch eccleſiaſtics as kept concubines [C]; and made a new one, whereby he declared both thoſe to be excommunicated, who ſhould receive the inveſtiture of any benefice from a layman, and thoſe who ſhould give it. He excepted no body: Hence it was, that his legates declared to the emperor, who went to meet them as far as Nuremberg, that they had expreſs orders to treat him as an excommunicated perſon, and not to confer with him, till *he had received from them the abſolution of the excommunication he had incurred for the crime of ſimony, of which he had been accuſed to the late Pope* (c). He did what they deſired of him; he received the abſolution, and wrote to Gregory, that he would be always very ſubmiſſive

(a) For though he was at laſt expelled from Rome by the emperor, he put the Popes, who ſucceeded him, in a capacity of triumphing on many occaſions.

(b) The emperor Henry IV.

(c) *See* Maimb. Decadence de l' Empire, lib. iii, pag. 228, Dutch Edit.

[A] *It cannot be denied, that he had the qualities of a great man.*] A modern author gives us the following character of him. 'He was a man of ſmall 'ſtature, but he had a very great ſoul, a quick and 'penetrating wit, an undaunted courage, and never 'gave over his enterprizes, whatever difficulty he met 'with in the execution of them. He was fiery, im'perious, haſty, bold, and daring, too forward in the 'execution of his deſigns, and carrying things to the 'laſt extremities, without being afraid of the ill con'ſequences that might attend his vigorous, but too 'violent, reſolutions. He was, otherwiſe, a man of 'an unblameable life, notwithſtanding all the calum'nies of his enemies. He gave firſt the example of 'what he required from others *; and was very 'learned, eſpecially in the divine ſciences †, the 'laws, and the rules and cuſtoms of the church, as 'the hiſtorians, and even the Germans, who have 'no reaſon to favour him, acknowledge. Laſtly, if 'his fiery and inflexible humour could have per'mitted him to temper his zeal with the noble 'moderation of his five predeceſſors .... it is cer'tain, that he would have prevented many evils, and 'the ſhedding of a great deal of chriſtian blood, and 'the hiſtorians would have beſtowed none but great 'encomiums upon him (1).' If you conſider well the following words of Naudé you will find in them the idea of a great man. *He was one of the greateſt pillars of the church, and, to ſpeak of him ſincerly and impartially, he was the firſt, who put her in poſſeſſion of her franchiſes, and who freed the ſovereign pontiffs from the ſlavery of the emperors* (2). Some may ſay, that purchaſing liberty, ſhaking off the yoke, making one's ſelf independant, and ſubduing one's own maſters, are wicked actions; but they cannot ſay, that ſuch things can be performed without noble endowments, and a great courage.

* Forma gregis factus, quod verbo docuit, exemplo demonſtravit. *Otto Friſing.*

† Virum ſacris literis erudititiſſimum, & omnium virtutum genere celeberimum. *Lambert. Schafnab.*

(1) Maimbourg, Decadence de l'Empire, livr. iii, pag. 220, Dutch edit. *He quotes* Willel. Malmſb. lib. iii, de geſt. Reg. Angl. Petr. Dam.

(2) Naudé, Apologie des Grans Hommes, pag. 577.

[B] ..... *as well as ſome conquerors, who are, otherwiſe, guilty of a great many crimes.*] I am the more willing to uſe this compariſon, becauſe I am perſuaded, that the conqueſt of the church was a work, that required no leſs courage and ability, than the conqueſt of an empire. The power the Popes have attained to is more to be wondered at, than the vaſt monarchy of ancient Rome; ſo that it may be ſaid, that this great city was to be, in two different manners (3), the ſpring of the moſt ſublime qualities, that are requiſite for the foundation of a very great ſtate. If this does not prove, that the Romans equalled other nations in moral virtues, it proves at leaſt, that they had more courage and induſtry. It is an amazing thing, that a church, which pretends to have no arms but the ſpiritual ones of the word of GOD, and which grounds her rights only upon the goſpel, that teaches every where humility and poverty, ſhould have been ſo bold as to aſpire to an abſolute dominion over all the kings of the earth: but it is ſtill more amazing, that ſhe ſhould have been ſo ſucceſsful in ſuch a chimerical deſign. If ancient Rome, which pretended only to conqueſts and military virtue (4), ſubdued ſo many nations, it is a noble and glorious thing in the eyes of the world; but any one, who reflects upon it, will not wonder at it. It is a much more ſurpriſing thing to ſee new Rome, pretending only to an apoſtolical miniſtry, arrive to ſo great a power, that the greateſt monarchs have been forced to ſubmit to it; for it may be ſaid, that there is hardly an emperor, who oppoſed the Popes, but found himſelf the worſe for it at laſt. At this very day, the quarrels of the moſt potent princes with the court of Rome do generally end to their own confuſion. We have ſo freſh inſtances of it (5) that I need not mention them. In the eyes of the world, ſuch a conqueſt is a more glorious work than thoſe of the Alexanders and Cæſars; and therefore Gregory VII, who was the chief promoter of it, ought to be placed among the great conquerors, who had the moſt eminent qualities.

You will ſee in the remark [S] my anſwer to an objection, publiſhed againſt what I ſay here.

(3) *When ſhe loſt the temporal dominion, ſhe got the ſpiritual one.* Sedes Roma Petri, quæ paſtoralis honoris Facta caput mundo, quicquid non poſſidet armis Religione tenet. *Proſper Aquitanicus, lib. de Ingratis, & lib. ii, de Vocatione Gentium, cap. vi.*

(4) Excudent alii ſpirantia mollius æra.
. . . . . .
Tu regere imperio populos Romane memento,
(Hæ tibi erunt artes) paciſque imponere morem,
Parcere ſubjectis & debellare ſuperbos.
Let meaner ſouls the ſtatue form with art:
Conqueſt and empire are a Roman's part;
Peace to diſpenſe, to ſway the giddy croud,
The humbled [illegible] to ſpare, but to chaſtiſe the proud.
Virg. Æneid, lib. vi, ver. 848, 852.

(5) I write this in 1695.

[C] *He renewed the ancient decrees againſt ſimoniſts, and ſuch eccleſiaſtics as kept concubines.*] No Pope had ever been ſo ſevere as our Hildebrand againſt the prieſts, who did not obſerve celibacy; and therefore he was very much hated. Here are the words of Lambertus Schaffnabergenſis: 'Pope Hildebrand, hav'ing called ſeveral ſynods of the biſhops of Italy, 'ordered, that, according to the ancient canons, 'prieſts ſhould have no wives, and thoſe, who had, 'ſhould part with them, or be depoſed, admitting 'none into the prieſthood, but ſuch as ſhould pro'miſe to live in perpetual continency. This decree 'being publiſhed all over Italy, he wrote to the 'biſhops of Gaul, enjoining them to do the ſame in 'their churches, and that the prieſts ſhould leave their 'wives, upon pain of excommunication. The whole 'faction of the clergy roſe up immediately againſt 'that decree, ſaying, that it was heretical, and con'tained ſenſeleſs doctrine, contrary to the word of 'GOD, which ſays, *all men cannot receive this ſay'ing; he that is able to receive it, let him receive 'it:* and likewiſe contrary to the apoſtle, who com'mands, that thoſe, who cannot contain themſelves, 'ſhould marry, it being better to marry than to 'burn. They farther added, that this man, by a 'violent exaction, would have men to live like an'gels, and would occaſion all manner of filthineſs, 'by ſtopping the courſe of nature. Theſe factious

'prieſts

ſubmiſſive to him. Nevertheleſs he did not permit the legates to call a council; and he kept with him thoſe miniſters of his, who had been excommunicated by the Pope. For which reaſons, and ſeveral others, the Pope ſummoned him *to appear at the next Synod of Rome*; *in default* of which, he threatened to excommunicate him. The emperor ſlighted his threatenings, and offered all ſorts of indignities to the legates, who had been ſo bold as to threaten him; and he convoked a council at Worms, wherein cardinal le Blanc ſet up for an informer againſt Gregory. He charged him with ſo many crimes [*D*], that the aſſembly declared the election of that Pope to be void, and wrote to him letters full of injurious words, to acquaint him with their determination. Thoſe, who preſented the letters, did it with great brutality; and yet *that Pontiff, who, notwithſtanding his haſty and fiery temper, had a great command of himſelf, took them unconcernedly, and without ſaying any thing* (*d*): But, the very next day, having imparted them to his ſynod, he pronounced (*e*) in a ſolemn manner an anathema againſt the emperor [*E*], and declared I know not how many prelates of Germany and Lombardy excommunicated. The latter were ſo little concerned at it, that they quickly aſſembled at Pavia, and excommunicated him. As he had foreſeen, that his conduct would draw upon him very potent enemies, he omitted nothing to ſtrengthen his party; and, in the firſt place, he brought over three princeſſes to his intereſt [*F*]; one of which, called Mathilda, adhered to him in ſuch a manner as was much talked of [*G*]. Beſides, he excited the Saxons

(*d*) Id. ibid. pag. 236.

(*e*) *In the year* 1076.

‘ prieſts concluded, that, if he obſtinately perſiſted in his reſolution, they had rather renounce the prieſthood, than forſake their wives; and he might then ſee where he could find angels to govern the churches, ſince he would not make uſe of men (6).’ Coëffeteau adds, according to the teſtimony of Marianus Scotus, *that many clergymen choſe rather to be excommunicated by the Pope, than to part with their wives; but the Pope ordered, in a ſynod, that no Chriſtian ſhould hear the maſs of a married prieſt* (7).

I ſhall obſerve a thing, which ſeems to deſerve attention. *viz.* That the Popes have found it incomparably more difficult to bring the clergy of the northern countries under the law of celibacy, than thoſe of the ſouthern. When thoſe of Italy and Spain had been for a long time ſubjected to that yoke, thoſe of Germany, and other cold countries, held out ſtill, and diſputed the ground for marriage, *tanquam pro aris & focis*: nay, I do not know but it may be ſaid, that, in Luther's time, the concubinage of prieſts was more apparent and ſcandalous in Germany than in Italy. It ought not to be inferred from thence, that the inhabitants of the ſouthern countries are more chaſte: on the contrary it ſeems, that the northern prieſts choſe rather to keep to certain concubines, than to diſguiſe their incontinence by a vague leudneſs. They acted therefore with greater fairneſs, and perhaps they believed it was a leſs crime.

[*D*] *Cardinal le Blanc charged him with ſo many crimes.*] In order to know his accuſations, we need only read the ſentence pronounced againſt the Pope by the aſſembly of Worms. I ſhall ſet it down as I find it in du Pleſſis Mornai (8). ‘ Hildebrand, who calls himſelf Gregory, is the firſt, who, without our conſent, againſt the will of the Roman emperor, appointed by GOD, and againſt the cuſtom of our anceſtors, and contrary to the laws, has invaded the papal ſee by his ambition, which he has made known for a long time. He will do any thing that comes into his head, *per fas nefaſque*, whether it be lawful or unlawful. He is an apoſtate monk, who corrupts the holy theology by a new doctrine, adapts the holy ſcripture to his affairs by falſe and ſtrained interpretations, diſturbs the peace of the college, pollutes ſacred things, and lends an ear to the devils, and to the ſlanders of the wicked, being at the ſame time a witneſs, a judge, and an accuſer. He parts husbands from their wives, and prefers whores to honeſt women, fornication, inceſt, and adultery, to a chaſt marriage. He ſets the people againſt the prieſts, and the mob againſt the biſhops; and would make every body believe, that none is rightly ordained, unleſs he begs the prieſthood of him, or buys it, *ab ejus Auriſugis*, of his blood-ſuckers. He deceives, impoſes upon, and bubbles the vulgar by a meer ſhew of religion. He handles the holy myſteries of religion, *in ſenatulo muliercularum*, among ſilly women: he diſſolves the law of GOD, and encroaches upon the papacy and the empire. He is guilty of high-treaſon divine and humane, deſiring to deprive a ſacred emperor and a good prince of his life and ſtates. For theſe reaſons, the emperor, the biſhops, the ſenate, and chriſtian people, declare him to depoſed, and will no longer leave CHRIST'S flock to the keeping of ſuch a wolf.’

[*E*] *He pronounced an anathema againſt the emperor.*] ‘ And, what had never been done yet by any Pope, he deprived him of the imperial dignity, and of his kingdoms of Germany and Italy; declared all his ſubjects abſolved, by the pontifical authority, from the oath of fidelity they had taken to him; and wrote ‡ afterwards circular letters to all the biſhops and princes of Germany, whereby he permitted them, in caſe Henry ſhould obſtinately perſiſt in his revolt againſt the holy ſee, to proceed, by the ſame authority, to the election of another king, who might receive the imperial crown, and govern the empire juſtly, and according to the laws (9).’

[*F*] *He brought over three princeſſes to his intereſt.*] ‘ *Viz.* The empreſs Agnes his mother (10), the ducheſs Beatrix his aunt, and the counteſs Mathilda his couſin-german. As for the empreſs, ſhe might be of great uſe to him by her intreaties and remonſtrances. And indeed *, ſhe took a journey into Germany, with the legates that Gregory ſent thither the firſt time; and the emperor promiſed to grant all the requeſts ſhe made in the Pope's name, but performed nothing. The counteſſes Beatrix and Mathilda being very powerful in Italy, where they had vaſt eſtates, were able to aſſiſt him more effectually than the empreſs Agnes by her remonſtrances, which Henry made no great account of. Theſe two princeſſes, who were very devout, had a great opinion of Gregory's virtue, who was looked upon as a holy man, and very auſtere; nay, he was ſaid to have revelations and extaſies, with the gift of prophecy and miracles, which are powerful motives to make one a ghoſtly father. Afterwards they reſolved to be intirely governed by him; and he, on his part, anſwering the confidence they repoſed in him, took a particular care to direct them by his letters in the way to virtue, and expreſſed a great affection for them, and a mutual confidence: ſo that, when this great rupture between the Pope and the emperor divided the empire into two parties, they did not in the leaſt waver, but openly declared for Gregory, and reſolved to aſſiſt him with all their power, eſpecially the counteſs Mathilda (11).’ I uſe the words of this Jeſuit on purpoſe, leſt the readers ſhould ſuſpect that I deſign to impoſe upon them by artificial tranſlations. It muſt be confeſſed, that this Pope was a very cunning man, and that, notwithſtanding his fiery and violent temper, he knew very well how to make uſe of the moſt effectual devices: he made ſure of the female ſex, and pitched upon the ladies, who had the greateſt power.

[*G*] *Mathilda adhered to him in ſuch a manner as was very much talked of.*] A Pope, though never ſo peaceable and well-beloved, could not have avoided the ſatirical ſtrokes of ill tongues, had he been ſo intimate with a lady, as Hildebrand with Mathilda. You may therefore judge, whether a Pope, ſo violent as he was, and who had many enemies, could avoid being defamed on account of the mutual affection between him and that counteſs. I ſhall ſet down another paſſage of a Jeſuit, who cannot be ſuſpected upon this occaſion. ‘ The

---

(6) Lambertus Schafn. de rebus Germanic. ad ann. 1074, apud Coëffeteau, Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 677.

(7) *See the remark of the article* MUTIUS (HULDRICH).

(8) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 240. *He quotes* Avent. Annal. Boior livr. v, Lambertus Schafnab. de rebus Germaniæ. Carolus Sigonius de regno Italiæ, lib. ix. Autor vitæ Henrici.

‡ Gregor lib. iii, Ep. vi, & lib. iv, Ep. ii, & iii.

(9) Maimbourg, ibid. pag. 237.

(10) *That is, mother of the emperor Henry IV.*

* Lambert Greg. lib. i, Ep. lxxxv, & lib. ii, Ep. xxx.

(11) Maimb. ibid. pag. 238.

Saxons to a revolt; he made a league with the duke of Suabia *(f)*; and diſperſed ſeveral circular letters, which had a good effect; for he declared all thoſe to be excommunicated, who ſhould correſpond with the emperor; he forbad all biſhops to abſolve him; and enjoined all princes to force him to ſubmit to the holy ſee, or to proceed to the election of another emperor. What is very remarkable, is, that he durſt maintain, that, in depoſing him, he had only conformed to the practice of the court of Rome [*H*]. The league, that was formed in his favour in Germany, was ſo powerful, that, after a long deliberation, it was declared, that *they ought to elect another king by the Pope's authority, who ſhould give him the imperial crown (g).* The emperor, notwithſtanding his mean condeſcenſion to the confederate princes, could obtain but very hard conditions; which obliged him to go and beg the Pope's abſolution; and, in order to obtain it, he was forced to ſubmit to the moſt unheard-of indignities [*I*]. His excommunicated

‘The counteſs Mathilda finding herſelf alone, and being abſolute miſtreſs of her ſtates, becauſe the ducheſs Beatrix, her mother, died much † about the ſame time that the death of Godfrey (12) came to be known, reſolved to be directed by Gregory more than ever, made him intirely maſter of her mind, her conduct, and eſtate: and therefore, according to the uſual cuſtom of thoſe devout women, who would think themſelves undone if they were far from their directors, for whom they have ſometimes too great a fondneſs, ſhe did whatever ſhe could not to loſe the ſight of him ⸸. She conſtantly followed him, and did him a thouſand ſervices with an incredible affection. She only acted by his orders, which ſhe executed with a wonderful exactneſs; and though ſhe was the greateſt princeſs of Italy, ſhe preferred to that title that of his moſt humble ſervant, and dear daughter, looking upon him as her father and maſter, for whom ſhe expreſſed a great deal of reſpect, zeal, and devotion; though perhaps ſhe did it with leſs prudence and diſcretion than ſhe ſhould have done, if I may ſay ſo, without pretending to leſſen the honour that is due to the memory of ſo illuſtrious a princeſs. For, in ſhort, the partiſans of the emperor, and the enemies of Gregory, eſpecially the clergy of Germany, whom he abſolutely reſolved to deprive of their wives, whom they had impudently married againſt the moſt holy laws of the church, took occaſion from thence to inveigh againſt him in a ſtrange manner, to accuſe him of too great a privacy with that counteſs ‡, and to tell many ſcandalous ſtories of him, and ſuch as cannot be credited in the leaſt, as being contrary to truth, and the known virtue of both. And therefore the German hiſtorian, who lived at that time, and who relates this, adds, that all judicious perſons, and ſuch as were not blinded and prejudiced by an unjuſt paſſion, were fully ſenſible, that they were meer impudent calumnies, which, like thin clouds, ſo vaniſhed away by the apoſtolical life the Pope led in the ſight of all the Roman court, that thoſe, who knew him, did not entertain the leaſt ſuſpicion of him (13).’

I am obliged in equity to mention, in this place, a complaint of Coëffeteau againſt du Pleſſis Mornai. That monk was angry with du Pleſſis, becauſe he quoted only the firſt part of a paſſage of Lambertus Schaffnaburgenſis: *And therefore ſhe cannot avoid being ſuſpected of inceſtuous love, ſince the king's friends gave out every where, eſpecially the clergy, whom he forbad to marry contrary to the canons, that he ſpent nights and days in her embraces, and that ſhe, being extreamly fond of that Pope, would not marry again after the death of her huſband* (14). Du Pleſſis goes no farther; whereupon Coëffeteau makes the following complaint. *But, reader, what will you ſay, if I ſhew you, that this author*, this grave hiſtorian, *as he calls him, confutes this impudent calumny in that very ſame place . . . How then can he be ſo unfair and ſo bold as to alledge it to defame his life and domeſtic converſation* (15)*?* This monk makes too great a noiſe for a ſmall matter: I confeſs, that du Pleſſis had not done amiſs, to obſerve by the bye, that Lambertus Schaffnaburgenſis confutes this; but, after all, his chief deſign being to tell what judgment was made of Pope Gregory, it is not very ſtrange, that he ſhould quote only the words of that hiſtorian, whereby it appears, that many ſcandalous ſtories were told of that Pope. Note, that he calls this Lambert, abbot of Hirtzaw. His adverſary reproves him for it, and ſays, he was only a monk at Hirtzaw; but they are both miſtaken; for he was a monk of Hirsfeld in the dioceſe of Mentz.

I ſhall conclude with a thought of Father Maimbourg. ‘Though, *ſays he* (16), thoſe reports were plainly falſe; yet, becauſe men, through a malignity natural to them, are more inclined to give credit to ill reports than to good ones, eſpecially with reſpect to thoſe, who are in ſome reputation for their virtue, it produced an ill effect, and did Gregory ſome prejudice. From whence the directors of conſciencies ought to learn, that the ſhorteſt converſations they have with devout women are always the beſt; and that long and frequent diſcourſes with them are always more dangerous, than uſeful, to thoſe of their profeſſion.’

[*H*] *He durſt maintain . . . . . that he had only conformed to the practice of the court of Rome.*] This ſhews how little thoſe are to be depended on, who boaſt of doing nothing but in imitation of the ancients: the greateſt innovators have been ſo bold as to boaſt of ſuch a thing. We have here a very remarkable inſtance of it, which I ſhall ſet down in the words of a Jeſuit, leſt any one ſhould be apt to think, that I exaggerate things (17). ‘I find alſo, that Heriman, biſhop of Metz, having propoſed to Gregory, in writing, his difficulties upon this ſubject, and asked, among other things, what anſwer was to be made to thoſe, who maintained, that the Pope could not depoſe the king, nor diſpenſe his ſubjects from their oath of fidelity, as he had done in the laſt ſynod at Rome; he anſwered him plainly, and without any heſitation **, that he had done it very juſtly, according to the cuſtom and practice of his predeceſſors, who had excommunicated kings and emperors, depriving them of their empire, and of their kingdoms. And yet Otho Friſingenſis, a very learned and moſt holy biſhop, and a man well affected to the Pope, and often commended by Baronius aſſures us, with great ſincerity, that having been an exact †† reader of hiſtories, he had never found, that any Pope, before him, ever attempted ſuch a thing (18).’

[*I*] *He was forced to ſubmit to the moſt unheard of indignities.*] He ſet out *in the beginning of the winter, with his wife, one of his children, and a very ſmall retinue,* and paſſed the Alps *in the worſt time of the year, being expoſed to great inconveniencies, which might raiſe compaſſion for a meer traveller, and much more for ſo great a prince, reduced to ſo miſerable a condition* (19). Nevertheleſs, his arrival in Italy gave ſome uneaſineſs to the Pope; and therefore Mathilda *carried him to her caſtle of Canoſſa, that he might be ſafe whatever ſhould happen* (20). Many princes intreated him to abſolve the emperor, but he continued a long time inexorable; and then, *being rather overcome by importunities, than moved with the continual and earneſt ſollicitations of thoſe princes, he told them at laſt, that he would abſolve him, according to their deſires; but upon condition, that, in order to make it appear to all the world that he truly repented of his revolt, he ſhould firſt ſend him his crown, and all his other royal ornaments, to diſpoſe of them at his pleaſure; and that he ſhould publickly confeſs, that, after what he had done in his infamous conventicle at Worms, he was unworthy of being a king or an emperor.* The princes threw themſelves at the Pope's feet, beſeeching him for God's ſake to be contented with ſomething more tolerable: and they obtained, with great difficulty, *that he might come then, in GOD's name, if he had a mind to be abſolved; but that, in order to obtain that favour, he muſt reſolve to do whatever ſhould be enjoined him for a penance* (21). The emperor ſubmitted to thoſe terms (22). ‘He went to the firſt gate of the caſtle, expecting with great ſubmiſſion what ſhould be required of him. Firſt, he was obliged to go in alone, a

---

(f) His name was Rodolphus, and he was elected emperor by the Germans.

(g) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, pag. 251.

† *The eighteenth of April*, 1076.

(12) *He was Mathilda's huſband.*

⸸ *Lambert. Schafnab.* Poſt cujus mortem Romani Pontificis lateri pene comes individua adhærebat, eumque miro colebat affectu. Cumque magna pars Italiæ ejus pareret imperio, & omnibus quæ prima mortales ducunt, ſupra cæteros terræ illius principes abundaret: ubicumque opera ejus Papa indiguiſſet ociùs aderat, & tanquam patri & domino ſedulum exhibebat officium.

‡ Unde nec evadere potuit inceſti amoris ſuſpicionem, paſſim jactantibus regis fautoribus, & præcipuè clericis, quibus illicita, & contra ſcita canonum conjugia prohibebat, quod die ac nocte impudenter Papa ejus, *&c.* Sed apud omnes ſanum aliquod ſapientes luce clarius conſtabat falſa eſſe quæ dicebantur. Nam & Papa tam eximiè tamque apoſtolicè vitam inſtituebat, ut nec minimam ſiniſtri rumoris maculam converſationis ejus ſublimitas admitteret, & illa in urbe celeberrima, *&c.* *Lamb. Schafnab.*

(13) Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 243.

(14) Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 246.

(15) Coëffeteau, Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 695.

(16) Ubi ſupra, pag. 245.

(17) Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 248.

** Lib. iv, Epiſt. xxv.

†† Lego & relego Romanorum regum & imperatorum geſta, & nuſquam invenio quemquam eorum ante hunc à Romano Pontifice vel excommunicatum, vel regno privatum. *Otto Friſing, Chron. lib. vi, cap. xxxv.*

(18) *See Father Alexander,* Select. Hiſtor. Cap. Seculi xi & xii, Part. II, *where he ſuppoſes, that Gregory VII was deceived by his ſecretary, who alledged to him falſe records.*

(19) Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 254.

(20) Id. ibid. pag. 255.

(21) Ibid. pag. 257.

(22) Ibid. pag. 258.

excommunicated friends were treated much in the ſame manner [*K*]. This made the Lombards leſs zealous for him; and he could not recover their eſteem, but by expreſſing a great deſire of revenging himſelf. The wars he had upon his hands in Germany, where Rodolphus duke of Suabia had been made king, prevented his attacking the Pope; but, having obtained great advantages over his rival, he ſhewed himſelf but little diſpoſed to perform what Gregory required of him. Wherefore this Pope, in a council held at Rome in the year 1080, excommunicated and depoſed him anew [*L*]. This laſt ſtroke brought things to the laſt extremities. The emperor called an aſſembly firſt at Mentz, and then at Brixen (*b*), wherein Gregory was declared to have forfeited the pontificate, and Guibert of Parma, archbiſhop of Ravenna, was elected in his room, and took the name of Clement III. This aſſembly, among other crimes, charged Hildebrand with magic [*M*]. The emperor, having gained two battles, one in Germany over Rodolphus, notwithſtanding the Pope's prophecies [*N*]; the other, near

(*b*) *It is a town in Tirol, between Trent and Inſpruc.*

‘ to leave all his attendants without doors to wait for him, and go back with him at his coming out from thence; which was certainly a very nice point, and no ſovereign prince but he would have ſubmitted to it. For, in ſhort, he delivered himſelf, as it were, bound hand and foot, into the hands of thoſe, who might have abſolutely diſpoſed of him as they pleaſed, and kept him priſoner in a place that was thought to be impregnable, and out of which his attendants had never been able to reſcue him. Beſides, when he got out of the firſt incloſure, they ſtopped him in the ſecond; where he was obliged to lay down all the enſigns of the royal majeſty, to pull of his cloaths, and put on a woollen tunic, like a hair-cloth (23), and to ſtay there bare footed in the coldeſt time of the winter; (for it was about the latter end of January), and faſting from morning till night, imploring with deep ſighs GOD's and the Pope's mercy. And what is moſt ſtrange, is, that this poor prince was forced to continue in this ſad and pitiful condition three days together, whilſt the Pope could not be moved with tears and intreaties to admit him ſooner into his preſence, in order to comfort him: and the thing went ſo far, that as he himſelf confeſſes, boaſting of his extream ſeverity in his letter to the princes of Germany, all thoſe, that were with him, murmured at it, being amazed at his hard-heartedneſs; nay, ſome made no ſcruple to ſay, that ſuch a behaviour was more like the barbarous cruelty of a tyrant, than the juſt ſeverity of an apoſtolic judge ‡‡. They are the very words of Gregory, mentioned by cardinal Baronius. . . . (24). That prince was like to loſe his patience, about the end of the third day of ſo ſevere a penance . . . . when the counteſs Mathilda undertook this buſineſs with more earneſtneſs than before: and then Pope Gregory, who could not deny any thing to ſo great a princeſs, to whom he was ſo much indebted, reſolved at laſt to receive Henry on the fourth day in the morning, and to reconcile him to the church upon theſe terms: *The he ſhould ſubmit to the judgment, which the Pope, in the time and place appointed for it, ſhould give upon the accuſations brought againſt him . . . . and that, in the mean time, he ſhould not exerciſe any act of ſovereignty.*’ I omit the other conditions, which were all very ſevere.

[*K*] *His excommunicated friends were treated much in the ſame manner.*] ‘ He did not uſe much more gently the German biſhops and others, both eccleſiaſtics and laymen, who came a little before to throw themſelves at his feet, in order to be abſolved from the excommunication, which they had incurred. For, before he abſolved them, he cauſed each of them to be ſhut up in little cells, as in priſons, and made them faſt a conſiderable time, againſt the cuſtom of their country, where, by reaſon of the cold, faſting is with more difficulty obſerved than in Italy (25).’ Faſting is without doubt one of the greateſt mortifications, that can be laid upon the northern nations, eſpecially upon rich people, who are uſed from their younger years to feed well, and to make long meals, where, if they eat a great deal, they drink ſtill more. If the Chriſtian religion had been firſt planted in that country, I do not think they would have ſent into the eaſt the ſame canons about abſtinence and vigils, which came from the eaſt to the northern nations. See the complaints, which were made againſt cardinal Alamandus (26).

[*L*] *He excommunicated and depoſed the emperor anew.*] By this thundering decree, he * *deprived him of the empire, and of the kingdoms of Germany and Italy, abſolves all his ſubjects from their oath of allegiance; and, what he would not do till then, confirms Rodolphus's election, to whom he ſent a rich crown of gold, about which there was an inſcription, contained in one verſe, importing that CHRIST, who is the myſtical ſtone, gave the diadem to Peter, and in the perſon of Gregory to Rodolphus* †. They are father Maimbourg's words (27). If it be true, that Gregory's father was a carpenter, we have here an inſtance, that men of the moſt lofty courage may be born among the dregs of the people. Can any body be more haughty than our Hildebrand was? did not he make it his buſineſs *to humble kings, becauſe,* ſaid he, *they carried it too high, and he was reſolved to bring down their pride by his ſevere uſage.* ‘ Imperatoribus & regibus, cæteriſque principibus ut elationes maris, & ſuperbiæ fluctus comprimere valeant, arma humilitatis, Deo auctore, providere curamus: proinde videtur utile, maximè Imperatoribus, ut cùm mens illorum ſe ad alta erigere, & pro ſingulari vult gloriâ oblectare, inveniat quibus ſe modis humiliet, atque unde gaudebat, ſentiat plus timendum (28). —— *To humble the pride of kings and princes, we take care, by GOD's aſſiſtance, to provide the arms of humility: eſteeming it uſeful to ſhew monarchs the way to humble themſelves amidſt their greatneſs, and diſcover to them the danger of the ſituation, they ſo much pride themſelves in.*’ Obſerve, that the Jeſuit Maimbourg rejects what has been ſaid of Gregory's father. Theſe are his words. *What is commonly ſaid, that he was a carpenter's ſon, and that playing with ſhavings, when he was but a child, he accidentally formed ſome letters out of them, which were ſo diſpoſed as to make this verſe of the Pſalmiſt,* Dominabitur à mare uſque ad mare; He ſhall rule from one ſea to another; *is a meer ſtory* (29).

[*M*] *Among other crimes, they charged him with magic.*] This appears from the ſentence pronounced againſt him. Du Pleſſis Mornai mentions it at large. *And likewiſe,* ſaid he (30), *in the year* 1080, *the biſhops of Italy, Germany, and Gaul, met at Brixen in Bavaria* (31), *and condemned Hildebrand a ſecond time as guilty of ambition, hereſy, and ſacrilege*: ‘ Becauſe, *ſay they,* he is a falſe monk, a magician, a diviner, an interpreter of dreams and prodigies, a deſpiſer of the Chriſtian religion, who has bought the pontificate, contrary to the cuſtom of our foreſathers, againſt the will of all good men, *&c.* A ſworn enemy to the emperor and the empire, a corrupter of divine and human laws, teaching falſhood inſtead of truth, evil inſtead of good, *&c.* An inſtigator of all manner of wickedneſs, the abettor of a tyrant, a lover of diſcord between brethren, friends, and relations; occaſioning divorces among married people; denying that prieſts, who have lawful wives, are true prieſts, and yet bringing fornicators, adulterers, inceſtuous people, *&c.* to the altars, *&c.* We, by the authority of Almighty GOD, declare him to have forfeited the pontificate? and if he does not voluntarily reſign it, we ordain that he be for ever deprived of it. *Sigonius, who alſo mentions this decree, uſes theſe words,* manifeſtum necromanticum, Pythonico ſpiritu laborantem: A plain necromancer, poſſeſſed by the ſpirit of Pytho’

[*N*] *The emperor gained two battles . . . . notwithſtanding the Pope's prophecies.*] Hildebrand, in order to encourage Rodolphus and the Saxons, aſſured them, that he knew, by revelation, *That a falſe king was* near Mantua, over the counteſs Mathilda's troops, reſolved to go and ſettle his Anti-Pope at Rome. He effected it after many difficulties, and had the ſatisfaction of forcing his enemy to fly from Rome, and to retire to Salerno. Pope Gregory VII died there the 24th of May 1085 (*i*). It is no eaſy thing to give a particular account of his actions with any certainty; for, beſides that the writers, who ſpeak of him, confute one another [*O*], it cannot be denied, that his enemies appear too paſſionate, and that what they ſay of his being a magician, looks altogether like a fiction [*P*]. However

---

(23) *Malmeſburienſis adds, with Sciſſars and a broom in his hands,* as ſubmitting to be ſhorn and whipt. *Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag.* 242, 243.

‡‡ Ut pro eo multis precibus & lacrymis intercedentes, omnes quidem inſolitam noſtræ mentis duritiem mirarentur, nonnulli verò in nobis non apoſtolicæ ſeveritatis gravitatem, ſed quaſi tyrannicæ feritatis crudelitatem eſſe clamarent. *Greg. lib iv, Ep. xii, & apud Baron. ann.* 1077, *n.* 17.

(24) Maimb. ibid. pag. 260.

(25) Id. ibid. pag. 259.

(26) *Above, in remark* [*A*], *of the article* ALAMANDUS.

* Conc. Rom. 7. t. 10. Concil. edit. Pariſ.

† Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rodolpho.

(27) Maimb. ibid. ibid. pag. 278.

(28) Greg. Epiſt. ad Heriman. Epiſc. Met. de Excom. Henr. IV, apud Maimbourg, ibid. pag. pag. 259.

(29) Maimb. ibid. pag 218.

(30) Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 244.

(31) *Or rather in Tirol.*

to die that very year, which he underſtood of the emperor Henry IV; *and if it be not true,* added he, *I deſire to be no longer Pope; nay, if it does not happen before St Peter's day.* Du Pleſſis Mornai (32), who had this from Sigebert, obſerves, *that Rodolphus, depending on that oracle, renewed the battle four times, others ſay ſix times, and not only loſt it, but alſo his right hand, wherewith he had ſworn to the emperor, and alſo his life.* *Coëffeteau* anſwers (33), *that cardinal Baronius had prevented that calumny, and ſhewed that Gregory never pretended to the revelations, his enemies fathered upon him; but only that he affirmed in general, truſting to GOD's mercy, and the juſtice of his cauſe, that GOD would deſtroy his enemies, and that his friends would ſhortly be uppermoſt; but without fixing any day, as he had been falſly charged with it by the ſchiſmatics.* ‘ From whence, ſays Baronius, ‘ Gregory's enemies took occaſion to calumniate him, ‘ and to call him a falſe prophet, as if he had foretold that Henry ſhould quickly die, and many other ‘ things of that nature. Though, the truth is, he ‘ never pretended to ſay that by a prophetic ſpirit, ‘ but according to the uſual courſe of things; for it frequently happens, that men reap according as they have ‘ ſowed. And therefore Gregory, relying upon the ‘ juſtice of his cauſe, was confident that God would ‘ make it prevail; which, *ſays he,* all things duly conſidered, will be found to be true; for Henry and his ‘ adherents came to a miſerable end.’ The reply, that ‘ was made to Coëffeteau, was this: *He ſhould have conſidered, that Baronius ſays this, upon occaſion of a letter* † *written by Gregory to his fellow biſhops, and other faithful; and it is true, that the words of that letter may bear ſuch an interpretation. But this does not prove that the Pope did not ſpeak otherwiſe elſewhere. And, indeed, the charge laid upon him concerns quite another thing, not contained in a letter, but ſpoken in a public ſermon, which he preached in his pontifical habit. The words run thus:* Do not look upon me hereafter as a Pope, but turn me out from the altar, if this prophecy be not fulfilled on St Peter's day. *It fell out, that the aſſaſſins, who had been bribed, could not ſtrike the intended blow, in order to fulfil the prophecy; ſo that, to juſtify himſelf, he pretended that his words were only to be underſtood of the death of the emperor's ſoul, becauſe he had not been able to kill his body* (34).

It is plain, that du Pleſſis's objection remains in it's full force, ſince Coëffeteau's anſwer, taken from Baronius, is altogether inſignificant. We may therefore affirm, that Hildebrand pretended to foretel things, which quickly proved falſe by the event. Mind theſe words of Father Maimbourg (35). *He wrote circular letters* ‡ *to all the faithful, particularly to thoſe of the province of Ravenna, to perſuade them to engage in a confederacy with the Norman princes againſt the anti-Pope. He alſo wrote to the princes of Germany, and exhorted them to make war againſt Henry, promiſing all of them, that they ſhould obtain a glorious victory. But it fell out unluckily for him, that the ſucceſs proved quite contrary to what he had ſo confidently aſſured them of; for, three weeks after he wrote thoſe letters, bearing date the twenty ſecond of September, the armies of Henry and Rodolphus came to a furious engagement* * *on the fifteenth of October, upon the banks of the river Elleſtre near Mersburg in Saxony* (36). Here is a dilemma: either Hildebrand believed, that his prediction would come to paſs, or he did not believe it. If he believed it, he muſt be called a falſe prophet; if he did not believe it, but only deſigned to encourage the rebels, he ought to be called an impoſtor, who, by an execrable policy, ſacrificed the ſacredneſs of prophecy, and the honour of the holy name of God, to his temporal intereſt. We have ſeen, in our days, ſome interpreters of the Apocalypſe, who may be confounded by a like dilemma. Hildebrand's craft puts me in mind of the article DEJOTARUS (37). Thoſe, who pretend to foretel things to come, take care above all things to have a brazen face, and an inexhauſtible ſource of equivocations, in order to explain events in their favour, though they be never ſo contrary to them. If the enemies meet with worldly proſperity, they ſay, they grow more obdurate, and that it is the true miſery, that was foretold by them. See how Hildebrand applies to the death of the ſoul, what he ventured to foretel concerning the emperor's death. Of what uſe could it be to Rodolphus, that the emperor Henry IV ſhould be damned after a certain number of years, if, before that, Rodolphus was to be killed in a battle gained by that emperor? what ſenſe was there in foretelling the damnation of Henry IV, a prince, who was quickly to triumph over his rival? if Gregory VII had been a true prophet, that triumph would have been the firſt thing foretold by him. This I obſerve, to ſhew the vanity of that Pope's ſubterfuge.

[*O*] *The writers, who ſpeak of him, confute one another.*] It is certain, that they run into extreams, ſome againſt Pope Gregory VII, and others againſt the emperor Henry IV. The modern hiſtorian, I have often cited, deſcribes this ſo happily, that I rather chooſe to uſe his expreſſions, than my own. ‘ That ‘ quarrel, *ſays he* (38), which divided all Europe, and ‘ armed one part of it againſt the other, did ſo prepoſſeſs ‘ and heat the authors, that wrote of it, that I may ‘ very well affirm, there never was ſeen ſo much ‘ animoſity, bitterneſs, and rage, as appears in the ‘ works of thoſe, who have undertaken to vindicate ‘ either of thoſe parties, and who, by reaſon of their ‘ paſſion and prejudices, run into extreams. For, ‘ beſides that they are not ſparing of the moſt injurious words, againſt all the rules, I will not ſay ‘ of Chriſtianity, but of common morality, and even ‘ humanity; ſome, after the ſchiſmatical cardinal Benno, ‘ revile in a moſt horrid manner the memory of ‘ Gregory VII, and repreſent him as the moſt wicked and execrable of all men: and others, on the ‘ contrary, will have it, that he had all the perfections requiſite in a pontiff, and beſtow upon him ‘ the greateſt encomiums they can think of.’ The better to judge of the hiſtorians of that time, it will not be improper to conſider what was written for or againſt the league under Henry III, and Henry IV. How many falſe ſtories and calumnies were then publiſhed? I forbear alledging any inſtance of a later date; and I am perſuaded, that thoſe, who are moſt prepoſſeſſed, will grant me, that future ages would be very unjuſt, ſhould they judge of our principal actors by the libels daily printed on both ſides, in which every body vents, with the utmoſt confidence, not what he knows, but what he forges and takes up in the ſtreets. I write this in the year 1695.

[*P*] *What they ſay of his being a magician has all the air of a fiction.*] Cardinal Benno ſays (39), that he learned magic of Theophilactus, who was Pope Benedict IX, of Laurence his companion, of the archbiſhop of Melfi, and of John arch-prieſt of San Giovanni Porta Latina, who was Pope Gregory VI, ‘ who, by converſing with devils, and the flying ‘ and ſinging of birds (40), pretended to know what ‘ paſſed in the remoteſt countries, the ſucceſs of wars, ‘ and the death of princes. That, as long as they ‘ lived, even when they were Popes, he was the ‘ chief miniſter and accomplice of their faſcinations. ‘ . . . . That, one day, coming from Alba, he left ‘ behind him a book of necromancy, he uſed to ‘ carry about him, which perceiving, when he came ‘ to the gate of the Lateran, he ſent back two of ‘ his truſty friends to fetch it, ſtrictly forbidding ‘ them to look into it: but their curioſity prompted ‘ them to read it, and immediately the angels of Satan appeared to them in great numbers, who frighted ‘ them almoſt out of their ſenſes, &c. That it was ‘ an uſual thing with him, when he ſhook his ſleeves, ‘ to ſend out fire and flames, and the like.’ Coëffeteau complains (41) of Du Pleſſis's *et cætera.*

(*i*) *Conſult the authors quoted by Maimbourg in his* Decadence de l'Empire. *I have made uſe of his narrative.*

(32) Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 244.

(33) Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag 692.

† Gregor. Regiſt. lib viii, Ep. vii.

(34) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, Part. II, pag. 182.

(35) Ubi ſupra, pag. 281.

‡ Greg. lib. viii, Ep vii.

* Lib. viii, Ep. ix.

(36) *Rodolphus was killed in that battle.*

(37) *In the remark* [*K*].

(38) Maimb ubi ſupra, pag 216, 217.

(39) *See* Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 248, 249.

(40) Coëffeteau, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 704, ſays, That Benno tells the following ſtory about that Laurence. One day a ſparrow ſinging in the preſence of ſeveral prelates, ſome aſked him what that bird ſaid; and he replied, That bird bids the other birds go immediately to the Porta Maggiore, where a cartfull of millet is juſt now broke: He therefore invites them to go and eat their ſhare. Then ſome of them went thither, and found the thing as he had ſaid.

(41) Ubi ſupra, pag. 704.

However it be, I can affirm, that no Pope was ever ſo well or ſo ill ſpoken of as our Gregory VII. Many miracles are aſcribed to him, and he has been placed in the catalogue of ſaints (*k*). It is ſaid, that his body was found almoſt entire five hundred years after his death [Q]; and we may very well wonder at the uncertainty of hiſtory, when we read the apologies publiſhed by his favourers [*R*].

The

‘He forgets the beſt, *ſays he*; for Benno adds, that *the wicked ſpirits urged thoſe two ſervants to tell them why they had called for them, and given them ſo much trouble: command us quickly to do what you deſire we ſhould do*, ſaid thoſe devils to the ſervants, *otherwiſe we will fall upon you, and torment you.* Whereupon the youngeſt ſaid to them, *pull down thoſe walls quickly*; *pointing at the high walls of Rome, which was near: at the ſame inſtant thoſe ſpirits threw down the walls of Rome, and the two young men, making the ſign of the croſs, returned to their maſter in a great fright.*’ Coëffeteau will have it, that Du Pleſſis was aſhamed to inſert this laſt ſtory in his book, *no author of that age having mentioned this overthrow of the walls of Rome.* GOD forbid that I ſhould ſuſpect Du Pleſſis of having deſignedly left out the moſt fabulous part of Benno's paſſage; but I dare ſay, he had not done amiſs, if he had omitted his *Et cætera* upon ſuch an occaſion. His apologiſt charges Coëffeteau with a falſification. *He ſhould not*, ſays he (42), *have put in the margin, that* no author of that age mentions the overthrow of the walls of Rome. *Benno does not mention it neither*; *he only ſays of that young man*, oſtendit illis muros altos vicinos Romæ, quos in momento maligni ſpiritus dejecerunt; *that he ſhewed them ſome high walls near Rome, which were immediately pulled down by thoſe evil ſpirits*; *and therefore he ſaid nothing of the walls of Rome, near which ſome old walls might fall down, though the hiſtorians do not mention it.* The ſincerity I pretend to does not allow me to declare againſt Coëffeteau; for I am perſuaded he is wrongfully cenſured: *Muros altos vicinos Romæ* are the very walls of Rome, from which thoſe two men were at a ſmall diſtance, and not ſome other walls, that were in the neighbourhood of Rome. This is an inſtance of the equivocations of the Latin tongue. How many diſputes do they not occaſion?

Here follows the judgment Naudé made of cardinal Benno's narrative. ‘I can hardly believe, *ſays he*, that ſuch ſtrange things can be ſaid of the moſt profligate man in the world, as this author relates of that Pope, and occaſionally of Sylveſter II, John XX, XXI, and Benedict IX, who, as he ſays, by virtue of his magic, made women run after him through woods and mountains, and foretold things to come. But theſe ſtories are nothing, if compared with what he adds concerning archbiſhop Laurence, who very well underſtood the language of birds, and Gregory VII, who threw the holy hoſt into the fire, attempted upon the emperor's life, cauſed ſix Popes to be poiſoned by his confident Gerard Brazutus, and had ſo well learned magic of Theophylactus and Laurence, Sylveſter's diſciples, that he ſent out fire by ſhaking his arms, and a thundering noiſe out of his ſleeves. But this author is too full of ſuch ſtories to be credited; and ſince he had a mind to ſlander the Popes, he ſhould have done it with more modeſty and judgment (43).’ Satirical writers ſhould continually think upon theſe laſt words. They will do too much, and do not enough, *Ipſa ſibi obſtat magnituao* (44): they diſcredit true matters of fact by mixing ſeveral falſe ſtories with them. It were better for them to leave out ſome things, than to add needleſs ones (45). The maxim, *dimidium plus toto* (46), ſhould be their conſtant rule. Father Maimbourg (47) obſerves, that the calumnies, publiſhed againſt Gregory VII, *came to nothing, becauſe they were too heinous, too groſsly invented by men blinded with paſſion, and highly improbable.*

[Q] *It is ſaid, that his body was found almoſt entire five hundred years after his death.*] He was buried at Salerno in St Matthew's church, which he conſecrated not long before he died. His body was ſearched for in the year 1573, and it was found cloathed with the pontifical ornaments. The following epitaph was added to it (48). ‘Gregorio VII. Soanenſi Pont. Opt. Max. Eccleſiaſticæ libertatis vindici acerrimo, aſſertori conſtantiſſimo, qui dum Rom. Pontificis auctoritatem adverſus Henrici perfidiam ſtrenuè tuetur, Salerni ſancte decubuit, Anno Dom. 1085. 8 Kal. Junii. Marcus Antonius Columna, Marſilius Bononienſis, Archiepiſcopus Salernitanus, cum illius corpus, quingentos circiter annos, ſacris amictum, ac ferè integrum reperiſſet, ne tanti pontificis ſepulcrum diutius memoria careret. Gregorio XIII. Bononienſe ſedente, anno dom. 1578. pridie kalendas Quintilis.—— *To perpetuate the Memory of Gregory* VII, *of Soana, Pope, the moſt inflexible aſſertor of the immunities of the church, who, whilſt he ſtrenuouſly maintained the papal authority againſt the perfidiouſneſs of the emperor Henry, died holily at Salerno, A. D.* 1085, *May* 25. *This epitaph was inſcribed by Marc Anthony Colonna, archbiſhop of Salerno, having found his body, after about* 500 *years interment, cloathed in the pontifical habit, and almoſt entire: A. D.* 1578. *June* 30. *in the Reign of Gregory* XIII.’ He was placed in the Roman Martyrology in the year 1584, and his feſtival was celebrated in 1595 (49).

[*R*] *The apologies publiſhed by his favourers.*] He who moſt ſignalized himſelf for this Pope was a German Jeſuit (50): he produces fifty holy and learned authors, as he calls them, who gave a good character of Gregory VII. Amongſt whom he reckons *Paulus Bernriedenſis*, and *Gerochus*, or *Gerhohus Reicherſpergenſis*. Du Pleſſis thought (51), that this Gerochus wrote the Life of Gregory VII, and has quoted ſomething from him upon the credit of Aventinus. But he is charged with a double miſtake: His adverſaries maintain (52), 1. That Gerochus did not write that life, but only mentioned (53) ſeveral things relating to that Pope's quarrel with the emperor. 2. That he does not ſay what du Pleſſis quotes him for. Gerochus's book, publiſhed at Ingoldſtadt in the year 1611, is alledged in order to prove it. Rivet replies (54), that one is not obliged to depend on that edition, as being procured by the Jeſuit Gretſer, who perhaps left out what he thought fit. This Jeſuit maintains (55), that the Words, aſcribed to Gerochus, are Aventinus's. He talks in a very haughty ſtrain againſt thoſe, who ſhall be ſo bold as to doubt ſtill of that Pope's innocence, after his apology, and the pieces publiſhed by Sebaſtian Tegnagel, the emperor's library-keeper. ‘Quid Benno & Sigebertus, Gregorii VII calumniatores, ſi conferantur cum tot ſanctiſſimis & doctiſſimis ſcriptoribus à parte Gregorii VII ſtantibus, quorum in apologia pro eodem pontifice, quinquaginta protulimus, recitatis eorum verbis; ex quibus nonnulli interea integri in lucem venerunt, ut Paulus Bernriedenſis, & Gerochus, ſeu Gerhohus Reicherſpergenſis, ut taceam præclara illa antiquorum monumenta, quæ in defenſionem Gregorii VII. jam olim ſcripta, nuper ex tenebris eruit vir clariſſimus dominus Sebaſtianus Tegnagel, J. U. D. Cæſareus Viennæ bibliothecarius, quorum fulgore tam priſcorum, quàm recentium in Gregorium VII convicia adeo obnubilantur, ut jam non niſi à noctuis, ululis, veſpertilionibus & nycticoracibus, & ſi quæ ſunt aliæ hujus generis caliginis patientes, lucis impatientes aves, conſpiciantur (56).—— *What are Benno and Sigebert, the calumniators of Gregory* VII, *when compared with ſo many holy and learned writers, favourers of that Pope, fifty of whom I have produced, in my apology for him: Among whom, ſome have come to light entire, as Paulus Benriedenſis, and Gerochus, or Gerhohus Reicherſpergenſis; to ſay nothing of thoſe excellent remains of antiquity, which, having been formerly written in defence of Gregory* VII, *were lately brought to light by Sebaſtian Tegnagel, doctor of the laws, the emperor's librarian at Vienna; by the luſtre of which, both ancient and modern, the calumnies againſt Gregory* VII *are ſo darkened, that, at preſent, they are viſible only to owls, and bats, and ſuch like birds of the night.*’

AVENTINUS diffamed.

Is it poſſible that Aventinus ſhould be guilty of what is laid to his charge? It is affirmed, that, in order to abuſe the Popes more maliciouſly, he pretended to have found in old books the ſatirical reflexions, he had himſelf forged. ‘Quis vel obiter in Aventino verſatus neſcit, Aventinum ſine fronte in pontifices maledicta jacere, & ne impudentiæ accuſetur mentiri talia à veteribus vel dicta vel prodita de pontificibus,

---

(k) *See the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, April, 1689, pag. 166, 167, *in the extract of the* Acta Sanctorum Maii, Tom. VI, & VII, *in which is the life of Gregory VII.*

(42) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, Part. II, p. 193.

(43) Naudé, Apologie de Grans Hommes, pag. 553.

(44) Florus, in Proœmio *See the remark* [*H*] *of the article* ACHILLEA.

(45) *The maxim of the civilians,* Superflua non nocent, *cannot be applied here.*

(46) *See the remark* [*H*] *of the article* ACHILLEA.

(47) Ubi ſupra, pag. 290.

(48) *See Father Jacob*. Biblioth. Pontificia, lib. i, pag. 93. *It ſeems there are many faults in that paſſage, many words left out by the printers.*

(49) Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, April 1689, pag. 165.

(50) *James Gretſer.*

(51) Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 246.

(52) Coëffeteau, ubi ſupra, pag. 696. Gretſerus in Examine Myſterii Pleſſ. pag. 356.

(53) In primo libro de Inveſtigatione Anti-Chriſti.

(54) Rivet, ubi ſupra, pag. 186.

(55) In Præloquiis ad Gerochianum Syntagma. *See his* Examen Myſterii Pleſſæani, pag. 357.

(56) Gretſ. in Exam. Myſter. Pleſſæani, pag. 359, 360.

The anonymous writer of a book, intituled, *l'Eſprit des cours de l'Europe* (*l*), which comes out monthly, has made a reflexion, which I ſhall examine. It concerns what I have ſaid in the remark [*B*], concerning the Popes conqueſts. He thinks they were not ſo difficult as I imagine [*S*], and that one ought rather to wonder they have not been

'cum ipſe ex hæretico ſuo cerebro omnia hujus generis exſculpſerit, & quæ olim dicta vel ſcripta voluiſſet, dicta vel ſcripta fuiſſe, cynico prorſus ore affirmet (57). —— *Who is there ſo little converſant in Aventinus, as not to know, that he impudently ſlanders the Popes, and, to avoid the charge of impudence, pretends, that ſuch and ſuch things were ſaid of the Popes, when he himſelf forged all thoſe things in his heretical brain, and whatever he would have to have been ſaid or written, affirms to have been ſaid or written, with the aſſurance of a Cynic?*

To prove this it is alledged, that he quotes Gerochus for ſome matters of fact, that are not to be found in the manuſcript of that author. This ſeems to be a ſtrong objection; but then Aventinus's favourers may ſay, that Gretſer falſified his edition of Gerochus (58). It may be ſaid in anſwer to Gretſer, that it is not very likely Aventinus ſhould have vented his own ſlanders under the name of an ancient author, ſince he might have found many ancient writers, who did not ſpare the court of Rome. It was but naming thoſe authors: the zealous Papiſts take care to complain, that the enemies of the holy ſee, 'are daily buſy in looking out for the proofs and calumnies, which they cannot find in good writers among the tombs and old ſhores of ſchiſmatics; and, as the civilian Michael Ritius has well obſerved *; 'Antiquos & manuſcriptos libros in latebroſis lucis laborioſe evolvunt, & ex fœtido pulvere auctores quoſvis excitant, quos licentioſe in ipſos Pontifices ſcripſiſſe deprehendunt. —— *They, with great pains, turn over ancient manuſcripts in obſcure holes and corners, and diſturb the duſt of old authors, whom they find to have written freely againſt the Popes.* Witneſs the collection of Matthias Flaccius Illiricus, intituled, *Catalogus teſtium veritatis*, which cannot be better compared than with Poneropolis, a town built by Philip of Macedonia; for, as it was only inhabited by people baniſhed for their crimes, and by villains, and in general by all the raſcals of that country, ſo it may be truly ſaid, that, excepting the paſſages corrupted out of the fathers and councils, that large catalogue is only ſtuffed with fragments and ſcraps of thoſe, who formerly ſet up againſt the church, or were cut off from the body of it as rotten members; ſuch as was, among a great many others, the falſe cardinal Benno (59).'

[*S*] *The author of* l'Eſprit des Cours de l'Europe *pretends, that* the Popes Conqueſts *were not ſo difficult as I imagine.*] His reflexion may be divided into two parts: in the firſt, he pleaſantly and ingeniouſly jeſts upon the Popes power; and in the ſecond, he plainly and ſeriouſly affirms, that it was an eaſy thing for them to aggrandize themſelves. The ingenious ironies, contained in the firſt part, are ſuch, that an Ultramontane doctor might well be deceived by them, and ſeriouſly make uſe of them as good proofs; and therefore it will not be improper to bring them to a diſcuſſion. 'Is it not ſaid, that every knee ſhall bow before the inviſible head? how can the viſible head want power to overthrow all his enemies? how could he miſs confounding all thoſe, who durſt oppoſe him? the viſible head acts only by the power of the inviſible one: if the maſter is always victorious, the vicar muſt needs be ſo too. This miracle is an article of faith, nay, it is the great ſpring of religion: religion ought to ſubdue the body as well as the mind; no body denies it: It has a power over the whole man: ſince rewards are propoſed to the material ſubſtance as well as to the ſpiritual one, both of them ought equally to undergo the yoke of the laws, and threatenings concern both of them alike. This principle being once overthrown, what would become of the holy inquiſition? that divine tribunal would then have no other foundation but a barbarous cruelty, and all the arms of that ſacred arſenal would have been forged in the fire of hell. The Pope is therefore maſter both of the bodies and ſouls; and becauſe his authority over the conſcience is unlimited, his power over the body ought to be invincible. Beſides, did not the oeconomy of ſalvation require, that power ſhould be no leſs extenſive than knowledge? what would it avail a head divinely eſtabliſhed to know every thing, if he had not the power of diſpoſing of every thing? It were to no purpoſe for that Hercules to cruſh the monſters of error, if he had not the right of deſtroying the monſters of impiety. This right takes in kings and princes, who, though they command whole nations, are neverthele ſs the ſubjects of the church. The Popes oppoſed thoſe great ſubjects, whenever they revolted againſt that good mother: they made uſe of an infinite power againſt them; how then could they be worſted? this is the true unravelling of the glorious and wonderful ſucceſs of the new Roman monarchy (60).' This diſcourſe, being ſeriouſly underſtood, would afford this argument, that as ſoon as the biſhops of Rome were looked upon as the vicars of JESUS CHRIST, whoſe power over the body and ſoul is unlimited, they could not fail eaſily to eſtabliſh their empire over the people, and even over the temporalities of ſovereigns. A diſtinction will be ſufficient to reſolve this difficulty. Tho' it be ſuppoſed, that CHRIST eſtabliſhed a vicar in his church; yet common ſenſe and reaſon will teach us, that he eſtabliſhed him, not as he is the ſupream maſter and creator of all things, but as he is a mediator between GOD and men, or the founder of a religion, which ſhews men the way to ſalvation, and promiſes a glorious reward to the faithful, and threatens the impenitent with ſevere puniſhments. If CHRIST had eſtabliſhed a vicar upon earth, his power would be confined within thoſe bounds; and the moſt that vicar could do, were only to determine which is the doctrine of ſalvation, and which is that of damnation. After having declared to men future rewards and puniſhments, after having inſtructed and cenſured them, he would be obliged to leave to GOD the execution of the threatenings, not only with reſpect to the torments of another life, but alſo with reſpect to the corporal puniſhments inflicted in this world. CHRIST himſelf acted in the ſame manner: he exactly conformed to the true ſpirit of religion, which conſiſts in inſtructing and ſanctifying the ſoul, and leading it to ſalvation by way of perſuaſion, without aſſuming the authority of corporally puniſhing the obſtinate and unbelievers, who were ſo many; for it is not true, that in this reſpect the head and maſter of the church *is always victorious* (61). And therefore thoſe, who were moſt fully perſuaded, that the Pope is CHRIST's vicar, ſhould have looked upon his pretending to a temporal juriſdiction, and to the authority of puniſhing the body, as an ill uſe he made of his vicarſhip. This ſhould have naturally produced many obſtacles to the conqueſts of the biſhop of Rome. It is not uſeleſs to know every thing, tho' one has not the power of diſpoſing of every thing. Religion needs only teach men what they ought to believe and practiſe: it needs only put them in a capacity of confuting error, and it is only in that ſenſe that the authority of deſtroying the monſters of hereſy and impiety belong to it. If men do not act according to the knowledge it affords them, it belongs to GOD to puniſh them for it as being without excuſe: This is not the buſineſs of religion, nor part of the miniſtry eſtabliſhed by JESUS CHRIST. I proceed to the ſecond part of the reflexion of the anonymous writer.

'But, not to take ſuch a high flight, and to ſpeak more humanly, I find nothing that is very ſurpriſing in the Popes greatneſs. By the help of ſome paſſages of holy writ, they have perſuaded the world of their divinity. Is this a new thing? Is it not uſual with men to ſuffer themſelves to be impoſed upon in point of religion? above all things they love to deify their fellow-creatures, as Paganiſm makes it plain. Now if it be once ſuppoſed, that the Popes could eaſily eſtabliſh the divine privileges of their office; was it not natural for people to declare for them againſt all other powers? for my part, I am ſo far from admiring their elevation, that I wonder they did not arrive at univerſal monarchy. The great number of princes, who have

---

(*l*) *Ever ſince June 1699.*

(57) Gretſerus, ibid. pag. 355.

(58) *Rivet affirms it, above, citat.* (54).

* Lib. de fide Gallica.

(59) Naudé, Apologie des Grans Hommes, pag. 551.

(60) L'Eſprit des Cours de l'Europe, Nov. 1699, pag. 6[illegible]3.

(61) *See the remark* [*E*] *of the article* XENOPHANES.

been greater, than that they have been ſo great. I ſhall ſay ſomething of a book lately printed

‘ have ſhaken off the Roman yoke, confounds me: when I enquire into the reaſon of it, I can only think of theſe two cauſes, which are very general and well known, that men do not always act according to their principles, and that this preſent life makes a deeper impreſſion upon them, than the future (62).’ Suppoſe, as this ingenious writer will have it, that the Popes could eaſily make the world believe they were Gods upon earth, that is to ſay, that being the viſible heads of the church, they might authoritatively declare what is heretical or orthodox, regulate ceremonies, and command all the biſhops of of the Chriſtian world: will it follow from thence, that they could eaſily ſet up their authority over kings, and bring them under their yoke without any difficulty? I confeſs I do not ſee this conſequence. On the contrary, it ſeems to me, that, in all appearance, their ſpiritual authority would run a great danger by their attempting upon the temporalities of kings. The Athenians were told one day, have a care that your concern for heaven do not make you loſe the earth (63). The Popes might have been told in a contrary ſenſe, have a care, that your great deſire of getting the earth do not make you loſe heaven: you will be deprived of the ſpiritual power, if you pretend to uſurp the temporal. It is well known, that the moſt orthodox princes are more tender of their ſovereignty than of religion: a thouſand examples ancient and modern prove it: and therefore it was not likely they ſhould ſuffer the church to invade their demeſnes and rights; and it was likely they would rather increaſe their authority to the prejudice of the church, than ſuffer the power of the church to increaſe to the prejudice of their temporal power. Princes, who underſtand the art of reigning, have generally the gentry and the ſoldiery at their command; and when that part of their ſubjects remain faithful to them, they need not be afraid of the clergy; their troops will fight for them againſt all ſorts of enemies. The army of Charles V made war againſt Clement VII. The troops of France fought againſt Julius II, for Lewis XII, and would have done the ſame for Lewis XIV, againſt Alexander VII, not long before the peace of Piſa (64) delivered the Pope from the ſtorm ready to fall upon him. I was at Mr Juſtel's at Paris, in the year 1675, when a noveliſt affirmed, that the count de Vignori, governour of Triers, made this anſwer to the monks, who repreſented to him, that the convents he pulled down, to fortify the town, had been founded by Charlemagne; *I do but execute the king's orders, and, if he ſhould command me to raiſe a battery againſt the holy ſacrament,* *I would do it.* Francis Mendoſa de Corduba was not ſo paſſionate in the anſwer he made to a letter of the emperor, the thirtieth of December 1598; but he did not want much of it. He wrote to him, *that if his imperial majeſty was with his power on the one ſide, and the holy father the Pope with his excommunication on the other, commanding him once more to retire, he would not do it, ſince he had a maſter who had ordered him to perform his exploits, unleſs he was obliged by force of arms to do otherwiſe* (65). We may add, that kings and emperors are able to beſtow ſo many favours and noble rewards upon ſo many people, that they may eaſily bring over to their party many prelates and monks, and put them upon writing againſt the pretenſions of the court of Rome. This paper-war, in all appearance, muſt needs be very prejudicial to the pontiffs, who uſurp a temporal authority; for it is eaſy to ſhew, by ſeveral expreſs texts of ſcripture, by the ſpirit of the goſpel, by ancient tradition, and the practice of the firſt centuries, that the Popes have no manner of ground to pretend to diſpoſe of crowns, and to ſhare, in ſo many things, the rights of ſovereignty. Nay, this may ſerve to bring into queſtion their ſpiritual authority; and, being thus upon the defenſive, as to that point, they muſt needs be reduced to great ſtraits. Nay, the very articles, which the people came to believe by degrees, will run a great hazard. Beſides, the clergy, whom the court of Rome will force to abſtain from marriage, will be thereby diſpoſed to ſerve their princes, which is no inconſiderable thing. Thoſe, who cannot bear that yoke, are innumerable: the honeſt clergymen, who cannot live in celibacy, are moſt fond of marriage; for thoſe, who are not conſcientious, do not ſcruple to keep concubines. Celibacy is intolerable to a vaſt many people: marriage is to them the deareſt and moſt precious of all the ſacraments; and whoever ſhould write a book on this ſubject like that of the *Frequent Communion*, would become as odious as Mr Arnauld, when he publiſhed, under this title, but on another ſubject, a work, which has made a great deal of noiſe. Therefore one ſhould have thought, that princes and emperors would find great numbers of biſhops, prieſts, and monks, well-affected towards them, and ready to ſerve them againſt the Popes zealous promoters of celibacy. Now what may not a prince expect, who, beſides great armies, has ſo many clergymen at his diſpoſal, who cannot be without women, and are extreamly deſirous of having wives and children?

But, in order to know, whether ſuch conjectures about the obſtacles, the Popes would meet in their way, would have been well grounded, we muſt have recourſe to experience, and conſult hiſtory; whereby it will appear, that thoſe conjectures would have been right as to the obſtacles, though perhaps wrong in pretending that thoſe obſtacles would prove inſurmountable. Read du Pleſſis's book, intituled, *Le Myſtere d'Iniquité, or l'Hiſtoire de la Papauté*, and you will find, in every chapter, the progreſs, and the oppoſition. The Popes cannot go forward, and get ground, but by overcoming the obſtacles they meet with at every ſtep. Armies and books, ſermons, libels, and prophecies, have been made uſe of againſt them; nothing was left unattempted to put a ſtop to their conqueſts, and at laſt every thing proved inſignificant. Why? Becauſe they uſed all imaginable means to ſucceed in their deſigns. Their excommunications have been ſupported with arms and cruſades, and by the tribunals of the inquiſition: craft, violence, courage, and artifice, have concurred to protect them. Their conqueſts have coſt the lives of as many men, or near as many, as thoſe of the commonwealth of Rome. Many writers apply to new Rome what Virgil obſerves concerning the old.

Multa quoque & bello paſſus dum conderet urbem,
Inferretque Deos Latio (66) . . . . .
. . . .
TANTÆ MOLIS ERAT ROMANAM CONDERE GENTEM (67).

Much ſuffer'd he in war. . . . .
Till ſettl'd, with his gods, on Latian ground:
So arduous was the taſk the Roman name to found.

Zipporah told Moſes, *Surely a bloody huſband art thou to me* (68); but if the church of Rome were the ſpouſe of JESUS CHRIST, he might tell her with much more reaſon, *Surely a bloody ſpouſe art thou to me.*

I think this ſufficient to juſtify the propoſitions, which I inſerted in the firſt edition of this dictionary, in the remark [*B*] of this article. I am ſtill perſuaded, that the power, the Popes have attained to, is one of the greateſt prodigies of human hiſtory, and one of thoſe things, which never happen twice. If it had never happened, I believe it would never be. Future ages would not afford a time ſo proper for ſuch an enterprize, as paſt ages have been; and if that great ſtructure ſhould be deſtroyed, it were in vain to undertake to raiſe it up again. All that the court of Rome can do now, with the greateſt policy in the world, is to maintain herſelf. Her conqueſts are at an end (69). She dares not excommunicate a crowned head; and how often is ſhe obliged to diſſemble her reſentment againſt the Catholic party, who deny the ſuperiority and infallibility of the Popes, and burn the books that are moſt favourable to them? If there was now an anti-papacy, I mean a ſchiſm, like thoſe, which have been ſo frequent in former times, when a Pope ſet up againſt a Pope, and a council againſt a council;

- - - - - - - infeſtiſque obvia ſignis
Signa, pares aquilas, & pila minantia pilis (70);

Standards in hoſtile form 'gainſt ſtandards rais'd,
Eagles 'gainſt eagles, piles to piles oppos'd;

---

(62) L'Eſprit des Cours de l'Europe, ubi ſupra, pag. 665.

(63) *See the citation of Eraſmus, in the remark* [F] *of the article* OLYMPIAS.

(64) *It was concluded in* 1664.

(65) *The author of the* Apology for the Houſe of Naſſau, pag. 184. Edit 1664. *He quotes* Meteren, fol. 456.

(66) Virgil. Æn. lib. i, ver. 5.

(67) Id. ibid. ver. 33.

(68) Exod. iv, 25.

(69) This muſt be underſtood in the ſenſe of the ſchool diſtinction, *intenſivè*, and not *extenſivè*.

(70) Lucan. Pharſ. lib. i, ver. 6.

printed with this title, *Hiſtoire des amours de Gregory* VII. *The hiſtory of the amours of Gregory* VII [*T*].

She would not come off with honour, ſhe would be confounded, and at her wit's end. Such a contraſt, in ſuch an age as ours, would prove deſtructive. Obſerve by the bye, in order to have a right notion of the great obſtacles above-mentioned, that the Popes were obliged to make themſelves maſters of many general councils. This was a very difficult taſk; for the more numerous a council is, the more it is like a ſhip toſſed with contrary winds, and expoſed to the violent ſtorms, thus deſcribed by Virgil:

> Incubuêre mari, totumque à ſedibus imis
> Unà Eurusque Notuſque ruunt, creberque procellis
> Africus; & vaſtos volvunt ad littora fluctus.
> Inſequitur clamorque virûm, ſtridorque rudentum.
> Eripiunt ſubitò nubes cœlumque diemque
> Teucrorum ex oculis: ponto nox incubat atra.
> Intonuêre poli: & crebris micat ignibus æther (71).

> *Together, from their caverns, eaſt and weſt,*
> *And ſouth, ſtill brewing tempeſts in his breaſt,*
> *Ruſh on the ocean with impetuous roar,*
> *And roll enormous billows to the ſhore.*
> *Th' affrighted ſeamen dread th' impending wreck,*
> *Whilſt the tough cables in the tempeſt crack.*
> *The gathering clouds, ſpread o'er the heavenly way,*
> *Snatch from the Trojans eyes the light of day.*
> *Night hovers o'er the deep: loud thunders roll,*
> *And the quick light'nings dart from pole to pole.*

The ſteering of ſuch a ſhip requires the utmoſt art and ſkill; and if the beſt working is ſufficient to bring it into the deſigned harbour, it is a wonder.

[*T*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of a book . . . . with this title,* Hiſtoire des Amours de Gregoire VII.] The whole title runs thus: *Hiſtoire des Amours de Gregoire VII, du Cardinal de Richelieu, de la Princeſſe de Condé, & de la Marquiſe d'Urfé. Par Mademoiſelle D**. A Cologne chez Pierre le Jeune MDCC.* Though the author uſes the word *romance* in the firſt lines of the preface, he affirms, *that theſe ſtories are all true, and might have been longer, if he had been willing to exerciſe his invention.* This is the higheſt pitch of boldneſs: one may eaſily perceive it now by the meer reading of his book; but can any one ſay, that it will not be a difficult thing in future ages? Let us ſuppoſe, that ſuch a book had been written in the time of Gregory VII; is it not very likely, that Aventinus or Flacius Illyricus, finding it in a library, would have made uſe of it as a true hiſtory? Would it not be quoted every day, as a genuine piece, in all controverſial books? Do we know what will happen between the XVIIIth and the XXVIIIth centuries? Perhaps ignorance and barbarity will prevail again, and then learning will be revived. Perhaps a thouſand good books will be deſtroyed, and this will be preſerved. Perhaps a curious perſon will find it out, and it will be accounted an invaluable piece of ſecret hiſtory, and a certain monument of cardinal Richelieu's amours, *&c.* People have been impoſed upon by ſuch books more than once, and it is likely will be ſo in future ages.

GREGORY (**Peter**), a native of Toulouſe, taught the civil law firſt at Cahors, and then in the town, where he was born. He flouriſhed in the XVIth century. He was a very learned man, and wrote ſome books full of great erudition [*A*]; but he does not appear very judicious in the choice of the things contained in them. What was ſaid of his book *de Republica*, may be applied to all his works [*B*]. He was invited into *Lorrain* in a very glorious manner, to be profeſſor of the civil and canon law at Pontamouſſon (*a*), where duke Charles had lately founded an univerſity. See the margin (*b*). He diſcharged the duties of that place with great reputation, till the year 1527, in which he died [*C*]. He was buried in the convent of the nuns of St Clara (*c*). He underſtood the Hebrew tongue [*D*]. If Mr Colomiés had known it, he would have taken notice of it in his *Gallia Orientalis*.

[*A*] *He wrote books full of great erudition.*] This any one may be convinced of, that will peruſe never ſo little his book, intituled, *Syntagma Juris univerſi atque Legum pene omnium Gentium, & Rerumpublicarum præcipuarum, in tres partes digeſtum, in quo divini & humani Juris totius, naturali ac nova methodo per gradus, ordineque, materia univerſalium & ſingularium ſimulque judicia explicantur.* It is a large folio, which has been reprinted many times (1). His other works are, *Syntaxis Artis mirabilis. De Republica, Libri XXVI.* Two volumes upon the canon-law: the firſt contains *Partitiones totius Juris Canonici, in quinque libros digeſtæ, Scholiis & Annotationibus illuſtratæ inſtar Syntagmatis totius Juris Eccleſiaſtici, quæ à methodo Partitionum Ciceronis Oratoriarum diverſæ, Summam potius Hoſtienſis imitantur:* The ſecond volume contains, *Commentaria & Annotationes in Decretalium proœmium. Ad Tit. de ſumma Trinitate & fide Catholica. De conſtitutionibus. De reſcriptis. De electione enarratio. Ad Cap. conquerente de officio & poteſtate Judicis Ordin. Rei beneficiariæ Eccleſiaſticæ Inſtitutiones. Ad Tit. de Sponſalibus & Matrimoniis. De Uſuris libri tres* (2). He wrote againſt Charles du Moulin (§ *a*), to ſhew, that the council of Trent ought to be received in France.

[(§ *a*) Under the name of *Ræmundus Rufus*, if I am not miſtaken, and for the reception of the council of Trent in France, againſt what du Moulin had written to the contrary in his *Conſilium ſupra facto Concilii Tridentini.* The work of Peter Gregory was inſerted, in 1682, in one of the laſt editions of Charles du Moulin's works, to introduce, as it were, into the world, this little piece, which made it's appearance for the firſt time in the works of this civilian. Rem. Crit.]

[*B*] *What was ſaid of his book* de Republica.] Gabriel Naudæus made the following judgment of it. 'Copioſior (Nicolao Bieſio Medico Lovanienſi) extitit 'Gregorius Tholoſanus, ac magis ex arte ſcribens, 'quia Juriſperitus: deſiderantur tamen in eo modus, 'quem ſibi præſcribere non potuit eruditione vulgari 'luxurians; & majeſtas, cui non magis indulſit quàm 'judicio, dum omnia ingerit, & pauca digerit: cæterum valde utilis eſt, & diverſa in ſe continet, propter 'quæ theſauri inſtar haberi poſſit, ubi meliorum auctorum gemmas ac precioſam variæ doctrinæ ſupellectilem poſſis invenire (3). —— *Gregory of Toulouſe 'was a writer of more ſcope and art, as being a civilian, than Nicolas Bieſius the civilian of Louvain: 'yet the luxuriancy of his erudition allowed him to ſet 'no bounds to his writing: he wants likewiſe dignity, 'which he no more conſulted than judgment, crowding 'in every thing, and digeſting nothing: however he is 'a very uſeful writer, and full of variety; upon which 'account he may be looked upon as a treaſure, in which 'you may find whatever is moſt valuable in many 'authors.'*

[*C*] *The year* 1597 . . . . *was that in which he died*] This I find in Mr Doujat (4); and, becauſe he was this author's countryman, I rely more upon him, than upon Konig, who ſays our Gregory died in the year 1585. The Francfort bookſeller (5) is not exact, when he ſays, in his epiſtle dedicatory of the firſt of March 1599, that, thro' the misfortunes of the times, he could not enjoy the preſence and aſſiſtance of the author (6), when he reprinted the *Syntagma Juris univerſi.* Would he have ſpoken thus of a man in the year 1599, if he had known, that he had died in the year 1597? He could not be fully excuſed, by ſaying, that this book was ſome years in printing.

[*D*] *He underſtood the Hebrew tongue.*] Feltman, a civilian of Germany, ſays ſo; for he calls him, not only *virum omni ſtudiorum genere excultiſſimum* (7), but alſo, *Hebræi Juris ac ſermonis callentiſſimum* (8).

GRENAILLE

(71) Virg. Æn. lib. i, ver. 84.

(*a*) Decani titulo & cum ſumma poteſtate accitus eſt, atque in ea utrumque jus magna cum laude profeſſus. *Doujat. Præn. Canon. pag.* 638.

(*b*) Mr Doujat places this in the year 1582; but Peter Gregory, in the epiſtle dedicatory of the *Syntaxis artis mirabilis*, dated from Lyons, Novemb. 4, 1574, ſtiles himſelf profeſſor of law in the new univerſity of Pontamouſſon. That univerſity was founded, in the year 1573, by cardinal Charles de Lorrain, if we believe Baudrand, pag. 431, of the ſecond volume of his *Geography*.

(*c*) Taken from Doujat, ubi ſupra.

(1) I make uſe of the Francfort edition, 1599.

(2) *See* Doujat, Prænot. Canonic. pag 638.

(3) Naudæus, Bibliograph. Politica, pag. 22.

(4) Doujat, ubi ſupra

(5) Johnas Rhodius. He had removed from France to Francfort, as he ſays in the epiſtle dedicatory.

(6) Cum per injuriam temporis ipſius auctoris præſentia & ope frui non liceret. *Johnas Rhodius Petri Fiſcheri Bibliopolæ Francofortenſis ſucceſſor, Epiſt. Dedicat. ad Archiepiſcopum Moguntinum.* Cum ipſius Auctoris præſentia in hiſce deplorandis Gallicarum rerum tumultibus frui non liceret. *Id præfat. ad lector.*

(7) Feltman. lib. i, de tit Honor cap xiii. apud Magirum. Eponymol. pag. 403.

(8) Ibid. cap. i, n. 3, apud eundem ibid.

GRENAILLE (Francis de), born at Uzerche in the Limouſin, in the year 1616, wrote a great many French books [*A*], that are very indifferent. He turned monk at Bourdeaux, and then forſook the order at Agen (*a*). He was made hiſtoriographer to the duke of Orleans. See the Sorberiana [*B*]. He prefixed his print to his books with a proud inſcription [*C*]. He informs us in a preface (*b*), that he was accuſed of a ſtate-crime, and found himſelf in danger of death.

(*a*) *See* La Guerre des Auteurs, pag. m. 169, *and the remark* [*C*].

(*b*) *That of the ſecond tome of the* Sage réſolu contre la Fortune.

[*A*] *He wrote a great many French books.*] He publiſhed one upon another, *L'honnête Fille*; *l'honnête Garçon*; *l'honnête Veuve*; *l'honnête Mariage*; *l'honnête Maîtreſſe*; *la Bibliotheque des Dames*; *le Plaiſir des Dames*; *le Sage réſolu contre la Fortune* (1), *la Revolution du Portugal*; *le Théatre du Monde*; *la Mode ou le Caractere de la Religion.*

[*B*] *See the* Sorberiana.] There you will find theſe words (2): 'At that time there was at Paris one Grenaille, Sieur de Chatonnieres *, a native of Limouſin, of twenty ſix years of age, who all of a ſudden put out a prodigious number of books, ſome of which he intituled, *L'honnête Fille*, *l'honnête Veuve*, *l'honnête Garçon*, and others, *La Bibliotheque des Dames*. What ſeemed to me commendable in his book, intituled, *Le plaiſir des Dames*, was, that, in all likelihood, a man of his age had kept in his cloſet, and avoided many debaucheries, to write books: but then there were but few good things in them, and what was good in them had been ſo often printed, that he could expect no great glory by repeating them. His ſtile was inſipid, whereby it appeared that the author wrote only for the ſake of writing. That book, concerning the pleaſures of the ladies, is divided into five parts, *Du Bouquet*, *du Bal*, *du Cours*, *du Concert*, *de la Collation.* —— *Of the Noſegay, the Ball, the Ring, the Concert, and the Collation.* At firſt he handles this queſtion, whether the noſegay adorns the breaſt, or the breaſt the noſegay? And he decides it in favour of the breaſt; being of opinion, that a certain influence proceeds from the two hemiſpheres of a lady, which revives the noſegay, and makes it not only more beautiful, but alſo more laſting.'

[*C*] *He prefixed his print to his books with a proud inſcription.*] Sorbiere goes on thus: 'He hopes that theſe fine thoughts will make him immortal; and it is the ſenſe of the motto under his print prefixed to his book, *Hac mortales evadimus immortales.*' Gueret is ſtill more ſevere upon him. 'I will ſpare, *ſays he to him* (3), your *reſolute Sage* out of reſpect for Petrarch. I will alſo *ſpare your relation of the Revolution of Portugal*, upon condition that you will take away your picture from it, whoſe inſcription is too vain for ſuch an author as you are. Had you only mentioned your birth-place, and added to it, that you turned monk at Bourdeaux, and then forſook your order at Agen; one might bear with it: But you add, that you have made yourſelf immortal at Paris; which is an article altogether falſe, and, by Apollo's leave, it ſhall be ſtruck out.'

(1) *It is a tranſlation of Petrarch. See the remark* [*C*].

(2) Pag. 105.

* *It ſhould be* Chateaunieres.

(3) Guerre des Auteurs, pag. 168, 169. Dutch Edit.

GRETSERUS (James), a very learned man, born at Marcdorf in Germany, turned Jeſuit at ſeventeen years of age, in 1577. He was profeſſor in the univerſity of Ingoldſtadt for a long time [*A*]. It is ſaid, that, notwithſtanding his application to ſtudy, he was very conſtant at prayers, and that his great learning was attended with a wonderful modeſty. The inhabitants of Marcdorf were very deſirous to have his picture, in order to place it in the town-houſe; but, when he came to know, that they had made an earneſt application to his ſuperiors about it, he was ſorry for it, and told them, that, if they had a mind to get his picture, they needed only draw the picture of an aſs (*a*). To make themſelves amends, they bought all his works for the uſe of the public. He never uſed his intereſt to procure ſome mark of diſtinction to his nephew, who was a ſtudent. He died at Ingolſtadt the twenty ninth of January, 1625 (*b*). He was continually ingaged in diſputes with the Proteſtant writers, and in defence of his order. He wrote ſomewhat ſharply againſt them; but he was anſwered in the ſame ſtrain. He compoſed, or tranſlated, a prodigious number of books [*B*]. Some authors have commended him very much (*c*). Cardinal du Perron acknowledged, that he was a man of parts; but this commendation of his was attended with a very uncivil clauſe, ſince it reflected upon a moſt illuſtrious and learned nation [*C*]. A modern author carried this incivility farther than that cardinal, and was juſtly cenſured for it (*d*).

(*a*) Indignatus ille eſt ubi reſcivit, monuitque tum demum illos ſuam imaginem habituros ſi pictum in tabula aſinum haberent. *Sotuel, Biblioth. Script. Societ. pag.* 369.

(*b*) *Taken from Sotuel*, ibid.

(*c*) *See the remark* [*B*].

(*d*) *See the remark* [*C*].

[*A*] *He was profeſſor at Ingolſtadt for a long time.*] He taught there philoſophy three years, morality ſeven years, and ſchool divinity fourteen years (1).

[*B*] *He compoſed . . . . a prodigious number of books.*] The catologue of them was publiſhed at Munich in 1674, in 4to, by George Heſerus a Jeſuit. It is a very exact catalogue; and it was printed from the author's original (2). I ſhall only ſet down the titles of ſome of his books. *De Sancta Cruce Tomi III. De ſacris Peregrinationibus Libri IV.* Three apologies for the life of the founder of the Jeſuits. The refutation of the hiſtory of the Jeſuits. That hiſtory was written by one Haſenmullerus. *De Jure & More probibendi Libros noxios Libri II. Controverſiarum Roberti Bellarmini Defenſio Tomi II*, in folio. *Baſilicon doron, ſeu Commentarius exegeticus in Sereniſſimi Magni Britanniæ Regis Jacobi Præfationem monitoriam*; & *in Apologiam pro juramento fidelitatis.* Many books againſt Goldaſt, and, among others, one intituled, *Arnoldi Brixienſis in Melchiore Goldaſto Calviniſta redivivi vera Deſcriptio & Imago* (3). Notes upon Thuanus's hiſtory. A treatiſe upon *Compelle intrare, an Heterodoxi ad fidem cogendi ſint.* An anſwer to du Pleſſis Mornai's book, intituled, *Le Myſtere d'Iniquité.* This anſwer is more cloſe, and leſs inſtructive, than that of Coëffeteau; but it was eaſier to reply to Coëffeteau, than to Gretſer. The latter has unmercifully ſcanned the quotations, and the leaſt chronological faults. I have mentioned, in another place, what he wrote in vindication of Gregory VII (4). Some authors of his communion call him the ſcourge of heretics, and the terror of the calumniators of the Jeſuits (5). He was well skilled in the Greek tongue, and publiſhed ſome grammatical pieces upon that language, and notes upon ſome Greek authors, as George Codinus Curopalata, John Cantacuzenus, &c. I muſt not forget, that he procured the im reſſion of ſeveral manuſcripts.

[*C*] *Cardinal du Perron allowed him . . . . . wit; but he added a very uncivil clauſe ſince it reflected upon . . . . . a nation.*] Gretſer *is very much to be commended; he has a great deal of wit for a German* (6) (§ *a*). They are cardinal du Perron's words. Father Bouhours alledged this teſtimony, when he called in queſtion the wit of the Germans. There was a Frenchman, who took the part of that injured nation, and critized Father Bouhours in the following manner. 'It is in the ſame diſcourſe the author puts this queſtion, *whether a German can be a wit?* I think the poſſibility of it was never yet doubted of; and it is likely, the author is the firſt, that ever asked ſuch a queſtion. His anſwer to it is, that *it is kind of prodigy, that a German ſhould be a very witty man*; whereupon he cites cardinal du Perron . . . . . But it does not follow from all this, that the author ſhould have carried the thing ſo far as to make it a queſtion, whether a German can be a wit; and it is the way to be treated with very ill language in German (7).' In another place (8) he ſpeaks thus: this 'is no great ornament, no more than his queſtion, *whether a*

(1) Natan. Sotuel. Biblioth. Script. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 369.

(2) Ex Natan. Sotuelo, ibid. pag. 372.

(3) *See the title of a like work againſt Mr Arnauld, above, citation 40) of the article* ARNAULD (Ant.) doctor of the Sorbonne.

(4) *In the article of that Pope, remark* [*R*].

(5) Magnus Lutheranorum Domitor, ac Malleus Hæreticorum, & Calumniatorum Societatis Terror. *Nat. Sotuel, ubi ſupra, pag.* 368.

(6) Perroniana, pag. m. 163.

(7) Barbier Daucour, Sentimens de Cleanthe ſur les Entretiens d'Ariſte & d'Eugene, pag. 91, 92. Buſſels Edit.

(8) Ibid. pag. 78.

‘ *German can be a wit ?* I aſſure you, Sir, that ſome ‘ very wiſe perſons have been offended at it, and ‘ told me, that, if the author of the Entretiens were ‘ more judicious, he would not have been ſo rude ‘ to a nation very much addicted to learning and war, ‘ by whom admirable diſcoveries have been made in ‘ the arts and ſciences, as artillery, printing, and the ‘ ſector ; and who, beſides, are moſt of them our ‘ friends, allies, and neighbours. ’ Cleanthes was not thought to have ſufficiently vindicated the Germans ; and therefore M. Cramer has publiſhed, upon that account, a fine apology for his nation, in a book (9) that came out laſt year. An extract of it may be ſeen in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans* (10).

[(§ α) I dare almoſt aſſert, that this expreſſion of cardinal du Perron is not ſo uncivil as it appeared to Mr Bayle. What the French call *de l'Eſprit*, (wit) is a certain talent for trifling things, or at moſt a kind of vivacity, which in general is little agreeable to the German gravity, and the ſerious character of that nation. When therefore this cardinal ſaid of Gretſer, that he had a great deal of wit (*de l'Eſprit*) for a German, he ſeems to have meant no more, than that a German has ſeldom ſo much of this French vivacity, as Father Gretſer had, as much a German as that Jeſuit was. I ſay as much of the queſtion, *whether a German can be a wit ?* no body denies the German nation the moſt refined good ſenſe, the greateſt ſagacity, and the nobleſt ſallies of genius ; and, ſatisfied with this lot, ſhe may look upon the French vivacity as no great prerogative. REM. CRIT.]

(9) *Intituled*, Vindiciæ nominis Germanici contra quoſdam Obtrectatores Gallos. Amſterdam 1694.

(10) *For July*, 1694, *pag.* 499, & ſeq.

GREVIUS (JOHN), an Arminian miniſter, born in the duchy of Cleves, was depoſed, and baniſhed, for refuſing to ſubſcribe the canons of the ſynod of Dort ; and becauſe he did not keep in his exile, he was condemned to a perpetual impriſonment [*A*] ; but, in the year 1621, he made his eſcape out of the priſon. He began there a work, which he publiſhed afterwards [*B*], wherein he condemns the uſe of the torture. He pretends, that reaſon is for him [*C*], though the moſt general practice be againſt him. He gives an account of his deliverance in his letter to Vorſtius (*a*). His impriſonment laſted a year and a half (*b*). He was admitted miniſter the tenth of May 1605,

(*a*) *It is the* 405*th among the letters of the Arminians.*

(*b*) Præfat. Diſſertat. de Tortura.

[*A*] *He was baniſhed . . . . . and becauſe he did not keep in his exile, he was condemned to a perpetual impriſonment.*] He ſays, that tho' he was ſeparated from his flock, yet he continued to take care of it ; and that his flock deſiring he would give them the ſpiritual food, he thought himſelf more obliged to mind their ſalvation, than to obey the ſentence of the magiſtrates, whereby he was forbidden to return into the country. He therefore returned into Holland, and had ſome private meetings at Campen, for the inſtruction of his flock. This thing came to be known ; he was apprehended, and condemned to perpetual impriſonment. Thus the matter is related by him (1). I know no more of it : but I know, that, on this account, he muſt needs be looked upon as a truly honeſt man, who diſcharged his duty. I appeal to thoſe, who maintain, that the miniſters, who return into France, to inſtruct the Proteſtants privately, notwithſtanding the prince's prohibition, do a very noble action. Obſerve, by the by, that perſecution is inconſiſtent with the maxim, *Quod tibi fieri non vis alteri ne feceris* : you puniſh ſuch a one, and you blame thoſe, who do the ſame.

Revius obſerves, in his hiſtory of Deventer, that Grevius had been miniſter of Heuſden ; and that he came to Campen in November 1619, where he preached eleven times in the houſes of the Arminians (2),

[*B*] *He began there a work, which he publiſhed afterwards.*] The title of it runs thus : *Tribunum reformatum, in quo ſanioris & tutioris juſtitiæ via judici Chriſtiano in proceſſu criminali commonſtratur, rejecta & fugata* TORTURA *cujus iniquitatem, multiplicem fallaciam, atque illicitum inter Chriſtianos uſum libera & neceſſaria diſſertatione aperuit* JOANNES GREVIUS *Clivenſ. quam captivus ſcripſit in Ergaſtulo Amſterodamenſi.* This work was publiſhed at Hamburgh in the year 1624 (3). It turns upon a very nice ſubject ; for it ſeems one cannot be for the negative, without condemning a practice authoriſed by the laws of the ſtate. The torture is practiſed in moſt countries ; but it ought to be obſerved, that the ſovereigns, who authoriſe it, and even will have it to be a conſiderable part of the proceedings in criminal cauſes, do not impoſe upon private men the neceſſity of believing the lawfulneſs of it. Many learned men at all times, and in all countries, have taken the liberty to ſhew the injuſtice of it. Our Grevius is one of them : his treatiſe is worth reading. Such as have the ſpirit of perſecution ſhould learn from hence, that they are in the wrong to vex and harraſs their enemies, under pretence they do not approve all the uſages of their country, or all the principles of their governors. Subjects are indeed bound to obey the magiſtrates, but not to believe, that they act juſtly and at all times ; and that of two uſages, they have not ſometimes pitched upon the worſt. Nay one may be allowed to write againſt abuſes in a reſpectful manner, that the ſovereign may reform them.

[*C*] *He pretends*, in condemning the uſe of the torture, that *reaſon is for him.*] The author of the *Philoſophical Commentary upon theſe words*, Compel them to come in (4), quotes a very fine paſſage of Michael de Montagne, wherein the two inconveniencies of the torture are mentioned : one is, that thoſe, who are able to endure the torments, do not ſpeak the truth ; the other is, that thoſe, who cannot bear pain, confeſs things that are falſe. Montagne's words deſerve to be ſet down here at length ; however, I ſhall only direct the reader to the place, where they may be found (5). The ſame commentator obſerves, that Saintmars, who was beheaded at Lyons, in 1642, for high treaſon, ‘ died with great conſtancy, and ex‘ preſſed a great contempt for life ; but, at the ‘ ſame time, ſeemed to be ſo afraid of the rack, that, ‘ if he had been put to it, it is very likely he would ‘ have confeſſed any thing. ’ It were an eaſy thing to collect many authorities and examples, to ſhew the injuſtice of the torture ; for many modern authors have publiſhed collections upon that ſubject. See among others, Ramirez de Prado in the ninth chapter of the *Pentecontarchos*, Segla in thirty ſixth annotation upon a decree of the parliament of Toulouſe, and Rupert upon the fourth chapter of the ſeventh book of Valerius Maximus. I omit the civilians, who have wrote upon this ſubject, *ex profeſſo*. Thoſe authors do not fail to mention a paſſage of St Auguſtin (6), wherein the injuſtice of the torture is both ſtrongly repreſented, and weakly excuſed. Ludovicus Vives, in his note upon that paſſage, openly declares againſt the uſe of the torture : but Leonard Coquæus, in his commentary upon the ſame words of St Auguſtin, condemns Vives's opinion, and ſays, that the fathers and the canon law approve, that the torments ſhould be made uſe of, to extort truth from thoſe, who are accuſed. Nor are theſe words of Quintilian forgotten : ‘ Sicut in tormentis quoque ‘ qui eſt locus frequentiſſimus, cùm pars altera quæ‘ ſtionem, vera fatendi neceſſitatem vocet, altera ſæpe ‘ etiam cauſſam falſa dicendi, quòd aliis patientia fa‘ cili mendacium faciat, aliis infirmitas neceſſarium (7) : ‘ —— *As in the caſe of the torture, which is a very* ‘ *common topic, when the one ſide calls the rack a* ‘ *neceſſity laid on the accuſed of confeſſing the truth* ; ‘ *the other, the occaſion likewiſe of ſaying what is* ‘ *falſe* ; *becauſe patience makes ſome eaſily guilty of a* ‘ *lye, and infirmity lays others under a neceſſity of be*‘ *ing ſo.*’ Nor theſe of Ulpian (8).’ Statutum eſt non ‘ ſemper fidem tormentis, ne tamen nunquam adhi‘ bendam fore. Etenim re eſt fragilis (*quæſtio*) & pe‘ riculoſa, & quæ veritatem fallat : nam plerique pa‘ tientiâ, ſive duritia tormentorum, ita tormenta con‘ temnunt, ut exprimi eis veritas nullo modo poſſit : ‘ alii tanta ſunt impatientia, ut quævis mentiri, quàm ‘ pati tormenta velint. Ita fit, ut etiam vario modo ‘ fateantur, ut non tantùm ſe, verum etiam alios cri‘ minentur.

(1) *In the preface to his tract* De Tortura.

(2) Revius, Daventriæ illuſtratæ, lib. vi, pag. 626.

(3) *Konig ſhould have ſaid*, Grævius (Joh.) JCtus de tortura quædam meditatus eſt ann. 1635. *Beſides, Grevius was no civilian. See his preface.*

(4) Tom. II, pag. 251, 252.

(5) *Montagne's Eſſays, book* ii, *chap.* v, *pag. m.* 61. *See alſo the* Menagiana, pag. 374. 375, *of the firſt Dutch edition.*

(6) Auguſtin. de Civit. Dei, lib. xix, cap. vi.

(7) Quintil. Inſtit. Orat lib. v, cap. iv.

(8) Ulpian. in lib. i, Sect. Quæſt. de Quæſt.

1605, and that very day he preached his firſt ſermon at Arnheim. This I find in a letter, which he wrote, in 1620, to Balthazar Brantius (*c*), who intreated him to forſake the party of the Remonſtrants.

minentur. —— *It is agreed, that we are not always to believe what is extorted by the rack, but not that we are never to give credit to it. The torture is a dangerous thing, and which ſometimes deceives the truth: for many perſons are ſo hardened againſt pain, as to deſpiſe the torture, and can by no means be brought to confeſs the truth: others are ſo unable to endure pain, that they will tell any lye rather than ſuffer the torture: hence it is, that they ſay and unſay, and accuſe, not only themſelves, but others.*’ I have obſerved in another place (9), that the Cappadocians could ſtoutly endure the greateſt torments: the ſame has been ſaid of the (10) Egyptians and Spaniards (11). Obſerve, that the torture is not practiſed in England; no not againſt thoſe, who are accuſed of high treaſon. Barclay makes this obſervation in the fourth chapter of his *Icon Animorum*. To conclude, Grevius had a copious ſubject; and as the materials were plentiful, he knew how to make a good uſe of them.

GRIBALDUS (MATTHEW), a learned civilian of Padua, left Italy in the XVIth century, in order to make an open profeſſion of the Proteſtant religion; but, in imitation of ſome other Italians, who turned Proteſtants, he fell into the hereſy of the Antitrinitarians. After he had been profeſſor of the civil-law at Tubingen for ſome years, he left that employment, to avoid the puniſhment he had undergone, if he had been convicted of his errors. He was apprehended at Berne, where he would have been ſeverely uſed, had he not pretended to renounce his opinions; and, becauſe he returned to the mire, and openly favoured the heretics, who had been expelled from Geneva, and particularly Gentilis, whom he harboured in a ſeat he had not far from that town (*a*), he would have been ſooner or later puniſhed with death [*A*], if the plague, of which he died in September, 1564, had not prevented his being proſecuted for hereſy. In a journey he took to Geneva, during Servetus's trial, he deſired to have a conference with Calvin, but could not obtain it. Some time after, Calvin ſent him word, that he would admit him to a conference; at which his colleagues, and three elders of the conſiſtory, ſhould be preſent. Gribaldus came to the appointed place, but went away haſtily, when he ſaw that Calvin refuſed to give him his hand. He would not admit his excuſe, that ſuch a thing could not be done, till he and they ſhould agree (*b*) as to the principles of religion, *viz.* the Trinity and the divinity of CHRIST (*c*). He was ſummoned to appear before the magiſtrates, to give an account of his faith; and becauſe his anſwers were not ſatisfactory, he was ordered to leave the town. This is what may be inferred from the letter I quote (*d*). He wrote ſeveral books, which are eſteemed [*B*].

[*A*] *He would have been ſooner or later puniſhed with death.*] This is what I find in Beza: I ſhall ſet down his words, which prove many things I have advanced. ‘Domi verò Serveti cineres pullulare cœperunt: cujus blaſphemiis favere deprehenſus Matthæus Gribaldus, non incelebris Juriſconſultus quam Genevam forte veniſſet . . . . . deductus ad Calvinum à quibuſdam Italis, quos Patavii docuerat, recuſante Calvino dextram illi porrigere, niſi prius de primario Chriſtianæ fidei articulo, id eſt de ſacra Triade & Deitate Chriſti inter eos conveniret, nullum poſtea locum ullis admonitionibus vel argumentis reliquit. Itaque quod ei jam tum prædixit Calvinus, grave nimirum Dei judicium pertinaci ipſius impietati imminere; hoc reipſa poſtea expertus eſt, Tubinga primùm profugus, quò fuerat Vergerii favore introductus: Bernæ poſtea captus, ſimulatâque abnegatione liberatus, ad ingenium poſtea rediens, & Gentilis illius de quo mox dicemus fautor & hoſpes, ſupervenіente demum peſte correptus, paratum ſibi in terris ſupplicium antevertit (1). —— *At home, the aſhes of Servetus began to ſpring up: for Matthew Gribaldus, a famous civilian, who was found to favour the blaſphemies of that man, coming by accident to Geneva . . . . . was introduced to Calvin by ſome Italians, whom he had taught at Padua; but, upon Calvin's refuſing to give him his hand, till they ſhould agree upon the principal article of the Chriſtian faith, the ſacred Trinity, and the divinity of CHRIST, he left no room for any farther admonitions or arguments. This man afterwards experienced the judgment of GOD on his obſtinate impiety, as Calvin at that time foretold him, being firſt baniſhed from Tubingen, whither he had come by the favour of Vergerius; afterwards, being apprehended at Berne, and ſet at liberty upon a pretended recantation, but returning to the ſame ſentiments, and openly favouring and entertaining Gentilis, whom I ſhall ſpeak of preſently, he was ſeized with the plague, and prevented the puniſhment prepared for him in this world.*’ It does not appear from theſe words, in what year Gribaldus died; but it is known, that he was no longer alive when Valentinus Gentilis went in queſt of him into the territories of the canton of Berne, in 1566 (2), and it may be proved, That he died in September, 1564 (3). See, above, a paſſage of Languet at the end of the remark [*E*] of the article GOVEA.

[*B*] *Gribaldus wrote ſeveral books which were eſteemed.*] Here follow the titles of them. *Commentarii in legem de rerum miſtura, & de jure fiſci*: they were printed in Italy (4). *Commentarii in Pandectas juris*, printed at Lyons. *Commentarii in aliquot præcipuos Digeſti, Infortiati novi, & codicis Juſtinianei titulos atque leges utiliſſimis concluſionibus illuſtrati*, Francfort 1577 in folio. *Hiſtoria Franciſci Spiræ (cui anno* 1548, *familiaris aderat) ſecundum quæ ipſe vidit & audivit*, *Baſil* 1550. *De omni genere homicidii*, *Spire* 1583, in 8vo. *De methodo ac ratione ſtudendi in jure civili libri tres*, *Lyons* 1544, & 1556. Probably it is in this laſt book he maintained, that a civilian ought to underſtand hiſtory; and that he ſhewed the miſtakes into which ſome civilians are fallen through ignorance (5). He ſpent only eight days in writing that book (6).

Note, that Sledian confirms, that he was one of the ſpectators of the diſmal condition the unhappy Spiera was reduced to, and that he wrote and publiſhed an account of it, *Multi præterea Spieram in eo ſtatu viderunt magni omnis viri, & in his Mathæus Gribaldus, Jureconſultus Patavinus, qui & rem omnem, quam ipſe coràm vidit & audivit, ſcripto complexus in lucem edidit* (7).

(*c*) *It is the 376th letter among thoſe of the Arminians, Edit.* 1684.

(9) *In citation* (19) *of the article* CAPPADOCIA.

(10) Ælian. Var. Hiſtor. lib vii, cap. xviii, Ammian. Marcell. lib. xxii.

(11) *See* Rupert, in Valer. Max. lib. iii, cap. iii, pag. 218.

(*a*) Erat Fargiarum Dominus. *He was lord of Fargia.* Beza, in Vita Calvini ad ann. 1555, & Bibl. Antitrinitar. pag. 17.

(*b*) Confer quæ Sylla erga Mithridatem, apud Plutarchum in in Sylla, pag. 467.

(*c*) *See the remark* [*C*].

(*d*) *It is the 238th letter of Calvin, dated the ſecond of May,* 1557.

(1) Beza, in Vita Calvini, ad ann. 1555. pag. m. 378. *See alſo the 238th letter of Calvin, pag.* m. 440.

(2) Veluti trahente illum ad pœnam ipſius Chriſti manu in Sabaudiam ad ſuum Gribaldum venit (Gentilis). At illam peſtem altera jam peſtis ſuſtulerat. *Id. ibid. pag.* 308.

(3) *See the preface of Theodore Beza, before Calvin's* Commentary on Joſhua, pag. m. 24.

(4) *See the* Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum, pag. 18, *and the catalogue of the Bodleian library.*

(5) *See* Albericus Gentilis de Juris Interpretibus, fol. 54.

(6) Id. ibid. fol. 65.

(7) Sleidan. lib. xi, fol. m. 590.

GRILLON, a gentleman of Provence, one of the moſt valiant men of his time, under the reigns of Henry III, and Henry IV. See his hiſtory in Varillas's preface to the hiſtory of Henry III. That hiſtorian calls him always Crillon, which is the true orthography of his name, though unknown to almoſt all other authors (§ α).

[(§ α) This gentleman ſubſcribed himſelf *Crillon* in conformity to the orthography of the ancient titles of his houſe ; but, probably, he called himſelf *Grillon*, in like manner as, notwithſtanding the etymology, we pronounce *gril*, *grotte*, *migraine*. REM. CRIT.]

GROPPER (JOHN) archdeacon of Cologne in the XVIth century, and raiſed to the purple by Pope Paul IV. See his article in Moreri's dictionary, and add to it, that he took it extreamly ill, that Sleidan ſhould endeavour to render him ſuſpected of having once inclined to Lutheraniſm [*A*].

[*A*] *He took it extremely ill, that Sleiden ſhould endeavour to render him ſuſpected of having once inclined to Lutheraniſm.*] Sleidan affirms (1), that Gropper had always very ſtrongly recommended Martin Bucer to Herman de Wida, archbiſhop of Cologne, who made uſe of the miniſtry of the ſame Bucer to eſtabliſh the reformation in his diminions in the year 1543. But, as Gropper threw obſtacles in the way of it, Sleidan would make him paſs for a deſerter, who, after having had an intimacy with that miniſter, ſtrongly oppoſed him. *Hujus libri* (2) *fuit author, ut aiunt, & architectus, Gropperus. Nam is, etſi Bucero fuerat admodum familiaris ante biennium in comitio Ratisbonæ, quamquam inde domum reverſus, vehementer eum non Archiepiſcopo tantùm, ſed paſſim apud omnes prædicaverat, licet crebras ad eum dediſſet & amiciſſimas literas : tamen, quum res eſſet in eum deducta caſum, ab ejus amicitia ſe totum avertit, & principe relicto, cui fortunam omnem debebat, in adverſariorum caſtra tranſiit* (3). As to the reſentment of Gropperus, I am going to cite a copyiſt of Surius. 'Sleidan . . . . would make us believe, that . . . . John Gropper was an heretic, and that he had always greatly eſteemed and recommended Martin Bucer. But this ſo valuable a man did plainly ſhew, that, what was ſaid of him was meer calumny, in a book, which he dedicates to Charles V; and again in another place he witneſſes, that Sleidan (whom he repreſents as maliciouſly ignorant of the affairs of the empire) has falſely lied in his hiſtory full of untruths when he ſays ſuch a thing of him, and that Martin Bucer inſinuated himſelf by little and little in the dioceſe of Cologne, not only without his knowledge, and that of all the Catholics, but even in deſpite of them ; and in the ſame place he expreſsly calls Bucer a deteſtible wretch. In truth Sleidan would not have ſaid ſo injurious a thing, without receiving an anſwer had he not died before Gropper could anſwer him in writing, as he had reſolved to do (4).'

Maimbourg does not deny, that Gropper, who was one of the three Catholic doctors, that conferred with Bucer and with two other Proteſtants, at the conference of Ratisbon, in the year 1541, had correſponded after that time with Bucer; but it is, adds he (5), 'becauſe, this preacher of Strasburg, convinced by the reaſons, which that excellent man produced in that conference, gave him room to believe, by the letters, which he wrote to him, that he was prepared to renounce Luther, as he had already done Zuinglius, and to return to the Catholic church.' However it be, the copyiſt of Surius obſerves, that Gropper, in his in his return from this conference of Ratisbon, 'caſt his eyes on the books of Bucer, and, to prove the conſtancy of the man, he compared them with the articles, that had been agreed upon in the ſaid conference. Then he met with an immenſe number of points directly oppoſite to thoſe, which Bucer had admitted and approved in that conference ; and nevertheleſs he remarked ſome villanous repugnancies of the ſaid Bucer, errors, lyes, and blaſphemies ſo great, that the Manicheans never uttered the like, that if any one deſires farther information in this matter, he muſt read what the learned Everard de Billy (6), has written, in defence of the judgment of the univerſity and clergy of Cologne, againſt the calumnies of Melancthon, Bucer, and others, in which he will find this matter fully handled (7).' Surius and his copyiſt alledge this, in order to have an opportunity of ſaying that Sleidan is a liar. They expreſs great rage againſt him in this and an hundred other places.

(1) Sleidan, lib. xv, fol. m. 367.

(2) *That is to ſay, the* Antididagma, *of which I have ſpoken in the remark* [C] *of the article* WIDA.

(3) Sleidan, lib. xv, fol. 367, verſo.

(4) Du Preau, Hiſt. de l'Egliſe, Tom. II, fol. 475. *See Surius,* ad. ann. 1543, pag. m. 384.

(5) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de Luther. Tom. I. p. 269, Edit. of Holland.

(6) Everardus Billicus, *or rather* Billichius. *He was a Carmelite.*

(7) Du Preau, ubi ſupra.

GROTIUS (CORNELIUS), in Dutch, *de Groot*, that is *the Great*, was born the 25th of July 1544, at Delft, where his family had been illuſtrious for the ſpace of four hundred years [*A*]. He went there, through his ſchool-learning ; and then he was ſent to Louvain, where he ſtudied philoſophy four years. He applied himſelf chiefly to that of Plato [*B*]. He learned alſo Greek and Hebrew, and even Mathematics. At twenty years of age he went to Paris, where he continued to ſtudy the *belles lettres* and philoſophy, and was very well beloved by John Daurat, Regius profeſſor. From thence he went to Orleans to learn the civil law ; and when the profeſſors thought he deſerved to be admitted doctor, he was contented to take his licentiate's degree, to which he kept all his life-time. Being returned into his country, he betook

[*A*] *He was born at Delft, Where his family had been illuſtrious for the ſpace of four hundred years.*] Here follow the words of the author I have quoted in the text of this article. 'Patrem habuit Hugonem Grotium virum antiqua virtute & opibus pollentem, ex patricia Grotiorum familia quæ in repub. Delphenſi totis quadringentis annis continuis illuſtris, etiam hucuſque conſulatibus & ſummis reipub. honoribus decoratur (1). —— *His father was Hugo Grotius, a man of great probity, and wealth, deſcended from the noble family of the* Grotii, *which, having been famed in the republic of Delft four hundred years, ſtill continues to ſhine in the moſt diſtinguiſhed poſts of the common-wealth.*' That author is not exact, and wants to be explained. His words do manifeſtly imply, that the ancient family of the De Groot's continued in the male line down to our Cornelius Grotius ; which is not true : for about the year 1430, Dederic de Groot, burgomaſter of Delft, and illuſtrious by many deputations, had but one daughter, who, marrying Cornelius Cornetz, ſtipulated, that her children ſhould go by the name of de Groot. Which began to be executed in the perſon of Hugh de Groot, the father of our Cornelius. The Cornetz deſcended from a French gentleman, who ſettled in the Low-Countries in the time of the dukes of Burgundy. See the paſſage quoted by me in the remark [*E*].

[*B*] *He applied chiefly . . . to the philoſophy of Plato.*] The author of his elogy expreſſes it in this manner : (2) 'Philoſophiam Platonicam, quippe quam ſolam inter humanæ ſapientiæ ſectas magis divinam (ut re vera eſt) judicavit, adeo avide amplexus eſt, ut omnia Platonicorum ſcripta perſcrutatus fuerit, memoriæ infixerit, ac per totam vitam manu ac mente volutaverit. —— *He was ſo fond of the Platonic philoſophy, which he thought (as indeed it is) the moſt divine among the ſects of philoſophy, that he read over all the works of the Platoniſts, got them almoſt by heart, and was perpetually meditating upon them.*'

(1) Academia Leidenſis, p. 76.

(2) Ibid. p. 77.

[C] He

betook himſelf to the bar. The city of Delft made him counſellor and echevin at the ſame time; and becauſe he gave ſeveral proofs of his virtue and learning, prince William conferred upon him the office of maſter of the requeſts. He worthily diſcharged the duties of that office till the year 1575, when he was made profeſſor in the univerſity of Leyden, newly founded, where he taught philoſophy for ſome years, and then the civil-law. He was ſo well pleaſed with that employment, that he would not leave it to be counſellor in the great council, though that office was offered him ſeveral times. He died in the year 1601, without iſſue. He left behind him ſome books concerning the civil-law, that have not been printed (a) [C]. He had a brother, whoſe name was JOHN DE GROOT [*D*], who was the father of HUGH DE GROOT, who makes the ſubject of the following article. They were both the ſons of HUGH DE GROOT, the firſt of his family who went by that name [*E*], and who died in the year 1567 (b), being burgomaſter of Delft the fifth time.

(a) *Taken from the book intituled,* Illuſtrium Hollandiæ & Weſt-Friſiæ Ordinum Alma Academia Leidenſis, *printed at Leyden, in* 1614.

(b) Ibid. in Jano Grotio.

[C] *He left ſome books concerning the civil-law, that have not been printed.*] The ſame author goes on thus: ‘Libros nullos edidit, ſed elaboratos quoſdam commenrios ad diverſas Juris partes conſcripſit. Inter quos *Abſolutiſſimum commentarium ad quatuor libros Inſtitutionem juris civilis. Ad omnes titulos quatuor primorum librorum digeſtorum. Duos Tomos commentariorum & obſervationum feudalium. Singularem tractatum continentem quinquaginta differentias feudorum, à feudis Hollandicis.* —— *He publiſhed no books, but wrote ſome elaborate commentaries on different parts of the civil-law; among which, one, which he intituled,* Abſolutiſſimum Commentarium, *&c.*’ Konig did not obſerve this; for he ſays, that moſt of thoſe books were publiſhed by the author of them (3), and he quotes Swertius and Meurſius, who ſays no ſuch thing (4).

[*D*] *He had a brother, whoſe name was JOHN DE GROOT.*] Who, after he had gone through his ſchool-learning at Delft, ſtudied philoſophy and the civil-law at Douay. He returned into Holland, as ſoon as the univerſity of Leyden was founded; and lived, till the year 1582, in the houſe of his brother Cornelius de Groot, profeſſor of the civil-law in that univerſity. Afterwards he was made ſucceſſively Schepen and Burgomaſter of Delft, and curator of the univerſity of Leyden (5); and did not ſcruple to be admitted doctor of law after he had been curator (6). *There are ſome of his works written with great politeneſs,* if we may believe Moreri; but he is miſtaken: He too much enlarges what Meurſius had already too much amplified. Theſe are Meurſius's words (7): *Pater* (Hugonis) *erat Joannes Grotius cujus exſtant carmina, & Lipſii ad ipſum literæ, Douſæque verſus, nec pauca aliorum monumenta ipſius inſcripta nomini.* The plain meaning of which is, That John Grotius had made ſome verſes, which had been publiſhed. But ſince the whole paſſage of Meurſius, is to be found in the life of Grotius, except theſe words, *cujus exſtant carmina* (8), it is very probable that Meurſius was miſtaken upon that head. Beſides, it is certain, that John Grotius underſtood poetry: Lipſius ſays ſo. ‘Negas agnoſcere te Deas, idque carmine quod agnoſcant ipſæ Deæ. . . . . Carmen totum approbum, nec critica illi à me nota (9). —— *You deny, that you acknowledge goddeſſes, and that in a poem which goddeſſes themſelves might acknowledge. . . . The whole poem is perfectly good, nor will I offer to criticiſe it.*

[*E*] *HUGH DE GROOT, was the firſt of his family, who went by that name.*] This I find in the life of Grotius, prefixed to his works, and among the lives collected by Dr Bates. The paſſage deſerves to be ſet down at length. ‘Avus ei fuit ille Hugo *de Groot* qui ex illuſtri Cornetziorum gente prognatus, primus Grotianum nomen in familiam ſuam tranſtulit. Quippe cùm circa annum trigeſimum ſeculi decimi quinti in Diderico *de Groot* ejuſdem itidem civitatis conſule, & non paucis deputationibus ſatis claro, defeciſſet ſtrips maſculina, filia ejus Ermgarda *de Groot*, domûs ſatis opulentæ hæres, viro Nobiliſſimo Cornelio Cornetzio, qui genus ſuum ex ea Cornetziorum proſapia ducebat, qui ſub Ducibus Burgundiæ ex Gallia in Belgium migraverant, nuptura, matrimonium non iniit, niſi factâ conditione, ne, qui ex eo naſcerentur maſculini ſexûs liberi, alio quam Grotiano nomine nuncuparentur; ita natus Hugo *de Groot*, ejus Hugonis, de quo loquimur, avus, vir ſupra quam ea tempora ferebant, Latinarum, Græcarum & Hebræarum quoque literarum ſciens. —— *His grand-father was that Hugh de Groot, who, being deſcended from the illuſtrious family of the Cornetz, firſt introduced the Grotian name into his family. For the male line failing in Dideric de Groot, chief magiſtrate of the ſame town, and well known by his many deputations, about the year* 1430 *his daughter Eremgard de Groot, a rich heireſs, being to marry the moſt noble Cornelius Cornetz, deſcended from that branch of the Cornetz, which, under the dukes of Burgundy, tranſplanted itſelf from France into Holland, articled with him, that their male iſſue ſhould bear the name of Grotius: from this marriage ſprung Hugo Grotius, grand-father of that Hugo we are ſpeaking of, a man of uncommon skill in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, for the times he lived in.*’ It appears from the ſequel of this paſſage, that this Hugh was burgomaſter of Delft, and married Elſelinge Heemskerk, a woman of a very noble extraction.

(3) Edidit Com. ad 4. libros inſtitutionum Juris civilis; item 2. tomos obſervationum feudalium. *Konig. Biblioth. vet. & nova, pag.* 366.

(4) *Swertius ſays in expreſs words,* Libros nullos edidit, ſed elaboratos . . . . conſcripſit. *Meurſius mentions no books publiſhed or compoſed.*

(5) *He was burgomaſter four times ſucceſſively, before he was curator of the univerſity.* Acad. Leidenſ.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Athen. Batav. pag. 205.

(8) Patrem habuit Joannem de Groot . . . . ad quem exſtant Lipſii epiſtolæ, illuſtris viri Jani Douzæ verſus, & non pauca aliorum monumenta ejus nomini inſcripta. *Vita Grotii init. apud Bateſium, pag.* 420.

(9) Lipſius, Epiſt. xvii, Centur. 1, Miſcellan.

GROTIUS (HUGO), one of the greateſt men in Europe, was born at Delft the tenth of April 1583. He made ſo early a progreſs in his ſtudies, that he wrote verſes before he was nine years of age; and at fifteen he had great ſkill in philoſophy, divinity, and the civil-law: But he was ſtill better ſkilled in the *belles lettres*, as he made it appear by the commentary he wrote at that age upon a very difficult author (*a*). In the year 1598, he accompanied the Dutch ambaſſador (*b*) into France, where Henry IV gave him ſeveral marks of his eſteem. He took there his degree of doctor of laws; and, being returned into his country, he applied himſelf to the bar, and pleaded before he was ſeventeen years of age. He was not twenty four years old, when he was made advocate-general. He ſettled at Rotterdam in 1613, and was ſyndic of that town (*c*); he would not accept of that employment, but upon condition that he ſhould not be deprived of it; for he foreſaw, that the quarrels of divines about the doctrine of grace, which formed already a thouſand factions in the ſtate, would occaſion many revolutions in the chief towns. He was ſent into England in the ſame year, on occaſion of the miſunderſtanding between the merchants of both nations, about which he had written ſomething [*A*]. He found himſelf ſo far engaged in the affairs, which

(*a*) Martianus Capella. *See Mr Baillet,* Enfans celebres, pag. 232, & ſeq. *where you will find the proofs of Grotius's great learning before he was twenty years of age.*

(*b*) *It was the famous Barnevelt.*

(*c*) *The Dutch call thoſe, who are inveſted with that office,* Penſionaries.

[*A*] *About which he had written ſomething.*] I ſhall ſet down Meurſius's words. ‘Cum intelligeret navigationem in Indiam, fœderaque ejus Orbis ingentia eſſe præſidia patriæ ſuæ, quo magis populares ſuos excitaret ad eas res magno animo ſuſcipiendas, *de jure commercii Indicani* libellum compoſuit (1). —— *Being ſenſible, that the navigation and trade to the Indies, was of great ſervice to his country, to* ‘excite

(1) Meurſius, Athen. Batav. pag. 206.

which ruined Barnevelt, that he was arreſted in Auguſt 1618, and condemned to a perpetual impriſonment, the 18th of May 1619, and to forfeit his eſtate. He was confined to the caſtle of Louveſtein the 6th of June, in the ſame year. Every body knows how he made his eſcape [*B*], after he had been ſeverely uſed above a year and and a half (*d*). He retired into France, where he met with a kind reception at court, and had a penſion aſſigned him. The Dutch ambaſſadors endeavoured to prepoſſeſs the king againſt him; but that prince did not mind their artifices, and gave a glorious teſtimony to the virtue of that illuſtrious refugee [*C*]. Grotius applied himſelf very much to ſtudy, and to compoſe books. The firſt he publiſhed, after he had ſettled in France, was an apology for the magiſtrates of Holland, who had been turned out of their places [*D*]. He left France, after he had been there eleven years, and returned into Holland full of hopes, by reaſon of a kind letter he had received from prince Frederic Henry; but his enemies prevented the good effects of it [*E*]; and therefore he was forced once more to leave his country. He reſolved to go to Hamburgh, where he ſtayed till he accepted the offers of the crown of Sweden in the year 1634. Queen Chriſtina made him one of her counſellors, and ſent him ambaſſador to Lewis XIII. Having diſcharged the duties of that employment about eleven years, he ſet out from France to give an account of his embaſſy to the queen of Sweden. He went through Holland, and received many honours at Amſterdam. He ſaw queen Chriſtina at Stockholm; and, after he had diſcourſed with her about the affairs he had been intruſted with, he moſt humbly begged of her, that ſhe would grant

‘*excite his countrymen to undertake thoſe things with courage, he wrote a book*, Of the right of commerce to the Indies.’ That tract was intituled, *Mare liberum, ſive de jure quod Batavis competit ad Indicana commercia diſſertatio*, and was printed in 1609. See Colomiés's *Bibliotheque Choiſie, pag.* 157.

[*B*] *Every body knows how he made his eſcape.*] It was ‘by the advice and artifice of Mary de Regelſberg (2) his wife, who having obſerved, that the guards, being weary of ſearching a large trunk full of books, and linnen to be waſhed at Gorcum, a neighbouring town, let it go without opening it, as they uſed to do, adviſed her husband to put himſelf into it, having made ſome holes with a wimble in the place, where the fore part of his head was, that he might breathe, and not be ſtifled. He followed her advice, and was in that manner carried to a friend of his at Gorcum; from whence he went to Antwerp in the uſual waggon, after he had croſſed the public place in the diſguiſe of a joyner, having a rule in his hands. That artful woman pretended all the while, that her husband was very ſick, to give him time to make his eſcape into a foreign country: but, when ſhe thought that he was ſafe, ſhe told the guards, laughing at them, that the bird was flown. At firſt there was a deſign to proſecute her; and ſome judges were of opinion, that ſhe ſhould be kept in priſon inſtead of her husband: but by a majority of votes, ſhe was releaſed, and praiſed by every body for having, by her wit, procured her husband's liberty (3).’ Such a wife deſerved not only to have a ſtatue erected to her in the commonwealth of learning, but alſo to be canonized; for it is to her we are indebted for ſo many excellent works, publiſhed by her husband, which had never come out of the darkneſs of Louveſtein, if he had remained there all his life-time, as ſome judges, appointed by his enemies, deſigned it (4).

[*C*] *Lewis XIII gave a glorious teſtimony . . . of this illuſtrious refugee.*] Grotius preſerved ſtill an affection for his country, though he had been ſo ill uſed. This Lewis XIII admired; and doubtleſs it was one of the reaſons, which moved that prince to reject the ill councils of the Dutch miniſters, who hated him, and endeavoured to make him odious to the court of France. ‘Semper intentus patriæ & popularibus ſuis ubi quid negotii illis apud aulam eam eſſet, conſilio, operâ, & quâ pollebat apud nonnullos Miniſtros regios gratiâ inſervire ac prodeſſe; quamvis non ignoraret, eos, qui ibi res Fœderatorum curabant, nihil intentatum relinquere, quo Regis animum ipſi infeſtum redderent, ſed fruſtra laborabant apud Principem nihil ignorantem eorum, quæ annis cIↄ Iↄc xviii & cIↄ Iↄc xix in Hollandia acta erant; quin dixiſſe non ſemel fertur, mirari ſe virtutem hominis, qui tam malè in patria habitus, non deſineret tamen ei, ſubditiſque ejus bene velle, imò quocunque etiam poſſet modo benefacere (5). ——— *Always ready to aſſiſt his countrymen, who had any buſineſs at court, by his advice, and his credit with ſome of the king's miniſters; tho' he was not ignorant, that the States envoys left no ſtone unturned to alienate the king's affection from him; tho' they laboured to no purpoſe with a king, who knew every thing that had been tranſacted in Holland, in the years* cIↄ Iↄc xviii *and* cIↄ Iↄc xix: *nay he was often heard to ſay, that he admired the virtue of the man, who, notwithſtanding the ill uſage of his countrymen, ceaſed not to wiſh well to them, and even to ſerve them whenever he could.*’ Grotius ſhewed, by his conduct, that he had made a good uſe of the noble examples he had read in the ancient Roman authors (6). See what I have obſerved in relation to Camillus (7).

[*D*] *The firſt book he publiſhed was an apology for the magiſtrates of Holland who had been turned out of their places.*] The contrary party was very much diſpleaſed with that book. They thought Grotius made it appear, that they had acted againſt the laws, and they endeavoured again to ruin him; but the protection of the French court ſecured him againſt their attempts. Which may be ſeen more at large in the following paſſage (8). ‘Primum operum, quod poſt receptam libertatem edidit, fuit Apologeticus ſive defenſio, non tam ſua, qui non potuerat peccare in exſequendis iis, quæ ſibi à Superioribus ſuis mandata erant, quam eorum, qui legitimo modo creati, legitimò jure Reip. Hollandicæ annis decimo octavo & nono præfuerant. Quo comperto Fœderatorum Delegati, neque ignorantes ſuas in eo libro artes, illatamque Hollandiæ vim (9) detegi, cum nihil haberent, quo expreſſam in eo veritatem redarguere aut refutare poſſent, uſitatâ jam diu violentiâ utentes, proſcriptionibus eum perſecuti ſunt: quod brutum fulmen, cùm per Chriſtianiſſimi Regis tutelam, qui eum in fidem ſuam receperat, evanuiſſet, nihil aliud eo actum eſt, quam quod, &c. —— *The firſt work he publiſhed, after he was ſet at liberty, was an apology, or defence, not ſo much of himſelf who could not offend in the performance of thoſe things, which his ſuperiors required of him, as of thoſe, who, being legally created, preſided legally over the commonwealth of Holland, in the years eighteen and nineteen, which being known, the delegates of the States, conſcious that their arts, and the violence offered to Holland, were detected in that book, and not being able to deny the truth of what he had ſaid, had recourſe to their old violènce, and purſued him with proſcriptions: which impotent malice being diſappointed by the protection of the moſt Chriſtian King, nothing farther was done than that &c.*’

[*E*] *His enemies prevented the good effects of it.*] Prince Frederic Henry wrote a letter to Grotius in the year 1622, wherein he offered to ſerve him. It is printed at the end of Grotius's life: and, in all probability, that prince would have gladly reſtored that great man, had he not been told there was ſome danger in it. Here follows a Latin paſſage, wherein the whole matter is explained. ‘Mortuo Mauritio Arauſionenſium Principe, frater ejus Fredericus Henricus ad gubernaculum Reipublicæ admotus, non mitioris tantùm regiminis, ſed & priſtinæ in adminiſtranda Republica libertatis ſpem dederat, ipſique jam pridem Grotio animi ſui affectum per literas teſtatus erat, cre-

debaturque

(*d*) Ubi poſtquam ultra ſeſquiannum ſuſtentatus bonis uxoris, aſpernantis judicum largitionem, qui vicenos & quatuor in diem aſſes captivo totique ipſius familiæ aſſignaverant, ſtudiis præcipuè impendiſſet, plurimaſque ab iis qui cuſtodiæ ejus præerant injurias perpeſſus fuiſſet, &c. - - - *Where being ſupported above a year and a half by his wife, who refuſed the ſcanty allowance of the judges, amounting to not more than four and twenty pence a day for himſelf and his whole family, after he had ſpent his time chiefly in ſtudy, and had ſuffered much ill uſage from his keepers*, &c. Vita Grotii, apud Bateſium, pag. 423.

(2) Her true name was Mary Reygerſbergen.

(3) Du Maurier Memoires de Hollande, pag. m. 404. *See the letters* Eccleſiaſticæ & Theologicæ, pag. 654, & ſeq.

(4) Eorumque (*novem menſium*) ſex elapſi eſſent in conquirendo infenſiſſimos quoſque, quibus judicum munus tuto committerent. —— *And ſeven of the nine months had been ſpent in looking out his moſt inveterate enemies, whom they might ſafely make his judges.* Vita Grotii, pag. 423. *See, in remark* [F], *of the article* GRANDIER, *what Menage ſays on judgments made by ſelect commiſſioners.*

(5) Vita Grotii, apud Bateſium, pag. 423.

(6) See the letter he wrote to Erycius Puteanus. It is the 388th letter among the *Epiſt. Eccleſiaſt. & Theolog. in fol.*

(7) In the article CAMILLUS, in the text, between citations (*d*) and (*e*).

(8) Vita Grotii, pag. 424.

(9) *We are told, pag.* 423, *in what that violence conſiſted.* Delegatos illis judices dare, illegitimo modo accuſare, indefenſos damnare; Oldenbarneveldium ſeptuageſimum ſecundum ætatis annum agentem capitali ſupplicio plectere, reliquos duos ad perpetuos carceres mittere, & omnia eorum bona publicare: nitentibus contra & vim auctoritati ſuæ inferri fruſtra clamantibus ipſis Hollandiæ Ordinibus, donec optimis quibuſque à muneribus ſuis dimotis, noviſque in eorum loca contra leges impoſitis omnia pro libidine eorum agi cœpêre qui iſtius novitatis auctores erant. - - - *The delegates appointed them judges, accuſed them illegally, and condemned them unheard: they put to death Oldenbarnevelt, at ſeventy two years of age; the other*

two

two they ſent to perpetual impriſonment, and confiſcated all their effects: and this notwithſtanding the States of Holland oppoſed them, and cried out, that their authority was abuſed; till having removed the beſt perſons from their employments, and ſubſtituted others, contrary to law, in their places, every thing began to be at the beck of the authors of theſe new proceedings.

grant him his diſmiſſion. He had much ado to obtain it; and that princeſs gave him ſeveral marks of her great eſteem for him. He had many enemies in that court [*F*]. The ſhip, on board which he embarked, was violently toſſed by a ſtorm, and caſt away on the coaſt of Pomerania. Grotius, being ſick, and uneaſy in his mind, continued to travel by land; but his illneſs forced him to ſtop at Roſtoc, where he died, in a few days, on the 28th of Auguſt 1645. His body was carried to Delft, to be buried among his anceſtors (*e*). Notwithſtanding his embaſſy, he publiſhed many books upon ſeveral ſubjects [*G*]. He engaged in an unpleaſant diſpute, having undertaken to reconcile theological controverſies. A divine of Leyden (*f*), who was a native of France, wrote againſt him upon that account, and left nothing unattempted to make him ſuſpected by the Proteſtants, and to exaſperate the court of Sweden againſt him. That diſpute afforded an inſtance of the truth of this maxim, *That the mind is deceived by the heart.* Grotius, being deſirous to re-unite all Chriſtians, looked upon it as a thing that might be effected; his deſire did not permit him to ſee the unſurmountable obſtacles, which the obſtinacy of ſome private perſons would eaſily raiſe, though there had been none,

(*e*) *Taken from his life, prefixed to his theological works, printed at Amſterdam, in* 1679, *and in the collection, printed at London in* 1681, *and intituled,* Vitæ ſelectorum aliquot virorum.

(*f*) Andrew Rivet.

'debaturque à non paucis, quæſiturus ſibi gloriam ex tanti viri tam injuſtè damnati in integrum reſtitutione; ſed ut plerumque apud animos eorum, qui Principum conſiliis præſunt, utilia honeſtis prævalent neque deeſſent qui ipſi ante oculos ponerent, quam periculoſum rebus ſuis foret, hominem, tam pertinaciter libertatis ac patriæ ſuæ amantem, iterum ad Rempublicam admittere, potentiæ ſuæ quàm exiſtimationi conſulere maluit, & Proceribus ſuper manſione Grotii, in Hollandiam reverſi circa finem anni cIɔ Iɔc xxxii. deliberantibus, iis acceſſit, qui interdicendam illi in patria habitationem opinabantur (10). ——— *Maurice, prince of Orange, being dead, his brother Frederic Henry, being at the helm of affairs, gave hopes, not only of a milder government, but alſo of reſtoring the ancient freedom in the adminiſtration of affairs, and ſoon expreſſed his friendſhip for Grotius by letter; and many thought that he aſpired to the glory of reſtoring ſo great a man ſo unjuſtly condemned: but, as thoſe, who manage the affairs of princes, have generally more regard to profit, than honour, and there were ſome, who repreſented to him how dangerous to his affairs it would be, to admit into the common-wealth one ſo fond of liberty and his country, he conſulted his power rather than his reputation; and, when it was debated, whether Grotius, upon his return to Holland in the year* cIɔ Iɔc xxxii, *ſhould be allowed to reſide there, he ſided with thoſe, who voted, that he ſhould be forbid to ſettle in his own country.*'

(10) Vita Grotii, pag. 424.

[F] *He had many enemies in the court of Sweden.*] The queen gave him no poſitive anſwer, when he asked leave to retire; which diſpleaſed ſome great men, who were afraid that ſhe would keep him in her council. He perceived their diſcontent, and was ſo preſſing to obtain his dimiſſion, that it was granted him at laſt. 'Neque dubitavit hoc unum ſufficere ad irritandam invidiam illam, quam à principio adventûs ſui in nonnullis Regni Proceribus animadverterat. Quare, cùm nihil minùs propoſitum ei eſſet, quàm in ea terrarum parte habitationis ſuæ ſedem figere, ubi non minus cum ingeniis hominum tam malè ſibi volentium, quàm cum aëris inclementia luctandum quotidie foret, non deſtitit coram Regina, quoties ad eam accederet, dimiſſionem ſuam & veniam ad ſuos revertendi efflagitare (11). ——— *Nor did he doubt that this would encreaſe that envy, which he had obſerved in ſome of the nobles from his firſt arrival. Wherefore, as he deſigned nothing leſs than to fix his reſidence in that country, where he muſt daily ſtruggle, not only with the tempers of men, who wiſhed ſo ill to him, but alſo with the inclemency of the air, he perpetually ſollicited his diſmiſſion, and leave to return to his own country, as often as he had acceſs to the queen.*' Du Maurier ſays (12), that chancellor Oxenſtern would have taken care to get Grotius deprived of his embaſſy much ſooner, had he not been willing to vex cardinal Richelieu. This cardinal (13) ſtruck off the penſion of three thouſand livres, which had been paid to Grotius for the ſpace of ten years, which obliged that illuſtrious refugee to leave France. The author of that affront being informed, that Grotius was coming again with a noble character, was very ſorry for it, and earneſtly deſired the court of Sweden to recal that ambaſſador, who did not love him, and whom he did not love. Oxenſtern who was reſolved to mortify the cardinal, refuſed to grant him his requeſt; but, as ſoon as he heard that the cardinal was dead, he ceaſed to protect the ambaſſador and even proved ſo unkind to him, that he was obliged to ask leave to retire, which was granted him. Du Maurier adds (14), 'that Grotius being not at all regarded in Sweden, left Stockholm without taking leave of the queen, or of any of her miniſters, and was already come to the Dalles to take ſhipping; but the queen, having ſent for him, preſented him with twelve thouſand Rixdollars.' This does not agree with Grotius's life. See in the margin a paſſage out of the Menagiana (15). 'Mr Arnauld produces a letter, importing, that Grotius, being diſſatisfied with the court of Sweden, tho' very well pleaſed with the queen, left it, to return into France, where he was to be ambaſſador of Poland; that before he was far advanced in his journey, the queen urged him to come back; that he did it; and being ſet out again, &c (16).'

(11) Ibid. pag. 426.

(12) Memoires, ubi ſupra, pag. 412, & ſeq.

(13) Ibid. pag. 409.

(14) Ibid. pag. 430.

(15) It is a ſurprizing thing, that queen Chriſtina, who was ſo much for protecting learned men, ſhould have begun her reign by recalling Grotius, who was then embaſſador of Sweden in France, and depriving him of his employment: She was an ungrateful woman, and ſhewed herſelf a woman more than any other. *Menagiana, pag. m.* 404.

(16) Calviniſme convaincu de nouveau, pag. 146.

[G] *Notwithſtanding his embaſſy he publiſhed many books.*] Here I ſhall ſpeak of the works of that author, in whatever time they were written or publiſhed.

During his ſtay at Paris, before he was ambaſſador of Sweden, 'he tranſlated into Latin proſe his book concerning the truth of the Chriſtian religion, which he had writ in Dutch verſe, for the uſe of the ſeamen, who travel into the Indies, that they might have ſome diverſion in ſinging ſuch a pious poem.' Thus Du Maurier ſpeaks of it (17). He is very much to blame for giving ſuch a mean notion of the author's deſign; for Grotius aimed at a nobler end: he had a mind to enable the Dutch, who travel into the Indies, to promote the converſion of the infidels. 'Propoſitum enim mihi erat, omnibus quidem civibus meis, ſed præcipuè navigantibus, operam navare utilem, ut in longo illo marino otio impenderent potiùs tempus, quàm quod nimium multi faciunt, fallerent. Itaque ſumto exordio à laude noſtræ gentis, quæ navigandi ſolertia ceteras facilè vincat, excitavi eos, ut hac arte, tanquam divino beneficio, non ad ſuum tantùm quæſtum, ſed & ad veræ hoc eſt Chriſtianæ religionis propagationem, uterentur (18). —— *My deſign was to write a work, which might be of uſe to all my countrymen, but eſpecially our ſailors, that, during their leiſure of a long voyage, they might employ their time, rather than, as many do, miſpend it. Beginning therefore with the praiſe of our nation, which excels all others in the art of navigation, I exhorted them to employ this ſcience, as a favour from heaven, not only to their own profit, but to the advancement of the true, that is the Chriſtian, religion.*' It is an excellent work, and the notes upon it are very learned. It was tranſlated into Engliſh, French, Dutch, German, Greek, Perſian, and Arabic; but I do not know whether all thoſe tranſlations have been publiſhed. The Greek was not printed in the year 1637 (19). In the year following Grotius mentions the Perſian tranſlation only, as a book, which the Pope's miſſionaries had a mind to publiſh. 'Liber meus de veritate Religionis Chriſtianæ . . . . . qui Socinianus eſt Voëtianis adeo hic pro tali non habetur, ut ſtudio Religioſorum Pontificiorum vertatur in ſermonem Perſicum ad convertendos, ſi Deus cœpto annuat, ejus imperii Mahumetiſtas (20). ——— *So far is my book, of the Truth of the Chriſtian religion from being thought a ſocinian work, that the Roman Catholics have got it tranſlated into the Perſian*

(17) Ubi ſupra, pag. 408.

(18) Grotius de Verit. Religionis Chriſtian. pag. 3, Edit. Par. 1640, in 12mo.

(19) Etiam Græcè verſus eſt ſed nondum editus. *Grot. Epiſt.* cccexi, *Part. II, pag.* 872.

(20) Id ibid. Epiſt. ccccxliv, pag. 881.

none in the cauſes of the diviſion. The calumnies, maliciouſly diſperſed by his enemies, about his death, are irrefragably confuted by the relation of the miniſter, who attended him, when he was dying [*H*]. Thoſe falſe reports are nevertheleſs revived from

‘ *ſian tongue, in order to convert, by the grace of GOD, the Mahometans of that empire.*’ In the year 1641, an Engliſhman. who had tranſlated that book into Arabic, was deſirous, that his tranſlation ſhould be printed in England ‘ Fuit apud me his diebus Anglus vir doctiſſimus, qui diu in Turcico vixit imperio, & meum librum de Veritate Religionis Chriſtianæ in Arabicum vertit ſermonem; curabitque ſi poteſt, typis in Anglia edi. Is nullum librum putat eſſe utiliorem aut inſtruendis illarum partium Chriſtianis, aut etiam convertendis Mahumetiſtis, qui ſunt in Turcico imperio, aut Perſico, aut Tartarico, aut Punico, aut Indiano (21). —— *A very learned Engliſhman was lately with me, who reſided long in the Turkiſh empire, and tranſlated my book* of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, *into Arabic; and will, if he can, get it printed in England. This man thinks no book more uſeful, either for inſtructing the Chriſtians of thoſe parts, or even for converting the Mahometans of Turkey, Perſia, Tartary, Barbary, or India.*’ That tranſlation made by the famous Dr Edward Pocock, was printed at London in the year 1560, in 8vo. We ſhall ſee, in the article HENICHIUS, that Grotius has been taxed with plagiariſm. There are three German tranſlations of that work (22), two in proſe and one in verſe, and two French tranſlations in proſe. The laſt was made, and publiſhed at Utrecht, in the year 1692 (23); the other came out long before. I have ſeen two editions of it; one in 12mo, in the uſual character, and the other in 8vo, in a letter like that of a writing-maſter: and therefore it is ſaid in the title, that it was made *at Paris, in the printing-houſe of the new letters invented by Peter Moreau, a writing-maſter at Paris.* There is no date, neither in the title page, nor at the end of the epiſtle dedicatory. The author of that verſion dedicated it to Mr Bignon, counſellor of ſtate, and put only an M to it to denote his Name: I have been told, that his name was Mr de Courcelles.

The incomparable work, *De Jure Belli & Pacis*, was publiſhed at Paris in the year 1625 (24). I ſhall ſpeak of it at large in the remark [*O*].

As for the commentary, *De imperio ſummarum poteſtatum circa ſacra* (25); the treatiſe, *De ſatisfactione Chriſti contra Fauſtum Socinum* (26); the notes upon the goſpels (27); the *Pietas Ordinum Hollondiæ* (28); the diſſertation, *De Cœnæ adminiſtratione ubi Paſtores non ſunt, & an ſemper communicandum per Symbola* (29); the *Epiſtolæ ad Gallos* (30); I refer my readers to a book of Colomiés, quoted in the margin, where they will find ſome curious particulars. Concerning the edition of the letters in folio, conſult the firſt volume of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* and *Morhofius's Polyhiſtor* (31). But as to the *Hiſtoria Belgica*, I refer to the remark [*P*]. Note that there is in the fourth volume of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* (32), a large abſtract of the treatiſe, *De Cœnæ Adminiſtratione ubi Paſtores non ſunt, &c.* which was reprinted at London, with ſome other pieces, in the year 1686.

There are ſeveral miſtakes in the following words of du Maurier: ‘ during that embaſſy, which laſted twelve years, Grotius publiſhed ſeveral books; among others, a Latin diſſertation againſt la Perrere (33), who had written a piece concerning the Pre-Adamites: that diſſertation is intituled, *De origine gentium Americanarum Diſſertatio*, wherein he ſays, That the nations of America are not very ancient; and that they came from Europe, either by a land-paſſage or being driven thither by a Storm: *Niſi*, ſays he, *quis Præ-Adamitas eſſe dixerit, ut nuper quidam in Gallia ſomniavit.* But one Laëtius of the Low-Countries having written againſt him, he put out a ſecond diſſertation, intituled *De origine gen- Americanarum Diſſertatio altera*, wherein he confutes Laëtius at large (34).’ It is not true that Grotius wrote his diſſertation *de Origine gentium Americanarum* againſt la Peyrere; nor is it true, that the book concerning the Pre-Adamites was then printed. The words, quoted by du Maurier, are not in that diſſertation; but the following paſſage is to be found in his reply to Laëtius: ‘ Cui conſequens eſt ut credatur ...... aut aliquos ante Adamum fuiſſe conditos homines, ut nuper quis in Gallia ſomniavit. —— *The Conſequence of which is, that we muſt believe ...... or that there were men created before Adam, as a certain perſon in France lately imagined.*’ I believe la Peyrere is hinted at in thoſe words; but I maintain ſtill, that the book concerning the Pre-Adamites was not yet publiſhed (35). Grotius was acquainted with that man's opinion; and therefore he ſaid ſomething of it occaſionally. But this cannot be called a confutation.

[*H*] *The calumnies of his enemies .... concerning his death, are irrefragably confuted by the relation of the miniſter who attended him when he was dying.*] That miniſter, named John Quiſtorpius, was profeſſor of divinity at Roſtoc. His relation (36) imports, that he went to Grotius, who had ſent for him, and found him almoſt dying; that he exhorted him to prepare for death, in order to enjoy a more happy life, to acknowledge his ſins, and repent of them; that, having mentioned to him the publican, who confeſſed himſelf a ſinner, and begged GOD's mercy, the ſick man anſwered, I am that publican (37); that he went on, and told him, he ſhould have recourſe to JESUS CHRIST, without whom there is no ſalvation; and that Grotius replied (38), *I place all my hopes in JESUS CHRIST alone*; that he repeated with a loud voice, in High-Dutch, the prayer, which begins thus: *Heer Jeſu wahrer Menſch und Gott*, &c (39). and that the ſick man ſaid it ſoftly after him with his hands joined; that having ended, he asked him, whether he underſtood him? and his anſwer was, *I underſtood you very well* (40); that he continued to repeat to him ſome paſſages of the word of GOD, which dying people are uſually put in mind of, and to ask him, *Do you underſtand me?* and that Grotius anſwered, *I hear your voice, but I do not underſtand every thing that you ſay* (41); that, after this anſwer, the ſick man loſt his ſpeech, and expired ſoon after.

It would be ridiculous to call into queſtion Quiſtorpius's ſincerity: no reaſon of intereſt could move him to tell a lie; and every body knows, that the Lutheran miniſters were no leſs diſpleaſed, than the Calviniſts, with the particular opinions of Grotius (42); and therefore the teſtimony of the profeſſor of Roſtoc is an authentic proof; and, if ſuch a proof is not ſufficient in matters of fact, we make way for Scepticiſm, and it will be a hard matter to prove any thing. It is therefore an undeniable matter of fact, 1. That Grotius, being a dying, was affected like the publican mentioned in the goſpel; he confeſſed his faults; he was ſorry for them; he implored the mercy of his heavenly father. 2. That he placed all his hopes in JESUS CHRIST alone. 3. That his laſt thoughts were thoſe that are contained in the prayer of dying people, according to the liturgy of the Lutheran churches (43). Now I do not think there is any prayer that contains more pious thoughts, ſuch as a true Chriſtian ought to have, when he is preparing to appear before GOD's tribunal, than that prayer.

The reſult of this is plainly; 1. that thoſe who ſay *he died a Socinian* (44), would be too gently uſed, if they were only told, that they are guilty of a raſh judgment; they deſerve to be called calumniators. 2. That theſe words of du Maurier contain a fabulous ſtory (45): ‘ I have been told, *ſays he*, that during his ſickneſs, a Catholic prieſt, and ſeveral Lutheran, Calviniſt, Socinian, and Anabaptiſt miniſters. came to him, to perſuade him to die in their belief: But whilſt they diſcourſed of controverted points, and each of them endeavoured to prove that his religion was the beſt, his only anſwer was, *non intelligo*; and when they had done ſpeaking, he told them, *hortare me ut Chriſtianum morientem decet*; exhort me, as a dying Chriſtian ought to be exhorted.’ 3. That the report that was ſpread *immediately after his death, that he refuſed to hear a miniſter, who had a mind to ſpeak to him*, is another lie (46). 4. That it is not true, ‘ that, when a Lutheran miniſter began to ſpeak to him of his religion .... the ſick man anſwered only, *non intelligo*, giving him to underſtand by thoſe words, that he did not like his diſcourſe,

‘ and

---

(21) Id. ibid. Epiſt. DXXXIV, pag 914.

(22) Scheffer, *in Suecia literata, pag.* 301, ſays, that the German tranſlation of that work, by Valentinus Muſculus, was printed at Stockholm, in 1651.

(23) By a French refugee, called le Jeune. He died at Utrecht ſome time after.

(24) See the 534th letter of Grotius, Part II, at the end.

(25) See Colomiés's *Biblioth. Choiſi, pag.* 23.

(26) Ibid. pag. 160.

(27) Ibid. pag. 76.

(28) Ibid. pag. 117.

(29) Ibid. pag. 182.

(30) Ibid. pag. 186.

(31) Pag. 294.

(32) Pag. 93, & ſeq.

(33) It ſhould be la Peyrere.

(34) Du Maurier, ubi ſupra, pag. 417.

(35) See the 52d letter of Sarravius, pag. 50, Edit. 1697.

(36) It is printed among the *Epiſtolæ Eccleſiaſticæ & Theologicæ, pag* 828, of the folio edition, 1684.

(37) Ego ille ſum publicanus.

(38) In ſolo Chriſto omnis ſpes mea eſt repoſita.

(39) That is, *Lord Jeſus, true man and God.*

(40) Probe intellexi.

(41) Vocem tuam audio ſed quæ ſingula dicas difficulter intelligo.

(42) Patin, letter vii, pag 31, of the firſt volume, ſays, there was a report, that the Lutherans were ſuſpected of having poiſoned Grotius, *by reaſon of what he writ concerning Antichriſt, in the Pope's behalf.*

(43) *You will find it tranſlated into French in the book, intituled,* Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande ſur l'Hiſtoire Critique du Pere Simon, pag. 397.

(44) *See Patin*, ubi ſupra.

(45) Du Maurier, ubi ſupra, pag. 431.

(46) *See Mr Arnauld's book, intituled,* Le Calviniſme convaincu de nouveau, pag. 145.

from time to time; but none has been ſo exceſſive in his accuſations as the author of the book, intituled, *L'eſprit de Mr Arnauld* [*I*]. He was ſo bold as to ſay, that Grotius died like an Atheiſt. Several people wondered, that his grand-children did not demand ſatisfaction for ſuch an injury; and that they appeared leſs ſenſible in this point, than Janſenius's relations, upon (*g*) ſlighter calumnies; but ſome wiſe perſons highly approve their waving all juridical proceedings [*K*]. We have ſeen a very ſolid anſwer to

' and that accordingly the miniſter went away (47).' 5. That there is a falſity in a little Engliſh book (48), wherein it is affirmed, ' that Grotius, being a dying, ' ſaid, ×*multa agendo, nihil egi*, though I have under- ' taken many things, I am not a jot the better for it.' 6. That thoſe, who ' ſoon after the death of that ' great man . . . . . ſpread a report that he had been ' thunder-ſtruck (49),' gave out a falſity more ridiculous ſtill, than malicious. (I have been very busily employed & have not done what I ought

I ſhall conclude this remark with a paſſage, wherein Andrew Rivetus, one of the moſt zealous adverſaries of Grotius, is concerned. He gave out, that Grotius was dead, breathing out threatenings, and full of anger and bitter gall, without ſhewing any ſign of repentance. However, ſays he, we will not judge another's ſervant. The caution contained in theſe laſt words ſeemed ridiculous to an Arminian profeſſor, becauſe good ſenſe does not permit us to admit a principle, without admitting the conſequences neceſſarily reſulting from it; but eternal damnation is an infallible conſequence of a final impenitence; ſo that it is but a ſilly artifice to ſay, ſuch a one is dead without repenting of his heinous crimes; nevertheleſs I will not decide about his fate. This is what that profeſſor ſays about it (50): I do not examine whether he is in the right. But here is the paſſage I have promiſed: ' Paulo apertius egit A. Rivetus, de illuſtri viro Hu- ' gone Grotio loquens: ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς, inquit, ' *& totus in fermento jacens, imo in felle amaritudinis,* ' *videtur ad plures abiiſſe, nullo pœnitentiæ, quod ſcia-* ' *mus, ſigno exhibito, &c.* Ubi nihil aliud ſuperfuit, ' niſi ut adderet, Actum eſt de ejus ſalute. Licet ad ' emolliendum tam inclementem ſententiam, ita con- ' cludat: *Sed tamen non judicamus ſervum alienum, qui* ' *Domino ſuo ſtetit & cecidit.* Sed quorſum modera- ' tionis ſpeciem præ ſe ferre circa conſequens, cum ' tota difficultas ſit in antecedente? Ego contra, ſi ' mihi conſtaret, vel Grotium, vel Blondellum, in ali- ' quo gravi delicto ſine pœnitentia obiiſſe, non vererer, ' etſi dolens, dicere, damnatus eſt. Non enim ipſe ' ſententiam ferrem, ſed Deus in verbo ſuo, quod ' cœlo & terra firmius eſt. —— *Andrew Rivetus dealt* ' *a little more openly, ſpeaking of Hugo Grotius:* ' Breathing out threatening, *ſays he*, and being wholly ' in a ferment, even in the gall of bitterneſs, he ſeems ' to have died, without ſhewing any ſign of repen- ' tance, that we know of, &c. *To which he had no-* ' *thing to add, but that his ſalvation was deſperate;* ' *though, to ſoften ſo harſh a ſentence, he concludes*; Yet ' we judge not another man's ſervant; to his own ' maſter he ſtandeth or falleth. *But to what purpoſe* ' *this ſhew of moderation as to the conſequent, when the* ' *whole difficulty lies in the antecedent? I, on the con-* ' *trary, if I were certain, that Grotius, or Blondel, had* ' *died in ſome heinous ſin, without repenting of it,* ' *ſhould not ſcruple to ſay, though with grief, he is* ' *damned. For it is not I who paſs the ſentence, but the* ' *word of GOD, which is firmer than the heavens and* ' *earth.*' I have ſeen, in a book of Mr Arnauld, a like ſtroke againſt Mr Daillé's regard for St Ambroſe (51). But this is foreign to my purpoſe. I ſhall only ſay, that Rivetus advances a thing, concerning the pretended impenitence of Grotius, that is contradicted by the relation of the Lutheran miniſter. Mareſius, who refutes the paſſage I have quoted, does not in the leaſt diſapprove Rivetus's conduct.

[*I*] *No one was ſo exceſſive in his accuſations, as the author of the book, intituled,* L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld.] He is not contented to ſay, that Grotius is a paſſionate Arminian, a Socinian, a Papiſt (52), things which are inconſiſtent in one and the ſame perſon; but he adds (53), ' that Grotius died without profeſſing any reli- ' gion, and without giving any anſwer to the perſon, ' who exhorted him upon his death-bed, but, *non in-* ' *telligo*, I do not underſtand you (54), turning his ' back to him.' His only authority for it is Mr Arnauld, a man of whom he gives ſo hideous a character in that ſame book, that no equitable judges would fine a perſon, charged with murther, by twenty witneſſes like him. Can there be a more ſtrange blindneſs? Muſt we not confeſs, that of all paſſions, the deſire of ſlandering is moſt proper to make one act againſt common ſenſe? But, laying aſide ſuch moral reflexions, I ſhall only ſay, that it is manifeſt, the author of *L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld* affirms, that Grotius died an Atheiſt. To reject all manner of religion at the point of death, to die without profeſſing any religion, and to die an Atheiſt, are three ſynonymous propoſitions: and therefore, if the accuſer was to be proſecuted, the matter ſhould be reduced to this queſtion, DID GROTIUS DIE AN ATHEIST? The accuſer does plainly aſſert it: he muſt therefore prove it; and it were to no purpoſe for him to prove, that Grotius was neither a Lutheran, nor a Calviniſt, nor a Papiſt, nor an Arminian. Now is it not a horrid thing, that a man, who died in the manner mentioned by Quiſtorpius, ſhould be accuſed of dying an Atheiſt? Is not the impudence of ſuch a calumniator prodigious? Can any one that reads his book believe it, without calling to mind what he knows of the great corruption of men, and thinking of theſe words of the ſcripture, *The heart of man is deſperately wicked* (55)? I have already ſaid (56), that there is no reaſon to doubt of Quiſtorpius's ſincerity; and I add, that the thing he witneſſes is of ſuch a nature, that he could not be deceived in it. He heard what Grotius anſwered him; he ſaw the motion of the lips and hands of his penitent, whilſt he was repeating an excellent prayer. The ears and the eyes are authentic witneſſes in ſuch matters of fact. I confeſs, he did not know whether Grotius ſpoke with a low voice other things than thoſe he (Quiſtorpius) ſpoke aloud: it is an objection, Mr Arnauld was not aſhamed to propoſe (57): it does not deſerve an anſwer; for, at this rate, one might doubt of the faith of all dying people.

[*K*] *Very wiſe perſons highly approve their waving all juridical proceedings.*] The example of Janſenius's relations, which ſome wiſhed Grotius's family had followed, is one of the things that can beſt juſtify their contempt of that calumny. The Janſeniſts hoped to mortify Father Hazart, a famous Jeſuit, who had ſaid in one of his books, that Janſenius's father was a Proteſtant, and that Janſenius had been a profeſſed Calviniſt till he came to a certain age. They publiſhed very fine caſes (58), to ſhew, that this Jeſuit was a downright calumniator; and he was ſummoned with all the uſual forms to give ſatisfaction for that injury by a ſolemn retractation. They applied themſelves to the tribunals, to which it belonged, to decide that difference; but after many writings, and a great ſtir, they miſcarried in their deſign. Father Hazart had ſuch an intereſt, and invented ſo many cavils, that the proceedings of the plantiffs came to nothing. This inſtance ſhews, that Grotius's deſcendants did well in not proſecuting the author of the calumny; for he would have invented as many cavils as Father Hazart, and would have been as powerfully ſupported, to avoid the puniſhment he deſerved. He might have been proſecuted before the ſecular courts by the law, *Si quis famoſum.* Complaints might have been made alſo to the eccleſiaſtical judges: But he would have had ſuch powerful patrons, and ſo great an intereſt in the ſecular courts, that all the proceedings would have come to nothing, It had been worſe ſtill, if the eccleſiaſtical courts had been applied to; in which he never wants cavils to juſtify himſelf, and his friends uſe a thouſand artifices to ſecure him from the leaſt cenſure. The author of the *Thoughts on Comets*, could he obtain any ſatisfaction for a calumny very like this relating to Grotius? The accuſer, heaping frauds on frauds, did he not always elude the juſt demands made on him by the accuſed, before their proper judges? What ſucceſs had the miniſters, who charged him with a falſe doctrine? Did they not find him ſuperior to the laws of diſcipline, tho' they took never ſo much pains, and made his errors manifeſt? This is a new reaſon why Grotius's relations ought to be glad, that they did not proſecute him juridically.

(*g*) See the beginning of the remark [*K*].

(47) Ibid. pag. 146.

(48) *It contains a collection of ſeveral hiſtories. See the* Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande, pag. 402.

(49) *See the* Sentimens de quelques Theologiens, ibid.

(50) Stephanus Curcellæus, in Præfat. Apologetica, præfixa Anacriſi Davidis Blondelli de Joanna Papiſſa, apud Mareſium in Johanna Papiſſa reſtituta, pag. 329.

(51) *See the firſt volume of the* Perpétuité défenduë, pag. m. 128, & ſeq. *Mr Arnauld wonders at Mr Daillé's* extraordinary civility, *and* exceſſive moderation, *towards St Ambroſe, of whom he only ſays, that he* had a good noſe, *or was cunning, after he had laid down ſome principles, according to which he ſhould have called him a* cheat, an impoſtor, and a ſeducer.

(52) Eſprit de Mr Arnauld, Tom. II, pag. 307.

(53) Ibid pag. 308.

(54) This is not to be found in the letter produced by Mr Arnauld, pag. 145, of the *Calviniſme convaincu.* It is an addition, and a falſification of the author of l'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld.

(55) Jerem. xvii, 9.

(56) In the remark [*H*].

(57) Calviniſme convaincu, pag. 147.

(58) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, 1686, pag. 68, 209, 502, & 1314. *Thoſe caſes have been reprinted in the eighth volume of* la Morale pratique des Jeſuites.

to that paſſage of *l'eſprit de Mr Arnauld* [L]; and ſince the accuſer made no reply to it, it is a plain ſign that he has been convicted of calumny. Now this is a ſcandalous thing upon two accounts; for on the one ſide, he made no ſtep in order to give ſatisfaction for ſo great an injury; and on the other, his eccleſiaſtical ſuperiors never cenſured him for ſo plain a calumny, and never intimated to him, that they did not approve his publiſhing ſuch books as *l'eſprit de Mr Arnauld.* Caſpar Brand, an Arminian miniſter of Amſterdam, is writing a life of Grotius (*b*): It will be large and very inſtructive: It is pity he does not write it in a language more generally underſtood than the Dutch. He will not fail to praiſe him for his memory, which was ſo good, that, being preſent at the muſter of ſome regiments, he remembered the names of every ſoldier (*i*). A letter of Salmaſius has been printed within theſe few days, wherein he is ill uſed [*M*]. He left behind him three ſons, and one

daughter

(*b*) I ſaid this in 1695, but that miniſter is dead ſince.

(*i*) Borremans, Var. Lect. cap. iii, apud Crenium, Animadverſ. Philolog & Hiſt. Part. I, pag 19.

[*L*] *We have ſeen a very ſolid anſwer to that paſſage of* L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld.] The apologiſt begins thus. ‘ But, Sir, what that author, and Father Simon, ſay of Grotius, is nothing, if compared to what the nameleſs author of the ſcandalous libel, intituled, *L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld*, ſays of him. It is true, he ſlanders every body in that book, and that the manifeſt lies, that are in it, ought to make one disbelieve every thing elſe. But, becauſe ſome are ſo weak as to be impoſed upon by his bold way of ſpeaking, and becauſe ſome of thoſe, to whom you ſhew my letters, entertain an ill opinion of Grotius upon that account, you will give me leave to undeceive them here. Perhaps, they will not be diſpleaſed to find an author, for whom they have ſo great an eſteem, guilty of the moſt horrid calumny that ever was. This will teach them, that one ought to ſuſpect thoſe, who appear ſo zealous for truth; and that ſometimes a prodigious malice and detraction are concealed under that zeal, upon pretence of defending the church of GOD (59).’ Afterwards, the apologiſt examines the four accuſations one after another. I ſhall not dwell on what he ſays upon the firſt head (60): What he ſays upon the ſecond runs thus (61): ‘ Grotius, ſays our ſatirical author, *in the ſecond place a Socinian, as it appears from his enervating ALL the proofs of CHRIST's divinity.* Sir, deſire your friends to read Grotius's annotations upon the paſſages of St Mark and St John, which I have mentioned to you; and if they do not ſay, that it is an abominable calumny, I am willing to be accounted a moſt wicked calumniator. See alſo the DXLVIIIth letter among the *Literæ Eccleſiaſticæ & Theologicæ* (62).’ I ſhould be too long, ſhould I mention what he ſays upon the third head, both againſt the author of *L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld*, and Mr Arnauld himſelf. I ſhall only ſet down this paſſage out of it. ‘ When Mr Arnauld ſays ſomething that is injurious to the reformed, the author of the libel exclaims violently againſt him, and Mr Arnauld is then an inſincere man, an unfair accuſer, an infamous calumniator; but, when he ſays ſomething that may ſerve this ſatirical writer to inveigh againſt thoſe, whom he hates, every thing is then right; it ſerves him to fill up his page, and to prevent his being placed among the *little authors* 63).’

I muſt not forget, that Mr Arnauld blames the Lutheran miniſter for not asking Grotius *in what communion he would die* (64). This is a material thing, ſays Mr Arnauld, ‘ with reſpect to a man, who was known to have had no communion for a long time with any Proteſtant church, and to have confuted, in his laſt books, moſt of the doctrines that are common to them.’ Whereupon the apologiſt ſays (65), that Mr Arnauld, and the author of the libel, ‘ do wrongfully fancy, that a man has no religion, when he joins with none of the factions that condemn all mankind, and each of which pretends to be the only church of CHRIST. Grotius abſtained from communicating with the Proteſtants, as well as with the Roman Catholics, becauſe the communion, which was appointed by CHRIST as a ſymbol of peace and concord among his diſciples, is accounted in thoſe ſocieties a ſign of diſcord and diviſion ..... (66). Quiſtorpius acted the part of a wiſe man, in not asking him what communion he would die in, ſince he ſaw him dying in the communion of JESUS CHRIST, by virtue of which we are ſaved, and not by virtue of that of the biſhop of Rome, or of the ſeveral Proteſtant ſocieties.’

Without inquiring whether Quiſtorpius was in the right or the wrong, not to ask him ſuch a queſtion, I obſerve, that a man, who believes the fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity, but forbears receiving the communion, becauſe he looks upon that action as a ſign that one damns the other Chriſtian ſects, cannot be accounted an Atheiſt, but by an old doating fool, who has forgot the notions of things, and the definitions of words. Nay, I go farther, and I maintain it cannot be denied, that ſuch a man is a Chriſtian. I allow you to ſay, that his believing all the ſects, that receive the goſpel, to be in the way to ſalvation, is an hereſy; I allow you to maintain, that it is a pernicious and dangerous doctrine: notwithſtanding which, can it be ſaid, that thoſe, who believe that JESUS CHRIST is the eternal Son of GOD, co-eſſential and con-ſubſtantial with the Father; that he died for us; that he was raiſed from the dead; that he ſits at the right hand of GOD his father; that men are ſaved by faith in his death and interceſſion; that one ought to obey his precepts, and repent of one's ſins, *&c.* I ſay, can it be affirmed, that ſuch perſons are not Chriſtians? No man of ſenſe can affirm it; but none would be more unreaſonable, in aſſerting ſuch a thing, than the author *of L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld*, ſince he publiſhed another book (67), wherein he ſhews, that all thoſe, who believe the fundamental points, belong to the true church, whatever ſect they may be of. I omit ſeveral other maxims advanced by him, whereby it appears, that one may be ſaved in all religions; as an anonymous writer (68) has demonſtratively proved to him. I only mention ſuch doctrines as he cannot deny, and according to which he ought to acknowledge, that Grotius, who believed the fundamental doctrines, without approving Calviniſm, or Popery, *&c.* in every thing, was a member of the true church.

For the reſt, we need not wonder, that Grotius was abuſed by a man, whoſe book is looked upon as a ſatire upon all mankind. ‘ Homo iſte procaciſſimus in illo ſuo ARNALDI SPIRITU, univerſum genus humanum impetit, nec Sacris parcens nec profanis, nec Eccleſiaſtico, nec Civili Statui; Regem ſuum, Regem Chriſtianiſſimum, ſingula Regiæ familiæ capita, familiares Miniſtroſque Regis tam fœdè, tam impudenter carpit: ut vel in ſuo Hollandiæ aſylo vix tutus ipſe (69), tutum præſtare id libri monſtrum nequiverit (70). —— *This moſt ſlanderous author, in his* Eſprit de Mr Arnauld, *falls foul of all mankind, ſparing neither things ſacred nor prophane, the church, nor the ſtate: he attacks his prince, the moſt Chriſtian king, every branch of the royal family and the king's favourites and miniſters, ſo baſely and impudently, that he could ſcarce publiſh ſuch a monſtrous book with impunity, even in his aſylum of Holland.*’ See the margin (71), and judge whether ſuch an author could fail to meet Grotius in his way, there being ſome particular reaſons, which made him angry with that great man: thoſe, who know Rotterdam, underſtand me.

[*M*] *They have publiſhed a letter of Salmaſius . . . wherein he is ill uſed.*] Mr Crenius has publiſhed that letter in the firſt part of his *Animadverſiones Philologicæ & Hiſtoricæ*, printed at Rotterdam in 1695. Salmaſius wrote it to Sarravius, the twentieth of November 1645. Not contented to prefer Voſſius to Grotius, he undervalues the merit of the latter as much as he can: he hardly allows him to have an indifferent skill in philoſophy, and makes him inferiour to every body, as to the reaſoning part. *In Philoſophicis ſi diſputandi ſolertia ſpectetur, vix mediocribus par eſt:*

nec

(59) Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande, pag. 390.

(60) *Viz.* That Grotius was a violent Arminian.

(61) Sentimens, pag. 392.

(62) Epiſt. Præſtant. Viror. pag. 797.

(63) Sentimens, pag. 395.

(64) Arnauld, Calviniſme convaincu, pag. 147.

(65) Sentimens, pag. 398.

(66) Ibid. pag. 399.

(67) *Intituled,* Le vrai Syſtême de l'Egliſe.

(68) Carus Larebonius in Janua cœlorum reſerata.

(69 This is falſe.

(70) *See the book, intituled,* Catholica Querimonia, pag. 9.

(71) *See, above, citation* (59), *where it is affirmed, that this author* ſpeaks ill of all mankind. *Another expreſſes himſelf thus:* The abomination of this ſatire does not principally conſiſt in this, that is is a work of one, who, like the devil, goeth about ſeeking whom he may devour, but, *&c.* *Chimere de la Cabale de Rotterdam demontrée*, in the preface, pag. 173. See alſo the *Cabale Chimerique*, pag. 281.

daughter [*N*]. The eldeſt ſon of one of his ſons is Droſſart (*k*) of Bergenopzoom.

Grotius's book *de Jure Belli & Pacis* being a maſter-piece, and having received a very particular honour from the public, I ought to ſpeak of it ſomewhat at large [*O*]. I ſhall

nec unquam vidi qui minore tum vi ratiocinetur. A profeſſor of Tranſilvania, adds he, who is writing againſt the book *De Jure Belli & Pacis*, pretends to ſhew groſs miſtakes in every page of it; *adſirmavit ſe oſtenſurum eſſe nullam paginam vacare inſignibus erratis.* Grotius, ſays he, is a mean critic; many of his notes upon the Old Teſtament are extreamly childiſh; I would not put my name to ſuch a work. *Scimus etiam in Critica quam infelix fuerit & ἄςοχος vir alioquin ſummus Grotius . . . . Nollem meum nomen adſcriptam eſſe adnotatis in Vetus T. nibil his in multis puerilius invenio, & tanto nomine indignius.* How ſhall we reconcile this with Salmaſius's letters to Grotius? There is one, in which he calls him *ſupereminentiſſimus*; and ſays, he had rather be like him, than enjoy all the wealth and glory of the ſacred college. *Non ſolum Cardinalibus, ſed etiam mibi rem minime gratam facis, qui me dones eo titulo, quo tu dignior, ſupereminentiſſime Groti. Quid enim te non ſic appellem, cujus me multo ſimilem malim, quàm omnes purpurati illius gregis divitias & honores poſſidere* (72)? See the paſſage of Juſtus Pacius in the margin. I was asked not long ago, whether the letters, written by great men to an author, are like thoſe, wherein they ſpeak of that author to other perſons? I anſwered, that they ſeldom ſpoke the ſame things in thoſe two ſorts of letters. When they write to an author, they commend his book; but when they write to others, they praiſe it but little, and ſometimes find fault with it. If they themſelves publiſhed their own letters, they would endeavour to ſuppreſs their double-dealing; but moſt times they come out after their death. If Salmaſius had publiſhed the letter of the twentieth of November 1645, he would have ſuppreſſed thoſe wherein he beſtows high encomiums upon Grotius. He was no friend to him, as he made it appear when he wrote againſt him under the diſguiſe of Simplicius Verinus (73).

[*N*] *He left behind him three ſons and one daughter.*] The daughter was married to a French gentleman, called Mombas, who was very much talked off on occaſion of a trouble he was brought into, ſoon after the French had paſſed the Rhine in the year 1672. The eldeſt ſon, and the youngeſt, pitched upon a military life, and died without being married. The ſecond, whoſe name was PETER DE GROOT, made himſelf illuſtrious by his embaſſies. The elector Palatine, being reſtored to his dominions by the treaty of Munſter, appointed him his reſident in Holland. He was made penſionary of the city of Amſterdam in 1660, and diſcharged the duties of that place with great ability for the ſpace of ſeven years. He was ſent embaſſador to the northern crowns in the year 1668. A year after he went into France with the ſame character, and acquitted himſelf in that employment with great dexterity and wiſdom. When the war was kindled in 1672, he returned into his country, and was deprived of his office of penſionary of Rotterdam, which he had enjoyed ever ſince his return from his embaſſy into Sweden: he was deprived of it during the popular tumults, which occaſioned ſo many alterations in the towns of Holland. He retired to Antwerp, and then to Cologne, whilſt the peace was treating there, and acted for the good of his country as much as ever he could; and yet, when he returned into Holland, he was accuſed of a ſtate crime. The cauſe was tried, and he was acquitted. He retired to a country houſe, where he died at ſeventy years of age (74). See his encomium in Wicquefort (75).

[*O*] *I ought to ſpeak ſomewhat at large of his book* De Jure Belli & Pacis.] It was printed at Paris in 1625, and dedicated to Lewis XIII. ‘ King Guſtavus of Sweden, having read and admired it, re‘ ſolved to make uſe of the author, whom he took ‘ to be a great politician by reaſon of that work: and ‘ chancellor Oxenſtern, prime-miniſter of that conque‘ ror, confirmed him in that deſign, making great ac‘ count of his work *De Jure Belli & Pacis*, which ‘ he continually peruſed. But that prince being killed ‘ at the battle of Lutzen, in the year 1632, chan‘ cellor Oxenſtern, according to his inclination, and ‘ the deſign of the late king Guſtavus, nominated him ‘ to be ſent embaſſador into France (76).’ Colomiés ſays (77), ‘ it is believed, that Grotius exhauſted his parts ‘ upon that book, and that he might have ſaid of it ‘ what Caſaubon ſaid of his own commentary upon ‘ Perſius, in a letter to Mr Perillau his kinſman, ‘ which is not printed, *in Perſio omnem ingenii cona‘ tum effudimus*; and indeed that work of Grotius is ‘ an excellent piece; and I do not wonder that it ‘ has been explained in ſome German univerſities . . . ‘ Here follows the judgment, which Mr Bignon, ‘ that unblameable magiſtrate, makes of that book, in ‘ a letter to Grotius, dated the fifth of March 1632.’ I had almoſt forgot, *ſays he*, to thank you for your treatiſe *De Jure belli*, which is as well printed as the ſubject deſerves. I have been told, that a great king had it always in his hands; and I believe it is true, becauſe a very great advantage muſt needs accrue from it, ſince that book ſhews, that there is reaſon and juſtice in a ſubject, which is thought to conſiſt only in confuſion and injuſtice. Thoſe, who read it, will learn the true maxims of the Chriſtian policy, which are the ſolid foundations of all government. I have read it again with a wonderful pleaſure.‘ They did not ‘ make the ſame judgment of it at Rome, where it ‘ was placed among prohibited books, the fourth of ‘ February 1627.’

The memoir, which M. Chauvin has inſerted in his journal (78), concerning the fate and importance of that work, is ſo fine and ſo curious, that I cannot forbear tranſcribing ſeveral things out of it. It informs us, that Grotius undertook to write that book at the ſollicitation of the famous Peireskius. *He himſelf ſays ſo in a letter he wrote to him, when he preſented him with a copy of that work.* ‘ The ſubject ‘ of it was thought to be ſo important and uſeful, ‘ that it gave occaſion to make a particular ſcience ‘ of it; for the explication of which, ſome profeſ‘ ſors have been appointed on purpoſe in the univer‘ ſities.’ Charles Lewis, elector Palatine, ‘ did ſo ‘ highly value that book, that he thought fit it ſhould ‘ ſerve as a text to the lectures, concerning the law ‘ of nature, and the law of nations; and in order ‘ to expound it, he appointed Mr Puffendorf in his ‘ univerſity of Heidelberg; and, in imitation of that ‘ prince, the like ſettlements have been made in ‘ other univerſities. . . . . It does not appear that any ‘ body criticiſed or wrote againſt that book of Gro‘ tius, during his life. Some indeed are of opinion ‘ that Mr Selden wrote his book *De Jure Natura‘ li & Gentium juxta diſciplinam Ebræorum* out of ‘ emulation . . . . . The firſt author, who criticiſed ‘ Grotius, was Joannes à Felden, doctor of the civil‘ law, and profeſſor of the mathematics, at Helmſtadt. ‘ He cloſely follows the three books of Grotius, ‘ and dwells upon ſuch ſubjects as concern the civil‘ law and morality . . . . . He contradicts him every ‘ where.’ His work came out in 1653, and was confuted the next year by Theodorus Graſwinckel. The public ſaw, in 1663, ‘ Boeclerus's commentary upon ‘ the firſt book of Grotius, which he continued af‘ terwards upon the ſeven firſt chapters of the ſecond ‘ book; and beſides, he has publiſhed five important ‘ ſubjects of the ſame book . . . . . He does not fol‘ low all the opinions of that author, but differs quite ‘ from him upon ſeveral ſubjects . . . . In 1664, John ‘ Philip Mullerus, a civilian, reduced the three books ‘ of Grotius into tables . . . . In 1665, Janus Klen‘ kius (79) publiſhed his inſtitutions *De Jure natu‘ rali & gentium*, taken out of Grotius's book. In ‘ 1666, Gaſpar Zieglerus . . . . . profeſſor of the civil‘ law at Wittemberg, put out his notes on the three ‘ books of Grotius . . . . He does not appear to be ‘ acted by a ſpirit of contradiction; nevertheleſs he de‘ parts from Grotius's opinions in a great many things.’ Grotius's younger brother (80) publiſhed, in 1667, *Enchiridion de Principiis Juris Naturalis*: that book is properly an introduction to the work *De Jure Belli & Pacis*, and was illuſtrated with notes, in 1675, by John George Simon, profeſſor of the civil-law at Iëna (81). About the year 1668, David Mevius, vice-preſident of the ſupream court of Wiſmar, undertook to compoſe a juſt ſyſtem of the *doctrine concerning the law of nature and the law of nations*, and

(*k*) A conſiderable office in Holland.

(72) Epiſt. Salmaſ. xxi, lib. i, pag. 45.

(73) *Grotius was already dead. See the book written in anſwer to that work of Salmaſius I mean* Juſti Pacii Reviſionem judicii; *wherein Salmaſius is cenſured for his inconſtancy.* Illum phœnicem ſui ſeculi in tuis literis prædicares, quid te igitur modo impulit virum adeo in te benignum canino dente perſtringere, *pag.* 3. - - - *What induced you to fall foul of one ſo much your friend, and whom you had extolled, in your letters, as the phœnix of his age.*

(74) Taken from the life of Hugo Grotius.

(75) Traité de l'Ambaſſadeur, livr. ii, pag. 454. *See alſo pag.* 411.

(76) Du Maurier, Memoires d'Hollande, pag. 410.

(77) Colomiés, Biblioth choiſie, pag. 128.

(78) Journal des Sçavans, *written at Berlin, pag.* 220, & ſeq. *in the year* 1696.

(79) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, Jan. 25, 1666, pag. m. 80.

(80) William Grotius.

(81) He is profeſſor in the new univerſity of Hall, in the year 1696.

I ſhall alſo ſay ſomething of Grotius's book concerning the hiſtory of the Low-Countries [*P*]. He wrote it in his youth, and according to Tacitus's ſtyle.

and publiſhed *an introduction to it in nine conſiderations.* He highly commends Grotius in his preface, *and gives him the glory of being the firſt, who introduced the ſtudy of the law of nations, and explained it more ſolidly and learnedly than any one before him.* His great work was to be made up of three parts: the two firſt were finiſhed, *and ready for the preſs*; but he knew not, whether his great age, and his affairs, would permit him to make an end of the other. John Adam Oſiander, profeſſor of divinity in the univerſity of Tubingen, publiſhed his obſervations upon the work of Grotius in 1671, and affected to criticize him almoſt every where. The year following, Mr Puffendorf publiſhed his book *De Jure Naturæ & Gentium*, wherein he fully explains what had been omitted or lightly touched upon by Grotius: and *ſome look upon* his work *as a large ſupplement to Grotius, and others, as a continued commentary* upon Grotius. *The obſervations of Henry Heniges upon Grotius came out in* 1673. *He follows the opinions of that author, and maintains them againſt thoſe who wrote againſt them.* About the ſame time, John George Simon reprinted Grotius's book with notes, particularly concerning the civil-law, and the law of nations. Sometimes he takes part with John à Felden againſt him. In 1676, Samuel Rachelius publiſhed his treatiſe *De Jure Naturæ & Gentium*, and *Valentinus Velthem put out his introduction* to Grotius's work in three volumes. John George Kulpis publiſhed alſo his remarks upon the ſame Grotius in 1682. Gronovius made learned notes upon the ſame book of Grotius in the year 1680. Mr de Courtin tranſlated it into French in 1687. Mr Becman publiſhed it in 1691, *cum notis Variorum*, which he took *out of the moſt famous authors who had written upon it*, as Boeclerus, Zieglerus, Oſiander, Puffendorf, Simon, Gronovius, and ſome others. It is further ſaid, in Mr Chauvin's memoir, that in the year 1696, there came out a new edition of that book of Grotius in folio, with Mr Vandemeulen's commentary (82). It is to be obſerved, that this memoir ſerves as an introduction to an abſtract, publiſhed by Mr Chauvin, of a commentary of *Job. Teſmarius in Hugonis Grotii de Jure Belli ac Pacis libros* 3. printed in folio at Francfort, in the year 1696, with the notes of Ulric Obrecht upon the ſame work of Grotius. Mr Teſmar, who died in the year 1693, had been twenty years upon that commentary (83). Mr Becman's work abovementioned was reprinted at Francfort on the Oder in 1699, in 4to. It is intituled; *Hugonis Grotii de jure belli & pacis libri tres, in quibus jus naturæ & gentium, item juris publici præcipua explicantur cum Annotatis Autoris ex poſtrema ejus ante obitum cura. Acceſſerunt excerpta annotationum variorum virorum inſignium in totum opus. Edente Job. Chriſtoph. Becmano.* Thus Grotius, fifty years after his death, obtained an honour, which was not beſtowed upon the ancients till after many ages: I mean, that he has appeared *cum Commentariis Variorum.* I have juſt now read in a book of Mr Crenius (84), that Theodore Graſwinckel wrote the original of that book of Grotius, who dictated it to him, *ex ore dictantis Grotii ſe excepiſſe, eoſque in ordinem demum redegiſſe.* Chriſtopher Arnoldus had this particular from Graſwinckel himſelf, and inſerted it in a letter printed with thoſe of Richterus.

[P] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of Grotius's book, concerning the hiſtory of the Low-Countries.*] It contains an account of what happened in the Netherlands from the departure of Philip II. till 1608. It is divided into annals, and hiſtory: the annals comprehend five books: the hiſtory contains eighteen, and begins in the year 1588. Caſaubon, *who had read ſomething of it in the year* 1613, *ſpeaks well of it in a letter written from London to Thuanus* (85). He obſerves, that there were twenty one books in that work: he did not reckon well; but perhaps the two laſt books were added to it ſince. The author did not publiſh that hiſtory; he only ſhewed the manuſcript copy to Caſaubon. *It did not come out till after the author's deceaſe, Grotius having had ſome reaſons to keep it by him during his life* .... (86). *His wife refuſed the manuſcript of that hiſtory to Sarravius, though he offered her two thouſand livres for it* (87). It was printed at Amſterdam for John Blaeu, in the year 1657, in folio, and in the year 1658, in 12mo (88). *Mr L'Heritier tranſlated it into French* (89). The French tranſlation was reprinted at Paris in the year 1672, in folio. See the extract Mr Denys gave of it, in his ſeventh memoir concerning arts and ſciences (90). Here follows the judgment of the author of the Parrhaſiana. 'We may add to Polybius, a famous hiſtorian among the moderns, who, tho' he had been a great ſufferer by the injuſtice of a great prince, relates his noble actions as carefully as any other hiſtorian, and ſpeaks of him according to his merit, without ſaying any thing, whereby it may appear that he had reaſon to complain of him. I mean, the incomparable Hugo Grotius, who ſpeaks, in his hiſtory of the Netherlands, of prince Maurice de Naſſau, as if he had never been ill treated by him. This is a remarkable inſtance of impartiality, which ſhews, that it is not impoſſible to overcome one's paſſion, and ſpeak well of one's enemies, as ſeveral people fancy, who judge of others by themſelves (91).' The author, who obſerves this fine paſſage in Grotius's hiſtory, did it not out of flattery; for he blames him afterwards for a thing that deſerves to be blamed: he does not approve Grotius's ſtyle; and ſhews thereby, that he is a man of a good taſte. 'None, *ſays he*, (92), of thoſe, who ſpoke well at Athens, and at Rome, expreſſed themſelves ſo obſurely in converſation, as Thucydides and Tacitus did in their hiſtories. Doubtleſs, they had a mind to raiſe themſelves above common uſe, and thereby they fell into that obſcurity, for which they are juſtly reproved. It cannot be denied, that they have an affected ſtile, and that they hoped to recommend their hiſtories, as it were, by a manly eloquence, whereby it ſeems that many things are expreſſed in few words, and raiſed above the capacity of the vulgar. I cannot apprehend why ſome learned men undertook to imitate them, as Hugo Grotius, and Dionyſius Voſſius in his tranſlation of Rheide's hiſtory, and how they could reliſh ſuch a ſtile. For certainly good thoughts need not be obſcure to be approved by good judges; and when a reader is obliged to ſtop continually, in order to look for the ſenſe, he does not think himſelf in the leaſt obliged to an hiſtorian, who gives him that trouble. This is the reaſon why ſome hiſtories, though excellent as to the matter, are read by few people; whereas if thoſe hiſtorians deſigned to write for the inſtruction of thoſe, who have a ſufficient knowledge of the Latin tongue, to read a hiſtory with pleaſure, they ſhould have endeavoured to make themſelves eaſily underſtood, and uſeful to as many people as ever they could. The more a hiſtory deſerves to be read by reaſon of the events contained in it, the more it deſerves to be of a general uſe. The authority of the ancients, who neglected the clearneſs of the ſtile, cannot juſtify the moderns, who have imitated them, contrary to the reaſons, I have mentioned, or rather contrary to good ſenſe.' There is nothing in Tacitus that leſs deſerves to be imitated, than his too conciſe and conſequently obſcure ſtile; and yet that very fault has been moſt imitated. I am ſorry Grotius is one of thoſe who did not avoid it. The great Bignon, who did not approve that ſtile, had almoſt perſuaded the author to alter it. 'Amavit (Grotius) ubique orationem preſſam, & quadam dignitate gravem. A qua nec in hiſtoria ſibi temperavit. Satis conſtat, virum noſtri ſæculi ſummum, omniſque doctrinæ & auctorem & cenſorem graviſſimum, Hieronymum Bignonium, cum ineditas adhuc Grotii hiſtorias & Annales legiſſet, non probaſſe brevitatem orationis, obſcuritati obnoxiam, in illo genere ſcripturæ, quod à perſpicua venuſtate potiſſimum commendationem caperet; peneque Grotio perſuaſiſſe, ut reſcriberet (93). —— *Grotius was every where fond of a conciſe and majeſtic ſtile; which he could not forbear uſing in hiſtory. It is well known, that one of the learnedeſt men of our time, Jerom Bignon, having read the hiſtories and annals of Grotius in manuſcript, diſapproved the brevity of ſtile, which made it liable to obſcurity, in a kind of writing, whoſe greateſt recommendation is perſpicuity; and that he had almoſt perſuaded Grotius to write it over again.*' Mr de la Neufville, in the preface to his hiſtory of Holland, affirms, that Grotius had begun to mould his work anew.

---

(82) It ſhould be Vander Meulen. See an abſtract of his book in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, Novem.* 1695, *pag.* 123, *& ſeq.*

(83) Chauvin, ubi ſupra, pag. 316, 317.

(84) Thomas Crenius, Animadv. Parte V, pag. 204.

(85) Colomiés Bibliotheque choiſie, pag. 24. Edit. 1699.

(86) Id. ibid.

(87) Ib. pag. 25.

(88) There is alſo an edition in 8vo. The edition in 12mo is very faulty.

(89) Colomiés, ubi ſupra, pag. 25.

(90) Pag. 85, of Mr Denys's Memoirs. Paris 1673.

(91) Parrhaſiana, pag. 160.

(92) Ibid. pag. 179.

(93) Boecler. Præfat. Commentar. in Grotium de Jure Belli & Pacis, pag. m. 30.

GRUTERUS (Peter) was born in the Palatinate. His father, THOMAS GRUTERUS, who fled thither (a), becauſe the Proteſtants were perſecuted in the Netherlands, was profeſſor at Duiſburg [A], and had three or four ſons who were men of letters [B]. Peter Gruterus, who makes the ſubject of this article, practiſed phyſic in ſeveral towns of Flanders, at Dixmuyde, at Oſtend, *&c.* and was not very well pleaſed with the Flemiſh (b). He publiſhed, at Leyden, in the year 1609, a century of Latin letters, that were very ill uſed by the printers and the critics [C]. He affected, in thoſe letters, a ſtyle, full of old words and obſolete phraſes. He left Oſtend in 1620, and retired to Middleburg. I know not whether he made a long ſtay in that town; but I think he endeavoured to make his fortune in ſeveral places, before he ſettled at Amſterdam, where the magiſtrates proved bountiful to him (c). He publiſhed there a new century of letters in the year 1629 [D], and died in the ſame place, in the year 1634 (d). Swertius (e) ſays, he was born at Ziriczée in Zealand; and that he ſpent ſome years in Italy.

(a) Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag. 741.

(b) *See the ſecond century of his letters.*

(c) *See the epiſtle dedicatory of the ſecond century of his letters.*

(d) Val. Andr. ubi ſupra.

(e) Athen. Belg. pag. 618.

[*A*] *His father Thomas Gruterus was profeſſor at Duiſburg* (1).] This appears from ſome letters printed at the end of the ſecond century of Peter Gruterus, his ſon, ſome of which were written by that Thomas Gruterus. He wrote ſeveral books (2), and, among others, the hiſtory of David George, and a confutation of his hereſies.

[*B*] . . . *and had three or four ſons, who were men of letters.*] JAMES GRUTERUS, the ſon of Thomas, was profeſſor of hiſtory in the illuſtrious ſchool of Middleburg in the year 1604. Some of his letters have been printed at the end of the ſecond century of Peter Gruterus, his brother, with a catalogue of ſome books written by him, which were never printed. REINIER GRUTERUS, the ſon of the ſame Thomas, was principal of Caſimir college at Heidelberg. Some of his letters to his brother Peter are to be found at the end of the ſecond century, juſt now mentioned, with a liſt of his manuſcript works. JOHN GRUTERUS, another ſon of Thomas, left his ſtudies, and took a journey into Italy, which did not prove lucky; for, being ſo imprudent as to diſpute about the euchariſt, he was obliged to run away, for fear of falling into the hands of the inquiſitors. He fled to Naples in the night, and ſoon after ſet out to return into his own country; but he died of a ſickneſs before he made an end of his journey (3). Some of his letters have been publiſhed with thoſe of his brothers'.

[*C*] *His Latin letters were very ill uſed by the printers and the critics.*] He complains of the printer at the beginning of his ſecond century (4): 'Externa 'quoque fata ſæpe eas involvunt; Typographo alibi 'ſtertente, & correctoris ignavia vacillante: quæ ſors 'meas certe obruit, nuſquam prælo magis famæ au'toris invidente, quibus ſi deſidiam illius aſſocio, cujus 'fidei typorum curam adſcripſeram, omnem excuſa'tionis cumulum confeci. ——— *They likewiſe ſuffer 'thro' the negligence of the printer and corrector: This 'was certainly the fate of my letters, no author's fame 'having ſuffered more by the preſs; to which if I add 'the careleſſneſs of him whom I intruſted with the care 'of the impreſſion, I ſhall have fully apologized for 'myſelf.*' The ſame complaint is to be ſeen in many other places in that work. His reſentment againſt thoſe, who cenſured the firſt century, does alſo frequently appear in it, and he expreſſes it with the ſame earneſtneſs. His ſon hopes that the ſecond century will meet with a better reception. 'Vario fato prima 'Centuria fluctuavit, iniqui ſubinde Cenſoris aciem ex'perta, prout rudi manu libram hanc vitio-creati Ju'dices verſarunt. Sed qui felices adoleſcentiæ tuæ 'primitias non benignè ventilarunt, ſæcundæ virili'tatis meſſem admirari diſcant (5). —— *The firſt cen'tury of letters was variouſly fated, meeting now and 'then with an ill-natured critic, as it happened to fall 'into the hands of bad judges. But let thoſe, who 'cenſured the firſt fruits of your youth, learn to admire 'the harveſt of your fertile manhood.*' The truth is, that thoſe, who ridiculed thoſe letters, had good reaſon for it; and yet many perſons complimented the author upon that work in a very high ſtrain: he took care to prefix thoſe compliments to his ſecond century. Which ſhews, that whoever writes to a vain author, whoſe books are not good, ought duly to conſider his words. It is to be feared, that ſuch a man will publiſh the encomiums beſtowed upon him, if he has the originals in his hands. Peter Gruterus foreſaw, that the affectation of his old language would not be approved, and therefore he made an apology for it before-hand, and printed it with the firſt letters (6).

[*D*] *He publiſhed a new century of letters.*] Valerius Andreas is miſtaken, when he ſays, that Iſaac Gruterus, the author's ſon, publiſhed it. It plainly appears from the epiſtle dedicatory, and the preface, and from a letter of Giles Snouck prefixed to the reſt, that it was Peter Gruterus who put out the ſecond century. The ſame appears from a letter of his ſon Iſaac, printed at the end of the book, with a *Carmen gratulatorium*, which he made upon that edition, and with ſome other letters written by him to ſeveral perſons.

(1) *In the year* 1560, *and* 1561, Centur. 2, Epiſt. Petri Gruteri, pag. 197, 198.

(2) They were never printed; a liſt of them is to be ſeen, *ibid.* *pag.* 200.

(3) Petri Gruteri, Epiſt. Centuria 2, pag. 234.

(4) Pag. 4.

(5) Ibid. pag. 184.

(6) Centuria Epiſtolarum & Apologia pro eadem, quâ inſtituti ſui & ſtyli ab uſu & latiniſmi puritate abhorrentis rationem reddit. *Val. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag.* 741.

GRUTERUS (Janus), a learned philologer, and one of the moſt laborious writers of his time, was born at Antwerp the 3d of December 1560. He was but a child, when his father (a) and mother, being proſcribed on account of the Proteſtant religion by the ducheſs of Parma, governeſs of the Low-Countries, removed him into England. His mother, who was a learned woman [*A*], was his chief tutor. He ſpent ſome years in the univerſity of Cambridge, from whence he went to that of Leyden [*B*], in order

(a) I ſpeak of him towards the end of the remark [*B*].

[*A*] *His mother* . . . . *was a learned woman.*] She was an Engliſh woman (1), and her name was Catherine Tiſhem (2). She underſtood Greek ſo well, that ſhe could read Galen in that language, which very few phyſicians can do. 'Is ſicut rebus duris 'conſtantiæ doctores utrumque parentem, ita matrem 'præcipuè ſtudiorum magiſtram, votum ſimul Agaſi'clis conſecutus eſt, ut eorum diſcipulus diceretur, 'quorum & filius eſſet. Mater enim præter Galli'cam, Italicam, Britannicam linguam, Latinas litteras 'optimè, Græcas ita callebat, ut & Galenum, quod 'milleſimus Medicus vix ſolet, linguâ Galeni legerit. '—— *In adverſity, he was taught conſtancy by both 'his parents; but his mother had the chief direction of 'his ſtudies; in which he had, what Agaſicles wiſhed 'for, the happineſs of being both pupil and ſon to the 'ſame perſon. For his mother, beſides French, Italian, 'and Engliſh, was ſo well acquainted with Greek and 'Latin, that ſhe could read Galen in his own language, 'which ſcarce one phyſician in a thouſand can do.*' I doubt this woman has been too often forgotten by thoſe, who have publiſhed catalogues of learned women.

[*B*] *He paſſed ſome years in the univerſity of Cambridge, from whence he went to that of Leyden.*] He ſtudied there for the ſpace of ſeven years, if we believe Valerius Andreas (3), who quotes a preface of Gruterus himſelf; and adds, that Gruterus had been in England ever ſince he was four years of age, till he came to be nineteen; and that, intending to ſettle at Antwerp, his birth-place, after he had been admitted doctor of the civil-law, he immediately left it, being informed, that the duke of Parma was ready to beſiege it. His father, who was a conſiderable man, and had ſome

(1) Fridericus Hermannus Flayderus, in Vita & Morte Jani Gruteri.

(2) Balthaſar Venator, in Panegyrico Gruteri, apud Henning. Witte, Memor. Philoſophorum, Oratorum, *&c.* pag. 227.

(3) In Biblioth. Belg. 438.

order to ſtudy the civil-law. He took there his doctor's degree; but afterwards he wholly applied himſelf to the *belles lettres*, and ſoon publiſhed ſome critical books [*C*]. Though it is known in general that he travelled, one cannot give an account of the circumſtances and order of his travels. He was in Pruſſia, when Chriſtian, duke of Saxony, offered him the profeſſorſhip of hiſtory in the univerſity of Wittemberg. He accepted it, but kept it only a few months, becauſe Chriſtian died ſoon after; and thoſe, who governed after him, obliged all the profeſſors to ſubſcribe a formulary, or to reſign their places. Gruterus choſe rather to reſign his, than to ſubſcribe any confeſſion of faith againſt his conſcience [*D*]. I find, that he read publick lectures in the univerſity

ome employments in that town during the ſiege, being unwilling, that his ſon ſhould ſtay in it at that troubleſome time, ſent him to travel into France. Theſe computations are wrong; for they ſuppoſe, that the duke of Parma beſieged Antwerp in the year 1586, which is not true; he beſieged it in 1584; and therefore, if Gruterus had left Leyden, to retire to Antwerp, before the ſiege, he could not have ſtudied in England till he was nineteen years of age, and then at Leyden for the ſpace of ſeven years. But to go on, our Gruterus's father's name was Gualtherus; he was a burgomaſter of Antwerp (4), and ſubſcribed the famous petition, that was preſented to the duchеſs of Parma, and which gave riſe to the name *Gueux*, *Beggars*. Being proſcribed, he went through many hardſhips, before he got to Norwich in England, where he ſtayed a conſiderable time; afterwards he came to Middleburg, from whence he removed to Antwerp, when the States were maſters of it. He demanded of the ſenate that he might be exempted from all offices; which was granted him, till they were threatened with a ſiege, and then he was not only appointed captain of his ward, but alſo one of the four overſeers of the proviſions. 'Gualtherus vici ſui Magiſter delectus eſt; cui muneri minùs gravi ſucceſſit deinde gravius, cùm *Parmenſis* obſidionem feciſſet. Rei namque frumentariæ quatuorvir, collegis *Aldegondio*, *Leſdale* & *Roſa*, adſcitus in partem gloriæ illius mittendus eſt, quod annonæ conſcientiam ſic inter paucos ſeptam tenuiſſent, ut citra deditionem nec civi nec hoſti conſtare poſſet, tantum tridui frumentum ſuperfuiſſe (5).'

[*C*] *He ſoon publiſhed ſome critical books.*] He publiſhed firſt of all ſome Latin verſes, being about twenty years of age. *Famæ ſuæ immortalis januam circa annum vigeſimum aperiebat verſibus quos Ocellos vocabat* (6). Afterwards he put out, at Wittemberg in the year 1591, *Suſpicionum libri IX. in quibus varia ſcriptorum loca emendata & explicata*; and then he printed, ſucceſſively, notes upon moſt of the ancient Latin authors, upon the two Senecas, Martial, Cicero, Livy, Florus, Velleius Paterculus, *&c.*

[*D*] *He choſe to reſign his place, rather than to ſubſcribe any confeſſion of faith againſt his conſcience.*] They required from him, that he ſhould ſign the book of the concord: he anſwered, that he knew not what it was, that he had never read or ſeen that book, and that it would be great raſhneſs for any one to approve a thing, that he has not examined (7). Whereupon he was diſmiſſed, with two others, who refuſed to ſubſcribe; but they came off cheaper than he. They received half a year's ſalary as a gratification, as is uſually practiſed in that country, in favour of thoſe, who are honourably diſmiſſed. Gruterus was ſo far from being gratified in the ſame manner, that he had not ſo much as the charges of his journey paid him. He was the worſt courtier in the world; he minded nothing but his books, and did not care to trifle away his time in viſiting and cringing to the court favourites, in order to inſinuate himſelf into their good graces; and he thought, that, all things duly conſidered, it would be better for him not to think of that gratification, than to engage in long and troubleſome ſollicitations about it. 'Causâ ſuperius indicatâ, quod purpuras Aulicas adorare neſcierat, Principi verò tormentum, aut ſupplicationis continuæ fidiculas adhibere ſibi interdixerat. Minus enim moleſtiæ ineſſe videbatur diſpendio expedito, quàm ſtipendio aut præmio intricato (8).' This is the true character of a man, who is a meer ſcholar. But perhaps it may ſeem ſtrange, that a man, who had read ſo much, ſhould not have known what the book of the concord was. I do not think that Gruterus had a vaſt genius; but his extraordinary application, his great deſire of knowing a world of things, and his prodigious diligence in making large collections, gave him a kind of univerſal knowledge, for which he was not naturally qualified. How comes it then, that he neglected to inform himſelf of a thing, which divided the churches, and made a great noiſe among divines? In all likelihood, he had no inclination for the ſtudy of controverſies. To ſpeak more poſitively, he did not approve the diſputes of divines (9); he would never meddle with them; he never had any quarrel about religion with the Roman Catholics; and therefore he was ſuſpected of being inclined to change his religion. Venator, his panegyriſt, is a little angry with thoſe, who entertained ſuch ſuſpicions. Theſe are his words (10): 'Huc accedit quædam alia dementia, quæ frigere eos dicit in Religione, quos in contentiones non vident ardeſcere. *Pontificio* non oblocutus es? *Pontificius* haberis. *Lutherano* non reluctatus? *Lutheranus* audis. *Calviniſtæ* non inſultaſti? *Calviniſta* es. Iſtis enim nominibus invicem diſcedimus. Novi qui de GRUTERO propter hanc ipſam cauſam Tranſitionem ſparſerant. Sicut & *David Chytræus*, quod in *Academia Roſtochiana* GRUTERO, qui tunc ibidem *Suetonium* legebat, conjunctior erat, & ſtudium rixandi averſabatur, *Calviniani* nominis invidiam ſuſtinuit. —— *To this may be added another piece of madneſs, which calls thoſe cold in religious matters, who are not heated with controverſy. Have you never reviled a* Papiſt? *You are a* Papiſt. *Have you never ſtruggled with a* Lutheran? *You are called a* Lutheran. *Have you never inſulted a* Calviniſt? *You are a* Calviniſt. *For theſe are the names, that alternately divide us. I know ſome, who, for this very reaſon, ſpread a report, that Gruterus was gone over. In like manner* David Chytræus, *becauſe he was intimate, in the univerſity of Roſtoc, with* Gruterus, *who then read lectures on* Suetonius, *and hated contention, was branded with the name of a* Calviniſt.' This panegyriſt had been ſpeaking very judiciouſly againſt thoſe, who love diſputing, and concerning the ill effects of controverſies. Men do not grow the better for them, ſays he, but more ſpiteful againſt their neighbours. 'Certamina talia ſemper ferè iſtis eventibus finiuntur, ut acerbius fiat odium inter partes, & nemo per illa melior. Mira res eſt, quod commiſſionibus factionum, argumentorum verſutiis, clamoribus, convitiis, mutuis execrationibus Deo nos gratiores fieri putamus, cum amor & pax, & manſuetudo, & præcedentium mater Fides nobis rem conficiant, quorum tamen poſtrema cura habetur, & inter diſceptandum nulla. Hæreſes odiſti? Dicam quæ maxima ſit, *Hypocriſis*. Hanc prius exuamus. Quotus enim quiſque de gloria Dei prius cogitat, quam de ſua? Quotuſquiſque melius vivit, quàm diſputat (11)? —— *Such kind of diſputes generally end in ſuch a manner, that the parties are ſtill more exaſperated againſt each other, and no one is the better for it. It is ſtrange, that we ſhould think to render ourſelves acceptable to GOD, by factious diſputes, by clamour and mutual reviling; when love, peace, mildneſs, and faith, the mother of them all, do our buſineſs, yet are laſt taken care of, and amidſt diſputation not at all. Do you hate hereſies? I will tell you which is the greateſt*; Hypocriſy. *Let us firſt diveſt ourſelves of this. For how ſeldom do we conſider the glory of GOD before our own? How few of us live better, than we diſpute.*' I muſt acquaint the reader, that one ought not haſtily to believe what Venator advances upon this ſubject; for he ſeems too angry with the divines, and makes an odious deſcription of them; and therefore the following words ought to be read with caution (12). 'Multas inauſpicatas, inimicas & arcentes aves mortales illi ubique fere nanciſcuntur, nullas tamen infeſtiores hodie, quàm quæ de ſuggeſtu diris omnibus regnant, & populares animos odiis aſperant, quos vetus Augurum verſity of Roſtoc (b), but I do not know when, nor how, he left that univerſity. The place, where he appeared as a profeſſor with the greateſt luſtre, was Heidelberg, where he had alſo the direction of that famous library (c), which was removed to Rome ſome time after. He was very fit for ſuch an employment, which very much helped him in writing a great many commentaries. One of the moſt uſeful works, he publiſhed, is a large collection of inſcriptions [E]. Nothing could be more deplorable for a man of his character, than the loſs he ſuſtained, when his fine library was plundered [F], with the town of Heidelberg, in the year 1622. Before that town was taken, he retired to his ſon-in-law at Bretten, from whence he removed to Tubingen. He returned to Bretten, when the affairs of the Palatinate began to be in a better poſture; but,

---

(4) Flayderus, ubi ſupra.

(5) Venator, ubi ſupra, pag. 224.

(6) Flayderus, ubi ſupra.

(7) Gruterus cùm *Librum Concordiæ* nec vidiſſet nec legiſſet unquam abſtinuit à ſubſcriptione, quod temerarium eſſet & fatuum judicare de re, quam non videris, approbare librum, quem non legeris, firmare ſententiam, quam non conſideraveris, ſubſcribere divinis, quæ cum divinis nondum contuleris. Miſſionem igitur prætulit. *Venator, ubi ſupra, pag.* 244.

(8) Id. ibid.

(9) Erat noſter alienus ab iſtis velitationibus, quas nec in aliis probavit. *Id. pag.* 269.

(10) Ibid.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Ibid. pag. 222.

rum diſciplina ignoravit, niſi, quia de ſummo vocem mittunt, *Supervaganeas* cum antiquis appelles, aut picarum generi adſcribas quodam collegio naturæ, quoniam utriſque par inſolentia, quam illis fabulæ tribuunt, par conviciandi & obtrectandi libido,

Raucaque garrulitas, ſtudiumque immane loquendi.

Dicam clariùs. Sunt nonnulli (abſit enim omnes eadem cenſura vexem) & in ipſa matre noſtra Germania de ſacro ordine homines ſacerrimi, qui velut divinarum & humanarum rerum judices atque arbitri tanta confidentia partem illam, quam neſcio quis optimam & peſſimam dixit, exercent, ut quidvis in quoſvis nullâ curâ, verum an falſum intemperanter effundant, aureſque & fidem Vulgi ignobiliſſima captivitate damnent & ſervitute. Aliquis ipſis non dedit? Avaritia: non ſcrupuloſe ſatis honoravit? arrogantia: non laudavit? ambitio: non rudis eſt? invidia: non aſſentitur? Inimicitia: malum morem tangit? tum verò capitale odium eos facit diſertos. —— *Thoſe men almoſt every where get ill-omen'd, unfriendly, birds, yet none at preſent more pernicious, than thoſe which reign from the pulpit with all kind of curſes, and exaſperate the minds of the vulgar, ſuch as the ancient diſcipline of the Augurs knew nothing of, unleſs, becauſe they utter their voice from on high, you will call them, with the ancients,* Supervagants, *or range them among the magpyes from a certain ſimilitude of nature, ſince they both have the ſame inſolence, aſcribed to them by fable, the ſame luſt of calumny and detraction, the ſame* hoarſe garrulity, and boundleſs deſire of talking. *I will ſpeak plainer. There are ſome (*GOD *forbid I ſhould involve all in the ſame cenſure) even in our mother-country Germany, men of the moſt ſacred character, who, as if they were ſole judges of things divine and human, act, with ſo much confidence, that part, which ſome one has called both the beſt and the worſt, that they ſay any thing of any one, without any caution, right or wrong, and hold the ears and faith of the vulgar in moſt ignoble bondage and ſervitude. Does any one refuſe to beſtow ſomething on them? he is avaritious: is he wanting in paying a particular reſpect to them? he is arrogant: has he not praiſed them? he is ambitious: does he not aſſent to them? he is their enemy: but if he cenſures their bad morals, ſo heinous an offence makes them eloquent.*' This is ſufficient: he ſays a great deal more upon this ſubject; the readers may conſult the original, if they have a mind to know it.

[E] *One of the moſt uſeful works he publiſhed is a large collection of inſcriptions.*] Here follows an hiſtorical account of that work (13). Martin Smetius, a native of Bruges, ſpent ſix years in Italy, to make a collection of inſcriptions, and adding them to thoſe, which ſome learned men gave him, he digeſted them into a very good order. Mark Laurinus, lord of Watervliet, a great lover of antiquity, deſired to have a copy of thoſe inſcriptions, and promiſed to requite him for ſuch a painful office. Whilſt Smetius was about it, his houſe was ſet on fire, and all his goods and inſcriptions, except fifty ſheets he had laid by in a cloſet, were burnt. Laurinus encouraged him, with entreaties and promiſes, to reſtore that work to it's firſt perfection, which was done; and thus that fine collection was delivered to Laurinus, who, preparing to retire into France by reaſon of the civil wars, took thoſe inſcriptions along with him, as alſo the treaſure of ancient medals, which Hubert Goltzius had collected with great pains and vaſt charges. The whole was taken from him by the Engliſh garriſon of Oſtend. No application could be made again to Smetius; for, being miniſter of the Reformed at Bruſſels, he had been hanged there by the ſoldiers. Goltzius married his widow. Whereupon Janus Douza, being ſent into England by the States, bought the manuſcript inſcriptions of an Engliſh ſoldier, and gave it to Lipſius, who had it printed with ſome ſupplements. Gruterus took thoſe inſcriptions, to which he added as many as he could get, with prodigious pains, and, putting them in order, publiſhed them at Heidelberg, in the year 1601, being ſo happy as to prevail upon Scaliger to make twenty four Indexes, upon which that great man beſtowed ten months. *Hoc Gruterus tandem noſter aſinino prorſus labore ex lateritio marmoreum imo aureum fecit, nam & illas pauciores primo ſervavit, & omnes quotquot unquam in toto orbe ſuperfuerant collegit inſcriptiones, & eaſdem in ordinem coëgit, & denique Cæſari Rudolpho parenti publico perpetuoque Auguſto dedicatum publicavit. Cui ipſemet Joſephus Scaliger in ſenecta ætate, ſolo amore atque ſtudio quo Gruterum proſequebatur compulſus, viginti quatuor Indices decem menſibus continuo illis inſudando adjecit* (14). The emperor commended that work very much, and left it to Gruterus's choice what reward he ſhould beſtow upon him. The author anſwered, he left it to the diſcretion of the emperor, provided the reward ſhould not conſiſt in money: and, when he came to hear that there was a deſign to give him a coat of arms, in order to ſet off his noble extraction in the empire; he gave to underſtand, that he was ſo far from deſiring a new coat of arms, that he found that, which he had from his anceſtors, a burthen to him. Whereupon the emperor was adviſed to grant him a licence for all the books he ſhould publiſh (15). That prince approved of it, and, beſides, thought fit that Gruterus ſhould have a character whereby he might have a right to grant licences (16): he deſigned to make him *count of the ſacred palace*; but, becauſe he died before he could ſign the patent, the buſineſs came to nothing. Gruterus was too haſty in expreſſing his acknowledgement. 'Decreta res apud Principem, approbata in Senatu Auguſto, relata ad principem iterum, ut ſubſcribendo firmaret, quod præſcripſerat communicando. Sed Cæſarem occupavit morbus, deinde fatum, quod bonas actiones plerumque cum authoribus finit. Literæ itaque quibus ſuperiora Privilegia continebantur, ſicut ejus generis mille alia, more quodam differendi, relicta ſunt abſque manu Imperatoris, abſque ſignatione, nec poſtea unquam productæ, quia nova Poteſtas faciliùs ſua beneficia orditur, quàm aliena abſolvit, & novis curis occupata raró ſuccedit in obligatione veteris promiſſi. Itaque GRUTERUS luculentiſſimum munus nunquam accepit, & laudes Cæſaris optimi ſic celebravit, quaſi integrum accepiſſet (17). —— *The thing was conſented to by the emperor, approved by the Aulic council, and returned to the emperor, that he might confirm, what he had directed, by his ſign manual. But it was prevented by the emperor's death, a fatality, which generally puts an end to good actions with their authors. Therefore the letters patent, which contained the above privileges, together with many others of the ſame kind, by being deferred, were left unſigned by the emperor, nor were ever after produced; for a new prince is more inclined to begin with conferring his own favours, than with compleating thoſe of others, and, being taken up with new cares, thinks itſelf under no obligation to make good an old promiſe. Therefore* GRUTERUS *never received this noble privilege; yet he celebrated the praiſes of the beſt of emperors, as if had been put in full poſſeſſion of it.*'

[F] *His fine library was plundered.*] It coſt him twelve thouſand crowns (18). Oſwald Smendius, his ſon-in-law, endeavoured in vain to preſerve it: to that end, he wrote to one of the general officers of the Bavarian

(b) See the remark [D], citation (10).

(c) He began to have it in the year 1602.

(13) Taken from Gruterus's life, written by Flayder.

(14) Flayder, ubi ſupra.

(15) Venator, ubi ſupra, pag. 241, & ſeq.

(16) Annuit igitur Cæſar de privilegio, & in ipſo privilegio, de privilegiis ultro cogitavit. Non tantum illis quæ GRUTERO, ſed & quæ concederet GRUTERUS. *Comitem* enim *S. Palatii* deſignavit. *Id. ibid. pag.* 243.

(17) Ibid.

(18) Flayder, ubi ſupra.

but, being moleſted there by the Roman Catholics [*G*], he retired to a country-houſe, which he bought near Heidelberg. He went to that town now and then, and ſet out from it, on the day that he fell ſick of the illneſs of which he died. He ſet out from it the tenth of September, 1627, to go to Berhelden (*d*), where he ended his life ten days after. He was buried at Heidelberg in St Peter's church. Juſt at the time of his death, the news came, that the univerſity of Groningen offered to make him profeſſor of hiſtory, and of the Greek tongue (*e*). He had been invited to ſeveral other places [*H*]. As I have already ſaid, he was a moſt laborious man [*I*]. He had a very uncommon quality ;

varian troops ; but the licentiouſneſs of the ſoldiers prevailed over the good intentions of that officer. Smendius, being informed, that Gruterus's houſe was plundered, repaired to Heidelberg, and ſaw the books pillaged. He endeavoured to ſave at leaſt thoſe, which the amanuenſis of Gruterus had removed into the electoral library, and deſired the Pope's commiſſioner to give him leave to take them out. He was anſwered, that the Pope would have all the manuſcripts to be carefully preſerved, and carried to Rome ; but that the printed books might be reſtored to Gruterus, provided Tilly approved of it by a note ſigned with his own hand. This pretended civility proved inſignificant, becauſe Tilly could not be ſpoken to (13).

[*G*] *He was moleſted there by the Roman Catholics.*] I have already ſaid (20), that he never loved controverſies, or diſputes about religion ; and therefore, being importuned by ſome young Jeſuits, who were mightily for diſputing, he quickly left Bretten. The firſt time he gave them a gentle anſwer, and ſet them right upon a paſſage of St Auguſtin, which they had quoted wrong ; but, when they renewed the attack, he grew ſomewhat angry, called them preſumptuous young men, and told them how civilly he was uſed by Andreas Schottus and James Sirmond. 'Ipſum quoque juvenes quidam ex familia *Jeſuïtarum* diſputando ſolicitabant, quibus ille primum placidè reſpondit, & ſemel etiam ſententiam *Auguſtini*, quam non ſatis memoriter ipſi meminerant, ex libro præſenti oſtendit, docuitque aliis verbis, & alio loco extare, quod ab illis & pro illis fuerat allatum. Deindè cum nec dum deſiſterent, quin ipſum talibus obtunderent, libertate reſumpta, *mirari ſe* dixit, *ubi frontem reliquiſſent ſemibarbatuli juvenes, ut ſperent docere ſenem ſexagenarium, qui plures patres in vita legerit, quàm ipſi ſaltem vidiſſent. Jeſuitas ſenes & primarios (SCHOTTUM* nominabat & *SIRMONDUM) ſibi mutuo honore litterarumque commercio coli : nullam tamen ab iſtis de religione ſibi moleſtiam exbiberi.* Erat enim noſter alienus ab iſtis velitationibus, quas nec in aliis probavit (21). —— *Some young Jeſuits likewiſe teized him with offers of diſputation ; whom he at firſt anſwered with mildneſs, and even once pointed out to them, upon the ſpot, a paſſage of St Auſtin, which they had not ſufficiently remembered, and ſhewed them that it was extant in other words, and in another place, than as they had produced it. At laſt, when he found they continued to importune him in the ſame manner, he aſſumed a freedom of ſpeech, and ſaid,* he wondered where they had left their modeſty, that ſuch half fledged boys ſhould pretend to inſtruct an old man of ſixty, who had read more fathers in his life, than they had ſeen : that men of years and diſtinction among the Jeſuits (particularly *SCHOTTUS* and *SIRMOND*) did him the honour to correſpond with him, but never troubled him about religion. *For Gruterus was averſe himſelf to thoſe ſquabbles, and diſapproved of them in others.*' It was not the buſineſs of ſuch a critic, as Gruterus, to diſpute about controverted doctrines with young Jeſuits, bred up in the ſubtilties of the ſchools ; and he found, that the only way of avoiding their importunity, was to live at ſome diſtance from them.

[*H*] *He had been invited to ſeveral other places.*] The moſt conſiderable invitation was that of Padua. They offered him (22) the chair of Riccoboni, who was lately dead, with a noble ſalary, and a promiſe that he ſhould enjoy liberty of conſcience ; but he refuſed all thoſe advantages, notwithſtanding the ſollicitations of Pinellus and Velſerus to the contrary. He was afraid of expoſing himſelf to envy by ſo honourable and profitable an employment, and would not deprive himſelf of the public exerciſe of his religion. 'Erat ei religioni religio, ſed & erat religioni ipſa pecuniæ ſumma, quæ cæteroqui paucis nimia eſt, & multis opportuna ad impietatem merces ..... Cultus enim divini libertatem publicam (quamvis privatam recepturus) pro quibuſcunque divitiis ſibi negabat eſſe venalem ; præterea tam humanum ſciebat eſſe invidere alienæ felicitati, quàm alienæ virtuti, & hanc quidem propter invidiam non eſſe deſerendam, illum verò feliciorem eſſe, qui non ſit infelix, quàm qui cum invidia feliciſſimus (23). —— *He made a conſcience of religion, as he did likewiſe of the ſalary, which to a few is too great, and to many an occaſion of impiety .... for he declared nothing ſhould bribe him to quit the public exerciſe of his religion, tho' he might have been allowed it in private ; beſides, he knew men are as apt to envy another's happineſs, as another's virtue, and that the latter is not to be forſaken on account of envy ; but that he is more happy, who is not unhappy, than he who is moſt happy, with envy.*' This is more meritorious in a critic, than it would be in many others. I find, that Gruterus was invited to Denmark ; and that the conſtable d'Eſdiguieres wrote to him, and deſired him to enter into his ſervice ; and that Claudius d'Expilly, and Charles Perinet, lord of Maugarniac, exhorted him to comply with the conſtable's deſire (24). The curators of the univerſity of Franeker offered him, in 1624, the profeſſorſhip of hiſtory (25).

[*I*] *He was a moſt laborious man.*] How many learned men might be called idle, if their labours were compared with Gruterus's? *Cum quo etiam doctiſſimi hujus ævi, ſi laboris emenſi reſpectu comparentur, deſidioſiſſimi vocabuntur* (26). Spizelius, who ſays this, had it from Flayder, who adds : 'Cum etiam illi qui tota ſua vita literis aſſident huic collati, quaſi ſomno ac inertiæ dediti erubeſcere cogantur, niſi Gruteri labores callidius diſſimulare velint, quam candidius æſtimare. - - - *When even thoſe, who ſpend their whole lives in ſtudy, if compared to him, are forced to bluſh for their want of induſtry, unleſs they more cunningly diſſemble, than candidly reckon up the labours of Gruterus.*' Spizelius obſerves, that Gruterus publiſhed a book almoſt every month : 'Nullus ferè author ſive Græcus ſive Latinus extabat ex antiquis, quem non notis ac commentariis ſuis aut illuſtrarit, aut illuſtrare potuerit ; nemo plura veterum recenſuit monumenta & reſtituit, imò ſingulos ſuæ vitæ annos, ac propemodum menſes, libris ſingulis à ſe editis diſtinxit. - - - *There was ſcarce any ancient author, Greek or Latin, extant, whom he did not either comment upon, or could have done it : no one reviſed and reſtored more remains of antiquity, inſomuch that he diſtinguiſhed each year, almoſt each month, of his life by the books he publiſhed.*' He ſtudied all day, and a great part of the night, and always ſtanding : *Die toto maximam ſæpe noctium partem ſtans literis operam navabat .... ſtans ſcribebat, ſtans legebat, ſtans ſtudebat* (27). Any one that conſiders the many books he wrote, or collected into one body, will eaſily believe this extraordinary application. His *Theſaurus Criticus* (28) is a work of the laſt ſort, wherein he collected into ſix large volumes, in 8vo, a vaſt number of tracts of the moſt excellent critics, which could hardly be met with, if he had not collected them. He did the ſame ſervice to many modern poets, whoſe works he collected, with this title : *Deliciæ Poëtarum Gallorum, Italorum, Belgarum*, in nine volumes (29). He called himſelf, in that compilation, Ranutius Gerus, which is the anagram of his own name (§ *α*). He publiſhed two Florilegiums. The firſt, in three volumes in 8vo, contains a great collection of proverbs of moſt nations, and notes. The ſecond is a continuation of Langius's Polyanthea. The firſt volume of that continuation was printed at Strasburg in the year 1624, in folio. 'Compoſuit (30) quoque Polyantheæ tomum tertium & quartum nondum tamen editos, qui ſi referantur ad Langia-

' num

(*d*) A country-houſe of Oſwaldus Smendius his ſon-in-law, a league from Heidelberg. Moreri ſhould not have ſaid, that he died at Heidelberg.

(*e*) Taken either from Balthaſar Venator, in his panegyric upon Gruterus, or from Frederic Herman Flayder, *De Vita & Morte Gruteri.*

(19) Taken from Venator, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 265.

(20) Above, remark [*D*].

(21) Id. pag. 268, 269.

(22) Id. Venator, ibid. pag. 239.

(23) Ibid.

(24) Id ibid. pag. 275.

(25) Gruter. Epiſt. ad Hofmannum inter Richterianas, pag. 549.

(26) Spizelius, in Felice Literato, pag. 1042.

(27) Flayder, ubi ſupra.

(28) *The title of it is,* Lampas ſive Fax Artium liberalium, hoc eſt Theſaurus Criticus.

(29) *Printed in the years* 1608, 1609, 1614.

(30) *Theſe words are in the Catalogue of Gruterus's works at the end of his life, written by Flayder.*

quality ; for he was not intent upon gain. He did not care to increaſe his income. He was very charitable to the poor, and lent money, without much inquiring whether it would be paid him again [*K*]. He patiently bore adverſity ; and, if he was not inſenſible upon the death of his four wives, it appeared at leaſt that it was no very difficult thing to comfort him [*L*]. His moſt violent quarrel, about learning, was with Philip Pareus : I have mentioned it in another place (*f*). That which he had with Dionyſius Gothofredus, was like a torrent [*M*] ; violent, but of no long continuance. He

'num ſunt Oceanus ad guttulas. - - *He compoſed likewiſe the third and fourth volumes of the Polyanthea, not yet publiſhed, which, if compared with that of Langius, are as an ocean to a few drops.*' He publiſhed a *Chronicon Chronicorum Eccleſiaſticum & Politicum*, in four large volumes in 8vo, at Francfort, 1614, and, inſtead of putting his own name to it, he put that of Johannes Gualterus, in honour of his father's memory (31). He was too fond of writing many books ; which is the reaſon why choice and judgment do not prevail in his works. *Non curat*, ſays Scaliger (32), *utrum charta ſit cacata, modo libros multos excudat . . . quod fecit Gruterus in Senecam*, is a ſchool-boy's or a printer's work. Mr Amelot de la Houſſaye (33) ſpeaks with great contempt of this critic's performance upon Tacitus, and Baudius had paſſed the ſame judgment upon it long before. 'Vidi quæ J. Gruterus ad eum auctorem annotavit. Diligentiam ejus in colligendis varie ſententiis improbare nefas ſit. Sed (quod libere liceat) commiſſiones meræ ſunt, &, ut flagitioſiſſimi Caligulæ non abſonum dictum in re ſimili uſurpem, arena ſine calce. Videtur ſibi propoſuiſſe ad imitandum rationem illam, quam ſecutus eſt Lipſius in admirabili & præſtantiſſimo opere De civili doctrina. Sed Dii boni ! quam longo intervallo, quam non paſſibus æquis veſtigia ſectatur (34). —— *I have ſeen the annotations of Janus Gruterus on that author. I can by no means diſapprove his diligence in collecting the opinions of different authors. But I muſt ſay they are meer patch-work, without coherence, and, to uſe an apt expreſſion of the wicked Caligula on a like occaſion, ſand without lime. . . . . he ſeems to have propoſed to himſelf for imitation the method which Lipſius followed in his excellent work* De civili Doctrina. *But, Good GOD! how greatly does he fall ſhort of that author.*' You will ſee another paſſage of the ſame author in the remark [*M*].

His exceſſive application to books was probably the cauſe of ſome ſtarts of fancy, which made Commelinus ſay, that Gruterus 'was a mad man. When he meets with ſomething, that he does not underſtand, he frets, and throws the book upon the floor (35).

[(§ α). Mr Bayle ſhould have ſaid *Gherus* ; for ſo it is in the title page of the books he ſpeaks of. Father Vavaſſeur has written with an *h*, but erroneouſly, *Grutherus*, p. 209, *de Epigrammate Liber & Epigrammatum Libri tres, Pariſiis* 1609 in 8vo. REM. CRIT.]

[*K*] *He lent money, without much inquiring whether it would be paid him again.*] Tho' he had been caught, he was ſtill willing to lend his money, and thought himſelf happy, that he was not a woman ; for, ſaid he, by way of jeſt, I ſhould have denied no body. 'Et egenis benignè dedit, & indigis prompte credidit ; utrumque virtute indolis, cum tam crudele putaret non dare eſurienti, quam inhumanum negare mutuanti. Et quamquam ipſius argentum non ſemel in mala nomina inciderat, & oblivioſam fidem, facientibus ex commodato donum, quibus dignum erat ultra ſortem etiam uſuræ loco reddere gratias ; non tamen deſiſtebat ille, quoties rogaretur, pecunias promere auxiliares, cùm interim ſubinde confiteretur damnoſam facilitatem ſuam, dicere per jocum ſolitus : *Bene ſecum actum, quòd puella non eſſet natus, haud dubiè enim nemini ſe fuiſſe negaturum* (36). —— *He was both charitable to the poor, and ready to lend his money to thoſe who wanted it ; and in both he followed his natural inclination, whilſt he thought it as cruel not to feed the hungry, as inhuman to refuſe a borrower. And tho' he often met with bad debts, thoſe, who borrowed of him, looking on what he lent as a gift, who, beſides the intereſt, ought to have repaid him with thanks ; yet he ceaſed not to lend his money, as often as he was asked, at the ſame time acknowledging that he ſuffered by his eaſineſs, and ſaying jeſtingly of himſelf : that* it was well for him he was not born a girl, ſince he ſhould undoubtedly have refuſed no body.' The ingratitude or unfairneſs of ſome of his debtors did not make him more cautious for the future, by requiring ſecurity, or a bond. Nay, he neglected thoſe formalities, when he paid the portions of his daughters. 'In ſe itaque potius facetè luſit, quam ingratos aſperè perſtrinxit, aut propter hos inhumaniter alios rejecit, aut eoſdem ſponſoribus, teſtibus, aut ſcriptis publicis ſtipavit, ut & ipſi in ære eſſent, & fides in cuſtodia. Quem morem vulgò receptum noſter ne tunc quidem adhibuit, cùm majoris etiam momenti pacta forent condenda, cùm filiabus generos daret & dotem, nulla teſtium conſcientia, nulla Formulariorum curioſitate, nulla cerâ, quam ſoceri generique opus eſſe cenſebat (37). —— *Therefore he rather jeſted upon himſelf, than reflected upon the ingratitude of his creditors, or inhumanly rejected others upon their account, or even required proper ſecurity of them. This uſual precaution he neglected even when he was to enter into contracts of much more importance, I mean when he was to marry and portion his daughters ; for he thought there was no need of witneſſes, of writings, of ſigning and ſealing, between father-in-law and ſon-in-law.*'

[*L*] *It was no very difficult thing to comfort him*] This may be inferred from the words of his panegyriſt ; and it is likely, he did not ſay all that he knew about it, thinking that inſenſibility was not a commendable thing. He ſays, that one of Gruterus's four wives died a violent death ; ſhe fell from the top of the houſe and was killed : nevertheleſs her husband bore it patiently, tho' the circumſtances of his wife's death ſhould have encreaſed his grief. 'Doluit ille quidem magnopere morte uxoris, doluit ipſa ſpecie mortis, doluit inopinâ viduitate ; ſed poſt amiſſionem tamen uxoris multum abfuit ab amiſſione ſui, multum ab impatientia vulgari, quæ plerunque cùm corrigere non poſſit mala ſua, corrigere vult Deum (38). —— *He grieved indeed greatly for the death of his wife ; he lamented the particular circumſtancies of it ; he was afflicted at his ſudden widdowhood ; but the loſs of his wife was far from making him loſe himſelf ; nor did he ſhew that uſual impatience, which, when it cannot remedy it's miſfortunes, is apt to quarrel with GOD.*

[*M*] *The quarrel he had with Dionyſius Gothofredus was like a torrent.*] That learned civilian corrected ſome paſſages of Seneca differently from him ; whereupon Gruterus immediately put out a book with this title ; *Confirmatio ſuſpicionum extraordinariarum contra Dionyſii Godofredi conjecturas & varias lectiones in Senecam Philoſophum.* He publiſhed it at Francfort in 1591. The heat of youth carried him too far, and he was very ſorry for it afterwards, when Gothofredus became his colleague (39), and they were reconciled. The panegyriſt will have it that this diſpute is of ſuch a nature, that, conſidering the learning it contains, we ſhould have been ſorry that thoſe two critics had not quarelled ; and that one would wiſh they had never had any quarrel, by reaſon of the great paſſion that appears in it. 'Quod certamen inter ipſos certatum vix poſſis nolle, quin velis, vix velle, quin nolis. Adeò multum excidebat inter diſceptandum humanioris doctrinæ, adeò multum rurſus inhumanioris cenſuræ. GRUTERUS ipſe calorem illum juventutis ſæpe poſtea deteſtatus eſt. Cùm enim optimus & doctiſſimus Ille, quem GRUTERUS paulo vehementiùs ante tetigerat, Heidelbergam ipſe quoque docendi cauſa veniſſet, reconciliatio primùm inter ipſos facta eſt, deinde ſecuta propior notitia, & tandem apud GRUTERUM pœnitentia ſcriptionis, ut ita loquar, piperatæ. Nam ſi mihi conſtitiſſet, inquiebat noſter, Dionyſium virum eſſe tam bonum, nunquam quicquam mihi tanti fuiſſet, ut contra illum manum tam ſeriò miſiſſem (40). —— *The quarrel between them was ſuch, that you would wiſh, and would not wiſh, it had happened ; ſo much*

(*f*) *In remark* [*C*] *of the article* PAREUS (PHILIP).

(31) Flayder, ubi ſupra.

(32) Scaligerana, pag. m. 100, 101.

(33) *Preface to his tranſlation of Tacitus.*

(34) Baudius, Epiſt. xiii, Cent. 2, pag. m. 171.

(35) Scaligerana, pag. 101.

(36) Venator, ubi ſupra, pag. 254.

(37) Id. ibid.

(38) Ibid. pag. 256.

(39) *He was profeſſor of the civil-law at Heidelberg.*

(40) Venator, pag. 261.

He made a very good uſe of his misfortunes in the laſt years of his life; which appears by the moral reflexions he publiſhed (g). His curioſity, though never ſo great, went no farther than learning: he did not mind the town news, as ſo many other learned men do [*N*], who never go to bed without being informed of all the flying ſtories. Nor did he mind controverſies (*h*); and doubtleſs this was one of the reaſons why one of his antagoniſts accuſed him of having no religion. Nevertheleſs, he gave ſuch proofs of his attachment to the Proteſtant church, that many paſſionate and reviling controverſiſts are not pious enough to do the like [*O*].

'learning fell from them during the diſpute, and at the ſame time ſo much ſevere cenſure of each other. GRUTERUS himſelf afterwards deteſted that heat of youth. For when that beſt and learnedeſt of men, whom Gruterus had before a little too vehemently attacked, came likewiſe to Heidelberg to teach there, they were firſt reconciled, then grew more intimate, till at laſt GRUTERUS repented of the ſharp invectives he had thrown out againſt him. For had I known, ſaid he, that Dionyſius was ſo good a man, nothing would have provoked me to have fallen upon him ſo earneſtly.'

To ſhew that he was ſincerely reconciled to Gothofredus, I ſhall mention a thing, which I find in Baudius's letters. Baudius deſired him to preſent his ſervice to that civilian; but Gruterus would not do it, becauſe he thought Baudius had not praiſed Gothofredus according to his merit; and he wrote to him, that it was not enough, for ſuch a man, to ſay, that he was laborious, and had done no ſmall ſervices to the civil-law; but that he ſhould have commended him for having done very great ſervices to that ſcience, or rather that he ſhould have uſed more emphatical words. Baudius was offended at this advice, and ſpoke very unkindly of Gruterus, in a letter which he wrote to a learned man of Hamburgh. 'Quemamodum Grutero non fuit animus ſalutandi meo nomine Dionyſium Godofredum, quia nimis parca manu laudes & virtutes ejus eram perſecutus: quod & ſignificavit per literas adjuncto noſtro elogio, ſi forte me ratio fugiſſet. Erat autem tale, *vir laborioſus, & non male de jure meritus*. Dicere debueras, inquit, *optime*, aut ſi quid aliud efficacius. Vide quid oneris nobis injungatur, ut faſces ſubmittamus ſcilicet iis, quibus οὐκ ἐςι νοῦς αρτίφρων. Omnes hominis dotes abunde complexus eſſe videor, ſi dicam *Sarcinatorem eſſe probum ſuere centones optime*. Ego malim in æternum ejerare omnem ſcribendi copiam, quam tali pacto me poſteritati æſtimandum proponere, etſi hæc via & ad opes & ad æſtimationem ducit. ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον αἰσχύνομαι καὶ ἐμαυτὸν, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἐσομένων δόξας. Quanquam bonum illum Gruterum (eſt enim vir minime malus, imo vix capax malitiæ) prorſus habeo excuſatum, ſi id ætatis homo non poteſt ablegare vaniſſimam illam gloriæ cupiditatem, quæ nunquam ſeneſcit, & (uti incomparabilis meus Tacitus ait) ſapientiam profeſſis, noviſſima exuitur (41). —— *In like manner as Gruterus was unwilling to make my compliments to Dionyſius Gothofredus, becauſe I had been too ſparing in reciting his praiſes and virtues; which he ſignified alſo by letter, adding my Elogium, leſt I ſhould have forgot it. It was as follows:* an induſtrious man, and not ill deſerving of the law. *You ought, ſays he, to have ſaid* moſt deſerving, *or ſomething ſtill ſtronger. Behold what task is impoſed upon me, to ſubmit, forſooth, to thoſe, who are not proper judges. I think I comprehend all the qualifications of the man, if I ſay,* He is a good compiler, and patches up cento's admirably. *For my own part, I had rather forſwear writing for ever, than be tranſmitted to poſterity under ſuch a character, tho' this way leads both to riches and fame. Tho' I entirely excuſe Gruterus (who is indeed a man of no guile) if, at that age, he cannot get rid of that moſt empty deſire of glory, which never decays, and (as Tacitus admirably expreſſes it) is the leaſt thing which a philoſopher ſhakes off.*' I think no body will be diſpleaſed to know upon what occaſion Baudius wrote this. He had been ſaying: 'If any body enquires after me, be pleaſed to give him my ſervice, tho' I do not mention him to you; for I do not think that people miſtruſt you to ſuch a degree, or that they are ſo ridiculous in our country, as to believe nothing but what they read (42).' Whereupon he tells his friend, that Gruterus refuſed to give his ſervice to Gothofredus, being not willing to do it without ſhewing Baudius's own words. This piece of ſervitude has no place in the epiſtolary correſpondence of men of figure.

[*N*] *He did not mind the town news, as ſo many other learned men do.*] The author, I quote, blames the learned men who have ſuch a curioſity, whereby, *ſays he*, a man muſt be willing to hear a thouſand ſlanders and to know the ill deſigns of ſtep-mothers, and the temptations of widows: temptations do I ſay? the Latin has it *Big-bellies* (43). Gruterus was to be praiſed for not minding ſuch news (44). 'Quamquam in omni artium ac ſcientiarum indagine curioſiſſimum ſemper ſe exhibuerat, alieniſſimus tamen fuerat ab omni reliqua curioſitate, ſive πολυϖραγμοσύνῃ, quæ haud raro doctiſſimis quibuſdam nimis eſt familiaris ac domeſtica, ut ubique tibi obvii, nil niſi novitates aut rumuſculos aniles ad innocentium ac ſimplicium, ut vocant, mortalium vitam macula inurendam fabrefactos, aucupentur, & impetuoſorum inſtar ventorum atque turbinum, non modo veſtes hominum, ſed ædium quoque parietes atque facta intima ſupinent, nec prius in dulcem, &c (45). —— *Tho' he had ever ſhewed himſelf moſt curious in all enquiries of arts and ſciences, yet was he a perfect ſtranger to all other kind of curioſity, ſuch as that impertinent one, which too often is to be found in the moſt learned men, who run after news and idle reports, which injure the characters of innocent perſons, and, like impetuous winds, or ſtorms, lay bare, not only the garments of men, but their very houſes, and moſt ſecret actions, nor can ſleep, &c.*' The ſequel of this paſſage may be ſeen in the margin.

[*O*] *He was accuſed of having no religion. Nevertheleſs, he gave ſuch proofs of his attachment to the Proteſtant church*, &c.] It is ſaid, that Philip Pareus charged him with ſetting a greater value upon a ſentence of Apuleius or Petronius, than upon all the precepts of JESUS CHRIST: he added, that his atheiſm, and unconcernedneſs for religion, were very well known. *Unum Appuleji aut Petronii effatum pluris facit, quam infinita ſervatoris noſtri* ϖαραγγέλματα. *Notus quippe eſt ejus* ἀθεισμὸς, *& in ſacra religione* ψυχρότης *frigus* (46). I cannot at preſent verify whether James Gretſerus, a Jeſuit, who is quoted for this, does faithfully cite Pareus's words; but I am ſure, that the following paſſage is to be found in the index of one of Pareus's books (47): *Gruterus ſcurriliter illudit religioſiſſimis Salvatoris myſteriis*; and this other, *Gruterus* ἄθεος *& Theologiæ ſacræ ignarus*. The reader is referred to Pag. 334. where theſe words may be ſeen: 'Abi, Grutere; & Theologica mitte, quæ nihil ad Criticum tuum umbonem. Tuum eſt, conflictari cum blattis ac tineis: non ſcrutari myſteria ſacra, quæ numquam didiciſti, immò quæ adſpernari ſolitus es, Critico planè & aſinino ſupercilio. —— *Go, Gruter, and lay aſide divinity: it has nothing to do with criticiſm; your buſineſs is to combat with moths and worms, not to ſearch into ſacred myſteries, which you never learnt, nay always deſpiſed, with the ſupercilious contempt of a dull critic.*' We have ſeen that Gruterus refuſed to ſubſcribe a formulary (48), out of a principle of conſcience, tho' he loſt his place by it: and, being offered a profeſſor's chair at Padua (49), he would not accept of it, becauſe he could not there have the public exerciſe of his religion: how great therefore was his boldneſs, who charged him with atheiſm? beſides, this pretended atheiſt anſwered thoſe, who put it to his choice, *either to leave his country, or to change his religion*, I had rather leave my country: if I am not allowed to live in a town, I ſhall live in the fields or in woods; GOD will ſupply me with herbs or roots the remaining part of my life, which will not be long. *Cum juberetur ad aliam Religionem tranſire, aut exire foras*, hoc malo, *inquit*, quàm illud. Si non licebit vivere in urbe, licebit in agris aut in ſilvis. Aliquid ſemper Deus ſuppeditabit radicis

(g) *With this title:* Bibliotheca Exulum, ſive Enchiridion divinæ humanæque Prudentiæ.

(h) *See the remarks* [*D*] *and* [*G*].

(41) Baudius, Epiſt ix, Centur. 2, pag. m. 164, 165.

(42) Quæſo te quoties in quempiam incideris cui veniat in mentem noſtri, ne graveris eum verbis noſtris impartiri ſalute, tametſi nihil ea de re nominatim caveam. Non enim arbitror aut tibi tam parum eſſe fidei, aut veſtros homines adeo ineptire, ut nihil niſi inſpectis ſignis & tabellis credere ſuſtineant. *Id, ibid. pag.* 164.

(43) Nec prius in dulcem declinent lumina ſomnum, *niſi exactiſſime à ſui ſimilibus congerronibus cognorint*, Quid toto fiat in orbe, Quid Seres, quid Thraces agant, ſecreta novercæ Et pueri, quis amet, quis decipiatur adulter? *Imo* quis viduam prægnantem fecerit & quo menſe. —— *Nor go to ſleep, till they have learnt, from ſuch as themſelves, all the tranſactions of the day, with the amours and intrigues of the whole town.* Flayder, ubi ſupra. *See* Juvenal, Sat. vi, ver. 400.

(44) *See remark* [*A*] *of the article* ALTINGIUS (JAMES).

(45) Flayder, *ib.*

(46) Philipp. Pareus, teſte Jacobo Gretſero. *See the fourth part of Crenius's* Animadverſiones, pag. 142.

(47) *Intituled,* Analecta Plautina. *It was printed at Francfort, in* 1623.

(48) *See the remark* [*D*].

(49) *See the remark* [*H*].

radicis aut herbæ, quod ſpiritum hunc alat, non diu moraturum (50). Do theſe things betray a man guilty of atheiſm or indifferency for religion? do they not rather ſhew, that Gruterus had a true zeal, preferable to all the clamours and bitterneſs of violent controverſiſts, who damn all other communions?

(50) Venator, ubi ſupra, pag. 272.

GRYNÆUS (SIMON) a countryman's ſon of Suabia, was born at Veringen in the county of Hohenzollern, in the year 1493. He ſtudied at Pfortſheim at the ſame time with Melanchthon, and this gave birth to a friendſhip of long continuance between them. He continued his ſtudies at Vienna in Auſtria, and received there the degree of maſter in philoſophy, and the profeſſorſhip of the Greek tongue. Having embraced the Proteſtant religion, he found himſelf expoſed to many dangers, and eſpecially in Baden, where he was for ſome years rector of the ſchool. He was impriſoned at the inſtigation of the monks; but, by the recommendation of the nobility of Hungary, he was ſet at liberty, and retired to Wittemberg, where he ſaw Luther and Melanchthon, and had a conference with them. Upon his return to his own country, he was ſent for to Heidelberg, to be profeſſor of Greek, in the year 1523. He diſcharged this employ till 1529, when he was invited to Baſil, to teach there publickly. There he explained ſeveral authors, and even the epiſtle to the Romans. He was employed with ſeveral others, in the year 1534, to reform the church and ſchool of Tubingen. He returned to Baſil in 1536, and was aſſociated, in 1540, with Melanchthon, Capito, Bucer, Calvin, *&c.* for the conferences of Worms. He died of the plague at Baſil, the firſt of Auguſt 1541 (*a*). He had taken a journey into England, in 1531, and had received, from the lord chancellor Sir Thomas More, to whom Eraſmus had recommended him, all imaginable civilities [*A*]. He was a learned and induſtrious man, and did great ſervice to the Republic of Letters [*B*]. See his Elogium in Verheiden's collection (*b*), and in Joachim Camerarius's preface to Theophraſtus. His ſon **SAMUEL GRYNÆUS**, born at Baſil in the year 1539, obtained there the profeſſorſhip of rhetoric at the age of twenty five years, and afterwards that of civil-law. He died the third of April 1599 (*c*).

(*a*) *Taken from* Melch. Adam, in Vitis Philoſ. pag. 118, *&c.*

(*b*) Verheiden, in Elogiis præſtant. aliquot Theologor. pag. 61.

(*c*) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Juriſconſ. pag. 338, *&c.*

[*A*] *He received from the lord chancellor, Sir Thomas More ..... all imaginable civilities.*] This particular is not found in Melchior Adam; for which reaſon I am the more careful in relating it. I have taken it from the epiſtle dedicatory to the works of Plato, printed in Greek at Baſil, *apud Joannem Valderum*, 1534, *in folio.* It is there that Grynæus, to teſtify his gratitude, thus addreſſes himſelf to John More, ſon of the chancellor (1): 'Annus eſt (ut noſti) tertius jam, cum in Angliam '..... veniens, ac Eraſmi noſtri commendatione velut vento ſecundo ad illas muſis totas ſacras ædes veſtras delatus, humanitate mira acciperer, majori tractarer, maxima dimitterer. Non ſolum enim ampliſſimus vir pater tuus, ac tum quidem conditione, per cætera vero rebus omnibus egregiis, facile toto regno princeps, privatum hominem ignotumque me, literarum tanto ergo, ad colloquium inter tot publica privataque negotia admiſit: menſæ ſuæ ſceptra regni gerens, adpoſuit: in aulam abiens rediens ſecum traxit: laterique adjunxit ſuo: ſed omnem meam de religione ſententiam locis non paucis diverſam ab ipſius eſſe haud difficulter præſentiens placide benigneque cognovit: ac cum ab illa non parum tum diſcreparet opera conſilioque ſic juvit nos tamen, ut omne mihi negotium ſumptibus etiam ſuis confecerit. Nam & itineri comitem Harriſium doctum juvenem addidit, & Oxonienſis Gymnaſii Proceribus ſic literis inſinuavit, ut ad earum conſpectum omnes nobis collegiorum omnium non ſolum bibliothecæ, ſed ſtudioſorum etiam animi velut mercuriali quadam virgula tacti pateſcerent. —— *It is now three years (as you know) ſince, coming into England, and being recommended by my friend Eraſmus to your houſe, the ſeat of the muſes, I was received with wonderful humanity, entertained with greater, and diſmiſſed with the greateſt. For that great man your father, diſtinguiſhed both by his rank and noble actions, not only admitted me, a private and obſcure perſon, to converſe with him (ſo great was his love of learning) amidſt the hurry of both public and private affairs, not only ſet me at his table, tho' the firſt man in the kingdom, carried me with him to and from court, and made me his conſtant companion; but, with great affability and good nature, informed himſelf wherein my religious principles differed from his, and even defrayed all my expences himſelf. He ſent me likewiſe to Oxford, accompanied by Mr Harris, a learned young gentleman, and recommended me ſo ſtrongly to the heads of that univerſity by letters, that, at the ſight of them, I had acceſs to all the public libraries, and met with the moſt friendly treatment from the ſtudents.*' They communicated to him at Oxford ſome manuſcripts of Proclus, and he was permitted to take them away: Sir Thomas More added another favour; he made him a preſent of them (2). The paſſage of Eraſmus, which I am going to cite, makes mention of this journey of Grynæus.

(1) Simon Grynæus, Epiſtola ad Jo. Morum, Operibus Platonis præfixa.

(2) Quibus de velut Theſauro invento gratulantem pater tuus donatum liberaliter ac beneficiis ſuis plane cumulatum in patriam remiſit. *S. Grynæus, ibid.*

[*B*] *He was a learned man ..... and did great ſervice to the republic of letters.*] See here the good opinion Eraſmus had of him, which he thus teſtified in 1531: 'Simon Grynæus ...... eſt homo Latine Græcèque ad unguem doctus, in Philoſophia & Mathematicis diſciplinis diligenter verſatus; nullo ſupercilio, pudore penè immodico. Pertraxit hominem iſthuc *Britanniæ* viſendæ cupiditas, ſed præcipuè bibliothecarum veſtrarum amor (3). —— *Simon Grynæus ..... is a compleat maſter of Latin and Greek, a good philoſopher and mathematician, of no pride, and modeſt to exceſs. The deſire of ſeeing England brought him thither; but the chief inducement was, the libraries you have there.*' We are obliged to him for editions of ſeveral books of the ancients. He was the firſt, who publiſhed the Almageſt of Ptolemy in Greek (4): he added to it a preface concerning the uſe which is to be made of that author's doctrine. He likewiſe publiſhed Euclid in Greek with a preface (5), and the works of Plato, with ſome commentaries of Proclus (6). He retouched in ſome places the Latin verſion of Plato made by Marſilius Ficinus. See the edition of Plato, 1539, at Baſil, for Frobenius. Whoever would fee a particular account of his tranſlations, prefaces, and other writings, need only conſult the abridgment of Geſner's Bibliotheque, at pages 755 and 756 of rhe edition of Zurich, 1583.

The Oxford catalogue aſcribes to him ſome works, which cannot be his: *de Cometa qui fulſit annis* 1577-78; *de inuſitata magnitudine & figura Veneris annis* 1578-79. We have ſeen that he died in 1541. I make no queſtion but the treatiſe, *de ignitis Meteoris & de Cometarum cauſis ac ſignificationibus*, which the ſame catalogue aſcribes to him, is, as well as the other two, the production of SIMON GRYNÆUS, phyſician and mathematician at Heidelberg, and ſon of THOMAS GRYNÆUS, nephew of him we are ſpeaking of. The other works, which the Oxford catalogue attributes to Simon Grynæus, really belong to the Grynæus of this article.

(3) Eraſmus, Epiſt. xxxix, lib. xxvi, pag. m. 1464. C.

(4) *At Baſil,* apud Jo. Valderum, 1538.

(5) *At Baſil,* apud Hervagium, 1533.

(6) *At Baſil,* apud Jo. Valderum, 1534.

GRYNÆUS (THOMAS) nephew of the preceding, was born at Veringen in Suabia, about the year 1512. He ſtudied under his uncle at Heidelberg and Baſil; and he taught the Latin and Greek languages in the city of Berne during eleven years; after which the love of eaſe, and a diſreliſh for diſputes, induced him to retire from this employ, becauſe they drew him into the controverſies, which divided the miniſters. He returned to Baſil, where he became one of the profeſſors, in 1547. He read public lectures, and preached ſometimes in the villages. The marquis of Baden, having introduced the reformation in his dominions, made him miniſter of Rotelen (*a*). He acquitted himſelf honourably in this employ, during eight years, to his death, that is to the ſecond of Auguſt, 1564. He left four ſons, famous for their learning, THEOPHILUS, SIMON (*b*), JOHN-JAMES, and TOBIAS (*c*).

(*a*) *In the high marquiſate of Baden, a mile from Baſil.*

(*b*) *See the end of the remark* [*B*] *of the preceding article.*

(*c*) *Taken from* Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. pag. 398.

GRYPHIANDER (JOHN), born in the county of Oldemburg, was profeſſor of poetry and hiſtory in the univerſity of Iëna, after Elias Reuſnerus, who died in the year 1612. He was admitted doctor of the civil-law in the ſame univerſity in the year 1614, and, four years after, returned into his country, to take poſſeſſion of an office of judicature. He died in December, 1652 (*a*). There are ſome books of his writing [*A*].

(*a*) *Taken from Freberus's* Theatrum, pag. 1130.

[*A*] *There are ſome books of his writing.*] A treatiſe of iſlands. The whole title runs thus: *Joannes Gryphiandri ICti de INSULIS Tractatus ex ICtis, Politicis, Hiſtoricis, & Philologis collectus, ut omnibus hiſce uſui eſſe poſſit, in quo plurimæ cognatæ quæſtiones de mari, fluminibus, lacubus, littoribus, portubus, aquæ ductibus, aggeribus, navigationibus, alluvionis, alveique incremento &c. excutiuntur.* It was printed at Francfort in 4to, in the year 1624. Nothing can be more inſtructive than a particular treatiſe upon a certain queſtion, when a learned man ſets about it, and undertakes to exhauſt his ſubject. There are a vaſt number of quotations in that book of Gryphiander. He wrote one about the Phœnix in 1618. He publiſhed another in 1625, which is very curious, in which he treats of a certain right of ſome towns in Saxony, *viz.* that of erecting Roland's ſtatues of a gigantic ſize. That book is intituled, *Commentarius de Weichbildis Saxonicis, ſive Coloſſis Rulandinis urbium quarundam Saxonicarum.* Konig aſcribes to Gryphiander a tract, *de Oeconomia legali*: Freherus ſays nothing of it.

GRYPHIUS (SEBASTIAN), a famous printer of Lyons in the XVIth century, was a German. He perfomed the duties of his profeſſion with ſo much honour, that ſome learned men beſtowed public praiſes on him upon that account. And among others Julius Cæſar Scaliger, and Conrad Geſner. The latter dedicated to him one of his books [*A*]. Some will have it, that the other dedicated to him his work *De cauſis Linguæ Latinæ*; but it is a miſtake [*B*]. One of his beſt editions is a Latin bible, which he publiſhed in two volumes in folio, in the year 1550. He made uſe *of the largeſt letter that had been ſeen till then* (*a*). *It is inferiour to none, but the bible printed at the Louvre in the year 1642, in nine volumes in folio* (*b*). *His many editions are eſteemed by all thoſe, who know wherein the art and perfection of printing doth conſiſt.* He dealt very fairly

(*a*) Majoribus & auguſtioribus typis. *Gryphius, in Præfat. apud Chevillier, Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris, pag.* 150.

(*b*) Chevillier, ibid. pag. 151.

[*A*] *Geſner dedicated to him one of his books.*] *Viz.* The twelfth of his *Pandects*. He beſtows the following encomium upon him: 'Tu inter primos, humaniſſime Gryphi, minime prætereundus in mentem 'mihi veniſti πολλῶν ἀντάξιος ἄλλων, cui non poſtremus inter eximios ætatis noſtræ chalcographos locus deberetur: idque eò magis, quoniam non ſolum 'inter externos in Gallia innumeris optimis libris optima fide ſummaque diligentia elegantiaque procuſis, 'maximam tibi gloriam peperiſti: ſed noſtras etiamnum eſſe videris, qui Germanus in Galliam veneris '(1). —— *Nor can I forget you, moſt humane Gryphius; you, who deſerve not the laſt rank among the 'printers of our age: for this reaſon in particular, becauſe you have not only acquired the greateſt reputation, of any foreigner in France, by the many beautiful and correct editions you have publiſhed of the beſt 'books; but ſeem to be one of our own countrymen, 'ſince, though a German, you came into France.*' Next to his epiſtle dedicatory, there is a catalogue of the books printed by Gryphius.

[*B*] *But it is a miſtake.*] 'It is not true, that Julius Scaliger dedicated his book, *De cauſis Linguæ 'Latinæ*, to Sebaſtian Gryphius, a printer at Lyons. 'He only wrote a letter to him on occaſion of that 'book, which he was to print, wherein he tells him: 'Tuam vero, mi Gryphi, veram pietatem, excellentem eruditionem, inſignem humanitatem, his noſtris 'lucubratiunculis & præeſſe volui, & moderari: ſi id 'tibi ita collibuiſſet: ut Poſteri intelligerent, ejus 'frugis proventum, ſi qua ad eorum commoda per nos 'exculta eſſet, à nobis tantùm commendari, quantùm 'ex diligentia tua, atque auctoritate gratiæ conſequi 'potuiſſet. —— *I was willing, my Gryphius, that 'a man of ſuch true piety, excellent learning, and remarkable humanity, ſhould have the care and direction of my works, if you think fit to undertake it; 'that poſterity make know, that I tranſmit the fruits 'of my labours to them, if my abilities can be of any 'ſervice, recommended by your diligence and authority.*' 'Can this be called a dedication? Julius Scaliger 'likewiſe wrote a letter to the printer Vaſcoſan, to 'recommend to him the edition of his book *De Subtilitate*. Not to ſay, that Julius Scaliger was too 'proud to dedicate his book to a printer, how could 'he dedicate his book, *De cauſis Linguæ Latinæ*, 'to Gryphius, ſince he had inſcribed it to his eldeſt 'ſon Silvius Cæſar Scaliger, to whom he alſo inſcribed 'his *Ars Poëtica?* Julius Scaliger wrote to Sebaſtian 'Gryphius, in the ſame manner as Quintilian wrote 'to Trypho, a bookſeller, to recommend to him his '*Inſtitutiones Oratoriæ*, which he had dedicated to 'Marcellus; and in the ſame manner as Scævola 'Sammarthanus inſcribed ſome Hendecaſyllabic verſes 'to Mamert Patiſſon, to recommend to him the edition 'of his works (2).' This is what Menage obſerves in a book printed in 1688. If the curious Mr Chevillier had known it, he would not have ſaid, that Julius Cæſar Scaliger dedicated to Gryphius (3) 'his treatiſe *De cauſis Linguæ Latinæ*, printed in 1540, in '4to, wherein he paſſes this compliment upon him: 'that if his works have been kindly received by the 'learned, it is no leſs owing to the beauty and charms 'of the impreſſion, than to their own merit. *Cum 'plerique librorum meorum . . . . tuis opibus atque apparatibus ea gratia effecti* (4) *ſint, ut non minus tuum 'ob beneficium quam propter ſuum meritum eos doctiſſimus quiſque exceperit & probarit.*' It was an eaſy thing to commit the fault cenſured by Menage; for Scaliger's letter to Gryphius is prefixed to that book. You will find the ſame fault in the ſupplement to Moreri's dictionary.

[*C*] *He*

(1) Geſner. in Pandectis, fol. 117.

(2) Menage, Anti-Baillet, Tom. I, pag. 55, 56.

(3) Chevillier, Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris, pag. 151.

(4) *In my edition, which is in 8vo,* apud Santandreanum, 1597, *it is* affecti.

fairly in his errata [*C*], and had excellent correctors [*D*]. He *alſo printed Hebrew perfectly well* (*c*) [*E*]. I muſt not forget, that he was a learned man [*F*]. He died the ſeventh of September (*d*). ANTONY GRYPHIUS, his ſon, worthily followed his ſteps in the ſame town. Both of them have been praiſed by Du Verdier Vau-Privas [*G*]. There was, at Venice, in 1557, a printer, called JOHN GRYPHIUS.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

(*d*) Inventaire de l'Hiſtoire Journaliere, *by* T. G. P. fol. 190, verſo, Paris 1599.

[*C*] *He dealt very fairly in his errata.*] ‘To ſhew that his bible was correct, and at the ſame time to give an inſtance of his fairneſs, he did a remarkable thing. It was an uſual thing to place the errata in the leſs viſible part of the book; but Gryphius put it in the moſt obvious place. The firſt page contains the title of the book, the printer's mark, and the year of the impreſſion; the ſecond contains the errata; and the third the epiſtle dedicatory (5).

[*D*] *He had excellent correctors.*] Here is an inſtance of their exactneſs. The Errata of Stephen Doletus's *Commentarii de Lingua Latina* contains only eight errors, tho' that work is made up of two volumes in folio. Since the errors of the preſs were ſo few, Gryphius was in the right to affirm, that the proofs had been very carefully corrected (6). One of his correctors was a phyſician of Cologne, called Adam Knouf (7).

[*E*] *He printed Hebrew perfectly.*] Mr Chevillier adds: ‘there is, in the library of the Sorbonne, *Bagninus's Theſaurus Linguæ Sanctæ*, which is a very fine edition in folio, printed in the year 1529 (8).’

[*F*] *I muſt not forget, that he was a learned man.*] (9) ‘Majoragius calls him, *Vir inſignis ac litteratus* (10), and John Vulteius ſays, in one of his epigrams of the firſt book, that Robert Stephens corrected books very well, that Colinæus printed them very well, but that Gryphius knew very well both how to print and correct them.

Inter tot norunt libros qui cudere, tres ſunt
Inſignes; languet cætera turba fame.
Caſtigat Stephanus, ſculpit Colinæus, utrumque
Gryphius edocta mente manuque facit.

See the letter which Sadolet wrote to him (11).

[*G*] *Sebaſtian and Antony Gryphius have been praiſed by Du Verdier Vau-Privas.*] ‘Sebaſtian Gryphius *ſays he* (12), a native of Reutlingen in Suabia, near Augsburg, reſtored the Art of Printing at Lyons, which had been corrupted, and adorned it with new and very fine Hebrew, Greek, and Latin characters, being very well verſed in thoſe three languages .... The poets of his time called him the excellent Trypho of our age mentioned by Martial. Learned men reſorted to him. He was diligent and curious in ſearching every where for the good books, that were almoſt loſt, to procure ſuch a rare treaſure to poſterity. Antony Gryphius, his ſon, has ſtill many of them that remain to be printed; and, as his father ſpared nothing to recover and publiſh them, he freely beſtows his money and his pains to make them public. He died in the year 1556, at ſixty three years of age.

(5) Chevillier, ibid.

(6) Erratis & mendis in opere tam vario tamque ſpiſſo carere omnino non potuimus, tametſi omni diligentia & cura quanta maxima potuit adhibita. *Apud Chevillier, ibid.*

(7) Jacobus Zuinger, in Auctario Theatri Vitæ humanæ, pag. 1712, Edit. 1604, apud Chevillier, ibid.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Menage, ubi ſupra, pag. 57.

(10) In his Apology for changing the name of Antonius Maria Comes, into that of Marcus Antonius Majoragius, *apud Menagium, ibid.*

(11) It is the 16th of the fifth book, *pag. m.* 184.

(12) Du Verdier Vau Privas, Proſopographie, pag. 407. Edit. 1573. in 4to.

GUADAGNOLO (PHILIP), reader of Arabic and Chaldee at Rome, in the college *Della Sapienza*, in the XVIIth century, was one of the firſt that was made uſe of to tranſlate the ſcripture into Arabic, when the congregation *De propaganda fide* reſolved to comply with the deſires of ſome Eaſtern prelates, who preſented a petition to Pope Urban VIII upon that ſubject, about the year 1624. The archbiſhop of Damaſcus, and Father Guadagnolo, were put upon that tranſlation; but, ſome time after, only the latter undertook that taſk. He was very much eaſed under the pontificate of Innocent X; having nothing to do but to correct that verſion. He died at Rome the twenty ſeventh of March, 1656 *(a)*. A book, publiſhed by him againſt a Mahometan, is very much eſteemed [*A*].

(*a*) Taken from the *Giornale de Letterati* of the 20th of January, 1672, where mention is made of that tranſlation of the bible, which came out at Rome, in 1671, in three volumes in folio.

[*A*] *A book publiſhed by him againſt a Mahometan is very much eſteemed.*] It is an apology for the Chriſtian religion againſt the objections of Ahmed Ben Zin Alabedin. He publiſhed it at Rome in Latin in the year 1631, and then in Arabic in the year 1637. Theodorus Hackſpan (1) declares, that he never ſaw a better book againſt Mahometiſm. Note, that Father Guadagnolo publiſhed *Linguæ Arabicæ Inſtitutiones*, in folio, in the year 1642.

(1) In Tractatu ad librum Nizachon R. Lipmanni adjecto, pag. 343, apud Crenium de Philologia, pag. 221.

GUAGNIN (ALEXANDER) a native of Verona, naturalized in Poland, made himſelf illuſtrious by his ſword and pen. He had conſiderable offices in the Poliſh armies; and after he had given ſeveral proofs of his valour, both in the wars of Livonia and Moldavia, and in thoſe of Muſcovy, he was not only honoured with the Indigenate (*a*), under the reign of Sigiſmund Auguſtus, but alſo made governour of the fortreſs of Witebsk. He continued in that poſt for the ſpace of fourteen years. At laſt, he applied himſelf to ſtudy, and wrote a hiſtory of Poland [*A*]. He died at Cracow in 1614, aged ſeventy ſix years. He never was married. His titles were, *Comes Palatii Lateranenſis, & Eques Auratus* (*b*).

(*a*) That is, the privilege of being reputed a noble Polander.

(*b*) *Taken from* Starovolſcius, pag. 101, 102. Ἑκατοντάδος Scriptorum Polonicorum.

[*A*] *He wrote a hiſtory of Poland.*] The title of it, according to the Francfort edition 1584, in 8vo, for John Wechel, runs thus: *Rerum Polonicarum tomi tres: quorum primus omnium Poloniæ Regum, à Lecho primo gentis Duce, ad Stephanum Bathoreum, etiamnum Regem: tum Principum Lituaniæ, chronologicam recenſionem, ac ſingulorum res geſtas complectitur: adjecta recens Hiſtoriarum in noſtram ætatem incidentium continua narratione. II. Provinciarum, quæ uno Sarmatiæ Europææ nomine vulgò veniunt, chorographicam deſcriptionem continet. III. Res ſingulariter à Polonis in Valachia geſtas, Orationes item & Epiſtolas ſceptri Polonici negocia concernentes habet. Alexandro Guagnino, equite aurato peditumque præfecto authore.* Sigiſmund Feyerabenius, a bookſeller, who was at the charges of the impreſſion, dedicated the work to Marc Fugger, lord of Kirchberg and Weiſſenhorn; and mentioned to him the great ſervices Antony Fugger, his father, and John-James and George Fugger, his uncles, had done to the imperial city of Augsburg, when Charles V was ready to puniſh the inhabitants for an inſurrection. Starovolſcius obſerves, that Guagnin compoſed that chronicle of Poland in the year 1578, *Puro & nitido ſermone Latino*, and got it tranſlated into the Poliſh language, by Martin Paſcowski, in the year 1611 (1).

(1) Starovolſc. Ἑκατ. Script. Polon. pag. 102.

GUALDRADA, a Florentine lady, illuſtrious for her chaſtity, of which ſhe gave ſo ſeaſonable a proof before the emperor Otho IV (*a*), that ſhe had immediately, for a reward, the ſatiſfaction of being married very advantageouſly [*A*], as will be ſeen below. Dante makes mention of her in a very glorious manner; for, ſpeaking of a famous warrior [*B*], he calls him, *Nepote della Gualdrada*.

(*a*) He reigned about the beginning of the XIIIth century.

[*A*] *She had immediately, for a reward, the ſatiſfaction of being married advantageouſly.*] To comment upon this, I ſhall make uſe of the old French commentator upon Dante. ‘That lady, *ſays he* (1), was in her younger years a very handſome and genteel maid, the daughter of Belnicio Barti des Ravignans, an ancient family of Florence, and a branch of that of the Ademares. It happened one day, that the emperor Otho IV, being at Florence, in an aſſembly of ladies, on account of the feſtival of St John the Baptiſt, was wonderfully moved with the beauty of that maid; and asking whoſe daughter ſhe was, Bellincio, her father, being near the emperor, anſwered before the company, that ſhe was the daughter of a man, who would get him to kiſs her. The maid, hearing this, got up merrily, and told him, out of a principle of virtue, pray, father, do not be ſo liberal of a thing, wherein I am ſo nearly concerned: for you will give me leave to tell you, that no man ſhall ever kiſs me, unleſs he be my lawful husband. The emperor was ſurpriſed at ſuch a virtuous and prudent anſwer, and immediately ſent for one of his barons, called Guido, and ordered him to marry her upon the ſpot. He gave her for her portion the Caſſentin, and part of Romagna, and conferred the title of count upon her husband, from whom the counts Guido's are deſcended. The ſaid Guido and Gualdrada had two ſons, *viz.* William and Ruggier.’

[*B*] *Dante .... ſpeaking of a famous warrior .... calls him* nepote *della Gualdrada*.] It is in the ſixteenth canto of his Inferno, wherein we find theſe words:

Queſto, l'orme di cui peſtar mi vedi,
Tutto che nudo, e dipelato vada
Fu di grado maggior, che tu non credi:
Nepote fu della buona Gualdrada:
Guidoguerra hebbe nome: e in ſua vita
Fece col ſenno aſſai, e con la ſpada.

This ſhade, whom you ſee me treat ſo contemptibly, tho' he wanders naked and ſtript, was of greater rank than you think: he was grand-ſon of the fair Gualdrada; his name was Guidoguerra, famed, in his lifetime, for his prudence and his valour.

The French commentator upon Dante (2) tells us alſo, that Ruggier Guidoguerra, nephew to the fair Gualdrada, ‘was a valiant knight, and a man of great prudence; ſo that in the battle of Benevento, between Charles I, and Manfredo, he was accounted the chief cauſe of the victory obtained by the ſaid Charles, becauſe he happened to be colonel of four hundred Florentine knights, who had been baniſhed for being Guelfes, and ſome time after returned to Florence, from which they expelled the Ghibelins by Charles's aſſiſtance.’ I muſt obſerve, that Grangier contradicts himſelf, when he explains that degree of kindred in the following page. ‘The ſaid Guido and Gualdrada had two ſons, William and Ruggier, and the latter had Guidoguerra, who is therefore Gualdrada's nephew (3).’ How can a man be ſo groſly miſtaken? is it not plain, that the ſon of Gualdrada's ſon is the grand-ſon, and not the nephew of that lady? I think the word *nepote* in Dante ought to be taken in the ſame ſenſe as *nepos* in the good Latin authors: Father Paul (4), and cardinal Pallavicini (5), uſe it to denote the grand-ſons of Paul III. One may therefore ſay, that *nepote* or *nipote* ſignifies ſometimes a grand-ſon in Italian: Franceſco Alunno ſhould have taken notice of it in his dictionary of the words uſed by Dante, Petrarch, Boccace, *&c* (6).

(1) Grangier, Commentary upon the 16th Canto of Dante's *Inferno*, *pag.* 182.

(2) Grangier, ubi ſupra, pag. 181.

(3) Id. ibid. pag 182.

(4) Hiſtoria del Cancilio Tridentino, lib. i, pag. m. 75.

(5) Iſtoria del Concilio di Trento, lib. iii, cap. xvii, n. 5. pag. m. 346.

(6) *It is intituled*, Della fabrica del mondo. *The word* Nepote, *is mentioned*, num. 1529.

GUARINUS, a native of Verona, and ſcholar of Emanuel Chryſoloras, was one of the firſt, who revived the *Belles Lettres* in Italy, in the XVth century [*A*]. He underſtood Greek and Latin, and taught thoſe two languages with great ſucceſs, firſt of all at Venice, and then at Ferrara (*a*). Pope Nicolas V ordered him to tranſlate

(*a*) Voſſius de Hiſtor. Lat. pag. 584.

[*A*] *He was one of the firſt, who revived the* Belles Lettres *in Italy, in the XVth century.*] Leander Albertus (1) beſtows this encomium upon him; and the following paſſage of Jovius confirms the ſame thing: ‘Ab hoc inſigni viro, Græcæ Latinæque literæ obſcuris illis temporibus antiqui ſeculi normam, quadratæque ſtructuræ ordinem & diu quæſitum decus receperunt (2). —— *From this famous man, the Greek and Latin languages, in thoſe obſcure times, received the long ſought for ornaments of antiquity.*’ Poggius acknowledges, that the Italians were very much indebted to Guarinus: ‘Vir doctiſſimus, *ſays he* (3), *ſpeaking of him*, atque humaniſſimus, cujus ſtudia & præſtans doctrina plurimum Italis profuerunt. —— *A moſt learned and humane man, whoſe ſtudies and excellent erudition were of great ſervice to the Italians.*’ Laurentius Valla (4) calls Guarinus and Leonard Aretin, the moſt learned men of their age. Philelphus (5) calls Guarinus a moſt eloquent man.

Gabriel Naudé affords me a very good addition. He ſays (6), that Boccace, endeavouring to revive good literature, did ſo well ſucceed in it, that, when he came to die in 1375, he had for his ſucceſſor in that deſign, one John of Ravenna, who was the firſt that re-eſtabliſhed the ſchools of Venice, out of which came Gaſparinus, who did the ſame at Milan, and Guarinus Veronenſis.

Qui niſi proſtratas relevaſſet funditus artes,
Priſcorum vanus ſtaret labor *:

Had not his hand the baniſh'd arts reſtor'd,
And had the muſes be again ador'd,
Learning's old ſource had yet been unexplor'd.

‘For it was he, properly ſpeaking, who began to revive eloquence and philoſophy, as well by the journies he made to Conſtantinople, where he learned the Greek tongue, as by his precepts of rhetoric, tranſlations, and other books; but much more by his great number of ſcholars, who went from Ferrara, where he taught, all over Italy, to run down the fooleries of former times, and make the youth ſenſible of

Senſa tot auctorum mille indeprenſa per annos †.

A thouſand ancient wits reſtor'd to day,
Whoſe ſenſe, for many ages, dormant lay.

What he ſays afterwards is alſo very remarkable (7). ‘Whoever had been at Conſtantinople to learn *the Greek tongue*, came home as it were in a triumphant manner, and was accounted a kind of prodigy, as it appears from what Johannes Ungheretus, or Pannonius biſhop of the five churches, ſays of Guarinus's return into Europe.’

- - - - - - - - Vagus omnia rumor
Gymnaſia Italiæ centeno murmure complet,
Affulſiſſe virum gemina qui Pallade ſolus
Polleat, & duplicem præſtet ſitientibus hauſtum ‡.

Fame tells to Italy, the man is nigh,
Who, twice inſpir'd by Pallas from on high,
Can learning's ardent thirſt twice ſatisfy.

[*B*] *Pope*

(1) In Deſcript. Italiæ, pag. m. 722.

(2) Jovius, in Elog. cap. 110.

(3) Poggius, II in Philelphum Invectiva.

(4) Apud Poggium, I in Vallam Invectiva. *See* Voſſius de Hiſt. Latin. pag. 585.

(5) Epiſt. ad Flavium Blondum, Ann. 1450, apud Voſſium, ibid.

(6) Naudé, Additions to the Hiſtory of Lewis XI, pag. 179.

* Janus Pannonius in ejus Paneg.

† Id. ibid.

(7) Naudé, ibid. pag. 181.

‡ In Panegyrico citato.

ſlate Srabo (b) [B]. It was a good tranſlation for that time; and the ſame may be ſaid of his other verſions; for he tranſlated ſome lives, and ſome tracts of Plutarch. He died at Ferrara the fourteenth of December 1460 (c). All his writings are not tranſlations [C].

[B] *Pope Nicholas V ordered him to tranſlate Strabo.*] Others ſay, that Guarinus ſet about it thro' emulation: he was unwilling to be inferiour to Gregory Tiphernas, who had tranſlated Strabo's Aſia; and therefore he tranſlated the deſcription of Europe wrote by the ſame geographer (8).

[C] *All his works are not tranſlations.*] He publiſhed ſome grammatical tracts, ſome letters, ſome orations, and ſome verſes (9).

(b) Geſner. in Biblioth. fol. 285.

(c) Voſſius, ubi ſupra.

(8) *See* Voſſius, ubi ſupra.

(9) Geſner, in Biblioth. fol. 285.

GUARINUS (BAPTIST), ſon of the foregoing, trod in his father's ſteps, and made himſelf very famous for his skill in the learned languages. He taught them for a long time at Ferrara with great reputation, and publiſhed ſome books anſwerable to the glory he had acquired [*A*].

He was ſtill living in the year 1494, and he had been then thirty three years profeſſor of the *Belles Lettres*, having ſucceeded his father in his profeſſorſhip (*a*). The paſſage, wherein Geſner informs us of this particular, was not well underſtood by Henry Stephens [*B*].

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books anſwerable to the glory he had acquired.*] A treatiſe *De Secta Epicuri*, another *de Ordine docendi* (1), another *De Regno adminiſtrando*, notes upon Ovid's Faſti, upon Catullus, ſeveral orations, letters, verſes, and a tranſlation of ſome orations of Demoſthenes and St Gregory Nazianzen, &c. (2).

[*B*] *Was not well underſtood by Henry Stephens.*] Let us compare his words with thoſe of Geſner. 'Memini me in Bibliothecographia Geſneri legere, Guarinum patrem (nam fuit & Baptiſta Guarinus ejus filius, quem Geſnerus, etiamnum ſe de illo ſcribente, claruiſſe Ferrariæ ait, ubi patris ſucceſſor jam per annos tres & triginta linguam utramque florentiſſime doceret) ſcripſiſſe canoniſmata in lingua Græca (3). *I remember to have read in Geſner's Bibliotheque, that Guarinus the father (for there was alſo Baptiſt Guarinus, his ſon, of whom Geſner, at the time he wrote of him, tells us that he flouriſhed at Ferrara, where, being his father's ſucceſſor, he had already taught both languages, for thirty three years, with great ſucceſs) had written rules for the Greek tongue.*' They are Henry Stephens's words. The paſſage in Geſner runs thus: 'Claret uſque hodie Ferrariæ, ubi patri ſuccedens, jam per annos tres & triginta utramque linguam florentiſſime docet & varia conſcribit (4). —— *He is famous to this day at Ferrara, where, ſucceeding his father, he has already taught both languages, for thirty three years with great ſucceſs, and writes on various ſubjects.*' Can you find two paſſages that agree better than theſe two, you will ſay: I will anſwer, yes; for the words uſed by Geſner are Trithemius's. It is not Geſner, who ſays *claret uſque hodie*, as Henry Stephens will have it, wherein he is groſly miſtaken. He ſhould have referred the word *hodie* to the year 1494, which Geſner placed in the margin of his book at that place. It is not true, that our Guarinus was alive in the year 1545, in which Geſner's Bibliotheque was printed.

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

(1) The *Memoires de Trevoux, Sept.* 1704, *pag.* 1643, inform us, that Mr Struvius has cauſed this Treatiſe to be reprinted, corrected from a Manuſcript, with a Preface on the writers of the like methods.

(2) Geſner, in Biblioth. fol. 130.

(3) Henricus Stephanus, in Dialogo de bene inſtituendis Græcæ linguæ ſtudiis, pag. 116.

(4) Geſner, ubi ſupra.

GUARINI (BAPTIST), was born at Ferrara, in the year 1538. He is more known by his tragi-comedy, called *Paſtor Fido*, than by all his other works, and by the honourable employments [*A*] beſtowed upon him by the duke, his maſter. That piece was his favourite work; and he made it appear by his great paſſion againſt a critic [*B*], who had only reflected upon it indirectly. He has expreſſed the myſteries of love ſo much to the life, in that piece, that it is thought the reading of it has been very prejudicial to the chaſtity of many perſons among the fair ſex. This ſeems to confute a maxim of Mr de la Fontaine [*C*]. I cannot tell whether Guarini would have alledged ſuch

[*A*] *By the honourable employments.*] See Moreri's dictionary, to which you may add, that Guarini, being ſent to Venice by Alfonſo II, duke of Ferrara, made an Italian ſpeech before the ſenate, which was admired; and that, after the death of Alfonſo, he was ſent by the city of Ferrara to Paul V, to congratulate him upon his acceſſion to the pontificate (1).

[*B*] *His great paſſion againſt a critic.*] Jaſon Denores (2), a native of the iſle of Cyprus, and originally deſcended from a gentleman of Normandy, and profeſſor of morality at Ferrara, wrote a treatiſe concerning poetry, wherein he reflected upon a kind of dramatic poetry, that was very much in vogue, I mean tragi-comic paſtorals (3). He called them monſters, produced by men wholly unacquainted with antiquity, and contrary to the rules of ancient poetry. Guarini, being perſuaded that this criticiſm was levelled at him, wrote an apology againſt Denores. The latter replied, and died whilſt Guarini was writing ſo ſharp a rejoinder, that it is thought it might have occaſioned the death of that critic. Thuanus ſpeaks of it in the following manner: 'Baptiſta Guarinus lectiſſimus eques Ferrarienſis, qui ſub id Paſtorem fidum magno plauſu ubique in Italia exceptum ediderat, eum ſermonem ad injuriam ſuam pertinere exiſtimans, defenſionem ſub nomine Verati publicavit, quam apologia contraria ſtatim Denores refutavit. Sed dum alteram defenſionem meditatur Guarinus, morte minime fatali Denores conceſſit, quæ niſi dilectiſſimi filii calamitate fuiſſet præcipitata alterius Verati lectione accelerari potuiſſe credita eſt. Tanta ſiquidem vi eloquentiæ ſimul & aſperitate ac verborum amaritudine in Jaſonem invectus eſt Guarinus, ut Archilochum ipſum in Lycamben ïambos ſtringentem eo ſcripto ſuperaſſe paſſim jactaretur (4). —— *Baptiſt Guarini, a knight of Ferrara, who about that time had publiſhed his* Paſtor Fido, *a work received with great applauſe all over Italy, thinking thoſe words reflected upon him, publiſhed a defence under the name of Veratus, which Denores preſently refuted by a contrary apology. But whilſt Guarini was preparing another defence, Denores died, not unluckily, ſince his death, if it had not been haſtened by the calamity of his deareſt ſon, might, it is thought, have been brought on ſooner by a ſecond reading of Veratus. For Guarini inveighed againſt Denores with ſo much eloquence, and at the ſame time in ſuch ſharp and bitter terms, that it was generally ſaid he had outdone Archilochus himſelf, who wrote Iambics againſt Lycambes.*

[*C*] *This ſeems to confute a maxim of Mr de la Fontaine.*] Nicius Erythræus having ſaid, that the *Paſtor Fido* is reprinted almoſt every year, and that all nations, tho' never ſo barbarous, have it tranſlated into their language, adds, that perhaps that book is prejudicial to chaſtity (5), and he gives this reaſon for it: 'Etenim in ejus dulcedine ſuavitateque tanquam in infeſto Sirenis mari in quo etiam Ulyſſes erravit, virgines nuptæque complures pudicitiæ naufragium feciſſe dicuntur. ——— *For many virgins and married women are ſaid to have made ſhipwreck of their modeſty by it's allurements, as in a ſea infeſted by Sirens, in which even Ulyſſes went aſtray.*' Let us ſee Mr de la Fontaine's maxim (6).

---

(1) Nicius Erythræus, Pinac. I, pag. 96.

(2) Thuan. lib. xcix, pag. 379, ad ann. 1590.

(3) Inter alia quæ ſcripſit cum de Poëtica differens Tragicomœdias Paſtorales quæ hodie inter Italos uſurpantur, tanquam monſtra quædam & nullo veterum exemplo, contraque Poëticæ priſcæ leges ab imperitis rei antiquariæ introducta exagitaſſet, &c. *Id. ib.*

(4) Ibid.

(5) Morum fortaſſe integritati non utilis. *Nic. Eryth. ubi ſupra.*

(6) It is in one of his tales.

ſuch a maxim in his vindication; perhaps he would have had recourſe to a more common thought [*D*]. I do not think there is any part of his work ſo remarkable as that ſcene, which has been ſo well tranſlated into French by the counteſs de la Suze; wherein

Iroit-il après tout s'allarmer ſans raiſon
Pour un peu de plaiſanterie?
Je craindrois bien plûtôt que la cajolerie
Ne mît le feu dans la Maiſon.
Chaſſez les Soupirans, Belles, prenez mon livre,
Je répons de vous corps pour corps.

Is there any reaſon, after all, to be alarmed at a little pleaſantry? I ſhould ſooner fear, that a lover's courtſhip would ſet fire to the houſe. Baniſh your ſuitors, ye fair, and read my book: I will anſwer for you, body for body.

Thus that author extricates himſelf out of a great difficulty. It was complained that his tales raiſed a thouſand leud deſires in the minds of his readers: his anſwer is, that if the women, who read his book, will not ſuffer any gallant to come near them, they will not loſe their honour. This is a ſophiſtical anſwer; for it requires a condition, the practice whereof is made very difficult by the very book complained of. You will have us read your book, and baniſh our lovers; you are unjuſt in requiring ſuch a thing from us, ſince your poems deprive us of the power of baniſhing our lovers. They fill us with love, they inflame us, they raiſe in us a violent deſire to ſee thoſe gentlemen: how then can you ſay, with any ſhew of reaſon, that if we baniſh them, we ſhall be ſafe. Another difficulty may be objected to Mr de la Fontaine, *viz.* that, tho' a woman ſhould baniſh her lovers, ſhe would be expoſed to many leud paſſions, excited by the reading of his tales; which is no ſmall miſchief. In order to make a good apology for that author, it ſhould be ſuppoſed, that his book cannot be prejudicial to chaſtity, and that nothing but the ſight of the beloved objects, and actual courtſhip can be contrary to that virtue. But ſuch a thing cannot be ſuppoſed, if it be true, as it is ſaid, that the reading of *Paſtor Fido* has undone many women and maids. This is a ſufficient commentary upon my text.

Tho' what we are told of the ill effects of that poem ſhould be falſe, yet it would be true, that the reading of certain books is very pernicious to young people of both ſexes. Some phyſicians have preſcribed the reading of the Priapeia to thoſe, who are not well diſpoſed for love-ſports (7); and I have obſerved, that the emperor Ælius Verus, a very leud prince, had always the amorous poems of Ovid in his bed, and that he ſet a great value upon Martial: *Idem Ovidii libros amorum in lecto ſemper habuiſſe: idem Martialem Epigrammaticum Poëtam Virgilium ſuum dixiſſe* (8). I remember to have read in Taſſoni, that ſtudy raiſes leud thoughts, among other reaſons, becauſe it diſcovers a thouſand obſcenities that are in books: he alledges that as a reaſon, why many learned women, mentioned by the ancients, were very leud. Theſe are his words (9). 'Che ſimilmente le lettere ſieno cagioni d'eccitar la libidine, e di parturire moli atti oſceni, non è ne da dubitarne; poſciache col leggere accidenti, e ſtratagemi amoroſi, e libri laſcivi, e particularmente nelle ſolitudini, e ne gli ozi, che richieggono le lettere, s'appreſentano fantaſmi oſceni, e penſieri, e voglie di coſe illecite ſotto apparenza di guſto e di diletto; e l'ingegno ſagace vi s'abbandona ſopra. E quindi è (cred'io) che in Euripide, e Giuvenale (10) leggiamo notate d' impudizia le donne di lettere antiche, le quali leggendo libri de coſe laſcive, e converſando ſotto quel preteſto di lettere più liberamente con gli huomini, che ſi conveniva alla debolezza del ſeſſo, ſi ſecero ardite, e la libidine loro s'infervorò nell'ozio e la ſagacità dell'ingegno s'offerſe di ricoprire gli eceſſi. —— *That this book likewiſe may be the occaſion of exciting luſt, and of producing many obſcene actions, cannot be doubted; becauſe, together with the reading of adventures, ſtratagems of love, and wanton books, and eſpecially in ſolitude and at leiſure, obſcene images preſent themſelves, thoughts, and deſires after unlawful things, under the appearance of pleaſure and delight; and the ſagacious mind gives itſelf up thereupon. And thence it is, I believe, that in Euripides, and Juvenal, we read of learned women among the ancients branded with immodeſty, who, by reading of books on wanton ſubjects, and converſing, under this pretence of learning, with men, more freely, than ſuits the weakneſs of their ſex, have grown bold, and their luſt has been inflamed in idleneſs, and all the ſagacity of their wit employed in excuſing their exceſſes.*'

[*D*] *Perhaps he would have had recourſe to a more common thought.*] He might have ſaid, that his readers learned nothing by his Paſtoral but what they knew before; or if young people found ſomething in it that was unknown to them, they would have learned it elſewhere; ſo that the ſuppreſſion of *Paſtor Fido* had been of no advantage to the public. A friend to Mr de la Fontaine has nicely touched this ſort juſtification. 'Thoſe, *ſays he* (11), who are entruſted with the education of youth, ought to prevent not only their reading (12) of them, but alſo their learning a great deal more than there is in them, by frequenting bad company. Men do not always learn from books what they ſhould be ignorant of.' This author plainly intimates, that, as the world goes, thoſe, who ſhould not learn from la Fontaine's book what it is fit they ſhould be ignorant of, would learn it ſeveral other ways. The ſame kind of thought has been made uſe of (13), in anſwer to the unjuſt complaints of thoſe, who do not approve, that the obſcenities of Juvenal and Martial ſhould be left out. This apology is more tolerable than la Fontaine's Maxim, and yet it is not a good one; for, tho' diſorders be ever ſo unavoidable, even when we do not contribute to them, every body ought to be more willing that they ſhould proceed from others than from himſelf. It is to be obſerved, that what I ſay concerns thoſe, who invent obſcene ſtories, or tranſlate them with new flouriſhes of their own, and not thoſe, who quote a paſſage of Martial *&c.* to prove a fact, which the nature of their work, or their character of hiſtorian, commentator, *&c.* requires they ſhould mention. Upon the whole, it muſt be granted, that all the leud things, that may be read in ſome books, may be learned, without books, by converſation. It is almoſt incredible how many things of this nature are known to people, who are ſtill in their younger years, and never learned to read. The progreſs of this ſcience is ſurpriſing, and does not require many years. Let us ſee what Montagne ſays about it (14). 'When women are free in their diſcourſe, we are but children, if compared to them in that reſpect. When they talk of our courtſhips and converſations, they plainly diſcover that we tell them nothing but what they knew before. Shall we ſay, that they were formerly diſorderly boys, as Plato will have it? I happened one day to be in a place, where I could hear what they ſaid among themſelves, without being ſeen. It is pity I cannot tell it. Faith, ſaid I to my ſelf, we need not learn phraſes from Amadis, and ſtudy Boccace and Aretin, in order to fit our ſelves for their converſation: it is all time loſt. They know every thing better than thoſe, who read books for that purpoſe. It is a ſcience that grows in their veins, *Et mentem Venus ipſa dedit*; nature, youth, and health, three excellent maſters, do continually infuſe it into their minds: they need not learn it; they produce it.

Nec tantum niveo gaviſa eſt ulla columbo
Compar, vel ſi quid dicitur improbius,
Oſcula mordenti ſemper decerpere roſtro:
Quantum præcipue multivola eſt mulier *.

Not with more ardour bills the milkwhite dove,
Than woman, raging in exceſs of love.

Women learn thoſe things one from another; the old inſtruct the young; and, if the ignorant are greedy of knowledge, the learned are no leſs deſirous of imparting it to them. One would think they look upon this axiom as a canonical one, *viz.* That knowledge is inſignificant, unleſs others know that we have it (15). And therefore the Italian education, the great care that is taken in Italy to keep girls from the company of boys, does not remove the evil. Beſides, women, in the countries, where they are kept under reſtraint, have the liberty to be at a wedding pro-

(7) Medici, in his Paulus Ægineta, diſertis verbis ad excitandam languentem Venerem vel præcipuum remedium præſcribunt Priapeorum & ſimilis poëſeos infamis aſſiduam lectionem. *Caſaubonus in hæc verba Perſii, Sat. I, ver.* 19. Cum carmina lumbum Intrant, & tremulo ſcalpuntur ubi intima verſu. —— *When wanton thoughts are by ſoft numbers rais'd.*

(8) Spartian. in Ælio Vero, cap. v.

(9) Penſieri diverſi di Aleſſandro Taſſoni, lib. vii, cap. xi, pag. 227.

(10) It is not true, that Euripides and Juvenal charge them with that fault: Juvenal does not approve, that one ſhould marry a learned woman; but he gives no reaſon for it. The reaſon alledged by Euripides, is, that Venus makes them more crafty. *See Muret, Variar. Lect. lib. viii, cap. xxi.*

(11) Preface to la Fontaine's Tales of the Amſterdam Edit, 1685.

(12) That is, the reading of la Fontaine's Tales.

(13) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Oct. 1684, art. v, pag. 792, 793.

(14) Eſſays, book. iii, chap. v, pag. m. 125, 126.

(15) Uſque adeone Scire tuum nihil eſt, niſi te ſcire hoc ſciat alter? *Perſ. Sat. I, ver.* 25.

* Cat. 109.

wherein he touches upon one of the moſt incomprehenſible myſteries of nature [*E*]. The number (*a*) of the editions and tranſlations of *Paſtor Fido* is incredible (*b*). Guarini died at Venice in an inn, in the year 1613 [*F*]. His funeral pomp, by the academy of humoriſts, ſhews, that he was in great eſteem (*c*).

He was great-grandſon of Guarini of Verona, and taught moral philoſophy in the univerſity of Ferrara. Notwithſtanding the great reputation he had acquired by the abovementioned poem, he could not endure the name and title of a poet; for he thought that ſuch a title does no honour to thoſe who have it, and expoſes them to contempt. One would think by reading his verſes, that he made them with the greateſt facility; but it is miſtake; they coſt him a great deal of pains [*G*], and many alterations and raſures. He was not fond of getting riches; and, becauſe he was a little fond of pomp, he found himſelf in no good circumſtances, when fortune forſook him, having taken but little care to huſband the gratifications of Alphonſo II, his maſter. That prince ceaſed

(*a*) Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth. 1, pag. 96.

(*b*) Lewis Zuccolo does very much commend *Paſtor Fido* in his treatiſe *della Eminenza della Paſtorala*, *pag.* 25.

(*c*) Id. Nicius Eryth. ubi ſupra, pag. 97.

---

miſcuouſly with men. Now can there be a more ſcandalous ſchool of leudneſs, than the aſſemblies, ſports, and entertainments of weddings? how many fooliſh and obſcene things are ſpoken upon ſuch an occaſion (16)? St Cyprian was in the right, not to approve, that virgins ſhould go to a wedding; he tells them, that they will come home with a maimed virginity (17). ‘Quaſdam non pudet nubentibus intereſſe, & in illa laſcivientium libertate ſermonum colloquia inceſta miſcere; audire quod non licet dicere: obſervare & eſſe præſentes inter verba turpia & temulenta convivia, quibus Libidinum fomes accenditur, Sponſa ad patientiam ſtupri, ad audaciam ſponſus animatur. Quid illic diſcitur? quid videtur? Quantum à propoſito ſuo virgo deficit, quando, pudica quæ venerat, impudica diſcedit? Corpore licet virgo ac mente permaneat; oculis, auribus, lingua, minuit illa quæ habebat (18). —— *Some are not aſhamed to be preſent at a marriage, and to mix in the wanton converſation uſual at ſuch times; to hear what I dare not repeat; to obſerve, and be preſent at the filthy diſcourſe, and drunken revelling, which excite the fire of luſt, which animate the bride to endure being defloured, and encourage the bridegroom to the attack. What is learnt there? what is ſeen? how does a virgin fail in her purpoſe, when ſhe, who came modeſt, departs immodeſt? for tho' ſhe continues a virgin in body, yet her eyes, ears, and tongue, rob her partly of what ſhe brought with her.*’ See what will be ſaid in the remark [G] of the article LYCURGUS, and remember, Xenophon's maxim. He was of opinion, that a bride ſhould come to her huſband's houſe, before ſhe has ſeen and heard many things. Ὁ Ξενοφῶν οἴεται δεῖν ἐλάχιστα τὴν νύμφην ἰδοῦσαν, ἐλάχιστα δὲ ἀκούσασαν εἰς ἀνδρὸς βαδίζειν. *Xenophon cenſet ſponſam ita debere in mariti domum venire ut quam minimum viderit, quam minimum audiverit* (19).

[*E*] *He touches upon . . . . one of the moſt incomprehenſible myſteries of nature.*] He introduces a young woman, who, being at the diſcretion of two tyrants, who hate one another (20), envies the happineſs of beaſts, whoſe love is directed by no other rule than love it ſelf. She is amazed at the oppoſition that is between nature and the law. One of them annexes a great pleaſure to certain things, and the other will have them to be ſeverely puniſhed. Her concluſion is this: this cannot be accounted for without the revelation of Moſes; and I have often wondered that the ancient philoſophers have ſo little reflected upon it. I mean only ſuch philoſophers, who acknowledged the unity of GOD; for thoſe, who admitted of many gods could find no difficulty in it: it was but ſuppoſing, that a deity was the cauſe of the inclination of nature; and that ſome other deities imprinted the inſtincts of conſcience and the notions of honour. The difficulty concerned only thoſe, who believed, that the world is the work of one moſt holy Being. How is it poſſible that under ſuch a Being men ſhould be drawn to evil by a bait that is almoſt unſurmountable, I mean, by the ſenſe of pleaſure, and are deterred from it by the fear of remorſe, infamy, or ſeveral other puniſhments; they ſpend their lives, toſſed by theſe contrary paſſions, pulled ſometimes one way, and ſometimes another, being ſometimes overcome by the ſenſe of pleaſure, and ſometimes by the fear of the conſequences. Manicheiſm probably aroſe from a ſtrong meditation on this deplorable condition of man.

[*F*] *He died at Venice in an inn.*] He was gone to Venice upon account of a law-ſuit, and died of grief and old age. His enemies made his life very unhappy, if we believe the author I quote. ‘Semper cum adverſa fortuna iniquorum odio conflictatus (non enim malevoli tanto viro deeſſe poterant) demum cum Venetias litium quarumdam cauſa veniſſet, & ad cauponem divertiſſet, ibi ſenio curiſque confectus, exceſſit è vita (21). —— *Having all his life-time ſtruggled with ill fortune thro' the envy of unjuſt men (for ſo great a man could not be without enemies), at laſt, coming to Venice on account of a law-ſuit, he died in an inn, worn out with old age and cares.*’ Another author, I ſhall quote, is very much miſtaken as to the year, wherein Guarini died; for he ſays it was in the year 1590 (22).

[G] *His verſes coſt him a great deal of pains.*] Let us ſee firſt what Imperialis ſays of it. ‘Inſuper mirandum etiam, quòd licet expedita illa carminum pangendorum ubertas, illaborata penitus, & ſpontè fuſa videatur; tamen ab ipſo anxiè affectatam ac diutino quæſitam ſtudio ipſimet (*familiares*) aſſerunt, præmonſtrantes extrarias quaſdam carminum ſuorum ſchedulas, frequentiſſimis expunctas ac immutatas locis, ex quibus herculè peracris quidam, ac implexus ſcribendi arguitur labos (23). —— *What is more to be wondered at, is, that tho' his numbers ſeemed to flow with the greateſt eaſe, yet his intimate friends aſſure us, he compoſed with great labour and pains, which they prove by ſome rough draughts of his poetry, which were corrected in a multitude of places, and ſeemed to denote a laborious writer.*’ This author informs us of two things: one is, that Guarini took great pains in making his verſes; the other is, that one would think they were made with a wonderful facility. If any one ſhould fancy that thoſe two things are inconſiſtent, he muſt needs be unacquainted with the different characters of men, and believe, that no compoſures coſt a great deal of pains, but thoſe of which a reader may ſay, what was ſaid of Demoſthenes's orations, *Olent lucernam, they ſmell of the lamp* (24): but we ought to know, that there are many other varieties in the characters of men. Some authors make their readers ſenſible of the great pains they have been at; and, if they correct three or four times a certain place with a profound meditation and great pains, the reader perceives, that that paſſage is more laboured than another, which has been corrected only two or three times. But there are ſome writers, whoſe labour and pains make every thing they write appear eaſy and natural; ſo that the more they reviſe a piece of work, the leſs it ſeems to have been reviſed and laboured. Such was Guarini's character (25). He thought, that the perfection of a piece of poetry conſiſted in natural beauties, and a fluent and eaſy turn. He endeavoured to gain the approbation of the public by ſuch a method, and perceived, with great penetration, whether there remained any thing in his work, that was forced and unnatural; and then he made it his buſineſs to reviſe and correct thoſe faults. Thus it was only by much reviſing and poliſhing his verſes, that he made them run ſmoothly and fluently. Other authors, having a quite different taſte, place perfection in thinking and expreſſing one's ſelf in an affected and bombaſt ſtile, and ſuch as diſcovers the fatigue of a profound meditation. They fancy, they do not expreſs themſelves happily and ingeniouſly, if they can be underſtood without much wit and attention (26); and they are never ſatisfied, till they have ſtruck out of their writing whatever appears ſimple, natural, and common; and therefore the more they correct their works, the more they diſcover the pains they have

A COLLECTION of paſſages concerning the apparent or real facility of compoſing.

(16) See the paſſage of St Cyprian, which I ſhall preſently quote.

(17) Cyprianus de diſciplina & habitu virginum, cap. xiv.

(18) *Barthius*, in Claudian. pag. 766, *has a good note upon this.* Ita etiam, *ſays he*, ultimo edita ſunt ſancti viri verba; Scripſiſſe tamen arbitror; *Corpore licet virgo permaneat: at mente, oculis, auribus, lingua, minuit illa quæ habebat.* Sanè niſi mens tangeretur per ſenſus, minime minuerentur poſſeſſa.

(19) Plut. de Pythiæ Orat. pag. 405. C.

(20) Love and Honour. *See the ſonnet of the Abortive.*

(21) Nicius Erythræus, ubi ſupra, pag. 97.

(22) Aub Miræus in Scriptor. Sæc. xvi, pag. 177.

(23) Imperialis in Muſæo Hiſt. pag. 129.

(24) Plut. in Demoſt. pag. 849.

(25) According to Imperialis, whoſe words I have quoted above.

(26) Quid quod nihil jam proprium placet, dum parum creditur diſertum quod & alius dixiſſet? . . . tum demum ingenioſi ſcilicet ſi ad intelligendos nos opus ſit ingenio. *Quint. lib. viii, in Proœm. pag. m.* 354.

ceaſed to love him, and then Guarini applied himſelf ſucceſſively to Vincent of Gonzaga, Ferdinand of Medicis, great duke of Tuſcany, and Francis Maria of Feltri, duke of Urbino;

been at. Their labour is certainly very great; but ſometimes it does not come near the toil of thoſe, who deſire, that their works ſhould apppear eaſy and natural throughout. I have been told by ſome perſons, who pretended to have it from good hands, and I have read it within theſe few days in a printed book (27), that Voiture did not publiſh his verſes and letters, ſuch as we have them, till he had taken great pains to correct them. His apologiſt does not ſay ſo; but yet he intimates, that the great eaſe, which appears in the works of that wit, coſt him no ſmall pains. I hope the reader will not be diſpleaſed to find here a piece of that apology. The thing is curious enough to appear here, attended with the approbation of ſome good judges. ‘ Mr de Voiture was above all things for that ſort of negligence which ſo well becomes beautiful perſons, which ſets off the advantages of their birth, and, after having charmed the eyes, leaves room to think of what the beauties of art might have added to thoſe of nature. There is ſomething ſo eaſy and natural in all his writings, that every body thinks at firſt he might write in the ſame manner; and it is only after long and vain endeavours, that they cry out, *Queſto facile, quanto è difficile! This eaſy, how difficult is it!* I remember he was not diſpleaſed that I ſhould beſtow upon him an encomium, which Taſſo beſtows upon one of his heroines,

Non ſo ben dire, s'adorna, ò ſe negletta,
Se caſo od arte, il bel volto compoſe;
Di natura, d'amor, del cielo, amici
Le negligenze ſue ſono artifici.

Whether from chance alone her beauties riſe,
Or art improves the luſtre of her eyes;
Friended by nature, love, and ev'ry ſtart,
Ev'n negligence itſelf in her is art.

‘ Indeed, what ſeems to be negligence in him, is but art diſguiſed in the ſhape of it's contrary, to act with the more addreſs and greater ſafety. And as nature is never more admirable, than when ſhe ſeems to imitate the works of art; ſo art is not in it's perfection, unleſs it imitates nature, and covers it's labours and great efforts with an apparent eaſineſs. The painters of old Greece repreſented the graces without cloaths, and without a headdreſs; and, if at any time they painted them with gowns, they were looſe gowns, to denote that the greateſt charms do not proceed from artful and viſible ornament; and particularly, that whoever pretends to pleaſe, ought to avoid the very ſhadow of conſtraint. Our love of liberty reaches to the productions of the mind; and we are naturally ſo great enemies to ſubjection and ſlavery, that a thing, though never ſo fine, will loſe all it's charms, when it appears forced and ſtrained. No man was ever more ſenſible of this truth than Mr de Voiture; no man did ever conceal more induſtriouſly the art he made uſe of, to bring forth out of his imagination the fine things he has left us. One would think, that flowers ſpring up every ſtep he makes, or that he meets with them by chance, that the fineſt paſſages of his works coſt him no pains, that every thing drops from his pen without any trouble and labour, as it were, out of a plentiful and unexhauſtible ſpring (28).

Mr Pelliſſon, who was ſo good a judge of all ſorts of ingenious works, was perſuaded, that it is often a very difficult thing for an author to make it appear, that his work coſt him no great labour (29). Two things, *ſays he* (30), ‘ make poetry admirable, *viz.* Invention, from which it had it's name; and eaſineſs, which is ſo neceſſary to it. I do not mean a facility in compoſing; it may be ſometimes happy, but it ought to be always ſuſpected: I mean the facility, which the readers obſerve in a compoſition, which is ſometimes one of the moſt difficult things in the world for an author; ſo that it might be compared to garden-terraſſes, the expence of which does not appear, and which, after having coſt ſeveral millions, yet ſeem to be a meer work of chance and nature.’ What he had been ſaying about the eaſineſs, that appears in the works of good poets, is admirable. ‘ One would think they could not have expreſſed themſelves otherwiſe than they have done; their words and expreſſions are ſo eaſy that they ſeem to have dropped from their pen of themſelves, and to have taken their proper places. The lyre of Amphion did not work greater miracles, when ſtones, drawn by his harmony, placed themſelves one upon another, of their own motion, to raiſe up the famous walls of Thebes (31).

This is what the reader thinks, but the author knows the contrary, and remembers, that the moſt eaſy and fluent verſes are thoſe, that have obliged him to ſcratch his head, and bite his nails (32). He remembers, that, in making thoſe verſes, he followed Horace's advice (33), with the greateſt exactneſs, and was like thoſe ancient philoſophers, whom a deep meditation put out of their wits.

Obſtipo capite, & figentes lumine terram,
Murmura cum ſecum, & rabioſa ſilentia rodunt,
Atque exporrecto trutinantur Verba labello,
Ægroti veteris meditantes ſomnia, *Gigni*
De nihilo nihil, in nihilum nil poſſe reverti (34).

Wry-neck'd, and fixing on the ground their eyes,
They mutter muſty maxims of the wiſe;
To nothing nought returns, from nothing nought
can riſe.

Some exceptions ought to be made; for ſome poets, as Ovid among the ancients, and Moliere among the moderns, made verſes with great facility, and the readers were ſenſible of it.

Take notice that Mr Pelliſſon obſerves, that this facility *may be ſometimes happy, but that it ought to be always ſuſpected* (35). Which puts me in mind of a thought of Mr Godeau. ‘ The facility in compoſing, *ſays he* (36), ſeems to be an advantage; but it is a kind of fault, becauſe it hinders the mind, which naturally hates labour and pain, from carrying things to the higheſt point of perfection they are capable of. And indeed, the correction, which purifies the firſt productions, is more troubleſome to thoſe, who have that facility, than to others, who finiſh things as they produce them, and in whom art bears a greater part than nature.’ This agrees well enough with Quintilian's notions. That great maſter would have an author, who begins to compoſe, to do it ſlowly. By this means, he will learn to write well, and then he will write readily; but if he writes haſtily, or, which is the ſame, if he writes with great facility, he will never write well. *Hanc moram & ſolicitudinem initiis impero . . . cito ſcribendo non fit ut bene ſcribatur: bene ſcribendo, fit ut cito* (37). Let this facility be as much a fault as you pleaſe, yet it is better to be ſubject to it, than not to be able to bring forth one's conceptions without intolerable pains; and it is a greater misfortune for an author never to end his corrections, than to end them a little too ſoon. Balzac has been placed among thoſe authors, who become unhappy by being too nice. Read theſe words of Coſtar (38). ‘ There is nothing fluent and natural in *Balzac*. His great labour is ſo ſenſible, that nice readers grow weary of his works, like that famous Sybarite, who was all in a ſweat, ſeeing a poor workman labouring very hard. And indeed he himſelf confeſſed ſometimes, that, when he took pen in hand, he ſuffered as much as a galley ſlave. Not but that he had a great and noble genius; but he found it as difficult to ſatisfy himſelf, as that excellent man, of whom the late biſhop of Lizieux ſaid, *The fine things he publiſhes coſt him ſo dear, that were I in his caſe, I would pitch upon ſome other employment to ſerve my neighbours, and ſhould not think that GOD required that from me.*’ Coſtar is in the right to ſay, that the readers eaſily perceive, that the productions of this famous writer coſt him a great deal of pains. They will not ſay, that they might eaſily write as he does; for it is only the reading of an author, whoſe thoughts and expreſſions have

(27) *In Vigneul Marville's* Mélanges d'Hiſt. & de Literature, pag. 223, *of the Rouën Edit.*

(28) Coſtar, Defenſe des Ouvrages de Mr de Voiture, pag. 16, 17.

(29) Vincta quædam quaſi ſolvenda de induſtria ſunt illa quidem maximi laboris, ne laborata videantur. *Quint. lib. ix, cap. iv, pag. m.* 457.

(30) Pelliſſon, Preface to Sarraſin's works, pag. 457.

(31) Id. ibid. pag. 28.

(32) Et in verſu faciendo Sæpe caput ſcaberet, vivos & roderet ungues. *In making verſe . . . His head he ſcratch'd and bit his nails to th' quick.* Horat. Sat. x, lib. i, ver. 70. *Confer quæ Perſius, Sat i, ver.* 106. Nec pluteum cædit, nec demorſos ſapit ungues. *Nor ſtrikes his writing deſk, nor bites his nails.*

(33) Ludentis ſpeciem dabit & torquebitur. *He'll ſeem to ſport, tho' on the rack of thought.* Horat. Ep. ii, lib. ii, ver. 124.

(34) Perſius, Sat. iii, ver. 80.

(35) Redeamus ad judicium & retractemus ſuſpectam facilitatem. *Quintil. lib x, cap. iii, pag.* 483.

(36) Godeau, Preface to his tranſlation of the Pſalms. *Confer quæ Quintilian. lib. x, cap. iii, pag. m.* 485.

(37) Quintil. lib. x, cap. iii, pag. 484. *See citation* (1), *of the article* ORICELLARIUS.

(38) Coſtar, Apol. pag. 37. *See alſo the pieces in vindication of the queen-mother,* Tom I, pag m. 471, 472. *Where it is ſaid, that all that Balzac could do,* was to poliſh a period in one day, *and that he ſpent a whole day* in placing a conjunction or a prepoſition.

Urbino; he was eſteemed for his wit and poetry, which was all that he got by ſo many maſters. At laſt he retired into his country, where he was conſulted like an oracle about the means of pacifying Italy (*d*).

(*d*) *Taken from* John Imperialis in Muſæo Hiſtor. pag. 129, 130.

have an eaſy turn, that makes one think he might do the ſame. But then, whoever tries it, will find himſelf very much miſtaken; experience will teach, that nothing can be more difficult than to imitate what ſeems to be ſo eaſy.

> Ex noto fictum carmen ſequar, ut ſibi quivis
> Speret idem, ſudet multum, fruſtraque laboret
> Auſus idem (39).
>
> *With ſo much ſeeming eaſe my verſe ſhall flow,*
> *Each ſhall believe, that he could write the ſame,*
> *Yet labour much, and to no purpoſe ſweat.*

This judgment of Horace agrees with that of Cicero, ſpeaking of certain orators. ‘ Summiſſus eſt & humilis, conſuetudinem imitans, ab indiſertis re plus quàm opinione differens. Itaque eum qui audiunt, quamvis ipſi infantes ſint, tamen illo modo confidunt ſe poſſe dicere. Nam orationis ſubtilitas imitabilis quidem illa videtur eſſe exiſtimanti, ſed nihil eſt experienti minus (40). —— *His language is humble and familiar, differing more in reality than appearance from the uneloquent. Thoſe therefore that hear him, tho' they are themſelves infants, yet are confident they can ſpeak like him. For that artful eloquence ſeems indeed ſuch as may be imitated, to thoſe, who judge without trying, but nothing is leſs to him, who makes the experiment.*’ Note, that ſome ſaid, that this ſort of orators were the only ones that could be called Attics (41). To conclude, I add, that Ovid is one of thoſe inimitable poets, whoſe imitation ſeems at firſt ſight to be the eaſieſt thing in the world (42).

(39) Horat. de Arte Poët. ver. 240.

(40) Cicero, in Oratore, fol. 120. C. *See alſo* Iſocrates in Panathenaico.

(41) Quem ſolum quidam vocant Atticum. *Cicero, ibid.*

(42) Dictionem *Ovidii* quæ non nemini tanquam in triviis invenienda vileſceret, eſſe nimirum ex eo genere rerum quas omnes inveniant inventas. *Fam. Strada Proluſ. VI, lib. ii, pag. m.* 380.

GUARINI, or GUARINIO (GUARINUS), a Theatin monk and mathematician of the duke of Savoy, was a native of Modena, and flouriſhed in the XVIIth century. His *Placita Philoſophica* were printed at Paris in 1666, and his *Cæleſtis Mathematica* at Milan in 1683. He was dead when this laſt book came out.

[*A*] *His* Placita Philoſophica *were printed . . . . . and his* Cœleſtis Mathematica.] Each of thoſe two works is a book in folio. The firſt is a body of philoſophy, wherein the author particularly enlarges upon phyſics, and departs from the common opinion of the ſchools. See the *Journal des Savans* of the twenty ninth of November, 1666. As for the other work, I refer the reader to the *Acta eruditorum Lipſienſium* (1).

(1) For June, 1684, pag 259.

GUEBRIANT (RENATA DU BEC), widow of the Mareſchal de Guebriant, was the daughter of Renatus du Bec, marquis de Vardes [*A*], and ſiſter of Renatus du Bec, who married the counteſs de Moret, miſtreſs of Henry IV. Her eldeſt brother was killed in Italy by ſome Banditti [*B*]. She was ordered to conduct the princeſs Mary of Gonzaga to the king of Poland, who had married her at Paris by proxy; and ſhe was inveſted with a new

[*A*] *Renatus du Bec, marquis de Vardes.*] I add, that he was knight of the king's orders, and governor of la Capelle, and the country of Tieraſche; and that his ſon, who married the counteſs de Moret, had by her the marquis de Vardes, who has been ſo long out of favour by reaſon of ſome intrigues mentioned in the book, intituled, *Les Amours du Palais Royal.* This diſgrace did not laſt till the death of the marquis de Vardes; but it wanted but a few years of it. The huſband of the counteſs de Moret was governor of la Capelle, and condemned to death for contempt of the court, as having too ſoon ſurrendered that place to the Spaniards in the year 1636 (1). But he was declared innocent by a decree of the parliament of Paris, after the deceaſe of the cardinal de Richelieu.

[*B*] *Her eldeſt brother was killed in Italy by ſome Banditti.*] It is commonly ſaid ſo in the books that contain a genealogical account of the marquis de Vardes's anceſtors (2). But in the collection of pieces, printed at the end of the journal of Henry III, there are ſome obſervations on the amours of Henry IV; wherein we are told, that this eldeſt brother was killed by a peaſant, whom he had attempted to beat; ‘ and that his father, a venerable old man, who was ‘ worth fifty or ſixty thouſand livres a year, in order ‘ to conceal the death of his ſon, cauſed his train to ‘ take the road of Lyons and Italy, and ſome days ‘ after pretended to have received letters, whereby ‘ he was informed of the ſudden death of his ſon, ‘ upon the road.’ He, who gives this account, does it upon this occaſion. He ſays, that one Villeneuve, a gentleman of Guienne, who was married in the Vexin, got together many gentlemen at Saucour (3) near Giſors, in the year 1622, to have their advice about this caſe of conſcience *viz.* A gentleman (probably the ſame, who conſulted the reſt) went alone into a country man's houſe to chaſtize him: the country man took him by the neck, and flung him down, ſwearing, ‘ he would kill him, unleſs he promiſed and ‘ ſwore, that he would never revenge himſelf either ‘ directly or indirectly.’ The gentleman ſwore it, and deſired to know whether he was bound to keep his word. The author of the obſervations adds, ‘ that all ‘ of them, being ten or twelve, voted in the affirma‘tive, reſolving that, for the time to come, no gen‘tleman ſhould attack ſuch people but upon ſure ‘ ground; and they alledged a new and worſe inſtance ‘ of a certain marquis, &c.’ It is the adventure I have mentioned concerning the eldeſt brother of the marquis de Vardes, and of the lady de Guebriant.

This ſtory is related with ſo many circumſtances, that one would take it to be true; but, if we conſider other circumſtances, we may very well doubt of the truth of it, and even affirm that it is falſe. We find in the voyage of the queen of Poland, written by le Laboureur (4), that the lady de Guebriant, paſſing by Genoa, cauſed a tomb to be erected for her brother, who had been killed by ſome banditti of that country. I ſhall ſet down the whole paſſage of Mr le Laboureur, which contains many circumſtances, that render what is ſaid of the aſſembly of Saucour altogether improbable. That writer, having obſerved, that the princes of Monaco, and the lords du Bec-Criſpin in Normandy, are deſcended from the ſame anceſtors, adds, ‘ that this very thing moved ‘ the late meſſire John du Bec, marquis de la Boſſe (5), ‘ eldeſt ſon of Renatus du Bec, marquis de Vardes, ‘ knight of the king's orders, being in Italy in the ‘ year 1616, to go and pay a viſit to the Grimaldi, ‘ related to him; and, being killed in his way thither ‘ by the banditti, they took care to revenge his death ‘ by an exemplary puniſhment, and cauſed his body ‘ to be depoſited in St Francis's church, where many ‘ of the family had been buried, and where it re‘mained till the year 1646, when the lady de Gue‘briant his ſiſter, and meſſieurs Grimaldi, had it re‘moved to *Our Lady of Conſolation* without the walls ‘ of Genoa, where a monument was erected to him, ‘ and I made the epitaph.’

Can any one believe, that the farce would have been carried ſo far, to conceal from the world, that a young marquis had been killed by a peaſant? would that family have been diſhonoured by ſuch a misfortune; and was there no other way to conceal the thing, but by bringing in the Italian banditti? We muſt not uſe people

(1) The *Mercure François*, for the Year 1636, calls him only Baron du Bec.

(2) *See Father Anſelme*, Tom. II, pag. 626. Le Laboureur, Additions to Caſtelnau's Memoirs, Tom. II, pag. 500.

(3) I think it ſhould be Sancour.

(4) Third Part, pag. 353.

(5) Moreri, in the article *Bec-Creſpin*, has once put *la Broſſe* inſtead of *la Boſſe*. He had read, or heard ſomething of the other manner in which they relate this death, as appears by theſe words: *others ſay, that the peaſants of Normandy murthered him at Budavid*: which makes a new difference.

a new character (a), which was that of embaſſadreſs extraordinary. Le Laboureur, in his relation of that journey, does not ſeem to give a ſincere account of the iſſue of the French Embaſſador's quarrel [C], nor does Mr de Wicquefort give an exact account of it [D], and he ſays without any reaſon, that the lady de Guebriant was concerned in it. She worthily kept up her character: ſhe was an intriguing woman, and endowed with very noble qualities [E]. Priolo does not give a right account of

people to give more credit to ſtories told in converſation, than to hiſtorical monuments, like thoſe mentioned by Mr le Laboureur; it would be an ill example, and a thing of dangerous conſequence.

PRETENSIONS of Mr de Bregi, embaſſador of France in Poland.

[C] *Le Laboureur .... does not ſeem to relate ſincerely the iſſue of the French embaſſador's quarrel.*] Though one be never ſo deſirous to ſpare a man of his merit, one cannot forbear ſaying, that he does not give an impartial account of the French embaſſador's diſpute, and endeavours to conceal the ill ſucceſs of his pretenſions. Having mentioned, *page* 137, 138, the moſt ſolid reaſons of the Polanders, he does not ſay what was replied to them, nor what was at laſt reſolved. At *page* 151, he places Mr de Bregi at table below prince Charles (6), without telling us how, and why, that embaſſador gave up his pretenſions. In the 194th page, he places him ſtill below the prince; but he adds, that this prince *repreſented the embaſſador extraordinary of the emperor.* Whereby he, artfully inſinuates, that Mr de Bregi had all the advantage he could expect from his diſpute, ſince prince Charles was deſignedly inveſted with a character, to which all the embaſſadors of crowned heads give the upper hand. But the reader is told in the errata, that the words, *who repreſented the perſon of the emperor*, ought to be left out. It is ſomewhat ſtrange, that this fault ſhould not be expreſſed in the errata exactly in the ſame words as it is in the book. But the artifice, which plainly appears in it, is much more inexcuſable, if it be conſidered that few people mind an errata (7). The reader is alſo deſired to ſtrike out of the ſame page what is ſaid in it, that the nuncio placed himſelf below that lady at the wedding feaſt. However thoſe two corrections do not well anſwer the expectation of the reader (8) grounded upon the cenſure paſſed upon Mr Renaudot's gazettes, and another relation of that feaſt, and upon theſe words of Mr le Laboureur: *Perhaps I ſhall be accounted a more credible witneſs as to the perſons, who ſat down at their majeſties table, and the order they were placed in, ſince the queen of Poland ſent for me to be preſent at it.* If ſo many falſities were publiſhed at Paris about things relating to the ceremonial, how could the news, that concerned things more difficult to be known, be depended upon? The multitude of thoſe, who pretend to ſend relations, produces a ſtrange confuſion. Le Laboureur ſays, *they had ſeveral ſervants, who pretended to write news, and that the baker took care to obſerve, among other things, the price and goodneſs of meal* (9).

[D] *Nor does Mr de Wicquefort give an exact account of it.*] The embaſſador, ſays he (10), 'who 'ſcrupled to give the upper hand to the hereditary 'prince of Sweden, brother to the king of Poland, and 'the lady de Guebriant, who pretended to have the 'ſame honours that were formerly paid to the arch-'ducheſs of Tirol, were guilty of an unpardonable 'impertinence, and procured an affront to their maſter.' The embaſſador he means is the ſame, whom he calls viſcount de Bregi, *page* 593, of the firſt book; where having called his pretenſion *an extravagant one*, he adds, that the pretenſion of the lady de Guebriant was not *leſs ridiculous, ſince ſhe deſired to have the ſame rank*, and the ſame honours that were paid to the arch-ducheſs, *when ſhe brought to the queen her daughter into Poland.* It is ſaid in the index, wherein the reader is referred to the ſame page 593, that the lady de Guebriant pretended to have the upper hand of the arch-ducheſs; but there is no ſuch thing in that page.

I will not contradict Mr de Wicquefort in what he ſays concerning thoſe pretenſions; it is not a matter of fact. I ſhall only ſay, that he has no reaſon to tell us, that Bregi and the lady de Guebriant *procured an affront to their maſter* by their pretenſions. This cannot be ſaid of that lady; for it does not appear from le Laboureur's relation, that ſhe had any diſpute. We read in it (11), that *there was a long conteſt at two ſeveral times*, occaſioned by the pretenſions of the French embaſſador? but le Laboureur is ſo far from ſaying, that this lady was engaged in a conteſt, that, on the contrary, he tells us, that, on the very day Mr de Bregi began to have a diſpute, the queen of Poland *deſired the lady de Guebriant not to concern her ſelf in it, and that the count d'Honoff, the embaſſadors, and the grandees of Poland, aſſured her, that ſhe ſhould have the honours due to her character, not only of embaſſadreſs extraordinary, but alſo of ſuperintendant of her majeſty's conduct, according to ſeveral precedents, and* PARTICULARLY THAT OF THE ARCH-DUCHESS OF INSPRUC, *when ſhe brought the late queen.* In another place the author informs us (12), that *the king declared to all the grandees of the kingdom, that he intended ſhe ſhould receive all the honours due to a lady of her quality and character,* THE SAME WITH THOSE THAT WERE PAID TO THE ARCH-DUCHESS OF INSPRUC, *ſiſter to the great duke of Tuſcany, who brought the late queen.* After this I need not alledge the following paſſage of that relation to confute Mr de Wicquefort (13). *The lady de Guebriant going down ſtairs in the palace, to get into her coach* (14), *the biſhop of Poſnania gave her his bleſſing in his pontifical habits. This honour is only paid to kings and queens, and ſovereign princes; but the king ordered it to be paid to her, the better to ſhew how much he eſteemed that illuſtrious lady.*

[E] *She was endowed with very noble qualities.*] I think that, in order to judge of that lady's merit, it is neceſſary to keep a medium between the praiſes beſtowed upon her by le Laboureur, and the ill character others give of her. However, any one that reflects upon her employments muſt needs own, that ſhe had a great deal of wit, and all the talents that a lady muſt have, in order to maintain and diſtinguiſh herſelf in the moſt eminent poſts of the court. Tho it be ſaid, that thoſe, who beſtow employments, have no great regard to merit, men of ſenſe will never believe, that the queen mother and cardinal Mazarin made that lady ſuperintendant of the conduct of the queen of Poland (15), and embaſſadreſs extraordinary, if ſhe had not been looked upon as a woman well qualified to do a great deal of honour to France in the court of Poland, and to keep up that new character (16) with all the wit, prudence, and grandeur, it required. She is very much praiſed in the letters, written to her by the king, the queen-mother, and the cardinal, when ſhe was nominated to that employment, and in thoſe, which the king of Poland wrote to the king and queen-mother, when ſhe returned to Paris; and it is certain ſhe acquitted herſelf of that employment with great ability. Thoſe letters may be ſeen in le Laboureur's relation.

As I have ſaid before, the praiſes he beſtows upon her ought not to be taken in their full latitude. It ſeems to him, *that when their majeſties pitched upon her, they acted according to the wiſhes of the whole French nation, and particularly of the chief perſons of the court.* He ſays, *the thing was made public before it was reſolved upon; that this illuſtrious widow lived a retired life; that her huſband revived every day in her memory, to die in her heart; that ſhe ſacrificed to him daily ſome of her paſſions; that ſhe minded neither court preferments, nor the court itſelf:* Laſtly, that ſhe accepted of that employment, only becauſe ſhe could not diſobey her ſovereign, being ſo much beholden to him *for ſo many many favours, and particularly for the funeral honours paid to the mareſchal her huſband by his orders.* This he ſays in the firſt part of his relation. He tells us, in the ſecond volume of his additions to Caſtelnau's memoirs, page 499, that *ſhe kept up the reputation and memory of the mareſchal de Guebriant, by ſo many ſervices and glorious labours, that the king, by making her lady of honour to his queen, has not only pleaſed all his* of her negotiation at Briſac [*F*]. It is not the only fault he has committed concerning that lady: which may ſerve to remove ſome ſuſpicions about her [*G*]. Every thing

---

(a) See the remark [E], citation (16).

(6) He was the king of Poland's brother.

(7) See ſomething of this nature in the *Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, June*, 1686, *art. iii.*

(8) See Page 194.

(9) Ibid.

(10) Traité de l'ambaſſadeur, lib. ii, pag. m. 200.

(11) Page 137, of the firſt part.

(12) Pag. 207, of the firſt part.

(13) Pag. 3, of the third part.

(14) It was on the day ſhe ſet out from Poland.

(15) Louiſa Maria de Gonzaga, the daughter of a duke of Nevers, who was afterwards duke of Mantua, married to Uladiſlaus IV, king of Poland, in 1645. *See Marolles's Memoirs, pag.* 162.

(16) Rex atque Regina mater Renatam Dubecam Vardiam mulierem viduam genere atque probitate inſignem, unà cum Sponſa in Poloniam ire juſſere, quæ hanc vice ſua Uladiſlao Regi traderet, Dubecam ea cauſa novo, ut opinor, exemplo atque apud omnes gentes inaudito Legati, ſeu ſi fas eſt dicere Legatæ titulo ornavere. *Labardæus* (Mr de la Barde) *Hiſtor. de Reb. Gallic. lib. iii, pag.* 176. The lady de Guebriant is the firſt, and, if I am not miſtaken, the only lady, who has had the character of embaſſadreſs; and perhaps ſhe will be the laſt. *Wicquefort, lib. i, de l'Ambaſſ. pag.* 15.

his ſubjects, but alſo acted according to the wiſhes and eſteem of all foreign nations, among whom ſhe diſcovered her great merit, during her embaſſy extraordinary to conduct the queen of Poland into her kingdom. There is certainly too much rhetoric, and too many poetical thoughts, in theſe encomiums, eſpecially for a man, who makes very bold reflexions upon the abuſes of his time in many places of his additions to Caſtelnau's memoirs, and whoſe blows are much like thoſe of the count de Lude, of whom he ſays, *That though he ſhot at a great diſtance upon the government, all his ſhots were not loſt; ſome carried home, and made deſperate wounds.* This he ſays at page 767 of his additions. We ſhall ſee hereafter a paſſage of Patin, whereby it does not appear, that the whole French nation wiſhed that heroine might be raiſed to great honours; and I have juſt now read in a modern hiſtorian, that ſhe had an exorbitant ambition, which was the reaſon why the mareſchal de Guebriant had a magnificent burial. ' Guebriantii exſequiæ non vulgari pompa celebratæ. ' Corpus illatum Fano Deiparæ Virginis, qui honos infrequens non tam conceſſus Viri meritis, quàm uxoris ' Renatæ Bekiæ flagitatione extortus; fœmina impotens, gloriæ potius quàm luctus immodica juſta ma' rito perſoluta in ſui oſtentationem trahere (17). —— ' *The obſequies of the mareſchal Guebriant were celebrated with no ordinary pomp. The body was depoſited in ' the church of Notre-Dame, which unuſual honour was ' not ſo much granted to the mareſchal's merit, as extorted by the importunity of Renata du Bec, his wife; ' who was prompted to the performance of theſe immoderate rites, not through exceſs of grief, but ambition and oſtentation.*' I muſt needs ſay, that I do not believe ſhe accepted the embaſſy extraordinary of Poland out of obedience, and that it was beſtowed upon her without her deſiring and ſuing for it. The oratory of a man, who praiſes, ought to be ſuſpected.

[*F*] *Priolo does not give a right account of her negotiation at Briſac.*] That hiſtorian (18) relates a thing, which is not much to this lady's honour. He ſays, that, during the laſt troubles, Charlevois, who commanded in Briſac, quarrelled with the governour ſent thither by the court, (it was Mr de Tilladet), and that he ſo well purſued his point, that the governour was obliged to yield to him. That the lady de Guebriant, either out of avarice or ambition, undertook to make herſelf neceſſary; and, being willing the court ſhould think ſhe had preſerved that important place, ſhe formed an intrigue to ruin Charlevois. That ſhe repaired to Briſac with a young woman he loved; and that Charlevois, being ſo imprudent as to go out of that place to ſee this woman (19), was taken, and carried priſoner to Philipsburg. That the lady de Guebriant was very much abuſed upon that account, and obliged to retire to Baſil as faſt as ſhe could; and that Charlevois had a ſecret intrigue with the count de Harcourt, who was diſſatisfied with the government, and made his peace upon advantageous terms, ſo that the lady was hated by both parties, and died of grief (20).

Here is an inſtance of what commonly happens to thoſe who write abridgments: they omit many circumſtances, without which a fact is but a rough and ſhapeleſs maſs, as thoſe know, who, after they have read it in a large hiſtory, compare their notion of it with what they read in an abridgment. Whoever reads this intrigue of the lady de Guebriant in Mr de la Barde's hiſtory, will find the truth of what I ſay. But, laying aſide Priolo's omiſſions, it is certain he has advanced two falſities.

The firſt conſiſts in ſaying, that Charlevois went out of Briſac to ſee the miſtreſs the lady de Guebriant brought him. Nothing can be more falſe; he had no occaſion to go out of that place to ſee her, ſince ſhe was there in that lady's retinue. Beſides, the reader may very well wonder that this lady ſhould be at Briſac, and that Charlevois's miſtreſs, by whoſe means he was to be entrapped, ſhould not be with the lady that carries on the intrigue, and knows ſo well how to uſe the ſtratagems of Catherine de Medicis (21). It is certain ſhe was there, and that the artifice made uſe of to bring Charlevois into the ſnare, was to uſe him to ride in a coach at a great diſtance from the town with the lady de Guebriant, and his miſtreſs. But on the day that he was taken, the lady de Guebriant, being willing to be in the town, when the firſt news of it ſhould come thither, pretended ſome buſineſs that did not allow her to go abroad, and yet deſired all her retinue ſhould go. The ſecond falſity concerns the death of that lady. Priolo ſays, ſhe died of grief, when the civil-war was not yet ended; but it is certain (22) ſhe was not diſturbed for the ill ſucceſs of her enterprize at Briſac, and that ſhe carried on her intrigues even at Baſil, and filled her head with vaſt deſigns, to ingratiate herſelf with the queen-mother, and cardinal Mazarine: in a word, that ſhe died only in 1659, after ſhe had made ſo great a figure at court, that ſhe was to be firſt lady of honour to queen Maria Thereſa. How came Priolo, who was ſufficiently acquainted with great people, to know what paſſed among them, and who publiſhed his hiſtory few years after the death of that lady, to place her death ſo wrong, as to take away from her five or ſix years of a ſhining proſperity? Perhaps he did her a good office by it.

Mr de la Barde obſerves, that this lady, not contented with the character of embaſſadreſs, which ſhe had been inveſted with, deſired to engage in a war-intrigue, as being a thing of greater luſtre (23). Nay, it was ſaid, ſhe aſpired to the government of Briſac; and that ſhe was deſirous to be poſſeſſed of the king's lands in Alſace. She would have recovered by that means the money the king owed her, and would have formed a ſmall ſtate upon that frontier. ' Eâ tempe' ſtate vulgatum Dubecam non modò Briſiacum expe' tere ſibi, cui Præfecta eſſet, ſed & prædia quæ Rex ' in Alſatiâ poſſidet omnia, quibus huic permiſſis ære ' ſe alieno liberaret, quo ſatis grandi Dubecæ obſtrictus ' erat: ita mulier nihil niſi ingens animo volvere ſolita, ' ſibi ſpeciem Principatus aliquam in hâc ab Aulâ re' motâ regione fingebat (24).'

[*G*] *This may ſerve to remove ſome ſuſpicions about her.*] I have juſt now ſaid, that perhaps Priolo did her a good office. I mean, that, if this author had not ſaid, that the lady de Guebriant died before the troubles were over, many readers might have ſuſpected, that ſhe was one of the four women, of whom he gives a very ill character. He ſays, that four women kindled a civil-war all over France, that they had more wit than virtue, and that, their projects having miſcarried, they ſet up for devout women; which, ſays he, is a common thing with women, when their looking-glaſs makes them ſenſible, that they are no longer able to make a figure in the world. ' Tunc quatuor, non ' quidem abſurdæ ingenio, ſed quæ plus moribus no' cebant quàm ingenio proderant, omnem Galliam ' commiſerunt . . . . Ipſæ poſtea improſperis, ut fit, ' rebus ſe prædamnantes Numini fidem obligarunt per ' religionis mendacem ſimulationem & fucoſa ſuperſti' tione: effœtis vitiis januâ clauſâ, cum ſpeculo dam' nante, ſe putris ſenectus, præciſa ejus ſententiâ refor' midat (25). Ad arbitrium quatuor fœminarum noſtra ' diu recta. Illæ neque Regno neque ſibi felicis uteri ' dum ſua magnitudine peccandi licentiam metiuntur, ' Galliam omnem in ſummum diſcrimen vocavere, *&c.* ' (26).' The better to apprehend how much this lady is beholden to that hiſtorian, for not making her one of thoſe four women, we muſt remember, that he repreſents them as being barren (27); and proportioning their ſins to their greatneſs; that their minds were always full of great deſigns; that they made a private application to the cardinal by the mediation of their gallants, and betrayed one another; ſo that his eminence was not the judge of three, but of four wanton goddeſſes. *Sic Mazarinus non trium ſed quatuor dearum libidinantium judex fuit.* Whilſt theſe women were in his intereſt, others were very much againſt him, and thruſt themſelves into ſecret intrigues at any rate. They proſtituted themſelves (28), which is almoſt unavoidable to thoſe women, who concern themſelves with civil-wars. They want the confidence of party-leaders; it is neceſſary that thoſe gentlemen ſhould aſſiſt them with their ſwords and politics; but they do nothing gratis, and they know how to improve the opportunity. Such is the condition of a lady, who deſigns to have the direction of ſtate-revolutions. It is ſaid, that the marſhal de Turenne, tho' a very wiſe man, could not reſiſt the impetuoſity of the torrent, and required alſo ſuch perſonal ſervices from the ladies during the civil-war. I thought it might be the firſt and

PRIOLO ſlanders ſome Ladies.

(17) Benjam. Priolus de Rebus Gall. Hiſtor. lib. ii, cap. vi, pag. m. 41, 42.

(18) Ubi ſupra, lib. viii.

(19) Imponit hamo eſcam quam ſciebat appetiturum Charlovoium: puella amata illicium fuit, cui inviſendæ miſer arce exit. *Id. lib. viii, cap. viii.*

(20) Guebriantia utrimque exoſa, tædio & mœrore vitam inquietam finivit.

(21) It is obſerved in hiſtory, that ſhe made uſe of the beauty of her maids of honour, to bring great men into the ſnare, according as her occaſions required. Her daughter did the ſame. *See Mezerai, ad ann.* 1579.

(22) Labardæus, Hiſt. de Reb. Gallic. lib. x, pag. 737, ad ann. 1652.

(23) Legati . . . . perſonam ſuſtinuerat, quod tametſi amplum ipſi, magnificumque viſum, tamen magis ſuprà fœminam eſſe videbatur, quidpiam quod ad militiam pertineret, attingere, cujus ſibi facultatem dari in Charlevoſii negotio eſt arbitrata. *Labardæus, pag.* 620.

(24) Id. ibid.

(25) Priol. lib. ii, n. 43.

(26) Id. lib. viii, n. 10.

(27) *See the end of this remark.*

(28) Pars ſui copiam facere ut aulæ arcanum quodlibet rimarentur. *Id. lib. ii, n.* 42.

thing that Patin ſays of her ought not to be credited [*H*]. This affords a remark, wherein we ſhall ſee when ſhe died. We ſhall ſee, in another remark, the miſtake of a German writer [*I*], who publiſhed notes on Priolo. I muſt not forget, that this lady, who thought herſelf undermatched, having married a man, who was very rich, cauſed her marriage to be declared void [*K*], and married (*b*) the count de Guebriant,

and the laſt time he was talked of on account of his gallantry; but I have been informed by a perſon, who knew it well, that he frequently uſed that trade. Notwithſtanding the age of the lady de Guebriant, all the readers would take her to be one of the four, had not the hiſtorian prevented it by the method he took, much better than by the characters he gives of them, moſt of which ſuit with her: I ſay, her age would ſignify nothing; for, not to go ſo far as Aſpaſia, Lamia, and even theducheſs of Valentinois, do we not ſee, much about the ſame time Priolo ſpeaks of, a ducheſs ſomewhat advanced in years (29), whoſe amorous conqueſts were very conſiderable? Mr de la Barde, whom I quote, agrees with Mr Priolo in this point, *viz.* that women were very much at the helm during the ſtorms of the late minority. The author of the *Thoughts on Comets* might have added this citation to his 236th article, and not this alone, but an infinite number of the like, which we meet with in books.

Take notice, that when I ſaid, that Priolo repreſents the four ladies, who had ſo great an intereſt, as being barren; I ſaid ſo, only with reſpect to moſt readers; for thoſe, who know, that theſe words of that hiſtorian, *Neque regno, neque ſibi felicis uteri*, are an alluſion to what Paterculus ſaid of Julia, Auguſtus's daughter (30), will not take them to be a ſign of barrenneſs.

[*H*] *Every thing that Patin ſays of her, ought not to be credited.*] Here are two paſſages out of his letters. The lady de Guebriant, ſays he, in a letter of the ninth of September, 1659, *is dead* (31) *at Perigueux: She had not been ſick above thirteen hours, and ſhe is dead without confeſſion. She was a partiſan in that country, where ſhe has been very much curſed.* Ten days after, he ſpoke of her in the following manner. *We hear that the lady de Guebriant is dead, attending upon the court. She was the marquis de Vardes's aunt, and never had any children: I believe ſhe has left a good eſtate behind her. She died in four days, without confeſſion. One might ſay of her, what Eraſmus ſaid in jeſt of a Franciſcan, who died ſuddenly,* Obiit ſine crux, ſine lux, ſine Deus (§ *a*). *It is ſaid, ſhe was very much in debt; but then the queen owed her* 40000 *piſtoles, which ſhe lent her during the ſiege of Paris.*

[(§ *a*) This ſaying occurs in the *Facetiæ* of Bebelius, fol. 56. Edit. 1542. And Luther has likewiſe uſed it in his *Table-Talk*, Tom. 1. fol. 86. *Omnes*, ſays he of a good number of his adverſaries, *mortui ſunt ſine crux, & ſine lux.* Rem. Crit.]

There being many things in Patin's letters, which he picked out as he was viſiting his patients (32), I would not much rely upon what I have juſt quoted from him. I could eaſily believe this lady had a hand in finding out ways and means to raiſe money for the king, and that loving to make great expences, and to keep her ſelf buſy, ſhe willingly turned her mind that way, and that therefore ſhe was curſed in the places, wherein ſhe ſhewed her skill in that point; but I do not think it was in Perigord (33). Doubtleſs ſhe died in that province, as ſhe was going through it, during the progreſs of the court into Guienne, when ſhe expected to be ſoon firſt lady of honour to the queen; for no body doubted then of the king's marriage with the Infanta of Spain.

If the letters of that phyſician be reprinted, his miſtakes ſhould be rectified by way of notes, and a good alphabetical index ſhould be added to them. But, before I proceed, I muſt quote another paſſage, concerning the family of Guebriant, out of one of the letters I have quoted. He ſays, that the counteſs de Moret, miſtreſs to Henry IV, *is famous in Barclay's* Euphormio, *under the name of Caſina; that it is in the place, where ſhe was married to the count de Ceſy-Sancy, who was afterwards embaſſador at Conſtantinople, and that there is in it a deſcription of a contract of marriage of a man, who is willing to be a cuckold, and engages to bear it; that, about the year* 1618, *ſhe was married again to the marquis de Vardes, ſon of the good man, governour of la Chapelle, &c.* He ſhould have ſaid la Capelle (34); he, who married the counteſs de Moret, was alſo governour of that place. It might have been further ſaid, that Henry IV ſtipulated with the count de Ceſi, that he ſhould leave that counteſs the very night of the wedding, which was done accordingly (35). The count does not make ſuch a promiſe, in the *Euphormio*; but he promiſes in the contract not to meddle with the bride. Patin ſhould not have omitted that particular. For the reſt, the author, who publiſhed the key of the *Euphormio* (36), is miſtaken in taking Olympion, who ſubmitted to thoſe terms, for the count de Moret.

[*I*] *We ſhall ſee . . . the miſtake of a German writer.*] Priolo's hiſtory was reprinted at Leipſic, the ſecond time, in the year 1686, with the notes of a profeſſor, called Franckenſtein: they are not free from faults; nevertheleſs it appears from them, that the author was pretty well informed for a foreigner. That profeſſor, having ſaid, that Priolo does frequently tax the lady de Guebriant (37) with too great ambition, adds, that ſhe gave a remarkable inſtance of it, when ſhe demanded, at the court of the king of Poland, the ſame honours the arch-ducheſs of Auſtria had received there, when ſhe brought her daughter, who was contracted to the king. He quotes Wicquefort in the ſecond book *De l'Ambaſſadeur, Sect.* 8. *pag.* 134. But, beſides that he ſhould have quoted *pag.* 200, and not 134, he ſhould alſo have cited the 594th page of the firſt book, where that arch-ducheſs is ſtiled the mother of the queen of Poland, whom ſhe brought. They are both miſtaken as to that quality of the arch ducheſs; for ſhe was not the mother of the queen of Poland. That queen was daughter of the emperor Ferdinand II, and ſiſter to the emperor Ferdinand III. And therefore were it true, that this queen was conducted into Poland by her mother, ſhe would have been conducted thither by the empreſs, and not by the arch-ducheſs of Auſtria. Beſides, that author ſhould have ſaid, the arch-ducheſs of Inſpruc, and not the arch-ducheſs of Auſtria. Laſtly, I obſerve, that Le Laboureur does not intimate, that the lady de Guebriant required the ſame honours, which the arch ducheſs had received; he only ſays, that the king of Poland ordered it ſo: But Wicquefort is more concerned in this, than the profeſſor of Leipſic. See what I have ſaid about it in the remark [*D*].

[*K*] *She cauſed her marriage to be declared void.*] Nothing can better diſcover her ambition than this. The count de Guebriant was a hopeful man, and very much eſteemed at court; and his skill in the art of war made it very probable, that he would be preferred to the greateſt poſts. Our Renata du Bec found her man in him: ſhe foreſaw he would raiſe himſelf (38), and that ſhe would have ſeveral opportunities of intriguing, whilſt he commanded the armies: and therefore, tho' he was no rich man, ſhe reſolved to marry him, and to that end ſhe got her marriage diſſolved. Mr de la Barde will give us this account in good Latin. 'Hæc mulier animo ſuprà ſexum valido eſt, cui videlicet nec prima, nec magna uſquè fuit ſicuti vulgo mulierum ſolet, rei familiaris cura: primas, quia imparem animo, ſicuti rebatur, virum nacta erat, nuptias dedignata eſt, atque infirmas eſſe contendit, maluitque ſe I. Budæ Guebriani virtutis, quàm alterius amplioris rei, cujus rationem, ut ferè fit, filiam collocando parentes habuerant, ſociam eſſe. Ex illâ ſecum, atque ex gloriâ viri poſtillà multis rebus præclarè geſtis celeberrimi communicatâ ita crevere mulieri animi, uti magna, atque inſolita moliretur (39). —— *This lady had a ſtrength of mind above her ſex, ſince her domeſtic affairs were neither her principal, nor ever her great care, as is the caſe of moſt women; ſhe diſdained her firſt marriage, as having got a huſband unequal, as ſhe thought, in mind; and therefore ſhe inſiſted it was void, and choſe to ſhare in the virtue of the count de Guebriant, rather than in the larger fortunes of another, a circumſtance, which her parents, as is uſual, had conſidered in marrying her. The ſhare ſhe had in her huſband's glory ſo exalted her thoughts, that ſhe attempted great and uncommon things.*'

[*L*] *She*

(*b*) *In the year* 1532.

(29) Huic erat noverca Maria Avaucuria (d'Avaugour) quam Hercules Rohanus Mombaſonus pater dudum uxorem duxerat eximia per adoleſcentiam pulchritudine; tantaque vis boni in ipſa erat forma ut ne hanc quidem ætas extingueret, quo fiebat uti multi domum ejus frequentarent mulieris amore capti, atque inter hos Henricus Guiſis, vir è Lotharingica gente Princeps. Prius Henricus Aurelius Longavilla apud hanc multus fuerat frequenſque. *Labardæus, lib ii, pag.* 72, *ad ann.* 1644.

(30) *Theſe are Paterculus's words*, lib. ii, cap xciii. Filiam Cæſaris Juliam . . . . feminam neque ſibi neque reip. felicis uteri.

(31) Father Anſelme, *Hiſtoire des Grans Offic. Tom. II, pag.* 626; and after him Moreri, in the article of the Mareſchal de Guebriant, place her death on the ſecond of September, 1659.

(32) See the *Menagiana, pag.* 279, of the firſt Dutch edition.

(33) Note, that, ſince this was printed in my *Project*, I have ſeen the verbal proceſs of the funeral of mareſchal de Guebriant (cited by Laboureur, in the hiſtory of that mareſchal) where he is called count of Guebriant, and of Perigueux.

(34) Moreri ſays alſo la Chapelle, in the article of du Bec.

(35) Hiſtoire des Amours d'Alcandre, n. 70. *It is ſaid in the notes, that this count's name was Philip de Harlay, and that he died in May,* 1652, *aged* 71 *Years.*

(36) See the Leyden edition, *apud Hackium*, 1674, in 8vo.

(37) I have not obſerved that he taxes her with it in more than two places: The index made by Mr Franckenſtein, tho' very large, only mentions one of them.

The author of the notes on Priolo has taken for daughter of the archducheſs her that was not.

(38) That lady, who had a great deal of wit, received him with greater ſatisfaction, becauſe ſhe knew his noble extraction, and becauſe ſhe foreſaw, that he would be quickly raiſed to the higheſt poſts, by reaſon of his great endowments. *Le Laboureur, Hiſtoire du Mareſchal de Guebriant, livr. i, chap. vii, pag.* 12.

(39) Labardæus, ubi ſupra, lib. ix, pag. 619, ad ann. 1651.

Guebriant, a younger brother of an ancient family of Bretagne. She very much contributed to his being made a mareſchal of France [*L*].

[*L*] *She very much contributed to his being made mareſchal of France.*] We have juſt now ſeen, that according to Mr de la Barde, ſhe was none of thoſe women, who, like the reſt of her ſex, take great care of their domeſtic concerns; ſhe loved to negotiate at court. Le Laboureur obſerves (40), ' that he had been ' an eye-witneſs of the extraordinary care ſhe took to ' ſollicit the miniſters, that the army commanded by ' her husband ſhould want nothing; and I can affirm, ' *adds he*, that the dignity of mareſchaleſs of France ' belongs to her on a double account, becauſe her huſband is a mareſchal of France, and becauſe ſhe had a ' great ſhare in the good ſucceſs of his arms.'

(40) Hiſt. du Marêchal de Guebr. pag. 12.

GUESCLIN (*a*) (**Bertrand du**), conſtable of France, was one of the greateſt captains of his time. However, we ought not to believe whatever the old chronicles ſay of him; for the authors of that ſort of works were not yet cured of the diſtemper, which produced the hiſtories of Roland, of Ogier the Dane, and the like. Our du Gueſclin was a Breton, and did yet very great ſervices to France during king John's impriſonment, and under the reign of Charles V. Being gone into Spain to aſſiſt Henry king of Caſtile, he did extraordinary things in that country. He returned into France, when the crown was ſecured to Henry by the death of Dom Pedro the Cruel, his competitor, and was very ſucceſsful in recovering ſeveral countries from the Engliſh. He died in the year 1380, being ſixty ſix years old, or thereabouts (*b*). He was a little man, and very ugly [*A*]. See his life, written by Mr du Chatelet [*B*].

It is better than that, which was printed in the year 1618, in very old French, out of which I ſhall ſet down a very remarkable paſſage quoted by ſome controverſiſts [*C*], to ſhew, that laymen had a right to adminiſter the ſacraments in certain caſes of neceſſity.

(*a*) *This name is written fourteen ſeveral ways in French books.* Guido Ludovicus Longolius in genealogia Longoliorum, apud Menagium in vita Petri Ærodii, pag. 6.

(*b*) *Father Anſelme*, Hiſtoire des Grans Officiers, pag. 37.

[*A*] *He was a little man, and very ugly.*] ' Tho' ' Bertrand du Gueſclin was a little man, and very ' ugly, he was made conſtable of France, and was all ' along very much eſteemed. It has been ſaid in his ' favour, that nature ſeemed to have formed him ſuch ' as he was, leſt he ſhould have ſomething common ' with women: and had he ſpent every morning in ' adorning his head with a peruke, he had never ' made himſelf worthy of a never-dying lamp, and ' of being buried at the king's feet in St Denys's ' church (1).'

[*B*] *See his life publiſhed by Mr du Chatelet.*] Menard publiſhed an old hiſtory of that hero in the year 1618, which had been written in 1387. But the reader ought to be referred to that, of which an extract was publiſhed in the *Journal des Savans* of the twenty firſt of June 1666. It had been lately publiſhed at Paris in folio by Meſſire *Paul Haï, Seigneur du Chatelet* (2): it is *digeſted into a better order than the other; the ſtyle is incomparably more pure and elegant, and beſides it is illuſtrated with many proofs* (3).

[*C*] *I ſhall ſet down a very remarkable paſſage quoted by the controverſiſts.*] Read theſe words of Mr Drelincourt (4): 'we have a very remarkable example of ' of this lay-communion in our Hiſtories of France *, ' and a very clear proof that it was practiſed for a ' long time. For Bertrand du Gueſclin, conſtable of ' France, who lived in the reign of John and Charles ' V, kings of France, deſcribing the battle of Pontvalin, in which he obtained a ſignal victory over ' the Engliſh, informs us, that his ſoldiers confeſſed ' their ſins, and gave the communion one to another, ' before the battle.' But it is better to ſet down the words of the author: ' *in that place, they eat bread ' and drank wine, which they had brought with them; ' and ſome of them took bread, and made the ſign of ' the croſs upon it, in the name of the holy ſacrament; ' and having confeſſed their ſins one to another, they ' uſed it inſtead of the communion* (§ α). *Afterwards, ' they ſaid many prayers, beſeeching GOD that he ' would preſerve them from death, maiming, and impriſonment.*' Grotius made uſe of the ſame paſſage in a diſſertation, printed in 1638, *De Cœnæ Adminiſtratione ubi Paſtores non ſunt.* See the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, *pag.* 115, 116. of the fourth volume.

[(§ α) We meet with footſteps of theſe communions ſtill more ancient, in our old romances; among others, in ch. 36. of the *Galien reſtauré*, in which Roland, wounded to death, and lying in a corn-field, adminiſters the communion to himſelf with three ears of corn, in the name of the three perſons of the holy Trinity. Rem. Crit.]

(1) La Mothe le Vayer, letter cxiv, Vol. XII, pag. 15.

(2) So the letters P. H. and D. C. in the title-page, ought to be explained.

(3) Journal des Sçavans, June 21, 1666.

(4) Drelincourt, Triomphe de l'Egliſe, Part. II, pag. 320, 321.

* This hiſtory of Meſſire Bertrand de Gueſclin, conſtable of France, was printed at Paris for Sebaſtian Cramoiſi, in 1618.

GUEVARA, (**Antony de**), preacher and hiſtoriographer to the emperor Charles V, was born in the province of Alaba in Spain. He was brought up at court; but, after the death of queen Iſabella of Caſtile, he turned a Franciſcan monk, and had very honourable employments in his order. Afterwards, having made himſelf known at court, he was made preacher to Charles V, and was much eſteemed for his politeneſs, eloquence, and great parts (*a*). He ought to have been contented with the glory he got by his tongue; for, pretending to write books, he made himſelf ridiculous to good judges. His high-flown and figurative ſtyle, full of antitheſes [*A*], is not the greateſt fault of his works. An ill taſte, and a wrong notion of eloquence, put

(*a*) Nicol. Antonius Biblioth. Scriptor. Hiſpan. Tom. I, pag. 98.

[*A*] *His high-flown and figurative ſtyle, full of antitheſes.*] A learned Jeſuit paſſed this judgment upon it. ' Scripſit vernaculo ſermone, in quo affectaſſe nimium ſchemata viſus, pompa quadam tumens, & antithetis putide nimium iteratis lectorem ' enecat: quin &, ut poëtæ verbis utar, *projicit ampullas & ſeſquipedalia verba* (1) —— *He wrote in ' his mother tongue, in which affecting too much a ' figurative ſtyle, and pomp of expreſſion, he quite tires ' the reader with repeated antitheſes; and, as the ' poet ſays*, throws out big, ſwelling, many-footed ' words.' The judgment, which Matamorus, a Spaniſh writer, made of it, is not more advantageous to Guevera, than that of the Flemiſh Jeſuit. You will find it in the following paſſage of Nicolas Antonio (2): ' Quantumvis ſtylus hominis non uſquequaque ' placeat, neque in gymnaſio rhetorum ſolidam reportaverit eloquentiæ laudem. Cum præcipue Alphonſo ' Garſiæ Matamoro & Andreæ Scoto (qualis judicii ' & doctrinæ viris!) affectata nimium ab eo antitheſtorum ſibi mutuo reſpondentium perpetua cura diſpliceat maxime. Horum enim prior Matamorus in ' *de Academiis & doctis viris Hiſpaniæ* Libello ingenue exiſtimat virum fuiſſe *miræ facundiæ & incredibilis ubertatis naturæ, ſed omnium rerum momenta* (ait) *quod poëtis objecit Perſius, raris librat in antithetis*

(1) Andr. Schott. Biblioth. Hiſpan. pag. 250.

(2) Nic. Antonius, Biblioth. Hiſpan. Tom. I, pag. 98.

put him upon ſuch a way of writing; which was an inconſiderable thing, if compared with his extravagant way of handling hiſtory [*B*]. He broke the moſt ſacred and the moſt eſſential laws of it, with a boldneſs that cannot be ſufficiently deteſted; and he ſhewed, that no man was ever ſo unworthy of the character of Chronicler to Charles V, which was given him. He alledged a very bad excuſe, when he was cenſured for it [*C*]: he pretended, that, excepting the holy ſcripture, all other hiſtories

'*antithetis doctas poſuiſſe figuras laudari contentus. Fulgurat interdum & tonat, ſed non totam* (*ut olim Pericles Athenienſis*) *dicendo commovet civitatem, & dum nihil vult, niſi culte & ſplendide dicere, ſæpe incidit in ea quæ deriſum effugere non poſſunt. Qui ſi illam* (ſubjungit) *extra ripas effluentem verborum copiam artificio dicendi repreſſiſſet, & graviorum artium inſtrumento locupletaſſet, dubito quidem an parem in eo eloquentiæ genere in Hiſpania eſſet inventurus.* —— *Tho' this author's ſtyle be not altogether pleaſing, nor merits true praiſe in the ſchool of the rhetoricians. Particularly Alphonſus Garſias Metamorus, and Andreas Scotus, men of great learning and judgment, are highly diſpleaſed with that perpetual affectation of antitheſes. The former of theſe, Metamorus, in his book*, de Academiis & doctis viris Hiſpaniæ, *owns that he was* a writer of wonderful eloquence, and incredible fertility of genius; but (*ſays he*) he fell into the fault, which Perſius objects to the poets, of perpetually playing with antitheſes. He ſometimes thunders and lightens, but does not, as formerly Pericles the Athenian did, ſhake a whole ſtate with his eloquence; and whilſt he aims at elegance, he often falls into thoſe things which expoſe him to laughter. Had this author (*he goes on*) kept the torrent of his eloquence within bounds, I queſtion whether Spain could have ſhewn an author equal to him.' It is in vain, and thro' a blind conceitedneſs, that Wadding (3) taxes Father Schottus with envy.

[*B*] *His extravagant way of handling hiſtory.*] The liberty he took to falſify whatever he pleaſed, and to advance, as true matter of fact, the meer inventions of his ſhallow brains, comes near that of the writers of romances. The latter deceive no body; for they do not require, that whatever they ſay ſhould be accounted true: the only thing they are fond of, is, that their fictions ſhould be approved as being ingeniouſly contrived; but Guevara pretended, that what he advanced, ſhould be looked upon as hiſtorical facts taken from good authors. He was therefore a public poiſoner, and a ſeducer, and deſerved to be puniſhed as a prophane and ſacrilegious man, at the tribunal of the commonwealth of learning; for he violated the moſt ſacred laws of hiſtory. Nicolas Antonio is too indulgent. 'Illud, *ſays he* (4), 'commiſeratione potius quam excuſatione indiget, talis famæ virum putaſſe licere ſibi adinventiones proprii ingenii pro antiquorum proponere, & commendare, fœtus ſuos aliis ſupponere, ac denique de univerſa omnium temporum hiſtoria, tanquam de Æſopi fabulis, portentoſiſve Luciani narrationibus ludere. —— *It deſerves our pity rather than our cenſure, that a writer of ſuch fame ſhould think himſelf at liberty to forge ancient facts, and to play with the hiſtory of the world, as with Eſop's fables, or Lucian's monſtrous ſtories.*' See the whole extent of his impoſtures in the article RUA: I have alſo touched upon them in other places (5).

[*C*] *He was cenſured*]. Peter Rua, profeſſor at Soria, did not ſuffer the boldneſs of this author to go unpuniſhed. He wrote ſtrongly againſt him, as may be ſeen in his article. Here follows the judgment that Voſſius paſſed upon the pretended life of Marcus Aurelius, written by Guevara: 'Vita illa M. Aurelii Antonini, quæ ab Antonio Guevara, Mendonenſi Epiſcopo, & Cæſari Carolo V. à conſiliis, Hiſpanicè edita eſt, eâque è linguâ in alias permultas tranſlata fuit, nihil Antonini habet; ſed tota eſt ſuppoſititia, ac genuinus Guevaræ ipſius fœtus; qui turpiter os oblevit lectori, planè contra officium hominis candidi, maximè Epiſcopi. Habet interim plurima lectu nec inutilia nec injucunda imprimis viro principi: unde & *Horologium principum inſcribitur* (6). —— *That life of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, which is publiſhed in Spaniſh by Antony Guevara, biſhop of Mondonedo, and privy counſellor of the emperor Charles* V, *and tranſlated from thence into many other languages, has nothing in it of Antoninus; but the whole is fictitious, and the genuine offſpring of Guevara himſelf; who ſcandalouſly impoſes upon the reader, plainly againſt the duty of an honeſt man, but eſpecially of a biſhop. In the mean time, he has many things not unuſeful or unpleaſant, eſpecially to a prince; whence it is intituled,* the Dial of Princes. I quote Martin Schoockius in the margin (7): he knew very well the faults of that Spaniard; but, becauſe he goes upon Rupertus's authority, it will not be improper to ſet down ſomewhat at large the words of that learned German (8). 'Eandem quoque impoſturam notaram in eodem *Guevara*, quem ob id tanta Imperatoris ſui, tanta noſtrorum hominum benevolentia prorſus indignum ſtudioſæ juventutis manibus excuſſum ibam. Refert *lib. I. Horologii Principum* c. 1. gentem apud Romanos fuiſſe *Clavillam* magno in honore, quæ ſe originem ducere glorietur à *Camillo* ducum Romanorum celeberrimo, viros ex ea *Camillos*, Feminas *Clavillas* dictas in memoriam filiæ *Clavillæ*, quæ abhorrens nuptias in Virginum Veſtalium numerum cooptari voluerit. Mortuam divinis honoribus cultam, ejuſque monumento inſcriptos fuiſſe hos verſiculos.

Unica ſub tumulo jacet hoc Clavilla Camilli,
Nata quater denos & ſex quæ maluit annos
Vivere Veſtales inter concluſa ſorores
Magno Trinacriæ quam nubere libera Regi.
Quam Miſerum! extinctæ nunc artus rodere vermes
Artus qui vitam puri effulſere per omnem.

'Hoc Epitaphium addit è *Græco tranſlatum* eſſe, & paullo poſt, multa refert de *Camillorum prærogativis*, de *perſecutionibus* eorundem ſub *Sylla*, quæ omnia putida, vana & falſa, nec cuiquam Hiſtoricorum veterum tradita, quamvis ille *Cinnam* & *Pollionem* laudet ſcriptores quos tot anni & profunda ſeculorum oblivio fere cogitationibus hominum & memoriæ, nedum oculis exemit. —— *I had obſerved the ſame impoſture in the ſame Guevara, whom for that reaſon I endeavoured to take out of the hands of our young ſtudents, as being unworthy of the favours of his maſter the emperor, and our country-men: he relates* book 1. ch. 1. *of his* Dial of Princes, *that the family of the* Clavilli *were had in great honour at Rome, which pretended to derive it's origin from* Camillus, *a moſt famous Roman general; that the males of that family were called* Camilli, *the females* Clavillæ, *in memory of his daughter* Clavilla, *who, abhorring marriage, choſe to become a Veſtal virgin; that, after her death, divine honours were paid to her, and this epitaph inſcribed on her tomb.*

Here lies Clavilla, only daughter of Camillus, who
choſe to live forty ſix years among the Veſtal ſiſters,
a priſoner, rather than to marry, at liberty, the great
king of Sicily. Sad fate! the worms now feed upon
thoſe limbs, which ſhone pure and undefiled thro' her
whole life.

'*He adds, that this epitaph was tranſlated out of the Greek, and, immediately after, he relates many things concerning the* privileges of the Camilli, *and of their* perſecutions *under* Sylla; *every word of wich is idle ſtuff, and falſehood, nor mentioned by any one ancient hiſtorian; tho' he cites two authors,* Cinna *and* Pollio, *authors unheard of for ſo many centuries.*' I have quoted this long paſſage at length, becauſe it contains a ſpecimen, whereby one may better judge of Guevara's impudence, than by what I have ſaid of it in general. The learned Antonius Auguſtinus has very well deſcribed the faults of that man. Antonius Guevara, ſays he (9), 'qui ſcire antiquas Romanaſque Hiſtorias fingit, eaque comminiſcitur quæ nec viſa nec audita mortalibus, nemo ut divinare queat in quos ille libros inciderit. Nova itaque nomina ſcriptorum excogitavit, ſomniaque venditat obtruditque quæ apud

'nullum

---

(3) *An Iriſh Franciſcan, in his book,* De Scriptoribus Ordinis Minorum, apud Nicol. Anton. ibid.

(4) Bibl Hiſp. Tom. I, pag. 99.

(5) In the articles LAIS, remark [*U*]; and LAMIA, remark [*L*]. He is the author of the fabulous ſtories, which Brantome relates, in the article of the ſecond FLORA, remark [*F*].

(6) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Græcis, pag. 226.

(7) Quod ſpecìatim quoque de Guevara ... vocato etiam ad ſuffragium Reineſio ... docet Cl. Rupertus ad Florum, l. ii, cap. xvii, §. 17, quo loco, ubi ſpecimen impoſturarum ipſius propoſuiſſet, hæc ſubjicit: *Taceo innumeras alias fraudes, quibus mendaciorum auctori ſtrenue litat, & id max me agit, ne ab Hiſpanica vanitate deſciſcere videatur.* —— *Which is particularly true of Guevara, even from the teſtimony of Reineſius; as we learn from Rupertus on Florus, l. ii, cap. xvii, §. xvii, in which place having given a ſpecimen of his impoſtures, he adds,* I omit innumerable other frauds, by which he ſacrifices to the father of lies, and does it chiefly, that he may not be thought deficient in Spaniſh vanity. *Martinus Schoockius de fabula Hamelenſi, pag.* 87.

(8) Rupertus, ubi ſupra.

(9) Anton. Auguſt. Dial. x, pag. m. 152. *See alſo, pag.* 159.

hiſtories are too uncertain [*D*] to be credited. Being in the emperor's retinue, he ſaw a great part of Europe (*b*), and was made biſhop of Guadix in the kingdom of Granada, and then biſhop of Mondonedo in Galicia (*c*). He died the tenth of April 1544, after he had been poſſeſſed of that dignity for ſome years (*d*). It is a fiction to ſay, that he was beatified by the court of Rome [*E*]. The eagerneſs of foreigners, in tranſlating ſome of his works into ſeveral languages, cannot be ſufficiently admired [*F*]. I ſhall give

‘ nullum reperias auctorem. —— *Antonius Guevera, ‘ who pretends to be ſkilled in the ancient Roman hiſtory, and invents ſuch things, as were never ſeen or ‘ heard of, and which no one can tell whence he had ‘ them. He even invents new names of authors, and ‘ publiſhes idle ſtories, not to be met with in any ‘ author.*’

[*D*] *He pretended, that . . . hiſtories are too uncertain.*] He alledged this excuſe, when he found himſelf nonpluſſed by the learned Peter Rua. ‘ Adeo in lubrico ‘ eſſe omnem veterum factorum fidem cauſabatur, ut ‘ non aliis diceret quam Sacrorum Bibliorum hiſtoriis ‘ præſtandam: nempe hoc velamenti genus ſibi à ‘ tam parum æquo de præſtantiſſima arte judicio tunc ‘ quæſivit cum è Sorienſis Scholæ cathedra vir eximiæ ‘ eruditionis Petrus Rua eum de fide in hiſtoris præſtanda non ſemel datis admonuit expoſtulatoriis literis (10). —— *He pretended, by way of excuſe, that ‘ all ancient facts were ſo little to be depended upon, ‘ that the holy ſcripture alone deſerves to be believed. This ‘ was the falſe pretence, under which he endeavoured ‘ to ſkreen himſelf, when the very learned Peter Rua ‘ admoniſhed him by ſeveral expoſtulatory letters, concerning the credit due to hiſtory.*’ It was a poor excuſe; for though hiſtorical Scepticiſm were as well grounded as ſome pretend, yet an author would not be allowed to advance, that Cicero or Cæſar ſaid or did a certain thing invented by himſelf. Every body would be obliged to aſcribe nothing to them but what is to be found in ancient monuments. An author ought not to go by particular rules of his own; he muſt conform to public rules: but, according to the public laws in point of hiſtory, what is proved by the teſtimony of grave authors is admitted; and whatever a modern writer advances concerning antiquity, without taking it from good hiſtorians, is rejected as a fable: and therefore, whatever opinion Guevara had of ancient hiſtory, whether he believed it to be true, falſe, or doubtful, he ſhould have cited what he found in it, and only that, otherwiſe he deſerves to be treated like a public ſeducer. Rua confuted that ſubterfuge, and wrote againſt him, in vindication of the truth of hiſtory. Another author (11) did likewiſe enter the liſts, to run down Guevara's principles. ‘ Cujus rei ‘ etiam nomine doctiſſimus ille *Theologicorum locorum* ‘ ſcriptor libri ſecundi ſexto capite in Guevaræ hoc, ‘ indignum eo, ac dignitate ejus, ſive judicium, ſive, ‘ quod magis credere eſt, ingenii luxuriantis licentiam, ‘ acri, quod decuit, oratione invehitur. Præſertim cum ‘ Chronographi munus regio beneficio apud Carolum ‘ exerceret, neutiquam debuit eam qua ornabatur hiſtoriarum profeſſionem ſic deprimere, ut propria confeſſione ſibi ipſi quoque & monumentis ſuis fidem apud poſteros derogaret (12). ——— *Upon which account, likewiſe, the learned writer of the* Theological ‘ Common-places, *in the ſixth chapter of the ſecond ‘ book, inveighs ſharply againſt this opinion, or rather ‘ wanton liberty, of Guevara, ſo unworthy of him, ‘ and of his dignity. Eſpecially, conſidering he was ‘ chronicler to the emperor Charles, he ought by no means ‘ to have ſo depreſſed the authority of hiſtory, which ‘ was his profeſſion, as, by his own confeſſion, to take ‘ away all credit from himſelf and his writings to all ‘ poſterity.*’

Mention is made, in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (13), of a certain Triumvirate, to which Guevara might be added. That Triumvirate is made up, I. of Father Morin, who, ‘ three years after the ‘ taking of Rochelle, maintained ſtill that it had not ‘ been taken, and that all the reports that went about ‘ it were meer romance.’ II. Of a famous and dreadful logician, who told a gentleman, who had been ſaying, that he had ſeen the duke d'Epernon at Plaſſac, ‘ that cannot be . . . . . for four undeniable reaſons, and ‘ I will make it out that this duke muſt neceſſarily be ‘ at London . . . . . It is more probable that the eyes ‘ are miſtaken, than reaſon . . . . The news in queſtion implies a moral contradiction, and perhaps a ‘ phyſical one.’ III. Of a man, who told Iſaac Voſſius ‘ that after long and intent meditations, he had ‘ writ a book, wherein he ſhewed by invincible arguments, that whatever is contained in Cæſar's commentaries, concerning the wars of Gaul, is falſe; ‘ and beſides, that Cæſar never went beyond the ‘ Alpes.’

[*E*] *It is a fiction to ſay that he was beatified by the court of Rome.*] Don Nicholas Antonio quotes an author, who compoſed the martyrology of the Franciſcans, and ſaid, that the holy ſee, after the neceſſary informations, ſolemnly declared, that Guevara is one of the beatified perſons, and ought to be looked upon as ſuch. *Neſcio unde Arcturus, à Monaſterio* Franciſcani Martyrologii *auctor rem aliis indictam, inauditam acceperit.* Antonium *ut* Guevaram *Octobris die* XXIV *in albo eorum collocaret quos Apoſtolica Petri ſedes Beatos eſſe atque appellari debere, acceptis prius exquiſitiſſimis probationibus, ritè ſanxit* (14). This is a greater boldneſs than that of Guevara. If this fact had any apperance of truth, how comes it to be mentioned only by one author? the ſilence of all others is a demonſtrative proof againſt the author of the Martyrology.

[*F*] *One cannot ſufficiently admire the eagerneſs of foreigners, in tranſlating ſome of his works into ſeveral languages.*] The *Dial of Princes* was tranſlated into Italian by Mambrin Roſeo in 1548, and into French in 1588 (§ *a*). Frederic William duke of Saxony cauſed it to be printed in Latin, with notes and aphoriſms, by John Vankelius in 1611, in folio. That edition was reprinted at Leipſic in 1615, and 1624, and at Francfort in 1664 (15). Emericus Caſaubonus in prologo ‘ ſic feliciter Guevaræ ſuam contigiſſe fictionem confirmat, omnium ſit ut hic liber ubique gentium celebratiſſimus, Europæique omnes ſuo uniuſcujuſque ‘ idiomate loquentem theſauri ad inſtar habeant, mirificéque ejus poſſeſſione fruatur (16). ——— *Emeric ‘ Caſaubon, in the prologue, aſſures us, that Guevara's ‘ fiction ſucceded ſo well with him, that that book was ‘ in great reputation all over the whole world, and ‘ tranſlated into every language of Europe, as a moſt ‘ valuable treaſure.*’ This I take from Nicolas Antonio: he ſays, Vankelius's edition was made at Torgau in 1611; but he ſhould have added that this edition of the year 1611 is the third. I rather think that it came out at Leipſic than at Torgau; for the tranſlator oppoſes it to that of Torgau, which was the firſt (17), and which appeared in the year 1601. The ſecond came out in 1606. Guevara's epiſtles have been taanſlated into Italian and French. The Jeſuit Schottus very juſtly laughs at thoſe, who valued thoſe two books in France. ‘ Nam *Principum Horologium*, ſays he, *Pag.* 215. of his Bibliotheca Hiſpanica, ‘ ſeu de ‘ vita M. Aurelii Imperatoris, & Fauſtinæ Conjugis ‘ conficta ſunt, non ex hiſtoriis petita: ne quis erret, ‘ ut in Gallia, ubi cupide nimis in ſinu olim nobilium, ‘ manibuſque geſtatum fuiſſe memini; ut & *Epiſtolas* ‘ ejus nauci plenas & ineptiarum, *Aurearum* titulo ‘ tranſcribere non iidem dubitarunt (18): ſed quas illi ‘ legant, per me licet, quibus meliora non ſuppetunt, ‘ aut capere non poſſunt. —— *For the* Dial of Princes, ‘ *or the life of M. Aurelius the Emperor, and his wife* ‘ *Fauſtina, is a meer fiction, not borrowed from hiſtory:* ‘ *that no one may be deceived, as in France, where* ‘ *I remember it was too much in requeſt among the* ‘ *nobility; who made no ſcruple likewiſe of tranſlating* ‘ *the ſame author's nauſeous and trifling* Epiſtles *under* ‘ *the name of* Golden: *which thoſe may read, for me,* ‘ *who have nothing better, or know no better.*’ *And he ſays Pag.* 567. ‘ M Aurelii Antonini vita & Fauſtinæ ‘ ejuſdem Guevarræ, ridicula eſt & meræ nugæ, quam ‘ tamen Galli applauſu magno exceperunt, ſæpius verterunt, edideruntque, & nobiles plerique manibus geſtant: ſed quid mirum quibus Amadiſius Gallicus, ‘ Orlandus Furioſus, ceteraque ægrorum ſomnia perplacent, quæ, qui ſapiet, ne horas collocet male, ‘ fugiet. —— *The life of M. Aurelius Antoninus, and* ‘ *Fauſtina, by the ſame Guevara, is ridiculous, and meer* ‘ *trifling; which yet the French received with great* ‘ *applauſe, often tranſlated, and publiſhed; and which*

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Vankelius, Præfat. Verſionis Horolog. Principum, *not knowing that Guevara had thoſe two biſhoprics, knew not how to reconcile thoſe who call him biſhop of Guadix, with thoſe who call him biſhop of Mondonedo.*

(*d*) Qua dignitate aliquot annis peſta obiit. *Nicol. Anton. ubi ſuprà.* Moreri *therefore ſhould not have ſaid, that* Guevara *did not enjoy it long.*

(10) Nicol. Anton. ubi ſupra, pag. 99.

(11) Melchior Canus.

(12) Nicol. Anton. ibid.

(13) *For April* 1685, *Art.* 7. *pag.* 410, 411.

(14) Nicol Anton. ubi ſupra.

(15) Id. ibid.

(16) Id. ibid.

(17) Certa cum ſpe quanto hæc editio primæ illi TORGENSI quoad typos chartaſque eſt ſimilior, tanto etiam fore ad lectionem frequentiorem quam ſecunda fuit. *Vankelius, Epiſt. Dedicat.*

(18) Montagne's Eſſays, lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m 498.

give a catalogue of his writings [*G*]. I have ſomething to add to what I have ſaid of his *Dial of Princes* [*H*], and I will ſhew, that, if the French are to blame for having highly valued ſuch a book, the Spaniards, who have eſteemed it ſtill more, deſerve more to be laughed at.

‘*moſt of the nobility are very fond of: but what wonder, ſince the ſame perſons were pleaſed with Amadis of Gaul, Orlando Furioſo, and ſuch like ſick mens dreams; which a man of ſenſe will avoid, that he may not miſemploy his time.*’

[(§ α) There has been two French tranſlations of this book, publiſhed at about ſixty years diſtance: the firſt of Bernard de la Griſe, in 4to, in the Gothic letter, 1531, reprinted in 16mo, with a fine letter, by John de Tournes, Lyons 1550: the ſecond of Nicolas de Herberay, Sieur des Eſſars, reprinted ſeveral times. To theſe two different tranſlations, the laſt of which, by the by, is caſtrated of ſeveral chapters, alludes the *ſæpius verterunt* of the Jeſuit Schottus, Rem. Crit.]

[*G*] *I ſhall give a catalogue of his writings.*] I have mentioned the moſt famous, which is intituled in Spaniſh, *Relox de principes: ò Marco Aurelio.* It is thought the firſt edition is of the year 1529. It was followed by ſome others before the author publiſhed it himſelf. He complained, that it had been taken from him tho' imperſect, and made public without his knowledge. His letters were printed the firſt time in 1539; and ſince in ſeveral places, and at ſeveral times. His other works are, *Prologo ſolenne, en que el autor toca muchas hiſtorias. Una decada de las vidas de los X. Ceſares Emperadores Romanos deſde Trajano à Alexandro. Del menos precio de la Corte y alabanca de la Aldea. Aviſo de privados, y doctrina de Corteſanos* (19). *De los inventores del marear y de muchos trabaxos que ſe paſſan en las Galeras* (20). *Monte Calvario, ſive de myſteriis Dominicæ paſſionis ac de verbis Domini in Cruce pendentis* (21). *Oratorio de eligioſos y exercitio de virtuoſos.* He was about a hiſtory of Charles V, and it is ſaid, he ordered by his will, that the penſion of hiſtoriographer ſhould be reſtored (22) to that emperor, which he had received, for one year, wherein he had beſtowed no time upon that hiſtory (23).

[*H*] *I have ſomething to add to what I have ſaid of his Dial of Princes.*] He declares, that this work (24) was a tranſlation of the life of Marcus Aurelius, and that the original had been ſent to him from Florence (25). He confeſſes, that he had not confined himſelf to tranſlate it word for word, and that he had added many things to it. He begun *this work* in the year 1518, and finiſhed it in the year 1524: ‘and tho' during thoſe ſix years, *ſays he* (26), I kept my book ſecret, nevertheleſs it was divulged: for the emperor, being ill of an ague, ſent for it, to paſs away the time, and divert his diſtemper. Wherefore in obedience to his intention, I myſelf carried him Marcus Aurelius, without it's having been reviſed, corrected, or finiſhed, humbly beſeeching him, in recompence of my labour, that he would not ſuffer it to be tranſcribed, nor taken out of his royal apartment, otherwiſe his majeſty would do me a great prejudice, becauſe, in purſuing and finiſhing my undertaking, he would know, that my intention was not only to publiſh Marcus Aurelius, juſt as it was, but to add to it many ſentences worthy of recommendation: notwithſtanding this, it unfortunately happened, that the book was ſtolen, and afterwards copied by ſeveral hands, by which means it became every day more incorrect and faulty; for there was but one original to correct it by: it is true, ſome perſons brought me ſome copies, to reviſe and correct them; but, if they could ſpeak, they would complain more of thoſe, who have copied them, than I of the thieves, who ſtole them; and, what is worſe, about the time when my labour was near at an end, ready to diſperſe the fruit, Marcus Aurelius was printed at Sevil, and ſoon after in Portugal, and in the kingdom of Arragon, in ſuch a manner, that, if the firſt edition was bad, the others were more ſo.’ Judge from hence, whether the Spaniards deſerve leſs than the French the ralleries of Andrew Schottus (27). Perhaps, he knew not, that there were Frenchmen, who deſpiſed the epiſtles of Guevara, *of which*, ſays Montagne (28), *thoſe who call them golden make a judgment very different from what I do.* It muſt be owned, however, that they impoſed upon a great many Frenchmen, and that the Dial of Princes met with very good ſucceſs in France. It was printed there ſeveral times. I make uſe of an edition of Lyons, by Benoiſt Rigaud, 1592, in 12mo, and I ſee, in the title, that the work was *tranſlated out Caſtilian into French by R. B. de Griſe. Afterwards reviſed and corrected by N. de Herberay, lord des Eſſars, beyond the preceding editions.* The epiſtle dedicatory to cardinal de Givri is not ſigned. I there find, that the lord des Eſſars died whilſt he was tranſlating this work. ‘We have therefore, *continues he*, only the firſt book of his tranſlation, in which we ſtill find ſome looſe ſheets, in ſo poor a condition, that it is impoſſible to read them; for which reaſon the work has been continued from the old tranſlation, after having been corrected, from the Spaniſh copy, of an infinite number of faults, and altered as to certain phraſes, contrary to our language, which often obſcure the ſenſe of the author, and ſometimes are entirely repugnant to his meaning.’

The Italians likewiſe have more than once tranſlated this book. I have ſpoken of the verſion made by Mambrin Roſeo, and I add, that Fauſto da Longiano gave another, which was printed in the year 1546, in 8vo. He added ſome things to it, which were not in the Spaniſh original, and he replaced thoſe, which the other Italian tranſlation had retrenched from the ſame original. He lays open, in his preface, the liberty Guevara gave himſelf of advancing facts which were not true. His criticiſm is good and learned. He promiſed a life of M. Aurelius, compoſed from the teſtimony of the ancient hiſtorians, in order to ſet in compariſon with this, which the Spaniſh writer had forged. He repreſents himſelf as one, who applys himſelf to more ſerious ſtudies, in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, than ſuch as tranſlating a Spaniſh book into Italian, and he gives us hopes of his Latin works.

---

(19) *It was tranſlated into* French *with this title,* Reveillematin des Courtiſans, *by* Alexander Hardy, a Pariſian. *I make uſe of the ſecond edition printed at Paris in* 1623, *in* 8*vo.*

(20) Du Pinet *tranſlated it into French.*

(21) Wadding *has made two books of one: He thought that the book* De verbis Domini in cruce, *was different from* Monte Calvario. Nicol. Anton. ibid.

(22) Ægidius Gonzales Davila *affirms this, ſpeaking of the biſhop of* Mondonedo *in his* Thatr. Eccleſiaſticum, apud Nicol. Anton. pag. 100.

(23) Ex Nicol. Anton. ubi ſupra, pag. 99.

(24) Guevara, *in the* Prologue of the Dial of Princes.

(25) He had juſt been ſaying, that ten books of the emperor Auguſtus, intituled, *Of the Cantabric War*, had been ſent to him from Cologne. Thus he advances two impoſtures.

(26) Preface to the Dial of Princes.

(27) Produced in Remark [*F*].

(28) Eſſays, *book I, chap. XLVIII, pag. m.* 498.

GUICCIARDIN (Francis), deſcended from one of the moſt noble and ancient families of Florence, and author of an hiſtory very much eſteemed [*A*], and of ſome other works (*a*), was born in that town the ſixth of March 1482. He was profeſſor

[*A*] *He is author of an hiſtory very much eſteemed.*] It contains, in twenty books, the tranſactions in Italy, from the year 1494, to the year 1532. I confine it within theſe bounds (1), becauſe the author of his life will have it ſo; but I muſt obſerve, that the hiſtorian goes back as far as the ſtate that Italy was in, in the year 1490, and ends with the death of Clement VII, and the election of Paul III (2). It is true, he is very ſhort in his account of what paſſed in the laſt years of Clement VII, eſpecially from the year 1530. This hiſtory has been tranſlated out of Italian into ſeveral languages. Cælius Secundus Curio publiſhed it in Latin, at Baſil, in 1566. One Jerome Chomedey, a Pariſian, publiſhed it in French at Paris in 1568. The Engliſh have it in their own language, as appears from the catalogue of the Bodleian library. The Spaniards, the Germans, and the Dutch, have alſo tranſlated it into theirs (3). The beſt Italian edition is that, which is illuſtrated with the marginal notes of Thomas Porcacchi. The firſt edition of that nature is of Venice in 1573 (4). This hiſtory did not appear till after Guicciardin's death; and it was Agnolo Guicciardin his nephew, who publiſhed it. The Proteſtants took care to preſerve the fragments, that were left out, becauſe the court of Rome did not like them. They publiſhed them by themſelves at

---

(*a*) See Remark [*H*].

(1) Bullart, Academ. des Sciences, Tom. *I*, pag. 151, *ſays, it begins with the entrance of the French into Italy in the year* 1490, *and ends with the pontificate of Paul III, in* 1535. *The French entered not into Italy before the year* 1494.

(2) *Made the* 13*th of Oct.* 1534.

(3) Bullart, ibid.

(4) Poſſevin. Bibl. Select. *Tom. II, lib. xvi, cap. xli, pag.* 337.

feſſor of the civil-law, being twenty three years of age; but he rather choſe to follow the law, than to teach it, as he had done before. He became a very famous advocate, inſomuch that he was thought fit to be employed in ſtate-affairs. He was ſent embaſſador to the court of Ferdinand, king of Arragon, in January 1512. His embaſſy laſted two years, and proved very glorious to him; for, at his return to Florence, he met with a kind reception, and was very well approved. Some time after, he entered into the ſervice of Leo X, who made him governour of Modena and Reggio. He defended Parma with great ſucceſs, after the death of that Pope, and continued in the ſame governments under Hadrian VI, and Clement VII. Beſides, he was made governour of Romagna, under Clement VII, and lieutenant of the army, and ſhewed, that he was as great a captain, as a good negotiator. He was governour of Bologna, when that Pope died, and took care that the enemies, he had gained by an exact obſervation of juſtice, ſhould not take advantage of the *Interregnum*, to his prejudice. The new Pope beſtowed that government upon another; whereupon Guicciardin returned to Florence, where he ſettled, till he died. He did great ſervices to the houſe of Medicis, and would not accept the offers of Paul III, who deſired to take him into his ſervice. He had a wife, but no ſons, and therefore he conſidered, that he could not be preferred to eccleſiaſtical benefices, nor procure any to his ſons: beſides, being afraid that he could not ſerve the Pope, without diſobliging ſometimes the duke of Florence, he rather choſe to live a quiet life in his country-houſe, and to ſpend his time in writing the hiſtory he had undertaken. He was advanced very far in it, when he died of a malignant fever, in May 1540, being fifty five years of age. He deſired to be buried without pomp, and without an epitaph or funeral oration (*b*). His hiſtory of Italy is very good. Many look upon him as an impartial hiſtorian, who flatters no body, and blames only what is to be blamed; but ſome are of opinion, that he ſhews too great a partiality againſt France [*B*], or that

he

(*b*) Taken from his Life, written by Father *Remi de Florence.* Prefixed to his Hiſtory of Italy.

ſeveral times (5). Heidegger, laſt of all, inſerted, in his *Hiſtoria Papatus* (6), the fragment of the fourth book. Varillas affirms, that Guicciardin's heirs *preſumed to publiſh, againſt his intention,* the four laſt books *in the third edition.* I ſhall enquire into the truth of it hereafter (7). Note, that Sanſovino publiſhed an epitome of that hiſtory, and that Guicciardin deſigned, in imitation of Cæſar, to write ſome memoirs concerning the actions of his life; but James Nardi, whom he conſulted about it, made him reſolve to undertake a nobler work, *viz.* a hiſtory of his own times. He took him to be a man well qualified for ſuch an undertaking, knowing, that neither fear nor hope would hinder him from diſcharging the duties of a faithful hiſtorian. Beſides, had he confined himſelf to the hiſtory of his own life, he might have expoſed himſelf to the envy of the Florentines. *Fu da lui diſſuaſo, & eſſortato a ſcriver l'Hiſtoria de ſuoi tempi, ſi perche lo conoſceva d'ingegno, atto a condurre un' impreſa coſi fatta à perfettione; e perche anche ſapeva molto bene, ch'egli era per deſcriver la pura verità, ſenza riſpetto di paura, ò ſperanza di premio, delle quali due corruttele par che ſieno ſtati ne' tempi paſſati, e ſieno ancor hoggi corrotti quaſi tutti gli Scrittori; ſi ancora perche fuggiſſe l'invidia de' ſuoi Cittadini, e'l biaſimo univerſale de l'haver voluto celebrare ſolamente ſe ſteſſo* (8).

[*B*] *Some think, that he ſhews too great a partiality againſt France.*] I ſhall ſet down a long paſſage of Claudius du Verdier (9). ‘ Guicciardinus tam frigide invituſque Gallorum victorias & gloriam narrat, ‘ quam accuratè lubenſque, adverſa quæque, quantumvis minima, à fortunæ potentiſſimo belli numine ‘ ejaculata: quemadmodum ſarcinarum in alicujus fluminis trajectione ſubmerſionem perſequitur, atque dilatat. Dum videt Carolo VIII totam Italiam ab ‘ Alpibus ad Neapolim nemine penitus obſiſtente occupanti, victoriam abſque ſuſpicione falſi adimi non ‘ poſſe, in Gallorum quorundam militum internecione ‘ paucorumque, quâ ſine victoria obtineri non potuit, ‘ totus eſt, magnam eam appellans ſtragem; Carolo ‘ tamen agri dominium ſuperſtitiſſe diffiteri non auſus ‘ eſt. Sed quæ de victoribus ſtrages fieri potuit? Si ‘ de ſuis ſermonem inſtituit, eis ſemper plus meritis ‘ attribuit, & regionis laudes magis, quàm ſuæ gentis ‘ res geſtas perſequitur, unde maxima laus ducenda ‘ eſt. —— *Guicciardin relates as coldly, and as much ‘ againſt his will, the victories and glory of the French, ‘ as he does accurately, and readily, every the leaſt ‘ unfortunate event, ſuch as the loſs of baggage in paſſing a river, on which he deſcants at large. Whilſt ‘ he ſees, that he cannot, without ſuſpicion of falſehood, ‘ deny the ſucceſs of Charles VIII in conquering all ‘ Italy, from the Alps to Naples, without any reſiſtance, ‘ he dwells wholly on the putting to death of a few ‘ French ſoldiers, without which the victory could not ‘ have been obtained, calling it a great ſlaughter; at ‘ the ſame time not daring to deny, that Charles remained maſter of the field. But what ſlaughter could ‘ be made of conquerors? But, when he is to ſpeak ‘ of his own party, he ever attributes more to them than ‘ they deſerve, and rather expatiates in praiſe of the ‘ country, than relates the actions of his own countrymen, whence the greateſt praiſe is to be fetched.*’ If this cenſure be well grounded, Guicciardin made himſelf ridiculous, and as our gazetteers do. They afford ſport every day; for, to give an inſtance of it, when the French are encamped beyond the Rhine, the gazetteer of the contrary party ſpeaks of nothing but of their parties beaten, of the priſoners made upon them, and of their deſerters. The Paris gazette ſays nothing of all this; but then the French gazetteer enlarges upon the loſſes of the allies, and the contributions they are forced to pay. When the Germans march into the territories of France, as they did in the autumn of the year 1694, the French gazetteer does not forget to take notice of their parties that are defeated, or obliged to ſurrender: he ſpeaks of nothing elſe. On the contrary, the gazetteer of the allies, forgetting all thoſe things, keeps a very exact account of all the villages plundered by the the Germans, of all the magazines burnt, of all the French parties beaten, &c. There are a thouſand unlucky reaſons for uſing ſuch a method in thoſe daily writings (10); but an hiſtorian, who does the ſame, is wholly inexcuſable. He ought to relate the loſſes and advantages of his party with the ſame exactneſs. Is there any that does it?

AN OBSERVATION upon Gazettes.

La Popeliniere is one of thoſe, who tax Guicciardin with too great a partiality againſt France. ‘ He ‘ is a free and ſincere writer, *ſays he* (11), exempt ‘ from paſſion, but not from hatred, which he could ‘ not conceal againſt the French, the duke of Urbino, and others . . . . nay, he could not forbear reſenting the injury, which the Italians continually ‘ complain, in their words and writings, to have received from the French, when they diſturbed the ‘ lòng and profound repoſe of Italy under the reign ‘ of Charles VIII. . . . . though it be an improper ‘ ſubject for Guicciardin and moſt Italian authors to ‘ ſhew their animoſity: and I cannot apprehend upon ‘ what grounds he ſays, that that king was a man of a ‘ monſtrous ſhape.’ La Popeliniere confutes this with many tedious words: he ſhould have been contented with the following paſſage. ‘ If king Charles had ‘ been ſuch a man, or any thing like it, let any body ‘ judge, whether the other Italians, as great enemies ‘ to the French as Guicciardin, (who has only men-

‘ tioned

---

(5) *They publiſhed two (one taken from the third book, and the other from the 4th) at Baſil, in Latin, Italian, and French, in the year* 1569, *in* 8*vo, and with ſome other pieces in the year* 1602, *without naming the place of the impreſſion, in* 8*vo, and at Francfort in* 4*to,* 1609. *See Remark* [*Q*] *of of the article JULIUS II.*

(6) *Printed at Amſterdam in* 1684. *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres *for May* 1684, *pag.* 316, *of the* 2*d edition.*

(7) *In the Remark* [*H*].

(8) *The author of Guicciardin's Life.*

(9) Claud. Verderius, in Cenſione Autorum, apud Pope Blount, pag. m. 390.

(10) *See the* Critique Générale de l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſme, *Lett. II, pag.* 27 *of the* 3*d edition.*

(11) La Popeliniere, Hiſtoire des Hiſtoires, livr. vii. pag. 406.

he dwells too much upon inconſiderable things [*C*], or that he has inſerted too many prolix harangues [*D*], or that he is too apt to aſcribe actions to bad motives [*E*]. Cardinal Palavicini is not favourable to him: I will mention what he ſays of him [*F*]. As for Guicciardin's ſtyle, his moſt unjuſt cenſurers acknowledge, that it is very pure and exact; but they make a great difference between the firſt books, and the following, becauſe they ſuppoſe, that the firſt five books were corrected by an able hand (*c*). Father Poſſevin blames him for aſcribing to fate and fortune the ſucceſs of wars, and the revolutions of ſtates: he is willing to believe, that it does not proceed from an error of his mind, and that it is only an effect of cuſtom; but he fancies

(*c*) Cui etiam illi qui eidem ſunt iniquiſſimi in primis quinque libris, quos eruditi cujuſquam viri lima perpolitos fuiſſe contendunt, omnem Florentini ſermonis elegantiam concinnitatemque concedunt: in ceteris libris non item, quos nullius cenſuræ, ut priores quinque ſubjecerat. *Nic. Eryth. Pinac. III, pag.* 220.

'tioned the virtues he could not deny, without being 'taxed with lying) would not have ſtuffed their writings with it before and after him: but no man 'among chriſtian nations did ever reflect upon that 'king in his life-time (12).' Not to refer it to another time, I ſhall mention the other faults, for which that writer blames Guicciardin. They are the ſame that have been obſerved by others, as it will appear by the following remarks. 'I do not find, *ſays he* '(13), any thing in him, for which he ought to be 'more valued than others, except his great freedom 'of ſpeaking of great men, and his care to inquire 'into the cauſes and motives of ſeveral actions. But 'he is ſo prolix, and ſo full of harangues, and inconſiderable things not worth mentioning, that, if ſome 'author had gone before him in boldly laying open 'the faults of eminent men, he would not have been 'much eſteemed. But it is well known how much 'the minds of men are affected with a remarkable 'novelty: and yet he has done himſelf a great deal 'of injury by not keeping within due bounds, and by 'preferring the regard he had for his country, to the 'duty of an hiſtorian, and even of a Chriſtian, and a 'man of honour, to whom ſuch things ought to be 'indifferent.'

[*C*] . . . . *or that he dwells too much upon inconſiderable things.*] It is Lipſius's opinion (14). 'Vitia duo propria hujus ævi non effugit, quod & juſto 'longior eſt, & quod minutiſſima quæque narret, parum ex lege aut dignitate hiſtoriæ, quæ, ut Ammianus, lib. 26. ait *Diſcurrere per negotiorum celſitudines aſſueta, non humilium minutias indagare cauſarum.* —— *He did not eſcape the two faults peculiar 'to this age: I mean, that he is too prolix, and too 'particular, contrary to the law and dignity of hiſtory, which, as Ammianus, book* 26, *ſays*, is wont to 'dwell on the ſummit of affairs, not to deſcend into a minute recital of every little ſpring of 'action.'

[*D*] . . . *or that he has inſerted too many prolix harangues.*] Beſides what you will ſee in the paſſage out of Montagne in the following remark, here are Lipſius's words (15). 'Sed non orationes ejus ſatis 'vegetæ mihi aut caſtigatæ, languent ſæpe aut ſolutè 'vagantur. Denique, uno verbo, inter noſtros ſummus eſt hiſtoricus: inter veteres, mediocris. —— '*But his harangues appear to me to be incorrect, 'and ſometimes ſpiritleſs and tedious: In a word, among the moderns, he is one of the beſt hiſtorians; 'among the ancients, but indifferent.*'

[*E*] . . . . . *or that he is too apt to aſcribe actions to bad motives.*] It is Montagne's opinion, who aſſumes a ſpirit of charity for mankind in that reſpect. Many others will not believe, that Guicciardin deſerves to be cenſured upon that account: but let us ſee what Montagne ſays, both upon what concerns the text of this remark, and in general about the character of that famous hiſtorian. 'It is not at all likely, that 'he has miſrepreſented things out of hatred, love, or 'vanity; and one may be convinced of it by the judgment he freely paſſes upon great men, and eſpecially 'upon thoſe, by whom he had been raiſed and employed, as Pope Clement VII. As for that part of 'his hiſtory, of which he ſeems to be moſt proud, '*viz.* his digreſſions and diſcourſes; ſome of them 'are very good, and adorned with fine ſtrokes; but 'he is too fond of them. For, being willing to omit 'nothing, and having a very full, and, as it were, 'an infinite ſubject, he grows weak by it, and his 'hiſtory ſavours of ſcholaſtic prattling. I have alſo 'obſerved, that, among ſo many events and counſels, 'about which he gives his judgment, he never aſcribes 'any to virtue, religion, and conſcience, as if thoſe 'things were wholly baniſhed from the world: and 'he imputes all actions, tho' they appear never ſo fine, 'to a vicious principle, or ſelf-intereſt. It is impoſſible 'to believe, that, among ſuch a vaſt number of actions, none ſhould have been produced by a reaſonable motive. Men can never be ſo generally 'corrupt, but ſome will avoid the contagion: 'which makes me afraid, that Guicciardin had a 'vicious taſte, and perhaps he judged of others by 'himſelf (16).'

[*F*] *I will mention what cardinal Palavicini ſays of him*] Firſt, he taxes him with three falſities, and then judges of him in general. The firſt falſity concerns Hadrian VI. The cardinal pretends, that Guicciardin ſhould not have ſaid *, that, on the day of that Pope's election, no cardinal intended to raiſe him to the pontificate; and that thoſe, who voted for him in the ſcrutiny, deſigned only to ſpend the time that morning (17). I omit the reaſons alledged by the cardinal againſt it. The ſecond falſity concerns the elector of Saxony. Palavicini maintains, that it is not true, that Leo X publiſhed a threatning monitory againſt that prince, which did very much exaſperate him. *Due altre abbagli piu rilevanti prende egli nelle principal noſtra materia. Il primo è l'affermar che Leone ſpediſſe contra l'Elettor di Saſſonia un monitorio con minacce di gravi pene, e pero con irritazion di quel Principe. Il che è un vano ſogno contrario à quanto ſi leggi nelle memorie pieniſſime di que' ſucceſſi* (18). The third falſity concerns Luther, who, according to Guicciardin, was ſo frighted when he was put to the ban of the empire, that he would willingly have renounced his errors, had not cardinal Cajetan caſt him into deſpair by his threatnings and injurious words, and had he made him honourable offers. Palavicini maintains, that cardinal Cajetan returned to Rome twenty months before Luther was put to the ban †, and that he ſpoke to him very kindly. *E pur è certo che il Cardinal di Gaeta non parlò con Lutero nè allora, nè dipoi, nè per gran tempo addietro; eſſendo tornato in Roma venti meſi prima del Bando: E quando gli parlò, gli offerſe benignamante il perdono, ſecondo che Lutero ſteſſo racconta: E la medeſima eſibizione gli fù più volte fatta in Vormazia nella Dieta, come teſtificò Ceſare nel ſuo Bando* (19). Whereupon Palavicini ſays, that Guicciardin had but a confuſed notion of things, that did not directly belong to his ſubject, and was more inclined to believe ill than good, in order to ſatisfy his ſlandering humour. He adds ſomething to make one ſuſpect his ſlanders againſt the court of Rome. Theſe are his words (20): 'Dal che m'auveggo, che quell' 'Iſtorico, di ciò che non apparteneva al ſuo principal argomento, preſe notizie molto confuſe: e fû 'anche ſempre inclinato à credere le peggiori, come 'appare nella ſua ſpeſſa maledicenza di ciaſcheduno; 'la quale appreſſo alla vulgare malignità gli hà guadagnata eſtimazion di veridico. Mà contro à Pontefici fù anche più ſpecialmente amaro, così per 'quell' uſato rancore che i miniſtri di lungo ſervigio 'concepiſcono contra i padroni da cui non ottennero 'le mercedi ſperate; come forſe perch'egli riconoſceva da loro la perdita della libertà nella ſua Repubblica. —— *This hiſtorian has a very confuſed notion 'of what does not immediately belong to his principal ſubject. Beſides, he was inclined to believe the 'worſt, as appears from his frequent ſlandering of 'every one; which with the vulgar gained him the 'reputation of ſpeaking the truth. But he was eſpecially bitter againſt the Popes, through that uſual 'diſguſt, which thoſe, who have long ſerved, conceive 'againſt their patrons, from whom they do not obtain 'the expected reward; becauſe, perhaps, they impute 'to them the loſs of liberty in their republic.*

[*G*] *It*

(12) Ibid. pag. 410.

(13) Ibid. pag. 412.

(15) Lipſius, in Notis ad I Lib. Politic. cap. ix.

(15) Id. ibid.

(16) Montagne's *Eſſays, book II, chap. x, pag. m.* 153, 154.

* Nel Libro *XIV*.

(17) Quaſi le prime voci date nello Squittinio al Cardinal Adriano foſſero non perche veruno haveſſe intenzione d'eleggerlo, ma per conſumare indarno quella matina. *Palavic. Iſtor. del Concilio, Lib. II, Cap. II, num.* 7, *ad ann.* 1521.

(18) Palavic. ib. num. 8.

† A 5 di Settembre 1519, come ne gli Atti conſiſtoriali. *Id. ibid.*

(19) Id. ibid.

(20) Id. ibid.

fancies that ſuch a thing ſpoils the readers (*d*). It does not clearly appear, whether he is more inclined to cenſure him, than to commend him [*G*]. Varillas charges him with calumny in what he ſays about Francis the firſt's intelligence with Soliman: I ſhall examine what that French hiſtorian obſerves upon it [*H*]. I ſhall likewiſe take notice of Bonifacio Vannozzi's a little too devout complaints [*I*], and ſhall not forget that the Venetians complain of a Speech, which Guicciardin aſcribes to the embaſſador, whom

(*d*) Poſſevin. Biblioth. Select. Tom. II, lib. xvi, cap. xli, pag. 337.

[*G*] *It is not eaſy to know whether he is more inclined to cenſure, than commend him.*] He (21) ſays, Guicciardin was a man of great judgment and experience in public affairs: he mentions the good opinion Thomas Porcacchi had of his hiſtory (22); but he ſays alſo, that John Baptiſt Leone publiſhed (23) five books of conſiderations upon that work, to ſhew the falſities and partiality of the author. That book, ſays he, is in every body's hands, and therefore I need not dwell upon it. For the reſt, he informs us, that Clement VIII had lately cauſed the Latin tranſlation of Guicciardin, made by the heretic Cælius Velcurio, to be put into the index (24). He pretends, that the true reaſon of it was, becauſe the tranſlator had not rightly explained the original (25); but ſuch a reaſon ought not to be minded, as we ſhall ſee hereafter from what Vannozzi ſays. Had Poſſevin intended to inſpire his readers with a great eſteem for Guicciardin's hiſtory, he would have been as careful to mention Remigius, as John Baptiſt Leone. This Remigius, a Florentine monk, is the author of a book printed at Venice in 1582, with this title, *Conſiderationi civili ſopra l'Hiſtorie di M. Fr. Guicciardini, e d'altri hiſtorici.*

[*H*] *I ſhall examine what Mr Varillas obſerves upon it.*] He affirms (26), that Francis I, and Henry VIII engaged, in 1532, ‘to defend, without any exception, any ſtate of Chriſtendom attacked by the Turks .... The original of that agreement, *adds he* (27), is ſtill to be found in the Chamber of Accompts at Paris; and Guicciardin muſt needs have known nothing of it, ſince he poſitively ſays, as moſt foreign hiſtorians do, upon his credit, that the moſt Chriſtian king ſollicited Soliman at the ſame time to make an end of the conqueſt of Hungary, and offerred to join his forces with thoſe of the Turks, in order to attack the houſe of Auſtria. This is ſo groſs a calumny, that Jovius, who wrote his hiſtory at the ſame time with Guicciardin, and in Italy as well as he, was ſenſible of it. But Guicciardin will be found more excuſable, if it be conſidered, that he inſerted this calumny only in the latter part of his work; and that the four laſt books of that author are neither ſo good, nor ſo authentic, as the ſixteen that go before; that they are imperfect in many places; that the author did not think they deſerved to be printed; and that they were publiſhed only after his death, when his heirs preſumed to publiſh them againſt his intention in the third edition.’ This account does not ſeem to me to be exact: I do not find, that Guicciardin ſays more than this, *viz.* that, in 1531, Francis I kept correſpondence with the German princes, diſſatiſfied with the emperor, and with the Pope, and Soliman (28); and that, in 1532, the ſame prince and Henry VIII, projected to attack the Milaneze, becauſe they thought Soliman would be all the winter in Hungary (29). Beſides, I do not find, that Jovius confutes what Varillas aſcribes to Guicciardin. He only mentions as a report, the truth of which he will not warrant, that Soliman came into Hungary in the year 1532, at the ſollicitation of the king of France, and of the king of Poland (30). Varillas expreſſes himſelf, as if he believed, that the firſt ſixteen books of Guicciardin's hiſtory were printed during the author's life, which is not true. They were publiſhed in the year 1561, by his nephews. The epiſtle dedicatory to Coſmo de Medicis, duke of Florence, is ſubſcribed Agnolo Guicciardini. The editors promiſe to publiſh the four laſt books, though they are ſenſible of their imperfection (31). Thoſe four books are not in the edition of Venice, 1565, in 4to, *appreſſo Nicolo Bevilaqua.* It was corrected and enlarged with ſummaries and marginal notes by Father Remigio, a Florentine. Neither are they in the edition, which the ſame Bevilaqua put out in the year 1568, in 4to. And therefore Varillas ſhould not have ſaid that they were inſerted in the third edition. They were printed by themſelves at Venice, *appreſſo Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari,* in the year 1564, in 4to. I have that edition. The nephews of the author dedicated it to the ſame Coſmo de Medicis, duke of Florence, to whom they had dedicated the ſixteen books. Agnolo Guicciardini ſigned for them all the epiſtle dedicatory dated from Florence the twentieth of July, 1564. The Pope, the doge of Venice, and the duke of Florence, granted licences to Giolito the bookſeller, which were prefixed to that work. And doubtleſs this was the reaſon why the bookſeller, Bevilaqua, did not inſert thoſe four books in the edition of the firſt ſixteen.

Theſe ſame four laſt books were printed at Parma *appreſſo Seth Viotti* in the year 1567, in 4to, *con l'aggiunta de' Sommarii à ciaſcun Libro, & di molte Annotationi in margine delle coſe piu notabili,* DI MARCO PAPIRIO PICEDI.

[*I*] *I will mention the devout complaints of Bonifacio Vannozzi.*] His hiſtory, ſays he (32), is more acceptable to private perſons than to princes; for he ſpeaks of the latter without any reſerve, and reflects ſo much upon the Pope, that his book tranſlated into Latin has been greedily read in heretical countries. From whence it appears, continues he, that the Italian writers may do a great deal of prejudice to the Papacy. Vannozzi pretends, they ought not to diſcover their mother's nakedneſs; and that, if they publiſh a diſgraceful truth, they offend againſt charity; and if they publiſh falſities, they offend againſt juſtice. This is in general the meaning of what he ſays; but I ſhall ſet down his own words, for the ſatisfaction of thoſe, who may be deſirous to know more particularly how he expreſſes himſelf. ‘Si che vegga un pò chi ſcrive, con quanta facilità egli poſſa pregiudicare alla Chieſa Romana; alla Sedia Apoſtolica, & al Sommo Pontefice: & che le penne de gl' Italiani, profeſſanti il Chriſtiano, ò ſcoprano le noſtre vergogne, ſe dicono il vero, che è contro alla carità, dovuta al proſſimo; ò calunniando per odio, ò per altra paſſione, chi merita eſſer onorato; facciano da maligno, & da triſto (33).’ He owns, that Guicciardin's hiſtory does not give ſo great a ſcandal, ſince it has been corrected; but he maintains, that the Latin tranſlation made from the firſt original (34) may offend the devil himſelf. ‘Ma la fatta Latina, cavata dal primo originale, & piena di maledicenze contro à Papi, & altri Eccleſiaſtici, può ſcandalizare il Diavolo ſteſſo; parlo di quel ch'io sò di propria ſcienza, & come ſi dice di veduta. Et un moderno Scrittore, parlando di queſta Storia, dice così per l'appunto. Il Guicciardini hà potuto per ſe ſteſſo, acquiſtar tanto d'autorità all' Iſtoria ſua, che molte indegnità, molti errori, & molte bugie, ch'ella contiene, ſono ſtate non ſolo ſopportate dal Mondo; ma approbate da molti, per eſempi, & per dogmi del vero, & perfetto viver civile. Et laſciando il reſto, ſi legge pur in eſſo, un'aperta, & faſtidioſa irreverenza, dice il medeſimo moderno Scrittore, verſo gli ſteſſi Vicari di Chriſto, con grande indegnità della Sedia Apoſtolica, & non potendoſi accuſarlo d'ignoranza, biſogna neceſſariamente confeſſarlo, per troppo appaſſionato, & commiſerare più toſto, che biaſmare una così bella, ma così difettoſa, fatica (35). —— *But the Latin tranſlation, made from the firſt original, and full of calumnies againſt the Popes, and other eccleſiaſtics, may ſcandalize the devil himſelf; I ſpeak by experience, and, as it were, by ſight. And a modern writer, ſpeaking of this hiſtory, expreſſes himſelf thus: Guicciardin ſo eſtabliſhed the credit of his hiſtory, that the many meanneſſes, the many errors, and the many lies, which it contains, have been not only born with in the world, but approved by many, as examples of true and perfect civil life. And omitting the reſt, let any one read only the bare-faced and contemptuous irreverence in him (ſays the ſame modern writer) towards the very vicars of CHRIST, and as he cannot be accuſed of ignorance, we muſt confeſs, that he is too paſſionate an author, and pity, rather than blame, ſo fine, but defective, a work.*’ This long paſſage is not needleſs in this place, ſince it belongs to the hiſtory of the ſeveral judgments paſſed upon Guicciardin.

(21) Poſſevin. Biblioth. Select. Tom. II, lib. xvi, cap. xiv, pag. 336.

(22) Id. ibid. pag. 337.

(23) At Venice, in 1583. That work is in Italian.

(24) It ſhould be Curio.

(25) Haud omnino recte converſa eſt. *Poſſevin, ubi ſupra.*

(26) Varillas, Hiſt. de François I, livr. vii, pag. 220.

(27) Id. ibid. pag. 221.

(28) Guicciardin, lib. xx, fol. m. 107.

(29) Id. ibid fol. 108.

(30) Paul. Jov. Hiſtor. lib. xxx, fol. m. 187, verſo.

(31) Laſciando queſta opera imperfetta & quattro altri ultimi libri d'eſſa piu preſto abbozzati che finiti, i quali per tale cagione non ſi mandano fuori al preſente.

(32) Vannozzi, de gli Auvertimenti Politici, Tom. II, pag. 367.

(33) Id. ibid.

(34) Obſerve this againſt Poſſevin.

(35) Vannozzi, ubi ſupra.

whom they ſent to the imperial court [*K*]. Beſides this, he wrote ſome other books [*L*]. **LEWIS GUICCIARDIN** his nephew ſignalized himſelf in the common-wealth of learning [*M*].

[*K*] *The Venetians complained of a ſpeech, which Guicciardin aſcribes to their embaſſador.*] Nothing can be more humble than that ſpeech. That hiſtorian ſuppoſes it was made by Antonio Juſtiniani to the emperor Maximilian, in the year 1509. *Per ottener da lui con qualunque conditione la pace gli mandarono cón ſomma celerità Ambaſciatore Antonio Giuſtiniano: il quale ammeſſo in publica audientia al coſpetto di Ceſare; parlò miſerabilmente è con grandiſſima ſommiſſione* (36). Not contented with this general notion of the too great humility of the Venetians; he adds, that it is not improper to ſet down the whole ſpeech, that the reader may ſee how great was their conſternation. Accordingly he ſets down the whole diſcourſe of the embaſſador, without any alteration; only he tranſlates it out of Latin into Italian. *Non mi pare alieno dal noſtro propoſito, accioche meglio s'intenda in quanta conſternatione d'animo fuſſe ridotta quella Repub. la quale già più di dugento anni, non haveva ſentito averſità pari a queſta, inſerire la propria oratione havuta da lui innanzi a Ceſare, transferendo ſolamente le parole Latine in voci volgari, lequali furono in queſto tenore* (37). The Venetians maintain, that it is a chimerical ſpeech, and, in order to prove it, they ſay, that Francis Capello (38), whom they ſent to the emperor, after they had retaken Padua, could not ſo much as obtain leave to go into the territories of that prince; and that Lewis Mocenigo and Antony Juſtiniani, whom they ſent to him ſome time after, were neither admitted, nor heard, no more than Francis Capello. What is certain, is, that thoſe embaſſadors were ordered to make very advantageous offers to his imperial majeſty. The hiſtorian of Venice, whom I have quoted, does not deny it. Peter Bembo, another Venetian hiſtorian, confeſſes it ſtill more expreſsly. 'Latum, *ſays he* (39), 'ut Antonius Juſtinianus .... ad Maximilianum recta 'contenderet; & cum illo, ſi poſſet, pacem quantumvis duris conditionibus faceret: Tergeſtéque oppidum, '& Portum Naonis, reliquaque municipia, quæ reſp. 'ex ejus ditione ſuperiore anno ceperat, Senatum ei 'paratum eſſe reſtituere: ac quæ oppida ex Romanorum imperatorum ditione in Carnis, & Gallia, & Venetia reſp. poſſideret, ea ſe omnia illi tanquam accepta relaturum nuntiaret. —— *It was decreed, that 'Antony Juſtiniani .... ſhould go directly to Maximilian, and make peace with him, if poſſible, upon any 'conditions, how hard ſoever; and inform him that the 'ſenate was ready to reſtore the city of Tergeſte, the 'harbour of Naon, and the other towns, which the republic had taken from him the year before, and to deliver up to him the imperial towns, which ſhe poſſeſſed 'in Carinthia, France, and the territories of Venice.*' Take notice, that he affirms, that Antonio Juſtiniani was ſent to the emperor, as ſoon as the Venetians heard of the victory obtained by the French. Perhaps Guicciardin ſaw a copy of the ſpeech, which Juſtiniani had prepared. This cannot juſtify him; for if it be true, that the embaſſador had no audience, his copy could not be produced as a diſcourſe actually made before the emperor. The hiſtorians were very bold as to the ſpeeches mentioned by them; they forged them, and yet they would have the world to believe, that they had been actually delivered. Read, in Jovius, the ſpeech ſpoken by the embaſſador of the duke of Milan to Charles VIII, to perſuade him to make an expedition into Italy: read it alſo in Guicciardin, and you will find that thoſe two pieces are not alike (40). The diſcourſe, which the doge Loredano made to the ſenate, in order to ſend 200 noble Venetians to the defence of Padua, is mentioned by Guicciardin quite otherwiſe than it is by Mocenigo and Juſtiniani, hiſtorians of Venice (41).

[*L*] *Guicciardin wrote ſome other books.*] I reduce them to two; one of which is intituled, *Conſigli aurei*, and the other, *Auvertimenti Politici*. Ghilini mentions only thoſe two books (42). There are ſome other books aſcribed to Guicciardin in the catalogue of the Bodleian library, *viz. Piu Conſigli e Auvertimenti in materia di re publica e di privata*, printed at Paris in 1576, in 4to. *I Precetti e Sententie in materia di Stato*, printed at Antwerp in 1585, in 4to. *Auvertimenti Politici*, printed at Venice in 1583, in 4to. *Hypomneſes Poëticæ*. Theſe are the titles we find in the Bodleian catalogue, without being told they are only different editions of the ſame books. The bookſellers occaſion this confuſion by the liberty they take to put different titles to one and the ſame book. Some will be apt to think, that Guiccardin publiſhed the rules of poetry, becauſe the catalogue of the Bodleian library aſcribes to him *Hypomneſes Poëticæ*. But it is a fault of impreſſion; it ſhould be *Hypomneſes Politicæ*; for ſo the Latin tranſlator of Guicciardin's *Auvertimenti Politici* intituled his tranſlation. Theſe works of Guicciardin, tranſlated into French by Charles de Chantecler (43), were printed at Paris in 1577, in 8vo, with this title, *Pluſieurs Advis & Conſeils tant pour les affaires d'eſtat que privez*. There is a great miſtake in the catalogue of Thuanus's library. Two books, written by Lewis Guicciardin, are aſcribed there (44) to Francis Guicciardin his uncle; one of them is intituled, *Raccolta de i detti & fatti notabili coſi gravi come piacevoli*; and the other, *Hore di Ricreationi*. That miſtake implies an abſurdity; for Guicciardin the uncle was ſo far from being a facetious man, that he never uſed any jeſt. He was extremely grave and ſevere. 'Fuit indignationi proclivior, oriſque ductu licet ſuavi, 'tamen ſevero & gravi genioque ſupra modum ſalſæ 'urbanitatis dicteriis repugnante, quorum nullum in 'tota vita ipſi unquam excidiſſe perhibent quidam '(45).' An Italian hiſtory, *Urbis Haliæ*, is aſcribed to him in the epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheque*.

[*M*] *LEWIS GUICCIARDIN his nephew ſignalized himſelf in the common-wealth of learning.*] Beſides the two books I have juſt now mentioned, he publiſhed *Commentarii delle coſe più memorabili ſeguite in Europa, ſpecialmente in queſti Paeſi baſſi dalla pace di Cambrai del M. D. XXIX inſino a tutto l'Anno M. D. L.* I have the edition printed at Venice, *appreſſo Domenico Farri* 1566 *in 4to*. The author dedicates that book to the grand duke of Florence: his epiſtle dedicatory is dated at Antwerp, the firſt of January 1565. That hiſtory was tranſlated into Latin (46), and followed ſoon after by the *Deſcrizione di tutti i Paeſi baſſi, altrimenti detti Germania inferiore*. That deſcription of the Netherlands is a very good book: the author was a long time in that country, and took great pains to be informed of every thing, and viſited the places as much as he could, in order to ſay nothing but what he was ſure of. He publiſhed three editions of that book; the laſt is of the year 1587, and exceeds the ſecond, as much as the ſecond exceeds the firſt. That book was tranſlated into French by Belleforet, and into Latin by John Brant, a ſenator of Antwerp, and by Regnier Vitellius. Brant's tranſlation was never printed; the author ſuppreſſed it, being prevented by others (47). Ghilini knew ſomething of it: but his account is ſtrangely confuſed. Theſe are his words: *Reynero Vitellio, e avanti di lui Giovanni Branzio Senatore di Anverza, che dal Vitellio fu prevenuto la traduſſero dal Franceſe nel Latino* (48). Theſe words are very faulty: firſt, they ſignify, that Brant's tranſlation was publiſhed; for when an author mentions a book, without ſaying, that it was never printed, he gives us to underſtand that it was made public. This falſity is attended with a ſtrange piece of nonſenſe. Ghilini ſays, that Brant tranſlated that book before Vitellius, and was prevented by Vitellius: theſe things are inconſiſtent, when an author forgets, as Ghilini does, to diſtinguiſh the compoſition from the impreſſion. Nay, it is to be obſerved, that Valerius Andreas does not ſay, that John Brant made a tranſlation of that book before Vitellius did the ſame: he only ſays, that he was prevented as to the impreſſion (49). Laſtly, it is not true, that Vitellius and Brant tranſlated that Book from the French tranſlation. Vitellius ſays in the title page of his verſion (50), that he made it from the Italian; and Valerias Andreas affirms the ſame with reſpect to Brant. I have quoted his words. Ghilini committed all thoſe faults, becauſe he blindly followed Swertius (51). Pocciantio (52) ſays, that Guicciardin underſtood Greek and Latin, and mathematics, and was a good antiquarian. Thuanus does very much commend the deſcription of the Low-Countries, and mentions a remarkable thing, *viz.* that the duke of Alva cauſed Lewis Guicciardin to be impriſoned, for writing a book, containing the reaſons why Lent ſhould be ſuppreſſed. Which ſhews the fierceneſs and the enormous pride of that duke; for Guicciardin wrote that book by his order; but,

(36) Guicciardin, lib. viii, fol. 222, verſo.

(37) Id. ibid.

(38) See the Hiſtory of Venice, by Peter Juſtiniani, in the 10th book. Porcacchi quotes it in his preface upon Guicciardin, and in his marginal notes upon the eighth book, *fol.* 222, *verſo.*

(39) Bembus, Hiſtor. Venetæ, lib. viii, circa init. fol. m 188, verſo.

(40) Porcacchi, Notes upon Guicciardin, lib. i, fol. 8.

(41) Id. ibid. lib. viii, fol. 230.

(42) Si vedono anco del ſuo duo componimenti che per titolo hanno, &c. *Ghilini, Teatr. Tom. I, pag.* 59.

(43) *See Du Verdier's* Biblio theque Françoiſe, pag. 151.

(44) *Pag.* 403, *of the ſecond part.*

(45) Imperialis in Muſæo Hiſtorico, pag. 99. *See alſo Guicciardin's Life, written by Remigio Fiorentino.*

(46) *By Peter Paul Kerckhovius. His tranſlation was printed at Antwerp,* 1566, *in 8vo.* Valer. Andreas, Bibl. Belgic. pag. 754.

(47) Valer. Andreas, ibid. pag. 467.

(48) Ghilini, ubi ſupra, pag. 150.

(49) Ex Italica Latinam factam quia in edendo ab aliis præventus premere maluit. *Valer. Andreas, ubi ſupra.*

(50) Ex idiomate Italico ad exemplar tertium ac poſtremum ab ipſo authore recognitum ... in Latinum ſermonem converſa.

(51) *See Swertius's* Athenæ Belgicæ, pag. 520.

(52) Poccіantius de Scriptor. Florent pag. 118.

but, becauſe he himſelf did not give his copy to the duke, and that haughty Spaniard received it from the hands of a third perſon, he fell into a violent paſſion againſt the author, and cauſed him to be ſhamefully impriſoned. Guicciardin was betrayed by a man, who, deſigning to ingratiate himſelf by his diligence, preſented the manuſcript he had been intruſted with. ‘ In carcerem ignominioſum ob id conjectus, quod Albanus poſtea excuſavit, cùm diſceret, non tàm ob conſilium optimo viro ſuccenſere, quam quod illud juſſu ſuo; nam fatebatur, cùm ſcriptis mandaſſet, non per ipſum ſcriptorem, ſed per alias manus in ſuas præpoſtera perfidi hominis gratiam ſuam aucupantis diligentia illud perveniſſet (53).’ He died at Antwerp the twenty ſecond of March, 1589, aged ſixty ſix years.

(53) Thuan. lib xcvi, ſub fin. pag. m. 315, ad ann. 1589.

GUICHENON (Samuel), advocate at Bourg in Breſſe, deſerves an illuſtrious place among the hiſtoriographers of the XVIIth century. He was born at Mâcon. He publiſhed the hiſtory of Breſſe, in 1650, and then he ſet about the Genealogical Hiſtory of the houſe of Savoy, and had it printed at Lyons in the year 1660, in two large folios. He publiſhed, in the ſame year, a Latin book, intituled, *Bibliotheca Sebuſiana* [*A*]. Thoſe three works are very good in their kind, and made him worthy of the rewards beſtowed upon him *(a)*. Le Laboureur owns it, but in ſuch a manner, as ſeems to reflect upon the court of France for their ingratitude towards their hiſtoriographers [*B*]. He had been a Proteſtant, and he died a Roman Catholic, the eighth of September, 1664. He has been taxed with plagiariſm [*C*].

I have been accuſed of believing, without any grounds, that he had been an Huguenot. A confutation of this cenſure appeared in the *Memoires de Trevoux*, for January 1703 (*b*); but I am going to ſay ſomething ſtronger than all that: I ſhall cite a miniſter, who has publickly upbraided Guichenon with abjuring the reformed religion. He makes uſe of very harſh expreſſions [*D*]; whence we may gather that he was well aſſured of the truth of what he advances.

(*a*) *His titles run thus*, Lord of Paineſſuyt, Counſellor and Hiſtoriographer to the King and his Royal Highneſs, Count Palatine, Knight of the Empire, and of the Sacred Order of St Maurice and St Lazarus.

(*b*) *Of the edition of Amſterdam*, *pag.* 59.

[*A*] *He publiſhed a Latin book, intituled,* Bibliotheca Sebuſiana.] It is a book in 4to, containing 448 pages, printed at Lyons. I ſhall ſet down the whole title, that the reader may know what it treats of. *Bibliotheca Sebuſiana, ſive variarum chartarum, diplomatum, fundationum, privilegiorum, donationum & immunitatum à ſummis Pontificibus, Imperatoribus, Regibus, Ducibus, Marchionibus, Comitibus, & Proceribus, Eccleſiis, Monaſteriis & aliis locis aut perſonis conceſſarum nuſquam antea editarum, miſcellæ Centuriæ II. Ex Archivis Regiis, Monaſteriorum tabulariis & codicibus manuſcriptis ad hiſtoriæ lucem collegit, & ad locorum explicationem & familiarum illuſtrium cognitionem notis illuſtravit S. Guichenon, Dominus de Paineſſuyt, Regi à Conſiliis, Franciæ, Sabaudiæ, & Dombarum Hiſtoriographus, Eques auratus & Comes Palatinus, Sacræ Religionis SS. Mauritii & Lazari miles.*

[*B*] *Mr le Laboureur . . . . . ſeems to reflect upon the court of France, for their ingratitude towards their hiſtoriographers.*] Theſe are le Laboureur's words. ‘ Whilſt ſhe (1) enlarges their dominions by her victories, ſhe takes care to have the genealogical hiſtory of the dukes of Savoy written by the Sieur Guichenon. The name of the author is ſufficient to ſhew, that ſhe has made a good choice, and to give a good opinion of that work, which is now (2) in the preſs. M. Guichenon has already illuſtrated Breſſe with an excellent collection of the antiquities of that country, and with the hiſtory of it's ancient lords and nobility. If that princeſs was not the daughter of the great Henry IV, I ſhould be aſhamed for our nation, to ſay, that ſhe made it appear to him, by the honours he received from her, whilſt he was about that work, that the affection of ſovereigns is not ſuited to the extent of their dominions; and that the character of hiſtoriographer of Savoy is now the moſt glorious and happy in the world (3).

(1) That is, the ducheſs of Savoy, ſiſter to Lewis XIII.

(2) Le Laboureur wrote in the year 1659.

(3) Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau's Memoirs, Tom. I, pag. 752.

[*C*] *He has been taxed with plagiariſm.*] That accuſation is contained in theſe words of Varillas. ‘ I ſpeak, in the eleventh book, of the pretenſions of the duke of Savoy, and of the biſhop of Geneva, to the town of that name; and I confeſs Mr Guichenon's hiſtory has been of good uſe to me. Not but that I find this author too much addicted to the houſe of Savoy, to which he was born a ſubject; but, becauſe that inclination did not prevent his reading all the printed books and manuſcripts relating to his work, I have found ſome fragments in it, which I had not ſeen before. However, I am obliged out of ſincerity, to take notice of one of his faults, which ſeems to me ſo groſs, that I wonder no body has reproved him for it. He finds fault with William Paradin in his preface, for having taken the greateſt part of his hiſtory of Savoy from the ancient chronicle of that houſe, and from the hiſtory of Jerome Champier, without ever quoting either of them; and yet I have found out that Guichenon is guilty of the ſame ingratitude. Nani's hiſtory is well known, and it is acknowledged, that few hiſtorians of our age come near him in politeneſs and ſubtilty. Any one, who compares it with Guichenon's account of the laſt dukes of Savoy, will find, that he inſerted it word for word, in his laſt volume, without mentioning the hiſtorian he tranſcribed (4).’

(4) Varillas, preface to the third volume of his Hiſtory of Hereſy.

[*D*] *A miniſter . . . . has publickly reproached Guichenon with having abjured the reformed religion. He makes uſe of very harſh expreſſions.*] Conſider only the parentheſis of the paſſage I am going to copy. ‘ Guichenon . . . has juſt publiſhed a large hiſtory in three great volumes in folio, in which he evidently falſifies, againſt his knowledge and conſcience, all that relates to the right, the innocence, and the conduct of theſe Vaudois, both in general and in particular; and he is not aſhamed to employ his mercenary pen in giving the lie, both to the truth of the maſſacres of the year 1665, and to whatever may tend to the juſtification of thoſe good Chriſtians, and in repreſenting the cruelty and perfidy of their enemies as acts of great forbearance and mildneſs (WHICH I THINK NO STRANGE THING IN A RENEGADE, WHO HAS APOSTATISED FROM THE KNOWN TRUTH, AND GONE OVER TO THE INTERESTS OF LYING) (5).’ This is what John Leger, miniſter and moderator of the churches of the Valleys has obſerved in his preface. Let us ſee what he ſays in the body of the book, when he endeavours to juſtify his uncle Antony Leger, whom Guichenon repreſents as a factious ſpirit, and *capable of diverſe crimes*. ‘ I might confute this Guichenon, only by ſaying, that he was himſelf born and bred up in the reformed religion, and that he went through part of his ſtudies with the abovementioned Leger, whoſe conſtant companion he was, as I learned from the ſaid Leger's own mouth, but that afterwards, in order to arrive at the honours he now enjoys, he turned his coat, and denied the known truth, to embrace the maſs, taking for his device the Italian proverb, *Guelfo io fui, e Gibbelin m'appello, à chi più mi darà volterò il mantello.* For no one doubts, that he, *who ſells his ſoul for bread, and his birthright for a meſs of pottage*, can let out his tongue and pen to ſay and write, as thoſe, who hire him, direct. And I am poſitive, that he did not dare to ſet down one line in his book, which had not been ſifted and re-ſifted at Turin, and that he could not refuſe to inſert in it all the anſwers of the oracles of the marquis de Pianeſſo, and of the preſident Truquis (6): and I have by me proofs of it (7).’

He refutes him, in another place (8), in relation to two facts, and obſerves again, that he is *one, who has betrayed religion, and renounced the known truth for worldly advantages.*

(5) John Leger, Hiſt. generale des Egliſes Vaudoiſes, *at the end of the preface, Edit of Leyden*, 1669, *in folio.*

(6) *He calls him Truchis, at pag.* 164, *of the firſt part.*

(7) Leger, Hiſt. des Egliſes Vaudoiſes, Part. II, pag. 68, 69.

(8) Ibid pag. 262. *See alſo pag.* 111.

GUIGNARD (John), a Jeſuit, native of Chartres (*a*), and profeſſor of divinity in the college of Clermont (*b*), was executed at Paris, the ſeventh of January 1595, for high-treaſon. He was convicted of having written a book full of rebellion and rage againſt Henry III and Henry IV [*A*]: and, as the circumſtances of the time required, that a doctrine, which had not long before expoſed the life of the king to the wicked attempt of John Chaſtel, ſhould be puniſhed with the utmoſt ſeverity, it was not thought proper to ſhew any favour to this Jeſuit. He obſtinately refuſed to make the *amende honorable*; and he perſiſted to his death in not acknowledging Henry IV for king of France [*B*]. He has been extolled as a martyr by the apologiſt of John Chaſtel [*C*]. We ſhall ſee what the Jeſuits anſwered, when they were reproached with

[*A*] *He was convicted of having written a book full of of rebellion and rage againſt Henry III and Henry IV.*] This is the way how they came to know it. "Whilſt the parliament was carrying on the proceſs againſt John Chaſtel, ſome of them, deputed for that purpoſe, went to the college of Clermont, and ſeized on ſeveral papers, among which was found a book written in Guignard the Jeſuit's own hand, containing ſeveral propoſitions and means to prove, that it was lawful to kill the king, with ſeveral inductions for the murther likewiſe of his ſucceſſor. Here are ſome of them extracted from the ſaid book, which are yet extant in the rolls of the court (1).' The author of the Anti-Coton afterwards produces ſome extracts of that book; but, as Victor Cayet has given them more at large, I chooſe to make uſe of his narrative upon this occaſion. 'As to Guignard, he could not deny, that he wrote the nine following propoſitions, to wit,

'I. *That in the year* 1572, on St Bartholomew's-day, if they had bled the royal vein, we ſhould not have fallen out of the frying-pan into the fire, as we experience: But *quicquid delirant Reges*; by being ſparing of blood, they have involved France in fire and blood, *& in caput reciderunt mala*.

'II. That the cruel Nero was ſlain by a Clement, and the pretended monk diſpatched by the hand of a true monk.

'III. Shall we call a Nero Sardanapalus of France, a Fox of Bearne, a Lyon of Portugal, a She-wolf of England, a Griffin of Sweden, and a Hog of Saxony.

'IV. Think that he ſaw in vain three kings, if kings they may be called, the late tyrant, he of Bearne, and this pretended monarch of Portugal D. Antonio.

'V. That the fineſt anagram, that ever was, on the name of the deceaſed tyrant, was that, by which it was ſaid, *O the baſe Herod*.

'VI. That the heroic action performed by James Clement, as a gift of the HOLY GHOST, ſo called by our divines, has been juſtly extolled by the late prior of the Jacobins, Burgoign, confeſſor and martyr, by ſeveral reaſons, as well at Paris, where I was an ear-witneſs of them, when he taught the book of Judith, as before that fine parliament of Tours: and this the ſaid Burgoign, which is more, ſealed with his own blood, and conſecrated by his death; and we muſt not believe what the enemies report, that with his laſt breath he diſapproved this action as deteſtable.

'VII. That the crown of France might and ought to be transferred to another family than that of Bourbon.

'VIII. That he of Bearne, though he were converted to the Catholic faith, would be treated more mildly than he deſerved, if he were preſented with a monkiſh crown in ſome well-reformed convent, there to do penance for the many evils he has done to France, and to thank GOD for giving him the grace to know himſelf before death.

'IX. That if he cannot be depoſed without war, let war be made on him: that if war cannot be made on him, let him be aſſaſſinated (2).'

[*B*] *He obſtinately refuſed to make the* amende honorable, *and perſiſted to his death in not acknowledging Henry IV for king of France.*] Let us give the ſequel of Cayet's narrative. 'The parliament having ſeen theſe writings, Guignard the author, being interrogated concerning them, acknowledged that he had compoſed and written them with his own hand; and for that he was condemned by the court * to make the *amende honorable*, naked to his ſhirt, with a rope about his neck, before the principal gate of the church of Paris, and there, being on his knees, and holding a lighted torch of wax, of the weight of two pounds, in his hands, to ſay and declare, that wickedly, traytorouſly, and againſt the truth, he had written that the late king was juſtly killed by James Clement, and that, if the reigning did not die in war, he ought to be aſſaſſinated: of which he repented, and aſked pardon of GOD, the king, and juſtice. This done, to be led and conducted to the Greve, to be hanged and ſtrangled on a gibbet to be there erected for that purpoſe, and afterwards his dead body to be burnt to aſhes in a fire, which ſhould be made at the foot of the ſaid gibbet. This decree was put in execution the ſeventh of January, and the ſaid Guignard was hanged and burnt at the Greve. As they were conducting him before the church of Noſtre-Dame, there to make the *amende honorable*, being naked to his ſhirt, and having the torch in his hand, he aſked the Sieur Rapin, lieutenant of the ſhort robe, what he muſt do: he told him, that he muſt aſk pardon of GOD and the king, repeating what the regiſter ſhould ſay to him. I will aſk GOD's pardon, ſaid he, with all my heart; but why the king's? You have offended him, ſaid Rapin to him, in that you have written againſt him: Guignard replied; what I wrote thereupon was before Paris ſubmitted to him. What you ſay, is not true, ſaid Rapin to him, and, though it were, you have no right to the pardon and general indemnity, granted by the king to his ſubjects of Paris after their ſubmiſſion, ſince you were not ignorant, that it was ſtrictly commanded to burn ſuch writings, on pain of death: by keeping them contrary to theſe decrees, you have therefore offended both him and the public. After diſputing the matter above a quarter of an hour, notwithſtanding all the reaſons and menaces of the ſaid Sieur Rapin, Guignard refuſed to make the *amende honorable*, and was carried to execution without making it (3).'

It is plain, that in ſaying he had not offended the king, he ſuppoſed that Henry IV was not king. We are going to ſee, that he is commended for entertaining this opinion, and for never renouncing it.

[*C*] *He has been extolled as a martyr by the apologiſt of John Chaſtel.*] The tenth chapter of the fifth part of the apology of that villain is intituled *The martyrdom of Father Guynard juſtified in every point*. The author declares him *happy* in dying 'as one, who kept himſelf unſhaken on the baſis and ſtrength of the goſpel ſtone. That is to ſay, of the obedience, and for the obedience of the church (4). The conſtancy of this perſon †, to his laſt breath, (*adds he* (5), in refuſing to acknowledge for king, him whom the church has condemned, and for lawful judges, thoſe who are ſeparated from the church, and judge contrary to the church: and refuſing to repeat the clauſes and words, preſcribed by the Arrêt, to make the *amende honorable:* and inſiſting upon the truth, both of what he had preached, and of what he had laid down in his memoirs (for which reaſon his execution was haſtened, and on the ſpot, and in his ſhirt, without carrying him back to priſon), all which entirely juſtifies the martyrdom, having no other foundation than the pure Catholic truth, maintained to death incluſively, the contrary of which is hereſy: this will ſerve as a witneſs, to make out their proceſs one day, to chain them hand and foot, to pronounce their ſentence, and to condemn them definitively, and by an irrevocable judgment, as *this glory is to all his ſaints* ⸸. When he, *who guards the eternal truth* ‡, who keeps the books of the eternal regiſter, in which every thing is written, ſhall *render judgment to thoſe, who ſuffer injury* *.

(*a*) Thuanus, lib. cxii, pag. m. 653.

(*b*) Appendix Apologiæ Franciſci Montani pro Societate Jeſu, pag. 352.

(1) Anti-Coton, pag. 15.

(2) Cayet, Chronol. Novenaire, ad ann. 1594, fol. 435, verſo.

* Arrêt againſt Guignard.

(3) Cayet, ibid.

(4) Apology for John Chaſtel, Part. V, chap. x, pag. 238.

† Conſtancy of Father Guynard.

(5) Ib. pag. 239.

⸸ Pſalm cxlv.

‡ Apoc. xx.

* Pſalm cxli.

with giving him a place in their martyrology [*D*]. They denied the fact; and as to what regards his puniſhment, they employed ſeveral turns of wit, and they endeavoured to extenuate the outrageouſneſs of his tenets [*E*], and to excuſe him by alledging the great

[*D*] *We ſhall ſee what the Jeſuits anſwered, when they were reproached with giving him a place in their martyrology.*] Let us begin with quoting a paſſage of the Anti-Coton (6): 'The reader may aſk, if he pleaſes, if there ever was a Jeſuit, who has condemned this Guignard of treaſon and perfidy. On the contrary, Richeome, in his apology, excuſes him as much as he can; ſaying, that Guignard treated the abovementioned propoſitions, by way of a diſpute in divinity. And in this we agree; for thus, I ſay, that *to kill the king*, has always been one of the reſolutions of the divinity of the Jeſuits. If any Jeſuit, half thro' force, and half thro' ſhame, condemns him, it is for not having been diſcreet enough, or for having taken a wrong time, or for ſome ſuch reaſon. This appears by the Jeſuits having put Guignard in the catalogue of their martyrs, which they publiſhed at Rome, in two forms, in one of which Guignard is, in the other not, that there might be copies, which might be ſold in France without danger. Thus the Jeſuit Bonarſcius, in the eighth chapter of his Amphitheatre, extols Guignard to the ſkies, tho' without naming him, for fear of offending our king, always plainly enough, that we may diſcover him in theſe words: *ſhall I ſay nothing of you, O! bright ſtar of heaven and earth, and laſt expiation of the houſe, which after this ought to ſuffer nothing more? no time ſhall eraſe the memory of your death:* then he adds, *all France will join in my wiſhes* ††: This can only agree with Guignard, who was a French Jeſuit, and who was the laſt Jeſuit, that ſuffered puniſhment in France.' Father Coton replied, among other things (7), that no Jeſuit had 'diſapproved the judgment of the court, and that every one of them had endeavoured to perſuade himſelf, that Guignard had been juſtly condemned; that all that is added to it is not equally certain, and that many things muſt be imputed to licentious tongues, and the injuſtice of the time (8); that if no Jeſuit has condemned Guignard of treaſon and perfidy, it is becauſe none of them are thoroughly acquainted with the proceſs.' *I have ſeen* (*continues he*) *ſeveral catalogues of Jeſuit martyrs*, 'but not one in which is Guignard; and yet I have ſeen ſome printed at Rome. And, if he appear as ſuch in prints made elſewhere, who knows not the liberty, which painters and poets give themſelves?' He denies that the paſſage of Bonarſcius relates to Guignard; but it is to deny an almoſt indiſputable fact. Another apologiſt was not ſo peremptory; he was contented to evade the queſtion. Thus he replied to the author of the Anti-Coton: 'You are angry, that Clarus Bonarſcius, in his Amphitheatrum, praiſes this father, and that he calls him a *ſhining ſtar* in heaven, how do you know, that he ſpeaks of this father, ſince he does not name him? Do you gueſs ſo, becauſe he was the laſt that was executed in France; he is likewiſe the firſt. But, ſuppoſing your conjecture to be right, why are you angry, that he extols this father as a ſaint (9)? . . . . . Now accuſe, and complain of Clarus as as much as you will, you will not hinder me from commending him for this praiſe, and from praiſing, with him, this father, becauſe he was a great divine and did honour to France, his country which you diſhonour; and I believe, with the ſame Clarus, that he is in heaven, if not in the liſt of martyrs, at leaſt in the number of the ſaints: not becauſe he was condemned to death, but for having forſaken the vanity of the world to ſerve God and the public in religion, to the utmoſt of his abilities: for having lived as a true Religious many years; for having taught the catholic faith, and oppoſed hereſy which you defend under the cover of the ſtate; laſtly, for having patiently ſuffered all the torments of death, and the ſhame of puniſhment, and given up his ſoul as a good and firm Catholic (10).' He had expreſſed himſelf as follows, p. 181. 'You take exceptions at our placing the ſaid father in the liſt of martyrs: who told you ſo, except the ſpirit of lying, which directs your pen? for, among the many thouſand perſons of credit, who have read this catalogue, not one has found what you pretend to diſcover in it: if you have not ſeen this catalogue, which is moſt probable, why do you ſpeak ſo poſitively of a thing unknown to you? have you ſo little regard for your honour to take all falſe reports for truth, and to give them as matters of fact, and become the ſubject of contempt and laughter thinking to prejudice the Jeſuits?' The Jeſuit Eudæmon Johannes, replying to the Anti-Coton, denies, that Guignard was placed in the martyrology of the Jeſuits, and obſerves that the prints of their martyrs were made and ſold by perſons, who only aimed at profit, and who had no dependance on the Jeſuits (11). 'Verebaris nimirum, ne prolatis Martyrum noſtrorum Catalogis, impudentiſſimi mendacii convincerere, quæ te cauſa impulit, ut frigidam hanc Catalogorum varietatem dignam planè ſtupore iſto animi ſomniaris. Nam neque mendacium tegis, & vecordiam tuam prodis: Martyrum enim noſtrorum effigies non à nobis, ſed ab exteris lucri ſui cauſa typis excuſæ, venales per orbem palam expoſitæ ab iis ſunt, ut in noſtra poteſtate nullo modo fuerit quis Martyrum Catalogus, aut à Gallis emeretur, aut in Galliam ab emptoribus importaretur. Neque vero ita ſtolidos quiſquam Jeſuitas exiſtimaturus eſt, ut cum rem eam aggrederentur, non viderent fieri non poſſe, ne Gignardus quoque cum cæteris martyribus vel ab amicis, vel ab inimicis in Galliam mitteretur. Mirum vero eſt, ſi cum utriuſque generis Catalogi venderentur, non niſi unus in Galliam, iſque ad tuas unius manus venerit, in quo Gignardus legeretur, quem ſi apud te habes, profer ſodes, ſi non habes indica, apud quem inveniri poſſit. Nam nos quidem Romæ nunquam Gignardum adſcriptum Societatis Martyribus vidimus: numquam in Martyres retulimus. —— *No doubt, you were afraid, if we produced the catalogue of our martyrs, of being caught in a lye, which put you upon inventing this nonſenſical variety of catalogues. For you betray both the lye, and your own folly. For the prints of our martyrs, engraved, not by our ſelves, but by foreigners, for the ſake of gain, are ſold by them all over the world, ſo that it is not in our power what catalogue of martyrs ſhall be bought by Frenchmen, or imported into France by the buyers. Nor would any one think the Jeſuits ſuch fools, as to think they can prevent Guignard being ſent, with the reſt of the martyrs into France, either by friends, or enemies. And it is ſtrange, that, when catalogues of both kinds are ſold, but one ſhould come into France, and that into your hands, in which Guignard appears; which if you have, pray, produce it; if not, tell us where we may find it. For we at Rome never ſaw Guignard in the liſt of martyrs of the ſociety nor ever put him there.*

[*E*] *They endeavoured to extenuate the outrageouſneſs of his tenets.*] See in the remark [*A*] the doctrine of Guignard. It is abominable. In 1602, a little book was publiſhed, intituled *The free and true addreſs to the King, on the re-eſtabliſhment of the Jeſuits, deſired of him.* We find in it, among other things, that, 'if the Pope can lay his hand on the SCEPTRE and temporalities of kings, as the Jeſuits affirm, it remains without difficulty, that, when his holineſs excommunicates a king, he is *ipſo facto* deprived, he becomes a private perſon, and is no longer a king; and if he continues reſolved to reign, he is a tyrant. Whoever allows the firſt propoſition, muſt grant the latter. Now the book, written by John Guignard the Jeſuit, and which he acknowledged in full parliament, the two chambers being aſſembled, contained theſe two propoſitions outrageouſly written: for among other things there was, *that the Nero*, &c. . . . . THAT IF HE OF BEARNE COULD NOT BE DEPOSED WITHOUT WAR, WAR MUST BE WAGED: THAT IF WAR CANNOT BE WAGED, HE MUST BE ASSASSINATED. Your majeſty may ſee the original; this well deſerves it (12).' The Jeſuits replied, by the pen of Richeome, as follows (13). 'Sire, I will not here accuſe any one, nor plead for this deceaſed, he is out of the reach of an earthly tribunal, nor call for vengeance, any more than he does, whom I believe to be praying in heaven for his enemies. I only ſay, that your majeſty has pardoned great number of perſons, who at that time held the ſame maxims. It is certain, the kingdom

---

(6) Anti-Coton, pag. 18, 19.

†† Tacebo ego te clarum cœlo terraque ſidus & ultimum nil amplius dolituræ domus innocuum piamentum? Nullus tui ſanguinis veſtigia dies exteret, totaque in hæc vota mea ibit Gallia.

(7) Réponſe Apolog. à l'Anti-Coton, pag. 42.

(8) Ibid. pag. 43.

(9) Richeome, Examen Categorique de l'Anti-Coton, cap. xxi, pag. 182.

(10) Richeome, ibid. pag. 183.

(11) Eudæmon Johannes, Conf. Anti-Cotoni, cap. ii, pag 51.

(12) Franc & véritable Diſcours, pag. 31.

(13) Richeome, Plainte Apolog. pag. 135, 136.

'pardoned whatever paſſed of this kind, and that prudently and royally, in imitation of the emperor Octavian ⸸⸸, who ordered all inſtruments concerning debts, which occaſioned calumnies and quarrels, to be burned; and of the emperor Conſtantine the Great ‡‡ who likewiſe condemned to the flames contentious libels. And certainly, if it had been neceſſary to make enquiry after all thoſe of the League, who had written and ſpoken, there would have been no end of the troubles and enmities: and there were at that time a thouſand and a thouſand Frenchmen who had by them worſe writings, than that which this perſon here counterfeits and produces, who nevertheleſs have continued your very faithful ſervants and ſubjects: why then does he alledge this writing againſt the law of Oblivion, and againſt one deceaſed. If he had been guilty of a puniſhable fault, has it not been ſufficiently expiated by the puniſhment of death? ought the proceſs to be revived, and ſentence again paſſed, on one, who has been executed eight years ſince? I ſay farther, that this piece ** was not written by that divine, but is an invention of his adverſary.' Obſerve well, that they pretended, that the writing of John Guignard was not ſuch as their adverſaries would have it to be. The obſervations of Richeome (14), to prove this, are the weakeſt imaginable; but if Henry IV, on this plea of falſification, did not demand to ſee the original, and if he did not give order, that the enemies of the Jeſuits ſhould prove inconteſtably, that the propoſitions, which they attributed to Guignard, were really in his book, he was guilty of extreme negligence, or of a piece of policy, which might paſs for fear. However it be, the author of the Anti-Coton, who knew, without doubt, that the Jeſuits had ſtiffly denied what was given out concerning the manuſcript of their brother, continued to object to them the ſame propoſitions, as *the free and true addreſs*, and to ſay, that they were extracted out of Guignard's manuſcript, *which was ſtill extant in the rolls of the court* (15). He was anſwered, that what he ſaid was one of thoſe things, which muſt be aſcribed to licentious tongues, and the injury of the times, and that *it was denied, that the words*, if war cannot be waged, he muſt be aſſaſſinated, *are to be found in the court rolls, in which words nevertheleſs lies the ſting of the ſcorpion* (16). Theſe words, replied another to him (17), *contain the poiſon of your calumny*; *but they are meer words and lies*; *for nothing of them appears in the Regiſter*. Theſe anſwers are pitiful; for the author of the Anti-Coton had not ſaid, that theſe words were found in the regiſter of the parliament, but in the manuſcript, which was preſerved in the rolls. Therefore, to give any thing of a ſolid anſwer they ſhould have maintained to him, that they were not in this manuſcript. But this is what the Jeſuits, who have refuted the Anti-Coton, never ventured to maintain, and thus, we may very juſtly believe, that this propoſition is in the writing of Father Guignard. Several reaſons convince me of it.

I. In the firſt place, the Arrêt of parliament expreſſes (18), that, conſidering 'the criminal proceſs ..... made againſt John Guignard .... for having been found poſſeſſed of ſeveral books, containing, among other things, approbations of the moſt cruel and inhuman parricide of the late king, whom God abſolve, AND INDUCTIONS FOR THE MURTHER OF THE KING NOW REIGNING. . . . The court has declared and does declare the ſaid Guignard attainted and convicted of high-treaſon, and of having compoſed and written the ſaid books, containing ſeveral falſe and ſeditious means to prove, that it was lawful to commit the ſaid parricide, AND THAT IT WAS RIGHT TO KILL KING HENRY IV, NOW REIGNING. There is no doubt, but that the words of the Arrêt, which are here in capitals, are grounded on thoſe, which, according to the author of the Anti-Coton, were contained in Guignard's book.

II. Beſides this, who can doubt, that Thuanus, preſident of the parliament of Paris, had read this Jeſuit's book? now he, as well as a great many other authors, affirms, that the words in queſtion are found in it (19).

III. In the third place, the Jeſuits have never proved, that the propoſitions, which were objected to them as taken from this manuſcript, are not to be found in it. They have only denied, that the laſt is in the parliament rolls, which was not the thing in queſtion and, as to the others, they have alledged but weak probabilities. They have never boaſted, that they have ſeen the book; ſo that they have ſaid nothing to the purpoſe, and have not offered the king, as their adverſaries do, to ſhew him this or that in the manuſcript preſerved in the regiſter of parliament. If they could have hoped to convict their enemies of calumny, they would have deſired of the king or parliament, that this book ſhould be given to be examined in their preſence by ſuch commiſſaries as he ſhould chuſe. Is it not very certain, that, not having taken this ſtep, they have given to underſtand, that they diſtruſted the book, and that, if they treated the propoſitions alledged by their adverſaries, as fictitious, it was only acting like lawyers? It is well known that pleaders treat as fictitious, whatever makes againſt them as long as ever they can. I know not whether the adverſaries of the Jeſuits have taken the ſtep I ſpeak of, I mean, of petitioning the parliament to name commiſſaries to examine the manuſcript in the preſence of the parties concerned. A good verbal proceſs thereupon would have for ever ſtopped the mouth of the moſt obſtinate caviller. But, having none of theſe formalities, we have ſufficient reaſon to believe, that Guignard had inſerted in his treatiſe the propoſitions aſcribed to him.

This being ſo, one cannot but be ſurpriſed at the falſe idea which his apologiſts give of it. Let us quote Richeome. 'What was found in John Guignard's, chamber, ſays he (20), and on which he was condemned to death, was a queſtion, which he had formerly treated on, when he read divinity which was: *whether it be lawful to kill a tyrant*; a queſtion, which all the canoniſts and moral philoſophers put in their diſcourſes, and which Bodin among the moderns, has diſcuſſed in his republic.' Richeome informs us elſewhere (21), that Henry IV was *ſatisfied* with this anſwer. This prince, then, muſt have been eaſily ſatisfied; for it was a very bad one, ſince it repreſents in the moſt unfaithful manner the character of John Guignard's book. We have ſeen above (22) the reflexion, which was made on this paſſage of Richeome by the author of the Anti-Coton. It does not point out the defect which is to be found in the words of this Jeſuit, and only aims at improving an opportunity of laſhing the whole ſociety of the Jeſuits. So true it is, that there are thoſe, who take more pleaſure in ſatirizing a whole body, than in refuting one member of it in form.

The Jeſuit Eudæmon Johannes has improved upon Richeome; for he has ſaid, that Guignard only diſputed for and againſt the theological queſtion, whether it be lawful to take away the life of tyrants; and he adds, that this did not render him more worthy of death, than other divines, who exerciſe themſelves, not only on this queſtion, but on that likewiſe of the exiſtence of God (23): *Theologica quæſtione in utramque partem ſcripta ſupplicium non magis meritus eſt, quam S. Thomas, quam reliqui Theologi, qui non modo de Tyrannorum nece, ſed de ipſa etiam Dei exiſtentia, in utramque partem diſputare ſoliti ſunt.* A moſt horrible miſrepreſentation of the ſtate of things, ſince Guignard was not contented to examine a problem, as a reporter of reaſons for and againſt; but he took the affirmative, and approved by name the aſſaſſination of Henry III, and every the like action which ſhould be executed on Henry IV.

Father Gretſer inſerted in one of his books (24) an account of the tryal of John Chaſtel, in which the book of Father Guignard is deſcribed as a mere collection of various paſſages concerning the theſis, whether private men may take away the lives of tyrants. He adds that, in the way of narrative, Guignard had ſpoken of the Jacobin, who aſſaſſinated Henry III, and that he declared on the ſcaffold, that this was the true character of his book, and that he had not written one word in it, which might offend the king (25): 'In cubiculo P. Johannis Guignardi Theologiæ Profeſſoris, perbrevis Tractatus repertus eſt, quem ipſe ante annos quatuor vel quinque conſcripſerat, quo illa Quæſtio continebatur à Doctoribus in Scholis paſſim tractata & agitata: *Utrum Tyrannum qui ſe palàm hoſtem gerit Reipublicæ li-*

⸸⸸ Cæſar Octavian ordered all the papers to be burnt, which might afford matter for calumny. *Sueton. in Octav. cap. xxxii.*

‡‡ Conſtantin. Sozom. lib. i, cap. xvi.

** The forged writing.

(14) Richeome, ubi ſupra, pag. 136, 137.

(15) Anti-Coton, pag. 15.

(16) Réponſe Apolog. à l'Anti-Coton, pag. m. 42, 43.

(17) Richeome, ubi ſupra, pag. 181.

(18) Paſquier, Catechiſme des Jeſuites, livr. iii, chap. xviii, pag. m. 447, 448.

(19) Si ſine bello deponi non poſſit, bellum cum eo gerendum. Si bellum geri non poſſit, de medio quavis ratione tollendum. *Thuan. lib. xvii, pag. 653, col. 2.*

(20) Reſponce de René de la Fon pour les Religieux de la Compagnie de Jeſus, chap. xiv, pag. 72, 73.

(21) Examen categor. de l'Anti-Coton, pag. 184.

(22) In the remark [*D*], citat. (6).

(23) Eudæm. Joh. Confut. Anti-Cotoni, cap. ii, pag. 51.

(24) The Latin tranſlation of *Richeome's Anſwer*, diſguiſed under the name of *Francis de Montagnes* to *Antony Arnauld*.

(25) Appendix Apologiæ Franciſci Montani pro Societate Jeſu in Gallia, pag. 352.

kingdom was at that time full of ſeditious preachers [*F*], and of perſons, who, in their writings

‘*ceat privato occidere?* De quâ Quæſtione Argumenta, quæ in utramque partem, ut ſolet, ad diſcutiendam diſquirendamque veritatem, à variis Auctoribus adferuntur, ibi quoque congeſta erant. Inter alia item narratione comprehenſum fuit quid Frater Clemens Dominicanus Monachus in Henricum III auſus fuiſſet. (26) Cum jam patibulum à longè conſpexiſſet cui appropinquabat, S. Andreæ Apoſtoli exemplo & verbis illud piè & alacriter conſalutavit; lætâ mente ac fronte ſcalas conſcendit, è quibus allocutus circumfuſam ſpectantium multitudinem: quod ſupplicii hoc genere enecaretur, aliam non ſubeſſe cauſam, quàm quia ante annos quatuor vel quinque perbrevem Tractatum conſcripſiſſet, nullius injuriâ, nullius incommodo, in quem collegiſſet opiniones & ſententias Sanctorum Patrum, variorumque Auctorum, quos ipſi ante monumentis commendaverant de hac Quæſtione: *Utrum liceat privato homini occidere manifeſtum Tyrannum*; Tractatum illum ſe neque typis in lucem editum evulgaſſe; quin in aliorum manus eum nunquam perveniſſe. Regem ibi neque verbulo læſum aut offenſum. Quæ Patris verba omnem circumſtantem Populum in magnam commiſerationem inflexerunt. —— *In the bed-chamber of Father John Guignard profeſſor of divinity, was found a ſmall treatiſe, which he had written four or five years before, in which was contained that queſtion, every where handled and diſcuſſed by the doctors in the ſchoools;* whether a private man may kill a tyrant, who is an open enemy to the ſtate? *the arguments on which queſtion, which are alledged by various authors on both ſides, for diſcuſſing and enquiring into the truth, are there likewiſe collected. Among others, there was a narrative of what Father Clement, a dominical monk; had attempted againſt Henry III. When he ſaw the gallows at a diſtance, to which he approached, he piouſly and chearfully ſaluted it, after the example, and in the words, of St Andrew the Apoſtle; he mounted the ladder with a chearful mind and countenance, from whence he harangued the croud of ſpectators round him: he told them, that the ſole reaſon of his ſuffering this kind of death, was, that, four or five years before, he had written a ſhort treatiſe, with no ill deſign, nor to the detriment of any one, in which he had collected the opinions and ſentiments of the holy fathers, and of various authors, concerning this queſtion,* whether it was lawful for a private man to kill a manifeſt tyrant: *that he had never printed that treatiſe, nor ſuffered it to go into the hands of any perſon. That he had not offended the king by the leaſt word. Which ſpeech of the father greatly inclined the ſurrounding audience to pity.*’

What diſguiſes, or rather what impoſtures? But obſerve, that, by the help of an equivocation, he might pretend, that he had ſaid nothing, which might offend the king; for he did not acknowledge Henry IV for king.

Let us quote a very long paſſage of a book, which is ſeldom to be met with. This may ſerve to excuſe the length of the citation, without reckoning, that this paſſage will inform us, I. that Guignard had preached the ſame doctrine, which he had maintained in his writing; II. that he pretended, that this doctrine was agreeable to that of the ancient fathers, and to a deciſion of the church, and to the opinion of the Catholic party. This is a mixture of truth and falſehood. ‘But the exceſs, committed in the perſon of Father Guygnard, was the more cruel, as he was put to death unjuſtly; to wit, for collections and memoirs, taken both from the fathers, and decrees, to prove, that it is lawful to make war againſt heretical and excommunicated princes, which were found in his ſtudy; on eſpecial notice given them to ſearch it, and to make uſe of them for this purpoſe, by a certain miniſter, who, ſome years before, had heard the ſaid Guygnard, preaching at Bourges on this ſubject. For if a man is to be ſentenced to death for ſcholaſtic collections, what injury is this to the holy fathers, out of whom they are taken? And what becomes of St Hilary, the light of the French, and of Lucifer biſhop of Sardinia, who, in their times, wrote ſo ſtrongly, on this ſubject, againſt the emperor Conſtantius, and ſent him their books? Likewiſe of St Cyril, and St Gregory Nazianzen, againſt Julian the apoſtate? If theſe are things debated time out of mind, digeſted by conſent of the ancients, ratified by the judgment of the church, which has the ſole right of determining ſuch truths, and afterwards received and made public in the ſchools of the divines; what are theſe cenſors, who ſo highly exclaim againſt them? What! Do they condemn the holy ſpirit? And dare they judge of colours, in which they are truly blind, and leaders of the blind? And if ſuch collections are condemned, and ſo ſeverely puniſhed, how will they bear with thoſe of heretics? How will they endure their books and peſtilent writings, their propoſitions and maxims, judged and condemned as they are, both by the church, and the parliaments of France? Why are their preachings and blaſphemies againſt God and the church tolerated, nay, approved by edicts, and verified by them? And if it be not lawful to make war againſt an heretical prince, how is it lawful for an heretic to make war againſt a Catholic prince? And how can he be juſtified, who, as head of the heretics, has made war, all his life, againſt the Catholic kings of France: upon which he has valued himſelf, and is the reaſon why he has been condemned, and why they acknowledge him for their prince? Why is it not lawful againſt him, ſince beſides the authority of decrees, he himſelf has ſet the example? Add, that this was not at all to be condemned, for being a propoſition of the ſchools, and a general one, and meerly the doctrine of the church. And however it be, belonging to the party in general, and conſequently covert, as well by the edict of treaſon of Paris, as by that, which was afterwards publiſhed. Conſidering that, upon this treatment, there was no one, not only of the ſaid ſociety, but even no zealous eccleſiaſtic, nay, no one of the whole Catholic party, but ought to undergo the ſame puniſhment (27).’

[*F*] *The whole kingdom was full of ſeditious preachers.*] The evil did not ceaſe by the abſolution, which the Pope granted to Henry IV, the ſixteenth of September, 1595. Read theſe words of cardinal d'Oſſat: they are in a letter, which he wrote from Rome to the duke of Villeroy, the fourteenth of May 1601. *I ſpoke the other day to the Pope of what the king deſired; which was, that his holineſs would order his new Nuncio to take care, that the preachers in France, preached with the requiſite diſcretion and moderation, without meddling in ſtate-affairs, of which they knew not the motives, nor hold ſeditious diſcourſes: and I delivered to him likewiſe a Memorial in writing, the copy of which I ſend you incloſed. His holineſs told me, he would order his new Nuncio accordingly* (28).’ Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie has commented admirably on this paſſage of cardinal d'Oſſat. ‘It no better becomes preachers (ſays he) to talk about affairs of political government, which they underſtand nothing of, for the moſt part; than it does politicians, to decide in matters of faith and religion. Affairs of ſtate are of ſo nice a nature, that it is always dangerous to ſpeak of them before the people, who are not always well-affected to the government. *Omni populo*, ſays Plutarch, *ineſt malignum quiddam & querulum in imperantes.* All preachers have a good zeal, I confeſs; but as this zeal is not always attended with knowledge and prudence, it is for the intereſt of the public that thoſe of ability ſhould forbear, through modeſty, to bring theſe matters into their ſermons, in order to oblige others to confine themſelves within the limits of the goſpel doctrine, which every where recommends peace and obedience. In the laſt years of the reign of Henry III, and the firſt of Henry IV, the doctors, Aubry, Boucher, Pelletier, Linceſtre, Roſe, Feu-ardent, and many others of that ſtamp, had ſo prophaned the miniſtry of the word, that the pulpit, where nothing but truth ſhould be ſpoken, was become the ſeat of impoſture and calumny; and that the people, infected through the ears, adored no other croſs, but that of Lorrain. For which reaſon it was abſolutely neceſſary to reſtrain this licence, and reeſtabliſh good diſcipline in the ſacred miniſtry, which the ſpirit of rebellion had converted into a myſtery of iniquity.’

If the Pope's Nuncio acquitted himſelf well of his commiſſion, yet he did not remove this great diſorder. They continued to preach and talk ſeditiouſly, and to give riſe thereby to conſpiracies againſt the life of Henry IV (29). The true Frenchmen, favourers of the independant

(26) Id. ibid. pag. 553.

(27) Apology for John Chaſtel, Part V, chap ix, pag. 234, & *ſeq.*

(28) D'Oſſat, Lettre cclxxiii, pag. 360, 370, Tom. II, Edit. of Paris, 1698.

(29) See the *Anti-Coton, chap. iii.*

writings and private converſation, inſinuated the aſſaſſination of ſuch princes as Henry IV, whom they ſuſpected of favouring the enemies of Popery. This was perhaps one of the reaſons, which obliged the parliament of Paris to involve all the Jeſuits of France in the cauſe of John Chaſtel, and John Guignard [*G*]. They hoped perhaps, that, by baniſhing out of the kingdom thoſe who paſſed for the principal authors of dangerous doctrines, they ſhould bridle the boldneſs of other Eccleſiaſtics.

independant power of the king, and attached to the monarchical maxims of ſtate, attributed to the Jeſuits eſpecially this republican and ultramontane ſpirit. Not that they looked upon them as the firſt authors of it (30): they only conſidered them as it's ſtrongeſt ſupport. This puts me in mind of a remark, which appeared in a book, printed in the year 1701, and intituled, *The preſent ſtate of the faculty of divinity of Louvain, treating of the conduct of ſome of it's divines, and of their ſentiments againſt the ſovereignty and ſafety of kings, and againſt the four articles of the clergy of France.* It is three letters of a canon of Tournai to a doctor of the Sorbonne. They are preceded by a letter of that doctor, in which we find theſe words (31): ‘But whence is it, that in mentioning, in your letters the ſentiments of thoſe divines, who teach, that kings ſubjects may be abſolved from the oath of fidelity, you ſpeak only of ſome particular doctors of Louvain, of ſome Auguſtins, of ſome Recollects, and not at all of the Jeſuits? Know you not, that theſe deteſtable opinions are derived from them? Not that they are the firſt, who maintained them: ſeveral canoniſts, ſome divines, above all, the Italians, ſubject to the Pope, taught them before them: but their writings were ſo inſignificant, that they fell of themſelves, and ſerved rather to diſcredit theſe opinions, than to bring them into faſhion. But the Jeſuits have heightened them, and have undertaken to give them credit.’

[*G*] *This was one of the reaſons, which obliged the parliament to involve all the Jeſuits of France in the cauſe of John Chaſtel, and John Guignard.*] There were ſome perſons, who were ſurprized, that there being at moſt but preſumptions, that the Jeſuits had adviſed John Chaſtel to the wicked attempt, which he executed, yet they were baniſhed the kingdom by the ſame Arrêt, which condemned that aſſaſſin. But to juſtify in this the conduct of the parliament of Paris, we muſt obſerve, that the action of that young man was not the foundation of the baniſhment, to which the Jeſuits were condemned: it was only an occaſion of determining a cauſe, which had been pleaded ſome months before. This cauſe was a proceſs carried on againſt the Jeſuits by the univerſity of Paris. Antony Arnauld, who pleaded for that univerſity, had concluded, ‘that the court might be pleaſed in confirming the requeſt of the univerſity, to order all the Jeſuits of France to quit the kingdom and all his majeſty's dominions, within fifteen days after notice given in every one of their colleges or houſes, ſpeaking to one of them for the reſt. *Alias*, and, upon their refuſal, wherever any of them ſhall be found in France after the ſaid time, they ſhall be condemned upon the ſpot, without form of proceſs, as guilty of high-treaſon, and attempting on the life of the king (32).’ The judgment of the cauſe was referred to another time; but, on occaſion of the affair of John Chaſtel, they complied with the petition of the univerſity, and the methods made uſe of by Antony Arnauld. Some other parliaments imitated that of Paris: but the parliament of Toulouſe, and that of Bourdeaux refuſed to conform themſelves to it (33); and thus the Jeſuits kept their ground in Languedoc and Guienne till their re-call. They did not obtain it till the beginning of the year 1604.

(30) Compare the remark [*S*] of the article LOYOLA.

(31) Letter of a doctor of the Sorbonne to a canon of Tournai, fol. a. 4.

(32) Cayet, Chronol novenaire, ad ann. 1594, fol. 387, verſo.

(33) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. VI, pag. m. 124.

GUILLELMA, or GUILLELMINA, of Bohemia, the head of an infamous ſect, which appeared in Italy in the XIIIth century, did ſo effectually deceive the world by the appearances of an extraordinary devotion, and acted her part ſo well to the laſt, that ſhe died with the reputation of holineſs, and was in great veneration for a conſiderable time after her death, as if ſhe had been a ſaint. At laſt her impoſture was found out; her corps was dug up, and burnt, in the year 1300. She died in 1281, and had been buried at Milan in the church-yard of *San Petro del Horto*. Half a year after, ſhe was removed to the convent of Caravalla (*a*), and a tomb was erected to her, the ruins whereof are ſtill to be ſeen in the burying-place of the monks. Two learned men, Puricellus and Boſſius, have publiſhed an account of that ſect; but they do not agree in every particular. Boſſius was the firſt, who defamed that ſect on account of their leudneſs [*A*]; but Puricellus maintains, that the corruption did not pro-

ceed

(*a*) *It is of the order of Citeaux, two leagues from Milan. It is wrongly called Claravallis.* Mabillon, Muſeum Italicum, Part. I, pag. 19.

[*A*] *Boſſius . . . . . firſt diffamed this ſect on account of their leudneſs.*] That ſect was accuſed of a thing, wherewith many other conventicles have been charged at ſeveral times, and in ſeveral places. It was ſaid, that the followers of Guillelma met in a cave in the night-time, and that, after they had repeated certain prayers, they put out the candles, and men and women lay together, as chance directed. *Quos ipſi in quadam Synagoga ſubterranea conventibus antelucanis congregantes, cum ad modum Presbyterorum induti certas orationes ad altare fudiſſent, extincto aut ſub modio abſcondito lumine ad fortutitos concubitus hortari, conſueverant* (1). It is further ſaid, that a rich merchant having a wife, who uſed to go frequently by ſtealth to that cave, followed her one day privately, and lay with her, and convicted her of it by a ring he took from her finger. He ſet up for a informer againſt that ſect (2). The ſame ſtory is related of the Fratricelli, as I have ſhewn in their article (3). I believe ſuch accuſations have been ſometimes calumnious: but doubtleſs many leud actions have been frequently performed in thoſe conventicles: and I do not wonder, that ſo many husbands do not approve, that their wives ſhould grow fond of certain devout aſſemblies; for love will come in ſooner or later, and one cannot ſufficiently admire the docility of the fair ſex in relation to the doctrines that are moſt contrary to chaſtity (4). I do not much wonder, that women ſhould have been prevailed upon to proſtitute themſelves, in the ancient Paganiſm; it was accounted a kind of divine worſhip; the goddeſs Venus was honoured in that manner: but it is an amazing thing, that, in the midſt of Chriſtianity, notwithſtanding the wiſe counſels of mothers, and the pathetical exhortations of preachers, the firſt hypocrite, that comes in their way, ſhould be able to perſuade them to a thouſand abominations. If he tells one of his devotees, as St Aldhelme (5) did, *lie by me; I deſire to know whether you will be ſo powerful an inſtrument in the devil's hands, as to make me yeld to the temptation*; ſhe will do it. If he tells her, as ſome heretics did, who were puniſhed by the inquiſition of Toulouſe, *let us be ſtark naked one by another one upon another; let us kiſs and tickle one another; we ſhall thereby give proofs of our ſpiritual ſtrength* (6); he is obeyed. Can there be a greater docility? would ſhe refuſe to proceed farther, if he was willing? have not many women complied with the order of lying with the firſt comer, when candles were put out, in the conventicles of the fraternity?

I muſt take notice of another docility not ſo bad, but yet very ſtrange. When infirm men want to have their natural heat in ſome meaſure reſtored to them, there are young women who will not ſcruple to lie by them, in order to do them that good office. A panegyriſt of the fair ſex affords me a very remarkable paſſage about it. ‘Phyſicians, *ſays he* (7) cannot deny, that the heat of a young woman's breaſt, applied to an old man's ſtomach, may revive and keep up

‘ his

(1) Spondanus, ubi infra.

(2) Ex Spondano, ad ann. 1300, n. 10.

(3) *Citat.* (12) *of the article FRATRICELLI.*

(4) *See the article FRATRICELLI, remark* [*A*].

(5) *See the article FRANCIS of Aſſiſi, remark* [*C*].

(6) Nonne eſt bene magnum meritum quod ſe ſtemus oſculando, amplexando, tangendo, tamen non conſentiamus in perpetratione carnalis peccati? *In the trials of the inquiſition of Toulouſe, printed at Amſterdam, in 1692, pag. 382.* Erat opinio aliquorum, quod non debebat reputari homo vel mulier virtuoſus vel virtuoſa, niſi ſe poſſent ponere nudus cum nuda in uno lecto, & tamen non perficerent actum carnalem. *Ibid. pag. 383.*

(7) Billon, Fort inexpugnable de l'honneur du ſexe femenin, fol. 112.

ceed from the mind to the body, and that Guillelma and her followers were only guilty of an abominable Fanaticiſm, which he proves by the verbal proceſs of the Inquiſition (*b*) [*B*]. Guillelma's feſtival was celebrated three times a year at her tomb; on St Bartholomew's day, on which ſhe died; on the day of the tranſlation of her body to Caravalla; and upon Whitſunday (*c*). Her viſions were not extirpated for ever [*C*].

‘his natural heat. The royal prophet David was not ignorant of it, ſince he pitched upon * the beautiful Shunamite, that ſhe might, in that manner, drive away the coldneſs of his old age. And it is likely, that, in imitation of him, the grandfather of the late king of Navarre, called Monſieur d'Albret, being 120 years old, kept two young handſome women to that effect. He lived a long time upon their milk without any other food, and lay between them; which was the reaſon why they were reſpected like princes in his houſe. But I would not have every man to do the ſame; for they would often imitate a Notary in the Chatelet of Paris, whoſe name was Martin Maupin. That man made his jealous wife believe, that he was ſick of David's diſtemper, that ſhe might give him leave to make uſe of his maid in order to warm his ſtomach; and the poor woman was ſometimes deceived in it.' I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that St Jerome does not approve, that what is related of the Shunamite ſhould be taken in a literal ſenſe. He explains it allegorically, and ſays the meaning of it is, that David, in his old days, was more intimately united to wiſdom. That great doctor of the church rejects the literal ſenſe with the utmoſt indignation. ‘Nonne tibi videtur, ſi occidentem ſequaris litteram, vel figmentum eſſe de mimo, vel Attellanarum ludicra? .... Quæ eſt igitur iſta Sunamitis, uxor & virgo, tam fervens, ut frigidum calefaceret, tam ſancta, ut calentem ad libidinem non provocaret: Exponat ſapientiſſimus Salomon patris ſui delicias, & pacificus bellatoris viri narret amplexus. Poſſide ſapientiam, poſſide intelligentiam, &c. (8) --- *Do you not think, that, by following the literal ſenſe, you make a meer fiction of the ſtory? .... What therefore is that Shunamite, both wife and virgin, ſo hot, as to warm the cold, ſo holy, as not to provoke him, when warm, to luſt? let Solomon, the wiſeſt of men, explain his father's joys, and a peaceful king relate the embraces of a warlike one. Get wiſdom, get underſtanding, &c.*'

[*B*] *By the verbal proceſs of the Inquiſition.*] That act, drawn up in the year 1300, imports, that Andrew Saramita and Mayfreda Pirovana, the chief followers of Guillelma, maintained, that ſhe was the HOLY GHOST incarnated in the feminine ſex, and born of Conſtantia, wife of the king of Bohemia; that ſhe was only dead according to the fleſh; that ſhe would riſe again before the general reſurrection, and aſcend into heaven in the ſight of her diſciples; that ſhe had left a vicar upon earth, *viz.* Mayfreda Pirovana, a nun of the order of the humbled; that this nun would ſay maſs at Guillelma's tomb; and at laſt, that ſhe would be poſſeſſed of the holy apoſtolical ſee at Rome; that ſhe would expel the cardinals from thence, and have four doctors, who would make four new goſpels. Puricellus gives us a full account of all thoſe impious aſſertions. His book was never printed, and it is not known whether it will ever come out. It does not appear that Guillelma boaſted of that pretended incarnation; nay, it ſeems that by a falſe modeſty ſhe affected not to own it (9).

[*C*] *Her viſions were not extirpated for ever.*] The author of the continuation of Nangis's chronicle ſays, upon the year 1306, that one Dulcinius of Verceil vented the like doctrines concerning the HOLY GHOST (10). Poſtel, and his mother Joan, were guilty of as great extravagancies; and it were eaſy to ſhew that this ſort of Fanaticiſm is revived from time to time. One would think, that the devils have plotted to have religion ridiculed by women, and that, notwithſtanding the ill ſucceſs of many attempts, they renew them from time to time in many places.

GUIMENÉ (The Princeſs of): Colomeſius reckons her among thoſe, who underſtood Hebrew [*A*]. Menage tells a pleaſant ſtory relating thereto [*B*].

[*A*] *Colomeſius reckons her among thoſe, who underſtood Hebrew.*] Theſe are his words: ‘Lutetiæ apud D. Hardy hujus principis Horas (ut vocant) vidi Hebraicè & Gallicè excuſas, unde colligo ipſam fuiſſe Hebraici idiomatis haud ignaram. Claruit circa A. 1625 (1). ——— *At Paris I ſaw the Horæ or prayer book of this Princeſs, in Hebrew and French, at Mr Hardy's, whence I conclude ſhe was not ignorant of the Hebrew tongue. She flouriſhed about* 1625.

[*B*] *Menage tells a .... ſtory relating thereto.*] ‘The prince of Guimené, ſeeing a man (it was Mr des Valles), with ragged breeches, come every morning into the princeſs of Guimené's chamber, asked her one day what he came for. She told him, he ſhews me Hebrew. Madam, (replied the prince) he will quickly ſhew you his backſide (2).'

GUINDANO (SIGISMUND) a native of Cremona, having made a poem about the actions of the emperor Charles V, preſented it to that prince at ſuch an unlucky time, that he received nothing for it. He did not pitch upon *a proper time* [*A*]; for he made his compliment with his copy in his hand, when Charles V was engaged in a great war in Germany. He was ſo vexed at ſuch an unprofitable reception, that he threw his poem into the fire: It is thought, that, if he had been rich enough to get it printed at his own charge, he would not have been ſo cruel to his work; but his great poverty, which did not permit him to publiſh it, together with his ſpite, was a ſufficient reaſon for him to deſtroy it (*a*).

[*A*] *He did not pitch upon* a proper time.] All thoſe, who intend to preſent their works to great men, ſhould mind this advice of Horace:

Ut proficiſcentem docui te ſæpe diuque
Auguſto reddes ſignata volumina, Vinni,
Si validus, ſi lætus erit, ſi denique poſcet.
Ne ſtudio noſtri pecces, odiumque libellis
Sedulus importes opera vehemente miniſter (1).

When laſt we parted, this was my command:
Preſent theſe papers to Auguſtus' hand;
From cares of empire if his mind unbends,
Or if he asks to ſee what Horace ſends;
Leſt, Vinnius, by thy diligence miſplac'd,
Thy maſter's verſes be at court diſgrac'd.

That is, one ought to avoid an unſeaſonable time; for all princes are in that reſpect like Auguſtus; they will not be unſeaſonably interrupted (2). An author will miſcarry for want of obſerving the critical minute, and what the Latins call, *Molles aditus, molliſſima fandi tempora.* Our Guindano had this misfortune; he miſ-timed his buſineſs; he ſhewed a poem of twelve books to an emperor, who was engaged in a very troubleſome war (3). *O eſſendo preſentati con poco garbo, ò non à tempo trovandoſi egli occupatiſſimo nel'e guerre d'Allemagna, non hebbe mai niente* (4).

(*b*) Mabillon, ubi ſupra, pag. 19, 20.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

* Reg iii, cap 1.

(8) Hieronym. Epiſt. ad Nepotianum, pag. m. 207.

(9) Mabill. in Muſeo Italico, Part. I, pag. 20.

(10) Id. Mabill. ibid.

(1) Colomeſ. Gall. Orient. pag. 261.

(2) Menagiana, pag 189, *of the firſt Dutch Edit.*

(*a*) *Taken from Lancellotti di Perugia, in the 27th* Diſinganno *of the firſt volume of his* Hoggidi, pag. 273. *He quotes* An. Camp. lib. iii, Aug. Ju. lib. v.

(1) Horat. Epiſt. xiii, lib. i.

(2) Niſi dextro tempore, Flacci Verba per attentam non ibunt Cæſaris aurem. *But, above all, a proper ſeaſon chuſe, Or Cæſar will not liſten to the muſe.* Id. Sat. I, lib. ii, ver. 18.

(3) Havea queſti compoſto dodici libri de fatti di Carlo V. Imperadore intitulati *Auſtriades.* Lancelotti di Perugia, Hoggidi, Part. I, cap. xxvii, pag. 273.

(4) Id. ibid.

GUISCARD. It is the name, which the lords de la Coſte, de la Bourlie, de la Laurie, *&c.* beſtowed upon their family, which is one of the moſt noble and moſt ancient in the province of Quercy. They pitched upon it out of reſpect to one of their anceſtors, whoſe proper name was GUISCARDUS. It was not the cuſtom of thoſe times to preſerve the proofs of the origine of families in favour of their poſterity; nevertheleſs thoſe lords can produce ſome writings near five hundred years old; for they make it appear, not only that they are poſſeſſed of lands, which never were out of their family for many ages, but alſo that their nobility has been tranſmitted without any interruption to the count de GUISCARD, who is *(a)* a worthy ſucceſſor of his illuſtrious anceſtors. BERNARD DE GUISCARD makes the firſt degree of the genealogy of that houſe. The teſtimonies of his actions, which are extant, ſhew that his race had an original, which reached beyond the age he lived in. He took the title of knight in all the leaſes of his lands from the year 1247 to 1283. This is a manifeſt proof, that he had ſignalized himſelf in war, and that his ſervices procured him that title, which was then, and for many ages after, the moſt honourable reward beſtowed upon military valour. There are fourteen degrees in a direct and male line from that Bernard to the preſent count de Guiſcard, and that ſeries of ſucceſſions affords ſeveral illuſtrious alliances, and ſeveral perſons diſtinguiſhed by their merit [*A*]. But it muſt be confeſſed, that thoſe, who gave a greater luſtre to that family, are, GEORGE DE GUISCARD, lord of la Bourlie [*B*], and LEWIS DE GUISCARD, his

(a) I write this n March, 1700.

[*A*] *Several illuſtrious alliances, and ſeveral perſons diſtinguiſhed by their merit.*] I ſhall mention ſome of them. BERTRAND DE GUISCARD, Damoiſeau (1), the third ſon of BERNARD (2) DE GUISCARD, left a ſon behind him called GAILLARD DE GUISCARD, 'about whom there is an uncommon record preſerved in the archives. Having been knighted, as his forefathers were, a private man called Peter de la Tour, who probably ſerved under him, and was upon the point of death, having deſired him to honour him with the ſame title, he conferred it upon him in the year 1334: *In infirmitate qua deceſſit, fecit ſe militem fieri per Gaillardum Guiſcardum militem, & per eundem Guiſcardum inſignia militaria ſibi dari.* King Philip de Valois, approving that action, by his letters dated from Paris in Auguſt, 1337, confirmed that knighthood, and was willing that the deſcendants of him, who had received it, ſhould enjoy, by virtue of it, all the privileges belonging to nobility. The ſame Gaillard de Guiſcard ſerved ſtill in the wars of Gaſcogne, in the year 1339, with four eſquires under the command of meſſire Peter de Marmande, ſeneſchal of Perigord, according to an account of that year given by Bartholomew de Drack, treaſurer of the war. But it is not known, whether he was married, and left any children behind him (3).'

BERNARD DE GUISCARD fourth of that name, Seigneur de la Coſte, and de la Laurie, Damoiſeau, married the twenty eighth of April, 1315, Helis de Montaigu, daughter and heireſs of Bernard de Montaigu, Seigneur de Montcuc. 'His caſtle of la Coſte being then an important fortreſs, Galois de la Baume, lord of Valſin, who had the direction of the war in Languedoc, and was then at Cahors, gave him the government of it, and kept him in the pay of Charles V, by letters of the tenth of May, 1348, with ſix men of arms, and ſix foot-ſerjeants, to ſecure that place. There is good reaſon to believe, that he preſerved it out of intereſt and zeal, as he had engaged; for he made his will in that caſtle, the twenty ſeventh of April in the year 1353 (4).'

WILLIAM BERTRAND DE GUISCARD, ſecond of that name, married, firſt, on the fifth of October, 1413, Margaret de Veirac, daughter of Guy de Veirac, lord of Merle and Coſſac in the dioceſe of Tulles; and, ſecondly, Helis de Landore, ſiſter to Bernard de Landore, viſcount de Cadars in Roüergue. ANTONY DE GUISCARD, lord of la Coſte and Montcuc, married, the ſixteenth of October, 1492, Iſabella de Lomagne, daughter of John de Lomagne, lord of Montagu in Agenois. JOHN DE GUISCARD, firſt of that name, gentleman in ordinary of the king's chamber, married the eleventh of Auguſt, 1528, Souveraigne de Ricard de Genouillac, daughter of John de Ricard ſirnamed de Genouillac, knight, baron de Gourdon, and lord of Genouillac, and Vaillac, and of Margaret Daubuſſon. JOHN DE GUISCARD his ſon, one of the hundred gentlemen of the king's houſhold (5), married, the twelfth of November, 1554, Frances de la Barthe, daughter of Matthew de la Barthe, baron de Montcornel, and firſt baron d'Aſtarac, and of Catherine de Lomagne, lady de Montarac. JOHN DE GUISCARD, his ſecond ſon, lord of Puy de Sirects, married Agnes de Temines, the fifth of January, 1625.

[*B*] *GEORGE DE GUISCARD lord of la Bourlie.*] That family was divided into two branches towards the end of the XVth century, *viz.* that of the lords du Puy de Sirects (6), and that of the lords du Cairou and de la Bourlie. The head of the firſt was the ſecond ſon of John de Guiſcard, ſecond of that name. The head of the other was GABRIEL DE GUISCARD, lord of la Gardelle, du Cairou, and de la Bourlie, the third ſon of John de Guiſcard, ſecond of that name. Gabriel de Guiſcard had eight ſons: the ſixth is the count de la Bourlie, whoſe name appears in the text of this remark. He was born the ninth of Auguſt, 1606. 'He has been ſucceſſively captain of foot and of horſe in the regiment of Vaillac and Coallin. One of his legs was broke by a musket-ſhot, at the deſcent into the iſles of St Margaret and St Honorat; and one of his arms was run through with a ſpear, at the battle of Rocroy; and having ſignalized himſelf at the battle of Lens (7), at the ſiege of Arras, and on ſeveral occaſions, he deſerved to be made one of the king's penſionaries in the year 1644. He was made ſerjeant of battle, and governor of Courtray, in the year 1647. The year following, the queen-mother thought him worthy of the choice ſhe made of him to fill the place of ſub-governor to the king. Afterwards he was made counſellor of ſtate in 1649, marêchal de camp in 1651: and his majeſty being well pleaſed with the ſervices he had done in his employments, gave him, in 1662, the command of the ſovereignties of Sedan, Raucour, and St Mange; and he had the government of that important place in 1671, of which he had been made great bayliff. The king thought he could not beſtow upon a more faithful perſon the command of the towns and citadel of Dunkirk, Bergues, Furnes, and Graveline, and of the troops appointed for the defence of that frontier, which was given him with the power of lieutenant-general in 1672: and the year following, he beat, near Furnes, with 500 troopers, above 800 men of the enemies, a great part of which were killed upon the ſpot, and he brought 140 priſoners to Dunkirk. At laſt, crowned with the reputation he had juſtly acquired by his wiſdom and valour, during the ſpace of a very long life, he died the ninth of December, in the year 1693, aged eighty ſeven years and four months. He had been married in the royal-palace, in the king's and the late queen-mother's preſence, the twenty eighth of November 1648, to Genevieve de Longueval, lady de Fourdrinoy in Picardy, daughter of Antony de Longueval, lord of Tenelles and Lemont, and of Elizabeth de Margival; and he left behind him four ſons by that lady.' LEWIS DE GUISCARD count de Neuvy, of whom I ſhall ſpeak in the following remark. 'JOHN-GEORGE DE GUISCARD, born the twenty ſeventh of September, 1657. he gave great proofs of his valour, being enſign in the colonel's company of the regiment of

---

(1) *Children of good families, who had not yet b en knighted, were diſtinguiſhed by that title.*

(2) *He was the ſon of that Bernard de Guiſcard, with whom the genealogy begins.*

(3) Hoſier, Genealogie de la Maiſon de Guiſcard. *See citat.* (9).

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) *That company was then compoſed of perſons of quality.*

(6) *It is extinct.*

(7) *Note*, That the battle of Lens was fought in 1648, and therefore there is here one name for another, or a ſmall anachroniſm.

his eldeſt ſon [*C*]. Read the following Remarks. This family bears, argent, a bend gules; for ſupporters, two lions, or; and for the creſt, a lion naiſſant of the ſame (*b*).

‘Normandy, during the defence of Grave, where he was wounded with a muſket-ſhot in the head; and, whilſt he was captain in the regiment of guards, he ſignalized his courage in many battles and ſieges. He was ſhot through the body at the ſiege of Ipres; and has been ſince colonel of the regiment of Normandy, at the head of which the count de Guiſcard, his brother, had ſerved with great diſtinction. ANTONY DE GUISCARD, born the twenty ſeventh of December 1658, abbot of Bonnecombe in Roüergue, and prior of Dieu en Souvienne. Genevieve Catherine de Guiſcard was married, the thirtieth of Oct. 1683, to Camillus Savari, count de Breves (8).’

Note, that the eldeſt branch is now, in the fifteenth degree, in the perſon of FRANCIS DE GUISCARD, Seigneur de St Jean and de la Coſte.

[C] .... *LEWIS DE GUISCARD, his eldeſt ſon.*] He was born the twenty ſeventh of September, 1651; and, ‘ever ſince he bore arms, he has had important poſts in the king's ſervice. For being animated with the ſame ſentiments, which procured to the count de la Bourlie, his father, all the glorious rewards, wherewith his majeſty honoured his courage, he began to ſerve as a captain in the regiment des Vaiſſeaux, in the year 1671. He ſerved in that quality, the year following, at the ſieges of Orſoy, Rhimberg, Duiſburg, and Zutphen, and at thoſe of Maeſtricht and Unna in the country of Marck, in the year 1673. The king made him colonel of the regiment of Normandy in March 1674; and immediately he entered into Grave, which was inveſted already, and where the ſaid regiment was. He forced a guard, and carried 16 priſoners into the place, with 30 troopers of the garriſon of Mazeyck, whom he had taken for a convoy. He was dangerouſly wounded with a muſket-ſhot in the arm-pit, towards the end of the ſiege, where he commanded the infantry. The year following, he was wounded again with a muſket-ſhot in the head, at the ſiege of Bouchain: and, being detached, the ſame campaign, to bring ſix battalions to the body, commanded by the mareſchal de Crequi near Thionville; he was at the battle of Conſarbrick, and was ſo happy, as to bring to Metz the broken remains of the Infantry, with the remainder of the regiment of Normandy and Bourlemont. He ſerved the years following, in Germany, and was at the ſiege of Friburg, and of fort Kiel; and alſo, in the year 1684, at the ſiege of Luxemburg. He always ſignalized himſelf with ſo much bravery in all the places, where he had occaſion to act at the head of that body, that his majeſty granted him, in 1689, a commiſſion of brigadier in his infantry, and gave him power to command in Dinant, and a general inſpection over the troops garriſoned in that place, and in Charlemont, Rocroy, Beaumont, and Philippeville. Having diſcharged the duties of that poſt with the utmoſt vigilance and activity (9), the king thought fit to make him, the next year, mareſchal de camp, and commander of Rocroy and Charlemont, with orders to throw himſelf into Philippeville, if it ſhould be attacked. And becauſe his wiſe conduct and indefatigable application made way for new rewards, the count de la Bourlie having reſigned his government of Sedan, the king thought it juſt to give it to the count de Guiſcard, his ſon. It was conferred upon him in the year 1692. And his majeſty being well pleaſed with the zeal and intrepidity he had ſhewn, wherever he had executed his orders, thought he ought to entruſt him with the keeping of the town and caſtle of Namur, the moſt important place of Europe, which he had juſt then ſubdued at the head of his army. He had the power to command in it as a governor; and that glorious choice was attended with the dignity of lieutenant-general, wherewith the king honoured him, the thirtieth of March, 1693. His majeſty gave him the command of a conſiderable body, to inveſt Huy, in order to make a diverſion, whereby the ſiege of Furnes, undertaken by the mareſchal de Boufflers, might be carried on; which ſucceeded, by keeping on that ſide part of the enemies troops commanded by the earl of Athlone. He ſuſtained, at Boſſu, a vigorous attack of the enemies upon a convoy, which he conducted from Maubeuge to the army of the mareſchal de Luxemburg, with a firmneſs the more extraordinary, becauſe he had but thirteen ſquadrons; and Mr du Puy, lieutenant-general of the Spaniſh armies, who had eighteen ſquadrons, and 2400 foot, of the garriſon of Charleroy, was entirely defeated, and put to flight, having had many men killed and made priſoners. He was ſo lucky as to be at the battle of Nerwinde, having ſet out from Huy at break of day. The mareſchal de Luxemburg placed him in the right wing, where he proved very ſerviceable. Having acquired a new degree of glory by the defence of Namur, attacked by all the forces of the allies, he was honoured with the order of the HOLY GHOST, to which the king nominated him the ſeventeenth of December, 1695; and he was admitted, with the uſual ceremonies, on the firſt day of January of this year 1696. He married the twenty fourth of February, 1677, Angelique de Langlée, the daughter of Claudius de Langlée, chevalier, Seigneur de l'Epicheliere, quarter-maſter-general of the king's armies, and of Catherine Roze; by whom he has LEWIS AUGUSTUS DE GUISCARD, born the twentieth of May 1680, and colonel of the regiment of Guiſcard, *&c.* Catherine de Guiſcard, born the twelfth of June 1688 (10).’

This is what Mr d'Hoſier ſaid in December 1696. He could not then mention the embaſſy of Sweden, to which the count de Guiſcard was named in 1698 (11); nor the untimely death of the only ſon of that count. That young lord had been educated with all imaginable care, and had wonderfully anſwered ſo good an education. He had very noble inclinations he loved not only warlike exerciſes, but alſo the *Belles Lettres* and philoſophy, and had made a great progreſs in them. He ſaw the court of England in the retinue of the count de Tallard the French embaſſador, in the year 1698, and accompanied his father to Stockholm in 1699. He was preparing to take a journey to Rome; but, being arrived at Vienna, he fell ſick of the ſmall-pox, of which he died in a few days, towards the end of December 1699, to the great grief of all thoſe, who knew and admired him. Had not the count de Guiſcard, who loved that only ſon with a particular tenderneſs, been a man of a very ſteady ſoul, he had never been able to bear ſuch a ſevere blow.

GUISE (JAMES DE), a Franciſcan monk, was born at Mons in Hainault. He was doctor of divinity, and taught that ſcience, philoſophy, and mathematics, for the ſpace of twenty-five years more or leſs, in the convents of his order. He earneſtly applied himſelf to illuſtrate the antiquities, and the hiſtory, of his country; but he followed fabulous traditions; for he affirmed, that his birth-place was founded by the Trojans. We have only an abridgment of his chronicle of Hainault (*a*) [*A*], and it is not

[*A*] *We have only an abridgment of his chronicle of Hainault.*] That abridgment is written in French, and not in Latin, as the chronicle. It was printed at Paris in the year 1531, in folio. The title of it runs thus: *Les illuſtrations de la Gaule Belgique, antiquitez du Pays de Hainault & de la grand cité des Belges, à preſent dite Bavay, dont procedent les chauſſées de Brunehaut, & de pluſieurs Princes qui ont regné, & fondé pluſieurs villes & citez audict pays, & autres choſes ſingulieres & dignes de mémoire, advenues durant leurs regnes, juſques au Duc Philippes de Bourgogne dernier decedé. Par Frere Jaques de Guiſe Religieux de l'Ordre de Saint François. Oeuvre diviſé en ſix Volumes, deſquels il n'y a que les trois premiers imprimez.* That is, ‘the illuſtrations of Gallia Belgica, the antiquities of Hainault, and the great city,

(*b*) *Taken from the genealogy of the houſe of Guiſcard, drawn up from records in Decemb. 1696, by Mr d'Hoſier.*

(8) Genealogie de la Maiſon de Guiſcard.

(9) I have followed the original, which I had by me; but it is plain, it is a faulty copy in this place, and that we muſt not aſcribe to Mr Hoſier what we there find contrary to the grammatical conſtruction of words.

(10) D'Hoſier, in the Genealogy of the Houſe of Guiſcard, drawn up from Records in Decemb. 1696.

(11) He is actually exerciſing the functions of that embaſſy, which he entered upon ſeven or eight months ago: I write this in March 1700.

(*a*) *Taken from* Valer Andreas, Bibl. Belg. pag. 411.

not likely, that the whole work will ever be publiſhed. The author died at Valenciennes, the ſixth of February, 1399 (*b*). Moreri has committed ſome faults [*B*].

(*b*) Valer. Andr. ibid.

city of the Belgæ, now called Bavay, where the cauſeway (commonly called les Chauſſées de Brunehaut) begins, and of many princes, who reigned and built many towns in that country, and other memorable things, which happened in their reigns, till the time of the late duke Philip of Burgundy. By brother James de Guiſe, a monk of the order of St Francis. A work divided into ſix volumes, whereof only the three firſt are printed.' Thus the title of this work is mentioned by Andrew du Cheſne (1). Du Verdier does not mention it ſo fully; but he has not forgot a circumſtance omitted by du Cheſne, viz. That this book was *tranſlated into French* (2). La Croix du Maine falſly believed, that James de Guiſe was the author of that tranſlation (3). He adds, that the Latin chronicle of that monk *is to be ſeen in manuſcript in the convent of the Minor Fryars at Valenciennes, as John le Maire ſays in his* Illuſtrations of Gaule; that it was compoſed *at the requeſt of William earl of Hainault*, and that it reaches to the year 1244. This laſt particular does not agree with the title of the abridgment; for no duke of Burgundy, called Philip, died at that time. Philip de Rouvre, the laſt duke of Burgundy of the firſt branch, died the twenty firſt of November 1361. Valerius Andreas obſerves (4), that the Paris edition, 1531, is intituled, *Extraict des Chroniceques de Jacques de Guiſe*; and that there was, at Mr Gevart's at Antwerp, another abridgment of thoſe chronicles, made by order of Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy. He further ſays, that the Franciſcans of Mons had the manuſcript of that chronicle of Hainault in three volumes.

I learned yeſterday (5) of Baron le Roy, a very curious and knowing man, that, not long before his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty beſieged Mons in 1691, he wrote a letter to the warden of the convent, where that manuſcript was, deſiring him to get ſome chapters of it tranſcribed for him; and that the warden made anſwer, that, after he had tranſcribed ſomething of it, he had left it off, not being able to read the author's letters and abbreviations, and that the moſt able monks of his convent could not do it neither. Baron le Roy added, that, during the ſiege, a lay-brother of that convent ſet up for a gunner, and made it appear, that he had not forgot the experience he had formerly got in that art; and that, a deſerter having acquainted the French with it, many bombs were thrown upon that convent, which ſet it on fire; ſo that the manuſcript of James de Guiſe was burnt, with the library of the monks.

[*B*] *Moreri has committed ſome faults.*] I. James de Guiſe was not a *a native of Valenciennes*, but of Mons. Obſerve, by the bye, that La Coix du Maine, who conjectured he was born at Guiſe (6), is miſtaken; beſides, he did not know that this monk lived in the XIVth century. II. Moreri ſhould not have ſaid, that he died in 1398, or in 1399; for authors do not differ in that manner as to the year, in which James de Guiſe departed this life. Their variations conſiſt in this, that ſome begin the year with January, and others after Eaſter. According to the latter, he died in 1398, and, according to the former, in 1399 (7).

(1) Du Cheſne, Biblioth. des Hiſtoriens de France, pag. m. 198.

(2) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franc. pag. 608.

(3) La Croix du Maine, pag. 188.

(4) Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag. 411.

(5) I write this in Novem. 1697.

(6) La Croix du Maine, ubi ſupra.

(7) *See* Valerius Andreas, ubi ſupra.

GUISE, a town of Picardy, upon the river Oiſe, in the dioceſe of Laon, was the ancient patrimony of the younger brothers of the houſe of Lorrain, and was erected into a dutchy and peerdom in January 1527 (*a*). It went through ſeveral revolutions, according to the different ſucceſs of arms, during the wars of Francis I, and the emperor Charles V. It was taken by ſtorm in 1536. *The caſtle, which might have held out, was baſely ſurrendred; for which reaſon the captains were branded with infamy* (*b*). But in 1543, Ferdinand de Gonzaga, who beſieged it, being early informed of the march of Francis I, raiſed the ſiege, and was ſo briſkly charged in his retreat, that he loſt two thouſand men in the rear of his army, beſides many priſoners (*c*). In 1636, the Spaniards, who had made ſome conqueſts in Picardy, did not think fit to beſiege Guiſe, being afraid that the count de Guebriant, who commanded in it, would make a vigorous reſiſtance (*d*). They could not make themſelves maſters of it in 1650, though every thing ſeemed to favour them. See the book, intituled, *Le Triomphe de la Ville de Guiſe*. It was written by John Baptiſt de Verdun, a Minime, and printed at Paris in 1687: It is mentioned in the Journal des Savans (*e*). I ſhall obſerve in another place (*f*), that the miſcarriage of that enterprize of the Spaniards is chiefly to be aſcribed to the marquis de Bougi.

(*a*) Du Cheſne Antiq. des Villes de France, pag. m. 438.

(*b*) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. IV, pag. 595.

(*c*) Id. Hiſt. de France, Tom. II, pag. 1021.

(*d*) Le Laboureur, Hiſt. du Maréchal de Guebriant.

(*e*) Of the 17th of May, 1688.

(*f*) In one of the remarks of the article REVEREND.

GUISE (CLAUDIUS DE LORRAIN, duke of), the ſecond ſon of Renatus duke of Lorrain, went and ſettled in France, after he had endeavoured in vain, as it is ſaid, to hinder Antony his eldeſt brother from ſucceeding his father [*A*]. Being a man of

great

[*A*] *He in vain endeavoured, as it is ſaid, to hinder Antony his elder brother from ſucceeding his father.*] The following account is to be found in Thuanus, where he gives an account of the ſpeech, which la Renaudie is ſuppoſed to have made to his accomplices (1). Renatus, duke of Lorrain, when he married Margaret d'Harcourt (2), heireſs of the houſe of Tancarville, obliged her, by the contract of his marriage, to make over to him her eſtate by deed of gift. Afterwards, under pretence that ſhe was ugly, and then under pretence that ſhe was barren, he cruelly divorced her, without reſtoring her eſtate to her, and married the ſiſter of the duke of Guelderland before his firſt wife died. He had, by this ſecond wife, among other children, Antony, who ſucceeded him, and our Claudius. The latter, who was born after the death of Margaret d'Harcourt, pretended, that Antony, being born during the life of that lady, was to be reputed a baſtard, and uncapable of ſucceeding; ſo that he did not ſcruple to diſhonour his own mother, by giving out, that ſhe was a concubine, provided he might become by that means duke of Lorrain, to the prejudice of his elder brother (3). Having miſcarried in his attempt, he left his country, and retired into France. I cannot tell whether this be true; and I give little credit to what is ſaid by a ſpeech-maker, in ſuch circumſtances as la Renaudie was in: but I am ſure, that a very ambitious man is little concerned to diſhonour his mother, when great advantages accrue to him from it. I ſhall ſet down ſome words of Thuanus, which ſeem to have ſome obſcurity in them. *Cum primo ſimulatis nuptiis Margaritam Gulielmi Haricuriani Tancarvillæ Comitis filiam & ampliſſimorum bonorum, quæ Lotaringi hodie in Caletenſi agro poſſident, heredem duxiſſet, & tabulis dotalib. ad donationem illorum bonorum adegiſſet, poſtea deformitatem & ex deformitate ſterilitatem cauſſatus miſeram feminam repudiavit, & tamen bona retinuit* (4). Thuanus's meaning ſeems to be this, that the two pretences of the duke of Lorrain were grounded one upon another; that is, he alledged, firſt, that Margaret was an ugly woman; and, in the ſecond place, that her uglineſs was the cauſe of her barrenneſs. None but a wretched philoſopher would argue thus: for there is no other connexion between a woman's uglineſs and her barrenneſs, than what a malicious and nice husband can make, by refuſing to pay to his wife

(1) At the time of the conſpiracy of Amboiſe, in the year 1560.

(2) The daughter of William d'Harcourt, Count de Tancarville.

(3) Et Claudius quidem . . . Antonium fratrem, quod is viva Margarita ex Philippa natus eſſet, tanquam ex adulterio procreatum Lotaringiæ ſucceſſione dejicere voluit, ne communis quidem matris pudori parcens: quod cum fruſtra tentaſſet, & in patria impius eſſe non poſſet, ſpes iniquas ſecum in Galliam . . . attulit. *Thuanus, lib. xxiv, pag.* 490, *ad ann.* 1560.

(4) Thuan. lib. xxiv, pag. 489, ad ann. 1560.

what

great courage and merit, he was very much eſteemed. He married a princeſs of the blood(*a*), and was raiſed to great offices. The county of Guiſe was erected into a duchy and peerdom upon his account. Such erections had not been made till then but for the princes of the blood. It is ſaid, Francis I was angry with him upon ſome occaſions [*B*], and would not permit him to be acknowledged a prince [*C*], nor to aſſume all the marks of one. However it be, Claudius de Lorrain became ſo powerful, that he founded a houſe, which was like to dethrone the lawful ſucceſſors. He died in 1550, leaving behind him ſix ſons and four daughters, the eldeſt of which was married to James Stuart, the Vth of that name, king of Scotland. He ſignalized himſelf upon ſeveral great occaſions, particularly at the battle of Marignan [*D*]. His brother John, who went by the name of cardinal of Lorrain, proved a great ſupport to him (*b*).

what we call a due benevolence. Perhaps, duke Renatus took care not to want a pretence of barrenneſs upon occaſion; but I am perſuaded, that the only meaning of Thuanus's words, is, that, after the duke had alledged his wife's uglineſs, he gave another reaſon for his divorce, *viz.* that he could get no children by her.

I cannot tell whether Varillas had any other authority beſides la Renaudie's ſpeech: however, it will not be improper to quote him (5). ‘ When Claudius de ‘ Lorrain conſulted his own intereſt, he pretended, ‘ that the duchies of Lorrain and Bar belonged to ‘ him, and that Antony, his eldeſt brother, was not a ‘ lawful ſon, ſince he was born in the life-time of the ‘ firſt wife (6) of their father. The ſame Claudius ‘ could not forbear ſaying ſo to ſome perſons, who ‘ told duke Renatus of it; and he was afraid that his ‘ two ſons would attempt upon one another's life. He ‘ found no better expedient, than to ſend Claudius into ‘ France, and to marry him there to Antoinette de ‘ Bourbon, eldeſt daughter of the count de Vendôme, ‘ and to beſtow upon him all the lands he had in that ‘ kingdom; which were ſo many, that they take up ‘ two pages in the manuſcript of the contract *, and ‘ ſo conſiderable, that they brought in as great a re‘venue as the duchies of Lorrain and Bar.’ Beloi ſays the quite contrary; for he affirms, that the firſt duke of Guiſe was not worth above *fourteen or fifteen thouſand livres per annum, when he married the lady Antoinette de Bourbon* (7).

[*B*] *Francis I was angry with him upon ſome occaſions.*] La Renaudie affirms it in his ſpeech: he ſays, that Claudius de Lorrain, having ſent, without the king's order, ſome troops out of the province, of which he was governour, did ſo exaſperate his majeſty, that his pardon could not be obtained, but upon condition that he ſhould no more appear at court. The pretence he made uſe of to ſend thoſe troops out of his government of Champaigne, was, that he had a mind to repulſe the Anabaptiſts, who made excurſions into the dominions of the duke of Lorrain (8). *Antonio ab Anabaptiſtis, uti ajebat, infeſtato, injuſſu regis ex præfectura ſua auxiliareis copias adduxit. Quod adeo impatienter tulit Franciſcus, qui his præludiis patientiam ſuam tentari interpretabatur, ut niſi in Joannis fratris* (9) & *Annæ Momorantii, qui factum excuſavit, gratiam, nunquam eam injuriam condonaturus fuiſſe credatur: quam tamen ea lege remiſit, ut Claudius in poſterum aula abſtineret, neque in ſuum conſpectum veniret.* As I have already ſaid, I do not much depend upon la Renaudie's ſpeech; but part of what he ſays is to be found in a good hiſtorian: let us keep to his account. *The late king Francis,* ſays he (10), *never had a good opinion of the father* (11), *ſince he came to know, that, during his impriſonment, he had brought the forces of the kingdom to Savern, in order to pacify the troubles of Germany, and fight thoſe, who troubled the Netherlands, and other countries, belonging to the houſe of Auſtria. The ſaid king took it ſo ill, that, being come from Spain to St Sever, he ordered he ſhould be impriſoned; and, had it not been for the conſtable's interceſſion, it had gone hard with him. He was alſo very much blamed, not only by the nobility, but alſo by the king, for the attempt he made upon the government of Burgundy in the life-time of Philip Chabot, admiral and governour of that country; for the doing of an ill office to the crown, and encroaching upon the office of a gentleman ſtill living, are two things very much taken notice of in France: which made the father and the ſons ſo odious to the king, that they loſt all hopes of raiſing themſelves without the alliance and favour of the ducheſs of Valentinois.* I wonder this hiſtorian does not add, that the king, not long before he died, charged his ſucceſſor to beſtow no office upon the Guiſes. This particular is mentioned by ſome hiſtorians: La Renaudie did not forget it. Theſe are his words in Thuanus. *Ejus rei memoria cum tenaciſſime in Franciſci prudentiſſimi principis animo, quamdiu vixit, hæſiſſet, moriens ille inter ſalutaria præcepta, quæ de poſteritate ac regno ſolicitus Henrico F. dedit, imprimis eum monuit, ut ſibi à Guiſianorum ambitione caveret, ac proinde eos publicæ rei gubernaculis ne admoveret* (12).

[*C*] . . . . . . *and would not permit him to be acknowledged a prince.*] Preſident de la Place, whom I have quoted before, mentions a diſcourſe, that was made to Catherine de Medicis, by Lewis Regnier, Sieur de la Planche. ‘ The French gentlemen, (*they are Regnier's* ‘ *words*) honour foreign princes, when they keep with‘in due bounds; otherwiſe they cannot endure them, ‘ and much leſs acknowledge them for princes, but ‘ only for lords and gentlemen. Which was confirmed ‘ by the judgment of the late king Francis, when the ‘ duke d'Aumale married; for he would not permit his ‘ wife to be dreſſed like a princeſs on her wedding-day, ‘ ſaying, that he would not beſtow upon the princes ‘ of Lorrain the honours that belong only to the ‘ princes of the blood; and that, if they had a mind to ‘ appear like princes, they muſt go out of the king‘dom, and do it at their own charges. And the late ‘ duke of Guiſe, who very carefully ſued for the ‘ place of chief hunter, which before was only poſſeſ‘ſed by meer gentlemen, was well contented, that his ‘ daughter-in-law ſhould have no mantle on her wed‘ding-day (13).’ We ſhall ſee, that Henry II did not tread in his father's ſteps, and even that Francis I was not always ſo ſtrict on that head. ‘ The late king ‘ Francis, (*they are la Planche's words*) (14) at the en‘try of queen Alienor, was willing that Mademoiſelle ‘ de Guiſe, afterwards queen of Scotland, ſhould be ‘ dreſſed like a princeſs; but, when her brother mar‘ried, he plainly made it appear, that he would not ‘ have it to be made a precedent. And if the late ‘ king, at the ſollicitation of the ducheſs of Valen‘tinois, (to whom all thoſe of the houſe of Guiſe, ‘ that are now living, are indebted for their grandeur) ‘ altered the ancient cuſtom, which was, that no maid ‘ ſhould be dreſſed like a princeſs on her wedding-day, ‘ unleſs ſhe was the daughter of a prince of the blood, ‘ or married to one; it is certain, that, if he had ‘ lived, he was reſolved to humble them ſufficiently.’ There are two other particulars in Lewis Regnier's diſcourſe, that deſerve to be inſerted in this place. ‘ The late M. de Saint Paul never heard *the duke of* ‘ *Guiſe, Claudius de Lorrain, ſtile himſelf prince,* but ‘ he ſmiled, and told ſome perſons about him, that he ‘ ſpoke German in French; and that whenever he had ‘ a mind to call himſelf a prince, he ſhould add; of ‘ Lorrain, to ſpeak proper French (15).’ This is the firſt particular: here follows the ſecond (16). ‘ It has ‘ been an ancient cuſtom of our parliaments, eſpecial‘ly of that of Paris, to prevent any one's aſſuming the ‘ title of prince in thoſe courts, unleſs he be one of the ‘ royal blood. Which was confirmed, with reſpect to ‘ Meſſieurs de Guiſe, pleading before the late preſident ‘ Lizet, who told their advocate in a full court, that ‘ the title of prince belonged to none in France but ‘ to the princes of the blood, and ordered it to be ‘ ſtruck out immediately (17).’

[*D*] *He ſignalized himſelf . . . . . particularly at the battle of Marignan.*] Francis I obtained a victory over the Swiſs at Marignan in the year 1515. ‘ Clau‘dius duke of Guiſe, who commanded the Lanſque‘nets in the abſence of Charles duke of Guelderland, ‘ his uncle, was trampled under foot. A German gen‘tleman belonging to him ſaved his life, and loſt his ‘ own, by covering his body, and receiving the blows ‘ levelled at him (18).’ See Father Anſelme (19) who deſcribes the thing more to the advantage of the duke of Guiſe.

(*a*) *Antoinette de Bourbon, ſiſter to Charles duke of Vendôme, the 18th of April,* 1513. Anſelme, Hiſt. Genealog. pag. 285.

(*b*) *See the marginal note* (9) *of remark* [*B*].

(5) Varillas, Hiſt. de Henry III, livr. xii, pag. m. 311, 312.

(6) Varillas calls her Joan de Harcourt-Tancarville.

* Among the MSS of Lomenie.

(7) Beloi, Apologie Catholique, fol. 10, verſo.

(8) Thuanus, ubi ſupra, pag. 490.

(9) Thuanus had been ſaying a little before, that Claudius had obtained the government of Champagne and Brie, at the ſollicitation of his brother John, a cardinal, who had a great intereſt with the king.

(10) Preſident de la Place, Commentaires de l'Eſtat de la Religion & Republique, liv. ii, fol. m. 54, verſo, ad ann. 1560.

(11) That is, Claudius duke of Guiſe.

(12) Thuan. ubi ſupra, pag. 490. *See below citat.* (2), *of the article of the duke of* GUISE, *grandſon of this.*

(13) Preſident de la Place, ubi ſupra, fol. 59. *See alſo* Hiſtoire de l'Eſtat de France ſous François II, *by Lewis Regnier, Sieur de la Planche, pag.* 399.

(14) Preſident de la Place, ibid. & fol. 60.

(15) Id. ibid. fol. 59, verſo.

(16) Id. ibid. fol. 60.

(17) *Here are la Planche's own words, pag.* 400, *of his hiſtory of Francis II.* Nay, in a full parliament, an advocate pleading for the ſaid duke of Guiſe, and giving him the title of prince, it was immediately ordered, that this title ſhould be ſtruck out; and it is thought, that this was one of the reaſons, why the late firſt preſident Liſet was deprived of his office, at the requeſt of cardinal de Lorrain, tho' under another pretence.

(18) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. IV, pag. 480.

(19) Anſelme, Palais de la Gloire, pag. 442.

GUISE (Francis de Lorrain duke of) eldeſt ſon of the foregoing, was one of the greateſt captains of his age. He did very important ſervices to the ſtate, by defending Metz againſt the emperor Charles V, and by the taking of Calais, and on ſeveral other occaſions; but it may be ſaid, that the evils he occaſioned do infinitely exceed the advantages he procured to France by his valour and conduct. His ambition, and that of cardinal Charles de Lorrain his brother, which was ſtill more exorbitant than his, brought a dreadful deſolation upon the kingdom: beſides, the bloody ſpirit, wherewith they were animated againſt the Proteſtants, occaſioned the civil wars, which brought France ſo often to the laſt extremities. That hatred was at firſt a meer political pretence; for had they had a proſpect of a better fortune among the Reformed, they would doubtleſs have ſided with them [*A*]; but at laſt it proved a true hatred. The greateſt

[*A*] *If the Guiſes had had a proſpect of a better fortune among the Reformed, they would doubtleſs have ſided with them.*] The author of a ſhort romance (1), which came out in France in 1675, introduces the prince of Condé ſpeaking to admiral Chatillon in the following manner. *Does the religion you are of, and which I profeſs, only becauſe the Guiſes make profeſſion of another, (for I ſhall not ſcruple to tell you, that if they turned Proteſtants, I would turn Catholic the very next day) I ſay, does that religion forbid to love the moſt beautiful woman that can be ſeen?* Theſe words may be an unjuſt reflexion upon that prince; but it is true, generally ſpeaking, that the heads of great factions reſolve upon a thing, only becauſe their competitors are engaged in a thing contrary to it: and it is not to be doubted, that the Guiſes confirmed themſelves in their religion, becauſe their moſt dreadful enemies were in the other party. If the prince of Condé and the Chatillons had affected a great zeal for the extirpation of the Proteſtants, and if they had been enabled by that means to oppreſs the Guiſes, it is not to be queſtioned, that the latter would have forſaken the church of Rome to make themſelves dreaded at the head of the Huguenots. Some ſay, they were for ſome time wavering about it; but Varillas pretends to have very good reaſons to deny it. Theſe are his words (2). ‘Here I muſt confute an error, which is the more dangerous, becauſe the beſt hiſtorians have not always avoided it. It is ſaid, that the Guiſes took into conſideration, in the preſent juncture (3), whether it was more advantageous to them to continue in the Catholic religion, or to put themſelves at the head of the Calviniſts; and that, after an exact diſcuſſion of their intereſts, they preferred the ancient religion to the new one. Meſſieurs du Puy, thoſe two brothers, ſo famous for their great abilities, whiſpered that matter of fact to all the learned men, who viſited them in the king's library, as one of the moſt important ſecrets of the French hiſtory. They affirmed, that this ſecret was to be found in the book againſt the league of Gonzaga, duke of Nevers. They got that book very neatly bound, and kept it with particular care; and yet, when they came to die, that book was examined the more exactly, becauſe ſeveral people remembered what they had ſaid of it; but no ſuch thing was found in it. Beſides, Marin le Roy de Gomberville, having undertaken to print the memoirs of the duke of Nevers, borrowed the ſame book. He tranſcribed it, and inſerted it in the firſt volume of his memoirs (§ α). But that pretended deliberation of the houſe of Guiſe does not appear in it, tho' Gomberville knew what Meſſieurs du Puy had ſaid of it. Laſtly, all the circumſtances of that time ſhew, that this particular is a chimerical thing; for, on the one ſide, the Guiſes would have got nothing by turning Calviniſts; and, on the other, would have loſt all by it. They would have got nothing, ſince the Proteſtants, though they had ſided with them, would not have been headed by them excluſively of the two firſt princes of the blood, eſpecially of the prince of Condé, who was too ambitious to yield the command to foreigners, in a faction he had partly formed, having taken all proper meaſures to do every thing under his brother's name, and to ſucceed him, in caſe he ſhould return to the pale of the church of Rome. Beſides, ſuppoſing the princes of the blood had yielded to the Guiſes in ſo nice a point, the three Chatillons would not have done the ſame, but would have had the general direction of Calviniſm, which was afterwards ſo ſolemnly beſtowed upon them, after the deſertion of the prince of Navarre, and the death of the prince of Condé.’

[(§ α). Not in the firſt volume, but in the ſecond. For the reſt, the original of this treatiſe, containing 583 pages in 8vo, has not a word of what Varillas ſays that Meſſ. Du Puy boaſted to have found in it. It is of the year 1590, without the name of the place, or of the printer, but probably of James Metayer, and printed at Tours, whither that able printer had followed Henry III. Rem. Crit.]

I could eaſily reſt ſatisfied with theſe reaſons alledged by Varillas, tho' I know, that thoſe, who publiſh memoirs, leave out, and add, what they think fit (4). I can find no time, in which the Guiſes might have thought, that their forſaking the Catholic religion would be advantageous to them; and they never had leſs reaſon to think ſo, than in the reign of Francis II. And therefore what ground could there be for the deliberation, which Meſſieurs du Puy imparted to their friends as a great ſecret? What ſeems very likely to me, is, that, if the Guiſes had found that the Chatillons had a greater intereſt with the Catholic party than themſelves, they would have ſided with the Proteſtants; for, in all probability, ſelf-intereſt was the only cauſe of their zeal for the church of Rome, and they expreſſed a great averſion for the contrary party, only to ingratiate themſelves with the populace, and the clergy. What I ſay concerns the time, when private quarrels and libels had not yet exaſperated them: For, at laſt, when their political hatred made them execrable to the party perſecuted by them, they hated it in earneſt, and yet they cunningly diſſembled, when ſome political reaſons required it. I have read in one of the pieces that came out at that time (5), that cardinal Charles de Lorrain gave to underſtand, that by his advice *the Sieur d'Aumale, his brother*, favoured, *as much as he could, the churches of Burgundy and Champagne, according to the edict; that he cauſed the informations drawn up againſt the Proteſtants, ſince the Declaration of the peace, to be burnt, at Chalons, in his preſence; that he knew, that Madame de Guiſe, his ſiſter, was a Proteſtant, and that ſhe took care, that the Sieur de Guiſe, her ſon, ſhould be ſecretly brought up in the confeſſion of Augsburg; at which*, ſaid he, *I am not diſpleaſed in the leaſt* (6). He is there anſwered, among other things, *I know very well, you make ſome German princes believe, that you take care to have your nephew brought up in their confeſſion; but it is only in order to get him inveſted with the four baronies of Metz, that he may be made a prince of the empire. To that end, when you paid your laſt homage, you made him harangue the nobility in the German language, to get the love of the country by degrees.* Some pages before, he was told in a reproachful manner, that he had, *with one hand, given ſome cups of gilt ſilver to the German miniſters at Saverne, and executed, with the other, the maſſacre of Vaſſy.* During the Paris maſſacre, the duke *of Guiſe harboured in his houſe above a hundred Proteſtants, whom he hoped to bring over to his party* (7).

The author of the anſwer to cardinal de Lorrain's epiſtle was a good Proteſtant. What he confeſſes, concerning the hatred, which the Proteſtants had conceived againſt the Guiſes, is expreſſed by him thus: ‘It is, and it will always be, *ſays he* (8), the general conſent of our churches, to make head againſt all thoſe, whom you favour, directly or indirectly, and to ſide with your enemies, whatever quality or religion they may be of. I wonder you are ſtill ignorant of a thing ſo well known to the Pope, ſince he lately told the biſhop of Auxerre, that he would willingly give a hundred thouſand crowns, to make you a Huguenot, being perſuaded, conſidering the mortal hatred we have for you, that we would greateſt panegyriſts of that duke of Guiſe cannot clear him of a very unjuſt and violent uſurpation; for a man may be called an uſurper, not only when he uſurps the ſupreme authority, but alſo when he invades the power that belongs only to the princes of the blood, and deprives them of the ſhare they ought to have in the government of the ſtate, during the minority of a king. But this is what the Guiſes did under the reign of Francis II, who had married their neice (*a*), by making an ill uſe of that prince's weakneſs, without obſerving any rules of decency. Nay, it is ſaid, they had a deſign to put to death the firſt princes of the blood [*B*]. That uſurpation, attended with a horrid cruelty againſt the Proteſtants, occaſioned the famous conſpiracy of Amboiſe, whereby their authority was the more encreaſed. They carried things ſo far, as to get the ſecond prince of the blood condemned to death; and, doubtleſs, the ſentence would have been executed, and all the Proteſtants in the kingdom maſſacred, if Francis II had lived ſomewhat longer (*b*). After his death, the Proteſtants obtained liberty of conſcience, by virtue of the edict of January (*c*); and the Guiſes, notwithſtanding their authority, could not prevent it, as they had done in the aſſembly of the *Notables* [*C*] under Francis II: but they made that uſeleſs by the maſſacre of Vaſſy. It is in vain to ſay, it was not a premeditated deſign; the moſt flattering hiſtorians acknowledge ſome things, which plainly ſhew the contrary [*D*]. That maſſacre was ſoon followed

---

(1) *Intituled*, Le Prince de Condé.

(2) Varillas Hiſt. de l'Hereſie, lib. xxxiii, pag. m. 131, ad ann. 1560.

(3) That is, after the death of Henry II.

(4) The Leipſic journaliſts have obſerved it, againſt Varillas, in the *Acta Eruditorum*, for January, 1691, pag. 29.

(5) Printed in 1565. It is intituled, *Réponſe à l'Epiſtre de Charles de Vaudemon, Cardinal de Lorraine.* That epiſtle had been publiſhed under the name of a gentleman of Hainault, both to excuſe the cardinal for taking up arms in January, at Paris, contrary to his majeſty's ordinances, and to accuſe the mareſchal de Montmorency.

(6) Ibid. fol. D. iiii.

(7) Mezerai, Abrégé, Chron. Tom. V, pag. 157.

(8) Réponſe, &c. fol. C. iii.

(*a*) Mary Stuart, daughter of James V, king of Scotland.

(*b*) *See* Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Calviniſ. liv. ii, pag. 157, & ſeq. Edit. de Holland.

(*c*) It was made the ſeventeenth of January, 1562.

'would forſake our religion, if you made profeſſion 'of it. Wherefore, since this unanimous deſign of 'our churches againſt you cannot but proceed from 'a ſpecial goodneſs of GOD, we ought certainly to hope, 'that he will prevent the ill effects of your deſigns 'which you carry on by a cruel war, againſt our lives 'and fortunes.'

Mind theſe words of Brantome. Cardinal de Lorrain 'was very devout, and for that very reaſon 'very much hated by the Huguenots; yet he was 'accounted a great diſſembler and hypocrite. For I have 'heard him often diſcourſe of the confeſſion of Augſburg, and he ſeemed to approve it in great meaſure; 'which he did rather to pleaſe ſome Germans, than 'for any thing elſe. I heard him publickly talk at 'that rate at Rheims in his mother's preſence, the 'week before Eaſter (9).' See the remark [*Q*] of the article LORRAIN.

(9) Brant. Eloge du Duc de Guiſe, *in the third volume of his Memoirs, pag. m.* 135.

The following paſſage is not leſs remarkable. I take it from a piece, which Du Pleſſis Mornay wrote, in in April 1589, to juſtify Henry III, for joining with the king of Navarre. He was to anſwer the clamours of the league about the king's confederacy with the Huguenots. Du Pleſſis alledges, not only the king of Spain's alliances with Proteſtant princes, but alſo what had been done by the Guiſes. 'We need not 'go farther than our leaguers. How often did the 'late duke of Guiſe endeavour to treat with the 'king of Navarre, and thoſe of his party? did he 'not write to many Proteſtant gentlemen? let them 'remember what he uſed to ſay: *Friend, I am no 'enemy to thy religion: if one miniſter is not enough 'for thee, take two.* Who does not know the going 'backward and forward of the vice-ſeneſchal of Montelimar to Rochelle from the duke of Mayenne; 'what he made him ſay, that he was willing to be 'his ſervant, that he was no enemy to his religion, that 'his mother had bred him up in it, that a way might 'be found for an accommodation; that, upon his 'word, he would come to him with four horſes; 'that he would give him his wife and children as 'hoſtages; at that very time that he was upon his 'return from Caſtillon, and made a great ſhew of 'devotion and zeal for the Church? and indeed he 'did not ſcruple to make uſe of Lutheran reiſters, 'who publickly received the ſacrament in their own 'way in his army: and the letters he lately wrote 'to his agent may be ſeen, wherein he ſays, that he 'has taken up arms to exterminate the ſacramentarian 'Huguenots, but not thoſe of the confeſſion of Augſburg, whom he loves and intends to preſerve; and 'yet they have not been leſs condemned by the Pope 'than others, and they were the firſt, who roſe up 'againſt the church of Rome (10).'

(10) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Memoires, Tom. I, pag. 922, 923.

[*B*] *It is ſaid he had a deſign to put to death the firſt princes of the blood.*] 'One cannot read without horror what was ſaid at that time (11), and 'printed ſince. That the Guiſes, being afraid of the 'king of Navarre's reſentment, and being of opinion 'that their authority would never be ſettled, as long 'as there ſhould remain a prince of the blood to oppoſe it, undertook to make away with them; and 'that the method they had pitched upon was ſuch, 'that, if their deſign had ſucceeded, all the royal 'family would have been deſtroyed. That the king, 'to whom they gave to underſtand, how important it 'was not to ſuffer a prince to live, who might revenge the death of the prince of Condé, was to 'ſend for the king of Navarre into his chamber. 'That he ſhould upbraid him with the crimes of 'his brother in very ſharp words, and tell him he 'had juſt reaſons to complain of him too. That the 'prince would boldly deny the thing, or at leaſt vindicate himſelf too warmly; whereupon he ſhould be 'ſtabbed by ſome men lying in wait, to whom the 'king ſhould make a ſign. It is further ſaid, that 'this prince was informed of the danger he was 'threatened with, and that, after he had been a long 'time uncertain what he ſhould do, he reſolved to 'venture himſelf; and that, as he was going into the 'king's chamber, he told one of his moſt faithful 'ſervants; *If I happen to ſink under the multitude 'and treachery of my enemies, take my bloody ſhirt, 'and carry it to my wife and to my ſon. My blood 'will ſuggeſt to them what they ought to do, to revenge my death.* That, afterwards, he went to the 'king, who either durſt not, or would not, give the 'ſignal agreed upon; and that Guiſe, being vexed 'at the ill ſucceſs of that attempt, cried out to thoſe, 'who were with him: *Oh, what a poor prince have 'we got!* (12).'

(11) That is, when the ſtates of the kingdom met at Orleans, under Francis II, in 1560. The prince of Condé was arreſted at his arrival, and, a few days after, being tried by commiſſioners, appointed by the king, he was condemned to be beheaded. The author of the Life of Francis de Lorrain, duke of Guiſe, printed at Paris in 1681, who ſays afterwards what I have related in this remark.

(12) Vie du Duc de Guiſe, *printed at Paris in* 1681, *pag.* 78, *Dutch Edition.*

[*C*] *As they had done in the aſſembly of the Notables.*] It was held at Fontainebleau, in Auguſt, 1560 (13). The admiral preſented a petition in the name of all the Proteſtants of France, wherein they deſired to have churches for the public exerciſe of their religion. John de Monluc, biſhop of Valence, voted for the admiral; but the duke of Guiſe, and the cardinal his brother, did ſo violently oppoſe that petition, that it was rejected. They were like to eſtabliſh an inquiſition in France (14). They uſed their utmoſt endeavours towards it; and the chancellor, in order *to ward off that blow, bethought himſelf of propoſing to the king the edict of Romorantin*, which was very ſevere againſt the Proteſtants. From whence it appears, that all the calamities of the civil-wars of thoſe times ought to be imputed to thoſe two brothers. They oppoſed the granting of liberty of conſcience to the Proteſtants; they promoted perſecution, and introduced bloody maxims into the kingdom, contrary to the moſt eſſential and moſt indefeaſible right that a man can enjoy, and which ſovereigns ought to look upon as the moſt inviolable.

(13) *See* Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 145, & ſeq.

(14) Id. ibid. pag. 144.

[*D*] *The moſt flattering hiſtorians acknowledge ſome things, which plainly ſhew,* That the maſſacre of Vaſſy was a premeditated deſign.] Varillas owns (15), I. That the duke of Guiſe, and the cardinal de Lorrain, not doubting, *that the civil wars would quickly begin*, and that the Catholics *would obtain the victory, provided the German princes did not ſide with them*, went privately to Saverne, where they had an interview with the duke of Wirtemberg. II. That they omitted nothing, *that might raiſe a jealouſy* in the *Lutherans, about the progreſs of Calviniſm, and make them believe*, that they WERE GOING TO ATTACK IT in France, (mind theſe words, for they ſhew there was a deſign to begin the acts of hoſtility) *only to endeavour afterwards to re-unite the Lutherans with the holy ſee by gentle means* (16). III. That the German prince having promiſed them *be*

(15) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, Tom. I, pag. 121. Dutch Edit.

(16) Ibid. pag. 122.

followed by a religious war, as the Guiſes expected. The ſucceſs of that war proved fatal to both parties, and conſequently very pernicious to France. The Guiſes were the only gainers by it. Our duke of Guiſe had the art to engroſs to himſelf all the glory of the battle of Dreux; and, in all probability, the taking of Orleans would have enabled him to deſtroy the reformed religion, when he was aſſaſſinated by Poltrot. He died of his wound (d) the 24th of February 1563, at 44 years of age (e) [E]. It is ſaid, he *proteſted upon his death-bed, that he had no hand* in the maſſacre at Vaſſy (f); but I doubt whether ſuch a proteſtation can counterballance the proofs we have of the contrary [F]. The writers of his party do very much commend him for a Chriſtian maxim, which

he would uſe his intereſt with thoſe of his party to obtain their conſent, in order to prevent Calviniſm's taking root in France, they returned to Joinville, *where they intended to have ſome diverſion for ſome days* (17). IV. That the ducheſs-Dowager of Guiſe, their mother, who lived *a very retired life* at Joinville (18), uſed *her intereſt with them, to perſuade them not to ſuffer any longer ſo near them the temple of Vaſſy, whoſe contagion would quickly reach Joinville.* V. That *the duke of Guiſe being reſolved to comply with his mother's deſires, as far as he could do it without infringing the edicts, went through Vaſſy with cardinal de Guiſe his youngeſt brother* (19). VI. That *he was far from having any violent deſign, ſince he ſuppoſed that his bare preſence would be ſufficient to prevent the aſſemblies of the Calviniſts, wherever he ſhould be.* VII. That *he came to Vaſſy the firſt day of March* 1562, and that being forced to interrupt his prayers during maſs, becauſe *the Calviniſts, whoſe temple was very near the church, fell a ſinging their pſalms . . . . he ſent them them word, that he deſired they would leave off ſinging for a quarter of an hour, aſſuring them they might afterwards go on, becauſe maſs would be over by that time.*

I need only make two reflexions upon this account. I. It plainly appears from it, that the duke of Guiſe deſigned to have the edict repealed, and took meaſures to attack the Huguenots; and that, beſides this general diſpoſition, he paſſed through Vaſſy, only after he had promiſed his mother to comply with the great deſire ſhe expreſſed, that the heretics ſhould not preach there. It is not therefore likely, that he went to Vaſſy, without a premeditated deſign of uſing violent means againſt the Proteſtants. II. Varillas could not diſſemble the truth, without putting together ſome facts that contradict one another. For, in the firſt place, how could the duke of Guiſe have performed his promiſe to his mother, if he had intended, that the Calviniſts ſhould freely ſing their pſalms, as ſoon as the maſs was over? This is a contradiction; and therefore it muſt be confeſſed, either that he never acquainted the Calviniſts, that he had no deſign to diſturb them in their pious exerciſes, or that he did not go to Vaſſy, in order to ſatisfy the ducheſs dowager of Guiſe, or that he ſent a falſe meſſage. The laſt thing is ſo unworthy of a man of honour, that it cannot be imputed to the duke of Guiſe, if one has a mind to juſtify him; and therefore we muſt ſtick to the other two, both which contradict Varillas; ſo that the duke of Guiſe cannot be juſtified, without giving the lye to the hiſtorians, that are moſt favourable to him. In the ſecond place, it is not true, that the duke ſuppoſed his preſence would be ſufficient to prevent the aſſemblies of the Proteſtants. He knew that people, as greedy of ſermons as they were, who had purchaſed the liberty of preaching at the price of ſo many perſecutions and capital puniſhments, would not renounce their privilege by reaſon of his preſence. Thirdly, had that duke ſuppoſed, that his preſence would prevent their aſſemblies, he could not have gone thither, without infringing the king's edicts; from whence it plainly follows, that he contradicts himſelf, in Varillas, when he ſuppoſes, that his bare preſence will prevent the Proteſtants meeting at Vaſſy; and yet that he will comply with his mother's deſire no farther, than he can do it without infringing the edicts. It was impoſſible for him to ſatisfy his mother without breaking that aſſembly; and Varillas owns, that at leaſt he intended to break it by his preſence. Beſides, he could not break it without acting againſt the laſt edict; and therefore he is repreſented as acting inconſiſtently. Hiſtorians may be commonly reduced to this extremity, when they endeavour to throw a veil over the moſt glaring truths.

I might add ſeveral particulars (20), whereby it plainly appears that the duke of Guiſe intended to get the edict of January repealed; but we need only conſider what he himſelf confeſſed, as we find it in Davila. When the tumult of Vaſſy was over, the duke of Guiſe ſent for the judge of that place, and ſeverely reproved him for allowing the Huguenots ſuch a pernicious liberty of meeting together. The judge alledged, for his excuſe, the kings edict, whereby thoſe aſſemblies were permitted. The duke, being no leſs angry at that anſwer than at the thing it ſelf, laid his hand upon his ſword, and ſaid, *the edge of this ſword ſhall quickly cut that edict, ſo cloſely faſtened.* It is nature that ſpeaks on this occaſion; and it is not the firſt inſtance of a fit of anger that has betrayed the greateſt diſſemblers. Thoſe words did not fall to the ground; they were alledged as a ſtrong proof of the violent deſigns of the duke of Guiſe. Davila makes that obſervation. His words are theſe. *Finito il tumulto, il Duca di Guiſa, chiamato à ſe l'ufficiale del luogo comminciò con gravi parole à riprenderlo, che permetteſſe in danno de paſſaggieri queſta perniciosa licenza: & iſcuſando egli di non poterle impedire per la permiſſione dell' editto di Gennaio, che concedeva le radunanze publiche a gli Ugonotti, il Duca ſdegnato non meno della riſpoſta, che del fatto, meſſa la mano sù la ſpada, replicò pieno di colera, che l'editto così ſtrettamente legato, preſto ſi troncarebbe con il filo di quella: dalle quali parole dette nell' ardore dell' ira, e non traſcurate da quelli, ch'erano preſenti, molti poi l'arguirono per autore, e per machinatore delle guerre ſeguenti* (21). The Proteſtant hiſtorians afford many other circumſtances againſt the duke of Guiſe. If it be ſaid, that they ought to be miſtruſted, coming from ſuch hands, what can one ſay againſt Davila?

[E] *He died . . . . . the twenty fourth of February* 1563, *at forty four years of age.*] Father du Londel, tho' an exact man, knew not the true time of his death: he places it on the twenty ſixth of Febuary (22). The miſtake, which remains ſtill in Moreri's dictionary, is much more conſiderable. The death of that duke of Guiſe is placed therein the year 1553 (23). I wonder Mr de Valincourt mentions neither the year nor the day of that death, nor the year of the birth, in the life publiſhed by him in 1681 (24); but I am more ſurpriſed ſtill, that he makes him fifty years old.

[F] *I know not whether ſuch a proteſtation can counterballance the proofs we have to the contrary.*] We know no longer what to think of the proteſtations of dying people: the authors, who have written for and againſt the conſpiracy declared in England by Titus Oates, produce ſome accuſed perſons, who proteſted to the laſt breath, that they were innocent, and ſome witneſſes, who did the ſame. The accuſed, or the witneſſes, muſt needs make falſe proteſtations at the point of death; ſo that the depoſitions of dying people cannot afford us a fence againſt Scepticiſm (25). The ſentence of Lucretius, that men at laſt pull off the maſk, at the point of death (26), is not always true. A falſe ſhame does often attend us to our very graves; and the love of glory, the idol of great men, does frequently oblige them to conceal all their life-time what might blot their reputation. The power of a prevailing paſſion is ſo great, that the proſpect of approaching death is not always able to put a ſtop to it. This was obſerved in Tiberius as to diſſimulation, his darling quality. 'Jam Tiberium corpus, nondum diſſimulatio deſerebat. Idem animi rigor, ſermone ac vultu intentus, quæſita interdum comitate, quamvis manifeſtam defectionem tegebat (27). —— *Tiberius's ſtrength and limbs began now to fail him, but not his diſſimulation. The ſame ſtern diſpoſition, and earneſtneſs in look and ſpeech, ſometimes with an affectation* which they ſay he alledged againſt a Proteſtant, who had a mind to kill him. That maxim was not very well placed in his mouth [G]. It were to be wiſhed, that the Proteſtants had not printed ſo many libels and ſatires againſt that duke, and the cardinal his brother [H]; wherein they acted neither according to the rules of the goſpel, nor

---

(d) Poltrot ſhot him with a piſtol, during the ſiege of Orleans, the eighteenth of February, 1563.

(e) He was born at the caſtle of Bar the ſeventeenth of February, 1519. Father Anſelme, *Hiſt. des grans Officiers*, pag. 424.

(f) Maimb. Hiſt. du Calviniſme, livr. iv, pag. m. 295.

(17) Ibid. pag. 124.

(18) Ibid pag. 125.

(19) Ibid. pag. 126.

(20) *Among others, the retreat of the leaders of the Catholic party.* Percoſſe queſt' editto i capi della parte Cattolica: nè volendo, che il mondo ſtimaſſe, che conſentiſſero alle coſe, che ſi facevano, il duca di Guiſa, il Conteſtabile, & i Cardinali, de' quali era mancato di vita il Cardinale di Tornone, i Mareſcialli di Briſſac, e di Sant' Andrea, ſi partirono dalla Corte, machinando già di diſturbare l'editto, e d'opporſi per ogni modo alla fattione Ugonotta. *Davila, lib. ii, pag. m.* 79.

(21) Id. ibid. lib. iii, pag. 86.

(22) Du Londel, Faſtes des Rois de la Maiſon d'Orleans, pag. 71.

(23) Under the word Guiſe; but under the word Francis, which is not a proper place to look for the hiſtory of the dukes of Guiſe, Moreri ſets down the right year, 1563.

(24) I quote it in the remark [*B*].

(25) Mr le Grand, *Defenſe de Sanderus, pag.* 164, alledges Smeton's teſtimony againſt Anne Bullen, and puts the reader in mind, that Dr Burnet took advantage of ſuch a depoſition. Which ſhews, that contending parties object the teſtimony of dying people one to another, and that they reject, or make uſe of it, as they find it prejudicial or favourable.

(26) Nam veræ voces tum demum pectore ab imo
Ejiciuntur, & eripitur perſona, manet res.
Truth then breaks out, extorted by our fears,
And all the man, without diſguiſe, appears. Lucret. lib. iii, ver. 57.

(27) Tacit. Ann. lib. vi, cap. l.

‘*tion of courteſy, covered a too plain decay.*’ The hiſtory of the duke d'Epernon affords another inſtance of what I ſay. He was a very haughty man, and his haughtineſs appeared all along in all his words and actions. The very day on which he died, he made it appear, that he was ſtill animated with the ſame ſpirit, though a ſickneſs, and a very old age, had prodigiouſly weakened him. A clergy-man, who attended upon him, having made him ſay, that he forgave his enemies, and all his domeſtics who had diſpleaſed him, bethought himſelf of aſking him, whether he aſked pardon of his domeſtics, whom he might have offended: the reaſon why he put ſuch a queſtion to the duke was, becauſe, ſome few days before, he had ill uſed a perſon, who was in his ſervice. He expreſſed ſome uneaſineſs at ſuch a propoſition, and anſwered with an angry tone, *that it was enough for him to forgive thoſe, who had diſpleaſed him, and that he never heard any body ſay, that, in order to die like a good Chriſtian, a maſter ought to beg pardon of his ſervants* (28). The duke of Guiſe, who is accuſed of the maſſacre at Vaſſy, having made it his buſineſs all along to ſalve appearances, and pretending to more probity and candor than the other courtiers, ſaid, and proteſted a thouſand times, that he was innocent of that maſſacre; and his intereſt required he ſhould make ſuch a proteſtation; becauſe, if he had owned the thing, he would have declared himſelf to be the firſt cauſe of the calamities of France, and would have been publickly deteſted upon that account. He was therefore engaged to proteſt the ſame thing to his laſt hour, not only for fear his memory ſhould be deteſted by all thoſe, who abhorred the civil-wars, but alſo for fear all Europe ſhould know, that he had been a lyar in all the proteſtations he had made, that he had no hand in the ſlaughter committed at Vaſſy. Few ambitious men can reſolve to retract, when a retractation is ſo ſhameful.

But this is not the only thing that can be ſaid againſt the laſt words of dying people; moſt things that are told of them may be called into queſtion, becauſe they are only grounded upon the teſtimony of ſuſpected perſons (29). Who can aſſure us, that a man made ſuch a declaration when he was dying, and that his friends or relations, who are concerned in his glory, do not aſcribe thoſe words to him, in order to make the world believe, that he was innocent? there is nothing more eaſy than to give out, that *ſuch a man declared ſuch a thing, when he was a dying, and that thoſe, who ſaw him dye, ſay ſo.* If it be a thing, wherein the public is concerned, the news of it will be ſpread all over a great town in an hour's time: every body writes it to his friends; none goes about to enquire into the truth of it; it is immediately printed in the gazette; and you may be ſure, that, as long as the world laſts, the declaration of that dying man will be alledged, with as much confidence, as if it had been verified by the moſt ſtrict enquiries of magiſtrates. In order to ſhew how little thoſe declarations ought to be depended upon, we need only conſider how that of the duke of Guiſe is related by Maimbourg and Varillas, two famous hiſtorians, who publiſhed their works much about the ſame time. The firſt affirms, upon Brantôme's authority, that the duke proteſted he had no hand in that diſorder, and yet begged GOD's pardon for it (30); but the other aſſures us, *that he prayed GOD to forgive him all his faults, except that of Vaſſy* (31). Reconcile theſe two things if you can; and remember, that the Catholics were highly concerned to make the world believe, that the duke of Guiſe had made ſuch a proteſtation upon his death-bed. They were thereby enabled to deny what the Proteſtants continually upbraided them with. What will not men do, to confute ſuch things, when they are influenced by a religious hatred?

[G] *That maxim was not very well placed in his mouth.*] Here follows a reflection of one of the Proteſtant Authors, who have written moſt vehemently againſt the French Dragoonades (32). ‘It is ſaid, that, during the ſiege of Roüen, a Proteſtant gentleman being brought to him (33), who had a deſign upon his life, and who had confeſſed, that it was not out of hatred to him, but that he thought he was bound to do it, to ſerve his religion; the duke diſmiſſed him, telling him, *Get thee gone: if thy religion commands thee to aſſaſſinate thoſe, who never offended thee, mine will have me to give thee thy life, though I may juſtly deprive thee of it; judge which of the two religions is the beſt* (34). This anſwer might be looked upon as a wiſe and Chriſtian one, if the duke had not been a Catholic, and at the head of a perſecuting army; but, when I conſider, that they are the words of a perſecutor, he muſt needs be laughed at, as a man who acts the part of a comedian, and ſports with religion, who, out of vanity and bravado, forgives a private man that deſerves death, whilſt he exerciſes a wild and abominable cruelty upon a great body of innocent people. Was not this duke of Guiſe of the ſame religion with Francis I, and Henry II? did he not approve and adviſe the edict of Chateau-Briant, and that of Romorantin, whereby the Proteſtants were to be put to death? did he not uſe his utmoſt endeavours to eſtabliſh the Inquiſition in France, whereby, properly ſpeaking, there had been a continual ſlaughter of men, and a court of juſtice always ſitting, and ſurrounded with executioners? was he not the chief promoter of the deſign, that was broke by the death of Francis II; which was to ſend troops into all the provinces, and to require, that every French-man ſhould ſubſcribe a formulary, and that thoſe, who ſhould refuſe it, ſhould be expelled the kingdom, (which was the mildeſt puniſhment) and deprived of all their eſtates? but how many would have been put to death? again, was it not the ſame duke, who ſuffered his men to ſlaughter many Proteſtants at Vaſſy, whilſt they were praying to GOD in a barn? in a word, was not his obſtinacy, in having thoſe poor people always puniſhed with death, the cauſe of the civil-wars of religion, which had never been in France, if they had been allowed to ſerve GOD in their own way? did he not do it out of a religious zeal? would he have done it, if he had been a heathen? would he not have tolerated the Proteſtants as well as the Papiſts? was not what he did approved by the Pope and the clergy? how then could he ſay, that his religion enjoined him to forgive them, who offended him, ſince it put him upon perſecuting and tormenting, a thouſand ways, a vaſt number of people, who did him no harm, and only deſired to ſerve GOD according to the dictates of their conſcience? ſuch is the enormous and comic turpitude of a perſecuting religion. A man of ſuch a religion will not ſcruple to proteſt, that, for his own part, he forgives a man of a different religion the injuries he has done him; and yet he ſends him to the gallows, or to the gallies, under pretence, that he does not hold the true faith, even tho' that perſon had been ſerviceable to him. Indeed that duke little thought of what he ſaid, ſince he durſt compare the two religions together, and prefer his to the other in point of charity. The gentleman, who had conſpired againſt him, thinking that his death would prove advantageous to the Proteſtant religion, did not follow the true doctrine of his party; for all Proteſtant divines ſay, preach, and maintain, that it is not lawful for any man to aſſaſſinate any body, in order to procure ſome advantage to his religion: but the duke, purſuant to a doctrine approved, and a thouſand times commanded in his religion, voted in the king's council for publiſhing edicts, whereby a vaſt number of good people ſhould be condemned to death, and made it his buſineſs to extirpate the Proteſtants by the moſt violent methods. Is it not a jeſt for a man, thus diſpoſed, to boaſt that he profeſſes a religion, which enjoins him to forgive? I beſeech the converters to conſider this. Their conduct is ſuch, that the fineſt maxims of Chriſtian morality, when alledged by them, are trifling and comical, or perfect nonſenſe.’

[H] *It were to be wiſhed the Proteſtants had not printed ſo many libels and ſatires againſt this duke ...... and his brother.*] In the aſſembly of the Notables above nor according to thoſe of prudence, ſince thoſe books exaſperated more and more a moſt potent enemy [*I*], and afforded him a pretence to keep up his hatred, and encreaſe the perſecution [*K*]. It would be an unjuſt thing to aſcribe to the whole body the impatience

---

(28) See the Life of the duke d'Epernon, written by Girard.

(29) See the remark [*N*] of the article HENRY II. It is ſaid, he never ſpoke, after he was wounded, and yet authors make him ſay a great many things.

(30) Maimb. Hiſt. du Calviniſ. pag. 259.

(31) Varil. Vie de Charles IX, Tom. I, pag. 128.

(32) *Commentaire Philoſophique ſur ces paroles*, contrain les d'entrer, *in the preface*, *pag. lxiv*, & ſeq.

(33) That is, the duke of Guiſe.

(34) *See* Maimb. Hiſt. du Calviniſme, lib iv, pag. m. 316.

above-mentioned, cardinal de Lorrain ſaid, haughtily, *that he gloried in being hated by the Huguenots, and expoſed to their fury; that they had diſperſed in Paris, and from thence in all the provinces of the kingdom, a vaſt number of libels, full of outrageous words, and furious threatnings againſt him, and the duke of Guiſe his brother; that, for his own part, he had twenty two in his hands, which he carefully preſerved, and that he took delight in ſhewing them, as being ſo many ſhining proofs of their zeal for religion, and of their inviolable fidelity to the king, who had been pleaſed to make them his miniſters* (35). I repeat it again, it were to be wiſhed the Proteſtants had not publiſhed ſo many ſatirical pieces; they are to this day prejudicial, by reaſon of the reflections they afford to the miſſionaries. To give an inſtance of it; Maimbourg did not fail to make a malicious and ſatirical obſervation on what was ſaid by the cardinal concerning thoſe libels. ‘ And indeed it is manifeſt, that it was the uſual ſtile of the Huguenots, at that time, to revile unmercifully, by a thouſand ſcandalous libels and impudent ſatires, all thoſe, who did not favour them, without any regard to merit or quality, and without ſparing kings, princes, prelates, and what is moſt ſacred and inviolable among men. For my part, I can affirm, that I have ſeen a large collection in ten volumes in folio, made up of thoſe ſorry pieces, which the Huguenots publiſhed at that time againſt Henry II, and Francis II, againſt queen Catherine, when ſhe was not inclined to favour them; againſt the king of Navarre after he had ſided with the Catholics; but eſpecially againſt the duke of Guiſe, and cardinal de Lorrain archbiſhop of Rheims; wherein they brutiſhly inſerted, without judgment and wit, the moſt heinous calumnies and accuſations †, that can be invented by the moſt malicious and ſlandering men. So that any one who has never ſo little honour and good ſenſe, cannot peruſe thoſe fooliſh and inſolent writings, without expreſſing the utmoſt contempt for them, and a juſt indignation againſt thoſe impudent writers (36).’ Such are the odious reflections, which Maimbourg made upon thoſe libels. Thoſe, who anſwered his hiſtory of Calviniſm, did not fail to confute them. He adds (37), that cardinal de Lorrain, ‘ whoſe greatneſs of ſoul anſwered the greatneſs of his wit, did not revenge himſelf upon thoſe libellers, but by a noble contempt of their weak fury: notwithſtanding which, the magiſtrates, purſuant to their duty, apprehended ſome of them, who were dealt with according to the utmoſt ſeverity of the laws; whereby it is enacted, that they be uſed as public poiſoners. And indeed two of them were hanged ‡, *viz.* the author (38) of one of thoſe wicked libels, entituled, *Le Tigre*, and he who ſold it underhand.’

(35) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Calviniſme, pag. 151. *Theſe are his citations:* Dupleix under Francis II, pag. 619. Spond. ad ann. 1560. n. 16. Mezerai, Tom. II, pag. 785, *taken from* la Popelin. lib. vi, pag. 104, *and from* Belcar. lib. xxviii. pag. 946.

† Memoir. de Caſteln.

(36) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, pag. 151, 152.

(37) Maimbourg, ibid. pag. 153.

‡ Memoir. de Caſteln. lib. i, cap. vii. *Whereupon they apprehended a printer, who had printed a book, intituled,* Le Tigre, *the ſuppoſed author whereof, and a merchant, were hanged.*

[*I*] *Theſe kind of writings exaſperated more and more a moſt potent enemy.*] Maimbourg is in the wrong to ſay, that the cardinal de Lorrain, having a great ſoul, *did not revenge himſelf upon thoſe libellers but by a noble contempt*; for can there be a more violent and unjuſt vengeance than this? he made no enquiry after the private authors of thoſe libels, which is all that Maimbourg can pretend to ſay; but he exterminated, as much as he could, the whole body of the Reformed; he was the great promoter of penal laws, and of the capital puniſhments inflicted upon them; he endeavoured to bring them under the cruel yoke of the inquiſition. Was it not a more cruel vengeance, than if he had been contented to get the authors of thoſe ſatires puniſhed? it will appear from what follows, that it is not true, that he ſtifled his reſentment againſt thoſe writers.

(38) This is not true: See the following remark.

Caſtelnau, quoted by Maimbourg (39), makes this obſervation: *The Huguenots publiſhed continually ſeveral injurious libels againſt the houſe of Guiſe. Whereupon a printer was apprehended, who had printed a ſmall book, intituled,* Le Tigre, *the reputed author whereof, and a merchant, were hanged upon that account.* This account is not exact; we are not told what became of the printer, and it is not true, that the perſon ſuſpected of being the author of that book was hanged. Caſtelnau ſhould have ſaid as la Planche does, that the printer and the vender were hanged; but neither of them was the *reputed author*. I ſhall ſet down that hiſtorian's own words (40). ‘ The parliament made a ſtrict inquiry after thoſe, who printed and ſold the pieces, that were handed about againſt the Guiſes. They ſpent ſome days in it, with ſo good ſucceſs, that they came to know, at laſt, who had printed a ſmall book, very ſatirical, intituled, *Le Tigre*. A counſellor, called du Lion, was intruſted with that employment, which he willingly accepted, being promiſed an office of preſident in the parliament of Bourdeaux, which he might ſell if he thought fit. The printer, called Martin l'Hommet, was found out with the book in his hands. Being asked from whom he had it, he anſwered, he had it from an unknown perſon; and at laſt he accuſed ſeveral people of having ſeen and read it; they were proſecuted for it, but they made their eſcape. As they were carrying that printer to the place of execution, a merchant of Roüen, who was a man in pretty good circumſtances, ſeeing the mob very much incenſed againſt him, ſaid only to them, good people, is it not enough for him that he muſt die? Let the executioner perform his duty. Will you torment him more than his ſentence imports? (Now he knew nothing of the crime, for which he was to be hanged, and was lighting from his horſe at an inn hard by). He had no ſooner ſpoke thoſe words, but ſome prieſts came up to him, calling him a Huguenot, and that man's accomplice; and immediately the mob fell upon him, and beat him unmercifully. Whereupon ſome officers of juſtice came to him, and, to refreſh him, carried him to goal, whither du Lion forthwith repaired, and asked him ſeveral queſtions about the book, intituled, *Le Tigre*, and what he had ſaid to the mob. That poor merchant ſwore he knew nothing of the book, and had never ſeen it, nor heard of the Meſſieurs de Guiſe; adding, that he was a merchant, and minded nothing but his own concerns.’ He proteſted, that the man that was going to be hanged was wholly unknown to him; but that he had been *moved with pity*, and had exhorted the people *to let the executioner perform his duty*. He deſired *his life and converſation* ſhould be inquired into, *ſubmitting to every body's judgment*. ‘ Du Lion, without any further proceedings, made his report to the parliament, and to the judges deputed by them, who condemned him to be hanged in the Place Maubert, where the printer had been executed. Some days after, du Lion, being at ſupper, in a great company, fell a jeſting upon that poor merchant. His own words were made uſe of, to ſhew him the injuſtice of that ſentence. How can it be helped? ſaid he; there was a neceſſity to give ſome ſatisfaction to the cardinal, ſince we could not apprehend the author, otherwiſe we had never been quiet.’ Judge whether the Guiſes were unconcerned at the ſatires publiſhed againſt them: the following paſſage of Brantôme ſhews how tender they were on that point. ‘ Many libels came out at that time (41) againſt thoſe, who governed the kingdom; but none was ſharper and more offenſive than an invective, intituled, *Le Tigre*, (in imitation of Cicero's firſt invective againſt Catiline) becauſe it mentioned the love-intrigues of a very great and handſome lady, married to a great man related to her. If the author had been apprehended, if he had had ten thouſand lives he would have loſt them; for that great man and that great lady were extremely vexed and almoſt diſtracted at it (42).’ I have ſaid in another place (43), that Francis Hotmanus was accounted the author of that ſatire.

Of the libel, intituled, *THE TIGER*.

(39) He quotes *lib i, cap. vii.* He ſhould have quoted lib. ii.

(40) La Planche, Hiſtory of France under Francis II, pag. m. 385.

(41) That is, under Francis II.

(42) Brantôme, Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. m. 374.

(43) In the remark [*N*] of the article HOTOMANUS.

[*K*] . . . . *and gave him a pretence to keep up his hatred, and encreaſe the perſecution.*] Though you make the Guiſes never ſo wicked, yet it is certain, that the libellers imputed to them many things, which they had not done. Whoever goes about to write, without having been concerned in public affairs, or without conſulting good memoirs, will unavoidably advance many falſities, if he writes againſt a man, by whom he has been ill uſed. Such writers are willing to revenge themſelves, and to defame their perſecutors: being thus diſpoſed, they believe whatever they hear; and, though they do not even believe it, they think

they

patience of ſome private perſons, and their itching deſire of writing ſatirical books [*L*]. This duke of Guiſe had been made duke d'Aumale, and governor of Dauphiné, in the year 1547 (*g*). He was knight of the order, high-ſteward, great-chamberlain, and grand veneur of France (*h*). His barony of Joinville, which was under the juriſdiction of the town of Vaſſy (*i*), was erected into a principality in 1552 (*k*), and ſome villages belonging to the ſame town were added to it (*l*). He married Anne d'Eſte, daughter of Hercules d'Eſte, ſecond of that name, duke of Ferrara, the 4th of December 1549 (*m*), and had ſeveral children by her. If what we read in the hiſtory of the reformed churches of France be true, he diſcovered, ſome time before he died, that he did not believe his wife's virtue had been always unſpotted [*M*].

(*g*) *Father Anſelme*, ubi ſupra, pag. 424.

(*h*) Id. ibid. pag. 425.

(*i*) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. 721, lib. iv.

(*k*) Baudrand. in Geogr.

(*l*) Beza, ubi ſupra.

(*m*) *Father Anſelme*, ubi ſupra, pag. 425.

they may lawfully publiſh it, ſince they have heard it. Now, when thoſe who are defamed in thoſe libels, conſider, that they are charged with crimes of which they are perfectly innocent, they look upon the authors and approvers of them as men without honour and conſcience; they think they can never hate them too much, and fancy there is no harm in exterminating ſuch calumniators, or favourers of calumny. It is therefore certain, that thoſe, who publiſh ſuch defamatory libels, vent their ſpleen, and give a free ſcope to their zeal, with great imprudence. The whole party pays too dear for it.

[*L*] *It would be unjuſt to aſcribe to the whole body the impatience of ſome private perſons, and their itching deſire of writing ſatirical books.*] We may judge of the XVIth century by the preſent time (44). We know, that thoſe, who every day publiſh a vaſt number of anonymous libels, make no figure in the world. They live in ſuch an obſcurity, that the moſt curious inquirers cannot find them out; and, when ſome of thoſe writers come to be known, it frequently appears, that they are neither good Chriſtians, nor honeſt men. I am perſuaded, that moſt of thoſe, who wrote thoſe many libels, whereof Maimbourg pretends to have ſeen ten large volumes, were the leſs noble parts of the reformed church of France. Moſt of them were unknown, and never owned by the party, and it was not neceſſary they ſhould be many. Five or ſix men naturally ſatirical, who have nothing elſe to do, and get ſome money by it, will fill a large kingdom with their libels in leſs than thirty years. Is it reaſonable to impute to a great body the faults of a few men? In order to have a right notion of them, it is not ſufficient to ſay, that they are credulous; it muſt be further ſaid, that they are cheats: they publiſh many things, which they know to be falſe; for they themſelves invent them. Here follows a paſſage of Mezerai concerning ſuch impoſtures (45). 'Some have been of opinion, that thoſe memoirs (46) were ſuppoſititious; and the moſt equitable perſons thought, that, if they were true, they only proceeded from the deep melancholy of that advocate, who, having received ſome injury from the Huguenots, was extremely incenſed againſt them. It is highly probable, that thoſe memoirs were forged by the Minions, or the Huguenots, or by the queen-mother, all mortal enemies to the Guiſes; and it is certain they invented many other calumnies to make them odious. The Guiſes took care to be even with them; and therefore little credit ought to be given to the writings, or relations of that time, unleſs they be throughly examined.'

[*M*] *He did not believe his wife's virtue had been always unſpotted.*] 'As to the manner how he died, the biſhop of Riez, whoſe name was Carles, made a very impertinent diſcourſe about it, aſcribing to him ſeveral theological words, and expreſſions taken from the holy ſcripture, which however he had never looked into. Among other things, thinking to praiſe him, he does a great deal of wrong to the ducheſs, his widow, to whom he confeſſes he was not always a faithful husband, which he deſires ſhe would forgive, as he forgives her the like (47).' This is what I find in a book of Beza. It is not very likely, that a biſhop ſhould have given ſuch a turn to the laſt words of his hero, to the great diſhonour of the widow and her children. Wherefore I miſtruſted Beza, and endeavoured to conſult the book of Lancelot Carles; and, not being able to find it, I deſired Mr de Larroque to give me ſome information about it. He was pleaſed to ſend me the following anſwer. 'The letter of Carles, biſhop of Riez, to Charles IX, concerning the laſt words of the duke of Guiſe, has been printed three times (48), as it appears from the advertiſement to the reader, prefixed to the ſecond French edition; where it is ſaid, that what was printed before this, *was but an incorrect copy, which the author, who was preſent at that diſcourſe, wrote ſummarily, to ſerve him for a memorandum.* I have not been able to meet with the firſt edition; and therefore I cannot tell whether what you have read in another book was contained in it. There is no ſuch thing in the ſecond; for that duke ſpeaks to his wife in the following manner. *We have been long united by the holy bond of faith and friendſhip, having all things in common. You know, that I always loved and eſteemed you, as much as any wife can be, and that our mutual affection has been the ſame all the time we have been married, as I always made it my buſineſs to convince you of it, and you have done the like to me. I do not deny that the ſuggeſtions and frailties of youth made me ſometimes take a courſe, at which you may have been offended: I beſeech you to forgive me. I muſt needs ſay, that I am none of the greateſt ſinners in that reſpect, as I am none of the leaſt, though I am one of the moſt guilty in the ſight of GOD. But you know how reſpectfully I have behaved my ſelf towards you of late years, avoiding all occaſions of giving you the leaſt diſcontent.* Page 84, 85, 86, 87. This paſſage has been tranſlated into Latin by John le Vieux in the following manner. *Nos enim arctiſſimo matrimonii vinculo conjugati & conſociati ſumus, ut individuam non bonorum duntaxat, ſed etiam conſiliorum & voluntatum ſine ulla exceptione, communitatem ſocietatemque ſervaremus. Et certè ut nihil mihi optabilius, aut antiquius adhuc fuit, quam ut nodum illum amabiliſſimum ſanctè conſtrictum tenerem; ſic me viciſſim inviolabili obſervantia & officio coluiſti.* page 30.'

Since Mr de Larroque could not find a copy of the firſt edition, I can ſay nothing either for or againſt Beza. Only I may conjecture, that he has not calumniated the biſhop of Riez; for the advertiſement, prefixed to the ſecond edition, intimates plainly enough, that the firſt was in great diſorder, and that ſome paſſages were left out, or placed otherwiſe. Now, ſince the Latin tranſlator thought himſelf obliged to leave out of the ſecond, what remained in it concerning the amorous intrigues of the duke of Guiſe; it is likely, that Lancelot Carles left out of the firſt what he had inſerted in it, concerning the gallantries of the ducheſs. Which ſhews how neceſſary it is to keep the firſt editions, and to diſtruſt tranſlators. You ſee, that John le Vieux, or John le Vieil (49), did boldly leave out whatever concerned the duke of Guiſe's adulteries, in the original.

(44) I write this in 1695.

(45) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. V, pag. 200, ad ann. 1577.

(46) That is, thoſe of the advocate David, concerning the excluſion of the deſcendants of Hugh Capet, and the reſtoration of the crown to the Guiſes, deſcended from Charlemagne.

(47) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſtiques des Egliſes Reformées, livr. vi. pag. 270.

(48) Twice in French, and once in Latin. Thoſe three editions came out in 1563.

(40) La Croix du Maine, pag. 272, mentions one John le Vieil, who might very well be this perſon.

GUISE (HENRY DE LORRAIN duke of) eldeſt ſon of the foregoing, had a certain mixture of good and bad qualities [*A*], which made him fit to over-turn a ſtate.

[*A*] *He had a certain mixture of good and bad qualities.*] A modern author (1) deſcribes this character in the following manner. 'He wanted nothing, either good or bad, that was neceſſary to make him ſucceed in what he was fully reſolved upon . . . He was a prince, who . . . . had all the noble qualities, and all the perfections of body and mind, that are moſt proper to charm one's heart, and to procure to thoſe, that are endowed with them, an abſolute empire over the people; and indeed they were in a manner bewitched with him, and doted upon him. For he was a man of a tall ſtature, admirably proportioned,

(1) Maimbourg, Hiſtoire de la Ligue, lib. i, pag. m. 18, & ſeq.

ſtate. He wanted no ability, on the one ſide, to find out the way of doing it; and, on the other, he was wicked enough to put it in execution. He ſo far indulged his ambition, that, after he had brought a thouſand calamities upon the kingdom, he himſelf was undone by it. He carried things to ſuch extremities, that no other expedient could be found out to put a ſtop to his attempts, than putting him to death. The manner how Henry III made away with him, and the cardinal de Guiſe, in the caſtle of Blois, during the ſitting of the ſtates (*a*), is ſo well known, that I ſhall not dwell upon it. I ſhall only obſerve, that many hiſtorians have advanced a falſity, in ſaying, that, ſoon after the execution of the duke of Guiſe, the Pope's legate (*b*) ſpoke to the king ſo unconcernedly, or rather ſo chearfully [*B*], that it was thought that prince and the court of Rome acted in concert. It may be ſaid, that the violent reſolution of the court of France, upon that occaſion, was one of thoſe maſter-pieces of ſtate-policy, which cannot be excuſed, but becauſe they are abſolutely neceſſary to the public good; for, if the duke of Guiſe had not been killed,

(*a*) In December, 1588.

(*b*) His name was Moroſini.

tioned, and like that which is aſcribed to heroes, having all the features of his face extremely fine, quick and ſparkling eyes; a large, ſmooth, and ſerene forehead, attended with a pleaſant ſmile, more charming ſtill, than the obliging words he ſpoke to all thoſe, who were fond of approaching him; a lively, clear, and red complexion . . . . He had a grave and ſtately gate, without any ſhew of pride or affectation; and there was in his carriage a certain air of heroical grandeur, intermixed with ſweetneſs, boldneſs, and loftineſs, without any thing diſagreeable; which inſpired, all at once, love, fear, and reſpect, into all thoſe, with whom he diſcourſed. This admirable outſide was attended with an inſide more wonderful ſtill, by reaſon of the noble qualities of a truly great ſoul, being liberal and magnificent, ſparing nothing to get creatures, and to gain all ſorts of people, eſpecially the nobility and military men; civil, obliging, popular; always ready to do good to thoſe, who made their application to him; generous, magnanimous, incapable of hurting any body, even his greateſt enemies, except in an honourable way; extreamly perſuaſive, diſſembling under the appearance of a great ſincerity; wiſe and prudent in his counſels; bold, quick, and valiant, in the execution; bearing chearfully all the inconveniences of war, as the meaneſt ſoldier; expoſing himſelf to the greateſt dangers, in order to ſucceed in his enterprizes . . . . But as there is no gold mine, wherein that precious metal is to be found pure and without mixture of a great deal of earth; ſo the great natural endowments of the duke of Guiſe were corrupted by a mixture of many faults and vices; the greateſt of which was his unſatiable deſire of grandeur and glory, and that vaſt ambition, to which he made every thing ſubſervient; being, beſides, raſh, preſumptuous, and ſelf-conceited, deſpiſing the opinion of other men, without ſeeming to do ſo; reſerved, cunning, little ſincere, and no true friend; regarding no body but himſelf, tho' he was the moſt careſſing and the moſt officious man in the world; doing no good to any body, but in order to gain his end the more eaſily; and always covering his vaſt deſigns with the ſpecious pretence of the public good, and the preſervation of the the true religion; truſting too much to his good fortune; blind in his proſperity, which made him reliſh his preſent happineſs with ſo much pleaſure, that he took no care to provide for the time to come; laſtly, too fond of women, whom nevertheleſs he cunningly made uſe of, to promote his great deſigns, though they were not ſenſible of it.' The dangerous ſpirit of the Guiſes, which Francis I did ſo well diſcover, that he adviſed his ſon to beware of it, grew worſe and worſe in every generation. 'Hoc adverterat Rex Franciſcus I. & levia licet quæ tunc ab iis cæpta, cavenda nihilominus liberis ſuis edixerat, ut parva ex queis magnarum rerum motus orirentur: nunquam ſatis fidam potentiam, ubi nimia eſt, rebus ſuis proſpicerent, nec majores domus eos crearent, quibus mos erat vim principis complecti, nomen remittere. Utinam Henricus II. patris conſilium haud aſpernando liberis ſuis conſuluiſſet, nec Guiſianos rebus gerendis præfeciſſet (2). —— *King Francis I obſerved this, and cautioned his children to guard againſt their attempts, though then but trivial, ſince great commotions might ariſe from ſmall beginnings; he repreſented to them that too great power is never to be truſted; he bid them take care of themſelves, nor create thoſe mayors of the palace, who were wont to exerciſe the ſovereignty, without the name. It were to be wiſhed, Henry II, remembering his father's advice, had conſulted the good of his children, and not have placed the Guiſes at the head of affairs.*' What an ancient poet ſaid of the Roman people, may be applied to them.

Ætas parentum pejor avis tulit
Nos nequiores, mox daturos
Progeniem vitioſiorem (3).

Degenerate more, thro' each deſcent, we grow,
And ſons more vices, than their fathers, know.

[*B*] *The Pope's legate ſpoke to the king . . . . in a chearful manner.*] There are few facts more proper than this is to confirm the uncertainty of hiſtory. I ſhall mention it, as I uſe to do, in the very words of the author from whom I have it.

'Davila ſays, that, after that (4), the king, coming down into the court, walked a long time with the legate, to whom he gave an account of all his reaſons, which that hiſtorian ſets down at large, as if he had been preſent at that long conference, and heard every word the king ſpoke to that cardinal; whoſe political reflexions he likewiſe mentions, and the anſwer he made to the king's long diſcourſe. For he ſays, that, for fear of leſſening that Prince's affection to the holy ſee, he aſſured him that the Pope . . . . He adds, that the king promiſed him upon his oath . . . . that he would allow of no other religion in his kingdom than the Roman Catholic. That, after ſuch an oath, the legate did not think fit to proceed further in that conference and, without ſpeaking to him in favour of the prelates that were priſoners, he treated with him with the ſame confidence as he had done before. Nay, ſome ſay †, that his free behaviour towards the king (for ſometimes he whiſpered in his ear, and laughed with him) created a belief, that the king had acted in concert with the court of Rome: and they add, with Davila, that it gave the king occaſion to proceed further, and to make away with the cardinal de Guiſe, perceiving how little the legate was concerned for the impriſonment of the cardinal. This is what thoſe authors tell us very ſeriouſly, as a certain truth; that conference, as they ſay, having been held in every body's ſight, in the court of the caſtle of Blois. And yet nothing can be more falſe; and the whole narrative of Davila is one of thoſe fictions, which none but a poet is allowed to invent. The proof of it is evident and unanſwerable. We have the printed memoirs of the life of the cardinal Moroſini, written in Italian very elegantly, and with great force, by Monſignor Stephano Coſmi, archbiſhop of Spalato, who was pleaſed to ſend them to me from Venice above three years ago; and it appears by the letters ‡ of that cardinal legate to cardinal Montalto, nephew to Pope Sixtus V, to whom he gives an exact account of what happened the twenty third of December, and the following days, that, though he inſtantly deſired, at the requeſt of the ducheſs of Nemours, to be admitted to the king's audience, that day, in the morning, he could not ſo much as get into the caſtle, and had not the deſired audience but on the twenty ſixth, three days after the cardinal had been killed. What will become then of all thoſe fine diſcourſes, and of all the particulars of

(2) Vindic. ſecundum libertat. Eccleſ. Gallic. pag. 6, & 7.

(23) Horat. Od. vi, lib. iii.

(4) That is after he had acquainted Catherine de Medicis with the death of the duke of Guiſe, and after he had ſent cardinal de Gondi to the legate, to inform him of what had been done, and of the reaſons that moved him to it, and after he had heard maſs.

† D'Aubigné.

‡ Memor. del vit. del Card. Moroſ. iib. iii, cap. xvi, xvii, xviii.

killed, the ſtates of the kingdom would doubtleſs have done for him, what they had done in former times for Pepin and Hugh Capet [*C*]: But the transferring of the crown would have been attended with conſequences much more fatal to the whole kingdom [*D*] in the XVIth century, than they were in the time of Pepin and Capet. The party of the duke of Guiſe was ſo powerful, that, notwithſtanding the execution of Blois, whereby they loſt their head, they maintained themſelves in ſuch a manner, as to deſtroy the king himſelf, and force Henry IV to change his religion. France cannot remember that time without bluſhing; for there never was any democracy, where the authority and majeſty of kings were ſo ſlighted, as they were then in that kingdom. The preachers furiouſly inveighed againſt the king [*E*], and repreſented the duke of Guiſe

'of the pretended conference on the twenty third day, and of the cardinal's appearing ſo eaſy, or rather ſo chearful, and ſpeaking in the king's ear, and laughing heartily, which made people believe, that he acted in concert with the king, who, perceiving his unconcernedneſs, reſolved to proceed further, and to get alſo the cardinal de Guiſe put to death? This is writing a hiſtory of one's own invention, that is, a meer fable, as two Proteſtant writers ‡ have done in this particular, *viz.* d'Aubigné, and the author of the diſcourſe, *De ce qui s'eſt paſſé à Blois juſqu'à la mort du Duc de Guiſe*; — *What paſſed at Blois till the death of the duke of Guiſe*. And our Catholic hiſtorians, being deceived by thoſe Huguenots, have alſo deceived their readers (5).' If hiſtorians are ſo groſsly miſtaken about things of ſuch a nature, how can we rely upon a thouſand things more difficult to be known, which are related by them with ſo much confidence? this falſity, tho' confuted by Maimbourg, is ſtill to be found in modern books: I have juſt now read it in a romantic hiſtory of the duke of Guiſe (6).

[*C*] *The States .... would have done for him what they had done in former times for Hugh Capet.*] Doubtleſs the leaguers deſigned to degrade Henry III, and confine him to a monaſtery (7), and to place the duke of Guiſe on the throne. The ducheſs of Mompenſier, ſiſter to that duke, made no myſtery of it. She (8) *one day told ſeveral people, ſhewing them her gold ſcizars *, that they would quickly ſerve to ſhave the king, that he might be ſhut up in a monaſtery, and that the throne, of which he was unworthy, might be filled by a man better qualified to reign and deſtroy the heretics. That man was her brother. Mr Maimbourg does not deny, that this duke aſpired to the crown, at leaſt after the death of the Valois.* He entered, *ſays he* **, into the League, to be the head of a party, which, after the death of the Valois, might raiſe him higher ſtill. Among other preparations for it, a genealogy had been publiſhed, whereby it appeared that the houſe of Lorrain derived their original from Charlemagne (9). The deſign of it was to intimate, that the crown would be reſtored to the deſcendants of that king, who had been deprived of it by Hugh Capet. The decrees of providence break through all obſtacles, *Fata viam invenient*: but, humanly ſpeaking, it may be ſaid, that Henry III made way for them, by cauſing the duke of Guiſe to be put to death; for if, on the one ſide, the ſituation of the king of Navarre enabled him to oppoſe the uſurpation with great vigour; it is certain, on the other ſide, that never was a more favourable concourſe of diſpoſitions to ſettle the duke of Guiſe upon the throne. A modern author rightly obſerves, that nothing but the power of fate could ſtop that duke. *The event*, ſays he (10), *made it appear, that providence, which abſolutely diſpoſes of empires, deſigned to take that of France from the Valois, and to transfer it to the Bourbons; and there was a neceſſity, that whatever could oppoſe it ſhould yield to the invincible power of that decree, which no conſpiracy, no league, no fortune, no earthly power, was able to reſiſt.* Apply here what Horace ſo well ſays of fortune:

Te ſemper anteit ſæva Neceſſitas
Clavos trabales, & cuneos manu
Geſtans ahena; nec ſeverus
Uncus abeſt, liquidumque plumbum (11).

Cloſe by thy ſide neceſſity ſtill ſtands;
Crows, books, and melted lead, and wedges load her hands.

It was the king of Navarre's good fortune, that he, who was ſo reſolute, wanted reſolution, when it was moſt neceſſary to him; and that he, who was ſo weak, appeared bold, when he wanted to be ſo. Thoſe two things ſaved his crown. Henry III, awaking out of his lethargy, ſtruck a great blow; but the duke of Guiſe was not bold enough to give up himſelf to the torrent of his fortune. The league *had certainly crowned him, had he accompliſhed the crime, for which he was juſtly puniſhed, as great malefactors are when they want reſolution.* They are the words of the author of the romantic hiſtory of that duke. It is certain, and experience confirms it, that the ſureſt way to ſucceed in ſuch deſigns, is not to ſtop, under pretence, that it would be too great a crime (12).

[*D*] *The tranſlation of the crown would have been attended with conſequences much more fatal to the whole kingdom.*] For the prince, who was to be the lawful ſucceſſor of Henry III, being a man of an extraordinary merit, extreamly brave, and ſupported not only by the Proteſtants, but alſo by a conſiderable number of Catholics; the uſurper would have been obliged to fight a hundred battles, in order to maintain himſelf, and both parties would have fought almoſt to the laſt man. Judge what had become of France during ſuch a furious competition: It would have been the ſtage of the moſt horrid tragedies; and, to compleat the ſcandal, religion would have been, not only the pretence, but alſo the moſt powerful cauſe of thoſe bloody operations; and it might have been ſaid more than ever,

Tantum Relligio potuit ſuadere malorum (13).

Such tragic acts religion could perſuade.

When Pepin and Hugh Capet uſurped the crown, the circumſtances were not the ſame. The lawful party was ſo weak, that no body durſt ſtir to ſupport it; and therefore the revolution was not fatal to the kingdom. From whence it may be inferred, that there are certain times, as well as certain places, wherein ſuch undertakings are not ſo wicked; becauſe the perſons, concerned in them, may be morally ſure, that there will be little blood ſpilt; for the lawful poſſeſſor will be quickly forſaken by all his friends, or have ſo few left, that he will not be able to make any reſiſtance; every body ſiding with the ſtrongeſt party. I have ſaid more than once (14), that every thing is of ſome uſe in a ſtate: The ingratitude of great men, that unfaithfulneſs, and want of activity, and many other faults, are ſometimes more beneficial to the public, than the contrary virtues.

[*E*] *The preachers furiouſly inveighed againſt the king.*] 'They (15) changed their ſermons into invectives againſt the king's ſacred perſon, and deſcribed ſo pathetically the tragical death of the two brothers, whom they extolled to the ſky, as if they had been martyrs, that all their hearers melted into tears, and broke out into ſighs; and †, inſtead of propoſing to them St Stephen's example, they inſpired them with a violent deſire of revenge. Inſomuch, that thoſe, who had no mind to cry or ſigh, and were offended at ſuch a way ſo unworthy of the holy miniſtry of the word of God, were forced to do as others did, for fear of being knocked down. .... Francis Pigenat, curate of St Nicolas in the fields ... preaching the duke of Guiſe's funeral ſermon .... ‡ carried his fury ſo far, as to aſk his auditors, whether none of them would undertake to revenge the duke's murder by killing the tyrant; and to move the people, he brought in the ducheſs, wi-

---

‡ D'Aubigne, Tom. II, livr. ii, cap. xv, Mem. de la Ligue, Tom. III, pag. 161.

(5) Mamb. ubi ſupra, pag. 279, &c.

(6) *Printed in* 1694.

(7) *He was threatened with it in a diſtich poſted up in public places. This diſtich runs thus:* Qui dedit ante duas, unam abſtulit, altera nutat; Tertia tonſoris nunc facienda manu. *It was in anſwer to the inſcription of the clock in the palace.* Qui dedit ante duas, triplicem dabit ille coronam.

(8) Critique générale de l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſme, *Letter iii*, *pag.* 40. *See alſo pag.* 44, *where Mezerai is quoted.*

* Thuanus, pag. 95.

** Hiſt. du Calvin. pag. 491.

(9) *See* Varillas, Hiſt. de Henri III, livr. vii, pag. 216.

(10) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, pag. 284.

(11) Od. xxxv, lib. i.

(12) *See the remark* [*A*] *of the article* EDWARD IV.

(13) Lucretius, lib. i, ver. 102.

(14) *See the text of the article* DOLABELLA (PUBLIUS), *between citations* (*b*) *and* (*c*).

(15) Maimb. Hiſt. de la Ligue, livr. iii, pag. m. 295. & ſeq.

† Cayet Chron. Nov. Lettere di Moroſ. Mem. del vit. del detto, lib. iii, cap. xvi.

‡ Journal Manuſcrit d'Antoine Loyſel.

Guiſe as a martyr, who deſerved to be canonized [*F*]. The people imitated the fury of the preachers [*G*]: And what was moſt ſtrange, was, that the Sorbonne applauded the rebellion, and made ſome decrees altogether republican [*H*], of which the Proteſtants did not fail to take advantage. The parliament of Paris heard the complaints of the duke of Guiſe's widow, who demanded, that Henry IV ſhould be puniſhed for the death of her huſband [*I*]. I ſhall ſet down an encomium, which is to be found in Balzac's

' dow of the deceaſed, who was ready to lye-in, ' ſpeaking theſe terrible words imitated from Virgil:

Exoriare aliquis noſtris ex oſſibus ultor,
Qui face Valeſios ferroque ſequare Tyrannos.

Some brave avenger from my aſhes riſe,
With fire and ſword the tyrants to purſue,
And quite extirpate the Valeſian race.

' (16) The furious Guinceſtre, ſhewing in the pulpit ſome ſmall ſilver candleſticks (17), nicely wrought ' above a hundred years before, in the ſhape of ſatires ' carrying flambeaux, *charged the king* with being a ' ſorcerer, ſaying, that they were the idols and the ' figures of the devils, to whom Henry de Valois ' uſed to ſacrifice in his retirement at Vincennes, and ' that they had ordered him to murder the duke of ' Guiſe, defender of the faith. *To which I add, that* ' (18) the curates and confeſſors of the faction of the ' ſixteen, making a ſacrilegious uſe of the power, ' which their holy miniſtry gives them, of binding ' and unbinding, refuſed to abſolve thoſe, who declared, ' in confeſſion, that they could not reſolve not to ' acknowledge Henry III as their king.'

[*F*] . . . *and repreſented the duke of Guiſe as a martyr.*] The ducheſs of Nemours was revered at Paris (19), ' as the mother of two holy martyrs; and ' the little Feuillant, preaching one day in her preſence, ' was ſo furious as to turn to her, and direct his ' ſpeech to the late duke in theſe words: *O holy and* ' *glorious martyr of* GOD; *bleſſed is the womb that* ' *bore thee, and the breaſts that ſuckled thee* ‡!' Thuanus ſays, that this ducheſs (20), ' entreated Henry III to reſtore to her the bodies of her ſons; ' but it was repreſented to the king, that he ſhould ' not do it, becauſe, the people being ſo much prepoſſeſſed in their favour, his enemies would not fail ' to make them worſhip thoſe dead bodies as reliques ' of ſaints, which would make * the king more odious: ' ſo that care was taken to get thoſe bodies conſumed with lime, through a precaution much like that ' whereby God would not ſuffer the Jews to know ' where the body of Moſes lay. It appeared by the event, that thoſe, who gave the king that advice, ' were in the right. For, among other extravagances, ' that were done at Paris, after the death of ' thoſe two brothers, Thuanus obſerves, that their ' effigies at full length were daily carried to the ' altars, bloody all over, and having a ghaſtly look **.' See the firſt paſſage quoted by me in the following remark.

[*G*] *The people imitated the fury of the preachers.*] ' At the ſame time, that, by virtue of that unhappy ' decree (21), he was deprived of the title of king, ' and only called Henry de Valois, he was abuſed and ' reviled by the furious mob, all manner of ways: they ' vented their rage againſt him by ſatires, invectives, ' libels, calumnies, and all ſorts of outrageous words, ' the leaſt of which was that of tyrant and apoſtate: ' they fell with a brutiſh fury upon his arms, his ' ſtatues, and pictures, which were broke, tore, trampled upon, dragged through the ſtreets, burnt, thrown ' into the river, with a thouſand curſes upon him, ' whilſt the duke of Guiſe and his brother were reverenced as martyrs, ſo far as to place their pictures upon the altars (22).' Obſerve what Maimbourg had been ſaying. As ſoon as the decree of the Sorbonne was publiſhed at Paris, ſays he, *They proceeded all of a ſudden to ſuch horrid extremities, and ſuch an execrable fury, contrary to the duty of ſubjects to their lawful prince, that, tho' our writers have mentioned them, I think it more proper to ſay nothing of them, than to profane my hiſtory with a relation, that would make it unpleaſant and odious.* An Act (23) of the pretended parliament, *ſent to all the towns, that ſided with the League, encreaſed the fury of the people, who did ſtill worſe things than before: nay, ſome, through an abominable mixture of parricide, ſacrilege, and magical enchantments, placed waxen imagies, like the king, upon the altars, and pricked them in ſeveral places, uttering certain diabolical words at each of the forty maſſes, that were ſaid for them in many churches, to give a greater force to their charm; and when the fortieth maſs was ſaid, they pricked them in the heart, as it were to give him the mortal blow* (24).

[*H*] *The Sorbonne . . . . . made ſome decrees altogether republican.*] I have ſaid in another place (25) why I uſe Maimbourg's words; and therefore I ſhall not excuſe my ſelf again for it. Here follows another entire paſſage of the ſame hiſtorian (26). ' Thoſe, ' who made up the town-body . . . . propoſed to the ' Sorbonne, not only by word of mouth, but alſo by ' an authentical Act, ſigned by the magiſtrates, and ' ſealed with the ſeal of the town, theſe two great ' caſes of conſcience: † one was, *whether the French* ' *were actually free from the oath of fidelity and obedience ſworn to the king?* The other was, *whether* ' *they might take up arms and unite themſelves; and* ' *whether they might raiſe money, and contribute towards the defence and preſervation of the Catholic, Apoſtolic, and Roman, religion in France* ⸸, *to oppoſe the* ' *execrable deſigns and attempts of the king and all his* ' *adherents, ſince he had violated the public faith at* ' *Blois, to the prejudice of the Catholic religion, of the* ' *edict of the holy union, and of the natural liberty of* ' *the States.* Whereupon the Faculty meeting on the ' ſeventh of January, to the number of ſeventy doctors, after a ſolemn proceſſion, and a maſs of the ' Holy Ghost, *concluded, in the affirmative, upon* ' *thoſe two points, with a common conſent, and without* ' *any oppoſition*; they are the very words of the decree: *And that this reſolution ſhould be ſent to the* ' *Pope, that it might be approved by him, and confirmed* ' *by his authority; and that he would be pleaſed to aſſiſt* ' *the Gallican church, which was under great ſufferings,* ' *and very much oppreſſed.*' On the fifth of April of the ſame year 1589, the Sorbonne made another decree, whereby they declare, *that Henry de Valois cannot be prayed for in any eccleſiaſtical prayer, much leſs in the canon of the maſs, by reaſon of the excommunication he has incurred; and that theſe words,* pro Rege noſtro, *ought to be left out of the canon, leſt it ſhould be thought that he is prayed for, though the prieſt, directing his intention to ſome other perſon, means thoſe that govern, or him to whom* GOD *deſigns to give the kingdom. They ordain, that, inſtead of thoſe words, three prayers,* Pro Chriſtianis Principibus noſtris ‡, *be ſaid at maſs, out of the canon: they were printed, and are to be ſeen ſtill. Laſtly, they add, that thoſe, who ſhall refuſe to comply, ſhall be deprived of the prayers and rights of the Faculty, out of which they ſhall be expelled as excommunicated perſons; which was unanimouſly approved by all the doctors.* Thoſe republican principles ſpread in ſuch a manner among the French divines, that Genebrard, one of the principal deputies of the clergy to the ſtates aſſembled at Paris in 1593, preached a ſermon before that aſſembly, *wherein, inſtead of exhorting the deputies, by the word of* GOD, *to think only of the preſervation of the ſtate and of religion, which is the greateſt ſupport of it, he endeavoured to prove, by very bad arguments, that their aſſembly might change and repeal the Salic law, which is the fundamental law of the ſtate, and has been always inviolably obſerved from the beginning of the French monarchy to this preſent time* (27).

[*I*] *The parliament of Paris received the complaints of the duke of Guiſe's widow, who demanded that Henry III ſhould be puniſhed for the death of her huſband.*] What we read in the General Criticiſm on Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm (28), concerning the action brought againſt that king, is very curious; but what follows is more curious ſtill. It was imparted to me by a very learned man (29), who has collected a vaſt number of uncommon things relating to learning, and has a wonderful knowledge of all ſorts of books, tho' never ſo ſcarce and ſo little known. He was pleaſed to write

(16) Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 311, 312.

(17) *They were found in the oratories of Henry III, at Bois de Vincennes, when the mob plundered them.*

(18) M. de Nevers, Traité de la Priſe des Arm. pag. 467, apud Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 301.

(19) Maimb. ibid. pag. 305.

‡ Journal de Henry III.

(20) Critique générale de l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſme, *Letter iii*, *pag.* 37.

* In regis invidiam etiam tanquam beatorum fœlices exuvias ad adorationem vulgo expoſituros.

** His accedebant libelli ineptiſſimi de martyrio fratrum cum imaginibus eorum inſcite pictis, nec contenti libris, eorundem effigies juſtâ hominis menſurâ ad pulvinaria templorum quotidie ſiſtebant, ſanguinolentas, & pallore violentæ mortis horridas.

(21) *That is, The decree of the Sorbonne.*

(22) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, pag. 300.

(23) *Whereby all the members of that parliament, to the number of a hundred and twenty ſix, reckoning the princes and prelates, ſwore upon the crucifix, They would never depart from their League, and that they would revenge the death of the two Guiſes, all manner of ways, upon all the authors or accomplices of it.* Id, pag. 311.

(24) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de la Ligue, pag 300.

(25) *In the article of* GREGORY I, *between citations* (46) *and* (47). *See also that of* GREGORY VII, *at the end of the remark* [*E*].

(26) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, pag. 297, 298, ann. 1589.

† Mem. de la Ligue, Tom. III, Mr de Nevers, Traité de la Priſe des Armes.

⸸ Mem. del vit. di Moroſ. lib. iii, cap. xxiii.

‡ Mem. de la Ligue, Tom. III.

(37) Maimbourg, ibid. pag. 458.

(28) *Letter xiii, pag.* 228, *of the third edition. He quotes a very notable paſſage of* Mr de Perefixe, Hiſtoire de Henry IV.

(29) *Mr Bourdelot, phyſician to Mr Boucherat, chancellor of France. He is now phyſician to the ducheſs of Burgundy.*

Balzac's Entretiens [*K*]. This duke was born the 31ſt of December 1550 (*c*). He married in 1570, Catherine de Cleves, the ſecond daughter of Francis de Cleves, duke of Nevers, who died at Paris the 11th of May 1633, at 83 years of age (*d*). Varillas relates

(*c*) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. de la Ligue*, *pag.* 284, ſays, He was killed at forty two years of age: He is miſtaken by four years.

(*d*) *See* Hilarion de Coſte, Tom. I, pag. 301.

write to me, that he has a ſmall book of ſixteen pages in 8vo, intituled, *Advertiſſement & premieres Eſcritures du procés pour Meſſieurs les Députez du Royaume de France, aux prêtendus Eſtats qui ſe devoient tenir en la ville de Blois, demandeurs d'une part. Le peuple & les héritiers des défunts Duc & Cardinal de Guiſe, auſſi demandeurs & joints d'une part. Contre Henry de Valois troiſieme de ce nom, jadis Roy de France & de Pologne, autrement dit Theſſalonien, au nom & en la qualité qu'il procede, défendeur d'autre part. Avec l'approbation des Docteurs. Et ſe vendent chez Denis Binet, avec permiſſion.* 1589. That is, *Advertiſement and firſt writings of the proceſs for the deputies of the kingdom of France to the pretended ſtates, that were to meet in the city of Blois, plaintiffs: the people and the heirs of the deceaſed duke of Guiſe, and cardinal de Guiſe, likewiſe plaintiffs, and joined together: againſt Henry de Valois, the third of that name, heretofore king of France and Poland, otherwiſe called the Theſſalonian, in the name and quality he proceeds, defendant. With the approbation of the doctors. Sold by Denys Binet, with licence:* 1589. The book begins thus:

Advertiſement of the law ſuit.

‘ The deputies of the kingdom of France, plantiffs, according to the ſummons of Monſ. Peter de Four l'Eveſque, bearing date the twelfth of January 1589, on the one part, and the people and conſorts, likewiſe joined plantiffs on the one part: againſt Henry de Valois, in the name and quality he proceeds, defendant, on the other part: ſay, before you gentlemen, officers, and counſellors of the crown of France, holding the court of parliament at Paris, that, for the cauſes, reaſons, and arguments, hereafter ſet forth,

‘ The ſaid Henry de Valois, by reaſon of the murder and aſſaſſination committed upon the moſt illuſtrious perſons of the duke and cardinal de Guiſe, ſhall be condemned, for a reparation of the ſaid aſſaſſination, to make the *amende honorable*, having nothing but his ſhirt on, bare-headed, and bare-footed, with a halter about his neck, attended by the executioner, holding in his hands a burning torch of thirty pounds weight; who ſhall ſay and declare in the aſſembly of the ſtates, upon his knees, that, wrongfully and without a cauſe, he has committed, or cauſed the ſaid aſſaſſination to be committed, upon the ſaid duke and cardinal de Guiſe, for which he ſhall beg pardon of GOD, of the juſtice, and of the ſtates: that from this very time, as a criminal, and declared to be ſuch, he ſhall be depoſed and declared unworthy of the crown of France, renouncing all the rights he might pretend to, for the things more fully mentioned and declared in the proceſs, of which he ſhall be found well and duly attainted and convicted; beſides, he ſhall be baniſhed, and confined for ever to the convent and monaſtery of the Hieronymites, near the wood of Vincennes, to live there upon bread and water the reſt of his days; and he ſhall be condemned to pay the charges; and for theſe cauſes, they ſay, &c. By theſe means, and others, which the court of grace may ſupply, the plaintiffs conclude with charges. In the advocate's abſence, ſigned

CHICOT.

Arreſt of the ſupream court of the peers of France againſt the murderers and aſſaſſins of the cardinal and of the duke of Guiſe. Paris, for Nicolas Nivelle, 1589, 8vo, with licence.

‘ The court, all the chambers being aſſembled, having ſeen the petition preſented to them by the lady Catherine de Cleves, ducheſs-dowager of Guiſe, &c. and heard the attorney-general upon it, and all things duly conſidered; has ordained, and ordains, that the commiſſion be delivered to the ſaid petitioner, directed to two counſellors, to inform about the contents of the ſaid petition, and it's circumſtances and dependencies; to the end that the information being made, reported to the ſaid court, and communicated to the ſaid attorney-general, they may ordain what they ſhall think fit. Done in parliament the laſt day of January, 1589, ſigned

BOUCHER.

‘ Upon the petition, preſented this day by the lady Catherine de Cleves, &c. The court, all the chambers being met together, has appointed and appoints Meſſieurs Peter Michon and John Courtin, counſellors, to make an information of the contents of the ſaid petition, and of it's circumſtances and dependencies, and the execution of the preſent arreſt ſhall be made by virtue of the extract of it. Done in parliament the laſt of January, 1589.

BOUCHER.

An extract of the regiſters of parliament.

‘ The court, all the ſeveral chambers being met together, having ſeen the petition preſented to them by the lady Catherine de Cleves, &c. importing that, upon another petition preſented by her, &c. and having heard upon it the attorney-general, and all things duly conſidered, the ſaid court has admitted and admits the ſaid de Cleves, appellant, from the grant of the ſaid commiſſion, and execution thereof, and from whatever enſued or might enſue upon it; ordains, that a commiſſion of the ſaid court be delivered to her, to ſummon whomſoever it may concern upon the ſaid appeal; and in the mean time, forbids, particularly, commiſſioners, and all others, to proceed further; and all other courts to take cognizance of the fact contained in the ſaid petition, and of it's circumſtances and dependencies, upon pain of a nullity of proceedings. Moreover, the ſaid court ordains, that all ſummons made in general, and proclaimed in the neighbouring places of a ſafe acceſs, will be as good and effectual as if they were made to the perſons, or in the houſes of thoſe whom there will be occaſion to ſummon. Done in parliament the firſt day of February, 1589, ſigned

DU TILLET.

[K] *I will relate an encomium which is to be found in Balzac's Entretiens.*] I make no doubt that Balzac is the author of it, and that, being a great lover of an hyperbolical ſtile, he took care to exaggerate the thing. However it be, theſe are his words:

‘ France doated upon that man; for, ſhould I ſay only, that ſhe was in love with him, I ſhould expreſs my ſelf too faintly. It is no wonder if ſhe departed from her duty as ſhe did. Such a paſſion came very near idolatry: ſome invoked him in their prayers; others put his cut in their common prayer-book. His picture was every where; ſome ran after him in the ſtreets to rub their beads againſt his cloak: and one day, as he returned from Champagne, entering into Paris through St Antony's-gate, the people not only cried, *long live Guiſe*, but many ſung, *Hoſanna filio David*. Some aſſemblies, that were not ſmall, yielded in an inſtant to his good mien. No heart could hold out againſt his face; he perſuaded before he ſpoke a word; it was impoſſible to bear him an ill-will in his preſence. The firſt glance he caſt upon his enemies did immediately remove their animoſity againſt him, and produced ſuch a commotion in their blood, and ſo ſtrange an alteration in their humours, that afterwards they could not reſume their hatred, without animating themſelves a long time; and therefore, what I heard a courtier of that reign ſay, ſeems to me to be well obſerved, that *the Huguenots were for the league, when they looked upon the duke of Guiſe*. I leave it to hiſtory to give an account of his actions, and to carry curioſity as far as his thoughts. I will not take upon me to explain court-riddles, nor do my ſpeculations reach ſo far. It is enough for me to believe, without pretending to gueſs, that he muſt needs have been a very extraordinary man, ſince his bare name was ſufficient, after his death, to continue the war againſt two potent kings; and ſince the greateſt captain of Europe, the ſecond founder of this ſtate, Henry the Great, of relates a very remarkable thing concerning that marriage [*L*]. They were mutually unfaithful [*M*]: and, if we believe that hiſtorian, it was not the huſband, who revenged himſelf upon his wife's lover; he was contented to put her into a violent fright [*N*]. He left many children behind him (*e*).

He was ſirnamed Gaſh-Face [*O*], by reaſon of a wound he received in the cheek, in a fight, in the year 1575. The duke of Mayenne his brother ſet up for the head of the

‘glorious memory, took towns, and won battles, only to ruin the intereſt of a man, who was no longer in being. I will not omit a ſaying, which you will not be diſpleaſed to know. It is ſeparated from the encomium, and aſcribed to mareſchal de Rais's lady. *Thoſe Lorrain princes,* ſaid ſhe, *had ſo noble a look, that other princes looked like citizens to them* (30).’

[*L*] *Varillas relates a very remarkable thing concerning that marriage.*] He ſays (31), that the duke of Guiſe being informed, that Charles IX deſigned to have him aſſaſſinated, conſulted the ducheſs of Nemours, his mother, who *told him, he could not avoid the misfortune he was threatened with, but by marrying that very ſame night* (32), and that *ſhe undertook to get him a wife. She ſent for the princeſs of Porcien, who did not think fit to refuſe that match. Thus the marriage was propoſed, negotiated, concluded, and conſummated, and the ducheſs proved with child of a ſon, who was afterwards the fourth duke of Guiſe; and all this was tranſacted in the ſpace of four hours. The king, being told of it the next morning, revoked the order he had given to* la Tour-Gondy. Were this true, I ſhould wonder that le Laboureur knew nothing of it. He knew ſeveral particulars concerning that ducheſs of Guiſe. He tells us (33), that the prince of Porcien, not long before he died, deſired his wife, *whom he ſuſpected to have a kindneſs for the duke of Guiſe, not to marry him. You are young, ſaid he to her, rich, and handſome: theſe qualifications, attended with a noble extraction, will move ſeveral perſons to court you. I approve your marrying again, and leave you the choice of a huſband all over the kingdom, except the duke of Guiſe, whom of all men in the world I hate moſt: and I beg of you, that my greateſt enemy may not be the heir of what was the deareſt to me. He died of a fever at Paris, in the year* 1564: *and ſix years after, his widow, having compared the memory of a dead huſband with the preſence of ſo great an object as Henry de Lorrain, duke of Guiſe, was, yielded to his merit, and married him.* This account, and that of Varillas, are little conſiſtent.

[*M*] *They were mutually unfaithful.*] The galantries of the duke of Guiſe are well known: they make part of the deſcription Maimbourg gives of him, as has been ſeen above. ‘He ſpent the night before he was aſſaſſinated with a lady belonging to the queen, which was the reaſon why he came later than others to the council: nay, it is thought, that his bleeding at the noſe in the council-hall, which obliged him to aſk for ſome ſweat-meats, proceeded from his having exhauſted his ſtrength with that woman. If you will not take my word for it, believe at leaſt Thuanus, whoſe words I quote in the margin †, and admire the injuſtice of that duke. Notwithſtanding his being ſo unfaithful to his wife, he could not endure, that ſhe ſhould be unfaithful to him; for he cauſed a handſome young gentleman, called St Megrin, one of the king's darlings, to be cruelly aſſaſſinated, for ſome reports that went about him and his ducheſs ⸸. By the king of Navarre's leave, who had ſome reaſons to approve St Megrin's puniſhment (34), that action of the duke of Guiſe was a very great crime (35).’ We ſhall ſee, by and by, that an author ſays, the duke of Guiſe had no hand in St Megrin's aſſaſſination. However, he was thought to be the author of it, at the court of France (36); and the king of Navarre was ſo fully perſuaded of it, that he ſaid; *I am glad my couſin the duke of Guiſe could not endure, that ſuch a ſpark as St Megrin ſhould cuckold him: all other court-ſparks, who pretend to make amorous addreſſes to princeſſes, ſhould be ſerved in the ſame manner* (37). But the author, I am going to quote, does not deny the love-intrigues of the ducheſs of Guiſe; it is true, he does not pretend to warrant the truth of them.

[*N*] *He was contented too put his wife into a violent fright.*] ‘Cauſſade St Maigrin, a gentleman of Bourdeaux, became a favourite of Henry III, meerly on account of his beauty . . . . He was ſo impudent as to ſay, that the ducheſs of Guiſe had proſtituted herſelf to him ‡. The duke of Guiſe, being of all men the leaſt capable of jealouſy, as to women, was not at firſt informed of the fooliſh vanity of St Maigrin; but the thing was imparted to his neareſt relations and beſt friends: and all of them were ſo preſſing upon him, that, in order to free himſelf from their importunity, he promiſed them to revenge himſelf firſt upon his wife, and then upon her pretended lover. Accordingly, he did not lie with her the night following, contrary to his cuſtom; and the next day, he went into her chamber at four a clock in the morning, with a dagger in his right hand, and a ſilver porringer full of a blackiſh liquor in his left. He awaked the ducheſs, who was faſt aſleep, upbraided her in a few words with her unfaithfulneſs; and, with a look and voice, in which ſhe might diſcover all the ſymptoms of fury and deſpair, told her, he left it to her choice to be ſtabbed or to drink the poiſon prepared in the porringer (38).’ The ducheſs, not being able to prevail with him by her entreaties, *took the pretended poiſon, and drunk it off, and, falling upon her knees* before her oratory, waited for the moment ſhe ſhould expire: but as that pretended poiſon was *the beſt jelly-broth that could be made,* ſhe was not the worſe for it; and in an hour's time, her huſband came to her, and told her, *how he had been ſollicited to make away with her, and what courſe he had taken. The friends and relations of the duke, having loſt all hopes of exaſperating him againſt his wife, reſolved to kill St Maigrin. About twenty men on horſeback waited for him, at his coming out of the Louvre, at twelve o'clock at night, and gave him thirty three wounds with their ſwords and piſtols, moſt of which were mortal.* The king expreſſed no reſentment, *becauſe he was told, that a man had been ſeen among the aſſaſſins, who ſeemed to be the duke of Mayenne, being extraordinary tall, and having hands like a ſhoulder of mutton.*

Take notice, that this ducheſs of Guiſe had been a Proteſtant, during the life of her firſt huſband; but ſhe turned Catholic *in the chappel of the caſtle of St Germain en Laye, at the preſſing requeſt of Catherine de Medicis her godmother* (39).

[*O*] *He was ſirnamed Gaſh-Face.*] A famous hiſtorian makes an obſervation, which does not ſeem to me to be right. *The duke of Guiſe,* ſays he (40), *governour of Champagne, charged the Reiſters, and defeated them near Chateau Thierry. He was wounded in the left-cheek with the ſhot of an arquebuſe, the gaſh* whereof remained all his life-time, very glorious with reſpect to the Catholics, and very advantageous with reſpect to the ladies, who think that brave men are ſo every where.* He has ſome reaſon to ſay, that the marks of bravery are very acceptable to the fair ſex. Madam de Scudery ſays (41), that *tho' valour is not the virtue of women, yet it is certain they love it, and ſometimes prove unjuſt to ſome other qualities for the ſake of this, by preferring ſome men, who are only valiant, to others, who have ſeveral virtues inſtead of one.* It is certain, that a gentleman, ſuſpected of cowardice, will be deſpiſed by the ladies (42), and that many of them try the courage of their lovers; I mean, that they expoſe them to quarrels, in order to ſee whether they will come off with honour. How many raſh actions were done in the French armies, in the XVIth century, for the ſake of a miſtreſs, and to deſerve her favour (43)? Mezerai's obſervation cannot therefore be criticized in all reſpects; but it may be ſaid, that the reaſon he goes upon is not ſolid. I grant, the ladies love valiant men, and courageous ſparks; but it is not becauſe they fancy they are ſtout every where, but becauſe the reputation of bravery is attended with great glory, in which thoſe have a ſhare, whoſe lovers have got ſuch a ſhining reputation: and therefore, when women prefer ſoldiers to citizens, and warriors of a diſtinguiſhed valour to common warriors, they ſhew more pride and vanity than leudneſs. They think it much more glorious to

captivate

(*e*) He had fourteen, not in fourteen years, as Varillas will have it, *Hiſtoire de Henry III, livr. xii, pag.* 343: for he was married eighteen years, and he left his wife with child.

(30) Balzac, Entretien xxiv, pag. m. 260.

(31) Varillas, Hiſtoire de Henry III, livr. xii, pag 342.

(32) *Charles IX deſigned to have him killed, becauſe he thought he was in love with the princeſs Margaret. See the romantic hiſtory of the duke of Guiſe, printed at Paris,* 1694, *in which this princeſs is repreſented as ſo much in love with the duke of Guiſe, that it ſurpaſſes all the decorum of a romance, but is not improbable, except in this, that the author ſuppoſes, that, in the moſt favourable opportunities of enjoyment, they parted without, &c.*

(33) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtelnau, Tom. I, pag. 390.

† Ultimus comparuit Guiſius, quem ea nocte ſecurum Veneri furtivæ cum quadam Gynæcei matrona, quam perdite deperibat, indulſiſſe, eoque tardius ſurrexiſſe conſtans rumor fuit. . . . Dulciaria quædam Cubiculariis regiis ad refocillandas vires petiit, quod tamen ab aliis non tam pavori quàm laſſitudini ex contubernio feminæ illius, cum qua concubuerat contractæ aſſignatum eſt. *Thuan. lib. xciii.*

⸸ Journal de Hen. III, 21 July, 1578.

(34) *See below citat.* (37).

(35) Critique générale de l'Hiſt. du Calviniſme, *Letter lii, pag.* 41.

(36) *See the* Journal de Henry III, pag m. 31.

(37) Ibid.

‡ *In Mr de Beiſſy's Memoirs. They are in Mr de Meſmes's library.*

(38) Varillas Hiſtoire de Henry III, livr. xii, pag. 343.

(39) Hilarion de Coſte, Vies des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. I, pag. 295.

(40) Mezerai, Abr. Chron. Tom. V, pag. 207, ad ann. 1575.

* *For which reaſon he was called Gaſh-Face.*

(41) *In one of the volumes of* Clelia.

(42) *See the remark* [*B*] *of the article* CERISANTES.

(43) *Brantôme ſpeaks of them in ſeveral places.*

the league; and, in that quality, he exerciſed a power little different from the royal. He might have taken the title of king [*P*]; but doubtleſs he had ſome reaſons to content himſelf with the title of *lieutenant-general of the ſtate and crown of France*, really attended with an almoſt deſpotical authority. He and the league ſuppoſed, that the throne was vacant, and ſo they overturned the moſt ſolemn and the moſt fundamental laws of the kingdom. I ſhall ſet down an act, which has been purloined from the records of the parliament of Paris [*Q*]; whereby it will appear, that, in what concerns the

captivate a great courage, than to conquer a peaceful heart. They get a certain advantage by it; whereas the reſt is very caſual. Some brave men are not to be compared in their armorus embraces to ſome others, who ſeldom ſtir out of doors. Many a Roman, who had made twenty glorious campaigns, and had been loaded with military rewards, was much inferiour in this reſpect to Ovid and Horace (44), and a hundred fops not fit to handle a ſword. I do not think the braveſt man in France could have diſputed this point with Zacachriſt, or that the mareſchal de Rantzaw, who bore ſo many glorious marks of his valour, and whoſe face was much more gaſhed than that of the duke of Guiſe, came near the ſtrength of Voiture.

If we go higher, we ſhall find, that the raviſher of Helena was not the valiant Hector, but Paris, a coward, and an effeminate man; and it will appear, that Homer, who is ſo happy, and ſo natural in deſcribing paſſions, alledges the example of that coward, to cry down the impatience of thoſe, who careſs their wives in the day-time. Paris is the only man in his poems that does it. Nay, he is tranſported with ſuch an impatience, when he ſhould have been aſhamed of having juſt then ran away from the fight. Did not the poet deſign to denote by it the venereal ſtrength of poltroons? Plutarch does not ſay ſo; but perhaps he might have ſaid it, with as much reaſon as there is in theſe words of his (45): *to which purpoſe I ſhall mention what Homer ſays of Paris, who, running away from the battle, went to bed with the fair Helena; for, ſince the poet mentions no other man in his poem, that lies with his wife in the day-time, he plainly intimates, that he takes ſuch a piece of incontinence to be a very ſhameful thing* (46). See, in the third book of the Iliad, how Hector upbraided that run-away with his cowardice: Helena ſpoke to him thus:

Quod bene te jactas, & fortia facta recenſes;
  A verbis facies diffidet iſta ſuis.
Apta magis Veneri, quam ſint tua corpora Marti.
  Bella gerant fortes: tu Pari, ſemper ama.
Hectora, quem laudas, pro te pugnare jubeto;
  Militia eſt operis altera digna tuis (47).

On war's rough theme thy tongue be ever mute;
Such boaſts but ill with ſuch an aſpect ſuit.
To war's impetuous deity unknown,
Soft Cytherea claims thee all her own.
Let the tough hero's arm the jav'lin wield;
Exert thy proweſs in love's gentler field.
For thee let Hector, valiant Hector, fight;
Thy courage, Paris, other wars invite.

[*P*] *The Duke of Mayenne exerciſed a power little different from the royal. He might have taken the title of king.*] He heard at Lyons, that the duke, and the cardinal de Guiſe, his brothers, had been murdered, and immediately he went into Burgundy, whereof he was governor (48). He got ſome troops together, and then marched towards Paris. He was received at Troyes *with the ſame honours that are paid to kings, and acted there like a ſovereign, ſending commiſſions to the duke of Guiſe's creatures, eſpecially to Roſne and St Paul, to whom he ſent orders to command in Champagne and Brie* (49). He entered Paris the twelfth of February, 1589, 'where ‡, as if he had been the duke of 'Guiſe raiſed from the dead, the inhabitants expreſſed 'their joy to ſuch an exceſs, that they expoſed his 'picture with a cloſe crown to the public view, and 'erected a royal throne to him ⸸: and, had he been 'ambitious and bold enough to place himſelf on it, 'perhaps he would have found people enough that 'would have acknowledged him, in hopes of getting 'ſome governments, which he would have erected 'into dutchies and countries with homage, as Hugh 'Capet did (50).' But he refuſed that honour, and afterwards would not ſuffer, that another ſhould be poſſeſſed of it. He was contented, *firſt of all, to ſettle his authority*, by making himſelf the ſtrongeſt in the council of the league (51). 'He ordered every thing 'according to his mind, in ſpite of the ſixteen, and 'procured to himſelf an authority very like the ſupream power of kings. For the firſt thing, that was 'decreed in that new council, was, that, to denote the 'almoſt abſolute and ſupream power beſtowed upon 'him, he ſhould have, till the meeting of the States, 'the extraordinary and unprecedented title of lieutenant-general, not of the king, for the league acknowledged none then, but of the ſtate and crown of 'France . . . . (52). He took an oath for this new 'and odd dignity, on the thirteenth of March ‡, in 'the parliament, who confirmed the patent, ſealed with 'the new ſeals, that were made, inſtead of the king's, 'which had been broken: and, to begin the exerciſe 'of his office with an act of ſovereignty *, he immediately cauſed new laws to be publiſhed, containing 'twenty one articles, to unite, under the ſame form of 'government, all the towns, that were engaged in 'the league, and thoſe that would enter into it, the 'number of which proved very great in a little time '(53).' He took the field, and attacked the king's army more than once: he brought the Spaniſh troops into the kingdom; and, if he oppoſed the deſign of the Leaguers, who intended to make a king, who ſhould marry the Infanta, it was only becauſe he could not be concerned in that nomination, ſince he was married, and becauſe it was only deſigned for the duke of Guiſe, his nephew. He was ſo obſtinate in his rebellion, that he continued to make war againſt Henry IV, when the city of Paris had ſubmitted to that prince, reconciled to the church of Rome. He did not ſubmit, till he had ſuch advantageous offers made him by the king, that he could hardly have expected ſo great favours from a prince highly beholden to him (54). The edict, that was made in his favour, is dated at Folembray, the eleventh of January, 1596 (55).

[*Q*] *I will produce an act, which has been purloined from the records of the parliament of Paris.*] I have a copy of it drawn from the original, ſigned du Tillet. here is the tenour of that act.

An extract of the records of parliament.

'This day the Sieur duke de Mayenne, lieutenant-general of the royal ſtate and crown of France, the chambers being met together, and the king's council preſent, 'having remonſtrated to the court the cauſes of his, 'coming to this city, and leaving a great army; and 'that ſince the fourteenth day of the laſt month, the 'ſaid court did not ſit (56), and there being no preſident in it, he thought it neceſſary to come and adviſe with them about it, in order to appoint four preſidents, that this great chamber, and that of the Tournelle, 'may not remain without heads, and that he may cauſe 'patents to be drawn up for thoſe who ſhall be elected, 'being not willing to name any of them himſelf, but 'referring the whole matter to the ſaid court: whereupon having ſeveral times called upon the court to 'name them, and the king's council being heard, it 'has been remonſtrated to him by Mr Matthew 'Chartier, dean, and the eldeſt counſellor, that, up'on a vacancy of the ſaid offices, the court was uſed to 'nominate ſome perſons to the king, out of which he 'choſe one or two, who were put in poſſeſſion of 'them. But now there being no king, and conſidering the condition the town was in, the ſaid court referred it to him, and deſired him to name ſome: 'and at laſt, after many excuſes, he has ſaid, that ſince 'the court deſired it ſhould be ſo, and according to 'to the prayer he had put up in the morning to GOD, 'and his holy ſpirit, that this affair might be 'managed with ſincerity, he reſolved to name, for the 'office of firſt preſident, the Sieur Chartier, eldeſt the nomination of the preſidents of that parliament, he exerciſed all the functions of a king. He aſſembled the ſtates of the kingdom (f), at Paris, in the year 1593. He made an admiral and four mareſchals of France in that aſſembly (g), and declared, they *had been called together to proceed to the election of a king who ſhould be a Catholic* (h). But, when he ſaw, that he could not be elected, for he was married, and there was a deſign to elect a prince, who might marry the Infanta of Spain, he dexterouſly oppoſed it; which he did the more earneſtly, becauſe he knew, that the duke of Guiſe, his nephew, was the perſon, whom they intended to make king. He was extreamly vexed at that nomination (i). The ducheſs, his wife, could not endure it, and adviſed her huſband *to make a peace with the king, rather than be ſo baſe as to acknowledge, for his maſter and king,* that young lad: *So ſhe called her nephew, out of contempt.* Thoſe, who conſider the ſeveral attempts of the Guiſes, cannot apprehend what the Carteſian philoſopher, James Rohault, was dreaming of [R], when he wrote the epiſtle dedicatory prefixed to his Phyſics.

---

(44) *He confeſſes,* Od. vii, lib. ii, *that he ran away in a fight; and* Suetonius, in vita Horatii, *ſays, that this poet* ad res venereas intemperantior traditur, nam & ſpeculato, *&c.*

(45) Plut. de audiendis Poëtis, pag. 18, F.

(46 Οὐδένα. γὰρ ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων ἡμέρας συγκοιμώμενον γυναικὶ ποιήσας ἢ τὸν ἀκόλαςον καὶ μοιχικὸν, ἐν αἰσχύνῃ δῆλός ἐςι καὶ ψόγῳ τιθέμενος τὴν τοιαύτην ἀκρασίαν. Nam quum neminem alium interdiu cum uxore rem habere commemoret, extra intemperantem hunc & adulterum: ſatis evidenter docet, ſe hoc de eo opprobrii & reprehenſionis cauſa referre. *Id. ibid.*

(47) Ovid. Epiſt. Helen. ad Parid. ver. 251, pag. m. 74.

(48) Maimb. ubi ſupra, pag. 294.

(49) Id. ibid. pag. 315.

‡ Journal MS. *of Mr Loyſel.*

⸸ Journal de Hen. III.

(50) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra.

(51) Ibid. pag. 316.

(52) Id. ibid. pag. 317.

‡ Journal MS. *of Mr Loyſel.*

* Cayet, Tom. I.

(53) Maimb. ibid. pag. 318.

(54) Id. ibid. pag. 518, & ſeq.

(55) Ibid. pag. 519.

(56) The reader muſt know, that, after the ſixteen had cauſed preſident Briſſon to be hanged, the parliament would meet no more; which obliged the duke of Mayenne to repair to Paris for the affair here mentioned.

(f) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de la Ligue, pag. 456.

(g) Ibid. pag. 460.

(h) Ibid. pag. 462.

(i) Ibid. pag. 479.

‘ counſellor, before named by the court, to be preſident, ‘ whoſe virtue, integrity, and ability, are notorious to ‘ every body; and, for the office of ſecond preſident, ‘ the Sieur Hacqueville, preſident in the great council; ‘ and for the office of third preſident, the Sieur de ‘ Nully, firſt preſident in the court of aids, and heretofore inveſted with one of thoſe offices; and for the ‘ office of fourth preſident, the Sieur le Maiſtre, the ‘ king's advocate, having never ſeen, that he knows of, ‘ the ſaid Sieurs Chartier and le Maiſtre, or any other, ‘ whom the court ſhall think fit to name. Which nomination being approved by the ſaid court, the matter being taken into conſideration, and, notwitſtanding ‘ the excuſes and remonſtrances of the ſaid Sieur Chartier, on account of his age of ſeventy nine years, of ‘ his being ſickly, and lately recovered from a great ‘ ſickneſs, and becauſe his age requires a quiet life ‘ rather than the toils of ſuch an office, it has been ‘ reſolved, that he ſhall take the oath of firſt preſident ‘ in the ſaid court. And having ſworn, that in order ‘ to be promoted to that office, he has neither given, ‘ nor promiſed to give, or cauſe to be given, by himſelf or others, gold, ſilver, or any thing elſe; and ‘ beſides, that he will faithfully and worthily exerciſe ‘ the ſaid office of firſt preſident, he has been admitted ‘ into it, and has made a profeſſion of his faith to Mr ‘ Stephen Fleury, eldeſt counſellor. Done in parliament ‘ the ſecond day of December, 1591. A collation, ‘ has been made.’ Signed.

DU TILLET.

Formulary of proviſions in execution of the above arreſt.

‘ Charles de Lorrain, duke of Mayenne, lieutenant-‘ general of the ſtate and crown of France, to all thoſe ‘ to whom theſe preſents ſhall come, greeting. The ‘ greateſt ſign of the authority and good will of thoſe ‘ who have governed ſtates, and what they have been ‘ moſt eſteemed for by their ſubjects, and admired by ‘ foreigners, has been their care of eſtabliſhing and ‘ maintaining the two pillars, on which the preſervation ‘ of all monarchies is founded, *viz.* piety and juſtice. ‘ Wherefore, ſince it has pleaſed God to call us to ‘ the management of the affairs of this kingdom, after ‘ we have conſidered, to the beſt of our power, the ‘ regulations neceſſary to promote the glory of God, ‘ our chief intent has been to fill up the places of the ‘ chief miniſters of juſtice, with perſons of a probity ‘ and integrity ſuitable to thoſe offices. And whereas ‘ it has been remonſtrated to us, and we are ſenſible ‘ that it is very neceſſary to fill up the vacancies of the ‘ preſidents of the parliament of Paris, leſt the courſe ‘ of juſtice ſhould be interrupted, as it is has been of ‘ late, having reſolved to appoint four of them, that ‘ both the great chamber of the Pleas and Tournelle ‘ may not be without heads: be it known, that, having this day communicated our deſires and intentions ‘ to the gentlemen of the ſaid court, the chambers being met, and having named the four perſons, whom ‘ we have thought worthy of thoſe offices, and whom ‘ they have approved, as it appears from the act and ‘ decree of this day, here affixed under the counters ‘ ſeal; we, conſidering the good and acceptable ſervices, ‘ which Mr &c. For ſuch is our deſire. In witneſs ‘ whereof, we have cauſed the ſeal of the kingdom of ‘ France to be ſet to theſe preſents. Given at Paris ‘ the ſecond of December, 1591, ſigned Charles de ‘ Lorrain; and upon the fold, by Monſeigneur, Pericard.’

Mr Marais, advocate in the parliament of Paris, has been pleaſed to ſend me the copy he had taken of this act. He has alſo imparted to me ſome obſervations upon my Dictionary, which give me a great notion of his parts and learning.

[R] *Thoſe, who conſider the attempts of the Guiſes cannot apprehend what the Carteſian philoſopher, James Rohault, was dreaming of.*] He publiſhed his Phyſics in the year 1671, and dedicated them to the duke of Guiſe, to whom he made this compliment. ‘ Though I had been at liberty to deliberate upon the ‘ choice, what protection could I have deſired for the ‘ natural truths I offer to the public, than that of a ‘ name, which has been all along deſigned for the ſupport of the greateſt truths in the world? your anceſtors have defended, with a piety that deſerves ‘ to be ever propoſed as a pattern, the divine truths ‘ of religion, againſt the profeſſed enemies of them. ‘ Thoſe illuſtrious heroes maintained the political ‘ truths at the expence of their lives; I mean the ‘ fundamendal laws of the ſtate, and the immutable ‘ rights of our ſovereigns (§ *a*) againſt foreign enemies, and the domeſtic fury of the rebels. And it ‘ was your highneſs's lot to be moreover the protector of the truths of nature, having in every thing ‘ elſe all the noble ſentiments of your anceſtors. Nay, ‘ we might ſee ſtill the ſame zeal ſhine, with the ‘ ſame luſtre, in the perſon of your highneſs, were it ‘ not for want of occaſion under the glorious reign of ‘ the greateſt and the wiſeſt monarch in the world ‘ (57).’ Should a poet vent the ſame things, even in very fine verſes, it might be reaſonably ſuppoſed, that he did it for his ſins, and to expiate ſome great crime. This thought of Horace might be applied to him:

(57) Rohault, epiſtle dedicatory to his Phyſics.

Nec ſatis apparet cur verſus factitet, utrum
Minxerit in patrios cineres, an triſte bidental
Moverit inceſtus: certe furit (58).

(58) Horat. de Arte Poet. ver. 470.

Whate'er the guilt that drew down ſuch a curſe,
'Tis ſure the man is mad, and raves in verſe.

What then ſhall we think of a famous philoſopher and a good mathematician, who is guilty of ſuch a folly; had he not committed an abominable action, which deſerved he ſhould be given over to ſo reprobate a ſenſe? but, to uſe him more gently, has he not diſhonoured his character by affirming ſuch a palpable lye? I am willing to excuſe his Carteſianiſm as well as I can; and therefore I will ſuppoſe, that Rohault did not write his epiſtle dedicatory as a philoſopher: he wholly diveſted himſelf of that character, and aſſumed that of a panegyriſt, which is the unlucky fate of thoſe, who write epiſtles dedicatory. A good leſſon to diſcourage a true philoſopher from ſuch a deſign! I go farther, and I ſay that this philoſopher, when he appeared under a character ſo foreign to himſelf, did not wholly ceaſe to be a philoſopher; and that, if he vented a groſs falſity, it was not through baſe flattery, but ignorance. It is likely he was one of thoſe philoſophers and mathematicians, who reliſh nothing but natural philoſophy and Euclid, and who deſpiſe every thing elſe, and do not vouchſafe to learn the hiſtory of their own country. Perhaps it might be further ſaid, that his great application in making experiments againſt a Vacuum, and upon the various qualities of the load-ſtone, refractions of light, &c. did not afford him time enough to read Thuanus and Mezerai; which was the reaſon why he had but this general notion of the hiſtory

hiſtory of the Guiſes, that they had very much oppoſed the rebellion of the Huguenots. He was therefore ſincere in ſome meaſure: but his ignorance, not being invincible, cannot juſtify him; he might eaſily have been cured of it. Any one of his ſcholars might have given him an account of what the Guiſes did againſt Henry III, and Henry IV; and the meaneſt lawyer, or practitioner in the law, might have told him, that their attemps were diametrically contrary to the laws of the kindom, and a total ſubverſion of the principles moſt eſſential to the French monarchy, and a continued ſeries of the greateſt crimes of felony and treaſon, that can be committed. And therefore if he did not ſpeak againſt his conſcience, he deſerves at leaſt to be blamed for neglecting to get himſelf informed about the things he ſpoke of. I think this is the only fault he is guilty of, and I cannot believe that he acted againſt his knowledge, to ſet up for a flatterer; for had he had any tincture of the hiſtory of the XVIth century, he would not have been ſo bold as to praiſe his patron in the manner he did. Would he have ventured to commend him for being ready to imitate his anceſtors, if there was occaſion for it? was it not the ſame thing as if he had ſaid: *When occaſion offers, your highneſs will be always ready to raiſe a rebellion in Paris; to carry on the barricado's as far as the Louvre; to force the king to run away; to expoſe him to the moſt violent invectives of the preachers; to bring an action againſt him in the parliament of Paris; to depoſe him; to have him aſſaſſinated by a monk; to exclude the Dauphin, and all the princes of the blood from the ſucceſſion; to bring a Spaniſh army into the kingdom, in order to prevent their aſſerting their right?* &c. I conclude, that Mr Rohault would not have expreſſed himſelf in ſuch a manner, had he known, that his words did really imply ſuch propoſitions; and therefore, if he deſerves to be excuſed for ſuch a fault, it is becauſe he did not know what he ſaid.

I muſt obſerve, that the Proteſtants are not the only writers, who made a diſadvantageous deſcription of the actions and deſigns of the Guiſes; ſome Catholic authors have done the ſame. Read a piece that is aſcribed to Lewis Servin, advocate-general in the parliament of Paris (59).

[(§ α) Baptiſt le Grain, l. 6. of his Decad of Henry the Great, p. 635. of the edition of Rouen, 1633, ſpeaking of the duke of Mayenne, ſays, in expreſs terms, that, as much head of the league as this duke was, *he would never ſuffer the fundamental laws of the ſtate to be broken through:* and the edict of Folembrai, of the eleventh of January 1596 * praiſes the ſame duke for the affection he ſhew'd *in preſerving the kingdom entire, which he would never ſuffer to be diſmembered, even when the ſucceſs of his affairs ſeemed to offer him the means of doing 'it: as he has not ſince attempted, after being weakened.* . . . . Probably, Mr Rohault, being a better philoſopher than genealogiſt, took for one of this man's deſcendants, that duke of Guiſe, to whom he dedicated his Phyſics, in 1671. REM. CRIT.]

(59) *Intituled,* Vindiciæ ſecundum libertatem Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ, & regii ſtatus Gallo-Francorum. *I make uſe of the edition,* 1593, *in* 8*vo.*

* Mem. de la Ligue, Tom. VI, pag. 376, edit. of 1599.

GUISE (CHARLES DE LORRAIN duke of), eldeſt ſon of the foregoing, was born the 20th of Auguſt 1571. He was arreſted with ſeveral others on the day of the execution of Blois, and remained priſoner till the month of Auguſt 1591, when he made his eſcape from the caſtle of Tours (*a*). *The league made bone-fires upon it every where, and the Pope gave public thanks to GOD for it.* That young prince was received at Paris with great acclamations (*b*), and not only the people, but alſo the nobility concerned in the league, flocked to him. He made a ſtrict confederacy with the faction of the ſixteen; but this great proſperity proved the ruin of the party, by reaſon of the jealouſy which the duke of *Mayenne* conceived upon that account. I have mentioned it in the foregoing article. It is ſaid, that the ducheſs of Mompenſier fell in love with that young duke of Guiſe her nephew [*A*]. The latter deprived the leaguers of one of their worthies, by killing the brave St Pol with his own hands [*B*]. He obtained the government of Provence, when he ſubmitted to Henry IV, in the year 1594 (*c*). He had ſome employments by ſea and land under Lewis XIII (*d*); but care was taken to prevent his growing too powerful, and he was even obliged to leave France. It was the effect of the wiſe politics of cardinal de Richelieu [*C*]. He retired to Florence (*e*), and died at Cuna, in the Sieneſe, the 30th of September 1640. He married, in 1611, Henriete Catherine de Joyeuſe, the only daughter of Henry de Joyeuſe, mareſchal of France

(*a*) Mezerai, Abr. Chronol. Tom. VI, pag. m. 59. *See in the fourteenth book of Paquier's Letters, pag.* 173, & ſeq. *how he made his eſcape.*

(*b*) Maimbourg, Hiſt de la Ligue, pag. 435, ad ann. 1591.

(*c*) Anſelme, Hiſt. des grans Officiers, pag. 427.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 428.

[*A*] *It is ſaid, that the ducheſs of Mompenſier fell in love with that young duke of Guiſe, her nephew.*] Here is a paſſage of Mr Menage (1). 'The ducheſs of Montpenſier was very much in love with 'her nephew the duke of Guiſe, ſon of Henry Gaſh-'Face. I have formerly ſeen ſome paſſionate letters 'ſhe writ to him. Hence it is, that, in the *Satire* '*Ménippée*, when every body is placed according to 'his rank, the herald cries, Madam de Montpenſier, 'place your ſelf under your nephew.' Mr Menage did not recollect all that the herald ſaid: he forgot a very remarkable clauſe: there is in the Catholicon, *Madam Dowager of Montpenſier, as princeſs in your own right, place your ſelf under your nephew.* See the reflexions, made upon this, by the author of the new remarks upon this *Satire Ménippée* (2).

(1) Menagiana, Part. II, pag. m. 58.

(2) At pag. 390, 391, of the edition 1699.

[*B*] *He deprived the leaguers of one of their worthies, by ſlaying with his own had the brave St Pol.*] 'Saint Paul, a ſouldier of fortune, who got his title of nobility by his valour and good conduct in 'the art of war (3)' was one of the four mareſchals of France, created by the duke of Mayenne, in 1593. That duke, *after the death of the duke of Guiſe, whoſe creature this captain was, gave him the government of Champagne, where, after he had made himſelf maſter of Rheims, Mezieres, and Vitry, he was ſo bold as to invade the duchy of Retelois, and take poſſeſſion of it in the quality of a duke, by virtue of a grant he ſaid he had received from the Pope, as the king wrote from the camp before Chartres to the duke of Nevers. And, at laſt, his intolerable pride, together with the tyranny he exerciſed in that province, occaſioned his being killed by the young duke of Guiſe, who thruſt his ſword into his heart, becauſe that prince having very civilly deſired him to withdraw the troops, he had put into Rheims to ſecure it, that pretended mareſchal, who was reſolved to be abſolute maſter of it in ſpite of him, told him haughtily, laying his hand to his ſword, that he would not do it* (4). It is no unuſual thing for brave men, who revolt againſt their lawful prince, to be fond of independency. But they frequently find, that the head of the rebellion requires a greater ſubmiſſion than the true maſter. I believe Henry IV would have been more indulgent to St Paul, than the duke of Guiſe was. Note, that Mezerai lays all the blame on the duke, who, ſays he (5), deſigning *to get the ſpoils* of that brave man, *picked a quarrel with him in the ſtreets of Rheims, and ran his ſword into his belly.* The ſame hiſtorian obſerves, *that Saint Pol, the day before the barricadoes, ſaved the life of that* duke's father. See how thankful he was for that great ſervice.

(3) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de la Ligue, pag. 460.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) Mezerai, Abr. Chron. Tom. VI, pag. 124. *See, hereafter, in the remark* [*G*], *what Mary de Medicis ſaid of that action of the duke of Guiſe.*

[*C*] *He was obliged to quit France. This was the effect of the wiſe politics of cardinal Richelieu.*] A ſad experience had been made of the great power of the name of Guiſe, even when the league was diſſolved. That houſe was in a manner a ſtate within a ſtate, and it was to be feared, that the folly and the wrong zeal of the people would make an idol of it, as often as any religious war ſhould ariſe. And therefore prudence required, that their credit ſhould be ſomewhat leſſened, which the firſt miniſter took care of under the reign of Lewis XIII.

[*D*] By

France, and widow of Henry de Bourbon, duke of Mompenſier (*f*), by whom he had ſeveral children [*D*]. The mareſchal de Baſſompierre commends him very much (*g*). I ſhall make a remark concerning the duke of Chevreuſe, brother to this duke of Guiſe [*E*], and another upon the chevalier de Guiſe [*F*], who was alſo his brother, and

[*D*] *By whom he had ſeveral children.*] I ſhall only ſpeak of his ſons: you may ſee in another place (6) what concerns his daughters. The prince of Joinville, his eldeſt ſon, died at Florence, the ſeventh of November, 1639, in his twenty eighth year, without being married (7). His ſecond ſon was called Henry: I ſpeak of him in the following article. The third was called CHARLES LEWIS, and went by the name of duke of Joyeuſe, and died in Italy, unmarried, the fifteenth of March, 1637. Lewis, their brother, took then the title of duke of Joyeuſe; he was born in 1622. He was great chamberlain of France, and he married, at Toulon, in November, 1649, Frances Mary de Valois, the only daughter and heireſs of Lewis Emanuel de Valois duke of Engouleſme. He died at Paris, the twenty ſeventh of September, 1654, of a wound he received, in charging a party of the enemies near Arras (8). His ſon LEWIS JOSEPH de Lorrain duke of GUISE, Joyeuſe, and Engouleſme, born the ſeventh of Auguſt, 1650, married, in 1667, Elizabeth of Orleans, younger daughter of Gaſton of France, duke of Orleans, and died of the ſmall pox, at Paris, the thirtieth of July, 1671 (9), leaving behind him a ſon, called FRANCIS JOSEPH de Lorrain duke of Alençon, and of GUISE, Joyeuſe, and Engouleſme, who was born the twenty eighth of Auguſt, 1670 (10), and died the ſixteenth of March, 1675 (11). With him ended the males of that famous branch of the houſe of Lorrain. There are ſtill many of the other younger branches of that of Guiſe. See the laſt remark of the following article, and obſerve, that Roger de Lorrain, the fifth ſon of our Charles duke of Guiſe, died knight of Malta, at Cambray, the ſixth of September, 1653, being in his thirtieth year (12).

[*E*] *I will make a remark concerning the duke of Chevreuſe, brother of this duke of Guiſe.*] His name was Claudius de Lorrain, and he was the ſecond ſon of Henry duke of Guiſe. He was born the fifth of June, 1578, and his firſt title was that of prince of Joinville. He ſignalized himſelf in 1596, at the ſiege of la Fere, and, in 1597, at that of Amiens. The king being diſpleaſed with him by reaſon of ſome court-intrigues, he was obliged to betake himſelf to the war in Hungary. He was made duke of Chevreuſe, and peer of France, in March, 1612, and knight of the HOLY GHOST, the firſt of January 1620. He ſerved, in 1621, at the ſieges of St Jean d'Angely, Montauban, *&c.* and was honoured with the offices of great chamberlain of France, and great falconer. He was ſucceſſively governor of the upper and lower Marche, and of Auvergne, Bourbonnois, and Picardy. He married, as proxy to the king of Great Britain, the princeſs Henriette Mary of France in 1625, and conducted her into England with a magnificent train. He was at the ſiege of Rochelle, in 1628. He died of an apoplexy at Paris, the twenty fourth of Jauuary, 1657, without male-iſſue. He had only daughters (13). He married in 1622, Mary de Rohan, widow of the conſtable de Luines, and eldeſt daughter of Hercules de Rohan, duke of Mombazon (14). It is that ducheſs of Chevreuſe, who was ſo much talked of, during the broils of the court of Lewis XIII, and during the civil-war of Paris under Lewis XIV. Cardinal Richelieu cauſed her to retire from the court; ſhe made her eſcape into Lorrain, from whence ſhe went to Bruſſels. She had leave to return into France, after the death of Lewis XIII, and quickly renewed her intrigues, being ſeconded by the ducheſs of Mombazon, her mother-in-law. We ſhall ſee ſome proof of it hereafter (15). She had ſtipulated during the impriſonment of the princes, that he daughter ſhould be married to the prince of Conti (16); but it came to nothing.

[*F*] *A remark upon the chevalier de GUISE.*] He was the ſon of that duke of Guiſe, who was murthered at Blois in 1588, and was a poſthumous child, and called Francis Alexander Paris (17). He killed Baron de Lux, in the ſtreets of Paris, the fifth of January, 1613; and, within a month, he killed the ſon of the ſame baron, and was not in the leaſt moleſted by the court, nor by the judges upon that account: ſo great was the authority of that houſe! the writer, I am going to quote, will make us very ſenſible of it (18). The chevalier de Guiſe and Baron de Lux, 'met one morning it St Honoré's 'ſtreet: the Baron was on foot (19), and the chevalier on horſe-back, who alighted from his horſe, 'and bad the baron draw his ſword, as he drew 'his. The baron dreamed of no ſuch think, and 'could not imagine, that it was in earneſt; however 'he drew his ſword, but with little ſucceſs; he 'was grown old, and was no match for a young 'prince, who had lately made an end of his exerciſes. And, indeed, the chevalier gave him only 'a thruſt through the body, of which he fell down 'dead in a ſhoemaker's ſhop. As for him, he very 'ſedately got on horſe-back again, and went a ſlow 'pace to the king's great ſtables, as if he had done nothing. Thus died baron de Lux, for boaſting, as it 'was ſaid, that he had been one of the council of 'Blois againſt the life of the late duke of Guiſe . . . . . 'He had a ſon of the ſame age with the chevalier de 'Guiſe, who heard the news of that accident, with 'the juſt grief of an only ſon for the death of his father . . . . . Every one talked differently of what he 'would do if he was in his place, and every one would 'have found it a very hard matter. He had to do 'with a prince, whom he muſt kill, or be killed by 'him. If he ſhould kill him, he could not expect to 'be ſafe in any place of Chriſtendom; and if he 'ſhould be killed by the perſon who had killed his father, he would not ſatisfy his renſentment. To have 'ſatisfaction done him by juſtice, rather than by the 'ſword, was not a thing to be thought of. The 'chevalier was in the Hotel de Guiſe, from which he 'would not have ſtirred, and where no man would 'have been ſo bold as to go and aſk for him. It is a 'misfortune for gentlemen to have to do with princes, 'who are like iron veſſels againſt an earthen one, 'which cannot ſtrike, without breaking them. However the king ought to do juſtice to all his ſubjects, 'and no prince is exempt from it (20).' The young baron de Lux reſolved to challenge the chevalier de Guiſe. 'The challenge was carried by his gentleman, 'who worthily performed his maſter's order. It was a 'dangerous attempt; for, if he had been known, and 'his deſign had been never ſo little ſuſpected, he 'would have been thrown out of the higheſt windows. 'But he went thither ſo early, that every body was 'ſtill aſleep. He entered into the chevalier's chamber, 'and, awaking him in the name of the baron de Lux, 'moſt humbly beſought him, *&c* (21).' The chevalier went to the place appointed, and killed his enemy, and 'returned to the Hotel de Guiſe, where he 'was viſited by the braves of the court. Several 'verſes were made upon that duel under the names of 'Paris and Lucidor, becauſe the chevalier of Guiſe's 'name was Paris (22).' Take notice, that the poets declared for the conqueror. They *wrote, that this prince and chevalier,*

Pouſsé d'un vif reſſentiment
Avoit fait paſſer vaillamment
Au fil d'une juſte cholere
Celuy-là qui s'eſtoit vanté
D'avoir peu (chere vanité)
Empeſcher la mort de ſon pere (23).

Urged by ſtrong reſentment, had bravely ſacrificed to a juſt revenge him, who had boaſted (fond vanity!) that he might have hindered the death of his father.

People did not fail to make their obſervations upon the inequality of ſucceſs in combats, where juſtice ſeemed to be equal. If the chevalier was to have the advantage in the firſt fight, becauſe he deſigned to revenge his father's blood; he ſhould have been overcome in the ſecond, becauſe he was to give ſatisfaction to the ſon of a man, whom he had killed; and yet he was as ſucceſsful in the ſecond as in the firſt. Many people were

(*f*) The daughter ſhe had by this Henry de Bourbon, was married to Gaſton of France, brother to Lewis XIII. This Henriete Catherine de Joyeuſe died in the year 1656.

(*g*) In the laſt page of his *Journal.*

(6) In the laſt remark of the following article.

(7) Anſelme, Hiſt. des grans Officiers, pag. 428.

(8) Id. ibid.

(9) Ibid. pag. 459, 460.

(10) Idem. pag. 460.

(11) Etat de la France, 1680, Tom. I, pag m. 544.

(12) Anſelme, ibid. pag. 428.

(13) Taken from Father Anſelme, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 458, 459.

(14) Id. ibid.

(15) In the remark [*D*] of the following article.

(16) *See* Priolo, lib. v, cap. xl, & lib. vi, cap. iv.

(17) Anſelme, ubi ſupra, pag. 427.

(18) D'Audiguier, vrai & ancien uſage des Duels, pag. 538.

(19) The continuator of Thuanus's hiſtory, *lib. vi, init. pag.* 327, and the *Mercure François, Tom. III, pag* 48, *ſay he was in a coach.*

(20) D'Audiguier, ibid. pag. 540.

(21) Id. ibid. pag. 542.

(22) Mercure François, Tom. III, pag. 50.

(23) Ibid. pag. 48.

and who killed, in a very ſhort time, the barons de Lux the father and ſon, without being brought into the leaſt trouble upon that account [G]. He ſignalized himſelf in the

were ſurprized at it, and made ſerious reflexions upon it. But, generally ſpeaking, ſuch quarrels are decided according to the greater or leſſer ſkill, courage, and ſtrength, of the combatants, or by the concourſe of ſome fortuitous cauſes, and not according to the greater or leſſer right. I cannot tell whether any body made two other reflexions, which naturally offer themſelves. One is, that, taking things ſtrictly, the firſt combat was contrary to the laws of good chivalry; for a young man, newly come from the fencing-ſchool, and prepared for fighting, to attack an old man, who expects no ſuch thing, who has been a long time without drawing his ſword, who has forgot all the fencing rules, in a word, whoſe legs and arms are weak, is almoſt the ſame thing as if two men ſhould attack one, or a boy of ſixteen years ſhould fall upon a boy of ten years. The ſecond reflexion is, that Meſſieurs de Guiſe were very unjuſt under the reigns of Henry IV, and Lewis XIII, to revenge themſelves ſo violently upon thoſe, who had been ſomewhat concerned in the execution of Blois. They had obtained a general amneſty for all their rebellions, and as many favours as if they had done great ſervices to their king. Should they not have been as indulgent to thoſe, who had only executed the orders of Henry III, or had not diſſuaded him from an attempt, he thought moſt neceſſary for the preſervation of his crown? ſhould they not have comprehended it under the general amneſty, which was ſo advantageous to them? one might make another reflexion concerning thoſe, who bitterly lament the loſs, which, ſay they, the princes and great lords of France have ſuffered of their authority. The power, ſay they, is too much concentred; it ſhould be divided as it was formerly. But why then do they forget the horrid couſuſions that kingdom was expoſed to, when the court was weak, under the minority of Lewis XIII? do they wiſh for the return of that pretended happy time, when a chevalier de Guiſe killed a man of quality in the ſtreets of Paris with impunity, and was not ſo much as obliged to excuſe himſelf to his prince, or the juſtice of the kingdom.

This chevalier died at Baux, in Provence (24), about a year after (25). *He himſelf fired a cannon that burſt, and carried off one half of his body ..... Being carried into the city of Arles the next day, the people, crying and groaning in a ſtrange manner, unnailed his coffin, ript open his ſhroud, and, finding no alteration in his face, had his picture drawn, and ſet up in the town-houſe, as a warning for the living to lament him, and a monument to poſterity to preſerve his memory for ever. But what is more ſurprizing ſtill, the two chief towns of that province, Aix and Arles, having a diſpute about his body, and each of them ſtriving to have the honour of burying it, could not be reconciled but by this expedient, which was to give his heart to the one, and to leave the body to the other. He was alſo lamented at court, not only by his relations, but alſo by the king and the queen-mother, who paid a viſit to the duke of Guiſe, and condoled with him in his very palace. But eſpecially the princeſs of Conti, his ſiſter, was ſo afflicted, that the fineſt pens of that time made it their buſineſs to comfort her* (26). Here you ſee a remainder of the idolatary of the French Catholics for the name of Guiſe. Had none been found of that name, that great ſcourge of Heretics, but thoſe, who continually endeavoured to live a Chriſtian life, a philoſopher would be leſs ſurprized at it; but what ſort of men were the greateſt idolaters of that kind? thoſe, who were moſt addicted to the common vices, ſuch as leudneſs, drinking, gaming, avarice, lying, ſlandering, and envy. Theſe are the men, who, to keep up the temporal proſperity of their religion, and to extirpate what they call hereſy, carry their zeal beyond all bounds.

[G] .... *Without being brought into the leaſt trouble upon that account.*] This plainly reſults from the narrative I have taken out of the book, intituled, *Vrai & ancien Uſage des duels*. But I will not uſe this teſtimony without examining what I find in Baſſompierre (27). ‘The queen was very angry, *when ſhe heard, that the chevalier de Guiſe had killed baron de Luz*. I went at the ſame time to the Louvre, where I found her weeping; and ſhe had ſent for the princes and miniſters to hold a council about that affair, which ſhe laid very much to heart. She told me then; you ſee, Baſſompierre, how I am addreſſed to, and what a noble exploit it is to kill an old gentleman without defence, and without giving him warning. But theſe are the tricks of that family, like the killing of St Paul (28) .... The council met in the other hall, whither I led the queen, happening to be near her. That action occaſioned great murmurings, and every body was offended to hear, that there was a great concourſe of nobility in the Hôtel de Guiſe, and that the duke of Guiſe was to come to the queen well attended. Whereupon the queen was adviſed to ſend Mr de Chateau-vieux to the duke of Guiſe, to forbid him to wait upon the queen, till ſhe ſent for him, and to command, in her majeſty's name, all the nobility, that were in the houſe, to retire ... (29). Mr de Chateau-vieux obſerved his orders, and, being returned, ſaid, that ſome had appeared unwilling to retire, and that the duke of Guiſe had deſired them to go away, ſince the queen commanded it. And, being asked, who thoſe refractory men were, he named three or four, and, among others, Mr de la Rochefoucaut. Some incenſed the queen againſt him, who, being maſter of the king's wardrobe, ſhould have been more willing to obey than any body elſe; whereupon it was reſolved to turn him out of the court. It was alſo reſolved, that the parliament ſhould take cognizance of that affair, and ſhould be informed of it. The queen was ſomewhat appeaſed by the quick obedience of the duke of Guiſe; and becauſe, when the chevalier came to the palace of Guiſe, after he had killed the baron, the duke bad him go into the country.’ Mareſchal de Baſſompierre adds, ‘that the duke of Guiſe, ſpoke to the queen with ſo much reſpect and ſubmiſſion, that he pacified her a little; but that Madam de Guiſe his mother ſpoke ſo haughtily *to the queen*, that ſhe provoked her anew; *that Mr de la Rochefoucaut* was ordered to leave the court (30);’ that the duke of Guiſe ſided with the cabal of the prince of Condé, and ſaid, ſpeaking of la Rocheſoucaut; ‘yes, by GOD, he ſhall come again, and I ſhall not be beholden to the queen for it (31).’ That the queen was ſo alarmed at the union of the duke of Guiſe with the prince of Condé, that ſhe ordered Baſſompierre to offer to that duke the ſum of a *hundred thouſand crowns ready money, the general lieutenancy of Provence for his brother, the chevalier, the reverſion of the abbey of St Germain* for the princeſs of Conti, his ſiſter, and the *return of la Rochefoucaut* (32); that the duke of Guiſe accepted thoſe offers, and promiſed to leave the cabal (33). I ſhall conclude with theſe words of mareſchal de Baſſompierre (34). ‘Some few days after, the young baron de Lux ſent a challenge to the chevalier de Guiſe, who killed him. I ſaw one thing more very ſtrange in the changes of the court. The chevalier de Guiſe having killed the father, the queen ordered the parliament to take cognizance of it, and to proſecute him; and yet, in leſs than a week after, though he had alſo killed the ſon of the ſaid baron de Lux, the queen ſent to him, to know how he did after the wounds he had received in this laſt combat (35).’

Baſſompierre's account ſeems to be inconſiſtent with what I have ſaid in the preceding remark, building upon d'Audiguier's narrative, which contains nothing, whereby it appears, that the judges took cognizance of that affair, or that the chevalier de Guiſe was brought into any trouble; but at the bottom thoſe two accounts may be eaſily reconciled. All that can be concluded from Baſſompierre's narrative, is, I. That the queen's council ordered that the parliament ſhould take cognizance of that cauſe. II. That this order continued till the duke of Guiſe ſided with the prince's cabal. But this interval was ſo ſhort, that it is very likely the parliament did not begin their proceedings, or that they went on ſo ſlowly, that few people heard of them; and therefore d'Audiguier is very excuſable for making no mention of them. He ſuppoſes, that the chevalier lay every night in the palace of Guiſe, and yet Baſſompierre ſays, that the duke ſent him into the country. I believe the duke told the queen, that he had taken ſuch a courſe with the chevalier; nevertheleſs I think d'Audiguier is not miſtaken. The duke

(24) D'Audiguier, ubi ſupra, pag. 552.

(25) Id. ibid. pag. 550. *Father Anſelme*, ubi ſupra, pag. 427, *places his death on the firſt of June*, 1614.

(26) Id. ibid. pag. 551.

(27) Baſſomp. Memoir. Tom. I, pag. m. 274, 275.

(28) *See, above, citation* (5).

(29) Baſſomp. ibid. pag. 276.

(30) Id. ibid. pag. 277.

(31) Id ibid. pag. 281, 282.

(32) Id ibid. pag. 284.

(33) Id. ibid. pag. 292.

(34) Id. ibid. pag. 303.

(34) Id ibid. pag. 303.

the Carrouſel of the year 1612, and was like to carry the prize at the running at the ring [*H*].

knew well enough, that no commiſſaries would be ſent to his houſe, in order to ſee whether the chevalier was there ſtill. And it is to be obſerved, that all authors are agreed, that the young baron de Lux ſent his challenge to the palace of Guiſe, when the chevalier was in bed. The latter lay therefore in that houſe, and conſequently his abſence had been very ſhort, if he had been ſent into the country, as the duke affirmed. But what deſerves moſt to be conſidered, is, that Baſſompierre's narrative ſhews, ſtill more clearly than d'Audiguier's, the horrid confuſion, and the dreadful diſorders France is reduced to, when the court wants a ſufficient power to make itſelf dreaded. This is the right way of confuting thoſe republican authors, who continually ſay, that the happy time is over, when the power was divided between the king and great lords. Oh! what a fine golden age was that, in which the chevalier de Guiſe killed the father and ſon in a month's time, and yet obtained general-lieutenancies; and it was but ſiding with a prince's faction, to put a ſtop to all proceedings of royal juſtice, and to be well paid beſides! Take notice, that, though Baſſompierre was an eye-witneſs of what he relates, it does not follow, that he gives a better account of the ſmall circumſtances of things than other hiſtorians do. He is ſometimes groſsly miſtaken in that reſpect. Here is an inſtance of it; he reckons (36) but a week between the death of baron de Lux the father, and that of baron de Lux the ſon; and yet it is certain there was a month between.

[*H*] *He ſignalized himſelf in the Carrouſel . . . . and was like to carry the prize at the running at the ring.*] I ſhall comment upon theſe words, not ſo much to prove what I advance, as to have an opportunity of mentioning a law, that is obſerved in that ſort of exerciſes. 'When people run at the ring, and ſome of the competitors hit it an equal number of times, they contend for the prize among themſelves, by beginning a new race, till one only has the advantage; and if, upon the ſame day, the equality of their ſkill prevents their deciding the honour of the race, the whole company has the privilege of beginning it anew; as it happened in the great Carrouſel of the late king, in which the duke of Vendôme, the counts de St Agnan, and de Monrevel, and the barons de la Chaſtegneraye, and de Fontaines Chalandary were equal, each of them having hit the ring twice in three races, which obliged them to run at it again three times; and being ſtill equal, as by their advantage they debarred others from pretending to the prize, ſo by their equality they loſt their pretenſions to it, according to the laws of thoſe races; and, in ſuch a caſe, the right of diſpoſing of the prize belongs to the lady who gives it. Thus the races being put off, the ring remained in diſpute between the chevalier de Guiſe, the marquis de la Valette, and the marquis de Rouillac, who hit it in all their races, ſo that they were obliged to begin again; and the chevalier de Guiſe and the marquis de la Valette having hit it but twice, the marquis de Rouillac, who hit it in all the races, carried the prize (37).' The chevalier de Guiſe was of the firſt troop of the aſſailants in that Carrouſel, and took the name of Olivante de Loro. That troop was that of the knights of the ſun, and the prince of Conti was their head (38).

(36) Id. ibid. pag. 303.

(37) Meneſtrier, Traité des Tournois, Jouſtes, Carouſels, & autres Spectacles publics, pag. 304.

(38) *Taken from the* Mercure François, Tom. II, pag. m. 536, ad ann. 1612.

GUISE (Henry de Lorrain duke of), ſon of the foregoing, was born the fourth of April 1614 (*a*), and was one of the moſt accompliſhed lords of France, well ſhaped, ſkilled in all ſorts of exerciſes, and full of wit and courage. There would be no need of many fictions to make his hiſtory look like a romance. He was deſigned for the church, and inveſted with many abbies [*A*], *and even nominated to the archbiſhopric of Rheims* (*b*); 'but having promiſed to marry the princeſs Anne of Mantua [*B*]... cardinal de Richelieu found a way to deprive him of all his benefices, which occaſioned his retiring to Bruſſels, where he married the counteſs de Boſſu [*C*], whom he

(*a*) Anſelme, Hiſt. des grans Officiers, pag. 460.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

[*A*] *He was inveſted with many abbies.*] 'Thoſe of St Denys in France, St Remy of Rheims, St Nicaiſe, St Peter of Corbie, Feſcamp, Mont St Michael, St Martin of Pontoiſe, Orcamp, Chambon, and Montirandé (1).' He had five hundred thouſand livres a year in benefices, if we believe the author of the State of France (2), printed in 1657. Note, that he was but a child, when he began to have that vaſt income, the ſpoils of two rich cardinals. He ſucceeded, in 1615, cardinal de Joyeuſe, his mother's uncle, in his eſtate, and cardinal de Guiſe in 1621. This I have read in preſident de Gramond (3), who obſerves, that cardinal de Guiſe had a hundred thouſand crowns a year, which the king gave to the young abbot of Feſcamp.

[*B*] *Having promiſed to marry the princeſs Anne of Mantua.*] I am going to quote an author, who is ſo far from ſaying, that the duke was deprived of his benefices by reaſon of that engagement, that he affirms he had parted with them before he engaged in that marriage. 'That prince, being a younger brother, was deſigned for the church, and made archbiſhop of Rheims: he parted with his benefices, after the death of his brother, and intended to marry Anne Gonzaga, ſiſter to the princeſs Mary, whom I have ſpoken of. Cardinal de Richelieu, being ſenſible that this match was againſt the good of the ſtate, made uſe of the king's authority to prevent it, and cauſed that princeſs to be confined to a convent. The duke of Guiſe, being extremely vexed at it, left the kingdom, and retired to Cologne, whither his miſtreſs went to him in a man's diſguiſe; but he ſent her back, and went to Bruſſels, where he found the other exiles (4).'

[*C*] *He married the counteſs de Boſſu.*] The ducheſs of Chevreuſe, who was then at Bruſſels, brought the duke of Guiſe acquainted with that counteſs (5), 'who was a young widow of a ſweet and gay humour . . . She was brought into a company, where the duke of Guiſe was; and ſhe made ſo many advances to him, that he could not forbear anſwering them. It is true, that, leſt he ſhould have an ill opinion of her conduct, ſhe immediately talked to him of marriage; and the duke declared, he deſired nothing more than to unite his fortune to her's, but in ſuch terms, as ſufficiently ſhewed that he intended only to divert himſelf during his exile. Though the counteſs ſaw through his intention, ſhe made as if ſhe had not perceived it, hoping to engage him more eaſily by a feigned ingenuity. One day ſhe carried him to a fine houſe ſhe had a league from Bruſſels, and afforded him all the diverſions that could be had in that ſeaſon, which was the moſt pleaſant in the year. The duke could not forbear expreſſing his acknowledgement, and talking to her of love as he uſed to do. The counteſs told him, that if he was as much in love as he pretended to be, he would ſhew a more earneſt deſire to marry her. The duke ſwore to her, that he deſired nothing ſo earneſtly as to ſpend the reſt of his life with ſo lovely a perſon, and that ſhe might put him to the trial. The counteſs, taking him at his word, replied, that ſhe would quickly know, whether his proteſtations were ſincere, ſince ſhe had in her houſe a notary and a prieſt to marry them. The duke was ſurprized at her diſcourſe, but diſſembled the matter, and thought he might grant her deſire without any hazard, and that ſhe would be entrapped in her own ſnares, ſince ſuch a marriage, made without the formalities preſcribed by the canons, and without the king's conſent, could not ſtand. The counteſs, perceiving that the duke was diſpoſed to do what ſhe deſired, called in Manſele, chaplain to the army, who married them, and diſpenſed them from publiſhing the bans, as if he had had the ſame authority as the archbiſhop of Mechlen. The duke ſpent the night in that noble houſe with his bride, expreſſing ſo much love to her, that ſhe

'was

(1) Anſelme, Hiſt. des grands Officiers, pag. 460.

(2) Pag. 53.

(3) Gramond. Hiſtor. Galliæ, lib. vii, pag. m. 407, ad. ann. 1621.

(4) Intrigues galantes de la Cour de France, Tom. II, pag. 179, Edit. 1695.

(5) Ibid. pag. 180.

‘ he left ſoon after, and returned into France. Being out of favour again, he retired to Rome, where he had his marriage diſſolved. From whence he removed to Naples to command the army of the people, where he was ſoon after made a priſoner, and carried into Spain (*c*).’ This is what I find concerning him, in a book printed at Paris in the year 1657. To which I muſt add, that the duke of Guiſe had a hand in the treaty, which the count de Soiſſons, the duke of Bouillon, and ſome other male-contents, concluded with Spain (*d*); that he made a *public journey to Bruſſels for a greater ſecurity of that treaty*; that he was proſecuted as a criminal; that he was ſentenced for contumacy the ſixth of September 1641, and made his peace in Auguſt 1643 (*e*); that, ſome months after, he fought a duel with the count de Coligni [*D*], and that this quarrel was occaſioned by a difference, wherein Madam de Longueville, daughter of the prince of Condé, was concerned. He came off victorious, and

‘ was well pleaſed with the happy ſucceſs of her deſign. The next day he went home, after he had deſired the new ducheſs, that their marriage ſhould be kept ſecret, till he had obtained the conſent of the court and his family. Notwithſtanding the care that was taken to keep that adventure from being made public, it came to the knowledge of the duke d'Elbeuf, and the ducheſs of Chevreuſe, who upbraided the duke of Guiſe with it, as a very baſe thing. The reſpect he had for the ladies, prevented his falling into a paſſion againſt the ducheſs; but he fell out with the duke d'Elbeuf to ſuch a degree, that they would have fought, had not the arch-duke reconciled them. The duke of Guiſe, having loſt all hopes of revenging himſelf with ſword in hand, looked for ſome other way of vexing the two perſons, who had offended him, and thought the moſt effectual was to bring the counteſs to his houſe, and to treat her publickly as his wife. This he did, and ever after he lived in good underſtanding with her all the time he was at Bruſſels.’ The author, who relates this, ſuppoſes, that the duke of Guiſe endeavoured to get his marriage diſſolved, for no other reaſon, but that he might marry Mademoiſelle de Pons. I ſhall ſet down his own words again (6). ‘ The duke of Guiſe could not marry Mademoiſelle de Pons, without getting his marriage with the counteſs de Boſſu diſſolved, and therefore he reſolved to go to Rome, in order to ſollicit the diſſolution of it at the Rota. The action was already commenced, and the ducheſs of Guiſe, his mother, had ſent a gentleman thither to that purpoſe; but, when ſhe heard, that her ſon was in love with Mademoiſelle de Pons, ſhe ſent word to her agent to drop the proſecution. The duke ſet out at laſt, and, after many dangers at ſea, arrived ſafe at Florence, and engaged the great duke to write in his behalf to Innocent X, lately raiſed to the pontificate. When that prince came to Rome, he was very kindly received by the Pope, who at his requeſt gave a cardinal's hat to cardinal Mazarin's brother. The duke of Guiſe hoped, that this ſervice would move that firſt miniſter to favour his deſign; but, on the contrary, the French embaſſador was ordered to oppoſe it.’

I muſt obſerve, that the queſtion concerning the validity of the marriage of the duke of Guiſe, and the counteſs de Boſſu, has been debated again, not long ago. We have ſeen in the public news, that it has been declared valid by the Rota at Rome (7), and that the parliament of Paris has given a contrary judgment. It is therefore ſtill a matter of diſpute: *Adhuc ſub judice lis eſt.* I muſt not forget what mareſchal de Baſſompierre ſays, that the duke of Guiſe, who died in 1640, had *ſuffered* very much *in his family by the loſs of his two children . . . . and by reaſon of the ill conduct of the third, who lived not according to his profeſſion* (8). He, whom Baſſompierre calls the third ſon of that duke of Guiſe, was the ſecond, the ſame who courted the counteſs de Boſſu, who had ſo many abbies, and lived a liſe ſo unbecoming thoſe, who are deſigned for prelacies.

[*D*] *He fought a duel with the count de Coligni.*] This affair made a great noiſe, and I believe the readers will be well pleaſed to find here a particular account of it. It is a remarkable inſtance of the diſorders uſually occaſioned by the jealouſy and gallantry of the fair ſex. The following narrative may be depended upon; for, though I take it from an author, who does not put his name to his book, who is ſometimes miſtaken, and often confounds matters of fact, without taking much care to avoid anachroniſms, he was very well informed of the affair, upon this occaſion, and relates it much in the ſame manner as Mr de la Barde, a very exact hiſtorian (9). ‘ (10) The ducheſs of Chevreuſe, who fancied, that the prince was the chief cauſe of the duke of Beaufort's confinement, and of Chateauneuf's diſgrace, reſolved to be revenged of him. Though the ladies are apt to flatter themſelves in point of beauty, her glaſs had acquainted her more than once, that her charms, half worn out, ſtood in need of a younger perſon, to ſtrengthen her intereſt, and ſhe was not obliged to look for one out of her family. The daughter of the counteſs de Vertus, whom the duke of Montbaſon her father had married, was, as has been ſaid before, the moſt beautiful woman in France; beſides, he had a ſpite againſt the prince of Condé's ſiſter, who, having married the duke of Longueville, had deprived her of a lover; and ſo ſhe found it no difficult thing to bring her over to her intereſt. The duke of Guiſe, who, after his return, had declared for that handſome ducheſs, ingaged all the Lorrain princes to ſide with him; beſides, they ſeemed to be inclined to it out of reſpect for the duke of Chevreuſe, who was of the ſame family (11). Thoſe two ladies, being ſtrictly united, reſolved to begin their revenge by reflecting upon Madam de Longueville's reputation. They publiſhed the letters, written by that lady to the duke of Beaufort, who had given them to the ducheſs of Montbaſon: they alſo forged others, which they pretended to have been written by Madam de Longueville to Coligny. The princeſs of Condé, hearing, that the ducheſs of Montbaſon had ſpread that report, highly reſented it, and engaged all her friends to help her to be revenged of her. This quarrel divided the whole court, and made the queen apprehenſive it would revive the ancient enmity of the houſes of Bourbon and Guiſe. Thoſe two parties were pretty equal, becauſe the duke of Orleans, who had married a woman of the houſe of Lorrain, declared for Madam de Montbaſon; and therefore that quarrel might have been attended with dangerous conſequences. Though is was the queen's intereſt to prevent too ſtrict an union between the duke of Orleans and the prince of Condé, leſt their authority ſhould be prejudicial to her's; yet, becauſe it was more dangerous ſtill to ſuffer them to carry their reſentment to the laſt extremity, ſhe endeavoured to reconcile them. She obliged the princeſs of Condé, and the ducheſs of Longueville, to receive ſatisfaction from the ducheſs of Montbaſon; and that ducheſs declared to the two princeſſes in her preſence, that ſhe had no hand in ſpreading thoſe reports, and that ſhe diſowned them. The two princeſſes declared alſo, as it had been agreed upon, that they were willing to believe it, ſince Madam de Montbaſon ſaid it: it was ſtipulated by the ſame agreement, that this ducheſs ſhould avoid all occaſions of meeting the two princeſſes; which ſhe did not obſerve afterwards. The ducheſs of Chevreuſe, having invited the queen to a collation prepared for her in Renard's houſe, near the door of the conference, brought her mother-in-law with her. The queen was accompanied by the princeſs of Condé, who, perceiving the ducheſs of Montbaſon, had a mind to retire; but the queen detained her, and deſired that ducheſs to walk out ſomewhere for her ſake; which ſhe did ſo unwillingly, that the queen was very angry with her: and being returned to the royal palace, ſhe ſent Guenegaud, ſecretary of ſtate, to command her to retire forthwith to her ſeat of Rocheſort. That quarrel ſeemed to be at an end by the removal of the ducheſs; but Coligny, not thinking himſelf revenged of thoſe, who deſigned to ſet him at variance with the houſe of Bourbon,

---

(*c*) L'Eſtat de la France, pag. 53. Paris 1657.

(*d*) Memoires de Montreſor, pag. 369.

(*e*) Father Anſelme, ubi ſupra, pag. 460.

(6) Ibid pag. 234.

(7) See the *Mercure Hiſtor. Febr.* 1700, *pag.* 183. But ſee particularly the remark [*C*] of the following article.

(8) Baſſompierre, Journal of his Life, in the laſt page.

(9) *See the ſecond book* de Rebus Gallicis Hiſtor. Joannis Labardæi, pag. 71, & ſeq.

(10) Intrigues Galantes de la Cour de France, Tom. II, pag. 228, & ſeq.

(11) See the remark [*F*] of the foregoing article.

and was little afraid of the conſequences of that fight, though it was a true duel, fought in the middle of the Place Royale, and though part of the princes of the blood were againſt him. Notwithſtanding thoſe circumſtances, and many others, and the informations the parliament of Paris began to make at the inſtance of the king's attorney-general (f), the duke of Guiſe appeared in public, and made a campaign the year following (g) at the ſiege of Graveline, under the duke of Orleans. However, it is not to be doubted, that this duel was the chief reaſon of his going ſoon after into Italy. He was at Rome, when the Neapolitans made an inſurrection, and deſired him for their leader. He accepted their propoſal, and ſet out the 13th of November 1647 (h). The obſtacles he was obliged to overcome, in order to get into Naples (i), were ſuch, that la Calprenede and Scudery hardly invented any thing more worthy of a romantic adventurer. The duke was received by the inhabitants of Naples with an extraordinary joy; and it was ordered, the 17th of November, *That he ſhould be ſtyled generaliſſimo of the army, and defender of liberty, with the ſame honours the prince of Orange enjoyed in Holland, under the protection of the moſt Chriſtian king* (k). He met with many difficulties in the exerciſe of that new dignity, and gave many proofs of his ability and courage; but fortune proved contrary to him: The court of France not being able or willing to aſſiſt him, he could not maintain himſelf, and was obliged to make dangerous attempts, in which he fell, and loſt his liberty. He was taken by the enemies, who carried him into Spain, where he was a priſoner a conſiderable time. He was ſet at liberty in Auguſt 1652 (l), at the ſollicitation of the prince of Condé (m); and it is thought, the court of Spain conſented to it the more willingly, becauſe they hoped the duke of Guiſe would occaſion new broils and factions in France (n). It has been the common opinion, that the court of France neglected to aſſiſt him, becauſe they were not willing he ſhould eſtabliſh his authority in the kingdom of Naples, and thought it more for their intereſt, that the inhabitants of that county ſhould be under the power of Spain, than ſubject to the houſe of Lorrain. The duke of Guiſe being returned into France,

‘Bourbon, to which he had the honour to be related, ſent a challenge to the duke of Guiſe, by the marquis d'Eſtrades; the duke accepted it, and took the marquis de Bridieu for his ſecond. The duel was fought in the Place Royale, and the duke of Guiſe had the advantage: he diſarmed his enemy, after he had dangerouſly wounded him, and then parted the ſeconds, who fought with great courage, without any advantage on either ſide. The duke of Guiſe got a great deal of honour by that duel, which would have increaſed the conſideration his miſtreſs had already for him, if he had continued in his love; but his heart received other impreſſions ſoon after (12).’

Note, that la Barde places that duel in the year 1644, and ſays, the two ſeconds wounded one another very much (13). But Sarravius, in a letter he writ ſome few days after that action, affirms, that Mr d'Eſtrades was not wounded (14), and that the duel was fought the twelfth of December, 1643. Grotius agrees with him as to the time; for, in a letter (15) he writ from Paris, the nineteenth of December, 1643, he ſays, the duke of Guiſe and the count de Coligny had fought a duel a week before. He obſerves a circumſtance omitted by Sarravius, *viz.* that the count was diſarmed. I wonder Sarravius takes no notice of it: can a man write ſuch a conſiderable piece of news without obſerving whether one of the combatants was worſted, or whether they were both parted? Here we ſee an effect of the paſſions. Sarravius, as a good Proteſtant, was ſorry for the duke of Guiſe's victory. The count de Coligny, eldeſt ſon of the mareſchal de Chatillon, deſcended from an admiral de Coligny in a right line: he was a Proteſtant; and his quarrel looked like a renewing of the ancient enmity of the Guiſes and Chatillons. Upon theſe conſiderations, Sarravius could have heartily wiſhed, that the advantage had been on Coligny's ſide. He was vexed at his being worſted; he would gladly have concealed it from himſelf; but, not being able to do it, he at leaſt concealed it from others. This was the reaſon why he ſaid nothing of it in his letter to Salmaſius. Such is the diſpoſition of men upon unacceptable news. They do what they can not to believe it; and, if they cannot deceive themſelves, nor maintain that it is falſe, they will at leaſt ſpare themſelves the vexation of plainly owning the truth of it, and acquainting others with it. Sarravius writ to his friend, ſome days after, that the prince of Condé had abſolutely commanded the duke of Enguien, who had harboured the count de Coligny in his houſe, to diſmiſs him; and that the poor count retired to a miniſter's houſe (16). He died of grief (17) five months after the duel (18).

Whoever makes ſolid reflexions upon that duel, muſt needs highly commend cardinal Richelieu's prudence, in ſending the ducheſs of Chevreuſe out of the kingdom. Ladies, who make an ill uſe of their beauty and wit, to intrude into ſtate-intrigues, are the plagues of a court: the beſt way is to get rid of them as ſoon as poſſible, and ſend them to grace foreign countries. If the ducheſs I ſpeak of had continued at Paris, after the conſpiracy of Chalais, her favourite lover (19), ſhe would have played many tricks. We ſee that ſhe was hardly returned into France, but ſhe laid the foundations of that unhappy duel, which occaſioned the death of the count de Coligny, a young lord, who might have done many ſervices to the crown; a duel, in which Mr d'Eſtrades might have been killed, whoſe ability and ſword were very ſerviceable to the kingdom, as it appeared afterwards by his military actions and important embaſſies. If you trace the duel of the duke of Guiſe, and the count de Coligny to it's original, you will find the cauſe of it in the ambition of the ducheſs of Chevreuſe, who made uſe of the jealouſy of another ducheſs as a proper inſtrument for it. Thoſe two ladies, who perfectly agreed, tho' one of them was the ſtep-mother (20) of the other, contrived a ſtory, in order to caſt a blot upon the reputation of a princeſs of the blood. This was the occaſion of that duel. A plot, attended with ſuch a conſequence, without any other conſideration, is ſufficient to create an horror. But the thing will appear more horrid, if it be conſidered by what motives it was contrived. Was it out of tenderneſs for the ducheſs of Longueville's husband, was it to revenge an injury done to his honour, that a ſcandalous ſtory was given out concerning that ducheſs? No, it was through a quite different deſire of revenge: the husband's honour, far from being repaired, ſuffered the more by it. A married lady was reſolved to be revenged of the ducheſs, becauſe ſhe had deprived her of the duke of Longueville her lover, by marrying him. In order to ſucceed in her deſign, ſhe ſpoke ſome words, which, among other conſequences, occaſioned a duel mentioned in hiſtory. By this means, the ſtep-mother and the daughter-in-law have immortalized their names; for their conduct will be known as long as there are any French hiſtories of Lewis XIV's reign. Some are of opinion, that the true merit of a woman conſiſts in concealing ſo prudently her beſt qualities under the veil of modeſty, that they may afford no matter for hiſtory or converſation (21). This is perhaps too

---

(f) Sarravius, Epiſt. lv, pag. m. 53.

(g) In 1644.

(h) Galeazzo Gualdo Priorato, Hiſtoire des Revolutions de Naples, livr. ii, pag. m. 72.

(i) Id. ibid. pag. 73, & ſeq.

(k) Id. ibid. pag. 74.

(l) Father Anſelme, ubi ſupra, pag. 460.

(m) See the remark [E].

(n) See the ſame remark.

(12) He means, that the duke of Guiſe fell in love with Mademoiſelle de Pons, maid of honour to the queen.

(13) Eſtrada atque Brideus qui unà cum his alter alteri ſocius decertabant, ambo vulnerati graviter, eorum qui his intervenere, operâ quominus alter alterum necaret, prohibiti ſunt. *Labardæus, ubi ſupra, pag.* 74.

(14) Solus Stradius invulneratus receſſit. *Sarravius, Epiſt. lv, pag.* 53. *Edit. Ultraj.* His letter is dated from Paris, the eighteenth of December, 1643.

(15) Grotius, Epiſt. 1630, Part II, pag. 719.

(16) Sarrav. Epiſt. lvii, pag. 55.

(17) Colliniu merore & tædio vitam finivit. *Priolus, lib. ii, cap. ix.*

(18) *About the latter end of May,* 1644. Anſelme, Hiſt. des grans Officiers, pag. 244.

(19) *See* le Miniſtere du Cardinal de Richelieu, Tom. I, pag. m 310, & 317, *and the Hiſtory of the ſame cardinal, printed at Amſterdam,* 1694, Tom. I, pag. 303.

(20) *Noverca* a ſtep-mother; a title of enmity, ſtill greater than that of *Socrus.*

(21) See the remark [D] of the article JUDITH.

France, did not think of forming any cabals which might accommodate the prince of Condé's affairs: he was much more taken up with love-intrigues; and, if he undertook an expedition to recover Naples [*E*], it was rather a meer oſtentation, than a ſolid deſign: that expedition came to nothing. He was made great chamberlain, that place being vacant ſince the death of the duke of Joyeuſe, his brother (*o*). He was appointed, in 1656, to go and meet the queen of Sweden, who was coming into France: a more judicious choice could not have been made; for no man was ever better qualified for ſuch commiſſions, and whatever required pomp and magnificence. He made a great figure in the famous carrouſel of the year 1662. He headed the troop of Moors. He was born for ſuch ſhews and ſpectacles; and no man did ever better deſerve to live in the time of Tournaments, and in the age of the Paladins. We are told a very remarkable thing, concerning the gift he had of making women in love with him. It is ſaid, that thoſe, who loved him, could diſcover by the motion of their heart, though they did not ſee him, whether he was preſent [*F*]. He died of ſickneſs, at Paris, the ſecond

too rigid a morality, and there is no inconvenience in mitigating it, and ſuffering a lady to have the ambition of being placed in the temple of Fame, and in the writings of an hiſtorian: but ſhe ſhould only deſire to be mentioned by the authors, who, like Valerius Maximus, make a catalogue of the greateſt examples of piety, chaſtity, conjugal love, charity, conſtancy, *&c.* Women might lawfully be ambitious of having a place in ſuch books; but, when their conduct can only bring an eternal diſgrace upon them in hiſtory, it deſerves all the indignation the heart of man can conceive.

For the reſt, I ſhall obſerve, that authors do not agree as to the manner how the court expreſſed their reſentment againſt the ducheſs of Chevreuſe, at the time of the affair of Chalais. Some ſay, ſhe was baniſhed into Lorrain. It is the expreſſion of the author of the hiſtory of cardinal Richelieu, printed at Amſterdam in 1694 (22). Preſident de Gramond ſays only, that ſhe fled, and was not impriſoned by reaſon of her ſex. He adds, that if ſhe had been ſecured, it had been well for the public, both within and without the kingdom, ſince ſhe diſturbed moſt of the courts of Europe. *Fuga item conſulit ſibi Duciſſa Capruſii multis rea nominibus: ſexus fragilitas, & veneratio inbibuerant nuper quo minus & ipſa in carcerem traheretur: certe magnum erat Galliæ, magnum principibus externis ab ea detentione beneficium, auctrice paſſim in res novas intra & extra Galliam eâ fœmina, aularumque ferme tota Europa omnium perturbatrice, quod ſuo infra loco reddemus* (23). The true account of the matter is, that, at firſt, ſhe was ordered to leave the court, and that afterwards ſhe was kept in cuſtody, and found a way to get out of the kingdom. *Per difficilia Reginæ tempora hanc diligentiſſimè coluerat, atque obſervaverat* (Rohana Mombaſona) *atque eâ causâ & Ludovico XIII. & Richelio inviſa, Aulâ pulſa, in cuſtodiam conjecta, poſtremò fugâ ſibi conſulere, atque in Hiſpania, & Belgio exulare coacta fuerat* (24). La Barde, who ſays ſo, rightly obſerves, that ſhe became odious to Lewis XIII; for we read in la Rochefoucaut's memoirs (25), that the reaſons, which made the queen irreſolute about the return of the ducheſs of Chevreuſe, *were a particular clauſe of the declaration, and a ſtrange averſion which the king expreſſed againſt her, at his death.* That lady died in Auguſt 1679, in her ſeventy ninth year (26).

[*E*] *He was much more taken up with love-intrigues; . . . he undertook an expedition to recover Naples*] That expedition was in the year 1654. The duke made himſelf maſter of Caſtell' à-mare, and loſt it ſoon after (27). I ſhall ſet down a paſſage of Priolo, whereby it appears, that the duke of Guiſe's liberty was of no uſe to the Spaniards, nor to the prince of Condé. ‘Guiſius ante paucos annos dux electus Reipublicæ Neapolitanæ, & inter ſævos tumultus captus ac deductus in Hiſpaniam, nunc libertate donatur, id maxime procurante Condæo. Iberica fuit vafrities, Guiſium Galliæ redonare, & Condæo concedere; ut, qui avorum non immemor, poſſet rurſus moliri nova, & ciere turbas. At oblitus donatæ libertatis, & Condæi negligens, choreas & haſtiludia cogitavit. Rurſus ab eo tentatum iter Neapolitanum oſtentui fuit, renovaturum in animo levi ſpes acciſas per vanum ludibrium. Nullus mortalium tam vana concepit, editus atavis, qui tam grandia, tam ſolida captabant (28). —— ‘*The duke of Guiſe, being a few years before choſen leader of the republic of Naples, and amidſt cruel commotions taken priſoner, and carried into Spain, is now ſet at liberty by the interpoſition of the prince of Condé. It was Spaniſh cunning to reſtore Guiſe to France, and to comply with Condé; ſince he might have trod in the ſteps of his anceſtors, and raiſed new troubles. But, forgetful of the gift of liberty, and regardleſs of the prince of Condé, he thought of nothing but tournaments and balls. The expedition to Naples, which he afterwards attempted, was very ſurpriſing; no mortal, ſprung from anceſtors, who had done ſuch great things, having ever entertained ſuch vain conceits.*’ La Barde ſays, that the queen-mother had conſented to the exchange propoſed by the Spaniards, who had offered to releaſe the duke of Guiſe, provided France ſhould reſtore all the priſoners of their party. But they altered their mind ſoon after; and, hoping the duke of Guiſe would be a powerful inſtrument in the prince of Condé's hands, to foment many troubles in the kingdom, they releaſed him at that prince's requeſt. But, as ſoon as the duke came into France, he declared, that, ſince he had been ſo ill uſed by the Spaniards, he would do nothing for them, nor to expreſs his gratitude to the prince, whilſt he remained in their intereſt; but, if he forſook it, he would do any thing for him. He found, that he was highly obliged to the queen-mother, who had conſented, that, in order to have him releaſed, four thouſand priſoners, ſome of whom were conſiderable men, ſhould be reſtored to the Spaniards (29). However it be, he minded love more than war. *He returned to Paris, more in love with Mademoiſelle de Pons, than he had been before his impriſonment,* and reſolved to marry her (30), but, being informed that ſhe was unfaithful to him, *he treated her with great indignity, and even ſued her at law, demanding the pendants, valued fifty thouſand crowns, and a piece of rich tapeſtry, which he had given her; but he had not the ſucceſs he promiſed himſelf. The loſs of his cauſe encreaſed his rage, and he reſolved to go and inſult her in her own houſe* (31). She was informed of it, and avoided the inſult. Some time after ſhe left the kingdom. *The duke of Guiſe, hearing of her departure* (32), embarked in the king's fleet *for a ſecond voyage to Naples* (33). Being returned into France, he fell in love with Mademoiſelle de Gorce, who *loved him more ſincerely, and, after his death, ſhe retired into the convent of the Carmelites, where ſhe took the habit* (34). All this ſhews, that if he was a hero, he was not one according to the notions of Corneille, but according to thoſe of Racine and Quinaut. He was a hero always in love (35), and ſometimes like him of the Æneid: He enjoyed all the privileges of a husband; he made his miſtreſs believe ſhe was his wife, and yet never deſigned to marry her. Thus ſhe was like Dido (36), and he was like Æneas (37). It does not follow from hence, that his adventures were heroical: there is nothing in them, but what is frequently to be ſeen among citizens and ordinary gentlemen.

[*F*] *It is ſaid, that the women, who loved him, could diſcover . . . . tho' they did not ſee him, whether he was preſent.*] I do not give this particular as a certain truth; I only mention what I have read. *Thoſe two lovers*, that is, the duke of Guiſe and the counteſs de Boſſu, *muſt needs have loved one another very much, and I wonder how their love ended before their life. They had an inward foreſight, which informed them of their arrival, a long time before they*

(*o*) He died in the year 1654.

(22) *Pag.* 303, *of the firſt Tome,* ad ann. 1626. *See alſo the* Miniſtere du Cardinal de Richelieu, Tom. I, pag. 319.

(23) Gramond. Hiſt. Galliæ, lib. xvi, pag. 701, ad ann. 1626.

(24) Labardæus, Hiſt. de rebus Gall. lib. ii, init. pag. 71.

(25) Pag. m. 14.

(26) Mercure Galant, Auguſt. 1679, pag. 121, Edit. Holland.

(27) Anſelme, ubi ſupra, pag. 461.

(28) Priolus, lib. viii, cap. v, pag. m 312.

(29) *Taken from* M. de la Barde. lib. x, pag. 756, ad ann. 1652.

(30) Intrigues Galantes de la Cour de France, pag. 251.

(31) Ibid. pag. 253.

(32) Ibid. pag. 254.

(33) Note, That, in order to juſtify himſelf, he publiſhed a relation of that inglorious expedition. You will find it in an hiſtorical collection of ſeveral pieces printed in Holland, in 12mo. in the year 1666.

(34) Intrigues, *&c. pag.* 258.

(35) See the Life of Henriette Sylvia de Moliere, Part. I, pag. m. 5 , 56, & Part II, pag. 162, 163.

(36) Nec jam furtivum Dido meditatur amorem;
Conjugium vocat, hoc prætexit nomine culpam.
No longer Dido would conceal her flame;
She gilds her crime with wedlock's ſpecious name.
Virgil. Æn. lib. iv, ver. 171.

(37) . . . . nec conjugis unquam
Prætendi tædas, aut hæc in fœdera veni.
Amidſt our joys, I never call'd thee wife,
Nor thought to tye the marriage-knot for life.
Id. ibid. ver. 338. *See, in remark* [*B*] *of the article* GARNACHE, *a duke of Nemours and a lady de Rohan in circumſtances like theſe of the duke of Guiſe, and the counteſs de Boſſu.*

ſecond of June 1664 (*p*), and was carried to Joinville, to be buried among his anceſtors [*G*]. He left no children behind him; all his brothers were dead: his two ſiſters died ſince, without being married [*H*]. His Memoirs were publiſhed in 1668. The abbot le Gallois commended them (*q*). See, above, the article **CERISANTES**.

(*p*) Anſelme, ubi ſupra.

(*q*) *In the* Journal des Sçavans, November 12, 1668.

*ſaw one another: pray, madam, judge whether it was a juſt foreſight. The duke grew jealous of the count de *** who was very much in love with the counteſs; and it is well known, that he was one of the moſt handſome men that can be ſeen. She did not love him, and, notwithſtanding what has been ſaid to the contrary, Angelique ſwore to me, that Madam de *** loved no body but the duke of ***. But he was not ſo fully convinced of his happineſs as he ſhould have been: and, being daily informed, that his rival was very conſtant and paſſionate, he reſolved to know the truth of it, without being perceived, and to that end he came to Bruſſels* incognito. *There were great rejoicings at that time for the birth of a Spaniſh prince, called Baltazar* . . . (38). ‘The duke, being arrived, ‘was told, that many young lords of the country ‘were to make a maſquerade of Indians, and to go ‘in that diſguiſe to the counteſs de Cantecroix, in ‘whoſe houſe there was to be a great aſſembly. ‘He had one of thoſe ſuits of cloaths brought to ‘him, and found it no difficult thing to have a ſight ‘of them, for there was no order to hide them. He ‘got one made for him exactly like them, and, go‘ing among the maskers, he entered with them in‘to the hall, where they danced. He ſaw there Ma‘dam de ** who appeared more beautiful to him than ‘before, and the Count de ** by her; for he was ‘conſtantly at thoſe aſſemblies, and ſhe could not pre‘vent it by reaſon of the reſpect that was due to his ‘quality . . . as ſoon as the duke came in, the coun‘teſs felt a certain emotion, which his preſence al‘ways produced in her. She could not think that ‘ſhe was deceived by it; and, though her lover had ‘written to her, that he was going to take a jour‘ney, ſhe curiouſly looked for him among the maſ‘kers, and diſcovered him. This made their love ‘very conſpicuous; for the lady, in the ſudden fit of ‘her joy, could not diſſemble her paſſion; and the ‘lover was likewiſe ſo tranſported, that he forgot the ‘reaſons he had ſtill to conceal his love . . . I have ‘ſeen an original letter of the duke about that effect ‘of ſympathy, which, in my opinion, was one of ‘the fineſt letters that ever was written: he com‘plained in it, that he was too happy; for he ‘owned, that it was a very great happineſs to be ‘thus gueſſed at by one’s miſtreſs; but he ſaid, it de‘prived him of the pleaſure of knowing what paſ‘ſed in her heart, when ſhe had no mind to let him ‘know it: ſuch a diſcovery was, in his opinion, one ‘of the greateſt pleaſures a lover can enjoy; and no‘thing appeared to him more moving, than a diſ‘cloſing of tenderneſs and ſincerity, when there is ‘no ground to ſuſpect, that art and precaution have ‘any ſhare in it (39).

[*G*] *He was carried to Joinville, to be buried among his anceſtors.*] I have ſaid in another place (40), that the barony of Joinville was erected into a principality in the year 1552. It fell to the houſe of Lorrain by the marriage of Ferri de Lorrain, firſt of that name, with Margaret de Joinville, eldeſt daughter of Henry, fourth of that name, count de Vaudemont, and lord of Joinville: that Ferri was killed at the battle of Azincourt in 1415 (41). Renatus II, duke of Lorrain, left by his will, dated the twenty fifth of May 1506, to Claudius his younger ſon, the ſeats of Guiſe, Elbeuf, Aumale, Mayenne, JOINVILLE, and others, which he had in France (42). The tombs of the dukes of Guiſe are to be ſeen in St Laurence’s church at Joinville. See the deſcription of that of Claudius in Remy Belleau (43).

[*H*] *His two ſiſters died ſince, without being married.*] One of them was called Mary, and was born the fifteenth of Auguſt 1615, and went by the name of Mademoiſelle de Guiſe (44). I have read ſomewhere (45) that ſhe was near marrying Uladiſlaus king of Poland. The other’s name was Frances Renata: ſhe was born the tenth of January 1621, and was put into a convent. She was abbeſs of St Peter at Rheims, and then of Montmartre (46). After the death of thoſe two daughters, there remained no male nor female iſſue of the branch of Guiſe; and it is to be obſerved, that, tho’ the four firſt dukes of that name had many children, all their poſterity is extinct, except that of Renatus de Lorrain marquis d’Elbeuf, eighth ſon of Claudius firſt duke of Guiſe. All the princes of the houſe of Lorrain, that are now in France, are deſcended from him; they are ſtill many, and in a flouriſhing condition. If the title of duke of Guiſe comes to be beſtowed upon any body, it will be a very heavy burden. I do not know who is now in poſſeſſion of that duchy; I could not receive in due time the memoirs I deſired concerning the conſequences of the laſt will of Mademoiſelle de Guiſe. She had been ducheſs of that name a conſiderable time, when ſhe died in March 1688. She left, by her will, *the duchy of Guiſe, worth a hundred thouſand livres a year, to the younger ſon of the duke of Lorrain, with the principality of Joinville, which is worth not much leſs, and her fine houſe at Paris, upon condition that he* ſhould bear *that name, and live in France, with the king’s approbation* (47). The noveliſt, who publiſhed thoſe things, adds: ‘But, beſides ‘that the king is not well pleaſed with that donation, ‘the duke d’Elbœuf pretends he has been wronged, ‘ſince he is the next heir in the male line; and there‘fore he has already entered an action againſt it to get ‘it declared void, eſpecially as to the duchy of Guiſe, ‘maintaining, that the late ducheſs could not diſpoſe ‘of it to his prejudice . . . . (48) The deceaſed lady ‘is ſuſpected of having had a marriage of conſcience ‘with the late Mr de Montreſor, a gentleman of ‘quality and merit. Nay, it was ſaid, they had ſeveral ‘children, of whom their remained two daughters. ‘This report was particularly ſpread four years ago, ‘when that princeſs made a donation to the prince ‘of Harcourt, which however had no effect. It was ‘pretended, that the money he was to give her was ‘deſigned for the marriage of thoſe two daughters; but ‘whether it be that they died ſince, or that there ‘was no ground for ſuch a report, it is certain no ‘mention is made of it in her will (49).’

(38) This is wrong chronology; for Dom Baltazar was born in 1629: the duke of Guiſe was then but fifteen years of age; and *Note*, That Father Anſelme, pag. 441, of his book, intituled, *Le Palais de l’Honneur*, ſays, that he married, in December, 164 , Honorina de Berghes, daughter of the count de Grimberghe, widow of Albert Maximilian de Hennin count de Boſſut.

(39) Vie de Henriette Sylvie de Moliere, Part. VI, pag. 151, & ſeq. Dutch Edit. 1674.

(40) *Above, citat.* (*k*) *of the article* GUISE (FRANCIS duke of).

(41) Anſelme, Hiſt. des grans Officiers, pag. 455.

(42) *See the* Miniſtere du Cardinal de Richelieu, Tom. I, pag. m. 237.

(43) *Fol.* 134 *of the firſt part of his works, edition of Lyons*, 1592.

(44) Anſelme, ubi ſupra, pag. 428.

(45) *In a book, intituled*, L’Etat de France.

(46) Anſelme, ubi ſupra.

(47) Mercure Hiſtorique & Politique, March 1688, pag. 279.

(48) Ibid pag. 280.

(49) Id. ibid. pag. 281.

GUISE (LEWIS DE LORRAIN Cardinal de). There have been three cardinals of that name. The firſt was brother of Francis de Lorrain, duke of Guiſe. The ſecond was ſon of the ſame duke. Moreri ſpeaks of both (*a*), but ſays nothing of the third; and therefore I ſhall only ſpeak of him. He was the ſon of Henry de Lorrain, duke of Guiſe, who was killed at Blois, and he was born in the year 1575. He was a man of ſuch a martial temper, that he breathed nothing but war, tho’ he was an eccleſiaſtic, a cardinal, and archbiſhop of Rheims. He followed the king in his expedition of Poictou, in the year 1621, and ſignalized himſelf among the moſt valiant and reſolute gentlemen of the army, in the attack of a ſuburb at the ſiege of St Jean d’Angeli (*b*). He fell ſick ſome days after, and was carried to Saintes, where he died, the twenty firſt of June 1621. His ſuit with the duke of Nevers about a priory turned to a quarrel, and he appeared very willing to put an end to it with ſword in hand. I ſhall mention ſome circumſtances relating to that affair [*A*]. He repented upon his

(*a*) *Under the word* LOUÏS.

(*b*) *See* Malingre, Hiſt. de la Rebellion, Tom. I, pag. m. 297, 298, *and the VIIth Tome of the* Mercure Franç. pag. 515.

[*A*] *His ſuit . . . . . turned into a quarrel . . . . . I ſhall mention ſome circumſtances of it.*] ‘(1) During ‘the ſiege of St Jean d’Angeli, cardinal de Guiſe died ‘at Saintes of a fever, proceeding from the fatigue he ‘had undergone. He was a cardinal, but only a dea‘con, and never ſung maſs: he was a martial prince, ‘and

(1) Mercure François, Tom. VII, pag 570, 571.

his death-bed of his looſe life (c), and of the injury he had done to the duke of Nevers (d). Preſident de Gramond blames him with reſpect to his warlike actions, which made him dip his hands in blood; but he ſpares him as to his concubinage [B]; which, tho' infinitely

'and more inclined to war than to learning. Many 'authors have mentioned his quarrel with the duke of 'Nevers, about the collation of the priory of La 'Charité, and what paſſed betwixt them in the houſe 'of the judge that was to report their caſe. Thoſe, 'who, by their writings, produced in the proceſs, 'ſet thoſe two princes at variance, were the occaſion 'of their coming to blows, and going out of Paris, 'each with their friends, to put an end to their quarrel 'at the expence of their lives. But his majeſty hav'ing ſent the light-horſe to ſeize their perſons, he, 'who commanded them, and had expreſs orders to 'arreſt the cardinal, executed his majeſty's command, 'and brought him to Paris; where, for fear of a 'ſecond meeting, becauſe the duke of Nevers was 'always abroad, he was carried one evening to the 'Baſtile, and from thence to Bois de Vincennes (2).' Preſident de Gramond mentions ſome other curious particulars, *viz.* that cardinal de Guiſe, meeting the duke of Nevers in the judge's houſe, gave him ſome offenſive words, to which the duke made a ſmart anſwer; and that thereupon the cardinal gave him a blow with his fiſt, in the judge's preſence. The prince of Joinville, brother to the cardinal, immediately drew his ſword, and ſtruck ſeveral times, with the flat ſide of it, Mareſcot maſter of the requeſts, who with his majeſty's leave managed the affairs of the duke of Nevers. The king, being informed, that the duke was reſolved to fight a duel with the prince of Joinville, interpoſed his authority to reconcile them, and obliged the cardinal to aſk the duke's pardon. As for the affront done to the maſter of the requeſts, it was repaired thus: the prince of Joinville was obliged to uſe theſe words before the arbitrators. *Mr Mareſcot, out of conſideration for the duke of Nevers, I am ſorry I have beaten you: I deſire you to forget it, and to believe that I ſhall be your friend for the ſake of the duke of Nevers.* Preſident de Gramond makes a very ſolid obſervation upon the diſorders of that time, when a maſter of the requeſts might be beaten with impunity. That diſorder proceeded only from the diminution of the royal authority, and ceaſed as ſoon as cardinal de Richelieu humbled the princes and great lords, who had uſurped a very great part of the ſovereign power, and made them ſubmit to Lewis XIII. Does it not ſavour of anarchy, that, in a country, which has the title of a kingdom, thoſe, who have beaten a great magiſtrate, ſhould not be obliged to acknowledge, that they are ſorry for it, by reaſon of his character, but only for the ſake of the great lord he ſerved? conſider theſe words of preſident de Gramond. 'Principum 'per ea tempora ſumma erat ratio, affectabantque di'ſtingui ab omni ordine, prærogativa ſanguinis. Per 'injuriam Joinvillius percuſſerat magiſtratum, & ait 'dolere ſe ex perſona Niverni, quod percuſſerit; quaſi 'adeo infra poſitus in quem collata offenſa, ut gratis 'cædi poſſet. Erat hæc labes ejus ætatis, qua à 'principibus rex parum diſtinguebatur; quo jure 'utimur hodie, nempe anno M. DC. XLII. quo 'hæc ſcribo, externi principes parum à Regni primori'bus, parum hi à nobilibus differunt, uno ferme 'ordine habemur omnes; eoque ventum ut nemo 'publice, nemo privatim peccare poſſit ſine ultore, 'quod ejus ſapientiæ & æquitati debitum, qui ætate 'noſtra ſummam rerum tenet in Gallia (3). —— '*At that time the princes of the blood were highly con'ſidered, and they affected to be diſtinguiſhed from every 'order, by the prerogative of their birth. The prince 'of Joinville had injuriouſly ſtruck a magiſtrate, and 'ſays, he is ſorry for it in regard to the duke of Nevers; 'as tho' the offended perſons was ſo much beneath him, 'that he might be ſtruck with impunity. This was 'the reproach of that age, which made little diſtinction 'between the king and the princes of the blood; but at 'preſent,* viz. *in the year 1642, in which I write this, 'foreign princes differ little from the chief men of the 'kingdom, theſe but little from the nobility; there ſeems 'to be but one rank among us; and it is come to this paſs, 'that no one can offend publickly, or privately, with'out an avenger; which is owing to his wiſdom and 'equity, who, in this our age, has the management of 'affairs in France.*' The abbot de Marolles affords ſome other circumſtances. *About the beginning of the winter* 1620, ſays he (4), *the duke of Nevers had a great quarrel with cardinal de Guiſe, for the priory of La Charité, which depended on the abbey of Cluni; for, having got it conferred on the prince of Tymeraye, his ſecond ſon, by the court of Rome, upon a letter or promiſe of cardinal de Guiſe, abbot of Cluni; and the cardinal going from his word, and intending to procure it to one of the children he had by the lady des Eſſars, they went to law about it, aud their ſuit divided all the perſons of quality at court . . . . . The pacifying of that quarrel proved a difficult thing, becauſe ſome blows were ſtruck on both ſides; and the duke of Nevers, who was firſt offended, miſtruſting nothing, had no time to draw his ſword, which Fouques his gentleman held out of the judges chamber, where he was alone.*

[B] *The preſident de Gramond blames him with reſpect to his warlike actions . . . . . but he ſpares him as to his concubinage.*] He makes uſe of this antitheſis (5): 'Militiam affectabat impatiens ſui; non miles, quia 'Cardinalis; non item Cardinalis, quia miles erat . . . . 'Indebitum certe characteri, quod in Engeriaca obſi'dione ſæpe ferrum in hoſtem ſtrinxit, immemor Ec'cleſiam neſcire ſanguinem. —— *He affected the ſol'dier, thro' a kind of ſelf-impatience; being not a ſol'dier, becauſe a cardinal; and not a cardinal, becauſe 'a ſoldier . . . . He certainly acted out of character, 'ſince, at the ſiege of St John d'Angeli, he drew his 'ſword againſt the enemy, forgetting that the church is 'a ſtranger to blood.*' Perhaps it will be ſaid, that he did not mention that cardinal's amours, becauſe he knew nothing of them. But I cannot believe he was ignorant of them; they were too public, and had been attended with iſſue. The Chronicle of the Favourites, printed in 1622, ſuppoſes (6), that there *happened* a diſpute between cardinal de Guiſe and the duke du Mayne, who ſhould get firſt into Charon's boat. *The cardinal ſaid, he died firſt, and conſequently ought to have the precedence. The duke did not deny it, but repreſented that he ought to go in firſt, becauſe he had been killed in the king's ſervice, whereas the other died only of ſickneſs. The cardinal replied, that he had left his wife and children for GOD's cauſe, of which he deſired no other witneſs than the duke of Nevers, whereas the duke du Mayne had left no ſuch thing.* Every body knew then, that this cardinal had kept one of Henry the fourth's miſtreſſes, *viz.* Charlotte des Eſſars. The memory of it was the more eaſily preſerved, becauſe that woman had been ſo fortunate as to marry a great lord; notwithſtanding the public diſgrace ſhe was under; a king of France, and then an archbiſhop of Rheims, having got ſeveral children by her (7). Mr du Hallier, who perhaps would have thought himſelf undermatched, if he had married Charlotte des Eſſars with a clear reputation, did not ſcruple to make her his wife when ſhe had loſt it. He was a man of quality, and brother of a mareſchal of France (8). He was knight of the order of the HOLY GHOST, and captain of the life-guards, and had given proofs of that military virtue, which raiſed him afterwards to the dignity of mareſchal of France; and yet, in a lawful marriage, he was contented with the leavings of a cardinal. The public did not fail to take notice of it. There are ſo many occaſions of alledging ſuch examples, that this ſort of adventures are ſeldom forgotten. But when people began perhaps to talk more of it, there aroſe ſome perſons, who laid a claim to Mademoiſelle de Guiſe's eſtate, and revived the ideas of that object. Read what follows: I take it from the *Mercure Hiſtorique & Politique* for April, 1688. 'The marchioneſs d'Acy, wife of the younger brother 'of count de Gamache, knight of the king's orders, 'diſputes at preſent the ſucceſſion of the houſe of Guiſe, 'by virtue of a box brought to her by an unknown 'perſon, in which ſhe found a contract of marriage 'between cardinal de Guiſe and Charlotte des Eſſars, 'mother of count de Romorantin, her father, who was 'always accounted the cardinal's baſtard. That con'tract is attended with the nuptial benediction in due 'form; and, moreover, with a diſpenſation from the 'Pope, permitting the cardinal to enjoy his benefices 'tho' he be a married man: in ſhort, nothing 'ſeems to be wanting, but a ſufficient ſupport, to diſ'pute ſo great a ſucceſſion with thoſe concerned in it.

'However,

(c) Aulico luxu & militari licentia traduxerat vitam. *Gramond, Hiſt. libr. viii, pag. m.* 407.

(d) Id. Ibid.

(2) Note, *That he did not continue long in it*; for, ſoon after, the king, intending to ſet out for Poictou, ſent for him to Fontainebleau, to accompany him. *Ibid. pag.* 571.

(3) Gramondus, Hiſtor. lib. viii, in fine, pag. m. 408.

(4) Marolles, Memoir. pag. 45, 46.

(5) Gramondus, ubi ſupra, pag. 407.

(6) Chronique des Favoris, pag. 14.

(7) Father Anſelme, pag. 441, of the *Palais de l'Honneur*, ſays, that the cardinal de Guiſe left behind him three ſons and two daughters, whom he had by Charlotte des Eſſars; that the eldeſt ſon was biſhop of Condom, and that the ſecond was count de Romorantin, and killed in Candia in the ſervice of the Venetians, and father of the marchioneſs d'Acy. I omit what he ſays of the third ſon, and of the daughters.

(8) *Viz.* Nicolas de l'Hoſpital, marquis and then duke of Vitri.

nitely more common among the clergy than military functions, is an infraction of the canonical diſcipline. To conclude, I believe ſome reflexions have been made upon this, That the deſcendants of the ſame prince of Condé, whom Francis de Lorrain, duke of Guiſe, endeavoured to deſtroy, are become the heirs of the deſcendants of that duke [*C*] in the ſpace of 130 years.

‘ However, whatever place that box might come from, it is like to make a noiſe in the parliament, the more becauſe it is in the hands of a lady who has learned all the chicanery of the law by a long experience, as if ſhe had known that ſhe would have occaſion for them one day. Since this happy diſcovery, ſhe has removed the bar that was a blot in her eſcutcheon. But it is feared ſhe will be quickly obliged to put it in again: ſhe has to do with the prince of Condé, who pretends to be the chief heir of that houſe in right of the princeſs his wife; and as there is little proportion between them, it is not improbable, that the box will be found ſuppoſititious in time (9).’ Note, that the author of the Mercure ſuppoſes (10), that this cardinal de Guiſe was he that was killed at Blois; which is a miſtake.

[*C*] *The deſcendants of the ſame prince of Condé, whom Francis duke of Guiſe endeavoured to deſtroy, are become the heirs of that duke* of Guiſe.] Here I ſhall place the memoir, which I ſhould have inſerted in the remark [*H*] of the foregoing article, if I had received it in due time. This memoir will inform us of the proceedings occaſioned by the marriage of the duke of Guiſe with the counteſs de Boſſu, and of the pretenſions of the prince of Condé, who carried the cauſe.

‘ (11) The ſixteenth of November 1641, there was a marriage between the duke of Guiſe and Honorata de Berghes, widow of the count de Boſſu her firſt huſband.

‘ The nineth of June 1666, there was a definitive ſentence given, contrary to that of the Rota, whereby the marriage was declared valid *ad quoſcunque effectus, & dictam comitiſſam veram & legitimam conjugem.* Note, that the duke of Guiſe was dead; but he had produced his reaſons and vouchers at Rome in his life-time. Note alſo, that, during that time, Mademoiſelle de Guiſe obtained ſome decrees of the parliament, whereby the proceedings of the Rota were declared null, and ſuing in that court was forbidden, and all the ſerjeants in France were alſo forbidden to give any ſummons for that court, and to execute it's judgments. The counteſs de Boſſu acted all the reſt of her life as ducheſs of Guiſe. She conſtantly maintained the validity of her marriage, and always demanded the execution of it. She hoped to get it acknowledged in France by the recommendation or authority of the league, or of the king of Spain, at the treaty of Nimeguen, in 1678. But the French party was too powerful, and the miniſters of France abſolutely refuſed to hearken to any propoſitions relating to private perſons. The counteſs de Boſſu uſed vain endeavours, and died in 1679, having made the count de Berghes, one of her nephews, her heir. The count de Berghes ſettled the affairs of his ſucceſſion, and gathered together all the writings, concerning the marriage, that were diſperſed at Rome, Paris, Madrid, and Vienna, and in the Low-Countries, and elſewhere. By the favour of the truce of Luxemburg, he came to Paris, and put in his demand at the Chatelet, the third of Auguſt 1687, againſt Mademoiſelle de Guiſe, as heireſs of her late brother, that the contract of marriage, of the ſixteenth of November 1641, might be executed againſt her, and all rights reſulting from it adjudged to him. Immediately Mademoiſelle de Guiſe obtained a decree of parliament, whereby it was forbidden to proceed in the Chatelet, to ſtyle the counteſs de Boſſu ducheſs of Guiſe, to make any demand on account of that pretended marriage, and all ſerjeants were forbidden to give any ſummons to that effect. On the eighth of March 1688, Mademoiſelle de Guiſe died, after ſhe had made many wills and codicils, the laſt whereof is dated the ſecond of March 1688. The war broke out ſoon after, and kept things in ſuſpence. At laſt, the peace being concluded at Ryſwick, the count de Berghes returned into France honoured with the title of prince and knight of the golden fleece. He renewed his demand the twenty fifth of October 1698, not in the Chatelet, but in the parliament. He demanded, by virtue of a commiſſion under the great ſeal, to be admitted opponent to the execution of the decree of 1687, and the other two made long before againſt his aunt: and that juſtice ſhould be done him upon his oppoſition, and the appeal brought in by Mademoiſelle de Guiſe, and her heirs, concerning the celebration of the marriage, and the ſentence of the Rota, bringing his firſt demand from the Chatelet, petitioning that all matrimonial rights ſhould be wholly adjudged to him. Upon this illuſtrious controverſy ſentence was given on tueſday in the morning, the fifth of January 1700, in the great chamber, according to the opinion of Mr Dagueſſeau, advocate-general, Mr Robert, and Mr Nouet pleading for the parties, and Mr de Harlay being preſident, after fifteen hearings, ſeven of which were taken up by Mr Robert, ſix by Mr Nouet, and two by Mr Dagueſſeau, wherein, conſidering the petition of the prince of Berghes, the court ordains, that the information made againſt Honorata de Berghes, counteſs de Boſſu, ſhall be rejected, without minding the oppoſitions made by the prince of Berghes to the execution of the decrees of 1665, 1666, and 1687, doing juſtice, on the appellations, as an abuſe both of the celebration and the procedure made at the Rota, and the ſentences there intervening; declares the marriage to be void. In conſequence whereof, the court rejects the demands of the prince of Berghes depending upon the queſtion concerning the marriage, condemns him to coſts, and ordains, that upon other demands, he may take his courſe.’

It plainly appears from the genealogical table, printed during that law-ſuit, that Anne palatine of Bavaria, wife of the prince of Condé, was the right heireſs of Mademoiſelle de Guiſe; for ſhe is deſcended from the duke of Mayenne, ſon of Francis de Lorrain duke of Guiſe. This duke of Mayenne had a daughter, who married Charles Gonzaga duke of Nevers, by whom he had Anne Gonzaga, mother of the princeſs of Condé.

GUYET (Francis), born at Angers, of a good family [*A*], was one of the beſt

[*A*] *He was of a good family.*] He had two uncles, Lezin Guyet, and Martial Guyet. The firſt, who was a counſellor in the preſidial of Angers, made a map of the province of Anjou: the ſecond wrote French verſes (1). This is what Mr Portner ſays. I find ſome difficulty in it, when I compare it with what I find in Menage (2), *viz.* that Lezin Guyet, counſellor in the preſidial of Angers, who made the firſt map of the province of Anjou, was an echevin at Angers in 1493. But this difficulty vaniſhes by conſulting la Croix du Maine (3), who ſays, that Lezin Guyet was born in the year 1515, on the thirteenth of February. From whence I infer, that Menage's printer put one figure inſtead of another, or that Menage took one Lezin Guyet, who lived before the eldeſt brother of Martial, for him who made the map of Anjou; for he ſays, that Lezin Guyet had a ſon called Andrew, and he mentions two Andrews, one of whom was mayor of Angers in 1550, and the other echevin of the ſame town in 1519. The laſt of theſe two Andrews cannot be the ſon of him, who made the map of Anjou, ſince the author of that map was born in 1515. For the ſame reaſon, it is not likely, that he was the father of the other Andrew; but both of them might be the ſons of one Lezin Guyet, echevin of Angers, in 1493. However it be, Menage calls that family ancient; and having mentioned ſome other perſons of that name, he comes to our Francis Guyet, and calls him *the moſt learned Angevin that he knows of.*

[*B*] *He*

---

(9) Mercure Hiſtor. & Polit. April 1688, pag. 375, 376.

(10) Id. ibid. pag. 386, 387.

(11) A memoir, imparted to me by Mr Dalencé.

(1) *See* la Croix du Maine, pag. 312.

(2) Remarques ſur la Vie de Guill. Menage, pag. 292.

(3) Biblioth. pag. 289.

beſt critics of the XVIIth century. He was born in the year 1575 [*B*], and was but a child when he loſt his father and mother. The ſmall eſtate they left him, came almoſt to nothing, by the ill management of his guardians: which, far from diſcouraging him from his ſtudy, made him more fond of it; and being of opinion, that Paris would enable him to perfect his knowledge and judgment by the converſation of learned men, he took a journey thither in 1599. He quickly got the friendſhip of Chriſtopher and Auguſtine du Puy, the two eldeſt ſons of Claudius du Puy (*a*), who had been the ornament and ſupport of good literature. His farther acquaintance with Peter and James du Puy, the ſons of the ſame Claudius du Puy, proved very advantagious to him, in order to make a great progreſs in learning; for the moſt learned perſons in Paris did frequently viſit thoſe two brothers, and many of them met every day in the houſe of Thuanus, where Meſſieurs du Puy received the company. After the death of that preſident, they held thoſe conferences in the ſame place. Guyet was conſtantly at thoſe aſſemblies. He made a journey to Rome in 1608, and applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the Italian tongue with ſo good ſucceſs, that he could make Italian verſes, which the beſt poets of that nation would not have thought unworthy of their pen. He renewed with Reignier (*b*), who was then in the houſe of cardinal de Joyeuſe, the acquaintance which he had contracted at Paris; and was very much eſteemed by cardinal du Perron, and Gabriel de l'Aubeſpine biſhop of Orleans, to whom he proved ſerviceable more than once, by explaining to him many difficult paſſages, both in ſacred and prophane writers. He returned to Paris by the way of Germany, and was taken into the houſe of the duke d'Epernon to teach the abbot de Granſelve, who was afterwards ſo well known by the name of cardinal de la Valette (*c*): Being thoroughly ſkilled in Greek and Latin authors, he picked out of them what was moſt proper for his pupil, and explained it to him, not like a pedant, but according to the uſe, which a man, deſigned for great employments, would make of it. The pupil did very much improve under ſo learned a maſter, and conceived ſo great an eſteem for him, that he always entruſted him with his moſt important affairs. He took him along with him to Rome, when he went thither, after he had been made a cardinal, and procured him a good benefice, beſides that which he had already beſtowed upon him (*d*). Guyet, being returned to Paris, choſe rather to live a private life, than in the houſe of cardinal de la Valette, and pitched upon Burgundy college, to make his abode in it. There he lived the remaining part of his life, minding nothing but his ſtudies, and being contented to make his court when that cardinal was at Paris; for he could not reſolve to follow him into the armies and the provinces. He enjoyed every day the converſation of Meſſieurs du Puy, who lodged in Thuanus's houſe near Burgundy college; but, after Mr Rigaut's departure, they removed to the king's library, where they held their conferences. He chiefly applied himſelf to a work, wherein he pretended to ſhew, that the Latin tongue was derived from the Greek, and that all the primitive words of the latter conſiſted only of one ſyllable. Being the firſt who had ſuch a deſign, he was willing that none ſhould have the glory of executing it but himſelf, and ſhewed his eſſays to no body. Notwithſtanding his long and continual application to that work, his labour proved of no uſe; for they found, after his death, only a vaſt compilation of Greek and Latin words (*e*), without any order or coherence, and without any preface to explain his project; ſo that one would think he had, even with reſpect to his paper, the ſame miſtruſt which hindered him from explaining to his friends his plan, his method, and principles. He applied himſelf to ſomething elſe: The margins of his Horace, Virgil, Lucan, Plautus, Martial, Philoxenus, Heſychius, *&c.* were full of critical notes [*C*], wherein he took a great deal of liberty [*D*]; for he rejected, as ſuppoſititious, all ſuch verſes as

(*a*) He was dead in 1594.

(*b*) A French poet, famous for his ſatires.

(*c*) He was made cardinal in 1621.

(*d*) One of thoſe two benefices was the priory of St Andrade near Bourdeaux. See the *Hiſtoire de l'Academie Françoiſe, pag. m.* 269.

(*e*) It contained twenty five quires of paper in *folio*, written with a fair and very legible hand.

[*B*] *He was born in the year* 1575.] This came to be known only by his heirs; for he would never tell in what year he was born. He was unwilling to be accounted ſo old as he was (4); and, hoping to live much longer than he did, he was willing that people ſhould not know his age. In all other things he hardly had a confident; but perhaps there was none he took more care to conceal, than that; and, becauſe he was not grown very hoary in his old age (5), and his ſtrength was not impaired in proportion to the time he had lived, he was unwilling to undeceive thoſe, who made him younger than he was. Had he intended to marry, one would be leſs ſurprized at his myſterious taciturnity. His ſight being ſo good, that he could read the ſmalleſt print without ſpectacles (6), might have wonderfully contributed to make him appear younger than he was. It is thought that becauſe he hoped to live much longer (7) he neglected to ſettle his affairs, either with reſpect to his works or his eſtate: He died without making his will. Thoſe, who ſhall read this remark, and have read the letters of the chevalier d' Her..... will call to mind the paſſage I quote in the margin (8). It is in the thirty ſixth letter of the firſt part. See the remark [*C*] of the article Gombauld.

[*C*] *The margins of his Horace, Virgil, &c. were full of critical remarks.*] Menage bought the books, whoſe margins were full of thoſe notes. All of them have not been buried in the obſcurity of a cloſet. Thoſe upon Heſiod were imparted to Mr Grævius, who inſerted them in his edition (9). Thoſe upon Stephanus Byzantinus have been likewiſe publiſhed (10). I ſhall obſerve by the bye, that Guyet was none of thoſe readers, who skip from book to book: he read a book through with the greateſt attention, before he applied himſelf to any other. Thus he wrote upon Terence, Heſiod, Horace, and Plautus. The reading of the ancient authors was his main buſineſs. As for modern books, he only read hiſtories and voyages (11). I obſerve theſe things, not only becauſe ſome perſons are curious of them, but alſo becauſe they may give a good opinion of the notes of this great critic.

[*D*] ..... *wherein he took a great deal of liberty.*] He carried his criticiſms ſo far, that he muſt needs have been in the wrong ſometimes. Guyet ſtruck out many verſes in his Virgil, pretending they were ſuppoſititious, and that the poems of that great poet were like thoſe troops, among which there are many falſe muſters; ſo that he acted like a rigid commiſſary,

(4) Periander, in Vita Guyeti.

(5) Id. ibid.

(6) Id ibid.

(7) Epiſt. Iſmael. Bullialdi, apud Periandrum, ubi ſupra.

(8) The fair ſex conceal their age with the greateſt ſecrecy, and I think it is the only ſecret they can keep. Many women have entruſted me with their domeſtic concerns, and even with their love intrigues; but none did ever impart her age to me. I have ſeen ſome, that were ſo reaſonable as to reſolve upon a thing with great firmneſs and conſtancy, when there was occaſion for it; but I never ſaw one ſo couragious as to tell her age.

(9) In 1667.

(10) Baillet. Jug. des Sçav. Tom. III, n. 518.

(11) Portner, in Vita Guyeti.

as ſeemed to him not to ſavour of the author's genius. The moſt compleat thing, that was found among his papers, was his notes upon Terence; and therefore they have been printed in the Straſburg edition, 1657: they were ſent by James du Puy to the learned Boeclerus. He was ſo happy as to be accounted a man of great learning, though he had printed nothing: it was well done of him to avoid the diſputes he would have been engaged in, if he had publiſhed ſome books [*E*]. He ſeldom confeſſed, that he was miſtaken. He grew hot when any body denied what he ſaid, and then he would jeſt in a pleaſant manner. He had a very good memory, and was a hearty, ſincere, honeſt man. He was cut for the ſtone in 1636, and bore the pains of that operation with a wonderful conſtancy. Abating this, his long life was hardly attended with any illneſs; and he was ſo happy as to die of a catarrh, which affected him only three or four days, and did not prevent the curate of the pariſh performing the uſual functions. He died in the arms of James du Puy, and Menage his country-man, the twelfth of April, 1655 (*f*), being eighty years old. His Life (*g*) was written in Latin, with great judgment and politeneſs, by Mr Portner a ſenator of Ratiſbon (*h*), from which I have takn this article.

commiſſary, who muſters none but true ſoldiers. He looked upon the firſt ode of Horace, and the ſecret hiſtory of Procopius, as ſuppoſititious pieces; and when the cadence, or the turn of a period, did not pleaſe his ear or his taſte, he immediately concluded it was not genuine, though the ancient Grammarians, and the beſt manuſcripts, were againſt him. But to be convinced, that he had ſometimes a depraved taſte (12), and went beyond the *delicati faſtidii* imputed to him, one need only read the verſes he made againſt beer, wherein he ſpeaks of all the Dutch poets with great contempt (13). Grotius made a very good anſwer to him (14):

> Duræ mentis iners, merumque rus eſt,
> Si quem baſia non movent Secundi,
> Et quos Douſa canit parente major
> Cœlo ſydereos rotante curſus,
> Et quæ ſpicula Baudio vibrante
> Non unum ſibi deſtinant Lycamben,
> Et quos dat numeros nihil vetuſtis
> Cedens vatibus Heinſii Thalia.
>
> *Inſenſible the man, and dull his wit,*
> *Whoſe ſoul ſuch pens in vain attempt to hit;*
> *Secundus*'s kiſſes; *Douſa's lofty verſe,*
> *Heav'n circling in it's empyreal courſe;*
> *Baudius, thy pointed arrows, dipt in gall,*
> *That doom Lycambes to a ſecond fall;*
> *And Heinſius, by Apollo's ſelf decreed*
> *In verſe to write what ancient Rome might read.*

[*E*] *It was well done of him to avoid the diſputes he would have been engaged in if he had publiſhed books*] Notwithſtanding his bold criticiſms, and his intrepidity in ſpeaking out his thoughts in converſation, he was afraid of the public. He dreaded particularly Salmaſius (15), who, being in Meſſieurs du Puy's houſe, threatened to write a book againſt him, if he publiſhed his thoughts about ſome paſſages of the ancient authors. Salmaſius would have proved too hard for him; he would have printed a hundred ſheets before Guyet had been able to ſend four to the preſs; for Guyet had much ado to pleaſe himſelf (16); and therefore he continued to forbear ſetting up for an author, even after Salmaſius's death. It were to be wiſhed for the ſake of the public, that many authors had had ſuch a ſcare-crow: thoſe, who ſhould forbear to print books upon ſuch an account, would be very glad of it, if they knew their own intereſt; for how many writers do we ſee, who verify this thought of Horace, or at leaſt the laſt part of it?

> Sed tacitus paſci ſi poſſet corvus, haberet
> Plus dapis & rixæ multo minus invidiæque (17).
>
> *But, could the fooliſh crow in ſilence eat,*
> *He'd have leſs ſtrife and envy, and more meat.*

Happy are thoſe learned men, who, like our Guyet, are contented with being accounted men of learning upon the teſtimony of others (18). This was Guyet's caſe: Balzac, among others, was his trumpeter. See his *Ludus Poëticus de Hypercritico Galeſo* (19).

GUYET (CHARLES), a French Jeſuit, born at Tours in the year 1601, was admitted into the ſociety in the year 1621, where he taught the *Belles Lettres* for the ſpace of five years, and moral theology for the ſpace of two years. Afterwards he ſet up for a preacher, which laſted a long time. He got a perfect knowledge of the ceremonies of the church, as it appears by two books which he wrote [*A*]. He died at Tours the thirtieth of March, 1664 (*a*).

[*A*] *This appears by two books which he wrote.*] One of them is intituled, *Ordo generalis & perpetuus divini Officii recitandi*; and the other, *Heortologia, ſive de feſtis propriis locorum*, printed at Paris for Sebaſtian Cramoiſy, 1657, in folio. The explication of the holy days in each place, is one of the moſt laborious deſigns, and requires a very minute and particular account: this our author has done.

GYMNOSOPHISTS. So the Greeks called the philoſophers, who went naked [*A*]. There were ſome of them in Africa; but the moſt famous were in the Indies. Thoſe of Africa inhabited a mountain in Ethiopia, not far from the Nile, without either houſe or cell. They did not live in community; nor did they ſacrifice together,

[*A*] *So the Greeks call the philoſophers, who went naked.*] It would be abſurd to deny, that there were Indian philoſophers that wore no cloaths; but it might be maintained, that the Brachmans were not of that number: for beſides the authorities I have alledged in another place (1), it may be obſerved: I. That the Iarchas (2) of Philoſtratus (3) ſtrips himſelf before he ſteps into a fountain with Apollonius. II. That another Brachman pulls a letter from under his gown (4); a letter I ſay, which he wrote to a dæmon, to command him with threats to go out of the body of a young man. III. That Apollonius upbraids the Gymnoſophiſts of Ethiopia with their having left the habit of the Indian Gymnoſophiſts, hoping thereby to make people believe, that they were originally of Ethiopia. There is another queſtion to be propoſed: whether thoſe that went naked covered their natural parts. St Auguſtin maintains they did. 'Per opacas, *ſays* '*he* (5), quoque Indiæ ſolitudines quum quidam nudi 'philoſophentur, unde Gymnoſophiſtæ nominantur; 'adhibent tamen genitalibus tegumenta quibus per 'cætera membrorum carent. —— *There are certain* '*naked philoſophers in the ſhady ſolitudes of India,* '*thence called Gymnoſophiſts; yet they cover their ſecret* '*parts.*'

(*f*) Reineſius, *Epiſt. ad Daumium, pag.* 170, is miſtaken in ſaying 1657.

(*g*) It is prefixed to Guyet's commentary upon Terence, printed with that of Boeclerus at Straſburg in 1657.

(*h*) He took the ſuppoſititious name of Antonius Periander Rhœtus. See *Placcius de Script. anonymis & pſeudonym. pag.* 236.

(12) Portner, ubi ſupra.

(13) Hinc Batavi fumis cerealibus ebria turba Carmina tot Muſis inficianda vomunt.

(14) See thoſe two ſmall poems in Balzac's *Lettres Choiſies, pag.* 313. *Dutch Edit.*

(15) Portner, ubi ſupra.

(16) Vir enim acutiſſimi judicii non humanius de ſuis quam de alienis curis ſtatuebat, ac proinde ipſi ſibi nunquam ſatisfaciebat, in exprimendis quæ meditatus erat ſupra modum tardus, in exigendis quæ expreſſerat ſupra fidem ſeverus. *Id. ibid.*

(17) Horat. Epiſt. xvii, lib. i.

(18) Nullis quod vixit libris à ſe editis inclaruit, notitia eorum quibus alii ingentem ſibi pepererunt famam, ac eruditionis ſuæ quam in dubium nemo unquam vocare auſus eſt conſcientia contentus. *Portn. ubi ſupra.*

(19) By Galeſus, he means Guyet.

(*a*) *Taken from* Natan. Sotuel. Biblioth. Script. Societ. pag. 129.

(1) In the remark [*G*] of the article BRACHMANS.

(2) He was at that time preſident of the Brachmans.

(3) In Vita Apollon. lib. iii.

(4) Simul Epiſtolam è ſinu detractam mulieri dedit. *Id. ibid.*

(5) Auguſt. de Civitate Dei, lib. xiv, cap. xvii.

gether, as thoſe who were in the Indies (a). Each of them had his ſmall habitation, where they performed, apart, their exerciſes and ſtudies. Thoſe, who had committed manſlaughter, were obliged to come before them, to aſk their abſolution, ſubmitting themſelves to ſuch a penance as was impoſed upon them, without which they could not return into their country. Theſe philoſophers profeſſed a great frugality; for they lived only upon ſuch things as the earth naturally yielded. According to Philoſtratus (b), they derived their origin from the Indian Gymnoſophiſts [B]. I cannot tell, whether we ought to attribute to them the aſtronomical diſcoveries, of which Lucian (c) has given their nation the glory. He pretends, that the ſcience of the ſtars had it's beginning in Ethiopia; where, by conſidering the different phaſes of the moon, they began to diſcover, that ſhe borrowed her light from the ſun. As to the Gymnoſophiſts of the eaſt, they were divided into Brachmans (d), of whom I have given a long article, and Germanes. The moſt conſiderable of theſe were called Hylobians, becauſe they lived in the woods. They lived there upon leaves and wild fruits; forbore wine and women; anſwered the queſtions of princes by meſſengers; and, by their means, kings honoured and praiſed the deity. The next degree of honour was for the phyſicians. Theſe were not ſedentary, as the Hylobians: and among other things, they pretended to remedies againſt barrenneſs [C]. They were freely entertained in peoples houſes. For this ſcience, how to get boys or girls, gave them a good title to hoſpitality. Others pretended to predictions and inchantments, and ſeemed well acquainted with the ceremonies and traditions that concern the condition of the dead: they were of an unſettled, roving, humour. Others, much more polite than theſe, had no regard to any thing that was ſaid of the other world, but what might ſerve to heighten holineſs and and piety (e). Generally ſpeaking, the Gymnoſophiſts have done credit to their profeſſion: the maxims and diſcourſes, which hiſtorians aſcribe to them (f), do not ſavour of barbarity: on the contrary, one may ſee in them a great many things, that are the reſult of great wiſdom and profound meditation. One cannot complain, that they have

(a) Philoſtratus, who ſays this in the Life of Apollonius, *lib. vi*, differs very much from Porphyry. See the remark [B] of the article BRACHMANS.

(b) *In Vita Apol. lib. vi*, from whence I have taken what I have ſaid before.

(c) De Aſtrolog.

(d) See Strabo, lib. xv, and the remark [*F*] of the article BRACHMANS.

(e) Οὐδ' αὐτοὺς δὲ ἀπεχομένους τῶν καθ' ᾅδου θρυλλουμένων ὅσα δοκεῖ πρὸς εὐσέβειαν καὶ ὁσιότητα. Qui nec ipſi abſtineant ab iis quæ de inferis memorantur quæ ad pietatem ſanctimoniamque pertinent. *Strabo, lib. xv, pag.* 491.

(f) *See* Strabo, ibid. Philoſtrat. in Vita Apollon. lib. iii, Plut. in Alexandro. Arrian. Exped. lib. vii.

'*parts*.' I think he is in the right: for notwithſtanding ſuch a girdle, thoſe philoſophers might have been ſaid to go naked; as we ſay, and write now-a-days, that certain nations go naked, though they wear ſuch a ſort of girdle. When Philoſtratus ſpeaks of the Gymnoſophiſts of Africa, he calls them a hundred times, ſimply and abſolutely, *the naked:* nevertheleſs, he does not repreſent them as having nothing on their bodies; for, on the contrary, he ſays (6), that they are dreſſed like the reapers of Athens; and reproaches them with having quitted the Indian habit, hoping, that, with the habit of Ethiopia, they ſhould gain the reputation of being true Ethiopians. I find that, to ſupport St Auguſtin's opinion, ſome (7) quote Nicolas Damaſcenus, and Diodorus Siculus. The firſt (8) relates, as eye-witneſs, that the preſents, which the king of the Indies made to the emperor Auguſtus, were carried by eight ſlaves who were naked indeed, but whoſe privy-parts were covered. Ludovicus Vives and Pererius relate this, as if thoſe eight ſlaves had been preſented to Auguſtus. Thus you ſee how careleſs the moſt learned are in their quotations. They (9) make Diodorus Siculus ſpeak as if he had affirmed, that the Ethiopians went naked, but ſo as to wear girdles, either of hair, or of foxes tails; which is a ſuppreſſing of part of the paſſage, in favour of the cauſe they maintain. They deſign to ſupport St Auguſtin's opinion, that, ſince the firſt ſin, ſhame is natural to all men, with reſpect to the parts, which Adam and Eve could not behold naked, after they had eaten the forbidden fruit. If Diodorus Siculus had advanced, that all the Ethiopians that go naked hide thoſe parts, his authority would have ſome weight. They ſhould not therefore have mentioned him, or elſe have ſuppoſed, that he expreſſed himſelf ſo. But the truth is, he does not; and therefore he does more prejudice than good to St Auguſtin's cauſe. He ſpeaks of four ſorts of Ethiopians (10): the firſt go naked; the ſecond cover their privy-parts with the tails of beaſts; the third cover themſelves with the ſkin of certain animals; and the laſt weave hair together, with which they cover themſeves from the waiſt downwards.

[*B*] *According to Philoſtratus, they derived their origin from the Indian Gymnoſophiſts.*] Apollonius had ſeen theſe, before he went into Ethiopia, and was ever ſpeaking of the admiration he had conceived for them. The Gymnoſophiſts of Ethiopia, being informed of it, affected to ſpeak to him with contempt of thoſe of the Indies: whereupon he anſwered them freely, that they ſpoke ill of the Indians, only with a deſign to perſuade people that they were not come from thence into Ethiopia upon any diſhonourable account, as it was reported they did (11). This report was (12), that the Ethiopians came originally from the Indies; that they had anciently been ſubject there to king Ganges, whom they had put to death; that, ſince that murder, the other Indians had looked upon them with abomination; that the earth would no longer bear them; that neither their corn ever grew ripe, nor their women with child came to their full reckonings, nor their cattle encreaſed; and that the ground ſunk where-ever they had a mind to build houſes; that the ghoſt of the murdered king followed, and frighted them every where; and that thoſe calamities continued, till the authors of that parricide had been ſwallowed up by the earth. It is pretended (13), that all theſe prodigies made thoſe people fly their country, and that they came to ſettle themſelves in that part of Africa, which was called Ethiopia. Others have ſpoken of that tranſmigration as has been ſhewn by the learned Marſham (14). He has ſhewn likewiſe, that there were two ſorts of Ethiopians; the one in Aſia, and the other in Africa; and alſo Indians in Africa: but he pretends, without reaſon, that, in a paſſage of Virgil, we ought to underſtand Ethiopia by the word *Indis*. Virgil underſtood, by that, the Eaſt-Indies, where he thought the Nile had it's ſource; and you ſee alſo, that he makes it run by the frontiers of Perſia:

Nam, quâ Pellæi gens fortunata Canopi
Accolit effuſo ſtagnantem flumine Nilum,
Et circùm pictis vehitur ſua rura phaſelis,
Quâque pharetratæ vicinia Perſidis urget,
Et viridem Ægyptum nigrâ ſœcundat arenâ,
Et diverſa ruens ſeptem diſcurrit in ora,
Uſque coloratis amnis devexus ab Indis:
Omnis in hac certam regio jacit arte ſalutem (15).

For where Canopus' happy ſons abide,
Who border on the Nile's o'er flowing tide,
And o'er their lands in painted veſſels ride;
And where, deſcending from black India's ſhores,
The ſtream faſt by the Perſian frontiers pours,
'Till, ruſhing thro' ſeven channels, it's black ſands
Fatten the ſoil of Egypt's fruitful lands;
All this fair tract, this ſalutary coaſt,
For med'cine fam'd, the healing art can boaſt.

[*C*] *Among other things, they pretended to remedies againſt barrenneſs.*.] They boaſted of three things upon that account. Firſt, To enable a perſon to beget many children: ſecondly, to order it ſo, that they ſhould be boys; or, thirdly, that they ſhould be girls. Strabo

(6) Lib. vi, pag. m. 247.

(7) Vives in Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib xiv, cap. xvii. Pererius in Geneſim, cap. iii.

(8) Apud Strab. lib. xv.

(9) Pererius, ubi ſupra.

(10) Diod. Sicul. lib. iv, cap. i.

(11) Philoſtrat. in ejus vita, lib. vi.

(12) Id. ibid. lib. iii.

(13) Id. lib. vi.

(14) Chron. Canon. Ægypt. Sæcul. xiii, pag. 335, Edit. in 4to.

(15) Virg. Georg. lib. iv, ver. 287.

have not well maintained the dignity of philoſophy, ſince it was their method not to go to any body; but to put themſelves on ſuch a foot, even with reſpect to kings [*D*], that, if any body wanted them, they were obliged come themſelves to them, or ſend ſome body to acquaint them with what they wanted. Therefore Alexander, who thought it not conſiſtent with his greatneſs to go in perſon, ſent a deputation to them, in order to ſatisfy the deſire he had to be informed of them (*g*). Nothing can be finer than their way of educating their diſciples [*E*]. They aſked them every day, before they ſat down to dinner, how they had ſpent the morning; and every ſcholar was obliged to produce ſome good moral action, or ſome proficiency in the ſciences: if they failed, they were ſent to their work, without being allowed any thing to eat. We have ſeen, in the article of the **BRACHMANS**, the great frugality of the Gymnoſophiſts, and their extraordinary patience, in being a long while in the ſame poſture [*F*]. It is not unlikely, that the doctrine of the Metempſycoſis led them to eat nothing, which had animal life in it; and that Pythagoras borrowed this opinion from them: but it is ridiculous to derive the origin of the Jews from them, as Ariſtotle has done (*h*). It was a ſhameful thing amongſt them to be ſick; ſo that thoſe, who would ſhun that diſgrace, did burn themſelves (*i*). Thus Calanus, who was in the retinue of Alexander, made away with himſelf. We have ſaid elſewhere, that the doctrine of the tranſmigration of ſouls inſpired the Brachmans with a great indifference either for life or death [*G*]. Porphyry anſwers pertinently to thoſe, who objected, *What would become of the world, if all men did live as the Brachmans did* [*H*].

(*g*) Plut. ibid. & alii.

(*h*) Apud Clearchum, *quoted by* Joſephus, lib. i, contra Appion.

(*i*) Strabo, pag. 493.

Strabo marks all this. *Δύνασθαι δὲ καὶ πολυγόνους ποιεῖν, καὶ ἀῤῥενογόνους καὶ θηλυγόνους διὰ φαρμακευτικῆς. Poſſe eos & fœcundos facere & marium & feminarum procreationem medicamentis præſtare* (16). This was a ſure means to make themſelves neceſſary or acceptable to ſeveral ſorts of perſons; for there are thoſe, who wiſh for a numerous family: others, having none but girls, wiſh paſſionately for a boy; and others again, having none but boys, would fain have a girl alſo. This laſt is principally the deſire of mothers: nor is it unreaſonable; for a daughter is a more convenient help and companion for a mother, than a boy.

(15) Strabo, lib. xv, pag. 491.

[*D*] *Even with reſpect to kings.*] This ought not to be generally underſtood of the Gymnoſophiſts; for, according to Nearchus, the Brachmans went to court, and followed kings in the quality of their counſellors (17).

(17) Nearchus, apud Strabonem, lib. xv, pag. 493.

[*E*] *Nothing can be finer than their way of educating their diſciples.*] All that Apuleius ſays about it deſerves, in my opinion, to be copied. 'Eſt præterea, '*ſays he* (18), genus apud illos (Indos) præſtabile, 'Gymnoſophiſtæ vocantur. Hos ego maximè admiror: 'quod homines ſunt periti, non propagandæ vitis, 'nec inoculandæ arboris, nec proſcindendi ſoli. Non 'illi norunt arvum colere, vel aurum colare, vel 'equum domare, vel taurum ſubigere, vel ovem vel 'capram tondere vel paſcere. Quid igitur eſt? Unum 'pro his omnibus norunt. Sapientiam percolunt, tam 'magiſtri ſenes quàm diſcipuli minores. Nec quidquam apud illos æque laudo quàm quod torporem 'animi & otium oderunt. Igitur ubi menſa poſita, 'priuſquam edulia apponantur, omnes adoleſcentes ex 'diverſis locis & officiis ad dapem conveniunt. Magiſtri perrogant, quod factum à lucis ortu ad illud diei 'bonum fecerit. Hic alius ſe commemorat inter duos 'arbitrum delectum, ſanata ſimultate, reconciliata gratia, purgata ſuſpicione, amicos ex infenſis reddidiſſe: 'inde alius, ſeſe parentibus quidpiam imperantibus, 'obediſſe: & alius, aliquid meditatione ſua reperiſſe, 'vel alterius demonſtratione didiciſſe. Denique ceteri 'commemorant. Qui nihil habet adferre cur prandeat, 'impranſus ad opus foras extruditur. —— *There is alſo, 'among the Indians, an excellent kind of philoſophers, 'called Gymnoſophiſts. Thoſe I particularly admire 'for their skill, not in cultivating the vine, not in inoculating trees, nor in ploughing the ground; for indeed 'they are ignorant of agriculture, of managing the houſe, 'of taming the bull, of ſheering or feeding the ſheep, or 'goat: what is it for then? One thing they know 'worth all this: they cultivate wiſdom, both the old 'that teach, and the young that learn. Nor is there 'any thing more commendable in them, than that they 'hate all manner of ſloth and idleneſs. When therefore the table is ſpread, before the repaſt is ſet before 'them, all the youth aſſemble from diverſe places and 'employs. The maſters examine what good action each 'has done ſince day-break to that time. Here one relates, that, being choſen umpire between two, he had 'reconciled and made them friends: another, that he 'obeyed ſome order of his parents; a third, that he had 'found out ſomething by his own meditation, or learnt 'ſomething from another. He, who can give no good 'account of himſelf, is ſent back to his work, without a 'dinner.'*

(18) Apul. Floridor lib. i, circa init. pag. m. 343.

[*F*] *We have ſeen . . . . their patience in being a long while in the ſame poſture*] Beſides what has already been related upon that ſubject in the remark [*A*] of the article BRACHMANS, I ſhall ſay here, that that hard conſtraint was not unuſual even among the Greek philoſophers. Socrates put himſelf ſometimes to that trial, in order to lay in a good proviſion of patience for neceſſities to come. 'Stare ſolitus Socrates dicitur pertinaci ſtatu perdius & pernox, a ſummo lucis ortu ad ſolem alterum orientem, inconnivens, immobilis, iiſdem in veſtigiis, & ore atque oculis eumdem in locum directis, cogitabundus (19). '——— *Socrates is ſaid to have ſtood, from ſunriſe to ſun-ſet, in one poſture, without winking, and 'with his eyes directed to one and the ſame place, in profound meditation.'* We ſhould look upon this as a piece of folly. I have heard people mention, as a great ſign of ſoftneſs and ſtupidity, the cuſtom, a certain monarch had, towards the beginning of the XVIIth century, to leave his hat juſt as thoſe, who dreſſed him, ſet it upon his head. But let us remark, that there can hardly be a more inſupportable puniſhment, than the being condemned to keep all one's life-time in the ſame poſture. That, which we look upon as moſt convenient, I mean, ſitting, would cruelly fatigue at the long run (20).

(19) Aul. Gell. lib. ii, cap. i.

(20) *See Virgil's Commentators on theſe words of the ſixth book of the* Æneid.
Sedet æternumque ſedebit
Infelix Theſeus.
See particularly Mr du Rondel. Diſſert. upon the Chenix, pag. 96, & ſeq.

[*G*] *The tranſmigration of ſouls inſpired them with a great indifference for life or death.*] To this relates what Trajan ſaid of the Getæ (21), that they were the moſt warlike of all men, not only by reaſon of the ſtrength of their bodies, but alſo becauſe of the opinion, which Zamolxis had perſuaded them of: for, as they looked upon death only as a change of habitation, they prepared themſelves more eaſily to die, than to undertake a journey. This is ſufficient to cover Chriſtians with ſhame, in whom, generally ſpeaking, the near hopes of heaven cannot extinguiſh the immenſe love they have for life.

(21) Apud Julianum in Cæſar.

[*H*] *Porphyry anſwers pertinently to thoſe, who objected,* what would become of the world, if all men lived as the Brachmans did?] He could not fail to commend thoſe Indian philoſophers in his book of abſtinence, ſince they practiſed ſo well what he taught. He makes (22) a very advantageous deſcription of their frugality, good morals, and contempt of life. As to the objection of the worldlings, he confutes it after the ſame manner as Pythagoras has done. If all men, ſays he, became kings, human life would be ſtrangely troubleſome: muſt men therefore renounce being kings? And if all men followed virtue, they would ever continue in public employments; for thoſe that ſhould be poſſeſſed of them, ought never to forfeit that recompence of their probity: nevertheleſs, no body is ſo fooliſh as to pretend, that it is not the duty of all men to tread chearfully in the paths of virtue. There are ſeveral things, which the laws tolerate in the people, and which would not be allowed in a philoſopher.

(22) Lib. iv, de Abſtin.

The

The laws do not forbid the people to divert themſelves with women of pleaſure, or to ſpend their time in taverns; but they account the keeping of ſuch company, and ſuch a kind of life, to be ſcandalous, even in perſons of moderate probity. Therefore what is ſuffered in the common people, is not to be allowed in the virtuous: a philoſopher ought to preſcribe to himſelf the holy laws which the gods, and the miniſters of the gods, have eſtabliſhed. Theſe maxims of Porphyry may ſerve thoſe, who preſs the obſervation of the ſtricteſt morals, and who recommend ſo much celibacy. What would become of the world, ſay we to them, if every body followed your advice? Do not trouble yourſelf about that, may they anſwer (23); ſew people will take us at our word. The Anabaptiſts make good uſe of the like anſwer, touching their condemning the holding places of magiſtracy: they know well enough, that maſters will never be wanting; and that, let their cenſures and exhortations be never ſo pathetic, there will ever be more competitors than employments. This puts me in mind of a divine of the church of England, whom ſome endeavoured to perſuade, that the tenet of paſſive obedience ought to be renounced, as entirely oppoſite to the public good: Never fear, anſwered he, that the people will thereby be more apt to ſuffer themſelves to be oppreſſed: for, as you do not fear, by preaching warmly againſt revenge, to expoſe thereby your neighbour to inſults, for you know well enough, that, for all your ſermons, he will take care that his inſenſibility of a box on the ear does not draw more affronts upon him; ſo, *&c.* Note, that Porphyry thought, *that the laws do not forbid the people, &c.* may be confirmed by this paſſage of Cicero (24). 'Aliter leges aliter philoſophi tollunt aſtutias: leges quatenus tenere manu res poſſunt: philoſophi quatenus ratione & intelligentia. —— *The laws provide againſt fraudulent practices one way, the philoſophers another; the laws, ſo far only as the hand can reach; the philoſophers, as far as reaſon and underſtanding extend.*' And by this paſſage of Seneca (25): 'Quam anguſta innocentia eſt ad legem bonum eſſe? quanto latius officiorum patet quàm juris regula? quam multa pietas, humanitas, liberalitas, juſtitia, fides exigunt? quæ omnia extra publicas tabulas ſunt. ——. *How confined an innocence is it to be good only in the eye of the law? how much farther does the rule of duty extend, than that of law? how many things do piety, humanity, liberality, juſtice, fidelity, require; all which are without the written law?*' See Grotius, in the tenth chapter of the third book, *De Jure Belli & Pacis.*

For the reſt, the thought of St Auguſtin, which I point out in the margin (26), puts me in mind of a philoſopher. 'Your philoſopher, *ſays he* (27), is not over-wiſe, when he deſigns to marry, to propagate his race in France. If he was of the race of emperors and ſovereigns, I would not hinder it for any thing in the world. What! Does N. fear the world ſhould fail? If it failed in him, it could never end more gloriouſly. Let a courtier, a magiſtrate, or a mechanic, marry with my conſent: but that a philoſopher ſhould take upon him the charge of a wife and children, nay, a philoſopher of the family of Zeno, is a ſort of prodigy, which deſerves more to be expiated, than that of the cows that ſpoke, and ſaid formerly, with a dreadful voice, *Rome look to thyſelf.*'

(23) *See Mr Baillet, in the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, Dec. 1686 pag. 1435. *There is another anſwer of St Auguſtin, in the author of the* Nouvelles Lettres contre l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſme de Maimbourg, pag. 767.

(24) Cicero, de Offic. lib. iii, cap. xvii.

(25) Seneca, de Ira, lib. ii, cap. xxvii.

(26) *Citat.* (23).

(27) Cotin, Oeuvres Galantes, Tom. I, pag. m. 275.

H.

HACKER (*a*) (JAMES), was profeſſor of divinity at Friburg in Briſgaw, about the beginning of the XVIIth century. I only ſpeak of him, to have occaſion to diſcover a pſeudonymous writer [*A*], who has not yet been mentioned that I know of, in the catalogues of this kind of authors.

(*a*) *And not Hacler, as in Konig.*

[*A*] *I only ſpeak of him, to diſcover a pſeudonymous writer.*] Hacker having publiſhed (1) a diſpute about predeſtination, was anſwered by a monk of Mantua, under the falſe name of Daniel Neidinger. He defended himſelf, in a reply, with this title, *Diſputationis de Prædeſtinationis cauſa falſo & ementito authore Dan. Neidingero, vero autem & germano ejus fabro Fr. Andr. Urciano Ord. Min. Obſ. reg. in urbe Mantuana nuper editæ, & ibidem à tredecim diverſorum Ord. Fratribus & Patribus ſuſceptæ, in quatuor ex quibus coaluit, elementa, mendacia, hæreſes, antilogias, ſordes ſermonis, Analyſis. Autore J. Hackero.* Dorſcheus, profeſſor of divinity at Strasburg (2), makes uſe of this example, to ſhew that the Roman Catholics accuſe one another of Hereſy. He ſays, that this reply of Hacker was printed in 1618, but ſince it is put in the Oxford catalogue, printed at Friburg in 1614. I ſuppoſe the firſt edition was not known to him. The ſame catalogue mentions two volumes of James Hacker, on Thomas Aquinas. They were printed at Friburg, the firſt in 1619, and the ſecond in 1621. Mr Konig does not diſtinguiſh this, and gives the title wrong.

(1) *In the year 1609, according to the catalogue of the Bodleian library.*

(2) Dorſcheus, in Hodegetico Catholico. cap x, pag. 868, 869.

HACKET (WILLIAM), and Engliſh Fanatic in the XVIth century, was firſt ſervant to one Mr Huſſey, and expreſſed his fidelity to him by an action perfectly brutal [*A*]. He afterwards married a rich widow, and ruined her in a little time by his luxurious expences. He had never ſtudied, but had a great memory, which he abuſed in repeating the miniſters ſermons over his cups. This he did only to laugh at them, and had no deſign in hearing ſermons, but to furniſh his memory for this ridiculous exerciſe. He was a very great lover of wine and women; and he corrupted a maid who came to his houſe to aſk his advice (*a*). He robbed alſo upon the highway. At laſt he ſet up for a prophet, and declared, I. That England ſhould feel the ſcourges of famine, peſtilence, and war, unleſs it eſtabliſhed the conſiſtorial diſcipline: II. That for the future their ſhould be no more Popes. He named the time of this deſolation of England, which, according to him, was to be the ſame year he threatened it. He began to propheſy at York and Lincoln, where, in puniſhment of his boldneſs, he was publickly whipped, and condemned to be baniſhed. He had a wonderful fluency in extemporary prayer; and had choice and very pompous phraſes, and this made the people believe it was an extraordinary gift of the HOLY GHOST. He had a very great confidence in his prayers [*B*]; for he ſaid, that if all England ſhould pray for rain,

(*a*) Potator ſcortatorque fuit enormis, virginiſque quæ ad eum conſilii cauſa acceſſit conſtuprator. *Fitz Simon, in Britannomachia Miniſtrorum, &c.* See citation (*e*).

[*A*] *He expreſſed his fidelity to his maſter by an action perfectly brutal.*] A tradeſman of Oundle in Northamptonſhire, did ſomething that cauſed an enmity betwixt him and a gentleman who had Hacket in his ſervice. Obſerve how this ſervant revenged his maſter. He familiarly and friendly accoſted this tradeſman's ſon (1), and was received in the ſame manner: then ſuddenly took him by the throat, threw him down, and bit off his noſe, and inſtead of returning it to the ſurgeon, who pretended to ſet it on again, eat it; *eique naſum dentibus evulſit, nec chirurgo volenti reſtituere tradidit, ſed* (*ut fertur*) *barbara immanitate devoravit* (2). Cambden does not relate this fact with the ſame circumſtances. He ſays, that Hacket embracing the ſchool-maſter, in ſign of reconciliation, bit a piece of his noſe off, and that it was the ſcool-maſter who deſired him to reſtore it, that it might be ſewed on while the wound was freſh. *Ad vindictam adeo efferus* (Hacquetus) *ut ingenuo Ludimagiſtro, dum redintegrati amoris ſpecie amplecteretur, naſum mordicus abſciderit, & coram miſero deformi ſupplicante ut redderet, quo vulnere adhuc recente aſſueretur, canine ut ferutn* (3) *devoraverit* (4). The variety of theſe circumſtances is not ſuch, as that we may conclude from thence, that the fact is falſe; we may only obſerve therein a ſign of the lazineſs or infirmity of a man's memory. They that hear a ſtory, attend principally to the main point and eſſence of the fact, and this they beſt retain; but not having the ſame attention to all the circumſtances, for that would be too troubleſome, they forget many of them: They are not at the trouble of loading their memory with them, which beſides is not ſtrong enough to bear all the parts of the burden, and thus ſome hours or days after, if they would tell the ſame ſtory, they are forced to ſupply the circumſtances they have loſt. Every one makes this ſupplement according to the particular character of his genius; and hence come infinite variations, which creep even into the very accounts of hiſtorians.

[*B*] *He had a very great confidence in his prayers.*] Thou haſt the power, ſaid he, to GOD, and I have the faith, therefore the thing ſhall be done. He uſed imprecations, in his prayers, againſt himſelf, and pretended that the efficacy of his imprecations was certain. He boaſted, that in diſputing with a papiſt, he propoſed to him this condition; *I ſubmit inſtantly to eternal damnation* (5), *do you do ſo too, and one of us ſhall change his religion, according to the unhappy or happy ſucceſs of our imprecation.* This was very abſurd; for the effect of the imprecation was to be the ſudden death of one or the other, and conſequently, neither of them could change his opinion. The dead man could not do it, and the ſurviver would have been far from doing it, ſince the bad ſucceſs of his adverſary's imprecation, had given ſo authentic a teſtimony to his religion. But it muſt not be expected, that ſuch extravagant viſionaries ſhould avoid contradictions. Hacket having accuſed too great lords of treaſon, propoſed to them a like form of prayer (6): for this was the name he gave his execratory oath. If after you have done it, ſays he, you do not die, I will ſubmit to the *lex talionis*. But if you refuſe to do it, and I do it, without any harm, you ſhall be condemned to loſe your head. The judges ſent him away as a mad man.

He impoſed on abundance of people by this ſort of prayer, and perſuaded them, that for the ſins of men,

(1) *He was ſchoolmaſter of the place.*

(2) Henry Fitz Simon, Britannom. Miniſtror. cap. vi, lib. ii, pag. 202, 203.

(3) Note, *That Fitz Simon uſes the ſame reſerve, he ſays, it is ſaid,* fertur.

(4) Camden's Annals, Part. IV, ann. 1591, pag. 618.

(5) Æternæ damnationi è veſtigio ſubeundæ. *Fitz Simon, ibid. pag.* 203.

(6) Ad ſimilem quoque (ut dicebat) orandi modum duos procerum quibus noxam perduellionis objecit provocavit. *Id. ibid pag.* 204.

rain, and he ſhould pray to the contrary, it ſhould not rain. Edmund Coppinger, and Henry Arthington, two perſons of ſome learning, joined with him: The firſt by the title of the *prophet of mercy*; and the ſecond by the title of the *prophet of judgment*. Arthington gave out, that they had an extraordinary miſſion, and that next to JESUS CHRIST, none upon earth had greater power than William Hacket. Coppinger declared, that Hacket was the ſole monarch of Europe. They afterwards went farther, and equalled him in all things to JESUS CHRIST, without being oppoſed by Hacket; for he ſaid in his prayers, *Father, I know thou loveſt me equal with thyſelf* (*b*). They would have proceeded to the ceremony of unction, but he would not ſuffer them, being already anointed, he ſaid, by the HOLY GHOST in heaven. They aſked him at laſt, what he had to command them, and proteſted they would pay him an obedience without reſerve. He ordered them to go and proclaim through all the ſtreets of London, that JESUS CHRIST was come to judge the world, and lodged in ſuch an inn, and that no body could put him to death. They obeyed with ſo much haſte, that Arthington had not time to take his gloves. They added this to their maſter's inſtructions, *England repent, repent*. They drew together, by their bawling, ſuch a concourſe of people, that being come to Cheapſide, they could go no farther, nor be heard; but finding an empty cart, they mounted upon it, and diſcourſed of the important commiſſion of William Hacket [*C*]. They returned to him, and, when they ſaw him, Arthington cried out to the people, *Behold the king of the earth*. This happened the ſixteenth of July 1592 (*c*). They were proſecuted and tried. Hacket was ſentenced to be hanged and quartered the twenty eighth of July, and the ſentence was accordingly executed. Coppinger famiſhed himſelf in priſon: but Arthington was pardoned (*d*). The blaſphemies contained in the prayer that Hacket made upon the ſcaffold, are ſo horrid, that I ſhall only relate them in Latin (*e*) [*D*]. We ſhall ſee, in the remarks, ſome particulars of his fanaticiſm, complicated with rebellion. He was filled with hatred againſt queen Elizabeth [*E*]. The truth of this ought not to be queſtioned, on pretence that I have it from the book of a Jeſuit; for Camden's annals, contain moſt of theſe facts, and even with greater force.

men, the devils and witches had for two months, inflicted on him the very pains of hell, or within a little of them (7). Camden ſays, that by ſwearing by his eternal damnation, and with the moſt execrable imprecations, he ſeduced Coppinger and Arthington, and made them believe he frequently converſed with GOD, and that the devil had ſtigmatized him. His frequent and moſt fervent prayers, the outward ſhew of an holy life, and the cuſtom of faſting every Sunday, contributed to perſuade them of the ſame things (8). Poor human reaſon, how great are thy errors, and how great is their efficacy!

[*C*] *Coppinger and Arthington diſcourſed of the important commiſſion of William Hacket.*] They ſaid, that he partook of the nature of glorified bodies, and was to convert all Europe to the conſiſtorial diſcipline; and that the power of judgment was committed to him. They added, that ſuch as deſired to ſee him, ſhould find him in ſuch an houſe, and we foretel, that all who refuſe to obey this king of all Europe, ſhall kill one another, and that the queen ſhall be dethroned (9). Before they made this extravagant ſally, they went to a puritan miniſter, called Wigginton, and proteſted to him, that the night before, JESUS CHRIST appeared to them, not in body, but by his principal ſpirit, by which he dwelt in William Hacket, with greater fulneſs than in any other, and that Hacket was the angel who was to come before the end of the world, with a fan and crook in his hand, to ſeparate the goats from the ſheep: that he was to trample Satan under his feet, and totally overturn the kingdom of Antichriſt (10). The day they went to preach up this new kingdom through the ſtreets of London, Hacket commanded them to ſay, that JESUS CHRIST was come, with his fan in his hand, to judge the world, and that this was as true, as that GOD was in heaven. They punctually diſcharged their commiſſion, and when they were on the cart, they declared, that Hacket, already glorified as to his body, participated of JESUS CHRIT by his principal ſpirit, and that he was there with the fan to eſtabliſh the goſpel in Europe.

[*D*] *He ſpoke blaſphemies . . . . . which I ſhall only relate in Latin.*] They exceed thoſe of Caligula (11), and yet they were the concluſion to a moſt devout prayer, whence we may infer, that there is nothing ſo extravagant of which the heart of man is not capable. '*Hæc fuit ultima ejus oratio.* Deus cœli, 'Potentiſſime Jehovah, Alpha & Omega, Domine 'Dominorum, Rex Regum, æterne Deus. Tu me 'noſtri verum iſtum Jehovah quem miſiſti. Miraculum aliquod ex nubibus oſtende his infidelibus, & 'libera me ab his inimicis meis. Sin minus cœlos 'ſuccendam, & te è throno detractum manibus meis 'lacerabo (12).' Camden having related the ſame blaſphemies, almoſt in the ſame words, adds, that Hacket pronounced others ſtill more execrable, *Aliaque magis infanda. Converſus ad carnificem laqueum admoventem*, Tune ſpurie, *inquit*, Hackettum Regem tuum ſuſpendes? *Laqueo innodatus oculis in cœlum ſublatis*, Hoccine, *inquit frendens*, pro regno collato rependis? venio ulturus (13). This hiſtorian obſerves, that this enthuſiaſt and his two companions, did not take their hats off before their judges, and impudently anſwered, they were above the magiſtrates; that afterwards, Hacket owned himſelf guilty (14), but anſwered in ſo blaſphemous a manner as made all that heard him tremble. There was in this perhaps a good deal of fraud; for who knows but that he had a mind to make his judges believe, that he was diſtracted. However, his other geſtures, and affected gravity, ſhewed no ſign of madneſs (15). This we have from Camden. Note, that Arthington repented, and even printed a book to teſtify his repentance (16).

[*E*] *He was filled with hatred againſt queen Elizabeth.*] He would never pray for her; and his deſign was to rob her of her crown and life, and change the whole form of the government. He heard the ſermon bare-headed, but he put on his hat when he perceived that the queen was mentioned in the prayers (17). He confeſſed to the judges before whom he was tried, that he had ſtabbed the effigies of this princeſs to the heart, with an iron pin; and that he never owned her for queen. *Julii 20 & 23. palam confeſſus eſt Hackettus Regine imaginem ſe transfixiſſe ad cor ſtylo ferreo, eamque pro Regina non habuiſſe* (18). A little before he was hanged, he curſed her with all manner of imprecations (19).

(*b*) Pater; ſcio te non minus teipſo me diligere. *Id. ibid.*

(*c*) *Camden relates this under the year* 1591.

(*d*) *See the remark* [D], *at the end.*

(*e*) *Taken from the ſixth chapter of the ſecond book of the* Britannomachia Miniſtrorum *of Henry Fitz Simon, who cites the account which Bancroft (afterwards archbiſhop of Canterbury) publiſhed of this buſineſs at London*, 1592, *intituled*, A Survey of the pretended Diſcipline, &c.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) Camden, Annal. Part. IV, pag. m. 619, ad ann. 1591.

(9) Fitz Simon, ubi ſupra, pag. 205.

(10) Camden, ubi ſupra, pag. 620.

(11) *See, above, the remark* [F], *in the article* CALIGULA.

(12) Fitz Simon, ubi ſupra, pag. 205, 206.

(13) Camden, ubi ſupra, pag. 622.

(14) Se reum agnovit. *Id. ibid.*

(15) Id ibid.

(16) Id. ibid. pag. 623.

(17) Fitz Simon, ubi ſupra, pag. 204.

(18) Id. ibid. pag. 205.

(19) Diris omnibus reginam devovit. *Id. ibid.*

HADRIAN (Publius Ælius), a Roman emperor, would furniſh a very long article, ſhould we omit nothing of his principal qualities and actions. I muſt content myſelf with ſome of them, and repeat as little as may be, what we find in Moreri's Dictionary, in which this article is not very full of faults [*A*].

Hadrian was born at Rome the twenty fourth of January, 76 [*B*], loſt his father ten years after [*C*], and had, for his guardians, Trajan, his relation [*D*], and Cælius Tatianus a Roman knight. His genius ſo enclined him to the ſtudy of the Greek tongue, that it expoſed him to ſeveral railleries (*a*). He ſerved early in the armies, and was tribune of a legion before the death of Domitian. The army of the lower Mœſia choſe him (*b*) to compliment Trajan, adopted by the emperor Nerva, and it was he that brought Trajan the firſt news of Nerva's death. He regained the favour of this emperor, which he had almoſt loſt by his exceſſive expences, which had brought him into debt. He married (*c*), a grand niece (*d*) of this prince [*E*], and he had in the empreſs a great patroneſs (*e*). The ſpeech which he made before the ſenate when he was quæſtor (*f*), was ſo unpoliſhed, that he was hiſſed for it: upon which he applied himſelf hard to the ſtudy of the Latin tongue, and became very well ſkilled in it, and very eloquent. He attended Trajan in the expedition againſt the Daci (*g*); and to make his court effectually to him, he drank ſtoutly, and was nobly rewarded for it. He had been tribune of the people (*h*), before he went with Trajan to the ſecond Dacian war. He did ſome noble actions there, and received a preſent, which gave him ſome hopes of ſucceeding to the empire (*i*). He was made prætor ſome time after, and afterwards commanded

(*a*) Imbutuſque impenſius Græcis ſtudiis, ingenio ejus ſic ad ea declinante ut à nonnullis Græculus diceretur. - - - - *He was very well acquainted with the Greek learning, his genius inclining that way to ſuch a degree, that he was by ſome nick-named Græculus.* Spartian, in ejus Vita.

(*b*) *In* 97.

(*c*) *In the year* 100.

(*d*) *SABINA. See her article.*

(*e*) *See the article PLOTINA.*

(*f*) *In the year* 101.

(*g*) *In* 101, *or* 102.

(*h*) *In* 105.

(*i*) Adamante gemma quam Trajanus à Nerva acceperat donatus ad ſpem ſucceſſionis erectus eſt. - - - *Having got a preſent of a diamond, which Trajan had received from Nerva, he conceived hopes ſucceeding to the empire.* Spartian. ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *In Moreri this article is not very full of faults.*] It is one of the beſt. I have however obſerved, without entring into a general diſcuſſion, ten or twelve things which I think cannot be proved. I. That there was in Italy, a city called Italica. II. That Hadrian rebuilt Adria. III. That upon his return from England, he heard in Languedoc of Plotina's death. IV. That he built a temple at Niſmes to her. V. That Quadratus and Ariſtides were aſſiſted by Severus, one of the emperor's lieutenants, *when they preſented books in favour of the Chriſtian religion.* VI. That Jeruſalem and Ælia were two different cities in Judæa. VII. That Plutarch was Hadrian's tutor. VIII. That Hadrian recalled Epictetus, Numenius, and other learned men to Rome. IX. That he ſent others to Alexandria, to teach the ſciences there, before he went himſelf to that city. X. That he underſtood the mathematics, and wrote tracts of them. XI. That he died the twelfth of July, in the year 138, having reigned twenty years, ten months, and twenty nine days. XII. That Phavorinus was his ſecretary. We ſee, in my article, that Hadrian, died the tenth of July, and began his reign on the eleventh of Auguſt. If he had died the twelfth of July, it muſt have been ſaid, that he reigned twenty years, eleven months, and one day. Let it be obſerved, that I will not deny that he received a letter from Serenius Granius, proconſul of Aſia, exhorting him to equity towards the Chriſtians, and that he ſtudied geometry. Spartian ſays it expreſsly (1), and Mr Moreri has done well to ſay ſo too; but beſides this, he makes mention of mathematics. They that deceived him, did not know, that *matheſis*, in Spartian, ſignifies only *aſtrology*. 'Matheſin ſic ſcire ſibi viſus eſt, ut ſero 'Calendis Januariis ſcripſerit quid ei toto anno poſſet 'evenire. —— *He imagined that he underſtood aſtrology 'ſo well, that in the evening of the firſt of January, 'he wrote down whatever ſhould befal him, thro' the 'whole year.*' I paſs over what Mr Moreri ſays, concerning Hadrian's memory; he exaggerates the matter. *He had*, ſays he, *ſo happy a memory, that he knew the names of places and rivers where he had paſſed, and even of all the ſoldiers of his armies.* This idea exceeds what Aurelius Victor gives us in theſe words: 'Memor ſupra quam cuiquam credible eſt, locos, negotia, 'milites abſentes quoque nominibus recenſere. —— '*He had an incredible memory; and could name particularly places, affairs; and even the abſent ſoldiers*:' Spartian is ſtill more particular but yet falls ſhort of Moreri. 'Nominina plurimis ſine nomenclatore 'reddidit quæ ſemel & congeſta ſimul audiverat, ut 'nomenclatores ſæpius errantes emendaverit. Dixit '& veteranorum nomina quos aliquando dimiſerat: 'libros ſtatim lectos & ignotos quidem plurimis memoriter reddidit; uno tempore ſcripſit, dictavit, audivit, & cum amicis fabulatus eſt (2). ——— *He called 'many by their names, without the aſſiſtance of the roll, 'tho' he had only heard them once named; and without any order, ſo that he frequently corrected the miſtakes of the men who read the names. He could likewiſe repeat the names of the veterans, whom he had at 'any time diſmiſſed. He recited books which had been 'juſt before read to him, and even ſuch as he was a 'ſtranger to, before a great many people: he all at once 'wrote, dictated, heard, and converſed with his friends.*'

[*B*] *Hadrian was born at Rome January 24, 76.*] What makes me believe that Eutropius is miſtaken in ſaying, that Hadrian was born at Italica, is the account Spartian gives us of this emperor's family. He obſerves, that Hadrian's anceſtors, originally of Adria in Italy, ſettled at Italica in Spain, in the time of the Scipio's *&c.* He cites Hadrian himſelf, who had thus written in the hiſtory of his life. Doubtleſs Spartian had read in the ſame book, what he adds at the ſame time, that Hadrian was born at Rome IX. Kal. Feb. in the ſeventh conſulſhip of Veſpaſian, and the fifth of Titus.

[*C*] *Loſt his father ten years after.*] His name was Ælius Hadrianus Afer. It is conjectured, that the government of Africa gave him the ſirname of Afer, and that he ought not to be diſtinguiſhed from the preſident Hadrianus, in Veſpaſian's reign, who put to death the holy martyr Leontius, at Tripoli. The acts of this martyrdom, inſerted in Metaphraſtus's collection, ſay, that the preſident Hadrianus, who in perſon judged Leontius, was a ſenator. Now Suidas obſerves, that the emperor Hadrian's father was a ſenator, and that he had been prætor. Theſe grounds of Mr Triſtan's conjecture, are reaſonable enough. (3) I do not know why Caſaubon (4) has found fault with theſe words of Xiphilin; ἦν δὲ Ἀδριανὸς γένος μὲν Ἀδριανοῦ Ἄφρου υἱός; for after all the ſtir that is made, it muſt be owned, that theſe words may ſignify, that Hadrian was the ſon of Hadrian Afer. This is doubtleſs their true and natural ſignification, as Salmaſius (5) declares. So that one would be much to blame to cenſure Xiphilin for corrupting Hadrian's genealogy, in his abridgment of Dion, and making an African family of a Spaniſh. It is true, Cedrenus, miſtaking Xiphilin's meaning, fell into a groſs error, in ſaying, that the emperor Hadrian was of African extraction. Let us not forget, that Domitia Paulina, Hadrian's mother, was born at Cadiz (6).

[*D*] *Trajan, his relation.*] Hadrian's father, was couſin-german to Trajan; for he was ſon of Ulpia, ſiſter to Marcus Ulpius Trajan, the emperor Trajan's father. See Caſaubon in his commentary upon Spartian. The relation was not ſo near, according to Eutropius, who ſays, that Hadrian's mother was couſin to Trajan (7).

[*E*] *He married a grand niece of this prince.*] I ſhall ſay ſomewhere elſe, who ſhe was, and how ſhe ſucceeded in her marriage. It ſuffices to ſay here, that they who affirm (8), that Hadrian was married to Trajan's daughter, are miſtaken. It does not appear that Trajan had any children, or that Hadrian had any wife beſides Sabina, daughter of a niece of Trajan. The author of the chronicle of Alexandria, has given us a pleaſant chimera, *viz.* that the emperor Hadrina married the daughter of that Aquila, who made a verſion of the Bible.

(1) *This ought to be underſtood only of the ſtudy of geometry.*

(2) Spart. in Hadr.

(3) Hiſtorical Comment. Tom. I, pag. 456.

(4) In Spartian. pag. m. 7.

(5) In Spartian. ibid.

(6) *Gadibus orta.* Spartian. in Vita Adriani.

(7) Eum Trajanus quamquam conſobrinæ filium vivens noluerat adoptare. — *Trajan would not adopt him in his life-time, though he was ſon to his couſin-german.*

(8) Conſtantinus Manaſſes, Glycas, J. Tzetzes, *cited by Triſtan,* ubi ſupra, p. 454.

commanded in the lower Pannonia, with ſo good a conduct, as procured him the conſulſhip (k). The orations he compoſed for Trajan, increaſed his intereſt with him [F]. After the raiſing of the ſiege of Atra in Arabia, Trajan being ſick, and reſolved to return to Rome, left him the command of the army. He had before given him the government of Syria; and finding himſelf near his end, adopted him (l). We examine, in the article of PLOTINA (m), whether this adoption was fictitious. What is certain, is, that Hadrian receiving, at Antioch, almoſt at the ſame time, the news of his adoption, and of the death of Trajan, cauſed himſelf to be declared emperor the eleventh of Auguſt 117. One of the firſt things he did, was to abandon almoſt all the conqueſts of Trajan, and to be contented that the Euphrates ſhould be the boundary of the empire [G]. He did not return to Rome till the year 118. The ſenate decreed him a triumph, and the title of father of the country (n), but he refuſed it, and would have the triumph given to the ſtatue of Trajan. His munificence to the people was very extraordinary [H]. The year following he went into Mœſia, to repulſe the *Sarmatæ* (o). During his abſence, many perſons of the greateſt merit were put to death (p); and he in vain proteſted that it was not by his orders, he was nevertheleſs loaded with all the odium of theſe violences. Never prince travelled ſo much as he; there being hardly a province in

bible St Epiphanius ſeems to ſay the ſame thing (9). Triſtan (10) charges this Alexanderian chronicler with ſaying, that, according to Epiphanius, Hadrian was a Greek by nation, and came from Sinope. It is abſolutely falſe, that Epiphanius ſays it, he ſays, only, that he came from Aquila.

[F] *The orations he compoſed for Trajan increaſed his intereſt with him.*] I will cite Spartian's words; *Defuncto quidem Sura, Trajani ei* (Adriano) *familiaritas crevit, cauſa præcipuè orationum quas pro imperatore dictaverat.* Caſaubon applies this *dictaverat* to Sura, which at firſt ſight ſeems to make the hiſtorian's argument a lamentable one; for what reaſoning is this. *After Sura's death, Hadrian's familiarity with Trajan encreaſed, eſpecially on account of the orations that Sura had made for Trajan.* But if we examine it more ſtrictly we ſhall find, that, according to Caſaubon's ſenſe, there is only a want of clearneſs in Spartian's expreſſion. The later meant not that the ſame harangues numerically, that Sura had compoſed, increaſed Hadrian's favour, he ſpeaks only of harangues, like thoſe of of Sura. Therefore Caſaubon's interpretation, does not really differ from Salmaſius's which is very good. The ſenſe of which is this: *Hadrian got farther into Trajan's friendſhip by doing him the ſame ſervices that Sura had done, in compoſing ſpeeches.* I would not with Salmaſius, change the text, nor ſuppoſe with him, that Plotina's favour was neceſſary to Hadrian, to obtain from the emperor the honour of making his ſpeeches. This poſt was not conſiderable enough, with reſpect to Hadrian, that he could not obtain it, without interceſſion. There have been mere maſters of rhetoric employed in it, witneſs this paſſage of Spartian (11). 'Ælius 'Orationem pulcherrimam quæ hodieque legitur, ſive 'per ſe, ſive per ſcriniorum aut DICENDI MAGISTROS paraſſet. —— *Ælius prepared a beautiful 'oration, which is ſtill extant, and was either compoſed by himſelf, or by his ſecretaries or rhetoricians.*' Domitian employed others to compoſe his letters, ſpeeches, and edicts (12). It was not Nero but Seneca, who compoſed Claudius's funeral oration, which Claudius recited (13). It is true, that the old men, being great makers of compariſons betwixt the paſt and preſent times, amuſed themſelves with obſerving, that before Nero, no prince had need of a borrowed eloquence: as we are told by Tacitus, in the third chapter of the thirteenth book of his annals. *Adnotabant ſeniores, quibus otioſum eſt vetera & præſentia contendere, primum ex iis qui rerum potiti eſſent Neronem alienæ facundiæ eguiſſe.* Mr Spanheim obſerves, that the Roman emperors, ſometimes *imployed their quæſtors, not only in compoſing, but alſo in ſpeaking for them their orations, as Suetonius, amongſt others, obſerves of Nero, and even of Auguſtus* (14). For the reſt, if we believe the emperor Julian (15), it was not from ignorance, but lazineſs, that Trajan made uſe of Sura.

[G] *He was contented that the Euphrates ſhould be the boundary of the empire.*] St Auguſtin has made uſe of this action of Hadrian, to jeer the idolaters, who ſaid, the god Terminus would not even give place to Jupiter himſelf, at the building of the capitol, which was a preſage, that the limits of the Roman empire ſhould never ſhrink. 'Your god Terminus, ſays 'St Auguſtin pleaſantly to them (16), ſtood in greater 'fear of Hadrian, king of men, than of Jupiter king of the gods. 'Poſtea in orientalibus partibus 'Hadriani voluntate mutati ſunt termini imperii Romani. Ille namque tres provincias nobiles Armeniam, Meſopotamiam, Aſſyriam Perſarum conceſſit imperio, ut Deus ille Terminus qui Romanos terminos 'ſecundum illos tuebatur, & per illud pulcherrimum 'auſpicium loco non ceſſerat Jovi, plus Hadrianum 'regem hominum quam regem deorum timuiſſe videatur —— *Afterward, at the command of Hadrian, the 'boundaries of the empire were changed in the Eaſt; for 'he yielded to the Perſians three great provinces, Armenia, Meſopotamia, and Aſſyria; ſo and that the god Terminus, who, as they imagine, takes care of the Roman 'boundaries; and who, by an auſpicious preſage, had not 'given place to Jupiter, ſeems to have been more afraid of Hadrian, king of men, than of the king of the Gods.*' There is no probability, that the abandoning theſe conqueſts was the effect of any envy Hadrian had to Trajan (17). For what greater honour could be done to the memory of the late emperor, than to ſhew, that things could not be maintained in the ſame height to which he had raiſed them? we muſt ſay then, that the impoſſibility of preſerving theſe conquered countries, induced Hadrian to this conceſſion. 'Omnia trans 'Euphratem ac Tigrim reliquit exemplo, ut dicebat, 'Catonis, qui Macedonas liberos pronunciavit quia teneri non poterant (18). —— *He abandoned all beyond 'the Euphrates, and the Tigris, after the example of 'Cato, ſaid he, who declared the Macedonians free, 'becauſe they could not be kept in ſubjection.* He choſe rather to ſuffer in the compariſon betwixt him and his predeceſſor, than expoſe his empire to the confuſions that threatened it on all ſides. Ammianus Marcellinus ſays, that before Jovian, no emperor, or conſul, gave up an inch of ground to the enemy. Mr Valois (19) pretends he had reaſon to ſay ſo, and that Caſaubon had no reaſon to criticiſe him for it (20).

[H] *His munificence was —— very extraordinary.*] 'It ſeems, that he remitted all that was due from 'private perſons in Rome and Italy, and in the provinces, whatever was owing for ſixteen years paſt, 'at leaſt in the imperial provinces; for Spartian, and 'an inſcription of this year 118, ſeem to confine it to 'theſe. . . . He burnt in Trajan's Forum, the bonds and 'accompts of all that he had remitted, that no body 'might fear being called to account for it, for the future '. . . This remiſſion amounted to immenſe ſums, and 'ſome learned men, who have reduced what the hiſtorians 'write of it, to the value of our money, make it riſe to 'twenty two millions five hundred thouſand crowns of 'gold. This liberality had no preſident before him; the 'memorial of it, is not only preſerved in hiſtorians, but 'alſo in famous inſcriptions of this year, and the following, in which perhaps it was perfected, and in medals, 'repreſenting Hadrian with a torch in his hand, ſetting fire to the obligations he had remitted.' I copy this from Mr Tillemont (21) in whoſe remarks may be ſeen an examination of many difficulties concerning this. I do not enter into them; but chooſe rather to make this reflexion, that there is no bonfire for a town taken, or a battle won, that can pleaſe the people ſo much as this of Hadrian. I have read ſomewhere, that the Venetian ambaſſador, burning before Henry IV, the papers in which he owned himſelf indebted for many ſums to that republic, this prince, who loved witty ſayings, in the empire which he did not honour with his preſence. And as he was magnificent, and deſired a perſonal knowledge of every thing, he every where left ſome marks of his liberality, and exactneſs in examining the conduct of the governors. It is ſuppoſed he began his travels in the year 120. He viſited Gaul, Germany, and Britain, where he built a wall to hinder the Iſlanders, under his obedience, from being ravaged by thoſe who had ſhaken off the Roman government. He returned into Gaul in the year 121, from whence he went to Spain; it is thought it was at that time, he went to Mauritania. His firſt journey to the eaſt was pretty long; for he did not return to Greece 'till the year 125. He paſſed the winter at Athens, and was initiated in the myſteries of Ceres. He was at Rome in the beginning of the year 129 (*q*); and it is believed he went into Africa the ſame year, and that, after his return to Rome, he ſet out again for the eaſt in the year 130. Having paſſed through Aſia, where many kings came to compliment him, he went into Egypt in the year 132. He ſpent the winter at Athens in 135, and the ſpring following came back to Rome. He adopted Lucius Aurelius Annius Ceionius Commodus Verus, who, though he had names enough already, took beſides, that of Ælius. After this adoption, Hadrian retired to Tibur, where he built ſumptuous edifices [*I*], and gave himſelf up to effeminacy, and then to cruelty; for he put many people to death, either by open violence, or clandeſtine ways, and ſpared not his own brother-in-law Servianus, though ninety years of age. Lucius Verus dying the firſt of January 138, Hadrian adopted Titus Antoninus, and charged him to adopt Marcus Annius Verus, and the ſon of Lucius Verus. This emperor's dropſy oppreſſed and vexed him to that degree, that he grew as it were raging mad [*K*]. All imaginable remedies were employed to cure him. The relief which the magical art gave him, laſted not long (*r*). Abundance of phyſicians were ſent for, and, ſome ſay, he attributed his death to them [*L*]. To deliver him from his deſpair, it was pretended to

---

(k) In 105.

(l) Ex Spartiano, in Hadriano.

(m) *Remark* [*G*].

(n) *He afterwards accepted of this title. See Tillemont, note 1, upon the Hiſtory of Adrian.*

(o) Spart. ubi ſupra.

(p) Id. ibid. Dion. lib. lxix.

(9) De Ponderib. & Menſ. cap. xiv, *where he ſays*, αὐτȣ̃ πενθερίδην. *Upon which Petavius makes this remark*: Quæ vox cum alibi à me lecta non fuerit, vel πενθερὸν ſignificat vel πενθερȣ̃ filium, affinem certè, nos *Socerum* reddidimus, quaſi πενθερὸν legeretur, quomodo Alexandrini Chronici ſcriptorem hic legiſſe ſuſpicor: nam pag. 508 ex hoc Epiphanii loco hiſtoriam Aquilæ Pontici referens, Ἀκύλας, inquit, ἐγνωρίζετο ὃς ἦν πενθερὸς Ἀδριανȣ̃ τȣ̃ βασιλέως.

(10) Comment. Hiſtor. pag. 455.

(11) In Vita Ælii Veri.

(12) Sueton. in ejus vita, cap. xx.

(13) Tacit. Ann. lib. xiii, cap. iii.

(14) *Spanheim, notes on the Cæſars of Julian*, pag. 232.

(15) In Cæſarib. *See Spanhemius's notes.*

(16) Auguſtin. de Civit. Dei, lib. iv, cap. xxix.

(17) *Eutropius*, ubi ſupra, pag. 90, *ſays, notwithſtanding*; Trajani gloriæ invidens, ſtatim provincias tres reliquit quas Trajanus addiderat. —— *Envying Trajan's glory, quickly abandoned the three provinces which Trajan had added to the empire.*

(18) Spartian. in Adriano.

(19) In Ammian. Marcellin. lib. 25, cap. ix, pag. 439.

(20) *See the remark* [*D*], *of the article* JOVIAN.

(21) Hiſtory of of the Emperors, Tom. II, pag. 408, 409 Bruſſels Edit. *He cites* Dion. lib. lxix, pag. 791. Spartian, in vita Adriani. *Father Mabillon's* Analecta, Tom. IV, pag. 484, 486. Onufr. in Faſtis, pag 220 Spanheim, de Numiſmat. pag. 811.

(*q*) Digeſtor. v, tit. 3. l. 20, pag. 174, apud *Tillemont's Hiſtory of Adrian.*

(*r*) Xiphilin, in Hadrian.

ſayings, ſaid *he never ſaw a finer fire in his life.* Ageſilaus, one of the Lacedæmonian Ephori, made uſe of this thought on a like occaſion. Καὶ τὰ παρὰ τῶν χρεωστῶν γαμματεῖα συνεισενέγκαντες εἰς ἀγορὰν, ἃ κλάρια καλοῦσι, καὶ πάντα συνθέντες εἰς ἓν, ἐνέπρησαν. ἀρθείσης δὲ φλογὸς, οἱ μὲν πλούσιοι καὶ δανειστικοὶ, περιπατοῦντες ἀπῆλθον, ὁ δὲ Ἀγησίλαος, ὥσπερ ἐφυβρίζων, οὐκ ἔφη λαμπρότερον ἑωρακέναι φῶς οὐδὲ πῦρ ἐκείνου καθαρώτερον. Ita congeſtas in forum debitorum ſyngraphas, quas claria appellant, omnes coacervatas concremaverunt. Sublata flamma pecunioſi & fœneratores, qui ibi deambulabant, digreſſi ſunt. At Ageſilaus, quaſi illudens illis, negavit clarius ſe lumen vel ignem lucidiorem vidiſſe (22). —— *And having heaped together the creditors bonds, called Claria, in the market place, they ſet them all on fire. At the ſight of the flames, the rich and the uſurers, who were walking there, went away. But Ageſilaus laughing at them, ſaid, he had never ſeen a more ſhining light, or a brighter fire.*

[*I*] *After the adoption of Lucius Verus, he retired to Tibur, where he built ſumptuous edifices.*] Aurelius Victor (23) gives a lively deſcription of the effeminate life this emperor led in his retreat, whilſt Lucius Ælius Cæſar governed at Rome; but he makes a groſs blunder in Chronology. He ſays, that Hadrian at this time plunged himſelf into the infamous amours of Antinous; which is not to know, that Antinous's death preceded the adoption of Ælius Verus. As for his buildings, theſe are his words (24); 'Rus proprium Tibur ſeceſſit, permiſſa 'urbe Lucio Ælio Cæſari, ipſe uti beatis locupleti'bus mos, palatia exſtruere, curare epulas, ſigna, ta'bulas pictas. —— *He retired to his villa at Tibur; 'having left the city to the government of Lucius 'Ælius Cæſar: while he, after the manner of the 'rich, built palaces, gave grand entertainments; and 'collected ſtatues and pictures.*' Add to this a paſſage of Spartian (25): 'Tiburtinam villam mirè exædifi'cavit, ita ut in ea & provinciarum & locorum cele'berrima nomina inſcriberet: velut Lyceum, Acade'miam, Prytaneum, Canopum, Pæcilen, Tempe 'vocaret. Et ut nihil prætermitteret, etiam inferos 'finxit. —— *He built his villa at Tibur in an ad'mirable manner; and gave the names of the pro'vinces, and moſt celebrated places, to different parts 'of it, as the Lyceum, the Academy, the Prytaneum, 'Canopus, Pæcile, Tempe. And that he might omit 'nothing, he had a place repreſenting the infernal 'regions.*'

[*K*] *His dropſy vexed him to that degree, that he grew as it were raging mad.*] To this time is to be referred what Lampridius ſays, that Hadrian impoſed his name on a town that was called Oreſta; and that by this means his madneſs went off a little. He had this advice from an oracle. 'Et Oreſtam 'quidem urbem Hadrianus ſuo nomini vindicari juſſit 'eo tempore quo furore cœperit laborare, ut ex 'reſponſo quum ei dictum eſſet ut in furioſi alicu'jus domum vel nomen irreperet. Nam ex eo emol'litam inſaniam ferunt, per quam multos Senatores 'occidi juſſerat, quibus ſervatis Antoninus Pii nomen 'meruit, quod eos poſt ad ſenatum adduxit, quos omnes 'juſſu principis interfectos credebant (26). —— *Ha'drian likewiſe ordered the city of Oreſta to be called 'by his name, when he began to be ſeized with mad'neſs, in obedience to the oracle, which adviſed him 'to take privily the houſe or name of ſome mad-man. 'It is reported, that by this means his madneſs abat'ed, during the continuance of which he had com'manded many ſenators to be put to death, and by 'ſaving them, Antoninus obtained the name of PIUS; 'having brought them into the ſenate, when every body be'lieved that they were put to death by the emperor's order.*' The Sieur Triſtan (27) fell into two groſs miſtakes in this paſſage. He makes Lampridus ſay, that Hadrian recovered of his phrenſy, after he had viſited the town of Oreſta, and that this happened at the beginning of Hadrian's reign. It was eaſy to perceive, that, Lampridius ſpeaks not of a voyage of this emperor, and that what he ſays, muſt relate to the time when Antoninus was already adopted; which was but a few months before this prince's death.

[*L*] *Some ſay that he attributed his death to the great number of his phyſicians.*] Xiphilin relates (28) that Hadrian died with theſe words in his mouth, *the multitude of phyſicians have killed the king*, πολλοὶ ἰατροὶ βασιλέα ἀπώλεσαν. He adds, that theſe words were a kind of proverb. Pliny aſſures us, that there was an epitaph, which contained a propoſition like to this (29): *Hinc illa infelicis monumenti inſcriptio* TURBA SE MEDICORUM PERIISSE. I wonder that St Epiphanus has not touched upon this circumſtance of Hadrian's laſt moments, in the paſſage where he ſays, that he ſent for all the phyſicians of his empire, and laughed at them, after he had found the vanity of their preſcriptions, and even wrote a ſatirical letter againſt their art and profeſſion. Οἱ δὲ πολλὰ κεκμηκότες καὶ μηδὲν ἀνύσαντες ἐσκώφθησαν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ὡς καὶ ἐπιστολὴν ὀνειδιστικὴν γράψαι κατ' αὐτῶν τὴν τήχνην αὐτῶν αἰτιωμένην ὡς μηδὲν εἰδυῖαν τῆς περικειμένης αὐτῷ νόσου ἕνεκα. *Cum omnem operam ſine ullo fructu poſuiſſent, ab imperatore riſu ac ludibrio habiti ſunt, uſque adeo ut mordaci in illos epiſtola profeſſionem ipſam artemque damnaret, ut quæ nihil de ægritudine ſua extricare potuiſſet* (30). If this ancient father was no better informed about the fact itſelf, than the circumſtance of time, his authority is of no weight, for he ſays, that after he had written this ſatire,

(22) Plut. in Agide, pag. 801. B. *See the remark* [*F*] *of the article* CHARLES the fifth.

(23) Aurel. Victor. in Cæſaribus, pag. m. 129.

(24) Id. ibid.

(25) Spartian, in Adriano, cap. xxvi, pag. m. 215.

(26) Lamprid. in vita Heliogab. pag m. 809.

(27) Comment. Hiſtor. pag. 453.

(28) In Epit. Dion, vita Adriani.

(29) Pliny, lib. xxix, cap. i, pag. m 667. *Father Hardouin ſays upon this,* Senarius eſt, ut putant Menandri Comici. πολλῶν ἰατρῶν εἴσοδός μ' ἀπώλεσεν.

(30) Epiphan. de Ponder & Menſ. cap. xiv, pag. 170.

to him, that he had done miraculous cures [*M*]; but notwithſtanding all theſe artifices, he would have killed himſelf, had he not been hindered (*s*). He ſought death, and could not find it [*N*]. It came at laſt the tenth of July 138. He died that day at *Baiæ*, in the ſixty third year of his age, having reigned twenty one years, within thirty days. The Latin verſes he addreſſed to his ſoul (*t*), ſhows his uncertainty as to the other world. He was a prince who had both great virtues, and great vices. He was liberal, laborious (*u*), civil, exact; maintained order and diſcipline, eaſed the people, did juſtice with a particular application, and rigorouſly puniſhed thoſe that did not well diſcharge their offices. He had a vaſt deal of wit, a great memory (*x*), and perfectly underſtood arts and ſciences, and wrote many books [*O*]. He was on the other hand, cruel, envious,

ſatire, he departed from Rome, to go into Egypt, which is falſe. It is certain, that after the phyſicians had tried in vain all experiments to cure his dropſy, he only travelled to Baiæ. It cannot be doubted, but he had conceived a great contempt or indignation againſt them, ſince, at laſt, he gave over all courſe of diet, and eat whatever his fancy led him to (31).

[*M*] *They pretended that he had done miraculous cures.*] Obſerve what Spartian relates: a woman came to tell Hadrian, that ſhe had been admoniſhed in a dream to repreſent to him, that ſince he ſhould recover, he ſhould have a care of killing himſelf; that ſhe had loſt her ſight, for not having obeyed the inſtructions of her dream; that ſhe had received a ſecond order to come and tell him the ſame things, with a promiſe of recovering her ſight, by kiſſing his knees. The woman having executed this command, and waſhed her eyes with the water of a temple, ſaw as well as before. Another miracle: a man born blind came from the furtheſt part of Pannonia, and touched Hadrian, who had the fever; which done, the man recovered his ſight, and Hadrian's fever left him (32). Spartian had the prudence to add, that, according to the teſtimony of Marius Maximus, there was nothing but impoſture in all this. We ſhould conjecture as much, though we knew nothing of what Marius Maximus ſaid. There is no difficulty in perceiving, that Antoninus, Hadrian's adopted ſon, uſed this ſtratagem to give him ſome hope, and to remove the melancholy which oppreſſed him. How often have theſe tricks been plaid ſince that, to foſter ſuperſtition, and even ſtate-cabals. Fallacies, you will ſay, are lawful, upon children and the ſick. By the ſame argument we may prove them lawful upon the people, who are always children, and diſtempered in ſome reſpects. But omitting theſe reflexions, which would fall on too many formidable perſons, let us ſay a word of Grammatical criticiſm, to the great Salmaſius. He will not have the man that came from Pannonia, to be blind from his birth, but only for a long time; and therefore, inſtead of reading *Natus Cæcus*, he reads *Vetus Cæcus*. His reaſon is, that it cannot be believed that people born blind, recovered their ſight, and that it is more credible that this might happen to people blind for ſeveral years. Obſerve, that in the following note he confutes Caſaubon, who underſtood by the word *Simulationem*, a magical charm, a conjuration. This ſenſe is unworthy of Caſaubon. *Simulatio*, in that place, only ſignifies a counterfeiting. Salmaſius explains it ſo, and hits it right: but upon that hypotheſis, what becomes of the difference he finds betwixt one born blind, and one blind for a long time? does he not ſee, that it was as eaſy for Antoninus to ſuborn one counterfeiting blindneſs from his birth, as for three days, and that it is as eaſy for one as the other to recover his ſight, by touching a prince that had a fever, and to cure this fever at the ſame time? But what is this to the purpoſe? he had read *Vetus Cæcus* in the Heidelberg manuſcript; he knew there was *Veteres Cæci* in Juvenal, and *antiqua cæcitas* in Marcellus; would a man loſe theſe diſcoveries for the ſake of good reaſoning?

[*N*] *He ſought death, and could not find it.*] So that Severian's prayer was heard, which he made when he was a dying. Ὅτι μὲν οὐδὲν ἀδικῶ, ἔφη, ὑμεῖς ὦ θεοὶ ἴστε· περὶ δὲ Ἀδριανοῦ τοσοῦτον μόνον εὔχομαι, ἵνα ἐπιθυμήσας ἀποθανεῖν, μὴ δυνηθῇ. Vos, inquit, Dii immortales, quos habeo innocentiæ meæ teſtes hoc unum rogo, ut Adrianus quamvis mortem obire percupiat, tamen non poſſit. (33). —— *Immortal gods*, cried he, *ye witneſſes of my innocence, I have but one favour to beg of you, which is, that Hadrian may paſſionately deſire to die, and yet may not die.* This prayer beſpoke a ſoul exceſſively vindictive; no imprecation was ever more ſevere; witneſs theſe words in the ninth of the Revelation, and ſixth verſe: *And in thoſe days ſhall men ſeek death, and ſhall not find it, and ſhall deſire to die, and death ſhall flee from them.* If we had Hadrian's letter in which he deſcribed the deplorable condition of a man who could not die, tho' he deſired it (34), we ſhould ſee ſomething very tragical; for a pen ſo eloquent and learned as his, could not chuſe, but excellently repreſent the miſeries he felt. He promiſed impunity, and even a reward, to whoever ſhould kill him, and finding no body that would do him that good office, he wept like a child (35); becauſe, tho' he was ſtill able to cauſe the death of others, he could not kill himſelf (36). His diſcontents and ſuſpicions, induced him to take off a great many perſons, and it was perhaps on that occaſion, that perceiving the public was not ſatisfied about the juſtice of his jealouſies. He ſaid that princes were much to be pitied, ſince it is never believed, that deſigns are formed againſt their lives, till they are killed. 'Scis ipſe quid avus tuus Adrianus dixerit, miſera 'conditio imperatorum quibus de affectata tyrannide 'niſi occiſis non poteſt credi. Ejus autem exemplum 'ponere quam Domitiani, qui hoc primus dixiſſe 'fertur, malui (37), tyrannorum enim etiam bona 'dicta non habent tantum auctoritatis quantum de'bent (38). —— *You know what your grand-father 'Hadrian ſaid, Hard is the fate of princes, whom 'no body will believe with regard to conſpiracies form'ed againſt them, till they are ſlain. I choſe rather 'to name him here, than Domitian who is reported 'to have firſt made this obſervation; becauſe even the 'good ſayings of tyrants have not that weight which 'they deſerve.*'

[*O*] *He wrote many books.*] He wrote both in verſe and proſe. There remain ſome fragments of his Latin poems (39), and ſome of his Greek verſes in the Anthology. You will find in Caſaubon and Salmaſius, (40), the epitaph of his hunting-horſe (41), in Latin verſe. This emperor had ſuch a love for this horſe, that he built a tomb for him (42). Stephanus Byzantinus twice cites a poem, intituled *Alexandreis*, whoſe author's name was Adrian: it is not generally agreed that this is a work of our emperor. He wrote abundance of verſes upon his amours (43). He made others alſo in the praiſe of Plotina, his benefactreſs (44). We cannot tell whether a collection of his witty ſayings were publiſhed: for Spartian's words (45) may only ſignify, that many of them were remembered: but it is certain he publiſhed ſome diſcourſes, and ſome orations (46), ſome citations from them are ſtill extant. We find in Soſipater, that he had ſaid in the firſt book of his diſcourſes, that Auguſtus was not very learned. 'Tametſi Auguſtus 'non pereruditus homo fuerit, ut id adverbium (*o*'*biter*) ex uſu potius quàm ratione protulerit. —— '*Auguſtus was not very learned, for he made uſe of 'the adverb* (obiter) *rather from common uſe than 'from particular choice.*' By the way here is an authority for thoſe who in languages would have cuſtom ſubmit to reaſon. Here is alſo a great example for thoſe whoſe moſt ſerious ſtudies are a rigorous examination of their native tongue; for it appears by the paſſage of Soſipater that our emperor was, with reſpect to Latin, what Vaugelas was with reſpect to French (47). Aulus Gellius (48) quotes the ſpeech that Hadrian ſpoke before the ſenate for the inhabitants of Italica, his father's native place. But this emperor's chief work was, doubtleſs, the hiſtory of his life. He was willing it ſhould appear under another's name, probably that he might have the

(*s*) Xiphilin. ibid. Spartian. in Hadriano.

(*t*) Spart. ibid.

(*u*) *See the remark* [*P*] *at the end.*

(*x*) *See the remark* [*A*], *towards the end.*

(31) Xiphilin. in Epiſt. Dion. Vit. Adrian.

(32) Gaſpar à Reies quæſt. 24, n. 4, *alledges Tacitus for this fact. A great blunder.*

(33) Xiphil. in Adriano, pag. m. 265.

(34) Xiphilin. ibid.

(35) *Compare with this Nero's complants in Sueton.* cap. xlvii, & *ſeq.*

(36) Xiphilin. ibid.

(37) Conditionem principum miſerrimam aiebat quibus de conjuratione comperta non crederetur niſi occiſis. *Sueton. in Domit. cap. xxi.*

(38) Marcus Aurelius ad Verum apud Vulcat. Gallicanum in vita Avidii Caſſii.

(39) *In the* Catalecta Virgilii & aliorum, & in Spartian.

(40) Comment. in Spartian. Adrian. pag. 189.

(41) *He was called* Boryſthenes.

(42) Dio, in ejus vita.

(43) De ſuis dilectis multa verſibus compoſuit. *Spart. pag.* 145. *Apuleius Apolog.*

(44) Xiphilin. in Adrian.

(45) Joca ejus plurima extant nam fuit etiam dicaculus. *Spart. pag.* 187.

(46) Photius ſpeaks of them, *pag.* 276.

(47) Conſider his diſpute with Favorinus, *in Spart.* 150.

(48) Lib. xvi, cap xiii.

vious, unchaſte, ſuperſtitious, and addicted to magic. What more abominable than his paſſion for Antinous (y). I omit his exceſſive curioſity [*P*]. He publiſhed no edict againſt the Chriſtians; 'tis however believed, that his exceſſive ſuperſtition occaſioned their being perſecuted. He had regard to the apologies which Quadratus and Ariſtides preſented to him on their behalf. The Jews having again taken arms in his reign, defended themſelves for three years againſt the forces he ſent into their country: after which they were worſted, and treated with the utmoſt ſeverity (z). They tell a ridiculous ſtory, about a queſtion they pretend was put by this emperor to a rabbi on the article of the reſurrection. I ſpeak of it in the article BARCHOCHEBAS (*aa*), as alſo the things done then in Judæa. Many particular facts which ſerve to acquaint us with Hadrian's character, his jealouſy againſt thoſe that excelled in arts, *&c.* will be found in ſeveral places of this Dictionary as we have occaſion to ſpeak of the perſons concerned in theſe facts. The alphabetical index will point out the particulars. The ſenate only granted the continuance of Hadrian's acts, to the tears and intreaties of Antoninus (*bb*); for they had reſolved to repeal them. But when once this reſolution was evaded, Antoninus obtained whatever he had a mind to, *viz.* the *Apotheoſis* of Hadrian. He built a temple to him at Puzzolo, and eſtabliſhed there ſome games with ſome ſocieties of prieſts, and other things belonging to the deification (*cc*). Hadrian had not waited till that time to taſte divine honours, having himſelf ſeized on the celeſtial crown. He conſecrated to himſelf an altar in Athens in the temple of Jupiter Olympius: And as he paſſed through many cities of Aſia, he multiplied the temples he built to himſelf (*dd*). There is no probability, that he deſigned them for JESUS CHRIST; and no body knows whence Lampridius took what he ſays upon that head [*Q*]. It does not appear that

the more liberty to commend himſelf. Phlegon, one of his freed men, a learned man, put his name to his maſter's work (49). Hadrian compoſed ſome books in imitation of Antimachus, a Greek poet, of whom he was a great admirer (50). Theſe books were very obſcure. Spartian had preſerved the title of them; but it is a queſtion whether the manuſcripts retained it right. So that this very title is a riddle, and a rack to the critics. Salmaſius turns himſelf a hundred ways, in order to draw his concluſion; and after he has fixed the reading that he thinks the only good one, he is as much at a loſs as before. 'Solam 'eam eſſe veram (lectionem) mihi perſuadeo; quomo'do tamen explicanda ſit juxta cum ignariſſimis ſcio '(51). ——— *I am perſuaded, that this is the only 'true reading, but am quite ignorant how it is to be 'explained.*' If this work of Hadrian had been handed down to us, it might have well been ſaid to the author when he was writing it: *You are going,*

To make racks for future Salmaſius's;

The very title will make them ſubmit and give up their arms. It is not well determined, whether Hadrian wrote concerning the military art. It is certain he made ſome fine regulations (52), and eſtabliſhed an excellent diſcipline among his troops. Vegetius owns that he made uſe of Hadrian's regulations; but as he acknowledges the ſame thing with reſpect to thoſe of Trajan and Auguſtus, which yet affords no grounds to pretend that theſe two emperors wrote books upon this ſubject, it is plain that Geſner had no reaſon to ſay, on the authority of this paſſage of Vegetius, that Hadrian wrote concerning the military art (53). Some will have (54) him to have written on Tactics, and that Urbicius's work upon this ſubject is Hadrian's, excepting Urbicius's additions. Rigaltius has publiſhed a fragment of it.

[*P*] *I omit . . . his exceſſive curioſity.*] I might give it this name, tho' he had not deſired to penetrate into futurity, ſo much as he did either by aſtrology or magic. There are other reaſons enough to make him be thought of too inquiſitive a ſpirit. He is called by Tertullian (55), *curioſitatum omnium explorator* — *An enquirer after all ſorts of curioſities*; and by Ammianus Marcellinus, *futurorum ſciſcitationi nimiæ deditus* —— *too much addicted to enquiries about futurities.* I ſhall not examine whether it became a prince to be ſo fond of beholding upon the place, whatever he met with in books concerning the ſeveral countries of the world. *Peregrinationis ita cupidus ut omnia quæ legerat de locis orbis terrarum, præſens vellet addiſcere* (56). The voyages he undertook to ſatisfy himſelf in this point, were not uſeleſs to the provinces; therefore let us not cavil with him on this account. Let us ſuffer him to aſcend Mount Ætna to ſee whether the riſing ſun has the ſame colours as the rainbow (57), and to get upon Mount Caſſius to ſee the ſame luminary riſe (58): but who can pardon him for imploying an infinite number of ſpies, to inform him of all the ſecrets of families: what a woman wrote to her huſband, what an huſband ſaid to his wife. *Erat curioſus non ſolum domus ſuæ, ſed etiam amicorum, ita ut per frumentarios occulta omnia exploraret, nec adverterent amici ſciri ab Imperatore ſuam vitam priuſquam ipſe hoc Imperator oſtenderet* (59). It is not to be doubted but that the intelligence the ſpies gave him facilitated his enterprizes of galantry; for he gave no better quarter to his friends in theſe matters, than to indifferent people. It is thus I could willingly underſtand the words of Spartian (60). *Et hoc quidem vitioſiſſimum putant* (he ſpeaks of his ſpying) *atque huic adjungunt quæ de adultorum amore ac nuptarum adulteriis, quibus Adrianus laboraſſe dicitur, aſſerunt, jungentes quod ne amicis quidem ſervaverit fidem.* Sovereigns have ſo many other ways to make themſelves formidable, that they ought to leave this to paraſites,

Scire volunt ſecreta domus, atque inde timeri (61).

and yet you ſee ſome in all ages, who ſpare nothing to be exactly informed of all that is ſaid in houſes. Hadrian's curioſity was doubtleſs the cauſe, that almoſt all his greateſt friends, and they whom he had raiſed to the greateſt dignities, incurred his enmity. He greedily ſwallowed all reports brought him concerning his friends, *Facile de amicis quidquid inſuſurrabatur audivit* (62). For the reſt, ſince I have conſidered him in this remark, as a curious traveller, I will finiſh it, by ſaying, that he marched on foot as a common ſoldier (63), and that he never covered his head in any weather (64). He ſuffered by it at laſt (65).

[*Q*] *It is not at all probable, that he deſigned the temples, which he built, for JESUS CHRIST; and no body knows whence Lampridius took what he ſays on that head.*] However let us ſee what Lampridius ſays (66); 'Chriſto templum facere voluit (Alexander 'Severus) eumque inter Deos recipere, quod & Adria'nus cogitaſſe fertur, qui templa in omnibus civitati'bus ſine ſimulacris juſſerat fieri, qui hodie idcirco 'quia non habent numina, dicuntur Adriani, quæ ille 'ad hoc paraſſe dicebatur, ſed prohibitus eſt ab iis qui 'conſulentes ſacra repererant omnes Chriſtianos futu'ros, ſi id optato eveniſſet, & templa reliqua deſe'renda. ——— *Alexander Severus reſolved to build a 'temple to CHRIST, and to receive him into the 'number of the gods. Hadrian is reported to have in'tended to do the ſame, and ordered temples without 'images to be built in every city, which becauſe they are 'not dedicated to any particular deity, are called Ha'drians. Theſe he is ſaid to have deſigned for that pur'poſe, but was hindered by ſome, who having conſulted* '*the* that any other, beſides himſelf, had any knowlege of his author.

(y) *See the article* ANTINOUS.

(z) *See Tillemont, Hiſtory of Hadrian.*

(*aa*) *Rem.* [*K*].

(*bb*) Dion. pag. 799. Spart. ſub fin. Eutropius, lib. viii.

(*cc*) Spart. ibid. Vide etiam Capitolinum in Antonino, pag. 249.

(*dd*) Spartian. pag. m. 126.

(49) Spart. pag. 150.

(50) Catacrianos libros obſcuriſſimos Antimachum imitando ſcripſit. *Id. pag.* 152.

(51) Salmaſ. in Spart. Adrian. pag. m. 152.

(52) *Dion ſays they had ſtill the force of a law. See Valerian's letter,* apud Vopiſcum in Probo. Caſaub. Comment. in Spart. pag. 83.

(53) *It is Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Gr. pag.* 215, *who criticiſes this fault of Geſner.*

(54) Salmaſius, in Spartian. pag. 83.

(55) In Apologet. cap. v.

(56) Spartianus, pag. m. 163.

(57) Ætnam montem conſcendit, ut ſolis ortum videret arcus ſpecie, ut dicitur, varium. *Id. pag* 124. *That is to ſay, according to Mr de Tillemont, pag. m* 43, *to ſee, ſay they, the ſun riſe in form of a bow. He ſhould have ſaid of a rainbow.*

(58) Id. Spart. pag 132.

(59) Idem pag. 102.

(60) Pag. 109.

(61) Juvenal. Sat. III, ver. 113.

(62) Spart. pag. 146.

(63) Idem pag. 84. Aur Victor. Epit. lib. v.

(64) Spart. pag. 163, 200.

(65) Idem pag. 201.

(66) Lamprid in Alexand. Severo, pag. m. 993.

‘ *the oracles, found, that if he ſhould do ſo, all the world would turn Chriſtians, and the other temples be deſerted.*’ Caſaubon, without doubt, is not to be blamed, for rejecting this as a fable. What I think probable here is this fear of the Heathens, that their temples ſhould be deſerted, if Chriſtianity was publickly tolerated. This does more honour to the Chriſtian faith, than the alarms that have appeared in the writings of a refugee miniſter (67), who, oppoſing the toleration of religions, has ſaid, amongſt other things, *put a Mahometan, a Socinian, a Papiſt, and a Calviniſt preacher, in the ſame town, and let not the magiſtrate intervene by his authority, nor GOD by his ſpirit and his miracles, and you will ſee quickly the truth intirely oppreſſed.* Here you ſee people who are afraid they ſhould preach to walls and benches, *vox clamantis in deſerto,* unleſs there be no body beſides themſelves in a town. I do not wonder then they are ſuch enemies to a toleration (68).

HADRIAN, cardinal, prieſt of the title of St Chryſogonus (*a*), was a native of Cornetto, in Tuſcany [*A*]. He was nuncio to Innocent VIII, in Scotland [*B*], and then in France: and after he had been clerk and treaſurer to the apoſtolic chamber, he was honoured with a cardinal's cap by Pope Alexander VI (*b*), whoſe ſecretary he had been (*c*). This cardinal's life was a ſcene of odd changes, the end whereof was far from being honourable. He narrowly eſcaped on the day in which Alexander VI poiſoned himſelf by a miſtake [*C*]. Afterwards he ſo incurred the enmity of Julius II, that he was forced to hide himſelf in the mountains of Trent, fulminated with the ſevere decrees of this Pontiff (*d*). Being recalled by Leo X, he had ſo little gratitude for this favour, that he engaged in a conſpiracy againſt him [*D*]. This Pope forgave him this fault; and granted letters of pardon for him (*e*); but the cardinal did not truſt to them [*E*]; or had not the power to withſtand the remorſe of conſcience, which the preſence of the objects might render more importunate: he made his eſcape by night, and it was never certainly known what became of him [*F*]. He was one of the firſt that attempted the reformation of the Latin tongue in

[*A*] *In Tuſcany.*] I ſpeak this with reſpect to the ancient diviſion of Italy, for at preſent Cornetto is in the country called St Peter's Patrimony.

[*B*] *He was nuncio in Scotland.*] I do not find he was nuncio in England, yet notwithſtanding it is true that he gained the affection of king Henry VII, who made him biſhop of Hereford, and of Bath and Wells (1).

[*C*] *He eſcaped narrowly the day when Alexander VI poiſoned himſelf by a miſtake.*] There is ſomething very ſingular in this adventure, It is thus related by one of our hiſtorians (2). *Alexander the ſixth's baſtard longing for cardinal Hadrian Cornet's ſpoils* (3), *had agreed with the Pope to go and ſup with the cardinal at his villa, and had ordered thither ſome bottles of excellent wine, but which he had prepared with a mixture to poiſon their hoſt. Now it happened, that the father and ſon coming betimes, and being very thirſty, by reaſon of the heat of the ſeaſon, asked for ſome wine, and whilſt the ſervant, who knew the ſecret, was out of the way, another gave them ſome of this. The father, who drank it pure, died the ſame day, which was the ſeventeenth of Auguſt* 1503. *The ſon, who was more vigorous, and had diluted it with water, had time to have recourſe to antidotes, and having cauſed himſelf to be wrapt up in a mule's belly, he eſcaped; but it left him ſo weak, that he was not able to act when he had the utmoſt occaſion for it.* Hadrian had not been promoted to the cardinalſhip above two or three months. Guicciardin deſerves to be read concerning the death of this Pope (4).

[*D*] *He engaged in a conſpiracy againſt Leo X.*] Cardinal Alfonſo Petrucci was the head of it; they aimed at Leo the tenth's life. Some (5) ſay, that our Hadrian engaged in it with the hopes of being Pope, and that theſe hopes were grounded upon ſome prediction, which promiſed the Papacy to one Hadrian of mean birth, but illuſtrious by his learning. As all this agreed to Hadrian de Cornetto, he applied it to himſelf, and thereby loſt all his honour, and the repoſe of his life. We may venture to ſay, that there are no greater peſts to mankind, than thoſe pretenders to predictions; for they find but too many ignorant and turbulent ſpirits, whom they engage in fatal enterprizes. A well governed ſtate ought not to ſuffer ſuch people, which way ſoever they boaſt to have conſulted heaven, whether by the ſtars, or by the apocalypſe. Moſt of them are impoſtors, who have no other aim, than the diſturbing the public peace. He who deceived cardinal de Cornetto, was a magician in the Apennine mountains, as Mr Varillas ſays, who tells this ſtory at large. See the 276th page of his Secret Hiſtory of Florence. But Paul Jovius ſays, it was a ſorcereſs. *Certam ſpem adipiſcendi Pontificatus conceperunt ex oraculo fatidicæ mulieris.* Thus he ſpeaks about the beginning of the fourth book of the hiſtory of Leo X.

[*E*] *Leo X granted letters of pardon for him; but he did not truſt to them.*] Mr Varillas obſerves, that two things made cardinal Hadrian diffident; one was, that cardinal Soderini and he *were fined ten thouſand crowns a-piece,* though they had proſtrated themſelves at the Pope's feet, and the Pope had declared, in a full conſiſtory, that *he would pardon the cardinals, who were accomplices in the conſpiracy, if they confeſſed their crime immediately, and asked his pardon before their brethren.* The other, was the marks of indignation, *which, in ſpight of his endeavours, appeared in Leo's countenance.* See the 283d, and 284th pages of the Secret Hiſtory of Florence.

[*F*] *It was never certainly known what became of him.*] It is worth while to hear Pierius Valerianus upon it, who places our cardinal at the head almoſt of his catalogue of unfortunate learned men. *Noctu clam fugam arripuit, neque quò abierit, neque ubi ſit quatuordecim jam annorum ſpatio quiſpiam potuit explorare.* He adds, that it was thought his ſervant killed him, for the ſake of the piſtoles the cardinal had ſewed up in his waiſtcoat. *Conſtans tamen opinio eſt eum in ſuto in interiorem toracem auro oneratum comitiis famuli perfidia oppreſſum, auroque ſurrepto cadaver in ſolitarium aliquem locum abjectum occultari.* Father Oldoini obſerves, that he was diveſted of the purple and his benefices; that he fled into Turkey, and died clandeſtinely, on what day or year no man knows (6). This agrees with Leander Albertus, in his deſcription of Italy, *Noſtra inſuper ætate,* ſays he, *magna illuſtrandæ patriæ principia jecerat Adrianus Cardinalis ex hac urbe* (*Cornetto*) *cum literarum ſtudio, tum cæremoniarum, ſed qui metu Leonis X. Pontif. Max. clam Roma profectus, exinde nunquam apparuit.* The author of the Secret Hiſtory of Florence ſays (7), that cardinal Hadrian went from Rome in the diſguiſe of a reaper; that he *travelled only by night till he came into his country, where he ſpent the reſt of his days in changing hiding-places; ſo fully perſuaded was he of the magician's prediction.* Here are two things borrowed from Paul Jovius (8); the reſt is perhaps the author's invention. Guicciardin is ſtill more general than Paul Jovius. *Adriano partitoſi occultamente, quello che s'aveniſſe di lui, non fu mai piu, che ſi ſapeſſe, nè trovato nè veduto in luogo alcuno* (9). He ſays this under the year 1517, whence we may conclude, that Pierius Valerianus's dialogues, *de Infelicitate Literatorum,* were compoſed in 1531. Moreri has placed our Hadrian's flight in the year 1518. Why did he not follow Guicciardin's chronology? He ſends this fugitive to Venice and Riva, in the dioceſe of Trent. I fear he confounds the exile under Julius II with that under Leo X.

---

(67) Tableau du Socinianiſme, pag. 519, *printed in* 1690.

(68) *Compare with this, what is ſaid is in the remark* [*E*] *of the article* LUBIENIETZKI.

(*a*) Pier. Valerian. de Liter. Infelicit.

(*b*) Oldoin. Athen. Roman. pag. 303.

(*c*) Pier. Valer. ibid.

(*d*) Acerbiſſimis percuſſus edictis annos aliquot in Germanicis Rhætorum Alpibus obſcura & ſordida peregrinatione delituit. *P. Valerianus, ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) Id. ibid.

(1) Epiſcopus Erfodienſis, Barthonienſis & Voellenſis, *ſays Father Oldoini, uncorrect in his orthography,* Athen. Roman. pag. 303.

(2) Mezeral, Abr. Chronol. Tom. IV, pag. m. 434.

(3) *It is he who is the ſubject of this article, that was his name, or rather de Cornetto, from his country.*

(4) Lib. vi, pag. m. 161.

(5) *See Moreri, in the article* Caſtelleſi. *Thus he calls our cardinal. Under the word Adrian de Cornetto he refers to Caſtelles. He had better have ſtopped there. Oldoini ſays* Hadrianus Caſtellenſis.

(6) Sub Leone contumax ſpoliatus eſt purpura & ſacerdotiis, quare necis metu perterritus in Thraciam fugit, ibique obſcurus & latens diem clauſit extremum incertum quo menſe vel anno. *Oldoin. ubi ſupra.*

(7) *Pag.* 284.

(8) Hadrianus, trepido ſuſpicacique ingenio vir, Leonis clementiæ diffidens, ab urbe meſſoris habitu profectus, uſque ad vitæ exitum nullo perſequente latebras mutavit. *Jovius, lib. iv, Vita Leon. X.*

(9) Guicc. lib. xiii, fol m. 384, verſo.

in a right manner. He ſtudied Cicero with excellent ſucceſs, and made abundance of admirable diſcoveries concerning the purity of this language. The treatiſe he wrote *de Sermone Latino*, while he abſconded in the Alps, is a proof of it. Whilſt he was labouring upon this he laid aſide a very conſiderable work, which was a Latin tranſlation of the Old Teſtament [*G*]. Some reckon it amongſt the works he compoſed (*f*). It is pretended alſo, that his tract *de Poëtis* is ſtill extant. As to his treatiſe *de Vera Philoſophia*, there is no doubt it was printed at Cologne in 1548. He wrote in verſe [*H*].

(*f*) Oldoin. Athen. Rom. pag. 303.

[*G*] *He had undertaken . . . . a Latin verſion of the Old Teſtament.*] ‘ Erat in animo proſequi cœptum jam ‘ pridem opus ſacros veteris inſtrumenti libros ex Hebræo ad verbum in Latinum ſermonem vertendi: ſed ‘ cum me procella temporis in Tridentinas rupes, quò ‘ Judæi ob Simonis cædem ne aſpirare quidem audent, ‘ detruſerit, atque animus inquies nihil agere non poſſet, hæc ſum adgreſſus (10). —— *I intended to go on* ‘ *with the deſign I had formed to tranſlate word for* ‘ *word, from Hebrew to Latin, the books of the Old Teſtament, but a ſtorm having thrown me on the moun*‘*tains of Trent, as I could not bear idleneſs, I undertook* ‘ *this treatiſe* De Sermo Latino.’

(10) Hadrian. in Præf. ad Carolum Principem Hiſpaniæ, de Serm. Latino.

[*H*] *He wrote in verſe.*] We have his little poem *de Venatione*, and that intituled *Iter Julii II Pontificis Romani*, beſides the verſes in praiſe of the holy Virgin and the deſcription of the palace he built near the Vatican, which is at preſent poſſeſſed by the family Colonna. It is called the Engliſh palace, becauſe cardinal Hadrian bequeathed it to the king of England (11).

(11) See Oldoinus, Athen. Roman. pag. 303.

HADRIAN VI was born at Utrecht, in the year 1459 (*a*) [*A*]. The genius which was diſcovered in him in his childhood, obliged his father [*B*] to deſign him for learning, though he had not wherewithal to maintain him in the ſchools. But the univerſity of Louvain, ſupplied this domeſtic indigence. The young man was admitted in a college, where a certain number of ſcholars were maintained *gratis*. We are told, that he uſed to read by night, by the light of the lamps [*C*] that were hung up in churches, or the corners of the ſtreets: which was both a ſign of his poverty and of his ſtudious temper. He made very great progreſs in all kinds of ſciences, and if he was not a poet [*D*], nor a polite writer, it was becauſe

(*a*) Valer. Andr. Biblioth. Belg. pag. 19.

[*A*] *He was born at Utrecht.*] This town, in Latin, is called *Trajectum ad Rhenum*, as Maeſtricht is called *Trajectum ad Moſam*. Some (1) who only ſay, that Hadrian was *Trajectenſis*, have cauſed others (2) to make him a native of Maeſtricht. So true it is, that the leaſt inaccuracy occaſions ſome author to ſtumble. Probably Father Labbe perceived Bellarmin's negligence; for in his commentary upon this Jeſuit's eccleſiaſtical writers, he does not uſe the word *Trajectenſis*, but *Ultrajectenſis*. It is ſo certain, that *Trajectum* alone rather ſignifies, Maeſtricht than Utrecht, that Mr de Marolles is not excuſable for taking (3) *Trajectenſem urbem* for Utrecht, in the ſecond book of Gregorius Turonenſis. The ſubject was concerning the retreat of St Servaſius, biſhop of Tongres, and that was another reaſon for his not miſtaking Maeſtricht. I doubt not but the learned Onuphrius Panvinius has taken *Trajectenſis* here, for a man born at Maeſtricht. *Adrianus VI*, ſays he (4), *Trajectenſis, Flander vel Brabantinus.* An error a thouſand times more pardonable than that of a German writer, who ſays (5), *Adrianus VI. patria Derthuſienſis Germanus.* Some make him born in Italy (6): *Ut plane ridiculi ſunt qui in ſuis ad Alphonſi Ciacconii hiſtoriam additionibus natales Adriani majoreſve Italiæ vindicant.* Jerome Niger, an Italian author, ſaid of this Pope, *he ſpeaks Latin always well enough for a Spaniard* (7).

(1) *Bellarmin is one of them, in his book* de Script. Eccleſ.

(2) *The Jeſuit Foreſti is one of thoſe in the* Mappa-mondo Iſtorico.

(3) *See his notes upon* Gregorius Turon. Tom. I, pag. 75.

(4) In Chronico Rom. Pontif. ad ann. 1522.

(5) In continuatione Chronici Euſebiani, excuſa Baſileæ anno 1536, ad ann. 1522. *See* Schoockius de fabula Hamelenſi, pag. 83.

(6) Valer. Andr. Biblioth. Belg. pag. 19.

(7) *See the letters of princes, collected by Ruſcelli, fol.* m. 91.

[*B*] *His father.*] His name was Florent Boyens, and he got his living by barge making, *Naupegus* (8). Others make him a weaver, and others a brewer. I think the firſt opinion is the righteſt, ſince Valerius Andreas, who has made a great many enquiries concerning Pope Hadrian VI, ſays not a word of the other trades aſcribed to his father. As for the ſon, he was called *Hadrianus Florentius*, that is, *Hadrian, ſon of Florent*: It was the cuſtom of the country, and ſtill remains amongſt the vulgar.

(8) Valer. Andr. ibid. pag. 19.

[*C*] *We are told that he uſed to read by night, by the light of the lamps.*] This I have from Gabriel Naudé: ‘ Non ſecus omnino, *ſays he* (9), ac olim fecere ‘ maximi illi viri, Euclides dum noctu Megaris Athenas ‘ proficiſceretur ad audiendum Socratem. . . . . Adrianuſque præterea ejus nominis Pontifex ſextus, & Auguſtinus Steuchus Eugubinus, quos inter luctandum ‘ cum ſtudiis & anguſtioris vitæ miſeriis, ſæpe videre fuit ad ellychnios noctu in templis aut compitis collucentes legendi deſiderio acceſſiſſe. —— *In* ‘ *the ſame manner as theſe great men in ancient times* ‘ *did, Euclid while he travelled by night from Megara to* ‘ *Athens to hear Socrates . . . . Pope Hadrian VI, and* ‘ *Auguſtinus Steuchus of Eugubio, who while they ſtruggled with their ſtudies, and the miſeries of a narrow* ‘ *fortune, were frequently ſeen reading by the light of* ‘ *the lamps, in the churches or in the ſtreets.*’

(9) Naudæus, in Pantade Quæſt. Iatrophilol. pag. m. 91.

[*D*] *And if he was not a poet.*] One of the things that made him decried by the Italians, was his ſlighting of poetry, and delicacy of ſtile, two things by which a great many under Leo X had made their fortunes, and upon which they had valued themſelves moſt in that country, for fifty or ſixty years. Hadrian had his reaſons for it, for the poets had produced the ſame ill effects, which they afterwards produced in France (10). ‘ Quod unum ei viri elegantes defuiſſe prædicant, eloquentiæ cultioris flores, & poëtarum amœnitates contemnere erat ſolitus, ſive quod putaret eas ſibi aliquid ‘ de graviſſimorum ſtudiorum autoritate detrahere, ‘ ſive quod caſtis & piis ingeniis poëtarum luſus pravos ‘ mores importare & religionibus officere arbitraretur ‘ (11). —— *In this only he was deficient, in the opi*‘*nion of the admirers of polite learning, that he uſed to* ‘ *deſpiſe the flowers of eloquence, and the charms of* ‘ *poetry; whether becauſe he thought they would leſſen* ‘ *the application to his more ſevere ſtudies, or becauſe he* ‘ *was of opinion, that the licentiouſneſs of poets corrupted the morals of chaſte and pious minds, and were detrimental to religion.*’ He was ſo little diſpoſed to favour them, that one of the reaſons of Paul Jovius's experiencing his kindneſs, was becauſe he had not joined poetry to the ſtudy of the liberal arts. ‘ Jovium ‘ omnino eo . . . . ſacerdotio eſſe perornandum, quem ‘ audiviſſet optimis diſciplinis liberaliter eruditum, & ‘ ſcriptorem annalium valde elegantem, nec tamen ‘ eſſe poëtam, ut cæteri qui cultio res literas ſectarentur (12). —— *That Jovius ſhould certainly have that* ‘ *benefice, who, as he was informed, was well verſed in* ‘ *the moſt uſeful learning, and a very elegant annaliſt,* ‘ *and yet not a poet, as at that time all thoſe were who* ‘ *cultivated polite literature.*’ The Paganiſm which the poets ſcattered in their works, contributed not a little to this Pope's coldneſs for them, for he underſtood not raillery in this point. He was no complaiſant man in theſe matters (13). He turned away his head when he was ſhewn the ſtatue of Laocoon, and ſaid theſe were the images of impiety. ‘ Ornamenta inſignis picturæ & ſtatuarum priſcæ artis nequaquam magni fecit, adeo ut Vianeſio Bononienſium legato commendante ſtatuam Laocoontis, quam in Belvederii viridariis Julius ingenti pretio coemptam ad loci dignitatem ‘ collocarat, averſis ſtatim oculis tanquam impiæ gentis ſimulacra vituperaret. —— *He was no admirer* ‘ *either of fine painting, or of antique ſtatues; ſo that* ‘ *when Vianeſius, the embaſſador from Bologna, was com-*
‘ *mending*

(10) Thuanus, lib. xxii, ad ann. 1559. *See, above, remark* [*I*] *of the article* GARASSE.

(11) Jovius, in ejus vita, pag. m. 223.

(12) Idem. pag. 277.

(13) Suſpecta habebat poëtarum ingenia, utpote qui minus ſincero animo de Chriſtiana religione ſentire & damnata falſiſſimorum Deorum nomina ad veterum imitationem ſtudioſe celebrare dicerentur. *Id. ibid.*

becauſe he did not value it. His manners were exemplary; and no man was ever known to intrigue leſs than he. A living was given him in Holland [*E*], without his expecting it. The meer reputation of his probity and learning, ſued for him with thoſe that raiſed him (*b*). He took his doctor's degree at Louvain, the twenty firſt of June, 1491. A little after he was made canon of St Peter and divinity profeſſor in the ſame city, and afterwards dean of St Peter, and vice-chancellor of the univerſity. He was removed from this collegiate life, to court, in 1507, in order to be preceptor to the arch-duke Charles, then ſeven years of age (*c*). He made no great progreſs in Latin under him [*F*]; and it was ſaid, that Chievres, this young prince's governor, was the cauſe of it (*d*). There is nothing commonly more diſagreeable to children than ſtudy; corporeal exerciſes are much more their delight. It was therefore ſaid, that Chievres, deſiring to have the ſole poſſeſſion of his pupil, and all the glory of his progreſs, cultivated his inclination and his biaſs, and was indifferent about his improvement by the leſſons of the Louvain profeſſor. However, the preceptor had as noble recompences as any man of that employ ever had; for it was Charles the fifth's intereſt that raiſed him to the Papacy [*G*]. Before this he was

(*b*) **Paul. Jovius, in vita Hadriani VI.**

(*c*) **Val. Andr. ubi ſupra, & in faſtis Academ. Lovan. pag. 96.**

(*d*) **Ferunt Carolum Cevrium - - ut integra adoleſcentis poſſeſſione frueretur, alumnum militares jocos ſæpius offerendo ſenſim avertiſſe a literis.** ***Jovius, ubi ſupra.***

'*mending the ſtatue of Laocoon, which Pope Julius had*
'*bought at an immenſe price, and ſet up in the gardens*
'*of the Belvidere. He turned away his eyes, to ſhow his*
'*contempt of the images of that idolatrous people.*' Paul Jovius (14) informs us of this particular. Judge whether the lovers of the fine arts, whether the Italians, who admired this maſterpiece of ſculpture, could have an eſteem for ſuch a Pope. The poets made him ſenſible, that it was not ſaid without reaſon, *Genus irritabile vatum.* —— *Poets a touchy race.* Here is an epigram that Sannazarius regaled him with.

Claſſe, viriſque potens, domitoque Oriente ſuperbus,
  Barbarus in Latias dux quatit arma domos:
In Vaticano noſter latet; hunc tamen alto,
  Chriſte, vides cœlo, (proh dolor) & pateris.

While the proud Turk, ſwell'd with the ſpoils of Aſia,
Threatens the Latian coaſt with dire alarms,
Our Pontiff lurks inglorious in the Vatican.
This, thou, Oh JESUS, *ſeeſt from heaven's high arc,*
And yet thy thunder ſleeps.

I will tranſcribe below, Pierius Valerianus's invective. Paſquin's ſtatue was continually checkered with ſatirical verſes againſt Hadrian. I ſhall ſay in another place (15), why he did not demoliſh it as he had reſolved.

[*E*] *The living which was given him in Holland.*] Paul Jovius ſays (16), that Margaret Maximilian the emperor's daughter, governeſs of the Netherlands, procured him this living, and that he was a little after preferred to the deanry of Louvain. He is miſtaken in making this princeſs governeſs of the Netherlands at that time: for ſhe was not ſo till after the death of the duke of Savoy, her ſecond *actual* husband. I uſe this word, becauſe the firſt prince (17), to whom ſhe was betrothed, returned her before the conſummation of the marriage, and becauſe I give no credit to thoſe who ſay the duke of Savoy did not conſummate his marriage with her (18). At the moſt, ſince he died in 1504, it is clear, that Margaret of Auſtria was not governeſs of the Netherlands, when Hadrian was promoted to the deanry of Louvain, which was in the year 1497 (19). Paul Jovius muſt have confounded this Margaret, with the widow of Charles the Hardy, laſt duke of Burgundy, ſiſter to Edwad the fourth king of England. She was alſo called Margaret, and was at the charge of Hadrian's promotion to his doctor of divinity's degree (20). They who tell us this, ſay indeed, that this doctor had the deanry of St Peter's at Louvain; that of Nôtre-Dame at Antwerp; a canonry, and the treaſurer's office at Nôtre-Dame le Grand of Utrecht, and the provoſtſhip of St Saviour in the ſame city; but they ſpeak not of any benefice, with cure of ſouls, or any parochial church. This pariſh is perhaps another confuſion of Paul Jovius. Cardinal Pallavicini (21), has corrected nothing in this narration of that writer.

[*F*] *Charles V made no great progreſs in Latin under him.*] Every body has heard how this emperor, upon hearing a ſpeech made to him in Latin, and not underſtanding it, cried out, with a ſigh, *Hadrian told me how it would be.* Paul Jovius ſpeaks of it, as of a thing that happened in his preſence (22): *Audivi ego Cæſarem, quum Genuæ Latinam orationem à quodam recitatam nequaquam præclarè intelligerat, ſuſpirantem hæc verba ore protuliſſe; agnoſco, inquit, nunc maximè & cum dolore quidem magiſtri mei divina monita, quum hos flores & elegantias Latini ſermonis percipere nequeam, & meminerim eum ſæpè prædixiſſe, me aliquando puerilis incuriæ pœnas daturum.* This hiſtorian had been ſaying, that Hadrian, not being able to ſtand it out againſt Chievres, contented himſelf with forewarning his young ſcholar, that he would repent his negligence hereafter. *Hadrianum authoritate imparem, & natura leniſſimum, officio facile deceſſiſſe, ita tamen ut diſcipulo perblande diceret, futurum aliquando ut eum præſentis negligentiæ pæniteret.* Charles V experienced it at Genoa, and frankly confeſſed it. Camerarius (23) would have Hadrian reſponſable for this emperor's uſing an interpreter, when ſpeeches were made in to him Latin, as if he had been more ſollicitous to inſtruct his pupil in the Catholic religion, that in good letters; but this confeſſion of the emperor, is ſufficient to excuſe the tutor. Mr Varillas (24) enters into a long diſpute againſt the Spaniſh hiſtorians, pretending that it is falſe, either that Chievres was guilty of what he is accuſed of with reſpect to his pupil's Latin, or that Charles V was ignorant of this language, or that he was unluckily ſenſible of this defect upon the hearing an oration which was made to him. As to the laſt fact, which the Spaniards, as he ſays, ſuppoſe to have happened in Germany, he maintains, that it is not related in any author of other nations. Would he have ſpoke thus, had he known the ſtory of the oration at Genoa, mentioned by Paul Jovius?

[*G*] *It was Charles the fifth's intereſt that raiſed him to the Papacy.*] Paul Jovius obſerves, that Hadrian had a ſhare in the numerous promotions of the year 1517 (25), by virtue of Maximilian the emperor's letters (26). He adds ſome other reaſons. As to the Papacy, it is a very common opinion, that Hadrian came to it, by the ſtrong intereſt of the emperor Charles V. 'Cæſare urgente Leoni demortuo abſens '(raro & inuſitato ſanè exemplo) Pontifex Max. un'dequadraginta patrum purpuratorum ſuffragiis crea'tur (27). —— *In compliance with the preſſing ſollicita'tions of the emperor, he, upon the death of Leo, was, 'tho' abſent, (a thing very uncommon) elected Pope, 'by the ſuffrages of thirty nine cardinals.* It is ſaid, that Amyot owed the place of grand-almoner of France, to a *converſation which happened on the ſubject of Charles V, at the table of Charles IX.* 'This em'peror was praiſed for many things, but eſpecially for his 'making his preceptor Pope . . . . The merit of this 'action was ſo heightened, that it made an impreſſion 'on Charles IX, ſo as to ſay, that *if occaſion offered 'he would do as much for his* (28).' It is therefore a pretty general opinion, that Pope Hadrian VI, was the creature of Charles V. But yet it ſeems, that this emperor procured him the papacy, but indirectly, and by accident. Paul Jovius, who has dived well enough into the intrigues of this conclave, tells us, that Julian de Medicis, the head of the ſtrongeſt faction, did not concern himſelf for Hadrian, till he found he could do nothing for himſelf (29). It is true, Hadrian's attachment for the intereſt of Charles V, made Julian's faction very favourable to him, when they could not carry it for the latter. They mention an inſcription wherein Hadrian owned himſelf obliged to his imperial majeſty for all his greatneſs (30). This inſcription was compoſed, ſay they,

(14) Ubi ſupra, pag. 283.

(15) *At the end of this work, in the* Diſſertation on defamatory Libels, n. XII.

(16) Margarita Maximiliani Cæſaris filia, quæ tum Belgis imperabat, ſacerdotio parochiali in Hollandia liberaliter honeſtavit.

(17) *Charles VIII, king of France.*

(18) Fabert, Hiſtory of the dukes of Burgundy, pag. 488. Heiſs, Hiſt. of the Empire, Tom. I, pag. 372.

(19) Val. Andr. Faſt. Academ. pag. 60.

(20) Idem. pag. 95, Biblioth. Belg. pag. 19.

(21) Iſtor. del. Concil. lib. ii, cap. ii.

(22) In vita Hadriani VI, pag. m. 227.

(23) Meditat. Hiſtor Tom. III, lib. iv, cap. vii, pag. m. 282.

(24) Prattique de l'Educat. des Princes, pag. 26, *& ſeq.*

(25) *Thirty one cardinals were made all at once.*

(26) Tum præſertim Maximiliani Cæſaris literis. *Jovius, pag.* 230.

(27) Swertius, Athen. Belg. pag. 95.

(28) *The abbot de St Real,* de l'Uſage de l'Hiſtoire. *See the remark* [*E*] *of the article* AMYOT.

(29) Itaque Medices deſperato vel neglecto Pontificatu Adrianum nominat. *Jovius, pag.* 246.

(30) *Wolfius,* Lect. memorab. Tom. II, pag. 192, *ſays, that this inſcription appeared upon a piece of tapeſtry at Louvain, when rejoicings were made for the creation of this Pope.*

was ſent embaſſador in Spain, to king Ferdinand, and ſome ſay he managed things with much greater addreſs [*H*], than could be expected from a man who had ſo long imbibed the univerſity air. He ſoftned this monarch, who was much diſſatisfied with his ſon-in-law's treatment of him, and with the zeal the nobility had expreſſed for the Auſtrian princes. Hadrian removed theſe ill impreſſions, the conſequences whereof were to be feared, and was honoured a little after with the biſhopric of Tortoſa [*I*], and continued his embaſſy notwithſtanding. He diſcharged the functions of it till Ferdinand's death (*e*). After which he ſhared the regency with cardinal Ximenes (*f*) [*K*]. It is true, his ſhare was the leaſt, to ſay no worſe (g): but there came

they, in theſe words, *Ultrajectum plantavit, Lovanium rigavit, Cæſar vero incrementum dedit*; that is, *Utrecht planted, Louvain watered, but the emperor gave the increaſe:* upon which ſome body ſaid, *there is nothing left here for GOD to do. Deo iſtic nec ſeritur, nec metitur.* This doth not hinder the creation of this Pope to have been only an effect of chance and ſpleen. Read theſe verſes of Pierius Valerianus, which are as fine as ſatirical (31).

Cum fluctuaret cymba, quæ magnos Deos,
  Romæ penates quæ vehit,
Leone adempto: providum, vigilem, parem
  Optabat infelix ducem.
Dum tota is ora quæritur Liguſtica,
  Totoque Tyrrheno mari,
Per Adriatici omne littus, per Padi
  Ripas, Lemani per juga:
Per Celtiberos, Gaditanos, Gallici
  Vaſtros per Oceani ſinus,
Quaque æſtuo ſum Sarmatas lambit ſalum,
  Qua circuit Britannias:
Repente nobis hunc dedit vecors furor
  Regione Rheni ab ultima;
Nil tale Patribus facere ſe putantibus:
  Nihil minus volentibus
Quam quem eligebant: nil minus poſcentibus
  Quam quem vocabent: ô mare!
O terra! votis Hadrianus omninm
  Fit Pontifex; ſed omnibus,
Quis credat? invitis. Deûm vis hæc, Deûm,
  Deûm abditum hoc arbitrium eſt.
Ut qui natantis deſpuunt regnum trabis,
  Parere diſcant viperæ:
Ut invicem qui ſe oderant Patres, ducem
  Inviſum haberent omnibus,
Malarum ut eſſet ſævus ultor mentium,
  Acri ipſe mente in ſingulos.

Fraught with the gods of Rome, to winds a prey,
(Great Leo from it's helm remov'd away)
The ſacred veſſel floated down the tide,
And wiſh'd as good and provident a guide.
Whilſt ſuch was look'd for on Liguria's ſhores,
Where Adria, or the Tyrrhene ocean, roars;
On Leman hills, or on the banks of Po,
Thro' various countries as it's waters flow;
O'er ev'ry coaſt of the wide weſtern main,
In German realms, in France, and diſtant Spain;
Or where the foamy flood Sarmatia laves,
Or throws around Britannia's iſles it's waves:
Faction, to an unuſual frenzy grown,
Sent us this man, to fill the Papal throne:
From the far diſtant Rhine, obſcure of fame,
Unthought of, undeſir'd by all, he came.
O ſea and land! the univerſal voice
Makes Hadrian Pope . . . . a moſt unwilling choice:
Heav'n's ſecret councils ſo decreed, that they,
Who ſcorn to own the floating veſſel's ſway,
May learn from hence the viper to obey;
That the grave fathers, ſwoln with mutual gall,
Might chuſe a leader hated by them all;
And he, to'ards all with malice prepoſſeſt,
Revenge on each the malice of the reſt.

Naudé relates (32) that Peter Martyr, *not the Florentine heretic, but the apoſtolic protonotary, a native of a little town of the duchy of Milan, ſaid, ſpeaking of the election of Hadrian VI: Cardinalibus hoc loco accidit quod in fabula de Pardo ac Leone ſuper Agno raptando ſcribitur; fortibus illis ſtrenuè ſe dilacerantibus, quodcumque quadrupes iners aliud prædæ ſe dominum fecit.* That is, according to Lewis de May's verſion, author of the notes on the *Coups d'Etat*. *It happened to the cardinals, on this occaſion, what the fable tells of the leopard and the lion, in contending for a lamb: whilſt theſe two generous animals were tearing one another, in conteſting valiantly for the prey, one of the moſt cowardly and brutiſh of beaſts, made himſelf maſter of it.*

[*H*] *In his he embaſſy managed things with addreſs,*] Mr Varillas is of another opinion. According to him (33), Hadrian was fit for nothing but to dictate in a college; he underſtood neither politics nor court intrigues, for which this is given amongſt other proofs, that, in his embaſſy to Arragon, he did not anſwer Chievres expectation. But who told Varillas that this was a ſign of his inability? Hadrian hated Chievres on many accounts (34); and inſtead of negotiating according to his views, he did him ill offices underhand. This no doubt was ill anſwering this lord's hopes, but was no ſign of inability.

[*I*] *He was honoured with the biſhopric of Tortoſa.*] Many authors (35) whom I have conſulted, agree, that Ferdinard gave Hadrian this biſhopric. But Mr Varillas ſays (36), that it was given him after this prince's death, as an amends for the power he was deprived of. We muſt know, that cardinal Ximenes, nominated regent of the kingdom by Ferdinand's will (37), would fill that poſt in ſpight of the commiſſion that Hadrian had brought from Flanders, to be regent of Caſtile and Arragon, in caſe of Ferdinand's death. The cardinal was more reſolute than Hadrian in his pretenſions; for the latter was brought to be content with part of the regency, and Mr Varillas ſuppoſes he was made biſhop (38), to make him amends. I have juſt been looking in a book (39) later than Mr Varillas's, where I find, that the author ſuppoſes our Hadrian was not biſhop at the time of the diſpute about the regency. Relating the circumſtances of this diſpute, he calls him only dean of Louvain, and he ſays (40), that Ximenes pretended *that this dean having conſented to have it only as a ſecond, the dignity and rank he bore in Caſtile, not permitting a SIMPLE PRIEST, as the dean was, to pretend to a precedency over a cardinal archbiſhop, he would allow him only what ſhare he thought fit.* The biſhop of Niſmes ſays expreſly (41), that the dean came not to the biſhopric of Tortoſa, but by Ximenes's recommendation after Ferdinand's death; and as he cites Alvara Gomez (42) and Peter Martyr (43), it is probable that Paul Jovius and the Biographers of the Netherlands, are miſtaken. The manner of Ferdinand's receiving the dean, does not intimate that he made him a biſhop: *He had penetrated the true ſubject of his embaſſy, he had treated him as a ſpy, and when Hadrian ſollicited for a ſecond audience, he angrily anſwered* what would he have; does he come to know whether I am dying? tell him I am not to be ſeen to day. *However he ſaw him a few days after, by the advice of his miniſters, and told him, that he was not well enough to treat with him about buſineſs, and ordered him to retire to Guadalupa, to the convent of St Jerome . . . . . . He gave him officers, in appearance, to ſerve him, but in effect to guard him, and to hinder ſuſpected people from having any commerce with him* (44).

[*K*] *He ſhared the regency with cardinal Ximenes.*] There is great probability in one of the circumſtances related by Mr Varillas. He ſays, (45) that one of the arguments urged to the dean of Utrecht (46), during his diſpute with Ximenes about the regency, was the repreſenting

---

(*e*) *Happening the twenty third of January,* 1516.

(*f*) Jovius, in vita Hadriani VI.

(*g*) *See* Varillas, Prattique de l' Education, du Prince, pag. 186. Holland Edit.

(31) *The author of the notes upon Sannazar's poems, printed at Amſterdam, in* 1689, *has inſerted them in page* 236, 237.

(32) Naudé, Coups d'Etat. pag. m. 23.

(33) *See the preface to the* Prattique de l'Education.

(34) Jovius, pag. 232.

(35) Jovius, ibid. pag. 228. Swert. Athen. Belg. pag. 95. Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag. 20.

(36) *Preface to the* Prattique. *See alſo, pag.* 190.

(37) Prattique de l'Education, pag. 183.

(38) *Note*, That after Hadrian's promotion to the cardinalſhip, he was called the Cardinal de Tortoſa.

(39) The Hiſtory of the Miniſtry of cardinal Ximenes, *by Mr Marſolier.*

(40) Pag. 372. Holland Edit.

(41) Flechier, Hiſt. of Cardinal Ximenes, *book iv, pag.* 633. Holland Edit.

(42) De rebus geſtis Ximen. lib. vi.

(43) Epiſt. 576, lib. xxix.

(44) Flechier, ibid. lib. iii, pag. 492, ad ann. 1515.

(45) Pag. 185.

(46) *It is thus they called Doctor Hadrian Florent, in Spain.*

came a time when his authority was much greater. Ximenes took too much upon him, for which reaſon the arch-duke Charles ſent him home, when he went in perſon to take poſſeſſion of his kingdoms of Spain; and ſome time after he gave the government to Hadrian in a very honourable manner, I mean, when he departed for Germany, where the imperial crown called him (*b*). Hadrian found himſelf much embarraſſed with the government of ſo many kingdoms, becauſe there aroſe a dangerous ſedition, which he could not have been able to ſurmount, had he not had two colleagues aſſigned him, *viz.* the Conſtable and Amirante of Caſtile. The invaſion of Navarre by the French, was another great trouble during his government. He came off with honour, and while he was enjoying the ſatisfaction of having recovered Navarre, he received the news of his election to the papacy (*i*). I have omitted to ſay, that Leo X, gave him a cardinal's cap in the year 1517. After his death, the ſeveral factions of the conclave terminated in the election of Hadrian (*k*), which highly diſpleaſed the people of Rome [*L*]. The new Pope embarking in Catalonia arrived at Rome the thirtieth of Auguſt [*M*]. He refuſed to change his name; and in every thing expreſſed his averſion to pomp and pleaſures, which was a thing againſt which preſcription was very old. His Pontificate laſted but till the fourteenth of September 1523. He had a great partiality for the emperor Charles V, and very little ſatisfaction in his triple crown [*N*]. It was perhaps his diſcontent, that gave occaſion

repreſenting to him, ‘that if he attempted to execute the commiſſions he had brought from Flanders, he would kindle a civil war in Spain, and be anſwerable to GOD for all the murders, and other crimes, that ſhould be committed; as he himſelf had previouſly confeſſed, in his excellent commentary on the Maſter of the Sentences, where he had taught, that a man raiſing diſturbances in a ſtate, when he might forbear it, without hazarding his conſcience, and his honour, was reſponſible for all the ſubſequent calamities. We have ſeen, above, that the dean was an honeſt man, and that he was not well ſkilled in the matter he pretended to. He was ſo charmed with the deference that was paid him, in referring to himſelf an affair wherein he was a party, and with the honour done him in citing the writings he had formerly dictated in the univerſity of Louvain, and afterwards printed, that he promiſed to ſubmit to what the council of Spain ſhould determine, provided an expedient was found to ſecure his reputation, and hinder the arch-duke's commiſſions from being turned into ridicule.’ Here is exactly the fable of the Raven and the Fox, only with this difference, that the Raven loſt his prey for future praiſes, whereas honeſt Hadrian loſt his, for praiſes given his ſinging in times paſt.

[*L*] *His election ..... highly diſpleaſed the people of Rome.*] What they call in the conclave, *being elected by inſpiration*, had a great ſhare in Hadrian's fortune. The cardinal de Medicis, at the head of all the young cardinals, a faction more powerful than that which is ſometimes calle *the Flying Squadron*, had no ſooner reſolved upon the election of the cardinal of Tortoſa, but he made his party promiſe to give him their voices all at once. This was done. The opening of the balots, ſhewing that a candidate was propoſed, of whom it ſeemed no body had yet thought, cauſed a great ſurprize. Cardinal Cajetan gave freſh encouragement, by adviſing thoſe that were neareſt him to take this ſide, ſince it was as he ſaid, that of GOD and men (47). Immediately many of them eſpouſed his intereſt with a good grace, by I know not what motive of religion; others, who knew not ſo much as the cardinal of Tortoſa's name, heſitated, but nevertheleſs followed the prevailing opinion: the torrent of inſpiration hurried them along, and made them forget all their intereſts. None but cardinal Urſini reſiſted this inſpiration of the conclave. Julian de Medicis was overjoyed, but the others fell into a ſad dejection; and the people were ſo inraged at their choice, that they loaded them with a thouſand abuſes, upon the coming out of the conclave. ‘Id populus adeo indignanter tulit, ut quum patefacto Conclavi Cardinales domum redirent, paſſim maledictis inceſſerentur, quod infamibus comitiis non modo urbem Romam ſuo antiſtite orbatam prodidiſſent, ſed quod inſaniæ proximum videretur, Italiam etiam Pontificatus honore ſpoliaſſent (48). —— *The populace were ſo enraged at it, that they loaded the cardinals with curſes as they went home, upon the breaking up of the conclave, calling out, that they had by their infamous cabals, not only betrayed the city of Rome, which was deprived of it's head, but had alſo, which appeared to be next to madneſs, robbed Italy of the honour of the popedom.*’ One of them thanked the people, for ſuffering them to come off ſo cheap, whereas if they had had their deſerts, they ſhould have been ſtoned. *Adaperto conclavi quum globus Cardinalium Hadriani pontem eſſet prætervectus, & opifices puerique minacibus oculis voceque & manibus obſtreperent, nec à fœdiſſimis probris abſtinerent, Sigiſmundus Gonzaga Cardinalis renidenti vultu his egit gratias, quod adverſus extrema ſupplicia meritos contumeliis eſſent contenti, nec lapidibus publicam injuriam vindicarent* (49). The peoples indignation was founded upon their having had no regard to the ſtain of *original ſin*, and the fear that the new Pope would keep this ſee elſewhere than in Rome.

[*M*] *He arrived at Rome the thirtieth of Auguſt.*] Francis Swertius (50) ſays, that Didacus Stunica has made a relation of this voyage. I doubt it much; for Nicolas Antonio does not ſpeak of it, tho' he ſpeaks of another relation of a voyage written by this author, of leſs conſeqence than this would be. Probably Swertius has confounded the one with the other. The relation mentioned by Nicolas Antonio, is that of a voyage which Stunica made to Rome in 1520, which Schottus has inſerted in the end of his *Spaniſh Bibliotheque*. Inſtead of Didacus Stunica, he ſhould have called him Blaiſe Ortiz, for it is he who compoſed a relation of the voyage of Hadrian VI. It was printed at Toledo, in the year 1548. The author went from Spain to Rome with this Pope (51).

[*N*] *He had ..... very little ſatisfaction in his triple crown.*] This is ſignified in the inſcription he would have engraven on his tomb; *Adrianus VI hic ſitus eſt, qui nihil ſibi infelicius in vita duxit quam quod imperaret —— Here lies Hadrian VI, who eſtemed no misfortune, which happened to him in life, ſo great, as his being called to govern.* Father Labbe (52) ſays, this epitaph was put on his tomb in the church of St Mary *dell'Anima*, but he is miſtaken; the cardinal, who erected him a mauſoleum in this church, put a much longer and more pompous inſcription on it. It is to be ſeen in abundance of authors. The other was only engraven on the tomb where he was proviſionally depoſited in St Peter's church. See Paul Jovius at the end of this Pope's life. We need not wonder that Hadrian VI thought the papal crown ſo heavy, for the general affairs of Chriſtendom were in great confuſion in his pontificate, and he was not ſufficiently acquainted with the genius of the Italians, to avoid offending them in a thouſand inſtances. The news he daily received of the progreſſes and menaces of the Ottomans, and his little experience in the affairs of Italy, ſo diſturbed his head, that he could not forbear ſaying, he had more ſatisfaction in governing a college of Louvain, than in governing the whole Chriſtian church. *Neceſſe erat Pontificem rerum Italicarum penitus ignarum, & tum primum urbium ſuarum & provinciarum regulorumque nomina perdiſcentem, in omnibus conſiliis vehementiſſimè conturbari, adeo ut quum his curarum fluctibus jactaretur, aliquando diceret, ſibi fuiſſe jucundius Lovanii gymnaſium cum ſtudiorum laude moderari, quam Romæ pontificia in ſede Chriſtianam rempublicam adminiſtrare* (53). If he had not been able to know, of himſelf, that his irreſolutions and delays cauſed miſchief and murmurs, he would

---

(*b*) Hadrianus cum imperio toti Hiſpaniæ præficitur tanta cum dignitate, ut Cæſar recuſantem & præoptantem ſequi humaniſſimis precibus ut manere vellet exorare cogeretur, quando rege abſente in Hiſpania præſide opus foret præclaræ dignitatis & famæ, qui &c. *Jovius*, pag. 231.

(*i*) Idem. pag. 251.

(*k*) *January* 9, 1522.

(47) Poſtquam Diis ac hominibus placet. *Jovius, pag.* 250.

(48) Ibid.

(49) Idem. pag. 251.

(50) Athen. Belg. pag. 95.

(51) Nic. Anton. Tom. I, pag. 179.

(52) De Script. Eccleſ. Tom. I, pag. 415.

(53) Jovius, pag. 262.

occaſion to ſuch a behaviour, as made him paſs for a hater of mankind [*O*]. The Italians have publiſhed heinous calumnies againſt him [*P*]; and even they, who inſtead of defaming him in his morals, acknowledge his probity and zeal, fail not to ſay, he was not fit to be Pope [*Q*]. His very ſobriety has not eſcaped railleries [*R*]. The joy that was expreſſed for his death, was in reality a great commendation

would have known it by the reproaches he received from Ferdinand's ambaſſador, even to his face, who began his ſpeech thus: 'Fabius Maximus, ſanctiſſime 'pater, rem Romanum cunctando reſtituit, tu vero 'pariter cunctando rem Romanam ſimulque Europam 'perdere contendis. —— *Moſt holy father, Fabius* '*Maximus, by delays, reſtored the affairs of Rome;* '*but you, by delays, endeavour to ruin, not only Rome,* '*but all Europe.*' This exordium ſo confounded the Pope, that as the cardinals hated him, they were ready to break out into laughter (54).

[*O*] *His behaviour made him paſs for a hater of mankind.*] Pierius Valerianus (55) makes him a man who avoided human ſociety, and who in the cavalcades kept at as great a diſtance as poſſible from the courtiers; he put ſpurs to his horſe when he ſaw others approach him. To ſee this author's ſatire in all it's extent, we muſt chooſe certain editions, for there are ſome that have been expunged in this particular. That of Baſil, of 1575, is not of this number, as Father Theophilus Raynaud has obſerved (56), who has taken this Pope's part, againſt the humaniſts of that time.

I do not mention the Capitolo of Bernai againſt this Pope; I only ſay, that this paſſage is not to be taken literally:

> Baſta ch'egli hanno fatto un Papa ſanto
> Che dice ogni mattina la ſua Meſſa,
> E non s'el tocca mai ſe non col guanto.
>
> *Sufficient 'tis we have got a ſaint for pope,*
> *Who every morning mutters o'er his maſs,*
> *And toucheth not himſelf without a glove.*

It is a burleſque, familiar, and even a proverbial hyperbole amongſt the Italians, *Gli hippocriti*, ſays Aretin Giorn. I della II parte, *che non ſel toccano mai ſe non col guanto.* —— *The hypocrites who never touch themſelves but with a glove.* I owe this obſervation to Mr de la Monnoie.

[*P*] *The Italians have publiſhed heinous calumnies againſt him.*] They were not contented to accuſe him of prodigious avarice, but gave out (57), that they had at laſt diſcovered the reaſon of his retiring every day into a corner of the Vatican, where he ſuffered no body to enter; that it was not like Numa, to conſult heaven how to govern well, but to careſs an handſome woman; his nymph Egeria. They added, that the diſtemper he died of, proceeded from too much uſe of venery (58); and that he was not contented to divert himſelf with women, but alſo muſt have handſome boys (59). This was not all. They publiſhed that he was a magician, and that his friends, deſiring to elude the proofs that were taken from I know not how many magical inſtruments, which were found in his chamber after his death, ſaid, that laboured to find the philoſopher's ſtone. As it could not be denied, that he had the outward appearance of an honeſt man, and was a lover of reformation and juſtice, they ſaved themſelves by ſaying, that he was only a hypocrite; and that this vice is more common in Germany, than is imagined. See, concerning all this, a letter of Chriſtopher Battus, to Jerome Saulius, in the ſecond volume of Wolfius. We read in the ſupplement of the abbot of Urſperg's chronicle (60), that they found amongſt this Pope's ſecret papers, ſome magical books, and that ſome pretend he came to the Papacy by this wicked art.

Note, that Gerard Moringus obſerves, that this honeſt Pope underſtanding that the Italians formed evil ſuſpicions upon his bringing ſome youths from Spain, ſent them immediately back into their own country. 'Si 'quando antea, tum maxime ſpeciem omnem impudi'citiæ amovit. Eoque cum adoleſcentes aliquot ho'neſtæ tum indolis tum ſtirpis in gratiam parentum 'in familiam aſcitos, ex Hiſpaniis ſecum in urbem 'duxiſſet, intellexiſſetque Italos ex convictu illorum, 'neſcio quæ abominanda, noſtratibus inuſitata ſuſpicari, 'ſtatim in Hiſpanias remiſit, in academia Salmanticenſi 'plenius literis imbuendos, quibus antea domi ipſius 'à pio ſimul & erudito viro Theodorico Hezio ſe'cretario ipſius utcumque imbuti fuerant eo jubente '(61). —— *If at any time before, he then more par*'*ticularly removed the ſmalleſt appearances of impurity.* '*Therefore, having brought over with him from Spain,* '*ſome youths of good parts, as well as of good birth, whom* '*he had, at the deſire of their relations, taken into his* '*family; and hearing that the Italians took occaſion,* '*from this, to ſuſpect I do not know what abominable* '*practices, quite unknown to our countrymen, he preſently* '*ſent them back to Spain, to finiſh their ſtudies in the* '*univerſity of Salamanca, which they had begun, while* '*in his family, under the pious and learned Theodoric* '*Hezius, his ſecretary.*' The ſame writer expreſſes an extream indignation againſt the author of the letter I have quoted, which Wolfius has inſerted in the ſecond volume of his lectures. 'Battus quidam Parmenſis 'quandam de ejus defuncti relicta fama epiſtolam edi'dit, Latinam quidem illam ac terſam, ſed adeo im'pudenter mendacem, ut ipſa mentiendi impudentia, 'dicam an inſcitia, vel apud malevolos fidem ſibi ab'roget. Quid os impurum eo impulerit, nihil eſſe 'aliud reor, quam id quod Comicus habet, Mala mens, 'malus animus (62). —— *Battus of Parma publiſhed an* '*epiſtle concerning his character, in elegant Latin in*'*deed, but filled with ſuch notorious falſhoods, that* '*the groſſneſs, or ſhall I ſay the folly, of his lies,* '*will deprive him of credit even among the moſt mali*'*cious. I cannot imagine what could tempt him to ſuch* '*impudent abuſe, except, as the comic poet has it,* 'mala mens malus animus, *the wickedneſs of his own* '*heart.*'

[*Q*] *Even they who acknowledge his zeal, fail not to ſay, that he was not fit to be Pope.*] Few will read this place, without perceiving that cardinal Palavicini is pointed at, and thinking of the *new goſpel*, in which many maxims of his hiſtory of the council of Trent have been ſo ſeverely cenſured. Hadrian VI was, in the cardinal's opinion, an excellent eccleſiaſtic, but an indifferent Pope. *Fu Eccleſiaſtico ottimo, Pontefice in verita mediocre* (63). He was leſs eſteemed in the opinion even of the people, who judge of things only by the event; for, in conſequence of the bad ſucceſs of his reign, he was reckoned even leſs than an indifferent Pope (64). This honeſt Flemming, not finding in Italy the candour and ſincerity, in which he had been trained up, entered into a general miſtruſt: he believed that ſnares were laid for him every where; he durſt truſt only thoſe of his own country, who, with their openneſs, without experience, did him more injury, than the Italians would have done with their diſſimulation. The Janſeniſt, who wrote the *new goſpel*, has made a malicious uſe of all cardinal Palavicini's conceſſions concerning the good qualities of this pope; but at the bottom, the cardinal is not ſo much in the wrong, as may be pretended. It is true, if the Chriſtian church was what it ought to be, the ſame virtues which would furniſh out a good clergyman, would ſuffice for a Pope; but (65) in the ſtate in which the church of Rome has long continued, under an head whoſe ſpiritual power is ſo incorporated with the temporal, that the preſervation of the one depends upon that of the other, it is folly to pretend, that a Pope, who underſtands not the arts of courts, and the ſlights of politics, can diſcharge his duty. See the remark [*U*] of the article BELLARMIN, at the end. To accompliſh the Proteſtants prophecies, there need be but four or five Popes ſucceſſively, ſuch as ſome have been, who were otherwiſe rigid moraliſts. However, it is worth while to ſee Dr de Launoi's letter (66) wherein he makes our Hadrian's apology againſt cardinal Palavicini.

[*R*] *His very ſobriety has not eſcaped railleries.*] He was ſo little uſed to the dainties of Rome, that there was no fiſh he preferred before ſtock fiſh; ſo that the price of this fiſh roſe conſiderably in his pontificate, not without the laughter of all the fiſh-market. Inſtead of praiſing him for this, Paul Jovius has had the boldneſs to ſay, that he had no better taſte with reſpect to good diſhes, than judgment for the adminiſtration of affairs. I ſo weaken the force of this author's Latin, that it is neceſſary dation of him [S]. I cannot tell whether they were Catholics or Proteſtants, who gave out firſt that he permitted ſacrifices to be made to the heathen gods, in order to ſtop the peſtilence [T]. Guicciardin has not ſpared him more than others; for he pretends (*l*) that they who elected this barbarian to the popedom, were led rather by a blind fury, than by choice and deliberation (*m*); and that being unable to aſſign any reaſon for their extravagant conduct, they excuſed themſelves by imputing it to the Holy Ghost, who was uſed, as they ſaid, to inſpire the cardinals, during the election of the Popes (*n*). Hadrian's body was depoſited in the Vatican church, betwixt thoſe of Pius II and Pius III, and removed afterwards to St Mary *dell' Anima.* William Enckevort, the only cardinal he had made, took all the care of it, and

---

(54) Idem, pag. 276.

(55) Hieroglyph. lib. xix.

(56) Hoplotheca, pag. 346.

(57) Poſtea compertum eſt illic mulierem forma egregia clam habuiſſe, cujus amoris causâ eò tam frequenter itaſſe creditur ejus amplexu frui ſolitum. *Battus, apud Wolfium, Lect. memorab. Tom. II, pag.* 192.

(58) Laboravit permultum antequam è vita excederet & ſtranguria & torminibus, in quas ægritudines plerumque incidere ſolent qui coitu immodico utuntur. *Ibid.*

(59) Datum eſt hoc inſuper crimini quod puerorum amoribus delectaretur, quia inter cæteros miniſtros nonnullos tenellæ ætatis & eximiæ formæ habebat. *Ibid.*

(60) *See* John Creſpin, Etat de l'Egliſe, ad ann. 1523.

(61) Ger. Moringus, in vita Hadriani VI.

(62) Id ibid. in præfat.

(63) Palavic. lib. ii, cap. ix.

(64) Id. ibid.

(65) *See* Palavicini, lib. ii, cap. vii, pag. m. 206.

(66) Epiſt. iv. 7.

neceſſary to tranſcribe it word for word. *Modo Merlucciæ plebeio admodum piſci Hadrianus Pontifex, ſicuti in adminiſtranda republica hebetis ingenii vel depravati judicii, ita in eſculentis inſulſiſſimi guſtus ſupra mediocre pretium ridente toto foro piſcario jam fecerat* (67). The court of Rome went from one extream to another; for never was there a Pope, whoſe table was ſo delicate, as that of Leo X. Men got into his favour by the invention of ragoos; and there were four nice judges of good eating, who became his minions. They invented a ſort of ſauſage, which aſtoniſhed Hadrian VI, when he examined the expences of his predeceſſor. ‘Mire favit Pogio ſeni Pogii Hiſtorici filio, itemque Moro nobili à gulæ intemperantia . . . . . & Brandino Equiti, Marianoque Sannioni cucullato facetiſſimis helluonibus, & in omni genere popinalium delitiarum eruditiſſimis. Nam inter alia portenta inſanientis eorum gulæ lucanicas conciſis pavonum pulpis farctas commenti fuerant, quod obſonii genus mox ſucceſſor Hadrianus, vir Batavæ frugalitatis, mirabundus expavit, quum ſumptuarias rationes Leonis inſpiceret (68). —— *He was wonderfully taken with old Poggius, ſon to the hiſtorian of that name, with Morus a noted Epicure . . . . . Brandini, a knight, and Mariana, a merry monk, who were all good fellows, and nice critics in good eating. For, among other prodigies of their luxury, they invented a ſort of ſauſages ſtuffed with the delicateſt parts of peacocks, which aſtoniſhed his ſucceſſor Hadrian, a man of Dutch frugality, when he looked into the expences of Leo's table.*’ For his part, he kept no ſuch uſeleſs officers as thoſe, and was ſo much the reverſe of Leo X, that his charge was not above twelve crowns a day. The Romans ſatirized this great frugality, and ſaid, that the Vatican was grown like thoſe houſes which were deſerted becauſe they were haunted by ſpirits. *Familiam adeò ſordidam & exiguam alebat, ut ſumptus quotidianus duodecim aureos non excederet. Quid plura? Vaticana domus non jam domus illa Pontificia, & ocellus urbis ut quondam, ſed domus aliqua, ut poëtæ tradunt, quæ propter lemurum formidinem vacua & deſerta ſit, præ ſolitudine videbatur.* Thus ſpeaks Chriſtopher Battus, whom I have cited above. Paul Jovius's words give us to underſtand, that there were ſome people at Rome, who, in complaiſance to this Pope, valued his favourite fiſh. We ſhall ſee, in the article of the chancellor DU PRAT, that this was not the firſt time that great men have brought into faſhion, ſome diſhes which were deſpiſed before. I believe likewiſe, that Hadrian's preference of beer to wine, was no leſs laughed at, than that of the ſtock-fiſh to all other fiſh. His common drink was beer, to which his laſt ſickneſs was attributed. He had a great care of his health, and he dined at ſo conſtant an hour, that he abruptly quitted the moſt important affairs, when he had notice that dinner was ready: but he eat little. *Ferunt Hadrianum alioqui vegetæ viridiſque ſenectæ contraxiſſe morbum aſſiduo cerviſiæ potu . . . . Nam per ſe cibi parciſſimus erat, & in tuenda valetudine apprime diligens & moroſus, tanta horarum definitione, ut denunciante Architriclino paratas eſſe epulas, vel maximarum rerum colloquia protinus abrumperet* (69).

[S] *The joy that was expreſſed for his death was, in reality, a great commendation of him.*] Becauſe nothing rendered him more odious than his deſire to put a ſtop to the crying ſins, and to imploy the ſevereſt puniſhments againſt them. The report was, that he was going to publiſh ſome terrible bulls againſt Judaizers, ſcoffers at holy things, Simoniſts, Uſurers, and Sodomites. This laſt article alarmed both the court and city; and ſome young men there, after his death, fixed feſtoons upon his phyſician's gate, with this inſcription in capital letters, TO THE DELIVERER OF THE COUNTRY. *Ultimo inquirere punireque decreverat juventutis corruptores, ejus enim criminis non omnino falſa ſuſpicione urbs ipſa conniventibus legibus infecta credebatur. Quâ inopinatâ & gravi ſeveriſſimæ legis mentione, maculoſos quoſdam cum aulæ tum civitatis veluti deſperata publica ſecuritate terruerat, adeo ut non defuerint petulantiſſimi juvenes, qui Joanni Antracino Pontificis Medico poſtes feſta fronde per intempeſtam noctem protinus exornarent, cum titulo uncialibus literis inſcripto in hæc verba,* Liberatori Patriæ S.P.Q.R. (70). Could the joy at ſuch a ſovereign's death, be any thing elſe than a proof of his virtue? Paul Jovius relates, that this joy was exceſſively great. ‘Morte ejus plerique & præſertim veteris aulæ ſectatores effuſiſſime ſunt lætati, & ſecundum eos nonnulli Romanorum qui detrimenta rerum ſuarum ſenſerant. —— *Moſt people, eſpecially the courtiers of the former Pope, rejoyced exceedingly at his death; and next to them, ſome of the citizens of Rome, who had ſuffered in their particular affairs.*

[T] *I cannot tell . . . . . who they were, who firſt gave out that he permitted ſacrifices to be made to the heathen gods, in order to ſtop the peſtilence.*] I have not yet had time to proceed far in the ſearch of the original of this lye. I have only traced it to a book printed at Amſterdam, in 1661 (71), wherein are theſe words. ‘Is (*Adrianus VI.*) ad *avertendam peſtem* quæ graviſſime in urbe ſæviebat, *Mago Demetrio Græco conceſſit ſylveſtrem taurum Diis Gentilium ad placandam eorum iram mactare,* ceſſavitque lues. —— *Hadrian, in order to avert a plague which then raged violently in the city, allowed Demetrius, a Greek magician, to ſacrifice a wild bull to the heathen deities, to appeaſe their wrath, and accordingly the plague ceaſed.*’ The author cites Paul Jovius in the twenty firſt book of his hiſtory; but we muſt believe in charity, and for his honour, that he had not read this hiſtorian. Let us ſee what Paul Jovius ſays; the paſſage deſerves relating. He only ſays, that the Pope did not ſeverely forbid the communication with the infected houſes, and that this method, which was very different from the cuſtoms of Italy, occaſioned the death of abundance of people. He is not ſaid to have given leave to the magician to make this ſacrifice; it is only ſaid in general, that no body durſt oppoſe the populace, who favoured this Demetrius: beſides, it is not ſaid that this man pretended to ſacrifice the bull to the heathen Gods; and as to the ſucceſs, it is only ſaid, the plague decreaſed. What then do they think of, who cite Paul Jovius, when they vent ſo many circumſtances which he has not mentioned? ‘Exorta eſt in Urbe peſtilentiæ lues, quæ quum ſeveris legibus more noſtro Pontifici minime coërcenda videretur, contactu ægrorum ita exarſit, ut multa funera in compitis viſerentur, appareretque vaſtari Urbem, haud multo dierum ſpatio, niſi Græculus quidam nomine Demetrius Spartanus, ſedandæ peſtilentiæ, faventi ei turba hominum, negotium ſuſcepiſſet, nemine ſuperſtitionem vetare auſo. Nam ferum taurum, cui dimidium cornu diſſecarat, magico carmine dextram in aurem prolato repente ita manſuefactum reddiderat, ut injecto tenui filo ad integrum cornu, quo vellet perducens, peſtilentiæ placando numini ad Amphitheatrum immolaret. Nec credulæ multitudinis ſpem ex toto fefellit, quum ab ea inanis ſacrificii proſpera litatione, miteſcere morbus cœpiſſet (72). —— *The plague broke out in the city, and the Pope not thinking it proper to confine the infected, by ſevere laws, according to the cuſtom of Italy, it raged ſo, by the touching of the ſick, that the ſtreets were crouded with funerals, and it ſeemed as if the city would have been laid waſte in a very few days, if one Demetrius Spartianus, a Greek, had not undertaken to ſtop the peſtilence, who, being favoured by the populace, no body durſt oppoſe his ſuperſtition.*

(*l*) Lib. xiv, fol. m. 421.

(*m*) *Cardinal Palavicini confutes this*, lib. ii, cap. ii. *See the article* GUICCIARDIN, *remark* [*F*].

(*n*) Della quale eſtravaganza non potendo con ragione alcuna eſcuſarſi, transferivano la cauſa nello Spirito Santo, ſolito ſecundo dicevano à inſpirare nella elettione de' Pontefici i cuori de' Cardinali.

(67) Jovius de Piſcibus Romanis, cap. i.

(68) Jovius, in vita Leonis X, pag. 191. *Varillas*, Secret Hiſtory of Florence, pag. 207, *ſays, that theſe ſauſages were filled with nothing but the moſt delicious parts of the fleſh of pheaſants. He takes a peacock for a pheaſant.*

(69) Jovius, in vita Hadriani, pag. 283.

(70) Jovius, pag. 281.

(71) Compend. Hiſtoriæ, *by John Lætus, profeſſor at Franeker.*

(72) Jovius, Hiſt. lib xxi, fol. m. 11.

and erected a ſtately monument to him (*o*). Let it not be forgotten, that this Pope was an author [*U*]. It is ſomewhat ſtrange, that a man who owed his advancement to his learning, ſo little countenanced men of letters [*X*]. The collection of the letters of princes, contain (*p*) ſome particulars of this Pope's humour. His life has been amply written by Gerard Moringus, a divine of Louvain.

He did not diſſemble the great abuſes he obſerved in the church; he publickly acknowledged them, and that in a very ſtrong manner, in the inſtruction he gave the nuncio who was to ſpeak in his name at the Diet of Nuremberg [*Y*]. He therein deplored the ſad life of the clergy, and the corruption of morals which had appeared in

‘*ſuperſtition. He took a wild bull, and having cut the half of one of his horns in two, by repeating ſome magical verſes in his right ear, he became preſently ſo tame, that leading him about at pleaſure, by a ſlender thread, which he tied about his entire horn, he ſacrificed him at the Amphitheatre to appeaſe the deity. Neither did he entirely beguile the hopes of the credulous multitude, for from the time of this vain ſacrifice, the plague began to aſſuage.*’

[*U*] *Let us not forget that this Pope was an author.*] His *Quæſtiones* and *Expoſitiones* upon the fourth book of the Maſter of the Sentences, were printed at Paris in folio, in the year 1512, and in 1516 (73), and his *Quæſtiones quodlibeticæ duodecim*, at Louvain, in octavo, in 1515, and at Paris in folio, the year following. During his ſtay in Spain, he compoſed *Computum hominis agonizantis, & Sermonem de ſacculo pertuſo*. After his pontificate, he publiſhed *Regulas Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ*, and writ many letters to the princes of Germany, *&c.* which were printed with the Councils, or elſewhere.

I have ſomething to obſerve concerning his work upon the Maſter of the Sencences. The Sieur Konig (74), deceived by their ambiguity, who have ſaid *in* IV *ſententiarum quæſtiones & expoſitiones* (75), affirms, that our Hadrian publiſhed queſtions on the four books of the ſentences. Here is a new proof of what is ſaid in the firſt remark of this article, that an author cannot be ever ſo little unexact but he throws another into falſhood. Would it not have been better to have ſaid *in quartum ſententiarum*, or *in* IV *librum ſententiarum*, than to uſe the number IV, which ſignifies as well *Quatuor* as *Quartos*. Father Oldoini (76) has committed the ſame error as the Sieur Konig. Mr Varillas deſerves to be heard concerning this book of Hadrian: *his commentary*, ſays he (77), *upon the Maſter of the Sentences, was admired, and certainly if this book was not the ſubtleſt of three hundred of the ſame nature, which were then to be found in the libraries; it was at leaſt the cleareſt and moſt methodical.* The author had maintained (78) *in the moſt deciſive manner imaginable*, that it *was certain the Pope might err even in matters belonging to faith*, and it is pretended he did not change his opinion when he was Pope, as did Pius II, for he altered nothing in this part of his book, in the edition of it which was printed at Rome, during his pontificate.

[*X*] *It is ſtrange .... that he ſo little countenanced men of letters.*] We have ſeen, in the remark [*D*], his notions of the poets. This might more eaſily be pardoned him than the ſinking the funds which had been imployed for the maintenance of learned men, who came from Greece into Italy, to whom the weſt is indebted for the reſurrecton of polite learning. Cardinal Beſſarion *maintained at Rome, part of theſe great genius's, and eſtabliſhed an academy for them in the Vatican. But the greateſt number ſubſiſted upon the bounties of Pope Nicolas V. . . . .* (79) *Of all his ſucceſſors, there was none but Hadrian VI who ſuppreſſed theſe gratifications, by an oeconomy which doth no honour to his memory* (80). Let us ſee the obſervation of another author (81). ‘All the learned of his time promiſed themſelves advancement on his coming to the pontificate, becauſe he owed all his fortune and exaltation to learning. And therefore they could not but be aſtoniſhed to ſee him ſo ill diſpoſed towards all who delighted in polite literature, calling them *Terentianos*, and treating them in ſuch a manner, that it was thought he would have brought in barbariſm again, had he not died in the ſecond year of his ſupream dignity. Paul Jovius ingeniouſly ſays *, that he thus ill treated the wits of his age, with the ſame ſenſe and judgment, as he preferred the Dutch ſtock-fiſh, before all other diſhes, and the beſt fiſh in Italy.’ Paul Jovius does not ſay this See his text in the remark [*R*]. The reader will be glad to know where la Mothe le Vayer has taken what he ſays; for that reaſon I ſhall give a fine paſſage here, of Pierius Valerianus. ‘Fuit & ſub Hadriano VI par bonarum omnium litteratum infortunium. Nam cùm is Leoni Decimo ſuffectus eſſet, ad quem utpote litterarum Principem magnus litteratorum numerus confluxerat, dum non minora de Hadriano ſibi quiſque pollicetur, ecce adeſt muſarum & eloquentiæ, totiuſque nitoris hoſtis acerrimus, qui litteratis omnibus inimicitias minitaretur, quoniam ut ipſe dictitabat, Terentiani eſſent, quos cùm odiſſe, atque etiam perſequi cœpiſſet, voluntarium alii exilium, alias atque alias alii latebras quærentes, tamdiu latuere, quoad Dei beneficio altero Imperii anno deceſſit, qui ſi aliquanto diutius vixiſſet, Gottica illa tempora adverſus bonas literas videbatur ſuſcitaturus (82). —— *Learning laboured under the ſame misfortune, under Hadrian VI. For he having ſucceeded to Leo X; to whom, as to the great protector of learning, a great many learned men had flocked, and they expected no leſs favour from Hadrian; but he, on the contrary, proved a violent enemy to poetry, eloquence, and all polite learning; and threatened all ſcholars with his diſpleaſure, becauſe of their being Terentiani, as he called them. They therefore being thus hated, and ſome of them perſecuted by him, retired, ſome into a voluntary baniſhment, others into ſuch retirements as they could find; where they continued till, by the goodneſs of* GOD, *he died in the ſecond year of his Pontificate, who, if he had lived a little longer, would probably have plunged us again into Gothic barbarity and ignorance.*’

[*Y*] *He acknowledged the abuſes . . . . . in a very ſtrong manner, in the inſtruction he gave to the Nuncio, who was to ſpeak . . . . . . at the Diet of Neuremberg.*] This Nuncio's name was Francis Cheregat. This was a part of his inſtruction. ‘Dices nos ingenuè fateri, quod Deus hanc perſecutionem à Lutheranis illatam, eccleſiæ ſuæ inferri permittit, propter peccata hominum, ſacerdotum maximè, & eccleſiæ prælatorum. Clamant ſcripturæ peccata populi derivari à peccatis ſacerdotum, proptereaque, ut ait Chryſoſtomus, Salvator noſter curaturus infirmam civitatem Jeruſalem, ingreſſus eſt priùs templum ut peccata ſacerdotum primò caſtigaret, inſtar boni medici, qui morbum à radice curat. Scimus in hac ſancta ſede aliquot jam annis multa abominanda fuiſſe, abuſus in ſpiritualibus, exceſſus in mandatis, & omnia denique in perverſum mutata, nec mirum, ſi ægritudo à capite in membra, à ſummis Pontificibus in alios inferiores prælatos deſcendit. Omnes nos prælati, videlicet eccleſiaſtici declinavimus, unuſquiſque in vias ſuas, nec fuit jam diu qui faceret bonum, non fuit uſque ad unum. —— *You ſhall acquaint them that we ingenuouſly own, that* GOD *has ſuffered his church to be perſecuted by the Lutherans, becauſe of the ſins of men, eſpecially of the prieſts and prelates of the church. The ſcriptures teſtify, that the ſins of the people proceed from the ſins of the prieſts. For this reaſon St Chryſoſtom obſerves, that when our Saviour was about to cure the city of Jeruſalem of it's diſeaſes; he firſt of all went into the temple, that he might firſt chaſtiſe the ſins of the prieſts, like a good phyſician, who ſtrikes at the root of the diſtemper. We are ſenſible that for ſome years paſt, there have been many abominations in this holy ſee, abuſes in ſpirituals, exceſſes in mandates, and, in fine, every thing changed to the worſe; and it is not to be admired, if the diſeaſe has deſcended from the head to the members, from the Pontiffs to the inferior prelates. All we prelates, I mean eccleſiaſtic, have gone aſtray, every one into his own*

‘*paths,*

(*o*) Jovius, ubi ſupra. Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg. Aub. Miræus, Elog. Belgic.

(*p*) *In two letters of Jerome Niger, to Mark Anthony Micheli, fol. m.* 81, 85.

(73) *There are more editions of it.*

(74) Bibliotheca vet. & nova.

(75) Swertius, Athen. Belg. Valer. Andreas, Bibl. Belg.

(76) Athen. Roman. pag. 306.

(77) *Preface to the* Prattique de l'Education.

(78) *Maimbourg, Treatiſe of the Church of Rome, pag.* 138.

(79) Notæ in Phranzam, pag. 275. *Platina, cited in Guillet's Hiſt. of Mahomet II, Tom. I, pag.* 255.

(80) Theodor. Spandug. apud eumdem Guillet, ibid.

(81) La Mothe le Vayer, Tom. I, pag. 436.

* 7 De Piſc. Rom. *It ſhould be* 1, *and not* 7.

(82) Pier. Valerianus, de Literat. Infelicitate, lib. ii, pag. m. 90.

in the perſons of ſome Popes. He had long wiſhed to introduce among the clergy, a reformation of manners. He had laboured to effect this, whilſt he was dean of St Peter's at Louvain, but the fruitleſſneſs of his pains had obliged him to deſiſt from his enterprize [Z]. The juſteſt cenſure which can be made of him, is his contradicting the good rules he had given againſt the purality of benefices [*AA*]. Note, that when he canonized

‘ *paths, and there has not been one for a long time* ‘ *who has done good, no not one.*’ A Proteſtant writer imagines, that the cardinals ſo ſtrongly reſented this Pope's diſhonouring the court of Rome in this manner, in the diet of the empire, and burning a man for the crime of beaſtiality, that they ſhortened this Pope's life. *Nec tamen tam fœlicibus ad perfectum Papatum rudimentis profecit, quo minus illi purpuratæ Partæ offenſæ, quòd comitiis Noribergenſibus dedecoraſſet rem Romanam, & quòd quendam jumento ſuo pro ſuo arbitatu uſum, homo Batavus & ad Papalem venerem frigidus, cremaſſet: filum illud diu regnandi, & videndi, abrumperent* (83).

[Z] *He had laboured to bring about a reformation of manners, whilſt he was dean, but the fruitleſſneſs of his pains made him deſiſt from his enterprize.*] As ſoon as he was raiſed to the deanry of St Peter's at Louvain, which is a very conſiderable preferment, with fine privileges annexed, he ſet himſelf more than ever to preach by his own example; knowing that his endeavours to bring his colleagues into the right way, would be more effectual, if he himſelf practiſed the duties of temperance. He perſiſted to live frugally; there was more neatneſs than magnificence at his table; and when he entertained, he preſſed no body to drink, and never began thoſe healths which oblige the company to drink round. Neither did he ſuffer any perſon to begin any ſuch healths to him; he ſet himſelf above all this pretended German civility. His feaſts laſted but an hour, and he cauſed ſome piece of ſcripture to be read part of the time: he would have had it read during all the meal, but for fear of diſguſting ſome of his gueſts. *Neque temere ultra horam accumbebat, etiamſi convivas magnos haberet, atque interim fere adhibito lectore, qui aliquid e literis ſacris recitaret, ut non minus mente, quam ventre convivæ delectarentur, ſed id tantum ad tempus ne lectio longior cuiquam fortaſſis moleſtiæ eſſet* (84). He alſo continued a very chaſt life: There was nothing of wantonneſs in his geſtures or diſcourſes: nor would he ſuffer any obſcene words in his preſence; though otherwiſe he delighted in a virtuous facetiouſneſs. Nor did he only abſtain from all actual impurities, but carefully avoided the appearances and ſuſpicions of it. He particularly made it his duty to poſſeſs his colleagues with the ſame practical morality. He vehemently exhorted them to it, in the diſcourſes he made at the chapter meetings, and ſharply cenſured ſuch as he knew addicted to drinking and gaming, and eſpecially thoſe who kept concubines (85), omitting nothing that could oblige them to refrain from that evil commerce. But he met with ſo many obſtacles, becauſe ſome of the more aged and potent oppoſed his deſign, that he renounced it. His zeal had like to have coſt him his life; he had been poiſoned, if his phyſician had not found a good antidote againſt arſenic. It was thought this was done by a canon's concubine, were he was invited to dinner. *Sed in re longe honeſtiſſima tantum difficultatis habuit, obnitentibus quibuſdam è ſenioribus ac potentioribus, & præſertim non ſuppetente auxilio, ſine quo hujuſmodi non temerè confici queunt, ut negotium magna ex parte infectum relinquere debuerit. Quinimo parum abfuit, quin per eam ipſam cauſam, veneno perierit. Id concubina unius e Canonicis, a quo ad prandium vocatus erat, boluſculo ejus, quod primum omnium menſæ inferri ſolenne eſt, indidiſſe putabatur* (86). When he ſaw there was no hope of reformation, and that his endeavours procured him many enemies, he totally deſiſted and declared, that the deans of chapters were much leſs reſponſible for theſe diſorders, than the biſhops, for the deans were obliged to receive thoſe whoſe corruption was grown inveterate. But nothing obliged the biſhops, or their vicars, to confer orders and benefices, as they did, upon infamous debauchees. *Dum ſpem nullam fructus conſpiceret, nihilque aliud ſibi quam odium & malevolentiam quæri intelligeret, in totum conatu ſuſperſedit, ſatis habens, ſignificaſſe ſibi diſplicere, poſtquam aliud præterea non poſſet, prædicans tamen culpam eam non tam Decanis Collegiorum, qui jam obſtinatos & in ſordibus illis inveteratos exciperent, quam Epiſcopis, eorumque vicariis præſtandam, qui quoſcunque ſine delectu, quantumvis probroſos & infames, ad ordines & beneficia admitterent; nulla aut exigua, in retroactam vitam inquiſitione facta* (87). All this is taken from a book written by a prieſt. Let it not then be objected, that theſe are ſlanders of Proteſtants.

It is certain, that the dean ſhewed the true cauſe of the evil: the negligence of the biſhops, or their vicars, was the ſcource of the diſorder. They did not examine whether they, who were admitted to benefices, had lived well, and given good proofs of a conſtitution which could abſtain from bodily pleaſures. This want of enquiry was a gate through which abundance entered into the church, who were already bent towards ſenſuality: a bent which is difficultly rectified, which gathers ſtrength continually, till it grows into habit, an almoſt incurable diſeaſe. You ſee then why our Hadrian's exhortations could have no effect upon canons long practiſed in drunkenneſs, and the pleaſures of concubinage. They were ſo beſotted with this courſe of life, that they could not imagine how it was poſſible to live without it. It is infinitely harder to perſuade a bachelor of forty five or fifty years to marriage, than a widower of ſixty, who has juſt loſt his wife: ſo great is the power of cuſtom. The concubine, on her part, finds it as hard to part with her canon, after having been ſo many years at bed and board with him. Where ſhall I go, ſays ſhe, what ſhall I do? where ſhall I find ſo good a bed, ſo good a table, ſo good a fire? and therefore you will find her, and her companions, very ready to oppoſe the deſigns of a reformer. The dean of Louvain needed a more undaunted courage; for the poiſon of theſe concubines was as formidable as the dagger of an aſſaſſin. Not finding he had any call to martyrdom, he choſe rather to leave things as they were, than to expoſe himſelf to hatred, and even death, by going to reform them. *In magnis voluiſſe ſat eſt*, was doubtleſs his maxim.

[*AA*] *He may be juſtly reproached with having contradicted the good rules he had given . . . . . againſt the plurality of benefices.*] When he was only profeſſor of Louvain, he maintained, that this plurality was vicious; and that a man, who had once gotten a living that was ſufficient to maintain him handſomely, ought to be content with it, and ſtop there. But when he was at the the arch-duke of Auſtria's court, he accepted many preferments, and forgot his former doctrine. This inconſtancy gave ſcandal to ſome people. *Honores & ſacerdotia quædam magnifica acceſſere, non ſine admiratione, & fortaſſis offenſione aliquorum, qui eum diverſum facere incuſabant, atque aliquando docuiſſet. Docuiſſe quippe, non eſſe fas cuiquam multa habere beneficia, ſed uno aliquo ad honeſtam mundamque ſuſtentationem vitæ ſufficiente, quietum ac contentum eſſe debere* (88). The author I borrow theſe words from, declares he will not examine whether this conduct was cenſured juſtly or unjuſtly (89); but yet he undertakes to juſtify it, and uſes the moſt plauſible arguments which can be offered upon ſuch a ſubject. He ſays, amongſt other things, that it ſhould not be thought ſtrange, that Hadrian thought that lawful in himſelf, which would have been unlawful in others, who had not the ſame extraordinary qualities, or poſts at court, that he had. The great talents that God has given a prieſt, are much more ſerviceable to the church, when they are accompanied with a large revenue; and it cannot be denied, but that an eccleſiaſtic, who has employments at court, is neceſſarily obliged to greater expences. The author adds to this, many other arguments of the ſame nature, and which have all the fault of being fit to be employed in an apology for the caſuiſts, like that of Father Pirot. I mean, they may ſerve to juſtify thoſe, who being in great poſts, heap all the vacant places upon their own heads. May not it be ſaid on their behalf, that they will make a better uſe of them than others, and that they are neceſſary for them, that their great qualities may have liberty to act in their whole extent, for the profit and advantage of the ſtate. The author adds, that it is falſe, that Ha-canonized Antoninus and Benno, he did not ſuffer the expences which were uſual in ſuch ſort of ceremonies, fobidding them as a thing repugnant to the ſanctity of canonization (q). A learned Jeſuit was cenſured for having cited this fact [BB]. This Pope's ſucceſſors, were of another opinion; they have tolerated worldly pomp in canonizations, to that exceſs as to offend the vulgar by it [CC].

---

(83) Novor. Epiſcop. Belgic. Diviſio, pag. 79. Edit. 1570.

(84) Gerardus Moringus in vita Hadriani VI.

(85) Arguebat graviter, ſi quos malæ frugis, bibaces, aleones ſciret, & præſertim, qui amicas domi prope uxorum loco haberent, quos dirimere viribus omnibus contendebat. *Id. ibid.*

(86) Id. ibid.

(87) Id. ibid.

(88) Id. ibid.

(89) In quo merito ne eum an immerito culparint equidem non habeo dicere, cum hiſtorici perſonam hic potius quam cenſoris agam. *Id. ibid.*

drian oppoſed the plurality of benefices, either in his books or lectures. He has rather countenanced it, continues he, as appears by his commentary upon Lombard. *Neque vero ipſe Hadrianus uſquam diverſum aut docuit, aut ſcripſit, ut ei falſo intendunt, ſed potius contra. Legat eum qui velit, in quartum Petri Lombardi ſcribentem, ubi de reſtitutione agens, quæſtionem illam ex profeſſo differit* (90). All that this author mentions afterwards from this commentary, is not much to his purpoſe. If what he pretends might be inferred from it, it would only be by an oblique and very indirect conſequence; and he ſays nothing of the *quodlibetic* oration, that it is affirmed Hadrian printed againſt the plurality of benefices. We will cite a Proteſtant writer, who tells us the anſwer this Pope made to thoſe that asked him why he did not remove a corruption, which he had ſo well condemned. ‘ Imò cùm Lovanii olim edidiſſet Quodlibeticam Orationem contra pluralitatem beneficiorum, monentibus ‘ cur ipſe qui jam poteſtatem tollendi haberet, quod ‘ antè reprehendere tantum potuiſſet, omnia beneficia ‘ maximè ex Inferiore Germania ſupplicantibus intercíperet, reſpondit: cum parvuli eſſemus loquebamur, ſapiebamus, faciebamus ut parvuli: nunc autem poſtquam viri facti ſumus, reliquimus ea quæ ‘ ſunt parvuli. Sic homo Trajecti non ſolum ex ‘ viliſſimis parentibus ortus, verum etiam uſque ad ‘ ipſum magiſterium, mendicitate, & eleemoſinariis ‘ ſumtibus educatus, ad inſuetæ fortunæ pruritum ‘ exiliit, ſic in illa ſede promovit, hanc reformationem ‘ promiſit (91). —— *He having long before publiſhed ‘ at Louvain a quodlibetical oration againſt plurality of benefices, ſome took the liberty to ask him, why he, who ‘ now had the power of removing that abuſe, which before he could only condemn, did now himſelf lay hold ‘ on all the vacant benefices, eſpecially in the Low-Countries, he anſwered,* when I was a child, I ſpake as a ‘ child, I thought as a child, and acted as a child, but ‘ when I became a man, I put away childiſh things. ‘ *In this manner, that man born at Utrecht, of mean parents, and who, till he arrived at the degree of maſter ‘ of arts, was maintained by the charity of others, was ‘ ſwelled with his uncommon fortune, and thus when he ‘ arrived at the Papal chair did he promote this promiſed reformation.*’ I imagine, the Walloon miniſter I am going to cite, took the following reflexion from this Latin (92): ‘ Pope Hadrian VI, preceded him. ‘ There were ſome who wondered to ſee him act a‑ ‘ gainſt a certain oration he had made at Louvain, being there *Magiſter Noſter*, diſapproving the multiplicity of benefices, and their crouding them under one ‘ hat: when, being Pope, he did the ſame thing, eſpecially with reſpect to the benefices in the Netherlands. He anſwered them in the words of St Paul, ‘ *When I was a child, I ſpake as a child, &c.* 1 Cor. ‘ 13.’ Mention is made of this, in the News from the Republic of Letters, 1684 (93).

[BB] *He prohibited the expences . . . . of canonization. A learned Jeſuit was cenſured for having cited this fact.*] He found himſelf publickly accuſed of maintaining, that the charges of canonization are contrary to the purity and holineſs of this act. His accuſer's name was Sebaſtian of St Paul; he had been divinity profeſſor at Louvain, and twice provincial of the Carmelites in the Netherlands. Obſerve how this Jeſuit defended himſelf. He ſaid (94), that he only reported what he had read in Blaſius Ortizius, canon of Toledo, and a domeſtic of Hadrian VI. II. That having cited this in Italic, and named his author, he had reaſon to complain of being calumniated by his critic, who has ſuppreſſed theſe circumſtances; for an accuſation is not only unjuſt, when it affirms a falſhood, but alſo when it conceals the truth. *An ignoras certam eſſe apud Theologos ſententiam, quod accuſatio eſſe poſſit graviter injuſta, non tantum ex falſi impoſitione, ſed etiam ex reticentia veri* (95). III. That from his alledging a thing as glorious to Hadrian VI, it does not thence follow, that he taxes the other Popes with error, who approve or appoint the great expences of canonization. IV. That he praiſed Hadrian as a pontiff moved with an honeſt zeal, and acting according to the inſtincts of conſcience, of which we may, and on many occaſions ought, to follow the innocent error (96). V. That he did not give his approbation to Hadrian's motive, which was, that theſe expences were repugnant to the purity and holineſs of canonization. VI. That he doubts not but they are founded upon many weighty reaſons. VII. That Hadrian VI might err in that point as a private doctor, without prejudice to the infallibility of Popes pronouncing *ex cathedra.* VIII. That Baronius relates ſome much more notable errors of ſome Popes without being obnoxious, to be accuſed of injuring the holy apoſtolic ſee.

Who doth not here ſee the fatal marks of pre-engagement? A Roman Catholic is a true ſlave in his judgment: there are a thouſand inſtances in which he cannot commend good actions. Can any thing be more ſelf-evident than that Hadrian VI merits approbation both for what he did, and for the reaſon why he did it? And yet here is a Jeſuit, who not being able to praiſe him without indirectly cenſuring the other Popes, is forced to tread upon thorns in juſtifying himſelf; nor can he get off but by ſuppoſing our Hadrian in an error, but that his errors, being accompanied with a good intention, excuſe him. This is all the glory a Pope can promiſe himſelf, who ſets up to reform corruptions. He ſhall be excuſed for the errors of his conſcience, and be ſaid to have erred, not as a Pope, but as a private doctor. Great goodneſs indeed.

[CC] . . . *His ſucceſſors have allowed them to that exceſs as to offend the vulgar by it.*] Every body was ſcandalized in Paris, in 1622, to ſee the pomp wherewith the barefooted Carmelites celebrated the canonization of St Thereſa. There came out the ſame year a little book, wherein it is feigned the good women murmured very much. One of them complains that ſhe was burnt there. *Pray, couſin, ſays a young married woman, was you at this fire? For my part, I never ſaw ſuch diſorder, nor ſo much miſchief; one of my brothers too had his whole face deſtroyed, and there is no likelihood of his recovery. But to what purpoſe are all theſe ſuperfluities, ſays a toothleſs old woman? In my younger days I never heard of canonizing ſaints in this faſhion, it is rather canonading than canonizing. Softly, ſoftly, aunt, ſays a merchant's wife of St Denis's ſtreet, a great deal more has been done at Rome. Theſe are public rejoicings; there is no danger ſometimes in ſuperfluities, when we are induced to them by a pure and ſincere affection; and beſides, what the Carmelites have done, was by the command of the queen, who has ſupplied this expence, becauſe St Thereſa was a native of Spain. No matter for that, ſays a citizen's wife, living near Saint Leu, GOD has been a thouſand times more offended than honoured by it; and I promiſe you, I do not at all approve of theſe things: how many maids do you think have been run away with? All the corn round about is beaten down and burnt: they have taken the month of Auguſt for it, rather than July. For my part, ſays an advocate's wife of the great council, I would have been of opinion, that all theſe ſuperfluities ſhould go to the adorning their church, at leaſt it would have remained there for them, and they would have been more eſteemed for it, and not to evaporate ſo much wealth into ſmoak, this would have kindled the fire of devotion in the hearts of thoſe who came to viſit them; whereas, on the contrary, all the air and fields round about have been ſet on fire with there fuſees: I had a ruff of five ſtories utterly ſpoiled: beſides, if the fire had been lighted at eight of the clock, ſo many cloaks had not been loſt; all the ſcholars were there in arms* (97). After all, it muſt be ſaid here, as on many other occaſions, there is nothing but is good for ſomething or other; the greateſt abuſes have a fair ſide. If canonizations could be made without vaſt expences, they would be more common: it is well that the impoſſibility of ſupplying the expence is a barrier to the greedineſs of the monaſtic orders. Subjects of canonization would not be wanting; every community would have as many of them as the others; and if the charge was but little, the other engines would eaſily be prepared.

(q) Tales ſumptus quaſi alienos à ſanctimonia & puritate canonizationis fieri vetuit. *Blaſius Ortizius, apud Papebrochium, Tom. VII, Maii, pag.* 555.

(90) Id. ibid.

(91) Novor. Epiſcop. Belgic. diviſio, pag. 78, 79.

(92) Jeremy de Pours, Melody of the Holy Pſalmiſt, pag. 859.

(93) In November, art. vi, pag. 931.

(94) Daniel Papebrochius reſponſ. ad exhibitionem errorum, pag. 62.

(95) Id. ibid.

(96) Laudo Adrianum VI, quia id fecit zelo bono & ſecundum conſcientiam quam inculpabiliter errantem ſequi cum laude poſſumus, & ſæpe debemus. *Id. ibid.*

(97) *See the book intituled,* Le Caquet de l'Accouchée . . . *The Goſſiping Tittle-Tattle,* pag. 5, *of the ſecond day.*

HADRIAN.

HADRIAN (CORNELIUS DE), in Dutch Hadrianſen (*a*), a famous Dutch preacher in the XVIth Century, was of Dort: he became a Franciſcan, and was guardian of the convent, and lecturer of divinity (*b*). He underſtood Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, well, and publickly taught theſe three languages (*c*). He preached thirty years at Bruges, and never was concerned at the ſlanders which were publiſhed againſt him. He died at Bruges, at ſixty years of age, the fourteenth of July, 1581. He compoſed a treatiſe concerning the ſeven ſacraments. John Lernutius had ſeen in manuſcript many very learned ſermons of this friar (*d*). The works which came out under his name, after his death, were mixed with buffoonry, and immodeſt jeſts. Sanders pretends, that the heretics foiſted them in, to defame the memory of this good and innocent monk (*e*). He ought to have proved this, or not to have ſaid it. The Proteſtants ſpeak of this Franciſcan, as of a violent declaimer (*f*); and there are books which ſay that, he had introduced among women, a new ſort of devotion, which was, that he appointed them certain days, in which they were to ſtrip themſelves ſtark naked before him [*A*], that he might give them a gentle diſcipline for the expiation of their faults (*g*). There is nothing that theſe people are not able to perſuade women to, under the ſpecious pretence of devotion [*B*], when they have the talent of prating, and are celebrated for their preaching. I have read ſomewhere, that George Caſſander, who taught the *Belles Lettres* at Bruges, whilſt Cornelius de Hadrian taught divinity there, found himſelf obliged, in the year 1554, to baniſh himſelf [*C*], in order to avoid the calumnies of this colleague.

[*A*] *His devotees were to ſtrip themſelves ſtark naked before him.*] If Gyges's maxim were true, that a woman diveſts herſelf of her modeſty with her cloaths (1), our Hadrian's affairs had been in a good caſe, ſuppoſing him not to have been viſionary enough to fancy, that his giving ſome laſhes to the naked bodies of the penitents, would have a ſingular virtue to expiate their ſins. The world is ſo ready to conſtrue things perverſly, that there are few who will attribute the conduct of this friar, to any other principle than what ſomebody calls an inquiſitiveneſs into the pleaſures of others. Ἔοικε ἤ τε μοιχεία, πολυπραγμοσύνη τῆς ἀλλοτρίας ἡδονῆς εἶναι, καὶ ζήτησις καὶ ἔρευνα τῶν φυλαττομένων καὶ λανθανόντων τοὺς πολλούς. Videtur adulterium curioſa in alterius voluptatem eſſe inquiſitio eorumque indagatio, quæ abſconduntur & pleroſque latent (2). ——— *A curious prying into other peoples pleaſures, and breaking in upon their ſecrecy, ſeems to be a ſort of adultery.* If it were true, as ſome learned men have affirmed (3), that in the primitive church, thoſe who were baptized, of what age or ſex ſoever, were as naked as they came into the world, one might better apprehend how this man, by his fine tongue, and great airs of piety, might bring his devotees to his ends. The ſacrament of penance, ſaid he perhaps to them, ought to be adminiſtred as baptiſm formerly was; the puniſhment of the laſh, to which I condemn you, makes part of this ſacrament; therefore, *&c.* Meteren (4) relates ſo fully, and with ſo many circumſtances, what concerns the devotees of this friar, that one may believe it to be true.

Henry Stephens tells a ſtory that has ſome relation to this. ‘ They went ſo far, *ſays he* (5), as to require ‘ (as I have read it) that they ſhould be allowed in confeſſion to handle the parts which have been the inſtruments of the ſin that is confeſt. And one of them ‘ who made that requeſt, being told by a biſhop that ‘ it would be a ſhameful thing, if men and women ‘ were obliged to ſhew them their privy-parts; he anſwered, that if a confeſſor may honeſtly conſider ‘ with the eyes of the mind, (which are much more ‘ precious than thoſe of the body) not only the members that have committed filthy actions, but alſo the ‘ very filthineſs committed by them, which are diſcovered to him in confeſſion; much leſs ought it to be ‘ thought an immodeſt thing to look upon thoſe very ‘ members with the eyes of the body.’ He further alledged, ‘ that a confeſſor, being a ſpiritual phyſician, ‘ ought to feel his patient, as the phyſician of the ‘ body feels and handles his patient. And mixing ‘ ſome blaſphemies and prophanations with his jeſting ‘ diſcourſe, he brought in theſe words of our Lord, ‘ *Go, and ſhew thyſelf to the prieſt*, as if it had been ‘ the cuſtom to ſtrip, and ſhew themſelves naked to ‘ the prieſt.’

Dr Boileau mentions what concerns our Hadrian. *Inter exempla*, ſays he (6), *tam infauſtæ notitiæ recenſere non pertimeſcam, Hiſtoriam hominis cucullati & cordigeri conventus Brugenſis anno circiter MDLXVI cui nomen erat Cornelio Adriaſem* (7) *origine Dordracenſis, adverſus hæreticos Guezios ſtomachoſiſſimi concionatoris; qui puellas ceu fœminas quaſdam Sacramento fidelitatis & obedientiæ ſibi adſtrictas & ſpecie pietatis devotas non quidem aſperatis & nodoſis funibus verberabat, ſed nudata earum femora, & nates inhoneſtis vibicibus rorantes virgis betuleis aut vimineis ictibus molliter inflictis perfricabat, uti refert Emanuel Meteren Hiſtoriæ Belgicæ fol. cliij. & cliv. edit. Amſtelodamenſis ann.* 1570 (8). Theſe words are to be found in his curious *Hiſtoria Flagellantium*. The French tranſlator has not underſtood them; for he tranſlates them as follows: ‘ Amongſt all theſe woeful examples of rigid ‘ piety, I ſhall venture to report, on the teſtimony of ‘ Meteren *, a ſtory of a Franciſcan of a convent at ‘ Bruges, called *Cornelius Adriaſem*, originally of *Dort*, ‘ who lived about the year 1566, and was a violent ‘ preacher againſt the Heretics, called *Gueux*: This ‘ monk had ſome girls and married women, who, ‘ under the appearance of religion, and under the oath ‘ of fidelity and obedience, were ſo devoted to him, ‘ that he was not ſatisfied with beating them with ‘ cords, with large knots; but beſides, he gently whipt ‘ their thighs and naked hips, with rods of oſier, or ‘ birch.’ The Latin paſſage is ſo far from ſaying that this monk made uſe of cords with large knots, that the contrary is evident from it.

[*B*] *There is nothing but theſe people are able to perſwade women to, under pretence of devotion.*] I have ſpoken elſewhere of the great docility of the ſex. See the remarks of the articles FRATRICELLI and GUILLEMETE.

[*C*] *George Caſſander . . . found himſelf obliged . . . to baniſh himſelf.*] The paſſage which I am going to quote, as a proof of this, contains a parentheſis, which concerns the whipping I ſpoke of above. ‘ Quum ‘ ante annos circiter XL (*they are the words of Vulcanius, in an epiſtle dedicatory, dated from Leyden, on new-years-day,* 1595) (9) Georgius Caſſander vir doctiſſimus Brugis Flandrorum communi utriuſque noſtrûm ‘ patria publicum bonarum literarum profeſſorem agens, ‘ ut collegæ cujuſdam ſui qui ſacras ibidem literas docebat, (illius inquam furioſi Theologi, à quo poſtea ‘ cùm ſe in Seraphicam familiam dediſſet, famoſa illa ‘ Gynopygica diſciplina Cornelianæ nomen invenit) calumniis cederet, voluntarium ſibi ipſi exilium indixiſſet. —— *When about forty years ago, the learned ‘ George Caſſander, who publickly taught the* Belles ‘ Lettres *at Bruges in Flanders, our common country, ‘ went into a voluntary baniſhment, that he might avoid ‘ the calumnies of one of his colleagues, who taught divinity there; I mean that furious divine, from whom, ‘ after he had entered into the Seraphic tribe, the famous ſtripping diſcipline, got the name of the Cornelian.*’

HAY,

(*a*) *That is to ſay, ſon of Hadrian.*

(*b*) Swert. Athen. Belg.

(*c*) Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg.

(*d*) Swert. ibid.

(*e*) Apud Valer. Andr. ibid.

(*f*) Tempore quo caninam ſuam eloquentiam celebratiſſimi nominis Franciſcanus, Cornelius Adriani - - - exercebat. *Schoockius, Exercitat. Sacr. pag.* 538.

(*g*) *See* Voëtius, Polit. Eccleſ. Tom. I, pag. 686.

(1) Herodot. lib. i, cap. viii.

(2) Plutarch. de Curioſ. pag. 519.

(3) Joſephus Vicecomes de ritibus Baptiſmi. Voſſius, in Theſibus de Baptiſmo.

(4) Meteren, Hiſt. des Païs-Bas, livr. viii, fol. 153. Hague Edit. 1618.

(5) Apology for Herodotus, book i, chap. xxi, pag. m. 254, 255.

(6) Hiſtor. Flagellantium, pag. 218, 219.

(7) He ſhould have ſaid Hadrianſen, as Meteren's tranſlator did.

(8) I do not believe that there is ſuch an edition of Meteren.

* Hiſt. Belgicæ, fol. 153, 154, Edit. Amſt. ann. 1570.

(9) Prefixed to Nilus's treatiſe *de Primatu Papæ*.

HAY, a family of Scotland. It owes the beginning of it's nobility to a very famous action. It is ſaid, that the Danes having invaded Scotland in the reign of Kenneth III, about the year 980, a battle was fought betwixt them and the Scots in which the latter being put to flight, retired towards Perth. They were obliged to paſs through a very narrow way, betwixt the mountains and the river Tay. A countryman, with his two ſons, who happened to be there, all men of undaunted courage, made himſelf maſter of the defile, exhorted the fliers to make head againſt the enemy and ſtopt the paſſage againſt thoſe who endeavoured to continue their flight. He did more, he armed himſelf with what came next to his hands, and followed by his two ſons, who were armed with a piece of their plough, he fell with ſuch fury upon the Danes, and ſo encouraged the fliers by his example, that victory declared for the Scots. The enemy was put to flight in his turn, and Scotland was preſerved from the ſlavery the Danes had deſigned to reduce it to. This peaſant, known afterwards by the name of HAY, was the founder of the family I ſpeak of. He and his two ſons ſignalized themſelves in an extraordinary manner in the fight; they cauſed a great conſternation, and made a great ſlaughter wherever they fought. This noble action which ſaved their country, met with a ſuitable recompenſe [*A*], and ſince that time this family has been one of the moſt eminent of the kingdom. It has produced ſeveral branches [*B*], and many perſons of great merit [*C*]. The earl of Errol is at preſent the head of it. He is married to Anne Drummond, ſiſter to the earl of Perth (*a*).

[*A*] *This noble action . . . met with a ſuitable recompenſe.*] HAY was conducted by all the army to the king's palace, and received in the meeting of parliament the higheſt degree of nobility. The king gave him a conſiderable part of the enemies ſpoils, and the flight of a falcon in good lands: that is, a falcon was let looſe, and notice taken where he perched, and all the lands ſituate betwixt his riſe and the place where he reſted, were given to Hay. The place where he ſtopped, is ſtill called Falcon-Stone. By this means Hay was poſſeſſed of the moſt fertile ſoil in Scotland, ſituate where the battle was fought, along the river Tay. King Kenneth gave him a coat of arms, which were argent three eſcutcheons gules, to ſignify that the courage of three men had ſaved the kingdom (1).

[*B*] *This family has produced ſeveral branches.*] They are ſpread not only in Scotland, and England, but alſo in France, and eſpecially in Normandy (2). I only mention the branch of the earls of Tweedale and Kinnoul, which ſtill ſubſiſt (3).

[*C*] . . . *and many perſons of great merit.*] We have no accounts of the condition of this family, from the reign of Kenneth III, to the reign of Robert Bruce; for Edward I king of England, taking advantage of the diviſions of Scotland, at the time when Robert Bruce and John Baliol were diſputing for the crown, made an irruption into the kingdom, and carried away, not only the public records, but alſo the papers and documents of particular families; thoſe of the family of Hay were carried away, as well as many others. During this civil war, ROBERT HAY ſtuck to the intereſts of Robert Bruce with an entire fidelity, and did him ſo conſiderable ſervices, that he was rewarded for them with the place of hereditary high-conſtable of Scotland, in the year 1313, and that he might ſupport that dignity with a ſuitable luſtre, the ſame prince gave him great poſſeſſions in land, in the county of Aberdeen. This office has ſtill remained in the family, and is enjoyed at preſent by the earl of Errol, who is reckoned the nineteenth of his family; who has enjoyed it. NICOLAS lord HAY was killed in 1332, with 280 gentlemen of his family, at the battle of Duplin, taking the part of king David Bruce againſt Edward Baliol. DAVID lord HAY, his ſucceſſor, accompanied king David Bruce in the war againſt the Engliſh, and was killed in the year 1344, at the battle of Durham. THOMAS lord HAY, married king Robert the ſecond's daughter, who brought him for her dowry, the barony of Inchtuthill, in the county of Perth, about the year 1376. WILLIAM lord HAY was deputed in the year 1423, with ſome other gentleman, to deliberate about the means of reſtoring king James I to liberty, who was kept priſoner in England. He ſucceeded in that affair, and a little time after was created earl of Errol. WILLIAM HAY, earl of Errol, high-conſtable of Scotland, and ſheriff of the county of Aberdeen, accompanied James IV, to the battle of Floudon, in the year 1513, and was killed there with his prince, together with eighty ſeven gentlemen of his name. Francis Hay, earl of Errol, by his conſtant adherence to queen Mary, and the Romiſh religion, was expoſed to great misfortunes, his houſes were demoliſhed, his eſtate pillaged, and himſelf impriſoned: but under king James VI, ſon to queen Mary, he was in favour. He was one of the Scotch lords, who was ſent into England in 1604, to ſettle the union of the two crowns. His ſon aſſiſted at the coronation of Charles I in Scotland, in the year 1633. GILBERT HAY, earl of Errol, had a great ſhare in the the friendſhip of Charles I, and made a conſiderable figure in the parliament at Edinburgh, at the time of Charles the ſecond's reſtoration. JOHN HAY, earl of Errol, at preſent high-conſtable of Scotland, is his ſon (4).

(*a*) Taken from a memoir communicated to the Bookſeller.

(1) Taken from the aforeſaid memoir.

(2) Mr Pelliſon, *Hiſtory of the French Academy, pag. m.* 246, ſays, Paul Hay, Sieur du Chatelet, was of the ancient family of Hay in Bretagne, which boaſts of being deſcended ſix hundred years ago, from that of the earls of Carliſle, one of the moſt illuſtrious families in Scotland.

(3) Taken from the aforeſaid memoir.

(4) Taken from the ſaid memorial.

HAY (John) a Scotch Jeſuit, entred into the ſociety in the year 1566 (*a*), and made his noviciate at Rome, and the profeſſion of the fourth vow. He taught in ſeveral places, in Poland, France, and the Netherlands. His chief theatre was the college of Tournon, where he taught divinity, mathematics, and Hebrew. He died the twenty firſt of May, 1607, at Pontamouſſon, where he was chancellor of the univerſity. He imployed himſelf much in controverſy, and wrote ſeveral books againſt the Proteſtants [*A*]. He had alſo a verbal diſpute in Straſburg, with Pappus, and John

[*A*] *He wrote ſeveral books againſt the Proteſtants.*] *A collection of queries to the miniſters.* He compoſed it in Scotch, as Father Alegambe ſays: who adds, that the French tranſlation was made by Michael Coyſſard. *The apology for thoſe queries.* He wrote it in French, according to Father Alegambe; but it is an error: for John Hay affirms in his preface that he wrote it in Latin, and that it was tranſlated into French by ſome of their ſcholars. This apology was made *againſt the libel of James Pineton de Chambrun, preacher at Niſmes*, and printed at Lyons in 1586. The epiſtle dedicatory, dated the ſecond of July, 1585, ſhews that the author had read divinity publickly for five years at Tournon. *Antimonium ad Reſponſa Bezæ. Diſputatio contra Miniſtrum anonymum Nemauſenſem.* His *Helleborum Joanni Serrano*, found among his papers, is preſerved in the archives of the ſociety at Rome (1). This is all we learn from the two *Bibliotheques* of the Jeſuits. The authors of them did not know that John Hay had actually publiſhed a book againſt de Serres, (*viz.*) an Anſwer to that miniſter's ſecond Anti-Jeſuit (2). The other works of John Hay are, *Scholia brevia* in

(*a*) According to Southwell, *Bibliotheca Script. Societ. Jeſu, pag.* 459. For Father Alegambe puts 1562, and not 1566.

(1) Sotuel, Bib. Script. Societ. pag. 459.

(2) See the Defence to the Queries, at the end of the Anſwer to the Preface.

John Sturmius (*b*). Father Alegambe deſerves a little cenſure (*c*). We muſt not confound John Hay with a Jeſuit of that name, who was baniſhed by a decree of the parliament of Paris [*B*]. They both pretended to be of the family of Hay (*d*), mentioned in the foregoing article.

in Bibliothecam Sanctam Sixti Senenſis, and a Latin tranſlation of ſome letters of Jeſuits, written from Japan and Peru. It was printed at Antwerp, in 1605, in 8vo. See Father Alegambe.

[*B*] *A Jeſuit of his name, was baniſhed by an arrêt of the parliament of Paris.*] His name was ALEXANDER HAY. 'He was convicted of ſeveral ſeditious diſcourſes againſt the king, after the reduction of Paris, ſo far as to ſay, that if he paſſed by their college, he would gladly throw himſelf headlong out of the window to break his neck by that means.' This we read in Mezerai's great hiſtory (3). The author of the Anti-Coton will inform us of the date of the decree of the parliament. 'There were informations given Alexander Hayus, a Scotch Jeſuit, who had taught publickly, that we ought to diſſemble and obey the king for a time ſeemingly, frequently ſaying theſe words, *Jeſuïta eſt omnis homo.* —— *A Jeſuit is all to all men.* This Jeſuit was moreover charged with often ſaying, that he would be glad, if the king paſſed by their college, to throw himſelf from the window, and break his neck. For which reaſon, by a decree of parliament, of the tenth of January, 1595, the ſaid Hayus was condemned to perpetual baniſhment, and enjoined to continue it, upon pain of being hanged and ſtrangled, without any form of proceſs (4).' The author of the *Remerciment des Beurrieres*, having ſaid the ſame thing, adds (5) 'that this Jeſuit having afterwards repeated and confirmed theſe words in the city of Prague, and as the grandees of the kingdom having ſollicited to have him brought back into France on that account, it was anſwered, that he had eaten ſome peeled barly, not well boiled, and was found dead as ſuddenly as the provoſt-marſhal of Pluviers, ... who was ſtrangled at the Chatelet, with a ſtring of his drawers, which was not ſtrong enough to bridle a fly.' Alexander Hayus, if we believe Paſquier (6), *in the time of the troubles, was teacher of the firſt claſs of the Jeſuits college at Paris.*

HAILLAN (Bernard de Girard lord of) hiſtoriographer of France, deſcended from an ancient and noble family [*A*], was born at Bourdeaux about the year 1535. He ſet up early for an author, and after having appeared in the Republic of Letters, in the quality of a poet and tranſlator [*B*], he applied himſelf to the writing of hiſtory, and ſucceeded ſo well, that by his firſt performances of this nature, he obtained of Charles the IX, the title hiſtoriographer of France, in 1571 [*C*]. In 1576,

[*A*] *He was deſcended from an ancient and noble family.*] When he ſpeaks of the materials he collected to compoſe the Hiſtory of France, he does not forget the aſſiſtances of his relations. 'Francis de Girard, my brother, lord of Haillan, *ſays he* (1), ſent me from Bourdeaux, many papers, concerning the affairs of Guienne, collected by the late Lewis de Girard, our father; and by Giles, Mark, and Richard de Girard our grand-father, and great-great-grand-father; the two laſt whereof lived in Bourdelois, in nourable poſts, at the time that the city of Bourdeaux, and the country of Guienne were reduced to the obedience of the French in 1451.' He tells us, in another place (2), that his father was a 'curious man in the antiquities of his country, who for above forty five years was lieutenant in the admiralty of Guienne; and afterwards, *adds he*, Francis de Girard, lord of Haillan, my brother, was for above ten years in the ſame admiralty, under the late kings of Navarre, Henry and Antony.'

[*B*] *After having appeared in the quality of a poet and tranſlator.*] In 1559, he publiſhed a poem at Paris, intituled, *The Union of the Princes, by the marriages of Philip king of Spain, and the lady Elizabeth of France, and of Philbert Emanuel, duke of Savoy, and the lady Margaret of France* (3). He publiſhed in the ſame city, the ſame year, another poem, called *The Tomb of the moſt Chriſtian king Henry II*, and a Latin work, intituled, *Regum Gallorum Icones à Faramundo uſque ad Franciſcum 2. Item Ducum Lotharingorum à Carolo primo uſque ad Carolum tertium verſibus Latinis expreſſæ* (4). I may take for a tranſlation, the tract concerning the duties of men, which he printed at Blois in 1560, in 8vo; for he took it from Tully's Offices. He publiſhed the ſame year at Paris (5); *The Roman hiſtory of Eutropius, containing, in ten books, all the tranſactions in peace and war, from the beginning of Rome, to the year MCXIX, of the ſame, tranſlated from the Latin.* Eight years after he printed (6) *The Lives of the greateſt, moſt virtuous, and moſt excellent Commanders, and other illuſtrious perſons, both Greeks and Barbarians, written by Æmilius Probus, and tranſlated from the Latin* (7).

[*C*] *He obtained of Charles IX the title of hiſtoriographer of France, in 1571.*] This he tells us himſelf, in an epiſtle dedicatory, dated at Paris in July, 1576, where he thus ſpeaks to Henry III (8). 'It is now five years ſince the late king, your brother, your ſelf, Sir, and the queen your mother, having ſeen my book concerning the State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France, which was printed, and the two firſt books of the Hiſtory of France, only in manuſcript, it pleaſed the late king, at your's, and the queen your mother's requeſt, to command me (and you, Sir, did the ſame) to write in French the Hiſtory of the kings of France, your predeceſſors, hitherto ill written by our countrymen, and negligently or enviouſly handled by ſtrangers. And to furniſh me with means and courage to undertake this work, it pleaſed the king, your brother, at the inſtance and requeſt of Mr de Villequier, who always loved me, and my writings, and who is at preſent almoſt the only worthy witneſs of the long ſervices, which, in more ways than one, I have done you ſince your childhood, to give me the place of hiſtoriographer of France, and to promiſe to raiſe and prefer me, which alſo, Sir, you aſſured me of on your part, and that my long and faithful ſervices, and my ordinary labours, ſhould receive their fruit.' As this paſſage may ſerve for the proof of a thing which I have advanced in the text of this article (9), I was willing to give it intire. But that we may not be obliged to mention this again, here is a ſtronger proof ſtill. This hiſtorain having ſaid that Henry III, *loved always to hear and ſpeak the truth, gave hopes to men of learning, that he would be their ſupport, and ſometimes would read and hear hiſtories* (10), adds, 'which I can truly ſay, as having known it from your infancy, at the time when I had the honour to be near your perſon, to ſerve you, and that not in the loweſt rank, ſometimes to diſcourſe with you about many fine hiſtories, both of the kings your anceſtors, and of other kingdoms and ſtates.' The paſſage which I take from the epiſtle dedicatory of his State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France, is ſtill more deciſive. 'I have learned, Sir, *ſays he, addreſſing himſelf to Henry III*, by the education I have had, and the communication of the affairs which I have ſeen, being near you, for the ſpace of twelve years before your acceſſion to the throne; and by many affairs which I have managed and ſeen for the ſervice of the kings your predeceſſors, and your's, both within and without the kingdom, how one ought to ſpeak and write of kings and their affairs (11).' See alſo what will be related in the remark [*L*] (12).

'Note, that he publiſhed at Paris, in 1571, *A brief Hiſtory of the earls and dukes of Anjou, from Godfrey Griſegonnelle, to Henry, ſon and brother to the kings of France, and duke of Anjou, Bourbonnois, and Auvergne* (13). He alſo publiſhed there the ſame year, *A Promiſe*

(*b*) *Taken from* Alegambe, Bibl. Scriptor. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 248.

(*c*) *See the remark* [*D*].

(*d*) *See the Defence of John Hay's Queries.*

(3) Tom. III, pag. 1135, 1136.

(4) Anti-Coton, pag. m. 38.

(5) Pag. 19. *This* Remerciment *was printed in* 1610.

(6) The Jeſuit's Catechiſm, book ii, chap. xx, pag m. 472.

(1) Du Haillan, preface to the Hiſtory of France,

(2) The State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France, book iv, folio m. 321, verſo.

(3) La Croix du Maine, pag. 31.

(4) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franç. pag. 117.

(5) By Frederic Morel, in 8vo.

(6) At Paris, by Peter Huillier, in 4to.

(7) Du Verdier, ubi ſupra, pag. 116.

(8) Du Haillan, epiſtle dedicatory of the Hiſtory of France,

(9) *Viz.* That du Haillan was in the duke of Anjou's ſervice.

(10) Id. ibid.

(11) Epiſtle dedicatory, of the State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France to Henry III, in the edition of 1580.

(12) That is to ſay, the paſſage where he complains, that he was the only perſon whom Henry III had not advanced.

(13) Du Verdier, Biblioth Franc. pag. 116.

1576, he publiſhed a hiſtory, which reaches from Pharamond, to the death of Charles VII (*a*). He was the firſt who compoſed a body of the French hiſtory in French. Henry III, was very well pleaſed with this; and ſhewed his ſatisfaction, by the advantageous and honourable gratifications he made the author [*D*]. He had him in his own ſervice before his coming to the crown (*b*). The reaſons which induced du Haillan to conclude his work with Charles the ſeventh's death, are very good, and ſhew that he underſtood the duties of an hiſtorian [*E*]. However, he afterwards promiſed to Henry IV, to continue

miſe and Deſign of the Hiſtory of France (14). Du Verdier Vau-Privas, who tells me this, does not ſpeak of a work which du Haillan had publiſhed in 1570, intituled, *Of the Fortune and Power of France, with a ſummary diſcourſe on the Deſign of a Hiſtory of France* (15). He publiſhed the ſame year a book (16) that has been reprinted very often (17), which he dedicated to the duke of Anjou. He ſays in his advertiſement to the reader (18): 'This book, concerning the State and Succeſs of 'the Affairs of France, which I preſent to you, clad in 'a new dreſs, much longer and finer than it wore for'merly, was born ten years ago, and was preſented 'to you at it's birth, being then very ſmall. Two 'years after I took it out of it's infancy, and cloath'ing it in a longer habit, I gave it, by your com'mand, to the late king Charles your brother.' Thus he ſpeaks in the epiſtle dedicatory, of an edition in which this work appeared *in a dreſs entirely new, and much larger, finer, and richer than it was before* (19). The author reviſed and enlarged it in 1594, and dedicated it to Henry IV. Zeiller ſays, this book is often cited and commended; and that he has, in his 190th letter, given d'Aubigné's judgment about it (20). I have not ſeen that letter, but I am certain it contains a blunder: for d'Aubigné in the preface which Zeiller cites (21), paſſes no judgment on du Haillan's writings, contenting himſelf only to name him. His criticiſm only concerns la Popeliniere, and Thuanus. This therefore is a great fault of Martin Zeiller; his omiſſion is not a ſmall one, for that author did not know that du Haillan writ the Hiſtory of France. Konig likewiſe is ignorant of it.

[*D*] *Henry III ſhewed how well ſatisfied he was with it, by the advantageous and honourable gratifications he made the author.*] La Popeliniere, omitting the title of hiſtoriographer of France, conferred on du Haillan by Charles IX, touches only the recompences of Henry III. This omiſſion may be excuſed, conſidering the difference which is betwixt a bare title, and a place ſettled, with a ſalary annexed to it. Now ſuch was the employ that Henry III conferred on him. However, let us ſee what la Popeliniere ſays (22). 'Henry III, the firſt of princes, ancient or 'modern, not only gratified the Sieur du Haillan of 'Bourdeaux, one of the ſecretaries of his finances, 'with ſeveral bounties, as an acknowledgment of 'the pains he had taken in the firſt body of his 'French hiſtory. But alſo honoured him afterwards 'with the firſt place of hiſtoriographer of France, 'which he erected into a laſting title of office, with a 'fixed ſalary of 1200 crowns *per annum*, and made 'him one of his privy-counſellors, at the inſtance of 'chancellor Chiverny, that he might there be the bet'ter inſtructed in the knowledge and account of the 'moſt important affairs of the kingdom. So that 'Henry III was the firſt who raiſed the bare and ſim'ple title of hiſtorian, to the honourable degree and 'title of hiſtoriographer of France, in the perſon of 'Bernard de Girard, Sieur du Haillan, after his dedi'cating and preſenting to him his Hiſtory of France, 'collected from preceding authors, as the firſt body of 'hiſtory in a French dreſs.' We read in the French Mercury (23), 'that Henry III as an acknowledg'ment of the pains du Haillan had taken in the firſt 'book of his French hiſtory, gratified him with a place 'of ſecretary of his finances.' I do not know what this firſt book of the Hiſtory of France, is, which was recompenſed in this manner: for du Haillan publiſhed the Hiſtory of France all at once; and he does not ſay in his epiſtle dedicatory, that he had already obtained any recompence, He only ſays (24), that Charles IX had given him the place of hiſtoriographer, with fair promiſes, and that Henry III, then duke of Anjou, had alſo promiſed him ſome benefactions. I fancy that the compiler of the Mercury was afraid of being cenſured for tranſcribing the paſſage of la Popeliniere word for word, and that to prevent it, he quoted him with ſome alterations, but he did not ſucceed well in it. He changed *the firſt body of his French hiſtory*, into *the firſt book of his French hiſtory*, Theſe two phraſes are widely different. The former ſignifies, that du Haillan was the firſt who publiſhed a body of French hiſtory: the other ſignifies, that the firſt book of the French hiſtory, written by du Haillan, was printed by it ſelf, before all the reſt. The author of the Mercury ſuppoſes, moreover, that this firſt book procured him the ſecretaryſhip of the finances, from Henry III; but la Popeliniere, the Mercury's author, ſays no ſuch thing; he ſuppoſes that du Haillan was ſecretary of the finances before the publiſhing of the Hiſtory of France. It muſt however be acknowledged, that his narrative is ſomewhat confuſed: he has inſerted an *afterwards*, which perplexes the ſenſe; it being a term which but ill agrees with the words following. The Mercury adds, I. that after the recompence for the firſt book, the hiſtorian obtained a better, when he dedicated his Hiſtory of France to Henry III, for he was honoured with the place of counſellor and hiſtoriographer of France. II. That *he afterwards wrote the State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France*; this is falſe, this book was printed before the death of Charles IX (25). III. That *he was made genealogiſt to the knights of the order of the HOLY GHOST, at the creation of that order.* He might have ſaid, that he had, *in commendam*, an abbey which the famous Abelard had poſſeſſed (26). Note, that in the firſt edition of his hiſtory, he only ſtiles himſelf hiſtoriographer of France, but in the latter he is ſtiled *counſellor to his majeſty, ſecretary of his finances and chamber, and hiſtoriographer of France.* Note alſo, that in 1584, he was not yet rewarded. We ſhall ſee his complaint below (27).

[*E*] *The reaſons which induced him to conclude his work with Charles VII, . . . ſhew, that he underſtood the duties of an hiſtorian.*] I mean chiefly, the reflexion he has made, that a man expoſeth himſelf to an unlucky alternative, who writes the hiſtory of monarchs lately dead. He muſt either diſſemble the truth, or provoke perſons who are moſt to be feared. The firſt of theſe inconveniencies ſhocks an hiſtorian's honour and conſcience, the other offends againſt his prudence. It is beſt therefore to ſay nothing. This was one of du Haillan's reaſons with reſpect to the reigns that followed Lewis XII (28). He adds (29) a general reaſon of great weight; *viz.* that there were already particular hiſtories of all the reigns after Charles VII, and that in the common opinion it was almoſt impoſſible to equal the writers of ſome of theſe works. This conſideration ought to affect an honeſt man, and a famous hiſtorian. He ought to ſave the reader the diſcontent of purchaſing the ſame thing twice. The reſpect he owes the public requires this, and juſtice will not allow him to tranſcribe the hiſtories which others have wrote: this is robbing another of his property. His own reputation and prudence, oblige him to ſeek a more difficult and certain way to glory. To copy or give a new form to the writings of others, is too cheap a labour to be honourable, and expoſes you to the infamy of plagiary. You will be reckoned a vain man, if you pretend to equal their glory who are thought incomparable, and you run the risk of being ſtill accounted inferiour, though you ſhould equal or exceed them. Ought a wiſe man to encounter the prepoſſeſſions of the public? It is pity but ſuch reaſons ſhould make as great impreſſions on every body, as they did on du Haillan (30), libraries would not be ſo thronged with books, containing the ſame things. Let us here give the deſcription he has made of the inconveniencies which the authors of the hiſtory of their own times fall into. 'For as much as all 'thoſe hiſtories which treat of king Francis I were 'written in his, or his ſon Henry's time, the authors 'have perhaps more enlarged on the praiſes of this 'king, than was ſuitable to his merit, (though he was 'a great and excellent prince) or to the duty of an 'hiſtorian, or to truth. This is the conſtant fault of 'thoſe who write the hiſtory of their own times, and 'of the princes under whom they live. For where is

'the

(*a*) It was printed at Paris, by Peter l'Huillier in folio and in 8vo, in 1576, the following year it was printed by Peter de St André at Geneva (if I miſtake not), in two volumes in 8vo.

(*b*) See the remark [*C*].

(14) Id. ibid.

(15) La Croix du Maine, pag. 30.

(16) Of the State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France.

(17) See, below, citat. (58).

(18) Du Haillan, epiſtle dedicatory of the State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France, to Henry III, in the edition of 1580.

(19) Id. ibid.

(20) Martinus Zeillerus, Hiſtor. Chronol. &c. Part. II, pag. 71.

(21) Aubignæus prefatione in hiſtoriarum ſuarum partem primam. *Id. ibid.*

(22) La Popeliniere, book i, of the the new Hiſtory of the French, pag. 375.

(23) Mercure Franç. Tom. II, pag. m. 61.

(24) See his words, above, citat. (8).

(25) See, above, citat. (18), the words of Du Haillan's epiſtle dedicatory.

(26) That of Ruys in Bretagne. See Francis d'Amboiſe, in the apologetical preface to Abelard's works.

(27) In the remark [*L*], citat. (61).

(28) See the preface to his Hiſtory of France.

(29) Ibid.

(30) At leaſt for ſome years. See the following remark.

continue this hiſtory to his time [*F*]. But he has not made this promiſe good. The reaſon which obliged him to continue it, is not for the honour of Philip de Comines (*c*). He had the courage to confute many traditions, which an indiſcreet zeal for the

‘ the man who would dare to touch upon the vices of his prince, or blame his actions or thoſe of his miniſters, and relate the plots, deceits, and treaſons which are acted in his reign, or ſay, that his prince committed ſuch an injuſtice, was guilty of fornication; or that a certain man ran away in a battle, and that another committed ſuch a treaſon, ſuch a one was guilty of a robbery, and another of a treachery, and a third of ſuch another villany? There is no body bold enough to do this. And therefore they who write the hiſtory of their own times, are agitated by ſeveral paſſions, and are obliged, either to lie openly, if they univerſally and throughout praiſe their princes, or favour their nation, if they always blame their enemies; or to diſſemble and palliate the truth, or to make a motley piece of work of it, or to gild over their writings, and the actions of their princes with fine words, or (if they reſolve to ſpeak the truth) they are forced to conceal their names, and print their works without them. They who write the hiſtory of their predeceſſors, may (if they will) avoid this fault, and run boldly in the field of truth, with all aſſurance and liberty of language (31).’ Many readers will here call to mind the words of the emperor Peſcennius Niger. *Praiſe Marius, or Hannibal, or ſome other great general, of former ages*, ſaid he to an orator who preſented himſelf before him, to ſpeak a panegyric in his praiſe; *for it is ridiculous to praiſe the living, eſpecially if they be emperors: rewards are expected from them, they are feared, they can kill and baniſh.* Quum imperatori facto quidam panegyricum recitare vellet, dixit ei, *Scribe laudes Marii vel Annibalis, vel alicujus ducis optimi vita functi, & dic quid ille fecerit ut eum nos imitemur. Nam viventes laudare irriſio eſt, maxime imperatores, à quibus ſperatur, qui timentur, qui præſtare publice poſſunt, qui poſſunt necare, qui proſcribere: ſe autem vivum placere velle, mortuum etiam laudari* (32).

Let us ſay, by the by, that we muſt not make du Haillan’s ſecond reaſon a general rule (33); for there are many caſes, in which it is very reaſonable to write the hiſtory of the ſame reigns which have already been written by others. As I. when a man has many new things to ſay, or when he can illuſtrate and rectify the preceding hiſtories in many places. II. When the deſign is to collect into one body all the facts belonging to a hiſtory, ſome whereof lie in ſome books, and others in ſome others. III. When the taſte of the readers requires a new language, and a new turn. At preſent, for inſtance, moſt people would chuſe rather to be ignorant of hiſtory, than to read the authors who compoſed it, in the fifteenth or ſixteenth century. And therefore, though an hiſtorian ſhould have nothing to ſay but what was already printed, yet it would be commendable to publiſh an hiſtory, provided the turn and the ſtile could allure the reader, and the public appeared altogether diſguſted with the other hiſtorians. Whence it appears, that if there are ſo many books containing the ſame things, it is not always the fault of the authors, but frequently of the readers, who will not be at the pains of ſeeking hiſtorical facts ſeparately, or of turning over books written in old French. It is therefore for their convenience and profit, that ſome authors publiſh hiſtories, which teach nothing new, and only connect together in a better ſtile, the different pieces of other authors. If you have diſcovered ſome new facts, will it be ſaid to you, be contented to publiſh them, and nothing elſe, why do you from thence take occaſion to make a large book, in which you crowd ſo many trite ſtories? This cenſure is juſt on many occaſions, but not when their new diſcoveries may be diffuſed upon a very long train of events. They muſt then be incorporated with former narrations; the intereſt and convenience of the reader requires it. We ſhall ſee, by and by, that upon this principle, our du Haillan changed his reſolution.

What has been ſaid of hiſtorical books, may be applied to other works. There are but too many I own which contain nothing but what is found in an hundred others; but on the other ſide, it would be a thing prejudicial to the republic of letters not to dare to put in a book, what other books have already publiſhed (34). A divine of Leyden pretends, that it is of great uſe to publiſh ſeveral books upon the ſame ſubjects, when they are important; he aſſerts alſo, that it is an excellent way to leſſen the multitude of books which burden and oppreſs ſo many people. The reaſon of this paradox is, that a conſiderable number of books upon certain ſubjects, would imploy the public, and by that means abundance of other books would be neglected, and leap at once from the Bookſellor’s to the Grocer’s ſhop. Let us ſee this author’s words, in which we ſhall find an excellent thought of St Auguſtin. ‘ Id (*ſcribendi cacoëthes*) nunc his temporibus in immenſum eſt auctum, ut omnem medelam ſuperaſſe videatur, nec alio modo poſſit coerceri, quam ſi plures divulges libros; quam rationem agendi forte paradoxam aliquis dixerit, optimam tamen nemo jure negaverit. De multitudine librorum utilium immenſo numero non eſt quod jure conqueramur, qui non facile nimis augentur. Quamvis enim de rebus iiſdem ſcribunt plures, modo illæ ſint cognitu dignæ, nullum id nocumentum veritati videtur inferre, quæ ſic ad plures ſibi viam pandit, cùm lectorum alii his potius, quàm illis ſcriptoribus delectentur, quamvis de eodem argumento commentatis. Quod rectè obſervavit Auguſtinus lib. 1. de Trinitate cap. 3 *Neque enim omnia, quæ ab omnibus conſcribuntur, in omnium manus veniunt. Et fieri poteſt, ut nonnulli, qui etiam hæc noſtra intelligere valent, illos planiores non inveniant libros, & in iſtos ſaltem incidant. Ideoque utile eſt, plures à pluribus fieri diverſo ſtylo, non diverſa fide, etiam de quæſtionibus eiſdem, ut ad plurimos res ipſa perveniat, ad alios ſic, ad alios autem ſic.* Quâ ratione inutiles libri ſenſim eliminantur, ut alii poſtea non ſit uſui, quàm ut piperi & thuri involvendo inſerviant (35). —— *This (itch of writing) is prodigiouſly increaſed in our days, and ſeems to be paſt remedy, neither can it be checked any other way than by publiſhing ſtill more books; this may appear a paradox to ſome, but the reaſon will appear evident. For no body can juſtly complain of the great number of uſeful books which can hardly be too great. For though many write on the ſame ſubjects, provided they be uſeful ſubjects, truth cannot ſuffer thereby; but by this means gains more votaries, ſince ſome readers are more pleaſed with ſome books than with others, tho’ treating on the ſame ſubjects. This St Auguſtin rightly obſerved.* All books, *ſays he*, which are written, do not come into the hands of all. And it may happen, that they who are able to underſtand this book of mine, may not meet with the books which are written in a more intelligible manner, and may only light on mine. Therefore it is uſeful that different perſons ſhould write on the ſame point in a different ſtile, though not containing a different doctrine, that ſo the doctrine it ſelf may arrive at a greater number of perſons, to ſome in one dreſs, to others in another. *By this means uſeleſs books are baniſhed by degrees, and come to be only employed to wrap up ſmall wares.*’

[*F*] *He promiſed to Henry IV to continue this hiſtory to his time.*] I prove it by this paſſage (36): ‘ I have alſo written a book concerning the monarchy of France, which will ſoon be preſented to your majeſty, with a deſcription of all the ſecrets and affairs of the eſtabliſhment, greatneſs, and power of your kingdom, and of the kings your predeceſſors. Their hiſtory, which I have compoſed and finiſhed at the death of Charles VII, ſhall be quickly followed by that of the other ſucceeding kings, down to your majeſty; then your’s will appear, if you pleaſe, to have it publiſhed.’ This is what du Haillan ſaid to king Henry IV in an epiſtle dedicatory, dated in October, 1594. He had acquainted his readers with the change of his reſolution ten years before; for dedicating to Henry III the ſecond edition of his Hiſtory of France, corrected and enlarged in 1584, he ſpeaks to him in this manner. ‘ Though in my epiſtle dedicatory to your majeſty, and in the preface of the firſt edition, I ſaid, that I would proceed no further, nor write the hiſtory of Lewis XI, becauſe it was already done by Philip de Comines, Sieur d’Argenton; yet having ſince changed my reſolution, I have began it with hopes of finiſhing it this next winter, if I find that this my labour ſhall be acceptable to you.’ It is

(*c*) See the remark [*F*].

(31) Du Haillan’s preface to the Hiſtory of France, fol. o i, verſo, edit. 1577.

(32) Ælius Spartian. in Peſcennio Nigro, cap. xi, pag. m. 672, Tom. I.

In what caſes it is lawful to write hiſtory, &c. already handled by others.

(33) It is the ſecond, not in his book, but in the abſtract I have given above of his narrative.

(34) See the preface to the firſt edition of the Several Thoughts upon Comets.

(35) Chriſtophorus Wittichius in Præfat. Conſenſus veritatis ſecundæ, edit. præfixa.

(36) Du Haillan’s epiſtle dedicatory of the State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France, in the edition of 1594.

the glory of France had propagated, and to ſpeak freely upon ſome tender points, as for example, concerning the maid of Orleans [*G*]. This liberty gave offence to narrow minds, and ſuch as would have every thing ſacrificed to policy. I do not know whether

is not amiſs to ſee the reaſon of his change; for beſides that, we ſhall thereby ſee his judgment concerning Philip de Comines, we ſhall find that he was under one of thoſe caſes in which it is permitted to write a hiſtory after other writers. 'That which has cauſed me, *ſays he* (37), to alter my reſolution, and to treat of the ſaid king Lewis was, that the Sieur d'Argenton began his hiſtory, called *Memoirs*, but from the fifth year of his reign, and that all the cauſes of the wars, and of the great affairs this king had, are compriſed betwixt the beginning of his reign, and the time wherein Philip de Comines begins to write, and in that part of hiſtory which he has treated, he has concealed many things, which I have diſcovered, and extracted from many books, memoirs, and diſpatches of that time, and from many ſecret diſcourſes, written either in his reign, or a little after his death, free from fear, hatred, flattery, praiſe, or paſſion, into which they often fall who write the hiſtory of their own times, and by the two laſt of which Philip de Comines has been influenced, being moved thereto either by his great affection towards his maſter, or the benefactions he had received from him, or the fear of his ſucceſſor. And therefore he has not ſaid what others might ſay, and what other hiſtorians have ſaid of the actions, vices, and craft (38) of that king; and praiſing him more than he ought, he in many places acts the part of an orator, and of a panegyriſt, and not of an hiſtorian; and in his long digreſſions on the affairs of foreign potentates, he tranſgreſſes the bounds of hiſtory, and of an hiſtorian.' For the reſt, none of the promiſes du Haillan made, of continuing the Hiſtory of France, came to any thing. Nothing of this kind was found amongſt his papers after his death (39); the Bookſellers, who added a continuation to his work, as far as the year 1615 (40), and afterwards as far as the year 1627, took it from Paulus Æmilius, Philip de Comines, Arnoul Ferron, du Bellay, *&c.*

[*G*] *He had the courage to confute many traditions . . . . and ſpeak freely . . . . concerning the maid of Orleans.*] Let no body wonder at the length of the paſſage I am going to cite; it is inſtructive, and ſhews the true character of an hiſtorian, and the ridiculous offence which is taken by ill-turned heads, from his boldneſs in preferring truth before all things. This wrong turn of mind is of all times and places. It is worth while to obſerve, how celebrated authors have contemned and oppoſed it. Du Haillan's words are as follows (41). 'I have not acted the part of a flatterer, nor of a courtier, but that of an hiſtorian, and I have ſpoken the truth. I have not imitated flattering painters, who drawing a face, if it happen to have any imperfection or deformity in it, leave it out, or paint it to advantage. My reſolution was to paint the uglieſt as well as the fineſt features, and to ſpeak boldly and freely of every thing with an unuſual liberty, which will be praiſed and admired by all good readers; as I have formerly done in my Hiſtory of the State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France; in which I have boldly ſpoken many things, which, before me, no body would, nor durſt, ſay, and poſſibly did not know. For both in that work, and in this I have encountered many commonly received opinions, ſuch as the coming of Pharamond into Gaul, the inſtitution of the Salic law, which is attributed to him, the creation of the peers of France, aſcribed to Charlemagne, and other particular points, having with boldneſs and truth affirmed, that Pharamond never paſſed the Rhine to enter Gaul, and that he did not make the Salic law to exclude the daughters from the ſucceſſion of our crown, becauſe he never came into our France. Whereupon, ſome who pretend to ſpeak of every thing, and know nothing, and who think by their ill-grounded opinions to overturn thoſe which are built upon judgment and reaſon, have ſaid, that I went about to deſtroy the principles of our hiſtory, by denying the inſtitution of this law by Pharamond. But, Sir, this is not my deſign, but only to reject an ancient error, the Salic law being, in my opinion, ancient and approved enough, ſince it has been practiſed as a law, from the beginning of our firſt kings (as you may ſee more at large at the beginning of the firſt book of this hiſtory in the life of Pharamond) and my opinion thereupon, can give no advantage to ſtrangers, nor ſcandalize our natives, except ſuch as are ſcandalized with every thing but what themſelves ſay and do. Some have found fault with my liberty of language in this particular, and in that of the peers of France, and in others, ſaying, that I act againſt the duty of an hiſtorian, by robbing France of an ancient opinion ſhe had of the coming of Pharamond into Gaul, of the Salic law made by him, and the inſtitution of the peers of France, and that it is a crime to abrogate things grown old in opinion, and written by ignorant people, who never read good books, and believed by others as ignorant, who have neither ſenſe nor underſtanding to read, or underſtand, good and ancient authors, but rather amuſe themſelves with old trumpery, as unpoliſhed as their own heads. Good hiſtorians (Sire) ought not in their words or writings to follow the opinions of the vulgar, but only faithful true ones, and ſuch as are approved by authors, or by good arguments and conjectures, which when they are numerous, and well applied, ſerve for a true and certain teſtimony, when, by the injury of time, the proof of the truth by writing is wanting. I have therefore (Sire) in theſe things, and many others, rejected the common opinon for the true. In which I preſume I have done good ſervice to the Hiſtory of France, diſingaging it from many forgeries and fables, which render it diſagreeable, and ſometimes contradictory, delivering the readers from uncertainty in many points, concerning which they could not come at a right judgment in it. In which I am certain of pleaſing men of judgment, for it is ſuch whom I ſtudy to pleaſe, and not thoſe who ſhall diſlike my opinions and writings.' If you would know what he ſays of the maid of Orleans, read this other paſſage (42). 'The miracle of this maid, whether it was invented and feigned, or true, raiſed the courage of the nobles, the people, and the king, who had loſt it; ſuch is the force of religion, and frequently of ſuperſtition. For ſome ſay, that this Joan was a whore to John, baſtard of Orleans, others to the Sieur Baudricourt, others to Pothon, who being politic and prudent, and ſeeing the king at his wits end, and the people ſo diſcouraged by continual wars, that there was no raiſing their hopes and ſpirits, bethought themſelves of imploying a miracle, made up of a falſe religion, which of all things in the world is moſt apt to raiſe and animate the courage of men, and to make even the moſt ſimple believe what is not. And the people were very much diſpoſed to receive ſuch ſuperſtitions. They who believe ſhe was a maid ſent from GOD, are not damned; neither are thoſe who do not believe it. Many think this laſt article an hereſy; but I ſhall ſuſpend my belief on either ſide. Theſe lords for ſome days together, inſtructed her in all ſhe was to anſwer to the queſtions which ſhould be put to her by the king, and them, when ſhe ſhould come into his preſence (for they themſelves were to interrogate her) and that ſhe might know the king, (whom ſhe had never ſeen) when ſhe ſhould be brought near him, they made her, every day look ſeveral times on his picture. On the day appointed, in which ſhe was to come to his chamber, which being by their appointment, they failed not to be there. And when ſhe came in, the firſt who asked her what ſhe would have, were the baſtard of Orleans and Baudricourt; who asked her what ſhe wanted, ſhe anſwered ſhe deſired to ſpeak with the king. They ſhewed her one of the other lords who was there, ſaying that he was the king, but ſhe being before inſtructed in every thing that was to be ſaid and done to her, and in what ſhe was to ſay and do, ſaid that he was not the king, and that the king was hid behind the bed, (where indeed he was) and going to him, ſhe ſaid to him, what has been above related. This feigned and counterfeit invention of religion, was of ſuch advantage to the kingdom, that it raiſed the drooping and diſpirited courage of the people from deſpair. At laſt ſhe was taken by the Engliſh before Compeigne, whether he did well to publiſh ſome things, which he knew only by hear-ſay [*H*]. He was much criticiſed, and he ſhowed how it vexed him, by the haughtineſs wherewith he anſwered his cenſurers [*I*]. He has not been unjuſtly cenſured in every thing as

---

(37) *Idem*, Epiſtle dedicatory of the Hiſtory of France, in the edition of 1584.

(38) He had added in the edition of 1576, *and cruelties*.

(39) See the advertiſement of the Bookſellers, in the editions of his Hiſtory of France after his death. I uſe that of Paris, 1527, in two volumes in folio.

(40) Du Cheſne, Bibliotheque of the Hiſtorians of France, pag. 55, of the edition of 1618, ſpeaks only of this edition, which is in two volumes in folio. Apply to this the criticiſm we have ſeen upon him in a like caſe, in the article EMILIUS, remark [*C*], citat. (15).

(41) Du Haillan, epiſtle dedicatory of his Hiſtory of France, edit. 1584.

(42) *Idem*, in the ſecond book of the State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France, pag 138, *& ſeq.* of the Paris edition, 1619. *Note*, That Gabriel Naudé is of the ſame opinion: The Engliſh, *ſays he, in the third chapter of his* Coups d'Etat, *pag. m.* 328, being maſters of almoſt all France, it was neceſſary under Charles VII, to have recourſe to ſome piece of ſtate-policy to expel them, ſuch was that of Joan the maid, which was confeſſed to be ſuch by Juſtus Lipſius, in his politics, and by ſome other foreign hiſtorians, but particularly by two of our own, to wit, du Bellai Langey, in his Military Art, and by du Haillan, in his Hiſtory, not to cite many other leſs conſiderable writers.

'piegne, and carried to Rouen, where ſhe was tried and burnt. Some have been, and will be, diſpleaſed at my ſaying this, and that I deprive our countrymen of an opinion, which they have ſo long entertained of this as a ſacred and miraculous thing, and that I thus turn it at preſent into a fable. But I reſolved to ſay this, becauſe it has been diſcovered to be ſo by time, which diſcovers all things: beſides, it is not a thing of that importance, that it ought to be believed as an article of faith.'

[*H*] *He publiſhed ſome things which he knew only by hear-ſay.*] It was upon ſuch foundation that he publiſhed that Charles VIII. was ſuppoſititious. See the News from the Republic of Letters (43). Varillas confutes this ſtory (44).

[*I*] *He ſhewed how much he was vexed being criticiſed, by the haughtineſs wherewith he anſwered his cenſurers.*] As the works he had publiſhed before the hiſtory of France, had been criticiſed, he doubted not but this would have the ſame fate. And therefore he ſhewed his contempt of it before hand, and placed on the backſide of the title, a ſonnet, which has ſomething of the Gaſcon in it. Theſe are the ſix laſt lines,

Mille & mille ignorans, ſuperbes envieux,
Meſdiſans, eſtourdis, vains & preſumptueux,
Te voudront attaquer une indigne querelle.
Mais ne crains tout cela, ains paſſe hardiment,
Car leur preſumption, ny leur ſot jugement,
Ne pourront empeſcher ta carriere immortelle.

Tho' baſely attacked by thouſands of ignorant, proud, envious, malicious, vain, and preſumptuous, men, do not fear, but march boldly on; for neither their preſumption, nor fooliſh cenſures, ſhall be able to ſtop thy immortal carreer.

In the very beginning of this preface, he makes this obſervation. 'If this hiſtory of France cannot pleaſe every body, as I well know it will not pleaſe the nice, the ignorant, and the envious (and ſuch I will not pleaſe) who will paſs their fooliſh, ignorant, and envious judgments on it, I am certain it will pleaſe thoſe amongſt you who are writers, who know by experience what labour is, who have a judgment free from all paſſion, and who generouſly excuſe the faults and inadvertencies which may be met with in ſo great a work.' The laſt part of this paſſage is conſiderable, and moſt true in certain reſpects. No ſort of readers are more prone to criticiſe, or more raſh and unjuſt in their cenſures, than they who write nothing. An author has more reaſon to promiſe himſelf ſome ſupport and equity amongſt authors, than amongſt ſuch as know not by experience, the difficulties of writing. Provided only there be no emulation in the caſe; as ſometimes there is not; for authors do not always take the ſame road: the reputation of one, is not always of the ſame kind with that of another. And, in this caſe, it is better to be judged by a laborious author, than by lazy readers. In the other caſe, a reader proves more equitable. But to return to du Haillan, he ſpeaks thus towards the end of his preface: 'In the mean time, I will conſider the enviers and ſlanderers of me and my works, who will caſt the darts of their malice againſt both. Being able to ſay with truth, readers, that in my fortune, actions, and writings, I have never been envied or hated by any, but by the ignorant and the wicked, and thoſe whoſe name, bodily health, and reputation, have been tainted with ſome vice.' The ſtorm of criticiſm which he foreſaw actually happened (45). Let us ſee what he obſerves in the epiſtle dedicatory (46) of the ſecond edition (47). 'This work . . . . . was no ſooner born, but it was barked at, and bit by the envy and obloquy of all ſorts and ranks of people, ſome openly my enemies, and others my pretended friends; nay, there were ſome, who carrying it fair with me, as they did in all their actions, and courting your favour by indirect and oblique ways, of which they were extreamly greedy, went about to purchaſe it by impoſture and calumny, at the expence of my reputation and that of my hiſtory, cenſuring it in your preſence, (Sire) for that for which it has ſince been moſt eſteemed, and which will give it the greateſt honour and favour with poſterity; I mean the ſimple truth, and the freedom with which I have wrote.' He expreſſes ſtill more reſentment, and confidence, at the end of his preface. 'They, ſays he, according to their uſual malice, were of the number of my aſſailants; but I have reſolved to deſpiſe their ignorance, and laugh at it, covering my ſelf with the veil of truth, and the benevolence of ſuch of my readers, as have read and ſhall read my book with judgment, and have approved, and ſhall approve it; for it is for you that it is written, and not for the envious, ignorant, and malicious, who can ſee nothing that is good, and know not how to judge of, or eſteem what is praiſe-worthy.' Amongſt the things he ſaid to his critics, I have met with one that deſerves conſideration. 'If ſometimes I name men, whoſe name the too tickliſh reader will ſay, is not an affair of ſtate; I will anſwer him, that it ſeemed ſo to me, that I have a judgment as well as he, and (let him be who he will) I know better what I write, than he knows how to judge of my writings (48).' This is what many other authors may and ought to repreſent to their critics. A man who has been employed many years upon one kind of work, knows better than another what are the properties of it. He has not, if you will, ſo good a taſte and judgment as another, generally ſpeaking; but ſince he has ſtudied certain ſubjects, and applied himſelf to them for a long time, we ought to believe, that he judges better of their nature, and the ornaments which belong to them, than they who have not made them their particular ſtudy. And therefore we ought not to imagine, that certain authors act imprudently, when on ſeveral occaſions, they prefer their own judgment, before that of their friends, or their enemies, though otherwiſe more knowing than themſelves. A writer leſs intelligent, generally ſpeaking, than his readers, will yet have more views than they upon the ſubjects he treats of; and whilſt they know not whether he had reaſon to ſay ſuch or ſuch things, he will know that he was induced to it by many reaſonable motives, grounded upon the character of his work. Hence ariſe infinite ill-grounded cenſures, and hence we alſo ſee how requiſite it is to ſtudy well the rules, before we pronounce whether a work be good or bad. For example, to judge well of this hiſtory, with a commentary annexed, which I call *an Hiſtorical and Critical Dictionary*, a man muſt have ſtudied the rights and privileges of an hiſtorical commentator; and hereupon I might ſay, with du Haillan, *I know better what I write, than ſuch a one knows how to judge of my writings.* I have ſtudied the nature and properties of compilations; if they every where pleaſed one kind of people, they would not be good. They who know not the character of them want to find in them only what pleaſes their own palate.

Here are two other paſſages of du Haillan, which will inform us that he was criticiſed and vexed at it. 'My works, Sire . . . . . have not been able to avoid the barkings and bitings of calumny and envy, and of railers and ſlanderers, with whoſe ſtings, not only my writings have been pricked, but alſo the courſe of my fortune, has been wounded, ulcerated, and ſtopt; it ſeems that ſome rays of virtue and ability, which my enemies diſcovered in me, were offenſive to the eyes of their ignorance and malice, and that my luſtre could not be born by them. Nay, Sire, in your preſence, I have been ſo ſlandered and ill uſed, that it is not long of my enemies, if I have not forfeited your favour and good opinion, in which alone I have ever ſowed the hopes of all my happineſs, and the ſeeds of my moſt humble and devoted ſervice. But your goodneſs and wiſe judgment, Sire, has made them appear impoſtors, and delivered me from the fears of the miſchief with which they threatened me (49).' He ſpoke thus to Henry III, in 1580, dedicating a new edition of one of his books to him. The preface of the ſame book thunders againſt du Haillan's critics, I have taken what follows from it. 'There are ſome phantaſtical wits (the number whereof is endleſs) accuſtomed

WHETHER it be better to be judg'd by an author, or by others.

WHY authors ought ſometimes to prefer their own judgments before the judgments of others.

---

(43) *Month of July*, 1686. *art.* ix, *pag.* 825.

(44) *Varillas's Hiſtory of Lewis XI, book* x, *pag.* 328. *Dutch Edit.*

(45) *Wherever ſpeaking of his cenſurers, he had made uſe of the future-tenſe, in the preface to the firſt edition, he makes uſe of the preter-tenſe in the ſecond.*

(46) *To Henry III.*

(47) *That of the year* 1584.

(48) Idem. *Preface to the Hiſtory of France, pag. m.* 18. *I here make uſe of the edition of* 1577, *in* 8*vo.*

(49) *Du Haillan's epiſtle dedicatory of the State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France, in the edition of* 1580.

as I ſhall ſhew by a paſſage of Sorel [*K*]. His manner of ſpeaking of himſelf, is a teſtimony that he was not diſintereſſed enough, either as to his glory or fortune. He diſplays too much his labours, and the ſucceſs of his books, their ſeveral editions, tranſlations, *&c.* and he too palpably manifeſts his deſires of reward [*L*]. I do not know

accuſtomed to ſlander and abuſe every thing, being ſtupified with ignorance and preſumption, who do not reliſh it. Of theſe ſome are danglers about the court, others are lawyers, others collegians, others ſome young coxcombs, lately come from the univerſity, with three borders of Latin upon their gowns, and a ſhred of purchaſed honour, who ferreting all ſorts of books, pretend to deſpiſe and reject them, if they find a letter miſplaced, or do not find what they know not how to look for. Others are profeſſed writers, who, being ſwelled up, and big with books, bring forth one every week, fill the bookſellers ſtalls with them, talk boldly of every body, deſpiſe the works of others, and approve of none but their own. Some of theſe laſt, are meer apes, for if they ſee another do a work, at thirty paces diſtance from thence, they bring forth another in embryo to which they give the ſame name. All theſe ſorts of people have attacked, pinched, and barked at me, but however they have not bitten me, nor done any injury to my preſent performance, or to my hiſtory of France, being only like dead coals, which blacken, without being able to burn: for in ſpight of their envy, cavils, pedantry, railling and preſumption, my works fly through the world, have obtained a great reputation, and are tranſlated into ſeveral languages . . . . . As for the courtiers who have defamed my writings, and attempted to make them odious, they are men accuſtomed to rob others of their honour, when they want opportunities of pillaging any thing elſe (50).

[*K*] *He has not been unjuſtly cenſured in every thing: as I ſhall ſhow by a paſſage of Sorel.*] It contains a juſt cenſure of ſome of du Haillan's faults, and alſo ſome ſmall commendations ' He was even deſirous to imitate the elegance of the beſt hiſtorians, but to avoid pains, he has almoſt tranſlated word for word, all Paulus Æmilus's orations, and has alſo copied him in his narrations: it is true, he has added a great many curious obſervations, which he found elſewhere. He may be charged with giving a fabulous exordium to his hiſtory, intirely of his own invention, making Pharamond, and his faithful counſellors, deliberate, whether, having the power in his hand, he ought to reduce the French to an ariſtocratical or monarchical government, and making each of them harrangue in ſupport of his opinion. We there find the names of Charimond and Quadrek, imaginary perſons. It is a thing very ſurprizing: we have but little certainty that there was ever ſuch a man as Pharamond in the world, and though we knew that there was, yet it is an egregious boldneſs to relate things of him, which have no foundation. Dupleix cenſures du Haillian for it, and reproaches him for having taken his ſpeeches from Amadis de Gaule; but Amadis has no ſuch political diſcourſes. We muſt ſuppoſe Dupleix only meant, that du Haillan had invented this, as it were to write a kind of a romance. However, if they are not to be found in Amadis, they may be found in many other places. They are common places, which are uſually met with in books, that treat of ſo trival a ſubject, as the different forms of government. Du Haillan is accuſed on another hand of talking too freely of ſome eccleſiaſtics: but he has done this poſſibly to ſhew his zeal for our kings, and to maintain their authority. Notwithſtanding all this his writings are more judicious and methodical than thoſe who preceded him. His hiſtory inſtructs us in many particulars of the French government, which he underſtood well enough, as he has likewiſe ſhown in his book, *of the ſtate and ſucceſs of the affairs of France.* In fine, he is to be praiſed for having firſt attempted to put our hiſtory in a good and agreeable form, which he has effected according to the knowledge of the time in which he loved (51).

[*L*] *He diſplays too much his labours, and the ſucceſs of his books. . . . he too palpably manifeſts his deſires of reward.*] Let us begin with theſe words of his epiſtle dedicatory to his hiſtory France (52). ' From that time (53) to the year 1576, when it was firſt printed, I laboured night and day upon this hiſtory, with the ſweat and labour of my body, the waſting of my years, the great fatigue of my mind, and expence of my purſe, in procuring of books, titles, charters, memoirs, and other materials requiſite for the building ſo great a work; and I have neglected my affairs, and the means of improving them, at a time that every one in my ſight, was making his fortune, and ſtriving more than in any age, to get wealth, and obtain gifts and bounties from your majeſty, rather than to write or read books, that I might give my ſelf up intirely and wholly to the accompliſhment of this work, which at laſt after four years imployed in raiſing it, I have finiſhed; after many days ſpent in ſtudy, in ſolitude, and in great racking of my brain; after many watchings, and after great reading, tumbling, turning over, and collating many Latin, French, and Italian books, both ancient and modern, and many monuments, papers, titles, old writings, and muſty manuſcripts, rummaged and turned over; I have found it a hard task, Sire, that if, when I undertook this work, I had known or imagined the pains I was to take, and which I have taken, I ſhould have excuſed myſelf to your majeſty; and no gift, or promiſe, or deſire, or hope of honour, glory, or advantage, could have induced me to engage in it.' He afterwards ſhews at large, the imperfections of the hiſtorians (54) he was obliged to conſult, and then he adds: ' from all theſe confuſions, diverſities, prolixities, and labyrinths, Sire, I have overcome, and have written the hiſtory of France, and of the kings your anceſtors, in the beſt manner that I could. I have not been able to do it ſo well as it deſerves, or to give it it's juſt perfection; and I will not blame the dead or their works, to give the praiſe and advantage to my own. Only I will ſay, without preſumption and boaſting, that I have done a thing which had not been done before, or ſeen by any of our nation, and have given to the hiſtory France, a dreſs it never appeared in before . . . . . Some may be able to write the hiſtory of France as well, and better than myſelf, and others worſe; but if I obtain not the firſt rank amongſt them, I aſſure myſelf I ſhall not have the laſt. I have found the way of drawing the quinteſſence out of theſe groſs maſſes of ancient hiſtories, and of reducing their luxuriancy ſuperfluity, and prolixity, to things neceſſary, and not ſuperfluous; and beſides, not willing to rely upon our hiſtories and chronicles, I have extracted from foreigners, from the regiſters of courts of parliament, from the chambers of accounts, and charters of churches, and from books lent me by ſome of my friends, the neceſſary materials for my ſubject. My ſole aim was truth, which is the eye of hiſtory &c.' He repeats a great deal of this in his preface: ' I have laboured upon it, *ſays he,* for five years, I have ſpent many whole days, and half nights; many watchings, ſtudies, and ſolitudes, have been employed in it. I have rummaged, read, and turned over and over, many books, charters, monuments, old writings, papers, and parchments; I have had many Latin, French, and Italian books, treating of the hiſtories of France, England, Germany, Italy, Spain, Flanders, Scotland, Burgundy, Bretagne, Anjou, Berry, and Aquitain, of the holy wars in Aſia and Europe, the lives of Popes and emperors, and abundance of others, with a world of old writings and ancient monuments. From all theſe I have extracted the quinteſſence, diſtilling them in the alembic of my judgment and labour, and I ſhew you what I have extracted from them in my book.'

If you would know what he ſays of the ſucceſs of his work, read what follows (55). ' My hiſtory, which has vanquiſhed their envy, and that of all thoſe who railed at it, ſhall live as long as the French tongue ſhall continue and prevail in your kingdom. Since it's firſt edition, it has been often printed, both in your kingdom, and out of it, in ſeveral volumes and characters, and turned into Latin by Peter Boulanger (56), who inſtructs youth in the college of Loudun, a man of a good life, and great learning, and who, in his Latin writings, imitates, as much as any man know whether we ought to believe that he threatened with his iron pen, thoſe who ſhould deſpiſe his works (*d*), and that he judged it as ſufficient to blaſt them, as he pretended, that his golden pen was capable of eternizing the merit of his benefactors. He died at Paris the twenty third of November, 1610, in his ſeventy ſixth year, and was buried at St Euſtache (*e*). It muſt not be forgotten, that he had attended Francis de Noailles, biſhop of Acqs, in his embaſſies to England and Venice (*f*). We ſhall ſee in the remarks, ſeveral paſſages of his epiſtles dedicatory and prefaces. They will diſpleaſe thoſe that deſire only a ſuperficial knowledge of famous men, but not ſuch as would know them exactly *intus & in cute*. It is for theſe latter that I labour, and I am certain the pains I take to ſhew them the picture of the heart, according to the lineaments I find of it in books, where authors have painted themſelves, will be acceptable to them. Let this be ſaid once for all. We might make a great many reflexions upon this picture of du Haillan, and therefore I imagine, I ſhall not diſpleaſe the reader by making ſome [*M*]. This will give me an

---

(50) Idem, *Preface to the ſame book, and the ſame edition.*

(51) Sorel, Bibl. Franç. pag. m. 373, 374.

(52) *Du Haillan's epiſtle dedicatory of the edition of* 1584.

(53) *That is, from* 1571, *when the king commanded him to write the Hiſtory of France.*

(54) *He ſhews 'em alſo in the preface.*

(55) *Du Haillan's epiſtle dedicatory of the Hiſtory of France, of the edition of* 1584.

(56) *See his elogy in Sammarthanus,* lib. i, pag. m. 44, *where he ſpeaks of this verſion. He was the father of Julius Cæſar Bullengerus.*

in Europe, the purity and ſweetneſs of Cicero. But ſince, Sire, I have augmented and enlarged my hiſtory anew, having in ſome places inſerted two or three leaves, in others leſs, he waits for this impreſſion that he may add to his Latin verſion, what I have added to my French compoſition. So that you, Sire, as alſo your ſubjects and ſtrangers, will quickly ſee this hiſtory in the Latin tongue.’ Add to this the beginning of his preface (57). *I wiſhed my hiſtory of France might be as much agreeable to you, as I have taken much pains and labour in the compiling of it. My deſire has not been altogether vain; for it ſo pleaſed men of judgment, that ſince that time it has been frequently printed, and in divers volumes, both within and without the kingdom, and read over and over, by all the ingenious men of France, and many foreigners. . . . Now, reader, ſeeing my work has ſo well ſucceeded, and been ſo well received, both by foreigners and by our countrymen, and ſo often reprinted and deſired, I have corrected and much enlarged it, and enriched it with many curious enquiries.* Dedicating his book of the ſtate and ſucceſs of the affairs of France, to Henry III in 1580, he expreſſed himſelf in this manner (58). ‘I am, Sire, the firſt of all the French, who have written the hiſtory of France, and in a polite language ſhewn the grandeur and dignity of our kings; for before there was nothing but the old rubbiſh of chronicles which ſpoke of them. My works are ſeen and read by all chriſtendom, and tranſlated into ſeveral languages, particularly my hiſtory of France, is put into Latin, by a very learned man of your kingdom, and is ready to appear and preſent itſelf to your majeſty, clothed in a Latin dreſs. I am none of thoſe venturous and ignorant writers, whoſe brains daily teem with books, who raiſe up whole foreſts of them, and who, in their obſcure ſtudies, wherein they ſee not the light of the affairs of the world, ſpeak and write confidently, right or wrong, of the preſent ſtate-affairs, of your moſt ſecret and important councils, judge of every thing, are partial for one, and prepoſſeſſed againſt another, extol thoſe who give them money, make a meer pretender of a great general, and commander of an army, and live only by the ſale of their preſumptuous writings. And therefore ſuch writers will ſee their works expire, before themſelves, and ſhamefully aſſiſt at their funeral. I have learnt, Sire (59), ...’ Let us ſee the beginning of the preface of the ſame book. *Many of you (readers) who ſhall ſee this preſent work, which I have newly reviſed and much enlarged and enriched, have ſeen it before printed in ſeveral ſorts of volumes, and characters, from it's firſt edition, of the year* 1570. *For ſince that time, there has not a year paſſed, but it has been reprinted* (60), *and given ſatisfaction to all who have ſeen it, and who approve of what is good.* When he dedicated the ſame book to Henry IV in 1594, he thus ſpoke of it to this prince. *It has travelled, and ſeen the world, and has been well received within and without the kingdom, and ſtrangers have made it ſpeak their language.*

As for his deſire of rewards, it may be clearly enough ſeen in the paſſages I have already related, but it will more plainly ſtill appear in this, that follows (61). *I have compoſed this work in four winters, ſeaſons proper for writing and ſtudying, and have ſpent but few ſummers days, in it, which ſeem not ſo fit for ſuch a fatigue, as the ſhort and cold days are which I have employed in it. So that I am apprehenſive of being benummed, unleſs the ſun of your majeſty, by the rays of your liberalities and bounties, afford ſome warmth. There is not a man of letters in your kingdom, who excels in any ſcience, or has compoſed any elegant performance, whom you have not rewarded for it, and all your ancient ſervants, are raiſed to honours and preferments, and are full and rich with your gifts and benefactions. I am the firſt who have written the hiſtory of the kings your anceſtors, and poſſibly the only perſon who hath done it in a good method, and fine language, and I am one of the firſt and eldeſt of your ſervants, and yet I am the only one, and the laſt, to be provided for, but not the laſt in merit, I have laboured, and labour ordinarily for the public, more than for myſelf; nor have I only been engaged in writing books, but alſo ſometimes employed in travels to foreign countries; and by the obſervation of affairs for theſe twenty nine years paſt* (62), *in which I have been a courtier, I have learnt how hiſtories ought to be written, and how to ſpeak of kings, and treat and write of affairs of ſtate.* Here you ſee the ſtyle of a diſcontented author, complaining that he is not enriched, nor advanced to honours, by the productions of his pen, and aſking that this ſo much deſired, ſo well deſerved, recompence of his labours may come at laſt. We find the ſame complaint, at the end of a preface he publiſhed in 1580. *I have taken this pains,* ſays he. (63) *to ſerve the public, which I think I do ſervice, and have done ſervice, by my labours: this gives me a ſingular ſatisfaction; for I have laboured with that deſign. And is likewiſe almoſt all the recompence I have had: and I ſhall be very well ſatisfied with this laſt labour, when I find it has been acceptable to you.* You may believe what you pleaſe of what I am going to recite, I will quote my author (64). ‘Henry the great . . . . made one day a repartee to the Sieur du Haillan . . . . for as du Haillian, a man . . . . vain . . . . . and given to his belly . . . . . ſpake one day to the late king too freely, complaining of the ſmall ſalary which he received from his liberality, and had the boldneſs to ſay to him, Sire, you know that I have two pens as a public hiſtorian, a title with which it has pleaſed your majeſty to honour me, one is of gold, and the other of iron: with my golden pen, I render thoſe immortal who honour me and do me good, and with my iron one I tarniſh the reputation of thoſe who do not take notice of the merits of my works.’ The king knowing by this harangue, the character of the man, who was more valiant at a meal, than he was in the field, ſaid to him, with a wonderful and royal quickneſs, Mr du Hallian, I do not believe that you have a *golden pen*; for if had you one, you would have ſwallowed it long ago.

[*M*] *We might make ſo many reflexions on this picture of du Haillan, that I imagine I ſhall not diſpleaſe the reader by making ſome.*] It is not eaſy to let this paſs without ſome reflexion. One who ſhould aſk whether thoſe in public poſts are as mercenary, as the ſervants of a private man, would ſeem at firſt ſight to make an abſurd queſtion; but upon examination, we ſhould find in it a juſt ſubject of a problem, and ſhould even declare for the affirmative. Conſider a little the printed or not printed relations of newswriters, and the converſations of thoſe who have for a long time been in high life. Conſult the hiſtorians who enter moſt into particulars; eſpecially, read the authors of memoirs; do this attentively, and I doubt not but you will own, that a poor foot-boy is in proportion, leſs mercenary, and more diſintereſted, than moſt of thoſe who poſſeſs great employments, either in princes

A REFLEXION upon the mercenary ſpirit of thoſe, who ſerve the public.

(*d*) *See the remark* [*L*], *at the end.*

(*e*) French Mercury, Tom. II, pag. m. 61.

(*f*) *Du Haillan's preface to the Hiſtory of France.*

(57) Idem, *in the preface of the ſame edition.*

(58) Idem, *epiſtle dedicatory of the State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France, in the edition of* 1580, *he had already ſaid,* I have performed all thoſe things in the body of my Great Hiſtory of France, which, Sire, I have dedicated to you, and which is known all over Chriſtendom.

(59) *You will find the ſequel of this paſſage above, remark* [C], *citat* (11).

(60) *Lower he ſpeaks thus:* I will tell you, that the Printer, who, for ten years ſucceſſively, has reprinted it every year, deſigned to reprint it again. *Note, that this preface was written in* 1580.

(61) Idem, *epiſtle dedicatory of the Hiſtory of France, in the edition of* 1584.

(62) *His epiſtle dedicatory is dated the firſt of Aug.* 1584.

(63) Idem, *preface to the State and Succeſs of the Affairs of France, in the edition of* 1580.

(64) Garaſſe, Recherche des Recherches, pag. 941, 942.

an occaſion of praiſing the modeſty of Mr Deſcartes.

princes houſholds, or in the government. Theſe are perſons who are hardly ever contented, always ready to beg new honours, and greater penſions, and to complain of the ſmallneſs of their recompences, to magnify their ſervices, to murmur if they are forgotten, whilſt others are thought on, to threaten to retire, and to manifeſt their diſcontent, by rude and audacious proceedings, *&c.* Theſe gentlemen imagine they have the greater right to demand magnificent rewards, becauſe they perſwade themſelves, that their maſter, a king, or a ſovereign, in a word, the public, will never come to want, though they have famiſhed leeches upon them continually ſucking (65). Tell me not of ſuch, or ſuch an one, who are ruined in their prince's ſervice, and of ſuch a great lord, whoſe lands, and even houſe, are under an execution. Theſe are not examples of their diſintereſtedneſs. It is not zeal for their country, but a mercenary temper, or their luxury and debauchery, which are the cauſes of their poverty. They imagined, that by appearing at court, or in the army with great equipages, tho' really uſeleſs to the public good, they ſhould the eaſier come to preferments: and at laſt, if they are ruined, it is not for the advantage of the ſtate, but to gratify their pomp and pride, and other particular paſſions. The Ariſtides and Fabricii, who after having enjoyed the greateſt poſts, and ſpent all their life in a wonderful frugality, had hardly any thing to leave their children, are good examples of an unmercenary ſpirit; but where are ſuch to be found?

But what is more vexatious, is to ſee that the men of learning cannot cure themſelves of this common diſtemper. The court and the army being the ſchools of ambition and luxury, and conſequently of hunger and thirſt after riches, it is no wonder they teach men to do nothing gratis, but to deſire large recompences for their ſervices. And as this paſſion is not eaſy to be ſatisfied, without boaſting of what they have done, and complaining of the want of a juſt reward, there is no occaſion to take ſo much exception at this conduct. But there will ſtill be ſufficent ground to lament, that ſtudy and the profeſſion of letters, ſhould not have taught du Haillan the prudence to avoid ſo much oſtentation of his labours, and to forbear complaints of the meanneſs of his fortune. If he were the only author guilty this way, it would not be neceſſary to take notice of it: but the miſchief of it is, that in this he copied a great number of writers, and that an hundred others have copied, and ſtill copy him. This is a great injury to the muſes, and deprives them of the glory they ſhould enjoy, of inſpiring their votaries with a true generoſity, and a noble contempt of riches and public rewards. They are like other men, you will ſay, and no leſs ſubject to ambition and avarice, the two epidemical diſeaſes of the ſoul of man. It is certain, that the deſire of living at eaſe, by means of a good revenue, is not the only reaſon of the boaſtings and complaints of du Haillan, and thoſe who are like him; pride has a great ſhare in it. They fancy, that the public will have a great eſteem, both for their perſons and their works, if it is known that they have had large penſions (66), but in this they are much miſtaken: ſome few, I confeſs, may be impoſed on by this outward appearance, and argue fallaciouſly thus: *ſuch an author has got noble employs, and rides in his coach, therefore he has a great deal of merit and his works are good.* But the public is ſeldom caught thus; and however, it is a charm but of ſhort continuance. Poſterity judges of books by the books themſelves: if they are good, it doth not deſpiſe them, tho' it ſhould be ſaid at the beginning of the preface that the author died with hunger: if they are bad, they are deſpiſed, tho' ſhould appear in the firſt page, that the author was an earl, or a marquis, and left a million. What is it you fear? why do you torment your ſelf? might one have asked du Haillan: you are allowed to ſay that you have not ſpared your pains or care to render your work perfect: your duty obliged you to great fatigues, and it is a civility to the public, to declare in a preface, that you have done all you could to merit their approbation. You ought to have ſtopped there, and not to have urged the greatneſs and value of your labours, as a juſt cauſe of demanding greater recompences, and complaining that you had not been ſufficiently paid. Are you afraid that future ages ſhould know that your ſtudies and reſearches have put the hiſtory of France in a very fine light, but have not enriched you? what injury can that do your memory? if it be ſaid that you was not induſtrious to heap up riches, they will ſuppoſe you wanted a quality which is none of the beſt; your glory will not by ſuffer it: ſleep at reſt, if it be ſaid that this induſtry was not above your capacity, but that you did not care to employ it, being content with your books and your ſtudies, and to conſecrate your time to the inſtruction of the public: would not this be an excellent elogy? would it not be a prejudice in favour of your works? if the contempt of riches, and your continual application to writing good books, expoſe you to the danger of dying poor, you ought to wiſh that this may be put in your epitaph (67). This would be equivalent to a title of honour or nobility in the republic of learning; this would be a glorious way to immortality (68). Never fear the judgment of poſterity upon it. If they who were careleſs of recompenſing your labours, are cenſured for their ingratitude and injuſtice, what is that to you? it is a cenſure which doth not fall upon you.

A LAUDABLE paſſage concerning Mr Des Cartes.

It muſt be here ſaid to the glory of Mr Des Cartes, that he preſerved himſelf pure and untainted from this ſhameful diſeaſe, though one of his friends had taken the moſt dangerous ways to infect him with it. Obſerve in what manner this zealous friend excited him to boaſt, and make loud demands of recompence (69). 'Know, that to obtain any thing of the public, it is not enough to mention a word or two concerning it, by the by, in the preface of a book, without ſaying expreſsly that you deſire and expect it, and explaining the reaſons, to prove not only that you deſerve it, but alſo that it is much their intereſt to give it you, and that they ought to expect great advantage from it. It is ſo uſual to ſee thoſe who imagine they have merit, make ſuch a noiſe about it, and ſo importunately aſſert their pretenſions, and promiſe ſo much above what they can do, that when any one ſpeaks modeſtly of himſelf, and deſires nothing of any body, nor makes any confident promiſes, whatever proofs he otherwiſe gives of his ability, that will not be conſidered, they will never think of him. You will ſay perhaps that you are not of a temper, either to ask any thing, or ſpeak to your own advantage; becauſe the one ſeems to be a ſign of meanneſs, and the other of pride. But I maintain that this humour ought to be corrected, and that it proceeds from error and infirmity rather than from an honeſt baſhfulneſs and modeſty . . . You may ſay likewiſe that your works ſpeak ſufficiently, and that you have no need to add promiſes and boaſtings, which being the cuſtom of cheating quacks, ſeem not becoming a man of honour who only ſeeks the truth. But what makes theſe pretenders blame-worthy, is not their boaſting great and good things of themſelves, but only falſe ones, and ſuch as cannot be proved; whereas thoſe things I would have you ſay of yourſelf, are ſo true, and ſo evidently proved by your writings, that by all the laws of decency you may affirm them, and thoſe of charity oblige you to it, becauſe it concerns others to know them. For though your writings ſpeak ſufficiently to ſuch as carefully peruſe them, and are able to underſtand them; yet this is not enough for the deſign I would put you upon, becauſe every one cannot read them, and the managers of public affairs have hardly leiſure. It is probable that ſome who have read them, may ſpeak to them about it: but whatever they may ſay, the little noiſe you are known to make, and the great modeſty you always have obſerved in ſpeaking of your ſelf hinders them from attending much to it. Nay, becauſe they are accuſtomed to hear indifferent people ſet off to them in the moſt advantageous terms imaginable, they have no reaſon to take the moſt extraordinary praiſes that ſhould be given you by thoſe who know you, for exact truth. Wheras when a man ſpeaks of himſelf and ſays extraordinary things, he is heard with greater attention, eſpecially when he is well born, and is known not to be of a temper or condition to play the mountebank. And becauſe he would make himſelf ridiculous by uſing hyperboles on this occaſion, his words are taken literally; and ſuch as will not believe them, are at leaſt excited by their curioſity, or their jealouſy, to examine into the truth of them . . . . This being moſt certain, and ſince it can moſt eaſily be proved by the writings you have already printed, you ought to ſpeak it aloud, to publiſh it ſo aſſiduouſly, and to put it ſo expreſsly in all the

---

(65) Nec miſſura cutem niſi plena cruoris hirudo. *Horat. de Arte Poët. ver. ult.*

(66) *See, above, the remark* [*G*] *of the article* ALCIATUS (ANDREW).

(67) Titulo res digna ſepulchri.

(68) Hac itur ad aſtra.

(69) *Letter I, written to Mr Des Cartes. It is before his treatiſe of the Paſſions.*

‘ titles of your books, that no body for the future ‘ may be ignorant of it.’ Could Mr Des Cartes's modeſty be attacked by more ſpecious and ſtronger arguments than theſe? Here is nothing omitted, all excuſes foreſtalled, and yet it was all to no purpoſe (70). Note, that the gentleman had good reaſon to tell him, that the public is uſed to be dunned with great importunity and boaſting: becauſe the petitioners know they ſhall otherwiſe obtain nothing. Woe to them who are diſheartened by the firſt refuſal, and cannot ſpeak out in their petitions. Du Haillan knew his cue, when he acted in the manner we have ſeen above. A man muſt complain, and petition often, to be once heard in a court: if cardinal Richelieu was ſuch an one as he is repreſented in the Hiſtory of the French Academy (71), he was a phœnix.

(70) See before the ſaid *Treatiſe of Paſſions*, Mr Des Cartes's anſwer to his friend's letters.

(71) Cardinal Richelieu never did any good to Mainard, partly, becauſe he did not love that any thing ſhould be aſked of him, and that he might have the glory of giving of his own accord. *Pelliſſ. Hiſt. of the Academy, pag. m.* 278.

HALI-BEIGH, firſt dragoman at the Grand Seignior's court, in the XVIIth century, was born a Chriſtian in Poland; but being taken very young by the Tartars, he was ſold to the Turks, who educated him in their religion in the Seraglio. His Poliſh name was Albert Bobowſki [*A*]. He acquired the knowledge of a great number of languages [*B*], and became ſo learned as to be able to write books [*C*]. He had a great correſpondence with ſome Engliſhmen, who engaged him to tranſlate ſome books into the Turkiſh language (*a*). He was deſirous to return to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity; but he died before he executed that noble deſign (*b*). See the Supplement to Moreri.

(*a*) See the remark [C].

(*b*) Leipſic Journal, 1691, pag. 226.

[*A*] *His name was Albert Bobowſki.*] This name has been latinized Bobovius; but moſt authors have been miſtaken in it. Sir Paul Ricaut calls this Polander Albert Bobonius (1). Beſpier, his tranſlator, corrects him, and puts Bohonius (2), becauſe Thomas Smith *writ it ſo, pag.* 39, *of his epiſtle de Morib. Turc. 'Tis true, that in this paſſage it is* Bozonius, *but the errata, ſhews, that it ſhould be read* Bohonius. Sir Paul Ricaut's firſt tranſlator (3) has put Robovius.

[*B*] *He acquired the knowledge of a great number of languages.*] Give me leave to cite here, ſomewhat at large, the author of the old and new Lacedemon: ‘ Obſerve, *ſays he* (4), Fornetti, Panagiotti, la Fontaine, and all the other dragomen of the Porte; how ‘ circumſpect they are when they treat with the mini‘ſters of Chriſtian princes, or with thoſe of their re‘tinue. Halybey, the famous Poliſh renegado, who, ‘ bating his apoſtacy, and morally ſpeaking, is one of ‘ the honeſteſt men in the world, does not better ex‘plain himſelf with the Franks, though he be their ‘ great friend; who yet could do it very well, as ‘ ſpeaking eighteen different languages.’

[*C*] *He became ſo learned as to be able to write books.*] At Dr Thomas Smith's requeſt, he wrote a treatiſe *de Turcarum liturgia, peregrinatione Meccana, circumciſione, ægrotorum viſitatione, &c.* —— *Concerning the liturgy of the Turks, their pilgrimage to Mecca, their circumciſion, and viſiting of the ſick, &c.* which was publiſhed by Dr Hyde, to whom Dr Smith gave it (5). Hali-Beigh tranſlated into Turkiſh, the Catechiſm of the Church of England, about the year 1653, at Mr Baſire's requeſt He tranſlated all the Bible into the ſame tongue, at the inſtance of Levinus Warnerus, who ſent this tranſlation to Leyden, that it might be printed there. This is not as yet done, but the manuſcript is kept in the library of Leyden. I do not mention a Turkiſh grammar and dictionary, written by the ſame dragoman. Sir Paul Ricaut confeſſes, he had many things from him, which he has related in his book concerning the Preſent State of the Ottoman Empire. If he had conſulted him upon all that he has ſaid, he would not have advanced that the Mahometan women had no hopes of entering into paradiſe. Hali-Beigh maintains the contrary, in the work which Dr Hyde has publiſhed. *Rycautum refellit, docuitque mulieres Turcicas omnino ſperare ſe aliquando æque ac viros in Paradiſum receptum iri, quod iſte pag.* 271 *negaverat* (6). Sir Paul Ricaut, amongſt other things, ſays (7), that he learnt from this dragoman, that there are ſome Turks who believe, that the ſouls of dead men enter into the bodies of beaſts, whoſe conſtitution comes neareſt to that of the bodies they have left. A Druggiſt one day told Hali-Beigh, *that he prayed to God, with thoſe of the ſame profeſſion* (8), *that their ſouls might have the honour, after their death, to enter the bodies of camels, becauſe they are ſober, laborious, patient, and gentle creatures, and bring their drugs from the remoteſt countries of the eaſt That he doubted not, but after the revolution of* 3365 *years, during which his ſoul would travel all the world over, and paſs ſucceſſively from camel to camel, it would return once more into an human body, much purer and more perfect than it had at the beginning. This was the Druggiſt's creed. It is ſaid, that moſt of the Chineſe are much addicted to this opinion.* We have in Dr Barrow's Poſthumous Works, an Engliſh relation of a conſpiracy that was formed in the Seraglio, againſt Kioſen, grandmother to Mahomet IV. Albert Bobovius, *Muſician of the Seraglio, and eye-witneſs of this event*, has written that relation (9).

(1) Ricaut, Preſent State of the Ottoman empire, lib. ii, pag. m. 405.

(2) Curious Remarks, pag. 667.

(3) His name is Briot.

(4) Pag. 81, of the Dutch edition.

(5) In the appendix of Abraham Peritſol's *Itinera Mundi*, at Oxford, 1691. See the Leipſic Journal of May, 1691, pag. 226.

(6) Leipſic Journal, ibid.

(7) Preſent State of the Ottoman Empire, pag. 406, 407.

(8) All thoſe that this Druggiſt was acquainted with at Conſtantinople, who believed the tranſmigration of ſouls, were Druggiſts.

(9) *See the* Bibliotheque Univerſelle, Tom. X, pag. 62.

HALICARNASSUS, the capital city of the kingdom of Caria, was a colony of the Argians (*a*) [*A*]. It became famous under the two Artemiſia's, and Mauſolus the huſband of the later. This prince's tomb was a very great ornament to it, being reckoned one of the ſeven wonders of the world. The fountain Salmacis was another curioſity of Halicarnaſſus. There were few towns on that coaſt, which made ſo ſtout a reſiſtance againſt Alexander as this did (*b*); becauſe care had been taken to fortify it well. Vitruvius (*c*) tells us ſome particulars about it's conſtruction, and eſpecially concerning it's ports. Meurſius, as learned as he was, applied to the two ports of Rhodes (*d*), what Vitruvius has only ſaid concerning thoſe of Halicarnaſſus. Alexander was obliged to burn the town, whilſt the garriſon ſtill vigorouſly defended itſelf in the fortreſſes, Herodotus and Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus were born in this city.

(*a*) Strab. lib. xiv, pag. 451. Pomp. Mela, lib. i, cap. xvi.

(*b*) Freinſhem. Supplem. in Curt. lib. ii, cap. ix, & x.

(*c*) Lib. ii, cap. viii.

(*d*) In Rhodo, pag. 36.

[*A*] *It was a colony of Argians.*] The conductor of this colony was called Anthes, who departed from the town of Trezen (1). Pauſanias (2) calls him Antha, and makes him the ſon of Neptune. He does not make him the leader of this colony, but attributes it to his deſcendants. However, the Halicarnaſſians were ſirnamed Ἀνθεάδαι (3).

(1) Strab. lib. xiv, Calimachus, apud Stephan.

(2) Lib. ii, pag. 73.

(3) Stephan. in Ἀθῆναι.

HALL (JOSEPH), one of the moſt illuſtrious Engliſh biſhops that appeared in the XVIIth century, read Rhetoric lectures to pupils in the univerſity of Cambridge, and afterwards became ſucceſſively miniſter at Halſtede, dean of Worcheſter, biſhop of Exeter, and at laſt biſhop of Norwich (*a*). He was deputed to the ſynod of Dort, and aſſiſted there for ſome time; till he was obliged by ſickneſs to leave that famous aſ-

(*a*) Witte, in Diario Biographico.

ſembly [*A*]. He publiſhed many books, ſeveral of which have been tranſlated from Engliſh into French by Theodore Jaquemot. They are filled with fine thoughts, excellent morality, and even a great deal of piety. He died in the year 1656, aged eighty two years (*b*). He was ſo great a lover of ſtudy, that he earneſtly wiſhed that his health would have allowed him to do it, even to exceſs [*B*]. His writings, when an occaſion offers, ſhow that he was very zealous againſt Popery [*C*]. Neither was he more favourable to thoſe who ſeparated from the ſtock without an extreme neceſſity. What he ſaid of Arminius is a proof of this [*D*]. He lamented the diviſions of Proteſtants,

(*b*) Id. ibid.

[*A*] *He was obliged, by ſickneſs, to retire from the Synod of Dort.*] A prieſt, who wrote againſt him, did not fail to inſult him upon this deputation; but Joſeph Hall anſwers him as follows (1): 'Let himſelf, or any of his eaves-dropping companions . . . (to whom that place ſtood open) ſay, wherein I ſhamed thoſe that ſent me. It was my juſt grief, that the neceſſity of my health, yea of my life, called me off immaturely; but ſince either death or departure muſt be yielded to, others ſhall judge whether I went away more laden with infirmity, than (however unworthy) with approbation.'

[*B*] *He was ſo great a lover of ſtudy, that he earneſtly wiſhed . . . that his health would have allowed him to do it even to exceſs.*] This circumſtance of his life is to be found in one of his letters. 'Fear not my immoderate ſtudy, *ſays he, writing to a friend* (2), I have a body that controuls me enough in theſe courſes, my friends need not. There is nothing whereof I could ſooner ſurfeit, if I durſt neglect my body to ſatisfy my mind: but while I affect knowledge, my weakneſs checks me, and ſays: *Better a little learning, than no health.* I yield, and patiently abide myſelf, debarred of my choſen felicity.' How happy are they who with ſouls ſo fond of ſtudy, have bodies able to ſupport themſelves under this earneſt and continual application of mind! Joſeph Hall, not being of this happy number, acted as wiſe men ought on ſuch an occaſion: he curbed his inclination, whenever his body warned him, that his health required that he ſhould do ſo. They who would force nature, and continue poring on their books, even after they find that ſtudy too much heats their blood, or exhauſts their ſpirits, depart too far from the maxim, that life doth not conſiſt in living, but in enjoying health.

At noſtri bene computentur anni;
Et quantum tetricæ tulere febres,
Aut languor gravis, aut mali dolores,
A vita meliore ſeparentur:
Infantes ſumus, & ſenes videmur.
Ætatem Priamique, Neſtoriſque
Longam qui putat eſſe, Martiane,
Multum decipiturque, falliturque.
Non eſt vivere, ſed valere vita (3).

From our account of life if we cut off
What pain, diſeaſes, and the ſpleen have marr'd,
We'll find we were only infants, tho' old men we ſeem:
Priam's and Neſtor's years will ſeem but few,
For only then we live when we are happy.

And if zeal for the ſervice of the public encourage them to neglect their health, it muſt be a miſtaken zeal; for they might be more uſeful to the Republic of Letters, by ſparing than by overſtraining themſelves. A man makes greater progreſs by doing a little every day, than by applying ſo cloſe for ſome weeks in an obſtinate manner, ſo as to occaſion infirmities of a long continuance. Happy, I ſay once more, is he who has ſtrength to ſtudy fourteen or fifteen hours a day, without being ever ſick. An infinite number of men of letters are deprived of this happineſs; ſome few, *pauci quos æquus amavit Jupiter*, are bleſt with it:

- - - - Unus & alter
Forſitan hæc ſperant juvenes, quibus arte benigna
Et meliore luto finxit præcordia Titan (4).

A few perhaps may with ſuch labour play,
Form'd in a ſtronger mould, of more enduring clay.

[C] *He was very zealous againſt Popery.*] One may find many proofs of this in his miſcellaneous epiſtles (5). I ſhall only tranſcribe one paſſage out of them; and it ſhall be ſuch that it will ſhow he bore a great hatred to the Jeſuits; and obſerve, that I take it from a letter which contains Joſeph Hall's obſervations in his journey through the Spaniſh Netherlands in 1610. The relations of travellers ordinarily ſhow us what is their prevailing taſte, whether they are antiquaries, phyſicians, geographers, engineers, religious, or bigots, *&c.* this of Joſeph Hall breathes nothing but controverſy. And accordingly he owns that his deſign was only to relate what he had obſerved *as a divine* (6): but to return to our purpoſe, let us quote what we have promiſed. 'Along our way, how many churches ſaw we demoliſhed, nothing left but rude heaps to tell the paſſenger, there hath been both devotion and hoſtility. Oh the miſerable footſteps of war, beſides bloodſhed, ruin, and deſolation! *Fury* hath done that there, which *covetouſneſs* and *ambition* with us would do, but ſhall not: the truth within ſhall ſave the walls without. And, to ſpeak truly (whatever the vulgar exclaim) idolatry pulled down thoſe walls (7), not rage. If there had been no Hollander, to raze them, they ſhould have fallen alone, rather than hide ſo much impiety under their guilty roof. Theſe are ſpectacles, not ſo much of cruelty as juſtice; cruelty of man, juſtice of God. But (which I wondered at) churches fall, and Jeſuits colleges riſe every where. There is no city where theſe are not rearing or built. Whence cometh this? Is it for that devotion, is not ſo neceſſary as policy? Thoſe men (as we ſay of the fox) fare beſt when they are moſt curſed. None ſo much ſpited of their own; none ſo hated of all; none ſo oppoſed of by ours: and yet theſe ill weeds grow. Whoſoever lives long, will ſee them feared of their own, which now hate them, ſhall ſee theſe ſeven lean kine devour all the fat beaſts that feed on the meadows of Tyber. I propheſy as Pharaoh dreamed. The event ſhall juſtify my confidence (8).' This prophecy has not as yet had it's accompliſhment: the power of the Jeſuits is much increaſed ſince that time, in ſpite of all the efforts of their adverſaries; but theſe laſt are ſtill very formidable, and give them a great deal to do. They who read the treatiſe of Joſeph Hall, intituled, *No Peace with Rome*, will be convinced of his zeal againſt Popery. Jaquemot's French verſion of it, was printed at Geneva, in 1629, in 12mo. See likewiſe his *Serious Diſſuaſive from Popery, to W. D. revolted*, &c (9).

[*D*] . . . . *neither was he more favourable to thoſe, who ſeparated from the ſtock. . . . . What he ſaid of Arminius is a proof of this.*] The firſt epiſtle of the third Decade was written to Mr Smith and Mr Rob. *Heads of the late ſeparation at Amſterdam.* He repreſents to them in very ſtrong terms (10), that they could not *do a greater injury to their mother*, the church of England, than *to fly from her*, that *ſay ſhe were corrupted yet ſhe was ſtill their mother, which ought to be cauſe enough for them to lament her, to pray for her, to labour for her redreſs, and not to avoid her. This unnaturalneſs is ſhameful.* They alledged the command, *go out of Babylon* (11); but he anſwered them that the church from which they had ſeparated, was gone out of it. 'Babylon, *continues he* (12), feels it herſelf, and ſees that ſhe is abandoned, and complains to all the world, that we have not only forſaken, but ſpoiled her; . . . . . and except you will be willingly blind, you may ſee the heaps of her altars, the aſhes of her idols, the ruins of her monuments, the condemnation of her errors, and the revenge of her abominations. . . . . Where are the main buildings of that accurſed city? . . . . Where are thoſe rotten heaps (rotten, not through age, but by corruption) of tranſubſtantiating of bread, adoring of images, multitude of ſacraments, power of indulgences, neceſſity of confeſſions, profit of pilgrimages, conſtrained and approved ignorance, unknown devotions; where are thoſe deep vaults (if not mines) of penances, and purgatories,

(1) Joſeph Hall, in his Apology for the Honour of the married Clergy, pag. 646, Edit. 1621.

(2) Hall, Miſcellaneous Letters, Dec. II, Epiſt. v, pag. 290.

(3) Martial, Epigr. lxx, lib. vi.

(4) Juven. Sat. XIV, ver. 33.

(5) See particularly the firſt of the firſt Decade, the fourth of the ſecond, and the firſt of the fifth.

(6) Hall. Epiſt. Decad. I, pag. 269, Edit 1621.

(7) A falſe thought; for this idolatry has not been the cauſe of the ruin of any church in the countries where religious wars have not carried their ravages.

(8) Hall's Epiſtles, Decad I, pag. 269 *Note*, That, in the remark [*N*] of the article LIPSIUS, I have cited another paſſage from the ſame epiſtle.

(9) Jaquemot's French verſion of it was printed at Geneva, 1629.

(10) Hall's Epiſtles, Decad III, letter i, pag. 303.

(11) Id. ibid. pag. 303.

(12) Ibid.

Proteſtants, and wrote ſomething concerning the means of putting an end to them. This was highly agreeable to that great pacificator Dury [*E*]. Amongſt other controverſies,

purgatories, and whatſoever hath been deviſed by thoſe Popelings, whether profitable or glorious, againſt the Lord and his Christ? are they not all razed and buried in the duſt? Hath not the majeſty of her gods, like as was done to *Mithra*, and *Serapis*, been long agon offered to the public laughter of the vulgar (13).' They alledged that by *conſorting of ceremonies* the church of England, *tarried ſtill in the ſuburbs* of Babylon (14). He anſwers, amongſt other things, that by this manner of arguing, they would find Babylon every where. *Would you run from Geneva,* asks he (15), *becauſe of her wafers* (16)? . . . . ' Compare the place you have left, with that you have choſen, let not fear of ſeeming to repent over-ſoon, make you partial. Lo there a common harbour of all opinions, of all hereſies; if not a mixture. Here you drew in the clear and free air of the Goſpel, without that odious compoſition of *Judaïſme*, *Arrianiſme*, *Anabaptiſme*: there you live in the ſtench of theſe and more. You are unworthy of pity, if you will approve your miſery. Say, if you can, that the church of England (if ſhe were not your's) is not an heaven, to Amſterdam (17) . . . . . . Who gains by this ſequeſtration, but *Rome* and *Hell?* How do they inſult in this advantage, that our mothers own children condemn her for unclean, that we are daily weakened by our diviſions, that the rude multitude hath ſo palpable a motive to diſtruſt us? . . . . The God of heaven open your eyes, that you may ſee the injuſtice of that zeal, which hath tranſported you, ... otherwiſe your ſouls ſhall find too late, that it had been a thouſand times better to ſwallow a ceremony, than to rend a church: yea, that even whoredoms and murders ſhall abide an eaſier anſwer than ſeparation (18).'

To all this we may add the reaſons which he gives in the fifth letter of the VI Decade (19), and the praiſes he beſtows on the memory of Junius, in another letter (20). It is in a letter wherein he deplores the diviſions among the Leyden divines, and wherein he pathetically deſcribes the miſeries which the church ſuffers by theſe kind of civil wars. Here follows the exhortation which he addreſſeth to the profeſſor who gave occaſion to theſe diviſions. ' If I might challenge ought in that your acute and learned Arminius; I would thus ſollicit and conjure him; alas, that ſo wiſe a man ſhould not know the worth of peace; that ſo noble a ſon of the church ſhould not be brought to light, without ripping the womb of his mother! What mean theſe ſubtle novelties? If they make thee famous, and the church miſerable, who ſhall gain by them? Is ſingularity ſo precious, that it ſhould coſt no leſs, than the ſafety and quiet of our common mother? If it be truth thou affecteſt; what alone? Could never any eyes (till thine) be bleſſed with this object? Where hath that ſacred verity hid herſelf thus long from all her careful inquiſitors, that ſhe now firſt ſhews her head to thee, unſought? Hath the Goſpel ſhone thus long, and bright, and left ſome corners unſeen? Away with all new truths; fair and plauſible they may be, ſound they cannot: ſome may admire thee for them; none ſhall bleſs thee. But grant that ſome of theſe are no leſs true than nice points; what do theſe unſeaſonable crotchets, and quavers trouble the harmonious plain ſongs of our peace? Some quiet error may be better than ſome unruly truth. Who binds us to ſpeak all we think? So the church may be ſtill, would God thou wert wiſe alone. Did not our adverſaries quarrel enough before at our quarrels? Were they not rich enough with our ſpoils? By the dear name of our common parents, what meaneſt thou Arminius? Whether tend theſe new raiſed diſſenſions? Who ſhall thrive by them, but they which inſult upon us, and riſe by the fall of truth? Who ſhall be undone, but thy bretheren? By that moſt precious and bloody ranſom of our Saviour, and by that awful appearance we ſhall once make before the glorious tribunal of the Son of God, remember thy ſelf, and the poor diſtracted limbs of the church, let not thoſe excellent parts wherewith God has furniſhed thee, lie in the narrow way, and cauſe any weak one either to fall, or ſtumble or err. For God's ſake, either ſay nothing or the ſame. How many great wits have ſought no by-paths, and now are happy with their fellows! Let it be no diſparagement to go with many to heaven. What could he reply to ſo plain a charge (21).' We muſt not forget that he inſinuates that the adverſaries of Arminius beſtirred themſelves too much. *Neither Gomarus*, adds he (22), *nor your other grave fraternity of reverend divines, have been ſilent in ſo main a cauſe. I fear rather too much noiſe in any of theſe tumults: there may too many contend, not intreat, multitude of ſuiters is commonly powerful; how much more in juſt motions?* . . . . *Wiſdom and charity could teach us to avoid the prejudice* of differences. *If we had but theſe two virtues, quarrels ſhould not hurt us, nor the church by us: but (alas!) ſelf-love is too ſtrong for both theſe: this alone opens the flood-gates of diſſenſion, and drowns the ſweet, but low, valley of the church. Men eſteem of opinions, becauſe their own; and will have truth ſerve, not govern. What they have undertaken, muſt be true: victory is ſought for, not ſatisfaction; victory of the author, not of the cauſe. He is a rare man that knows to yield as well as to argue* (23). Theſe are excellent thoughts, and make a fine ſupplement to my articles of Arminius and Gomarus (24). Obſerve that the ſermon, which Joſeph Hall preached before the ſynod of Dort, turned chiefly on this maxim, that we ought not to affect ſubtilties in matters of religion. He maintained that the Remonſtrants by their too great deſire of ſubtiliſing, had been the cauſe of the diſorders which at that time embroiled the church (25).

The letter which he wrote to a man very unſettled in religion, will convince us of his earneſt deſire of ſeing perfect concord reign in the church. *You are*, ſays he to him (26), *to day in the tents of the Romaniſts, to morrow in ours, the next day between both, againſt both. Our adverſaries think you ours, we theirs . . . What hinders you? is it our diviſions? I ſee you ſhake your head at this, and by your ſilent geſture bewray this the cauſe of your diſtaſte: would GOD I could either deny this with truth, or amend it with tears: but I grant it with no leſs ſorrow, than you with offence. This earth hath nothing more lamentable, than the civil jarrs of one faith* (27). He goes on to anſwer the pretext, which ſome take from theſe diviſions to join with no party; and maintains that not only no communities, is exempt from diviſions, but likewiſe that every particular perſon is expoſed to them. *Shew me that church which hath not complained of diſtraction; yea that family, yea that fraternity, yea that man, that always agrees with himſelf. See if the ſpouſe of CHRIST in that heavenly marriage-ſong, do not call him a young Hart* in the mountains of diviſion. *Tell me then whither will you go for truth? if you will own no truth but where there is no diviſion? To Rome perhaps famous for unity, famous for peace. See now how happily you have choſen, how well you have ſped. Lo then, cardinal Bellarmin himſelf, a witneſs above exception, under his own hand acknowledgeth to the world, and reckons up 237 contrarieties of doctrine among the Romiſh divines* (28) ' If our church diſpleaſe you for differences, *continues he* (29), theirs much more, unleſs you will be either wilfully incredulous, or wilfully partial: unleſs you diſlike a miſchief the leſs for the ſecrecy (30). What will you do then? Will you be a church alone? Alas, how full of contradictions are you to your ſelf! how full of contrary purpoſes! how often do you chide with yourſelf! how often do you fight with yourſelf?

Let us obſerve, by the by, that what he here ſays of Bellarmin, was diſputed: an Engliſh prieſt pretended that it was a ſhameleſs aſſertion (31). Joſeph Hall among other things anſwered (32), that he had reckoned the 237 contrarieties, *according to Pappus's enumeration*, and that *his Peace of Rome, makes up* 103. This Peace of Rome is a book of Joſeph Hall. One might have put this queſtion to him: If you had found the enumeration of Pappus juſt, why do you in this book content your ſelf with objecting 103 contrarieties? and if you found it not juſt, why do you in your letter object 237 diſputes?

[*E*] *This was highly agreeable to that great pacificator Dury.*] He, in the year 1634, publiſhed the advices troverſies, he wrote concerning the vow of celibacy [*F*]; and when he was informed that Marcus Antonius de Dominis deſigned to return from England into Italy; he wrote a letter to him repreſenting the neceſſity of remaining ſeparate from the communion of the church of Rome. This letter has been inſerted at large in the anſwer of Marcus Antonius de Dominis (*c*). His Miſcellaneous Epiſtles are very good: they are without date; but being dedicated to prince Henry (*d*), eldeſt ſon to king James I, we may conclude that they were wrote before the year 1613. He obſerves, in his epiſtle dedicatory, that it was not as yet uſual in England, to publiſh diſcourſes in form of letters,

---

(13) Ibid. pag. 303, 304.

(14) Ibid. pag. 304.

(15) Ibid.

(16) This cuſtom was aboliſhed in 1623. See Spon's Hiſtory of Geneva, pag. m. 373.

(17) Ibid. pag. 304.

(18) Ibid.

(19) It was written to M. I. W. to diſſuade him from ſeparating.

(20) Your famous Junius had nothing more admirable than his love of peace; when our buſy ſeparatiſts provoked him, with what a ſweet calmneſs did he reject them, and with a grave importunity called them to moderation. How it would have vexed his holy ſoul, &c. *Hall's Epiſtles, Decad VI, epiſt. vii,* pag. 383.

(21) Ibid. pag. 384.

(22) Ibid.

(23) Ibid.

(24) See the remark [*E*] of the article ARMINIUS; and remark [*D*] of the article GOMARUS.

(25) *See the* Epiſtolæ Eccleſiaſticæ & Theologicæ præſtantium Virorum, pag. 515. Edit. 1684.

(26) Hall's Epiſtles, Decad III, epiſt. v, pag. 312.

(27) Ibid. pag. 312.

(28) Ibid. pag. 313.

(29) Ibid.

(30) He had ſaid before in this letter, that the Papiſts have not leſs diſſenſion, but more ſmothered, they fight cloſely within doors, without noiſe, all our frays are in the field.

(31) See Joſeph Hall's Honour of the married Clergy, in the anſwer to the advertiſement.

(32) Ibid.

(*c*) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, April 4, 1667.

(*d*) Who died Novemb. 6, 1612.

advices of ſome French divines, and of three Engliſh biſhops, concerning the way to reconcile Proteſtants. Our Joſeph Hall was one of theſe three biſhops. Davenant and Morton were the other two. The *Irænicorum Tractatuum Prodromus*, publiſhed by Dury, in 1662, contains two pieces of Joſeph Hall. The one is intituled, *Columba Noæ olivam adferens jactatiſſimæ Chriſti Arcæ, præſertim adverſus machinationes Pontificiorum*. It is a ſermon which he preached before a ſynod at London. The other is intituled *Pax terris, continens varia ad concordiam inter Chriſtianos hoc tempore ſuadendam Conſilia & Argumenta.*

[*F*] *Among other controverſies he wrote concerning the vow of celibacy.*] The third letter of the ſecond decad, is intituled *an Apologetical Diſcourſe of the Marriage of Eccleſiaſtical Perſons*. It coſt the author only three hours, and three leaves of paper (33). It conſiſts of twenty three pages in 12mo, in the French tranſlation of Jaquemot. Twelve years after, an Engliſh prieſt anſwered it, in a piece of 380 pages (34). Joſeph Hall very quickly replied in a book which he intituled, *the Honour of the married Clergy, maintained againſt the malicious challenges of C.E. Maſs-prieſt.* He publiſhed it in Engliſh in 1620. The French verſion by Jaquemot, was printed at Geneva in 1665, and contains 362 pages in 12mo. The author was glad to ſhow his diligence, *that his ſelf-conceited adverſary and his ſeduced abettors, might ſee how little a well ordered marriage is guilty of deadening our ſpirits, or ſlackening our hands* (35). Notwithſtanding he was married he began this reply, and wrote it twice over with his own hand, in a very ſhort time; tho' he made it only *the recreation of the weightier buſineſs of his calling, which then more than ordinarily urged him.* (36). This gives us ground to conjecture, that the Engliſh prieſt, had made uſe of the common argument, that marriage diverts too much from ſtudy (37). Some expreſſions had eſcaped biſhop Hall, which ſeemed to import, that continence was a thing impoſſible; he was a little embaraſſed with the conſequences! which his adverſary drew from that aſſertion. Here follows one of the objections of the Engliſh prieſt (38). *Mr Hall was abſent in France; fleſh is frail, temptations frequent, yet both then and before his marriage, he would take it in great ſcorn, to be ſuſpected for diſhoneſt. If Mr Hall could for ſo long time together, live a chaſte life, why no more?* he anſwered that this concluſion was not good, and compares it to theſe following. A good ſwimmer may hold his breath under the water for ſome minutes, why not for an hour? why not for more? a devout Papiſt may faſt after his breakfaſt, till his dinner in the afternoon, therefore why not a week? why not a month, why not as long as Eve the maid of Meurs (39)? after this, he, amongſt other things, anſwers that St Paul* having allowed the married to ſeparate with conſent for a time, *that they might give themſelves to faſting and prayer*, commands them *to come together again, that ſatan tempt them not for their incontinency.* Which ſuppoſeth, that tho' a perſon may contain for ſome days, it doth not hence follow, that he can do ſo for his whole life. *Where there is an impoſſibility*, objected they to Hall, (40) *or a neceſſity, there is no ſin, no counſel, as no man ſins in not making new ſtars, in not doing miracles.* He anſwered (41) that this is ' a ſtale ſhift, that oft ' ſounded in the ears of Auſtin and Proſper from their ' Pelagians.' It is objected likewiſe to him (42) *that the father cannot blame his child for incontinence; to contain, implies impoſſibility: to provide an huſband or a wife* (43) *is not a work of an hour's warning; in the mean time what ſhall they do?* ' Certainly, *anſwers he* (44) the ' man thinks of thoſe hot regions of his religion, ' where they are ſo ſharp ſet, that they muſt have ' ſtews allowed of one ſex at leaſt; elſe what ſtrange ' violence is this that he conceives? as our Junius ' anſwered his Bellarmine in the like, *Hic homo ſibi ' videtur agere de equis admiſſariis ruentibus in venerem, & de hippomane, non de hominibus ratione præditis.* He ſpeaks as if he had to do with ſtallions, ' not with men, not with Chriſtians, amongſt whom ' is to be ſuppoſed a decent order, and due regard ' of ſeaſonableneſs. and expediency.' Laſtly, they object the caſe of divorce to him: *the huſband and wife are ſeparated upon diſcord, or diſeaſe: what ſhall they do? to live continent with this man is impoſſible, I anſwer; if only their will ſunders them, that muſt yield to neceſſity. Diſſention may not abridge them of the neceſſary remedy of ſin: if neceſſity, that finds relief in their prayers; if they call on him who calls them to continency by this hand of his, he will hear them, and enable them to perſiſt, and why not then in the neceſſity of our vows? this is a neceſſity of our own making; and that of his; he hath bound himſelf, to keep his own promiſes, not ours* (45).

Whoever will impartially examine theſe anſwers of Mr Hall, will find them but weak. He fairs in the ſame manner as a general, who having engaged himſelf too far in the enemy's country, cannot make a retreat without the loſs of his rear. A clergyman, who will own that continence is beyond the power of man, and who ſhall give this as the reaſon why he married, will give great reaſon to ſupect his conduct in the time that preceded his marriage, a time when he was ſtill younger than when he took a wife. For if to juſtify himſelf as to that time, he ſhall ſay, that he was not then in love; but that at laſt, a certain woman having touched him by certain ſympathies, which are to be found in nature, and by certain machinal proportions betwixt the objects and the faculties (46); he found himſelf deprived of the power of containing himſelf, which he before enjoyed; if I ſay he ſhould make uſe of ſuch an apology, he would expoſe himſelf to very ticklish and embaraſſing queſtions. How have you behaved, might one aſk him, ſince that fatal occaſion, in which you fell in love? you have been employed five or ſix months, perhaps a year, in courting the beloved object, and in ſettling the marriage articles with her parents, your love deprived you of continence, you muſt needs then have fallen into irregularities. But what would you have done, if a married woman had ſtruck you by theſe ſympathies, or proportions, of which you talk? would you have been able to contain? if ſo, then love and continence are not incompatible, and ſo you fall into a contradiction. If you ſhould not have been able to contain, you muſt have fallen either into real or mental adultery. Suppoſe after your marriage, your maid, who poſſibly may be younger and handſomer than your ſpouſe, ſhall be placed with regard to you in theſe machinal proportions, you preſently fall in love with her, and conſequently you are not able to contain. The ſame thing will happen, if a married woman find herſelf in theſe proportions; and ſo one cannot depend upon your virtue: one muſt be daily affraid that your conduct will give ſcandal, or at leaſt conſider you as a perſon, whoſe virtue reſts on a weak foundation. It is certain, that a man, whoſe profeſſion obliges him not only to a good life, but to paſs for chaſte, cannot handſomely own that he married becauſe he found it impoſible for him to contain. He ought to ſay, that he could have contained, and that he married only that he might have children, domeſtic ſociety, a faithful friend, &c. Let us therefore conclude, that the controverſy concerning celibacy, cannot be well handled, if we do not take care not to expoſe ourſelves too much to the cannon of the enemy. Mr Hall is much more ſucceſsful when he comes to prove the bad effects of monaſtic vows: he doth not want abundance of citations. Here follows one (47). *Do not our hiſtories tell us, that in the reign of Henry III, Robert Groſthead, the famous biſhop of Lincoln, in*

(33) Joſeph Hall, dedication to his Honour of the married Clergy.

(34) Ibid.

(35) Ibid.

(36) Ibid.

(37) See the remark [*B*] of the article USHER, (HENRY).

(38) See Hall's Apology for the married Clergy, pag. 662. Compare with this the twenty firſt letter of the *Suite de la Critique Generale de Maimbourg*, pag. 688.

(39) Hall's Apology for the married Clergy, pag. 662.

* 1 Cor. vii, 5. 622.

(40) Ibid. pag. 663.

(41) Ibid.

(42) Ibid. pag. 664.

(43) Confer the twenty firſt letter of the *Critique Générale du Calviniſme de Maimb.* pag. 707.

(44) Hall's Apology for the married Clergy, pag. 78.

(45) Ibid. pag. 664.

(46) See the remark [*I*] of the article FAREL.

(47) Hall's Apology for the married Clergy, pag. 667.

letters, as was done in other nations. In the catalogue of the Bodleian library: there is a book aſcribed to him, intituled *Mundus alter & idem* [*G*], *ſive Terra auſtralis antehac ſemper incognita, longis itineribus peregrini Academici nuperrimè luſtrata, Authore* MERCURIO BRITANNICO. He did not approve of Engliſh gentlemens travelling in foreign countries, and compoſed a book on that ſubject, which he dedicated to the nobility [*H*]. His Chriſtian Seneca has been tranſlated in ſeveral languages. It is a very ſolid piece.

in his viſitation, was fain to explore the virginity of their nuns, by nipping off their dugs, indignum ſcribi, *at Matth. Paris* † *writes.*

For the reſt, it is not only among Proteſtants that continence has been thought impoſſible: ſome Roman Catholics have been of the ſame opinion; for they laughed at the Eccleſiaſtics who abſtained from adultery and fornication, and reckoned them either eunuchs or Sodomites, and there have been pariſhes which obliged their prieſts to keep a concubine: without that precaution, they did not think the honour of their wives ſecure, and that even that did not free them altogether from danger. Nicholas de Clemangis tells us theſe things. *Taceo de fornicationibus & adulteriis* (Clericorum) *a quibus qui alieni ſunt, probo cæteris ac ludibrio eſſe ſolent, ſpadoneſque aut Sodomitæ appellantur, denique Laici uſque adeo perſuaſum habent nullos Cælibes eſſe ut in pleriſque parochiis non aliter velint Præsbyterum tolerare, niſi Concubinam habeat, quo vel ſic ſuis ſit conſultum uxoribus, quæ nec ſic quidem uſque quaque ſunt extra periculum* (48).

† Matth. Paris, Hiſt. Anglic. pag. 1085. Et quod indignum eſt ſcribi, ad domos religioſarum veniens facit exprimi mammillas earundem ut ſic phyſicè, *&c.*

(48) Nicolas de Clemangis de Præſulibus Simoniacis, pag. m. 165, col. 1.

[G] *There is a book intituled* Mundus alter & idem * *aſcribed to him.*] It is a learned and ingenious fiction, wherein he deſcribes the vicious manners of ſeveral nations, the drunkenneſs of one, the leudneſs of others &c; the court of Rome is not ſpared here. The author compoſed this book while he ſtudied human learning; and afterwards having applied himſelf to divinity, he neglected it as a trifle. But his friend William Knight, did not conſider it as ſuch, he thought it ſo deſerving of ſeeing the light, that he publiſhed it, tho' by ſo doing he was afraid that he ſhould incur the diſpleaſure of the author, who had entruſted him with the manuſcript. This he tells us at large in the preface. I do not know in what year he publiſhed it. I have only the Utrecht edition of 1643 in 12mo, to which is joined, becauſe of the conformity of the matter, Campanella's city of the Sun, and the new Atlantis of chancellor Bacon. This work of Joſeph Hall is divided into four books, and adorned with maps, it contains 213 pages in this Utrecht edition. The reader probably will be glad to ſee the opinion of Mr Naudé concerning it. After having mentioned More's Utopia, and the City of the Sun. He ſpeaks of it as follows. ‘ Ultimum verò Angli, ‘ neſcio cujus, Mundus Alter & Idem, non ita dudum ‘ prodiit; aut veriùs Satyra adverſùs depravatos præ‘ſentis ſeculi mores; in quo dum ſingulas ſtationes ſin‘gulis vitiis adſignat, genteſque illas incolentes ac ‘ loca ipſa, contorticulatis ingenioſè, fictiſque ex cu‘juſque rei natura vocibus adpellat, non ineptè meô judiciô Poneropolim inſtituit, quæ ad hilaritatem non ‘ minùs homines excitare, quàm ad virtutem inflam‘mare poſſit (49). —— *And laſt of all, the* Mundus ‘ Alter & Idem, *of a certain Engliſhman, was not long ‘ ſince publiſhed; or rather, a ſatire againſt the corrupt ‘ manners of the preſent age; in which, while he aſſigns ‘ ſeparate ſtations to the ſeveral vices, and diſtinguiſheth ‘ the nations inhabiting them, and the places themſelves ‘ by names ingeniouſly compounded and feigned, ſuitably ‘ to the nature of every thing, he, in my opinion, founds a ‘ Poneropolis* †, *which will no leſs divert the readers, ‘ than inflame their minds with the love of virtue.*’

* *The World different yet the ſame.*

(49) Naudæus, Bibliograph. Politic. pag. 517, Edit. Crenii, 1692.

† *A city of the wicked.*

[*H*] *He did not approve of Engliſh gentlemens travelling in foreign countries, and compoſed a book on that ſubject, which he dedicated to the nobility.*] This book is intituled *Quod vadis?* or a *Juſt Cenſure of Travel, as it is commonly undertaken by the gentlemen of our nation.* It is dedicated to Edward lord Denny, baron of Waltham, father to the lord Hay, who had been ambaſſador in France, and who, amongſt other attendants there, had our Joſeph Hall. Much may be ſaid on both ſides on this ſubject. Our author is not the only perſon who has complained of the bad effects of travelling. Thomas Lanſius (50) has ſometimes declaimed on this ſubject. Juſtus Lipſius on the contrary approves of travelling (51); and has given very good inſtructions concerning it. See the XXII letter of the firſt century.

(50) *In his Harangues,* De Principatu inter Provincias Europæ.

(51) *See his letters; in the places marked in the Index, under the word* Peregrinatio.

HALL (RICHARD), an Engliſh divine of the Romiſh communion, was, if I am not miſtaſten, one of thoſe who left England on account of the penal laws enacted there againſt the Papiſts by queen Elizabeth. He retired to the Spaniſh Netherlands, and was profeſſor of divinity at Douay, and canon of St Omer. He publiſhed, amongſt other things [*A*], a diſcourſe concerning the origin of the troubles of that country. He was not qualified to handle this ſubject; for on the one hand his gratitude to the king of Spain, under whoſe protection he lived, and on the other, his reſentment on the account of his exile which ſoured him againſt all Proteſtants, hindered him from judging equitably of the conduct of the provinces which revolted from Philip II. Accordingly, it is certain that he diſcovered a great deal of paſſion in this book [*B*]. He died in the year 1604 (*a*).

(*a*) Witte, in Diar. Biograph.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] Here follows a catalogue of all his writings which have come to my knowledge, the preface to a book of *Joannes Giovanus de Schiſmate ſeu Eccleſiaſticæ Unionis diviſione,* printed at Louvain, in 1573, in 8vo: *De tribus primariis cauſis Tumultuum Belgicorum, & contra coalitionem multarum Religionum, quam liberam Religionem vocant,* at Douay, in 1581, in 8vo. *Pro Defenſione Regiæ & Epiſcopalis auctoritates contra rebelles,* ibid. in 1584, in 8vo. *De quinque partita conſcientia libri tres,* ibid. 1598, in 8vo. *De Proprietate & Veſtiario Monachorum, aliiſque ad hoc vitium extirpandum neceſſariis,* ibid. 1585, in 8vo.

[*B*] *He diſcovered a great deal of paſſion in that work.*] Eſpecially againſt the prince of Orange; for he employs whole chapters to prove that he is a tyrant; that he, like Abſalom, aſpired to the kingdom by tyrannical means; that he had all the ten qualities which, according to Bartolus, form the character of a tyrant, *&c.* He compares him to Julian the apoſtate, and omitted no ſort of invectives againſt this prince and his adherents (1), and to animate the Catholics againſt granting a liberty of conſcience, which the Proteſtants ſought for (2). A man who had ſo many perſonal reaſons to be partial to the king of Spain, and ſoured againſt Holland, ought not to pretend to write concerning the cauſes of this civil war. An hiſtorian ought to be perfectly diſintereſſed; and whenever a man conceives a reſentment againſt a nation, he ought to abſtain from writing it's hiſtory, eſpecially when, by indulging his peeviſhneſs never ſo little, he will give great ſatisfaction to another nation, for which he ought to have complaiſance and gratitude. Such a man, I ſay, ought to exclude himſelf, as judges, who are men of honour, do when they are intereſſed in any cauſe (3). Hiſtory ought not to be handled but by clean hands, we ſhould leave the writing it to thoſe who have not embrued their hands in the combat, neither in the figurative nor proper ſenſe; at leaſt they ought to ſtay till time has cleanſed their ſpots and healed their wounds. It ought to be revered like the Penates of the ancients:

(1) *See* Scultingius, Biblioth. Cathol. Tom. IV, pag. 254.

(2) *See the ſame, pag.* 255.

(3) *See what I have ſaid, remark* [*D*] *of the article* REMOND; *and remark* [*L*] *of the article* TIMÆUS.

' Tu, genitor, cape ſacra, patrioſque penates.
Me bello è tanto digreſſum, & cæde recenti,
Attrectare nefas; donec me flumine vivo
Abluero (4).

My father, guard the rites, and gods of Troy . . . .
Forbid to touch with hands embru'd in blood,
I haſte to waſh me in the chryſtal flood.

HALLÉ (PETER), profeſſor of canon-law in the univerſity of Paris, was born at Bayeux in Normandy, the eighth of September, 1611. He ſtudied philoſophy, law, and divinity, in the univerſity of Caen for five years. We muſt add, that he there alſo very ſtudiouſly cultivated poetry, in which Antony Hallé his relation, and one of the great poets of his age, gave him good inſtructions. He had inſinuated himſelf into his favour, by publiſhing ſome poems; and he made ſo good uſe of this illuſtrious kinſman's leſſons, that he carried the prize at Caen and Rouen, in the poetical conteſts which are celebrated there every year (*a*). He got ſuch a reputation by it, that though he was very young, he had the rhetoric claſs given him in the univerſity of Caen. Some time after, being rector of the univerſity, he harangued Mr Seguier, chancellor of France [*A*], at the head of the four faculties. His ſpeech was highly approved, and procured him the eſteem and protection of that chancellor, ſo far as to receive from his hand the degree of doctor of the civil-law, in preſence of the great council, the eighteenth of March 1640, have firſt defended ſome theſes in that illuſtrious aſſembly (*b*). He followed Mr Seguier to Paris, and made himſelf ſo advantageouſly known by ſome pieces, which he publiſhed, that he was offered the place of teacher in five ſeveral colleges, and was extraordinarily admitted into the body of the univerſity (*c*), the fourteenth of Auguſt 1651. He choſe rather to teach in the college of Harcourt than in any other; where he had a great croud of auditors. He publiſhed from time to time ſome Latin poems which increaſed his reputation, and gave occaſion to his patron to procure him the place of poet to his majeſty, and reader in Latin and Greek in the royal college the eighteenth of December 1646. His too violent application to ſtudy having ruined his health, he was forced to reſt two years to re-eſtabliſh it; when he was recovered he reſolved to reſtore the Faculty of Law to ſome credit, which was fallen to a very low ebb, having but one profeſſor remaining in it [*B*]. He was made Regius profeſſor of the canon-law in 1655, and he uſed all his endeavours to raiſe and encourage the ſtudy of this ſcience, the rights whereof he ſtrenuouſly ſupported [*C*], notwithſtanding the oppoſitions he met with. It is to him, eſpecially, we ought to aſcribe the advantage the profeſſors of Paris have enjoyed ſince the year 1679 [*D*]. He compoſed ſome very good books [*E*], and had the ſatisfaction to have the moſt famous learned men for

[*A*] *Mr Seguier, chancellor of France.*] He was gone into Normandy to pacify popular tumults, which cauſed great diſorders in many places of that province.

[*B*] *The faculty of law . . . . was fallen very low, having but one profeſſor left.*] This profeſſor was Mr Doujat. The Faculty had loſt in a little time Francis Florent, and John Dartis. *In juridicam deinde ſcholam geminato Franciſci Florentis, & Joannis Dartiſii funere afflictam ac prope deſertam cum Joanne Doujatio Collega primario extra ordinem accitus* (1) *anno* 1655. Thus ſpeaks Mr Pinſſon-des-Riolles in an inſcription which he publiſhed in honour of our Hallé.

[*C*] *He ſtrenuouſly ſupported the rights of this Faculty.*] Mr Pinſſon immediately adds: *Quam quidem poſtea reſtitui, exornari, ac amplificari magis ac magis . . . . procuravit.* The author of the elogy deſcends to particulars, and ſays that Hallé obtained, by his ſollicitations, that Pompone de Bellievre firſt preſident in the parliament of Paris, ſhould reſtore to the ſtudents of the canon-law, the privilege of pleading (2). Hence aroſe many ſuits. ' Hinc obortæ lites: vicina Juris Collegia in eos acriter inſurrexerunt, & eos tum ad Senatum, tum ad Regis conſiſtorium traduxerunt. Ut tot malis ſuccurreret Hallæus, viginti quatuor viros pietate & doctrinâ commendatiſſimos, tanquam adjutores, in facultatem, re cum ſuis Collegis priùs communicata, adſcivit: facultate vix ab externo hoſte quietâ, nonnulli ex Doctoribus honorariis, Collegarum diſcordias in ſuum commodum alentes, plurima Anteceſſorum Jura ſibi arrogare tentabant. In hac temporum difficultate quâ facultas in partes ſcindi videbatur animum tantiſper ſuſtinuit, donec illâ invidiæ tempeſtate feliciter pacatâ, & concordia facultati reſtitutâ, animum à negotio omni alieno revocans, ſedulo ſummaque diligentia ad reſtauranda Juris ſtudia totus incubuit (3). ——— *Hence aroſe ſome diſputes. 'The neighbouring colleges of the law vigorouſly oppoſed them, and ſummoned them, both before the parliament and the king's council. Mr Hallé, to prevent ſo many diſaſters with which they were threatened, with the conſent of his colleagues, admitted twenty four men of eminent learning and piety into the Faculty, as coadjutors: the Faculty were ſcarce at reſt from theſe attacks from abroad, when ſome of the honorary doctors, cheriſhing the diſcords of their colleagues for their own private ends, arrogated ſeveral of the privileges of the teaching profeſſors to themſelves. In theſe troubleſome times, when the Faculty ſeemed to be quite divided, he was for ſome time at a ſtand, but theſe ſtorms being blown over, and peace reſtored to the ſociety, he laid aſide all avocations, and applied himſelf with the utmoſt diligence to the reſtoring of the ſtudy of the law.'*

[*D*] *The advantages which the Paris profeſſors have enjoyed ſince the year* 1679, *are owing to him.*] Before that they did not teach the civil-law. ' Ab eo præcipuè docendi rectam rationem inchoatam à Rege probatam & confirmatam fuiſſe affirmaverim. Studiis enim latius effloreſcentibus ab invictiſſimo Rege Ludovico Magno, promovente illuſtriſſimo viro Michaële le Tellier Franciæ Cancellario, publica civilis Juriſprudentiæ profeſſio Pariſienſi ſcholæ, quâ ſuperiori ſæculo male exciderat, reſtituta eſt, & aſſerta Anteceſſoribus Juris Civilis interpretandi autoritas menſe Aprili 1679 (4). ——— *I may with juſtice affirm, that the right method of teaching was introduced by him, and approved of and confirmed by his majeſty. For good letters ſpreading more and more, the king, by the advice of Michael le Tellier, chancellor of France, reſtored the profeſſion of the law in the ſchools of Paris, which had unluckily dropt in the preceding age, and confirmed the power of interpreting the civil-law to the doctors, in April* 1679.'

[*E*] *He compoſed very good books.*] Theſe are the words of his elogy: ' In auditorum favorem præter Inſtitutiones Canonicas quas in lucem anno 1685, velut in famæ teſtamentum emiſerat, varios ad Jus Canonicum & Civile tractatus de Conciliis, de ſummi Pontificis autoritate, de Regalia, de Simonia, de Uſuris, de Cenſuris, de Regularibus, de Beneficiis Eccleſiaſticis, de Matrimonio, de Teſtamentis, & alia plura for his friends, who were yet more charmed with his virtue than his learning. He died excellently prepared [*F*] the twenty ſeventh of December 1689 (*d*).

---

(4) Virgil. Æn. lib. ii, ver. 717.

(*a*) It is in honour of the immaculate conception of the Bleſſed Virgin.

(*b*) Propugnatis utriuſque juris theſibus laurea doctorali in ampliſſimo Comitum Conſiſtorianorum conſeſſu die 18. Martii 1640, ab ipſomet Cancellario decorari meruit. *Vita Petri Halle, de qua infra, citat.* (*d*).

(*c*) Abſens ab univerſitate extra ordinem . . . . cooptaretur. *Ibid.*

(1) *Note alſo that he obtained the profeſſorſhip without diſputing, which was a diſpenſation.* Ab eo (ſuo Mæcenate) Regii Conſiſtorii placitum, quo Regiæ conſtitutionis anteceſſuras ad publici certaminis aleam ordinantis, remiſſo rigore, ad munus anteceſſorium promovebatur obtinuit. *Vita Hallai.*

(2) Juris Canonici auditoribus poſtulandi munus. . . . Hallæo potiſſimum procurante reſtitutum eſt. *Ibid.*

(3) Ibid.

(4) Ibid.

(*d*) Taken from an elogy written in Latin, by John Hallé, the king's ſecretary, of which Mr Pinſſon des Riolles communicated a manuſcript copy to me.

Since the firſt edition of this dictionary I have read the Latin encomium which one (*e*) of this profeſſor's diſciples conſecrated to him: it is a well writ piece, printed at Amſterdam by Henry Boon 1692. The readers will find in it ſeveral particulars which will be agreeable to them.

(*e*) Daniel Laët, Batavus.

'plura reconditæ doctrinæ monimenta exaravit. —— '*He wrote for the uſe of his ſcholars, beſides his Inſtitutions of the canon-law, which he publiſhed in* 1685, '*as a monument of his merit, ſeveral treatiſes both on the canon and civil-law. As concerning councils, concerning the authority of the Pope, on the Regalia, Simony, Uſury, Cenſures, the Regulars, Eccleſiaſtic Benefices, Marriage, Teſtaments; together with ſeveral other monuments of his profound learning.*' He publiſhed a collection of Latin poems and orations in 1655, in 8vo.

[*F*] *He died excellently prepared.*] I refer to this the legacy he left to the faculty of law, to have a maſs ſaid four times a year, wherein all the profeſſors and doctors preſent receive a certain ſum of money (5).

(5) Legata prius Juris utriuſque Facultati ad ſacroſanctum Miſſæ ſacrificium ſtatis diebus quater in anno celebrandum ſummâ, ab Anteceſſoribus & Doctoribus utriuſque ordinis præſentibus percipienda. *Ibid.*

HAMADRYADES: Thus they called the nymphs whoſe fate depended on certain trees with which they were born and died [*A*]. It was eſpecially with the oaks they had this great union (*a*). It is ſaid they were ſometimes extreamly grateful to

(*a*) See the remark [*A*], citat. (8).

[*A*] *Their fate depended on certain trees, with which they were born and died.*] See the note of Servius the grammarian, upon the ſixty ſecond verſe of Virgil's tenth eclogue. 'Hamadryades, *ſays he*, Nymphæ 'quæ cum arboribus & naſcuntur & pereunt, ἀπὸ τοῦ 'ἅμα καὶ τῆς δρυὸς, qualis fuit illa, quam Eryſichthon occidit: qui cum arborem incideret, & vox 'inde erupit, & ſanguis, ſicut docet Ovidius. —— '*The Hamadryades are nymphs which are born and die with trees, of this kind was the nymph whom Eryſichthon ſlew. Ovid tells us, that when he cut down the tree, a voice was heard, and blood ſprung out.*' Ovid, cited by this grammarian, has elegantly deſcribed the complaints and misfortune of the Hamadryade whom the impious Eryſichthon deſtroyed. She lived in an old oak of a prodigious bigneſs which all the world reverenced.

Stabat in his ingens annoſo robore quercus
Una, nemus - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - menſuraque roboris ulnas
Quinque ter implebat - - - - - (1).

(1) Ovid. Metam. lib. viii, ver. 749.

An ancient oak in the dark center ſtood,
The country's glory, and itſelf a wood.

Eryſichthon's ſervants durſt not obey his order to cut the tree: he was forced to do it himſelf.

Dixit: &, obliquos dum telum librat in ictus,
Contremuit, gemitumque dedit Dodonia quercus:
Et pariter frondes, pariter palleſcere glandes
Cœpere, ac longi pallorem ducere rami.
Cujus ut in trunco fecit manus impia vulnus;
Haud aliter fluxit diſcuſſo cortice ſanguis,
Quàm ſolet, ante aras ingens ubi victima taurus
Concidit, abrupta cruor è cervice profundi.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Editus è medio ſonus eſt cum robore talis:
Nympha ſub hoc ego ſum, Cereri gratiſſima, ligno;
Quæ tibi factorum pœnas inſtare tuorum
Vaticinor moriens, noſtri ſolatia lethi (2).

(2) Id. ibid. ver. 763.

He ſpoke, and, as he pois'd a ſlanting ſtroke,
Sighs heav'd and tremblings ſhook the frighted oak,
It's leaves look ſickly, pale it's acorns grew,
And it's long branches ſweat a chilly dew.
But when his impious hand a wound beſtow'd,
Blood from the mangl'd bark in currents flow'd.
When a devoted bull of mighty ſize,
A ſinning nation's grand atonement dies,
With ſuch a plenty from the ſpouting veins
A crimſon ſtream the turfy altar ſtains.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
When from the groaning trunk a voice was heard,
A Dryad, I, by Ceres' love prefer'd,
Within the circle of this claſping rind
Coëval grew, and now in ruin join'd,
But inſtant vengeance ſhall they ſin purſue,
And death is chear'd by this prophetic view.

GARTH.

Some grammarians divide what Servius unites. They will have the Hamadryades to be ſo called, either becauſe they were born, or becauſe they died with the oaks. Ἁμαδρυάδας νύμφας μνησίμαχος φησὶ, διὰ τὸ ἅμα ταῖς δρυσὶ γεννᾶσθαι· ἢ ἐπεὶ δοκοῦσιν ἅμα ταῖς δρυσὶ φθείρεσθαι, νύμφαι ἁμαδρυάδης λέγονται (3). This diviſion ought to be rejected, becauſe the general opinion is, that the life of theſe nymphs was preciſely of the ſame continuance with that of their trees. Hence Pindar, in a poem that is loſt, ſaid, ἰσοδένδρου τέκμαρ αἰῶνος λαχοῦσα, finem ævi æqualis arbori nacta. — *Having obtained a life equal that of a tree.* Callimachus has this expreſſion; ἥλικος ἀσθμαίνουσα περὶ δρυὸς, coætaneam ingemiſcens propter quercum (4), — *Sighing for the tree along with which ſhe was born,* ſpeaking of the Hamadryade Melia. Apollonius imitated him, when he introduced an Hamadryade intreating one not to cut down a certain tree.

(3) Scholiaſt. Apollon. Rhodii, in lib. ii, ver. 479, pag. m. 192. *See alſo Plutarch*, de Oraculor. Defectu, pag. 415, *where he quotes theſe words of Pindar.*

(4) Callimach. Hymo in Delum. ver. 81.

Ἦ μιν ὀδυρομένη ἀδινῷ μειλίσσετο μύθῳ,
Μὴ ταμέειν πρέμνον δρυὸς ἥλικος, ᾗ ἔπι πουλὺν
Αἰῶνα τρίβεσκε διηνεκές.

Quæ ipſi flens blandiebatur voce miſerabili,
Ne coævam extirparet arborem, in qua multa
Uſque ſæcula degiſſet (5).

(5) Apollon. Rhod. lib. ii, ver 480, pag. m. 193.

She weeping, with a plaintive ſoothing voice,
Begg'd he would ſpare her dear coæval tree,
In which for many ages ſhe had dwelt.

Add to theſe teſtimonies the authority of Homer. We read in one of his hymns, that there were trees who were born at the ſame time with the nymphs, and that theſe died when the trees decayed.

Τῇσι δ' ἅμ' ἢ ἐλάται ἠὲ δρύες ὑψικάρηνοι
Γεινομένῃσιν ἔφυσαν ἐπὶ χθονὶ βωτιανείρῃ.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Ἀλλ' ὅτε κεν δὴ μοῖρα παρεστήκῃ θανάτοιο,
Ἀζάνεται μὲν πρῶτον ἐπὶ χθονὶ δένδρεα καλὰ,
Φλοιὸς δ' ἀμφιπεριφθινύθει, πίπτουσι δ' ἀπ' ὄζοι,
Τῶν δέ χ' ὁμοῦ ψυχὴ λείπει φάος ἠελίοιο.

Simul autem cum his Nymphis aut abietes, aut quercus altis capitibus præditæ
Naſcentibus naſcuntur ſuper terram alentem viros,
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Sed quandò jam parca aſtiterit mortis,
Siccantur quidem primum ſuper terram arbores pulchræ.

Cortex

to thoſe who preſerved them from death [*B*], and that they who had no regard to their humble intreaties to ſpare the trees they depended on, were puniſhed for it [*C*]. There was nothing of a mortal nature that lived ſo long as this kind of nymphs [*D*]. The

Cortex autem circum-circa corrumpitur, cadunt verò ab ipſis rami.

Harum autem ſimul anima relinquit lucem ſolis (6).

Together with theſe nymphs, from earth's moiſt bed
Coæval oaks uplift their airy head;
And, when they yield to death's all-powerful ſway,
The ſympathetic branches feel decay,
And nymphs and trees together die away.

Statius makes mention of a wood that had out-lived the Nymphs and Fauni: but this does not contradict the tradition concerning the Hamadryades. Beſides, who knows not that this poet's ſallies had no reſpect for any thing; therefore there is no reaſon to attend to them, as to things which can be oppoſed to the general opinion. You will ſee his words in the remark [*D*]. Auſonius, more remote than he from the fountain-head, has notwithſtanding conformed more to the old tradition. *Non ſine Hamadryadis fato*, ſays he (7), *cadit arborea trabs.*

Note, that Pauſanias expreſſes himſelf in a manner that ſeems to prove that the Hamadryades were younger than their trees. Speaking of a town called Tithorea, he ſays (8), Τιθορέαν δὲ, οἱ ἐπιχώριοι κληθῆναι φασὶν ἀπὸ Τιθορέας νύμφης, οἷαι τῷ ἀρχαίῳ λόγῳ τῶν ποιητῶν ἐφύοντο ἀπό τε ἄλλων δένδρων, καὶ μάλιστα ἀπὸ τῶν δρυῶν. Tithoream incolæ vocatam eſſe dicunt à Tithorea Nympha, de iis una quas priſci poëtarum ſermones, quum ex cæteris arboribus, tum vero è quercubus maxime genitas prodiderunt. — *The inhabitants ſay, that it was called Tithorea, from a nymph of that name, and of that kind which the poets ſay proceed from trees, and eſpecially from oaks.* This is making the trees the mothers of the Hamadryades: and therefore it is not true that they were born at the ſame time. But I do not think Pauſanias's expreſſions are to be much inſiſted on: it was not his buſineſs preciſely to deſcribe the nature of theſe old fables. Let us ſtick therefore to what the poets affirm, that theſe nymphs and trees were born at the ſame time. Obſerve that Pauſanias takes notice that they were eſpecially born of the oak. I do not ſee that this can be impugned by Pherenicus's authority; for what he ſays does not ſeem to concern the Hamadryades, properly ſo called. He ſays (9) that the fig-tree was called συκῆ, from a daughter of Oxylus; and that this Oxylus having lain with Hamadryade, his ſiſter, begot eight daughters, which were all called nymphs Hamadryades; but they had each a particular name, which was afterwards given to trees. She that was called συκῆ, *Syce*, and gave origin to the name of the fig-tree: It ſeems to me that Hamadryade, Oxylus's ſiſter, was not of the ſame kind with the nymphs ſpoken of in this article. Let this be ſaid without offending a famous author (10).

[*B*] *It is ſaid they were ſometimes extremely grateful to thoſe who preſerved them from death.*] One Rhæcus perceiving that an oak was ready to fall, commanded his children to prevent it, either by ſtrengthning it at the root with earth, or underpropping it. The nymph who muſt have periſhed if the oak had fallen, appeared to Rhæcus, and thanked him for ſaving her life, offering him any recompence he deſired; he anſwered he deſired to enjoy her. The nymph promiſed to grant his requeſt, and commanded him to abſtain from all other women; ſhe added that a bee ſhould be the meſſenger betwixt them: but the bee happening to come whilſt Rhæcus was playing, he ſaid ſome rude things, which provoked the Hamadryade ſo much, that he was maimed for it (11). This is the account of Charon of Lampſacus, if we believe the ſcholiaſt of Apollonius. He told another ſtory with a more happy concluſion: which is this, as I find it in Natalis Comes, who does not cite the author he had it from. Arcas, the ſon of Jupiter and Calliſto, hunting in a wood, met with an Hamadryade in great danger of periſhing; for the tree with which ſhe was born, had been very much damaged in it's roots by the ſtream of a river: ſhe prayed Arcas to ſave her life; he granted her requeſt, by turning the courſe of the river, and putting new earth about the tree. The nymph was not ungrateful, ſhe granted him what we call the laſt favour and had two children by him; her name was Proſpelea (12). We only find in Pauſanias that Arcas was married to a Dryade nymph, called Erato, by whom he had three boys (13). We might conclude from this, that tho' the Hamadryades could not ſurvive their oak, or their fir, &c. they might ſometimes leave them, and if this conſequence was doubtful, it might be confirmed by a paſſage of Homer, where we find that the ſame nymphs which had their birth and death with trees, taſted the pleaſures of love in caves with the Sileni.

Τῇσι δὲ Σιληνοί τε καὶ εὔσκοπος Ἀργει-
φόντης
Μίσγοντ' ἐν φιλότητι μυχῷ σπείων ἐροέντων.

Cum his autem Silenique & bonus explorator Ar-
gicida,
Miſcentur in amore in receſſu ſpeluncarum amabi-
lium (14).

Silenus' followers to the grots reſort,
Where Hamadryads keep their Sylvan court;
And ſpend, with Maia's ſon, the day in wanton ſport.

[*C*] *They who had no regard . . . to their intreaties . . . were puniſhed for it.*] Apollonius relates that Periboea's father drew an heavy curſe on himſelf and his children, becauſe he had cut down a tree which a nymph had intreated him to ſpare. She had lived many ages in it, we have ſeen above her ſupplication; here follows the ſequel.

Αὐτὰρ ὅ τήν γε
Ἀφραδέως ἔτμηξεν, ἀγηνορίῃ νεότητος.
Τῷ δ' ἄρα νεκερδῆ νύμφη πόρεν οἶτον ὀπίσσω
Αὐτῷ καὶ τεκέεσσιν.

Eam tamen ille
Incogitate ſuccidit per juvenilem petulantiam.
Quamobrem inutile deinde manupretium nympha
Et ipſi perſolvit & generi (15).

The thoughtleſs youth, by cutting down the tree,
Entail'd a curſe on his poſterity.

[*D*] *There was nothing that lived ſo long as this kind of nymphs.*] Auſonius tells us this in the following verſes, which are a verſion from Heſiod's Greek.

Ter binos deciesque novem ſuper exit in annos,
Juſta ſeneſcentum quos implet vita virorum.
Hos novies ſuperat vivendo garrula cornix:
Et quater egreditur cornicis ſecula cervus.
Alipedem cervum ter vincit corvus: & illum
Multiplicat novies Phœnix, reparabilis ales.
Quam vos perpetuo decies prævertitis ævo
Nymphæ Hamadryades, quarum longiſſima vita eſt.
Hi cohibent fines vivacia fata animantum.
Cætera ſecreti novit Deus arbiter ævi
Tempora (16).

The life of man, compleat and full of day,
To ninety ſix it's lengthen'd years extends:
Nine times this term the raucous crow exceeds:
The ſtag compleats four ages of the crow:
The raven thrice outlives the winged ſtag;
Whoſe life the phœnix nine times multiplies.
And you, ye long-liv'd Hamadryad nymphs,
Ten periods of the live-long phœnix ſee.
Theſe bounds of life to animals are giv'n;
All farther terms the gods alone can tell.

Heſiod's poem which contained this doctrine is loſt; but we may ſee a fragment of it, in five verſes, in a tract of Plutarch. I will cite a paſſage out of that tract.

We

---

(6) Homer. Hymn. in Vener. pag. m. 852.

(7) Auſon. Edyll. xii, pag. m. 483. *Compare Balzac's verſes cited in the remark* [*K*] *of the article* THOMAS (PAUL).

(8) Pauſan. lib. x, cap. xxxii, pag. 879.

(9) Apud Athenæum, lib. iii, pag. 78.

(10) Vide Spanhem. in Callimach. Hymno in Delum, ver. 83, pag. 378.

(11) Ὥστε πηρωθῆναι αὐτόν. Schol. Apoll. ubi ſupra.

(12) Taken from *Natalis Comes Mythol. lib. v, cap. xi, pag. m.* 465, 466. He ſays that Charon of Lampſacus wrote this; but all this author's writings being loſt, Natalis Comes ſhould have cited him, who quotes Charon Lampſacenus.

(13) Pauſan. lib. viii, cap. iv, pag. 604.

(14) Homer. Hymn. in Vener. pag. m. 852.

(15) Apollon. Rhod. lib. ii, ver. 482, pag. 193.

(16) Auſon. Edyll. xviii, pag. m. 533.

The poets have ſometimes taken the Hamadryades for the Naïades [*E*]: they did not confine

We ſhall learn from it, that ſome Heathens maintained the mortality of the deities of the ſecond rank. ‘ Heſiod is the firſt who clearly diſtinguiſhed four kinds of reaſonable natures; the gods, the dæmons, which are many in number, and good beings, the demy-gods, and men. He thinks that the dæmons themſelves, after ſome revolutions of time, come to die; for ſpeaking in the perſon of a naïd, he denotes the period of their duration.

Neuf hommes vit la corneille criarde;
Le cerf autant quatre fois vif ſe garde,
Le corbeau noir ſi longuement vieillit,
Que de trois cerſs les vies il emplit,
Et le Phenix de neuf corbeaux égale
Les jours, mais vous, progenie Royale
De Jupiter, Nymphes aux chefs plaiſans,
De dix Phenix vous fourniſſez les ans.

Nine times the croaking crow outlives a man:
Four times this ſpace the ſtag continues life:
The raven black ſo lengthens out old age,
That of three ſtags he meaſures out the lives.
The phœnix' life that of nine ravens equals.
But you, ye royal progency of Jove,
Ye Hamadryad nymphs, that haunt the woods,
Ten ages of the long liv'd phœnix know.

‘ Now they that miſtake the poet's meaning in the word *Genean*, that is, the age of man, make this calculation of time to amount to a vaſt number of years; for it only ſignifies one year, ſo that the ſum total amounts but to nine thouſand ſeven hundred and twenty years, which is the age of dæmons. And there are many mathematicians, who make it ſhorter. Even Pindar has not made it greater, when he ſays, the life of nymphs is appointed equal to that of trees, and therefore they are called Hamadryades, becauſe they are born and die with oaks (17).’ Plutarch deſerves ſome cenſure, for not citing the verſe in which Heſiod determined the duration of human life: for it was the baſis of all the following calculations. I may ſuppoſe that Heſiod determined this duration, ſince his tranſlator begins with ſaying, the age of man contained ninety ſix years. This period being granted, it is eaſy to compute the age of ſtags, ravens, *&c.* and we find that the crow lived 864 years, the ſtag 3456, the raven 10368, the phœnix 93312, and the Hamadryad 933120. All this is ridiculous, and Pliny has reaſon to reject it as fabulous. ‘ De ſpatio atque longinquitate vitæ hominum, non locorum modo ſitus, verum exempla, ac ſua cuique ſors naſcendi incertum fecere. Heſiodus, qui primus aliqua de hoc prodidit, fabuloſè (ut reor) multa de hominum ævo referens, cornici novem noſtras attribuit ætates, quadruplum ejus cervis, id triplicatum corvis. Et reliqua fabuloſius in phœnice, ac Nymphis (18). — *Not only the ſituation of countries, but many examples, and every man's particular fate, make the duration and length of human life very uncertain. Heſiod, who firſt wrote on this ſubject, among other* (*in my opinion*) *fabulous relations concerning the age of man, attributes to the crow nine times the age of man, to the hart four times the age of the crow, to the raven three times the age of the hart; and adds ſome things ſtill more fabulous concerning the phœnix and the nymphs.*’

Upon the leaſt computation, which is making the age of man to be only one year (19), the aſſertion of Heſiod concerning the Hamadryades would be falſe: they could not live longer than trees, but there is no tree that can laſt 9720 years. What Pliny ſays of the long life of ſome trees (20), and others of the oak of Mamre (21), and an hundred ſtories of this nature, they tho' were as true as they are doubtful, make nothing againſt my aſſertion.

Note, that the poet Statius ſuppoſes, that the mortal demi-gods live not ſo long as trees. He mentions a wood, that had ſeen the re-production of it's Dryads and Fauni, which might be compared to thoſe old caſtles, that have ſerved for habitations to fathers, ſons, and grandſons, *&c.*

- - - - Stat ſacra ſenectæ
Numine, nec ſolos hominum tranſgreſſa veterno
Fertur avos, Nymphas etiam mutaſſe ſuperſtes,
Faunorumque greges (22).

- - - - *long had it ſtood,*
Sacred thro' age, a venerable wood,
And ſeen it's tenant nymphs and fauns renew'd.

He ſpeaks ſomewhat differently in another place; for he ſuppoſes the tree would die, upon the deceaſe of the Hamadryad.

Quid te, quæ mediis ſervata penatibus, arbor,
Tecta per & poſtes liquidas emergis in auras?
Quo non ſub domino ſævas paſſura bipennes?
Et nunc ignaro forſan vel lubrica Naïs,
Vel non abruptos tibi demet Hamadryas annos (23).

And you, Oh tree, in houſe preſerv'd with care,
Burſting thro' roofs and poſts to liquid air;
Doom'd on the ground, by axes fell'd, to lye,
Or, ſudden, with ſome Hamadryad, die.

For the reſt, it was not hard for the Gentiles to imagine ſuch a kind of nymphs; for they had a religious veneration for trees which they believed to be very ancient, and whoſe extraordinary bigneſs demonſtrated their long life (24). It was an eaſy tranſition from hence to believe, they were the abode of ſome deity. They made a natural idol of them, I mean, they fancied, that without the help of conſecration, which brought down the god into the ſtatues dedicated to him, a nymph or deity dwelt in the center of theſe trees: the oak that Eryſichthon felled, was reverenced for it's bulk and great age, it was adorned as a conſecrated place, it was hung with the tokens of the ſucceſs of their devotions, and with the monuments of anſwered vows.

Stabat in his ingens annoſo robore quercus
Una, nemus: vittæ mediam memoreſque tabellæ,
Sertaque cingebant, voti argumenta potentis (25).

An aged oak here lifts it's boughs in air,
Hung round with wreaths, ſign of ſucceſsful pray'r.

Is it any wonder that it was taken for the ſeat of an Hamadryad?

[*E*] *The poets have ſometimes taken the Hamadryades for the Naïades.*] This Propertius does, ſpeaking of the nymphs who ſtole away Hercules's minion (26): he ſometimes calls them Hamadryades, ſometimes Dryades; yet they were fountain nymphs. Ovid, on the contrary, calls the nymphs whoſe fate depended on a tree, Naïades.

Naiada vulneribus ſuccidit in arbore factis
  Illa perit: fatum Naiados arbor erat (27).

A naid in the tree he ſlew, whoſe fate
Depended on the tree's uncertain date.

I ſhall occaſionally obſerve, that it was ſtill more common to confound the Hamadryades, and the Dryades reciprocally. There is in Hercules Oëteus, a ſcene deſcribing the effects of Orpheus's ſinging. Amongſt other things, it is ſaid, that the Dryades leaving their trees ran after him.

Et quercum fugiens ſuam
Ad vatem properat Dryas (28).

The Dryad quits her oak, and haſtens to his ſong.

There is ſome probability, that the ſame nymphs are here meant, who were born and died with a tree, and who, properly ſpeaking, were called Hamadryades, and not Dryades. It was not a conſtant tradition, that theſe nymphs could not depart from their trees: not

---

(17) Plutarch. de Oraculor. Defectu, pag. 415.

(18) Plin. lib. vii, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 73.

(19) That is, ſuppoſing, as in Plutarch's paſſage, that Heſiod, by the word *Genea*, meant a year.

(20) Plin. lib. xvi, cap. xliv.

(21) See the remark [*G*], of the articles ABRAHAM and BARCOCHEBAS.

(22) Statius, Theb. lib. vi, ver. 93.

(23) Idem. Silva. III, lib. i, ver. 59, pag. m. 14, 15.

(24) Ennium ſicut ſacros vetuſtate lucos adoremus in quibus grandia & antiqua robora jam non tantam habent ſpeciem, quantam religionem. *Quintil. lib. x, cap. i, pag. m.* 471.

(25) Ovid. Metam lib. viii, ver. 746.

(26) Propert. Eleg. xx, lib. i.

(27) Ovidius, Faſt. lib. iv, ver. 231.

(28) Seneca, in Herc. Oëteo, ver. 1051, pag. m. 322.

confine themſelves ſo exactly to the definitions of each ſpecies, but that they confounded them when they thought fit.

for a few moments. And therefore Seneca might ſuppoſe they left them to hear Orpheus ſing. Note, that Servius was miſtaken in thinking Statius ſpoke of the Hamadryades, in theſe verſes of the ſixth book of the Thebaïs.

Linquunt flentes dilecta locorum
Otia, cana Pales, Silvanuſque arbiter umbræ,
Semideumque pecus, migrantibus adgemit illis
Silva, nec amplexæ dimittunt robora Nymphæ (29).

Pan and Sylvanus quit their lov'd retreat . . . .
The feeling wood, at their departure, groans;
The nymphs embrace their oaks, and pour fourth piteous moans.

It is certain, that the nymphs he ſpeaks of, were thoſe that were properly called Dryades, and therefore Servius is to blame, to apply the *nec amplexæ dimittunt robora Nymphæ* to the Hamadryades, whoſe character he had been giving in theſe words. *Hamadryades cum arboribus & naſcuntur & pereunt, unde plerumque, cæſa arbore, ſanguis emanat* (30). Barthius did not perceive this grammarian's error, though he produces a paſſage, that was very proper to make him ſenſible of it. *Pulcra notatio in Commentario Antiquo,* ſays he (31), *Dimittunt.*] *Non cum effectu intellige, dimittunt enim omnino, quamvis ſero dimittant. Sed diuternitatem manifeſtat amoris; non abſceſſiſſe Nymphas, niſi penitus proſtratis arboribus. Sic ſolemus dicere: Ille modum non facit plorandi, non facit alius finem ridendi, cum diutius rideat aut fleat.* Do not theſe words plainly ſhew, that Statius does not ſpeak of the ſame kind of nymphs defined by Servius, and who neceſſarily died when their trees were cut down?

HANNO, a Carthaginian general, was imployed to ſail round Africa (*a*). He entred the ocean by the ſtraits, which we now call the ſtraits of Gibraltar, and diſcovered many countries (*b*). He would have continued his navigation, if proviſions had not failed him. Some authors aſſure us that he accompliſhed it [*A*], I mean that he ſailed to the extremity of Arabia. He wrote a relation of his voyage, which was often quoted; but little credit was given to it [*B*]. There is ſome part of it ſtill extant [*C*]. It is not agreed at what time he lived [*D*], and there is no proof that the Carthaginians

[*A*] *He would have continued his navigation, if proviſions had not failed him. Some ſay he accompliſhed it.*] Two paſſages, one of Pomponius Mela, the other of Pliny, ſhall be our commentary here. ' Hanno Carthaginenſis exploratum miſſus à ſuis, cum per Oceani ' oſtium exiiſſet, magnam partem ejus circumvectus, ' non ſe mare ſed commeatum defeciſſe memoratu retulerat (1). ——— *Hanno, the Carthaginian, being ' ſent out to make diſcoveries, when he had taken his ' courſe by the ſtraits into the ocean, ſailed round a great ' part of it, and related that nothing hindered his further navigation, but want of proviſions.*' Let us ſee Pliny's words (2): ' Et Hanno, Carthaginis potentia ' florente, circumvectus à Gadibus ad finem Arabiæ, ' navigationem eam prodidit ſcripto. —— *And Hanno, ' when Carthage flouriſhed, ſailed round from Cadiz to ' the remoteſt parts of Arabia, and left an account of his ' voyage in writing.*' Salmaſius ſuppoſes Pliny miſtaken, and that Hanno did not continue his diſcoveries to the Red Sea, but only to the iſlands called Gorgades (3). Iſaac Voſſius doth not much differ from him, he thinks, that the iſland, called at preſent St Anne, was the boundary of this general's navigation (4).

[*B*] *He wrote a relation of his voyage . . . . . but much credit was not given to it.*] Pliny, in other reſpects indulgent enough, as every body knows, could not forbear ſaying, that this author has vented a great many fables. ' Fuere, *ſays he* (5), & Hannonis Carthaginenſium ducis commentarii, Punicis rebus floreutiſſimis explorare ambitum Africæ juſſi: quem ſecuti plerique è Græcis noſtriſque, & alia quædam ' fabuloſa, & urbes multas ab eo conditas ibi prodidere, quarum nec memoria ulla nec veſtigium extat. ——— *There were extant likewiſe, the memoirs ' of Hanno the Carthaginian general, who when the ' glory of their ſtate was at it's height, was ordered ' to diſcover the bounds of Africa: moſt of the Grecian ' and our writers, have followed him in their accounts, ' and beſides many other fabulous ſtories tell us of ' many cities, built by him there, of which there is ' not the leaſt remembrance or marks remaining.*' See alſo Athenæus (6).

[*C*] *There is ſome part of it ſtill extant.*] Sigiſmund Galenius had it printed in Greek, at Baſil, by Frobenius, in 1533. There came out a ſecond edition of it in the ſame place, in 1559, with the Latin verſion and ſome notes of Conrad Geſner: and yet Salmaſius ſays, that this work ſeems to have been unknown to the Greeks. ' Scriptum illud non videtur innotuiſſe. ' Etenim ſi veniſſet in notitiam ac manus Græcorum ' totam eam meridiani Oceani oram minime reliquiſſent intactam (7). —— *This piece ſeems to have ' been unknown. For if it had been known and read ' by the Greeks, they would never have left the whole ' coaſt of the Southern ocean unexplored.*' He knew not therefore of the words of Pliny, cited in the foregoing remark, and of the paſſage of the book ϖερὶ θαυμασίων ἀκουσμάτων, *de auditionibus admirandis*, in which Hanno is quoted. Mention is alſo made of it in Artemidorus the Epheſian's Epitomy. Here are inſtances that ſhew, that men of the greateſt reading, and vaſteſt memory, are ſometimes ignorant of things very eaſy to be known. Iſaac Voſſius has not forgiven Salmaſius this miſtake (8). Nor has Father Harduin omitted it (9). Note, that they publiſhed at Leyden, in 1674, what had been publiſhed at Baſil in 1559. I mean Hanno's Periplus, with Geſner's Latin verſion and notes, and with John Leo's Africa. But Berkelius added ſome remarks to it, taken from the ſecond part of Mr Bochart's *Geographia ſacra.* The ſame little piece (10) of Hanno has been publiſhed at Oxford, in 1698, by Dr Hudſon, with ſeveral other writings of the ſame nature, in the firſt tome of *Geographiæ veteris Scriptores Græci Minores.* Mr Dodwell's diſſertations prefixed to this volume, which treat amply of thoſe ancient Greek authors, are full of learning. That concerning Hanno is not the leaſt important. Mr Dodwell does not believe, that this Carthaginian commander wrote the *Periplus* that went under his name. He aſcribes it to ſome Grecian of Sicily, a great admirer of the glory of Carthage. He believes alſo, that the *Periplus* which goes at preſent under Hanno's name, is very different from that which the ancients had. See the margin (11).

[*D*] *It is not agreed at what time he lived.*] Pliny ſays, it was when the Carthaginian affairs were the moſt flouriſhing. This is indefinite: nevertheleſs Voſſius (12) finds there a juſt reaſon to conclude, that our Hanno was neither he that Juſtin ſpeaks of in the twentieth book, nor he that Pliny mentions in the ſixteenth chapter of the eighth book, nor he that was the leader of a faction in Carthage, in the ſecond Punic war (13), but he that was ſent againſt Agathocles, as Juſtin informs us in the twenty ſecond book. Hanno in the twentieth book of Juſtin was ſent againſt the tyrant Dionyſius: the Gauls had then taken the city of Rome (14), which they did in the 366th year from it's foundation. The ſame Hanno was killed ſome time after, with all his family, for endeavouring to make himſelf maſter of Carthage (15). I do not know but this city was in as flouriſhing a condition at that time, as when another Hanno was ſent againſt Agathocles (16). He loſt his life in a battle in the 443d year of Rome. I therefore ſee no certainty in Voſſius's thought. Note, that the paſſage of Pliny, alledged by him, is to be underſtood of a Hanno, who was condemned for having had the art of taming a lion; for they were perſuaded, that the liberty of their country could not be ſafe in the hands of a general, who could maſter the cruelty of wild ginians put him to death. He hung up, in Juno's temple, the ſkins of ſome ſavage women who were flead by his order. See the laſt remark (c).

---

(29) Statius, Theb. lib. vi, ver. 110, pag. m. 234.

(30) Servius, Æneid. lib. iii, ver. 34.

(31) Barth. in Statii, Theb. lib. vi, ver. 113, pag. 389, Tom. III.

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

(*b*) Pliny and Pomponius Mela, cited in the remark [*A*].

(1) Pomponius Mela, lib. iii, cap. ix, pag. 63, Edit. Iſaici Voſſii.

(2) Plinius, lib. ii, cap. lxvii, pag m. 220, 221.

(3) Salmaſ. Exercit. Plin. pag. 1242, 1244.

(4) Iſaac. Voſſius in Melam, lib. iii, cap. ix, pag. 305.

(5) Plinius. lib. v, cap i, pag. m. 523, 524.

(6) Athen. lib. iii, pag 83, de cujus verbis vide Voſſium de Hiſtor. Græcis, pag. 514.

(7) Salmaſius, ubi ſupra, pag. 1242.

(8) Iſaac Voſſius, ubi ſupra, pag. 302.

(9) Harduin. in Ind. Autor. Plin. pag. 113.

(10) It may well be called ſo, for it doth not contain ſix half pages in the Oxford edition, in 8vo, 1698.

(11) Note, that in the preface to the Oxford edition, it is not ſaid, that Boëclerus publiſhed Hanno with notes, in 1661.

(12) Voſſius, ubi ſupra, pag. 513.

(13) Neque iſtum factionis Barchinæ, de quo Livius libro de bello Punico ſecundo. *Id ibid.* There is much confuſion in theſe words of Voſſius: after Barchinæ, he ſhould have put *inimicum*, and after *libro* there muſt be 21 *dum de*, or ſome ſuch word.

(14) Juſtin. lib. xx, cap. ult.

(15) Id lib xxi, cap. iv.

(16) Id. lib. xxii, cap. vi.

(c) Citat. (21).

wild beaſts. ‘ Primus hominum leonem manu tractare auſus, & oſtendere manſuefactum, Hanno è clariſſimis Pœnorum traditur : damnatuſque illo argumento, quoniam nihil non perſuaſurus vir tam artificis ingenii videbatur : & male credi libertas ei, cui in tantum ceſſiſſet etiam feritas (17). —— *Hanno, a noble Carthaginian, is reported to have been the firſt, who ever had the courage to handle a lyon, and ſhow him tame. He was condemned on that account, becauſe they believed that nothing would be too hard for a man of ſo much addreſs ; and that the public liberty was not ſafe in the hands of a man to whom the moſt ſavage natures had yielded.*’ Voſſius obſerves, that Plutarch has ſpoken of the ſame HANNO. Indeed, he ſays, that the Carthaginians baniſhed him, becauſe ſeeing him make a lion carry his baggage. they ſuſpected he aſpired to the ſovereignty (18). Neither Pliny nor Plutarch ſay any thing to denote the time this was done, and it is difficult to conceive, what reaſon Voſſius had to imagine they ſpeak of a Hanno different from ours. Father Hardouin is of another opinion, for he thinks that the traveller was the ſame that was condemned for taming a lyon. He cannot offer any proof of it ; and we may even conjecture that he is miſtaken ; for it is ſomewhat probable, that if this Hanno, who ſailed round Afric, was the ſame, who tamed the lion, Pliny would have touched upon this circumſtance. The ſureſt way is to take neither ſide, neither denying what Voſſius denied, nor affirming what Father Hardouin affirms. Note, that he ſuppoſes Pliny to affirm that Hanno was put to death (19), but it is better to give a more indefinite explication to the word *damnatus*, ſince Plutarch ſpecifies the puniſhment of baniſhment. The following objection may be made to Voſſius. Ariſtotle has cited Hanno in his book *de admirandis auditionibus*. Wherefore this Carthaginian general muſt have lived before Agathocles. But Voſſius anſwers (20), that Ariſtotle was not the author of this book. Solinus ſtands us in no ſtead, when he ſays, that Xenophon of Lampſacus has cited Hanno ; for beſides that, it is not known at what time this Xenophon lived, we have reaſon to believe that Solinus deceives us. Theſe are his words (21). ‘ Has *(Gorgades inſulas)* incoluerunt Gorgones monſtra, & ſanè uſque adhuc monſtroſa gens habitat. Diſtant à continente bidui navigatione. Prodidit denique Xenophon Lampſacenus Hannonem Pœnorum regem in eas permeaviſſe, repertaſque ibi fœminas aliti pernicitate, atque ex omnibus quæ apparuerant, duas captas tam hirto atque aſpero corpore, ut ad argumentum ſpectandæ rei duarum cutes miraculi gratia inter donaria Junonis ſuſpenderit : quæ duravere uſque in tempora excidii Carthaginenſis. —— *Theſe (to wit the iſlands called Gorgades) were inhabited by the monſters called Gorgons, and are even to this day inhabited by a monſtrous people. They are diſtant from the continent, two days ſailing. Xenophon Lampſacenus relates, that Hanno, the king of Carthage, ſailed to them, and found women there as ſwift as birds, and that of the many which they ſaw, caught two which had bodies ſo rough and hairy, that, in memory of that expedition, he preſented their ſkins to be hung up in the temple of Juno, which remained there till the deſtruction of Carthage.*’ It is plain, that this paſſage is a tranſcript of this following. ‘ Contra hoc quoque promontorium Gorgades inſulæ narrantur Gorgonum quondam domus bidui navigatione diſtantes à continente, ut tradit Xenophon Lampſacenus. Penetravit in eas Hanno Pœnorum imperator, prodiditque hirta fœminarum corpora, viros pernicitate evaſiſſe : duarumque Gorgonum cutes, argumenti & miraculi gratia in Junonis templo poſuit, ſpectatas uſque ad Carthaginem captam (22). —— *Over againſt this promontory, the iſlands of Gorgades are placed, which were formerly inhabited by the Gorgons, and are two days ſailing from the continent, as Xenophon Lampſacenus relates. Hanno, the Carthaginian general, went into them, and reported that the women there with their bodies covered hair, out-ran his men. He placed two of the Gorgons ſkins in the temple of Juno, as a proof of this, which were ſeen till the taking of Carthage.*’ The copy differs from the original, ſince Pliny does not, make Xenophon ſay, as Solinus does, that Hanno penetrated into the Gorgades &c. Salmaſius ſuppoſes, that Solinus has perplexed this to prove, that Xenophon of Lampſacus lived after Hanno. *Hoc obtinere vult Solinus ut finis illi reſpondeat principiis, & toto in curſu ſibi conſtet. Hanno vetuſtior Xenophonte Lampſaceno. Quomodo igitur hic de illo prodere potuit* (23) ? I confeſs, this is an inexplicable riddle to me, for I cannot conceive that Solinus had any intereſt to ſhew, that Hanno preceded this Xenophon. And I can ſtill leſs comprehend why, if Xenophon lived after this Carthaginian, it ſhould be impoſſible for him to cite him, as Salmaſius's interrogation ſuppoſes. I think it probable enough, that Solinus has reduced Pliny's two citations into one, by a ſpirit of confuſion peculiar to him ; but I would not venture to affirm, that Xenophon of Lampſacus has not ſaid all that he aſcribes to him. You will ſay, that if this were ſo, Pliny would not have cited two writers, but would have been content with Xenophon's teſtimony. I anſwer, the conſequence is not juſt : order requires, that for thoſe things which Hanno is known to have ſaid himſelf, he ſhould be quoted preferrably to thoſe who affirm that he has related them.

Iſaac Voſſius is very far from his father's opinion ; for inſtead of ſaying, that our Hanno lived in the time of Agathocles (24), he makes him elder than Homer and Heſiod. He was not content to make him the leader of the expedition made by the Phenicians a little after the ruin of Troy (25), he found afterwards that this would not give him antiquity enough : he therefore ſuppoſed in another work (26), that Hanno and Perſeus lived in the ſame time. Mr Dodwell has learnedly and ſolidly confuted this pretenſion, and all the proofs brought to ſupport it. He makes a good uſe of the paſſage of Pliny's ſecond book, wherein it is remarked, that Himilco and Hanno undertook long voyages. ‘ Et Hanno, Carthaginis potentia florente, circumvectus à Gadibus ad finem Arabiæ, navigationem eam prodidit ſcripto : ſicut ad extera Europæ noſcenda miſſus eodem tempore Himilco (27). —— *Hanno, while Carthage flouriſhed, ſailed round from Cadiz to the remoteſt parts of Arabia, and left an account of that voyage in writing : at the ſame time, Himilco was ſent to make diſcoveries of the remote parts of Europe.*’ We find, that in the Carthaginian war with Agathocles, they had two generals, one called Hanno, and the other Himilco (28). We may moreover very probably ſuppoſe, that this flouriſhing ſtate of the Carthaginians, mentioned by Pliny, preceded their firſt war with the Romans ; for during this war, it is not likely they thought of diſcovering new countries, and it is well known they concluded this war with great loſs. Wherefore theſe two great chronological characters of Pliny, lead us to ſuppoſe, that he ſpeaks of a Hanno that flouriſhed in the time of Agathocles. You will find in Mr Dodwell (29) a fine collection of obſervations, that may convince us, that Hanno is to be placed betwixt the XCIId and CXXIXth Olympaid.

(17) Plin. lib. viii, cap. xvi, pag. 161.

(18) Plutarch. in Præcept. de Gerend. Republ. circa, init. pag. 799.

(19) De eo multa paſſim Plinius : de ejus præſertim obitu, lib. viii, ſect. xxi, Harduin, ubi ſupra.

(20) Voſſius, ubi ſupra, pag. 514.

(21) Solinus, cap. ult.

(22) Plinius, lib vi, cap. xxxi, pag. 746.

(23) Salmaſius, ubi ſupra, pag. 1297.

(24) Iſaac Voſſius, ubi ſupra, pag. 302, 303.

(25) Strabo ſpeaks of it in his firſt book.

(26) De magnitud. Carthaginis, pag. 52.

(27) Plin. lib. ii, cap. lxvii.

(28) *See Diodorus Siculus*, ad Olympiad. CXVIII.

(29) Dodwell, Diſſertat. de Peripli Hannonis ætate *in limine* Geographiæ veteris tam Scriptorum Græc. minor. Tom. I, Edit. Oxon. 1698.

HARCHIUS (Jodocus) (*a*) born at Mons in Hainault, lived in the XVIth century. He practiſed phyſic in the place of his birth, and publiſhed ſome pieces ſuitable to his profeſſion (*b*) [*A*]. Afterwards he went out of his ſphere, and meddled

(a) And not Lodocus, as it is in Konig.

(*b*) Valer. Andr. Biblioth. Belgic. pag. 593.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome pieces ſuitable to his profeſſion.*] He printed at Liege in 1563, a book *de cauſſis contemptæ Medicinæ*. concerning the cauſes of the contempt of phyſic in 8vo. His *Enchiridion Pharmacorum Simplicium quæ in uſu ſunt*, or, *Manual of Simple Medicines, which are in uſe*, is in verſe, and was printed at Baſil in 1573 in 8vo (1). He might therefore have been placed in the liſt of phyſicians, who wrote in verſe, publiſhed by Bartholinus. He is not the only one who is wanting there.

(1) Valer. Andr. Biblioth. Belgic. pag. 593.

[*B*] *Beza*

meddled with divinity, but with very indifferent ſucceſs. He wanted to find a middle way in the doctrine of the Euchariſt betwixt the Roman Catholics and the Proteſtants, to compoſe their differences, but he was laughed at by both. The book which he publiſhed on this ſubject was anſwered by Theodore Beza, who affirms that it is a piece ſo confuſed, ſo obſcure, and ſo deſtitute of method, that it is a hard matter to gueſs at it's author's meaning [*B*]. We ſhall give a general idea of his opinion [*C*].

[*B*] *Beza . . . . affirms that . . . . Harchius's book is ſo confuſed . . . . that it is a hard matter to gueſs at his meaning.*] The book which he compoſed againſt this author is intituled *De Cæna Domini adverſus Jodoci Harchii Montenſis* (2) *dogmata*, and is to be found in the third tome of his *Tractationes Theologicæ*, from page 148, to page 186 of the Geneva edition 1582 in folio. Hoſpinian (3) ſays, that this work of Beza was printed in the year 1580, and that Jodocus Harchius's book had been printed at Baſil in 1573, with this title: *de Euchariſtiæ myſterio ad ſedandas Controverſias in Cæna Domini Libri tres. A Treatiſe concerning the Myſtery of the Euchariſt, to compoſe the Differences concerning the Lord's Supper, in three books.* Beza aſſures us, that this piece of Harchius had been printed at Worms, ſeven years before he read it. He adds, that he doth not know whether the place of the impreſſion be truly marked, but that he was of opinion, that it would not be neceſſary to anſwer it, becauſe no body could approve of ſuch odd opinions; but that notwithſtanding, having ſeen the contrary of what he expected, he had ſubmitted to the opinion of his friends, who deſired that he ſhould write againſt this author. 'Licet urgentibus nonnullis ut falſiſſimo 'ſane ipſius dogmati utpote quo novæ potiùs con'troverſiæ excitarentur, quam veteres tollerentur, re'futationem opponerem, ſilentio potius ejuſmodi ſcrip'ta eſſe obruenda reſpondit. Nullum enim fore ar'bitrabar, qui tam abſurdis ſententiis aſſentiretur: quæ 'ſpes cum me fefellerit, cogor amicorum precibus, 'quam hæc vana ſint demonſtrare, id eſt pene cum 'ratione, inſanire. Adſcribam autem primo loco ipſius 'Jodoci verba ex variis ejus libri paginis optima 'fide deſcripta, ut quæ ſparſim, & prorſus per'turbatè ſcripſit, adeo denique ἀμεθόδως & obſcurè, 'ut de induſtria texiſſe potius quam aperte ſuum dog'ma ſpectandum propoſuiſſe videatur, melius appa'reant: & ne quam etiam, homini præſertim, ut au'dio, jam mortuo, injuriam in ipſius erratis annotan'dis, & refutandis, feciſſe me quiſquam ſuſpicetur (4). '—— *Being preſſed by ſome people to write an an'ſwer to his erroneous doctrines, by which new con'troverſies are raiſed, rather than old ones compoſed, 'I anſwered, that ſuch books were beſt neglected. For 'I did not imagine, that ſo abſurd a doctrine, would 'find any proſelytes: but having found that I was 'miſtaken in this, I am under a neceſſity, in com'pliance with the deſire of my friends, to ſhow how 'ill founded it is. I ſhall in the firſt place, ſet down 'Jodocus's own words, faithfully extracted from the 'different parts of his book, that what he has wrote 'in a ſcattered, confuſed, immethodical and obſcure 'manner, and ſo as one would think, he rather de'ſigned on purpoſe to conceal his doctrine, than to lay 'it down clearly, may be the better underſtood: and 'that no body may ſuſpect that I do the gentleman, 'who I hear is now dead, the leaſt injury either in 'quoting or confuting his errors.*' Obſerve, by the by, that Harchius was dead at the time when Beza anſwered him. The extracts which they give of his book, make it more intelligble than the reading of the book itſelf. After giving the extracts, Beza obſerves as follows: 'Et hæc quidem Harchius non 'minus obſcurè quàm perturbatè, ut qui ab una quæ'ſtione ad alteram deſiliat, & plurimis ambiguis vo'cibus ac formulis utatur, adeò ut mihi ſæpiſſime hæc 'omnia relegenda, conſideranda, perſcrutanda fuerint 'priuſquàm quid homo iſte ſibi vellet, intelligere '& in ſuos locos diſtinctè ſingula referre potuerim (5). '—— *Thus far Harchius, but with as much ob'ſcurity as confuſion, for he ſtarts from one queſtion 'to another, and makes uſe of ſo many ambiguous 'words and phraſes, that I was frequently obliged to 'read him over and over, to conſider and ſearch be'fore I could gather his meaning, and put every 'thing in it's proper place.*' The Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheca (6), mentions two other books of Harchius on theological ſubjects, *de Cauſis Hæreſis, proque ejus exilio & concordia Controverſiarum in Religione, Hæreticorum, Pontificiorum, & pœnitentium, Oratio ad Deum Patrem*, at Baſil 1573 in 4to. *Orthodoxorum Patrum Irenæi, Cyrilli, Hilarii, Auguſtini, & reliquorum, de Euchariſtia & Sacrificio univerſalis Eccleſiæ Fides*, in 8vo. This laſt book was printed in the year 1577, as Hoſpinian ſays (7).

[*C*] *We ſhall give a general idea of his opinion.*] I take it from a letter of Andrew Rivetus to Milletierre July twenty nine 1641. 'Your diſtinctions 'of *matter* and *myſtery* of αἰσθητὸν and νοητὸν, ſen'ſible and inteligible, ruin all that you intend to eſta'bliſh, without ſhowing how we can with the mouth 'of the body, eat a myſtery in which there is no 'matter; or how after the matter of a body is gone, 'the ſubſtance remains; this I do not find explained 'in your treaſure of rich conceptions. Above thirty 'years ago, I read ſomething like this, in a book 'of a certain phyſician of the country of Juliers named 'Tſarchius (8), with whoſe heifer it ſhould ſeem 'you have plowed. He maintained that the body, 'which the church gives in the bread, is the body 'of the Eternal Word, which coming into the bread 'in a wonderful manner, changed it into the ſubſtance 'of that fleſh, which he carried up into heaven; that 'it was a fleſh of the ſame kind, with that with 'which the ſubſtance of our fleſh is nouriſhed. He 'called it, as you do, a *ſpiritual* and *intelligible* '*fleſh.* He ſaid that the fleſh, which is daily created 'in the bread and wine, and taken at the altar by 'the faithful, was like, as to it's nature, to the fleſh 'which CHRIST has in heaven, quickening be'cauſe of the divinity, which mixeth itſelf with the 'bread in an inexpreſſible manner. He would have 'the Calviniſts to acknowledge, on St Auguſtin's au'thority, that the ſacraments have really in them 'the true fleſh of CHRIST, although ſpiritual, 'which, in a particular manner, is eat by the mouth 'with the bread, and is in ſome manner, digeſted in 'the heart. That it is called the fleſh of CHRIST 'in a myſtery, tho' it be neither nervous, muſculous 'nor animated. Upon the ſame foundations he want'ed likewiſe, with you, to eſtabliſh a real and pro'pitiatory ſacrifice of the body and blood of CHRIST, 'and the adoration of the ſacrament. And tho' he 'pretended by this means, to be able to reconcile all 'the contending parties; he was neither regarded by 'the Papiſts, by the Lutherans, nor by us; no body 'would acknowledge his chimæras for ſolid truths. 'and his ſpeculations vaniſhed as your's will (9).' La Milletiere having anſwered, that he was not acquainted with this author. Rivetus replied as follows. 'This Harchius, whom I mentioned to him, 'and in whoſe book I found whims like to his own, 'ought no more to be unknown to him, than 'the *Diallaction* (10), recommended by Grotius, 'and coupled with Milletiere's books. Theſe are two 'piece, printed together in 1576, without the name 'of the place, or of the Printer, tho' the firſt edi'tion of *Harchius*'s book, bears the name of the city 'of Worms (11).

HARDENBERG (ALBERT), a Proteſtant divine, miniſter at Bremen, in XVIth century, followed the confeſſion of Augſburg eighteen years, and afterwards declared for Calviniſm with ſo much ſucceſs, that he introduced it into that city, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of his colleagues, and of the magiſtrates. He had inſinuated himſelf

(2) He is by miſtake called Modenſis in the Epitome of the Bibliotheque of Geſner, pag. m. 515.

(3) Hoſpin. Hiſtor. Sacrament. *parte altera.*

(4) Theod. Beza, Oper. Tom. III, pag. 148.

(5) Id. ibid. pag. 161.

(6) Pag 515, of the Zurich edition, 1583.

(7) Hoſpin. Hiſt. Sacrament. *parte altera.*

(8) This is an error of the preſs for Harchius. Beſides, I do not know why he is here ſaid to be of the country of Juliers, for he was of Mons in Hainault. Poſſibly he might have practiſed Phyſic in the country of Juliers; or it may be that Rivetus fancied that *Montenſis* ſignified the duchy of of Berg, which he confounded with that of Juliers, becauſe of their neighbourhood, and their common lord.

(9) Rivet, Reſponſes à trois Lettres du Sieur, de la Milletiere, pag. 62, & *ſeq.*

(10) Concerning this book. See, below, the article POINET.

(11) Rivet, ubi ſupra, pag. 143, 144.

himſelf ſo far into the favour of the people [*A*], that he made them declare for him againſt Lutheraniſm; ſo that the magiſtrates who refuſed to reject the confeſſion of Augſburg, were degraded and baniſhed. They all died in exile (*a*). The author who informs me of theſe particulars, refers his readers to a book which Dithmar Kenchelius, burgomaſter of Bremen, compoſed during his baniſhment, intituled, *Brevis, dilucida, ac vera Narratio, de initiis & progreſſu Controverſiæ, Bremæ à Doctore Alberto Hardenbergio motæ, oppoſita recenti Scripto ejuſdem Hardenbergii de Ubiquitate & Cœna Domini.* Or, *A ſhort, plain, and true Account of the Riſe and Progreſs of the Controverſy ſet on foot at Bremen, by Doctor Albert Hardenberg, in anſwer to a late book of the ſaid Hardenberg, concerning the Ubiquity and Supper of our Lord.* Hardenberg did not long enjoy his triumph: he was expelled from Bremen, as a ſeditious Sacramentarian, by the Lutheran party, which regained the aſcendant (*b*). He wrote the Life of Weſſelus, which has been printed.

(*a*) *Taken from George Braun, in his* Catholicorum Tremonenſium Defenſione, pag. 46, 49.

(*b*) Ex eodem, ibid. pag. 164.

[*A*] *He had ſo far inſinuated himſelf into the favour of the people.*] This is the true method of bringing about a change: a preacher, ſupported by the people, is able to introduce all ſorts of revolutions. It is ſaid that he had rendered himſelf ſo popular, that he had not even omitted, to procure the affection of the valets and ſervant maids, after which he made no ſcruple of cenſuring the Burgo maſters and ſenators, by name, in his ſermons, and to leſſen their authority with the people. *Calvini hæreſim, ſenatu & reliquis ſuis Lutheranis collegis invitis, Bremam introduxit. Quod ut commodius faceret, (ut ſcribit Dithmarus Kenchelius, ejuſdem Civitatis Conſul libello contra Hardenbergium edito) in intimam populi, hoſpitum, plebeiorum, mulierculárum, puellarum, famulorum, denique & ancillarum familiaritatem ſe inſinuans, auram popularem captavit, adeoque ut ex publico ſuggeſtu non modò Prædicantes Collegas jlocaliter irridere, ſed ipſos etiam Senatores, & Conſules nominatim taxare, eorumque authoritatem apud plebem imminuere non vereretur* (1).

(1) *George Braun, in his* Defenſio Catholicorum Tremonenſium, pag. 46, 47.

HARPALYCE, the moſt beautiful young woman of Argos. Clymenus her father grew ſo much in love with her, that having found that all endeavours to conquer his paſſion, only ſerved to increaſe it, he reſolved on the means to ſatisfy it. He therefore corrupted his daughter's nurſe, and, by her means, enjoyed ſecretly the beloved object. Some time after came the ſon-in-law, to whom he had promiſed his daughter. Immediately all things were ſumptuouſly prepared for the wedding: the marriage was conſummated: the huſband departed with his bride to return home. Then Clymenus repented he had given conſent to the match. His love diſtracted him to ſuch a degree, that before they came to the end of their journey, he made away with his ſon-in-law, and brought back his daughter to Argos, where he behaved himſelf publickly as her huſband. She at laſt reflected on the indignities ſhe had ſuffered from her father; and to revenge herſelf, ſhe killed her young brother [*A*], and gave him to her father to eat; after which, begging of the gods to be taken out of the world, ſhe was changed into a bird [*B*]. Clymenus was ſo overwhelmed with theſe accidents, that he killed himſelf (*a*). We ſhall ſee other Harpalices in the article HARPALICUS.

(*a*) *Taken from* Euphorion apud Parthenium, *in chap. xiii, of his Erotics, or amorous Stories.*

[*A*] *She killed her young brother.*] Hyginus (1) ſays ſhe killed her own ſon which ſhe had by Clymenus, and he adds that ſhe made her father eat him, who, when he knew it, killed her. In the 206th chapter of this author the word *filiam* ought to be corrected *filium*, agreeably to what he ſays in the 238th, and 239, and 246th chapters. Beſides this difference, I find another betwixt him and Parthenius. The latter ſays that Harpalyce's father was the ſon of Teleus, and that he lived at Argos: the former makes him ſon of Schæneus, and king of Arcadia (2). But as in the 238th chapter he makes him the ſon of Oeneus, we may be certain that inſtead of Schæneus, it ought every where to read Oeneus; for we learn from Apollodorus (3), and Antoninus Liberalis (4), that Oeneus had a ſon named Clymenus.

(1) Hygin. cap. 206.

(2) Id. ibid. & cap. cclxvi. *There is in cap. cxlii.* Cœneus, *and not* Schœneus.

(3) Lib. i.

(4) Cap. ii.

[*B*] *She was changed into a bird.*] There are two great defects in the fabulous inventions of the ancient Greeks; one is, that they have not ſufficiently diverſified the capital incidents; the other is, that they have not been able to obſerve any kind of uniformity in the circumſtances. You will ſcarce find two authors who, in treating of the ſame fact, agree about the qualities and names of perſons, and about the times and places. If they meant by that means to diſplay the fertility of their genius, they were miſtaken; the barrenneſs of the principal is difficultly repaired by diverſified acceſſories. Parthenius's Euphorion ſeems at firſt ſight to give us ſomething new: but obſerve it well, it is only Tereus removed to another ſcene with ſome changes of the actors.

DEFECTS of the Mythologiſts.

HARPALICUS, king of the Amymnians (*a*) in Thrace, had a daughter named Harpalice, who was brought up with cows and mares milk [*A*], and whom he had accuſtomed betimes to handle arms. By this means he made her a good warriour, and found his account in it; for had not his daughter come to his reſcue when he was aſſaulted and wounded by Neoptolemus, the ſon of Achilles [*B*], he had unavoidably

(*a*) Hygin. cap. 193. Servius, in Ænied. lib. i, ver. 317, *calls them* Amymonians.

[*A*] *His daughter was nouriſhed with cows and mares milk.*] Servius (1), applying theſe words of the firſt book of the Æneid to her,

> - - - - - - Qualis equos Threiſſa fatigat
> Harpalyce, volucremque fuga prævertitur Hebrum,
>
> *With ſuch array Harpalice beſtrode,*
> *Her Thracian courſer, and out-ſtript the rapid flood:*

ſays, ſhe was nurſed in the ſame manner as Virgil makes Camilla by her father Metabus.

> Hic natam in dumis interque horrentia luſtra
> Armentalis equæ mammis, & lacte ferino,
> Nutribat, teneris immulgens ubera labris (2).
>
> *A ſhepherd's ſolitary life he led,*
> *His daughter with the milk of mares he fed,*
> *The dugs of bears, and every ſavage beaſt,*
> *He drew, and thro' her lips the liquor preſs'd.*

[*B*] *When he was aſſaulted by Neoptolemus.*] The father of this damſel was already his priſoner, according to Servius. Others ſay Harpalice delivered him from

(1) In Æneid. lib. i, ver. 317.

(2) Virgil Æneid. lib xi, ver. 570.

voidably loſt his life; but Harpalice charged the enemy ſo ſeaſonably, that ſhe put him to flight. Her father, whom ſhe had ſo happily delivered from that foreign war (*b*), loſt his life ſome time after in a civil one: His ſubjects depoſed him, and at laſt killed him (*c*). Harpalice retired into the woods, and fell to robbing. She flew like lightning; ſo that when ſhe was purſued by horſemen to recover from her the cattle ſhe had carried off, they could not overtake her. They did not ſeize her but by laying nets as they do for ſtaggs. They killed her, but it coſt them dear who did it: for there immediately aroſe a diſpute in the neighbourhood, concerning the property of the cattle ſhe had ſtoln. They came to blows, and left many on both ſides dead upon the place. Since that time a cuſtom was eſtabliſhed of aſſembling at the tomb of the damſel, and of expiating her death with turnaments. There was an HARPALICE who was deſperately in love with Iphiclus (*d*), and who died of grief on finding herſelf ſlighted by him. From her it was that a certain ſong was called Harpalice.

(*b*) Hygin. ibid.

(*c*) Servius, ubi ſupra.

(*d*) Turneb. Adverſar. lib. x, cap. xi.

the hands of the Getæ. ‘Quidam hujus patrem ‘à Getis, ut alii volunt à Mirmidonibus captum, ‘collecta multitudine aſſerunt liberaſſe celerius, quam ‘de fœminis credi poteſt (3). —— *Some relate that ‘her father being taken captive by the Getæ, others ‘ſay by the Mirmidons, ſhe gathered a body of men, ‘together and reſcued him, ſo quickly, as is hardly ‘credible of a woman.*’ I know not where Charles Stephens, followed by Lloyd and Hofman, had read that the father of our Harpalice was called Lycurgus, and that he was old when he became priſoner of the Getæ.

(3) Servius, ubi ſupra.

HARPALUS, a Grecian aſtronomer, corrected the cycle of Cleoſtratus by another cycle, which had need to be corrected [*A*]. It was Meton who corrected the new cycle of Harpalus, in the fourth year of the LXXXVIth Olympiad (*a*). Cleoſtratus diſcovered the ſigns of the Zodiac, after Anaximander had found out, in the LVIIIth Olympiad, the obliquity of that circle (*b*). Judge by this of the age in which Harpalus lived. What Moreri ſays is not true, that Diodorus Siculus makes mention of Harpalus. There is a great confuſion in Voſſius upon all this [*B*].

(*a*) Diodor. Siculus, lib. xii, n. 36.

(*b*) Plinius, lib. ii, cap. viii, pag. m. 148.

[*A*] *He corrected the cycle of Cleoſtratus by another cycle which had need to be corrected.*] Cleoſtratus's cycle was called *Octaëteris*; it contained eight years, at the end whereof he pretended the ſun and moon returned to the ſame point. Harpalus finding that to be a miſtake invented a cycle of nine years.

Nam quæ ſolem biberna novem putat æthera volvi
Ut lunæ ſpatium redeat, vetus Harpalus, ipſam
Ocius in ſedem momentaque priſca reducit.
Illius ad numeros prolixa decennia rurſum
Adjeciſſe Meton Cecropia dicitur arte.
Inſeditque animis: tenuit rem Græcai ſolers
Protinus, & longos inventum miſit in annos (1).

Meton finding that the cycle of nine years had ſucceeded no better than the reſt, invented the cycle of nineteen years. This cycle was followed, as Feſtus Avienus obſerves in the verſes above mentioned: It is ſtill in vogue and called the Golden Number.

[*B*] *There is a great confuſion in Voſſius upon all this.*] I. After he had ſaid (2) in his theſis, that Meton publiſhed the *Enneadecateris* in the firſt year of LXXXVIIth olympiad, or in the year before, he ſays, in his commentary upon his theſis, that Diodorus Siculus ſpeaks of this under the third year of the LXXXVIth olympiad. Is not this to produce a famous evidence againſt his own calculation? Is this very prudently done? This is the part of an honeſt man, you will ſay. I will own it is, provided Diodorus made uſe of that chronology: but it is certain that he places the cycle of nineteen years in the laſt year of the LXXXVIth olympiad. II. He quotes Pliny, book 2. Chap 12. concerning Cleoſtratus, whereas he ſhould have quoted the eighth chapter. III. He ſays that the *Octaëteris* of Cleoſtratus comprehended 2090, years and 22. It is plain that the Printer has confounded the numbers; but the word *annorum* is doubtleſs a miſtake of the author: change then theſe words, *introduxit octaëterida quæ erat annorum*, CIↃ CIↃ XC XXII. into theſe, *introduxit octaëterida quæ erat dierum* CIↃ CIↃ CMXXII; for this cycle contained 2922. Days. IV. He quotes the twelfth book of Diodorus Siculus concerning the *Octaëteris*. I have not found that word in it. V. This phraſe, *in hac octaëteride deprehenſum eſt vitium ab Harpalo commiſſum*, is ill expreſſed, as ſignifying quite contrary to what it ought to do. There is no reader but would believe Harpalus was deceived in making that cycle: and yet the meaning of Voſſius is to let us know that Harpalus diſcovered the fault which the author of the cycle had committed. VI. He ſhould not have ſaid, that inſtead of the *Octaëteris* of Cleoſtratus, the *Octaëteris* of Harpalus was made uſe of: For Avienus's verſes, which Voſſius immediately quotes, ſhew plainly that the invention of Harpalus was a cycle of nine years.

(1) Feſtus Avienus in Arateis Prognoſticis, pag. m. 65.

(2) De Scient. Mathemat. pag. 150, 151.

HARPALUS, a Macedonian lord, and one of Alexander's captains, ruined himſelf by his prodigious expences (*a*). He took the part of Alexander, during the differences that aroſe betwixt that prince and his father Philip, and was diſgraced on that account (*b*): But as ſoon as Philip died, Alexander recalled Harpalus, and ſhewed an extraordinary friendſhip to him; I believe that he gave him the government of Cilicia [*A*]. As for that of Babylon, it is moſt certain that he gave it him, together with the office of high-treaſurer (*c*). Harpalus, imagining the king his maſter would never

(*a*) Athenæus, lib. xiii, pag. 594 Pauſanias, lib. i, pag. 35.

(*b*) Plutarch. in Alex. p. 669. E.

(*c*) Diod. Sicul. lib. xvii, cap. cviii.

[*A*] *I believe that Alexander gave him the government of Cilicia.*] I ground my conjecture upon what Athenæus ſays (1), that Harpalus having loſt his miſtreſs, ſent for another from Athens, and lodged her in the royal palace of Tarſus. There ſhe was adored by every body, and was called queen. And all thoſe who crowned Harpalus had orders to crown her alſo? This ſuppoſes that Harpalus lived, at Tarſus with all ſort of authority. Now Tarſus was the chief city in Cilicia (2). I do not regard the paſſage of Athenæus (3), where it is ſaid that Harpalus erected a brazen ſtatue to his miſtreſs Glycera in Tarſus a town of Syria [ἐν Ταϱσῷ] τῆς Συϱίας. I doubt not but this paſſage is corrupted: for beſides that there was not in Syria any royal or conſiderable town that was named Tarſus, we find in the 586th page of Athenæus, that the ſtatue of Glycera was erected in Roſſus, ἐν Ρωσσῷ. We ſee in the Margin of the 595th page oppoſite to the place of the text, where it is printed [ἐν Ταρσῷ] that other manuſcripts have it ἐν Ῥωσσῷ. Athenæus quotes the ſame author, *viz.* Theopompus in both theſe paſſages; which ſhews that the tranſcribers have confounded the name of the town where that ſtatue was.

(1) Lib. xiii, pag. 586.

(2) Τὴν τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπίχȣσα λόγον, metropolis rationem obtinet. *Strabo, lib. xiv, pag.* 463.

(3) Lib. xiii, pag. 595.

never return from his expedition to the Indies, committed infinite extortions, in order to ſupport the exceſſive expences of his bed and table. He plunged himſelf into all ſorts of pleaſures, and denied nothing to his miſtreſſes [B]. Many other governors fancying as he did, that Alexander would never be in a capacity of calling them to an account for their extortions, had been guilty of innumerable acts of injuſtice. The firſt thing Alexander did, upon his return from the Indies, was to puniſh very ſeverely ſome of theſe governors. This gave grounds to Harpalus to apprehend the ſame treatment; ſo that to prevent it he fled into Greece with immenſe ſums, which he took from the royal treaſure with which he was entruſted. He levied alſo ſix thouſand men, which he landed at Tænarum in the Lacedemonian territories; from whence he went to Athens, to try to engage them in a war againſt Alexander (*d*). He gained ſome orators by his money (*e*); knowing that there is not a more powerful inſtrument than the tongue of this ſort of men to diſturb the public tranquillity, and to excite the populace to take up arms. But as he knew on the one hand what power they have over the people, he was not ignorant on the other, how great a power a good ſum of money had over them. Wherefore finding himſelf well provided with gold and ſilver, he hoped to bring over the city of Athens to his intereſt. But he was deceived; Phocion was not to be corrupted [C]; beſides, the letters of Antipater, governor of Macedonia, and thoſe of Olympias, the mother of Alexander, kept the Athenians in reſpect

[B] *He denied nothing to his miſtreſſes.*] If any thing could ruin the conjecture I have advanced in the preceding remark, it would be the deſcription that Diodorus Siculus has left us, of the luxury Harpalus wallowed in during Alexander's abode in the Indies. It appears from thence, that Harpalus gave himſelf up to the pleaſures of women, and even to impurities of a more odious nature; that he ordered great quantities of fiſh to be brought from the Red Sea; that his ordinary expences were exceſſive, and beſides that he ſent for a famous courteſan from Athens named Pythionice; that he made her preſents of an immenſe value; that when ſhe died he built her a noble ſepulchre; and ſent for another celebrated courteſan named Glycera, from the ſame country, with whom he lived in ſo prodigal a voluptuouſneſs as cannot be deſcribed. All this happened, according to Diodorus Siculus, whilſt Harpalus was governour of Babylon, and high-treaſurer, and whilſt Alexander was employed in his Indian expedition. You will ſay I was then in the wrong to mention his government of Cilicia. It would be a ſtrong objection, if there was not room to believe that Diodorus Siculus, after the manner of thoſe who compoſe a general hiſtory, has too much huddled together particular events, and too much neglected the diſtinction of times. The authors, whom Athenæus quotes, are more credible than Diodorus; for they have treated particularly of the debaucheries of Harpalus. It is preſumed therefore they have better deſcribed the circumſtances of them than Diodorus could do, who has only ſpoken of Harpalus in general, and who paſſed over the particular incidents with the greateſt haſte imaginable. That is the method of a general hiſtory. But what ſay Athenæus's authors? Why, that after the death of Pythionice, whom Harpalus paſſionately loved, he ſent for Glycera, and brought her to the royal palace at Tarſus, causing the people to adore her, and call her queen. Ἣν καὶ ἐλθȣ̃σαν οἰκεῖν ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις τοῖς ἐν Ταρσῷ καὶ προσκυνεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τȣ̃ πλήθȣς βασίλισσαν προσαγορευομένην. *Ac illo profectam in regia quæ Tarſis fuit collocaſſe, ut adorarent omnes ac reginam ſalutarent, juſſiſſe* (4). If he had been governour of Babylon when he ſent for Glycera, he had conducted her to the palace of Babylon, and it muſt have been at Babylon that he had ordered the honours of adoration to be paid, and the title of queen to be given to her. He did this at Tarſus, therefore he was governour of Cilicia, when Pythionice died, and when Glycera ſupplied her place: Therefore Diodorus is miſtaken in the circumſtances of time, ſince he ſuppoſes that Harpalus's amours with Pythionice, and afterwards with Glycera, were poſterior in time to Harpalus's being made governour of Babylon, and Alexander's expedition to the Indies. Let not the ſepulchre which Harpalus ordered to be built for Pythionice in Babylon (5) be objected to me; for that does not prove ſhe died after his being preferred to the government of Babylon. I know not whether we ought to reckon amongſt the inſtances of this governour's luxury, the care he took to have all ſorts of plants brought from Greece for the ornament of the gardens, and walks of Babylon (6), for if we may believe Theophraſtus (7), he did this by Alexander's order. If Scaliger had concluded from thence that Harpalus was ſupervisor of the royal gardens and orchards at Babylon, he could be blamed but for one thing; but he ſays that Plutarch aſcribes that employment to Harpalus (8), he has therefore made two ſlips. I. He did not remember that Harpalus was governour of the province of Babylon, and that therefore the ſuperviſing of the gardens was not his principal office, but a ſmall dependance upon his great employ. II. It is falſe that Plutarch ſays what he imputes to him.

[C] *Phocion was not to be corrupted.*] He it was whom Harpalus aimed principally to gain. He gave to the other orators, whom he ſaw come over to him, but very moderate gratuities; but he offered Phocion 700 talents, and would have made him the abſolute manager of his affairs. Τῶν εἰωθότων ἀπὸ τȣ̃ βήματος χρηματίζεσθαι δρόμος ἦν καὶ ἅμιλλα φθειρομένων πρὸς αὐτὸν, τȣ́τοις μὲν ἀπὸ πολλῶν μικρὰ δελεάζων, προήκατο καὶ διέῤῥιψε, τῷ δὲ Φωκίωνι προσέπεμψε διδȣ̀ς ἑπτακόσια τάλαντα. *Concionalium hirudinum fuit certatim concurſatio operas ſuas ei venditantium: modicam his ille ex multis obtulit & objecit eſcam, Phocioni vero per internuncios ſeptingenta talenta obtulit* (9). Phocion repulſed him, and let him know that he would make him repent of his intriguing, if he went on to corrupt the inhabitants. Hereupon Harpalus acted with more reſerve. He found that all thoſe mercenary tongues he had gained, oppoſed him openly, in order to remove all ſuſpicions, and that Phocion who had received nothing of him, was the leaſt his adverſary. This put him upon making new attempts to gain him; but he found him impenetrable on every ſide. Charicles, Phocion's ſon-in-law, did not imitate his integrity, but rendered himſelf ſo ſuſpected that his father-in-law refuſed to aſſiſt him when he ſaw him under proſecution for correſponding with Harpalus (10). As for Demoſthenes, he uſed Harpalus in a moſt diſingenuous manner; for when he had taken large ſums to ſpeak for him, and came to the bar, he appeared in the aſſembly with his throat muffled up, and complained he had a ſore throat which deprived him of the uſe of ſpeech (11). Which occaſioned the jeſt upon him, wherein they alluded to the quincy. Οἱ δὲ εὐφυεῖς χλευάζοντες ȣ̓χ ὑπὸ συνάγκης ἔφραζον ἀλλ' ἀπ' ἀργυράγχες εἰλῆφθαι νύκτωρ τὸν δημαγωγόν. *Ibi homines faceti cavelantes non angina dixerunt, ſed argentangina oratorem nocte correptum* (12). But he did not come off only with being rallied; for his engagements with Harpalus were the cauſe of his baniſhment (13). Note that Pauſanias believes him innocent (14). Harpalus, and his concubine Glycera, ordered great quantities of corn to be diſtributed in Athens. Which was one of the things for which he was ridiculed in a comedy that was acted on the banks of Hydaſpes, which ſome will have Alexander himſelf to be the author of (15). It is obſervable, that after the death of Harpalus, a daughter he had by Pythionice was taken home by Phocion, and educated with all poſſible care both by himſelf and his ſon-in-law Charicles (16).

[D] This

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) Plut. in Phocione, pag. 750, in Demoſthene, pag. 857.

(4) Theopompus & Clitarchus, apud Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 586.

(5) Theopompus, ibid. pag. 595.

(6) Plut. in Alexand. pag. 686. B.

(7) Apud Plut. Sympoſiac. lib. iii, cap. ii, pag. 648.

(8) Plutarchus in Sympoſiacis, qui inter alia ſcribit eum hortis regiis & viridariis Babyloniacis præpoſitum fuiſſe. *Scalig. Animadverſ. in Euſeb.* n. 1691. *pag.* 127.

(9) Plut. in Phocione, pag. 751. B.

(10) Id. ibid.

(11) Id. in Demoſthene, pag. 857.

(12) Id. ibid.

(13) Juſtin. lib. xii, cap. v.

(14) *See the remark* [D], *at the end.*

(15) Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 586, & 595.

(16) Plutarch. in Phoc. pag. 751.

reſpect (*f*), This obliged Harpalus to ſeek another refuge [*D*]. He returned to Tænarum, where he had left his troops, and paſſed over from thence to Crete. But he was not there long before one of his friends treacherouſly killed him (*g*) [*E*]. The Supplement to Moreri is faulty in this particular, as I ſhall make appear (*h*). Alexander was ſo firmly perſuaded that Harpalus was an honeſt man, that he cauſed thoſe who brought the firſt news of his flight, to be put in chains as falſe accuſers (*i*). The news he received, that this perfidious man was expelled from Athens and killed, made him lay aſide his thoughts of returning into Europe to humble the Athenians [*F*]. He had employed Harpalus to ſend him books [*G*], when he ſaw there were none to be met with in the provinces that were remote from the country of the Greeks. The Sepulchre that Harpalus erected to one of his miſtreſſes, was very ſumptuous [*H*]. I do

[*D*] *This obliged Harpalus to ſeek another refuge.*] He received orders to depart from Athens, as we learn from Plutarch (17) and Quintus Curtius (18). I believe the cauſe was pleaded with great ſolemnity: For Pollux quotes an oration of Hyperides ὑπὲρ Ἁρπάλȣ I will not take notice of Dinarchus's oration, intituled ὑπὲρ τȣ̃ μὴ ἐκδȣ̃ναι Ἅρπαλον Ἀλεξάνδρῳ; becauſe it is thought ſuppoſititious. It is however certain that that orator actually pleaded in that cauſe: there were five of his orations περὶ Ἁρπαλείων (19). That tryal had great conſequences; for after it was reſolved upon in Athens, that Harpalus ſhould depart, they informed againſt thoſe who had ſuffered themſelves to be bribed by him. If he had not found ſuch as would be corrupted by his preſents he had been delivered up to Alexander (20). One of that prince's friends (21) earneſtly ſollicited the Athenians, that Harpalus might be given up to him, and not having obtained it, he ſhewed them ſome time after to whom it was Harpalus had given money and how much. He found that in the papers of Harpalus's ſteward (22).

Let us here make ſome critical obſervations upon the article of Philoxenus in Moreri's dictionary. The author of that article (23) aſſures us, that *Philoxenus, a Macedonian captain, took Harpalus in Candia, who had robbed Alexander's exchequer, that he diſcovered all thoſe to whom Harpalus had intruſted this treaſure in Athens: that he ſent a liſt of them to the magiſtrates, to recover the money out of their hands, and to cauſe them to be puniſhed; but that he would not name Demoſthenes, though he had ſome difference with that famous orator, preferring, on that occaſion, the eſteem he had for his eloquence to his own reſentment*. Pauſanias is quoted for this. I find five faults in it. I. It is falſe that Philoxenus took Harpalus either in Crete or in any other place. He only took his ſteward who had eſcaped to the iſle of Rhodes (24). The author I criticiſe, does not mention it. Let that omiſſion be his ſecond fault. III. *Harpalus did not truſt his treaſure in Athens*, he only diſtributed certain ſums to gain ſome people to his intereſt. IV. The liſt which Philoxenus ſent to the magiſtrates did not contain the names of the pretended truſtees of this treaſure, but the names of thoſe whom Harpalus had bribed. V. Pauſanias (25) does not ſay that Philoxenus had a deſire to recover that money. VI. And ſo far is he from ſaying that this Macedonian ſuppreſſed his reſentment in reſpect to Demoſthenes's eloquence, that he manifeſtly ſuppoſes that orator would have appeared in Philoxenus's catalogue, if his name had been found in the papers of Harpalus's ſteward. Pauſanias argues thus: if Demoſthenes had received any bribe from Harpalus, this had been diſcovered, by the papers of his ſteward: and if it had been diſcovered, Philoxenus would have named him in the catalogue he ſent to the Athenians: for he had particular quarrels with Demoſthenes, and he knew that Alexander was to the laſt degree enraged againſt that famous orator. But he makes no mention of Demoſthenes in imparting to the Athenians the names of thoſe whom Harpalus had corrupted, and the particular ſums they had received. We muſt therefore conclude that Demoſthenes was guiltleſs. Who will truſt after this to ſuch dictionary-makers? Who wont rather deplore the fate of innumerable readers, who have honeſtly believed that Pauſanias gives us here an example of a very ſignal generoſity, a man ſo full of admiration for Demoſthenes, his enemy, that he ſtifles his reſentment in his behalf, when he has the moſt favourable opportunity of revenge. So great is the force of eloquence! Will the young declamers cry out, who ſhall ſeek their materials in this new Polyanthea (26).

[*E*] *One of his friends treacherouſly killed him.*] He was called Thimbron, as Diodorus Siculus ſays, and he was of Lacedemon, as Arrian inform us. He ſeized upon all the effects of Harpalus. Others ſay it was a traveller that committed this murder (27); others attribute it to Harpalus's domeſtic (28), others to a Macedonian, named Pauſanias (29). Theſe diſagreements put one out of patience, and diſgrace the hiſtorians.

[*F*] *The news which he received that he was expelled from Athens, made Alexander lay aſide his deſign of returning . . . to chaſtiſe the Athenians.*] This we are taught by Quintus Curtius. ‘His cognitis, *ſays he*, ‘Rex Harpalo Athenienſibuſque juxta infeſtus, claſſem ‘parari jubet; Athenas protinus petiturus. Quod ‘conſilium dum agitat, clam literæ ei redduntur, ‘Harpalum intraſſe quidem Athenas, pecunia conciliaſſe ſibi principum animos, mox conſilio plebis ‘habito, juſſum urbe excedere, ad Græcos milites perveniſſe, à quibus interceptum & trucidatum à quo‘dam viatore per inſidias. His Lætus in Europam ‘trajiciendi conſilium omiſit (30). —— *Upon hearing ‘theſe things, the king being equally enraged againſt ‘Harpalus and the Athenians, commanded that a fleet ‘ſhould be made ready; intending to go to Athens without delay. While this was in agitation he received ‘ſecret advice that Harpalus had indeed entered Athens, ‘and had by preſents drawn over the principal inhabitants to his party, but that an aſſembly of the people ‘being held, he was ordered to leave the city, that he ‘had gone to the Grecian ſoldiers, by whom he was ‘ſtopped, and that he was at laſt ſlain by a certain traveller who had lain in wait for him. Being overjoyed at ‘this, he laid aſide his deſign of paſſing over into Europe.*’ A man muſt be ſtupid, not to perceive that there is a pretty large gap betwixt the firſt and ſecond chapters of the tenth book of Quintus Curtius. For is there any hiſtorian ſo void of common ſenſe, as to ſpeak of Harpalus in the manner Quintus Curtius does in the foregoing paſſage, unleſs he had before explained, who this perſon was, and what enterprize he had formed? There is no need of ſaying more upon this. If any one is not ſenſible of it, he is not capable of comprehending the reaſons I ſhould alledge to prove it.

[*G*] *Alexander employed Harpalus to ſend him books.*] Plutarch acquaints us with this fact. Read what follows, and you will find they did not think they ſhould diſpleaſe that prince by ſending him poetry. Τῶν δὲ ἄλλων βιβλίων ȣ̓κ εὐπορῶν ἐν τοῖς ἄνω τόποις, Ἅρπαλον ἐκέλευσε πέμψαι. κἀκεῖνος ἔπεμψεν αὐτῷ τάς τε Φιλίϛȣ βίβλȣς, καὶ τῶν Εὐριπίδȣ καὶ Σοφοκλέȣς καὶ Αἰσχύλȣ τραγῳδιῶν συχνάς, καὶ Τελέϛȣ καὶ Φιλοξένȣ διθυράμβȣς. Aliorum librorum quum in ſuperioribus provinciis non eſſet ei facultas, mandavit Harpalo ut mitteret. Ille miſit ei Philiſti libros, Euripidiſque & Sophoclis, & Æſchyli tragœdiarum magnam vim, Teleſtis quoque Philoxenique dithyrambos (31). —— *Alexander not finding any other books in the upper provinces, ſent orders to Harpalus to ſend him ſome. Accordingly he ſent him Philiſtus's writings, and a great many of the tragedies of Euripides, Sophocles, and Æſchylus, together with the dithyrambics of Teleſtes and Philoxenus.*

[*H*] *The ſepulchre which Harpalus erected to one of his miſtreſſes was very ſumptuous.*] He had been at incredible expences for Pythionice, whilſt ſhe lived, and he was not at leſs to bury her. The funeral was ſolemnized with the moſt magnificent ſymphony in the world. Whatever was fine in muſic, either vocal or inſtrumental, was brought together (32). He erected to her memory two ſtately monuments, one at Babylon, the other near Athens. The expence was above 200 talents. He conſecrated a temple and a grove to her,

(*f*) Diod. Sicul. ubi ſupra.

(*g*) Id. ibid.

(*h*) *In the remark* [*D*].

(*i*) Τȣ̀ς δὲ πρώτȣς τὴν Ἁρπάλȣ φυγὴν καὶ ἀπόδρασιν ἀπαγγείλαντας ἔδησεν Ἐφιάλτην καὶ Κίσσον ὡς καταψευδομένȣς τȣ̃ ἀνδρός. Illos qui Harpali fugam primi nuntiaverunt in vincula conjecit, Ephialtem & Ciſſum, tanquam mendacia de eo nunciantes. *Plut. in Alexandr. pag.* 689. *B.*

(17) Id. in Demoſthene, pag. 875. E.

(18) Lib. x, cap. ii.

(19) Vid. Scaliger. Animad. in Euſebium, n. 1691, pag. m. 127.

(20) Pauſanias, lib. i, pag. 35.

(21) Philoxenus, *a Macedonian*. Pauſan. lib. ii, pag. 76.

(22) Id. ibid.

FAULTS of the Supplement to Moreri.

(23) It is the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary.

(24) Pauſanias, lib. ii, pag. 76.

(25) Id. ibid.

(26) *That is, in Moreri's Dictionary.*

(27) Quint. Curt. lib. x, cap ii.

(28) Pauſanias, lib. ii, pag. 76.

(29) Id. ibid.

(30) Quint. Curt. lib. x, cap. ii.

(31) Plut. in Alexandro, pag. 668. *D.*

(32) Poſidonius, lib. xxii, Hiſtor. apud Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 594.

do not think that a certain complaint againſt providence, which Cicero has preſerved to us, relates to our Harpalus [*I*]. If I am in the right, the moral reflexions of Father Leſcalopier are but ill applied. There is a fault in Euſebius, which I ſhall take notice of [*K*].

her, under the name of Venus Pythionice. Ταύτης ἐτόλμησεν ὁ φίλος εἶναι σοῦ φάσκων ἱερὸν καὶ τέμενος ἱδρύσασθαι, καὶ προσαγορεῦσαι τὸν ναὸν καὶ τὸν βωμὸν Πυθιονίκης Ἀφροδίτης. *Auſus hic eſt qui de amicitia tua gloriaretur, illi & lucum & templum conſecrare, ædemque illam & aram Pythionices Veneris nuncupare* (33). The tomb that he cauſed to be built in Attica, in the way to Eleuſis, exceeded all that were near it. One would have taken it for that of one of the greateſt men that Athens had produced. What ſurprize then muſt it be to ſtrangers to underſtand, it was erected to a ſtrumpet? What judgment would they paſs upon the Athenians? This is Dicæarchus's reflexion (34). An author, who was well verſed in theſe matters, aſſures us, that Pythionice's tomb, in the way to Eleuſis, was the fineſt of all the ancient monuments that were to be ſeen in Greece. Ὡς καὶ μνῆμα ἀποθανούσης ποιῆσαι πάντων ὁπόσα Ἕλλησίν ἐστιν ἀρχαῖα, θέας μάλιστα ἄξιον. *Ut mortuæ monimentum poſuerit omnium quæ in Græcia veterum operum quod ſpectetur digniſſimum* (35). It is even true, that Harpalus's intentions were not faithfully executed. The whole ſum that he appointed for it, was not laid out upon that monument. Charocles, Phocion's ſon-in-law, undertook the direction of that work, at the requeſt of Harpalus, and did not lay out upon it the thirty talents depoſited in his hand. He diſgraced himſelf two ways: I. in taking upon him the direction of a monument deſigned for a whore; II. in appropriating to himſelf part of the money depoſited with him. Μνημεῖον ἀπὸ χρημάτων πολλῶν ἐπιτελέσαι θελήσας προσέταξε τῷ Χαρικλεῖ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν. οὖσαν δὲ τὴν ὑπουργίαν ταύτην, ἀγεννῆ προσκατῄσχυνεν ὁ τάφος συντελεσθείς. διαμένει γὰρ ἔτι νῦν ἐν Ἑρμείῳ, ᾗ βαδίζομεν ἐξ ἄστεος εἰς Ἐλευσῖνα, μηδὲν ἔχων τῶν τριάκοντα ταλάντων ἄξιον, ὅσα τῷ Ἁρπάλῳ λογισθῆναι φασὶν εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὑπὸ τοῦ Χαρικλέους. *Quum Harpalus monumentum ſumptuoſum locare vellet faciendum, ejus rei demandavit Chaɾicli curam. Hoc miniſterium per ſe turpe fœdavit inſuper ſepulcrum abſolutum. Extat enim & hac ætate in Hermio, qua Athenis Eleuſina itur, neque in eo triginta talenta, quantam ſummam expenſam tuliſſe in id opus Harpalo autumant Chariclem, comparent* (36). Pauſanias confeſſes, that he knows nothing, either of the country or family of Pythionice, but only that ſhe exerciſed the trade of a courtezan at Athens and Corinth. Athenæus knew a little more of her. He ſays, ſhe had been a ſervant of Bacchis the famous artiſt on the flute, and that afterwards ſhe liſted her ſelf under a bawd of Thrace, who lived at Ægina, and that ſhe followed her to Athens, whither ſhe removed her brothel houſe, ſo that Pythionice was a triple ſlave, and a triple proſtitute; ὥστε γίνεσθαι μὴ μόνον τρίδουλον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τρίπορνον αὐτήν. *Ut non ſolum ter mancipium, ſed etiam ter ſcortum fuerit* (37).

[*I*] *I do not believe that a certain complaint againſt providence relates to our Harpalus.*] The words of Cicero are theſe (38): 'Diogenes quidem Cynicus dicere ſolebat, Harpalum, qui temporibus illis prædo felix habebatur contra Deos teſtimonium dicere, quòd in illa fortuna tam diu viveret. —— *Diogenes the Cynic, uſed to ſay, that Harpalus, a famous pirate in thoſe days, did bear witneſs againſt the gods, becauſe he lived ſo long bleſt with ſo much good fortune.*' I am of Menage's opinion. The Harpalus of Cicero, the Scirpalus of Diogenes Laërtius (39), and the Scirtalus of Suidas (40), ſeem to me to be one and the ſame man. But the Scirpalus of Diogenes Laërtius, and the Scirtalus of Suidas, was a famous pirate, who took Diogenes the Cynic, and ſold him. I therefore believe that the Harpalus of Cicero was a pirate, and not a captain of Alexander the Great. The character Cicero has given of Harpalus, by no means agrees with Alexander's captain. The Harpalus of Cicero was a famous pirate, as well known for the good luck that accompanied his piracies, as for his piracies themſelves: his long proſperity was well known, as appears from the conſequence Diogenes drew from it; ſince a man would render himſelf ridiculous that ſhould argue in that manner, in a town where the ſucceſſes of a pirate had not been taken notice of above four or five years. Add to this, that there is nothing tempts a man more to make murmuring reflexions upon providence, for the proſperity of the wicked, than the ſeeing ones ſelf miſerable by reaſon of their proſperity (41). If therefore there was any robber that could draw from Diogenes's mouth the complaint which Cicero mentions, it was doubtleſs he that made Diogenes his ſlave. But ſince he became a ſlave to a pirate, and not to the governour of Babylon, we muſt conclude, that the witneſs who he thought might be produced againſt the exiſtence of the gods, was the pirate who had taken him captive.

It is to little purpoſe therefore, that Father Leſcalopier (42) repreſents to his readers, that Harpalus, the governour of Babylon, continued not long unpuniſhed, after he had carried off the treaſures of the king his maſter. It is in vain he ſhews, that this robber fell from one miſfortune into another, and that he was miſerably killed about a year after. He does but reaſon againſt himſelf. The farther he advances towards his deſign, the farther he deviates from his ſubject. The queſtion is concerning a robber, who had been a long time fortunate; this is the objection; and here you alledge to us a robber that was puniſhed almoſt upon the ſpot. This is not to anſwer; it is rather to labour unwarily to make of an inconſiderable difficulty, a ſtumbling block for the ſimple, who will be ſcandalized to ſee a libertine anſwered by overturning the whole ſtate of the queſtion. And now is not this concluſion of this Jeſuit very edifying? 'Omitte Harpalum, ſume Diogenem: ne querere quod regiæ pecuniæ prædo unum annum vivat in ſua fortuna: querere quod prædo divinæ providentiæ in ſua impietate longam vitam vivat: ſed neque id certe conquerendum eſt, nam longa vita miſerrimi canis omnibus infeſti, omnibus exoſi, longum ſupplicium fuit, longioris tamen ſupplicii breve præludium (43). —— *Inſtead of Harpalus chooſe Diogenes for an example: do not complain, that a perſon who robbed a royal treaſury is allowed to enjoy it one year: complain rather that one who robs* GOD *of his providence is ſuffered to live for a great number of years in his impiety: but neither is this any ground of complaint, for the long life of this miſerable dog who hated all men, and was hated by all, was a long puniſhment, though indeed only the ſhort prelude, to a much longer puniſhment.*'

[*K*] *There is a fault in Euſebius, which I will take notice of.*] He ſays under the third year of the CXIIIth Olympiad, that Harpalus fled into Aſia. *Harpalus fugit in Aſiam.* Scaliger approves of that chronology. But he corrects Aſiam, by Atticam, and it is certain, that if Euſebius did not ſay Atticam, he ought to have done it. Bongarſius (44) had corrected it, *fugit ex Aſia.*

(33) Theopompus, in Epiſt. ad Alexandrum, apud Athen. ibid. pag. 595.

(34) In libris de deſcenſu in antrum Trophonium, apud Athenæum, pag. 594.

(35) Pauſanias, lib. i, pag. 36.

(36) Plut. in Phocione, pag. 751. D.

(37) Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 595. ex Theopompo in Epiſt. ad Alexandrum.

(38) De Nat. Deor. lib iii, cap. xxxiv.

(39) Lib. vi, in Diog. n. 74.

(40) In Διογένης.

(41) *See, above, the remark* [*C*], *of the article* DIAGORAS the Atheiſt.

(42) Leſcalop. Commentar. in Ciceron. de Nat. Deor. lib. iii, pag. 683.

(43) Leſcalopier, ubi ſupra, pag. 682.

(44) In Juſtin. lib. xii, cap. v.

HARRAVAD (Isaac Ben) a noted Rabbi, toward the end of the XIIth Century. He has written ſomething, but we know not truly what it is. There are two wonderful qualities aſcribed to him: one is, that he could diſcover by peoples faces, whether their ſoul was tranſmigrated from another body, or began to exiſt at the moment of it's union with their own; the other, that though he was blind, he diſtinguiſhed certainly by the ſmell, whether a man were alive or not (*a*). The criticiſm of Father Bartolocci is ſomewhat dull on this occaſion [*A*].

[*A*] *The criticiſm of Father Bartolocci is ſomewhat dull on this occaſion.*] Having quoted theſe words of Rabbi Reckanati, '& licet fuiſſet cæcus, ſenſibiliter percipiebat ex aëre an iſte fuiſſet vivus an vero mortuus. —— *And though he was blind, he could ſenſibly diſtinguiſh by the air, whether a man was dead or alive.*'

(*a*) *Taken from* Bartolocci's Bibliotheca Rabbinica, Tom. III, pag. 888, 889.

'*alive*,' he adds (1), 'cognoſcere cadaver ex olfactu 'mira res apud Judæos: quia cum Judæi male olentes 'inter ſe continuo verſentur, illorum olfaciendi ſenſus 'videtur depravatus, ut inter cadaveris & latrinarum 'malum odorem diſtinguere neſciant, niſi prodigium 'fiat. —— *To know a carcaſe by the ſmell, is a won- 'derful thing among the Jews: becauſe it would ſeem 'that the ſtinking Jews, by conſtantly herding among one 'another, deprave their ſenſe of ſmelling to ſuch a de- 'gree, that they cannot, without a miracle, diſtinguiſh 'betwixt the ſtink of a carcaſe, and of a jakes.*' This is a ſilly piece of raillery; and if one would lay aſide the ſpirit of cavilling, he might ſee that the ſmell of that Rabbi had ſomething very particular in it, provided he had that nicety of ſenſe that is pretended. For it muſt not be ſuppoſed, the meaning of it is, that he could diſcern that a man who had been dead ſome days, was not alive. All blind men can eaſily do this. But the meaning is, that the change he perceived in the air as ſoon as a man expired, gave him certainly to underſtand that the man was dead. Will it not be acknowledged, that this change is imperceptible? Father Bartolocci has cenſured another thing. He asks how that blind Rabbi could know the age of the ſoul, by looking on the face? This reflexion cannot be ſolid, unleſs the ſame authors, who have mentioned that faculty of our Rabbi, have expreſsly declared, that he was then blind, and that he made uſe of the inſpection of the face. Now there is no appearance of any ſuch declaration in them. 'Pius 'iſta Ben Harravad cognoſcebat ex vultu, utrum anima 'creata in ipſo actu infuſionis informaretur homo, an 'vero aliunde ex tranſmigratione animam haberet ad- 'venticiam (2). —— *The pious Ben Harravad knew by 'the face, whether the ſoul of a man was created in 'the very act of infuſion; or if it was given by way of 'tranſmigration.*' Theſe words of Rabbi Rekanati (3), ſhew indeed, that the other Rabbi knew by the face, whether peoples ſouls were new, or not; but they do not determine whether he knew this, by looking on the face, or touching it. Now either of theſe ways is equally wonderful, and the latter even ſeems to be more difficult than the former. It will be objected to me in favour of Bartolocci, that Rekanati, making mention of the other faculty, obſerves, that Rabbi Harravad was blind; but I ſhall ſtill ask, whether he ſays, that this marvellous phyſiognomiſt was blind at that time, when he could diſcern whether ſouls were in the place of their nativity? for if he only meant, that Harravad had that faculty before he grew blind, what will become of the railleries, exclamations, and invectives of Bartolocci? He had reaſon enough to laugh at thoſe tales, but it ought to have been upon other motives. Exactneſs is neceſſary, who ever it be, that is to be confuted.

(1) Bartoloccius, Biblioth. Rabinica, Tom. III, pag. 889.

(2) R. Rekanati apud Bartolocc. ibid. pag. 888.

(3) *They are inſerted by Gruterus in the ſecond Tome of* Theſaurus Criticus.

HARTUNGUS (John) born a Miltemberg (*a*), in the year 1505, ſtudied firſt in his own country, and afterwards in the univerſity of Heidelberg. He afterwards took arms, which he bore in Hungary againſt the Turks; but ſome time after he returned again to the gentle ſervice of the Muſes, and became profeſſor of the Greek tongue in the univerſity of Heidelberg. He acquitted himſelf gloriouſly of that profeſſion fifteen years together; nor would he have reſigned it, had not the Proteſtant religion been eſtabliſhed in the Palatinate, in the year 1546. That change obliged him to ſeek another employment; and he found one at Friburg in Briſgaw, with which he was ſo well contented, that he kept it as long as he lived. He held an honourable rank amongſt the profeſſors at Friburg, and had many ſcholars. He read lectures upon Homer, and ſome other poets; and he compoſed ſome pretty good books [*A*]. He died in the ſame town, the 16th of June, 1579, after having taught the *Belles Lettres* there thirty three years. The epitaph he made for himſelf, teſtifies, that in the inſtruction of youth, he both ſuffered and learned a great deal (*b*) [*B*].

(*a*) *A town in Germany on the Main.*

(*b*) *Taken from Melchior Adam*, in Vitis Philoſ. German. pag. 300, 301.

[*A*] *He compoſed ſome pretty good books.*] Some Prolegomena, and notes upon the three firſt books of the Odyſſey. *Chiliades locorum Homericorum: Decuriæ locorum quorundam memorabilium* (1). He tranſlated Apollonius's poem upon the Argonaut, into Latin. That verſion is not in eſteem. This is the judgment of a good critic upon it (2). 'Miratus ſum hominem & 'eruditum, & in Græca præſertim lingua cum laude 'verſatum ita tranſtuliſſe [Apollonium] ut non paulò 'facilius ſit Apollonium ſua, hoc eſt Græca, lingua 'aſſequi, quam ea qua eum Hartungus loquentem 'fecit, latina. —— *I have wondered that a man ſo 'learned, and eſpecially ſo verſed in the Greek language, 'ſhould have tranſlated Apollonius in ſuch a manner, 'that it is much eaſier to underſtand Apollonius's 'Greek, than Hartungus's Latin.*' He afterwards ſhews ſome errors of this verſion, and lets us know, that he could point out abundance more (3).

[*B*] *The epitaph he made upon himſelf, declares, that . . . he had ſuffered . . . and learned much.*] It deſerves to be ſet down here,

Πολλὰ παθὼν, καὶ πολλὰ μαθὼν ἐν παιδοδιδάσκειν
Ἔνθα δὲ νῦν κεῖμαι σὺν Θεῷ ἡσύχιος.

In teaching youth I learn'd and ſuffer'd much,
And now, in duſt, I quietly reſt with GOD.

The Latin verſion of it, which is found in Melchior Adam (4), is very bad: it no way anſwers the author's intention, which was to ſhew, that his profeſſorſhip had been a heavy burden. I will not inſert here the other epitaph which Hartungus made upon himſelf in Greek; it may be ſeen in Melchior Adam. I am ſure that Lorenzo Craſſo would have placed him in his liſt of Greek poets, if he had known as much as has been here ſaid of him. The forgetfulneſs of that Italian puts me in mind, that Mr Baillet has not given Hartungus a place among the critics.

(1) Melchior Adam, in Vitis Philoſoph. pag. 301.

(2) Janus Rutgerſius Variar. Lect. lib. vi, cap. vi, pag. 562.

(3) Infinitum eſſet ea perſequi in quibus longiſſimè à ſententia Apollonii aberrarit. *Id. ibid. pag.* 566.

(4) *This is it.* Multa tuli, didici, docui dum fata ſinebant, Mortuus in ſummo nunc requieſco Deo.

HEBEDJESU, Patriarch of the Neſtorians re-united to the Church of Rome, under Pius IV in 1562. I have already ſpoken of him under another name (*a*), which has been given him by divers authors; but what I have farther to ſay concerning him, I thought worthy to be told in this place. Since the printing of the Article ABDISSI, I have obſerved in a very curious work (*b*), that after the death of Simon Julacha [*A*], a Monk of the order of St Pachomus, who had been created Patriarch

(*a*) *Viz.* ABDISSI. *See the article.*

(*b*) *This is the title of it:* Hiſtoire Critique de la Creance & des Coutumes des Nations du Levant, publiée par le Sr de Moni, à Francfort chez Frederic Arnaud (*or rather at Roterdam, by Renier Leers*). 1684. *It is believed that Father Simon is the author of this Hiſtory.*

[*A*] *Simon Julacha.*] It ſhould be written *Sulacha*, as Aubertus Miræus writes it (1). We need not wonder that the critics can collect out of manuſcripts an infinity of *variæ Lectiones*, when printed books are not exempt from them. The Sieur de Moni gives the name *Caremit*, to a town of Meſopotamia, which Aubertus Miræus calls *Charemet*. The latter calls him *Donba Simon*, whom the other names *Denba Simon*. The one uſes the word *Zeinalbach*, the other chooſeth rather to ſay, *Zeinalbech*. They have both drawn from the ſame fountain, *viz.* from Peter Strozza's book *de Chaldæorum Dogmatibus*; why therefore do not they agree? Is it eaſier to write *Sulacha*, than *Julacha*, *Donba*, than *Denba*? Mr Arnaud, from the ſame original, ſays (2), that Simon Sulacha eſtabliſhed his ſee at Caramit. Mr Claude (3) makes uſe of the word Sulak. Father Paul, at the beginning of his fifth book (4), ſays, *one Simon Sultakam*. Mr Amelot makes

(1) Polit. Eccleſ. pag. 216.

(2) Perpet. défendue, lib. v, cap. xx.

(3) Réponſe à la Perp. défendue, lib. iv, cap. v.

(4) *Of the Hiſtory of the Council of Trent.*

triarch of the Neſtorians, by Julius III, “ Abdjeſu, or, according to the Chaldaic pronunciation, Hebedjeſu was made Patriarch in his room. Abraham Ecchellenſis, who has printed a little Syriac treatiſe of Abdjeſu [*B*], gives him the title of Metropolitan of Soba, in the preface he prefixed to that work. He obſerves, that this Hebedjeſu had compoſed ſeveral books in defence of the religion of the Neſtorians; but that coming to Rome in Julius the third's pontificate, he abjured Neſtorianiſm. It is he that is ſpoken of in the life of Pius IV, in whoſe time he made a ſecond voyage to Rome [*C*], to obtain the confirmation of his Patriarchate; and he aſſiſted at the Council of Trent [*D*]. As he was a man of parts, he had the dexterity to bring over a great number of Neſtorians to the church of Rome. But his ſucceſſors could not retain them in it, having neither his capacity, nor his addreſs. Ahathalla, who was alſo a Monk of St Pachomus, ſucceeded Hebedjeſu, and living but a little while, had Denha Simon for his ſucceſſor, who was before archbiſhop of Gelu. But he was obliged to leave Caremit [*E*], and to retire into the province of Zeinalbech, in the extremity of Perſia, having been forced to ſubmit to the power of the Patriarch of Babylon. His ſucceſſor, whoſe name alſo was Simon, reſided at the ſame place, which much diminiſhed the authority of this ſecond Patriarch”. This is what I have found in this book (*c*). I was of opinion, when I drew up the article of ABDISSI, that we might rely on the narrative of Father Paul. But I ought not to paſs over in ſilence, what I have ſince obſerved in Father Pallavicini, *viz.* that it is not true, that this Patriarch wrote letters to the Council. The following notes will give an account of what has been criticiſed in Father Paul's Narrative [*F*].

(*c*) Pag. 85.

makes no correction here. Theſe are trifles I confeſs: but from ſuch trifles as theſe, do often ariſe very conſiderable and important diſputes. *Hæ nugæ ſeria ducunt in mala.* It would go better with the Republic of Letters, if every one would think himſelf obliged to avoid even the leaſt faults.

[*B*] *Abraham Ecchellenſis printed a little Syriac treatiſe of Abdjeſu.*] I believe it is the ſame treatiſe Mr Arnaud ſpeaks of, when he cites (5) the *notes of Abraham Ecchellenſis, a Maronite, upon a catalogue of Chaldean books, made by Abdjeſu, or Hebedjeſu, a Neſtorian biſhop, who came over to the church of Rome.* Some pages after (6) he touches upon ſome circumſtances, which deſerve a place here, as giving us a more particular account what ſort of man our Hebedjeſu was. *He had formerly been one of the moſt violent Neſtorians*, ſays Mr Arnaud, *and written ſeveral books whilſt he himſelf was in that error, which he reckons up at the end of the catalogue of the Chaldean books which he wrote, and which has been tranſlated by Ecchellenſis. It appears by that catalogue, that the book intituled* Margaritarum, *was compoſed by him whilſt he was yet a Neſtorian.* The Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary obſerves (7), that the catalogue of the Syrian writers (it is doubtleſs that whereof Hebedjeſu is the author) was publiſhed at Rome, in Syriac in the year 1653, with a Latin verſion and notes, by Abraham Ecchellenſis. That this catalogue makes mention of ſeveral works compoſed in Syriac by Hebedjeſu; that there are two poems compoſed in Syriac, and written with his own hand, preſerved in the Vatican, where he gives the reaſons of his re-union, *&c.* Aubertus Miræus relates (8) that the picture of that Patriarch was placed in the palace of the Vatican, amongſt the cardinals and prelates, that accompanied Alexander III, when he received the ſubmiſſions of the emperor Frederic at Venice.

[*C*] *He made a ſecond voyage to Rome.*] I am ſurprized, that neither Father Paul, nor his cenſurer, cardinal Pallavicino, or any one of the many authors I have conſulted concerning Hebedjeſu, have mentioned a voyage which he made to Rome in Julius the third's time. It had not been a ſuperfluous, nor an uſeleſs, circumſtance; and I am perſuaded, they would not have omitted it, had they known it.

[*D*] *He aſſiſted at the council of Trent.*] I have elſewhere refuted this falſhood. It ſuffices to add here, that there is no writer, though never ſo inconſiderable, who ſometimes does not cauſe the greateſt authors to ſtumble. Peter Strozza, ſecretary to Paul V, was very likely miſled by ſome wretched chronicler; and it is no doubt upon the credit of that ſecretary, that the Sieur de Moni, and before him Mr Arnaud (9), have publiſhed, that Hebedjeſu aſſiſted at that council.

[*E*] *Denha Simon was obliged . . . . to leave Caremit.*] This happened at the time that Leonard Abel, biſhop of Sidon, went to the Levant with the character of Apoſtolic Nuncio (10). He was a native of Malta, and underſtood perfectly the Arabian tongue, which is as it were natural in that iſland. He died at Rome, in the year 1605, or 1606. He compoſed a book concerning the ſtate of the Oriental Chriſtians, whence Aubertus Miræus, from whom I copy this whole remark, confeſſes he has taken many things, in his *Notitia Epiſcopatuum.* He adds, that this work of Leonard Abel, is in manuſcript in the library of the deceaſed cardinal Aſcanio Colonna, protector of the churches of the eaſt, and that this library was wonderfully increaſed, by the addition of the books of cardinal William Sirlet.

[*F*] *The following notes will give an account of what has been criticiſed in Father Paul's Narrative.*] That author relates, that the letters of cardinal Amulius were read, *who, in quality of protector of the Oriental Chriſtians, ſent the news to the council of the arrival of Abdiſſi . . . . . He related, that the people under this prelate's juriſdiction, had been inſtructed in the faith by St Thomas and St Thaddæus, &c.* (11). The hiſtorian adds, that afterwards the Patriarch's confeſſion of faith was read, and *laſtly, the letters he addreſſed to the council, to excuſe himſelf for not being able to come there*, &c (12). Cardinal Pallavicino (13) tells the ſtory more at large, and with greater exactneſs, not confounding what Amulius ſaid by the Pope's order, with the conſequences which he drew himſelf from the narratives of the Neſtorian prelate. It does not appear, that Father Paul has made that diſtinction, but his principal fault lies in affirming, that a letter wrote by Abdiſſi to the council was read. Pallavicino maintains, that that letter never had a being but in the imagination of Father Paul (14).

(5) Perpetuité de la Foi defend. livr. v, chap. v.

(6) Chap. x.

(7) *Article* EBEDJESU.

(8) Polit. Eccleſ. pag. 217.

(9) Perpet. défendue, chap. x.

(10) *See* Aubert. Miræus, pag. 218, & ſeq. *of his* Status Politiæ Eccleſiaſticæ, *printed at Lyons in* 1620.

(11) *Father Paul's Hiſtory of the Council of Trent*, lib. vi, pag. 557.

(12) *See article* ABDISSI.

(13) Hiſtor. Concil. Trident. lib. xviii, cap. ix, n. 5.

(14) Sed hæc epiſtola non in alia pagina, niſi in Suaviana imaginatione fuit exarata. *Id. ibid.* n. 8.

HEGESILOCHUS was one of thoſe who committed infinite violences in the iſle of Rhodes, when it's Democratical government was chang'd into an Ariſtocratical, by the authority of *Mauſolus*, King of *Caria* (*a*). Athenæus has preſerved us a ſpecimen of the lewdneſs of theſe new maſters (*b*). They debauched the wives of the moſt eminent citizens, and abuſed many boys. In ſhort, they carried their licentiouſneſs ſo far, as to ſtake the honour of women at the game of hazard [*A*]. They made it

(*a*) *See* Libanius, in Argum. Orat. Demoſth. pro Rhod. libertate.

(*b*) Athen. lib. xx, cap. xii, pag. m. 444. ex Theopompo.

[*A*] *He was one of thoſe Rhodians who carried their licentiouſneſs ſo far, as to ſtake the honour of women, at the game of hazard.*] The abbot Lancelloti of Perugia, had here a fair opportunity to carry on it a rule, that the loſer ſhould be obliged to bring the lady that was played ſor, to him that had won her, and ſhould uſe all ſorts of methods to convey her into his arms. No trick or evaſion was allowed; perſuaſions and violences were to ſucceed one another, to proceed or to follow, according to the exigence of the caſe, till the wager that was played for was actually paid. He who moſt frequently, and moſt impudently, put in practice this new game at hazard, was Hegiſilochus (c). His drunkenneſs and other debaucheries rendered him ſo incapable of buſineſs, that he loſt his dignity, and was look'd upon, even by his friends, as an infamous wretch. This Hegeſilochus ought not to be confounded with one of that name, who came ambaſſador from the Rhodians to Rome [B], after he had exerciſed the principal dignity of their ſtate [C]. This man lived in the time of Perſeus king of Macedonia, the other in the time of Philip, Father of Alexander the Great.

(c) Ταύτην τὴν κυβείαν ἔπαιζον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ῥοδίων τινές, ἐπιφανέστατα δὲ καὶ πλειστάκις αὐτὸς ὁ Ἡγησίλοχος. Teſſeris hic luſerunt Rhodiorum quidam, ſed apertiſſime & ſæpiſſime. (*The Lyons edition of* 1657 *has* ſæviſſime) Hegeſilochus ipſe. *Id. ibid. pag.* 445.

on his Hoggidiani; for I do not believe, that our age has ſeen in any country of Europe, diſorders equal to thoſe of theſe Rhodians. I have heard indeed, that the footmen of a great miniſter of ſtate, who has not been many years dead, uſed to play at cards or dice for captains commiſſions; but beſides that this is very uncertain, it may be reduced to a ſmall matter, *viz.* that each of theſe footmen obtained for his new-year's gift the promiſe that ſuch a number of companies ſhould be given at his recommendation: after which they played this fund among themſelves, and when any one loſt a company, it was no longer in his power, but the winner's, to recommend any body. In all this diſorder it was ſtill eaſy to hinder the commiſſions from being given to people unfit for ſervice. So that this is nothing comparable to the debauchery of theſe petty tyrants at Rhodes, who ſtaked down at play, maiden-heads and cuckoldoms, and gave no reſpite to the loſer, till he had delivered them their prey. They were not content to venture the honour of the fineſt women, which is inſeparable, as the world will have it, from that of their huſbands: they alſo ventured their own: for the loſer was under a neceſſity of turning procurer. Here was reaſon, with a witneſs, to cry out, *O tempora? O mores?*

[B] *Another Hegeſilochus was ambaſſador at Rome from Rhodes.*] This we learn from Polybius (1). Geſilochus was the word in the manuſcripts; but Fulvius Urſinus (2) having obſerved in Livy (3) that this Rhodian was called Hegeſilus, corrected theſe two authors by one another, and reſtored Hegeſilochus to both.

[C] *He had exerciſed the chief dignity of their ſtate.*] It was called πρυτανεία (4), and the exerciſing of it was expreſſed by the verb πρυτανεύειν. The Latins called thoſe who exerciſed that dignity, Prytanes. 'Quadraginta navibus autore Hegeſilocho comparatis, '*ſays Livy* (5), qui cum in ſummo magiſtratu eſſet '(Prytanin ipſi vocant). —— *Having got together 'forty ſhips, by the advice of Hegeſilochus, who being 'chief magiſtrate (or Prytanis) as they call him.*'

(1) Excerpt. ex Legat. cap. lxiv.

(2) Notis in ea Excerpta.

(3) Titus Livius, lib. xlii.

(4) *See* Meurſius de Rhodo, pag. 65.

(5) Lib. xlii.

HEIDANUS (Abraham) divinity profeſſor at Leyden, was born at Frankendal, in the Palatinate, the 10th of Auguſt, 1597. He began his ſtudies at Amſterdam, whither Gaſpar Heidanus, his father, was called to the office of the miniſtry in the year 1608. An Engliſhman, called Matthew Slade, who was then rector of the college of Amſterdam, took particular care of Abraham Heidanus, whom he ſaw to be a youth of promiſing parts. Daniel Colonius applied himſelf with no leſs zeal to further the progreſs of this his diſciple, when he was committed to his inſtruction at Leyden, in the Walloon college. Colonius not being one of thoſe fiery ſpirits who were for carrying all things to the laſt extremities, when the Arminian diſputes began to riſe, made himſelf to be ſuſpected, as inclining that way [A]; ſo that there were many perſons who expreſſed their diſlike at Gaſpar Heidanus's ſuffering his ſon to ſtudy under ſuch a tutor. But the raſhneſs of this ſort of detraction produced a contrary effect to what theſe zealots aimed at: the miniſter of Amſterdam continued his ſon with Colonius, his old friend, whoſe orthodoxy he was aſſured of: he continued him with him, I ſay, that he might give his friend an authentic proof of their agreement in opinion. This ſcholar made good progreſs under Colonius, not doing as the generality did, who only ſtuffed their heads with the diſpute about the five articles of the Remonſtrants

[A] *Colonius being none of thoſe fiery ſpirits . . . . made himſelf ſuſpected of Arminianiſm.*] This is one of the moſt vexatious inconveniences that attend diſputes about religion. They who either through their natural temper, or an exact knowledge of the true intereſts of the church, are for healing and uniting things, and talk not of cutting off corrupted members, become ſuſpected of heterodoxy. They of a hot choleric, and furious ſpirit, the zealots, who have always at their tongues end *Principiis obſta*, and the maxim, *that evil muſt be ſtifled in it's cradle*, cry down the moderate men, and make them odious to the people; and this cauſes many who cannot kindle into paſſion, to abandon however the ſhew of moderation: they chooſe rather to offer a little violence to their natures and conſciences, than to paſs for baſe prevaricators. The hot men know well enough, that their calumnies will have this effect, and therefore they ſpread them as much as poſſible, both in converſation and in the pulpit, without any ſcruple. This is what happened at the beginning of the Arminian diſputes, if we will believe Wittichius. 'Vigebat illo tempore ob diſcrepantes de prædeſtinatione ſententias non tantum inter diſſentientes magna 'contentio quæ animos à ſe invicem alienabat, & diſjungebat, ſed etiam inter ὁμοψήφους, & idem de 'controverſia illa ſentientes obſcura quædam diffidentia, qua locus dabatur ſuſpicionibus quibus alii 'alios tanquam bonæ cauſæ minus addictos differebant. Qui enim ferventioris erant ingenii, & omnia 'ſumma tentanda in initiis putabant, ut in herba 'opprimeretur malum, quoſcunque videbant moderatius & lentius agere, ac de reconciliatione animorum potius laborare ſi vulnus forte poſſet conſolidari, ac ſchiſma, quod ad opera carnis pertinet, 'evitari, eos tanquam prævaricatores bonæ cauſa apud plebem criminabantur (1). —— *The different 'opinions about predeſtination, at that time, produced not 'only great contentions, among men from one another, 'which totally alienated the minds of thoſe who thought 'differently on that ſubject, but even produced amongſt 'thoſe who agreed in opinion concerning that controverſy, a ſort of diffidence which made way for ſuſpicions, every one accuſing another of want of zeal, 'in the good cauſe. For they who were of warmer 'tempers, and thought that the utmoſt ſerverities 'ought to be uſed to check the evil in the bud, accuſed thoſe to the people, as prevaricators in the 'cauſe of* GOD, *whom they obſerved to be of more 'moderate ſentiments, and who laboured to heal the 'wounds and prevent ſchiſm, which is one of the 'works of the fleſh.*' This ſeems to be a true picture. Theſe diſputes cauſe a violent war without, and ſow the wicked ſeeds of ſuſpicious within, which

(1) Wittich. in Orat. Funeb. Heidani.

Remonſtrants (*a*). He learned that and the reſt. He was made proponent at the ſynod of the Walloon churches, in the year 1618, and he preached in ſeveral French churches, with the applauſe of his auditors. He preached alſo in ſome Dutch churches with the like ſucceſs. He travelled two years, and ſaw part of Germany, Swiſſerland, France, and England. A little after his return he was promoted to the miniſtry, and he exerciſed his function at Naerden, to the year 1627, when he accepted of a call from the conſiſtory of Leyden. He was contracted to a daughter of one of the principal merchants in Amſterdam, when he took poſſeſſion of his new church, and a little after he celebrated his marriage. He was a good preacher, which, together with other good qualities, both of temper and parts, procured him a fair reputation. He was fifty years old, when the province of Guelderland, having reſolved to eſtabliſh an univerſity at Harderwic, offered him the divinity profeſſorſhip, upon very advantageous conditions. The church of Leyden, to keep him with them, allowed him either the ſame advantages, or, in general, what ſhould make him ample amends for his refuſal. The curators of the univerſity found a ſtill better expedient to prevent his going to Guelderland; they gave him the profeſſorſhip of divinity, which became vacant by the death of Conſtantine l'Empereur. He was ſo well ſatisfied with Leyden, that he would not hearken to the offers which the Elector Palatin made him, in the moſt preſſing manner. And yet that refuſal did not hinder that prince from giving him many honourable marks of his eſteem [*B*] when he paſs'd through Heidelberg, in the year 1656, in the journey he made to Straſburg with his family. The profeſſor Smidius, who invited him to a publick diſputation, and deſired him to impugn, did not come off honourably from the diſpute [*C*]. But Heidanus's victory on that occaſion, was not ſo plain as that in the Jeſuits college at Cologne [*D*]. This learned man died at Leyden very piouſly, the 15th of October 1678, having exceeded his eighty firſt year, which of all the climacteric years is look'd upon as the moſt dangerous, and with good reaſon. He left four children, two ſons and two daughters, thirteen grand-children, and three great grand-children. He had a great ſhare in Mr Des Cartes's friendſhip, and by that means he finiſhed the work he had begun, under Jachæus, philoſophy profeſſor at Leyden, one of the moſt ſubtle peripatetics then living. This Jachæus brought the queſtion

(*a*) Studioſi juvenes in partes diſtracti, & queſtionibus illis quotidjanis agitati, ſæpe quo ſe verterent neſcirent, & neglecto pietatis ſtudio ille doctiſſimus haberetur, qui de quinque iſtis articulis argute diſſerere & adverſarium argumentis irretire poſſit, ſecuri de reliquis fidei articulis cognoſcendis, quaſi in hoc ſolo omnis eruditionis culmen poſitum eſſet. *Witticbius, in Orat. Fun. Heidani.*

which are wonderfully fruitful. They produce, amongſt other things, as I ſaid juſt now, a great change in thoſe whom reaſon inſpires with a ſpirit of moderation. They are decried as ſecret traitors (2), and there are ſome among them, who will not continue reaſonable at that rate, and who believe their honeſty would coſt them too dear, if they muſt loſe their reputation for it; and therefore they turn perſecutors, to refute the calumny:

Tanto major famæ ſitis eſt, quam virtutis (3),

This was the conduct of a great many Catholics in France, who had diſapproved the rigour that was exerciſed againſt the Proteſtants under Francis I, and Henry II.

[*B*] *The elector Palatine gave him many honourable marks of eſteem.*] They who ſhall think it ſtrange that I give the particulars, will cenſure Mr Wittichius, rather than me. For there muſt be a greater allowance to mention theſe things in a dictionary of two volumes in Folio, when one meets with them in a funeral oration, than to diſplay them in a funeral oration, when they are only taken from a memoir in manuſcript. Let it be how it will, Mr Wittichius ſays, that Abraham Heidanus was invited to dinner every day by a new meſſenger, and he does not forget the preſents he received. ‘Dum Heidelbergam ‘appulit, nihil omiſit Sereniſſimus Elector quod non ‘ferventiſſimum erga ipſum ſpiraret affectum. Ad menſam quotidie, novis ſemper miſſis nunciis, invitabat ‘in colloquiis benevole complectebatur, donabat medio cervo & aliquot leporibus, nunciato hanc omnem ‘eſſe prædam quam illo die cepiſſet; quæcumque in ‘diverſorio cum familia conſumpſerat liberaliſſimè ſolvit, ‘& cum Bacheracum rediiſſet, ad ſuos Leidenſes reverſurus, magno dolio optimi & generoſiſſimi vini ‘Bacheracenſis voluit donatum. — *When be arrived at ‘Heidelberg; the elector omitted nothing that could ‘expreſs his great affection towards him. He invited ‘him daily to his table, and always by a new meſſenger; and converſed with him in the moſt affable ‘manner. He preſented him with a ſide of veniſon, ‘and ſome hares, telling him, that this was all the ‘game be had killed that day. He defrayed all his ‘and his families expences, while there, in the moſt ‘liberal manner; and when be returned to Bacherac ‘in his way to Leyden, he was pleaſed to make him ‘a preſent of a hogſhead of excellent Bacherac wine*’.

[*C*] *The profeſſor Smidius who invited him to diſpute . . . . . did not come off honourably.*] After Heidanus had excuſed himſelf ſeveral times from entring the liſts, he at laſt gave way to his repeated civilities, and attacked him upon the point of univerſal grace, which the Lutherans teach: great was the attention of the auditors, and the ſucceſs very glorious to the opponent. *Smidius ipſum palam non ſemel, ſed quia declinabat noſter, iteratis vicibus ad opponendum invitavit, quod, cum non videretur ſibi ſalvo honore ſuo poſſe detrectare, ea ſoliditate, ea efficacia Gratiam quam Lutherani urgent, Univerſalem ita oppugnavit, ut omnium oculos in ſe converterit, & apud omnes præſentes magnam admirationem ſuæ conſummatæ eruditionis excitaverit, diſputationis vero præſes multorum judicio parum honorificè ex illa diſputatione diſceſſerit* (4).

[*D*] *Heidanus's victory . . . . . was not ſo plain as that in the Jeſuit's college at Cologne.*] If this laſt victory was eaſier to be obſerved than the foregoing, it was in other reſpects not ſo honourable; for it conſiſted in a jeſt, to which the Jeſuit, who had ſhewn him whatever was to be ſeen in the college of Cologne, and perhaps was a lay-brother, could not anſwer a word. Heidanus asked the Jeſuit, whether JESUS CHRIST had done and ſuffered all that was neceſſary for our Salvation? *Yes*, ſaid the Jeſuit: *Then* replied he, *you are not his companions* (§α). The Jeſuit, confounded with ſhame and aſtoniſhment, had nothing to ſay for himſelf. Malincrot, dean of Munſter, who heard this converſation, and had got acquainted with Heidanus (5), congratulated him upon that victory, obtained, ſaid he, over my enemies. Wittichius, who alſo heard this diſcourſe, relates it in this manner: *Accidit ut poſtquam Collegium luſtraveramus Jeſuitarum, & jam in area eramus conſtituti ut patribus valere diceremus, converſus Heidanus ad Jeſuitam qui nos ducebat, ex ipſo rogaverit annon Jeſus omnia illa quæ ad ſalutem eſſent neceſſaria egiſſet & paſſus fuiſſet? Ac Jeſuita nihil ſiniſtri metuens, reſpondiſſet, Omnino: Heidanus regeſſerit: Ergo vos non eſtis Socii Jeſu; atque ſic illo in ruborem dato & attonito ut ne verbum quidem reſpondere poſſet, diſceſſit noſter & nos cum ipſo, atque patribus valere dixit. Quod Malincrotium tanto affecit gaudio, ut hoc nomine gratias ſolennes illi egerit, quod ſic ſuos hoſtes (ita vocabat Jeſuita) ad incitas ex improviſo redegiſſet.* I muſt confeſs, that hitherto I have ſought in vain wherein the jeſt lies. I cannot gueſs to what he alluded,

---

(2) *See the article* FERRIER (JEREMIAH), *remark* [*D*], *at the end, and remark* [*L*].

(3) Juvenal. Satyr. x, ver. 140.

(4) Wittichius, in Oratione Funebri Heidani.

(5) Dum Coloniæ initio itineris aliquot dies ſubſiſteret, in diverſorio inciderit in familiaritatem Malincrotii . . . . viri elegantiſſimi ingenii qui inter literatos primatum jure merebatur, hominis Pontificiæ quidem religioni addicti, ſed moderati, qui etiam nunquam cum Heidano de religione ſermonem voluit cædere. *Id. ibid.*

queſtion concerning ſubſtantial forms into great repute in the univerſity [*E*]. The young Heidanus, excited by the noiſe it made, examined the objections to the bottom, and compared them with the anſwers of Jachæus. He found, that philoſophizing upon theſe principles, was but loſing time, and he was in hopes, that ſome time or other a more certain road would appear (*b*). He thought he had found it in the converſation and writings of Deſcartes. But if this was more proper to lead him to the truth, it was not ſo commodious with reſpect to his fortune. For it expoſed him to a thouſand croſſes and perſecutions [*F*], over which his panegyriſt Wittichius, who ſupplies me with this article, thought it fit to draw a curtain. Heidanus was of a good family [*G*].
I ſhall

luded, or what rules of logic he made uſe of on this occaſion.

[(§ *a*) Strictly ſpeaking, to call ones ſelf companion to a perſon, ſignifies, that we pretend to be ſo in all reſpects. Now the Jeſuit confeſſed, that they of his ſociety were not companions of JESUS in the work of redemption. Therefore the Jeſuits, without reaſon, ſtile themſelves companions of JESUS. This was Heidanus's argument, to which the Jeſuit having made no reply, Malincrotius conſidered it as a victory for his friend Heidanus. REM. CRIT.]

[E] *Jachæus brought the queſtion concerning ſubſtantial forms into great repute.*] There is no queſtion in Phyſics, that is a clearer proof of the power of prejudices than this. They muſt needs darken the mind with reſpect to the moſt evident notions, ſince there are ſo many people, who cannot ſee the impoſſibility of extracting a ſubſtance from the boſom of matter, unleſs it was there before, or unleſs it be produced by a true creation. The peripatetics tell you very coldly, or rather they paſſionately maintain, that forms do not exiſt in their ſubject, and that nevertheleſs they are drawn out of it by an action which muſt not be called creation but eduction (6). This opinion would be the moſt monſtrous thing in the world, if it were not a more amazing prodigy to ſee ſuch a number of learned and ingenious men, eſpouſe ſtill at this day, the doctrine of ſubſtantial forms. Wittichius could not better prepare his auditors to obſerve in Heidanus a diſciple of Deſcartes, than by telling them what Heidanus, as yet but a ſcholar, judged of the principles of the ſchool, from the inexplicable confuſion in which Jachæus involved himſelf. ‘Fervebat in Academia quæſtio de formis ſubſtantialibus, earumque ex potentia materiæ productione, quæ mirificè non tantum Auditores, ſed & ipſum defenſorem earum acerrimum Jachæum vexabat & torquebat. Quam cum univerſa diſtinctionum ſuarum panopliâ expedire non poſſet, & ad liquidum oſtendere quænam illæ formæ ſubſtantiales eſſent, à materia realiter diſtinctæ & tamen materiales, quænam illa potentia materiæ, an pars ejus quædam converſa in formam, an vero ejus cùm producitur tantum ſuſtentaculum, an autem ut ex aſſere figura ſcamni educitur, ita eodem modo præexiſteret in materia forma; cumque aliæ plurimæ ſupereſſent difficultates, nec ullum ſuppeditaretur filum ex hoc labyrintho emergendi, factum eſt ut auditores & perſpicaciores diſcipuli, inter quos Heidanus primas obtinebat de tota hac philoſophandi ratione quam intelligendo aſſequi ſe non poſſe videbant, plane deſperarent (7). —— *The queſtion concerning ſubſtantial forms, and their production out of the power of matter, was then much debated in that univerſity, and wonderfully perplexed the ſcholars, and even Jachæus himſelf, a warm defender of them. And he not being able to extricate himſelf with all his diſtinctions, nor clearly ſhow what theſe ſubſtantial forms are, which are really diſtinct from matter, and yet are material, nor what this power of matter is, whether a part of it converted into form, or only a prop to it when it is produced, or whether as the figure of a bench is taken out of a plank, ſo form, in the ſame manner, preexiſts in matter. There being likewiſe many other difficulties, and no thread left to get out of this labyrinth, many of his moſt ſagacious hearers, and ſcholars, among the chief of which was Heidanus, gave over all hopes of this whole ſyſtem of philoſophy, which they found ſo unintelligible.*’

[F] *Des Cartes's method expoſed him to a thouſand croſſes and perſecutions.*] I do not know the particulars: but I remember a paſſage of his Conſiderations, where he relates that he had made himſelf many enemies, and had been expoſed to horrible ſlanders, for having always been averſe to too rigid maxims. He had not declared war againſt Proteſtant canons: he had not thundered in the pulpit againſt periwigs: he was not of opinion, that the Remonſtrants ought to be rigorouſly examined, who returned to the boſom of their ancient mother. Hereupon they repreſented him as an enemy to the new model of reformation, that was to be introduced; all his other opinions were ſcanned and ſifted; he was accuſed of being addicted to Des Cartes's opinions, and of contemning the Lord's day. But it is better to hear Heidanus himſelf. *Ætatem illam meam ancipitem duxi, modo tempeſtates, hinc expertus halcyonia, intra & extra nos paſſus adverſarios, hinc hoſtes, inde fratres, nec nunquam mordacis linguæ exceptus flagellis. Fuit, cum ſciſſam in partes chariſſimam hanc noſtram Eccleſiam metu prævidimus: tum nobis ſed eam ſapientiam ſimul largitus eſt Deus, ut quidvis pati potius, quam idipſum permittere, maluerimus: Hinc jam Moderatores, per contemptum (ac ſi probroſum hoc nomen foret) audivimus; jam ut Carteſii plus ſatis addicti Philoſophiæ; hinc Sabbathi contemptores; inde novæ quam urgebant quidam Reformationis hoſtes traducti ſumus: quod fœneratoribus trapeziticis pluſculum illis concedere viſi, nec Canonicis bellum indicere, neque de ſuggeſtis in comas detonare, neque Eccleſiæ diſciplinam ſtrictiùs exercere, nec Remonſtrantes ad nos tranſeuntes rigidiùs examinare, & quæ ſunt id genus alia* (8). Matters were carried ſo high, that he was depoſed from his place of profeſſor of divinity, upon the following account. The curators of the univerſity of Leyden publiſhed a decree the ſixteenth of January, 1676, forbidding the the profeſſors to treat in any wiſe of certain propoſitions (9), which had for ſome time been a ſubject of diſpute, and of Des Cartes's metaphyſics. Heidanus acted againſt that decree, almoſt in the ſame manner as the Janſeniſts did againſt the mandate of the archbiſhop of Paris, who forbad the reading of the New Teſtament of Mons. He animadverted upon it; and pretended to find nullities or irregularities in it: he maintained, that the twenty propoſitions which had been condemned, had not been diſcuſſed in the univerſity of Leyden, as the curators affirmed. He complained, that theſe gentlemen had ſuffered themſelves to be impoſed on by unfaithful extracts, and he made odious compariſons betwixt the Jeſuits, and thoſe who had furniſhed theſe extracts, the Jeſuits, I ſay, who had cauſed to be condemned at Rome for Janſenius's propoſitions, what was not to be found in his writings. He made another compariſon: for he alledged Giles Hunnius, a Lutheran, who, from artificial extracts out of the woks of John Calvin, pretended to convict him of Judaiſm. Laſtly, he illuſtrated the condemned propoſitions, and tryed to ſhew, that in the ſenſe of the authors they were taken from, they were orthodox. That work of Heidanus was printed in Dutch and afterwards in Latin (10). This offended the curators to that degree, that they degraded him. Heidanus's friends pretend, that nothing could have happened to him more ſeaſonably, ſince his great age would not ſuffer him to acquire a new reputation by his lectures, nor even to ſupport that which he had already gained; and beſides that, his degradation rendered him more dear and venerable to his own party (11), and might caſt an odium on the adverſe ſide.

[G] *Heidanus was of a good family.*] His great grand-father, Gerhard vander Heyden, was of Mechlen (12): ſo was his grand-father, Gaſpar vander Heyden, who was expelled his father's houſe on the account of his having embraced the reformed religion. He was miniſter at Antwerp, from whence he retired to Franckfort by reaſon of the perſecution. Here he found many refugees, whom the rigid Lutherans would not tolerate; which obliged them to petition Frederic II Elector Palatine, for a place of retreat. Peter Dathenus was at the head of them. The elector
granted

(*b*) *Taken from the Funeral Oration of Heidanus, ſpoke at Leyden, the twentieth of October, 1678, by the profeſſor Wittichius.*

(6) *A Jeſuit named John Guilleminot, doctor of divinity in the univerſity of Pont à Mouſſon, printed at Paris in the year* 1679, *two diſſertations* de principiis intrinſecis rerum corporearum, *in which he racks his brains a thouſand times to prove againſt Father Marignan, that the production of forms is not a proper creation. All in vain.*

(7) *See the article* GORLÆUS (DAVID), *remark* [*A*].

(8) Heidanus, Conſideration, ad res quaſdam nuper geſtas in Academia Batava, pag. 40.

(9) *They named twenty, ſome theological, and others philoſophical.*

(10) *I make uſe of the Latin tranſlation, printed at Hamburg,* 1678, *in* 8vo.

(11) *Florus,* lib. iv, cap. iv, *expreſſes that by* injuria favorabilis; *and* Tacit. Ann. lib. iii, cap. lxxv, *by* commendatio ex injuria.

(12) Proavus illi fuit Gerhardus vander Heyden, antiqua & honeſta familia natus Mechliniæ. *Wittich. ubi ſupra.*

I ſhall ſpeak of his writings below [*H*].

granted them the monaſtery of Frankendal, the monks being ordered to depart: theſe refugees performed their religious exerciſes in Flemiſh, and by degrees enlarged that monaſtery into a town. Dathenus being called to Heidelberg, our Gaſpar vander Heyden ſucceeded him as paſtor of that church. He was deſired to be preſent at the national ſynod of Embden, in the year 1571, and was even choſen preſident of that aſſembly. There the canons of diſcipline were made. A little after, returning to the Palatinate, the elector appointed him to attend his ſon, whom he ſent with ſome troops to the aſſiſtance of the Proteſtants, in the Low-Countries. Theſe troops were beaten. Vander Heyden retired into Holland, and preſided in the national ſynod aſſembled at Dort, 1574. He ſerved for ſome time the church of Middleburg; afterwards thinking himſelf ſafe by virtue of the pacification of Ghent, he returned to take the charge of his firſt flock at Antwerp. When that town was taken by the Spaniards, he returned to the Palatinate, and was made ſuperintendant of the churches about Bacharac. He was diſpoſed to quit that employ, in compliance with the deſires of the church of Frankendal, who deſired him for their miniſter again; when he died, leaving an only ſon of the ſame name, Gaſpar, who was born in the year 1566. The latter was firſt miniſter at Wolmerſheim, afterwards at Frankendal, and then at Amſterdam, where he died in the year 1626. He married Clara Vanden Borne, a daughter of the baliff of Frankendal, by whom he had ſix ſons, and eight daughters. Our Abraham Heidanus was one of his ſons (13).

[*H*] *I ſhall ſpeak of his writings below.*] He publiſhed ſome orations on divers ſubjects; the examination of the Remonſtrants Cathechiſm; a book in 4to *de Origine Erroris*; and a Dutch book, where he maintains the cauſe of God, againſt the Pelagians, and Semi-Pelagians, with ſuch force, that no body has been able to anſwer it. *Evolve ſolidiſſimum & nunquam ſatis laudandum Commentarium de Cauſa Dei Belgice ante plures annos conſcriptum (qui digniſſimus videtur ut in Latinam linguam transferatur, ut ab exteris legi poſſit) in quo adeo nervoſe, adeo eloquenter partes Dei defendit contra hominem, ut Pelagiani nihil in hunc uſque diem potuerint reperire quo vires ſuas plane attritas & fractas queant reſtaurare* (14). As to his *Corpus Theologiæ Chriſtianæ in quindecim locos digeſtum*, it was publiſhed after his death, in two volumes in quarto, by the care of Mr Crucius, his grandſon, in the year 1686. See the *News from the Republic of Letters* (15).

(13) *Taken from Wittichius's Funeral Oration.*

(14) Wittichius, ubi ſupra.

(15) *Month of June, in the Catalogue of new Books, n. 8, pag.* 729.

HELEN, daughter of Tyndarus, king of Lacedemon, was the fineſt woman of her age [*A*]; but otherwiſe, without honour and virtue, and of a life full of unhappy adventures. There are ſome authors, who have been ſo particular in deſcribing the perfections of her body [*B*], that they can by no means be excuſed, though they ſhould ſay, in expreſs terms, they only did it by way of amuſement. She was ſought in marriage by a great number of princes, and as her father did not know what courſe to take

[*A*] *She was the fineſt woman of her age.*] There are ſome authors (1) who have deſcribed the particulars of Helen's beauty. He who has done it moſt at large, is Conſtantine Manaſſes: he has included in eleven Greek verſes, a good number of epithets, repreſenting the corporeal perfections of this woman. He does not forget to tell us, that her beauty owed nothing to art, and that her complexion, without the help of waſhes, had a noble luſtre (2). They have aſcribed to her, legs finely made, a little mouth (3), a long, and very white neck (4), large eyes, and fine breaſts (5). Brantome furniſhes me with a paſſage upon this laſt part. *Helen*, ſays he (6), *deſiring once to preſent to the temple of Diana a handſome cup, by reaſon of a vow, employed a goldſmith to make it for her, cauſing him to take the pattern from one of her handſome breaſts, and to make it of white gold. In which it was hard to tell which was moſt to be admired, the cup, or the reſemblance of the breaſt, which appeared ſo pretty, and ſo like, that the artifical one could not but create a deſire for the natural. Pliny ſays this with great admiration, and is very particular, where he ſays that there is white gold, which is very ſtrange, and that this cup was made of it . . . He that would make golden cups by the great dugs of ſome women, had need furniſh the goldſmith with a great deal of gold, and would not eſcape afterwards the laughter of the world, when it ſhould be ſaid, behold theſe cups are modelled after the breaſts of ſuch and ſuch ladies. Theſe, inſtead of being like cups, would reſemble your round wooden pails the hogs are ſerved with, and the nipple would reſemble a rotten cherry.* Brantome is miſtaken in two things; for Helen did not conſecrate that cup to the temple of Diana; nor is it true that Pliny ſays, it was made of white gold. *Minervæ templum habet Lindos inſulæ Rhodiorum in quo Helena ſacravit calicem ex electro. Adjicit hiſtoria mammæ ſuæ menſurâ.* Theſe are Pliny's words in the fourth chapter of the thirty third book.

But to return to Helen, I ſay that the deſcriptions which have been made of her beauty, do not give an idea of it comparable to what we form in reading ſome lines of the Iliad, which have nothing of a deſcription in them. Homer contents himſelf with making the counſellors of Priamus ſays, upon ſeeing Helen coming whilſt they were deliberating about ſtate-affairs with their prince, that neither the Grecians nor the Trojans could be blamed, for enduring ſuch pains for the ſake of ſo divine a beauty.

Οὐ νέμεσις Τρῶας καὶ ἐϋκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς
Τοιῇδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα
πάσχειν·
Αἰνῶς ἀθανάτοισι θεῇς εἰς ὦπα ἔοικεν.

Non eſt indigne ferendum, Trojanos & bene ocreatos Achivos
Tali de muliere longum tempus dolores pati:
Omnino immortalibus deabus vultu ſimilis eſt (7).

They cry'd no wonder ſuch celeſtial charms,
For nine long years, have ſet the world in arms;
What winning graces! what celeſtial mein,
She moves a goddeſs, and ſhe walks a queen.

Pope.

[*B*] *There are ſome authors who have been very particular in deſcribing the charms of her body.*] A Spaniſh fryar obſerves, that the beauty of this woman was a miracle of nature; and that for a multitude of ages, it has been a common proverb, when any one intends to praiſe a beauty in the higheſt manner, to ſay, *ſhe is an Helen.* He adds, that John Nevizan ſaid, that of the thirty accompliſhments which muſt be united to the making a woman perfectly handſome (α §), not one was wanting in her. *Nacio eſta tan aventajada, y enrequecida de hermoſura, que fue un portento, un prodigio, y milagro de naturaleza. quedando deſde aquel tiempo à eſte, y aun para muchos ſiglos, en proverbio, ſu belleza, y gallardia: de tal ſuerte, que quando queremos ponderar, y encarecer la hermoſura de una muger, dezimos que es una Helena: y en tal lugar la pone, el Nivernienſe* (8), *Natal Comite, Bartolome Caſaneo, Juan Nemizano* (9); *el qual pone las treynta coſas, que ſe requieren para que una muger ſea perfectiſſima en ſu hermoſura: y dize que las tenia todas ſin faltar ninguna, la hermoſa Helena* (10). I believe he never ſaw the work of John Nevizan, and he ſpeaks of it only upon the credit of Chaſſanæus, who not only quotes it, but alſo repeats the Latin verſes, wherein are contained the thirty things, which, as is ſaid, conſtitute a perfect beauty, and which were all found in the body of Helen. ' Difficile eſt cuſtodire ' quam plurimi amant, (*it is Chaſſanæus who ſpeaks*) ' (11), ut ſatis colligitur ex dictis Jo. Nevizani Aſtenſis *in ſua Sylva nuptiali, in ampliatione* 7. *in verb.* ' *quæro juxta prædicta, ſi ſint duo.* ubi ponit, quid ' operetur

(1) Dares Phrygius, Cedrenus.

(2) Κάλλος ἀνεπιτήδευτον, ἀβάπτιστον, αὐτόχρουν Conſtantin. Manaſſes, apud Meziriac ſur Ovid, pag. 917.

(3) Cruribus optimis, ore puſillo. *Dares Phrygius.*

(4) Δειρὴ μακρὰ κατάλευκος. Conſtantine Manaſſes. *He adds, that on this account the poets feigned ſhe was born of a ſwan. Meziriac did not know that this thought came from Lucian. See the remark* [Q].

(5) Ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχουσα μεγάλους, εὔμαστος, Cedrenus.

(6) Memoires des Dames Galantes, Tom. I, pag. m. 275.

(7) Homer. Iliad. lib. iii, ver. 156. *See* Athenæus, lib. v, pag. 188, & Quintil. lib viii, cap. iv, pag. m. 378.

(8) *That is* Riviſius Textor.

(9) *He ſhould have ſaid*, Nevizano.

(10) Baltaſar de Victoria *Predicador de San Franceſco de Salamanca*, Theatro de los Dioſes de la Gentilidad, lib. ii, cap. x, pag. 181. *Edit. of Salamanca*, 1620.

(11) Bartholomæus Chaſſanæus in Catalogo gloriæ mundi, Part. II, Conſiderat. xxii, pag. m. 168.

take, for fear of provoking thoſe that ſhould not obtain her; he was taught by Ulyſſes, a very good expedient (*a*), which was to make all the rivals ſwear they would approve the choice he ſhould make of a ſon-in-law, and that they ſhould be ready to aſſiſt him againſt all pretenders that would go about to diſturb his daughter's marriage. Tyndarus thereupon diſpoſed of her to Menelaus [*C*]. She had already been ſtole away by Theſeus; but they were ſo good-natured as to believe, upon her word, that ſhe diſengaged her ſelf from that affair without the loſs of her virginity [*D*]. And yet there was nothing leſs true: Theſeus did not part with her, but after having been ſo familiar

‘ operetur pulchritudo mulieris. Et ibi dicit, quod debet habere triginta quatuor, ad hoc, ut ſit pulchra, quæ his verſibus ibi poſitis continentur:

Triginta hæc habeat, quæ vult formoſa vocari
  Fœmina, ſic Helenam fama fuiſſe refert.
Alba tria, & totidem nigra, & tria rubra puella:
  Tres habeat longas res, totidemque breves.
Tres craſſas, totidem graciles, tria ſtricta, tot ampla
  Sint itidem huic formæ: ſint quoque parva tria.
Alba cutis, nivei dentes, albique capilli,
  Nigri oculi, &c.

‘ —— *It is difficult to keep good watch over her, whom many love, as we may ſufficiently gather from the words of John Nevizan Aſtenſis, in his* Nuptial Grove, *ſeventh ampliation, on the words* quæro *&c. where he lays down the effects of a woman's beauty. And there he ſays, ſhe ſhould have thirty four, which are there contained in the following verſes:*

Th' ambitious fair who ſtrives for beauty's prize,
And hopes to Helen's glorious fame to riſe,
Theſe thirty charms muſt have to bleſs a lover's eyes.
Three white, three black, and three of roſy hue,
Three long, three ſhort, three ſlender to the view,
Three large, three ſmall, three ſtraight, as many wide,
All theſe together form the accompliſh'd bride.
The ſkin, the teeth, be white, the flaxen hair,
Black eyes &c.

[(§ *a*) See Brantome tom. II. pag. 330 of his *Dames Galantes.* Rem. Crit.]

I ſuppreſs the reſt of that ſmall Latin poem (12) though Chaſſanæus, who was the firſt preſident in in the parliament of Aix, has not ſcrupled to inſert it intire in his book. To which he adds, ‘ Non aliter hic inſiſto circa talia, cum ſatis, & ultra quam decens ſit, ponatur in dicta ſylva nuptiali. —— *I ſhall not inſiſt further on theſe things, enough, and more than is decent, being to be found in the ſaid Sylva Nuptialis.*’ I can aſſert with reaſon, that they who thus cite John Nevizan, are not exact, ſince he himſelf is but the copier of ſome other writers, whom he names. The fountain from which he traces it, is a French writer, whoſe book has this title, *De la Loüange & Beauté des Dames.* The eighteen verſes he gives us, and which Chaſſanæus gives us after him, were a tranſlation out of French made by Francis Corniger. He ſays it was not yet printed, but that there was an Italian verſion of it in a work of Vincent Calmeta, which is publiſhed. ‘ Et triginta requiſita, *ſays he* (13), enumerantur per Gallicum in libr. *de la loüange & beauté des dames* circa fin. quas Latinas fecit Franciſc. Corniger, quem nunc refero, quia non eſt impreſſus: ſed bene Vincentius Calmeta idem pones in carm, vulgari. incip. dolce Flaminia, & ecloga proxima ſeq. incip. per dare riſpoſta. Lege ergo verſus Corniger*i*.

Triginta hæc habeat &c.

‘ —— *And the thirty requiſites are named by a French author, in a book* De la loüange & beauté des Dames *near the end; theſe were tranſlated into Latin by Francis Corniger, which I now quote becauſe it is not printed. Vincentius Calmeta has given us the ſame in an Italian poem, which begins* Dolce Flaminia, *and in the eclogue which follows it, which begins* perdare Riſpoſta, *Corniger's verſes are as follows:*

Triginta hæc habeat &c.

If you conſult a book intituled, *Les neuf Matinées du Seigneur de Cholieres,* you will find (14) a ſonnet beginning thus:

Celle qui veut paroir des belles la plus belle,
Ces dix fois trois beautez, trois longs, trois courts, tros blancs,
Trois rouges, & trois noirs, trois petis & trois grands,
Trois eſtroits & trois gros, trois menus ſoient en elle.

That is,

She, who would excel other fair ones, muſt have theſe thirty beauties: viz. *three long, three ſhort, three white, three red, three black, three ſmall, three large, three ſtrait, three big, three ſlender.*

And which ends with *levres, doigts & cheveaux menus tell' fut Helene.* The concluſion is no leſs impertinent than all the preceding verſes. For to know that Helen was thus formed, it had not been enough to have ſeen her performing her exerciſes at Lacedæmon (15), it muſt have been either Paris, or Menelaus, or ſome of her former husbands or gallants.

[*C*] *Tyndarus . . . . diſpoſed of her to Menelaus.*] Some ſay (16) that Tyndarus did not chooſe his ſon-in-law himſelf, but left it to Helen to make choice of an husband out of all her lovers, and that ſhe preferred Menelaus before the reſt. Apollodorus (17) pretends, that Tyndarus reſigned his kingdom to his ſon-in-law; but others ſay (18), he only named him for his ſucceſſor. What a fortune then was Helen, who, with ſo incomparable a beauty, brought alſo a crown to her husband!

[*D*] *Theſeus had ſtole her . . . . they believed that ſhe diſengaged herſelf from that affair without the loſs of her virginity.*] Plutarch ſays ſhe was not yet marriageable when Theſeus ſtole her from the temple of Diana, where ſhe was dancing (19). He committed her to his mother's care (20), and put them both under the tuition of one of his good friends in Aphidna: and ſo went in purſuit of another rape (21), with his friend Pirithous. Caſtor and Pollux, Helen's brothers, loſt no time, but entered Attica with ſword in hand, to demand their ſiſter. The Athenians proteſted to them, they knew not where ſhe was. That anſwer did not ſatisfy them, and they were ready to commit hoſtilities, when one Academus acquainting them, that ſhe was at Aphidna (22), they aſſaulted that town, and took it by ſtorm. The gates of Athens were opened to them: they entered the town without committing any diſorders; only deſiring to be initiated into their myſteries. They carried Helen back to Lacedæmon; it is ſaid alſo, that they brought Theſeus's mother along with her, and that that good woman accompanied Helen (23) even to Troy (24).

Hellanicus makes Theſeus to be 50 (25) and Helen ſeven years of (26) age, at the time of her being ſtolen, and yet does not ſcruple to ſay that he deflowered her. Duris, the Samian (27), affirms that Helen was with child of Iphigenia, when ſhe was recovered from the hands of the raviſher. Pauſanias ſays the ſame thing, and adds that ſhe lay-in at Argos, at her ſiſter Clytemneſtra's, wife to Agamemnon, and that ſhe committed her daughter's education to her (28). He ſays that Euphorion, Alexander Pleuronius, and Steſichorus, had wrote in their poems, that Iphigenia was the daughter of Theſeus and Helen. The Argians were ſo far of this opinion, as to believe that Helen cauſed the temple of Lucina, which is in their city, to be built after her lying-in (29). A great many were impoſed upon on that occaſion. Agamemnon thought Iphigenia was his daughter,

(*a*) Apollodor. lib. iii. Pauſanias, lib. iii, pag. 103, *obſerves, that they ſwore upon the entrails (according to Ameſius's verſion upon the teſticles) of an horſe, which was ſacrificed, and afterwards buried in that place.* See alſo Iſocrat. in Encomio Helenæ.

(12) *It contains eighteen verſes.*

(13) Joannes Nevizanus, in Sylva Nuptiali, Art. xciii, pag. 182. Edit. Lugd. 1572, in 8vo.

(14) *Pag.* 167, *of the Paris edition, by John Richer,* 1585, *in* 8*vo.*

(15) Inter quos Helene nudis capere arma papillis Fertur, nec fratres erubuiſſe Deos. *Propert. Eleg.* xiii, *lib.* iii. See the article LYCURGUS, remark [*B*].

(16) Hyginus, cap. lxxiii.

(17) Biblioth. lib. iii.

(18) Hygin. ubi ſupra.

(19) Plutarch. in Theſeo, pag. 15.

(20) *Her name was Æthra.*

(21) *That of Proſerpina, daughter of Aidoneus, king of the Moloſſi.*

(22) *Herodotus,* lib. ix, cap. lxxvii, *attributes this to the Deceleans, a tribe of Athens, or to Decelus only.*

(23) *See the article* ACAMAS, *remark* [*A*].

(24) Plutarch. in Theſeo, pag. 15.

(25) Plut. ibid. pag. 14.

(26) Apud Tzetzen, in Lycophronem.

(27) Apud Meziriac, *upon Ovid's Epiſtles, pag.* 482.

(28) Pauſanias, lib. ii, pag. 65.

(29) Id. ibid.

liar with her as to get her with child, of which ſhe lay-in at her ſiſter's (*b*). The thing was kept ſecret, becauſe her ſiſter made the child (*c*) paſs for her own (*d*). The common fate of young women when they are carried away, is to change their condition, whether they own it or deny it. The handſomer they are, the more credible it is they have ſubmitted to this law. Our romance-writers have not obſerved this [*E*], or at leaſt

daughter, for his wiſe told him ſo. Caſtor and Pollux were perſuaded that their ſiſter returned a maid: for when they queſtioned her on that nice point, ſhe affirmed that no man had touched her. *Θησέως καὶ Ἑλένης τῆς Διὸς ἐγένετο θυγάτηρ Ἰφιγένεια, καὶ αὐτὴν ἐξέτρεφεν ἡ τῆς Ἑλένης ἀδελφὴ Κλυταιμνήστρα πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα εἶπεν αὐτὴ τεκεῖν. Ἑλένη γὰρ πυνθανομένη τῶν ἀδελφῶν, ἔφη κόρη παρὰ Θησέως ἀπελθεῖν. Theſei & Helenæ, Jove natæ filia fuit Iphigenia, eamque ſoror Helenæ Clytemneſtra educavit, Agamemnoni dicens ſe eam peperiſſe: nam Helenæ fratribus auſcultans virginem ſe à Theſeo diſceſſiſſe ajebat* (30). What ſhall we think then of Menelaus, who married her ſome time after? he honeſtly believed he had bedded a pure virgin, and yet he had married a mother.

When I ſaid Helen was queſtioned by her brothers, I followed the learned Mr Meziriac (31), who underſtood in that ſenſe the Greek paſſage which I have quoted: but others, perhaps, with more reaſon, ſay, that Caſtor and Pollux adviſed their ſiſter to give out that ſhe had preſerved her virginty. It was a very wiſe advice, and which might have been well ſpared to Helen as young as ſhe was: ſhe would have boaſted of that advantage, without any one's ſuggeſtion. She declares, in Ovid, that Theſeus obtained only ſome kiſſes of her by force; and that ſhe came off clear, abating only her fear.

Non tamen è facto fructum tulit ille petitum,
  Excepto redii paſſa timore nihil:
Oſcula luctanti tantummodo pauca protervus
  Abſtulit: ulterius nil habet ille mei (32).

No fruit his paſſion reap'd, tho' bolder grown,
And all I ſuffer'd was in fear alone.
'Tis true, he raviſh'd a reluctant kiſs;
From Helen he can boaſt no greater bliſs.

She confeſſes however that Theſeus was very young (33). Ovid has obſerved a decorum in making her ſpeak in that manner; nor has he obſerved it leſs, in introducing another woman, who believed Helen told a lye:

Illam de patria Theſeus, (niſi nomine fallor)
  Neſcio quis Theſeus, abſtulit ante ſuâ.
A juvene & cupido credatur reddita virgo.
  Unde hoc compererim tam bene, quæris? amo.
Vim licet appelles, & culpam nomine veles,
  Quæ toties rapta eſt, præbuit ipſa rapi (34)

One Theſeus (if I hit the name) before
Had born this fair one from her native ſhore.
Theſeus was young: and can you think the dame
Return'd a virgin from ſo fierce a flame?
Call it a rape; yet Helen ſure was kind;
Repeated rapes betray a willing mind.

The following remark will ſerve for a ſupplement to this.

Reflexion upon the rapes of fair damſels in romances.

[*E*] *Our romance-writers have not obſerved this.*] It is certain that Mr or Madam de Scuderi, and the other writers of romances, their contemporaries, have violently ſhocked probability, whilſt they have feigned their heroins were carried off, and yet will not permit us to believe, that they granted any favours to their lovers either by conſent or force. I confeſs they would be infinitely more inexcuſable, if they did not ſuppoſe as they do, that they were ſtolen, without any manner of conſent of theirs. There are countries where there is no puniſhment inflicted on ſuch as ſteal away young women who conſent to it: which is the cauſe that theſe ſorts of thefts are very frequent: and there is no body that believes the raviſhers are very dilatory in point of enjoyment: the firſt lodging they come to is the utmoſt, and moſt people are even inclined to ſuſpect, that enjoyment has preceded the eſcape. However it be, this ſort of rape is generally followed with matrimony; becauſe, if the parents did not conſent to the marriage, they would find themſelves burthened with a daughter diſhonoured in all mens opinion, and who is not like to find any other huſband unleſs ſome one can be content with another man's leavings. Let us confeſs then that romance-writers ſecure themſelves from the greateſt part of the ridicule, by the care they take to ſuppoſe that the damſel oppoſes as much as poſſible her being carried off: but yet they cannot come off clear; they overturn common notions, and form a ſyſtem diametrically oppoſite to the judgment of the public, and to good ſenſe. What motives have their heroes when they carry off a miſtreſs? Do they want to declare to her that they die for love of her, and that her cruelties throw them into deſpair? They have declared that over and over, and they have not recourſe to this violent method, till they know that ſhe is determined to make another man happy, and to be for ever indifferent to them. Do they hope their ſighs, ſo vainly waſted before they had provoked her, will move her under the lively reſentment ſhe is in againſt her raviſher? This is not probable: what they propoſe to themſelves muſt then be to take advantage of the condition, which ſubmits her to their diſcretion, and to bring her under ſuch terms as ſhall make it her intereſt to be the firſt to talk of marriage: this is no doubt one of the views of thoſe who carry off a young woman againſt her will. They perſuade themſelves that after ſhe has been ſome months in their power, her reputation at leaſt will ſuffer very much, and cannot be reſtored but by the nuptial benediction. And it is ſeen, that if others marry ſuch girls, they are ſuſpected to have taken up with the leavings of the raviſher. They are rallied upon it, and regarded as men of no delicate taſte: a new charge this againſt the romance-writers, whoſe heroes are paſſionately deſirous of marrying thoſe miſtreſſes, whom their rivals have carried off more than once. You will find criticiſms upon all this in Parnaſſus Reformed. Cyrus complains there, that they had not given him a heroin of an unblamable character. 'You will doubtleſs, *ſays he* (35), judge by 'this diſcourſe, that I am not ſatisfied with Mandana, 'and truly what would you have me to think of 'her, after ſhe has been ſo often run away with? 'Should I believe that ſhe eſcaped untouched from 'the hands of four men who carried her off? Or 'will thoſe that are the leaſt clear ſighted in 'theſe myſteries, doubt that you have given me 'another's leavings? Methinks you ſhould have put 'her modeſty to other ſort of proofs, theſe are too 'rude for things ſo frail, and Mandana was not a 'fort that could withſtand ſo many aſſaults? It may 'be ſhe might come off well from the firſt attack: 'I am willing to believe her ſo fortified with virtue, 'as not to ſurrender at the very firſt, and her honour 'might be ſafe, without, a miracle, in that ticklish incident? But relapſes are mortal in theſe matters: a 'ſecond carrying off ruins all: and a heroin who 'has no more than the remains of a ſhaken conſtancy, or perhaps leſs, makes but uſeleſs efforts to 'defend her ſelf.' Apollo lent an ear to that complaint, and pronounced this decree. 'We declare that 'we acknowledge none for heroes that are cuckolds, 'nor for heroins, thoſe who have been carried off 'more than once (36).' Sarraſin's ballad *upon the carrying off of Mademoiſelle de Bouteville by Monſieur de Coligny* (37), is another decree of condemnation: Here is the opinion of that fine wit.

Ce gentil joli jeu d'amours
Chacun le pratique à ſa guiſe,
Qui par Rondeaux & beaux diſcours,
Chapeau de fleurs, gente cointiſe,
Tournoy, bal, feſtin, ou deviſe
Penſe les belles captiver;

Mais

(*b*) *Clytemneſtr. Agamemnon's wiſe.*

(*c*) *The child of which Helen lay-in, was the famous Iphigenia.*

(*d*) *See the remark* [*D*].

(30) Nicander. lib. iv, Alteratorum, apud Anton. Liberalem, Narrat. 27.

(31) *On Ovid's Epiſtles, pag.* 483.

(32) Ovidius, Epiſt. Helenæ ad Parid. ver. 25, & ſeq.

(33) Et juvenem facti pœnituiſſe patet. *Ibid. ver.* 32.

(34) Ovid. in Epiſt. Oenones ad Parid. ver. 127, & ſeq.

(35) Parnaſſe, Réformé, pag. 165. Dutch Edit.

(36) Ibid. pag. 187.

(37) *Not he who fought with the duke of Guiſe, as the author of the Galantries of the Kings of France would have it,* Tom. II, pag. 223, *but his younger brother.*

leaſt they have preferred the ſcene of adventures, to probability. Every Body knows that Helen was ſtole away by Paris, the ſon of Priamus, and that all Greece reſented the injury Melenaus had received. Hence roſe the Trojan war, which has been ſo celebrated by the poets. Paris loſing his life in the laſt year of that war, his Brother Deïphobus ſupplied his place with Helen. The Grecians barbarouſly murdered him the night that Troy was taken: in which they were favoured by Helen as much as they could wiſh [*F*]. Menelaus behaved himſelf like a good-natured man; he reconciled himſelf to his wife without much difficulty, and took her very lovingly home again [*G*]. After his Death ſhe was forced to fly, and to retire into the iſle of Rhodes, where

Mais je penſe, quoy qu'on en diſe,
Qu'il n'eſt rien tel que d'enlever.
C'eſt bien des plus merveilleux tours
La paſſeroute & la maiſtriſe:
Au mal d'aimer, c'eſt bien touſiours
Une prompte & ſouëſve criſe,
C'eſt au gaſteau de friandiſe
De Venus la fêve trouver.
L' Amant eſt fol qui ne s'aviſe
Qu'il n'eſt rien tel que d'enlever.
Je ſçay bien que les premiers jours
Que Becaſſe eſt bridée & priſe,
Elle invoque Dieu au ſecours
Et ſes parens à barbe griſe:
Mais ſi l' Amant qui l'a conquiſe
Sçait bien la Roſe cultiver,
Elle chante en face d'Egliſe
Qu'il n'eſt rien tel que d'enlever (38).

(38) Sarafin, Poëſies, pag. 59, 60.

Love practiſes a thouſand arts,
To carry captive female hearts;
The ſoft ſing-ſong, the converſe ſweet,
The tournament, the ball, the treat.
But, let who will the truth conteſt,
Still I affirm, the rape is beſt.
It is love's boaſted maſter-piece,
Of all it's pains the readieſt eaſe;
The ſhorteſt way to Chloe's bed,
And hits the very nail o'th' head.
That lover is a fool confeſs'd,
Who ſees not, that the rape is beſt.
At firſt, I own indeed 'tis odds
But the dear nymph invokes the gods,
Calls heaven and earth to help: 'tis true;
But, if the lover know his cue,
The fair one ſhall herſelf proteſt,
That of all things a rape's the beſt.

[*F*] *The Grecians barbarouſly murdered Deïphobus . . . . favoured by Helen as much as they could wiſh.*] See in Virgil the horrible uſage of Deïphobus's body, and the manner how his wife betrayed him.

Atque hic Priamiden laniatum corpore toto
Deïphobum vidit, & lacerum crudeliter ora:
Ora manuſque ambas, populataque tempora raptis
Auribus, & truncas inhoneſto vulnere nares (39).

(39) Virgil. Æn. lib. vi, ver. 494.

Here Priam's ſon, Deïphobus, he found,
Whoſe face and limbs were one continu'd wound,
Diſhoneſt, with lopp'd arms, the youth appears,
Spoil'd of his noſe, and ſhorten'd of his ears.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Sed me fata mea, & ſcelus exitiale Lacænæ,
His merſere malis: illa hæc monumenta reliquit (40).

(40) Ibid. ver. 511.

Theſe are the monuments of Helen's love,
The ſhame I bear below, the marks I bore above.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

- - - - - flammam media ipſa tenebat
Ingentem, & ſummâ Danaos ex arce vocabat.
Tùm me confectum curis, ſomnoque gravatum,
Infelix habuit thalamus; preſſitque jacentem
Dulcis & alta quies, placidæque ſimillima morti.
Egregia intereà conjux arma omnia tectis
Emovet; & fidum capiti ſubduxerat enſem:
Intra tecta vocat Menelaum, & limina pandit.
Scilicet id magnum ſperans fore munus amanti,
Et famam extingui veterum ſic poſſe malorum (41).

(41) Ibid. ver. 518.

Then waving high her torch the ſignal made,
Which rais'd the Grecians from their ambuſcade.
With watching overworn, with cares oppreſt,
Unhappy I had lain me down to reſt,
And heavy ſleep my weary limbs poſſeſt.
Mean time my worthy wife our arms miſlay'd,
And from beneath my head my ſword convey'd,
The door unlatch'd, and, with repeated calls,
Invites her former lord within my walls.
Thus in her crime her confidence ſhe plac'd,
And with new treaſons would redeem the paſt.

DRYDEN.

She thought that this barbarous ſacrifice was neceſſary to appeaſe the fury of Menelaus: ſhe would have made a better judgment, if ſhe had conſidered more the good nature of that Grecian prince, and reflected leſs on the guilt of her own crimes.

[*G*] *Menelaus . . . . reconciled himſelf to his wife, without much difficulty, and conducted her very lovingly home.*] That poor cuckold was ſo ſilly as to believe his wife conſumed herſelf with grief in the houſe of Priamus, and this was the principal motive which induced him to make war againſt Troy.

Μαλιϛα δὲ ἵετο θυμῷ τίσασθαι
Ἑλένης ὁρμήματά τε ϛοναχάς τε.

Maxime vero cupiebat animo ulciſci
Helenæ raptumque gemituſque (42).

(42) Homer. Iliad. lib. ii, ver. 96, deſcript. *See the* Penſées ſur les Cometes, n. 237, pag. 717.

He has been handſomely reproached that his conjugal flame, which was almoſt extinct, rekindled upon Helen's quitting him for another man.

Acrius Hermionem ideò dilexit Oreſtes,
Eſſe quod alterius cœperat illa viri.
Quid Menelae doles? ibas ſine conjuge Creten,
Et poteras nupta lætus abeſſe tua:
Ut Paris hanc rapuit, tum demum uxore carere
Non potes, alterius crevit amore tuus.

'Tis ſaid, when fair Hermione began
To look with pity on another's pain.
Oreſtes an increas'd affection prov'd,
And, whom he fear'd to loſe, more fondly lov'd.
So Menelaus, when to Crete he went,
Found, ev'n in abſence from his wife, content:
But when ſoft Paris ſtole the Grecian dame,
The rape reviv'd the jealous husband's flame;
Redoubl'd paſſion ſeiz'd his amorous heart:
What husband from ſo dear a wife cou'd part?

Antiquity muſt needs be ſtrongly perſuaded of the good humour of cuckolds, ſince it repreſents the god Vulcan ſo eaſy to his wife. ' The god of our poet, ' when he caught one of his wife's gallants in bed ' with her, was content only to make them aſhamed. ' . . . . And for all that ſuffers himſelf to be melted ' with the ſoft careſſes which ſhe offered him, com' plaining that ſhe entertained a diſtruſt of his love.

where ſhe came to a miſerable end [*H*]: for ſhe was hanged on a tree. The ſcandalous diſorders of her life [*I*], did not hinder the paying her divine honours after her death, and attributing miracles to her [*K*]. It is not probable that Paris waited to enjoy

Quid cauſas petis ex alto? fiducia ceſſit
Quo tibi, Diva, mei? - - - - - *

Why ſeek you reaſons for a cauſe ſo juſt,
Or your own beauty, or my love, diſtruſt.

Dryden.

'Nay, ſhe makes a petition to him for one of her baſtards †, *Arma rogo genitrix nato*, which is generouſly granted her, and Vulcan makes honourable mention of Æneas ⸸: *Arma acri facienda viro*, with an humanity truly more than human: and ſuch an exceſs of goodneſs, I am willing ſhould be left to the gods ‡, *Nec divis homines componier æquum eſt* (43).' Theſe words of Montagne are too ingenious to diſpleaſe the judicious in this place. But not to diſſemble, I muſt needs own, there have been ſome ſo officious, as to do Menelaus the honour, to arm him with reſentment againſt the infidelity of Helen. In the Troades of Euripides, he threatens to kill her; and ſhe is forced to make uſe of all ſorts of excuſes to obtain pardon. She ſays, amongſt other things, that after the death of Paris ſhe often endeavoured to make her eſcape from Troy to the Grecian camp, and that the centinels ſurprized her endeavouring to come down the walls by a rope. She adds, that Deïphobus married her by force. Pauſanias makes mention of a ſtatue of Menelaus, purſuing Helen with his ſword in hand, to kill her, when Troy was taken (44). But others ſuppoſe he threw away his ſword when he ſaw her boſom, and ſuffered that treacherous bitch to kiſs him, and returned her careſſes.

Ἑλὼν δὲ Τροίαν, εἶμι γὰρ κἀνταῦθά σοι,
Οὐκ ἔκτανες γυναῖκα χειρίαν λάβων·
Ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἐσεῖδες μαστὸν, ἐκβαλὼν ξίφος
Φίλημ᾽ ἐδέξω, προδότιν αἰκάλλων κύνα.

Capta autem Troja (nam & huc tua cauſa veniam)
Non interfeciſti uxorem redactam in tuam poteſtatem:
Sed poſtquam vidiſti ubera abjecto gladio
Oſculum accepiſti adulans canem proditricem (45).

When Troy was ſack'd, and Helen in your power,
Her life you ſpar'd, and ſeeing her fair boſom,
The avenging ſword dropp'd from your coward hand,
Baſely you then receiv'd her falſe careſſes,
And hugg'd the treacherous monſter to your breaſt.

[*H*] *Where ſhe came to a miſerable end.*] Nicoſtratus and Megapenthus, baſtards of Menelaus, had expelled her from Lacedæmon. She retired to Polyxo, her relation, the widow of Tlepolemus, king of Rhodes, and regent of the kingdom during her ſon's minority. Polyxo, remembering that her huſband died at the ſiege of Troy, and ſo looking upon Helen as the cauſe of her widowhood, reſolved to be revenged of her: and, to that end, when Helen was bathing, ſent women dreſſed in the habit of furies, who hanged her on a tree. The Rhodians, deſirous to immortalize that accident, built a temple, which they called the temple of *Helena Dendritis*. This I have from Pauſanias (46). The author of the old and new Athens, has reaſon to ſay (47), that a *thouſand people talk of the fair Helen, who know nothing of her being hanged.* What is ſaid in Moreri's Dictionary, that *one of her companions* murdered her, is not true. You will find in Photius that ſhe ſtrangled herſelf, and that near the oak on which ſhe hung, there grew an herb, which they called *Heleneion*, which made people quarrelſome who eat of it (48). Pliny attributes very different qualities to this herb; it beautified women, and exhilarated thoſe who mixed it in their wine (49). He obſerves (50), that it was ſaid to ſpring from the tears of Helen. You will find in the ſame Photius (51), that Thetis put Helen to death, during the return of the Greeks; and, according to others, that ſhe went with Menelaus into Taurica Cherſoneſus in queſt of Oreſtes, and that there they were both ſacrificed by Iphigenia. I have read in Vigenere (52), that Herodotus relates that Nicoſtratus and Megapenthus expelled Helen, and that ſhe retired to Rhodes to Polypo, the widow of king Tlepolemus, and that Polypo's maids hating Helen, *becauſe ſhe had been the cauſe of their late lord's death, one day as ſhe went ont to recreate herſelf in an orchard without their miſtreſs, they hung her up and ſtrangled her on one of the trees.* I find no ſuch thing in Herodotus.

The Spaniſh monk whom I have above-cited, is groſsly miſtaken concerning the cauſes of the death of Helen. He ſays (53) that having retired to Rhodes, to Polyxena, wife of Ptetolemo, king of that iſle, her conduct was very irregular, as it had always been from her earlieſt youth; that ſhe fell in love with the king, and gave herſelf wholly up to his pleaſures. Polyxena, enraged with jealouſy, cauſed her to be hanged on a tree. Pauſanias, adds he, affirms, that by reaſon of her having committed adultery with Ptetolemo, during the Trojan war, Polyxena put her to death. Judge by this, if that Spaniſh author is faithful, or ſkillful in his citations.

[*I*] *The ſcandalous diſorders of her life.*] Several authors (54) *have blamed her for her lewdneſs, but eſpecially Lycophron in his Caſſandra, where he calls her* πεντάλεκτρον, *that is to ſay, a woman of five huſbands* (55) . . . . *Euripides, in his Andromache, makes Hermione, Helen's daughter, to be thus reproached for the vice of her mother.*

Μὴ τὴν τεκοῦσαν τῇ φιλανδρίᾳ γύναι
Ζήτει παρελθεῖν·

Strive not in love's ſoft buſineſs to excell
A mother's ſkill, who knew the trade ſo well.

. . . . *Ptolemæus Hephæſtion in Photius, tells a very particular ſtory, which confirms Helen's incontinence.* The fact is, *that a certain Arcadian, called Peritanus, meeting Helen with Paris Alexander, in the country of Arcadia, had to do with her. But Paris, to chaſtiſe the adulterer, cut off his parts of generation. And hence they that are thus caſtrated, are, in Arcadia, called Peritanes.* Lycophron has uſed her more ſeverely, than to call her a wife of five huſbands; they pretend that he called her dove, becauſe of her laſciviouſneſs, and bitch becauſe of her impudence, or her promiſcuous uſe of men (56). I do not ſee that thoſe who would excuſe Helen, alledge any other reaſon than this (57), that ſhe was inticed by the gods to follow Paris (58). There is no crime whatever, but may be juſtified by the ſame apology. But I confeſs, that taking the method of Homer's ſcholiaſt, one might make a good apology. What he ſays is this (59). '*Alexander, ſon of Priamus, travelled out of Aſia to Lacedæmon, where he formed the deſign of ſtealing Helen, who had lodged him in her palace: but ſhe, who had been vertuouſly educated, and loved her huſband tenderly, would never conſent to it, ſaying ſhe liked a lawful marriage better than a ſhameful adultery, and that ſhe choſe rather to ſtay with Menelaus. So Paris not being like to ſucceed, it is ſaid, that Venus bethought herſelf of a ſtratagem, which was to metamorphoſe Alexander into the ſhape of Menelaus, and that ſhe cheated Helen by that means: for believing him to be the true Menelaus, ſhe made no ſcruple to follow him, and to go even to his ſhips, where Paris having made her go aboard, preſently hoiſed his ſails to the wind.* Euſtathius alſo, upon the ſame book of Homer, touches upon this ſtory, and obſerves, that Penelope governed her ſelf much more prudently: for though ſhe thought ſhe knew Ulyſſes again, yet ſhe would not venture to gratify him with any thing, and eſpecially to lie with him, till he had told her many particulars, and given her many ſigns, to aſſure her, that he was really her huſband, and that ſhe could not be miſtaken (60).'

[*K*] *Did not prevent paying her divine honours . . . and attributing miracles to her.*] I have already ſpoke of the temple conſecrated to her by the Rhodians. Pauſanias makes mention of that which was built to her in the country of Lacedæmon (61). As to her miracles, joy her, till they landed in an iſland [*L*]. Nevertheleſs, it is ſaid, that he built in that iſland a monument of his firſt enjoyment. It is added that Menelaus did not ruin that monument [*M*], but contented himſelf with ſignifying, that he had ſatisfaction given

---

* Virgil. Æneid. lib. viii, ver. 395.

† Ibid. ver. 383.

⸸ Ibid. ver. 441.

‡ Cat. ad Mal.

(43) Montagne, Eſſais, livr. iii, chap. v, pag. m. 138.

(44) Pauſanias, lib. v, pag. 166.

(45) Eurip. in Androm. ver. 627, pag. m. 520.

(46) Pauſan. lib. iii, pag. 102.

(47) Pag. m. 63.

(48) Photius, pag. 479, ex Ptolem. Hephæſtione.

(49) Plin. lib. xxi, cap. xxi.

(50) Ibid. cap. x.

(51) Photius, pag. 479.

(52) *Upon the Proteſilaus of Philoſtratus*, fol. 235, verſo, Edit. in 4to.

(53) Baltaſar de Victoria, Theat. de los Dioſes de la Gentilidad. lib. ii chap. xix, pag. 189.

(54) *Meziriac upon Ovid's Epiſtles, pag.* 485, & ſeq.

(55) *Viz.* Theſeus, Menelaus, Paris, Deïphobus, *and* Achilles.

(56) Vid. *Canterus and Meurſius, upon the 87th verſe of* Lycophron.

(57) *See Homer,* Odyſſ. xxiii, *and Euripides in his* Troades, *and in* Andromache, apud Meziriac, *on Ovid's Epiſt.* *pag.* 486, 487.

(58) *See the remark* [*X*].

(59) In lib. xxiii, Odyſſ. apud Meziriac, pag. 487.

(60) *See the Critical Obſervations on Maimbourg, concerning the adventure of Alcmena.* Nouvell. Lettres, pag. 284. *See alſo* pag. 277, 278.

(61) Pauſan lib. iii, pag. 96.

racles, it ſuffices to obſerve, that ſhe ſtruck Steſichorus blind, who had ventured to ſlander her in his poems (62); and that ſhe reſtored his ſight upon his ſinging his Palinode (63). She beſtowed extraordinary beauty upon an ugly girl, who was every day brought to her temple (64). See the article ACHILLEA, where we have ſaid, ſhe was the wife of Achilles in the other world; and that ſhe knew how to make her ſelf conſiderable there. See alſo Iſocrates, in his panegyric on Helen; you will there find, that ſhe not only obtained immortality, but alſo a divine power, which ſhe employed in placing her brothers and husband in the number of the gods: ſo that if Caſtor and Pollux were capable of ſuccouring thoſe who during tempeſts made their prayers to them, it was becauſe their ſiſter had communicated that power to them, to prove to the world the metamorphoſis ſhe had wrought upon them. They were in their graves, when ſhe made them gods. What is moſt laudable in this is, that having conferred the ſame gift on Menelaus, ſhe deſired to live with him eternally. *Τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἤδη κατεχομένους ὑπὸ τῆς πεπρωμένης, εἰς θεοὺς ἀνήγαγε· βουλομένη δὲ πιστὴν ποιῆσαι τὴν μεταβολὴν, οὕτως αὐτοῖς τὰς τιμὰς ἐναργεῖς ἔδωκεν, ὥσθ' ὁρωμένους ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ κινδυνευόντων σώζειν, οἵ τινες ἂν εὐσεβῶς αὐτοὺς ἐπικαλέσωνται· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Μενελάῳ τοσαύτην χάριν ἀπέδωκεν . . . ὥστε . . . . οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ θεὸν ἀντὶ θνητοῦ ποιήσασα σύνοικον αὐτῇ καὶ πάρεδρον εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα κατεστήσατο. Fratres, qui fato jam conceſſerant, inter Deos retulit. Cui mutationi cum autoritatem & fidem afferre vellet, honores ita manifeſtos eis dedit, ut in mari conſpecti, periclitantes ſervent, quicumque ipſos piè invocarint. Deinde Menelao tantam gratiam retulit, ut . . . . . non tantum. . . . ſed mortalem ejus ſortem divinitate mutarit, eumque contubernalem ſibi & aſſeſſorem in omne ævum conſtituerit* (65). Iſocrates alledges, as a proof of this, the practice of the Lacedemonians, who offered ſacrifices to Menelaus and Helen, not as to heroes, but as to gods. The ſame author obſerves, it was at Therapnæ that theſe divine honours were paid them. But Pauſanias does not ſay, that Helen had a temple in that city; he only ſays, that that of Menelaus was there, and that it was believed that Menelaus and Helen were buried in it (66).

I wiſh that Theodoret had built upon the authority of Iſocrates, and not upon that of Euripides, to inſult the Pagans with their numbring ſo famous an adultereſs as Helen among the gods. For though Euripides has feigned that ſhe did not die, but was exalted to the heavens, by the favour of the gods, and immortalized, it does not follow from thence, that this was the opinion of the Pagans. The epiſodes of a tragedy were ſo much at the poet's diſpoſal, that unleſs they were known to be true on other grounds, they were looked upon as the particular fictions of the tragedian. Theſe are Theodoret's words: *Καὶ τὴν Ἑλένην δὲ, μετὰ τὴν πολυθρύλλητον καὶ παμπόλλην μοιχείαν, τοῦ Μενέλεω χωρίσαντες, εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, ᾗ φησιν Εὐριπίδης, ἀνήγαγον* (67).

[*L*] *It is not probable that Paris delayed enjoying her till they came . . . into an iſland.*] Homer, who gives him ſo much patience, did not do him much honour, according to the principles of gallantry (68). See to what end he mentions that circumſtance of place. Paris, being vanquiſhed by Menelaus, was miſerably reproached by Helen. He prays her not to inſult him, but to go to bed with him, pretending he never felt ſo much of the fire of love, not even when he enjoyed her firſt in the iſle of Cranaë. Hereupon he roſe from his ſeat to go to bed, and was followed by the fair Helen without any reluctance.

Οὐ γάρ πώ ποτέ μ' ὧδε ἔρως φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν,
Οὐδ' ὅτε σε πρότερον Λακεδαίμονος ἐξ ἐρατεινῆς
Ἔπλεον ἀρπάξας ἐν ποντοπόροισι νέεσσι,
Νήσῳ δ' ἐν Κραναῇ ἐμίγην φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ.
Ὥς σέο νῦν ἔραμαι, καί με γλυκὺς ἵμερος αἱρεῖ.
Ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἄρχε λέχος δὲ κιὼν, ἅμα δ' εἵπετ' ἄκοιτις.

Non enim unquam me ſic amor mentem complexus eſt,
Ne tunc quidem quando te pridem Lacedæmone ex amabili
Navigabam raptâ in tranſeuntibus pontum navibus,
Inſulâ vero in Cranaë miſtus ſum amore & concubitu:
Sicut te nunc amo, & me dulce deſiderium capit.
Dixit, & præibat in lectum aſcendens, ſimul autem ſequebatur uxor (69).

Not thus I lov'd thee when from Sparta's ſhore,
My forc'd, my willing, heavenly prize I bore,
When firſt entranc'd in Cranaë's iſle I lay,
Mix'd with thy ſoul and all diſſolv'd away.
Thus having ſpoke, the enamour'd Phrygian boy
Ruſh'd to the bed impatient for the joy;
Him Helen follow'd ſlow with baſhful charms,
And claſp'd the blooming hero in her arms.

POPE.

Jaſon has a patience aſcribed to him, more wonderful ſtill than this of Paris would be; which makes it hard to diſcover, wherein your writers of romances employ their judgment. Ought they not above all things to ſtick to probability? And do not they tranſgreſs it, when they ſuppoſe, on one hand, Medea ſo much in love with Jaſon, as to be carried by her paſſion into the greateſt crimes, and, on the other, ſpending many months with him, without conſummating the marriage? Obſerve too, that it had not been conſummated ſo ſoon, but for the advice which was given to Jaſon. *Quem cum interrogaret Arete, quidnam eſſet judicaturus, reſpondit Alcinous, Si virgo fuerit Medea, parenti redditurum: ſin autem mulier, conjugi. Hoc cum audivit Arete à conjuge, mittit nuntium ad Jaſonem; & is Medeam noctu in antro devirginavit* (70).

[*M*] *That Menelaus did not ruin that monument.*] Here is a paſſage which would bring Homer off, if it were true. It is pretended, 'that on the ſhore of the 'main land, which is over-againſt the *Iſle of Cranaë*, 'there was a temple of Venus, which Paris cauſed to 'be built, after that agreeable conqueſt . . . to teſtify 'the tranſports of his joy and gratitude. He gave this 'Venus the name *Migonitis*, and called the territory '*Migonion*, from a word ſignifying the amorous 'myſtery that had been acted there. Menelaus, the 'unfortunate husband of that princeſs, 18 years after ſhe 'had been carried away from him, went to viſit this 'temple, the ground whereof had been witneſs to his 'miſfortune, and the infidelity of his wife. He did not 'deſtroy it, but only placed on each ſide of the ſtatue of 'Venus, the images of two other goddeſſes, *viz.* Thetis 'and Praxidice, meaning the goddeſs of Puniſhment, 'to ſignify that he would not ſuffer the affront to paſs 'unrevenged. But he had not the good fortune to ſee 'himſelf revenged of Helen; for ſhe ſurvived him (71).' The author of the News from the Republic of Letters, having cited this paſſage, adds this reflexion (72): 'Theſe laſt words would furniſh an occaſion of 'criticizing, to any one that would ſeek it. For it is 'certain, that eighteen years after Helen was ſtolen, 'Menelaus had revenged himſelf, as amply as he could 'wiſh, by the ruin of the kingdom of Priamus, the 'father of the raviſher. It is therefore very likely, that 'that image of the goddeſs Praxidice, had no reference 'to a future revenge, but to a revenge already taken, 'and it is not likely, that it had relation to any 'deſign of puniſhing Helen. For if Menelaus had not 'been ſincerely reconciled to his wife, he would not 'have delayed ſo long to puniſh her. The hiſtory of 'that age aſſures us, that that artful woman made 'her peace with her husband, the very night the 'Greeks became maſters of the town, which is very

'probable

(62) Id. ibid. pag. 102.

(63) Suidas, in Στησίχορος. & ante ipſum Iſocrates in Helenæ encomio.

(64) Herodot. lib. vi, cap. lxi.

(65) Iſocrates in Helenæ encomio, pag. m. 320.

(66) Pauſan. lib. iii, pag. 102.

(67) Theodor. Therapeut. Serm. iii.

(68) *See the News from the Republic of Letters, Jan.* 1687, *pag.* 68.

(69) Homer. Iliad. lib. iii, ver. 442. *See citation* 45), *of the article of the third duke of* GUISE.

(70) Hygin. cap. 23, pag. m. 60.

(71) *Guillet, Athenes anciennes & nouv. pag.* 63. *Note*, That I cite his own words, not only becauſe they are well written, but alſo becauſe they give occaſion for criticiſm. The facts he mentions are taken from Pauſanias. *Lib. iii, pag.* 105.

(72) News from the Republic of Letters, Jan. 1687, pag. 67.

given him for the injury. A modern author does not ſeem to have taken right Menelaus's meaning (*e*). Some authors ſay, that Paris did not long preſerve his prize [*N*]. Many fables have been vented about the birth of Helen [*O*], I mean about the egg
from

‘ probable, conſidering the character good Menelaus ‘ has in the Iliad.’ Be it how it will, I will not maintain on one hand, that there was no temple of Venus Migonitis, near the iſle of Cranaë; nor acknowledge on the other, that Paris cauſed it to be built for the reaſon that is given. I keep to probability, which ſtrongly inclines one to believe, that Paris enjoyed Helen before he left Lacedæmon. What ſhould hinder him? Manelaus was in the iſle of Crete (73); his preſence could not have hindered Helen from favouring her handſome gueſt, who made love to her; his abſence was ſtill leſs capable of doing it. See how Paris uſed him, and ridiculed his abſence:

Sed tibi & hoc ſuadet rebus, non voce, maritus,
Neve ſui furtis hoſpitis obſtet abeſt.
Non habuit tempus, quo Creſſia regna videret,
Aptius, ô mira calliditate virum! &c. (74)

That husbands for their wives ſhou'd pimp, is meet:
Your's choſe the propereſt time to viſit Crete.
Kindly the good man favours your eſcape,
And, by his abſence, ev'n perſuades a rape.

He was not baſhful with the ladies: Helen confeſſes he was not ſo reſerved as Theſeus, who did no more than kiſs her:

Quæ tua nequitia eſt, non his contenta fuiſſet
Dî melius? ſimilis non fuit ille tui,
Reddidit intactam (75).

Your boldneſs greater liberties had claim'd;
Theſeus, more modeſt, gave me back unſtain'd.

Paris preſſed her ſo warmly one day, that ſhe ran away from him, and loſt one of her ſhoes in her flight, the place in which ſhe loſt it was Sparta, and was called *Sandalion*, from that ſhoe (76).

[*N*] *Some authors ſay that Paris did not long preſerve his prize.*] It is pretended that he ſailed towards Ægypt, and landed at the mouth of the Nile, called Canopus, where there was a temple of Hercules, which was a ſanctuary to fugitive ſlaves. Some of Paris's ſlaves having fled thither, acquainted the prieſts with the action of their maſter; whereupon king Proteus ordered him to be ſeized, reproached him ſeverely, and afterwards commanded him immediately to depart. But he kept Helen, with all the other things of which they had robbed Menelaus (77). It is added, that Paris had not enjoyed that woman, before his arrival in Egypt (78); a tale that I have already refuted. I do not know very well, how Proteus uſed her, and whether, whilſt he waited till he ſhould reſtore her to her rightful lord, he did not obtain the laſt favours from her (79). I only know, that Herodotus thinks it very probable, that ſhe was never brought to Troy; for he could not perſuade himſelf that Priamus could be ſo ſtupid, as to chooſe rather to keep that woman, than avoid the fatal conſequences of a refuſal (80). He thinks then, that the Trojans anſwered the Grecian embaſſadors ſincerely, that Helen was not at Troy, and that they ought to ſearch after her in Egypt, where ſhe was kept by king Proteus (81). The Grecians taking this anſwer for a ſharp raillery, prepared to beſiege the town, which when they had taken, without finding Helen in it, they were perſuaded ſhe was with king Proteus; whereupon Menelaus ſet ſail for Egypt, and recovered his wife from thence (82). There is ſuch a prodigious medley of variations in mythological authors, that I do not wonder to find Servius ſaying (83), I. That Theſeus, after he had ſtoln Helen, gave her to Proteus king of Egypt, and that Menelaus recovered her out of Proteus's hands, after the war of Troy: ſo that that war was not kindled upon the account of the rape of Helen by Paris, but of the affront which the Trojans offered Hercules, in ſhutting their gates againſt him, when he was in queſt of Hylas. II. That Helen was taken out of the hands of Proteus, to whom Theſeus had given her, and put into the power of Menelaus, from whom Paris ſtole her.

I forgot to obſerve, that Proteus did not ſend Paris away, without leaving him ſome ſort of conſolation; for he reſtored him the picture of Helen (84). One of Lycophron's commentators applies to this very injudiciouſly, what Helen ſays in Euripides, that Juno, to puniſh Paris for not giving her the victory in the conteſt of beauty, gave him only a living image of Helen, inſtead of her real perſon, which image was formed in the air.

Ἥρα δὲ μεμφθεῖσ', οὕνεκ' οὐ νικᾷ θεάς,
Ἐξηνέμωσε τἄμ' Ἀλεξάνδρου λέχη.
Δίδωσι δ' οὐκ ἔμ', ἀλλ' ὁμοιώσασ' ἐμοὶ
Εἴδωλον ἔμπνουν, οὐρανοῦ ξυνθεῖσ' ὕπο.
Πριάμου τυράννου παιδί. καὶ δοκεῖ μ' ἔχειν
Κενὴν δόκησιν οὐκ ἔχων.

Sed Juno moleſte ferens, quod non viciſſet Deas,
Irritum fecit meum conjugium Alexandro:
Dedit enim non me: ſed aſſimilatam mihi
Imaginem vivam, ſub cœlo compactam,
Filio regis Priami: putavit autem ſe habere me,
Falſa opinione *deceptus*, cum non haberet (85).

Juno enrag'd at loſs of beauty's prize,
Robb'd Priam's ſon of me, his promis'd bride,
And in my ſtead gave him an airy phantom,
Bearing my ſemblance. And this the cheated boy
Preſs'd to his breaſt, thinking he me enjoy'd,
Vain thought!

It is manifeſt, that the difference betwixt theſe two things lies not in this, as Canterus would have it, that Proteus is the actor in one, and Juno in the other. One may likewiſe obſerve, that Juno forgot her ſpirit of revenge on this occaſion: Paris was as happy with a living image of Helen, as he would have been with the original. I remember I have read, that the poet Steſichorus ſaid, that the Trojans, not knowing the true Helen, quarrelled among themſelves about her image. Ὥσπερ τὸ τῆς Ἑλένης εἴδωλον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Τροίᾳ Στησίχορος φησὶ γενέσθαι περιμάχητον ἀγνοίᾳ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς. *Quemadmodum Steſichorus Trojanos, inquit, veræ ignaros Helenæ de imagine ipſius invicem decertaſſe* (86). This is, in the notion of ſome Libertines, an image of the diſputes about religion.

[*O*] *Many fables have been vented about the birth of Helen.*] It has not been thought enough to ſay that ſhe was born of an egg; they have added, that this egg fell from the orb of the moon, and that the women of that region lay eggs, from whence are bred men fifteen times bigger than thoſe who inhabit the earth. This we learn from Athenæus (87), who ſays, upon the teſtimony of Herodorus of Heraclea, that Neocles of Crotona had publiſhed it in one of his writings. Obſerve here ſome falſe quotations about that chimera. Cœlius Rhodiginus (88) inſtead of Herodorus, ſays Herodotus. This error has been copied by Salmuth (89). Who could forbear laughing to read this paſſage in a Spaniſh phyſician? ‘ Nonne admirabilius adhuc in tota naturæ majeſtate rariſſimum, quod ‘ mulieres quaſdam produxerit, quæ non more aliarum ‘ fœtus, ſed ova edant ac incubent, ex quibus homines naſcantur, qui ad giganteam proceritatem ex‘ creſcant? Et tamen hoc in Seleniticis mulieribus ac‘ cidere referunt ex Lycoſthene Raviſius Textor, & ‘ ex Herodoto Heracleotes, ut quoque teſtator Rhodi‘ ginus, lib. 27. cap. 17. licet pro mera fabula hoc ‘ habeat Adrianus Junius, lib. 1. animad. cap. 15. ci‘ tatus apud Pancirolum part 2. memorab. titulo 2. ‘ hiſtor. tamen cum icone exhibet (90). —— *Is it not* ‘ *ſtill more admirable, and the moſt extraordinary thing* ‘ *in nature, that ſhe has produced ſome women, which* ‘ *do not bring forth children as others do, but eggs which* ‘ *they hatch, and from which men are produced, which* ‘ *grow to a gigantic ſtature. And yet that the wo-*

(*e*) *See remark* [*M*], *citat.* (71).

(73) Ovid. Epiſt. Helenæ ad Parid. Coluthus, de raptu Helenæ.

(74) Ovid. Epiſt. Parid. ad Helen. ver. 297.

(75) Id. in Epiſt. Helen ad Parid. ver. 29.

(76) Ptolemæus Hephæſt. apud Photium, pag. 480.

(77) *See* Natalis Comes, Mythol. lib. vi, cap. xxiii, pag. m. 658. *He ſhould have cited Herodotus. and obſerved, that a tempeſt forced Paris to put into Egypt.*

(78) Quam deportavit in Ægyptum, atque ibi primum cum illa congreſſus ſit. *Id. ibid.*

(79) *Helen denies it in the prologue of Euripides's tragedy, intituled,* Helena, *but her teſtimony here is of no weight.*

(80) Herodot. lib ii, cap. cxx

(81) Id. ibid. cap cxviii.

(82) Id. ibid. & cap. cxix.

(83) Servius in hæc verba, Virg. Æneid. lib. xi, ver. 262. Atrides Protei Menelaus ad uſque columnas.

(84) *See Canterus and Meurſius upon Lycophron, ver.* 113.

(85) Eurip. in Prologo Helenæ, ver 31, pag. m. 308.

(86) Plato, de Republica, lib. ix, pag. m. 738.

(87) Athen. lib. ii, cap. xvi, pag. 57.

(88) Antiq. Lect. lib. xxvii, cap. xvii, in fin.

(89) Salmuth. Commen. in Pancirolum de novis repertis, pag. 93.

(90) Caſpar à Reis, in Elyſio jucundarum Quæſt. Campo, Quæſt. xlvii, n. 14, pag. m. 581

from which it is pretended ſhe was hatched. The inventions which are attributed to her moſt faithful maid, reflect diſhonour upon her [*P*]. If the authors who have written of

‘ *men in the moon bring forth in this manner, is related by Raviſius Textor from Lycoſthenes, and by Heracleotes from Herodotus, and likewiſe Rhodiginus; altho' Adrianus Junius looks upon this as fabulous, as cited by Pancirollus, yet he gives us a print of it.*’ Does he not begin his citations well, who ſets out with Lycoſthenes, who lived in the XVIth century; Is it not a ſtrange blunder, to put Raviſius Textor after Lycoſthenes, who lived after and abridged the other? What a leap is there at once to Herodotus? What confuſion in taking Herodorus for Herodotus? What a fiction, to give us one Heracleotes, who has cited Herodotus? is not this to make two authors, where the writer quoted gives but one? for Cœlius Rhodiginus has ſaid expreſsly, *Herodotus Heracleotes*. And what ſort of reaſoning is this? Tho' Hadrian Junius looks upon this as a meer fable, Lycoſthenes, Raviſius Textor, Herodotus, Heracleotes, Rhodiginus, have nevertheleſs mentioned it. How was the authority of Junius like to hinder them, who lived after them all except Lycoſthenes. But to return to Helen.

Some ancient poets have ſaid ſhe was the daughter of Jupiter and Nemeſis, and that Nemeſis to avoid the warm addreſſes of Jupiter, fled by ſea and land, and diſguiſed her ſelf in all ſhapes: but at laſt by a reſiſtleſs force Jupiter begot upon her Caſtor and Pollux, and afterwards Helen;

Τὴν ποτε καλλίκομος Νέμεσις φιλότητι μιγεῖσα
Ζηνὶ θεῶν βασιλῆι. τέκεν κρατερῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης.

Auricoma hanc Nemeſis peperit compreſſa tonante
Ab Jove vi (91).

Her the fair Nemeſis with golden locks
Brought forth to mighty Jove.

We read in Pauſanias (92) that, according to the vulgar opinion, Helen was the daughter of Jupiter and Nemeſis; and as for Leda, that ſhe was only her nurſe. Phidias, agreeable to this tradition, repreſented Leda in ſuch a manner on the baſis of the ſtatue of Nemeſis, that ſhe ſeemed to lead Helen to that goddeſs. Some ſay (93), that Nemeſis, being impregnated by Jupiter, laid an egg, and that Leda finding this egg ſat on it, and hatched Caſtor, Pollux, and Helen. Others ſay (94), that Jupiter not being able to gain Nemeſis, made Venus take the ſhape of an eagle, and metamorphoſed himſelf into a ſwan, which flew before the eagle. He reſted himſelf in the lap of Nemeſis, and was kindly received; the lady embraced him and fell aſleep: the pretended ſwan taking the advantage of that ſleep enjoyed her; and becauſe he did it in the ſhape of a bird, order required that Nemeſis ſhould lay an egg. Mercury took this egg, and carried it to Lacedæmon, and laid it in Leda's boſom. Hence came the fair Helen, and this was the reaſon why Leda adopted her for her daughter. *Nemeſis autem ut quæ avium generi eſſet juncta menſibus actis ovum procreavit, quod Mercurius auferens detulit Spartam, & Ledæ ſedenti in gremium projecit, ex quo naſcitur Helena, cæteras corporis ſpecie præſtans, quam Leda ſuam filiam nominavit* (95). Auſonius (96) has obſerved the diſtinction which they made betwixt Nemeſis and Leda.

Iſtos tergemino (97) naſci quos cernis ab ovo
Patribus ambiguis & matribus aſſere natos.
Hos genuit Nemeſis: ſed Leda puerpera fovit:
Tyndareus pater his, & Jupiter. Hic putat, hic ſcit.

Thoſe whom you ſee born from the threefold egg,
Say are deſcended from uncertain parents.
Theſe born by Nemeſis, but by Leda hatched.
Their fancied father, Tyndareus, their real, Jove.

Here are a good many authors for this opinion; and yet there are as many, who ſay Leda was the true mother of Helen. The ſame Hyginus, whom I have quoted, having ſaid that there was alſo a tradition that Jupiter lay with Leda in the ſhape of a ſwan, adds, that ſhe will decide nothing in the matter, *De quo in medio relinquimus* (98), becauſe he ſaw arguments of equal weight on both ſides. Theon of Alexandria obſerves, that Jupiter, transformed into a ſwan, lay with Nemeſis according to ſome, and with Leda according to others; and that Helen, Caſtor, and Pollux were produced from the egg which Leda brought forth (99). Pauſanias, who, as we have ſeen, relates the tradition concerning Nemeſis, relates in another place (100), the tradition concerning Leda, and he moreover obſerves that there was a memorial of it in a temple of Lacedæmon (101); for there was to be ſeen an egg hanging from the roof by a ribbon, which paſſed for that of Leda. Iſocrates ſpeaks more poſitively. He mentions two metamorphoſes of Jupiter into a ſwan, one on the account of Nemeſis, the other of Leda. Κύκνος γενόμενος εἰς τοὺς Νεμέσεως κόλπους κατέφυγε. τούτῳ δὲ πάλιν ὁμοιωθεὶς Λήδαν ἐνύμφευσεν. *Oloris figura in ſinum Nemeſeos confugit, atque iterum ejuſdem avis ſpeciem cum haberet Ledam ſibi deſpondit* (102). Which being ſo, there is no doubt but he ſuppoſed Helen proceeded from that ſecond metamorphoſis. Euripides in his tragedy of Oreſtes expreſsly affirms that Leda was the mother of Helen, and he gives Helen the epithets ὀρνιθόγονος and κυκνόπτερος, which expreſs Jupiter's metamorphoſis into a ſwan. I do not make uſe of Plutarch's authority, becauſe by the egg of Tyndareus, he may have meant that which Mercury had caſt into Leda's lap: and indeed he obſerves that this egg fell from heaven (103). So that Hadrian Junius ſhould not have alledged Plutarch in favour of the ſecond opinion. Ovid has been juſtly alledged, ſince he introduces Leda lying under the wings of a ſwan, *Ovidius quoque Ledam recubantem facit ſub olorinis alis* (104). Lucian (105), and the ſcholiaſt upon Homight have been quoted (106). The latter ſays thing which many others take no notice of, *viz.* that the egg which Leda brought forth, and put into a cheſt, produced there Caſtor, Pollux, and Helen, without being hatched.

To reconcile theſe two opinions, Junius ſuppoſes that Nemeſis and Leda are one and the ſame perſon, and for that he quotes Lactantius (107), and the ſcholiaſt on Euripides, and Germanicus. The words of the laſt are very clear. ‘ Cygnum dicunt inter aſtra ‘ conſtitutum eo quod Jupiter in Cygnum transfiguratus evolaverit in Rhamnuntem Atticæ regionis, ibique compreſſerit Nemeſin quæ & Leda dicitur, ut refert Crates tragœdiarum ſcriptor, quæ enixa eſt ovum, unde nata eſt Helena (108). —— *They ſay, that the ſwan was placed among the ſtars, becauſe Jupiter being changed into ſwan, flew into Rhamnuris, in the territory of Attica, and there lay with Nemeſis, who is likewiſe called Leda, (as Crates, a writer of tragedies, reports) who brough forth the egg from which Helen was born.*’

I will not end this remark, without obſerving, that Jupiter, who acknowledged many boys for his ſons, which were the fruits of his commerce with women, owned no daughter, but Helen. I ſpeak of daughters which proceeded from his amours with women: Iſocrates obſerves this (109). I omit thoſe who pretend Helen was the daughter of Venus, or of the Sun and of Leda (110).

[*P*] *The inventions that are attributed to her faithful maid, reflect diſhonour upon her.*] It is pretended ſhe invented I know not what poſtures, and that ſhe even wrote upon that ſubject. I ſhall explain myſelf more clearly in Latin, in the words of Leonicus Thomæus. ‘ Aſtyanaſſa quædam nomine, *ſays he* (111), ‘ inter Helenæ miniſtras & famulas fuiſſe commemoratur, quæ dominam à Theſeo primum, poſtea à Paride raptam ſemper proſequuta eſt: hanc in Venerea palæſtra primam complures reperiſſe figurarum modos omnis perhibet antiquitas. Voluminibus quinetiam quibuſdam editis de variis concubitus generibus perſcripſiſſe narratur, quam poſtmodum Philenis & Elephantis pervulgatiſſimæ mulieres ſunt inſequutæ, quæ hujuſmodi de rebus non minus accurate, quàm turpiter conſcripta commentaria reliquere. —— ‘ *Aſtyanaſſa, a ſervant maid of Helen, who followed her, when ſhe was carried away by Theſeus, and after*

‘ *wards*

(91) Taraſinus ſive Staſinus in carmine de rebus Cypriacis, apud Hadrianum Junium, Animadv. lib. i, cap. 15.

(92) Pauſanias, lib. i, pag. 32.

(93) Interpres Callimachi apud Hadrianum Junium, ubi ſupra.

(94) Hygin. Aſtronom. lib. ii, cap. viii.

(95) Hygin. ibid.

(96) Auſon. Epigram lvi.

(97) *That word ſhews, that Auſonius ſpeaks alſo of Helen, and that Hadrian Junius,* Animad. lib. i, cap xv, *ſhould not have ſaid, as he has done.* Conſentit & Auſonius poëta de Caſtore & Polluce loquens.

(98) Hygin. ubi ſupra.

(99) Theon Alexandrinus in Arateis commentariis, apud Hadr. Junium, ubi ſupra.

(100) Lib. iii, pag. 97.

(101) *Hadrian Junius believes, without reaſon, that Pauſanias places that temple in the town of Amyclæ.*

(102) Iſocrat. in Helen. Encomio.

(103) Τὸ Τυνδάρειον οἱ ποιηταὶ λέγουσιν οὐρανοπετὲς ἀναφῦναι Plutarch. Sympoſ. lib. ii, cap. iii, pag. 637.

(104) Hadr. Junius, ubi ſupra. *Ovid's words are* Fecit olorinis Ledam recubare ſub alis. *Metam. lib. vi, ver.* 109.

(105) In Dearum judicio, pag. m. 170, Tom. I.

(106) In Odyſſ. lib. vii.

(107) Inſtit. lib. i, cap. xxi.

(108) Germanic. Cæſar in Arateis Phænomenis, pag. m. 116.

(109) In Encomio Helenæ.

(110) Ptol. Hephæſt. apud Photium, pag. 480.

(111) Nicolaus Leonicus Thomæus, de varia Hiſtoria, lib. iii, cap xxxi. *He ſhould have cited Suidas.*

of her had been good chronologers, her beauty muſt have laſted prodigiouſly [Q], and we ſhould be obliged to ſay, that the Grecians and Trojans had fought ten years for the

wards by Paris, is ſaid by all the ancients to have been the firſt inventor of various poſtures in the field of Venus. She is likewiſe reported to have publiſhed ſome books on this ſubject. In which ſcience ſhe was followed by the wellknown Philenis, and Elephantis, who have left writings treating of theſe matters with no leſs accuracy than immodeſty.' If that be true it will caſt an indelible ſtain on Helen's memory; for it is probable if that ſervant gave leſſons to her miſtreſs, her miſtreſs intruſted her with their effect; and that ſo both Helen and Aſtyanaſſa joined their endeavours, to perfect thoſe horrid inventions. I have read in Photius (112) that Aſtyanaſſa ſtole an embroidered girdle, which Juno had obtained of Venus to give to Helen; but that Venus took it away from that maid.

[Q] *If the authors . . . . had been good chronologers, her beauty muſt have laſted prodigiouſly.*] It is pretended that Helen and Caſtor were hatched from the ſame egg: We may well ſuppoſe then that Helen was a woman grown, when the Argonauts went to Colchos; for her two brothers, Caſtor and Pollux, ſignalized themſelves in that famous expedition. Let us allow her twenty years at leaſt, which cannot be too much. We will not take advantage of Euſebius's error; I will ſpeak of that hereafter. Let us make uſe of the chronology that is moſt exact. About thirty years are reckoned betwixt that expedition and that of Troy. Helen then was fifty years old, more or leſs, when Paris carried her off. The ſiege of Troy laſted ten years, and it was in the laſt year of the ſiege that Agamemnon and Achilles quarrelled. Now the admiration Priamus's counſellors (113) expreſſed for the divine beauty of Helen, muſt be referred to a time poſterior to that quarrel. Thus Helen, at ſixty years of age, by the extraordinary luſtre of her beauty, obliged a whole ſenate to confeſs that ſhe deſerved that two powerful nations ſhould ruin one another in a ten years war for her ſake. Is not this very wonderful? Paris having been killed ſome time after, there aroſe a warm diſpute between his brothers, who ſhould marry his widow. Priamus appointed a combat, and promiſed her to him who ſhould obtain the victory. Deïphobus had the beſt of it, and carried Helen. Ἀλεξάνδρου τοξευθέντος ὑπὸ Φιλοκτήτου, Πρίαμος τὸν Ἑλένης γάμον ἔπαθλον ἔθηκε τῷ ἀριστεύσαντι κατὰ τὴν μάχην. Δηίφοβος δὲ γενναῖος ἀγωνισάμενος ἔγημεν αὐτὴν ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Λυκόφρονι (114). One of his brothers (115) was ſo enraged with his loſs, that he departed from Troy, and contributed all he could to the ruin of his country. Does not this prove that Helen at ſixty years of age was ſtill a prodigy of beauty. Lucian proves, that at the ſiege of Troy ſhe was an old woman, almoſt as old as Hecuba. Εἶδον γὰρ λευκὴν μέν τινα καὶ ἐπιμήκη τὸν τράχηλον ὡς εἰκάζειν κύκνου θυγατέρα εἶναι· τἄλλα δὲ πάνυ πρεσβῦτιν ἡλικιῶτιν σχεδὸν τῆς Ἑκάβης. Siquidem vidi quandam candida & procera cervice ut cygno prognatam illam hinc conjicerent. Cæterum anum Hecubæ propemodum æquævam (116). —— *For I ſaw a woman with a neck ſo long, and ſo white, that one from thence might gueſs that ſhe was begot by a ſwan. But ſhe was very near as old as Hecuba.* She muſt have been much older than Hecuba, if that was true which has been ſaid (117), that Hercules was the laſt child of Jupiter. Our admiration of ſo aged a beauty would ceaſe, if we could believe the ſtory that is told, that Helen, by a notable privilege, was exempted from the hard fate of growing old (118); but every body does not give credit to it. 'It is ſaid of Helen, that in her latter days, as often as ſhe looked in her glaſs, ſhe with aſtoniſhment ſought for herſelf there, and complained of time which had been her third raviſher, and had ſtolen Helen from Helen herſelf.' I have read this in the book of a Jeſuit who has a very affected ſtile (119). Another modern tells the ſame ſtory, almoſt in the ſame manner (120). 'She of whom you ſpeak, deſerves to be looked on with ſuch an eye as your's. You will quickly ſee in her a change quite contrary to that (121) which has given you ſo much aſtoniſhment. It is that which a few years will make you obſerve; that which made Helen weep when he ſaw herſelf in her glaſs, and obliged her to call time her third or fourth raviſher, for the number of them is not very certain. A ſtrange ſort of rape, to ſee Helen raviſhed from herſelf, to ſee Helen, whom the three parts of the world, which then made all, acknowledged for the fineſt woman of her age, ſeeking for her face in a glaſs, which preſented nothing now to her but what was frightful.' That thought agrees with two verſes of Ovid.

Flet quoque ut in ſpeculo rugas conſpexit aniles
Tyndaris, & ſecum cur ſit bis rapta, requirit (122).

I muſt obſerve that if we follow Euſebius's chronology, we ſhall find that Helen had lived above an hundred years, when Paris ſtole her; for, according to his calculation, the expedition of the Argonauts was eighty nine years before the taking of Troy. He had obſerved the miſreckoning of the Greek authors, and therefore he made this objection to them: 'Si inter Argonautas fuerunt Caſtor & Pollux, quomodo poteſt eorum ſoror Helena credi, quæ poſt multos annos virgo rapitur à Theſeo (123). —— *If Caſtor and Pollux were in the number of the Argonauts, how can Helen be believed to be their ſiſter, who many years after was carried away a virgin by Theſeus.* Obſerve here Scaliger's remark upon this Latin. 'In Græcis, *ſays he* (124), ἡ μήπω μετὰ πολλὰ ἔτη παρθένος ἁρπάζεται, *quæ non multis poſt annis virgo capitur.* Sive culpa librariorum, ſive quod veroſimilius, Hieronymi properantia accidit, ut negatio in latina interpretatione expreſſa non ſit, omnino ridicula ſententia efficitur. Nam quo remotior fuerit raptus Helenæ eo credibilior erit. Contra quo propior his temporibus eo remotior à Trojæ excidio, ideoque minus credibile Helenæ tempus in hujus ſæculi tractum incidiſſe. —— *The Greek ſays,* Who not many years after was carried away a virgin. *But whether by a miſtake of the tranſcribers, or, which is more probable, by Jerom's hurry, the negative particle is not expreſſed in the Latin verſion, and by that means the whole ſentence is made ridiculous. For the farther back the rape of Helen is placed, the more credible it will be. And, on the contrary, the nearer it is placed to theſe times the farther it will be from the ſacking of Troy, and therefore it will be leſs credible that the age of Helen fell into this period of time.*' This criticiſm appears to me very falſe, and the more I examine it the more I am ſurprized at it. I do not deny but the negative particle, the omiſſion whereof Scaliger thinks a fault in St Jerome, may make a good ſenſe; but I cannot comprehend that the ſenſe would be ridiculous if that particle were ſuppreſſed; and on the contrary Euſebius's objection ſeems more intelligible to all ſorts of readers, without that negative particle than with it. Euſebius's deſign is to prove that thoſe who have ſaid, that Caſtor and Pollux, Helen's brothers, were in the voyage of the Argonauts, and that Theſeus ſtole Helen yet very young, have but ill concerted the times. If Caſtor and Pollux, ſays he, were in the number of the Argonauts, how can we believe they were the brothers of Helen, who was ſtole away young by Theſeus many years after? The moſt ſtupid readers perceive the force of the objection, without any need of reaſoning, without having recourſe to any thing but to the very words of Euſebius: but if we ſuppoſe with Scaliger, that Euſebius expreſſed it in this manner. *If Caſtor and Pollux were in the number of the Argonauts, how can we believe they were the brothers of Helen, who was ſtole away young by Theſeus a few years after?* Every one ſees, that to be ſenſible of this objection, we muſt take our eyes off from the words that contain it, and have recourſe to the arguments and calculations that are found in the following pages; for if one only conſiders Euſebius's expreſſions, one would imagine that he reaſoned ill, and brought a proof directly contrary to what he pretended to aſſert.

FAULTS of Scaliger.

Here are ſome other words of Scaliger which to me ſeem unexact. 'Ab hoc tempore (125), *ſays he* (126), ad excidium Ilii, anni ſunt LXXIX, ut Helenam admodum anum fuiſſe oportuerit, ſi Argonautica hoc tempore contigerunt. Nam adultis Caſtoribus, Helenam quoque maturam viro fuiſſe neceſſe eſt. Quod ſi Argonautica hic collocentur, tempore excidii Iliaci Helena fuerit major annorum CXX. Hoc eſt quod objicit Euſebius & merito. —— *From this time* the poſſeſſion of an old woman. This would make them very ridiculous, as they were indeed; though we allow her all the beauty that the poets aſcribe to her. See in Herodotus, what value ought to be ſet on a woman who ſuffers her ſelf to be run away with [*R*]. Opinions are different concerning Helen's children: ſome ſay ſhe had only daughters (*f*), others aſſure us, that Menelaus had four boys by her (*g*) A ſon too has been mentioned that ſhe had by Achilles, (*h*). She had by Menelaus, the beautiful Hermione; and by Paris, a daughter named Helen, whom Hecuba put to death. The father would have had her named Alexandra; but, as the mother oppoſed it (*i*), they caſt lots who ſhould give the name. Helen won, and gave her daughter her own name (*k*). There has been much talk of Helen's necklace [*S*], and of her *Crater*, and

---

(112) Photius ex Ptolem. Hephæſt, pag. 480.

(113) *I have related above what they ſaid, remark* [*A*], *citat.* (7).

(114) Scholiaſtes Homeri in Iliad. lib. ult. ver. 251.

(115) *His name was Helenus. See the Bibliotheque of Photius, in the Extracts of Conon, pag.* 441.

(116) Lucian. in Gallo, Oper. Tom II, pag. m. 251.

(117) Diod. Sic. lib. iv, cap. xiv.

(118) Τὴν μὲν φάτις ἔμμεν ἀγήρω. Nam & ſenectæ haud obnoxiam eſſe fama perhibetur. *Quintus Calaber, lib. x, ver.* 312.

(119) *In the* Peintures Morales *of Father le Moine.*

(120) La Mothe le Vayer, Letter cxiv, pag. 14, Tom. XII.

(121) *He ſpeaks of an ugly woman grown handſome.*

(122) Ovid. Metamorph. lib. xv, ver. 232.

(123) Euſeb. in Chronic. n. 756.

(124) Animadv. in Euſebium, n. 756, pag. m. 47.

(125) *That is from the number 756 of Euſebius. But I wonder that Scaliger did not obſerve, that Euſebius had already ſpoken of the* Argonautæ *under the number* 746.

(126) Ibid. pag. 46.

' *time to the ſacking Troy there are ſeventy nine years; ' ſo that Helen muſt have been very old, if the expedition of the Argonauts happened at that time. For ' when Caſtor and his brother were grown men, Helen ' muſt likewiſe have been marriageable. But if the expedition of the Argonauts be placed here, Helen muſt ' have been above 120 years old. This is what Euſebius objects, and with reaſon.'* That is, if there was ſeventy nine years betwixt the voyage of the Argonauts and the taking of Troy, Helen muſt needs be above 120 years old when Troy was taken. What conſequence is here? Is this worthy of the great Scaliger? Muſt a maid be above forty years old to be ſaid to be marriageable, *matura viro?* This is the expreſſion of the author whom I confute.

He has ſucceeded much better in his animadverſions upon Euſebius's calculations; for it is not true, that the expedition of the Argonauts, and that of Troy, were at ſuch a diſtance from one another, as Euſebius imagines. But it is certain that Euſebius followed very famous writers; and conſequently I may affirm that if the ancient authors, who ſpeak of Helen, had been good chronologers, her beauty muſt have laſted a prodigious while; for it would be above a century! Let us conſider a little the calculations, which Clemens Alexandrinus borrows from Apollodorus, and ſome other celebrated hiſtorians. In one place (127) he ſays that there were thirty eight years betwixt the beginning of Hercules's reign in Argos, after the expedition of the Argonauts, and his deification; and that Caſtor and Pollux were deified fifty three years after Hercules, about the time that Troy was taken. Which is to reckon ninety one years betwixt the voyage of the Argonauts, and the taking of Troy, and to make Helen an hundred years old, or thereabouts, at the time that Paris carried her off as an accompliſhed beauty. In an other place (128) the ſame father makes a computation, which puts ſixty eight years betwixt Paris's ſtealing Helen, and the expedition of the Argonauts.

[*R*] *See in Herodotus what value ought to be ſet on a woman who ſuffers herſelf to be run away with.*] Herodotus tracing up to their firſt original, the long continued wars betwixt Europe and Aſia, owns the Aſiatics were the aggreſſors, as having ſtole away Io the daughter of Inachus king of Argos (129). The Europeans (130) who ſtole away the king of Tyre's daughter, only did it by way of repriſal But they did not ſtop there, they engaged in a ſecond rape, *viz.* that of Medea, daughter to the king of Colchos. That prince demanded ſatisfaction for the injury. They anſwered they would give him none, becauſe they had never received any for the rape of Io. The rape of Helen was undertaken by way of repriſal, and when the Greeks redemanded her, it was anſwered that they would deal by them as they had dealt by the Aſiatics, when they demanded back Medea. They were not ſatisfied with that anſwer, but raiſing a great army they went to deſtroy the kingdom of Priamus. See now what pleas the Perſians had to juſtify their wars. They pretended that the expedition againſt Troy gave them a right to hold the Europeans for enemies, and to treat them as ſuch. They diſapproved of the violence of thoſe who carry off a woman, but they looked upon thoſe as fools, who buſied themſelves about recovering her; and conſidered them as wiſe who deſpiſed her; ſince no women are carried off but ſuch as are willing. As for us, ſaid they, we never minded the women that were ſtole from Aſia: it was the Greeks who firſt made war for the ſake of a woman of Lacedæmon. Τὸ μὲν νυν ἁρπάζειν γυναῖκας, ἀνδρῶν ἀδίκων ἔργον νομίζειν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ ἁρπασθεισέων σπουδὴν ποιήσασθαι τιμωρέειν, ἀνοήτων, τὸ δὲ μηδεμίην ὤρην ἔχειν ἁρπασθεισέων, σωφρόνων. δῆλα γὰρ δὴ ὅτι εἰ μὴ αὐταὶ ἐβουλέατο, οὐκ ἂν ἡρπάζοντο. σφέας μὲν δὴ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίης λέγουσι Πέρσαι ἁρπαζομένων τῶν γυναικῶν λόγον οὐδένα ποιήσασθαι. *Se quidem ſentire injuriorum virorum factum eſſe rapere feminas: amentium vero, raptis ulciſcendis operam dare: prudentium autem, pro nulla habere raptarum pulchritudinem: quippe quæ, niſi voluiſſent, haud dubie raptæ non fuiſſent. Eoque ſuarum feminarum ex Aſia raptarum Perſæ negant ullam ſe habuiſſe rationem* (131). We muſt not omit Iſocrates's obſervation here. The war of Troy, ſays he, was very advantageous to Greece: many things were invented during the continuance of it; and Europe began to have the ſuperiority over Aſia. Before that war, the Barbarians made conqueſts upon the Grecians. It was Helen that gave occaſion to a new turn of affairs; for after that war, the Greeks took towns and provinces from the Barbarians (132).

We muſt not forget that paſſage of Euripides, where Peleus ſpeaks ſuch home-truths to Menelaus. He blames him eſpecially for two great faults: the firſt was for having behaved to his wife as if ſhe had been virtuous; the ſecond was for having raiſed an army to recover her. You left her, ſays he, entirely at her own diſpoſal; you left your houſe without ordering your doors to be locked, and your ſervants to look after her, as if ſhe, who was the wickedeſt of women, had been very chaſte.

> Ἄκληστ' ἄδουλα δώμαθ' ἑστίας λιπὼν,
> Ὡς δὴ γυναῖκα σώφρον' ἐν δόμοις ἔχων,
> Πασῶν κακίστην.

> *Linquens domum non clauſam, & ſine ſervis,*
> *Quaſi haberes caſtam mulierem in ædibus,*
> *Quæ omnium eſt peſſima* (133).

She ran away with a young ſtranger; and you, forſooth, for the love of her, muſt call all Greece to arms: you ſhould, on the contrary, after you had found out her infidelity, have left her where ſhe was, and rather have paid a tribute, than that ſhe ſhould ever have ſet foot in your houſe again.

> Ἣν χρῆν σ' ἀποπτύσαντα, μὴ κινεῖν δόρυ,
> Κακὴν ἐφευρόντ', ἀλλ' ἐᾶν αὐτοῦ μένειν,
> Μισθὸν τε δόντα, μή ποτ' εἰς οἴκους λαβεῖν.

> *Quam oportebat te conſpuentem non movere haſtam,*
> *Cum inveniſſes malam, ſed ſinere ibi manere,*
> *Mercedemque dare* præterea, *ne unquam in ædes* eam
> *reciperes* (134).

Menelaus anſwers in a ſoft manner, that the adventures of his wife had been involuntary, and the work of fate (135), and that from thence great advantages to the Greeks had proceeded (136), who firſt began to learn the art of war, at the ſiege of Troy. This confirms Iſocrates's obſervation.

[*S*] *There has been much talk of Helen's necklace.*] Menelaus preparing for the expedition of Troy, went to Delphos with Ulyſſes to conſult the oracle, and offered Helen's necklace there. Τότε δὴ Μενέλαος μὲν τῇ Προνοίᾳ (137) Ἀθηνᾷ τὸν τῆς Ἑλένης ὅρμον ἀνέθηκεν ἐν Δελφοῖς. *Tunc ſane Menelaus Providæ Minervæ monile Helenæ Delphis dedicavit* (138). The oracle ordered him to do it, and promiſed by that means the puniſhment of the raviſher. Athenæus (139) has preſerved the oracle's anſwer: it contains only three verſes, which ſhew, that this necklace was made of maſſy gold, and that Venus had given it to Helen. When the Phoceans pillaged the temple of Delphos in the CVIth Olympiad, this necklace

---

(*f*) Stephanus, in voce αἴγυς.

(*g*) Scholiaſt. Homeri, & Euſtathius in Iliad, lib. iii.

(*h*) *See the article* ACHILLEA, *citat.* (*e*).

(*i*) Ptolem. Hephæſt. apud Photium, pag. 480.

(*k*) Id. ibid.

(127) Clemens Alexandr. lib. i, Stromat 322, ex Apollodoro.

(128) Ibid. pag. 336.

(129) Herodot. lib. i. init.

(130) *They were Cretans.*

(131) Herodot. lib. i, cap. iv.

(132) Iſocrat. in Encomio Helen. ſub fin.

(133) Eurip. in Andromacha, ver. 593, pag. m. 518.

(134) Id ibid. ver. 607.

(135) *See the remark* [*Y*], *at the beginning.*

(136) Eurip. in Andromacha, ver. 681, pag. 522.

(157) *Meurſius, inſtead of* προνοίᾳ, *reads* προναίᾳ, protem plari. *See his treatiſe* de regno Laconico. pag. 22, *where he refers us to his* Atticæ Lectiones, lib. ii, cap. xvii, *concerning the two epithets of Minerva* προνοία & προναία.

(138) Euſtathius, ad Odyſſ. lib. iii.

(139) Athen. lib. vi, pag. 233.

and of the Nepenthes which ſhe made Telemachus, the ſon of Ulyſſes, drink [*T*]. It is ſaid

lace was a part of their booty; but it produced a ſtrange effect; the lady who wore it became an infamous proſtitute (140); ſhe quitted her houſe to run all the world over, with a young Epirote whom ſhe was in love with (141). It was either a very active contagion, or a manner of puniſhment very unworthy of the goddeſs to whom Menelaus had devoted it. It ſhould rather have been by a natural than a moral evil, that this woman's boldneſs, who durſt appropriate to her ſelf the ſpoils of ſo ſacred a place, ought to have been puniſhed. See the remark [*C*] of the article EGIALEA.

Note that there are ſome who will have it, that the lady who got this necklace, was a leud woman before. It is ſaid that the wives of thoſe who plundered the temple diſputed who ſhould have the necklace of Helen, and that of Eriphyle, and that they at laſt decided it by lot. That of Eriphyle fell to a grave, ſevere woman, who afterwards killed her huſband; the other fell to a very handſome, but very leud, woman (142).

[*T*] *And of her* Crater, *and the* Nepenthes, *ſhe made Telemachus, the ſon of Ulyſſes, drink.*] The *Crater* was a work of Vulcan, and a nuptial preſent; for when Pelops married, Vulcan made him a preſent of it. Menelaus deriving his pedigree from Pelops, ſucceeded to that part of the inheritance, and loſt it, when Paris carried away Helen, with the jewels and movables of his hoſt. But it is pretended, that Helen threw this fine preſent into the ſea, near the iſle of Cos; which being found in the net of ſome fiſhermen, there aroſe a diſpute concerning it, the concluſion whereof was, that it ſhould be conſecrated to Apollo. According to the author from whom I have this, it was a *tripos* (143); nevertheleſs, the interpreters (144) pretend, that Lycophron, Diogenes Laërtius, Apuleius, and Philoſtratus, have underſtood the ſame thing. Now Lycophron has called it (145), *ταμάσιον κρατῆρα*: and theſe are the words of Apuleius (146), 'Nunquam apud eum (Homerum) marino aliquo & piſculento medicavit nec Proteus faciem, nec Ulyſſes ſcrobem, nec Æolus follem, nec Helena CRATEREM, nec Circe poculum, nec Venus cingulum. —— *We never find in Homer, that Proteus made uſe of any thing from the ſea, or of fiſhes, to enchant his face, nor Ulyſſes to enchant the furrow, nor Æolus the bellows, nor Helen the crater, nor Circe the cup, nor Venus the girdle.*' As to Philoſtratus, he ſays as follows in the epiſtle dedicatory of the Life of the Sophiſts. Τόδε φρόντισμα τοῦτο ἄριστε ὑπάτων, καὶ τὰ ἄφθη σοι κουφιεῖ τῆς γνώμης, ὥσπερ ὁ κρατὴρ τῆς Ἑλένης τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις φαρμάκοις. It does not ſeem to me, that either he, or Apuleius, ſpeak of a particular veſſel which belonged to Helen, as a piece of exquiſite work. It is plain, that they allude to what Homer relates, in the fourth book of the Odyſſey, touching the Nepenthe, *viz.* that Helen, to exhilarate Telemachus, the ſon of Ulyſſes, and her other gueſts, and to hinder them from attending to their misfortunes, mingled in their wine a little Nepenthe, which was I know not what, that had an extraordinary virtue.

Ενθ' αὖθ' ἄλλ' ἐνοησ' Ἑλένη Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα.
Αὐτίκ' ἄρ' εἰς οἶνον βάλε φάρμακον, ἔνθεν ἔπινον,
Νηπενθές τ' ἄχολον τε, κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἁπάντων.
Ὃς τὸ καταβρόξειεν ἐπὴν κρητῆρι μιγείη.

Ibi tum alia excogitavit Helena è Jove nata.
Protinus ſane in vinum miſit pharmacum unde bibebant.
Abſque dolore & ira, malorum oblivionem inducens omnium
Qui illud deglutierit poſtquam crateri mixtum erit (147).

Helen had brought that wonderful remedy from Egypt, which ſhe had learned of Polydamna, the wife of Theon. Homer ſays nothing at all about the veſſel, which contained the mixt wine; and therefore Apuleius and Philoſtratus conſider there only the virtue of the Nepenthe, and conſequently ſpeak not of that fine veſſel mentioned by Diogenes Laërtius, I mean the nuptial preſent, which Pelops received from Vulcan, *&c.* Call to mind here, what I have ſaid in the firſt remark, in mentioning the cup which Helen offered to Minerva: and if you would know the reaſon why I have made uſe of the barbarous word *Crater*, I muſt tell you, it is becauſe the words, glaſs, cup, bowl, goblet, do not expreſs what was meant by the word *Crater* in Homer's time. 'The *Crater* was a great veſſel, which was not uſed to drink in, but only to mingle wine with water, ... and from this veſſel they took out the wine thus mingled with cups, or they firſt poured it into pots and pints, and then into drinking cups (148).' Note, that the veſſel mentioned by Diogenes Laërtius, was thrown into the ſea before the Trojan war, but that ſpoken of by the others, was in Menelaus's poſſeſſion after that war.

AN inſtance of the effects of a digreſſing ſpirit.

I ought not to forget, that ſome learned men have made Homer's Nepenthe the ſubject of their ſtudies and meditations; they have made many conjectures and have built ſeveral hypotheſes. See Peter Petit's diſſertation, intituled *Homeri Nepenthes*, and printed at Utrecht in the year 1689, in 8vo. There is both wit and learning in it. The author ſpeaks of a civilian of Naples, who has treated of the ſame matter, and has given himſelf up to all the excuſes of the ſpirit of digreſſion. I inſert this picture of that author, becauſe it very naturally repreſents the character of an affectation of diſplaying all that one has read; and becauſe likewiſe one may obſerve in it many frothy imaginations, concerning the Nepenthe. 'Non morabor hic ſtudioſos variis quæſtionibus, ut Petrus la Sena, an Nepenthes ex eorum numero eſſet medicamentorum quæ chimica arte parantur, an ſimplex quid & ſolius naturæ proprietate efficax. Ut ſcilicet habeat occaſionem, quæ de artis ejus origine & antiquitate legerat, effundendi: qua in diſputatione plures onerat paginas, abutiturque patientia lectorum. Nec minus inanis & ſuperfluæ operæ arguendus; cum tam ſollicite de gemmarum viribus diſſerit, ceu non ſatis ex Homeri deſcriptione conſtaret Nepenthes plantis eſſe annumerandum quod ipſe poſtea fatetur. Cum etiam profeſſus non eſſe hominis frugi, tempus terere inveſtigando, an forte hæc Helenæ potio (verba ejus refero) *μαγικῶς*, hujuſmodi curationis efficaciam retinuerit, multa nihilo ſecius ſubjungit de Magia Ægyptiorum, veterumque Medicorum incantationibus, locaque Homeri profert ex Odyſſea, quæ ad magiam pertinere exiſtimantur, eorum ſcilicet teſtimnoio, qui, ut Plinius *lib.* 30 *cap.* 50 refert, Protea & Sirenum cantus apud Homerum non aliter intelligi voluerunt. Tum multa interponit de cratere Helenæ captata occaſione ſermonis ex quodam Cœlii Rhodigini loco. Et quid magis *ἀπροσδιόνυσον*, quam de Clematide Ægyptia dicere, quo ſcommate Zenonem Cittiæum ſolitum peti, quod procero gracilique & fuſco corpore eſſet, tradit Laërtius? His igitur (inquam) quæ nihil ad rem attinent, prætermiſſis, aio Nepenthes fuiſſe unum e terra naſcentibus quoddam ſcilicet herbæ aut virgulti genus (149). —— *I will not here detain my readers, as Peter la Sena doth, with various queſtions, as whether the Nepenthes was drug prepared by Chymiſtry, or a ſimple medicine; and all this, that he may have an occaſion of giving out of his common places, all that he had read concerning the origin & antiquity of that art. With this he fills ſeveral pages, and abuſeth the patience of his readers. His laborious diſſertation concerning the virtues of gems, is no leſs vain and ſuperfluous, as if it was not obvious from Homer's deſcription, that the Nepenthes was a plant as he himſelf afterwards owns. He owns that it is not worth while to ſpend time in enquiring, whether this potion of Helen's owed it's virtue to magic, and yet he is very copious concerning the magic of the Egyptians, and the inantations of the ancient phyſicians, and quotes paſſages out of Homer's Odyſſey, which are thought to relate to magic, by thoſe I mean, who, as Pliny tells us, think that what he ſays of Proteus and the ſyrens ſongs, is to be ſo underſtood. He next ſubjoins a great deal concerning Helen's crater,*

(140) Quin & principum in Phocide uxores quæ aurea ex Delphis monilia ſibi circumdederant, meritas impietatis pœnas incurrerunt. Nam quæ Helenes torquem geſtabat in turpitudinem meretriciam prolapſa, formæ elegantiam protervæ ſcortatorum libidini proſtituit. *Diodor. Sicul. lib. xvi, cap. lxv.*

(141) Athen. ubi ſupra, pag. 233.

(142) Id. ibid.

(143) Diog. Laërtius, in Thalete, lib. i, n. 32.

(144) Menag. in Laërt. ibid. Meurſius in Lycophr. pag. 272.

(145) In Caſſandra, ver. 854.

(146) Apolog. pag. m. 294.

(147) Homer. Odyſſ. lib. iv, ver. 219.

(148) Meziriac upon Ovid, *pag.* 286. where he proves this, and cenſures Amiot and Vigenere for tranſlating *crater*, drinking cup, or diſh.

(149) Petrus Petitus in Homeri Nepenthe, cap. iii, init. pag. 6.

ſaid alſo that when ſhe was going to be ſacrificed, ſhe was ſaved by a miracle [*U*]: And they have endeavoured to excuſe her adulteries, by ſaying ſhe was forced to them by the Gods [*X*]. The Heathens have made uſe of ſuch like ſuppoſitions on ſo many occaſions, that it will not be unſeaſonable to enquire what could have induced them to reaſon in that manner. I will beſtow a remark upon this head [*Y*].

Some

‘*taking occaſion from a paſſage of Cœlius Rhodiginus. And is there any thing more abſurd than his bringing in the jeſt put upon Zeno, becauſe he was of a tall ſlender make? neglecting therefore theſe queſtions, which are nothing to the purpoſe, I ſay that the Nepenthes was a kind of herb or ſhrub.*’ The chevalier de Meré imagines, that the Nepenthes was nothing elſe but the charms of Helen's converſation. See how he expreſſes himſelf in a treatiſe, where he addreſſes his diſcourſe to a lady. ‘Though Homer doth not enlarge upon the eloquence of Helen, he who ſpeaks ſo much of that of Ulyſſes and of Neſtor, he omits not however, by a myſtery of poetry, to make us ſenſible, that it was a pleaſure to hear her ſpeak; and here is in a few words, what gives me reaſon to think ſo. Ulyſſes wandered a long time after the ſacking of Troy, without being able to return into his iſle of Ithaca; his ſon Telemachus was in pain about him, and, to know whether he was alive or dead, he made a viſit to Neſtor, who could not inform him what was become of him. From thence he continued his voyage, and came to Menelaus, where he had a ſight of Helen, and ſupped with her. He was very melancholy, and that princeſs having pity on him made uſe of a charm to make him forget all his ſorrows. That charm, ſaith Homer, was a liquor which ſhe mingled with the wine, before ſhe ſat down to table, which potion was of ſuch a virtue, that after one had taſted it, it was impoſſible to ſhed a tear all the day after. She had another excellent ſecret, which was given her by the goddeſs of the Graces. You know, Madam, that there is no lady who can imitate the ſound of your words; but if ſhe had obſerved you, ſhe had made herſelf ſo perfect miſtreſs of your voice and manners, that ſhe would have been miſtaken for you (150).

[*U*] *She was ſaved by a miracle.*] The miracle was this: a great plague depopulated the town of Lacedæmon: the gods let them know that health ſhould be reſtored, provided they ſacrificed every year a maid of quality. The lot fell once upon the fair Helen; but as ſhe was led to the altar, an eagle ſtooped and took way the knife, and put it on an heifer; and for this reaſon Helen's life was ſpared (151).

[*X*] *They have endeavoured to excuſe her adulteries, by ſaying ſhe was forced to them by the gods.*] I have touched upon this point already (152), but there is ſomething wanting. If ſome ſay, that Venus contrived this rape, to teſtify her gratitude to the judge, who had determined the cauſe in the diſpute of beauty in her favour; others aſſure us, that ſhe did it to revenge herſelf for an affront. Menelaus had promiſed her a hecatomb, in caſe he ſhould obtain Helen; but having gained what he deſired, he took no care of his vow. Venus took this heinouſly, and, to puniſh him, contrived the carrying away of his wife (153). Others date the original of this higher; they pretend (154) that Tyndarus forget Venus in a ſacrifice that he offered to all the gods; and that in puniſhment of this contempt, Venus made all the daughters of that prince bigamiſts, trigamiſts, and elopers from their husbands. The beſt of all was, that the ſame goddeſs, who had puſhed Tyndarus's daughter into theſe diſorders, reproached him for their adulteries. It is ſaid, that theſe reproaches touched him ſo ſenſibly, that, to be revenged on her, he put her feet in irons. Pauſanias cannot believe, that Tyndarus was ſo ridiculous as to imagine he could revenge himſelf on Venus, by a making a ſtatue, which he ſhould call by her name, and tying it by the legs. But in this the hiſtorian was unacquainted with his own religion. He did not know, that, on many occaſions, the heathens diſcharged their fury upon the temples and ſtatues of the gods, whom they believed the authors of their ill ſucceſs (155). And, in effect, is it not affronting a prince to abuſe his pictures and ſtatues? conſider the indignation of Theodoſius againſt the city of Antioch; nothing moved him more ſenſibly, than the outrages that were done to the ſtatue of the empreſs during the ſedition. See his hiſtory writ by Mr Flechier (156). For the reſt, I muſt declare that when I ſpoke of the reproaches made by Venus to Tyndarus, I have only reported the opinion of ſome moderns, who have been miſled by the tranſlation of Pauſanias. It is certain, that the Greek text does not import, that this goddeſs had reproached Tyndarus in that manner: they who underſtand the Greek tongue, will ſee that I am not miſtaken. Τὸν γὰρ δὴ ἕτερον λόγον, ὡς τὴν Θεὸν πέδαις ἐτιμωρεῖτο ὁ Τυνδάρεως γενέσθαι ταῖς θυγατράσιν ἐξ Ἀφροδίτης ἡγούμενος τὰ ὀνείδη, τοῦτον δὲ οὐδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν προσίεμαι. ἦ γὰρ δὴ παντάπασιν εὔηθες, κέδρου ποιησάμενον ζώδιον καὶ ὄνομα Ἀφροδίτην θέμενον, ἐλπίζειν ἀμυνέσθαι τὴν Θεόν. That is, according to Amaſæus's tranſlation; *Nam Deam ulciſci voluiſſe compedibus (ſunt enim qui hoc etiam memoriæ prodiderint) exprobrantem* (157) *illi filiarum adulteria, ut credam, adduci non poſſum. Quam enim ridiculum, ſi putaſſet ab effigie, quam è cedro feciſſet Veneris nomine, injectis compedibus pœnas expeti poſſe* (158).

[*Y*] *I will beſtow a remark upon this.*] Menelaus anſwering the ſevere reproaches of Peleus, declared, that the will of Helen had not been the cauſe of thoſe adventures which ſhe had undergone, but that it was done by the will of the gods.

> Ἑλένη δ᾽ ἐμόχθησ᾽ οὐχ ἑκοῦσ᾽ ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ Θεῶν.
>
> *Helena vero venit in ærumnas non volens, ſed divinitùs* (159).

This language was common enough among the Pagans. They imputed to fortune, that is to ſay, to GOD, not only their ill ſucceſs, but alſo their faults. This excuſe, or this miſerable comfort, ſeemed to be always at hand, and they preſently had recourſe to it. Plutarch teaches us this, in rehearſing ſome verſes, which contain what a father ſaid to his ſon, and the ſon's anſwer.

> Πολλ᾽ ὦ τέκνον σφάλλουσιν ἀνθρώπους Θεοί.
> Τὸ ῥᾷστον εἶπας, αἰτιάσασθαι Θεούς.
>
> Multis homines in rebus decipiunt Dii,
> Mea proles, atque dura conciliant mala.
> FIL. Dixti id, nihil quo facilius dictu eſt, Deos
> Incuſans (160).
>
> *The gods, ſon, chouſe poor mortals oftentimes.*
> Anſ. *'Tis eaſy, Sir, on gods to lay our crimes.*

You will imagine perhaps, that the great eaſe men found in making complaints againſt the gods, inclined them to make uſe of that ſubterfuge, without conſideration and reflexion, and that it was one of thoſe firſt motions that ariſe in our minds, before we have time to prepare ourſelves to judge of things; but it is certain, that in many inſtances they ſpoke in this manner, after mature conſideration. They who examine not to the bottom, what paſſes in their own breaſts, eaſily perſwade themſelves that they are free, and that if their will inclines them to evil, it is their own fault, as being by a choice of which they are maſters. They who paſs another judgment, are perſons who have carefully ſtudied the ſprings and circumſtances of their actions, and have well conſidered the progreſs of the motion of their ſouls. Theſe perſons for the moſt part doubt of their free-will; and proceed even to perſuade themſelves, that their reaſon and their underſtandings are ſlaves, incapable of reſiſting the force which drags them where they had no mind to go. Now it is this ſort of perſons eſpecially who charged the gods as the cauſes of their evil actions. They remembered, that they had well conſidered, that they were going on in a way pernicious to their fortune, and ſcandalous to their reputation, and that they had made many endeavours to deſtroy the paſſion that made them continue in

its

REFLEXIONS upon the Pagans ſaying the gods forced them to evil.

---

(150) Cheval. de Meré Diſcours des Agrémens, pag. 140, Dutch Edit.

(151) Plutarch. in Parallelis, pag. 314.

(152) *In the remark* [*I*].

(153) Ptol. Hephæſt. apud Photium, pag. 480.

(154) *See the article* EGIALEA, *citation* (10).

(155) *See the* Thoughts upon Comets, n. 132.

(156 Pag. 341, 342, ad Ann. 387, Dutch Edit.

(157) Theſe equivocal words, but which expreſs more plainly the reproaches made by Venus, than to Venus, have miſled ſome authors.

(158) *See how Sylburgius would have this tranſlated:* Nam profecto ſtolidum omnino foret, facto è cedro ſimulachro, & Veneris nomine ei indito, putare ſe hac ratione ulciſci.

(159) Eurip. in Androm. ver. 680, pag. 522.

(160) Plut de Audiendis Poet. pag. 20. D.

Some ſay, that when ſhe cut off her hair, being in mourning [*Z*], this did not at all abate

it; but they remembered ſtill better, that all theſe endeavours had been uſeleſs, and that reaſon, though called to their aſſiſtance a thouſand times, and vows and prayers, had been very weak helps. They concluded then, that it muſt be an occult cauſe, ſome ſuperior force, that drove and dragged them; in a word, that the gods were the cauſe both of the paſſion which they felt, and of the pernicious and criminal conſequences of thoſe paſſions. Here then is the unfolding of the myſtery: there is, ſaid they, ſomething divine in it, juſt as in ſome bodily diſtempers which nonplus the ſkill and experience of the ableſt phyſicians. We know what we ought to do, what would be moſt uſeful, advantageous, and honourable, for us, and nevertheleſs we take a contrary courſe. This is the doing of the gods. The poet Perſius addreſſes himſelf to Jupiter, to beg the favour that he would be pleaſed to make tyrants acknowledge the power of virtue, and feel the ſevereſt regret for not having purſued it.

Magne pater divum ſævos punire tryannos
Haud alia ratione velis, cum dira libido
Moverit ingenium ferventi tincta veneno;
Virtutem videant, intabeſcantque relicta (161).

Great Jove! when impious tyrants you wou'd croſs,
May they ſee virtue, and regret it's loſs.

Plutarch recites a poetical ſentence, which ſhews that the heathens reaſoned in this manner: *they who know good, do it not; therefore the gods are the cauſe of it.* I put his Greek words in the margin (162). Medea argued in this manner, when ſhe found ſhe could not reſiſt the love ſhe entertained for Jaſon, when ſhe could not, I ſay, reſiſt it, though ſhe clearly ſaw the ſhameful and criminal conſequences of her conduct, and that her own reaſon condemned them.

Concipit interea validos Æetias ignes,
Et luctata diu, poſtquam ratione furorem
Vincere non poterat; Fruſtra Medea repugnas,
Neſcio quis deus obſtat, ait (163).
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Excute virgineo conceptas pectore flammas,
Si potes, infelix. Si poſſem, ſanior eſſem;
Sed *trahit invitam nova vis: aliudque Cupido,*
Mens aliud ſuadet. Video meliora, proboque
Deteriora ſequor (164).

Mean while Medea, ſeiz'd with fierce deſire,
By reaſon ſtrives in vain to quench the raging fire.
But ſtrives in vain; ſome god, ſhe ſaid, withſtands,
And reaſon's baffled counſel countermands.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Wretch, from thy virgin breaſt this rage expel,
And ſoon, ah could I! all would then be well.
But love, reſiſtleſs love, my ſoul invades,
Diſcretion this, affection that, perſuades.
I ſee the right, and I approve it too,
Condemn the wrong, and yet the wrong purſue.

GARTH.

She propoſed to herſelf all the arguments that might cure her of that paſſion; ſhe repreſented to herſelf the heinouſneſs of the fault which ſhe ſhould commit, and ſhe had ſome intervals, wherein theſe lively images of duty were ready to carry the victory, but the ſight of Jaſon eaſily defeated all her reſolutions.

Conjugiumne putas? Specioſaque nomina culpæ
Imponis, Medea, tuæ? Quin aſpice quantum
Aggrediare nefas; &, dum licet, effuge crimen.
Dixit, & ante oculos rectum pietaſque pudorque
Conſtiterant, & victa dabat jam terga Cupido.
Ibat ad antiquas Hecates Perſeidos aras,
Quas nemus umbroſum, ſecretaque ſylva tegebat:
Et jam fractus erat, pulſuſque reſederat ardor.
Cùm videt Æſonidem, extinctaque flamma reluxit (165).
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Sic jam lentus amor, quem jam languere putares
Ut videt juvenem, ſpecie præſentis inarſit (166).

'*Didſt thou ſay husband, canſt thou ſo deceive*
'*Thy ſelf, fond maid, and thy own cheat believe,*
'*In vain thou ſtriv'ſt to varniſh o'er thy ſhame,*
'*And grace thy guilt with wedlock's ſacred name.*
'*Pull off the coz'ning mask, and oh! in time,*
'*Diſcover and avoid the fatal crime.*
She ceas'd, the Graces now, with kind ſurprize,
And virtue's lovely train before her eyes,
Preſent themſelves and vanquiſh'd Cupid flies.
Then to a ſhrine of Hecate's that ſtood
Far in the covert of a ſhady wood;
She calm retir'd, and found her flames aſſwag'd,
But ſeeing Jaſon there, again they rag'd.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

So in her breaſt the ſleeping paſſions riſe,
When kindled by the heroe's ſparkling eyes.

GARTH.

Abundance of people of both ſexes, whom hiſtory has made no mention of, have found themſelves in the ſame condition. Love has made them commit a thouſand faults, whereof they have ſeen the ſhame and danger ſo clearly, as to have endeavoured to prevent them, by calling reaſon to their aſſiſtance, and making many wiſhes againſt their paſſion. It was natural for them to conclude, that they were not the cauſe of their evil conduct, inaſmuch as they had a reaſonable underſtanding, and a ſoul that was free, and miſtreſs of it's will. This firſt concluſion led them to another, which was, that ſome cauſe, that was external and ſuperior to all their forces, ſwayed them. This ſecond concluſion made them draw this third, that ſome god was an external and neceſſitating cauſe. This was the original of the pretended divinity of Venus and Cupid; and becauſe we find by experience that jealouſy, envy, avarice, drunkenneſs, the deſire of revenge, and many other paſſions, make men commit a thouſand things which reaſon condemns, and which are even contrary to the true intereſt of ſelf-love, and which one would not wiſh for, it has been believed that the gods inſtigated us to theſe things. The heathens did not accuſe them therefore becauſe they made no reflexions, but rather becauſe they made a great many obſervations upon what paſſed in the ſoul. If the Pagans had had the the juſt idea of GOD that we have, which repreſents him to us as a being perfectly holy, they would have ſecured themſelves from that raſh judgment; but attributing to the gods the ſame faults that men are ſubject to, nothing hindered them from believing the gods urged men on to evil, and rendered the light of reaſon ineffectual, ſometimes by a flattering view of pleaſure, which neceſſitated the will; at other times by importunate pain, which had the ſame effect. Paris was agreable to Helen, and Jaſon to Medea; they could not think of their union with theſe objects, without feeling before-hand an incredible ſatisfaction; nor could they conſider themſelves as ſeparated from them, without feeling a great torment. Theſe impreſſions depended not on their liberty, and were no more under it's command, than the agreeable or diſagreeable ſenſations we feel upon taſting honey or gall. All that theſe two women could do, was to oppoſe reaſon and duty to theſe two fortaſtes; feeble weapons, if Paris and Jaſon continued to raiſe the ſame ideas and the ſame impreſſions; ſince in that caſe they would captivate their will ſooner, or later, and extort a conſent from it, whatever deſire it had to be unſubdued, and to paſs from love to indifference. Uſeleſs are the vows, weak the velleities, in the preſence of thoſe foretaſtes I have ſpoke, and whoſe cauſe proceeds not from ourſelves. Whence proceeds it then? the Pagans might well look for it on all hands, they could not

(161) Perſius, Sat. III, ver. 35.

(162) Αἲ αἲ τόδ' ἤδη Θεῖον ἀνθρώποις κακὸν Ὅτάν τις εἰδῇ τἀγαθὸν, χρῆται δὲ μή. Eheu, malum mortalibus divinitus Venit, ut bonum videant, non utantur tamen. *Plut. de Audiend. Poëtis, pag.* 33, *E.*

(163) Ovid. Metam. lib vii, ver. 9.

(164) Id. ibid. ver. 17.

(165) Id. ibid. ver. 69.

(166) Id. ibid. ver. 82.

abate her charms. A French author pretends ſhe had a great deal of wit and eloquence, and was as amiable for that as for her beauty (l) [AA].

(l) See citat. (150).

not find it upon the earth, and for that reaſon they attributed it to the gods. This they might do two ways, either by ſuppoſing a Cupid who wounded the heart, or by ſuppoſing that the author of human bodies had adjuſted the parts of them with ſuch an artifice, that, for example, that of Jaſon ſhould excite in the heart and head of Medea, thoſe motions of the ſpirits on which love mechanically and inevitably depends. According to this laſt principle, if Helen or Medea fell in love, he muſt be blamed who has faſhioned and arranged the parts of their bodies; juſt as if a chimney ſhould ſmoke when the wind blows, this muſt not be imputed to the wind, but to the Maſon who made the chimney.

How much moſt paſſions and their effects are involuntary.

This was an abyſs the Pagans could not get out of, and they muſt needs fall into it, as often as they pretended to give a reaſon of the contrariety that is found betwixt what we do and what we know; and conſequently they fell into it very often: for humane life is hardly any thing elſe but a continual combat betwixt the paſſions and the conſcience, in which the latter has generally the worſt of it. And what is the moſt ſtrange and odd in this battle, is, that the victory very frequently declares for the ſide, which ſhocks all at once the ideas we have of virtue, and the knowledge which we have of our temporal intereſts. I am willing to believe there are many ſo brutiſhly ſtupid, as not to ſee that their life would be more happy, if they did not not cheriſh in their breaſts the paſſions which they cheriſh there; but I cannot believe but that the greateſt part of the jealous and envious, are fully perſuaded that it would be an incomparable temporal advantage to be exempt from jealouſy and envy, and worthy to be purchaſed at any rate. A woman jealous of her husband or gallant, a husband jealous of his wife or miſtreſs, are perſons who have the moſt lively ſenſe of their miſery, and paſſionately wiſh to be delivered from this tormentor. They do all that is poſſible to drive away this fury which perſecutes them; they employ all the reaſons their mind can ſuggeſt to them to deceive or undeceive themſelves; but in ſpite of all theſe efforts jealouſy ſtands it's ground, and they find, to their great regret, that they are more ingenious at inventing what can nouriſh it, than what can weaken it. The ſame almoſt may be ſaid of the envious; they know very well that ſelf-love would find it's account incomparably better, in being content with their own condition, and looking on the proſperity of others with pleaſure, than in afflicting themſelves becauſe your neighbour is advanced and enriched above them; yet nevertheleſs in ſpite of their knowledge they torment themſelves and pine away, when they ſee the good fortune of others (167), and inſtead of rejoycing at it, as they ought to do for their own advantage, they are reduced to ſeek ſome remedy in baſe and perfidious actions. By reproaches and treacherous blows, they oppoſe their neighbour's ſucceſs, and thereby endeavour to mitigate the malignant fever that preys upon them. What could a Heathen philoſopher ſay to this? ought not he to acknowledge a ſuperiour cauſe in it, and rank all this ſort of people in the number of phanatics, the poſſeſt, the enthuſiaſt, and, in general, of all thoſe whom they believed to be acted by a divine furor (168)? Note, that Ovid ſuppoſes that the jealouſy which Aglaura, the daughter of Cecrops king of Athens, conceived againſt her ſiſter, was inſpired into her by a divinity (169). The true ſyſtem of the Chriſtians is the only one that can reſolve theſe difficulties; it teaches us, that ſince the firſt man fell from the ſtate of innocence, all his poſterity have been ſubjected to ſuch corruption, that without a ſupernatural grace they are neceſſarily ſlaves of iniquity, *inclined to do evil, unprofitable to all good* (170). Reaſon, philoſophy, the ideas of virtue, the knowledge of the true intereſt of ſelf-love, all this is unable to reſiſt the paſſions. The empire which was given to the ſuperiour faculty of the ſoul, over the inferiour, was taken from man, from the time of Adam's ſin. Thus it is that divines explain the change which this ſin introduced; but as the greateſt part of metaphors muſt not be preſſed beyond a certain point, we muſt not abuſe this; for it would not be reaſonable to ſay, that in the ſtate of innocence, the inferiour faculty was in the ſame condition it is at preſent, but that no diſorder could ariſe from it, becauſe the ſuperiour could always ſeaſonably interpoſe to withſtand it. This would be to ſuppoſe that the body of man, as it came from the hands of his creator, was actually inclined towards ſenſualities and blameable paſſions, this would be to injure the perfections of the ſupreme being.

(167) Videt ingratos intabeſcitque videndo Succeſſus hominum; carpitque & carpitur una; Suppliciumque ſuum eſt. *Ovidius, Metam. lib. ii, ver. 782. He ſpeaks of Envy.*

(168) Eſt Deus in nobis, agitante caleſcimus illo. Impetus hic ſacræ ſemina mentis habet. *Ovidius, Faſtor. lib. vi, circa init. He ſpeaks of the Poets.*

(169) Ovid. Metam. lib. ii, Fab. xii.

(170) See the prayers of the Geneva liturgy.

[Z] *She cut off her hair being in mourning.*] What I have to ſay upon this point was communicated to me by a profeſſor at Geneva (171); I will tranſcribe his words. 'The ſubject of the firſt letter of John 'Michael Brutus's collection, is diverting. Victorius, 'who writes to John della Caſa, pretends that Helen, 'to expreſs her ſorrow for the death of her ſiſter 'Clytemneſtra, cut off her hair to the root, without 'prejudice to her beauty; and Monſignor della Caſa 'is of opinion, that ſhe only cut off the ends, as 'is ſometimes done to hinder them from branching; 'and he produces on this ſubject ſome verſes of an 'ingenious poem of that archbiſhop, addreſſed to count 'Geleazzo de Florimont, wherein the prelate makes 'an ingenuous confeſſion, that he has not quitted the 'world but very ſuperficially, and that ſo he has imitated Helen, who ſacrificed to her grief for her ſiſter 'only the extremities of her locks: the poetry of it 'is noble.

(171) Mr Minutoli, of whom before in the remarks [L] and [M] of the article EPICURUS.

Ut captâ rediens Helena cum conjuge Troiâ
Lento homine, atque animi lenis, nimiumque remiſſi,
Incidit in cædem ipſam, & funus prope ſororis,
Quam præceps miſeri virtus jugularat Oreſtis,
Succiſam de more comam miſſura ſepulto
Germanæ cineri, fertur dempſiſſe capillo
Vix tandem è ſummo paulum, ne ſorte placeret
Tonſa minus metuens Spartanis improba mœchis.
Haud aliter Galatæ malis erroribus actus
Nuper ego, & Phrygios nautos Paridemque ſecutus
Aufugi longè, atque idem rediit tamen ut mens
Ad ſeſe, peregrè nimium remorata protervæ
Ornamenta fugæ ſenſim lenteque repono, &c.

When Menelaus, Troy in aſhes loſt,
Return'd, with Helen, to his native coaſt,
Where the ſad news of poor Electra ſlain
By mad Oreſtes, gave him added pain;
Forc'd by a law, which tyrant cuſtom made,
Her hair to offer to her ſiſter's ſhade,
Fair Helen clipt th' extremes alone, 'tis ſaid.
To ſpare the honours of her head ſhe choſe,
Leſt, ſhorn too cloſe, ſhe leſs ſhou'd pleaſe the beaus.
So I, whom lately wandring error drew
To follow Paris, and the Phrygian crew,
Reaſon return'd, and judgment now ſet right,
Put off the trappings of too raſh a flight.

The faſhions of head-dreſſes may be ſo diverſified, that ſome may be found where the charms of a face may not perhaps ſuffer any diminution by the loſs of hair; but in general it is certain this loſs is reckoned a very dreadful accident to beauty. See the note [G] in the article ANACREON.

[AA] *A French author pretends ſhe had a great deal of wit, and eloquence, and owed her conqueſts to theſe as much as to her beauty.*] That French author is the chevalier de Meré: he proves, by two great examples, *that women ought not to put too much confidence in their beauty, nor men in their genteel carriage, and that it is addreſs, and the turn of wit, which does almoſt all in all, provided the perſon has nothing diſguſtful in him* (172). The firſt example is Cleopatra: ſhe had no great ſhare of beauty, *ſaith he* (173), 'and as the 'world ſpoke of her, ſhe was not ſo handſome as to 'ſurprize at the firſt ſight: but when ſhe came to be 'conſidered, ſhe was charming to a miracle, and it 'was by the delicacy of her manners, that ſhe kept 'Cæſar inchanted three or four years. . . . For a 'certain proof that it was her wit that made that 'princeſs ſo admired, we may obſerve that Antony, 'who had as nice a taſte as Cæſar, did not ſee her 'till an age, in which few women retain their beauty; 'yet he became ſo deſperately in love with her, that 'he choſe rather to renounce the empire of the world, 'than to loſe her out of his ſight.' See here his ſecond example.

(172) Chevalier de Meré, Diſcours des Agrémens, pag. 138, Dutch Edit.

(173) Id. ibid.

Helene par même voye
Aux rares beautez de ſon corps
Ajouſtant de l'eſprit les aimables threſors,
Cauſa l'embraſement de Troye.
Si ſon eſprit n'euſt eu des charmes
Ce peuple n'euſt jamais voulu,
Contre le droit des gens d'un pouvoir abſolu,
Pour la garder prendre les armes.
La Grece auſſi l'euſt oubliée
Entre les bras de ſon amant,
Mais elle ſe ſouvint de ſon eſprit charmant,
Et la guerre fut publiée.

The force of wit and beauty cou'd deſtroy
(In Helen met) the lofty walls of Troy.
Trojans and Greeks (renown'd in ancient ſong)
For vulgar wit had never fought ſo long.
But the remembrance of her wond'rous charms
Kindled revenge, and ſet all Greece in arms.

‘ There is great probability, Madam, that her beauty was not alone, ſince all the gods intereſſed themſelves to give it to thoſe whom they favoured; and if ſhe had no more than a good face and a fine ſhape, they muſt have made them but an indifferent preſent. I imagine that what they more eſteemed in her, was the art of pleaſing which ſhe poſſeſſed, and of making herſelf beloved by her converſation (174).’ Add to this the words of the ſame author, which I have related in mentioning the Nepenthes (175).

I do not examine whether he be in the right as to the particular inſtance of the beautiful Helen; but his maxim in general ſeems to be true (176). Beauty without the charms of wit and language, is of no great force; and if it makes any conqueſts, it is after the manner of thoſe brave generals, who quickly ſubdue a province, but know not how to keep it: The empire of the fair is at leaſt as much maintained by the charms of wit, as by thoſe of the face. Theſe are two ſorts of graces that ſtand in need of one another, and mutually perform good offices to each other. Some inſipid and ridiculous diſcourſes would be extreamly diſtaſtful, if the beauty of the perſon did not lend them I know not what charms to adorn them: and ſome beauties of the body would make no impreſſion, if they did not borrow charms from the graces of the mind. Theſe are aſſiſtances that are reciprocally given. But as the wit is moſt times the principal inſtrument in preſerving the conqueſt, and very frequently in making it, it may be aſſerted to be that which contributes moſt to the eſtabliſhing the dominion of beauty. The poet that aſſures us, there is no leſs leſs force required to preſerve than to obtain a conqueſt,

Non minor eſt virtus, quam quærere, parta tueri:
Caſus ineſt illis; hic erit artis opus (177),

Not leſs the boaſt to keep, than to acquire:
Chance may beſtow; to keep, will art require.

is one of the greateſt legiſlators in the empire of love; and he applies that ſentence to the caſe we are now treating of. Nay, he goes farther, he will have the acquiſition to be leſs difficult than the preſervation.

Nunc mihi, ſi quando, Puer & Cytherêa, favete:
Nunc Erato: nam tu nomen amoris habes.
Magna paro; quas poſſit Amor remanere per artes
Dicere, tam vaſto pervagus orbe puer (178).

Thy aid, bright goddeſs of the Cyprian ſhore,
And, Erato, thy favour I implore.
Vaſt my deſign, to fix love's fleeting joy,
And ſhew what arts confine the wanton boy.

This is likewiſe the opinion of many hiſtorians, concerning the progreſs of arms (179).

(174) Id. ibid. pag. 139.

(175) In the remark [*T*], at the end.

(176) See above, the remark [*A*] of the article DELLIUS, and the New Letters againſt the Hiſtory of Calviniſm of Maimbourg, pag. 591, and 774.

(177) Ovid. de Arte Amandi, lib. ii, ver. 13.

(178) Id. ibid. ver. 15.

(179) Plus eſt Provinciam retinere, quam facere. *Flor. lib. ii, cap. xvii.* Facilius eſt quædam vincere quam tueri. *Q. Curtius, lib. iv, cap. xi.* See Freinſhemius's Commentaries on thoſe two paſſages.

HELIODORUS, a native of Emeſa in Phœnicia (*a*), is more known by the romance which he compoſed in his youth [*A*], than by the biſhopric of Trica (*b*) to which he was afterwards preferred. There are few who believe that he was depoſed by a ſynod, becauſe he would not conſent to the ſuppreſſion of that romance [*B*]. Nicephorus

(*a*) Heliodor. Æthiop. lib. x, ſub. fin.

(*b*) In Theſſaly.

[*A*] *The romance which he compoſed in his youth.*] The title of it is Αἰθιοπικὰ, and it contains the amours of Theagenes and Chariclea. We find an extract of it in Photius (1). Mr Huet is of opinion that Heliodorus has been, with reſpect to writers of romances, what Homer was with reſpect to poets; that is, that his work has ſerved as an original and plan for a great number of ſucceeding romances. *Eum ſibi ſequentium temporum fabulatores Romanenſes tanquam exemplum propoſuerunt ad imitandum, & tam verè omnes dici poſſunt ex hoc fonte, quàm Poetæ ex Homerico ſuas, ut ut dicam, aquas hauſiſſe* (2). The firſt edition of this book is, as I take it, that of Baſil 1534. Opſopæus, who dedicated it to the ſenate of Nuremberg, aſſures us, that a ſoldier ſaved the manuſcripts, when the library of Buda was pillaged (3). Staniſlaus Warſzewiczki, a Poliſh knight, is the author of the Latin tranſlation, which was printed at Baſil, with the Greek, in the year 1551. Amiot began his French verſions with this work. [Melin of St Gelais, biſhop of Angouleme (§ *α*), has turned a good part of it into French verſe (4). John Bourdelot's notes upon this romance are very learned; they were printed at Paris in the year 1619, with the Greek of Heliodorus, and the tranſlation of the Poliſh knight.

[(§ *α*) If Sorel has ſaid what Mr Bayle ſeems to make him ſay, to wit, that the poet Melin de St Gelais was biſhop of Angoulême, he muſt neither have conſulted the Elogies of Sammarthanus, nor the *Gallia Chriſtiani*. It was Octavian de S. Gelais, natural father of Melin, who was biſhop of that city. He lived under Charles VIII and Louis XII, and ſeveral pieces of poetry of this biſhop, are to be found in a collection in 4to. in Gothic characters, intitled *Vergier d'Honneur*.

It is ſurpriſing that Mr Bayle ſuffered ſuch a miſtake to eſcape him: it has probably been occaſioned one of thoſe [illegible] inattentions, to which the greateſt genius's are ſubject. In copying Sorel (*a*), from whom he has taken this, he has not obſerved this author's miſtake; otherwiſe he would have, as uſual, acquainted us with it. Sorel likewiſe probably fell into this, led by inadvertency; but ſtill it is a great fault, ſince, beſides Mr Bayle, this has made the author of the *Eſſais de Literature* (*b*), and even the famous Mr Fabricius (*c*), fall into the ſame error. Inſtead of Melin de St Gelais, he ought to have ſaid Octavain de St Gelais, his father, who was indeed biſhop of Angoulême (*d*), and who was the perſon they meant. However neither du Verdier (*e*), nor la Croix du Maine (*f*), nor any other author that I know, has made mention of this tranſlation in verſe, of a part of the amours of Theagenes and Chariclea; and Sorel is perhaps the only perſon who has ſpoke of it.

By the by, I ſhall obſerve that in the *Incunabula Typographiæ* of *Beughem*, pag. 176, they have changed this *Octavian de St Gelais* into *Octavicus de St Gervais*. This is to disfigure names ſtrangely. Rem. Crit.]

[*B*] *There are few who believe that he was depoſed by a ſynod, becauſe he would not conſent to the ſuppreſſion of that romance.*] Nicephorus relates, that a ſynod having given Heliodorus his choice, either to burn his romance or renounce his biſhopric, the author choſe rather to ceaſe from being a biſhop than to throw his work into the fire (5). This ſeems fabulous; a thing ſo remarkable, would have been related by many hiſtorians; and we ſhould not have had it preſerved only by Nicephorus, a man of great credulity and little judgment. ‘ Quæ omnia eò me facilè reducunt, ut diffidam iis maximè quæ addit Nicephorus, ſcriptor credulus, ſapientiæ & fidei non ſatis ſpectatæ, Synodum ſcilicet Provincialem cognito periculo, in quod lectio fabulæ hujus, cui autoris ſui dignitas tantum ponderis & autoritatis dabat, juvenes ſuapte naturâ ad id propenſos & quaſi nutantes impelleret, eam ipſi conditionem obtuliſſe, ut aut opus ſuum

(1) Num. 73, pag. 157, & ſeq.

(2) Huet. de Origin. Fabul. Roman. pag. 38.

(3) See Geſner's Bibliotheque, fol. 301.

(4) Sorel's Notes on the thirteenth book of the Extravagant Shepherd, pag. 5.

(*a*) Sorel, Remarques ſur le xiii livre du Berger Extravagant, pag. 477.

(*b*) Tom. II, pag. 304, 305. Edit. de Holland.

(*c*) Biblioth. Græca, Tom. VI, pag. 787.

(*d*) Sammarth. Elog. pag. 39.

(*e*) Biblioth. Françoiſe, pag. 928.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 364.

(5) Nicephor. Hiſtor. lib. xii, cap. xxxiv.

cephorus is the only author who ſays ſo. Socrates (c) ſays, that Heliodorus introduced the cuſtom of depoſing eccleſiaſtics, who lay with their wives after their ordination. This is a favourable prejudice for the chaſtity of that prelate. His romance even ſhews him to be a lover of this virtue. For the hero of the piece is of ſuch a modeſty as has given occaſion to ſevere railleries [C]. The tranſlator of Photius does not well expreſs

'flammis aboleret, aut ſuâ dignitate cederet; eumque, quod ultimum erat, prætuliſſe (6). —— *All theſe things make me doubt, eſpecially what Nicephorus adds, (a credulous author, and of no great judgment or credit) to wit, that a provincial ſynod, being aware of the danger into which the reading of that romance might lead the youth, who are too prone by nature to be hurried away by that paſſion: and conſidering that the dignity of it's author would make it ſtill more dangerous, offered him theſe terms, that he ſhould either burn his book, or reſign his biſhopric, and that he choſe the laſt.*' Would Socrates have been ſilent of it in the paſſage where he ſays that Heliodorus compoſed ſome books of love in his youth? Οὗ λέγεται πονήματα ἐρωτικὰ βιβλία, ἃ νέος ὢν ἔταξε καὶ αἰθιοπικὰ προσηγόρευσε: Cujus nomine circumferuntur amatorii libri quos ille dum juvenis eſſet compoſuit, & Æthiopicos inſcripſit (7). —— *Under whoſe name we have ſome books of love adventures, which he compoſed in his youth, and intituled Ethiopics.* Valeſius, not content to reject as a fable what Nicephorus tells, will not ſo much as believe that this romance was compoſed by Heliodorus the biſhop. See his notes upon this paſſage of Socrates. Let us hear what Mr Sorel ſays. *I cannot believe that Heliodorus was a biſhop, and ſo fooliſh as to chooſe rather to loſe his biſhopric than to burn his book, according to the option that was given him. Theſe are little ſtories forged at pleaſure; for if his book was ſo ſcandalous, that it could not be ſuffered to be publiſhed, they would not have failed to have forbidden it, tho' he had quitted his dignity, ſo that he would have loſt his aim* (8). This author had better have given his judgment without any reaſon; for the reaſon he offers is good for nothing. The condemnation of a book by a ſynod, does not hinder it from being read, known, and commended according to it's merit; and conſequently Heliodorus would not have been defeated of his end, tho' the biſhops, who gave him his choice, had condemned his romance. Father Vavaſſeur has argued in a more ſolid manner, in ſaying that it was no longer in Heliodorus's power to ſuppreſs his book; from whence we ought to conclude that the biſhops did not give him that option which is pretended. What advantage could accrue to morality from it? 'Neutrum, quantum opinio mea eſt, vere dicitur. Neque lata Epiſcopo conditio tam præpoſtera, tamque gravis: neque ab illo accepta, aut repudiata quoquo modo: quod ipſe, qui narrat, abunde narratione ſua refellit. An vero fuit in poteſtate Heliodori, ut aboleret igni, ac perderet opus ſuum, aut omnino ſuppreſſum teneret, quod jam exiſſet in vulgus, & manibus omnium evolveretur, quodque juventus periculo aliquo, damnoque morum, ut vult Nicephorus, legendo contriviſſet (9). —— *Neither of theſe, in my opinion is true, either that ſo prepoſterous and hard conditions were impoſed on the biſhop, or that he accepted of, or refuſed, them in any ſort: the relater of the ſtory methinks abundantly confutes it. For was it any longer in the power of Heliodorus to deſtroy or altogether to ſuppreſs his work which had been publiſhed, and was in every body's hands, and which, as Nicephorus pretends, had been ſo well received by the youth as to endanger their morals.*' He adds, that Petavius did not think this ſtory of Nicephorus worthy of any credit.

[C] *The hero of the piece is of ſuch a modeſty as has given occaſion to ſevere railleries.*] Obſerve a little this paſſage of *Parnaſſus Reformed*, where Theagenes ſpeaks. 'If things had been faithfully reported as they were tranſacted, I ſhould have no reaſon to complain, I ſhould not find fault with my romancer: but he repreſents me as an inſenſible creature, and attributes to me that ſtupid baſhfulneſs, which is offended with the moſt innocent liberties; making me give my miſtreſs a box on the ear, rather than permit her to kiſs me. It is my part (Chariclea interrupts him) to complain of the box on the ear you ſpeak of. If it be ſcandalous for you to have given it, it is much more ſo for me to have received it, and the reparation you may pretend to expect from Heliodorus, belongs to me alone.' Now obſerve Heliodorus's anſwer. *The box on the ear which diſturbs you, is an argument of your modeſty,* ſays he to Theagenes; *it is the effect of a virtue which is much to your advantage, and thereby I have preſerved that decorum which the dignity of my character obliged me to. It is true,* replyed Theagenes, *that for a biſhop* (10), *you have repreſented your own character well enough in that place, but you would have repreſented it better, if you had burnt your romance, or if you had never thought of writing it. Lovers have nothing to do with epiſcopal virtues, and biſhops do not well agree with the liberties of lovers. A veſtal chaſtity ill becomes heroes, whoſe love ought to be diſengaged from all thoſe ſcrupulous formalities which check it's noble tranſports and charming raptures.* It is obſervable that the author is ſuppoſed to have nothing to anſwer to Chariclea's complaint. And indeed what could be ſaid to an accuſation ſo well grounded? the heroine of a romance, who would kiſs her lover, and receives a box on the ear from him in return from the favour. Doth not ſhe make a very ridiculous figure in ſuch a piece?

Thus I finiſhed this remark, in the firſt edition of this Dictionary. I ſuppoſed that Mr Gueret having ſhewn a great deal of wit and good taſte, in his *Parnaſſus Reformed*, had not founded his ralleries upon a falſhood of his own invention: for nothing could have been more contrary to the laws of criticiſm and ſatire (11). Believing therefore he could not be guilty of ſuch a fault, I did not queſtion but the fact was ſo as he relates it; and for that reaſon I was not at the pains of examining the original. But Mr du Rondel had no ſooner read the remark [C] of this article, but he wrote to me, that the matter was not at all as Mr Gueret has repreſented it; he ſhewed me the circumſtances of the action, and made it appear that Theagenes deſerved not the leaſt cenſure. I have juſt now read the place where Heliodorus recites that adventure, and am convinced with my own eyes that Mr du Rondel is in the right, and that the author of *Parnaſſus Reformed*, impoſed on the public, and took the liberty to make railleies which ought rather to be called impoſtures. Theagenes and Chariclea, ſeparted from each other by the ſtrokes of capricious, fortune, which are ſo frequent in romances, happened to come near Memphis at the ſame time. They had made no aſſignation, nor taken ſo much as the ſame road; it happened that Chariclea arrived near the town, when Theagenes was walking round the walls, on an occaſion which furniſhed the inhabitants with a ſhew. She knew him at a great diſtance; for, as Heliodorus obſerves, lovers eyes are very ſubtile (12). She felt ſuch emotions on the ſight of that object, that, as if a waſp had ſtung her, ſhe ran with tranſport towards Theagenes, and threw her arms about his neck without ſpeaking a word. She was in a ſorry dreſs and her face all beſmeared, ſo that he took her for a proſtitute and puſhed her from him: but not being able to get rid of her, he gave her a box on the ear. Χαρίκλεια . . . . . πόρρωθεν ἀναγνωρίσασα τὸν Θεαγένην . . . . ὥσπερ οἰςρηθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῆς ὄψεως, ἐμμανὴς ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἵεται· καὶ περιφῦσα τοῦ αὐχένος ἀπρὶξ εἴχετο καὶ ἐξήρτητο, καὶ γοεροῖς τισι κατησπάζετο θρήνοις. ὁ δὲ, οἷον εἰκὸς, ὄψιν τε ῥυπῶσαν καὶ πρὸς τὸ αἰσχρότερον ἐπιτετηδευμένην [ἰδὼν] καὶ ἐσθῆτα τετρυχωμένην καὶ κατερρωγυῖαν, ὥσπερ τινα τῶν ἀγυρτίδων καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀλῆτιν, διωθεῖτο καὶ παρηγκωνίζετο· καὶ τέλος ἐπειδὴ οὐ μεθίει, ὡς ἐνοχλοῦσαν καὶ τῇ θέᾳ τῶν ἀμφὶ Καλάσιριν ἐμποδὼν ἱσταμένην, καὶ διεῤῥάπισεν. *Chariclia . . . . . cum è longinquo cognoviſſet Theagenem . . . . tanquam icta illius aſpectu, furibunda ad ipſum fertur, & hærens in amplexu, è collo nulla voce edita pendebat, lugubribuſque quibuſdam lamentis eum ſalutabat. Ille autem, ut eſt veriſimile, vultum ſqualidum, & ex induſtria contaminatum & pollutum videns, & veſtem vilem ac laceram, veluti aliquam ex circulatricibus, & revera vagabundam repellebat, ac rejiciebat:*

(c) Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. v, cap. xxii.

(6) Huetius, ubi ſupra, pag. 36.

(7) Socrat. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. v, cap. xxii.

(8) Sorel, ubi ſupra, lib. xiii, pag. 685.

(9) Vavaſſor, de Ludicra Dictione, pag. 150.

(10) Heliodorus was not biſhop when he compoſed his Romance. Socrates aſſures us he wrote it when he was young.

(11) Compare this with the remark [C] of the article COLOMIES.

(12) Ὀξὺ γάρ τι πρὸς ἐπίγνωσιν ἐρωτικῶν ὄψις, καὶ κίνημα, πολλάκις καὶ σχῆμα μόνον κἂν πόῤῥωθεν ἢ κἂν ἐκ νώτων τῆς ὁμοιότητος τὴν φαντασία[illegible] ρέςησεν. est enim [illegible] noſcendo a[illegible] tium aſpect[illegible] piuſque mo[illegible] tantum & [illegible] tus, quamvis [illegible] longinquo, aut etiam à tergo, ſimilitudinis opinionem præbuit. *Heliodor. lib. vii, pag. 311. Edit. Pariſ. 1619.*

expreſs the elogy that is given to the chaſt amours of Theagenes and Chariclea; for according to the tranſlation, we ſhould believe that Heliodorus had compoſed a romance on the amours of a huſband and wife [*D*], which would be very abſurd. An author has pretended, that Heliodorus was not a Chriſtian; but he goes upon very weak grounds [*E*]. Mr. Huet (*d*) does not doubt that the author of this romance, was biſhop of Trica, in the reign of Theodoſius; but he thinks it cannot be proved, that Heliodorus, the biſhop, to whom St. Jerome wrote letters, was biſhop of Trica. He thinks alſo, that they who ſhould affirm it, could not be ſolidly confuted. If the depoſing of Heliodorus was true, it would be a great inſtance of the fondneſs of authors for their works. A modern writer knew ſome men who would have done what is attributed to the biſhop of Trica [*F*].

(*d*) De Origine Fabularum Romanenſium, pag. 38.

rejiciebat: & ad extremum, cùm non deſiſteret, tanquam ſibi moleſtæ & ſpectaculum illud Calaſiris impedienti, etiam alapam inflixit (13). But as ſoon as he found that it was his dear Chariclea, he paſſionately embraced her (14). It is eaſy to conclude from this narration that the reformer of Parnaſſus has quite changed the nature of the action, which makes all his railleries inſipid and abſurd. Chariclea, I confeſs, received a box on the ear; but it cannot with juſtice be affirmed that Theagenes gave Chariclea a box on the ear, he believed that he ſtruck one of thoſe creatures which go by the name of gypſies. Apply to this what the civilians and caſuiſts obſerve concerning the ignorance that excuſes.

[*D*] *According to the tranſlation we ſhould believe that Heliodorus had compoſed a romance on the amours of a huſband and wife.*] Theſe are the tranſlator's words. 'Dramatis hujus argumentum auctori præbuere Theagenes & Chariclea caſtè inter ſe ac pudice amantes, cum ultro citroque jactati errarunt, & capti etiam idemtidem, fidem tamen *conjugalem* conſtanter ſervarunt. —— *The ſubject of this piece, is the chaſte and modeſt loves of Theagenes and Chariclea; who, tho' toſt about by adverſe fortune, and ſometimes taken captives*, yet *ſtill preſerved their conjugal faith with inviolable conſtancy.*' Here is a *tamen (yet)*, which is wrong, and is an addition of the tranſlator. Photius has not reaſoned ſo ill as to ſay, that tho' adverſe fortune had made Theagenes and Chariclea wanderers and captives, yet they had notwithſtanding, continued conſtant lovers. Every body knows, that the wandering, and ſometimes captive, life theſe two lovers led, is rather a reaſon why the hero did not change his miſtreſs, nor the heroine her lover, than a reaſon why they ſhould alter the object of their loves. Inconſtancy is leſs ſurprizing in the ſoftneſs of a life, altogether calm and ſerene, and unmixt with adverſity. But the tranſlator's principal fault is his ſaying, they exactly obſerved the conjugal faith. How could that be, ſince they were not married? they do not marry, according to cuſtom, till the end of the book. It is the concluſion of Heliodorus's romance. Here is the true verſion of Photius's words. Ἔστιν αὐτῷ ἡ τοῦ δράματος ὑπόθεσις Χαρίκλεια καὶ Θεαγένης, σώφρονες ἀλλήλων ἐρασταί, καὶ πλάνη τούτων, καὶ αἰχμαλωσία παντοδαπὴ, καὶ φυλακὴ τῆς σωφροσύνης. *Sunt ipſi argumentum dramatis Theagenes & Chariclea pudice inter ſe amantes, & eorum errores, ac captivitas omnimoda, & cuſtodia caſtitatis* (15). Opſopæus a long time ago committed the fault that I am cenſuring. 'Conjugalis amoris ac fidei & conſtantiæ pulcherrimum exemplar in Theagene & Chariclea adumbravit (16). —— *He drew a beautiful picture of conjugal love, faith, and conſtancy, in the hiſtory of Theagenes and Chariclea.*'

[*E*] *Some body has pretended that Heliodorus was not a Chriſtian, but he goes upon very weak grounds.*] The firſt is, that Amiot ſays, *that Philoſtratus makes mention of a Sophiſt, called Heliodorus; and that ſome have believed that it is of our author he ſpeaks there.* The ſecond is, *that this author, by ſaying at the end of his book, that he is a Phœnician, a native of the city of Emeſſa, and of the race of the Sun, muſt deſtroy the opinion of his being a Chriſtian. For there is no doubt but a Chriſtian, and a biſhop too, muſt be mad if he ſhould ſay he was a deſcendant of that luminary* (17). I need not ſay, that the firſt reaſon proves nothing. The ſecond is of more force; but not enough to found a good proof upon. It is certain, that many Chriſtians of the IVth century, made mention of the antiquity of their families (18). Why then ſhould we not believe, that Heliodorus has mentioned his? he did not believe that he owed his original to the Sun; but he might think he ought to characterize it by it; It was a title his family had been of a long time diſtinguiſhed by; and which did honour to it; and though the principle was falſe, yet advantageous conſequences to his family might be drawn from it, with reſpect to it's antiquity. This might be a reaſon for a Chriſtian thus to deſcribe the nobility of his extraction. Add to this, that Heliodorus was not a biſhop when he compoſed his romance. He was in the firſt vigour of youth; and as he did not name himſelf, he might the more freely point out his race according to the ancient tradition of his family.

[*F*] *A modern writer knew ſome men who would have done what is attributed to the biſhop of Trica.*] This modern writer is Father Vavaſſeur. He doth not at all believe what Nicephorus relates, it appears to be ridiculous to him; whether we conſider the perſons propoſing ſuch an alternative, or the choice that was made (19). Nevertheleſs, he aſſures us, that he knows people ſo fond of their works, that they had rather looſe the beſt benifices in the kingdom, than give up the praiſes they think they have merited by their romances. *Cujus tamen factum ne magnopere vituperetur, aut ne reprehendatur ex toto, nonnulli obſtant, quos ego ſcio, ſi iſto loco eſſent, fieretque poteſtas eligendi; hoc idem & amplius facturos; taleſque partus ingenii, qualia Heliodori Æthiopica ſunt, non Thraciæ modo, ſed opimis Galliæ ſacerdotiis omnibus antepoſituros, & loco graduque, & quavis dignitate ceſſuros potius, quam laboris, & induſtriæ, & bonæ exiſtimationis fructum hunc qualemcumque amitterent* (20).

---

(13) Id. ibid.

(14) Id. ibid. pag. 312.

(15) Photius, n. 73, pag. 157.

(16) Obſopæus Epiſt. Dedicat. apud Geſner. Biblioth fol 301.

(17) Sorel, ubi ſupra.

(18) See a Diſſertation of Balzac which follows his Chriſtian Socrates; where, amongſt other things, you will find St Jerom makes St Paul a deſcendant of Agamemnon, and that Syneſius boaſts that he is deſcended from Hercules.

(19) Lepida vero optio data præſuli, utrum ſalvum vellet, jocularemne librum, quem ſcripſiſſet olim, an ampliſſimum ſacerdotium, cui tum præeſſet. Lepidius etiam judicium & electio epiſcopi, ſacræ dignitatis jactura commune & pervagatum ſcriptoris nomen redimentis. *Vavaſſor, de Ludicra Dictione, pag.* 149.

(20) Vavaſſor. ibid. pag. 150.

HELOISA, concubine, and afterwards wife of Peter Abelard, a nun; and afterwards prioreſs of Argenteuil; and laſtly, abbeſs of the Paraclet, has occaſioned too much diſcourſe of her, not to deſerve an article of ſome length in this work. She had an uncle, by her mother's ſide, named Fulbert [*A*], who was a canon of Paris, and who loved

[*A*] *She had an uncle by her mother's ſide, named Fulbert.*] This is all I have found of certainty concerning Heloiſa's genealogy; and therefore I have not ſaid that ſhe was legitimately deſcended from the ancient houſe of Montmorenci. I have read this indeed, in the apologetical preface of Francis d'Amboiſe (1): but as he cites no author for it, and Andrew du Chêne (2) makes no mention of it, I ſuſpect the credit of it; and the more, becauſe Heloiſa owns in her letters, that her family had been much honoured by her marriage with Abelard, and that he had married much beneath himſelf (3). Papyrius Maſſo (4) aſſerts, that Heloiſa was the natural daughter of one John, a canon of Paris. Andrew du Chêne is in the right not to lay much weight on this, ſince he does not ſay whence he had this curious circumſtance; but he has no reaſon to oppoſe againſt that annaliſt, the calender of the Paraclet, where are theſe words. *VII Cal. Januar. obiit Hubertus* (5) *Canonicus Dominæ Heloiſæ avunculus. —— The twenty ſixth of December died canon Hubert, uncle to Heloiſa.* For what is eaſier than to reconcile Papyrius Maſſo with this calender? cannot the ſame woman be the baſtard of one canon, and the neice of another? but once more: he who ſays loved her tenderly. He took an extraordinary care to have her well educated; and as ſhe had a great deal of wit, ſhe in a little time grew ſo learned, that her reputation was ſpread all over the kingdom [*B*]. And beſides, ſhe was pretty handſome [*C*]. There was, at that time, a famous doctor in Paris, who read public lectures with wonderful reputation. His name was Peter Abelard, the moſt ſubtile logician of his age, and he who firſt brought the ſcholaſtic philoſophy and divinity in vogue. He enjoyed all the glory that a man of his profeſſion could deſire: he had an infinite number of ſcholars, was look'd upon as a very able maſter, and got a great deal of money; but he did not make love; and this he thought was a conſiderable flaw in his good fortune. That nothing therefore might be wanting to his happineſs, he reſolved to become a lover, and choſe Heloiſa for his miſtreſs. We have told, in another place (*a*), the reaſons that led him to this choice, and how he got into the canon's family, under the notion of a domeſtic tutor. Poor honeſt Fulbert hoped, that, under ſuch a maſter, Heloiſa would make a wonderful proficiency in the ſciences; but he found ſhe learnt only the art of making love. She had an incomparable diſpoſition for it. She was taught to make ſo great progreſs in a little time, that her maſter ſoon paſt from the firſt to the laſt favour; and that without any thoughts of demanding a promiſe of marriage.

---

(1) Ad Oper. Abælardi.

(2) Notis ad Hiſt. Calamitat. Abælardi.

(3) Quanto amplius te pro me humiliando ſatisfeceras, & me pariter & totum genus meum ſublimaveras, tanto te minus tam apud Deum, quam apud illos proditores obnoxium pœnæ reddideras. *Pag.* 57.

(4) Annal. lib. iii.

(5) It ſhould be Fubertus.

ſays that Heloiſa was the natural daughter of one canon John, without quoting any author for it, will not merit credit. If any canon were to be ſuſpected in this matter, it would rather be canon Fulbert than any other. For that tender affection for Heloiſa which Abelard aſcribes to him, is ſo uncommon among uncles (6), and ſo naturally reſembles the affection of the beſt fathers, that there might be ſome grounds to imagine, that Fulbert acted as a great many others do, who cannot be fathers according to the canons: they conceal that relation, under that of uncle, and educate their children under the title of nephews. This is what may be ſuſpected. But this ought not to regulate the ſtyle, nor hinder us from giving people the titles, under which the public has known them. Fulbert in a book, muſt be only an uncle. Note, that according to Papyrius Maſſo, the canon who took care to have Heloiſa educated, and cauſed Peter Abelard to be caſtrated, was called John. That hiſtorian therefore does not pretend that ſhe was the niece of one canon, and the natural daughter of another. He pretends, that the canon whom all the other authors name Fulbert, and whom they take to be the uncle of Heloiſa, was her father, and that his name was John (7).

[*B*] *She grew ſo learned, that her reputation was ſpread.*] Let us hear Abelard. 'Qui (Fulbertus) eam 'quanto amplius diligebat, tanto diligentius in omnem 'quam poterat ſcientiam literarum promoveri ſtuduerat. Quæ cum per faciem non eſſet infima, per 'abundantiam literarum erat ſuprema. Nam quo 'bonum hoc, literatoriæ ſcilicet ſcientiæ, in mulieribus 'eſt rarius, eò amplius puellam commendabat, & in 'toto regno nominatiſſimam fecerat (8). —— *As 'Fulbert loved her exceedingly, he took the utmoſt 'pains to have her inſtructed in all manner of learning. And as ſhe was not the laſt of her ſex in 'beauty, ſo in letters ſhe was the firſt. For the rarer 'letters are among women, ſo much the more was ſhe 'diſtinguiſhed by them, and celebrated all over the 'kingdom on that account.*' In that age a young woman with a very moderate ſhare of erudition, might have paſſed for a miracle. This ought to be well obſerved by thoſe who would not carry their ideas of our Heloiſa beyond due bounds; and yet it muſt be granted that ſhe deſerves an honourable place, among the learned women. She not only underſtood the Latin tongue, but alſo the Greek and Hebrew; Abelard teſtifies this alſo, in the letter he wrote to the nuns of the Paraclet. *Magiſterium habetis in matre, quod ad omnia vobis ſufficere tam ad exemplum ſcilicet virtutem, quam ad doctrinam literarum poteſt, quæ non ſolum Latinæ, verum etiam tam Hebraicæ quam Græcæ non expers literaturæ, ſola hoc tempore illam trium linguarum adepta peritiam videtur, quæ ab omnibus in beato Hieronymo tanquam ſingularis gratia prædicatur* (9). Francis d'Amboiſe tells us (10), how ſhe ſubtilly ſatisfied St Bernard, who asked the reaſon why in the monaſtery of the Paraclet, when they repeated the lord's prayer, they did not ſay, *Panem noſtrum quotidianum*, but *panem noſtrum ſuperſubſtantialem*. She gave him a reaſon for it, taken from the originals, and told him we muſt follow the Greek verſion of the goſpel, which St Matthew wrote in Hebrew. I know not whether ſuch an anſwer would have pleaſed St Bernard, but I doubt not that it was able to puzzle him, and make him give over the diſpute; and I wiſh with all my heart the ſtory were true; it would be an inſtance how a woman would heartily perplex a great author in a controverſial point, by alledging the Greek text. I was ſorry therefore, I confeſs, when, conſulting the letter (11) quoted by Francis d'Amboiſe I found that Heloiſa had no hand in it, and that the whole remark is Abelard's, who wrote thereupon to St Bernard, after having known from Heloiſa the exceptions that were made to *panem ſuperſubſtantialem*. Let this be ſaid without prejudice to the learning of that abbeſs. But if any one ſhould imagine that ſhe did not become learned till after ſhe was a recluſe, I would refer him to a letter of Peter the Venerable, abbot of Clugni, which declares, that before that time ſhe had accquigreat knowledge; 'Necdum, *ſays he to her* (12), metas 'adoleſcentiæ exceſſeram, necdum in juveniles annos 'evaſeram, quando nomen non quidem adhuc religionis 'tuæ, ſed honeſtorum, tamen & laudabilium ſtudiorum mihi fama innotuit. Audiebam tunc temporis mulierem, licet necdum ſæculi nexibus expeditam, literatoriæ ſcientiæ & ſtudio ſæcularis ſapientiæ ſummam operam dare, quo efferendo ſtudio 'tuo & mulieres omnes eviciſti, & pene viros univerſos ſuperaſti. —— *When I was only a boy, and had 'not arrived to manhood, the fame, not indeed as yet, of 'your piety, but of your polite and laudable ſtudies, reached my ears. I was told that a woman tho' not then 'retired from worldly avocations, gave the cloſeſt application to letters and the ſtudy of human learning, and by that means, you not only excelled all 'your own ſex, but almoſt out-did all ours.*' The monk of Auxerre ſays, ſhe was well acquainted with Latin and Hebrew, and the Calender of the Paraclet thus ſpeaks of her: *Heloïſe mere & premiere Abbeſſe deceans, de doctrine & religione tres reſplendiſſante* (13) —— *Heloiſa, the mother and firſt abbeſs of this monaſtery, illuſtrious for her learning, and for her devotion.*

[*C*] *She was pretty handſome.*] I obſerve a great many authors aſcribe to her a raviſhing beauty; but are they more credible than Abelard himſelf, who having more reaſon to enlarge than diminiſh things, contents himſelf to ſay, that ſhe was not the laſt of her ſex in beauty, but that ſhe was the firſt in erudition. *Cum per faciem non eſſet infima, per abundantiam literarum erat ſuprema* —— *As ſhe was not laſt of her ſex in beauty, ſo in letters ſhe was the firſt.* Would a man ſpeak thus of an accompliſhed beauty? would a lover, concerned to juſtify his choice, and the violence of his paſſion, employ ſuch a figure of rhetoric? ſome (14) obſerve that Heloiſa was eighteen years old when Abelard debauched her? I have not met with that circumſtance in any ancient author. It is true. the word *adoleſcentula*, which which Abelard makes uſe of (15), may very well ſuit the age of eighteen; and ſo may that of *juvencula*, which ſhe confeſſeth (16), but nothing can be concluded from ſuch a proof. It is a meer chimera to ſay, that Abelard in his *Romance of the Roſe*, drew the picture of Heloiſa, under the name of *Beauty* (17). That romance did not ſee the light till after their death.

(*a*) In the article ABELARD.

(6) See the Teſtimonies quoted by Lambinus, upon theſe words of the twelfth Ode of the third book of Horace, *Metuentes patruæ verbera linguæ.*

(7) Joannes Canonicus Pariſinus Heloyſam naturalem filiam habebat præſtanti ingenio formaque. *Papyr. Maſſo, Annal. lib. iii, pag. m.* 256.

(8) Abæl. Oper. pag. 10.

(9) Abælardi Oper. pag. 260.

(10) Præfat. Apologet.

(11) It is the fifth of the ſecond book.

(12) Vide Oper. Abælardi, pag. 337.

(13) See Andrew du Cheſne's Notes upon Abelard's letter *de Hiſtor. Calamitat.* *pag.* 1187.

(14) The Hiſtory of Heloiſa and Abelard, abridged at the Hague, 1693.

(15) Oper. pag. 10.

(16) Ibid. pag. 47.

(17) The author of the Hiſtory abridged, before cited, ſays it

marriage. Abelard ſo gave himſelf up to his pleaſures with her [*D*], that he grew negligent of his lectures. He confeſſes himſelf, that he kept no meaſures, but plunged into thoſe pleaſures, without diſtinction of times and places; without diſtinction of holy-days, or worky-days, or of holy and profane places; that he made no further progreſs in Philoſophy; and that all the productions of his genius dwindled into ſonnets and love-verſes [*F*]. His ſcholars quickly found out the matter, upon enquiring into the reaſons of the abatement of his lectures. The ſcandal was quickly propagated all over the town, and at laſt it reached the ears of her uncle [*G*], but found

him

[*D*] *Abelard gave himſelf up to his pleaſures.*] We muſt hear himſelf ſpeak, that we may loſe nothing of the force of his expreſſions. ‘ Nullus à cupidis intermiſſus eſt gradus amoris, & ſi quid inſolitum amor ‘ excogitare potuit, eſt additum. Et quo minus illa ‘ fueramus experti gaudia ardentius illis inſiſtebamus, ‘ & minus in faſtidium vertebantur (18). —— *So fond ‘ we were, that no degree of love was left untried, and ‘ if ought new love could invent, it was added. And ‘ the leſs we were accuſtomed to theſe joys the more ‘ greedily we devoured them, and the leſs were cloyed.*’ He compares himſelf to thoſe who have ſuffered a long famine, and come afterwards to a plentiful table. A man who has lived chaſtly, is more apt to fall into exceſs with his wife, than a debauchee.

[*E*] *Without diſtinction of times and places.*] We muſt again hear him ſpeak, in a letter he wrote to Heloiſa, a long time after their monaſtic engagements. He puts her a little in mind of their paſt conduct, and how he careſſed her in a corner of the refectory of the nuns of Argenteuil, finding no other convenient place, and having no reſpect to the Holy Virgin, to whom that place was conſecrated. ‘ Noſti poſt noſtri ‘ confœderationem conjugii cum Argenteoli cum Sanctimonialibus in clauſtro converſabaris, me die quadam privatim ad te viſitandum veniſſe, & quid ibi ‘ tecum meæ libidinis egerit intemperantia in quadam ‘ etiam parte ipſius refectorii, cum quò alias divertere‘ mus non haberemus. Noſti, inquam, id impuden‘ tiſſime tunc actum eſſe, in tam reverendo loco & ‘ ſummæ Virgini conſecrato . . . . Quid priſtinas forni‘ cationes & impudentiſſimas referam pollutiones quæ ‘ conjugium præceſſerunt (19)? —— *You remember ‘ when after our marriage you lived in the nunnery at ‘ Argenteuil, that I one day came ſecretly to ſee you, ‘ and what my unbridled paſſion made me do, even in ‘ the refectory, having no other place to which we could ‘ retire. You know, I ſay, what was acted there in ‘ that ſacred place, dedicated to the Bleſſed Virgin. ‘ Why ſhould I call to mind the follies and pollutions ‘ which preceded our marriage?*’ A little after he tells her, that ſhe knows very well, that neither the moſt ſolemn feaſts, nor even the Paſſion-Day, diſcouraged them from wallowing in that filthy courſe; and that whenever ſhe began to be ſcrupulous, he made uſe of threatenings and whipping to bring her to conſent (20). Behold a man perfectly free from the ſuperſtitions of thoſe who obſerved days and feaſts, new-moons, and ſabbaths (21).

[*F*] *All the productions of his genius, dwindled into ſonnets and love-verſes.*] This we learn from himſelf. ‘ Ita negligentem & tepidum lectio tunc habebat ut ‘ jam nihil ex ingenio, ſed ex uſu cuncta proferrem, ‘ nec jam niſi recitator priſtinorum eſſem inventorum, ‘ & ſi qua invenire liceret, carmina eſſent amatoria, ‘ non philoſophiæ ſecreta (22). —— *I then was ſo ‘ careleſs and negligent in my lectures, that all I ſaid ‘ was rather by rote than from any ſtudy. I only recited ‘ my former inventions, and if I then invented any thing ‘ it was rather love ſongs, than ſecrets in Philoſophy.*’ He adds, that theſe verſes were ſtill ſung in many provinces, and eſpecially amongſt perſons that made love: *Quorum etiam carminum pleraque adhuc in multis, ſicut & ipſa noſti, frequentantur & decantantur regionibus, ab his maxime quos vita ſimilis oblectat.* Heloiſa tells us more of it. She ſays, that her Abelard had two qualifications which other philoſophers wanted, by which he could ſoon gain all womens hearts; *viz.* that he wrote finely, and ſung well; his love verſes were ſo pretty, and his ſongs ſo agreeable, both as to the words and airs, that every body was charmed with them, and full of the author's praiſes. Women were not ſatisfied with being charmed with Abelard's ſongs and verſes; they were as much taken with his perſon, and loved him paſſionately; and as the greateſt part of his verſes were filled with nothing but his love for Heliosa; the name of that miſtreſs, flew preſently into the provinces, and made an infinite number of women envy her good fortune. I enervate much the force of Heloiſa's expreſſions, and I believe they ought not to be literally taken. As ſhe loved Abelard even to diſtraction, ſhe fancied no woman could look upon him, but muſt fall into the ſame paſſion; which made her ſay, that there was neither wife nor maid, who in Abelard's abſence did not wiſh for him, and in his preſence was not inflamed with love; and that even queens and great ladies envied the pleaſures ſhe reaped by the enjoyment of ſuch a man. See here the Latin, which ſpeaks ſtill more ſignificantly (23). ‘ Quæ conjugata, ‘ quæ virgo non concupiſcebat abſentem, & non exar‘ debat in præſentem? Quæ Regina vel præpotens ‘ femina gaudiis meis non invidebat vel thalamis? ‘ Duo autem, fateor, tibi ſpecialiter inerant quibus ‘ feminarum quarumlibet animos ſtatim allicere poteras, ‘ dictandi videlicet & cantandi gratia, quæ cæteros ‘ minimè Philoſophos aſſecutos eſſe novimus. Quibus ‘ quidem quaſi ludo quodam laborem exercitii recreans ‘ philoſophici, pleraque amatorio metro vel rithmo ‘ compoſita reliquiſti carmina, quæ præ nimia ſuavitate ‘ tam dictaminis quam cantus ſæpius frequentata tuum ‘ in ore omnium nomen inceſſanter tenebant, ut etiam ‘ illiteratos melodiæ dulcedo tui non ſineret immemo‘ res eſſe. Atque hinc maxime in amorem tui feminæ ‘ ſuſpirabant. Et cum horum pars maxima carminum ‘ noſtros decantaret amores, multis me regionibus ‘ brevi tempore nunciavit (24), & multarum in me ‘ feminarum accendit invidiam. —— *What wife, what ‘ maid, did not languiſh for you when abſent, and was ‘ not inflamed with love when you was near? What ‘ queen, what lady, did not envy my joys? Two qualities ‘ you had, rare to be found among the learned, by which ‘ you could not fail to gain all womens hearts, Poetry I ‘ mean, and Muſic. With theſe you unbended your ‘ mind after it's philoſophic labours, and wrote many ‘ love verſes, which becauſe of the ſweetneſs both of the ‘ words and muſic, were in every mouth, and carried ‘ your fame to every corner, and made even the illiterate ſound your praiſe. By this it was that you chiefly gained the womens love. And as the greateſt part ‘ of your ſongs celebrated our loves, they ſpread my ‘ name to many nations, and kindled there the envy of ‘ the women againſt me.*’ If the *Romance of the Roſe* had been Abelard's performance, and if he had characteriſed his Heloiſa under the name of *Beauty*, no doubt ſhe would not have concealed it; and here was the proper place to ſpeak of it. So that though we did know that this romance was written an hundred years after Abelard, we might learn from Heloiſa's ſilence, that there is no reaſon for aſcribing it to him in the little book I have quoted more than once (25). Much leſs has any one had reaſon to make Heloiſa ſay this in the tranſlation of her letter. But to return to our ſubject: a man would not believe, were it not for experience, that verſes, letters, and ſonnets, had the power of advancing ſo much the affairs of a lover (26); but here is a witneſs of it that is worth a thouſand. The wits of this age complain, that their wares have not the ſame effect as in the time of our anceſtors. The times are changed, I confeſs, but not entirely. See the New Letters againſt Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm (27). As for what Heloiſa declares concerning the weakneſs of thoſe of her own ſex with reſpect to Abelard, it is confirmed by a certain prior named Foulques; whoſe article muſt be conſulted.

[*G*] *The ſcandal . . . . at laſt . . . . reached the ears of her uncle.*] That word *at laſt* ſeems at firſt ſomewhat ſtrange; but they who know the world, are not ignorant that on ſuch occaſions, they who are moſt concerned in a piece of news, are the laſt who hear it. Abelard cites upon this ſubject, a notable paſſage from a letter of St Jerome to Sabinian (28). *Solemus mala domus noſtræ ſcire noviſſimi, ac liberorum ac conjugum*

vitia

(18) Pag. 11.

(19) Pag. 69.

(20) Noſti quantis turpitudinibus immoderata mea libido corpora noſtra addixerat, ut nulla honeſtatis vel Dei reverentia in ipſis etiam diebus Dominicæ paſſionis, vel quantarumcunque ſolemnitatum, ab hujus luti volutabro me revocaret. Sed & te nolentem & prout poteras reluctantem & diſſuadentem, quæ natura infirmior eras, ſæpius minis ac flagellis ad conſenſum trahebam.

(21) *See* Coloſſians, chap. ii, ver. 16.

(22) Pag. 12.

(23) Oper. Abælardi, pag. 46.

(24) *See what ſhe ſays, pag.* 48. Cum me ad temporales olim voluptates expeteres crebris me epiſtolis viſitabas, frequenti carmine tuam in ore omnium Heloiſſam ponebas: me plateæ omnes, me domus ſingulæ reſonabant.

(25) Hiſtory of Heloiſa and Abelard, *printed at the Hague*, 1693.

(26) *See* Ovid. de Arte Amandi, lib. iii, pag. 205.

(27) Pag. 590, *&c. and* pag. 745, & ſeq.

(28) Ex Tom. I, Epiſt. xlviii.

him at firſt incredulous, ſo much had he truſted to the diſcretion of Abelard and of Heloiſa; but at laſt, by repeated aſſaults, his incredulity was over powered. The pretended tutor left the canon's houſe, from whence he likewiſe removed Heloiſa, when he found that ſhe was with child; and having diſguiſed her in the habit of a Nun (*b*), ſent her into Bretagne, to one of his ſiſters, where ſhe was brought to bed of a boy. Fulbert was enraged to the laſt degree againſt Abelard, who ſtood upon his guard, not without hopes that they durſt not proceed to kill or mutilate him, whilſt they might fear repriſals upon Heloiſa. To get clear of all his trouble, he promiſed her uncle to marry her, provided the marriage might be kept ſecret. He had all the difficulty in the world to bring Heloiſa to conſent to it, who brought a thouſand arguments to put him out of conceit with the conjugal tie [*H*]. She had conceived ſo ſtrong and unbounded a paſſion for him, that it ſtifled all ſentiments of honour in her ſoul

vitia vicinis canentibus ignorare. The diſorders of our wives and children, are the theme of all the neighbourhood, when we as yet know nothing of theſe diſorders; but we come to know them at laſt, it being impoſſible a ſingle perſon ſhould be ignorant of what is known by all the world beſides. *Sed quod noviſſimè ſcitur, utique ſtiri* (29) *quandoque contingit, & quod omnes deprehendunt non eſt facile unum latere.* St Jerom, in another place, has confirmed this maxim, by two great examples; the firſt is that of Sylla, the ſecond of Pompey. The gallantries of Metella, the wife of Sylla, were the town-talk of Athens before her huſband heard any thing of her leudneſs. The railleries of the Athenians, againſt whom he then made war, gave him the firſt news of it. The adulteries of Mucia, Pompey's wife, were ſo public, that every one ſuppoſed he was acquainted with them. And yet he knew nothing of the matter, till told of it by a ſoldier who ſerved in his army. *L. Syllæ (felicis ſi non habuiſſet uxorem) Metella conjux palam erat impudica, & (quia noviſſimi mala noſtra diſcimus) id Athenis cantabatur & Sylla ignorabat, ſecretaque domus ſuæ primum hoſtium convicio didicit. Cn. Pompeio Muciam uxorem impudicam quam Pontici Spadones & Mithridaticæ ambiebant catervæ, cum eum putarent cæteri ſcientem pati, indicavit in expeditione commilito, & victorem totius orbis triſti nuncio conſternavit* (30). The emperor Claudius might be brought for a third example, who knew nothing of the infamy of Meſſalina (31), when all the world knew ſhe proſtituted herſelf in the ſtews, and had carried with her many ladies thither, and to crown her imprudence, had married another man. Our age has furniſhed us with one inſtance of this kind, in the mareſchal *de la* ——. It is affirmed (though I can ſcarce believe it) that he knew nothing of his wife's commerce with the count *de* ——, when the ſon whom that count had by her, had been already naturalized in full parliament. Even moderate fortunes are not exempt from this irregularity. How many people do we ſee who know all the news of the town, except what diſhonours their own family? They reſemble him whom Martial ridicules ſo pleaſantly (32), and are little better for the ancient proverb, *Ædibus in noſtris quæ prava aut recta gerantur* (33). Men of letters, I mean thoſe who dwell too much in their cloſets, and have their head always pregnant with ſome compoſition, ſometimes find themſelves in the condition we are talking of. As familiar as they are with the domeſtic misfortunes of Sylla and Pompey, who died many ages ago, they little think the ſame trick is plaid them not far from their own ſtudy. This is the way of the world.

A writer of the XVIth century, brings a famous example to prove the maxim he had laid down, that they who have the greateſt intereſt in knowing their family misfortunes, are the laſt that know them; whereas they are the firſt who learn the news of what ſhould but little concern them. *Solet uſu venire,* (ſays he) (34), *ut domeſtica mala ultimi ſint qui norint, quorum maxime intereſt ea non ignorare, iidem principes norint aliena, & quorum nullus ad eos pertineat ſenſus.* After having given ſome reaſons of this odd phenomenon, he ſays, that it was not long ſince a great king puniſhed with death the diſhonourers of his nuptial bed, and that the execution was ſo ſudden, that there did not intervene one hour betwixt their accuſation and their death; an argument, that that prince had not heard of that diſorder before, though the news of it had ſpread far and wide into foreign countries. *Accidit hoc quidem, me puero, in magna atque illuſtri Europæ regia, quo minus diu obſcura res eſſe poſſet, ut in regina, læſi pudoris fama prius apud exteras gentes longe lateque evagata emanaret, quàm is, cujus in eo erat læſa majeſtas, maculam regio nomini impoſitam, eorum ſanguine quorum erat ſcelere violata, elueret. Satis quidem potuit indicio eſſe, poſtremum omnium reſciſſe, ita ſumptum de reis ſupplicium, ut inter id, & delatum ſontium nomen, ne horæ quidem momentum intercedere ſit paſſus* (35).

[*H*] *She brought a thouſand arguments to put him out of conceit with the conjugal tie.*] Theſe arguments were reduced to two heads; the danger and the diſhonour to which marriage would expoſe Abelard. I know my uncle's temper, (ſaid ſhe to him) nothing will appeaſe his rage againſt you; and then what glory will it be to me to be your wife, ſince I ſhall ruin your reputation by it? What curſes have not I reaſon to fear, if I ſhall rob the world of ſo bright a luminary as you are? What injury ſhall I not do the church? What ſorrow ſhall I not give the philoſophers? What a ſhame and injury will it be to you, whom nature has formed for the public good, to give yourſelf up entirely to a woman? Conſider theſe words of St Paul, *Art thou looſed from a wife, ſeek not a wife.* And if the counſel of this great apoſtle, and the exhortations of the holy fathers, cannot diſſuade you from that heavy burden; conſider at leaſt what the philoſophers have ſaid of it. Hear Theophraſtus who has proved by ſo many reaſons, that a wiſe man ought not to marry. Hear what Cicero, when he had divorced his wife Terentia, anſwered to Hirtius, who propoſed a match to him with his ſiſter; that he could not accept that offer, becauſe he could not divide his thoughts betwixt philoſophy and a wife. Beſides, what conformity is there betwixt ſervant-maids and ſcholars, ink-horns and cradles, books and diſtaffs, pens and ſpindles? How will you be able to bear in the midſt of theological and philoſophical meditations, the cries of children, the ſongs of nurſes, and the diſturbance of houſe-keeping? I ſay nothing of the ſtink and nauſeouſneſs that attends little children (36). The rich can ſcreen themſelves from all theſe incoveniencies, by the ſeveral apartments in their houſes. The daily cares and expences cannot diſquiet them; but it is not ſo with philoſophers; and whoever would heap up wealth, and engage in worldly affairs, makes himſelf incapable of the functions of a divine, and of a philoſopher. Obſerve the conduct of the ancient ſages, both amongſt the Jews and Heathens; if Pagans and laymen have preferred celibacy to marriage, what a diſgrace would it be for a clergyman and a canon to prefer ſenſual pleaſures before divine offices? But if you are but in little concern for the prerogative of your prieſthood, maintain at leaſt the character and dignity of a philoſopher. The concluſion of her ſermon was, that there would be more honour for himſelf, and more delight for her in the quality of a galant, than of a huſband; that ſhe deſired to be united to him, not by the neceſſity of a conjugal bond, but by the ſole affection of her heart, and that their pleaſures would be infinitely more ſenſible, if they ſaw each other only from time to time. We ſhall ſpeak of this laſt reaſon in the remark [*U*]. In the mean time, obſerve Paſquier's opinion on Heloiſa's diſcourſe. *I will not* (ſays he) (37) *repreſent to you all the reaſons whereby ſhe tried to gain him; but I can aſſure you I never read in any orator, ſo many elegant expreſſions and perſuaſive ſentences to gain a point, as ſhe made uſe of there.* I muſt acquaint my reader, that I have extreamly abridged this lady's remonſtrance, and that I was ſurprized, not to find one reaſon borrowed from her lover's being in orders (38). Does not this ſeem to prove, that it was not as yet believed that the law of celibacy was obligatory to eccleſiaſtical perſons?

[*I*] *Her*

(*b*) Noſti etiam quando te gravidam in meam tranſmiſi patriam, ſacro te habitu indutam Monialem te finxiſſe, & tali ſimulatione tuæ quam nunc habes religioni irreverenter illuſiſſe. *Abalard. Epiſt. ad Helen. pag.* 70.

(29) *Theſe words are cited in the edition of Abelard, as a ſequel of what I have already quoted from St Jerom's letter to Sabinian, but they are not in that letter.*

(30) D. Hieronym. adverſ. Jovinian.

(31) Dion Caſſius, lib. lx. Juv. Satyra X, ver. 342, *ſaid upon it,* Dedecus ille domus ſciet ultimus.

(32) Epigr. IX, lib. vii.

(33) Ὅττι τοι ἐν Μεγάροισι κακῶν τ' ἀγαθῶν τε τέτυκται. Homer. Odyſſ. lib. iv.

(34) Jo. Michael. Brutus in præceptis conjugalibus, pag 798, Edit. 1698.

(35) Id. ibid.

(36) Quis ſacris vel philoſophicis meditationibus intentus pueriles vagitus, nutricum quæ hos mitigant nænias, tumultuoſam familiæ tam in viris quam in feminis turbam ſuſtinere poterit? Quis etiam inhoneſtas illas parvulorum ſordes aſſiduas tolerare valebit. *Oper. Abalardi, pag.* 14.

(37) Recherch. de la France, lib. vi, cap. xvii.

(38) *I mean that ſhe did not alledge that marriage was forbid ſuch as were in orders.*

ſoul [*I*] ; it ſtruck it's roots ſo deep, and made ſuch a havock in her ſoul, that ſhe never was cured of it [*K*]. In vain poor Abelard loſt his virility [*L*], in vain ſhe took the veil. There remained ſtill a grain of that folly [*M*]. And it is not from the Portugueſe letters that we firſt learned that it only belongs to Nuns to ſpeak of love. The letters of Heloiſa had been long before a proof of this truth. Be it how it will, this amorous creature in vain employed all her wit and eloquence to diſſuade Abelard from the marriage. They were married in ſecret; but ſhe always denied with oaths that ſhe was his wife (*c*). This conduct made her uncle uſe her harſhly, who, to cover the diſhonour of his family, publiſhed the marriage in all places, though he had promiſed to Abelard not to mention it. The ill treatment to which Heloiſa was expoſed in the houſe of canon Fulbert, made her huſband reſolve to remove her from thence, and to put her into the nunnery of Argenteuil, where ſhe had been educated. This ſecond carrying of her away put her relations out of all manner of patience, and inſpired

(*c*) Avunculus ipſius atque domeſtici ejus ignominiæ ſuæ ſolatium quærentes, initum matrimonium divulgare & fidem mihi ſuper hoc datam violare cœperunt. Illa autem è contra anathematizare & jurare, qui falſiſſimum eſſet. *Idem, Hiſt. Calamitatum, pag.* 17.

[*I*] *Her love ſtifled all ſentiments of honour in her ſoul.*] It often happens that the paſſion of love ſtifles or ſurmounts the ſentiments of conſcience; but it is rarely obſerved to ſuppreſs the ſenſe of honour: and excepting a ſmall number of perſons of mean birth, who for the moſt part have not had even common education, all the young women who yield, put one or other of theſe four ſtrings to their bow. They either hope they ſhall not conceive, or by ſome medicine to procure abortion, or to lye-in privately, or to oblige their galant to marry them: and this ſhews that if love be ſometimes the ſtrongeſt tyrant in the world, it is a tyrant who leaves honour in poſſeſſion of it's rights. See the famous ſonnet on an abortion, where we have ſo fine a deſcription of the power of honour, and the power of love, by turns conquered and victorious. Our Heloiſa was ſo deſperately in love, that ſhe no longer regarded either her honour or reputation. For in the firſt place ſhe was overjoyed when ſhe found herſelf with child (39); and in the ſecond place ſhe did all that was poſſible to prevent her marriage with the father of it. Two things, which are not only rarer than the moſt frightful monſters, when they are joined together, but ſuch as the firſt only is never found but in ſuch caſes, where love has little to do, and where the deſign is only to make ſure of a good match, which they deſpair of obtaining without the noiſe of a great belly. How many young women are there that rather chooſe to have an huſband given them by a decree of court againſt his inclination, than to live with a ſtained reputation. They are well ſatisfied that he will take his revenge with uſury, and that this decree will coſt them dear; but that ſignifies nothing, provided the title of huſband repairs the breach made in their honour. Our Heloiſa had none of theſe niceties. See the following remark, and eſpecially the remark [*U*].

(30) Non multo autem poſt puella ſe concepiſſe comperit, & cum ſumma exultatione mihi ſuper hoc illico ſcripſit, conſulens quid de hoc ipſe faciendum deliberarem. *Abelard. pag.* 13.

[*K*] *She never was cured of it.*] Is this to be cured, to ſay many years after ſhe had renounced the world, and engaged in a monaſtic life, *That ſhe had rather be the whore of Peter Abelard, than the lawful wife of the emperor of the whole world.* Now this is what our Heloiſa, ſaid when ſhe was abbeſs of Paraclet, and what ſhe was pleaſed to call God to witneſs to. *Deum teſtem invoco, ſi me Auguſtus univerſo præſidens mundo matrimonii honore dignaretur, totumque mihi orbem confirmaret in perpetuo præſidendum, charius mihi & dignius mihi videretur* TUA DICI MERETRIX *quam illius Imperatrix* (40). How can it be ſaid that her paſſion had left her in the abbey of Paraclet, when ſhe wrote an ingenuous confeſſion there of the bad ſtate of her ſoul, which ſhews that the fire of love preyed on her to the very marrow. I dare not expreſs in French all that ſhe accuſes herſelf of: ſhe confeſſes that the pleaſures ſhe taſted in the embraces of Abelard had been ſo delicious to her, that ſhe thought of them night and day, ſleeping and waking, and even during the celebration of the maſs. She continually regretted the loſs of them, and for want of a better way repeated them in imagination. They who underſtand Latin may ſee with what force of eloquence ſhe could repreſent her thoughts. *In tantum verò illæ, quas pariter exercuimus amantium voluptates, dulces mihi fuerunt, ut nec diſplicere mihi, nec vix à memoria labi poſſint. Quocunque loco me vertam ſemper ſe oculis meis cum ſuis ingerunt deſideriis. Nec etiam dormienti ſuis illuſionibus parcunt. Inter ipſa miſſarum ſolemnia ubi purior eſſe debet oratio, obſcœna earum voluptatum fantaſmata ita ſibi penitus miſerrimam captivant animam, ut turpitudinibus illis magis quàm orationi vacem. Quæ cum ingemiſcere debeam de commiſſis, ſuſpiro potius de amiſſis. Nec ſolum quæ egimus, ſed loca pariter & tempora in quibus hæc egimus ita tecum noſtro infixa ſunt animo, ut in ipſis omnia tecum agam, nec dormiens etiam ab his quieſcam. Nonnunquam & ipſo motu corporis animi mei cogitationes deprehenduntur, nec à verbis temperant improviſis* (41). This obliged her to cry out with St Paul (42). *O wretched man that I am, who ſhall deliver me from the body of this death?* Would to God, *continues ſhe*, I could truly add, *the Grace of GOD, through JESUS CHRIST our Lord.* That grace, ſays ſhe, to her Abelard, has prevented you, my dear, in delivering you from all the incentives of ſenſuality, by that one ſtroke of a knife which made you an eunuch . . . . But my youth and experience of paſt pleaſures kindle theſe fires in my ſoul; and the weaker my nature is, the more I am overpowered by thoſe violent attacks. *Hæc te gratia, chariſſime, prævenit, & ab his tibi ſtimulis una corporis plaga medendo multas in anima ſanavit . . . . . hos autem in me ſtimulos carnis, hæc incentiva libidinis ipſe juvenilis fervor ætatis & jucundiſſimarum experientia voluptatum plurimum accendunt, & tanto amplius ſua me impugnatione opprimunt, quanto infirmior eſt natura quam oppugnant.* (43). Laſtly, ſhe recommends herſelf to his prayers with ſo much the more ſollicitude, and that was the only remedy which her incontinence could find in him. *Time, obſecro, ſemper de me potius quam confidas, ut tua ſemper ſollicitudine adjuver. Nunc vero præcipuè timendum eſt* (44), *ubi nullum incontinentiæ meæ ſupereſt in te remedium.* Thoſe who cenſured Abelard's frequent viſits to the Paraclet (45), were doubtleſs guilty of a raſh judgment, ſince they knew not the internal diſpoſitions of Heloiſa: but had they known them, they had been obliged to have gotten theſe viſits forbid; having reaſon to fear that it was impoſſible, humanly ſpeaking, that this woman ſhould not commit acts of impurity with that man. The holy fathers never truſted to mutilations. They compared an eunuch to an ox that has loſt his horns, and yet does not leave off giving blows with his head. See a fine paſſage of St Baſil on this ſubject, in our remarks upon the article COMBABUS (46). But as appearances are ſometimes fallacious, I ſhould not approve of thoſe, who, knowing what Heloiſa had in her heart, ſhould imagine ſhe tranſgreſſed the rules when ſhe met again with her huſband, and that ſhe had ſometimes occaſion to write to him, *Si libidinoſa eſſem, quererer decepta, nunc etiam languori tuo gratias ago: in umbra voluptatis diutius laſi* (47).

(40) Pag. 45.

(41) Pag. 59.

(42) Rom. chap. vii.

(43) Pag. 60.

(44) Pag. 61.

(45) *See the article* ABELARD, *rem.* [*T*].

(46) *Citat.* (6).

(47) Circe Polyæno, apud Petronium.

[*L*] *In vain poor Abelard loſt his virility.*] It was an effectual remedy for love, if we will believe ſome verſes of Cyrano de Bergerac (48). They are addreſſed to a man whom he had beſpoke in this manner.

J'entens que le diminutif
Qu'on fit de vrai trop exceſſif
Sur vôtre flaſque genitif,
Vous probibe le conjonctif.

Then he adds,

O viſage! ô portrait naïf!
O ſouverain expeditif
Pour guerir tout ſexe laſcif
D'amour naiſſant, ou effectif!
Genre neutre, genre metif,

(48) *See the play intituled,* le Pedant joué.

Qui

inſpired them with an exquiſite piece of revenge, which they executed by corrupting Peter Abelard's ſervant. That villain introduced, by night, into his maſter's chamber, the perſons who were to commit the fact. They ſurprized him in his ſleep, and cut off thoſe parts which are not to be named (*d*). That action made a great noiſe [*N*]; people went the next morning, as in a proceſſion, to Abelard's chamber. His ſcholars made ſtill greater lamentations than the reſt. The women diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their doleful complaints [*O*]. Some very curious letters of conſolation were wrote to him [*P*]. That action was ſeverely puniſhed by the magiſtrates [*Q*]. But all that did not hinder Abelard, overwhelmed with ſhame and grief, from ſequeſtring himſelf from the world, in the monaſtery of St Denys; after having taken care that Heloiſa ſhould become a nun at Argenteuil. We have ſaid, in another place, what happened to him after he became a monk, and how he was condemned to burn, with his own hands, a book he had written, *&c.* The loſs of that work afflicted him ſtill more than the loſs of his virility had done [*R*]: And yet the loſs of a book may be made up by another, which cannot be ſaid in the other caſe [*S*]. As for Heloiſa, ſhe was made prioreſs of the nuns at Argenteuil; but, as they behaved very ill in that monaſtery [*T*], the abbot of St Denys, who claimed a juriſdiction over it, expelled the nuns; and then Heloiſa ſtood in great need of her huſband. He had built an oratory near Troies, to which he had given the name of Paraclet (*e*), and afterwards he had accepted an abbey in Bretagne. Underſtanding that his Heloiſa was quite deſtitute, after her expulſion from Argenteuil, he gave her that oratory, with all it's dependencies, which

Qui n'êtes homme qu'abſtractif,
Grace à vôtre copulatif,
Qu'a rendu fort imperfectif
Le cruel tranchant d'un canif.

But as there is no rule ſo general but has an exception to it, the love of Heloiſa was proof againſt this violent remedy. She had that in common with queen Stratonice whom I have mentioned before (49).

[*M*] *There remained ſtill a grain of that folly in her.*] This appears by the paſſages I have cited in the remark [*K*]. They not only prove that the love of concupiſcence prevailed in Heloiſa, but alſo that ſhe was ſomewhat beſides her ſelf: for a perſon in her perfect ſenſes, would never have talked at that rate. It is probable that ſtudy began firſt to diſorder her, and that love made a great addition to the breach. There appear in her writings many marks of a diſordered imagination; ſomething ſo extravagant, and ſo many inconſiſtencies, that ſhe is a proof of Seneca's maxim, *Nullum magnum ingenium ſine mixtura dementiæ* (50). — *Great wits to madneſs nearly are allied.*

[*N*] *That action made a great noiſe.*] See what Abelard ſays of it (51); *Mane autem facto tota ad me civitas congregata quanta ſtuperet admiratione, quanta ſe affligeret lamentatione, quanto me clamore vexarent, quanto planctu perturbarent, difficile imo impoſſibile eſt exprimi. Maximè verò Clerici, ac præcipuè Scholares noſtri, intolerabilius me lamentis & ejulatibus cruciabant.* See the article to which I refer in the following remark.

[*O*] *The women diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their doleful complaints.*] Abelard does not ſpeak of this: but we learn it from one of his friends who wrote a letter of conſolation to him. See the article FOULQUES (52).

[*P*] *Some very curious letters of conſolation were wrote to him.*] Foulques, prior of Deuil, wrote him one which has been inſerted in the edition of Abelard's works. We ſpeak of it in the article of that prior, and we refer thither many things belonging to Heloiſa and her husband, which would make their articles too long, if they were not ſeparated, in order to be placed elſewhere. They who ſay they had rather find it altogether in the ſame place, have not well conſidered of the matter.

[*Q*] *That action was ſeverely puniſhed.*] See the article FOULQUES (53) to which I refer for the two foregoing remarks.

[*R*] *The loſs of that work afflicted him yet more than the loſs of his virility.*] Authors have been ſufficiently bantered upon their exceſſive fondneſs for their own works; and, amongſt other inſtances, biſhop Heliodorus, has been quoted, who choſe rather to renounce his biſhopric than to condemn his romance of Theagenes (54). What Sarraſin makes Voiture ſay has alſo been alledged (55). But I do not know that Abelard has been cited upon this occaſion: though there is ſomething more ſtrong in his example; for Job was reſtored to his proſperous ſtate; he begat ſons and daughters, and it is certain that Voiture would rather have been a Job for ſome time, than an Abelard to his grave; and that he would gladly have thrown away all his books and all his muſes, if there had been a neceſſity for it, to preſerve the fund of his love-intrigues. Where are the prelates who would refuſe to ſign the reſignation of their biſhoprics, ſhould they be threatned with raſor in hand with . . . . in caſe of their refuſal. Doubtleſs Heliodorus would have conſented to the condemnation of his romance, if they had reduced him to this ſad alternative. But now here is a man who declares he reckons the loſs of his natural parts, as an inconſiderable thing, in compariſon of the loſs of a work which he was obliged to caſt into the fire. But to judge impartially in this caſe, we muſt not attribute Abelard's whole grief, to the paternal affection which his character of an author inſpired him with for his book. There was another thing here that afflicted him more than this; which was, that by obliging him to burn his own book, they branded him with the mark of hereſy, a puniſhment which anſwers to that of the hot iron. His murmurs againſt the providence of GOD are another teſtimony of his concern. See his words, which I ought to produce, that I may not be ſuſpected of aggravating things, to divert my reader. 'Deus, qui judicas æquitatem quanto 'tunc animi felle, quanta mentis amaritudine teipſum infamis arguebam, te furibundus accuſabam, 'ſæpius repetens illam beati Antonii (56) conqueſtionem, *Jeſu bone, ubi eras?* Quanto autem dolore 'æſtuarem, quanta erubeſcentia confunderer, quanta 'deſperatione perturbarer ſentire tunc potui, proferre 'non poſſum. Conferebam cum his quæ in corpore 'paſſus olim fueram, quanta nunc ſuſtinerem, & omnium me æſtimabam miſerrimum. *Parvam* illam 'ducebam proditionem in *Comparatione* hujus injuriæ, '& longè amplius famæ quam corporis detrimentum 'plangebam (57). —— *O righteous GOD! with what 'rage and bitterneſs of ſoul did I, wretch that I am, 'complain and deſperately accuſe thee, often repeating 'that complaint of St Anthony.* Good JESUS, where 'was thou? *The ſorrow with which I then was toſt, 'the ſhame which confounded me, and my horrible deſpair, I then could feel, but cannot now deſcribe: I 'compared with this, what I before had ſuffered in 'my body, and what I now endured, and concluded, 'that I was the moſt miſerable of men. I judged the 'former treachery but ſmall compared to this, and lamented more this injury done to my fame, than that 'done to my body.*'

[*S*] *Which cannot be ſaid in the other caſe.*] See again the article FOULQUES, remark [*F*].

[*T*] *They behaved ill in that monaſtery.*] Sugger, abbot of St Denys, took advantage of the diſorderly life of the nuns of Argenteuil, to re-inſtate himſelf in the poſſeſſion of that monaſtery. He ſent his titles to Rome, and received a favourable anſwer. See what he ſays of it in the hiſtory of his life under the year 1127.

(*d*) Crudeliſſima & pudentiſſima ultione punierunt, & quam ſumma admiratione mundus excepit, eis videlicet corporis mei partibus amputatis, quibus id quod plangebant commiſeram. *Ibid.*

(*e*) *See the article* PARACLET.

(49) *In the article* COMBABUS.

(50) *See, above, citat.* (78), *of the article* CARDAN.

(51) Oper. pag. 17.

(52) *Rem.* [*I*].

(53) *Rem.* [*M*].

(54) *See, above, rem.* [*B*] *of the article* HELIODORUS, *what credit ought to be given to this.*

(55) Un Atheur qui dans ſon eſcrit, Comme moi reçoit une offenſe, Souffre plus que Job ne ſouffrit, Bien, qu'il eût d'extrêmes ſouffrances. *Saraſin, Poëſies, pag. m.* 87.

(56) Apud S. Hieronym. in ejus Vita.

(57) Oper. pag. 25.

which donation was confirmed by Pope Innocent II. Thus ſhe was the firſt abbeſs of Paraclet. She obtained ſuch favour with all ranks of men, that ſhe was quickly loaded with riches. The biſhops loved her as their daughter, the abbots as their ſiſter, and the laity as their mother (*f*). However, ſhe was very ill ſatisfied with the providence of God (*g*), and murmured much more than Job. She kept up a correſpondence by letters with Abelard [*U*], and deſired him to give her rules for her nuns, and the ſolution of ſeveral difficulties. He complied with her deſire in both. I do not find, that the hope ſhe had of ſeeing him dignified with the mitre was the reaſon of her reluctance to marry him [*X*]. When he died, being a monk of Clugni, ſhe requeſted his corps of the abbot, and having obtained it, ſhe interred it in the Paraclet, and deſired that ſhe might be buried in the ſame tomb (*h*). They tell a moſt ſurprizing miracle that happened, as is ſaid, when the ſepulchre was opened in order to lay Heloiſa's body there,

(*f*) *All this is taken from Abelard's letter, intituled,* Hiſtoria Calamitatum, *except a few things, the proofs of which I cite by themſelves.*

(*g*) *See the article* FOULQUES, *remark* [*K*].

(*h*) *See the remark* [*Y*] *of the article* ABELARD.

1127. 'Nuntios noſtros & chartas antiquas fundationis & donationis, & confirmationum privilegia bonæ memoriæ Papæ Honorio Romam delegavimus, poſtulantes ut juſtitiam noſtram canonico inveſtigaret & reſtitueret ſcrutinio. Qui, ut erat vir conſilii & juſtitiæ tutor, tam pro noſtra juſtitia, quàm pro enormitate Monacharum ibidem malè viventium, eundem nobis locum cum appendiciis ſuis, ut reformaretur ibi religionis ordo, reſtituit. —— *I ſent meſſengers to Rome with the ancient charters of erection, donation, and confirmation of privileges, to be laid before Pope Honorius of bleſſed memory, and begged that he would be pleaſed to enquire into the juſtice of my pretenſions, and reſtore me to my rights. Accordingly he being a wiſe and juſt man reſtored that place to me with all it's privileges, not only upon account of my juſt claim, but becauſe of the irregular lives of the nuns who then poſſeſſed it, that a religious order might be again eſtabliſhed there.*' He ſays the ſame thing in the life of Lewis the Burley (58). They who are inclined to judge ill of their neighbour, will not read this paſſage without violent ſuſpicions of Heloiſa's conduct. She confeſſes her ſelf ſubject to the raging heats of luſt (59): and it is often ſeen, that the abbeſs of a convent carries herſelf ill, when leudneſs is prevalent in the ſociety (60). From theſe two principles, they who are fond of ſcandal, may eaſily draw this conſequence, that the prioreſs of Argenteuil, was no better than her nuns. But for my part having never read that ſhe was by name comprehended in the ſcandal her monaſtery gave, I ſhall be cautious of fixing the leaſt blemiſh on her. We ſhould imitate our lord, and make uſe of his maxim (61), *Has any body condemned*, or accuſed, *thee? Neither do I condemn*, or accuſe, *thee*. And it is very true that inferiours imitate the bad and not the good life of their ſuperiours. The court of France under Lewis XIII, was not chaſter than under Henry IV.

[*U*] *She kept up a correſpondence by letters with Abelard.*] That correſpondence began but late, and it was a fortuitous adventure that occaſioned it. Abelard had written to a friend a long relation of his misfortunes, which fell into the hands of Heloiſa, then abbeſs of Paraclet. Having read it, ſhe immediately wrote to Abelard the reflexions ſhe had made upon it, and paſſionately deſired him to write to her, that ſhe might be no longer deprived of the conſolation his letters might afford her in his abſence. She repreſented to him the diſintereſtedneſs of her affection, and how ſhe had neither ſought the honour of marriage, nor the advantages of a dowry, nor her own pleaſure, but the ſole ſatisfaction of Abelard. She tells him that though the name of wife has ſomething in it more great and ſacred, ſhe had always found that of his miſtreſs, concubine, or whore, more agreeable. *Etſi uxoris nomen ſanctius ac validius videtur, dulcius mihi ſemper extitit amicæ vocabulum, aut, ſi non indigneris, concubinæ vel ſcorti* (62). She adds, that he had related a part only of the reaſons ſhe had repreſented to diſſuade him from marriage; but that he had almoſt ſuppreſſed all thoſe which were drawn from the preference ſhe gave to love, before the conjugal tye, and to liberty before neceſſity (63). I know not how this lady meant; but there is here one of the moſt myſterious refinements of love. It has been for ſeveral ages believed that marriage deſtroys the principal poignancy of this ſort of ſalt, and that when one does a thing by engagement, duty, and neceſſity, as a task and drudgery, he no longer finds the natural charms in it: ſo that, according to theſe nice judges, a man takes a wife *ad honores*, and not *ad delicias*. 'Marriage has on it's ſide profit, juſtice, honour, and conſtancy; a flat but more univerſal pleaſure. Love is founded only upon pleaſure, which then is more touching, ſprightly, and poignant: a pleaſure excited by difficulty, there muſt be a reliſh and ſmartneſs in it. It is no longer love, if it be deſtitute of darts and flames. The bounty of the ladies is too profuſe in marriage, it blunts the edge of affection and deſire (64).' *Patere me*, ſaid a Roman emperor (65) to his wife, *per alias exercere cupiditates meas, nam uxor nomen eſt dignitatis, non voluptatis* (66). — *Suffer me, to ſatisfy my deſires with others, for ſpouſe is a name of dignity, not of pleaſure.* One might therefore give an unlucky interpretation to Heloiſa's deſign of never being the wife, but ſtill the dear miſtreſs of Peter Abelard. One might ſuſpect ſhe was afraid leſt marriage ſhould prove the grave of love, and hinder her from taſting ſo deliciouſly, as before, the careſſes of her friend. The author, who has paraphraſed ſome pieces of our Heloiſa's letters (67), at bottom aſcribes this view and taſte to her, though his words are nicely couched. He makes her ſay (68), *That ſhe found nothing but what was dull and inſipid in thoſe public engagements which tye thoſe knots, that only death can looſe, and which make a ſad neceſſity of life and love; that* (69) *it is not to love, to court wealth and honours, in the taſteleſs embraces of an inſenſible husband; that ſhe never would believe one could this way taſte the ſenſible pleaſures of an agreeable union, or feel the ſecret and charming commotions of two hearts, which have a long time ſought one another in order to be united; and that ſhe is fully* (70) *ſatisfied, that if there be any ſuch thing as happineſs in this world, it is only to be found in the union of two perſons, who love with liberty, whom a ſecret inclination has joined, and a reciprocal merit has rendered ſatisfied.* We ſhall ſee preſently that another cauſe has been ſuppoſed of Heloiſa's deſign not to marry Abelard.

[*X*] *I do not find, that the hope of ſeeing him dignified with the mitre, was the reaſon of her reluctance to marry him.*] The Sieur d'Amboiſe (71) makes mention of an ancient French poet, who after having exhorted men not to ſubmit their necks to the yoak of marriage, confirms his opinion by that of our Heloiſa, who, ſays he, moſt importunatly begged and intreated of her lover, that he would not marry her. She was much better ſatisfied to be loved by a man, whom ſhe ſhould one day ſee elevated to a good biſhopric. *Satis eſſe dictitans ſi illa intimo pectoris amorem mutuum ſervans, illum videret mitra & infulis Pontificalibus quibus dignus erat ornatum.* — *Saying, it was enough, for her while ſhe cheriſhed their mutual love in her breaſt, to ſee him adorned with the mitre and pontifical robes which he ſo well deſerved.* The Sieur d'Amboiſe obſerves, I, that this poet gives another turn to it, *viz.* that Heloiſa intimated, that the embraces of married people are not attended with ſo delicious a pleaſure, as thoſe that are illegitimate (72). II. That we ought not to believe that Heloiſa preferred a licentious concubinage, before the condition of a wife; but that her love and reſpect for her galant, enclined her rather to turn recluſe, than by her marriage to hinder Abelard from receiving the rewards that were due to his wit and learning, as ſuppoſe a cardinal's cap (73). I have found no footſtep of this in Heloiſa's letters, and for that reaſon, I have made it the ſixth fault of Mr Moreri, in the article of ABELARD. That which gives birth to theſe ſorts of falſhoods, is the liberty an author takes to lend people thoſe thoughts, which he thinks agreeable to their intereſts. There is ſometimes more advantage for a woman

THE quality of miſtreſs was more grateful than that of wife to Heloiſa.

(58) Papa Honorius vir gravis & ſeverus, juſtitiam noſtram de Monaſterio Argenteuilenſi puellarum miſerrima converſatione infamato, *&c.*

(59) *See, above, rem.* [*K*], *citat.* (41) *and* (43).

(60) *It is a common-place upon this head,* Regis ad exemplum totus componitur orbis; *and* Sequitur leviter filia matris iter.

(61) *St John, chap.* viii, *ver.* 10.

(62) Abelardi Opera, pag. 45.

(63) Rationes nonnullas quibus te à conjugio noſtro infauſtis thalamis revocare conabar exponere non es dedignatus, ſed pleriſque tacitis quibus amorem conjugio, libertatem vinculo præferebam.

(64) Montagne, Eſſais, lib. iii, cap. v, pag. m. 120.

(65) Ælius Verus, apud Spartian. in ejus vita, pag. m. 235.

(66) *See many remarks of this nature in the ninth letter of the* Criticiſm on the Calviniſm of Maimbourg, *and in the twenty firſt and twenty ſecond letters of the ſequel of that* Criticiſm.

(67) Hiſtoire d'Eloiſe & d'Abelard, *printed at the Hague*, 1693.

(68) Pag. 51.

(69) Pag. 53.

(70) Pag. 54.

(71) Præfat. Apologet. ad Oper. Abelardi.

(72) Sed poëta in alium ſenſum hoc detorquet, quaſi illa innuere voluerit ſuaviores eſſe amantium, quam legibus connubialibus nexorum amplexus. *Ibid.*

(73) Potius quam obice & interventu ſuarum nuptiarum, impedimento eſſe ne Abelardus factus uxorius fruſtraretur præmio excellentis ingenii admirabiliſque doctrinæ, pota purpura & galero. *Ibid.*

there, *viz.* that Abelard ſtretched out his arms, to receive her, and cloſely embraced her [*Y*]; and yet he had been above twenty years dead: but that's no great matter; they pretend that they have inſtances of things of this kind [*Z*]. She died the ſeventeenth of May 1163. The letters ſhe wrote to her huſband, are to be met with in the edition of Abelard's works. But what Mr Moreri advances, is not true, viz. that Andrew du Cheſne has made remarks on theſe letters, and on Abelard's anſwers. He has only commented on the letter wherein Abelard gives the hiſtory of his misfortunes to a friend. John de Meun tranſlated into French the letters which Heloiſa and Abelard wrote to one another (*i*). A little book (*k*) was lately publiſhed, intituled, *The Hiſtory of Heloiſa and Abelard, with the paſſionate Letter ſhe wrote to him, tranſlated from the Latin.* This pretended tranſlation, is nothing elſe but a collection of ſome paſſages taken at pleaſure from this woman's letters, to which the author has given what form he thought fit, by ſuppreſſing what he did not like, and adding what he thought more to his purpoſe.

The Count de Buſſi Rabutin tranſlated into French ſome letters of Abelard and Heloiſa. This tranſlation was publiſhed after his death, in the ſecond volume of his letters. *I never ſaw,* (ſays he) (*l*) *finer Latin, eſpecially than that of Heloiſa, nor more love and wit than ſhe was miſtreſs of.* If he had been as good a judge of the Latin ſtyle as he was of the French, he would not have given this elogy to the latinity of Heloiſa.

(*i*) *See the preſident Fauchet, in the 126th chapter of the ancient French Poets.*

(*k*) *Printed at the Hague, by John Alberts,* 1693.

(*l*) *Buſſi, letter xv, of the ſecond Tome, pag.* 49. *Holland Edit.* 1697.

woman to ſuffer a young galant to riſe to the dignities of the church, than to ſtop his way to them by marrying him. But muſt we therefore ſuppoſe that Heloiſa had ſuch views? Here is a well known ſtory. A man who had a prebend, quitted it to marry: the day after the wedding, he ſaid to his wife, *See, my dear, how I love you, I have even quitted my prebend for your ſake. You are a fool,* ſays ſhe, *for your pains: you ought to have kept your prebend; and you might have had me notwithſtanding* (74).

[*Y*] *They tell us that Abelard ſtretched out his arms and cloſely embraced her.*] A manuſcript chronicle of Tours (75) relates this pretty miracle. 'Hæc, '(Heloiſa) ſicut dicitur, in ægritudine ultima poſita 'præcepit ut mortua intra mariti tumulum poneretur, '& ſic eadem defuncta ad tumulum apertum deportata, maritus ejus qui multis diebus ante eam defunctus fuerat, elevatis brachiis illam recepit, & ita 'eam amplexatus brachia ſua ſtrinxit. —— *Heloiſa, as 'we are told, when a dying, ordered that ſhe ſhould 'be buried in her huſband's grave, and accordingly after her death, being put in the grave, her huſband, 'who, had died long before her, received her with 'opened arms, and folding his arms together embraced 'her.*' But how comes it then that they are not in the ſame tomb? Francis d'Amboiſe, who tells us, that he has ſeen at the Paraclet, the tombs of the founder and foundreſs by one another, *contigua fundatoris fundatricis ſepulchra,* ſhould have ſolved this ſmall difficulty.

[Z] *That they have inſtances of things of this kind.*] See what Gregorius Turonenſis relates (76) concerning two married perſons, who always remained virgins, and whom the inhabitants of the country (77) called *the two lovers.* The wife died firſt: the huſband, in burying her, made uſe of this thankſgiving: *I thank thee, my Lord and my God, that I have returned thee this treaſure in the ſame purity that thou was pleaſed to commit it to me.* The woman with a ſmile ſaid to him: *Why do you talk of a thing which no body asks you about.* The huſband died a little after, and was buried over againſt his ſpouſe; but on the morrow their corps were found both in the ſame grave. That blunt interrogatory might give occaſion to ſome of the profane to think, that the virgin wife was not willing the ſhould know her huſband had been ſo cold. She confined herſelf to the merit of her continence, without being willing to be expoſed to the opinions, that might be formed to the prejudice of her charms. It is not thus that *depoſitum* ought to be preſerved; it is not reſtoring it well, to render it juſt as we received it. It is not for this that God inſtituted marriage; *non hos quæſitum munus in uſus.* One may therefore be ſorry, that the public ſhould think one has not ſufficiently pleaſed the depoſitary. But the hiſtorian will remedy this inconvenience, if you conſult the thirty ſecond chapter, concerning the glory of confeſſors, where the diſcourſe of the deceaſed wife is a little better turned. Ten chapters after, he relates, that a ſenator of Dijon, called Hilary (78), having been buried a whole year, lift up his hand to put it round his wife's neck, when ſhe was laid in the ſame tomb.

(74) *See a book called,* Le Moyen de parvenir, *made by a canon of Tours, as the* Menagiana *ſays, pag.* 366, *of the ſecond edition of Holland.*

(75) Apud Andream Querceta-tum, Notis ad Hiſtor. Calamit. Abæl. & apud Franc. Amboſium Præfat. Apologet.

(76) Hiſt. des François, livr. i, chap. xlii.

(77) Clermont in Auvergne.

(78) *See the notes of the abbot de Marolles, upon Gregor. Turon, Tom. II, pag.* 283.

HELVICUS (Christopher) profeſſor of Divinity, of Greek, and of the Oriental languages in the univerſity of Gieſſen, was born the 26th of December, 1581, at Sprendlingen (*a*), where his father was miniſter [*A*]. He was not one of thoſe tardy wits, which do not ſhew themſelves till the latter ſeaſon. He was able, before the age of twenty, to teach Greek and Hebrew, and even philoſophy; and he had compoſed many Greek verſes at the age of fifteen or ſixteen. He ſtudied at Marpurg, and was made maſter of arts there in 1599. He might have obtained it ſooner if he would; for he was admitted bachelor at fourteen (*b*). He made himſelf ſuch a maſter of the Hebrew, that he could ſpeak it as his mother-tongue. He made himſelf thoroughly acquainted with a vaſt number of Greek authors. He ſtudied alſo phyſic for ſome time, though he had dedicated himſelf to the miniſtry. In fine, he gave ſo many teſtimonies of his capacity, that he was choſen, in the year 1605, teacher of Greek and Hebrew in the college the Landgrave had then erected at Gieſſen (*c*). The

(*a*) *A ſmall town half a league from Francfort.*

(*b*) XIV ætatis anno, perraro exemplo Baccalaureatus gradum conſecutus. *Chriſtoph. Scheiblerus in Programmate de Funere Helvici.* A bachelor of arts degree in Germany, muſt be different from what it is elſewhere.

(*c*) *Konig is miſtaken; he makes him profeſſor at Marpurg.*

[*A*] *His father was miniſter.*] He was called Chriſtopher as his ſon; he had been in his younger days, two years together, director of the college of Geraw. After which be ſtudied divinity at Tubingen, and was made miniſter of the church of Griſheim; but prince George, landgrave of Heſſe, preferred him a little after to Sprendlingen; Helvicus ſerved this church till his death, and went through many troubles. *Multa propter ſinceram confeſſionem perpeſſus, tandem ibidem vitam hanc terreſtrem cum cœleſti commutavit.* He was ſon to QUIRINUS HELVICUS, who ſignalized himſelf in the defence of Darmſtadt, during the war of Smalcalde. One may ſee in Sleidan, and Thuanus, the opinion which the count de Buren had of him. Seeing no proſpect of relief, he went upon the ramparts to capitulate, but he received a ſhot which pierced his right-arm, after which the place was taken by ſtorm. They deſigned to hang him, and perhaps they would have done it, if the ranſome that was promiſed for him had not hindered them. He had attended the landgrave Philip in almoſt all his expeditions (1).

(1) Ex Oratione Funebri Chriſt. Helvici habita à Joanne Wynckelmanno.

[*B*] *He*

The year following, the emperor honoured that college with the title of an univerſity, and the privileges belonging thereto. Helvicus having for five years acquitted himſelf in the duties of his profeſſion with great reputation, was advanced to be profeſſor of divinity in the year 1610. He married the ſame year. I know not whether he deferred his marriage till he ſaw himſelf rais'd to a preferment that might help him to a better match, or whether he had other reaſons that engaged him to continue in a ſingle life till that time; for the author whom I ſhall cite, ſays nothing of it; but he obſerves, that marriage did not make Helvicus leſs diligent in the diſcharge of the duties of his function (*d*). He was offered a church in Moravia, in the year 1611, and a profeſſorſhip at Hamburgh, with a conſiderable ſalary. However, he refuſed both theſe invitations. He took the degree of doctor in divinity, in the year 1613: the Landgrave deſired it; as alſo, that he ſhould go and ſee the libraries of the Jews at Francfort, who had been driven lately from thence, by popular commotions. Helvicus, who was much addicted to the reading of the Rabbies, purchaſed many of their books there. He died in the flower of his age, Sept. 10, 1617, having many deſigns of books in his head [*B*]; and had the reputation of a man who had the greateſt dexterity, and beſt method of teaching languages (*e*) [*C*]. He was not only a good Grammarian, but a good Chronologer. His chronological tables have been much eſteemed [*D*], though they are not entirely

(*d*) Neque vero inito matrimonio τὰ Θεῖα χείρων fuit, & in officio remiſſior. *Jo. Wynckelmannus, ubi infra.*

(*e*) *Taken from his Funeral Oration, pronounced by John Wynckelman, profeſſor of Divinity at Gieſſen.*

[*B*] *He died having many deſigns of books in his head.*] He had publiſhed ſeveral grammars, a Latin, a Greek, a Hebrew, a Chaldee, and a Syriac. (2). But they were only abridgments. His Hebrew and Latin Lexicons, were only a ſort of eſſay for the uſe of youth. He had a great deſire to perfect all theſe Grammars, and to make Lexicons for the uſe of the learned, and he begged of God that he might live ſo long as to finiſh theſe undertakings. He moreover prayed for life ſufficient to reduce the eccleſiaſtical hiſtories into order, and to animadvert on Piſcator's tranſlation of the Old and New Teſtament, and on that author's commentaries on the Scripture. He thought alſo, it was requiſite to publiſh a new edition of Luther's bible, with a good apology, and neceſſary explications. The edition of that bible, which Paul Toſſanus had procured not long before, with marginal notes, containing the opinions of Calvin, put Helvicus upon that project, and gave him a vehement deſire to execute it (3). 'Cum ante biennium Paulus Toſſanus Heidelbergenſis Doctor, verſionem Biblicam B. Lutheri Germanicam in lucem edidiſſet, non ſolum variis notationibus marginalibus (quæ quales hinc inde ſint viri cordati judicabunt) conſperſam, ſed etiam erroribus Calvinianorum contra ipſius Lutheri mentem & voluntatem proterva temeritate & impudentia contaminatam, judicabat operæ pretium eſſe, ſi opus illud Biblicum Lutheri cum ſolida ubi opus eſſet apologia, neceſſariis explicationibus, & macularum quas Pontificii & Calviniani illi aſperſerunt abſterſione in lucem prodiret. Ubi animadverti in ipſo ſinglare hoc ipſum præſtandi deſiderium, ſi Domino ita viſum eſſet (4). —— *Paul Toſſanus, a doctor at Heidelberg, having two years before publiſhed Luther's German tranſlation of the Bible, not only with many marginal notes (with what ſucceſs let the learned judge), but likewiſe corrupted it moſt impudently, and contrary to the doctrine and intention of Luther, with many Calviniſtical errors, Helvicus thought it would be a ſervice to the public, to publiſh that work of Luther's, with a ſolid apology where there is occaſion for it, with neceſſary explications, and purged from all theſe foul interpolations, by which the Papiſts and Calviniſts had polluted it. I obſerved, that he vehemently deſired to have executed this deſign if it had pleaſed GOD.*'

[C] . . . . *who had the greateſt dexterity, and beſt method of teaching a language.*] He ſought a road eaſier than the common way uſed in the ſchools to lead youth to learning. He was not at all diſcouraged, by the obſtacles that were raiſed againſt his new method. Being perſuaded, that it would ſave a great deal of time and pains to the ſcholars; and, prompted by the affection which all have for their own inventions, he earneſtly endeavoured to introduce his method into the ſchools. He put the buſineſs in a good way; they endeavoured to ridicule him, they wrangled with him, and calumniated him, which obliged him to defend himſelf, and repel thoſe rude aſſaults (5). I believe, that his death happening before his inventions took effect, gave opportunity to the partiſans of the old method, to maintain themſelves, or to recover their ground. However, it was inſcribed in his epitaph, that he had invented a new art of teaching, *novæ Didacticæ author & informator feliciſſimus.* The thing deſerved it, *titulo res digna ſepulchri,* and merited to be copied more exactly than has been done by the Sieur Freher, who, inſtead of *Didacticæ,* has put it *Dialecticæ.* One would think, that Helvicus had ſome idea of a project, which, they ſay, a very learned man is employed about, which is to reduce languages to common principles, which may ſerve to learn them very eaſily all together; one might believe this, I ſay, if we depended on this title of one of his books: *Libri didactici Grammaticæ univerſalis Latinæ, Græcæ, Hebraicæ, Chaldaicæ* (6): but it is plain by his funeral oration, that there is a comma wanting after *univerſalis.* See, above, quotation (2).

[D] *His chronogical tables have been much eſteemed.*] I ſpeak of the work which is intituled, *Theatrum Hiſtoricum, ſive Chronologiæ Syſtema novum.* He publiſhed it in the year 1609. Seth Calviſius, who was a great maſter of hiſtory and chronology, much approved of that work, and found it a new and very uſeful invention, ſince things are there ſeen altogether, and at one view: *Utpote in quibus exemplo antehac non viſo omnia uno intuitu lectorum oculis ſubjiciantur.* Wynckelman obſerves, that this approbation is found in the letter that Seth Calviſius wrote to Helvicus, September the ſeventh 1609. He adds, *the work is at preſent reprinting, corrected, and enlarged by the author. Jam ſecundum emendatius & ex ipſius* αὐτογράφῳ *auctius editur.* We muſt ſay then, that the firſt edition of this work was in the year 1609, and the ſecond in the year 1618, John Steuber, profeſſor at Gieſſen, had the care of the latter, and dedicated it to a Daniſh lord (7), a patron of learned men, and who had honoured Helvicus with his friendſhip. Twenty years after a new edition of this book was publiſhed by the care of John Balthaſar Schuppius, ſon-in-law to the author, and profeſſor of Eloquence at Marpurg. He advertiſes in his preface, that he will ſay nothing of the Engliſh edition. Since that time this *Chronological Theatre* has been often reprinted. Voſſius hath not been exact in the account he gives of the date of the firſt edition, and hath given that for the ſecond edition, which was not ſo. 'Anno CIƆIƆCXII *ſaith he* (8), Chriſtophorus Helvicus edidit ſyſtema Chronologicum, æqualibus denariorum quinquagenariorum, & centenariorum, intervallis. Id poſtea continuavit & recenſuit Joannes Balthaſar Scoppius . . . . . Emiſit anno CIƆIƆCXXXVIII. —— *In the year 1612, Chriſtopher Helvicus publiſhed a ſyſtem of chronology, with equal intervals of tens, fifties, and hundreds. It was afterwards continued and reviſed by John Balthaſar Scoppius.* . . . . . *He publiſhed it in 1638.*' It cannot be objected to me, in favour of Voſſius, that it is very true, that Helvicus publiſhed a book of chronology in the year 1612, which was augmented by Schuppius, in 1638, for that is not the book which Voſſius ſpeaks of; the title of it is *Chronologia Univerſalis ab origine mundi per quatuor ſumma imperia, quas Monarchias appellant, ad annum uſque MDCXII, deducta, cum præcipuis ſynchroniſmis virorum illuſtrium eventorum & politiarum cæterarum* (9). All is there accommodated to the prophecy in the ſecond and ſeventh

(2) *He publiſhed firſt a General Grammar.* Grammatica univerſalis, continens ea quæ omnibus linguis ſunt communia. *They who have it, will do well to compare it with Mr Arnauld's Grammar.*

(3) Ex Oratione Funebr. ubi ſupra.

(4) Wynckelm. ibid.

(5) *See* Spizelius, in Templo Honoris reſerato, pag. 50.

(6) *This title is to be found in Spizelius,* ibid. pag. 52.

(7) Oliger Roſecrantz. *The epiſtle dedicatory of Steuber, is dated the eighteenth of March* 1618.

(8) De Scient. Mathemat. pag. 404.

(9) Vide M. Euſebium Bohemum in epitome Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ Novi Teſtamenti, pag. 72, & ſeq. apud Joh. Juſtum Wynckelmannum, in Cippo memoriali Chriſtophoro Helvico reſtaurato, pag. 10.

entirely free from errors [*E*]. We may conjecture by the books we have of his [*F*], that if he had attained the age of ſixty, his works would have made many volumes in folio. As for the reſt, he was a man of an unblameable life; he ſtudied to have peace with all mankind, and never had any difference, either with his colleagues, or with other people (*f*): *Rara avis in terris.* He was much eſteemed by ſeveral princes of Germany, and received Letters from them, full of civilities. Anne Dorothy, ducheſs of Saxony, did him the honour to write frequently to him. He was lamented in an extraordinary manner; all the poets of Germany, of the Ausburg confeſſion, made funeral elegies, lamenting his untimely death. A collection of theſe poems has been printed, with the funeral oration, and ſome other pieces, under the title of *Cippus memorialis*, by the care of Wynckelman, colleague of the deceaſed. The ſon of this Wynckelman had the *Cippus* reprinted in the year 1650.

(*f*) Concordiam colebat cum omnibus: nullo enim unquam tempore cum ullo ſive collega, ſive extraneo in diſcordia vixit. *Wynckel. ibid.*

ſeventh chapters of Daniel. This character doth not agree with the *Theatrum Hiſtoricum.* On the other hand, the title and character by which Voſſius repreſents the book he ſpeaks of, agree perfectly with the with the *Theatrum Hiſtoricum, ſive Chronologiæ ſyſtema novum*, where we ſee only diviſions of tens, fifties, and hundreds, which do not exceed one another. In fine, John Juſtus Wynckelman, the ſon of him who pronounced the funeral oration, remarks very expreſsly (10), that Schuppius publiſhed two works of his father-in-law Helvicus, with Continuations until the year 1639; one is, *Theatrum Hiſtoricum*, in folio; the other *Chronologia Univerſalis*, in quarto. I forbear obſerving, that Helvicus did not at all publiſh his chronology himſelf, which he had continued to the year 1612. It was publiſhed by his colleague, Steuber, in the year 1618.

(10) Wynckelm. ibid.

[*E*] . . . . *tho' they are not entirely free from errors.*] Tanaquillus Faber, doth not find them exact as to the time in which the poets, philoſophers, and other learned perſons flouriſhed. ‘ Primum hoc mihi —— ‘ credas velim, Helvicum non ſatis locupletis eſſe fidei ‘ in hac Chronologiæ parte quæ virorum ſcriptis il‘ luſtrium ætatem ſignat: dein hoc quoque habet Hel‘ vicus, quod fere plerumque recentiores ſcriptores ſe‘ quatur, ut eclogarios, bibliothecarios, &c. quale ali‘ quid quoque in Calviſio improbarat Scaliger, quem‘ admodum ex Epiſtolis ejus apparet; quamvis Cal‘ viſii opus, ex quo totus eſt Helvicus, mirifice lau‘ daret. Sed quod dico, allatis infra exemplis pla‘ nius conſtabit (11). —— *In the firſt place, I deſire* ‘ *you to obſerve, that Helvicus is not entirely to be* ‘ *depended upon, in that part of chronology, which re*‘ *lates to the age of famous authors: and likewiſe* ‘ *he for the moſt part follows modern authors,* ‘ *ſuch as collectors and writers of Bibliotheques &c.* ‘ *Scaliger finds ſome ſuch fault with Calviſius like*‘ *wiſe, tho' he highly commended that work of Calvi*‘ *ſius, from which Helvicus takes moſt of his. What I* ‘ *ſay will be more evident from ſome examples, which I* ‘ *ſhall afterwards produce.*’ The inſtances he promiſes and afterwards gives, relate to the errors of Helvicus concerning Athenæus, Lucian, Juſtin, and Hermogenes.

(11) T. Faber, Epiſtolar. lib. i, pag. 211.

[*F*] *By the books we have of him.*] I have already taken notice of ſome of them, and here follow more. He publiſhed chronogical diſſertations on the four monarchies, on the ſeventy weeks of Daniel, on Cyrus, and the other kings of Perſia, *&c.* He ſo ſolidly confuted the opinions of Angelocrator, that nothing could be replied (12). And yet Angelocrater pretended to inſpiration, declaring in the front of his book, that he had compoſed it, *Deo illuminante* (13). This much diminiſhes the glory of thoſe who confuted him, it being an eaſy thing to find a thouſand chimæra's in the writings of thoſe pretended inſpired men. Though they ſhould not be actually Fanatics, and had only in view, the raiſing of the paſſions, they would, by their boaſt of ſuch a thing againſt their conſcience, betray ſuch a diſordered mind, as muſt needs expoſe them to the laſhes of the meaneſt critic. Helvicus wrote ſome treatiſes, *de Dialectis Græcis, de ratione carmina Græca conſcribendi, de Paraphraſi Bibliorum Chaldaica*, a Latin art of poetry, *deſiderium Evæ, cum aliorum dictorum Biblicorum à depravationibus Judæorum, Calvinianorum & Photinianorum erroribus annexa vindicatione: Synopſis hiſtoriæ univerſalis.* He had put to the preſs the Hebrew art of poetry, and had already written the epiſtle dedicatory to it; but he ſuppreſſed it for ſome reaſons (14). See the Sieur Witte, in his *Diarium Biographicum*; but eſpecially ſee the Theatre of Paul Freherus (15), and the *Templum Honoris* of Spizelius. You will there find a long, and, I think, a pretty exact catalogue of Helvicus's works. Moſt of them are in Latin, the reſt in High-Dutch. Correct Freherus in the epitaph XXXVI (16), and IX and make it XXXV, and IIX. It is ſtrange, that they who have corrected this great book, ſhould not ſee, that a man who was was born the twenty ſixth of December, 1581 (17), and died the tenth of September, 1617 (18), did not live thirty ſix years, nine months and a half. There are XXXV years and IIX months in the epitaph recited by Wynckelman (19), he has likewiſe been guilty of a miſtake by ſaying, in the funeral oration, that Helvicus died in the thirty ſeventh year of his age, *anno ætatis ſuæ trigeſimo ſeptimo.* He writ this all at length, and not in figures. He writes in the ſame manner the day of his birth, and the day of his death; the firſt is, according to him, the twenty ſixth of December 1581, and the other is the tenth of September 1617. How then doth he make out the thirty ſeven years? the eaſier it is to avoid theſe faults, the more a man is obliged to avoid them.

(12) Contra abſurdas Danielis Angelocratoris opinationes, ut eas inſignis Chronologus Sethus Calviſius in literis ad Helvicum datis indigitat, quem ita errorum convicit, ut ne contra quidem hiſcere potuerit. *Wynckelm. in Orat. Funebri.*

(13) Apud Voſſium de Scient. Mathem. pag. 402.

(14) Quam tamen poſt certis de cauſis prælo ſubduxit. *Wynckel. ibid.*

(15) Pag. 394.

(16) Magirus in Eponymol *hath alſo* XXXVI.

(17) *Paul Freher affirms it, pag.* 393.

(18) *As his epitaph teſtifies in Freher*, pag. eadem & 394.

(19) In Cippo Memoriali, pag. m. 16.

HEMELAR (JOHN)

HEMELAR (JOHN) a canon of Antwerp, born at the Hague (*a*), was a very learned man. He applied himſelf much more to the ſtudy of polite learning, and the ſcience of medals [*A*], than to theological diſputes. He was both a poet and an orator. At Rome he made a panegyric upon Clement VIII, with ſo great ſucceſs, that the choice was given him of being either keeper of the Vatican library, or of

(*a*) Valerius Andreas, Biblioth. Belg. pag. 514.

[*A*] *He applied himſelf to the ſtudy of polite learning, and the ſcience of medals.*] He compoſed a book upon that ſcience, and gave it to be publiſhed, on condition that they ſhould not put his name to it. *Auctor eſt* Expoſitionis Numiſmatum Imperatorum Romanorum à Jul. Cæſare ad Heraclium *quam operi ſuo* Jac. Biæus *adjecit, tacito, ut ſtipulatus erat, nomine Antwerp. apud Verduſ.* 1614 4to (1). This is what we find in Valerius Andreas. What follows is ſomething more particular. ‘ In Numiſmata Regum & ‘ Impp. Romanorum à C. Julio Cæſare uſque ad Fl. ‘ Juſtinianum ex Caroli Arſchotani reguli & Nic. Ro‘ coxii conſularis viri armariis deprompta’ commen‘ tarios edidit bonæ frugis plenos, in quibus quic‘ quid in auro, argento, ære, flato percuſſo in urbe ‘ æterna, exquiſitum, elegans, hiſtoriæ temporum & ‘ genio principum conveniens, per notas figuras, am‘ bages breves & ſirpos verborum ſignificatur, acutiſ‘ ſime paucis & planiſſime explicat, penu quoddam ‘ nummariæ antiquitatis: & quo opere aliquis arrogantior ‘ ſuperis ſe miſceri poſſet arbitrari, in eo nomen ſuum ‘ diſſimulavit (2). —— *He publiſhed moſt uſeful com*‘ *mentaries on the medals of the Roman the emperors, from* ‘ *Julius Cæſar, down to Juſtinian, taken from the* ‘ *cabinets of Charles duke of Arſchot, and Nicholas Ro*‘ *coxius, a Burgomaſter. In which he briefly and ac*‘ *curately, explains every thing that is exquiſite elegant,* ‘ *or agreeable to the hiſtory of theſe times, or genius of* ‘ *princes, whether thoſe medals be in gold, ſilver, or* ‘ *braſs, whether caſt or ſtruck in that immortal city. It* ‘ *is a compleat treaſury of the knowledge of medals, and* ‘ *yet in this work, from which others would have ex*‘ *pected*

(1) Val. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag. 514.

(2) Gronovius. in Orat Funebri Jac. Golii, pag. 7, & 8.

of having a very good benefice (*b*). He contented himſelf to be a canon of the cathedral of Antwerp (*c*). He had a great ſhare in the eſteem and friendſhip of Juſtus Lipſius, his profeſſor; which appears by the letters that Lipſius wrote to him (*d*), and the teſtimony he gave him in the year 1600 (*e*). Hemelar was then preparing himſelf for his voyage to Italy. He lived ſix years at Rome with cardinal Ceſi (*f*). He was a friend of Grotius, and publiſhed ſome verſes, congratulating him on his eſcape out of priſon (*g*). He was brother to the mother of James Golius, that learned profeſſor at Leyden, who acquired ſo great a reputation by his profound knowledge of the Oriental tongues. He would doubtleſs have deſired to bring over this nephew to the Roman communion, as he had done Peter Golius, the brother of James; but he would not have been able to accompliſh this deſign. James Golius was a good Proteſtant, who all his life entertained a grudge againſt his uncle, for having perſuaded his brother to change his religion (*h*). Moreri, who in the article of Golius, informs us, that he ſpeaks elſewhere of our John Hemelar, gives us but a falſe information. I ſhall not imitate him with regard to the promiſe I have made in the ſame article, of ſaying ſomething concerning PETER GOLIUS [*B*].

‘ *pected the higheſt fame he conceals his name.*’ The words preceeding theſe in Gronovius's oration, are too fine to be omitted. ‘ Mater (*Golii*) omni ſexus laude prædita . . . . . vel unica Johannis Hemelarii fratris imagine ſat nobilis eſt, viri & in veterum literarum tractatione cum primis exercitati, & poëtæ diſerti, & probitate ac tranquillitate vitæ fugaque honorum & negotiorum T. aliquem Pomponium Atticum referentis. Panegyricum dixit votis tertiorum quinquennalium Clementis VIII tam illuſtri gratia exceptum, ut Vaticanæ bibliothecæ præfecturam, aut optimum ſacerdotium (Canonicatum vocant) optare juſſus ſit: ſacerdotio Antwerpiæ contentus fuit. ——— *His* (*Golius's*) *mother endowed with all the virtues of her ſex . . . illuſtrious enough by all her reſemblance to her brother John Hemelar, a man throughly acquainted with ancient learning, an excellent poet, and, for probity, tranquillity of life, and neglect of honours and employments, reſembling a Pomponius Atticus. He delivered a panegyric on Clement the VIII, which gained him ſuch applauſe, that, being deſired to chuſe either the office of keeper of the Vatican library, or a rich benefice* (*a canonry as it is called*), *he contented himſelf with a living at Antwerp.*’ Mr Colomiés (3) aſſures us, that Hemelar's book upon medals is very ſcarce, and yet there were three editions of it (4). The other works of this canon of Antwerp, are, *Gratulatio in inaugurationem D. Chriſtiani Michaëlii, D. Michaëlis apud Antverpienſes Præmonſtratenſis Cænobii Abbatis. Poëmata multa ſparſim edita. Oratio in funere Joannis Malderi V. Antverpienſis Epiſcopi habita.*

[*B*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething concerning PETER GOLIUS.*] He had the ſame inclination as his brother for voyages to the Levant, and for the Oriental tongues. He turned a barefooted Carmelite, and took the name of Celeſtin of Saint Liduïna. He ſojourned many years upon mount Libanus, and was profeſſor of the oriental tongues at Rome. He tranſlated *Thomas à Kempis*, into Arabic, and undertook, at the age of ſeventy four, a voyage to the coaſts of Malabar, to endeavour the converſion of the infidels. The diverſity of religion and profeſſion, did not hinder the two brothers from loving one another very affectionately. Peter wrote to James that he was beholden to him for the civil treatment which he received in Aſia. ‘ Frater Aſcetes è familia diſcalceatorum cum per veſtigia fratris in Oriente decurreret, ſcripſit ad noſtrum diu jam reducem omnia ſibi evenire præter expectationem: paraſſe ſe ad vincula carceres verbera, cruces, invenire amplexus, gratulationes, ſtudia, gratias potentium ob nomen Golium: eam memoriam id deſiderium ſui reliquerat: ita gratiam abſenti referebant. (5) — *When his brother, the Carmelite was travelling in the eaſt, in the ſame places where James had before been, he wrote to him that every thing had happened to him beyond his expectation, and that he had prepared himſelf for bonds, impriſonments, buffetting, and croſſes, and inſtead of theſe he had found embraces, welcomes, civilities, and caraſſes, from the great, on account of his name Golius: ſo acceptable, ſo beloved, had he rendered himſelf when there, and ſo did they ſhow their affection to him when abſent.*’ Thus the name of Golius was in ſuch eſteem there, ſince James's travels, that a great deal of honour was paid to it in the perſon of Peter. For the reſt, we muſt not imagine that Hemelar had need of much wit or induſtry to bring over his nephew to the Roman communion; for he perſuaded him to it when he was but a child. Peter Golius was bred in his houſe from eight years of age. I will tranſcribe the words of Gronovius, upon which I ground this opinion. They will ſhew that this child had a very forward wit. ‘ Unum in eo (*Hemelario*) non ſine gemitu ſolebat accuſare noſter, quod fratrem Petrum revocaſſet ad religiones parentibus ejuratas virum alioquin egregium, & fraterno ſecum animo, nec minus gnarum rerum & linguarum Orientis, diuque in partibus iiſdem verſatum & Arabicæ linguæ Romæ Profeſſorem: qui quam præcoqui fuerit indole, teſtis eſt oratio, quam Chriſtiano Michaëlio Abbati Præmonſtratenſi ab Hemelario ſcriptam gratulandi cauſa, puer octo annorum conſtanter, & quaſi feciſſet, memoriter pronuntiavit. —— *Our Golius uſed to accuſe Hemelar of one thing, not without ſighs, that he had ſeduced his brother Peter to the Roman communion, who was, in other reſpects, a very extraordinary perſon, and he always retained a brotherly affection to him, who was no leſs skilled in the affairs and languages of the eaſt, where he had long ſojourned, and was profeſſor of the Arabic tongue at Rome: a proof of the forwardneſs of his wit, we have in a gratulatory oration compoſed by Hemelar, to Chriſtian Michaelius, abbot of the Premonſtants, which he, when a boy of eight years of age, pronounced with as much eaſe as if it had been his own performance.*’

(*b*) Joh. Fridericus Gronovius, in Orat. Funebri Jacobi Golii, pag. 7.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

(*d*) Id. pag. 8.

(*e*) *It is full of elogies: you may find it in Swertius*, Athen. Belg. pag. 436.

(*f*) Idem. Swert. ibid.

(*g*) Grotio arcam & angelum cuſtodem luculento carmine gratulatus eſt. *Gronov. ibid.*

(*h*) Unum in eo non ſine gemitu ſolebat accuſare noſter, quod fratrem Petrum revocaſſet ad religiones parentibus ejuratas. *Id. ibid.*

(3) Mêlanges Hiſtoriques, pag. 78.

(4) *The ſecond is of the year* 1627, *in* 4to, *and the third of the year* 1654, *in folio, both at Antwerp. See Father Labbé*, Biblioth. Nummar. pag. 262.

(5) Gronov. in Orat. Funebri Golii, pag. 19.

HEMMINGIUS (NICOLAS) profeſſor of Divinity at Copenhagen, was born in the year 1513, in the iſle of Laland (*a*). His firſt education could not be very advantageous to him, being under the direction of a Blackſmith, his father's brother. However he made ſome progreſs in learning, and afterwards went to Wittemberg, where for five years he was one of Melanchthon's moſt conſtant auditors. As he was obliged to get his living either by inſtructing ſcholars, or writing for them, we muſt the more admire the learning he acquired. He returned from thence to Denmark, and by Melanchthon's recommendation, was taken into a gentleman's houſe to inſtruct his daughters. He was afterwards made miniſter of the church of the Holy Ghoſt at Copenhagen, and afterwards profeſſor of the Hebrew tongue. He took his doctor of divinity's degree in the year 1557, and immediately after was made profeſſor in the ſame faculty at Copenhagen. He diſcharged the duties of it excellently well till the year 1579, when he was declared *emeritus*, and veſted with a canonry in the church of Roſchild. He peaceably enjoyed that preferment to his death; that is, to the twenty

(*a*) *It belongs to the king of Denmark.*

third of May 1600. He was blind the laſt years of his life (*b*), which is the leſs ſurprizing, when we conſider that he was very ſtudious, and lived eighty ſeven years. It ought to be obſerved, that he not only was not a very rigid Lutheran [*A*]; but that there is ſome probability, that if it had not been prevented, he would have ſhewn himſelf a good Calviniſt. His inclination for the opinions of Geneva was perceived: he was obliged to explain himſelf, and even to make a recantation [*B*]. He gave a confeſſion of the Lutheran faith, and yet not long ſince there has been a divine who has endeavoured to ſhew that it agrees with that of the Calviniſts [*C*]. Hemmingius publiſhed

[*A*] *He was not a very rigid Lutheran.*] This one proof will be ſufficient for me. The articles of union, which the divines of Saxony, and their adherents, endeavoured to eſtabliſh over all the Lutheran world, were rejected with great indignation in Denmark. King Frederic II forbad all his ſubjects to ſign them, and threatened all with baniſhment who ſhould diſobey that order, or bring copies of that book into his dominions (1). See the remark [*E*]. Now Hemmingius was the principal promoter of this affair (2), as Hoſpinian obſerves, who in this fact has not been contradicted by Hutterus.

[*B*] *He was obliged . . . . . to make a recantation.*] Hoſpinian (3) relates that Hemmingius, in his *Syntagma Inſtitutionum Chriſtianarum*, publiſhed in the year 1574, explained himſelf upon the Real Preſence like a Calviniſt. Mr Maſius does not diſown this; but he adds, that Hemmingius, being admoniſhed of his error, ſolemnly retracted it (4). ‘ *Non diſſimulandum eſſe* ‘ (ſays Maſius) *Calvini ſententiæ de S. Cæna aliquandiu* ‘ *indulſiſſe, (Hemmingium)* ſed monitum à cæteris ‘ Theologis ad meliorem mentem reverſum depoſito ‘ errore palinodiam ceciniſſe. *Quam in rem* ejus con‘ feſſionem, ipſius manu ſcriptam (5) *ſibique à Viro Il*‘ *luſtri* D. Engberg *Conſiliario Regis & Judice Provin*‘ *ciali Seelandiæ dono datam, ſubjungit.*’ The author from whom I borrow theſe words, ſhews us, by ſome paſſages of the *Syntagma*, that Hemmingius impugned the ubiquity, and beſtowed elogies on Calvin for accuſing, and on the magiſtrates of Geneva for puniſhing, Servetus. ‘ Cum his hæreſiarchis damnamus etiam ‘ impium nebulonem Michaelem Servetum, qui ra‘ biosè contemtis ſanctorum Patrum Conciliis, Arii ‘ & aliorum fanaticorum hominum damnatas hæreſes ‘ revocare conatus eſt, quem juſtò accuſatum à D. Jo‘ hanne Calvino, meritò Genevates affecere ſupplicio ‘ (6). —— *Together with theſe hereſiarchs, we likewiſe* ‘ *condemn that impious villain Michael Servetus, who* ‘ *deſperately contemning the councils of the holy fathers,* ‘ *endeavoured to revive the condemned hereſies of Arius,* ‘ *and other fanatics, whom Mr John Calvin juſtly ac*‘ *cuſed, and whom the magiſtrates of Geneva juſtly put* ‘ *to death.*’

[*C*] *A divine has endeavoured to ſhew that Hemmingius's confeſſion agrees with that of the Calviniſts.*] Mr Maſius, profeſſor of divinity at Copenhagen, has communicated to the public the confeſſion that was required of Hemmingius. It imports that he firmly believed that JESUS CHRIST wholly, GOD and man, is ſubſtantially preſent in the Lord's Supper, whereever it is celebrated according to his inſtitution; and that he conveys and delivers to all communicants, worthy and unworthy, his true body and true blood, which he has ſhed for us, for the remiſſion of ſins; and that his body and blood are truly and really taken with the bread and wine by the communicants, inſomuch that it is a true meat, and a true drink, with which man is nouriſhed, refreſhed, and quickened to eternal life. *Se ſtatuere & firmiter credere totum Chriſtum Deum & hominem ſubſtantialiter adeſſe præſentem in Cæna ſua ubicunque celebratur juxta ipſius ordinationem, ipſumque adferre & exhibere omnibus communicantibus dignis & indignis ſuum verum corpus & verum ſanguinem quem effudit pro nobis in remiſſionem peccatorum, & hoc corpus & hunc ſanguinem vere & realiter cum pane & vino à communicantibus ſumi, ita ut verus ſit cibus & potus quo homo paſcitur, reficitur & vivificatur ad vitam æternam* (7). For the reſt, Hemmingius acknowledged that his confeſſion was conſonant to that of Augsburg, to the little Catechiſm of Luther, and to the ſyſtem of the doctrine of the Saxon churches, and he declared that he diſowned whatever in his *Syntagma* has offended the churches, and is agreeable to Calvin's opinion about the Holy Supper, or that is not conſiſtent with his preſent confeſſion. *Cum jam aliter in Syntagmate ſuo ſcripſerit juxta ſententiam Calvini de re ſacramentaria quo Eccleſiæ offenſæ ſint, & quod cum hac ſua præſenti confeſſione pugnet, id quicquid ſit in univerſum revocare, & hoc ſuo ſcripto revocatum velle* (8). He begs pardon of the king, and of all thoſe whom his *Syntagma* had offended (9). It is plain, that his confeſſion is wholly Lutheran, and we ought to believe that the doctors who obliged him to retract, preſcribed him the expreſſions that they thought moſt capable of taking away equivocations, and denoting preciſely and formally his orthodoxy, and the abjuration of his error. And yet it is incredible what efforts the divine, whom I cite, hath made in order to ſhew that Hemmingius did not make a recantation. The Parentheſes, and the Nota Bene's with which he intermixes the words of the confeſſion, in order to evade the conſequences and pretenſions of Mr Maſius, ſeem to him ſo ſolid, that he is not afraid to affirm that Hemmingius retracted but very little, and that good Calviniſts might honeſtly ſign that confeſſion, explained and underſtood in it's true ſenſe. *Videt itaque rurſum vir clariſſimus, quantillum id ſit quod hac confeſſione ſua* Hemmingius *revocavit, cui & nos dummodo dextre intelligantur & recte explicentur poſſumus adſtipulari; & quam procul ille adhuc abſuerit tum cum collegis à fide* γνησίως *Lutherana* (10). From whence we may conclude, how difficult it is to draw up any Formulary, that ſhall cut off all occaſion of diſpute. Men believe they have prevented all ſorts of equivocations, but in the end they find that an adverſary finds a thouſand evaſions, and would perſuade us, that we had quite other thoughts than what we know very well we had. In certain caſes this is to undertake what Pericles undertook, and in which he ſucceeded. Being thrown upon the ground in wreſtling, he perſuaded the ſpectators that he did not really fall (11). Some readers may poſſibly here call to mind an unlucky obſervation which they may have read in the *Hiſtory of the Variations* (12). ‘ The Lutherans aſſure us in their book of Con‘ cord, that Luther was led to that expreſſion (13) by ‘ the ſubtilties of the Sacramentarians, who found a way ‘ to accommodate to their moral preſence, the ſtrongeſt ‘ and moſt preciſe expreſſions of Luther, for the real ‘ and ſubſtantial preſence; from which we, by the by, ‘ ſee once more, that we ought not to wonder if the ‘ defenders of the figurative ſenſe, find a way of draw‘ ing the holy fathers to their ſide, ſince Luther him‘ ſelf, alive and ſpeaking, who knew their ſubtilties, ‘ and undertook to confute them, was hard put to it ‘ to find words which they did not pervert to their ‘ own ſenſe by their interpretations: being tired with ‘ their ſubtilties, he reſolved to find an expreſſion ‘ which they could no longer elude, and therefore ‘ compoſed the article of Smalcalde in the form that ‘ we have ſeen it.’ The biſhop of Meaux might have found a famous inſtance of all this in his own church. The bull of Innocent X, againſt the opinions of Janſenius, did not hinder the Janſeniſts from proceeding in their diſputes. They intrenched themſelves in abundance of ſubtilties and infinite diſtinctions. To drive them from that hold, Alexander VII was made to ſpeak in a more preciſe manner, and they inſerted in his Bull whatever was thought proper to ruin the diſtinctions and ſubterfuges of the Port Royal. That ſignified nothing. The Janſeniſts continued to maintain, that the doctrine of Janſenius was not yet condemned. Mr Arnauld diſplayed a hundred obſervations borrowed from the ſubtleſt logic (14). The reading of ſuch a paper muſt have greatly aſtoniſhed the Pope: He would have ſeen the vanity of his precautions, and perceived that they proved to him, that he did not mean what he knew very well he had meant. As far as I ſee (he might have ſaid) you know my thoughts better than myſelf. What a pretty thing is the *Connotatum* of cardinal Laurea (15)? And when we conſider the infinite diſtinctions that are neceſſary in order to diſcover exactly what is ordained by the bulls, and what is not (16), we eaſily perceive that the infallibility of St Peter's chair is of no uſe, unleſs we ſuppoſe that every

(*b*) *Taken from Paul Freber*, Theatr. Viror. Illuſtr. pag. 312, 313.

(1) *Taken from* Hoſpinian. de Origine & Progreſſu Libri Concordiæ, cap. 35, pag. 307.

(2) Promoventibus cauſam hanc D. Hemmingio, & aulico concionatore, *&c.* *Id. ibid.*

(3) Idem, Hiſtor. Sacrament Parte II, pag. 595.

(4) Samuel Andreas, in epiſtola ad Antonium Horneck qua Daniæ Orthodoxæ fidelis & pacificæ Autori reſpondetur. pag. 62. Edit. Marpurg. 1690.

(5) *The ſixth of April*, 1576.

(6) Hemmingius in Syntagm. Inſtitutionum Chriſtianarum, Loco de Deo, n. 38, apud Samuelem Andream, ubi ſupra, pag. 63.

(7) *See Samuel Andreas*, ibid. pag. 65, 66.

(8) Apud Samuel. Andream, ibid. pag. 67.

(9) Ibid.

(10) Ibid.

(11) *See the article* PERICLES, *remark* [*D*].

(12) Biſhop of Meaux's Hiſtory of Variations, book iv, n. 37, pag. m. 181.

(13) *Viz.* That the bread was the true body.

(14) See the writings that have been publiſhed, pag. 240, and following, of the fourth Tome of the Tradition of the Church of Rome concerning Grace, at Liege, 1696.

(15) See the fourth Tome of the Tradition of the Church of Rome concerning Grace, pag. 138, and following.

(16) See what is cited from Melchior Canus in the ſame Tome, pag. 120, &c.

liſhed ſeveral books: his ſhort theological treatiſes were ſo highly eſteemed by Simon Goulart, that he cauſed them to be re-printed at Geneva, in the year 1586 [*D*]. Add to this, that at the age of ſeventy years, he compoſed a book, intituled, *Immanuel*, which ſeems principally to have been deſigned as a confutation of James Andreas, the great promoter of Ubiquitiſm (*c*). This work which is much praiſed (*d*), was not printed till after the death of the author. It was publiſhed at Francfort, in the year 1615 (*e*), with a preface which will furniſh us with a ſupplement to what we have ſaid concerning the vigour with which the king of Denmark rejected the Book of Concord [*E*].

every private perſon is thoroughly acquainted with the moſt ſubtile rules of logic, or that every curate is infallible.

[*D*] *His ſhort theological treatiſes were ſo highly eſteemed by Simon Goulart, that he cauſed them to be reprinted at Geneva in the year* 1586.] See the epiſtle dedicatory of the edition which he procured. For the reſt, he acquaints the reader, that he has cleared ſome things which Hemmingius had not ſufficiently explained, and which offended many people.

[*E*] *Here follows a ſupplement to what we have ſaid* (17) *concerning the vigour with which the king of Denmark rejected the book of the Concord.*] An Engliſhman (18), who wrote the preface to this poſthumous Work of Hemmingius, acquaints us (19), that queen Elizabeth left no means uneſſayed to induce the king of Denmark to act in this manner. He relates ſeveral particulars of the indignation of this prince, and, among others, that he threw into the fire, the book of Concord, which was ſent him covered with ſilk, and adorned with jewels: ‘ Imo quod memorabile imprimis eſt è pientiſſimo Danorum Rege Frederico 2. ab aula Electorali Saxoniâ, ut ut miſſus, holoſerico obductus, auro, gemmiſque pretioſis affabre ornatus magno, & pio Zelo Vulcano traditus eſt, annexâ graviſſimâ pœnâ & inſpectione ejus rei univerſi Regni Epiſcopis demandata ſub confiſcatione, in regnum ne importaretur, ibidemve diſtraheretur, ne-ve ſub exilio certiſſimo ab ullo poſſideretur, eo quod in illo nova, & in iſtis regionibus antè inaudita, ac (prout habet ipſum diploma Regium in librum Concordiæ vibratum, à doctis viris mihi non ſemel in Dania explicatum) inuſitata comprehenderentur dogmata: recepta verò ibi ex adverſo ſunt cum Lutheri, Philippi quoque ſcripta, inter hæc cum primis CORPUS DOCTRINAE, tribunitiæque illæ, ac declamatoriæ conciones S. Cathedris pulſæ (20). —— *Nay which above all deſerves to be obſerved, it was with a holy zeal thrown into the flames, by that pious prince, Frederic II, king of Denmark, though it was ſent to him from the electoral court of Saxony, covered with ſilk, and richly adorned with gold and jewels, the importing or vending of it in his kingdom, was likewiſe forbid under a high penalty, and the inſpection was committed to all the biſhops of the kingdom, under the penalty of confiſcation, and that none ſhould preſume to keep it in their poſſeſſion, under the pain of baniſhment; it containing many new, ſtrange, and unheard-of doctrines, in theſe parts: (theſe are the words of the Royal Edict, publiſhed againſt the book of Concord, as I have heard it more than once explained by learned men in Denmark.) On the other hand, the books of Luther and Melanchthon are here received, and above all his CORPUS DOCTRINÆ, and theſe ſeditious and declamatory harangues were baniſhed from the pulpits.*’ He obſerves that Hutterus highly condemned this conduct of the king of Denmark. ‘ Heroicum iſtud Regis Frederici factum vocat (Hutterus in libro quem appellat CONCORDIA CONCORS) durum nimis & Rhadamantheum plane, Regemque & quidem Chriſtianum haud decens, ſed cum enormi, tantoque Rege indignâ prorſus animi impotentiâ, & nimiâ affectuum vehementiâ conjunctum, quod tanti Regis dignitatem, prudentiam, & exiſtimationes haud leviter, omnibus, qui ſaltem aliquid judicare poſſunt, ſuſpectas reddit. —*Hutterus, in his book he entitles CONCORDIA CONCORS, calls this heroic action of king Frederic, harſh, and altogether Rhadamanthean, unbecoming a prince, and a Chriſtian, attended with great folly and heat of paſſion, altogether unworthy of ſo great a king. And that it gives no ſmall ground, to people of ſenſe; at leaſt to call in queſtion his dignity, prudence, and reputation.*’ But that it has been highly celebrated by Chriſtopher Knobius, in his funeral oration on that prince. I ſhall quote the paſſage which will ſhow us the warm zeal of that prince, who frequently ſaid, that this controverſy among the Lutherans, had done more miſchief, than the Turks could have done, by ſacking theſe provinces where it firſt aroſe. ‘ Chriſtophorus Knobius Aulicus illius (*Regis*) Concionator in Concione funebri in exequiis Regiis habita *anno* 1588. 5 *Junii* ſic de illo loquitur: *Sollicitus erat ne ſui quoque Doctores in abyſſum hujus periculoſæ, & nocentiſſimæ diſputationis abriperentur, ideoque noluit iſti negocio immiſceri: etiam querebatur, damnum quod Chriſtiana Eccleſia ex hâc diſputatione ſentiebat, non poſſe tali Concordiæ Bergenſis formula ſanari: & ſciunt complures honeſtiſſimi viri, quanto cum affectu id factum doleret, quinimo illum ſæpius dixiſſe, ſi Turca illas regiones, in quibus hæc certamina nata ſunt, & adoleverunt, depopulatus fuiſſet, non tantum damni potuiſſe inferri, quantum hæc diſputatio intulit, nec finem poſſe videri hujus certaminis* (21). —— *Chriſtopher Knobius, chaplain to that prince, in an oration pronounced at his obſequies in the year* 1588, *June* 5, *ſpeaks of him in this manner.* Being afraid leſt his clergy ſhould be hurried into the abyſs of this dangerous and hurtful controverſy, he would not at all meddle in it; and he complained that the hurt which the Chriſtian church had ſuſtained by it, could not be healed by this form of Concord of Berg. Many men of great note know what ſorrow he felt on that account, and that he has frequently ſaid, that if the Turk had ſacked theſe provinces wherein theſe diſputes began, and were cheriſhed, he could not have done ſo much hurt as this diſpute had done, and that no end of that controverſy could be foreſeen.’ Queen Elizabeth made uſe of the ſame compariſon in her letter to the elector of Saxony. Your country, ſays ſhe (22), has ſuſtained more prejudice by this pretended Concord, than if the Turks, had entered it with fire and ſword. The author (23) who mentions this particular, obſerves that the miniſters in Holland, prevailed with this queen, to perſuade the king of Denmark to reject the book of Concord. We ſee, in the preface to Hemmingius's book, that the ſucceſſor of this king continued to reject that book, for which the author of the preface beſtows great praiſes on him. ‘ Robinſonus pag. 10. ejuſdem ad Lectorem præfationis ſic concludit. Deus qui nunquam deeſt Eccleſiæ ſuæ, irrequietorum talium hominum conatus ut olim per pios Magiſtratus, in Daniâ præſertim, mirè impedivit: ita etiam nunc per optimi patris optimum filium, re & nomine verum Chriſtianum, paternis veſtigiis ſeverè inſiſtentem, pietate, & juſtitiâ regna ſua firmantem, Pontificiorum, Ubiquitariorum, & aliorum ſchiſmaticorum ac turbulentorum hominum ſtudia maturè, & prudenter in ipsâ herbâ reprimentem, benignè retardavit (24). —— *Robinſon in the tenth page of the ſaid preface to the reader concludes thus. GOD, who never forſakes his church, put a wonderful ſtop to the attempts of theſe turbulent ſpirits, as in former times, by pious rulers, eſpecially in Denmark. So likewiſe in our days has he graciouſly curbed them by the excellent ſon of an excellent father, a Chriſtian, both in name and thing, and who worthily goes on in his father's foot-ſteps, eſtabliſhing his kingdom in piety and juſtice, and prudently checking in the bud the deſigns of Papiſts, Ubiquitarians, and other ſchiſmatics, and ſeditious perſons.*’

I frankly own that I do not take thoſe things from the fountain-head, I have no other original but the notes of Lewis Gerard de Reneſſe on a letter which he reprinted at Breda in 1651 (25), and which had been firſt publiſhed in 1579, in Latin, Dutch, and German. It is intituled, ‘ Apologetica Reformatarum in Belgio Eccleſiarum Epiſtola, ad, & contra Auctores Libri Bergenſis, dicti, Concordiæ. —— *An Apology for the Reformed Churches in Holland, by way of Epiſtle to and againſt the authors of a book from Berg called Of Concord.*’ Mr Reneſſe was ignorant of

---

(*c*) Lud. Gerard. à Reneſſe, Not. in Apolog. Belg. Eccleſ. pag. 114.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) Id. ibid. pag. 111.

(17) In the remark [*A*].

(18) He is named Robert Alenſon in the notes which I ſhall quote below; but afterwards he is always named Robinſon.

(19) *Preface to the book of Hemmingius, called*, Immanuel apud Ludovicum Gerardum à Reneſſe. *In his notes on the* Apologetica Reformatarum in Belgio Eccleſiarum Epiſtola, ad & contra Auctores libri Bergenſis, de Concordiæ dicti, pag. 111.

(20) *Preface, above, cited from* L. G. à Reneſſe, pag. 111.

(21) Lud. Gerardus à Reneſſe, Not. in Epiſt Apolog. Eccleſiæ Reform. in Belgio, pag. 113.

(22) *Scribens ad* Auguſtum Electorem *ſic inter alia* ſi Turca totam tuam ditionem, ferro flammaque vaſtaſſet, tanta non dediſſet damna quanta ex concordiæ diſcordis negocio accepit. *Id ibid. pag.* 114. *ex Jo. Lampadii, Epiſt. Dedic.* Cenſuræ Ubiquitatis.

(23) Joh. Lampad. ibid.

(24) Lud. Gerard. à Reneſſe, ibid.

(25) He was a miniſter there, and profeſſor of Divinity.

of the author of it; but I know it has been aſcribed to Peter de Villiers (26), a French miniſter, and chaplain to the prince of Orange. ‘ Anno 1579, Petrus Villerius Gallus concionator aulicus Principis Auriaci, Polypragmonicus, ſub miniſtrorum Belgicorum nomine Epiſtolam criminatoriam contra Autores libri Concordiæ publicavit (27). —— *In the year 1579, Peter Villiers, a Frenchman, and chaplain to the prince of Orangr, a pragmatical man, publiſhed a ſlandering epiſtle under the names of the miniſters of Holland, againſt the authors of the book of Concord.*’

HENAULT (N). A French poet in the XVIIth Century, ‘ Author of the ſonnet upon Mrs de Guerchi [*A*], and teacher to Madam des Houlieres, was pretty famous in Paris whilſt he lived, and is ſo ſtill, though he has been dead theſe fourteen years (*a*). It is true, his merit not being in print [*B*], to uſe Mr Menage's phraſe, his reputation could not ſpread itſelf like that of ſome others, who at Paris never enjoyed ſo great a one as himſelf. He was a man of wit and learning, loving pleaſure with refinement, and a debauchee with art and delicacy; but he had the worſt turn of mind imaginable. He pretended to be an Atheiſt, and made oſtentation of his ſentiments with a fury and affectation that were abominable. He compoſed three different ſyſtems concerning the mortality of the ſoul [*C*], and made a ‘ voyage

[*A*] *Author of the ſonnet upon Mrs de Guerchi.*] Before I publiſhed, in the remark [G] of the article SPINOZA, the extract of the letter where theſe words are contained, I had already obſerved (1) that the ſonnet of the Abortive was thought to be Mr Henault's, and that he had compoſed it upon Mrs de Guerchi. But as ſoon as my dictionary appeared at London, a learned Engliſh gentleman there, did me the honour to write to me, I. that he knew from the firſt hand, that this ſonnet was ſeen two or three years before the death of Mrs de Guerchi; II. that ſome perſons *who pretended to know it very well*, aſſured him, that it was made by Subligni, author of the Falſe Clelia. I communicated this to the ingenious gentleman, who had written to me the letter, whereof I had inſerted an extract in the article of SPINOZA. He anſwered me, that Mr Lucas ‘ had aſſured him that the ſonnet on the Abortive was compoſed twenty years before the accident of Mrs de Guerchi, but that all connoiſſeurs in theſe matters, whom he had conſulted, ſaid, it was written upon a miſcarriage of that handſome woman, but not that which coſt her her life. Twenty of my friends, *adds he*, who have lived with Henault, have aſſured me, that the ſonnet was poſitively his, and that he owned it. Subligni * was ſtill in the college when that piece was firſt publiſhed: his widow and his daughter have confirmed it to me, *that he was not the author of it*.’ Let us then lay down for certain, that it is a piece of our Henault; for we ſhall ſee, below, that it was put into the collection of that poet's works: but let us very much doubt that it was made on Mrs Guerchi. It is looked upon as a maſter-piece, though it be againſt the rules (2) and has even one barbariſm in it (3).

[*B*] *His merit not being in print.*] This is found to be falſe. ‘ Mr d'Henault himſelf in his life-time, cauſed a little collection of his works to be printed at Paris by Barbin in 1670, in 12mo. *Oeuvres diverſes .... par le Sieur D. H.* It is dedicated to Monſieur Doort without any other title, it contains proſe and verſe, and letters in proſe and verſe to Sapho, who very probably is Madam des Houlieres. The ſonnet on the Abortive is there ... We muſt not forget the firſt piece in the book intituled, *Conſolation to Olympia.* It will furniſh me with two critical obſervations: one is, that the compilers of St Evremont's works, being perhaps deceived by ſome body, or by a pretended conformity of ſtile, have placed this whole letter, which is very long, among his works, and a great many people who pretend to be nice judges, have taken it for a genuine piece of his. This is an example, which you may add to thoſe which you have collected concerning the errors, into which this likeneſs of ſtile daily leads the critics. The ſecond obſervation falls directly upon a new cenſor ... who has pretended to paſs a judgment upon the works of St Evremont ‡ ... This man has fallen headlong into the ſnare that was laid by the compiler. He attacks that letter of Conſolation to Olympia in the ſtile, on the thoughts and ſentiments, and he beſtows a fourth part of his book on this notable criticiſm.’ This is what I have found in a collection of remarks, which a young advocate of the parliament of Paris did me the favour to ſend me in the year 1698, and which convinced me, that he has an infinite deal of wit, and an exact knowledge of many curious matters of fact, and ſuch as are very proper for this dictionary (4).

[*C*] *He had made three different ſyſtems concerning the mortality of the ſoul.*] Let us give one paſſage more out of that collection of remarks juſt now mentioned. ‘ Henault ſaith, in his epiſtle dedicatory, *You know that I am a man wholly by my ſelf, that I do not place my happineſs in the opinion of others, that my maxims or my errors are very different from thoſe of all the world beſides.* By this he begins to diſcover what he was. Many of his verſes are imitations of the Chorus's of Seneca, and amongſt others of the ſecond act of the Troas, where the mortality of the ſoul is eſtabliſhed: that ſubject hit his taſte.’

Comme ſe perd en un moment
Cette portion d'air dans les corps enfermée;
Que le plus actif element
Developpe & pouſſe en fumée;
Comme au ſoufle des aquilons
On voit bien-tôt evannoüie
Une groſſe nuée ou de grêle ou de pluie,
Qui d'un deluge afreux menace les valons;
Ainſi s'épand cette ame vaine
Qui meut tous les reſſorts de la machine humaine.
Tout meurt en nous quand nous mourons:
La mort ne laiſſe rien, & n'eſt rien elle-même,
Du peu de tems que nous durons
Ce n'eſt que le moment extrême, &c.

‘ I am ſurprized that this was printed with the king's privilege. This man had a tender heart; he ſaid to his miſtreſs:

Sappho fit des vers comme vous,
Faites l'amour comme elle.

‘ He would have her to renounce glory.

Pour moi je ne ſuis point la dupe de la gloire,
Je vous quitte ma place au Temple de memoire,
Et je ne conçoi point que la loi du trepas
Doive épargner mon nom & ne m'épargner pas.
Je me mets au deſſus de cette erreur commune,
On meurt, & reſſource & ſans reſerve aucune.
S'il eſt apres ma mort quelque reſte de moi,
Ce reſte un peu plus tard ſuivra la même loi,
Fera place à ſon tour à de nouvelles choſes,
Et ſe replongera dans le ſein de ſes cauſes.

‘ This is no tranſlation, but an original, and thus it is, that this man ſcattered in his works the ſeeds of his errors. In the two pieces that have been inſerted in the Furetieriana, you will find alſo the ſame opinions which he endeavours to inſinuate every where. To his impieties he added groſs impurities. Some are to be found in a piece intituled *le Bail d'un cœur à Cloris, the leaſing of a heart to Chloris*, which is in that collection, and aſſuredly that Chloris might well be one of la Fontaine's Jeannetons †. Theſe verſes are bolder than all ‘ his

---

(26) See the remark [*S*] of the article CHARLES V, the paſſage of Grotius's Annals, where the apology of the prince of Orange is aſcribed to this Peter Villiers.

(27) Schyſelburg. lib. ii, Theol. Calvinianæ, cap. vii, apud Schulting. Bibl. Cathol. Tom. I, pag. 23.

(*a*) *Viz.* in 1682.

(1) In the article PATIN, *pag.* 744, *letter (d)*, I have left it out in this ſecond edition.

* He made himſelf eſteemed at the Bar. There are ſome plays of his compoſure, and ſome critical remarks on Andromache.

(2) See the *Amitiez Amours, and Amourettes*, of Mr le Pays, book iii, letter iv.

(3) See Father Bouhours's *Maniere de bien Penſer, pag* 373. *Edit. Holland.*

‡ Judgment upon the works of St Evremont, 1698, in 12mo, at Paris by the Sieur Dumont. It is a falſe name: it is attributed to Mr Cotolendi, author of *Arlequiniana*; ſome think Mr Erard, a famous advocate, had a good hand in it.

(4) See, below, the end of the remark [*Q*], in the article of the third duke of GUISE.

† Mais les gens de delà les monts Auront bientôt pleuré cet homme, Car il deffend les Jannetons, Choſe très neceſſaire à Rome. *La Fontaine, in his Poſthumous works, ſpeaking of Innocent XI*, Quand l'objet en mon cœur a place, Et qu'à mes yeux il eſt joli, Do nomen quod libet illi. *Id. ibid.*

'voyage to Holland on purpoſe to ſee Spinoſa, who yet made but little account of 'his learning. At his death matters changed extreamly: he was converted, and would 'have carried things to exceſs: his confeſſor was obliged to hinder him from receiv'ing the Viaticum in the midſt of his chamber with a halter about his neck. D' He'nault was of no conſiderable family, his father was a Baker, and he himſelf was at 'firſt receiver of the taxes in Forez, where he did not manage his affairs well. 'He taught Madam des Houlieres all that he knew or fancied he knew. It is pre'tended that this appears in the works of that lady [*D*]." This is an extract of a letter which an ingenious gentleman honoured me with the twenty ſeventh of April, 1696. He writ to me another the nineteenth of July, 1697, in which he informed me, that d' Henault *had drawn up the plea of Mr Clodoré, governor of Martinico, againſt Mr de la Barre, governor of the iſles of America, and a manifeſto of Mr de Gadagne, about the affair of Gigeri.* You will find in the Fureteriana, an elegy (*b*) and an eclogue (*c*) of this author. The elegy is uſher'd in with this commendation, *Monſieur d'Henault was eſteemed by every body . . . . He was every way a gentleman, and amorous.* He compoſed a ſonnet which gave occaſion to Mr Colbert to do a handſome thing [*E*]. He was married, and left one daughter, who is a penſionary in a convent at Paris. Our remarks are filled with ſeveral particulars which have been communicated to us, to which I refer the reader.

'his tales, and better deſerved the cenſures of the 'magiſtrate.'

[*D*] *It is pretended that this appears in the works of that lady.*] The reader may have ſeen in the firſt edition of this dictionary, pag 1088, of the ſecond tome, that he, to whom the words of this text belong, immediately adds, *I have ſeen ſome people take notice, among other verſes in the Idylle, on a river* ‡

Courez, ruiſſeau, courez, fuyez & reportez
Vos ondes dans le ſein des mers dont vous ſortez;
Tandis que pour remplir la dure deſtinée
Où nous ſommes aſſujettis,
Nous irons reporter la vie infortunée
Dans le ſein du neant d'où nous ſommes ſortis.

Run, river, run, and haſten to the ſea;
There loſe yourſelf in it's immenſity.
So we, the ſtruggle or'e with care and ſtriſe,
In non-exiſtence loſe a wretched life.

It is certain that a perſon, who ſhould ſpeak after this manner, dogmatically would deny the immortality of the ſoul. But for the honour of Madam des Houlieres, let us ſay that ſhe only followed poetical ideas which are not to be drawn into conſequence. Thus in imitation of the ancient poets, ſhe ſays in another place (5), that after our death our ſoul wanders on the infernal ſhores. This could not have been her belief, if Mr de Henault had taught her his impieties. Let us not judge her by poetical phraſes. Not but that abundance of licentiouſneſs may be concealed under the privilges of verſification. The advocate I have mentioned, has a note upon this paſſage. *You have quoted,* ſays he to me in his letter, *ſome verſes of Madam des Houlieres which are ſuſpected of Libertiniſm: but they have made you omit one* ‡ *which is not the leaſt emphatical, and which is in the edition of her poems. To ſpeak the truth; there are many moral, and even Chriſtian and ſacred, pieces in her works, which correct this one. Some people however were at pains to repreſent her as a Libertine; for ſhe complains of it in her epiſtle to Father la Chaiſe on the hypocrites She was a very great wit, the honour of her ſex, and the ſhame of ours.*

Note, that under pretence that ſhe ſays we are produced out of nothing, it could not be pretended, that ſhe believed the creation; for Mr d'Henault ſhews plainly enough (6) that by the word *nothing*, he meant not the privation of exiſtence, but the meer privation of life. In this ſenſe he did not admit of the creation.

[*E*] *He compoſed a ſonnet which gave occaſion to Mr Colbert to do a handſome thing.*] The collection of remarks before cited, furniſhes me with another good commentary. 'To return to Mr d' Henault, it 'is of him Mr Boileau ſpeaks in two places of his 'ninth ſatire: *Je le declare donc, Haynault* * *eſt un* '*Virgil. I declare it then, Haynault is a Virgil.* 'But Mr Boileau told me himſelf that he thought him 'a pretty good poet, and that his beſt piece, not for 'it's matter, but for the compoſition, was a ſonnet 'againſt Mr Colbert, which began with this verſe, *Miniſtre avare & laſche, eſclave Malheureux,* —— *O* '*griping baſe miniſter, O miſerable ſlave.* Mr Colbert 'on this occaſion did a noble thing; he was told of 'this ſonnet, which made a noiſe at that time. He 'asked whether there was nothing in it againſt the 'king, he was told there was not; whereupon he 'anſwered, that he minded it not, and would not 'reſent it againſt the author. Is not this ſomething 'nobler than the ſonnet?

HENICHIUS (JOHN) profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſity of Rinthel in the country of Heſſe, was the ſon of a miniſter of Winhuſen, and was born in the month of January 1616. He went through the Claſſics at Zell and Lunenburg, and then was ſent to Helmſtadt in the year 1634; where, after he had ſtudied four years, he was admitted doctor of philoſophy. Having afterwards read ſome lectures, and moderated in ſome public diſputations, he gained, in a very particular manner, the friendſhip of Dr Calixtus and Dr Horneius, two celebrated divines. He went to Heldeſheim towards the end of the year 1639, and he lived there about three years with a gentleman of merit (*a*). He took a journey after that towards the Rhine, and then ſtaid ſome time with James Lampadius at Hanover. He was made profeſſor of Metaphyſics, and of the Hebrew tongue in the univerſity of Rinthel, in the year 1643, and at the end of a year and a half he was called to Bardewic to be ſuper-intendant there. He exerciſed the functions of that office five years together, with ſo much diligence, that Auguſtus, duke of Brunſwic, would have given him the inſpection of the whole dioceſe of Wolfenbuttle; but he did not accept of it. He even quitted his employment, becauſe the fatigues he had gone through had brought on him a tedious ſickneſs. He returned to Rinthel in the year 1651, to be profeſſor of Divinity there. He was ſolemnly inveſted with the honour of a doctor's degree in the ſame faculty, and had a place ſoon aſſigned him in the eccleſiaſtical Conſiſtory, and was made inſpector of the churches of the county of

(*b*) Page 77 of the Dutch Edit.

(*c*) Page 238.

‡ Pag. 164, Tome I, of Madam des Houliere's Poems: you will find it alſo in the *Courier Galant* of May 1693, pag. 552.

‡ Nous irons reporter la vie infortunée, QUE LE HAZARD NOUS A DONNE'E, Dans le ſein du neant d'où nous ſommes ſortis.

(5) See the article PLOTINUS, remark [*A*].

(6) See the ſonnet of the Abortive.

* He calls him ſo to diſguiſe him.

(*a*) Ad Nobiliſſ. atque præſtrenuum Virum D. Fridericum Wilhelmum GANSIUM ſe contulit, apud quem triennium fere ſatis commode exegit. *Apud Witte, Memor. Theologor. Decad. xiii, pag. 1716.*

Schawemburg (b). He gave proofs of his learning in ſeveral works which he publiſhed [A]; he had a great deal of candour and moderation, and paſſionately deſired an union betwixt the Lutherans and Calviniſts [B], and it was probably this which expoſed him to the malice of ſome zealots. He married in 1645, a very virtuous woman, who did not prove barren; for he had thirteen children by her. He died at Rinthel the twenty ſeventh of June, 1671 (c). His epitaph, made by Gerhard Walter Molan, is very fine. You will find it in the 338th and 339th pages of a book of Gaſpar Sagittarius (d)

(b) The town of Rinthel is in that county.

(c) *Taken from his funeral* Programma, *inſerted by Mr Witte, in the* XIII Decade Memoriarum Theolog. noſtri ſæculi, pag. 1716, & ſeq.

(d) *Intituled,* Introductio in Hiſtoriam Eccleſiaſticam: *and printed in* 1694.

[A] *Several works which he publiſhed.*] Here is the catalogue that Mr Witte has given of them (1). *Diſſertatio de Majeſtate civili:* Rintel. 1653 *in* 4to. *De Cultu creaturarum & imaginum Diſſert.* ibid 1653 *in* 4to. *De Libertate Arbitrii, imprimis de concurſu cauſæ ſecundæ cum primis:* ibid. 1645 *in* 4to. *De officio boni Principis piique Subditi*: ibid. 1661 *in* 12mo. *Diſſertatio de Pœnitentia lapſorum*: ibid. 1659 *in* 4to. *De Gratia & Prædeſtinatione Diſſertatio:* ibid. 1663 *in* 4to. *Compendium S. Theologiæ:* ibid. 1657, 1671, *in* 8vo. *De Veritate Religionis Chriſtianæ:* ibid. 1667 *in* 12mo. *Inſtitutiones Theologicæ:* Brunſvigæ, 1665, *in* 4to. *Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ & Civilis, Pars I.* Rintel. 1669. *Pars II.* 1670. *Pars III.* 1674. *in* 4to. *Diſputationes aliquot emiſit publiceque habuit, ex quibus eſt; de Myſterio SS. Trinitatis: De Confeſſione Auguſtini, de Fide & Operibus: &c.*

I have ſomething to obſerve upon the book *de Veritate Religionis Chriſtianæ*, which is in that liſt. It is a very good ſupplement to that of Grotius on the ſame ſame ſubject: for Henichius explains, illuſtrates, and proves more at large the arguments that Grotius had made uſe of. He informs us of this in the title, where he ſays, *quo ea quæ vir illuſtris* Hugo Grotius *de hac materia commentatus eſt, aliquanto uberius exponuntur.* By the way let us obſerve, that Grotius has been accuſed of plagiariſm, and let us place here an addition, which was at the end of the firſt volume of this dictionary in the firſt edition, and which the Printer has not placed where it ought to be in the ſecond. It contains theſe words: ‘ to me there ſeems ‘ nothing more falſe, than what was ſaid to Mr Wheeler and Mr Spon, *That Grotius had ſtole his principal argument* for the truth of the Chriſtian religion, ‘ *from an Arabic author, and particularly from the* ‘ *works of an excellent man, whom the Latins held* ‘ *for an arch-heretic but whom the Cophti look upon* ‘ *as a ſaint, who has written an excellent book againſt* ‘ *the Turks and Jews for the truth of the Chriſtian* ‘ *religion* (2). Note as to the three volumes of our Henichius's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, that they reach but to the end of the Vth century; and though the title promiſes the civil as well as the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, the author dwells principally on the latter. The firſt volume contains the three firſt centuries; the ſecond contains the fourth, and the third, the fifth. Boſius who had ſaid, in his *Schediaſma de comparanda notitia ſcriptorum Eccleſiaſticorum*, that Henichius's work comprehended the ſix firſt centuries, was too rudely cenſured for it. He acknowledged his error, and corrected it with his own hand in the copy of his book. Such faults as theſe may be pointed out, but it ſhould be done without bitterneſs and inſulting, remembring that it is very eaſy to commit them. *Aberrationem agnovit, ac manu ſua in exemplari privato correxit: ut adeo acrem illam Clariſſimi* Sluteri *cenſuram* * *non videatur meruiſſe. Et quam facilis in his talibus ſit lapſus, unuſquiſque intelligit* (3). The author who ſays this, obſerves, that Henichius, after giving the ſubſtance of what is ſaid by the ancient authors, afterwards ſets down the paſſages at full length. He has reaſon to ſay that this ought to recommend his work. *Cæterum Henichianum opus vel eo etiam nomine meretur commendari, quod integra auctorum veterum teſtimonia adſcribat, quorum ſummam prius attulerat* (4).

[B] *He paſſionately deſired an union betwixt the Lutherans and Calviniſts.*] He is praiſed for it in his funeral *Programma* (5): ‘ Pacis & concordiæ perpetuus ſtudioſus, nihilque magis in votis habebat, quàm ‘ ut ſchiſma inter Evangelicos funditùs tolleretur, & ‘ togata prælia in ſuggeſtibus & Cathedris cum ſalutiferâ, DEO & hominibus gratâ pace, fauſto omine, ‘ commutarentur: qua de cauſa immortalem nominis ‘ gloriam apud omnes bonos, adeptus eſt. —— *He was* ‘ *a conſtant lover of peace and concord, and deſired nothing more earneſtly, than that the ſchiſms among* ‘ *Proteſtants ſhould be entirely healed, and that inſtead of theſe contentions among divines, both in their* ‘ *chairs and pulpits, we might be bleſſed with peace* ‘ *grateful to God and man: and on this account his* ‘ *name will ſtill be remembered with honour among* ‘ *all good men.*’ The author of the Programma ſays a little after (6), ‘ Equidem invidia & malignitas, ‘ ut ſunt virtutis fata, non unum in eum jaculata fuit ‘ fulmen: ſed & illa, quæ viventi gravis fuit, mortui ‘ famæ, credo, favebit, ſuamque vel imperitiam vel ‘ livorem tandem profitebitur. —— *Indeed the envious* ‘ *and malicious, as the common fate of virtue, did not* ‘ *ſpare him, but theſe which afflicted him while living* ‘ *will, I do not doubt, add to his fame now he his dead,* ‘ *and at length own their ignorance or ſpite.* He doth not point out the cauſes of that malicious envy which perſecuted Henichius: but I conjecture, that the peaceable diſpoſition of that profeſſor, furniſhed pretences to ſlander him.

(1) Witte, Memor. Theolog. Dec. XIII, pag. 1720.

(2) Wheeler's Voyage to Dalmatia, *&c. lib. ii, pag.* 163, *Edit. Holland.* 1689.

* In Propylæo Hiſtoriæ Chriſtianæ, pag. 26.

(3) Caſpar Sagittarius, Introd. in Hiſtor. Eccleſ. pag. 340.

(4) Id. Sagittar, ibid.

(5) Witte, Memor. Theolog. Decad. XIII, pag. 1718.

(6) Id. ibid. pag. 1719.

HENRY VI, emperor of Germany, ſon of Frederic Barbaroſſa, was crowned by Pope Celeſtin III [A], the fifteenth day of April, 1191. He marched with a potent army to take poſſeſſion of Naples and Sicily, which fell to the empreſs Conſtantia his wife, after the death of the young William, king of Sicily (a). He found ſo many oppoſitions to his taking poſſeſſion of it, that we may almoſt ſay, that he obtained thoſe two kingdoms by conqueſt. He made himſelf ſo much feared, that the emperor Alexis, ſirnamed The Angel, could not obtain peace of him without paying tribute (b). If he had only done that, his valour might have been praiſed; but all the applauſe he may have merited, on that account, is ſwallowed up by the cruelty and treachery he ſhewed, in exterminating, under falſe pretences, all that remained of the race of the brave Normans who had conquered that part of Italy, which the empreſs, his wife, their heireſs, gave him right to poſſeſs (c). It is ſaid, that this princeſs, to puniſh him for it, made him ſwallow poiſon, whereof he died at Meſſina, in the year 1198, being thirty two years old (d). He left a ſon, who was emperor under the name of Frederic II. Conſtantia was ſo old, when ſhe brought that ſon into the world, that, to avoid all ſuſpicions of impoſture, ſhe was brought to bed publickly [B]. Theſe precautionns did not

(a) *See Maimbourg's* Decade de l'Empire, livr. v, pag. m. 476.

(b) *See* Maimbourg, ibid.

(c) Id. ibid. pag. 477.

(d) Id. ibid. *citing the abb.t of Urſperg.*

[A] *Was crowned by Pope Celeſtin* III.] They tell this circumſtance of that coronation. As the emperor ‘ was at his feet, Celeſtin, who put the crown ‘ on his head, lifted up his foot, and kicked it down, ‘ to ſhew that he could give it and take it away. ‘ Baronius praiſes this action, but things, in my opinion, ‘ have changed their aſpect ſince, and there is not ‘ one prince who would ſincerely ſubſcribe to the ‘ opinion of that cardinal (1).’ I cite the author who ſpeaks thus.

[B] *To avoid all ſuſpicions of impoſture ſhe lay-in publickly.*] Here is a paſſage of Brantôme, which deſerves

(1) Chevreau, Hiſtory of the World, book v, chap. ii, pag. 75, of the third Tome, Holland Edition, 1687.

not hinder the world from ſaying, that this child was ſuppoſititious [*C*]. There are authors who maintain, that Conſtantia was neither a nun, nor very old when ſhe married Henry VI [*D*].

---

deſerves to be read: ‘ Conſtantia, queen of Sicily, who ‘ had never ſtirred from the cloyſter, leading all her ‘ youth and life in Veſtal chaſtity, ſetting herſelf at ‘ liberty at the age of fifty, tho' not handſome, but ‘ quite decrepit, had a mind to taſte the pleaſures of ‘ the fleſh; ſhe married, and became with child at ‘ the age of fifty two, which ſhe reſolved to be delivered of publickly in the plains and meadows of ‘ Palermo, having cauſed a tent and pavilion to be erected there for that purpoſe, that no body might ‘ diſtruſt the legitimacy of her fruit, which was one ‘ of the greateſt miracles that has been ſeen ſince ‘ St Elizabeth. The hiſtory of Naples ſays, notwithſtanding, that he was reputed ſuppoſititious: however, he proved a very great man: but moſt baſtards ‘ are brave, as a great man once told me (2).

[*C*] *Theſe precautions did not hinder the world from ſaying, that this child was ſuppoſititious.*] Brantôme whom we have juſt quoted tells us this. But here is another author, who will point out the proofs of it better. ‘ It is certain, *ſaith he* (3), that women fifty ‘ years old and upwards, have born children. We ‘ have an example of it in that renowned nun Conſtantia, the mother of Frederic II, who, being taken ‘ from a cloyſter, was the only heireſs and queen of ‘ Sicily, being with child at the age of fifty two years ‘ compleat, to take away all ſuſpicion, had a pavilion ‘ ſet up in a public place of a certain town in Sicily, ‘ and in the preſence of the greateſt ladies of that country, lay-in in public. Notwithſtanding which many ‘ diſputed that fact; amongſt others the marquis of ‘ Ancona, named Marquardus, who offered to prove, ‘ that that child was not the iſſue of Henry and Conſtantia, and ſo was ſuppoſititious. As it is ſaid by ‘ Pandolfo Collenuccio *. If it may be ſaid, that the moſt exquiſite precautions are uſeleſs againſt love, we may likewiſe ſay, that they are ſo againſt ambition. Do whatever you pleaſe to convince the public that ſuch or ſuch a child-birth was not imaginary, but moſt real, they will always find anſwers ready for you; the expedient which cured St Thomas's incredulity, is the only one that can be proof againſt theſe cavils: *unleſs I put my finger, &c.* will they ſay to you, as that apoſtle did, *I will not believe* (4). Nay I know not but after feeling they would ſay, *I have ſeen and felt how the child came out, but not how it came in. Was your huſband capable of begetting it.*

[*D*] *Some authors . . . . maintain that Conſtantia was neither a nun, nor very old, when ſhe married Henry VI.*] It is the common opinion, that ſhe was taken from a cloyſter, and that ſhe obtained a diſpenſation to be married to the emperor Henry VI, and that ſhe conceived about the age of fifty five. But there are hiſtorians who deny this. Let us ſee the ſequel of the paſſage of Camerarius, which I have cited (5). ‘ Poſſibly John Michael Brutus (6) took occaſion ‘ from this ſtory, flatly to deny, that Conſtantia was ‘ ever a nun or abbeſs, or that Pope Celeſtin diſpenſed with her marriage, foraſmuch as according to his ‘ calculation ſhe muſt have been ſixty years old. On ‘ the contrary, he alledges Hugo Falcandus the hiſtorian, who ſaith ſhe was then in the flower of her ‘ age, and married to Henry, in the reign of William, ‘ ſirnamed the Good, when Frederic Barbaroſſa was ‘ yet alive: but that the confuſion of times was the ‘ cauſe of that miſtake. I am of opinion, *ſays he*, ‘ that ſhe was conveyed from the palace royal to ‘ an abbey of nuns, when the people mutinying, ‘ impriſoned king William, ſirnamed the Bad, and ‘ and that no more convenient place could be found ‘ for her ſecurity, during theſe commotions. When ‘ theſe were appeaſed, that princeſs, who was entirely at liberty, and was neither veiled nor profeſſed, ‘ lived among the nuns, till ſhe married Henry.

(2) Brantôme, Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. 207.

(3) Camerarius, Meditat. Hiſtoriques, Vol. II, livr. iv, chap. vii, pag. 296.

* Book iv, of the Hiſtory of Naples.

(4) St John, ch. xx, ver. 25.

(5) Camerarius, ubi ſupra.

(6) Lib. ii, De Inſtauratione Ital. *Thus Camerarius quotes him in the Latin edition of Francfort*, 1658, *pag.* 276.

HENRY II, king of France, ſucceeded Francis I, his father, the laſt of March 1547. One of the firſt things he did, was to deſpiſe the order his father gave him on his death-bed. I mean, that a few days after he came to the crown, he recalled the conſtable of Montmorenci [*A*], whom Francis I. had baniſhed for very good reaſons (*a*). That diſobedience coſt him dear [*B*]. For it may be affirmed, that the moſt grievous events that were the ſtain of his reign, were owing to the conſtable. It was he that by his evil conduct loſt the famous battle of St Quintin (*b*); after which he was the cauſe

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

(*b*) The tenth of Auguſt. 1557.

[*A*] *He recalled the conſtable of Montmorency.*] His ‘ father had ſeriouſly recommended to him Annebaut ‘ for his chief miniſter, in whom he had found great ‘ experience, wiſdom, and zeal, and no ſtain of avarice ‘ or ambition; but more eſpecially adviſed him to ‘ beware, if he loved the good of his kingdom, of ‘ recalling the conſtable of Montmorenci . . . . Nevertheleſs, although he had paid a moſt dutiful obedience to his father during his whole life, yet he ‘ paid no dieerence to his commands after his death. ‘ He took the adminiſtration of all affairs, from Annebaut and from the cardinal de Tournon, to give it ‘ to Montmorenci (1). We ſhall ſee, that this moſt *dutiful obedience* had it's exceptions, which will not permit us to think that Mezerai had reaſon to give it ſo good a character as he has done. ‘ The ‘ precaution of Francis, reached even to the forbidding moſt expreſly the Dauphin, his eldeſt ſon, ‘ who was afterwards king Henry II, from having ‘ any communication with the conſtable . . . . . . ‘ But all that he could obtain of his ſon, was to diſſemble, for ſeven years together, his friendſhip for ‘ the conſtable. And he did not even diſſemble with ‘ ſo much artifice, but that the whole court knew, ‘ that no day paſſed without their receiving letters ‘ from one another. But Francis I. was at no pains ‘ to break off that correſpondence, whether becauſe ‘ the Dauphin, and the conſtable were equally ſucceſſful in concealing it from him: or that having no ‘ other ſon than the Dauphin, he was unwilling to ‘ to diſoblige him (2).’ Theſe are Mr Varillas's words, and they may be very juſtly criticiſed; for firſt, if the Dauphin had diſſembled his friendſhip ſeven years together, he would not *ſo often have preſſed* his father *to re-call the conſtable*; and yet Mr Varillas aſſures us, he did this (3). Secondly, how ſhall we reconcile this author's alternative, with what Mezerai, relates (4), that the king was much offended, *that the Dauphin, in defiance of his orders, correſponded with the conſtable of Montmorenci.*

[*B*] *That diſobedience coſt him dear.*] Mr Varillas will furniſh me with a commentary upon this text. I will not content myſelf with citing him for Henry the ſecond's reign, but ſhall take his words ſomething higher; ‘ the diſgraces of conſtable Montmorenci, ‘ *ſays he* (5), of admiral Chabot, and of chancellor ‘ Poyet, are related in the ninth book in ſuch a manner as not to ſurpriſe thoſe, who have read in Bodin's republic, that Francis I. grew worſe humoured ‘ as he advanced in years; that he had been convinced, ‘ by his own experience, that he could not have ‘ made choice of two men leſs fit for the intrigues ‘ of the cabinet, than Montmorenci and Chabot; and ‘ that tho' he could not charge Poyet with ‘ the ſame defect, yet this chancellor had another as ‘ great, which was to carry things too far; that this ‘ had been the ſource of all the misfortunes which ‘ had happened to his majeſty, and that if he continued the ſame miniſtry, he was not to expect a more ‘ favourable ſucceſs. The event proved, that the three ‘ miniſters, who ſucceded to the places of the diſgraced, were more capable of filling them than they: ‘ and that if Henry II had not been obliged to give up, ‘ Montmorenci, ‘ he would not have reſtored the conſtable ‘ in order to recover him, 198 towns, or ſtrong places, ‘ and almoſt as much extent of ground, as one third ‘ of France.’

(1) Mezerai, at the beginning of Henry II, pag. 1057, of the ſecond Volume of the Hiſtory of France.

(2) Varillas's Hiſtory of Henry II, book i, pag. 6.

(3) Hiſtory of Francis I, book xii, pag. 295.

(4) Chronological Abridgment, Tom. IV, pag. 635.

(5) Preface of the Hiſtory of Francis I.

[*C*] The

cauſe of a treaty of Peace (*c*), much more ſcandalous to the French monarchy [*C*], than the loſs of that battle. Poſſibly he would not have been able to have made Henry II conſent to that diſadvantageous peace, had it not been for a ſpirit of perſecution, which had got the maſtery of this prince [*D*]. The conſtable deſerves alſo much blame,

[*C*] *The conſtable was the cauſe of a treaty of peace much more ſcandalous to the French monarchy.*] Mr Mezerai, though, of all the hiſtorians of France, he is the higheſt favourer of the ſubjects againſt the court, yet he blames the joy that the people expreſſed for that peace. ‘The people, *ſays he* (6), who always deſire peace at any rate, greatly rejoiced at this . . . . But the party of the Guiſes, the wiſe politicians, and all the nobility, highly condemned it, as a manifeſt cheat, which made France loſe 198 ſtrong places, only for three that were reſtored, which were Ham, Catelet, and St Quintin.’ He ſpeaks with greater force in his great hiſtory (7). For in relating the articles of that peace, he inſerts after theſe words, *that the more ſtrongly to unite the hearts of the princes*, this parentheſis (but rather to cover, with ſome honourable pretence, the ſhame and loſs that France received by this unfortunate treaty); and towards the end of the ſame page he ſays as follows. ‘Theſe articles being brought to the king, and communicated by his majeſty to the princes and grandees of his kingdom, there were few but judged them entirely diſadvantageous, and ſhameful to France: all France indeed univerſally condemned them by their murmurs. Briſſac having advice of it, though the articles had been diſguiſed to him, diſpatched Boyvin-Villars to court, he that has left us the memoirs of the war of Piedmont, with inſtructions to lay before the king his moſt humble remonſtrances, and to diſſwade him from ſo diſhonourable a peace. Concluding, that if his majeſty was reſolved to give up what he poſſeſſed in Italy, which was worth the beſt province of his kingdom, and could bring him in, all expences defrayed, a revenue of 300000 crowns into his treaſury, he only begged for all the recompence of his good ſervices, that he would pleaſe to baniſh him, together with all the forces that were beyond the Alps, as rebels, and that he knew how to preſerve the places which he held, at the expence of the Milaneſe, and the republic of Genoa, or at leaſt would die gloriouſly, in a country, where all the forces of Europe had not been able to force him to loſe an inch of ground, in the ten years time that he had the defence of it . . . . The king expreſſed an approbation of his zeal, but having his heart wholly ſet upon peace, he anſwered, *that tho' he ſhould make it upon the conditions propoſed to him, he ſhould ſtill retain enough to make himſelf feared by his enemies* (8). Whereupon Guiſe, moved either by his own intereſt, or by a ſenſe of honour and conſcience, boldly interrupting him, ſaid, Sir, your majeſty will pardon me, if I ſay, that this is not the right way to do it, and that though you ſhould find for twenty five years to come, as contrary a fortune as that of the laſt year, you would not loſe in all that time, what they would have you give up in one day. It did not coſt the late king, when he was vanquiſhed and a priſoner, but, *&c.*’ I omit all the reaſons of the duke of Guiſe, but not what follows them in the hiſtorian; ‘he ſaid many other things with ſo much vehemence, as made the king often change his colour, but not his reſolution; the dice were caſt, and whoever was the cauſe of it, either his favourites, or his natural temper, his courage was ſo caſt down, that he could no longer bear the war; he therefore ratiſyed the treaty, and the peace was publiſhed the tenth of April . . . . All the French authors, who have written of that time, have called it the unfortunate and curſed peace. Briſſac hearing that it was made, cryed out often, *ah miſerable France, what evils* . . . . He remained governour of the five towns and eight caſtles which the king retained, with 8000 foot and 450 horſe, and reſtored the other places, but he firſt demoliſhed the greateſt part of them, and ſold the ammunition according to the king's command; not without much difficulty of receiving the money, and orders that were neceſſary from court, becauſe the conſtable, favouring the duke of Savoy, did all that he could to put the places entire into his hands, and even thoſe which the king had reſerved to himſelf (9).’ We ſhall ſee below (10), that the court of France was ſo weak under Charles IX and Henry III, as to ſuffer itſelf to be perſuaded to evacuate that little it had reſerved; and there is no doubt but that in Charles XIth's time, the conſtable had a great ſhare in that miſmanagement. When we conſider the immenſe wealth he heaped together, we cannot ſay of him, as of many others, that in managing his maſter's affairs well, he managed his own very well; but we muſt ſay, that in managing his own affairs very well, he managed thoſe of his maſter very ill. Did not he, under Charles IX, enter into a league with the Guiſes? was not he the cauſe of that prodigious power they roſe to, that was ſo fatal to the monarchy, and had like to have given to France a fourth race of kings? when Francis I. diſgraced the conſtable, *he charged him with ignorance in the two principal parts of his employment, which was war and policy* (11). See the character which the partiſans of the Guiſes give of him in Mezerai (12).

Some critics will ſay perhaps, that Mr Mezerai does too much extenuate the advantages granted to Henry II by the treaty of Cateau. Why does he mention only the three towns that were reſtored to France? Why doth he ſuppreſs the conqueſt of Calais, Mets, Toul, and Verdun? but that criticiſm would be a very bad one; for the treaty of Cateau did not grant theſe four places to Henry II. It left the empire at full liberty to redemand the reſtitution of the three laſt; and it ſolemnly engaged France to reſtore Calais to England at the end of eight years. This is a thing which an anonymous hiſtorian has not obſerved who ſpeaks thus (13). ‘The king of France reſtored to the king of Spain, all that he had conquered of him on both ſides the Alps. Item, to the prince of Piedmont, Breſſe, Savoy, and Piedmont, except four towns: to the Genoeſe, the iſle of Corſica; Siena, to the duke of Florence; and retained nothing but Calais, without gaining a foot of any other land in that long and pernicious war, which had laid waſte ſo many provinces, plundered, burnt, ruined ſo many cities, towns, villages, caſtles, and had occaſioned the death of ſo many princes, lords, gentlemen, captains, ſoldiers, citizens, and peaſants, cauſed the rapes and violations of ſo many women and maids; in a word, that had turned all Europe topſy-turvy. The king gave up above 200 (others ſay almoſt twice that number) places, for the conqueſt whereof a ſea of his ſubjects blood had been ſpilt, the treaſures of the kingdom exhauſted, his own demeſns mortgaged, and himſelf indebted on all ſides.’ This hiſtorian ſuppoſes, that Henry II ſaw his dominions enlarged at leaſt by the ceſſion of Calais, but that is a falſehood: all the reſt of his diſcourſe is ſolid. And as it is certain, that one might have repreſented to the king of Spain, what Hannibal repreſented to the Roman general (14), what thunderbolts does that diſcourſe level at the head of Henry II? it might have been ſaid to the king of ſpain, that the countries he had ſtripped France of by this treaty of peace, were not worth the immenſe ſums which that war had coſt him, nor ſo many ſoldiers and officers as he had loſt. If this was capable of leſſening the joy which an advantageous peace made him feel, how muſt it break the heart of the monarch to whom it was diſadvantageous? to return from a long war with empty hands, is a diſgrace, ſaid Homer (15). He would have uſed much ſtronger expreſſions in ſuch a caſe as this.

[*D*] *The ſpirit of perſecution . . . . got the maſtery of this prince.*] Henry II was extreamly ſevere againſt the Proteſtants, he put them to death without mercy, and yet they encreaſed much under his reign. If they were not concerned for the extream conſternation which ſeized the court of France, and the city of Paris, after the battle of St Quintin, it was but what nature inſpired them; every ſect which is ill uſed, and which can hope for no relaxation, unleſs the court finds itſelf embarraſſed, will rejoice at the progreſs of an enemy, and be glad to ſee their perſecutors ſo taken up with affairs abroad, as not to know

---

(*c*) The treaty of Cateau, in Cambreſis, concluded in the year 1559.

(6) Mezerai, Chronological Abridgment, Tom. IV, pag. 715.

(7) Id. Hiſtory of France, Tom. II, pag. 1132.

(8) *This brings to my mind the words of Trebellius Pollio:* Pudet numerare inter hæc tempora quum iſta gererentur, quæ ſæpe Gallienus malo generis humani quaſi per jocum dixerit. Nam quum ei nuntiatum eſſet, Ægyptum deſciviſſe, dixiſſe fertur, *Quid? ſine lino Ægyptio eſſe non poſſumus?* Quum autem vaſtatam Aſiam & elementorum concurſionibus & Scytharum incurſionibus comperiſſet, *Quid*, inquit, *ſine aphronitris eſſe non poſſumus?* Perdita Gallia arriſiſſe ac dixiſſe perhibetur, *Non ſine atrebaticis ſagis tuta* Reſp. eſt? Sic denique de omnibus partibus mundi, quum eas amitteret, quaſi detrimentis vilium miniſteriorum videretur affici, jocabatur. *Trebell. Pollio in Gallienis, duob. cap. vi, pag. m.* 200.

(9) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 1134.

(10) In the remarks [*G*] and [*H*], where more murmurs are to be ſeen againſt the peace of the year 1559.

(11) Varillas, Hiſtory of Francis I, book ix, pag. 397. Holl. Edition, 1690, *ad ann.* 1540.

(12) Mezerai, Hiſtory of France, pag. 1135, Tom. II,

(13) Hiſtoires des choſes mémorables avenues en France depuis l'an 1547 juſques au commencement de l'an 1597, pag. 61.

(14) *See* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, n. 113, pag. 658.

(15) Αἰσχρόν τοι δηρόν τε μένειν, κενεόν τε νέεσθαι. Turpæ diuque manere, inanemque redire. *Homer. Iliad. lib. ii, ver.* 298.

blame, for not having given better advice to his maſter, with relation to the ducheſs of Valentinois, who, at an age ill ſuited to that of Henry II, held him in her chains, and made a very unjuſt uſe of his ſlavery. Inſtead of fortifying this prince againſt the ſnares of that woman, the conſtable intrigued for her, and devoted himſelf to her faction (*d*). It is pity the reign of Henry II had theſe ſtains in it, for it was otherwiſe remarkable for glorious actions, and for very noble ſucceſſes, which cruelly mortified Charles V. We cannot deny Henry II the glory of being brave, and it is ſaid that queen Elizabeth of England admired him upon that account [*E*]. But after all, it will be an eternal teſtimony of his weakneſs, and of the dominion which his favourites had over him, that, contrary to the advice of the wiſeſt heads of his kingdom, he ſigned the treaty of peace of Cateau in Cambreſis. *A peace, not leſs ſcandalous to France than that which the emperor Jovinian made with the king of Perſia, ſo much decryed by all antiquity* (*e*). A peace, which by one ſtroke of a pen, loſt in one moment all the labours and conqueſts of many years, and an extent of country, equalling one third of the kingdom (*f*). No body profited ſo much by that diſgrace of France, as the duke of Savoy; for, beſides being reſtored to his dominions, he married the ſiſter of Henry II, a princeſs of great merit [*F*], and who knew how to bubble the court of France

know which way to turn themſelves. Of all the Chriſtian ſects, there is none more diſpoſed to this ſort of conduct, than thoſe of the Romiſh communion. And therefore we need not wonder, though what Mr Maimbourg affirms (16) ſhould be true, namely, that the Proteſtants ‘took advantage of the public affliction after the battle of St Quintin . . . . and ventured to hold their meetings in open day, in the moſt frequented ſtreets of Paris, and even to appear in public, and aſſemble openly in great bodies, in the *Pre-aux-Clercs*, there to ſing aloud Clement Marot's Pſalms.’ This ought to teach princes, that their perſecuting edicts expoſe them to great inconveniences. This is the cauſe why their bonfires afflict one part of their ſubjects, and why the ſucceſſes of their enemies afford them comfort. If they complain they have bad ſubjects, it ought to be anſwered, it is you who make them ſuch (17); for to pretend, that a perſecuted party will afflict themſelves for the public calamities, which are the ſource of their repoſe, and the foundation of a very plauſible hope of proſperity, is to pretend, that the primitive ages of Chriſtianity ſhould return again; now thoſe times will not come twice. It is to expect, that men ſhould be like thoſe of the Millennium if it ever comes. But let us return to Henry II. When he ſaw that the Proteſtants ‘thought to take advantage of the loſs which he had ſuſtained in the battle of St Quintin, he publiſhed a new edict, forbidding all the judges to moderate the puniſhment of death, and confiſcation of goods, with regard to all thoſe, who ſhould be found not only guilty of Hereſy, but convicted of having brought into France books, printed at Geneva, againſt the doctrine of the Catholic church. Thus they proceeded againſt the Calviniſts more rigorouſly than before (18).’ But as that hindered them not from multiplying, nor even from engaging perſons of the firſt quality in their party, the king ſaw, that, in order to extirpate them, he muſt make peace with the houſe of Auſtria; and this doubtleſs was one of the great motives which made him ſhut his eyes upon the good condition in which he had ſettled his affairs (19). He had ſtopped the progreſs of his enemies, and had even taken ſome very ſtrong places from them. But that ſignified nothing, he choſe rather to grant them all they had a mind to, than not to have his hands at liberty to exterminate the Proteſtants of his kingdom. Thus we have ſeen the ſame court, let ſlip the moſt favourable occaſions of aggrandizing itſelf in the year 1684, in order to apply itſelf ſolely to the ſuppreſſion of the Edict of Nantes. They who ſuffer themſelves to be poſſeſſed with this ſpirit, muſt renounce the title of conquerors. If Henry II had long ſurvived this ignominious peace, which he accepted, we ſhould have ſeen him entirely taken up with tournaments and preſecutions, but he died a little after it was ſigned. Mr Maimbourg is an exceptionable witneſs, as to the joy he ſays the Heretics conceived upon it; his words are theſe (20). ‘Thus he was lamented with moſt unfeigned tears, and infinitely regretted by all his ſubjects, except the Proteſtants alone, who thinking themſelves delivered by his death, from what they called the perſecution of the church, expreſſed in a moſt unworthy manner by their words and actions, and ſcandalous writings, the exceſſive joy which it gave them.’

We may with regard to Henry II make the ſame obſervation which we made concerning Francis I (21). He attacked the party weakly on one ſide, while he made it ſtronger on the other. He put to death ſome inconſiderable private perſons in France, and at the ſame time entered into alliance with the Proteſtants of Germany againſt Charles V, &c. (22). And was fond of the title of *protector of the German liberty*, which was to ſay at that time, protector of the Proteſtants (23). The other Catholic princes obſerved the ſame conduct (24). I think the following words of Mr le Laboureur are worthy of notice: ‘To pluck the tares from amongſt the wheat (*ſays he*) (25), GOD will only chuſe princes who are innocent, and of a good life, and will not employ politic hands, as were thoſe of the counſellors of all the Catholic crowns of that time, who only weeded their own fields to caſt the darnel into thoſe of their neighbours, and who perſecuted Hereſy only as a faction againſt authority.’ Charles V, and the kings of Spain his ſucceſſors, have favoured, on many occaſions, the Proteſtants of Germany and France. See the proof of this in the firſt Tome of the Apology for the Catholics (26), compoſed by Mr Arnauld. The Spaniſh ambaſſador ſollicited ſuccours in England for the duke of Rohan. What Grotius writes concerning this is remarkable. ‘Validus eſt rumor, Gonthomerum, & qui in aula Anglica Hiſpanicæ ſunt factionis, apertè profiteri, non debere à Rege Britanniarum deſeri religionis conſortes in Gallia, ne ſi quando vetera jura repetere ipſi ſit animus, deſint, qui partes Anglicas ſequantur (27). —— *It is confidently reported, that Gundamor, and thoſe of the Spaniſh faction in the court of England, openly affirm, that the king of Great Britain ought not to deſert thoſe of his own religion in France; leaſt he might want their aſſiſtance, if ever he ſhould think of aſſerting his ancient pretenſions to that crown.*’ See in the *Political Teſtament* of the marquis de Louvois (28), ſome reflexions upon the violences exerciſed in Hungary againſt the Proteſtants, by order of the ſame court, which a little after rendered ſuch great ſervices to the Proteſtants of Great Britain and Holland, whom Lewis XIV and James II were reſolved to oppreſs, as was reported.

[*E*] *Queen Elizabeth of England admired him for his bravery.*] Brantôme will inſtruct us about this matter: ‘I have heard, *ſays he* (29), the preſent queen of England ſay, that he was the king and the prince whom ſhe moſt deſired to ſee, for the great character ſhe had heard of him, and the great renown which he every where had obtained . . . . Being at table, diſcourſing familiarly with thoſe lords, ſhe ſaid theſe words, (after having beſtowed great praiſes on the king) he was a prince that I moſt deſired to ſee of any, and I had already ſent him word that I would quickly ſee him, and for that purpoſe I had given order to have my gallies ſplendidly fitted out (theſe were her words), that I might go over to France on purpoſe to ſee him.’ See the ſame ſtory in the Memoirs of the *Dames Galantes*, where it is expreſly obſerved, that the queen deſired to ſee Henry II, becauſe he was *brave, valiant, generous, and very martial* (30).

[*F*] *The duke of Savoy married the ſiſter of Henry II, a princeſs of great merit.*] Her name was Margaret, as was her aunt's the queen of Navarre, and ſhe was like

---

(*d*) See the article POITIERS.

(*e*) Paſquier's Letters, Tome II, book xv, pag. 221, alſo Tome I, book iv, pag. 471.

(*f*) Monluc, Memoires, lib. iv, pag. m. 789.

(16) Maimbourg, Hiſtory of Calviniſm, lib. ii, pag. 96.

(17) Apply here this ſaying of Seneca, againſt thoſe who complain of the ungrateful, *Multos experimur ingratos, plures facimus.* Seneca. de Beneficiis, lib. i, cap. i.

(18) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, pag. 100.

(19) See, in the remark [*M*], the words of the cardinal de Lorraine

(20) Ubi ſupra, pag. 114.

(21) See the article FRANCIS I, remark [*P*].

(22) The king reſolved to apply himſelf wholly to the great affair of religon, for which he had a mighty zeal, which he never relaxed in all his reign, not even when, for purely political intereſts, he made an alliance with the Proteſtant princes of Germany, againſt the emperor Charles V. *Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, pag.* 110.

(23) See the remark [*AA*].

(24) See the article of queen ELIZABETH, remarks [*G*] and [*R*].

(25) Addition to the Memoirs of Caſtelnau, Tom. II, pag. 577.

(26) Pag. 78, &c.

(27) Grotius. Epiſt. clvii, Part. I, pag. 60.

(28) Pag. 367. Edit. Cologne, 1695.

(29) Brantôme, Diſc. of Henry II, Tom. II, of his Memoires, pag. 60, 61.

(30) Tom. II, pag. 261.

France very advantageouſly for her huſband [*G*]. She was not young when ſhe married; for which reaſon the murmurs againſt the peace reached even to her [*H*]. It is without reaſon that a modern author has attempted to juſtify the conduct of Henry III [*I*], who paid

her, much addicted to ſtudy, and a patroneſs of the learned. She was ſuſpected to have imbibed the new opinions, and to have communicated ſomething of them to Catherine de Medicis (31). See her elogy in Brantôme (32), and in Mr le Laboureur. The latter tells us a paſſage which deſerves to be known. 'Margaret of France, *ſays he* (33), was married at forty ſix years of age (34), and as ſhe ſeemed to be too old to bear children, it was believed that the noiſe of her great belly was a ſtratagem, to oblige the king to reſtore her more willingly the places he detained. It was on this account that the Sieur Huraut de Bois-Taillé, embaſſador at Venice, wrote a letter of the twenty ſeventh of July 1561, to Bernardin Bochetel, biſhop of Rennes, the French embaſſador in Germany, wherein he had theſe words. *It is ſaid that the ducheſs of Savoy is big with child, but I believe, that is done* ad aliquid. That report was verified by the birth of Charles Emanuel, grandfather to the preſent duke of Savoy (35).'

[*G*] *Who knew how to bubble the court of France, very advantageouſly for her huſband.*] The treaty of Cateau imported 'that in three years the rights which the king pretended to upon the territories of the duke of Savoy, ſhould be examined and regulated by commiſſioners on both ſides (36).' King Francis II, and the duke had named deputies for that purpoſe in the year 1560. The king's deputies made ſix very conſiderable demands; but inſtead of obtaining any thing, France abandoned all the towns ſhe had kept. She ordered by Letters Patents the eighth of Auguſt 1561, 'that there ſhould be reſtored to the duke, Turin, Chivas, Quiers, and Ville Neuve d'Aſt, excepting the ammunition and artillery, in exchange for Pignerol, Savillan, and Perouſe, with their dependencies. Imbert de la Platiere Bourdillon, the king's lieutenant beyond the Alps, formed many difficulties, and ſent great remonſtrances to the council, to hinder the execution of that order; and would not obey it till after three commands, and upon the moſt ſolemn diſcharges imaginable.' The ducheſs plaid her part very well in that negotiation; 'her prudence was praiſed for having obtained by her addreſs the places that ſtill remained undelivered, and which the king's commiſſioners could not guard againſt her gentle way of raiſing an innocent revolt in their hearts, and forcing the moſt impenetrable places.' It is Mr le Laboureur who ſays this (37). Brantôme tells this whole affair at length; the diverſe ſentiments of the miniſters, the oppoſitions formed by Bourdillon, and the manner in which he ſuffered himſelf to be wrought upon. It coſt the duke and ducheſs of Savoy many preſents (38). There remained ſtill three places in Piedmont in the French hands, *viz.* Pignerol, Savillan, and Perouſe. The ducheſs ſeconded her huſband wonderfully to regain them, when Henry III paſſed by Turin in his return from Poland. I ſhall make uſe of the words of Mr Varillas. 'The duke and ducheſs of Savoy, who propoſed to do what Spain had not been able to accompliſh, when in the moſt flouriſhing condition, that is, to ſend back the French beyond the Alps, made uſe of an artifice wholly new, which was that of diverſions, and feaſts ſucceeding one another ſo faſt that there was ſcarce time left for ſleeping. Some relations that come from very good hands, ſpeak of a magnificent collation which coſt 100000 crowns; the duke and ducheſs were at the expence of it, and to reimburſe themſelves they preſſed Henry III to reſtore to them Pignerol, Savillan, and Perouſe (39).' Henry promiſed to gratify their requeſts, and kept his word: for holding a council at Lyons upon that affair, the evacuation of theſe three places was there concluded on; notwithſtanding the ſtrong reaſons alledged againſt it by the perſon who commanded there. It was the duke of Nevers (§*a*). 'He had the liberty of ſaying what he pleaſed, and the ſatisfaction that the memorial which he preſented to ſecond his ſpeech, though very long, was read in the preſence of Henry III; but the reſtitution of theſe three places was nevertheleſs reſolved on, and his majeſty gave him orders with his own mouth to evacuate them. He ſhould have ſtopped there, ſince all the world did him the juſtice to believe he had ſatisfied his conſcience and his honour; but he had recourſe to other precautions, which drew upon him the averſion of the court, and hindered him a long time from being re-admitted into the council of ſtate. He obſtinately ſollicited, that the order he had received from the king's mouth ſhould be likewiſe written with the king's own hand; that the queen-mother, the princes of the blood, and the officers of the crown ſhould ſign it, and that it ſhould be regiſtered in the parliament together with the writing, which he had drawn up, deſiring to be diſpenſed with from complying with it, and that the principal cities of the kingdom ſhould inſert it in their archives. All this was almoſt granted him, but not without reproaching him that he affected to ſignalize himſelf at his maſter's coſt, and that he ought to imitate the mareſchal Briſſac, who was content in a like caſe to redouble his moſt humble remonſtrances and to deſire that they would ſend him a ſucceſſor (40).'

[(§*a*) See his Memoirs, Tom. I. pag. 68. REM. CRIT.]

[*H*] *The murmurs againſt the peace reached even to her.*] Brantôme, who lived at that time, tells us very freely ſome circumſtances of theſe murmurs. 'This marriage . . . . coſt France dear, as being obliged to return in one hour all that had been conquered and preſerved in Piedmont and Savoy for the ſpace of thirty years, ſo much king Henry deſired a peace and loved his ſiſter, that he would ſpare nothing in the world to place her well, when yet the greateſt part of France and Piedmont murmured at it, and ſaid it was a little too much. Others thought it very ſtrange, and others very incredible, until they had ſeen it with their own eyes; and even ſtrangers laughed at us for it; and they who loved France and it's intereſt, wept and lamented it, eſpecially thoſe of Piedmont, who did not deſire to return to their firſt maſter. Can the dukes of Savoy juſtly ſtile themſelves maſters and lords of Piedmont, ſince the kings of France were ſo formerly, and are ſtill lawful lords, titulars, and maſters of it, as juſtly belonging to them. As for the ſoldiers who had been a long time accuſtomed to the garriſons, and to the eaſe and delicate ſuſtenance of that country, we need not aſk what they ſaid, how they cried out againſt it, and lamented, and what fine ſpeeches they made upon that occaſion; not only the Gaſcons, but others. Hey-day, ſaid they, muſt ſo many fine and large pieces of ground be given up for one little piece of fleſh about a woman: others cried ſhe had done mighty well to keep her virginity for forty five years (41), to loſe it at laſt for the ruin of France. If they had been as diſorderly, ſeditious, and mutinous, at that time, as we have ſeen them ſince in our civil wars, we may be aſſured every one of them would have taken his ſhare and have ſeized thoſe places, out of which they could not eaſily have been driven (42).' Is it not ſtrange that Mr le Laboureur, who had not long before read theſe words, ſhould come and tell us notwithſtanding, 'that only a few politicians found fault with her being married at ſo dear a rate, and that ALL OTHERS were glad that ſhe carried with her a recompence ſuitable to her merit, and that ſhe had got for her dowry, the territories which had been taken from her huſband (43).' This is the language of a panegyriſt: ſuch a man without any authority, takes upon him notwithſtanding, in the name of the public, to make all the ſteps neceſſary to a panegyric, and is not at all concerned that the fact is refuted by authors of the greateſt credit. Mezerai, who wrote a hiſtory, not a panegyric, agrees much better with the teſtimony of Brantôme, than with le Laboureur (44).

I cannot read theſe words, *and even ſtrangers laughed at us for it* (45), without crying out, *what a happy time was this for the writers of the Low-Countries, and all others, who had no good will to France? What inſults had they not a fair opportunity to make upon it? What gaſconades might they not have publiſhed?* For I ſuppoſe they were within a little of the humour of the preſent time.

[*I*] *A modern author has attempted to juſtify the conduct of Henry III.*] That modern author is the antagoniſt of Coſtar. The latter was offended that Voiture paid ſo dear for the good reception which that princeſs gave him. The peace of Cateau is not the only monument of the too great weakneſs of Henry II. The impunity of his favourites after the prodigious wealth they had got by ſo unjuſt means [*K*], is another monument of it. He died of a wound he received in a tournament (*g*). A ſtrange adventure, and ſtill more extraordinary than fatal, for I do not believe there ever was a monarch who loſt his life on ſuch an occaſion. It would have been infinitely more glorious for him to have loſt his life in a battle, than in theſe mock-fights, or combats of peace; where beſides, he behaved himſelf unſuitably to his dignity, and in a way more becoming a young cavalier, than the royal majeſty [*L*]. Many reflexions were made upon this ſad deſtiny [*M*].

---

(31) See le Laboureur, Additions to the Memoirs of Caſtelnau, Tom. I, pag. 750.

(32) Memoires des Dames Illuſtres.

(33) Le Laboureur, ubi ſupra, pag. 752.

(34) He miſtakes; ſhe was born the fifth of June, 1523, and married in 1559.

(35) Mr le Laboureur publiſhed his Book in 1659.

(36) Mezerai, Abridg. Chronol. Tom. V, pag. 41.

(37) Addit. au Caſtelnau, Tom. I, pag. 751.

(38) See in the Additions to Caſtelnau's Memoirs, Tom. I, pag. 847, &c. what Brantôme ſays upon all this in the elogy of Imbert de la Plattiere, lord Bourdillon.

(39) Varillas, Hiſt. of Henry III, book i, pag. 74.

(40) Id. ibid. pag 84.

(41) Mezerai, *Abridg. Coronol. Tom. IV*, pag. 722, ſaith ſhe was in the thirty ſeventh year of her age, he is in the right, for ſhe was born the fifth of June, 1523. *See citation* (34).

(42) Memoires des Dames Illuſtres, pag. 325.

(43) Addit. to Caſtelnau, Tom. i, pag. 751.

(44) See, above, remark [*C*], citat. (7).

(45) Brantôme, ubi ſupra.

He

(*g*) He was wounded the 30th of June 1559, and died the 10th of July following.

ture (46) was cenſured for having ſaid by way of raillery, *that he valued a good ſoop more than the panegyric of Pliny, or the longeſt oration of Iſocrates.* Monſieur de Girac, adds he, *thinks* Monſieur de Voiture, *is as great a fool as that profane perſon, who ſold his birthright for a meſs of pottage, or that prince of ours, who gave Pignerol for a good meal.* To what length doth not one go when carried away by the heat of a diſpute? The ſmalleſt faults which eſcape an adverſary are converted into crimes. Girac, who with regard to another man, would probably have been content to have ſaid, that the word *fool* was too ſtrong to be employed to expreſs the fault of a prince, accuſeth Coſtar, his enemy, as guilty of treaſon. Conſider well all his words (47). ‘ He has dared, *ſays he*, by an attempt, which deſerves the ſevereſt puniſhments, to dart his venom and malice againſt the ſacred perſon of our kings. Does not he compare * the liberality of Henry III, to the folly of Eſau, who parted with his birth-right for a meſs of pottage? Does he not call that prince a fool for having reſtored Pignerol to the duke of Savoy, who had the honour to be his uncle, and from whom he expected great ſuccours in the preſſing neceſſity of his affairs? Was ever Lewis XII taken for a fool, who made a preſent of the principality of Bearn to the king of Navarre, and who diſmembered his kingdoms of a part of that importance? Has any body accuſed the people of Rome of folly †, though they frequently gave intire provinces and kingdoms to kings their allies? and if Alexander, as Plutarch ſays, willingly parted with the iſle of Cyprus, as a price for ſome verſes compoſed in his praiſe, can a king of France be looked upon as a mad-man amongſt any that have the leaſt ſhare of common ſenſe, for having reſtored a place to his near relation, who had received him in his dominions with great coſt and magnificence?’ A little after he asks whether Mr Coſtar *is not afraid of being puniſhed under the reign of a prince ſo nearly related to Henry, who lived not ſo very long ago?* And he cites Guicciardin and Paul Jovius for the extreme veneration the French have for their monarch. He returns often to the ſame accuſation (48); this muſt be attributed to the ſymptoms of a ſort of fever, which ſeizes writers when they are upon replies and rejoinders.

Though he had named all the ſovereigns that gave up cities, or provinces, or even kingdoms from the beginning of the world, he would never have perſuaded men of ſenſe, men verſed in politics, that any one ever made ſuch preſents in circumſtances like thoſe of Henry III, without being guilty of a folly. Henry III gave up Pignerol in favour of a prince, who owed his glorious re-eſtabliſhment to the Spaniards, who in his heart was a violent Spaniard (49), that is, was always ready to favour the moſt formidable enemy France then had. It was to ſuch a duke of Savoy that a place was delivered which opened a way into the kingdom to the enemy, and which kept the ſame duke in awe, and hindered him from leaguing with Spain. But ſome will ſay, that duke had ſo much careſſed Henry III, and been at ſuch vaſt expences to regale him at Turin, was it not reaſonable to regard him as a good and conſtant friend? No, that was not reaſonable: it is only the ignorant who can rely upon the conſtancy of friendſhip among ſovereigns. To ſee the preſents they make and the letters they write in time of peace to one another, one would ſwear they are moſt hearty friends, and would continue ſo all their life: but it is often true that they are negotiating at the ſame time a treaty in order to a rupture, and have no deſign of ſerving one another any farther than till a proper occaſion ſhall preſent itſelf of beginning hoſtilities to advantage. This was never ſo true, as when Henry III was ſo infinitely careſſed at the court of Savoy. The duke was entirely diſpoſed to take advantage of the confuſions he ſaw in France, and to make uſe of the aſſiſtance of the Spaniards to that purpoſe. And he left a ſon who inherited the ſame paſſion and not only ſeized the marquiſate of Saluces, but alſo formed deſigns for the diſmembering of France, and totally ruining the monarchy (50). Can we then ſufficiently blame this blunder of Henry III? See the remark [*F*] of his article.

[*K*] *His favourites acquired great riches by unjuſt means.*] Leſt I ſhould be accuſed of aggravating things, I will make uſe of Mezerai's words. ‘ The expences the diſpoſers of his favour and affairs put him to, a good part whereof they converted to their own advantage, were ſo exceſſive, that he oppreſſed the kingdom with great impoſts, and ran above forty millions of livres in debt. Beſides this, they ruined abundance of families by their damnable avarice. The invention of farmings and monopolies being not then ſo much in uſe, they had another method, which was no leſs pernicious, namely, to accuſe thoſe who were richeſt under the pretence of Hereſy, and other crimes, and to find, or to make, delinquents that they might have their ſpoils, or force them to purchaſe their pardon by their interceſſion (51).’ This hiſtorian had juſt been ſaying that Henry II was not *accuſed of any other fault, than of being too eaſy and more capable of being governed than governing himſelf.* This is one of the greateſt faults of a king, becauſe generally they who govern him, when he is in that caſe, do more miſchief than if he governed them.

[*L*] *He behaved himſelf unſuitably to his dignity, and in a way more becoming a young cavalier, than the royal majeſty.*] This was the judgment of the wiſe, as we learn from an author of that time (52). ‘ A tournament was appointed in St Anthony's ſtreet before the Tournelles, with all the magnificence and pomp imaginable, for as much as the king was one of the combatants, followed by the dukes of Ferrara, Guiſe, and Nemours, which a great many people of good ſenſe thought ſtrange; ſaying, the majeſty of a king ought to be judge of the combat, and not enter the liſts. Even in the old romances, kings, on ſuch occaſions, never attempted acts of common knights, but diſguiſed themſelves, if they had a mind to enter the liſts, or abſtained wholly from it; yet ſuch was the misfortune of the king, that he would have the firſt honour of the juſts. And I believe the deſire he expreſſed for it was to ſhew ſtrangers how dextrous he was at arms, and ſkilled in the management of a horſe. So that thoſe that were near him, durſt not diſſuade him from that enterpriſe. A thing which has ſince opened a diſmal ſcene to France.’

[*M*] *Many reflexions were made upon this ſad deſtiny.*] I will not alledge the teſtimony of Proteſtant writers; it is viſible, that of Stephen Paſquier will have greater force (53). ‘ You ſee how our good king Henry died. And as the common people naturally fix their eyes upon the actions of their king, ſo that death did not happen without the commentaries and interpretations of ſome people. For to tell you at large how things happened in France; as ſoon as the peace was concluded, the cardinal of Lorrain, who had been one of the principal mediators of it, declared, in full parliament, that it had been the king's opinion that it ſhould be made on any terms, that he might be more at liberty from thence forward to exterminate and baniſh the Hereſy of Calvin. And in fact on the tenth day of June, he came actually in perſon into parliament to take the opinion of every counſellor concerning the puniſhment of Heretics. Whereupon many gave it with great liberty; ſome being of opinion that he ſhould ſuſpend the puniſhment till the

‘ deciſion

(46) A continuation of the Vindication of Voiture, pag. 172.

(47) Reply to Coſtar, Sect. i, pag 8.

* Pag. 173.

† See Val. Max. lib. iv, cap. viii, Tit. Liv. livr. xxx, *&c.* *Plut. of the Fort. of Alex. Diſc. ii.*

(48) See pag. 91, where he inſinuates that Coſtar ought to be put in the Baſtile for having called Henry III *fool.* See alſo pag. 190.

(49) As long as ſhe lived, ſhe always perſuaded and prevailed with the duke, her huſband, to maintain the peace, and that he, who was a Spaniard in his heart, ſhould not engage againſt France, as he did after ſhe was dead. *Brantôme, Illuſtrious Women,* pag. 328.

(50) See the article GONTAUT (CHARLES), remark [*D*].

(51) Hiſtory of France, Tom. II, pag. 1138.

(52) Paſquier's Letters, Tom. I, book iv, pag. 172, 173.

(53) Id. ibid. pag. 174, 175.

He never ſpoke after he was wounded [*N*]; ſo that all the diſcourſes which are aſcribed to him, are only ſtories forged at pleaſure. The ſincerity wherewith the French hiſtorians have confeſſed the faults of this monarch, and the ignominy he brought upon the nation by preferring the counſels of the conſtable before the remonſtrances of the duke of Guiſe [*O*], is ſcarce to be ſeen in other hiſtorians. The Proteſtants imagined, that they ſhould be gainers by his death, but they experienced ſtill greater ſeverities under Francis II, and humanly ſpeaking they had been intirely ruined in France, if he had lived two years longer [*P*]. They are accuſed of having expreſſed their joy in too inſulting a manner upon the tragical end of Henry [*Q*]; but nothing can be more modeſt than Theodore Beza on that ſubject (*b*). I forgot to obſerve, that this prince, when he was only dauphin, lived in a miſunderſtanding with his brother,

(*b*) See the remark [*Q*], at the end.

decision of a general council, which they ſaid was neceſſary. Whereupon the king was moved with ſo great and juſt a paſſion, that he commanded immediately Montgommery to ſeize ſome of the company, who had given their opinion more freely than he would have them. They were forthwith carried priſoners to the Baſtile. For which reaſon, ſaid theſe new commentators, this diſaſter beſel the king, by God's juſt judgment, as a vengeance upon him for theſe unjuſt impriſonments. That opinions ought to be free, and not ſounded by a king, in order, after hearing them, to commit the counſellors to a cloſe priſon. That God had chaſtiſed him by the hand of that miniſter, who had aſſiſted him in making thoſe impriſonments. Likewiſe that, as on the tenth of June, he had done that diſhonour to the court of parliament, ſo on the tenth of July following, day for day, he loſt his liſe. Thus ſome of the people diſcourſed, according to their particular paſſions, concerning this death; being ignorant, at the ſame time, that the myſteries of God are wholly concealed from us, and ſuch as, by reaſon of our weakneſs, we oſtner refer them to our opinions than to truth.' Anne du Bourg was one of thoſe whom the king ſhut up in the Baſtile, and againſt whom he was moſt enraged, *for amongſt other diſcourſe, he ſaid he would ſee him burnt with both his eyes* (54). Father Paul obſerves, that *the queen-mother was horribly provoked at the Lutherans publiſhing in their manifeſto's, that the wound of the king her huſband in the eye was a puniſhment of GOD for his threats againſt Anne du Bourg, when he ſaid to him, that he would ſee him burnt* (55).

[*N*] *He never ſpoke after he was wounded.*] Almoſt all the hiſtorians ſay, that a ſplinter of Montgommery's lance flew into the eye of Henry II, and wounded him mortally; but what Mezerai ſays of it, ſeems more probable. 'It happened, *ſays he* (56), that Montgommery breaking his lance in his breaſt-plate, could not retain his arm, ſo that he gave him a thruſt in the right eye, with the ſtump of it, which remained in his hand, with ſo great violence, that a ſplinter of it paſſed even to the hinder part of his head.' In this manner Montgommery might appear infinitely more criminal, tho' at bottom he had not done it voluntarily. The hiſtorian adds, 'it was not certainly known, even at that time, whether the king ſpoke or not, after he received the wound, the truth being diſguiſed by thoſe that were about him, or rendered uncertain by the different reports, which were ſpread about it, by thoſe who had different intereſts. There are ſome who tell us, the fine remonſtrances he made to his ſon; ſome others add, that when he was carried out of the liſts, he looked towards the Baſtile where the priſoners of parliament were confined, ſaying with a deep ſigh, that he was afraid, he had wrongfully puniſhed innocent men, and that the cardinal of Lorrain, immediately rebuking him exhorted him to reject that thought which was ſuggeſted to him by the tempter. Others maintain, that he loſt his voice and all manner of ſenſe from the moment he was ſtruck (57), which is confirmed by the arguments of many Phyſicians, who ſay that a man becomes neceſſarily dumb, when his brain is wounded or violently ſhaken. Truſt now, after this, to the relations which are ſpread abroad concerning the laſt words of dying men (58).

[*O*] *He preferred the counſels of the conſtable before the remonſtrances of the duke of Guiſe.*] The conſtable, who was priſoner from the time of the battle of St Quintin, reſolved to recover his liberty at any price. The Guiſes made too much advantage of his abſence. This was the reaſon, why he negotiated a treaty of peace, in which he granted to the Spaniards all they had a mind to. And he ſo well knew the weak ſide of his maſter, that he eaſily perſuaded him to conſent to that treaty. In vain the duke of Guiſe employed a thouſand demonſtrative reaſons (59), to make him reject a peace which ſacrificed to the Spaniards, the glory of the French name, and more places in one day than they had been able to conquer in an age, the king was deaf to all that. We muſt mention here an obſervation of Brantôme (60); he pretends that Henry II, tired and diſguſted with the inſolence of the Guiſes, reſolved to ſend them home; for which end he was obliged to regain his conſtable, and to terminate the war; he wrote to him therefore, and to the marſhal de St André (61), *to negotiate a peace, which they did to our diſadvantage.* Let us not forget another artifice; theſe two priſoners and the ducheſs of Valentinois enriched themſelves with the ſpoils of the Heretics, and who can doubt but that, to obtain a peace, they obliged the king to accept of any conditions, that they might more eaſily proſecute the buſineſs of the Inquiſition? it is certain (62) that the cabals of that ducheſs, ſeconded by the conſtable, drew the king into that precipice.

[*P*] *The Proteſtants had been intirely ruined in France, if Francis II had lived two years longer.*] It is the opinion of Theodore Beza; for, having drawn out all the reaſons that promiſed them a more proſperous time after Henry's death, he adds (63): 'But God had otherwiſe ordered it, being willing to have the honour that belongs to him, of re-eſtabliſhing his church by his own arm and might alone, which is ſo much the more wonderful, as the reſiſtance of the greateſt men had been moſt furious againſt it. It was therefore in the reign of Francis II, ſucceſſor to Henry, that the rage of ſatan over-flowed beyond all bounds; ſo that it might be ſaid of this reign, which laſted but ſeventeen months, what Jesus Christ ſays in St Matthew, *viz.* that unleſs thoſe days had been ſhortened, no man could be ſaved: but for the elects ſake they were ſhortened.' The particulars of the meaſures that were taken to ruin that party entirely, are to be ſeen in a few pages of Maimbourg (64). Take notice of the words which he ſets at the head of this detail (65).

[*Q*] *They are accuſed of having expreſſed their joy in too inſulting a manner upon the tragical end of Henry.*] I have already cited (66), Maimbourg upon this, and here are the words of Mezerai (67). 'As he was a prince of great goodneſs, he was lamented by all his people, except the new ſectaries, who believed his death would be their liberty and advancement. They were ſo over-joyed at it, that they made ſongs and thankſgivings to God, or rather blaſphemies, daring to ſay, that the Almighty had ſmitten him under the walls of the Baſtile, where he kept the innocent in priſon.' It muſt not be thought ſtrange that, in a great number of people, there are ſome that are indiſcreet; but the hiſtorian of the Reformed churches deſerves to be very much praiſed for obſerving that moderation which the following words expreſs. 'There remained nothing, in all probability, but a moſt horrible ſpectacle of extreme deſolation, when the Lord prevented it. For king Henry, in the midſt of his peaceful triumphs, joined with a marriage . . . . . tilting in the liſts . . . . . . was ſtruck with a counter-blow of a lance . . . . and died the tenth of July following. Strange things were obſerved in the unexpected death of that prince, who in his own nature was gracious and kind, but neither ſaw nor heard but with the eyes and ears of thoſe, who poſſeſſed and governed him at their pleaſure (68).

[*R*] *He*

---

(54) *La Place, Comment.* of the State of Religion and Republic, fol. m. 19.

(55) Father Paul's Hiſtory of the Council of Trent, book v, pag. m. 400.

(56) Mezerai, Hiſt. of France, Tom. II, pag. 1138.

(57) Mezerai, *Abridg. Chronol. Tom. IV, pag.* 721, abides by this opinion. That blow was ſo great, *ſays he*, that it threw him to the ground, and made him loſe his ſenſe and ſpeech, which he never recovered again. Whence we may prove the falſity of the different ſpeeches which have been aſcribed to him, according to mens different intereſts and paſſions.

(58) See, above, remark [*F*], of the article Francis duke of GUISE.

(59) Mezerai gives them at large. *See, above, the remark* [*C*], *betwixt the citations* (8) *and* (9).

(60) Elogy of Henry II, Tom. II, pag. 52.

(61) He was priſoner as well as the conſtable.

(62) See Belcarius, book xxviii, n. 17, &c.

(63) Eccleſiaſt. Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches, book iii, pag. 212.

(64) Hiſt. du Calviniſme, livr. ii, pag. 157, 158, 159.

(65) All things were then (that is to ſay, when Francis II died) ſo diſpoſed for the entire ruin of Calviniſm in France, that it ſeemed to be utterly inevitable. *Ibid. pag.* 157.

(66) In remark [*D*].

(67) Hiſtory of France, Tom II, pag. 1139.

(68) Theodor. Beza, ubi ſupra, lib. ii, pag. 195.

brother, the duke of Orleans, that coſt France dear [*R*], and had been more fatal, if the duke had not died. Who knows but the duke of Orleans might have diſputed the ſucceſſion with him [*S*]. The ladies had the boldneſs to hand horoſcopes about, which could not but foment the jealouſy of theſe two brothers. They had ſhewn thoſe pretended aſtrological predictions to Francis I. Caſtellan confuted them [*T*], and the event confuted them ſtill more effectually. Several authors ſay, that a famous aſtrologer foretold that Henry II ſhould be killed in a duel [*U*]. The different accounts that are given of

[*R*] *He lived in a miſunderſtanding with the duke of Orleans, his brother, which coſt France dear.*] The chief of the Dauphin's faction was Diana of Poitiers, who was his miſtreſs. Which was the reaſon the ducheſs of Etampes ſided with the duke of Orleans. I have ſpoke elſewhere (69) of the prejudice the intrigues of that ducheſs did to the affairs of Francis I.

[*S*] *Who knows whether the duke of Orleans might not have diſputed the ſucceſſion.*] Tavanes, who was in his ſervice, and who had a boundleſs paſſion for aggrandizing himſelf, hoped much from the ambition of this prince, ‘ who thought of making himſelf maſter ‘ during the life of the Dauphin, his elder brother. The ‘ emperor Charles V flattered him very much with ‘ hopes, which had much exalted his courage; where- ‘ fore being at the point of death at Farenmonſtier, ‘ where he had raſhly defied death in an infected ‘ houſe, which he choſe on purpoſe, Tavanes, his con- ‘ fident, coming to tell him the news of the exploit ‘ he had performed againſt the garriſon of Calais, ‘ whereof he had killed 800, and taken 400 priſoners ‘ he ſaid to him theſe words; my friend, I am dead, ‘ all our meaſures are broken; my great ſorrow is ‘ that I cannot recompenſe your merit (70).

[*T*] *The ladies had ſhewn Francis I, theſe aſtrological predictions, Caſtallan refuted them.* About two years before the death of that prince, ſome ladies, who had a great ſhare in his friendſhip, told him that the ſtars promiſed the duke of Orleans great conqueſts, and prognoſticated that the Dauphin would perform nothing worthy of the quality of a king of France. They talked in this manner becauſe they knew the particular affection of Francis I. for the duke, and they hoped to enrich themſelves by the intereſt of that young prince. They praiſed him, they cryed him up to the skies, and decryed the Dauphin as having a dull and eavy genius, and who had the moſt unfortunate nativity in the world (71). Caſtellan could not bear either their flatteries or ſlanders: but turning to theſe ladies with a ſtern look, he told them that aſtrology was a difficult thing to underſtand, and that it was ſtill more difficult to adjuſt it to human events; he added, that the vanity and impudence of aſtrologers rendered them unworthy of credit; that he had formerly ſtudied thoſe things under Turreau (72), and made as much progreſs in them as another; that for a ſort of amuſement, and for the ſatisfaction of the curious, he had erected the ſchemes of the Dauphin and the duke of Orleans with all poſſible exactneſs; and that according the rules of the aſtrological art, he had found that the duke was to have a good, great, and warlike ſoul; that he was to be ſupported with the forces and friendſhip of the great, and ſhould arrive at a very conſiderable power (73); that the Dau. phin ſhould not be inferior to him either with reſpect to military virtue, or thoſe other qualities that are worthy of a prince; and that he ſhould enjoy a happy reign, and be a moſt ſucceſsful conqueror of his enemies (74). But that all theſe ways of predicting futurities, being vain and dubious, the ſureſt way to gueſs at the fortunes of theſe two princes, was to ground our conjectures upon their manners and genius. The king heard this diſcourſe very favourably; the flatterers of both ſexes were enraged at him. The Dauphin having heard what Caſtellan had ſaid, was extreamly pleaſed with it, not becauſe he had been praiſed, but becauſe his innocence had been declared before Francis I, to whom he afraid leaſt they ſhould render him odious (75), *apud quem ne in ſuſpicionem aut odium traheretur metuebat* (76). Oh curſed peſts of a court! who can ſufficiently deteſt you? what malice is it to cheriſh by ſo many artifices the jealouſy of two brothers! we muſt not forget that the aſtrology of Caſtellan proved falſe with reſpect to the duke of Orleans. He died a little while after; and yet it had promiſed him a very great power, which Caſtellan conſidered as a thing to come; and he could not conſider it otherwiſe at that time; for this prince died nineteen months or thereabouts before his father, and was not yet twenty four years old.

[*U*] *Many authors ſay, that a famous aſtrologer foretold that Henry II ſhould be killed in a duel.*] See what Brantôme ſays of it (77). *I have heard, and I have it from good hands, that ſome years before he died, (ſome ſay ſome days) there was an aſtrologer who calculated his nativity and preſented it to him, in which he found, that he was to die in a duel and ſingle combat. The conſtable was preſent, to whom the king ſaid, ſee, friend, what death is foretold me; ah, Sir, anſwered the conſtable, will you believe theſe raſcals, who are only liars and braggadochio's? throw it into the fire. Why ſo, friend, replyed the king? they ſometimes ſpeak truth; I do not care whether I die that death or another, nay, I ſhould rather chuſe it and to die by the hand of any man whatever, provided he was brave and vailant, and I ſhould purchaſe glory by it; and, without minding what the conſtable ſaid to him, he gave that prophecy to be kept by Monſienr de l'Aupeſpine, ordering him to keep it till he asked him for it . . .* (78) *Now the king was no ſooner wounded, dreſſed, and carried to his chamber, but the conſtable remembering that prophecy, called Monſieur de l'Aupeſpine, and ordered him to go and fetch it, which he did, and as ſoon as he had ſeen and read it, the tears came in his eyes; ah! ſays he, ſee here is the combat and the duel he was to die in, it is done, he is a dead man; it was not poſſible for a diviner to ſpeak better and clearer than this, tho' by their natural temper, or by the inſpiration of their familiar ſpirit, they are always ambiguous, and doubtful, and therefore always ſpeak ambiguouſly, but here he ſpoke very clearly. Curſed be the aſtrologer who propheſied ſo truly and ſo fatally.* Thuanus does not, like Brantôme, omit the name of this diviner: he calls him Luke Gauric, and adds, that this ſcheme was erected at the requeſt of Catherine de Medicis, and that it was laughed at till the king received his wound. Thuanus mentions this prediction as a certain matter of fact (79). But they who cite Luke Gauricus's own words, taken from the horoſcope of Henry II, deſerve more credit. Now it is certain by theſe words, that the aſtrologer promiſed a long life to this monarch, and never threatened him with a fatal duel. Gaſſendus has not failed to cite this great example, and to add that Cardan was no leſs miſtaken in the horoſcope of this prince than Gauricus (80). ‘ Conſtat ex Hi- ‘ ſtoriis Henricum II, Galliæ noſtræ Regem obiiſſe ‘ anno ætatis quadrageſimo completo, ex oculari vul- ‘ nere: En autem de eo Gaurici vaticinium in Prog- ‘ noſtico Anni MDLVI. *Quoniam in ſui natalis penè* ‘ *divini ſchemate habuit ſolem ſub gradibus ſuæ alti-* ‘ *tudinis Veneri ferè partiliter alligatum; quin & Lunam* ‘ *atque Venerem ſub Arietis Aſteriſmo, per Horoſcopum* ‘ *progredienteis, vivet fœliciſſimus annos LXX. deductis* ‘ *duobus menſibus, ſi nutu divino ſuperaverit annos inſalu-* ‘ *breis LXIII, LXIV, & ſemper vivet in terris pientiſſimus.* ‘ Paria ſunt quæ idem Gauricus anteà ediderat, quæ- ‘ que à Sixto (81) referuntur. En & vaticinium Car- ‘ dani, cum de eodem Henrico loquens. *Erit certe,* ‘ inquit, *ſenecta tantò felicior quantò etiam plura fuerit* ‘ *expertus*, &c. ——— *It is evident from hiſtory, that* ‘ *our king Henry II died in the forty firſt year of his* ‘ *age, of a wound in his eye: now ſee Gauric's pre-* ‘ *diction concerning him, in his prognoſtication for the* ‘ *year* 1556. Becauſe in the ſcheme of his almoſt ‘ divine nativity, he had the ſun almoſt in partile ‘ aſpect with Venus, and the Moon and Venus in ‘ the conſtellation of Aries, advancing thro' his horoſ- ‘ cope, he ſhall live happily the ſpace of ſeventy years, ‘ wanting two months, if, by the divine favour, he ‘ ſurvive the critical years, ſixty three and ſixty four. ‘ and ſhall be remarkable for his piety. *This Gau-* ‘ *ricus had before publiſhed almoſt the ſame things as we* ‘ *find them related by Heminga. Here alſo follows a pre-* ‘ *diction of Cardan concerning the ſame Henry II.* ‘ His old-age *ſays he*, ſhall be ſo much the happier, ‘ as he ſhall have experienced the more viciſſitudes.

---

(69) *In the remark* [*R*] *of the article* FRANCIS I. *See alſo the remark* [*E*] *in the article* ETAMPES.

(70) Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau's Memoirs, Tom. II, pag. 572.

(71) Animo lento & ſopito infelici quodam ſyderum poſitu natum. *Gallandius, ubi infra, pag.* 73.

(72) *See, above, remark* [*C*] *of the article* CASTELLAN.

(73) Valde potentem futurum. *Galland ubi ſupra, pag.* 73.

(74) Suorum hoſtium late victorem feliciſſimum regnaturum compeririſſe. *Id. ibid.*

(75) *Taken from the Life of Peter Caſtellan by Gallandius, chap. xliv, pag.* 72, &c.

(76) Id. ibid. pag. 74.

(77) *Brantôme, Diſcourſe of Henry II, in the ſecond Tome of his Memoires, pag.* 50.

(78) Ibid. pag. 52.

(79) Genus ac tempus mortis à Luca Gaurico Mathematico Pauli tertii perfamiliari prædictum, CONSTAT, cum Catharina uxor futuri anxia fœmina eum ſuper viri ac filiorum fato conſuleret, fore nimirum ut in duello caderet, vulnere in oculo accepto: quod irriſum à multis ac pro tempore neglectum fuit, quaſi regis conditio ſupra duellum poſita eſſet. *Thuan. lib.* xxii, *ſub finem.*

(80) Gaſſendus, Sect. II, Phyſicæ, lib. vi, pag. 745. Tom. I, Oper.

(81) He ſpeaks of Sixtus ab Heminga, who hath ſhewn, by the example of thirty famous nativities, how the event belied them.

of that prediction, would be alone ſufficient to make us doubt whether it was made by an aſtrologer [*X*]. He had ten lawful children, and two natural. Some pretty remarkable particulars are told concerning the mothers of the latter [*Y*].

Henry II was born at St Germain en Laïe, the thirty firſt of March, 1519. He bore the title of duke of Orleans, when he married Catherine de Medicis, at Marſeilles, the twenty eighth of October, 1533. He was but fourteen years and ſome months old: which made Pope Clement VII, uncle to Catherine, fear that the marriage was not conſummated the wedding-night; and ſome authors pretend, that by the curioſity he had to

be

This matter is of ſuch importance, as to deſerve that I ſhould cite a ſecond witneſs; he is not a man who goes upon hear-ſay, he relates what he read in the very writings of Gauricus; he ſaw there the moſt fortunate predictions that could be wiſhed to Henry II. ‘Et memini in Italia quaſdam Ephemerides annuas Lucæ Gaurici, vidiſſe, in quibus cùm pro libertate ſcribendi quæ tunc vigebat, ſingulis principibus Europæis maximas felicitates aut graviſſima damna minaretur, nihil poſtea perinde cecidit, ac ipſe futurum prædixerat. Atque utinam Henricus ſecundus, quem ille extremâ tantum ſenectute, & morbo placidiſſimo fatis conceſſurum dixerat, non ætate potius florenti, & tam acerbo præcipitique fato nobis ereptus fuiſſet (82). —— *I remember to have ſeen in Italy, certain annual ephemerides of Luke Gauricus, in which, according to the liberty of thoſe times, he had foretold either great felicity, or terrible diſaſters, to the ſeveral princes in Europe, but nothing happened of all that he had predicted. And would to* G O D, *that Henry II, who, according to him, was to arrive to an extream old age, and to die of the moſt gentle diſeaſe, had not, on the contrary, been ſnatched away in the flower of his age, by a cruel and violent death.*’

[*X*] *The different accounts . . . . . were alone ſufficient to make us doubt whether it was made by an aſtrologer.*] Let us ſee Stephen Paſquier's account of it; wherein we do not ſo much as find the name of Gauricus. It turns quite upon other perſons, and other circumſtances. ‘It ſeems that a long time before . . . . this diſaſter had been ſecretly prognoſticated to the king by Hierome Cardan, who, in a ſcheme which he erected of his nativity, promiſed him all things eaſy at the beginning of his reign, but aſſured him in the decline of his life of an unfortunate end, and which, for the Grandeur of a king, he thought himſelf obliged to conceal. There was likewiſe a report ſpread at court, that, upon the cardinal of Lorrain's return from his laſt voyage to Italy, a letter was preſented to him from a Jew of Rome, who was greatly verſed and practiſed in theſe fantaſtical predictions, and divinations, who admoniſhed him carefully to avoid a ſingle combat. Which letters the king having heard read, made no account of them, not imagining, conſidering his high rank, that he ſhould ever fight a duel. Theſe letters were from that time laid up by Monſieur de l'Aubeſpine, who after the king's death ſhewed them to ſeveral lords, as is reported. Beſides it is added (I will not aſſert it for a truth) that the queen remembering theſe letters, and the time that had been prognoſticated, intreated him ſeveral times, that ſince the two preceding days were paſt to his honour and contentment, he would for that third day not enter the liſts, to avoid all accidents, and ſubſtitute ſome other lord in his room. To which however he would not condeſcend. And that on the very day in which he was wounded, the queen ſent a gentleman from her ſeat on purpoſe to intreat him, in her name, to be content with what he had done; he made anſwer, that he would run but once more, in which, as ill fortune would have it, he was wounded (83).’ Obſerve well that Paſquier tells this ſtory only upon an uncertain hear-ſay, of the truth whereof he was not himſelf perſuaded. But takes ſtill more particular notice, that it is not ſaid, that Cardan publiſhed that pretended horoſcope after the death of Henry II. And yet he was vain enough and ſufficiently bigotted to aſtrology (84), to have deſired to take the glory of ſo ſurpriſing a diſcovery. Nothing could have dignified his art ſo much as that, he might have called to witneſs the conſtable of Montmorenci, Catherine de Medicis, Aubeſpine, and other perſons of the higheſt rank. For what cauſe could he have neglected the intereſts of his glory and fortune (85) in ſuch a manner? We have ſeen in the foregoing remark, what Gauricus promiſed Henry II, in the year 1556. Let us ſee what he predicted to him four years before. *Inclitiſſimus Gallorum Rex*, this is what he put at the bottom of the ſcheme of the king's nativity in the Venice edition, 1552, printed by Curtius Trojanus Navò, ‘Henricus Chriſtianiſſimus, erit Regum quorundam Imperator, ante ſupremos cineres ad rerum culmina perveniet, fœliciſſimamque ac viridem ſenectam, uti colligitur ex Sole Venere & Luna horoſcopantibus, & potiſſimum, Sole in ſuo trono partiliter ſupputato. In civitatibus Arieti ſubjectis maximum ſortietur dominium, ſi forte ſuperaverit ſuæ ætatis annos 56, 63, 64, ad annos 69 Menſes 10 dies 12 facili ac fœlici tramite perducetur (86). —— *The moſt Chriſtian king Henry ſhall rule over certain kings, arrive at the height of power, and live to a happy and vigorous old age, as is plain from the Sun, Venus, and the Moon, ſtrong in the aſcendant in partile aſpect, and chiefly from the Sun, being in his exaltation. He ſhall obtain great dominion in the ſtates, lying under Aries, if he ſurvive the fifty ſix, ſixty three, ſixty four, to the ſixty ninth year, ten months, and twelve days of his age, and ſhall enjoy great felicity.*’

[*Y*] *Some pretty remarkable particulars are told concerning the mothers* of the two natural children.] Read what follows out of Brantôme (87). ‘Henry II who was of an amorous complection, when he went to viſit the ladies, did it in the moſt ſecret manner poſſible to prevent any ſuſpicion of their diſhonour; and if any of them were diſcovered, it was not by his fault, or by his will, but rather by the ladies, as I have heard ſay of one Madam Fleming, a Scotch lady of a good family, who being with child by the king, did not mince the matter, but ſpeaking boldly in her French Scotch, ſaid, I have done all that I could, ſo that by good fortune I am with child by the king, which I take to be a great honour and happineſs; I think there is ſomething ſweeter and more delicate in the blood royal, than in any other, ſo well I find myſelf after it, without reckoning the good preſents that attend it. His ſon whom he had by her then, was the late grand prior of France, who was lately killed at Marſeilles (88), which was a very great loſs; for he was a very honourable, brave, and valiant lord.’ What I have to ſay of the other miſtreſs, is a ſingularity of another nature. ‘The Dauphin, afterwards king Henry II, falling in love, with a young lady of Cony in Piedmont (89), in the journey that he made thither with the conſtable of Montmorenci, his ſervants ſet the houſe on fire in the night; and the danger giving acceſs to all people, they ran there in great numbers, crying *ſalva la Donna*, and taking her out, they carried her to the Dauphin (90).’ He had a daughter by her, called Diana, who had for her firſt husband, Horatio Farneſe, duke of Caſtro, and for her ſecond, Francis duke of Montmorenci, eldeſt ſon to the conſtable. The ſecond marriage commenced the fifth of May 1557 (91), and ended by the death of her husband, ſixth of May 1579 (92). The only ſon they had, died before his father. The widow lived to the third of January 1619, being above eighty years of age. She mediated a reconciliation between Henry III and Henry IV, and tenderly loved Charles de Valois, her nephew, natural ſon to king Charles IX. She ſaved his life, when Henry IV would have involved him in the affair of the duke of Biron. She repreſented to that prince, that it was too much his intereſt to render ſacred and inviolable the heads of the natural ſons of kings, not carefully to avoid the eſtabliſhing of ſo fatal a precedent againſt them. She married that nephew to Charlotte de Montmorenci, her husband's niece, *and left his children heirs of all her eſtate, and of the palace of Engoulême* (93), *which ſhe had at* Paris (94).

[Z] *Some*

(82) Naudæus in judicio de Cardano.

(83) Paſquier's Letters, Tom. I, lib. iv, pag. 175.

(84) Confer quæ ſupra, *remark* [*E*] *of the article* CARDAN.

(85) He would have been much more largely paid for his predictions, if it had been known that he had found out by aſtrology, that a king of France ſhould be killed in a duel.

(86) Lucas Gauricus in tractatu Aſtrologico in quo agitur de præteritis multorum hominum accidentibus per proprias eorum genituras ad unguem examinatis, *fol.* 42, *verſo.*

(87) Memoirs of Gallant Ladies, Tom. II, pag. 372.

(88) *Father Anſelm's Hiſtoire Genealog. de la Maiſon de France*, *pag.* 144, ſays, that he was born of N. de Leviſton, a Scotch lady, and that he was killed at Aix in Provence, by Philip Altoviti, baron of Caſtellanes, the ſecond day of June, 1586.

(89) Father Anſelme, *ibid.* ſays, that ſhe was called Philippa des Ducs, and that ſhe was ſtill alive the firſt of July, 1572, and did not turn nun, as Peter Matthieu believed.

(90) Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau's Memoirs, Tom. II, pag. 447.

(91) Anſelm, ubi ſupra, pag. 144.

(92) Le Laboureur, ubi ſupra, Tom. II, pag. 418.

(93) Henry III gave him the duchies of Engoulême, and Chatelleraut, the county of Ponthieu, and the government of Limoſin. *Le Laboureur, ibid.*

(94) Taken out of the Additions of Mr Le Laboureur, *ibid.*

be informed about it, he found ſuch proofs as ſatisfied him [*Z*]. This young prince came to be Dauphin, the tenth of April, 1536, by the death of his elder brother. We have ſeen elſewhere (*i*), that his wife was barren ſeveral years, and afterwards bore him many children. He perſecuted his ſubjects of the Reformed religion, with the utmoſt cruelty, and yet he forged thoſe arms himſelf, which aided them moſt effectually to maintain their cauſe [*AA*]; for by his means the Proteſtants of Germany put their affairs in ſo good a poſture, as to be able to ſend great ſuccours to the Calviniſts of France. The compariſon which has been made betwixt his reign, and the latter years of Francis I. teaches us, that a prince which is too liberal of his favours, is more prejudicial to his kingdom, than a prince who is exceſſively ſparing of them [*BB*]. Henry the ſecond's fault

[*Z*] *Some authors pretend, that by the curioſity which Clement VII had to be informed about it, he found ſuch proofs as ſet his mind at reſt.*] I have read this, only in Mr Varillas. 'The interview of his holineſs, *ſaith he* (95), and of his majeſty, was at Marſeilles, and the nuptials of the duke of Orleans and Catherine were there celebrated with great magnificence. As the bridegroom was but ſixteen years old, and the bride but thirteen, the king, who was unwilling to hazard his ſon's health, would have had the conſummation of the marriage deferred for two or three years. But this did not reliſh with the Pope; who feared, that if he ſhould happen to die before his neice's marriage was conſummated, ſhe would be ſent back to Italy. And indeed he was not ſatisfied, ſays Paul Jovius, till he had ſeen certain proofs of the conſummation of the marriage.' If Paul Jovius has made mention of ſuch a circumſtance, it is not in the place of his hiſtory, where he ſpeaks of that interview of the Pope and Francis I, which yet was the moſt proper place, and the moſt natural occaſion of touching upon that particular, eſpecially conſidering, that the author forgot not to take notice of the tender age of the duke of Orleans. And to make many other obſervations; and even to ſay, that the marriage was conſummated the firſt night. 'Augebant ſuſpicionem maturatæ nuptiæ, quæ impares regio ſanguini viderentur. Siquidem nobiliſſimus adoleſcens Henricus, quanquam ætate tenerior, Catharinam celebratis inſigni ceremonia nuptiis, ex virgine mulierem prima nocte reddiderat (96). —— *The haſtening of the nuptials, which ſeemed unſuitable to the royal blood, increaſed the ſuſpicion. For Henry, tho' very young, after celebrating the marriage with great magnificence, enjoyed Katharine the firſt night.*'

I confeſs then, that Mr Varillas may be ſuſpected to have cited Paul Jovius wrong. What he ſays of the bridegrom's being ſixteen years old, and the bride thirteen, is not exact. For it is certain, that Henry II was born the thirty firſt of March, 1519, and that he married Catherine de Medicis, the twenty eighth of October, 1533 (97). Father Anſelm, who dates his birth the thirty firſt of March, 1518, adds, that it was before Eaſter, and conſequently, that that year was 1519, new ſtile. He ſays alſo, that Catherine was born the thirteenth of April, 1519. Gauricus ſets down the ſame day and year in that lady's nativity. There was therefore but fourteen days difference betwixt their ages. Spondanus is no leſs miſtaken than Varillas, ſince he ſays, that Catherine was but thirteen years, and that Henry was fifteen years and ſeven months (98).

[*AA*] *He forged thoſe arms himſelf which aided the Proteſtants the moſt effectually to maintain their cauſe.*] See what I have ſaid concerning this in the remark [*D*], and join to it this paſſage of Stephen Paſquier (99), 'we ſaw the emperor Charles V make war upon his German ſubjects, for having embraced hereſy . . . . His affairs went on ſucceſsfully; this made them implore our aſſiſtance. Could there be any thing more plauſible in point of intereſt of ſtate, as politicians judge of it, than to take their cauſe in hand, not to ſuffer a great prince to aggrandize himſelf ſtill more at our very gates, by the ruin of all the princes of Germany? but, on the other hand, could there be any thing more unjuſt than to aſſiſt a ſubject againſt his lawful ſovereign? and eſpecialy to take the part of a Heretic, againſt a Catholic emperor, who fought only for the honour of GOD, and the good of his church? our king was a Catholic prince, as were alſo the lords who had the greateſt ſhare in his favour; yet, notwithſtanding, we take upon us the protection of the German Heretics; and the king in full parliament cauſed himſelf to be proclaimed by the glorious title of *protector of the German liberty*, that was to ſay of the German hereſy; and as ſuch cauſed money to be coined bearing that inſcription. Under that ſpecious title he undertook this expedition with a powerful army; wherein things ſucceeded in ſuch a manner, that upon the meer fame of our enterprize, when we were on the point of paſſing the Rhine, the emperor was forced to come to an agreement with his ſubjects, and to grant them many privileges againſt the honour of GOD, and his conſcience, whom he would not otherwiſe have tolerated. As for my part, I firmly believe, that GOD afterwards was pleaſed to chaſtiſe us with the ſame rods, wherewith we afflicted the emperor. Having permitted, that, after Henry's deceaſe, his children, while minors, ſhould be made war upon by their ſubjects, for the maintenance of an opinion more violent than that of Luther, and that they ſhould make uſe of the aſſiſtance of the German princes againſt them. And when GOD was pleaſed to exerciſe his vengeance upon us, it was paſt all human power to put a ſtop to it, whence all the remedies that we thought to apply to it, turned to our deſtruction.' Paſquier makes another remark, which doth not appear to me to be good. 'At our return, *ſays he*, from that fine German expedition (100), Calvin began to ſollicit one after another by letters, who ſuffered themſelves to be eaſily overreached, thinking, probably, that ſince the king and his council had undertaken the protection of the Lutherans, they were in their hearts of the ſame religion. Thus by little and little the ſeeds of a new religion ſpread through France, which at length came to the noble parts, I mean, even to princes and great lords.' The author here commits two faults, he ſuppoſes, that Calvin did not begin to ſollicit the French by letters, till towards the end of the year 1552. Which is falſe; for he had never ceaſed to do it ſince the year 1536; and beſides, it is not true, that the French could believe, that the king and his council were Lutherans in their hearts. They, of the very contrary, could not doubt, ſince they ſaw him perſecute with fire and ſword, thoſe of the new religion over all his kingdom. The protection that he granted, and the good offices he did the Proteſtants of Germany, were of no force to elude this proof of his averſion to their ſect. That only ſhewed, that he ſacrificed the intereſts of his religion to the political intereſts of his ſtate. This is the common courſe of ſovereigns. Though they ſometimes take another, and ſacrifice to the ſpirit of perſecution, not only the conqueſts they might make, but even thoſe they have already made, and the moſt ſolid advantages of their kingdom. Henry II was an inſtance of this, when he accepted of the peace of Cateau.

[*BB*] *A prince too liberal of his favours is more prejudicial to his kingdom, than a prince who is too niggardly of them.*] A French civilian (101) has maintained. 'that they are in a great error, who praiſe and adore the goodneſs of a gentle, gracious, courteous, and ſimple prince; for ſuch ſimplicity without prudence, is moſt dangerous and pernicious in a king, and much more to be feared than the cruelty of a ſevere, moroſe, rough, covetous, and inacceſſible prince. And methinks our fore fathers have not uſed this proverb without cauſe, *An ill* (102) *man makes a good king*: which may ſeem ſtrange to delicate ears, and which are not accuſtomed to weigh the reaſons on both ſides. By the indulgence and fooliſh ſimplicity of too good natured a prince, it comes to paſs that flatterers and paraſites, and the worſt of men, carry off all of-

'fices,

(*i*) *In the article* FERNEL, *remark* [*K*].

(95) Varillas, preface to the fifth Tome of the Hiſtory of Hereſy, fol. **3, Edit. of Holland.

(96) Jovius, Hiſtor. lib xxxi, fol. 230, Edit. Baſil, 1555.

(97) *See the* Faſtes *of Father du Londel, p.* 23, *and* 34, *and Father Anſelm's* Hiſt. Genealog. pag. 137 *and* 139.

(98) Spondan. ad ann. 1533, n. 7.

(99) Paſquier's Letters, Tom. II, book xv, pag. 218.

(100) Id. ibid. pag. 219.

(101) Bodin of a Republic, book ii, chap. iv, towards the end, pag. m. 295. See alſo, book vi, chap. ii, pag. 895.

(102) *Note,* That he gives not to that word it's whole ſignification: he only takes it in the ſenſe of auſtere and rigorous. *See the end of that chapter of the ſecond book of Bodin.*

fault was the ill management of his revenues, by which means he perverted the adminiſtration of them, and contracted immenſe debts [*CC*]. Some have reckoned, amongſt the diſorders of his reign, the miſchief which the poets cauſed (*k*). Polygamy, under the preceding reigns, was not *an hanging matter*: Henry II firſt made it capital [*DD*]. You will find, in other places of this Dictionary, what laws he made againſt clandeſtine marriages (*l*), and againſt mothers who deſtroy their new-born children (*m*).

I ſhall

fices, employments, benefices, and grants, draining the treaſures of a kingdom; by which means the poor people are gnawed to the very bones, and cruelly enſlaved by the great: ſo that for one tyrant there are ten thouſand, *&c.* To confirm this poſition by examples, he afterwards adds what follows (103). ‘We have ſeen this kingdom great, rich, and flouriſhing in arms and laws, towards the latter end of the reign of Francis I, when he became moroſe and inacceſſible, and when no body durſt approach him to aſk any thing of him; then governments, offices, and benefices, were only given to the merit of men of honour; and penſions were ſo retrenched, that there was found in his treaſury, when he died, a million of gold, and ſeven hundred thouſand crowns, and the March quarter to receive, whilſt there was nothing due, except a little to the Griſons, and to the bank of Lyons, which they did not pay, that they might keep them in their duty: peace was ſettled with all the princes of the earth; the frontiers extended even to the gates of Milan; the kingdom full of great commanders, and the learnedeſt men in the world. We have afterwards ſeen in the twelve years that Henry II reigned, (whoſe bounty was ſo great, as not to be parallelled by any prince of his age) the ſtate almoſt quite changed; for as he was gentle, gracious, and good natured, he could refuſe no body any thing: thus the treaſures of his father in a few months being exhauſted, places of truſt were more than ever expoſed to ſale, benefices given without regard to merit, civil offices ſold to the higheſt bidder, and conſequently to the moſt unworthy: taxes greater than ever they were before; and yet when he died, his Exchequer was found in debt forty two millions: after having loſt Piedmont, Savoy, Corſica, and the frontiers of the Low-Countries. And yet theſe loſſes were but inconſiderable in reſpect of reputation and honour. If the gentleneſs of this great king had been accompanied with ſeverity; if his goodneſs had been mixed with rigour; his facility with auſterity, they had not ſo eaſily drawn from him every thing that they aſked of him.’ The opinion of this learned man ſeems a paradox at firſt ſight, but if it be examined nearly, it will be found to be well-grounded.

[*CC*] *He perverted the adminiſtration of his finances, and contracted immenſe debts.*] ‘There was an ordinance of Francis I. confirmed by his ſucceſſor, importing, that there ſhould be four keys to the Exchequer-cheſt, whereof the king ſhould have one, and the others ſhould be in the hands of commiſſioners appointed by him; and the disburſements of the money ſhould be made by order of the king, in preſence of the treaſurer and of the comptroller of the Exchequer. But king Henry II, by an edict ſome time after granted * diſcharges to the commiſſioners and officers of the Exchequer, that no body afterwards might call them to an account: nay, one of theſe commiſſioners had at one time, purely as a gift, an hundred thouſand crowns, given him, if the rumour which went of it every where be true: which was then a very great ſum (104).’ It is Bodin who makes this obſervation, and a little after adds (105), that Francis I. did not make ſo many largeſſes during a reign of thirty two years, as his ſucceſſor did in two. *Francis I. had ſcarce cloſed his eyes, but the* Tilletage, *or money which is given for the renewing of commiſſions, which was then a prodigious ſum, was given to a ſingle perſon* (106). See how this is expreſſed in the Latin tranſlation. *Nondum juſta Parenti fecerat* (*Henricus ſecundus*) *cum Hirudo quædam Palatina Pecuniæ vim infinitam, quam officiarii, accepta confirmatione, regibus initiatis fiſco dependere, ſolent, uno abſorbuit & eodem hauſtu* (107). This prince's prodigality was the cauſe doubtleſs of his laying new taxes on his ſubjects, forgetting the promiſes he had made, when he impoſed them. Conſider well theſe words of Bodin (108); ‘When the Taillon was laid on the ſubjects in the year 1549, the king promiſed not to employ or appropriate it to any other uſe beſides the paying the Gendarmery, without confounding this revenue with any other: which was alſo promiſed, when the tax for payment of fifty thouſand foot was impoſed in Francis the firſt's time, which was only to be raiſed in walled towns, and their ſuburbs, which did not ſuffer by the number of ſoldiers; and yet ſince it has been extended equally to cities, towns, and villages, great and ſmall, in the year 1555, by which the poor countrymen are doubly oppreſſed; for they pay and are pillaged on all ſides.’ The bad management of this king, produced another diſorder, which was the borrowing great ſums at high intereſt: ‘When king Henry had occaſion for money, he borrowed at ten, twelve, nay ſixteen, *per cent.* as he did in the year 1554, of the Caponi, the Albici, and their partners in Germany; and the intereſt was paid at the four fairs, or became part of the principal. The emperor did the like on his part; but it is true, he gave but ten or twelve *per cent.* at moſt; and the ſame year the king of England borrowed from the German merchants an hundred thouſand crowns, at 12 *per cent.* And whereas Henry thought, by giving greater intereſt than the emperor, and the king of England, to command a greater ſupply, he began to ſink his credit by it; for the wiſeſt managers concluded, that at long run he would neither be able to pay principal nor intereſt; for as much as 16 *per cent.* came at leaſt to 18, by means of the intereſt, which he could not pay (109).’ Note, that he was not the inventer of this practice; it began in his father's time. ‘This was alſo a project brought into France in the year MDXLIII by cardinal de Tournon, when he was in favour with Francis I, whom he perſuaded, by the ſuggeſtion of ſome Italians, that there was no way of drawing money into France from all parts, and making a fund for the time to come, to fruſtrate it's enemies, but by eſtabliſhing a bank at Lyons, and taking in money from all hands, paying 8 *per cent.* But at bottom the cardinal wanted to ſecure a hundred thouſand crowns, which he had in his coffers, and receive as much intereſt as he could for it. The letters-patent having paſſed the ſeals, and the Bank being opened in the manner above related, every one ſtrove who ſhould firſt get there from France, Germany, and Italy: ſo that Francis I, when he died, was indebted to the bank of Lyons five hundred thouſand crowns, which he had in his coffers, and four times as much; and there was a ſettled peace with all the world (110).’ Bodin (111) condemns that invention ſuggeſted to Francis I. He thinks that it ruins the foundation of the finances, and that it proved the origin of a thouſand misfortunes. Let us cite him once more (112). *And as to the treaſury*, ſays he, *it was ſo ill managed, that in leſs than twelve years that Henry II reigned, he* (113) *owed more intereſt, than all his predeceſſors, forty years before, had raiſed for all their expences.*

I am perſuaded theſe citations from Bodin, will not be diſagreeable to ſuch as deſire to know the epochas of taxes, and the original of cuſtoms in general.

[*DD*] *Henry II firſt made Polygamy a capital crime.*] This I find in Bodin, ‘Imperatores, *ſays he* (114), perpetua lege πολυγαμίαν infamiæ pœna ſubjecta vetuerunt †: noſtris vero legib. pœna capitalis Henrici II principatu irrogari cœpit. —— *The emperors, by a perpetual law, prohibited Polygamy, under the penalty of infamy: but in the reign of Henry II it was firſt made a capital crime by our laws.*’ The author of the *Miſcellanies of Hiſtory and Learning* was probably ignorant of this particular. For ſee how he expreſſes himſelf, ‘Some parliaments in France, condemn to death thoſe whoſe are convicted of Polygamy, becauſe they ſuppoſe it to be a law

‘of

(*k*) *See, above, remark* [*I*] *of the article* GARASSE.

(*l*) *Remark* [*H*] *of the article* PIENE.

(*m*) *See the remark* [C] *of the article* PATIN.

(103) Id. ibid. pag. 296.

* In 1556.

(104) Bodin. ibid. livr. vi, chap. ii, pag. 904.

(105) Id. ibid. pag. 1055, *of the Latin edition* 1601, *in 8vo.*

(106) Id. ibid. pag. 905, *of the French edition*, 1608, *in 8vo.*

(107) Ibid. pag. 1055.

(108) Id. ibid, pag. 898.

(109) Id. ibid. pag. 893, 894.

(110) Id. ibid. pag. 893.

(111) Id. ibid. pag. 896.

(112) Id. ibid. pag. 595.

(113) *See the foregoing remark, citat.* (103).

(114) De Republ. lib. v, cap. i, pag. m. 793.

† L. neminem. de inceſtis. Cod.

I ſhall add a thing which I find in a letter of Bodin's. Pope Julius III ſummoned this prince *to appear before GOD, to anſwer for the wrong he did to him by keeping poſſeſſion of Miranda. The king anſwered that he would appear there, but that he was fully perſuaded that the Pope would not appear* (n).

(n) Bodin, in a Letter dated from Laon the twenty ſeventh of March, 1597, and mentioned by Mr Menage, *Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, pag. 250.

‘ of the kingdom. If we aſk where is that law to be found? It lies upon our French lawyers to tell us. The conſequence of it well deſerves that they ſhould take the trouble. As for me, I believe it is not for Polygamy they ſend theſe people to the gallows, but for the impoſtures, whereby they ſurprize the women which they thus trepan into marriage (115).’

(115) Vigneul Marville, Melang. d'Hiſt. & de Litter. pag. 175.

HENRY III, king of France, ſon of Henry II and Catherine de Medicis, had obtained ſo much renown before he was king, and even before he was twenty years old, that the Poles thought him worthy of their crown; but they had ſoon reaſon to repent of that election. The manner in which he ſtole away from Cracow, is one of the moſt ſhameful actions in the world. The reaſon of that flight, was his deſire of inheriting the crown of France after Charles IX. He indeed reigned after him, and in ſuch a manner, that the Poles had no reaſon to regret the loſs of him. It may be ſaid of him, as it was of Galba, that he would have been thought worthy of a crown, if he had never wore one [*A*]. His life was ſo divided betwixt debaucheries and devotions, that a more ſtrange mixture was never ſeen. He gave himſelf into the hands of his minions, with ſo little reſerve, that all France was offended with it; more eſpecially, becauſe the exceſſive expences he was at for them [*B*], turned to the charge of the poor people. He incurred the hatred of the ladies, which was very prejudicial to him [*C*]. The

[*A*] *It may be ſaid of him, as it was of Galba, that he would have been thought worthy of a crown if he had never wore one.*] Every body is acquainted with the following ſaying of Tacitus. ‘ Major privato viſus (Galba) dum privatus fuit, & omnium conſenſu capax Imperii, niſi imperaſſet (1). —— *Galba was thought more than a ſubject while he was one, and would have been thought worthy of the empire by all, if he had not reigned.*’ Suetonius ſays the ſame in other words, ‘ Majore adeò & favore & auctoritate adeptus eſt quam geſſit Imperium (2). —— *He obtained the empire with more favour and authority, than he governed it.*’ The ſame judgment has been made of the emperor Jovian (3); but the quite contrary was ſaid of Marius (4). Our Henry III verified, to his coſt, this judicious maxim, *Magiſtratus virum prodit* (5): he ſhewed by wearing a crown, that they were miſtaken, who thought him worthy to wear it. The words of Caſſiodorus cannot reaſonably be applied to him. *Hic eſt probatæ conſcientiæ gratiſſimus fructus, ut quamvis ſumma potuerit adipiſci; judicetur tamen ab omnibus plus mereri* (6). Much leſs could it be ſaid of him, *magna eum præceſſerat fama, qua major inventus eſt* (7).

(1) Tacitus, Hiſtor. lib. i, cap. xlix.

(2) Sueton. in Galba, cap. xiv.

(3) Deceſſit ſuſcepto clarior apice quam geſto. - - - *He died, having gained more glory before he came to the crown, than after he had wore it.* Jo. Cluverus, Epit. Hiſtoriar. Mundi, pag. m. 308.

(4) Marius in poteſtatibus eo modo agitavit, ut ampliore quam gerebat, dignus haberetur. - - - *Marius behaved ſo in all offices, as to appear worthy of a higher ſtation than that which he enjoyed.* Salluſt. in Bello Jugurth.

(5) *See* Ariſtotle, de Morib. lib. v, cap. iii, pag. m. 44. *G.*

(6) Caſſiodor. Varior. Lect. lib. i, Epiſt. iv.

(7) Plin. Epiſt. iii, lib. ii.

[*B*] *The exceſſive expences he was at for his minions.*] ‘ (8) The principal employment, and greateſt pleaſure of the king, conſiſting in pleaſing two favourites (9), he declared that he could not be content till he had made them as great as himſelf, and rendered them, as he ſaid, ſo potent, that it ſhould not be in the power, either of envy or fortune to deſtroy them. He reſolved then, having no daughters to beſtow on them, to marry them to his wife's ſiſters, Margaret, and Chriſtierne, though they were already betrothed to two other heireſſes . . . but in order to honour them with ſome title that might qualify them for ſuch an high alliance as his, he reſolved to make them both dukes and peers of France . . . . In the mean time, the duke of Lorrain brought his nieces with ſuch a train and magnificence, as if he had been to marry them to kings. As for Chriſtierne, being as yet very young, ſhe was only betrothed to the duke of Epernon; and yet ſhe never was married to him, but choſe rather to take the veil. As for Margaret ſhe was betrothed at the Louvre, in the queen's chamber, and the nuptials were celebrated eight days after, in the church of St Germain de l'Auxerrois. It would be ſuperfluous to deſcribe the Maſquerades, Balls, Tournaments, Feaſts, and Muſic, and all the other pomps which luxury invented, for the wedding. In a word, it laſted near ſix weeks; and Paris, the Theatre of Wonders, had never ſeen any thing like it. The king, dreſſed in the ſame manner as his favourite, led the bride to church . . . . after the marriage, he appointed ſeventeen entertainments, which were made in order by the princes and lords who were related to the lady: the leaſt of them came to more than a hundred thouſand livres: at each of which, the gueſts had changes of ſuch rich and precious habits, that gold and ſilver cloth could make no figure there. There were ſuits which coſt ten thouſand crowns for the workmanſhip. In fine, the expence was ſo prodigious, that the king for his part only, ſpent no leſs than four millions of livres; beſides, he promiſed to pay the huſband, for his wife's fortune, four hundred thouſand crowns in two years time; and when he was told, that theſe exceſſive profuſions would ruin him, he anſwered, that after he had married his two children, he would be frugal. He meant Joyeuſe and Epernon.’ The Swiſs embaſſadors ‘ coming to Paris to demand the money that was due to them, and the treaſurers anſwering, that the king had none, and that they muſt have patience, they replied, according to the uſual liberty of their nation, that it was not credible, that a prince, ſo wiſe and ſo prudent, ſhould ſpend 1200000 crowns for his pleaſure at the marriage of a gentleman, and not have much more in his coffers for the public occaſions of his kingdom (10).’

See in the ſame hiſtorian (11) the extravagant affection this prince expreſſed for Maugiron and Quelus, when they had fought a duel (12).

(8) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Vol. III, pag. 499, 500, ad ann. 1580.

(9) They were the dukes of Joyeuſe and of Epernon.

(10) Mezerai, Tom. III, pag. 500.

(11) Ibid. pag. 451, ad ann. 1578.

(12) Maugiron was killed upon the ſpot; Quelus received nineteen wounds and lived thirty three days.

[*C*] *He incurred the hatred of the ladies, which was very prejudicial to him.* ‘ The ladies, to whom the minions told all, diſcovered to the duke of Guiſe, all the ſecrets of the cabinet, to revenge themſelves of the king, whom they hated, for certain reaſons which are not told (13).’ Theſe are Mr Maimbourg's words, which ſhew plainly how much the ladies prejudiced the king; but the reaſons of their hatred are intelligibly enough explained by many hiſtorians. See, in the margin, the words of Mezerai (14). The obſervation mentioned by the author of the News from the Republic of Letters, is a meer cavil. *Some critics,* ſays he (15), *have found fault with Maimbourg for ſaying,* That the ladies to whom the minions told all, &c. *They ſay, that theſe words are highly diſobliging to the fair ſex, becauſe they inſinuate, that women conceive an averſion for men, who make no addreſſes to them. Now, ſay they, if they are chaſt, what is it to them, if they are neglected? They ought ſure to be very indifferent about it. If they are not ſo, it is a manifeſt ſign they do not deſire to be chaſt. But I think myſelf obliged to take Mr Maimbourg's part, againſt ſuch unreaſonable critics: I ſay then, that he ſpeaks only of the ladies that were in the intrigues of the duke of Guiſe* (16); *and it is not to be doubted, but that women of that character do violently hate, when they have ſuch reaſons for it as are here to be underſtood. Conclude as much as you pleaſe, that if they were virtuous, it would be indifferent to them. Say, if you will, that this concluſion is diſobliging. Mr Maimbourg has taken precautions, in his preface, againſt ſuch ſort of ſubtilties; he declares, that he ſeeks for truth, and not for what may pleaſe, and that if any one finds fault with it, they muſt blame thoſe* who

(13) Maimbourg, Hiſtory of the League.

(14) Since the death of the princeſs of Condé Henry III had little affection for women, and his Venice adventure had given him another inclination. *Mezerai, Abridg. Chronol. Tom. V, pag. 251, ad ann. 1581.*

(15) Month of April, 1684, art. III, pag. 135.

(16) It is certain he means the ladies in general.

The ducheſs of Montpenſier revenged herſelf terribly for ſomething the king had ſaid of her [*D*]. The duke of Guiſe, by this concurrence of circumſtances, and by the troubles of religion, growing bolder than he would have been otherwiſe, to prepare his way to the throne, found that the weakeſt princes are ſometimes capable of a vigorous reſolution. He was maſſacred by order of Henry III. I have ſpoke elſewhere (*a*) of the conſequences of that affair; but I have not ſaid, that without the aſſiſtance of the Proteſtants, this monarch would have been oppreſſed at Tours, where the League attacked him (*b*), ſome months after he had put to death the duke and cardinal de Guiſe. Being delivered from that danger, he laid ſiege to Paris, and had doubtleſs brought that ſeditious city to it's duty, had he not been aſſaſſinated by James Clement, a Dominican. *He died the ſecond of Auguſt*, 1589, *the day after he was wounded* (*c*). I have ſaid in another place (*d*) that he has been juſtly blamed for yielding ſome towns to the duke of Savoy, who had accompanied him as far as the bridge of Beauvoiſin in September 1574 [*E*]. He had reaſon to repent of that ceſſion; for it encouraged the ſon of that duke to form ſome enterprizes againſt France [*F*].

There ſcarce ever was a prince born under a more capricious planet than Henry III. His capricious fortune made him experience a fate, not unlike that of thoſe children, who are firſt educated by a tender mother, and afterwards by a cruel ſtep-mother. The glory of his youth was very ſhining, and procured him the kingdom of Poland in a very glorious and ſhining manner, but that dazling light was quickly eclipſed: He abandoned that crown a little after, more ignominiouſly than he gained it glorioully at his election; for what can be ſeen more ſtrange and ſhameful, than a monarch running away in the darkneſs of the night, and flying out of his own dominions, as ſwiftly as if he had been a criminal who had diſcovered a provoſt-marſhal at his heals? Thus it was that Henry III abandoned Poland (*e*). If that eſcape could be excuſed, upon the intereſt he had to make haſte to ſucced to an inheritance much better than the ſceptre he wore; we might ſtill juſtly ſay, that he muſt be born under a very unfortunate conſtellation, and *Diis iratis*, ſince he found himſelf reduced to ſuch extremities,

as

(*a*) *In the article* GUISE (HENRY).

(*b*) *In the month of May* 1589.

(*c*) Mezerai, Abregé Chronol. Tom. V, pag. 355.

(*d*) *In the article* HENRY II, *remark* [*G*].

(*e*) *See Thuanus, in the beginning of book lviii.*

---

who have formed the laws of hiſtory, who require us to tell things as they are, and not as they ought to be.

There is too much ſubtilty in this reflexion; it is natural for us to deſire, that the talents ſhould not fall into contempt. This, I ſay, is natural, though we deſire not to make an ill uſe of thoſe qualities. The raillery is carried too far in the voyage of Meſſieurs la Chapelle and Bachaumont, upon the ſubject of the anger that is aſcribed to the ladies of Montpellier, againſt the unfortunate Daſſoucy.

[*D*] *The ducheſs of Montpenſier* (17) *revenged herſelf terribly for ſomething he ſaid of her.*] ‘It was told the king, that the League deſigned him no leſs a miſchief than the making him a monk, and that the ducheſs of Montpenſier ſhewed the ſciſſars which ſhe had prepared to cut off his hair. The reaſon was, that he had offended this widow, by holding ſome diſcourſe, which diſcovered ſome ſecret blemiſhes of her's; a more unpardonable affront to the fair ſex, than that which is offered to their honour (18).’ That affront was deeply rooted in that ducheſs's heart, if we judge of it by the active zeal ſhe ſhewed to deſtroy Henry III. ‘She brought a good part of the materials from the invention of her genteel wit, and the labour of her body to build the aforeſaid league; ſo that after it had been well-formed, playing at cards one day at Primero (for ſhe loved play), one ſaying to her, that ſhe ſhould ſhuffle the cards well, ſhe anſwered before a great deal of company, I have ſhuffled them ſo well, that it is impoſſible to ſhuffle, or unſhuffle, them better. This had been well, if her relations had not been killed, the loſs of whom, without being dejected at it, ſhe undertook to revenge. As ſoon as ſhe heard the news in Paris, without ſhutting herſelf up in her chamber to lament and mourn for them, according to the faſhion of other women, ſhe came out of her palace, with her brother's children in her hands, and leading them through the city, ſhe made her lamentation before the people, animating them with tears and cries, with her pitiful and moving diſcourſe, which ſhe made to all, to take up arms, to make a a violent inſurrection, and to inſult the palace, and picture of the king, as we have ſeen, and I hope to relate in his life, to renounce their allegiance, and to enter into rebellion againſt him, which was quickly followed by his murther; from which we may know who are the men and women who adviſed it, and are guilty of it (19).’ It was ſhe who prevailed moſt with James Clement to kill the king. She ſpared nothing to bring it about, not even what, as is ſaid, they call the laſt favour (20).

[*E*] *In September*, 1574.] The king arrived the fifth of September, 1574, at the bridge of Beauvoiſin, and not on the twenty firſt of September, 1575, as is ſaid by two or three hiſtorians (21), whom John Aymes de Chavigny cenſures, in the 224th page of the firſt face of his French *Janus*. Thus he calls his explication of Noſtradamus.

[*F*] *To form enterprizes againſt France.*] The author of the firſt *Savoiſienne* (22) reports (23), that when Henry III returning from Poland paſſed by Savoy, he was asked *as a recompence for a collation*, the towns of Pignerol and Savillan, and *that this prince, whoſe only fault was too much good-nature*, granted it; that the duke of Savoy, ſon of him who received this noble preſent (24), took advantage of the confuſions of France in 1588, for ſeeing king Henry III *out of his capital city*, he invaded the marquiſate of Saluces; that after having ſent an embaſſador to the king, *with promiſe to reſtore all into his hands*, he degraded, all at once, *the officers of his majeſty, and eſtabliſhed others by his ducal authority . . . . and at the ſame inſtant to diſplay every where the trophies of his victory, he cauſed a proud medal to be ſtruck, whereon was the figure of a centaur trampling under foot a crown reverſed, with this device*, Oportunè. Which was to ſhew he knew how to take his opportunity (25). We ſee, in the ſecond Savoiſienne, that after the death of Henry III he made himſelf maſter of many places in Provence; which obliged Henry IV to ſeize Savoy, to bring him to reaſon. Obſerve, *that in return for his medal* (26), the king cauſed *another to be ſtruck, on which was a Hercules armed after the antique way, trampling a centaur under foot, over whom he lifts up his club with his right hand, and with his left a crown, which he ſeems to have taken up; and the device, which as a ſoul was to animate this body, was the word*, Oportuniùs; *to ſhew that he knew better than he how to ſeize an opportunity, and more honourably; ſince he had employed force of arms inſtead of ſurprizes, which the other had practiſed with great ingratitude* (27). This repaired the miſchief, which the ceſſion of Pignerol had occaſioned; but the fault of Henry III was not thereby rendered the more excuſable.

The author of a piece that reflects very much on the preſent duke of Savoy (28), has mentioned this affair, but not without ſome errors. *Henry III*, ſays he (29), *being engaged in a war againſt a potent league*, Charles Emanuel, *grandfather* (30) *to his royal highneſs, acted much the ſame part he has done at preſent. He conceived great hopes, for his fortune, if he ſhould lay hold on that opportunity of declaring againſt France, and in the year* 1588 *he actually joined his arms with*

thoſe

(17) She was ſiſter to the duke of Guiſe, killed at Blois.

(18) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 315, ad ann. 1588. *See the* Critique Générale, Lettre iii, pag. 44.

(19) Brantôme, Gallant Ladies, Tom. II, pag. 316.

(20) See Thuanus, quoted by the author of the *Critique Générale, letter iii*, pag. 43.

(21) Milles Piguerre, John le Frere, and he who has made the Appendix to the Annals of France.

(22) A piece publiſhed at the time that Henry IV obliged the duke of Savoy to do him juſtice as to the marquiſate of Saluces.

(23) The firſt Savoiſienne, pag. m. 16.

(24) Ibid. pag. 17, & ſeq.

(25) See the ſecond Savoiſienne, pag. 109.

(26) Ibid. pag. 132.

(27) See concerning the two inſcriptions *oportunè, oportuniùs*, Paſquier's Letters, Tom. II, book xix, pag. 450, *& ſeq.*

(28) This was written in October 1697.

(29) Memoirs of Mr D. F. L. concerning the tranſactions in Italy between Victor Amadeus II, duke of Savoy, and the moſt Chriſtian king, pag. 146. This book was publiſhed in 1696.

(30) He ſhould ſay great grandfather.

as not to be able to ſucceed to the king, his brother, but upon thoſe terms. This would always be a ſign, that his fortune maliciouſly led him through perplexed and entangled ways. The world looked for him in himſelf, after his return to France, but could not find him. The duke of Anjou, who had acquired ſo great a reputation (*f*), was quite loſt in the perſon of Henry III. There was nothing to be ſeen in him then but the humour of a man-hater [*G*]. Here follow ſome other caprices of this monarch's fortune. He had a brother who was a heavy burthen upon his ſhoulders: death delivered him from this burden; he was overjoyed at that deliverance, and this itſelf ought to be reckoned a misfortune; for what can be more odd, than to be reduced to rejoice at the death of an only brother? But however, this would be ſtill a ſort of advantage, if it was the ſource of many laſting advantages. But it did not prove ſo to Henry III; for he quickly found, that the duke of Alençon's death, whatever advantages attended it, was more prejudicial than uſeful to him [*H*], ſince it furniſhed a pretext for caballing, and fomented that dangerous faction, which gave ſuch frequent mortifications to the king, and at laſt overwhelmed him. The joy he conceived upon having got rid of the duke of Guiſe, was of the ſame nature. It laſted but a little while; he immediately found, that this deciſive blow, which he thought abſolutely neceſſary

(*f*) *See the article* MARIANA, *remark* [O].

thoſe of Henry the third's enemies, and having formed a powerful party, whereof he declared himſelf the head, he entered into Provence, and by ſtratagem ſeized on the towns of Marſeilles and Arles, and grew ſo haughty upon his conqueſts, as to ſtrike a medal to ſerve as an everlaſting monument of his victories. He cauſed himſelf to be repreſented under the emblem of a centaur, &c. The author adds, that *Henry IV carrying the war into Italy, in the year* 1600, *made himſelf maſter of almoſt all Savoy and Piedmont,* and that *he in his turn cauſed a medal to be ſtruck,* &c. This narration is not exact. The junction of the forces of Savoy, with the enemies of Henry III was not made in the year 1588, nor was it in that year, but in the year 1590, that he entered into Provence. He did not ſtrike the medal of the centaur, after making himſelf maſter of Marſeilles, but after the invaſion of the marquiſate of Saluces. Henry IV did not carry the war into Italy in the year 1600, and he conquered nothing in Piedmont. The author perhaps is more judicious in his political reflexions than in his narrations. *Henry IV,* ſays he (31), *after the conqueſt of Savoy and Piedmont, ſuffered himſelf to be wrought upon by the entreaties of Pope Clement VIII, who ſought to reconcile the diſtreſſed duke with the king: though the opinion of all the politicians of that time was, that Henry IV ought to keep Savoy and Piedmont to chaſtiſe the raſhneſs of that imprudent prince, and thereby to have a free paſſage to enter Italy whenever he thought fit. This was the advice of cardinal d'Oſſat, one of the greateſt politicians of his age; but Henry IV on that occaſion ſhewed more generoſity than policy, and reſtored all again to Charles Emanuel.* What would cardinal d'Oſſat have ſaid of the imprudence of Henry III in diveſting himſelf of Pignerol, ſince he blames Henry IV for quitting Savoy at a time when he was a hundred times more capable of reſiſting his neighbours, than ever his predeceſſor was? France had been very unhappy, if ſhe had not been poſſeſſed of Pignerol, when the duke of Savoy entered into the alliance with the houſe of Auſtria, England, and Holland in 1690. She was forced to part with it ſix years after, which is no ſmall loſs.

(31) Id. ibid. pag. 148, 149.

[*G*] *There was nothing to be ſeen in him then, but the humour of a man-hater.*] ‘ At his return from Poland he was almoſt inacceſſible, except to three or four, and would eat in private, contrary to the cuſtom of our kings; but it was not liked, and remonſtrances were made to him on that ſubject: wherefore being forced, as it were, by cuſtom to eat in public, he ordered great rails to be ſet round his table, which are ſtill in the hall of the Louvre at Paris, and the following verſes were made on that occaſion, and fixed up in ſeveral places of the Louvre.

'Puis qu' Henry Roy des François
N'en ayme que quatre ou trois,
Il faut que ces trois ou quatre,
Allent ſes ennemis combatre.

Since Harry of France
Loves only a few,
Theſe few muſt advance,
His foes to ſubdue.

‘ He ordered, that no body ſhould enter into his chamber without a bonnet (32).’ I imagine, that the motive of that order, was, *that he himſelf wore a little bonnet like a child's, that had a roll cut with ſlaſhes acroſs, and upon it a plume of feathers before, with ſome fine crotchet of ſtones, and a great perriwig, and he never uncovered his head, not even at church, becauſe his head was ſhaved* (33). There was a great deal of humour in all this. For the reſt, this will make you underſtand the words I am going to tranſcribe. *Even his turbant ſufficiently repreſented his infidelity, being always covered like a Turk, which he never pulled off to do honour to JESUS CHRIST* (34). This is what the author of the book, intituled, *The Martyrdom of the two Brothers,* reproaches Henry III with.

(32) Du Verdier Proſopographie, Tom. III, pag. 2558.

(33) Id. ibid. pag. 2560.

(34) Martyres des deux Freres, fol. G ii, verſo.

[*H*] *The duke of Alençon's death, whatever advantages attended it, was rather prejudicial than uſeful to him.*] I ſtudy not only to ſay nothing without proof, but every where, as much as I can, to bring the teſtimony of cotemporary writers; it is eaſy to imagine therefore that it is with pleaſure that I here make uſe of the words of Stephen Paſquier (35). ‘ He (36) had ſtill a thorn in his foot, which in the midſt of this peace (37) ſeemed to ſtop the courſe of his ſatisfaction: for though in appearance he was in no ill underſtanding with his brother, the duke, yet he was a ſecond king, and had a diſtinct court and favourites, ſometimes in the city of Tours, ſometimes in other towns of his appenage; who differed in their notions ſo much from thoſe of the king, that he never would ſuffer either himſelf, or any of his followers, to be inveſted with the order of the Holy Ghoſt. Beſides, his appenage was ſo great, that it took up a good part of France. He had his chamber of accounts in Tours, his exchequer at Alençon, which judged, without appeal, of the cauſes of the duchy, both civil and criminal. Beſides, this prince preferred to the biſhoprics and abbies of his appenage whom he pleaſed to be nominated to the Pope, by the king, according to the *Concordate:* all theſe were grandeurs in ſome meaſure like thoſe of the king, and might cauſe jealouſies in his ſoul, but he prudently diſſembled them. Now it happened, that, in the year 1583, the duke died, and by his death his appenage was united to the crown. They who governed the king, rejoiced exceedingly in their hearts; and he himſelf ſufficiently expreſſed, how much he thought his grandeur was thereby increaſed, when he writ with his own hand, the regulations of it, ordering, that the chancellor, ſitting in council, ſhould be cloathed with a gown, and long robe of crimſon-velvet, and the counſellors of ſtate with purple ſatin, and that his uſhers and valets de chambre ſhould have velvet-doublets, and upon them a thick chain of gold hanging about their necks. Then a long ſet of rooms before he could be come to, and a long train of lords that were to walk before him, when he went to church. Indeed, that death at firſt ſight promiſed him a long repoſe, and yet it was the conſummation of his and France's miſery; for if the duke had lived, all pretences had been cut off from the Leaguers ..... Immediately after his death, in the year 1584, the princes of the League made no ſcruple of diſplaying the diſcontents they had been a hatching, covered with the cloak of

(35) Paſquier's Letters, Tom. II, book xiv, pag. 140, & *ſeq.*

(36) He means Henry III.

(37) That which was concluded in the year 1577.

‘ the

ceſſary to his own repoſe and ſafety, plunged him into new troubles, and mortal diſquiets [*I*]. It muſt be confeſſed, that he ſurpaſſed himſelf in the execution of the project of putting the duke of Guiſe to death [*K*]. He ſhowed a great deal of prudence and reſolution in that action, at leaſt much more than on former occaſions, wherein he behaved himſelf in ſuch a manner, as made him deſpicable to the Pope [*L*]. One of the greateſt odneſſes of his deſtiny was, that he equally drew on himſelf the enmity of the Papiſts, and Huguenots. Theſe two parties, that are oppoſite in all things both in temporals and ſpirituals, agreed in their averſion to this prince. This was a centre of unity to people, that in every thing elſe found a ſubject of diviſion. Humanly ſpeaking, the Huguenots had juſt reaſons to hate him, for he perſecuted them without meaſure; and he was looked upon as one of the great promoters of the Paris maſſacre, and he gloried

‘ the Catholic, Apoſtolic, Romiſh religion.’ Note, that love-intrigues had ſowed the ſeeds of diſcord betwixt theſe two brothers. *They happened to be rivals in love: one of their hearts would diſlodge the other, and not being able to bear partners in love, any more than in authority, they changed the affection of brothers into implacable hatred and ſpite* (38). I leave you to conſider, whether that twofold jealouſy, one of love, the other of ambition, betwixt two brothers (39), the one a king, and the other preſumptive heir to the crown, and who both had minds and inclinations ill enough diſpoſed, was not capable of giving them a prodigious antipathy for one another (40).

[*I*] *He found that the death of the duke of Guiſe . . . . plunged him into new troubles and mortal diſquiets.*] Paſquier ſhall likewiſe here be my commentator. ‘ As ſoon as the duke of Guiſe was dead, *ſays he* (41), never was king ſo ſatisfied as ours, ſaying aloud, and clearly to every body, that he had no longer a companion, nor conſequently a maſter; and the next day the death of the cardinal was the accompliſhment of his wiſhes. In this eaſe and ſatisfaction of mind, he enjoyed himſelf ſome days, diſpatching letters to all parts, to declare the reaſons of what he had done, but he reaped little profit by them. Some eight or ten days after receiving no news from Paris, he began to bethink himſelf, and to abate ſomething of that exceſſive joy. And afterwards hearing of that general revolt, he earneſtly wiſhed that what he had done were ſtill to do . . . . The king by degrees began to be diſpleaſed with every thing, even with himſelf. I can ſay it, and write it to you, as one that has been an eye witneſs of it. Diffidence more than ever took poſſeſſion of his heart, as you ſhall preſently hear.’ Paſquier after theſe words gives four or five examples, that clearly expreſs the unſpeakable confuſion of this prince. He had a mind to convey to the caſtle of Amboiſe, ſome perſons whom he had ordered to be arreſted after the death of the Guiſes, *and he found no body that he durſt truſt but himſelf. I will tell you frankly*, adds Paſquier, *that the greateſt part of us, who were at Blois, almoſt burſt with indignation, to ſee the affairs of the king in ſo bad a poſture, that he was forced to be marſhal to his own priſoners. He had ſcarce gone when we received the news that the mareſchal d' Aumont having abandoned the cittadel and raiſed the ſiege of Orleans, upon the march of the Sieur de Mayenne, was retired with his troops to Baugency. Many of his wounded ſoldiers came to Blois. Then it was we all believed, that the conducting of theſe priſoners was a fine and ſtudied pretence of the king, that ſo he might quit the town with leſs diſhonour. And I can aſſure you that if the Sieur de Mayenne had fallen upon us, the fear was ſo great and general, that he would have found no reſiſtance, and being once maſter of Blois, all the river Loire had been his own, eſpecially as all the towns were wavering, and the king would have been wonderfully at a loſs to find a place of retreat. GOD was pleaſed to reſcue us from that misfortune* (42). The author adds (43), that Longnac, who *firſt induced the king to command that murther, which had proved ſo unſucceſsful*, loſt all his favour with him. Some hiſtorians relate, that this brave gentleman not thinking himſelf ſafe at court, asked the king for a place to which he might retire, in order to ſecure himſelf from the reſentments of the league (44). This was to make the king ſenſible, in what a wretched condition his affairs were believed to be; the anſwer that is pretended he made to Longnac, is not unworthy of a great monarch. I mention it in another place (45).

[*K*] *He ſurpaſſed himſelf in the execution of the project of putting the duke of Guiſe to death.*] His heart had failed him on the day of the barricadoes, he had given up the day to his rival, he had made his eſcape from Paris, and left the duke of Guiſe all the glory of a triumph. His heart returned to him again at Blois, and there he humbled his haughty enemy. We may apply the words of the Æneid to him:

Quondam etiam victis redit in præcordia virtus,
Victoreſque cadunt - - - - - (46).

And then we might ſee the truth of a ſentence of Homer, I mean the remonſtrance that Calchas made to Achilles, that a king who is irritated againſt his inferior, has the better of him ſooner or later.

Κρείσσων γὰρ βασιλεὺς ὅτε χώσεται ἀνδρὶ χέρηϊ,
Εἴπερ γάρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτῆμαρ καταπέψῃ,
Ἀλλά γε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἔχει κότον ὄφρα τελέσσῃ
Ἐν στήθεσσιν ἑοῖσι.

Potentior enim Rex quando iraſcitur viro inferiori,
Quamvis enim iram vel eodem die decoxerit,
Tamen & poſtea retinet ſimultatem donec perfecerit
In pectoribus ſuis (47).

I have read, in ſeveral authors, the relation of that exploit of Henry III, but I have not ſeen any where the particulars are better connected and proſecuted, than in that which Mr Marcel hath inſerted in the fourth tome (48) of his Hiſtory of France. There one may ſee all the exactneſs of the meaſures that were taken to ſecure that great blow: the king therein diſcovered a great vigilance and reſolution, and a ſoul ſo much maſter of itſelf, as carefully to obſerve the ſmalleſt things, that might be prejudicial (49). Conſider well the encouragement he gave to the ſecretary of ſtate, who was to acquaint the duke of Guiſe that the king would ſpeak with him. ‘ Hereupon his majeſty hearing the duke of Guiſe was in the council, ſaid to Monſieur Revol, ſecretary of ſtate; *Revol, go and tell Monſieur de Guiſe, that he muſt come and ſpeak with me in my old cloſet.* The Sieur de Nambu having refuſed to admit him, he returned to the cloſet with a frighted countenance, he was a great man, but timorous; *Good Lord*, ſaid the king, *Revol, what ails you? what is the matter. How come you to be ſo pale? you will ſpoil all, rub your cheeks, Revol: there is no harm, Sir*, ſaid he, *only Monſieur de Nambu would not open the door to me unleſs your majeſty command him.* The king orders him from the door of his cabinet to let him come in again, and Monſieur de Guiſe alſo (50). I will on this occaſion cite here, what I have read in the *Journal des Savans. What paſſed at Blois, touching the propoſal which was made to the States, not to ſuffer in France any other than the Catholic religion, ſhews ſufficiently that Henry III, was more politic than the generality of the world imagine* (51).

[*L*] *He had behaved in ſuch a manner as made him deſpicable to the Pope.*] See the General Criticiſm on Maimbourg's Hiſtory Calviniſm; you will there find (52) two exclamations of Sixtus V. One, relating to the temerity he attributed to the duke of Guiſe, and the other the ſimplicity he aſcribed to Henry III. He expreſſed himſelf on this ſubject very cavalierly. Some authors (53) relate, that conſidering one day the conduct this monarch, *he ſaid I have done all that I was able, to get out of the condition of a monk, and he doth all that he can to fall into it.*

[*M*] *The*

(38) Matthieu apud Marcell. Hiſtor. of France, Tom. IV, pag. 602.

(39) See, above, remark [*B*] of the article DRUSELLA, what is ſaid concerning the hatred of brothers. See likewiſe citation (20) of the article DRUSUS, ſon to Germanicus.

(40) It was ſo great, that Henry III one day charged the king of Navarre to kill the duke of Alençon. *See Pereſixe, Hiſt. of Henry the Great, pag. m. 42. ad ann.* 1575.

(41) Paſquier's Letters, Tom II, lib. xiii, pag. 61, *& ſeq.*

(42) Id. ibid. pag. 64.

(43) Id. ibid. pag. 65.

(44) See the article LONGNAC, remark [*F*].

(45) In the ſame article.

(46) Virgil. Æneid lib. ii, ver. 367.

(47) Homer. Iliad. lib. i, ver. 80. *See alſo the remonſtrance of Neſtor to the ſame Achilles*, ibid. ver. 275.

(48) Pag. 626, *& ſeq.*

(49) What the author of the relation ſays of the uneaſineſs in which the king was, is not contrary to this, for they hindered neither his application nor his vigilance.

(50) Marcel. Hiſt of France, Tom IV, pag. 631.

(51) Journal of the Learned, Jan. 25, 1666, pag. 83, 84, in the Extract of the Memoirs of the duke of Nevers.

(52) In the third Letter, n. 2, pag. 38, of the third Edition.

(53) See Naudé, chap i, of his *Coups de Etat*, pag. m. 22.

gloried in it (*g*). This, joined with his zeal for the moſt monkiſh devotions, ought to have purchaſed him the friendſhip of the eccleſiaſtics, and of the moſt vehement bigots of the Romiſh church; and yet he was the object of their hatred more than can be imagined. This is one inſtance of the whimſicalneſs of his fate; and here follows another. Whatever he had moſt ardently loved, at laſt turned to his ruin (*h*). What we have already ſaid (*i*) concerning the diſorders, which were occaſioned by Henry the ſecond's prodigality, agrees ſtill better with the reign of Henry III, a prince infinitely more prodigal than his father. So that they ſaw under his reign more impoſts, more pecuniary edicts, and more waſte of the finances, than was ever before known in the kingdom. The miſchief had ſtill been greater, if the king had obtained leave to alienate the crown-lands. But the States-General would not conſent to it [*M*]. Let us obſerve that Henry III, who, in regard to his favourites, was not jealous of his authority, nor aſpired to independence, paſſionatly deſired to enlarge the royal power [*N*]. I will ſay ſomething of his devotions [*O*]: and I will not

(*g*) Thuan. lib. xcvi, pag. 301.

(*h*) Ei fatale erat ut quicquid ardentius dilixerat, id illi poſtremo perniciem adferret. *Id. lib. xc, ſub fin, pag. m.* 193.

(*i*) *Above, remark* [*BB*] *of the article* HENRY II.

[*M*] *The States-General would not conſent to alienate the domains of the crown.*] Beſides what I have already ſaid of this in the article BODIN (54), I ſhall ſet down here a paſſage of Mezerai (55). ‘As to the point of alienation of the crown-lands . . . . Emar (56) by order of the aſſembly, anſwered Bellievre, whom the king had ſent there, that the common, and the fundamental, laws of the ſtate abſolutely forbid that alienation; that the crown-lands reſembled the jointure of a wife, which can neither be ſold nor appropriated to any other uſe by her huſband; that they were ſtill more ſacred than thoſe of the church, becauſe they could not be alienated for any reaſon whatſoever, even with ſolemnity; that it was a thing unheard of, that recourſe was ever had to that expedient, even in the greateſt neceſſities of France, and when it was in greater danger than it was at that time; as in the reign of king John, for whoſe deliverance, ſo much money, ſo many towns, and provinces, were given; that, in a word, they were one of the ſtrongeſt pillars that ſupported the crown, upon which portions, dowries, and appennages, were founded, and therefore that the king's demeſn ought rather to be ſtrengthened than weakened, and raiſed higher, rather than be lowered; that as for the reſt, if the third ſtate ſo earneſtly remonſtrated the conſequence s of that alienation, it was becauſe whatever ſhould be taken from the crown-lands, muſt be made good at their expence, and the whole loſs would fall upon it alone, and not on the other two eſtates, who for that reaſon did more eaſily conſent to it.’ If you will ſee the limitations of the royal authority in that reſpect, read what follows. ‘By the edict that was made in the year 1565, at Moulins, where all the princes and great lords were convened, with a great number of preſidents and counſellors of ſovereign courts, it was expreſly enacted, that all the alienations made, or to be made, of the crown-lands, ſhould be null, except in two caſes, namely, for proviſion for the younger children of our kings, and for mortgages neceſſary to raiſe ſufficient ſums for the neceſſities of the war; and that in theſe two caſes, letters-patents ſhould be paſſed and publiſhed, in the courts of parliament, it being expreſly forbid them to have any regard to ſuch letters, for any other cauſe or time whatever, though it were but for a ſingle year (57).’

[*N*] *Henry III who, in regard to his favourites, aſpired not to independence, paſſionately deſired to enlarge the royal power.*] Here are two points: I prove the firſt, by an obſervation that was made upon the great intereſts of the duke of Epernon, and on a *Fortune* of gilt-ſilver which the city of Roüen preſented him (58). This goddeſs ſtrictly embraced him in her arms, *and below were theſe Italian words,* E per non laſciar ti. — And not to leave thee. *A device taken from an equivoque on his name; to ſhew, that that grandeur could never be deſtroyed, as indeed, the king having an exceſſive favour for him, had proteſted to him before, that he would make him ſo great in the midſt of his friends, that he himſelf ſhould not have the power to leſſen him, tho' he ſhould afterwards deſire to do it. This paſſage we have ſince learned from the duke of Epernon, in a very elegant letter, which he writ to the king in his diſgrace* (59). They who ſay that kings never love any body, and look upon that as a great fault, are in a double error; for moſt monarchs are ſubject to an exceſs of friendſhip, which cauſes more diſorders than could flow from an indifferent and inſenſible heart. See, above, the compariſon that Bodin has made betwixt the latter years of Francis the firſt's reign, and the reign of Henry II. See alſo the remark [*B*] of this article. It were perhaps a thing to be deſired, that kings like the Stoics wiſe man, were without love and hatred. It is at leaſt very certain, that the too kind, affectionate, beneficent and prodigal temper of our Henry, was the cauſe of infinite ills. Let us go on to the ſecond point.

The States of the kingdom, in 1576, had reſolved to name twelve deputies to aſſiſt in the king's council, when the papers which would be preſented by the three eſtates to his majeſty, ſhould be examined there. That reſolution was diſagreeable to Henry III, becauſe he feared theſe deputies of the States would hinder him from diſpoſing of affairs to the advantage of his power; but when he was made ſenſible, that he would thereby gain a greater authority, he was glad that the States had taken ſuch meaſures, and he was ſorry that they changed their mind, and was very angry with Bodin, who had been the cauſe of that change (60). It will not be amiſs to hear Thuanus himſelf: ‘Cum Bodinus tertium ordinem, ſi ulterius pergerent, interceſſurum diceret, ſacer ordo, ac mox nobilitas acquievit, ac commune ſuffragiorum votum fuit, ne ulli delegati, qui cum regiis conſiliariis de poſtulatis decernerent, ab Ordinib. elîgerentur, contrarium cum initio placuiſſet, eaque re non mediocriter Rex animo commotus eſſet, ut ſupra oſtendimus, poſtea mutaverat, à Lugdunenſi Archiepiſcopo, ut putatur, inductus, qui principi POTENTIÆ SUÆ AMPLIFICANDÆ SUPRA MODUM CUPIDO, ex quo majeſtati regiæ decrementum metuebat, ex eo incrementum acceſſurum artificioſe perſuaſerat (61). —— *Bodin having ſaid, that the third eſtate, would oppoſe it, if they puſhed that matter any further, the eccleſiaſtical eſtate, and ſoon after the nobility, deſiſted, and it was carried, that no deputies ſhould be choſen by the States to deliberate with the king's council, concerning petitions, tho' they had formerly reſolved on the contrary, and thereby had highly offended the king, as we have before related. But the king afterwards changed his ſentiments concerning this matter, by means, as it was thought, of the archbiſhop of Lyons, who artfully perſuaded his majeſty,* WHO WAS EXCEEDINGLY DESIROUS OF ENCREASING THE ROYAL AUTHORITY, *that, inſtead of leſſening his power, as he apprehended, this would be the means of encreaſing it.*’ The archbiſhop of Lyons acted a very politic part on this occaſion.

[*O*] *Somthing of his devotions.*] I will make uſe of the words of du Verdier Vau-Privas. ‘He performed ſeveral extraordinary devotions, going ſometimes at ten a clock at night, to the Carthuſian monaſtery, to hear maſs. He inſtituted the fraternity of the White Penitents, of the Annunciation of our Lady in the Auguſtins at Paris, and went in proceſſion like the reſt, with his ſack-cloth, and whip at his girdle. . . . . He would needs likewiſe erect many other fraternities, as that of St Jerome, called the Blew Penitents, in the college of Marmoutier; that of the Crucifix of the Black Penitents, in the college of St Michael; that of the Grey Penitents of St Francis, at St Eloy. He brought the Feuillans, which are certain reformed monks of the order of Ciſteaux, from the abbey of Feuillance, near Tholouſe, and lodged them in the ſuburb of St Honoré, not forget, that he was eloquent, a lover of the ſciences; and that he took great delight in the converſation of learned men; but he was charged with doing this unſeaſonably as alſo with reſpect to the pains he took in ſtudying the Latin tongue [*P*]. I have received

---

(54) Rem. [*I*].

(55) Mezerai, Hiſt. of France, Tom. III, pag. 433.

(56) Preſident of Bourdeaux, one of the deputies to the ſtates of Blois, in 1576.

(57) Paſquier, ubi ſupra, Tom. I, livr. vi, pag. 341.

(58) When he made his entry into Roüen, as governor of Normandy.

(59) Paſquier's Letters, Tom. II, book xiii, pag. 72.

(60) See, above, remark [*I*], of the article BODIN.

(61) Thuan. lib. lxiii, pag. 187.

noré, and went often thither to perform his devotions; he had built a houſe near the Capuchins, where, on certain days, he went in like manner, to perform his ſpiritual exerciſes. Every one was porter, and performed the other offices in their turn, and he was called there, Brother Henry; and if any one asked for him, he muſt ask for Brother Henry, as if any courier came there, or any other matter happened whilſt he was in that conclave. He erected another fraternity of Hieronimitans at Vicennes, and at St Mary de vie ſaine [*of wholeſome life*]. He cauſed a great and noble houſe to be built in the horſe-market, in a fantaſtical manner, with certain little cells, that he might go and paſs ſome days there as a monk (62). He carried at his girdle a pair of beads containing ten Ave-maries (63).'

This author has reaſon to ſay, *that many have looked upon all theſe things as grimace* (64), for the writers of the League, and others, have much traduced him upon that account. I will content myſelf with relating a paſſage, which I find in a libel of the Leaguers. *The cells built by that hypocrite, ſerved only for a cover to his laſciviouſneſs, wickedneſs, ordures, and ſodomies; John d'Eſpernon knows ſomething of them, and cannot give me the lye in this matter. The wiſeſt people have well ſaid, that this was only to amuſe fools, and cages deſigned for other ſort of birds, and not a religious ſimplicity, which has always been the true motive for all the princes and honeſt men to ſequeſter themſelves, who were not (like that ſeeming hermit) touched at their hearts with a ſpirit of hypocriſy* (65) Du Verdier obſerves, that the preachers, and, amongſt others, Maurice Poncet, cryed out againſt the fraternities and proceſſions of the king. This Poncet ſeems to me to have been the moſt furious of them all. I will cite what Peter Matthieu has ſaid of him, by which you will ſee, that theſe external acts of devotion were looked upon only as grimace, without any inward amendment. 'On Sunday the twenty ſeventh of March, 1583, the king impriſoned Poncet the friar, who preached in lent at Notredame, for having preached the Saturday before too freely againſt this new fraternity (66), calling it the fraternity of hypocrites and athieſts, and in proof of this (I repeat his very words) I have been informed from very good hands, that laſt night, which was the Friday of their proceſſion, the ſpit was turning for the ſupper of thoſe fat penitents, and that after having eaten good capons, they ^ for their night collations, young virgins that were made ready for them. Ah? wretched hypocrites, do you mock GOD then under a mask, and carry a whip at your girdle, only for faſhion's ſake? it is not there, by GOD, that you ought to carry it; but it ought to be laid on your backs and ſhouldiers, and you ought to be threſhed very well with it; for there is not one of you but hath well deſerved it. For which words the king, without deſiring otherwiſe to ſpeak to him, ſaying he was an old fool, ordered him to be conducted in his coach by the captain of the watch, into the abbey of S. Pere at Melun, without doing him any other harm, than the fear they put him in, that they would caſt him into the river (67).'

had /

[*P*] *He was eloquent, . . . a lover of learning . . . but he was charged with applying to theſe unſeaſonably, and with reſpect to the pains he took in ſtudying the Latin tongue.*] Mezerai reports the ſubſtance of the ſpeech which this prince made to the ſtates of Blois, in the year 1576, and he adds (68): 'that fine oration pronounced by the mouth of a king, with an action that was truly majeſtic, and a wonderful grace, was received by all the auditory with a general applauſe; but not without ſome grief by the wiſer part; who, admiring ſo many fine external qualities in that prince, lamented within themſelves, that his education had not been anſwerable to his birth, and they could not praiſe the natural beauty of his genius, without deteſting at the ſame time, thoſe who had miſerably corrupted it.' He gives alſo a ſummary of the ſpeech which the ſame prince made at the opening of the ſtates of Blois, in the year 1588, and he prepares his reader for it by theſe words (69). *He made a fine ſpeech to them in which he obſerved this temper, that he was very willing to aſſure them, that he had buried all paſt injuries in oblivion; but it was upon this condition, that, all factions being extinct, his authority ſhould be reſtored to it's full force; this he enlarged upon with ſo much art and politeneſs, that if the queſtion had been only whether he was a good orator, he had doubtleſs carried his point.* I will confirm this elogy, with a letter written by one of the deputies (70) of the ſtates of Blois, 'it was the fineſt and learnedeſt ſpeech that was ever heard, not only from a king, but from one of the beſt orators in the world, and he had ſuch grace, ſuch aſſurance, ſuch gravity and ſweetneſs in pronouncing it, that he drew tears from the eyes of many perſons, from which number I cannot exempt myſelf; for I found in my ſoul ſuch a commotion, in hearing this prince ſpeak, that my tears witneſſed it, whether I would or no: he diſplayed with ſo much compaſſion the miſeries of this kingdom, ſet forth his ſorrow for them with ſo much vivacity, compared the felicity, *&c.* (71).' It would be in vain to object to me, that his ſpeeches were made for him, for that will not prejudice his title to the character of eloquent, conſidering the manner with which he ſpoke. They who fill the firſt places in parliaments; are deſervedly eſteemed ſometimes good orators, tho' they cauſe the diſcourſes, which they make at the opening of their audiences, to be compoſed by others; and how many excellent preachers are there that do not compoſe the ſermons which they deliver; but not to inſiſt upon this, let us recite a paſſage of Mezerai, which will ſhew that this monarch ſpoke very well off-hand (72). 'He rendered himſelf ſo eloquent by the natural diſpoſition that he had for it, that if there could be any exceſs in ſo fine an accompliſhment, we might have reaſon to ſay, that he had too much of it. And indeed he wonderfully delighted in the great aſſemblies, and ſolemnities, where it was found, that his ſpeech was always the fineſt, and that even the anſwers he made without premeditation to the deputies and embaſſadors, were much better than the diſcourſes they had prepared with great art and pains (73).' I do not know, whether this great hiſtorian has ever inſinuated, that this prince's ſpeeches were made by any body elſe. I know indeed, that Thuanus relates that Morvillier was thought to be the author of that which the king pronounced in the ſtates of Blois, in the year 1576 (74). But I am ſure that if that prince did not compoſe thoſe pieces himſelf, he at leaſt contributed his examination, advice, and corrections; I am perſuaded to believe ſo, from what I am going to ſay.

He had a great ambition to underſtand the French tongue perfectly, and to ſpeak it politely and correctly. The pains he took in this, had all the ſucceſs that could be expected from it. 'Noſter Galliæ Rex Henricus III, elegantiæ ſermonis ſui ſtudioſus (aliquot præſertim ante obitum annis, quo tempore plura regia quam multi credunt, habebat) haud infelici & inutili ſtudio, fuit. In eo enim tandem excelluit, & ita quidem ut not minus caſtigatum quàm ornatum eſſe cuperet (75). —— *Our king Henry III was exceedingly curious about the elegancy of our language, (eſpecially ſome years before his death, at which time he poſſeſſed more truly royal qualities than is commonly believed) and was very ſucceſsful in that ſtudy. For he at laſt arrived to a great excellency in it, and aimed no leſs at accuracy, than elegance.*' He could gueſs at an author by the ſtile of a book; by which he judged, that Henry Stephens was the author of a work that had appeared without any name to it (76), and he was not miſtaken. He was heartily zealous for the intereſts of his language, and having commanded Henry Stephens to ſhew the advantages and excellencies of it, he preſſed him ſo earneſtly to compoſe ſuch a treatiſe, that he was obliged to bring him a copy of it very quickly (77). I have ſaid elſewhere (78), that he deſired that learned man to make a parallel betwixt the Ciceronians of Italy, and the Ciceronians of France. I have ſaid alſo (79) that he loved Bodin for the learned diſcourſes he heard from him. There were many other learned perſons, whoſe converſation he loved. Note, that in the year 1579, he gave three thouſand livres to Henry Stephens, and a penſion of 300 livres *per annum* (80).

It

---

(62) Du Verdier, Proſopog. Tom. III, pag. 2559.

(63) Id. ibid. pag. 2560.

(64) Id. ibid. pag. 2559.

(65) Martyrdom of the two Brothers, fol. 5, Edit. 1589, in 8vo.

(66) It was that of the Penitents.

(67) Peter Matthieu, Hiſtory of the late troubles, pag. m. 15.

(68) Mezerai, Hiſtory of France, Tom. III, pag. 422. *See alſo pag.* 481.

(69) Id. ibid. pag. 714.

(70) In 1588.

(71) Marcel. Hiſt. of France, Tom. IV, pag. 602.

(72) Mezerai, ubi ſupra. pag. 799.

(73) See Mezerai, pag. 481.

(74) Thuan. lib. lxiii, pag. 179.

(75) Henricus Stephanus, Epiſt. Dedicat. Tractatus de Lipſii Latinitate, pag. 11.

(76) Id. ibid.

(77) Ita ergodioctes fuerit, ut intra breve temporis ſpatium non ſolum compoſitum ſed excuſum etiam afferre ad illum oportuerit. *Id. ibid.*

(78) Above, citation (3) of the article BUNEL (PETER).

(79) Above, citation (27) of the article BODIN.

(80) La Caillé, Hiſt. de l'imprimerie, pag. 135.

received two very curious memoirs: one relating to the propoſal which he had been perſuaded to approve of, declaring for his ſucceſſor the eldeſt ſon of the duke of Lorrain [*Q*]. The other relating to what the deputy of the League was ordered to repreſent to the Pope, after the king was aſſaſſinated by James Clement a Dominican [*R*]. That execrable murder was committed at St Clou, Some Proteſtant writers have taken notice of

It remains for me to prove, that it was the opinion of ſome that he employed that time in thoſe things, which ought to have been employed in more urgent affairs. 'If ever any prince had reaſon to fear, it was then (81), nevertheleſs this new king, as if he had begun his reign in the tranquillity of a profound peace, inſtead of putting on his arms, fell to learning on one hand, grammar and the Latin tongue of Doron, (whom he afterwards made counſellor in the great council) and on the other hand, he held a kind of conference, and academy, with Pibrac, Ronſard, and other wits, on certain days, on which every one diſcourſed upon ſuch ſubjects, as were before marked out. A noble and worthy exerciſe indeed, but not ſuitable to the affairs this prince had then upon his hands. Theſe new leſſons of grammar gave me occaſion to vent, in a paſſion, theſe ſix Latin verſes:

Gallia dum paſſim civilibus occidit armis,
  Et cinere obruitur ſemiſepulta ſuo,
Grammaticam exercet media Rex noſter in aula,
  Dicere jamque poteſt vir generoſus, Amo.
Declinare cupit, verè declinat & ille,
  Rex bis qui fuerat, fit modo Grammaticus. (82).

While France is all inflam'd by civil rage,
And her own ſons in impious war engage,
Immur'd our monarch cons his grammar rules,
Declines and conjugates with bearded fools.
Decline he ſurely doth, who, from twice king,
Is now a ſchool-boy grown a nameleſs thing.

Mr de Pibrac having told Paſquier one day (83), that he had heard, that Marillac (84) was the author of that epigram, added, *that if he was ſure of it, he would make him repent it*; for it does not belong *to a ſubject to play in that manner upon the manners and deportment of his prince* (85). 'That would be well enough, replied Paſquier (86), in any one's mouth but your's, who ought to conſider that if a king, that is expoſed to the view of all his ſubjects, does not bridle his actions, it will be very difficult for him, to prevent the diſcontents of thoſe, that moſt reſpect him: he added, that ſuch verſes proceeded not from one that was an enemy to his majeſty, but rather from one who adored him, but at the ſame time was troubled to ſee him fall by that means into the contempt of all his people, and that we ought all to wiſh, as the caſe then ſtood, that that epigram had fallen into the hands of our king, to be a leſſon to him not of Latin grammar, but of what he had to do.'

[*Q*] *They had perſuaded him to declare for his ſucceſſor, the eldeſt ſon of the duke of Lorrain.*] Monſieur de Schomberg warded off that blow: I have a copy (87) of a memorial which he drew up on that ſubject, and which, in my opinion, deſerves very well to be inſerted at length.

Memoir of the Sieur de Schomberg.

'Some time after the death of Meſſieurs de Guiſe, which happened at Blois, it was propoſed by the cardinal de . . . . on the part of his holineſs, that if his majeſty would declare the marquis du Pont, his nephew, heir of the crown, and get him acknowledged as ſuch, with all the requiſite ſolemnities; his holineſs aſſured himſelf, that the king of Spain would give the Infanta in marriage to the ſaid marquis, which would bring all the troubles of France to an end. To which the king being ready to conſent, by the perſuaſion of ſome who were then about his majeſty, Mr de Schomberg broke the deſign, by theſe arguments: that this would be to invert the order of France, aboliſh the fundamental laws, and leave to poſterity a certain monument of it's cowardice, and puſillanimity for which his majeſty would be juſtly blamed by hiſtorians, and his ſervants and ſubjects branded with treachery and diſloyalty, with which vice for his part he would not be tainted: that that war was betwixt the French againſt the French, who at firſt ſhew ſome heat, but afterwards of themſelves return to reaſon: that his majeſty ſhould only be ſollicitous to live, and to gain time, and to be upon his guard againſt any reſolute villain, who in theſe firſt furies might undertake ſomething againſt his perſon, as a preſervation againſt which, his majeſty ſhould command a waſtcoat of mail to be made for him that he might ordinarily wear. A thing that was reſolved upon but not executed. The Sieur Schomberg having made the king alter his opinion by the aforeſaid remonſtrance, his majeſty commanded him, to tell him, by what means he thought that he might quell theſe commotions. To which the ſaid Sieur Schomberg immediately gave obedience, and beſeeched the king not to be guided any longer by the maxims that he had hitherto followed, and not to imagine that this affair could be accommodated by his uſual connivance and lenity; that he muſt reſolve to have recourſe to arms and to make himſelf the ſtrongeſt in the field; that for that purpoſe he ſhould countermand Mr de Nevers, who was then before Garnache, and give a pledge to the king of Navarre to march with all his forces to his aſſiſtance, and that he ſhould ſend into Germany, Italy, England, Denmark and to all other potentates, to let them know the juſtice of his cauſe, and the conſequences of it, and deſire their ſuccours, and aſſiſtance to raiſe a great army of foreign troops This propoſal was violently oppoſed, and eſpecially by Mr de Nevers, who went ſo far as to ſay that it was heretical; and that neither the Pope, nor any of the Catholic princes would approve of the king of Navarre's being ſo near his majeſty. On the contrary, Mr de Schomberg ſtedfaſtly maintained that that war did not in any ſort concern religion, but the ſtate, and that his majeſty could not ſo ſafely depend upon any perſon in the world, as the ſaid king, as being himſelf intereſſed in the preſervation of the kingdom, to this he added many other ſtrong reaſons; which had ſo much weight, that from that time the treaty with the ſaid king was ſet on foot at Blois, and was afterwards executed at Tours, where the firſt interview was held betwixt theſe two kings. It is therefore with great reaſon that the ſervice, which the Sieur Schomberg did then to France in theſe two points, particularly to the houſe of Bourbon, was very much celebrated. The king likewiſe then adviſed, that the ſaid Sieur de Schomberg ſhould write to the preſident Jeannin; to keep the duke of Mayenne to his allegiance: but his majeſty having heard of the departure of the ſaid duke from Lyons, and his coming this way, the ſaid letter was never ſent, and it is ſtill among my papers in Germany, full of excellent reaſons and perſuaſions, which ſince have been aſſiſting the reduction of the ſaid duke of Mayenne.'

[*R*] *What the deputy of the League was ordered to repreſent to the Pope, after the king was aſſaſſinated by James Clement a dominican.*] Thoſe pieces cannot be too carefully preſerved, which are authentic proofs of the fury moſt of the French were ſeized with, in the reign of Henry III, and ſome years after his death. Some people, will endeavour hereafter to darken the truth of theſe matters of fact: we muſt prevent their wicked atttempts; for the farther men are from the age, theſe things were acted in, the eaſier it is for them to wrangle. Henry III had not been a hundred years dead, when an anonymous author was ſo bold as to publiſh a treatiſe (88), maintaining that James Clement did not kill that prince, which is to deny that it is day at noon. You will find ſome convincing circumſtances againſt that monk in a writing, of which I have received a copy (89), which I here inſert entire.

---

(81) That is at the time of the civil war which the duke of Alençon and the king of Navarre raiſed againſt him at the beginning of his reign.

(82) Paſquier, ubi ſupra, Tom. II, lib. xix, pag. 482.

(83) Id. ibid. pag. 483.

(84) A young advocate of great hopes. *Id. ibid.*

(85) Id. ibid. pag. 484.

(86) Id. ibid.

(87) It was communicated to me by Mr Marais (of whom I have ſpoken in the end of the remark [*Q*] of the third duke of GUISE) an advocate of the parliament of Paris, to which he has added this note; *In an inſtruction of Henry III to the Sieur de la Clyette going to Florence, I find that Mr de Schomberg is named counſellor of his majeſty in his council of ſtate, and mareſchal of his German ſoldiery.*

(88) Intituled, *La Fatalité de St Clou.* It was printed in the year 1672. The Jeſuit Maimbourg mentions and refutes it in few words, in the Hiſtory of the League, *lib. iii, pag m.* 353.

(89) The ſame Mr Marais communicated to me.

of that circumſtance, and have found ſome myſteries in it. The fact that they alledge will

'*An extract of what was repreſented to the Pope by the commander of Diou, embaſſador for the union of Catholics at Rome.*

'It was then (90), moſt holy father, that the evil appeared moſt extreme, and that the prayers as well of the clergy, as of the people, continued with greater perſerveance, and we muſt certainly believe, that they forced the divine majeſty to commiſeration, which would not leave ſo many good men, and ſo zealous for his holy cauſe, in a longer doubt of his goodneſs and mercy; but rather deliver them from their languiſhing, by ſo great and ſo wonderful an event, that the more it is conſidered, the more it raiſes our thoughts to the meditation and admiration of God's incomprehenſible judgments. It is the death of the king that happened in ſo ſtrange a manner, that the truth of the thing and the impoſſibility, that was objected againſt it, were long contending which ſhould carry it. At laſt the news was confirmed by many concurrent advices, and tho' your holineſs has had the particulars of it from other hands, I preſume you will not be fatigued with the account which I ſhall give to your holineſs of it. A monk of the order of St Dominic of the convent of Paris, named Brother James Clement, of twenty three or twenty four years of age, a native of the village of Sorbonne, in the dioceſe of Sens, and the laſt of 300 or 400 which are in the ſaid convent, yet divinely elected, and choſen for ſo generous an exploit, which God has done by his hands, had often boaſted (91) amongſt his brethren, even after the rout of Senlis, that he ſaw the enemies affairs proſpered, that the king ſhould never die but by his hands, at which the reſt took occaſion to laugh at him, calling him, in deriſion, Captain Clement. But this did not make him depart from that opinion and inward motion. But, on the contrary, he confirmed himſelf in ſuch a manner in the deſire of executing it, that he became conſtant in that deſign, thinking only of the means, whereby he might accompliſh it. In that enterprize he muſt reſolve upon death, but what kind of death he could not gueſs, and he was willing to ſuffer the moſt cruel that could be invented for him, which is a conſtancy ſo admirable in a monk, that it is without example in this age. To bring the matter to an iſſue, he found the way to get very ſecretly the letters of ſome politicians, and concerted with them to inform the king of what was doing in the city to the advantage of his affairs. He received ſome words of credence from them, and obtained from the count de Brienne, priſoner in the caſtle of the Louvre, a paſſport that he might have the eaſier acceſs into the enemies army. Now having all that was neceſſary for him, in order to go to the king, he left Paris the laſt day of July, to go to St Cloud, and took leave of all the other monks (92), exhorting them to put up their prayers for him, ſaying that he went for the ſervice of God, to deliver the people from miſery, without any hopes of returning; and he did not deſire it, provided God ſhould give him the grace not to fail in his deſign, of the event whereof they ſhould hear in twenty four hours. The ſame day arriving at St Cloud he could not find means to get an audience of the king; he paſſed the night there which might have given him other counſel. The next day, being the firſt of Auguſt, he addreſſed himſelf to the Sieur de la Gueſle, the king's attorney-general, in the court of the parliament of Paris, which he had relinquiſhed; and acquainting him, that he was ſent intruſted with letters from the king's good ſervants, and with ſome words of credence for things of great importance to the ſervice of his majeſty: he deſired to be introduced by him that he might diſcharge his duty. The king having notice of it, commanded the monk ſhould be brought it, and retiring into his cloſet, he there talked more than a quarter of an hour with him, and in the mean time, he gave him his letters one by one to the laſt; and the king aſking him if that was all, the monk anſwered, I believe not, Sir, and that there muſt be ſome more behind; and putting his hand farther into his ſleeve, he drew out the knife he had in it, ſtriking the king the belly, who perceiving himſelf wounded, cried out, and ſeized the knife in the hand of the Dominican, holding it in the wound by which he hurt himſelf exceedingly, and with it gave the monk a blow in the face, who at the ſame inſtant received numberleſs ſtabs from thoſe who ran in upon hearing the king cry out; and whilſt he was thus maſſacred, it is ſaid, that he ſpoke theſe words, *I thank GOD I die ſo eaſy a death, for I did not expect to depart this life in ſuch a manner, and to come off at ſuch a cheap rate.* His body was thrown into the open ſtreet, and was afterwards burnt, as it was reported to Mr de Mayenne. Thus the king died, the night after his wound, at two a clock in the morning. Your holineſs may pleaſe to obſerve ſome of the moſt remarkable circumſtances of that fact. It happened on the day on which the church celebrates the feaſt of St Peter in bonds, whom God miraculouſly delivered by his angel, from the hands of Herod, and from all the expectation of the Jews, to whom he was to have been given up; the Catholics may ſay, that on the ſame day God has delivered them from the hands of Heretics, and from the yoak of a prince, who deſigned in his heart to fill all Chriſtendom with deſolation. In what day, moſt holy father, could the monitory of your holineſs againſt an impenitent king, and a deſpiſer of the holy apoſtolical ſee, be better authoriſed with the power of God? when twenty four hours after the aſſaſſination of the duke of Guiſe, the ſaid king, in cold blood, cauſed the cardinal, his brother, to be inhumanly maſſacred; it was obſerved, that the watch-word which he gave the murtherer, was St Clement. Whilſt they were committing that execrable crime, he was in his cloſet, making merry with his minions, and accomplices of the ſaid murther; and God has permitted a monk, named Clement (93), to kill him in his cloſet, in the midſt of a great army, which could not ſecure his deteſtable life. Impiety had ſo poſſeſſed him, after hypocriſy had made way for it, that he abhorred the preachers who had publickly reproved his vices, and for that reaſon he breathed nothing but ruin and revenge againſt them, which he proteſted commonly in his private diſcourſes, wherein every one was allowed to give his opinion about the puniſhment that ſhould be inflicted on them; but he has been prevented in his barbarous deſigns, by a poor monk of the order of the preaching friars, who has inflicted upon him the divine puniſhment that others had foretold him. Theſe things, moſt holy father, are, in my opinion, of ſuch conſequences, as your holineſs will judge worthy of conſideration. Moreover it is notorious, that this is not the work of men: God has applied that great remedy to our miſeries, by the miniſtry of your holineſs. And it is to be hoped, that by your interpoſition he will effectually cure them; and to that end I ſhall make moſt humble requeſts and ſupplications to your holineſs, as I am ordered to do both by the duke of Mayenne, and the aforeſaid lords of the general council, whom I hope your holineſs will ſo far pleaſe to honour as to accept of them.'

(90) He had juſt before given an account of the murder of the Guiſes, and the revolutions that followed it.

(91) *NOTA BENE.*

(92) *NOTA BENE.*

(93) *NOTA BENE.*

This memoir, not only furniſhes us with invincible proofs againſt thoſe, who would deny James Clement to have committed the aſſaſſination, but alſo againſt all thoſe who undertake to juſtify his brethren the Dominicians of Paris. Mr Varillas pretends to give the reaſons of thoſe wretched apologiſts (94), and ſays nothing to confute them. He diſplays at length all that is ſaid in vindication of the Dominicans in general, and then he ſpeaks thus (95): *but one of them, who was Father Bernard Guyart, has printed a book to which he durſt not put his name, wherein he offers to juſtify the order of St Dominic from the murther of Henry III.* The word *but*, at the beginning of the period, prepares the reader for a particular apology for James Clement; no body can imagine, that Bernard Guyart deſigned any thing elſe, and yet Mr Varillas ſpeaks only of a general juſtification *of the order of St Dominic.* Let the grammarians find fault with that hiſtorian, for placing ſo ill the particles that they call adverſatives; I leave that to them, and ſhall content myſelf with cenſuring him upon another point. The treatiſe intituled, *La Fatalité de St Clou*, is doubtleſs

(94) Varillas, Hiſt. de Henri III, livr. xi, pag. 252. Edit. Holland.

(95) Id. ibid. pag. 253.

will appear very uncertain, whilſt they leave the obſervations of Peter Victor Cayet unanſwered [*S*].

leſs the ſame work, which, according to Mr Varillas, was publiſhed by Bernard Guyart: now the principal drift of that book, is to ſhew that James Clement did not kill Henry III. Mr Varillas is therefore very much in the wrong, not to repreſent that work under that idea, but under that of a general apology for the Dominicans. This fault appears to me more excuſable, than that of omitting to ſay, that the book intituled *La Fatalité de St Clou,* ought not to hinder one from holding the general opinion. Mr Maimbourg has done his duty, in ſaying, that notwitſtanding that book, we ought to believe that James Clement was guilty of the parricide, and that *it is the beſt way, honeſtly to fall in with the public voice, whatever profeſſion one may be of* (96). What he adds, has not ſo much reaſon in it. *Eſpecially,* ſays he, *ſince the honour of the Dominicans does not ſuffer by it; for after all, faults are perſonal, and there is no man of good ſenſe, who would lay the crime of a private perſon to the charge of an order ſo holy as that of St Dominic.* This diſcourſe has nothing of ſolidity; the crime of James Clement was not perſonal, but the whole convent of the Dominicans at Paris, were guilty of it. They knew his deſign (97), they did not diſcourage him, but approved of the execution of it. The prior of that convent was puniſhed with death, being fully convicted by many witneſſes of having made an elogy of that aſſaſſin (98) in the pulpit: and ſince the city of Paris, and the preachers eſpecially, beſtowed a thouſand benedictions and praiſes upon the monk who killed the king, and all the other cities of the kingdom, that were in the intereſt of the League, and even the Pope himſelf (99), extolled that infamous action; we may be aſſured, that the crime of Jame Clement, was the crime of the whole League, and of the court of Rome; for the authors, adviſers, and approvers of an action, are reputed to be under the ſame predicament. This I will demonſtrate in ſome other place (100).

[*S*] *Whilſt they leave the obſervations of Peter Victor Cayet unanſwered.*] Conſider well his words (101): ‘The Hugenots ſay, *Death has carried this king from this world into the other, but* (*which is a notable circumſtance*) *it happened in the very chamber where it is believed the reſolution was taken for the furious maſſacre on St Bartholomew's day, in the year* 1572. *Theſe words are to be found in the additions to the Inventaire de l'Hiſtoire de France,* made by Montliard. The book, called *the Hiſtory of the five Kings,* printed at Geneva, aſſures us of the ſame thing, almoſt in the ſame words. And in the *State of the Church,* written by John Taffin a miniſter, are theſe words; *It is obſerved, that, by the providence of* GOD, *this happened in the ſame chamber, in which, in the year* 1572, *that furious maſſacre on St Bartholomew's day was reſolved upon.* Thoſe are *notable circumſtances,* and *reflexions on the providence of* GOD, raſhly, and, I will dare to ſay, falſly publiſhed. For at the time of the Paris maſſacre, the place where the king was wounded, belonged to a citizen of Paris, named Chapelier and he poſſeſſed it above two years after, into which his majeſty never entered, whilſt he was duke of Anjou, nor a long time after his return from Poland. When the queen, his mother, bought it, it was after the death of king Charles, with intention to build there; but as ſhe found that place was too ſtrait, ſhe gave it, in the year 1577, to the wiſe of the Sieur Jerom de Gondy, who pulled down the houſe, and new modelled it quite, having adorned it with grotto's and fountains, and put it in ſuch a condition, that it has been ſince frequented by lords and princes; which it never was before: now the compiler of the aforeſaid *Hiſtory of the five Kings,* from whom Montliard and Taffin have taken what they have inſerted in their books (for he wrote before them) has theſe words, *It is ſaid, that the conſultation for the maſſacre was held in the ſame chamber, &c.* Behold a hear-ſay, invented by the author of the aforeſaid collection. This ſtory of his own invention, was put into the Memoirs, and little Diſcourſes printed at Geneva in the year 1569, concerning what happened at the maſſacre on St Bartholomew's day, where it is ſaid, the thing was reſolved upon at St Clou, and at the Tuilleries. Now we find ſome colour for that calumny, the author of the ſaid Hiſtorical Collections of the ſaid five Kings, from the king's being killed in Gondy's houſe, draws this conjecture, and cunningly ſlips in this word; *it is ſaid, that in the ſame chamber, &c.* Montliard, who wrote after him, goes farther, and ſays, *It is believed, &c.* It is not now a meer *hereſay*; there are ſome that believe it: but Taffin the miniſter, who wrote after them all, is more confident, he aſſures us of it, and ſays, that it was *a providence of* GOD. What a lye is this? accordingly the attorney-general having made his complaint in court againſt Montliard, theſe words were ſtruck out of his book, as were a great many others, and he himſelf was greatly vexed, excuſing himſelf upon a hear-ſay; but his book being ſince reprinted at Geneva, all this was again inſerted in it, and is believed amongſt the people of that party (102).’ If the facts, which Cayet relates, about the houſe where Henry III, were aſſaſſinated, be true, there is no doubt but the Proteſtant authors whom he confutes, were much in the wrong, and that the myſterious circumſtances they have taken pains to obſerve, are meer illuſions, and the vain imaginations of credulous minds. But if they had been able to prove, that Cayet was miſtaken, it had been a commendable thing in them, to reprint in the Geneva edition, what Montliard had been forced to ſuppreſs. It is certain, that according to order, and the method of an exact proceeding, the public ought to have been acquainted in the Geneva edition, why that paſſage was reſtored; that is to ſay, it ought to have been made out by ſtrong proofs, that the council about the maſſacre, was held at St Clou, in the ſame chamber where the Dominican killed Henry III. My edition of the *Inventaire* of John de Serres, is of Roüen, 1612 (103), and contains the paſſage which the attorney-general cauſed to be ſuppreſſed. Mezerai ſuppoſes, that the reflexions of the Huguenots deſcended into a more myſterious enumeration of particulars. *They wrote,* ſaith he, (104) *that the king was wounded at the ſame hour, and the ſame day, in the ſame place, and in the very chamber where he had concluded the Paris maſſacre.* He ſays nothing againſt it, he quotes no body, and does not imitate Peter Cayet in any thing. That myſterious obſervation is ſtill more ſtrongly urged in a book intituled, *a Journal of the remarkable things, that happened in the reign of Henry III king of France and Poland,* and which has been printed perhaps above twenty times in Holland, with three or four ſatirical pieces (105); the laſt edition, is that of 1699. The journal is more large in it, than in the edition of 1693. Now theſe words are found at the end of the additions (106). *The farther we ſeek for obſervations and particularities, in ſo miraculous an accident* (107), *the more wonders we find in it, ſo that to poſterity that death will appear a wonder, full of innumerable wonders, amongſt which this has been obſerved, as being moſt worthy of remark, and yet moſt true, that in the ſame place, the ſame houſe, the ſame day, and at the ſame hour, the king returning from his affairs, as he did when he was killed, the Paris maſſacre was concluded on, the late king* (*who then was called Monſieur*) *preſided in the council,* viz. *in the town of St Clou, in Gondy's houſe, the firſt day of Auguſt* 1572, *in the ſame chamber, at the ſame hour, to wit, at eight of the clock in the morning, the breakfaſt,* (*which was three ſpits of partridges*) *being ready below for the conſpirators of that curſed action.* Note, That this addition was ſuperfluous; for all that is conſiderable in it, may be ſeen in the ſame words, in the Journal of Henry III, printed in 1693 (108), and 1699, (109), and I believe it is alſo in the editions that went before.

If we could be ſure, that this Journal, ſuch as the Bookſellers of Holland have publiſhed it, was the work of a Catholic, it would be certain, that the reflexions of the Proteſtants upon the circumſtances of Henry the third's death, are not ſo ſtrong as thoſe of a writer of the other party. The three Proteſtant authors which Victor Cayet confutes, go beyond one another; the firſt was contented with an *it is ſaid*; the ſecond was not ſatisfied with an expreſſion ſo weak, he ſaid, *it is believed*; and the third expreſſed himſelf ſtill more poſitively. This is the ordinary method in

(96) Maimbourg, Hiſtory of the League, lib. ii, pag. m. 354.

(97) *See, above, the memoir of the deputy of the League to the court of Rome.*

(98) Thuan. lib. xcviii, pag. 346.

(99) Idem. lib. xcv, pag. 302.

(100) *In the article* PROBUS.

(101) Cayet Chronol. Novenaire, ad ann. 1589, fol. 224, verſo.

(102) Cayet, ubi ſupra, fol. 225.

(103) *There is in the title,* ſe vendent à Roüen chez Eſtienne Vereul dans la Court du Palais.

(104) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. III, pag. m. 799.

(105) *The* Divorce Satirique; *the* Amours du Grand Alcandre; *the* Confeſſion Catholique de Sanci; Diſcours merveilleux de la vie de Catherine de Medicis.

(106) Journal de Henri III, pag. 316, 317, Edit. 1699.

(107) *That is, Henry the third's death.*

(108) Pag. 129.

(109) Ibid.

in telling of news; the laſt relater is generally the moſt deciſive, and fulleſt of circumſtances. One would think that here is a ſort of an auction, where people are to bid one higher than another, becauſe the goods are adjudged to him that bids moſt. Be it how it will, the journaliſt of Henry III goes farther than the three Proteſtant bidders. He delivers the fact, not only as *moſt worthy of remark*, but alſo as *moſt true*. Father Anſelm (110) aſcribes that journal to Mr Servin; which agrees well enough with the initial letters which have been put in the editions of that book (111). But Mr Pelliſſon affirms (112), that Mr de l'Eſtoille, one of the forty members of the French academy, was the ſon of an Audiencer of Chancery at Paris, 'who had collected many memoirs 'of the affairs of his time, from which one of his 'friends, to whom he had lent them, compoſed the 'book, intituled *a Journal of what happened in the 'reign of Henry III*.' The queſtion is, to know, whether they into whoſe hands the manuſcript fell, before it was publiſhed, or after the firſt edition of it, have neither added to, cut off, nor altered any thing in it. However it be, thoſe who depend upon that part of the journal, are obliged to anſwer the reaſons of Peter Cayet.

HENRY IV, king of France, was one the greateſt princes mentioned in the hiſtory of theſe laſt ages, and we may ſay, that if the love of women had ſuffered him to diſplay all his fine qualities [*A*] in their whole extant, he would have ſurpaſſed, or at leaſt equalled, the heroes that are moſt admired. If the firſt time that he debauched the daughter or wife of his neighbour, he had been puniſhed in the ſame manner as Peter Abelard was, he would have been capable of conquering all Europe [*B*], and might have

[*A*] *If the love of women had ſuffered him to diſplay all his fine qualities.*] It cannot be ſaid of him, as of ſome great commanders, who were much addicted to their pleaſures (1), that he renounced them, when the exigency of his affairs required it; for he loſt all the advantages of the victory of Coutras to run after a miſtreſs. Read what Mezerai ſays (2). 'The 'valour of the king of Navarre, ſignalized itſelf in 'that battle, more eminently, than his conduct in 'reaping the advantages of it; for ſo far was he from 'marching directly towards the foreign army, as the 'prince of Condé would have had him, promiſing, 'if he would give him troops, to go and poſſeſs him'ſelf of the paſſage of Saumur, that he ſuffered his 'victorious army to ſeparate, being contented to take 'an oath from his officers, that they would be, on 'the twenty ſixth of November, on the confines of 'Angoumois and Perigord, in order to march to'wards the Reiſters. He only kept 500 horſe, and 'taking the count de Soiſſons along with him, forced 'his way into Gaſcogne, whether the violent love 'he had for the beautiful counteſs de Guiche, drew 'him as it were by force (3).' One of the greateſt affairs that Henry IV had ever upon his hands, was doubtleſs the ſiege of Amiens; and yet he took the fair Gabrielle along with him thither, and lodged her cloſe by him; and would have kept her, during all that difficult expedition, had he had his own deſires: *but he was quickly obliged to remove that ſcandal from his ſoldiers eyes, not only becauſe of their murmurs, that reached his ears, but alſo by reaſon of the reproaches of the marſhal de Biron* (4).

What I have ſaid at the beginning of this remark, that there have been great commanders, who, tho' much addicted to their pleaſures, knew how to quit them when there was occaſion, is not unknown to thoſe who know the characters of Alcibiades and Sylla. See what Salluſt ſaith of the latter. 'Sulla . . . . . 'animo ingenti, cupidus voluptatum, ſed gloriæ cu'pidior, otio luxurioſo eſſe, tamen ab negotiis nun'quam voluptas remorata (5). —— *Sylla . . . . . had 'a great ſoul, he loved his pleaſures, but loved glory 'ſtill more, his leiſure hours were ſpent luxuriouſly, 'but his pleaſures never interrupted his affairs.*' See what is ſaid of Alcibiades. 'Quum tempus poſce'ret, laborioſus, (*Alcibiades*) patiens, liberalis, ſplendi'dus non minus in vita, quam victu: affabilis, blan'dus, temporibus callidiſſime inſerviens. Idem ſimul 'ac ſe remiſerat, nec cauſa ſuberat, quare animi la'borem perferret, luxurioſus, diſſolutus, libidinoſus, 'intemperans reperiebatur, ut omnes admirarentur in 'uno homine tantam ineſſe diſſimilitudinem, tamque 'diverſam naturam (6). —— *Upon occaſion he* (Alci'biades) *was laborious, patient, liberal, ſplendid both 'in his equipage and table: affable, courteous, and 'could, in the moſt artful manner, accommodate him'ſelf to all circumſtances. But when once he had un'bent his mind, and his affairs laid him under no 'obligation to fatigue, he was luxurious, diſſolute, leud, 'and intemperate; ſo that all men admired to ſee in 'the ſame perſon ſuch different manners, and contrary 'characters.*'

[*B*] *If he had been puniſhed in the ſame manner as Peter Abelard was, he would have been capable of conquering all Europe.*] On the contrary, you will ſay, he would have grown a ſluggard and a coward; for the ſame ſpirits that inclined him to the love of women, made him valiant, and we have ſeen few great captains who have not been laſcivious. I anſwer, that though it be certain, that many great generals have been of a very amorous complexion, yet it does not follow, that their courage and luſt flowed from the ſame principle in their conſtitution. Each of thoſe two qualities had it's cauſe, and all that can be ſaid is, that theſe two cauſes concurred in forming the conſtitutions of theſe men. But it is eaſy to prove, that there is no connexion between thoſe two qualities. How many cowards are there, more timorous than hares (7), that have a prodigious vigour in the acts of Venus? Was there ever a man more brave and undaunted than the marſhal de Gaſſion, who had a mortal hatred to women (8)? The count de Tilly, who lived chaſt all his life-time (9), was one of the greateſt commanders of the XVIIth century. Did not Mr de Turenne, though no debauchee, match thoſe thunder-bolts of war, who lived at the ſame time with him, and whoſe leudneſs made almoſt as much noiſe as their triumphs? And to give a ſtill ſtronger proof, do not we know, that the brave Sigiſmund Battori, prince of Tranſylvania, ſirnamed the Invincible (10), for his great exploits, *was as great a poltroon in the wars of Venus, as he was brave in thoſe of Mars*, and that *having confeſſed his impotence* (11), his marriage with Mary Chriſtina, daughter of Charles archduke of Grats, *was declared null*: Some eunuchs have been very brave generals of armies; for not to go ſo high as the famous Narſes, who lived under the empire of Juſtin II, in the VIth century, do not we know, that one of the moſt valiant generals of Solyman, was an eunuch (12). He was not fortunate, I confeſs, in the expedition of Hungary, in the year 1556, and he died with vexation, for not having maintained his reputation, nor anſwered the public expectation (13): but for all that, he had a great ſoul, and his mortal chagrin was a proof of it. See Thuanus, who tells a pleaſant humour of that eunuch, when a piece of ill news was brought him, it was the taking of Gran. A great matter indeed, anſwered he to the meſſenger, that is a ſmall thing; behold here my great loſs, ſhewing him the lower region of his belly. *Ejus rei cum trepidus nuncius ad eum veniſſet, ipſa vultus conſternatione magnum aliquod malum profeſſus, purpuratus non ſine circumſtantium riſu conſternationi nuntii illudens, & Strigonii, quod nullo negotio recuperari poſſet, amiſſionem elevans; his verbis eum excepiſſe dicitur. Quam tu mihi cladem ingentem, fatue, quod tantum incommodum narras? ea demum mihi clades deploranda contigit, cum hinc (genitalium ſedem oſtentans) ea membra adempta ſunt, quibus vir eram* (§α) (14). Let us conclude from all this, that if Henry IV had been treated as Abelard was, he would have loſt nothing, either of his courage, prudence, or wit. Origen, Photius, and Abelard, are a manifeſt proof, that the loſs of the maſculine organs doth not in the leaſt prejudice the natural talents of the ſoul.

[(§α) Taken from the *Legat. Turcicæ* of Busbekius, Letter III. pag. 196, of his Works, Edit. of 1633. REM. CRIT.]

[*C*] *He*

---

(110) Anſelme, Hiſtoire des Grans Officiers, pag. 375.

(111) *Theſe words are to be ſeen on the back of the title page,* Journal du Regne de Henry III. compoſé par M. S. A. G. A. P. D. P. *Now theſe initial letters are very well filled up with theſe words,* Monſieur Servin Avocat General au Parlement de Paris.

(112) Pelliſſon, Hiſt. de l'Academie Françoiſe, pag. m. 330.

(1) *See the end of this remark.*

(2) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. V, pag. 308. ad ann. 1587.

(3) *See the annotations upon the* Amours du Grand Alcandre, n. 3, *wherein the CIſt book of Thuanus's Hiſtory is quoted. See alſo the Remarks on the Catholic Confeſſion of Sancy, pag.* 552, *Edit.* 1693.

(4) Mezerai, ibid. Tom. VI, pag. 170, ad ann. 1595.

(5) Salluſt. in Bello Jugurth. pag. m. 362.

(6) Cornel. Nepos in Alcibiade.

(7) *This compariſon puts me in mind, that there is no creature more fearful, and more laſcivious, than a hare.*

(8) *See his Life, in the fourth Tome, pag.* 329, & ſeq.

(9) Veneris vinique expertem tota ætate ſe fuiſſe jactaverat. - - - *He boaſted, that during his whole life he had lived without wine or women.* Puffendorf, Rerum Suecicarum, lib. iv, pag. 64, col. 2. *See alſo* Blanc, Hiſt. de Baviere, Tom. IV, pag. 381.

(10) Diſcours Hiſtorique & Politique ſur les cauſes de la Guerre de Hongrie, Cologne, 1666, pag. 264.

(11) Id. pag. 266.

(12) Erat Halis eunuchus, ſed corporis defectum animo penſabat: de cætero ſtatura brevi, ſufflato corpore, colore buxeo, ſubtriſti vultu, torvis oculis, & inter latos & eminenteis humeros depreſſo capite, ac prominentibus ex ore duobus veluti aprugnis dentibus deformis. - - - *Haly was an eunuch, but made amends for the defect of his body by the greatneſs of his ſoul. He was of a low ſtature, corpulent, and of a ſallow complexion, had a melancholy countenance and ſtern look, his head ſtooping betwixt his high and broad ſhoulders, and two long teeth in the manner of tuſks ſticking out of his mouth.* Thuanus, lib. xvii, pag. 361.

(13) Fractus ac inglorius Budam ſe contulit, ubi dux, qui tantam de ſe initio exſpectationem excitaverat, dolore atque ignominia expeditionis inauſpicatæ inviſam vitam cum morte commutavit.

(14) Id. ibid.

have eclipſed the glory of the Alexanders and the Cæſars. In vain it would be objected to me, that ſuch a puniſhment would have taken away his courage [C]. It was his prodigious incontinence [D], that hindered him from raiſing himſelf to that pitch of of grandeur that he might have done; but notwithſtanding that powerful obſtacle, he has juſtly deſerved the ſirname which he bears (a). To convince us of this, we need only conſider the aſtoniſhing difficulties he ſurmounted, before he was ſettled on the throne; and the flouriſhing condition to which he reſtored his kingdom, which he had found in the moſt diſmal deſolation that can be imagined. He inherited that crown in

(a) *He is called Henry the Great. See, above, the citation* (47) *of the article* BARCLAY (JOHN).

[C] *It would be in vain to object to me, that ſuch a puniſhment would have taken away his courage.*] You will find, in the preceding remark, the commentary, or proof, that this may require. However, I will add, by way of Appendix, the following obſervations. Was not Hannibal one of the greateſt generals of antiquity, a chaſt man? ‘ Conſtat Annibalem .... pudicitiam ‘ tantam inter tot captivas habuiſſe, ut in Africa natum ‘ quivis negaret (15). —— *It is certain that Hannibal ‘ ... behaved with ſo much chaſtity towards his female ‘ captives, that no body would have thought him an African.*’ We do not find, that Scipio Africanus was of a very amorous conſtitution, and he gave a notable example of his chaſtity, during his expedition in Spain; for which he is extremely praiſed by hiſtorians (16). Druſus, the brother of the emperor Tiberius, and one of the greateſt commanders among the ancients, was extremely reſerved in reſpect to women (17). The bravery of the emperor Aurelian was incomparable, and yet attended with the greateſt chaſtity. We ſhould injure him, ſhould we make the leaſt compariſon betwixt his bravery, and that of the laſcivious Proculus, who ſet up for a tyrant; a letter of whom Flavius Vopiſcus has preſerved to us, which I ſhall only inſert in Latin. ‘ *Tacendum non eſt, quod & ipſe gloriatur in ‘ quadam ſua epiſtola, quam ipſam melius eſt ponere quam ‘ de ea plurimum dicere.* Proculus Metiano affini S. D. ‘ Centum ex Sarmatia virgines cepi. Ex his una ‘ nocte decem inivi: omnes tamen quod in me erat, ‘ mulieres intra dies xv. reddidi. *Gloriatur* (*ut vides*) ‘ *rem ineptam & ſatis libidinoſam; atque inter fortes ‘ ſe haberi credit ſi criminum denſitate coaleſcat. Hic ‘ tamen quum etiam poſt honores militares ſe improbe & ‘ libidinoſe, tamen fortiter ageret ... in imperium vocitatus eſt* (18).’ You ſee by this, that he was owned to be a good ſoldier, but allow me to ſay that his valour came not near to that of Aurelian. What ſhall we ſay of Alexander, whoſe courage was extraordinary? More praiſes have been beſtowed upon his chaſtity, than he deſerved; yet it muſt be confeſſed, that by his conſtitution he had more indifference than inclination for the fair ſex; and this is ſufficient to confute thoſe who imagine I know not what mechanical connexion betwixt luſt and valour. To the modern examples already alledged (19), I add one of a brave man, who lived in the XVIth century, and who gained the title of *the fearleſs and blameleſs knight.* It will be eaſily underſtood by this, that I mean Bayard. Love never was his maſter, but he ſhowed that he was maſter of it on ſome dangerous occaſions. See his life. What a catalogue might I not give, if I ſhould reckon up all that have reſembled Sardanapalus; men that were valiant in bed only, but cowards and poltroons every where elſe? Were Caligula, Nero, and Heliogabalus, great warriors? Did not they with the moſt infamous exceſſes, plunge themſelves into the leudeſt debaucheries? Was ever Domitian, who was the author of a new name (20) for theſe baſe exerciſes, wherein he ſignalized his ſtrength, reckoned a good ſoldier, or a good commander? Thoſe ſparks that were called formerly Mignons de Couchette, did ſometimes pretend to make a campaign, in order to avoid the contempt to which the ſuſpicion of cowardice expoſed them among the brave; but they acquitted themſelves ſo ill, that we may apply to them with a great deal of reaſon, what Jupiter anſwered Venus, when ſhe complained to him of the wound ſhe had received in aſſiſting her ſon Æneas in a battle. Do not you pretend to war, which is not your province; your buſineſs is love.

Οὔ τοι τέκνον ἐμὸν δέδοται πολεμήϊα ἔργα·
Ἀλλὰ σύγ᾽ ἱμερόεντα μετέρχεο ἔργα γάμοιο.

Non tibi filia mea commiſſa ſunt bellica opera;
Quin tu deſiderabilia obi munera nuptiarum (21).

Not theſe, Oh daughter, are thy proper cares,
Thee milder arts befit and ſofter wars,
Sweet ſmiles are thine, and kind endearing charms.
POPE.

Helen gives Paris the like advice, as I have obſerved, in another place, where I confute Mezerai (22). That hiſtorian fancies, that the ladies love brave men, becauſe they ſuppoſe them no leſs vigorous in the exerciſe of love, than in war. He does not judge rightly of their motives; glory or vanity are the great ſprings of their prepoſſeſſion in behalf of the brave. Monluc obſerves, that women would rather chuſe to be widows, than ſee their husbands return from the army in good health, but loaded with ſhame and diſhonour. It is plain, that luſt has no ſhare in that, and ſince this is a new proof againſt Mezerai, I ſhall here inſert Monluc's words. He ſpeaks to the governours of a place, and ſhews the prejudice they will do themſelves, if they do not defend it well. ‘ Not only ‘ your maſter, *continues he* (23), and princes and lords, ‘ will look upon you with an evil eye, but alſo women and children. Nay, to go farther, even your ‘ own wiſe, though ſhe pretends to love you, will ‘ hate you, and eſteem you leſs in her heart. For it ‘ is the nature of all women to hate mortally cowards ‘ and poltroons, though they be never ſo ſprucely ‘ dreſſed. And they love the bold and courageous, ‘ though they be never ſo ugly and deformed. They ‘ ſhare in your diſgrace; and though they are in your ‘ arms a-bed, pretending to be pleaſed with your return; they had rather you had been ſtrangled, or ‘ that a bullet had taken you off. For as we think, ‘ that the greateſt ſhame of a man is to have a whore ‘ to his wife; ſo the women think, that their greateſt ‘ ſhame is to have cowards for their husbands. See ‘ then how you will come off, Mr Governour, if ‘ you loſe your fort, ſince you will be curſed in your ‘ own bed for it.’

[D] *His prodigious incontinence.*] I may well call it ſo, after the ſtories d'Aubigné has publiſhed of him, eſpecially after theſe words of a very grave hiſtorian. ‘ If it was the buſineſs of hiſtory to make apologies, it might juſtify him from the greateſt part of ‘ theſe reproaches, but not however for his boundleſs ‘ paſſion for gaming .... much leſs could it excuſe ‘ him for his leudneſs with women, which was ſo ‘ public and univerſal, from his youth to his laſt days, ‘ that we can hardly give it the name of love and gallantry (24).’ In what follows Mr de Perefixe tells us ſomething that is very ſtrange. ‘ It were to be ‘ wiſhed, for the honour of his memory, that gaming ‘ had been his only vice. But his continual weakneſs ‘ on the ſcore of the fair ſex was another, much more ‘ blamable in a Chriſtian prince, in a man of his ‘ age, who was married, and whom GOD had ſo highly favoured, and who meditated ſo great enterprizes ‘ in his mind. Sometimes he had deſires that were ‘ tranſient, and which enſlaved him but for a night; ‘ but when he met with beauties that ſtruck him to ‘ the heart, he loved them even to extravagance, and ‘ in thoſe tranſports, he appeared to be nothing leſs ‘ than Henry the Great. We are told, that Hercules ‘ took a diſtaff and ſpun, to pleaſe his fair Omphale; ‘ Henry did ſomething meaner for his miſtreſſes. He ‘ dreſſed himſelf one day in the habit of a peaſant, and ‘ carried a burthen of ſtraw upon his ſhoulders, to get ‘ acceſs by that means to Madam Gabrielle; and it is ‘ ſaid the marchioneſs of Verneuil has ſeen him more ‘ than once at her feet, ſuffering her diſdains and inſults (25).’ It muſt have been a cruel mortification to the good Huguenots, to ſee their Chief lead ſo ſcandalous a life, even in Rochelle. He debauched there the daughter of a gentleman of the long robe, and had a ſon by her. *The church had often remonſtrated his ſin to him, which he confeſſed very ingenuouſly; but he could*

(15) Juſtin. lib. xxxii, ſub fin.

(16) Livius. lib. xxvi. ſub fin. Valer. Maximus, lib. iv, cap. iii, n. 1.

(17) *See, above, remark* [B] *in the article of the firſt* ANTONIA.

(18) Flavius Vopiſcus in Proculo, Tom. II, pag. m. 735.

(19) *In the foregoing remark.*

(20) Libidinis nimiæ aſſiduitatem concubitus velut exercitationis genus Clinopalen vocabat. *Sueton. in Domit. cap. xxii.*

(21) Homer. Iliad. lib. v, ver. 428.

(22) *Remark* [O], *citation* (47), *of the article of the third duke of* GUISE.

(23) Monluc, Comment. lib. iii, pag. m. 500, 501.

(24) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, Tom. VI, pag. 392.

(25) Perefixe, Hiſt. de Henri le Grand, pag. m. 461, 462, ad ann. 1609.

in a very remote degree of kindred [*E*]. We ſhould probably have known, and admired his merit more if he had lived five or ſix years longer than he did; for he was juſt upon the point of entring upon the execution of a prodigious deſign (*b*), when he was aſſaſſinated in his coach the fourteenth of May, 1610, by Ravaillac. Some hiſtorians ſay, that this was foretold him the day before [*F*]; but thoſe who have examined the matter to the bottom, have found it to be falſe. He was of ſo noble a diſpoſition that it is not at all probable that he ever adviſed the duke of Alençon to make away with Catherine de Medicis [*G*]; yet ſome memoirs affirm it. He had the uſual fate of great men,

(*b*) *See his Hiſtory ad ann.* 1610. *Written by Harduin de Perefixe.*

could not be perſuaded to make a public acknowledgment of it, till a little before the battle of Coutras (26). You will find the circumſtances of this, in the life of Mr du Pleſſis Mornai (27).

[*E*] *He inherited the crown in a very remote degree of kindred.*] 'It was doubtleſs an uncommon good fortune, that the crown of France devolved to him; there was never a more remote ſucceſſion in any hereditary ſtate than this: for there were betwixt ten and eleven degrees of diſtance betwixt Henry III and him, and when he was born, there were nine princes of the blood before him; namely, king Henry II, and his five ſons; Antony, king of Navarre his father, and his two ſons, who were elder brothers to our Henry. All theſe princes died to make way for him to the crown (28).'

[*F*] *Some hiſtorians ſay, that this was fore-told him the day before.*] We will begin this remark with the words of Peter Matthieu (29). 'Hereupon la Broſſe, a learned Phyſician and Mathematician, ſaid to the duke of Vendôme, by way of concluſion to a long converſation, that if the king could avoid an accident wherewith he was threatened, he would live thirty years longer. No body is willing to tell kings any thing that may diſpleaſe them: the duke of Vendôme thinking it more proper that la Broſſe ſhould be the meſſenger of his advice, beſought the king to hear him: the king aſked him what he would have? Upon that the duke of Vendôme was ſilent, his ſilence encreaſing the king's deſire to know it, he preſſed him, the other excuſed himſelf; at laſt, the king's command drew from him what la Broſſe had told him. You are a fool, ſays the king, you believe him? Sir, anſwered the duke of Vendôme, in theſe caſes, credulity is a fault, but not fear? the ſafety of your majeſty obliges every body, and me more than all the reſt, to make light of nothing: I moſt humbly beſeech you to be pleaſed to hear him. The king refuſed it, and forbad him to ſpeak of it: I cannot, at leaſt, ſays the duke, but tell the queen of it. The king replied to him twice, that if he mentioned it, he would never love him. And ſo la Broſſe was ſent away. I have this converſation word for word from the duke of Vendôme.' This is very poſitive; but here follows ſomething that is no leſs ſo, which yet entirely overthrows this narrative of Peter Matthieu. 'So true it is, *it is a philoſopher who ſpeaks* (30), that moſt hiſtorians are credulous and liars, and that thereby they always confirm people in the belief of prognoſtications, when they report theſe ſtories without confuting them, But without going farther, why ſhould not the ancients have done it, ſince we often ſee it practiſed in our own time? Has not one of our hiſtorians, ſpeaking of the death of our Henry the Great, ſaid, that being warned of it by a prince that is yet alive, (whom it is not neceſſary to name) the day before that unfortunate ſtroke was given, his majeſty ſlighting the information, anſwered him, that la Broſſe was an old fool of an aſtrologer, &c. I being deſirous to learn this from the mouth of that prince himſelf † above thirty years ago, in the preſence of a princeſs ‡ of great worth, he did me the honour to tell me, that it was falſe. And within theſe two days, only to be farther informed of it, and that I might publiſh nothing of that conſequence without being very ſure of it, I had the honour to ſpeak to him about it again in the preſence of ſeveral perſons of his family, and he confirmed the ſame thing to me, adding beſides, that the hiſtorian ‡ had confounded both the times and the things; and that la Broſſe had indeed told him, after that fatal accident, that he had foreſeen it ~~by~~ by his majeſty's horoſcope, (as aſtrologers always do when things are come to paſs) but that he had not given him notice of it the day before to acquaint his majeſty with it. This however is written by a French author, who lived at the ſame time; who will not believe him then in after times? Will any one think, that a man appointed and paid for writing hiſtory, durſt ſay a thing of this conſequence, and even cite a prince then living who could witneſs it, if it were not true? And yet it is as I ſay. If any one doubts of it, he may inform himſelf about it, and I am not ſorry that I have an occaſion here to mention it, as well to undeceive poſterity, as to ſhew, that there are a great many things of this nature written, which deſerve no ſort of credit.' Obſerve, that Mr Petit doth not relate this altogether ſo faithfully as he ſhould have done. He ſuppoſes that the hiſtorian makes the king give this anſwer, *La Broſſe is an old fool of an aſtrologer*; but the hiſtorian doth not ſay ſo; for according to him, it was to the duke of Vendôme that the king ſaid, *You are a fool.*

Let us produce a ſecond witneſs, with the confutation of what he ſays. 'The evening of the ſame coronation, la Broſſe, an excellent Phyſician and Mathematician, ſaid to the duke of Vendôme, that if the king could avoid a dangerous accident, which threatened him, near at hand, he would live thirty years longer, and deſired him to procure him an audience of his majeſty: But the king underſtanding what he deſigned to talk to him about, would neither ſee nor hear la Broſſe (31).' The confutation of this is contained in the words of mareſchal Baſſompierre (32). *It is falſe that la Broſſe deſired to ſpeak with the king; but if he had done it, the anſwer that he* (33) *has invented had been true, that he* (34) *would have ſcorned to ſpeak with him, for he looked upon him as a fool.* We find in a diſcourſe upon the death of Henry IV, printed at the end of the Memoirs of the duke of Nevers, that the duke of Vendôme told ſeveral perſons, that la Broſſe did not ſpeak to him about it.

[*G*] *It is not at all probable that he ever adviſed the duke of Alençon to make away with Catherine de Medicis.*] Mr le Laboureur relates, that this queen, 'ſeeing Charles IX near his end, was afraid leſt the duke of Alençon ſhould be adviſed to pretend to the regency, and even to the crown, to the prejudice of his brother the king of Poland. She contrived upon this a pretended conſpiracy, which might give her occaſion to ſecure his perſon, as alſo that of the king of Navarre: She kept them under a good guard in the wood of Vincennes, till the king's death, tho' without declaring them priſoners; in the mean time, ſhe ſpread abroad the report of that conſpiracy, for which ſhe cauſed the marſhals of Montmorenci and Coſſé to be arreſted, and, in order to remove all occaſions of doubting of it, ſhe ſacrificed to this ſtate-intrigue, two favourites of the duke la Molle and Coconnaz . . . the duke of Alençon himſelf betrayed his cauſe, and his domeſtics, in the fear he was in; and he who kept up beſt to the character of a king oppreſſed, but incapable of doing any thing below his dignity, was Henry IV, then king of Navarre. Not but that he feared he was undone, and it was with that deſign, as I have learnt from ſome memoirs, that he was accuſed of having adviſed Monſieur to pretend to be ſick, to oblige the queen to come and ſee him, and under pretence of having both ſomething to ſay to her in private, to cauſe her retinue to withdraw, and then to ſtrangle her. His reaſons for it were, their own ſafety, the opportunity of the king's death, who was ready to expire, the credit that time would give to their friends, and that the ſame policy which made her renounce the laws of nature, to deſtroy her own ſon, and her ſon-in-law, diſpenſed them, upon a ſtronger motive than that of reigning, from abhorring an action, which would preſerve to the ſtate two princes that were neceſſary

(26) Vie de du Pleſſis Mornai, pag. 108.

(27) Ibid.

(28) Perefixe, Hiſt. de Henri le Grand, pag. m. 514.

(29) Relation de la mort de Henry IV, pag. m. 24.

(30) *Peter Petit, ſurveyor of the fortifications,* Diſſertation ſur les Cometes, pag. 89.

† *The duke of Vendôme.*

‡ *Madam de Chevreuſe.*

‡ *Matthieu.*

(31) Du Pleix, Hiſt. de Henry IV, pag. 411.

(32) Remarques ſur Du-Pleix, pag. 172.

(33) *That is, Du-Pleix.*

(34) *That is, Henry IV.*

men, which was to be unfortunate in his family. The two wives whom he ſucceſſively married, the latter, in the former's lifetime, gave him a thouſand vexations [H]. He deſerved it, ſince he had ſo little regard to the ſacred laws of marriage. His ſecond wife was one of thoſe princeſſes againſt whom he had raiſed objections in examining, with Roni, what ſort of a wife was proper for him (c). His notions about marriage are very curious [I], and there are few converſations more ſolid and more pleaſant than that which he had upon that ſubject. It plainly appeared, that religion was only a falſe pretence of the League, and of the king of Spain; this, I ſay, plainly appeared, from the endeavours that were uſed to hinder the Pope from giving him abſolution.

(c) *See the remark* [I].

'neceſſary to it, by the death of a woman who diſturbed the peace, and cauſed the ruin of it. He had neither the courage to do it, nor the diſcretion to conceal it ſome time after, which was the reaſon of the mortal and implacable hatred of Catherine de Medicis, againſt the king of Navarre; and therefore ſhe did not ſcruple to have a hand in the conſpiracy againſt her own ſon Henry III, and to embroil the ſtate, when ſhe ſaw that he had no children, that ſhe might hinder Henry IV from ſucceeding him, and ſubſtitute, in his room, Henry duke of Lorrain her grand-ſon by her daughter (35). According to theſe memoirs, Henry IV deſigned to be one of the murtherers of the queen-mother.'

[H] *His two wives . . . gave him a thouſand vexations.*] There is no need of proving this with relation to Margaret de Valois. I will therefore only alledge the proof relating to Mary de Medicis. 'The high eſteem and affection the French had for him (36), prevented their being ſo much offended with his ſcandalous way of living; but the queen, his wife, was extreamly vexed at it, which occaſioned daily diſputes betwixt them, and made her diſdainful and ill humoured. The diſcontent and uneaſineſs of theſe domeſtic quarrels, no doubt retarded the execution of the great deſign he had formed for the good and perpetual repoſe of Chriſtendom, and afterwards for the deſtruction of the Ottoman power (37).'

[I] *His notions about marriage are very curious.*] I have a very long paſſage to quote, which yet I am confident will ſeem ſhort to curious readers; for it contains a kind of a criticiſm upon many princeſſes and a very ſolid reaſoning of Henry IV, about the choice of a wife. Here follows what he ſaid to Monſieur de Roni, his favourite (38). 'So that nothing more ſeems wanting to the accompliſhment of this deſign, but to ſee whether I can get another wife ſo well qualified, that I may not be expoſed to the greateſt misfortune of this life, which is (in my opinion) to have an ugly, ill-humoured, and quarrelſome wife, inſtead of that eaſe, repoſe, and ſatiſfaction, I ſhould propoſe to my ſelf in that condition: if a wife could be had according to one's wiſhes, that I might have no cauſe to repent of ſo hazardous a bargain, mine ſhould be endowed, amongſt other good qualities, which theſe ſeven principal ones; namely, beauty in her perſon, chaſtity in her life, complaiſance in her humour, ingenuity of mind, fruitfulneſs of body, eminence of birth, and great eſtate in poſſeſſion. But I believe, my friend, that this woman is dead, or rather ſhe is not yet born, nor ready to be born, and therefore, let us conſider a little, what maids or women, which we have heard of, would be fit for me, either within or without the kingdom. And foraſmuch as I have, in my opinion, thought of it more than you, I will tell you briefly, that I could content my ſelf with the Infanta of Spain, as old and ugly as ſhe is, provided I could marry with her the Low-Countries, tho' it ſhould be upon condition of reſtoring to you the county of Bethune; neither would I refuſe the princeſs Reibelle (39) of England, if, as they ſay, that the crown is juſtly her's, ſhe was only declared preſumptive heireſs of the kingdom: but I muſt not expect either the one or the other, for the king of Spain and the queen of England are very far from having ſuch a deſign. Sometimes I have heard mentioned ſome princeſſes of Germany, whoſe names I do not remember; but the women of that country would never agree with me; and I ſhould believe, if I had married one of them, that I muſt always have a barrel of wine by my bed-ſide; beſides, I have heard there was once a queen of France of that nation, who almoſt ruined the kingdom. So that all theſe conſiderations diſguſt me. Some have alſo ſpoke to me of one of the ſiſters of prince Maurice, but beſides that they are all Huguenots, and that ſuch a match might make me ſuſpected at Rome, and amongſt the zealous Catholics, that their mother was a nun, and ſomething elſe, which I will tell you another time, makes me averſe to it. The duke of Florence has a niece, who they ſay is pretty handſome; but he being of one of the leaſt families of Chriſtendom, that bears the name of a prince, it being but ſixty or eighty years ſince his predeceſſors were ranked only among the moſt illuſtrious citizens of Florence, and being of the ſame race with Catherine the queen-mother, who has been the cauſe of ſo much miſery to France, and ſtill more to me in particular, I am apprehenſive of ſuch a match, leaſt it ſhould prove as prejudicial to me, my friends, and my kingdom. Theſe are all the foreign women which I think I have heard of. As to thoſe within the kingdom, my niece of Guiſe is one of thoſe that would pleaſe me beſt, notwithſtanding the report that ſome malicious people have ſpread, that ſhe is a little wanton; for as to my own humour, beſides that I believe it to be falſe, I had rather have a wife given to gallantry, than one that ſhould prove ill-humoured; of which ſhe is not ſuſpected: On the contrary, ſhe is of a very ſweet and agreeable humour, and of a complaiſant converſation, and likewiſe of a good family, handſome, tall, and likely to have fine children ſoon. I fear only the too great paſſion ſhe expreſſes for her family, eſpecially for her brothers, which might poſſeſs her with deſires of raiſing them to my prejudice, and more ſtill to that of my children, if ever the regency of the ſtate ſhould fall into her hands. There are alſo two daughters of the houſe of Mayne, the eldeſt of which, as ſwarthy as ſhe is, would not diſpleaſe me, being modeſt and well educated; but they are too young. There are alſo two in the family of Aumalle, and three in that of Longueville, which are not contemptible for their perſons, but other reaſons hinder me from thinking of them. So much for princeſſes. You have beſides a daughter of the houſe of Luxemburg, one of the houſe Guimené, and my couſin Catherine of Rohan; but ſhe is a Huguenot, and the others do not pleaſe me; and then the daughter of my couſin the princeſs of Conty, of the houſe of Lucé, who is a very fine young lady, and well bred, and who would pleaſe me beſt of any, if ſhe was ſomewhat older. But tho' they ſhould all pleaſe me, as far as I can know them, who can aſſure me, that I ſhall meet with the three principal qualities which I deſire in a woman, and without which I would not marry; namely, that I ſhall have male children by them, that they ſhall be of a ſweet and complaiſant humour, and ſufficiently qualified to help me in ſedentary affairs, and to govern my kingdom and my children well, if I ſhould happen to die before they come to age, ſenſe, and judgment, to endeavour to imitate me: as this is like to happen, if I marry at ſo advanced age. But pray (anſwered you) may it pleaſe your majeſty, what do you mean by ſo many affirmatives and negatives, from which I can conclude only, that you are deſirous to be married, but that there are no women to be found upon earth that are fit for you? At this rate we ſhould implore the aſſiſtance of heaven to make young again the queen of England, and raiſe from the dead Margaret of Flanders, Mademoiſelle de Bourgogne, Jane la Loca, Anne of Bretagne, and Mary Stuart, all rich heireſſes, that you might take your choice of them. For according to the humour that you have expreſſed, ſpeaking of Clara Eugenia, you would like ſome of thoſe ladies who poſſeſſed ſo great eſtates: but laying aſide all theſe impoſſibilities and vain imaginations, let us conſider a little what is to be done, &c.

WHAT the king deſired in a wife.

SEVERAL women propoſed for the king.

RONI's anſwer to the king's diſcourſe.

(35) Le Laboureur, Additions aux Memoires de Caſtelnau, Tom. II, pag. 381.

(36) *That is, for Henry IV.*

(37) Perefixe, Hiſt. de Henri le Grand, pag. m. 463, ad ann. 1609.

(38) Memoires de Sulli, Tom. II, pag. 112, Edit. Holland, in 12mo.

(39) *I give this word as I find it in my edition.*

ſolution. I have related in another place (*d*) the pleaſantries of d'Aubigné, about the ſtrokes of a ſwitch, which the proxies of that prince received, when he was abſolved at Rome. I will ſay ſomething of it again, in this place [*K*].

Henry IV was born at Pau in Bern, the thirteenth of December, 1553 (*e*). Antony de Bourbon, his father, and Jane d'Albret, his mother, brought him to the court of France when he was five years old; *but they ſtayed there but a few months, and returned to Bern* (*f*). Antony came again to court after the death of Henry II. He was *declared lieutenant-general of the kingdom* after Francis the ſecond's death. He ordered the queen, his wife, and the prince, his ſon, to come to him. He died of a wound which he received at the ſiege of Roüen in the year 1562, and then his wife, whom he had uſed pretty harſhly [*L*], *returned to Bern, where ſhe openly profeſſed Calviniſm* (*g*). She left her ſon at the court of France, *under the conduct of a prudent tutor, named la Gaucherie.* She ſent for him to Pau in the year 1566, and put Florent Chreſtien *in the room of la Gaucherie deceaſed* (*h*). This new preceptor, a good Huguenot, brought up the prince in the Proteſtant religion: Jane d'Albret declared herſelf their protectreſs in the year 1569, and came with that intent *to Rochelle with her ſon, whom ſhe from that time devoted to the defence of this new religion. In that quality he was declared chief of the party, and his uncle the prince of Condé his lieutenant, with admiral Coligny* (*i*). He was in the army at the battle of *Moncontour, and was eager to be in the action, but he was not ſuffered, for fear of hazarding his perſon* (*k*). He followed the army from that time to the peace which was concluded the eleventh of Auguſt, 1570, and then he returned to Bern. His marriage with princeſs Margaret, ſiſter to Charles IX, was celebrated at Paris in Auguſt 1572. His mother arrived there ſome months before, to make preparations for the wedding, and died there as her ſon was on the road thither. He took upon him the title of king, when he received in Poictou the news of her death (*l*). All the world knows, that the maſſacre on St Bartholomew's day, was committed a few days after the wedding of this new king; and that this prince ſeeing himſelf reduced to chooſe to die, or to go to maſs, choſe the latter. The anſwers that ſome authors aſcribe to him, are only fancies of their own brain [*M*], and only teſtify their deſire of employing

(*d*) *In the article* BOTERO, *remark* [*C*].

(*e*) Perefixe, Hiſt. de Henri le Grand, pag. m. 15.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 20.

(*g*) Ibid. pag. 22.

(*h*) Ibid. pag 23.

(*i*) Ibid. pag. 24.

(*k*) Ibid. pag. 25.

(*l*) Ibid. pag 29.

[*K*] *I will again ſay ſomething of the ſtrokes of a ſwitch.*] I will make uſe of the words of a Walloon miniſter (40). *The pſalm* Miſerere *was ſung at the reconciliation of Henry the Great, where du Perron and d'Oſſat proſtrated all along on their faces, repreſenting the king of France, in the preſence of the Pope, and the Conſiſtory, received in the king's ſtead his penance decreed by the Holy See, which was to adjuſt to every verſe, a ſtroke of a ſwitch, over head, ſhoulders, and back, down to the feet, from the beginning of the Pſalm to the end. Du Perron in his letters, fol 172. ſhews the verbal proceſs of the abſolution of the king by Pope Clement VIII . . . . d'Oſſat, his companion, in the royal penance, ſhews how gentle it was.* In the inſtruction of the Inquiſition, there was this hyperbolical expreſſion (41), when the choriſters ſung *miſerere mei*, the Pope at every verſe, *verberabat & percutiebat humeros procuratorum cujuſlibet ipſorum virga, quam in manibus tenebat. —— Beat and ſmote the ſhoulders of the proxies, with a rod which he held in his hand.* It was a ceremony we no more felt, than we could have felt a fly creeping upon our cloaths.

[*L*] *Jane d'Albret whom her husband had uſed pretty harſhly.*] The lure made uſe of to bring him off from the new religion, was the promiſe of the kingdom of Sardinia. He was ſo ſimple as to believe theſe promiſes; and *he began by degrees to withdraw from the Proteſtants, and to vex the queen, all ſorts of ſnares being laid for him, by which a man given, as he was, to women, might be ſurpriſed; ſo by little and little, forgetting every thing elſe, he had nothing in his head but Sardinia, and women, amongſt which, a maid of honour to the queen began to have a great ſhare of his affection. Mean time, the queen of Navarre, as a moſt wiſe and virtuous princeſs, endeavoured to reclaim him, enduring all that was poſſible, and romonſtrating to him what he owed both to* GOD *and his people. But all was in vain, he was ſo bewitched. Which the queen ſeeing, ſhe had only recourſe to her prayers and tears, moving compaſſion in every one but the ſaid king her husband. The queen-mother, during theſe tranſactions, endeavoured to perſuade her to bear with the king her husband: To whom ſhe gave this final anſwer; that if the kingdom and her ſon were in her hands, ſhe would throw them both to the bottom of the ſea, that they might be no impediment to her, rather than ever go to maſs, which was the reaſon they troubled her no more upon that ſubject* (42),

[*M*] *The anſwers ſome authors aſcribe to him, are only fancies of their own brain.*] During the maſſacre, Charles IX ſent for the king of Navarre, and the prince of Condé, into his cloſet, and declared to them, if they did not renounce their Hereſy, they ſhould be treated as the admiral. *The king of Navarre extreamly aſtoniſhed at theſe words, pronounced with a menacing voice, and at the dreadful ſpectacle he had ſeen before his eyes, anſwered with great humility and trembling; that he begged of his majeſty to leave them their life and conſcience undiſturbed, and that in all other things they were ready to obey him* (43). Tho' I make uſe of theſe words of Mezerai, yet we may be aſſured it is the ſame thing as if I had uſed the very words of a Calviniſt hiſtorian; for d'Aubigné (44) relates the anſwer of the king of Navarre in the ſame manner: it runs thus in the *Inventaire* of John de Serres; 'The king of Navarre beſeeches his majeſty, to remember his promiſe, and the conſanguinity ſo lately contracted, and not to do him any violence on account of the religion, which he hath learned from his youth (45).' The author of the Hiſtory of the *Memorable Things*, ſays no more than that: nor is the author of the commentary *de Statu Religionis & Reipublicæ in regno Galliæ* more prolix, as to the ſenſe, tho' he uſes more words (46); and note, that he expreſly obſerves, that the anſwer was made with a trembling voice (47). Thus you ſee four Proteſtant writers, who agree with Mezerai; which ſhews, that his ſincerity cannot be queſtioned. Which being ſo, ought we not to laugh at the hiſtorian, who lengthens out the anſwer we are ſpeaking of for three or four pages? 'Our Henry, *ſays he* (48), made an anſwer, which ſhewed from that time what the heighth of his courage, the depth of his ſenſe, and the great ſweetneſs of his clemency, ſhould be. He beſeeched his majeſty to remember his word that he had given him, the nearneſs of their blood, and their new alliance, and not to offer any violence to the religion which he had ſucked in from his childhood, with his nurſe's milk. He ſaid, that it was a great misfortune that ſo great a king, who had in his ſoul the ſeeds of all great virtues, ſhould be ſo pernicioully counſelled to force his ſubjects by murders and maſſacres, to ſerve God, according to his own fancy. That there was nothing that could ſubdue a courageous people, and particularly the French, but the lenity of their prince, whom they reverence as a God. That this was the method Flaminius took to make the Romans maſters of all Greece: ſo that though he had the ſuperior force in the city of Thebes, yet he uſed as much perſuaſion to gain the people, as an orator would

(40) Jeremie de Pours, Divine Melodie du Pſalmiſte, pag. 686.

(41) *D'Oſſat's Letters, fol.* 172.

(42) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. des Egliſes, lib. iv, pag. 688, ad ann. 1561.

(43) Mezerai, Hiſt de France, Tom. III, pag. 257.

(44) D'Aubigné, Tom. II, livr. i, chap. iv, pag. m. 547.

(45) Invent. de l'Hiſt. de France, Tom. II, pag. m. 704.

(46) Lib. x, fol. m. 35.

(47) Quæ tamen humiliſſimo animo & conſternato ore ab illo dicebantur. *Ibid.*

(48) *Julian Peleus, advocate of the parliament of Paris,* Hiſtoire des Faits & de Vie de Henri le Grand, Tom. I. pag. 828.

ploying their reading. He was obliged againſt his will to ſtay ſome years at the court of France: He knew very well how to diſſemble his chagrin, and he often drove it away, by the help of ſome gallantry, which his own conſtitution, and the corruption of the ladies made very eaſy to him. The lady de Sauves, married to one of the ſecretaries of ſtate, was one of his chief miſtreſſes (*m*). But he was not ſo taken up with love, as altogether to neglect political intrigues. He had a hand in thoſe that were formed to *take away the government from the queen-mother, and to expel the Guiſes from court* (*n*). That queen *diſcovering theſe practices* (*o*), *cauſed him, and the duke of Alençon to be arreſted, ſet guards upon them, and ordered them to be examined, upon many beinous allegations* (*p*) [*N*]. Theſe two princes were ſet at liberty by Henry III, before whom Catherine de Medicis carried them as far as Pont Beauvoiſin (*q*). The king of Navarre at laſt made his eſcape in the year 1576, and retired to Alençon (*r*). *He ſided again with the Huguenots, and again profeſſed his firſt religion* (*s*). The Rochellers received him into their town, and *after he had ſtaid with them ſome months, he went to take poſſeſſion of his government of Guienne* (*t*). From that time to the year 1589, his life was a mixture of battles, nagotiations, and love-intrigues. His wife was a great impediment to him, and yet ſhe proved ſometimes uſeful to him [*O*]. There were frequent ruptures and pacifications betwixt him and the court of France; but at laſt Henry III confederated with him ſincerely, and in good earneſt, to reſiſt the League, which was more furious than ever ſince the death of the duke of Guiſe and of the cardinal, his brother. The reconciliation and confederacy of theſe two kings, was concluded in April 1589. Their interview was at Tours, the thirtieth of the ſame month, attended with great demonſtrations of mutual ſatisfaction. They joined their troops ſome time after, to lay ſiege to Paris. They beſieged it in perſon, and were upon the point of ſubduing that great city, and chaſtiſing it as it deſerved, when the king of France was killed by James Clement at the village of St Clou. The king of Navarre ſucceeded him the ſecond of Auguſt, 1589, but it was not without very great difficulties, and without renouncing the Proteſtant religion, that he forced the Leaguers to acknowledge his title. The city of Paris perſiſted in it's revolt till the twenty ſecond of March 1594. I mean the king did not make his entry into it till that day. He declared war againſt the Spaniards the following year, and had not much reaſon to be pleaſed with it. He loſt much more than he got by it, but by good fortune, unknown to all his predeceſſors, he made a treaty of peace, wherein he indemnified himſelf for his loſſes [*P*]. This treaty

‘ would have done from his roſtrum, and that he ought to know, that he commanded a people that could neither bear an entire liberty, nor a perfect ſlavery: and that the royal authority was not a ſovereignty over ſlaves, but a government of fellow-citizens. That he had often heard that the Romans had commanded all nations, and made themſelves lords of the world, to ſhow that they were governed by reaſon, and did not give themſelves up to revenge (49) . . . Your majeſty knows, that one example of the Roman humanity was of greater effect to ſubdue the Faliſci, who were foreigners, than all their military power. What might not therefore your majeſty's gentleneſs have done with reſpect to the Proteſtants your natural ſubjects? A great king, as you are, ſhould not do all that he can do; but imitate the ſun, who proceeds more gently, the higher he is raiſed (50) . . . They who have given you ſo ill advice, are more to blame than you; and deſerve an equal puniſhment with thoſe that poiſon the public fountains, cauſing as many to die as drink of them.’ I have omitted the greateſt part of what this compiler of common places has put in the king of Navarre's mouth; but I ſhall take nothing from the the reply which he falſely aſcribes to Charles IX. ‘ Theſe, ſaid the king, are the fine things you have learned of Chreſtien, your tutor. But I know a finer one than any of them, which is, that God has given the ſupream command to the prince, the ſprings of which it is not lawful for a ſubject to meddle with: the glory of obedience is only his. Go and do as I command you upon pain of death. And though I am not bound to give any account of my actions, yet I am willing to let you know, that every great example ſeems to have ſomething of injuſtice in it, which is compenſated by the public good (51).’ Note, that he ſuppoſes, the king ſent for the king of Navarre and the prince of Condé ſeparately; the other hiſtorians relate that Charles IX ſent for theſe two princes at the ſame time.

[*N*] *The queen-mother ordered him and the duke of Alençon to be examined on many beinous allegations.*] ‘ (52) The chancellor went about to examine the king of Navarre; but though he was threatened, and a priſoner, he would not do ſo much injury to his dignity, as to anſwer him. However, to ſatisfy the queen-mother, he made a long diſcourſe, addreſſing himſelf to her, in which he gave a deduction of many things concerning the preſent poſture of affairs; but he accuſed no body at all, as the duke of Alençon had weakly done (53).

[*O*] *His wife was a great impediment to him, and yet ſhe proved ſometimes uſeful.*] Catherine de Medicis had brought her to him in the year 1578 (54). He kept his little court then at Nerac (55). *Neither the husband nor the wife* were pleaſed with ſeeing one another. ‘ (56) Margaret, who was fond of the great ſplendor of the court of France, where ſhe ſwam, if we may ſo ſpeak, in a full current of intrigues, thought that living in Guienne was a baniſhment to her; and Henry knowing her humour, and her conduct, wiſhed her rather at a diſtance, than at home. Nevertheleſs, being ſenſible that it was an evil that could not be avoided, he reſolved to ſuffer her, and left her at perfect liberty . . . . (57) and accommodating himſelf to the times, and the neceſſity of his affairs, he endeavoured to draw ſome advantages from her intrigues and intereſt. He obtained a conſiderable one by her means, at the conference that he and the deputies of the Huguenots had at Nerac with the queen-mother. For whilſt ſhe hoped to enchant them by the charms of the handſome young ladies ſhe had with her, and by the eloquence of Pibrac; Margaret played the ſame artifices againſt her, gained the gentlemen of her mother's retinue, by the charms of her own women, and employed ſo dexterouſly her own, that ſhe captivated the ſoul and the heart of poor Pibrac; ſo that he was altogether acted by her ſpirit, and did every thing contrary to the queen-mother's intention, who not ſuſpecting that ſo wiſe a man could be capable of ſuch a folly, was deceived in many articles, and inſenſibly led to grant much more to the Huguenots, than ſhe had reſolved to do.’

[*P*] *By a good fortune, unknown to his predeceſſors, he made a treaty of peace, wherein he indemnified himſelf for his loſſes.*] Bodin (58) obſerves, that for 100 years the Spaniards had made no treaty with France, without having the better of it. He had reaſon for what he ſaid; Henry IV was the firſt king of France who gained

---

(*m*) Ibid. pag. 39

(*n*) Ibid. pag. 35.

(*o*) *In* 1574.

(*p*) Ibid. pag. 36.

(*q*) Ibid. pag. 37, *and* 38.

(*r*) Ibid. pag. 46.

(*s*) Ibid. pag. 47.

(*t*) Ibid. pag. 48.

(49) Id. ibid. pag. 831.

(50) Ibid. pag. 832.

(51) Id. ibid. pag. 833.

(52) Perefixe, Hiſt. de Henri le Grand, pag. m. 36, ad ann. 1574.

(53) *See, above, remark* [*G*].

(54) Perefixe, ibid. pag. 54.

(55) Ibid. pag. 57.

(56) Ibid.

(57) Ibid. pag. 58.

(58) Bodin, de la Republique, livr. v, chap. i, pag. m. 676.

treaty was concluded at Vervins, the ſecond of May 1598. From that time, till his death, the kingdom was free from civil and foreign wars, excepting the expedition in the year 1600. It was undertaken againſt the duke of Savoy, and laſted but a little while, and was followed by an advantageous treaty (u), as it had been attended with glorious actions. If the valour and great courage of this king had not ſhewn themſelves on a hundred occaſions, the wonderful generoſity he exerciſed towards his moſt mortal enemies, had been looked upon as a weakneſs, and an effect of fear; but ſince he could not be ſuſpected of cowardice, there is great reaſon to believe, that he treated them ſo out of a noble and generous clemency. And it is certain, that even the moſt refined policy required it of him, his enemies not being to be reconciled to him any other way: nay, even he found that way defective, for he gained but a part of the Leaguers: a great many prieſts obſtinately refuſed to pray for him [Q]. It is obſerved in Moreri's Dictionary, that *more than fifty Hiſtorians, and five hundred Panegyriſts, Poets,*

(u) *That in which Breſſe, &c. was exchanged for the marquiſate of Saluces.*

gained any thing by making peace with Spain. He recovered all the places he had loſt in Picardy; and alſo Blavet, which the Spaniards were maſters of. That peace did not eſcape the cenſure of the critics. Some blamed the king of Spain, and others, the king of France. I will cite Mr de Perefixe. 'Many among the French, who were not well acquainted with the miſerable condition, the king of Spain and his affairs were in, could not apprehend how that prince could purchaſe peace ſo dear, as to give up ſix or ſeven good places, amongſt others, Calais and Blavet, which might be called the keys of France. The Spaniards, on the contrary, who ſaw that their king was in a dying condition, his treaſury exhauſted, the Low-Countries tottering, Portugal, and his territories in Italy ready to revolt, the ſon that was to ſucceed him, a good prince indeed, but who loved a quiet life, were aſtoniſhed that the French, who had ſo bravely retaken Amiens, and re-united all their forces after the treaty of the duke of Mercœur, had not made an irruption into the Low-Countries, becauſe in all probability they would have conquered the whole country, or at leaſt part of it. The king anſwered, that if he had deſired peace, it was not becauſe he was tired out with the inconveniencies of war, but to afford Chriſtendom a breathing-time; that he knew very well, that in the preſent conjuncture of affairs, he might have reaped great advantages; but that the hand of GOD frequently overturns princes, in the height of their proſperity, and that a wiſe man ought never, out of an opinion of ſome favourable event, to be averſe to a good peace, nor truſt too much to the appearance of a preſent good fortune, which may be changed by a thouſand unforeſeen accidents; it often happening, that a man overthrown, and wounded, has killed him, who would make him beg his life of him (59).' This anſwer of Henry IV does not agree with what is reported by others, that he told the duke of Epernon, who was preſent at the ſigning of the treaty of peace, *With this ſtroke of a pen, I have done more exploits than I could have done in a long time with the beſt ſwords of my kingdom* (60). Indeed, there is great probability, that he promiſed himſelf no advantage by the continuation of the war, and I am ſure, that thoſe who were moſt diſintereſſed, and capable of judging of things of this ſort, were equally convinced of the weakneſs which Philip II ſhewed on that occaſion, and of the prudence of Henry IV in accepting ſuch a peace. The Spaniards were aſhamed of their king's weakneſs. The prince, his ſon, paſſionately deſired that ſo ſucceſsful a war might be continued; and he put out of favour Don Chriſtopher de Mora, who had repreſented in a council the moſt forcible arguments for a peace (61). The king of Spain was unmoveable, deſiring peace *at any rate; he found no condition in the treaty of Vervins, capable of diſſuading him from approving it, though his council judged the reſtitution of the towns ſo fortunately taken, and ſo hard to be re-taken, ſhameful and prejudicial. He urged that it might be ſworn and executed* (62). It is very probable, he would have had very different ſentiments, had he been in the vigour of his age. But how can it be helped? It is one of the faults of old age, to make people timorous.

Multa ſenem circumveniunt incommoda; vel quod
Quærit, & inventis miſer abſtinet, ac timet uti;
Vel quod res omnes TIMIDE GELIDEQUE miniſtrat (63).

An old man's character is hit with eaſe,
For he is pettiſh, and all one diſeaſe.
Still covetous, and ſtill he gripes for more,
And yet he fears to uſe his preſent ſtore;
Slow, long in hope, ſtill eager to live on,
And fond of no man's humour but his own.

CREECH.

I have ſaid elſewhere, that republics have an advantage which kingdoms want: the ſovereign in a common-wealth is never too young, nor ever too old. He is not ſubject either to the infirmities of childhood, or thoſe of old age. Kingdoms have not that good fortune; they experience one while the diſorders of a minority, ſometimes the heat of boiling blood, and at other times the ſlowneſs and heavineſs of a declining age. A king is forced to complain more than once, that the number of his years take away the activity and reſolution which he formerly enjoyed, and which a young prince, his enemy, poſſeſſes.

- - - Non laudis amor, nec gloria ceſſit
Pulſa metu: ſed enim gelidus tardante ſenectâ
Sanguis hebet, frigentque effœtæ in corpore vires.
Si mihi, quæ quondam fuerat, quâque improbus iſte
Exultat fidens, ſi nunc foret illa juventa (64).

- - - - my ſoul is ſtill the ſame,
Unmov'd with fear, and mov'd with martial fame:
But my chill blood is curdled in my veins,
And ſcarce the ſhadow of a man remains.
Oh could I turn to that fair prime again.
That prime of which this boaſter is ſo vain:
The brave who this decrepid age defies,
Should feel my force without the promis'd prize.

DRYDEN.

For the reſt, we muſt not wonder that the critics found fault with the peace of Vervins, and that ſome blamed France, others Spain, and a third ſort Spain and France together. It is the fate of thoſe great negotiations; it was the fate of the treaty of the peace at Ryſwic in the year 1697. Many people blamed the Allies for not having demanded better conditions; others blamed France for having given up ſo great an extent of country. The French repined at it, and the Pariſians refuſed to make bon-fires, till they were forced to it by repeated menaces. They would not have had the nation return to the condition of paſſed ages, in which it might be juſtly ſaid, they knew to make war better than peace, and underſtood as well the art of reſtoring as of taking. They wiſhed the popular diſcourſes of the Flemings had proved falſe. They knew that abundance of ignorant people had ſaid that there was no reaſon to be alarmed at the loſs of ſome towns, but rather to rejoice at it, ſince they would be recovered again fortified, according to Vauban's method. Scholars expreſſed this in another manner: we loſe towns built with brick, they ſhall be reſtored built with marble (65).

[Q] *Abundance of prieſts obſtinately reſolved not to pray for him.*] The king's attorney-general in the parliament of Toulouſe having notice, that a great number of prieſts in ſaying maſs, omitted the prayer for the king (66), and that it was ſuppreſſed in many printed Miſſals (67), complained of it in parliament. It was there ordered, that all prieſts ſhould be obliged

(59) Perefixe, ubi ſupra, pag. m. 262, 263. *Note, that Peter Matthieu,* Hiſt. de la Paix, livr. i, Narrat. 3, pag. 69, *tells us, that Henry IV ſaid part of thoſe things to the Spaniſh embaſſadors, who came to be preſent at his oath.*

(60) *I think this is to be found in the life of the duke of Epernon, written by Girard.*

(61) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, Narrat. 1, pag. 13.

(62) Idem. Narrat. iii, pag. 68.

(63) Horat. de Arte Poët. ver. 169.

(64) Virgil. Æneid. lib. v, ver. 394.

(65) *It is an alluſion to a thought of the emperor Auguſtus, concerning the ſtate into which he had put the city of Rome.*

(66) In Miſſæ canone paſſim à Sacerdotibus per cunctas diœceſes celebrantibus orationem pro Rege omitti. *Thuan. lib. cxxxvi, pag.* 123.

(67) *Printed at Paris, at Bourdeaux, and at Lyons.*

Poets, or Orators, have mentioned this great monarch with commendation. It is certain, on the other hand, that a great many authors have ſpitefully ſtained his glory, and have made it their buſineſs to extenuate his good actions, and to ſet his faults in the ſtrongeſt light. The duke of Sulli complains of them, and confutes their obloquies, and, among other things, maintains, that it is falſe, that this prince granted every thing to the importunities of his miſtreſſes [*R*]. Nevertheleſs, I believe, that if he had not had faithful

obliged to obſerve the ancient cuſtom of uſing that prayer, in celebrating divine ſervice, and the uſe of thoſe miſſals was forbidden where that prayer was omitted, and all Printers and Bookſellers were commanded to add immediately the leaf that was wanting, and, in caſe of refuſal, threatened them with corporal puniſhment, and the loſs of their copies. That decree was made the ſeventh of June, 1606 (68). If twelve years after the king had abjured Huguenotiſm, and had given a good many tokens of his zeal for Popery, and many teſtimonies of his kindneſs to the Leaguers, there were ſtill ſo many eccleſiaſtics, that mortally hated him, what could he have expected from a contrary conduct? the fury of the bigots and the obſtinate, had been infinitely more terrible, if he had neglected the outward profeſſion of religion, and acted like a prince full of reſentment. One of his hiſtorians (69) gives us, as an Inſtance *of admirable policy*, what I am going to tranſcribe: *that very night* (70) *he played at cards with the ducheſs of Montpenſier, who was of the houſe of Guiſe, and the ſtrongeſt leaguer that was in the party* (71). Undoubtedly this diſpleaſed his ancient ſervants. He would have been leſs forward to have paid ſuch an honour to a Huguenot lady; this is going beyond the parable of the goſpel. Did they perhaps ſay, that ducheſs hath not yet laboured in your vine-yard, and ſhe hath done all that was poſſible to ruin it; and yet ſhe is better paid than we, who *have born all the burden and heat of the day* (72). In the parable it was thought enough to equal the recompence of thoſe who had laboured but an hour, and had done no prejudices before, with that of thoſe who had laboured all the day. There were doubtleſs a great many murmurs of this ſort, which could not have been ſatisfied by this anſwer of the maſter of the family: *is your eye evil, becauſe I am good* (73). This would have been but chafing the wound; Henry IV would rather have ſaid for his vindication, that the neceſſity of the times required ſuch a conduct (74). *Res dura & regni novitas me talia cogunt Moliri* (75).

Mr du Pleſſis Mornaï, in a letter which he writ to Morlas in the year 1594, during the time that they who had followed the League, went off from it upon advantageous terms, uſes theſe remarkable words:
‘ We do not envy your killing the fatted calf for the
‘ prodigal ſon; provided you ſay with a ſincere heart
‘ to the obedient ſon, *you know, my ſon, that all that*
‘ *I have is thine*, provided you do not ſacrifice the
‘ obedient ſon to give a better entertainment to the
‘ prodigal one. In ſhort, I am glad of all that is
‘ done, if it be of ſome advantage. But I am afraid
‘ of ſuch bargains, by which things are given away
‘ and nothing is got for them but words; words I
‘ ſay, ſpoken by men, who hitherto never kept their
‘ word (76).’

[*R*] *Mr de Sulli complains of them, and ..... maintains that it is falſe ..... that he granted every thing to the importunity of his miſtreſſes.*] He ſpeaks of ſome hiſtoriographers, who had diſtributed their praiſes and cenſures unjuſtly; for they found no blot in thoſe that hired them, and hardly any thing good in Henry the Great, who gave them nothing. *And* (*ſays he*) (77) *foraſmuch as they cannot deny him ſome praiſes, amongſt an infinite number that are every where publickly beſtowed upon him by the conſent of all nations, they maliciouſly forget the moſt neceſſary to be known, diſguiſe others, and extenuating them all as much as poſſible, they have made uſe of a malice of another ſort, full of impoſture, which is to aſcribe to him, impudently and falſly, deſires, projects, deſigns, enterprizes, and reſolutions about affairs of ſtate, the moſt abſurd, fooliſh, impertinent, and ridiculous that can be imagined. And, on this occaſion, they give themſelves airs, and talk as if they had been the king's greateſt confidents, and had been admitted into all his moſt ſecret thoughts and deſigns, or kept intelligence with one of his moſt familiar ſervants, both for peace and war, who told them all. Then proceeding to ſpeak of his private converſation, domeſtic life, and conduct in it, and, above all, of his recreations, diverſions, ſports, pleaſures, paſtimes, and gaities, tho' they were for the moſt part ordinary, common, and familiar to all men, nay, even to women, and always moſt general, univerſal, tolerated, lawful, and permitted to all kings, potentates, princes, and great lords, there being few to be found among the moſt wiſe, virtuous, debonaire, pious, and holy, who were not delighted with them, and which their people and ſubjects have not gladly ſuffered, when for ſuch pleaſures and paſtimes there has been no injuſtice, rape, murder, violence, extortion, or pillage committed. Yet when they come to diſcourſe of the gaities and mirth of this ſweet and debonaire prince; they ſo exaggerate and miſrepreſent them, with ſo many lyes and fallacious circumſtances, and miſchievous and pernicious conſequences, aſcribing to him ſo many vicious, ſhameful, infamous, nay execrable and ſcandalous paſſions, that to hear them ſpeak, with ſo much boldneſs, impudence, and raſhneſs, one would think, that they were ſearchers of the hearts and thoughts of men ..... or that they had been the king's confeſſors or great penitentiaries ..... Nay, they have been ſo bold, as to place in the number of his miſtreſſes, a lady, whoſe qualities, eminence, virtue, and prudence, would have cautioned him, even though he had thought on her, not to take her for ſuch a one; and conſequently thoſe impudent writers deſerve to be ſeverely puniſhed for having talked at that rate. They ſay likewiſe, that the women had got ſuch dominion over him, becauſe vice was grown natural and habitual to him, by a long uſe, and great familiarity with wicked people, and that he was become ſo deſperately fond of ſome of theſe beauties, that he had no other will but theirs, and that this weakneſs was the cauſe that all his moſt important affairs were managed by their mediation, and that they were refuſed nothing they could deſire. They ſo frequently add ſo many other fooliſh and trifling things, that all theſe impoſtures being too long to be confuted in this preſent diſcourſe, (which is otherways deſigned) we will refer thoſe who are willing to ſee their calumnies expoſed, to what ſhall be ſaid of them in ſeveral places of theſe memoirs, from which it will appear by what means, and for what reaſons, the king never intended to marry a lady of pleaſure; that women diſpoſed of no affairs, and that he had ſervants, who by his own command knew how to tell them their faults, even in his preſence, and to refuſe them ſuch things as they judged unjuſt, or prejudicial to the ſtate, the affairs and revenues of the king, or to his people; and they were obliged to bear it.* I will confirm this by ſome words taken from a letter of Henry IV, in which we ſhall ſee the calumnies which were thrown upon him. ‘ Some blame me for being too fond of build-
‘ ings and coſtly edifices. Others find fault with
‘ my hunting, with my dogs, and hawks; ſome cen-
‘ ſure me for cards, dice, and other ſorts of games;
‘ others for loving the ladies; others for feaſts, ban-
‘ quets, and dainties: others find fault with me for
‘ loving of comedies, balls, dances, and running at the
‘ ring, where (ſay they to reproach me) I am ſtill
‘ ſeen with my grey beard, as jocund and vain for
‘ having made a handſome courſe, entered twice or
‘ thrice (as they merrily expreſs it) and carried off the
‘ ring of a fine lady, as I could have been in my
‘ youth, nay, as the vaineſt man in my court. In all
‘ which diſcourſes, I will not deny but there may be
‘ ſomething true. But I ſay, at the ſame time, that
‘ whilſt I exceed not bounds, this ought rather to be
‘ ſaid in my commendation than as a fault; and I
‘ ought ſurely to be excuſed for uſing ſuch diverſions,
‘ as bring no damage or inconvenience to my people,
‘ by way of retribution, for the frequent bitterneſs
‘ I have taſted, and for thoſe many diſquietudes, vexa-
‘ tions, and dangers, which I have run through from
‘ my childhood to fifty years of age ..... The ſcrip-
‘ ture does not abſolutely command us to be free
‘ from ſin and failings. Foraſmuch as ſuch infir-

---

(68) *Taken from* Thuanus, lib. cxxxvi, pag. 1123, 1124.

(69) Perefixe, ubi ſupra, pag. 225.

(70) That is on the day on which he made his entry into Paris.

(71) See, above, the remark [*D*] of the article of HENRY III.

(72) Matthew, xx, 12.

(73) Ibid. ver. 15.

(74) Compare with this the remark [*AA*] of the article CHARLES V.

(75) Virgil. Ænied. lib. i, ver. 567.

(76) Memoirs of Du Pleſſis Mornai, Tom. II, pag. 398, 399.

(77) See Sulli's Memoirs, in the preliminary Epiſtle of the third Tome, fol. m. e ii.

ful ſervants to diſappoint the rapaciouſneſs of thoſe harpies, and whoſe oppoſition he approved of, they had been more deſpotic over him. The inſtances wherein he had the power to diſengage himſelf from the ſnares that were laid for him, by fine ladies [*S*], were not common, yet ſome there were. Thoſe ſervants whoſe fidelity he had experienced, might give him their advices, without diſguſting him; and it has never been ſaid, that Villeroy fell into diſgrace, for having ſaid a thing, that was likely enough to diſpleaſe him [*T*]. It cannot be denied but that prince had a vaſt generoſity, which baniſhed from his conduct abundance of artifices, which are but too common among thoſe that govern. We ſhall ſee, upon this head, the judgment [*U*] he made of an artifice of one of the kings of France.

‘ mities are the inſeparable attendants, of the impetuouſneſs and eagerneſs of humane nature; but only not to be enſlaved by them, and not to ſuffer them to get an empire over our wills. Which is what I have ſtudied to do, not being able to do better. And you can witneſs in abundance of things, relating to my miſtreſſes, (which have been the paſſions the world believes I am moſt ſubject to) whether I have not often maintained your opinions. againſt their fancies, even ſo far as to tell them, when they pretended to make a noiſe, that I had rather loſe ten ſuch miſtreſſes as they, than one ſuch ſervant as you, who was neceſſary to me in honourable and uſeful affairs (78).’

[*S*] *There have been inſtances wherein he had the power to diſengage himſelf from the ſnares which were laid for him by fine ladies.*] Catherine de Medicis asking him at the conference of Saint Brix (79), *What he would have? he anſwered, looking on the young ladies of her retinue; there is nothing there, Madam, that I am for, meaning, that he deſigned no longer to be caught by ſuch ſort of lures.* He was not ſo prudent on other occaſions: for ſome time after the Paris maſſacre (80), ‘ he ſuffered himſelf to be captivated by the charms of ſome young ladies of the court, whom it is ſaid that queen made uſe of on purpoſe to amuſe the princes and lords, and to diſcover all their thoughts (81).’ Behold an abominable queen! every body knows what name is given to ſuch a trade. Good GOD! what a ſchool for young ladies of quality, whom they call maids of honour? obſerve that if this queen had deſired to keep two or three hundred, ſhe would have been ſupplied with them: ſo great was the corruption of that time; for it was well known what uſe ſhe made of theſe maids of honour.

[*T*] *Villeroy ſaid a thing that was likely enough to diſpleaſe him.*] There is none ſo ignorant, as not to know, that it is a very rude advice, and that toucheth to the quick, to tell a man he knows not how to keep his rank, and that he forgets the dignity of his character. And yet this was done by Villeroy to king Henry the Great. Naudé praiſes him for it. *One of the beſt advices*, ſays he (82), *that ever Monſieur de Villeroy gave to Henry the Great, who had lived as a ſoldier during the wars, which happened at his coming to the crown, was, that a prince who is regardleſs of the reverence due to his majeſty, permits it to be ſlighted and affronted. That the kings, his predeceſſors, in the greateſt confuſions, had always acted as kings, and that it was time that he ſhould ſpeak, write, and command, as a king.*

[*U*] *We ſhall ſee the judgment he made of an artifice of one of the kings of France.*] He was ‘ a great obſerver of things, which concerned the preſervation of the reputation of princes, in which he choſe rather to recede from his right and power, than give the leaſt occaſion to doubt his ſincerity, always blaming faithleſs and tricking princes, ſo far as not to ſpare his own predeceſſors, when the converſation fell upon any of their actions, wherein they failed of integrity in their promiſes and public faith, as he did one day, when the great affairs of king Philip de Valois, and his great courage, little ſeconded by his fortune, were the ſubject of diſcourſe. *He was great*, ſaid the king, *but he had ſubtilties in his words, more becoming the wheedlers of little children than ſuch a king, which I do not at all approve. He had made a treaty with the emperor Lewis of Bavaria, and by it engaged not to make war with the empire; contrary to which, notwithſtanding, he raiſed armies by ſea and land, which he threw into the Low-Countries, under the conduct of the duke of Normandy, his eldeſt ſon, who was defeated by ſea at Sluys, and having beſieged Thin, the king, his father, was preſent at that ſiege as a ſoldier, fighting under his ſon, being nevertheleſs, one of his counſellors, thinking by that captious equivocation to eſcape the blame of breaking the treaty he had made as king of France, as if it was not the ſame thing to execute any enterprize, ones ſelf, or by another* (83). It is not long ſince a doctor, with whom I was walking, told me, that Henry IV, having heard a ſtory of a fallacy of the king of Spain, cried out *it muſt be confeſſed, that kings are great knaves*: I asked him immediately, whether he had found that in any book; he anſwered me, it was one of the fine ſayings of Henry the Great (§α), in a collection that has been publiſhed of them, at the end of his hiſtory, compoſed by the biſhop of Rhodez (84), preceptor to Lewis XIV. I doubt it much, ſaid I, for I have read that work of Mr Perefixe from one end to the other, and there remains in my mind, no idea of what you tell me; and yet theſe are words ſo like to make an impreſſion, that they are not eaſily forgot. I afterwards found it true, that it was not in the book of the biſhop of Rhodez, and I wrote ſo to the doctor. He ſent me word, that after reflecting more maturely, he believed that exclamation of Henry IV was related in one of the Engliſh letters of Howel. I bring this here, only by way of advertiſement, that we ought not to truſt to *hear-ſays*, and that facts change very much in paſſing from one writer to another. What a vaſt difference is there betwixt the words of le Grain and thoſe of Howel!

[(§α) We have a collection of them printed, but in it are wanting two repartees, which this prince ſaid while only fifteen years of age, and which have been preſerved to us by his illuſtrious mother, Jane d'Albret queen of Navarre. Catherine de Medicis the queen mother, in concert with the cardinal of Lorrain, had ſent the Sieur de la Motte-Fenelon, to the queen of Navarre, to diſſuade her from joining her forces with thoſe, which the Reformed, were raiſing under the command of the prince of Condé, in the year 1568, at the beginning of the third civil-war. One day la Motte Fenelon addreſſed himſelf particularly to the prince of Navarre, and ſeemed to appear ſurprized, that he, who was ſo young, ſhould intereſt himſelf in a quarrel, which properly concerned only his uncle, the prince of Condé and the Huguenots, who were engaged in a war againſt the king. I do ſo, anſwered the prince, becauſe it being evident, that under pretence of rebellion, with which they falſly charge the prince, my uncle, and the Huguenots, our enemies intend no leſs than the entire diſtruction of the royal branch of Bourbon, we have a mind to dye altogether, to ſave the expences of mourning, which otherways we ſhould be obliged to wear for one after another.

Upon another occaſion, the ſame gentleman, addreſſing his diſcourſe to the ſame prince of Navarre, deplored the miſeries with which the flames of that war were about to devour the whole kingdom, as he expreſſed himſelf. Very well, anſwered the prince, theſe flames may be quenched by one bucket of water. How ſo, replyed la Motte-Fenelon? by making the cardinal of Lorrain, the real, and principal incendiary of France, drink it till he burſt, ſaid the prince. The queen of Navarre relates this in a long and elegant manifeſto, to be found pag. 234, and 235, of a Collection printed in 12mo. in 1570 intituled *L'Hiſtoire de noſtre temps &c.* REM. CRIT.]

(78) Sulli's Memoirs, Tom. III, pag. 137, 138.

(79) A caſtle near Coignac.

(80) Perefixe, ubi ſupra, pag. 80. ad ann. 1586.

(81) Id. ibid. pag 33.

(82) Naudé, Coups d'Etat, chap. i, pag. m. 22.

(83) Baptiſte le Grain, Decad. du Roy Henri le Grand, livr. viii, pag. m. 781.

(84) Hardouin de Perefixe.

HERACLEOTES (Dionysius), ſo called becauſe he was of Heraclea (*a*), a city of Pontus, ſtudied under ſeveral maſters, and at laſt he attached himſelf to the founder of the Stoics (*b*). He learnt of him to ſay, that pain is no evil; that nothing but vice deſerves that name, as nothing but virtue deſerves the name of good, and that all other things are indifferent. He was ſteady in that doctrine, as long as he was in good health; but happening to feel ſome violent pains, he altered his opinion [*A*], and renounced the ſect of the Stoics; and, which is worſe, he embraced that of the Cyrenaïcs, who placed the *Summum Bonum* in pleaſure. He reſorted, without ſhame, publickly to the ſtews, and was willing, that the pleaſures he indulged himſelf in ſhould be known to all the world (*c*). There are ſome that ſay, that he was a debauchee from his youth [*B*], and that remembring as he was going by a brothel-houſe, that he had left it the day before, without paying what was due to the women of pleaſure, he put

[*A*] *Happening to feel ſome violent pains, he altered his opinion.*] This change acquired him the title of ματαθέμενος (1), which we may tranſlate *deſerter*. Some ſay, that ſore eyes made him change his opinion; others attribute it to the pains of the gravel. Cicero relates both theſe traditions (2). ‘Nobis ‘Heracleotes ille Dionyſius flagitioſe deſciviſſe videtur ‘à Stoicis propter oculorum dolorem. Quis verò hoc ‘didiciſſet à Zenone, non dolere quum doleret? Illud ‘audierat nec tamen didiceret malum illud non eſſe ‘quia turpe non eſſet, & eſſet ferendum viro: Hic ſi ‘peripateticus fuiſſet, permanſiſſet, credo in ſententia, quoniam dolorem dicunt malum eſſe, de aſperitate autem ejus fortiter ferenda præcipiunt eadem ‘quæ Stoici (3) —— *This Dionyſius Heracleotes appears to have deſerted the Stoics infamouſly, on account of a pain in his eyes. For to whom did ever Zeno teach that what is painful is not painful? He had heard, but without underſtanding it, that pain is not an evil, becauſe it is not ſhameful, and that a man ought to ſuffer it. If he had been a Peripatetic, I am of opinion, that he would have continued ſo, for they maintain that pain is an evil, but they teach, as to the Stoics do, that a man ought to ſuffer it with courage.*’ I have ſet down more words than I needed to prove what I had ſaid, and yet I do not think my labour loſt; for, by the way, I diſcover to my reader, that the controverſies of the Stoics and Peripatetics, upon the nature of pain, was but a diſpute of words. They both agreed, that it ought to be born courageouſly: but the former denied that it ought to be called an evil, and the latter maintained it ought. A matter of conſequence indeed to make ſuch a ſtir about. We diſpute at this day, both in divinity and philoſophy, about things wherein the miſunderſtanding is no leſs viſible. Here is a paſſage of Cicero, which I will ſet down entire, that we may have a full view of the way of reaſoning of our Heracleotes. He preſumed much upon the ſtrength of philoſophy; for he judged, that it being inferior to the force of pain, pain muſt needs be an evil. ‘Homo ſanè levis Heracleotes Dionyſius, cum à Zenone fortis eſſe didiciſſet, à dolore ‘deductus eſt. Nam cum ex renibus laboraret, ipſo ‘in ejulatu clamitabat, falſa eſſe illa, quæ antea de ‘dolore ipſe ſenſiſſet. Quem cum Cleanthes condiſcipulus rogaret quænam ratio eum de ſententia deduxiſſet, reſpondit, Quia cum tantum operæ Philoſophiæ dediſſem, dolorem tamen ferre non poſſem ‘ſatis eſſet argumenti malum eſſe dolorem. Plurimos autem annos in Philoſophia conſumpſi, nec ‘ferre poſſum: malum eſt igitur dolor. Tum Cleanthem, cum pede terram percuſſiſſet, verſum ex Epigonis ferunt dixiſſe:

Audiſne hæc Amphiaraë, ſub terram abdite?

‘Zenonem ſignificabat, à quo illum degenerare dolebat (4). —— *Dionyſius Heracleotes, being a man of no conſtancy, after he had been taught hardineſs by Zeno, fell from it, being overcome by pain. For being afflicted with the gravel, in the anguiſh of his pain, he cryed out, that his former opinion concerning pain was falſe. And, when his condiſciple Cleanthes asked him, why he had changed his opinion, he anſwered, ſince I have ſtudied Philoſophy ſo long, yet am not able to ſuffer pain, that is a ſufficient reaſon to believe that pain is an evil. Cleanthes upon this, after ſtamping with his foot on the ground, as the ſtory goes, repeated this verſe out of the Epigonia,*

Audiſne hæc Amphiaraë ſub terram abdite?

Amphiaraus, now thou art entomb'd in earth,
Doſt thou hear this?

‘*Meaning Zeno, from whom he lamented that Dionyſius ‘had degenerated.*’

[*B*] *There are ſome who ſay that he was a debauchee from his youth.*] We have juſt now ſeen, that he philoſophized many years upon the auſtere maxims of the Stoics; he himſelf affirms it, if we believe Cicero. What muſt we think then of the ſtory we find in Athenæus? Shall we ſay that this author diverted himſelf with collecting all the ſcandalous ſtories, true or falſe, that he found in the moſt ſatirical writers? I leave the deciſion to my readers. I only inſert the Greek of Athenæus, with Dalecampius's verſion, which ſhould be rectifyed by Caſaubon's notes. Ἦν δὲ ὁ Διονύσιος ἔτι ἐκ νέου, ὥς φησι Νικίας ὁ Νικαεὺς ἐν ταῖς διαδοχαῖς πρὸς τὰ Ἀφροδίσια ἐκμανὴς, καὶ ϖρὸς τὰς δημοσίας εἰσῄει ϖαιδίσκας ἀδιαφόρως. καί ϖοτε πορευόμενος μετὰ τινῶν γνωρίμων, ὡς ἐγένετο κατὰ τὸ ϖαιδισκεῖον εἰς ὃ τῇ ϖροτεραία ϖαρεληλυθὼς ὤφειλε χαλκοῦς, ἔχων τότε κατὰ τύχην, ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ϖάντον ὁρώντων ἀϖεδίδου. Fuit autem Dionyſius ille, quod ait Niceas Nicæenſis libro de Succeſſionibus, jam ab adoleſcentia, tam immani furioſaque libidine percitus, ut ſine diſcrimine cum plebeiis ancillis ac pediſſequis coiret, & aliquando cum familiaribus inambulans, ubi ad ancillarum ædes venit, quas pridie ingreſſus aliquot obolos quos debebat non ſolverat, caſu tum forte in loculis habens, diſtenta manu coram omnibus numeravit (5). —— *Niceas Nicenſis, in his book of Succeſſions, ſays, that this Dionyſius was from his youth ſo abandoned to his pleaſures, that he lay promiſcuouſly with all the wenches he could come at. And that one day walking with ſome of his friends, and paſſing by the houſe of ſome wenches, with whom he had lain the day before, and to whom he owed ſome pence, he having then ſome in his pocket, held out his hand, and publickly paid his debt.* They who well remember the ſeventh book of Athenæus, will be eaſily determined on Cicero's ſide, and believe, that Dionyſius did not deſert the Stoics, till he was grown grey amongſt them; for Athenæus gives him the name of old man, at the time of this deſertion, and cites Timon the jeſter, who ſaid, that this wiſe man had begun to devote himſelf to pleaſures, when the ſeaſon of them was over. But let us give the original, it is in the ſixth chapter of the ſeventh book of Athenæus, pag. 281. Περὶ δὲ Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἡρακλεώτου τι δεῖ καὶ λέγειν; ὃς ἀντικρυς ἀποδὺς τὸν τῆς ἀρετῆς χιτῶνα ἄνθινα μετημφιάσατο, καὶ Μεταθέμενος καλούμενος ἔχαιρε, καί τοι γεραιὸς ἀποστὰς τῶν τῆς στοᾶς λόγων, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἐπίκουρον μεταπηδήσας· ϖερὶ οὗ οὐκ ἀχαρίτως ὁ Τίμων ἔφη,

Ἡνίκ᾽ ἐχρῆν δύνειν, νῦν ἄρχεται ἡδύνεσθαι.
Ὥρη ἐρᾷν, ὥρη δὲ γαμεῖν, ὥρη δὲ ϖεπαῦσθαι.

Quid autem de Heracleote Dionyſio attinet dicere? Aperte quidem & palàm virtutis exuta veſte, cùm indumentum mutaſſe & alienum ſumpſiſſe criminarentur, gaudebat, quamvis jam natu grandis à Stoicorum ſchola defeciſſet, & tranſiviſſet ad Epicurum. De illo non invenuſte Timon ſcripſit:

Ille

(*a*) Diog. Laërt. lib. vii, n. 166.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Idem, n. 167.

(1) That word ſignifies properly *immutatus*, and not *tranſpoſitor*, as Athenæus's tranſlator renders it, *lib. x, pag.* 437. *See Voſſius*, de Hiſt. Græc. pag. 466. *Caſaubon*, in Athenæum, pag. 731, *had already obſerved that fault.*

(2) Compare citation (3) with citation (4).

(3) Cicero, lib. v. de finib. cap. xxxi. *Laërtius*, lib. vii. n. 166, *ſpeaks only of his ſore eyes.*

(4) Cicero Tuſc. II, cap. xxv.

(5) Athen. lib. lib. x, pag. 437.

put his hand in his pocket, and paid his debts regularly in the face of the world. There was a perplexing objection made to him [*C*] upon his admitting with all the Dogmatiſts, a rule for diſtinguiſhing of truth and falſhood. He compoſed ſeveral philoſophical works, and alſo ſome poems (*d*). He brought Heraclides into a ſnare by one of his poems [*D*]. He lived to the age of eighty years, after which, chooſing not to live any longer, he put an end to his life by refuſing all nouriſhment (*e*). His laſcivious deſires accompanied him to an age, wherein nature could not ſatisfy them [*E*]. Mr Moreri is groſsly miſtaken [*F*].

Ille voluptati ſe tradit jam moriturus.

Tempus amandi, tempus habendæ conjugis eſt quod
Rebus ab his tandem moneat deſiſtere tempus.

What ſhall we ſay of Dionyſius Heracleotes? Who, having openly thrown off the robe of virtue, laughed at the title of Apoſtate, that was given him on that account, though he had in his old age deſerted from the Stoics to the Epicurean ſect. Timon pleaſantly wrote concerning him: Heracleotes devotes the dregs of life to Venus. There is a ſeaſon for love, a ſeaſon for marriage, and a time when we ſhould attempt neither.

I add, that Lucian obſerves, that Dionyſius was a a very ſober man, when he quitted the Stoics (6). I dare not affirm, with Mr Menage (7), that he had been in Aſia in Alexander's retinue, and had danced to the ſound of flutes at this conqueror's nuptials. Athenæus indeed ſays this of one Dionyſius Heracleotes but how many people of the ſame name doth he mention, without any mark of diſtinction?

[*C*] *A perplexing objection was made to him.*] Antiochus was the man that made this objection; he had embraced a ſect, which admitted no ſcience, that is, no propoſition certainly true, and afterwards he forſook that party, when he had for a long time maintained incomprehenſibility, and written ſubtilly for that cauſe, 'Scripſit de his rebus acutiſſime, & idem 'hoc acrius accuſavit in ſenectute quàm antea de'fenſitaverat. Quamvis igitur fuerit acutus, ut fuit 'tamen inconſtantia elevatur autoritas. Quis, in'quam, etiam iſte dies illuxerit, quæro, qui illi oſten'derit eam quam multos annos eſſe negaviſſet veri '& falſi notam (8)? —— *He wrote very acutely on* '*theſe ſubjects, and in his old age, impugned his for*'*mer doctrine with more vehemency than he had be*'*fore defended it. Therefore tho' he was a very a*'*cute writer, as certainly he was, yet his authority* '*was leſſened by his inconſtancy. For I would ask him* '*on what happy day it was that he luckily found,* '*that criterion of truth and falſhood, which he had* '*ſo long denied.*' Now whilſt he was oppoſing certainty, he cruelly teazed our Dionyſius; you believed a long time, ſaid he, that there was no other good but virtue; afterwards you maintained that virtue was a vain name, and that the ſupream good conſiſts in pleaſure. You ought therefore to believe, that falſhood preſents itſelf to our minds, and ſtamps itſelf there in the ſame character, to truth, and conſequently, that the characteriſtic or mark of true and and falſe, which you truſt to in affirming or denying, is fallacious and deluſive. All the force of this objection lay in this, that Dionyſius had ſucceſſively maintained two contradictory propoſitions. Antiochus felt the force of his own objection, when he changed his opinion; for he was beaten with the ſame weapons, that he had employed againſt Dionyſius. Here follow Cicero's words (9): 'Quoque ſolebat uti 'argumento tum, cùm ei placebat, nihil poſſe perci'pi, cùm quæreret, Dionyſius ille Heracleotes, utrum 'comprehendiſſet certa illa nota qua aſſentiri dicitis 'oportere, illudne, quod multos annos tenuiſſet, Ze'nonique magiſtro credidiſſet, honeſtum quod eſſet, id 'bonum ſolum eſſe; an quod poſteà defenſitaviſſet, 'honeſti inane nomen eſſe, voluptatem eſſe ſummum 'bonum: qui ex illius commutata ſententia docere 'vellet, nihil ita ſignari in animis noſtris à vero 'poſſe, quod non eodem modo poſſit à falſo, is cura'vit, quod argumentum ex Dionyſio ipſe ſumpſiſſet, 'ex eo cæteri ſumerent. ———— *He uſed the follow*'*ing argument, while he was of opinion that we* '*could not arrive at certainty of truth. Which of* '*theſe two opinions, ſaid he, did Dionyſius Heracleotes* '*diſcover by that criterion, to which you ſay we ought* '*to ſubmit, whether the firſt, which he long main*'*tained, and which he had learned from his maſter* '*Zeno, that nothing is good but what is virtuous;* '*or that which he defended afterwards, that virtue* '*is an empty ſound, and that pleaſure is the chief* '*good: deſigning to ſhow, from Dionyſius's change of* '*opinion, that truth makes no other impreſſion on the* '*mind, but what it may receive from falſhood. He* '*took care that thoſe who came after him, ſhould draw* '*the ſame argument, from his inconſtancy, which he* '*had drawn from that of Dionyſius.*' This objection may perplex thoſe modern Proteſtants, who maintain that the truths of the goſpel enter not into the mind by the way of evidence, but by ſenſe. What will they ſay, if we ſhew them Chriſtians who change their religion, and, like our Dionyſius, for a long time violently eſpouſe the ſame opinions, which afterwards they reject with an equal zeal? Doth not the ſenſe of falſhood, might one ask, imprint itſelf on the ſoul, with all the ſame characters as the ſenſe of truth?

A PYRRHONIAN objection.

[*D*] *He brought Heraclides into a ſnare by one of his poems.*] Having written a poem, called Παρθενοπαῖον, *Parthenopæum*, he publiſhed it, and aſcribed it to Sophocles. Heraclides honeſtly took this work for a production of Sophocles, and cited it as ſuch in one of his books. Then Dionyſius diſcovered the trick to him, and Heraclides would not believe him; he maintained, that it was Sophocles's work; and even when Dionyſius ſent him his manuſcript, he perſiſted in his opinion, and pretended, that chance might cauſe two poets to jump (10). So diſagreeable it is to an author to acknowledge himſelf caught in that manner. Scaliger, being deceived the ſame way by Muretus, was not ſo obſtinate, but he was very much vexed at it.

[*E*] *His laſcivious deſires accompanied him to an age wherein nature could not ſatisfy them.*] Upon a great feſtival, which he celebrated as agreeably as he could, he ſent for a courteſan, that nothing might be wanting to the pleaſures of the day; but age had ſo ſubdued him, that his attempts were vain. He confeſſed his infirmity, making uſe of the words (11) which Homer puts in the mouth of one Penelope's galants, who not being able to bend Ulyſſes's bow, cryed out, let another take it, I am not able to do it (12). Dionyſius in like manner declared, that ſince his ſtrength failed him, another ſhould make uſe of the Courteſan. *Φησὶ τὸν Διονύσιον τοῖς οἰκέταις συνεορτάζοντα, ἐν τῇ τῶν Χόων ἑορτῇ, καὶ μὴ δυνάμενον διά γῆρας χρῆσθαι ἣ παρειλήφεσαν ἑταίρᾳ, ὑποστρέψαντα εἰπεῖν πρὸς τοὺς συνδειπνοῦντας, ΟΥ δύναμαι τανύσαι, λαβέτο δὲ καὶ ἄλλος. Tradit Dionyſium cum domeſticis, diebus feſtis congiorum, ferias illas agentem, cum ob ſenectutem meretrice quam adduxerant uti non poſſet, ad convivas facie verſa, dixiſſe. Arrigere nequeo, ſumat alius* (13) Antigonus Caryſtius related this in the life of our Dionyſius Heracleotes.

[*F*] *Mr Moreri is groſsly miſtaken.*] I. He ſays, *that Dionyſius of Heraclea . . . . . . having quitted the ſchool of Zeno, followed the Cynics.* He ſhould have ſaid Cyrenaïcs, whoſe ſect was extreamly different from that of the Cynics. We may judge of it, from the oppoſite characters, which were found in Ariſtippus and Diogenes. There is not at the bottom any great difference betwixt Diogenes Laërtius, who makes our Dionyſius go over to the camp of the Cyrenaïcs, and Athenæus, who makes him go over to the ſect of Epicurus; for tho' Epicurus gave a more virtuous explication of the word Pleaſure, he agreed with the Cyreniacs, that the laſt end of man, the ſupreme good, the happineſs of man, was pleaſure. II. Theſe words, *he did not ſcruple . . to do publickly, what might give him pleaſure,* are a conſequence of his firſt error, and a new error. If Dionyſius had embraced Cyniciſm, he would not have been aſhamed to have lain with a woman in the middle of the ſtreets; but as he only went over to the ſchool of Ariſtippus, who was a pleaſant debauchee, and a polite libertine, who knew the world

---

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) Id. ibid.

(6) Ἄνδρα τότε σώφρονα. Virum tunc modeſtum. *Lucian. in his Accuſato, pag.* 325, *Tom. II.*

(7) In Laërt. lib. vii, pag. 334.

(8) Cicero, Academic. Quæſtion. lib. ii, cap. xxii.

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Diog. Laërt. lib. v, n. 92, 93.

(11) He made ſome alteration in thoſe words, by way of parody. See Caſaubon upon Athenæus, pag. 733.

(12) Odyſſ. lib. xxi, pag. m. 647.

(13) Athen. lib. x, pag. 437, ex Antigono Caryſtio.

admirably well, and that the Cyrenaïcs, who give nature all it desired, had not however adopted the impudence of the Cynics, it is wrong to pretend, that he had no more reſpect than Diogenes for the eyes of his neighbours. I confeſs he was willing to be ſeen to enter into the public ſtews, and to have it known that he had do with proſtitutes (14), but every body knows, that this doth not ſignify that he knew women publickly, and in the ſight of every body, as was the practice of the Cynics. III. Our Philoſopher's deſerting from the Stoics, could not be more confuſedly repreſented than Moreri has done it. *Dionyſius*, ſaith he, *being exceſſively tormented with a pain in his eyes, would never ſay that pain was indifferent.* Is this a true deſcription of the change of this Philoſopher? Is not one tempted to fancy here a man that is put upon the rack, to make him ſay, that pain is indifferent, and who obſtinately perſiſts in denying it? See in the paſſages of Cicero, above quoted (15), the genuine ſtate of this adventure. IV. He ſhould not have taken from Dionyſius ten years of his life; it was at the age of eighty, and not of ſeventy, *that he ſuffered himſelf to die with hunger.*

(15) Citat. (3) and (4).

---

(14) Εἰς τε τὰ χαμαιτυπεῖα ὑπεισῄει καὶ τἄλλα ἀπαρακαλύπτως ἡδυπάθει. Luſtra ingrediebatur, cæteriſque voluptatibus aperte operam dabat. *Laërtius, lib. vii, n.* 167. The common tranſlation imports too much, and it is likely Moreri was deceived by it. *Palam luſtra ingrediebatur cæteraque ſub omnium gerebat oculis quæ ad voluptatem pertinerent.*

HERACLIUS, Patriarch of Jeruſalem, in the XIIth century, was the maker of his own fortune. He was born at Auvergne, without fortune or friends, and yet he was promoted to the archbiſhopric of Cæſarea, and afterwards to the patriarchate of Jeruſalem. His good mein and addreſs brought him into the ſtricteſt intimacy with the king's mother; ſo that the oppoſitions of the archbiſhop of Tyre, proved vain, though he grounded them upon prophecies [*A*]. In vain he proteſted againſt the election of Heraclius, in vain he appealed to the Pope, and even went to Rome, in order to get it declared void: he had not time to put an end to that affair. Heraclius cauſed him to be poiſoned [*B*], and afterwards going to Rome, got his election confirmed by the Pope. He ſucceeded the Patriarch Almeric, who died in the year 1180. He led a very ſcandalous life with a merchant's wife of Napoli in Syria, whom he brought to Jeruſalem after the death of her huſband (*a*). You will ſee, below, ſome circumſtances of it [*C*]. We muſt not diſtinguiſh him from the Patriarch Heraclius, mentioned in the Hiſtory of the Cruſades; and who expreſſed ſo much paſſion againſt Henry II king of England [*D*], when he found that that prince excuſed himſelf from going in perſon to the

(*a*) See Hiſtoire de la Conquête du Roiaume de de Jeruſalem par Saladin, *printed at Paris, in* 1679.

[*A*] *Though he grounded them upon prophecies.*] He ſaid, that the prophecies foretold, that as the croſs was conquered by one Eraclius, it ſhould be loſt under another (1). I believe he would have ſpoke more agreeably to hiſtory, if he had ſaid, that as the Infidels had taken the croſs under one Heraclius, they ſhould retake it under another Heraclius. I know the emperor or Heraclius recovered, by a treaty of peace, the croſs which the Perſians had carried off; but can this be called a conquering of the croſs?

(1) Hiſtoire de la Conquête de Jeruſalem par Saladin. *See the remark* [*C*].

[*B*] *The archbiſhop of Tyre had not time to put an end to that affair. Heraclius cauſed him to be poiſoned.*] I have found this in a preface, that Bongarſius has placed before the *Geſta Dei per Francos.* He tells us, that William archbiſhop of Tyre, the ſame that has written the hiſtory of this times, remonſtrated in vain to the canons of the Holy Sepulchre, againſt their nomination of Heraclius to the Patriarchate of Jeruſalem. He alledged to them the abovementioned prophecy; and that they might not think that he aſpired to the vacant dignity, he conjured them neither to nominate Heraclius nor himſelf. Neverthelеſs, they were the two that were nominated. The king, according to the promiſes he had made to his mother, made choice of Heraclius, who immediately publiſhed his mandate, requiring obedience from the archbiſhops and biſhops, depending on the Patriarchate of Jeruſalem. None but the archbiſhop of Tyre refuſed to appear. He appealed to the Pope, and undertook to ſhew that Heraclius was not worthy of the Patriarchate. He immediately ſet out for Rome, and was very well received there, and put things on ſuch a foot, that the depoſition of Heraclius was looked upon as unavoidable; but the new Patriarch prevented the blow, by corrupting a Phyſician, who poiſoned William. He afterwards made a voyage to Rome, and obtained all that he deſired from the Pope. Bongarſius found this only in French authors.

[*C*] *You will ſee, below, ſome circumſtances of it.*] The hiſtory of the Conqueſt of Jeruſalem, which I have cited, was publiſhed at Paris in the year 1679. The publiſher had taken it from an old manuſcript which Mr Cabart de Villermont had given him. Theſe words are to be ſeen in it: *The Patriarch kept her* (2) *openly, as if ſhe had been his wife, only ſhe did not live with him, and when the Patriarch went to the church, ſhe was as magnificently dreſſed, as if ſhe had been an empreſs or a queen; and when any body who did not know her, asked who that lady was; thoſe that knew her, anſwered, that ſhe was the Patriarcheſs, the Patriarch's wife. Her name was Paſque de Riveri, and ſhe had many children by the Patriarch. There goes a ſtory, that this Patriarch being in council about important affairs, a madman having thruſt into the room, ran to him and told him, my Lord Patriarch, get a good reward ready for me; for I bring you a piece of good news, your wife, Paſque de Riveri, is happily delivered of a fine girl.*

(2) That is, the widow of the merchant of Napoli in Syria.

Bongarſius relates in Latin, the ſame hiſtory, and more at large (3); for he ſays that the French author who reports it, obſerves, that that conduct of the Patriarch ſerved as a model for others, and that the prieſts, the clerks, and the monks, were ſo addicted to leudneſs and adultery, that there was ſcarce a chaſt woman in Jeruſalem, and that JESUS CHRIST ſeeing theſe impurities in a city, where he had ſhed his blood for the redemption of his people, would no more ſuffer them, than thoſe of Sodom and Gomorrah; wherefore, he again ſo well purged it of that abominable filth, that of all thoſe who lived there in the time of Heraclius, there were only two perſons, who eſcaped captivity, when that city was taken by Saladin. The ſame Bongarſius quotes Marinus Sanutus, and Paulus Æmilius, the firſt whereof ſays that the people called Heraclius's concubine Patriarcheſs (4); and the other aſſures us, that this Patriarch and his clergy led a diſorderly life: *Sacordotes fuiſſe flagitiis ſceleribuſque obrutos: atque adeo ipſum Patriarcham neque caſte neque integre vitam egiſſe* (5).

(3) Bongarſ. præfat. Geſtorum Dei per Francos.

(4) Cui (*Almerico*) ſucceſſit Heraclius tam pernicioſi exempli ut procedentem ornatiſſimam mulierem quam publicè tenebat, vulgus Patriarchiſſam vocaret. *Marinus Sanutus, Part. IV, lib. iii, cap. xxiv, apud Bongarſ. ibid.*

(5) Paulus Æmilius de rebus geſtis Francor. lib. v, ſub fin. apud eund. ibid.

[*B*] *It was he who expreſſed ſo much paſſion againſt Henry II king of England.*] 'That prince, to expiate 'the crime he had committed by giving occaſion to 'the aſſaſſins of St Thomas archbiſhop of Canterbury, 'to murder him in his own church, had accepted a 'penance from the Pope, by which he was obliged to 'bring in perſon in three years time a conſiderable 'ſuccour to the Holy-Land. More than ten were lapſed after that term was expired, and yet he had not 'put himſelf in a capacity to accompliſh his promiſe '(6).' This made Heraclius hope for a good ſucceſs in his negotiation. He made a *very pathetical* diſcourſe to this monarch *after he had preſented to him the keys of Jeruſalem, and of the holy ſepulchre* (7). He was made to hope that he ſhould be ſoon ſatisfied, but the king broke his word with him. Henry conſulted his clergy, *to know whether in the preſent poſture of affairs, he was obliged to make good his promiſe, and to accompliſh that part of the penance which the Pope had laid on him, and to which he had ſolemnly obliged himſelf* (8). The Patriarch Heraclius was preſent at the aſſembly where this caſe of conſcience was examined. *All the biſhops and abbots . . . . concluded unanimouſly . . . . . that*

(6) Maimbourg, Hiſt. des Croiſades, Tom. II, livr. iv, pag. 57. Dutch Edit.

(7) Ibid pag. 58, ad ann. 1185.

(8) Ibid. pag. 59.

the ſuccour of Jeruſalem. He was the chief of the embaſſy, which the princes of the Holy-Land ſent into the Weſt to demand aſſiſtance, and *had undertaken in Paleſtine to bring back with him, either the king of England, or one of the three princes his ſons* (b).

. . . . that not only the king was not at preſent obliged to make a voyage into Paleſtine, but that he would do much better for the ſalvation of his ſoul to remain in his own dominions; becauſe the promiſe he had made in accepting of the penance, from which he might and ought to have been diſpenſed with, could not prejudice that which is abſolutely indiſpenſable, and which he made at his coronation, to govern his ſubjects well, and to defend them from the inſults of domeſtic and foreign enemies; which he could not do in his abſence in the condition affairs were in. They all unanimouſly added, as alſo did the lords, that as to one of the king's ſons, who was demanded in his ſtead, the aſſembly could determine nothing thereupon, ſince they were abſent, and the reſolution they were to take, depended ſolely upon them (9). The Patriarch, *who was a man of a violent temper, was ſo provoked* at that reſolution, *that he had like to have ſpoiled all by loſing altogether the reſpect which he owed to the king, and treating him in a manner which cannot at all be excuſed, whatever attempt may be made to cover it with the name and falſe appearance of zeal* (10). He anſwered the king, *who offered 50 thouſand marks of ſilver for that war* (11). ‘That they had no occaſion for his money but for him; that they had more gold and ſilver than they deſired, and that they did not come ſo far but to find out a man, who had need of money, to make an advantageous war againſt the Infidels, and not to look for money which wanted a man ſkilled in the art of uſing it well in that war. For the reſt, *added he, ſpeaking in a very inſolent manner,* you have reigned hitherto with great glory; but know, that God, whoſe cauſe you have forſaken, will immediately forſake you. To be ſatisfied of it, you need only compare the benefits you have received from him with the enormous crimes with which you have repaid him by a moſt horrid ingratitude. You have violated the faith, which you owe to the king of France, your ſovereign, and now you alledge the war, which you fear he will declare againſt you as a pretence for your refuſal. You have cauſed the holy archbiſhop of Canterbury to be barbarouſly maſſacred, and you refuſe at preſent to go to the defence of the Holy-Land, after having ſolemnly engaged in it upon the holy ſacrament. *And when he ſaw the king changing colour, reddened through indignation and anger,* do not believe, *continued he thruſting out his neck,* that I am afraid of the effects of that fury, which the truth I ſpeak, and you cannot bear, kindles in your ſoul. Behold my head here: treat me as you have done St Thomas: I ſhall be as ſatisfied to die by your hands in England, as by thoſe of the Saracens in Syria: and indeed you are little better than a Saracen (12).’ The king bore all he ſaid patiently, and continued to treat the Patriarch very civilly, even to the conducting him in his own ſhip to Roüen, from whence *he carried him to the frontiers, to the end he might be witneſs of the conference he had there for three days with king Philip, on the ſubject of the holy war* (13). Heraclius went away *without obtaining his deſires, and even without the aſſiſtance that was offered him, which his paſſion made him fooliſhly ſlight againſt all the rules of prudence and good ſenſe, and to the great prejudice of the affairs of his maſter: ſo much it is requiſite that kings ſhould not abandon their intereſts to the diſcretion of thoſe who have hardly any, and who frequently by the violent paſſions that govern them are deprived of the little that they have.*

HERALDUS (Desiderius) in French Herault, advocate in the parliament of Paris, has given good proofs of his learning, in ſeveral books that he has publiſhed [*A*]. He diſguiſed himſelf under the name of *David Leidbreſſerus*, to write a political diſſertation upon the independence of kings (*a*), ſome time after the death of Henry IV. He died in June 1649, and left ſome children [*B*]. Salmaſius and he wrote againſt one another [*C*].

[*A*] *He gave proofs of his learning in ſeveral books that he has publiſhed.*] His *Adverſaria* appeared in the year 1599. It is a little book which he repented the publiſhing of, if we may believe the *Scaligerana*. His notes upon Tertullian's Apology, *Minutius Felix*, and Arnobius have been eſteemed. He has alſo commented upon Martial's epigrams.

[*B*] *And left ſome children.*] When Mr Daillé (1) ſpeaks of the Proteſtant writers who condemned the execution of Charles I king of England, he quotes *Le Pacifique Royal en deuil*, written by Mr Heraud. That author, the ſon of our *Deſiderius Heraldus*, was miniſter in Normandy when he was called to the ſervice of the Walloon church in London, in Charles the firſt's time, and he was ſo good a royaliſt, that he found himſelf obliged to return into France, to eſcape the fury of the republicans, who were diſpleaſed with his exhortations to ſubmit themſelves to their lawful prince. He returned into England after the reſtoration of the royal family, and again took poſſeſſion of his former ſtation in the Walloon church at London, and ſome time after he obtained a canonry of Canterbury, which he kept till his death. This is what has been lately told me by a perſon who had opportunities of being acquainted with his hiſtory. See alſo the laſt page of Mr Bochart's letter to Mr Morley.

[*C*] *Salmaſius and he wrote againſt one another.*] ‘An old and very learned advocate is dead here, called Monſieur Heraut (*Deſiderius Heraldus*) who had a diſpute with Salmaſius, who had writ againſt him, *Obſervationes ad Jus Atticum & Romanum* about four years ſince. Monſieur Heraut, who was offended with that book, was writing an anſwer to it in folio; but death having ſurprized him, I think it muſt be ſold, ſuch as it is, and an end muſt be put to it where the author found his own. He ſeemed to be about ſeventy years of age . . . He had the reputation of a very learned man, as well in the civil-law, as in polite learning, and he wrote very eaſily upon what ſubject he pleaſed (2).’ I learn from a letter of Sarravius (3), that after twenty ſeven years ſilence, Heraldus having examined his papers at the inſtance of his friends, was ready to publiſh his book *de Autoritate rerum judicatarum*. What he had prepared againſt Salmaſius was printed in the year 1650, it is a folio, intituled, *Queſtiones quotidianæ, & Obſervationes ad Jus Atticum ac Romanum*. There are two books in the catalogue of the Bodleian library, aſcribed to Hier. Herbarius, which certainly were miſplaced by the Printers; they ought to have been a little higher under *Deſiderius Heraldus*. Theſe are the titles of them, *De de Rerum judicatarum autoritate Libri II.* at Paris, 1640. *Obſervationum & Emendationum Liber unus, ibid.*

HERCULES. There have been ſeveral heroes of this name [*A*]; but he of Thebes has been the moſt famous, becauſe the Greeks have aſcribed to him the actions of the others, and talked very much of him according to the fabulous genius of their nation.

[*A*] *There have been many heroes of this name.*] Cicero reckons ſix heroes of that name. ‘Quamquam quem potiſſimum Herculem colamus ſcire ſane velim, plures enim tradunt nobis ii qui interiores ſcrutantur & reconditas Literas: antiquiſſimum Jove natum, ſed item Jove antiquiſſimo; nam Joves quoque plures in priſces Græcorum literis invenimus. Ex eo igitur & Lyſito eſt is Hercules quem concertaviſſe cum

---

(b) Maimbourg, Hiſt. des Croiſades, Tom. II, livr. iv, pag. 65, Dutch Edit.

(9) Ibid. pag. 61.

(10) Ibid. pag. 62.

(11) Ibid. pag. 63.

(12) According to Maimbourg, *pag.* 64, the patriarch ſaid things to the king, that were ſtill more offenſive, *which*, adds he, *I will not repeat.*

(13) Maimbourg, ibid. pag. 65.

(a) The Jeſuit Eudæmon Joannes anſwered it.

(1) Replique à Adam & a Cottibi, Part. II, chap. xxi, pag. 127.

(2) Patin, letter xxix, pag. 121, of the firſt Tome, dated the third of November, 1649.

(3) It was written in 1639. *See Sarravii, Epiſt. pag.* 16.

nation. I deſign only to ſpeak of him. He paſſed for the ſon of Jupiter and Alcmena. I have ſaid, in another place (*a*), how this lady was deceived by that god, and I will neither repeat that, nor what is to be found in Moreri. Our Hercules had a prodigious ſtrength both in the combats of Mars and Venus [*B*]. He was alſo a great eater [*C*]. I will mention ſome circumſtances of it that are very ſingular, as alſo his being

‘ Apolline de tripode accepimus. Alter traditur Nilo ‘ natus Ægyptius, quem aiunt Phrygias literas conſcripſiſſe. Tertius eſt ex Idæis Dactylis, cui inferias ‘ afferunt. Quartus Jovis eſt, & Aſteriæ Latone ſororis ‘ quem Tyrii maximè colunt, cujus Carthaginem filiam ‘ ferunt. Quintus in India, qui Belus dicitur. Sextus hic ex Alcumena, quem Jupiter genuit; ſed tertius Jupiter: quoniam, ut jam docebo, plures Joves ‘ etiam accepimus (1). —— *I would gladly know which ‘ of the Hercules's we worſhip, for the curious enquirers ‘ into ſecret hiſtory, give us account of ſeveral who have ‘ bore that name; the moſt ancient of all was the ſon of ‘ Jupiter, and of the moſt ancient of the Jupiters too, ‘ for we find likewiſe ſeveral Jupiters in the ancient ‘ Greek writers. It was this Hercules, the ſon of Jupiter and Lyſito, who ſtrove with Apollo about a tripode, as hiſtory informs us. We are told of another ‘ Hercules, an Ægyptian, the ſon of Nilus, who is ſaid ‘ to have invented the Phrygian characters. A third ‘ we owe to the* Idæi Dactyli, *to whom infernal rites ‘ are paid. A fourth was the ſon of Jupiter and Aſteria, ſiſter to Latona, and is highly worſhipped by the ‘ Tyrians, and, as they tell us, had a daughter named ‘ Carthago. A fifth of India, who is named Belus: ‘ and a ſixth, the ſon of Alcmena by Jupiter, but a ‘ third Jupiter: becauſe, as I ſhall prove, by and by, ‘ we have accounts of ſeveral Jupiters.’* According to this account the Egyptian Hercules will be only the third; but the Egyptians give him the firſt place (2). Diodorus Siculus (3) who mentions but three Hercules's, gives the Egyptian the birth-right, and confeſſes, that the conformity of name and inclinations has been the reaſon, that the actions of the others have been aſcribed to the Theban Hercules, who was the youngeſt of them all. It is ſaid that Varro has reckoned up forty four Hercules's.

[*B*] *He had a prodigious ſtrength . . . in the combats of . . . Venus.*] Some ſay (4) that in ſeven days he deflowered the fifty daughters of Theſtius; others (5) will allow but one night for it, and add, that he impregnated them all with boys, and that two of them, the oldeſt and the youngeſt, brought him two ſons a piece. According to ſome (6) the youngeſt would not at all conſent to the loſs of her virginity, and that as a puniſhment for her obſtinacy he condemned her to keep it for her life, and ordered her to ſerve him as a prieſteſs. This was the reaſon why the temple of Hercules at Theſpis was ſerved by a prieſteſs who was obliged to remain a virgin as long as ſhe lived (7). Pauſanias could not perſuade himſelf that Hercules could be ſo much enraged againſt the daughter of his good friend (8): he therefore looked upon the penalty, which Hercules had inflicted upon her as a very ſevere puniſhment. What he ſays of Theſtius's friendſhip for Hercules, agrees very well with what we read in Diodorus Siculus (9), that Theſpius (10) being deſirous that his daughters might give him a poſterity whereof Hercules ſhould be the father, invited him to a noble feaſt, and entertained him magnificently, after which he ſent him his fifty daughters one after another. Vigenere has pleaſantly ſaid, *that it was the ſtouteſt battle that Hercules was ever engaged in, in all his life* (11). And yet the antients have not placed this in the catalogue of his labours. It has been obſerved that becauſe he made war, ſometimes in one country, and ſometimes in another, being a great lover of the fair ſex, he had diſperſed women in ſeveral provinces of the world, that he might every where find ſome at his diſpoſal. Lactantius was not in the wrong for laughing at the Pagans, who placed in the number of the gods a man who had left every where marks of his leudneſs: ‘ Hercules . . . . nonne ‘ orbem terræ quem peragraſſe ac purgaſſe narratur, ‘ ſtupris, libidinibus, adulteriis inquinavit? nec mirum, cum eſſet adulterio genitus Alcmenæ. Quid ‘ tandem potuit in eo eſſe divini, qui ſuis ipſe vitiis ‘ mancipatus & mares, & fœminas, contra omnes leges ‘ infamia, dedecore, flagitio afficit (12)? —— *Did ‘ not Hercules (which they tell us travelled over the ‘ world, and purged it from monſters) pollute it with ‘ whoredoms, leudneſs, and adulteries? And no wonder, ‘ ſince he owed his birth to the adultery of Alcmena. ‘ What could there be in him that was divine, who being ‘ a ſlave to his luſts, contrary to all laws, entailed infamy, diſgrace, and crimes, both on males and females.’* Arnobius very agreeably ridicules the Pagans for making nine nights neceſſary to Jupiter to get one child, and allowing but one night to Hercules to get fifty maids with child. ‘ Quis illum (Jovem) in Alcmena ‘ novem noctibus fecit pervigilaſſe continuis? non vos? ‘ . . . . Et ſane adjungitis beneficia non parva: ſiquidem vobis Deus Hercules natus eſt, qui in rebus hujuſmodi patris ſui tranſiret exuperaretque virtutes. ‘ Ille noctibus vix novem unam potuit prolem extundere, concinare, compingere: at Hercules ſanctus ‘ Deus natas quinquaginta de Theſtio nocte una perdocuit & nomen virginitatis exponere, & genitricum ‘ pondera ſuſtinere (13). —— *Who told us that this ‘ Jupiter lay nine whole nights with Alcmena? Was ‘ it not you? And indeed you make him do ſomething ‘ worthy of all this labour; for hence ſprung your ‘ mighty Hercules, who far excelled his father in feats ‘ of this nature. He with much ado could hardly ſtrike ‘ out one child in nine nights: but the good god ‘ Hercules in one night not only deflowered Theſtius's fifty daughters, but made them all mothers.’* Note that Theſtius was amazed at that vigour of Hercules (14).

[*C*] *He was alſo a great eater.*] He gloried in being able to eat more than others, and he was extreamly vexed to find a man that could match him in that point. He diſputed the prize of voracity with one Lepreus, and did not get the victory (15). They each of them ſacrificed an ox, and if Hercules eat all his at one meal, his antagoniſt was no leſs expeditious and vigorous upon his victim. Lepreus ſhould have ſtopped there, but he had the boldneſs to provoke Hercules to another ſort of combat, to a duel, wherein he was killed. I ſhall ſpeak more fully of this diſpute at the end of this remark. Here is another ſtory. Hercules travelling with his wife and his little ſon Hyllus, and ſeeing the little boy diſtreſſed with hunger, applied himſelf to a husband-man for ſome food for him; but obtaining nothing he unyoked one of the oxen from his plough, and ſacrificed him to the gods and eat him (16). That canine appetite did not leave him even in heaven; hence it is that Callimachus exhorts Diana not to catch hares, but wild-boars and bulls, becauſe Hercules had not loſt the quality of a great eater amongſt the gods which he had amongſt men.

Οὐ γὰρ ὅγε Φρυγίῃ περ ὑπὸ δρυῒ γυῖα θεωθεὶς
Παύσατ' ἀδηφαγίης· ἔτι οἱ πάρα νηδὺς ἐκείνη
Τῇ ποτ' ἀροτρεύοντι συνήντετο Θειοδάμαντι.

Non hic in Phrygia ſub quercu membra levatus
Atque Deus factus, fit edax minus: alvus at illi
Eſt eadem, taurum quæ quondam Thiodamantis
Edit planitiem cum lati ſcinderet agri (17).

For tho' a god, his appetite's as ſtrong,
As when Theodamas's plough he loos'd,
And at one meal the labouring ox devour'd.

Athenæus cites ſome verſes of Epicharmus, which admirably expreſs the voracity of this heroe.

Πρῶτον μὲν αἴκ' ἔσθοντ' ἴδῃς νιν, ἀποθάνοις,
Βρέμει μὲν ὁ φάρυγξ ἔνδοθ', ἀραβεῖ δ' ἁ γνάθος,
Ψοφεῖ δ' ὁ γόμφιος, τέτριγ' ὁ κυνόδων,
Σίζει δὲ ταῖς ῥίνεσσι, κινεῖ δ' οὔατα, τῶν τετραπόδων οὐδὲν ἧττον.

Primùm quidem, eum comedentem ſi videas, pe-
rieris:
Fremunt intus fauces; ſtrepunt buccæ:

Molares

(*a*) See the articles ALCMENA and AMPHITRYON.

(1) Cicero, de Natura Deorum, lib. iii, cap. xvi.

(2) Inde proximum amnis (*Nili*) os dicatum Herculi, quem indigenæ ortum apud ſe antiquiſſimum perhibent, eoſque qui poſtea pari virtute fuerint in cognomentum ejus adſcitos. *Tacit. Annal. lib. ii, cap. lx.*

(3) Lib. iii, ſub finem.

(4) Athenæus, lib. xiii, pag. 556.

(5) Pauſan. lib. ix, pag. 302.

(6) Id. ibid.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) Ἐκεῖνο δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἡγήσομαι πιστόν. Ἡρακλέα ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ὀργῆς ἀνδρὸς φίλου θυγατρὶ ἀφικέσθαι. Ergo vero adduci nunquam poſſim ut credam, Herculem in amici hominis filiam ira tam acri incitari potuiſſe. *Id. ib.*

(9) Lib. iv, cap. xxix.

(10) The father of thoſe fifty maids is called Theſtius by ſome, and Theſpius by others.

(11) Vigenere upon Philoſtratus, Tom. I, pag. 98. Edit. in 4to.

(12) Lactant. lib. i, cap. ix.

(13) Arnobius, lib. iv, pag. 145.

(14) Qualemve vagæ poſt crimina noctis. Theſpius obſtupuit toties ſocer. *Stat. Silv. I, lib. iii, ver.* 42.

(15) Pauſanias, lib. v, pag. 151.

(16) *See* Natalis Comes, Mythol. lib. vii, pag. m. 693, 694. Apollodorus, *lib. ii, pag.* 145, does not ſay ſo much, and has not the ſame circumſtances; but he owns that Hercules killed and eat that ox. The Scholiaſt upon Apollonius, *in lib. 1, ver.* 1212, ſays the ſame as Natalis Comes.

(17) Callimachus in Hymno Dianæ, ver. 159, pag. m. 78.

being a great drinker [*D*], in which he did not leſs excel. He ſhewed his voracity upon an occaſion that gave riſe to a very ſingular ceremony, which was, that they curſed him during the ſacrifices which the Lindians offered to him [*E*]. Some, upon conſidering his inclination to wine and women, have denied that he performed thoſe great

Molares dentes ſonant: caninus ſtridet:
Sibilat naribus: aurem utramque movet (18).

You'd die if you ſhou'd ſee his horrid meal:
And hear the action of his hollow gorge:
And craſhing of his grinders when wide ſtretch'd:
His noſtrils blow: and both his ears do move.

He cites ſome other poets to prove his poſition that Hercules was a very great eater, ὅτι ἦν καὶ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἀδδηφάγος, and he forgets not the competition of Lepreus. Here follows what he ſays of it.

Lepreus challenged Hercules to a tryal of gluttony, and was worſted. Εἰσάγεται δὲ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς καὶ Λεπρεῖ περὶ πολυφαγίας ἐρίζων ἐκείνου προκαλεσαμένου, καὶ νενίκηκε. Inducitur Hercules de voracitate cum Lepreo certans qui eum provocaverat, in qua contentione Hercules victor evaſit (19). —— *Hercules is introduced ſtriving with Lepreus for the prize of gluttony, to which the latter had challenged him, and in which he was defeated by Hercules.* Zenodotus ſays that Hercules had put in chains Lepreus the grandſon of Neptune, after he had cleanſed Augeas's ſtable; he ſet him at liberty when he had finiſhed his labours, at which time he had three trials of ſkill with him. They plaid at quoits, they ſtrove who ſhould pump water beſt, and who could eat up an ox ſooneſt, in all which Hercules had the victory. At laſt Lepreus, being drunk, challenged Hercules afreſh, and was killed by him. Others ſay they did not diſpute who ſhould eat moſt, but who ſhould drink moſt, and that Hercules had the better of Lepreus (20). Others pretend that the diſpute was, both who ſhould eat up an ox ſooneſt, and who ſhould drink moſt (21). I will mention ſome other facts in the note [*H*].

[*D*] *And a great drinker.*] To be convinced of it, we need only conſider the prodigious bigneſs of his goblet, which required two men to carry it; but as for himſelf he only needed one hand to lift it up and drink it off.

Huic pretium palmæ gemini cratera ferebant
Herculeum juvenes. Illum Tyrinthius olim
Ferre manu ſola, ſpumantemque ore ſupino
Vertere ſeu monſtri Victor, ſeu marte ſolebat (22).

A maſſy cup, the prize, was carry'd high
By two fair youths; this Hercules of old
Was wont, with eaſe, to carry in one hand,
And at one draught to empty, when returning
From his fell labours, or the bloody field.

It apppears by the hiſtory of Alexander, that in feaſts, where there was extraordinary drinking, they drank round in a great cup, which was called the cup of Hercules. It was reſerved for the laſt, as we may infer from Alexander's not having yet drank it, when he fell ſick at table (23) at an entertainment where he had already drank a great deal. Others ſay, he did drink it, and that it was his fatal cup. *Alexandrum . . . . intemperantia bibendi atque ille Herculeanus & fatalis ſcyphus condidit* (24). Diodorus Siculus tells us, that Alexander having already drunk much, to conclude, drank off Hercules's cup, and immediately fell into a ſwoon (25). To reconcile theſe differences, I believe, we muſt ſuppoſe this prince was ſtruck as he was drinking this cup, and before he had made an end of it. This hiſtorian obſerves this cup of Hercules was very large. But what can be alledged more deciſive hereupon than the words of Macrobius? ‘ Scyphus Herculis poculum eſt ita ut Liberi patris cantharus: Herculem vero fictores veteres non ſine cauſa cum poculo fecerunt & nonnunquam caſabundum & ebrium, non ſolum quod is heros bibax fuiſſe perhibetur, ſed etiam quod antiqua Hiſtoria eſt Herculem poculo tanquam navigio ventis immenſa maria tranſiſſe. Sed de utraque re pauca ex Græcis antiquitatibus dicam, & multibibum Heroa iſtum fuiſſe, ut taceam quæ vulgo nota ſunt, illud non obſcurum argumentum eſt, quod Ephippus in Buſiride inducit Herculem ſic loquentem, &c (26). —— *The* ſcyphus *is the cup of Hercules, as the* cantharus *is that of Bacchus: It was not without cauſe, that the ancient ſculptors repreſented Hercules with a cup in his hand, in a tottering condition, and drunk, not only becauſe this hero is ſaid to have been a lover of wine; but likewiſe becauſe antient hiſtory informs us, that Hercules made long navigations in a cup inſtead of a ſhip. I ſhall relate a few things concerning both theſe from the antiquities of the Greeks. As to the firſt, that Hercules was a lover of wine, not to mention what is commonly known, we have no obſcure proof of it in Ephippus, who in his Buſiris introduces Hercules ſpeaking thus, &c.*’ Athenæus ſeems to point out to us the capacity of this cup, for he ſays (27), that that which was the cauſe of Alexander's death, contained two gallons. The poet Steſichorus can teach us a very notable particular. He ſays that Pholus drank a health to Hercules in a pitcher that held forty eight gallons. *Centaurorum & Lapitharum convivium deſcribens* (Steſichorus) *ait Pholum* (*quem propterea hoſpitem Alcidæ nuncupat Lucanus*) *impleviſſe Herculi craterem trium lagenarum capacem, quem prior ipſe obbibiſſet: amplum autem fuiſſe oportuit, qui urnam, hoc eſt, quatuor & viginti ſextarios caperet* (28). He drank it off firſt, and was immediately pledged by Hercules.

Σκύφιον δὲ λαβὼν δέπας ἔμμετρον ὡς τριλάγυνον
Πῖεν ἐπισχόμενος, τό ῥά οἱ παρέθηκε Φόλος κεράσας (29).

Hercules (*de eo enim loquitur*) acceptum in manus ſcyphum plenum, trium lagenarum capacem, ori admovens obbibit, quem Pholus ipſi infuderat.

The bowl capacious in his hand he took,
Which Pholus with a liberal hand had fill'd,
With three lagenæ, *and at one huge draught*
Empty'd the foaming cup.

Athenæus explains in a very probable manner, why the poets have feigned Hercules to have croſſed the ſeas in a drinking-bowl. That fiction, ſays he (30), is in all likelihood founded upon the delight this heroe took in drinking in great glaſſes; for he was a notable drinker: Ὅτι δὲ εἷς ἦν ὁ Ἡρακλῆς τῶν πλεῖστον πινόντων προείπομεν. *Bibacem inter alios Herculem fuiſſe antea nos memoravimus* (31).

[*E*] *They curſed him during the ſacrifices which the Lindians offerred to him.*] I have told above, that Hercules eat an ox that he took from a countryman; but I add here, that as he was eating it, the countryman poured out a thouſand curſes againſt him, which was only a diverſion to Hercules: ſo that when an altar was built to him he choſe this countryman for his prieſt, and commanded him to repeat the ſame curſes as often as they ſhould offer ſacrifices; for, ſaid he, I never eat with a better ſtomach. Lactantius tells the ſtory at large: ‘ Apud Lindum, quod eſt oppidum Rhodi, Hercules ſacra ſunt, quorum à cæteris longe diverſus eſt ritus. Si quidem non, εὐφημία, ut Græci appellant, ſed maledictis & execratione celebrantur; eaque pro violatis habent, ſi quando inter ſolemnes ritus vel imprudenti alicui exciderit bonum verbum. Cujus rei hæc ratio redditur, ſi tamen ulla eſſe ratio in rebus vaniſſimis poteſt. Hercules, cum eo delatus eſſet, famemque pateretur, aratorem quendam aſpexit operantem, ab eoque petere cœpit, ut ſibi unum bovem venderet. Ille negavit fieri poſſe, quia ſpes ſua omnis colendæ terræ duobus illis jumentis niteretur. Hercules ſolita violentia uſus, quia unum accipere non potuit, utrumque ſuſtulit. At ille infelix, cum boves ſuos mactari videret, injuriam ſuam maledictis ultus eſt, quod homini eleganti & urbano gratiſſimum fuit. Nam dum comitibus ſuis epulas apparat, dumque alienos boves devorat,

---

(18) Athen. lib. x, init.

(19) Id. ibid.

(20) Matris in Herculis laudatione. Caucalus Rhetor Chius, frater Theopompi Hiſtoriographi in Herculis laudatione apud Athen. ibid.

(21) Ælian. Var. Hiſtor. lib. i, cap. xxiv.

(22) Statius, Theb. vi, lib. ver. 531.

(23) Nondum Herculis ſcypho epoto repente velut telo confixus ingemuit. *Q. Curtius, lib. x, cap. iv, n.* 18. *Editionis Freinſhem.* See alſo *Plutarch in Alexandro, ſub fin.*

(24) Seneca, Epiſt. lxxxiii.

(25) Diod. Sicul. lib. xvii, cap. cxvii.

(26) Macrob. Saturnal. lib. v, cap. xxi. *See* Dempſterus, in Roſinum, lib. v, cap. xxx, pag. m. 856.

(27) Lib. x, cap. ix, pag. 434.

(28) Hadrianus Junius, Animadverſ. lib. iv, cap. v, pag. m. 410.

(29) Apud Hadrian. Junium, ibid.

(30) Μή ποτε μεγάλοις ἔχαιρε ποτηρίοις ὁ ἥρως, διὰ τὸ μέγεθος παίζοντες οἱ ποιηταὶ [καὶ συγγραφεῖς,] πλεῖν αὐτὸν ἐν ποτηρίῳ ἐμυθολόγησαν. Poculis fortaſſe quia heros amplis gaudebat, per jocum ſcriptores, ac poetæ, eum in poculo navigaſſe fabulati ſunt. *Athen. lib. xi, pag.* 469.

(31) Id. ibid.

great atchievements which are aſcribed to him [F]. There is a very particular circumſtance related concerning his voracious way of eating; for it is pretended that he moved his ears (b): that phœnomenon is very rare [G]. I believe it is a miſtake to ſay, that he would

devorat, illum ſibi amariſſime convicíantem, cum riſu, & cachinnis audiebat. Sed poſtquam Herculi divinos honores ob admirationem virtutis deferri placuit, à civibus ei ara poſita eſt, quam de facto βούζυγον, id eſt bovis jugum nominavit: ad quam duo juncti boves immolarentur, ſicut illi, quos abſtulerat aratori, eumque ipſum ſibi conſtituit Sacerdotem, ac præcepit, ut iiſdem maledictis ſemper in celebrandis ſacrificiis uteretur, quod negaret, ſe unquam epulatum eſſe jucundius (32). —— *At Lindus, a town in the iſland of Rhodes, Hercules is worſhipped with rites very different from thoſe uſed in other places. For the ſacrifice is performed not with praiſes, but with curſes and execrations, and it is thought to be profaned, if a good word ſhould even ignorantly eſcape from any who aſſiſt at the ſolemnity. For this they give the following reaſon, if there can be any reaſon for ſuch fooliſh obſervances. Hercules, ſay they, paſſing that, way, was hungry, and ſeeing a peaſant at plough, deſired him to ſell him an ox. He anſwered, that he could not do ſo, having no other means of ploughing his land but by theſe two oxen. Hercules, making uſe of his uſual violence, ſince he would not give him one, took them both from him. The poor man, ſeeing his cattle ſlain, revenged himſelf by execrations, which were very pleaſing to this polite and elegant traveller. For while he was making ready this entertainment for his companions, and devouring theſe ſtolen cattle, he jeered and laughed at the misfortunate owner, who bitterly curſed him. But when afterwards it was thought fit, in admiration of his virtue, to decree divine honours to him, the inhabitants of that city erected an altar to him, which he actually called the yoke of oxen; at which they were to offer two oxen yoked, as theſe were which he took from the peaſant, whom he appointed his prieſt, and ordered, that he ſhould make uſe of the ſame execrations in celebrating the ſacrifices, affirming that he had never eat with more pleaſure.*’

[F] *Some have denied that he performed thoſe great atchievements which are aſcribed to him.*] Megaclides in Athenæus cenſures the poets that came after Homer and Heſiod, for ſaying that Hercules commanded armies and took towns, when it is certain that he was a man who led a very voluptuous life, having many lawful wives, and getting children clandeſtinely upon a great many young women (33), addicted likewiſe to eating and drinking; ſo that after his example, they who made libations to him, left nothing in the glaſs, they drank it all up. Other proofs are brought (34) of his effeminacy, and it is pretended that Steſichorus was the firſt that armed him with a club, a bow, and a lion's skin. We find in Eraſmus a paſſage that violently ſhakes that tradition of Hercules's effeminacy. It is in the explication of the proverb. *Take heed of a man with a black breech* (35). Eraſmus tells us, that a mother gave this advice to her two boys, who were unlucky rogues. They had a mind to attack Hercules ſleeping under a tree, but he awaked and tied them to his club (36), and laid them over his ſhoulders witheir heads downwards. That poſture diſcovered to them, that Hercules's back was very hairy, and that the hairs were very black and thick, which made them remember the advice of their mother, and made them fall a laughing. Hercules underſtanding what they laughed at, gave them their liberty. The words of Eraſmus, which I am to cite, are theſe: ‘Melampygus Græcis ſignificat eum qui nigro ſit podice: quo quidem cognomento notatus eſt Hercules quòd eam corporis partem, non Lydorum more vulſam, neque candidam (quemadmodum effœminati ſolent) ſed nigris pilis hirſutam ac ſylvoſam haberet. Nam Græci quemadmodum molles & imbelles, fractoſque deliciis, πυγάργους καὶ λευκοπύγους appellant: itidem è diverſo fortes ac ſtrenuos, μελαμπύγους vocare conſueverunt, ut author eſt Lycophronis interpres. — *Melampygus, among the Greeks, ſignifies one who has a black breech. This firname was given to Hercules, becauſe that part of his body was rough with black hair and ſhaggy, and not ſhaved after the manner of the Lydians, or white (as thoſe effeminate people are). For as the Greeks called the effeminate, and weak, and thoſe who were enervated by luxury, white breeched; ſo, on the contrary, they uſually called the brave and ſtrong black breeched, as the interpreter of Lycophron aſſures us.*’ See Suidas, in the article μελαμπύγου τύχοις, *in Melampygum incidas*. See alſo Apoſtolius, Zenobius, & Diogenianus, in their Collections of Proverbs.

[G] *That phænomenon is very rare.*] The journal of the *Academiæ Naturæ curioſorum* (37) ſpeaks of a maid who moved her ears. The author of the News from the Republic of Letters, giving an extract of this journal, obſerved (38), that there was not reaſon to doubt of this particular, ‘after what the abbot de Marolles atteſts of the philoſopher Craſſot, in the thirty ſecond page of his Memoirs. *He had a great reſemblance*, ſays he, *to thoſe pictures of the Cynic philoſophers, which are to be found in the cabinets of the curious, being ſlovenly like them, with a long and buſhy beard, and hair ill combed. He had one thing very particular, and which I never obſerved in any one elſe, which was, that he could move his ears backwards and forwards when he would, without touching them.* Peter Meſſie relates, in the twenty fourth chapter of his firſt part, that St Auſtin ſaw (39) a man, who not only moved his ears as he pleaſed, but alſo his hair, without any motion of his hands or head.’ Give me leave to join to this ſome paſſages relating to this. I begin with a pretty long one of Caſaubon (40). ‘Iſtud planè communi hominum naturæ contrarium eſt, quibus [ſolis (41) ex omnibus animantibus (niſi forte ſimias excipias)] dedit aureis ἡ πολυποίκιλος τοῦ ΘΕΟΥ σοφία moveri ſuapte ſponte neſcias. [Nam quod ſcribit Martialis, Cinnæ cuidam natum filium *auribus ſ longis Quæ ſic moventur, ut ſolent aſellorum*, poetica ſine dubio licentia eſt, non rei veritas] Narrat tamen Euſtathius ſacerdotem fuiſſe quendam aureis motitantem. Accepimus etiam à viris fide dignis, viſas manifeſto aures movere viro cuidam eruditiſſimo (42), cum per Allobrogum fines tranſiens, vivicomburii periculum ſibi à magiſtratu imminere intellexiſſet: quòd diceretur nefandi criminis reus Toloſa in Italiam fugere. ——— *This is quite contrary to the common nature of men, to whom alone of all animals (unleſs you ſhould except apes) God has given ears which have no ſelf motion. (For what Martial writes of the ſon of one Cinna, who had long ears, which moved like thoſe of aſſes, is undoubtedly rather a poetical invention than a true ſtory). However Euſtathius tells us of a certain prieſt who moved his ears. I have been informed likewiſe by men worthy of credit, that the ears of a certain learned man were plainly ſeen to move, when, paſſing through the confines of Savoy, he underſtood that he was in hazard of being burnt alive by the magiſtrates, upon a report that he was then flying from Toulouſe into Italy, on account of his having been guilty of a heinous ſin.*’ Since Caſaubon doth not doubt of the truth of Euſtathius's report, nor of what was told him of the learned man that eſcaped from Toulouſe, why doth he doubt of the ſtory of Cinna's child, in the thirty ninth epigram of the ſixth book of Martial? He would have leſs doubted of it, if he had taken notice of what St Auſtin ſays in the twenty fourth chapter of the fourteenth book, *De Civitate Dei: ſunt qui & aures moveant vel ſingulas vel ambas ſimul.* —— *There are ſome people who move their ears, either ſingly, or both together*; but alſo of what Veſalius atteſts. That great anatomiſt affirms (43) that he ſaw at Padua two men, whoſe ears moved. He elſewhere explains the cauſe of this motion. ‘Interdum, *ſays he* (44), quibuſdam raris fibris carnalis membrana quam carnoſam vocamus ſupra aures augetur, & modice auri proximam cutem, & ipſam quoque aurem motu agit arbitrario. ——— *Sometimes by means of certain delicate fibres, the fleſhy membrane, which we call the* carnoſa, *is enlarged above the ears, and gives a gentle arbitrary motion to the skin next to the ear, and even to the ear itſelf.*’ Du Laurent affirms, that he has ſeen people that cauſed their ears to move (45). Valverdus ſaw the ſame thing in a Spaniard at Rome (46). Procopius compares Juſtinian ‘to an aſs, not only becauſe of his dulneſs and ſtupidity, but alſo with reſpect to his moveable ears, which occaſioned his being called in a full theatre

A COLLECTION concerning men who moved their ears.

(b) *See the remark* [G].

(32) Lactant. lib. i, cap. xxi, pag. m. 70. *See alſo* Conon, apud Photium, pag. 429.

(33) Ὃς μεθ' ἡδονῆς πλείςης τὸν μετ' ἀνθρώπω βίον διετέλεσε. πλείςας μὲν γυναῖκας γήμας, ἐκ πλείςων δὲ λάθρα παρθένων παιδοποιησάμενος. Cum maximè voluptariam inter homines vitam egerit plurimarum uxorum maritus, & puellis clam multis compreſſis, è quibus ſuſcepit liberos. *Athen. lib xii, cap. i, pag.* 512.

(34) Id. ibid.

(35) Μὴ τῷ μελαμπύγῳ περιτύχοις. Ne in melampygum incidas. *It is the forty third proverb of the firſt century of the ſecond Chiliad in Eraſmus.*

(36) *See Moreri at the word Achemon.*

(37) *In the volume of the year* 1685.

(38) Nouvel. de la Republ. des Lettres, Septemb. 1686, pag. 1021.

(39) *St Auguſtin's words, quoted here below, do not import, that he had ſeen that, and therefore Father Hardouin,* in Plin. lib xi, pag. 543, *ſhould not have ſaid,* quæ vidit Auguſtinus.

(40) Caſaubon. in Athen. lib. x, cap. i, pag. 702.

(41) *This is taken from Ariſtotle,* μόνον ἄνθρωπος οὖς οὐ κινεῖ *ſays he,* lib. i, Hiſt. Animal. cap. ix, *Pliny likewiſe,* Aures homini tantum immobiles, *lib. xi, cap. xxxvii.*

(42) *It is likely that Antony Muretus is meant in this place.*

(43) De humani corporis fabrica, lib. ii, cap. xiii, apud Coquæum Not. in Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. xiv, cap. xxiv.

(44) Ibid. cap. xvii, apud eundem Coquæum, ibid.

(45) Laurent. lib. xi, Hiſtor. Anat. cap xii, apud eumdem ibid. *I have verified this paſſage.*

(46) Valverdus, lib. ii, Anatomes Corporis Humani, cap ii, apud eumdem ibid. *I correct Coquaus, who calls him Valvardus.*

would be drawn in that poſture, in one of his moſt famous pictures [*H*]. It is not true that his club was in a chapel at Rome [*I*], and that it kept away the dogs and flies. It

' γαύδανε, (which is to ſay, word for word, Mr Aſs) ' by thoſe of the green faction, or the Praſini, which ' he was an enemy to.' I have read theſe words in la Mothe le Vayer, page 134 of the third Tome in 12mo. He cites the 36th page of Procopius's Secret Hiſtory.

[*H*] *I believe it is a miſtake, to ſay that he would be drawn in that poſture, in one of his moſt famous pictures.*] Coſtar ſays ſo in his Dialogues. Let us ſet down the latter part of what he ſays there concerning Hercules. ' In the *Anthologia* a peaſant praiſes very much ' Mercury's moderation, who is contented with milk ' and fruits, and he complains of Hercules, who would ' have abundance of oxen and ſheep ſacrificed to him. ' And being told, *but this god preſerves your flocks and* ' *herds ſo well. What is the difference,* replied he, *whe-* ' *ther my flocks be eaten by the wolves, or by their keeper.*

- - - - - Τί τὸ πλέον εἰ τὸ φυλακτὲν
Ὄλλυται ὑπὸ λύκων εἴθ' ὑπὸ τȣ̃ φυλακός (47).

Here is Voiture's anſwer to Coſtar. *It is true, that Hercules gladly eat ſheep, and in great quantities. The Argonauts, when they ſailed to Colchos, left him in an iſland. Many pleaſant reaſons are given for it. Some ſay, that he broke all the oars in rowing: others ſay, that he was too heavy; ſome ſay, the Argonauts were afraid, he would carry away all the glory; and others, that it was becauſe he eat too much. I remember I have read in a Greek poet, (that is to ſay Greek and Latin) that he moved his ears in eating,* &c (48). Coſtar anſwering his friend, tells him (49), that *Hercules eat like a devil, and that, according to Athenæus, he had an ox for every meal.* He cites Philoſtratus, *in his picture of Theodamas.* We there find theſe words, according to Vigenere's verſion, pag. 906 of the firſt tome. *You have perhaps found it in Pindar, where, at Coronus's houſe, he eat an ox ſo entire, that he ſcarce left the bones behind him.* Coſtar cites alſo Lactantius, in the twenty firſt chapter of the Chriſtian Inſtitution (50), it is to acquaint his friend with the ceremony of the maledictions the Lindians uſed in ſacrificing to Hercules. He tells him, *that in that caſe Hercules was of the humour of Fortune, who is never honoured ſo much, as when ſhe is reviled, and accuſed for all the changes and diſorders that happen in the world,* cum convitiis colitur, *it is a ſaying of Pliny* (51). He adds, that ' this *Beef-eater* (for ſo ' he was ſirnamed βȣφάγος and βȣθοίνης), was in ' ſuch reputation for gluttony, that the ancients con- ' ſecrated a bird to him, called the Glutton: it is ' that which the French call *la Foulque*, the Latins ' *Gavia*, or *Furica*, and the Greeks λάρος.' *It may be ſaid of him,* continues he, *what Martial ſaid of Tucca,* that he was not contented to be a glutton, but would have it known and talked off.

Non eſt Tucca ſatis, quod es guloſus,
Et dici cupis, & cupis videri (52).

Once upon a time he appeared to the Painter Parrhaſius, in the ſame ſtate he was in, when his ears moved, *and would be painted in that ſame poſture, in which Theodamas had ſeen him.* He quotes for that apparition, the twelfth book of Athenæus, and he obſerves, that in the thirty fifth book, and tenth chapter, of Pliny, one Dæmon, an Athenian Painter, brags that he drew this picture. It cannot be denied, that Athenæus reports, that Parrhaſius boaſted to have painted Hercules in the town of Lindus, juſt as he ſaw him in his ſleep: he carried his boaſt ſo far, as to put this in the inſcription of his picture (53), but it doth not follow from thence, that he gave Hercules that mobility of ears mentioned by Coſtar. It is a ſtrange boldneſs to affirm, firſt that Athenæus ſays, that Hercules appeared to Parrhaſius, *in the ſame condition he was in when his ears moved.* Secondly, that Theodamas had ſeen Hercules *in that ſame poſture,* but theſe two faults are inconſiderable, in compariſon of the blunder I am going to obſerve. Theſe are the words of Pliny. ' Pinxit Demon Athenienſium, ' argumento quoque ingenioſo. Volebat namque va- ' rium, iracundum, injuſtum, inconſtantem; eundem ' exorabilem, clementem, miſericordem, excelſum, ' glorioſum, humilem, ferocem, fugacemque; & om- ' nia pariter oſtendere. Idem pinxit Theſea . . . . . & ' in una tabula, quæ eſt Rhodi, Meleagrum, Herculem, ' Perſea (54). —— *He painted the people of Athens,* ' *and the deſign of his piece was very ingenious. For* ' *he intended to repreſent them at once fickle, paſſio-* ' *nate, unjuſt, inconſtant; exorable, merciful, gentle,* ' *proud, humble, fierce, and cowardly. He painted like-* ' *wiſe Theſeus . . . . . and in one piece, which is at* ' *Rhodes, Meleager, Hercules, and Perſeus.*' Pliny there reckons up the works of Parrhaſius; the word Dæmon ſignifies the people of Athens, whoſe contrary paſſions Parrhaſius had ingeniouſly repreſented. But here you ſee Coſtar metamorphoſes that picture of Parrhaſius into a Painter, and pretends, that this chimerical Painter aſcribed to himſelf the picture of Hercules, where that heroe moved his ears. This is a new blunder; for in ſuppoſing that Dæmon was a Painter, no other picture could be aſcribed to him, but that of Rhodes, wherein Meleagar, Hercules, and Perſeus, were painted, and which Pliny manifeſtly diſtinguiſhes from the Hercules at Lindus, which was drawn according to the Painter's dreams; *& Herculem qui eſt Lindi talem à ſe pictum, qualem ſæpe in quiete vidiſſet* (55). But if we make the pretended Dæmon the author of the Hercules at Lindus, we muſt likewiſe aſcribe to him almoſt all Parrhaſius's paintings.

[*I*] *It is not true that his club was in a chapel at Rome.*] A famous Proteſtant divine has ſpoke thus (56): *You will frequently hear in our temples, Atheiſm and error aſſaulted and deſtroyed; theſe peſts are driven thence by the odour of the word of GOD, which is purely preached there, as in old time at Rome, Hercules's club kept the dogs and flies from the chapel where it was.* He cites the ſecond chapter of Solinus, where there is nothing of this; but here follows what he ſays in the firſt chapter. ' Hoc ſacellum Herculi in boario ' foro eſt, in quo argumenta & convivii & majeſtatis ip- ' ſius remanent. Nam divinitùs illò neque canibus ' neque muſcis ingreſſus eſt. Etenim cum viſceratio- ' nem ſacricolis daret, Myiagrum deum dicitur impre- ' catus, clavam vero in aditu reliquiſſe, cujus olfactum ' refugerent canes: id uſque nunc durat. —— *This* ' *little temple of Hercules is ſituate in the* Forum ' Boarium, *and there ſtill remain in it proofs both of* ' *the ſacrifice, and of the majeſty of the god. By* ' *his divine Power, neither flies nor dogs enter into it.* ' *For when he gave the bowels to the prieſts, he is re-* ' *ported to have prayed to the god Myiagrus, and to* ' *have left his club at the door, the ſmell of which* ' *made the dogs run from it, and it's influence continues* ' *to this day.*' It is plain, that Solinus doth not affirm, that Hercules's club was ſtill there, he only ſays, that Hercules left it in the entrance of the place, where he gave the prieſts an entertainment after a ſacrifice, and that the ſmell of the club kept off the dogs. This was the club's effect; as to the flies, it was not that club that drove them away, but the prayers that Hercules made to the god Myiagrus. What was obſerved on that occaſion, namely, that dogs and flies kept at a diſtance from this place, continued to ſucceeding ages. This is what Solinus ſays; but it was not neceſſary that the club ſhould be preſerved in the chapel, nor doth Solinus ſay it. If the Proteſtant divine had given us a true matter of fact, that club might be reckoned in the number of Taliſmans, and be compared to the fly which is engraven, as is ſaid, upon the door of the ſhambles of Toledo, and which hinders the flies from entring in. To this purpoſe, I will relate a thing which I have read in a modern author (57), which is, that, at Miſitra, the dogs do not enter into the moſques of the Turks, nor into the churches of the Chriſtians. The Turks explain this by a miracle as to themſelves, and by a natural reaſon as to the Greeks. Let us hear Mr Guillet.

Dogs that do not go into churches.

' The Turks ſpeak of the diſcretion of theſe dogs, ' as of a miracle. Theſe creatures ſometimes ſlip into ' private houſes, when they find the doors open; but ' the moſques need not be ſhut at all, the dogs never ' go into them. The Turks take occaſion to make a ' wonder of it, and call that a miraculous reſpect, which ' is only an imitation of the young dogs, who have al- ' ways ſeen the old ones keep off from the entrance of ' the moſques, where, in all likelihood formerly the ' Turks

---

(47) Entretiens de Voture de Coſtar, pag. 32.

(48) Ibid. pag. 38.

(49) Ibid. pag. 55.

(50) *He ſhould have added,* of the firſt book. *Beſides, that work of Lactantius is not intituled* Chriſtian Inſtitution, *but* Divinæ Inſtitutiones. *Vigenere deceived Coſtar.*

(51) *Thoſe words of Pliny are in the ſeventh chapter of the fifth book; but they do not ſignify that fortune is never ſo much honoured, as when ſhe is reviled.*

(52) Martial. lib. xii, Epigr xli.

(53) Οἷος δ' ἐν νύχιον φαντάζετο πολλάκι φοιτῶν Παῤῥασίῳ δι' ὕπνȣ, τοῖος ὅδ' ἐςὶν ὁρᾷν. Qualem noctu ſæpe videndum ſe objiciebat dormienti Parrhaſio, talem hinc videre licet. *Athen. lib. xi, pag.* 544.

(54) Plinius, lib. xxxv, cap x, pag. m. 202.

(55) Id. ibid. pag. 204.

(56) Sam. des Marets, Eſchantillon des Maximes du Clergé Romainés Provinces Unies, pag 59.

(57) Guillet, Lacedemone ancienne & nouvelle, pag. 232, Dutch Edit.

It is ſtill leſs trues that he ſet up columns at Cape Finiſterre [*K*], and placed there a looking-glaſs of a wonderful Virtue [*L*]. Some ſay, that he lived but fifty years, and that he burnt himſelf at that age, becauſe he was no longer able to bend his bow [*M*]. He was the laſt child that Jupiter had by mortal women [*N*]. It is ſaid, that he was three days in the belly of a whale [*O*], and that he came out ſafe and ſound, having loſt nothing

Turks had ſoundly beat them, to make them loſe the habit of running thither. Neither are dogs to be ſeen in the Grecian churches. The Turks do not wonder at that; but give a reaſon for it, which I find probable enough. I have ſaid before, that when the Greek ſchiſmatics enter into their churches, they make ſo low a bow, that by the inclination of their bodies, they bring their hands to the ground. The Turks ſay, that the dogs, ſeeing them put their hands ſo low, imagine, it is to take up ſtones, to throw at their heads, and that the fear of that drives them from the churches.’

To return to Hercules’s club, a great miracle has been told of it, namely, that being fixed in the ground it took root, and ſhot up into a tree. Πρὸς τȣ́τω τῷ ἀγάλματι τὸ ῥόπαλον θεῖναί φασιν Ἡρακλέα. καὶ (ἦν γὰρ κοτίνȣ) τȣ̃το μὲν (ὅτῳ πιςά) ἐνέφυ τῇ γῇ, καὶ ἀνεβλάςησεν αὖθις. *Ei clavam ab Hercule dedicatam perbibent, factam ex oleaſtro. Quod adjiciunt miraculum, haud ſcio an cuiquam fide dignum videri poſſit, eam clavam radicibus actis regerminaſſe* (58). I add, that it was the Troezenians, who told this ſtory. They had the image of Mercury Polygius, to whom Hercules had dedicated his club. Every body knows it was made of olive-wood. Pauſanias ſays, that the tree was ſtill ſhewn, from which it was taken. Hercules found it near the marſh of Saronis (59). Here is an article for any one that will undertake the collection of hiſtorical parallels, relating to certain ſtories of the Pagans and Chriſtians; for we are told by travellers, ‘that at the gate of the old fortreſs of Smyrna, there is a great wild cherry-tree, which the Greeks of the country ſay was the ſtaff of St Polycarp, the firſt biſhop of Smyrna, which a moment after it was planted in the earth, ſent out branches (60).

[*K*] *Nor that he erected columns at Cape Finiſterre.*] The fable concerning the foundation of Corunna, which I ſhall ſpeak of in the following remark, has perſuaded ſome learned men, that Hercules erected columns in that place. Paul Jovius has fallen into that error; for which he has been thus cenſured by Ludovicus Nonnius. ‘Ab hac fabula perſuaſi nonnulli, credidere arcem Herculis fuiſſe, & alteras columnas ab illo hic fixas, non ſecus ac circa Gades, dictamque urbem hanc *Corunna* tamquam *columnam:* quod egregiam etymon apud Paulum Jovium, virum aliàs gravem & doctum, tantùm valuit, ut ab imperito aliquo Hiſpaniæ antiquitatis perſuaſus, huic opinioni etiam ſubſcriberet, cùm in vita Gonſalvi Ferdinandi d’Aguilar, agens de adventu Regis Philippi I. in Hiſpaniam, ita ſcriberet: *Nec diu Philippus amicorum ſuorum ſtudia, votaque fruſtratus, ut ſua regna ex arbitrio adminiſtranda ſuſciperet, in Cantabriam Oceano devectus, pervenit in portum, qui vocatur ad Columnas, fortaſſe quod ibi quoque alteræ Herculis columnæ, ſicuti Gadibus, poſitæ fuerunt, quum eo externo litore terræ Haſpanicæ finis.* Sed opinio hæc infirmiori tibicine fulta, quàm ut rationibus convelli mereatur (61). ——— *This fable has made ſome people believe that it was a fortreſs built by Hercules, and that he erected pillars here, as well as near Cadiz, and that, the town was called Corunna, as it were Columna; this notable etymology weighed ſo much with Paulus Jovius, otherways a learned and judicious man, that, on the authority of ſome perſon ignorant of the antiquities of Spain, he has gone into it. For he writes as follows in the life of Gonſalvo Ferdinando d’Aguilar, ſpeaking of the arrival of Philip I. into Spain.* Neither did Philip long fruſtrate the deſires and wiſhes of his friends, that he might take upon himſelf the adminiſtration of his dominions. Having arrived in the bay of Biſcay, he landed in the port of Columna, ſo called, probably, becauſe certain pillars of Hercules were placed here as well as at Cadiz, *this being the outmoſt point of Spain. But this opinion is ſo very ill founded, that it do not deſerve a confutation.*’

[*L*] *Nor that he placed there a looking-glaſs of a wonderful virtue.*] Ludovicus Nonnius having ſaid, that Flavium Brigantium of the ancients, is the preſent Corunna, adds, that the inhabitants attribute the foundation of it to Hercules, and that they ſay he built a tower in it, in which he ſet a mirror, which brought the moſt diſtant ſhips in view (62). The original of this fable is almoſt as ridiculous as the fable itſelf. ‘In tam ridiculam opinionem vocum ignorantia & antiquitatis imperitia ita lapſi ſunt, nam cum turris illa ſpecula dicatur, ſpeculum illud mirandum ſine opifice ullo confinxere (63). ——— *They fell into this ridiculous opinion, through their ignorance of language and antiquity, for this tower being called* Specula *in Latin, they without any artiſt formed this wonderful mirror or* Speculum.

[*M*] *He burnt himſelf becauſe he was no longer able to bend his bow.*] Ὡς πυρὶ αὑτὸν ἀνεῖλε μὴ δυνηθεὶς τὸ οἰκεῖον ἐντεῖναι τόξον πεντηκοντȣ́της γενόμενος. Ut igne vitam ſibi abſtulerit, quod arcum ſuum intendere non poſſet annos jam natus quinquaginta (64). ——— *That he burnt himſelf to death, becauſe being fifty years of age he could not bend his bow.* Some who miſpend their time in ſeeking out allegorics, imagine, that in covered words here is ſignified, that Hercules no longer found himſelf capable of contenting a woman, and upon conſideration of that grievous change, fell into ſo deep a melancholy, that he would live no longer. He would at this rate have been more impatient than Milo the wreſtler (65), who ſeeing in his old age the weakneſs of his arms, which had been ſo ſtrong and vigorous in his youth, was contented to lament this change with tears. If we give the article of Penelope, we will ſpeak of theſe allegory-ſeekers; for they explain in the ſame manner, the *nemo meo melius arcum tendebat Ulyſſe.* ——— *None could bend his bow like my Ulyſſes.*

[*N*] *He was the laſt child that Jupiter had by mortal women.*] Diodorus Siculus makes that obſervation to raiſe the glory of Hercules. He ſuppoſes, that Jupiter renounced all commerce with women, becauſe he would not have his laſt productions inferior to his foregoing (66). He feared then, that the children he ſhould get after Hercules, would not come up to him. Pliny the younger has ſaid ſomething (67) which puts me in mind of this thought. It turns upon Nerva’s dying a little after he had adopted Trajan. I have read in Lactantius, a ſtrong raillery upon the greateſt of the gods at laſt ceaſing to beget children. ‘Cum verò dicantur aliqui (*Dii*) ex aliquibus nati, conſequens eſt, ut ſemper naſcantur, ſiquidem aliquando ſunt nati; vel ſi aliquando naſci deſierunt, ſcire nos convenit, cur, aut quando deſierint. Non illepide Seneca in libris moralibus Philoſophiæ. QUID ergo eſt (inquit) quare apud Poëtas ſalaciſſimus Jupiter deſierit liberos tollere? Utrum ſexagenarius factus eſt, & illi lex Papia fibulam impoſuit? an impetravit jus trium liberorum? An tandem illi venit in mentem,

Ab alio expectes alteri quod feceris?

‘Et timet, ne quis ſibi faciat quod ipſe Saturno (68)? —— *Since ſome gods are ſaid to be born of other gods, it follows, that they ſhould continue to be born if they were once ſo, or if at any time they gave over, being born, it is fit that we ſhould know why, or when, they did ſo. Seneca, in his moral writing, ſays very pleaſantly: For what reaſon, pray, do the poets pretend that Jupiter, who was ſo great a lover of the ſex, has now ceaſed from begetting children? Is it that being now paſt ſixty, the* lex papia *has put a ſtop to his game? or has he got the privileges ariſing from being father to three children? or does he at laſt remember the proverb,*

Expect that what you have done to others, ſhould be done to you.

‘*And is afraid leaſt ſome of his own ſons ſhould ſerve him as he ſerved his father Saturn.*’

[*O*] *It is ſaid that he was three days in the belly of a whale.*] I will make uſe of the words of the commentator nothing but his hair. After his death he was adopted by Juno; but it is ſaid, that he refuſed to be aſſociated in the college of the twelve great gods [*P*]. We muſt ſay ſomething of the Gallic Hercules [*Q*].

---

(58) Pauſanias, lib. ii, pag. 74.

(59) Pauſanias, ibid.

(60) Spon. Voiage de Grece, Tom. I, pag. 232, Dutch edit.

(61) Ludov. Nonnius, in Hiſpania. cap. liv, pag. m. 170.

(62) Incolæ ab Hercule conditam referunt, turrimque hic eſſe ab eodem exſtructam, in qua ſpeculum arcana arte fabricatum erat, unde naves vel longiſſimo ſpatio diſtantes contemplari liceret. *Id. ib. pag.* 196.

(63) Id. ibid.

(64) Ptol. Hephæſt. apud Photium, cod. 190, pag. 472.

(65) *See the article ACHILLES, citation* (128).

(66) In hac ipſa (*Alcmena*) tandem deſiit, nec cum ulla deinceps mortali rem habere ſobolemque procreare voluit, ne præſtantioribus ſcilicet deteriora ſubſtitueret. *Diod. Sicul. lib. iv, cap. xiv.* See the remark [*C*] of the article ALCMENA.

(67) Hunc (*Nervam*) Dii cœlo vindicaverunt, ne quid poſt illud divinum & immortale factum mortale faceret. *Plin. in Panegyr. Trajani.*

(68) Lactantius, lib. i, cap. xvi, pag. m. 51, 52.

One

commentator upon Philoſtratus, to expreſs that adventure, and the occaſion of it. ‘ The gods having on ‘ a time conſpired together to poiſon their ſovereign Jupiter, as he came to diſcover the plot by Themis, he ‘ prevented them, and puniſhed them, ſome in one manner, and ſome in another. As for Neptune and Apollo, he ſent them in his rage to ſerve the maſons, ‘ who were building the walls of Ilion; where being ‘ hired by Laodemon, after the work was finiſhed, he ‘ indeed recompenſed Apollo with abundance of ſacrifices and offerings, but he made no account of ſatisfying Neptune. Whereupon the enraged god ſent a ‘ horrible great whale, which diſgorging great floods ‘ of ſea-water upon the country, drowned it all; and ‘ Laomedon was obliged, by the oracle's advice, in order to deliver himſelf from this calamity, to expoſe ‘ his daughter Heſione, adorned with royal robes, ‘ as a prey to be devoured by this monſter. Hercules, paſſing by chance that way, moved with compaſſion, offered the father to deliver her, if he would ‘ give him the horſes that came of an immortal race, ‘ which he had received of Jupiter, for Ganymede who ‘ was raviſhed and carried away by him to heaven, to ‘ ſerve him as cup-bearer. The terms being agreed ‘ upon, Hercules, armed cap-a-pee, threw himſelf headlong into the throat of this monſter; and deſcending ‘ from thence into his belly, remained encloſed there ‘ three days, hacking and hewing till he had quite ‘ deſtroyed it. Laomedon afterwards not fullfilling his ‘ agreement, Hercules returned to Troy with ſix ‘ ſhips, filled with ſoldiers, and ſacked it; put Laomedon to death, carried Heſione captive, and made ‘ a preſent of her to Telamon, the father of Ajax, ‘ for being the firſt that ſcaled the wall (69).’ Vigenere quotes no body. To ſupply that defect I will ſet down a paſſage of Tzetzes, which Mr Drelincourt has communicated to me (70). Τριέσπερον γὰρ τὸν Ἡρακλέα καλεῖ διὰ τὸ ἐν τῷ κήτει τρεῖς ἡμέρας εἶναι ἃς ἑσπέρας καλεῖ Λυκόφρων διὰ τὸ ἀφότιστον καὶ σκοτεινὴν εἶναι τὴν γαστέρα τοῦ θηρίου (71). The ſcholiaſt upon Homer (72) relates moſt of the things that I have cited from the commentator of Philoſtratus, and tells us this ſtory was to be found in Hellanicus. Hercules did not come out the ſame way he went in; he came out through the breach, I mean through the belly of the whale, I have not been able to verify whether Natalis Comes has faithfully related what he cites from Andrœtas of Tenedos concerning the loſs of Hercules's hair (73): ‘ Ubi vero cetus acceſſiſſet hians in ejus os Hercules irruit, ‘ ubi cùm per triduum fuiſſet, ceto diſrupto exiit omnibus amiſſis capillis capitis, ut ſcriptum reliquit Andrœtas Tenedius in navigatione Propontidis (74). — ‘ *When the whale approached with open mouth, Hercules ruſhed into it, where, after continuing three* ‘ *days, upon the burſting of the whale; he came* ‘ *out having loſt all his hair, as we are told by Andrœtas of Tenedos, in his voyage to the Propontis.*’ Lycophron plainly intimates, that it was the heat of the whale's belly, which made Hercules's hair fall off.

Ἔμπνους δὲ δαιτρὸς ἡπάτων φλοιδούμενος,
Τινθῷ λέβητος ἀφλόγοις ἐπ' ἐσχάραις,
Σμήριγγας ἐστάλαξε κωδείας πέδω.

Vivus autem diſſector inteſtinorum ambuſtus,
In calido campo, in ollæ focis non ignitis
Jubas capitis diſtillavit (75).

[*P*] *He was adopted by Juno, but it is ſaid that he refuſed to be aſſociated into the college of the twelve great gods.*] Juno, who had perſecuted him ſo much while alive, found herſelf much diſpoſed to love him when he was dead. Which verifies theſe verſes of Horace;

- - - - Diram qui contudit Hydram,
Notaque fatali portenta labore ſubegit,
Comperit invidiam ſupremo fine domari (76).

He that kill'd Hydra, he deſign'd by fate,
To quell the monſters rais'd by Juno's hate,
Tho' he, the mighty he, had always try'd,
Found envy vanquiſh'd only when he dy'd.

Here follows what we are told by Diodorus Siculus. After Hercules was placed in the number of the gods, he was adopted by Juno, who loved him afterwards as a good mother. The ceremony of the adoption was this: Juno went to bed, and to imitate a true child-birth, ſhe placed Hercules in ſuch a manner, that he fell to the ground from under her petticoats. The Barbarians ſtill obſerved that ceremony in their adoptions in Diodorus Siculus's time. Hercules was afterwards married to Hebe; but he refuſed the honour which Jupiter would have done him, of aſſociating him in the college of the twelve great gods, and he juſtified his refuſal by this reaſon, that there being no place vacant in that college, he ought not to be admitted into it, and that it would be very unreaſonable to degrade any other God to make room for him (77). Juno had for a long time begun to act as a mother with reſpect to Hercules, but it was without knowing him. The matter of fact was this. Alcmena fearing the jealouſy of this goddeſs, durſt not own herſelf the mother of Hercules, but expoſed him in the middle of a field, as ſoon as he was born. Minerva and Juno paſſed that way ſoon after, and Minerva beheld the infant with admiration, and adviſed Juno to give him ſuck, Juno did it; but the infant preſſed her nipple ſo ſtrongly, as gave her an intolerable pain, ſo that ſhe left him there. Hereupon Minerva took him, and carried him to Alcmena, as to a nurſe, to which ſhe would recommend him (78). Here one might make a parallel betwixt Moſes and Hercules.

[*Q*] *We muſt ſay ſomething of the Gallic Hercules.*] A modern author (79) has imitated the Greeks, whilſt he refuted them. He has transferred to this Hercules almoſt all the actions of the others, and has left nothing to the Grecian but moral conqueſts, that is to ſay, triumphs over his paſſions. According to him, the Gallic Hercules built in Gaul, the city Alexia (80), he was attacked *by Albion, king of Great Britain, and by Bergiona, both of them ſons of Neptune.* He defeated them in Provence, *by the ſuccours he received from his father Jupiter,* who ſeeing the army of his ſon unprovided with arrows, diſcharged upon his enemies a ſhower of ſtones, which overwhelmed them (81). ‘ In quo (*lapideo campo*) Herculem contra ‘ Albionem & Bergiona Neptuni liberos dimicantem ‘ cum tela defeciſſent, ab invocato Jove adjutum ‘ imbre lapidum ferunt, credas pluiſſe, adeo multi ‘ paſſim, & latè jacent (82). —— *In this ſtony field, we* ‘ *are told, that Hercules, being engaged againſt Albion* ‘ *and Bergion, two ſons of Neptune, after having ſpent* ‘ *all his arrows, invoked Jupiter, who ſent him a* ‘ *ſhower of ſtones to his aſſiſtance, and indeed you would* ‘ *believe that it had rained ſtones there, they lie ſo* ‘ *thick and widely ſpread.*’ He was the firſt of the Gauls, who penetrated into Italy thro' the Alps (83). *He rendered Ombria habitable, having formed the river Arno out of it's marſhes. He conducted ſome colonies of Gauls beyond the Pyrenees, where Gerion king of Spain was conquered . . . . He died in that expedition into Spain, and was honoured there with a ſtately temple, dedicated to him by the Tyrians, in the city of Gades, where his bones ſtill remained in Pomponius Mela's time, who aſſures us of it* (84). ‘ His accoutrements were, ‘ a quiver upon his back, a club in his right hand, ‘ a bow in his left, having the face of an old man, ‘ bald, wrinkled, ſwarthy, but venerable, drawing a ‘ croud of people after him, that were faſtened with ‘ little chains of gold and ſilver hanging from his ‘ tongue, and though the chains were extreamly ſmall, ‘ none of theſe captives endeavoured to break them, ‘ but all, on the contrary, expreſſed by their looks, ‘ that they would be ſorry to be delivered from ſo ‘ ſweet a vaſſalage, as being leſs conquered by the ‘ force of arms of this Gallic Hercules, than by his ‘ eloquence, this is the deſcription Lucian hath left ‘ us of him (85). This deſcription agrees but ill with what Mr Menage has read ſomewhere, which is, that ‘ our old Gauls had a great veneration for Hercules, ‘ becauſe he was GREAT and STRONG, and ‘ having declared upon their turning Chriſtians, that ‘ it

---

(69) *Vigenere, in the* Summary of Perſeus in Philoſtratus, Tom. I, pag. m. 466.

(70) *With ſeveral other things concerning the text of this remark.*

(71) Tzetzes, ad Lycophronem, pag. 13.

(72) In Iliad. lib. xx, ver. 145.

(73) Natalis Comes, Mytholog. lib. viii, cap. iii, pag. m. 821.

(74) *Voſſius*, de Hiſtor. Græcis, pag 321, *ſays, that this work of Andrœtas is quoted by the Scholiaſt upon Apollonius,* in lib. ii.

(75) Lycophron. ver. 35.

(76) Horat. Epiſt. i, lib. ii.

(77) Ex Diodoro Siculo, lib. iv, cap. xl.

(78) Ex eodem, ibid. cap. ix.

(79) Audigier, Origines des François, & de leur empire, Part. I, pag. 225, & ſeq.

(80) Ibid pag. 230.

(81) Ibid. pag. 231.

(82) Pomponius Mela, lib ii, cap v, pag. m. 38, 39.

(83) Audigier, ibid. pag 230.

(84) Lib. iii, cap. vi. *But Pomponius ſpeaks of the Egyptian Hercules.*

(85) Audigier, ibid. pag. 229.

One of the moſt famous Athenian orators obſerves, that writers were extreamly fond of celebrating the combats and courage of Hercules, but made no mention of his other qualities, which might yet have afforded them a very noble theme. He ſays that that part of Hercules's greatneſs which they had ſo much neglected, would require an excellent orator, and that if he had thought of treating of it in his youth, he would have ſhewn that that heroe excelled other men, in prudence, knowledge, and juſtice, ſtill more than in ſtrength of body. Old age, adds he, will not permit me to undertake his panegyric in that light: I find myſelf too weak to handle a ſubject ſo important, and ſo copious (*c*). The reflexion of this orator may give us an occaſion of reflecting upon the bad taſte of mankind [*R*]. What this great Rhetorician has ſaid of this hero's knowledge,

'it would be one of their greateſt troubles not to ſee 'his image any more, they were comforted by being 'told, that the Chriſtians had a ſaint, who, for his 'BULK and STRENGTH, was a match for ſix 'Hercules's (86) (§ *α*).'

[§ *α*] That is, *ſix Hercules's*, *Alexicaci* or averters of evil, in which ſenſe St Chriſtopher is the Hercules of the French, and in general of all Roman Catholics, witneſs theſe fine verſes quoted by St Aldegonde, in his *Tableau des différens de la Religion*, Tom. II pag. 136, edition 1605.

Chriſtophori ſancti faciem quicunque tuetur,
Illa nempe die mala morte non morietur.

Whoever ſees the face of holy Chriſtopher,
Death's fatal dart that day he need not fear.
REM. CRIT.]

Mr Audiger applies the beſt he can to his hypotheſis a ſtory of Diodorus Siculus. *Viz.* that a daughter of the king of the Celtæ, proud of her extraordinary ſtature, and great beauty, deſpiſed all who ſought her in marriage; but when ſhe had ſeen Hercules, ſhe was ſeized with a ſtrong deſire to have to do with him by her father's conſent. Her paſſion was gratified. Hercules got a ſon by her, named Galates (87). The hiſtorian doth not tell her name; but others ſay, her name was Galatea (88). This ſtory is told otherwiſe in the *Erotica* of Parthenius. There we find that Hercules, as he drove Gerion's oxen from Erythia, went through Gaul, and came to Bretannus, the father of Celtina, who fell ſo deeply in love with this heroe, that having ſtole Gerion's oxen from him, ſhe would not reſtore them but upon condition of his lying with her. Hercules as well to recover his oxen, as on the account of Celtina's beauty, agreed to it, and got her with child of a boy called Celtus, from whom the Celtæ took their name. Herodotus (89) tells us that Hercules being in Scythia lay on the ground on his lion's skin and fell aſleep. When he awaked he could not ſee his mares; he ſought them every where; and when he came to the country of Hylæa, he entered into a cave where he found a damſel who had a human ſhape from her head to her waſte, but downwards ſhe had the form of a ſerpent. He asked her whether ſhe had ſeen his mares? yes, ſaid ſhe, I have them in my cuſtody, but I will not reſtore them unleſs you lie with me. He was glad to regain them at that price, but when the ſport was ended ſhe delayed as long as poſſible the reſtitution of the mares, for ſhe vehemently wiſhed to begin it again. At laſt not not being able to retain a man any longer, who was deſirous to be gone with his mares, ſhe ſaid to him I have kept them for you, and you have rewarded me for it; for you have gotten me with child of three boys. Τὴν δὲ φάναι ἑαυτὴν ἔχειν, καὶ οὐκ ἀποδώσειν ἐκείνῳ πρὶν ἢ οἱ μιχθῆναι, τὸν δὲ Ἡρακλέα μιχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ μισθῷ τούτῳ. κείνην τε δὴ ὑπερβαλέσθαι τὴν ἀπόδοσιν τῶν ἵππων, βουλομένην ὡς πλεῖστον χρόνον συνεῖναι τῷ Ἡρακλέϊ. *Illamque reſpondiſſe, ſe quidem illas habere: ſed non prius reddituram ei quam cum ipſa coiiſſet: Herculem pro ea mercede cum fœmina concubuiſſe. Sed quum illa differet reddere equas, cupida diutiſſime cum Hercule concumbendi &c* (90).

Mr Audigier pretends (91) that the Celtic Jupiter, the moſt ancient of the Jupiters, was the father of our Gallic Hercules, and that all the great divinities of Greece, were firſt known in Gaul (92). This is a very ſtrange pretenſion, but not ſo chimerical as that of the learned Rudbeck (93).

[*R*] *A remark of Iſocrates may make us reflect on the bad taſte of mankind.*] The prudence, philoſophy, and juſtice of Hercules were qualities infinitely more valuable than the ſtrength of his arms: and yet the orators and poets praiſed him only for the actions he performed by that ſtrength; and they ſuffered the perfections of his mind to fall into oblivion. Καὶ τῇ φρονήσει καὶ τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ καὶ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, πλέον διενεγκόντα πάντων τῶν προγεγενημένων, ἢ τῇ ῥώμῃ τῇ τοῦ σώματος. *Et prudentia, & literis, & juſtitia plus antecelluiſſe* (Herculem) *ſuperiorum temporum hominibus omnibus quam robore corporis* (94). They did ſo as well becauſe they themſelves were more affected with what is ſhining, than with what is ſolid, as becauſe they were perſuaded that their auditors and readers would much more applaud ſtories of battles, than a deſcription of virtues which are exerciſed in times of peace. Horace has very well obſerved this in ſuppoſing that the ſhades lent a favourable ear to the poeſies of Sappho and Alcæus, but were more delighted with the latter, becauſe they treated only of war, revolutions of ſtate, baniſhments, *&c* (95).

Utrumque ſacro digna ſilentio
Mirantur Umbræ dicere: Sed MAGIS
  Pugnas, & exactos tyrannos
  Denſum humeris bibit aure vulgus (96)

With ſilent reverence ghoſts admire
The wondrous fury of his lyre:
The vulgar ſhades throng moſt to hear,
Of kings depoſed, of feats of war,
Aud drink them with a greedy ear.
CREECH.

Beſides, it muſt be obſerved that tyrants overcome and monſters ſubdued, and, in a word, times of confuſion and ſlaughter, are ſubjects more proper to ſhew the wit and eloquence of a writer, than is the conduct of an uniform life led according to the rules of virtue. A hiſtorian who has no great events to deſcribe, falls aſleep over his work, and makes his readers yawn; but a civil-war, two or three conſpiracies, as many battles, the ſame leaders ſometimes humbled, ſometimes exalted, ſharpen his pen, warm his imagination, and always keep his readers in breath. I really believe that if he were commanded to write a hiſtory of a quiet reign, and all of a piece, he would complain of his fate much in the ſame manner with Caligula, who complained that in his reign there did not happen any great misfortunes. 'Queri etiam palam de conditione 'temporum, ſuorum ſolebat: *quod nullis calmitatibus publici inſignirentur.* Auguſti principatum clade 'Variana: Tiberii, ruina ſpectaculorum apud Fidenas, memorabilem factum: ſui oblivionem imminere 'proſperitate rerum. Atque identidem exercituum 'cædes, famem, peſtilentiam, incendia, hiatum aliquem terræ optabat (97). ——— *He uſed openly to 'lament the condition of the times in which he lived,* 'becauſe they were not diſtinguiſhed by any public 'calamities. *Saying that the reign of Auguſtus would 'ſtill be remembered, on account of the defeat of 'Varius; and that of Tiberius, by the fall of the 'theatre at Fidenæ; but that he was in hazard of 'falling into oblivion, becauſe of the proſperity of the 'times. He would often expreſs his wiſhes for the 'cutting off of armies, for famine, burning of cities, 'and earthquakes.'* Deſolations, and public calamities, are an advantage to an hiſtorian, and give luſtre to his writings. He pities, if he be a good man, the illuſtrious Veſtal who was buried alive; he abhors the tyrant who, to make his reign more remarkable, oppreſſed her (98); but yet it is a favourable topic, and very advantageous to his pen, and an ornament to his book. His work is a veſſel that never ſails better

(*c*) *Taken from Iſocrates*, Orat. ad Philippum, pag. m. 152.

(86) Suite du Menagiana, pag. 285. Dutch Edit.

(87) *Audigier does not quote Diodorus's book; it is the fifth book, chap. xxiv. Edit. Hanov.* 1611, *in* 8*vo*.

(88) *Compare with Diodorus Siculus theſe words of Ammianus Marcellinus*, lib xv, cap. ix Celtas nomine regis amabilis, & matris ejus vocabulo Galatas dictos.

(89) Herod. lib. iv, cap. ix.

(90) Herod. ib. pag. m. 227, 228.

(91) Pag 228.

(92) Pag. 222.

(93) *See the* Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres, February 1685, pag. 140.

(94) Iſocrat. Orat. ad Philipp. pag m. 152.

(95) Dura navis, Dura fugæ mala, dura belli. *Horat. ubi infra.*

(96) Horat. Od. xiii, lib. ii.

(97) Sueton. in Calig. cap. xxxi.

(98) Cum Corneliam Veſtalium maximam defodere vivam concupiſſet (Domitianus) ut qui illuſtrari ſeculum ſuum ejuſmodi exemplo arbitraretur. *Plin. Epiſt. xi, lib. iv.*

ledge, may be confirmed from antiquity, which has owned a moſt intimate relation between the Muſes and Hercules *(d)*. Hence he was ſirnamed *Muſagetes*, that is, the companion and conductor of the Muſes, and on this account theſe nine goddeſſes were put under his protection in the temple which Fulvius Nobilior cauſed to be built to him [*S*]. The thought which Poſidonius made uſe of to ridicule a paſſage of Æſchylus's tragedies was not juſt; Strabo, who cenſured him, did not know wherein the real fault of it lay [*T*]. It concerns a certain ſhower of ſtones, which fell in favour of Hercules when he was fighting the Ligurians.

than in a ſtorm; a tempeſt is his beſt gale: a calm is as diſagreeable to it as to a real ſhip: and when an hiſtorian can begin like Tacitus with 'Opus aggredior opimum caſibus, atrox præliis, diſcors ſeditionibus, ipſa etiam pace ſævum. Quatuor Principes ferro interempti. Tria bella civilia, plura externa, ac plerumque permixta (99), —— *I begin a work fruitful in great events, horrid with wars, divided by ſeditions, aud terrible even in peace. Four princes ſlain: three civil wars, more foreign, and for the moſt part both joined together;*' he prepoſſeſſes his readers in his favour, and knows very well he has found an advantageous ſubject. But after all, it is a mark of a depraved taſte to prefer an account of warlike actions before that of an equitable conduct; and to admire a man more for the ſtrength of his arms and for his boldneſs, that give him the victory over a wild boar, or a bull, than for his virtue, that makes him maſter of his paſſions, and moves him to eſtabliſh good laws amongſt his neighbours. This virtue, tho' it ſhines leſs than the other, has much more of true grandeur in it; there is more reality in the qualities of Hercules, which writers have paſſed over in ſilence, than in thoſe which they have ſo pompouſly magnified. But what ſhall we ſay, they followed the taſte of the public. Note, that young people are much more delighted with romantic than real hiſtories, and that after age has ripened and rectified our judgment, we would rather read a Thuanus and a Mezerai, than a Calprene or a Scuderi. But few people loſe the taſte of their childhood with reſpect to the deſcription of a peacable reign, and to the hiſtory of one full of troubles and great events.

[*S*] *The Muſes were put under his protection in the temple.*] This temple was built by Fulvius Nobilior, who conquered the Ætolians in the year of Rome 565. He was then conſul. The principal of their cities was called Ambracia; he made himſelf maſter of it, and finding the ſtatues of the nine Muſes there, he carried them to Rome, and conſecrated them in the temple which he built to Hercules, and put them under that god's protection. I believe we ſhould not have known theſe circumſtances, had not an orator, who lived five or ſix ages after, made mention of them. His words deſerve to be cited. 'Ædem Herculis Muſarum in circo Flaminio Fulvius ille Nobilior ex pecunia Cenſoria fecit, non id modo ſecutus, quod ipſe litteris & ſumma Poëtæ amicitia duceretur, ſed quod in Græcia cum eſſet imperator, acceperat Herculem Muſagetem eſſe, id eſt comitem ducemque Muſarum, idemque primus novem ſignæ, hoc eſt omnium Camænarum, ex Ambracienſi oppido tranſlata, ſub tutela fortiſſimi numinis conſecravit, ut res eſt, quia mutuis operibus & præmiis juvari ornarique deberent: Muſarum quies defenſione Herculis & virtus Herculis voce Muſarum (100). —— *Fulvius Nobilior built a temple to Hercules and the Muſes, in the Circus Flaminius, out of the money ariſing from the office of cenſor, this he did not only becauſe he was a friend to letters and to the Muſes, but becauſe he had learnt, while he was general in Greece; that Hercules was named Muſagetes, or the companion and leader of thee Muſes. It was he likewiſe, who firſt put the ſtatues of the nine Muſes, which he brought from the city of Ambracia, under the protection of this powerful deity. And very properly too, becauſe they ought to aſſiſt and adorn one another with mutual ſervice and rewards. The Muſes ſhould owe their repoſe to the valour of Hercules, and the valour of Hercules ſhould be celebrated by the voice of the Muſes.*' This orator has reaſon to ſay that great warriours and the Muſes ſtand in need of one another; it belongs to the former to procure repoſe and ſecurity of the Muſes, and to the latter to immortalize the noble actions of heroes by their ſongs. One might, according to the notion of the ſame orator, apply to our Hercules what has been ſaid, that they who do noble actions worthy to be celebrated by the poets, are lovers of verſe (101). Obſerve that Statius ſuppoſes that Hercules underſtood muſic well.

Dic age Calliope, ſocius tibi grande ſonabit,
Alcides, tenſoque modos imitabitur arcu (102).

Ariſe Calliope and tune the lyre,
Alcides to the air divine ſhall raiſe,
His voice ſublime, and, with his twanging bow,
Shall join in conſort.

Others obſerve that he underſtood Aſtrology: Gabriel Naudé gives this for certain, but he makes uſe of it ſomewhat ignorantly, by his leave. It is in that part of his *Coups d'Etat* where he ſpeaks of ſome perſons who have uſed fraud to arrive at the honour of diefication: *what Hercules did,* ſays he (103), *was more ingenious; for being well verſed in Aſtrology, witneſs the fables of his life which make him carry the heavens together with Atlas, he choſe exactly the hour and time of the appearance of a great comet, to put himſelf upon the burning pile in which he was to finiſh his days, to the end that this new fire from heaven might be preſent as a witneſs, and make it believed of him, what the Romans afterwards would have the world to believe of their emperors, by means of an eagle which flew up from the midſt of the flames, as it were to carry the ſoul of the deceaſed into the arms of Jupiter.* Here is an author who ſuppoſes that the appearance of comets can be foreſeen by Aſtrology. He is miſtaken; his commentator has cenſured him for it (104).

Note, that the temple which Fulvius Nobilior cauſed to be built to Hercules, was almoſt ruined in the time of Auguſtus, but Lucius Martius Philippus (105) cauſed it to be rebuilt, and joined a portico to it. See Ovid at the end of his fixth book *de Faſtis* and *Martial Epigram* 51 book 5.

[*T*] *Strabo, who cenſured a thought of Poſidonius, did not know wherein the real fault of it lay.*] Æſchylus ſuppoſes (106), that Hercules was admoniſhed, that being to fight the Ligurians he ſhould be deſtitute of arrows, fate having ſo ordained it, and in a place where he could not get a ſingle ſtone; but that in that extremity he ſhould be pitied by Jupiter, who by means of a cloud filled with ſtones would furniſh him with arms with which he ſhould beat the Ligurians. How much better had it been, ſaid Poſidonius, for Jupiter to have darted theſe ſtones upon the Ligurians and deſtroyed them, than to have reduced Hercules to ſuch an indigence, ἢ τοσοῦτον δεόμενον ποιῆσαι λίθον τὸν Ἡρακλέα. *Quam ad tot lapidum indigentiam redigere Herculem* (107). Strabo has anſwered this cenſure, and ſaid two things, one is, that was need of abundance of ſtones, ſince the buſineſs was to beat a great number of enemies, ſo that in that reſpect the thought of the poet Æſchylus was more probable than that of his cenſor. Τὸ μὲν οὖν τοσοῦτον ἀναγκαῖον ἦν, εἴπερ καὶ πρὸς ὄχλον παμπληθῆ. ὥς τε ταύτῃ γε πιθανώτερος ὁ μυθογράφος τοῦ ἀνασκευάζοντος τὸν μῦθον. *At verò tot lapidibus opus erat contra tantam multidudinem, ut hac quidem in parte fabulæ autor probabiliora dixerit, quam fabulæ reprehenſor* (108). Secondly, he adds, that the poet having expreſsly ſaid it was a thing ordered by fate, ſhould have ſtopped the mouth of all critics; for if one ſhould attempt to diſpute upon predeſtination and providence, many things would be found both in the moral and phyſical world, which might give occaſion to ſay, that they might have been better ordered in another manner; for example, it had been better to pour rain upon Ægypt than to moiſten it with the the waters of Æthopia; it had been better if Paris had been ſhip-wrecked in going to Lacedæmon, than to ſuffer him to carry away Helen, and to puniſh him for it afterwards to the great damage of the

---

(d) See Paſſerat. upon Propertius, Elog. 2, lib. iv.

(99) Tacitus, Hiſtor. lib. i, cap. ii.

(100) Eumenius, in Oratione pro Scholis inſtaurandis.

(101) Carmen amat quiſquis carmine digna genit.

(102) Statius, Silv. i, lib. iii, ver. 50.

(103) Naudé, Coups d' Etat, cap. ii, pag. m. 89.

(104) *See Lewis de May's Reflexions upon Naudé's* Coups d' Etat, pag. 144.

(105) *The mother of Auguſtus was married again to that Philippus.*

(106) *See* Strabo, lib. iv, pag. m. 126.

(107) Id. ibid.

(108) Id. ibid. pag. 127.

the Greeks and Trojans: a thing which Euripides attributes to Jupiter. Καὶ τὸν Πάριν εἰς τὴν Σπάρτην πλέοντα, ναυαγίῳ περιπεσεῖν. ἀλλὰ μὴ τὴν Ἑλένην ἁρπάσαντα, δίκας τίσαι τοῖς ἀδικηθεῖσιν ὕστερον, ἡνίκα τοσοῦτον ἀπειργάσατο φθόρον Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων, ὅπερ Ἐυριπίδης ἀνήνεγκεν εἰς τὸν Δία,

Ζεὺς γὰρ κακὸν μὲν Τρωσὶ πῆμα δ' Ἑλλάδι
Θέλων γενέσθαι, τὰ δ' ἐβούλευσεν πατήρ.

Et Paridem cùm Spartam peterit debuiſſe potius naufragium facere, quam rapta Helena pœnas poſtmodo ſceleris dare, autorem tanta cladis Græcorum ac Barbarorum: quam Euripides Jovi imputat:

Jupiter malum Troibus, & cladem Græciæ
Volens contingere, iſta decrevit pater (109),

(109) Id. ibid.

I believe that Strabo acted more ſubtilly than ſincerely. There is no probability that Poſidonius founded his raillery upon Hercules's wanting ſo many ſtones; yet becauſe his words were capable of that ſenſe, Strabo took advantage of it. But ſtill he has not obſerved the true fault of the criticiſm; he ſhould have anſwered Poſidonius, that if Jupiter had intended only, and in general, to kill the Ligurians in the head, he had better have cauſed the ſhower of ſtones to fall upon their heads, than about Hercules; but deſigning that Hercules ſhould be the author of the defeat of theſe people, it was requiſite that he ſtones ſhould fall near him and not upon his enemies. The critic went upon a notion which is an inexhauſtible ſcource of paralogiſms. He did not conſider that deſtiny includes all at once both the end and the means.

HERLICIUS (David), a Philoſopher, Phyſician, and Aſtrologer, was born at Zeitz in Miſnia the twenty eighth of December 1557. He ſtood in need of the aſſiſtance of his mother's relations to ſubſiſt at ſchool; his father not being in a condition to advance what was neceſſary. He learned to make verſes and to ſing, and he gained ſomething by that means on ſeveral occaſions, when his neceſſities preſſed hard upon him [*A*]. He ſtaid but a ſhort while in the univerſity of Wittemberg, becauſe Peucer, whoſe lectures he principally deſired to hear, was impriſoned. Not being able therefore to improve under ſo learned a profeſſor, he went to Leipſic, and ſtudied there with very good ſucceſs. He went afterwards to Roſtoc, where the profeſſors permitted him to give private lectures. He acquitted himſelf ſo well in them, that the duke of Mecklenburg made him ſub-principal of the college of Guſtraw. He continued in that ſtation two years, and ſpent all the time he had to ſpare in the practic of Phyſic, and in calculating nativities (*a*). He ſpent the two following years at Prenſlow (*b*), where he taught Natural Philoſophy, and afterwards, in the year 1583, he accepted a like employ at Anclam, where he alſo practiſed Phyſic. He publiſhed the following year an Almanack, which was highly applauded [*B*]. From that time he made one every year for the ſpace of fifty two years. He was called in the year 1585 to teach Mathematics in the univerſity of Gripſwald, and he continued in that employment thirteen years, and publiſhed ſeveral books. He took his doctor of Phyſic's degree with great ſolemnity in that univerſity in the year 1597, and a year after he accepted of the poſt of profeſſor of Natural Philoſophy at Stargard, a town of Pomerania, from whence he removed to Lubec in the year 1606, to exerciſe the ſame profeſſion. He practiſed Phyſic there with great reputation (*c*), and yet, by I know not what fickleneſs of temper, he left that town in the year 1614, and retired to Stargard, where he ſpent the reſt of his days. He died the fifteenth of Auguſt 1636. He had ſuffered a very grievous loſs the year before, his houſe and all his papers being burnt in the fire that reduced Stargard to aſhes the ſeventh of

(*a*) Quicquid temporis extraordinarii lucrari potuit Aſtrologiæ ſtudio, conſtructioni & judicio geniturarum tribuit, & inſuper ad Medicinam factitandam ſe applicuit. *Eichſtadius, ubi infra, citation* (*d*).

(*b*) *In the March of Brandenburg.*

(*c*) *See, remark* [*E*], *citat.* (12), *in the margin.*

[*A*] *He gained ſomething by that means on ſeveral occaſions, when his neceſſities preſſed hard upon him.*] This is what his friend Eichſtadius ingenuouſly confeſſes. ' Sponte, *ſays he* (1), ad Poëſin & Muſicam ' exercendam ſe dedit, à quo utroque ſtudio etiam po- ' ſtea in Academiis, quoties aliquâ inopia laborabat, ' fructus non pœnitendos percepit, eoque ſibi viros bo- ' nos & homines doctos patronos atque amicos conci- ' liyait; ſicut & habuit duos alios fratres Stralſundi in ' Pomerania & Muſica Inſtrumentali & Vocali (quorum ' unus Cantorem Scholæ, alter Muſicum organicum ' in templo Nicolaitano inibi egit) celebres atque ex- ' cellentes. —— *He applied himſelf to poetry and muſic,* ' *from both which ſtudies he afterwards, even in the* ' *univerſities, reaped no ſmall advantages, when he was* ' *ſtraitened in his circumſtances; and he alſo thereby* ' *procured the friendſhip and protection of ſeveral good and* ' *learned men. He had two brothers in Stralſund, in Po-* ' *merania, who were famous for their skill, in vocal and* ' *inſtrumental muſic, one of which was a ſinging maſter,* ' *and the other was organiſt to St Nicholus's churh there.*'

[*B*] *He publiſhed . . . . . an Almanack which was highly applauded.*] See the words of Eichſtadius (2): ' Anno 1584. primum ſuum Calendarium & progno- ' ſticon de mutationibus auræ & tempeſtatum in hoc ' phyſicatu publicavit, quod magno hominum applauſu ' ſtatim exceptum fuit. —— *In the year* 1584 *he firſt* ' *publiſhed his Calendar and prognoſtication of the* ' *changes of the wind and weather, which was receiv-* ' *ed great applauſe.*' This good ſucceſs encouraged him to go on, and he had the ſatisfaction to obſerve that his Almanacks were tranſlated into ſeveral languages, and that he on their account was looked upon as the ornament of Pomerania. ' Sed & prognoſtica annua de ' ſtatu aëris, quæ jam per quatuor ac decem annos ' conſcripſerat, maximo labore, ſumma fide, indefeſ- ' ſiſque obſervationibus, in uſum Pomeraniæ & regi- ' onum regnorumque adjacentium quotannis per 52. ' annos continuavit. Qui labor progreſſu annorum in ' tantem lucem venit, ut non tantùm à Germanis in ' ſuo idiomate expetitus, verùm etiam ab exteris in ' Latinam, Bohemicam, Polonicam, Danicam & deni- ' que Suecicam linguam tranſlatus, mox hinc inde in ' vicina climata illatus, atque Herlicius noſter tam ' utili anniverſario opere decus & ornamentum Pome- ' raniæ factus ſit (3). —— *He likewiſe continued his* ' *yearly Almanacks, which he had already publiſhed four-* ' *teen years ſucceſſively, with great labour, fidelity, and* ' *unwearied obſervation for fifty two years together,* ' *for the uſe of Pomerania, and the neighbouring coun-* ' *tries and kingdoms. Which work of his became ſo* ' *famous, that it was not only ſought after by the* ' *Germans in their own language, but tranſlated by* ' *foreigners into the Latin, Bohemian, Poliſh, Daniſh, and* ' *even Suediſh languages, and being carried every were,* ' *our HERLICIUS was on account of this uſeful* ' *yearful performance conſidered as the honour and or-* ' *nament of Pomerania.*' He loved this ſort of labour ſo much, that one of the reaſons why he quitted Lubeck, was the hopes of having ſo much leiſure at Stargard, as was neceſſary to finiſh a great work, wherein Aſtrology was to have a conſiderable ſhare (4). ' Ut ' defatigatus iſtic plurimis negotiis, curis, turbis, ho- ' neſtum ſibi otium quæreret, & Deo, ſuis Muſis at- ' que affinibus (5) vacare commodius poſſet, rurſus va- ' ledicens Lubecæ anno 1614 cum univerſa ſua fami- ' lia rebus compoſitis Stargardiam Pomeranorum ſe ' contulit, ubi majore tranquilitate literariâ ad abſol- ' vendum

(1) Eichſtad. in vita Davidis Herlicii, apud Henning. Witte Memor Medicorum, Decad. i, pag. 74.

(2) Apud Witte, ibid. pag. 76.

(3) Ibid. pag. 77.

(4) Ibid. pag. 77, 78.

(5) *His wife was of Stargard. She was a widow when he married her in the beginning of the year* 1611. Ibid. pag. 78.

of October 1635. Had it not been for this accident the public would have ſeen an infinite number of his aſtrological obſervations [*C*], it being a ſcience he had very much ſtudied (*d*). He had got money by calculating nativities [*D*]; and as he did not want wit, he took great care that the uncertainty of his art ſhould not be too much expoſed [*E*]. The prediction which he publiſhed againſt the Turks had not it's accompliſhment

‘vendum & expoliendum opus illud magnum, quod de *triplici Kalendario Eccleſiaſtico, Aſtronomico, & Aſtrologico* conſcribere inceperat, ſed ante annum (6), proh dolor, in communi Civitatis Stargardenſis flamma una conflagravit, ſe frui poſſe ſperabat —— *Being tired with a multiplicity of affairs, and with the cares and crowds that attended him there, and in order to find ſome repoſe, wherein he might at more leiſure ſerve his GOD, his muſe, and his friends, he again, in* 1614, *left Lubec, and all affairs being ſettled, went with his whole family to Stargard, in Pomerania, where he hoped to enjoy more leiſure to finiſh and correct a great work which he had begun, intituled a* Triple Kalendar, Eccleſiaſtical, Aſtronomical, and Aſtrological; *but alas! not a year after, it was conſumed in that fire which laid the town of Stargard in aſhes.*’ See the following remark.

[*C*] *Had it not been for that conflagration, the public would have ſeen an infinite number of his aſtrological obſervations.*] To ſhew this man's application to the minuteſt particulars of aſtrology, I will here inſert an inſtance which I find in his life. ‘Interea ſuas obſervationis Aſtrologicas publici juris facere decreverat; ſæpe enim ad me ſcripſit, quod ultra mille & ducenta collegerit Themata, quæ ſuo tertio operi Calendariographico & Aſtrologico inſerere, iiſque veritatem aliquot Aphoriſmorum Aſtrologicorum probare nitebatur: e. g. *Quod Planetæ benefici, Jupiter, & Venus conjuncti, imprimis in octava domo longam vitam & annos* (ultra 70) *diuturnos polliceantur.* Item *quod Fomahant, inſignis ſtella aſteriſmi Aquarii, in octava domo celebrem & glorioſum poſt mortem faciat.* Item, *quod Cauda Draconis in prima domo Cœli vel altero oculo carentem vel gibboſum fore minetur.* Ut complures alios taceam. At hæc cum reliqua ſua inſtructiſſima bibliotheca (cujus ſimilem vix privatus alius tota noſtra in Pomerania quoad Mathematicos, Hiſtoricos, & Medicos libros poſſedit) in communi Stargardienſi excidio flammis conflagrarunt (7). —— *In the mean while he had reſolved to publiſh his aſtrological obſervations; for he frequently wrote to me, that he had collected above twelve hundred nativities, which he deſigned to inſert in his third Kelendar and aſtrologic work, intending thereby to prove the truth of ſeveral aſtrologic aphoriſms. Such as,* that the benign planets, Jupiter and Venus, in conjunction, eſpecially in the eighth houſe, foretel a long life (*of more than ſeventy years*). *Secondly,* That Fomahant, a famous ſtar in the conſtellation Aquarius, in the eighth houſe, makes a perſon famous, and celebrated after his death. *Thirdly,* that the Dragon's Tail, in the firſt houſe of heaven, threatens that a perſon ſhall want one eye or be crook backed. *Not to mention many others. But all theſe, with his large library* (*which hardly had it's equal in Pomerania for mathematical, hiſtorical, and phyſical books*) *were burnt in the general conflagration of the town of Stargard.*’

[*D*] *He had got money by calculating nativities.*] The Bohemians and Polanders were his beſt cuſtomers. ‘Diverſæ ſæpe nationes ad eum conflebant, & ob multa experimenta nominiſque celebritatem judicium de ſuis genituris ab eo poſcebant Germani & exteri, præſertim Bohemi & Poloni, quorum liberalitatem præ reliquis prædicabat (8). —— *People of different nations flocked to him, both Germans, and foreigners, becauſe of his many experiments, and great fame, and asked his opinion concerning their nativities, and above all the Bohemians and Poles, whoſe liberality he uſed to extol above all others.*’ And being one of thoſe who take care of themſelves, he was very careful of his eyes, that they might be of ſervice to him in his old age; for which reaſon he had recourſe to the aſſiſtance of his friend Eichſtadius, who was likewiſe a lover of Aſtrology: He gave him nativities to calculate, and deſired his judgment on them (9).

[*E*] *He took great care that the uncertainty of his art ſhould not be too much expoſed.*] He would never work for thoſe who could not tell the hour of their nativity, chooſing rather to be without their money, than to expoſe his credit (10). What he wrote to Eichſtadius ſhows that he was ſincere, and looked upon Aſtrology as a venerable ſcience, the honour whereof he ought to preſerve, tho' he were a looſer by it. He could not endure that any one ſhould ask him of what colour horſes and cloaths muſt be of to bring good luck. He ſaw plainly, that he run a risk of being deceived in queſtions of that nature. He was angry with ſeveral Aſtrologers, who not uſing the like diſcretion, expoſed judicial Aſtrology to contempt and cenſure; and, at bottom, he would gladly have been ſo rich as not to be neceſſitated to gain a livelihood by this low profeſſion. ‘*Sobriè quoque hanc artem tractari volebat: hinc aliquando in ſuis literis ita ad me perſcripſit:* Utinam amicis fortuna me intueretur oculis, ut ſine Aſtrologicis gerris ſenectuti meæ (quæ mihi cæcitatem minatur) proſpicere poſſem, nunquam γενέθλια calculo inquirerem. Interim quando multi plura inquirunt, & ſcire deſiderant, quàm Ars noſtra fert, aut patitur, aut habet, aut explicat, malo juxta conſcientiam agere, quàm ſanctam Uraniam noſtram deturpare & velut ſtuprare, eique nigrum ſalem vel atrem notam aſpergere: quum alias tot ſuperſtitionibus Chaldaicis noſtra Ars ſcateat, quas multi ex noſtratibus adhuc mordicus tenent. Multi ex me ſcire laborant, qui colores veſtimentorum & equorum fortunati ſibi ſint futuri? Hac & alia monſtra quæſtionum ſæpè albis dentibus rideo, ſæpè etiam deteſtor. Amo enim virginitatem noſtræ Artis nec patiar eam ita neſario ſtupro pollui, ne Miſaſtrologi hoſce abuſus in contemptum Aſtronomiæ nobis objicere poſſint (11).’ It is hard to imagine how a man, who had ſo much buſineſs in Phyſic (12), and who never had any children ſhould fear to want neceſſaries in his old age, unleſs he calculated nativities. This might give credit to thoſe ſcandalous ſtories that went of him, and make one believe that he was too expenſive in his amours.

[*F*] *The prediction which he publiſhed againſt the Turks had not it's accompliſhment.*] Mr Thomaſius made an oration at Leipſic the fifteenth of Auguſt 1665, by way of thankſgiving for the peace concluded betwixt the emperor and the the Ottoman Porte. That peace had very much diſguſted the Millenarians, becauſe they had foretold that the downfal of the Turkiſh empire was near. They founded their predictions upon ſome texts of Scripture, and upon many preſages which they interpreted according to their fancy (13). This is their way, they renew it every day. Thomaſius is amazed that after ſo many falſe prophecies, which have been vended concerning this pretended approaching downfal of the Turks, people are not more cautious in propheſying. It ſeems that the more people have been deceived, the leſs one ought for the future to fear being ſo, ſince, after all, the word of GOD, which cannot lie, has promiſed us the overthrow that potent monarchy. It is this therefore that emboldens the new prophets. The orator doth not ſtop at this reaſon; he thinks that the deſire theſe gentlemen have of enjoying the golden age apon earth ſeduces them. ‘Sed fortaſſe curioſitati huic nihil potentiorem ſtimulum admovet, quàm neſcio cujus aurei ſeculi per mille duraturi annos perſuaſio, ubi profligatis ab omni latere hoſtibus Deo dilecta cohors in otio ſit ſuaviſſimo victura. Trahimur omnes beatæ his in terris vitæ cupiditate. Itaque ſi qua nobis eam fama polliceatur, ei ſitientiſſimas aures adjungimus inque omnes articulos temporis, qui favere huic affectui videntur, enixè vigilamus (14).’ After this he repreſents to his auditory, that there has not been any conſiderable war in the XVIIth century againſt the enemies of the true church, but predictions have been propagated, promiſing an utter ruin of the Pope or the Turk, or of both together. The glory of this defeat was promiſed to Frederic king of Bohemia, afterwards to Guſtavus Adolphus, and then to Charles Guſtavus. ‘Tantæ victoriæ lauream erant qui ſuperioris Germanici belli tempore Friderico Palatino, erant qui Guſtavo Adolpho Suecorum Regi, erant qui Carolo Guſtavo deſtinarent, cùm is Poloniam ‘ante

---

(*d*) *Taken from a letter of Laurence Eichſtadius, inſerted in the* Memoriæ Medicorum *of Henninges Witte,* Decad. i, pag. 73, & ſeq.

(6) *That is, in the year* 1635.

(7) Witte, Memor. Medicor. Decad i, pag. 81.

(8) Ibid. pag. 80.

(9) Et quia in ſua ingraveſcente ætate parcere oculis, & ad plures annos eorum uſum reſervare volebat, haud raro à me petiit, ut ſibi ad calculum geniturarum perficiendum & aliquod breve judicium de iis ferendum ſubvenirem, cui lubens annui. *Ibid.*

(10) Nunquam illis γενεθλιακὸν ſuum adornare volebat, qui ſine cognita nativitatis hora ad eum accedebant; maluitque dignitati artis, quam pecuniæ turpique lucro conſulere. *Ibid.*

(11) Id. pag. 76.

(12) In ampla praxi Medica vixit (Lubecæ) ita ut mihi aliquoties retulerit, ſe ſæpius ſubobſcuro mane ægros ſuos viſitatum extra ædes pedem extuliſſe, & uſque ad veſperam, ut numerum eorum in chartam relatum abſolveret, contentius per plateas ambulaſſe, demumque tenebris obortis domum reverſum eſſe. *Id. ibid. pag.* 77.

(13) Non aliis armis inſtructi prodierunt, qui per hos annos credi à nobis voluere, fore brevi, ut jam deletum Ottomannidarum imperium cerneremus: non levi, opinor, cum ſacræ Scripturæ profanatione, quam & generis diverſiſſimi prædictionibus ſociarent, & ſui cerebri ſomnia cogerent interpretari. *Thomaſius, in Orationib. pag.* m. 397.

(14) Id. ibid. pag. 395.

complishment [*F*]. He was twice married, and was very unfortunate in his firſt wife [*G*]. It was perhaps his own fault; for he was accuſed of being one of thoſe letchers, who go abroad to ſeek miſtreſſes. His friend makes but an ill apology for him on this ſcore [*H*]. He

ante hos novem annos infeſtaret (15). Afterwards he ſpeaks of our David Herlicius, who promiſed about the end of the XVIth century, that the Turk ſhould be ſoon deſtroyed. ‘Plenus talium in primis eſt, Davidis Herlicii, in aliis fortaſſe prædictionibus, quam in hæc felicioris Aſtrologi, libellus, quem ſub finem ævi ſuperioris, miſerè Pannoniam vexante Turcâ, vulgavit. Ibi Danielem, Apocalypſin, dictum Eliæ, præſagia Johannis Hilteni, Antonii Torquati Ferrarienſis, Turcarum ipſorum, curſus ſiderum, conjunctiones planetarum, quaſi in exercitum unum conſcribi video, quo in animis hominum ultimo prælio cum Turcâ decidatur (16). —— *But above all, a book of David Herlicius, (an Aſtrologer who was perhaps more ſucceſsful in ſome of his other predictions than in this) which he publiſhed about the end of the laſt century, when Hungary was miſerably ravaged by the Turks, is full of ſuch predictions. There we find Daniel, the Apocalypſe, the promiſe of Elias, the prophecies of John Hilten, Antonius Torquatus of Ferrara, of the Turks themſelves, the courſes of the ſtars, the conjunctions of the planets, all drawn together, as it were into one army, to fight this final battle againſt the Turks in the minds of men.*’

[*G*] *He was very unfortunate in his firſt wife.*] God knows why, ſaith the hiſtorian. ‘Anno 1593, honeſtiſſimam virginem *Reginam Hungers* primarii civis Primiſlavienſis filiam in matrimonium accepit, cum qua tamen non adeo concorditer (cauſam novit Deus) vixit, & ſine fructu matrimonii per 17 annos (17). —— *In the year 1593, he married Regina Hungers, daughter to one of the chief citizens of Prenſlow, and lived with her, tho' not ſo amicably, as were to have been wiſhed, (for what reaſon GOD knows) ſeventeen years, without having any children by her.*’ Seventeen years to people ill-matched is a pretty long term. We ſeldom find in the writers of the lives of famous men the ingenuity which we ſee here. Since I have been employed in this work, I have run over a great many elogies, and lives of learned men; but I have ſcarce ever read there that they lived ill with their wives: we are generally aſſured that the ſweeteſt agreement imaginable has been the benediction of their hymen. The neighbourhood frequently know the contrary. I remember a ſtory which deſerves ſome attention. A learned Roman (18), who died in the year 1640, had kept his wife in ſo ſevere a captivity as not to ſuffer any body to ſee her, or her to ſee any body (19). He ſuffered not ſo much as the parſon of the pariſh to enter his houſe at Eaſter, to take an account of the perſons in his family, and to ſprinkle holy-water, as is the cuſtom at Rome. He ſaid that the Pope going that way gave his benediction to the houſe, and that it was enough; and if the parſon was importunate the gentleman threatned to cudgel him (20). One day demanding a diſpenſation for his wife from keeping Lent, the prieſt anſwered he would not grant it, unleſs he ſaw with his own eyes the condition of the ſick perſon; the huſband replied aloud that the diſeaſe lay in her matrix: do you want, added he, to ſee the ſeat of the diſtemper? Nicius Erythræus was preſent at this diſcourſe. ‘Atque ipſemet adfui, cum in ſacrario S. Spiritus in Saxia Parocho, neganti, non aliter ſe uxori ejus poteſtatem facturum veſcendi carnibus in quadrageſima, niſi ſuis ipſe oculis, quo morbo affecta eſſet, aſpexiſſet, palam multis audientibus, dixit, Uxori meæ morbus in matrice inhæret, placet ne morbi locum aſpicere?’ It is eaſy to judge whether a man of this humour could live forty five years with his wife, without any ſort of diſpute. And yet this is aſſerted in his epitaph placed in the 275th page of the *Bibliotheca Romana* of Proſper Mandoſio. ‘Sed quod raro contingit cum Claudia Sebaſtiani Tiburtina uxore ſine querela conjunctiſſime vixit annis XLV. —— *But what very ſeldom happens, he lived forty five years with Claudia Sebaſtiani of Tivoli, his wife, in the ſtricteſt amity, without the leaſt miſunderſtanding.*’ Neither epitaphs nor elogies are to be truſted to.

[*H*] *His friend makes but an indifferent apology for him on this ſcore.*] Some, ſays he, maintain, that Herlicius loved young women, and his ſtars would have it ſo; but if any one would conclude from hence, that the troubles of his firſt marriage roſe from this, I anſwer in his juſtification that he had no child by either of his wives, and that he was uſed to ſay that he ſowed in barren ground; and conſequently he deſired only to be loved by young women, and not to enjoy them. ‘Ferunt nonnulli eum, quum ætas ferret, non abhorruiſſe à puellarum amoribus, id quod in geneſi ejus conjunctio Veneris cum Marte præ ſe ferre videtur. Quod ſi quis hinc eum fortè ſalacem, & hinc multas turbas in priore matrimonio ortas eſſe dixerit, ille ſciat, D. Herlicium ex utraque ſua conjuge nullos liberos vel Herliciolum ſuſcepiſſe, ſed illorum exortem fuiſſe, atque in ſterili agro (ut dicere ſolebat) laboraſſe, & proinde animo juvencularum mutuo potius, quam coitu captum eſſe (21).’ To confirm this apology Cardan is alledged, who has proved himſelf laſcivious by the multitude of his children (22). Never was a more wretched apology; for, in the firſt place, Herlicius did not boaſt of any continence or moderation; he only complained that he had cultivated a barren ſoil. He had therefore laboured, and he confeſſed it. What concluſion will you draw after this, from his having never had any children? Will you hence conclude, that if he endeavoured to get the love of young women, it was only for the pleaſure of being loved by them, without any farther pretenſions? But there are no engines ſtrong enough to draw that concluſion. In the ſecond place a barren wedlock is no proof of a leſſer incontinence; on the contrary, Phyſicians ſay, that too great a laſciviouſneſs is one of the obſtacles to conception; and that the reaſon why there are unfruitful marriages the firſt year, is the two frequent commerce of the new-married couple; ſo that before the firſt fires are over, nature being interrupted and diverted cannot take her meaſures right. Read Ariſtotle cited by Montagne (23). ‘It is requiſite, ſaith Ariſtotle, to approach a wife prudently and ſeverely, leaſt the too irritating pleaſure ſhould carry her beyond the rules of reaſon. What he ſays for conſcience, Phyſicians ſay for health; that an ardent, voluptuous, and too frequent pleaſure, adulterates the ſeed, and hinders conception. On the other hand they ſay, that as to a languiſhing congreſs, ſuch as this is naturally, the uſe of it muſt be rare, and with conſiderable intervals in order to furniſh it with a juſt and fertile heat.

‘*Quo rapiat ſitiens Venerem, interiuſque recondat.*’

Laurence Joubert, a famous Phyſician, employs one of the chapters (24) of his vulgar errors to oppugn ‘thoſe, who think by frequent embraces to have children, and thoſe who think to have fewer by a contrary method.’ The ignorant vulgar, *ſays he* (25), ‘miſtake two contrary ways, totally contradicting their intentions; ſome being very deſirous of children, think to obtain them by the frequency of their embraces; and others by much abſtaining from their wives, think to avoid the increaſe of their family. The firſt imagine that if they fail at one time, they ſhall ſucceed at another: but it happens quite otherwiſe; for what might have have been effected by the firſt enjoyment may be deſtroyed by a ſecond. And which is more, theſe frequent returns, without the invitation of nature, give not the ſeed time to elaborate and perfect itſelf, and therefore it is not fecund and prolific, but rather as inſignificant as water.’

It is a true ſaying that it is better not to have one's cauſe pleaded than to commit it to a bad advocate. Eichſtadius deſerves to be compared to him whom the Prætor Scipio recommended to one that was at law. ‘Ille Siculus cui Prætor Scipio patronum cauſæ dabat hoſpitem ſuum, hominem nobilem, ſed admodum ſtultum: Quæſo, inquit, Prætor, adverſario meo da iſtum patronum, deinde mihi neminem dederis (26). —— *The Prætor Scipio having aſſigned a gueſt of his, who was a man of quality indeed, but of very mean parts, to be advocate to a Sicilian, in a cauſe which he was proſecuting: I beg, ſaid the Sicilian, that you will give that advocate to my adverſary, and then I ſhall have occaſion for none.*’

---

(15) Id. ibid. pag. 396.

(16) Ibid.

(17) Eichſtadius, ubi ſupra, pag. 76.

(18) *His name was Gaſpar Cabus.*

(19) Uxorem adeo amplius quadraginta annos quibus cum ea vixit cuſtodiis ſuis domi ſubjectam habuit, ut mortalium nemini fas fuerit aſpicete. *Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth. i, pag. 226.*

(20) Parochis, quibus mos eſt quotannis, Paſchalibus feriis, ſuis in parœciis capita hominum recenſere, ac ſingulorum domos aqua luſtrali conſpergere, verborum contumeliis, ac metu etiam fuſtis, ſi auſi eſſent accedere, domi ſuæ foribus abigebat, quod diceret, Pontificem Max. cum illac iter faceret, bene domui ſuæ dicere, proinde nihil opus eſſe cujuſquam ad eam rem opera. *Id. ibid.*

(21) Eichſtadius, ubi ſupra, pag. 78.

(22) Hieron. Cardanus quidem in judicio ſuæ genituræ ſe laſcivum fuiſſe multitudine procreatorum liberorum probat. *Id. ibid.*

(23) Montagne, Eſſais, livr. iii, chap. v, pag. m. 112.

(24) *It is the ſixth of the ſecond book.*

(25) Joubert, Erreurs Populaires, livr. ii, chap. vi, pag. m. 74.

(26) Cicero, de Orat. lib. ii, cap. lxix.

He publiſhed a good many books [*I*]. I forgot to ſay that he was a good Lutheran.

[*I*] *He publiſhed a good many books.*] Moſt of them are in High-Dutch: the Latin are either poems or orations, or tracts of Philoſophy and Phyſic: the Sieur Witte gives a catalogue of them (27).

(27) Memoriæ Medicor. Decad. i, pag. 87.

HERMANT (Godfrey)

HERMANT (Godfrey) one of the moſt famous writers of the XVIIth century, was born at Beauvais the ſeventh of February 1617. ‘ He gave in his childhood proofs of a very lively wit and happy memory, qualities which he preſerved to the day of his death. He learned the Latin and Greek tongues with a wonderful eaſe, and at an age at which others can hardly read and write. He was but twelve years old when Auguſtine Potier, biſhop and count of Beauvais, ſent him to Paris to ſtudy Rhetoric under the Jeſuits. After he had finiſhed his courſe of philoſophy in the college of Navarre, and of Divinity in the Sorbonne, this good prelate, who loved him, called him back to Beauvais to teach the Claſſics and Rhetoric. He ſent him again to Paris in the year 1640, to be tutor to Mr d'Ocquerre, his nephew. That employ did not hinder him from teaching Philoſophy in the college of Beauvais, in order to be admitted into the houſe of Sorbonne. He was made bachelor in 1641, and canon of the cathedral church of Beauvais in 1642. Hitherto his merit was known only to his friends, but the Jeſuits having preſented a requeſt to the king in the year 1643, to be incorporated into the univerſity of Paris, Mr Hermant was made choice of to write againſt it, ’ and he compoſed three or four pieces which got him great reputation. Mr le Camus, biſhop of Bellai, congratulated him upon it, in a manner that deſerves to be related [*A*]. He repreſented to him the reſentment of the Jeſuits againſt him; but as Mr Hermant was no ambitious man, he did not give them an opportunity to employ their great intereſt to his prejudice. ‘ He was made prior of the Sorbonne in 1644, a licentiate and rector in 1646. It was in the ſecond year of his rectorſhip that there happened one of theſe fortuitous conjunctures, which hinders ſome people from ſeeing the vanity of judicial Aſtrology [*B*], and from abſolutely condemning

[*A*] *Mr le Camus congratulated him upon it in a manner that deſerves to be related.*] Mr Hermant wrote four pieces on that occaſion. I. Obſervations upon the Requeſt of the Jeſuits. II. The firſt Apology for the Univerſity. III. Academical truths. IV. The ſecond Apology, which is a reply to the anſwer which the Jeſuits publiſhed. He did not prefix his name to theſe pieces. ‘ Mr le Camus, biſhop of Bellai, having diſcovered Mr Hermant to be the author of thoſe pieces, made him a viſit at Albiac-Houſe, where he lodged, and, embracing him, ſaid, that he bleſſed God for having not only given him ſo much ſenſe and learning at ſo early an age, but alſo a heart and courage not to fear the hatred and vengeance of ſo terrible a ſociety as that he wrote againſt. Yet all the evil that the Jeſuits could do him whilſt he lived, did only conſiſt in their not loving him, nor ſpeaking of him with eſteem, though he had been their diſciple. His modeſty ſheltered him from their moſt formidable reſentment, and they could not oppoſe him in his pretenſions to the firſt dignities of the church which they diſpoſe of, becauſe he was ſo far from ſeeking them, that he ſincerely ſlighted them, and even refuſed them when he was preſſed to accept of them (1).’ The want of ambition often proves the beſt ſanctuary.

[*B*] *While he was rector, there one of thoſe fortuitous conjunctures, which hinders ſome people from ſeeing the vanity of judicial Aſtrology.*] Here are the words of a Memoir which has been imparted to us (2), ‘ Marcellus, profeſſor of Rhetoric in the college of Liſieux, had compoſed in Latin an elogy on mareſchal de Gaſſion, who was killed with a musket-ſhot at the ſiege of Lens, and he was ready to deliver it in public, when an old doctor, who made it his chief buſineſs to read all the papers that were poſted up, being ſurprized to find that which gave notice of Marcellus's oration at two of the clock, ran to complain of it to Mr Hermant, and repreſented to him, that it ought not to ſuffered, that, in a Catholic univerſity, a man ſhould deliver a funeral oration in praiſe of a perſon who died in the Proteſtant religion, and deſired him to call a convocation to determine the matter. Mr Hermant not being able to refuſe this to him, it was reſolved by a majority of votes, that Marcellus ſhould be immediately forbid to deliver the panegyric on Mr de Gaſſion; and the Aſtrologers triumphed upon it, obſerving to every body that in the Almanack of the famous Larrivey, amongſt the predictions of that ſame month, there was written in great characters, LATIN PERDU, *Latin loſt*.’ That we may the better underſtand the circumſtances of this prohibition I ſhall ſet down a paſſage of du Boulai (3). ‘ Mr Marcel, profeſſor of Rhetoric in Liſieux's college, having advertiſed that he was to pronounce the funeral oration of mareſchal de Gaſſion, the rector forbad him, becauſe the ſaid Gaſſion died a Huguenot; whereupon Mr James Deſperiers, principal of the ſaid college, going with the ſaid Marcel to complain to the chancellor of France, they were ordered to ſubmit to the rector's ſentence. The act taken from the regiſters of the German nation teſtifies it, 22 December (an. 1647.) Ampl. D. Rector habitis Comitiis ex conſilio D. D. Decanorum & 4. Procuratorum prohibuit D. Guill. Marcel. eloquentiæ Profeſſorem in Collegio Lexovæo *declamare laudes & præconia demortui Mareſchalli nomine Gaſſion*, quod prolixo programmate publico notum fecerat omnibus Studioſis; ſed quia res erat peſſimi exempli & contra Religionem laudare hominem in hæreſi mortuum, noluit Academia acquieſcere inſtantiſſimis precibus D. Marcelli neque D. Deſperiers Gymnaſiarchæ Lexovæi, qui provocarunt ad D. Seguier Franciæ Cancellarium, qui eos auditos ad Ampl. D. Rectorem hujus rei Judicem remiſit. Et ſic ſilentium illis impoſitum eſt. —— *December* 22. 1647. *The rector in convocation, with advice of the Deans, and of the four Procurators, prohibited Mr William Marcel, profeſſor of Eloquence in the college of Liſieux, to* pronounce any panegyric on the late mareſchal de Gaſſion, *as he had advertiſed that he intended to do; but it being of very bad example, and contrary to religion, to praiſe a perſon who died a Heretic, the univerſity rejected the earneſt ſuit of Mr Marcel, and of Mr Deſperiers, head of the ſaid college of Liſieux, and they having thereupon applied to Mr Seguier, chancellor of France, he, after hearing them, referred the matter to the rector as the proper judge in this caſe. And by that means they were put to ſilence.*’

How many reflexions might be made upon that ſpirit of policy, or falſe devotion, which makes the church of Rome deny to Heretics the praiſes that are due to them? But, ſetting reflexions aſide, I ſhall confine my ſelf ſome facts, and ſhall begin with a paſſage in the News from the Republic of Letters, taken from the extract of a book of Daniel Francus *de Papiſtarum Indicibus Librorum prohibitorum & expurgandorum*. ‘ He recites the inſtructions that are given to the inquiſitors, wherein we ſee amongſt other things an order to expunge without exception all praiſes given to Heretics. Theſe are things, which we muſt ſee with our own eyes, in order to believe them, it being otherwiſe impoſſible to imagine that religion could give ſuch a turn to our minds. Bellarmine was

A Collection of ſeveral things relating to the ſcruples of the church of Rome, about the praiſes beſtowed upon Heretics.

---

(1) Taken from a memorial communicated to the bookſeller.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Ceſar Egaſſe du Boulai, remarques ſur la Dignité Préſéance, &c. du Recteur de l'Univerſité de Paris, pag. 91.

‘ condemning it.’ I will give an exact catalogue of the works which he publiſhed [C], and I will ſay ſomething of his difference with Father Maimbourg [D]. He died a ſudden death at Paris in the ſtreet the eleventh of July 1690, as we ſhall ſee in his epitaph. I will inſert it entire, tho’ it was not put upon his tomb [E], his enemies having had malice

was ſo perſuaded, that it is part of the character of an orthodox never to praiſe a Heretic, that the author cenſures him for having poſitively ſaid *, *that it was never known that the Catholics have praiſed the doctrine or the life of Heretics.* However, he ſhews by the commendations which Cochleus, Æneas Sylvius, Poggius Florentinus, the Jeſuit Clavius, Mr de l’Aubeſpine, biſhop of Orleans, and Caramuel, have given to Heretics, that Bellarmine’s touchſtone is not very certain. However, by this we diſcover the ſpirit of the Inquiſition. It is ſomething very ſingular; for the gentlemen of the Inquiſition will have the prefaces of books, epiſtles dedicatory, and, in general, whatever doth any honour to perſons out of the Roman communion, without excepting princes, to be expunged. Hence the Expurgatory Index’s order, that if any hiſtorian has ſaid, *ſuch a day Chriſtopher the illuſtrious duke of Wirtemberg was born*, Præclarus Dux Wurtenbergenſis, that the word *illuſtrious*, *præclarus*, ſhall be ſtruck out, which yet is of ſo little conſequence, that it is given in Latin to the meaneſt ſchool-boy. They order alſo that all the capital letters put before proper names, to ſignify that a Heretic is called *Doctor*, *Maſter*, *a famous divine*, *vir clariſſimus*, *vir reverendus*, be immediately expunged. The Jeſuit Serarius affirms in his *Minerval*, that the praiſes of a Heretic in the book of a Catholic writer, are an abomination to God, like thoſe abominable offerings mentioned in the twenty third chapter of Deuteronomy and eighteenth verſe (4).’ I have read in a Paris Gazette, that, in 1633, the maſter of the ſacred palace publiſhed at Rome ‘ a prohibition againſt the keeping of any proſe, poetry, image, figure, or medal, made in memory of Guſtavus Adolphus king of Sweden (5).’ Mr Sallo, giving an extract of a book of Father Bona, hath the following reflexion: ‘ This author, *ſays he* (6), is the firſt that hath given the catalogue of the authors whom he cites with his judgment upon each in particular (7). There are in this criticiſm things that are very curious. For the reſt, we need not think it ſtrange that this good Father ſpeaks ſo ill of heterodox authors in this criticiſm, even in things where faith is not concerned, becauſe he wrote at Rome, where it is a crime to like a Heretic’s book.’ Let us add to this the following words of Balzac (8). ‘ Madam de Saumaiſe requeſted me, by Monſieur Conrart, that I would give her ſome lines to be engraved on her huſband’s tomb. But I took care not to promiſe her any thing, being in a condition wherein I could not perform it, and afflicted with a diſtemper which deprives me of reſt, and leaves no room for poetic thoughts. Beſides, interments and whatever concerns funeral obſequies belonging to religion, I thought that the epitaph of a Huguenot could not be compoſed by a Catholic. I ſay an epitaph like this; which muſt be placed in a church; which muſt be written in a Chriſtian ſtile; and in which it would be difficult not to give to underſtand by ſome word favourably explained, that the deceaſed was paſſed from this life to a better. But you know, my lord, that theſe terms are criminal in our church, and that they have been condemned at Rome, in the writings of the greateſt men of our age.’

Note, that this maxim of Rome is not always obſerved; for if you conſult James Laurent, in the ſecond and ſixth chapters of his *Prodiga Jeſuitarum liberalitas*, you will there find praiſes beſtowed by Catholic authors on the virtue and learning of the heterodox. See the margin (9).

[C] *I will give an exact catalogue of the works which he publiſhed.*] I call it ſo without any ſcruple, becauſe I take it from a Memoir which has been communicated to us. ‘ He publiſhed in 1644 an apology for Mr Arnaud, his friend, againſt a libel of F. Noüet, intituled, *Judicious Remarks upon the book concerning the frequent communion.*’ He wrote, in 1651, under the name of St Julian, againſt the viſions of Labadie an apoſtate Jeſuit; and, under that of Hieronymus ab Angelo Forti, three Latin letters to Mr de Saintebeuve, againſt Mr des Marets, miniſter of Groningen, who had taken ſome advantage of a Catechiſm concerning grace, printed by order of a pious biſhop. He publiſhed the life of St Chryſoſtome in 1644, that of St Athanaſius in 1671, the Aſcetics of St Baſil in 1673, the life of St Baſil and of St Gregory Nazianzen in 1674. He printed ſome ſpiritual dialogues upon St Matthew in 1690. Since his death his ſpiritual dialogues upon St Mark, and a little Treatiſe of Silence have been printed. A perſon of quality having begged of him the extracts he had made of the councils, he truſted them to a faithleſs amanuenſis, who kept a copy of them, and publiſhed them at Liſle in 1693, with this title, *Clavis Diſciplinæ Eccleſiaſticæ, ſeu Index univerſalis totius juris Eccleſiaſtici.* They are diſgraced by ſome additions very unworthy of Mr Hermant, and which might prejudice his memory if the public was not told that they are none of his, eſpecially the collection of letters falſly attributed to our firſt Popes. God grant we may one day ſee his eccleſiaſtical and ſecular hiſtory of Beauvais and Beauvaiſis, and that it may not be loſt in the hands of thoſe who have ſeized upon it, to the prejudice of one of his friends, to whom the truſted it, and by his will appointed him to take care of the impreſſion (10).’

[D] *I will ſay ſomething of his difference with Father Maimbourg.*] This Jeſuit, ‘ having in his hiſtory of Arianiſm tranſcribed all that was curious and fine in the life of St Athanaſius, thought he had nothing to do but to cry down the author of it by an ill-natured preface, to diſguiſe his plagiariſm, fancying that no body would ever imagine he had vouchſafed to take any thing from a book which he treated with ſo much contempt. He blames Mr Hermant. I. For having inſerted the paſſages of authors. II. For having put ſome illuſtrations at the end of his work upon the moſt difficult points. III. For having ſaid that it is difficult to know any thing more about the order of the ſitting of the council of Nice, except that ſimplicity, modeſty and civility regulated it, and that the probabilities that are urged to the contrary upon this ſubject, are not ſolid reaſons nor ſtrong deciſions. Mr Hermant printing the life of St Baſil and St Gregory Nazianzen in 1674, after having juſtified himſelf in the preface againſt the three complaints of Father Maimbourg, ends his reply thus: But I am perhaps already blamed for having been ſo long in refuting an accuſation which has no ſolid foundation; and in truth I might have intirely neglected it. For it is certain that an author draws upon himſelf the indignation of all equitable judges, when having profited by the labours of other men, and enriched and decked himſelf with their ſpoils, he makes them no other return for it but reproaches. This excuſes me from anſwering in particular, a man who has thought fit to deal with me in this manner, and it ſuffices me that there is nothing more univerſally acknowledged by all the world, than this maxim of the canoniſts, which, in the firſt place, orders that reſtitution be made to thoſe that have been robbed, *ſpoliatus ante omnia reſtituendus.* I ought to make a better uſe of my time, than to examine his faults, which are perhaps more numerous than he imagines. What he has cenſured in my hiſtory of St Athanaſius, ſubſiſts by the invincible force of truth, and I need not bring new proofs for it, *&c* (11).’

[E] *I will here inſert his epitaph, though it was not put upon his tomb.*] Let us make uſe of the very words of the above quoted Memoir (12). ‘ A canon, who was his relation, had made him an epitaph, and the chapter approved of it; but ſome falſe brother having given notice of it to the Jeſuits, they cauſed it to be ſuppreſſed by an order from court, at the ſame time that in the ſight of all Paris, and and to the ſcandal of the church, a chapel was profaned by Lully’s Mauſolæum . . . The epitaph deſigned for him was this:

Heic

---

* De Not. Eccleſ. cap. xvi, art. i.

(4) Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres, July 1685, art. ii, pag. 776, & ſeq.

(5) Gazette de Paris, March 14, 1633.

(6) Journal des Sçavans, January 19, 1665, *in the Abſtract of a book* de divina Pſalmodia.

(7) This is not true: Dempſter had done it long before in his Additions to Roſinus’s *Roman Antiquities.* The like may be ſeen in Nicolas Vignier’s *Theatre de l’Antichriſt*, of the Geneva edition, in 8vo, 1613.

(8) Balzac, Extrait d’une Lettre à Mr le Marquis de Montauſier, *at the end of his letters to Mr Conrart, pag.* 416, *of the Dutch edition*, 1659.

(9) Lorenzo Craſſo has placed ſeveral Proteſtants (for example Guſtavus Adolphus and Salmaſius) among the great captains and learned men, whoſe elogies he publiſhed in Italy.

(10) Taken from the above quoted memoir.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Ibid.

malice and authority enough to hinder it (*a*).

(*a*) Taken from a memorial communicated to the Bookſeller.

Heic reſurrectionem expectat
GODEFRIDUS HERMANT BELLOVACUS,
Eruditione clarus, fama celebris, virtute præſtantior,
Rector quondam Academiæ Pariſienſis
ſtrenuuſque defenſor,
Doctor & Socius Sorbonicus,
Hujus Eccleſiæ Canonicus,
Amans diſciplinæ ſi quis unquam ſanctioris
Excelſi vir ingenii, ſtupendæ doctrinæ, facundiæ mirabilis,
Debebantur majora.
Oblata recuſavit modeſtiâ ſingulari.
Impendit
Doctis elucidata illuſtrium Patrum geſta,
Piis Sacras in Matthæum & Marcum exercitationes,
Civibus urbis hujus & Dioceſis hiſtoriam,
Omnibus ſeipſum, verbo, converſatione, charitate.
Super impendit
Egenis ſua omnia.
Repentinâ morte ereptus non improviſâ
Pariſiis ictu ſanguinis exanimatus viâ publicâ
A. R. S. MDCXC. XI. Julii. Æt. LXXIII.
Ad ſacelli hujus cancellos tumulum deſignavit ſibi
Dignum cum Ambroſio ratus requieſcere ſacerdotem
ubi offerre conſueverat.

Here lies expecting the reſurrection, Godfrey Hermant born at Beauvais, famous for his learning, but more ſo for his piety, ſome time rector of the univerſity of Paris and it's ſtenuous defender. Doctor and Fellow of the Sorbonne, and canon of this church, a lover of the holy diſcipline, if ever any man was ſo. Of an elevated genius, prodigious learning, and admirable eloquence. Tho' he deſerved greater honours, he with a ſingular modeſty refuſed thoſe that were offered to him. To the learned he gave his Lives of the holy Fathers. To the pious, his Sacred Exercitations on Matthew and Mark. To his citizens, his Hiſtory of this city and dioceſe. To all men himſelf, in word, converſation, and charity. And to the poor all his poſſeſſions. He was ſnatched away by a ſudden, tho' not an unexpected, death, being ſeized with a violent bleeding in the ſtreets of Paris, of which he died there, in the year of our Lord 1690, 11. July, in the LXXIII year of his age. He was buried near the rails of this chapel, as he had deſired, being of St Ambroſe's opinion, that a prieſt was worthy reſt where he had uſually offered.

HERMESIANAX, an elegiac poet, born at Colophon, was honoured with a ſtatue in his country (*a*). See the remarks of the article LEONTIUM (*b*).

(*a*) Pauſanias, *in Eliacis, (and not* Iliacis, *as we read in* Voſſius de Hiſtor. Græc. pag. 374.) *or* lib. vi, pag. 194.

(*b*) *See Remark* [*A*].

HERMIAS, a philoſopher of Alexandria, in the Vth century, ſtudied with Proclus under Syrianus. He had two ſons, Ammonius and Heliodorus, who were of his profeſſion, the firſt whereof became much more famous than the latter. Hermias was a very virtuous man, good-natured and ſincere. He was as laborious as poſſible, but of a mean genius, and he could not invent the ſtrong proofs which are neceſſary in philoſophizing. He had an admirable memory, and recited to a miracle the lectures of his profeſſor, and what he had read in books: his chief talent lay in this; for when he undertook to ſolve the objections and doubts of a diſputant, he quickly expoſed his weak ſide. His morals were wonderful [*A*]. It is ſaid, that he did not approve the uſe of diminutive and fondling words, which mothers and nurſes uſe to children, and that he ſeverely reprimanded his wife (*a*) upon that account (*b*)

(*a*) Ὁ δὲ ἀκȣ́σας ἠγανάκτησε, καὶ ἐπετίμησε τὸν παιδικὸν τȣ̃τον ὑποκορισμόν. Pater audiens conqueſtus eſt, & increpuit hanc puerilem diminutionem. *Photius, ubi infra.*

(*b*) Taken from Photius, in the the Abſtract of Damaſcius, *pag. m.* 1044.

[*A*] *His morals were wonderful.*] We may judge of them by the maxims upon which he went in his bargains. He maintained, that we ought not to take advantage of the ſeller's ignorance, but acquaint him with the juſt price of the merchandize, if he is ignorant of it. They who did otherwiſe, were, according to him, guilty of a very great injuſtice. They did not rob like highway-men, and at the peril of their lives, but they defrauded the law, and corrupted juſtice. He did not approve the axiom, *Volenti non fit injuria.* He pretended that beſides the injuries which are done by violence, there is another ſort, which people may be guilty of without forcing the will of thoſe we injure. He practiſed this fine theory; for one day perceiving that a man who was ſelling him a book did not put it at the juſt price, he acquainted him with it, and paid him more than he asked: he did the ſame thing on many other occaſions, and as often as there was opportunity (1). Καὶ ȣ̓χ ἅπαξ τὴν δικαιοσύνην ταύτην, ἧς τοῖς ἄλλοις ȣ̓δέ τις ἐπιστροφὴ· ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις, ὁσάκις συνέβαινεν ἀγνοεῖν τὸν πιπράσκοντα τὸ δίκαιον τίμημα ἐπεδείκνυτο. Nec ſemel hanc juſtitiam, cujus nullam alii rationem habent, verum etiam ſæpius quoties venditorem debitum pretium ignorare contigiſſet oſtendit (2). Is there any thing more worthy of a philoſopher? Chriſtians who do ſo, are very rare.

Rara avis in terris, nigroque ſimillima cygno (3)

(1) Taken from Photius, pag. 1044.

(2) Photius ex Damaſcio, Biblioth. ibid.

(3) Juven. Sat. VI, ver. 164.

HEROLD (BASIL JOHN) was born at Hochſtet (*a*) upon the Danube, in Suabia, in the year 1511. He applied himſelf diligently to learning, and went, in the year 1539, to Baſil, where he ſtudied at the ſame time Divinity and Hiſtory. He married there, and was appoined miniſter of a village of that canton; but as the Bookſellers found him fit for their ſervice, they cauſed him to return to Baſil in the year 1546. His application in preparing work for them, was incredible, and it was in acknowledgment of his long labours, that the magiſtrates of Baſil made him a burgher in the year 1556. From that time he took the name of Baſil: he was alive in the year 1566 (*b*). I will give the titles of moſt of his books [*A*]. Lezana, the annaliſt of the Carmelites, has committed a groſs

(*a*) Hence it is, that he ſirnames himſelf *Acropolita* in his *Philopſeudes*.

(*b*) *Taken from* Martin Hankius, de Scriptoribus Rerum Romanarum, Tom II, pag. 142.

[*A*] *I will give the titles of moſt of his books.*] I have ſpoke elſewhere (1) of his *Philopſeudes, ſive declamatio pro Deſ. Eraſmo Rot. contra dialogum famoſum anonymi cujuſdam medici.* That piece was printed at Baſil in the year 1541 (2). His ſix books *Belli ſacri hiſtoriæ continuatæ,* were printed with *Gulielmus Tyrius,* in folio, in the year 1560. They begin at the year 1185, and end at 1521. His *Leges antiquæ Germanorum* were printed at Baſil in 1557, as alſo his *Princeps juventutis, ſive panegyricus Ferdinando Archiduci Auſtriæ dicatus, cum hiſtoriola Turcici belli anno* 1556 *geſti.* He tranſlated many books into the German tongue, whoſe titles you will ſee in the Epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheque.* His *Pannoniæ Chronologia* is commonly joined with the decads of Bonfinius. His treatiſe *de Germania veteris veræ quam primam vocant locis antiquiſſimis; item de Romanorum in Rhætia littorali ſtationibus, & hinc ortorum ibidem vicorum atque municipiorum hodie*

(1) In the remark [*C*] of the article ERASMUS.

(2) Geſnerus, in Biblioth fol. 425, verſo.

a groſs blunder ſpeaking of this author [*B*]. Konig has made two writers of John Herold, and Baſil John Herold. They are one and the ſame man. There was, in the XVth century, a Dominican, named **John Heroldus**, a German. He was an eminent Divine, and a very good preacher. He compoſed ſeveral books, which have been publiſhed in diverſe places. An edition of his works was publiſhed at Mentz in the year 1612, in three volumes in quarto (*c*).

(*c*) *See* Dr Cave's Scriptor. Hiſtor. Eccleſ Literar. Part. II. pag. 314, 315. Edit. Genev. 1699.

hodie ſuperſtitum originibus, has been inſerted in the firſt volume of Simon Schardius *de ſcriptoribus rerum Germanicarum*. Chriſtopher Lehman (3) has cenſured him in the firſt book of his Chronicle of Spire; but an apology has been made for Heroldus. One may ſee how laborious he was, by cousulting the preface (4), which he prefixed to the firſt Tome of the Treaſures of Eugyppius. He there promiſes a Collection of Stratagems, and I ſee in the Epitome of Geſner, that he publiſhed ſix chiliads of them. He compoſed a funeral oration upon the emperor Ferdinand, which was printed at Francfort, in the year 1564. It muſt not be forgot that he publiſhed (5) the writings of ſeventy ſix authors, under the title of *Orthodoxography*, and a *Hæreſeologia, ſeu Syntagma veterum Theologorum tam Græcorum quam Latinorum numero* 18 *qui graſſatas in Eccleſia hæreſes confutarunt*, *& præcipua Theologiæ capita tractarunt* (6).

[*B*] *Lezana . . . . has committed a groſs blunder ſpeaking of this author.*] He ſays under the year 1159, that St Antoninus was in the wrong to ſet down word for word a paſſage of John Heroldus, without confuting him. That paſſage contains a deſcription of the original habit of the Carmelites. The Jeſuit Papebroch took notice of that blunder, by ſaying, that St Antoninus a lived a century before John Heroldus; for, adds he, St Antoninus died in the year 1459, and the *Principis juventutis*, which Herold dedicated to the archduke Ferdinand, was printed in the year 1557 (7). The difference is not quite a century: we have ſome books of Heroldus printed in the year 1540. Nevertheleſs, Lezana was very much miſtaken. Here is a queſtion which that Jeſuit propoſed to a Carmelite, who wrote againſt him (8): ‘An Joannes Heroldus Hochſtettenſis, continuator belli ſacri, cujus Continuationis ſingulos libros Catholicis Prælatis dedicavit, ſemper cum laude etiam de religioſis mendicantibus locutus, ſed in ſolis Carmelitis explodens enormem quem fingebant ſeſe in Syria habuiſſe, monaſteriorum ac Fratrum numerum; an, inquam Heroldus iſte in] dignus ſit qui citetur, tanquam infeſtiſſimus ſedis Apoſtolicæ hoſtis: eſto juvenis ſub nomine Heroldi Acropolitani ſcripſerit Apologiam pro Eraſmo, inter prohibitos relatam. —— *Whether John Heroldus of Hochſtet, the continuator of the Hiſtory of the Holy War, each book of which Continuation he dedicated to Catholic prelates, and who always mentions the friars, even of the mendicant orders, with honour, and only explodes the great number of monaſteries and fryars, which the Carmelites pretended to have in Syria; whether, I ſay, this Heroldus be unworthy of being quoted, as being an inveterate enemy of the holy ſee: tho' we grant that, in his youth, he wrote an Apology for Eraſmus, under the name of Heroldus Acropolitanus, which is in the Index Expurgatorius.*’

(3) *See* Zeiller de Hiſtoricis, Part. II, pag. 74.

(4) *Geſner*, ubi ſupra, *gives a ſmall part of it.*

(5) At Baſil in 1555.

(6) At Baſil in 1556.

(7) *See* Daniel Papebroch Reſponſ. ad Exhibit. Errorum, pag. 153.

(8) Papebroch. in Synopſi Quæſt. curioſarum, Art. xxiv, pag. 43.

HERWART (**John George**) chancellor of Bavaria, about the beginning of the XVIIth century, made himſelf famous by the Apology he wrote for the emperor Lewis of Bavaria, againſt the falſhoods of Bzovius, many other faults of whom he cenſured beſides. Scaliger looked upon him as a bad chronologer (*a*).

Our Herwart was originally deſcended from a Patrician family of Augſburg. I will give the title of a chronological work which he compoſed, and that of a book publiſhed by his ſon [*A*], containing a very particular opinion concerning the firſt deities of Paganiſm; for the author aſſerts, that the winds, the needle touched with the load-ſtone, &c. were the firſt gods of the Egyptians, and that they were adored under myſterious names. A branch of the family of Herwart tranſplanted to Paris, makes there a conſiderable figure (*b*).

(*a*) *See the* Scaligerana, *at the word* Chancelier, pag. m. 48.

(*b*) *Mr Bachelier, des Marets, whom I mentioned before, citation* (3) *of the article* EPPENDORF, *has imparted to me the greateſt part of what I ſay in this addition, both in the text and the commentary.*

[*A*] *I will give the title of a chronological work which he compoſed, and that of a book publiſhed by his ſon.*] *Chronologia nova, vera, & ad calculum aſtronomicum revocata*, at Munich in the year 1612. in quarto, *pars prima*. The other part was printed in the year 1626. *Pars altera quæ eſt Chronologicorum ſeu emendatæ temporum rationis, adverſus incredibiles aliorem errores*, in quarto. You will ſee his ſon's Chriſtian name in the title, which I have promiſed to inſert. Admiranda Ethnicæ Theologiæ myſteria propalata, ubi lapidem magnetem antiquiſſimis paſſim nationibus pro Deo cultum, & artem qua navigationes magneticæ per univerſum orbem inſtituerentur à veterum ſacerdotibus ſub involucris deorum dearumque, & aliarum perinde fabularum cortice ſummo ſtudio occultatam eſſe noviter commonſtratur. Acceſſit exacta temporum ratio adverſus incredibiles Chronologiæ vulgaris errores. Opus diu deſideratum. Jo. Fridericus Herwart ab Hohenburg in Schuuindeck S. E. Bavariæ &c. à Conſiliis ex incompletis optimi parentis P. M. eruit monumentis, atque ad finem perduxit, à Munich 1626 in quarto —— *The wonderful myſteries of the Pagan theology diſcovered; wherein is ſhown, that the load-ſtone was commonly worſhipped by the ancients, and that the art of navigation by the magnet, was carefully, concealed by the prieſts under the notions of gods and goddeſſes, and other fables. To which is added, an exact computation of time, in oppoſition to the prodigious errors of the common chronologers. A work long wiſhed for. Compleated by John Frederic Herwart of Hohenburg in Schwindeck, counſellor to the elector of Bavaria, from the unfiniſhed labours of his deceaſed father, at Munich*, 1626, *in quarto*. This book has a great deal of learning in it. There is a table before it, intituled, Tabula nauticæ & hieroglyphicæ deſcriptionis totius mundi vetuſtiſſima, quæ Theologiam Chaldæorum Babylonis, Ierogrammateon Ægypti, & Orphei Phrygis, nec non Magiæ, Sophiæque Zoroaſtris & Magorum Perſidis oſtendit originem. —— *An ancient, nautical, and hieroglyphical deſcription of the World, which ſhows that the Theology of the Chaldeans at Babylon, was the origin of the Hierogrammati of Egypt, of the Phyrygian Orpheus, and alſo of Magic, and of the learning of Zoroaſter, and the Perſian magi.* Voſſius's ſilence about the books that I have mentioned may be well wondered at. That learned man doth not ſpeak of them, either in his Collection of Chronologers, or in his great work of the Orgin of Idolatry, where he has heaped together abundance of things concerning the load-ſtone, and where he has not forgotten to ſay, that the winds were worſhipped as gods. Could he be intirely ignorant that Herwart the father, and Herwart the ſon, were authors? that would be wonderful in a man of ſo much reading. Could he have omitted to cite them, when he knew their works? that would be no leſs ſtrange in an author, who was ſo apt to make a ſhew of his reading.

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

HESHUSIUS.

HESHUSIUS (Tilemannus), a divine of the Augſburg confeſſion, born at Weſel [*A*] in the year 1526, has been famous for his reſtleſs and impetuous temper. He was very young when he had two conſiderable poſts given him at Heidelberg, that of profeſſor of Divinity, and that of preacher in the church of the Holy Ghoſt. He did not diſcharge them without many troubles; for there aroſe a violent diſpute betwixt him and William Clebitius, concerning the doctrine of the Euchariſt. The elector Palatine, Frederick III, being perſuaded that Melanchthon's ſuffrage would be of great weight to terminate the diſpute, conſulted him upon that ſubject. His anſwer provoked Heſhuſius, who would not bate any thing of Luther's opinions; and as there was no appearance of ſeeing an end of theſe quarrels [*B*] whilſt he ſtaid at Heidelberg, he was ordered to depart. He retired into Saxony, and publiſhed ſome contentious writings in the univerſity of Jena. Being called into Pruſſia, he taught divinity in Konigſberg, till he was driven thence in the year 1577, with the miniſters of his faction. He had a furious contention with Wigandus, upon controverſies of ſmall importance (*a*) [*C*]. He retired with his family to Lubec, and afterwards to Helmſtadt, where he was made profeſſor of Divinity. He died there the twenty fifth of September 1588. He ſtrongly combated the doctrine of Ubiquity, in the conference of Quedlinburg, in the year 1583. [*D*].

Melchior

[*A*] *Born at Weſel.*] According to Moreri he was born at Ober Weſel upon the Rhine, in the dioceſe of Triers; but Quenſted (1) who ſays it was at Weſel in the country of Cleves, ſeems more worthy to be believed.

[*B*] *There was no appearance of ſeeing an end of theſe quarrels.*] Melanchthon's anſwer was compoſed in the year 1559, and was publiſhed after his death, contrary to his intention (2). Heſhuſius raged furiouſly againſt him, and forgot all the reſpect that was due to that great maſter. 'Heſhuſius itaque cùm Lutheri de cœna ſacra ſententiam mordicùs retineret ac propugnaret, à principe Electore, ut finis eſſet conviciorum & inſectationem in ſua urbe, dimiſſus offenſoſque vehementer judicio Melanchthonis de ſe acerbè reſpondit, ac ne mortuo quidem & benè merito preceptori pepercit (3). ——— *Heſhuſius therefore being very tenacious of Luther's doctrine concerning the Euchariſt, the elector, in order to put an end to quarrels and invectives in the city of his own reſidence, diſmiſſed him, and he being highly offended at Melanchthon, on account of the judgment he had given againſt him, wrote a moſt bitter anſwer againſt him, and did not even ſpare him after his death, tho' he had been his maſter, and had deſerved other treatment from him.*' Calvin cenſures him for that fury aganſt Melanchthon. 'Pauliſper expendant lectores, *ſays he* (4), quam atrociter Philippum Melanchthonem ſuum præceptorem, cujus memoriam ſancte revereri debuerat, ſugillet ac laceret . . . . . Probroſis elogiis, Philippum ita digito monſtrat, ut videri poſſit data opera materiam ejus traducendi in ſcribendo libro captaſſe. —— *Let the readers only obſerve how outrageouſly he calumniates and maltreats Philip Melanchthon, his own maſter, whoſe memory he ought to have revered . . . . . He points him out with ſuch ſpiteful elogies, that he ſeems on purpoſe to have laid hold of all occaſions of traducing him in that book.*'

[*C*] *He had a furious contention with Wigandus, upon controverſies of ſmall importance.*] This is the ground of the quarrel. Heſhuſius, in a book againſt Theodore Beza (5), advanced, that the fleſh of Jesus Christ *in abſtracto*, is adorable (6). 'Non ſolum in concreto dici debere, filium Dei eſſe adorandum, omnipotentem & vivificum, ſed etiam in abſtracto carnem Chriſti eſſe adorandam: quia majeſtas adorationis ſit carni communicata. ——— *We ought not only to maintain in the concrete, that the Son of GOD is adorable, omnipotent, and enlivening, but likewiſe that the fleſh of CHRST is to be adored in the abſtract: becauſe the majeſty of adoration is communicated to the fleſh.*' His adverſaries aſſaulted him, pretending that he taught, that the fleſh of Jesus Christ is adorable in itſelf, independently on the hypoſtatic union: 'Quod in abſtracto & in ſua eſſentia caro Chriſti, etiam extra unionem conſiderata, ſit adoranda (7). — *That the fleſh of CHRIST is to be adored in the abſtract and it's own eſſence, even conſidered ſeparately from the union.*' He denied this to be his opinion, and explained his notion; but his adveſaries were not content with it. Biſhop Wigandus (8), maintained this to be a dangerous propoſition: 'Humanitas Chriſti in abſtracto eſt adoranda omnipotens, vivifica. — *The humanity of CHRIST in the abſtract is adorable, omnipotent and enlivening.* Heſhuſius maintained that he had not advanced it, and explained himſelf once more, but got nothing by it. A ſynod was called, who rejected Heſhuſius's expreſſion, and Wigandus would even force him to retract it publickly. Heſhuſius refuſing to do it, was expelled the country, tho' he promiſed to correct any improper expreſſions that might have eſcaped him: all the miniſters who ſided with him, had the ſame treatment. The adminiſtator of Pruſſia, in the year 1578, conſulted the divines that met at Hertzberg, for the Formulary of the Concord, and receiving an anſwer that was favourable to Heſhuſius, he ordered Wigandus to ſpeak no more of that diſpute. This was the eleventh ſchiſm of the Lutheran church (9). It is of greater uſe than is imagined, to know this ſort of hiſtories; we therein diſcover the factious ſpirit, which animates the authors of theſe diſputes.

[*D*] *He ſtrongly combated the doctrine of the Ubiquity, in the conference of Quedlinburg in the year* 1583.] This conference was held the fourteenth and ſixteenth of January 1583 (10), betwixt the divines of H. E. H. of Saxony, and thoſe of Brunſwic. The latter were headed by Heſhuſius. The acts of this diſpute were publiſhed. 'In eo (colloquio) præcipuæ partes demandatæ à Theologis Brunſuicenſibus Heſhuſio fuerunt, qui *διαῤῥήδην* negavit dogma illud generalis Ubiquitatis . . . in ſacræ ſcripturæ canone haberi, neque inde poſſe demonſtrari (11). —— *The divines of Brunſwic committed the chief part of this conference to Heſhuſius, who poſitively denied that the doctrine of a general Ubiquity was to be found in ſcripture, or could be demonſtrated from thence.*' Quenſtedt pretends, that Heſhuſius did not know the ſtate of the queſtion, imputing to his adverſaries a doctrine which they did not hold, and which was a vain phantome of his own imagination. This is very uſual in diſputes of this kind. I ſhall ſet down the words of Quenſtedt; they are hiſtorical, with reſpect to our doctor. 'Veſalia inferior vulgo *Unter-Weſel* . . . urbs Cliviæ clariſſima, . . . excepit in hanc lucem editum . . . . Tilemannum Heſhuſium Theologum Lutheranum inſignem, multiſque ſcriptis Didacticis & Polemicis contra Calvinianos clarum, qui ante Librum Concordiæ defendit Omnipræſentiam Carnis Chriſti, poſtmodum verò non tam ipſam in Libro Concordiæ de Majeſtate Chriſti hominis doctrinam, quàm præconceptum cerebri ſui idolum impugnavit, talem ſcil. omnipræſentiam, quâ ſubſtantia Carnis Chriſti ſit localiter, extenſivè, diffuſivè & objectivè in omnibus creaturis, cum qua portentoſa ubiquitate noſtris Eccleſiis nihil quicquam fuit commercii. —— *Unter-Weſel, a town of Cleves, gave birth to Tilemannus Heſhuſius, a Lutheran divine, famous for his many didactic and polemical writings againſt the Calviniſts; he maintained the omnipreſence of CHRIST's body before the publication of the book of Concord, but afterwards he attacked not the doctrine contained in the book of Concord, concerning the dignity of CHRIST's human nature, but rather a phantom of his own imagination, that is, ſuch an omnipreſence whereby the ſubſtance of the fleſh of CHRIST is locally, extenſively, diffuſively, and objectively, in all creatures, which monſtrous Ubiquity our churches never maintained.*' *Vide Concord. Concord. Hutteri cap. XLVI* (12). Micrælius pretends, that Heſhuſius diſputed

---

(*a*) Ingens inter ipſum & Wigandum diffidium fuit exortum propter *abſtracti* uſum. *Melch. Adam in Vita Theol. pag.* 622.

(2) Quenſtedt, de Patriis Viror. Illuſtr. pag. 208.

(2) Publice poſt mortem auctoris contraque voluntatem ejus editum exſtat in Conſil. Th. Part. II, pag. 378. *Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. pag.* 622.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) Calvin. in dilucida Explicat. ſanæ Doctrinæ de vera participatione, pag. 840. Tractat. Theol.

(5) *Intituled*, Aſſertio contra Bezianam Exegeſin Sacramentorum.

(6) Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. m. 867.

(7) Micrælius, ibid.

(8) Wigandus Epiſcopus Pomezanienſis, *Id. ib.*

(9) *Taken from* Micrælius, ibid.

(10) *According to Melchior Adam,* ubi ſupra. *Micrælius places it in the year* 1585. *I cite him below, citation* (14).

(11) Melchior. Adam, ibid. pag 622.

(12) Quenſtedt, de Patriis Viror. Illuſtr. pag. 622.

Melchior Adam, from whom I borrow what is above, has been very barren in his account of our author's adventures. I adviſe thoſe who would ſee them more at large to conſult the life of Heſhuſius, written by his ſon-in-law [*E*]. Heſhuſius was baniſhed four times [*F*]. And he took care, if we may believe Calvin (*b*), that it ſhould do him no prejudice. He wrote many books [*G*]. They who ſpeak of the ſect of the Heſhuſians, and impute to him the doctrine of Arius, deſerve the utmoſt contempt [*H*]. And

puted only out of ſpite againſt the doctrine of Ubiquity. An aſſembly met to deliberate upon the apology that was to be made for the book of the Concord, and ſome meaſures were taken that were diſagreeable to Heſhuſius. There needed no more to exaſperate his ſpirit of contradiction, and to engage him to take up arms againſt the Ubiquitarians. ‘Contra Calvinianos ore & calamo omnipræſentiam carnis Chriſti fortiter uſque ad annum Chriſti 1582 defendit. Tandem cum nonnulli theologorum ad conſcribendam pro Formula concordiæ apologiam conveniſſent: ille ſuum ad arbitrium non omnia agi indignatus, majeſtatem Chriſti, libro Concordiæ inſertam, quam *ubiquitatem generalem* vocant, oppugnare cœpit, & cum *Dan. Hoffmanno*, collega, orthodoxis eam ſententiam affinxit, ac ſi ſubſtantiam carnis Chriſti extenſivè ac localiter in omnibus creaturis eſſe dicerent. Sic igitur proprii cerebri commentum impugnans, loco omnipræſentiæ introduxit multipræſentiam (13). —— *He boldly, both by word and writing, defended the omnipreſence of CHRIST's body againſt the Calviniſts till the year* 1582. *But ſome-time after, ſome divines having aſſembled in order to write an apology for the form of Concord, and being piqued, becauſe every thing was not done there according to his humour, he began to impugn the doctrine of the book of Concord concerning the majeſty of CHRIST, which is called the* General Ubiquity, *and together with Daniel Hoffman, his colleague, miſrepreſented the doctrine of the orthodox, as if they maintained that the ſubſtance of the fleſh of CHRIST was extenſively and locally in all creatures. And thus fighting with a phantom of his own brain inſtead of an omnipreſence he introduced a multipreſence.*’ Daniel Hoffman vigorouſly ſeconded him, and would bate nothing in the conference of Quedlenburg (14).

[*E*] *Melchior Adam has been very barren . . . I adviſe the reader . . . to conſult the life of Heſhuſius wrote by his ſon-in-law.*] The journaliſts of Leipſic had reaſon to obſerve it (15). ‘Tilemanni Heſhuſii vitam conciſam admodum & mancam ad nos tranſmiſit Melchior Adamus *Vit. Germ. Theolog. p.* 621. *ſeq.* multo locupletiorem, eamque carmine heroico exaratam, & Heſhuſii commentariis in Eſaiam adjectam gener ejus D. Jo. Olearius: ubi & quarti, quod ſuſtinendum illi fuit, mentionem reperies exilii; cujus hiſtoriam illuſtrabunt egregie quæ (16) *Parte II. ſub anno* 1565. *p.* 182. *ſeqq.* tum in ipſius Heſhuſii, tum in aliorum epiſtolis leguntur. —— *Melchior Adam, in his* Lives of the German Divines, *has given us a very ſhort and imperfect hiſtory of Tilemannus Heſhuſius. We have a much fuller account of him wrote in heroic verſe by his ſon-in-law John Olearius, which is ſubjoined to Heſhuſius's Commentaries on Iſaiah: in it we find a fourth baniſhment of Heſhuſius mentioned, the hiſtory of which is greatly illuſtrated by what we read in the ſecond part, under the year* 1565, *both in the letters of Heſhuſius himſelf, and in thoſe of others.*’

[*F*] *Heſhuſius was baniſhed four times.*] This may be ſeen in the paſſage of the Journal of Leipſic, which I have juſt now cited. Here is a diſtich which confirms the ſame thing, and is not very honourable to that doctor's memory.

Quæritur, Heſhuſi, quarta cur pulſus ab urbe;
In promptu cauſa eſt, ſeditioſus eras (17).

Baniſh'd four times! Good doctor, tell us why?
The reaſon's plain, ſedition made you fly.

The deſcription which Calvin (18) gives us of Heſhuſius, wonderfully confirms this diſtich. ‘Illuc (19) eum rapit naturæ intemperies, vel quod videt in moderata docendi ratione nullum ſibi laudis gradum relinqui, qui tamen ambitione totus ad inſaniam uſque flagret. Certè in ſuo libello turbulenti ſe ingenii hominem, præcipitis etiam audaciæ & temeritatis eſſe prodit . . . Concionatur de ingentibus ſuis periculis, qui ſemper non minus ſecurè, quam lautè, delicias ſuas coluit. Prædicat multiplices ærumnas, qui cùm largos theſauros habeat domi repoſitos, ſemper amplis ſtipendiis ſuas operas venderet, omnia tamen ſolus ingurgitat. Verum quidem eſt, quum multis locis tranquillum nidum figere voluerit, ſæpius propria inquietudine fuiſſe excuſſum. Sic Gloſſlario (20), Roſtochio, Heidelberga, Brema pulſus, Magdeburgum nuper conceſſit. Ac laudi quidem danda eſſent exilia, ſi pro conſtanti veritatis confeſſione ſolum vertere ſæpius coactus eſſet: ſed quum homo inexplebili ambitione plenus, contentionibus & rixis deditus, immani verò ferocia ubique fuerit intolerabilis, non eſt cur queratur aliorum injuria ſe fuiſſe vexatum, qui ſua importunitate, moleſtias homini delicato graves exhibuit. Intereà tamen providè ſibi cavit, ne damnoſæ eſſent migrationes: quinetiam divitiæ ipſum magis animoſum reddunt. —— *He is hurried on to this by the reſtleſſneſs of his temper, or becauſe he ſees that he cannot diſtinguiſh himſelf by a moderate manner of teaching, which is inſupportable to a man ambitious even to madneſs. In his book he certainly ſhows himſelf to be a perſon of a very turbulent ſpirit, and precipitate boldneſs . . . . He makes great boaſts of the many hazards he has undergone, though he has always taken care to enjoy the pleaſures of life, not only ſecurely, but even opulently. He talks of his manifold ſtraits, who, notwithſtanding his great riches, has always ſold his labours at the higheſt rate, and ſwallowed all up by himſelf. It is true indeed that he has endeavoured to ſettle in many different places, but his own reſtleſs temper has ſtill been the cauſe of his diſgrace. In this manner, after being baniſhed from Gloſſlar, Roſtoc, Heidelberg, and Bremen, he has lately ſettled at Magdeburg. His baniſhments indeed would be honourable, if he had ſuffered them on account of his conſtant profeſſion of the truth: but being inſatiably ambitious, contentious beyond meaſure, and haughty beyond all ſufferance, it is in vain for him to complain of the injuries of others, who has himſelf by his turbulent temper raiſed troubles not to be born by perſons of any delicacy. He has however taken care that theſe migrations of his ſhould not hurt his fortune, nay his riches add to his boldneſs.*’ We might infer from this paſſage, that Heſhuſius was baniſhed above four times; for it is not ſaid there, that he was expelled from Jena, and afterwards from Pruſſia; nor could this be ſaid, ſince theſe events were poſterior to this book of Calvin (21). He was expelled from Jena in the year 1573 (22), and went thence into Pruſſia, where he was made biſhop of Samia in Morlin's place.

[*G*] *He wrote many books.*] A Commentary on the Pſalms, on Iſaiah, and all the Epiſtles of St Paul: a Treatiſe upon the Lord's-Supper, and Juſtification; Aſſertio Teſtamenti Jeſu Chriſti contra blaſphemias Calviniſtarum: Antidotum contra impium dogma Math. Flacii Illyrici, quo adſerit quod peccatum originis ſit ſubſtantia: de ſervo hominis arbitrio, & converſione ejus per Dei gratiam contra Synergiæ adſertores: de vera Eccleſia ejuſque authoritate, *&c.* *The Teſtament of JESUS CHRIST aſſerted againſt the blaſphemies of the Calviniſts: an antidote againſt the impious doctrine of Matthew Flacius Illyricus, who aſſerts that original ſin is a ſubſtance: on the neceſſity of the will and man's converſion by the Grace of GOD, againſt the maintainers of cooperation. On the true church and it's authority,* &c.

[*H*] *They who ſpeak of the ſect of the Heſhuſians deſerve the utmoſt contempt.*] I have given my opinion more than once (23) upon thoſe wretched writers of catalogues of Heretics. The only authority they have here, is a dialogue of Lindanus, wherein are theſe words (24): ‘Heſhuſii, à Tilmanno Heſhuſio quem Calvinus Servetianum infamat, Boquinus, Arrianum: Wilhelmus Cleinwitzius vero præter peculatum plurimis de fidei capitibus accuſat: quibus ‘hoc

---

(*b*) *See the remark* [*F*].

(13) Micrælius, ubi ſupra, pag. 758.

(14) Nec pertinacia ejus in Quedlenburgenſi colloquio anno 1585, frangi voluit. *Id ibid. pag.* 759.

(15) Acta eruditor. Lipſienſ. menſ. Junio 1684, pag. 288.

(16) *That is in the book intituled,* Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ ſeculi à nato Chriſto ſexti decimi ſupplementum celeberrimorum ex illo ævo Theologorum Epiſtolis ad Joannem, Eraſmum, & Philippum Marbachios conſtans . . . . editum à Jo. Fechtio.

(17) *See the article* ACRONIUS, *in the text.*

(18) Calv. Tract. Theolog. pag. 842, col. 1.

(19) *That is,* ad paradoxa & opinionum abſurditatem.

(20) *I think it ſhould be Goſlario.*

(21) *It was written in* 1561.

(22) Micrælius, ubi ſupra, pag. 758.

(23) *See the article* BEZANITES.

(24) Lindanus, in Dubitantio Dial. ii, pag. 135.

And yet Mr Moreri does it after them.

'hoc anno (25) ſua reſpondit defenſione objecta inficiatus, niſi quod illud Trinitas eſt unitas negat ſe meminiſſe an dixerit in lectionibus: cum ita diſertè doceat de præſentia Chriſti corporis in cœna objectione quinta. —— *Heſhuſians, from Tilmannus Heſhuſius, whom Calvin accuſeth of being a follower of Servetus, and Boquinus accuſeth of Arianiſm, and William Cleinwitzius accuſeth him not only of extortion, but alſo with reſpect to ſeveral articles of faith: to all theſe he has anſwered this year, by denying the whole charge, only he ſays that he doth not remember to have ſaid in his lectures, that Trinity is Unity: tho' he has expreſsly taught this in the fifth objection, concerning the preſence of Chriſt's body in the Euchariſt.*' There are three things in this paſſage to be animadverted on. I. It is an impertinent piece of injuſtice to charge a man with the hereſies, of which his adverſaries accuſe him in the heat of a diſpute. Has not Hunnius, a Lutheran author, written a pretty large book, in which he boaſts that he has convicted John Calvin of Judaiſm? Who but a madman would infer from thence that Calvin entertained Jewiſh notions? Thus, under pretence that Calvin, Boquin, and other ſuch adverſaries of Heſhuſius, exaſperated by his ſlanders, have imputed Arian doctrines to him, a wiſe man will not think he has ſufficient grounds to call him an Arian. He will judge that ſuch accuſations may eaſily be the fruits of too great leiſure, which is often abuſed to ſift all the words of an enemy and to wreſt them, in order to find hereſies in them, by means of far fetched conſequences. II. This injuſtice, which would be only impertinent, if one were ignorant of Heſhuſius's anſwer, becomes wholly criminal, when one knows that he has publickly denied the things his adverſaries accuſed him of. Now Lindanus himſelf confeſſes that he knew this. III. Though this divine ſhould have taught ſome hereſies, it doth not follow, that there was a ſect of Heſhuſians in Germany. A profeſſor, who teaches particular doctrines, has not always diſciples, much leſs has he always ſome, who ſeparate from the body, which they muſt do to deſerve the name of a ſect.

Prateolus, upon the bare authority of Lindanus, has ranked the Heſhuſians in the catalogue of Heretics. Father Gaultier (26) has done the ſame upon the ſole credit of Prateolus.

O imitatores ſervum pecus, ut mihi ſæpe
Bilem, ſæpe jocum veſtri movere tumultus (27)!

Baſe imitators, ſlaves to others wills,
How oft you move my frowns, how oft my ſmiles.

(25) *That is, in the year* 1564, *which is the date of Lindanus's epiſtle dedicatory.*

(26) In Tabula Chronographica.

(27) Horat. Epiſt. x, lib. I, ver. 19.

HIEROCLES, author of a book intituled Φιλίςορες, *The Lovers of Hiſtory* (*a*), vented a great many fables, if we may judge of his book by Tzetzes's quotations out of it. He ſaid, that in the Torrid Zone there were men whoſe ears ſerv'd them for umbrello's, and others, whoſe feet did them the ſame ſervice, when they lifted them up. He boaſted to have ſeen theſe, and to have heard ſay, that there were men who wanted heads, and others who had ten heads, four hands, and four feet (*b*). It is not known at what time he lived, but it is not at all probable that he was the ſame **HIEROCLES**, who from a Wreſtler became a Philoſopher, and who was a native of Hyllarima, a town of Caria (*c*).

(*a*) Steph. Byzant. voce Βραχμᾶνες & Ταρκυνία.

(*b*) Tzetzes, Chil. vii, Hiſtor. cxlvi, ex Hierocle.

(*c*) Steph. Byzant. voce Ὑλλάριμα.

HIEROCLES, a great perſecutor of the Chriſtians, in the beginning of the IVth century, was preſident in Bithynia, and then governour of Alexandria. He was the chief promoter of the bloody perſecution, in the reign of Diocleſian. He was not ſatisfied with oppreſſing them, by the power which his poſt conferred on him, but would likewiſe ruin them by his pen. To this end he wrote two pieces, which he addreſſed to them, wherein he endeavoured to ſhew that the ſcripture confuted itſelf by the contradictions that it contained, as he pretended. He wrote violently againſt the perſon of our LORD and his Apoſtles, and made a parallel betwixt the miracles of JESUS CHRIST, and thoſe of Apollonius Tyanæus, to ſhew that Apollonius equalled or even excelled our Saviour in that particular (*a*). Two fathers of the church have confuted him [*A*]. 'Tis ſaid that the holy martyr Ædeſius, animated with a ſtrong zeal, came up

(*a*) *Taken from Lactantius, chap. ii, and iii,* Divin. Inſtitut. *See remark* [*A*].

[*A*] *Two fathers of the church have confuted him.* That is to ſay, Lactantius and Euſebius. The firſt relates that at the time when he taught Rhetoric in Bithynia (1), and when the temple of the Chriſtians was demoliſhed there, there were two writers who wrote to inſult the oppreſſed truth. One was a Philoſopher, whoſe work was deſpiſed and quickly fell to the ground: the other was one of the judges, and treated that ſubject more maliciouſly. 'Alius eandem materiam mordaciùs ſcripſit, qui erat tum è numero judicum, & qui auctor in primis faciendæ præſecutionis fuit, quo ſcelere non contentus, etiam ſcriptis eos, quos afflixerat, inſecutus eſt. Compoſuit enim libellos duos non contra Chriſtianos, ne inimicè inſectari videretur, ſed ad Chriſtianos, ut humanè, ac benignè conſulere putaretur; in quibus ita falſitatem ſcripturæ ſacræ arguere conatus eſt, tanquam ſibi eſſet tota contraria; nam quædam capita, quæ repugnare ſibi videbantur, expoſuit, adeo multa, adeo intima enumerans, ut aliquando ex eadem diſciplina fuiſſe videatur .... præcipuè tamen Paulum, Petrumque laceravit, cæteroſque diſcipulos, tanquam fallaciæ ſeminatores, quos eoſdem tamen rudes, & indoctos fuiſſe teſtatus eſt: nam quoſdam eorum piſcatorio artificio feciſſe quæſtum ... (2) Ipſum autem Chriſtum affirmavit à Judæis fugatum, collecta noningentorum hominum manu latrocinia feciſſe .... Item cum facta ejus mirabilia deſtrueret, nec tamen negaret, voluit oſtendere Apollonium vel paria, vel etiam majora feciſſe (3). —— *Another writer treated the ſame ſubject in a more ſatirical manner. He was at that time one of the judges, and had been one of the chief adviſers of the perſecution, and not content with that crime he attacked thoſe by his writings whom he had before perſecuted. He compoſed two books, not againſt the Chriſtians, leſt he ſhould be thought to fall upon them as an enemy, but to the Chriſtians, that he might paſs for a humane and benevolent counſellor; in which he endeavoured to prove the falſehood of the holy ſcriptures, by the contradictions of which he accuſeth them; he there produceth certain chapters which ſeemed to him to contradict one another, and advanceth ſo many particulars, and appears ſo well acquainted with them, that he ſeems to have ſome time profeſſed Chriſtianity . . . Above all he inveighs bitterly againſt Peter and Paul, and the other diſciples, as deceivers of mankind, and yet he owns that they were rude and illiterate men: ſome of them fiſhermen by trade . . . . He affirms that* CHRIST, *being baniſhed by the Jews, gathered together* 9000 *men, and lived by robbery . . . And in order to invalidate his miracles, which however he doth not deny, he pretends to ſhow that Apollonius performed equal, or even greater.*' We do not ſee here the name of this writer; but we need not doubt that Lactantius ſpoke of the ſame judge, whom he calls Hierocles in another book (4), and to confirm this, I obſerve two things; one is the title of the book of this great perſecutor of Chriſtianity, the other is the name which Euſebius gives to the author of it. *Auſus eſt libros ſuos*

(1) Lact. Divin. Inſtitut. lib. v, cap. ii.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. m. 307.

(3) Id. ibid. cap. iii, pag. 308.

(4) Incidiſti .. in Hieroclem ex Vicario præſidem, qui auctor & conſiliarius ad faciendam perſecutionem fuit. *Lactantius, de Mortib. Perſecut. cap. xvi, pag. m.* 124.

up to him, as he preſided at the condemnation of the Chriſtians in Alexandria, and confounded him with ſhame both by words and deeds; I mean that Ædeſius, gave Hierocles a box on the ear upon the tribunal, reproaching him with his infamous barbarities [*B*]. We will point out ſome errors of Moreri and of Cardinal Baronius [*C*].

ſuos nefarios, ac Dei hoſtes φιλαληθεῖς *annotare.* —— *He had the boldneſs to name his impious and profane books* Lovers of Truth. Theſe are Lactantius's words (5). Now Euſebius has named Hierocles for the author of the book intituled Φιλαλήθης (6). It is therefore certain that he whoſe name is not mentioned in the fifth book of Lactantius, is the ſame whom he calls Hierocles in his tract *de Mortibus Perſecutorum*. Note, that Euſebius, in refuting this author, inſiſted only on the parallel of the miracles of JESUS CHRIST, and Apollonius Tyanæus, not touching upon other points, but contenting himſelf with ſaying, that Origen had confuted them before in his book againſt Celſus, and that Hierocles was only a bold copier of other mens thoughts and words. Note farther, that with reſpect to this parallel, he contented himſelf with ſlightly running over, and criticizing the life of Apollonius wrote by Philoſtratus. It is certain Euſebius did no great exploits upon that ſubject. See what Dr Cave ſays of it: ‘Poſterioris hujus operis partem de comparatione Apollonii cum Chriſto refutandam in ſe ſuſcepit Euſebius libro contra Hieroclem; quod & SATIS JEJUNE præſtitit, cum potius Philoſtrati libros *de vita Apollonii* in eo opuſculo breviter percurrit & refellit (7). —— *Euſebius, in his book againſt Hierocles, undertook to anſwer the latter part of this work, which contained a compariſon of Apollonius with CHRIST. This he executed* very indifferently, *giving us only a ſhort confutation of Philoſtratus's book concerning the life of Apollonius.*’ Note laſtly, that Lactantius did not undertake a particular confutation of Hierocles, and that he is ſo far from following him ſtep by ſtep, that he never expreſsly anſwers any objections taken from the work of this enemy of our Lord. The end he propoſed to himſelf was, to eſtabliſh in general the foundations of the goſpel, and to ruin thoſe of Paganiſm, and he thought this was ſufficient to overturn at once all that the adverſaries had publiſhed, or ſhould publiſh for the time to come. ‘Ii ergo, de quibus dixi, cum præſente me ac dolente, ſacrilegas ſuas literas explicaſſent, & illorum ſuperba impietate ſtimulatus, & veritatis ipſius conſcientia, & (ut ego arbitror) Deo, ſuſcepi hoc munus, ut omnibus ingenii mei viribus accuſatores juſtitiæ refutarem; non ut contra hos ſcriberem, qui paucis verbis obteri poterant, ſed ut omnes, qui ubique idem operis efficiunt, aut effecerunt, uno ſemel impetu profligarem. Non dubito enim, quin & alii plurimi, & multis in locis, & non modò græcis, ſed etiam latinis literis monumentum injuſtitiæ ſuæ ſtruxerint, quibus ſingulis quoniam reſpondere non poteram, ſic agendam mihi hanc cauſam putavi, ut & priores cum omnibus ſuis ſcriptis perverterem, & futuris omnem facultatem ſcribendi, aut reſpondendi amputarem (8). —— *The perſons above-mentioned, having explained their impious letters in my preſence, I heard them with ſorrow, and being ſtimulated by their daring wickedneſs, by the conſciouſneſs of the truth, and (as I verily believe) by GOD himſelf, I undertook this task, to confute to the utmoſt of my abilities the enemies of the truth; not with a deſign to anſwer theſe particular perſons only, who might be eaſily put to ſilence by a very few words, but that I may at one blow confound all thoſe who have been, or are, employed in that impious cauſe in all parts of the world. For I do not doubt but many others, in various places, and in writings, both Greek and Latin, have left monuments of their impiety; ſince therefore it is impoſſible to anſwer them all particularly, I have endeavoured to handle this ſubject in ſuch a manner, that I might not only confute all former writers, but likewiſe take away all poſſibility either of writing, or anſwering, from thoſe who ſhall come after.*’

[*B*] *It is reported that Ædeſius gave Hierocles a box on the ear upon the tribunal, reproaching him with his infamous barbarities.*] Euſebius doth not expreſs this ſo clearly, but we muſt believe that the thing is implicitely contained in the words he makes uſe of. Λόγοις τε καὶ ἔργοις τὸν δικαστὴν αἰσχύνη καὶ ἀτιμία περιβαλῶν. Cum verbis ſimul & factis illum pudore atque ignominia perfudiſſet (9). —— *When he had both by words and deeds covered him with ſhame and ignominy.* Here is the note of Valeſius upon this paſſage (10): ‘In hoc Euſebii loco, ἀτιμία quidem deſignat verbera quibus judex affectus eſt ab Ædeſio: αἰσχύνη verò denotat convicia, quibus Ædeſius judicem ipſum appetiit. Utrumque autem indicat Euſebius his verbis: λόγοις τε καὶ ἔργοις τὸν δικαστὴν, &c.’ Euſebius doth not tell us the name of the judge who was thus treated, but we learn from other authors that it was was Hierocles. Read theſe words of Metaphraſtes, you will there find this, and ſome other particulars of the holy zeal of the martyr Ædeſius; you will there find, that he boxed the governor of all Ægypt, threw him upon the ground and redoubled his blows. ‘Poſt hanc calamitatem, incidit in Hieroclem, qui totam Ægyptum adminiſtrabat. Hunc cùm in Dei martyres injuria ſævientem animadvertiſſet, ſanctaſque Dei virgines tradentem lenonibus, nec tantam iniquitatem perferre poſſet, ſimile fraterno facinus aggreditur. Namque Divino repletus zelo procedit, & verbis ac factis Hieroclem confundit. Manu enim ſua plagas illi in os infligit, humique ſupinum proſternit & cædit: ac monet, ne audeat contra naturæ leges, Dei ſervos offendere (11). —— *After this calamity, he fell upon Hierocles, the governor of all Egypt. Having obſerved how he raged againſt the martyrs of GOD, and delivered the holy virgins to panders, not being able to ſuffer ſuch wickedneſs, he did an action equal to that of his brother. For, being filled with a divine zeal, he confounded Hierocles both by words and deeds. He ſtruck him on the face with his hand, and, throwing him down to the ground, beat him, admoniſhing him not to dare to injure the ſervants of GOD, againſt the laws of nature.*’ Valeſius quotes the *Menæum* of the Greeks, where it is obſerved that the governor Hierocles was ſtruck in Alexandria by Ædeſius (12).

[*C*] *We will point out ſome errors of Moreri and cardinal Baronius.*] I. He gives the title of *Platonic Philoſopher* to our Hierocles, who was not even a Philoſopher generally ſpeaking. I have not found any author among the antients who makes him of that profeſſion, and I ſee that Dr Cave, amongſt the moderns, doubts whether he ſhould be called a philoſopher (13). II. Mr Moreri ſpeaks of another ‘Hierocles, a Pagan philoſopher, one of the judges of the Areopagus, who undertook to demonſtrate that Apollonius Tyanæus and JESUS CHRIST, where the ſame man.’ He adds, ‘that Euſebius wrote againſt him.’ This is to multiply beings without neceſſity; for the Hierocles whom Euſebius confuted, was the ſame that Mr Moreri mentioned in the preceding article, and called a Platonic Philoſopher. III. Beſides, we do not know any Hierocles that was a judge of the Areopagus. Cardinal Baronius, who miſled Moreri in that, might have eaſily avoided that miſtake; for he grounds himſelf upon Lactantius whoſe words he even ſets down (14). Now Lactantius ſaith expreſsly, that the author who wrote againſt the Chriſtians, was one of the judges in Bythinia. Seeing then Baronius very juſtly ſuppoſed, that this enemy of the Chriſtians was called Hierocles, he might eaſily conceive that he was not to be placed among the judges of the Areopagus. Note, that he ſaith, and with reaſon, that Euſebius and Lactantius wrote againſt the ſame Hierocles, and yet Moreri, who copies him, has given us two Hierocles, one refuted by Lactantius and the other by Euſebius. IV. He has not well underſtood theſe words of Baronius: ‘Nihil magis monſtrare conatus eſt (Hierocles) quam Apollonium æqualem fuiſſe Chriſto (15). —— *Hierocles has chiefly endeavoured to prove that Apollonius was equal to CHRIST.*’ For he thought they meant that Hierocles pretended to prove that Apollonius was the ſame with JESUS CHRIST (16). What I have further to ſay, doth not ſo much concern him as the cardinal. We have ſeen above that Lactantius makes mention of two heathens, who wrote againſt the Chriſtians. Baronius pretends, that our Hierocles is the ſecond of thoſe authors, and that Porphyrius is the firſt. Moreri mentions this without finding fault with it. It is true he declares that he in this follows the opinion of the cardinal. Let us turn then to Baronius and tell him, that he could not have found Porphyrius in that place of Lactantius, if he

(5) Id. Divin. Inſtit. lib. v, cap. iii, pag. 311.

(6) Euſeb. contra Hierocl. init. pag. 511, 514. Volum. de Demonſtr. Evangel.

(7) Cave, Hiſt. Literat. Script. Eccleſ. Part. II, pag. m. 61.

(8) Lactant. Div. Inſtit lib. v, cap. iv, pag. 311, 312.

(9) Euſeb. de Martyr. Palæſtinæ, cap. v, pag. m. 326.

(10) Valeſius, Not. in Euſebium, ibid. pag. m. 177.

(11) Metaphraſtes, apud Valeſium, ibid.

(12) Αὐτοχείρως τὸν ἄρχοντα ἔτυψεν.

(13) Philoſophus, an ſolum homo politicus, non liquet. *Cave, Hiſtor Literat. Part. I, pag. m.* 279. He calls him a Philoſopher, in the ſecond Part, pag. 61, but without telling us how he was reſolved of his doubt.

(14) Baron. ad. ann. 68, n. 31, pag. m. 654.

(15) Id. ibid.

(16) *This error has been corrected in the Dutch editions, and in that of Paris.*

had well examined things. The firſt of theſe two heathen authors was at Nicomedia at the ſame time with Lactantius, and there publiſhed his invective againſt the Chriſtians (17). He was a man notoriouſly vicious, covetous, voluptuous, and very ſumptuous at his table. He was very rich, and made his court to the judges very diligently, in order to grow ſtill richer, that is to ſay in order to ſell their ſentences, and to ſtop the proceedings of his neighbours, whom he drove out of their poſſeſſions. The three books he publiſhed againſt the Chriſtians were fooliſh and ridiculous; he underſtood nothing of the matter and knew not what he ſaid. The Chriſtians ridiculed him for it, and he failed miſerably in his attempt (18). This is the character of that author and of his book, if we credit Lactantius. How comes it then that Baronius (19) could diſcover Porphyrius by ſuch marks? Where has he found that this philoſopher made a long ſtay at Nicomedia? Men never ſollicite the favour of the judges to maintain themſelves in poſſeſſion of lands, which they have unjuſtly uſurped about their country-houſes: they never do this, I ſay, upon a journey; it is a way of acting which ſuppoſes a fixed abode and a conſtant ſettlement. Porphyrius then muſt have been thus eſtabliſhed in Nicomedia, if Baronius was in the right; now this is a fact which no body hath mentioned; his abode at Rome and Sicily, took up the greateſt part of his life: beſides, he was never accuſed of having been addicted to a voluptuous life; and after all he did not write fooliſhly againſt the Chriſtians. He has been complained of for his cavils, his malice, and his calumnies; but no body ever ſaid that he wanted wit, or that his books were impertinent and ridiculous (20), and even expoſed him to the cenſure of the Heathens, inſtead of the glory that he promiſed to himſelf. ‘ Verum hic pro ſua inanitate contemptus eſt; qui & gratiam, qurm ſperavit, non eſt adeptus; & gloria, quam captavit, in culpam, reprehenſionemque converſa eſt (21). —— *But he was deſpiſed as his folly deſerved; and did not obtain that favour, which he hoped for; and inſtead of the glory which he aimed at, he got only reproof and blame.*’ According to Baronius (22) he had been a Chriſtian; ſo that he could not be ſo groſly ignorant of the matter he treated of, as he that is mentioned by Lactantius; for you may obſerve, that when this father tells us that the other writer canvaſſed many particular things, he adds: *He ſeems to have been formerly a Chriſtian, ut aliquando ex eadem diſciplina fuiſſe videatur* (23). This obſervation might have been of ſome uſe to Baronius, not to have found Porphyrius in the deſcription that Lactantius has given of a Philoſopher, who impertinently and ignorantly attacked the perſecuted Chriſtians.

For the reſt, the preface which that philoſopher prefixed to his book, may teach us the conformity between the Pagan and Chriſtian perſecutions. An intereſted and flattering writer never fails to uſe his pen againſt the perſecuted party: he imagines it a fine opportunity of praiſing his prince, he takes hold of it and diſplays the importance of the ſervice done to God, and ſhews how charitable it is to join inſtruction to the authority of the laws, that erring men, being thus enlightened, may be delivered from the puniſhments to which their obſtinacy would expoſe them. This voluptuous Philoſopher of Nicomedia forgot none of theſe common places: one would think that he has been the model of many French authors, who have written during the perſecution of the Proteſtants. See what a turn he gave to things. ‘ Profeſſus omnia philoſophi officium eſſe, erroribus hominum ſubvenire; atque illos ad veram viam revocare, id eſt, ad cultus Deorum; quorum numine, ac majeſtate (ut ille dicebat) mundus gubernetur, nec pati homines imperitos quorundam fraudibus illici: ne ſimplicitas eorum præde, ac pabulo ſit hominibus aſtutis. Itaque ſe ſuſcepiſſe hoc munus, philoſophia dignum; ut præferret non videntibus lumen ſapientiæ; non modo ut ſuſceptis Deorum cultibus reſaneſcant, ſed etiam ut pertinaci obſtinatione depoſita corporis cruciamenta devitent; neu ſævas membrorum lacerationes fruſtra perpeti velint. Ut autem appareret, cujus rei gratia opus illud elaboraſſet; effuſus eſt in principum laudes; quorum pietas, & providentia (ut quidem ipſe dicebat) cum in cæteris rebus humanis, tum præcipue in defendendis Deorum religionibus claruiſſet; conſultum eſſe tandem rebus humanis, ut cohibita impia, & anili ſuperſtitione, univerſi homines legitimis ſacris vacarent, ac propitios ſibi Deos experirentur. —— *Affirming that it was the chief buſineſs of a Philoſopher, to aſſiſt thoſe who err, and to bring them back into the right way, that is, to the worſhip of the gods; by whoſe power and majeſty* (ſaid he) *the world is governed; and not to ſuffer the ignorant to be deceived by the guile of a few, leaſt their ſimplicity ſhould make them fall a prey to the crafty. That on this account he had undertaken this taſk worthy of a Philoſopher; to hold out the light of wiſdom to thoſe who do not ſee, not only that by returning to the worſhip of the gods, they may be reſtored to health, but alſo, that, laying aſide their pertinacious obſtinacy, they may eſcape the torturing of their bodies, and that they may not without reaſon expoſe themſelves to ſuch cruel mangling of their perſons. But that it might appear to what end he had compoſed this work, he launched out in the praiſe of thoſe princes, whoſe piety and care* (ſaid he) *had been illuſtrious, not only in governing in humane affairs, but eſpecially in protecting the worſhip of the gods, that at length the welfare of mankind had been provided for, that a ſtop being put to impious and idle ſuperſtition, all men might now enjoy a lawful worſhip and experience the favour of the gods.*’ It is eaſier to depart from the method of the perſecutor Diocleſian, than from that of his panegyriſts.

(17) Lactant. lib. v, cap. ii, & iv.

(18) *Taken from* Lactantius, ibid. cap. ii.

(19) Baronius, ad ann. 302, n. 51, pag. 730.

(20) Ineptus, vanus, ridiculus apparuit. *Lactant ubi ſupra, pag.* 307.

(21) Id. ibid.

(22) Baron. ubi ſupra, n. 53, *who cites Socrates,* lib. iii, cap. xix.

(23) Lactant. lib. v, cap. ii.

HIEROCLES, the ſon of that Alypius who commanded in England, and whom Julian the apoſtate had ſent to Jeruſalem to rebuild the temple there, was accuſed jointly with his father in the reign of Valens, and ſo many ways tortured that they could no longer tell what member to rack, in order to make him ſpeak through the violence of his pains what they wanted him to declare (*a*). Order was given at laſt that he ſhould be led to execution; but as he was going thither, the people in a body addreſſed themſelves to the emperor, and ſo earneſtly interceded for him as to obtain his pardon. This we may learn by comparing a paſſage of Ammianus Marcellinus with another of St Chryſoſtome [*A*]. Our Hierocles had been a diſciple of Libanius and was much eſteemed by him [*B*].

(*a*) Omni laniena excruciato ut verba placentia Principi, vel potius arceſſitori loqueretur, quo cum pœnis non ſufficerent membra vivo exuſto, *&c. Ammian. Marc. lib. xxix, cap. i, pag.* 556.

[*A*] *He was pardoned. This we may learn by comparing a paſſage of Ammianus Marcellinus with a paſſage of Chryſoſtome.*] It is this: ‘ Ipſe quoque Alypius poſt multationem bonorum exſulare præceptus, filium miſerabiliter ductum ad mortem, caſu quodam proſpero revocatum excepit (1) —— *Alypius likewiſe, after being condemned to forfeit his eſtate, and to ſuffer baniſhment, had his ſon reſtored to him, who being led out to execution was ſaved from death by a ſingular piece of good fortune.*’ The paſſage of St Chryſoſtome is in the third Homily upon the incomprehenſible nature of God. This father deſigning to ſhow to his hearers the force of the united prayers of a whole people, alledges an example that they had ſeen ten years before, when a criminal, who was led gagged to the place of puniſhment, obtained his pardon at the requeſt of all the people of Antioch, who went in a body to beg it of the emperor. Valeſius (2) does not doubt that this criminal was Hierocles the ſon of Alypius.

[*B*] *He was much eſteemed by Libanius.*] Libanius writing to Alypius, told him (3) that his ſon, though a child, ſhewed greater wiſdom than grown up perſons; and that many fathers in chiding their ſons exhorted them to take example by the ſon of Alypius. The teſtimony of Ammianus Mercellinus agrees in ſubſtance with that of Libanius (4).

(1) Amm. Marcellin lib. xxix, pag. 557.

(2) Henr. Valeſius, in Marcell. ubi ſupra.

(3) Lib. iv, Epiſt. cclxxxiv, apud Valeſium, ibid.

(4) Citatus eſt cum Hierocle, filio adoleſcente indolis bonæ. *Amm Marcell. ibid. pag.* 556.

HIEROCLES, a platonic Philoſopher in the Vth century, taught in Alexandria with great reputation; he was admired on account of the ſtrength of his parts, and the readineſs and beauty of his expreſſions (a). He compoſed ſeven books upon Providence and Fate, and inſcribed them to the Philoſopher Olympiodorus, who by his embaſſies did great ſervice to the Roman empire in the reigns of Honorious and Theodoſius junior (b). Thoſe books are not now extant, and we only know them by the extracts which we find in Photius. Theſe extracts teach us, that Hierocles had demonſtrated that there is a perfect agreement betwixt the doctrines of Plato and Ariſtotle, and that they who had denied it did not well underſtand the opinions of theſe two great men (c). He turned his wits a thouſand ways in order to explain the difficulties of providence, fate, and free-will, and pretended that the ground or key of all theſe things conſiſted in the paſſage of ſouls from one body to another, and in the life they had led before they entred into humane bodies. He laid out all his ſtrength on this, and had none left to furniſh him with good arguments to eſtabliſh the doctrine he undertook to prove (d). For which reaſon Photius obſerves, that all that great train of reaſonings dwindled into meer trifles (e). There is one thing very ſingular in the doctrine of this Philoſopher; he maintained that Plato had taught that the world was produced out of nothing [A]. He married only with a view to have children [B]. His wife happened to be poſſeſſed (f): and he employed fair words in vain to deliver her from the demon, that ſpirit having no regard to his compliments; but Theoſebius (g) without any ſkill in magic, exorciſed him in ſuch a manner as forced him to retire. Jonſius, who very ſolidly proves our Hierocles to have lived after Euſebius, is however miſtaken [C] in ſuppoſing him the

[A] *He maintained that Plato had taught that the world was produced out of nothing.*] Hierocles (1) moſt ſolidly confuted the Platoniſts, who maintained that tho' God ſhould from all eternity employ his power and wiſdom, he would not be able to form a world without the concourſe of an increated matter. Therefore they ſaid that he produced things only by co-operating with matter, whoſe exiſtence did not depend upon him. All things, added they, were virtually contained in matter, and God had nothing to do but to draw them out, and ſet them in order. Hierocles argued with a great deal of judgment againſt that ſuppoſition: he ſaid, that ſuch a work of God would not be ſo much a ſign of his goodneſs, as the effect of a ſuperfluous diligence (2), for why ſhould he go about to diſpoſe and ſet in order what he has not made? Is not good order ſufficiently found in this, that a being ſubſiſts eternally of itſelf? whatever happens to ſuch a being, is it not extraneous to it's nature? And is it not conſequently an imperfection? Τί γὰρ δὴ μαθὼν ἃ μὴ ὑπέστησε διατάττειν πειρᾶται, πάντως που τῆς εὐταξίας αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ ἀγεννησίᾳ τῆς ἑαυτῶν φύσεως κειμένης, τὸ γὰρ ἀγεννήτως καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸ ὑφεστὼς εἴ τι προσλάβοι, παρὰ φύσιν προσλήψεται. τὸ δὲ παρὰ φύσιν δατεθῆναι, κακὸν τῷ μετατρεπομένῳ ὥστε οὐκ ἀγαθὸν τῇ λεγομένῃ ὕλῃ τὸ κοσμεῖσθαι, εἴπερ ἀγέννητος εἴη μὴ ἀπὸ χρόνου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ αἰτίου. *Quorſum enim ea, quæ non condidit, digerere conatur, cum omnino bona ordinatio in natura eorum ingenita conſiſtat. Si quid enim ingenito, ac per ſe ſubſiſtenti addatur, præter naturam fiet. Quod autem præter naturam efficitur, vitiatur: quare dictam materiam ornari minimè bonum, ſiquidem non ſolum in tempore, ſed & abſque cauſſa ingenita ſit* (3). He concludes from hence, that God would have begun his work with an ill action (4), namely by undertaking to diſpoſſeſs of it's natural ſtate, a ſubſtance that was increated as well as himſelf, and his own ſiſter. Theſe reaſons are ſo ſtrong (5), that whoever conſiders them well, and is concerned for the glory of Plato, will endeavour to ſhew that he did not admit two principles collateral, eternal, and independent of one another, God and matter. This doubtleſs was the reaſon of our Hierocles attributing to him the doctrine of a true creation. I believe he had read it in the Chriſtian writings, and that being ſtruck with the arguments that oppoſe the exiſtence of an increated matter, and joining withal the idea of a creator, which carries the divine power and majeſty to the higheſt point, he ſuppoſed, for the honour of his ſect, that it's founder had known God under the idea of a nature, the ſimple act of whoſe will was ſufficient for the formation of the univerſe. Ὅτι δημιουργὸν θεὸν, φησι, προϋφίστησιν ὁ Πλάτων ἐφεστῶτα πάσης ἐμφανοῦς τε καὶ ἀφανοῦς διακοσμήσεως, ἐκ μηδενὸς προϋποκειμένου γεγενημένης. ἀρκεῖν γὰρ τὸ ἐκείνου βούλημα εἰς ὑπόστασιν τῶν ὄντων. *Plato opificem Deum cenſuit ſuſtinere omnem aſpectabilem & inaſpectabilem mundum, nulla prius exiſtente materia productum. Sufficere enim illius voluntatem ad ſuſtinendum univerſum* (6). But it were eaſy to ſhew, that this is an officious lie, ſince Plato has clearly maintained the concourſe of an independent and increated matter. We may ſay then, that Hierocles has here ſhewn his induſtry as much as on any other occaſion, I mean the induſtry of giving to the expreſſions of dead authors ſuch a ſenſe as one has a mind to (7), or of finding at leaſt two or three different ſyſtems in their works. He underſtood that game; for the two explications he gave of Plato's Gorgias were in nothing like one another, and yet they ſeemed to agree with the Platonic doctrine. Theſe are ſports of wit, but they require a very fruitful imagination. Ἀντιπαραβαλὼν τὰ πρότερα καὶ τὰ ὕστερα εὗρεν οὐδὲν τῶν αὐτῶν, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν· ἑκάτερα δὲ ὅμως, ὃ καὶ παράλογον ἀκοῦσαι, τῆς Πλάτωνος ἐχόμενα, καθόσον οἷόν τε, προαιρέσεως. τοῦτο μὲν οὖν ἐπιδείκνυται. τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἡλίκον ἦν ἄρα τὸ τῶν φρενῶν πέλαγος. *Collatis prioribus cum ſecundis, nihil, ut ſic dicam, eorundem invenit. Utraque tamen, quod ſanè auditu novum eſt, Platonis, quod ejus fieri poterat, inſtitutum continebat. Hinc colligitur quanta viri illius in ſententiis copia* (8).

[B] *He married only with a view to have children.*] Damaſcius makes the ſame obſervation, ſpeaking of Theoſebius, Hierocles's ſcholar, which ſhews that the moſt famous Platoniſts were perſuaded, that theſe were the juſt rules and true bounds of marriage, and that whatever went beyond theſe limits was an irregularity, or at leaſt, a liberty which wiſe men ought not to allow themſelves. This Theoſebius ſeeing his wife was barren, made a ring of chaſtity and gave it her. I preſented you, ſaid he, formerly with a ring of generation (9), but now I give you a ring of continence, which will always aſſiſt you to behave chaſtly (10), live with me if you pleaſe, or if you can contain; but if that condition doth not ſuit with you, I am willing you ſhould marry another man, and I only aſk one thing, which is, that we may part good friends. She willingly accepted the condition. My author ſtops there, and leaves us in uncertainty, for we do not know, whether his wife accepted the firſt or the laſt. He ſhould not have left ſuch an ambiguity in his ſtory.

[C] *Jonſius who proves . . . . our Hierocles to have lived after Euſebius is however miſtaken.*] His firſt proof is taken from the mention Hierocles made of Plutarch the Athenian, who lived after Iamblicus (11). Now the latter flouriſhed under Julian the apoſtate; we have ſtill ſome letters which that emperor wrote to him. The ſecond proof is taken from this, that Olympiodorus, to whom Hierocles dedicated his books, did not precede the reign of Honorius and Theodoſius the younger; for he wrote a hiſtory commencing at the ſeventh conſulſhip of Honorius and the ſecond of Theodoſius the younger, and he continued it to Valentinian, Honorius's, ſucceſſor, or as far as the year 425 (12). Jonſius had reaſon after this to maintain that Euſebius, who the author of a hiſtory of Apollonius Tyanæus, and that the ſeven books of Providence were anſwered by a writer named Euſebius, who was different from him who wrote the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, &c.

(a) Photius, Bibl. Cod. 242, pag. m. 1037.

(b) Id. Cod. 214, pag. 549.

(c) Id. ibid.

(d) Id. ibid. pag. 552.

(e) Εἰς λῆρον αὐτοῦ τὸ πολύμοχθον διαλύεται σπούδασμα. In nugas operoſa illa machinatio abit. *Id. ibid.*

(f) Photius, Cod. 242, pag. 1037.

(g) *He was Hierocles's diſciple.*

(1) Photius, Bibl. Cod. 251, pag. 1380.

(2) Ὃ περιεργία μᾶλλον ἂν εἴη ἢ ἀγαθότητος θεοῦ. Quod ſupervacaneæ potius eſſet diligentiæ quàm bonitatis Dei. *Id. ibid.*

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) Τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς δημιουργίας ἀπό τινος κακοποιΐας ἐνστησάμενος. Initium creationis à quodam maleficio inchoans. *Id. ib.*

(5) *Compare what is above, remark* [R] *of the article* EPICURUS.

(6) Photius, Bibl. ubi ſupra, pag. 1381.

(7) *See the remark* [C] *of the article* HEMMINGIUS.

(8) Photius, Bibl. Cod. 242, pag. 1037.

(9) Δακτύλιον ἁρμοστὴν παιδουργοῦ συμβιώσεως. Annulum procreatricis conjunctionis conciliatorem. *Id. ibid.*

(10) Ἐπίκουρόν σοι παρεσόμενον ἀεὶ τῆς σώφρονος οἰκουρίας. Adjutorem tibi ſemper futurum temperantis officii. *Id. ibid.*

(11) Jonſius, de Script. Hiſt. Phil. pag. 303. *He cites Photius,* Eccl. 244.

(12) Id. ibid. pag. 304. *He cites Photius,* tom. 80.

who was the author of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, the Evangelical Preparation, *&c.* did not confute the writings of this Hierocles; but he errs in ſaying that another Euſebius did. The cauſe of his error was this. He imagined that the ſame Herocles who wrote the ſeven books upon Fate, compoſed a hiſtory of Apollonius Tyanæus, intituled *Philalethes*, the refutation whereof we have in the works of Euſebius. This was to confound Hierocles, the perſecutor of the Chriſtians under the emperor Diocleſian, with Hierocles the philoſopher of Alexandria, under Theodoſius the younger. It is a little ſurprizing that Jonſius, who had a vaſt and exact knowledge of authors who have bore the ſame name, did not know the preſident of Bithynia, and the governor of Alexandria, who did ſo much miſchief to the Chriſtians, and who wrote againſt them, and was called Hierocles. Beſides, this learned man was miſtaken in thinking that Euſebius refutes the opinions of one Hierocles concerning Fate. It is certain that Euſebius only confuted the opinion of Apollonius, as he found it in Philoſtratus (13).

(13) *Note, that* Dr *Cave*, Hiſt. Literat. Script. Eccleſ. Part. I, pag. 131, *has taken notice of theſe two errors of Jonſius.*

HIERO I, king of Syracuſe, was the ſon of Dinomenes, and brother of Gelon, who after he had gained the ſovereignty of Gela, had the good fortune to ſee the city of Syracuſe ſubmit to him, when he intended no more than to reſtore ſome inhabitants that the populace had baniſhed out of it. He was ſo well pleaſed with this new acquiſition, that he voluntarily reſigned Gela to his brother Hiero, and wholly employed himſelf to find out the means of rendring Syracuſe a moſt flouriſhing city (*a*). He reigned there gloriouſly and happily; he acquired a great reputation by his victories, and the love of his ſubjects by his equity and moderation (*b*). Hiero, who ſucceeded him, did not tread in his ſteps; he was covetous, violent, and altogether different in his conduct from the virtuous Gelon: which was the reaſon that many were ready for an inſurrection; but the memory of his predeceſſor was ſo dear and glorious, that it kept them in their duty (*c*). He had a great deſire to put his brother Polyzelus to death, whom he ſaw beloved by the Syracuſans, and whom he ſuſpected of aſpiring to the crown. He would have ſent him to the aſſiſtance of the Sybarites who were beſieged by the Crotoniates, to the end that he might cauſe him to be ſlain in the battle; but Polyzelus who foreſaw the deſign, refuſed that employ; and ſeeing that this furiouſly provoked the king, his brother, he retired to Theron who reigned in Agrigentum. They were afterwards reconciled by the mediation of Theron (*d*). The latter might have taken advantage of that miſunderſtanding, but he was a good man (*e*), and would do one good office for another [*A*]. His ſon Thraſydeus ſucceeded him, and was unfortunate in the war that he undertook againſt the Syracuſans. Hiero with a good army made an irruption into the country of the Agrigentines and gained a battle, whereby Thraſydeus loſt his crown (*f*). Obſerve here a difference betwixt poets and hiſtorians. The ſame Hiero who appears ſuch an accompliſhed prince in the odes of Pindar [*B*], is a wicked king in the hiſtory of Diodorus Siculus. I fancy that if the poet flatters him too much, the hiſtorian treats him too ſeverely; for he doth not ſay all the good of him that he might, I mean that Hiero civilized himſelf and reformed many of his vices, by the converſations he had with ſome ingenious men whom he loved and loaded with his favours [*C*]. He died in the town of Catana in the ſecond year of the LXXVIIIth Olympiad

(*a*) Herodot. lib. vii, cap. clv, clvi.

(*b*) Diodor. Sicul. lib. xi, cap. lxvii. *See alſo* Plutarch. de ſera Numinis vindicta, pag. 551, 552.

(*c*) Id. Diod. ib.

(*d*) Id ibid. cap. xlviii.

(*e*) Id. ibid. cap. 53.

(*f*) Id. ibid.

[*A*] *Theron would do one good office for another.*] Whilſt Hiero was preparing to make war againſt Theron, to whom his brother had retired, the inhabitants of Himera ſent him deputies to offer him their ſuccours, and even to declare they would live under his government. Thraſydeus, Theron's ſon, had been made their governor, and was become odious to them by his violences and cruelty. Hiero made uſe of that conjecture not to puſh on his deſign of war, but to turn things towards a pacification. He informed the king of Argigentum of the deſign of the inhabitants of Himera. This intelligence cauſed Theron to take the neceſſary meaſures to fruſtrate the conſpiracy, and to make peace with the king of Syracuſa, and to reconcile the two brothers (1), Moreri, citing the eleventh book of Diodorus Siculus, rmsaffi, that *Hiero defeated Theron the tyrant of Agrigentum who deſpiſed him.* I have found nothing like this in Diodorus Siculus. Note, that the hiſtorian Timæus had related that Theron, who could not abide that his ſon-in-law Polyzelus ſhould be ill uſed by Hiero, declared war againſt him; but it was immediately terminated before the hoſtilities were begun (2). Let us ſay by the way that Demarata (3), Theron's daughter, was married to king Gelon, who ordered when he died, that ſhe ſhould marry Polyzelus (4).

[*B*] *Hiero appears a very accompliſhed prince in the odes of Pindar.*] He won the prize in the horſe-race in the Olympic games. He did the ſame at the Pythic games; and was alſo victor in the chariot-courſe. Theſe victories were magnificently celebrated by the poet Pindar (5), and you may believe that tho' digreſſions take up more than three fourths of his odes, he forgot not to ſay that Hiero had all the virtues of a good and brave king. Note, that the inſcription of his *ex voto* (6), teſtifies that he won the prize three times at the Olympic games, twice in the horſe-race, and once in the chariot-courſe. John Benedictus, has falſly affirmed in his Commentary on Pindar (7), that Hiero gained the prize of the horſe-race at the Olympic games in the LXXIII Olympiad; for that prince was king of Syracuſe when he gained that prize (8): now he did not begin to reign there till the third year of the LXXVth Olympiad (9). The ſame commentator pretends that he gained a like prize at the games of the LXXVIIth Olympiad. But this is to give him a reign of more than ſixteen years, and groundleſsly to contradict the beſt hiſtorians.

[*C*] *Hiero civilized himſelf, and reformed many of his faults, by the converſations which he had with ſome ingenious men.*] He was exceedingly ignorant, and as ruſtical as his brother Gelon; but falling ſick, he ſpent the time which the weakneſs of his body gave him in the converſation of the learned, and became himſelf a learned man; and afterwards recovering his health he continued to love theſe ſorts of converſation, and often diſcourſed with Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchilide (10). The author from whom I have this, adds, that Hiero was a great lover of learning, and very liberal, that he had a great ſoul, lived without jealouſy with his three brothers, whom he affectionately loved, and was mutually beloved by them, and that his inclination to make noble preſents, determined Simonides, tho' very old, to croſs the ſea to wait upon him (11). Some critics (12) pretend that Chronology will not permit us to affirm that Hiero ever ſaw Simonides, but they have been ſhewn their

(1) Diodor. Sicul. lib. xi, cap. xlviii.

(2) *See Benedictus upon Pindar*, Od. II. Olymp pag. 43.

(3) *See concerning that woman*, Diodorus Siculus, lib. xi, cap. xxvi.

(4) *See the ſame commentator upon Pindar.* Od. II, lib. xi, cap. xlviii.

(5) *See the firſt Ode of his Olympics, and the firſt, ſecond, and third of Pythics.*

(6) See Pauſanias, lib viii, pag. 637.

(7) Jo. Benedict. in Pindar. Od I, Olymp pag. 2.

(8) Pindar. Od. I, Olymp.

(9) Diod. Sicul. lib. xi, cap. xxxviii, xxxix.

(10) Ælian. div. Hiſt. lib. iv, cap. xv.

(11) Ibid. lib. ix, cap. i.

(12) Biſciola, Tom. II. Hor. Subciſ. lib. ii, cap. xix.

Olympiad (*g*) in the twelfth year of his reign (*h*). It was a town that he had peopled anew, having driven out the inhabitants and ſeated there a colony of Greeks drawn out of Peloponneſus and Syracuſe (*i*). He changed the name of Catana into that of Ætna, and would himſelf be ſirnamed Ætneus, when he was proclaimed victor in the Pythic games (*k*). The funeral honours that were paid to him in this new town, were like thoſe paid to heroes (*l*). His brother Thraſybulus reigned after him, but his tyrannical actions moved the Syracuſans to an inſurrection, and reduced him to ſuch a condition as to be forced to ſubmit to a hard capitulation. He retired into Italy into the country of the Locrians, and there ſpent the reſt of his days in a private life, having reigned but one year. The Syracuſans having reſtored the Republican government, maintained it till the tyranny of Dionyſius, that is for ſixty years (*m*). For the reſt, it is ſomewhat ſtrange that Dinomenes, Hiero's ſon, did not reign after him. He ſurvived him as we learn from the inſcription of the gifts which his father had vowed to Jupiter Olympius (*n*). The offerings which the king of Syracuſe conſecrated to the temple of Delphis were magnificent (*o*). His firſt wife, who was the daughter of Anaxilaus king of Rhegium and couſin to Theron, bore him no children (*p*); but by his ſecond wife daughter of Nicocles, he had Dinomenes abovementioned (*q*). Some will have it that he gave him the government of the town of Catana, with the title of king of Ætna [*D*]. I do not know to which of his two wives we muſt aſcribe the anſwer mentioned by Plutarch (*r*).

(*g*) Id. ibid. cap. lxvi.

(*h*) Id. ibid cap. xxxviii, pag. m. 397.

(*i*) Id. ibid. cap. xlix.

(*k*) *See* Pindar, Pyth. Od. i, & ibi Commentar. Jo. Benedicti.

(*l*) Diod. Sicul. ubi ſupra, cap. lxvi. *Note, that the ancient inhabitants of Catana retook poſſeſſion of it, and deſtroyed Hiero's tomb* *See* Strabo, lib. vi, pag. 185.

(*m*) Id. Diodor. ibid. cap. lxvii lxviii.

(*n*) *See* Pauſanias, lib. viii, cap. xlii, pag. 687, & lib. vi, cap xii, pag. 479.

(*o*) *See* Athenæus, lib vi, pag. 231, 232.

(*p*) *See Benedictus upon Pindar*, Od. i, Pyth. pag. 263.

(*q*) Ibid.

(*r*) Plut. in Apophtheg. pag. 175. *See above, remark* [*E*] *of the article* DUELLIUS.

their error (13). All the ancients were perſuaded of their interview and converſations. Xenophon has ſuppoſed a dialogue between them (14), which is a good piece. Hiero ſpeaks in it like a man of wit and very good ſenſe. Timæus the hiſtorian ſaid, that Simonides meditated the peace betwixt Hiero and Theron (15). See alſo Athenæus (16) and Pauſanus (17); and take notice that tho' the elogies which Pindar and Ælian have beſtowed upon this king of Syracuſe had nothing of flattery in them, it could not thence be concluded that what Diodorus Siculus ſaith is falſe; for what he ſays of the avarice and violence of Hiero might be true, with reſpect to the time that preceded his ſickneſs. I do not obſerve this to excuſe him in all reſpects; I ſtill blame him for having paſſed over in ſilence Hiero's reformation, and for having too plainly inſinuated that he never grew a better man (18). This I think is very falſe; and we had better doubtleſs give a little credit to Ælian and Plutarch (19), and give this prince as an example of the truth of Horace's maxim;

Nemo adeo ferus eſt ut non miteſcere poſſit,
Si modo culturæ patientem commodet aurem (20).

- - - - - *none ſo wild,*
But may be tam'd, and may be wiſely mild,
If they conſult true virtue's rules with care.
And lend to good advice a patient ear.

CREECH.

The ſickneſs which made our Hiero fond of learned converſation was the gravel. The ſcholiaſt on Pindar (21) cites upon this a work of Ariſtotle that is loſt. Moreri is groſly out in aſcribing to Hiero II what belongs to Hiero I. I mean this learning that he got upon his ſick bed, &c.

[*D*] *Some will have it that he gave him the command of the city of Catana, with the title of king of Ætna.*] They go upon theſe words of Pindar (22).

Μοῖσα καὶ πὰρ Δεινομένει κελαδῆσαι
πείθεό μοι ποινὰν τεθρίππων,
χάρμα δ' οὐκ ἀλλότριον νι-
καφορία πατέρος.
ἄγ' ἔπειτ' Αἴτνας βασιλεῖ
φίλιον ἐξεύρωμεν ὕμνον.
τῷ πόλιν κείναν θεοδμά-
τῳ σὺν ἐλευθερίᾳ,
Ὑλλίδος στάθμας Ἱέρων
ἐν νόμοις ἔκτισσε.

Muſa etiam apud Dinomenem ad canendum mihi obſequere, præmium quadrigarum, Gaudium enim non alienum a filio *victoria patris. Agedum poſtea Ætnæ regi gratum excogitemus hymnum: cui urbem illam cum divinitus fundata libertate, Doricæ libræ in legibus Hiero condidit.* Benedictus makes this note upon it. *Poſtquam poëta laudavit Hieronem ab* εὐτεκνίᾳ, & *filium Dinomenem à ſtudio in patrem: ad alias ejuſdem Dinomenis laudes digreditur: quem Ætnæ regem appellat: nam illam à ſe conditam Hiero dedit filio adminiſtrandum: eumque ducem Ætnæorum conſtituit.* This increaſes our wonder to ſee Thraſybulus ſucceed Hiero. I believe the Syracuſans favoured the brother in prejudice of the ſon, to do greater honour to the memory of Gelon; for Dinomenes, Hiero's ſon, was only Gelon's nephew, but Thraſybulus was Gelon's brother; and thus ſetting thoſe upon the throne who were more nearly related to Gelon, they more plainly ſhewed that they looked upon him as the ground of the pretenſion to the crown.

(13) *See* Kuhnius's *Notes upon Ælian.* lib. iv, cap. xv.

(14) *Intituled,* Ἱέρων, ἢ Τυραννικός, Hieron, ſive Tyrannicus.

(15) *See* Benedictus in Pindar. Od. ii, Olymp. pag. 43.

(16) Athen. lib. xiv, pag. 656.

(17) Pauſan. lib. i, pag 6.

(18) Μετὰ δὲ τὴν Ἱέρωνος τελεύτην παραλαβὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν Θρασύβουλος ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑπερέβαλε τῇ κακίᾳ τὸν πρὸ αὐτοῦ βασιλεύσαντα. Sublato è vivis Hierone, inito Thraſybulus regno, inito Thraſybulus regno, improbitate germanum ante ſe regem excelluit. *Diod. Sicul. lib. xi, cap. lxvii.*

(19) Plut. de ſera Numinis vindicta, pag. 551, & in Apophthegm. pag. 175.

(20) Horat. Epiſt. i, lib. i, ver. 39.

(21) *See* Benedictus in Pindar. pag. 260, 296.

(22) Pindar, Od. i, Pythiar. pag m. 262, 263.

HIERO II, king of Syracuſe, deſcended from the family of Gelon, who had reigned in the ſame place; but becauſe his mother was a ſervant, Hierocles, his father, looked upon him as a child that diſhonoured his houſe, and abandoned him to the mercy of fortune (*a*). He was fed many days by bees, and as the ſoothſayers declared, that this was a preſage that he ſhould be king, Hierocles ordered him to be brought back to his houſe, and educated him with all poſſible care. The child improved very much by ſuch an education, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf many ways. He was a man of admirable beauty and ſtrength, a graceful ſpeaker, and he often fought with thoſe that provoked him, and always had the victory. Pyrrhus gave him ſeveral military rewards (*b*). The Syracuſans made him prætor [*A*], after the departure of Pyrrhus; and as

(*a*) Ex ancilla natus, ac propterea à patre, velut dehoneſtamentum generis, expoſitus fuerat. *Juſtin. lib xxiii, cap. iv.*

(*b*) A Pyrrho rege multis militaribus donis donatus eſt. *Id. ibid.*

[*A*] *The Syracuſans made him prætor.*] I have uſed the compendious expreſſions of Juſtin; but I will here clear up this matter, which is ſomewhat maimed in that author's narration. I ſay then, there was a miſunderſtanding betwixt the citizens of Syracuſe and their army, and that the army encamping near Mergana proceeded to the creation of magiſtrates, and conferred that dignity upon two officers, Artemidorus and Hiero. The latter being introduced into Syracuſe by the ſecret intrigues of his friends, ſurmounted the oppoſition of the contrary party, and behaved himſelf with ſo much humanity and greatneſs of ſoul, that the inhabitants agreed to acknowledge him for their prætor, though they looked upon thoſe aſſemblies as unlawful, in which the ſoldiers pretended to confer magiſtracies (1). Polybius, who is here my author, relates two inſtances of Hiero's ability. The firſt was, that he remedied a diſorder which was very prejudicial to the ſtate. The Syracuſans who ſtaid in the town, whilſt the troops and the prætors were in the field, raiſed

(1) Ex Polybio, lib. i, cap. viii.

as he diſcharged that office with great wiſdom, all the cities unanimouſly agreed to appoint him Captain-general againſt the Carthaginians, and afterwards to raiſe him to the throne (*c*). He ſoon after carried on the war vigorouſly againſt the Mamertines, whom he had already defeated in ſome engagements, and he reſolved to drive them out of Meſſina, which they had ſeized againſt all right and reaſon. They found themſelves incapable of reſiſting him, and therefore they had recourſe, ſome to the Carthaginians, others to the Romans. The queſtion whether they ſhould be ſuccoured, was warmly debated at Rome, it was carried in the affirmative, and this was the occaſion of the firſt Punic war. The conſul Appius Claudius being ordered to ſuccour the Mamertines, landed his troops in Sicily in the year of Rome 490. They delivered up their town to him, and obliged the Carthaginian general, who commanded in their fortreſs, to leave it. The Carthaginians laid ſiege to Meſſina, and made a treaty of alliance with Hiero, who joined his troops with theirs. The Roman conſul reſolved upon giving battle, and firſt attacked the Syracuſans: the battle was very ſharp; Hiero behaved himſelf there valiantly, but was beaten, and thought it convenient to return to Syracuſe. Appius Claudius having likewiſe gained a victory over the Carthaginians, found himſelf maſter of the field, and advanced as far as Syracuſe, and beſieged it. Hiero ſeeing Sicily in conſternation, and the Carthaginian forces much weakened, ſent propoſals of peace to the Romans: They were accepted, and from that time till his death, he faithfully adhered to their intereſts (*d*), and gave them all the proofs of the moſt ſincere friendſhip [*B*]. If he had lived only five or ſix years after this alliance, to judge of things

raiſed a thouſand ſeditions, and laboured to introduce innovations. It was therefore neceſſary that in the army's abſence ſome perſons ſhould keep the citizens in their duty. Leptines was a very proper man for this, as having a great many clients, and much credit with the people. For this reaſon Hiero ſecured him, by marrying his daughter, and by that means obtained that the public tranquillity ſhould be preſerved in Syracuſe whilſt he was abroad at the head of the army. His ſecond piece of policy, was his getting rid of the old foreign ſoldiers, who were mutinous and debauched. He took the field under pretence of engaging the Mamertines (2), and when he came in ſight of the enemy, he divided his army into two parts; he placed his Syracuſan ſoldiers on one ſide, and the foreigners on the other; and putting himſelf at the head of the former, as if to make an attack, he left the others expoſed to the Mamertines, who cut them in pieces. He raiſed other troops, and attacked the enemy ſo ſeaſonably, that he obtained a glorious victory. He was created king after that exploit (3).

[*B*] *He gave the Romans all the proofs of a ſincere friendſhip.*] In proof of this I ſhall relate what he did, when the Roman affairs were in a great confuſion, after the victory that Hannibal obtained over them, near the lake Thraſymenus (4). It was the third battel they had loſt in Italy from the time Hannibal entered it, that is, in a year's time. Leſs than that now-a-days would incline a prince to quit his allies, and take the conqueror's ſide; a prince, I ſay, whoſe territories ſhould be ſituated as Syracuſe was with reſpect to the republic of Carthage. And yet Hiero proved a generous ally, he ſtood faſt to the intereſt of the Romans, and ſent them good ſupplies. Read theſe words of Livy (5): ‘Per eoſdem dies ab Hierone claſſis Hoſtiam cum magno commeatu acceſſit. Legati Syracuſani in Senatum introducti nunciarunt, cædem C. Flaminii conſulis exercituſque allatam adeo ægrè tuliſſe regem Hieronem, ut nulla ſui propria, regnique ſui clade moveri magis potuerit. Itaque, quamquam probè ſciat magnitudinem populi Romani admirabiliorem propè adverſis rebus, quàm ſecundis, eſſe, miſſa tamen à ſe omnia, quibus à bonis fidelibuſque ſociis bella juvari ſoleant. Quæ ne accipere abnuant, magnoperè ſe P. C. orare. Jam omnium primum ominis cauſa victoriam auream pondo CCCXX. afferre ſeſe: acciperent eam, tenerentque & haberent propriam & perpetuam. Advexiſſe etiam trecenta millia modiûm tritici, ducenta hordei, ne commeatus deeſſent. Et quantum præterea opus eſſet, & quò juſſiſſent, ſubvecturos. Milite atque equite ſcire niſi Romano Latinique nominis non uti populum Romanum: levium armatorum auxilia etiam externæ vidiſſe in caſtris Romanis. Itaque miſiſſe mille ſagittariorum ac funditorum aptam manum adverſus Baleares ac Mauros, pugnaceſque alias miſſili telo gentes. Ad ea dona conſilium quoque addebant, ut Prætor, cui provincia Sicilia eveniſſet, claſſem in Africam trajiceret, ut & hoſtes in terra ſua bellum haberent, minuſque laxamenti daretur iis ad auxilia Annibali ſummittenda. Ab Senatu ita reſponſum regi eſt, Virum bonum, egregiumque ſocium Hieronem eſſe, atque uno tenore, ex quo in amicitiam populi Romani venerit, fidem coluiſſe, ac rem Romanam omni tempore ac loco munificè adjuviſſe: id, perinde ac deberet, pergratum populo Romano eſſe. Aurum & à civitatibus quibuſdam allatum, gratia rei accepta, non accepiſſe populum Romanum: victoriam, omenque accipere: ſedemque ei ſe divæ dare, dicare Capitolium, templum Jovis Optimi Maximi. In ea arce urbis Romæ ſacratam, volentem propitiamque, firmam ac ſtabilem fore populo Romano. Funditores, ſagittariique, & frumentum traditum conſulibus. ——— *About this time a fleet arrived at Oſtia from Hiero, with large ſupplies. The Syracuſan embaſſadors being introduced to the ſenate, ſaid that Hiero, on receiving the news of the defeat of the conſul Flaminius and his army, was as ſenſibly touched as it was poſſible for him to be for his own, or his kingdoms, misfortunes. That on that account, though he well knew that the Roman greatneſs was rather more admirable in adverſe than in proſperous circumſtances, he had ſent ſuch ſupplies as were uſual from good and faithful allies to one another, when ingaged in war; and moſt earneſtly begged that the ſenate would do him the honour to accept of them. That firſt of all, by way of good omen, they had brought a golden Victory of* 320 *pound weight: wiſhing they would receive it, and retain it, as their peculiar property for ever. That they had likewiſe brought* 300000 *meaſures of wheat, and* 200000 *meaſures of barley, leſt proviſions ſhould fail, and that they were ready to bring as much more as they ſhould have occaſion for, to what port the ſenate ſhould pleaſe to command them. That they knew that the Romans admitted of no legionary ſoldiers, or cavalry, but their own and thoſe of the Latins, but they had obſerved light armed auxiliaries, even of foreign nations, in the Roman camps; and for that reaſon Hiero had ſent a thouſand archers and ſlingers, which would be of ſervice againſt the Baleares, Mauritanians, and other nations, which uſed miſſive weapons. Together with theſe preſents, they gave the following advice, that the prætor, to whoſe ſhare the province of Sicily ſhould fall, ſhould ſend a fleet to Africa, that the enemy might not only have war in their own country, but might be leſs at liberty to ſend ſuccours to Hannibal. The ſenate ſent the following anſwer to the king. That Hiero had acted like a man of honour, and a faithful ally, had ſhown an uninterrupted fidelity, from the time he had firſt joined in amity with the Roman ſtate, and had at all times, and on all occaſions, liberally aſſiſted them in their affairs: that the Romans had ſuch ſentiments of theſe favours as they deſerved. That gold had been brought by ſome other ſtates, and had, after returning them thanks, been refuſed by the Romans, but that they accepted the Victory, and the omen: and had appointed the capitol, the temple of Jupiter, for the abode of that goddeſs. In which fortreſs of the city of Rome ſhe would be ſacred, willing, and propi-* ‘*tious,*

(*c*) Juſtin. lib. xxiii, cap. iv.

(*d*) Ex Polybio, lib. i, cap. x, & ſeq.

(2) The ſoldiers, who poſſeſſed themſelves of Meſſina in a treacherous manner, called themſelves by that name. *See Polybius in the ſeventh chapter of the firſt book.*

(3) *Taken from* Polybius, ibid. cap. viii, & ix.

(4) In the year of Rome 537.

(5) Titus Livius, lib. xxii, pag. m 340, 341. *See alſo* Val. Maxim. lib. iv, cap. viii, n. 1, in Ext.

things by the preſent age, we ſhould have reaſon to wonder at his conſtancy. How great therefore ought our admiration to be, when we conſider that he lived near fifty years after? This long reign was a very happy one; for Hiero's conduct was attended with ſo much prudence, that it preſerved him ſecure amongſt his own ſubjects, procured him a great reputation abroad, and gave ſucceſs to all his public and private affairs. He cultivated the friendſhip of the Greeks, and was proud of ſharing in the prizes which they beſtowed on the victors in their games (*e*). His ſons erected him a ſtatue on horſe-back, and another on foot in Olympia (*f*); his ſubjects erected others alſo in the ſame place (*g*). The money he gave to the Rhodians, and the preſents he ſent them after that great earthquake, which had made havock of their iſland, and over-turned their Coloſſus, is a very noble inſtance of his liberality, and magnificence (*h*). He ordered a ſhip to be built which was one of the moſt famous veſſels in antiquity; Archimedes (*i*) was the director of the work. You will find the deſcription of it in Athenæus (*k*), who cites a book written purely upon that ſubject by one Moſchion. The 16th Idyl of Theocritus is addreſſed to this king of Syracuſe, and the author ſeems to complain of having praiſed him without obtaining a recompence. Hiero compoſed ſome books of Agriculture (*l*), and died at the age of ninety [*C*], in the ſecond year of the CXLIſt Olympiad, and the 539 (*m*) of Rome. He out-lived his ſon Gelon (*n*), who was married to Nereis, daughter of Pyrrhus (*o*), by whom he left a ſon, named Hieronymus (*p*). He obſerved that this Hieronymus was vain, and he feared leſt the good condition in which he had ſettled his kingdom, would quickly change under ſuch a prince. This made him deſirous to reſtore the Syracuſans to their liberty; but his daughters hindered him [*D*], and in his great

'*tious, firm and conſtant to the Roman people. The ſlingers and archers, and the corn was delivered to the conſuls.*' We ſcarce now ſee ſo generous a conduct amongſt private perſons. Gelon, the ſon of Hiero, had not ſtrength of mind ſufficient to imitate ſo great an example. He forſook the vanquiſhed party without any regard to the trouble he ſhould thereby give his father. You will ſee Livy's words in this paſſage of Caſaubon. 'Fides vera & conſtantia ejuſdem (Hieronis) in conſervanda Po. Ro. majeſtate laudari ſatis pro merito non queat; quum præſertim ea mox & deinceps perſæpe ſecuta ſint tempora, quæ ejus conſtantiam eximie probarent. Quot & quantas clades populus Ro. bello Punico primo, & ſecundi initio ſit perpeſſus, nemo neſcit. Solent adverſa hominum voluntates, & abdita mentium nudare. Hieronis propoſitum & conſtantiam in ſuſcepta ſemel amicitia Romanorum, non Reguli calamitas, non Claudii naufragium, non Thraſymenus, non Trebia, poſtremo ne Cannenſis quidem dies potuit labefactare. Manſit inconcuſſa illi fides, etiam tunc quum & in Italia & extra Italiam omnes Po. Ro. ſocii & amici ad Pœnos fortunam ſecuti inclinabant: ne domus quidem Hieronis tota (verba ſunt Livii) ab defectione abſtinuit, namque Gelo maximus ſtirpis contempta ſimul ſenectute patris, ſimul poſt Cannenſium cladem Romana ſocietate ad Pœnos defecit. Hiero tamen nihilo ſecius immotus ſtetit, ceu Marpeſia quædam cautes, eique etiam tunc fides conſtitit: quam etiam ad extremum vitæ conſtantiſſime ſervavit (6). —— '*The extraordinary fidelity and conſtancy of Hiero in preſerving the majeſty of Rome, cannot be ſufficiently praiſed; eſpecially if we conſider that then, and frequently afterwards, there happened conjunctures, which put his conſtancy to very ſingular trials. Every body knows how great, and how many diſaſters the Romans ſuffered in the firſt Punic war, and in the beginning of the ſecond. Adverſity uſually diſcovers peoples inclinations, and ſtrips the mind of all diſguiſes. Neither the calamity of Regulus, the ſhipwrack of Claudius, neither Thraſymene, nor Trebia, nor even Cannæ itſelf, could ſhake the reſolution and conſtancy of Hiero in the alliance he had contracted with the Romans. It continued firm even when all the allies and friends of Rome, both in Italy and out of it, following fortune, inclined to the Carthaginians. Even Hiero's own family (to uſe the words of Livy) was not free from this defection, for his eldeſt ſon Gelo, deſpiſing at once the old age of his father, and the alliance of the Romans after the battle of Cannæ, went over to the Carthaginians. Hiero, notwithſtanding, remained unmoved, and continued in that fidelity, which he conſtantly preſerved to the end of his life.*' Let us add another obſervation. This prince's fidelity to the Romans was ſometimes very burdenſome to him; for ſometimes the Carthaginian veſſels made great ravage in his country (7). Laſtly, let us obſerve that on his death-bed he recommended it to the tutors of his grandſon, who was to be his ſucceſſor, not to ſuffer any change in the alliance he had ſo faithfully kept with the Romans (8).

[*C*] *Hiero died at the age of ninety.*] Livy affirms it as we ſhall ſee in the following remark. Lucian (9) cites Demetrius Caliſtianus, who wrote that Hiero died of ſickneſs at ninety two years of age, having reigned ſeventy. Let us keep to the round number of Livy and Valerius Maximus. *Siciliæ rector Hiero ad nonageſimum annum pervenit* (10). —— *Hiero, the king of Sicily, lived ninety years.* Note, by the way, a ſmall miſtake of Father Hardouin. 'Hieron, Siciliæ Rex, quem inter ſcriptores de agricultura memorant Varro, & Columella l. 1. c. 1. cum Attalo Philometore Pergami rege. Multa de eo præclare habet Valerius Max. l. 8. c. 13. p. 405 (11). —— *Hiero, king of Sicily, is mentioned by Varro and Columella, among the writers on Agriculture, together with Attalus Philometor, king of Pergamus. Valerius Maximus tells many extraordinary things concerning him.*' Conſult Valerius Maximus in the place that Father Hardouin has quoted, and you will find nothing about Hiero but the ſeven words that I have ſet down, but you will there a great many curious things concerning Maſſaniſſa, king of Numidia. I am perſuaded that a falſe glance of the eye was the cauſe of Father Hardouin's miſtake. One line skipped, made him believe that the whole page related to Hiero: that little leap eclipſed Maſſaniſſa in the following line: this is a cauſe of miſtakes that ſpreads itſelf farther than is imagined. A writer, who is to conſult many authors, dwells upon things as little as he can; his eyes run over the pages with great ſwiftneſs; they glance ſometimes ſo lightly upon certain lines, that the mind retains no idea of them, and then the pen joins facts together which it ought to ſeparate. To conclude, Hiero did not reign ſeventy years as Lucian affirms: he was prætor ſeven years before he was proclaimed king (12).

[*D*] *He deſired to reſtore the Syracuſans to their liberty, but his daughters hindered him.*] It was becauſe they ſaw that their husbands and themſelves ſhould have the chief management of the kingdom. Livy deſcribes this admirably well. 'In Sicilia, *ſays he* (13), Romanis omnia mutaverat mors Hieronis, regnumque ad Hieronymum nepotem ejus tranſlatum, puerum vixdum libertatem, nedum dominationem modicè laturum. Læte id ingenium tutores atque amici ad præcipitandum in omnia vitia acceperunt. Quæ ita futura cernens Hiero, ultima ſenecta voluiſſe dicitur liberas Syracuſas relinquere, ne ſub dominatu puerili per ludibrium bonis artibus partum firmatumque interiret regnum. Huic conſilio ejus ſumma ope obſiſtere filiæ: nomen regium penes puerum futurum ratæ, regimen rerum omnium penes ſe, viroſque ſuos, Andronodorum, & Zoilum, nam ii tutorum primi relinquebantur. Non facile erat nonageſimum jam agenti annum, circumſeſſo dies noctesque muliebribus blanditiis liberare animum, & convertere ad publicam privatamque curam. Itaque tutores numero quindecim puero reliquit.

(*e*) *See* Polybius, ibid. cap. xvi.

(*f*) Pauſan. lib. vi, cap, xii, pag 480.

(*g*) Id. ibid. cap xv, pag. 489. *But note, that he ſays, pag* 480, that his ſons erected two ſtatues to him, *and pag.* 489, that they erected but one, and that the Syracuſans erected two.

(*h*) *See* Polybius, lib. v, cap. xxxviii.

(*i*) Concerning the care Hiero took to get Archimedes's Geometrical ſpeculations applied to mechanical uſes. *See Plutarch, in Vita Marcelli, pag.* 305.

(*k*) Athen lib, vi, pag. 206, & ſeq *See the article* ARCHIMELUS.

(*l*) *See the remark* [*C*].

(*m*) *And not* 549, *as Moreri ſays.*

(*n*) Calviſius ad ann. Romæ 538, *ſuppoſes the contrary, and is miſtaken.*

(*o*) Pauſan lib. vi, cap xii, pag. 479.

(*p*) Polybius, in excerpt Legat. cap i, Titus Liv. lib. xxiv, pag. 382.

(6) Caſaubonus, Commentar. in Polyb. pag. 151, 152.

(7) *See* Livy, lib. xxii, pag. m. 349.

(8) Livius, lib. xxiv, pag. 381.

(9) Lucian. in Macrobiis, pag. 635, Tom. II. Oper.

(10) Valer. Maxim. lib. viii, cap. xiii, n. 1, in Ext.

(11) Harduin. in Ind Autor. Plin. pag. 115.

(12) *See* Caſaubon, in Polybii, libr. i, pag. m. 99, 100.

(13) Tit. Livius, lib. xxiv, pag. 381.

great age he had not ſufficient reſolution to reſiſt the careſſes and artifices of theſe two women who beſet him day and night. He was therefore obliged to leave the kingdom to his grandſon, under the tuition of fifteen perſons. What the old man foreſaw happened. There was nothing but confuſion in Syracuſe after his death [*E*]. Pauſanias is miſtaken in ſaying that Dinomenes killed him (*q*).

quit. —— *In Sicily the Roman affairs were quite changed by the death of Hiero, and the ſucceſſion of his nephew Hieronymus to the crown, a boy, who was not capable of enjoying liberty with moderation, much leſs dominion. His guardians and friends joyfully laid hold of this diſpoſition of his to precipitate him into all manner of vice. It has been related that Hiero, in his old age having foreſeen this, intended to have left the Syracuſans a free ſtate, to prevent the kingdom which he had obtained and eſtabliſhed by his great abilities, to be ſhamefully loſt under the government of a boy. His daughters earneſtly oppoſed this deſign, thinking that though the name of king ſhould be with Hieronymus, yet that the authority would be lodged with them and their huſbands, Andronodorus and Zoilus: for they were appointed his chief guardians. It was too hard a task for him in the ninetieth year of his age, beſet night and day with their female arts, to preſerve a freedom of ſpirit, and to employ it in public and private cares. He therefore left fifteen guardians to him.*'

[*E*] *There was nothing but confuſion in Syracuſe after his death.*] The firſt thing that was done, was to preſent to the people Hiero's will, and Hieronymus the new king, who was but fifteen years old. Some people hired to make acclamations approved of the will: others were filled with diſquiet, and conſidered the kingdom as an orphan who had juſt loſt his father. A little after they proceeded to the funeral ſolemnity, which if it was conſiderable for the number of thoſe who attended it, it ought rather to be attributed to the love of the people than to the care of Hiero's family (14). After this Andronodorus, ſon-in-law of the deceaſed, and one of Hieronymus's fifteen tutors, declared, that the king was of age to govern, and that the minority was expired. By this he aſſumed to himſelf the power of all the others. Royal equipage was introduced, and whereas Hiero always went in a common dreſs, his grandſon appeared in purple with a diadem and guards. This outward pomp was attended with an equal pride, cruelty, and debauchery; and one would have thought that Hieronymus was at pains to make them lament the loſs of his grandfather. Had he had the qualities of the beſt princes, he would have ſcarce contented the Syracuſans, they ſo adored his predeceſſor. What diſcontent then muſt they have had under a ſucceſſor ſo unlike him? I cannot ſufficiently admire the dignity of the expreſſions that Livy makes uſe of to repreſent it. 'Vix quidem ulli bono, moderatoque regi facilis erat favor apud Syracuſanos, ſuccedenti tantæ charitati Hieronis: Verùm enimvero Hieronymus, velut ſuis vitiis deſiderabilem efficere vellet avum, primo ſtatim conſpectu omnia quàm diſparia eſſent, oſtendit. Nam qui per tot annos Hieronem, filiumque ejus Gelonem, nec veſtis habitu, nec alio ullo inſigni differentes à cæteris civibus vidiſſent, conſpexere purpuram, ac diadema, ac ſatellites armatos, quadrigiſque etiam alborum equorum interdum ex regia procedentem, more Dionyſii tyranni. Hunc tam ſuperbum apparatum, habitumque convenientes ſequebantur mores; contemptus omnium hominum, ſuperbæ aures, contumelioſa dicta, aditus non alienis modo, ſed tutoribus etiam difficiles, libidines novæ, inhumana crudelitas (15). —— *It would have been no eaſy matter, even for a good and moderate prince, to have gained the love of the Syracuſans who ſo adored their late king Hiero. But Hieronymus, as if he had deſigned by his vices to make his grandſather's memory more dear to them, all at once ſhowed them how much every thing was altered. They who for ſo many years had ſeen Hiero and his ſon Gelo differing neither in dreſs, nor by any other marks of diſtinction, from the other citizens, now ſaw the purple, the diadem, the armed guards and chariots drawn by white horſes, iſſuing from the palace after the manner of the tyrant Dionyſius. And this pomp and gorgeous dreſs was attended with ſuitable manners: with a contempt of all men, with pride, contumelious ſpeeches, difficulty of acceſs, not only to ſtrangers, but to his guardians themſelves, unheard-of luſts and inhuman cruelty.*' This young king preferred the alliance of the Carthaginians to that of Rome (16); but he had not time allowed him to do them ſervice; they conſpired againſt him and killed him (17). Andronodorus fortified himſelf as well as he could in ſome places of Syracuſe; and yet, contrary to the advice of Demarata (18) his wife, Hiero's daughter, he ſubmitted to the new republican government, and was created prætor: but new troubles ariſing, he tried to make an advantage of them, being teized with the continual inſtigations of his wife (19). He concerted his enterprize with Themiſtius, the huſband of Harmonia, Gelon's daughter, and truſted it to a comedian, who betrayed him; ſo that he and Themiſtius were killed as they entered the ſenate (20). To juſtify this murder, it was neceſſary to repreſent to the people the crime of theſe two men. The orator who was appointed to do it, ſaid, amongſt other things, that their wives had filled them with ambition. The people upon this vehemently cried out, that theſe two women ought to die, and the whole race of the tyrants. This was immediately decreed and executed. Livy, in relating this tragical adventure, doth not forget to make a reflexion upon the capricious and changeable temper of the populace. 'Sub hanc vocem ex omnibus partibus concionis clamor oritur, nullam earum vivere debere, nec quenquam ſupereſſe tyrannorum ſtirpis. Hæc natura multitudinis eſt: aut ſervit humiliter, aut ſuperbè dominatur; libertatem, quæ media eſt, nec ſpernere modicè, nec habere ſciunt, & non fermè deſunt irarum indulgentes miniſtri, qui avidos atque intemperantes plebeiorum animos ad ſanguinem & cædes, irritent: ſicut tum extemplo Prætores rogationem promulgarunt. Acceptaque penè prius quàm promulgata eſt, ut omnis regia ſtirps interficiretur. Miſſique à Prætoribus Demaratam Hieronis, & Harmoniam Gelonis filias, conjuges Andronodori & Themiſtii, interfecerunt (21). —— *Upon this a cry aroſe from all parts of the aſſembly, that neither of them ought to live, and that none of the race of the tyrants ſhould eſcape. Such is the nature of the populace: they either ſerve meanly or command inſolently: and do not know with moderation, either to deſpiſe or enjoy liberty, which is the middle betwixt theſe two, and there are ſeldom wanting thoſe who, indulging the popular fury, ſtir up their eager and headſtrong paſſions to blood and ſlaughter. And ſo it happened in this caſe, the prætors without delay put it to the vote. And it was decreed, almoſt ſooner than it was propoſed, that all the royal family ſhould be put to death. Accordingly the prætors ſent and ſlew Demarata, daughter to Hiero, and Harmonia daughter to Gelo, and the wives of Andronodorus and Themiſtius.*' There remained a daughter of Hiero named Heraclea: when ſhe knew that they were come to kill her, ſhe ſhut herſelf up with her two daughters in the chapel of her houſe, and placed herſelf by her Penates, uſing the moſt pathetical ſupplications and the ſtrongeſt arguments to ſave her life, or at leaſt that of her daughters; but all in vain, ſhe was dragged from the chapel and murdered. Her two daughters who had eſcaped from the houſe, were killed in the ſtreets (22). See the margin (23).

(*q*) Pauſan. lib. vi, cap. xii, pag. 480.

(14) Funus fit regium magis amore civium & charitate, quam cura ſuorum celebre. *T. Livius, lib. xxiv, pag.* 381.

(15) Id. ibid.

(16) Id ibid. pag. 381. *See alſo* Polybius, in Excerpt. Legat. cap i.

(17) Livius, ib.

(18) *What ſhe told him may be ſeen in the remark* [*F*] *of article PERIANDER, near the end.*

(19) Feſſus tandem uxoris vocibus monentis, nunc illud eſſe tempus occupandi res, tum turbata omnia nova atque incognita libertate eſſent, dum regiis ſtipendiis paſtus obverſaretur miles: dum, &c. *Livius, ubi ſupra, pag.* 391.

(20) Id. ibid.

(21) Id. ibid. pag. 393.

(22) Id. ibid.

(23) *I will make ſome reflexions upon this in the remark* [*C*] *of the article HOBBES.*

HIERO, a great friend of Nicias, and head of the colony which rebuilt Thurium (*a*), pretended to be the ſon of Dionyſius, ſirnamed Χαλκὸς [*A*], that is to ſay *of braſs*, *æneus*. He was bred up at Nicias's houſe, who himſelf inſtructed him in Literature and Muſic. He in return uſed a great many artifices to recommend Nicias (*b*). I have found an error in Amiot, and in ſome Dictionaries (*c*).

(*a*) *A town of Italy.*

(*b*) *Taken from* Plut. in Vita Niciæ.

(*c*) *See the quotation* (5).

[*A*] *The ſon of Dionyſius ſirnamed* Χαλκὸς.] This Dionyſius was a poet. Some of his poems were ſtill extant in Plutarch's time (1). His Elegies are cited by Athenæus (2), and by Ariſtotle (3). He was alſo an orator; for he was ſirnamed Χαλκὸς, becauſe the Athenians, being perſuaded by one of his orations, made uſe of braſs money (4). See the margin (5).

---

(1) Plut. in Nicia, pag. 526. (2) Athen. lib. x, pag. 443, & lib. xv, pag. 668. (3) Ariſtot. Rhetor. lib. iii, cap ii. (4) Callimachus, in Tract. de Rhetoribus, apud Athen. lib. xv, pag. 669. (5) Note, That, according to Amiot's tranſlation, this Dionyſius conducted the colony of Thurium; but it was Hiero who did it, according to the true ſenſe of Plutarch. Note alſo, That Charles Stephens, Lloyd, and Hofman ſay, that the poems which were extant in Plutarch's time, were written by Hiero; which is falſe.

HIEROPHILUS, a Phyſician of whom I can ſay nothing elſe but that he taught his art to a certain maid called Agnodice. She was obliged to diſguiſe herſelf in a man's dreſs; for there was a law among the Athenians, which prohibited women and ſlaves to ſtudy Phyſic (*a*). Agnodice becoming a Midwife, gave occaſion to the repeal of that law. It is too curious a piece of hiſtory not to be related in a remark [*A*].

(*a*) Athenienſes caverant ne quis ſervus aut fœmina artem Medicinam diſceret. *Hygin. cap. cclxxiv.*

[*A*] *It is too curious a piece of hiſtory not to be related in a remark.*] Hyginus relates ‘that the ancients having no midwives, abundance of women died in travel, becauſe ſhame hindered them from applying to the Phyſicians; and there was a law among the Athenians forbidding women to practiſe Phyſic. hereupon Agnodice, a young woman, having a great inclination for that ſcience, diſguiſed herſelf in man's apparel, and learned it. After which ſhe uſed to ſeek out women that were in labour, and to take away all ſcruples, ſhe immediately ſhewed them what ſhe was, and ſo brought them to bed. The Phyſicians, obſerving that they loſt their practice with the women, ſued her, accuſing her of an unlawful commerce with the ſex. They complained alſo of I know not what colluſion, and certain pretended illneſſes that they had to countenance the gallant. In a word they cauſed her to be condemned by the Areopagites; but ſhe ſhewed ſo plainly the proofs of her innocence in a full ſenate, that the Phyſicians were forced to change their battery, to wit, to recur to the law that prohibited women the profeſſion of Phyſic. The Athenian ladies interpoſed, and cauſed the law to be reformed; ſo that free women were permitted to learn that art (1).’ The author from whom I borrow theſe words, makes a reflexion againſt Hyginus. ‘There is *ſays he* (2), but little exactneſs in theſe words of Hyginus: for one might conclude from his diſcourſe, that from the time that Agnodice laid the women, they no longer imployed the Phyſicians in that affair, which would prove againſt this author's own obſervation, that they made uſe of their aſſiſtance in it before. But tho' there be no exactneſs in his words, we may at leaſt ſave him from a contradiction, by ſuppoſing he meant that the women having been aſſiſted in their lyings-in by Agnodice, would no longer make uſe of any body but her in their other indiſpoſitions, wherein they had no ſcruple againſt imploying the Phyſicians.’ This author makes another remark upon Hyginus's obſervation, that before Agnodice practiſed Midwifry, ſeveral women had died, who had not the courage to make uſe of a Phyſician (3). ‘It muſt be confeſſed, *ſays the writer of the News from the Republic of Letters* (4), that ſhame is no leſs ſubject than other things to the caprice of the faſhion. Time has been that it was the faſhion to be aſhamed to make uſe of a Man-Midwife, and we read in Louiſe Bourgeois a very dexterous Midwife, that Henry IV charged her to do her duty ſo well with queen Mary de Medicis, that it might not be neceſſary to have recourſe to a man; for her modeſty, added he, would ſuffer too much by it. At preſent it is *à la mode* to be void of that ſhame; our age is much more enlightened than the preceding.’ This raillery againſt the preſent age is not well grounded; for if on one hand there is now leſs ſhame in ſome reſpects, impudence on the other hand is leſs than it was at Athens. Are there any virtuous women at preſent, who would have the aſſurance in a full auditory to take up their peticoats, and demonſtrate to the judges that they are women? Agnodice did ſo in the Areopagus, the graveſt and moſt venerable tribunal that was in the world. ‘Quod cum vidiſſent medici, ſe ad fœminas non admitti, Agnodicen accuſare cœperunt, quod dicerunt eum glabrum eſſe & corruptorem earum, & illas ſimulare imbecillitatem. Quo cum Areopagitæ conſediſſent, Agnodicen damnare cœperunt. Quibus Agnodice tunicam allevavit, & ſe oſtendit fœminam eſſe (5).’ Could there be a more conſummate impudence than this? had ſhe not before given ſufficient proofs of her want of ſhame? could not ſhe have diſcovered her ſex by more modeſt methods than thoſe ſhe uſed to the women? *Quæ cum credere ſe noluiſſet, æſtimans virum eſſe, illa tunica ſublata oſtendebat ſe fœminam eſſe* (6). Thoſe prelates, who, to purge themſelves of incontinency, have ſhewn their nakedneſs in full councils (7), do not come up to the impudence of this Athenian woman.

I have ſaid elſewhere, that Albertus Magnus practiſed Midwifry, if we may believe ſcandalous report (8). If this be ſo, it is a long time ſince the modeſty of the Athenian women has been gone; and as the reputation of Albertus was very well eſtabliſhed, who knows but that ſome women gloried in being delivered by his hand? juſt as Moliere's preciſe ladies would have every thing, even their under ſtockings, made by the beſt hand.

Since the firſt edition of this dictionary I have ſeen in the journaliſts of Lepſic, an obſervation which will ſerve here for a ſupplement. It can be denied, ſay they, that the French are fitter than any other nation to inſtruct us how women may be aſſiſted in their labour. It is not becauſe they have a more happy genius, but becauſe they have frequent occaſions of being preſent at child-births. It is the faſhion in France, that even new married women, caſting away all ſhame, permit themſelves, without ſcruple, to be ſeen and handled by Chirurgions, and all ſorts of women deſire their preſence and aſſiſtance when they are ready to lie-in. A quite different cuſtom prevails in other nations: for commonly women, and eſpecially thoſe who are newly married, are ſo ſcrupulous, that they can hardly be perſuaded to put themſelves into the hands of the midwives and their particular friends: It is only neceſſity brings them to it, and when the pain is ſo ſtrong as to overcome their repugnance. As I do not tranſlate this word for word, I will inſert the Latin of the Lepſic Journal, to ſhew that I expreſs the ſenſe of it with all the neceſſary faithfulneſs. ‘Non eſt negandum, de adjuvandis parturientibus Gallos præ cæteris nationibus nos inſtruere poſſe, non ingenio, ſed occaſione, qua licet ipſis quam frequentiſſime partui adeſſe, feliciores. Ita enim moris apud ipſos eſt, ut poſito pudore, etiam recens nuptæ ad tactum atque explorationem omnem chirurgos admittant faciles, & partus tempore præſentis atque adjutores fœminæ quælibet eos expetant. Quod longe fit aliter apud ceteras nationes, ubi plerumque vix perſuaderi poſſunt uxorculæ, cumprimis nuper in matrimonium ductæ, ut obſtetricibus propriique ſexus amicis ſui faciant copiam, niſi doloribus ac neceſſitate victæ (9).’ Thus the journaliſts of Leipſic ſpeak at the beginning of the extract of a book publiſhed by a Chirurgion of Paris (10) in the year 1694, and intituled *The Practice of Midwifry*. That Chirurgion did not print his obſervations, till after a long experience; he had aſſiſted at the deliveries of four or

(1) Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres, Jan. 1686, pag. 28, 29.

(2) Ibid. pag. 30.

(3) Antiqui obſtetrices non habuerunt, unde mulieres verecundia ductæ interierant. *Hygin. cap. cclxxiv.*

(4) January 1686, pag. 30.

(5) Hygin. cap. cclxxiv, pag. m. 329.

(6) Id. ibid pag. 328.

(7) *Concerning Dionyſius, Patriarch of Conſtantinople, ſee the New Letters againſt Maimbourg, pag.* 686, *to which you may add theſe words;* Atteſtantibus Nicephoro & Zonara, quum Macedonius Epiſcopus Conſtantinopolitanus, ſub Anaſtaſio, falſo atque factionibus Arrianorum & Manichæorum ab adoleſcentulis, impuræ Veneris; & Methodius Patriarcha, ſub Michaële, ſtupri accuſati eſſent: ambos ut convincerent mendacium, tunicâ ſubductâ oſtendiſſe, virilibus ſe carere: & exinde à criminibus illis liberos atque immunes fuiſſe pronunciatos. - - - *Nicephorus and Zonaras relate, that Macedonius, biſhop of Conſtantinople under Anaſtaſius, being falſly accuſed of unnatural luſt, by certain young men, at the inſtigation of the Arrian and Manichean factions; and that Methodius, the patriarch, in the reign of the emperor Michael, being likewiſe accuſed of whoredom, they both, in order to demonſtrate the falſity of the accuſation, put aſide their garments and ſhowed that they were caſtrated, and by that means were declared innocent of the crimes laid to their charge.* Salmuth. in Pancirolum, Part. II, pag. 88.

---

(8) See his article, remark [*B*]. (9) Actor. Eruditor. Lipſ. Supplem. Tom. II, Sect. x, pag. 470. (10) Called Philip Peu.

five thouſand women. Another Chirurgion of the ſame city (11) publiſhed another book the year following intituled, *Obſervations upon the pregnancy and and deliveries of women*, &c. It contains 700 choice obſervations out of more than three thouſand, which the author has made (12). This is enough to prove that it is the prevailing faſhion at Paris, to make uſe of men and not of women Midwives. The time will come perhaps that the ſame mode will prevail over the greateſt part of Europe; ſhame will underego the fate of a thouſand other things, which are ſubject to the capricious and inconſtant laws of cuſtom.

HILDEBERT, biſhop of Mans, and afterwards archbiſhop of Tours in the beginning of the XIIth century, had led a very ſcandalous life before he attained the mitre [*A*]. It is in vain they wrangle hereupon with the Annaliſt of the Romiſh church [*B*], and alledge the diſcoveries of a critic againſt him. Father Maimbourg ſucceſsfully produced an action of this prelate [*C*], to inſult thoſe few biſhops, who oppoſed the extention

[*A*] *He led a very irregular life before he attained the mitre.*] Even after his promotion to the dignity of archdeacon, he kept ſo many concubines, that he had baſtards of both ſexes in abundance. This is what Ivo biſhop of Chartres writ to him (1). ‘Dicunt quidam de majoribus Cenomanenſis Eccleſiæ qui anteactam vitam tuam ſe noſſe teſtantur, quod ultra modum laxaveris fræna pudicitiæ, in tantum ut poſt acceptum Archidiaconatum, accubante lateribus tuis plebe muliercularum multam genueris plebem puerorum & puellularum. —— *Some of the rulers of the church of Mans, who pretend to be well acquainted with your paſt life, teſtify that you ſet no bounds to your luſt, in ſo much that even after you arrived at the degree of an archdeacon, you had numberleſs concubines conſtantly with you, by whom you had many, both ſons and daughters.*’

[*B*] *It is in vain to wrangle hereupon with the annaliſt of the church of Rome.*] *Juret* (2) *cenſures Baronius for having written in Annals upon the authority of this letter of Ivo of Chartres, that Hildebert before he was a biſhop was addicted to women, pretending that this letter was written to one Aldebert, and not to Hildebert.* Aldeberto, Cenomanenſis Eccleſia electo. *It is thus this letter is intituled at the end of the manuſcript letters of Ivo of Chartres in the library of St Victor.* —— *But Father Sirmond, in his notes upon Godfrey of Vendôme, has very well juſtified Baronius; theſe are his words.* ‘Ildebertus vir in Epiſcopatu eximius, ante illum, vitæ ſolutioris, ut indicat Ivonis epiſtola 277. Quam quidem, qui de Ildeberto, quo de agimus, ſcriptam, pertinaciùs neget, is, opinor, clauſis oculis ſibi credi velit. Ecquæ enim alia Ivonis tempore Cenomanenſis Epiſcopi electio fuit, quàm Ildeberti? Quem prætera ſcimus ex Archidiacono, quod Ivo notat, ad Epiſcopalem Cathedram evectum. Neque tamen hæc ita differo, ut viri docti, qui contra ſenſit, nomini obtrectem: ſed quia immortalis memoriæ Cardinali Baronio me debere judico, ut quæ rectè & verè ab eo dicta ſunt, ea ut pro veris habeantur, enitar quoad poſſum (3). —— *Hildebert was a very good biſhop, but before he arrived at that dignity he was guilty of many irregularities, as we learn from Ivo in his 277th epiſtle. They who obſtinately deny that this letter was wrote to this Hildebert, would have us blindly to believe whatever they ſay. For what other election of a biſhop of Mans was there in the days if Ivo, but that of Hildebert? we know likewiſe, that he was advanced from being archdeacon (as Ivo obſerves) to the epiſcopal ſee. I do not ſay this with any intention of leſſening the reputation of the learned man who has mantained the contrary opinion: but becauſe I think I owe ſo much to the immortal memory of cardinal Baronius as to endeavour to the utmoſt my power that what he has juſtly and truly wrote, ſhould be acknowledged to be true.*’ Mr Menage adds ſome good things to theſe reaſons of Father Sirmond. ‘Ildebertus, ſays he (4), and Aldebertus is the ſame name: and Ildebert biſhop of Mans calls himſelf Aldebertus in one of his letters printed in the thirteenth volume of the Spicilegium. *Ranulfo, Dei gratia, Dunelmenſi Epiſcopo, omni honore & gratia ſublimando, ALDEBERTUS, humilis Cenomanorum Sacerdos.* He is thus called in a charter of the abbey of Etival, produced by Mr Pavillon in his obſervations upon the life of Abriſſel. *Aldeberto Epiſcopo Cenomanenſi*: for thus it ought to be read, and not, **Alberto Epiſcopo Cenomanenſi*: there having been no Albert biſhop of Mans. In a charter of Frontevaux, produced by Coſnier, page 131 of his notes upon the life of Arbriſſel, he is alſo called Audebertus; which is the ſame thing as Aldebertus. Courvaiſier in the life of Ildebert, confirms the letter of Ivo of Chartres by this place of the Necrologium of St Peter de La Cour of Mans: Tertio Idus Auguſti, obiit Gervaſius, Hildeberti Præſulis filius; matris Eccleſiæ Canonicus: qui vivens, ad hujus Eccleſiæ ſervitium quandam contulit Bibliothecam; cujus anima quiete fruatur æterna: *On the eleventh of Auguſt died Gervaſius ſon to biſhop Hildebert; a canon of the mother church; who in his lifetime left a library for the uſe of this church; may his ſoul reſt in eternal peace.* Pretending that this Gervaſius was the natural ſon of Ildebert. Bondonnet pretends he was only his ſpiritual ſon. But in the acts of the biſhops of Mans, publiſhed by Dom Mabillon in the third volume of his *Analecta*, the *delicta juventutis* of this biſhop are mentioned, which farther confirms Ivo of Chartres's letter.’ Mr Menage mentions in his additions (5) two charters produced by Father de la Mainferme (6), in which our Hildebert is called Audebertus. Thus Juret's criticiſm (7) falls to the ground, together with the praiſes given him by Father Maimbourg. See the following remark.

[*C*] *Father Maimbourg ſucceſsfully produced an action of this prelate.*] He firſt praiſes this prelate. St Hildebert, ſays he (8), biſhop of Mans, and afterwards archbiſhop of Tours, was one of the moſt holy and learned prelates that the Gallican church ever had. ‘We have ſome epiſtles and ſome other fine works of his in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. It is he whom St Bernard calls the excellent pontif, and the great pillar of the church; of whom the moſt famous writers ſpeak with the greateſt commendations, and whoſe ſanctity GOD himſelf was pleaſed to declare and honour, by miracles wrought at his tomb. And upon this occaſion I think my ſelf obliged to ſay, that I may give the honour that is due to his memory, that thoſe who have written upon the credit of an epiſtle of Ivo of Chartres, that when Hildebert was made biſhop of Mans, he led a very ſcandalous life, have taken him for another, being miſled by the inſcription of that epiſtle, wherein they have found Hildeberto inſtead of Aldeberto, as it is read in the old copies, as Mouſieur Juret, to whom we owe this important remark, has ſhewn in his learned notes upon Ivo of Chartres.’ After this Maimbourg ſays, that Hildebert was tranſlated from the biſhopric of Mans, to the archbiſhopric of Tours, by Pope Honorius II, in the year 1125, and that having found two canonries in his church which Lewis the Burly had filled during the vacancy of the archbiſhopric, *he went himſelf to court to make his his moſt humble remonſtrances to the king* (9). He was heard, but being not contented with the ſentence that was pronounced, he demanded a canonical determination; his obſtinacy occaſioned the revenues of his archbiſhopric to be confiſcated. Then he had only recourſe to the moſt ſubmiſſive entreaties, recommending himſelf to a biſhop who was in the king's favour. ‘I do not write to you, *ſaid he*, * to complain of the king's proceedings, to exaſperate you by my complaints, to raiſe clamours, troubles, ſeditions, and tempeſts againſt the Lord's Anointed, and to demand the rigour and cenſures of the church againſt him. So far from that, I only deſire that you would be ſo kind as to intercede for me, and by your good and charitable offices to prevail with the king, not to exerciſe his anger and indignation againſt a poor biſhop loaded with years, who only deſires to live a quiet life.’ Father Maimbourg does not fail to obſerve, that the king ‘continued in full poſſeſſion and injoyment of his right, and that Pope Honorius, that moſt Holy Pontif and great protector of this archbiſhop, found no fault with it.’ Obſerve how this hiſtorian, in his hiſtory of Lutheraniſm, ſtuffs in an epiſode upon the affair of the Regale, in order to make his court to the king, by decrying the conduct of the biſhop of Pamiers tion of the Regale. The remark I ſhall make upon this ſubject, will contain ſome things relating to our Hildebert's hiſtory. Illyricus has reckoned him among the witneſſes of the truth, becauſe of a very ſmart letter which he wrote againſt the court of Rome [*D*]. He was of no great birth [*E*].

---

(11) *Called* Francis Mauriceau.

(12) See the Leipſic Journal, January 1695, pag. 42.

(1) This letter is 277th. See Menage. *Hiſtoire de Sablé*, *pag.* 107.

(2) Notis in Epiſt. 277. Ivonis Carnutenſis.

(3) Menage. Hiſt. de Sablé, pag. 107, 108.

(4) Ibid. pag. 108.

* But perhaps *Alberto* was put here by contraction for *Aldebertus*, and perhaps *Albertus* is the ſame name.

(5) Pag. 310.

(6) In Clypeo naſcentis Fontebraldenſis Ordinis, pag. 62, & 73.

(7) Voſſius, *de Hiſtcr. Latin.* *pag.* 404, and after him Moreri, has adopted this criticiſm.

(8) Hiſt. du Lutheraniſme, livr. ii, pag. m. 192.

(9) Ibid. pag. 193.

* Nec tamen hæc loquor tanquam vobis clamorem ſuper Chriſto Domini deponens, tanquam poſtulans Eccleſiaſticæ rigorem diſciplinæ. Subvenire Eccleſiæ & mihi per veſtrum deprecor interventum, & Regi ex charitate ſuggeri, ne ſagittas ſuas in ſene compleat ſacerdote. *Hildebert. Epiſt. vi, apud Lucam Dacherium*, *Tom. XIII, Spicilegii.*

miers and Pope Innocent XI. He took the ſame method with reſpect to all the affairs of the time, as he has been upbraided with it in the fourth and fifth letter of the General Criticiſm on his Hiſtory of Calviniſm.

[*D*] *He wrote a very ſmart letter againſt the court of Rome.*] It contains a very lively deſcription of the diſorders of that court, and I do not believe that it has loſt any thing of it's ſtrength in Mr du Pleſſis Mornai's French tranſlation of it (10). Hildebert was only biſhop of Mans when he wrote this letter, but when he wrote another to Honorius II, complaining that all cauſes were carried to Rome by way of appeal, he was archbiſhop of Tours. He made a deſcription of Rome in verſe, concluding with theſe words.

Urbs fœlix, ſi vel Dominis urbs illa careret,
Vel Dominis eſſet turpe carere fide.

Happy city, if it had no maſters, or if thoſe maſters were aſhamed of their want of faith. *Coëffeteau* (11) does not deny that the letter to Honorius *is Hildebert's*; but he does not think ſo of the other. *It is not credible*, ſays he, *that this epiſtle is his, ſince it is not to be found among thoſe that are printed, nor even among thoſe that are in manuſcript, which we have ſeen amongſt other rare books of Meſſieurs du Puy . . . but alſo becauſe, excepting ſome youthful ſallies of this prelate, we find that he was always very modeſt, and eſpecially very reſpectful to the holy ſee, as we ſhall ſhew by and by* (12). *And indeed, neither Vignier, nor Illiricus, nor du Pleſſis, mention upon what occaſion it was written. They have only given us a fragment of it without any title or any other marks.* It is fit the reader ſhould know what was replyed to this. ‘ If this ‘ will ſerve for a reaſon, we ſhall be double gainers ‘ by it, and ſhall ſhew, by better arguments and teſti‘ monies, the baſeneſs of his party, in forging new ‘ pieces and falſifying old ones. Illyricus finding it a‘ mong others, publiſhed it according to the original, the ‘ ſtyle of which is plainly different from his. If he and ‘ others after him, publiſh it without any title or ar‘ gument, this cannot ſurpriſe thoſe who have ſeen ‘ theſe that are printed, amongſt which there are ‘ many, which it is impoſſible to gueſs to whom they ‘ were written, and to know particularly on what oc‘ caſion (13).’ It is Rivetus who ſpeaks thus: a little after he obſerves that Gretſerus (14) *cannot believe that the eighty ſecond epiſtle, wherein he talks of taking away or moderating appeals, could come from Hildebert*; though Coëffeteau ſays *that is truly his*. The curious may conſult Father Hommey's *Supplementum Patrum*, where there are ſeveral pieces of Hildebert, with notes upon his epiſtles, together with the names of thoſe to whom he wrote them (15).

[*E*] *He was of no great birth.*] ‘ There is in the pro‘ vince of Maine, near Montoire, a place called Lavardin, ‘ which has given it's name to a very noble family ‘ of Vendômois . . . . La Croix du Maine in his ‘ *Bibliotheque* ſays, in the article of James Lavardin, ‘ that Hildebert biſhop of Mans, was of that family; ‘ which is not true. He was born at Lavardin, but ‘ was not of the houſe of Lavardin. He was a man ‘ of a great deal of learning and merit, but of no ‘ birth (16).’ The words of La Croix du Maine are theſe (17), ‘ That houſe of Lavardin (18) has uſually ‘ produced learned men and long ago; for Hildebert, ‘ biſhop of Mans, and afterwards archbiſhop of Tours, ‘ five hundred years ago, was of that houſe, and ſir‘ name, and was reckoned the moſt famous poet and ‘ orator of his time, as his epiſtles and Latin poems ‘ witneſs.’

(10) In the 28oth page of the *Myſtere d'Iniquité.*

(11) Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 757.

(12) He ſays, in the next page, that, in the year 1107, Hildebert, being perſecuted by the king of England, went to conſult Pope Paſchal, and to implore his aſſiſtance, and that having held a ſynod at Nantes, under Pope Honorius, he ſent the acts of that ſynod to the ſaid Pope.

(13) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, Part. II, pag. 240.

(14) In Examine Myſterii Pleſſæani, pag. 376.

(15) *See the* Acta Eruditor. 1685, pag. 465.

(16) Suite du Menagiana, pag. 103. Dutch Edit.

(17) Bibliotheque Françoiſe, pag. 190.

(18) He ſpeaks of the houſe of Lavardin near Montoire in Vendômois, different from the houſe of Lavardin ſix leagues from Mans, the lords whereof are ſirnamed de Beaumanoir, and are originally of Bretagne.

HILTEN (John) a German Franciſcan pretended to ground ſome predictions upon the book of Daniel in the year 1485 [*A*]. Melanchthon, who had ſeen the original of that work, ſays, that the author foretold, that in the year 1516 the power of the Pope ſhould begin to decay, and that afterwards it ſhould decline more and more, till it came to it's downfal, and never ſhould riſe again; and that about the year 1600, the Turks ſhould be maſters in Italy and Germany (*a*) [*B*]. Some tell us (*b*) that he foretold that in the year 1600, there ſhould be ſeen a man extreamly cruel, and that in 1606, Gog and Magog ſhould reign over all Europe. After having, with a great deal of

(*a*) Taken from a letter of Melanchthon to Matheſius. It is the 6th of the 2d book, pag. 259. Edit. London, 1642.

(*b*) *See* Paul. Freher. Theatr. pag. 97.

[*A*] *He grounded ſome predictions upon the book of Daniel in the year* 1485.] I have met with this date in a paſſage mentioned by Melchior Adam, which teaches us alſo where this fryar had ſtudied. ‘ Ego ‘ olim juvenis, *it is Hilten who ſpeaks* (1), almæ ma‘ tris Univerſitatis Erphurdenſis alumnus, ardens phi‘ loſophus: nunc ſenex exuli ſolitudini deditus ab an‘ no Chriſti milleſimo quadringenteſimo ſeptuageſimo ‘ primo, in hunc annum milleſimum quadringenteſi‘ mum octogeſimum quintum ejuſdem Domini Jeſu ‘ Chriſti voluntate, qui & me inſtigavit ex ſuo libro ‘ cognoſcere veritatem contra vacuos errores de futuro ‘ tempore nunc volantes. Quam me ſolum ſcire amor ‘ Dei & proximi non finit, ſed & aliis piis & benevo‘ lis impertiri admonet. —— *I ſtudied in my youth* ‘ *in the univerſity of Erfurt, and warmly purſued phi*‘ *loſophy, but am now in my old age fond of ſolitude,* ‘ *and retirement, from the year of our Lord* 1471, *to* ‘ *this preſent year* 1485, *it being the will of my Sa*‘ *viour, who likewiſe excited me to ſeek the knowledge* ‘ *of the truth from his word, in oppoſition to the vain* ‘ *errors now propagated concerning future times.* ‘ *Which truth, the love of* GOD, *and of my neigh*‘ *bour, would not allow me to hoard up, but obligeth* ‘ *me to impart it to the pious and well diſpoſed.*’ Notwithſtanding this, Melchior Adam, a few lines before, ſays, that Hilten lived in the XIVth century. This want of attention is very common among writers.

[*B*] *He foretold that the Turks ſhould be maſters in Italy and Germany.*] He ſeemed to promiſe that the Turks ſhould be the inſtrument of a wonderful reformation by the ruin of the papacy; but they who ſhould reform, were afterwards to aboliſh Mahometiſm; after which the Roman emperor was to reſign his crown to Jesus Christ never to be reſtored. *Ita digerit omnia Calchas* (2). It appeared by the event that John Hilten knew no more of the matter than that diviner of the Grecian army. His words are theſe (3) ‘ Plures ‘ gloriantur Romanum Papam eſſe monarcham, quia ‘ Jeſus omnia dedit Petro & ejus ſucceſſoribus. Fa‘ teor, verùm quamdiu ſunt ejus vicarii. Sed legan‘ tur revelationes S. Brigittæ: & videbitur querela ‘ Chriſti de perverſione illius vicariatus. Quapropter ‘ Deus dedit gladium Mahometo, quo monarchiam ‘ illam à vicario ad ejus Dominum Jeſum Chriſtum ‘ compellit, vicariam & omnes Chriſtianos reformando. ‘ Qui plenè reformati exurgent, & delebunt ſectam ‘ Mahometi. Quo facto, ultimus Imperator Romanus ‘ reſignabit cum effectu Jeſu Chriſto coronam regalem ‘ & omne jus Imperiale; non recepturus, ut Conſtan‘ tinus. —— *Many boaſt that the Pope is a king, be*‘ *cauſe* CHRIST, *gave all things to Peter and his* ‘ *ſucceſſors. I own this, but this is only while they* ‘ *are his vicars. Now if we read the revelations of* ‘ *St Bridget, we ſhall ſee* CHRIST'*s complaints of the* ‘ *corruption of that Vicar. And for this reaſon* GOD ‘ *has given the ſword to Mahomet, that he may take* ‘ *that kingdom from the vicar, and give it back to* ‘ *it's rightful ſovereign* JESUS CHRIST, *by re*‘ *forming his vicar, and all Chriſtians, who being* ‘ *throughly reformed, ſhall deſtroy the Mahometan ſect.* ‘ *After this the laſt Roman emperor, ſhall effectually* ‘ *reſign his royal crown, and imperial title to* JESUS ‘ CHRIST *never to be reſtored, as did Conſtantine.*

[*C*] *Mr du*

(1) Apud Melchior. Adam. in Vitis Theol. pag. 3.

(2) Virgil. Æn. lib. ii.

(3) Apud Melch. Adam ubi ſupra, pag. 4.

of pains, endeavoured to find the time of the end of the world (*c*), he placed it in the year 1651 (*d*). Mr du Pleſſis Mornai has only taken ſo much of thoſe predictions as ſerved his purpoſe [*C*]. Hilten was perſuaded that charity did not ſuffer him to ſuppreſs that knowledge which God had given him about things to come (*e*). It is ſaid that he died in the year 1502 (*f*).

(*c*) Multus fuit in exquirendo fine mundi. *Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. p.* 5.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) See the remark [*A*].

(*f*) Freherus, in Theatro, pag. 97.

[C] *Mr du Pleſſis has taken only ſo much of thoſe predictions as ſerved his purpoſe.*] ‘John Hilten, a monk of Henac in Thuringia, beyond all human foreſight, being put into priſon for having reproved ſome monaſtical abuſes, being very ſick, ſent for the Guardian and told him, *I have ſpoke no great matter againſt monkery, but there ſhall come one in the year* 1516, *who ſhall overturn it, and they ſhall not be able to reſiſt him.*’ And in that very year Luther began to preach (4). Du Pleſſis Mornai is miſtaken one year, for the Æra of Lutheraniſm began not till 1517. I believe alſo that he miſtakes the place, and that he ſhould have ſaid *Eiſenach* inſtead of *Henac*. He ſhould have added, that the thing happened about the year 1500 according to Melanchthon (5).

(4) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 573. *He quotes Philip Melanchthon*, in Apolog. cap. de Votis Monaſticis.

(5) *See* Micrælius, Syntagma, Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. 647.

HYPERIUS (ANDREW GERARD) a famous miniſter and profeſſor of Divinity, was born at Ipres in Flanders the ſixteenth of May 1511. He took the name he is known by from the place of his birth (*a*). His father, who was an advocate, and who had already made him ſtudy in ſeveral places, finding himſelf near his end in the year 1525, recommended it to his wife to ſend him to Paris to continue his ſtudies there. This was done in the year 1528, Hyperius ſtudied Philoſophy there three years together in the college of Calvi; and after a ſhort journey that he made to Ipres, returning to Paris in the year 1532, he ſtudied Divinity till 1535. He afterwards went to Louvain, and made ſeveral journies into ſeveral provinces of the Low-Countries, and into Germany, whereby the attempts his friends had made without his knowledge, to get him a benefice, proved ineffectual; for when it had been repreſented to Carondilet, archbiſhop of Palermo, and chancellor of the emperor, that Hyperius had travelled in Germany, he was ſo ſuſpected of hereſy, that it became neceſſary for him to think of a retreat. He went over into England, and lived above four years with an Engliſh gentleman a lover of learning [*A*]. He croſſed the ſea again in 1541, with a deſign to ſee the univerſity of Straſburg, and particularly Bucer, who rendered it very famous; but going by the way of the country of Heſſe, he met at Marpurg with Geldenhaur, a profeſſor of Divinity, who was one of his friends, who, to retain him, gave him hopes of an employment in the univerſity of that city. He actually ſtaid there, and a little while after ſucceeded his friend, who died in January 1542. He exerciſed that function ſomewhat more than two years without marrying; but thinking he could not live conveniently without a wife, eſpecially his health being none of the beſt, (a reaſon which would have diſcouraged many others from thinking of it) he married in 1544 (*b*) a widow, by whom he had ſix ſons and four daughters. He died at Marpurg the firſt of February 1564, having exerciſed the profeſſorſhip in Divinity above 22 years with the greateſt application. He wrote ſeveral books [*B*], ſome of which were copied by a doctor of Louvian [*C*]. He

(*a*) The city of Ipres has been called *Hypera* by ſeveral authors. Beza, in *Iconibus*, calls it ſo, and ſays that *Andreas Gerardus à patria Hyperius fuit cognominatus*.

(*b*) Animum & matrimonium adjecit quod non putaret ſe commode ſine uxore, maxime cum non ita firmâ valetudine eſſet, vitam tranſigere poſſe. *Melch. Adam, in Vitis Theolog. pag.* 393.

[*A*] *He lived with an Engliſh gentlemen a lover of Learning.*] He was ſon to William Montjoy, whom Eraſmus has ſo much praiſed, and who lay under many obligations to him. ‘In Carolum Montjoium, Guilielmi filium, Baronem incidit (*Hyperius*) quem Eraſmus Roterodamus ampliſſimè in ſcriptis ſuis ac ſæpè commendat. Is amicè cum Hyperio multis ac variis de rebus collocutus cùm ingenium ejus perſpexiſſet, oblato liberali ſtipendio, domum ſuam eum invitavit, ubi annos quatuor amplius ſuaviſſime Hyperius cum Montjoio vixit in otio literario (1) —— *Hyperius accidentally met with Lord Charles Montjoy, ſon to that Lord William whom Eraſmus ſo highly and frequently celebrates in his writings. My Lord having converſed freely with him, and various ſubjects, and ſeeing his genius, invited him to ſtay at his houſe, and offered him very handſome appointments. Here Hyperius continued above four years in the happieſt condition a man of letters could deſire.*’ Note that in Freherus's Theatrum (2) we find *Monticius* inſtead of *Montjoius*, and that though Eraſmus dedicated his Livy to Montjoy the ſon, and praiſed him in ſome other places, yet thoſe great and frequent praiſes mentioned here can properly belong only to the father. The ſon was very young when Eraſmus died (3).

(1) Melch. Adam in Vita Hyperii, pag. 302, Vitar. Theolog.

(2) Pag. 198.

(3) Vide Eraſmi, Epiſt. xvii, lib. xxvi, & Epiſt. xv. lib. xxviii.

[*B*] *He wrote ſeveral books.*] If we may believe Verheiden, Hyperius's writings that are publiſhed would make ſeven volumes *in Folio*. Some of them concern Rhetoric, Logic, Arithmetic, Geometry, Coſmography, Aſtronomy, Optics, Phyſics, *&c.* The reſt are either commentaries upon the Scripture, or treatiſes of divinity. His book *de recte formando Theologiæ ſtudio*, and another, *de formandis concionibus ſacris*, were ſo well approved by a doctor of Louvain, that he inſerted them almoſt intire in the books he publiſhed upon the ſame ſubject at Antwerp in the year 1565. Hyperius was but a young ſtudent, when he made an oration at Paris (4), which has been ſince printed and which is in praiſe of one of his friends (5).

(4) Quem (Joachimum Ringelbergium) & exquiſita quæ extat oratione ad Senatum Pariſienſem laudavit Hyperius. *Verheiden, pag.* 95.

(5) Mr Teiſſier, *pag.* 14, *Catalogi Auctorum*, ſpeaks of it, as if it was the life of Ringelberg; but he is miſtaken.

[*C*] *Which were copied by a doctor of Louvain.*] Valerius Andreas owns it (6). This doctor was a Spaniſh monk of the order of St Auguſtin, named *Laurentius à Villavicentio*. He is often quoted for a famous plagiary. The firſt author that I have found to take notice of this plagiariſm, was the learned Raynolds; he mentions it in the fourth chapter of the firſt book of his treatiſe *de Idololatria Romana* printed at Oxford in the year 1516, and he obſerves that this monk corrected in Hyperius's book all that offended the church of Rome. Some time after Keckerman (7) mentioned this ſame theft, owning that Raynolds had obſerved it before. Voëtius (8) ſpoke, of it, quoting Keckerman in a theſis maintained in 1655. But he would have the work which was ſtolen to be Hyperius's method of divinity. Now that method contains only three books, whereas the work that Raynolds, Keckerman, and the bibliographer of the Low-Countries, ſay the Spaniſh monk adopted, contains four, and is commonly quoted by this title *de ratione Studii Theologici*. Certainly this laſt is not the ſame book with Hyperius's *Methodus Theologiæ*. We muſt believe that Voëtius has not been altogether exact. Mr Colomiés (9) likewiſe mentons this theft, citing Raynolds. Mr Placius (10) mentions it only upon the credit of one of his friends who wrote to him, that Simon Oomius ſpoke of it in the ſecond preface to a Dutch book; and both he and Mr Konig (11) will have this plagiariſm to relate to the book intituled *Methodus Theologiæ*. A modern author (12) cites con-

(6) Quicquid boni habent ejuſdem (Hyperii) de formandis ſacris concionibus libri duo, deque rectè formando ſtudio Theologico libri iv. id in ſuos ſimilis argumenti libros tranſtulit Laurentius à Villavicentio ex Ord. Auguſtiniano Doctor Theol. Lovanienſis. *Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag.* 49.

(7) In Præcognit. Logic.

---

(8) Diſp. Select. Vol. III, pag. 687. (9) Gall. Oriental. pag. 10. (10) De Pſeudonym. pag. 273. (11) Bibl. pag. 420. *See alſo pag.* 846, *where he quotes* Rivetus, Tom. II, Oper. pag. 1095 (*it ſhould be pag.* 1065), qui vocat Villavicentium Hyperii interpolatorem & expilatorem. (12) Joh. Albertus Faber, Decade Decadum, n. 36. Lipſiæ, 1689.

cerning

He laboured eſpecially to teach the ſtudents in Divinity a good method of preaching. He had a very clear head; and beſides his ſkill in the Languages, Hiſtory, Philoſophy, and Divinity, he had an excellent art of teaching. He had exerciſed that talent very early; for when he ſtudied at Paris, he aſſiſted many other ſcholars. He was modeſt at entertainments, affable and polite in converſation; and as much as he hated immoderate cups [*D*], and that idle buffoonry, which is too frequent in converſation, ſo he delighted in well ordered entertainments, and agreeable diſcourſe. In a word, he was a man of a very elegant turn of wit, attended with virtue and zeal. Thoſe who would know more of him, may read the writers I quote (*c*). There is ſome difference between Verheiden's and Melchior Adam's account [*E*]. I can ſcarce believe that Hyperius had been a monk [*F*]. Part of his books were not publiſhed till after his death [*G*], by the care either of Laurence Hyperius, his ſon, or of John Mylius (*d*).

(*c*) Wigandus Orthius, in Oratione Funebri Hyperii. Melch. Adam. in Vita Hyperii, *which is but an abſtract of the Funeral Oration.* Verheiden Præſtant. aliquot Theol. Effig. pag. 95.

(*d*) Verheiden, Præſtant. aliquot Theolog. Effig. pag. 95.

cerning this plagiariſm, not only Keckerman and Colomiés, but alſo John Heilfeld cap. 25. *Sphingis Theologico-Philoſophicæ*. It is to be obſerved, that none of theſe authors, except Valerius Andreas, ſpeaks of the double plagiariſm of the Spaniſh monk; they only obſerve that which relates to the book intituled *de Studio Theologico*. But, on the other hand, Nicolas Antonio does not only ſay, that Villavicentius took all that he thought good in two books of Hyperius, to make two others upon the ſame ſubject; but beſides, aſcribes to him the ſame conduct with reſpect to two other books publiſhed by Proteſtants, one is *de Phraſibus ſacræ Scripturæ*; the other is, *Tabulæ compendioſæ in Evangelia & Epiſtolas*. Note, that he has added ſome faults to thoſe of Valerius Andreas. Like him (13) he will have Hyperius to have been a Dominican: To this he has added other errors of his own, I. By giving Hyperius the name of Hiſperius. II. By allowing but three books to the treatiſe *de formando Studio Theologico*. III. In making his treatiſe *de formandis ſacris Concionibus*, to contain three book, whereas in contains only two.

[*D*] *He hated immoderate cups.*] See what his funeral oration ſays it (14); 'In colloquiis & converſationibus humanus & æquus, & quemadmodum immania 'illa in conviviis hominum pocula, & ſcurriles in colloquiis nugas ex animo fuit averſatus, ita moderatis 'conviviis, jucundiſque amicorum confabulationibus 'nonnunquam interfuit.'

[*E*] *There is ſome difference between Verheiden's and Melchior Adam's account.*] Verheiden has given us only a very ſhort elogy; but the account which the other gives is more hiſtorical, and the times more diſtinctly marked. The latter, does not ſay that Hyperius travelled into Spain: he only ſays that he ſaw the provinces of Italy between the Alps and Bologna; and that he ſaw them during his ſtudies in Paris, and before his journey to Louvain. Verheiden, on the contrary, pretends that Hyperius travelled into Spain and Italy, after having ſtudied at Paris and Louvain. He makes him firſt teach Philoſoſophy at Marpurg, and afterwards Divinity. Melchior Adam ſays nothing of his profeſſing Philoſophy.

ERRORS of Moreri and Valerius Andreas.

[*F*] *I can ſcarce believe that Hyperius had been a monk.*] The extract of his funeral oration does not ſpeak of it: we may be ſure then that Wigandus Orthius has not ſaid it; for ſuch a fact, good Melchior Adam would not have paſſed over in ſilence, even though he had given but a ſhort extract, and not a long relation filled with a hundred particularities. However I would not truſt to that reaſon; I have ſought and at laſt found Wigandus Orthius's oration, and I can ſee nothing in it that can give me any ſuſpicion that Hyperius was ever of any religious order. Hence I conclude, that he never was a monk. Let it not be objected to me that this is a negative argument: I do not pretend to plead the cauſe of that way of arguing (15); but I dare ſay it appears here concluſive, both becauſe he who compoſed Hyperius's funeral oration, could not be ignorant whether he had been a monk or not, and becauſe if he knew it, all the reaſon in the world obliged him to obſerve it. No body ever thought of concealing theſe ſort of truths concerning Muſculus, Marlorat, Peter Martyr, Zanchius, and many other other pillars of the growing reformation, who came from the cloiſters, and there could not be perhaps a man more incapable of ſilence upon things of this nature than Orthius. He who thought himſelf obliged to tell in a funeral oration, that Hyperius went to wait for his baggage at Marpurg, becauſe he knew he could live cheaper there than in any other place on the banks of the Rhine (16). He tells you a hundred particulars of the ſame importance, which Melchior Adam has faithfully copied. And therefore I do not ſee that Moreri could ſay, without being miſtaken, that Hyperius was *a monk of the order of St Dominic, in which he diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his learning; but that he afterwards baſely apoſtatized.* In this he has been only the tranſcriber of Valerius Andreas, who had told that lie before. This bibliographer of the Low-Countries, who is beſides miſtaken in placing Hyperius's death in the year 1560, is not excuſable for not having ſaid at leaſt, that Hyperius had been a miniſter at Marpurg; and Moreri who has ſaid this (17) ought to be blamed for his ſilence about his profeſſing divinity. His want of exactneſs appears alſo in this expreſſion. *He fell into the errors of Luther which he taught.* To what end is this laſt remark expreſſed in an indeterminate manner. Was it not enough for him to have given him the title of a Proteſtant miniſter in the firſt line of the article? Would not this ſufficiently import that Hyperius taught the Proteſtant doctrine? Beſides, it is not true that he followed the reformation of Luther: the Index of prohibited books (18) might have inſtructed Mr Moreri in that point.

[*G*] *Part of his books were not publiſhed till after his death.*] Conſult the epitome of Geſner where you will find that ſeveral of Hyperius's works were printed in his life-time; ſo that I do not ſee that he can be alledged as an inſtance of that ſingular modeſty, which makes an author defer the publication of his writings till after his death, that he may not be an ear-witneſs of his own praiſes. This ought to be obſerved by thoſe who read in Mr Selden (19) what I am going to quote. 'Cujus (*contemptus famæ vel glo-'riæ propriæ*) illuſtre exemplum antehac præbuit 'Theologus ſua ætate celeberrimus *Andreas Hyperius*, 'de quo teſtis eſt *Juſtus Vultejus* (20), quod ideo 'poſt mortem demum in lucem prodire ſua voluerit, 'quia *gloriam* ſibi *nullam*, nec *vulgi applauſus* iis cap-'tabat. *Hos enim* (inquit) *ſi tanti faciendos eſſe pu-'taſſet, utique* vivo *ei frui illis licuiſſet.* —— *Andrew 'Hyperius a famous divine, in the age in which he 'lived, gave an illuſtrious example of this contempt of 'praiſe and perſonal honours; for, as Juſtus Vulterius 'relates, he deſired that his works might be publiſhed 'after his death, becauſe he did not deſire any glory 'or popular applauſe that might ariſe from them. If* '(ſays he) *he had put any value upon theſe things, 'he might have enjoyed them during his life.*'

(13) Nic. Anton. Biblioth. Hiſpan. Tom. II, pag. 9.

(14) Apud Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. pag. 397.

(15) Mr de Launoi has writ ſome books concerning the authority of negative arguments, and Mr Thiers among others oppoſed his opinion.

(16) Sciebat enim minoris ſe apud Cattos interea poſſe vivere, quàm uſpiam ad Rheni ripas.

(17) He has given a falſe name to the town, calling it Marburge.

(18) The following words are to be found in it, pag. 16, of the edition in folio, 1667. *Andreas Hyperius, ſeu Hypperius, Theologus Calvino-Zuinglianus, Profeſſor Marpurgenſis.* Konig, *Bibliotheque*, *pag.* 420, calls him a Reformed Divine; who, according to the ſtyle of the German Proteſtants, is the ſame as Calviniſtical Divine.

(19) De Libris, & eorum Lectione, pag. 47.

(20) Vultej. in Dedic. Oper. Hyper. præfix.

HIPPARCHIA, wife to the Philoſopher Crates, was ſo charmed with the diſcourſes of that Cynic, that ſhe was reſolved to marry him at any rate. She ſaw herſelf ſurrounded by a great many admirers, diſtinguiſhed by their nobility, riches, and the genteelneſs of their perſons. She was preſſed by her family to make choice of a huſband amongſt thoſe rivals; but nothing could bring her off from Crates. She declared that ſhe valued him above all the world, and that if ſhe had him not, ſhe would ſtab herſelf. The family, upon this declaration, addreſſed themſelves to Crates, intreating him to uſe his eloquence and authority with her, to cure her of her paſſion. He did all that was poſſible, without gaining any thing upon her obſtinacy. At laſt when he ſaw all his arguments and counſels were of no weight, he diſplaid his poverty before her [*A*], he diſcovered his crooked back, he laid his ſtaff, his wallet, and his cloak upon the ground, ſaying to her, *See here the man that you will have, and the goods that you will find with him; conſider well of it, you cannot become my wife without leading the life which our ſect preſcribes.* He had ſcarce made an end of ſpeaking, when ſhe declared, that condition infinitely pleaſed her. She took the habit of the order, I mean the equipage of the Cynics, and ſtuck ſo cloſe to Crates, that ſhe followed him every where, went to feaſts with him [*B*], and made no ſcruple to pay him the conjugal duty in the middle of the ſtreets [*C*]. It was one of the tenets of that ſect that we ought not to be aſhamed of any bodily exerciſe which nature requires of us [*D*]. Hipparchia being at dinner one day

---

[*A*] *Crates diſplaid his poverty before her.*] No body has deſcribed this with ſo much exactneſs as Apuleius: he tells us that Hipparchia anſwered, that ſhe had ſufficiently conſidered that affair, and was perſuaded it was impoſſible to find a handſomer or a richer husband than Crates; and that he might lead her where he pleaſed. He led her to the Portico. It was one of the moſt ſumptuous public buildings, and the moſt frequented of all Athens, and there he conſummated the marriage. All the people might have ſeen it, and the ſpouſe was reſolved to entertain the company with that ſhew; but a friend of Crates ſpread his cloak about them, and by that means made a ſort of a curtain, which skreened them from the view of the ſpectators. To ſhew that I lend nothing to my author, I will ſet down his words. ‘ Adeoque is (*Crates*) cupiebatur; ut virgo nobilis, ſpretis junioribus procis, ultro eum ſibi optaverit. Cumque interſcapilium Crates retexiſſet, quod erat aucto gibbere, peramque cum baculo & pallium humi poſuiſſet, eamque ſuppellectilem ſibi eſſe puellæ profiteretur, eamque formam quam viderat: proinde ſedulò conſuleret, ne poſt querelæ cauſam caperet: enimverò Hipparche conditionem accipit. Jamdudum ſibi proviſum ſatis, & ſatis conſultum reſpondit: neque ditiorem maritum, neque formoſiorem uſpiam gentium poſſe invenire. Proinde duceret quò liberet. Ducit Cynicus in porticum. Ibidem, in loco celebri, coram luce clariſſimâ accubuit: coramque virginem imminuiſſet, paratam pari conſtantiâ; ni Zeno procinctu palliaſtri, à circumſtantis coronæ obtutu magiſtrum in ſecreto defendiſſet (1). Mr Menage (2) affirms that Clemens Alexandrinus ſays, that the wedding of Crates and Hipparchia was celebrated in the Portico called ποικίλη: but it is certain Clemens does not ſay it: We only can infer it from his words. *In honour of Hipparchia*, ſays he (3), *the Cynogamia were celebrated in the Pœcile.* The word *Cynogamia* ſignified, according to Mr Menage (4), a feaſt which the Cynics kept to the honour and memory of Crates's marriage. He adds, that Mr Petit the Phyſician has made a fine poem upon the amours aud nuptials of this Cynic. The poem is intituled, *Cynogamia*. Many will call to mind here a French verſe, mentioned by Furetiere, *Voulurent chauds de reins faire noces de chien* (5).

[*B*] *She went to feaſts with him.*] This, and the cuſtom of rambling about with Crates, were two things not practiſed by the other Grecian women. They were ſhut up in the remoteſt part of the houſe, and were viſited by none but their relations, and never went to a feaſt but at the houſes of their relations. Cornelius Nepos, who relates this, obſerves that the Romans had quite contrary cuſtoms. Women lived then at Rome, as they do now at Paris. The mode of Italy has very much changed: it has for a long time reſembled that of ancient Greece. *Altri tempi, altri coſtumi.* - - - - *Different times, different manners.* Let us ſee the words of Cornelius Nepos (6): ‘ Quem Romanorum pudet uxorem ducere in convivium? Aut cujus materfamilias non primum locum tenet ædium, atque in celebritate verſatur? Quod multo fit aliter in Græcia. Nam neque in convivium adhibetur, niſi propinquorum: neque ſedet niſi in interiore parte ædium, quæ γυναικωνίτης appellatur: quò nemo accedit niſi propinqua cognatione conjunctus. —— *What Roman* (ſays he) *is aſhamed to carry his wife to a feaſt? Or whoſe wife doth not live in the principal apartment, and in the view of the world? In Greece it is quite otherwiſe. For there a wife is never carried to a feaſt, except in the houſes of her relations: and ſhe never ſits in any other but the remoteſt part of the houſe; to which none approach but near relations.*’

[*C*] *She made no ſcruple of paying the conjugal duty in the middle of the ſtreets.*] We ſhall not wonder that this philoſophical lady, Hipparchia, ſet herſelf above cuſtom, with reſpect to the two points I have mentioned, when ſhe was able to trample upon decorum with reſpect to the third. The contempt of cuſtom cannot be carried farther. This was a great triumph of love, ſhe ſacrificed to it the virtue that is moſt natural to the fair ſex, that ſhame, or that modeſty, which is a thouſand times deeper rooted in the heart of women, than chaſtity itſelf. And what is more ſtrange, Hipparchia was prepared for this impudence all at once; there was no need of leading her to it by degrees. Juvenal obſerves that when the buſineſs is to ſatisfy love, nothing appears difficult to women. Are they to go on ſhip-board with their husbands whom they do not like, they know not how to reſolve upon it; the dangers and fatigue of the ſea are inſupportable. But are they to embark with a gallant, they have the beſt ſtomach in the world for it, and a Tarpaulin's life is a pleaſure to them.

> Fortem animum præſtant rebus quas turpiter audent.
> Si jubeat conjux durum eſt conſcendere navim,
> Tunc ſentina gravis, tunc ſummus vertitur aër:
> Quæ mœchum ſequitur ſtomacho valet. Illa maritum
> Convomit hæc inter nautas & prandet & errat
> Per puppem, & duros gaudet tractare rudentes (7).

Hipparchia juſtifies this obſervation; ſhe doted upon Crates; he would have her to ſhake off all ſhame, *non aliter hæc ſacra conſtant*, ſaid he to her in all likelihood: ſhe was ſatisfied to do it to gratify him. Many authors report the fact. Sextus Empiricus (8) and Theodoret (9) witneſs it; I have already cited others But St Auguſtin had a very ſingular thought upon this ſubject; he believed that the Cynics uſed only poſtures and vain efforts. ‘ Illum (*Diogenem*) vel illos qui hoc feciſſe referuntur, potius arbitror concumbentium motus dediſſe oculis hominum neſcientium quid ſub pallio gereretur, quàm humano premente conſpectu potuiſſe illam peragi voluptatem. Ibi enim Philoſophi non erubeſcebant videri ſe velle concumbere, ubi libido ipſa erubeſceret ſurgere (10) ——— *As for Diogenes and ſome others, who are ſaid to have done ſo, I imagine that they rather imitated the motions of lovers, before people who knew not what was tranſacted under the cloak, than that they were able really to conſummate. For here Philoſophers did not bluſh to deſire to be thought to do, what luſt itſelf bluſhed to enable them to perform.*’ A modern has ſet up for a Cato againſt this father of the church, and has given him a ſevere reprimand for that thought. ‘ When St Auguſtin adds, *ſays he*, that he cannot believe that Diogenes and thoſe of his ſect, who are reported to have done every thing in public, enjoyed a true and real pleaſure there; he thinks they only imitated, under the Cynic cloak, the motions of thoſe who lye together, impoſing by that means upon the eyes of the ſpectators. Tho' they in effect were not able to do any thing to purpoſe. I am aſhamed to mention this, and I deſire you to read his own words (11) . . . . . How could ſo great a man allow his imagination the liberty of diving into thoſe Cynical ſecrets? How could St Auguſtin's hand lift up Diogenes's cloak, to let us ſee ſome motions, which ſhame (tho' that Philoſopher profeſſed to have none) made him hide with his own cloak (12).’

[*D*] *We ought not to be ſhamed of any bodily exerciſe which nature requires of us.*] See what was ſaid above in the Remark [*L*] of the article DIOGENES. Some think the Cynics had their name, becauſe like dogs they lay with their wives in the ſtreets: ‘ Nam quid ego de Cynicis loquar: quibus in propatulo day at Lyſimachus's with the Atheiſt Theodorus, made a ſubtle objection to him, to which

---

(1) Apuleius, in Floridis, pag. m. 350.

(2) In Hiſtoria Mulierum Philoſopharum, ad calcem Diogen. Laërt. pag 497.

(3) Ἐφ᾽ ᾗ καὶ τὰ κυνογάμεια ἐν τῇ ποικίλῃ ἐτετέλεστο. Propter quam in Pœcile quoque celebrata fuere Cynogamia. *Clem. Alexand. Stromat. lib. iv, pag.* 523.

(4) In Laërt. lib. vi, n. 96.

(5) At the word *Rein*. This is a verſe of Reignier, which relates to the fight of the Lapithæ.

(6) In Præfat.

(7) Juvenal. Sat. VII, ver. 97.

(8) Pyrrhoniarum Hypotypoſeon, lib. i, cap. xiv, pag. m 31, & lib. iii, cap. xxiv, pag 152.

(9) Serm. XII, de Virtute Activa.

(10) De Civitate Dei, lib. xiv, cap. xx.

(11) Here he ſets down the words of St Auguſtin.

(12) La Mothe Vayer, Hexameron Ruſtique, pag. 63, 64, 65.

‘patulo coïre cum conjugibus mos fuit. Quid mirum ſi à canibus quorum vitam imitantur, etiam vocabulum nomenque traxerunt (13)?’ The Cynics pretended they acted agreeably to reaſon, for, ſaid they, if it be lawful to know one's wife, it is lawful to know her in public: but it is lawful to know one's wife, therefore it is lawful to know her in public. ‘Hoc illi canini Philoſophi, hoc eſt Cynici non viderunt proſerentes contra humanam verecundiam, quid aliud quam caninam hoc eſt immundam impudentemque ſententiam, ut ſcilicet quoniam juſtum eſt quod fit in uxore, palam non pudeat id agere, nec in vico, nec in platea qualibet, conjugalem concubitum devitare (14).’ I have obſerved elſewhere (15) a like argument of Diogenes. It is the wretched ſophiſm, *a dicto ſimpliciter ad dictum ſecundum quid*. It is as if one ſhould ſay; *it is good to drink wine, therefore it is good to drink it in a fever*. Theſe people did not know that there are many actions that are good only in certain circumſtances, the omiſſion of which may render an action evil, which with them would have been good. To lend money to a friend in order to pay his debts is a very commendable action: but to lend it him to make himſelf drunk, or to game, is an evil action. There are ſome actions eſſentially evil; which cannot be good under any circumſtances whatſoever, but there are ſome things which are good or evil according to the times, and places, and other circumſtances, wherein they are done. I confeſs that this is not ſufficient to non-plus the Cynics; for they might turn their argument thus. When a thing is good and lawful in itſelf, one ought not to be aſhamed of doing it: but the conjugal duty is in itſelf a thing good and lawful; and therefore one ought not to be aſhamed of paying it: and conſequently it may be lawfully paid in public. For if any thing could vitiate that public action, it would be only want of ſhame in circumſtances, wherein men are obliged to have it. The difficulty then is reduced to this one queſtion. *Ought one to be aſhamed of paying the conjugal duty in the face of the world?* A pretty queſtion, you will ſay; who doubts it? Diogenes would anſwer, I do, and do you prove that I am in the wrong. The anſwer to him would be, that ſhame, with relation to theſe actions is a natural impreſſion, and that therefore it is to offend againſt nature not to be aſhamed in theſe occurrences. But, he would reply, that if it were a natural impreſſion, the animals, which ſo faithfully follow the inſtincts of nature, would ſeek ſhades and dark receſſes for the work of generation. Now nothing is more falſe than this. At leaſt all men would in the like caſes ſeek the darkeſt retreats, which is likewiſe falſe; for many people in the Indies propagate in the ſight of all the world. This is what the famous Pyrrhoniſt Sextus Empiricus obſerves, in order to ſhew, that the common practice is not grounded upon an immutable and eternal law of nature, but upon a meer cuſtom, and the impreſſion of education. Τὸ *δημοσίᾳ γυναικὶ μίγνυσθαι καίτοι παρ' ἡμῖν αἰσχρὸν εἶναι δοκοῦν, παρά τισι τῶν Ἰνδῶν οὐκ αἰσχρὸν εἶναι νομίζεται· μίγνυνται οὖν ἀδιαφόρως δημοσίᾳ καθάπερ καὶ περὶ τοῦ φιλοσόφου* Κράτητος *ἀκηκόαμεν. Publice cum uxore congredi quamvis apud nos turpe eſſe videatur, apud quoſdam ex Indis non videtur eſſe turpe. Congrediuntur enim indifferenter publice, quemadmodum etiam de Cratete Philoſopho accepimus* (16). He might have alledged the cuſtom of the MOSYNIANS, whoſe article may be ſeen. A modern author has obſerved, that ſome nations have made love ‘even in the temples, and ſaid, that if that action diſpleaſed the deity, he would not ſuffer it in other animals (17).’ He adds, that ‘a Mahometan ſect practiſes the ſame at this day, and that the new world appeared to us in that innocence.’ It might be replied to Diogenes, that it is enough that the civilized nations are ſubject to ſhame, and that it is nothing to us what the barbarous nations do; but he would reply in his turn, that the people we call barbarous, have leſs departed from the rule of nature, than the people who have ſo much multiplied by their ſubtilties of wit, the laws of decency and civility; and that in fine, natural rights not being ſubject to preſcription, every one may lawfully repoſſeſs himſelf of it in all times and places, without any regard to the arbitrary yoke of cuſtoms, and the opinion of his fellow-citizens.

A Reflexion upon the weakneſs of reaſon.

This ſhews how many different ways human reaſon may lead us aſtray. It was given us to direct us in the right way; but it is a deſultory, wavering, and ſupple inſtrument, which turned every way like a weather-cock. See how the Cynics made uſe of it to juſtify their abominable impudence. I may add, for the honour and glory of the true religion, that it alone furniſhes us with ſtrong weapons againſt the ſophiſtry of theſe people; for though we could not ſhew in Scripture, any formal precept, for hiding the privacies of marriage in the dark, it ſuffices to ſay, in the firſt place, that the ſpirit of the Scripture engages us to avoid whatever may weaken the impreſſions of ſhame; and ſecondly, that there are preciſe texts, forbidding us to do any thing that ſhocks decency, or ſcandalizes our neighbour. I do not know whether any of the Caſuiſts, who have ſo much abuſed their leiſure in examining many caſes of conſcience, in ſome reſpects metaphyſical, have ever thought to what kind of crime the impudence of a Crates, or of a Diogenes, ought to be reduced. They did not believe there was any divine law about it, nor that a man was obliged to conform to municipal cuſtoms. They believed that non-conformity in ſuch caſes would at moſt incur the blame of ruſticity, and want of complaiſance to a received cuſtom: to be incivil, ill-bred, and an ill obſerver of faſhions, is not a criminal or evil action, morally ſpeaking. What then can be ſaid againſt the Cynics, unleſs they be condemned by revealed truth? I have never read any thing whatever upon this point, and I do not know whether any one has ſaid, that at preſent a Cynical action would only be criminal:

1. Becauſe of the ſcandal given to one's neighbour.
2. Becauſe of the contempt of the municipal cuſtoms.
3. Becauſe of the negligence of preſerving the barriers of chaſtity.

I ſuppoſe a man perſuaded that the action in itſelf is not expreſly forbidden in ſcripture, nor contrary to the law of nature. If it was contrary to it, the ſentences that command a congreſs, would be ſo many crimes chargeable upon the judges.

There are, no doubt, ſome Caſuiſts who will take ſelf-pollution which Diogenes was guilty of in the public market-place (18), to be a greater crime than this congreſs of Crates and Hipparchia. It is a very ſtrange and ſcandalous thing, to ſee Chryſippus, that celebrated and rigid Stoic, praiſe that infamous action of Diogenes. Ἐπαινεῖ *τὸν Διογένην τὸ αἰδοῖον ἀποτειβόμενον ἐν φανερῷ, καὶ λέγοντα πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας, εἴθε καὶ τὸν λιμὸν οὕτως ἀποτρίψασθαι τῆς γαστρὸς ἠδυνάμην. Diogenem laudat qui in publico maſturbaſſet, dixiſſetque adſtantibus, utinam liceret ſic etiam famem attrito ventre pellere* (19). That Cynic could not have juſtified himſelf by his ſophiſm, *It is lawful to pay the conjugal debt, therefore it is lawful to pay it in the ſtreet*; for his action is bad both in public and private. Sextus Empiricus owns, that it was looked upon as deteſtable, though Zeno, the founder of the Stoics, had approved it, and many others had recourſe to it as a good action. Τότε *αἰσχρουργεῖν ἐπόρατον ὂν παρ' ἡμῖν, ὁ Ζήνων οὐκ ἀποδοκιμάζει καὶ ἄλλους δὲ ὡς ἀγαθῷ τινὶ τούτῳ χρῆσθαι τῷ κακῷ πυνθανόμεθα. Quum praeterea deteſtabile ſit apud nos αἰσχρουργεῖν, Zeno approbat & alios quoſdam ut bono quodam hoc uſos malo accepimus* (20). Diogenes made uſe of another ſophiſm; he took what is done by ſome fiſh for a dictate of nature (21): but the ſophiſm is no better than what one might draw from the practice of the Lydians. For the reſt, the Cynics in vain ſought out arguments to colour their abominable impudence. They durſt not continue in it. The public indignation was probably a ſtronger bridle for them, than the ideas of virtue. St Auguſtin obſerves, that at laſt natural modeſty got the better of this ſort of people. ‘Vicit tamen pudor naturalis opinionem hujus erroris, nam etſi perhibent, hoc aliquando gloriabundum feciſſe Diogenem, ita putantem ſectam ſuam nobiliorem futuram, ſi in hominum memoriam inſignior ejus impudentia figeretur, poſtea tamen à Cynicis fieri ceſſatum eſt: pluſque valuit pudor ut erubeſcerent homines hominibus, quàm error, ut homines canibus eſſe ſimiles affectarent (22). —— *But at laſt natural modeſty got the better of this error, for though we are told that Diogenes ſometimes oſtentatiouſly did ſo, thinking that his ſect* which he gave no verbal anſwer [*E*], but had recourſe to his hands, and whatever he could do and ſay afterwards, he found a woman very reſolute, and afraid of nothing (*a*). She wrote ſome books, which are not come to us [*F*]. Mr Moreri has committed ſome faults in her article [*G*]; and ſo has Lorenzo Craſſo [*H*]. I forgot to ſay, that Hipparchia

---

(13) Lactantius, lib. iii, cap. xv, Divin. Inſtitut.

(14) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. xiv, cap. xx.

(15) See, above, remark [*E*] of the article DIOGENES the Cynic.

(16) Sext. Empiricus, Pyrrhon. Hypot. lib. iii, cap. xxiv, pag. 152.

(17) La Mothe le Vayer, Dialog. d'Oraſius Tubero, pag. m. 156. *He quotes* Herodotus, lib. ii.

(18) See his article, remark [*L*].

(19) Plutarh de Stoicor. Repugn. pag. 1044.

(20) Sextus Empiricus, Pyrrhon. Hypoth. lib. iii, cap. xxiv, pag. 153.

(21) See his article, citat. (73).

(22) De Civit. Dei, lib. xiv, cap xx.

(*a*) *Taken from* Diogenes Laërt. in Hipparchia, lib. vi, n. 96, & ſeq.

‘ *ſect would be more famous by fixing this extraordinary* ‘ *impudence of his in mens memoirs, yet afterwards the* ‘ *Cynics laid aſide this practice. And ſhame was of* ‘ *more force to make men bluſh in the preſence of men,* ‘ *than error, to make men affect to be like dogs.*’ But as there are always ſome exceptions to the moſt general rules, we ſee, in Lucian, the Cynic Peregrinus coming near the conduct of Diogenes. Ἐν πολλῷ δὲ τῶν περιεστώτων δήμῳ ἀναφλῶν τὸ αἰδοῖον, καὶ τὸ ἀδιάφορον δὴ τοῦτο καλούμενον ἐπιδεικνύμενος. *Multa autem in corona populi pudenda contrectabat, & hæc indifferentia vocans oſtentabat* (23).

(23) Lucian. de Morte Peregr. pag. m. 767, Tom. II.

AN Obſervation for thoſe who may be offended at what I have now related.

They who may think it ſtrange, that I ſhould mention ſuch horrible obſcenities, ought to be reminded of the privileges or duties of an hiſtorian. Whoever at preſent writes the hiſtory, either of an ancient philoſopher, or of any other perſon who has acquired a name in preceding ages, has a right to relate whatever he finds in books concerning them, whether it deſerves the praiſe, or the horror and execration of the reader; and if he ſhould be contented to collect only what is commendable, he would very ill diſcharge the duties which the nature of his work requires of him. In writing the life of a modern, there is more liberty allowed; for if he has committed filthy actions, which are unknown to the world, they may be paſſed over in ſilence, according as one thinks it neceſſary to prevent ſome inconveniencies, that might ariſe from the publication of ſuch things. But when the queſtion is about a fact mentioned by a hundred authors, we are no longer maſters of the like caution; and if one chooſes to ſuppreſs it, it is an uſeleſs ſcruple, ſince the readers will eaſily find ſome other way, what you are ſo induſtrious to conceal from them. The impudence of Diogenes the Cynic, is ſo well known in the world, that ſome jeſts go about of him, which are not founded on the teſtimony of any ancient writer. ‘ Du Mouſtier put me in mind of a book of ‘ the ſame Orleans, intituled, *The human plant to the* ‘ *Queen*: it is a ridiculous title, which makes me re‘member Diogenes's *Planto Hominem* (24).’ Theſe words are cardinal du Perron's. Abundance of people tell the ſame thing in their common converſations. It is found in ſeveral books, where it is ſaid, that Diogenes embracing a woman in the middle of the ſtreets, being asked what he did? anſwered, φυτεύω ἄνθρωπον, *I plant a man*. No ancient that I know of, tells this ſtory, and Mr du Rondel, whom I have conſulted upon it, anſwered me, that he had never found it but in modern authors. Now when a ſtory ſo ill grounded, about the impudence of this ancient Philoſopher is ſo generally known; it is not likely that people ſhould be ignorant of what has been ſaid of him by the authors whom I quote. To what end then ſhould I ſuppreſs theſe facts? You ought at leaſt, you will ſay, to make uſe of expreſſions which may veil theſe infamous actions. I anſwer, that this would be the way to diminiſh the horror they deſerve; for theſe delicate and diſguiſed phraſes which are now commonly uſed in ſpeaking of impurities, do not give ſo much diſguſt as more natural and ſtrong expreſſions, and thereby more apt to raiſe our indignation, would do; let not an author therefore amuſe himſelf with inventing ambiguous expreſſions, which, properly ſpeaking, are only a covering to the deformity of theſe actions. I add, that it is more uſeful and important than people are aware of, to mention the horrible abominations which the Pagan Philoſophers approved. This may humble and mortify human reaſon, and convince us of the infinite corruption of the heart of man, and teach us a truth, of which we ſhould be always mindful, namely, that man wanted a revealed light to ſupply the defect of the philoſophical; for you ſee, that the Stoics (25), who cultivated morality beyond the other Philoſophers, and had very ſublime ideas of it, did neverthele ſs approve of the impudent obſcenities of Diogenes. To them we may particularly apply the general declaration of St Paul againſt the Heathens, *Thinking themſelves wiſe, they became fools* (26).

(24) Perronina *at the word* Orleans, pag. m. 225.

(25) See, above, citat. (19) and (20).

(26) Romans, chap. i, ver. 22.

[*E*] *Hipparchia made an objection to which the Atheiſt Theodorus gave no verbal anſwer.*] It was a ſophiſm eaſy to be reſolved and retorted. *If I did*, ſaid ſhe, *the ſame action which you could juſtly do, I could not be accuſed of having done an unjuſt action: Now if you ſhould beat yourſelf, you would do juſtly; therefore if I beat you, I cannot be accuſed of having done an unjuſt action.* Theodorus did not ſtand to anſwer her as a Logician; he threw himſelf upon her, and untied her gown. According to the preſent way of dreſſing and ſpeaking, we might ſay, *he took up her coats.* This is the explication which Mr Menage (27) gives theſe words of Diogenes Laërtius, ἀνέσυρε δ᾽ αὐτῆς θοἰμάτιον. Here is a briſk and gallant way of anſwering the ſophiſtry of a woman. Hipparchia was not out of countenance, and Theodorus having cited a verſe of a tragedy, deſcribing a woman who had quitted the ſpindle and the diſtaff, ſhe anſwered him, I ſee my own character there, I am that woman; but do you think I have made an ill choice, rather to ſpend my time in philoſophizing, than in ſpinning? Let us now ſee what Theodorus might have anſwered her, if he would have given himſelf the trouble. Anſwering directly, he might have ſaid, that the action of Theodorus beating himſelf, and that of Hipparchia beating Theodorus, were two different actions, and not one action of the ſame ſpecies. There were therefore four terms in Hipparchia's ſyllogiſm. To the end that two actions may be alike, it is requiſite there ſhould be the ſame relation in both, betwixt the agent and the patient; but ſuch a relation was not to be found in Hipparchia's hypotheſis. If Theodorus had choſen to anſwer by way of retortion, and puzzle Crates's wife he might have done it thus: If I do the ſame action which your huſband might lawfully do, I cannot be accuſed of an unjuſt action. But your huſband acts lawfully when he kiſſes you, *&c.* therefore if I kiſs you, *&c.* I cannot be accuſed of doing an unjuſt action. One might have ſeen whether Hipparchia, who was a brazen faced woman, durſt have anſwered him, before witneſſes, *Concedo totum.*

(27) Notis ad Laërt. lib. vi, n. 97, pag. 266.

[*F*] *She wrote ſome books which are not now extant.*] Suidas ſays ſhe compoſed *Hypotheſes Philoſophicas: Epicheremata quædam, & Queſtiones ad Theodorum cognomento Atheum.* Mr Menage's conjecture is very probable, that we muſt read in Diogenes Laërtius (28), not Φέρεται δὲ τοῦ Κράτητος βιβλίον ἐπιστολαί, but φέρεται δὲ πρὸς τὸν Κράτητα βιβλίον ἐπιστολαί. According to this conjecture, we muſt ſay, that Hipparchia publiſhed ſome letters which ſhe had written to her huſband, in which ſhe philoſophized nobly, and in a ſtile reſembling Plato's. We muſt likewiſe ſay, that ſhe writ ſome tragedies, in which ſhe employed the elevated philoſophical ſtile. It would be very ſtrange, that Diogenes Laërtius, who wrote the life of Crates, ſhould ſpeak of his writings in the life of Hipparchia. To clear him from ſuch an incongruity, Mr Menage has made the conjecture above mentioned.

(28) In Hipparchia, lib. vi, n. 98.

[*G*] *Mr Moreri has committed ſome faults.*] He ſhould not have ſaid, that Hipparchia's love for learning made her prefer Crates before all her other ſuitors. It was Crates's perſon ſhe was in love with, and it was her love for him that made her a Philoſopher. It is true, he had charmed her by his fine and learned diſcourſes; but we cannot from this conclude, that her preference of this Philoſopher, before any other man, was founded upon her love of learning. There have been maids and women, who have fallen in love with miniſters in hearing them preach, and have married them, preferably to more advantageous matches. The learning and eloquence of theſe miniſters was indeed the cauſe of thoſe womens falling in love with them, but it was not the love of ſciences or books that made them marry theſe gentlemen. If Moreri had ſpoke of the correction (29) of the paſſage in Laërtius, he might have ſaid, that according to that hiſtorian, Hipparchia's ſtile reſembled Plato's, and that ſhe wrote tragedies; but not having ſaid that, he had no reaſon to ſay the reſt.

(29) That of Mr Menage, which I have mentioned in the foregoing remark.

[*H*] *And ſo has Lorenzo Craſſo.*] He only cites Diogenes Laërtius, he is in the wrong therefore to ſay, I. that Hipparchia ſtudied firſt under her brother

Hipparchia and Metrocles her brother, who was Crates's diſciple (*b*), were born at Maronea (*c*). They flouriſhed in Alexander's time. From the marriage of Hipparchia and Crates, was born a ſon called Paſicles (*d*).

(*b*) Diog. Laërt. ibid. n. 94, & 96.

(*c*) *A town in Thrace called alſo* Hipparchia. Menag. Not. ad Diog. Laërt. lib. vi, n. xcvi.

(*d*) Diog. Laërt. in Cratete, lib. vi, n. 88.

Metrocles. II. That ſhe was courted by many galants on the account of her youth, her wealth and beauty (30). III. That, in order to follow Crates, ſhe dreſſed herſelf in man's habit. IV. That diſputing with Theodorus, who denied a providence, ſhe convinced him by moſt ſolid proofs, and inconteſtable arguments (31). Read the text of this article, and you will find, that Lorenzo Craſſo has taken Laërtius quite wrong. The riches, beauty, and nobility, which Laërtius ſpeaks of, belong only to her galants. She did not dreſs herſelf as a man that ſhe might follow Crates, but becauſe he declared he would not marry any wife, who would not ſubmit to the Cynical inſtitutes. Laſtly, in the diſpute with Theodorus, we have ſeen, that neither providence nor any point of religion was concerned. It is not to be imagined how much authors deceive their readers.

(30) Quantunque come giovane ricca, è bella deſiderata veniſſe da molti, con tutto ciò ricuſar volle ogni altro per Crate vecchio, povero e mal d'apparenza. *Lor. Craſſo, Iſtoria de Poëti Greci, pag.* 296.

(31) Riuſci coſi dotta che in diſputa convinſe con ſodiſſime prove e incontraſtabili ragioni, e con ſomma ſua gloria Theodoro che niegava la divina providenza. *Id. ibid.*

HIPPARCHUS, a great Aſtronomer, a native of Nicæa in Bithynia (*a*), flouriſhed between the CLIVth and CLXIIId Olympiad [*A*]. We have ſtill one of his works; it is his commentary upon the phænomena of Aratus [*B*]. Mr Rohault has committed a great miſtake in ſaying, that this Aſtronomer did not know the particular motion of the fixed ſtars, from the weſt to the eaſt, which varies their longitude. Pliny makes frequent and very honourable mention of Hipparchus. He places him in

(*a*) Suidas, pag. 1264.

[*A*] *He flouriſhed between the CLIVth and CLXIIId Olympiad.*] We have the ſtrongeſt argument that can be for it, ſince it is drawn from the aſtronomical obſervations which he made in that interval of time. Ptolomy has related ſome of them (1). Voſſius had reaſon to place Hipparchus under the reigns of Ptolomy Philometor, and Ptolemy Evergetes, and to cenſure Suidas, who contented himſelf to ſay, that this Aſtronomer lived in the time of the Roman conſuls; he ſhould have denoted a more determinate time; that of the third Punic war, and that of the war of Numantia. So far Voſſius goes on ſure grounds; but when he ſays he agrees with Suidas, as to the time of Hipparchus (2), he forgets himſelf, and ſays what is not true; for Suidas no more agrees with Voſſius upon that point, than with an author who ſhould place Hipparchus at the beginning of the IVth century of Rome, or at the end of the Vth. Calviſius (3) erred in ſaying, that Suidas has placed Hipparchus 130 years after the firſt of the Ptolemies. A French author (4) is no leſs miſtaken in affirming, that Hipparchus lived *in the time of Plato*. Moreri, who had no other reſource but Voſſius upon this article, ought not he to have found there an infallible preſervative againſt the miſtakes he has made? He has placed Hipparchus in the year 570, *and* 80 *of Rome, under the reigns of Ptolomy and Philometor Evergetes, kings of Egypt*. Ought he not to have made time betwixt the 589th year of Rome, and the 625th, correſpond to the Olympiads ſet down by Voſſius (5). Beſides, when one ſays barely Ptolomy, it is a ſign one ſpeaks of the firſt prince of that name who reigned in Egypt; and there are few exact writers, who do not more preciſely denote him. It is therefore a groſs fault to uſe the word Ptolomy ſimply, and abſolutely, when one doth not mean that Ptolomy who had Egypt to his ſhare, after the death of Alexander. It is plain, Moreri does not ſpeak of him, or if he doth, he commits a great blunder; for a man who lived *in the 570th, and 80th year of Rome*, could not poſſibly flouriſh under the firſt Ptolomy, who died in the 468th year of Rome. He is miſtaken in another thing; he ſuppoſes there was a king of Egypt, called Philometor Evergetes.

[*B*] *His commentary upon the phænomena of Aratus is ſtill extant.*] It is properly a criticiſm on Aratus; for Hipparchus accuſes him of having ſtole from Eudoxus's writings, and even in thoſe things wherein Eudoxius was miſtaken. He finds the ſame fault with Aratus the grammarian, who had wrote a commentary upon Aratus. The firſt publiſher of Hipparchus's commentary was Peter Victorius. Petavius has given us a more correct edition of it, and has added to it a Latin tranſlation of his own (6). The other works of Hipparchus were *de Conſtitutione ſtellarum inerrantium, & ſtatione immota, deque menſtruo lunæ motu ſecundum latitudinem* &c (7).

[*C*] *Mr Rohault has committed a great miſtake.*] Great Mathematicians, like him, are not commonly well verſed in the knowlege of matters of fact, and hiſtorical blunders frequently eſcape them (8). However, let us ſee what this learned Carteſian ſays, who by the ſole orthography of the word *Hipparchus*, ſhews that he did not underſtand Greek.

‘ Hyparchus, ſays he (9), lived the greateſt part of of his liſe, without making any other obſervation about the fixed ſtars, than that they had a motion from eaſt to weſt, in circles, which he thought exactly parallel to the equator; which made him conclude, that they were all inchaſed in one and the ſame ſolid heaven, (which is called the firmament) which he placed above all the planets: and becauſe he did not think it was neceſſary that the heaven ſhould borrow this ſimple motion from any other heaven above it; he maintained that it was the laſt of all the heavens, and that it ſerved to draw all the others the way that it turned, and ſo was the Primum Mobile. Hyparchus being then of this opinion, that the fixed ſtars did not change their places in the heaven, he thought they might ſerve to determine the courſe of the planets, juſt as rocks in the ſea may ſerve to point out the courſes of ſhips, which leave no footſteps of their paſſage behind them. He employed therefore his induſtry in meaſuring the diſtance betwixt every fixed ſtar, and the ſun's ecliptic; which is called the latitude of a ſtar; then to determine the number of degrees, and minutes of the ecliptic, which are reckoned from weſt to eaſt, from the firſt point of Aries to the point over againſt which every ſtar correſponds, which is called it's longitude; but death having prevented him, poſterity only could execute his deſigns. Ptolomy, who lived about two hundred years after Hyparchus, propoſed to ſettle the motions of the planets; and having had the curioſity to obſerve, whether his predeceſſor had been exact in obſerving the longitudes and latitudes of the fixed ſtars, he found that their latitudes was juſt as Hyparchus had obſerved it, but that their longitude was augmented two degrees. He concluded from thence, that beſides the motion the fixed ſtars had from eaſt to weſt in twenty four hours, they had another from weſt to eaſt in circles parallel to the ecliptic, by which being advanced two degrees in two hundred years, they would accompliſh their entire revolution in thirty ſix thouſand years. And whereas the firmament could have but one motion, which was properly it's own, he attributed to it that motion of thirty ſix thouſand years, and maintained, that it borrowed it's diurnal motion from eaſt to weſt, from a heaven beyond it. And thus people began to believe, that the Primum Mobile was a heaven, which had no ſtar in it, and which embraced the firmament.’

WHAT the longitude and the latitude of the ſtars are.

Mr Regis (10), another great Carteſian, advanceth the ſame thing in fewer words; but Mr Gadroys, another excellent Carteſian, well knew that the diſcovery of the particular motion of the fixed ſtars towards the eaſt, ought to be aſcribed to Hipparchus (11). Probably he had given greater attention than others to a thing which Gaſſendus has related. It is this. The Chaldeans, Ægyptians, and Greeks, believed that all the fixed ſtars were placed in the concavity of the higheſt heaven, and conſequently of the Primum Mobile, and therefore had no motion, but from eaſt to weſt upon the poles of the equator. But at laſt, Hipparchus, 130 years before JESUS CHRIST, found that this hypotheſis could not ſubſiſt; for having conſidered that

(1) *Eight: the firſt in the ſecond book, and the ſeven others in the third book. See* Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. pag. 159.

(2) Convenit de ætate Suidas. *Voſſius, ibid.*

(3) Ad ann. mundi 3665.

(4) Coutel, du Calcul. Eccleſ. pag. 189.

(5) *The* 154, *and the* 163.

(6) Voſſius, ubi ſupra, pag. 160.

(7) Idem, pag. 159, ex Suida.

(8) *Compare, above, remark* [*R*] *of the third duke of* GUISE.

(9) Rohault, Traité de Phyſique, Tom. II, Part II, chap. viii, pag. m. 35

(10) Regis, Syſtême de Philoſophie, Tom. III, pag. 42, & 43, Lyons Edit. 1691, in 12mo.

(11) Gadroys, Syſtême du Monde, cap. ii, pag. 27.

in the number of thoſe ſublime genius's, who by the prediction of the eclipſes ſhowed that men ought not to be ſurprized at theſe phænomena [*D*], and that the gods themſelves were ſubjected to ſome laws [*E*]. He admires him for having taken a review of the ſtars, for having counted them, and obſerved their ſituation and magnitudes, which put his poſterity in a capacity of diſcovering not only whether they are born and die, but alſo whether they change their place, and increaſe or decreaſe. We learn from this paſſage of Pliny, that Hipparchus aſcribed to our ſouls a celeſtial original [*F*].

Strabo

that according to Timocharis's obſervation, made 200 years before, there were eight degrees betwixt the Virgin's Spike towards the weſt, and the point of the autumnal equinox, and that he could find but ſix degrees diſtance betwixt that ſtar, and that point of the firmament, he concluded, that the ſtars muſt have a proper motion from weſt to eaſt upon the poles of the ecliptic; and that, if the obſervation of Timocharis was juſt, the progreſs of the fixed ſtars, by that particular motion, was one degree every hundred years. He wrote ſome treatiſes upon this new doctrine. 'Quare & intellexit ſi Timocharis quidem ritè obſervaſſet, ac Stellæ moveri ſic perſeverarent, peragi hoc motu unum gradum intra annos proximè centum. Intellexit præterea debere hunc motum fieri ſecundum Zodiacum, ſeu ſuper Eclipticæ Polis, idque prodidit tam in Tractatu, quem inſcripſit *de tranſgreſſu Æquinoctialium Solſtitialiumque punctorum*, quàm in eo, quem conſcripſit *de Anni magnitudine*, ut apud Ptolomæum habetur (12).' Note that Gaſſendus doth not obſerve exactly the age of Timocharis; for that Aſtronomer flouriſhed about the CXXIſt Olympiad, 130 years only before the firſt obſervations of Hipparchus, of which Ptolomy makes mention. This miſtake of Gaſſendus is much more tolerable than that of Mr Gadroys (13).

[*D*] *Pliny places him in the number of thoſe who, by the prediction of eclipſes, ſhowed that men ought not to be ſurprized at theſe phænomena.*] Thales was the firſt among the Greeks, who could foretel the time of eclipſes. Sulpitius Gallus among the Romans, began to be ſucceſsful in that ſort of predictions, and he made a very ſeaſonable trial thereof the night before the battle, in which Perſeus was overcome (14). Hipparchus, after theſe two, extended this ſcience much farther, for he made Ephemerides for ſix hundred years. 'Poſt eos utriuſque ſideris curſum in ſexcentos annos præcinuit Hipparchus, menſes gentium, dieſque & horas, ac ſitas locorum & viſus populorum complexus, ævo teſte haud alio modo quam conſiliorum naturæ particeps (15). —— *After them, Hipparchus calculated the motions of both theſe luminaries for 600 years to come, being throughly acquainted with the different computations of the months, days, and hours, ſituations of places, and the different aſpects in the ſeveral nations, in ſuch a manner as if he had been of nature's council.*' Pliny calls him, on this account, the confident of nature: the elogies he beſtows upon the Aſtronomers on that occaſion ſeem to be very well grounded. 'Viri ingentes ſupraque mortalium naturam, tantorum numinum lege deprehenſa, & miſera hominum mente abſoluta in defectibus ſtellarum ſcelera, aut mortem aliquam ſiderum pavente . . . . . Macti ingenio eſte cœli interpretes, rerumque naturæ capaces, argumenti repertores, quo Deos homineſque viciſtis. Quis enim hæc cernens, & ſtatos ſiderum (quoniam ita placuit appellare) labores, non ſuæ neceſſitati mortalis genitus ignoſcat (16)? —— *Illuſtrious men, nay more than men, who firſt diſcovered the laws by which theſe great divinities are governed, and firſt ſet free the minds of men who uſed before to tremble at eclipſes, fearing that they ſhould occaſion terrible calamities, or the extinction of theſe glorious luminaries . . . . Hail! ye interpreters of heaven, learned in the nature of all things, and diſcoverers of a ſubject whereby you have overcome both gods and men. For what mortal, ſeeing theſe things, and the ſtated labours of the ſtars (ſince we are pleaſed to call them labours) will not be content with the neceſſity to which his own nature is ſubjected.*' This elogy in proſe is full as good as that which here follows in verſe.

Felicis animos, quibus hæc cognoſcere primis,
Inque domos ſuperas ſcandere cura fuit!
Credibile eſt illos pariter vitiiſque lociſque
Altiùs humanis exſeruiſſe caput.
Non Venus & vinum ſublimia pectora fregit;
Officiumve fori, militiæve labor.
Nec levis ambitio, perfuſaque gloria fuco;
Magnarumve fames ſollicitavit opum.
Admovêre oculis diſtantia ſidera noſtris;
Ætheraque ingenio ſuppoſuêre ſuo.
Sic petitur cælum: non ut ferat Oſſan Olympus;
Summaque Peliacus ſidera tangat apex (17).

Hipparchus did ſo carefully obſerve what concerns eclipſes, that he found out the proportions of their intervals (18). He obſerved that the eclipſes of the moon might return at five months end, and the eclipſes of the ſun at ſeven, and that the ſun might be eclipſed twice in the ſpace of thirty days with reſpect to different parts of the earth. *Intrà ducentos annos Hipparchi ſagacitate compertum eſt & lunæ defectum aliquando quinto menſe à priore fieri, ſolis vero ſeptimo: eundem bis in triginta diebus ſupra terras occultari, ſed ab aliis atque aliis hoc cerni.* Theſe words of Pliny have been miſunderſtood by ſome. There is a very learned man, who thought that by *intra ducentos annos*, was meant that two ages muſt intervene to the end, that an eclipſe of the moon may ſucceed another, at five months end. This is not Pliny's meaning (19): his meaning is that Hipparchus had diſcovered that proportion two hundred years before. Pliny is right in his Chronology, there were two centuries betwixt Pliny and that famous Aſtronomer.

[*E*] *That the gods themſelves were ſubjected to ſome laws.*] There is no inconveniency in ſaying that GOD loves order, and good, by a neceſſary and indiſpenſible law; for, on the contrary, it would be an imperfection to be able to violate this law. But it is doubtleſs an imperfection to be ſubject to an order which retards or weakens our functions; and therefore they who pretended the ſtars were gods, were obliged to ſay, if they argued conſiſtently, that the Aſtronomers had diſcovered the weakneſs of the divine nature, and it's dependance on a very burdenſome law, which ſubjected it to a ſort of death, fainting, or ſlavery. To this it may be objected, that the ſun is no leſs luminous in itſelf at the time of an eclipſe, than before, or after; but may not I anſwer, that a courier who is ſtopped, loſes nothing of his vigour, and health? It is neverthеleſs, a proof of his ſubmiſſion to a burdenſome law; it is, in a word, a ſign of weakneſs to ſee that he cannot continue his journey. Apply this to the ſun, and you will find that his eclipſes are a ſign of imperfection. They hinder him from enlightening the earth; he is a prince, whoſe couriers are ſtopped, and whoſe functions are interrupted. If Pliny had purpoſed to reaſon, he had not drawn the conſequence, which he has drawn from that phænomenon: he would not have ſaid that this ought to comfort men on account of their mortality (20), he would have ſaid, that this proves that the ſtars are not of a divine nature.

[*F*] *We learn from a paſſage of Pliny, that Hipparchus attributed a heavenly original to our ſouls.*] It is ſo fine, that in giving it intire, I am ſure to pleaſe thoſe, who love not to change books, in order fully to ſatisfy their curioſity. 'Idem Hipparchus nunquam ſatis laudatus, ut quo nemo magis approbaverit cognationem cum homine ſiderum, animaſque noſtras partem eſſe cœli: novam ſtellam & aliam in ævo ſuo genitam deprehendit: ejuſque motu, qua die fulſit, ad dubitationem eſt adductus, anne hoc ſæpius fieret, moverenturque & eæ, quas putamus affixas. Idemque auſus, rem etiam Deo improbam, annumerare poſteris ſtellas, ac ſidera ad normam expangere (21), organis excogitatis, per quæ ſingularum loca, atque magnitudines ſignaret: ut facile diſcerni poſſet ex eo, non modo, an obirent, naſcerenturve, ſed an omnino aliqua tranſirent, moverenturve; item an creſcerent, minuerenturque, cœlo in hæreditate cunctis relicto; ſi quiſquam, qui rationem eam caperet, in-

ventus

(12) Gaſſendus, Phyſicæ, Sect. ii, lib. iii, pag. m. 596, primi Volum. Oper. ex Ptolemæo 7. Almag. 2, & 3.

(13) *He reckons but two hundred years between Timocharis and Ptolomy the Aſtronomer*, Syſt. pag. 30, *but he ſhould have reckoned above four hundred. Robault, who reckons two hundred years between Hipparchus and Ptolemy*, Tom. II, Part. II, of his Phyſics, pag. 36, *ſhould at leaſt have followed Gaſſendus, who reckons 260 years between thoſe two Aſtronomers.*

(14) Plinius, lib. ii, cap. xii.

(15) Id. ibid.

(16) Id. ibid.

(17) Ovid Faſt. lib i, ver. 297, & ſeq.

(18) Plin. lib. ii, cap. xiii.

(19) Neque vero ſenſus eſt, ut exiſtimavit vir alioqui extra ingenii aleam poſitus, expectandos eſſe annos ducentos ut recurrat lunæ defectus quinto menſe, cum vel intra annos decem animadverſum fuerit ætate noſtra geminam ita recurrere. *Harduinus, in Plin. lib ii, cap. xiii, pag.* 159, 160.

(20) *This conſolation would be ſtill ſtronger than that which Lucretius makes uſe of above, citat.* (8) *of the article* BAUTRU (WILLIAM).

(21) *In Father Hardouin's edition it is* ad nomen expungere.

Strabo (*b*) accuſes this Aſtronomer of being too critical, and of having made uſe of a manner of criticiſing, which ſavoured more of chicane than accuracy. Pliny judges more favourably of him (*c*).

' ventus eſſet (22). — *The ſame Hipparchus can never be ' ſufficiently praiſed, for no body more clearly proved that ' men are allied to the ſtars, and that our ſouls are a ' part of heaven. He, I ſay, diſcovered a new ſtar which ' was produced in his days; and by it's motion, at it's firſt ' appearance, he began to doubt whether this did not ' frequently happen, and whether thoſe ſtars which we ' call fixed do not likewiſe move. He alſo firſt under- ' took to number the ſtars for the uſe of poſterity, a task ' hard even to the gods, and reduced them to rule, having invented inſtruments by which he marked their ' places in the heavens and their magnitudes: ſo that by ' means of them it might be eaſily obſerved, not only ' whether they die and are born, but likewiſe whether ' they paſs by one another or move; and whether they ' encreaſe or decreaſe, leaving the heavens as an inheri- ' tance to all, if any ſhould be found able to fathom theſe ' myſteries.*'

HIPPOMANES. There is in the Project of this Dictionary a long article upon Hippomanes. I do not place it here, having changed the deſign which I had of giving promiſcuouſly, real, and perſonal articles; but I will place this article at the end of this work by way of diſſertation.

HIPPONAX, a Greek poet, born at Epheſus, lived not in the XXIIId Olympiad, as Euſebius ſays [*A*], but in the LXth, as we are aſſured by Pliny (*a*). Being baniſhed from Epheſus, by the tyrants Athenagoras and Comas (*b*), he went and ſettled at Clazomenæ [*B*]. He was deformed, little, and ſlender (*c*), but his deformity has by accident been the cauſe of his immortality; for he is ſcarce known but by the ſatirical verſes which he made againſt two Statuaries [*C*], who had carved him in the moſt ridiculous figures imaginable (*d*). He diſcharged upon them a thundering legion of Iambic verſes which ſo vexed them, that it has been reported they hanged themſelves. Pliny maintains that this is falſe, and proves it by a great number of ſtatues which they made after that time in the adjacent iſlands. Some authors have written, that *they only obliged them to leave Epheſus where Hipponax lived* (*e*). However it be, the humour and ſatirical vein of this poet diſtinguiſhed him [*D*], and do ſo ſtill in a very particular manner. His ſatire did not even ſpare thoſe to whom he owed his life (*f*). There are ſome who pretend that he died of hunger [*E*]. It is obſerved that though he was little and ſlender,

[*A*] *He did not live in the XXIIId Olympiad, as Euſebius ſays.*] Scaliger (1) confutes him by the paſſage of Pliny; he believed therefore that Pliny was in the right. So far it is well: but he adds, that Euſebius followed Tatian, and he refers us to his notes number 908, in which we find nothing that relates to Hipponax. In this there is no great exactneſs. Euſebius may alſo be refuted by the teſtimony of Proclus (2), who ſays that Hipponax flouriſhed under the reign of Darius. He means doubtleſs the ſon of Hyſtaſpes, whoſe reign began in the LXIVth Olympiad.

[*B*] *He ſettled at Clazomenæ.*] Hence the poeteſs Sulpitia deſcribes him in this manner:

Nec trimetro jambo, nec qui pede fractus eodem
Fortiter iraſci diſcit duce Clazomenio (3).

Nor in that verſe Iambic-like engage,
Taught by the Clazomenian bard to rage,
In daring numbers, thro' the manly page.

If what Tanaquillus Faber ſays be true, namely, that Hipponax lived at Epheſus, when he revenged himſelf on thoſe who had inſulted him upon his deformity; he muſt either have returned into his country, or elſe his baniſhment did not precede that adventure. I have ſeen nothing in Pliny that ſhews that Hipponax was or was not born at Epheſus, or whether he, and the Statuaries whom he ſatirized, lived there or not. And yet Mr Dacier (4) aſſures us, that Pliny is of their opinion, who ſay that our poet's verſes made his enemies quit Epheſus. Lloyd and Hoſman ſay that Bupalus lived at Clazomenæ (5). I believe this is a diſcovery made by reaſoning: they ſaw, on one hand, that Hipponax retired into that city; and, on the other, that Bupalus repreſented him in a groteſque manner, and from theſe two facts they concluded, that Bupalus lived at Clazomenæ.

[*C*] *Againſt two Statuaries.*] They were two brothers, one called Bupalus and other Athenis, they were of the iſle of Chios, the ſons of Anthermus, whoſe father's name was Micciades, and the grandfather's Malas. All theſe were Sculptors from father to ſon in that iſland; ſo that this profeſſion might be as antient there as the Olympiads (6). Pauſanias (7) ſpeaks of Bupalus with praiſe, on occaſion of the ſtatue of Fortune, and that of the Graces, which were at Smyrna of his carving. He makes him to have lived before Pindar. Two witneſſes ſuch as he and Pliny, deſerve to be preferred to the ſcholiaſt upon Horace (8), who ſays Bapulas was a Painter, and who has been followed in this by Tanaquillus Faber (9) and Mr Dacier (10), and almoſt all the dictionaries (11). Suidas ſays theſe two brothers were Statuaries; and becauſe he has given the laſt the name of Athenis, he has occaſioned Father Hardouin to think the paſſage of Pliny is corrupted, where this Statuary is called Anthermus. He has therefore put Athenis in the room of that word. See the remark [*E*] and the article BUPALUS.

[*D*] *His humour and ſatirical vein diſtinguiſhed him.*] Hence come thoſe proverbs we find made uſe of by Cicero (12). *Eum addictum jam tum puto eſſe Calvi Licinii Hipponacteo præconio.* Horace names Hipponax and Archilochus as the two greateſt ſatiriſts (13). Pliny ſays as follows. ' Hipponacti ' notabilis vultûs fœditas erat: quamobrem imaginem ' ejus laſcivia jocorum ii propoſuere ridentium circulis. ' Quod Hipponax indignatus amaritudinem carminum ' diſtrinxit in tantum ut credatur aliquibus ad laqueum ' eos impuliſſe: quod falſum eſt. ——— *Hipponax was ' remarkably ugly; they therefore made a ſtatue of him, ' which they ſet up for the diverſion of the public. ' Hipponax revenged this affront by ſuch ſevere ſatires, ' that ſome have wrote, that his enemies hanged them- ' ſelves: but there is no ground for that report.*' There is in the *Anthologia* (14) three or four epigrams, which repreſent Hipponax ſtill terrible after his death. Paſſengers are there adviſed to keep far from his tomb, as being a place that ſends out dreadful hail: Φεῦγε τὸν καλαζετῆ τάφον, τὸν φρικτόν, *fuge grandinantem tumulum horrendum* (15).

[*E*] *Some pretend that he died of hunger.*] I believe all the foundation they have for it are theſe two verſes:

Utque parum ſtabili qui carmine læſit Athenas
Inviſus pereas, deficiente cibo (16).

Hated by all, may famine be thy fate,
Like his, whoſe ſatire laſh'd th' Athenian ſtate.

Some critics pretend that Ovid did not ſay *Athenas*, but *Athenin*, whence it would follow, that he ſpeaks here of

---

(*b*) Lib. i, & ii, paſſim.

(*c*) Hipparchus & in coarguendo eo (Eratoſthene) & in reliqua omni diligentia mirus. *Plin. lib. ii, cap.* 108.

(22) Plinius, lib. ii, cap. xxvi, pag. m. 182, 183.

(*a*) Plin. lib. xxxvi, cap. v.

(*b*) Suidas, in Ἱππῶναξ.

(*c*) Ælian. div. Hiſt. lib. x, cap. vi.

(*d*) Plin. lib. xxxvi, cap. v.

(*e*) Apud Tanaq. Fabrum. Vie des Poëtes Grecs.

(*f*) Ὁ καὶ τοκέων ἔο βαΰξας. Qui etiam parentes ſuos allatravit *Anthol. lib. iii, cap. xxx, n.* 22, *pag. m.* 655.

(1) Pag. 79.

(2) Apud Photium, Biblioth. pag. 983.

(3) De Edicto Domitiani, inter Catalecta Virgilii, Edit. Ludg. Bat. 1617, pag. 247.

(4) *In his notes upon Horace,* Tom. V, p. 151.

(5) *Charles Stephens ſays ſo too at the word* Bupalus.

(6) Si quis horum familiam ad proavum uſque retroagat, inveniet artis ejus originem cum Olympiadum origine cœpiſſe. *Plin. lib. xxxvi, cap. v.*

(7) Pauſan. lib. iv, pag. 140, & lib. ix, pag. 309.

(8) In Epod. vi.

(9) Vie des Poëtes Grecs.

(10) Rem. ſur Horace, Tom. V, pag. 151.

(11) *See the ar.* BUPALUS, *remark* [*A*].

(12) Epiſt. xxiv, lib. vii, ad Famil.

(13) In Malos aſperimus Parata tollo cornua.
Quales Lycambæ ſpretus infido gener,
Aut acer hoſtis Bupalo.
Horat. Epod. vi. See alſo Cicero, de Natura Deor. lib. iii.

(14) Lib. iii, cap. xxv.

(15) Ibid. n. xxiv, pag. m. 566.

(16) Ovid. in Ibin, ver. 525.

ſlender, yet he had great ſtrength, and could throw an empty veſſel farther than other men (*g*). He was neither the firſt, nor the only perſon who have forced people to make away with themſelves by their invectives [*F*].

of Hipponax: ‘ Qui primus jambum claudicare fecit & ‘ ſcazonta in Bupalum & Athenin compoſuit, ut eſt ‘ apud Suidam, ut recte Ovidius, parum ſtabile, id eſt ‘ claudum carmen ei tribuat.’ Theſe are Alciatus’s words in the eighteenth chapter of the fifth book of his *Parerga*. Turnebus comes pretty near the ſame thought: ‘ Videtur, *ſays he* (17), de Hipponacte hoc intelligi ‘ qui claudicante & *parum ſtabili verſu*, id eſt *ſcazonte* ‘ in Bupalum & Athenin invectus eſt Athenienſes: quo ‘ in carmine ne Athenis quidem pepercerat. Quid ‘ tamen ſi pro *Athenas*, *Athenin* ſcribamus, quem ab ‘ eo probris oneratum accepimus! Ne hanc quidem ‘ lectionem improbarem, etſi alteram delere non auſim.’ Mr de Boiſſieu (18) who mentions theſe two paſſages, obſerves that Sanctius and Valerius approve of them. As for him, he is wholly for that conjecture, and finds it very probable, that Ovid has mentioned the two inventers of Iambic verſes one after the other. Now he had been ſpeaking of Archilochus, and we know from Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis (19), Clemens Alexandrinus (20), Rufinus (21), and the poeteſs Sulpitia (22), that Hipponax was the inventer of the ſcazons. Mr de Boiſſieu might have criticiſed Turnebus for ſaying that Hipponax’s enemies were Athenians; for Pliny ſays expreſsly they were of the iſle of Chios, and that they expreſſed it ſo in their works: ‘ Quibus ſubjecerunt carmen non vitibus tantum cenſeri ‘ Chium, ſed & operibus Anthermi filiorum (23). — ‘ *To which they added a poem wherein they ſaid that* ‘ *Chios was not only famous for vines, but likewiſe for* ‘ *the works of the ſons of Anthermus.*’ There is no ground for what Turnebus ſays, that Hipponax did not ſpare the city of Athens in the verſes he made againſt theſe two Statuaries; it is a random gueſs. A German miniſter (24), after applying to Hipponax the two verſes of Ovid, goes on thus: ‘ Ex Plinio nimirum compertum eſt Athenim vel Athenam ſculptorem in Hipponactis ſcripta incurreſſe, carmina ejus ‘ ſuſtuliſſe maledica, authorem verò lethali inedia fuiſſe confectum. —— *We learn from Pliny, that the* ‘ *Statuary Athenis, or Athenas, fell under the laſh of* ‘ *Hipponax’s pen, that he bore with his ſatirical verſes,* ‘ *but that the author of them died of hunger.*’ Pliny ſays nothing like it.

[F] *He was neither the firſt nor the only perſon who have forced people to make away with themſelves by their invectives.*] Before him Archilochus wrote ſatires which forced two or three perſons to hang themſelves (25). Poliagrus being abuſed in a comedy did the like (26). We need not wonder that a ſatire ſhould caſt men into deſpair, ſince a meer cenſure has ſometimes had that fatal effect. Pythagoras having reprimanded one of his diſciples ſomewhat harſhly in a great company, caſt him into ſo black a melancholy as made him ſtrangle himſelf, and ever after that great Philoſopher took care to cenſure only in private. Πυθαγόρȣ δὲ τραχύτερον ἐν πολλοῖς γνωρίμῳ προσενεχθέντος, ἀπάγξασθαι τὸ μειράκιον λέγȣσιν. ἐκ τȣ́τȣ δὲ μηδέποτε τὸν Πυθαγόραν αὖθις ἄλλȣ παρόντος ἄλλον νȣθετῆσαι. Ferunt, adoleſcentulum quendam à Pythagora, cui operam dabat, multis præſentibus compellatum aſperius ſuſpendio vitam finiiſſe, atque ab eo tempore Pythagoram nunquam alio præſente quenquam corripuiſſe (27). Diodorus Cronus died with vexation for having been inſulted by a king of Ægypt, upon his not being able to ſolve ſome logical difficulties, which Stilpo had propoſed to him at that king’s table (28). Some cenſures, without ccaſioning the death of the the cenſured perſons, have touched them ſo ſenſibly, as to make them attempt upon the life of the perſon who made the cenſure. The architect Apollodorus loſt his life, for obſerving to the emperor Hadrian ſome faults of a temple that prince had built (29). The laſt ages furniſh us with examples of all theſe different effects of cenſure. Muretus knew a man, who fell into ſo ſo deſperate a melancholy on account of ſome verſes made againſt him, that he died of it. And on that occaſion that writer cites Plato, who adviſed all thoſe who loved their reputation to take heed of provoking the poets. ‘ Laceſſiti (*Poetæ*) ita ſe ulciſcuntur, ut interdum eos à quibus offenſi erant, ad mortem adegiſſe ‘ narrentur. Nam præter id quod de Archilocho accepimus, novi ego qui hac ætate tantum verſibus ſuis ‘ inimico dolorem inuſſerit, ut ex eo ille ſit mortuus ‘ . . . . quo circa Plato in Minoe præcipit iis qui ‘ bonæ famæ ſtudioſi ſunt, ut diligenter caveant, ne ‘ cum poetis inimicitias ſuſcipiant (30). —— *Poets,* ‘ *when provoked, revenge themſelves in ſuch a manner,* ‘ *that ſometimes they have occaſioned the death of thoſe* ‘ *who had offended them. For beſides the ſtory we have* ‘ *concerning Archilochus, I know a perſon, in the age* ‘ *in which we live, who by his verſes ſtung his enemy* ‘ *ſo to the quick, that he died of it . . . . . For this* ‘ *reaſon Plato, in his Minos, adviſed thoſe who love* ‘ *their reputation, to take care not to provoke the poets.*’ It is ſaid that George Trapezuntius died with melancholy, upon ſeeing the errors in his tranſlation of Ptolemy criticiſed by Regiomontanus, and that the ſons of the deceaſed poiſoned the critic (31). I have ſaid in another place (32) that it was thought that Jaſon Denores would have died with grief, upon reading Guarini’s reply, if he had lived long enough to have ſeen that book out of the preſs. *Some zealous Calviniſts . . . . publiſhed ſo bitter a libel againſt Quintin . . . . that that doctor being too ſenſible of it, took his bed upon reading it, and never roſe again* (33). He had made ſpeech in the name of the clergy in the aſſembly of the ſtates of the kingdom in the year 1560, it was the criticiſms upon his ſpeech which occaſioned his death. Gregory de Valentia having read a paſſage of St Auſtin, otherwiſe than he ſhould, before Clement VIII (34), was convicted of a falſification, upon which the Pope ſaid to him (35). *Is it thus you pretend to deceive the church of* G O D? ‘ Theſe words, ‘ like a thunderbolt, ſtruck down Valentia, he fainted ‘ away in the preſence of the Pope, and died two days ‘ after.’ See in the article CERASI another blow of the ſame Pope. ‘ Mr de l’Etoile reprehended ſtrongly, ‘ and boldly, and with a ſtrange ſort of ſeverity, what did ‘ not pleaſe him in things ſubmitted to his judgment. ‘ He is accuſed for having cauſed a young man that ‘ came from Languedoc to die with grief and vexation, ‘ who brought him a comedy which he thought a maſter-piece, in which he clearly ſhewed him a thouſand ‘ faults.’ I take theſe words from Mr Peliſſon (36). Philip II king of Spain cenſured in as murthering a manner as the king of Egypt before mentioned. ‘ Cardinal Eſpinoſa died on having heard this reproof uttered by that prince, *Cardenal yo ſoy el Preſidente.* ‘ *Cardinal I am the preſident.* And the ſame king ſaying to a ſecretary who had poured ink upon ſome diſpatch inſtead of ſand, *Eſte es el tintero, y eſtotra* (37) ‘ *la ſalvadera.* — *That is the ink-horn, and this is the* ‘ *ſand-box.* So pierced him with theſe two or three ‘ words that he immediately retired from the king’s ‘ preſence to his death-bed (38).’ We have examples which prove that ſome authors have aſſaſſinated their critics. Murtola, enraged to ſee his reputation ruined by a ſatire of the cavalier Marini, fired a piſtol at him in the middle of the ſtreets of Turin; he miſſed him, tho’ he had five bullets in his piſtol, and ſhot at him very near; he confeſſed that his deſign was not to wound but to kill Marini (39). We find in Mr Baillet (40). ‘ That, Francis Robortellus having cenſured ſome books ‘ of Baptiſt Egnatius, a Venetian, had very near loſt his ‘ life, by a ſtab in his belly, which this Egnatius gave ‘ him in anſwer to his criticiſms.’ He cites *Joh. Imperial. Muſæi hiſtor. pag* 61. *& Theoph. Spizel. de felic. literat. comment.* 4. *p.* 485. Theſe the words of Imperialis: ‘ Cum Alciato pariter, aliiſque clariſſimis ‘ ejus ævi luminibus, internecinas prope ſimultates exercuit *(Robortellus)* quo factum ut ſemel Venetiis ‘ Baptiſta Egnatius optimus ac doctiſſimus vir crebris ‘ ab eo laceſſitus injuriis, educto ſenili gladiolo in eum ‘ impetum facere non dubitarit. —— *Robortellus had* ‘ *mortal quarrels with Alciatus, and other learned men* ‘ *of that age, to ſuch a degree, that Baptiſta Egnatius, a good and learned man, whom he had frequently abuſed, meeting him once at Venice, attacked* ‘ *him ſword in hand, tho’ then far advanced in* ‘ *years.*’

If I had diſperſed this in ſeveral places of my work, I might have avoided their cenſures who will call this remark, *meer traſh, and a trifling collection.* But as I ſeek more the advantage of my readers than my own, I am willing, tho’ at the expence of cenſure, to ſave them the trouble of gathering together what I might have diſperſed.

(*g*) Metrodor. Scepſius, apud Athenæum, lib. xii, pag. 552.

(17) Adverſar. lib. ix, cap. xxv.

(18) Comment. in Ibin, pag. 100, 101.

(19) Lib. de Interpret.

(20) Stromat. lib. i.

(21) De Metris Comicis.

(22) *See her verſes in the remark* [*B*].

(23) Plin. lib. xxxvi, cap. v.

(24) Spizelius, in Felicit. Literat. pag. 718.

MORTAL effects of detraction or cenſure.

(25) *See the article* ARCHILOCHUS, *remark* [*C*].

(26) Ælian. Var. Hiſt. lib v, cap. viii.

(27) Plutarch. de Diſcrim. Adul. & Amici, pag 70. F.

(28) Diogen. Laërt. lib. ii, n. cxii. *See alſo* Pliny, lib. vii, cap. lvii.

(29) Xiphilin. in Hadriano, pag. m. 258.

(30) Muretus, Variar. Lect. lib. viii, cap. i.

(31) Naudé, Conſiderations ſur les Coups de Etat. *See alſo* Thuan. lib xc.

(32) *In the article* GUARINI, *remark* [*B*].

(33) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, Tom I, pag. m. 18.

(34) Morale pratique des Jeſuites, Tom. III, pag. 122. *Where a falſity of the firſt Tome is corrected.*

(35) Morale pratique, Tom. I, pag. 268.

(36) Hiſt de l’Acad. Franç. pag. m. 322.

(37) *I think it ſhould be* eſta era.

(38) La Mothe Vayer, letter liii, pag. 441, *of the tenth Tome.*

(39) *See the* Anti-Baillet, Tom. I, n. 95.

(40) Jugemens des Sçavans, Tom. I, pag. 66.

I add a freſh example to the foregoing. *A poet having preſumed to preſent to Pope Urban VIII a work, whereof the ſubject, the diſpoſition, and the verſes, were unbecoming a Chriſtian, he reproached him for his impudence, with ſo much paſſion, that the poor wretch died with confuſion and grief.* You will find theſe words in the third page of a book publiſhed by Father Menêtrier at Paris 1681, intituled *Des Repreſentations en Muſique anciennes & modernes.*

HIPSIPYLE, or HYPSIPILE, the daughter of Thoas, king of the iſle of Lemnos, ſaved her father's life when the women of the iſland made a general maſſacre of all the men that inhabited it (*a*). She did not do it openly; but was forced to make people believe that ſhe had made away with him; upon which ſuppoſition, the other women choſe her for their queen (*b*). The Argonauts ſome time after landed in the iſle of Lemnos, and were received there with all the teſtimonies of the ſtricteſt friendſhip; for the women of the iſland had not killed the men out of any indifference for the male ſex [*A*], but rather out of a ſpirit of revenge, which ſhewed they were very ſenſible of the ſoft pleaſures of love. The Argonauts refreſhed themſelves from the fatigues of the ſea in the arms of theſe widows as long as they pleaſed; neither did Hypſipile forget herſelf: She applied herſelf to their leader, and was quickly with child of two boys. If her fate in that reſpect was not like Dido's [*B*], it was in this, that Jaſon was no leſs inconſtant than Æneas [*C*]. See in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary what became of Hypſipile, when her ſubjects underſtood that ſhe had not killed her father.

[*A*] *The women of the iſle of Lemnos, had not killed the men out of any indifference for the male ſex.*] They were induced to that maſſacre, only becauſe the men no longer careſſed them, and diverted themſelves only with the ſlaves which they had brought from Thrace (1). The men uſed this practice becauſe their wives were grown ſo ſtinking, that they could not come near them without the greateſt diſguſt (2). This ſtench was an effect of the anger of Venus; either becauſe this goddeſs was offended at their neglect of ſacrificing to her for ſome years (3), or becauſe ſhe conceived an averſion for the iſle of Lemnos, for having been caught there in the fact (4), for there it was the gods ſaw her lying with Mars. Others (5) ſay, that Medea being jealous of Hypſipile, threw into that iſland ſome drugs, which cauſed the women to ſtink ſo. It is added, that in after ages they ſmelt ſo ſtrong upon a certain day every year, that their huſbands and even their own children could not abide to come near them. It is diſputed whether this ſtink was from their breath, or their arm-pits. Euſtathius (6) is for the firſt opinion, and Dion Chryſoſtome (7) for the ſecond. Here follow ſome verſes of Statius in which Hypſipile repreſents the horrible ſtate of the iſland in the interregnum of love:

Protinus à Lemno teneri fugiſtis amores,
Motus Hymen, verſæque faces, & frigida juſti
Cura tori: nullæ redeunt in gaudia noctes,
Nullus in amplexu ſopor eſt: odia aſpera ubique
Et furor, & medio recubat diſcordia lecto (8).

With torch inverted, Hymen took his flight ——
The rites of wedlock, with the loves, are fled,
And hate and diſcord fill the marriage-bed.

That interregnum ſeemed ſo intolerable, that it moved them to the maſſacre before mentioned.

[*B*] *Her fate in that reſpect was not like Dido's.*] For the amours of poor Dido with Æneas were barren, and it was that which grieved her. I have elſewhere (9) obſerved the difference betwixt her taſte, and that of the women of theſe later ages. The ladies now-a-days when they are deſerted by their galants at the opening of a campaign, are over-joyed that the pleaſures of the winter quarter are paſſed over without propagation, I make uſe of this example without excluding thoſe that concern perſons of other conditions; I uſe it, I ſay, becauſe the ſtay of the Argonauts in the iſle of Lemnos, may well be compared to a long winter quarter. I muſt add that Hypſipile proteſts in the work of a Latin poet, that ſhe married the lovely Jaſon againſt her will.

- - - - - Cinerem furiaſque meorum
Teſtor, ut externas non ſponte aut crimine tædas
Attigerim (ſcit cura Deum) etſi blandus Jaſon
Virginibus dare vincla novis (10).

Neither by choice, nor paſſion, was I led
(The gods can witneſs) to this foreign bed;
Tho' lovely Jaſon boaſts the pleaſing art
To captivate each wiſhing virgin's heart.

But a Greek poet repreſents her ſo much in love with him at firſt ſight, as to offer him her kingdom.

Εἰ δέ κεν αὖθι
Ναιετάειν ἐθέλοις, καί τοι ἄδοι, ἦτ᾽ ἂν ἔπειτα
Πατρὸς ἐμοῖο Θόαντος ἔχοις γέρας.

- - - - - Sin vero hic
Sedem figere velis, idque allubeſcat tibi, cauſa nihil erit, quin
Augearis præmio Thoantis genitoris mei (11).

If in this land thou chuſeſt to remain,
Thoas, my ſire, ſhall give thee here to reign.

Valerius Flaccus in like manner repreſents her touched to the quick with the charms of this Hero, and ready to marry him as ſoon as ſhe ſaw him:

- - - - - - - - - - Unius hæret
Alloquio, & blandos paullatim colligit ignes,
Jam non dura thoris, Veneri nec iniqua reverſæ (12).

Faſt, as he ſpeaks, with kindled love ſhe burns,
And Hymen to her conquer'd heart returns.

[*C*] *Jaſon was no leſs inconſtant than Æneas.*] He forſook her and his two children, and purſued his voyage; ſo that ſhe is one of the heroins of Ovid, who ſung their ſad complaints, and tender ſighs, upon ſeeing themſelves forſaken by the galants, to whom they had refuſed nothing. Ariadne, grandmother to Hypſipile (13), experienced the ſame fate. See in Ovid her complaints againſt Theſeus. I make a reflexion upon this matter. The mythological authors and modern writers of romances have taken two different roads. The firſt come too near hiſtory, the latter keep too far from it. I only conſider the deſcription of manners, or the character which they give a hero. In Mythology the heroins are not only too amorous, but alſo too laviſh of their favours: the heroes are inconſtant; they get the heroins with child, or do what is neceſſary to it, and then they laugh at them. This looks too much like hiſtory, and affords an ill example to both ſexes (14). It is better to take the oppoſite extreme, as our writers of romances do, and in ſpite of probability to feign heroes and heroins quite faultleſs.

(*a*) Apollodorus, lib. i.

(*b*) His mihi pro meritis (ut falſi criminis aſtu Parta fides) regno & ſolio confidere patris Supplicium datur. *Hypſipyle, apud Statium, Theb. lib. v, ver.* 320.

(1) Apollodor. lib. i.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) In Inſula Lemno mulieres Veneri ſacra aliquot annos non fecerant. *Hyginus, cap. xv. See alſo* Apollod. ibid. Statius, Theb. lib. v, *and the Scholiaſt upon* Euripides in Hecub.

(4) Lactantius, in Statium, lib. v, Thebaid.

(5) Myrtitus Leſbius, lib. i, Leſbiacorum, apud Scholiaſten Apollonii in lib. i, Argonaut.

(6) In Iliad. lib. i.

(7) Oratione 33.

(8) Stat. Theb. lib. v, ver. 70.

(9) *In the article* GARNACHE, *remark* [*B*].

(10) Statius, Theb. lib v, ver. 454.

(11) Apollonius, lib. i, ver. 827.

(12) Val. Flacc. lib. ii, ver. 353.

(13) *Thoas, Hypſipile's father, was the ſon of Bacchus and Ariadne.*

(14) Horace's Hiſtorias peccare ducentes, Od. vii, lib iii, *may be applied to theſe narrations.*

HIRPINI, a people of Italy in the country of the Samnites. They were ſo called from a wolf (*a*), that conducted them when they went to ſettle a colony. Some ſay that upon a certain ſolemn day, they trod upon fire without being burned [*A*]: but it is probable that this is attributing to them what belonged only to the Hirpi [*B*], who lived

[*A*] *Some ſay they trod upon fire without being burnt.*] Varro, who oppugns ſuperſtition as much as he could, having mentioned an ointment, immediately adds this reflexion; the Hirpini rub the bottoms of their feet with it, when they are to walk upon fire. *Varro ubique expugnator religionis, ait, cùm quoddam medicamentum deſcriberet: eo uti ſolent Hirpini ambulaturi per ignem, medicamento plantas ungunt* (1). Theſe words give us no light concerning the ſituation of theſe Hirpini; ſo that we cannot tell, whether Varro ſpeaks of a people who were part of the Samnites, or whether with Servius he gives the name of Hirpini to the people who lived near mount Soracte in Tuſcany, and who were properly called Hirpi. Many imagine that Varro meant the Samnites called Hirpini, and if ſo, it is probable that the likeneſs of names miſled him. They who walked upon fire were diſtinct from the Samnites, and lived at a good diſtance from them. They were called Hirpi and not Hirpini; the commentator Servius is miſtaken in the name, and that firſt miſtake has led him into ſome others concerning the ſituation of thoſe who walked upon fire, upon the feſtival of mount Soracte, as we ſhall ſee in what follows.

[*B*] ... *what belonged only to the Hirpi.*] Virgil does not name thoſe who walked on fire; he only gives us to underſtand that they bordered on mount Soracte.

Summe Deûm ſancti cuſtos Soractis Apollo,
Quem primi colimus, cui pineus ardor acervo
Paſcitur, & medium freti pietate per ignem
Cultores multa premimus veſtigia pruna.
Da, pater, hoc noſtris aboleri dedecus armis (2).

O patron of Soractes high abodes,
Phœbus the ruling power among the gods
Whom firſt we ſerve, whole woods of unctious pine
Are fell'd for thee, and to thy glory ſhine.
By thee protected, with our naked ſoles,
Thro' flames unſing'd we march, and tread the kindled coals,
Give me propitious power to waſh away
The ſtains of this diſhonourable day.

DRYDEN.

But Servius names them Hirpini; *Soractis*, ſays he, in commenting on this paſſage of Virgil, *mons eſt Hirpinorum in Flaminia collocatus.* He adds, that this mountain is conſecrated to the infernal gods, and that one day whilſt they were offering a ſacrifice to Pluto, wolves came upon them which ſnatched the entrails of the victim out of the fire: the ſhepherds purſued them, and engaged them in a den, whence proceeded a mortal vapour. This cauſed a great peſtilence, which the oracle promiſed a ſtop to, provided they ſhould imitate the wolves, that is, ſhould live by rapine. They did ſo, and were thence called *Hirpini Sorani*, that is, *Pluto's Wolves*; for in the Sabine language *Hirpus* ſignifies a *Wolf*, and *Soranus* is the name of *Pluto*. If we conſult Strabo and Pliny, we cannot doubt but Servius has here committed a great blunder. He has confounded the names and hiſtory of two different people. Strabo (3) relates, that becauſe a *Wolf* in the language of the Samnites is called *Hirpus*, and becauſe a wolf was a guide to a colony that came to ſettle among the Samnites, this people were called *Hirpini.* As for Pliny, he affirms that in the country of the *Hirpini* there was a place that could not be entered without preſent death. *In Hirpinis Amſancti ad Mephitis ædem, locum quem qui intravere moriuntur* (4). Virgil gives a larger deſcription of this execrable place, and obſerves not only that it ſent out a curſed vapour, but alſo that it was a breathing hole of hell.

Eſt locus Italiæ medio ſub montibus altis,
Nobilis, & fama multis memoratus in oris,
Amſancti valles. - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Hic ſpecus horrendum, & ſævi ſpiracula Ditis
Monſtrantur: ruptoque ingens Acheronte vorago
Peſtiferas aperit fauces - - - - (5).

In midſt of Italy well known to fame,
There lies a lake, Amſanctus is the name.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Full in the center of the ſacred wood,
An arm ariſeth of the Stygian flood,
Which, breaking from beneath with bellowing ſound,
Whirls the black waves, and rattling ſtones around.
Here Pluto pants for breath from out his cell,
And opens wide the grinning jaws of hell.

DRYDEN.

Mount Soracte had nothing of this nature; the vapour that proceeded from it was only fatal to birds, as Pliny expreſsly aſſures us: *Alibi volucribus tantum ut Soracte vicino urbi tractu* (6). It is plain then that Servius made this mountain a place conſecrated to Pluto, and placed it in the neighbourhood of the cave which killed men, becauſe he confounded what concerned the *Hirpini*, with what related to the *Hirpi*. See Salmaſius upon Solinus page 85.

Any one that has a mind to know what ancient authors ſay of the *Hirpi* may be quickly ſatisfied. The *Hirpi* were a ſmall number of families in the country of the Faliſci near Rome, who walked upon fire without harm. This ſpectacle was ſeen every year on mount Soracte, on the day on which they offered a ſolemn ſacrifice to Apollo. The *Hirpi* walked upon burning piles of wood without being burnt, and on that account obtained many privileges. *Haud procul urbe Roma in Faliſcorum agro Familiæ ſunt paucæ quæ vocantur Hirpi: hæ ſacrificio annuo quod fit ad montem Soractem Apollini, ſuper ambuſtam ligni ſtruem ambulantes non aduruntur, & ob id perpetuo Senatus-conſulto militiæ omniumque aliorum munerum vacationem habent* (7). Solinus thought he faithfully copied this, and did not perceive that he changed a notable circumſtance. He expreſſes himſelf in a way that ſignifies, that the *Hirpi* walked a-croſs the flames; *Impunè inſultant ardentibus lignorum ſtruibus in honorem divinæ rei flammis parcentibus* (8). And yet Pliny has not ſaid this, but plainly inſinuates, that they walked only upon the burning embers, and it cannot be doubted but that they confined themſelves to this, ſince Varro alledged, that they rubbed the ſoles of their feet with an ointment. Conſider alſo the *multa premimus veſtigia pruna* of Virgil, and the expreſſions of the authors we ſhall quote, and you will agree that Salmaſius juſtly blames Solinus (9). A poet later than Virgil tells us, that they who walked on the fire were three times put to this trial, loaded with the entrails of the ſacrifices, which they afterwards laid on Apollo's altars:

Tum Soracte ſatum præſtantem corpore & armis
Æquanum noſcens, patrio cui ritus in arvo,
Cum pius arcitenens accenſis gaudet acervis,
Exta ter innocuos late portare per ignes;
Sic in Apollinea ſemper veſtigia pruna
Inviolata teras, victorque vaporis ad aras
Dona ſerenato referas ſolemnia Phœbo (10).

Knowing Æquanus, from Soracte ſprung,
For ſtrength renown'd, and hardy deeds of arms,
Who, on Apollo's feaſts, the entrails bears
Thro' harmleſs flames: ſo may'ſt thou ever tread
The burning coal, and, victor o'er the heat,
Offer the ſolemn gift at Phœbus' ſhrine.

(*a*) *Hirpus was the word for Wolf in the language of the Samnites.* Strabo, lib. v, pag. 173.

(1) Servius, in Æneid. lib. xi, ver. 787.

(2) Virg. Æneid. lib. xi, ver. 785.

(3) Lib. v, pag. 173.

(4) Plin. lib. ii, cap. xciii, pag. 240.

(5) Æneid. lib. vii, ver. 563.

(6) Plin. ubi ſupra.

(7) Plin. lib. vii, cap. ii, pag. m. 10.

(8) Solin. cap. ii.

(9) Sed is eſt Solinus: verba tantummodo curat rerum ſecurus quas digerit, miræ ubique ablepſiæ incuſandus. *Salmaſ. Exercitat. in Plin. pag.* 86.

(10) Silius Italicus, lib. v.

lived in another place of Italy. There were antiently other feaſts, wherein the ſame ſpectacle was ſeen [C].

We have ſeen that the feaſt of mount Soracte, where the walkers on fire plaid their part ſo well was dedicated to Apollo; we now ſhall ſee it conſecrated to another deity. Strabo (11) obſerves that at the foot of this mountain there was a town called Feronia. This was alſo the name of a goddeſs who was mightily worſhipped in that diſtrict, they celebrated an admirable ſacrifice in the *lucus* or grove of this goddeſs. Some men who were ſeized with the ſpirit of that divinity, walked bare-foot upon a heap of burning coals and were not harmed by it. Ἧς (Φερωνίας) τέμενός ἐστιν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ θαυμαστὴν ἱεροποιίαν ἔχον· γυμνοῖς γὰρ ποσὶ διεξίασιν ἀνθρακίαν καὶ σποδιὰν μεγάλην οἱ κατεχόμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς δαίμονος ταύτης ἀπαθεῖς. *Ibi eſt lucus Feroniæ, in quo ſacrificium perpetratur mirabile: correpti enim ejus numinis afflatu homines nudis pedibus prunarum ardentium ſtruem illæſi perambulant* (12). There was every year a ſolemn aſſembly in that place, wherein people were diverted with that ſight. It is not for the glory of the ancients to ſee them ſo little conſiſtent one with another upon matters of fact, which muſt have been known to all people.

[C] *There were antiently other feaſts wherein the ſame ſpectacle was ſeen.*] There was at Caſtabala in Cappadocia a temple of Diana called Peraſia. The prieſteſſes of it walked bare-foot upon burning coals without being hurt. Strabo ſpeaks of it by hear-ſay. Ὅπου φασὶ τὰς ἱερείας γυμνοῖς τοῖς ποσὶ δι' ἀνθρακιᾶς βαδίζειν ἀπαθεῖς. *Ubi aiunt ſacrificas mulieres illæſis pedibus per prunas ambulare* (13). There have been mountebanks in theſe latter ages, who have done things much more ſurpriſing (14), than what is told of the Hirpi and theſe prieſteſſes. But the better to ſhow the great conformity of the ancient and modern abuſes in religion, I will here ſet down what I have heard related by the late Mr Fremont d'Ablancourt, who being a zealous Huguenot, during his ſtay at Lisbon, was a moſt exact obſerver of the tricks of the monks. He told me that there is a certain convent in Spain (15) that every year furniſhes a monk, who ſhuts himſelf up in a hot oven, and continues there ſome hours, being only cloathed with linnen. He comes out in the ſight of a multitude of people who look upon it as a great miracle. This ſhow brings in a good income to the convent, and makes it worth while to harden a monk by degrees to bear the heat. I do not reckon all the artifices that may be uſed in it.

(11) Strab. lib. v, pag. 156.

(12) Id. ibid.

(13) Ibid. lib. xii, pag. 370.

(14) *See the* Journal des Sçav. 1677, pag. 54, & 222. Dutch Edit.

(15) *He named the place; but I have forgot it.*

HOBBES, (Thomas) one of the greateſt genius's of the XVIIth century, was born at Malmeſbury in England the fifth of April 1588 [*A*]. He had made great progreſs in the languages [*B*], when at fourteen years of age he was ſent to Oxford, where he ſtudied Ariſtotle's Philoſophy five years. Afterwards he went to William Cavendiſh, baron of Hardwic, who a little after was made earl of Devonſhire, in order to be governour to his eldeſt ſon. He travelled into France and Italy with his pupil; and finding that he remembered but little, either of his Greek or Latin, and that Ariſtotle's Philoſophy, in which he had made a great progreſs, was deſpiſed by the wiſeſt heads, he applied himſelf wholly to Literature when he returned into his own country. Thucydides appearing to him to be preferable to all the Greek hiſtorians, he tranſlated him into Engliſh, and publiſhed his tranſlation in the year 1628, in order to ſhew the Engliſh, in the hiſtory of the Athenians, the diſorders and confuſions of a democratical government [*C*]. In

[*A*] *Was born at Malmesbury . . . the fifth of April* 1588.] His mother, frighted with the reports that were current of the approach of the Spaniſh Armada, was delivered of him before her time; it is a wonder therefore that he lived ſo long. Hobbes's father was a miniſter (1).

[*B*] *He had made great progreſs in the languages.*] Before he went from Malmesbury ſchool to Oxford, he tranſlated Euripides's *Medea* into Latin verſe *Tantos autem jam adhuc in ludo literario degens in literatura tam Latina quàm Græca progreſſus fecit, ut* Euripidis Medeam *ſimili metro Latinis verſibus eleganter expreſſerit* (2).

[*C*] *The diſorders and confuſions of a democratical government.*] I have known men of ſenſe who have wondered, that in kingdoms where the authority of the prince is almoſt boundleſs, the inſtructors of youth are ſuffered to read the antient Greek and Latin authors, which contain ſo many examples of the love of liberty, and ſo many antimonarchical maxims. But this is no more ſurprizing than to ſee republican ſtates ſuffer the profeſſors of Law to explain the Code and the Digeſts, where there are ſo many principles which ſuppoſe the ſupreme and inviolable authority of the emperor. Here are therefore two things which ſeem equally ſurprizing, and which at the bottom ought to be no matter of ſurprize; for ſetting aſide many reaſons that might be offered, may we not ſay that the ſame works which contain the poiſon, either with reſpect to monarchies or republics, contain alſo the antidote? If you ſee on one hand the great maxims of liberty, and the noble examples of courage, with which it has been maintained or recovered; you ſee on the other, factions, ſeditions, and tumultuous freaks, that have troubled and at laſt ruined innumerable little ſtates, which ſhowed ſo great an averſion to tyranny in antient Greece. Does it not ſeem that this picture is a leſſon very capable of undeceiving thoſe, who are ſcared at the bare idea of monarchy? Hobbes believed ſo (3), ſince he, with that view, publiſhed a tranſlation of an Athenian hiſtorian. Turn the tables, and you will find that this picture will give a very different inſtruction from that before, and fortify the averſion to monarchy: for it will be asked, whence comes it that the Greeks and Romans choſe rather to be expoſed to theſe confuſions than to live under a monarch? Was it not from the hard condition to which tyrants had reduced them? And muſt it not be a very ſevere, intolerable, and deplorable evil, which they would deliver themſelves from at ſo high a price? It is certain, that the deſcription which hiſtory gives us of the conduct of ſeveral monarchs, frights us and makes our hair ſtand an end. Object not to me that generally ſpeaking, more confuſion has been occaſioned by the conſpiracies which have put an end to tyranny, than there would have been by patiently enduring it. Do not urge what I have ſaid above in the article of HIERO II (4). The Syracuſans, who had enjoyed a wonderful happineſs under the long reign of that prince, quickly loſt patience under his ſucceſſor, who governed tyrannically. They killed him at the beginning of the ſecond year of his reign; and a little after they put to death the two daughters of Hiero, and his three grand-daughters. Of theſe five ladies, there were three, againſt whom they had not the leaſt ground of complaint, and who took ſanctuary, as we may ſay, at the foot of the altars. Was not this deſtroying one tyranny to eſtabliſh a greater (5)? Has not Livy (6) juſtly obſerved upon this ſubject, that the populace is unable to keep within bounds; being humble even to baſeneſs, when they obey, and inſolent to the higheſt degree when they command? The maſſacre of theſe five ladies was not the raſh action of ſome private men; it was commanded by the ſenate and the people of Syracuſe, even whilſt the memory of Hiero was ſtill freſh in their minds, a prince whom they had ſo tenderly and ſo juſtly loved. The iniquity of their barbarous decree was ſo viſible, that they quickly perceived it, and revoked it; but to no purpoſe; it was already executed. *Tandem vulneribus confectæ, cum omnia repleſſent ſanguine, exanimes corruerunt, cædemque per ſe miſerabilem, miſerabiliorem caſus fecit; quod paulo poſt nuntius venit, mutatis repente*

(1) Vita Hobbeſii, pag. 32.

(2) Ibid. pag. 33.

(3) *See the article* PERICLES, *remark* [*O*].

(4) *Remark* [*E*].

(5) Ne tyrannos ulciſcendo, quæ odiſſent ſcelera ipſi imitarentur. *T. Livius, lib. xxiv, pag.* 393. This is what Heraclea, Hiero's daughter, repreſented to thoſe who murdered her.

(6) *See his words above, citat.* (21), *of the article* HIERO II.

In the year 1629, he travelled into France with an Engliſh gentleman (*a*), in quality of his governour, and applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the Mathematics during that journey [*D*]. In the year 1631, he was invited by the counteſs of Devonſhire (*b*), to be tutor to her ſon, who was thirteen years of age, and three years after he travelled with him into France and Italy. During his ſtay at Paris, he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Natural Philoſophy, and eſpecially to the inquiring into the cauſes of the ſenſitive operations of animals. He daily diſcourſed with Father Merſennus, upon that ſubject. He was recalled into England in the year 1637, but having foreſeen the civil war from the time that he had obſerved what happened in the firſt ſeſſion of the parliament in the year 1640, he ſought out an agreeable retreat at Paris, where he might quietly philoſophize with Father Merſennus, Gaſſendus, and ſome other great men. There he compoſed his treatiſe *de Cive* [*E*], of which he publiſhed only a few copies in the year 1642.

(*a*) *His name was Gervas Clifton. The father of his firſt pupil died in 1626, and his pupil in 1628.*

(*b*) *Widow of the earl of Devonſhire, father of his firſt pupil.*

pente ad miſericordiam animis, ne interficerentur. Ira deinde ex miſericordia orta, quod adeò feſtinatum ad ſupplicium, neque locus penitendi aut regreſſus ab ira relictus eſſet. Itaque fremere multitudo (7). The factions did not ceaſe by the intire extirpation of the royal family, they increaſed from day to day, and in a little time ſubverted the liberty and ſovereignty of the country. They unſeaſonably expoſed Syracuſe to the enmity of the Romans, who beſieged and ſubdued it. Silius Italicus very well deſcribes the confuſion that city fell into after they had put the tyrant Hieronymus, and all his family, to death. It was a chaos from which the Romans knew how to draw a famous conqueſt. The diſcord of the city encouraged them to beſiege it.

> Sævos namque pati faſtus, juvenemque cruento
> Flagrantem luxu, & miſcentem turpia duris,
> Haud ultra faciles, quos ira metuſque coquebat
> Jurati obtruncant, nec jam modus enſibus, addunt
> Fœmineam cædem, atque inſontum rapta ſororum
> Corpora proſternunt ferro, nova ſævit in armis
> Libertas, jactatque jugum: pars Punica caſtra,
> Pars Italos & nota volunt: nec turba furentum
> Deſit, quæ neutro ſociari fœdere malit (8).

> *Impatient of his luxury, and pride,*
> *United in conſpiracy, they ſlay*
> *The cruel tyrant, and avenge their wrongs.*
> *Nor ſtop'd the bloody vengeance of the ſword,*
> *Till, in his fate involv'd, his guiltleſs ſiſters fell.*
> *Recover'd liberty now ſtalks in arms,*
> *And ſhakes the galling yoke: ſome wou'd ſubmit*
> *Their city freed to Carthaginian ſway;*
> *From Italy a maſter ſome require,*
> *And madly ſome a neutral ſtate demand.*

Repreſent all this never ſo well, you will never convince thoſe, who are prejudiced againſt monarchy: they will anſwer you, that ſince it's diſorders are not to be remedied but by ſo horrible miſeries, you ought to conclude that is a great evil.

[*D*] *He applied to the ſtudy of the Mathematics during that journey.*] It is a misfortune that he applied himſelf to it ſo late (9), he was above forty years old when he began that ſtudy, which was the reaſon that he could not perfect himſelf in it ſo much as was neceſſary, not to give a handle to his critics. His fate reſembled Scaliger's. For the reſt, he knew perfectly well on what account one ought to ſtudy Mathematics; which is not to know the properties of angles, numbers, lines, or ſuperficies; but to accuſtom one's mind to a ſolid method of reaſoning and of proving. ‘Euclidi operam dare cœpit, non tam demonſtrationum materiâ allectus, quam perſpicuitate, certitudine & indiviſa rationum ſerie delectatus. Non enim Mathematicas artes admiratus eſt vir perſpicaciſſimus, ob laterum & angulorum affectiones, aut numerorum, linearum, ſuperficierum, corporumve mutuas inter ſe proportiones (de homogeneis intelligo quantitatibus) ſubtiliter indicatas; quippe iſtiuſmodi omnia à communi vita remotiora facilè animadvertit; licet ad praxin relata uſus non adeo contemnendi; ſed quòd methodo ipſis propriâ intellectus ad rerum cognitionem optimè duceretur, atque difficilia inveniendi, vera aſſerendi, falſa redarguendi certiſſimâ ratione imbueretur (10). —— *He began to ſtudy Euclid, not ſo much on account of the demonſtrations, as of the perſpicuity, certainty, and uninterrupted ſeries of the reaſoning. For this great man did not admire the Mathematics, becauſe of the ſubtile inveſtigation of the properties of ſides and angles, or of the mutual proportions of numbers, lines, ſuperficies, and bodies (I mean homogeneous quantities); for he eaſily ſaw that theſe things were not neceſſary for the common uſes in life, though when reduced to practice they be of no mean uſe. But that the underſtanding was thereby, in a method peculiar to them, led to the knowledge of things, and furniſhed with the moſt certain means of diſcovering difficult truths, of proving what is found to be true, and refuting what is falſe.*’

[*E*] *He compoſed his treatiſe* de Cive *at Paris.*] He printed but a few copies of it at Paris in 1642. He reviſed it a little after, and enlarged it, as it came out in the Amſterdam edition in 1647. It was Sorbiere who procured that ſecond edition. He did more, for he tranſlated this book into French, and publiſhed it in that language (11). Hobbes got many enemies by that work; but he obliged the beſt judges to own, that the foundations of Politics had never been ſo well diſcovered before. I doubt not but he carried many things too far, which is uſual with thoſe who write in oppoſition to a party, againſt which they have conceived a great averſion. Hobbes was enraged againſt the principles of the parliamentarians (12), their conduct was the cauſe of his living out of his own country, and he learned every day in the place of his exile, that their rebellion triumphed over the royal authority. He went into the other extreme, and taught that the authority of kings ought to be abſolute, and that in particular the externals of religion, as being the moſt fruitful cauſe of civil wars, ought to depend upon their will. Some people are of opinion, that if we conſider only the theory, his ſyſtem is well connected, and very ſuitable to the ideas that may be formed of a ſtate well ſecured againſt commotions. But becauſe the moſt reaſonable notions are ſubject to a thouſand inconveniencies, when they come to be reduced into practice, that is, when they are ſet in oppoſition to a horrible multitude of paſſions, which prevail amongſt mankind, it was no difficult thing to find many faults in the political ſyſtem of this author. He might have anſwered, that the oppoſite ſyſtem, even in the theory, includes a neceſſary principal of confuſion and rebellion. However it be, it is ſaid that the love of his country inſpired him with the deſign of that work, and that he intended by it to undeceive his countrymen with reſpect to the falſe principles, which produced there an horrible contempt of the royal authority. ‘Graſſante interim per Angliam civili bello, *Hobbius* pro ſummo in patriam amore, quod bonum & fidelem ſubditum maximè decuit; populares ſuos ſanioribus quam quæ hactenus obtinuerant principiis imbuere, exacerbatos hominum animos ad pacis & concordiæ rationes revocare, & in ſummæ poteſtatis obſequium addictiores præſtare anniſus eſt. Quare reliquis poſthabitis ſtudiis, quantum ipſi ſuppetiit tempores Politicæ ſcientiæ impendens, Librum *de Cive* (cujus pauca duntaxat Exemplaria Pariſiis 1642, evulgaverat) reviſit, & notis utilibus addauxit, in quo ſubditorum contra ſummum imperatorem conjuratione, rebellioneſque, & immanes illas de principe regnis vitaque exuendo opiniones penitus damnavit: poteſtati Civili jura ab *Eccleſiaſticis* caliginoſorum temporum beneficio prærepta reſtituit, & diram ſectariorum hydram effrœnem nempe conſcientiæ libertatem, heroico auſu perdomuit (13). —— *While the civil wars raged in England, Hobbes, out of his great love to his country, and as became a good and loyal ſubject, endeavoured to teach his countrymen*

---

(7) Tit. Liv. lib. xxiv, cap. xxvi.

(8) Sil. Italicus, lib. xiv, pag. m. 589.

(9) Dolendum nobile hoc ingenium eodem quo & magnum Scaligerum infortunio laboraſſe, quod Mathematicis ſtudiis ſerius paulo animum adjecit. *Vita Hobbeſ. pag.* 40.

(10) Ibid. pag. 39.

(11) *At Amſterdam* 1649.

(12) Tum pro ſuo in Regem officio atque obſequio, tum pro decumano quo ſemper in Democraticos odio laboravit, libellum ſcripſit juris regii aſſerendi gratia, qui poſtea in librum de Cive, & tandem in Leviathan excrevit. *Vita Hobbeſii, pag.* 45.

(13) Ibid. pag. 45.

1642. He taught Mathematics to the prince of Wales, who was forced to retire into France; and he beſtowed all his leiſure hours in compoſing his Leviathan [*F*], which he cauſed to be printed in England in 1651, being ſtill at Paris. Though he had given proofs of his faith according to the rites of the church of England [*G*], yet he was made

'*men ſounder principles than had as yet obtained among them, to ſooth their heated minds into a love of peace and concord, and to inſpire them with more ſubmiſſion to the ſupreme powers. To this end, laying aſide all other ſtudies, he employed all his time in the ſtudy of politics, he reviſed his book* De Cive *(of which he had only printed a few copies at Paris in* 1642), *and enlarged it with uſeful notes, and therein for ever deſtroyed the doctrine of the lawfulneſs of ſubjects conſpiring and rebelling againſt their ſovereigns, and the monſtrous opinions of dethroning and executing of princes: reſtoring to the civil powers thoſe rights of which they had been robbed by Eccleſiaſtics in the ages of ignorance, and heroically ſubduing that cruel hydra of the ſectaries, I mean the boundleſs liberty of conſcience.*' I am perſuaded none will be diſpleaſed to ſee here Mr Des Cartes's judgment concerning this work of Hobbes's. 'I believe, *ſays he* (14), that the author of the book *De Cive*, is the ſame who wrote the three objections againſt my Meditations (15). I find him much better ſkilled in morality, than in Metaphyſics or Phyſics: tho' I can by no means approve his maxims and principles, which are very bad, and dangerous, in as much as he ſuppoſes all men wicked, or gives them occaſion to be ſo. His whole deſign is to eſpouſe the cauſe of monarchy: which might be done to much better advantage, by going upon more virtuous and more ſolid maxims: he writes alſo very much to the prejudice of the church and the Romiſh religion; ſo that if he is not particularly ſupported by ſome powerful intereſt I do not ſee how his book can eſcape being cenſured.' Mr Des Cartes had reaſon to diſapprove of Hobbes's ſuppoſition, that *all men are wicked*: which puts me in mind that Montagne, notwithſtanding he ſo well underſtood the imperfections of humane kind, doth not approve of Guiciardin's attributing to wicked motives, all the actions he relates in his hiſtory (16). It is certain that there are ſome men who govern themſelves by the ideas of virtue, and the deſire of a noble glory, and that the generality of men are but moderately wicked. This mediocrity, I confeſs, is ſufficient to fill the train of human actions with inquities, and to leave almoſt every where marks of the corruption of the heart; but it would be much worſe (17), if the greateſt part of men were not capable of giving on many occaſions a check to their evil inclinations, through the fear of diſgrace, or the hopes of commendation. Now this is a ſign that depravation is not arrived to the higheſt point: I do not conſider here the good influences of the true religion; I conſider man in general.

POLITICAL ideas fail in practice.

As to the inconveniencies that might ariſe from the practice of Hobbes's ſuppoſitions, I ſay once more, that this is not the part on which he ought to be attacked, for has not the oppoſite ſyſtem many great inconveniencies in the practice? let a man do the beſt he can, let him build better ſyſtems than Plato's republic, More's Utopia, or Campanella's Common-wealth of the Sun, *&c.* All theſe fine ideas will be found ſhort and deficient, when they come to be reduced to practice. The paſſions of men, that ariſe from one another in a prodigious variety, would preſently ruin the hopes we had conceived from theſe fine ſyſtems. See what happens when Mathematicians attempt to apply their ſpeculations, about lines and points, to matter: they do what they pleaſe with their lines and ſuperficies, which are only meer ideas of our mind; they ſuffer us to diveſt them of their dimenſions, and by this means we demonſtrate the fineſt things imaginable concerning the nature of the circle, and the infinite diviſibility of matter. But all tihs is found defective when applyed to that matter which exiſts out of our minds, that is to hard and impenetrable matter. This may ſerve for an image of human paſſions, compared with the ſpeculations of a man, who forms a notion of a perfect government. You will find ſolid animadverſions upon Hobbes's Politic Syſtem in the author that I cite (18).

[*F*] *He beſtowed all his leiſure hours in compoſing his* Leviathan.] By that great beaſt he means the body politic. The divines of the church of England, who were in France with Charles II, made great out-cries againſt this work, ſaying that it contained many impieties, and that the author was not of the royal party (19). Their complaints were heard: Hobbes was ordered to come no more to court; and as he had extreamly provoked the Papiſts, he thought it was not ſafe for him to be in France, after he had loſt the protection of the king of England. 'Hoc tanto præſidio orbatus *Hobbius*, Romanæ Eccleſiæ, Spiritualis Monarchiæ ſatellitum metu correptus eſt quorum odium implacabile ſeſe merito incurriſſe ſenſerat, ob detectas in *Levithane* Eccleſiaſticorum technas, regni tenebrarum dolos, *Pontificis Romani* poteſtatum malis artibus occupatam, quà in civilis Poteſtatis jura involando, quà ſimplici ac imperitæ plebeculæ ſanctis præſtigiis illudendo; quare *Pariſiis* ſe minus tutum judicans, mediâ Hyemis tempeſtate aufugiens, in patriam ſe contulit (20). —— *Hobbes being deprived of this great protection, became afraid of the emiſſaries of the church of Rome, that ſpiritual monarchy, whoſe implacable hate he knew he had incurred, by detecting, in his* Leviathan, *the frauds of the Eccleſiaſtics, the deceits of the kingdom of darkneſs, the authority of the Pope of Rome, acquired by wicked arts,* viz. *either by ſeizing on the rights of the civil powers, or by deceiving the ſimple and ignorant populace by holy cheats; therefore not thinking himſelf ſafe at Paris, he retired from thence in the middle of winter, and came over into England.*' He tranſlated his *Leviathan* into Latin, and printed it with an appendix in the year 1668 (21). Ten years after it was printed in Dutch. The ſummary of this work is this, that without peace there can be no ſecurity in a ſtate; and that peace cannot ſubſiſt without command, nor command without arms; and that arms are of no uſe, unleſs in the hand of a ſingle perſon; and that the fear of arms cannot induce ſuch perſons to peace who are carried to war by an evil more terrible than death, that is, by diſſenſions about things neceſſary to ſalvation. *Ejus autem ſumma hæc fuit, ſine Pace, impoſſibilem eſſe incolumitatem, ſine Imperio Pacem, ſine Armis Imperium, ſine opibus in unam manum collatis nihil valere Arma, neque metu Armorum quicquam ad pacem profici poſſe in illis, quos ad pugnandum concitat malum morte magis formidandum; nempe dum conſenſum non ſit de iis rebus, quæ ad ſalutem æternam neceſſariæ creduntur, pacem inter cives non poſſe eſſe diuturnam* (22). The Leviathan has been much written againſt, eſpecially in England (23).

[*G*] *He had given proofs of his faith according to the rites of the church of England.*] Being very ſick near Paris, he was viſited by Father Merſennus, who had been adviſed not to let him die out of the pale of the church. That good father ſitting near the ſick man, after the common preambles of conſolation, began a diſcourſe about the power of the Romiſh church to pardon ſins; *Father*, replyed Hobbes, *I have long ſince examined all theſe things, and it would be uneaſy to me to diſpute about them at preſent; you can entertain me in a more agreeable manner. When did you ſee Mr Gaſſendus?* The good monk eaſily underſtood what he meant by that queſtion, and turned his diſcourſe to another ſubject (24). Dr Coſins (25) a few days after offered to pray with Hobbes, which he agreed to, provided he made uſe of the prayers of the church of England (26). After prayers he received the ſacrament. *Cum non amplius cuiquam relictus eſt fucum faciendi locus eo momento ſe Religioni patriis legibus ſtabilitæ addictiſſimum oſtendit, & precibus juxta* Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ *ritus præmiſſis ſupremum Viaticum recepit* (27). Being returned into England in the year 1651, he found the churches in the poſſeſſion of the rebels, as he ſaid, who had no liturgy, and he was three months without knowing with whom to communicate. 'Concionantes quidem invenit in Eccleſiis, ſed ſeditioſos: etiam preces extemporarias, & illas audaces, & nonnunquam blaſphemas, Symbolum autem fidei nullum, Decalogum nullum: adeo ut per tres primos menſes non invenerit quibuſcum in ſacris communicare potuerit (28). —— *He found preachers indeed in the* made odious to the epiſcopal party, and with ſuch ſucceſs as to be ordered to appear no more about the king (*c*). This occaſioned his return into England, where conſidering his great merit, he lived but in an obſcure manner with the earl of Devonſhire [*H*]. He drew this advantage from his obſcure condition, that he had more leiſure to compoſe his book *de Corpore*, and ſome others [*I*]. He received great marks of eſteem from Charles II at the reſtoration in 1660 [*K*]. From that time to his death, he applied himſelf to his ſtudies, and to defend himſelf againſt his adverſaries, who were very numerous. He retained the uſe of his underſtanding till his laſt ſickneſs [*L*], though he had lived more than ninety one years. His long life was conſtantly that of a perfectly honeſt man; he loved his country, was faithful to his prince, a good friend, charitable, and obliging: notwithſtanding all this, he has paſſed for an Atheiſt; but they who have written his life, maintain that he had very orthodox opinions about the nature of God [*M*]. It

---

(14) *Tom. III, of his Letters, pag.* 104, apud Baillet, Vie de Des Cartes, Tom. II, pag. 174.

(15) *He was not miſtaken.*

(16) *See the article* GUICCIARDIN, *remark* [*E*].

(17) *The reaſon why innocence is not oppreſſed on many occaſions, is the mediocrity I ſpeak of here. See, above, remark* [*A*] *of the article* EDWARD IV.

(18) Galeottus Galeatius Karlſbergius, apud Deckherum de Scriptis adeſpotis, pag. 328.

(19) Hobbium tanquam partibus regiis minus addictum tum ut novarum impiarumque in religione opinionum authorem criminabantur. *Vita Hobb. pag.* 61.

(20) Ibid. pag. 62.

(21) *At Amſterdam for J. ln Blaeuw with his other philoſophical works, in two volumes, in 4to. He could not get a licence to have his books printed in England.* Ibid. pag. 70.

(22) Ib. pag. 45.

(23) *The Catalogue of the books printed againſt the* Leviathan, *and the other works Hobbes, are to be found at the end of his Life.*

(24) Ib. pag. 20.

(25) *He was afterwards biſhop of Durham.*

(26) Obtulit ſe illi comprecatorem ad Deum. Cui ille cum gratias reddidiſſet, ita inquit ſi precibus præiveris juxta ritum Eccleſiæ noſtræ. *Ibid.*

(27) Ib. pag. 59.

(28) Ib. pag. 21.

' *churches, but ſeditious ones; extemporary prayers alſo, but theſe irreverent and ſometimes blaſphemous, no creed, no decalogue; ſo that he was three months without knowing with whom to communicate.*' But at three months end he was carried to a congregation, where the Lord's Supper was celebrated according to the church of England, and he communicated there. The author of his life makes this a characterſtic of his adherence to the epiſcopal party, and of the ſincerity of his Chriſtianity, ſince no man was then obliged to join with any particular communion. *Alterum hoc ſignum erat non modo hominis partium Epiſcopalium, ſed etiam Chriſtiani ſinceri; nam illo tempore ad Eccleſiam quamcumque legibus aut metu cogebatur nemo* (29).

[*H*] *He lived in an obſcure manner with the earl of Devonſhire.*] Not but that he had powerful friends; but as he had great enemies, all that could be done for him was to hinder his being oppreſſed. So his condition was the effect of an *æquilibrium* betwixt his friends and enemies(30). He lived the reſt of his days with the earl of Devonſhire.

[*I*] *He compoſed his book* de Corpore, *and ſome others.*] This book came out at London in 1655, intituled *Elementorum Philoſophiæ ſectio prima de corpore*. The year following Hobbes publiſhed *Prælectiones ſex ad Profeſſores Savilianos*. His book *de Homine, ſive elementorum Philoſophiæ ſectio ſecunda*, was printed at London in the year 1658. And his *Queſtions concerning Liberty, and Neceſſity, and Chance, clearly ſtated and debated between him and Dr Bramhall biſhop of London-Derry* in 1656 in 4to. He had a diſpute upon the ſame ſubject with Benjamin Laney, biſhop of Ely, which he did not publiſh till 1676 (31). Dr Wallis, profeſſor of Geometry at Oxford, having publiſhed his *Elenchus Geometriæ Hobbianæ* in the year 1655, raiſed a war which laſted till Hobbes's death, and had been carried on with a great deal of bitterneſs on both ſides. ' Diuturni illius belli Mathematici claſſicum cecinit, quod acerrimo Marte, adhibitis quadra & circino, intervolantibus nonnunquam acutiſſimis convitiorum telis, utrinque geſtum vicennium & amplius perduravit, nec tandem niſi *Hobbiana* morte conquievit (32). ' *He ſounded the charge to that long mathematical war, which was carried on with great vigour with ſquare and compaſs, and ſometimes with great vollies of invectives on both ſides, for above twenty years, and which only ended by Hobbes's death.*' Sorbiere hath mentioned this diſpute (33).

[*K*] *He received great marks of eſteem from Charles II*] Hobbes left the country to come to London, as ſoon as he had notice of the king's arrival. This prince paſſing in his coach by the houſe where Hobbes lived, perceived him, and deſired him to come to him. He gave him his hand to kiſs, and inquired about his condition and health. Some time after he gave him a particular audience, aſſured him of his affection, and promiſed him an eaſy acceſs to him (34). He cauſed his picture to be drawn by an excellent Painter, and placed it in his cloſet (35), and which was a more ſubſtantial mark of his affection, he gave him an annual penſion of (36) a hundred jacobus's (37).

[*L*] *He retained the uſe of his underſtanding till his laſt ſickneſs.*] He was not only capable of ſtudying Mathematics, when above eighty ſix years old, but alſo of writing very long poems. ' Quod autem inter rara fœlicitatis exempla numerandum eſt, ſummo ingenii vigore & ſenſibus integris ad obitum uſque in Philoſophia & Matheſi ſe aſſiduò exercitavit, & quod magis mirum, Poëſin exercuit, quâ propriis animi conceptibus exprimendis, quâ aliorum transferendis (38). ——— *He had the rare good fortune to enjoy an entire vigour of mind, and the uſe of all his ſenſes till his death, which he employed in the ſtudy of Philoſophy and Mathematics, and which is ſtill more extraordinary in poetry, ſometimes compoſing, at other times tranſlating.*' He tranſlated into Engliſh verſe, ſome books of the Odyſſeys in the year 1674, and becauſe that Eſſay had the appobation of the learned, he publiſhed a like verſion of the Iliads, and the whole Odyſſeys a little after, with a diſſertation upon the excellencies of heroic poetry (39).

[*M*] *The writers of his life maintain that he had very orthodox opinions about the nature of GOD.*] Of all the moral virtues there were hardly any but religion, that could be a matter of diſpute in the perſon of Hobbes. He was frank (40), civil, and communicative of what he knew (41), a good friend, a good relation, charitable to the poor (42), a great obſerver of equity (43), and was not at all ſollicitous about gathering wealth (44). This laſt quality is a favourable prejudice for the goodneſs of his life. For there is not a more copious ſource of bad actions than avarice. So that they who knew Hobbes, had no occaſion to aſk him whether he eſteemed and loved virtue; but one might have been tempted to put this queſtion to him:

Heus age, reſponde, minimum eſt quod ſcire laboro,
De Jove quid ſentis (45)?

But prithee tell me, 'tis a ſmall requeſt,
What ſort of thoughts of Jove has you poſſeſs'd.

The anſwer he might have ſincerely made, if we believe thoſe who wrote his life, had been this; that there is one God who is the origin of all things, but who ought not to be circumſcribed in the ſphere of our narrow reaſon (46). He would have added, that he embraced Chriſtianity as it was by law eſtabliſhed in England (47), but that he had an averſion to theological diſputes; that he chiefly eſteemed what tends to the practice of piety and good manners, and that he was uſed to blame the prieſts, who corrupted the ſimplicity of religion, by the mixture of a ſuperſtitious worſhip, or of many vain and profane ſpeculations. *Quicquid autem ad pietatis exercitia, aut bonos mores conferret, plurimi fecit.* Sanctius *illi*, & reverentius *viſum*, de Deo credere quam ſcire. *Sacerdotes interim inculpare ſolitus eſt, qui Chriſtianam Religionem abſolutam ac ſimplicem, vel ſuperſtitione macularent, vel inanibus interdum profanis ſpeculationibus implicarent* (48). They conclude, that perſons who accuſe him of Atheiſm, are horrible ſlanderers, who could alledge no other pretence for doing ſo than perhaps this, which was, that he had rejected many ſcholaſtic doctrines, by which certain attributes are aſcribed to God, the model of which are taken from our narrow genius. *Quare fortiter calumniati ſunt, qui ipſum Atheiſmi reum detulerunt; quod inde forſitan profectum quia Scholaſticorum aliorumque iſto de grege morem rejecerat, qui otioſi in Muſæis ſuis ſedentes, juxta imbecillem ingenioli ſui captum, Naturæ Divinæ incomperta affingunt attributa* (49). It is certain there is no accuſation, that is fallen into greater abuſe than that of Atheiſm. Abundance of narrow ſouls, or ill-natured people, fix it upon all thoſe, who, in their affimations on this ſubject, confine themſelves to the great and ſublime truths of ſolid Metaphyſics, and the general doctrines of ſcripture. They would fain oblige them, beſides theſe, to adopt all the particular articles which they are uſed to recommend

---

(*c*) *See the remark* [*F*].

(29) Ibid.

(30) Stantem inter amicos & inimicos quaſi in æquilibrio, fecerunt illi ne ob doctrinam opprimeretur, hi ne augeretur. *Ibid. pag.* 22.

(31) Ib. pag. 99.

(32) Ibid pag. 64, 65.

(33) Sorbiere Relation d'Anglet. pag. 78, Dutch Edit.

(34) Vita Hobbeſii, pag. 66.

(35) Ibid pag. 28. & 103. *See* Sorbiere, Relation d'Anglet. pag. 79.

(36) Vita Hobb. pag. 53.

(37) Sorbiere, ubi ſupra.

(38) Vita Hobb. pag 98, 99.

(39) Ib. pag. 99.

(40) Ib. pag. 30, & 111.

(41) Ib. pag. 111.

(42) Ib. pag. 108.

(43) Juſtitiæ erat cum ſcientiſſimus tum tenaciſſimus. *Ibid. pag.* 30.

(44) Cum eſſet pecuniæ negligentiſſimus. *Ib.*

(45) Perſius, Sat. II. ver. 17.

(46) Deum agnovit eumque rerum omnium originem, intra anguſtos tamen humanæ rationis cancellos nullatenus circumſcribendum. *Vita Hobb. pag.* 105.

(47) Religionem Chriſtianam quatenus in Eccleſia Anglicana, refectis ſuperſtitionis ineptiis regni legibus ſtabilitur, ex animo amplexus eſt. *Ibid. pag.* 106.

(48) Ibid. pag. 107.

(49) Ibid.

It has been ſaid alſo, that he was afraid of apparition and ſpirits [N]; but they maintain that this is a fable. They honeſtly confeſs, that in his youth he was a little given to wine and women (d); but that nevertheleſs, he lived a bachelor, that he might not be diverted from his ſtudy of Philoſophy. He had meditated much more than he had read [O]; and he never cared to collect a great library. He died the fourth of December, 1679, at the earl of Devonſhire's, after a ſickneſs of ſix weeks (e).

(d) Ætate adhuc intra juventutis terminos conſtante (liceat verum fateri) nec abſtemius fuit, nec μισόγυνος. *Vita Hobbeſ. pag.* 104.

(e) *Taken from his Life, printed in* 1682.

over and over to the people. All who dare deviate from that road, are Infidels and Libertines, if you will believe ſome doctors. It was on this account that Monconys incurred this bad imputation. He diſputed ſometimes very freely againſt thoſe who debaſe the greatneſs of God, by the conduct which they aſcribe to him, and by the weak reaſons they alledge; and he was unjuſtly called a Libertine, tho' he had the ſublimeſt idea of God that can be imagined. Read what follows: ‘ that agreeable way which he took ſometimes ‘ of contradicting ſome narrow-minded people, who, ‘ by their arguments, weaken the truths they would ‘ confirm, occaſioned theſe prejudiced perſons to take this ‘ effect of his openneſs and candour for a criminal li‘ cence. But his ſolid virtue, and ſincere piety, were ‘ every where conſpicuous, and he gave teſtimonies of ‘ it, which you may ſee in theſe travels. In his laſt ‘ ſickneſs he confeſſed to one of his friends, that he ‘ had always preſerved in his heart a profound ſub‘ miſſion, and an infinite reverence for the Deity, of ‘ whom he had a more exalted idea, than all that ‘ men have conceived of him. When he was at A‘ lexandria, at a time when he ſeemed to deny nothing ‘ to his curioſity, being alone one night, upon one of ‘ the terraſſes, which ſerve for a roof to the Buildings ‘ of the Levant, he found himſelf ſuddenly ſo filled with ‘ a ſenſible knowledge of the Deity, that he ſpent part ‘ of that night with unſpeakable conſolation, in a con‘ tinual adoration of the principle of all beings (50).’

[N] *It has been ſaid alſo that he was afraid of apparitions and ſpirits.*] His friends call this a fable. ‘ Nec minus falſo à nonnullis inſimulatus eſt, tanquam ‘ ſolitudinem fugeret, ſpectra metuens & phantaſmata, ‘ vana ſtultorum terriculamenta, quæ Philoſophiæ ſuæ ‘ lumine diſſipaverat (51). —— *He was as falſly accuſed* ‘ *by ſome of being unwilling to be alone, becauſe he was* ‘ *afraid of ſpectres and apparitions, vain bugbears of* ‘ *fools, which he had chaſed away by the light of his* ‘ *Philoſophy.*’ But it ſeems they do not deny, that he durſt not be alone, they only inſinuate, that the reaſon of it was his fear of being aſſaſſinated. If his Philoſophy freed him from the other fear, and not from this, it did not hinder him from being miſerable, and a thought of Horace might be applied to him.

Somnia, terrores magicos, miracula, ſagas,
Nocturnos lemures, portentaque Theſſala rides?
- - - - - - - -
Quid te exempta juvat ſpinis de pluribus una?

To ſay this by the by, his principles of Philophy were not proper to rid him from the fear of the apparitions of ſpirits: for to reaſon conſequentially there are no Philoſophers who have leſs right to reject magic, and ſorcery, than thoſe who deny the exiſtence of a God. But you will ſay Hobbes denied the exiſtence of ſpirits; ſay rather, that he believed there are no ſubſtances diſtinct from matter. Now, as that did not hinder him from believing, that there are many ſubſtances, which deſign, and do good or ill to others, he might and ought to believe, that there are beings in the air, or elſewhere, as capable of miſchief as the corpuſcles which, according to his ſyſtem, form all our thoughts in our brain. How come theſe corpuſcles to be better acquainted with the means of doing miſchief than thoſe other beings? And what reaſon is there to prove, that theſe other beings are ignorant of the manner of acting upon our brain, in order to make us ſee an apparition?

Let us conſider the matter in another light. A man would not only be very raſh, but alſo very extravagant, who ſhould pretend to prove that there never was any perſon that imagined he ſaw a ſpectre; and I do not think that the moſt obſtinate and extravagant unbelievers have maintained this. All that they ſay comes to this, that the perſons who have thought themſelves eye-witneſſes of the apparition of ſpirits, had a diſturbed imagination. They confeſs then, that there are certain places in our brain, that, being affected in a certain manner, excite the image of an object which has no real exiſtence out of our ſelves, and make the man, whoſe brain is thus modifyed, believe he ſees at two paces diſtance, a frightful ſpectre, a hobgobling, a threatning phantome. The like happens in the heads of the moſt incredulous, either in their ſleep, or in the paroxyſms of a violent fever. Will they maintain after this, that it is impoſſible for a man awake, and not in a Delirium, to receive in certain places of his brain, an impreſſion almoſt like that which by the laws of nature is connected with the appearance of a phantome? if they are forced to acknowledge that this is poſſible, they cannot promiſe, that a ſpectre will never appear to them, that is, that they ſhall never, when awake, believe they ſee either a man, or a beaſt, when they are alone in a chamber. Hobbes then might believe, that a certain combination of atoms, agitated in his brain, might expoſe him to ſuch a viſion, though he was perſuaded, that neither an angel nor the ſoul of a dead man was to be concerned in it. He was timorous to the laſt degree, and conſequently he had reaſon to diſtruſt his imagination, when he was alone in a chamber in the night; for in ſpite of him, the memory of what he had read, and heard concerning apparitions would revive, though he was not perſuaded of the reality of theſe things. Theſe images, joined with the timorouſneſs of his temper, might play him an unlucky trick. And it is certain, that a man, as incredulous as he was, but of greater courage, would be aſtoniſhed to think he ſaw one whom he knew to be dead enter into his chamber. Theſe apparitions in dreams are very frequent, whether a man believes the immortality of the ſoul or not. Suppoſing they ſhould once happen to an incredulous man awake, as they do frequently in his ſleep, we allow that he would be afraid, tho' he had never ſo much courage. And therefore for a ſtronger reaſon we ought to believe, that Hobbes would have been terribly affrighted at it.

[O] *He had meditated much more than he had read.*] It is ingenuouſly confeſſed in his life, that for a man who lived ſo long, his reading was inconſiderable. Nay he was uſed to ſay, that if he had beſtowed as much time on reading, as other men of letters, he ſhould have been as ignorant as they (53). He conſidered another thing, which induced him to make no great account of vaſt libraries; which is, that moſt books are extracts, and copies of others. ‘ Lectio ejus ‘ pro tanto ætatis decurſu non magna; Authores verſabat paucos, ſed tamen optimos. *Homerus, Virgilius,* ‘ *Thucydides, Euclides,* illi in deliciis erant. Ingentem ‘ Librorum ſuppellectilem, quâ ſuperbiunt Bibliothecæ, ‘ non magnifecit, cum Mortales plerumque pecorum ‘ ritu antecedentium inſiſtentes veſtigiis, vix extra tri‘ tas calles, & ſemitas ab ipſis quorum Tutelæ & Re‘ gimini ſubſunt, præſtitutas, evagari audeant (54). ‘ —— *His reading, for a man of his years, was not* ‘ *great; he was well acquainted with a few, and thoſe* ‘ *the beſt authors. He was a great admirer of Homer,* ‘ *Virgil, Thucydides, and Euclid. He made no great* ‘ *account of large libraries, obſerving that men for the* ‘ *moſt part following one another's ſteps like ſheep, have* ‘ *ſeldom the courage to go out of the trodden paths and* ‘ *roads, which are preſcribed to them by their guides.*’

(50) *Preface to the Voyages of Monconys*, pag. 7.

(51) Vita Hobb. pag. 106.

(52) Horat. Epiſt. ii. lib. ii, ver. 208.

(53) Quin & illud ſæpe dicere ſolitus eſt, quod ſi tantum libris incubuiſſet, quantum alii è Literatis vulgo faciunt, eâdem cum illis ignorantiâ laboraſſet. *Vita Hobb. pag.* 112.

(54) Ibid.

HOCHSTRATUS, or HOCHSTRATANUS, (James) took his name from the village where he was born (a). He ſtudied Philoſophy at Louvain, and took his maſter of arts degree there in 1485. He became a Dominican friar, and was made prior of the monaſtery of Cologne, doctor and profeſſor of Divinity, and inquiſitor in the three eccleſiaſtical electorates (b). Never was a man more worthy to be honoured

(a) *Hooghſtraten in Brabant, between Antwerp and Bergopzoom.*

(b) Valer Andr. Biblioth. Belg. pag. 412.

honoured with this laſt employment, for he was amply provided with all the ill qualities that are neceſſary to inquiſitors and informers. He was violent: he accuſed upon the ſlighteſt pretences; he would be both judge and party [*A*], he produced very unfaithful abſtracts (*c*), and would never own himſelf a ſlanderer; he advanced hereſies with impunity in the writings, wherein he pretended to confute heretics [*B*]. He once was

(*c*) *See the remark* [*A*].

THE diſpute between Reuchlin and Hochſtrat.

[*A*] *He would be both judge and party.*] This manifeſtly appeared in the buſineſs of Reuchlin. A Jew (1) converted to the Chriſtian religion, had defamed him in a book, intituled *Manuale Speculum.* Reuchlin juſtified himſelf by a book, intituled, *Speculum Oculare,* in which, he ſhewed, that his enemies had vented againſt him above thirty four calumnies (2). Hochſtratus, the principal abettor of the converted Jew, intereſted the divines of Cologne in that affair, and made them draw ſome extracts from the *Speculum Oculare,* which were publiſhed with artful notes, to defame Reuchlin every where as a favourer of Judaiſm. Nothing could be more unfaithful than theſe extracts. ‘Has propoſitiones . . . . . ubi vidit Reuchlinus peſſimè ac non ſine crimine falſi ex Oculari Speculo excerptas . . . . rogat theologos illos &c. . . . . Erupit tota Theologorum concio ſuppetias Chriſti ſacris recens initiato Judæo latura duce Tungro, qui *articulos* ſeu *propoſitiones de Judaico favore nimis ſuſpectas* ex Speculo Oculari extruxit, adjectis annotationibus & animadverſionibus: atque hoc omne non vernacula lingua, qua utrinque hactenus certatum fuit, adornat, ſed Latina; eo haud dubiè conſilio, ut apud exteras gentes nationeſque nomen Capnionis inviſum redderet, & cum perverſa interpretatione, cum mutila dictorum citatione ſecurius falleret (3). Reuchlin anſwered this work by a Latin apology addreſſed to the emperor. Hereupon a proceſs in form was entred againſt him before the elector of Mentz. His great age not permitting him to appear in perſon, he ſent thither a proxy, who offered very juſt cauſes of exceptions againſt our James Hochſtratus; but they were not heard. ‘Cum propter ſenium & imbecillitatem corporis tantum iter tam brevi temporis ſpacio conficere non poſſet, mittebat eò curatorem Petrum Staffelium Nurtingenſem, qui actorem Hochſtratam tanquam inimicum ſibi infenſiſſimum & meritò ſuſpectum recuſabat, ob eas cauſſas, quas publice allegabat . . . . . Tametſi vero nil obtineret Reuchlinus (4).’ Hochſtratus would not ſuffer himſelf to be accuſed (5). Hereupon Reuchlin's proxy ſued him by an appeal the court of Rome. Hochſtratus however cauſed the ſentence to be paſſed; and without waiting till the fifteen days, before which it ought not to be promulged, were expired, he ordered all the curates of Mentz to give notice to the people, that all thoſe who had Reuchlin's book, ſhould bring it immediately to the commiſſioners, on pain of excommunication. ‘Interea Hochſtratus quaſi jam acturus triumphum omnibus per Moguntiacum ſacerdotibus mandat, ut publice populum ſub proſcriptionis pœna monerent, ſi qui Oculare Speculum haberent, illud quantocyus eam in rem delegatis traderent (6).’ Reuchlin appealed to the Pope. Hochſtratus did the ſame. The biſhop of Spire, who was commiſſioned by the Pope to judge of that cauſe, (7), named judges, who cited the parties. Hochſtratus did not appear, and was ſentenced for contumacy to pay all the charges; he was forbid, under great penalties, to continue his proceedings, and the accuſation of the divines of Cologne was declared null. ‘Hochſtratus licet more conſueto per intervalla citatus, tamen non comparuit. Cauſſa nihilo ſeciùs diſcutitur & ſecundum Reuchlinum pronunciator: nullum errorem ab Eccleſia damnatum in libro ſæpiùs commemorato reperiri, nec plus eum favere Judæis, quam religio & jura ſinant, injuſte ergo ac præter veritatem eum delatum à Colonienſibus eſſe. Hochſtratus autem contumaciæ criminis reus, *&c* (8).’ However, the latter burnt John Reuchlin's book. ‘Hæc dum aguntur Spiræ, Colonienſes nefario auſu librum Reuchlini damnant, citra tamen contumeliam ut ajebant, & Februario deinde menſe anno ſupra milleſimum quingenteſimum decimo quarto exurunt, approbantibus factum Lovanienſi, Erphordenſi, Moguntina & Pariſienſi Univerſitatibus (9). —— *While theſe things are tranſacting at Spire, they of Cologne, had the boldneſs to condemn Reuchlin's book, but without reflecting contumely on him as they pretended, and in the month of Febuary* 1514, *burnt it, which action was approved by the univerſities of Louvain, Erford, Mentz, and Paris.* But I ſay this only occaſionally; the main thing I am to prove is, that this monk would be both judge and party. It is this he is accuſed of more than once in a poem intituled, *Triumphus Doctoris Reuchlini* (10).

Accuſat Capnionem & judicat idem
Acer Hogoſtratus (11). - - -
- - - - - - - -
Sed neque perditior neque flagitioſior alter
In Capniona fuit, tunc, cum tu perdite judex
Lectus, & abſurdis in litibus arbiter eſſes
Idem accuſator. Dic quo veſane pudorem
Fert omnem tibi livor edax (12).

Hochſtrat wou'd both accuſe, and judge, his foe,
- - - - - - - - -
Yet againſt Capnio did'ſt thou vent thy rage,
With unexampled ſpleen, when choſen judge
In conteſt moſt abſurd, you firſt accus'd,
Then ſentence paſs'd: ſay, madman that thou art,
Has malice robb'd thee of all modeſty?

[*B*] *He advanced hereſies with impunity. In the writings wherein he pretended to confute Heretics.*] We might ſee the catologue of them, if we had the book with which Agrippa threatened the Jacobins (13). For ſee what he repreſents to the migiſtrates of Cologne: ‘Unum tamen illorum excipio, Jacobum Hoſtratum, tunc Prædicatorum ordinis hæreticorum Magiſtrum, vulgo & veraciter dictum, qui taliter ſcripſit contra Lutheranas hæreſes, ut ipſe ſe proderet hæreticorum omnium peſtilentiſſimum. Sed ne quis veſtrum illius olim amicus, aut illius hypocriſi excæcatus, vel aliter deceptus, me non favore veritatis, ſed aut invidia aut alia offenſa iſta dicere putet rem ipſam digito monſtrabo. Nam in libro ſuo contra Lutheranos, quem Reverendiſſimo Cardinali ac Illuſtri Principi & Epiſcopo Leodienſi dedicavit, in illius lib. 2. diſp. 3. paulo ante finem 1. cap. ſic ait: Scimus enim conſecratione ſuper debitam materiam ritè facta, Chriſtum eſſe in Sacramento, non autem quòd ſub hac vel illa determinata hoſtia Chriſtus contineatur (§ *α*). Neque tamen putetis, hunc ſolum articulum apud illum reperiri hæreticum, ſed alii multi: quos cùm hic nimis longum, vobiſque tædioſum foret referre, enumerabo alibi, in eo ſcil. libro, quem de Fratrum Prædicatorum ſceleribus (14) —— *I except one of them, to wit James Hochſtratus, who was then commonly and juſtly ſtiled maſter of the preachers of the order of the Heretics, who wrote in ſuch a manner againſt the Lutheran Hereſies, as to ſhow himſelf the moſt peſtilent of all Heretics. But leſt any of you, who are his old friends, or blinded by his hypocriſy, or otherways deceived, ſhould imagine that I ſay this rather out of envy or revenge, than out of a love to truth. I ſhall demonſtrate it. For in his book againſt the Lutherans, which he dedicated to the moſt reverend cardinal and illuſtrious prince and biſhop of Liege, Book* 2. *Diſp.* 3. *near the end of the firſt chapter he writes thus. We know that when conſecration is rightly performed over a proper matter,* CHRIST *is in the ſacrament, but not that* CHRIST *is contained under this or that particular hoſt. But do not think that this is the only heretical propoſition, that is to be found in his writings, there are many more, which it would be tedious to repeat here, I ſhall therefore enumerate them elſewhere, I mean in that book, which I have wrote concerning the vices of the preaching friars.*’ See the ſequel of theſe words in the remark [*S*] of the article AGRIPPA.

[(§ *α*) Mr Bayle has not remarked all that is in Agrippa, concerning the Hereſies with which he charges his adverſaries, particularly Hochſtratus. He ſpeaks as follows in the ſecond chapter of his apology, againſt the the divines of Louvain: ‘Jam vero etiam noſtro ſeculo dogmatiſarunt Colonienſes Theologi, Ariſtotelem ſic eſſe præcurſorem Chriſti in naturalibus, quemadmodum Joannes Baptiſta in gratuitis. *Jacobus Hochſtratus* was obliged to make ſatisfaction to a worthy man whom he had ſlandered; but to bring him to it, they were forced to make uſe of a remarkable expedient, which was to take from his convent the privilege of begging [*C*]. He had not all the advantage he promiſed to himſelf in the troubles which he ſtirred up againſt Reuchlin; he was obliged to go Rome on account of that proceſs; and notwithſtanding the ſums of money wherewith he provided himſelf, he had much ado to avoid being condemned [*D*]. Beſides, he

---

(1) *Called* Johannes Pfefferkornius.

(2) Dilucide & quod dicimus ad oculum ibi oſtendit, adverſarios pluribus quam triginta quatuor mendaciis ad ſui contumeliam uſos eſſe. *Jo. Henricus Majus, in Oratione de Vita Reuchlini, fol. D* 3, *verſo.*

(3) Majus, ibid. fol. D 4.

(4) Id. ibid. fol. D 4, verſo.

(5) Reuchlin. Epiſt. ad Wimphelingum, apud Majum, Not. in Vitam Reuchlini, pag. 391.

(6) Majus, ibid. fol. D 5.

(7) Cauſſa ad Leonem X, devoluta, qui eam Spirenſi Epiſcopo, Georgio Palatino Duci penitus committit. *Id. ibid. verſo. In the* Bibliotheque univerſelle, Tom. VIII, pag. 501, *theſe words have been underſtood ſo, as if they mentioned two men, the biſhop of Spire, and the elector Palatine; but the biſhop only is meant by them.*

(8) Majus, ubi ſupra.

(9) Majus, ibid.

(10) *Mr Majus has inſerted it in his Notes upon Reuchlin's Life,* pag 480, & ſeq. *The author took the name of* Eleutherius Byzenus.

(11) Annot. in Vitam Reuchlini, pag. 485.

(12) Ibid pag. 491.

(13) *See the article* AGRIPPA, *remark* [*S*].

(14) Agrippa, Epiſt. xxvi, lib. vii, Oper. Tom. II, pag 1037, *that Letter is dated the* 11*th of January* 1533.

'*ſtratus* in ſuo de invocatione Sanctorum libello, hæreticum pronunciavit ad Scripturam confugere: & alius quidem Theologus palam concionari non erubuit, conſuetudinem potius ſequendam eſſe quàm Scripturam divinam, adhuc prænominatus *Hochſtratus* Hæreticorum (ut vocant) Magiſter in opere ſuo contra Lutheranos, inquit in hæc verba: Scimus enim conſecratione ſuper debita materia facta Chriſtum eſſe Sacramento, non autem quod ſub hac vel illa determinata hoſtia Chriſtus contineatur, quia, ut ſubdit, hæreticum eſt fidem infallibilem & infuſam ad taliæ particularia per certitudinem extendere, eademque ratione concludit, credendam eſſe remiſſionem peccatorum in generali, neminem autem in particulari ſibi eſſe peccata dimiſſa. An non eſt hoc vere magiſtrum Hereticorum eſſe? — *Now even in our age the divines of Cologne have taught, that Ariſtotle was the forerunner of* CHRIST *in natural as John the Baptiſt was in ſpiritual things. James Hochſtratus, in his book concerning the invocation of ſaints, has pronounced it heretical to appeal to ſcripture: and another divine was not aſhamed to preach, that cuſtom was rather to be followed than the holy ſcriptures, moreover the ſaid Hochſtraten, maſter of the Heretics (as he is commonly called) in his book againſt the Lutherans, has the following words: We know that conſecration of fit matter being performed,* CHRIST *is preſent in the ſacrament, but not that* CHRIST *is contained under this or that particular hoſt; becauſe, adds he, it is heretical to extend an infallible and infuſed faith to ſuch particulars, with certainty; and for the ſame reaſon concludes, that we are to believe the remiſſion of ſins in general, but no particular perſon ought to believe that his ſins in particular are forgiven. Is not this to be really the maſter of Heretics?* REM. CRIT.]

[*C*] *They took from his convent the privilege of begging.*] It is in Eraſmus's letters that we read this curious particular. The count of Nevenar, a lord of extraordinary merit, a learned man, and patron of the learned, was very much touched with the calumnies which James Hochſtratus had publiſhed againſt him. He omitted nothing to oblige him to make him reparation; he made uſe of the moſt ſolid reaſons, he had recourſe to advice, hard words, and menaces; all this was to no purpoſe; but at laſt he and his relations forbad all their vaſſals to give any eggs or cheeſe to the Jacobins. Theſe believed they were only vain threatnings, and continued their trade of begging in the territories of thoſe gentlemen; but they were repulſed in a terrible manner, ſo that for a year together they were deprived of the ſubſiſtence they uſed to have from thence. They then obliged Hochſtratus to give the count ſatisfaction, by a ſolemn recantation, ſome copies whereof were diſperſed abroad. Eraſmus, who had one them, found ſomething comical in it; for the monk reciting in expreſs words, the ſlanders he had publiſhed againſt the count of Nevenar, proteſted at the ſame time, that he had always had a very good opinion of him. The reader will be glad to ſee this in Eraſmus's Latin (15). 'Hermannus Comes à *Nova Aquila* indigne tulerat ſe notatum ab *Jacobo Hochſtrato Dominicano*. Is erat *Rabinus*, Prior Monaſterii quod Coloniæ ſanè quàm magnificum eſt & opulentum. Non potuit hominem compeſcere, donec illius cognati denuntiarint *Dominicanis*, ne poſthac colligerent caſeos in ulla ditione vel Comitis vel cognatorum illius. Illi rati minas eſſe inanes, clam tentarunt ſolito more venire ad ova & caſeos. Factus eſt in illos impetus terribilis. Hoc damno totum annum mulctati ſunt; itaque factum eſt, ut *Jacobus* à ſuis coactus pacis leges acceperit. Habeo illius palinodiam in qua cum recitet verba plena contumeliæ quæ ſcripſerat in comitem, tamen affirmat ac propemodum dejerat, ſe ſemper de Comite præclare ſenſiſſe (16). Bella palinodia (§ β) ſcurrâ quam Theologo dignior. He ſays in another place, that it is in vain to diſpute againſt the perſecutors of polite learning. He principally meant the monks and their favourers; theſe ſort of people, *adds he*, have inexhauſtible reſources in their factions, clamours, and tricks: nothing but the baſtinado and hunger can ſubdue them (17), and he brings as an inſtance of this, the count of Nevenar's conduct towards James Hochſtratus. 'Iſti numero, phalangibus, ſyncretiſmo, improbitate, clamoribus, adde ſi libet, fucis ac malis artibus, prorſus invicti ſunt: Nec alia re quàm fuſtibus ac fame domari queunt. Sic vir clariſſimus *Hermannus* à *Novaquila* Comes, adegit *Jacobum Hogeſtratum* ad abjectam & ſcurrilem palinodiam, cujus exemplar apud me eſt. Quibus, inquies, præſidiis? Non argumentis, non æquis rationibus, non monitis, non minis, non conviciis; nihil enim horum non fruſtra tentatum fuit: Sed quibus præſidiis? Caſeis & ovis quorum in ditione Comitis colligendorum jus illis ademptum fuerat (18).' Eraſmus has reaſon to ſay, that count Nevenar tried what hard words would do; for what can be more ſevere than the following words: 'Unica, crede mihi, peſtis eſt in Germania Jacobus Hochſtratus, quam ſi reſtrinxeris ἔςαι πάντα καλῶς. Homo præter ingentem ſuam audaciam inſigniter impudens atque temerarius. Omnes interroga, ſi libet, per Germaniam doctos viros. Omnes læſit, omnibus æque infeſtus eſt (19) — *I beg your Excellency will believe me, that James Hochſtraten is the only plague of Germany, if you ſilence him all will be well. He is not only bold beyond expreſſion, but remarkably impudent and furious. If your Excellency will enquire of all the learned men in Germany, you will find that he has injured them all, and is equally an enemy to them all.*' This is what the count of Nevenar repreſents to Charles V, in an oration, wherein he congratulated him in the name of the ſtudents of Germany, on his being elected king of the Romans. He had been exhorting him to give order that the monks ſhould concern themſelves only with the rules of their order. *Fraterculos quoſdam magnis titulis inſanientes, jube ſuorum Cœnobiorum curam gerere, jube domi Fratribus ſuis regendis operam impendere, ſacris faciendis invigilare* (20).

[(§ β) Above, citation (9), the Faculty of Theology of Cologne, in their condemnation of a piece of Reuchlin, inſert in their judgment the following clauſe. Citra tamen Autoris contumeliam. — *Without pretending, by this judgment, to mark the perſon of the author with infamy.* And here Hochſtratus, one of the members of this Faculty, giving ſatisfaction to the count of Nevenar, whom he had ſlandered in ſeveral libels, declares, that he doth this the more willingly, becauſe he always had a great reſpect and veneration for the count. According to the principles of theſe divines of Cologne, and of Hochſtratus, his conduct is no more contradictory than theirs. It is founded on an antient cuſtom eſtabliſhed in all the courts of Germany, wherein if the clauſe *Salvo honore*, is added to a penalty, of whatever kind that penalty be, it doth not render the ſufferer infamous. REM. CRIT.]

[*D*] *He was obliged to go to Rome on account of that proceſs againſt Reuchlin; and notwithſtanding his money he had much ado to avoid being condemned*] I have ſaid above (21), that the commiſſioners of the Pope's ſubdelegate paſſed a ſentence very diſadvantageous to our Dominican. The commiſſioners, which the Pope appointed to the parties in Rome itſelf, where Hochſtratus was in perſon, would not have given a leſs favourable ſentence for Reuchlin, had they had time to pronounce a deciſive decree; but when they were met to put an end to the affair, they received an order from the Pope to ſuſpend the judgment (22). Each of the judges gave in writing their ſuffrage with the reaſons of it, it is known, that they gave it to the diſadvantage of the Dominican, who, to ward off that terrible blow, extorted an order from the Pope for a demurrer, and to leave the ſuffrages in the ſecretary's hands (23). This is an authentic example of the immenſe power of theſe ſort of men: if they cannot gain their cauſe, if it is too apparently bad to obtain a favourable ſentence, they have at leaſt intereſt enough to avoid condemnation; they obtain all the neceſſary delays, and they make the he ran a great danger of his life in his return [*E*], for Reuchlin's party began already to make uſe of violent means. He perhaps deſerved that kind of death, which, Paul Jovius ſays, carried him off; but it is not true, that he had the deſtiny which that hiſtorian mentions [*F*]: for he did not die with grief to ſee himſelf ridiculed in the ſatires of

---

(15) Eraſm. Epiſt. xxix, lib. xix, pag. 841.

(16) *This is more expreſly deſcribed in the thirty firſt letter of the twenty ſecond book*, pag. 1196.

(17) *We muſt not ſay of theſe devils, that they only go out, by prayer and faſting: take away prayer; faſting alone will do the buſineſs.*

(18) Eraſm. Epiſt. I, lib. xx, pag. 958.

(19) Hermannus Nuenarius dum ann. 1519, in Comitiis Francofurtenſibus Carolo Auſtriaco electo Romanorum Regi, nomine ſtudioſorum Germaniæ adgratulatur, *apud Valer. Andream, Bibl. Belg. pag.* 413.

(20) Apud eumd. Valer. Andr. ibid.

(21) *In the remark* [*A*].

(22) *The twentieth of July*, 1516, Not. in Vitam Reuchlin. pag. 474.

(23) Majus, Notis in Vitam Reuchlin. pag. 474, 475.

the world believe, that this is an advantage; for they will never confeſs, that they have had the worſt of it. But yet every body knows, that they are in the wrong. In this affair John Reuchlin's friends thought they had obtained a victory, and they compoſed many inſulting poems (24).

Hochſtratus made a journey to Rome with a ſumptuous equipage, and provided with large ſums of money. 'Huic igitur edicto morem gerens *Jacobus* Romam contendit, multis magniſque ſuarum aliarumque Univerſitatum, Principum item & aliorum ſummorum virorum commendationibus, pulchro equitatu, &, qui rerum gerendarum, ut & olim fuerunt, & nunc quam maxime ſunt corrupti hominum mores, nervus eſt, ingenti pecuniæ vi inſtructus, qua *Capnionis* juſtam cauſſam, famam fortunaſque omnes facile ſe ſubverſurum, jactitavit (25). —— *Hochſtratus obeyed this ſummons, and went to Rome, well provided with many and great recommendations from his own, and from other univerſities, and from princes and other great perſonages, with a handſome equipage, and above all, with (what in the preſent corruption of manners is, and always was, the ſinews of buſineſs) an immenſe ſum of money, by which he boaſted that he would eaſily ruin Capnio's juſt cauſe, fame, and fortune.*' He who ſuſpected that this money was deſigned for the purchaſe of ſome voices, knew well enough how matters go at theſe courts (26). His words are theſe (27): 'Item Theologiſtæ, ut etiam comperi, *Jacobo Hochſtraten* proximis diebus mille quingentos aureos per Trapezitas Romam miſerunt, non ad victum, qui Monachis tenuis eſſe debet, nec ad neceſſarias impenſas litis, nam minore ſummula, ut reor, hæc adminiſtraretur. Sed quod vehementer ſuſpicor & illis male vertat, ad faciendas largitiones, pro obtinendis auro ſuffragiis quæ jure non ſperat (28). —— *The divines likewiſe, as I am informed, have lately ſent James Hochſtraten* 500 *golden crowns, by the Bankers, to Rome, not for his ſuſtenance, for monks ought to live at ſmall expence, not for the neceſſary expences of his proceſs, for that I believe, may be carried on at a ſtill ſmaller charge. But I grievouſly ſuſpect what I hope ſhall not profit them, that it was ſent to buy voices with gold, which he deſpairs of obtaining by right.*' What he adds, is more ſurprizing. Theſe ſame divines threatened to make a ſchiſm, if Reuchlin was not condemned, and ſpoke with the utmoſt contempt of Leo X. 'Nam modo reverendiſſimum Cardinalem *Grimanum* (29) ut indoctum cavillantur, modo ut ſemper ſuſpectum infamant. Præterea audent aperte jactare perverſiſſimi homines, niſi ſecundum ſe pronunciatum in urbe fuerit, ab Eccleſia & ſummo ejus Pontifice ſe defecturos, & ſchiſma novum ſuſcitaturos. Alii ad futurum Concilium provocaturos ſe minantur. Alii dicunt, quicquid contra ſe ſtatuerit Papa, nullius momenti eſſe, neque pro Papa habendum eum, qui ab ſe ſuaque ſententia diſſentiat. Tam cœca, tam præceps eſt arrogantia iſtorum, ut non pudeat etiam poſtulare obnoxium ſibi Summum Pontificem eſſe, ſe palam omnibus Eccleſiam eſſe dictitant, ſine ſe in rebus fidei Papam nihil decernere nec poſſe, nec debere, conclamant. Nihil hercle ſecius aut honorificentius de ſummo Pontifice loquuntur, quam de puero ſub ferula adhuc vivente, cui nihil niſi ad pædagogi ſui nutum integrum ſit aut liberum loqui (30). —— *For ſometimes they reproach cardinal Grimani with ignorance, at other times they ſlander him as one they always ſuſpected. Beſides, theſe ſeditious men have the boldneſs openly to boaſt, that unleſs this cauſe is decided in their favour, they will make a defection from the church and it's head, and raiſe a new ſchiſm. Others threaten that they will appeal to a general council. Others ſay, that whatever the Pope decides againſt them will ſignify nothing, and that he is not to be acknowledged as Pope, if he diſſents from their opinions. So blind and furious is their arrogance, that they are not aſhamed to pretend that the Pope is inferior to them, and proclaim that the Pope neither can, nor ought to decide any thing in matters of faith without them. And indeed they ſpeak of the Pope with no more reverence, than of a ſchool-boy, who is not at liberty either to ſay or do any thing, but by his maſter's direction.*'

[*E*] *He ran a great danger of his life in his return.*] If he had not had notice of the ambuſcades that the Reuchliniſts laid for him in the way from Nuremberg to Cologne, he had infallibly fallen into them; and even after he had intelligence of them, he could not have avoided the ſnare, had not he been preſerved from the danger by the paſſport he obtained from the marquis of Brandenburg. Mr Majus acknowledges all this. *Non tantum honorum odium*, ſays he (31), *ſed ingens præterea periculum ſibi accerſivit, quod vix ac ne vix quidem evaſit. Nam cum Roma diſcedens Noribergam iter feciſſet, Coloniam inde perrecturus, inſidiæ ipſi à* Reuchliniſtis *parabantur, quas, ſi præmonitus non fuiſſet, certe haud effugiſſet. Ac ne ſic quidem exceſſiſſet, evaſiſſet, erupiſſet, niſi* Marchionis Brandeburgenſis *ſalvo conductu à perſequentibus tutus fuiſſet.*

[*F*] *It is not true that he had the deſtiny which Paul Jovius ſpeaks of.*] He pretends, that the ſatires publiſhed by Reuchlin, againſt the barbarous ſtile of the monks, killed James Hochſtratus with vexation, and obliged the fraternity of this inquiſitor to have recourſe in their diſtreſs to the court of Rome, to obtain a prohibition of printing and ſelling theſe ſatires. Paul Jovius means the *Obſcurorum Virorum Epiſtolæ*: He will have Reuchlin to be the author of them, and he gives us an idea of them, which is very diſobliging to the monks in general, and to Reuchlin's perſecutors in particular. 'Admirabili facetiarum lepore conditæ, quibus ad excitandum riſum, cucullatorum Theologorum ineptiſſimè, atque ideo ridiculè Latina lingua ſcribentium, ſtylus exprimitur. Ulciſcebatur enim infeſtam nomini ſuo turbam, jucundiſſimo ſatyræ illudentis genere, quum maligna cucullatorum conſpiratione tanquàm Judæis parum æquus hoſtis, ac ex animo planè recutitus impietatis accuſaretur (32). —— *They are full of humour, and by imitating their Latin ſtile, expoſeth the barbarous dialect of the monkiſh divines. He wrote this elegant ſatire againſt them, in revenge of their ſpiteful rage againſt him, they having accuſed him of favouring Judaiſm.*' The way to convict this hiſtorian of falſity, is to ſay, that James Hochſtratus ſurvived Leo X and Reuchlin, and therefore it is not true, 1. that the *Obſcurorum Virorum Epiſtolæ*, having been the cauſe of that inquiſitor's death, his friends and accomplices ſupplicated Leo X to condemn the book. 2. That Reuchlin, to elude the prohibitions of Leo X, compoſed a ſecond volume, under another title more ſatirical than the former. Thus here are two falſhoods of Paul Jovius. 'Hic liber avide coemptus & evulgatus adeo graviter calumniatores ejus ordinis perculit, ut conjurationis princeps Hochſtratus letali dolore ſauciatus interierit; & reliqui æſtuantes à Leone ſuppliciter impetrarint, ut edicto divendi, atque imprimi vetaretur; ſed edicti majeſtatem Reuchlinus falſo ingenio ludificatus, ſecundum Epiſtolarum volumen, tanquam ex titulo minimè vetitum, altero quidem aculeatius impreſſoribus tradidit, ita ut cucullati miſere cum Hydra luctantes, animos in ea lite deſponderint (33). —— *This book was greedily bought, and by it's publication, ſo mortified the malicious ſlanderers of that tribe, that Hochſtraten, the head of the cabal, ſickened upon it and died; and the reſt, boiling with rage, obtained, by their humble applications to Leo, an order againſt the ſale and impreſſion of it; Reuchlin however eluded the prohibition by an ingenious artifice, giving a ſecond volume to the preſs more ſevere than the former, under a name not included in the prohibition. So that the monks having to fight with this Hydra, were entirely defeated.*' It will be objected perhaps, that notwithſtanding theſe two chronological faults, it may ſtill be true at bottom, that the letters *Obſcurorum Virorum*, occaſioned the death of James Hochſtratus. I anſwer, that it is abſolutely falſe that they had that effect; for they appeared at leaſt ten years before the death of that monk. He died in the year 1527, and I have read in a letter written the ſixteenth of Auguſt 1517, that Eraſmus very much diſapproved

(24) Ibid. pag. 478, & ſeq.

(25) Ibid. pag. 417.

(26) *See the article* FOULQUES, *remark* [*L*].

(27) Hermannus Buſchius Paſiphilus, in Epiſt. ad Reuchlinum, *apud Majum, ibid. pag.* 464.

(28) *In the dialogue intituled* Hochſtratus Ovans, *he is brought in ſpeaking thus:* Neceſſe habui vulgatam incedere viam, agere literis commendatitiis, pecuniis niti, & largitionibus immodicis, ut magnæ ſunt opes nobis mendicis, atque mendacia ſtruere contra inſontem, quæ non inſolens, neque imperite confinxi. atque haud difficulter credita ſunt Romanenſibus. *Apud Majum, ibid. pag.* 465.

(29) *He was the preſident of the commiſſion.*

(30) Idem, Buſchius, apud Majum, ibid.

(31) Annotat. in Vit. Reuchlini, pag. 477.

(32) Jovius in Elogiis, cap. cxliii, pag. m. 285.

(33) Id. ibid.

of his adverſaries. He was one of the firſt who wrote againſt Luther [*G*], and one of the perſecutors of Eraſmus [*H*]. In a word, whoever was an enemy to the ſcholaſtic barbarity, could not fail to be expoſed to his anger. He died at Cologne in the year 1527 (*d*). We have ſeveral books of his, which for the moſt part relate to his diſputes with Reuchlin and Luther. There was a cutting epitaph made upon him [*I*].

He did not do much honour to the divines at Paris, in publiſhing at Cologne, the judgment they paſſed upon Luther in 1521, upon the ſubject of the pretended Dionyſius the Areopagite [*K*].

diſapproved of thoſe letters (34). This criticiſm might be carried further; for it is very probable that they were written by Hutten (35), and not by Reuchlin.

I am leſs ſurprized at theſe faults of Paul Jovius, than to ſee them inſerted as matter of fact in the life of Reuchlin, by Mr Majus, and that he did not perceive that he contradicted himſelf. He ſuppoſes, that after the *Speculum oculare* was burnt at Cologne, Reuchlin ſeeing himſelf attacked by ſeveral ſatires, publiſhed the *Epiſtolæ obſcurorum virorum*, to revenge himſelf, which quickly cauſed James Hochſtratus's death. *Hic liber adeo graviter calumniatores Colonienſes perculit, ut conjurationis caput Hochſtratus PAULO POST letali dolore confectus ſauciatuſque interierit* (36). He afterwards relates that Reuchlin brought the cauſe before the Pope, and that James Hochſtratus made a voyage to Rome upon it, and had like to have fallen into an ambuſh of his enemies, as he returned to Cologne.

[*G*] *He was one of the firſt who wrote againſt Luther.*] He went the wrong way to work, if we believe Father Maimbourg, who ſays, ' that what made ' Luther's cauſe ſtill more plauſible was this, that ' James Hochſtratus, a Dominican inquiſitor, writing ' againſt him, exhorted the Pope to treat ſuch a wicked fellow only with fire and ſword, that the world ' might be rid of him as ſoon as poſſible (37).' I will now ſet down a paſſage of Valerius Andreas, which affords me at once a proof of my text, and an occaſion for a critical reflexion. ' Primos inter in Lutherum ' calamum ſtrinxit: ob id tum ab hæreticis quos in ' primis oderat, tum etiam ab aliis vitæ atque ingenii ' liberioris, ut tunc tempora ferebant, ſcriptis laceſſitus, & nominatim à Joan. Reuchlino ſive Capnione ' epiſtolis quas *obſcurorum virorum* titulo vulgavit (38). ' —— *He was one of the firſt who wrote againſt Luther: and on that account was ſeverely handled not* ' *only in the writings of the Heretics, whom he mortally* ' *hated, but likewiſe by others of a more liberal genius,* ' *and way of living, as times then went, particularly* ' *by John Reuchlin or Capnio, in the* Epiſtolæ Obſcurorum Virorum, *as he called them.*' The war of the monks againſt Reuchlin, began before Luther attacked the indulgencies, and dropped of itſelf when Luther raiſed his ſtandard. Reuchlin continued with the ſtrongeſt ſide all his life, and never concerned himſelf with the Lutheran diſputes. It is therefore very falſe, that he teized Hochſtratus with ſeveral ſatirical pieces to puniſh him for being one of the firſt that wrote againſt Luther. The *Epiſtolæ obſcurorum virorum*, preceded the birth of the Proteſtant Reformation. Valerius Andreas is thereby fully convicted of an Anachroniſm. For the reſt, the counſel which James Hochſtratus gave to the Pope againſt Luther, plainly ſhews the violent temper of the man. Eraſmus wrote a letter to him (39) in the year 1519, full of good advice, upon the inexcuſable bitterneſs he had ſhewn in his writings againſt Reuchlin. See Eraſmus's letters concerning Hochſtratus's proceedings with reſpect to Martin Luther (40).

[*H*] *And one of the perſecutors of Eraſmus.*] This we learn from theſe words (41): ' Aliquot ex hoſtium ' numero perierunt: Lovanii Ecmondanus Carmelita ' vomitu præfocatus . . . Coloniæ periit Jacobus Hogheſtratus coryphæus hujus tragœdiæ, qui tamen in ' morte dicetur nonnullis verbis prodidiſſe parum ſinceram conſcientiam. — *Some of the enemies are dead.* ' *At Louvain Ecmond the Carmelite was ſuffocated by* ' *a vomit . . . At Cologne died James Hochſtratus, the* ' *principal actor in this tragedy, who notwithſtanding is* ' *ſaid on his death-bed to have ſpoke ſome things* ' *which argued no very ſincere conſcience.*' In the letter wherein Eraſmus, gives ſo good advice to the inquiſitor, he complains of his having been ill uſed by him, for his opinion upon the diſſolubility of marriage (42).

[*I*] *There was a cutting epitaph made upon him.*] We find it in Paul Jovius: ' Hoſtrati autem tumulo, ' *ſays he* (43), hoc nobile carmen, Capnionis puer af' fixit (§γ).

Hic jacet Hoſtratus, viventem ferre patique
Quem potuere mali, non potuere boni.
Creſcite ab hoc taxi, creſcant aconita ſepulchro:
Auſus erat ſub eo, qui jacet, omne neſas.

Here Hochſtrat lies, whom, breathing vital air,
Shunn'd by the good, the bad alone cou'd bear.
Grow yew, and aconite, upon this tomb,
Which ſuch a wretch incloſes in it's womb.

[(§γ) Reuchlin, as it is well known, died in the year 1523. Now if, as we are told, the author of theſe verſes was actually a ſervant of Reuchlin when he died, theſe verſes could not be compoſed on the real death of Hochſtratus, which did not happen till 1527. But the truth of the matter is this. About the year 1515 the firſt volume of the famous *Epiſtolæ obſcurorum virorum* appeared in 4to, to the number of forty one only. The ſecond edition likewiſe in 4to, contains no greater number; but the third alſo in 4to, which, if we may judge by the character, was publiſhed ſoon after the two others, contains an *Appendix* of eight epiſtles, the laſt of which in the name of Hochſtratus, and dated from Rome, contains four Paſquinades in form of epitaphs upon himſelf; the firſt in four verſes, the ſecond and third contain each a diſtich, and the fourth four verſes as the firſt. Now the pretended epitaph, recited by Paul Jovius, is nothing but the ſecond of theſe Paſquinades, preceded by the firſt diſtich of the fourth.

Some unknown perſons, as Hochſtratus relates in this epiſtle, meeting him one day in the ſtreets of Rome, dropt a paper at his feet, he took it up, and found in it ſeveral ſatirical epitaphs on his pretended death, and out of this was formed that mentioned by Paul Jovius. So that this epitaph, far from being compoſed upon, and after the death of Hochſtratus, is only an imitation of the following, which Politian compoſed on the death of the poet Mabile (Marullus) his enemy:

Flecte viator iter, fœtet * nam putre Mabili
Hac fovea corpus conditur atque animus.

This epitaph of Mabilus, who nevertheleſs ſurvived Politian, is to be found among his poems; and the account Mr Bayle give of this is, that *one may ſay ſuch bitter things* in an epitaph; and find ſo fruitful a field by turning this way, *that many poets have falſly ſuppoſed the death of their adverſaries, to have the advantage of this common-place.* This reflexion in the remark [*O*] of the article POLITIAN, is the true key to this pretended epitaph, *Hic jacet Hoſtratus*, &c. compoſed, as we ſee, about ten years before Hochſtratus's death, in the height of his proceſs againſt Reuchlin. REM. CRIT.]

[*K*] *He publiſhed at Cologne the judgment of the divines at Paris . . . concerning the pretended Dionyſius the Areopagite.*] It was in the year 1521. You will find this judgment in the ſecond tome of Luther's works, in the Jena edition. You will find alſo other editions of it, and therefore Father Nourri had no reaſon to believe, that he firſt brought it to light by publiſhing it in his *Apparatus ad Bibliothecam maximam veterum Patrum* in 1694 (44).

(*d*) Valer. Andr. ubi ſupra, pag. 413. *See the paſſage of Eraſmus, remark* [*H*].

(34) Magnopere mihi diſplicebant Epiſtolæ obſcurorum Virorum. Eraſmus, Epiſt. ad Joann. Cæſarium, inſerta lamentationibus obſcurorum virorum, citante Majo, Not. in Vitam Reuchlin. pag. 425.

(35) Jacob. Thomaſius in præfatione ad Pauli Manutii Epiſtolas, certa fidei exploratum ſe habere affirmat, Huttenum eſſe earum autorem *Id. Majus, ibid.*

(36) Majus, in Vita Reuchlini.

(37) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Luther lib. i, pag. 30, ad. ann. 1518. *He quotes* Luth. contra Jac. Hoſtra. Tom. I.

(38) Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag. 412.

(39) *It is the laſt of the ſixteenth book.*

(40) *The eighteenth of the twenty ſixth book,* pag. 1249.

(41) Eraſm. Epiſt. xiii, lib. xix, pag. 829. *It is dated in May,* 1527.

(42) *See the 740th page of Eraſmus's Letters, publiſhed at London.*

(43) Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 286.

* Fœtens.

(44) *See the* Acta Eruditorum, *in the ſecond Tome of the Suplements,* pag. 737.

HOE (Matthias) a famous Lutheran miniſter, was born at Vienna, in the year 1580. He was ſent ſo ſoon to the Proteſtant colleges (*a*), that he found himſelf a Lutheran before he had made reflexion that he was born in the Romiſh communion. He ſtudied Divinity at Wittemberg; and in the year 1602, he was invited to the court of Saxony, to preach before the Elector. In the year following he was made director of ſome churches in Voightland; and after having diſcharged that employment eight years, he was ſent to Prague in the year 1611, to be ſuperintendant of the German churches. Two years after he was recalled to the court of Saxony, where he was promoted to the degree of eccleſiaſtical counſellor, and firſt preacher to his highneſs. He enjoyed thoſe poſts all the reſt of his life, and died the fourth of March, 1645. He was admitted doctor of Divinity at Wittemberg in the year 1604. His marriage, which laſted forty three years, and which gave him ſix ſons and four daughters, made ample amends for all the troubles that could ariſe from other circumſtances in life [*A*]. He was born a gentleman (*b*), and he had ſo warlike a pen, as proved he did not degenerate. He publiſhed a great number of books (*c*), ſome in Latin, and others in High-Dutch. He was a man who would not hear of the re-union of the Proteſtant churches [*B*]: but he was accuſed of having been bribed to endeavour a re-union of certain princes of the empire with the emperor [*C*], to the great prejudice of the Proteſtants. What he has publiſhed upon the Revelation, looks like the work of a man of a turbulent ſpirit [*D*].

I fancy he was more troubled to ſee the elector Palatine in poſſeſſion of the crown of Bohemia, than to ſee him a fugitive after the battle of Prague; for the letter which he wrote to a nobleman of that country, ſhews that he did not approve the deſign of giving

this

[*A*] *His marriage . . . . made amends for all the troubles that could ariſe from other circumſtances in life.*] I have given the moſt favourable conſtruction to the Latin words of the Sieur Witte; for as they are ſomewhat obſcure, one might think, that he meant, that Hoe's marriage was ſo happy, as to have leſs evil than good in it (1). This would be leſſening the joys of that marriage; wherefore I chuſe the other interpretation, which is, that thoſe advantages being put in the ſcale with all the evil the husband was expoſed to, weighed them down. Thus his dear ſpouſe agreeably comforted him for all the troubles and fatigues he had to go through. He would therefore have had reaſon to complain, if he had lived a bachelor.

[*B*] *He would not hear of the re-union of the Proteſtant churches.*] Guſtavus had a little before he died, called an aſſembly at Leipſic, of Lutherans and Calviniſts, in order to endeavour at an accommodation. His authority cauſed them to ſeparate like good friends, and with mighty hopes of peace; but they vaniſhed away by his death. Nevertheleſs, Dury did not deſiſt from the undertaking, and he came to Francfort, where the Proteſtants were aſſembled. A moſt ſevere letter of Hoe againſt the Calviniſts came hereupon, and did a great deal of miſchief. We have all this from Grotius. ' Rex Sueciæ magnus Guſtavus . . . non multum ante mortem Lipſiæ conventum inſtituerat utriuſque ſententiæ proteſtantium . . . Effecit ſua auctoritate ut amice diſcederetur cum magna ſpe reſtituenda unitatis. Sed triſtis exitus tanti Regis ſalubre hoc cœptum interſcidit. Neque tamen defuit ejuſdem negotii commendator ex Anglia Duræus, multorum Angliæ antiſtitum inſtructus literis, qui francofurtum ad Mœnum venerat eo ipſo tempore, cùm ibi conventus Ordinum Proteſtantium haberetur. Sed rem per ſe difficilem implicatiorem etiam reddidit doctoris Hoii ex Aula Saxonica reſponſum immite in eos quos Calvinianos vocat (2).' The doctors of the Augsburg Confeſſion, extol to the skies, the vigilance with which he oppoſed the ſmalleſt innovations. They even ſay, that on this account he expoſed himſelf to great dangers. ' In ſolis radiis pridem ſcriptum arbitror quos ille tuendæ fidei gratia pertulerit labores, quibuſcum difficultatibus ſit conflictatus, quæ ſubierit pericula, dum quidvis ſatius cenſebat, quam ut quicquam in Germania de Evangelicæ Religionis integritate (quam adverſarum partium promachi contaminare ſunt auſi,) decederet ac minueretur (3).'

[*C*] *He was accuſed of having been bribed to endeavour a re-union between certain princes of the empire with the emperor.*] In the year 1635, the elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Heſſe, made a treaty with the emperor at Prague, and engaged themſelves in his intereſts againſt the crown of Sweden, which was the way to deſtroy whatever Guſtavus had done in Germany for the advantage of the Proteſtant religion. It is believed that the emperor, by a good ſum of money, engaged Dr Hoe to remove all the ſcruples which might have perplexed the elector of Saxony. Mr Puffendorf, whoſe words I quote, is my warrant for it. *Arguebatur quoque Saxonicus Theologus Matthias Hoeus decem uncialium millia à Cæſare accepiſſe, eximendis Principis ſui animo ſcrupulis, quos alias facile iſta pax generare poterat* (4).

[*D*] *What he has publiſhed upon the Revelation looks like the work of a man of a turbulent ſpirit.*] According to the humour that he was of, it cannot be doubted but his Commentaries upon the Revelation, tended to raiſe a general war againſt the church of Rome, that is, to fill Europe with the moſt dreadful miſeries that it could fall under. However it be, the biſhop of Meaux reckons him amongſt the interpreters of the Revelation, who do nothing but ſound an alarm for war. *The Lutherans*, ſays he (5), *were not more moderate than the Calviniſts; and the principal miniſter of the court of Saxony, Matthias Hoe by name, diſperſed a book at Francfort intituled*, The judgment and total extirpation of the Whore of the Romiſh Babylon, or the ſixth Book of the Commentary upon the Revelation. ' The book is no leſs extravagant than the title, and this is what was written in Germany, and in the North. The biſhop of Meaux has taken this from a letter of an Arminian miniſter, I will ſet down the paſſage entire, becauſe it contains ſome other matters, relating to this article. ' I have ſeen the catalogue of this laſt fair of Francfort, which contains abundance of polemical books againſt Popery, amongſt others, one with this inſcription. *Judicium & excidium Meretricis Babyloniæ Romanæ, ſeu Commentariorum in Apocalypſin S. Johannis liber ſextus, authore Matthia Hohe Doctore Theologo, Lipſiæ in 4to.* This Hoe is the principal miniſter of the court of Saxony, of noble extraction in Auſtria, and who for a long time has been ſuſpected to be a ſecret Papiſt. I wonder that in ſuch a conjuncture of time and affairs, he thinks fit to write againſt Popery in ſo ſatirical and odious a ſtyle, eſpecially ſince the elector of Saxony has always earneſtly endeavoured to preſerve the emperor's favour towards his family (6).' Hoe began his work upon the Revelation in the year 1610 (7), and finiſhed it in the year 1640. It contains eight books, which have been reprinted in folio at Leipſic, in 1671. Factious and turbulent men will never be hindered from abuſing the obſcurity of the Revelation, in order to ſtir up war. Peace doth not pleaſe them; it is war which they wiſh for, in which they run no hazards, and find a way to make themſelves neceſſary. It is probable, that ſovereigns are not diſpleaſed to entertain ſuch pragmatical people they look upon them as fit perſons to ſpread confidence among their people, by turning the prophecies, ſometimes one way, ſometimes another, according to the current of affairs. Such ſort of people make themſelves feared; and for that reaſon their maſters keep fair with them.

[*E*] *The*

(*a*) Poſtea orthodoxa id ſibi vindicavit Eccleſia, ſiquidem parentum cura frugis bonæ adoleſcens purioris aëris, hoc eſt fidei hauriendæ gratia, ad loca evangelica ablegatus. *Spizelius, in Templ. Honoris, Reſerat. pag.* 165.

(*b*) *Taken from* Henning. Witte, Memor. Theol. Renovat. pag. 1014, & ſeq.

(*c*) *See the catalogue of them,* ibid. pag. 1021.

(1) Illius amore & convictu ſuaviſſimo totis uſus eſt noſter tribus & quadraginta annis, ut multo plura haberet de quibus gaudium quam dolorem conciperet. *Hen. Witte, Memor. Theol. Renovat. pag.* 1018.

(2) Grotius, Epiſt. ccccxliv, Part. I, pag. 165.

(3) Spizelius, in Templo Honoris reſerato, pag. 165, 166 Henning. Witte, ubi ſupra, pag. 1016.

(4) Puffendorf. Rerum. Suecicar. lib vii, pag 123. *See the* Biblioth. Univerſelle, Tom. III. pag. 458.

(5) *In his Explication of St John's Revelation, pag.* 2, *of the advertiſement, Dutch Edit.*

(6) *Charles de Nielles in his letter to Uyttenbogard, dated from the caſtle of Louveſtein, the third of June,* 1628. *It is the* 638*th, in the folio edition of the* Epiſt. Eccleſ. & Theolog.

(7) *He publiſhed then the firſt book; the laſt was printed in* 1640. *See* Spizelius, ubi ſupra, pag. 171.

this kingdom to that elector, and that he looked upon Calviniſm as an Antichriſt, that was not much better than the Popiſh Antichriſt [*E*].

[*E*] *The letter which he wrote . . . . ſhews that he looked on Calviniſm as an Antichriſt, which was little better than the Popiſh Antichriſt.*] That letter has been printed. Read this paſſage of the *Memorabilia Eccleſiaſtica* of the XVIIth Century (8). ‘ Cùm in eo ‘ eſſent occupati Bohemiæ Proceres, Legatis Moraviæ, ‘ Sileſiæ & Luſatiæ præſentibus, ut Fridericum quin‘ tum, Electorem Palatinum, ſacris Calvinianis addict‘ um, in Regem ſuum eligerent, Matthias Hoe t. t. ‘ Concionator Aulicus Dreſdenſis, Epiſtolam ſub 23. ‘ Aug. ſcripſit ad Joachimum Andream Slikium qua ‘ (poſtmodum typis excuſa) vir celeberrimus fideliſſimè ‘ monuit, ut quid, præſertim intuitu religionis, Or‘ dines iſti facerent, facere ſaltem deberent, probè ‘ perpendant ? Inter alia ſpiritum Calviniſticum appel‘ lans Anti-Chriſtum Orientalem atquè componnes ‘ cum Occidentali, ut non multò meliorem, allegante ‘ Hornbekio in ſumma Controverſiarum religiones ; ‘ libro nono de Lutheranis p. m. 699. —— ‘ *When the nobles of Bohemia were deliberating* ‘ *concerning the election of Frederic V, Elector Palatine,* ‘ *a Calviniſt, to be their king, the deputies from Mo*‘ *ravia, Sileſia, and Luſatia, being preſent, Matthias* ‘ *Hoe, court-preacher to the Elector of Saxony, wrote* ‘ *a letter dated Auguſt twenty fourth, to Joachim An*‘ *drew Slikius (which was printed afterwards) wherein* ‘ *that famous man faithfully admoniſhed, that the ſtates* ‘ *ſhould carefully weigh what they were about to* ‘ *do, at leaſt what they ought to do, eſpecially as* ‘ *to what concerned religion. And among other things,* ‘ *he called the Calviniſtic ſpirit, the eaſtern Antichriſt,* ‘ *and comparing it with the weſtern, declares it not much* ‘ *better. This letter is quoted by Hoornbeeck, in his* ‘ Summa Controverſiarum Religionis.’ Probably the author I quote had not ſeen this letter ; for he only ſpeaks of it upon the credit of Hoornbeeck.

(8) Andreas Carolus, Memor. Eccleſ. pag. 482, ad ann. 1619.

HOELZLIN (*a*) (JEREMIAH) profeſſor of Greek in the univerſity of Leyden, was born at Nuremberg. He made ſo great a progreſs in his claſſical learning, at Augſburg, that he excelled all his ſchool-fellows, both in the Greek and Latin tongues. After which he ſtudied Philoſophy in the univerſity of Altorf. His method of ſtudying it, was not like that of others ; he little regarded what was dictated by the profeſſors ; as he was a good Grecian, he read the originals, and the ancient interpreters of Ariſtotle, Themiſtius, Alexander Aphrodiſienſis, Simplicius, and Ammonius. He was not contented with Ariſtotle alone ; he ſtudied Plato likewiſe, and was a great admirer of the Stoics. After having ſpent eight years in this ſort of ſtudy, he was admitted doctor of Philoſophy, and applied himſelf to the Scriptures, and to Hebrew. He was afterwards rector of the college at Amberg, in the Upper Palatinate. The war drove him thence, and obliged him to retire to Bremen, after having loſt the beſt part of his effects. The count of Bentheim deſigned to make him head of his college of Rhede ; but the count died preſently after, and then the town of Ham offered our Hoelzlin a like employment. The ſoldiers of the emperor made ſuch ravages in that country, that he did not care to be expoſed to their violences. He therefore ſought a ſafe retreat, and found it in Holland ; he retired to Leyden, and there publiſhed a tranſlation of the Pſalms, which was judged to be exact. The univerſity did him the honour to retain him, when he was invited to Middleburg, and to the Brill [*A*]. He was thought worthy to appear on a greater ſtage, and had the Greek profeſſorſhip given him, which Voſſius had juſt laid down. He undertook the tranſlation of Apollonius Rhodius [*B*], and notwithſtanding his diſtempers, he accompliſhed it, and put his laſt hand to it, ſix days before he died. He was dropſical, and ſo weak, that at laſt he could not hold his pen in his hand, and yet he had this work ſo much at heart, that he dictated what he thought neceſſary to be added to it. He died the twenty fifth of January, 1641. He had been married a long time (*b*), but had no children. His happineſs on that account is taken notice of in his funeral ſermon, becauſe of the troubles he was expoſed to, when the rage of war forced him to leave his own country (*c*).

(*a*) *He is always called* Hoeſlinus *in his Funeral Oration.*

(*b*) *He married the daughter of a miniſter of Nuremberg.*

(*c*) *Taken from his Funeral Oration, ſpoken by Antony Thyſius.*

[*A*] *He was invited to the Brill.*] He was actually rector of the college of the Brill, if we may believe Voſſius, whoſe words I ſet down the more willingly, becauſe they have need of correction, ſince the proper name of our Hoelzlin is there miſerably mangled, not without a groſs ſoleciſm. Voſſius had been ſaying, that Antony Æmilius had refuſed the Greek profeſſorſhip, which the curators of the univerſity of Leyden had offered him, and then he ſays : ‘ Arbitror profeſſionem ‘ eam deinceps offerendam Mag. Jeremiæ Hoelellus ‘ quondam correctori Ambergenſis Gymnaſii Electo‘ ralis Collegæ Beckmani : nunc Brillanæ eſt Scholæ ‘ Rector. Vir eſt moribus ſimplex, ſed trium lin‘ guarum & Philoſophiæ admodum gnarus (1). —— ‘ *I am of opinion that this profeſſion ought next to be* ‘ *offered to Jeremiah Hoelellus, formerly co-rector of the* ‘ *Electoral College at Amberg, and colleague to Beck*‘ *man. He is now rector of the ſchool at the Brill. He* ‘ *is a man unpoliſhed in his manners, but well verſed* ‘ *in Philoſophy and the three learned languages.*’

[*B*] *He undertook the tranſlation of* Apollonius Rhodius.] The edition of this poet, with the verſion and commentary of Hoelzlin, was publiſhed in the year 1641, at Leyden *ex officina Elzeviriana.* Mr Menage ſpeaks very diſadvantageouſly of it (2). Firſt, he relates theſe words of Mr Baillet. ‘ We have ſome antient ‘ Scholia upon Apollonius . . . . . The new edition ‘ which Jeremiah Hotzlin hath given of it, is eſteemed ‘ by ſome, but others value it no more than many of ‘ thoſe which are called *Variorum* :’ and then having anſwered to what concerns the Scholia, he thus goes on. ‘ As for Jeremiah Hotzlin, he is a wretched wri‘ ter, he is wholly wrapped up in Hebraiſms, he af‘ fects old words that are out of date, and invents ‘ new ones. I will here obſerve, by the by, that he ‘ ſpeaks of Conradus Riterſhuſius as of his patron. ‘ Conradus Riterſhuſius ſanctiſſimus ille juris interpres ‘ & vindex, idemque patronus olim meus, inſigniter ‘ pius & conſtans animus (3). —— *Conrad Riterſhuſius* ‘ *that upright interpreter and reſtorer of the law, and* ‘ *formerly my patron, a man of diſtinguiſhed piety, and* ‘ *my conſtant friend.* It is at the 115th page. There ‘ are at the end of his edition of Apollonius, ſome ‘ notes of Holſtenius, which are very judicious.’ The Funeral oration tells us, that while Hoelzlin was at Altorf, he had an intimate friendſhip with Scipio Gentilis, Michael Picardus, Conrad Ritterſhuſius, and Daniel Swenſerus, and that they mutually wrote Greek and Latin verſes to one another, and that part of them has been publiſhed : *Cum quibus Græcis Latinisque carminibus certabat, quorum non pauca in lucem venerunt.*

(1) Voſſius, Epiſt. cxlviii, ad Joann. Meurſium, pag. 181, Londini 1693. *That letter is dated the 30th of Auguſt,* 1631.

(2) Anti Baillet, Tom. I, pag. 389, 390.

(3) *It ſhould be* amicus.

HOESCHELIUS (David), born at Augſburg in the fourteenth of April, 1556, was a very learned man. The public is indebted to him for the edition of ſeveral Greek authors [*A*]. He ſpent all his life in the inſtruction of youth in St Anne's college, of which at laſt he was made rector by the magiſtrates of Augſburg in the year 1593. They alſo made him library-keeper, and he cannot be ſufficiently praiſed for the pains he took to enrich their library [*B*]. He was very well acquainted with good manuſcripts, and good editions; and he took care that the manuſcripts which were bought for the ornament of that library, ſhould not lie buried like a treaſure hid under ground, but he publiſhed the moſt curious of them, with notes of his own. He made good ſcholars, and many reſorted to Augſburg upon his account (*a*) [*C*]. He died there in 1617. I will mention what Scaliger ſaid of him [*D*]. Mr Huet has not only commended his diligence in finding out old manuſcripts, but alſo his ſkill in tranſlating (*b*).

(*a*) *Taken from* Spizelius in Templo Honoris reſerato, pag. 328, & ſeq. & ex Theatro Freheri, pag. 1511, 1512.

(*b*) Huetius, de claris Interpretibus, pag 229. *See alſo* Colomiés, Biblioth. Choiſie, pag. 194.

[*A*] *The public is indebted to him for the edition of ſeveral Greek authors.*] He publiſhed the eight books of Origen againſt Celſus, in Greek and Latin, at Augſburg 1605 in Quarto. The wiſdom of Jeſus, the ſon of Sirach, or *Eccleſiaſticus*, in Greek and Latin, with notes, at Antwerp, in the year 1604. The *Bibliotheca* of Photius in Greek, with notes, at Augsburg in the year 1601, in Folio. The Hiſtory of Procopius, in Greek, with notes, in the ſame city, in the year 1607, in Folio. Theſe two laſt books had never been printed. *Geographica aliquot excellentiſſimorum authorum Marciani, Scylacis, Artemidori, Dicæarchi*, at Augsburg, in the year 1600. in Quarto. Three or four treatiſes of Philo. *Eclogæ legationum Dexippi Athenienſis, Eunapii, P. Patricii, Priſci Sophiſtæ, Malchi Philad. Menandri cum excerptorum corollis è libris Diodori Siculi amiſſis*, at Augsburg, 1603, in 8vo. Some treatiſes of the ancient fathers, *&c.*

[*B*] *He cannot be ſufficiently praiſed for the pains he took to enrich their library.*] Spizelius acquaints us with it: his words ſhew, that Antony Eparchus, biſhop of Corfu, had collected excellent manuſcripts, which fell into Hoeſchelius's hands. ‘Cum inſuper celebratiſſimæ Bibliothecæ Auguſtanæ adminiſtratio ipſi eſſet demandata, omni virium niſu ejus procuravit incrementum, nec ulli parcens labori, libros excuſos pariter ac manuſcriptos, maximè Græcos, melioris item notæ authores, ac librorum editiones conquiſivit, ſicque Bibliothecam Auguſtanam veluti publicum aliquod Ærarium inſtruxit ad omnium promiſcuè indigentiam ſublevandam. Et cum rariſſimorum Codicum MSS. Græcorum, magno ære ab Antonio Eparcho Epiſcopo Corcyrenſi coemptorum copiam eſſet conſecutus, maximam curam adhibuit, ne theſaurus iſte librarius in arcanis Bibliothecæ hujus receſſibus veluti in perpetuo quodam cuſtodiretur carcere, ſed in publicam etiam lucem magno cum totius Republicæ literariæ bono & commodo prodiret (1). ——— *Being appointed keeper of the famous library at Augsburg, he ſpared no pains to encreaſe it, and to ſeek out both books and manuſcripts, eſpecially of the Greek authors, and in general, all authors and editions of any note. And by that means made it a noble treaſury to ſupply the wants of the learned in every ſcience. And having got a large collection of very rare Greek manuſcripts, bought at a great price from Antonius Eparchus, biſhop of Corfu, he took effectual care that this precious treaſure of learning ſhould not lye hid in the corners of this library, as in a kind of perpetual confinement, but that it ſhould appear in public to the great advantage of the learned world.*’ The Catalogue of the Greek manuſcripts of that library, compoſed by Hoeſchelius, and publiſhed in the year 1595, is a maſter-piece (2).

[*C*] *He made good ſcholars, and many reſorted to Augsburg on his account.*] I will make uſe again of Spizelius's words. ‘Quam præclare, *ſays he* (3), quamque feliciter demandatæ ſibi functioni ſatisfecerit, plurimi teſtari poſſunt viri eruditi qui è variis Germaniæ, Italiæ, Belgiique civitatibus Hoeſchelii gratia Auguſtam ſe contulerunt, quibus viri hujus inſtitutione uti, inque lingua Græca proficere curæ & cordi fuit. Vere de illo dici poteſt quod

Mille foro dedit juvenes, bis mille miniſtrûm
Adjecit numero purpureæque togæ.

How ſucceſsfully he performed the duties of his profeſſion, many learned men can teſtify, who came from ſeveral cities of Germany, Italy, and Holland, to Augsburg, that they might be under Hoeſchelius's tuition, and make progreſs in the Greek language. It may be truly ſaid of him, that thouſands came from under his tuition who were ornaments to all the three learned profeſſions.’ Colomiés names ſome travellers, who mightily praiſed Hoeſchelius (4).

[*D*] *I will mention what Scaliger ſaid of him.*] ‘Hoeſchelius a Lutheran, but a learned man: if Velſerus did not ſupport him, he had been expelled before now. He is a great pedant, but a good man. Scaliger ſent him his *Procopius*, but he had one more compleat from the library of Bavaria. Hoeſchelius, in his *Procopius*, has printed ſome fragments of my letters, and of thoſe of Caſaubon. He is now printing Origen . . . . . Hoeſchelius non eſt magnus Græcus, ſed diligentiſſimus (5) —— *Hoeſchelius is no great critic in the Greek language, but very diligent.*’

(1) Spizelius, in Templo Honoris reſerato, pag. 330.

(2) *See* Colomiés, Biblioth. choiſie, pag. 194.

(3) Spizelius, in Templo Honoris, pag. 329, 330.

(4) Ubi ſupra, pag. 195.

(5) In Scaligeranis ſecundis, pag. m. 112.

HOFFMAN (Daniel) ſuperintendant and profeſſor at Helmſtadt (*a*), was the head of a theological faction [*A*], which raiſed ſome diſturbances towards the end of the XVIth century. He raiſed ſome difficulties upon the Formulary of Concord which was to be ſubſcribed; and inſtead of concurring with Dr John Andreas, for the defence of that Formulary, he made uſe of captious diſtinctions. He would not admit the Ubiquity, but only the preſence of Jesus Christ in many places. That quarrel, which laſted not long, left peoples minds diſpoſed to diviſion [*B*]. So that afterwards other

(*a*) *He ſucceeded Tilemannus Heſhuſius in the year* 1588. Melch. Adam. in Vit. Theol. pag. 622.

[*A*] *He was head of a theological faction.*] This was the thirteenth ſchiſm that happened in the Lutheran church. ‘Decimi tertii ſchiſmatis autores *Helmſtadienſis*, interque eos præcipuus *Heſhuſius & Hoffmannus*, peſſimo exemplo extiterunt. Formulæ enim concordiæ cum ſubſcribendum, & apologia conficienda eſſet, illi, livore dicam an protervia, pium J. Andreæ conatum ſpernentes, cum Chriſtum exaltatum omnibus rebus ob realem idiomatum communicationem deberent dicere præſentem, multipræſentiam ejus ſaltem defendebant (1) ——— *Heſhuſius and Hoffman were the heads of the thirteenth ſchiſm at Helmſtadt. For when the Form of Concord was to be ſubſcribed, and an apology to be compoſed, whether led by envy or obſtinacy, deſpiſing the pious endeavours of John Andreas, inſtead of owning as they ought, that CHRIST now exalted, is preſent with all things, becauſe of the real communication of the idioms, only maintain his multipreſence.*’ The Jeſuit Adam Contzen obſerves under the year 1584, that Hoffman's antagoniſt was preacher to Henry Julius, duke of Brunſwic (2), and that this prince, in the quality of adminiſtrator of the biſhopric of Halberſtadt, impoſed ſilence on the parties. See alſo what he ſays under the year 1592.

[*B*] *That quarrel . . . . left peoples minds diſpoſed to diviſion.*] The firſt author that I quote in the preceding remark, goes on thus. ‘Sed in cineribus ſuffocata eſt

(1) Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. lib. iii, ſect. ii, pag. 871. Edit. 1679.

(2) Hinc factum ut Daniel Hoffmannus Superintendens & Profeſſor Helmſtadienſis, & Baſilius Staterus Henrici Julii Ducis Brunſwicenſis concionator aulicus, graviter inter ſeſe de hoc dogmate contenderent. *Adam. Contzen, in Jubilo Jubilorum, pag.* 234. *See alſo pag.* 286.

other matters were diſputed with great heat, Hoffman being ſtill head of a party. The queſtion was, amongſt other things, what uſe ought to be made of philoſophical principles in Divinity; and it is to be obſerved, that the profeſſors of Philoſophy took that ſide which was moſt favourable to the orthodox [*C*]. Daniel Hoffman and Theodore Beza wrote againſt one

‘eſt controverſia, cui utinam fomes novus poſtea non eſſet quæſitus! Sopita jaceat cum altera illa, *qua de reſurrectione impiorum quærebatur, an virtute meriti Chriſti futura ſit, necne? ut & cum illa, qua quærebatur, an ſemper in forma ſyllogiſtica diſputari debeat: & cum aliis quæſtionibus vexatis, de philoſophiæ uſu & abſu* (3). —— *But this controverſy was buried in it's own aſhes, I wiſh that new fuel had not afterwards been ſought for to it! let it reſt forever together with that* concerning the reſurrection of the wicked, to wit, whether it would be by virtue of the merits of CHRIST? And this whether we ought always to diſpute in the ſyllogiſtic form? and with many other queſtions, which were much toſſed concerning the uſe and abuſe of Philoſophy.’

[*C*] *The profeſſors of Philoſophy took that ſide which is moſt favourable to orthodoxy.*] This is the teſtimony James Thomaſius gives them in one of his prefaces. ‘Celebris eſt, *ſays he,* quæ parentum noſtrorum memoriâ Juliam concuſſit Academiam, Hofmanniana controverſia, finiente ſeculo proximè præterito cœpta, ineunte hoc noſtro ſeculo non ſine Philoſophorum, qui tum ab ὀρθοδοξίας partibus ſtabant, laude ſopita. De quâ nihil addam, tùm quòd ob recentiorem memoriam nemini res eſt ignota . . . . . tùm maximè, quòd in perſonâ Theologi unius alteriuſve inconſiderati, ſanctiſſimæ ſcientiæ parcendum eſſe omninò exiſtimo (4). — *The famous Hoffmannian controverſy, which, in the days of our fathers, ſhook the Julian academy, aroſe about the end of the laſt century, and ended in the beginning of the preſent, much to the honour of the profeſſors of Philoſophy, who maintained the orthodox ſide. I ſhall add no more concerning it, becauſe the affair is ſo recent that no body is ignorant of it, but eſpecially becauſe I think the ſacred ſcience of Theology ought not to ſuffer on account of the raſhneſs of a few divines.*’ He examines in that diſcourſe, whether a thing can be true in Philoſophy, and falſe in Divinity, as ſome have pretended; and he obſerves, that amongſt thoſe who have ventured to maintain ſuch a paradox, ſome have been induced to it by an exceſſive reſpect for Ariſtotle, and others by an inordinate hatred to that philoſopher. Theſe laſt were the divines. ‘Ad Theologos venio, è diverſo planè affectu idem dogma defenſantes. Non enim amore, ſed odio Ariſtotelis; non veneratione, ſed dedignatione Philoſophorum, in iſtam temeritatem, ne quid gravius dicam, præcipitati ſunt (5). —— *I come now to the divines, who defended the ſame opinion from quite contrary motives. For they fell into that raſh ſtep, to ſay no worſe of it, not from their love but from their hatred to Ariſtotle, not from their veneration, but from their contempt of Philoſophers.*’ That the readers may the better underſtand what was Daniel Hoffman's opinion, I will add another paſſage of Thomaſius. It contains a thing which deſerves on it's own account to be related (6). ‘Niſi enim fallor, infelix illud & ſcandalo plenum certamen, quod noſtrâ memoriâ ſuper Quæſtione, ſitne DEUS peccati cauſa per accidens? certatum fuit, è ſepultæ Hofmannianæ controverſiæ cineribus aut propullulavit, aut videri ſaltem voluit propullulaſſe. Non planè abludere à vero quæ dixi, facile (opinor) perſpiciet, qui CL. Viri, Pauli Slevogni Pervigilium *de diſſidio Theologi & Philoſophi in utriuſque principii fundato,* (hoc enim libello nomen eſt) pervolutaverit *. Enimverò hic inter primos fuit, qui quæſtionem modo dictam in iſthoc ſcripto, quod vigeſimus tertius hujus ſeculi annus produxit in ſcenam, excitaret, hujuſque negativam in Scholis Theologorum, affirmativam inter Philoſophos veram eſſe † defenderet. Cui anno ſtatim ſequente Vir non minori eruditionis laude clarus Andreas Keſlerus diſcurſuum Theologicorum quadrigam ‡ oppoſuit. —— *If I am not miſtaken that unfortunate controverſy, which lately gave ſo much offence about the queſtion, Whether* GOD *be the accidental cauſe of ſin? aroſe or would ſeem to have ariſen from the aſhes of the Hoffmannian controverſy. That I am not entirely miſtaken in judging ſo, I believe any body may perceive who will read the* Pervigilium de diſſidio Theologi & Philoſophi in utriuſque principiis fundato, *of the learned Paulus Slevogtus. For he was one of the the firſt who revived that queſtion in that book which appeared in the year 1623, and therein maintained that the negative of it was true in Theology, and the affirmative true in Philoſophy. It was anſwered the year following by the no leſs learned Andreas Keſlerus in his* Quadriga Diſcurſuum Theologicorum.’ Thomaſius is in the right to ſay, it was a very ſcandalous thing to ſee people maintain, that it is true in Philoſophy, that GOD is the author of ſin by accident, but that it is not true in Divinity. And he is in the right to approve of Caſmannus, who ſaid that ſuch a diviſion of truth gives a handle to maintain the moſt impious errors (7); for indeed nothing is more proper to introduce Scepticiſm, becauſe by ſuch ſort of reaſoning, we reduce truth to the condition of corporal qualities. From the ſame body appearing little or big, according as we ſee it with glaſſes, or without, we have reaſon to conclude, that we are ignorant whether it be great or ſmall, abſolutely ſpeaking, and that the abſolute littleneſs or greatneſs of bodies, is unknown to us If therefore the ſame propoſition was true and falſe, according as it is conſidered either in Divinity or Philoſophy, it would neceſſarily follow, that we could not know truth in itſelf, and that it conſiſted only in a mutable relation to the diſpoſitions of our mind; as the pleaſantneſs of foods conſiſts only in a certain relation to the diſpoſitions of the tongue; which when they happen to change the foods which were agreeable are no longer ſo. I am going to cite an author, who will tell us, that our Hoffman, and his party, maintained, that Philoſophy ought to be baniſhed the univerſities, as a moſt pernicious diſcipline, according to which many theological truths are falſe. The oppoſers of this faction were excluded from the miniſtry. At laſt, by the authority of the prince, thoſe diſputes were quieted, and Hoffman was obliged to ſubmit. ‘Contendebant Hoffmannus & ipſius aſſeclæ *Philoſophiam pugnare cum Theologia: multa eſſe vera in Theologia quæ ſint falſa in Philoſophia, & contra; exterminandam Chriſtianis Academiis ut noxiam, ut toties etiam graviter ab antiqua Eccleſia damnatam.* His ſe initio ſtatim oppoſuerunt ejus Academiæ Philoſophi, *Duncanus* Liddelius Scotus Med. D. *Corn.* Martini, *Joh.* Caſelius & alii, rati ad ſe pertinere ejus defenſionem, cujus profeſſores eſſent. Res contentionibus diu acta eſt, ita ut Hoffmannus eos tandem à Miniſterio excluderet qui contrarium ſentirent. Habitæ ſæpius diſputationes & magni fluctus in illo ſimpulo excitati. Extant ejus tamen aliquam multa acta. Tandem lis ſopita eſt authoritate Principis: reſtitutus honos ſuus Philoſophiæ ejuſque Doctoribus eſt. Hoffmanniani ceſſerunt (8). —— *Hoffman and his party maintained,* that Philoſophy was repugnant to Divinity: that many things are true in Divinity, which are falſe in Philoſophy, and contrarywiſe: that Philoſophy ought to be baniſhed from Chriſtian univerſities, as pernicious, and as a thing which has been frequently, and ſolemnly condemned by the antient church. *The profeſſors of Philoſophy in that univerſity,* viz. *Duncan Liddal a Scotchman Med. D. Corn. Martini, John Caſelius, and ſome others, oppoſed themſelves to theſe opinions, thinking it their duty to defend Philoſophy of which they were teachers. The contentions continued fierce a long while, to ſuch a degree that Hofman at laſt excluded thoſe from the miniſtry, who maintained the contrary opinion. Many diſputations were had and great diſſenſions raiſed. Some of the deciſions are ſtill extant. At laſt the controverſy was ended by the authority of the prince: Philoſophy and it's profeſſors were reſtored to their honours, and Hofman and his partiſans were obliged to ſubmit.*’

To ſay that what is true in Philoſophy, is falſe in Divinity, is a pernicious error.

Henry Julius, duke of Brunſwic, ordered that Daniel Hoffman ſhould publickly acknowledge his error, and make a public recantation of it. That order was executed the ſeventh of March, 1601. See the *Memorabilia Eccleſiaſtica ſeculi a nato Chriſto decimi ſeptimi,* pag. 23, and 24 (9), and Grawerus in his book *De unica veritate.*

---

(3) Micrælius, ubi ſupra.

(4) Thomaſius, Præfat. xlii, pag. 244.

(5) Id. ibid.

(6) Id. ibid. pag. 245.

* Confirmant ſuſpicionem, quæ leguntur in veſtibulo dicti Pervigilii: aperta enim ibi litis, Helmſtadii ab Hofmanno agitatæ, mentio. Faciunt huc & quæ leguntur in controverſia Crameriana Magdeburgenſi, nam & huic aliquid affinitatis cum Hofmanniana conſtat interceſſiſſe. —— *This ſuſpicion is confirmed by what we read in the preface to the* Pervigilium, *where he plainly mentions the Helmſtadian controverſy, which was begun by Hoffman This is likewiſe confirmed by what we read in the Cramerian controverſy at Magdeburg, for it is plain, that this had ſome affinity with that of Hoffman.*

† Vide ibi Diſcurſum IV, pag. 64, & ſeq.

‡ Pro defendenda *(quod ipſum quoque legiter in titulo)* Philoſophi ac Theologi concordia.

(7) Non erubuerim dicere, duplicem illam veritatem eſſe pſeudariſtotelicum figmentum ad omnes errores & atheiſmos excuſandos & defendendos. *Caſmannus Coſmopœia, cap. i, q. 6, apud Thomaſium, Pref. xlii, pag.* 243.

(8) Georgius Hornius. Hiſtor. Philoſoph. lib vi, cap. xii, pag. 321, 322. *See Nibuſius, remark* [C].

(9) That book, compiled by Andreas Carolus, abbot of St George, in the duchy of Wirtemberg, was printed at Tubingen, in 1697.

one another, upon the controverſy of the Euchariſt. See the remark, where I give the titles of ſome of Hoffman's works [*D*].

It was not only upon the Ubiquity that our doctor quarrelled with the other miniſters, but alſo about Predeſtination; for he accuſed Hunnius of explaining it contrary to the intent of the book of the Concord. Nay, he accuſed him of having vented in Luther's chair, a more pernicious doctrine than that of the Papiſts. The book of the Concord, *ſaid he*, teaches, that the cauſe of election is wholly out of ourſelves; but Hunnius and Mylius teach, that election is founded on the foreſight of faith. Hunnius and Mylius cauſed Hoffman to be condemned in an aſſembly of divines in the year 1593, and threatned him with excommunication, if he did not ſubſcribe to their opinion. He publiſhed an apology againſt them in the year following (*b*). Hoſpinian relates this more exactly. He ſays (*c*), that ſome divines of Leipſic, Jena, and Wittemberg, having aſſiſted at the ſecond marriage of Samuel Huber, in 1593, met at Polycarp Lyſerus's houſe; and that ſome of them were of opinion, that it ought to be declared in a public and authentic form, that Daniel Hoffman was a Calviniſt, and of the number of thoſe Heretics, who ought to be avoided: but the greater number of them were for writing to him to exhort him to conform to their doctrine, under the penalty of excommunication, if he neglected to do ſo. Hunnius, in the name of the reſt, wrote a long letter to him to that purpoſe. It was againſt this letter that Hoffman publiſhed an apology in the year following (*d*), in which he declared the reaſons that hindered him from conforming to the divines of Wittemberg. He declared that he had found in their books above a hundred errors, quite contrary to the articles of the Chriſtian faith (*e*).

(*b*) *Taken from* Henry Alting. Theolog. Hiſtor. pag. 302.

(*c*) Hoſpinian. de Origini & Progreſſu Libri Concordiæ, cap li, pag. 429.

(*d*) Id. ibid. pag. 431, & ſeq.

(*e*) Id. ibid. pag. 434.

[*D*] *I give the title of ſome of Hoffman's works.*] He publiſhed at Helmſtadt in 1583. *Quæſtionum & reſponſionum in graviſſima controverſia de ſacroſancta cœna pars prima, in* 8vo. Theodore Beza refuted it in the year following; but preſently after came out (10), *Danielis Hofmanni Apologia miſſa ad Theodorum Bezam, qua τὸ ῥητὸν in verbis cœnæ dominicæ immotum, Bæza autem demonſtrationes falſiſſimæ demonſtrantur.* Beza publiſhed in 1585, *Reſponſionis pars altera contra Danielem Hofmannum*; and in the year 1586 *Conſpicillum ad Danielis Hofmanni demonſtrationes, &c.* Theſe are ſome other books of Hofman; *Reſponſio ad rationes & ſigna Chriſtophori Pezelii, &c. quibus docuit veros ſacramentarios agnoſcere: De* 17. *erroribus craſſioribus Jacobi Andreæ.* Thoſe two are in High-Dutch. Theſe which follow are in Latin. *De uſu & applicatione notionum Logicaram ad res Theologicas, & de inuſitatarum prædicationum reductione contra Goclenium*, at Francfort, 1596. *Liber apologeticus reſpondens chartis Miniſtrorum Eccleſiæ Bremenſis*, at Helmſtadt 1585. *Officina locorum Theologicorum. Explicatio ſententiæ in Epiſt. Canonica Joh. Apoſtoli*, ſanguis Jeſu Chriſti Filii Dei mundat nos ab omni peccato, Helmſtadt 1581.

(10) At Helmſtadt, in 1585.

HOFMAN (MELCHIOR) from a ſimple mechanic, ſet up for a preacher, and fell to dogmatiſing in Livonia, and elſewhere, without any ſort of call from any perſon whatever (*a*). He left Saxony in great diſcontent, and went from thence into Holſtein, in the year 1527. He was appointed miniſter at Kiel, by the king of Denmark, and he kept that poſt near two years, notwithſtanding Luther's oppoſition [*A*]. He preached up I know not what medley of Zuinglianiſm and Fanaticiſm; and hardly explained any thing to his auditors, beſides the conſtruction of the Moſaic tabernacle, the viſions of the Apocalypſe, and ſuch like things. He pretended the day of judgment would be in the year 1534. They who confuted him upon that or other points, met with their match; for, as he was a brawler, he anſwered them with the greateſt fury [*B*]. He loaded Marquardus Schuldorpius with reproaches, and accuſed him of the crime of inceſt [*C*]. To prevent the diſorders, that might ariſe from theſe diſputes, the king of Denmark appointed a conference in the year 1529 (*b*), in which Hofman was confounded: and whereas he perſiſted in his opinions, he was baniſhed out of Holſtein. From thence he went

(*a*) Ex pellione in Theologaſtrum tranſmutatus. *Mollerus, ubi infra, citat.* (*c*).

(*b*) *It was held at Flenſburg.*

[*A*] *He maintained himſelf . . . . notwithſtanding Luther's oppoſition.*] See what Luther wrote to a miniſter of Kiel (1): ‘A Melchiore pellifice velim cavere ‘vos omnes, ac curare apud Magiſtratus ne ad con‘ciones admittatur, etiamſi literas Regis oſtentet. A ‘nobis enim receſſit indignabundus, dum non volui‘mus ejus ſomnia probare. Ad docendum neque ‘valet, neque vocatus eſt. Hæc dicito nomine meo ‘omnibus veſtris, ut ipſum vitent ac tacere cogant. — ‘*I would have you all beware of Melchior the Tan*‘*ner, and apply to the magiſtrates to get him hinder*‘*ed from preaching, tho' he ſhould ſhow the king's* ‘*letters. For he went from me full of rage, be*‘*cauſe I would not approve of his dreams. He has* ‘*neither abilities nor a call to teach. Acquaint every* ‘*body with my deſire in this matter, that they may* ‘*ſhun him, and force him to ſilence.*’ Luther would have no body to hear this man who thruſt himſelf into the miniſtry, without any call or capacity. And Francis Burchard, counſellor of the dukes of Saxony, did alſo give notice to beware of him (2).

(1) Luther. Epiſt. ad Wilh. Praveſt, anno 1528. *See* Tom. II, Epiſt. Lutheri à Joh. Aurifabro Francofurti ad Viadrum ann. 1597, editarum, pag 371. Mollerus, Iſagoge ad Hiſtor. Cherſon. Cimbricæ, Part. III, pag. 129.

(2) In Epiſt. ad Petrum Suavenium Conſil. Danicum A. 1528, ſcripta, quam exhibet J. Manlii Farrago Epiſtol. Melanch. Part. III, pag. 493, 494. *Moler. ibid.*

[*B*] *He anſwered them with the greateſt fury.*] All his books were written in the vulgar language: His apology againſt Nicholas Ambſdorf, firſt miniſter at Magdeburg, was printed in the year 1528. This miniſter had confuted him, concerning the time of the world's end. ‘Oppoſuit ei Hofmannus apologiam a‘marulentiſſimam . . . . in iſta convitiorum plauſtra in ‘Adverſarium evomit (3). —— *Hofman wrote an apo*‘*logy, wherein he pours out all manner of reproaches* ‘*againſt his adverſary.*’

(3) Moler. ibid. pag. 130.

[*C*] *He reproached Schuldorpius with the crime of inceſt.*] The accuſation was founded upon Schuldorpius's marrying his niece. Marq. Schuldorpio, Ki‘lonienſi, Parocho Sleſvic. qui ſuam de S. Cœna ſen‘tentiam impugnarat, duobus itidem ſcriptis, Kilonii ‘ann. 1528 impreſſis . . . . . reſpondit & hominem, ‘cum alias ob cauſas, tum ob matrimonium cum filia ‘ſororis, ope eloquentiæ ſuæ caninæ, miſere exagita‘vit (4). —— *He anſwered Marquardus Schuldorpius* ‘*of Kiel, miniſter of Sleſwic, who had impugned his* ‘*doctrine concerning the Euchariſt, by two pieces, print*‘*ed at Kiel, anno* 1528, *and in his cynical ſtile hand*‘*led him very roughly on ſeveral heads, and particular*‘*ly on his having married his niece.*’ Schuldorpius alledges in his defence, among other reaſons, the authority of Luther, whoſe letter he produced, wherein he confeſſes, that he adviſed that marriage, and maintains, that it is lawful. ‘Utrique Schuldorpius mox ‘repoſuit *Epiſtolam ad Fideles civitatis Kilonienſis* ‘Saxonicam,

(4) Id. ibid.

went to Straſburg, where he publiſhed a falſe relation of the conference [*D*]. He was imprisoned there in the year 1532, after a publick diſpute, wherein he engaged with the miniſters. This loſt his reputation with his followers. He died in the year 1533, or thereabouts (*c*). He was not of Holſtein as ſome have affirmed [*E*].

Several writers ſay, that Hofman began to diſtinguiſh himſelf in Straſburg (*d*), and was followed by a crowd of diſciples, and that removing to Embden in the year 1528 [*F*], he there vented his viſions with ſo aſtoniſhing a ſucceſs, as to paſs for the firſt Patriarch of the Anabaptiſts of the Netherlands and the Lower Germany [*G*]. He ſo infatuated his followers, that they took him for that Elias, whom God is to ſend upon earth before the day of judgment. He returned from thence to Straſburg, with hopes of ſeeing the accompliſhment of a prophecy, that concerned him [*H*], and which had been delivered by a good old man of Frieſland. He there preached up Anabaptiſm openly. The diſturbances he raiſed, occaſioned the calling of a ſynod in June, 1532, where he was permitted to diſpute with the miniſters. He was ſolidly confuted, but he continued, notwithſtanding, to dogmatize, and it was thought neceſſary to impriſon him [*I*], the people thinking themſelves upon the brink of great troubles, becauſe his followers

'Saxonicam, eique adjecit Lutheri ad ſe literas, in eandem Dialectum transfuſas, in quibus ille conjugio huic, cujus ſe ſuaſorem fuiſſe fatetur, ingenti cum παῤῥησίᾳ patrocinari, ac Abrahami, Saram ducentis, exemplo defendere iſtud non dubitat (5).'

[*D*] *He publiſhed a falſe relation of the conference at Flensburg.*] He maintained, that he had ſtopped Pomeranus's mouth (6), and that the ſecretaries of the conference were forgers (7). Pomeranus, to refute theſe vauntings, publiſhed the acts of the conference with the moſt authentic formalities. He added to them a refutation of Hofman's writing, and the converſion of Heggius (8), which was one of the fruits of that diſpute: Heggius had been one of Hofman's ſeconds in it, and he gained ſo much knowledge by it, as induced him to renounce his ſect (9). The other of Hofman's ſeconds had done the ſame thing. Pomeranus did not appear at the conference as a diſputant, but as one of the directors under the eldeſt ſon of his Daniſh majeſty (10). He ended the conference with an oration, in which he confuted Hofman's arguments. *Finem Colloquio oratione Bugenhagii adverſus argumenta ipſius ἀνασκευαστικῇ impoſitum* (11).

[*E*] *He was not of Holſtein as ſome have reported.*] See the words of Mr Mollerus (12): 'Suevus ortu fuit, non autem Holſatus, uti Conrad. Dietericus † & Sebaſtianus Schmidius ‡ falſo ſibi perſuadent. —— *He was originally of Suabia, and not of Holſtein, as Conradus Dietericus and Sebaſtian Schmidius falſely affirm.*'

[*F*] *Several authors affirm that he removed to Embden in the year* 1528.] After Mr Mollerus's proofs, it cannot be doubted that Hofman was at Kiel in the year 1528, and 1529, and that he had retired thither upon his leaving Saxony in diſcontent (13), and therefore we may believe they are miſtaken, who make him remove from Strasburg to Embden in 1528. Mr Ottius obſerves, that many ſay this; and he doth not criticiſe them. 'Embdam Argentorato abiſſe Melchiorem Hoffmannum plures ajunt. Ergo non demum anno 1531 eò conceſſit niſi forte redierit, vel diutius ibi commoratus ſit (14). Theſe words inform us, that ſome ſay, Hofman went to Embden in 1531. This ſeems to be the true epoch of his miniſtry at Embden: for ſince he publiſhed in Strasburg a relation of the conference of Flensburg (15) in the year 1529; it is a proof that he went to Strasburg as ſoon as he was expelled from Holſtein. It is very probable that from Strasburg he went to Embden, and that he returned again to Strasburg: he was there in the year 1532. Note, that Mr Mollerus promiſes a relation of the tumults he raiſed in Strasburg and Embden, after he left Holſtein (16). Is not this to tell us, that he went to Embden after he had divulged his dreams in Strasburg, in the year 1529? Mr Hoornbeeck has reaſon for ſaying, that he returned from Embden to Strasburg, but not for ſaying, that he went from Straſburg to Embden in 1528 (17). This author obſerves, that at his going from Embden, he left there one Trypmaacker, who quarrelling with his colleagues, retired into Holland, and became the firſt apoſtle of the Anabaptiſts. Caſſander is leſs miſtaken about the date of this fanatic's miniſtry. 'Donec tandem, *ſays he*, ſub ann. 1532 Melchior quidam of Hmannus, arte pellio, hanc novam contagionem cum aliis quibuſdam non minus pernicioſis erroribus in Germaniam hanc inferiorem & Belgicam invexit (18). —— *Till at laſt, about the year* 1542, *one Melchior Hofman, a Tanner, brought this new contagion, together with ſome other no leſs dangerous errors, into the Netherlands, and into Holland.*'

[*G*] *He paſſed for the firſt patriarch of the Anabaptiſts of the Netherlands, and Lower Germany.*] The above-cited words of Caſſander prove this. Here follow two other witneſſes. 'Huic Patriarchæ etiam eorum qui in inferiori Germania ſuccreverunt, Anabaptiſtarum tradux adſcribi ſolet. —— *The origin of the Anabaptiſts in Lower Germany, is likewiſe uſually aſcribed to this patriarch.*' It is thus, Frederic Spanheim ſpeaks (19). 'Qui huc Anabaptiſtica deliria attulit ex Germania ſuperiore primus fuit Melchior Hofman. —— *Melchior Hofman was the firſt who introduced the dreams of the Anabaptiſts into this country from Germany.*' Hoornbeeck ſays this (20).

[*H*] *He hoped to ſee the accompliſhment of a prophecy that concerned him.*] Whilſt he was planting his goſpel at Embden with great heat, and ſtoutly re-baptizing people, there was a good old man there, who poſſeſſed him with a deſire of returning to Strasburg. This old man was of that party. He propheſied, that the magiſtrates of Strasburg ſhould impriſon Hofman, but that at ſix months end the priſoner ſhould be delivered, and ſhould go and preach the goſpel over all the earth, as another Elias, having with him a great train of prophets, and the one hundred and forty four thouſand ſealed perſons, mentioned in the Revelation (21). Hofman having publickly diſputed with the miniſters the eleventh of June, 1532, and not ceaſing to ſpread his enthuſiaſms, after he had been confounded in that diſpute, was put in priſon. When he ſaw that part of the prophecy was accompliſhed, he became more inſolent. He ſhook off the duſt from his feet, he threw his hat upon the ground, and proteſted before God, that he would feed upon nothing but bread and water, till he ſhould point out with his finger him that ſent him. His hopes were confounded, for he died in priſon (22). A hundred inſtances ſhew, that the moſt chimerical predictions have had ſome parts of them confirmed by the event: which has given ſtrength to the error; nothing contributing more to the drawing in of theſe viſionaries and their adherents. It is eſpecially with relation to theſe matters, that it may be ſaid, *The end crowns the work*. Men ſhould be very cautious of judging of the whole by a part, *ex ungue leonem*. The concluſion is to be waited for, and the firſt ſucceſs ought to be diſtruſted; for this is a ſnare, and a dangerous allurement.

[*I*] *They found it neceſſary to impriſon him.*] Spanhemius, Hoornbeeck, and many others, affirm, that Hofman diſputed in June 1532, and was not impriſoned till after the obſtinacy with which he ſtill continued to dogmatize after the diſpute. But I will here produce an author, who places that conference in June 1533, and aſſures us, that this enthuſiaſt was brought out of priſon to diſpute with the miniſters. 'Anno 1533, Menſe Junio die 11, Hofmannus Argentorati è vinculis ad publicam diſputationem productus & admiſſus fuit: à quo tempore inſtaurationem Regni DEI ortam eſſe ſui affirmabant. Iſdem Hoffmannus Authoritate prædictionum cujuſdam verè deliri Leonardi Joeſt civis Argentinenſis, & aliorum ſimilium fanaticorum hominum, multa vana de urbe Argent. prædixit, &c. quæ tamen ab urbe non recepta,

(*c*) *Taken from the* Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ *of John Molerus*, Part. III, pag. 128, & ſeq.

(*d*) Argentinæ inclareſcere cœpit. *Frider. Spanhemius, de Origine & Progreſſu Anabaptiſt. n.* 22, *pag. m.* 211.

(5) Id. ibid. pag. 131.

(6) His name is *Joh. Bugenhagius*: but he is commonly called *Pomeranus*, from his native country.

(7) Idem, Mollerus, pag. 133.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Paraſtatæ Hofmanni fuere Johan. à Campen & Jac. Hegge Dantiſcanus, ad ſaniorem in colloquio hoc mentem reducti. *Id. Moller. pag.* 131, 132.

(10) Mollerus, ibid. pag. 131.

(11) Id. ibid.

(12) Idem. pag. 127.

† In Analyſi Periochæ Evang. Dom. II. Adventus.

‡ In Diſſ. de Chiliaſmo Apocalyptico, pag. 9.

(13) An. 1527. Magdeburgo in Holſatiam delatus. Mollerus, ubi ſupra, pag. 128. Seckendorf, Hiſt. Lutheran. lib. ii, pag. 122, *ſays he departed from Wittemberg.*

(14) Johan. Henricus Ottius, Hiſtor. Anabapt. ad ann. 1528, n. 1, pag. 45.

(15) It was held a little after Eaſter, in the year 1529. *See* Mollerus, ubi ſupra, pag. 131.

(16) Tumultuum, quos Hofmannus poſt abitum ex Holſatia, Argentinæ & Embdæ concitavit Anabaptiſtico-Enthuſiaſticorum. *Id. ibid. pag.* 133.

(17) Hoornb. ſumma Controverſ. pag. m. 362.

(18) Caſſander, Epiſt. Dedicat. Tractatus de Baptiſmo.

(19) Spanh. de Orig. & Progreſſu Anabapt. n. 22, pag. m. 211.

(20) Hoornbeeck, ſumma Controv. pag. m. 361.

(21) Chap. vii, and xiv.

(22) *Taken from* Hoornbeeck, ubi ſupra, pag. 362.

followers ſaid that the town of Straſburg was to be the New Jeruſalem, where the new kingdom of CHRIST ſhould be eſtabliſhed, and that as Hofman was the Elias that was to come, Polterman was the Enoch who was to ſecond him. When they ſaw Hofman in priſon, they gave out, that he ſhould come out with one hundred forty four thouſand ſealed people, who ſhould anathematize the earth, and break through all the obſtacles which ſhould be oppoſed to them. Our Elias, and our Enoch, ſaid they, are the two olives, and the two candleſticks in the Revelation (*e*), which no body can hurt, and if any one attempt it, fire ſhall come out of their mouth, and devour their enemies. When they ſaw Hofman did not come out of priſon at the time foretold by certain prophets, they were in a great conſternation; but to amuſe them, he ſent them word, to reſt for two years, after the example of Eſdras and Haggai, who were forced for a like ſpace of time to interrupt the building of the temple. He died in priſon, and fruſtrated the hopes of his diſciples (*f*). I will mention ſome of his Hereſies [*K*]. Some ſay that he began to preach near the Rhine, after the defeat of the peaſants in 1525 (*g*).

(*e*) *See* Revelation, chap. xi, ver. 4, 5.

(*f*) *Taken from* Frederic Spanheim, de Orig. & Progreſſu Anabaptiſt. pag. 211.

(*g*) Joh. Henricus Ottius, Hiſt. Anabapt. ad ann. 1525, n. 21, pag. 36.

' cepta, ſed aquâ & igni interdicebatur omnibus, qui ' eam ſectam publicè privatimque tuebantur (23). —— ' *In the year* 1533, *June* 11, *Hofman was taken out of* ' *priſon, and admitted to a public diſpute: and from* ' *this period his diſciples date the inſtauration of the* ' *kingdom of* GOD. *The ſame Hofman likewiſe, on the* ' *authority of the prophecies, of one Leonard Joeſt, a* ' *delirious man, and citizen of Strasburg, and of other* ' *fanatics of the ſame ſort, predicted many vain things* ' *concerning that city, &c. which were not received by* ' *it; but, on the contrary, all who either publickly or* ' *privately embraced that ſect, were baniſhed from* ' *thence.*' Ottius (24) follows this chronology; which ſhews that many faults have crept into the narratives of the hiſtorians of Anabaptiſm. He quotes a paſſage of Henry Urſinus (25), where we learn that Hofman that year propheſied, that Strasburg ſhould be the New Jeruſalem, as Rome was Babylon; that Strasburg ſhould be beſieged the ſame year, and that there ſhould be a great ſlaughter in it; and that this man preferred his predictions before thoſe of Iſaiah and Jeremiah; and that Matthias and his favourers applied to Munſter all theſe fine prerogatives of Strasburg, which diſpleaſed Hofman when he knew it.

[*K*] *I ſhall mention ſome of his hereſies.*] He taught, I. that the word was not united to the fleſh taken from the Holy Virgin: his reaſon was, that all humane fleſh is defiled with ſin, and conſequently curſed. II. That JESUS CHRIST has but one nature. III. That the obtaining of Salvation depends on ourſelves, and that we are only ſaved or damned according to the uſe that we make of our free-will. IV. That the baptiſm of infants proceeds rather from the enemy of GOD and men, than from GOD (26).

(23) Ottius, Hiſt. Anabapt. ad ann. 1533, n. 6, pag. 61. *He quotes* Revius in Hiſtor. Georgii. *But he ſhould have quoted* Nicolaus Bleſdikius; *for it is he who wrote the* Hiſtory of David George, *and Revius did but publiſh it.*

(24) Ottius, ibid.

(25) Henr. Urſinus, Præf. in Apocalyp. in fine.

(26) *Taken from* Spanheim, ubi ſupra, pag. 211.

HONORIA, ſiſter of Valentinian III, incurred the indignation of that emperor by her leudneſs, and endeavoured to revenge herſelf by another crime. She ſollicited Attila to undertake the conqueſt of the empire, and promiſed to marry him. Authors vary a little about this. Some pretend that ſhe preſerved her chaſtity till ſhe ſaw her deſign of marrying the king of the Huns miſcarry [*A*]: others ſay that before ſhe had that intention, ſhe had led a diſorderly life [*B*].

[*A*] *Some pretend that ſhe preſerved her chaſtity till ſhe ſaw her deſign of marrying the king of the Huns miſcarry.*] A modern author, who quotes Sigonius and Marcellinus, ſays that Honoria, devoured with a luſtful flame, ſent an eunuch to Attila, to offer herſelf in marriage to him with the empire; that Attila ſent ſome embaſſadors to the emperor Valentinian to ask Honoria of him; but that before their return he fell ſo much in love with a young lady of his own nation, that he married her, and died on his wedding-day by too much drinking and careſſing his ſpouſe: that upon this, Honoria, being diſappointed of her hopes, gave up herſelf to ſome galants, who got her with child, after which ſhe was ſent to Conſtantinople. ' Hæc ' libidine inflammata Eunuchum legatum ad Attilam ' Hunnorum regem miſit, conjugium & regnum ei offerens. Miſit igitur Attila legatos ad Valentinianum, qui ſuaſionibus minas adjicientes, Honoriam ' petebant, ſed priuſquam legati Roma reverterentur, ' Attila . . . . . puellæ cujuſdam . . . . . amore captus ' . . . . . nuptias cum ea celebravit . . . . . Honoria igitur cum ſpe ſua fruſtaretur, aliis ſe ſubſternit: inde ' gravida facta, Conſtantinopolim mittitur (1).'

[*B*] *Others ſay, that before ſhe had that intention, ſhe led a diſorderly life.*] ' Honoria, ſiſter of the emperor Valentinian, giving herſelf up to the ſteward ' of his houſhold, was diſgracefully driven out of her ' brother's palace, and afterwards forced to retire into ' the eaſt to Theodoſius. This inſpired her with ſo ' furious a paſſion for revenge, that finding no other ' way to ſatisfy it, ſhe ſecretly ſent to Attila, to perſuade him to undertake the conqueſt of Italy, repreſenting to him, that the weakneſs of Valentinian, ' and the confuſion of the affairs of the empire, would ' make it very eaſy for him (2).' According to Bonfinius's account (3), ſhe was in a convent when ſhe ſent to ſound Attila, who perceiving that the affair did not go on, fancied that they made a jeſt of him; and that this induced him to marry the daughter of the king of the Bactrians. If Honoria was in a cloyſter, it is a ſign ſhe had behaved herſelf ill.

(1) Chriſtian. Matthiæ Theat. Hiſtor. pag. m. 733.

(2) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de l'Arian. Tom. III, livr. ix, pag. 6, & 7, Dutch Edit.

(3) Hiſtor. Hungar. Decad. I, lib. vii.

HONORIUS, a Roman emperor, ſon of Theodoſius. Not to repeat what is to be found in Moreri, I ſhall only ſpeak of his marriages. He married ſucceſſively Stilico's two daughters [*A*], who both died, as is ſaid, virgins. Zoſimus relates hereupon ſome very ſingular circumſtances [*B*], not to be found in other hiſtorians; but he

[*A*] *He married Stilico's two daughters..*] The firſt was called Mary, and the other Thermantia. Their mother Serena, fired with ambition, did not ſtay till Mary ſhould arrive to the age of marriage, in order to give her to the emperor; and after Mary's death, ſhe was in as great haſte to marry Thermantia to the ſame prince. The words I am going to quote, prove that they died maids. *Stilico Comes, cujus filiæ duæ Maria & Thermantia, ſingulæ uxores Honorii principis fuerant, utraque tamen virgo defuncta* (1). And yet the poet Claudian tells us, that Honorius and Mary lay together (2). See what Zoſimus tells us below.

[*B*] *Zoſimus relates hereupon ſome ſingular circumſtances.*] Serena, not being able to reſolve upon deferring the marriage of her daughter Mary with the emperor, nor to conſent that nature ſhould be forced by the conſummation of the marriage with Mary, who was not yet ripe for it, reſolved on a medium, which was to debilitate Honorius. She found out a woman experienced in this ſort of charms, who contrived the matter ſo, that Honorius when he went to bed to his young ſpouſe, had neither inclination nor power to pay what is called the conjugal duty. Mary died ſoon after with her virginity. Honorius ſome time after courted Thermantia, Mary's ſiſter: the father

(1) Marcellinus Comes in Chron. apud Barthium in Claudian. pag. 766. Edit. in 4to.

(2) Tyrio qua fuſus Honorius oſtro, Carpebat teneros Maria cum conjuge ſomnos. *Claudian. de Bello Gildonico, ver.* 327.

he is accuſed of a groſs contradiction [*C*], which every reader muſt perceive at firſt ſight.

ther was not inclined to that marriage; but Serena paſſionately deſired it, in order to maintain her authority. *Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ὁνώριος ἀπὸ πολλοῦ Μαρίας αὐτῷ τελευτησάσης τῆς γαμετῆς τὴν ταύτης ἀδελφὴν Θερμαντίαν ᾔτει οἱ δοθῆναι πρὸς γάμον.* Imperator autem Honorius, Maria conjuge jampridem rebus humanis exempta, ſororem ejus Thermantiam ſibi matrimonio jungi petebat (3). The marriage was concluded, but was but of ſhort continuance; Thermantia ſoon dying with the ſame fate as her ſiſter. That is to ſay, ſhe lay with a man who neither had the deſire, nor the power to know her: the ſorcereſs, whom Serena had made uſe of, renewed the operation of her charms. Zoſimus doth not expreſsly ſay this. It is only a conſequence I draw from his words. I will ſet them down at length; they deſerve it, as containing a very ſingular fact. *Τοῦ γάμου πρὸς τὴν Μαρίαν Ὁνωρίου ἐνισταμένου, γάμων ὥραν οὔπω τὴν κόρην ἄγουσαν ἡ μήτηρ ὁρῶσα, καὶ οὔτε ἀναβαλέσθαι τὸν γάμον ἀνεχομένη, καὶ τὸ παρ' ἡλικίαν εἰς μίξιν ἐκδοῦναι, φύσεως ἀδικίαν καὶ οὐδὲν ἕτερον εἶναι νομίζουσα, γυναικὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα θεραπεύειν ἐπισταμένῃ περιτυχοῦσα, πράττει διὰ ταύτης τὸ συνεῖναι μὲν τὴν θυγατέρα τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ ὁμόλεκτρον εἶναι. Τὸν δὲ μήτε ἐθέλειν μήτε δύνασθαι, τὰ τῷ γάμῳ προσήκοντα πράττειν. Ἐν τούτῳ τῆς κόρης ἀπείρου γάμων ἀποθανούσης, εἰκότως ἡ Σερήνα βασιλείου γονῆς ἐπιθυμοῦσα δέει τοῦ μὴ τὴν τοσαύτην αὐτῇ δυναστείαν ἐλαττωθῆναι, τῇ δευτέρᾳ θυγατρὶ συνάψαι τὸν Ὁνώριον ἔσπευδεν· οὗ δὴ γενομένου τελευτᾷ μὲν ἡ κόρη μετ' οὐ πολὺ ταυτὰ τῇ προτέρᾳ παθοῦσα.* Quum Honorius matrimonium cum Maria contraheret, mater ejus Serena quæ puellam necdum nubilem ætatem attigiſſe cerneret, ac neque ſibi poſſet imperare ut nuptiæ differentur, & immaturam maritali conſuetudini tradere nihil eſſe arbitraretur aliud quam injuriam naturæ facere; nacta mulierem quæ rebus hujuſmodi remedium adferre ſciret, ejus opera perfecit, ut filia cum principe quidem viveret, ac tori conſors ejuſdem eſſet, verum ille nec vellet nec poſſet, ea quæ matrimonium requireret, implere. Interim puella virgine mortua, non abs re Serena quæ ſobolis imperatoriæ conſequendæ percupida eſſet, ob metum ne quid ſibi de tanta potentia decederet, id operam dabat ut Honorium alteri filiæ copularet. Quo facto, puella non multo poſt vitam cum morte commutat, quum idem ei quod priori accidiſſet (4).

[*C*] *He is accuſed of a groſs contradiction.*] We have ſeen, that he ſays, that Thermantia died a little after her marriage; yet he aſſures us in the ſame book, that Honorius having put Stilico to death, ſent back Thermantia to her mother. *Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ὁνώριος τὴν μὲν γαμετὴν Θερμαντίαν παραλυθεῖσαν τοῦ βασιλείου θρόνου τῇ μητρὶ προσέταττε παραδίδοσθαι μηδὲν διὰ τοῦτο ὑφορωμένην.* Imperator autem Honorius uxorem Thermantiam auguſtali dejectam ſolio matri ſuæ reddi juſſit, nulla tamen idcirco ſuſpicione gravatam (5). Stilico was killed the ſame year in which Honorius married Thermantia, that is, during the conſulſhip of Baſſus and Philip in the year 408. As to the other daughter of Stilico, ſhe was married to the emperor in the year 398, in which year was the war againſt Gildo. See the paſſage of Claudian (6).

(3) Zoſimus, lib. v, pag. m. 333.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) Ib. pag. 346. *At pag. 350, he ſpeaks of the rewards beſtowed upon the Eunuchs who brought Thermantia to Serana.*

(6) In the remark [*A*].

HOORNBEEK (JOHN) profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſities of Utrecht and Leyden, was one of the moſt famous divines, who appeared in Holland in the XVIIth century. He was born at Haerlem (*a*), in the year 1617, where he performed his ſtudies till he was fifteen or ſixteen years of age; after which he was ſent to Leyden, where he made great improvement under the learned profeſſors of that univerſity. Having ſtaid two years there, he went to ſtudy at Utrecht, in the year 1635, from whence he returned to Leyden the year following. He was ordained miniſter in the year 1639, and went to exerciſe his office ſecretly at Cologne. He diſcharged all the duties of it, with a great deal of piety and prudence, and was not diſcouraged by the dangers he was expoſed to in that city which is ſo much addicted to the Popiſh religion. He returned to Holland in the year 1643, and was promoted (*b*) to the degree of doctor of Divinity with great applauſe, the twenty firſt of December the ſame year. He gave ſuch proofs of his great capacity, that he was looked upon as a man ſufficiently qualified for the profeſſorſhip of Divinity, which was vacant at Utrecht by the death of Schotanus. He accepted that imployment preferably to all others, which were offered him in other towns [*A*]. He was inſtalled profeſſor of Divinity at Utrecht in July 1644. He was choſen one the ordinary paſtors of the ſame town the year following, and notwithſtanding the difficulty of diſcharging the duties of thoſe two imployments, he acquitted himſelf of them with great exactneſs [*B*], whereby his excellent talents became ſo uſeful to the public,

(*a*) John Hoornbeek his grandfather, retired thither with his wife in the year 1548, when he left Flanders his native country on account of religion.

(*b*) In the univerſity of Utrecht.

[*A*] *Poſts were offered to him in other towns.*] In February 1644, the church of Maeſtricht deſired to have him for their miniſter. That of Graft in North Holland invited him in March in the ſame year, and he was offered a profeſſorſhip of Divinity in the illuſtrious ſchool at Harderwic (1) in May following (2). It is a very glorious thing to be thus courted at twenty ſeven years of age.

[*B*] *He diſcharged the duties of theſe two imployments with great exactneſs.*] I have reſerved the particulars of it for this remark, in which I make uſe of the words of him who wrote our Hoornbeek's life. ' In utraque autem Statione (3) per decennium fere ' perſeveravit, tanta eruditionis, eloquentiæ, pietatis ' & diligentiæ fama, omnibuſque ordinibus adeo gratus, ut nullus in majori fuerit exiſtimatione, non Ultrajecti ſolum, ſed in toto Belgio. Nempe aſſiduus erat ' in docendo, precando, concionando, legendo, diſputando, regendo, præſidendo, catechiſationibus habendis, membris Eccleſiæ, imprimis ægris viſitandis. Quibus artibus optimis certe, Magiſtratus *Trajectini* gratiam adeo meruit & inivit, ut Magiſtratus optimus ſuo ' proprio motu, non petentem, nec forte cogitantem, ' liberaverit dimidia parte oneris Paſtoralis, ſervato tamen integro honore & honorario. — *In both theſe ſtations he continued near the ſpace of ten years, in ſo great ' reputation for learning, eloquence, piety, and diligence, ' and ſo acceptable to people of all ranks, that none ' had a greater ſhare of the public eſteem, not only at ' Utrecht but in all Holland. For he was aſſiduous in ' teaching, praying, preaching, reading, diſputing, preſiding, catechizing and viſiting the members of the church, ' and eſpecially the ſick. By this excellent conduct, he deſerved and obtained the favour of the magiſtrates of ' Utrecht to ſuch a degree, that they of their own ' accord, without his asking, and poſſibly without his ' knowledge of it, freed him from one half of his paſtoral ' charge, preſerving his rank and ſalary.*' Would you have a notion of a good paſtor, read in what manner Hoornbeek performed his viſits. ' Membra Eccleſiæ ' frequenter inviſebat, pios animabat, ignaros docebat, ' malos corrigebat, hæreticos confutabat, afflictos ſolabatur, ægros recreabat, infirmos roborabat, dejectos ' erigebat, pauperibus ſubveniebat, omnes denique juvabat pro eorum ſtatu & conditione, omnibus, aderat in omnibus, omnibus ſe omnia faciebat, gravibus gravem, hilaribus hilarem, afflictis condolentem ' doctis doctum & Doctorem, plebi Paſtorem, errantibus ducem, ut in viam reduceret veritatis. —— ' *He frequently viſited the members of his congregation,* ' *encouraged*

(1) A town in Guelderland.

(2) Taked from John Hoornbeek's Life prefixed to his book *De Converſione Indorum.*

(3) That is the place of profeſſor and that of paſtor.

public, that he got the love and eſteem of every body. But that he might not ſink under ſo many labours, the magiſtates exempted him from part of his miniſterial functions. He was invited to Leyden, to the ſame imployments that he had exerciſed at Utrecht; and he accepted of that invitation in the year 1654. He was a great ornament to that famous univerſity, till his death, which happened the firſt of September 1666. He deſerved a much longer life; but it is more to be wondered that a man ſo laborious as he was [*C*], ſhould live forty nine years, than that he lived no longer. The many books he publiſhed [*D*], are a ſpeaking proof of his application, and of the vaſt extent of his knowledge. He underſtood ſeveral languages [*E*], and enjoyed the friendſhip of the greateſt divines of his age (*c*). He never deviated from the moſt rigid orthodoxy, and and was no leſs valuable for the qualities of a moral and virtuous man, than for the talents of his mind, and of a learned profeſſor. This we may ſee at large in his life (*d*). He left children worthy of him [*F*], and one needs ſay no more in their commendation.

(*c*) See the catalogue of them in his Life.

(*d*) It is prefixed to h's treatiſe *De Converſione Indorum & Gentilium*, and it was written by David Stuart. I have taken this article from it.

‘ *encouraged the pious, taught the ignorant, reproved the wicked, confuted the Heretics, comforted the afflicted, refreſhed the ſick, ſtrengthened the weak, raiſed the dejected, relieved the poor, and, in fine, aſſiſted every perſon according to his ſtate and condition; was helpful to all in all things, made himſolf all things to all men, grave with the grave, gay with the gay, ſorrowful with the afflicted, learned with the learned, a ſhepherd to the people, and a guide to thoſe that wandered, in order to bring them back to the ways of truth.*’ As to his vigilance in the functions of his profeſſorſhip, this is the teſtimony that is given of him. ‘ Studioſos vero Theologiæ velut filios omni cura complectebatur, laboreſque ſuos præcipuos iis impendebat; non lectiones ſolum in eorum gratiam habebat, ſed frequentia Collegia omnis generis, atque Diſputationes ordinarias & extraordinarias, ex quibus reſultarunt tot vaſta & egregia volumina ad inſtitutionem juventutis imo ad uſum omnium, ſed imprimis ad converſionem Hæreticorum (4). —— *He was as a father to the ſtudents of Divinity, and on them he beſtowed his chief labours; he not only gave them lectures in Divinity, but frequent courſes in all kinds of learning, as alſo diſputations ordinary and extraordinary, which produced many and excellent books, for the inſtruction of youth, nay for the benefit of all, but eſpecially for the converſion of Heretics.*’

[*C*] *So laborious as he was.*] This may be known from the particulars contained in the preceding remark; but we ſhall know it ſtill better by the words that follow. They relate to the time that he was profeſſor of Divinity and paſtor at Leyden. ‘ Curam Eccleſiæ ſuo jure poterat in Collegas derivare, quia primario Paſtori (5) ab ea immuni adjunctus, cum eo labores, honores, præmia & privilegia omnia ex decreto ſapientiſſimi Magiſtratus æqualiter diſtribuebat. Sed ab Eccleſiæ cura, membrorumque & ægrorum viſitatione diſpenſari noluit, contra vero, cum dimidias tantum Paſtoris vices demandatas haberet, integras voluit implere, zelo & diligentia ſtupenda in homine alias occupatiſſimo, imo non tam onerato quam oppreſſo, & tantum non fatiſcente ſub multiplici onere, cui plures ſimul juncti vix eſſent pares. Concionabatur in Templo, legebat in Academia, præſidebat in Conſiſtorio, Catechiſationes inſtituebat in Choro, Collegia habebat in domo, ſcribebat in muſæo, ſæpe in lecto, membra Eccleſiæ viſitabat in ædibus, ægros etiam & peſtiferos, curam ad omnes & ad omnia extendebat (6). ——— *He might have juſtly thrown his paſtoral charge upon his colleagues, becauſe he was put upon the ſame foot with the firſt miniſter, who was exempted from that charge; and by the decree of the magiſtrates was to ſhare all labours, honours, emoluments, and privileges with him. But he would not be exempted from the paſtoral office, and viſiting of the ſick, on the contrary tho' he was only charged with one half of the duty he would perform the whole; a zeal and diligence prodigious in a man, who had ſo much other buſineſs, who was not only loaded but oppreſſed, and ſcarce able to ſuſtain the various burthen for which the joint force of many would hardly have ſufficed. He preached in the Church, read in the Univerſity, preſided in the Conſiſtory, cathechized in the Choir, gave lectures at home, wrote in his cloſet, and many times in his bed, viſited his pariſhioners in their houſes, as alſo the ſick and thoſe infected with the plague. His care extended to all things, and all perſons.*’

[*D*] *The great number of books he publiſhed.*] They may be divided into five claſſes, *Didactica, Polemica, Practica, Hiſtorica, Oratoria.* Thoſe of the I. are, *Inſtitutiones Theologicæ in* 8vo. *Irenicum de ſtudio pacis & concordiæ, in* 4to. *De conſociatione Evangelica inter Reformatos, & Evangelicos, in* 4to. Thoſe of the II. are, *Socinianiſmi confutati tomi tres, in* 4to. *Pro convincendis & convertendis Judæis, l.* 8 (7) *in* 4to. *De converſione Gentilium, libri duo in* 4to. *Examen Bullæ Urbani VIII. de Jeſuitiſſis, Imaginibus, & Feſtis, in* 4to. *Examen Bullæ Innocentii X, de pace Germaniæ, in* 4to. *Epiſtola ad Duræum de Independentiſmo, in* 8vo. *Commentarius de Paradoxis Weigelianis, in* 12mo. *Apologia pro Eccleſia Chriſtiana hodierna, contra Libellum, ad Legem & Teſtimonium, &c. in* 8vo. *De obſervando à Chriſtianis Præcepto Decalogi quarto, in* 12mo. *De Epiſcopatu, in* 8vo. Thoſe of the III. are, *Theologiæ practicæ tomi duo, in* 4to. *De Peſte, in* 12mo. Thoſe of the IV. are, *Summa controverſiarum,* in 8vo. *Miſcella vetera & nova.* I put in the V. *Orationes variæ Inaugurales, Valedictoriæ, Rectorales & Funebres.* I do not give the titles of his Dutch works, which contain ſeveral tracts.

[*E*] *He underſtood ſeveral languages.*] Here follow the words of the author of his Life. ‘ Linguas ſi ſpectes novit plurimas doctarum & vulgarium, Latinam, Græcam, Hebraicam, Chaldaicam, Syriacam, Rabinicam, Belgicam, Germanicam, Anglicam, Gallicam, Italicam, Arabicæ & Hiſpanicæ Rudimenta attigit (8). —— *He underſtood many of the learned and modern languages, the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldaic, Syriac, Rabinic, Dutch, German, Engliſh, French, Italian, and had attained the elements of the Arabic and Spaniſh.*’

[*F*] *He left children worthy of him.*] He married at Utrecht Anne Bernard in the year 1650. By this marriage he became related to ſeveral famous men, as to Conſtantine l'Empereur (9), profeſſor of Divinity (10), and Jodocus Hondius (11) a famous Geographer, grandfather to Henry Hondius, who was killed in fighting valiantly for the ſervice of his country, in the ſhip of admiral Van Tromp which he commanded. Mr Hoornbeek left two ſons, ISAAC HOORNBEEK formerly an eminent advocate at the Hague, and at preſent penſionary of the city of Rotterdam (§*α*); and HENRY EMILIUS HOORNBEEK, a commiſſioner of the impoſts in the province of Holland.

[(§ *α*) He was made in 1720 counſellor-penſionary, keeper of the ſeals, and Stadtholder of the Fiefs of Holland and Weſt-Frieſland, &c. and he died at the Hague, the ſeventeenth of June 1727, in the ſeventy firſt year of his age. REM. CRIT.]

(4) Ex Vita Jo. Hoornbeeki.

(5) It was the profeſſor Heidanus.

(6) Ex eadem Vita.

(7) This book is without doubt the ſame that Mr Baillet, *Tom. II, of his Anti, pag.* 38, calls *Diſp. Anti-Judaëques,* but it is certain, that this is not the title of it. It is likely that Mr Bailet was deceived by ſomebody, who quoted it thus for brevity ſake.

(8) In Vita Hoornbeeki.

(9) The grandmother, by the father's ſide, of Anne Barnard was called Jacqueline l'Empereur, and was the aunt of Conſtantine l'Empereur, and of John l'Empereur, miniſter at the Hague.

(10) At Harderwic, and afterwards at Leyden.

(11) He was Anne Bernard's grandfather by the mother's ſide.

HORATIUS (PUBLIUS) ſirnamed Cocles, did a glorious action, whilſt the city of Rome, his native country, was beſieged by king Porſenna. His article being very good, and large enough in Moreri's Dictionary (*a*), mine ſhall be very ſhort, and I ſhall inſiſt only on the diſagreement that is to be found among the ancient hiſtorians, with

(*a*) *In the Paris, edition* 1699.

with reſpect to a circumſtance, that ſhould have been related without any variation [*A*].

[*A*] *I ſhall only inſiſt on the diſagreement that is to be found . . . . . with reſpect to a circumſtance which ſhould have been related without any variation.*] Some hiſtorians ſay, that throwing himſelf into the Tyber, after having repulſed the enemy till the bridge was broken behind him, he ſwam to the other ſide of the river, notwithſtanding the weight of his arms, without receiving any wound; but others affirm, that he received ſo great a wound in his thigh, that he continued lame of it all his life. Livy manifeſtly ſuppoſes that he was not wounded. ‘ Cunctati aliquandiu ſunt ‘ (*Hetruſci*) dum alius alium ut prælium incipiant, circumſpectant. Pudor deinde commovit aciem & clamore ſublato undique in unum hoſtem tela conjiciunt, quæ cum in objecto CUNCTA ſcuto hæſiſſent, neque ille minus obſtinatus ingenti pontem obtineret gradu, jam impetu detrudere conabantur virum, cum ſimul fragor rupti ponderis, ſimul clamor Romanorum alacritate perfecti operis ſublatus pavore ſubito impetum ſuſtinuit. Tum Cocles, Tyberine pater, inquit, te ſancte precor, hæc arma & hunc militem propitio flumine accipias. Ita ſic armatus in Tyberim deſiluit: multiſque SUPERINCIDENTIBUS TELIS INCOLUMIS ad ſuos tranavit, rem auſus plus famæ habituram ad poſteros quam fidei (1).’ We may be ſure that all thoſe who do not expreſsly obſerve his receiving of a wound, are of Livy’s opinion; for their deſign is to raiſe our admiration of the great courage of this Roman. Now that action is more admirable and glorious if he was wounded, than if he was not. We muſt conclude then, that if Florus (2), and Seneca (3) make no mention of the wound, it is becauſe they were perſuaded he received none. Valerius Maximus has ſo poſitively denied that he received any, that this ought to induce us to believe, there was a tradition for the negative. ‘ Ut patriam periculo imminenti liberatam vidit, armatus ſe in Tiberim miſit: cujus fortitudinem Dii immortales admirati, INCOLUMITATEM SINCERAM ei præſtiterunt. Nam neque altitudine dejectus, quaſſatuſve, neque pondere armorum preſſus, nec ullo vorticis circuitu actus: nec telis quidem, que undique conjerebantur, LAESUS, TUTUM natandi eventum habuit (4). —— *As ſoon as he ſaw his country delivered from this imminent danger, he threw himſelf armed into the Tyber: the gods, admiring his valour, ſaved him* FROM ANY HARM. *For he did ſwim* SAFE *to ſhore without being either ſtunned by the height, from which he leaped, or oppreſſed by the weight of his arms, or carried down by the rapidity of the ſtream: or* WOUNDED *by the darts which were thrown at him from all quarters.*’ But here are three famous hiſtorians, who go upon another tradition. Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus gives a long account of this fight, and aſſures us, in expreſs words, that Horatius received a wound with a lance that pierced his thigh, and put him to ſuch torture that he could ſcarce ſtand, when he underſtood the bridge was broken (5). This hiſtorian adds, I. that it was believed, he would ſoon die of his wounds: II. That when it was known he would recover, he had noble rewards given him; but that he could not arrive at the conſulſhip, nor any military command, becauſe he halted ever after that fight. Plutarch ſays that a ſtatue of braſs was erected to him in the temple of Vulcan, to comfort him upon the misfortune of his becoming lame by that wound (6). He had ſaid before, that he had entered the city by ſwimming, being wounded in his hip: Δύρατι θυῤῥηνικῷ βιβλημένος τὸν γλουτὸν. *Jaculo Hetruſco in natibus ictus* (7). Dion Caſſius affirms, that Cicero declaiming againſt Marc Antony before the ſenate, ſwore by Horatius’s thigh, and Mutius’s hand (8). I am not ignorant that that direct oration which he ſpeaks of, is not like any of Cicero’s Philippics (9). But Dion who forged it, would not have uſed ſuch an oath, had not there been a tradition that Horatius was wounded in the thigh, in defending his country againſt Tarquin’s friends. We will produce a fourth witneſs *viz.* Servius. ‘ Solus Cocles hoſtilem impetum, ſuſtinuit, donec à tergo pons ſolveretur à ſociis, quo ſoluto ſe cum armis præcipitavit in Tyberim, & licet LAESUS eſſet in coxa, tamen ejus fluenta ſuperavit. Unde eſt illud ab eo dictum, cum ei in comitiis coxæ vitium objiceretur, per ſingulos gradus admoneor triumphi mei. (10) —— *Cocles alone ſuſtained the ſhock of the enemy, till the bridge behind him ſhould be broke down by his companions, which being accompliſhed, he threw himſelf all in armour into the Tyber, and tho’ he was* WOUNDED *in the thigh, ſwam over. This made him ſay to thoſe who reproached him in the* comitia *with his lameneſs, every ſtep that I make reminds me of my triumph.*’ You ſee that the tradition about Horatius’s wound was ſupported by the circumſtance of a witty ſaying which he made uſe of when he was reproached with his lameneſs: *Every ſtep,* ſaid he, *that I make, puts me in mind of my triumph.* It is ſaid that Alexander made uſe of that thought to comfort the king, his father, who was afflicted on the account of his lameneſs occaſioned by a wound which he had received in a battle (11).

If we have reaſon to wonder that in an event ſo remarkable as this of Horatius, the traditions for and againſt his being wounded, ſhould have had each their partiſans and followers, even among the moſt famous writers, what ſhall we ſay of Polybius (12) who ſuppoſes that this brave and undaunted Roman loſt his life in the Tyber? Shall we ſay that he likewiſe had a tradition for it? Shall we conclude from hence, that antient hiſtory is ſo dark, that we know not generally what ſide to take amongſt thoſe who deny, and thoſe who affirm the ſame things? And that the yea and the no ſeeming to be equally authorized in matters, wherein it was the eaſieſt thing in the world to know the truth, we may well doubt of the leſs notable events which the hiſtorians have mentioned? ſhall we, I ſay, infer ſuch concluſions? I ſhould rather adviſe the reader to make uſe of theſe obſervations to fortify his judgment againſt the cuſtom of reading without attention, and of believing without examination. Note, that the difference of opinions about Horatius’s face, is not ſo much to be wondered at; it is however a ſign of hiſtorical uncertainty. Some affirm that Horatius was a very handſome man (13), others ſay, ‘ that he was ſirnamed Cocles. . . . becauſe he was extreamly flat-noſed, and that the upper part of his noſe was ſo ſunk into his head, that there was no diviſion betwixt his two eyes, and that his eyebrows joined; ſo that the people deſigning to call him Cyclops, miſtook and called Cocles (14).

(1) Titus Livius, lib. ii, Dec. I, cap. x.

(2) Florus, lib. i, (*and not lib.* v, *as in Moreri. Florus’s Hiſtory is only divided into four books*) cap. x.

(3) Seneca, Epiſt. cxx, pag. m. 464.

(4) Val. Maxim. lib. iii, cap. ii, n. 1, pag. m. 241, 242.

(5) Dion. Halic. lib. v, cap. xxiii, xxiv.

(6) Plutarch. in Valerio, pag. 106.

(7) Id ibid. pag. 105.

(8) Οὐ μὰ τὸ σκέλος τοῦ Ὁρατίου καὶ τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ Μουκίου. Non per crus Horatii & manum Mutii. *Dio, lib. xlv, pag. m.* 325.

(9) See, above, remark [*E*] of the article FULVIA.

(10) Servius. in Æneïd. lib. viii, ver. 646.

(11) Plut. de Fortuna Alex. Orat. II, pag. 331. B.

(12) Polyb. lib. vi, cap liii.

(13) Dion. Halic. lib. v, cap xxii.

(14) Plutarch. in Valerio, pag. 105.

HORSTIUS (JAMES) profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Helmſtadt, was born at Torgau, May 1, 1537 (*a*). He was admitted maſter of arts in the univerſity of Francfort on the Oder, in the year 1556 (*b*), and doctor of Phyſic in the year 1562 (*c*). He was invited to the poſt of public Phyſician in ſeveral cities, and exerciſed it ſucceſſively at Sagan and Suidnitz in Sileſia, and at Iglaw in Moravia, till he was called, in the year 1580, to be Phyſician in ordinary to the archduke of Auſtria (*d*). He continued in that poſt four years, after which he was called to be profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Helmſtadt. His inaugural oration *De remoris diſcentium Medicinam & earum remediis, concerning the obſtacles to the ſtudy of Phyſic and their remedies,* is exceeding good (*e*). He acquitted himſelf worthily in that profeſſion, and publiſhed ſome books [*A*], which ſupported his reputation. I have not been

able

(*a*) Jacobi Horſtii, Epiſt. Philoſoph. & Medicinal. pag. 41.

(*b*) Ibid pag. 48.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 77.

(*d*) Ib. pag. 199.

(*e*) It is to be found, *pag.* 530, *& ſeq.* of the book above quoted.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books.*] The firſt, if I do not miſtake, is a Commentary on Hippocrates’s book concerning the heart, *in Librum Hippocratis de Corde,* which appeared in the year 1563 (1). He publiſhed in 1576 a Treatiſe *qualem virum Pharmacopolam eſſe conveniat,* concerning the qualifications of an Apothecary (2). He had before publiſhed (3) in the German language, A Deſcription of the Qualifications of a good Phyſician. He publiſhed likewiſe a deſcription of the ſame kind in Latin, in the year 1580, which he dedicated

to

(1) Epiſt. Philoſoph. & Medicin. Jacobi Horſtii, pag. 79.

(2) Ib pag. 153.

(3) *In the year* 1570. Ibid. pag. 129.

able to diſcover in what year he died; I only know that he was alive in the year 1595, and was then dean of the faculty of Phyſic at Helmſtadt, and vice-rector of that univerſity. I learn this from the Latin verſes which wete made upon his Anagram, and are to be found at the end of a book intituled, *Jacobi Horſtii Epiſtolæ Philoſophicæ & Medicinales*, printed at Leipſic in 8vo, in the year 1596. We muſt obſerve to his praiſe, a thing which will be thought very ſingular, though perhaps without reaſon; viz. that he joined devotion to the knowledge and practice of Phyſic. He always implored the bleſſing of GOD upon his remedies, and publiſhed a book of prayers for that occaſion [*B*]. He

to the biſhop of Olmutz (4). He put out a German tranſlation of Lemnius's book *De occultis naturæ Miraculis*, concerning the hidden wonders of nature, in the year 1579, and added many things to it (5). In 1580 he publiſhed a book *De morbo epidemio febri Catharrali per totam Europam graſſante*. Concerning an epidemic catarrh and fever raging over all Europe (6), and in 1583, a Treatiſe, in German, of Remedies for the Plague (7), in 1587 he publiſhed a book *de Vite Vinifera* (8), and in 1593, another *De Noctambulonibus*, concerning thoſe who walk during their ſleep (9), and in 1595, a Diſſertation concerning the Golden Tooth of a Child in Sileſia (10). You will find in *Lindenius renovatus* (11) that his *Diſputationes Catholicæ de rebus ſecundum & præter naturam*, General Diſſertations concerning things Natural and Preternatural, were printed at Wittemberg in the year 1630, with the *Compendium Medicarum Inſtitutionum*, of Gregory Horſtius, and that the abridgment of his *Herbarium, ſeu de ſelectis Plantis & Radicibus libri duo*, by the ſame Gregory, was printed at Marpurg in the year 1630.

Let us obſerve that he ſuffered himſelf to be groſsly deceived concerning the pretended golden tooth. It was a meer impoſture, if you deſire to know how it was diſcovered, you need only read Van Dale *de Oraculis, book I. Chap. ult.* (12) He obſerves that our James Horſtius diſcovered a great prodigy in this golden tooth, which, according to him, ought to give comfort to the Chriſtians under the Turkiſh yoke, that is to ſay, that it was a happy preſage of the fall of the Ottoman empire. I have ſeen a letter which this Phyſician wrote to David Chytræus, dated February 7, 1595, in which he treats of the preſages of meteors. He ſays that the comet which appeared in the year 1556, and which was ſeen at Conſtantinople after it diſappeared in Germany, might well produce it's bad effects in the year 1596, and that then likewiſe the new ſtar in Caſſiopæa, would be not idle (13), and that the golden tooth alſo would not fail to act it's part. ‘Dens Aureus, dens pueri Sileſii molaris, quem ipſe vidi, tetigi & declarandum duxi, non prædictione atque effectu carebit. ô miſeros nos, qui adeò ſtupidi & ſecuri ad hæc ſimus! Deus noſtri & eccleſiæ ſuæ miſereatur. Nos pio ſtudio preces, votáque conjungamus (14). ——— *The golden tooth, the cheek tooth of the Sileſian boy, which I myſelf ſaw and felt, and thought deſerved to be made public, will not be without prediction and accompliſhment. Oh wretched we, who are ſo ſtupid and ſecure as to this matter! GOD have pity on us and his church! Let us piouſly unite our prayers and vows.*’ You ſee he doth not conclude without condemning the ſecurity of the world, and without putting up earneſt prayers.

[*B*] *He implored the bleſſing of GOD upon his remedies, and publiſhed a book of prayers for that occaſion.*] It was by this book that he ſignalized his admiſſion to the the place of profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Helmſtadt. This was the firſt preſent he made to the univerſity. ‘Helmſtadium ubi veniſſet, publicè librum, dictum Precationes medicorum, promulgat, & in præfatione cauſas neceſſitatis hujus libri reddit (15). —— *When he came to Helmſtadt, he publiſhed the book called the Prayers of Phyſicians, and gave the reaſons, why he was obliged to publiſh it, in a preface.*’ I muſt obſerve to the honour of Phyſicans, that many of them thanked him for publiſhing theſe prayers, and acknowledged that their art had a very particular need of the divine aſſiſtance (16). See what the Phyſician of the city Ratisbon wrote to him. ‘Mittis ad me libellum medicarum precationum nuper à te editum, unà cum tabula, in quæ methodum inventionis, qua in conficiendo illo opuſculo uſus es, eruditè exponis. Quam tuam operam non poſſum non vehementer probare, ut qui reipſa quotidie experior, nulli hominum generi in hac vita imploratione divini auxilii magis opus eſſe, quàm ipſis medicis; Qui etiamſi omnia ex præſcripto artis rectiſſimè agunt, malevolorum tamen calumnias ingratiſſimo hoc ſeculo evitare nunquam poſſunt. Id ne fiat, utque actiones illorum Deus Opt. Max. fortunet, precibus à Deo impetrent, neceſſe eſt (17). —— *You ſend me the book of the Prayers of Phyſicians, which you lately publiſhed, together with a table, in which you learnedly explain the method you followed in writing that piece. Which work of your's I cannot but greatly approve, as I daily experience in fact, that no men in this life have more occaſion to implore the divine aſſiſtance, than Phyſicians: who, though they do every thing according to the exacteſt rules of their art, cannot eſcape, in this moſt ungrateful age, the cenſure of the ill-natured. To prevent which, and to obtain a bleſſing from heaven on their endeavours, they muſt neceſſarily have recourſe to prayers.*’ Among the letters which were wrote to him on this ſubject, there is one which tells him, that very few of the Phyſicians in Bohemia followed his advice of praying to GOD; but that many old women there made uſe of charms and incantations. ‘Cum paucis, optime Horſti, habes hoc commune, ut non tantum ſequaris Hippoc. & Galenum, qui gemino medicam crure miniſtrat opem: ſed etiam ſanctos Patres & Prophetas, qui ſupra ægrotos invocabant nomen Domini vulnerantis & ſanantis. Rara ſunt hæc exempla in noſtra Bohemia, utpote ubi plures ſunt inſanæ & incantatrices vetulæ: quæ miſcuerunt herbas & non innoxia verba (18). ——— *This, my beſt Horſtius, you have in common with a few, that you not only follow Hipprocrates and Galen, the great maſter of Medicine, but the holy fathers likewiſe and the prophets, who called over the ſick on the name of the Lord, who both wounds, and heals. Theſe are uncommon examples in our Bohemia, where there are ſo many ſilly, quackiſh, old-women, who deal in potions and charms.*’ Matthew Dreſſerus, profeſſor of Eloquence at Leipſic, praiſeth him highly on account of his piety and of his prayers, and informs him that he knew a Phyſician, who never undertook any cure, nor gave any medicine without reciting the Lord's-Prayer. ‘De precum medicarum formulis à te editis, quid ſentiam aut ſcribam aliud, niſi videri mihi eas ad pietatem medico dignam, maximè eſſe compoſitas? Si enim Hymnus eſt Deo gratus, Medicina noſtra & medicamenta Dei munus ſunt: Num dubitare poſſumus, quin religioſè tota ars atque profeſſio tractanda ſit? noveram præclarum medicum, amicum meum integerrimum, qui nullam morbi curationem attingebat, aut ſuſcipiebat, nullumque medicamentum ægroto propinabat, niſi prius recitata oratione Dominica, & piis votis adjunctis. Quod cum laude & prædicatione dignum ſemper judicarim, ne nunc quidem hoc quod in pietate ponis ſtudium improbare poſſum. Sed opus dignum tua profeſſione atque perſona judico (19). ——— *As to the Formulary of Prayers for Phyſicians, publiſhed by you, I can only ſay, that they conduce greatly to that piety, which is worthy of a Phyſician. For if an hymn be acceptable to GOD, our medicines are the gift of GOD. Can we doubt, that the whole art and profeſſion is to be carried on religiouſly? I knew an excellent Phyſician, my very ſincere friend, who never undertook a cure, or adminiſtered Phyſic, without repeating the Lord's-Prayer, and adding pious wiſhes. Which as I always thought praiſe-warthy, I cannot now diſapprove your labours in the cauſe of piety, but think it a work worthy your profeſſion and character.*’ Compare with this remark [*C*] of the KIRSTENIUS, and read (20) the pious letter which James Horſtius wrote to a miniſter of Berlin. He appears there to have reſolved to ſet about a *Chriſtian Phyſic*. ‘Binis literis tuis, quibus me de medicina corporis ſacro-ſancta ex fragmentis Bibliorum ſacrorum excolenda etiam atque etiam mones, ita ſum adfectus, ut ad iſta perficienda, quæ cupis, vim mihi illatam eſſe putem

---

(4) *It is among his Letters*, Philoſoph. & Medic. pag 209, & ſeq.

(5) Ib. pag. 189.

(6) Ib. pag. 203.

(7) Ib. pag. 257.

(8) Ib. pag. 354.

(9) Ib. pag. 435.

(10) Ib. pag. 523.

(11) Pag. 485. *of the edit.* 1686.

(12) Pag. 423. Edit. 1700.

(13) Stella prope Caſſiopeam nec tunc feriabitur. *Jac. Horſtius, Epiſt. Philoſoph. & Medic. pag.* 521.

(14) Id. ibid.

(15) Ibid. pag. 282.

(16) *See* Jacobi Horſtii, Epiſt. Philoſoph. & Medic. pag. 283, & ſeq.

(17) Ibid. pag. 284.

(18) Ibid. pag. 290.

(19) Ibid. pag. 292.

(20) Ibid. pag. 194, & ſeq.

He married his firſt wife in the year 1562, and ſhe died in the year 1585 (*f*), after bearing him ten children (*g*). He married again in the year 1587 (*h*). He was brother to GREGORY HORSTIUS, who died May the 10th, 1592; and had been ſeven times Burgo-maſter of the town of Torgau, a man of great merit, as his elogy compoſed by Reineccius informs us (*i*). The book that I have quoted contains a thing which I think is worthy of being related [*C*].

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 77.

(*g*) Ib. pag. 330.

(*h*) Ib. pag. 363.

(*i*) *It is publiſhed in the beginning of* Jacobi Horſtii Epiſt. Philoſoph. & Medicinales.

‘ putem. —— *I am ſo affected by your two letters, in which you again and again put me in mind of cultivating the ſacred medicine of the body, out of the fragments of the ſacred books, that I find my ſelf as it were compelled to do what you deſire.*’ I muſt likewiſe add, that the program by which he exhorted the ſtudents to celebrate devoutly the feaſt of St Michael, in honour of the angels (22), is a very devout piece.

For the reſt, I do not believe that there are any books of devotion, which have not had a better ſale than theſe Prayers for the uſe of Phyſicians.

[*C*] *His letters contain . . . . . a thing worthy to be related.*] Jerom Nymnan, a miniſter and brother-in-law to Horſtius (23), wrote a letter to him dated from Torgau, March 10, 1556, in which he deſires him (24) to acquaint him whether a ſtory which Sabinus had lately told at Wittemberg was true. It was that a gentleman of the March of Brandenburg, near Standel, had harſhly rejected the requeſt of a poor woman, who deſired him in the name of GOD to abate ſomething of the price of the corn, that ſhe wanted to buy of him, and that the piece of money which ſhe gave him, was changed into a ſerpent by an unknown perſon whom he met on the road, and that this ſerpent had wreathed itſelf about that gentleman's neck, and could not be removed from thence. Horſtius, who was then at Francfort on the Oder, anſwered (25) to his brother-in-law, that he had heard nothing of all this, but that if he ſhould hear any thing about it he would inform him. We have here an example of the caprices of common fame. Prodigies frequently make more noiſe in remote countries than in that where it is pretended that they happen. This is a character of falſhood; for things that are true, are more certainly known in the places where they have happened than any where elſe. People who have a mind to tell lies ought to take care not to lay the ſcene too near. They do not always obſerve this precaution, and yet they are believed, but ſtill they run a greater hazard by doing ſo.

(22) Ibid. pag. 493, & ſeq.

(23) Ib. pag. 11.

(24) Ib. pag. 53.

(25) Ib. pag. 54.

HORSTIUS (GREGORY) nephew (*a*) to the former, acquired ſuch a reputation by the practice of Phyſic that he is uſually named the Æſculapius of Germany (*b*). He was born at Torgau in the year 1578, and received the degree of maſter of Philoſophy at Wittemberg, in the year 1601 (*c*), and of doctor of Phyſic at Baſil, in the year 1606, and in the ſame year was advanced to the poſt of profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Wittemberg. He reſigned it a year after, and went to Soltwedel, in the territory of Brandenburg, to be Phyſician of that city. He made no long ſtay there, for he accepted of the place offered to him by the Landgrave of Heſſe, of profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Gieſſen in the year 1608. He was appointed firſt Phyſician to that prince the year following, and being at laſt weary of a ſingle life (*d*), he married in the year 1615. The reputation which he had acquired, made the magiſtrates of Ulm offer him the poſt of firſt Phyſician of their city: He accepted of it, and exerciſed it with great reputation from the year 1622 to 1636, which was the year in which he died. He left by his firſt wife four ſons [*A*] and two daughters. She died in the month of November 1634; and he being by that means encumbered with domeſtic affairs, married a ſecond time in the month of June 1635. He was exceedingly happy in this ſecond marriage [*B*], but the gout, which he had more than once vigorouſly reſiſted before, having attacked him again, and that being attended by many dangerous ſymptoms, brought him to his end on the ninth of Auguſt 1636. He poſſeſſed in the higheſt degree, the three qualities

(*a*) He was ſon to George Horſtius, counſellor in the town of Torgau.

(*b*) Konig. Bibl. pag. 413.

(*c*) Lindenius, Renovat. pag. 359.

(*d*) Solitariæ vitæ pertæſo ſibi privato quoque invigilare curatio fuit. *Job Daniel Dietericus in Oratione funebri Gr. Horſtii, apud Witte Memor. Medicor. pag* 67, *& ſeq.*

[*A*] *He left four ſons by his firſt wife.*] Three of them were Phyſicians, and the fourth an Apothecary (1). JOHN DANIEL HORSTIUS, the eldeſt, was born at Gieſſen and was profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Marpurg, and afterwards in that of his own country; and Phyſician to the Landgrave of Heſſe Darmſtadt, and laſt of all to the city of Francfort. He was admitted into the academy of the *Curious Inquirers into Nature*, by the name of Phœnix. He publiſhed ſeveral books, and died January 27, 1685, aged ſixty eight years (2). Here follow the titles of ſome of his works: *Phyſica Hippocratea, Takenii, Helmontii, Carteſii, Eſpagnet, Boylei, aliorumque recentiorum Commentis illuſtrata*, Francfort 1682, in 8vo. *Decas Obſervationum & Epiſtolarum Anatomicarum, quibus ſingularia ſcitu digna, lactearum nempe thoracicarum, & vaſorum lymphaticorum natura, embryoniſque per os nutritio, atque alia rariora exponuntur*, Francfort 1646 in 4to. *Pharmacopœa Galeno-Chemica Catholica*, Francfort 1651, in Folio. He procured a new edition corrected and augumented of *Pauli Zachiæ Queſtiones Medico-Legales*, at Francfort 1666, in Folio, and of *Lazari Riverii Opera Medica Univerſa*, in the ſame city in 1674 in Folio (3). GREGORY HORSTIUS, the youngeſt of theſe brothers, was born at Ulm, September 20, 1626. He received the degree of Doctor of Phyſic at Padua, Fortunius Licetus being Præſes May 11, 1650. He was admitted a member of the college of Phyſicians at Ulm, and declared public profeſſor of Phyſic in the year 1653. He died the thirty firſt of May 1661, and left children (4). He is author of a Treatiſe *de Mania* and promiſed *Hiſtoriam Zibethi* (5).

(1) Paul. Freher. in Theatro, pag. 1366.

(2) Witte, in Diario Biographico, ad ann. 1685.

(3) *Taken from* Lindenius renovatus, pag. 564, 565.

(4) Paul. Freher. in Theatro, pag. 1389.

(5) Witte, in Diario Biograph. ad ann. 1661.

[*B*] *Being encumbered with domeſtic affairs, he married a ſecond time . . . . . He was exceedingly happy in this ſecond marriage.*] He had been no leſs ſo in the firſt, if we believe the author of his Funeral Oration. ‘ Huic optimi conſorti ſuæ, dum fata Deuſque ſinebant, ex veteri formula, feliciſſime convixit, & optimè cohabitavit. Quid autem hic Archiater noſter glorioſus, conceſſit ne illorum in numerum, qui blandâ venere detenti, omnem Muſis remittunt nuntium? Nullatenus, ſed potius domeſticis, privatiſque omnibus ſcitè adornatis, famæ ſuæ gloriam & calamo, & ore, & praxi expandere, & diffundere ſategit (6). —— *With this his excellent conſort he lived in the ſweeteſt ſociety imaginable, while heaven ſpared her with him. But did this famous Phyſician imitate thoſe who being ſlaves to the blandiſhments of Venus, quite neglect the Muſes? quite the contrary, for having wiſely ſettled his private and domeſtic affairs, he ſpared no pains to encreaſe his fame, both by his writings, diſcourſes, and practice.*’ The latter part of this paſſage acquaints us, that Horſtius did not do as a great many who abandon themſelves ſo entirely to the nuptial pleaſures, that they quite neglect the Muſes. As to the happineſs of his ſecond marriage, the ſame author gives us the following account of it. ‘ Is . . . . . poſteaquam ſecunda, quæ vocant, expleſſet vota, ... jamque conjugalem lineam ex animi ſententiâ duceret, amantiſſimè ab amantiſſima marita habitus, domique ac foris felix, optatâ

(6) Joh. Daniel Dietericus, apud Witte, Memor. Medicorum, fol. (*e*) 4.

ἐυπϱωξια

qualities of a good Phyſician, probity, learning, and good fortune (*e*) [*C*], as we ſee at

(*e*) *Taken from his Funeral Oration ſpoke by John Daniel Dietericus* apud Witte Memor. Medicor. pag. 67, *&c.*

‘εὐπραξίᾳ gauderet: ecce! malo arthritico, quod multò ante non ſemel fortiter ſuſtinendo repulerat, invaditur (7). —— *After his ſecond marriage in which he enjoyed all the charms of reciprocal love, being happy both at home and abroad, while he rejoyced in his wiſhed for happineſs, lo! he was ſeized with a violent fit of the gout, which he had frequently before repulſed by his heroic conſtancy.*’ What I am now to quote, relates to both his marriages (8). ‘Quando autem factum ut Anno 1634: ſuaviſſimam hanc ipſius tori ſociam maligna febris deartuaret, in hoc infelix fuit, quod ſævam illam declinare neſciens, menſe Novembri miſeram viduitatem colere fuerit coactus: quâ in cum ſex Liberorum Pater & occupatiſſimo functionis muneri & moleſtiſſimæ rei familiaris curæ vix non ſuccumberet, divinâ adlucente gratiâ, ad vota ſecunda accedens, Præclariſſimi Medici *Fingerlini* p. m. relictæ viduæ (9), matrimonialem addixit fidem hoc ipſo iterum titulo felicitatis privatæ redonatus, quod hæc caſtiſſimis illius amoribus mirâ morum amabilitate reſpondebat: ita ut charitate Conjugem, ſedulitate Miniſtram præſtaret. —— *His beloved wife was ſeized with a malignant fever in the year* 1634, *he was ſo unfortunate as not to be able to cure it, and in the month of November was obliged to ſubmit to a melancholy widowhood: being left with ſix children, and ready to ſink under the weight of the laborious duties of his profeſſion, joined to a load of domeſtic cares, he being guided by the divine favour made choice of the widow of the famous Phyſician Fingerlinus for his ſecond wife. By whom he was again reſtored to all manner of domeſtic happineſs, ſhe anſwering his love with a wonderful ſweetneſs of manners, ſo that he found in her the affection of a wife and the aſſiduity of a ſervant.*’

[C] *He poſſeſſed in the higheſt degree the three qualities of a good phyſician, probity, learning, and good fortune.*] I ſhall paſs over what relates to the firſt, and I ſhall only obſerve that, with regard to the third, the panegyriſt obſerves, that the good ſucceſs of Horſtius's preſcriptions, did not proceed from chance, but from the attention with which he conſidered the nature of diſtempers, &c. He, by the by, gives ſevere ſtrokes to thoſe quacks, who boaſt of the vaſt numbers of cures which they have performed, and by their impudence wheedle people out of a great deal of money. He applies to them what a poet ſaid of a man who was both Chirurgeon and Phyſician, I do not doubt it, ſaid the poet, for you kill abundance of people both by ſteel and poiſon. ‘Ea eſt Empiricorum, Thalmudicorum, & Bullatorum Medicorum indoles & natura, ut mucoſam ſuam praxin pro admiranda felicitate venditantes, ſæpiſſime animos Magnatum & Divitum (utpote hoc cenſu facile ſe defraudari patientium) à verò Medicorum vultu & cultu abalienent, egregiam ſpem, & vere prodigioſæ ſuæ curæ (quippe illâ ipſâ excidium denunciant) expectationem concitando: quâ ſuperſtitioſâ, ſplendidiſque ſtrophis ſuffultâ infeliciſſimâ felicitate Microcoſmum argento ſimul, & ſanguine emungere ſceleratiſſime norunt: quibus Plagiariis interim illud Poëtæ apprime adaptari convenit.

Es Medicus, ſimul Chirurgus,
Cur? mittis ſtygiam, viros ad Orcum,
Et manu ſimul, & ſimul veneno:

‘Nequaquam autem hujuſmodi felicitatis exceſſum in *Defuncto noſtro*, velut abſoluto Practici Exemplo, quæremus: quin Potius fortunam illius in Praxi integram & illibatam, cumulatiſſimo rationis & experientiæ inſtructu partam demirabimur, &c (10).’

Since this occaſion offers, I ſhall obſerve, that ſome people are of opinion, that the ſucceſs of a Phyſician, doth not at all depend upon his skill in his profeſſion. This is the opinion of Joubert. ‘If a perſon recovers *ſays he* (11), we are ready to commend the skill of his Phyſician: tho' he has done nothing to contribute to it. And on the contrary a Phyſician is accounted ignorant, if his patient dies or lanugiſhes a long time in thoſe diſtempers, which are thought the moſt ſlight by the vulgar. Modeſt people will not ſay that he is more or leſs skillful, if he has the character of a learned man, among men of learning: but they will ſay that he is not happy in his practice, and conſequently is not a good Phyſician, always judging by the ſucceſs. It is certainly true, that in every thing there is a good and a bad fortune, and (as the Italians ſay) *la buona e la mala ſorte*. And the good fortune of a Phyſician conſiſts in his not being called to thoſe who are to die. For there he will acquire neither reputation, honour, nor friendſhip, notwithſtanding the Phyſician ought not in this caſe to be blamed, if he has done his duty; nor ought he to be leſs eſteemed than if the patient had recovered . . . . . It is indeed a great happineſs to be fortunate in our affairs, but good fortune doth not depend upon knowledge, or abilities: it is a ſpecial gift of God to be called to the aſſiſtance of thoſe who are to recover: with regard to whom he is pleaſed to make effectual, and continue the virtues beſtowed on medicines: and likewiſe not to be called to thoſe who are to die, whom nothing can avail or profit. It is therefore quite wrong to judge of the abilities of Phyſicians by their ſucceſs, which is more owing to good fortune, and the grace of God, than to the skill of man (12).’ A Flemiſh Phyſician who has tranſlated into Latin, and commented upon the firſt book of Joubert, concerning Vulgar Errors, has not adopted this opinion; he has maintained that the good fortune of Phyſicians flows only from their skill, and their bad fortune from their ignorance. He cites on this occaſion a paſſage of Crato, a famous Phyſician. *Huic equidem Jouberti ſententiæ non ſubſcribam; quin potius ad Cratonis*, &c (13). He alſo quotes a paſſage of Paracelſus, affirming the ſame thing. In my opinion he carries the matter too far, I believe there are Phyſicians who ſometimes kill or cure their patients, without deſerving either praiſe or blame on that account. However skillful they may be, they do not always know the true cauſe of diſtempers, and they preſcribe a medicine, according to the rules of their art, which proves very pernicious, becauſe there is ſomething in the conſtitution of the patient which they cannot diſcover. The particular diſpoſitions of the machine, the imagination of the patient affected in a particular manner, the ſecret paſſions may produce effects, which the skill and moſt conſummate experience of Phyſicians could never have expected. The efficacy of theſe unknown cauſes, will occaſion a medicine given raſhly, ignorantly, and fooliſhly, to drive away a diſtemper: and another medicine given according to the rules of Phyſic to kill the patient. There is therefore good and bad fortune here, independant on skill or ignorance, and one cannot be ſaid to be ignorant becauſe he doth not know the ſecret paſſions of the heart, or the odd properties of a particular conſtitution, and becauſe he could not foreſee the obſtacles they would make to the virtue of the medicine. A Phyſician is not thought to fail through ignorance, except he be ignorant of what he might have learned from ſtudy and practice. The queſtion is, if there be Phyſicians, who, by a prerogative attached to their perſon, fall by chance, and frequently, upon the remedy which cures, and if there are others who, by a perſonal deſtiny, do quite the contrary: or the queſtion is this, are there ſome Phyſicians, who are called preciſely when it is predeſtinated, that the ſick perſon ſhall recover? and are there others who are called preciſely, when it is predeſtinated that he ſhall die? It would ſeem that Joubert has pretended this, and called it a particular favour of heaven, or a privation of that divine favour. Crato laughs at this conceit. This diſpute is the ſame with that which I have treated at large in another place (14), whether there is a good or bad fortune attached to certain perſons, or if good and bad fortune is always the conſequence the one of prudence and the other of imprudence? The antients did not pretend this; for when they enumerated the qualifications of a great general, they gave his fortune a particular rank, diſtinct from his skill in the art of war. ‘Ego ſic exiſtimo, *ſaid Cicero*, in ſummo Imperatore quatuor has res ineſſe oportere, ſcientium rei Militaris, virtutem, auctoritatem, felicitatem (15). —— *I think a great general ſhould be poſſeſſed of theſe four qualities, skill in the art of war, valour, authority, and good fortune.*’ He afterward ſhows, that Pompey poſſeſſed theſe four qualities in an eminent degree, and owns that the

---

(7) Id. ibid. pag. 67, 68.

(8) Id. ibid. pag. 5, *before the end. I cite it in this manner, becauſe the moſt part of the pages of this Funeral Oration are not numbered.*

(9) *This author had obſerved, that Horſtius had married a maid in his firſt marriage.* Interea, *ſays he*, *pag.* 69, & maritalem conditionem exoſculatus, Hedwigem Stammiam, Virginem lectiſſimam confarreatione ſibi ſacroſanctâ copulat.

(10) Dieterici Oratio funeb. Gr. Horſtii, apud Witte, Memor. Medicor. *page which follows the leaf* (*e*) 5.

(11) Joubert, Erreurs Populaires, livr. i, chap. vii, pag. m. 33, 34.

(12) Ib. pag. 35.

(13) Joannes Bourgeſius, in Scholiis ad cap. vii, Jouberti de Erroribus Vulgi, pag. 105, 106.

(14) See remark [*K*] of the article TIMOLEON.

(15) Cicero, pro Lege Manilia, cap. x, pag. m. 32, Tom. III.

at large in his funeral oration. He publiſhed ſeveral books [*D*] which were very much eſteemed. Two of his ſons were likewiſe authors.

laſt of them depends on GOD, and not upon man. 'Reliquum eſt ut de felicitate quam præſtare DE SE 'IPSO nemo poteſt, meminiſſe, & commemorare de 'altero poſſumus: ſicut æquum eſt homini de poteſta'te deorum, timide & pauca dicamus. Ego enim ſic 'exiſtimo: Maximo, Marcello, Scipioni, Mario, & 'ceteris magnis imperatoribus, NON SOLUM propter 'virtutem, ſed etiam propter fortunam, ſæpius impe'ria mandata atque exercitus eſſe commiſſos. Fuit 'enim profecto quibuſdam ſummis viris quædam ad 'amplitudinem, & gloriam, & ad res magnas bene 'gerendas divinitus adjuncta fortuna (16). —— *It re'mains that we ſhould with caution and brevity, as be'comes men when they ſpeak of the power of the gods, ſay 'ſomething concerning good fortune, which though no 'man can ſecure to himſelf, yet we can remember and 'relate it of others. For I am of opinion, that Maxi'mus, Marcellus, Scipio, Marius, and the other great 'generals, were frequently entruſted with the higheſt 'dignities, and the command of armies;* NOT ONLY '*on account of their valour, and other great qualities, 'but likewiſe on account of their good fortune. For cer'tainly ſome great men have been bleſſed by the gods 'with good fortune, to guide them to grandeur, glory, 'and the performance of heroic actions.*'

[*D*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] I believe the firſt was his *Inſtitutiones Logicæ*, which he publiſhed while he gave private lectures of Philoſophy in his chamber at Wittemberg, about the year 1601 (17). He printed in the ſame city, in the year 1607, his treatiſe *de Natura Humana, On human nature* (18). His *Diſſertatio de natura Amoris additis Reſolutionibus de cura Furoris amatorii, de Philtris, atque de pulſu Amantium*, at Gieſſen in 4to, in the year 1611. He publiſhed there in 1615, his book *de teunda Sanitate Studioſorum & Literatorum*, in 4to, and in 1619 his treatiſe *de cauſis ſimilitudinis & diſſimilitudinis, in fœtu, reſpectu parentum &c. cui annexa eſt Reſolutio Quæſtionis de diverſo partus tempore, imprimiſque quid de ſeptimeſtri & octimeſtri partu ſentiendum* in 4to. I refer you to *Lindenius renovatus* (19), where we find the titles and editions of all the works of this Phyſician particularly ſet down; and I ſhall only obſerve, that after his death they were publiſhed in one volume in folio at Nuremberg, in the year 1660, and in three volumes in 4to, at Torgau, in the year 1661.

HORTENSIA, ſiſter of the orator Hortenſius. Thus it is a modern author names her *(a)*; but as he himſelf acknowledges in another place (*b*), the name which Plutarch gives Hortenſius's ſiſter is Valeria. Turn therefore to VALERIA, for there is no reaſon to give Hortenſius two ſiſters of different names.

HORTENSIA, daughter of the orator Hortenſius, ſhewed herſelf worthy of ſuch a father, by her eloquence, when ſhe pleaded the cauſe of the Roman ladies before the Triumviri, who had decreed that fourteen hundred of them ſhould declare what eſtates they poſſeſſed, intending after that to tax them according to their fancy for the expences of the war. Thoſe Triumviri were Mark Antony, Octavius, and Lepidus. They had at firſt ſignified that thoſe who ſhould not give in a true valuation of their eſtates, ſhould be fined; and that a reward ſhould be given to thoſe who ſhould diſcover their deceit. The ladies had recourſe to the interceſſion of thoſe amongſt them, who might have intereſt with the Triumviri, and were civilly received by the ſiſter of Octavius, and the mother of Marc Antony; but Fulvia, Marc Antony's wife, ſhut the door againſt them; inſomuch that they reſolved to preſent themſelves before the Triumviri. Hortenſia was their ſpeaker, and made a moſt excellent ſpeech. Quintilian has mentioned it with praiſe (*a*). The Triumviri were ſo unkind as to cenſure the boldneſs which the ladies had expreſſed, and they commanded their officers to turn them out [*A*]. That order made all the company murmur, which hindered the officers from executing it. Whereupon the Triumviri put off the buſineſs to the next day. The iſſue was, that only four hundred women were obliged to give an account of their eſtates (*b*). By this we may form a better judgment of that event than by Moreri's account of it, or even by Valerius Maximus's words, which will be ſeen below [*B*].

[*A*] *The Triumviri commanded their officers to turn them out.*] Inſtead of this, James Philip de Bergamo, whom Proſper Mandoſius (1) follows, ſays that Hortenſia's eloquence was ſo admired by the auditory, that they thought they had heard her father, and that ſhe obtained of the Triumviri whatever the ladies deſired, beſides great praiſes. He has committed two other faults; 1. That Hortenſia writ many things. 2. That the Roman ladies were taxed, becauſe the public neceſſities required it. It was rather from the tyrannical avarice of the Triumviri. How many faults does the deſire of praiſing people, occaſion!

[*B*] *Moreri's account . . . . or even by the words of Valerius Maximus.*] He ſays, *that the ſenate had laid a ſevere tax upon the women of Rome . . . . and that Hortenſia alone undertook the cauſe of her ſex.* I. The Triumviri and not the ſenate laid this ſevere tax, as he calls it. II. They did not lay it on all the women of Rome, but only on the rich: it was a tax on thoſe that could well bear it. III. Hortenſia was indeed the only ſpeaker, but not the only actor or interceſſor for her ſex; for all that were concerned, went in a body to ſollicit the mothers, ſiſters, and wives, of the Triumviri; and afterwards they came to an audience; where, as in all ſorts of deputations, one ſpoke for the reſt. I ſay nothing of Moreri's omiſſions, nor of his wrong citation of Appian of Alexandria, which has been transferred into the Dutch edition with a little change, that may deceive the reader. That fault proceeds from the preſs: Moreri doubtleſs writ, *li.* 4. *belli civil.* Inſtead of which the Printers of Lyons put in *li.* 4. *b. li civil.* and thoſe of Holland *li.* 4. *b. li. civil.* Such a ſmall miſtake has been ſufficient upon many occaſions, to make people believe that an author had wrote books which he never thought of. Who would not believe, ſeeing Ovid quoted *in elog.* at the end of the article HORTENSIUS the orator, both in the Dutch and the preceding editions, that Ovid wrote a poem intituled *Elogies?* Every body doth not find out that inſtead of *in elog.* it ſhould be *in eleg.* a citation ſomewhat too general, by Voſſius's leave who has uſed it (2), but yet true at the bottom. There are many other wrong citations in this article of Moreri's Dictionary; Pliny is there cited twice; the firſt time falſly. The fifth chapter of the third book of Varro *de re ruſtica*, and the thirteenth of the third book of Macrobius's *Saturnalia*, are quoted wrong, and ſhew that Moreri did not verify whether Voſſius's Printers had put one figure for another.

Here are the words of Valerius Maximus which I have promiſed. 'Hortenſia Q. Hortenſii filia cum 'ordo Matronarum gravi tributo à Triumviris eſſet 'oneratus, nec quiſquam virorum patrocinium eis ac'commodare auderet, cauſſam fœminarum apud Trium'viros conſtanter & fœliciter egit. Repræſentata enim 'patris facundia impetravit ut major pars imperate pe-

(16) Cicero pro lege Manilia, cap xvi, pag. 53, Tom. III.

(17) Dieterici Oratio, &c. ubi ſupra, folio (*e*) 2.

(18) Id. ibid. folio (*e*) 3.

(10) Pag 359, & ſeq.

(*a*) Glandorpius, Onom. pag. 406.

(*b*) Idem. pag. 865.

(*a*) Quinti Hortenſii filiæ oratio apud Triumviros habita legitur non tantum in ſexus honorem. *Quintil. Inſtit. lib. i, cap i.*

(*b*) Ex Appiano, lib. iv. Bell. Civil.

(1) *In* Biblioth. Rom. Cent. II, n. 88.

(2) De Hiſt. Lat. pag 48, de Poeët. Lat. pag. 15.

‘ cuniæ his remitteretur (3). ——— *The Triumviri* ‘ *having loaded the Roman ladies with a grievous tax,* ‘ *and no man daring to appear in their favour, Hortenſia, daughter to Q. Hortenſius, pleaded their cauſe* ‘ *before the Triumviri with great conſtancy and ſucceſs.* ‘ *For being miſtreſs of all her father's eloquence, ſhe* ‘ *obtained a remiſſion of the greateſt part of it.*’

HORTENSIUS, the name of a Plebeian family of Rome, taken probably from their application to gardening, as that of Fabius and Lentulus, &c. came from a like original. Antonius Auguſtinus had no reaſon to rank this family among the Patrician [*A*], ſince we find in the Faſti one **LUCIUS HORTENSIUS**, tribune of the people in the year of Rome 331. He accuſed Sempronius Atratinus, the conſul of the foregoing year, of having raſhly attack'd the Volſci: But his four colleagues who were preſent at the battle, ſo earneſtly deſired him to drop the accuſation, that after having done all that was poſſible on his ſide to perſuade them to allow him to proceed in it, at laſt, when he ſaw them reſolved to quit the enſigns of their dignity all the time that the tryal ſhould laſt, he complyed with their deſire. He would not ſuffer the people to ſee their tribunes in ſuch a condition, nor puſh a conſul to the laſt extremity, who had at leaſt gained the love of his ſoldiers (*a*). Above a hundred years after, we find one **QUINTUS HORTENSIUS**, Dictator [*B*]. He brought back the people, who had retired to the *Janiculum*, and made a law, that thenceforth all the Romans ſhould be obliged to obey the ordinances of the people [*C*]. He died in his office (*b*) which had never happened before (*c*). Moreri is ſtrangely miſtaken concerning this Dictator [*D*]. Of all the Hortenſius's, he that made himſelf the moſt famous, was the orator, who is the ſubject of the following article.

[*A*] *Antonius Auguſtinus had no reaſon to rank this family among the patrician.*] The tract of Antonius Auguſtinus *de Romanorum gentibus & familiis*, which I make uſe of, was printed at Lyons in 1592, in 4to. We there find word for word upon the *Familia Hortenſia*, what Richard Streinnius ſaid of it in a book he publiſhed upon the ſame ſubject in 1559. They both go upon a very falſe foundation, in placing this family among the Patrician; namely, that Cicero gives the title of *nobilis* to Hortenſius, in his orations againſt Verres. Who knows not that *nobilis* and *plebeius* were not inconſiſtent words in antient Rome?

[*B*] *Above a hundred years after .... Q. HORTENSIUS, the dictator.*] It is hard to fix the preciſe year of our Quintus Hortenſius's dictatorſhip. I believe Sigonius was right in placing it in the year 467. Father Hardouin (1) doubtleſs approved that opinion; but his Printers by omitting a letter, make him ſay, that the ſedition of the people, which was ſuppreſſed by the dictator Hortenſius, happened in the year CCCLXVII. St Auſtin will have it, that Hortenſius was created dictator by reaſon of the retiring of the people to the Janiculum, which is very probable. ‘ Poſt graves & longas Rom. ſeditiones quibus ad ultimum plebs in Janiculum hoſtili diremptione ſeceſſerat, cujus mali tam dira calamitas erat, ut ejus rei cauſa quod in extremis periculis fieri ſolebat, & Dictator crearetur Hortenſius, qui plebe revocata in eodem Magiſtratu expiravit, quod nulli Dictatori ante contigerat (2). ——— *After grievous and long* ‘ *diſſentions in Rome, the commons at laſt retired in a* ‘ *hoſtile manner to the Janiculum, which produced ſuch* ‘ *dreadful calamities, that on this account, as was* ‘ *uſual in the moſt extream dangers, they choſe Hortenſius dictator, who, having appeaſed the people, died in* ‘ *that office, which had never happened to any dictator* ‘ *before him.*’

[*C*] ... *and made a law, that thenceforth all the Romans ſhould obey the ordinances of the people.*] An author cited by Aulus Gellius teaches us, that the ordinances made by the report or at the requeſt of the tribunes of the people, were not properly called laws, but *plebiſcita*, and that before Hortenſius's dictatorſhip, the patricians were not ſubject to ordinances of this ſort. *Ne leges quidem proprie ſed plebiſcita appellantur quæ Tribunis plebis ferentibus accepta ſunt, quibus rogationibus ante Patricii non tenebantur, donec Q. Hortenſius Dictator eam legem tulit ut eo jure quod plebs ſtatuiſſet, omnes Quirites tenerentur* (3). Livy tells us the quite contrary; for he ſays, that Lucius Valerius, and Marcus Horatius, who were made conſuls in the year of Rome 305, began to ſhew their complaiſance to the people by making a law, which left it no longer in doubt, whether the laws eſtabliſhed by the people obliged the ſenate. That law decided this matter in favour of the people. ‘ Omnium primum cum veluti in controverſo jure eſſet tenerenturne Patres Plebiſcitis, legem centuriatis comitiis tulere, ut quod tributim plebes juſſiſſet populum teneret, qua lege Tribunitiis rogationibus telum acerrimum datum eſt (4). —— *Firſt of all, it having been* ‘ *controverted, whether the ſenators were bound by the* ‘ *ordinances of the commons, they made a law in the* ‘ Comitiæ Centuriatæ, *that whatever the commons de-* ‘ *creed in their tribes ſhould bind the whole Roman peo-* ‘ *ple, by which law a dreadful force was given to the ro-* ‘ *gations of the tribunes.*’ They had juſt deſtroyed the power of the Decemviri, and recalled the mutinous populace that had withdrawn to mount Aventinus. The new conſuls omitted nothing to make themſelves popular. The conſul Quintus Capitolinus acknowledged the force of this new law three years after; when repreſenting to the people the advantages that the ſenate had yielded to them, he brings into the account *Scita plebis injuncta patribus* (5). This law was renewed in the 415th year of Rome; the dictator Publius Philo having ordained that the *plebiſcita* ſhould oblige all the Romans (6). The author alledged by Aulus Gellius was not therefore well informed. If he had ſaid that the ſenators had found the art of evading this deciſion, ſo that it was neceſſary to renew it authentically in Quintus Hortenſius's dictatorſhip, he would been above our criticiſms: but this he has not done. Pliny (7) ſpeaks of what was enacted by this dictator to the peoples advantage, without ſaying, whether there was any ſuch law before or not. Sigonius did not know what was done under the conſuls Valerius and Horatius; for he ſays (8), that the law of Hortenſius had been already made by the dictator Publius Philo in the year of Rome 414.

[*D*] *Moreri is ſtrangely miſtaken concerning this dictator.*] Two groſs blunders in a few words: one in ſaying, that he was *a famous civilian and law-maker*; the other in ſaying, that the orator Hortenſius was his grandſon. Did ever any one call the magiſtrates of the Roman common-wealth legiſlators, becauſe they procured the enacting ſome laws? In that caſe the number of the Roman legiſlators would be very great. Neither are they the perſons called *Juriſconſulti*. But it is very probable, that Moreri had no other knowledge of Q. Hortenſius the dictator, but his paſſing a law which ſubjected the ſenate to the *plebiſcita*. Beſides, ſince Moreri obſerves that the dictatorſhip of this Hortenſius fell in the year of Rome 468, how could he take him for the grandfather of the orator Hortenſius, a military tribune, according to him, in the year of Rome 664? What want of attention! What negligence is this!

---

(3) Val. Maxim. lib. viii, cap. iii. *Moreri quotes* lib. iii. Hofman, lib. ii.

(*a*) Non videbit plebs Romana ſordidatos Tribunos ſuos. C. Sempronium nihil moror quando hoc eſt in imperio conſecutus ut tam carus eſſet militibus. *Livius, lib. iv, Dec. I, cap. xlii.* See alſo *Valer. Maxim. lib, vi, cap. v.*

(*b*) Livius, in Epit. lib. xi.

(*c*) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. iii, cap xvii.

(1) In Plin. lib. xvi, cap x, pag. 239. Tom. III.

(2) Auguſtin de Civit. Dei, lib. iii, cap. xvii.

(3) Lælius Felix, apud A. Gell. lib. xv, cap. xxvii.

(4) Liv lib iii, Dec. I, cap. lv.

(5) Id. cap. lxvii.

(6) Ut plebiſcita omnes Quirites tenerent. *Livius, Dec. I, lib. viii, cap. xii.*

(7) Lib. xvi, cap. x.

(8) In Faſt. ad ann. 467.

HORTENSIUS (QUINTUS) cotemporary with Cicero, and almoſt as great an orator as he, was born in the 639th year of Rome *(a)*. He pleaded his firſt cauſe at nineteen years of age, and ſucceeded ſo well in it, that he had not only the approbation of the auditory, but alſo that of the two conſuls, who were beſt judges of that age [*A*]. This was the cauſe which he pleaded for Africa before the ſenate under thoſe two conſuls. Some time after he pleaded for the king of Bythynia, and had ſtill better ſucceſs. The Social war ariſing in the 663d year of Rome, the proceedings of juſtice were ſo interrupted in the city, that Hortenſius betook himſelf to arms *(b)*. In the ſecond campaign he was made a military tribune; but I believe that he ſtopped there, and that thoſe who pretend that he was lieutenant-general under Sylla, in the war with Mithridates, take him for another [*B*]. He went ſucceſſively through all the honours of the republic; he was queſtor, ædile, prætor, and then conſul with Q. Cecilius Metellus, in the year of Rome 684. The lot fell upon him to go into Crete, to reduce the inhabitants of that iſland; but as he triumphed at Rome by his eloquence *(c)*, he choſe rather to ſhine at the bar, than in the field. He therefore yielded up that poſt to his colleague, who gained thereby the honour of a triumph, and the ſirname of *Creticus*. Hortenſius had the happieſt memory in the world [*C*]. He uſed many geſticulations in pleading [*D*], which drew upon him a very blunt raillery before the judges; for L. Torquatus called him *Dionyſia*, who was a famous dancer. You may ſee in Aulus Gellius, what Hortenſius anſwered him. It cannot be denied that he had a great deal of affectation in his manner; or at leaſt, that he was exceſſively nice in his cloaths [*E*]. He carefully conſulted his glaſs as he dreſſed himſelf, and it

(a) *See the remark* [*B*].

(b) Cicero in Bruto.

(c) Xiphilin. ex Dion. lib. xxxv. init.

[*A*] *He had the approbation of the two conſuls, who were the beſt judges of that age.*] Theſe were Lucius Craſſus and Quintus Scævola, the firſt whereof was one of the greateſt orators, and the latter one of the greateſt lawyers that had ever appeared in Rome (1). This conſulſhip fell in the year 658: ſo that Hortenſius being then but nineteen years old, it is a neceſſary conſequence that he was born in the year 639: which we may likewiſe gather from Cicero's being eight years younger than he (2). Cicero, I ſay, who was born in the year 647. Here is the proof of what I have ſaid concerning the firſt cauſe which Hortenſius pleaded (3). 'Q. Hortenſii admodum adoleſcentis ingenium, ut Phidiæ ſignum, ſimul aſpectum & probatum eſt. Is L. Craſſo, Q. Scævola Coſſ. primum in foro dixit, & apud hos ipſos quidem Conſules, & cum eorum qui affuerunt, tum ipſorum Conſulum qui omnes intelligentia anteibant, judicio diſceſſit probatus; undeviginti annos natus erat eo tempore. —— *Hortenſius's genius, while he was very young, like Phidia's ſtatue, was no ſooner ſeen than admired. He firſt appeared at the bar in the conſulſhip of L. Craſſus and Q. Scævola, and pleaded before the conſuls with the approbation, not only of all preſent, but of the conſuls themſelves, who were the beſt judges of that age; he was at that time eighteen years old.*' Cicero (4) makes this L. Craſſus ſpeak thus: 'Ego eſſe jam judico (*omnibus iſtis laudibus quas oratione complexus ſum, excellentem Hortenſium*) & tum judicavi cum me Conſule in Senatu cauſam defendit Africæ, nuperque etiam magis cum pro Bithyniæ rege dixit. —— *I now think* (that Hortenſius deſerves all the praiſes I have beſtowed upon him) *and I was of the ſame opinion, when, during my conſulſhip, he defended the cauſe of Africa in the ſenate, and ſtill more when he lately defended the king of Bithynia.*'

[*B*] *They who pretend that he was lieutenant-general under Sylla in the war againſt Mithridates, take him for another.*] What makes me believe that our orator is not the Hortenſius, who had that poſt in Sylla's armies, is on one hand Cicero's ſilence, and on the other the character which Plutarch gives to that lieutenant-general. Plutarch repreſents him as a man who perfectly underſtood the art of war, and who never yielded (5); and relates ſome actions of him, which ſavour of an old experienced officer, and which concern the 667th year of Rome. Where ſhould the orator Hortenſius have got that experience; he who began to bear arms but in the year 663? And if he had acquired it, and ſignalized himſelf under Sylla, how comes it that it was not mentioned in thoſe paſſages where his praiſes are enlarged upon, and where it is obſerved that he was military tribune in his ſecond campaign? *Judicia intermiſſa bello ..... Erat Hortenſius in bello primo anno miles, altero Tribunus militum* (6). Doubtleſs Glandorpius (7) was miſtaken in taking him for Sylla's lieutenant-general. But what need is there to take advantage of Cicero's ſilence? What he ſays, is much more favourable to me. Do not the three years in which Hortenſius was the chief man at the bar, by reaſon of the death or abſence the moſt famous orators (8), coincide with the time that Sylla had the other Hortenſius in his army?

[*C*] *He had the happieſt memory in the world.*] He pronounced his pleadings juſt as he had meditated them, without writing one word, and forgot nothing that was ſaid by his adverſaries. 'Primum memoria tanta quantam in viro cognoviſſe me arbitror, ut quæ ſecum commentatus eſſet, ea ſine ſcripto verbis iiſdem redderet quibus cogitaviſſet. Hoc adjumento illo tanto ſic utebatur, ut ſua & commentata & ſcripta, & nullo referente omnia adverſariorum dicta meminiſſet (9).' What Seneca ſays of him, is much more remarkable. Upon a challenge that was given Hortenſius, he ſtaid a whole day at a public auction, and repeated in order what had been ſold, to whom, and at what price. His recital was compared with the clerk's account, and his memory was found to have ſerved him faithfully in every particular. 'Hortenſius à Siſenna provocatus in auctione perſedit diem totum, & omnes res, & pretia, & emptores ordine ſuo argentariis recognoſcentibus, ita ut in nullo ſalleretur, recenſuit (10).'

[*D*] *He uſed many geſticulations in pleading.*] Tho' his geſtures were fine enough to make the two beſt actors of that time ambitious of imitating them on the ſtage (11); it is certain they exceeded the juſt bounds of the art of oratory. 'Vox canora & ſuavis, *ſays Cicero in his Brutus*, motus & geſtus etiam plus artis habebat quam erat Oratori ſatis.' Moreri doth not give an exact account of the jeſt of Torquatus: 'He uſed ſo many motions in declaiming, that they gave him the name of Graſhopper, *Dionyſia Saltatricula*.' Who would not believe from theſe words, that Hortenſius had this nick-name given him all over the city? And yet there was but one man, who upon one ſingle occaſion, gave him not the name of Graſhopper, but of *Dionyſia*, a woman who was a celebrated dancer. The word *Saltatricula* is very ill rendered *Graſhopper*. Here is the paſſage of Aulus Gellius, in the fifth chapter of the firſt book: 'Cùm L. Torquatus, ſubagreſti homo ingenio & infeſtivo, gravius acerbiuſque apud conſilium judicum, cùm de cauſa Sullæ quæreretur, non jam hiſtrionem eum eſſe diceret, ſed geſticulariam Dionyſiamque eum notiſſimæ Saltatriculæ nomine appellaret; tum voce molli atque demiſſa Hortenſius, *Dionyſia*, inquit, *Dionyſia malo equidem eſſe quam quod tu Torquate*, ἄμυσος, ἀγεοδίαιτος, καὶ ἀπρόσιτος. —— *Lucius Torquatus, a rude and unpolite man, having ſaid in a very bitter and ſevere manner before the judges, in the cauſe of of Sylla, that Hortenſius did not now as formerly behave like a player, but like the dancer Dionyſia, Hortenſius replied in a ſoft and low voice,* I would rather be Dionyſia, than be void of all taſte, elegance, or humanity, as you are.'

[*E*] *He was exceſſively nice in his cloaths.*] This paſſage of Aulus Gellius, that I am going to quote, and which goes before the words you have juſt now read, will ſerve both to prove Hortenſius's geſticulations,

(1) Eloquentium juriſperitiſſimus Craſſus, juriſperitorum eloquentiſſimus Scævola putaretur. *Cicero in Bruto, cap. xxxix.*

(2) Me adoleſcentem (Hortenſius) nactus octo annis minorem quam erat ipſe. *Id. in Bruto.*

(3) Id. ibid. cap. lxiv.

(4) De Orat. lib. iii, ſub fin.

(5) Στράτηγικὸς ἀνὴρ καὶ φιλόνεικος. Vir rei bellicæ peritus & pervicax. *Plut. in Sylla, page* 461.

(6) Cicero in Bruto.

(7) Onomaſt. pag. 404.

(8) Triennium fere fuit urbs ſine armis, ſed oratorum aut interitu aut diſceſſu, aut fuga —— Primas in cauſis agebat Hortenſius, magiſque quotidie probabatur. *Cicero in Bruto.*

(9) Cicero in Bruto. *See alſo* Tuſcul. 1, & Academ. 2. init.

(10) Senec. Præf. lib. i, Controv.

(11) Neſcires utrum cupidius ad audiendum eum, an ad ſpectandum concurreretur, ſic verbis oratoriis aſpectus, & rurſus aſpectui verba ſerviebant. Itaque conſtat Æſopum & Roſcium ludicræ artis peritiſſimos viros illo cauſas agente in corona frequenter aſtitiſſe, ut foro petitos geſtus in ſcenam referrent. *Val. Maxim. lib viii, cap. x.*

it is ſaid that he commenced a ſuit againſt his colleague, who paſſing through a narrow place, had ruffled the ſymmetry of his gown (*d*). He had heaped up great riches, and uſed them plentifully to live an eaſy life in the city and in the country. He had ſeveral country-houſes [*F*]; and as he was very ſumptuous, he oppoſed the ſumptuary laws (*e*), which the conſuls had a mind to enact in the 699th year of Rome. He praiſed them ſo cunningly for their magnificence in their houſes, that they durſt not inſiſt upon a thing which did not agree with their own conduct. He was the firſt that eat peacocks (*f*), it was to furniſh a diſh in an entertainment he gave to the college of the Augurs. He was very curious and magnificent in parks and fiſh-ponds (*g*), and was as careful of the health of his fiſh [G], as of that of his ſervants. He muſt needs have been a great lover of plane-trees, ſince he watered them with wine; which he made ſo little a ſecret of, that he one day deſired Cicero to change with him his hour of pleading; for, ſaid he, I muſt go and pour ſome wine upon a plane-tree I have at one of my country-houſes (*h*). Whoever knows the heart of man never ſo little, will much more wonder that thoſe two great orators ſhould have given one another many marks of affection upon ſeveral occaſions [*H*], than that they ſhould not always have been perfectly good friends; for after all, Cicero was the cauſe that Hortenſius did not preſerve the glory which he had long enjoy'd of being the firſt orator in Rome; and Hortenſius was the cauſe of Cicero's having a dangerous rival, who came cloſe to his heels. Hortenſius publiſhed not only ſome orations, and ſome

tions, and his great niceneſs in his cloaths. ‘Hortenſius omnibus fermè Oratoribus ætatis ſuæ niſi M. Tullio clarior, quod multa munditia & circumſpectè compoſitèque indutus & amictus eſſet, manuſque ejus inter agendum forent argutæ admodum & geſtuoſæ, maledictis compellationibuſque probroſis jactatus eſt, multaque in eum quaſi in hiſtrionem in ipſis cauſis atque judiciis dicta ſunt. — *Hortenſius who next to Cicero was the moſt celebrated orator of his age, being very nice and curious in his dreſs, and in pleading, making uſe of a great deal of action, was much ridiculed and abuſed, and was frequently even at the bar twitted with being a comedian rather than an orator.*’ As for the ſuit he entered for diſordering the folds of his gown, here is a proof or a teſtimony for it. ‘Hortenſius vir alioquin ex profeſſo mollis & in præcinctu ponens omnem decorem; fuit enim veſtitu ad munditiem curioſo, & ut bene amictus iret, faciem in ſpeculo ponebat; ubi ſe intuens togam corpori ſic applicabat, ut rugas non forte ſed induſtria locatas artifex nodus conſtringeret, & ſinus ex compoſito defluens nodum lateris ambiret. Is quondam cum incederet elaboratus ad ſpeciem collegæ de injuriis diem dixit; quod ſibi in anguſtiis obvius offenſu fortuito ſtructuram togæ deſtruxerat, & capitale putavit quod in humero ſuo locum ruga mutaſſet (12). —— *Hortenſius was a man profeſſedly effeminate, and placed all decency in outward ſhow; he was curious in his dreſs even to nicety, and to adjuſt it the better made uſe of a looking-glaſs, by help of which he tricked up his gown in ſuch a manner, that the folds did not fall by chance, but were formed with great care by help of artful knots, and the lappet falling formally down went round the knots at his ſide. As he was a walking one day in this elaborate dreſs, he brought an action of damages againſt his colleague, becauſe he had accidentally diſcompoſed the oeconomy of his gown as he went by him in a narrow paſſage, conſidering it as a capital injury that he had changed one fold on his ſhoulder.*’

[*F*] *He had ſeveral country-houſes.*] Pliny (13) makes mention of Hortenſius's *Tuſculanum*, in which he placed the Argonauts of the Painter Cydias, which coſt him 14400 livres, according to Father Hardouin's computation. He had a houſe at Bauli (14), one near Laurentium (15), and another near the Porta Flumentana (16). Judge of his expences by the number of hogſheads of wine, which he left to his heir, which was above ten thouſand. *Hortenſius ſuper decem millia cadûm hæredi reliquit* (17). Here is the proof of what I have ſaid (18) concerning the care he took to pour wine with his own hands upon his plane-trees. ‘Is Hortenſius platanos ſuas vino irrigare conſuevit, adeo ut in actione quadam quam habuit cum Cicerone ſuſceptam, precario à Tullio poſtulaſſet ut locum dicendi permutaret ſecum, abire enim in villam neceſſario ſe velle, ut vinum Platano quam in Tuſculano poſuerat ipſe ſuffunderet (19). —— *Hortenſius uſed to water his plane-trees with wine, and was ſo punctual in doing ſo, that being once engaged in a cauſe with Cicero, he begged that he would change his time of pleading with him, being,* ſaid he, *neceſſarily obliged to go to the country to pour ſome wine on a plane-tree which I have planted at my villa of Tuſculanum.*’

[G] *He was careful of the health of his fiſh.*] Varro (20) relates upon this ſubject ſome very ſingular things. Hortenſius did with reſpect to his fiſh, as miſers do with reſpect to their money; he durſt not make uſe of them, he choſe rather to buy fiſh in any neighbouring town, than to take them out of his ponds: nor was he only contented not to feed upon his own fiſh, but he alſo fed them nicely and plentifully. ‘Neque ſatis erat eum non paſci piſcinis, niſi eos ipſe paſceret ultro . . . Celerius voluntate Hortenſii ex equili educeres rhedarias ut tibi haberes mulas, quàm è piſcina barbatum mullum . . . Non minor cura ejus erat de ægrotis piſcibus, quàm de minus valentibus ſervis: itaque minus laborabat ne ſervus æger, quàm aquam frigidam biberent ſui piſces. —— *It was not enough for him that he did not feed upon the fiſh of his own ponds, but he fed them with great care . . . And he would have been more eaſily perſuaded to give you the mules out of his ſtable, than a mullet out of his pond . . . He was as careful of the health of his fiſh as of that of his ſervants: and was more ſollicitous that his fiſh ſhould have freſh water, than that his ſervants when indiſpoſed ſhould be furniſhed with it.*’ It is ſaid he was ſo paſſionately fond of a lamprey that he ſhed tears for the death of her (21). This Porphyry (22), Macrobius (23), and Tzetzes (24) have aſcribed to the orator Craſſus.

[*H*] *One will much more wonder that he and Cicero gave one another . . . marks of affection.*] Perhaps there is nothing upon which jealouſy is more able to cauſe a greater alienation in mens minds than eloquence. I know not whether beauty or poetry ought to be excepted. Two famous preachers ſeldom love one another, and eaſily quarrel even to the utmoſt rupture. It is much if they can conceal their jealouſy, and keep fair appearances with each other. So that what Hortenſius did in Cicero's behalf, may well be admired; but the ill offices he may have done him privately, ought not to ſurprize us. He got him admitted into the college of the Augurs (25): he praiſed him nobly on an occaſion, wherein his praiſes might be of uſe of him (26); he ran the hazard of loſing his life for his ſake (27); and Cicero himſelf confeſſes, that there had always been between them a reciprocal commerce of good offices. ‘Cùm præſertim non modo nunquam ſit aut illius à me curſus impeditus, aut ab illo meus, ſed contra ſemper alter ab altero adjutus, & communicando, & monendo, & favendo (28). —— *Eſpecially ſince we never oppoſed one another's intereſts, but, on the contrary, always aſſiſted each other, by mutual communication, of counſels, advice, and favour.*’ Cicero's good-offices towards Hortenſius, are not ſo much to be wondered at, as thoſe of Hortenſius towards him; becauſe, though naturally ſpeaking, Cicero muſt have had for many years, his heart filled with the rancour of jealouſy, it is likely he did not keep half of it, when he ſaw himſelf ſuperior. There was a time when he did not equal Hortenſius, another when he equalled him, and a third, when he excelled him. This laſt period is an excellent

(*d*) Macrob. Saturn. lib. ii, cap. ix. *Moreri, after Voſſius, quotes* lib. iii, cap. xiii, *but the third book contains only twelve chapters.*

(*e*) Dion, lib. xxxix.

(*f*) Varro de re Ruſtica, lib. iii, cap. vi. Plin. lib. x, cap. xx. Ælian. lib. v, Hiſt. Anim. cap. xxi. Tertull. de Pallio, ſub fin.

(*g*) Varro, de re Ruſtica, lib. iii, cap. xiii, & xvii.

(*h*) *See the remark* [*F*].

(12) Macrob. lib. ii, Saturn. cap. ix.

(13) Plinius, lib. xxxv, cap. xi.

(14) Cicer. 2. Acad. quæſt. Varro, de re Ruſt. lib. iii, cap. xvii.

(15) Varro, ibid.

(16) Cicer. ad Attic. lib. vii. Ep. iii.

(17) Varro, apud Plin. lib. xiv, cap. xiv.

(18) *I have mentioned this in the text, citat.* (*h*).

(19) Macrob. Saturn. lib. ii, cap. ix.

(20) De re Ruſt. lib. iii, cap. xvii.

(21) Apud Baulos in parte Baiana Piſcinam habuit Hortenſius Orator, in qua Muraenam adeo dilexit ut exanimatam fleſſe credatur. *Plin. lib. ix, cap. lv.*

(22) De abſtin. lib. iii.

(23) Saturn. lib. ii, cap. xi.

(24) Chil. viii, Hiſt. 174.

(25) Cicero in Bruto, init.

(26) At Hercule alter tuus familiaris Hortenſius quàm plena manu, quàm ingenue quam ornate noſtras laudes in aſtra ſuſtulit, quum de Flacci Prætura & de illo tempore Allobrogum diceret. Sic habeto nec amantius, nec honorificentius, nec copioſius potuiſſe dici. - - - *I cannot expreſs how copiouſly, how ingenuouſly, and how elegantly your other friend Hortenſius raiſed my fame to the very ſkies in the Oration, in which he mentioned the pretorſhip of Flaccus, and the time of the Allobroges. Be aſſured that nothing could be ſaid more affectionately, more honourably, or more fully.* Id. ad Attic. Ep. ult. lib. ii.

(27) Vidi, vidi hunc ipſum Q. Hortenſium lumen & ornamentum Reip. penè interfici ſervorum manu cum mihi addeſſet. - - - *I ſaw with theſe eyes that very Hortenſius, the glory and ornament of the common wealth, in the utmoſt hazard of being ſlain by the hands of ſlaves, on my account.* Id. pro Milone.

(28) Idem in Bruto.

ſome annals, but alſo ſome laſcivious poems [*I*]. None of all theſe are now extant; and it muſt be confeſſed, that his tongue was much better than his pen [*K*]. Tho' he carried the cauſe of Meſſala his ſiſter's ſon, having pleaded with the beſt of his eloquence for

excellent remedy remedy againſt jealouſy. But, on the contrary, what a mortification muſt it have been to Hortenſius to ſee Cicero, who only came after him at the beginning, overtake him ſome time after, and at laſt get the ſtart of him? ‘ Hortenſius . . . qui diu princeps Oratorum, aliquando æmulus Ciceronis exiſtimatus eſt, noviſſimè quoad vixit, ſecundus.’ Thus Quintilian ſpeaks in the third chapter of the eleventh book: I know, that it was not a diſadvantage to Hortenſius to have ſuch a rival as Cicero. The honours of his conſulſhip had ſo ſlackened that ardent and indefatigable application, with which he had cultivated his mind from his youth, that he was perceived every day more and more to decline (29). He took heart again when he ſaw the great progreſs of Cicero's glory. But in truth, he would have eaſily diſpenſed with ſuch a ſpur, which coſt him the firſt place. There were hardly any great cauſes, wherein theſe two famous orators were not retained, ſometimes for the ſame, and ſometimes for contrary parties (30). The famous extortioner Verres was to have Hortenſius for his advocate, which was one of the ſtrongeſt reaſons Cicero alledged to exclude Cæcilius from being the accuſer. It appears by that pleading (31) how fit Hortenſius was to make the beſt of the cauſes he undertook. Cicero had all ſorts of advantages here: he was the accuſer; and it is ſaid that he at firſt made Hortenſius give over thoughts of pleading for his client Verres (32) there being ſo many charges and proofs againſt him. ‘ Multis diebus prima actio celebrata eſt, ‘ dum teſtes Verris producuntur criminum diverſorum, ‘ dum recitantur publicæ privatæque literæ. Quibus ‘ rebus adeò ſtupefactus Hortenſius dicitur, ut rationem defenſionis omitteret (33). —— *The opening ‘ of the cauſe continued many days, while by the witneſſes of Verres many crimes were produced, and the ‘ public and private documents were read. At the ‘ hearing of which Hortenſius, is ſaid to have been ſo ‘ aſtoniſhed, that he laid aſide thoughts of making any ‘ defence for his client.*’ We have ſeen how Cicero declared that Hortenſius had never done him any ill offices: and we may ſee in the ſame place, that he confutes thoſe, who thought that Hortenſius was not favourable to him. ‘ Dolebam quod, non ut plerique ‘ putabant, adverſarium aut obtrectatorem laudum ‘ mearum, ſed ſocium potius & conſortem glorioſi laboris amiſeram (34). —— *What added to my grief ‘ was, that I had loſt not, as moſt people fancied, an ‘ enemy, and an envious rival, but rather a companion ‘ and fellow in our glorious toils.*’ But he wrote in another ſtile to his brother Quintus, when he told him, ‘ Quantum Hortenſio credendum ſit neſcio: me ſumma ſimulatione amoris, ſummaque aſſiduitate quoti‘ diana ſceleratiſſime inſidioſiſſimeque tractavit, adjuncto ‘ quoque Arrio: quorum ego conſiliis, promiſſis, præ‘ ceptis deſtitutus in hanc calamitatem incidi (35). —— ‘ *I do not know how far Hortenſius is to be truſted: he ‘ together with Arrius have uſed me in the moſt baſe ‘ and treacherous manner, under appearances of the ‘ warmeſt friendſhip and affection to my intereſts: and ‘ I have fallen into this diſtreſs, by being at once deprived of their counſels, promiſes, and directions.*’ How few people are there even amongſt thoſe who are accounted honeſt men, who have not two ſorts of language, one for books which they deſign for the public, and another for the letters which they write to their friends. See the remark [*M*] of the article GROTIUS. As long as theſe are not public, this inſincerity or amphibious language doth not appear: but I wait for the publication of their letters to find it. We ſhould vex ſome authors not a little, ſhould we oblige them to repeat in converſation, or to hear repeated, the ſame elogies they have given in their writings, prefaces, citations, and the agreeable neceſſity of making a funeral oration, how do you impoſe on the world! However it be, we have reaſon to look upon it as a wonderful addreſs of Pomponius Atticus, that he was able to preſerve the intimate friendſhip both of Cicero and Hortenſius, and to hinder them from falling out. ‘ Utebatur intimè Q. Hortenſio, ‘ qui iis temporibus principatum eloquentiæ tenebat, ‘ ut intelligi non poſſet uter eum plus diligeret, Cicero an Hortenſius, & id quod erat difficillimum, ‘ efficiebat ut inter quos tantæ laudis eſſet æmulatio, ‘ nulla intercederet obtrectatio, eſſetque talium virorum ‘ copula (36). —— *He lived in the cloſeſt friendſhip ‘ with Hortenſius, who at that time was the moſt celebrated orator at Rome, ſo that it was impoſſible to ‘ tell whether Cicero or Hortenſius loved him moſt, and ‘ what was a proof of his great addreſs, he was the ‘ cauſe that theſe two mighty rivals, never expreſſed ‘ any jealouſy of one another, ſo that he was, as it were, ‘ the bond of friendſhip betwixt them.*’

[*I*] *He had publiſhed ſome laſcivious poems.*] This we learn from Ovid in his ſecond book *de Triſtibus*, where he gives a catalogue of thoſe who have with impunity compoſed love poems.

Is quoque Phaſiacas Argo qui duxit in undas
  Non potuit Veneris furta tacere ſuæ.
Nec minus HORTENSI, nec ſunt minus improba Servi
  Carmina. Quis dubitet nomina tanta ſequi?

The hero too, whom far-fam'd Argo bore
To diſtant Phaſis, and the Cholchic ſhore,
Diſclos'd the love-intrigues he follow'd there,
And boaſted of the favours of the fair.
Nor leſs obſcene Hortenſius' numbers flow,
Nor Servius' lines a chaſter ſubject know.
To copy ſuch examples who'd refuſe?
They authorize the licence of the Muſe.

Aulus Gellius doubtleſs ſpeaks of theſe poems of Hortenſius, when he ſays (37), they were not polite, *invenuſta*. I know not whether the poem which Varro (38) aſcribes to him, be another work: as to the annals, they have been cited by Velleius Paterculus. I believe Hortenſius was a learned man, Cicero having given him that commendation. But I do not ſee that his poems, his annals, and the proffer of Lucullus, are ſo good proofs of his learning, as Corradus would fain have us believe. ‘ Sane, *ſays he* (39), videtur ‘ benè doctus fuiſſe, ſiquidem poëma ſcripſit, ut Autor ‘ eſt Varro libro primo de Analogia, & Annales, ut ‘ Paterculus affirmat, & certè cum Siſenna & Lucullo ‘ de Græce Latineque ſcribendo venit in eam contentionem quam Plutarchus in Lucullo refert. —— ‘ *He ſeems to have been a learned man, for he wrote a ‘ poem, as we are told by Varro, in his firſt book of Analogy; he wrote likewiſe Annals, as Paterculus affirms; ‘ and he certainly ſtrove with Siſenna and Lucullus for ‘ the ſuperiority of writing, both in Greek and Latin, ‘ as Plutarch teſtifies in the Life of Lucullus.*’ Methinks Corradus has not underſtood Plutarch's meaning; for he does not ſpeak there of a challenge betwixt Hortenſius, Siſenna, and *Lucullus*, but of a little preſumption of the later, who undertook in the preſence of the other two, to write the Social War, either in Latin or Greek, in proſe or in verſe, as the lot ſhould decide. Plutarch conjectures, that the Greek proſe fell to him by lot, ſince the hiſtory of that war, written by Lucullus in Greek proſe, was extant in his time: but ſtill, this doth not at all ſignify, that Hortenſius and Siſenna had engaged to perform the ſame taſk if the lot fell to them. Catanæus who relates it ſo (40), is miſtaken.

[*K*] *His tongue was better than his pen.*] This we learn from Quintilian, third chapter, eleventh book, where he obſerves that action has a mighty force in an orator; and that as this was Hortenſius's great talent, when his pleading came to be read, they were not found to come up to the reputation of their author. ‘ M. Cicero, *ſays he*, unam in dicendo actionem dominari putat, hac . . . Antonium & Craſſum multum valuiſſe, plurimam verò Q. Hortenſium, cujus ‘ rei fides eſt quod ejus ſcripta tantum infra famam ‘ ſunt . . . ut appareat placuiſſe aliquid eo orante quod ‘ legentes non invenimus. —— *Cicero is of opinion, ‘ that action is the chief talent of an orator . . . that ‘ Anthony and Craſſus excelled in it, but eſpecially ‘ Hortenſius, which will appear, if we conſider how* for him [*L*], ſeeing him charged with being ingaged in a faction; yet he did himſelf a great injury by it, and expoſed himſelf, in his old age, to hiſſings and clamours, which he alone had eſcaped before (*i*). He died in the 703d year of Rome, in the 64th year of his age, 44 or 45 of which he had ſpent with a mighty reputation at the bar (*k*). It has been ſaid that he had ſo worn out his voice, that he loſt it before he loſt his life. Others have ſo ill underſtood that thought, that they have taken it, as if he died in pleading, having killed himſelf by the violence of ſpeaking. We muſt look upon this as fabulous, ſince he pleaded a cauſe of importance a few days before his death [*M*]; and ſince Cicero is ſo far from mentioning this ſort of death, as he would doubtleſs have done if he had died in that manner, he affords us reaſons to think otherwiſe. Conſult upon all this, the remark [*M*]. Hortenſius married in his youth a daughter of C. Catulus (*l*), I cannot well tell whether ſhe was alſo the daughter of Servilia (*m*), a lady of the greateſt diſtinction in Rome. He was Catulus's ſon-in-law, at the time of Verres's trial. But nothing can be more ſingular than his marriage with Martia [*N*] the wife of Cato of Utica, and

---

(29) Cicer. in Bruto, ſub fin.

(30) Sæpe, in iiſdem, ſæpe in contrariis cauſis verſati ſumus. *Cicer. Divinat. in Q. Cæcil.*

(31) Divinat. in Q. Cæcilium.

(32) It is to be obſerved, that Hortenſius did not ſo forſake Verres, but that Quintilian, *lib. x, cap. i*, ſpeaks of his pleadings for him.

(33) Aſcon. Pedian. in procœmio act. in Verrem.

(34) Cicero, in Bruto, init.

(35) Id. Epiſt. iii, lib. i, ad Quint. fratrem. *See alſo* Epiſt. ix, ad Attic. lib. iii.

(36) Cornel. Nepos, in Vita Pomp. Attic.

(37) Lib. xix, cap. ix.

(38) Lib. 1 de Annal. apud Corradum in Cicer. Brutum, pag. 428.

(39) Ibid.

(40) In Plin. Ep. lib. v, pag. m. 283.

‘*much inferior his writings are to the great fame he enjoyed . . . ſo that it would ſeem that they had certain charms while he pronounced them, which are quite loſt in the reading.*’ How many preachers have we of whom we may ſay the ſame thing? Mr Morus is an inſtance of it.

[*L*] *Having pleaded with the beſt of his eloquence for him.*] This cauſe was pleaded in the year of Rome 702. Hortenſius was then ſixty three years old, which age did not hinder him from making an excellent plea. Brutus, who always thought him a great orator, never admired him ſo much as he did on that day; others paſſed the ſame judgment; and Cicero having read the piece, publiſhed word for word, as it was pronounced, was of the ſame opinion (41). And if Hortenſius was hiſſed the next day, it was not becauſe he had pleaded leſs eloquently than he uſed to do, but becauſe people were vexed to ſee that he had brought his client off. That reſentment had already ſhewn itſelf againſt the judges. ‘Clamoribus ſcilicet maximis judices corripuerunt, & oſtenderunt planè eſſe quod ferri non poſſet . . . Acceſſit huc, quod poſtridie ejus abſolutionem in Theatrum Curionis Hortenſius introiit, puto ut ſuum gaudium gauderemus. Hic tibi *ſtrepitus, fremitus, clamor, tonitruum & rudentum ſibilus.* Hoc magis animadverſum eſt quod intactus ab ſibilo pervenerat Hortenſius ad ſenectutem. Sed tum ita bene ut in totam vitam cuivis ſatis eſſet, & pœniteret eum jam viciſſe (42). —— *They inveighed againſt the judges with terrible outcries, and ſhowed that it was a thing not to be ſuffered . . . Beſides, the next day after his acquittal, Hortenſius entered into the theatre of Curio, expecting, no doubt, the compliments of his friends upon that occaſion, but inſtead of that he was received with murmurs, outcries, clamour, and hiſſing. This was the more taken notice of, becauſe Hortenſius had arrived to old age, without ever being ſo uſed before, but then he got as much of it as was enough for one's whole life, and as made him regret that he had got his cauſe.*’ He pleaded a few days before his death, as Cicero obſerves; he was undoubtedly one of thoſe great wits, who have a laſting ſtrength of mind. It is true, he ſhined more in his youth, than in his more advanced age, for which two reaſons are aſſigned: one is that he had made choice of the Aſiatic eloquence, which was more becoming in a young than an old man: the other was, that he laboured with greater application when he was young. ‘Si quærimus, cur adoleſcens magis floruerit dicendo, quàm ſenior. Hortenſius, cauſas reperiemus veriſſimas duas: primum, quod genus erat orationis Aſiaticum, adoleſcentiæ magis conceſſum, quàm ſenectuti. Genera autem Aſiaticæ dictionis duo ſunt . . . Hæc . . . genera dicendi aptiora ſunt adoleſcentibus, in ſenibus gravitatem non habent. Itaque Hortenſius utroque genere florens, clamores faciebat adoleſcens . . . Sed cum jam honores, & illa ſenior autoritas gravius quiddam requireret, remanebat idem, nec decebat idem: quodque exercitationem ſtudiumque dimiſerat, quod in eo fuerat acerrimum, concinnitas illa crebritaſque ſententiarum priſtina manebat, ſed ea veſtitu illo orationis, quo conſueverat, ornata non erat (43). —— *If we aſk why Hortenſius was more famed for eloquence in his youth, than when he came to years, we ſhall find two very good reaſons for it, the firſt is, that he choſe the Aſiatic ſtile, which is more allowable in youth than in age. There are two kinds of Aſiatic eloquence. . . . Theſe . . . are fitter for young men, but have not gravity enough for the old. Therefore Hortenſius excelling in both theſe, could not fail to gain a great reputation in his youth . . . But when the honours he had obtained, and that authority which his age gave him required a graver manner, he continued in the ſame, which had not now it's former grace: beſides, he having ſlackened his application and ſtudy, which had been prodigious, the concinnity and frequency of his ſentences remained, but the elegant dreſs with which he uſed to adorn them was now gone.*’ He was happy even in the time of his death; for he died juſt before the deplora- confuſions into which the common-wealth was plunged (44).

[*M*] *It has been ſaid that he loſt his voice . . . Others have ill underſtood that thought . . . We may look on this as fabulous, ſince he pleaded a cauſe of importance a few days before his death.*] The proof of the firſt of theſe two things is contained in this paſſage of Quintus Serenus Samonicus:

Sic eſt Hortenſius olim
Abſumptus, cauſis etenim confectus agendis,
Obticuit, cum vox domino vivente periret,
Et nondum extincti moreretur lingua diſerti.

Hortenſius, tir'd with law, his tongue ſurviv'd,
And liv'd, an orator of voice depriv'd.

Glandorpius has not underſtood the ſenſe of theſe verſes. ‘Deceſſit è vita, *ſays he* (45), ſub bellum civile Cæſ. & Pompeii . . . . clamore in actione cauſæ diruptus, ut indicat Q. Serenus —— *He died during the civil-war between Cæſar and Pompey, having burſt himſelf by the vehemence of his ſpeaking in pleading a cauſe, as Serenus reports.*’ The following words of Cicero do not agree with the paſſage of Samonicus. ‘Perpaucis ante mortem diebus una tecum ſocerum tuum defendit Appium . . . Q. Hortenſi vox extincta fato ſuo eſt, noſtra publico (46). —— *A few days before his death, he, together with you, defended your father-in-law Appius . . . . The voice of Hortenſius was put to ſilence by his own fate, but ours by the fate of the public.*’

[*N*] *Nothing can be more ſingular than his marriage with Martia.*] Plutarch tells the ſtory thus (47). Hortenſius deſired Cato to give him Porcia his daughter, who was married to Bibulus, and had already born two children. Give her to me alſo, ſaid he, as a fertile ſoil, in which I may ſow children: I am ſenſible, added he, that, according to the opinion of the world, this is ſomewhat abſurd; but in reality is there any thing more excellent and more beneficial to ſocieties, than not to leave the fruitful field of a young woman uncultivated; and on the other hand, not to ſuffer a family to be oppreſſed with too many children, which have enough already? Beſides, the mutual lending of wives amongſt worthy men diſperſes virtue amongſt a greater number of families, and occaſions more alliances in the ſtate; and if Bibulus is not willing entirely to quit his title to Porcia, I promiſe to reſtore her, after ſhe has brought me ſome children, which may be a ſtricter bond betwixt you and him, and my ſelf. Cato did not think proper to treat of this affair; but when Hortenſius declared to him, that he had a mind to Martia, Cato's own wife, conſidering ſhe was ſtill very young, and that Cato had children enough, he readily promiſed her, provided Martius the lady's father would agree to it.

(*i*) Epiſt. ii, Cicer. ad Famil. lib. viii.

(*k*) Eſt autem L. Paulo, C. Marcello Coſſ. mortuus, ex quo videmus eum in Patronorum numero annos quatuor & quadraginta fuiſſe. *Cicer. in Bruto.*

(*l*) Id. de Orat. lib. iii, ſub fin.

(*m*) Ex ſocru tua, fœmina primaria Servilia. *Id. Verr.* 4.

(41) Hortenſium magnum Oratorem ſemper putavi maximeque probavi pro Meſſala dicentem, cum tu abfuiſti. Sic ferunt, inquam, idque declarat totidem quot dixit, ut ajunt, ſcripta verbis oratio. *Cicer. in Bruto.*

(42) Cælius ad Cicer. Epiſt. ii, lib. viii, ad Famil.

(43) Cicero, in Bruto, ſub. fin. pag. m. 451.

(44) Perpetua quadam felicitate uſus ille ceſſit è vita ſuo magis quam ſuorum civium tempore, & tum occidit cum lugere facilius Rempub poſſet ſi viveret quam juvare *Id ibid. init.*

(45) Glandorp. Onomaſt. pag. 405, 406.

(46) Cicero, in Bruto.

(47) Plut. in Catone Utic pag. m. 770.

and daughter of Martius Philippus. He asked her of Cato by way of loan, and obtained her without much difficulty, though her big belly declared ſhe had no great miſunderſtanding with her Husband. He had one ſon who gave him much trouble, ſo that when he

it. Martius conſented to it, and preſently Martia was transferred to Hortenſius. When ſhe became afterwards both his widow and heir ſhe again returned to her firſt husband. This Cæſar did not forget in his Anti-Cato, ‘ If he had need of a wife, *ſaid he* (48) ‘ why did he give her to another? And if he had ‘ no need of her, why did he take her again? Does ‘ not this ſhew, that he made uſe of this lure, that ‘ by lending a young wife to Hortenſius, he might ‘ recover her with great wealth?’ Strabo (49), having ſaid that the Tapyri (50) had a law, by which the husbands gave their wives to others, when they had two or three children by them, adds, that Cato practiſed the ſame thing to gratify Hortenſius's requeſt who deſired his Martia of him; and obſerves that Cato, in this only, followed the ancient cuſtom of the Romans. There is reaſon to doubt whether this was their ancient cuſtom; for beſides that, there are ſo few inſtances of it, that Turtullian cites only that of Cato (51); it appears that Hortenſius owned ſome ſingularity or novelty in his deſign, according to the common opinion. Δόξῃ μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ἄτοπον εἶναι τὸ τοιοῦτον, φύσει δὲ καλὸν καὶ πολιτικόν. Nam eſſe hominum quidem illud opinione novum *(ſo Xilander renders it)* natura pulchrum tamen & civile (52). —— *For this indeed is ſtrange in the opinion of men, but naturally it is beautiful and politic.* He does not oppoſe to this opinion the ancient laws or cuſtoms of the Romans, which ſo great a civilian would not have omited on that occaſion, but only nature. Bodinus (53) cenſures Plutarch without reaſon, as if he had ſaid, in the life of Cato Uticenſis, that it was lawful for the Romans to lend their wives; for that hiſtorian does not ſpeak of it as of a cuſtom founded upon the laws, or as a thing that was uſually practiſed: on the contrary, he introduces Hortenſius, confeſſing, that his propoſal ſeemed ſtrange or new. It is a great raſhneſs in the ſame Bodinus, not to give credit to this lending of Cato's wife; for it is a ſtory that Thraſeas had taken from the writings of Munatius, Cato's friend, and Cæſar would not have ventured to have reproached him for it, if it had not been well known (54). The reaſon upon which Bodinus grounds his not believing it, is a new fault; it is becauſe, ſays he, by the law of Romulus, and the antient practice reſtored by Tiberius, the relations puniſhed at their diſcretion wives that committed adultery. But what does this make againſt Cato's wife, who was given to another by her father and her husband? I ſay nothing againſt theſe words. *Plutarchus & Strabo Parthos æque ac Lacedæmonios mutuas uxores amicis dare conſueviſſe ajunt* (55), tho' they are very likely to deceive the reader; for who in reading them would not think, that Plutarch attributed this conduct to the Parthians, and Strabo to the Lacedæmonians? And yet Bodin means, that Strabo aſcribes this to the Parthians (56), and Plutarch to the Lacedæmonians. This way of quoting is but too frequent, and leads into miſtakes; it ſeems to bring many witneſſes for the ſame thing, when in reality there is but one. Bodinus ſeems to ſay, that Plutarch and Strabo both teſtify, that the lending of wives was practiſed both among the Parthians, and among the Lacedemonians. I have read in Mr Menage, that, according to Caſaubon, Plutarch mentions this marriage of Hortenſius and Martia, as a thing of which he doubted. *Ad quem Strabonis locum notat Caſaubonus. Plutarchum de Catone rem ita narrare ut de ea dubitaſſe ſignificet* (57). Mr Menage had reaſon to ſay that this is falſe: it is not about the fact itſelf that Plutarch expreſſes his doubts; he only ſays, that that part of Cato's life is like a piece of a play, in which the plot is not well opened, that is, in my opinion, that people paſſed different judgments upon it.

Note, that when I cenſure Bodinus for imputing this to Plutarch, I conſider that he cites the life of Cato of Utica; for if he had cited the parallel between Lycurgus and Numa Pompilius, he could not have erred. Plutarch there affirms, that this king of Rome permitted husbands to lend their wives; but I think he is miſtaken in ſaying ſo, and ſo does Mr Dacier. ‘ This is true, *ſay he* (58), of Lycurgus, but it does ‘ not appear that Numa ever had any ſuch deſign; ‘ it would be alſo eaſy to prove, that this community of wives did not begin at Rome, under Numa, ‘ but much later, and that it was not general.

Lucan ſuppoſes, that Martia, after Hortenſius's death, went to Cato, and moſt humbly intreated him to take her again. She declared to him, that being paſt child-bearing, ſhe only asked the name of wife, that ſhe would live in continence, and deſired only to ſhare with him in thoſe troubles and fatigues, that the ill poſture of public affairs had brought upon him. Lucan adds, that Cato was moved by theſe words of Martia, and though that was not a proper time for marriage, he granted her requeſt: it is true, that all the nuptial ceremonies were omitted, without excepting that which is looked upon as the principal, and the conſummation of the work. Martia did not quit her mourning weed, ſhe embraced her husband, as a mother doth her child (59). Cato was ſo deeply afflicted for the public calamities, that from the beginning of the civil war, he deprived himſelf of all diverſions; he let his beard grow, and lived as a man in mourning. Martia's offers were accepted in the literal ſenſe. See what Lucan makes her ſay:

Dum ſanguis inerat, dum vis materna, peregi
Juſſa Cato, & geminos excepi fœta maritos.
Viſceribus laſſis, partuque exhauſta, revertor
Jam nulli tradenda viro: da fœdera priſci
Illibata tori: da tantum nomen inane
Connubii: liceat tumulo ſcripſiſſe, Catonis
Martia; dec dubium longo quæratur in ævo,
Mutarim primas expulſa, an tradita, tædas.
Non me lætorum ſociam, rebuſque ſecundis
Accipis: in curas venio, partemque laborum.
Da mihi caſtra ſequi (60).

While nature yet with vigour fed my veins,
And made me equal to a mother's pains,
To thee obedient I thy houſe forſook,
And to my arms another husband took;
My pow'rs at length with genial labours worn,
Weary to thee and waſted I return,
At length a barren wedlock let me prove,
Give me the name without the joys of love.
No more to be abandon'd let me come,
That Cato's wife may live upon my tomb,
So ſhall my truth to lateſt times be read,
And none ſhall ask if guiltily I fled,
Or thy commands eſtranged me from thy bed.
Nor ask I now thy happineſs to ſhare,
I ſeek thy days of toil, thy nights of care.

Rowe.

If he had been throughout all his work as fond of fiction, as in this place, I am apt to think he would not have been accuſed of following too cloſely the thread of hiſtory, and not giving his work a form poetical enough. However it be, let us ſee what he ſays of the extreme rigidneſs Cato.

Ille nec horrificam ſancto dimovit ab oræ
Cæſariem, duroque admiſit gaudia vultu.
(Ut primum tolli feralia viderat arma,
Intonſus rigidam in frontem deſcendere canos.
Paſſus erat, mœſtamque genis increſcere barbam,
Uni quippe vacat ſtudiiſque odiiſque carenti,
Humanum lugere genus) nec fœdera priſci
Sunt tentata tori: juſto quoque robur amori
Reſtitit: hi mores (61).

Nor he the chief his ſacred viſage chear'd,
Nor ſmooth'd his matted locks or horrid beard,
Nor deigns his heart one thought of joy know,
But met his Martia with the ſame ſtern brow.
For when he ſaw the fatal faction's arm,
The coming war, and Rome's impending harm,

Regardleſs,

---

(48) Id. ibid. pag. 784.

(49) Strabo, lib. xi, pag. 355.

(50) *They bordered upon the Parthians.*

(51) Ex illa, credo, majorum & ſapientiſſimorum diſciplina, Græci Socratis & Romani Catonis qui uxores ſuas amicis communicaverunt - - - O ſapientiæ Atticæ! ô Romanæ gravitatis exemplum! lenones Philoſophus & Cenſor. - - - *Agreeably I ſuppoſe to the doctrine of the antients, and of the moſt wiſe men, of the Grecian Socrates, and the Roman Cato, who lent their wives to their friends. - - - O wonderful example of the Attic wiſdom, and Roman gravity! A Philoſopher and Cenſor both panders* Tertull. in Apologet. *The example of Socrates does not concern the Romans. Tertullian aſcribes to Cato the Cenſor, what he ſhould have aſcribed to Cato of Utica.*

(52) Plut. pag. 771.

(53) Bodin. Meth. Hiſt. cap. pag. m. 78.

(54) Plut. in Cat. pag. 770.

(55) Bod. Meth. Hiſt. pag. 78.

(57) *He ſhould have ſaid to the* Tapyri, *and not to the* Parthians.

(57) Menag. Amæn. Juris, cap. x. *I do not find this in Caſaubon's notes upon Strabo.*

(58) *Dacier in a marginal note of his tranſlation of Plutarch, in the parallel between Lycurgus and Numa.* pag. 362, 363. Dutch Edit.

(59) Sic ut erat, mœſti ſervans lugubria cultus, Quoque m do natos, hoc eſt amplexa maritum. *Lucan. l b. ii, ver.* 365.

(60) Lucan. ibid. ver. 338.

(61) Id. ibid. ver 373.

he pleaded for his nephew, he declared, that he made choice of him for his heir, to the prejudice of his ſon. And yet it was to this unworthy ſon that he left his eſtate, if we may believe Valerius Maximus. See the following article.

Regardleſs quite of every other care,
Unſhorn he left his looſe neglected hair;
Rude hung the hoary honours of his head,
And a foul growth his mournful cheeks o're ſpread,
No ſtings of private hate his peace infeſt,
Nor partial favour grew up in his breaſt,
But ſafe from prejudice he kept his mind,
Free, and at leiſure to lament mankind.
Nor could his former loves returning fire,
The warmth of one connubial wiſh inſpire,
But ſtrongly he withſtood the juſt deſire.
Rowe.

HORTENSIUS (Quintus) ſon to the former, behav'd himſelf ſo unworthily of ſuch a father, that he had like to have been diſinherited by him [*A*]. But if he be the ſame that was proconſul of Macedonia after Julius Cæſar's death, we may preſume he reformed his life. He warmly ſided with the aſſerters of liberty, and ſtrenuouſly engaged with Brutus, to raiſe armies which might be able to maintain the cauſe (*a*). He was taken at the battle of Philippi, and put to death by way of reprizal, by Marc Antony's order, upon Caius Antonius's tomb [*B*]. Some believe our Hortenſius was the ſame with him, who had joined with Julius Cæſar againſt Pompey [*C*]. But as they who ſpeak of him, ſufficiently intimate, that he was the only Son of Hortenſius, we may look upon him as the Father of Q. HORTENSIUS CORBIO and MARCUS HORTENSIUS HORTALUS, the firſt whereof was a monſter of impurity and debauchery [*D*], and the latter fell into poverty, and had the diſcretion not to marry, till

[*A*] *He had like to have been diſinherited.*] Cicero intimates plainly enough in his letters (1), that Hortenſius's ſon was good for nothing, and that his own ill temper (2) and a freed-man called Salvius, had ſpoiled him (3). He ſeems to ſay that his father did not love him (4); but let us hear Valerius Maximus, who is more than ordinary clear in this matter. ‘Q. Hortenſii, qui ſuis temporibus ornamentum Romanæ eloquentiæ fuit, admirabilis in filio patientia extitit. Cum enim eo uſque impietatem ejus ſuſpectam & nequitiam inviſam haberet, ut Meſſalam ſuæ ſororis filium hæredem habiturus ambitus reum defendens judicibus diceret, ſi illum damnaſſent nihil ſibi præter oſculum nepotum in quibus acquieſceret ſuperfuturum: Hac ſcilicet ſententia quam etiam editæ orationi inſeruit, filium potius in tormento animi quam in voluptatibus reponens: tamen ne naturæ ordinem confunderet, non nepotes ſed filium hæredem reliquit (5) —— *The patience of Hortenſius, who was the ornament of the Roman eloquence, in the age in which he lived, towards his ſon is worthy of admiration. For tho' he was ſo incenſed againſt him on account of his undutiful and ſcandalous behaviour, that he ſaid to the judges in a ſpeech which he made in defence of Meſſala, his ſiſter's ſon, whom he then deſigned to make his heir, and who was accuſed of corruption, that if they condemned him he ſhould have no other ſolace left but the embraces of his grand children: by this ſentence, (which he likewiſe inſerted in this oration when he made it public) ſhowing that he conſidered his ſon rather as the torment than the pleaſure of his ſoul; yet, that he might not overturn the order of nature, he left his ſon his heir, and not his grand-children.*’ It is ſomewhat ſtrange that Hortenſius ſhould have given out, that he had made choice of his nephew for his heir; for if he thought his own ſon deſerved to be diſinherited, could not he transfer his eſtate to his grand-children, as he ſaid he ſhould be obliged to do, if they condemned his nephew? A ſtrange grand-father ſure, not to think of his grand-ſons, but in caſe of failure of his ſiſter's ſon! Valerius Maximus has perhaps curtailed the matter by the ſuppreſſion of ſome eſſential circumſtances. It may be too, that we muſt take this declaration of Hortenſius only as a figure of rhetoric: there are ſtratagems in this profeſſion, which our orator knew well how to make uſe of. Probably he had a mind to move the judges in appearing ſo much concerned for the diſcharge of his client, as a perſon that was to be to him inſtead of a ſon. Others ſay that Hortenſius's wife inherited his eſtate (6), ſhe whom Cato had lent him, and whom he took again after Hortenſius's death.

[*B*] *He was murdered by way of reprizal, on the tomb of Caius Antonius.*] To underſtand what this reprizal was, we muſt remember that Caius Antonius, brother to Marc, fell into Hortenſius's hands during the confuſions that followed Julius Cæſar's death; and that Brutus underſtanding that by the rage of the Triumvirate, D. Brutus and Cicero had been put to death, together with other illuſtrious men, wrote to Hortenſius to ſacrifice his priſoner to their ghoſts (7): which was done. Thus you ſee what was the end of Caius Antonius, and how his death was revenged.

[*C*] *Some believe . . . . that he had ſided with Julius Cæſar againſt Pompey*] That which cauſes ſome difficulty here, is, that Hortenſius's ſon was at Laodicea in the year of Rome 702, and led a very ſcandalous life there (8). How then is it probable, will ſome ſay, that two years after he ſhould have raiſed himſelf ſo high in Cæſar's eſteem, that he ſhould entruſt him with the command of his army, the day that he deſigned to paſs the Rubicon, and poſſeſs himſelf of Ariminum, which was the leading ſtroke of that great affair, that was to determine the fate of the empire? Yet this he did to that Hortenſius who was in Cæſar's party (9). Some time after he gave him the command of a fleet upon the coaſts of Italy (10). We muſt not determine upon appearances.

I have not found in Eutropius what Glandorpius (11) pretends to have taken from his ſixth book, that Octavius and Libo, Pompey's lieutenants, defeated this fleet of Hortenſius. It is Oroſius who ſays it (12). However, Glandorpius will have Hortenſius, the orator's ſon, of whom Valerius ſpeaks ſo ill, to be the commander of that fleet. He goes upon good grounds in this; for Cicero (13) does not permit us to doubt, that this ſon of Hortenſius went over to Cæſar's party. I have not been able to find when he left it, nor how he obtained the proconſulſhip of Macedonia, a poſt, wherein he merited the applauſes of Cicero (14). Catanæus (15) confounding the father and the ſon, aſcribes to the orator the being in Pompey's party, and the putting to death Caius Antonius, and the having been put to death by Marc Antony.

[*D*] *Q. HORTENSIUS CORBIO was a monſter of impurity and debauchery.*] Valerius Maximus (16) giving a liſt of children that have verified the proverb, *Heroum filii noxæ*, forgets the ſon (17) but not the grandſon of Hortenſius. ‘Q. Hortenſii . . . . nepos Hortenſius Corbio omnibus ſcortis abjectiorem & obſceniorem vitam exegit, ad ultimumque lingua ejus tam libidini cunctorum inter lupanaria proſtitit, quàm avi pro ſalute civium in foro excubuerat. — *Hortenſius Corbio, grand-ſon to Hortenſius, lived in a more vile and beaſtly manner, than the moſt abandoned women, and at laſt his tongue was as much proſtituted to the luſt of all men in the brothels, as that of his grand-father had been watchful in the Forum for the ſafety of the citizens.*’ If Lipſius had remembered that this author ſpoke in the plural number of Hortenſius's grand-ſons in the ninth chapter of the fifth book, he would not have believed (18) that Hortenſius Hortalus, and Hortenſius Corbio were one and the ſame perſon. The character Tacitus gives the former, plainly diſtinguiſhes him from

---

(*a*) Cicero, Philipp. x.

(1) Epiſt. iii, lib. vi, ad Attic.

(2) Natura metuenda eſt: hæc Curionem, hæc Hortenſii filium non patrum culpa corrupit. *Ibid. lib. x, Epiſt. iv.*

(3) Illa Hortenſiana omnia fuere infantia: ita fiet homo nequiſſimus: à Salvio liberto depravatus eſt. *Ibid. Epiſt. xviii.*

(4) Ibid. Ep. iii, lib. vi.

(5) Valer. Maxim. lib. v, cap. ix, n. 2.

(6) Plutarch. in Catone min. pag. 784.

(7) Plutarch. in Bruto. *See alſo Velleius Paterculus,* lib. ii, cap. lxxi, *who ſays, that the ſon of Hortenſius loſt his life in that war.*

(8) Cicer. Ep. ad Attic. iii, lib. vi.

(9) Plut. in Cæſar. pag. 723.

(10) Appian lib. ii, Bell. Civil.

(11) Onomaſt. pag. 406.

(12) Lib. vi, cap. xv.

(13) Epiſt. ad Attic. iv, xvi, xvii, xviii, lib. x.

(14) Philipp. x.

(15) In Plin. Ep. lib. v.

(16) Lib. iii, cap. v.

(17) *He ſpeaks of him upon another occaſion, as we have ſeen in the remark* [*A*].

(18) Comment. in Tacit. Ann. lib. ii.

till Auguſtus gave him the means of maintaining a family (*b*). But that emperor's liberality not being ſufficient to ſupply the neceſſities of all the children that were born of that marriage, Hortalus begg'd the aſſiſtance of the ſenate [*E*]. Tiberius at firſt rejected this petition very harſhly; but afterwards perceiving that his ſeverity was diſliked by the ſenate, he ſaid that, if they deſired it, he would give a certain ſum to each of Hortalus's male-children (*c*) [*F*]. They thanked him for it, but Hortalus, either out of fear or greatneſs of ſoul, ſaid not a word; and from this time, Tiberius ſhewing him no favour, he by degrees fell into the moſt extreme poverty (*d*).

(*b*) Tacitus, Ann. lib. ii, cap. 37, 38.

(*c*) Docena ſeſtertia ſingulis qui ſexus virilis eſſent. *Tacit. ibid. Ryckius makes it amount to 5000 Crowns.*

(*d*) Egere alii grates; ſiluit Hortalus, pavore an avitæ nobilitatis etiam inter anguſtias fortunæ retinens. Neque miſeratus eſt poſthac Tiberius, quamvis domus Hortenſii pudendam ad inopiam dilaberetur. *Tacit. Ann. lib. ii, cap. xxxviii.*

from the later. Moreri and Hofman commit the ſame fault as Lipſius, ſince they cite Valerius Maximus chap. 5. book 3, Tacitus in the ſecond book of his annals, and Suetonius in the Life of Tiberius, with reſpect to Hortenſius's grandſon, *who was extreamly debauched.* Voſſius has miſled them, becauſe he refers thoſe three citations to a grand-ſon of Hortenſius, as if they had concerned the ſame perſon (19).

(19) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Latin. pag. 48.

[*E*] *M. HORTENSIUS HORTALUS begged the aſſiſtance of the ſenate.*] His ſpeech is in Tacitus (20): he brought with him his four little boys, and ſhewing them to the ſenate, intreated them to have ſome regard for the poſterity of ſo many conſuls, and ſo many dictators, *En ſtirps & progenies tot Conſulum tot Dictatorum*. Lipſius (21) thinks the hyperbole ſomewhat ſtrong, ſince the family of Hortenſius produced but one conſul, and one dictator. He endeavours to excuſe Hortalus, by ſaying that probably he had his mother's anceſtors in view. Ryckius (22) ſpeaks with more aſſurance, and lays it down as a thing undeniable, and is of opinion that Hortenſius had chiefly in view the Marcius Philippus's, from whoſe family, ſays he, Martia, Hortalus's grand-mother, deſcended. This laſt fact is by no means probable; for on one ſide, we find but one ſon of Hortenſius the orator; and this ſon was a grown man when Cicero paſſed through Laodicea in the year 702. On the other ſide, Cato could not be very young, when he parted with Martia to Hortenſius, ſince his daughter Portia had born already two children (23). But Cato died at forty eight years of age in the year 707 of Rome (24). If then we ſuppoſe, as it is very probable, that he was at leaſt 35 years old when he obliged Hortenſius with his wife, we muſt ſay that this marriage happened in the 694th year of Rome. It is not there poſſible that Hortenſius's ſon, whom Cicero ſaw in Laodicea, in the 702d year of Rome, ſhould be Martia's ſon. But we need not go upon a conjecture: there is a fact in Plutarch which decides the queſtion: Martia was ſtill Cato's wife during the expedition of Cyprus (25), that is, in the 696th year of Rome. It muſt not be diſſembled that Hortalus is called a young man by Tacitus in the 769th year of Rome, which would not very well agree with the ſuppoſition, that the only ſon of Hortenſius was that debauchee mentioned by Cicero, and Valerius Maximus, who died a little after the battle of Philippi in 712. But it is much more reaſonable to think, that Tacitus has not been ſo exact as to the age of Hortalus, than to cavil about the ſpeech which Valerius Maximus read, and Hortenſius ſpoke a little before his death. Now that ſpeech plainly ſuppoſes he had but one ſon: for if beſides this rake, who ſaluted Cicero in Laodicea, he had had any ſon by Martia, there had been no need of his making his grand-children his heirs, in default of his debauched ſon, and of Meſſala his nephew.

(20) Ann. lib. ii, cap. xxxvii.

(21) Comment. in Tacit.

(22) In Tacit. pag. 41.

(23) Plut. in Caton. min. pag. 770, 771.

(24) Ibid. pag. 794.

(25) Id. ibid. pag. 777.

[*F*] *Tiberius . . . ſaid that . . . he would give . . . . to each of Hortalus's male-children.*] This leaves room to believe that Hortalus only brought his four ſons with him, but that he left his a daughters behind; ſo that to ſpeak exactly, we muſt not ſay with Suetonius (26), that he had four children by his marriage; for if he had no more, Tacitus would make Tiberius guilty of an abſurdity. Neither do I think that, ſpeaking ſtrictly, we can ſay that Tiberius gave nothing to Hortalus (27). Did not he offer to give him a ſum, if the ſenate approved of it? was not he thanked for it? could he doubt of the favourable intention of the ſenate for that poor member? it is therefore highly probable that this ſum was given; but as it was the only liberality of that prince, it did not prevent the miſery of Hortalus. Let not Suetonius be urged (28), who pretends that the charities of Tiberius towards the poor ſenators, were annexed to ſome conditions, which excluded him from them. Theſe conditions, ſaid he, were, that he ſhould make his indigence appear to the ſenate (29): 'Quo pacto pleroſque modeſtia & pudore deterruit, in 'quibus Hortalum Q. Hortenſii oratoris nepotem. '—— *By which means the greateſt part were hindered by ſhame and modeſty, and amongſt others Hortalus grand-ſon to the orator Hortenſius.*' But it is not true that ſhame or modeſty hindered Hortenſius's grandſon from performing that condition: did not he confeſs his miſery? did not he carry his four ſons to deſire the ſenate to have compaſſion on them? did not he intreat the emperor to preſerve them from ſtarving? 'Nec ad invidiam iſta ſed conciliandæ 'miſericordiæ refero: adſequentur florente te, Cæ'ſar, quos dederis honores, interim Q. Hortenſii 'pronepotes, divi Auguſti alumnos ab inopia defende '(30). ———— *Nor is this requeſt invidiouſly made, 'but to move pity. In the progreſs of your happy reign, 'Cæſar, theſe children may arrive at the places you 'will be pleaſed to honour them with; defend them 'in the mean time from want; they are the great grandſons of Hortenſius, they are foſter ſons of Auguſtus.*' Achilles Statius (31), who ſays that our Hortalus is probably the perſon who is mentioned in the ſixty ſeventh epigram of Catullus, did not conſider that what he relates out of Tacitus, and we have juſt now ſeen, belongs to the year of Rome 769. It is true Catullus did not die in 697. Scaliger has ſolidly confuted that falſity of St Jerome; but there is no likelihood that he lived till 763. I have refuted Joſeph Scaliger upon this, in the article of CATULLUS. Certainly, Hortalus, mentioned by that antient poet, was rather Hortenſius than his grand-ſon; and I cannot but be amazed that Iſaac Voſſius in the ſame book (32), wherein he maintains againſt Scaliger, that Catullus died, in the 704th, or 705th year of Rome, ſhould pretend (33) that the Hortalus mentioned by that poet, is the ſame with him mentioned by Tacitus.

(26) In Tiber. cap. xlvii.

(27) *This is ſaid in Moreri's Dictionary of the Dutch edition, at the word* Hortalus.

(28) In Tiber. cap. xlvii.

(29) Tacitus, Ann. lib. i, cap lxxv, *ſays the ſame.*

(30) Tacit. Ann. lib. ii, cap. xxxvii.

(31) Notis, in Catull. Epig. lxvii.

(32) Obſervat. ad Catull. pag. 83.

(33) Pag. 252.

HORTENSIUS (JOHN) in French *Des-Jardins*, Phyſician to Francis I, was born near Laon in Picardy, being ſon of John Des-Jardins, governour of the caſtle of Hamelle in the dioceſe of Laon. He taught claſſical learning at Paris, in the college of cardinal le Moine, and afterwards applying himſelf to the ſtudy of Phyſic, he was made bachelor in that ſcience in the year 1514, a licentiate in the year 1517, and doctor in 1519. It appears by the regiſters of the univerſity of Paris, that he was regent-doctor in the year 1521, and dean of the faculty in 1524. As he underſtood Greek to perfection, he warmly exhorted his ſcholars to the ſtudy of that language; and that every body might be in a capacity of conſulting Galen in the original, he made a preſent of a Greek edition of that antient Phyſician to the library of that faculty; for at that time the Phyſicians at Paris had a public library in their ſchools (*a*). He got ſuch a reputation, that he was thought able to cure all ſorts of diſeaſes, provided the fatal hour was not come (*b*). That was the only exception [*A*], ſo that this proverb was commonly applied to him, *Contra*

(*a*) Hemeræus, Diſſert. de Acad. Pariſienſi.

(*b*) Bulæus, Hiſtoria Academ Pariſ.

[*A*] *That was the only exception.*] Vulgarly ſpeaking, this was ſaying a great deal; but at bottom it was to except a great deal; for if death does not interpoſe, there is no diſtemper but a Phyſician may cure; nature itſelf is then

Contra vim mortis non eſt medicamen in hortis (c). We find him commended in many books [*B*]; but as for himſelf, he printed nothing; nor have we any poſthumous work of his. He married Joan Bourdin in 1520, and Mary le Tellier in 1541. He left ſeven children by the firſt, and four by the later. Their ſettlements they had [*C*], and the real eſtate he left, are a proof that he had gained a great deal of money. He died ſuddenly of an apoplexy, as he was entertaining his relations and friends on his birth-day in 1547. This occaſioned a fine ſonnet of Des-Portes [*D*], which I will give intire in the remarks. Mr Menage, who deſcended from John Des-Jardins by the mother's ſide [*E*], has wrote his life *(d)*. We have taken this article from thence.

(c) *He was called in Latin* Hortenſius, *or* de Hortis.

(d) *It is in Latin, in the volume he publiſhed at Paris in the year* 1675, *in 4to, containing the Lives of Peter Ayrault, William Menage*, &c. *with ſeveral remarks.*

then ſufficient for the work. However according to our way judging of things, by repreſenting to our ſelves abundance of very poſſible conditions, which may change the chain and courſe of events, it is to give a great idea of a Phyſician, to ſay, that if a greater force does not interpoſe, he will reſtore a ſick man's health. This makes me remember a too hardy expreſſion of I do not know what admiral, who being ready to engage in very favourable circumſtances, and after having taken all proper meaſures, ſaid they were ſure of victory, if GOD would ſtand neuter, and leave both parties to themſelves.

[*B*] *We find him commended in many books.*] Mr Menage (1) cites Arnaud d'Oſſat, in his Expoſition againſt James Charpentier; Renatus Moreau, in the Life of James Sylvius; du Boulay, in the Hiſtory of the Univerſity of Paris; Lewis d'Orleans, in the Human Plant; Peter Ayrault, in his books *de Ordine judiciario*; John Vaſſe (2), in an Epiſtle Dedicatory.

[*C*] *The ſettlements his children had.*] Mr Menage has theſe words (3). *Prædivitem fuiſſe, ut tum erant tempora, teſtantur & ejus ædes plurimæ, & prædia multa & liberi undecim, qui nido majores pennas, ut Flacci verbis utar, extenderunt.* From the particular account of theſe eleven children, it appears that the daughters were married to perſons of diſtinction; one to William Verſoris, counſellor in the Chatelet, the ſon of John Verſoris, a famous advocate in the parliament of Paris; another to John Matayer, counſellor of the exchequer; a third to Peter Ayrault, lieutenant-criminal at Angers. One of the ſons was a counſellor in the Chatelet; another was canon of Senlis; a third was counſellor of the exchequer. He that was counſellor in the Chatelet, left a ſon who had the ſame office, was echevin at Paris in 1600, and left a ſon, who had, amongſt other children, the wife of Denis Godefroy, Hiſtoriographer of France. There remained amongſt John Des-Jardins's deſcendants but one perſon (4) who bore his name, when Mr Menage wrote his book.

[*D*] *His death . . . . . gave occaſion to a fine ſonnet of Des-Portes.*] The reader will not be diſpleaſed to ſee it. Here Father Vavaſſeur has tranſlated into Latin, and Mr Menage has made an epigram upon the ſame thought (5).

Après avoir ſauvé par mon art ſecourable
  Tant de corps languiſſans que la mort menaçoit,
  Et chaſſé la rigueur du mal qui les preſſoit,
  Gagnant comme Eſculape un nom toujours durable.
Cette fatale ſœur, cruelle, inexorable,
  Voyant que mon pouvoir le ſien amoindriſſoit;
  Un jour que ſon courroux contre moi la pouſſoit;
  Finit quant & mes jours mon labeur profitable.
PASSANT, moi qui pouvois les autres ſecourir,
  Ne dis point qu'au beſoin je ne me pus guerir,
  Car la mort qui doutoit l'effort de ma ſcience,
  Ainſi que je prenois ſobrement mon repas,
  Me prit en trahiſon, ſain & ſans defiance,
  Ne me donnant loiſir de penſer au trepas.

Long had I flouriſh'd in the godlike art
To ward the threats of death, and health impart;
From num'rous patients heal'd had gain'd a name,
And ſettled, Eſculapius-like, my fame.
Th' inexorable ſiſter ſaw each hour
Leſſen her conqueſts, and decreaſe her pow'r;
And jealous of my rival proweſs grown,
She ſtop'd my triumphs, to ſecure her own.
Yet ſay not, paſſenger, who hear'ſt this tale,
To heal myſelf my art cou'd not avail:
Death, when my thoughts were otherwiſe employ'd,
Seiz'd an unguarded hour, and all my art deſtroy'd.

[*E*] *Mr Menage was deſcended from John Des-Jardins by the mother's ſide.*] Peter Ayrault, grandfather by the mother's ſide to Mr Menage, married Anne Des-Jardins, daughter of our Hortenſius, and of Mary le Tellier his ſecond wife, who was of the ſame family, from which chancellor le Tellier deſcended (6).

---

(1) Remarques ſur la Vie de Pierre Ayrault, pag. 150.

(2) Ei præterea & Martino Acaciæ & Michaëli Dumontio, Medicis Pariſienſibus doctiſſimis interpretationem librorum Hippocratis & Galeni de victus ratione in morbis acutis nuncupavit Johannes Vaſſæus Medicus & ipſe Pariſienſis doctiſſimus. *Menag. in eodem volumine, pag.* 512.

(3) Ib. pag. 514.

(4) Petrum Hortenſium militem ſtrenuum, qui Margaretam de Gravella uxorem ſibi adjunxit *Ibid. pag.* 517.

(5) *All this is to be found*, ibid. pag. 514. *The Sonnet is at pag.* 510.

(6) Menage, Remarq. ſur la Vie de P. Ayrault, pag. 515, 517.

HORTENSIUS (LAMBERT) born at Montfort in the province of Utrecht, the firſt day of April 1518 [*A*], has been ranked among the learned of his age. He ſtudied at Louvain the learned languages with an extream application, under excellent maſters, and heard alſo Vives's lectures upon Logic. He publiſhed in Latin verſe a tranſlation of Ariſtophanes's Plutus, with notes, where he ſhewed the progreſs he had made in the Greek tongue. He publiſhed many other books [*B*]. He taught ſchool a long time at Naerden in Holland, and very nearly eſcaped with his life when that town was ſacked by the Spaniards in 1572, under the conduct of Frederic de Toledo, ſon to the duke of Alva. His houſe was plunder'd, and his natural ſon killed before his eyes *(a)*, and he himſelf was going to be killed, notwithſtanding his being a prieſt, but by good luck a gentleman *(b)* who had been his ſcholar, and then bore arms in the Spaniſh ſervice, came in very ſeaſonably to ſave his life. It is obſerved, that his only care was to ſave from the common wreck his comment upon Lucan's Pharſalia. He wrote a deſcription of the

(*a*) Occiſo in oculis filio ſuo naturali. *Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag.* 613. But obſerve that Brandt in his Dutch Hiſtory of the Reformation, *ad ann.* 1584, *pag* 702, 703, ſpeaks of Jerom Hortenſius, miniſter at the Hague, and then at Waſſenaer, who he ſays was Lambert's ſon.

(*b*) *His name was Weldam.*

[*A*] *He was born at Montfort the firſt day of April* 1518.] In this I diſagree with my author Valerius Andreas, who ſays he was born in the year 1500. He was deceived doubtleſs by theſe words of Swertius (1), *Naſcitur anno* CIↃ. IↃ. XVIII. *Kal. Aprilis*: he thought the numeral letters XVIII, referred to the word Kalends, for want of remembering that there is not in the Roman Calender, any eighteenth day, before the Calends of April. But this is not the only reaſon that determined me to join XVIII to the preceeding letters; I have been moved to that by another conſideration; Valerius Andreas ſays, that Hortenſius was very young (2) when he went to ſtudy at Louvain under Rutgerus Reſcius, profeſſor of the the Greek tongue: now he ſays in another place (3), that Reſcius died in 1545, which was the ſeventeenth year of his profeſſorſhip; ſo that he began it only in 1528. How then could Hortenſius ſtudy under this profeſſor when he was very young, if he was born in the year 1500? but if he was born in the year 1518, all is eaſy reconciled. Paul Freherus (4) is miſtaken, both in the year of his birth and of his death; for he ſays that Lambert Hortenſius was born in the year 1501, and died in 1577.

[*B*] *We have many books of his.*] Theſe are the titles of them; *Enarrationes in Virgilii Æneida*, in Fol. *Explanationes in Lucani Pharſaliam*, printed at Baſil in the year 1578, in Fol. *Satyrarum in ævi ſui* the plundering and ſlaughter of Naerden; the manuſcript whereof is at Utrecht. He ſcarce ſurvived that deſolation, for he died in 1573 (c) near Naerden, in (d) a country houſe (e).

---

(1) Athen. Belg. pag. 508.

(2) Admodum adoleſcens, pag. 613.

(3) Pag. 805.

(4) In Theatro, pag. 1473. *Konig ſays alſo, that he was born in* 1501.

(c) Anno à laniena quæ ſoli propter doctrinam ſingularem parſerat altero, à nato Chriſto MDLXXIII. *See the epitaph which thoſe of Naerden ordered to be made for him in the church of St Vitus. Valerius Andreas has it.*

(d) *Freberus, in his* Theatrum, pag. 1473, *ſays,* in præſidio ſub ſuburbano. *It ſhould be* prædio.

(e) Ex Valer. Andrea, Bibl. Belg. pag. 613.

ſui vitia & mores libri II. Epithalamiorum liber I. Seceſſionum civilium Ultrajectinarum libri VII. De Bello Germanico à Carolo V. Cæſare geſto libri VII. Tumultuum Anabaptiſtarum liber I. (5).

(5) *I have quoted that book in the remark* [*B*] *of the article* PICARDS. *I add here, that it was reprinted at Amſterdam, in* 1636, *with the* Hiſtoria Anabaptiſtica de factione Monaſterienſi *of Conrad. Hereſbachius, by the the care of Theodorus Strackius, miniſter of Burik in the country of Cleves.*

HORTENSIUS (MARTIN) a native of Delft in Holland, and profeſſor of Mathematics at Amſterdam, would have made a greater progreſs in that ſcience, if he had not died in the flower of his age (a) in the year 1639 [*A*]. The preface which he prefixed to a book of Philip Lanſbergius, which he tranſlated into Latin, and in which he makes ſtrong objections againſt Tycho Brahe's ſyſtem, ſhews how he cultivated the ſtudy of Aſtronomy; in which he was aſſiſted by Lanſbergius's converſation, to whom Beekman, rector of the ſchool of Dort, a man very much ſpoken of in Des Cartes's hiſtory, recommended him. That book of Lanſbergius is intituled *Commentationes in motum terræ diurnum & annuum, & in verum aſpectabilis cœli typum,* and was printed at Middleburg in the year 1630, in 4to. Hortenſius has alſo tranſlated the Aſtronomical Inſtitution of William Blaeuw, and writ a diſſertation *de Mercurio ſub Sole viſo & Venere inviſa,* dedicated to Gaſſendus, and an anſwer to what Kepler had prefixed to his Almanack in 1624 (b). Gaſſendus's letters to him, ſhew the particular eſteem he had for him. Hortenſius's letters to Gaſſendus are printed among thoſe of that famous Philoſopher. From them I learned that he was born in 1605 (c), and that he was admitted profeſſor at Amſterdam in the year 1634 (d). He did not ſeem to be contented with his condition; and he ſpeaks (e) of the ſpirit that reigned in that famous town, like a man vexed and inraged that they did not come to his lectures, nor encouraged the making of thoſe machines he had contrived, from which he expected a ſucceſs above all that Tycho Brahe had done (f). We have ſome orations of his, one *de utilitate & dignitate Matheſeos,* and another *de Oculo ejuſque præſtantia.* He ſays in one of his letters to Gaſſendus (g), that the impreſſion of his anſwer to the book which Peter Bartholinus had publiſhed againſt him in defence of Tycho Brahe, was only put off for want of paper. Probably that work kept company with the *Pleiadographia* (h); which remained in manuſcript among the papers of the ſame author when he died. Des Cartes does not ſpeak advantageouſly of his ability. *As for the ſchool-profeſſors,* ſays he (i), *not one of them underſtands* my Geometry; *no not Golius, much leſs Hortenſius, who has not made a ſufficient progreſs for that.*

(a) Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag. 652.

(b) *See* Voſſius, de Scient. Math. pag. 201, 202.

(c) Oper. Gaſſ. pag. 418, Tom. VI.

(d) Ibid pag. 422.

(e) Ib. pag. 429.

(f) Ibid. pag. 425. Vide etiam pag. 429, & pag. 432.

(g) Pag. 129.

(h) Valer. Andr. Biblioth. Belg. pag. 652.

(i) Letters, Tom. III, pag. 191.

[*A*] *He died in the year* 1639.] I have not followed Valerius Andreas here, who ſays he died in the year 1640. That which induced me not to follow him is a paſſage of Des Cartes, which deſerves to be copied: I take it from one of his letters to Father Merſennus (1) which tho' it be not dated, yet it ſolidly fixes the date which I have occaſion for, ſince in the very firſt lines the author acquaints us, that he wrote in anſwer to a letter of the laſt of December 1639. This is what I thought proper to copy of it: 'Hortenſius being ſome years ago in Italy ſet about 'making the ſcheme of his nativity, and told two young 'men of this country who were with him, that he 'ſhould die in the year 1639, and as for them they 'ſhould not live long after. Now he dying this ſum'mer as you know, theſe two young men fell into 'ſuch fears that one of them is already dead, and the 'other, who is the ſon of Heinſius (2), languiſheth in 'ſuch a manner, and is ſo melancholy, that he ſeems 'to do all that is poſſible to verify the Aſtrologer's 'prediction. Here is a fine ſcience indeed, which 'ſerves to kill people, who perhaps would not have 'been ſick without it.' It would be wrong to object to me that Des Cartes might have written this letter after the ſummer of the year 1640, and conſequently that he does not contradict Valerius Andreas; for his correſpondence by letters with Father Merſennus was ſo frequent, that this objection muſt needs be falſe. But beſides, I find in a letter of Boxhornius (3), dated the thirteenth of September 1639, that he laments the loſs of Hortenſius, who was lately dead.

(1) It is the 35th of the ſecond volume, in the edition of 1659.

(2) It is doubtleſs Nicolas Heinſius, who did not die till 1681. Mr Baillet ſays the contrary, pretending that Heinſius had two ſons, and that he whom Des Cartes ſpeaks of, actually died, and that his name was Daniel.

(3) Vide Epiſtolas Boxhornii, pag. 144. Edit. Francof. 1679.

HOSIUS (STANISLAUS) cardinal and biſhop of Warmia, was one of the moſt ingenious men that Poland has produced: he was born at Cracow in the year 1504. You will find in Moreri (a) an account of his actions, and of the honours he arrived to: It was not thought, when he was one of the preſidents of the council, that he had all the addreſs that ſuch a ſtation required [*A*]. His books of controverſy are not inferior to

(a) *And better ſtill in Bullart's* Academie des Sciences, Tom. I, pag 64, *and following.*

[*A*] *It was not thought, when he was one of the preſidents of the council, that he had all the addreſs that ſuch a ſtation required.*] The cardinal of Mantua dying the ſecond of March 1563, his colleagues, who preſided with him in the council, wrote immediately to the Pope. He who was the firſt preſident (1), deſired that a legate might be ſent that ſhould be above him. Hoſius deſired that he might have leave to go into Poland: but Simoneta adviſed the Pope not to ſend a new legate to Trent, hoping thereby to obtain the direction, not only becauſe cardinal Seripande was weary of the council, and had no inclination to direct it any longer, but becauſe cardinal Hoſius was a plain man, who was eaſily governed. *Simoneta deſideroſo che la ſomma di guidare il Concilio reſtaſſe à lui, & havendo ſperanza di condurlo bene, con ſodisfattione del Pontefice, & honor proprio; conſiderando che Seripando era ſatiato di quel negotio, & poco inclinato a volerlo guidare, & che Varmienſe era ſemplice perſona, diſpoſta à laſciarſi reggere; miſe in conſideratione al Pontefice, che, ritrovandoſi le coſe del Concilio,* &c. (2). Mr Amelot has not well tranſlated theſe words, as any one may eaſily perceive. Here follows his verſion: 'Simoneta earneſtly deſiring the direction, and hoping 'to

(1) *It was cardinal Seripande.*

(2) Fra-Paolo, Iſtoria del Concilio di Trento, lib. vii, pag. m. 603. *Compare with this the paſſage of the ſixth book, pag.* 548. *It is the* 517*th page in Amelot's tranſlation.*

to the beſt that were written in that age. Caſaubon has juſtly accuſed him [*B*] of having made an apology for a controverſiſt, who had ſaid, that without the authority of the church, the holy Scripture has no more weight than Æſop's Fables. The Jeſuit who has cenſured Caſaubon upon this account, has only ſhewn his own ignorance (*b*). Hoſius died near Rome the fifth of Auguſt 1579. Moreri has committed ſome miſtakes [*C*].

It

‘to obtain it to his honour, and the Pope's ſatisfaction; repreſented to him that the poſture of affairs being but ill, the leaſt novelty would make them go worſe, ſo that he ſaw no occaſion for ſending another legate: that Seripande loving his repoſe, and being not inclinable to direct the council; and Hoſius being a man of no addreſs and wholly governed by others, he offered himſelf in their place, undertaking to ſteer the veſſel like a skillful pilot (3).' I. the original does not import that Hoſius was *wholly governed by others*. II. It is not true that Simoneta wrote to the Pope, that Hoſius was *a man of no addreſs*. He thought ſo indeed, and built upon it: but he did not communicate that thought to the Pope. Father Paul clearly diſtinguiſhes what was thought from what was written by him. The tranſlator ſhould have followed that diſtinction.

Note, that cardinal Palavicini (4) pretends to prove by authentic pieces, that what Father Paul advances concerning the ambitious artifices of Simoneta, is falſe.

[B] *Caſaubon has juſtly accuſed him, &c. . . . . .*] Let us follow the progreſs of this diſpute, and begin with the words of this great critic (5): ‘Verbo Dei viventis ſcripto minus etiam tribuit (*Scioppius in Eccleſiaſtico, cap.* 135. quam ſive Pighius, ſive alius qui dixit Patrum memoria: *Scripturam ſi auctoritate Eccleſiæ deſtituatur, non plus per ſe valere quàm fabulas Æſopi.* Quod blaſphemum dictum poſtea defendere auſus eſt Cardinalis Hoſius. —— *He* (*Scioppius in Eccleſiaſtico) gives leſs authority to the written word of the living* GOD, *than either Pighius, or another, who in the days of our fathers ſaid:* That if the Scriptures were deprived the authority of the church, they would of themſelves be of no more value than Æſop's Fables. *Which blaſphemous ſaying cardinal Hoſius has dared to defend.*' The Jeſuit Eudæmon-Johannes maintained, that it was a calumny forged by Brentius, and pretended to prove it thus. ‘*Jam verò quando non memorat, neque quis Æſopicæ hujus fabulæ auctor ſit, neque quo loco eam Hoſius defenderit, vel ne convinci impoſturæ poſſet, vel quod in aliquo alio rem eam legerat, & auctorem & calumniam ex Hoſio detegam: videant deinde lectores, quàm bona fide infideles iſti fidei patroni diſputent. Is igitur lib* 3. *in prolegomena Brentii, ipſo ferè initio*; Magna pars, *inquit*, libelli [*prologomenorum Brentii*] non aliunde conſtant, quàm è ſannis, dicteriis, conviciis, in quo ſic etiam ludit Scripturis, ſic eas tractat jocu lariter: ut verè de ipſo dici poſſit, quod venerabili viro Petro à Soto falſo impingit, eum haud aliter Scripturis, quàm Æſopi fabulis uti. *Non eſt igitur ea Catholici cujuſquam Scriptoris vox; ſed calumnia Brentii: quam vir illuſtriſſimus falſo in virum doctiſſimum excogitatam, in auctorem ipſum verè convenire defendit* (6). —— But ſince he doth not tell us, either who is the author of this Æſopic Fable, nor in what place Hoſius has defended it, and this leaſt he ſhould be convicted of an impoſture, or that he had read this ſtory of ſome other perſon, I ſhall ſhow both the author of it and the calumny from Hoſius himſelf: and then let the reader judge, how ingenuouſly theſe faithleſs defenders of the faith argue. Hoſius therefore in the third book againſt the Prolegomena of Brentius, near the beginning, ſays, *The greateſt part of this book* [the Prolegomena of Brentius] *conſiſts only of buffoonry, jokes, and reproaches; in which likewiſe he ſo plays with the Holy Scriptures, and treats them in ſo burleſque a manner, that we may truly ſay of him, what he falſly alledges againſt the reverend Peter de Soto, that he uſeth the Scriptures in the ſame manner one would uſe Æſop's Fables.* This therefore is not a ſaying of any Catholic writer, but a calumny of Brentius; which our illuſtrious author ſhows to be falſly invented againſt a very learned man, and properly to belong to the inventor himſelf.' Here we find four things. I. A complaint that Caſaubon has not marked in what part of Hoſius's works he found this. II. That Brentius accuſes Soto of uſing the ſcriptures as Æſop's Fables. III. That Hoſius maintains, that this accuſation is a ſlander with reſpect to Soto, but moſt true with reſpect to Brentius. IV. That theſe words of Hoſius occaſioned the ſcandalous reflection mentioned by Caſaubon. The firſt of theſe four things is juſt. The careleſſneſs of thoſe who do not quote the particular chapter in an accuſation of importance cannot be too much blamed: great authors are moſt liable to this fault: they think they ſhall be believed on their own word, and ſo will not give themſelves the trouble of quoting: they think it enough to ſay, Plutarch, Cicero, St Auguſtin, *ſay this*. Abundance of readers had rather take it upon truſt, or remain dubious, than take the pains to verify it. Tho' Caſaubon had no real deſign to hinder any one from diſcovering whether his accuſation was falſe or no, yet he has left room for that ſuſpicion: why did he quote in ſo looſe a manner? the ſecond and third things are undeniable facts (7), but they ſignify nothing to this diſpute. The fourth is a notable blunder of the Jeſuit, as I ſhall prove in what follows.

The confidence with which he accuſes Caſaubon of calumniating cardinal Hoſius, raiſeth a certain prejudice to the diſadvantage of this critic; but when we ſee Caſaubon's apologiſts ſtop ſhort, and coldly confeſs he has no book of Hoſius (8), we are inclinable to believe that Eudæmon-Johannes is well founded in his accuſation. Can one eaſily believe that a miniſter, who undertakes the confutation of Caſaubon's cenſurer, ſhould not ſeek for Hoſius's books till he finds them? is it ſo hard a matter to find them? one therefore ſuſpects that this confeſſion of his want of them is a ſubterfuge, invented on purpoſe that he may not be obliged to own the cardinal's innocence. But be in no fear for Caſaubon: he charges Hoſius with nothing but what is moſt true. ‘Fingamus autem nunc verum eſſe, (*they are Hoſius's words* (9) *in the ſame book that Eudæmon-Joannes cites*) quod tu ſcripſiſſe neſcio quem narras, nam nomen non exprimis, ac fieri poteſt ut ſit commentum tuum, Scripturas valere quantùm fabulas Æſopi, ſi deſtituantur autoritate Eccleſiæ. Cedo Brenti, num hic minus reverentur de Scripturis loquutus eſt, quam qui vocat eam librum Hæreticorum (10), cùm tamen nullorum ſit minùs quàm Hæreticorum: eſt enim Catholicorum propria, qui tot ſeculis in ejus poſſeſſione præſcripſerunt. Et potuit illud tamen pio ſenſu dici, quem homo pius, qui charitatem habet quæ non cogitat malum, ex iis verbis eliceret. Nam revera, niſi nos Eccleſiæ doceret autoritas hanc ſcripturam eſſe canonicam, perexiguum apud nos pondus haberet. —— *Let us ſuppoſe that this is true, which you pretend ſome body or other has wrote, for you name no body, and poſſibly it may be an invention of your own, that the Scriptures are of no more value than Æſop's Fables, if you deprive them of the authority of the church. Pray, Brentius, has this perſon ſpoke with leſs reverence of the Scriptures, than he did who calls them the book of Heretics, when indeed it belongs to none leſs than to them: for it is the property of the Catholics, who have a right to it by the poſſeſſion of ſo many ages. Aud yet theſe words might have been ſaid in a pious ſenſe, which a good man, who has charity, and thinketh no evil, may draw out of them. For indeed if the authority of the church did not teach us that this is the Canonical Scripture, it would have very little weight with us.*'

[C] *Mr Moreri has committed ſome miſtakes.*] I. It was not to Pavia, but to Padua, that Hoſius's relations ſent him to ſtudy. Moreri might have diſcovered his miſtake, if he had known that Lazarus Bonamici, whom he makes Hoſius's maſter, was profeſſor at Padua. Du Sauſſai (11) ſuppoſes, that Hoſius being ſent into Italy by the advice of Peter Thomici, biſhop of Cracow, ſtopped at Bologna. He ſhould have ſaid that Hoſius having ſtudied at Padua ſome time, went to Bologna, and was there admitted doctor of law. ‘Patavii, dein Bononiæ . . . . . Juriſprudentiæ induſtriam primo addixerat, & lauream

ſub

(*b*) *See the remark* [*B*].

(3) Hiſt. du Concile de Trente, pag. 657, 658. Amſterdam Edit. 1686.

(4) Hiſtor. Concil Trident. lib. xx, cap. vi, n. 6.

(5) Caſaubon. in Baronium, Exercit. i, cap. xxxiii, pag. m. 134.

(6) Andr. Eudæmon-Joannes, caſtigat. Exercit. Iſaaci Caſauboni, lib. ii, cap v, pag. 147.

(7) *The words of Hoſius quoted by by Eudæmon-Joannes, are to be found in the third book againſt Brentius's Prolegomena, pag.* 196. *Edit, Colon.* 1551, *in fol.*

(8) Si nihil gravius dixit Hoſius, erit hæc in Brentium calumnia, non in Spiritum S. blaſphemia. Ego Pighii, Hoſii nihil habeo, nec Hermanni, cui blaſphemam hanc Scripturæ cum Æſopi fabulis comparationem tribuentes viros magnos audivi. *Jacob. Capellus, Vindic. Iſ. Caſaub. lib. iii, cap. v, pag.* 78.

(9) Hoſius, lib. iii, in Prolegom. Brentii, pag. 230, 231.

(10) Hoſius had been ſaying, that Luther calls the Holy Scripture *the book of Heretics*. Gretſerus obſerves it likewiſe, *Proleg. Exam. Myſterii Pleſſaani, pag.* 90, and quotes Luther's words, *ex Poſtil. Eccleſ. Domin.* 8. *poſt. Trin.*

(11) Continuat. de Script Eccleſ, cap. xxxii, pag. m. 23.

It has been thought, that this cardinal was the author of an anonymous book, very injurious to the Swiſs, which was confuted by Bullinger in the preface to Joſiah Simler's tract *de æterno Dei filio* (c).

It is certain (d) that he wrote the anonymous piece I am going to mention. He compoſed it the year 1564, and intituled it *Judicium & Cenſura de Judicio & Cenſura Miniſtrorum Tigurinorum & Heidelbergenſium de dogmate contra adorandam Trinitatem in Polonia nuper ſparſo.* It has been inſerted in the collection of his works (e) and I do not doubt but it is in the editions which the author himſelf publiſhed. I believe the moſt compleat edition of his works it that of 1584 [*D*]. It contains a volume of poſthumous works, among which there are many letters of Hoſius, wherein he frequently repeats the ſame things, to wit, that Heretics ought to be extirpated, and that their diviſions ſufficiently ſhow the injuſtice of their pretended reformation. He had read with great care the books which the Zuinglians and Lutherans had publiſhed againſt one another, and thoſe concerning the violent diſputes which had aroſe among the Lutherans. He is inceſſantly drawing odious concluſions from them, and he very ſubtily takes advantages from this, that theſe new doctors publiſhed books in defence of penal laws againſt thoſe who erred, and that the ſtrongeſt ſide in the ſchiſms among the Lutherans, baniſhed, impriſoned, &c. the other.

‘ ſub ipſo Hugone Boncompagno qui S. S. Gregorii XIII nomine dein præfuit, poſtremo adeptus eſt (12). —— *He began the ſtudy of the Law at Padua, and afterwards ſtudied at Bologna, and at laſt received the doctor's degree from Hugh Boncompagno, who was afterwards Pope, by the name of Gregory XIII.*’ This ſhews the ſecond falſity of Moreri; who ſays that Hoſius received his *doctor's degree* at Padua. III. *He* ‘ *was made biſhop of Culm, at the inſtance of king Sigiſmund I.*’ Theſe words of Moreri imply another falſity; for it was Sigiſmund Auguſtus who procured him that biſhopric. IV. How could Sigiſmund I. *ſend him to Rome to Pope Julius III.* He died in 1548, whereas this Pope was not created till 1550. V. He ſhould not have ſaid, that retiring into Poland after the concluſion of the council, *he writ thoſe admirable works that remain of his*: for this ſignifies, that he wrote no books before; whereas it is certain, that his anſwer to Brentius was printed at Cologne, in 1558. It is a work of four hundred pages in Folio. His book, intituled, *Confeſſio Catholicæ Fidei Chriſtiana* (13), was publiſhed before that at Mentz. His books *de Communione ſub utraque ſpecie*, *de Sacerdotum conjugio*, and *de Miſſa vulgari lingua celebranda*, were printed at Paris, in 1561 (14). Du Sauſſai (15) deſerves here a little cenſure; for he reckons moſt of theſe works among the books which Hoſius publiſhed after the council of Trent. VI. Moreri ſhould not have have ſaid in general, that Hoſius's books were printed thirty two times before he died. He ſhould, as Mr Bullart does, have made ſome exceptions. *Several of his writings*, ſays he (16), *were printed two and thirty times in his life-time, in the principal cities of Chriſtendom, and tranſlated into French, Italian, German, Flemiſh, Poliſh, Engliſh, Scotch, and Armenian.* Mr de la Rochepozai (17) is wrong in making no exception. See the following remark.

I have not taken notice of what Moreri ſays about the reaſons that obliged cardinal Hoſius not to be preſent at the twenty fourth ſeſſion. He pretends it was becauſe he diſapproved the deciſion, made concerning clandeſtine marriages: it is very true, that he did not like that deciſion, and that he endeavoured three or four times to get it revoked, for which reaſon he was taxed with obſtinacy (18), but it is not certain, that his abſence was grounded upon the reaſon which Moreri aſſigns. For he aſſiſted at the ſeſſion before, tho' he diſapproved ſome things which were determined there about the ſacrifice of the maſs: he made no ſcruple to oppoſe them. Why then durſt he not do as much as to clandeſtine marriages? would he not have been ſeconded by his colleague cardinal Simoneta, and ſome others? did he not ſend in writing, his opinion, which was contrary to the decree? did he not declare in writing, that he referred all that to the judgment of the holy father? In a word, his ſickneſs was not counterfeited, and laſted a long time. Thus you have moſt of the reaſons that Palavicini makes uſe (19) to refute a ſtory adopted by Father Paul, that Hoſius pretended to be ſick, that he might not be preſent at the ſeſſion, in which the decree for clandeſtine marriages was to be ratified. There is ſometimes reaſon to ſay, that the ſickneſſes of great men are affected, and only politic grimaces, But hiſtorians too ſpeculative, are likewiſe ſometimes miſtaken in ſaying ſo.

[*D*] *I believe the compleateſt edition of his works is that of* 1584.] It was printed at Cologn by Maternus Cholin, and makes two volumes in Folio. The firſt contains the works formerly publiſhed, but here you have them as they were laſt reviſed by the author. The ſecond volume conſiſts altogether of pieces which had not been printed before, and which were collected by Staniſlaus Reſcius, who dedicates them to Stephen Battori king of Poland. His Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from Rome, September 1. 1582. By the manner in which Mr Crenius ſpeaks (20) of the Treatiſe intituled *Judicium & Cenſura* &c. I conclude that it is not in the Antwerp edition of 1566 in Folio, but I am perſuaded that it is in the edition of Venice which the author himſelf dedicated to Pope Gregory XIII on the fifteenth of Auguſt 1573. He had reviſed and augumented his works for this edition. He dedicates the firſt Treatiſe to Henry of Valois king of Poland, and dates the Epiſtle Dedicatory on the ſame day with that of the whole volume. The firſt Treatiſe is intituled *Confeſſio Catholicæ Fidei Chriſtianæ.* The author had wrote part of it three and twenty years before, and having ſent it to Rome by the archbiſhop of Gneſna, it was ſo much approved of, that cardinal Otho Truchſes, biſhop of Augsburg, printed it in his own town of Dillingen. What was wanting being added, the whole work was printed at Mentz by the care of the archbiſhop of Gneſna. There ſoon followed other editions. Hoſius's name did not as yet appear to it, and was not put to it, till Ruard Tapper deſired the author to put his name, becauſe it was uſual in Germany to diſcourage the ſale of anonymous books (21). This has been the beſt received of any of Hoſius's works. Pope Pius IV made Paul Manutius reprint it at Rome (22): if there is no hyperbole in the thirty two editions which they mention (23), it muſt principally relate to this piece. Reſcius extends it to all Hoſius's works which he had publiſhed. ‘ Ipſo etiam Authore vivente bis & trigeſies in præcipuis Chriſtiani Orbis urbibus, Latinâ, Germanicâ, Gallicâ, Flandricâ Linguâ omnes Hoſii Libri typis excuſi, in Polonicam etiam & Italicam tranſlati videbantur, & fortaſſe etiam in Armenicam, ſicut ex ſermone viri cujuſdam in hac urbe illuſtriſſimi accepimus (24). —— *During the author's own life, all Hoſius's works were printed thirty two times in the chief cities of Chriſtendom, in the Latin, German, French, and Flemiſh languages, and tranſlated into the Poliſh and Italian, and poſſibly into the Armenian, as I have been informed by a famous man in this city.*’ But his Poſthumous Works, conſiſting of a large volume in Folio, being to be excepted, I had reaſon to condemn Moreri's general expreſſion.

(c) *See* Hottinger in Pentade Diſſert. Miſcell. pag. 214.

(d) Mr Crenius, *part XII of his Animadv. pag.* 65, only ſays, *It is reported.*

(e) From page 669 to 707, of the firſt Tome of the Cologn edition. My copy has in the title the year 1639.

(12) Thuan. lib. lxviii, ſub fin. pag. m. 297.

(13) See the preface of his anſwer to Brentius's *Prolegomena.*

(14) Oldoinus, in Athen. Romano, pag. 615.

(15) In Contin. de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt pag. 23.

(16) Bullart, Academ. des Sciences, Tom. I, pag. 70.

(17) In Nomenclatore Cardinalium, pag. 151.

(18) Palavic. Hiſtor. Concil. Trident. lib. xxii, cap. ix, n. 6.

(19) Ibid. lib. xxiii, cap. vii, n. 17.

(20) Crenius, Animadv. part. XII, pag. 65.

(21) Taken from Hoſius's dedication to Henry of Valois, king of Poland.

(22) See the ſame epiſtle dedicat.

(23) See the preceding remark, citation (16).

(24) Stan. Reſcius, Epiſt Ded. Tom. II, Oper. Hoſii, folio 3, verſo. Edit. Colon. apud Cholinum, 1584.

HOSPINIAN.

HOSPINIAN (Rodolphus) is one of the greateſt authors of Swiſſerland. He was born at Altorf, a village of the county of Kiburg, in the canton of Zurich, the 7th of November 1547, and at ſeven years of age he was ſent to Zurich to begin his ſtudies. He made a great progreſs in them, under the direction of John Wolphius (*a*), his uncle by his mother; and loſing his father (*b*) in the year 1563, he found a moſt affectionate patron in Rodolphus Gualterus (*c*) his godfather. He left Zurich to viſit the other univerſities in March 1565, and ſtaid two years at Marpurg, where he diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his great application to ſtudy, and his good conduct. He did the ſame at Heidelberg the ſix months he ſpent there; after which, his ſuperiors recalled him, and he was received into the miniſtry in 1568. He was obliged to go and preach twice a week in a country church four or five leagues from Zurich. He punctually diſcharged theſe duties for eight years together, though he had a great deal of other buſineſs upon his hands in that town. For he was made a teacher of the third claſs in 1569, and Proviſor of the Abbatial ſchool in 1571. He was made Proviſor of the Caroline ſchool five years after. He rolled this Siſyphean-ſtone with wonderful patience for nineteen years together [*A*]. He was made burgher (*d*) in the year 1569, and married happily the ſame year [*B*]. His paſtoral labours were ſomewhat leſſened in the year 1576; for they gave him a church but a league from Zurich. The duſt of the college did not diſcourage him from undertaking a noble work, and of a vaſt extent [*C*]. As he had beſtowed all his ſpare time on the ſtudy of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, he formed the ground-work of a deſign which might ſhew the Roman Catholics, that they vainly boaſt of the conformity of their

(*a*) He was a miniſter, and publiſhed many books.

(*b*) He was miniſter at Altorf.

(*c*) He was a famous miniſter, of whom we have ſeveral Latin Homilies.

(*d*) Jus civitatis Tigurinæ rara felicitate ipſi collatum eſt. *Heidegger. ubi infra, citat.* (*e*).

[*A*] *He rolled this Syſyphean ſtone for nineteen years.*] I take this thought from the author of his life. ‘ Hanc ‘ quoque Spartam ornavit, (*ſays he*) (1), quantum ‘ potuit, ſaxumque hoc vere Siſyphium volvit revol‘ vitque, & novemdecim annorum orbe circumegit in‘ defeſſus athleta pari & induſtria & ſucceſſu. —— ‘ *He likewiſe adorned this profeſſion, and rolled this* ‘ *truly Syſyphean ſtone with indefatigable labour for* ‘ *nineteen years, with a ſucceſs equal to his induſtry.*’ What he ſays a little after, is very judicious: he wonders that Hoſpinian's genius was not debaſed by ſo painful employments. *Ferreum certe adamantinumque dixeris qui tot labores exantlare, & ſimul ingenium à ſitu & ſqualore vindicare poſſet.*

[*B*] *He married ſucceſsfully in the year* 1569.] He married Anne Lavater, daughter of Lewis Lavater, then archdeacon of the Caroline church, and afterwards firſt miniſter. He was the ſon of Rodolphus Lavater, burgomaſter of Zurich. The mother of Anne Lavater, was the daughter of Henry Bullinger, one of the principal reformers. Our Hoſpinian lived very happily with his wife above above thirty years (2), and had fourteen children by her, whereof Elizabeth the youngeſt was ſtill alive in 1681. She was widow of Rodolphus Stuckius, and eighty eight years old; and as ſhe had preſerved her judgment, and her memory, ſhe furniſhed materials to him who wrote the life of her father (3). JOHN HENRY HOSPINIAN, his brother, was miniſter of the church of Bulac, and dean of the chapter of Reinsburg. RODOLPHUS HOSPINIAN, his brother, profeſſor of the Hebrew tongue at Zurich, and deacon of the Caroline church, left two ſons, RODOLPHUS HOSPINIAN, who was provoſt of the chapter of the ſame town, when Mr Heidegger wrote the life of our Rodolphus, and JOHN HENRY HOSPINIAN, miniſter of the church of Glattfeld. You will find in Mr Heidegger, ſeveral other perſons deſcended from our Rodolphus. Who loſing his wife in the year 1612, made reflexions becoming a good Chriſtian, and quickly ſought for conſolation in a ſecond wife. ‘ Patienter tamen domeſticam il‘ lam calamitatem, utcunque acerbam, tulit, memor ‘ utique, & mortalem ſe duxiſſe, & ad æternam bea‘ titudinem præmiſiſſe. Conſolabantur etiam mox or‘ bitatem ejus ſecundæ nuptiæ cum matrona hone‘ ſtiſſima *Magdalena Wirzia*, nobilis & eximii viri *Con‘ radi Wirzii*, Præfecti quondam Vadivillani, filia, bo‘ nis omnibus contracta, & d. XIII. Maji An. *M.* ‘ *DC. XII.* ſolenniter celebrata (4). —— *He patient‘ ly bore this domeſtic and bitter calamity, remembring* ‘ *that he had married a mortal woman, and that ſhe* ‘ *was gone before him to eternal happineſs. His wi‘ dowhood was ſoon after comforted by a happy ſecond* ‘ *marriage, with a virtuous matron Magdalen Wirz,* ‘ *daughter to that great and good man Conrad Wirz,* ‘ *ſome time governor of Wediſchwyl which was ſolemn‘ ly celebrated May* 13. 1612.’ He had experienced, that a wife did no ways take him off from his ſtudies. ‘ Cujus conſortium tantum abeſt ut, quod Ro‘ manenſes noſtris objiciunt, impedimentum aliquod ‘ ſtudiis ejus piis objecerit, ut magno illi contra & ‘ dulci ad omne opus bonum incitamento adjumento‘ que fuerit (5). —— *Whoſe ſociety far from being* ‘ *an impediment to his ſtudies (as thoſe of the Romiſh* ‘ *Church pretend) was a powerful and ſweet help, and* ‘ *incitement to every good work.*’

[*C*] *He engaged in a noble work, and of a vaſt extent.*] It was the hiſtory of the errors of Popery. That which gave him the firſt thoughts of this undertaking, was a converſation which he had in a country inn with his hoſt, who ridiculouſly believed, that the monaſtic life was derived from paradiſe. ‘ Faſſum ali‘ quando ferunt, cum illa excurſione neceſſum habe‘ ret in hoſpitio pornoctare, hoſpitem ruſticum non ‘ incurioſum crebra ſecum colloquia miſcentem, & de ‘ Origine Papatus, vitæ in primis Monaſticæ, quam ‘ ille pro ſimplicitate ſua ex Paradiſo arceſſendam ri‘ diculè ſuſtinuerit, anxiè inquirentem, anſam ſibi li‘ bros de Origine errorum ſcribendi præbuiſſe (6).’ He conſidered that the Papiſts, when beaten by the ſcripture, had recourſe to tradition, and vaunted their antiquity, and undervalued the Proteſtants for their novelty. To deprive them of that ſanctuary, he traced the original and progreſs of the Romiſh ceremonies and doctrines; and ſhewed by what degrees the truth, which Jesus Christ and his apoſtles had taught, had given place to innovations. ‘ Impetum concepit animo ſuo plane ‘ heroicum, & laude nunquam intermoritura digniſſi‘ mum, fictitiæ illius vetuſtatis ſpectrum debellandi, ‘ Gibeoniticaſque artes & fraudes, monſtratis genuinis ‘ errorum, qui paulatim Eccleſiam inundaverant, origi‘ nibus, detegendi convellendique. Et magnæ quidem ‘ molis, immenſique laboris opus aggrediebatur, cùm ‘ de cœleſti doctrina, & ceremoniis veræ primitivæ ‘ Eccleſiæ, tum de inclinatione & depravatione ejuſ‘ dem doctrinæ, deque ceremoniarum mutatione, au‘ ctione & progreſſu iis ſeculis, quæ Chriſtum & A‘ poſtolos primùm, deinde verò Conſtantinum Impera‘ torem, imprimis autem Gregorium M. ſecutæ ſunt ‘ (7). — *He formed a truly heroic deſign, and worthy of* ‘ *immortal honour, of deſtroying that ſpectre of pretended* ‘ *antiquity, and of detecting and rooting out all their Gi‘ beonitiſh arts and deceits, by ſhowing the true origin of* ‘ *theſe errors which by degrees have overwhelmed the* ‘ *church. And this indeed was a work of great importance* ‘ *and immenſe labour, not only treating of the heavenly* ‘ *doctrine and ceremonies of the truly primitive church,* ‘ *but alſo of the decline and corruption of that doctrine,* ‘ *and the change, encreaſe, and progreſs, of theſe cere‘ monies, firſt in the ages which followed* CHRIST ‘ *and the apoſtles, and then in thoſe which followed the* ‘ *emperor Conſtantine, but eſpecially in thoſe which* ‘ *followed Gregory the great.*’ He chiefly deſigned to write about baptiſm, the euchariſt, the churches, feaſts, faſts, orders, monks, the primacy of the Pope, and burials (8). He began alſo to compoſe the lives of the Popes, and ſome animadverſions upon Gratian (9). He was about forty one years old, when he laid the plan of this great deſign.

[*D*] *He*

(1) Jo. Henr. Heidegger. in Vita Hoſpiniani, pag. 8.

(2) Annoſque pluſquam triginta concorde in matrimonio tenuit. *Heidegger. ibid. pag.* 9.

(3) Quæ annum agens 88. ſic ſatis vegeta etiamnum integro judicio & memoria, ex qua non pauca mihi ſuggeſſit hiſtoriam hancce locupletantia, pollet. *Id. ibid.*

(4) Id. ibid. pag. 23.

(5) Id. ibid.

(6) Id. ibid. pag. 8.

(7) Ibid. pag. 11.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Anti Gratianum inſuper moliebatur, quo demonſtrare inſtituerat, *Gratianum in ſuo decreto multa falſa, pugnantia, commentitia & notha recitare, tum vero impudenter, fallaciter, malitioſe & impie corrumpere.* Id. ibid.

their doctrines with antiquity. He was not able to finiſh his undertaking; but he publiſhed conſiderable parts of it [*D*], which procured him a great reputation, and obliged his maſters to remove him from the duſt of the ſchool, to a more eminent ſtation. He was made archdeacon of the Caroline church the 25th of September 1588. Six years after, he was choſen miniſter of the Abbatial church; an employment ſo much the more convenient for him, becauſe it did not divert him ſo much from his great deſign. The book he publiſhed upon the Euchariſt, and that intituled *Concordia diſcors*, terribly vexed the Lutherans. They vexed him in their turn with their Anſwers [*E*]; to which he did not

[*D*] *He publiſhed conſiderable parts of it.*] I will here give a liſt of the books he publiſhed. The firſt was an oration *de origine & progreſſu rituum & ceremoniarum Eccleſiaſticarum*. He ſpoke it in an academical aſſembly, and printed it in 1585. Two years after he publiſhed his treatiſe *de templis, hoc eſt de origine, progreſſu, uſu & abuſu templorum, ac omnino rerum omnium ad templa pertinentium*. He publiſhed a ſecond edition of it in the year 1603, not only with corrections, but alſo with great additions; for he added to it, a confutation of the arguments which Bellarmin and Baronius had produced in behalf of their party upon that ſubject, ſince the firſt edition. In the year 1588, he publiſhed a tract *De Monachis, ſeu de origine & progreſſu monachatus ac ordinum Monaſticorum, equitum militarium tam ſacrorum quam ſecularium omnium.* —— *Concerning the origin and progreſs of monkery and monaſtic orders, and of all the orders of knighthood both eccleſiaſtical and ſecular.* He publiſhed a ſecond edition of it in 1609, in which he refuted Bellarmin's book *de Monachis*, publiſhed ſince the firſt edition of his work. He was juſt ready to publiſh his tract *de Origine & progreſſu jejuniorum*, in 1589, when a work of Bellarmin juſt printed gave him to underſtand, that this Jeſuit promiſed a book upon that ſubject. He therefore deferred the publication of it, till he could join a confutation of what Bellarmin ſhould alledge. But he having applied himſelf to other ſubjects in the mean time, never finiſhed that treatiſe. Theſe other ſubjects were the Holy Days, upon which he publiſhed two volumes, one in 1592, the other in 1593. The firſt treats, De feſtis Judæorum & Ethnicorum, hoc eſt, de origine, progreſſu, ceremoniis & ritibus feſtorum dierum Judæorum, Græcorum, Romanorum, Turcarum, & Indianorum. —— *Concerning the feaſts of the Jews and Heathens, that is, concerning the origin, progreſs, rites and ceremonies of the feaſt days of the Jews, Greeks, Romans, Turks, and Indians.* He reprinted it in the year 1611, with many corrections and additions. The ſecond is intituled, De Origine, progreſſu, ceremoniis & ritibus feſtorum dierum Chriſtianorum. —— *Concerning the origin, progreſs, rites, and ceremonies of the Chriſtian feaſts.* He reprinted it in 1612 with large ſupplements, which ſerved both to refute Bellarmin upon the Romiſh idolatry, and James Gretſer upon Corpus-Chriſti-day. In 1598, he publiſhed the firſt volume of his *Hiſtoria Sacramentaria*: ‘Hoc eſt libri quinqne de Cœnæ Dominicæ prima inſtitutione, ejuſque vero uſu & abuſu in primitiva Eccleſia, nec non de origine, progreſſu, ceremoniis & ritibus Miſſæ, tranſubſtantiationis & aliorum pœne infinitorum errorum, quibus Cœnæ prima inſtitutio horribiliter in Papatu polluta & profanata eſt. —— *That is five books concerning the inſtitution of the Euchariſt, and it is true uſe and abuſe in the primitive church; likewiſe concerning the origin and progreſs, rites and ceremonies of the maſs, of tranſubſtantiation, and an almoſt infinite numbers of other errors, by which the original inſtitution of the Euchariſt, has been horribly polluted and profaned in the church of Rome.*’ Four years after he publiſhed the ſecond volume of that hiſtory, containing the controverſies betwixt thoſe of the Augſburg confeſſion, and the other Proteſtants, about the Euchariſt. The title of it is De origine & progreſſu controverſiæ ſacramentariæ de Cœna Domini inter Lutheteranos & Orthodoxos quos Zwinglianos & Calviniſtas vocant exortæ, ab anno Chriſti Salvatoris 1517, uſque ad annum 1602. —— *Concerning the origin and progreſs of the Sacramentarian controverſy, about the Lord's-ſupper, betwixt the Lutherans, and the orthodox called Zuinglians and Calviniſts, from the year* 1517 *to* 1602. He publiſhed in the year 1607 a work intituled, Concordiæ diſcors, ſeu de origine & progreſſu formulæ Concordia Bergenſis. — *The Diſcording Concord, or of the origin and progreſs of the Form of Concord of Berg.* In the year 1619, he publiſhed a book againſt the Jeſuits. Hiſtoria Jeſuitica, hoc eſt, de origione, regulis, conſtitutionibus, privilegiis, incrementis, progreſſu, & propagatione Ordinis Jeſuitarum; item de eorum dolis fraudibus, impoſturis, nefariis facinoribus, cruentes conſiliis, falſa quoque ſeditioſa & ſanguinolenta doctrina (10) —— *A hiſtory of the Jeſuits, that is, of the origin, rules, conſtitutions, privileges, encreaſe, progreſs, and propagation of the order of Jeſuits; likewiſe of their deceits, frauds, impoſtures, flagitious crimes, bloody counſels, and falſe ſeditious and bloody doctrine.* With this he ended his compoſitions, being reſolved to ſpend the reſt of his days in prayers, pious reading, and ſacred meditations.

[*E*] *Two of his pieces vexed the Lutherans; and they vexed him in their turn by their anſwers.*] The hiſtory of the Sacramentarian war betwixt the Lutherans and Calviniſts, and that of the Formulary of Concord, ſhew ſo much confuſion, paſſion, ſhuffling and cavilling on the Lutheran ſide, that it would be a miracle, if theſe two books had not furiouſly provoked the Saxon divines. In Saxony they choſe a man to anſwer Hoſpinian, who was very fit to dazzle the public; a man, I ſay, who treated his adverſaries moſt contemptuouſly, and took upon him magiſterial airs. There is nothing like this to conceal the weak ſides of a cauſe. ‘Hiſtoriæ ſacramentariæ pars poſterior & concordia illa diſcors vehementer eos, qui Lutheranarum partium aſſeclas ſe profeſſi ſunt, urebant; qui eorum operum vim chryſippeis ſophiſmatis, & tortuoſis argutiis, acribuſque dicteriis convellere maximopere laborabant. Conſtat autem, utriuſque operis refutandi in Saxonicis oris negotium Leonhardo Huttero, Wittebergenſi Profeſſori, homini arroganti & prave facundo, datum eſſe. Et primum quidem An. M.DC.XI. perſonatus ille, uti prudenter conjectabant, prodiit, larva ſcilicet aſſumpta cujuſdam Chriſtophori à Vallo, S. Theologiæ Candidati, ſub qua adverſus ea, quæ Hoſpinianus in Annalibus Sacramentariis ad annum M.DC.XIX. (11) geſta prodidit, vernacula ſcriptione ingenii ſui libidinem procaciter ſatis exercuit (12). —— *The ſecond part of the Sacramentarian hiſtory, and the Diſcording Concord, grievouſly galled the Lutherans, who endeavoured to ruin the ſtrength of them by ſophiſtry, cavilling, and railing. It is certain that the task of anſwering them both was laid upon Leonard Hutterus, profeſſor at Wittemberg, a man of an arrogant and petulant wit. And he firſt appeared in the year* 1611, *diſguiſed under the name of Chriſtopher à Vallo, ſtudent in Theology, as was well conjectured, under this mask he exerciſed the petulancy and licentiouſneſs of his wit, in his native language, againſt what is contained in Hoſpinian's Sacramentarian hiſtory to the year* 1529.’ David Pareus no ſooner ſaw this work of Hutterus (13), but he gave Hoſpinian notice of it, and adviſed him to anſwer it in High-Dutch, without waiting till his adverſary ſhould finiſh his Confutation. ‘Adverſus Commentarium tuum alterum de re ſacramentaria, nec non Concordiam diſcordem comperimus, mandatum ex aula Saxonica D. Huttero datum, hiſtoriam tuam ut refutaret. Laboraſſe etiam illum ea in re ex domeſticis meis ſtudioſis cognovi. His nundinis Lipſenſibus prodiit Germanica hæc Hiſtoriæ Sacramentariæ conſignatio, uſque ad annum 29 deducta. Credo vobis non eſſe viſam. Author magna pollicetur, & triumphus eſt, ut audio, noſtris vicinis, &c. Percurri librum. Præter magnifica mendacia nihil video novi. Suaſerim ut veſtigia hujus ſcriptoris, qui haud dubiè eſt ille Hutterus, premas illico, neque exſpectes, dum tota moles te opprimat. Feceris magnum operæ pretium Germanicè reſpondendo (14). —— *I am informed that Hutterus, has received orders from the court of Saxony, to anſwer the ſecond part of your Sacramentarian hiſtory and ana Diſcording Concord. And I am told by ſome ſtudents*

(10) Taken from his Life, written by Heidegger.

(11) It is an error of the preſs: it ſhould be MDXXIX.

(12) Heidegg. ubi ſupra, pag. 22.

(13) *Note, that ſome ſay, that* Chriſtophorus Wilhelmus à Vallo, *was* Chr. Wil. Walpurgerus, *a divine of Leipſic. See* Mollerus, Iſagoge Hiſt. Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ, part. III, pag. 133.

(14) Heidegg. ibid. pag. 22.

not finiſh his reply, as knowing that the common enemies of the Proteſtants were too much diverted by ſuch a ſcene. He therefore turned all his forces againſt the Jeſuits. I doubt not but the ſuppreſſion of his Reply was very grateful to ſome Princes [*F*]. He loſt
the

‘ *dents who lodge in my houſe, that he has for ſome time been employed in it. This laſt Leipſic fair, this German confutation of the Sacramentarian hiſtory has appeared, carried down to the year twenty nine. I believe you have not yet ſeen it. The author promiſeth mighty things, and our neighbours, I hear triumph upon it, &c. I have read over the book; beſides impudent falſhoods I ſee nothing new in it. I would adviſe you to come as cloſe on this author's heels as poſſible, who no doubt is the above-named Hutterus, and not to wait till you are oppreſſed by the whole load. It would be of great uſe if you would anſwer him in the German language.*’ Hoſpinian immediately wrote a reply, but he did not publiſh it (15). In the year 1614 came out another work of Hutterus, intituled, Concordia concors, ſeu de origine & progreſſu formulæ concordiæ Eccleſiarum Confeſſionis Auguſtanæ. — *Concording Concord; Or, of the origin and progreſs of the Form of Concord of the churches of the Auguſtan confeſſion.* In which he undertook to deprive Hoſpinian of all the reputation he had got either for learning or candour. ‘ Quo quantum de libro ipſo, tantundem de eruditionis, candoris & judicii *Hoſpiniani* fama, ſuæque eccleſiæ infamia ſe detrahere poſſe ſperavit. Opus ipſum haud exiguæ molis, & μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας prodiit: aſt ſi inanem verborum ſtrepitum & rerum, convitiorum, ſplendidarumque calumniarum tumorem ei demeres, tantùm non ad incitas redigi, atque in nihilum recidere liquebat (16). —— *In which he hoped to take as much from the fame of Hoſpinian's learning, candor, and judgment; and from the infamy of his own church, as he could detract from that book. This work of no mean bulk appeared with much pomp, but if we take from it the empty ſound of big words and vain calumnies and reproaches, it would ſhrink into a very ſmall compaſs.*’ Hoſpinian's friends adviſed him to reply immediately, and to humble the pride of his adverſary (17). He preſently took pen in hand, and went about a reply; but he never finiſhed it. Mr Heidegger teſtifies, that this work is admirable. It is likely the author was diſcouraged, becauſe he had to do with ſo abuſive an enemy; he was afraid alſo of diverting the Jeſuits too much, by continuing this civil-war: whatever was the cauſe, his book was never publiſhed. ‘ Neque tamen opus iſthoc ad metam perduxit, ſeu tædio victus eſt maledicentiæ adverſarii, qui neſcio quibus agitatus furiis ubique inſultare, quàm cum ratione quadam diſputare maluit; ſeu faſtidium ſubiit ducendi funem moleſtæ adeò contentionis, qua non tantùm animos veritatis factâ copia ſauciatos ægroſque, magis exulceratum iri, ſed etiam capitales religionis hoſtes, Jeſuitas cumprimis, infauſti certaminis illius futuros ſpectatores avidiſſimos, delicias jucundo ejuſmodi ſpectaculo ſibi facturos . . . metuit (18). —— *But he did not finiſh that piece, whether tired by the abuſiveneſs of his adverſary, who, like a man poſſeſſed, choſe rather to rail inceſſantly than to argue: or becauſe he did not care to proceed in a controverſy in which he not only feared that ſick minds would be more and more irritated by declaring the truth to them, but likewiſe that the deadly foes of religion, the Jeſuits eſpecially, would be joyful ſpectators of ſuch an unfortunate conteſt.*’ The Lutherans ſeem by this to have got the victory, the world being ready to adjudge it to him that ſpeaks laſt. This is to remain maſter of the field of battle. I am going to mention a reaſon which probably contributed to Hoſpinian's ſilence.

[*F*] *The ſuppreſſion of his reply was very grateful to ſome princes.*] About the time that Hoſpinian printed his *Concordia diſcors*, Frederic IV, elector Palatine, wrote to the magiſtrates of Zurich, about a conference, that was propoſed betwixt the Lutherans and the Calviniſts, to find out ways of accommodation, that might ſerve for a league between the Proteſtant princes, againſt the ſanguinary deſigns of the Jeſuits. For this reaſon Hoſpinian's book was thought to be publiſhed out of ſeaſon. He juſtified himſelf as to that matter, the beſt he could, in a letter he wrote to Maurice, Landgrave of Heſſe (19). He ſaid, that though theſe conferences ſerve only to widen the breach, as has been often found by experience; yet he would have deferred the impreſſion of his work, or even condemned it to the obſcurity of his cloſet, if he had known the princes intentions before: ‘ Libri, intempeſtive editi culpam . . . . . ſic ſtudioſe amolitur, ut ſimul de inſtitutis ejuſmodi Colloquiis ſententiam graviter proferat hunc ferè in modum: *Etſi ego de hujuſmodi colloquio mihi ipſi nihil boni polliceri poſſim, & majoris animorum diſtractiones & conturbationes, odia item, contentiones, ac diſſidia poſt illud nocentiſſima vehementer metuam, præſertim ſi mecum reputem, quæ Marpurgenſe, Maulbrunnenſe, Mompelgardenſe & Ratisbonenſe colloquia ſecuta ſint; & adverſarii palam proteſtentur, ſe non diſcere, ſed docere, & ne in minimo quidem articulo ſententiam mutare, ſed in ſemel concepta opinione firmiter permanere velle: nihilominus editionem hujus libri vel in aliud tempus rejeciſſem, ac reſervâſſem; vel, ſi ex uſu eccleſiæ fuiſſet, prorſus ſuppreſſiſſem, ſi hoc conſilium & inſtitutum Illuſtriſſ. Principum vel ante ſemeſtre mihi cognitum fuiſſet, ne illud impediiſſe accuſari meritò poſſem* (20). —— *He makes an apology for the unſeaſonable publication of his book, and at the ſame time with great gravity, delivers his opinion concerning conferences of this kind, in the following words.* Though I, for my own part, hope for no good from ſuch a conference, but am very much afraid that it will be followed by greater diſtractions of mens minds, greater hatred, contentions, and dangerous diviſions, eſpecially when I conſider what were the conſequences of the conferences at Marpurg, Maulbrun, Montbeliard, and Ratisbon, and that the adverſaries openly declare that they will teach, but not learn, that they will not change their opinion in the leaſt article, but will remain firm in their preconceived notions: yet notwithſtanding I would have deferred the publication of this book to another time; or if it had been for the good of the church ſuppreſſed it altogether, if I had known the deſign of theſe illuſtrious princes, but half a year ago, that I might give no ground to any to accuſe me of hindering it.’ The fear he had of diſpleaſing ſome princes, and expoſing ſome people to great dangers, obliged him not to inſert in his work all that he knew (21). ‘ Faſſus eſt ingenuè, operi illi *de Concordia diſcorde*, deeſſe plurima: nulla equidem ſua culpa, ſed tum quòd ad cognitionem & manus ſuas plura non pervenerint; tum quôd nonnulla dedita opera, omitti conſultiùs viſum ſit, propter admonitionem ex aula potente inſinuatam, ut in ſcribenda ea hiſtoria caute circumſpecteque agat, ſi quid ſecretorum ex cameris Principum, præſertim verò ex oris Saxonicis habeat. Fore alioquin, ut res hæc ingenti periculo non careat, propter orthodoxos iis in locis ſuſpectos, ne cum iis ludus Crellianus vel Procerianus (22) ludatur. —— *He owned ingenuouſly, that many things were wanting in that book, intituled,* The Diſcording Concord, *and that through no fault of his, but partly becauſe many particulars never came to his knowledge, and becauſe he had thought it better to omit ſome things, on account of an advice he had received from a powerful court, that he ought to be very cautious in writing that hiſtory, if he had got any ſecrets from the cabinets of princes, eſpecially from thoſe on the Saxon ſide. That otherwiſe it might have dangerous conſequences to the orthodox who might be ſuſpected there, and the Crellian and Pucerian game might be played over again.*’ It is therefore very likely, that he gave over his reply, amongſt other reaſons, becauſe he feared he ſhould be looked upon as the cauſe of a Theological War, that might hinder the Proteſtant ſtates from uniting in their common intereſts (23). It is very certain, that the princes of the empire, both Lutherans and Calviniſts, were well pleaſed with his ſilence; for the hiſtory of that time informs us, that the controverſies of the divines very much embarraſſed the princes, and they ſtill at this day cauſe from time to time the greateſt diſturbances to the magiſtrates in ſeveral imperial towns. Into what troubles has Hamburgh fallen not long ago (24), upon the diſputes of the miniſters that divided the people, and were the cauſes of ſeditious aſſemblies? Theſe diſputes are hardly ever appeaſed, but by the baniſhment of him who has the weaker faction: ſo that, if
one

(15) **Non defuit bonæ cauſæ Hoſpinianus, utpote qui . . . perſonato larvam egregiè detraxit, adornata ſcriptione vernacula, quæ & hiſtoriæ à ſe conſignatæ veritatem in arce collocavit, & adverſantis vanitatem ſolidè detexit. Neque tamen reſponſio iſthæc, omnibus numeris abſoluta, lucem videt. *Id. ibid.***

(16) **Ib. pag. 22.**

(17) **Sine mora reprimendam exultantem hominis audaciam. *Id. ibid. pag. 24.***

(18) Id. ibid.

(29) The twenty ſecond of Auguſt, 1607.

(20) **Vita Hoſpin. pag. 21.**

(21) In literis ad Wolphangum Amlingum, Eccleſiæ Serveſtanæ Paſtorem & Superintendentem, die 22. Aug. 1607.

(22) I think it is an error of the preſs for *Peucerianus.*

(23) Idem, Heidegg. pag. 21.

(24) Two or three years ago, the Dutch Gazettes ſpoke of nothing elſe. I write this in September, 1695.

the uſe of his eyes for almoſt a year by a cataract; however, he preached as he uſed to do. It was happily couched the 18th of September 1613. At ſeventy ſix years of age he grew childiſh, and was not delivered from that miſerable condition, but by his death the 11th of March 1626, in his ſeventy ninth year. His writings had raiſed ſuch an opinion of his learning, that he was adviſed from all ſides to confute Baronius's annals, no body being thought more capable of doing it (*e*). A new edition of his works was printed at Geneva in ſeven volumes *in Folio*, 1681. [*G*].

one may be allowed to uſe compariſons, it might be ſaid, that theſe quarrels are like thoſe of bulls, who fight for a heifer; the weakeſt hides himſelf, and comes no more in ſight.

Nec mos bellantes una ſtabulare; ſed alter
Victus abit, longeque ignotis exulat oris,
Multa gemens ignominiam, plagaſque ſuperbi
Victoris, tum quos amiſit inultus amores:
Et ſtabula aſpectans regnis exceſſit avitis (25).

Nor when the war is over is it peace,
Nor will the vanquiſh'd bull his claim releaſe,
But feeding in his breaſt his antient fires,
And, curſing fate, from his proud foe retires,
Driven from his native land to foreign grounds,
He with a generous rage reſents his wounds;
His ignominious flight, the victor's boaſt,
And more than both, the loves which unreveng'd be loſt.
Often he turns his eyes, and with a groan
Surveys the pleaſing kingdom once his own.

Perhaps the reaſon I have mentioned, induced Hoſpinian to break off his hiſtory of the reformation projected in Saxony, under the elector Chriſtian. He had been furniſhed with memoirs, which might have provoked his ſucceſſors. See in the margin the title that was to be given to this hiſtory (26); and here follows what Mr Heidegger obſerves concerning the memoirs he was ſupplied with: ‘Grande ſcilicet volumen ex Saxonia ſubmiſſum in hæredum manibus verſatur, quo Chriſtiani Electoris illius Principis & pientiſſimi & fortiſſimi, dicere crebro ſoliti: *Ego nec Calvinianus ſum, nec Flaccianus, ſed Chriſtianus. Habent Flacciani ſuum Cœlum in quo etiam ipſum orcum collocant*: Ephemerides accuratiſſimè texuntur, & inſtituta ab ipſo eccleſiarum Saxonicarum Reformatio, ſubita & improviſa ejus morte interrupta, pleniſſimè exponitur, ex quibus, aliiſque etiam irrefragabilibus monumentis Chriſtianum illum redivivum orbi Chriſtiano, non parum certè pia Principis illius meditamenta admiraturo, repræſentare ſtatuerat (27). —— *A great volume which was ſent to him from Saxony, is ſtill in the poſſeſſion of his heirs, in which the Annals of Chriſtian, that pious and brave elector and prince, who uſed frequently to ſay*: I am neither a Calviniſt, nor a Flaccian, but a Chriſtian. The Flaccians have their heaven, in which they place, even hell itſelf, *are written with great accuracy, together with a full hiſtory of the reformation of the Saxon churches, begun by him, and interrupted by his ſudden and unexpected death, from which and other unqueſtionable authorities, he deſigned to offer his* Chriſtianus Redivivus *to the Chriſtian world, which without doubt would greatly admire the pious intentions of that prince*.’

[G] *A new edition of his works was printed at Geneva in* 1681, *in ſeven volumes in folio*.] There are none of thoſe tracts in it, to which the author had not put his laſt hand. His heirs have religiouſly obſerved his intention (28), being not willing to communicate them to the public; but have only furniſhed ſome remarks, which he added to his works after they were printed. You will find in his Life what pieces he had advanced a good way in, and what he had but made a rough draught of. This is enough to ſhew his vaſt learning and prodigious labour.

(*e*) Taken from his Life, written by John Henry Heidegger, and prefixed to the edition of his works, 1681.

(25) Virgil. Georg. lib. iii, ver. 224.

(26) Chriſtianus redivivus, *hoc eſt*, de ortu & progreſſu ſuſceptæ à Chriſtiano Electore Saxoniæ Eccleſiarum & Scholarum in Saxonia ſuperiore Reformationis Hiſtoria, ex actis & originalibus, ut ſint optimi Principis defuncti vindiciæ perennes, fideliter congeſta, & tribus libris comprehenſa. - - - *Chriſtianus Redivivus*, that is, *A Hiſtory of the Riſe and Progreſs of the Reformation of the Churches and Schools in Upper Saxony, begun by Chriſtian, Elector of Saxony. Extracted from Acts and Original Papers, which may ſerve for a laſting Apology for that excellent Prince, faithfully compiled in three books.* Heidegg. ubi ſupra, pag. 22.

(27) Id. ibid.

(28) Neque contemnenda etiam illa quæ inchoata & affecta, quoa nondum juſtus ordo, lima & colophon iis adhibita, ultimaque manu nec dum perpolita eſſent, neque ipſe ſuperſtes prodire paſſus eſt, ceu imparia ſuſtinendæ famæ nominis ſui, neque præter ejus voluntatem & conſilium hæredes, cimeliorum iſtorum cuſtodes, edere voluerunt. *Id. pag.* 11.

HOSPITAL (MICHAEL DE L') chancellor of France in the XVIth century, was one of the greateſt Men of his Time. He was of Auvergne, and of a family of no great diſtinction; he gradually raiſed himſelf [*A*], and was counſellor in the parliament of Paris, when princeſs Margaret, ſiſter to king Henry II, having had the duchy of

[*A*] *He was of Auvergne, and of a family of no great diſtinction.*] His father was a Phyſician, and was employed by the conſtable Charles de Bourbon. ‘He never forſook him, following him in diſguiſe, partaking of all his misfortunes, aſſiſting him in all his deſigns, againſt the king, againſt the emperor, and againſt Rome, againſt the cardinals, and the Pope himſelf (1).’ When he accompanied him in *his retreat to the emperor Charles*, he left in France, ‘all his children, both ſons and daughters; who being but young, could not bear the hazards and fatigues of ſuch a journey. Our Michael was then at Toulouſe and eighteen years of age, and though he was there with no other deſign than to ſtudy, he was carried away upon ſuſpicion, and ſhut up in the public priſons, till there was an expreſs command from the king to releaſe him, and give him liberty to purſue his ſtudies, ſince he was not found tainted with any deſign that could render him guilty (2).’ He went to ſee his father at the time that the conſtable being returned into Italy, *found affairs much perplexed there* (3); for Francis I. had laid ſiege to Milan (4), ‘and becauſe the ſiege was like to laſt long, this Phyſician fearing leſt his ſon, by too great a diſcontinuance, ſhould make a dangerous breach in his ſtudies, committed him to the care of ſome carriers, that they might take him along with them, with whom he left Milan, diſguiſed in the habit of a mule-driver; and with great danger of his life paſſed the river Abdua, and afterwards went to Padua, where the ſtudy of the Law had flouriſhed from all antiquity. His father left him in that univerſity ſix years, and then he recalled him to Bologna, and to Rome; where he was honoured with a place amongſt the judges whom they call auditors of the Rota. He reſigned it by the advice of his father, upon the promiſes made him by cardinal Grandmont to advance him to higher poſts in his country; but he was diſappointed of his hopes at once, both on one ſide and the other. For the place of auditor was given to another, and the ſudden death of cardinal Grandmont put an end to the hopes that brought him into France. Being thus diſappointed, he applied himſelf to the bar; and after practiſing there about three years, he married Mary Morin, daughter of the lieutenant-criminal Morin, who brought for a portion, a place of counſellor in the parliament (5), which he exerciſed about nine years, and then he was ſent embaſſador to Bologna, for king Henry, where a general aſſembly of the biſhops had been appointed for ſome reformation.’ Thevet adds, that he was afterwards chancellor to the ducheſs of Berry, and then ‘head and ſuperintendant of the king's Finances, in his chamber of accompts, and that after the death of king Henry he was elected privy-counſellor (6).’ Note, that his father, after the conſtable's death, followed for ſome time the court of the emperor Charles V (7), and then attaching himſelf to the ſervice of Renata de Bourbon, ſiſter of his firſt maſter, and wife of Antony of Lorrain, ſpent there the reſt of his days (8). Some make him the ſon of a man, *who was born, and lived and died, a Jew in the city of Avignon* (9). Varillas, from whom I take theſe words, ſays elſewhere (10), that the father of Michael de l'Hoſpital was a Jew. He is very much ſubject to this ſort of confuſion. Mr Teſſier aſſures us, that Mezerai relates,

(1) Naudé, Coups d'Etat. chap. v, pag. m. 787.

(2) Thevet, Elog. Tom. VII, pag. 368, Edit. in 12mo. *He takes this, as he owns, from the laſt will of chancellor de l'Hoſpital. You will find it in* Colomiés's Bibliotheque choiſie, pag. 53.

(3) Id. ibid. pag. 369.

(4) Id. ibid. *What he ſays is to be found in the chancellor's will. See Colomiés*, ubi ſupra.

(5) Note, that there is a miſtake as to the time in Moreri's Dictionary, where it is ſaid, that l'Hoſpital was counſellor of the parliament of Paris, in 1524, and that his place of chancellor to the princeſs Margaret, was given him after all the others, except that of chancellor of France.

(6) Thevet, ubi ſupra, pag. 371.

(7) Teſtam. de l'Hoſpital apud Colomiés, ubi ſupra, pag. 55.

(8) Belcarius, lib. xxviii, n. 57.

(9) Varillas, Hiſt. de l'Hereſ. livr. xxii, pag. m. 170. Dutch Edit. *He had this from Beaucaire*, lib. xxviii, n. 57.

(10) Idem, Hiſt. de François II, pag. m. 194.

of Berry aſſigned her, choſe him for her chancellor (a). He continued with her in the ſame poſt in Italy, after ſhe married the duke of Savoy, and he was at Nice when he was raiſed to the dignity of chancellor of France, under the reign of Francis II in 1560 (b). It was believed that the Guiſes procured him that office, and that they did it upon the notion they had, that being obliged to them [B], he would do all they ſhould deſire. They were miſtaken; for he laid down for his maxim the good of the kingdom, and the true intereſts of the king his maſter. It is true, he was obliged to uſe addreſs [C], becauſe if he had openly oppoſed the deſigns of the Guiſes, he had not been able to remedy the confuſions of France. He was forced then to ſwim betwixt two ſtreams, and by that prudent conduct he turned off ſome ſtorms, which threatned the kingdom, and retarded ſome others, and found the means of doing good ſervice to his country, as much as the miſerable condition of the times would permit him. He hindred, amongſt other things, the introduction of the Inquiſition, by conſenting to an edict (c) that was much more ſevere againſt the Proteſtants, than he would have deſired [D]. It was the edict of Romorantin. There is no doubt but that if he had been

(a) Paſquier, Letters, Tom. II, book xxii, pag. 758.

(b) La Planche, Hiſt. de François II, pag. m. 228.

(c) Dated in May, 1560.

relates, that the father of the chancellor *was the ſon of a Phyſician to the queen of Navarre, wife of Antony de Bourbon* (11). He cites (12) page 1156, of the ſecond volume of Mezerai's Hiſtory of France. I find nothing concerning chancellor de l'Hoſpital in the ſecond volume of that author: I only find in the twenty ſecond page of the third volume, that he was the *ſon of the Phyſician to Renata de Bourbon, wife of Antony of Lorrain.*

[B] *It was believed that the Guiſes procured him that office, and that they did it upon the notion they had, that being obliged to them,* &c.] Lewis Regnier, Sieur de la Planche, relates, that after the death of chancellor Olivier, they offered his place to Morvilliers, *a privy counſellor and biſhop of Orleans . . . . a moſt affectionate ſervant of* their family, and that they *cunningly ſerved themſelves by his refuſal.* 'For thinking they could make better uſe of Michael de l'Hoſpital, a man brought up, advanced, and formed by them, they took Morvilliers at his word, and ſent in queſt of the other to Nice, where he was chancellor to the ducheſs of Savoy. The ducheſs was therefore made to believe, that the king, to oblige her, made her chancellor his own (13).' But other hiſtorians ſay, that the queen-mother was the true author of that choice; being moved to it by the ducheſs of Montpenſier, who thought thereby to give a check to the ambition of the Guiſes. See the article LONGVIC (14). Thuanus (15) adds, that when they acquieſced in that choice, the affair was already concluded, and that Catherine de Medicis let Michael de l'Hoſpital know, that it was not at their recommendation, but at her's, that the king had honoured him with that dignity, and that therefore ſhe hoped to ſee him more zealous for the intereſt of his prince, and of the queen, his mother, than for that of a family, whoſe ambition was deteſted by every body. The ſame hiſtorian obſerves, that it was more eaſy for the queen-mother to bring this about, becauſe Michael de l'Hoſpital was in good eſteem with the cardinal of Lorrain. Note, that Mr Teſſier is miſtaken when he ſays, quoting Thuanus's twenty fourth book, 'that Catherine de Medicis obliged Henry II, to make Michael de l'Hoſpital chancellor of France (16).' He ſhould have ſaid Francis II.

[C] *He was obliged to uſe addreſs.*] We will ſtill make uſe of la Planche, for our comment upon this text. 'As for the chancellor de l'Hoſpital, few people rejoiced at firſt to ſee him raiſed to that dignity, having been ſo familiar with the cardinal (17), inſomuch that it was thought he would not be ſo bold as to contradict him in any thing, having had ſo many favours and preferments from him. But as he knew the genius of the Guiſes, having for a long time been acquainted with them; ſo he had the prudence dexterouſly to prevent their ſtratagems, if not as he ought, yet at leaſt as well as he could, according to the malice of the times, warding off their moſt furious blows with a ſingular induſtry. For having propoſed to himſelf, as ſoon as he was eſtabliſhed in his poſt, to ſteer a right courſe, like a wiſe man, and not to favour one party or another, but to ſerve the king and his country, he was obliged to uſe a wonderful addreſs to keep thoſe of the houſe of Lorrain within due bounds. And this likewiſe he had a mind to perform in ſuch a manner, that they might not perceive, he intended in any thing to contradict or diſpleaſe them, well knowing, that if they once entertained that opinion of him, he ſhould be able to do nothing to any purpoſe. Thus with great diſſimulation many things paſſed through his hands, which were thought very dangerous: however he kept a medium, giving hopes to thoſe who loved the public, that all ſhould end well at laſt, provided they would let him bring it about. Few people underſtood his intention: but time diſcovered that he had the ſervice of his king, and the ſafety of the people at heart, quite otherwiſe than was imagined. And to ſpeak truth, his prudence cannot be ſufficiently deſcribed. For certainly, though if he had taken a ſhorter way, and boldly oppoſed the evil, he would have been more to be praiſed, and GOD poſſibly would have bleſſed his conſtancy: yet as far as may be judged, he alone by his moderate management has been the inſtrument, which GOD has made uſe of to ſtop the force of theſe impetuous waves, in which all the French would have been overwhelmed. Nevertheleſs, outward appearances were againſt him. In ſhort, when any one minded him of an approaching danger, he had always this ſaying in his mouth, *patience, patience, all will go well* (18).'

[D] *He hindered . . . the introduction of the Inquiſition, by conſenting to an edict much more ſevere againſt the Proteſtants than he would have deſired.*] Here is the ſequel of the Sieur de la Planche's narrative (19). 'To make ſhort, when the queſtion was about expediting the edict for the Spaniſh Inquiſition, knowing that the privy-council and the parliaments had agreed to it, he moderated the matter, by an edict made on purpoſe, for which he gave ſo good reaſons, that the Guiſes themſelves, who had procured the firſt edict, were of his opinion, and made the Spaniards approve it, who were deſirous that France ſhould be ordered and framed by their model. This happened in the month of May, in the town of Romorantin, and that edict was ever after called the edict of Romorantin.' Varillas obſerves (20) that '. ſo moderate a conduct diſpleaſed the Calviniſts, and did not ſatisfy the Catholics. The Calviniſts took exception, that they had given them their adverſaries, and irreconcileable enemies, for their judges (21); and the Catholics ſuſpected from that time, that the chancellor was of the new religion . . . . . They reproached him with going to maſs only for form ſake; and the maſs of the chancellor became a proverb, to ſignify a maſs that people went to, only in obedience to the king. The houſe of Guiſe had no better opinion of this magiſtrate, and repented that they had contributed with the ducheſs of Savoy to raiſe him to that high-ſtation. They fancied, that this able politician endeavoured to withdraw himſelf from their dependance, by forming at court a third party with the queen-mother, to keep the balance even between the two others, ſo as neither of them might ſupplant the other.' This puts me in mind of this paſſage of Brantôme (22). 'He was reckoned an Huguenot though he went to maſs, but it was ſaid at court, *GOD preſerve us from the maſs of Monſieur de l'Hoſpital.*'

REFLEXION on moderate meaſures, ordinarly diſpleaſing both parties.

This is the common fate of thoſe, who ſeek to keep a temper between the pretenſions of two oppoſite parties, that they pleaſe neither the one nor the other. But that inconvenience is ſometimes a leſſer evil, than it would be to comply with the paſſions of one of the parties; and there are many conjunctures, in which the

(11) Teiſſier, Addit. aux Elog. Tom. I, pag. 396. Edit. 1696.

(12) Id. ibid. Tom. II, pag. 413. Edit. 1683.

(13) La Planche, pag. m. 228. Hiſt. de François II.

(14) In the remark [I].

(15) Thuan. lib. xxiv, ſub fin.

(16) Teiſſier, Addit. aux Elog. Tom. I, pag. m. 396.

(17) Thuanus, *lib. xiii, ſub fin. pag. m.* 278, obſerves, that Michael de l'Hoſpital, preſident of the chamber of accompts in the the year 1554, favoured the deſign of the cardinal of Lorrain, to make the parliament of Paris ſit half a year.

(18) La Planche, ubi ſupra, pag. 359, 360.

(19) La Planche, ibid. pag. 361.

(20) Varillas, Hiſt. de l'Hereſ. livr. xxii, pag. 170.

(21) By virtue of that edict, the cognizance of the crimes of Hereſy belonged only to the biſhops, and all the royal judges were deprived of it.

(22) Brantôme, Eloge du Connet. de Mommorenci, Tom. II. *of his Memoirs, pag.* 89.

been ſole manager of theſe things, he would have procured a full toleration for the Proteſtants. His good offices and management were undoubtedly one of the cauſes which altered the diſpoſitions of mens minds towards them; this alteration was ſo remarkable, that the ſecond year of his miniſtry there were almoſt as many voices for them as againſt them in the council which examined the petition they preſented to the king [*E*], deſiring the free exerciſe of their religion. His influence was no leſs effectual in the reſtrictions of the edict of July 1561 (*d*), and in the liberty they had not to obſerve it (*e*). The edict of January which they obtained ſome time after, was doubtleſs his work: now that edict permitted them public aſſemblies, and many other privileges. This was the only remedy for the evils of the kingdom; all the dreadful miſeries that afflicted it for thirty years aroſe from the infraction of that edict: and after all theſe diſmal calamities, it was neceſſary to take the ſame remedy, and in a ſtronger doſe. It was neceſſary to grant them the edict of Nantes, which was much more advantageous to the Reformed, than that which chancellor de l'Hoſpital had procured them. But I confeſs alſo that the Romiſh religion did not run ſuch a riſk when the edict of Nantes was granted, as it did when he procured the edict of January [*F*]. The obſtacles that he was

the greateſt good that can be done, is to divide the diſadvantages, that every one may have his ſhare of them. Our chancellor would have ſpoiled all, if he had at firſt undertaken to give full ſatisfaction to the enemies of the houſe of Guiſe. This had been to ſplit againſt a rock. Prudence would not ſuffer him to attack that faction, but with a ſide wind; they had the wind in the ſtern, and he was not to ſteer againſt it. I believe, that many Calviniſts, who had more zeal than knowledge of the world, always condemned this chancellor's conduct. They would have had him to declare himſelf openly and boldly the protector of their cauſe. But could he have preſerved his poſt three months together, had not he obſerved that temper? He well underſtood, that the beſt way to withſtand a tempeſt, was that which Plutarch makes mention of, ſpeaking of the government of republics. 'Aſtronomers tell us, the ſun's motion is neither exactly parallel with the reſt of the orbs, nor yet directly and diametrically oppoſite to them; but deſcribing an oblique line, with inſenſible declination, he ſteers his courſe ſo, to diſpenſe his light and influence, in his annual revolution, at ſeveral ſeaſons, in equal proportions to the whole creation. So it happens in political affairs, that if the motions of rulers be conſtantly oppoſite and croſs to the genius and inclination of the people, they will be ſtomached as arbitrary and tyrannical; as, on the other ſide, too much deference and indulgence to the ſubjects levity and wantonneſs, has often proved dangerous and fatal; but the gratifying them in reaſonable and fair requeſts, when they are not maſterly and inſolent, may prove for the honour and ſafety of the government (23).' Our chancellor was not ignorant of what Cicero obſerves, that politicians ought to imitate ſailors. 'An, cùm videam navem ſecundis ventis curſum tenentem ſuum, ſi non ea eum petat portum, quem ego aliquando probavi, ſed alium non minùs tutum atque tranquillum, cum tempeſtate pugnem periculosè potiùs, quàm illi ſalute præſertim præpoſita obtemporem & paream? neque enim inconſtantis puto ſententiam tanquam aliquod navigium, atque curſum ex Reipub. tempeſtate moderari (24). —— *Should I, when I ſee a ſhip holding a ſteady courſe with a fair wind, though ſhe doth not ſteer to the harbour which I once approved of, but to another equally ſafe and calm, ſhould I, I ſay, rather, with the utmoſt hazard, endeavour to ſtrive againſt the weather, than, eſpecially when I ſee ſafety in ſo doing, to yield to it, and be guided by it? For I do not think it inconſtancy for a man to guide his reſolutions and his courſe, as it were a ſhip, by the ſeaſons of the common-wealth.*' Though he had not the good fortune of Lepidus, who kept in the favour of Tiberius, by obſerving a juſt medium betwixt ſordid flatteries, and a too great ſtiffneſs, he deſerves the praiſes that Tacitus has expreſſed in this manner: 'Hunc ego Lepidum, temporibus illis, gravem & ſapientem virum fuiſſe comperio. Nam pleraque ab ſævis adulationibus aliorum, in melius flexit: neque tamen temperamenti egebat, cum æquabili auctoritate & gratia apud Tiberium viguerit. Unde dubitare cogor, fato & ſorte naſcendi, ut cetera, ita principum inclinatio in hos, offenſio in illos: an ſit aliquid in noſtris conſiliis, liceatque inter abruptam contumaciam, & deforme obſequium, pergere iter ambitione ac periculis vacuum (25).'

[*E*] *There were almoſt as many voices for the Proteſtants as againſt them, in the council which examined the petition that they preſented to the king.*] This particular ſeems to me to be curious; and I fancy, that every body will be pleaſed to find here the circumſtances of that affair. I make uſe of the commentary which a Catholic writer ſupplies me with (26). 'The Huguenots have preſented a petition to the king, that they might be permitted to have a ſeparate church from ours. The king ſent the petition to the parliament, to adviſe about it with the lords of the council. There they freely voted on both ſides, the one for the Catholic party, the other for the Proteſtant. The Catholics have carried it by three voices, it being their reſolution that people muſt either follow the Romiſh church as our anceſtors did, or depart the kingdom, with leave to ſell their eſtates. When the voices came to be caſt up, there was no ſmall murmur; becauſe the others maintained, that in a matter of ſuch importance, there was no reaſon that all France ſhould be put into a combuſtion by reaſon of thoſe three votes. Becauſe ſuch a baniſhment could not be executed, and beſides that, to undertake, while they continued in France, to bring them over to the Romiſh religion againſt their conſcience, was very abſurd, and amounted to an impoſſibility. The admiral and ſeveral other lords, cannot be ſilent about it. The duke of Guiſe, on the other hand, tho' the time ſeemed to oppoſe his deſign, plainly declared, that ſince it had been ſo reſolved, they muſt ſtand to that determination, and that his ſword ſhould never reſt in the ſcabbard, when the queſtion ſhould be whether that decree ſhould take effect. Things in this contention paſſed without concluſion...... (27) ſince that, to content both parties by a ſort of neutrality, an edict has been publiſhed in July laſt (28)......The ſincere Catholics complain of this edict, and ſay that thoſe of the new or pretended reformed religion, being not to be diſturbed in their houſes, it is in plain terms to fruſtrate the firſt article of the edict, and nevertheleſs to deliver them from the power of the magiſtrate: which ſome time after will give them occaſion quite to ſhake off the yoke from their necks (29).'

[*F*] *The Romiſh religion did not run ſuch a riſk ...... as when the edict of January was made.*] The Proteſtants had very nearly got the upper hand, in the beginning of Charles IXth's reign; and if they had, God knows what would have become of the religion that had perſecuted them under the three preceding reigns. If the king of Navarre, who had openly declared for them, had been able to diſcover the ſnare, that the other party laid for him, he would have continued firm in their communion. There needed no more to have procured them the victory; for he was lieutenant-general of the kingdom, and there had been no difficulty then to have brought over Catherine de Medicis to the reformed religion (30). But he ſuffered himſelf to be cheated by imaginary hopes, and had not penetration enough to diſcover the groſſneſs of the ſnare; he took the iſland of Sardinia, a country of exile, a country miſerable and diſgraced (31): he took it, I ſay, ſo well he knew the map, for one of thoſe fortunate iſlands mentioned in the fables. Being thus groſly deceived by the artifices of the Spaniards, and the cardinal Legate, he abandoned the Proteſtants (32); and thus ſee, how little was

(*d*) The zealous Catholics were diſpleaſed with thoſe reſtrictions. See the end of the remark [*E*].

(*e*) See the remark [*F*], citat. (33).

(23) Plutarch. in Phocione, init.

(24) Cicero, Orat. pro Plancio, cap. xxxix, pag. m. 619. *See alſo* Epiſt. ix, lib. i, ad Familiar. pag. m. 56.

(25) Tacit. Annal. lib. iv, cap. xx.

(26) Paſquier, Letters, Tom I, book iv, pag. 196.

(27) Id. ibid. pag. 197.

(28) That is 1561.

(29) Ibid. pag. 198.

(30) See the article SOUBISE (JOHN, &c.) remark [*B*].

(31) See the remark [*G*] of the article CHATEL (TANNEGUS du); and Tacitus, *Annal lib. ii, cap. lxxxv.*

(32) See the article HENRY IV, remark [*L*].

was to overcome, did not ceaſe after he had ſealed it. New ones aroſe concerning it's being regiſtered in parliament. And it was neceſſary for him to ſhew the force of his genius,

was wanting to their becoming maſters. I will quote a paſſage, which will ſhew the intereſt they had by his favour in the ſtates of Orleans, and the liberty they enjoyed under his protection. They publickly aſſembled even in the capital city of the kingdom, before they had any edicts permitting them to do ſo. But it muſt be noted, that the regent, Catherine de Medicis, agreed in this with the king of Navarre (33). ‘(34) The Huguenots. . . . . had all their dependance upon this king (35), as upon one whom they had carried on their ſhoulders, and to whom they had procured the government of France, by their intrigues and ſecret practices, in the aſſembly of the three ſtates. And indeed as an acknowledgment of this, he permitted, by a very great connivance, their preaching with the doors open, not only in Paris, but alſo at the king's court at St Germains en Laye. Indeed it was difficult for him, to maintain his grandeur, but by means of thoſe who reciprocally were to maintain themſelves by his countenance and ſupport. Neverthleſs changing his mind he was the firſt inſtrument of the Catholics arming themſelves againſt the others. But becauſe theſe are things unknown to many, and poſſibly you have not heard how theſe practices were carried on; you muſt know that the Pope perceiving the commotions that were among us, ſent the cardinal of Ferrara, uncle of Madam de Guiſe, as Legate into France with moſt ample inſtructions . . . . . . (36) We have here alſo the lord de Charantonneau, ſon to the deceaſed chancellor Granvelle. It is ſaid that this embaſſador of king Philip is gained by ſome of our great princes, who are not pleaſed with this diverſity of religions. He, according to the deſign laid betwixt them, went three or four times in a diſguiſed habit to the king of Navarre, aſſuring him in his maſter's name, that as ſoon as he would take upon him the protection of the church of Rome, he would reſtore him his kingdom of Navarre, or at leaſt an equivalent in as rich and plentiful a country. As this engine began to work, the legate alſo came in, promiſing from the holy ſee the county of Venaiſſin, and moreover to procure him from his Catholic majeſty the iſle of Sardinia, which the Pope would erect into a kingdom, in caſe the king would not reſtore to him the kingdom of Navarre. It is ſaid that the conſtable, and the mareſchal de St André, did all in their power to make him reliſh theſe promiſes. I will not venture to aſſure you that this is as true as the goſpel: but ſo much I can tell, that it was the common report (37). Only this I can ſay, that in an inſtant his countenance and affections were changed towards the Huguenots: for he forbad the miniſters to preach in the caſtle any more, as they had taken the liberty and permiſſion to do for five or ſix months before. Even in the aſſembly of St Germains he oppoſed the Huguenots as much as he could: but the prince of Condé, the admiral, and others, who then were not the leaſt in favour with the king, oppoſed him, and carried it with reſpect to the publication of the edict (38).' The ſame author, in what follows, will ſhow us the proſperity the Proteſtants enjoyed, even before the edict of January, and whilſt Antony king of Navarre favoured them. ‘The ſame day, (*that is to ſay*, the twenty ninth of September 1561) the Queen of Navarre in ſight of all the people, cauſed the marriage between young Rohan and the lady Brabanſon, niece to Madam d'Eſtampes, to be celebrated in the form of Geneva, in the borough of Argentueil, by Beza. There were preſent the prince of Condé and the admiral. That action performed thus, at the gates of Paris, and of St Germains en Laye, where the king reſided, not being controuled, mightily encouraged the miniſters. And in October following, they actually preached without the walls of Paris, near the monaſtery of St Antony in the fields, in the preſence of eight or nine thouſand perſons. At their return a tumult was raiſed, which was eaſily appeaſed by the authority of the king of Navarre. They have ſince proceeded farther. For on All-Saints eve there was another public aſſembly in the counteſs of Senigan's houſe, which was guarded by the provoſts of the marſhals and their archers, to prevent any popular commotion. A few days after, not confining themſelves to the king's edicts, but infringing that of July, they undertook to preach two ſermons, one in the ſuburbs of St Marcel, in the place called the Patriarch; and the other without St Antony's gate, in a place called Popincourt. It is incredible what crouds of people were preſent at theſe new devotions. To which Gabaſton, captain of the watch and his archers, ſerved as a guard. L'Aulnay and l'Eſtang preach at Popincourt: Malo and Viret at the Patriarch. The Catholic lords ſeeing a neceſſity of giving way to the ſtorm, the duke of Guiſe enraged has retired to his ſeat of Nantueil, cardinal de Lorrain to his archbiſhopric of Reims, Mr de Nemoux to Savoy, the conſtable to Chantilly, &c. (39).' See in ſome other letters of Stephen Paſquier's (40), the concourſe at theſe aſſemblies, and how they were ſupported by the ſecular power. You may alſo conſult Hubert Languet's letters (41), where we find amongſt other things (42) that the meetings near Paris had ſometimes fifteen thouſand people (43), the women in the middle being ſurrounded with men on foot, and theſe encompaſſed by horſemen, and during the ſermon the governour of Paris cauſed the avenues to be guarded by the ſoldiers, who beat or impriſoned, or repreſſed ſome other way, all that endeavoured to diſturb the devotion of the aſſembly.

WHETHER it can be alledged that the Proteſtants behaved in too oſtentatious a manner.

Many people who judge of things only by the event, will ſay that the Proteſtants would have been more prudent, if they had affected leſs haughtineſs at that time; for that oſtentation of their numbers was looked on as a bravado, which ſoured their enemies, and put them upon the moſt violent remedies. We ſee from a letter of the cardinal Legate, that theſe haughty ſteps gave him hopes of a proſperous iſſue: his letter is dated from St Germains the twenty ſeventh of February 1562. Here is a paſſage of it. ‘There happened lately a quarrel betwixt thoſe of both religions, in which ſome remained dead upon the ſpot: and yet the danger proved greater than the damage. The Catholics in an inſtant flocked hither to complain of the inſolence of the Hugnenots; they remonſtrated that, according to the expreſs order of his majeſty, they had laid down their arms; but that the Huguenots had done the quite contrary. For this reaſon they earneſtly deſired that they might be immediately permitted to reſume them, to ſecure themſelves from their ambuſcades, which made them juſtly apprehenſive that being emboldened by theſe troops of ſoldiers, they would afterwards do violence, both to their perſons and goods. But the Huguenots likewiſe failed not to come and excuſe themſelves, alledging in their vindication: *that the jealouſies the Catholics gave them by reaſon of their great numbers, was the reaſon they did not diſarm.* The anſwer of the queen and king of Navarre was extreamly favourable to thoſe of our party; for they bad them take courage, and alſo promiſed them *that they would take great care to provide for their particular ſecurity, and for the common repoſe of their city.* So that after ſuch obliging words proceeding from the mouths of their majeſties, by which they expreſſed more tenderneſs than they ever expected, they went away with all poſſible ſatiſfaction. On the contrary the Huguenots were aſtoniſhed, when they were told in very rough terms; *that if they would not be more modeſt, and abſtain from ſuch violences, they ſhould be taught better manners.* The king of Navarre went ſtill farther: for, even before them, he ſaid to the queen, *that her majeſty needed only give the command, and that when ſhe pleaſed, he would find a means to ſtop the courſe of their inſolence.* To this I add this particular, which is none of the leaſt conſiderable; that not only their majeſties but people in general, are extreamly ſcandalized with Beza's walking in Paris, conſtantly attended by Mr d'Andelot, and a great number of gentlemen following them. However after all, tho' diſorders and ſcandals are for the moſt part prejudicial; yet ſometimes they fail not to produce ſome fruit, becauſe provoking the patience of the great, they frequently incline them to generous enterprizes. Which makes me believe, that we ought to be the leſs troubled at this, becauſe it is probable, that, conſidering the preſent diſpoſition genius, and the conſtancy of his ſoul, in order to get the better of the ſcruples, and the ill humour of the parliament of Paris [*G*]. The ſpeeches he made for toleration, rendered

---

(33) Beza's Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches, book iv, pag. 670, and *Belcarius*, *lib. xxix*, *n.* 34, *pag.* 966.

(34) Paſquier, Letters, Tom. I, book iv, pag. 218.

(35) That is the king of Navarre.

(36) Id. ibid. pag. 219.

(37) That common report was true: the moſt exact hiſtorians own it.

(38) That is, the Edict of January 1562.

(39) Paſquier, ubi ſupra, pag. 200, 201.

(40) Ibid. pag. 202, 205, & *ſeq.*

(41) Lib. ii, pag. 145, 150, 155. Edit. Hal. 1698.

(42) Ibid. pag. 155.

(43) In a letter written the twenty third of January 1562 (the Edict was already made, but not regiſtered) he ſays that there were ſome aſſemblies at Paris of about thirty and forty thouſand people, and that two or three miniſters were obliged to preach in the ſame place at the ſame time. *Ibid. pag.* 196.

'of the minds of the great, ſuch diſorders will all at once fall on the heads of thoſe that cauſe them (44)?' Let us ſay however to theſe critics, that it was very natural for thoſe who had groaned near forty years under ſo hard and cruel an oppreſſion, to uſe their liberty without reſtriction, and to overflow like waters at the opening of the ſluces. Nay, there were ſome reaſons of prudence that might perſuade them to that conduct. They might reaſonably imagine, that the court would think itſelf obliged to treat civilly a party, whoſe power ſhould be found capable of making itſelf feared. Laſtly, I ſay, that neither the miniſters nor the people could hinder Andelot, and other brave men of quality, to mix with their zeal for religion, ſome airs of the ſoldier and gentleman, which courage and cuſtom made natural to them. However it be, the other church eſcaped narrowly; for if notwithſtanding the deſertion of the king of Navarre, the Proteſtants maintained the firſt war very well, what would not they have done under the protection of the lieutenant-general of the kingdom, which would doubtleſs have drawn after it that of the queen-mother? Languet tells us the good opinion one might have of their forces. 'Re patefacta plerique noſtrorum venerunt armati ad Concionem, & jam idem quotidie faciunt, & inter reliquos ſtudioſi magno numero. Iis præbent ſe Duces Dandelotus Frater Amiralii, Princeps de Rohan, & Frater nothus Reginæ Scotiæ, ac alii Illuſtribus familiis nati, quod, meo judicio, non faciunt ſine conſenſu Reginæ: aliter enim graviter peccarent in legis regni. Monmorantio urbis præfecto mandatum eſt, ut huc inducat, præſidii cauſa, duas alas equitum, & certum numerum peditum, quibus præerit Dandelotus. Interea autem dum iſti milites præſidiarii expectantur, nobilitas & ſtudioſi funguntur eorum officio, & tota urbs armis perſtrepit. Pontificii deſperant fere de reliquis urbibus Galliæ, ſed exiſtimant ſummam rerum in hoc conſiſtere, ut hanc ſibi addictam retineant. Verum ita creſcunt hic ſtudia factionum, ut verear, ne eam omnium primam amittant. Quamvis enim à partibus eorum ſint plures Cardinales, Epiſcopi, Abbates, Præſides, Aſſeſſores, & alii, qui opibus & auctoritate valeant noſtri tamen viribus & ferocia videntur eſſe potiores, & ſi ad vim deveniatur, totius ipſorum ſapientiæ nullus erit uſus. Mihi venet in mentem facetum dictum Ludovici 12 Regis Galliæ, cui ſuſcepturo bellum adverſus Venetos cum quidam dicerent fore periculoſum, illud bellum propter eximiam Venetorum ſapientiam: ego, inquit, multitudine ſtultorum ipſorum ſapientiam obruam . . . . Heri hic celebrarunt Jubilæum, ex mandato Legati Pontificii: noſtri vero convenerunt, (ut exiſtimo) ad quadraginta millia, & præcipuas plateas urbis armatis compleverunt. Tres concionatores tantæ multitudini vix ſufficiebant (45). —— *This being diſcovered, moſt of our people came armed to the ſermon, and now they do ſo daily, and among the reſt ſcholars come in great numbers. They are headed by Mr D'Andelot, brother to the admiral, by the duke of Rohan, by the queen of Scots natural brother, and by many others of noble families, and this not without the conſent of the queen, as I imagine: for otherwiſe this would be a high tranſgreſſion of the laws of the kingdom. Montmorancy, the governour of the city, has received orders to ſend for two ſquadrons of horſe, and a certain number of foot, hither, to be commanded by D'Andelot, and to ſerve for a guard. In the mean while till theſe ſoldiers arrive, the nobility and the ſtudents ſupply their place, and the whole city is filled with the noiſe of arms. The Catholics almoſt deſpair of the other cities of France, but they think their all depends upon their keeping this city ſteady in their intereſts. But our party gains ground ſo faſt here, that I am afraid they will loſe it firſt of all. For tho' on their ſide there are a greater number of cardinals, biſhops, abbots, preſidents, aſſeſſors, and others of great wealth and authority: yet ours ſeem to have the advantage in ſtrength and keenneſs: and if it come to trial by force of arms, all their wiſdom will be of little uſe to them. This makes me remember a pleaſant repartee of Lewis XII of France, who being to make war with the Venetians, was told by one of his courtiers that it would be dangerous, becauſe, of the ſingular wiſdom of Venetians: I, ſaid he, will overpower their wiſdom by a multitude of fools . . . . Yeſterday the Jubilee was celebrated by order of the Pope's legate: but our party convened to the number of* 40000 *(as I think) and filled all the principal ſquares with armed men. Three preachers were ſcarce ſufficient to ſo vaſt a multitude.*

[G] *It was neceſſary for him to ſhow the force of his genius, in order to get the better of the ſcruples, and ill humour of the parliament of Paris.*] This parliament refuſed to regiſter the edict of January, and deputed a preſident, and a counſellor, to make their remonſtrances to the king. Theſe two deputies 'having particularly explained before the king, the reaſons that moved the parliament not to receive that edict, the chancellor, by reaſon of the eminence of his office, and the minority of our king, anſwered them in this manner: that he did not doubt but all the arguments repreſented by them, were very weighty; but he deſired them to conſider, that they had not been forgotten in the great council of St Germains; that the queſtion in hand, was one of thoſe in which there is ſome difficulty, what way ſoever we turn our thoughts; and that to ſpeak the truth, there was room to excuſe the magiſtrates, whatever part they took. He granted that the foundation of a common-wealth was the having but one religion; but when things were come to ſuch a height, as was then obſerved in France, whoever rejects this edict muſt reſolve on one of theſe two things: either to put all the adherents of this new religion to the ſword, or to baniſh them intirely, with permiſſion to diſpoſe of their effects. The firſt point could not be executed, that party being too ſtrong both in leaders, and partiſans; and though it were poſſible to do it, if the king's youth were ſtained with the blood of ſo many ſubjects, perhaps when he came to age and underſtanding, he would require it at his governours hands. And as to the ſecond point, that it was as impracticable: and ſhould it ſucceed to our deſire, we ſhould raiſe by this conduct as many deſperate enemies as exiles. And as to the edict of July, though it had a plauſible pretence, it really tended to make men Atheiſts, by permitting them to abſent themſelves from the Catholic churches, and yet nevertheleſs depriving them of the exerciſe of their own religion. Wherefore to obviate all theſe miſchiefs, it had been thought good to eſtabliſh two churches in France, till GOD ſhould pleaſe to re-unite us in the ſame mind: and that this had been the practice heretofore of Galerius Maximian and Conſtantius, the emperors, to compoſe the diviſions betwixt the Chriſtians and Heathens: remonſtrating to them, and praying them to ſubmit to the preſent neceſſity; in brief to tolerate this ſcandal, to avoid a greater evil, and that if we tranſgreſſed in this, it was in imitation of the neighbouring nations, who in the like neceſſity had been obliged to do the ſame. This anſwer being reported to the parliament, the chambers once more aſſembled, did not change their opinion (46).' This reluctance diſturbed the court, and it was again debated with ſome deputies of Paris what was to be done (47). By a majority of voices, it was reſolved that the edict ſhould be maintained, 'And the prince of la Roche-ſur-yon was commiſſioned to publiſh it in parliament, with expreſs orders that if they ſhould refuſe or delay to do it, he ſhould cauſe it to be publiſhed without a judicial form, aſſiſted only by ſome particular counſellors, ſuch as he ſhould chuſe. This commiſſion was violent; but he being a wiſe prince, executed it very gently, declaring that the king's intention was founded on the neceſſity of the time; that the court of parliament might eaſily know what paſſed before their eyes in the city of Paris, but they were not informed of the complaints that came daily to the king and council from all parts of the kingdom; intreating them to give their reſolution briefly, and without any long diſcourſe, by yes or no, what they would anſwer. Hereupon it was by common conſent reſolved that all thoſe who had aſſiſted at the council of St Germains, ſhould have a deliberative voice in that matter as well as others: ſo that at laſt it was ordained that the edict ſhould paſs. It is true that in the execution, they ſufficiently declared,

(44) Negotiations, ou Lettres d'Affairs eſcrites au Pape Pie IV, & au Cardinal Borromée par Hippolite d'Eſt, Cardinal de Ferrare, Legat en France, pag. 93, 94.

(45) Hub. Languetus, Epiſt. lxx, lib. ii, pag. 207, 208. *It is dated from Paris, in March* 1562. *See alſo the ſixty ſeventh letter of the ſame book.*

(46) *Paſquier's Letters, Tom. I, book iv, pag.* 212, & ſeq.

(47) Id ibid. pag. 214.

dered him very much ſuſpected to the Catholics, and odious to the court of Rome [*H*], and becauſe he was conſtantly againſt the civil-war, they would not allow him to aſſiſt at the councils of war (*f*). He appeared very much afflicted, when he ſaw preparations made on both ſides to take up arms after the affair of Vaſſi: he declared plainly his thoughts upon it, and made a moſt excellent anſwer to the Conſtable, who told him, *that*

‘that it was by a forced conſent: becauſe on Friday the twenty ſixth of March an extraordinary day of pleading, it was confirmed with all the demonſtrations of conſtraint; foraſmuch as with the edict were publiſhed all the orders of the king, a thing not uſually done in ſuch publications. Beſides, the attorney-general required nothing publickly, but only declared that he had given his concluſions in writing. And therefore it was ordered by the court, that upon the back of the letters it ſhould be wrote, that they had been read, publiſhed, and regiſtered, after having heard the king's attorney-general, without approbation however of the new religion; the whole by way of proviſion, until it ſhould be otherwiſe ordered by the king. Thus it was this edict paſſed at Paris (48).’ This has ſome connexion with the hiſtory of Mr de l'Hoſpital, and contains ſome particular circumſtances, which are not to be found in the General Hiſtory; and therefore the reader will have ſome reaſon to be pleaſed that I have related them.

[*H*] *His ſpeeches . . . rendered him very much ſuſpected to the Catholics, and odious to the court of Rome.*] We have ſeen above (49), in a paſſage of Varillas, what was ſaid in France by way of jeſt, of the chancellor's maſs. Beaucaire de Peguillon ſpeaking of the aſſembly of St Germains (50), and reporting the heads of the ſpeech which the chancellor made there, obſerves that this firſt magiſtrate ſerved for an example to the judges who favoured the ſectaries, and that he only loved the Calviniſts. ‘Deinde Regios miniſtros qui juridicundo præſunt & Regia edicta non ſatis accurate exequuti ſunt, excuſat: inter quos ille merito accuſatus eſt, qui illis exemplo erat, & nullos, niſi Calvinianos in oculis habebat; quique præclara hac oratione, & multis aliis perverſis machinis ad condendum ſatis celebratum poſtea ſuum Januarii ſequentis edictum viam præparavit (51). —— *Then he excuſeth the king's judges who do not execute the royal edicts with ſufficient care: and amongſt them he is deſervedly accuſed, who gave them an example, and loved none but the Calviniſts: and who by that notable oration, and by many other wicked arts, paved the way for his edict of January which was afterwards ſo famous.*’ This hiſtorian has the impudence to call this great man an Atheiſt: here is what he ſays, when he obſerves that the cardinal of Lorrain raiſed him to the dignity of chancellor. ‘Interim Olivario Cancellario vita functo Cardinalis Lotharingus præter domeſticorum ſuorum omnium ac familiarium ſententiam, ut Michael Hoſpitalis homo quidem doctus, ſed nullius religionis, aut ut vere dicam ἄθεος in ejus locum ſurrogaretur, effecit (52). —— *In the mean while chancellor Olivier being dead, the cardinal of Lorrain, contrary to the opinion of all his ſervants friends, procured that place for Michael l'Hoſpital, a learned man indeed, but of no religion, or, to ſay the truth, an Atheiſt.*’ Something has been ſaid in another place (53) concerning this accuſation. Odoric Raynaldus has renewed this cruel reproach in the very words of Beaucaire. It is in a place where he ſpeaks of a certain enterprize of the preſident du Ferrier, which I have mentioned above (54). Mr Couſin ſhewed a juſt diſpleaſure at that injuſtice, and at the outrageouſneſs of Raynaldus, and has quoted a fine paſſage of the letter, which our chancellor wrote to Pius IV, the twenty ninth of September 1562 (55). Father Paul (56) tells us, that this Pope found the oration which that chancellor had made in the conference of Poiſſi *heretical in many points*. He adds, that the ſame Pope ‘threatened to have him cited before the Inquiſition, and that the court of Rome, where copies of this diſcourſe were ſpread, ſpoke very ill of him, and conjectured that all the miniſters of the kingdom had the ſame opinion of that court: and the embaſſador of France had much 'ado to defend himſelf.’ Note that Pius IV having determined to give the king of France an hundred thouſand crowns by way of donation, and to lend him as many more, ſtipulated among other things, that the ‘chancellor, the biſhop of Valence, and ſome others that he ſhould name, ſhould be impriſoned (57).’ I will here add a paſſage of a letter, which the cardinal legate Hippolytus d'Eſt wrote to the Pope the fourteenth of June 1562. It is dated from Bois de Vincennes. ‘Among other difficulties it is none of the leaſt to keep the chancellor, and many other dignified perſons, as your holineſs deſires, at a diſtance from the court, for you put in this number both Heretics, and thoſe that are ſuſpected of Hereſy. But if all the latter were to be baniſhed the court, would doubtleſs be deſerted, theſe new opinions having already made ſuch an impreſſion on the minds of the courtiers, that there are few that have not ſome little tincture of them . . . . But to return to the moſt factious of the court, your holineſs is not ignorant how hard a matter it was to get the Chaſtillons removed . . . But as to the removing of the chancellor which is deſired *, it is quite another thing: for beſides that, he is in a poſt that will not permit him to be abſent from court, except for very important reaſons; he cannot as yet either be deprived of his employment, but by the expreſs order of the king, or for ſome great fault, if he had committed any; nor can it be reaſonably ſaid, that he has deſerved death, unleſs it be proved by unqueſtionable arguments. Now to think to bring an accuſation againſt him to put him upon his trial, is a thing that cannot be done without a great deal of time. Beſides, ſuch a proceſs againſt him would doubtleſs be ill grounded, ſince he is ſeen commonly to go to maſs, to confeſſion, and communion, ſo that he could not be convicted of his not being a Catholic (58).’ The letter he wrote the next day to cardinal Borromeo, ſhews that Catherine de Medicis did not reliſh his propoſals of removing ſome perſons; and that ſhe was ſtill more diſpleaſed, when he named to her *particularly the chancellor, according to the expreſs order he had received from Pius IV* (59). Whence it appears that Varillas is in a great error in ſaying that the Triumviri obliged Mr de l'Hoſpital to retire, and that the queen ſacrificed him to them (60). He will have this pretended retreat to have preceded the declaration of the ſeventh of April 1562, and that it continued all the firſt war (61). This is contradicted as well by the ſilence of other hiſtorians, as by the letters of the legate dated the fifteenth of June, and the eighth of July 1562 (62).

They were not miſtaken in believing that Mr de l'Hoſpital approved in his heart the doctrine of the Proteſtants. Catherine de Medicis did not ſay any thing but the truth in all the diſcourſe that Mezerai reports. ‘She employed all her induſtry to undermine the credit that he had gotten in the mind of the young king; to whom ſhe taught her confidents to ſay, that undoubtedly he was a favourer of Heretics, that his wife, his daughter; his ſon-in-law, and all his family, being of that religion, there was no doubt but that he was of the ſame in his heart, and that it was only the fear of loſing his place, that hindered him from publickly profeſſing Calviniſm. Therefore as ſecret enemies are more dangerous than open ones, he was much more to be feared than the admiral; and that his majeſty ought not to ſuffer him to poiſon his whole council with theſe fine maxims of peace, under which, as under the ſkin of a ſerpent, variegated with colours moſt agreeable to the ſight, was concealed a moſt pernicious venom; and which by flattering cauſed certain death (63).’ She had no reaſon to ſay that Mr de l'Hoſpital was a dangerous enemy; for if he favoured the Proteſtants, it was not by any diſloyal artifices, but by maxims moſt conformable to the good of the ſtate, and the ſervice of the king. *The integrity of his morals, his experience and his wiſdom in the management of affairs were acknowledged by all the world; as alſo his inviolable affection for the good of the ſtate, the preſervation of the laws, and the eaſe of the people, and his conſtant courage in reſiſting the injuſtice of great men, were highly cried up by all good men* (64). Catherine de

---

(*f*) *See the remark* [*H*], *citat.* *.

(48) Id. ibid.

(49) *In the remark* [*D*], *citat.* (20).

(50) *Held in* 1561.

(51) Belcar. lib. xxix, n 30, pag. 964.

(52) Id. lib. xxviii, n 57, pag. 937.

(53) *See the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, pag. 539, *and the* Critical Anſwer to Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm, *Letter xvi, n. 2. of the third edition.*

(54) *See the remark* [C] *of the article* FERRIER (ARNAULD).

(55) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, Febr. 28, 1689, p. 118, 119, Dutch Edit.

(56) Hiſt. du Concile de Trente, book v, pag. 438, of Amelot's tranſlation.

(57) Id. ibid. lib. vi, pag. 487, ad ann. 1562.

* *He complied in the council with the intentions of the queen, who had privately inſtructed him; but becauſe he voted for a peace againſt the opinion of the duke of Guiſe, and the conſtable, he was ill treated by both*, and under pretence of being a man of the gown, he was excluded from the councils of war, where the queen found afterwards that ſhe wanted one of her principal miniſters. *Davilla, Hiſt. lib. ii.*

(58) Negotiations ou Lettres d' Affaires eſcrittes par le Cardinal de Ferrare Legat en France, pag. 224, 225.

(59) Ibid. pag. 240, 241.

(60) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, Tom. I, pag. m. 151.

(61) Id. ibid. pag. 353.

(62) *See the* Negociations du Cardinal de Ferrare, pag. 308.

(63) Mezer. Hiſt. de France, Tom. III, pag. 185.

(64) Mezer. ibid. pag. 296.

that it did not belong to thoſe of the long robe to give their opinions in matters of war: tho' ſuch men, anſwered he, *know not how to bear arms, yet they know when they ought to be uſed* (g). Cardinal Hippolitus d'Eſt, Legate à Latere in France, received orders to uſe all poſſible endeavours to get him diſmiſſed from court; but he anſwered the Pope, that he ſaw no probability of ſucceding in that affair (*b*). He propoſed it however to the queen-regent, at which ſhe was very angry. If Varillas had known this, he would not have been guilty of the fault which we ſhall ſee below (*i*). The peaceable counſels of this chancellor contributed more to his diſgrace than any thing elſe. I have given good proofs of it (*k*). He voluntarily retired, when he perceived that his enemies had exaſperated the king againſt him, and he ſpent the reſt of his life at his country ſeat (*l*) in Beauce. He made that retreat in June 1568. A meſſage was ſent to him ſome days after, to deliver up the ſeals. He returned them *very freely, ſaying, that indeed he was no longer fit for the affairs of the world, which he ſaw too much corrupted* (*m*). We ought to think it more ſtrange that he maintained his ground ſeven or eight years in ſo vicious a court, than to ſee him diſgraced at laſt. There had been ſomething wanting to the luſtre of his virtue and glory, if he had continued chancellor to his death; for under ſuch a reign it was a ſort of ſtain and a very bad ſign to be thought proper for that great employment. An honeſt man was not what thoſe who had then the management of affairs wanted. Let us obſerve that Mr de l' Hoſpital did however procure the enacting of ſeveral excellent laws [*I*], and that he neither flattered the ſubjects nor the prince

de Medicis ſpoke truth, when ſhe ſaid the chancellor's family were Proteſtants (65). Now this is a good argument, that he diſapproved the doctrines of the church of Rome. In the Icones of Theodore Beza, he was painted with a candle lighted behind him, to ſignify, ſays Spondanus (66), that he carried a torch to give light to others, and not to himſelf. The diſcourſe which attends that picture, teaches us, that two reaſons moved him to abſtain from the public profeſſion of the truth. He feared he ſhould be deprived of the means of ſerving the good cauſe, and he hoped the time would come when there ſhould be no more occaſion to diſſemble. He vainly expected that conjuncture, and afterwards having reſolved to declare himſelf, he could not execute his reſolution. He ſacrificed himſelf for others. Beza expreſſes this very well. *Huic . . . ad juſtum laudis cumulum id videtur defuiſſe, quod partim ne ſibi ad pios juvandos aditum præſtrueret, ſi veram religionem apertè profiteretur, partim vana quadam expectatione deluſus, eo luto ex quo erutos omnes optabat, penitus extricare ſeſe quum diu neglexiſſet, poſtea volens id præſtare non potuit. Sed ecquis illius memoriam non celebrarit, qui, ut aliis conſuleret, ſeipſum tamdiu penè neglexit* (67). His will is a proof that he was no Papiſt in his heart: there is no mention in it of the maſs, or purgatory, or prieſt, or any thing like it; and he obſerves in it that *Chriſtians have no great eſteem* for funeral ceremonies and burials (68). Spondanus pretends, that this is the language of a prophane perſon (69), and Maimbourg ſays that theſe words are unworthy of a Chriſtian (70). Genebrard had before inveighed againſt theſe words in the Funeral Oration of Peter Danes. Note that it has been ſaid, that Mr de l'Hoſpital had a hand in the enterprize of Amboiſe. Conſider well theſe words of d'Aubigné: *Chancellor Olivier dying at that time in the manner before mentioned, l'Hoſpital, a man of great eſteem, ſucceeded him, though he had been one of the conſpirators, in the buſineſs of Amboiſe. Which I maintain againſt all that has been written againſt it, becauſe the original of the enterprize was conſigned into my father's hands, in which was his name at length, betwixt that of Andelot and one Spiſame: a thing I have ſhewn to many perſons of note* (71). Mezerai confutes this by a very weak reaſon; which is (72), *that l'Hoſpital*, as he pretends, *had left France in the month of November.* But did not he know how many journies la Renaudie cauſed to be made? Was it ſo hard for him to diſpatch one of the accomplices to Mr de l'Hoſpital in Piedmont? However it be I am perſuaded that if he ſigned that conſpiracy, he was only ſhewn the beſt ſide of it, and that he did not expect it ſhould ever be executed in the manner it was projected.

Father Garaſſe, tranſported with a blind paſſion of cenſuring the Proteſtants, has accuſed them of calumny, in that *they endeavoured to perſuade all France, that chancellor de l'Hoſpital was of their perſuaſion.* He compares them to the Novatians, who publiſhed *in lying writings, that St Cyprian died in their communion*; and he ſays, that *this has been an ingenious malice of wicked men from all antiquity* (73). In this he only diſcovers his own ignorance.

I cannot forbear inſerting two obſervations in this place, which I find in an anonymous piece, which is excellent. They inform us of the cauſes of this chancellor's diſgrace. I do not think, ſays that unknown author (74), 'that a great miniſter who is employed in the great affairs of his prince, ought to be ſilent, whatever may happen thereupon. Otherwiſe he may be the cauſe of his maſter's ruin, as well by his ſilence as others are by their conſpiracies and enterprizes. It is for this reaſon that I cannot be of their opinion, who think that chancellor de l'Hoſpital needed not to have oppoſed ſo vigorouſly the reſolution which had been taken * * * againſt the prudent advice of the late conſtable, to cauſe the king to depart * * * at the beginning of the ſecond troubles. For ſince that wiſe and prudent miniſter judged, and that very well too as the event ſhewed, that ſuch a ſudden departure, if put into execution * * * *, would undoubtedly prevent a reconciliation, and bring things to extremity; it is certain that if he had concealed his opinion, and had not inſiſted upon it as he did. He would have been guilty of a baſeneſs, unworthy of a man whoſe virtue alone had raiſed him to that dignity. For tho' ever ſince he has been declining, and his enemies, that is to ſay, the enemies of his virtue, integrity and ſincerity, began from that time to conſpire together to remove him; yet that was no reaſon for him to be wanting in his duty, ſince the end of thoſe who have the honour to be employed in ſuch poſts, ought not to be to maintain themſelves in them, to the prejudice of their honour and conſcience, but to ſerve well and faithfully. Beſides, things taking the courſe which they took afterwards, a great man of good principles and courage, as this worthy chancellor was, ought to be very well ſatisfied to be diſmiſſed . . . . (75). A good miniſter and truly virtuous . . . . . will never give his advice contrary to his judgment, and when he is commanded to ſpeak and give his opinion, he will do it with fidelity and courage. This is what this chancellor did, about the queſtion concerning the bulls, which permitted the ſale of church lands, to the amount of an hundred and fifty thouſand livres of revenue, for the extirpation of Heretics. For that clauſe was contrary to the edicts of pacification, the obſerving of which the chancellor judged neceſſary for the good of the kingdom: beſides, thoſe edicts having been granted in a ſolemn manner, he was of opinion that they could not be infringed, and that this was one of the effects of the League which was then contriving; and therefore he propoſed his opinion, which was followed, *viz.* to obtain new bulls, without that clauſe, which was the laſt ſtumbling-block, and the reaſon which was urged to render this great man ſuſpected of hereſy, and to take away the ſeals from him, and put them into the hands of a man whom they thought more proper for the time, and ſoon after all parties made ready for war.'

[*I*] *He procured the enacting of ſeveral excellent laws.*] Stephen Paſquier furniſhes me with this reflexion; theſe are his words (76); 'We have ſeen in our time, a young king Charles IX, in France, who by reaſon of prince. He was very zealous to maintain and confirm the royal majeſty and authority, and he will knew how by the gravity of his cenſures to make the parliaments ſenſible of their error, in diſobeying their king [*K*]; but on the other hand, he took care that the prince

---

(g) *Paſquier's Letters, Tom. I, book iv, pag.* 226. *See alſo Baptiſt le Grain, book i, of his* Hiſtory of Henry IV, pag. m. 129, 130, *where he praiſes him as much, as he blames thoſe, who excluded him from the council of war.*

(*b*) *See citation* (58), *near the middle.*

(*i*) *Citat.* (60).

(*k*) *At the end of the remark* [*H*].

(*l*) *Called* Vignai, *and not* Vignan, *as Mezerai calls it, pag.* 186 *of the third Tome of his Great Hiſtory. He is far from being exact as to proper names.*

(*m*) *Brantome, in the Diſcourſe of the Conſtable of Mommorenci,* Tom. II, pag. 87.

(65) *See* Spondan. ad ann. 1573, n. 15, pag. m. 745.

(66) Ad ann. 1561, n. 18, pag. 609.

(67) Beza, in Iconibus, fol. V. iii.

(68) *See Colomiés's* Biblioth. choiſie, pag. 70.

(69) Spondan. ad ann. 1573, n. 15, pag. 745.

(70) Hiſt. du Calvin. pag. 105. *See what was anſwered to him in the General Criticiſm on his book, Letter xvi,* n. 3.

(71) D'Aubigné, Hiſt. Univerſ. Tom. I, book ii, chap. xviii, pag. m. 129.

(72) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. III, pag. 22.

(73) *See Garaſſe's* Doctrine curieuſe, pag. 918, 919.

(74) Fragment de Examen du Prince de Machiavel, pag. 95, *&c.* Edit. 1622, in 12mo.

(75) Ibid. page 97, *&c.*

(76) Paſquier, Letters, book xix, Tom. II, pag. 520, 521.

‘ of the weakneſs of his youth in the beginning, and afterwards by the extraordinary violence of his temper, had no leiſure to make laws; nevertheleſs none of his predeceſſors made ſo many good edicts as he: witneſs that of 1560, in the ſtates held in the town of Orleans, the other that he made at Rouſſillon in the year 1563, and the laſt at Moulins in the year 1566. Thoſe three edicts containing abundance of articles in matter of civil policy, and fine regulations, infinitely exceeding our ancient ordinances. To whom are we indebted for this advantage? To no other than to Michael de l' Hoſpital, his great and wiſe chancellor, who, under the authority of the young king his maſter, was the principal mediator of the firſt, and the inſtigator, promoter, and author, of the two others. And I which with all my heart that they had been always obſerved with the ſame zeal, as they were introduced.’ I wonder that Paſquier does not ſpeak of the excellent edicts Mr de l' Hoſpital procured under Francis II. A hiſtorian of that time (77) reckons three, which were extraordinary good and wholeſom. I am going to ſhew in what the firſt conſiſted; it was that which regulated the wills, or the donations of widows, who quickly married again. I will make uſe of the words of an author of that age (78). *It was at the ſollicitation of chancellor de l'Hoſpital, that many ordinances, edicts, and ſtatutes, were made and publiſhed by our kings of France, for the relief of the people, and the preſervation of juſtice. Among others, we have an edict of king Francis II, which gives a check to ſecond marriages, by taken away the liberty they who married again had to give more to the ſecond husband, than to one of the children of the firſt. The occaſion of this edict was this: it happened that a woman of this kingdom extreamly rich, fell in love with a young lord, who, becauſe ſhe ſeemed too old for him, had no inclination to make her his wife. She was ſo dotingly in love with him, that underſtanding how greedy he was of money, ſhe made him a donation of all her eſtate, reſerving only what might belong to her children of the firſt marriage as of their* falcidion, *or lawful portion. So that for a morſel of bread, they were almoſt entirely deprived of their mother's inheritance, which was transferred to a ſecond husband. To prevent ſuch frauds, this chancellor introduced in France the ordinance of the emperor Leo, which is mentioned in the law* hac Edictali. 6. tit. de ſecund. nupt. *in the fifth book of Juſtinian's Code, which forbids giving or leaving to the ſecond husband more than to one of the children of the firſt marriage.* It was very juſt and neceſſary to renew this law for the intereſt of the children of the firſt husband; for there are but too many woman, who deſiring to be married again, would deprive them of their rights, to make themſelves more agreeable to their new husband. They would ſupply by their liberalities, what age has taken from their charms; beſides, the liberty of diſpoſing of their eſtates would expoſe them to be courted by men, who without it would never have diſturbed the reſolution they might have taken, to ediſy their neighbours by a virtuous widowhood.

[*K*] *He knew how to make the parliaments ſenſible of their error in diſobeying their king.*] An attorney could not reprimand a clerk, who has been guilty of a great blunder more ſmartly than our chancellor did the parliament of Bourdeaux, when Charles IX, held his Bed of Juſtice there, the twelfth of April 1564, before Eaſter. *The king,* ſaid he (79), *has found many faults in this parliament, which, as it is of a later erection, being but of* 102 *years ſtanding, you have the leſs excuſe for forgetting ſo ſoon the antient ordinances, which would be excuſable in other parliaments that are old; nevertheleſs you are as much depraved, or perhaps worſe than the old ones . . . . I have received many complaints of your diſſentions . . . See here a houſe ill regulated, and it is you who are accountable for it. The firſt fault is your diſobedience to your king. For although his ordinances are preſented to you, you obſerve them as you pleaſe: If you have any remonſtrances to make, make them as ſoon as you will, and he will hear them. You rob him of his royal power, when you will not obey his royal ordinances, which is worſe than to rob him of his crown-lands. I am informed that the ordinance made at the requeſt of the States, is not yet publiſhed here. And, addreſſing himſelf to the preſidents, and the king's counſel, he ſaid, I will now ſpeak to you, that are preſidents and the king's counſel, who ought to require and ſollicite the publication of his edicts and ordinances; and you preſidents, you ought to propoſe them, for you are the king's preſidents in the court. I have alſo notice, ſaid he, that the ordinance about juſtice is not publiſhed. I remember likewiſe ſome others, which I will not mention that I may, not be too long: I think ſaid he, that you fancy your ſelves wiſer than the king but your wiſdom is limited to judge of proceſſes; do not think your ſelves wiſer than the king, the queen, and his council. He has obtained peace, and at preſent there is a war betwixt him and the court of parliament . . . .* (80) *You deſpiſe the queen and the king's council. I ſee that you ſo much value your own decrees as to ſet them above ordinances, which when you have received, you interpret as you pleaſe: It is not your buſineſs but the king's, to interpret an ordinance, even the ordinances that concern the public welfare.* I omit the ſequel of his diſcourſe, which is ſtill more thundering than what we have ſeen. Note, that this is but a commentary on what the King had ſaid in few words to this parliament; *That he would for the future be better obeyed than he had been; that he would not ſuffer any of his ſubjects to take up arms without his leave, and that he would alſo have his edicts obſerved* (81). There is no doubt but Mr de l'Hoſpital ſuggeſted this diſcourſe to him, as alſo the vigorous declaration made by the ſame prince ſome time before, to the deputies of the parliament of Paris. They had made remonſtrances to him about the edict of his majority, which they had not regiſtered. ‘ The king, whoſe voice and countenance was compoſed to a ſtudied ſeverity, anſwered them, that they muſt obey, that they ſhould meddle no more with public affairs, and that they ſhould rid themſelves of this old error, *That they were the king's tutors, the defenders of the kingdom, and the guardians of the city of Paris.* The deputies having made their report to the court, it was divided (82),’ and they ſent a new deputation to the king, *who ordered that the edict ſhould be publiſhed and regiſtered without delay, and that all the preſidents and counſellors ſhould be preſent at it, upon pain of interdiction* (83). It is is eaſy to perceive, conſidering the king's age, that he, in that caſe, only repeated the leſſon of Mr de l'Hoſpital. ‘ He once made a ſpeech to the parliament with open doors, who would not paſs ſome of his edicts . . . . and complaining of their adminiſtration of juſtice, and of their corruption, and of the refuſal of his edicts; it is your your buſineſs, ſaid he, with a brave, and as it were menacing, boldneſs, to obey my ordinances, without diſputing and conteſting about them; for I know better than you, what is proper and convenient for the advantage and intereſt of my kingdom. Having as yet no beard, he held this diſcourſe before thoſe old and wiſe heads, who all marvelled at this bold and grave ſpeech, which ſavoured more of his generous courage, than of the leſſons of Mr Amiot his preceptor (84).’ Brantome ſhould have added that *this diſcourſe* was the leſſon of Michael de l'Hoſpital. The prince, who had already diſgraced him (85), well remembered the inſtructions he had received from his chancellor, that it concerned him to humble the boldneſs of the parliament of Paris, ſo pernicious at that time to all the kingdom.

REFLEXION on what is commonly ſaid, that it is the intereſt of France, that the authority of the parliaments ſhould be increaſed.

In this place I ought to examine in a few words the diſcourſe we daily hear, which lays down as a principle of miſery, the ſuppreſſion of the right, which was heretofore in parliaments of rejecting the edicts, that appeared unjuſt to them. This was a bank, ſay they, which kept the people from being drowned under the arbitrary power of the monarch. The breaking of this bank ought to be compared to the blow by which Æolus ſhaked the mountain, which ſerved for a priſon to the winds.

- - - - Cavum

---

(77) Louïs Regnier Sieur de la Planche, Hiſt. de François II, pag. 515. *& ſeq.*

(78) Thevet, Elog. Tom. VII, pag. 375.

(79) See the Collection of ſeveral Memoirs, printed at Paris for Peter Chevalier, 1623, in 4to, pag. 424.

(80) Ibid. pag. 426.

(81) Ibid. pag. 421.

(82) Mezerai, Abr. Chron. Tom. V, pag. 80, ad ann. 1563.

(83) Id. ibid.

(84) Brantôme, Eloge de Charles IX, pag. 33, & 34, *of the fourth Tome of his Memoirs.*

(85) *Without doubt Brantome means the ſame ſpeech of Charles IX, mentioned by Mezerai in the year* 1571, *pag.* 239 *of the third volume of his Great Hiſtory.*

prince ſhould obey juſtice and reaſon. He oppoſed as much as poſſible unjuſt edicts. And if after all he was obliged to ſeal them, he ſhewed that it was againſt his will [*L*]. One

- - - Cavum converſa cuſpide montem
Impulit in latus: ac venti, velut agmine facto,
Quâ data porta, ruunt, & terras turbine perflant.
Incubuêre mari, totumque à ſedibus imis
Unà Euruſque Notuſque ruunt, creberque procellis
Africus; & vaſtos volvunt ad littora fluctus.
Inſequitur clamorque virûm, ſtridorque rudentum (86).

He ſaid, and hurl'd againſt the mountains ſide
His quiv'ring ſpear, and all the GOD *apply'd;*
The raging winds ruſh through the hollow wound
And dance aloft in air, and skim along the ground;
Then ſettling on the ſea the ſurges ſweep,
Raiſe liquid mountains and diſcloſe the deep,
South, eaſt, and weſt, with mix'd confuſion roar,
And roll the foaming billows to the ſhoar;
The cables crack, the ſailors fearful cries
Aſcend, and ſable night involves the skies,
And heaven itſelf is raviſh'd from their eyes,

DRYDEN.

They imbelliſh this with many maxims, which have a great appearance of ſolidity; but they never go farther, they never turn the tables, nor conſult experience, nor examine whether any one could anſwer, I appeal to experience. Now this is the weak ſide; for it is eaſy to prove, that France was never ſo diſtreſſed and miſerable as when the parliaments enjoyed the full authority of rejecting the edicts and ordinances of the prince, under Charles IX, and Henry III. It is eaſy to prove alſo, that the exerciſe of that authority, was the main cauſe of the miſeries of the kingdom from the year 1562 to 1594. Chancellor de l'Hopital had laid the foundations of the public peace by the edict of the month of January. The church of Rome had no longer reaſon to fear the danger I have mentioned above (87); the king of Navarre had deſerted the Huguenots; Catherine de Medicis no longer thought of pulling off the mask. They would have been contented to have had their fill of preaching; and ſo the kingdom would have remained in peace, provided the edict of January had been obſerved. But the Catholics infringed it, and from hence proceeded the firſt religious war, the root of all the evils that afflicted the ſtate, till the extinction of the League; for all thoſe evils were grafted upon, or ſprung from one another, by a well connected train of cauſes and effects (88). Now to whom muſt the infraction of this edict of January be principally aſcribed, but to the parliament of Paris? Did not they encourage every body to the non-obſervance of it? They did not regiſter it without defaming it (89), that is to ſay, not till after three commands, and with ſuch reſtrictions and clauſes, as plainly ſhewed that it was regiſtered by force, and as a very tranſient and very miſchievous ordinance. Who would have feared after this, to violate ſuch an edict, when they could not but be well aſſured, that a parliament who judged in this manner, would never trouble themſelves to puniſh thoſe that ſhould break it; Now at that time to be acceſſory to the infraction of the edict, and to ſound an alarm for civil war, was one and the ſame thing. Obſerve well the words Varillas makes uſe of in the beginning of his relation of the meaſures that were taken againſt the Proteſtants, a little before the maſſacre of Vaſſi. *The houſe of Guiſe*, ſays he (90), *judged by the oppoſition that the edict of January had met with in the parliament, that it would not long ſubſiſt, and doubted not but that civil-wars would quickly begin.* It may be ſaid in general, that the parliaments of France, by refuſing to ratify the edicts of pacification, or by ratifying them with an ill grace, and afterwards by a natural conſequence, taking no care that they ſhould be obſerved, were the chief cauſes of thoſe long calamities that waſted the ſtate, and had like to have ruined the monarchy root and branch. If Charles V had reigned at that time, France would infallibly have become a province of his dominions, or at leaſt would have been divided into a thouſand pieces.

You only alledge, will ſome ſay, the bad uſe the parliaments then made of their right to reject the edicts of the prince. But I anſwer, are tyranny and moſt other diſorders any thing elſe but an ill uſe of good things? It ſuffices to refute your reflexions, to tell you, that this bank or barrier you ſpeak of, and which, properly ſpeaking, includes this contradiction, that a ſtate is and is not monarchical, cannot be thought a good remedy, ſince it has done much more harm than good. What compariſon is there between the advantages that accrued from the rejection of ſome pecuniary edicts (91), and the deplorable miſery of the kingdom for thirty years together? Theſe calamities are much leſs to be imputed to the court, than to the parliaments. The court was grown wiſe by the inſtructions of a moſt able and a moſt virtuous chancellor. Mr de l'Hoſpital had perſuaded it to prevent, by the edict of January, all miſfortunes, and to deſtroy the root of civil-wars. The parliament, inſtead of ſeconding him, oppoſed him, and diſappointed the remedy he had found; a remedy which muſt needs be good, ſince there was no other (92). The court would have walked in the road the chancellor had marked out, and only left it, by reaſon of the confuſions into which the kingdom fell, through the fault of thoſe who diſobeyed the edict; and it was the parliaments that opened a wide path to this diſobedience. They therefore are reſponſible for ſo many churches prophaned, plundered, demoliſhed, of which ſome are pleaſed to give long liſts to render the Huguenots odious. Nor was it owing to them, that the miſeries of the ſtate were not perpetual, even after the deſtruction of the League. They oppoſed the edict of Nantes, the only remedy for theſe inteſtine confuſions: the parliament of Paris would never have ratified it, if Henry IV had not made uſe of intreaties; but in a tone, that ſhewed he knew how to make himſelf obeyed (93). Note, that the ſpeech of Mr de l'Hoſpital to the parliament of Bourdeaux (94), ſhews that at that time, when ſo little account was made of the king's ordinances, the adminiſtration of juſtice was horribly corrupted, and full of hideous diſorders. I will conclude with ſaying, that the government of the people is ſuch a perplexed affair, that the remedies which ſeem beſt, are ſometimes worſe than the diſeaſe, and the cauſe of the greateſt diſorders I have juſt now given a remarkable inſtance of it.

[*L*] *If he was obliged to ſeal unjuſt edicts, he ſhewed that it was againſt his will.*] A miniſter of ſtate, and eſpecially the chancellor of a monarch, ought to do two things, if he would well diſcharge his duty. One is earneſtly to recommend ſubmiſſion and obedience to the ſubjects; he ought not to ſpeak to them of any thing elſe: he muſt not ſtand arguing with them, whether they have ſometimes right to take up arms, or to refuſe obedience to the ordinances that they think unjuſt and burdenſome. He muſt ſuppoſe it a thing beyond diſpute, that they have not that right. The other thing which he ought to do is to repreſent ſtrongly and inceſſantly to the prince, that the royal authority does not diſpenſe him from an abſolute ſubmiſſion to juſtice, and that it has no right or privilege to depart from reaſon, equity, and promiſes, *&c.* Mr de l'Hoſpital punctually acquitted himſelf of both theſe duties. He took the part of the king before the ſubjects, and the part of the ſubjects before the king. He repreſſed with great vehemence, thoſe who made any attempt upon the royal authority. See (95) the cenſures that he made, or that the king made to the parliaments, according to his advice. See alſo (96) what he anſwered to the deputy of the parliament of Dijon. But you will now ſee with what integrity, with what conſtancy, he reſiſted the unjuſt propoſals which were ſuggeſted to the prince. He withſtood them by his arguments, as far as was poſſible; and if his remonſtrances did not hinder the concluſion of the affair, he ſhewed that he had no ways conſented to it. *Ah,* SIR, *what a foul and venomous tail is it in an edict, when the ratification of it is decreed with theſe words,* by the expreſs command of the king, often times repeated, *which only produce a condemnation from the wiſe and good, againſt the injuſtice of it, ſupported only by the commands, which the chancellors are frequently forced to ſeal againſt*

---

(86) Virgil. Æn. lib. i, ver. 85.

(87) *In the remark* [*F*].

(88) *Compare with this d'Aubigné's remark, chap. ii, of the fifth book of the third volume of his Hiſtory, pag.* m. 628.

(89) *See the remark* [*G*].

(90) Varill. Hiſt de Charles IX, Tom. I, pag m. 121, ad ann 1562.

(91) *The ninth of September*, 1578, *the parliament regiſtered only two pecuniary Edicts, out of the twenty two that were laid before them. See Father du Londel's* Faſtes, pag. 88.

(92) Optimum remedium quia unicum.

(93) *See Matthieu*, Hiſtoire de la Paix, livr. ii, Narrat. 1, n. 7, pag. m. 210, & ſeq.

(94) *I have quoted it above, citat.* (79).

(95) *In the foregoing remark.*

(96) *In the article* BEGAT.

One of the occaſions in which he diſcovered his great preſence of mind, was when the demands of the Engliſh embaſſadors were examined in the king's council concerning the reſtitution of Calais. He anſwered their firſt reaſons, and replies with ſo much force, that he had manifeſtly the victory (*n*), and gave occaſion to the king his maſter to flatter himſelf, that by retaining that place, he did not infringe the treaty of peace of Cateau. His vigilance, as great as it was, could not ſecure him from the artifices of a ſecretary, who was a wicked man [*M*]: which gave him a great deal of trouble. It has been obſerved, that his face reſembled Ariſtotle's [*N*]. Some attribute to him the

their opinion, in which are ſeen theſe odious and ſhameful words: Notwithſtanding all the remonſtrances made and to be made, which we hold as heard and underſtood, and for which we will not have it delayed. *That is to ſay, in ſpite of reaſon, by a malignant counſel, an unjuſt will, and a raſh determination, by the rebuke of virtue, the toleration of evil; and the hatred of honour, and by an affected ignorance, and the contempt of what is good. Wherefore that he might not participate of that ſhame, the good and moſt worthy chancellor de l'Hoſpital commonly wrote theſe words with his own hand upon the back of the letters,* Me non conſentiente, *that is to ſay, I have been forced to ſeal them againſt my opinion; as he did to the letters about the reception of the powers of the cardinal of Ferrara, ſent legate* * *into France by Pope Pius IV, and the court of parliament reading theſe words indorſed by the chancellor, joined with him, and would never ratify theſe powers* (97). Preſident de la Place will inform us more particularly of what concerns this laſt paſſage. 'Now for as much as among other articles decreed in the ſtates, it was ordered, that the benefices of the kingdom ſhould be conferred by the ordinaries in every dioceſe, and no longer by the Pope, and that no diſpenſations ſhould be received; there was great difficulty in admitting the power of the ſaid legate: the chancellor remonſtrating, that he could do nothing againſt what had been ſo unanimouſly reſolved and concluded by the ſaid ſtates. But notwithſtanding, the ſaid legate giving to underſtand, that he being related to the houſe of France, it would be a great reproach and diſhonour to him, to be the firſt legate refuſed in it, and offering not to uſe the ſaid power, and to return immediately after the ratification of it, the chancellor was commanded to ſeal the letters; which he did after many altercations betwixt the legate and him, writing with his own hand under the ſeal of the letters, theſe words, *Me non conſentiente*, that is, without my conſent: which being ſeen by the ſaid court, were refuſed with a declaration, that they could not, and ought not to receive them (98).' Some hiſtorians ſay *that at laſt the legate, in ſpite of the chancellor's opinion, got his powers received in the council of ſtate; in which he was allowed a place* (99). Every one knows the tranſcendent power of the Guiſes, under Francis II, yet they were not able to make the chancellor ſtoop. He was the only one that refuſed to ſign the Arrêt for putting the prince of Condé to death (100).

Languet has preſerved a ſmart repartee, which the chancellor made to the legate. The later was ſo bold as to tell him, that he did not know what was the duty of his place. I have endeavoured at leaſt, ſaid the chancellor, to learn it; but you who poſſeſs ſeveral biſhoprics, have never thought of getting yourſelf inſtructed in the epiſcopal duties. 'Solus Cancellarius pertinaciſſime reſtitit, & dixit in ea re fieri ſummam injuriam Regi Puero, ac Regni Gallici Jura, & Majeſtatem proſtitui, nec ſe paſſurum, ut Regio Sigillo ſibi Concredito, ad eam rem abuterentur. Ad quæ incandeſcens Ferrarienſis dixit eum ignorare quæ eſſent ſui muneris & Officii: Ego vero, inquit Cancellarius, hoc ſaltem egi, ut id intelligerem, ſed tu ne quidem cogitâſti unquam quod ſit Officium Epiſcopi, cum tamen aliquot Epiſcopatus poſſideas. Tandem victus aliorum importunitate tradidit eis Regium Sigillum, ſed tamen voluit inſtrumento permiſſionis inſeri, ſe contradicente hoc eſſe permiſſum (101). —— *The chancellor alone oppoſed it with the utmoſt vehemency, ſaying, that this was doing an injury of the higheſt nature to their ſovereign, as yet a child, and a proſtitution of the laws and majeſty of France, and that he would never ſuffer the ſeals which were intruſted to him to be abuſed to ſuch a purpoſe. Upon this the legate, incenſed, told him that he did not know the duty of his place and office. I have, replied the chancellor, at leaſt been at ſome pains to learn it, but you never ſo much as thought what is the duty of a biſhop though you poſſeſs ſeveral biſhoprics. At length, being overcome by the importunity of others, he gave them the ſeal, but obliged them to inſert in the Inſtrument, that the permiſſion was granted contrary to his opinion.*'

Here is a paſſage of Bodinus. 'It is very certain that the laws, ordinances, letters-patents, privileges and grants of princes, have no force but during their lives, if they are not ratifyed by the expreſs conſent, or at leaſt by the permiſſion of the prince who takes cognizance of them . . . . Which was the reaſon why Mr de l'Hoſpital, chancellor of France, refuſed to ſeal the confirmation of the privileges, and exemption from taxes for St Maur des Foſſez, whatever command he had to do it; becauſe they bore a perpetual exemption: which is againſt the nature of perſonal privileges, and diminiſhes the power of the ſucceſſors, and cannot be given to any corporations, but for the life of the prince who grants them; although the word *perpetual* be inſerted (102).'

[*M*] *His vigilance . . . . could not ſecure him from the artifices of a ſecretary, who was a wicked man.*] I will relate upon this, what I have read in a book, intituled, *La Fortune de la Cour.* —— *The Fortune of the Court.* 'Chancellor de l'Hoſpital was blamed, for that being naturally very ſevere in expediting juſtice, and ſtern to thoſe that came to ſollicit him; yet he was otherwiſe with reſpect to his domeſtics, and eſpecially to his ſecretary Bouvaut, who put upon him as often as he pleaſed; which he continued to do, till a complaint was brought to the council, on occaſion of a very indecent letter: the chancellor was aſhamed to be ſo over-reached, and was obliged to turn away, with a thouſand reproaches, a ſervant whom he had before much loved (103).' The author tells another thing, which has no reference to my text, yet I will tranſcribe it, being a remarkable paſſage. 'He was in like manner ſeverely reprimanded by the late Mr de Montpenſier, in full council, for that being almoſt inexorable to paſs the grants which the king made of ſums which were any way conſiderable, yet he had ſome days before received from the treaſurer fifty thouſand livres; and he was greatly reproached for it, though it was certain that the king himſelf, of his own deſire, had preſſed him to take them (104).'

[*N*] *It has been obſerved that his face reſembled Ariſtotle's.*] Beza affirms this in very ſtrong terms. *Ut ex antiquiſſimo numiſmate apparuit, ſummum illum omnium Philoſophorum principem Ariſtotelem ſic ore toto retulit, ut alterius ex altero imago expreſſa videri poſſet* (105). Thevet refutes it. 'And as to the likeneſs, *ſays he* (106), which Beza feigns, betwixt Ariſtotle and our chancellor; if he means in the features and lineaments of the face, there is no man that compares the true picture that I have given of Ariſtotle, above, with that of the chancellor, which he has got drawn to the life, but will diſcover at firſt ſight, that there is a great difference. But Stephen Forcadel gives us ſome circumſtances, which make for Beza. He ſays, that as Charles IX was viſiting the towns of his kingdom, a ſtatue was dug up, bearing the name of Ariſtotle, which perfectly reſembled Michael de l'Hoſpital. He adds, that he made verſes upon it, which pleaſed the chancellor. I tranſcribe his words at large, becauſe they contain the praiſes of this great man, and that my dictionary ought ſometimes at leaſt to reſemble thoſe compilations, wherein are collected the judgment of the learned upon famous perſons. Here follows then what Stephen Forcadel relates (107): 'Legis pervigil & excellens cuſtos Cancellarius: qualem re ipſa ſe præbuit, dum viveret, ideoque à fato maximè laudabilis vir Michael Hoſpitalis, cui Muſæ ſtatuam libentiſſimè ponerent, niſi Juriſprudentia, ſimulque Philoſophia

(*n*) *See Thuanus*, lib. xli, pag. 840, 841, ad ann. 1567, & Varillas, Hiſtoire de Charles IX, Tom. II, book vi, pag. m. 39, & ſeq. *See alſo* Tom. I, pag. 256.

* La Popeliniere, livr. vii.

(97) Le Grain, Decade d'Henri le Grand, livr. viii, pag. m. 898.

(98) La Place, Commentaires de l'Eſtat de la Religion & Republique, livr. vi, fol. m 214, verſo, ad ann. 1561. *See concerning that legate, the book on the origin of cardinals, pag.* 265, & ſeq. Dutch Edit. 1670.

(99) Le Grain, ubi ſupra, book i, pag. 118.

(100) Id. ibid. pag. 109.

(101) Languet. Epiſt. lxii, lib. ii, pag. 157.

(102) Bodin, de la Republique, lib i, cap. viii, pag m. 131, 132.

(103) La Fortune de la Cour. pag. 349. *That book was printed at Paris, in* 1642, *in* 8*vo. See Sorel's* Bibliotheque Françoiſe, pag. 414. Edit. 1667.

(104) Id. ibid. pag. 350.

(105) Beza, in Iconib ubi ſupra,

(106) Thevet, ubi ſupra, pag. 367.

(107) Stephanus Forcatulus de Gallor. Imperio & Philoſophia, lib. vii, pag. m. 1086, 1087.

the compariſon of the apes; and probably they do in that what is common enough, not only among babblers in converſation, but alſo among writers; I mean, they aſcribe to one what belongs to another [O]. He made a noble will, which was printed, in which he ſhewed, among other things, the inclination he had to peace [P], and his indifference for funeral ceremonies (o). He died the thirteenth of March 1573, being about ſixty eight years of age [Q]. He made his only daughter his heireſs, whom he had married

‘phia hoc decus præripuiſſet. Idque non ambiguè ſignificatum eſt ſuperioribus annis, Carolo IX Rege ſuam Galliam opidatim luſtrante, cùm fortè eruta fuit, & è ſinu terræ altiùs effoſſæ ſtatua inciſo Ariſtotelis titulo, quæ apprimè M. Hoſpitalem lineamentis ac figuram referebat, ut nec ſibi ipſi magis ſit ille ſimilis, ſicut nec animi dotibus ab inſigni Philoſopho multum differt. Unde bene ominari cœpi de componendo turbulentæ Reipublicæ ſtatu, quia Gallorum Cancellarius Regi maximo intimus Magni illius Alexandri doctorem effigie exæquaſſet . . . Nos itaque Hoſpitali humaniſſimoque viro, honoris gratia, tunc verſiculos dedicavimus comiter ſupra expectationem accipiendos:

Quiſquis Ariſtoteli doctum te contulit, idem
Blanditus docto fertur Ariſtoteli.

Thuanus confirms what Beza ſays (108). Note, that Brantome ſpeaks of another reſemblance: *Chancellor de l'Hoſpital*, ſays he, (109) *had all over Cato's mien, a great white beard, a pale face, a grave countenance; ſo that one would have ſaid upon the ſight of him, that he was the true picture of St Jerome, and ſo ſeveral people ſaid at court.*

[O] *Some attribute to him the compariſon of the apes, and probably they . . . give to one what belongs to another.*] They transfer to our chancellor a thought of his predeceſſor. Read theſe words of Montagne (110): ‘I have found the ſhorteſt and eaſieſt way . . . to rid myſelf of this deſire, and to ſit ſtill . . . judging impartially of my ſtrength, that it was not capable of great things. And remembring that ſaying of the late chancellor Olivier, that the French were like apes, who go leaping up a tree from branch to branch, and never leave off, till they are come to the topmoſt bough, to ſhew their breech when they are there (§α).’ Mr Menage (111) cites theſe words of Montagne, after having quoted ſome Greek verſes (112), in which Scaliger made uſe of the ſame thought againſt Lydiat, and the Latin verſes which Salmaſius made againſt Petavius, which turn upon the ſame compariſon. Coſtar intimates that chancellor Olivier ſaid this in a ſpeech, but I can hardly believe it. ‘Chancellor Olivier, *ſays he* (113), made no ſcruple publickly to compare the French to apes, who leap from branch to branch, and ſhew their breech when they are at the top of the tree.’ I will ſhew, that an advocate in the parliament of Paris, aſcribes that compariſon to chancellor de l'Hoſpital. This advocate is little known, but by the name of Gutherius (114), which may be tranſlated five or ſix different ways, without departing from the analogy, by which the French have latinized their names. This by the way. The paſſage is as follows. *Sæpe ego audivi à fori noſtri principibus viris, Michaelem Hoſpitalium Franciæ Cancellarium, cui nulla ætas habuit parem, ſolitum dicere, multos, qui ad honores à fortuna pelluntur, ſimiarum eſſe ſimillimos, quæ altiorem arborem nactæ, eouſque conſcendunt, ut cum ad ſummum arboris faſtigium evaſerint, foliis vento ſtridentibus opertæ totæ poſteriora tantùm prætereuntibus ridiculè oſtentant* (115). There are a thouſand inſtances which prove, that the ſame thought is commonly aſcribed to different perſons. I will only cite one which has ſome affinity with the reign, under which Mr de l'Hoſpital was chancellor. ‘Mr Villeroy was told one day, that he was the fitteſt man to write the hiſtory of Charles IX, as having had a hand in every thing, and for that reaſon that he ought to write it. I am too much obliged, anſwered he, to that prince, and I love his memory too well to write his hiſtory (§β); meaning that the truths he ſhould be obliged to relate, would diſgrace that king (116).’ This is what is ſaid by the author of the book, intituled, *La Fatalité de St Clou*; but Mr le Laboureur (117) relates this as Morvillier's anſwer. And I had rather follow this laſt tradition.

[(§α) The edition of Montagne's Eſſays in 16mo, printed at Lyons by Francis le Febvre 1595, has ſuppreſſed this as injurious to the French nation. It is however no more ſo than that of Livy, l. 10. *Gallorum prima prœlia plus quam virorum*, &c. a ſaying which Rabelais has ventured to put in the mouth of one of the generals of Garagantua's army, in a ſpeech which he makes in full council, and before his maſter. REM. CRIT.]

[(§β) This repartee which in Matthieu, Hiſtory of Lewis XI, pag. 571. edit. of 1610. is related of a certain lord to one Mr de Tinteville, who had ſaid to him, that none could write his late maſter's life better than he, was probably originally ſpoke by chancellor Morvillier, whom Lewis XI had affronted, by diſowning ſome ſevere words, which he had charged him to deliver in his name to the count of Charolois. REM. CRIT.]

[P] *He ſhewed in his will . . . the inclination which he had for peace.*] In that laſt act of his life, he was deſirous to claim honour on account of a thing of which Cicero boaſted in a full ſenate. ‘Quo quidem in bello, *ſaid that great Roman orator*, ſemper de pace agendum, audiendumque putavi; ſemperque dolui, non modo pacem, ſed orationem etiam civium pacem, efflagitantium repudiari; neque enim ego illa, nec ulla umquam ſecutus ſum arma civilia: ſemperque mea conſilia pacis, & togæ ſocia, non belli, atque armorum fuerunt . . . . Quod quidem meum conſilium minime obſcurum fuit, nam & in hoc ordine, integra re, multa de pace dixi: & in ipſo bello eadem etiam cum capitis mei periculo ſenſi (118). —— *During that war I always was for treating of peace, and giving ear to peaceful counſels; I always grieved, that not only peace but even the ardent prayers of our citizens for it were rejected; neither did I ever join in theſe or in any other civil wars: and my counſels always were on the ſide of peace and juſtice, and not on that of war and arms. That ſuch were always my ſentiments can be unknown to none, for when matters were ſtill entire, I frequently ſpoke for peace in this auguſt aſſembly: and even during the war, I declared my ſelf on the ſame ſide with the hazard of my life.*’ There is hardly any thing in this, but what Mr de l'Hoſpital might have ſaid; but here is what he wrote in his will (119). ‘I can ſay for myſelf, that though arms have been taken up four times, and battels have been given as often, I have always adviſed to a peace, not reckoning any thing ſo prejudicial to a country, as a civil war, nor any thing more advantageous than a peace, upon what condition ſoever (120).’ Afterwards ſpeaking of the enemies which that maxim drew upon him, and of the miſeries which France was plunged into, &c. he adds (121): ‘I gave place to arms, which were the ſtrongeſt, and retired into the country with my wife and family, and little children, begging but one thing of the king and queen at my departure: that ſince they had determined to break the peace, and to proſecute thoſe with war, with whom they had concluded a peace but a little before, and ſince they removed me from the court, becauſe they underſtood I was always contrary, and had an ill opinion of their deſign: I requeſted them, I ſay, that ſince they did not acquieſce in my counſels, yet at leaſt, when they had ſatiated and glutted their heart and their thirſt with the blood of their ſubjects, they would embrace the firſt occaſion of peace that ſhould offer itſelf, before things were reduced to extream ruin; for whatever might be the iſſue of that war, it muſt neceſſarily be very pernicious to the king and the kingdom.’

[Q] *He died about ſixty eight years of age.*] He begins his will thus (122): ‘I have always been in doubt concerning my age, becauſe my friends ſaid they have heard my father * ſpeak variouſly about it, who ſometimes ſaid that I was born before the war began againſt the Genoeſe, and at other times maintained married to Robert Hurault, and he left his library to Michael Hurault, the ſecond of his grand-ſons, who has been well known by the name of Mr du Fay [*R*]. I might have added a great many more things; but I have omitted them, becauſe they may be found in Moreri, or in the Additions of Mr Teiſſier to the Elogies of Thuanus, or in Thevet's Elogies, or Brantome's Memoirs. The later, who was a man of the ſword, has ſucceeded better in the praiſes of this chancellor (*p*), than all the profeſſed writers that I have read; tho' I confeſs, that Thuanus and Scævola Sammarthanus, have wrote very handſomly in his praiſe. Ronſard's ode, (*q*) deſigned as an elogy upon this chief officer of juſtice, has been looked upon as an excellent one; but in certain reſpects I find nothing that comes up to Brantome's deſcription. It ſhews Mr de l'Hoſpital to have been a man that might be oppoſed to the moſt eminent and generous men of the gown in ancient Greece and Rome. I ſhall cite in my remarks ſo many other paſſages, that not to be too tedious, I wave what Brantome has written. I only intreat my readers to conſider two things: the firſt is, what he obſerves upon the diſpute which the chancellor maintained with the utmoſt reſolution, againſt the cardinal of Lorrain, who demanded that the council of Trent ſhould be received (*r*): the other concerns the undauntedneſs that Mr de l'Hoſpital expreſſed after the Paris maſſacre, when he had reaſon to fear, that the murtherers had received orders to do execution in his houſe (*s*). I will add this one thing more. A famous author (*t*) having defined the force of the ſoul to be ‘ a certain temper and diſpoſition of mind, always equal in itſelf, conſtant, ‘ ſtable, heroic, able to ſee, to hear, and do all things without diſturbance, confuſion, ‘ or aſtoniſhement, adds, that *this is much the ſame with Juvenal's deſcription of it in* ‘ *ſix fine verſes of his tenth Satire* (*u*). Chancellor de l'Hoſpital (he goes on) (*x*), who ‘ was poſſeſſed of this ſtrength of mind, as much as any that went before, or came after ‘ him, deſcribed it ſtill in fewer, though in much bolder words, which he even choſe ‘ for his device; *Si fractus illabatur orbis, Impavidum ferient ruinæ* (*y*).’ See the margin (*z*). Shall I forget the ſervices which he did even after his death? Is it not juſt to obſerve, that the ſtate-maxims by which he regulated his conduct, were of very great uſe to France, becauſe he left ſome diſciples, imbued with his wiſe principles, who in due time oppoſed the Leaguers, and rendered their pernicious enterprizes abortive [*S*]? I ſhall add ſomething to the remark which relates to Mr du Fay, his grand-ſon (*aa*) [*T*].

(o) *See, above, the remark* [H], *citat.* (68).

(108) Qui non vultu tantum Ariſtotelis os, quod ex utriuſque imaginum ubique proſtantium comparatione conſtat, ſed Solonis . . . pectus . . . . referebat. *Thuan. lib. lvi, pag.* 43.

(109) Brant. Memoir. Tom. II, pag. m. 78, *in the Elogy upon conſtable Montmorency.*

(110) Montagne, Eſſays, book ii, chap. xvii, pag. m. 576, 577.

(111) Menage, Modi di dire Italiani, pag. 29, *at the end of his Etymologies of the Italian tongue.*

(112) *You will find them tranſlated into Latin,* apud Voſſium de Scient. Mathem. pag. 237.

(113) Coſtar, Suite de la Defenſe de Voiture, pag. 189.

(114) His French name was Goutiere, as I find it in Guichenon's Hiſtory of Breſſe, pag. 36.

(115) Jacobus Gutherius, de jure Manium, lib. ii, cap. xxvi, pag. 351, Edit. Lipſ. 1671.

(116) Fatalité de Saint Clou. *I have mentioned that book in the article of* HENRY III, *citat.* (89), *and at the end of remark* [R].

(117) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Mémoires de Caſtelnau, Tom. I, pag. 522.

(118) Cicer. pro Marcello, cap. v.

(119) Teſtament de Michel de l'Hoſpital, apud Colomiés, Bibl. choiſie, pag 60.

(120) See Paſquier's Letters, Tom. I, book x, pag 62, *& ſeq.* where he repreſents the miſeries of civil wars.

(121) Teſtam. *&c.* ibid. pag. 62.

(122) Ibid. pag. 52.

* John de l'Hoſpital.

‘ tained, that my birth was dated from the end which ‘ king Lewis XII put to that war, in which my father ‘ was employed as a Phyſician to Charles duke of ‘ Bourbon.’ It would be no wonder, that a groſs and ignorant clown ſhould not know the age of his ſon, and yet this happens but rarely; but it is very ſtrange, that a man of parts and learning, as was the father of Michael de l'Hoſpital, ſhould ſo vary about it, and that not by a day or a week, but by many months. His ſon declares (123), that he was eighteen years old when the conſtable of Bourbon left France (124); he believed therefore he was born in the year 1505. Note, that the war of Lewis XII againſt the Genoeſe, was terminated in April 1507. Brantome, who has inſerted in his Memoirs (125) the chancellor's will, does not forget the preface (126) which witneſſes, that the teſtator was ſixty eight years of age. The date of the will is *the third* (127) *day of March* 1573. This is ſtill to place his birth in the year 1505. If Thuanus (128), and Sammarthanus (129) had conſidered theſe things, they would not have ſaid that Michael de l'Hoſpital lived about ſeventy years.

[*R*] *The ſecond of his grand children . . . . has been very well known by the name of Mr du Fay.*] We find in his Elogy, compoſed by Sammarthanus, that he had a great deal of wit and learning, and that he was chancellor to the king of Navarre, and might have arrived to the dignity of chancellor of France, if inſtead of ingaging in a ſoldier's life, he had perſevered in the functions and exerciſes of the gown. We find there alſo, that he died of grief in 1592, for having been forced to quit the government of Quillebeuf (130); but we do not find there, that he was actually a Proteſtant. Some have accuſed him of being ready to turn Papiſt. See the *Confeſſion Catholique de Sanci* (131), and the notes upon it in the edition of 1699. He wrote a treatiſe in 1588, intituled *Le franc & libre Diſcours* (132), which paſſed for a very good piece. See the Perroniana, at the word *Fay*, and Thuanus's 92d book.

[*S*] *He left ſome diſciples who oppoſed the enterprizes of the Leaguers . . . . and made them abortive.*] An anonymous author, whom I have already quoted, furniſhes me with a commentary that I have occaſion for. He ſays (133), that *if* the *devotion* of a miniſter or counſellor to a prince *is not well grounded, and his zeal well regulated, it is impoſſible to imagine the miſchief he may do. Firſt of all, he ſuffers himſelf to be deceived, and then he himſelf deceives his maſter, for in point of devotion, the wiſeſt of men are often impoſed upon. Many think that they are very pious and devout, if they are groſsly ignorant of what concerns religion, and refer themſelves to thoſe whoſe buſineſs it is to teach it; ſome of whom being practiſed upon, lead them a fine dance. We have ſpoken of the great misfortunes into which ſeveral great princes, who were otherwiſe prudent men, have fallen for want of underſtanding this cabal. We will ſpeak a word of ſome of their miniſters . . . . There were two ſorts of them; for thoſe who had been bred up under the dicipline of chancellor l'Hoſpital, obſerved maxims, which were not only conſonant to piety and Chriſtian moderation, but uſeful for the preſervation of the peace, and maintenance of the king's authority. The others, on the contrary, whether it was out of conſcience, without much knowledge, or to make a ſeparate party, adhered ſo much to the externals of religion, that they thought it better to let the kingdom fall into a combuſtion, than to ſuffer the leaſt accommodation in matters of religion. Now what followed from this diverſity of opinions, was, that the later proved very inſtrumental in forming, raiſing, and fortifying the League, the other in deſtroying it and preſerving the kingdom, which the contrary party had brought to the brink of deſtruction.*

[*T*] *I ſhall add ſomething to the remark concerning Mr du Fay, his grand-ſon.*] He compoſed ſeveral books concerning the affairs of thoſe times. They aſcribe to him the *Anti-Sixte, Anti-Eſpagnol, and the Francophile contre les Conſpirations du Roi d'Eſpagne, du Pape, & des Rebelles de France* (134). Mr Baillet, from whom I have this, doth not give us any character of the firſt of theſe three pieces, and I do not know whether he means a book of which I have ſeen an edition *printed at Cologn by Herman Jolin* (135) in 1586 in 8vo. It is intituled, Moyens d'abus, entrepriſes & nullitez du reſcrit & bulle du Pape Sixte V du nom en date du mois de Septembre 1585, contre le Sereniſſime Prince, HENRY DE BOURBON, Roy de Navarre . . . . . & HENRY DE BOURBON . . . . . Prince de Condé, par un Catholique, Apoſtolique, Romain: mais bon François, & très-fidele Subjet de la Couronne de France. ——— *A proof of the abuſes, incroachments, and nullities, of the reſcript and bull of Pope Sixtus V, dated September* 1585, *againſt*

(*p*) *It is inſerted in the elogy of the conſtable of Mommorency.*

(*q*) *It is the tenth of the firſt book. Richelet, who commented upon it, ſays it is a maſter-piece of poetry. See alſo Paſquier, in the twenty ſecond book of his Letters*, pag. 758.

(*r*) Brant. Memoir. Tom. II, pag. m. 85. *See in Varillas*, Hiſt. de Charles IX, book vi, pag. m. 5, & ſeq. *the particulars of that diſpute at large.*

(*s*) Brantôme, ibid. pag. 87, 88.

(*t*) Naudé, Coups d'Etat, chap v, pag. m. 784.

(*u*) Fortem poſce animum mortis terrore vacantem, &c.

(*x*) Naudé, ibid. pag. 785, 786.

(*y*) *They are Horace's words*, Od. iii, lib. iii, *and ſignify*, If the world ſhould be overturned, the ruins of it would ſtrike me fearleſs, and undaunted.

(*z*) *The vigour which the court of France ſhewed in* 1563, *againſt the Pope, who had cited the queen of Navarre, &c. and who was obliged to revoke his Monitory, was owing to Mr de l'Hoſpital, and the conſtable of Mommorency. See* Thuanus, lib. lxxxii, pag. m. 32, 33.

(*aa*) *In remark* [*R*].

(123) Ubi ſupra, pag. 53.

(124) He left it in 1523.

(125) In the ſecond Tome, in the Elogy of the conſtable Montmorency.

(126) It is not in Colomiés's edition.

(127) The 12th in edit. Colomiés.

(128) Thuan. Hiſtor. lib. lvi, in fin. pag. 43.

(129) Sammarth. in Elog. lib. i, pag. m. 60.

(130) *See* Sammarthanus, Elog. lib. ii, pag. m. 177, & ſeq.

(131) In the fifth chapter of the firſt book, and in the ninth chapter of the ſecond.

(132) It was inſerted in the third Tome of the Memoirs of the League, pag. 1, *& ſeq.* with this title, *Excellent & libre Diſcours ſur l'eſtat preſent de la France.*

(133) Fragment de l'Examen du Prince de Michiavel, pag. 83, *& ſeq.*

(134) *See Baillet, in the* Recueil des Anti, art. xxxiv.

(135) *I believe this is ſuppoſititious.*

againſt the moſt ſerene prince, Henry of Bourbon king of Navarre, and Henry of Bourbon . . . . . . *prince of Condé . . . . . by a Catholic, Apoſtolic, and Roman : but a true Frenchman and faithful ſubject of the crown of France.* With regard to the ſecond of theſe three pieces, Mr Baillet ſays as follows. The Anti-Eſpagnol ' has been printed at different times with ſome alterations. That which appeared 1594 in 12mo, is intituled L'Anti-Eſpagnol & Exhortation de ceux de Paris qui ne ſe veulent faire Eſpagnols, à tous les François de leur parti, de ſe remettre en l'obéïſſance du Roi Henry quatriéme, & de ſe delivrer de la Tyrannie de Caſtille. —— *The Anti-Eſpagnol, and Exhortation of ſuch Pariſians as are not willing to become Spaniards, to all the Frenchmen of their party, to return to their obedience to king Henry IV, and to deliver themſelves from the tyranny of Caſtile.* It is the fourth and laſt of theſe excellent diſcourſes on the ſtate of France, publiſhed in 1695. But that which was afterwards reviſed was publiſhed under the title of L'Anti-Eſpagnol, ou brief diſcours, du but où tend Phillippe Roi d'Eſpagne ſe meſlant des affaires de France. —— *The Anti-Eſpagnol, or a brief diſcourſe concerning the ends of Philip king of Spain, in meddling in the affairs of France.* It is inſerted in the fourth volume of the Memoirs of the League publiſhed in 1604 by Samuel du Lis (136).' There is an edition which preceded both theſe, printed in 1590 in 8vo, and intituled only, Coppie de l'Anti-Eſpagnol faict à Paris. —— *A copy of the Anti-Eſpagnol written at Paris.* My edition of the fourth volume of the Memoirs of the League is printed in the year 1595 : the Anti-Eſpagnol is inſerted there at page 230. If Mr Baillet has ſeen an edition in 1604, it is not the firſt. What I am going to cite may ſerve for a ſupplement to a remark in the article of GREGORY VII (137). It is that wherein I ſay, that it is not a ſure way to judge of princes by the pieces which are publiſhed againſt them during the heat of factions. *It is ordinary for all factions to produce* Libels. *He who wrote the Anti-Sixte would not have ſtopped there, had he not been expreſsly ordered ſo to do by the king, long before he had the happineſs to be reconciled to the Church. His majeſty who never loved theſe turbulent and furious ſpirits, commanded that ſatirical piece to be ſuppreſſed. But it was not poſſible to do it ; and if it is preſerved to another age, it will ſerve as a ſword and buckler to the enemies of the church, who will riſe out of the aſhes of theſe people, to attack the head thereof, as is their cuſtom* (138).

(136) Baillet, Recueil des Anti, Art. cxii.

(137) It is remark [*O*].

(138) Flor. de Remond, l'Anti-Papeſſe, cap. xvi, n. 3, folio. 406.

HOSPITAL (FRANCIS DE L') created mareſchal of France, the twenty third of April, 1643 (*a*), was called before that time Mr du Hallier. Moreri, copying Father Anſelme, gives an ample account of his genealogy, and mentions his exploits and dignities ; but he does not take notice of a thing which I have read in a State of France [*A*]. I ſhall relate it here. I will alſo give a ſupplement to an obſervation I have made above, concerning the firſt wife of mareſchal de l'Hoſpital [*B*].

I ſaid

(*a*) Anſelme, Hiſt. des Grans Offic. pag. 266.

[*A*] *Mr Moreri doth not take notice of a thing which I have read in a State of France.*] Which is that marſhal de l'Hoſpital, ' was originally of Calabria, of a very illuſtrious family, having had many alliances with the kings and queens of Naples. But the love his predeceſſors had for Charles of Anjou, ſecond king of Naples, ingaging them in his intereſt againſt the kings of Arragon and Caſtile, they were forced to ſeek a ſanctuary in France, when theſe Spaniſh princes reſumed the ſceptre of that kingdom (1).' Since Father Anſelm has not mentioned this, he muſt either have not known it, or have judged it uncertain. He begins the genealogy of that family, with one Francis de l'Hoſpital, who lived in 1314, and 1338 (2) ; and in another book (3) he goes no higher than Francis de l'Hoſpital, chamberlain, &c. to Charles VI in 1404, and fifth grandfather to him, who is the ſubject of this article. Note that the author of the notes upon Gabriel Naudé's *Coups d'Eſtat*, is very much out in pretending (4), that our marſhal de l'Hoſpital was deſcended from the chancellor of the ſame name.

[*B*] *I will give a ſupplement concerning the firſt wife of mareſchal de l'Hoſpital.*] We have ſeen elſewhere (5), that he made no ſcruple to marry Charlotte des Eſſars, mother of ſeveral illegitimate children, ſome of king Henry IV, and others of cardinal de Guiſe. I forgot when I made that remark, what I had read in the notes upon the Amours of Henry the Great. But ſince I now remember it, I muſt give my readers a new circumſtance of the victory Mr du Hallier obtained over matrimonal ſcruples. You will ſee, that Charlotte des Eſſars was a baſtard herſelf, and that after the death of cardinal de Guiſe, ſhe was miſtreſs to another prelate. Henry IV ' loved alſo Charlotte des Eſſars, natural daughter of the baron de Sautour in Champagne, and of the lady Dheny, by whom he had two daughters. She had attended the counteſs de Beaumount Harlay in her embaſſy to England; then ſhe was miſtreſs to cardinal de Guiſe, who had ſeveral children by her, the count de Romorantin, the abbot de Chailly, the Chevalier, Madam de Rhodes, &c. Afterwards ſhe was miſtreſs to Mr de Vic, archbiſhop of Auſch, three years ; then ſhe married Francis de l'Hoſpital, count de Roſnay, baron de Bein, mareſchal of France (6).' Father Anſelm tells us, that ſhe was married to him about the year 1629, and that her huſband *married again the twenty eight of Auguſt*, 1633, *to Frances Mignot, by whom he had a ſon, who died a few days after he was born* (7). Moreri obſerves, that the adventures this Frances Mignot are very ſingular. This has been left out in the Paris edition of 1699. Mareſchal de l'Hoſpital's ſtars were not fortunate in that reſpect.

Father Anſelm (8) obſerves that Charlotte des Eſſars died in the year 1651. We ſhould conclude from this that our Francis de l'Hoſpital got his marriage diſſolved ; for he married another wife in 1633 (9). I do not know how this came about, neither do I know whether we have any account of it in any book. I believe many of my readers will imagine that he diſcovered the falſe ſtep which he had made after he had committed it, and that hoping to repair it, he commenced a ſuit againſt his wife. Poſſibly he did not find her ſo rich as he imagined. It is probable that he fancied that a lady who had been miſtreſs ſucceſſively to a king of France, and two archbiſhops, muſt needs be immenſely rich, and that if a perſon of quality is allowed to marry a maid of mean birth, who brings him the treaſures of a Financier, he ought not to be condemned for putting his affairs in a very good condition, by marrying a lady who had gained a great fortune by her galantries. If he reaſoned in this manner, and found afterwards, that the fortune of the lady was not ſufficient to repair either her want of youth or reputation, what he had to do but annul the contract ? however the lady obtained the great thing deſired by perſons of her ſex, ſhe got a huſband, ſhe entered the harbour notwithſtanding ſo many ſtorms and ſhipwrecks. It is very likely ſhe owed this to the opinion of her being rich. Let us conclude with ſome verſes of Regnier.

Je ne ſuis point adroit, je n'ay point d'éloquence
Pour colorer un faict, ou deſtourner la foy,
Prouver qu'un grand amour n'eſt ſujet à la loy,

. . . .

Desbaucher une fille, & par vives raiſons
Luy monſtrer comme Amour fait les bonnes maiſons,
Les maintient, les eſleve, & propice aux plus belles
En honneur les advance, & les fait Damoiſelles.

. . . .

Et pour le faire court
Dire qu'il n'eſt rien tel qu'aymer les gens de court
Allegant maint exemple en ce ſiecle ou nous ſommes
Qu'il ne'ſt rien ſi facile à prendre que les hommes,
Et qu'on ne s'enquiert plus s'elle a fait le pourquoy,
Pourveu qu'elle ſoit riche, & qu'elle ait bien dequoy.
Quand elle auroit ſuivy le camp à la Rochelle,
S'elle a force ducats elle eſt toute pucelle.

(1) Etat de la France, *printed in* 1657, *pag.* 92, 93.

(2) Anſelme, Palais de l'Honneur, pag. 414.

(3) Idem, Hiſt. des Grans Offic. pag. 232.

(4) Page 905.

(5) Above, remark [*B*] of the article GUISE (LEWIS de, &c.)

(6) Obſervations ſur l'Hiſtoire des Amours du grand Alcandre, pag. 299.

(7) Anſelme, Hiſt. des Grans Offic. pag. 266.

(8) Hiſt. Geneal. de la Maiſon Roiale, pag. 156.

(9) See the marginal note at the end of this remark.

I ſaid in the ſecond edition of this Dictionary, that Father Anſelm has not obſerved that the family of this mareſchal was originally from the kingdom Naples, as another writer, whoſe words I quoted, had obſerved. I ſhall confirm this, below, by the teſtimony of one author more, and ſhall ſhow that the marquis de L'HOSPITAL, one of the moſt profound mathematicians of the XVIIth century, was of the ſame family with this mareſchal of France [*C*].

L'honneur eſtropié, languiſſant, & perclus,
N'eſt plus rien qu'un idole en qui l'on ne croit
plus (10).

I am not artful, have not eloquence,
To colour o'er a fact, virtue ſupplant,
And prove that mighty love is ſubject to no law.
. . . .
A girl debauch, and by ſtrong reaſons ſhew,
That love makes families illuſtrious,
Raiſes their fame, and, to the fair propitious,
Advances them to th' rank of gentlewomen.
. . . .
And to cut it ſhort,
Say, 'tis an honour to intrigue with courtiers,
Alledging many examples of this age;
That nothing's eaſier to be had than men;
And that a woman's whole concern ſhou'd be
T' enrich her coffers with the ſpoils of love:
What tho' the camp ſhe follow to Rochelle,
If ſhe has ſtore of gold, ſhe's ſtill a maid.

There are both truth and hyperboles in the expreſſions of this ſatiriſt. See the margin (11).

[C] *I ſhall confirm this . . . . . by the teſtimony of another author, and will ſhow that the marquis de l'HOSPITAL, one of the profoundeſt Mathematicians . . . . . . was of the ſame family with this mareſchal of France.*] The count of Saint-Meſme, who died December 4, 1701, 'was of the family of l'Hoſpital, much more illuſtrious on it's own account (ſince it's orgin is loſt in royal and conſular families) than famous for the eminent poſts and high dignities which in has enjoyed for more than than four hundred years in France, that it has been ſettled there. It is originally, of Naples, and bore the name of Gallucy, which it quitted for a French one, which was that of the eſtate of l'Hoſpital which one Gallucy, the head of that family in France, bought upon his arrival there (12).' You will obſerve that the count of Saint-Meſme is deſcended (13) from ALOLF DE L'HOSPITAL, Sieur de Choiſy, captain of the foreſt of Orleans, elder brother of CHARLES DE L'HOSPITAL, Sieur de Vitry, from whom the mareſchal of France is deſcended. Theſe two brothers were ſons of HADRIAN DE L'HOSPITAL and Ann Rouhault daughter of Joachim Rouhault mareſchal of France. He ſwore fealty to the king at Paris November 27, 1498. The count de Saint-Meſme was *lieutenant-general of the king's armies, governour, bailif, and particular judge in Eyre of the foreſts of the county of Dourdan, firſt maſter of the horſe to* Gaſton of France duke of Orleans; *gentleman of Honour, and firſt maſter of the Horſe* to the ducheſs Dowager of Orleans (14), and afterwards to *the great ducheſs of Tuſcany* (15). You will find an elogy of him in the book which I quote (16). He was married to Elizabeth Gobelin, daughter to Mr Gobelin counſellor of ſtate, and intendent of the armies, and left behind him two ſons. The eldeſt is the marquis DE L'HOSPITAL, author of the *Analyſe des infiniment petits, or* Analyſis of infinitely ſmall quantities. The younger is the count DE L'HOSPITAL, who enjoys the ſame poſt with the grand ducheſs of Tuſcany which his father held (17).

The marquis de l'Hoſpital, author of the *Analyſe des infiniment petits*, and one of the greateſt Mathematicians of our age, died at Paris February 2, 1704, aged forty three years. See his elogy in the Memoirs of Trevoux (18), and in the News from the Republic of Letters (19). 'He had married Madmoiſelle Romilley de la Chenelaie, with whom he lived in ſo ſtrict an uniion, that he even communicated his genius for the Mathematics to her. He has left four children by her, one ſon and three daughters (20).'

(10) Regnier. Sat. III, folio m. 12. *He ſays*, in Sat. XIII, folio 66, verſo, Que lors qu'on a du bien, il n'eſt ſi decrepite, Qui ne trouve (en donnant) couvercle à ſa marmite.

(11) See the remark of the article ESSARS (CHARLOTTE des), and you will find the mareſchal's ſecond marriage was poſterior to the death of his firſt wife, &c.

(12) Mercure Galant, of Jan. 1702, pag. 170, 171. *See alſo the* News from the Republic of Letters, June 1704, pag. 621, &c.

(13) Anſelme, Hiſt. des Grans Officiers, pag. 232.

(14) Wife to Gaſton of France.

(15) Mercure Galant. Januar. 1702, pag. 169.

(16) Id. ibid. pag. 172, &c.

(17) *From the* Mercure Galant. ibid. pag. 179, 180.

(18) In the addition to the month of February, 1704, pag. 24, &c, of the edit. of France. See alſo June 1704, pag. 1014, &c.

(19) June 1704, art. ii.

(20) Journ. Trevoux, June 1704, pag. 1016.

HOTMAN

HOTMAN (FRANCIS), in Latin *Hotomanus* (*a*), was one of the moſt learned civilians of the XVIth century. He was born the twenty third of Auguſt, 1524, at Paris, where this family, originally of Sileſia [*A*], had flouriſhed for ſome time. At fifteen years of age he was ſent to Orleans, there to ſtudy the civil-law, and he became capable of a doctor's degree in three years. His father, a counſellor in the parliament who had already deſigned his employment for him, cauſed him to return home, and entered him at the bar; but the young gentleman was quickly diſguſted with the wranglings of the court, and engaged deeply in the ſtudy of the Roman law, and polite learning. He reliſhed the new opinions, for which ſo many were put to death in the kingdom; and finding that he could not make profeſſion of them at Paris, he went to Lyons in the year 1547, where he publiſhed a book. This was the ſecond work that he put to the preſs [*B*]. Seeing that he had nothing to hope for as a ſubſiſtence from his father,

(*a*) So he writes his name at the beginning of his books. Many write it *Hottomannus*, or *Hotomannus*.

[*A*] *His family was originally of Sileſia.*] There are ſeveral families of the name of Hotman in Breſlaw, the capital city of Sileſia, from which are deſcended ſeveral others, ſettled in Luſatia, in Miſnia, in the country of Cleves, &c. LAMBERT HOTMAN (1), went into France to bear arms in the ſervice of Lewis XI (2), and married advantageouſly at Paris. JOHN HOTMAN, his eldeſt ſon was ſo rich, that he diſburſed vaſt ſums for the ranſome of Francis I (3). PETER HOTMAN, the laſt of Lambert's eighteen children, was chief juſtice in Eyre, and afterwards counſellor in parliament of Paris, Our FRANCIS HOTMAN was his eldeſt ſon (4). The Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary ſays, that HENRY HOTMAN, born at Cleves in the year 1466 was the firſt of that name who came into France, and that he came with Engilbert duke of Cleves, who was the firſt duke of Nevers.

[*B*] *It was the ſecond work which he put to the preſs.*] For he had already publiſhed a little book *de gradibus cognationis*, which was very much eſteemed. 'Pene puer libellum *de gradibus cognationis* adjuncto diagrammate publicavit à doctiſſimis viris in precio habitum, & mox à quodam haud ignobili Juriſconſulto probatum, ita ut eum ſuis in Inſtitutiones commentariis vehementur commendatum inſereret (5). —— *When very young he publiſhed a book* on the Degrees of Affinity, *which has been greatly eſtemed by the learned, and was ſoon after ſo valued by a Civilian of no mean rank, that he publiſhed it in his Comment on the Inſtitutes, with great praiſes.*' His ſecond work was a Commentary *ad titulum Inſtitutionum de actionibus*. The beauty of the ſtile, and the knowledge of the Roman Antiquities, that ſhined in that piece, gave him a great reputation (6). Mr Teiſſier (7) ſhould not have applied that fine commendation to the little book concerning the degrees of Affinity. Had he more attentively conſulted the work he quotes (8), he would not have taken the one for the other.

La Croix du Maine will tell you, that the French tranſlation, which Hotomanus made of Socrates's apology, written by Plato, was printed in the year 1549, at Lyons, for Sebaſtin Gryphius in 8vo.

[C] *He*

(1) Born at Emmerick, in the duchy of Cleves, according to Mr Baillet, in the *Anti*, *art. cxxxi.*

(2) Thus I correct the fault *Lodovici VI*, in Hotomanus's Life, of the Leipſic edition, 1686, and in that of Amſterdam, 1700.

(3) Redimendo Franciſco Regi ad Ticinum capto, ingentem pecuniæ vim ſolus fide ſua curaverit ſummo Galliæ bono, ſumma ſua cum laude. *Petrus Neveletus Doſchius, in Vita Fr. Hottomanni*, *pag. m.* 208.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) Idem, Neveletus, in Vita Hottomanni, pag. 210.

(6) Juriſconſultis etiam magnis gratum ob Latini ſermonis elegantiam, & Rom. antiquitatis exquiſitam ſcientiam. *Id. ibid.*

(7) Addit. aux Eloges, Tom. II, pag. 115.

(8) Hotomanus's Life, written by Nevelet.

ther, he went to Lauſane [*C*], where the magiſtrates of Bern made him profeſſor of the *Belles Lettres*. He publiſhed ſome books there, and married a French gentlewoman (*b*), who had fled thither upon account of religion. His merit was ſo well known in all parts, that the magiſtrates of Straſburg offered to make him profeſſor of the civil-law; and whilſt he was diſcharging that office, he was ſought after by the duke of Pruſſia, and the landgrave of Heſſe. He did not accept thoſe invitations; but he did not ceaſe to go to the court of the king of Navarre, at the beginning of the troubles. He went twice into Germany to deſire ſuccours from Ferdinand in the name of the princes of the blood, and even in the name of the queen-mother (*c*). The ſpeech he made at the diet of Francfort is extant. Being returned to Straſburg, he yielded to the perſuaſions of John de Monluc, to go and teach the civil-law at Valence [*D*]; which he did ſo ſucceſsfully, as to reſtore the reputation of that univerſity. Three years after he went to profeſs it at Bourges, being invited thither by Margaret of France, ſiſter to king Henry II; but five months after he repaired to Orleans to the heads of the party, to whom his counſels were of notable ſervice. The peace which was made a month after, did not deliver him from the fear of a new ſtorm; for which reaſon he retired to Sancerre, and there waited for better times. It was there he wrote an excellent book *de Conſolatione* (*d*). He returned afterwards to his profeſſorſhip at Bourges, where he had like to have loſt his life, during the maſſacre of the year 1572. Having the good fortune to eſcape, he left France, fully reſolved to return thither no more, and betook himſelf to Geneva. He there read lectures of civil-law, and publiſhed ſome books with that ſtrength againſt the perſecutors, that he had great promiſes made him, to oblige him to write no more in that ſtrain: but he hearkened not to thoſe propoſals [*E*]. Some time after

(*b*) She was a native of Orleans, and her name was Claudine Aubelin. *Petrus Neveletus, ubi infra, citat.* (23).

(*c*) See, below, citat. (23).

(*d*) His ſon got it printed after his father's death.

[*C*] *He went to Lauſane.*] Mr Teſſier ſays that Francis Hotman, *after he had left France, retired to Geneva, and lived ſome time in Calvin's houſe* (9). I believe he is in the right, tho' the life of Hotman, which he cites, does not mention it. Nevelet ſeems to have ſuppreſſed a thing, which he ſhould not have omitted. It is not very probable, that the magiſtrates of Bern ſhould have offered a profeſſor's chair, in the academy of Lauſane, to a young man of twenty three years of age, who lived at Lyons. But it is probable, they made this offer to him, if we ſuppoſe, that he lived at Geneva, and had got the love of Calvin. Thus you ſee the want of exactneſs that is found in the beſt books; becauſe commonly good authors are thoſe, who love to ſhorten a narration. They do not always take notice, ſo that by this contraction they ſometimes ſtrangle it. *Brevis eſſe laboro, obſcurus fio* (10). This may have been the caſe of Nevelet; or we may ſay, that not having found in the memoirs that were given him, the journey from Lyons to Geneva, he thought Francis Hotman left Lyons, only becauſe he was choſen profeſſor of the *Belles Lettres* at Lauſane (11). But let us not decide on the moſt probable ſide; for as there were already at Lauſane many eminent refugees, who both knew and loved the merit and piety of Francis Hotman (12), they might eaſily obtain from the magiſtrates of Bern an invitation to him, while he was at Lyons. Mr Teſſier obſerves, that it was *by the mediation of Theodore Beza, that the town of Lauſane offered Hotman a profeſſorſhip of the* Belles Lettres. I believe he is miſtaken, and that he had better have aſcribed it to Calvin's intereſt; for Hotman was profeſſor at Lauſane, before Beza went thither to profeſs the Greek tongue (13), and it is certain that Beza ſtood in need of Calvin's good offices to obtain that profeſſorſhip. Is it likely a man ſhould procure a profeſſor's chair for another, in a town, where he is not, and where he cannot ſettle himſelf but the intereeſt of others? Mr Teſſier, no doubt, believed, that Beza was profeſſor of the Greek tongue at Lauſane before Hotman was invited thither. Thus you ſee how important it is in the narrative of this ſort of things, to conſult well the dates and the niceties of Chronology.

[*D*] *Being returned to Straſburg he yielded to the perſuaſion of John de Monluc, to go and teach the civil-law at Valence.*] If Thuanus had conſulted the dates, he would not have ſaid that John de Monluc took Hotman from Lauſane to ſettle him at Valence; 'Lauſanæ primum docuit, INDE, à Joanne Monlucio 'Valentiæ Epiſcopo, & poſtea à Margarita Biturigum 'Duce evocatus repetitis vicibus Valentiæ & Avarici 'Biturigum, ubi eum aliquando audivi, evocatus, &c. '(14). —— *He firſt taught at Lauſane, and from 'thence he was invited by John Monluc biſhop of Valence, and afterwards by Margaret, ducheſs of Berry, two ſeveral times to Valence and Bourges, where 'I heard him.*' Theſe words *repetitis vicibus* were not underſtood by the French tranſlator: he thought they ſignified that Hotman *taught the civil-law, ſometimes at Valence and ſometimes at Bourges* (15), which is not the meaning, for he taught no longer at Valence, when he once had left it. The tranſlator ſhould therefore have ſaid, that the ducheſs of Berry invited him twice to Bourges, as may be ſeen in the body of this article. Thoſe who ſee in Hotman's life his ſucceſſive removals from one town to another, will make no great account of the memoirs that Thuanus was ſupplied with, ſince he ſays, that after the maſſacre of the year 1572. Hotman went to Montbeliard, and from thence to Baſil. He ſhould have ſaid, that he went to Geneva, and from thence to Baſil, and then to Montbeliard, afterwards to Geneva, any laſtly to Baſil.

[*E*] *He publiſhed at Geneva* (16) *ſome books with that ſtrength againſt the perſecutors, that they made him great promiſes . . . . but he gave no ear to theſe propoſals.*] This is what is ſaid of it by the author of his life (17), 'Ad Allobroges igitur iterum tan'quàm in portum ſe refert, ſcriptiſque aliquot erudi'tis contra fidem immò, per fidem ipſam cæſorum 'innocentiam conſtanter tuetur: & quidem adeò ef'ficaciter, ut qui mollem putabant futurum ejus in 'tanta calamitate animum, prolixis pollicitationibus 'hortarentur ab iſtiuſmodi ſcriptionis genere abſtine'ret: quibus ille hoc tantum repoſuit, *Nunquam ſibi 'propugnatam cauſam quæ iniqua eſſet, nunquam quæ 'jure & legibus niteretur, deſertam præmiorum ſpe 'vel metu periculi; opprimi enim in bona cauſſa me'lius, quam male cedere. Non modo non excuſandum 'parricidium, ultro etiam defendendam cauſſam inno'centium.* —— *He therefore once more returned to 'Geneva, as to a ſafe port, and there, in ſeveral books, 'boldly defended the innocence of thoſe who were maſ'ſacred againſt all faith, or rather for their faith: 'This he did in ſo ſtrong a manner, that ſome who 'imagined that his ſpirit muſt needs be ſunk by his 'great diſtreſs, made him large offers if he would 'give over writing on that ſubject: to whom he an'ſwered,* That he never had defended an unjuſt 'cauſe, and never had deſerted a juſt and honou'rable one, either for hope of rewards or fear of dan'gers, that it was better to be oppreſſed in a good 'cauſe, than baſely to quit it. That theſe cruel 'murders were not only not to be defended, but 'that we ought openly to defend the cauſe of the 'innocent.' A little after he ſpeaks of the book, *de regni Galliæ ſtatu*, which Hotman publiſhed about that time under the title of *Franco-Gallia*. It is a commendable work in point of learning, but very unworty of a French civilian, if we believe even many Proteſtants concerning it. Mr Teiſſier ſpeaks thus of it: *His book intituled* Franco-Gallia, *drew upon him, WITH REASON, the cenſure of the true French-men. For in that work he endeavours to prove* (18) *that this kingdom which is the moſt flouriſhing in Chriſtendom, is not ſucceſſive, as the inheritances of private*

JUDGMENT concerning the book called the *Franco-Gallia*.

(9) Addit. aux Eloges, Tom. II, pag. 115.

(10) Horat. de Arte Poët. ver. 25, 26.

(11) In urbem Equeſtrium . . . ad humanorum quæ dicuntur literarum profeſſionem honorificè à Senatu Bernenſis Reipub. evocatus, cujus in ditione urbs illa ſe contulit. *Neveletus, ubi ſupra, pag.* 211.

(12) Id. ibid.

(13) Erant Lauſanæ tunc temporis doctrina & pietate viri inſignes Petrus Viretus Eccleſiæ Paſtor . . . Franciſcus Hottomannus eloquentiæ Profeſſor. *In Vita Theodori Bezæ, apud Melchior. Adam.* pag. 205.

(14) Thuan. lib. xcix, pag. 378, ad ann. 1590.

(15) See the elogies taken out of Thuanus by Mr Teiſſier, Tom. II, pag. 136, Edit. 1696.

(16) Mezerai is in the wrong to ſay, in his large Hiſtory, Vol. III, pag. 293, that Hotomanus was a fugitive in the Palatinate, when he publiſhed his *Franco-Gallia*.

(17) Pag. 221.

(18) This is only a tranſlation of Thuanus's Latin words, *lib. lvii, pag.* 49, *ad ann.* 1573.

after he removed to Baſil, where he taught the civil-law. The plague obliging him to leave it, he retired to Montbeliard, where he loſt his wife. He went afterwards to Geneva, where he wrote a book in defence of the rights of the king of Navarre [F]; after which he returned to Baſil and died there the twelfth of February 1590. He had refuſed to go to Leyden, where he was offered a profeſſor's chair. He had time to put his works in order, for a new edition (e), which did not appear till a long time after his death, in three volumes *in fol.* (f). They do not contain all that he had publiſhed [G]. Of all his writings, his *Franco-Gallia*, which he ſo much valued (g), is leaſt approved

private perſons are, and that antiently our princes owed the crown to the ſuffrages of the nobility and the people: ſo that as antiently the power and authority of electing kings belonged to the ſtates of the kingdom, and to all the nation aſſembled in a body; ſo it was the ſtates who depoſed them from the government. Hereupon he brings in the examples of Philip de Valois, John, Charles V, Charles VI, and Lewis XI. But that which he principally inſiſts on, is to ſhew, that as women have ever been judged incapable of governing the kingdom, they ought alſo to be excluded from all public poſts, and adminiſtration (19). Add to this paſſage of Mr Teſſier the judicious words of Bongars, taken from a letter to Thuanus (20). 'I will freely confeſs to you *de Franco-Gallia vellem parcius*, and I wiſh I could do it more gently, both becauſe the book is not ſeaſonable, and alſo becauſe it ſeems to me that the good man is groſsly miſtaken in that diſpute. Grief (21) gave ſome colour to the work when it was firſt printed: and we ſuffer many words to eſcape us in an extream trouble, which we ſhould bluſh to hear repeated when the paſſion is over: I write to you my thoughts about it, not knowing what judgment you make of it. I am ſorry I did it not ſooner. I know well that the good man was well pleaſed with that piece; he ſhewed it by the repeated impreſſions of it. It is a diſtemper, with which many of our people, and too many are tainted, who would willingly have our monarchy reduced to an anarchy. If there be any evil in a thing, it doth not follow that it muſt be deſtroyed (22).' Bongars, you will ſay, has hit the mark: Hotman was in a paſſion againſt his country when he wrote that book, and not content to revenge himſelf on the preſent rulers, he endeavoured to diſcharge his reſentment upon the monarchy itſelf, and the whole body of the nation; and that with ſo little judgment, that he furniſhed the Leaguers with powerful arguments for the excluſion of Henry IV; for, according to his principles, the Catholics of France had a full right to elect the duke of Guiſe, king of France to the prejudice of the princes of the blood. A paſſionate writer, you will add, is not capable of thinking of the future, his thoughts are only intent upon the preſent; he conſiders not that the times may change, and that the doctrine which this day ſuits with the intereſt of our cauſe, will one time or other be as favourable to our enemies. This was manifeſt in France under Charles IX, and Henry III. Each party was obliged to confute itſelf, as Montagne has finely obſerved: See the remark [*I*]. It is certain that if Catherine de Medicis had embraced the reformation, and eſtabliſhed it all over France, Hotman would have written a fine book to prove that the regency of women was a very good thing, and agreeable to our fundamental laws. With what ſtrength would he not have refuted the Papiſts, who ſhould have written againſt this queen? The ſtrongeſt reaſon that the Proteſtants of France alledged to juſtify their taking up arms, was what Catherine de Medicis wrote to the prince of Condé. They therefore acknowledged the authority of this woman. Did not Hotman himſelf ſollicite ſuccours in Germany in this queen's name? *Ab his paullo poſt, immo & ab ea quæ tum minorem annis Regem regnumque adminiſtrabat, in Germaniam bis miſſus eſt de Regis regnique rebus legatus, & auxilium a Cæſ. Ferdinando ordinibuſque Germaniæ rebus ruentibus petere juſſus. Exſtat dicta tum ab eo in comitiis Imperii Francofordienſibus oratio* (23). We ſhall ſee elſewhere (24) that he is accuſed of dealing unfairly in his *Franco-Gallia*, and we will endeavour to ſay ſomething in defence of this learned man.

[F] . . . *And wrote a book in defence of the rights of the king of Navarre.*] It was that of the right of the nephew againſt the uncle (25). The League had put into the head of Cardinal de Bourbon, uncle to the king of Navarre, to ſet up for the lawful ſucceſſor, and an Italian civilian was employed to write a treatiſe of the right of the uncle againſt the nephew. Francis Hotman learnedly confuted him. We will cite Father Maimbourg: *Antony Hotman*, ſays he (26), *advocate-general to the League in the Parliament of Paris, wrote* the treatiſe of the uncle againſt the nephew to ſucceed to the crown. *But it happened by a very lucky and pleaſant adventure, that the civilian, Francis Hotman brother to the advocate, having read this book, which was diſperſed in Germany, where he then was, maintained with great ſtrength, reaſon, and learning, the right of the nephew againſt the uncle; and in a learned piece he publiſhed on that ſubject, he manifeſtly expoſed the weakneſs and falſe reaſonings of his adverſary's treatiſe, without knowing that it was his brother, who had not put his name to it.* There are many miſtakes in theſe words. I. It is not true that Francis Hotman wrote againſt an unknown author. He wrote againſt one Matthew Zampini, of Recanati, an Italian civilian. 'Id Matthæus Zampinus Racanatenſis de trivio J. C. à fœderatis pecunia ſubornatus, edita conſultatione probare conatus fuerat, quam Fr. Hotomannus magni nominis noſtra ætate J. C. contraria conſultatione itidem edita confutavit (27). ——— *Matthew Zampini, a mercenary lawyer, being hired by the Leaguers, endeavoured to prove this, in a treatiſe which he publiſhed, and which was anſwered in a book written by Francis Hotman a famous civilian.*' II. And conſequently it is not true that he wrote againſt his brother. III. It is not true that he wrote this book in 1589 (§ α): it was about the year 1585, as Thuanus obſerves: which agrees with Nevelet, who makes him then ſixty years old. IV. He was then at Geneva, and not in Germany. V. Antony Hotman was not one of the advocate-generals of the League in 1589, and was not ſo till two years after (28), when John le Maître, who diſcharged that employment with Lewis d'Orleans, was promoted to the office of preſident *au Mortier*. Preſident Briſſonius was already dead. VI. It was Antony Hotman who wrote againſt his brother Francis Hotman, and not the later againſt Antony Hotman. 'Poſtea & peculiari libro quem conſultationi à Franciſco fratre pro Navarro editæ . . . oppoſuiſſe videri voluit, (*Antonius Hotmannus*) rationes amplificatæ (29). ——— *Afterwards theſe reaſons were laid down more at length in a particular book, which he* (Anthony Hotman) *would have the world think that he wrote, in anſwer to a treatiſe which his brother Francis had publiſhed in favour of the king of Navarre.*'

[(§ α) I have a treatiſe intituled: *Ad Tractatum Matthæi Zampini* J. C. *Recannatenſis, de ſucceſſione prerogativæ primi Principis Franciæ; Ornatiſſimi viri* P. C. A. F. *civis Pariſienſis, & Regii Conſiliarii, Reſponſio.* It is in 8vo, and conſiſts of eighty pages printed by the heirs of Wechelius, 1589. Francis Hotman was a Pariſian, and likewiſe he was counſellor of ſtate to the king of Navarre, who came to the crown of France, by the name of Henry IV. Hotman being ſtill alive. So this may be his book, Rem. Crit.]

[G] *The edition of his works doth not contain all that he had publiſhed.*] The burleſque pieces which he wrote againſt Matharel, and Papyrius Maſſo, were left out, as alſo the book he publiſhed at Geneva in the year 1553, under the name of Francis de Villiers, *Ad Remundum Rufum defenſorem Rom. Pontificis contra Carolum Molinæum de ſtatu primitivæ Eccleſiæ, &c* (30): the *Nullitatis proteſtatio adverſus formulam concordiæ* (31), which he publiſhed under the name of *Johannes Palmerius*; and the Apology of this laſt book, in which he diſguiſed himſelf under the name of *Johannes Franciſcus Aſpaſtis Salaſſi V. D. M.* (32). His *Anti-Tribonianus*, printed in French in 1603, the Latin verſion whereof was printed at approved, and has perſuaded ſome perſons, that he was the author of the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos* [*H*], which is a book intirely agreeable to republican notions. Some time after, his own maxims were retorted upon him [*I*]. It is hard to avoid this inconvenience

---

(e) Taken from his Life, written by Petrus Neveletus Doſchius, of whom we ſhall ſpeak in the remark [*O*]. It is one of the ten Lives of Civilians, reprinted at Leipſic, by Leickherus, in 1686. I make uſe of that edition.

(f) They were printed at Geneva by the care of James Lectius, in 1599.

(g) See the remark [*E*].

(19) Teiſſier, Additions aux Eloges de Mr de Thou, Tom. II, pag. 139.

(20) It was written from Straſburg in 1595, upon occaſion of Hotman's Life, written by Nevelet.

(21) The original has it *la doute*, I believe it ſhould be *la douleur*.

(22) Lettres de Bongars, pag. 651, *at the Hague*, 1695.

(23) Nevelet. in Vita Hotomanni.

(24) In the remark [*H*].

(25) Vexatam illam rebus ita poſtulantibus & magnis viris hortantibus tractavit controverſiam, *de ſucceſſione inter patruum & fratris filium*, atque univerſum de jure ſucceſſionis regiæ in regno Galliæ. *Nevelet. ubi ſupra*, pag. 824.

(26) Hiſt. de la Ligue, livr. iv, pag. m. 367, ad ann. 1589.

(27) Thuan. lib. lxxxi, init ad ann. 1585.

(28) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. III, pag. 999.

(29) Thuan. lib. xci, ſub fin. *See also Mezerai*, ubi ſupra, pag. 708.

(30) Epitome, Bibl. Geſneri, pag. m. 239.

(31) *See* Placcius, de Pſeudon. pag. 233.

(32) Placcius, ibid. pag. 153.

at Hamburgh in 1647, was alſo left out. Concerning this book, ſee the curious Mr Baillet (33). Laſtly, his *Brutum Fulmen* was left out, which is not a burleſque piece Thuanus ſays. It is a very ſerious work, in which Hotman refutes the Bull which Sixtus V publiſhed in 1585, againſt the king of Navarre and the prince of Condé. ‘ Poſtea, *ſays Thuanus* (34) & in cenſuram illam ſcripſit Franciſcus Hotmannus J. C. joculari iſto ſtilo, libroque Brutum Fulmen titulum fecit, quo & de B. Franciſci & B. Dominici vita ac moribus veteres hiſtoriæ, ab obſolete devotis viris ſcriptæ ridicule diſcutiuntur. —— *Afterwards Francis Hotman, a civilian, wrote againſt that Bull, in a burleſque ſtile, and intituled his book* Brutum Fulmen, *in which he, in a very ludicrous manner, criticiſeth the ancient accounts of the lives and actions of St Francis and St Dominic, written by weak and ſuperſtitious men.*’ There is nothing leſs than this treated of, in that tract of Francis Hotman. Deckher has been in this deceived (35) by Thuanus, but he has committed a fault of his own: He will have this learned civilian to have left France on account of that piece; which is falſe. Hotman quitted France in 1572, fully reſolved never to ſet foot in it again (36). The *Brutum fulmen* was publiſhed in 1585, as Deckher obſerves againſt Goldaſtus, who places the edition of it in the year 1586. I have ſaid nothing of the tract *de regno vulvarum*, which d'Aubigné aſcribes to our Hotman in the third chapter of the firſt book of the *Confeſſion de Sanci*: I know not what it is (§β).

[(β) The following epigram was in every body's hands, about the year 1561,* occaſioned by the greateſt part of the kingdoms of Europe, being then governed, or at leaſt adminiſtrated, by women.

Vulva regit Scotos (*a*), hæres (*b*) tenet illa Britannos,
  Flandros & Batavos, nunc notha vulva (*c*) regit.
Vulva regit populos quos ſignat Gallia portu (*d*)
  Et fortes Gallos Itala vulva regit (*e*).
His furiam furiis, vulvam conjungite vulvis,
  Sic natura capax omnia Regna capit.
Ad Medicem † artem incertam Gallia ſaucia tendit ‡
  Non uti Medicis eſt medicina tibi.
Non credas Medicis, vena qui ſanguinis hauſta
  Conantur vires debilitare tuas.
Ut Regi, matrique ſuæ ſis fida Deoque,
  Utere conſilio Gallia docta meo,
Et pacem tu inter proceres non ponito bellum,
  Hoſpita-(*f*)-lis Artus rodit agitque tuos.

This poſſibly is the pretended book *de regno vulvarum*, aſcribed by d'Aubigné to Francis Hotman. This lawyer was a Latin poet, and his *Franco-Gallia* which he publiſhed about twelve or thirteen years after, proves that he did not approve of female adminiſtrations. REM. CRIT.]

[*H*] *He has been thought to be author of the* Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos.] When I mentioned this work in the project of this Dictionary, I ſaid (37) that the error of thoſe who aſcribed Junius Brutus's book to Francis Hotman was a ſmall one, ‘ Hotman, *continued I*, left France for his religion, and tho' he was not like thoſe who fly from perſecution *breathing out threatnings and ſlaughter* (38), as fiercely as the perſecutors themſelves, yet he nevertheleſs complained and murmured in his retreat. He wrote a book intituled *Franco-Gallia*, to ſhew that the French monarchy is not what it is thought to be, and that of right, the people are the true ſovereigns in it. This was the reaſon that made it believed that he was the author of Junius Brutus's work; beſides, there are many maxims of the *Franco-Gallia* ſcattered in it. Barclay refutes only this laſt reaſon, which ſeems to him plauſible enough, and pretends to ſhew the weakneſs of it by ſomething that is ſtill more plauſible; which is, ſays he (39), that Brutus makes uſe of ſeveral arguments, which Hotman laughed at and refuted, and falls into ſuch childiſh errors as to the civil-law, that ſuch a man as Hotman could not be capable of. This is more obliging to this learned civilian, than what has been ſaid by Boeclerus. *I wiſh*, ſays he, *Hotman had not ſo obſtinately appeared among the authors, who ſound an alarm againſt kings, and by their private authority convert them into tyrants with ſuch querks and cavils, and not only corrupt ſound Philoſophy, but alſo the Holy Scriptures. I wiſh he had not given this bad example to others in his* Franco-Gallia, *and that he had not falſified hiſtory more than once, in order to offer incenſe to his prejudices with too ſervile a complaiſance.* The Greek Phraſe of Boeclerus has much more emphaſis in it, Εἰς τὸ δȣλεύειν τῇ ὑποθέσει, *etiam hiſtoriam non ſemel corrumpit* (40) . . . (41) I cannot forbear ſaying that Boeclerus does very much abuſe Hotman, who, to repeat it once more, was none of thoſe who, like ſome Engliſh Catholics of the laſt century, leave their country for religion, in a menacing manner, throwing about fire and flames, vomiting a thouſand imprecations, thundering out Maranathas, and endeavouring to re-enter it with ſword in hand, or by the help of the moſt exterminating armies; in a word, deſiring a return, preceeded, as the departure out of Egypt was, by all plagues of Pharaoh, not excepting the paſſage of the deſtroying angel. Hotman contented himſelf with ſmart ſtrokes of the pen, and with touching upon ſome things which were not pleaſing. It is true, that without thinking of it, he laboured for the League (42), and forged weapons for Bellarmin: It is alſo true that his blows were like thoſe of the Parthians (43); I mean, that, in the condition of a fugitive, he fought better than he would have done had he not retreated. But his writings are far from deſerving to be branded in the ſame manner with many others, that have been publiſhed in the like circumſtances. For example, the Engliſh Catholics have in vain made ſatires and bitter invectives againſt queen Elizabeth (44); this is all loſt paper, of which wiſe men make no manner of uſe in any party. However it be, the appearances were a little againſt Hotman, as to the book of Junius Brutus, and, as I have already ſaid, it was a very ſmall error to make him the author of the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*.'

[*I*] *His own maxims were retorted upon him ſome time after.*] It was by accident, and by a very common fate which changes the intereſts of parties, that Hotman's work was ſubject to the inconvenience I ſpeak of. The revolutions of France ſo changed the ſcene, that the maxims of each party were reciprocally metamorphoſed into their contraries. Montagne pleaſantly redicules the Catholics. *See*, ſays he (45), *with what horrible impudence we toſs about divine reaſons, and how profanely we reject them, and lay hold of them again, according as fortune has changed our ſituation in theſe public ſtorms. This important propoſition, whether it be lawful for ſubjects to rebel and arm againſt their prince for the defence of religion, was warmly maintained the laſt year by a certain party, and as warmly denied by the other party: but ſee now who maintains the affirmative, and whether arms rattle leſs for this cauſe than for that. We burn thoſe people who ſay, truth ſhould ſubmit to the yoke of our neceſſity; but does not France do worſe than ſay ſo?* &c. As long as the world is a world, there will be every where ambulatory doctrines, dependant on times and places: true birds of paſſage, which are in one country in the ſummer, and in another in the winter: wandering lights, that, like the Carteſian comets, illuminate ſucceſſively ſeveral vortices. Whoever pretends to ſet up for a cenſor upon this occaſion, will be looked on as a moroſe critic, and a native of Plato's common-wealth. And ſo Hotman ought not to be reſponſible for the advantage, the famous advocate of the Holy-League found means to draw from his *Franco-Gallia*. ‘ They cannot complain, (*it is Lewis d'Orleans who ſpeaks this in the name of the Engliſh Catholics*) that they are dealt with as they deal with others. Follow their councils, tread in the paths they have traced out to eſtabliſh themſelves, and you will eſtabliſh your ſelves, and involve them in ſhame and confuſion. In their *Franco-Gallia*, which is

---

(33) *Baillet, in his* Anti, art. cxxxi.

(34) Lib. lxxxii, pag. 33, ad ann. 1585.

(35) De ſcriptis Adeſpotis, pag. 84, Edit. 1686.

(36) Neque unquam poſtea induci potuit, ut in patria conſiſtendum ſibi judicaret: non Andegavenſis ipſius Ducis literis inflexus, non promiſſis, non denique cum ab eo Magiſter ſupplicum apud ſe libellorum dictus eſſet: hoc ſæpe uſurpans: *Fruſtra Neptunum accuſat, iterum qui naufragium facit.* Nevelet ubi ſupra, pag. 221.

* Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtel. Tom. I, pag. 773.

(*a*) Mary Stewart.

(*b*) Queen Elizabeth.

(*c*) Margaret, ducheſs of Parma, natural daughter to Charles V.

(*d*) Catherine of Auſtria, ſiſter to Charles V, widow of John III, king of Portugal, and regent during the minority of Sebaſtian, her ſon.

(*e*) Catherine de Medicis.

† Medicam.

‡ Tendis.

(*f*) An alluſion to the name of chancellor de l'Hoſpital, *to whom Catherine de Medicis, principally owed the regency.*

(37) Pag. 90.

(38) Ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνȣ, *ſays the Scripture in the Acts of the Apoſtles, chap. ix, ver. i, concerning Saul.*

(39) Barclay, lib. iii, contra Monarchomachos, cap. i, pag. 311.

(40) In Grot. de Jure Belli & Pacis, lib. i, cap. iv, pag m. 275.

(41) *In the Project, pag* 92.

(42) *See the following remark.*

(43) Navita boſphorum Pœnus perhorreſcit . . . Miles ſagittas & celerem fugam Parthi. *Horat. Od. xiii, lib. iii,*

(44) *See the article* ELIZABETH, *remark* [*K*].

(45) Eſſais, book ii, cap. xii, pag. m. 103. *Mezerai makes the ſame obſervation, pag.* 792, *of the third volume of the Hiſtory of France.*

venience in writing upon ſome ſubjects. He was well paid for his *Brutum Fulmen* [*K*] by the king of Navarre. He was one of thoſe who would never, conſent to drawing of their pictures (*b*), but his was drawn when he was in his laſt agony. He left two ſons and four daughters. JOHN HOTMAN, Sieur de Villiers, his eldeſt ſon, is thought to be the author of the *Anti-Chopinus*, a burleſque piece, and of the *Anti-Colazon*, which is an apology for his treatiſe of the embaſſador, in which he was, as they ſay, the plagiary of Charles Paſchal. See Mr Baillet (*i*). Moreri has not been guilty of many faults [*L*].

(*b*) Nevelet. ibid. pag. 229.

(*i*) *In his* Anti, art. cxviii, & cxix.

I wonder that a thing was forgotten in the life of Francis Hotman, which is very glorious for him, *viz.* that at the age of twenty three years he read public lectures in the ſchools of Paris [*M*]. The author of his life has alſo omitted, (and I do not wonder at

‘ one of the moſt deteſtable books that ever ſaw the light, and was compoſed to put all France in a flame, they ſay, that it is lawful to chooſe a king to ones own taſte. Tell then the Heretics that the king of Navarre is not to your taſte, and therefore let him keep in his Bern, till you deſire to have him. Thus they ought to be whipped with their own rods, that they may know that the powerful hand of GOD chaſtizes them, with their own wicked counſels, and pernicious writings (46).’ That book of Hotman is at the bottom a fine piece, well written, and full of learning, and ſo much the more vexatious to the contrary party, becauſe the author contents himſelf to cite matters of fact, as he himſelf repreſents to his cenſurers. ‘ Cur vel Maſſonus, *ſays he* (47), vel Matharellus Francogalliæ ſcriptori & ſimplici hiſtoriarum narratori ita terribiliter iraſcitur? Nam ut dicit Sylva nup. lib. 1. num. 10. quomodo poteſt aliquis ei ſuccenſere qui eſt tantum relator & narrator facti? Francogalliſta enim tantum narrationi & relationi ſimplici, vacat, quod ſi aliena dicta delerentur, charta remaneret alba. —— *Why is Maſſo, or Matharellus, ſo very angry with the writer of the Franco-Gallia, who only barely relates facts? for as the* Sylva Nuptialis *ſays, how can any body be in a paſſion with a perſon who is only a relater of a fact? for the writer of that book doth nothing but relate, and if his quotations from other writers were taken away nothing would be left but clean paper.*’ He was reproached as if his book looked like the production of a drunken, furious, and mad-man: to which he anſwers, that nothing could be more unſufferably impudent than this aſſertion, ſince he had conſtantly preſerved in that book the character of a moderate and ſedate relater (48). This is a wonderful advantage in ſuch ſort of books. For the reſt, tho' this anſwer be written in a burleſque ſtyle, yet it contains a thouſand things that ought to be underſtood ſeriouſly. *Ridentem dicere verum quid vetat* (49)? ſuch is, for inſtance, what he ſays to his adverſary, that it is not ſufficient for him to have brought in his accuſation, and given bail *de Lite proſequenda*; but that it is farther neceſſary he ſhould expreſsly engage to ſubmit to the law of retaliation, in caſe he ſhould be convicted of calumny. *Sed adhuc requiritur tertius ut ſe expreſſe obliget ad pœnam talionis, in caſu quo probetur calumniator; quod probatur per L. ult C. de calumniat. & omnes Canoniſtas, ſed maxime per Hieronym. de Zanetinis in repetit. cap.* 1. *Extr. de accuſat. De quo ſi ſumus concordes, & Matharellus ſe ſubjiciat talioni in caſu quod calumniæ convincatur, totum negotium noſtrum bene vadit, niſi fortè &c* (50).

If we believe a hiſtorian, who had been a miniſter, that piece of Hotman did not pleaſe all the Proteſtants, nor diſpleaſe all the Catholics of France, and was not written without ſome relation to the cabal of mareſchal d'Amville. *A little after*, ſays he (51), *the duke of Alençon, his majeſty's brother, retired from court with ſeveral lords, who had been gained by the ſaid mareſchal d'Amville; and taking the name of malecontents, they joined with the Huguenots. Some of which began to write in another ſtrain than formerly: and Hotman the Civilian, in his* Franco-Gallia, *undertook to prove*, that the people of France had formerly a ſupreme authority not only to elect their kings, but alſo to ſet aſide the ſons of their kings, and to chooſe ſtrangers: *he ſays upon that ſubject many things*, praiſing the people that curb the licentiouſneſs of their kings and bring them to reaſon. *After treating of many other matters, he falls* upon the regency of queens, the mothers of kings. *This he did becauſe the queen-mother had been declared regent till the return of the king of Poland her ſon: in ſhort, he alledged our antient hiſtories right or wrong, according to his paſſion. This book was agreeable to ſome Proteſtants, and to ſome united Catholics, who were fond of innovations, but not to all.* D'Aubigné gives the ſame plan of this book; but he ſays it was publiſhed (52) in 1573. While Charles the IXth was alive. Thuanus (53) and Mezerai (54) who give the ſame plan of it, place it, the one ſimply under the reign of Charles IX, the other, before the departure of the king of Poland. Which overthrows Cayet's hypotheſis; *viz.* That the regency conferred on queen Catherine at Charles IXth's death, was one of the grievances of Francis Hotman. It is certain his work was printed before the queen was declared regent by the edict of the 30th of May 1574. But he foreſaw perhaps that it would be ſo, and it is very likely he had her in view in what he ſaid againſt a female regency. He remembered the miſchiefs that princeſs had cauſed in her former regency. This great civilian who had quitted the poſt of counſellor in the parliament of Paris for his religion, had done better to anſwer his adverſaries ſeriouſly and modeſtly (55), than to uſe a burleſque ſtile. See what Mr Baillet ſays of it, pag. 336. Tom 2. of his *Anti*.

[*K*] *He was well paid for his* Brutum Fulmen.] We will begin our comment with theſe words of the author of his Life. ‘ His meritis præmium deberi cum intelligeret Henricus tum Navarræ Rex ultro codicillos ad eum miſit Senatoriæ in Conſiſtorio ſuo dignitatis: cujus tamen eum fructum non tulit, quem beneficus Princeps voluerat: ac opinor in tantis rerum omnium anguſtiis factum, ut ex annuo quod debebatur ſalario, vix ad eum quidquam, ſicut audio pervenerit (56). —— *Henry IV, who was then king of Navarre, underſtanding that by theſe ſervices he had deſerved ſome mark of diſtinction, of his own accord ſent him letters appointing him one of his counſellors of ſtate, from which dignity however he did not reap the fruit, which that generous prince intended; for I am informed, that, by reaſon of the public neceſſities of theſe times, he received little or nothing of the ſalarly annexed to it.*’ Bongars, to whom Nevelet dedicated Hotman's Life, made an obſervation upon this place (57). ‘ There is another paſſage. Having ſaid, that the king had upon his writing the *Brutum Fulmen*, given him a place of counſellor of ſtate, Cujus tamen eum fructum non tulit quem beneficus princeps voluerat (58). — *But that he had never reaped the fruit from it which that generous prince intended.* I aſſure you, Sir, the king never bought a book ſo dear as that: it was paid far above it's worth. You will tell me, that I ſhould have given my advice upon theſe paſſages ſooner; but it often happens, (and to me but too frequently) that we never conſider but when it is too late. I wrote my thoughts to Mr Hotman about the firſt (59). I do not touch upon the ſecond, he might poſſibly be offended at it, not knowing how the matter went.’ Note, that Nevelet does not ſpeak there of the *Brutum Fulmen*, as Bongars ſuppoſes, but of the book againſt *Zampini de ſucceſſione inter patruum & fratris filium*.

[*L*] *Moreri has not been guilty of many faults.*] I. He ſuppoſes falſly, that Hotman was ſaved by his ſcholars at Bourges, at another time beſide that of the maſſacre; that is, of one event he makes two. II. The year of his death is not well fixed; it ſhould have been 1590, inſtead of 1591. III. He ſhould not impute that miſtake to Spondanus, by citing him under the year 1591. *n.* 22. for it is under the number of the preceding year that he ſpeaks of Hotman's death.

[*M*] *At the age of twenty three years, he read public lectures in the ſchools of Paris.*] I prove it by theſe at it,) certain things which Baudouin had publiſhed againſt him, and which would horribly ſtain his memory, if they were true [*N*]. One could not give any credit to them,

---

(46) Advertiſſement des Catholiques Anglois, pag. 74, 75. Edit. 1587, in 8vo.

(47) Matagonis de Matagonibus, Monitoriale adverſus Italogalliam ſive Antifrancogallinm Antonii Matharelli. *It is a piece of Hotman's in a Macaronic ſtile.*

(48) Quod dicit Francogalliam compoſitam ab auctore bene poto in aliquo œnopolio, & eum evomuiſſe ſcriptum plenum furoris & inſaniæ, video multos auctoris amicos, dictum iſtud appellare meretriciam impudentiam flagris & carcere dignam . . . Ubi ullum iracundi animi ſignam? Ubi vox ulla perturbati animi in toto libro ac non potius ſedatæ & moderatæ narrationis? *Id. ibid.*

(49) Horat. Sat. I, lib. i, ver. 24, 25.

(50) Matagonis Monit. ibid.

(51) Peter Victor Cayet, avant-propos de la Chronologie novenaire.

(52) Hiſt. Univerſ. Tom. II. pag. 670. *Simler, in his Epitome of Geſner's* Bibliotheque, *places the impreſſion of the* Franco-Gallia, *in* 1573, *and he is in the right. That book was printed at Geneva, by Jacobus Stoerius in the year* 1573. *The epiſtle dedicatory to the elector Palatine is dated the twenty firſt of Auguſt*, 1573.

(53) Thuan. Hiſtor. lib. lvii.

(54) Hiſt. de France, Tom. III, in folio, pag. 293.

(55) Antony Matharel & Papyrius Maſſo.

(56) Nevel. ubi ſupra, pag. 225.

(57) Lettres de Bongars, pag. 651, *at the Hague*, 1695.

(58) *Theſe words are very incorrect in the edition of Bongars's Letters, which I quote. I inſert them as they ought to be.*

(59) *That is, what concerns the* Franco-Gallia. *See, above, the words of Bongars, in the remark* [*E*], *citat.* (22).

theſe words of Stephen Paſquier (60): ‘I aſſure you, that one of the moſt fortunate things that I think I met with in my youth, was that on the next day after our Lady's aſſumption in the year 1546, Hotman and Balduin began their firſt Law lectures in the ſchools of this city of Paris; the former at ſeven of the clock in the morning, reading the title *de Notionibus*; the latter at two of the clock in the afternoon, reading the title *de Publicis Judiciis*, before a great number of auditors. And that very day I began to ſtudy the civil-law under thoſe two learned men.’

[*N*] *Certain things which Baudoin has publiſhed . . . . . would horribly ſtain his memory if they were true.*] Baudouin aſſures us, that Hotman was excomunicated at Strasburg for adultery. *Argentinæ propter adulterium excommunicarat ſodalem tuum Hottmannum* (Petrus Alexander) (61). Theſe words are addreſſed to Beza. The author had already mentioned this with more circumſtances, and had added, that Hotman alſo loſt his canonry and his academical office. ‘Recitata tunc quoque noſtris fuit cauſa tui Hotmanni, nempe propter quod facinus illic aliquando primum fuiſſet excomunicatus abs ſuo Gallo concionatore Petro Alexandro, te quidem propter antiquam ſocietatem ſubmurmurante, ſed aſſentiente tamen tuo ſi minus parente, at certe avo Gulielmo Farello, ſæpius illum juriſperditum appellante. Addebant & complura ejuſdem generis quæ pervulgata erant per Joannem Infantium, teſtem valde idoneum, & cujus non ſolum opera, ſed & opibus quandiu opus habuiſti, tam liberaliter es abuſus, ut fidem ei detrahere vix audeas. Altera cauſa fuit expoſita cur tuus ille Hotmannus (cujus cauſa non eſt abs te ſejuncta) ut antea Eccleſia, ſic deinde ſchola & ſuo Canonicatu pulſus eſſet: tandemque quid in eo Sturmius ipſe graviſſime accuſaret narratum eſt, & perlecta Sturmiana adverſus eum terribilis expoſtulatio, quæ profecto non modo de iſtius flagitiis, ſed & de veſtræ conjurationis myſteriis narrabat nimis multa (62). —— *At the ſame time we were told the ſtory of your friend Hotman, to wit, the crime for which he had been there firſt excommunicated by his own French miniſter, Peter Alexander, and that you indeed murmured at it, on account of your ancient friendſhip with him, but that William Farel, who if he is not your father is certainly your grandfather, conſented to it, and gave him the name of* Juriſperditus. *They likewiſe told us a great many things of the ſame nature, which they had from John Infantius, a very proper evidence, and to whoſe intereſt and purſe you ſo liberally abuſed in the time of your neceſſity, that you dare not call his authority in queſtion. We alſo were informed, for what reaſon your friend Hotman (whoſe cauſe and your's are pretty much the ſame) who had formerly been thrown out of the church, was alſo depoſed from his canonry and his academical office: and laſt of all what things even Sturmius accuſed him off, and we read Sturmius's expoſtulation againſt him, which indeed contained not only a hiſtory of his crimes, but too many of the myſteries of your cabal.*’ All theſe things had preceded the year 1562. Baudouin a little after (63) relates, that having known Hotman at Paris, as a perſon who loved learning, he had adviſed him to go and ſee Geneva; that he received him in his houſe at Strasburg, with all civility, as an old friend, when Hotman retired thither, after having deſired his good offices for a law profeſſorſhip, and expreſſed a great diſlike to his teaching at Lauſane (64), and that he quickly perceived he harboured a viper in his boſom, ſince Hotman endeavoured all that was poſſible to ruin him by ſecret practices. Here is one of his tricks: having by his fraudulent contrivances, moved Duarenus to ſend him an invective againſt Baudouin; he diſperſed it all over the town, taking care however, that Baudouin ſhould not know it. He was at laſt obliged by Sturmius to go to him, and bear his reproaches, and he expreſſed an extream regret for his conduct. A fragment of the letter which Sturmius writ to him (65) is produced, in which he accuſes him of uſing a great many knaviſh arts to ſupplant Baudouin. His plot ſucceeded; for he made Baudouin weary of Straſburg. So that he went to ſeek another poſt (66), and Hotomanus ſucceeded him. All this is to be found in Baudouin's third anſwer to Calvin. He had already in the ſecond alledged this letter of Sturmius, and he had drawn many things out of it to Hotman's diſadvantage. He had mentioned a paſſage of it, which contains a reproach of an execrable perjury. Hotman, the very day that he received the ſacrament, proteſted to Sturmius, that he wiſhed the ſacrament he had received might be turned into a devil, if he denied falſly what he denied (67). And yet, adds Sturmius, he denied a thing that was moſt true. Baudouin mentions this as a proof, that his adverſary, who undertook to diſpute about the euchariſt, made no great account of it, and he takes this occaſion to reproach him, that he had been excluded from the euchariſt in Germany for adultery. ‘Etiam de myſterio Cœnæ Dominicæ diſputat, & me cum ſua Gallica (ut vocat) Eccleſia non idem ſentire narrat, qui ab ea propter Clodianum facinus in Germania excommunicatus aliam quæcunque illi fortaſſe patuit menſam occupavit. Vis ſcire quanti faciat totum iſtud myſterium tuus Myſtagogus? Audi Sturmium (68). —— *He likewiſe diſputes concerning the myſtery of the Euchariſt, and pretends that I do not agree in my ſentiments about it with his church of France (as he calls it) from which he being excommunicated in Germany for the crime of Clodius, embraced the next table that chance offered to him, to which he could procure admittance. Would you know what regard this explainer of myſteries of your's has to that whole myſtery? ask Sturmius.*’ Here is another paſſage of this ſecond anſwer of Baudouin (69). ‘Nonne ille eſt qui . . . . . Sileſium ſe eſſe finxit, cum in Germania negaret ſe eſſe Gallum ut in aulam Auſtriacam irreperet? Nonne ille eſt qui cum tuam (70) Eccleſiam clam fugeret & ſcholam, in qua tamen docuit aliquot annis Grammaticam, depoſita Juriſconſulti perſona, venit in Germaniam tuis ad Sturmium literis inſtructus quæ Sturmium feſellerunt? Nonne ille eſt cujus (ut nunc dicebam) vitam perfidiæ, nequitiæ, ſceleris, & omnium maleficiorum plenam ipſe Sturmius nuper deſcripſit? . . . Nonne ille eſt magnus ardelio, qui cum in Germania Principes miris modis eſt ludificatus, huc & illuc diſcurrens, modo in Gallia tumultuatur, modo ad Rheni ripas adverſus Regem ſuum milites cogit? Nonne ille eſt quem Sturmius . . . oſtendit etiam Galliæ Principibus plus quam proditoriè maledicere, cujuſque lingua nullum veneficium magis veneficum eſſe ait & probat? Nonne ille eſt qui ſuperioribus annis in Germania pinxit ſive ſuum ſive tuum tumultum Amboſianum, & Tigrim (71) peperit, & ejus generis formulas quotidie concipit novus magiſter libellorum, non (ut jactabat) ſupplicum ſed famoſorum? Denique nonne eſt ille tenebrio qui ad me aliquando ſcripſit, σκοτιϛέον ἐν τῷ νῦν χρόνῳ (72). —— *Is it not he . . . who pretended to be a Sileſian, when he was in Germany, denying that he was a Frenchman, that he might inſinuate himſelf into the Auſtrian court? Is it not he who having fled from your church and ſchool, where, laying aſide the character of a civilian, he for ſome years taught grammar, came into Germany with your letters of recommendation to Sturmius, by which Sturmius was deceived? Is it not he whom Sturmius himſelf (as I ſaid before) accuſeth of perfidy, treachery, and all manner of crimes? . . . Is not he that buſy body, who after having in the moſt unheard-of manner deceived the princes of Germany, now wanders about, ſometimes raiſing ſeditions in France, at other times on the banks of the Rhine, levying troops againſt his ſovereign? Is it not he whom Sturmius . . . proves to have ſlandered even the princes of France in a worſe than treacherous manner, and whoſe tongue he ſays, and proves it too, is more venomous than poiſon itſelf. Is it not he who ſome years ago deſcribed his or your tumult at Amboiſe, and brought forth the tyger, and who is daily hatching ſuch ſeditious libels, and not humble petitions as he pretends? In fine, is it not that ſcoundrel who once wrote to me, that* In theſe times one ought to ſeek darkneſs.’

Now this is the reaſon why I have made a diſtinction between what we find in Baudouin's ſecond and third anſwer. Beza has confuted the ſecond, but has ſaid nothing againſt the third; and therefore the third is not of ſo great conſequence againſt our civilian; for it

(60) *Paſquier, Letter to Mr Loyſel. It is in the nineteenth book of his Letters. The words that I quote, are at page 501, of the ſecond Tome.*

(61) Reſponſ. ad Calvin. & Bezam pro Franciſco Balduino, folio 77.

(62) Ibid. fol. 70, verſo.

(63) Ibid. fol. 86.

(64) Alterum Balduini ex non diſſimili errore peccatum fuit quod Hotmanni tui Lauſannæ languentis & in cædendis, quos in tuo ludo Grammaticam docebat, pueris defatigati, & ex eo carcere liberari miſere cupientis, & commendatione Balduini ad aliquam juris profeſſionem redire literis temere crediderit. *Ibid.*

(65) Ib. fol. 87.

(66) *He went to Heidelberg.*

(67) Balduin. Reſponſ. altera ad Joann. Calvin. pag. m. 176.

(68) Id. ibid.

(69) Id. ibid. pag. 181, 182.

(70) *Theſe words are addreſſed to Calvin.*

(71) *It is a libel, which I ſpeak of in the article* GUISE, (FRANCIS), *remark* [*I*].

(72) *That is to ſay, in theſe times one ought to ſeek the ſhade.*

them, without believing that it is a much eaſier thing to become very learned, and a great enemy to the perſecuting religion, than to become a tolerably honeſt man. I will ſpeak a word or two concerning the author of Hotman's life [O]. The book which was printed at Amſterdam (k), intituled, *Franciſci & Joannis Hotomanorum. Patris ac Filii & clarorum virorum ad eos Epiſtolæ*, might furniſh me with a great many additions for this article, both concerning the application of our civilian to the ſearch of the Philoſophers ſtone (l), which proved very prejudicial to him, and upon ſeveral other particularities of his life; but I think it better to refer my readers to Mr Bernard's journal (m). The extract which he gives us of this work, leaves nothing wanting. You may alſo conſult the firſt volume of *Obſervationum Selectarum ad rem litterariam ſpectantium* printed at Hall in the year 1700.

(k) *In* 1700, *in* 4*to.*

(l) *See the Funeral Oration of Scipio Gentilis*, apud Witte, Memor. Juriſconſ. pag. 33.

(m) Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres, March 1701, pag. 268, *&c.*

it may be preſumed, that if Beza had confuted it, he would have juſtified him. We muſt therefore give greater attention to the reproaches contained in the ſecond, becauſe they may be compared with the piece in which Beza refuted it. We muſt judge from that confutation, what grounds Baudouin went upon. I find that his adverſary advances nothing to the clearing of Hotman; he only ſays, that the reproaches of being ignorant of the Latin tongue, and of being an Atheiſt, will not at all diſturb Hotman, who will not vouchſafe to give any anſwer as to the laſt head. ‘ Magnum tibi certamen ſupereſſe video. Nam quæ tibi objecit magnam inſcitiam arguunt, quæ tamen (ut ajunt) refellere non poſſis. Illa verò quæ regeris cujuſmodi ſunt quæſo? Latinè ſcilicet neſcit, ut eum oportuerit ad Latinam epiſtolam ſcribendam alterius operam requirere. Crimen autem ἀθεότητος, etſi omnium eſt graviſſimum, ille tamen, ut opinor, ne reſponſo quidem dignum putabit. Quid enim hoc aliud eſt quam latrare (73). ——— *You have now got a very heavy task upon your hands. For the things which he objected to you, argue a very great ignorance, and yet (as I am informed) you are not able to diſprove them. But what is it you accuſe him of? That he indeed is ſo ignorant of Latin, that he was obliged to make uſe of another hand to write a Latin letter. As for the crime of Atheiſm, tho' it is the greateſt of all others, yet I believe he will not think it worthy of an anſwer. For what is this but to ſcold and ſlander.*’ Here is nothing relating to the accuſations I have tranſcribed, and which are contained in the 176, 180, 181, and 182 pages of Baudouin's ſecond anſwer. All that Beza has ſaid for Hotman, concerns the 175th page, where we find, 1. that Hotman appropriated to himſelf an epiſtle dedicatory that Sturmius had wrote: 2. that he then praiſed the very ſame works of Duarenus, which he had vilified formerly in writing againſt Rufus for du Moulin. 3. That an elegant maſter of Cicero's Atheiſm, is not fit to be a catechiſt. ‘ Noſter magiſter Latinitatis priuſquam de meis ſcriptionibus garriat, ſuarum oblitus reſpondeat Sturmio & aliis, à quibus accuſatus eſt quod ſuo nomine ediderit epiſtolam abs Sturmio ſcriptam, eamque inſtitutionibus præfixam tanquam ſuam vendiderit Duci Saxoniæ . . . Oportet iſtius tui patroni incredibilem eſſe, non jam dicam impudentiam, quia latitat, ſed nequitiam, cum quidem poſteaquam edito libello de ſacerdotiis adverſus Ruffum pro Molineo, proſcidit illos Beneficiarios commentarios (*Duareni*) nunc eos ſe adorare fingat . . . . . ſcilicet religionem nos docebit elegans magiſter Ciceronianæ ἀθεότητος (74).’

I am very certain, that all my readers will agree in comparing theſe paſſages of Baudouin and Beza together, that nothing could be more diſadvantageous to Hotman, than to anſwer, as Beza has done. Silence would have done him infinitely leſs hurt. To compleat his misfortune, Beza publiſhed (75) a letter of Sturmius, wherein he diſowns all that could be cited from him to the diſadvantage of Calvin and Beza; but as for Hotman, there is nothing like it.

Languet, a true Refugee, and a very honeſt man, having ſeen Sturmius's accuſations againſt Hotman, made very ſenſible reflexions, and altogether worthy of a good man; it was with the utmoſt ſorrow that he ſaw, that his countrymen behaved themſelves ſo ill in Germany, and that ſome men, who, under pretence of religion, endeavoured only to ſatisfy their vanity, did more injury to the Proteſtant religion, than the king of Spain and the Pope: however, he could not believe that Hotman could ſo far forget himſelf, as to be guilty of ſuch infamous actions. Theſe are his words: ‘ Hæc ſunt levia, ſi conferantur cum turpibus factis noſtrorum hominum in Germania, & quidem eorum qui ornati ſunt eruditione, & religionis ſpecie, inſinuarunt ſe in amicitiam bonorum virorum, qui ipſi ſumma beneficia exhibuerunt. Ut alios omittam, nuper vidi accuſationem Sturmii adverſus Hottomannum, quæ, ſi vera eſt, miſeret me Sturmii, & pudet alterius; ſed talia ſunt, ut mihi videantur vix poſſe venire in mentem erudito viro. Quidam mecum egerunt, ut ipſius accuſationis capita ad te perſcriberem, ſed à talibus miniſteriis ego planè abhorreo, cùm præſertim ſciam, te nec voluptatem nec utilitatem ex iis percipere poſſe, & ad me nihil pertineant, niſi fortè infamiæ pars in me redundet, eo quod à noſtris hominibus talia perpetrentur in ipſa Germania. Hæc ſane tanto dolore me afficiunt, ut neſciam an ex ulla re majorem unquam ſenſerim. Video ubique eorum ambitionem, qui prætextu Religionis ſua quærunt, magis obeſſe ipſius religionis progreſſui, quam Pontificem Ro. Regem Hiſpaniæ, & omnes ipſorum miniſtros; ſed de re odioſa nimis multa ſcribo (76). —— *Theſe are trifles, if compared with the baſe actions of our countrymen in Germany, and even of thoſe who are men of learning, and pretend to religion; who inſinuated themſelves into the friendſhip of good men there, from whom they received the greateſt favours. Not to mention others, I have lately ſeen an accuſation of Sturmius againſt Hotman, if the things alledged in it be true, I pity Sturmius, and am aſhamed of the other; but they indeed are of ſuch a nature, that I can hardly believe that a ſcholar could be guilty of them. Some people have deſired me to write the particulars of that accuſation to you, but I have a great averſion to ſuch a task, eſpecially ſince I know that you can neither reap pleaſure nor profit from it, and that I have no concern in them, except that I may poſſibly ſhare in the infamy, ariſing from ſuch things being done by our countrymen in Germany. I muſt own theſe things grieve me ſo much, that I do not know that ever any thing grieved me more. I ſee that the ambition of thoſe who under pretence of religion ſeek only their own advantage, doth more hurt to the progreſs of religion every where, than both the Pope, the king of Spain, and all their emiſſaries; but this is too much on ſo diſagreable a ſubject.*’ The letter out of which I have taken theſe words is dated from Paris, the eleventh of December, 1561. Another letter of his, dated from the ſame place the twenty third of January, 1526, informs us, that the duke of Guiſe, who was gone to ſee the biſhop of Straſburg at Saverne (77), had entered a proceſs againſt Francis Hotman, for defamatory libels, and that ſeveral people affirmed, that it was on that account he had undertaken that journey. Languet could not believe that ſo inconſiderable a motive had obliged the duke of Guiſe to go to Saverne; but I make no doubt, that he thought it was a ſhameful thing for Hotman to be proſecuted as a writer of libels.

[O] *I ſhall ſay a word or two concerning the author of Francis Hotman's life.*] His Latin name, *Petrus Neveletus Doſchius*, ſignifies *Peter Nevelet*, lord of Oſche. The title of that lordſhip, and that of *advocate in the parliament of Paris*, are given him in Paſquier's letters (78). He was ſon to a ſiſter of Peter Pitheus, as appears by a letter that uncle writ to him, which was printed at the end of Quintilian's Declamations, in ſome editions, Iſaac Nicolas Nevelet, his ſon, publiſhed Æſop, and other ancient fabuliſts, with notes, in 1610. This was the firſt fruit of his ſtudies, and he dedicated it to his father.

(73) Beza, Reſponſ. ad Balduin. ſub fin. pag. 233. Tom. II, Oper.

(74) Id. ibid. pag. 175.

(75) Beza, ubi ſupra, pag. 234.

(76) Languet, Epiſt lxiv, lib. ii, pag. 186, 187.

(77) Id. ibid. Epiſt. lxvii, pag 197.

(78) *See the eighth book of Paſquier's Letters, pag.* 467, *of the firſt Tome.*

HOTTINGER (John Henry), one of the moſt famous writers of the XVIIth century, was born at Zurich the tenth of March 1620. The progreſs he made in his firſt ſtudies, gave ſuch promiſing hopes, that the truſtees of the ſchools reſolved to ſend him to ſtudy in foreign countries at the public charge. He began his travels the twenty ſixth of March, 1638, and went to Geneva; from whence, after a ſtay of two months, he proceeded into France. He afterwards ſaw Flanders and Holland, and choſe Groningen for the ſeat of his ſtudies; but his deſire to perfect himſelf in the Oriental languages engaged him, a year after, to remove to Leyden (a), to be tutor to the children of profeſſor Golius, the moſt knowing man in thoſe languages of any in the world. He made a great progreſs in Arabic by Golius's aſſiſtance, and by the inſtruction of a Turk. He would have attended the embaſſador (b) of the States to Conſtantinople, in 1641, in quality of chaplain, if the magiſtrates of Zurich would have conſented to it; but they choſe rather to recal him that they might employ him for the reputation and good of their colleges. They permitted him to go over to ſee England before his return to Switzerland; and upon his return (c), they made him profeſſor of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; and a year after they gave him two other profeſſorſhips, that of catechetical Divinity, and that of the oriental languages. He married at twenty two years of age (d), and commenced author at twenty four [A]. He was ſo well pleaſed with that character, that he continually publiſhed a great many new books [B]. This was no difficulty to him; for he was extreamly laborious

(a) In the year 1639.

(b) William Boſwel.

(c) In the year 1642.

(d) See the remark [F].

[A] *And began to ſet up for an author at twenty four.*] It was not for a ſmall enterprize, but to attack, upon a very crabbed ſubject, one of the moſt learned men that was then in Europe. For he undertook to confute Father Morin's Diſſertations upon the Samaritan Pentateuch (1). We may therefore apply to him theſe verſes of the *Chapelain décoiffé:*

Mes pareils avec toi ſont dignes de ſe batre,
Et pour des coups d'eſſai veulent des Henris quatre.

My equals worthy are t'engage with thee,
And on four Henrys wou'd their courage prove.

This work, which he intituled *Exercitationes Anti-Moriniana*, was very grateful to the Proteſtants, whether becauſe of the learning of the author, or by reaſon of the ſubject, which could not be more favourable, ſince Hottinger defended the Hebrew text of the Bible, whoſe authority Father Morin invalidated as much as he could. Mr Simon judges this work to be one of the beſt that Hottinger publiſhed; and ſo it might be ſaid, that his firſt eſſay was his maſterpiece. Let us quote Mr Simon's paſſage at large: it is not very advantageous to the memory of this Swiſs doctor. ‘If Hottinger had obſerved ſome moderation in his works, and had not ſo much inſiſted on trifles, we might find ſomething uſeful in them, for the underſtanding of the literal ſenſe of the Scripture. But as he almoſt conſtantly wrote for a party, and compoſed his books with too much haſte, he is apt to fall into frequent miſtakes. One of his beſt works upon this ſubject, is that which he wrote againſt the *Samaritanæ Exercitationes* of Father Morin, but neither is he altogether exact in that work (2).’ Mr Simon, in another piece, has criticiſed this book of Hottinger; but lightly, and without any real deſign of prejudicing him. Theſe are his words (3): ‘Joannes Henricus Hottingerus, qui ſtatim à Libri ſui limine cujus hæc eſt inſcriptio, *Exercitationes Anti-Morinianæ de Pentateucho Samaritano ejuſque udentica authentica*, Morinum appellat Monachum qui communem Monachorum ſortem ſuperet. Ille de Samaritanis & eorum codicibus diſſerit, putatque Samaritanos à Judæis Pentateuchi ſui exemplar hauſiſſe; ſed conjecturis tantum, non autem firmiſſimis rationibus, ut ita ſentiret adduci potuit; iſtud minus accuratum eſſe probat exemplis aliquot Pleonaſmorum, vocum vel mutatarum in alias vel omiſſarum, ſimilibuſque erroribus quos profert, & ex quibus confici poſſe arbitratur, non magis credendum eſſe Samaritanis Pentateuchum ſuum jactantibus, quam Ebionitis verum & ſolum Matthæi Evangelium Hebræum venditantibus: qua in re profecto graviſſime hallucinatus eſt Hottingerus, qui tam venerandæ antiquitatis Pentateuchum Samaritanum cum adulterato Ebionitarum Evangelio comparare audeat. Morinum etiam imperitiæ arguit Hottingerus, quaſi Rabbinorum quorundam quos laudaverat mentem haud aſſecutus fuiſſet. —— *John Henry Hottinger, in the very beginning of his book, intituled,* Excercitations againſt Morin concerning the authenticity of the Samaritan Peutateuch, *calls Morin a monk, learned above the common rate of his fraternity. In this book he treats of the Samaritans and their copies, and thinks that the Samaritans derived their copy of the Pentateuch from the Jews; but he muſt have been induced to think ſo rather from conjectures than ſtrong proofs; he ſhows the inaccuracy of it, by producing ſome examples of pleonaſms, omiſſions, or changes of words, and ſuch like errors, from which he thinks it may be proved that we are no more to believe the Samaritans when they boaſt of their Pentateuch, than the Ebionites pretences of being poſſeſſed of the only genuine Hebrew goſpel of St Matthew: In this Hottinger has been guilty of a groſs blunder to dare to compare the Samaritan Pentateuch, which is of ſuch venerable antiquity, to the ſpurious goſpel of the Ebionites. He likewiſe accuſeth Morin of ignorance, pretending that he had not underſtood the ſenſe of ſome Rabbies whom he had cited.*’ Mr Heidegger is in the right to obſerve, that Father Morin's ſilence was a glorious thing to our Hottinger; but I queſtion whether he underſtood the thought of Father Merſenne (4): ‘Liber toti erudito orbi charus, acceptuſque fuit. Conſtat Morinum diu adhuc ſuperſtitem librum accepiſſe & legiſſe, neque contra mutire auſum (5). Et Merſennus, cui Hottingerus librum adjunctis literis miſit, id ſolùm reſpondit, nec ſibi Hottingeri juvenilem ardorem ſatis probari, nec Hottingerum Morinum penitus noſſe. Quaſi videlicet juveni integrum non fuerit ſenum deliria taxare, & ipſe Morinus interiorem animi ſui notam in vulgus edito libro non patefecerit. —— *This book was received with great applauſe by all the learned world. It is certain that Morin, who lived a long time after, received and read it, but never dared to write any thing in anſwer to it. And Merſennus, to whom Hottinger ſent a copy of his book, together with a letter, only anſwered, that he did not approve of Hottinger's youthful heat, and that Morin was not throughly known to Hottinger. As if, forſooth, it were not lawful for a young man to find fault with the dreams of old men, and as if Morin had not ſufficiently ſhown to the world his intention in publiſhing that book.*’ Father Merſenne ſeems to mean nothing elſe, but that Hottinger did not well know Father Morin. I doubt not but the ſenſe of his anſwer was this, ‘the heat of youth has carried you too far, and if you knew the real merit of Father Morin, you would not have treated him in that manner.’ Do you pretend to confute this, by ſaying, that Father Morin has diſcovered the bottom of his heart by his work? I grant he diſcovered that his deſign was to raiſe the credit of the vulgar Latin, and to enervate the authority of the original text; but is not this the general intereſt and deſign of the Romiſh controverſiſts? Hottinger did not very well know Father Morin, ſince he took him for a monk.

[B] *He continually publiſhed new books.*] If you would ſee an exact liſt of all the books he publiſhed, from the year 1644, to the year 1664, read his *Bibliotheca Tigurina* (6), you will there find the hiſtory, and

(1) Printed in 1631, and not in 16[illegible]1, as it is ſaid in Father Morin's Life, pag. 22, edit. Francof.

(2) Simon, Hiſtoire Critique du Vieux Teſtament, livr. iii, chap. xix, pag. m. 474.

(3) In Vita Joh. Morini, pag. 36, 37.

(4) Jo. Henr. Heideggerus, in Vita Hottingeri ad annum, 1644.

(5) *The following words of Hottinger have relation to this:* Non diſplicuerant hæ primitiæ viris eruditis, qui hinc inde novo Morini conatui finem impoſitum publicis teſtabantur ſcriptis. *Hotting. in Bibl. Tigurina, pag.* 122.

(6) *Pag.* 121, *& ſeq.*

was taken up by Mr Claude [*I*].

‘*countrymen.*’ Hottinger defended himſelf in few words (26): as for Ecchellenſis, he put him in mind (27) of the blunders, of which he had been convicted, and he ſhewed him ſome others. ‘Præfatus eſt illi libro de gradibus ſtudii Philologiæ, inſerta ſimul Apologia brevi adverſus Abrahamum Ecchellenſem, qui Præfatione in Catalogum librorum Chaldæorum Hebed Jeſu Metropolitæ Sobenſis, traduxit Seldenum, Hottingerum noſtrum, Calixtum, Ludovicum de Dieu, Conſtantinum L'Empereur, Salmaſium, eo potiſſimùm nomine, quod Orientalibus ſtudiis intenti, germanam tamen verborum ſignificationem, ut plurimum non deprehendant, ambigua & obſcura pro certis & luculentiſſimis ſtatuant, atque interim ea, quæ in clariſſima luce verſantur, quod ipſorum commenta radicitus extirpent, omnino prætereant. Verum non aliam defenſionem tum ſui, tum virorum horum doctiſſimorum, quos eâdem accuſatione involverat adverſarius, Hottingerus paravit, quàm in memoriam revocatis Ecchellenſi errorum plauſtris, quæ ipſi à contribulibus Flavignio, Gabriele Sionita, Johanne Morino objecta ſunt; nec non ex proprio ingenio demonſtratis notoriis ſphalmatis, quæ ille in tractatu Arabico-Latino, *Synopſis propoſitorum ſapientiæ Arabum Philoſophorum* inſcripto, adverſus genium Arabicæ linguæ admiſit (28). —— *He wrote a preface to the book concerning the degrees of the ſtudy of Philology, and therein inſerted a ſhort apology for himſelf againſt Abraham Ecchellenſis, who, in a preface to a catalogue of the Chaldaic books of Hebed Jeſu, Metropolitan of Seba, traduced Selden, our Hottinger, Calixtus, Lewis de Dieu, Conſtantine L'Empereur, and Salmaſius, accuſing them that notwithſtanding their application to Oriental learning, they had for the moſt part miſtaken the genuine ſignification of words, and laid down ambiguous and obſcure matters as certain and evident truths; tho' they at the ſame time paſſed by many things which are of the cleareſt nature, becauſe they entirely ruined their hypotheſis. Hottinger contented himſelf here inſtead of all other defence of himſelf, and of theſe learned men, whom his adverſary had involved in the ſame accuſation with putting Eſchellenſis in mind of the numberleſs blunders which had been objected to him by thoſe of his own tribe; to wit, by Flavigny, Gabriel Sionita, and John Morin; adding likewiſe ſome notorious miſtakes which Ecchellenſis had been guilty of in his treatiſe in Arabic and Latin, intituled,* Synopſis propoſitorum ſapientiæ Arabum Philoſophorum, *againſt the genius of the Arabic tongue.*’

[*I*] *Mr Arnauld had a fling at him, but was taken up by Mr Claude.*] ‘I relate this hiſtory (29) chiefly upon the credit of Allatius, who took a particular care to inform himſelf of it, and who being a Greek by nation, is more credible than Dutch or Swiſs miniſters, and than Hottinger amongſt others, who is one of the moſt paſſionate and unſincere writers I ever read.’ Theſe are Mr Arnauld's words (30); and this is Mr Claude's anſwer. ‘Why would Mr Arnauld have us rather believe Allatius than Hottinger? The firſt has all the characters of a paſſionate writer, who is always miſrepreſenting things; the later, on the contrary, whatever Mr Arnauld may ſay, has all the marks of a man of ſincerity, who ſpeaks things as he knows them. The firſt is more polite and more elegant I confeſs; but the other has more ſincerity. Allatius ſays of his own head whatever he pleaſes; Hottinger brings his witneſſes.’

HUARTE (JOHN) lived in the XVIth century, and acquired great reputation by a book which he publiſhed in Spaniſh, and has been tranſlated into diverſe languages, and frequently reprinted [*A*]. He treats there of the trial of wits, proper for the ſciences, and lays down many things which make one preſume that he did not follow the common road of Phyſicians; but was able to make many diſcoveries by his profound meditation, and careful ſtudy of the antients. However, it is not prudent to depend entirely, either on his maxims, or on all the authorities he alledges; for he is not to be truſted on either of theſe heads (*a*), his hypotheſes alſo are frequently chimerical, eſpecially when he pretends to teach us the formalities neceſſary to be obſerved, in order to beget children of a fine genius. There are many things in that part of his book which are contrary to modeſty, and which have been too groſsly tranſlated by Gabriel Chappuis. He is not to be excuſed for giving as an authentic piece, a pretended letter of the proconſul Lentulus from Jeruſalem to the Roman ſenate, containing a portrait of JESUS CHRIST, a deſcription of his ſtature, of the colour of his hair, the qualities of his beard, *&c.* There has been a criticiſm publiſhed on this author [*B*]. He was accounted a Spaniard, but was born in a town of the French Navarre (*b*).

[*A*] *He acquired great reputation by a book, which he publiſhed in Spaniſh, and has been tranſlated into diverſe languages and frequently reprinted.*] It was tranſlated into Italian by Camillo Camilli. This tranſlation was dedicated by Nicolo Manaſſi to Frederic Pendaſius, profeſſor of Philoſophy at Bologna (1). The epiſtle dedicatory is dated from Venice, the firſt of March 1582: the edition which I uſe is printed at Venice *preſſo Aldo* 1590 in 8vo. This book was tranſlated into French by Gabriel Chappuis in the year 1580. The title of his verſion is, *Anacriſe ou parfait Jugement & Examen des Eſprits propres & naiz aux Sciences, &c.* (2). that is, ‘An Anacriſis or perfect judgment and trial of wits, proper and born for the ſciences: wherein by wonderful and uſeful ſecrets, drawn both from true, natural, and divine Philoſophy, is ſhown the difference of the gifts and abilities of men, and for what ſort of ſtudy each man's genius is proper: ſo that whoever ſhall read this book with attention, may diſcover the property of his own genius, and will be able too chooſe that ſcience in which he ſhall make the greateſt progreſs.’ There is a better French tranſlation than this, it was printed at Amſterdam by John de Raveſtein in 1672. The tranſlator's name is Francis Savinien d'Alquié. It contains the additions which John Huarte made to the laſt edition of his book: they are conſiderable both in quantity and quality; but the new tranſlator could not inſert them in their proper places, and was obliged to give ſome of them at the beginning and ſome at the end of the book. I know the Latin verſion only by means of the Catalogue of the Bodleian Library. It was printed in the year 1622 in 8vo, and tranſlated by Æſch Major.

[*B*] *There has been a criticiſm on this author.*] It is intituled *L'Examen de l'Examen des Eſprits.* The name of the author of it is Jourdain Guibelet. Let us inſert this paſſage of Sorel (3). ‘The Spaniſh author of the trial of wits has been admired by ſome (4), and condemned by others. I ſhall not inſiſt on what they reproach him with, to wit, that he aſcribes ſo much efficacy to corporeal qualities, that one would think the ſoul depends upon them, and would hinder us from believing it to be immaterial and immortal. He ſufficiently defends himſelf on this head, by replying, that the ſoul of man acts only according to the diſpoſition of the organs; nevertheleſs it is ſtill thought, that he has too much ſubjected this ſpiritual ſubſtance to groſs and corporeal parts; and that the compariſons which he has drawn from brutes, and even the moſt imperfect of them, ſuch as inſects, are diſhonourable to ſo noble a creature as man; that it is likewiſe ridiculous to attribute aridity to ants, and ſuch inſects, becauſe they are wiſe, and from thence to draw a conſequence that prudence muſt be found in dry conſtitutions: for by what art has he been able to diſcover whether there is more

---

(26) In Eneade Diſſert. Philologico-Theolog. *printed in* 1662.

(27) *In the preface to* Etymolog. Orientalis, ſive Lexici Harmonico-Pentaglotti, *publiſhed in the year* 1661.

(28) Heidegger. in Vita Hotting.

(29) *Viz.* that of Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Conſtantinople.

(30) Perpetuité Defenduë, livr. iv. chap. vi. pag. 561. *Bruſſels, in 12mo.*

(31) Reponſe à la Perpetuité de la Foi, livr. iii, cap. xii, pag. m. 467.

(*a*) *See* L'Apologie de Coſtar, pag. 213, 214.

(*b*) *At* St Jean de Peid de Port. *See* Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franç. pag. 432.

(1) He had been formerly profeſſor at Padua.

(2) *See* Du Verdier, Biblioth. Françoiſe, pag. 432.

(3) Sorel de la Perfection de l'Homme, pag. 327.

(4) Anthony Zara (who wrote a book of the Anatomy of Wits and Sciences) Peter Charron, and others, receive the doctrine of this Spaniard, almoſt without contradiction. *Ibid. pag.* 335.

humidity or aridity in the brains of flies, which ſeem to be very humid? How likewiſe has he obſerved the difference betwixt the brains of bees and common flies, the firſt of which are reckoned very wiſe and the other quite the contrary? We ſhall not find any great difference in their brains upon diſſection, and if he ſays that the one have dry brains and the others humid, it is becauſe he has obſerved that the one are prudent, and the others imprudent, and not becauſe he has judged of their prudence or imprudence, by their aridity or humidity . . . . Some alſo object to the author of the Trial of Wits, that he has not well eſtabliſhed the temperaments for each faculty of the ſoul, and that he ought not to aſcribe the judgment alone to aridity but likewiſe the memory, and that theſe two faculties are not incompatible. Thus there are many things objected to ſeveral of his propoſitions, which have given occaſion to a French Phyſician, to write a Trial of his Trial, wherein he ſtrongly refutes the greateſt part of his doctrine. He treats it according to his fancy in a book as large as the other (5).' Sorel afterwards, makes ſome remarks againſt the doctrine of the author of the Trial of Wits. I ſhall inſert the following. 'Some have enquired into the means of putting the natural faculties in good condition. And in order to judge the better of them, they are not ſatisfied with obſerving men in themſelves, by their external marks; but have even carried their enquiries as far as the cauſes, to wit, to the time and place of their birth, and above all to the parents who begot them, who are the real ſources of the temperament, and have a great influence in making uſe of one humour or another. This being allowed, in order to make their doctrine the more acceptable, they have pretended at the ſame time to preſcribe remedies for the bad qualities which they diſcovered, or to give aſſiſtances to the acquiſition of the good. And in order to ſeek the perfection of men in their remoteſt origin, they would provide for their happy birth, and direct that they who bring them into the world ſhould uſe all manner of precautions to beget them with all the qualities which they deſire they ſhould have. Some Naturaliſts have enquired of what temperament and what age a man and a woman ought to be, in order to marriage, and how they ought to nouriſh and govern themſelves, that they may have children of good conſtitutions. The author of the Trial of Wits has added to this, the mannner of procreating them of ſuch temperaments, as ſhall render them fit to make progreſs in the liberal arts and ſciences. Both the one and the other lay it down as a rule, that great care ought to be taken in marriages, that a man of a very hot conſtitution ſhould be joined to a woman of a more moderate temperament, who has that humidity which he wants in order to form a perfect temperament. But it would be a very difficult matter to make ſuch enquiries, becauſe a great many other things are neceſſary to an agreeable match, which are principally regarded: it is ordinarily thought that as to bodily qualities, it is enough if the married perſons are not infirm or deformed. As to the manner of living of married people and the time of generation, and other obſervations which are preſcribed, in order to have ſons or daughters, and even to have them born with conſtitutions, proper for particular profeſſions, tho' all theſe I ſay do not ſucceed ſo exactly as we may promiſe to our ſelves, yet they muſt needs be attended with good conſequences. Some men leſs circumſpect enjoy theſe advantages without all this care: but that proceeds from the great vigour of their conſtitutions (6).'

It cannot be doubted that John Huarte has laid down ſome general maxims which are very true; ſuch as, for example, that it is advantageous to employ all perſons in thoſe profeſſions, for which they are moſt fitted by nature; that there are many who would have ſucceeded in the ſtudy of the Law, if they had not been ſet apart for the ſtudy of Phyſic; that great inconveniencies flow from the ſmall regard, that is had to natural diſpoſitions in the choice of employments: but it is very difficult to prevent this diſorder. The expedient which the author propoſed to Philip II, king of Spain, would not be attended with all the advantages which might be imagined. 'As I obſerve, *ſays he* (7), that the mind of man is ſo narrow and limited, that it is hardly ſufficient for one thing, I have always been of opinion that one can never be perfectly maſter of two different arts, and that we muſt of neceſſity be ignorant of one of them; this made Plato ſay, in his book concerning laws, *Nemo ærarius ſimul & lignarius faber ſit; duas enim artes, aut ſtudia duo, diligenter exercere humana natura non poteſt.* (No man can be both a good Smith and a good Carpenter; for human nature cannot excel in two arts or ſtudies): So I think that wiſe and knowing men ought to be appointed to examine the genius of children in their youth, in order to oblige them to follow that ſcience, which beſt ſuits them, without leaving it to their own fancy, leſt they ſhould make a bad choice of one leſs advantageous or leſs uſeful. By this means your majeſty would have the moſt exquiſite artiſts, and the moſt finiſhed works in the world in your dominions, and perſons who moſt happily join art with nature. I could wiſh likewiſe that all your univerſities ſhould uſe the ſame methods, and that as they do not permit the ſcholars to paſs from one faculty to another, till they are well skilled in Latin; ſo they would likewiſe appoint perſons to examine whether a ſcholar who wants to ſtudy Logic, Philoſophy, Phyſic, Divinity, or Law, has the genius which each of theſe ſciences requires in order to ſucceed in it: for beſides that it is a great injury to the public, for a perſon to exerciſe an art of which he is ignorant, ſo it is a great preſumption for a man to labour and rack his brain about a thing in which he can never acquit himſelf with honour.' What he ſays elſewhere would be ſtill more embaraſſing and doubtful in practice: 'In a well ordered commonwealth there ought to be marriage-makers, who ſhould know, by the rules of art, the qualities that perſons who marry ſhould have in order to a marriage's being happy for both parties. Hippocrates and Galen began to labour in this ſcience, and have given rules how to diſtinguiſh betwixt a fruitful and a barren woman, and betwixt a man fit for propagation and one who is unfit. But concerning theſe matters they have wrote but little, and not ſo diſtinctly as they ought, at leaſt, as is neceſſary for the preſent purpoſe (8).

(5) Sorel, ubi ſupra, pag. 327, 328.

(6) Sorel, de la Perfection de l'Homme, pag. 335, 336.

(7) Huarte, *epiſtle dedicatory*.

(8) Huarte, Examen des Eſprits, chap. xv, fol. m. 207.

HUGUES (James) a divine and canon, born at Liſle in Flanders, printed a book at Rome in 1655, of a moſt ſingular kind, conſidering the chimeras with which it is filled [*A*]. He dedicated it to Pope Alexander VII, and in his Epiſtle Dedicatory are ſeveral ridiculous applications.

[*A*] *He printed a book of a moſt ſingular kind, conſidering the chimeras with which it is filled.*] Here follows the title of it. *Vera Hiſtoria Romana, ſeu Origo Latii vel Italiæ ac Romanæ Urbis è tenebris longæ vetuſtatis in lucem producta. Liber primus qui primordia Europæ ac Latii primævi Annales demonſtrat atque urbis conditæ. Romæ, typis Franciſci Monetæ, M.DC.LV.* The true Roman hiſtory, or the origin of Latium or Italy, and of the city of Rome, brought to light out of the darkneſs of remote antiquity. Book the firſt, which contains an account of the firſt peopling of Europe, and the annals of antient Latium, and of the building of Rome. It contains 284 pages in 4to (1). A paſſage which I am going to cite from the Memoirs of Trevoux will give ſome idea of this extravagant production. According to James Hugues 'there never exiſted ſuch perſons as Janus, Æneas, or Romulus: all that has been ſaid of them is taken from the predictions of I do not know what Sybil, who, in the prophecies which ſhe delivered concerning St Peter, had given this ſaint the names of theſe heroes; and according to the prophetic ſtyle, had made uſe of the paſt time inſtead of the future. The book of the origin of Rome, compoſed by this author, is full of viſions as extraordinary as this is (2).

(1) Konig ſays this book was printed at Rome in folio, in 1655. I never ſaw that edition.

(2) Father Tournemine, in a Memoir inſerted in the Journal of Trevoux, February 1704, pag. 335, 336, of the Trevoux edition.

HUNGARY (Mary, Queen of) ſiſter of the emperor Charles V, was married in the year 1521 to Lewis king of Hungary, who unfortunately loſt his life at the battle of Mohatz in the year 1526. His widow was made governeſs of the Low-Countries in 1531, and ſhewed a great deal of courage and prudence in that poſt [*A*]. She exerciſed it till the abdication of Charles V, whom ſhe followed into Spain, where ſhe died the eighteenth of October 1558. She loved magnificence exceedingly [*B*], and was extreamly fond of hunting [*C*]. It is ſaid ſhe endeavoured to moderate the puniſhment of the Proteſtants [*D*). She underſtood Latin (*a*). There was a perſonal hatred betwixt her and Henry II, which occaſioned many ravages. They ruined in their turns even the country-ſeats of each other. Mary began this ſort of hoſtilities, to revenge herſelf for ſome ſongs that had been made againſt her honour in France [*E*]. Henry knew how to return theſe injuries [*F*]. He paſſionately deſired to make her a priſoner

[*A*] *She ſhewed a great deal of courage and prudence in her government.*] Conſult Brantome who tells you, ‘ that this queen of Hungary was very uſeful to the emperor, *and that ſhe proved ſo very ſerviceable to him, that one cannot tell* how he could have done without her, and that he ſo depended upon her in all the affairs of her government, that when the emperor himſelf was in Flanders, he referred all the affairs of the Low-Country to her, and the council was held under her and in her palace. It is true that ſhe, being a great politician, informed him of all that paſſed in the council when he was not there; which was a great pleaſure to him. She carried on glorious wars there ſometimes by her lieutenants, ſometimes in perſon, always on horſeback, as a valiant amazon (1).’ What he ſays (2) of the ſpeech ſhe made on the day of the abdication, is very curious. We have here a proof, that women are capable of reigning well.

[*B*] *She loved magnificence wonderfully.*] Brantome ſays (3), that when Philip II went to take poſſeſſion of the Low-Countries, the moſt ſumptuous entries that can be imagined were made for him; but he adds, ‘ the queen of Hungary ſurpaſſed them all in her houſes at Bains and Marimont.’ He afterwards deſcribes ‘ the ſiege of a place, which that queen repreſented to divert the emperor and all his court, in her fine houſe of Marimont.’ He ſays in another book (4) ‘ that ſhe feaſted at Bains the emperor Charles and all his court, when his ſon king Philip came from Spain to Flanders to ſee her, where the magnificence was ſo great that nothing was ſo much talked of then as *las fieſtas de Bains*, as the Spaniards called it: I remember likewiſe, that in the journey to Bayonne how great ſoever the magnificence was, in running at the ring, combats, maſquerades, and expences that were ſeen, yet all was nothing if compared with *las fieſtas de Bains*, as ſome old Spaniſh gentlemen, who had ſeen them, reported.’

[*C*] . . . *and was extreamly fond of hunting.*] She accompanied her husband every where, ‘ even when he went a hunting, for which ſhe had a wonderful paſſion; being afterwards regent of the Low-Countries for her brother the emperor Charles V, ſhe often quitted her agreeable palaces of Mechlen and Bruſſels, to live in the country at Marimont and in her houſes near the foreſts; where from morning till night ſhe diverted herſelf with hunting. For which reaſon the Flemings called her the Huntreſs, and painted her like Diana: ſhe communicated that inclination to her niece Margaret of Auſtria, ducheſs of Parma, who has been alſo governeſs of the Low-Countries. She had inherited a paſſion for the laborious exerciſes of hunting from her grandmother by her father's ſide, Mary ducheſs of Burgundy, wife of the emperor Maximilian I, who being a hunting, (with which ſhe almoſt every day diverted herſelf) fell from her horſe, and died to the great grief of the Flèmings and the emperor her husband, who loſt alſo his ſecond wife Blanche Sforza by the ſame misfortune (5).’ This ſeems to be the tranſlation of theſe words of Strada: *Capiebatur venandi ſtudio ſummopere Gubernatrix, plane ut Venatricem vulgo appellarent, habituque venatricis expingerent: neptem videlicet Mariæ Burgundæ, quæ ab inſectandis feris numquam deſtitit, donec inter venandum equo excuſſa vitam amiſit* †, *fato non tam ſuo, quàm Maximiliani mariti, cujus & uxor altera, Blanca Sfortia, in venatione equo decidit, obiitque* ‡. *Ejuſmodi autem ſtudium arripuit tam avide, in eumque laborem duravit adeo membra decennis nondum puella* (6), *ut amitam per ſaltus campoſque ſequeretur impavida* (7).

[*D*] *It is ſaid ſhe endeavoured to moderate the puniſhment of the Proteſtants.*] When to appeaſe the malecontents of the Low-Countries, the court of Spain promiſed them the ſuſpenſion of the Inquiſition in the year 1566; it was added, that the imperial laws which condemned Heretics to death, ſhould be mitigated, as they had been in the year 1550, at the requeſt of the queen of Hungary. ‘ Immo ſic Cæſarem facturum fuiſſe ſi viveret, quando ipſe ob ſimiles difficultates anno milleſimo quingenteſimo quinquageſimoque, poſtulante Mariâ Hungariæ Reginâ ejus ſorore, eaſdem pœnas quas ante ſtatuerat, emendare ac lenire non inutile aut indecorum arbitratus eſt (8).’

[*E*] *She begun theſe ſort of hoſtilities to revenge herſelf for ſome ſongs that had been made againſt her honour in France.*] Here is what we find in Brantome upon this ſubject (9). ‘ I have heard ſay, that the chief reaſon, that moved the queen of Hungary to burn Picardy, and other parts of France, was the inſolence of ſome babblers and ſtory-tellers, who ſpoke commonly of her amours, and ſung every where the Barbanſon of the queen of Hungary, which was a very coarſe ballad, and fit only for the mouths of ſuch rude reiſters.’ By this we ſee that the people are fated to bear the puniſhment not only of the follies of their ſovereigns (10), but alſo of many others. I ſhall ſet down a paſſage which does not ſeem to be full enough. ‘ There was a great hatred between Henry II, and the queen of Hungary, the occaſion whereof I do not know; but only that the French ſoldiers had made ſongs of her, and of Barbanſon the fineſt lord of her court (11).’ It was an eaſy thing to ſupply what is wanting in this diſcourſe; it was but ſaying that this queen ſet on fire ſeveral places of Picardy, even without ſparing the royal palace of Folembrai. By this we underſtand the reaſon of their perſonal hatred on both ſides. Mary doubtleſs believed, that Henry applauded theſe ſongs, and ſhe perſonally hated him for it. Henry on the other ſide took the burning of his houſe of pleaſure for a perſonal affront. I know not what we are to believe of the gallantries of this princeſs; I only remember what Brantome ſays (12), ‘ that ſhe was very handſome and agreeable, and very amiable, although ſhe appeared ſomewhat manly; but as for love, ſhe was not the worſe for it, nor for war, which ſhe made her principal exerciſe.’

If you deſire to know when ſhe made theſe ravages in Picardy; you need only caſt your eyes on the following words. ‘ Whilſt the emperor her brother was beſieging Metz, ſhe came with the count de Rœux into Picardy to make a diverſion, and ſo hinder the king from ſuccouring the beſieged, where ſhe made a great havock, and burnt Noyon, Neſle, Chauny, Roye, Folembrai, a royal palace, built by king Francis I, and ruined above ſeven or eight hundred villages; ſhe laid ſiege to Heiden and took it (13).’

[*F*] *Henry knew how to return theſe injuries.*] Having taken Marienburg and Dinant, and razed Bouvines, whoſe inhabitants were either hanged or put to the ſword, he paſſed the Sambre, and ruined Hainault, ‘ and burnt Mariemont, a country-ſeat built by the queen of Hungary; and the pretty town of Bains (14), with the magnificent palace ſhe had built there, adorned with infinite pictures, antient ſtatues, and works of graving and ſculpture. The antient town of Bavets, of whoſe antiquity and greatneſs, the old chroniclers have told a thouſand ſtories, ſuffered a like deſolation. Theſe burnings and deſtructions were very far from the temper of Henry II; but he thought himſelf in honour obliged thus to revenge the ruin of his caſtle of Folembrai, and the affront

(*a*) *See remark* [*H*].

(1) Brantôme, Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. 91.

(2) Ibid. pag. 95.

(3) Id. Memoirs, Tom. II, *in the Elogy of Henry II, pag.* 23.

(4) Memoires des Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. 92.

(5) Hilarion de Coſte, Elog. des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. II, pag. 561.

† 1482.

‡ 1496.

(6) *That is, Margaret, natural daughter of Charles V.*

(7) Strada, de Bello Belg. lib. i, pag. m. 45.

(8) Fam. Strada, Decad. I, lib. v, pag. 217.

(9) Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. 388.

(10) Quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi. *Horat. Epiſt. ii, lib. i, ver.* 14.

(11) Mezerai. Hiſt. de France, Tom. II, pag. 1090.

(12) Dames Galantes Tom. II, pag 90.

(13) Hilar. de Coſte, ubi ſupra, pag. 567.

(14) *He ſhould have ſaid* Binche.

priſoner [*G*]. Eraſmus dedicated a book to this princeſs, in which the Printers maliciouſly made a very ſtrange fault [*H*]. Father Hilarion de Coſte has committed ſome ſmall errors of Chronology [*I*]; and has not been well copied in every thing by Moreri [*K*]. I paſs over in ſilence the ſcandalous reports concerning the amours of Charles V, with the queen of Hungary [*L*], the mother, as they pretend, of Don John of Auſtria.

‘ affront of the Flemings, who had two days together there expoſed a picture of the great king Francis, his father, to the inſolence of the populace (15).’ I add to this teſtimony of Mezerai that of Brantome, which contains more circumſtances. ‘ It was ſhe that firſt began the great conflagration in our France, and made bon-fires of our fine houſes, and caſtles, as of that of Folembrai, a fine and agreeable houſe which our kings had built for the ſport and pleaſure of hunting; which gave the king ſo much indignation and trouble, that ſome time after he paid her in her own coin, revenging himſelf upon the fine houſe of Bains, which was reckoned the wonder of the world, ſurpaſſing (as I have heard thoſe relate who have ſeen it in it's perfection) the ſeven wonders of the world, ſo renowned in antiquity (16).’ There was in this queen's chamber in that palace *a ſuit of tapeſtry of gold, ſilver, and ſilk, wherein were figured and repreſented to the life* all the conqueſts and expeditions of Charles V (17). ‘ (18) In a word, there was nothing in it but what was exquiſitly fine: But the poor houſe quickly after loſt it's glory; for it was totally pillaged, ruined, and razed. I have heard ſay, that it's miſtreſs, when ſhe knew the ruin of it, fell into ſuch anguiſh, indignation, and rage, that ſhe could not for a long time recover herſelf; and coming one day near it, deſirous to ſee it's ruins, and looking upon it very pitifully with tears in her eyes, ſhe ſwore that all France ſhould repent of it, and that ſhe ſhould never be at eaſe till the fine Fontaine-bleau, which was ſo highly valued ſhould be levelled with the ground, and not one ſtone left upon another. And indeed ſhe diſcharged her rage upon poor Picardy (19), which felt it very heavily and the flames: and I believe if a truce had not intervened, her vengeance had been exceſſive; for ſhe had a heart that was great and could not eaſily be ſoftned; and ſhe was thought to be ſomewhat inclined to cruelty. But ſuch is the nature of women, eſpecially of great ones, who are too eager for revenge, when they are offended. The emperor, as it is ſaid, loved her the better for it.’ Some hiſtorians ſay, that Henry II, had an inſcription ingraved on a ſtone, which reproached this queen with folly, and put her in mind of Folembrai. *Bincium Mariæ Hungariæ Reginæ olim deliciæ Henrici ſecundi Galliarum Regis odium expertæ. Feruntque repertum inibi ſaxum, quod Henricus villæ ſuæ à Maria vaſtatæ ultor inciderat in hæc verba:* Inſana Regina, Folembræum memoria repete (20).

[G] *He deſired to make her a priſoner.*] Brantome tells us this (21). ‘ I have heard ſay, *ſays he*, that the late king Henry II, deſired nothing ſo much as to take the queen of Hungary priſoner, not to treat her ill, tho' ſhe had given him many occaſions by her ravages; but to have the glory of keeping that queen a priſoner, and to ſee what countenance and conſtancy ſhe would ſhew in priſon, and whether ſhe would be as brave and haughty as in arms: for there is nothing ſo lofty and brave as a great lady when ſhe pleaſes, and has courage as this lady had; and who was much pleaſed with the name the Spaniſh ſoldiers had given her, who, as they called the emperor her brother *el Padre de los ſoldados*, called her *la madre:* juſt as *Victoria*, or *Victorina*, in the old time of the Romans, was called in her armies *the mother of the camp* (22).’

[*H*] *Eraſmus dedicated a book to her, in which the Printers maliciouſly made a very ſtrange fault.*] The book which Eraſmus dedicated to her in the year 1529, is intituled *Vidua Chriſtiana*. The author declares, ſhe was wonderfully pleaſed with the reading of Latin books. ‘ Cæſaris germana *Maria* Latinos codices habebat in deliciis, cui nuper ſcripſi Viduam Chriſtianam. Id efflagitarat à me quidam Eccleſiaſtes illi chariſſimus. Scena rerum humanarum invertitur, monachi literas neſciunt, & fœminæ libris indulgent (23).’ She was then in Auſtria, from whence ſhe retired a little after into Moravia (24), not thinking herſelf ſafe Vienna, by reaſon of Solyman's irruption. But to come to the malicious fault of the Printers, you muſt know they were vexed they had not received the new-years gift they expected from the author. Hereupon the greateſt toper of them all undertook to be revenged, and found a means for it, which vexed Eraſmus heartily, and which cannot be tranſlated into another language. We muſt therefore be contented with the original. ‘ Nuper cùm inter imprimendum excuſores aliquot conqueſti fuiſſent me ſibi xenia nondum perſolviſſe, exortus eſt inter eos quidam cæteris vinolentior, qui profiteretur ſe pœnas à me exacturum, ni darem: atque id profectò veterator tam egregie effecit, ut auries nummis trecentis redimere eam ignominiam voluiſſem. Cùm enim in *Vidua* mea, quam ſereniſſimæ *Hungariæ* Reginæ dedicaveram, ad laudem cujuſdam ſanctiſſimæ fœminæ inter alia liberalitatem illius in pauperes referrem, hæc verba ſubjunxi: *Atque mente illâ uſam ſemper fuiſſe, quæ talem fœminam deceret.* Unde ſceleſtus ille animadvertens ſibi vindictæ occaſionem oblatam eſſe, ex *mente illa mentula* fecit. Itaque volumina mille fuere impreſſa (25).’

[*I*] *Father* Hilarian de Coſte *has committed ſome ſmall errors of Chronology.*] I. He ſays (26) that our queen of Hungary was born at Bruxelle the thirteenth of September, 1513. Which is falſe and impoſſible, ſince the arch-duke her father died in 1506. There is 1503, and not 1513, in Moreri's Dictionary. II. The ceremonies of that princeſs's marriage were not performed at Buda in the year 1521, *to the great content of Uladiſlaus* (27), king of Hungary, for Uladiſlaus died in 1516. III Queen Mary did not *live continually at Lintz in Auſtria* (28), during the years 1527, 1528, 1529, 1530. I have cited (29) Eraſmus, who aſſures us, that in 1529 ſhe retired into Moravia. IV. She did not govern the Low-Countries twenty eight years (30), but twenty four (31), namely, from 1531 to 1555. The author I confute contradicting himſelf confeſſes, page 569, that this government laſted but twenty five years; but he has committed many faults there. V. He ſuppoſes that the queen of Hungary reſigned *her government into her brother's hands in October* 1557. It was the twenty fifth of October, in 1555. VI. He ſuppoſes that Margaret of Auſtria, governeſs of the Netherlands, died in 1532. It was in the year 1530. In the elogy of this princeſs (32), he makes her to be born the tenth of January, 1480, and to die the firſt of December, 1532, aged fifty one years (33). Is this to have skill in numbers? VII. He ſuppoſes that the queen of Hungary began her government of the Low-Countries in 1532. It was the year before. VIII. He ſuppoſes, that when ſhe reſigned this government to her brother, ſhe made *a long ſpeech to the people.* This is not the name that ſhould be given to that aſſembly, before which Charles V renounced his kingdoms.

[*K*] . . . *and has not been well copied in every thing by Moreri*] Hilarion de Coſte had ſaid that the queen of Hungary died ‘ *as ſhe was ready to depart*, in order to return into Flanders . . . . where ſhe deſired to end her days, becauſe ſhe was very much beloved and honoured by that people (34).’ Moreri, inſtead of keeping within thoſe bounds, ſays ſhe died ‘ at the very ſame time that ſhe was about to go and re-aſſume the government of the Low-Countries.’ He has been a more faithful tranſcriber of one of the faults of this monk: he ſays after him, that this queen governed the Low-Countries twenty five years, till 1557, when ſhe went over into Spain. I have already ſaid, that ſhe governed them but from the year 1531, to the twenty fifth of October, 1555, and I add, that ſhe went into Spain in the year 1556. Moreri ſhould not have ſaid that *ſhe married Lewis Jagellon, king of Hungary, when ſhe was very young*; for ſhe was eighteen years old when the nuptials were celebrated. Moreri's expreſſion would make on believe that ſhe was younger. It is known that the daughters and ſiſters of kings are ſometimes married before they are ten years old.

[*L*] *I paſs in ſilence the ſcandalous reports concerning the amours of Charles V, with the queen of Hungary.*] Read above, the end of remark [*A*] of the article

Don

---

(15) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. II, pag. 1090, ad ann. 1554. *See alſo* Lewis Guicciardin, Deſcription du Païs Bas, pag. m. 468.

(16) Brantôme, Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. 92.

(17) Id. ibid. pag. 93.

(18) Ibid. pag. 94.

(19) *Brantôme here ſeems to be guilty of an anachroniſm: The ravages that queen made in Picardy preceded the deſtruction of her fine palace of Binche. Beſides, we find no truce under the government of Mary, after the year* 1554. *She was no more governeſs, when the truce was concluded the fifth of February* 1556.

(20) Famian. Strada, Dec. I, lib. ix, pag. 577. ad ann. 1578.

(21) Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. 305.

(22) *Brantome is in the right.* Hic puerulus à Victoria Cæſar eſt appellatus, quum illa mater caſtrorum ab exercitu nuncupata eſſet. *Treb. Pollio, in Triginta Tyrannis, n.* 24. *See alſo n.* 30.

(23) Eraſm. Epiſt xxxi, lib. xix, pag. 846. *See alſo* Epiſt. xx, lib. xxvi, pag. 1432.

(24) Idem, Epiſt. xxi, lib. xxvi, pag. 1434.

(25) Idem, Epiſt. lxviii, lib. xxx, pag. 1956, *dated from Friburg the ninth of January* 1535. *That letter was publiſhed by Merula with Eraſmus's Life, in the year* 1607.

(26) Hilarion de Coſte, Eloges des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. II, pag. 559.

(27) Id. ibid. pag. 560.

(28) Id. ibid. pag. 565.

(29) *In the remark,* [*H*], *citat.* (24).

(30) Hilar. de Coſte, ibid. pag. 566.

(31) Brantôme, Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. 91, *ſays about twenty two or twenty three years.*

(32) *Pag.* 313, *of the ſecond Tome.*

(33) Ibid. pag. 319.

(34) Ubi ſupra, pag. 570.

Don Jo'hn of AUSTRIA, and join to it theſe words of Gabriel Naudé. ‘ The ſame emperor .... covered all thoſe diſgraces with the veil of piety, and religion, ſhutting up himſelf in a cloyſter, where he had likewiſe the conveniency of doing penance, for a ſecret ſin he had committed in begetting a baſtard ſon, who was alſo his nephew (35).’ Lewis de Mai very juſtly condemns this writers boldneſs in affirming ſuch a thing. See page 765, and 766, of his remarks upon Naudé's *Coups d'Etat*.

HUNGARY (Isabella, queen of) ſiſter of Sigiſmund Auguſtus king of Poland, was a princeſs of great merit. She was married, in the year 1539, to John Zapoliha Vaivod of Tranſylvania, who had been elected king of Hungary in the year 1526, and who ſtrenuouſly diſputed that crown with Ferdinand of Auſtria, brother of the emperor Charles V. She was delivered of a ſon the ſeventh of July 1540. Her huſband was ſo pleaſed with it, that he drank at table to ſuch exceſs, as occaſioned his death the twenty firſt of the ſaid month [*A*]. Iſabella finding that ſhe was not able to keep the crown for her ſon, which Ferdinand would deprive him of, implored the protection of the Ottoman Porte, from whence ſhe received ſo great ſuccours, that Ferdinand's army which beſieged Buda was cut in pieces. Solyman came in perſon into Hungary to bring Ferdinand to reaſon. He careſſed Iſabella's little child [*B*], and alledged very honourable excuſes for his not viſiting her [*C*]. But he quickly diſcovered his wicked deſigns; he made himſelf maſter of Buda, and forced Iſabella to retire to Lippa (*a*). This was a cruel mortification to that princeſs, who was fond of dominion. The hopes of ſeeing him reſtore the kingdom of Hungary to her ſon, when he ſhould come to age; thoſe hopes I ſay, grounded on the promiſes of Solyman, were but a poor conſolation. She expreſſed a great deal of conſtancy in that unhappy trial, and comforted herſelf as well as ſhe could, with the title of regent of Tranſylvania, which Solyman had left her; but as he made George Martinuſias her co-adjutor, ſhe met with a thouſand cauſes of vexation in her regency. It was but a name; the authority being intirely in the hands of this monk George (*b*). An open rupture enſued, the conſequences whereof compleated the ruin of Iſabella's authority; for her adverſary, ſupported by Ferdinand, introduced a fine army, commanded by a very cunning Italian (*c*), who managed things ſo dexterouſly, that he engaged this queen to give up Tranſylvania to king Ferdinand, in the year 1551, after which he retired to Caſſovia. It was in her paſſage thither, that ſhe wrote ſome Latin words upon a tree, which are mentioned by hiſtorians [*D*]. She was a woman of a reſtleſs diſpoſition;

[*A*] *Her huſband drank to ſuch exceſs, as occaſioned his death.*] He was gone into Tranſylvania to ſuppreſs a ſedition which the favourers of Ferdinand had raiſed there. Stephen Mailats, the moſt obſtinate among them, was retired to ‘ the caſtle of Fogaras to wait for the ſuccours which Ferdinand ſent him, under the conduct of Nadaſdy. The king beſieged him in it, and took him after a long ſiege. In the mean time there comes a courier, who brought him the news of the birth of a ſon which God had given him. This news being agreeable to all that want to have children, and eſpecially to perſons far in years; we may imagine that John received it very joyfully: It made him fall into an exceſs, drinking like a Hungarian, and this exceſs increaſing his diſtemper, he died at Saſſebes a few days after the birth of his ſon, in the fifty third year of his age (1).’

[*B*] *Solyman careſſed Iſabella's little child.*] I will uſe here the words of the author I have cited in the foregoing remark. ‘ Solyman ſent preſents to the young king .... intreating the queen to let him ſee her ſon, aſſuring her it was only to engage his children to love him the more. At the ſame time the deputies were ordered to tell her, that if he did not viſit her, it was for fear his viſit might injure her reputation. The queen thanked the grand-ſeignor for his civility, and wavering in her mind, whether ſhe ought to ſend her ſon or not. George Martinuſias told her, that ſhe could not refuſe it. Being then overcome by neceſſity, ſhe put him into a cradle worthy of ſuch a child; and ordering the nurſe and ſome other matrons, and many Hungarian lords to accompany him, ſhe ſent him to the camp. Solyman deſigning to do him honour, received him with a troop of horſe, ſaw him, careſſed him, and made his children do the like (2).’ Hilarion de Coſte, in his elogy on our queen Iſabella (3), is very particular about theſe things. ‘ Solyman, ſays he, ſent the young king three horſes of an extraordinary beauty, with trappings adorned with gold, pearls, and precious ſtones, and alſo very rich plumes, and veſtments of cloth of gold. He alſo ſent to the principal lords and barons chains of gold, and rich Turkiſh robes..... The queen put her ſon into a gilt and very rich coach, with his nurſe and ſome ladies, who had dreſſed that little prince to advantage, that he might be more agreeable to him...... The Ottoman prince ſent ſome troops of horſe nobly equipped, and ſome bands of janizaries to meet him, and give him an honourable reception and entertainment. As ſoon as theſe troops had ſaluted the king of Hungary, they placed him in the midſt of them, to conduct him with that pomp to the emperor, who, as ſoon as he ſaw this little prince, expreſſed a great affection for him, and received him very tenderly, both as a vaſſel of the Ottoman houſe, and as the ſon of John, king of Pannonia, whom he had greatly loved and honoured, having protected him againſt Ferdinand, king of Bohemia, and the emperor Charles V. He commanded his ſons, Bajazet and Selim, who where then in his camp, to do the like. They were the ſons of the beautiful Roſe, or Roxelana.’ This author pretends (4) that Solyman had a ‘ mind to know whether this child was a ſon or a daughter; for there was a report ſpread in the Turkiſh army, that it was the later, and that for this reaſon Iſabella Jagellon had him brought up ſecretly.’

[*C*] *Solyman refuſed to ſee her, and alledged very honourable excuſes for it.*] I have already ſaid, that he aſſured this princeſs, ‘ that the reaſon of his not ſeeing her, was the injury that his viſit might do her reputation.’ This was a very honourable procedure, for it is certain, that an interview betwixt Solyman and this queen, would have occaſioned much obloquy in the world. Hilarion de Coſte makes him alledge other excuſes, which are not probable. ‘ They (5) alſo told this princeſs, that Solyman had no leſs reſpect for her, than for her ſon, as well for her own merit, as for being the daughter of Sigiſmund, king of Poland, whom he called his father; and that if his law permitted him to viſit her, he would not have failed in it: which was the reaſon he could not invite her into his tents, and he intreated her to ſend only her ſon with his nurſe (6).’ If Solyman's religion had forbidden him to receive Iſabella in his tents, would it have permitted him to receive the young prince's nurſe, and the ladies who accompanied him (7)?

[*D*] *She wrote ſome Latin words upon a tree which are mentioned by hiſtorians.*] Thuanus obſerves in relating this, that ſhe was a learned woman (8). ‘ Quæ (*Regina*) ſtatim, ne privata in eo regno, cui ſummo cum imperio præfuiſſet, diutius viveret, convaſatis rebus ſuis tion; ſhe ſtaid but little at Caſſovia. She went from thence into Sileſia, and then into Poland, to Bonna Sforza her mother, and Sigiſmund Auguſtus her brother. She kept intelligence with the grandees of Tranſylvania, to attempt the regaining that country. She had recourſe again to the protection of Solyman, and uſed ſo many arts, that ſhe returned into Tranſylvania, in the year 1556. There ſhe maintained herſelf till her death, and kept the authority as much as ſhe could [*E*], without imparting it to John Sigiſmund her ſon. The bigots vainly endeavour to excuſe that conduct [*F*]. She died at Alba Julia the fifteenth of September 1558 (*d*).

---

(35) Naudé, Coups d'Eſtat. chap. iv, pag. m. 617.

(*a*) *The fifth of September*, 1541.

(*b*) *So George Martinuſias was called.*

(*c*) *John Baptiſt Caſtaldo, marquis of Caſſano, who had been educated in the houſe of* Francis d'Avalos Marquis de Peſcara. *Hilar. de Coſté, Elog. des Dames, Tom. I, pag.* 644. Delectus eſt Joan. Baptiſta Caſtaldus Piedenæ Comes, & ob res recenter egregie geſtas (nam in bello Germanico caſtrorum præfecti ſumma cum laude munus obiverat) Caſſani Marchio à Cæſare creatus. *Thuanus, lib. ix, pag.* 180.

(1) Diſcours Hiſtorique & Politique ſur les Cauſes de la Guerre d'Hongrie, *printed with ſome other curious pieces at Cologne*, 1666, *in 12mo, pag.* 237, 238. *See alſo* Hilarion de Coſte, Elog. des Dames Illuſtres; Tom. I, pag. 629.

(2) Diſcours Hiſtorique & Politique, *&c.* pag. 242.

(3) Ubi ſupra, pag. 631, & ſeq. 242.

(4) Hilar. de Coſte, ibid. pag. 632.

(5) *That is, the deputies of Solyman, who brought the preſents to the young king.*

(6) Ubi ſupra, pag. 632.

(7) Idem, pag. 633.

(8) *She underſtood Italian. Hilarion de Coſte*, ubi ſupra, pag. 644, *ſays, that ſhe made a ſpeech in that language, to make her ſon reſign her kingdom.*

(*d*) *I have taken the matters of fact contained in this article, from Hilarion de Coſte*, Eloges des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. I, pag. 622, & ſeq.

‘ſuis per monteis aſperos Caſſoviam verſus iter direxit. Cum propter anguſtias viarum inter ſilvas de curru deſcendere cogeretur, cum auriga currum traduceret, ipſa retro in Daciam reſpiciens, priſtini culminis, è quo diciderat, memor altum corde ſuſpirium duxiſſe dicitur, & cum aliud non poſſet literata femina, inſcripto arbori nomine, hæc addidiſſe, SIC FATA VOLUNT, eoque relicto juſti doloris monumento, rurſus currum conſcendit, inſtitutum iter perſequitur (9). —— *The queen not caring to live any longer in a private ſtation, in a country where ſhe had enjoyed the ſovereign authority, having gathered all her effects together, ſet out for Caſſovia, thro' a very mountainous country. And being obliged to alight from her chariot, becauſe of the badneſs of the roads, among the woods, while the driver was diſingaging the chariot, ſhe looked back towards Tranſylvania, and remembering her former grandeur from which ſhe had fallen, fetched a deep ſigh, and, being a learned lady, carved her name on a tree, and under it SIC FATA VOLUNT, ſo fate decrees; and leaving that monument of her juſt grief, mounted her chariot, and proceeded in her journey.*’ Hilarion de Coſte deſerves to be copied, by reaſon of the particulars to which he deſcends (10). ‘As that virtuous but unfortunate princeſs . . . was going to Caſſovia through the troubleſome and difficult roads of thoſe countries, ſhe was forced in an ugly paſſage to light from her coach. Whilſt the coachman was buſied in getting out the coach from that bad place, which was near a wood; this heroine, being as learned as ſhe was valiant, looked back on Tranſylvania which ſhe had left; and remembring the honours ſhe had received there, and the condition ſhe was in, could not forbear fetching a deep ſigh, and leaving on the bark of a tree theſe three words, ſhewing thereby her juſt grief, and knowledge of the Latin tongue: SIC FATA VOLUNT: *ſo fate will have it*; as it is related by Thuanus, and many other hiſtorians (11). Martin Fumée, Sieur de Ginelle, has deſcribed it in this manner, ſaying, that queen Iſabella paſſing over the mountain which ſeparates Tranſylvania from Hungary, and going down a rugged and difficult hill, which her coach could not paſs through for the badneſs of the way, was forced to go down on foot with her ladies, not without much trouble and inconvenience, as well by reaſon of the roughneſs of the ways, as of a great ſhower which overtook her, with which ſhe was wet thorough (12). The poor queen of Hungary, as ſhe went along complained of her ill fortune, which not content to be contrary to her in great things, would alſo afflict her in little ones, and attributing this misfortune which happened to her in paſſing over that high and difficult mountain, to the obſtinate malice of her deſtiny, ſhe took a knife, and, a little to ſolace her affliction and extream ſorrow, wrote with the point of it on the bark of a great tree, under which he retired to reſt herſelf a little, and avoid the rain, which fell in great abundance, theſe Latin words: SIC FATA VOLUNT, and below *Iſabella Regina*: So the fates will have it, Queen Iſabella.’ There is reaſon to believe, that ſhe wrote not this inſcription without murmuring and reflecting upon divine providence; for in the ſpeech ſhe made in diveſting herſelf of her royalty, ſhe ended with violent complaints againſt deſtiny. ‘Although inconſtant fortune, *ſaid ſhe* (13), according to the cruel mutations with which ſhe takes away and confounds at her pleaſure the affairs of this world, hath ſo changed mine, that at preſent my ſon and myſelf are obliged to leave this kingdom, &c.’ This was to repreach the providence of God, and accuſe him of cruelty, as the Heathens did in their misfortunes.

(9) Thuanus, lib ix, pag. 182, col. 2, ad ann. 1551.

(10) Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, pag. 648.

(11) Natalis Comes, P. Mathieu, Artus Thomas.

(12) We give this period ſuch as the Monk Hilarion de Coſte has it.

(13) Hilar. de Coſte, ibid. pag. 645. *In Thuanus*, lib. ix, pag. 182, *ſhe ſpeaks thus to her ſon*: Quando tua aut mea potius fortuna non tulit ut regno paterno legibus jure gentium tibi delato uti frui poſſes, fatorum INIQUITATEM quæ nulla vi noſtra aut humana induſtria corrigi poteſt, æquo animo feramus neceſſe eſt.

Cum complexa ſui corpus miſerabile gnati,
Atque Deos atque aſtra vocas crudelia mater (14.)

(14) Virgil. Eclog. v, ver. 23.

The wretched parent, with a pious haſte,
Came running, and his lifeleſs limbs embrac'd,
She ſigh'd, ſhe ſobb'd, and, furious with deſpair,
She rent her garments, and ſhe tore her hair,
Accuſing all the gods, and every ſtar.

DRYDEN.

Probably our princeſs thought to leave on the bark of this tree, a monument of the injuſtice ſhe believed ſhe received from heaven, and to acquaint all the paſſengers with the courage ſhe had to complain of it.

[*E*] *She kept the authority as much as ſhe could, without imparting it to her ſon.*] This may be proved by the remonſtrance that Henry II ordered to be made to this princeſs. John James de Cambrai, dean of Bourges, embaſſador of this prince, had aſſured her as he went to Conſtantinople, that ſhe ſhould receive from France all the ſuccours ſhe could deſire (15), ‘which obliged her to ſend into France Chriſtopher Bathori on an embaſſy (16) . . . . to thank the moſt chriſtian king for his favour and good affection. Bathori was well received by Henry II. and ſent back with Peter Francis Martinez into Tranſylvania, where they aſſured queen Iſabella, on the part of his moſt chriſtian majeſty, of the alliance he would make with her by the marriage of one of his daughters with her only ſon king John Sigiſmund, who was ſeventeen years of age; upon condition that he ſhould be bred up, and educated like a prince, and ſhe ſhould not ſuffer near him ſo many women and men of mean birth, who are not fit to be entertained near young princes, and that ſhe would admit him to the knowledge of her affairs. Petrouvitz, and moſt of the lords of Iſabella's council, approved the reaſons of the moſt chriſtian king in her majeſty's preſence, and ſaid aloud to the embaſſador of France, that they had already remonſtrated this to the queen their miſtreſs; ſhe began then to ſuſpect that embaſſy, and thought thoſe lords had given this advice to the king of France.’ She conſulted her mother, who made her this anſwer. ‘Daughter, keep always the power in your own hands, do not give ſo much authority to your ſon; which you will loſe as ſoon as you marry him to the daughter of ſo potent a monarch as that of France. Iſabella following the unhappy counſel of queen Bonna her mother, rejected the alliance of the French king, and ever after had an averſion for thoſe who adviſed her to let the king her ſon ſee the armies, and to give him an inſight into the affairs of the kingdom, and to ſend him to Waraden. She gave the command of all her armies to Michael Bellaſſa, an imperious man; which was not agreeable to her ſubjects, who deſired that ſhe would make choice of a commander more tractable and human (17).’

(15) Hilar. de Coſte, ubi ſupra, pag. 657.

(16) The father of the brave and unfortunate Sigiſmund Bathori, prince of Tranſylvania. *Id. ibid.*

(17) Hilar. de Coſte, ubi ſupra, pag. 658.

[*F*] *The bigots vainly endeavour to excuſe that conduct.*] As there is no paſſion but they juſtify at the expence of religion, they made uſe of this admirable cloak to conceal our Iſabella's ambition. Here are the words of a Monk, who cites Florimond de Remond; ‘the authors, who have written in favour of this virtuous princeſs, ſay, that ſhe did not look with a kind eye on the great lords of Hungary and Tranſylvania; particularly, Petrouvitz was odious to her, becauſe of his profeſſing Luther's hereſy; and and that under pretence of giving him light into the affairs of his ſtate, they deſigned to remove him from the queen, his mother, to make him more eaſily quit the true and old religion, for a new and falſe one. Which he did after the deceaſe of the queen, his mother (18).’ Father Maimbourg ſays (19), that John Sigiſmund durſt not declare for the Heretics in his mother's life-time; but that was not the only reaſon, but alſo becauſe Solyman ‘had written to the queen, that new ſects ſhould not be ſuffered to be

(18) Id. ibid.

(19) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de l'Arianiſme, Tom. III, pag, 345. Dutch Edit.

‘introduced into the kingdom, for fear of diſturbing the peace of it, by dividing mens minds upon ſo nice a point as that of religion (20). . . . . But the queen dying ſoon after, and Selim, who troubled not himſelf about theſe diſturbances of religion, ſucceeding her Father, Solyman, who died of an apoplexy at the ſiege of Ziget, the Lutherans, the Calviniſts, and Arrians, returned into Tranſylvania, and, under the protection of Petrouvitz, took more liberty than ever (21).’

(20) Id. ibid. ad. ann. 1555.

(21) Id ibid. ad ann. 1566.

HUNGERUS (Wolfgang), a Civilian of the XVIth century, was born at Waſſerburg (*a*) in Bavaria. He was profeſſor of the Civil-Law in the univerſity of Ingolſtadt, chancellor of Friſingen, and aſſeſſor in the Imperial chamber at Spires (*b*). He wrote an apology for the the emperors Frederic Barbaroſſa, and Lewis of Bavaria, but being a good Catholic he thought it was more prudent to ſuppreſs it [*A*], than to publiſh it in an age ſuch as that in which he lived. He died of a diſtemper which continued ſeveral years (*c*), by which the public was deprived of ſeveral uſeful works which they might have expected from ſo learned a man. His death is placed in the year 1555 (*d*). The notes which he wrote on the Ceſars of Cuſpinian, were printed at Baſil in 1561. They correct and clear up many things which had been either falſly or confuſedly advanced in that Hiſtory of the Emperors, and in ſome other books. The abridgment of Geſner's Bibliotheca, gives us a Wolfgang Hungarus, different from our Hungerus: this is a miſtake, and ſhows that the ſmalleſt change of the letters in proper names, multiplies writers without reaſon. We find the titles of ſome other works of this Civilian in the ſame abridgment [*B*].

(*a*) From hence comes the Latin ſirname *Aquiburgenſis*, which he takes.

(*b*) See the epiſtle dedicatory of the Ceſars of Cuſpinian. Baſil Edit. 1561.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Kong, in Biblioth. pag. 418.

[*A*] *He compoſed an apology for the emperors . . . but he thought it more prudent to ſuppreſs it.*] As he lays all the blame upon the Popes, there is no doubt but the Proteſtants would have taken advantage from his book. However, let us ſet down what he ſays himſelf: ‘Nos certe pro utriſque optimis Imperatoribus Baioario & Ænobaro elucubrata Apologia integra, luce ipſa clarius oſtendimus, & fabulam illam de Ludovico Baioario vanam, falſam & tralaticiam eſſe: & Ænobarum non tam de verbis quam rebus ipſis contendiſſe, atque in ſumma longe alias fuiſſe ſummis Pontificibus in hos Imperatores odiorum cauſas: & quæcumque tandem eæ ſuerint, ſaltem negocia ipſa controverſa à Pontificiis ea animorum impotentia, faſtu & acerbitate tractata, ut horundem Imperatorum ubique major modeſtia, manſuetudo, humanitas, adeoque innocentia, pietas & juſticia eluceat: utcumque inſignis ille Theologus Albertus Pighius Campenſis, Pontificiorum hector Li. 5. ca. 14. & 15. Eccleſiaſticæ hierarchiæ, cauſam hujus Ludovici ita propoſuerit atque explicarit, ut univerſam eam damnaret. Sed voluiſſe ipſum eo in argumento, ac præſertim libr. 6. Romanorum Pontificum auribus aliquid dare, jam pridem etiam Catholicum veritatis amantiſſimum Theologum, virum Eccleſiaſticum, doctrina & vitæ ſanctimonia, nuper dum viveret, cum primis ſpectatum, ſcio pronunciaſſe: & ubi neceſſe ſit, ipſius cenſuram autographam ea de re in medium proferre poſſum. Neque vero noſtro ex capite iſti apologiæ noſtræ hoc glorioſe arrogamus, ſed potius concordi ex calculo amicorum aliquot, tam eccleſiaſticorum quam laicorum qui Catholica in religione juxta nobiſcum verſantur, & Eccleſiæ ſtatum ac fœdis & pernicioſis abuſuum & vitiorum monſtris repurgatum, ſartumque & tectum (ut ajunt) jam pridem pio zelo, ſed hactenus fruſtra optant, ac ſuper ea apologia ipſis exhibita conſulti, etiam ſcripto ſua ſinguli candide & libere expoſuerunt judicia. Attamen & ſponte noſtra, & præcellentis cujuſdam amici benevolo monitu, hoc tempore domi retinere eandem quam in publicum edere maluimus (1). ——— *In an apology which I wrote expreſsly in vindication of theſe two excellent emperors, Lewis of Bavaria, and Frederic Barbaroſſa, I have demonſtrated in the cleareſt manner, that the ſtory concerning the emperor Lewis, is falſe, groundleſs, and trifling: and that Barbaroſſa did not contend merely about words, but about things of conſequence, and in fine, that the hatred of the Popes againſt theſe two Emperors aroſe from quite different cauſes: and whatever theſe were that the controverſy was managed on the ſide of the Popes with ſuch fury, haughtineſs, and bitterneſs, that in the whole of it we may obſerve much more modeſty, meekneſs, humanity, and therefore more innocence, piety and juſtice on the ſide of theſe emperors: however, that famous divine Albertus Pighius of Campen, the champion of the other ſide, in the fifth book of his Eccleſiaſtic Hierarchy, has ſet forth and commented on the caſe of the emperor Lewis, in ſuch a manner as abſolutely to condemn him. But I know that a very ingenious Catholic divine (who while he lived was famous both for learning and piety, and whoſe opinion in this matter, I can, if needful, produce in writing under his hand) declared that Pighius, in that whole argument, and eſpecially in the ſixth book, deſigned to flatter the Popes. Neither do I here, on my own judgment, pretend to have proved theſe things in the ſaid apology, but on that of ſome of my friends, eccleſiaſtics as well as laics, all profeſſors of the Catholic religion, as I likewiſe am, who have long, but as yet in vain, wiſhed that the church being purged from many ſcandalous and dangerous abuſes, and immoralities, may be reſtored to it's primitive purity, they, I ſay, being conſulted about the ſaid apology which I ſhowed them freely and ingenuouſly, gave me each his approbation of it in writing. Yet of my own free choice, and by the advice of a very worthy friend, I have determined rather to keep it by me than to publiſh it at preſent.*’

(1) Hungerus, Annot in Cæſares Cuſpiniani, pag. m. 186, col. 2.

[*B*] *The title of ſome other works of Hungerus.*] We ſee that he corrected and publiſhed a new edition of *Bartholomæus Bologninus ſuper Authent. habita. C. ne filius pro patre*; and that he tranſlated from the Italian and Spaniſh into German, a book intituled, *Excitatorium Aulicorum, de officio Aulici ut gratiam Principis conſequatur & conſervet* (2). This verſion, printed at Strasburg in 8vo in 1582, is no doubt the tranſlation of a book of Guevara (3). We ſee in the *Bibliotheca Claſſica* of Draudius (4), *Wolffg.* Hungeri *Linguæ Germanicæ Vindicatio contra exoticas quaſdam, quæ complurium vocum & dictionum mere Germanicarum, Etymologias ex ſua petere conati ſunt* (5), at Strasburg 1586 in 8vo.

(2) Epitome Geſneri, pag. m. 824.

(3) See remark [*G*] of the article GUEVARA, citat. (19).

(4) Pag. 1377, Edit. Francof. 1625.

(5) This word is a ſolecism here.

HUNNIUS (Giles) born in a village of the country of Wirtemberg, the twenty firſt of December 1550, was one of the moſt famous divines of the Augſburg confeſſion. He ſtudied Divinity at Tubingen, under James Andreas, under Brentius the ſon, and under two other profeſſors; and he grew ſo learned in the five years he ſpent in that univerſity, that he was thought capable of profeſſing Divinity at Marpurg, at twenty ſix years of age. He very well anſwered the opinion they had entertained of his learning: for upon ſome lectures and ſermons that he made at Marpurg (*a*), the landgrave being reſolved to retain him, recommended him in a very honourable manner to the duke of Wirtemberg, to be promoted to his doctor's degree. Hunnius returned to Tubingen, where he was admitted doctor of Divinity a few months after his marriage, the ſixteenth of July, 1576. During the firſt ſix years of his profeſſorſhip,

(*a*) In the year 1576.

feſſorſhip, he publiſhed no books againſt the Calviniſts; but otherwiſe he was continually at war with them [*A*], and did not ſpare them in his Academical Diſputations. At laſt he wrote againſt them [*B*] in the year 1584, and got ſuch a reputation, that, in the year 1592, he was invited into Saxony to reform the electorate. He was made firſt profeſſor of Divinity at Wittemberg, firſt miniſter of the church of the caſtle, and a member of the eccleſiaſtical ſenate. He applied himſelf with an extraordinary diligence, to find out thoſe who were not good Lutherans [*C*]; and as he was very ſucceſsful in clearing the country of them, he was invited to do the ſame in Sileſia [*D*]. He was made ſuperintendant of the church of Wittemberg in the year 1595; and the ſame year, he had a ſharp combate to maintain againſt Samuel Huberus about Election and Predeſtination [*E*]. He was one of the principal opponents againſt the Jeſuits Gretſer and Tanner, in the conference of Ratiſbon [*F*], in the year 1602 *(b)*. He died the

(*b*) Moſt authors ſay, that conference was held in 1601.

[*A*] *He was continually at war with the Calviniſts.*] Read what is ſaid of it in his funeral oration (1). 'Quas autem & quàm ſerias, quamque frequentès velitationes in Haſſia tàm *Caſſellis*, quàm *Marpurgi*, jam cum clancularii, jam cum apertis hoſtibus, quos *Sacramentarios Lutherani* vocant, ſubire coactus fuerit; quæ & quam gravia certamina, ob ſanctiſſimum Religionis Chriſtianæ articulum, *de perſonâ Chriſti, ejuſque ad dextram Dei ſedentis adoranda majeſtate* ſuſtinuerit: id Deo, rerum omnium inſpectori ac judici notum eſt: neque fugit id multos pios & cordatos homines. —— *What warm and frequent wars he was forced to wage in Heſſe, both at Caſſel and Marpurg, ſometimes againſt ſecret, ſometimes againſt open, enemies, whom the Lutherans call Sacramentarians; what ſore attacks he ſuſtained on account of that ſacred article of the Chriſtian religion*, concerning the perſon of Chriſt, and his adorable majeſty, ſitting on the right hand of God: *Theſe, I ſay, are known to God, the witneſs and judge of all things: neither are they unknown to many pious and worthy men.*'

[*B*] *At laſt he wrote againſt them.*] The ſame orator will inform us, that Hunnius did not confine his exploits to the Sacramentarian war: He attacked alſo the followers of the Lutheran Illyricus. 'In publicum poſtea ſcriptis ſuis progreſſus ſub annum *octogeſimum quartum*, *Danæum* imprimis, *Urſinum*, *Pezelium*, *Grabium*, & alios oppugnavit, editis libellis *de perſonâ Chriſti, ejuſque ad dextram* D E I *ſedentis divina majeſtate*: de *altarium abrogatione*. Poſtea & *Flacianorum* cohorti bellum ſacrum indixit, edito libello de *ſubſtantiâ peccati originis* (2). ——— *Afterwards, about the year fifteen hundred and eighty four, he publiſhed ſome books* concerning the perſon of Chriſt, and his divine majeſty, ſitting at the right hand of God: *and concerning the* Abrogation of altars. *Wherein he attacked, above all, Danæus, and alſo Urſinus, Pezelius, and Grabius. Afterwards he denounced a holy war againſt the Flacians, in a book concerning* the ſubſtance of original ſin.'

[*C*] *He applied himſelf . . . . . . to find out thoſe who were not good Lutherans.*] This was a kind of Inquiſition, which deprived a great many honeſt men of their employments and country; for the refuſing to ſign the Formulary that Hunnius and his colleagues propoſed, was enough to paſs for a Calviniſt, and they found no mercy. The Jeſuit Contzen (3) makes himſelf merry in deſcribing this Inquiſition; and obſerves that Hunnius wrote an apology for it. 'Quin & Ægidius Saxonicam viſitationem contra Calviniſtas defendit; refutationem enim ſcripſit Calviniſtici libelli, quo viſitatio illa exagitata fuit (4).' The violences that were then exerciſed upon thoſe who were ſuſpected of Calviniſm, are horrible, as Hoſpinian has deſcribed them (5).

[*D*] *He was invited to do the ſame in Sileſia.*] This is witneſſed by Melchior Adam. 'Fridericus IV Lignicenſium & Brigenſium in Sileſia Dux, Hunnii potiſſimum opera ac ſtudio uſus, Eccleſiarum Lignicenſium per Sileſiam reformationem ſuſcepit atque perfecit; ejecto inde Leonhardo Krentzhemio, Lignicenſium tunc Superintendente; cui Calviniſmi crimen impingebatur (6). ——— *Frederic IV, duke of Lignitz and Brieg, in Sileſia, begun and compleated a reformation of the churches of Lignitz, in Sileſia, by the means and ſtudy of Hunnius above all others; and ejected Leonard Krantzheim, then ſuperintendant of Lignitz, who was accuſed of Calviniſm.*'

[*E*] *He diſputed againſt Samuel Huberus about Election and Predeſtination.*] This man had been miniſter of a village near Bern; and having examined the acts of the conference of Montheliard (7), he found four articles in Beza's doctrine, which he thought repugnant to the ſcripture: I. That Jeſus Chriſt did not die for all men. II. That moſt men are excluded from the promiſes of grace. III. That the cauſe of the damnation of the reprobate, is the ſole good pleaſure of God, who created them on purpoſe to ſhew in them the power of his anger. IV. That no body can know whether baptiſm regenerates children. He had the courage to contradict theſe four articles: but he was expelled for his boldneſs; Muſculus and Gryneus having ſucceſsfully procured his expulſion. He retired into the country of Wirtemberg, where he obtained a church, after having embraced the Augsburg confeſſion. Being made known to the elector of Saxony, by ſome books he publiſhed, he was invited to Wittemberg to profeſs Divinity. His earneſtneſs in refuting the Swiſs Proteſtants about the doctrine of Predeſtination, made him run into another extream, ſo far as to teach publickly, that GOD has elected all men to eternal life. Hunnius and his colleagues admoniſhed him of his error, and as he did not abandon it, he was expelled. He went from thence to Ratisbon, where he had conferences with ſome divines; he continued obſtinate in his errors, and publiſhed ſome books at Spires to maintain them. This was the fourteenth ſchiſm of the Lutheran church (8). Such was the man that our Hunnius had to deal with. He was ſo happy as to triumph over his enemy, for he got him deprived of his place; but he expoſed himſelf to ſome ſuſpicions of heterodoxy, and was obliged to write in his own juſtification. Read in the margin the words of Calixtus (9), and what follows. 'Fortem ſe & fidum purioris doctrinæ hyperaſpiſten, adverſus inanes *Huberi* φλυαρίας eo tempore præſtitit *Hunnius*, dum partim monendo, partim ſcribendo, errantem *Huberum* in viam revocare ſtuduit: quod ipſa res loquitur, & monumenta hac de controverſia bene multa edita, cum primis verò ille tractatus *Hunnii* de *providentia & prædeſtinatione filiorum Dei*, ſatis luculenter teſtatur. Diſſidio autem illo *Huberi* remotione ſopito, prodiit anno *nonageſimo ſeptimo* epiſtola: qua variorum errorum, de *cœnâ Domini*, de *baptiſmo*, de *libero arbitrio*, de *perſonâ Chriſti*, de *æternâ predeſtinatione* fuit inſimulatus. Hanc igitur *Hunnius* eodem anno reſutavit: ut & eos qui in *Anhaltinis* eccleſiis altaria, imagines, organa muſica, hoſtias, & alias ceremonias abrogarant (10). —— *At that time Hunnius ſhowed himſelf a bold and faithful defender of the purer doctrine, againſt the vain cavils of Huberus, while partly by admonition, partly by writing, he endeavoured to bring back Huberus into the path of truth. Of this there can be no doubt, and the many pieces which he publiſhed concerning that controverſy ſhow it plainly, eſpecially his treatiſe* concerning providence and the predeſtination of the ſons of GOD. *But theſe diviſions being healed by the removal of Huberus, there appeared in* 1597 *an epiſtle in which he was accuſed of diverſe errors concerning the* Lord's Supper, Baptiſm, Free-will, the Perſon of CHRIST, and Eternal Predeſtination. *This therefore Hunnius refuted that ſame year, as alſo thoſe in the churches of Anhalt, who abrogated altars, images, organs, hoſties, and other ceremonies.*' I add theſe laſt words, to ſhew, that Hunnius was not againſt altars and images, and many Romiſh ceremonies, which were deteſted by other Lutherans.

[*F*] *He was one of the principle opponents . . . in the conference of Ratisbon.*] I am ſure that moſt of my readers will be glad to be freed from the trouble of conſulting

(1) Apud Melchior. Adam. in Vit. Theolog. pag 727.

(2) Apud eumd. ibid.

(3) Contzen, in Jubilo Jubilorum ad ann. 1592, 1593.

(4) Id. ibid. pag. 304.

(5) Hiſtoriæ Sacramentariæ, parte altera, pag. 674, & ſeq.

(6) Melchior Adam, ubi infra.

(7) Between Theodore Beza, and John Andreas.

(8) *Taken from* Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ pag. 871.

(9) Poſt annum ſuperioris ſæculi octogeſimum Ægidius Hunniſi fallor, primus vel certe inter primos præcipuus priſcam & ante Auguſtinum in primitiva Eccleſia receptam ſententiam revocavit, & in Eccleſias Scholaſque noſtras reduxit; non tamen ſine difficultate, contradictione & inſimulatione Pelagianiſmi. *Calixtus, Conſider. Doct. Reform.*

(10) Hutterus, apud Melchior. Adam. in Vit. Theol. pag. 729.

the year following, the fourth of April (c). He was fruitful both in books and children [G]. Some of his ſons made themſelves known by their works [H], but one of them turned Roman Catholic [I]. There is no book in which our Hunnius has diſcovered

consulting another book, to know in general what this conference was: whereſore, I put down here, what Peter Matthieu ſays of it (11). ‘ Maximilian count Palatine of the Rhine, and duke of Bavaria, and Philip Lewis alſo, Palatine of the Rhine, and count of Veldents and Sponheim, couſins, and united by blood, but very much divided in the union of the mind, which is religion, reſolved, in order to re unite themſelves in the ſame belief, and to bring their ſubjects to the ſame confeſſion and profeſſion of faith, to aſſemble at Ratisbon the greateſt and moſt famous divines of Germany of both religions, that by an amicable conference they might clear the difficulties, that were the cauſe of that unhappy ſchiſm. The diſpute was only upon this theſis, *whether the the holy Scripture be a ſufficient rule for things neceſſary to ſalvation.* The Catholic diſputants were four profeſſors in Divinity of the univerſity of Paris (12), one of which was a Jeſuit. For the Proteſtants there were fifteen divines, as well of the Palatinate of the Rhine, as of the duchies of Saxony, Brandenberg, and Wittemberg . . . The preſidents were the two princes, and the ſpeakers Gretzerus a Jeſuit, and Heilbrun a miniſter (13) . . . The conference took up fourteen ſeſſions, in which they largely and warmly diſcourſed of the power of a judge, but not very clearly, ſince that verbal diſpute was followed by many apologies in writing.’ I inſert here this marginal note of Peter Matthieu. ‘ Upon this diſpute of Ratisbon, *ſays he,* beſides the acts and regiſters of the ſeſſions, day by day, we have a book with this title: *Analyſis Dialectica Colloquii Ratisbonenſis, anno* 1601. *de norma & judice omnium controverſiarum fidei Chriſtianæ habiti.*’

This hiſtorian's thought upon theſe verbal diſputes, is pleaſant enough. ‘ When I conſider, *ſays he,* the little advantage that has been reaped from theſe diſputes in ſeveral parts of Europe, and that the holy Scripture is the field in which every one thinks he has a right to fight; I cannot chuſe but wiſh there was ſome ſevere prohibition againſt this vulgar treatment of it: and it would be well if it were taught like Epicurus's atoms, Pythagoras's numbers, Plato's ideas, Ariſtotle's entelechia, and the figures of the cabaliſts; that no body might come at the knowledge of it, but by thoſe that are capable of underſtanding it. Whilſt every one pretends to be skilled in it, it happens, that from the ſame flower, the faithful, like the bee, gather honey, and the diſobedient, like the ſpider, gather poiſon, and many grow mad and beaſtly upon the beaſt of St John's Revelation.’

Add to this paſſage the words of Mr Baillet. ‘ This conference was like thoſe battles, wherein the victory is not determined by the number of the ſlain. Each party pretended to have come off with advantage; and relations were made of it on both ſides, and treatiſes in Latin and High-Dutch, above twenty in number. Amongſt theſe writings I have found one in the vulgar tongue, concerning the triumph over the Jeſuits, printed at Tubingen, a Lutheran town, in 1603, in Quarto, and another in Latin, compoſed by Hunnius, and publiſhed at Wittemberg in Saxony, the ſame year, in the ſame ſize, with this title, *Epiſtola conſolatoria cum not* . . . Hunnius endeavoured to revenge his party, by an *Anti-Tanner* . . . and an *Anti-Gretſer* (15).’ He had read the hiſtorical relation which Father Tanner had made; ‘ but he was not ſatisfied with an account ſo little favourable to his party. To prevent the effects he feared from the reading of it, he made a counter-relation, that is, a hiſtory of the conference of Ratisbon, in his own way, which was publiſhed in 1602, at Wittemberg in Saxony. Father Tanner thought he ought not to let that piece paſs unanſwered; and not content with reprinting his relation in Latin and German, at Munich in Bavaria, he publiſhed, beſides, ſome reflexions upon that of Hunnius, intituled, *Examen Narrationis quam hiſtoricæ Relationis nomine inſignitam de Colloquio Ratisbonenſi edidit Ægidius Hunnius Prædicans,* at Munich, 1602, in 4to. It was againſt this laſt work that Hunnius wrote his *Anti-Tanner,* which he printed the ſame year at Wittemberg.’ Father Tanner publiſhed a reply, *in which he made a defence of his firſt confutation* . . . . *and ſome remarks upon the death of it's author* (16). It appeared at Munich in 1603, in in 4to, intituled *Apologeticus pro compendiaria relatione de Colloquio Ratisbonenſi* 1601 *adverſus Anti-Tannerum cum Appendice de morte Ægidii Hunnii.* Mr Baillet obſerves, that Father Gretſer could not forbear making reflexions upon Hunnius's *Anti-Gretſer. They were printed at Ingolſtadt ſome time after, and inſerted afterwards among ſome of his works, with this title,* Admonitio de Anti-Gretſero (17). This Jeſuit publiſhed ſomething elſe againſt the ſame antagoniſt. *Labyrinthus Cretico-Hunnianus, hoc eſt, Diſputatio de Hunnio Prædicante, genioque Lutherano ſemetipſum contradictionibus implicante & jugulante in aliquot articulis fidei* 1602, *& Reſponſum ad Theſes Hunnianas, de Colloquio Pontificiis jucundo* (18), *una cum ſex digreſſionibus contra ejuſdem Hunnii calumnias,* 1602 (19). Note, that the two Bibliographers of the Jeſuits, aſcribe to Father Tanner a book, intituled *Labyrinthus Critico-*(20) *Hunnianus,* printed at Munich, in 1612. May not one think there is ſome miſtake in the matter (21). Would two Jeſuits have made uſe of the ſame title, writing againſt the ſame adverſary?

[G] *He was fruitful both in books and children.*] There is an edition of his works in five volumes. ‘ Primus varios tractatus de articulis fidei, alter polemica, tertius & quartus commentaria in Matthæum, Johannem & omnes pene epiſtolas Canonicas, quintus diſputationes & orationes varias continet. Edidit etiam vernacula lingua poſt illam Evangelicam & Epiſtolicam. Homilias in VI Prophetas, Threnos & Catechiſmum, confeſſionem de perſona Chriſti & id genus alia (22).’ As to his conjugal fecundity, we are aſſured in his funeral oration, that he received from heaven the benediction promiſed to the faithful by the pſalmiſt (23):

His wife like a fair fertile vine,
Her lovely fruit ſhall bring;
His children like young olive plants,
About his table ſpring (24).

[H] *Some of his ſons made themſelves known by their works.*] NICOLAS HUNNIUS, profeſſor of divinity at Wittemberg, and afterwards ſuper-intendent of Lubec, publiſhed, *Epitome credendorum: Examen errorum Photinianorum: Capiſtrum Lancillotto impactum: Neceſſaria defenſio de Papa Antichriſto: Refutatio Weigelianæ Theologiæ: Apoſtaſia Eccleſiæ Romanæ: Pellis ovina papiſtica: Innocentia Lutheranorum: Fundamentalis diſſenſus Lutheranorum & Calvinianorum: Neceſſaria Admonitio contra theoſophos* (25), *novellos Prophetas, nomine miniſterii Lubecenſis, Hamburgenſis, & Lunæburgenſis,* and ſome other tracts. He died in the year 1643, being fifty eight years old. His brother GILES HUNNIUS died the preceding year, being ſuper-intendant general of Altemburg (26).

[I] *One of them turned Roman Catholic.*] He was a civilian, and his name was HELFRICUS ULRICUS HUNNIUS. He publiſhed at Cologne, in 1633, a book, in which he pretended to ſhew, that even by the confeſſion of ſome learned Proteſtants, we are obliged to reſtore to the church of Rome, what was taken from her in the time of Luther's reformation. Voetius has been reproached with ſtealing from this book, his authorities and arguments, againſt the canons of Utrecht. ‘ Iteratò noto, pellucentem illum centonem, magnam partem conſarcinatum eſſe ex duodecim conſiliis Lutheranorum . . . . ſimul editis per Helfricum Ulricum Hunnium, J.C. filium Ægidii Hunnii, celebris quondam Theologiæ Doctoris & Profeſſoris in Academia Wittebergenſi qui pellectus offa Antichriſtiana, cum turpiſſimè defeciſſet ad Pontificios, atque ſecundum fatum Apoſtatarum, negligeretur ab iis, qui exemplo diaboli Matth. iv. 9. plurimos ſectatores ſibi colligere ſolent, per myſticam illam vocem: *Hæc tibi dabo*: Coloniæ Agrip-

pinæ

(c) Taken from Melchior Adam, *in Vitis Theolog. pag.* 723, *& ſeq.* who has given us an Abſtract of Hunnnius's Funeral Oration, made by Leoanard Hutterus.

(11) Matthieu, Hiſt. de la Paix, livr. iv, ad ann. 1601, pag. m. 134.

(12) Matthieu is miſtaken. Cayet, *Hiſt. de la Paix, pag.* 290, is not more in the right when he ſays, that the divines of the duke of Bavaria were Hunger and Tanner, doctors of the Faculty of Paris, and Gretſer a Jeſuit. Tanner had been a Jeſuit ever ſince he was eighteen years of age, and conſequently he was not doctor of the Faculty of Paris.

(13) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, pag. 135.

(14) Ibid. pag. 136.

(15) Baillet, article xxi, of the *Anti.*

(16) Idem, Art. xxxvii, n. 1.

(17) Idem, Art. xxi.

(18) It is an error of the preſs for the *ineundo.* Father Southwell has kept the word *jucundo.*

(19) Alegambe, Biblioth Script. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 200.

(20) An error of the preſs for *Cretico.*

(21) See Mr Baillet, article xxi, of the *Anti.*

(22) Micrælius, ubi ſupra, pag. 760.

(23) Inde divinæ benedictionis veſtigia, tum in re familiari, tum in eo potiſſimum deprehendit: quod juxta promiſſio Pſalmi, *vidit filios ac filias, ſicut plantationes olivarum, in circuitu menſæ ſuæ.* Apud Melchior. Adam. ubi ſupra, pag. 730.

(24) Pſalm cxxviii.

(25) *See* Moller. Iſagoge ad Hiſt. Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ, part. III, pag. 469.

(26) *Taken from* Micrælius, ubi ſupra, pag. 760, 761.

diſcovered more prepoſſeſſion and violence, than in that which he intituled, *Calvinus Judaïzans* [K]. He accuſed Calvin of ſo many crimes in point of Hereſy [L], that

pinæ anno 1633 evulgavit duodecim illa Reſponſa, ſeu, ut ipſe pariter vocat, *Præjudicia*, inſcripta Abbati Fuldenſi, eum in finem, ut evinci poſſet, Lutheranos (per errorum ſummum iis conjungit Calviniſtas, quum neque Matthæus Weſenbecius, neque Hieronymus Treutlerus, prout fingit Hunnius, unquam vixerint in communione eorum, qui Calviniſtæ audiunt) eſſe αὐτοκατακρίτους, atque dictante propria conſcientia, debere reſtituere bona Eccleſiaſtica, à ſe *invaſa, occupata, direpta, ac prophanata*, ut loquitur famelicus Apoſtata in titulo. Verum eſſe quod dico, quivis cognoſcet, ſi inſtituerit Conſilium Theologicum comparare cum hiſce Reſponſis; ubi aut Hunnius, aut ejus Typographus erravit in citandis authoribus, maxime juris Canonici textibus, pariter (reſpicio primam editionem) errant Architecti hujus, Κατ᾽ ἀντίφρασιν, Conſilii Theologici; quod adeo impudens, ut pag. 25. ſpeciatim in hunc Hunnii tractatum digitum intendat (27). —— *I once more obſerve, that this poor compilation is for the moſt part taken from the twelve councils of the Lutherans . . . publiſhed together by Helfricus Ulricus Hunnius, a Civilian, and ſon to Giles Hunnius, formerly a famous profeſſor of Divinity, in the univerſity of Wirtemberg; who being allured by the bait of Antichriſt, baſely went over to the Papiſts, and being, according to the common fate of Apoſtates, neglected by them, who, after the example of the devil, Math.* iv. 9. *uſe to make moſt proſelytes by theſe myſtic words*, all theſe things will I give unto thee, *publiſhed at Cologn, in* 1633, *theſe three Anſwers, or, as he alſo calls them*, Prejudices, *dedicated to the abbot of Fuld, intending therein, to prove that the Lutherans (by an egregious blunder, he joins the Calviniſts to them, tho' neither Matthew Weſenbecius, nor Jerom Treutlerus never lived in the communion of thoſe who are called Calviniſts, as Hunnius pretends) are ſelf-condemned, and ought, according to their own priciples, to reſtore the eccleſiaſtic poſſeſſions, which they have* invaded, poſſeſſed, robbed, and prophaned, *as this hungry apoſtate expreſſeth himſelf in his title page. Any body may be convinced of the truth of what I alledge, by comparing the Theological Council with theſe anſwers: wherever either Hunnius, or his Printer, has committed an error in quoting of authors, eſpecially in the texts of the Canon-law there (I mean in the firſt edition) the compilers of this pretended Theological Council likewiſe err; which is ſo impudent, that, pag.* 25, *he particularly points to this treatiſe of Hunnius.*' Mr Baillet, whom nothing can eſcape, was not ignorant of the change of this man's religion; but he did not know that he was the ſon of the author of the *Anti-Gretſer*. Let us ſee what he ſays. 'When the Proteſtants, who alledge againſt us the *Anti-Hunnius*, and the *Reſolutio Anti-Hunniana* of Valentinus Bullen, a Lutheran, reckon ſtill Hunnius amongſt thoſe of their communion; either they give us reaſon to believe, that they have confounded Nicolas Hunnius, a Lutheran, who died in 1643, with Helfricus Ulricus Hunnius, the German civilian, converted from Lutheraniſm to the church of Rome, who lived at the ſame time with the other Hunnius; or they are willing to conceal his converſion, either becauſe they take it to be falſe, or of a ſhort duration. However it be, Val. Bullen printed againſt him his *Anti-Hunnius*, at Leichen, in the year 1633, in 8vo, with this title, *Reſolutio Anti-Hunniana* ſeu *Reſponſio ad calumnioſam Reſolutionem tertiam præjudicialium Quæſtionum H. Ulr. Hunnii.* He ſhews in that work, that he is perſuaded there was no diſſimulation in his renouncing of Lutheraniſm, and he ſufficiently diſcovers, that he had read his book of the twelve *unanſwerable arguments of the Catholic religion*; which came out at Cologne, in 12mo, 1632 (28).' Our Ulricus Hunnius publiſhed at Gieſſen, a tract *de Tranſactione*, in 1615, four books *variarum reſolutionem Juris Civilis*, at Francfort, in 1620, and a diſpute *de homicidio & ejus pœna*, at Marpurg, in the year 1625.

[*K*] *He intituled one of his books*, Calvinus Judaïzans (29).] I am not ſatisfied with the knowledge I have hitherto acquired concerning the hiſtory of this book, and it's conſequences; but I think I may ſay, and I hope Mr Baillet (30) will not take it ill, that it did not come out in 1575. Hunnius was then but twenty five years old; and if he had ſignalized himſelf at that age by ſuch a work, the author of his Funeral Oration would not have failed to obſerve it, and would not have ſaid, that it was about the year 1584, that Hunnius began to write againſt the Calviniſts. The Jeſuit Contzen (31) places the impreſſion of *Calvinus Judaïzans* in the year 1593, and I believe he is in the right. That which perplexes me, is to ſee in Pareus's life, that in the year 1595. Giles Hunnius diſturbed the peace of the church, by accuſing the Calviniſts, and John Calvin by name, of judaizing. I ſet down the paſſage ſomewhat at large, becauſe we find in it ſome ſtrokes of our Hunnius's character in his adverſary's judgment: 'Repertus eſt anno deinceps 1595 turbulentus quidam Gracchus, qui pacem Eccleſiæ livido calamo inquietare paravit, ægre ferens, Evangelicorum Principum animos à tribunitiis Ecebolorum concionibus abhorrere, unionemque ac concordiam Chriſtianam ſerio meditari: quam proinde non alia fabrica melius ſe diſrumpere poſſe ſperavit, quam ſi immani iſto convitio gravaret Eccleſias Reformatas, criminatus eas *Judaïzare*, ac CALVINUM primipilarem Eccleſiarum Reformatarum Doctorem, Judaicis gloſſis pleraque oracula Veteris Teſtamenta detemerare. Accuſatio hæc tametſi non communem cauſam Eccleſiarum Orthodoxarum tangeret, proprieque eam ſpectaret, cujus Epiſcopus fuiſſet *Calvinus*, tamen quia per illius latus cæteræ omnes in capita CHRISTO unitæ petebantur, propudioſis iſtis calumniis CLYPEUM *Veritatis Catholicæ de ſacroſancta Trinitate* oppoſuit, Eccleſiaſque Orthodoxas, & CALVINUM Electum DEI organon fortiſſime aſſeruit: adeoque in fumos diſſipavit *Judaïca* & *Arianica illa cymbala* (32). —— *In the year* 1595, *there appeared a ſeditious fellow, who prepared to diſturb the peace of the church by his pen, taking it ill, that the Proteſtant princes highly diſapproved of the tribunitial aſſemblies of the Ecebolians, and thought ſeriouſly of an union and agreement among Chriſtians: the beſt way to prevent which, he thought, was to load the Reformed churches with the grievous accuſation of* judaizing, *and to charge* Calvin, *the leading doctor of the Reformed churches, with adulterating many of the ſacred oracles of the Old Teſtament by Jewiſh gloſſes. This accuſation, tho' it did not affect the common cauſe of the orthodox churches, and particularly reſpected that of which Calvin was biſhop, yet, foraſmuch as all the reſt, united in CHRIST their head, were ſtruck at thro' his ſides, he oppoſed to theſe baſe calumnies the* Clypeus Veritatis, &c. ſhield of Catholic truth concerning the Holy Trinity, *and ſtrenuouſly defended the orthodox churches, and* Calvin, *the choſen inſtrument of GOD; and thus he baffled the charge of Judaiſm and Arianiſm.*' In reading this concluſion, would not one think that the controverſy was intirely laid aſleep by Pareus's anſwer? And yet it is not true. Hunnius replied; and ſo did his adverſary. Hutterus relates that in 1598 Hunnius publiſhed two books againſt Pareus, who had written for Calvin (33). 'Pareus returned to the charge, and wrote a book that he printed at Neuſtadt in 1599, in 8vo, intituled *Orthodoxus Calvinus oppoſitus Pſeudo-Calvino Judaïzanti*. It was reprinted forty two years after at Geneva (34).' This I learn from Mr Baillet, who thereby brings me into a new perplexity; for I infer from the preface of *Calvinus Orthodoxus* (35) that Pareus compoſed and publiſhed it in 1594. He ſays (36) that Calvin had been dead thirty years, and that this Apology ſhould have come out at Francfort at the ſpring fair, if the authority of the ſuperiors had not retarded the impreſſion (37). He adds, they have changed their mind (38), and approved my publiſhing this book. This plainly ſhews that *Calvinus Orthodoxus* was printed in 1594, and yet the author tells us in the laſt pages that Samuel Huberus had been baniſhed from Wittemberg, which, according to Melchior Adam, did not happen till the year 1595 (39).

[*L*] *He accuſed Calvin of ſo many crimes in point of Hereſy.*] Here is the ſummary of his *Calvinus Judaïzans*, as Pareus gives it (40). 'In ipſo libri titulo Calvinum ex Ariano Judæum, vel certe ex Arianizante Judaïzantem facit, & amariſſimè paſſim inſectatur,

(27) Martinus Schoockius, Exercitat. Variar. pag. 52. Edit. in 4to.

(28) *Baillet, article lxxix, of the* Anti.

(29) *Here is the whole title:* Ægidii Hunnii Calvinus Judaïzans, hoc eſt, Judaïcæ gloſſæ & corruptelæ quibus Joannes Calvinus illuſtriora Scripturæ Sacræ loca, & teſtimonia de glorioſa Trinitate, Deitate Chriſti, & Spiritus Sancti, cum primis autem vaticinia Prophetarum de adventu Meſſiæ, nativitate ejus paſſione, reſurrectione, aſcenſione ad cœlos & ſeſſione ad dexteram Dei deteſtandum in modum corrumpere non abhorruit.

(30) Art. lxvi, n. 1, *of the* Anti.

(31) In Jubilo Jubilorum, pag. 307.

(32) Philippus Pareus, in Vita Davidis Parei, pag. m. 51.

(33) Duobus libris D. Pareo reſpondit, qui Calvini patrocinium ſuſceperat. *Apud Melchior. Adam. pag.* 729.

(34) Baillet, art. lxvi, n. 1, *of the* Anti.

(35) *It is the title of the book in the Geneva edition*, 1641.

(36) Præf. pag. 4.

(37) Ib. pag. 14.

(38) Ib. pag. 15.

(39) In Vita Hunnii, pag. 729.

(40) Pareus, in Præfat. Calvini Orthodoxi, p. 9.

that he might have feared to be treated as Servetus was, if he had lain at Hunnius's mercy.

There are ſome things in the remark, in which I mention the *Calvinus Judaïzans*, which ought to be rectified [*M*].

quod mera ambitione, ſtudio, perverſo, ludo aleatorio, verſutia veteratoria, temeritate deſultoria, Scripturas ſacras à ſenſu proprio ad peregrinum inflectat, quod eaſdem tetris corruptelis, gloſſis impiis, proditoriis eluſionibus & plenis Judaïcæ perfidiæ nequitiæque ſtrophis, ad ſuam & aliorum perniciem horribiliter alio detorqueat: quòd teſtimonia de Deo uno & trino ſtropharum ſuarum ſpinis intricet, quòd Scripturæ locis æternam Deitatem Chriſti confirmantibus caliginem Judaïcam offundere non reformidet quòd illuſtriſſima vaticinia Prophetarum de Meſſia Judaïcis perverſionibus involvat, in fraudem Chriſtianæ religionis adulteret, & ad perfidiam Judaïcæ infidelitatis, Arianæque impietatis retundendam ſtrophis nefariis hebetet, inutiliaque reddat: quod evangeliſtarum, Apoſtolorumque ſacroſanctas explicationes nequitur eludat: ipſos Apoſtolos ſub ferulam cenſoriam revocet; flagellet: quod Scriptorum Eccleſiaſticorum, veterum & recentium pias interpretationes altiſſimè deſpiciat & irrideat, ipſoſque ſexagenarios de ponte præcipitet, &c. Paſſim etiam non acerbis modo ſarcaſmis ſurdo illudit, ſed & conviciatur virulentiſſimè, appellitans acutum Diaboli inſtrumentum, Cenſorem, Ariſtarchum, Dictatorem Apoſtolo Paulo doctiorem, ἀυτοδίδακτον Scripturæ interpretem, Doctorem ſuperciolioſum, præſtigiarum Judaicarum architectum, colubrum, angelum & Spiritum tenebrarum ex abyſſi puteo emergentem, & quæ alia hujus generis infinita ſunt maledicentiæ ejus emblemata, vel potius convicia, lectu ſanè & auditu horrenda. — *In the very title of the book, he makes Calvin from a Arian a Jew, or at leaſt from an Arianizar a Judaizer, and every where bitterly inveighs againſt him, as one who, thro' meer ambition, a perverſe bent, gameſter-like, with wicked ſubtilty, and deſultory raſhneſs, wreſt the ſacred ſcriptures from their genuine ſenſe to a foreign one; as one who, by baſe corruptions, impious gloſſes, treacherous eluſions, and turnings full of Jewiſh perfidy and malice, terribly perverts their meaning to his own, and the deſtruction of others; as one, who perplexes the proofs of the one-three God; as one, who is not afraid to throw Jewiſh darkneſs over the paſſages which confirm the Eternal Divinity of Chriſt; as one, who obſcures by Jewiſh perverſions the moſt illuſtrious prophecies concerning the Meſſiah, adulterates them to the prejudice of the Chriſtian religion, and, to blunt the edge of Jewiſh infidelity, and Arian impiety, wickedly turns the force of them, and renders them uſeleſs; as one, who impiouſly eludes the ſacred explications of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles, and cenſures the Apoſtles themſelves; as one, who has a high contempt for, and laughs at the pious interpretations of the eccleſiaſtical writers, both ancient and modern,* &c. . . . . . . *He not only bitterly ſcoffs at him every where, but even ſlanders him moſt virulently, calling him a ſharp inſtrument of the devil, a cenſor, an Ariſtarchus, a dictator, more learned than the apoſtle Paul, a ſelf-taught interpreter of ſcripture, a ſupercilious doctor, an architect of Jewiſh witchcrafts, a ſerpent, an angel and ſpirit of darkneſs emerging from the abyſs of Hell, and a thouſand other ſlanderous appellations, ſhocking both to hear and read.*' Note, that he declares, that if he does not give a demonſtration of John Calvin's Judaiſm, he never deſires to be believed upon any thing elſe (41). One cannot forbear asking this queſtion; was he perſuaded of what he ſaid, or was he not? Chriſtian charity obliges us to ſay he was; for otherwiſe we muſt take him for the moſt wicked man alive. Let us ſay then, that he ſpoke according to his perſuaſion, and conclude from thence, that in hot conſtitutions like his, zeal is a ſort of drunkenneſs, which ſo diſorders the mind, that a man ſees every thing double, and the wrong way (42). The prieſteſs of Bacchus, who fell upon her own ſon, whom ſhe took for a wild boar (43), whilſt he looked on the ceremonies of the feaſt without any faith, or rather with contempt, is an image of the giddineſs which ſeizes the zealots. Pareus aſcribes all this outrage of Hunnius to the devil; it is the devil, ſays he (44), who employed Hunnius as a proper artiſt to write ſuch calumnies. 'En vero tandem, Chriſtiane Lector, extremæ improbitatis Satanæ exemplum. Quaſi enim hactenus Neſtorianiſmis, Arianiſmis, Turciſmis, Paganiſmis, Atheiſmis, & id genus impuriſſimis ſputis ſuis Eccleſias noſtras parum conſpurcarit: nuper eaſdem etiam JUDAISMI ſtercoribus petulantiſſimè conſpergere eſt aggreſſus, conflato per idoneum artificem libello mendaci juxtà & maledico, qui titulo CALVINI JUDAIZANTIS circumfertur. —— *Behold, Chriſtian reader, an inſtance of the extreme malice of the devil. As though hitherto he had not ſufficiently defiled our churches with Neſtorianiſm, Arianiſm, Turciſm, Paganiſm, Atheiſm, and the like; he has lately endeavoured to throw upon it Jewiſh filth, by the means of a lying and ſlanderous book, drawn up by an artiſt fit for the purpoſe, and handed about under the title of* Calvin turn'd Jew.' The deſign was, according to Pareus, to extirpate the Calviniſts, that the Ubiquitarian doctors might be in great repute. 'Hinc *Pſeudo-Calvinus Judaïzans* cujus hoc eſt argumentum & ſcopus. *Calvinus eſt Judaïzans Arianizans: Ergo & Calviniſtarum Eccleſiæ (quas vocant) ſunt tales: ergo extirpandæ: ergo ceſſabunt Ubiquitati faceſſere negotium: ergo ſtabit Ubiquitas: ergo in pretio erunt Ubiquitarii Doctores.* Hæc eſt Satanæ Dialectica (45). —— *Hence the* Falſe-Calvin turn'd Jew, *of which this is the argument and ſcope.* Calvin both judaizes, and arianizes; therefore the churches of the Calviniſts (as they are called) are ſuch; therefore to be extirpated; therefore they will ceaſe to diſturb Ubiquity; therefore Ubiquity will maintain it's ground; therefore the Ubiquitarian doctors will be eſteem'd. *This is the devil's Logic.*'

[*M*] *There are ſome things in the remark* [*K*], *which ought to be rectified.*] The two paſſages in that remark, in which I ſuppoſed, that Lipenius is not miſtaken in placing under the year 1594, the edition of Hunnius's Anti-Pareus, muſt be thrown out. At preſent I am of opinion, that Mr Baillet was not wrong in ſaying, that we ought to correct that date of Lipenius; for I have a copy of the Anti-Pareus, the title of which bears, that it was printed at Frankfort, *ex officina Paltheniana*, in the year 1598. The title of the book, ſuch as I have given it from Mr Baillet, is imperfect, and in ſuch a manner as to render it obſcure; but here it is entire: *Anti-Pareus: hoc eſt invicta refutatio venenati ſcripti a D. Davide Pareo, Heidelbergenſi Theologo, editi in defenſionem ſtrophorum & corruptelarum quibus Johannes Calvinus illuſtriſſima Scripturæ teſtimonia de myſterio Trinitatis, necnon oracula Prophetarum de Chriſto, deteſtandum in modum corrupit. Scriptus per Ægidium Hunnium.* Hunnius declares, that being ſufficiently taken up with other matters, he ſhould not have ſo much as caſt an eye on Pareus's book, if the advice of his friends, and the vanity with which his ſilence inſpired his enemies, had not determined him to reply (46). It is thus he excuſes his not replying ſooner. Now it being certain, that the book, which he refutes, is that which David Pareus intituled *Calvinus Orthodoxus*, it follows that this work of Pareus was not firſt publiſhed in 1599, and is not a Reply, as Mr Baillet thought it was. Let us now affirm, that it appeared either in 1594, or 1595.

Note, that Hunnius complains, that Pareus accuſes him of having maintained, that John Calvin was an Arian. He declares that he had acknowledged the very reverſe, and that he had only ſhewn, that the ſenſe, which Calvin gives to ſeveral paſſages of the Bible, is favourable to the Arians. I am going to cite a diſtinction which he makes uſe of. I am of opinion, ſays he, that Calvin had no intention to favour Arianiſm or Calviniſm, but the ſpirit (47), which ſuggeſted to him theſe falſe gloſſes, aimed at that end. 'Eſto autem, Calvinus ipſe ſtrophis ſuis non hoc ſibi habuerit propoſitum, ut Judæorum Arianorumque cauſam proveheret, ſed tantum ut interpretationis novitate & inſolentia ſibi præ cæteris doctoribus, veteribus & recentioribus, famam nominis conciliaret: Tamen ſpiritus, qui has ei gloſſas & eluſiones ſuggerebat, hunc ſibi ſcopum præfixum habuit abſque controverſia, ut nimirum ambiguis & lubricis hiſce ſtrophis unum poſt alterum de Trinitate teſtimonium, aut de Meſſia ora-

---

(41) Hac lege diſertè ſe adſtrinxit (pag. 6.) ut niſi Calvinum judaïzantem ad oculum demonſtret, nolit ſibi ulla unquam in re poſthac fidem adhiberi. *Id. ib. pag.* 16.

(42) Eumenidum veluti demens vidit agmina Pentheus
Et ſolem geminum & duplices ſe oſtendere Thebas. *Virgil. Æneid. lib. iv, ver.* 469.

(43) Ille aper in noſtris errat qui maximus agris,
Ille mihi feriendus aper. *Ovidius, Metam. lib. iii, ſub. fin.*

(44) Pareus, in Præfat. pag. 3.

(45) Id. in Calvino, Orthod. pag. 344.

(46) Hunnius, in Prolegomenis ad Anti Pareum.

(47) *That is, the Devil.*

‘ culum redderet incertum, atque ſic hominum animos paulatim a petra certitudinis dejectos in dubitationum fluctus conjiceret (48). ——— *Be it granted, that Calvin did not intend by his ſubtilties to favour the Jews or Arians, but only, by the novelty of his manner of interpreting, to raiſe his own character above that of other doctors, both ancient and modern: Yet the ſpirit, which ſuggeſted to him theſe gloſſes and eluſions, had doubtleſs this deſign, namely, by theſe ambiguous and ſubtile diſtinctions, to weaken, one after another, the evidences for the Trinity, and render the prophecies concerning the Meſſiah uncertain, and thus to plunge the minds of men, caſt down gradually from the rock of certainty, into a ſea of doubts.*’ Here is another paſſage, in which he ſays, that the devil diſcovers all his malice in Pareus's book. He expreſſes it very groſsly. ‘ Cum igitur hoc Parei ſcriptum ita comparatum ſit, ut in eo Satanas non dicam Diabolicæ ſuæ malitiæ veſtigia quædam oſtendat, ſed impurum ſuum podicem (ſalva venia) denudatum lectoribus conſpiciendum exhibeat, dubitavi, fateor, eſſetne quicquam operæ impendendum tam flagatioſi ſcripti refutationi: donec vel tandem & inimicorum inſulſis gloriationibus, & inprimis amicorum crebris admonitionibus excitatus, hunc quoque laborem, quamlibet moleſtum, ad vindicandam gloriam dei, & ſacro ſanctam veritatem ipſius, ſuſcipiendum mihi & exantlandum eſſe duxi (49). ——— *As therefore this work of Pareus is ſo drawn up, that Satan does not ſhew ſome footſteps only of his deviliſh malice, but (if I may ſay ſo) expoſes his filthy buttocks to the reader's view, I was in ſome doubt, I own, whether ſo vile a piece deſerved an anſwer: 'till at laſt, rouſed by the empty boaſtings of my adverſaries, and eſpecially by the repeated advice of my friends, I determined to undertake and go through with this toil, to vindicate the glory of God, and his ſacred truth.*’

(48) Hunnius, in Prolegomenis ad Anti-Pareum, pag. 30. *I mark the page, tho' the* Prolegomena *are not paged.*

(49) Id. ibid. pag. 3.

HUTTEN (Ulric de) a gentleman of Franconia, was born at Steckelberg (a) in the year 1488. He ſtudied firſt at Fulde, then at Cologne, after that at Francfort upon the Oder, where he was admitted Maſter of Arts in 1506, in the firſt promotion that was made in that univerſity newly erected. As he had a genius for Poetry, he began that way to ſet up for an author: it was in the year 1513 [*A*], when he publiſhed a work intituled, *Vir bonus*. The year following, prince Albert of Brandenburg making his firſt entry into Mentz, of which he was archbiſhop, occaſioned his writing a ſecond piece. Hutten made a large panegyric upon him in verſe, in which he included ingeniouſly that of all Germany. He had a couſin named **JOHN DE HUTTEN**, who was marſhal of the court to duke Ulric of Wirtemberg, and who was killed by this duke in the foreſt of Beblingen in the year 1515. Our poet waiting for an opportunity to expreſs his reſentment againſt this prince with ſword in hand, publiſhed ſeveral pieces againſt him (*b*). He was then in Italy [*B*], where he had given many proofs of his courage [*C*], in the war that the emperor Maximilian maintained nine years in that country. At his return into Germany (*c*) he was ſo recommended to this emperor by Conrad Peutinger, that this prince gave him the poetical crown [*D*]. From that time Hutten cauſed himſelf to be painted, armed, with a crown of laurel on his head, and was infinitely pleaſed with that equipage. He went ſoon after to the court of the elector of Mentz, where he compoſed a dialogue, intituled *Aula*, in 1518. A little after he went to the diet of Augſburg with the elector his maſter, who received there a cardinal's cap. In that diet complaints were made againſt the duke of Wirtemberg; nor was the murther of the marſhal of his court forgotten. Theſe complaints produced no great effect; but at laſt this prince having ſeized the imperial town of Reutlingen in January 1519, a league was formed againſt him in Suabia, which did not lay down their arms, till he was driven out of all his dominions, which he did not enter again, till fifteen years after. Our Hutten bore arms in that war. Luther's cauſe appearing to him to be good, he warmly embraced it, and publiſhed Leo X'ths bull againſt Luther in

(*a*) *It was the ſeat of the family, which ſubſiſts ſtill, and makes a figure.*

(*b*) *See the liſt of them in the remark* [*B*].

(*c*) *In* 1517.

[*A*] *It was in the year* 1513.] He was therefore twenty five years old when he began to ſet up for an author: Moreri is miſtaken then, and did not know how to copy Melchior Adam, when he ſays that Hutten *at eighteen years of age publiſhed ſeveral works in verſe.*

[*B*] *He was then in Italy.*] I have followed the chronology of my author Melchior Adam; but I ought to caution my readers, that I ſuſpect it a little. I do not believe that all the pieces, that concern the death of John Hutten, were publiſhed before Ulric Hutten's return into Germany. I find in Geſner's Bibliotheca, that the collection of all theſe writings was printed in the caſtle of Steckelberg, in 1519 in 4to. It contained *Ulrichi Hutteni ſuper interfectione propinqui ſui Joannis Hutteni equitis à Wirtenbergienſi Duce Ulricho deploratio, heroicis verſibus. Ad Ludovicum Huttenum ſuper interemptione filii conſolatoria Oratio. In Ulrichum Wirtenbergienſem orationes quinque invectivæ. In eundem dialogus, cui titulus Phalariſmus. Apologia pro Phalariſmo, & aliquot ad amicos epiſtolæ. Ad Franciſcum Galliarum regem epiſtola, ne cauſam Wirtenbergienſis tueatur exhortatoria. Inſeruntur etiam epiſtolæ aliquot ad amicos.* I ſee moreover that Melchior Adam cites a ſpeech of Ulric Hutten againſt the duke of Wirtemberg, which was not compoſed till 1519, that is, two years after the author's return from Italy into Germany: have I not reaſon then to queſtion the exactneſs of Melchior Adam? What he quotes out of this ſpeech, is too curious to be omitted. We learn from it, that John Hutten was digged up near the foreſt where he was killed, whilſt the confederates were at war with duke Ulrich of Wirtemberg. It was four years after the murther was committed, and yet the corps was not corrupted; it bled when it was touched, and the face was ſtill to be known. Ulric Hutten draws from hence a proof of his couſin's innocence (1).

[*C*] . . . . *he had given many proofs of his courage.*] Thoſe which he gave in the war, were doubtleſs inferior to that which he gave on a particular occaſion. He went from Rome to Viterbo, at a time that an embaſſador of France had made a ſtop in this laſt town. There happened a quarrel, in which Hutten, forſaken by his comrades, had five Frenchmen upon him at once, and put them all to flight, in ſpite of the wounds he had received. He made an epigram thereupon, *in quinque Gallos à ſe profligatos*, which may be ſeen in Melchior Adam.

[*D*] *The emperor Maximilian . . . gave him the poetical crown.*] He owned himſelf indebted for that honour to Peutinger's good offices, and expreſſed his acknowledgment of it in one of his books (2). He ſays alſo that that crown was made in Peutinger's houſe by his daughter Conſtantia, whoſe virtue and beauty he very much extols. ‘ Illam ajo coronam, illam lauream quam tuante domi tuæ, accurate contexente & adornante filia tua Conſtantia, omnium quæ iſtic ſunt puellarum & forma & moribus præſtantiſſima, apparaveras.’ For a poet who loved the fair ſex, like Hutten, this was a ſubject for new words, and a great many thoughts; and it had been a great chance if the fair Conſtantia Peutinger had not been praiſed in many epigrams.

[*E*] *He*

(1) Rem admirandam, & cujus prope nullius fides capax ſit, vidiſſes. Quartum jam annum defoſſum corpus non conſumtum, non putrefactum, totam adhuc faciem cognoſcibilem: quin etiam ſanguine commaduit attactum. En igitur innocentiæ teſtimonium! Depoſuimus Eſlingæ, inde ad patriam ſepulturam devecturi. *Hutten, in Orat. contra Wirtemb. apud Melchior. Adam. in Vitis Juriſcon. pag.* 17.

(2) Præfatione ad Principes German. ut Bellum Turcis inferant, apud Melch. Adam. in Vitis Juriſconſ. pag. 15.

in 1520, with interlineary and marginal gloſſes (*d*), in which he turned the Pope into ridicule. The liberty wherewith he wrote againſt the diſorders of the court of Rome [*E*], extreamly provoked Leo, and induced him to command the elector of Mentz to ſend him to Rome bound hand and foot. Hutten retired from that court [*F*], and went into the Low-Countries to that of Charles V; but he ſtaid not long there, having notice that his life was in danger. There is ſome probability, that he retired then into the fortreſs of Ebernburg; for there he wrote in 1520 his complaint to the emperor, to the electors of Mentz and Saxony, and all the ſtates of Germany, againſt the attempts that were made upon him by the Pope's emiſſaries. It was from the ſame place he wrote to Luther, in May 1521 (*e*), and ſent out ſeveral pieces in favour of the reformation. It is not well known, when he left this caſtle; but it is certain, that in the month of January 1523, he was gone from Baſil [*G*], where he thought to find a ſafe retreat; but he found himſelf expoſed to great dangers there. Eraſmus having excuſed himſelf from receiving his viſit, for fear of heightening the ſuſpicions that were raiſed againſt him, and for fear of ſomething elſe, which he afterwards confeſſed [*H*], found himſelf attacked ſoon after by a paſſionate piece of Ulric Hutten. He anſwered it [*I*]. Hutten had doubtleſs replied, had he lived long enough; but he died in an iſland in the lake of Zurich the twenty ninth of Auguſt 1523 [*K*]. He was a little man of

(*d*) *They are in the ſecond Tome of the Works of Luther, pag.* 53, & ſeq.

(*e*) *That Letter is in the ſecond Tome of the Works of Luther, Edit. Witt. pag.* 102.

[*E*] *He wrote againſt the diſorders of the court of Rome.*] Amongſt other works, he publiſhed an hiſtorical tract in High-Dutch upon the continual diſobedience of the Popes to the emperors. At the end of it we find that Maximilian I, who had been deceived by Leo X, uſed theſe words. 'This Pope has already 'baſely cheated me, and I can truly ſay, that no Pope 'ſince I have been in the world has been a man of 'his word; but with the grace of GOD I hope that 'this will be the laſt.' Cochleus (3) ſays, that before Luther had been ſpoken of, Ulric Hutten had publiſhed many things againſt the vexations, which Germany ſuffered from the Popes, and that in 1519, he made a little treatiſe called *Trias Romana*, of a very ingenious invention, which rendered the court of Rome extremely odious.

(3) Act. & Script. Lutheri, ad ann. 1519.

[*F*] *Hutten retired from the court of the elector of Mentz.*] I do not find in his life that the elector of Mentz ever cauſed him to be arreſted, as Moreri affirms; but only that he baniſhed him from his court, *excluſus itaque aula & urbe Moguntina* (4), and that he forbad all people to ſell and read his books under pain of excommunication.

(4) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Juriſconſult. pag. 19.

[*G*] *In the month of January* 1523, *he was gone from Baſil.*] This appears from theſe words of a letter of Oecolampadius (5): 'Sunt hic ex ſacerdotibus & 'theologis qui de me peſſime loqui cupiant, nec deſiſtunt ubi clam conveniunt. Tantum machinati ut 'Hutteno non fuerit diutius tutum hic agere, unde '& nudius tertius hinc diſceſſit, quorſum autem 'neſcio. —— *There are here ſome of the miniſters 'and divines who may deſire to have me ill ſpoken of, 'and who fail not to do ſo when they meet privately. 'Such were their contrivances, that it was not ſafe for 'Hutten to ſtay here any longer, on which account he 'went from hence three days ago, but whether I know 'not.*'

(5) *Dated from Baſil the twenty firſt of January,* 1523, lib. iv, Epiſt. pag. 968, apud Melchior. Adam. pag. 21.

[*H*] *Eraſmus refuſed . . . his viſit for fear . . . . of ſomething elſe, which he afterwards confeſſed.*] Writing to Melanchthon in September 1524 (6), he tells him that he would willingly have received his viſit without caring much what people ſhould ſay of it; and that the reaſon of his refuſing Hutten's viſit, was not ſo much for fear of rendering himſelf odious, as on another account, which was that he would have found himſelf obliged to lodge in his houſe that boaſter abounding with poverty and itch, who ſought only a neſt to abide in, and who borrowed of every body he met with. So that the intereſt of his purſe had more force upon Eraſmus on that occaſion than that of fame. 'Quod *Hutteni* colloquium deprecabar non invidiæ 'metus tantum in cauſa fuit: erat aliud quiddam quod 'tamen in *Spongia* non attigi. Ille egens & omnibus 'rebus deſtitutus quærebat nidum aliquem ubi moraretur. Erat mihi glorioſus ille miles cum ſua ſcabie '(7) in ædes recipiendus, ſimulque recipiendus ille 'chorus titulo *Evangelicorum*, ſed titulo duntaxat. '*Sletſtadii* mulctavit omnes amicos ſuos aliqua pecunia. *A Zuinglio* improbè petiit, quod ipſe *Zuinglius* 'mihi ſuis literis perſcripſit. Jam amarulentiam & 'glorias hominis nemo quamvis patiens ferre poterat. '—— *That I ſhunned an interview with Hutten, my 'regard to my reputation was not the only cauſe, there 'was indeed another which I have not touched upon in 'my* Sponge; *he being poor and deſtitute of all things, 'ſought only a neſt where he might remain, this boaſting ſoldier with his ſcabs, was to be received into my 'houſe, and received under the name of one of the Evangelics, though but in name only. He borrowed of 'all his friends at Schleſtadt what he could, he ſaucily 'importuned Zuinglius, as Zuinglius himſelf wrote me 'word. Since then the bitterneſs and vain glory of 'this man could not be born well by a perſon of the 'greateſt patience.*' You ſee then that our Hutten did not put Eraſmus in any fear on account of his being a good Lutheran, but conſidering him as a ſtripped officer, who would take up his winter quarters with him. There is no doubt but his viſits that were attended with borrowing of money, proved ungrateful to many, who were profeſſed Proteſtants.

(6) *That Letter is the xxiiith of the ninth book, pag.* 949.

(7) *It is very likely he means the pox by* ſcabies.

[*I*] *Eraſmus anſwered it.*] This anſwer is inſcribed to Zuinglius, and intituled *Spongia Eraſmi adverſus aſpergines Hutteni.* Eraſmus there ſincerely confeſſes, that he requeſted Hutten not to come to ſee him, unleſs ſome important reaſon obliged him to it; but he ſhews that his requeſt was ſo ſoftened, and that afterwards he made ſo many propoſals to that friend, that any reaſonable man would have been ſatisfied with them. The worſt is, he writ to Mark Laurinus, dean of Bruges, that if Hutten had come to ſee him, he would not have refuſed to diſcourſe with him (8). He adds, that the reaſon which hindered them from ſeeing one another, was, that Hutten could not be without a ſtove, and that Eraſmus could not endure one. By this inſtance we ſee, how liable the moſt honeſt men are not to ſay always in their letters things as they know them. Hutten was deſperately enraged againſt Eraſmus, and heaped up many diſobliging reproaches. Eraſmus juſtified himſelf the beſt he could. After Hutten's death, a Phyſician named Otho Brunfels, replied to Eraſmus for him.

(8) Fuit hic Huttenus paucorum dierum hoſpes: interim nec ille me adiit, nec ego illum; & tamen ſi me conveniſſet non repuliſſem hominem à colloquio. *Eraſm. Epiſt. vi, lib.* xxiii.

[*K*] *He died in an iſland in the lake of Zurich.*] He was alſo buried there, and after ſome years a gentleman of Franconia got this diſtich engraved on his ſepulchre.

Hic eques auratus jacet, oratorque diſertus
  Huttenus, vates carmine & enſe potens (9).

A knight, an orator renown'd,
  Here earth doth room afford,
Hutten, for various conqueſts crown'd
  Gain'd by his wit and ſword.

(9) Geſner. in Biblioth. folio 342.

The worſt of all is, that he died of the pox. If Varillas was the firſt that had ſaid it (10), I ſhould not be concerned for it: but I find this particular in Geſner's Bibliotheque: and who after this can chuſe but deplore the extravagance of man? Hutten running from place to place for religion, Hutten perſecuted for his great zeal, carries the pox with him wherever he goes, and dies of it at laſt. What a diſagreeing medley is this! He publiſhed a book in Latin in 1519, concerning the wood Guaiacum, and the venereal diſeaſe. At that time, he could treat of it like a maſter, for in all appearance, he had not got that diſtemper ſince his abjuration of Popery. For the reſt, Mr Varillas reckons

(10) Hiſt. de l'Hereſie, livr iv.

of a weak and ſickly conſtitution; but of great courage, and ſomewhat too paſſionate [*L*]. A collection of his poems was publiſhed at Francfort in 1538 (*f*). He is thought to be the author of many libels [*M*].

Part of his library fell into the hands of a Phyſician, who, as is ſaid, ſold ſome books to Frobenius. See the beginning of the ſecond book of Joachim Camerarius's letters.

The conjecture which the reader has ſeen in the foregoing editions, to wit, that John Hutten was ſuſpected to have too great a ſhare in the good graces of the ducheſs of Wirtemberg, is falſe. It was the duke who loved the wife of that gentleman (*g*). The duke has been introduced in a dialogue ſpeaking thus, *Nobilem juvenem, meum comitem, cum ejus uxorem puellam venuſtam deperirem, obtruncavi* (*h*). —— *I killed my companion, a noble youth; being paſſionately in love with his wife, a beautiful young woman.*

(*f*) *Taken from his Life in Melch. Adam*, in Vitis Juriſconſultor. Germaniæ, pag. 13, & ſeq.

(*g*) *See the fourth volume of* Obſervationum Selectarum ad Rem Litterariam ſpectantium, *printed at Hall*, 1701, *pag.* 169, 170.

(*h*) Ulr. Hutten. in Phalariſmo, fol. A iii.

---

reckons ill. He ſays that Hutten eſpouſed Luther's intereſt five years before his death, and two years after the diet of Augsburg, where he oppoſed the league that the court of Rome had a mind to form againſt the Turks. That diet was held in 1518. Hutten then muſt have turned Lutheran in 1520. Now he lived but three years after that. Varillas's remark, *that he was obliged to live* continently, *becauſe he had received holy orders*, is not perhaps altogether falſe; for we find theſe words in Melanchthon's life. ‘Interceſſerat Hutteno cum Croto Rubiano ſingularis uſus à prima adoleſcentia, quo autore vel certe adjutore reliquit ille contubernium Fuldanum, in quod pene puer magis diſciplinæ quam religionis cauſſa datus eſſet. —— *Crotus Rubianus was of ſingular uſe to Hutten from his infancy; for by his advice, or at leaſt aſſiſtance, he left the abbey of Fulda, where he had been put when almoſt a child, for the ſake of letters more than religion.*’

[*L*] *He was ſomewhat too paſſionate.*] Geſner (11) obſerves that at the beginning of the reformation, Hutten ſaid and wrote many things boldly and freely againſt the Roman Catholics, as alſo againſt the princes and magiſtrates of towns. He embraced Capnio's party againſt the Monks with ſo much violence, that after he had attacked that faction with the pen, he aſſaulted it with the ſword (12). He ſent news to Luther of the double war he made with the clergy. ‘Hutten literas ad me dedit ingenti ſpiritu æſtuantes in Romanum Pontificem, ſcribens ſe jam & literis & armis in tyrannidem ſacerdotalem ruere, motus quod pontifex ſicas & venenum ei intentarit, ac Epiſcopo Moguntino mandarit, captum ac vinctum Romam mittere (13). —— *Hutten ſent me a letter full of rage againſt the Pope, ſignifying he would now fall upon the tyranny of the prieſthood, both with his pen and arms, provoked that the Pope had threatened him with aſſaſſins and poiſon, and commanded the biſhop of Mentz to ſend him bound to Rome.*’ Since Luther diſapproved this man's violence (14), we need not wonder that it gave Melanchthon ſome uneaſineſs: He eſteemed Hutten's wit and learning; but he was afraid of his haughtineſs, and of his impetuous and innovating humour. ‘Ut virum magni facere & admirari propter doctrinæ eruditionem & præſtantiam ingenii, ſic ab illius natura vehemente & excelſo animo, & voluntate ad novas res propenſa . . . . nonnihil timere Philippum Melanchthonem licuit animadvertere.’ Camerarius (15) who tells us this, adds, that Ulric Hutten was very paſſionate, and that by his look and diſcourſe one might diſcover the inclination he had to cruelty. He applies to him what was ſaid of Demoſthenes; for he ſays that Hutten would have overturned all Europe, if his ſtrength could have ſeconded his deſigns and enterprizes. Judge of his humour by this ſpecimen. Having heard that the Carthuſians had made uſe of his printed picture in the houſe of office, he fined them two thouſand piſtoles (16). This was to make them pay dear for the little conſideration they had for the laurel that crowned that image. Mr Varillas (17) ſays, that Luther cauſed it to be placed in the front of his books. I have elſewhere (18) mentioned how Ulric Hutten threatened the nuncio, and ſo I can eaſily believe that he writ to the elector of Mentz, *If you burn my books, I will burn your towns* (19).

[*M*] *He is thought to be the author of many libels.*] Of theſe amongſt others; *Dialogus Philalethis civis Utopienſis. Oratio ad Chriſtum pro Julio ſecundo Ligure pontifice* (20). *Bullicida* (21): *Prædones: Momus: Carolus: Pietatis & ſuperſtitionis pugna: Conciliabulum Theologiſtarum adverſus bonarum literarum ſtudioſos. Apophthegmata Vadiſci & Paſquilli de deprevato Eccleſiæ ſtatu. Huttenus captivus, Huttenus illuſtris, authore S. Abydeno Corallo Germano* (22). A burleſque ſatire, intituled *Nemo*, was fathered upon Eraſmus, but it was Hutten that made it (23): he declared he was the author of it, and was angry that he ſhould be robbed of it. Some affirm that he is the author of the *Epiſtolæ Obſcurorum Virorum* (24). That fiction would be more tolerable than another that is imputed to him: it is pretended he forged the letter which he publiſhed in the name of the univerſities of Paris, Oxford, and Prague (25). If he had lived thirty five years longer (26), with what a deluge of books and libels, would not he have overflowed Europe?

(11) Biblioth. folio 342.

(12) Litigantes Monachos cum Capnione varie exagitavit, & illam factionem tum quidem vehementiſſimis ſcriptis, ſed aliquando poſt armis quoque expeditis adortus eſt. *Camerar. in Vit. Melancht.*

(13) Luther. Tom. I, Epiſt. pag. 282, & 285.

(14) Quid Huttenus petat vides, nollem vi & cæde pro Evangelio certari: ita ſcripſi ad hominem. *Idem, Tom I, Epiſt. pag.* 332.

(15) In Vita Melancht.

(16) Huttenus Carthuſianos, quia imagine ſua pro anitergiis uſi ſunt, in duobus millibus aureorum nummûm multavit. *Nicolaus Gerbelius, Epiſt. ad Jo. Schwebelium, apud Melchior. Adam.*

(17) Hiſt. de l'Hereſie, Livr. iv.

(18) *In citat.* (18), *of the article* ALEANDER (JEROME).

(19) Palavicin. Hiſt. Concil Trident. lib. i, cap xxv, n. 1.

(20) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Juriſconſ.

(21) Epitome Geſneri.

(22) Geſner, in Biblioth. *who takes that* Abydenus Corallus *to be a ſuppoſititious name.*

(23) *See Eraſmus's Letters, pag.* 543, & 575.

(24) *See remark* [*F*], *of the article* HOCHSTRATUS.

(25) *See Father Labbe*, de Script. Eccleſ. Tom. I, pag. 922.

(26) *Melchior Adam and Moreri, place his birth in the year* 1488, *and his death in the year* 1523, *and yet they ſay, that he lived thirty ſix years.*

HUTTERUS (LEONARD), profeſſor of Divinity at Wittemberg, was born in 1562 at Ulm, where his father was miniſter. He was ſo well inſtructed in the ſciences, and made ſo great a progreſs, that at thirty three years of age he was made profeſſor of Divinity in one of the moſt famous univerſities (*a*). He diſcharged all the parts of his office in ſuch a manner, that he was accounted a very laborious man, and very fit to teach (*b*). He expreſſed an ardent zeal for orthodoxy, being a moſt rigid and violent Lutheran. His writings breathe that zeal throughout [*A*]: and if what he ſaid of the martyrs of the Geneva confeſſion [*B*], be conſidered never ſo little, it muſt be

(*a*) *That of Wittemberg.*

(*b*) *Taken from Spizelius*, in Templo Honoris reſerato, pag. 32, & ſeq.

[*A*] *His writings breathe that zeal throughout.*] See eſpecially his book intituled *Concordia concors, ſive de origine & progreſſu formulæ Concordiæ Eccleſiarum Auguſtanæ Confeſſionis liber unus, Rudolpho Hoſpiniano oppoſitus.* It is in Folio and printed at Wittemberg in the year 1614 (1). See alſo his diſputation *pro formula Concordiæ* (2); his *Collegium Theologicum de articulis confeſſionis Auguſtanæ, & libro Chriſtianæ concordiæ* (3); his *Irenicum vere Chriſtianum, ſive de Synodo & unione Evangelicorum non fucata concilianda Tractatus Theologicus*; his *Sadeel Elenchomenus, hoc eſt Tractatio pro majeſtate humanæ naturæ Chriſti.* He wrote againſt Popery with great vigour. See his diſputes *de Sacrificio Romanenſium Miſſatico, ejuſque horrenda abominatione: de Tranſubſtantiatione & Proceſſionibus Pontificiis, pro aſſerendo integro Sacramento Cœnæ Dominicæ contra Jeſuïtas.* See alſo *Refutatio duorum Librorum Rob. Bellarmini de Miſſa: Triumphus de regno Pontificio: Ilias malorum regni Pontificio-Romani, ſive Hiſtorica Diſſertatio de injuſtiſſimo Pontificis Romani in Eccleſia Dei dominatu: Actio in Jacobum Gretſerum de Imperatorum, Regum, ac Principum Chriſtianorum in ſedem Apoſtolico Romanam munificentia pro Nicolao Clemangis* (4). I omit the titles of many other books both in High-Dutch and Latin. His *Calviniſta Aulico-Politicus*, which was printed at Wittemberg in the year 1615, ſhall be cited in the following remark.

[*B*] *What he ſaid of the martyrs of the Geneva confeſſion.*] The elector of Brandenburg had alledged amongſt other things, in his edict of toleration, the vexations and puniſhments which the Calviniſts had

(1) *See the article* HOSPINIAN, *remark* [*E*].

(2) *Printed at Wittemberg, in the year* 1605.

(3) *Printed at Wittemberg, in the Year* 1610.

(4) *Taken from Spizelius*, in Templo Honoris reſerato, pag. 37, 38.

undergone

be confeſſed that he ran into extreams. That humour of his expoſed him to ſeveral vexatious diſputes, in which he was forced to bear the ſtrokes of ſlander [*C*]. He died in the year 1616. He muſt not be confounded with him that publiſhed a Polyglot Bible [*D*].

undergone from the common enemy; but our Hutterus ſaid againſt it, that the Arians, the Anabaptiſts, and the Anti-Trinitarians, might make uſe of the ſame argument to obtain a toleration. He maintained, that the Calviniſts had not ſuffered death for believing that the blood of JESUS CHRIST would ſave them, but for refuſing to obey the Pope, whom they called Antichriſt. *Scripſerat quondam in Edicto Sereniſſimus Elector Brandeburgicus*, non excludendos eſſe à Chriſtiana communione *Reformatos*, qui idem ſentiunt in fundamento fidei, in Evangelio cum *Lutheranis* laborant, certant, luctantur, eoque nomine à communi hoſte innumeros cruciatos ſuſtinuerunt, ſuſtinentque, quique etiam ſanguinem pro confeſſione illa largiſſimè profuderunt. *Cornua illi obvertere auſus Hutterus in Aulico-Politico* cap. 2. pag. 176. &c. *ubi regerit*, à Papiſtis etiam Anabaptiſtas, Arianos, Antitrinitarios, alioſque ſupplicio affectos eſſe: cauſam ſupplicii noſtrorum non fuiſſe, quòd crediderint, ſe per Chriſtum ſervatum iri, ſed quòd Romanum Pontificem non agnoverint Paſtorem univerſalem ſed Antichriſtum, ejuſque jugum detrectaverint ferre (5). The Swiſs divine, who ſupplies me with this paſſage, judiciouſly obſerves, that this method of diſparaging the martyrdom of the Calviniſts might equally be imployed againſt the Lutheran martyrs. This he ſays, after having obſerved that a divine of Strasburg makes uſe of the ſame cavil as Hutterus. ‘ Gemella his effutivit Dannenhawerus, ‘ Argentinenſis Theologus, *Colleg. Decalog. p.* 394. ‘ ubi Reformatorum Martyrium *larvatum* vocare, & ‘ cum Judæorum, Ethnicorum, Arianorum ſub Atha‘laricho Gothorum Principe religionis cauſa occiſo‘rum Martyrio comparare non erubuit. Certè μεθοδεία talis etiam Lutheranæ Eccleſiæ Martyrii ‘ veri palmas laudemque præcideret (6). —— *To this ‘ purpoſe, Dannenhawerus, a divine of Strasburg, pub‘liſhed two pieces, wherein he does not bluſh, to call ‘ the martyrdom of the Reformed* Masked, *and to com‘pare it with the martyrdom of the Jews, Heathens, ‘ Arians, put to death under Athalaricus, prince of ‘ the Goths, on account of religion; certainly ſuch a ‘ fradulent conſtruction would alſo cut off from the ‘ Lutheran church, the honour and praiſe of true mar‘tyrdom.*’ Can we ſufficiently admire the effects of prepoſſeſſion? Is it not a deplorable thing, that a Popiſh miſſionary can object to the Proteſtants, that the martyrdom of their brethren is looked upon as a falſe martyrdom by ſome Lutheran doctors. See one of the remarks (7) of the article WESTPHALUS (JOACHIM). Note, that Pappus calls thoſe ſlanderers, who accuſe the Lutherans of looking upon the Calviniſt martyrs as the martyrs of the devil (8).

[*C*] *His humour expoſed him to ſeveral diſputes, where he was forced to bear the ſtrokes of ſlander.*] He is compared in his elogy, to the prophets and apoſtles, who were perſecuted for the truth; and it is affirmed that he anſwered calumny only with ſilence and contempt. I will not diſpute about theſe matters, being not ſufficiently acquainted with them; but I will ſay in general, that there are ſome doctors ſo paſſionate, ſo moroſe, and violent, that they get enemies, not becauſe they maintain orthodoxy, but by reaſon of their rude way of maintaining it. Their adverſaries take their revenge by perſonal reproaches, and publiſh the mcſt vexatious truths of them, and convict them of many ſcandalous things; and they know not how to juſtify themſelves. What muſt they do then? Why, they value themſelves extremely for their patience; they compare themſelves to the prophets and apoſtles, and to JESUS CHRIST himſelf. ‘ Being perſecuted, *ſay they*, like them for the truth, ‘ we open not our mouth, when the enemies of ‘ the truth abuſe us.’ Moliere ſhould have inſerted this in ſome ſcene of his Tartuffe, for it muſt be well obſerved, that theſe gentlemen are never ſilent, when they have ſcandals to publiſh againſt their neighbour, or when they can alledge any thing plauſible for their juſtification. Be it how it will, our Hutterus's panegyriſt crowns him with this fine elogy. ‘ Sicuti verò ſummis quibuſque Viris non omnia om‘ninò ex animi fluxere ſententia, ſed cruces, ca‘lumniæ & perſecutiones variæ illos exercuerunt, ita ‘ Hutterus certiſſimo hoc fidelium Dei Servorum cha‘ractere neutiquam caruit, quippe quo ab omnipo‘tente Deo, Prophetæ, Apoſtoli, & ſinceri Eccleſiæ ‘ Doctores olim ſunt ſignati . . . . Idem prorſus no‘ſtro fatum; quod æquo & patienti pertulit animo, ‘ magiſque de abſtergendis calumniis, ſuis anteceſſo‘ribus impactis, quam famæ & exiſtimationis propriæ ‘ vindicatione fuit ſollicitus, haud ignorans, omnes ‘ injurias oblivione melius, quam commemoratione ſa‘nari, & inimicorum calumnias contemptu potius ‘ quam lingua eſſe vindicandas (9). —— *But as all ‘ things have not altogether ſucceeded according to the ‘ wiſh of every great man, but croſſes, calumnies, and ‘ various perſecutions have exerciſed them; ſo Hutte‘rus did in no wiſe want this moſt certain mark ‘ of the faithful ſervants of* GOD, *as being that with ‘ which the prophets, apoſtles, and true doctors of the ‘ church were of old, ſealed by Almighty* GOD . . . . ‘ *The ſame was wholly the fate of ours; which he ‘ bore with an equal and patient mind, and was more ‘ ſollicitous to wipe out the reproaches levelled at his ‘ predeceſſors; than to vindicate his own fame and reputa‘tion, knowing that all injuries are better cured by ‘ oblivion than remembrance, and that the calumnies ‘ of foes are to be reſented with contempt, rather than ‘ the tongue.*’

[*D*] *He muſt not be confounded with him that publiſhed a Polyglot Bible.*] His name was ELIAS HUTTERUS. He firſt publiſhed a Bible in four languages, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and High-Dutch, at Hamburgh, in the year 1597. Afterwards he added to it the Italian, French, Sclavonian, and Saxon. His New-Teſtament was printed in the year 1600, in twelve languages, which are the Syriac, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, Bohemian, Italian, Spaniſh, French, Engliſh, Daniſh, and Poliſh. He reduced them to four in the edition of the year 1603, namely, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and German. This Polyglot Bible is very ſcarce. There is a collection of letters, containing the judgment of learned men about this work (10).

HUYBERT (PETER DE) lord of Burgh, Crayeſtein, &c. made himſelf famous by the great ſervices he did the Republic of the United Provinces of the Netherlands, and particularly to the province of Zealand. His family is very antient, and has produced many very conſiderable perſons [*A*]. He was born at Middleburg the firſt of Auguſt

[*A*] *His family is very antient, and has produced many very conſiderable perſons.*] He deſcended from CORNELIUS DE HUYBERT, and Joan de Haemſtede. The family of Haemſtede, is deſcended from Witte de Haemſtede, natural ſon to Floris earl of Holland and Zealand, lord of Frieſland, *&c.* and from a daughter of the lord Heuſden, a very conſiderable houſe at that time. That lady had too much complaiſance for count Floris, but it was under the promiſe of marriage. JACOB and HERMAN de HUYBERT, ſons of Cornelius, commanded the fleet, that carried the archduke Philip and his wife into Spain in the year 1506. Theſe two auguſt perſons were on board theſe two brothers: the fleet, which was very numerous, met with a dreadful tempeſt in the channel; ſeveral ſhips were loſt in ſight of the archduke, and yet by reaſon of ſome difference betwixt him and the king of England, he would not conſent to put into any Engliſh port. But when the two brothers HUYBERT repreſented to him the extream danger they were in, and that it was abſolutely neceſſary to make into Weymouth haven, he and his queen ſubmitted to their advice and good conduct. Then it was that he gave them this motto

WAECKT

---

(5) Heideggerus, Diſſertat. Select. Tom. II, pag. 352.

(6) Heideggerus, ibid.

(7) *The remark* [*H*].

(8) Nullo modo eos habemus pro martyribus Diaboli quemadmodum accuſamur. *Joh. Pappus, Epit. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. pag. m.* 49.

(9) Spizelius, ubi ſupra, pag. 35.

(10) *Taken from* Hottinger. Bibl. quadripartita, lib. i, cap. ii, pag. 141, 142.

Auguſt 1622, and was elected counſellor of that town the twenty fourth of March 1646. He gave ſuch proofs of his capacity, that the province of Zealand deputed him to the aſſembly of the States-General, and then to the firſt conferences (*a*) that were held between the deputies of the king of Spain, and thoſe of the United Provinces, after a long and bloody war of eighty years, and gloriouſly terminated at Munſter the thirtieth of January 1648. He was ſent in quality of embaſſador extraordinary to the king of Sweden, the king of Poland, and the elector of Brandenburg, during the famous war in which the Swedes invaded Poland, and made ſo many conqueſts upon the king of Denmark, that they forced him to give up to them three fine provinces on the other ſide of the Sound. In March 1659, he was choſen ſecretary of ſtate for the province of Zealand, and in May the ſame year was named plenipotentiary for the treaty of peace, which was concluded between Sweden and Denmark (*b*), by the mediation of France, England, and the United Provinces in 1660. The ability and fidelity that he ſhewed in thoſe illuſtrious employments, gave ſuch ſatisfaction, that, in March 1664, he was raiſed to the dignity of great penſionary of Zealand. The inſtructions of that poſt import, amongſt other things, that they ſhall maintain, on all occaſions, and at all times, the rights and preeminences of the ſtate, and the laws and privileges of the province, againſt all thoſe that ſhould attempt to violate them: whereby this becomes a very delicate as well as laborious employment. Nevertheleſs he diſcharged the duties of it twenty three years and an half with a general applauſe, and to the great ſatisfaction of his maſters, who deputing him, the twenty ſeventh of September 1687, to the great council of ſtate, expreſſed, in his commiſſion, *that they were very well ſatisfied with his long and faithful ſervices, of which they ſhould ever preſerve a grateful remembrance.* We muſt not forget, that he was created plenipotentiary of the United Provinces in the year 1667, for the treaty of Breda (*c*). He died at the Hague the ſeventh of January 1697. He was always obſerved to have an unſhaken zeal for the religion eſtabliſhed by the laws of the ſtate. He was it's defender on all occaſions, and could never ſuffer any alteration to be made in it, either in the doctrine or diſcipline (*d*). I ſhall ſpeak of his three ſons in the remarks [*B*]. His ſons buried him in a chapel of the church of Burgh in Zealand, and cauſed an epitaph to be engraved on his tomb (*e*), which may be ſeen below [*C*].

WAECKT HUYBERTS. That is to ſay, WATCH HUYBERTS. The emperor Maximilian, and the archduke Charles, to expreſs their great ſatisfaction for the ſervices they had done to the king of Caſtile, their ſon and father, on the thirteenth of March 1513, honoured the three brothers JOHN, Jacob, and Herman DE HUYBERT, and their poſterity with the privilege of wearing a ſword, permitting to each of them to have three domeſtics that ſhould wear it likewiſe: which was a very great honour at that time. John and Herman were ſent, the nineteenth of December 1512, to Henry VIII, king of England, by Margaret, archducheſs of Auſtria, then governeſs of the Low-Countries: It was about ſome negotiations, which ſhe was pleaſed to truſt them with. The emperor Charles V being in the town of Ziriczee, lodged in the houſe of LIVIN JACOBSEN DE HUYBERT, who was overſeer of the Dikes. The three brothers ſettled in the ſame town, and built each of them a houſe, which are ſtill the largeſt and moſt conſiderable buildings of Ziriczee (1).

Juan Chriſtoval Calvete de Eſtrella makes honourable mention of this family: *y no poco nombrados*, ſays he (2), *eran los Huybertos de Cirixea por ſu valor y riqueza*, that is, *The Huyberts were very famous for their valour and their riches.*

The author of the ſupplement to the chronicle of the abbot of Urſperg mentions him who conducted the archduke Philip into Spain: the name he gives him does not agree with the memoir which I have quoted: however, here is what he ſays. ‘Carolus Quintus *rediit in* Hiſpanias, Johannes Cornelius nauta navigatione decem dierum ab Anglico littore vehit. Hic nauta regem Philippum illuſtriſſimi Auguſti patrem, ultima navigatione in ſumma tempeſtate in Hiſpanias vexerat, & reginam Danorum una cum principe Ultrajectino in Daniam vexerat. Vir dives & peritiſſimus rei nauticæ (3). —— *Charles V returned by ſea to Spain. John Cornelius, a ſailor, conducted him thither in ten days from the Engliſh coaſt. He had formerly carried king Philip, the emperor's father, to Spain, in a great ſtorm, and had likewiſe before had the honour of conducting the queen of Denmark, together with the prince of Utrecht, into Denmark. He was a very rich man, and eminent for his ſkill in navigation.*’

[*B*] *I will ſpeak of his three ſons.*] The eldeſt is ANTHONY DU HUYBEBT, lord of Cruyningen, counſellor in the ſovereign court of juſtice. The ſecond is JOHN DU HUYBERT, lord of Nootgawe. He took to arms, in which his good conduct and valour advanced him to the poſt of lieutenant-general of horſe (4). The third has been counſellor in the council of Flanders, and at preſent is one of the directors of the Eaſt-India Company (5).

[*C*] *His ſons .... cauſed an epitaph to be engraved on his tomb, which may be ſeen below.*] It contains, in very noble expreſſions, an abſtract of his life and the character of his ſoul.

D. M.
Viri. Nobliſ. &. Ampliſſimi.
PETRI. DE. HUYBERT.
DOMINI. DE. BURG. ET CRAYSTEIN.
antiqua. &. multis. imaginibus. clara. familia.
Zeelandica. oriundi.

Natus. eſt. Middleburgi. propter. ingenii. præſtantiam. oris. facundiam. &. induſtriam. ſingularem. invigilandi. bono. publico. in. ſenatum. illius. urbis. cum. vix. adoleviſſet. eſt. cooptatus. omnium. expectationi. cum. ſatisfeciſſet. poſt. pacem. Monaſterienſem. ad conventum. Mechlinenſem. controverſiis. non. deciſis. inter. Hiſpanos. &. Batavos. componendis. dein. ad. Reges. Sueciæ. Poloniæ. Daniæ. &. Elect. Brandeb. miſſus. fuit. publice. graviſſimis. de. rebus. iiſque. confectis. ex. ſententia. Reip. redux. a. Præpot. Ordd. Zeeland. perſpecta. ejus. fide. & prudentia. delectus. fuit. ut. iis. eſſet. a. ſecretis. poſt. advocatus. perpetuus. Reip. Zeeland. eſt. factus. ſummo. omnium. conſenſu. dehinc. ab. Unitis. Belgis. Ablegatus. fuit. ad. Pacificationem. Bredanam. tandem. ne. tantæ. prudentiæ. fructum. ſoli. caperent. Zeelandi. paſſi. ſunt. eum. adſcribi. Conſilio. communi. ord. Sociatorum. ſeptem. populorum. ut. omnium. utilitatibus. ſerviret. ad. has. dignitates. illum. evexit. non. ambitio. populi. &. potentium. ſed. teſtata. cunctis. incredibilis. vigilantia. in. obeundis. ſtationis. ſuæ. muniis. ſumma. conſilii. præſentia. in. celeriter. inveniendis. quæ. tempora. Reip. exigebant. mira. dexteritas. in. efficiendis. quæ. in. rem. ſapienter. conſuluerat. ſingularis. ſagacitas. in. arduis. &. impeditiſſimis. negotiis. explicandis. &. ingens. robur. animi. in. iis. libere. oppugnandis. qui. rectæ. ſententiæ. de. Rep. cujus. ſæpe. auctor. fuit. adverſabantur. partes. nec. fecit. nec. fovit. in. omni. varietate. rerum. &. Reip. viciſſitudinibus. ſtatum. &. dignitatem. ſuam. tenuit. illibatam. ſatur. vitæ. defletus. bonis. omnibus. &. valde. deſideratus. Θ. D. VII. Januar. An. Ch. CIↃ. IↃC. XCVII. ætat. LXXV. mœſtiſſimi. liberi. P. C.

(*a*) *Viz.* The conferences held at Mechlen, in 1652. and 1653.

(*b*) The king of Sweden had begun a new war, and conquered all Denmark except Copenhagen.

(*c*) That treaty, which was made by the mediation of Sweden, put an end to the war between Charles II, king of England, and the United Provinces.

(*d*) Taken from a Memoir communicated to the Bookſeller.

(*e*) He himſelf cauſed this tomb to be made, and beſides his large contributions towards the repairing of the church wherein he is buried, he directed the building of it, which paſſes for a good piece of architecture.

(1) Taken from a Memoir imparted to the Bookſeller.

(2) In the deſcription of the journey of Don Philip, prince of Spain, through the Netherlands, in the year 1548, printed at Antwerp, 1552, in fol. pag. 263.

(3) Paralipomena ad Abbat. Urſpergenſ. apud Anton. Matthæum. Veter. ævi Analect. pag. 249.

(4) His Britannic majeſty raiſed him to that poſt after the peace of Reſwic.

(5) Taken from the abovementioned Memoir.

TO
The memory of
PETER DE HUYBERT.
Lord of Burg and Crayſtein.
Of an ancient and noble family
in Zealand.

He was born at Middleburg, and admitted, while very young, into the ſenate of that city, on account of his great genius, eloquence, and ſingular attention to the good of the public. After he had ſatisfied the expectations of all men in that ſtation, he, after the peace of Munſter, was ſent to the congreſs at Mechlen, in order to ſettle all controverſies remaining betwixt the Spaniards and Dutch. He was afterwards ſent in the quality of embaſſador, to the kings of Sweden, Poland, Denmark, and to the Elector of Brandenburg, to treat of matters of the higheſt importance; and after happily terminating all that, he was, on his return, in conſideration of his eminent fidelity and prudence, choſen ſecretary by the ſtates of Zealand, and afterwards, with univerſal approbation, perpetual Penſionary. Some time after he was ſent by the States-General, in quality of embaſſador, to the treaty of Breda; and laſt of all, that the Zealanders alone might not enjoy the fruits of his wiſdom, he was allowed by them to accept of a place in the council of ſtate of the United Provinces, that he might there be a common good to the whole common-wealth. To all theſe high honours he was advanced, not by courting the favour either of the people, or of the nobles, but by his univerſally known and admirable vigilance, in performing the duties of his charge, his great preſence of mind in contriving the moſt proper expedients in all exigencies of the ſtate, and ſingular dexterity in executing what he had ſo wiſely counſelled. His great ſagacity in unravelling the moſt arduous and perplexed affairs, and great ſtrength of mind in oppoſing thoſe who were enemies to ſuch reſolutions as were entred into for the public good, of which he was frequently the author. He neither formed nor encouraged parties; and in all viciſſitudes of affairs and changes in the ſtate, he preſerved his ſtate and dignity unblemiſhed. Being bewailed by all good men, he died VII *January, An. Ch.* CIↃ. IↃC. XCVII. *in the* LXXV *year of his age, his ſorrowful children erected this monument.*

JACCETIUS.

I.

JACCETIUS (Francis Cataneus) was born at Florence on the ſixteenth day of November, 1466. He was the diſciple of Marſilius Ficinus, and he made ſo great proficiency by the leſſons of this learned maſter, that he became one of the beſt Platoniſts of his time, and an excellent orator. He ſucceeded the ſame Ficinus in his profeſſorſhip of Philoſophy, who judged him excellently well qualified for it, even ſo far, as to believe, that nature had produced him for that purpoſe. He publiſhed ſeveral books [*A*], and died at Florence in the year 1522. He was buried in the church of the Holy Croſs, in the tomb of his anceſtors, and he left thirteen ſons [*B*]. Benedetto Varchi made his funeral oration: his life was moſt elegantly written by Euphroſynus Lapinus (*a*). His true Italian name *Diacceto*, has received a thouſand alterations from the writers who ſpeak of him or of his poſterity [*C*]. There is another FRANCIS CATANEUS JACCETIUS, who is an author [*D*]; but I think he is known only by the name of *Diacettius*, or *Diacetius*. I believe the count de Châteauvilain, who married one of Catherine de Medicis's maids of honour, was deſcended from our Francis Jaccetius [*E*]. That maid was call'd Madam d' Atri, and has been both well and ill ſpoken of (*b*).

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] Theſe are the titles of ſome of them: *De pulchro libri tres. De amore libri tres. Paraphraſis in Politicum, & Theagenem Platonis, & in Ariſtotelem de cœlo & meteoris. Enarratio in Platonis ſympoſium. Oratio in funere Laurentii Medices. Epiſtolæ variæ, &c.* An edition of his works in Folio, was printed at Baſil, in the year 1563. Mention is made of it in Geſner's Bibliotheque, under *Franciſcus Cataneus Jaccetius*. The catalogue of Oxford and Konig ſpeak of it only under the word *Cataneus*. Ghilini calls this author only *Franciſco Catanio* (1). He has very well paraphraſed what Pocciantius ſaid of him, and adds nothing beſides.

[*B*] *He left thirteen ſons.*] I make no doubt one of them was the perſon I ſpeak of in the article of MACHIAVEL (2) and whoſe miſerable end has been deſcribed by Pierius Valerianus in this manner: ‘Jacobus Jacettus juvenis & Græcè & Latinè egregiè peritus, pangendi carminis auctor non illepidus ‘Florentinam cathedram obtinebat; ſed infelici ſuo ‘ſidere conjurationis in Julii Cardinalis Medices cædem certo die patrandam conſcius fuit; qua patefacta, captus ipſe, & tam nefandi ſceleris convictus ‘Senatus Florentini judicio ſecuri percuſſus eſt (3). ‘——— *James Jaccetus, a youth perfectly well ‘skilled both in Greek and Latin, a graceful author ‘in compoſing verſes, was promoted to a profeſſorſhip ‘at Florence, but, by the malice of his ſtars, was an ‘accomplice in a conſpiracy to compaſs the murder of ‘Julius Cardinal Medicis, upon a certain day; which ‘coming to light, being apprehended and convicted of ‘ſo horrid a wickedneſs, he was, by judgment of the ‘ſenate of Florence, beheaded.*’ Paul Jovius, who gives him no other title but that of a poet (4), is to be cenſured. I fancy that Brother Angelus de Cataneis Diacetius (5), who after he had gone through all the dignities of the Dominican order, was made biſhop of Fieſoli, in the year 1566, was one of the thirteen ſons of our Jaccetius. He died the fifth of May, 1574, being eighty one years old (6). He is called in his epitaph (7) *Angelus Cataneus Diacetius*.

[*C*] *His true name Diacceto, has been very much altered by the writers that ſpeak of him or his poſterity.*] See the remark [*C*] of the article MACHIAVEL, and note, that the reaſon why I make Diacceto his true name, is becauſe I have found this word in the ſubſcription of a letter (8), which our Jaccetius's grandſon wrote to Varchi the ninth of September, 1561, upon ſending him two copies of a book of his grandfather (9). He had received four from Venice. The edition pleaſed him as to the character, but he found it uncorrect. Michael Pocciantius has not been altogether exact, having written that name *Franciſcus Cathaneus Diacetius* (10). Note, that the author of the notes upon the book, intituled, *La Confeſſion de Sanci*, informs me (11), that *Carolus Zenobii de Ghiaceto unus ex Decemviris Baliæ Florentinæ civitatis*, ſignified in that quality with *J....* ſon of Coſmo de Medicis, in a contract made at Florence, in 1453, which he ſaw *amongſt the archives of Lorrain*. This ſhews, that the ancient name of this family was not Diacceto. It is very probable that Diacceto was made by joining the article and the name together. I have ſpoken in another place (12) of the life of one Paul Ghiacetti.

[*D*] *There is another FRANCIS CATANEUS JACCETIUS, who is an author.*] Michael Pocciantius calls him *Franciſcus Cathaneus Diacettius*, and ſays, that he was canon of the cathedral of Florence apoſtolical protonotary, doctor of the civil law, and biſhop of Fieſoli, and that amongſt other works, he compoſed in Italian, the life of Jesus Christ, that of the Holy Virgin, and of St Dominic, and of ſome biſhops of Fieſoli, ſeveral ſermons, and the epiſtles and goſpels for all the year (13). Ughelli calls him *Franciſcus Cataneus Diacetius*, and ſays, that he was the ſucceſſor of Angelus de Cataneis Diacetius his uncle, in the biſhopric of Fieſoli, in the year 1570; that he ſate amongſt the fathers of the council of Trent; that he wrote ſome tracts *De authoritate Papæ & Concilii, de ſuperſtitione artis magicæ, &c.* that he diſcharged all the duties of a good prelate, and died the fourth of November 1595 (14).

[*E*] *The count de Châteauvilian . . . deſcended from our Francis Jaccetius.*] Mezerai, ſpeaking of the exploits of the king's troops againſt the League, obſerves, that Sanci made himſelf maſter of Châteauvilain in Champagne, in the year 1589, at the ſollicitation of the lord of the place. *It was*, adds he (15), *a Florentine, named Lewis Dijaceti, who, as many others of his nation, had got vaſt wealth by farming the impoſts and cuſtoms of the king.*

JANSENIUS (Cornelius) biſhop of Ipres, was one of the moſt learned divines of the XVIIth century. He was born near Leerdam [*A*] in Holland, in 1585. He

[*A*] *He was born near Leerdam.*] In a village called Accoy, as Mr Leydecker obſerves ‘Fallunt, *ſays he* (1), operis poſthumi editores quando referunt *eum natum eſſe Leerdami modico Bataviæ oppidulo, ſed tanti,*

(*a*) Ex Michaele Pocciantio, de Scriptor. Florentinis, pag. 67, 68.

(*b*) *See the notes upon the* Confeſſ. Catholique de Sanci, pag. 459, & ſeq. Edit. 1699.

(1) Ghilini, Teatro, Tom. II, pag. 88.

(2) *In the remark* [*C*].

(3) Pierius Valerian. de Litterator. infelicit. lib. ii, pag. 77.

(4) *See the article* MACHIAVEL, *remark* [*C*].

(5) *So he is called in the third volume of the* Italia Sacra *of Ughelli*, pag. 340.

(6) Id. ibid.

(7) *Ughelli*, ibid. *bas it*.

(8) *Bulifon has inserted it in page* 199, *of his* Lettere Storiche Politiche et Erudite, *printed in Pozzoli* 1685.

(9) Viz. *his book* de Amore.

(10) Mich. Pocciantius, de Script. Florent. pag. 67.

(11) *Page* 461, *of the edition of* 1699.

(12) *In the remark of the article* FONTIUS.

(13) Pocciant. ubi ſupra, pag. 71.

(14) Ughelli, ubi ſupra.

(15) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. III, pag. 784, Edit. 1685.

(1) Leydecker, de Vita & Morte Janſenii, pag. 2.

He has been often reproached as if his family had been Proteſtant, and he had for ſome time profeſſed that religion [*B*]; but this is not true. He went to ſtudy at Louvain in 1602, and he purſued his ſtudies with ſo much application, that he fell ſick (*a*), ſo that he was adviſed to remove to another place for the benefit of the air. He went from thence to Paris, where he found John du Verger de Hauranne (*b*), with whom he had entered into a ſtrict friendſhip at Louvain. Upon the recommendation of this good friend, he was made tutor in a good family (*c*); and being a learned man, he quickly became acquainted with ſome illuſtrious perſons. Some time after he went to Bayonne, to his good Friend, who had retired thither. They ſtudied together with an extraordinary application [*C*], and got ſo far into the eſteem of the Biſhop of Bayonne, that he procured a canonſhip in his Cathedral for du Verger, and the direction of a college for Janſenius (*d*). The biſhop being raiſed to the archbiſhopric of Tours [*D*], invited du Verger to Paris; and then Janſenius being parted from his friend, and being not ſure of the protection of the new prelate, left Bayonne, and returned to Louvain, where he was made principal of the college of St Pulcheria; a poſt which he diſliked, becauſe it did not allow him time to apply himſelf as much as he deſired to his ſtudies, which was alſo the reaſon why he would not undertake to teach Philoſophy (*e*). He was admitted doctor of Divinity in the year 1617 (*f*), and taken into the number of the ordinary profeſſors, and he acquired ſuch a reputation, that the univerſity ſent him twice into Spain [*E*] upon matters of importance.

‘*ti viri natalibus jam magno.* Etenim ſciant ejus Aſſeclæ eum in Comitatu quidem Leerdamenſi natum, non tamen in oppido LEERDAMO (Lingerdamo aliàs, quòd ad Lingam fluvium ſit ſitum) ſed in quodam Pago, quod Urbeculæ ſubeſt, & ACCOY appellatur: ſic Nepotes & Conſanguinei, qui ibi adhuc degunt, teſtantur, ſuperſtite humili Domuncula, in qua primum lucem adſpexit. —— *For be it known to his followers, that he was indeed born in the county of Leerdam, but not in the town of LEERDAM, (alias Lingerdam, becauſe it ſtands by the river Linga) but in a certain village which is under the little town, and called ACCOY: ſo teſtify his poſterity and relations, who live there ſtill, the little cottage being as yet remaining in which he firſt ſaw light.*’ We muſt not ſeek a myſtery in his calling himſelf Leerdamenſis (2), for he called himſelf ſo, according to the uſual cuſtom of taking the name of the town, in whoſe territory one is born. This may be proved by a thouſand inſtances (3).

[*B*] *He has been reproached as if he had for ſome time profeſſed the Proteſtant religion.*] A Jeſuit of Bourdeaux, called Moſes du Bourg, publiſhed a little book (4) in the year 1658, in which he ſaid (5) ‘that the father of Cornelius Janſenius profeſſed the Hereſy of the Calviniſts, though his ſon being of age, declared himſelf a Catholic.’ Father Labbe had publiſhed the ſame thing before him (6): ‘Princeps eorum extitit Cornelius Jansenius qui gente Hollandus, patria Leerdamenſis, inter hæreticos educatus à puero, tum Lovanii, *&c.* —— *The chief of them was* Cornelius Jansenius, *who, being a Dutchman, a native of Leerdam, was from a child educated among the Heretics then at Louvain,* &c.’ Father Hazart renewed the ſame calumny in a Flemiſh book, intituled, *The triumph of the Popes of Rome*, which he publiſhed at Antwerp, in 1681. *His father*, ſays he, *was a Calviniſt*; and as for himſelf, *being grown, he made an outward ſhew of being a Catholic* (7). When he was proſecuted as a ſlanderer, he alledged, amongſt other reaſons, that he was not the author of this reproach, ſince he publiſhed it only after Moſes du Bourg (8). It has been evidently proved in the Caſes which I quote, that this is a very falſe charge. Here is a paſſage of Mr Leydecker, which contains ſome particulars, that are not in the Caſes. ‘Parentes habuit honeſtos, Pontificiæ Religioni addictos, licet Evangelica lux Belgio affunderetur, quibuſque modicæ opes. Ut male Hazardus Jeſuita in Hiſtoriis Eum Patre Calviniano natum retulerit, illum falſi poſtulantibus, qui id non ferrent, Nepotibus. Pater appellatus fuit vernaculo nomine Jan Ottiie (9), fabrili opere victum quæritans, Mater autem Lyntje Gysberts, ceu referunt ſuperſtites, unde hic Filius Cornelis Jansen dictus eſt, antiquo vulgi in Belgio more, at Latina vel erudita terminatione, Cornelius Jansenius (10). —— *He was deſcended of honeſt parents addicted to the Romiſh religion, though the light of the goſpel had then ſhone in Holland, and who had a ſmall eſtate, ſo that Hazart the Jeſuit unjuſtly reported his father was a Calviniſt, for which he was ſued in an action of ſcandal by his relations who would not bear it. The father was in the language of his country, called* Jan Ottiie, *gaining his livelihood at Carpenter's work, the mother* Lyntje Gysberts, *as thoſe who know them give out, from whence this ſon was named* Cornelius Jansen, *after the antient cuſtom of the vulgar in Holland, but in the Latin, or learned termination,* Cornelius Jansenius.’

[*C*] *They ſtudied together with an extraordinary application.*] ‘It was at Mr d'Hauranne's houſe, who was afterwards abbot of St Cyran, that Janſenius ſpent the five or ſix years that he was at Bayonne, applying himſelf to the reading of the holy fathers and St Auguſtin, ſo aſſiduouſly, that he appearing to be of no ſtrong conſtitution, Mr Hauranne's mother uſed to ſay to her ſon, that he would kill that honeſt Fleming, by making him ſtudy ſo hard (11).’

[*D*] *Being raiſed to the archbiſhopric of Tours.*] According to Mr Leydecker (12) this archbiſhopric became vacant by the ceſſion of Sebaſtian Galigai, brother (13) of the marquis d'Ancre: *Vacante Cathedra per ſpontaneam Sebaſtiani Galigaji Florentini, infelicis Marchionis Ancræi fratris, ceſſionem.*

[*E*] *The univerſity ſent him twice into Spain.*] His enemies gave out a great many lies hereupon. They ſaid, ‘that he fled from Spain, juſt as he was going to be taken by the Inquiſition for venting his new doctrine there (14).’ This is what Father Hazart has aſſerted after Moſes du Bourg. Here is the anſwer that is to be found in the Caſes (15.)

‘His ignorance (16) of Mr Janſenius's affairs, plainly ſhews, that it is a calumny forged at pleaſure. He ſpeaks of his journey to Spain, as if he had made but one, whereas he has made two †: one in the year 1624, and the other in 1625. This would have perplexed the Jeſuit of Bourdeaux; for if he had fixed his ſtory to the firſt voyage of Janſenius, the falſhood would have been viſible, becauſe Janſenius would have taken care, not to return thither a ſecond time. And if he had fixed it to the ſecond, it would have been viſible another way; it being certain, that ſo unlucky an accident would have ruined all his negotiation, and that he would have returned in diſgrace to Louvain: inſtead of which it is moſt true, that he returned glorioufly, having obtained of his Catholic majeſty, all that the univerſity of Louvain deſired, to put a ſtop to the enterprizes of the Jeſuits. Laſtly, an author, who deſerves ſo little credit upon other accounts, is not at all to be credited about a thing which of itſelf is ſcarce credible, when in the ſame place he advances three other manifeſt falſities againſt the ſame perſon. This is what this Jeſuit of Bourdeaux has done; the firſt is, that Janſenius's father was a Calviniſt, *&c.* a calumny, the falſity whereof is unanſwerably proved in the firſt and third *Caſe*. The ſecond is, *That Janſenius being returned to Louvain, after the excurſion he had made into France, obtained, by his intrigues, under the notion of a poor Dutch Catholic, a penſioner's place in a college, in which a diſtribution of ſome money was made for the maintainance of ſuch poor ſcholars.* An impudent

---

(*a*) Valer. Andr. Deſſelius, Bibl. Belg. pag. 154.

(*b*) *He who made himſelf ſo famous under the name of the abbot of St Cyran.*

(*c*) Leydecker, ubi infra, citat. (*g*), pag. 8.

(*d*) Ib. pag. 10.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 12.

(*f*) Valer. Andr. ubi ſupra.

(2) Janſenius patria fuit Batavus, atque ut ipſe ſcribit, quaſi in honore id poneret, *Leerdamenſis* —— Unde verò iſte error? an quod, *&c. Id ibid. & pag.* 3.

(3) *See the remark* [*A*] *of the article* CASTELLAN.

(4) *Intituled,* Hiſtoire du Janſeniſme, contenant ſa conception, ſa naiſſance, ſon accroiſſement & ſon agonie.

(5) *See the* Factums, *or Caſes, of Janſenius's relations, in the eighth Tome of the* Morale Pratique, pag. 317.

(6) In præfatione Triumphi Catholicæ Veritatis, *printed at Paris,* 1651.

(7) *See the Caſes of Janſenius's relations, pag.* 307.

(8) Ibid. pag. 317.

(9) *It is obſerved at the beginning of the firſt Caſe, that he was called* John Otto Acquoy.

(10) Leydecker. de Vita Janſen. pag. 3.

(11) *The Caſes of Janſenius's relations, pag.* 410.

(12) De Vita Janſenii, pag. 10.

(13) *Or rather brother-in law; for the marquis d'Ancre's name was Concini, and his wife's name Galligai.*

(14) Caſes, pag. 450.

(15) Pag. 451.

(16) *That is, of* Moſes du Bourg.

† Valer. Andr. in Faſtis Academicis, pag. 393.

importance. The king his maſter made him profeſſor of the Holy Scripture in 1630, in the univerſity of Louvain; and five years after he preferred him to the biſhopric of Ipres. A book, that Janſenius publiſhed againſt France [*F*], mightily contributed to his getting this dignity. He enjoyed it but a ſhort time; for he died the ſixth of May, 1638. He had been above twenty years upon a work, in which he explained St Auguſtin's Syſtem concerning the Doctrine of Grace. This book, publiſhed after his death, has raiſed great diſturbances in the church of Rome [*G*], and found a great deal of work for the Popes.
The

‘ impudent lie, confuted by the public acts †; for as ſoon as he returned to Louvain in the year 1617, he took his degree of doctor of Divinity, and was made preſident of the college of St Pulcheria: *Lovanium revocatus novo Collegio D. Pulcheriæ præficitur.*’ The third is an infamous calumny, *viz.* that ‘*this penſioner ſtole money from the college to pay the penſion of the abbot of S. Cyran's two nephews.* I. The abbot of S. Cyran had but one nephew at Louvain. II. If Janſenius was only penſioner, how could he diſpoſe of the college money? III. This pretended theft is an horrid calumny, diſperſed in many of the Jeſuits libels, of which they have been convicted in the ſixteenth *Provincial letter*, in theſe words; *I will tell you, &c.*’

† Faſti Acad. pag. 138.

It has been ſaid a thouſand times, that there is no fiction but is grounded upon ſome truth. And this may be ſaid of that ſtory of Moſes du Bourg; for it appears by a letter of Janſenius, that the Spaniſh inquiſition made ſome informations againſt him after his departure. The words of his letter are theſe (17): ‘They write to me from Spain, that the Inquiſition has been ſet on againſt a doctor of Louvain, who had been in that kingdom; and that they have applied themſelves to a doctor of Salamanca, in whoſe houſe he lodged, who is the firſt doctor of that univerſity, called Baſil de Leon, to take information againſt him as an Hollander, and conſequently an Heretic: but he anſwered them ſo much to the advantage of this doctor, as put them out of countenance (18).’ I ſhall conclude this remark with the words of Valerius Andreas (19). ‘Brevi quoque tempore eam de ſe opinionem apud Academicos omnes excitavit, ut præ *Janſenio* alius magis idoneus non fuerit judicatus, qui nomine ejuſdem Academiæ bis Legatus in Hiſpanias mitteretur. Ubi quâ prudentiâ ac dexteritate ſeſe geſſerit, tum apud Regem Catholicum, tum in Academiis Salmanticenſi ac Valliſoletana, feliciſſimus utriuſque Legationis eventus docuit. —— *Alſo in a ſhort time he raiſed that opinion of himſelf, amongſt all the members of the univerſity, that none was reckoned ſo fit as Janſenius, to be ſent embaſſador in the name of the ſame univerſity into Spain, where with what prudence and dexterity he behaved himſelf both with the Catholic king and the univerſities of Salamanca and Valladolid; the moſt happy event of both embaſſies is a proof.*’ Conſult Mr Leydecker (20) concerning the ſubject and ſucceſs of theſe Spaniſh voyages.

(17) *Dated the thirty firſt of December*, 1627.

(18) Caſes, pag. 462, 463.

(19) Bibl. Belg. pag. 154.

(20) Pag. 23, & ſeq.

[*F*] *A book that Janſenius publiſhed* (21) *againſt France.*] It is written with great ſtrength of argument, and intituled *Alexandri Patricii Armacani, Theologi, Mars Gallicus, ſeu de juſtitia armorum & fœderum Regis Galliæ libri duo.* It contains the moſt malicious and odious outcries, againſt the continual ſervices which France did to the Proteſtants of Holland and Germany, to the great prejudice of the Catholic religion. The Hollanders are there called rebels who enjoy a republican liberty by an infamous uſurpation. They have anſwered that reproach a hundred times, and Mr Leydecker has not forgot to anſwer it ſolidly (22). He tells us (23), that there was a report that Janſenius being conſulted by the duke of Arſchot, and the archbiſhop of Mechlen, after the loſs of Boiſleduc, and Maeſtricht, adviſed them to ſhake off the Spaniſh yoke, and to canton in the way of the Swiſs. It was diſcovered, that he had given that counſel, and he was in great pain about it. Hereupon the preſident Roſe taught him an expedient to come off: he adviſed him to write againſt France, and gave him the plan of the *Mars Gallicus* (24). Mr Leydecker alleges a letter of the Nuncio Fabio Chigi. ‘Et ne mentiri viderentur, literas produxêre Fabii Gighii, Nuntii Apoſtolici (qui deinde Alexander VII. fuit) ad F. Barberinum, Cardinalem, datas Coloniæ 25. Martii, 1641. ubi hæc ſcripta; *Cardinalis Richelius admodum ſtomachatur in Janſenium, quod cum Roſæo Martem Gallicum conſcripſerit.* Nimirum hæ literæ adhuc in Collegio S. Officii Romæ aſſervantur (25). —— *And that they might not ſeem to tell a lie, they produced the letters of Fabio Chighi apoſtolic Nuntio, (who afterwards was Alexander VII) to F. Barberini cardinal, dated at Cologn the twenty fifth of March* 1641, *where theſe words were written*, Cardinal Richelieu is very angry with Janſenius, becauſe he wrote the *Mars Gallicus* with Roſe, *theſe letters are ſtill kept in the college of the Holy Office at Rome.*’ The Jeſuits failed not to exaſperate the court of France againſt the followers of Janſenius, as being a man who had defamed the nation and their monarchs, almoſt from the firſt to the laſt. Mr Leydecker cites a long paſſage out of a book which he believes to be Father Annat's (26); but in all probability it was written by Father Vavaſſeur (27), I will only ſet down ſo much of it as concerns the ingratitude that Janſenius was reproached with. ‘Ante omnia Janſenio exprobrat ingratum in Galliam animum, quæ ipſi valetudinem, quam recipere non poſſet in patria, concreto & pingui cœlo, reſtituerat puro & ſalubri; quæ victum, cum egeret, præbuerat, tum domeſtico Præceptori Lutetiæ Pariſiorum, tum ludi publici Magiſtro Bajonæ; quæ notitiâ Virorum illuſtrium atque doctorum animum fecerat ad majora, aditumque & viam muniverat. Quin in Galliis quod beneficii loco ſine dubio numeravit, magnam adeptus erat librorum Calvinianorum copiam, quorum de fontibus hauſit Auguſtini interpretationem, & invenerat homines à Calvini diſciplina non alienos quibuſcum liberiores de Gratia ſermones contulerit (28). —— *But above all he taxes Janſenius with ingratitude towards France, which had by its pure and good air, reſtored him to health, which he could not obtain from the groſs and thick air of his own country, which had in his neceſſity given a livelihood to him, both as a domeſtic præceptor at Paris, and a maſter of a public ſchool at Bayonne, which by an acquaintance with illuſtrious and learned men, had formed his mind to greater things, and added ſtrength to his intereſt. Nay, in France, with no doubt, he regarded as a benefit, he got a large quantity of Calviniſtical books, from which fountains he drew his interpretation of St Auguſtine, and found men not averſe to the doctrine of Calvin, with whom he had more free conferences concerning Grace.*’

(21) *In the year* 1635.

(22) Leydecker, de Vita Janſenii, pag. 94, & ſeq.

(23) Pag. 92.

(24) Opportune ſuam operam offerebat P. Roſæus, vir eruditiſſimus Sanctioris Conſilii Præſes, cujus ante meminimus, ſuppeditato voluminis argumento, quo vel pœnitentiam ageret, vel famam falſi accuſaret. Iſtud autem erat *Mars Gallicus*, ſtylo quidem Janſenii ornandus, cujus tamen materia ipſius opus, eruditionem & ingenium excedebat. *Leydecker, de Vita Janſenii*, pag. 93.

(25) Ibid.

(26) Ib. pag. 89.

(27) *It is aſcribed to him, page* 31, *of Sebaſtian Mabre-Cramoiſy's Catalogue, printed in* 1678. *The* Janſenius ſuſpectus *was printed in* 1650, *by Sebaſtian and Gabriel Cramoiſy.*

(28) Autor libri cui titulus, *Janſenius ſuſpectus*, apud Leydeckerum, pag 89.

Let us admire the viciſſitude of human affairs. Janſenius was rewarded with a mitre for having confounded France upon her entring into alliances with Proteſtant ſtates; and at preſent (29) the court of Spain would doubtleſs give a good prelacy to a doctor of Louvain, who ſhould write as ſtrong a book for the juſtification of ſuch a league, as that book was which Janſenius wrote againſt France: ſo true it is, that one may attain to the ſame end by quite contrary means, and that what is good at one time may become very bad at another (30). The confutation of a book may deſerve the reward that was given for the book itſelf. What a pretty ſcene would it be for unprejudiced people; ſhould they ſee a doctor of Louvain made a biſhop for ſolidly confuting our Cornelius's *Mars Gallicus*?

(29) *I write this in the year* 1695.

(30) *See remark* [*I*], *of the article* HOTMAN.

Naudé (31) makes him the author of the *Admonitio* (32), and of *Myſteria Politica*, two works, ſays he, that had wonderful effects againſt the deſigns of Lewis XIII. I believe he is miſtaken.

(31) Naudé, Coups d'Eſtat. chap. iv, pag. m. 610.

(32) *See, above, remark* [*F*] *of the article* BOUCHER (JOHN).

[*G*] *This book . . . . . has raiſed great diſturbances in the church of Rome.*] It has given birth to an infinite number of other books, ſome of which contain all that can be ſaid on both ſides upon the ſubject, by men of great acuteneſs, ſubtilty, and learning; but after all, a man is not one jot the wiſer than he was before; which will ever be the fate of diſputes of this kind: the more they are handled, the more they are confounded, and give the reader occaſion to ſay, *Feciſtis probe, incertior ſum multo quam dudum* (33). — *Very*
well,

(33) Terent. Phorm. Act. II, Scen. III.

The followers of Janſenius's doctrine have been call'd Janſeniſts, and the Jeſuits have been their greateſt adverſaries. Perhaps the ſhuffling and foul play that attends controverſies of this nature, was never ſo notorious as in this [*H*]. This doctor engaged in controverſy with the Proteſtants [*I*]; but he left them the field of battle. We have ſome other works written by him [*K*]. I have not ſaid that the court of Room proceeded againſt the epitaph of this biſhop [*L*]. Conſult Mr Leydecker's book lately publiſh'd.

It

well, I know leſs now than I did before. It has been ſaid, that the doctrine of grace is a ſea that has neither ſhore nor bottom. Perhaps it had been better to compare it with the Faro of Meſſina, in which there is always danger of running upon a rock, by endeavouring to avoid another: *Incidit in Scyllam cupiens vitare Charybdim.* The whole controverſy comes at laſt to this. Did Adam ſin freely? If you anſwer, yes: then, it will be replied, his fall was not foreſeen: if you ſay no: then it will be replied he was not culpable. You may write an hundred volumes upon either of theſe conſequences, and at laſt you muſt be forced to own either, that the infallible foreſight of a contingent event, is an inconceivable myſtery; or that the way how a creature ſins, though it acts in a neceſſary manner, is wholly incomprehenſible. I deſire no more: for to what purpoſe is it to write ſo many books, ſince you muſt own one of theſe two incomprehenſible myſteries?

[*H*] *The ſhuffling and foul play was never ſo notorious as in this.*] Thoſe that have never ſo little penetration ſee plainly that in the diſpute about Liberty, there are but too ſides to be taken: one is to ſay, that all the cauſes diſtinct from the ſoul, which concur with her, leave her the power of acting, or not acting; the other is to ſay, that they determine her in ſuch a manner to act, that ſhe cannot do otherwiſe. The firſt opinion is that of the Moliniſts; the other is, that of the Thomiſts, Janſeniſts, and the Proteſtants of the confeſſion of Geneva. Here are three ſorts of people that oppoſe Moliniſm, and who at the bottom muſt be of the ſame mind; and yet the Thomiſts have contended might and main, that they were no Janſeniſts, and the Janſeniſts have maintained with equal heat, that upon the point of liberty they were not Calviniſts. There are no artifices or ill-grounded diſtinctions, but what have been made uſe of to colour that pretence; and all this with deſign to avoid the dangerous conſequences they foreſaw, would follow their confeſſing any conformity, either with the Janſeniſts, or the Calviniſts. On the other hand, there is no ſophiſtry bnt what the Moliniſts have made uſe of, to ſhew, that St Auguſtin did not teach Janſeniſm, as being unwilling to own, that their doctrine is contrary to that of this great ſaint. Thus the Thomiſts refuſing to confeſs their conformity with people called Heretics; and the Moliniſts, to own themſelves againſt a doctor, who has been always reckoned orthodox in his opinions, have plaid an hundred tricks, without a grain of ſincerity in their conduct.

[*I*] *He ingaged in controverſy with the Proteſtants.*] Here follows the ſubſtance of that diſpute (34). The States-General made an edict in 1629, by which they prohibited the public exerciſe of the Romiſh religion in Boiſleduc, and appropriated the eccleſiaſtical revenues of the mayoralty of that town to the uſe of the Proteſtant religion, which they cauſed to be preached there by four miniſters. The latter having notice that many virulent ſlanders were ſecretly ſcattered againſt their doctrine, publiſhed a maniſeſto to declare, that they taught nothing but the pure goſpel, and to exhort their adverſaries to propoſe in public what they had to object. This was only anſwered in a piece (35) that Janſenius was the author of. Gisbert Voetius, one of the four miniſters who preached in Boiſleduc, made ſome remarks upon this work (36), which were confuted by a new book of Janſenius (37). The author of the remarks replied, and confuted his adverſary in a great book, publiſhed in the year 1635, and intituled *deſperata cauſa papatus.* Janſenius did not reply, but one of his friends replied for him, this was Libertus Fromondus. His book (38) was printed at Antwerp in the year 1636, and refuted by Martin Schoockius, profeſſor of Hiſtory and Eloquence at Deventer, who intituled his anſwer *deſperatiſſima cauſa papatus.* It was printed in the year 1638. Mr Leydecker ſays this was the end of that diſpute (39). But I find in the Bibliotheca of Valerius Andreas amongſt Fromondus's works, a piece intituled *Sycophanta: epiſtola ad Gisbertum Voetium*, printed in 1640. And ſince the firſt impreſſion of this article, I have ſeen a letter, in which this profeſſor of Utrecht is taxed with being miſtaken. 'Falleris, ô Præclare, 'ſecus res habet . . . . Fromondus . . . . ultimo ictu 'proſtravit adverſarium, nunquam quod ſciam refutatus (40). —— *Thou art miſtaken great man, the 'thing is of another ſort . . . Fromondus . . . with the 'laſt blow ſtruck down his adverſary, and as far as I 'know has never been refuted.*'

Janſenius had another war to maintain, which we may call a Proteſtant one. For Theodorus Simonis (41), a wavering Catholic, who wanted a maſter, came to Louvain to deſire him to explain ſome doubts about the infallibility of the Pope, the adoration of the Euchariſt, and ſome other points. Janſenius, being hampered with this man's objections, told him one day that he would no longer diſpute *vivâ voce*, but in writing, perceiving he had to do with a Catholic, who would quickly go into Holland, and boaſt that he had vanquiſhed him. Simonis, who had much ado to bring himſelf to diſpute in writing, reſolved upon it at laſt. But after each of them had wrote twice upon thoſe ſubjects, Simonis found himſelf beſieged with ſoldiers in his lodgings, and threatned to be puniſhed as an heretic. The ſecretary of the duke of Arſchot, cryed out againſt him, and ſaid there was wood enough in his maſter's foreſt to burn that Heretic. But he who examined Simonis, in the name of the archbiſhop of Mechlen, having reported that he had found him a good Catholic, and firmly reſolved to continue ſo, the priſoner was ſet at liberty, and Janſenius was obliged to pay the expence of the ſoldiers, *&c.* Simonis, two years after turned Proteſtant, and publiſhed a book (42) intituled, *De ſtatu & religione propria papatus adverſus Janſenium* (43). I have lately read, that this man having left Lutheraniſm, to embrace Popery, turned Lutheran again, and at laſt Socinian. He was made principal of the Socinian college of Kiſſelin, in Luthuania (44). He underſtood Greek very well, and tranſlated Comenius's *Janua Linguarum* into that language.

[*K*] *We have ſome other books written by him.*] An oration *de interioris hominis reformatione. Tetrateuchus ſive commentarius in IV Evangelia. Pentateuchus ſive Commentarius in V libro Moyſis.* The anſwer of the Louvain divines, *de vi obligandi conſcientias quam habent edicta regia ſuper re monetaria*, and that of the divines and civilians, *de juramento quod publica auctoritate Magiſtratui deſignato imponi ſolet*, are Janſenius's works (45). Mr Leydecker (46) complains that in Moreri's dictionary, the harmony of the goſpels is aſcribed to our Janſenius, whereas it ought to be attributed to another Janſenius, biſhop of Ghent. I have not found this in Moreri. The error, wherewith Mr Arnauld (47) taxed George Hornius of believing that our Janſenius was biſhop of Ipres, and afterwards of Ghent, is corrected in Mr Leydecker's edition (48).

[*L*] *The court of Rome proceeded againſt the epitaph of Janſenius.*] The tenth of December, 1655. 'Francis de Robes (49), of the family of the counts of 'Annap, biſhop of Ipres, cauſed the tomb-ſtone of his 'predeceſſor Cornelius Janſenius to be taken away 'ſilently by night, on which were written the praiſes 'of his virtue and learning, and particularly of his book 'intituled *Auguſtinus*, importing *that this moſt faithful 'interpreter of St Auguſtine's moſt ſecret thoughts, had 'employed upon that work a divine wit, an indefatigable labour, and all the time of his life*; *and that the 'church would receive the fruit of it upon earth, as he 'did the reward of it in heaven.* Words that were 'injurious to the Bulls of Pope Urbin VIII, and Innocent X, who had condemned that book. The de'ſtruction of this grave-ſtone was made by an expreſs 'order of Pope Alexander VII, and with the conſent 'of the archduke Leopold, governor of the Low'Countries, notwithſtanding the reſiſtance of the chap'ter; which went ſo far that one of the principal

'canons

(34) Leydecker, de Vita Janſenii, pag. 57, & ſeq.

(35) *Intituled* Alexipharmacum, *printed in the year* 1630.

(36) *Intituled,* Philonius Romanus correctus.

(37) *Intituled,* Notarum ſpongia, *printed in the* 1631.

(38) *Intituled,* Cauſæ deſperatæ Giſb. Voëtii adverſus Spongiam, . . . Cornelii Jenſenii Criſis oſtenſa.

(39) De Vita Janſenii, pag. 64.

(40) Epiſtola Chriſtiani Philireni ad Janum Palæologum, pag. 5.

(41 *He was a natvie of Holſtein.*

(42) *Printed at Leyden, in* 1638.

(43) *See the Hiſtory of all this at large in Mr Leydecker, pag.* 68, & ſeq.

(44) *See* Mollerus, Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ, Part. III, pag. 108.

(45) *Taken from Valerius Andreas, pag.* 155.

(46) Pag. 2.

(47) Morale Pratique, Tom. III, pag. 130.

(48) In Notis ad Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. Hornii, pag. 517.

(49) *Mr Leydecker, pag.* 133, *call's him,* Johannes Robleſius.

It is a very good book (g).

(g) *It is intituled,* De Hiſtoria Janſeniſmi Libri VI, quibus de Cornelii Janſenii Vita & Morte, nec non de ipſius & ſequacium Dogmatibus diſſeritur. *At Utrecht*, 1695, *in* 8vo.

‘ canons made bold to ſay, that it was not in the Pope's ‘ or the king's power to ſuppreſs this epitath : ſo much ‘ was Janſenius in the affection of that canon and his colleagues (50).’ See Mr Leydecker (51), who mentions this more at large I can ſcarce believe what he obſerves (52), that the Jeſuit La Chaiſe adviſed to break the ſtone on which Janſenius's epitaph was engraved ; but that the biſhop of Ipres was contented to throw it into a corner. I do not think that in the year 1655, Father la Chaiſe was in a condition to adviſe ſuch a thing. Let us add this curious particular : ‘ The laſt time the moſt Chriſtian King was at Ipres, ‘ an hoſpitaler nun who had aſſiſted him (53) in his laſt ‘ ſickneſs, and who ſpoke of him as of a ſaint, related ‘ with tears in her eyes to ſome lords of the court, ‘ that ſhe held him by the arm when he wrote his ‘ will, and ſhe intreated them at the ſame time to beg ‘ of the king that he would cauſe the injury to be ‘ repaired, which had been done to ſo holy a man in ‘ taking away his tomb-ſtone (54).’

JAPAN. This is a name of a great country ſituated eaſtward of China, and divided into ſeveral iſlands. There is ſo much ſaid of it in Moreri's Dictionary (*a*), that I have but few things to obſerve. Nor will I collect all that he has omitted ; but confine my ſelf to ſome points of the Theology of thoſe iſlanders. ‘ The monarchy of Japan ‘ is divided into two ſtates, the eccleſiaſtical and the ſecular. The firſt is compoſed of ‘ the Bonzes, and the ſecond of the nobility and commons : The name of Bonzes is ‘ common to all the miniſters devoted to the ſervice of the gods which the Japoneſe wor‘ſhip. They profeſs celibacy [*A*], and . . . have a Pontiff, whom they call Jaco or ‘ Xaco, who has authority over all the reſt, and judges of the affairs of religion, and ‘ determines what ought to be practiſed concerning the worſhip of the gods, and be‘lieved concerning the nature of them. He elects the Tundes, who diſpoſe of things ‘ leſs important, and repreſent in ſome manner our biſhops (*b*) . . . . The Japoneſe have ‘ two ſorts of gods. The firſt are the demons, whom they worſhip under ſeveral figures, ‘ not in hopes of receiving good from them, but for fear of being hurt by them. ‘ The ſecond ſort are the kings, the conquerors, and the learned, whom they have ‘ placed in the number of their gods. The chief are Amida and Xaca [*B*] . . . They ‘ reckon a dozen ſects, or a dozen religions in Japan ; and every perſon is at liberty to ‘ chuſe which he pleaſes : which occaſions no diviſions ; becauſe, ſay they, underſtand‘ings have no tye of relations or kindred like bodies. Amongſt theſe ſects there are ‘ three principal ones. The firſt hopes not for a life after this, and knows no other ſub‘ſtance, than what ſtrikes the ſenſes . . . . The ſecond, which believe the immortality of

[*A*] *The Bonzes profeſs celibacy.*] But ‘ they do not ‘ always obſerve it very exactly. They abſtain from ‘ fleſh and fiſh, ſhave their beards and hair, and conceal ‘ their debaucheries under the appearance of an au‘ſtere life (1).’ Their greateſt profit ‘ is the burying ‘ of the dead. The people being perſuaded, that in ‘ the other life the ſouls of their relations may fall un‘der ſome neceſſity; ſpare nothing to procure them ‘ the comfort, which the Bonzes promiſe them by ‘ means of their great alms. They uſe another ar‘tifice to enrich themſelves, *viz.* to borrow money, ‘ which they promiſe the ſimple people to pay again in the ‘ other world with great intereſt ; and borrowing it ‘ in this manner, they ſay among themſelves, that the ‘ term is worth the money (2).’ they who would draw a parallel betwixt the eaſt and the weſt, would find it defective as to the article of theſe debts payable in the other world ; but then celibacy ill-obſerved, cheats hid under the appearances of a rigid morality, the profit of burials, and the aſſiſtances ſent to ſouls ſeparated from the body, would afford them a great many compariſons. I am perſuaded that many people in reading Mr Couſin's (3) extracts, could not chuſe but ſay inwardly to themſelves, *thus it is with us.* It would be very curious to ſee an account of the weſt written by a Japoneſe, or a Chineſe, who had lived many years in the great cities of Europe. They would pay us in our own coin. The miſſionaries, who go to the Indies, publiſh relations, in which they particularize the falſities and frauds they have obſerved in the worſhip of theſe idolatrous nations. But whilſt they ridicule them for it, may they not fear that it ſhould be replied to them, ‘ Quid rides ? mutato nomine de te fa‘bula narratur (4). —— *Why doſt thou laugh, chang‘ing the name, the ſtory is told of thee,*’ or that they ſhould be upbraided as they deſerve, who wink at their own faults, and diſcover with the utmoſt ſagacity the vices of others ?

Cùm tua pervideas oculis mala lippus inunctis,
Cur in amicorum vitiis tam cernis acutum,
Quàm aut aquila, aut ſerpens Epidaurius ? at tibi contrà
Evenit, inquirant vitia ut tua rursùs & illi (5).

When thou art blind and ſenſeleſs to thine own,
How doſt thou ſee thy friend's diſeaſe ſo ſoon :
That ſcarce a ſerpent can ſo quickly ſpy,
Nor any eagle hath ſo good an eye.
Well then, go on, purſue thy mean deſign,
As thou doſt find their faults, ſo they will thine.

CREECH.

[*B*] *The chief are Amida and Xaca.*] ‘ The firſt is ‘ repreſented under ſeveral monſtrous figures. In one ‘ of his temples which is at Iedo, he is carried on a ‘ horſe with ſeven heads. The fineſt of his temples ‘ is near Meaco, and is five hundred feet in length. ‘ There are in it a thouſand idols of maſſy gold. As ‘ for Saca, or Xaca, the Bonzes tell a thouſand imper‘tinent ſtories of him. They ſay that he was born ‘ eight hundred times in different ſpecies, before he ‘ was born of a woman, and that when he was born, ‘ he came out of his mother's ſides, eating his way with ‘ his teeth. The truth is, that Xaca was a ſophiſter, ‘ who perſuaded people every thing he had a mind to. His ‘ mother, when ſhe was big with child of him, dream‘ed, that a white elephant came out of her mouth : ‘ for which reaſon the elephants of that colour are had ‘ in veneration in the Indies, in China, and Ton‘quin, at Siam, and Pegu. They are ſerved in veſſels ‘ of gold, and the great lords go in crouds to viſit ‘ them, and pay them the ſame honours as they do to ‘ kings (6).’ One of the three principal ſects of the Japoneſe, is that of the worſhippers of Xaca. ‘ They ‘ live in common, riſe at midnight to ſing hymns, and ‘ meet every evening to hear the diſcourſe, which their ‘ ſuperior makes to them upon ſome ſubject of mora‘lity ; then he gives them ſome points to meditate up‘on. Sometimes he repreſents to them a dying man, ‘ and relates the reproaches, that the ſoul and body ‘ make to one another in this laſt moment. The me‘ditation laſts an hour. When it is over, every one ‘ gives the ſuperior an account of the thoughts which ‘ came into his mind, and of the reſolutions he has ‘ taken (7).

---

(50) St Romuald, Journal Chronologique & Hiſtorique, Tom. II, pag. 612.

(51) Ubi ſupra, pag. 132, & ſeq.

(52) Pag. 135.

(53) *That is, Janſenius.*

(54) Morale Pratique, Tom. VIII, pag. 462.

(*a*) *Eſpecially in the edition of* 1699.

(*b*) Journal des Sçavans, July 18, 1680, pag m. 492, *in the Abſtract of the Hiſtory of the Church of Japan, by the abbot de T.*

(1) Journal des Scavans, July 18, 1680, pag. 492. Dutch Edit.

(2) Ibid. pag. 493.

(3) *Author of the* Journal des Sçavans, *quoted above and hereunder.*

(4) Horat. Sat. I, lib. i, ver. 69, 70.

(5) Idem, Sat. III, lib. i, ver. 25.

(6) Journal des Sçavans, ubi ſupra, pag 495.

(7) Ibid pag. 496.

‘ of the ſoul, and another life, is followed by the beſt ſort of people, and is called the ‘ ſect of the men of the moſt high God. The third is that of the worſhippers of Xa‘ ca (*c*).’ The Bonzes may be compared to our Monks (*d*). Some authors ſay (*e*), that the moſt general diviſion, that can be made of the ſects of the Japoneſe, is to divide them into ſuch as make profeſſion of adhering to appearance, and ſuch as ſeek reality which does not ſtrike the ſenſes, and which they call truth. They who adhere to appearance believe another life after this [*C*], for the eternal recompence of good men, and the eternal puniſhment of the wicked; but thoſe who ſeek the internal and inſenſible reality, reject heaven and hell, and teach things that have a great affinity with Spinoza's opinion [*D*]. They ſymbolize with the Epicureans, in taking from God the government of the world as a thing contrary to the ſupreme tranquillity, which, according to them, is his whole felicity. Nay, they go farther than Epicurus; for they deprive God of underſtanding and reaſon. They fear doubtleſs that theſe qualities would diſturb his repoſe, as they experience, that reaſoning is attended with ſome fatigue (*f*). The chriſtian religion which Francis Xavier, and afterwards ſeveral other miſſionaries, preached to the Japoneſe, found no greater obſtacles than what the Bonzes raiſed againſt him; not ſo much by their diſputes and arguments, as by a method uſual with eccleſiaſtics; I mean, by having recourſe to the ſecular power, and by their care of exciting the kings and the people to the maintenance of the old religion, and the perſecuting the followers of the new (*g*). It muſt however be confeſſed, that the Japoneſe prieſts entered into a conference with the

Chriſtian

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 494.

(*d*) *See the remark* [*B*].

(*e*) *See* Poſſevin. Biblioth. Select. lib x, cap ii, pag. m. 410, Tom. I.

(*f*) *See* Poſſevin. ibid. cap. iii, pag. 415.

(*g*) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, ubi ſupra, pag. 499.

[*C*] *Thoſe that adhere to appearance, believe another life after this.*] It appears that their opinion is that of Amida, Xaca, and Fotoque. They ſay that in the four cardinal points of the world, there are certain countries, where the inhabitants are in a plenary ſatisfaction, which makes them enjoy a ſupreme felicity; that Fotoque made all the laws of Japan, and that they who obſerve them, ſhall no ſooner leave this life, but they ſhall go into thoſe places, where they ſhall be born again, and Fotoque ſhall transform them, and give them 32 figures, and 80 qualities, with which they ſhall live eternally in a perfect beatitude, well ſatisfied with their condition, and very joyful (8). The women ſhall not be admitted into thoſe countries; but thoſe who ſhall be ſaved for having obſerved the laws of Fotoque, ſhall be transformed into men: for without that, they could not receive the reward of their good life, they being of their own nature, ſay they, unclean and execrable (9). As for the tranſgreſſors of Fotoque's laws, they ſhall go from this life into certain infernal places, and they ſhall ſuffer ſix ſorts of puniſhments, which ſhall never have an end. This is the general doctrine of the followers of appearance. The other ſect ſay thereupon what they think fit, but theſe agree in this center of unity, and their opinion is that of the ignorant and the vulgar. *Et quamvis de hiſce rebus una quæque Japoniorum ſecta loquatur, ut vult, communi tamen conſenſu quicunque extrinſecam rerum faciem ſectantur, in hoc, quod diximus, conveniunt, & hanc opinionem rudes & vulgares homines amplectuntur* (10). I borrow all this from the Jeſuit Poſſevin (11), who did not think himſelf obliged to refute the doctrines of this ſect; for ſince they profeſs, ſays he, to ſtick only to appearances, what they ſay has no reality nor truth, it is at beſt but a phantom, or the ſurface of truth. The Bonzes themſelves manifeſtly confeſs, that the whole ſyſtem of Camus and Fotoque was built, or rather forged, in favour of the ignorant, and of weak minds: *Nam (ut ipſimet Bonzii, qui ſuæ ſententiæ Magiſtri & Doctores ſunt, apertè fatentur) totam de CAMI & FOTOQUE diſciplinam propter rudes & inſcios rerum homines, captu, & ingenio imbecillos eſſe compoſitam, vel potius confictam, non quod aliquid eorum, quæ in ipſa docentur verum ſit* (12). Poſſevin however confutes the doctrines of this ſect in his fifth chapter (13).

[*D*] *Thoſe who ſeek . . . reality, reject heaven and hell, and teach things that have a great affinity with Spinoza's opinion.*] They neglect externals and apply themſelves only to meditations; they caſt off all diſcipline that conſiſts in words, adhering only to the exerciſe, which they call SOQUXIN SOQUBUT, that is, *the heart.* They maintain that there is but one principle of all things, and that this principle is found every where, and that the heart of man, and the internals of other beings, do not differ from this common principle, and return to it, when they are diſſolved. It exiſts, ſay they, from all eternity, being one only principle, clear and luminous, and uncapable of increaſe or diminution: it has no figure, and does not reaſon, it lives in idleneſs and a perfect repoſe (14). They teach, that they, who in this life have very well known this principle, ſhall obtain the perfect glory of Fotoque and of his ſucceſſors; and that they who arrive not to this high degree of knowledge, muſt be born again ſeveral times, and go from place to place, but in the other world they ſhall be all abſorbed in this common principle of all things. They ſay alſo, that knowledge does not differ from ignorance, that good and evil are not two beings, and that the one is not ſeparated from the other (15). Poſſevin reduces this ſyſtem to theſe four points. I. That there is but one principle of all things, that this principle is moſt perfect, that it is wiſe but underſtands nothing, and takes no notice of the affairs of this world, ſince it lives in perfect repoſe, and like a man that is very attentive to one thing, and neglects all others. II. That this principle is in all particular beings, and communicates it's eſſence to them, ſo that they are the ſame thing with it, and return to it when they have an end. III. That the heart of man does not differ from this common principle of all beings, and that when men die, their hearts periſh, and are conſumed; but that the firſt principle, which gave them their life, ſubſiſts ſtill in them: from whence it follows, that there is neither heaven nor hell, rewards nor puniſhments after this life. IV. That man may in this world raiſe himſelf to the condition and ſupreme majeſty of the firſt principle, for as much as by the force of meditation he may perfectly know it, and ſo arrive to the ſupreme tranquillity which that principle enjoys in itſelf; that this is all the good that man can acquire, and that till he has obtained it by meditation, and a perfect knowledge, he is tormented with perpetual diſquiet? he often paſſes from one hell to another, and finds reſt no where. It is very certain, that in this are ſeveral things, which Spinoza has not taught: but otherwiſe it is manifeſt, that he has taught as well as theſe Japoneſe prieſts, that the firſt principle of all things, and of all beings, which compoſe the univerſe, are but one and the ſame ſubſtance; that all things are God, and that God is all things in ſuch a manner, that God and all things that exiſt, make but one and the ſame being. One cannot ſufficiently admire that ſo extravagant a notion, and ſo full of abſurd contradictions, ſhould inſinuate itſelf into the mind of ſo many people ſo remote from one another, and ſo different in their humours, education, cuſtoms, and genius. Poſſevin (16) brings many arguments againſt the hypotheſis of theſe Bonzes, and confutes it principally by the contradictions it contains; and firſt he obſerves, that they have but very few doctrines about the nature of the firſt principle; that they ſay nothing upon it with any perſpicuity, that they cannot reſolve queſtions, and anſwer the objections propoſed to them, nor confirm their opinions, and that their only ſhift is to ſay, that it does not concern men to enquire into the nature and power of the firſt principle (17). *Omnia unico verbo putant ſe diſſolvere, dicentes* hominum non intereſſe hujus principii vim, & naturam perſcrutari inquirendo aut diſputando: *quod totum manifeſte conſtat ex ignoratione profectum & natum* (18). Note, that part, of his objections (19) oppugn alſo the ſyſtem of Spinoza.

[*E*] *The*

(8) In omnem æternitatem vivent læti admodum felices & ſua ſorte contenti. *Poſſevin. ubi infra.*

(9) Eo quod fœminæ ſint natura deteſtabiles, execrandæ & immundæ. *Id. ibid.*

(10) Id. ibid.

(11) *Taken from* Poſſevin. Bibl. Select. Tom I, lib. x, cap. ii, pag. m. 410, 411.

(12) Id. ibid. pag. 411.

(13) Ibid. pag. 429, & ſeq.

(14) Figura carens, ratiocinationis expers, vitam agens otii, quietis & tranquillitatis pleniſſimam. *Poſſev. ibid pag.* 411.

(15) *Taken from Poſſevin*, ibid.

(16) Poſſevin. ubi ſupra, Tom. I, pag. 412, 413.

(17) This is a groſs contradiction, which Poſſevin ſhould have charged them with; for ſince they ſay that the greateſt happineſs of men proceeds from the perfect knowledge they may have of the firſt principle, it concerns them to inquire into the nature of that firſt principle.

(18) Poſſev. ubi ſupra, pag. 412.

(19) Ibid pag. 419, 420.

Chriſtian prieſts, and made ſome objections againſt them, which ſhew they wanted no wit (b). They could not hinder the Chriſtian religion from making great progreſs in a little time; but at laſt they drove the emperor to ſuch violences as wholly extirpated it in Japan, and very much enlarged the Martyrology [E]. Father Poſſevin has very ſharply cenſured the laws of the Japaneſe legiſlator [F].

[E] *The violences of the Japaneſe very much enlarged the Martyrology.*] Read the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Japan, written by the Jeſuit Francis Solier, and the hiſtory of the church of Japan, by the abbot of T (20). ‘ This abbot admires the depth of the judgments of God, and wonders that he has permitted the blood of ſo many martyrs to be ſhed, without making uſe of it, as in the firſt ages of the church, as of a fruitful ſeed for the production of new Chriſtians (21).’ Without taking the liberty of enquiring into the reaſons the divine wiſdom may have for permitting at one time, what it does not at another, it may be ſaid that the Chriſtianity of the XVIth century had no right to hope for the ſame favour and protection of God, as the Chriſtianity of the three firſt centuries. The latter was a gentle, meak, and patient religion, that recommended to ſubjects ſubmiſſion to their ſovereigns, and never aſpired to raiſe itſelf to the thrones by the way of rebellion; but the Chriſtianity which was preached to the infidels in the XVIth century was no ſuch thing: it was a murthering and ſanguinary religion, uſed to ſlaughter for five or ſix hundred years. The Chriſtians had contracted a very long habit of maintaining and aggrandizing themſelves, by putting to the ſword all thoſe that reſiſted them. Fire, and hanging, the dreadful tribunal of the Inquiſition, cruſades, and bulls exciting ſubjects to rebel, ſeditious preachers, conſpiracies, and aſſaſſinations of princes, were the ordinary means they made uſe of againſt thoſe that ſubmitted not to their orders. Could they promiſe to themſelves the benediction that heaven granted to the primitive church, to the goſpel of peace, patience and gentleneſs? The beſt choice the Japaneſe could have made was to be converted to the true God; but having not a ſufficient knowledge to renounce their falſe religion, there remained nothing to chuſe but an active, or a paſſive perſecution. They could not preſerve their antient government, nor their antient worſhip, but by ridding themſelves of the Chriſtians, who ſooner or later would have ruined both, and as ſoon as they had been capable of making war, would have armed all their proſelytes, would have introduced into the country, the ſoldiers, and the cruel maxims of the Spaniards, and by killing and hanging, as in America, would have brought all Japan under their yoke. Thus conſidering things only by political views, we ſhall be obliged to own, that the perſecutions the Chriſtians ſuffered in that country were a prudential means to prevent the overthrow of the monarchy, and plundering of the ſtate. The ingenuous confeſſion of a Spaniard juſtifies the precaution of thoſe infidels. ‘ It gave a ſpecious pretence to the Bonzes to exerciſe their hatred, and to ſollicit the extirpation of the Chriſtians. Being aſked by the king of Toſſa, how the king of Spain became maſter of ſo great tracts of land in both the hemiſpheres, he too honeſtly anſwered, that he ſent Monks to preach the goſpel in foreign nations, and that after they had converted a good number of Pagans, he ſent his troops, which joining with the new Chriſtians, ſubdued the country. This indiſcretion coſt the Chriſtians dear (22).’

[F] *Father Poſſevin has ſharply cenſured the laws of the Japaneſe legiſlator.*] The firſt fault he finds with them is, that they command idolatry, and particularly the worſhip and adoration of Camus and Fotoque. He very well repreſents the enormity of idolatry, and ſets it in the higheſt degree of injury done to God. He proves this by the example of rebellions; for he ſays, the greateſt crime that can be committed againſt a prince, is to take away his power, and to confer it on another. ‘ Sicut nullum crimen in Regem ac Principem poteſt gravius admitti, quam eum è ſuo regno pellere, è regiæ dignitatis gradu dejicere, & alium in ſummum regiæ amplitudinis faſtigium evehere; ita ſumma eſt in Deum injuria, ſummum in eum ſcelus admittitur, cùm divinus honor, & cultus qui ipſi ſoli debetur, in alium transfertur, ipſi detrahitur, alii tribuitur (23). *As no greater crime can be committed againſt a king or prince than to expel him his own kingdom, to degrade him from his royal dignity, and to raiſe another to his throne, ſo it is the higheſt injury againſt GOD; and the greateſt wickedneſs is acted againſt him when divine honour and worſhip which are due to him alone, are taken from him and given to another.*’ The ſecond defect of thoſe laws is, that whilſt they ſeverely forbid the Bonzes the uſe of women, they allow pederaſty; they forbid them the former as a filthy and abominable thing, and approve the other practice as honeſt and holy. *In Bonziis omnem cum fœminis concubitum, ut rem fœdam, turpem, & deteſtabilem damnant: at uſum puerorum permittunt, imo in eiſdem Bonziis coitum cum pueris approbant, ut rem honeſtam & ſanctam* (24). Poſſevin ſhews by many reaſons that pederaſty is a moſt horrid crime. The third fault is, that forbidding to kill certain beaſts conſecrated to Camus and Fotoque, they permit men to kill one another, and even to be their own murderers. They not only ſuppoſe it to be an action acceptable to thoſe deities, but alſo the true way to deification; hence it is that great numbers of the Japaneſe kill themſelves either precipitating themſelves into the water, or burning, or burying themſelves alive, or throwing themſelves headlong from the top of a rock. Many alſo rip open their bellies upon ſlight occaſions; and many mothers kill their own children. Poſſevin ſhews the ſinfulneſs of ſuch conduct (25). The laſt fault he cenſures is, that the laws of Japan declare, that by the meer invocation of NAMUAMIDABUT, or by crying FORENGUELIO, men expiate all ſorts of ſins without any need of repentance. The Japaneſe, continues he, make no mention of ſatisfactory pains, or good works; they pretend that theſe things are injurious to the merit of XACA and AMIDA, who have been ſufficiently afflicted for the crimes of men, and have fully expiated them by their ſufferings. This doctrine opens the way to ſin; for there being nothing eaſier than to make an invocation, or a cry, men are ſure of eaſily avoiding all the puniſhments they have reaſon to fear, after they have given up themſelves to the greateſt crimes. Poſſevin (26) does plainly ſhew the enormity of that doctrine, and the pernicious effects that reſult from it.

There is no reader that can be afraid of being miſtaken in condemning ſuch a doctrine; but if he ventures to affirm, that the doctrine of the Bonzes is exactly ſuch as Poſſevin repreſents it, he may juſtly be afraid of making a raſh judgment: for after all, we ought never to condemn others upon the teſtimony of their enemies; it is fit to be informed, whether they own that their doctrine has been faithfully repreſented. It would not be a faithful repreſentation of it, if one ſhould inſiſt upon the literal ſenſe of ſome laws, without any regard to the interpretations of the doctors: for at this rate, the moſt reaſonable religions might be charged with abundance of abſurdities. There are ſome harſh things in the Scripture, which it would be wrong to conſider as the laws of the Chriſtians; for they take them not in the literal ſenſe, they explain, and ſoften them by other paſſages, and according to the analogy of faith. We ſhould know whether the Bonzes do not the ſame thing with reſpect to ſome laws of their legiſlators. I make no difficulty to believe what is ſaid of the tricks and hypocriſy of thoſe idolatrous prieſts; but I think it probable, that they cover their doctrines as well as their conduct with an outward ſeverity; and perhaps we ought to impute but to ſome of them, what Poſſevin charges upon the whole body of their ſects. Some Monks have taught, that the moſt wicked wretches have been ſaved by the bare invocation of the Holy Virgin. The extravagance of thoſe, who talk of the treaſure of indulgences, and who ſay that the merits of the ſaints, and their works of ſupererogation, ſupply the want of repentance in many men, would afford good chapters for a relation that a Japaneſe traveller ſhould publiſh. Were it not an unjuſt thing, ſhould he relate all this as ſo many articles of the Chriſtian faith? Once more, I would know what the Bonzes would anſwer to this queſtion; do you teach what Poſſevin imputes to you? I ſhould be glad alſo to ſee a hiſtory written by them

of

(b) *See the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, September 1691, pag. 8, & ſeq *in the Extract of the Hiſtory of the Church of Japan.*

(20) It was printed at Paris, in two volumes, in 4to, in the year 1689.

(21) Journ. des Sçavans, July 25, 1689, pag. m. 507.

(22) Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Sçavans, Sept. 1691, pag. 13, & 14.

(23) Poſſev. Bibl. Select. Tom. I, libr. x, cap. vi, pag. 435. *See thereupon,* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, pag. 349, 390.

(24) Poſſev. ibid.

(25) Poſſev ubi ſupra, pag. 436.

(26) Id. ibid. pag. 437.

of the eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity in their iſlands, and of it's extirpation. And if they ſhould write it, after having read thoſe of Francis Solier and the abbot de T. it would ſtill be very proper to compare them together.

JARCHI, or **JARHI** (Solomon) a famous Rabbi, who lived in the XIIth century [*A*], His true name is Iſaaki (*a*). ‘ Nevertheleſs, becauſe of that pretended name Jarhi, ſome believe that he was of Lunel in Languedoc ; but he was of Troyes in Champagne, as R. Ghedalia, and the greateſt part of the Jewiſh Chronologers affirm . . . . . His books are much eſteemed by the Jews [*B*], and he may be ſaid to be their great author.’ They ſometimes join to the Books, which they call the five volumes, the *Commentaries of Raſci, who is their great author upon the Bible, becauſe he is very much skilled in their divinity and traditions* (*b*). Mr Simon, who ſays all this, had done well to obſerve, that Rabbi Raſci is the ſame with Rabbi Jarchi or Iſaaki. He is alſo called *Iſaacites*. See the margin (*c*).

(*a*) Simon. Hiſt. Critique du Vieux Teſtam. pag. m. 545.

(*b*) Id. ibid. pag. 514, col. 2.

(*c*) *I give the article of this Rabbi at the word* ISAACITES.

[*A*] *He lived in the XIIth century.*] Mr Simon places him in that century (1). Some ſay he died in the year 1105 (2). Others ſay he lived in the XIIIth century, and make him cotemporary with Maimonides (3). Others ſuppoſe he lived in the XIVth century (4) ; for they ſay he was expelled from France with the other Jews, by king Philip the fair. Now the edict of that king againſt the Jews is of the twenty ſecond of July 1307 (5). Mr Hoornbeek ſuppoſes that this Rabbi was baniſhed from France at that time. He makes him to be a native of Lunel in Languedoc, and obſerves, that it is a town in which there have been always many Jews. See how he proves it : ‘ *Unde in epiſtolis Gregorii, libr. 3. epiſtol. 21. Venantio Epiſcopo Lunenſi inſcripta ita incipit:* multorum ad nos relatione pervenit, à Judæis in Lunenſi civitate de gentibus ad ſervitium Chriſtiana detineri mancipia (6). —— *In the letters of Pope Gregory III, book 3. epiſt. 21. addreſſed to Venantius biſhop of Lunel, we find the beginning runsthus :* We have it from many hands, that the Jews in the city of Lunel, detain for their ſervice certain Chriſtian ſlaves ranſomed out of captivity under the infidels.’ It is a groſs fault ; for Lunel in Languedoc was never an epiſcopal ſee. Pope Gregory in that place, means Luna a city of Italy in Tuſcany. The ruins of it are to be ſeen at the mouth of the Magra. It's epiſcopal ſee was transferred to Sarzana by Pope Nicolas V (7).

[*B*] *His books are much eſteemed by the Jews.*] ‘ We have his commentaries upon the Scripture, in the Bibles of Venice and Baſil. They have alſo printed with the body of the Talmud his gloſſes or commentaries upon this great book (8).’ Mr Brun (9) ſays, that he ſaw ſome Jews at Bourdeaux, *who were ſtill ſo fond of the memory of Solomon Jarchi, the moſt famous of all their Rabbies, for the learned commentaries he made, both on the holy Scripture and the Talmud, that they told me*, ſays he, *that they reſolved to make ſhortly a journey to Lunelle* (10) *near Niſmes, to ſee the place where that great man was born, and from which he had his name* *, *and that they would endeavour to live there, which they believed would eaſily be granted them.*

(1) Simon, Hiſt. Crit. du Vieux Teſtament, pag. 545.

(2) *See* Konig. Bibl. pag 423.

(3) Idem, *but note that Konig*, ibid. pag. 496, *who after Hottinger places Maimonides in the XIIIth century, differs from moſt authors, who place him in the XIIth.*

(4) Hoornbeek, contra Judæos, pag. 7.

(5) Mezer. Abr. Chronol Tom. II, pag. m 799.

(6) Hoornbeek, ubi ſupra.

(7) *See* Miræus, Geogr. Eccleſ. pag. 236.

(8) Simon, ubi ſupra.

(9) Brun, Veritable Religion des Hollandois, pag 224.

(10) *It ſhould be* Lunel.

* Jarcha *ſignifies the Moon in Hebrew ; ſo that they call him* Jarchi *for* de Lunelle.

JARDINS (Mary Catherine des) famous for her romances [*A*], flouriſhed in the XVIIth century. ‘ She was born at Alençon a little Town, whereof her father was provoſt. When ſhe came to be about nineteen or twenty years old, ſhe began to conſider her ſmall eſtate ; and being poor, and having as much wit as ambition, ſhe came to Paris with a deſign to make her ſelf known, and to change her fortune. She was not altogether miſtaken in this : Having a great genius, ſhe was quickly talked of, and people were ambitious to be acquainted with her. Mr de Ville-Dieu, a gentleman well made, and in pretty good circumſtances, was one of the firſt that knew Mrs des Jardins : he eſteemed and loved her, and tho' ſhe was not handſome, he married her. But by ill fortune he died ſome time after. The poor woman retired for grief into a nunnery ; but when ſhe had a little recovered from her affliction, ſhe left it, and married Mr de la Châte for her ſecond husband, whom ſhe buried alſo. Being ſenſibly touched with this new misfortune, ſhe utterly renounced marriage, and reſolved to ſpend the reſt of her days in gallantry. She began to hearken to the love-diſcourſes of the ſparks, and anſwered them in verſes and letters, which have a fine and delicate turn (*a*).’ The author who furniſhes me with this narrative has omitted ſeveral things [*B*], and has not

(*a*) Richelet, Vie des Auteurs François, pag. lviii. Hague Edit. 1699.

[*A*] *She is famous for her romances.*] The firſt, or one of the firſt which ſhe made (1), was to contain ſeveral volumes in 8vo, according to the cuſtom of that time. But ſhe did not carry it on ſo far as ſhe deſigned ; and I have heard the reaſon of it was, becauſe it was known, that ſhe intended to repreſent under fictitious names, and with ſome diſguiſes, the adventures of a great lady, who had under-matched herſelf. She was threatened with the reſentment of thoſe concerned, if ſhe carried on the intrigue to the end of the romance ; whereupon ſhe went no farther. But ſhe did not bury her talent ; on the contrary, having found out a new way of writing romances, ſhe publiſhed a great many with very good ſucceſs. She brought into faſhion thoſe little gallant novels, which quickly ſhew the good or ill ſucceſs of a ſoft paſſion, and ſhe put out of requeſt thoſe tedious and vaſt relations of heroical, warlike, and amorous adventures, which had brought ſo much profit to the Printers of Caſſandra, Cleopatra, Cyrus, Clelia, *&c.* The new taſte ſhe created does ſtill prevail ; and tho' that ſort of books quickly loſe the grace of novelty, yet the firſt romances, that ſhe compoſed upon this new model, are ſtill read with pleaſure ; as her *Journal amoureux*, her *Annales Galantes*, her *Galanteries Grenadines*, and many others. She publiſhed in 1672 *Les Exilez de la Cour d'Auguſte* ; a romance which an illuſtrious lady (2) thought *very pretty*. That which is intituled *Les Deſordres de l'Amour* (3), and another intituled *Portrait des Foibleſſes humaines* (4), are not inferior to the former. It is an unhappy thing that Mrs des Jardins ſhould have opened a way to a liberty, that is daily more and more abuſed ; which is, to father one's inventions and love-intrigues upon the greateſt men of the later ages (5), and to mix them with matters of fact, that have ſome foundation in hiſtory. This mixture of truth and fiction is ſpread in abundance of new books ; it ſpoils the taſte of young people, and makes one unwilling to believe what is really credible. See the remark [*C*] of the article NIDHARD.

[*B*] *Mr Richelet . . . . has omitted ſeveral things.*] Since I obſerve this, it would be proper for me to ſupply thoſe things ; but I am not in a fit place to conſult thoſe who could inform me, and ſo I cannot repair the fault, of which I give notice to my reader. I may be excuſed : but Richelet cannot ſo well come off ; for as he lived in Paris, and led no ſedentary life, it was an eaſy thing for him to inform himſelf of the time that Mrs des Jardins left the country, and ſettled in the capital city of the kingdom. He might as eaſily have learned what acquaintances ſhe firſt contracted, what patrons ſhe got, at what time, and with what book

(1) *I think it was intituled* Alcidiane, *or* Alcidamie. *I do not remember it well.*

(2) Madam de Sevigni. *See the Letters of the count de Buſſy-Rabutin. Part. III, Letter* cc, *pag* m 362.

(3) *See the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, Sept. 1686, *in the catalogue of the new books*, n. 1.

(4) *See the ſame* Nouvelles, Novemb 1685, art. i, *and the* Journal des Sçavans, Novemb. 19, 1685, pag. m. 494.

(5) *See the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, Oct. 1684, *in the Catal.* n. 8.

not been exact in the circumſtances of time; for he will have it that ſhe did not begin to lend an ear to love-diſcourſes, till after the death of her two huſbands: But I am aſſured from many hands, that this date is very ill placed, and that this woman's gallantry was infinitely leſs than ever at the time he ſpeaks of. There was in the Spaniſh Netherlands one Mrs DES JARDINS, cotemporary with this, whoſe name and picture have for ſome years together been placed in the front of the Almanack. She that makes the ſubject of this article, died in the year 1683 (*b*).

(*b*) *See the* Mercure Galant *for November*, 1683, *pag.* 267.

book ſhe firſt came out; what was the date of her firſt marriage and firſt widowhood, of her ſecond marriage, and of the death of her ſecond huſband; the chronological ſeries of her romances; the time of her death, and many things of this nature, of which he has not ſaid a word; and yet you ſee at the top of the pages, *The lives of the French authors*. Can a title be more ſhamefully abuſed? Can we call that a narrative, in which ſo many eſſential things are wanting? You will tell me doubtleſs, that many readers will not be angry at thoſe omiſſions; but this does not juſtify the writer. They would not have been diſpleaſed to find in his book the things that he has forgotten. Abundance of other readers would have been very glad to have ſeen them. He has not then taken the beſt method; for it is much better to do what pleaſes many people and diſpleaſes no body, than to do what diſpleaſes ſome, and does not diſpleaſe others.

JARRIGE (PETER), a native of Tulle in Limouſin, one of the moſt famous preachers among the Jeſuits, but otherways a very ill man [*A*], did ſo reſent the not obtaining in his order the imployments he thought he deſerved, that he reſolved to turn Proteſtant. He communicated his deſign to a miniſter (*a*), who contrived expedients for his retiring into Holland (*b*), and he made his abjuration in the conſiſtory of the church of Rochelle on Chriſtmas-day 1647. Being arrived at Leyden, he preached before a numerous congregation, concerning the motives of his converſion; and afterwards endeavoured to make people believe that he was no longer a Papiſt. The States granted him a penſion (*c*). But ‘ the Jeſuits made informations againſt him with the utmoſt fury, and ‘ uſed all poſſible means to defame him. They got him condemned by the judge of Ro‘ chelle to be hanged, and afterwards burnt .... But all theſe proceedings ſerved only ‘ to make public the vexation this loſs gave them, and to furniſh Jarrige, who was violent ‘ and vindicative, with a pretence to revenge himſelf upon them. He did it by a book ‘ intituled *Les Jeſuites mis ſur l' Echafaud*, (*The Jeſuits brought upon the Scaffold*) in which ‘ he treated them in ſo bloody a manner, that their ſociety never had ſuch a mortifica‘ tion (*d*).’ He publiſhed alſo a particular anſwer to *Peter Beauſés*, who had ſlandered him in a heinous manner (*e*). One would have thought, that he and the Jeſuits, whom he had ſo ſtrangely defamed, could never be reconciled; and yet the Jeſuit Ponthelier (*f*), who was then at the Hague in the retinue of an embaſſador, did not deſpair of bringing him back; and he managed him in ſuch a manner, that he brought him to a reſolution of returning to the church of Rome. The thing was executed in 1650. Jarrige left Leyden, and went to the Jeſuits of Antwerp, and immediately publiſhed his recantation [*B*]; but it

(*a*) *To Mr Vincent, miniſter of Rochelle.*

(*b*) Hiſtoire de l'Edit. de Nantes, Tom. III, pag. 93.

(*c*) Jarrige, Retractation, pag. 101.

(*d*) Hiſt. de l'Edit. des Nant. ubi ſupra.

(*e*) *In a book intituled*, Les Impietez & Sacrileges de Pierre Jarrige. *Retract. de Jarrige, pag.* 70.

(*f*) *See the remark* [*C*].

[*A*] *He was a very ill man.*] This is indiſputable from what he confeſſes himſelf in his Retractation. So that I need not uſe the argument which a very worthy man enforced one day in the preſence of ſeveral Proteſtants. He ſaid, that a man of letters, as Jarrige was, and perpetually taken up with preaching, could not have remembred at Leyden all the little adventures he diſplayed in his *Jeſuites mis ſur l'Echafaud*, and in his anſwer to James Beauſés, unleſs he had writ them down, as he heard of them, with the names and ſirnames of the perſons, and with all the little circumſtances of time and place. Now this was a ſign of a corrupt mind, and the character of an ill man; for he would never have been at the pains of keeping ſuch a regiſter, if he had not deſigned to lay up arms for the time to come, in caſe he ſhould break with the Jeſuits. He was thinking of revenge, and of the means of making himſelf dreaded, even before he knew whether he ſhould ever have occaſion for them. There are ſome men who keep even the leaſt notes of their friends, and eſpecially take care of ſuch notes which they might take advantage of in caſe of a rupture. They conſider the inconſtancy of our paſſions, and they love, as if one day they were to hate (1), and take their meaſures accordingly. It is certain, that thoſe who keep with that view the letters of their friends, their moſt free converſations, and ſtricteſt confidences, are diſhoneſt men. The perſon I ſpeak of, uſed this compariſon againſt Peter Jarrige's diary. I will not vouch for this thought; I relate it only as a meer matter of fact, every one may judge of it as he pleaſes. I have no occaſion for it to comment upon my text, as will appear from the following remarks.

A REFLEXION on the conduct of thoſe, who keep all the notes and letters of their friends.

(1) Ita amicum habeas, poſſe ut fieri inimicum putes. *Publius Syrus, apud Macrob. Saturn. lib. ii, cap. vii.*

[*B*] *He immediately publiſhed his recantation.*] He confeſſed (2) ‘ that a virulent paſſion of rage *had made* ‘ *him leave the Jeſuits, and that there was* nothing ‘ (3) in the curſed and ſcandalous *ſermon he preached at* ‘ *Leyden*, but what was truly ſpeaking a blaſphemy, ‘ ſo much the more puniſhable in the judgment of ‘ GOD, becauſe his conſcience gave the lye to his ‘ words.’ He accuſed himſelf (4) ‘ of having cloathed ‘ his firſt and impudent lye with circumſtances no leſs ‘ falſe than criminal, namely, that GOD had for ſix‘ teen years before put into his heart the firſt foun‘ dations of the work he had begun ſome months be‘ fore in his own country, and which he ſo happily ‘ and ſatisfactorily accompliſhed in Holland.’ He confeſſed (5) ‘ that by a further malice, he had defam‘ ed many innocent perſons, to revenge himſelf of ‘ two men whom he thought culpable; that upon ‘ the reading of the ſentence by which he was con‘ demned to die (6) for a religion, which he deteſt‘ ed in his heart..... Rage deprived him of his ‘ judgment, and that not knowing what he did, he ‘ had done like thoſe mad dogs, who bite their ma‘ ſters without knowing them. Being therefore de‘ ſtitute of reaſon, *ſays he* (7), and ſeized with a ſpi‘ rit of vengeance, I wrote a virulent book againſt ‘ the province of Guienne, from whence I came ‘ ....I uſed all manner of artifices to beſpatter ‘ their reputation. Rhetoric is like proſpective glaſſes, ‘ which make little things appear great, and repreſent a ‘ frog as big as an ox. It was ſufficient for me to have ‘ ſome ſlight foundation to build a great crime upon; ‘ I did not care to ſpeak truth, provided I had ſome ‘ judicious ſubterfuge to cover my lyes with. I in‘ duſtriouſly laboured upon a little matter, and by the ‘ circumſtances I added, I made a great elephant ‘ of a little fly. Thoſe who know the little acci‘ dents, and of ſmall conſequence, that happened in ‘ that holy province, ſee better than others, that the ‘ deſire of revenge ſupplied me with a great deal of ‘ art to magnify little things, and with too much in‘ vention to make them probable. The reverend Fa‘ ther Ponthelier warmly, but modeſtly, reproached ‘ me with it, when I was in the moſt violent heat ‘ of my anger, and received no other anſwer from me

(2) Pag. 8.

(3) Pag. 11.

(4) Pag. 22.

(5) Pag. 69.

(6) *The provincial of the Jeſuits obtained a ſentence in the Preſidial of Rochelle, whereby Jarrige was condemned to be hanged, and then burnt.* He carried me, *ſays Jarrige, pag.* 72 *of his Recantation*, to the gallows, and from the gallows to a wood pile; he cauſed the ſentence of the Preſidial to be printed, and the cauſes of my puniſhment to be explained; he ſent the ſentence into all the provinces, and what was done againſt my effigies, had been done againſt my body, had not God protected me in a country, where I was only to ſin againſt him

(7) Pag. 73.

it is not known what became of him afterwards. Many people believe that the Jesuits impriſoned him for life [*C*]. This might be ; but other reaſons may be given why ſuch a man ſhould be ſeen no more [*D*]. I am perſuaded, that the hiſtorian quoted by me, will

'but this, *that ſince Father Rouſſeau and Father Beaufais had uſed a thouſand tricks and inventions to get me condemned to the flames, it was very reaſonable, that I ſhould find inventions to revenge my ſelf, and that I ſhould build upon a little foundation heinous accuſations, as they had built theirs upon appearances.* I added, *that they had not only written as I did, but that they had actually hanged and burnt me in effigy* . . . . Like a revengeful man, I took the wrong way to exerciſe my reſentment . . . . . If I met with any ſlight occaſion to gloſs upon, I failed not to make my conjectures paſs for proofs ; and if it happened that any were ſuſpected, right or wrong, either at home or abroad, I took thoſe ſuſpicions for truths, and endeavoured to make worthy men paſs for great villains, who, upon a ſerious inquiry, would be found guilty of meer indiſcretion or at moſt of an inconſiderable fault. Any one that ſhall ſeriouſly and impartially examine my diſcourſe, will find, that I made ſpecious and artful preludes to make my forgeries go down the better. I have ſaid too much to be believed, and the Heretics themſelves, though for the time to come they will lay great ſtreſs upon my defamations, diſapproved them in the ſynod of Middleburg : and a man muſt needs be as much incenſed as I was, when I wrote that book, to give credit to my contumelies. Certainly, if any thing did happen, thoſe that were guilty were diſmiſſed from the ſociety, which having the qualities of the great ocean, cannot keep dead carcaſſes in it's boſom. My accuſations are therefore unjuſt, having charged an illuſtrious order with the faults of thoſe they have expelled as unworthy to live amongſt the ſaints, and to entertain the thoughts of the devil amongſt angels. My fury prompted me to diſcover the evil, and to ſay nothing of the remedies applied to it. I have indeed ſaid in ſome places, what ſome had done : but I did not add that they were immediately, and without any delay, expelled as peſtiferous men. I made a ſatire to revenge my ſelf, and not a panegyric to praiſe them. Thoſe who know the Jeſuits, will no doubt believe, that the crimes of Regicide, Infanticide, Sodomy, and ſuch other abominable tranſgreſſions, are meer forgeries . . . . (9). How often have I, againſt good reaſoning, made uſe of captious reflexions to draw a general inference from a particular thing, and to aſcribe to the whole ſociety, what could have been verified but of one private perſon, if I had been reduced to a judicial evidence ? What ſtories have I not forged and altered a thouſand ways, in order to cut more ſenſibly, and to make deeper and more dangerous wounds ? if I would refute every thing in particular, or give a reaſon of my accuſations, I ſhould trouble you, dear reader, with a thouſand circumſtances, which would render my retractation very tedious and irreligious. It ſuffices then to ſay, that I retract that pernicious book in general, and in all it's parts, without taking in the things which I have ſaid of Father Rouſſeau and Father Beauſais for my juſtification and defence. I beſeech the equitable readers to take this preſent book as one of my declarations, and I entreat them through the merciful bowels of JESUS CHRIST, never to read the other, becauſe it is heretical, and never to caſt their eyes upon it, becauſe it is a work which an evil conſcience has conceived, melancholy has formed, and revenge has produced.'

I leave my reader to judge, whether the gentlemen of Port Royal have any good reaſon for maintaining, that Peter Jarrige publiſhed an inſufficient recantation, *and that he indeed accuſes himſelf of having written his book againſt the Jeſuits with too much paſſion, but that he does not diſown, in particular, any of the ſcandalous ſtories he had related.* Thoſe who anſwered Maimbourg's hiſtory of Calviniſm, failed not to take advantage of this reflexion of the gentlemen of Port-Royal (10).

[*C*] *Many people believe the Jeſuits impriſoned him for life.*] As he foreſaw that this would be ſaid, or ſomething worſe, he affected to make it known, that the Jeſuits had given him a very good reception, and that they who would not believe it, might come and ſee him. Here is what he wrote to a merchant. 'I know very well, that the miniſters and gentlemen I have left, will ſay, that I am dead or impriſoned ; but do me this favour, to deſire thoſe who ſhall come to Antwerp, to come and ſee me in the college, and I promiſe you, I will not only ſpeak to them with freedom, but, if they pleaſe, I will wait on them through the town, and travel with them into the Catholic territories (11). To which you may add this paſſage of his recantation (12). 'I know very well, that the Heretics, meaſuring the actions of others by their own, will ſpread falſe reports, that I have been poiſoned, or clapt up in a dungeon, where I can only ſee the light through a hole ; that the reverend father John Ponthelier, who was the principal inſtrument God made uſe of to take me out of the abyſs, has ſeduced me, and cunningly conveyed me from the United Provinces, where I was ſafe, to deliver me into the hands of my enemies, or to death. But this concerns the converſion of all the apoſtates of ſeveral orders, who are ſtill in the mire of error, and only kept in it by the fear of puniſhment, to know that theſe ſtories are falſe, and that I am eſcaped out of the power of the wolves, to enter into the boſom of a merciful paſtor, who glories to carry the ſtraying ſheep upon his ſhoulders. Certainly, if I was treated according to my crimes, an impriſonment of ten years would not be ſufficient to expiate them. But ſince I return into the boſom of my father voluntarily, and without conſtraint, where ſin has for two years abounded, grace at preſent doth much more abound.' He affected to make it known how many ſecurities had been granted him. 'I have obtained from his majeſty, *ſaid he* (13), one of the fineſt patents of pardon and abſolution that ever was granted : ſo that I neither fear Bourdeaux, for the book, nor Rochelle, for the ſentence of death. I have received in the ſecond place, letters of aſſurance from our holy father the Pope, with power to retire into any Catholic town I pleaſe, in which he has commanded all magiſtrates and eccleſiaſtics to protect me, being contented that I ſhould only wear the habit of a prieſt. I have received thirdly, a paſſport from the arch-duke Leopold, through all his territories. Fourthly, the general of the ſociety of Jeſus, Francis Picolomini, has ſent me a patent to enter again among the Jeſuits, where I am with an entire abolition of my fault, without impoſing upon me any penance or ſatisfaction, except what I ſhall take upon myſelf : the ſame has given me other patents to go into what kingdom or province of the world I pleaſe, ſo that I have the choice of all the colleges of the ſociety : all this is ſigned with the great ſeals of his office, and nothing is more authentic. And to compleat my happineſs, Father Ponthelier, who has procured me all theſe favours and wonders, has leave to live with me as long as he pleaſes, and he will never leave me till I am entirely ſatisfied, I can aſſure you of it. Beſides (which is a thing granted to no body) I have the choice to be either a ſecular prieſt, or to live in the ſociety of the Jeſuits ; and I expect a definitive anſwer from Rome.'

[*D*] *Other reaſons may be given why ſuch a man ſhould be ſeen no more.*] His recantation proved him to be the greateſt rogue upon the earth ; for in it he acknowledged, that to revenge himſelf of two Jeſuits, he had defamed the whole ſociety with falſe accuſations *of regicide, infanticide, ſodomy, and ſuch other abominable crimes* (14). When a man owns himſelf a public calumniator, with reſpect to ſuch crimes as theſe, the beſt thing he can do, is to conceal himſelf all the reſt of his days. If he has any conſcience, he ought to confine himſelf to a place of penitence as long as he lives ; if he has none, and has any ſenſe of honour left, he ought to ſhun all company, and, like Bellerophon, avoid the very footſteps of men.

Ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κἀκεῖνος ἀπήχθετο πᾶσι θεοῖσιν,
Ἤτοι ὁ καππεδίον τὸ Ἀλήϊον οἶος ἀλᾶτο,
Ὃν θυμὸν καΐέδων, πάτον ἀνθρώπων ἀλεείνων.

Sed

(8) Pag. 77.

(9) Pag. 79.

(10) *See the* Apologie pour les Reformateurs, *&c.* livr. i, chap. ix, pag. 154, Edit. in 4to, *and the* Critique Generale, *Letter* ix, *pag.* 147, *of the third edition.*

(11) Lettre de Jarrige au Sieur G. M. Marchand à Leide, *dated from Antwerp the eighth of May,* 1650. *It was printed at Leyden the ſame year, with an anſwer, which I ſhall mention hereunder, in the remark* [*F*].

(12) Pag. 4.

(13) *Letter to the merchant of Leyden.*

(14) Retractat. pag. 79.

will not take it ill, if for the inſtruction of the public, I rectify his account [*E*]. In the anſwers that were made to Jarrige's retractation, it was ſaid that his morals had not been

Sed quando jam & ille inviſus fuit omnibus diis,
Ille quidem per campum Aleïum ſolus errabat,
Suum animum exedens, veſtigia hominum vitans (15).

Afflicted by the gods he roams alone
O'er the Aleïan plains, and ſeeks mankind to ſhun.

He ought then to practice what Balzac ſaid he would do for a much leſſer reaſon. *I would go*, ſays he (16), *and eat my heart in the deſerts of Thebais, Ipſe meum cor edens, hominum veſtigia vitans.*

[*E*] *The hiſtorian quoted by me, will not take it ill that I rectify his account.*] Jarrige 'was a turbulent 'and ambitious man, and poſſibly he converted him'ſelf more out of ſpite to ſee himſelf croſſed in the 'deſign he had to arrive to the dignities of his order, 'than out of any zeal for the truth. He made an abju'ration of the Romiſh religion, in the conſiſtory of Ro'chelle, on Chriſtmas day, after which he retired in'to Holland. This was the firſt breach made in their 'ſociety, none of which, before this man, was ever 'known to forſake the Catholic religion. At leaſt, 'if others have left it, there was no noiſe made about 'it, either becauſe the Jeſuits prudently thought fit to 'be ſilent, or becauſe theſe Perſons did not deſerve that 'any complaints ſhould be made of them (17). . . . 'Some time after his book was publiſhed, Jarrige diſ'appeared, and the Jeſuits boaſted, that as he left their 'order, only out of anger, he was returned to it out 'of repentance; that he had ſhut himſelf up in one of 'their houſes, to hide himſelf from all worldly com'merce, and to do penance all his life. But becauſe 'he was never ſeen afterwards, it was believed on the 'contrary, that the Jeſuits had cauſed him to be car'ried off, and that they had ſecretly revenged them'ſelves upon him, for the diſpleaſure he had given 'them by his change. Indeed, it is not imaginable, 'that after they had made ſo much noiſe for the loſs 'of him, they would not draw ſome advantage from 'his return, and produce him at leaſt ſome times in 'the provinces, where his diſertion was known, to 'leſſen the joy that the Proteſtants conceived upon 'that conqueſt. Beſides, we have had ſince many 'other experiments of what they can do againſt thoſe 'that deſert them, and we are no longer ignorant, that 'they know how to ſteal them away from their ſafeſt re'treats, and make them expiate with long ſufferings, 'the crimes of violating their vows (18).' I ſhall only make three remarks upon this narrative.

The firſt will be ſhort: This author ſhould not have expreſſed himſelf by a *poſſibly* upon the motives of Jarrige's change. It is evident that anger was the only cauſe. Mr Spanheim was convinced of it at the firſt converſation he had with him (19), and his whole retractation ſhews it.

My ſecond obſervation is, that it was not the firſt breach made in the ſociety of the Jeſuits, attended with conſequences that made a great noiſe. In the XVIth century, a Jeſuit called Elias Haſenmullerus, left the order to turn Lutheran. He was a man who had curiouſly obſerved both the ſtrong and weak ſide of that ſociety; ſo that for fear of his publiſhing the hiſtory of it, the Jeſuits did all that was poſſible to ſeize him. He had the good luck to avoid their ſnares, by hiding himſelf ſometimes in one place, and ſometimes in another but at laſt, to put himſelf out of the reach of their conſpiracies, he retired to Wittemberg, in the year 1587 (20), where he ſpent his time, in putting the laſt hand to a hiſtory of the Jeſuits, which he deſigned to publiſh. He died before he could do it: his manuſcript was publiſhed ſome time after by Polycarp Lyſerus (21). It is a very ſtrong piece againſt the Jeſuits (22), and take it altogether, it is more provoking than the books of Jarrige, though perhaps there are not ſo many particular adventures in it. This work was received with great applauſe. The Jeſuits cauſed it to be refuted by James Gretſerus, which occaſioned ſeveral books *pro* and *con*.

I have ſaid, that perhaps Haſenmullerus does not tell ſo many adventures as Jarrige; but it is certain, that in the chapter of the vow of chaſtity, he relates ſome that are very ſcandalous; and doubtleſs to make the impurities of which he accuſes the Jeſuits, the more abhorred, he has laid open many precautions, with which he ſays they fortify themſelves againſt this ſin. He ſays, they make uſe of foods that mortify and enervate the fleſh, and that they order watchings, faſtings, whippings, and hair-cloths, to thoſe that confeſs their temptations. 'In cibis & potu variis utuntur herbis & 'pharmacis, quibus naturæ vim enervant, & ſobolem, 'ut ita dicam, intra viſcera propria occidunt μισάνθρωποι, & à Deo ordinatæ humanæ propagationis 'hoſtes. Si qui fratres in confeſſionibus conquerun'tur de carnis infirmitate, flammis atque uſtione, eam 'ut extinguant ordinant illis vigilias, jejunia, cilicia, '& flagella, quibus carnem ſuam doment, caſtigent, & 'in ſervitutem, ut loquuntur, ſpiritus redigant (23). '—— *In their meat and drink, they make uſe of ſe'veral ſorts of herbs, and other drugs, whereby they 'enervate the ſtrength of nature; and thus theſe man'haters, if I may uſe the expreſſion, deſtroy their 'children even in their own bowels, and are enemies 'to the propagation of the human ſpecies, as ordained 'by God. If any of the brotherhood complain, in their 'confeſſions, of infirmities in the fleſh, of luſtful flames 'and burnings, they direct them, in order to extinguiſh 'theſe, to make uſe of watchings, faſtings, ſack-cloth 'garments, and ſcourges, whereby they may tame and 'correct the fleſh, and reduce it, as their phraſe is, 'into ſubjection to the ſpirit.*' He adds, that there are ſome who ſtudy to raiſe and cheriſh in their ſoul, a great hatred for the fair ſex, 'Nonnullos vidi qui ni'hil voluerunt edere, quòd a muliere coctum ſciebant. 'Alios dicentes audivi, quoties de fœmina cogito, 'toties ſtomachus meus & bilis commoventur & con'turbantur. Alius dicebat, tædet pudetque me quod 'à muliere ſum in hanc lucem editus; dignus certe 'cui vacca fuiſſet genitrix. Alii nihil prorſus boni in 'tota mulieris ſubſtantia eſſe dicunt, ſique ex illis 'quidam cæteros in harum calumniarum palæſtra vin'cere conantur, illi ad mentionem mulieris expuunt, '& in tabula maledicos & in ſexum fœmineum con'tumelioſos Mantuani verſus (quos tamen is non niſi 'de malis cecinit) deſcriptos ob oculos ponunt, ut ſic in 'ſeipſis majus in mulieres odium excitent (24). —— '*I have known ſome of them who would eat nothing 'that they knew to have been dreſſed by a woman; others 'I have heard ſaying, as often as I think of the ſex, 'my very ſtomach and bile are diſtorted and diſturbed. 'Another ſaid, it vexes and makes me aſhamed, that 'I was born of a woman; worthy ſure to have had 'a cow for his mother. Others aſſert, that there is 'nothing good in the whole ſubſtance of a woman; 'and when ſome endeavour to outdo the reſt in breath'ing out theſe calumnies, they ſpit at the very mention 'of a female, and when at table, ſet before their eyes 'Mantuan's bitter verſes on the ſex* (*though his ſatire 'is pointed only againſt the bad*) *that they may ſtir 'up in themſelves the greater averſion to women in ge'neral.*' By this we ſee that all ſorts of extravagancies may enter into the mind, under a falſe devotion; for what can be more abſurd, and more reſembling a lunatic, than the diſcourſes of thoſe people? *My ſtomach riſes*, ſay they, *and my choler is ſtirred as often as I think of a woman; I am ſorry and aſhamed, to owe my birth to a woman; I ſpit when I hear a woman mentioned.* I have not found in Haſenmullerus's book, a paſſage quoted by a modern author (25): he pretends to have read in it, that a workman who was at work for the Jeſuits, though they gave him meat and drink enough, could not careſs his wife; and yet when he laboured at other people's houſes, did very well perform his nocturnal duty, even when he drank nothing but water: for which reaſon his wife would not ſuffer him to work for the Jeſuits any longer, and afterwards the magiſtrates of Landsberg (26) did not permit any body to buy their beer. If it had that ill quality, the magiſtrates were to be praiſed for forbidding laymen to drink it; for the conjugal duty is ſo privileged a caſe, that many caſuiſts ſubmit the laws of the church to it. They pretend, that when faſting hinders a man from paying his duty to his wife, he is *ipſo facto*, diſpenſed from faſting. See the margin (27).

If the converſion of the Jeſuit Haſenmullerus made a great noiſe, that of the Jeſuit Reihing made ſtill a greater (28). It is he, who is thought to have contributed been edifying whilſt he appeared a Proteſtant [*F*]. Konig (*g*) calls him Jarrichius, and will have him to have publiſhed in 1665, *the Jeſuit upon the Scaffold* (*b*); which implies three faults.

---

(15) Homer. Iliad. lib. vi, ver. 200.

(16) *Letter xxxiv, to Chapelain, book v.* *See* Cicero Tuſc. Quæſt. lib. iii, fol. 263, D.

(17) Hiſt. de l'Edit. de Nantes, Tom. III, pag. 93.

(18) Ibid. pag. 94.

(19) Jarrige, Retractation, pag. 7.

Of Haſenmullerus, an Ex-Jeſuit, and of his *Hiſtoria Ordinis Jeſuitici*.

(20) *Taken from the preface of Polycarp Lyſerus, prefixed to Haſenmullerus's book.*

(21) *At Francfort, in the year* 1593, *in 4to.*

(22) Haſenmullerus qui fuit Jeſuita, & ſcripſit triumphum Papalem, habet multa bona. *Scaliger, in Scaligeranis, poſterioribus, pag m.* 105. It is not true that he is the author of the *Triumphus Papalis*, prefixed to his *Hiſtoria Jeſuitici Ordinis.* Maximilian Philo is the author of it. Scaliger's miſtake is alſo to be found in the Catalogue of the Bodleian library.

(23) Haſenmullerus, Hiſtoria Ordinis Jeſuitici, pag. 127, Edit. Francof. 1605.

(24) Ibid. pag. 131.

(25) *The author of the* Polygamia Triumphatrix. *The following words are to be found, pag.* 130. Haſenm. Hiſt. Jeſ. cap. vi, pag. 99, ubi jocoſam, ſed tamen veram hiſtoriam narrat de *opifice* quodam, qui apud Jeſuitas laborans, comedens & bibens, *uxori benevolentiam debitam non potuit reddere*, ſed apud alios vel aquam bibens virum ſe valuit præſtare, eamque ob cauſam non voluit, ut amplius Jeſuitis inſerviret, uti & poſtea Landſbergenſes prohibuerint in Bavaria, ne amplius *cereviſiam* apud Jeſuitas emerent.

(26) *A town in Bavaria.*

(27) *Thoſe are not obliged to faſt, who . . . when they faſt, cannot pay a due benevolence to their wives.* Emanuel Sa, Aphoriſ verbo Jejunium n. 9. Tolet. Inſtruct. Sacerdot. lib. vi, cap iv. Thomas 2. ſecundæ Queſt. 147. art. iv. *Du Moulin in the book of Traditions*, pag. m. 343.

(28) *He turned Lutheran about the year* 1620.

In the Catalogue of the Bodleian Library, he is confounded with another Jeſuit, whoſe work is aſcribed to him, and whoſe name was Peter Jarric.

(*g*) Biblioth. Vetus & Nova, pag. 424.

(*b*) Jeſuitam . . ferâli pegmate conſtitutum. *It ſhould be* Jeſuitas.

buted to bring the duke of Newburg to the Romiſh communion. See the Article of REIHING. Thus you ſee two eminent converſions of Jeſuits which preceded that of Peter Jarrige. I ſay nothing of Daniel Peirol, miniſter of the church of Montauban, and profeſſor in the academy of the ſame town. He had been a Jeſuit, and he wrote ſomething againſt Father Coton. I have found this in the twenty-firſt page of Gilbert Voetius's *Confraternitas Mariana.*

My third obſervation is, that Jarrige was not carried off: he retired voluntarily, being moved to it by the ſuggeſtion of the Jeſuit Ponthelier. This appears by the authentic pieces that have been printed Such is the letter he wrote to the merchant of Leyden, and much more his recantation (29).

[*F*] *His morals had not been edifying whilſt he appeared a Proteſtant.*] I have ſeen two anſwers to his recantation; one written by Ezekiel Daunois of Compeigne, a miniſter of the goſpel: The other by John Nicolai, of Luxemburg, a member of the French church at Amſterdam. In the preface of his ſecond anſwer, I have read, that Peter Jarrige endeavoured in vain to be admitted into the miniſtry, before the four years of trial were expired, which the synods have appointed for thoſe who come from Popery. ‘ That ‘ touch, *ſays he*, filled you with indignation after your ‘ laſt rejection in the ſynod of Harlem, where you ‘ was alſo accuſed (your conſcience knows whether it ‘ was wrongfully) of an action as infamous as thoſe ‘ filthy things, of which you accuſe the Jeſuits of your ‘ province to put them upon the ſcaffold. Now, tho’ ‘ it was not then examined to the bottom, foraſmuch ‘ as the witneſſes were not preſent; yet the ſuſpicion ‘ remained, conſidering the great knowledge and ex- ‘ perience you have expreſſed in your book, of ſuch ‘ ſort of impurities.’ The letter which the Leyden merchant wrote to him, will explain all this: theſe words are to be found there: ‘ You may remember ‘ with what ſpirit you was led, when you returned from ‘ the ſynod of Middleburg, which you had in vain ‘ ſo vehemently ſollicited, to obtain an exception to ‘ the order made againſt admitting to the holy miniſtry ‘ (which you was fond of to cauſe a greater ſcandal) ‘ thoſe that come from Popery, till after a trial of four ‘ years. Being refuſed, you made your preſumption, ‘ pride, and vanity, plainly appear; and in your way ‘ home you happened to be at night in the cabin of ‘ the veſſel, where were many women, whom not ‘ being able to talk with but by ſigns, you ſhewed ‘ them by candle-light your obſcene parts, and made ‘ them ſet up a cry againſt this villanous and abominable prieſt, as they called you; which not only ‘ awaked a good ſervant of God, who was there, ‘ but all the reſt of the crew, who running at the ‘ alarm, upon hearing the women talked of nothing ‘ but throwing you into the water; which they would ‘ have done, had it not been for that good man, ‘ who pacified them; but the boatman proteſted ‘ that he would tell it in the place from whence ‘ you came.’

(29) *See the remark* [*C*], *citations* (11), (12), *and* (13).

JAVERSAC (N.) was one of the authors that entered the liſts during Balzac's great quarrel with father Goulu. He was *a native of a town near* Angouleſme (*a*), and he removed to *Paris with a book againſt* Phyllarchus (*b*) and Narciſſus (*c*), *under the name of* Ariſtarchus to Nicander. His criticiſms are worth nothing in ſome places; for inſtance, he maintains, *we ought to ſay* Ruette, *and not* Ruelle; livraire, *and not* libraire, *ſince they ſay in* French, un livre, *and not* un libre. This new author found himſelf attack'd *in his lodgings, and even in his bed, with ſword and piſtol*; *but* as he was young and valiant, he took his ſword, *and purſued his enemy into the ſtreet, and got great honour, for this courageous defence.* Neverthelefs, *the very next day this adventure was ſung upon the* Pont-Neuf, *quite otherwiſe than it happened* [*A*]. A libel was publiſhed, intituled, *La Defaite du Paladin Javerſac par les alliez, & confederez du Prince des feuilles* (*d*). (*The defeat of the knight errant Javerſac, by the allies and confederates of the Prince of the leaves* [*Phyllarchus*]. I have heard a man of great wit ſay, that Balzac was the author of that piece, and that it is the beſt that came out upon that diſpute. *A ſacrilegious calumny* was found in the *title of that libel* (*e*); for father Goulu was charged in it *with that attempt, notwithſtanding the ſacredneſs of his profeſſion.* Javerſac declared him innocent of it, and imputed it only to Balzac (*f*); but *diſcreet perſons* could neither accuſe Phyllarchus nor Narciſſus of it (*g*). That which is certain, is, that it has been publiſhed (*b*) that Balzac being on his death-bed, *remembring, that in his younger years ſomething bad paſſed betwixt Javerſac and him, ſent one of his friends to his houſe, which was ſeven or eight leagues, diſtant from Angoulême to deſire him to make him a viſit, that he might have the ſatiſfaction of embracing him before he died. That he really embraced him with an incredible tranſport of joy, and poured into his boſom an effuſion of love, which agreeably put out of their minds the remembrance of their antient quarrel.* That Mr de Javerſac *was ſo ſenſibly touched with it, that immediately being all in tears, he made a ſonnet to lament for ever the loſs of his friend.*

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary, I have learned ſome circumſtances, of which I will give an account to my readers [*B*].

(*a*) Sorel, Bibl. Françoiſe, pag. pag. 132, Edit. 1667. *Note that Coignac is the town mentioned by Sorel.*

(*b*) *It is the name that Father Goulu took.*

(*c*) *It is the name Father Goulu gave to Balzac.*

(*d*) Sorel, ubi ſupra.

(*e*) Sorel, ibid.

(*f*) *See the laſt remark, citation* (14).

(*g*) Sorel, ubi ſupra.

(*b*) *Moriſcet, in the account of Balzac's death. It is in the edition of Balzac's works in folio.*

[*A*] *This adventure was related quite otherwiſe than it happened.*] Never were two things more different, than the manner how this adventure is related by Sorel, and by him that publiſhed *La défaite du Paladin Javerſac* (1). This pamphlet ſays, that the Paladin was of Coignac, where he had pleaded ſome cauſes; that after the publication of his book, there was a conſpiracy to fall upon him in the open ſtreet; but that they were forced to attack him in his chamber, becauſe he kept himſelf ſhut up all the day long; that he was ſurprized aſleep in the arms of his landlord's wife, on Thurſday the eleventh of Auguſt, 1628, at nine of the clock in the morning, and awaked by a ſalvo of baſtinadoes, which laſted as long as it pleaſed the aggreſſor, ſince Paladin wholly reſigned himſelf to providence. The concluſion of the libel is, that the friends of Phyllarchus ‘ joining in this with thoſe of the con- ‘ trary party, have ſworn to root out as many Javer- ‘ ſacs as they can meet with, and to make it plain to ‘ bad poets, that beſides the golden, braſen, and iron, ‘ ages, ſo celebrated in the fables, there is ſtill a ‘ wooden age to come, which the ancient poets have ‘ not mentioned, in the miſeries and calamities where- ‘ of they ſhall have a greater ſhare than other men.’ I make uſe of the edition of 1665 (2). See the following remark.

[*B*] *I have learned ſome circumſtances which I will give an account of to my readers.*] Javerſac's book was printed and reprinted in 1628, with this title, *Diſcours d'Ariſtarque à Nicandre, ſur le jugement des Eſprits*

(1) *It is a pamphlet of ſixteen pages in* 8*vo. It has been reprinted in the folio edi- of Balzac's works, with ſome other pieces made in his favour.*

(2) *That is, of the folio edition of Balzac's works.*

Eſprits de ce temps, & ſur les fautes de Phyllarque. The firſt thing to be met with in it, is an advertiſement of the Printer, full of lies; for it is there given out, that they were forced to uſe all ſorts of artifices to over-reach the vigilance, wherewith the author hindered the publication of his work. *He did not love it ſo little as to be willing to expoſe it to the rage of envy.* Afterwards you find an abuſive letter, which he writ to Mr Bergeron, counſellor to the king, and referendary in Chancery. As he ſuppoſes that this Mr Bergeron had made difficulties againſt the granting the king's licence, in order to deprive him of the advantage of being the firſt that ſhould publiſh any thing about the diſpute of Balzac and Goulu, and to give time to la Motte Aigron to be before him, he expreſſes a great rage in that letter. In the third place, you ſee his preface, wherein he mentions the great efforts his enemies had made to ſtop the impreſſion of his book. At laſt you find the book itſelf. This is not the only work that Javerſac has publiſhed. In the ſame year, 1628, came out the *Diſcourſe d'Ariſtarque à Calidoxe ſur ce qui s'eſt paſſè entre lui & Balzac.* The impreſſion coſt him a hundred crowns (3); and it was not poſſible for him to get it done at Paris, 'either with licence or without it.' He ſays (4), 'that his father 'had had ſeveral honourable deputations, and ſome of 'the moſt important poſts of the aſſembly of the Pro'teſtants before the rebellions . . . . and (5) that he 'can prove, that his anceſtors have acquired their no'bility by the right of veterans, in ſeveral honourable 'poſts of the crown of Navarre.' He ſays alſo (6), that he had offered to give Balzac ſatisfaction, either as a gentleman, or a Philoſopher. He relates at large, the misfortune that happened to him, of being aſſaulted in his bed (7). He did a little ward off the blow of one of the three villains that came into his chamber; but *it is too honourable a thing for me*, ſays he (8), *not to confeſs that he ſtruck me in the arm, ſaying, you was forbidden to write againſt Balzac.* He adds (9) that his landlady was wounded in her little-finger; and that *he purſued them with ſword in hand into the ſtreet*, and that two hundred witneſſes, *who ſaw him in his ſhirt upon the threſhold, had ſaid it every where before him; that he made a paſs at the breaſt of him who had ſtruck him, and that fifty perſons who ſaw his ſword bend to the hilt, knew that this rogue had a coat of mail* (10). He obſerves (11), that two or three days before, he had had the honour to ſerve a marquis in a quarrel. Truly, I believe he was fitter to fight than to write books, and that he would quickly have worſted Balzac in a diſpute to be decided with ſword in hand. He ſpreads upon the paper ſome ſtrong rhodomontades againſt him (12), but he expreſſes ſome fear, that his adverſary would accuſe *him of ſome youthful mad pranks in love* (13). We muſt remember, that he never ſuſpected Father Goulu to be the cauſe of that inſult. *I know not*, ſays he (14), *why Balzac is afraid of me, if he is not guilty; and ſince he thinks to clear himſelf ſo well every where from that crime, by throwing it upon Phylarchus, who has ſhewed himſelf much more generous, and who has a better opinion of his wit than to vindicate himſelf. I had ſo many convincing proofs againſt Balzac, and ſo good an opinion of Phylarchus's honeſty, that I could not ſuſpect him in the leaſt. My book I think, gave him more diſturbance than my perſon.*

Note, that it is eaſy to know he was born a Huguenot, but not whether he was not ſo ſtill; for what I am going to quote, is ambiguous. *Having heard from my landlady, that I lodged there, after they had made inquiries about it, they asked what religion I was of. She anſwered, that ſhe did not know it, but that I went often to church. She might have ſworn that there is no Catholic, who has a more orthodox faith than I have* (15). Bergeron publiſhed a letter *againſt the impertinencies and falſities printed by the Sieur de Javerſac, in a letter prefixed to a book,* &c (16). There came out alſo (17) a piece intituled, *Le non paſſionné ſur le livre intitulé la defaicte du Paladin Javerſac.* This piece is infinitely more favourable to the Paladin than to his adverſary. As to the book intituted *Acbates a Palemon pour la defenſe de Phyllarque* (18); it is a thundering one againſt Javerſac. I have cited a piece of it in the remark of the article ARTABANUS IV (19).

(3) Ariſtarque avis aux lecteurs.

(4) Diſcours d'Ariſtarque à Calidoxe, pag. m. 166.

(5) Ibid. pag. 168.

(6) Ibid. pag. 174.

(7) It was upon a Thurſday, the ſecond of Auguſt, 1628, according to the octavo edition of the *Défaite du Paladin Javerſac.*

(8) Diſcours d'Ariſtarque. pag. 183.

(9) Ibid pag. 184.

(10) Ibid. pag. 185.

(11) Ibid. pag. 189.

(12) See eſpecially, pag. 198.

(13) Ibid. pag. 201.

(14) Ibid. pag. 199.

(15) Ibid. pag. 176.

(16) It was written to Balzac, and printed in 1628.

(17) In the year 1628.

(98) Printed the ſame year.

(19) See alſo the article MUSAC.

JENISCHIUS (Paul) was born at Antwerp the ſeventeenth of June, 1558, and died at Studgard the eighteenth of December, 1647. He was a learned man, and underſtood ſeveral languages. His book, intituled, *Theſaurus Animarum*, expoſed him to a grievous perſecution: he was baniſhed, and his baniſhment laſted above fifty years. He bore it very patiently, and enjoyed an extraordinary good health to the laſt year of his life, eating well, ſleeping well (*a*), and ſpending his time in Muſic, which he underſtood to perfection, and in the ſtudy of the Holy Scripture, and in Mechanics. He had nineteen children, whereof four only were living when he died. He was grievouſly ſick the laſt year of his life, and he died in acute pains (*b*). He has been unknown to the Bibliographers of the Low-Countries.

(*a*) Perfruitus animi tranquillitate & corporis valetudine firma cum orexi, ſuavi ſomno uſus. *Job. Valent. Andreas, ubi infra.*

(*b*) Taken from the cxcth Letter of John Valentinus Andreas.

IGNATIUS, founder of the Jeſuits. See **LOYOLA**.

ILLYRICUS (Matthias Flacius) one of the moſt learned divines of the confeſſion of Augsburg, was born at Albona in Iſtria (*a*) the third of March 1520. He ſtudied claſſical learning at Venice, under Egnatius; and at ſeventeen years of age, finding in himſelf a ſtrong inclination for the ſtudy of Divinity, he reſolved to become a Monk, becauſe he could not maintain himſelf in the univerſities, and ſo the only way to ſatisfy his inclination, was to ſtudy in a monaſtery. He communicated his deſign to a provincial of the Franciſcans, a relation of his mother. But this provincial who was inclined to the Proteſtant religion [*A*], adviſed him to go into Germany, and not to ſhut himſelf up in a convent. Flacius followed his advice, and went to Baſil in the year 1539 [*B*]. He ſtaid there ſome months, and then he went to Tubingen, and from thence to Wittemberg in the year 1541, and became a diſciple of Luther and Melancthon. He maintained himſelf by teaching Greek and Hebrew. Having communicated to Pomeranus, and afterwards to Luther, the temptations that tormented him, about

(*a*) Part of the country formerly called *Illyrium*, or *Illyris*: hence it is that Matthias Flacius was ſirnamed *Illyricus*. It is not true, as Melchior Adam, and many others affirm, that he was born in Sclavonia.

[*A*] *This provincial, who was inclined to the Proteſtant religion.*] He deſerves a place in the Proteſtant Martyrology, ſince after he had been impriſoned twenty years becauſe he was ſuſpected of Hereſy, he was thrown into the ſea. He was called Baldus Lupatinus. See the margin (1).

[*B*] *He went to Baſil in the year* 1539] He was therefore nineteen years old. Verheiden (2) is therefore miſtaken in ſaying, that Illyricus made a journey to Baſil at ſeventeen years of age, Mr Teiſſier (3) has followed Verheiden.

(2) In Effigiebus, pag. 157.

(3) Addit. to the Elog. Tom. I, pag. 471.

---

(1) Baldus autem iſte, ut hoc ἐν παρόδῳ addamus, paulo poſt in ſuſpicionem hæreſeos venit: ac Venetiis viginti ipſos annos ſitum ſqualoremque carceris, tandem in mari ſummerſus ſupplicium fortiter pertulit. *Melchior. Adam, in Vit. Theol. pag.* 472. See alſo *Verheiden in Effigiebus, pag.* 157.

about ſin, the wrath of God, and Predeſtination, public prayers were put up for him, and ſcriptural comforts were adminiſtred to him, ſo that theſe temptations ceaſed. He received a thouſand tokens of kindneſs and liberality from Melanchthon. They married him, and gave him a public employment in the univerſity in the year 1544 (*b*). The War having diſperſed the ſcholars in Saxony, he removed to Brunſwic, where he made himſelf famous by his lectures: He went and re-aſſumed his firſt employment at Wittemberg, in the year 1547, and a little after he ſtrongly oppoſed the Interim, and all the gentle means that Melanchthon was for; and that he might have more liberty to declaim againſt Popery, he retired (*c*) to Magdeburg, which was then put under the ban of the empire. He publiſhed ſeveral books there, but the moſt conſiderable of his labours was doubtleſs that eccleſiaſtical hiſtory called the *Centuries of* Magdeburg, of which he had the chief direction. He accepted the employment that was offered him in the year 1557, in the new univerſity of Jena, where he was a profeſſor for five years; after which, not being able to agree with Victorinus Strigelius his colleague [*C*], he retired to Ratisbonne, where he continued to publiſh many books. He was invited into Brabant, with ſome others in the year 1567, to model ſome churches after the Augſburg confeſſion: but the perſecution diſperſed all theſe churches ſoon after, ſo that he removed from thence to Straſburg, and then to Francfort, where he found a great declenſion of his glory; for he was forſaken by moſt of his adherents, becauſe he was accuſed of Manicheiſm, under pretence that he taught, that ſin was not an accident, but the very ſubſtance of the ſoul (*d*). He died at Francfort the eleventh of March 1575 (*e*). He was a man that had excellent talents, a vaſt wit, a great deal of learning, and a mighty zeal againſt Popery; but his turbulent, furious, and quarrelſome temper, ſpoiled all his good qualities, and occaſioned a thouſand diſorders in the Proteſtant church. He made no ſcruple to declare, that princes were to be kept in awe, by the fear of inſurrections (*f*). There was no reaſon to lament his death; for diviſions which are always ſcandalous, were then very pernicious, becauſe of the advantages which the church of Rome drew from them, to inſult the growing reformation. Some have ſaid, that the only good thing he did was to die (*g*). But this is overdoing things. He publiſhed a vaſt number of books (*h*); and no man in his time, knew how to rummage old libraries to better advantage. He got from thence an antient maſs book [*D*], which he printed in the year 1557. This will give us an

(*b*) Micrælius, *Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. m.* 751, is therefore miſtaken, when he ſays that he was profeſſor at Wittemberg, in 1540.

(*c*) *In April* 1549. Bucholc. pag. m. 564.

(*d*) See the remark [*C*].

(*e*) *Taken from* Melch. Adam, in Vitis Germanorum Theologorum, pag. 472, & ſeq.

(*f*) Metu ſeditionum terrendos eſſe Principes. *Melantcht. Epiſt. cvii, pag.* 134.

(*g*) Nequidquam recti feciſſe niſi cum moreretur. *Guil. Budæus, Centur. XVI.* θανατολογίας *ad ann.* 1575, *apud Quenſtedt de Patriis Erudit. pag.* 263.

(*h*) Simler, in the Abridgment of Geſner's *Bibliotheque*, and Teiſſier, *Addit. Eloges. Tom. I, pag.* 472, gives a catalogue of them.

[*C*] *He could not agree with Victorinus Strigelius his colleague.*] They differed about the converſion of man, and the power of free-will. They diſputed upon it before the dukes of Saxony at Weimar (4). They went into two extreams. Strigelius inclined to the ſide of thoſe who were called Adiaphoriſts, and Synergiſts, who aſcribed a great power to free-will, and pretended that original ſin did only ſlightly touch the ſoul (5). Flacius on the contrary maintained, that this ſin was the very ſubſtance of the ſoul. The diſpute laſted thirteen ſeſſions: the acts of it were publiſhed with a preface of Muſæus, who was one of Flacius's followers (6). We have here a viſible effect of the deſire of contradicting others; which is a paſſion that commonly carries men of a lively wit beyond all bounds. Flacius not being able to content himſelf with a moderate oppoſition, ſet himſelf at the greateſt diſtance poſſible from his antagoniſt; and ſeeing him maintain that the ſoul was not wounded by original ſin, but in it's accidental faculties, he undertook to prove, that the very ſubſtance of the ſoul is corrupted, whence it followed that ſin is the very ſubſtance of the ſoul. Flacius had never thought of that doctrine, if his colleague had not taught the contrary. But if the diſpute which aroſe betwixt theſe two profeſſors ſhews what the ſpirit of contradiction, and the ἀμετρία τῆς ἀνθολκῆς, can do, it ſhews alſo how fit the peripatetic Philoſophy is to foment the diviſions of the divines. For Illyricus's doctrine would have offended no body, if they had believed, as the new Philoſophers do, that there are no accidents diſtinct from ſubſtances, but that for example, pain is nothing elſe but the ſoul itſelf, as it is modified in ſuch a manner: which being granted, it is plain that Illyricus's doctrine is moſt true. Sin is not a diſtinct being from a ſinful ſoul, and virtue is not a diſtinct being from a virtuous ſoul. I do not apprehend how the divines, who ſuppoſe a real diſtinction between the ſoul and it's modifications, can ſay there happens a change in man, when he paſſes from a ſtate of innocence, to that of guilt, and from a ſtate of ſin, to that of grace. According to theſe divines, when man ſins, a new entity, diſtinct from the ſoul, is produced, which, being joined with the ſoul, compoſes together with it a whole, which contains two beings really diſtinct from one another, one of which is called ſubſtance, and the other accident. I maintain, that this conjunction does not change the ſoul, and that it continues to be preciſely what it was before that conjunction. Mix as much as you pleaſe grains of wheat with grains of barley, you will never make them ceaſe to be wheat: and in all natural and artificial mixtures, it is true, that the compounds become capable of a new action; but each part of them, as it is diſtinct from every other, retains preciſely the ſame nature it had before. In like manner, if the ſoul was really diſtinct from it's ſin, that is to ſay, from the ſin to which it were joined, it would not paſs into another ſtate. A ſoul once innocent, would always be ſo. See what the Nominaliſts ſay (7) againſt thoſe, who teach that modes are really diſtinct from ſubſtances.

(4) In the year 1560, according to Micrælius, *Syntagm. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. pag. m.* 827, 828; but according to Melchior Adam, *in Vitis Theol. Germ. pag.* 420, it was in the year 1557.

(5) Spondanus ad ad. ann. 1560, n. 32.

REFLEXION upon Flacius's doctrine concerning the nature of ſin.

(6) *See* Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſtoriar. Eccleſ. pag. m. 827, 828.

(7) Caſimirus Tholoſas in Atomis Peripateticis, Tom. III, pag. 249, & ſeq.

[*D*] *He got from thence an ancient maſs-book.*] Here is the title of this work printed at Straſburg by Chriſtopher Mylius, in the year 1557. *Miſſa latina, quæ olim ante Romanam circa ſeptingenteſimum Domini annum in uſu fuit, bona fide ex vetuſto authenticoque Codice deſcripta à Matthia Flacio Illyrico.* So Mr Colomiés gives it (8), and poſſibly he had it from du Peyrat (9). He adds a great many curious things about this miſſal. He ſays, ‘that the Lutherans believing it to be contrary to the opinion and practice of the Catholics, expreſſed upon all occaſions how glad they were of that diſcovery; that the Catholics on their part, without any ſtrict examination of this Miſſal, prohibited it in their indexes (10)..... That the Lutherans coming to examine this miſſal with more care, and finding it not favourable to them, ſuppreſſed all the copies they could find, ſo that it is grown extreamly ſcarce, and that the Catholics taking advantage of that retractation, have ſince cauſed it to be reprinted (11), notwithſtanding the prohibition of the Pope and the king of Spain.’ I make no doubt that he took from du Peyrat what he ſays of the Lutherans about the ſuppreſſion of the copies; in which I think he has been too credulous for du Peyrat gives no other reaſon for what he imputes to the Lutherans, but the ſcarcity of the copies of this miſſal. I confeſs he quotes a paſſage of Wicelius, in which Illyricus is ſaid to have been ſo indiſcreet as to ſupply the Catholics with arms againſt his own ſect, by the impreſſion of this miſſal. But this makes much more againſt du Peyrat than for him. And indeed Wicelius does not ſay that the Lutherans mended their fault by the ſuppreſſion of the copies; and yet if du Peyrat was in the right, they had been already

(8) Colomiés, Bibliotheque choiſie, pag. 12.

(9) Du Peyrat, Antiquitez de la Chapelle du Roi, pag. 561.

(10) Philip II, by the advice, and at the requeſt of the duke of Alba, and afterwards Sixtus V. *Colomiés, Bibliotheque choiſie, pag.* 12.

(11) Father le Cointe has inſerted it in the ſecond volume of Eccleſiaſtical Annals of France, and cardinal Bona at the end of his work *de rebus Liturgicis.* Id. ibid.

an opportunity of diſcuſſing ſeveral things. Thoſe libraries afforded him vaſt collections, which have been ſerviceable to many people. I mean the memoirs which he gathered to compile his *Catalogus teſtium veritatis* [E]. It is ſaid that ſometimes he diſguiſed his name

already ſuppreſſed by them, when Wicelius publiſhed his book, which was in 1564. Now du Peyrat's proof is taken from the ſilence of Caſſander and Pamelius *his contemporary* about Illyricus's Miſſal in their liturgical books. *Nevertheleſs*, ſays he (12), *they have curiouſly inquired into every thing that related to that matter, and they had a great credit in Germany . . . to get all the books that might be neceſſary for them.* He therefore argues thus: if the Lutherans had not deſtroyed the copies of the miſſal, publiſhed by Illyricus, Caſſander would have mentioned this maſs-book; for he would doubtleſs have ſeen a copy of it. But he has made no mention of it; therefore it is certain the Lutherans had deſtroyed them. Note that Caſſander's book about liturgies was printed (13) ſome years before that of Wicelius. We ſhall ſee below, that Caſſander's ſilence is a very bad proof of the ſcarcity of thoſe copies, and that it is not a ſign that this maſs-book was unknown to him. At preſent I ſhall only obſerve, that Wicelius's reproach is a proof againſt du Peyrat. But let us ſee what he alledges (14).

'Flavius (15) Illyricus having printed it in the year 1557, at Strasburg by inadvertency, not conſidering what he did, and the Lutherans and other German Heretics being ſenſible of the prejudice this antient miſſal did to their new opinions, collected all the copies they could meet with, and ſuppreſſed them, that it might not come to the knowledge of the Catholics, and be uſed againſt them, being intirely contrary to the ſects of Luther and Calvin. George Wicellius †, an old diſciple of Luther, who at laſt forſook him, and returned into the pale of the church, ſpeaking of Flavius Illyricus in his defence of the Eccleſiaſtical Liturgy, printed in the year 1564, ſeven years after that Gallican Miſſal was publiſhed, falls ſharply upon Flavius Illyricus on account of that Latin miſſal, ſaying that a blind man may clearly ſee, that by printing it, he ignorantly and imprudently engaged againſt the ſects of Luther and Calvin, and greatly obliged the Catholics. Wicellius's words are theſe: *Mathias Flavius Illyricus edidit repertam Miſſam Latinam, non triumphans tamen de Theſauro tanto adverſus Catholicos, quùm vel cæcutienti homini appareat totum illud quod edidit, contra Lutheri, Calvinique ſectas edidiſſe, ſed & Catholicis nobis rem longe gratiſſimam feciſſe; quid enim ibi niſi Miſſam Latinam, quæ hodie in uſu generali eſt, inſciens, imprudenſque defendit? Tantùm abeſt, ut ſuo ſectæque more oppugnet; locupletior eſt illa quidem, pluſque precum continet, ſed omninò tamen eadem cùm uſitatâ, cujus etiam dicta, factaque omnia paſſim ſequitur, ut diverſam eſſe confirmare nemo audeat.* This undoubtedly was the reaſon why Flavius Illyricus and his adherents of Germany, being ſenſible of the fault they had committed, burnt, or otherwiſe ſuppreſſed, this Latin or Gallican Miſſal, fearing they ſhould be laughed at by every body. That which confirms me in this opinion is, that tho' it was printed at Strasburg in the year 1557, George Caſſander who died but in February 1566 ‡, and Pamelius, his commentary . . . . make no mention of it.' Du Peyrat repeates the ſame thing at the 623 page. 'I maintain, *ſays he*, that ſince Caſſander and Pamelius, who have been moſt curious in ſearching out all ſorts of liturgies, have never ſeen this tho' it was printed in their life-time, eight or nine years before the death of either of them (16), and ſince it is ſcarce to be met with at this day in France and Germany; that the Lutherans and Calviniſts burnt it as ſoon as it ſaw the light, to hinder the Catholics from making uſe of it againſt them, as of a ſharp knife coming from them to cut their throats, and juſtify their blind obſtinacy againſt the antient and true doctrine of the Catholic, Apoſtolic, and Roman Church.' Let us now ſee whether Caſſander's ſilence proves any thing.

Colomiés, who confutes Cardinal Bona, ſhould have known that du Peyrat had deceived the cardinal. Therefore his cenſure ſhould have been levelled firſt of all againſt du Peyrat: however here are Colomiés's words (17), 'Cardinal Bona is miſtaken in believing that Caſſander never ſaw the Miſſal publiſhed by Illyricus: beſides that in a collection of antient prayers made by Caſſander, there are ſome that are alſo in Illyricus's Miſſal; Fr. Baudouin, a famous civilian, writing to Caſſander from Francfort in the year 1557, that is, the ſame year that this Miſſal was printed, uſes theſe words: Francofordiam reverſus, reperi Illyrici ad me literas cum libello de Miſſæ ad Palatinum noſtrum. (*He means Otho elector Palatin, to whom this book was dedicated.*) Rogat ille meum judicium de ſuis Miſſæ antiquitatibus. Ego id ad te nunc refero, & libellum ipſum mitto de quo quid ſentire debeamus familiariter nos moneas, ut de qua re tam multi multa confuſè balbutiunt, rectè & diſtinctè reſpondere aliquando poſſimus. —— *When I returned to Franckfort, I found letters from Illyricus to me, together with a book, concerning the Maſs inſcribed to the Prince Palatine.* (He means Otho elector Palatine, to whom the book is dedicated) *He demands my judgment on his Antiquities of the Maſs. Now I refer that matter to you, and ſend you alſo his book, of which let us hear your ſentiments freely, that on a ſubject, whereon many talk confuſedly, and beſide the purpoſe, we may be able to offer ſomething that is clear and diſtinct.*' I have a better reaſon than this, to prove that Illyricus's Miſſal was not unknown to George Caſſander; and that which is very remarkable, is, that du Peyrat ſupplies me with it, the marginal note (18), which he has put in the 622d page, informs me, that mention is made of this Miſſal at the end of a book printed in 1561, and intituled, *De officio pii ac publicæ tranquillitatis vere amantis viri*, &c. Now it is certain Caſſander was the author of this book. If du Peyrat had known this, he would not have affirmed that this author never ſaw Flacius's Miſſal. By this we ſee that he uſed a very bad argument, as to what concerns Caſſander, to prove that the copies of this Miſſal were grown very ſcarce. But will ſome ſay, it is certain that they grew ſcarce, and that Caſſander makes no mention of that Miſſal in his book of liturgies. I anſwer as to the laſt point, that perhaps this book of Caſſander was printed off before the author received Illyricus's book. The Bibliotheque of Valerius Andreas ſhews, that this book of Caſſander was printed in the year 1558; it may be ſaid ſo in the title page though the book had been made public in the autumn of 1557, a time in which perhaps Caſſander had not received Illyricus's book publiſhed in the year 1557. Upon the other point, I ſhall only ſay, that there are ſeveral works of Illyricus as hard to come by as his Gallican miſſal, and yet no body went about to ſuppreſs them. There are many other cauſes of the ſcarcity of a book, beſides the care of gathering up all the copies to throw them into the fire.

[E] *I mean the memoirs which he gathered to compile his* Catalogus Teſtium Veritatis.] The worſt of it is, that he is accuſed of having ſtolen ſome manuſcripts. Let us hear Melchior Adam. 'Tertium locum facile obtinet *Martyrologium* illud, quod hac occaſione compilatum ferunt. Contexuit Abbas *Joannes Trithemius* Catalogum auctorum. Hunc cùm vidiſſet Flacius, temperare ſibi non potuit, quin diſſimulatâ perſonâ & habitu aliquot in Germaniâ Monaſteriorum bibliothecas perluſtraret: quos commodè poſſet Hiſtoricos clam auferret, atque iſto adminiculo librum qui *Catalogus teſtium veritatis* indigitatur, conſcriberet (19). —— *That Martyrology eaſily obtains the third place, the occaſion of compiling of which is thus reported. The abbot John Trithemius drew up a catalogue of authors. This when Flacius had ſeen he could no longer contain himſelf, but diſguiſing his perſon and habit as well as he could, he went round to the ſeveral libraries of German monaſteries, carrying away privately from them ſuch hiſtories as were for his purpoſe, and with this aſſiſtance, he compoſed his book, called a* Catalogue of the Witneſſes of Truth.' The Catholic writers have not failed to take advantage of that remark. 'Egregium ſcilicet opus, *ſays Spondanus* (20), quod ex furto & ſacrilegio impii tranſfugæ confectum eſt, ut mirum videri non debeat, ſi tot mendaciis & falſiloquiis ſcateat à patre omnis nequitiæ & immunditiæ eructatis. —— *An extraordinary work indeed, which is compoſed out of the theft and ſacrilege of an impious turn-coat; whence*

' it

---

(12) Du Peyrat, ubi ſupra, pag. 618.

(13) In the year 1558. See *Valer. Andr. Biblioth. Belg. pag.* 261.

(14) Du Peyrat, ubi ſupra, pag. 617.

(15) So he calls him always.

† Vide Georgium Wicellium in defenſione Liturgiæ Eccleſiaſticæ.

‡ Caſſander's epitaph made by Cornelius Galterus of Ghent, and placed in the church of St Francis of Poland, witneſſes it: it is prefixed to the Liturgies of Caſſander.

(16) This is falſe with reſpect to Pamelius, who died in September 1587, being in the fifty ſecond year of his age. His book of Liturgies was printed in 1571. See *Val. Andr. ubi ſupra. pag.* 425.

(17) Colomiés, ubi ſupra, pag. 14.

(18) *Here it is; I have corrected in it ſome errors of the preſs*: Ad calcem libelli de officio pii ac publicæ tranquillitatis vere amantis viri in hoc Religionis diſſidio typis excuſi, anno 1561. referuntur doctorum aliquot ac piorum virorum libri, ex quibus videri poteſt quam non ſit difficilis controverſiarum in Religione conciliatio, ſi controvertendi ſtudium vitetur, inter quos fit mentio ejuſmodi Miſſæ his verbis, Miſſa Latina vetus, quæ ante 700. annos in uſu fuit in Eccleſia Gallicana, & Germanica. Argentorati apud Chriſt. Mylium, 1557.

(19) Melch. Adam, in Vit. Theol. pag. 475. *He quotes* Keckerman in Method. Hiſtor.

(20) Spondan. ad ann. 1560, n. 32. *He is miſtaken in calling Melchior Adam a Lutheran.*

name [*F*]. Moreri is much in the wrong to place him under the letter *T*, at the word Trancowitz [*G*].

Spondanus has committed a great fault, ſpeaking of the Centuries of Magdeburg [*H*]: you may ſee it in the remark (*i*), where I ſhall mention ſome things relating to the hiſtory of

it need not ſeem ſtrange that it ſo much abounds with lies and falſhoods, belched out by the father of all wickedneſs and uncleanneſs.' See in the 120th page of Colomiés's *Opuſcula*, what is ſaid of Lindenbroch. But Spondanus goes too faſt, when he concludes from a man's ſtealing manuſcripts, that he falſifies them afterwards, and publiſhes them with a thouſand alterations; Spondanus is not well grounded in ſuch a conſequence. Beſides, he is miſtaken when he ſuppoſes that Illyricus publiſhed his *Catalogus Teſtium Veritatis*, only in oppoſition to William Eiſengreinius's book. It is juſt the contrary, Eiſengreinius publiſhed his *Catalogus Teſtium Veritatis* in oppoſition to that of Illyricus. This is plain from the dates of the impreſſions. Illyricus's catalogue, printed at Baſil in the year 1556, was re-printed at Straſburg in the 1562, that of Eiſengreinius was printed at Dillingen in 1565. Which confutes the following paſſage (21). ‘ Nec vero tam illud æmulatione Trithemii, cujus opus omninò diverſum eſt, ſuum concinnaſſe putamus; quam turpiori flagitio ad obſcurandum illud, quod *Gulielmus Eiſengreinius* itidem Germanus Catholicus ediderat eodem Titulo *Catalogi Teſtium Veritatis*, quo patrum & Eccleſiaſticorum omnium qui ad eam uſque diem hæreſes expugnaverant, non parvo labore teſtimonia pro veritate fidei Catholicæ protulerat. In cujus invidiam, ſimul & ut fucum faceret imperitis, Flacius commentarium ſuum eodem titulo edidit ſed abſque nomine auctoris (22), fabulis & mendaciis refertum. ——— *Nor do we think he compoſed his book in emulation of Trithemius, whoſe work is indeed of quite a different kind, as with a baſer deſign to obſcure that of Gulielmus Eiſengreinius, who was alſo a German Catholic, and who had publiſhed a treatiſe under that title a Catalogue of the Witneſſes of Truth; in which from the fathers and other eccleſiaſtics, who to this day had written againſt hereſies, he had with no ſmall labour drawn out proofs of the Catholic faith, in ſpite to whom, and with a deſign to deceive the ignorant, Flacius ſent out his book under the ſame title, but without the name of the author, and ſtuffed with fables and lies.*' Note, that this work of Illyricus was very much enlarged by Simon Goulart of Senlis in the editions of 1597, and 1608.

But he is juſtly complained of (23) for having taken the liberty to change the method of it, and to add and leave out what he pleaſed, without ſhewing what was his and what Illyricus's. This perhaps was the reaſon why a Lutheran procured a new edition of the *Catalogus Teſtium Veritatis*, altogether like that of Illyricus, except that he prefixed to it what learned men have ſaid in praiſe or diſpraiſe of it. This new edition came out at Francfort in the year 1666 in 4to. without the name of John Conrad Dietericus, who procured it; but it was publiſhed with his name in 1672 (24). I muſt obſerve, that Melchior Adam has not well abridged the author he quotes: I have conſulted the original ſince the firſt edition of this Dictionary, and I have found in Keckerman a circumſtance, which ſhould not have been ſuppreſſed. Illyricus having learned from John Trithemius's book, that many authors, who lived in the darkneſs of Popery, had left ſome monuments of it's corruption, reſolved to render uſeleſs the care that was taken to conceal the books of thoſe authors. The paſſage of Keckerman runs thus: ‘ Cæterum quod attinet ad inſidioſos occultatores Hiſtoriarum, certum eſt in Bibliothecâ Vaticanâ, & aliis Bibliothecis Italiæ, imprimis autem in Bibliothecis Monaſteriorum, clam ſervari multos Hiſtoricos ſuperiorum ſeculorum, qui de fraudibus Pontificum, deque abuſibus Eccleſiæ Romanæ, & contra de conſervatione veræ doctrinæ, etiam ſub mediis tenebris Papatus ſcripſerunt: id quod manifeſte patet ex Catalogo autorum, edito ab Abbate Johanne Trithemio, qui iſtos autores ex Bibliothecis ante annos paulo plus centum collegit; quem catalogum cum vidiſſet Mathias Flacius, temperare ſibi non potuit, quin diſſimulatâ perſonâ & habitu aliquot in Germania Monaſteriorum Bibliothecas perluſtraret, artemque arte eluſerit, quos commodè poſſet Hiſtoricos clam auferret, atque adeò eximium iſtum librum, qui dicitur *Catalogus Teſtium Veritatis*, iſto adminiculo conſcriberet (25). ——— *As to what concerns the frudulent concealers of hiſtories, it is certain that in the Vatican, and other libraries of Italy, and eſpecially in thoſe belonging to monaſteries, there are privately kept many hiſtorians of the former ages, who wrote plainly againſt the frauds of the Popes, the abuſes of the church of Rome, and maintained the true doctrine, even in the midſt of Papal darkneſs, as is manifeſt from the Catalogue of Authors, publiſhed by abbot John Trithemius, who collected his liſt of writers out of thoſe libraries, ſomewhat more than a hundred years ago, which catalogue when Mathias Flacius ſaw, he could no longer contain himſelf, but diſguiſing his perſon and habit, he went to viſit the libraries of ſeveral monaſteries in Germany, and eluding art by art, he laid hold of ſuch hiſtorians as he could privately carry away, and then wrote his admirable book, called a Catalogue of the Witneſſes of Truth, from the helps which he had thus procured.*'

[F] *It is ſaid, that ſometimes he diſguiſed his name.*] They pretend that Achilles Gaſſarus, who publiſhed a book of Otfridus a monk of Weiſſemburg (26), is the ſame with Flacius Illyricus. This book is an harmony of the four goſpels, in German verſe. It was dedicated to Solomon and Luitbert, archbiſhops of Mentz, and to Lewis king of the eaſtern France (27). Mr Wharton, who pretends (28) that Illyricus publiſhed it under the name of Achilles Gaſſarus, will give me leave to inform my readers, that there was in the XVIth century a German Phyſician, called Achilles Gaſſarus, who publiſhed ſome books (29) when Illyricus was a ſchool-boy.

[G] *Moreri is much in the wrong to place him unde the letter* T, *at the word* Trancowitz.] Mr Teiſſier was the occaſion of it, by theſe words of the 471ſt page of his firſt volume. *The name of MATTHIAS FLACCIUS was Trancowitz.* He cites Verheiden's Effigies: But Verheiden does not ſay ſo, Let us ſee what the curious Mr Colomiés has diſcovered upon this ſubject (30). ‘ I muſt ſet down the true name of Illyricus, which is Francowitz, as Bucholcerus the ſon gives it at the 831ſt page of his Chronology; or rather of the continuation of his father's, printed at Gorlitz in 1599. *Verum & integrum*, ſays he, *Flacii nomen ego ex certis authoribus cognovi eſſe tale: Mathias Francowitzius, cognomento Flacius, gente Illyricus, patria Albonenſis.* Konig (31) calls him alſo Francowitzius; but Quenſtedt (32) names him Trancowitzium.

[H] *Spondanus has committed a great fault ſpeaking of the Centuries of Magdeburg.*] He ſays that they began to be publiſhed in the year 1560, and that the fourth tome was the firſt that came out (33). This is very falſe; for the three firſt centuries were printed before the fourth. The catalogue of the library of Francfort publiſhed in the year 1604, by Becman (34), mentions the year 1559, for the time of the publiſhing of the three firſt centuries, and the year 1560, for the publiſhing of the fourth. Draudius (35) places likewiſe the edition of the three firſt in 1559. Mr Sagittarius ſays, that according to his copy, the three firſt centuries were printed in 1562, the fourth in 1560, the fifth and ſixth in 1562, the ſeventh and eighth in 1564, the ninth in 1565, the tenth and eleventh in 1567, the twelfth in 1569, and the thirteenth, which is alſo the laſt, in 1574. It is very probable that Spondanus's edition was like that of Mr Sagittarius, that is, that neither of them had the firſt edition of the three firſt centuries: but this does not excuſe Spondanus, for if he had read the preface of the firſt, he would have ſeen that the centuriators complain of a ſatire, in which their work was ill ſpoken of, though nothing had been publiſhed of what they had written. ‘ De ſumptibus vere profitemur, *ſay they*, nos pauciſſimos habere, qui annuatim aliquid conferunt: nec pro laborum conditione operarii ſatis ſuſtentantur, ſicut ipſimet optimi teſtes ſunt: imo niſi Deus nobis quoſdam Mecœnates adhuc excitarit (quod tamen ne

‘ fiat

(i) In the remark [*H*].

(21) Spondanus, ubi ſupra, pag. m. 602. Poſſev. Apparat Sacr. Tom. I, & alii paſſim, *as Mr Baillet ſays in his quotations, affirm the ſame thing. He affirms it likewiſe in his* Jugem. des Sçavans, Tom. I, pag. 537, 538.

(22) This is falſe. See, below, citat. (59).

(23) *See* Joh. Albertus Faber, Decade in Decadum, n. 96.

(24) Idem. ibid.

(25) Keckerm, de Natura & Proprietat. Hiſt. in Auctario, cap. i, pag m. 151.

(26) He lived in the IXth century.

(27) *See the* Acta Eruditorum *of Leipſic*, 1691, *pag.* 295, *in the Extract of a book of archbiſhop Uſher, intituled*, Hiſtoria dogmatica controverſiæ de ſcripturis & ſacris vernaculis.

(28) Apud Act. Lipſienſ. ibid.

(29) *His* Epitome Chronicorum Mundi *was printed in* 1532. *See Geſner's* Bibliotheque.

(30) Biblioth. choiſie, pag. 15.

(31) Biblioth. Vet. & Nova, pag. 306.

(32) De Patriis Illuſtr. pag. 262.

(33) Spondan. ad ann. 1560, n. 31, pag. 601.

(34) *See* Caſpar Sagittarius, Introduct. in Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt. pag. 279.

(35) Ibid.

of thoſe centuries. Varillas, who has faithfully tranſcribed this fault of Spondanus has added ſo many others to it [*I*], that it is hard to conceive how a man of wit could be guilty

‘fiat, multi invidi ſtrenue laborant) neque progredi ſatis expedite poterimus: neque forte totum Opus, ut eſt inſtitutum, abſolvere. Impudens igitur, planeque diabolicum eſt mendacium, & criminatio tetra iſtius ſcurræ, qui nuper in maledico & famoſo ſcripto, ſine nomine edito (ubi tamen aliam ſaltat fabulam) Sardonio riſu, & virulento ſarcaſmo noſtrum opus hiſtoricum *Aureum* appellat: eo quod ex multo auro Germanico ſit conflatum. Non vidit ſceleratus iſte ſcurra Opus, & tamen non veretur canino, aut viperino potius dente arrodere. Deinde non habet cognitas rationes noſtras iſte conviciator ac criminator: & tamen ut Semei, nos ſalſe irridet, ac mentitur ſplendide. Nam quam pauci, & quam parce dent, quam frugaliter alantur hujus inſtituti operarii, poterat iſte irriſor explorare, non à profugis, ſceleratis, pollutis, mendacibus, quibus gubernationis noſtræ ratio ne nota quidem eſt, ſed à nobis ipſis. —— *As to the expences, we truly declare that we have few who contribute any thing to them yearly, nor are thoſe concerned in the work rewarded in a manner adequate to their labour, as they themſelves can teſtify; nay unleſs God raiſe up to us ſome patrons (which yet many envious perſons labour earneſtly to prevent), we can neither proceed expeditiouſly enough, nor perhaps finiſh the whole after the manner at firſt intended. Impudent therefore, and plainly diabolical is that falſe charge and black imputation of the buffoon, who in a late lying and ſcandalous writing, without the name of it's author (wherein he advances a new tale) calls with a cruel ſneer, and a ſarcaſm full of venom, this hiſtorical work of ours* Golden, *as if it were collected with great expence of German gold: this villainous libeller never ſaw our work, and yet he attacks it with a dog's, or rather with a viper's tooth. Beſides, this railer, this accuſer of ours, knows nothing of our affairs, and yet, like Shimei, falſely mocks us, and lies moſt glaringly. For how few and how ſparingly they give, and with what frugality, ſuch as have any hand in this work are maintained, this defamer might have known, not from runaways, villains, infamous fellows, liars, who know nothing of our manner of proceeding from ourſelves.*’ This long paſſage may ſerve to two purpoſes; for beſides that it is an argument againſt the falſe date of the centuries, it informs us, what account ought to be made of theſe words of Spondanus: ‘Quod opus vocatum eſt ab aliis Evangelicis *Aureum*, non quidem in laudem, ſed ironice, propterea quod multo principum quorundam Germaniæ, & civitatum auro, oſtiatim emendicato, ſit editum. —— *Which work has been called by ſome of the Evangelics themſelves* Golden, *not by way of praiſe but ironically, becauſe the publication thereof coſt the princes and cities of Germany conſiderable ſums of gold, which were for that purpoſe collected from door to door.*’ He ſays, that the other Proteſtants called theſe centuries a golden work, by way of ridicule, and to ſignify that it had been compiled at the expence of the German princes; but theſe Proteſtants dwindle into an anonymous author, who publiſhed a piece under the falſe name of the ſtudents of Wittemberg (36). See in Mr Sagittarius (37) ſeveral extracts of the Epiſtles Dedicatory of the centuries, deſigned to ſhew that it was not without reaſon that Illyricus, Wigandus, Judex, Faber, and the other aſſiſtants in that undertaking, demand the encouragement of the public. Note, that the third century was enlarged, when it was reprinted at Baſil (38). *Acceſſerunt caſtigationes & additiones locorum aliquot in prima editione depravatorum vel omiſſorum* (39). Obſerve alſo, that the four firſt centuries, and part of the fifth, were compoſed at Magdeburg; that the fifth was compleated at Jena; that the ſixth was compoſed in the place where Illyricus, Wigandus, and Judex were in exile; that the ſeventh was written in the country of Mecklenburg, and the reſt in the town of Wiſmar, in the ſame country (40).

I had written all this, before I found a copy of the firſt editions of thoſe centuries; for the edition of Baſil 1624, in three volumes in folio, procured by Lewis Lucius, being more eſteemed than any other, every body will have it, and ſo it is hard to find the others in private libraries. At laſt, I have been able to conſult the edition, which the centuriators cauſed to be made at Baſil, by Oporinus; but becauſe the copy of the three firſt centuries, which was lent me, has been bound more than once, I could not find in it the date of the impreſſion. I imagine that the laſt leaf was torn off before the laſt binding, and it was probably in that leaf, that Oporinus placed the date 1559 (41). However, this copy of the three firſt centuries is in Italic characters, and has no additions nor corrections. But we have ſeen that the edition which Sagittarius made uſe of, which is that of 1562, contains ſome additions and corrections. It is not therefore the firſt, nor that which I have at preſent in my hands. Note, that the copy of the fourth century, printed by Oporinus, in 1560, is in Roman characters.

[*I*] *Varillas . . . has added to this fault of Spondanus many others.*] Melanchthon, ſays he (42), was ſcarce dead, when the centuriators of Magdeburg began to publiſh their work on Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory with the fourth volume. This is his firſt fault. This volume, continues he, *is indeed the beſt of the thirteen, in the opinion of the Lutherans, or the moſt tolerable according to the Catholics.* I challenge him to prove that (43). *There were at firſt but four miniſters of Magdeburg concerned in it, Matthias Flacius, John Wigandus, Matthew Judex, and Baſil Faber; but afterwards the moſt learned Lutherans put their hand to it, though we only know the names of four others;* viz, *Nicolas Gal, Celeſtin Hutten, Gaſpar Nidpruc, counſellor of ſtate to the emperor, and Baptiſt Hoincel* (44). Conſult Mr Sagittarius, and he will inform you (45) that Andrew Corvin, Thomas Holthuter, Pancratius Veltbeck, Nicolas Amſdorf, Nicolas Gallus, Martin Copus, Ebeling Almannus, Ambroſe Hidfeld, David Cicelerus, Gaſpar Leunculus, William Radenſis, Nicolas Beumeller, Bernard Niger, Peter Schrader, and Conrad Agrius had a ſhare in this work. So that Varillas names three perſons, who do not appear in this liſt, and falſly ſuppoſes, that we only know the names of eight centuriators. I have ſeen indeed in Mr Sagittarius, the names of John Baptiſt Heinzelius and Gaſpar Nidpruc, counſellor to the emperor; but he does not ſay, that theſe two perſons had a hand in the centuries, but only that they countenanced Mark Wagner, who went from library to library, in queſt of materials (46). This Wagner did great ſervice to the centuriators: he viſited the libraries of Germany and Denmark, and that of Edinburg in Scotland, *&c.* He had a very particular talent for this ſort of enquiries, and they gave him a very glorious teſtimonial, in which they acknowledged his faithfulneſs, diligence and exactneſs (47). This teſtimonial was dated the thirtieth of September 1557, and imports, amongſt other things, that he had made ſeveral journies with Illyricus, to collect materials (48), and that having ſhewn his capacity, he was thought able to continue his travels alone, and that they had committed that truſt to him with letters of recommendation, wherein they deſired learned and pious perſons to communicate to him ſuch manuſcripts and monuments, as he could draw any advantage from. Illyricus, was one of thoſe who ſigned this teſtimonial. Varillas affirms, that *the authors of the other ſects, ſprung from that of Luther, criticiſed the centuries ſeveral ways, and publiſhed ſeveral extracts of the errors, which they pretended had crept into them.* No body, that I know of, has mentioned thoſe extracts. Varillas would have been very much puzzled, had he been obliged to give proofs of what he ſaid. Conrad Brunus, whoſe invective againſt the centuries was confuted by Illyricus in 1566, was a Roman Catholic. Eiſengreinius, who wrote againſt them, was ſo too. Let us ſee ſome other faults of Varillas. Illyricus, ſays he (49), *undertook the year following* 1561, *in Thuringia, in the town of Weimar, a public diſputation againſt the famous Victorinus Spingel.* He is miſtaken, both as to the time of this diſpute (50), and the name of Illyricus's antagoniſt (51). *The Catholics obſerved, that more Hereſies had ſprung from that of Luther in leſs than fifty years, than there had ever been from our Saviour's time to Luther* (52). This hyperbole, which he took from Spondanus, but not without leſſening it, is very childiſh. *Et videas hinc etiam quam fecundus fuerit Lutherus, qui plures protulerit peſtiferarum hæreſum auctores, quam ab orbis ortu fuerint ante in univerſo mundo* (53). You will find in Moreri, that the liſt of the principle Heretics from the firſt century to Luther amounts guilty of ſo many blunders. I muſt not forget to ſay, that the *Clavis ſacræ Scripturæ* is one of Illyricus's beſt books. See what Mr Simon ſays of it in his Critical Hiſtory of the Old

---

(36) *See* Sagittarius, ubi ſupra, pag. 256, & 266.

(37) Ibid. pag. 260, & ſeq.

(38) In the year 1562, if I am not miſtaken.

(39) Sagittar. ubi ſupra, pag. 259.

(40) Id. ibid. pag. 245.

(41) Mr Hill, miniſter of the Engliſh church of Rotterdam, who has a fine library, and a great knowledge of books, has aſſured me that the firſt centuries were printed in that year.

(42) Varillas, Hiſt. de l'Hereſ. livr. xxiv, pag. m. 229, ad ann. 1561.

(43) Id. ibid.

(44) Spondanus, ad Ann 1560, n. 32, pag. 602, *calls him* Joannem Baptiſtam Hencelum.

(45) Sagitt. ubi ſupra, pag. 247, 248, 249.

(46) Id ibid. pag. 252, 255. *Note, that Melchior Adam,* in Vit. Theol. pag. 474, *ſays, that Gaſpar Nidpruck and John Baptiſt Hencelius helped Flacius and his colleagues.*

(47) Ibid. pag. 253, 254.

(48) Cum D. Illyrico aliquot monaſteria perluſtraſſe, & cum ipſo nulla alia de cauſa peregrinatum fuiſſe, quam ut pium hunc conatum pro ſua tenuitate juvaret. *Ibid. pag.* 254.

(49) Varillas, Hiſt. de l'Hereſ. livr. xxiv, pag. 231, 232.

(50) *See the remark* [*C*].

(51) *His name* Strigelius, *and not* Spingel.

(52) Varillas, ubi ſupra, pag. 232, 233.

(53) Spondan. ubi ſupra.

mounts to 183. Whereas we can ſcarce find ten or twelve ſchiſms in the firſt fifty years of Lutheraniſm. Varillas goes on (54). ‘It was probably with a deſign to eſcape for ſome time the perſecution which Flacius expected from his friends, becauſe of his outrage at Weimar, that he diſguiſed himſelf, and went *incognito* into all the libraries of the German monaſteries: he took the moſt ſcarce books * he could ſteal, and made extracts of others. The author of his life ſays, that he did it in emulation of Trithemius, and to compoſe like him, a collection of thoſe who had written books. But the thing will not appear probable to one, that will be at the pains to compare thoſe two works together, ſince they are in nothing alike. That of Trithemius, is properly ſpeaking, a table of eccleſiaſtical authors, and of books compoſed by them; whereas that of Flacius is a collection of paſſages, which ſeem to be contrary to the Catholic religion, and to favour the rigid Lutherans.’ There are many faults in theſe words; for in the firſt place, Illyricus viſited the libraries before the year 1560. He did it to collect materials for his *Catalogus Teſtium Veritatis*. Melchior Adam, the only author cited by Spondanus and Varillas, declares it in expreſs words. Now that catalogue was printed in the year 1556 (55). Therefore, *&c.* In the ſecond place it is falſe, that Melchior Adam ſays, that Illyricus undertook ſuch a work in imitation *of Trithemius, and to compoſe like him, a collection of thoſe who had written books*. If Melchior Adam had ſaid ſo, he would have been very much miſtaken, and conſequently Spondanus (56) would have ſaid a thing which is really falſe. See in the remark [*E*] how the reading of Trithemius's book contributed to Illyricus's deſign. In the third place, Varillas ſpeaks of Trithemius's book, and of that of Illyricus, in ſuch a manner, as plainly ſhews that he knew neither of them; for Trithemius does not confine himſelf to *Eccleſiaſtical Authors*, nor the other to the paſſages that ſeem to countenance *rigid Lutheraniſm*. Varillas ſuppoſes that Illyricus's jealouſy of *William Eiſingrem, a Catholic divine, who had wrote a book, intituled, The Catalogue of thoſe, who have given teſtimony to the truth*, determined him to undertake *the ſame taſk for his* Sect (57). It is juſt the contrary, as we have ſeen above (58). Laſtly, Varillas charges him with publiſhing this book, *without putting his name to it, either becauſe he would no longer quarrel with the other ſects, who he knew would not like it, or becauſe he ſuppoſed it would be well enough known in the world, that he was the author of the book, though he did not name himſelf* (59). All chimeras! He put his name to that bock, and had no reaſon to fear, that the other Proteſtants would diſapprove his compilation.

There is another thing, which deſerves to be cenſured: it concerns the Epiſtle Dedicatory to queen Elizabeth. Varillas (60) affirms, ‘that it gave more vexation than honour to that princeſs, and that there are few examples of ſo extravagant a miſs-timing, in the hiſtory of men of letters, though they are otherwiſe accuſed of not being always the beſt bred. The centuriators, who ſigned the Epiſtle Dedicatory, could not be ignorant of a thing ſo notorious, that Elizabeth was a Calviniſt in her doctrine, though ſhe was a Lutheran, as to the diſcipline; and yet they inſerted in the ſame epiſtle, by which they courted this queen's protection, a ſatire againſt the Calviniſts. They accuſed them of rendering, as much as in them lay, the Teſtament of JESUS CHRIST uſeleſe, by reaſons borrowed from Philoſophy; of rejecting the real preſence, and communion of the body and blood of that holy Saviour, againſt his own words, though moſt perſpicuous; and of endeavouring to dazzle thoſe, who read the goſpel, by confounding with ſubtle and ſtudied interpretations, the natural ſenſe of abundance of paſſages, ſo evident of themſelves, as to need no explanation. They proved afterwards unanſwerably in this volume, and the twelve following, that the church had always believed that preſence; and whoever will be at the pains of reading them, will eaſily obſerve, that though thoſe who paid them for their labour, had deſired them to write with leſs nicety and more moderation upon that point, that they might not oppoſe the accommodation, which was then negotiating afreſh betwixt the Lutherans and Zuinglians; they had ſo little complaiſance for their Mæcenas's, that they treated no point with greater vehemence and heat than that.’ Theſe things were all forged in the brains of that hiſtorian. He has added this romance of his own invention, to an incident remark of Spondanus, and it is very certain, he ſaid this without any authority for it, and without having read the Epiſtle Dedicatory, which he cenſured. There was no incivility, or imprudence, in the conduct of the centuriators. They did not as yet know, how the queen of England would determine herſelf; they only knew that ſhe laboured to eſtabliſh a good form of religion. They praiſed her, and congratulated her for it, and powerfully exhorted her to apply herſelf to it, by a total ſuppreſſion of the evils, which the followers of Antichriſt had brought in. ‘Ad te igitur nunc Regina potentiſſima & ſereniſſima, convertimur. Audimus enim, te poſt accepta Regia ſceptra, etiam de præcipuo fine ac munere tui officii, ſocietatis ac vitæ totius omnium ſubditorum tuorum cogitare. Itaque non tantum lætis acclamationibus Regiæ tuæ dignitati gratulamur: ſed toto etiam pectore patrem Domini noſtri JESU CHRISTI invocamus, ac rogamus, ut . . . . Sed quia non ſatis eſt bene cœpiſſe, hortamur etiam te, illuſtriſſima & potentiſſima Regina, ut totis viribus in id opus incumbas, ut Religio pura, integra, inviolata in toto regno tuo inſtauretur, omnibus Antichriſti crudelitatibus, vulneribus, peſtibus, ac carcinomatis rectè curatis, atque ſublatis. Debes enim hunc honorem Deo conditori ac redemptori tuo, debes tibi ipſi, debes ſubditis tuis (16). —— *To you therefore, moſt potent and moſt ſerene queen, we now turn ourſelves, for we hear that no ſooner you received the royal ſcepter, than you applied yourſelf to the great end of your high office, the taking care of all your ſubjects. We therefore think it not enough with joyful acclamations to congratulate your acceſſion to the royal dignity, but we alſo invoke, with all our hearts, the father of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, and beſeech, that . . . . But becauſe it is not enough to have begun well, we exhort you, moſt illuſtrious and moſt powerful queen, that you endeavour, with your utmoſt force, to eſtabliſh in your dominions the pure, ſound, and undefiled religion; all the cruelties, wounds, plagues, and cankers of Antichriſt, being thoroughly cured, and taken away. For this honour, you owe to God your creator and redeemer, to yourſelf, and likewiſe to your ſubjects.*’ It was not improper that the divines of the confeſſion of Augsburg ſhould add to this a word of advice about the doctrine of the real preſence; which they did in this manner (62): ‘Illud verò etiam non prætereundum eſt, cum jam variæ paſſim graſſentur quaſi factiones opinionum, inter quas aliqui etiam teſtamentum Domini planè philoſophicis rationibus ita evacuant, ut corpus & ſanguinem Chriſti, quod ad præſentiam & communicationem, juxta clariſſima, evidentiſſima, veraciſſima & potentiſſima verba ipſius CHRISTI, prorſus removeant, miraque verborum perplexitate fucum faciant: in primis videndum tibi eſt, ut & articuli fidei ſine phariſaico fermento, & Sacramenta à Chriſto inſtituta citra omnem adulterationem inſtaurentur: id quod te facturam eſſe, omnes pii ſperant, ſummiſque votis à te contendunt. —— *But moreover we ought not to paſs by, that at this time there rages various factions in opinion, among which ſome there are which quite make void the Teſtament of our Lord, by philoſophical reaſons, whereby they remove the body and blood of CHRIST, as to that preſence and communication, which is clearly, truly, and moſt evidently taught in the moſt expreſs words of CHRIST himſelf, impoſing on us by a wonderful perplexity of words, that you may reſtore this article of faith free from phariſaical leaven, and as it was inſtituted by CHRIST without any adulteration is what you ought to perform: what the faithful hope from you, and what with the moſt ardent wiſhes, they expect and deſire.*’ When Varillas ſuppoſes that they *could not be ignorant of ſo notorious a thing, as queen Elizabeth's being a Calviniſt in her opinions*, he betrays his own ignorance; he does not conſider, that they wrote their Epiſtle Dedicatory, at a time, in which it was not yet known upon

---

(54) Varil. ubi ſupra, pag. 233.

* *In Flacius's Life.*

(55) *See* Joh. Albertus Faber, in Decade Decadum, n. 96.

(56) Nec vero tam illud æmulatione Trithemii . . . ſuum concinnaſſe putamus, quam, *&c* *Spondan. ad ann.* 1560, *pag.* 602.

(57) Varillas, ubi ſupra, pag. 233.

(58) *In the remark* [*E*].

(59) Varillas, ubi ſupra, pag. 234.

(60) Ibid. pag. 230.

(61) Epiſt. Dedicat. Centur. IV, Magdeb. pag. 8.

(62) Ibid. pag. 9.

Old Teſtament (*k*). See likewiſe John Albert Faber, in the XCVIth article of his *Decas Decadum.*

[k] *In the thirteenth chapter of the third book, pag* 428, & ſeq. *of the Rotterdam edition*, 1685.

on what foot the Engliſh Reformation would be eſtabliſhed. I know indeed, that their volume bears the date of the year 1560, and that queen Elizabeth's Reformation was eſtabliſhed in 1559. But every body knows, that the bookſellers put the date of the year following to the books that come out towards the end of Auguſt. I believe therefore, that this Epiſtle Dedicatory, which has no date, was ſent in 1559 to Oporinus, the Bookſeller of Baſil, before it was known in Germany, what eccleſiaſtical regulations queen Elizabeth had made: however, it could not appear at that time, that this princeſs had declared for Calviniſm with reſpect to the real preſence. Read theſe words of Dr Burnet: ‘ Some Proteſtant divines were ‘ named, to reviſe the Luturgy of Edward. The only ‘ conſiderable change they made in it, was in the ‘ article of the Euchariſt. The deſign was to prepare ‘ an office for the communion, whoſe expreſſions ‘ ſhould be ſo well contrived, that, by avoiding the ‘ condemnation of the corporeal preſence, all the En- ‘ gliſh might be united in one and the ſame church; ‘ moſt people were imbued with that doctrine. So ‘ the queen charged the divines to ſay nothing that ‘ might abſolutely condemn it, but to leave it unde- ‘ cided, as a ſpeculative opinion, which every one was ‘ at liberty to embrace or reject, To this end, they ‘ left out of Edward's Liturgy, the rubric, which ex- ‘ plained for what reaſons the church of England or- ‘ dained, &c (63).’

(63) Burnet's Hiſtory of the Reformation of England, *ad ann.* 1559.

INCHOFER (Melchior) a German Jeſuit, born at Vienna in the year 1584, was admitted into the ſociety at Rome in 1607. He had already ſignalized himſelf in the ſtudy of the Civil-Law. He taught Philoſophy, Mathematics and Divinity, a long time at Meſſina; and there publiſhed a book in 1630, which brought him into trouble [*A*]. He was obliged to go to Rome to anſwer the complaints that were made againſt him in the congregation of the Index. His judges were well ſatisfied with the reaſons he alledged in his juſtification, and only enjoyned him to change the title of the book, and to explain ſome things more at large. This he did in a ſecond edition. He lived many years at Rome, and at laſt died at Milan the twenty eighth of September 1648 (*a*). Beſides the works we have of his [*B*], which ſhew he had a great deal of learning, he intended to publiſh ſeveral others (*b*), which would have ſhewn the great extent of his knowledge, if death had not prevented it. He is thought to be the author of a ſatire againſt the Jeſuits, intituled *Monarchia Solipſorum* [*C*]. He was not pleaſed with them (*c*).

(*a*) *Taken from Nathaniel Southwell*, Biblioth. Scriptor. Societ. pag. 608.

(*b*) See the titles of them in Nathan. Southwell, *ibid.*

(*c*) *It appears ſo from theſe words of his preface:* Illud conſtat niſi inter ſolipſos rubiginaſſ t, & copia & ſplendore inter ſummates literarum viros fuiſſe radiaturum.

[*A*] *He publiſhed a book .... which brought him into trouble.*] The title of it is, *Epiſtolæ B. Mariæ virginis ad Meſſanenſes veritas vindicata*, (*A letter from the bleſſed virgin Mary, to the inhabitants of Meſſina*) in Folio. The congregation of the Index having heard Father Inchofer's reaſons, gave him leave to reprint that work, with this title, *Conjectatio ad Epiſtolam Beatiſſimæ Mariæ Virginis ad Meſſanenſes.* This ſecond edition was made at Viterbo, in the year 1633. He obtained leave to ſtrike out, and to add what he ſhould think fit. *S. Congregatio non ſolum permiſit eidem dictum opus de novo edere, mutato tamen juſtis de cauſis titulo in hunc modum*, Conjectatio, &c. *& quibuſdam magis explicatis ..... ſed etiam demendi & addendi ſi quæ viderentur, liberam & amplam facultatem permiſit* (1). The meaning of it is, that provided it be not affirmed in too poſitive a manner, that the holy Virgin wrote to the inhabitants of Meſſina the letter that goes under her name, one may be allowed to believe it, and to perſuade others of the truth of it. A German writer (2) obſerves, that Baronius and Theoplius Raynaud are not of Inchofer's opinion concerning this letter. I will not diſpute it as to Baronius; for tho' that annaliſt does not ſpeak particularly of the pretended letter received by the inhabitants of Meſſina, he declares in general, that all the letters the holy Virgin is ſaid to have written to ſome towns, ought to be reckoned apocryphal. *Traduntur & aliæ ab ipſa ad alias ſcriptæ civitates, quas cunctas cum careant Eccleſiæ auctoritate, nonniſi in Apocryphorum claſſem rejiciendas eſſe omnes facile judicabunt* (3). But as for Theophilus Raynaud, he ought not to be cited upon this ſubject; for he only ſpeaks of the letter, which it is ſaid the holy Virgin wrote to St Ignatius, and of his pretended anſwers (4). The German author is not more happy in quoting Rivetus (5), who without making any mention of the letter of Meſſina, is contented to reject the ſtory of the epiſtolary correſpondence between the holy Virgin and Ignatius.

(1) Nath. Sotuel. Bibliot. Script. Societat. pag. 608.

(2) Placcius de Pſeudonymis Jo. Rhodii, n. 59, pag. 44.

(3) Baronius, ad ad ann. 48, n. 25.

(4) Theophil. Raynaudus de Malis & Bonis libris, n. 235, pag. m. 148.

(5) In Critico Sacro, lib. ii, capp. primis.

[*B*] *The works we have of his.*] I no not repeat what concerns his book relating to the pretended letter of the holy Virgin to the inhabitants of Meſſina. His other writings are, *Tractatus Syllepticus in quo quid de terræ ſoliſque motu vel ſtatione ſecundum ſacram ſcripturam & SS. Patres ſentiendum, quave certitudine alterutra ſententia tenenda ſit, oſtenditur*, Rome 1633, *in* 4*to*. *De ſacra Latinitate, hoc eſt de variis linguæ Latinæ myſteriis, ex origine, progreſſu, fine, cæteraque inſtituti ſui ratione ad Evangelii prædicationem, Latinæ Eccleſiæ exaltationem, Romanique Imperii magiſtatem ſpectantibus*, Meſſino, 1635, *in* 4*to*, and Munich, 1638, *in* 8*vo*. *Hiſtoria trium Magorum*, Rome, 1639. *Annalium Eccleſiaſticorum Regni Hungariæ, Tomus I.* Rome, 1644, *in Folio*. The funeral Oration of Nicolas Ricardi, a Dominican, maſter of the ſacred palace. He publiſhed ſome other books, to which he did not put his name (6).

(6) Alia quædam ipſius prodierunt ſub alienis nominibus R. P. E. L. &c. & ſub nomine Academici Vertumnii, adjectum prælectionibus Joannis Baptiſtæ Corteſii poëma in laudem Medicinæ, & contra malos Medicos. *Sotuel, ubi ſupra.*

[*C*] *Intituled* Monarchia Solipſorum.] The author of this ſatire (§ α) calls himſelf *Lucius Cornelius Europæus.* It was printed in in Holland, 1648, *juxta exemplar Venetum*, as the title imports; there is added to it a key to the ſeigned names. The edition of Venice 1651, aſcribes this work to Melchior Inchofer (7). Chriſtopher Pellerus, mentioning this conjecture, ſays likewiſe, that this German Jeſuit went to Rome after his writing this book, and returned no more. *Monarchia Solipſorum quam perhibent ſcripſiſſe quempiam patrem ex Societate N, Inckhoferum Germanum, poſtea Romam profectum nunquam reverſum* (8). He is miſtaken as to that journey to Rome, for Inchofer had quitted Germany long before he wrote that ſatire. He did not write it till after he had bore many diſcontents in the order, the habit whereof he took at Rome, at twenty three years of age. This paſſage of Pellerus has occaſioned Konig (9) to make two authors of one. He ſpeaks of Melchior Inchofer, and Nicolas Inchofer. He ſays of the firſt, part of what Alegambe ſays of him, and aſcribes the *Monarchia Solipſorum* to the other. He cites Chriſtopher Pellerus, but he makes him ſay more than he ſays, *viz.* that this piece was compoſed in 1648. Pellerus does not ſay ſo. If Konig had obſerved, that for want of knowledge of a man's Chriſtian name, an *N.* is put inſtead of it, he would not have forged a pretended *Nicholas Inckhofferus* upon Chriſtopher Pellerus's authority. He obſerves, that others aſcribe this work to Scioppius. It is certain, that Ottor Tabor, a German civilian, believed Scioppius might be the author of it; but he has not affirmed it. ‘ Lucius Cornelius ‘ Europæus, *ſays he* (10), ſive is ſit *Gaſper Scioppius*, ‘ ſive quis alius ex genere Scriptorum ſatyricorum, ‘ in Monarchia quam dicit Solipſorum Leoni Alla- ‘ tio dedicata, &c. ——— *Lucius Cornelius Europæ-* ‘ *us, whether he be Gaſper Scioppius, or whoever* ‘ *elſe of the claſs of ſatiric writers, in his Monarchy* ‘ (*as he calls it*) *of the Solipſians, dedicated to Leo* ‘ *Allatius, &c.*’ Deckherus (11) neither rejecting Pellerus's

[(§ α) It was tranſlated into French, and printed at Amſterdam, in 1722, in 12mo. The tranſlator has added ſome remarks, and ſome other pieces. The preface contains ſeveral particulars concerning that work, and it's author. Rem. Crit.]

(7) Vide Placcium in Rhodianis, n. 59, pag. 43.

(8) Chriſtoph. Pellerus in Politico ſcelerato impugnato, pag. 9, Edit. 1665.

(9) Bibl. Vet. & Nova, pag. 417.

(10) Otto Tabor, in præfat ad Diſputationes de Confrontatione apud Placcium in Rhodianis, pag. 43.

(11) De Scriptis Adeſpotis, pag 95, Edit. 1686.

Pellerus's (12) nor Tabor's conjecture, propoſes another without any foundation. He believes, that *Gabriel Bariacus Lermæus*, a gentleman of Languedoc, might be the author of the *Monarchia Solipſorum*. I ſhall ſet down two paſſages of Mr Arnauld, one of which will ſolve our doubts, and the other teach us Inchofer's deſign, and the meaning of the word *Solipſi*. 'The *Monarchia Solipſorum*, ſays Mr Arnold (13), ſhould be Scioppius's work, becauſe it 'was printed in Germany, with ſome books that 'are undoubtedly that author's. And yet IT IS CERTAIN that this *Monarchia Solipſorum* is the work of 'a German Jeſuit, called Melchior Inchofer. And 'we know where there is an original letter of a 'Spaniſh Jeſuit, who acknowledges it, and makes 'great complaints of it.' The other paſſage is this (14). 'It is well known, (ſays Mr Arnauld, ſpeaking to the Jeſuits) that it is your character to be 'zealous to do good, provided you can do it alone, 'and that no body may ſhare the glory of it with 'you; and if you would be ſincere, you would confeſs, that one of your ſociety, who wrote the *Monarchia Solipſorum*, knew you very well.' See the Theſes of Gisbert Voetius (15).

There was handed about a pretended letter of Innocent XII to the emperor, in the year 1696, in which the Pope calls the ſociety of the Jeſuits *Monarchiam Monopanthorum*. Upon which Father Papebroch made this reflexion: *Forſitan quaſi* μόνοι πάντα *ſoli omnia velint eſſe & æſtimari Jeſuitæ, ſcilicet alludendo ad vetus ſcomma ſatyrici cujuſdam commenti quo ſcripſit anonymus aliquis* Monarchiam Solipſorum, *veluti innuere volens quod Societas ſoli ſibi arrogare nitatur omnia* (16).

(12) *There is Pecler in Deckherus's edition of* 1686.

(13) Morale Pratique, Tom. III, pag. 686.

(14) Ib. pag. 86.

(15) Vol. III, pag. 685, 686.

(16) Papebroch. Elucid. Hiſtor. Actor. in controverſia Carmelitica, cap. x, pag. 138.

INNOCENT VIII, created Pope in the year 1484, was of Genoa, and his name was John Baptiſt Cibo. Authors are not agreed about the illuſtriouſneſs or the obſcurity of his family [*A*]; but it is acknowledged that he was ſent to the court of Naples in his youth, and that he ſerved king Alphonſo. He was afterwards one of cardinal Bologna's domeſtics at Rome, which I think was of ſome uſe to him, in order to be promoted to the biſhopric of Savona (*a*). Pope Sixtus IV, who was much his friend, beſtowed on him the biſhopric of Melfi, and afterwards a cardinal's cap. One of the firſt actions of Innocent VIII, after his advancement to the pontificate, was to conſpire with the grandees of the kingdom, againſt Ferdinand king of Naples; he ſent for Robert Sanſeverino to give him the command of the troops in the expedition againſt that king; but being not ſatisfied with the conduct of this general, he turned him out of that poſt, and made peace with Ferdinand. The conditions of the treaty were, that the king of Naples ſhould pardon the rebels, and pay to the holy ſee the tribute that he owed: he performed neither the one nor the other, and fruſtrated the Pope's deſigns, who endeavoured to revenge that infraction [*B*]. Afterwards Innocent VIII thought no more of war, and applied himſelf to make Rome enjoy the fruits of peace [*C*]. He procured there a great plenty and cheapneſs of proviſions, and cauſed robbers to be ſeverely puniſhed. He created new offices, the ſale whereof brought him a great deal of money, and he was the firſt

(*a*) *You will find in Moreri, that he was promoted to it by Paul II.*

[*A*] *Authors are not agreed about the illuſtriouſneſs or the obſcurity of his family.*] We ſhall ſee below (1), that, according to Volaterranus, he had been a poor boy. Onuphrius Panvinius affirms the ſame thing in one of his books (2), and makes him of a middling family, and the ſon of a Phyſician; but he ſpeaks otherwiſe in another work (3), wherein he ſets forth the antiquity and nobleneſs of the houſe of Cibo, and makes him the ſon of Aaron Cibo, a noble Genoeſe, illuſtrious for his military actions, governor of Naples, under king Renatus and king Alphonſo, and famous for having glorioully diſcharged the office of a Roman ſenator (4). It is conjectured (5), that Panvinius corrected his firſt account upon reading the funeral Oration of Innocent VIII, made by Leonelli, biſhop of Concordia, who forgot not to ſpeak of the nobility and employments of Aaron Cibo. It is ſomewhat ſtrange, that ſo learned an hiſtorian as Panvinius was, and a Monk beſides, who flouriſhed a little after this Pope, ſhould have been ignorant of the merit, and the great employments of Innocent VIII's father, and ſhould rather have known him under the falſe title of a Phyſician, than under the glorious character of a noble Genoeſe, governor of Naples, and ſenator of Rome. Many people will believe, that in his retractation, he leſs followed the truth than the notions of the preacher, who made this Pope's funeral oration, a ſort of diſcourſe which allows of an open flattery. Every one may think of it as he pleaſes; but we muſt remember, that it is a common thing to debaſe the firſt condition of ſuch as riſe to the higheſt poſts (6).

[*B*] *Ferdinand .... fruſtrated the Pope's deſigns, who endeavoured to revenge that infraction.*] The author who ſupplies me with this article, does not ſay that Innocent VIII excommunicated king Ferdinand; he only obſerves that the Pope's deputies returned without doing any thing: 'Quorum neutrum Ferdinandus 'quum poſtea minime præſtaret, miſſus Petrus Vincentinus cameræ auditor audaciſſimus, una ſimul cum 'Jacobo Volaterrano ſecretario apoſtolico ac cubiculario viro prudente ad res repetendas re infecta revertit (7). ——— *When afterwards Ferdinand performed neither the one nor the other, Peter Vincentin, Camerlengo, a perſon of great boldneſs, with 'James Volaterran, apoſtolic ſecretary, and a very prudent man, was ſent to demand reſtitution, but they 'returned without having been able to effect any thing.*' To ſupply this omiſſion, I ſhall ſet down the words of Coeffeteau. 'Ferdinand not obſerving the treaty 'he had made with him, the Pope demanded the tribute he owed to the church; upon which Ferdinand having but ill ſatisfied his embaſſadors, Innocent thundred againſt him, deprived him of the kingdom, and declared Charles, King of France, the 'lawful heir of it, who had the right of Renatus, 'king of Sicily, and of his brother the count Du 'Maine (8).'

[*C*] *He thought no more of war, and applied himſelf to make Rome enjoy the fruits of peace.*] We ſhall ſee how difficult it is to exerciſe the papacy; for if the Popes are blamed for meddling with the politic affairs of Europe, they are alſo blamed when they do not concern themſelves with them, and it is then ſaid that they are uſeleſs to the public good. Guicciardin gives us this idea of Innocent VIII. It is true, he adds ſomething that ſoftens his cenſure; for he obſerves, that the indolence this Pope fell into, produced this advantage, that no body feared his giving any diſturbance to Italy. This matter of fact is to be found in the following words, with a parentheſis of a Proteſtant divine. 'Guicciardin deſcribes Innocent 'VIII in theſe words, that his life in other reſpects 'uſeleſs to the public good (*an excellent quality for a 'Pope*) was at leaſt uſeful in this, that having ſuddenly 'laid down his arms which he had unfortunately taken 'up in the beginning of his pontificate againſt Ferdinand, at the inſtigation of ſeveral barons of the kingdom of Naples, and afterwards turned his mind to 'IDLE PLEASURES; he had neither for himſelf, nor 'for any that belonged to him, any thoughts that tended to diſturb the repoſe of Italy (9).' Thoſe who ſhall conſider the parentheſis, will perceive, that the reaſon why I quote Rivet's reply, rather than the original words of Guicdiardin, is becauſe the paſſage of Rivetus ſerves me for a proof. Would to God there were no other faults committed but ſuch as contribute to the public peace!

[*D*] *He*

(1) *In the remark* [*E*].

(2) In Commentario de Pontificibus & Cardinalibus.

(3) In Vita Innocentii VIII.

(4) *See* Spondanus, Ann. Eccleſ. ad ann. 1484, n. 5, pag. m. 180.

(5) Id. ibid.

(6) *See the remark* [*A*] *of the article* TOUCHET.

(7) Volaterranus, lib xxii, pag. 821.

(8) Coëffeteau. Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 1209.

(9) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Reſponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, Par. II, pag. 626, 627. *What he quotes out of Guicciardin, is towards the beginning of the firſt book.*

firſt Pope who gloried in having baſtards, and loaded them with wealth [*D*]. He was a handſome man, obliging even to exceſs; but covetous, ignorant, and of little wit [*E*].

He

[*D*] *He was the firſt Pope who gloried in having baſtards, and loaded them with wealth.*] Volaterranus ſpeaks of it in this manner. ‘Pontificum etiam primus, qui novum & ipſe exemplum introduceret palam liberos nothos jactandi, ac ſoluta omni antiqua diſciplina divitiis eos omnibus cumulandi (10). — *He was the firſt of the Popes who introduced that new and extraordinary proceeding of owning publickly his ſpurious iſſue, and without any reſpect to the antient diſcipline, heaping upon them riches without meaſure.*’ He mentions but one ſon, and one daughter of this Pope, and he ſays, that the one obtained of his father ſome towns in the neighbourhood of Rome, and the advantage of being ſon-in-law to Lawrence de Medicis, and that the daughter (11) was married with a prodigious fortune to a Genoeſe (12). Moreri has ſtumbled here; he ſays, that *Innocent VIII left two rich ſons, which he had before his pontificate.* This is an error both as to the ſex, and the number of theſe baſtards. They were ſixteen, eight ſons, and eight daughters; whence this epigram:

Quid quæris teſtes, ſit mas an fœmina Cibo,
  Reſpice natorum, pignora certa, gregem:
Octo nocens pueros genuit, totidemque puellas.
  Hunc merito poterit dicere Roma patrem.

Of Cibo's ſex, if you full proofs require,
  Look on the pledges he has left below,
Eight lads, eight laſſes, own him for their ſire,
  The ſtile of father well might Rome beſtow.

According to du Pleſſis (13), theſe four verſes are an epitaph upon Innocent VIII, compoſed by Marullus, but I do not find them in my edition (14) of this poet's works, and I cannot believe they were left out to pleaſe the court of Rome; for the following epitaph was left in it.

Epitap. Innocentii Octavi.
Spurcities, gula, avaritia, atque ignavia deſes
  Hoc Octave jacent quo tegeris tumulo (15).

Luſt, glutt'ny, av'rice, ſloth, beneath this ſtone,
Are with the corps of our Octavus thrown.

I find alſo the following diſtich in it:

De Xyſto & hærede.
Exhauſit Xyſtus bellis & cædibus urbem;
Tercentena hæres reſtituit ſobole (16).

By wars, by tumults, Xyſtus thinn'd the place,
His heir reſtor'd it by his numerous race.

Mr du Pleſſis ſays, that the firſt of theſe two diſtichs, is the concluſion of the epitaph, or of the four verſes firſt mentioned. I know not whether he made uſe of an edition of Marullus, different from mine, or whether he followed an unexact tranſcriber; but I make no doubt that the author of the *Prejugez contre le Papiſme*, advanced without any examination (17), that the elogy of Innocent VIII, *was included after his death in ſix Latin verſes*, which he ſets down. It is an epigram, the laſt diſtich whereof is the epitaph which is actually in Marullus's poems: the two firſt diſtichs are thoſe that are not found in my edition, either before the epitaph, or in any other place. Mr Zuinger (18), profeſſor at Baſil, ſuppoſes that theſe ſix verſes are two epigrams of Marullus: he has been however more judicious than the author of the *Prejugez*, having not joined what ought to be divided. As for Sannazar's epigram,

Innocuo priſcos æquum eſt debere Quirites,
  Progenie exhauſtam reſtituit patriam,

In debt to Innocent, Rome may be ſtil'd,
Whoſe loins her long exhauſted country fill'd.

He is in the right to mention it, ſince it is to be found among the verſes of this poet (19). Coëffeteau found himſelf very much perplexed in that part of his anſwer to du Pleſſis, as you will ſee. ‘Du Pleſſis, *ſays he*, not being able to find fault with Innocent about his lawful marriage, (for he was married before he was Pope) produces a nameleſs author, who ſays, *that he was the firſt that gloried in having baſtards.* And to confirm this, he produces an epitaph of Marullus, in which the poet ſpeeks only of the children which Innocent had in a lawful marriage. Now all thoſe authors are not to be credited, and the licentiouſneſs of their pen well deſerved a ſevere puniſhment, for taking the liberty to defame the head of the church. It is certain, that good hiſtorians do not accuſe Innocent VIII of any of theſe impurities, which the filthy poet Marullus taxes him with. However, we will let him enjoy the privileges of thoſe of his profeſſion (20).’ Rivet's reply will plainly ſhew the abſurdity of Coëffeteau's anſwer. *The pleaſures of this Pope were not always idle, for he had a great many children. If it was in a lawful marriage, before he was an eccleſiaſtic, no body could blame him for it; and if Coëffeteau had produced good authorities for it, he had done a ſervice to his memory; but I find no body that ſays he was married. As for the author who affirms* that he was the firſt Pope who introduced the new example of boaſting publickly of his baſtards; *it is not an obſcure author, as the adverſary would have it, but the ſame Volaterranus, whom a little before he calls* a great man, and an orthodox writer . . . . . . *Coëffeteau could not but know this author; but he had a mind to diſſemble it, to fall upon the poor poet Marullus, as if he had divulged this news, calling him* a filthy poet. *Let him conſult his Poſſevin, and he will teach him, that this * Marullus is in eſteem with the church of Rome for his piety, and his works have been often printed at Antwerp, Cologne, and elſewhere* (21). I find both a fault and an omiſſion in theſe words of Rivetus. The later conſiſts in not having cenſured Coëffeteau's boldneſs concerning Marullus's verſes (22). He affirms, that this poet *ſpeaks only of the children which Innocent had in a lawful marriage.* What then is the meaning of the word *Nocens* in the third verſe? does it not ſignify, a criminal fatherſhip? the other fault conſiſts in his taking Marullus of Spalato, whom Poſſevin praiſes, for Marullus, whoſe verſes are ſo well known: they are two different perſons.

[*E*] *He was a handſome man, obliging even to exceſs, but covetous, ignorant, and of little wit.*] I will quote a Catholic writer, becauſe a Proteſtant would be ſuſpected. ‘Fuit Innocentius corpore excelſo, ac candido, decoroque: ingenio tardo, ac literis procul (23). —— *Innocent was tall, well made, and of a fine perſon, but ſlow of underſtanding, and had no learning.*’ A little before he had ſaid (24), ‘Pauper olim puer, forma tamen præſtanti inter Alfonſi regis Siciliæ miniſtros (25) inde Romam veniens in contubernio Philippi Cardinalis Bononienſis fuit . . . . . Quum Xyſto plurimum dilectus eſſet ob dulces mores & humanitatem qua omnes uſque ad vitium ſuperavit. Nam & infimæ conditionis homines ſæpe exoſculabatur, amplectebaturque. Verum quum omnibus blandus eſſet, nemini tamen benignus, innatamque avaritiam jocis atque dicteriis tranſigebat. —— *Formerly bring a poor boy the beauty of his perſon introduced him to the courtiers of Alphonſo, king of Sicily, afterwards coming to Rome he lived in the houſe of Philip, cardinal of Bologna . . . Xyſtus loved him exceedingly for the ſweetneſs of his diſpoſition, and his exceſſive humanity in which he excelled every one, even to a fault, for he would kiſs and embrace the vileſt and meaneſt of the people. But as he was civil to all, he did good to none, diſguiſing his innate avarice, by familiar expreſſions, and a pleaſant behaviour.*’ Du Pleſſis Mornai thought that Volaterranus expreſſed here *in modeſt words, the filthineſs of Innocent the eighth's* private life (26); whereupon Coëffeteau fell into a paſſion: *It is a ſtrange thing*, ſays he (27), *that he ſhould make a vice of his natural beauty, and from thence render him ſuſpected of the ſin, for the puniſhment of which fire fell from heaven; which againſt all charity, and even a-*

gainſt

---

(10) Volaterr. ubi ſupra.

(11) *Her name was* Theoderina.

(12) Gerardo Uſumari Genuenſi nuptam opibus per quam magnis ornavit. *Volater. ubi ſupra.*

(13) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 559.

(14) *It is that of Spires*, 1595.

(15) Marull. Epigram. lib. iv, pag. m. 84.

(16) Idem, lib. iii, pag. 60.

(17) Jurieu, Prejugez ligitimes, Part. I, pag. 247.

(18) Jo. Zuinger, de Feſto Corporis Chriſti, pag. 135.

(19) *It is the thirty eighth of the firſt book, page* 124, *of the Amſterdam edition*, 1689.

(20) Coëffeteau, ubi ſupra, pag. 1209.

* Marcus Marullus Spalatinus.

(21) Rivet, ubi ſupra, pag. 627.

(22) *That is, the Verſes which he acknowledged to have been written by Marullus.*

(23) Volaterr. ubi ſupra, pag. 821.

(24) Id. ibid. pag. 820.

(25) Rocolles, *pag.* 123, *of the Life of Sultan Gemes, ſays*, that he was a domeſtic to an officer of the court of Alphonſus; *and in the following page*, that he was a ſervant in his youth. *See the remark* [*A*].

(26) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d' Iniquité, pag. 558.

(27) Coëffet. ubi ſupra, pag. 1208.

He died in July 1492, at ſixty years of age. He received from the Sultan a conſiderable preſent; I mean, the iron of the lance that pierced the body of our Saviour [*F*]. It is ſaid, that the inſcription of the croſs was found at Rome in the time of his pontificate (*b*). See in father Gretſer how they endeavour to anſwer the objections that were made to prove it ſuppoſititious (*c*.)

(*b*) *Taken from* Volaterranus, lib. xxii, pag. m. 820, & ſeq.

(*c*) Gretſer. Exam. Myſterii Pleſſæani, pag. 549, & ult.

gainſt good manners, he would confirm; becauſe this prelate was ſo affable, as to embrace even thoſe of a mean condition. Muſt not one have a ſoul ſtrangely corrupted with Hereſy to make ſuch an odious judgment of a Pope, recommended for his ſingular innocence?

[*F*] *He received from the Sultan . . . . the iron of the lance that pierced the body of our Saviour.*] Bajazet II, being in fear of his brother, even after he had forced him to retreat to Rhodes, omitted nothing to engage the grand maſter Peter d'Aubuſſon to deliver him up to him, or at leaſt to prevent his keeping intelligence with the Turks. The grand maſter engaged upon very advantageous conditions, to have him well obſerved. This agreement was ſigned the eighth of December 1482 (28). He permitted him to go into France ſome time after, and at laſt conſented, that Innocent VIII ſhould have him in his power, and enjoy the great ſums which Bajazet diſburſed (29). He obtained a cardinal's cap for his reward, and was ſo cautious as to make uſe of the king of France's authority; for the court of France put the Turkiſh prince into the hands of the Pope's embaſſadors, in the year 1488 (30). Bajazet had made great offers to the king of France, 'only to oblige 'him to keep him in his kingdom, under a ſtrict 'guard, that he might have no opportnnity of eſcaping, to return into his country, and begin a new war. 'Theſe offers were *to give up all the relicks of* GOD '*our creator, and of the apoſtles and ſaints, men and* '*women, which his late father Mahomet had found* '*at Conſtantinople, when he took that city, and in the* '*other towns he had conquered in Chriſtendom: he* '*repeated the ſame offers which he had made before* '*to the grand maſter of Rhodes, to uſe his endeavours* '*to conquer the Holy Land, and put it into the hands* '*of the king; he alſo offered a vaſt penſion for his* '*maintenance* (31). Bajazet's letter came too late; the court of France had already promiſed to put his brother in the cuſtody of Innocent VIII. When he knew this, he wrote to the Pope, *and endeavoured to gain him by preſents, and amongſt others, by the iron of the lance, that pierced our Saviour's ſide, which he had before offered to the grand maſter, and aſſured him of the punctual payment of* 40000 *ducats every year on condition he would not let him go upon any pretence whatſoever* (32). Volaterranus ſpeaks of this: it is worth while to ſet down the paſſage, in which we ſhall ſee other particulars; as that Innocent VIII. was buried near the ſhrine, which contained the iron of the lance, that was found in Antioch at the time of the cruſades '(33). Sepultus in Baſilica Petri æreo monumento juxta 'arcam ab eo deſignatam in qua ferrum haſtæ conditur 'quod latus dominicum perfodit. Hoc ſiquidem olim 'apud ædem ſancti Andreæ Antiochiæ repertum, capta jam civitate, Bohemundus in prælio corripiens, arcem quæ expugnari non poterat illico cepit, ſimul '& hoſtium L. millia prodigioſe trucidavit. Inde 'Conſtantinopolim dono imperatori advectum. Poſtremo Turca illi ſuccedens, Innocentio ut eum 'fratris captivi cauſa leniret pro munere miſerat (34). '—— *He is interred in the Baſilic of St Peter, under* '*a monument of braſs, not far from the cheſt, which* '*he himſelf had placed there, wherein is laid up the* '*iron of that ſpear, which pierced our Lord's ſide. This* '*is reported antiently to have been found in the church* '*of St Andrew, at Antioch, when that city was taken* '*by Boïmond, who after he had reduced the caſtle* '*in a wonderful manner, deſtroyed fifty thouſand of the* '*enemy; thence it was carried to Conſtantinople,* '*and preſented to the emperor, laſtly falling there into the hand of the Ottoman prince, he ſent it as* '*a preſent to Innocent, that he might ſoften him in* '*reſpect to his brother who was then a captive,* '*and in his power.*' See the article VIGERIUS (35).

(28) *See* Rocolles, Vie du Sultan Gemes, pag. 91.

(29) Bajazet remitted every year 4000 ducats to the grand maſter, and alſo 35000 for his brother's maintainance. *Id. ibid. pag.* 92.

(30) Id. ibid. pag. 126.

(31) Id. ibid. pag. 127, 128.

(32) Ib. pag. 142.

(33) *See* Maimbourg's Hiſtory of the Cruſades, book ii. pag. 175, & ſeq. *Dutch Edit. ad ann.* 1098.

(34) Volaterr. ubi ſupra, pag. 821, 822.

(35) *Rem.* [*A*].

INNOCENT XI, created Pope the twenty-firſt of September 1676, was of Como in Lombardy, and called Benedict Odeſcalchi, as may be ſeen in Moreri, with many other things, which I paſs over in ſilence for that reaſon. His firſt profeſſion was that of a ſoldier [*A*]. He left it to devote himſelf to the eccleſiaſtical ſtate, and went to ſtudy at Naples; where he received his doctor's degree, after which he retired to Rome, in the pontificate of Urban VIII, who made him firſt apoſtolical ſecretary. He diſcharged ſo well the duties of that place, that he was made preſident of the chamber, and afterwards apoſtolical commiſſary, and governor of Marca di Roma. He obtained a cardinal's cap the ſixth of March 1645, and the legation of Ferrara ſome time after, and after that the biſhopric of Novara (*a*). The French ſay, his liberality and courtlineſs procured him the cardinalſhip, by the intereſt of Donna Olympia [*B*]: but they cannot deny

(*a*) *Taken from a ſmall piece of ſixteen pages in* 4*to*, *intituled*, La Vie d'Innocent XI, Pape de Rome écrite par D. G. B. P. à l'illuſtre Seigneur le Baron Giovanelli couſin de ſa Sainctleté.

[*A*] *His firſt profeſſion was that of a ſoldier.*] Here follows what we find in the pamphlet of ſixteen pages (1). 'Benedict in his youthful years took an inclination 'to martial affairs, being a man of greater courage, 'and valour than of ſtature; and foreſeeing at a diſtance the wars which he ſhould have in his old age, 'eſpecially deſiring to have the knowledge of arms, 'to introduce them advantageouſly into the church 'militant. And becauſe he knew what are the conſequences of war, and that ſkill in arms could not 'be obtained, but by a continual exerciſe, he went 'into Poland to engage in the war, with the Turks, 'and to give proofs of his bravery.' This author gives us to underſtand that Benedict bore arms only in Poland; other writers affirm (2), that he was in Flanders in the Spaniſh ſervice againſt France, and there received a muſket-ſhot in his right ſhoulder, which incommoded him all his life-time. I have read in a certain newſmonger, that Innocent XIth's hatred againſt France, proceeded from an affront, a Frenchman offered him in the war; an affront, that Benedict Odeſcalchi left unpuniſhed, but revenged it upon the whole nation, when he was Pope.

[*B*] *His liberality and courtlineſs procured him the cardinalſhip by the intereſt of Donna Olympia.*] See the *Mercure Galant* (3), in which you will find that our Benedict Odeſcalchi, the ſon of a rich banker of Como, played with Donna Olympia and loſt his money on purpoſe, in complaiſance to this lady. This puts me in mind of a paſſage in Menagiana (4). 'Pope 'Innocent XI, was the ſon of a banker, he was elected on St Matthew's day and the ſame day 'Paſquin ſaid, *Invenerunt hominem ſedentem in telonio.* —— *They found a man ſitting at the receipt of* '*cuſtom.*'

The following words are to be found in a little book printed at Avignon for John Bramereau, in the year 1652, with this title *La juſte Balance des Cardinaux vivans*. 'After the death of Urban VIII. Odeſchalchi began to make his court to Donna Olympia, niece '(5) to Pope Innocent X, and having treated her 'ſeveral times, ſhe began zealouſly to eſpouſe his intereſt; and eſpecially for a thing, which this prelate did, that is worthy to be taken notice of. Going to ſee her in the beginning of the pontificate of 'her uncle (6) Innocent X, it happened that a Goldſmith came to ſhew her a noble and rich cheſt of 'ſilver drawers, which he had to ſell; Donna Olympia having taken a view of it in the preſence of 'Odeſchalchi, and ſeveral lords, who heard the anſwer 'that ſhe made, *that it was a noble piece of plate, but* '*that being a poor widow, ſhe could not lay out ſo* '*much*

(1) See the title of it in the margin of the text of this article, citat. (*a*).

(2) Mercure Galant *for* Auguſt 1689.

(3) Ubi ſupra.

(4) Pag. 18[illegible], of the firſt Dutch Edit.

(5) It ſhould be *ſiſter-in-law*; which is the ſignification of the Italian word *cognata* in the original.

(6) It ſhould be *brother-in-law*.

deny that he appeared very remote from a voluptuous life. He was of rigid morality, and looked upon as a devout man. He was much more favourable to the Janſeniſts than his predeceſſors had been; which was the reaſons why the Janſeniſts more zealouſly adhered to the cauſe of the Popes, than they had done before [*C*]. He offended abundance of people by the ſuppreſſion of an office of the immaculate conception, and alſo by that of ſeveral indulgencies. There was no body in France, beſides the Janſeniſts, that was edified with this. They diſperſed thoſe two decrees, and added ſome notes to them [*D*]. I do not believe that every body approved his forbidding to honour the name and bones of Anthony Cala [*E*]. He expreſſed ſuch an inflexible ſtiffneſs in his quarrel with France, that he has convinced the world that in point of revenge [*F*] there are no men comparable

'*much money*, and after having ſaid ſo, ſhe retired into her chamber. Immediately Odeſchalchi called the Goldſmith, asked the price of the cheſt, and bargained with him for 8000 crowns; after which, without ſaying any more, he ordered it to be preſented in his name to Donna Olympia, who ſeeing ſuch a preſent, was perfectly aſtoniſhed at ſo extraordinary a generoſity. Upon which ſhe went to the Pope, and begged the office of clerk of the chamber, as a pure gift, for this prelate, and afterwards a cardinal's cap, which he obtained likewiſe by the mediation of cardinal Palotta. I ſet down theſe words according to the copy, which has been communicated to me (7). I have the ſame book in Italian: intituled *La giuſta ſtatera de' Porporati*, and printed at Geneva in 1650. I have conſulted it, and not only found in it the original of what you have juſt now read, but alſo that our Benedict Odeſcalchi had made his court to Don Barberini, to be promoted to the office of clerk of the chamber; that he had paid the requiſite ſums, and yet had not obtained his end; that he was a perſon of an indifferent capacity (8), and that tho' he had been profuſe, he was a rich and magnificent cardinal; that whilſt he was a biſhop, he loved walks, plays, and feaſts, but that he lived a very retired life after he became a cardinal.

[*C*] *The Janſeniſts more zealouſly adhered to the cauſe of the Popes, than they had done before.*] This is what Mr Talon taxes them with in the famous plea he made againſt Innocent XI, the twenty third of January 1688. *A ſtrange thing!* ſays he (9), *that the Pope, whoſe principal care ought to be to preſerve the purity of the faith, and to hinder the progreſs of new opinions, has not ceaſed ever ſince he came to St Peter's chair, to keep up a correſpondence with all thoſe who had publickly declared themſelves Janſenius's diſciples, whoſe doctrine his predeceſſors have condemned. He has loaded them with his favours; he has given them commendations; he has declared himſelf their protector: and that dangerous faction, which has omitted nothing theſe thirty years to leſſen the authority of all eccleſiaſtical and ſecular powers, that were not favourable to them, at preſent erect altars to the Pope, becauſe he upholds and foments their cabal; which would have anew diſturbed the peace of the church, if the foreſight and indefatigable pains of a prince, whom heaven has raiſed up to be the ſhield, and the defender of the faith, had not put a ſtop to it.* I do not believe that any Janſeniſt did ever write in defence of the four propoſitions, decided by the clergy of France, in the year 1682, againſt which the favourers of the *Ultra-montain* doctrines made ſuch out-cries, and publiſhed ſo many books. If the ſame thing had happened in the pontificate of Innocent X or of Alexander VII, it is certain the Janſeniſts would have written a hundred volumes in defence of the deciſions of the clergy, and in confutation of the *Ultra montaines*. Humane nature diſcovers itſelf every where: the rule of our conduct changes according to the times, and as we find our ſelves diſpoſed towards other men. Out of gratitude to a benefactor, men ſpare thoſe doctrines, which they would have condemned out of a reſentment againſt an oppreſſor.

[*D*] *They diſperſed thoſe two decrees, and added ſome notes to them.*] The one was made at Rome the ſeventeenth of February 1678, and imports the condemnation of the book intituled, *Officio dell' immacolata concettione della Sanctiſſima Vergine noſtra Signora, approvato dal ſommo Pontefice Paolo V, il qualè à chi devotamente lo recitarà concede indulgenza di cento giorni, come appariſce nel ſuo breve dato in Roma li x. Juglio MDCXV. in Milano per Franceſco Vigone.* The other was made at Rome the ſeventeenth of March 1678, which ſuppreſſes abundance of indulgences. The Janſeniſts cauſed thoſe two decrees to be ſecretly printed in France, and added ſome rules to them, by which their uſefulneſs might be diſcovered. They conſiſt of a collection of paſſages. It will not be unneceſſary to inſert here the reflexion of a Jeſuit upon the Janſeniſts zeal for thoſe decrees, and the little account they make of the conſtitutions of the Popes againſt Janſenius. 'Some years ago a little Italian book printed at Milan, was put in the index at Rome; in which book the office of the immaculate conception of the mother of GOD was to be found. The prohibition did not concern the office of the conception, which is known and authorized long ago in the church, and which alſo has been lately approved by Innocent XI, but this decree reſpected other things, which were falſly and raſhly ſaid, and printed in the ſame book: and beſides it was only for Italy, and not for the reſt of the world, where that book was not like to appear. Neverthelefs this decree was ſeen immediately, printed in Latin and French, by the care of ſome of the party with a rhapſody of uſeleſs paſſages, to make a conſiderable libel of it. It was diſperſed all over France and the Low-Countries with as much zeal, as if it had been a canon of a general council, upon a capital point of religion: and it is well known to what exceſs the indiſcreet zeal of ſome of their directors went. Thus you ſee how far theſe gentlemen can carry when they pleaſe their ſubmiſſion to the orders of the church. Would not one believe after this, that the Pope (10) needed only prohibit the verſion of Mons, to hinder them from diſperſing and crying it up in the world? And was not there reaſon to expect they would do as much for his new decree in favour of the office of the conception, as they had done for the former, which I have been ſpeaking of? but we ſhould have been very much miſtaken in our hopes of it: they have other principles for their conduct in what concerns them (11).

[*E*] *He did forbid to honour the name and bones of Antony Cala.*] A veneration had been a long time paid to this man in the kingdom of Naples, on account of his having been a holy hermit: but Innocent XI, in 1680, commanded all this worſhip to be aboliſhed, and Antony Cala's bones to be carried into the common church-yard, to be there mixed with others, and never to be taken up again. He enjoined alſo that his images, his habits, and all his other relics, ſhould be removed from all conſecrated places (12). Father Papebroch by this example juſtifies the liberty he took to ſuppreſs ſome ſaints.

[*F*] *In point of revenge.*] The court of France under Lewis XIV, and the court of Rome under Innocent XI, were acted with the ſame ſpirit of haughtineſs and inflexibility, whereby they afforded all Europe inſtances of that ſpirit for a long time. They ſtrove on both ſides to carry revenge as far as ever they could; but at laſt the world was forced to yield to the church. The Pope has ſhewn that it is not for nothing that he calls himſelf the vicegerent of GOD on earth; of GOD I ſay, who reſerves vengeance, to himſelf, and who has declared (13) that it is he to whom it belongs, and that he will pay it. The Pope, as the vicegerent of the GOD of vengeance, has admirably maintained the rights of his deputation. I will not adopt the thoughts of thoſe ſatirical wits, who pretend that, in point of revenge, the laity are novices in compariſon of the clergy; but we have ſcarce ſeen any quarrels between the church and the world, in which

(7) By Mr Pallardy, abovementioned citation (*e*) of the article GLEICHEN.

(8) E ſogetto di mediocre intelligenza.

(9) Talon, Plaidoyer, pag. 42, Dutch Edit.

(10) He means Innocent XI, who had condemned the verſion of the New Teſtament of Mons. See the *Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, May* 1685, *pag.* 495.

(11) Father le Tellier, Obſervations ſur la Nouvelle defenſe de la Verſion de Mons, pag. 422.

(12) *See Father Papebroch*, in Reſponſ. ad exhibitionem errorum, pag. 18, 19.

(13) Deuteron. chap. xxxii, ver. 35.

comparable to thoſe who pretend to be rigid moraliſts. It is thought that a voluptuous Pope, who could have ſacrificed his paſſions to politic intereſts, would have been more uſeful to the catholic religion [*G*]. The French are inraged againſt him, and it is ſaid this will contribute much to his canonization [*H*]. He

which the Popes have not at laſt had the better in point of revenge, they are the vicegerents of God, who has reſerved vengeance to himſelf, that is ſaying all. If I well remember, the protection that was granted by Innocent XI to ſome biſhops of France, perſecuted for not conſenting to the extenſion of the Regale, was the firſt ſtep that provoked the court of France (14); becauſe the briefs of Innocent XI (15) in favour of thoſe biſhops, were expreſſed in very ſtrong and vigorous terms. This haughtineſs put the court of France upon the moſt effectual ways to vex him. The clergy declared (16) their opinion about the authority of the church, and formed four propoſitions thereupon, which reduced the power of the Pope, to ſuch bounds as were very odious to the court of Rome. This was not at the bottom a new doctrine; the clergy decided nothing but what was agreeable to the maxims of the Gallican church, and what the Sorbonne had taught a hundred times; ſo that one might have thought that another Pope would not have taken exceptions at it, and that Innocent XI would perhaps diſſemble his reſentment: but to put him under a neceſſity of confeſſing that he had received a very great affront, the deciſions of the clergy were propoſed by royal authority, as a doctrine that no body was allowed to oppoſe, and which was to be maintained by all thoſe, who would take their licences in Divinity and the Civil-law, and be advanced to a doctor's degree. They ſtudied all the formalities, that might give the greateſt luſtre to the king's declarations upon this affair. Theſe doctrines were maintained by the rector of the univerſity of Paris, in a diſputation where the archbiſhop of Paris preſided, and in which the reſpondent was inveſted with all the marks of his rectorſhip, that it might appear, that it was the whole body of the univerſity, repreſented by their head, that maintained theſe deciſions. The theſis was poſted upon the door of the nuncio's houſe, notwithſtanding the oppoſitions he threatened to make againſt it. The Pope expreſſed his reſentment againſt the clergy; he anſwered harſhly the letter he had received from them, and would never grant his bulls to thoſe who aſſiſted at the aſſembly of 1682. He aboliſhed the franchiſes of the embaſſador of France, like thoſe of others, and would never receive the marquis de Lavardin, who was ſent embaſſador to him (17). France did then a very remarkable thing. This embaſſador entred Rome almoſt by main force, and having taken poſſeſſion of his quarters, he ſet a guard about it, as if it had been a fortified town (18). The Pope, without being aſtoniſhed, revenged himſelf by a ſurpriſing blow: he caſt an interdict upon the church of St Lewis, becauſe the marquis de Lavardin had been admitted into it, and excommunicated this embaſſador, and obſtinately refuſed to acknowledge him.

Things were at this paſs, when his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty perceiving that the continuation of theſe differences, would be prejudicial to him, *ſecretly diſpatched a truſty man to whom he gave a letter of his own writing as a credential to his Holineſs* (19). This man was to diſcover to the Pope *the moſt ſecret intentions of the king*. But the Pope would neither receive the letter nor give him any audience. Hereupon the king writ a letter to cardinal d'Etrée, which was communicated to the cardinals. He complained in it of the Pope's conduct, and ſhewed, in particular, the prejudice that Europe and the church might ſuffer, from what the Pope had already done againſt cardinal Furſtenberg. He aſcribed to this partiality the intrigues that were forming againſt king James, in favour of the Proteſtant religion, *&c*. This letter diſperſed in Rome was perhaps a new motive, which induced the Pope to countenance more and more prince Clement of Bavaria, to the prejudice of cardinal Furſtenberg. Now by the excluſion of this cardinal, he revenged himſelf a hundred-fold, for all the affronts he had received. He deprived the king of France of being the arbitrator of peace and war, and involved him neceſſarily in a war with almoſt all Europe. He quickly ſaw the effect of this conduct; and if he lived not long after ſo terrible a revenge, he lived long enough to have the ſatisfaction of ſeeing France attacked by ſo many enemies, that according to the general conjectures, ſhe was to ſink the very firſt campaign. Tell me now whether the church did not obtain the victory over the world, in a long diſpute where both parties contended, in point of revenge. If Alexander the Great had been a Catholic, he would have had much ado to draw out of the Pope's mouth what he did from the prieſteſs of Delphi, *My ſon, thou art invincible* (20).

[*G*] *It is thought that a voluptuous Pope . . . would have been more uſeful to the Catholic religion.*] Thoſe, who do not love this Pope, ſay, that he was well enough acquainted with the general affairs, to know that, in the ſtate they were in when cardinal Furſtenberg ſued for the electorate of Cologne, he might have ſaved the king of England, and enabled France to execute all her projects; for with the aſſiſtance of ſuch a cardinal, who would have ſucceeded to all that his predeceſſor poſſeſſed, ſhe would have tied the arms of the princes of Germany that were ill affected to her. She experienced it, in the year 1684, when ſhe deſired a truce. Now it is certain that the victories of this crown, would have extended the Catholic religion, and ſtrangely weakened the Proteſtant: whence comes it then that the Pope was ſo contrary to that cardinal? It is, ſay they, becauſe he hated the king of France, and choſe rather to renounce the advantages of the Catholic religion, than the pleaſure of croſſing his enemy, or the ſweetneſs of revenge. Theſe ſame perſons ſay, that he knew very well there was a league forming, of which the Proteſtants would be the chief directors, and which might be able in it's turn to oppreſs the Catholic religion, almoſt all over Europe; and that the moſt effectual means to prevent this league, was to put the whole ſucceſſion of the late elector of Cologne into the hands of a cardinal, who would never join with Heretical princes. Why then was Innocent XI ſo contrary to the intereſt of this cardinal? Becauſe, ſay they, he was overjoyed to expoſe the French monarchy to the greateſt dangers; and provided he could revenge himſelf of the court of France, he cared but little for the loſſes of the Popedom. This is what is ſaid by his enemies: but it is not too much to be relied on; their paſſion ought to make their conjectures ſuſpected. It is perhaps much more reaſonable to ſay, that being very intent upon the reformation of manners, and pious exerciſes, he was neither capable of knowing what was uſeful to his religion, nor of preferring the profitable before the honeſt part. Now he believed he was bound in juſtice to preſer the duke of Bavaria's brother before the cardinal candidate. Some apply to Innocent XI what was ſaid of Hadrian VI: he was an honeſt man; but did not underſtand politics (21). It was the good fortune of the Proteſtants, that in the year 1688, the ſee of Rome was poſſeſſed by a Pope who did not well underſtand his own intereſts, or who was too ſtiff to take advantage of the preſent junctures, to the prejudice of his particular paſſions.

But after all, who can aſſure us, that Innocent XI did not in ſome reſpects behave himſelf like a good politician? Has the court of Rome nothing to fear from the too great power of princes, that are moſt violent againſt the ſects ſeparated from her communion? Did not Sixtus V who ſo well underſtood politics, chooſe rather to countenance Henry IV and queen Elizabeth, than to ſuffer the king of Spain to grow too powerful (22)? Who can affirm that Innocent XI was not moved by ſome ſuch ſpring, when he entered upon meaſures ſo contrary to the intereſts of France, and ſo uſeful to the Proteſtants? One thing ſeems very certain, that an anonymous author of a little book (23), intituled, *The extravagant reproach; in which is ſhewn, that the Pope cannot without folly be reproached, with the ruin of the Catholic religion in England*, has no reaſon to call this reproach a folly.

[*H*] *The anger of the French . . . . . will contribute much to his canonization.*] It is not long ſince (24) the news-writers of Holland, have publiſhed in their monthly accounts, that many miracles were wrought at this Pope's tomb, and that this is a great mortification

---

(14) See a liſt of ſeveral other occaſions of complaint given to France after this, in the Anſwer to the Proteſtation of the Marquis de Lavardin, pag m. 97, *&* *ſeq*.

(15) Written to the king of France in 1678, and 1679.

(16) In the year 1682.

(17) In the year 1687.

(18) *See Leti*, Monarchie Univerſelle, Part. II, pag. 346, & ſeq.

(19) A letter of the French king to cardinal d'Etrée of the ſixth of September 1688. It is in Leti's *Monarchie Univerſelle, ubi ſupra, pag.* 447, *&* *ſeq*.

(20) Delphos inviſit, Apollinem de eventu belli, quod moliebatur, conſulturus. Sed virgo fatidica negabat *per eos dies adiri deum fas eſſe*; donec ipſe eo profectus, vi conripuit virginem, & ad templum traxit. Sed quum inter eundum illa patrium morem pertinacia regis victum reputans, exclamaſſet, *invictus es, fili*; accipere omen dixit: *nec alio oraculo ſibi opus eſſe*. Frienſh. Supplement. in Q. Curtium, lib i, cap. xi, n. 16, ex Plutarcho.

(21) See remark [*Q*] of the article HADRIAN VI.

(22) See the remark [*R*] of the article ELIZABETH.

(23) Printed at Cologne, for Peter Marteau, in 1689.

(24) I write this in the beginning of September 1695.

He was not learned [*I*]. He died the twelfth of Auguſt 1689. The French king's letter to the conclave, ſays a great deal in a few words againſt the memory of this Pope [*K*].

I find in the Valeſiana a Paſſage which deſerves to be ſet down here at length [*L*]. I ſhall alſo inſert ſome Verſes of Mr de la Fontaine, which ſhew how freely they wrote againſt

to the court of France; and that probably the enemies of that crown, will endeavour out of ſpite to get this Pope canonized. This will then be a ſaint made out of ſpite. It is commonly prudence to take the ſtrongeſt ſide: but that maxim is ſometimes falſe. There are ſome princes who owe their elevation only to their nice policy, of declaring themſelves betimes irreconcileable enemies to a potent ſtate, which terrifies all it's neighbours; for all thoſe that are afraid of this power, countenance this declared enemy, and gratify him as far as they can in all his deſires: and we need not go ſo high as the ages of Paganiſm, to find ſome princes who have irrecoverably loſt themſelves, by preferring the alliance of the moſt potent of their neighbours, before that of others (25). A private perſon that falls from a proſperous ſtate into misfortune, does no longer ſee about him, that multitude of friends who encompaſſed him before: they forſake him, and leave him to himſelf.

Donec eris felix, multos numerabis amicos:
Tempora ſi fuerint nubila ſolus eris (26).

Serene your fortune, friends will then abound;
But once obſcur'd there will not one be found.

Sovereigns find it quite contrary: for if they grow too potent, they find no more allies; every body forſakes and confederates againſt them. It is certain that Innocent XI purchaſed a great many friends and admirers, meerly for his thwarting at much as he could the deſigns of the court of France. This will keep his memory ſweet, and make his pretended miracles more eaſily go down.

[*I*] *He was not learned.*] It is ſaid, he wanted his ſecretaries to explain to him in Italian what they wrote for him in Latin. See the *Menagiana*, wherein are theſe words (27): 'Favoriti, ſecretary to 'the late Pope, reading to him the briefs he had 'made, and explaining them in Italian; the Pope 'wept for joy, and ſaid, *Coſa diranno di noi nella 'poſterita, quando vederanno coſi bella latinita noſtra.* '—— *What will poſterity ſay of us, when they ſee our 'Latin ſo elegant.*'

[*K*] *The French king's letter to the conclave, ſays a great deal in a few words againſt the memory of this Pope.*] This is the beginning of it (28): *We have learned from your letter of the thirteenth of this month, the deceaſe of our holy Father Innocent XI, and we have juſt reaſon to believe that it has pleaſed the divine majeſty to take him out of the world at a time when all the re-united forces of Hereſy, ſeem to conſpire againſt the ruin of our religion, to which the diviſion of the Catholic princes contributes not a little.* This is to ſay in a few words, which have a great air of moderation, that the wants of the church requiring a Pope that ſhould lay her intereſts to heart, God had removed Innocent XI out of the world, who was ill-affected to the church, or unable to labour for her good.

[*L*] *I find in the* Valeſiana *a paſſage which deſerves to be ſet down here at length.*] It is pity ſaid the learned Hadrian Valois (29), 'that Innocent XI ſuffered him'ſelf to be influenced, as he was, by the enemies of 'France. If he had been ſeconded by people as well 'affected as himſelf, what advantages might he not 'have procured to the Chriſtian religion? what would 'he not have re-eſtabliſhed? what would he not have 'reformed? what promiſing hopes did not he give by 'his aboliſhing the office of the immaculate concep'tion, as Clement IX had done that of the ſlavery? 'what would he not have done, if he had heard of 'the impertinent devotion of that Monk, which 'M . . . . . . ſpoke of the other day? would he not 'have rigidly condemned the ſuperiors, who ſuffer 'one of their viſionaries to print oriſons, addreſſed to 'all the parts of the body of the holy Virgin (30). 'Are not religion, modeſty, and good ſenſe, wound'ed by ſuch an extravagance? Innocent XI would 'not have ſtopped there: he would have reformed the 'luxury and fineries of women. How many huſbands 'would have been obliged to him, had his deſign 'taken effect? I am aſſured alſo from good hands that 'he would have aboliſhed the privileged altars, as a 'very great abuſe. And indeed can ſome indulgences 'granted to an altar, make the maſs better? or does 'the blood of Christ, which is of infinite worth, 'want any acceſſion of merits to be more acceptable 'to God, and more efficacious to thoſe that are pray'ed for? the mendicant Friars have invented theſe 'things, to bring cuſtomers to their churches.'

Digression concerning the reformation of luxury.

What Mr Valois ſays concerning the deſign of *reforming the luxury and fineries of women*, puts me in mind of the great zeal Innocent XI expreſſed againſt thoſe who ſhewed their breaſts. 'This Pope finding 'he was not able to prevail with the fair ſex, by the 'many powerful means he uſed, not to ſhew their 'breaſts and their arms, and knowing withal that the 'terror which ſeized all Italy, when the Turks beſieg'ed Vienna, did not put a ſtop to that diſorder, had 'recourſe to the laſt remedy; namely, excommunica'tion. He publiſhed an order the thirtieth of Novem'ber 1683, which enjoined *all maids and women to 'cover their ſhoulders and breaſts, up to their necks, 'and their arms down to their hands, with ſome thick 'and not tranſparent ſtuff,* upon pain of being ſo fully 'excommunicated *ipſo facto*, if they did not obey in 'ſix days time, that, except at the laſt hour, no one 'but the Pope could abſolve them; for it was decla'red, that *the confeſſors who ſhould preſume to abſolve 'them from that excommunication, ſhould incur it them'ſelves, and ſhould be liable to ſuch ſpiritual and tem'poral puniſhments* as his holineſs *ſhould think fit to 'inflict upon them: which temporal puniſhments, the 'fathers, huſbands, maſters, and other heads of fami'lies, by whoſe permiſſion or connivance their daughters 'and wives act contrary to his ordinance, ſhall likewiſe 'undergo* (31).' I do not know what was the ſucceſs of theſe terrible menaces; but I believe that as they were renewed from time to time under the predeceſſors of Innocent XI (32), there was occaſion to renew them ſome time after. It is the fate of theſe ſumptuary laws: luxury, and the deſire of ſetting off ones beauty, quickly elude the wiſeſt regulations: we may ſay of this diſorder, what a grave hiſtorian has obſerved with reſpect to Aſtrologers; they were always commanded to depart Rome, but they never went out of it (33). King Lewis XIV has lately (34) put out fine edicts againſt luxury: if he can command obedience upon that head, it will be a more admirable thing, than the power he has had to leſſen very conſiderably in his kingdom the madneſs of duelling. The news-writers have told us lately, that the advocates of the parliament of Paris, have engaged to ſee this reformation of profuſeneſs obſerved in their own houſes. Time will inform us, whether by the concurrent authorities of the prince and the huſbands, the reformation will be eſtabliſhed for a continuance. Theſe gentlemen have been told (35) *that as part of thoſe* (36) *that ſet up moſt for women of quality, would perhaps, have a great repugnance to retrench any thing from their ſumptuous habits, furnitures, coaches,* &c. *as alſo from the ſuperfluous number of their waiting-women, embroiderers, tapeſtry-workers, and footmen, which they have in their ſervice; it had been reſolved to oppoſe a licentiouſneſs ſo little conſiſtent with the ſtate and quality of thoſe ladies* . . . . . . (37). *The king's intention being, that they ſhould obey and reform themſelves the ſooneſt, without any diſtinction of birth and quality, and that they ſhould begin immediately, by not ſuffering their train to be born up. It is added,* that two famous advocates (38) were charged to communicate this order to their brethren, and that the latter *being overjoyed, expreſſed their acknowledgment for it, and unanimouſly reſolved to thank the firſt Preſident for procuring a regulation ſo juſt, ſo neceſſary, and ſo worthy of the king's wiſdom; and to aſſure him at the ſame time, that they would cauſe it to be obſerved in their own houſes, with the utmoſt exactneſs; they all looking*

(25) Confer quæ ſupra, *in the remark* [*X*] *of the article* BELLARMIN.

(26) Ovidius, Triſt. lib i, Eleg. ix, ver. 5.

(27) *Page* 52 *of the firſt Dutch edition.*

(28) *The Letter is dated from Verſailles the twenty fourth of Auguſt* 1689. *It is to be found at length in the* Mercure Hiſtorique & Politique *of October* 1689, pag. 1026.

(29) Valeſiana, pag. 45, & ſeq. Dutch Edit.

(30) *Mr Baudelot, pag* 183, *of his* Ptolomy Auletes, *ſays he has ſeen the printed book, which contains thoſe oriſons.*

(31) Nouvelles de la Repub des Lettres, May 1686, art. ii, pag. 495.

(32) *See t'e* Nouvelles, *&c.* ibid. pag. 497.

(33) Genus hominum . . . quod in civitate noſtra & vetabitur ſemper & retinebitur. *Tacit. Hiſt. lib. i, cap. xxii.*

(34) *I write this in May* 1700.

(35) *See the* Lettres Hiſtoriques *of May* 1700, pag. 574.

(36) *That is, advocates wives.*

(37) Lettres Hiſt. ubi ſupra, pag. 575.

(38) *Mr Iſalis and Mr Chardon.*

againſt Innocent XI, in Paris [*M*]. You will find a noble encomium upon this Pope in the ſeventh ſpeech of Mr Malagonelli (*b*). The Latin ſtyle of it is admirable, and worthy of antient Rome.

(*b*) *Concerning the harangues of this Orator, ſee the* Acta Eruditorum, *in the third Tome of the Supplements,* pag. 43, & ſeq.

upon it as the moſt effectual means to free them from infinite diſcontent, and to prevent the fruits of their laborious employments from continuing to be ſacrificed to the extravagant ambition of their wives. It is very likely that they ſpoke as they meant; for indeed their fine, noble, and profitable employments, are attended with great toil. They ſometimes envy the happipineſs of a countryman, who can ſleep all night.

Agricolam laudat juris legumque peritus
Sub galli cantum conſultor ubi oſtia pulſat (39).

(39) Horat, Sat. I, lib. i, ver. 9.

The lawyer wak'd, and riſing with the ſun,
Cries happy Farmers that can ſleep till noon.

CREECH.

Is it not reaſonable, that they ſhould deſire that a gain, which coſts them ſo many watchings, ſhould not be ſquandered away by ſuperfluous expences; and that the royal authority ſhould enable them to remedy it, ſince otherwiſe they could never accompliſh it?

[*M*] *I ſhall inſert ſome verſes of Mr de la Fontaine, which ſhew how freely they wrote againſt Innocent XI at Paris.*] We find amongſt his poſthumous works a letter, part of which I will tranſcribe:

Pour nouvelles de l'Italie,
Le Pape empire tous les jours,
Expliquez, Seigneur (40), ce diſcours
Du coſté de la maladie.
Car aucun Saint-Pere autrement
Ne doit empirer nullement.
Celuy-ci veritablement
N'eſt envers nous ni Saint ni Pere.
Nos ſoins de l'erreur triumphans
Ne font qu'augmenter ſa colere
Contre l'Ainé de ſes Enfans.
Sa ſanté toûjours diminuë,
L'avenir m'eſt choſe inconnuë,
Et je n'en parle qu'à tâtons;
Mais le gens de delà les Monts
Auront bien-tôt pleuré cet homme;
Car il deffend les Jannetons,
Choſe très-neceſſaire à Rome (41).

(40) *He ſpeaks to the prince of Conti.*

(41) La Fontaine, Oeuvr. poſtumes, pag. 182, Dutch Edit.

From Italy, my lord, they ſay
The Pope grows worſe and worſe each day,
But let me beg you to apply
This language to his malady;
Since it ſounds odly, in diſcourſe,
To ſay the Pope grows worſe and worſe.
But as 'tis true, I ſay it rather,
To us, nor holy he, nor father,
Our triumphs over error here
Only augment his ſpleen and fear,
And ſerve to egg his anger on,
Againſt the church's eldeſt ſon:
Worſe as he grows . . . . I cannot tell
Whether he will do ill or well,
On this howe'er I'll pawn my word,
His loſs will not much grief afford
Beyond the Alps . . . . ſince he diſmiſs'd
Each girl who would be freely kiſs'd,
And baniſh'd by, too harſh a doom,
The ſweeteſt, ſlighteſt, ſin in Rome.

Here are ſome verſes of a freer ſtrain, and taken from the ſame work:

Je vois ces Heros retournez
Chez eux avec un pied de nez.

- - - - -

Et tout le parti Proteſtant
Du Saint-Pere en vain très-content.
J'ay là deſſus un conte à faire.
L'autre jour touchant cette affaire
Le Chevalier de Sillery,
En parlant de ce Pape-cy,
Souhaitoit pour la paix publique,
Qu'il ſe fuſt rendu Catholique,
Et le Roy JAQUES Huguenot.
Je trouve aſſez bon ce bon mot (42).

(42) Id ibid. pag. 171.

Theſe heroes I return'd have ſeen,
Succeſsleſs and o'ercome with ſpleen.

- - - - -

- - - - -

In vain the party Proteſtant,
Are with our holy Pope content.
But t'other day I heard a tale,
To make you laugh it ſcarce can fail,
The Chevalier de Sillery
Said for the public peace 'twould be,
If once the Pope turn'd Catholic,
And good king James a Heretic.
However this odd change might hit,
His ſaying ſurely wants not wit.

Racine (43) had a ſtroke at the Pope, but not ſo openly; however it was a ſtroke. Mr de Vize in his *Mercure Galant*, and in his books about the tranſactions of the preſent times, ſays many things to the diſhonour of Innocent XI.

(43) *See his prologue to* Eſther. *Mention is made of it in the* Avis important aux Réfugiez, pag. 343.

JOACHIM, huſband of St Anne [*A*], and father of the holy Virgin. His marriage was a long time unfruitful, by reaſon of which his oblations were rejected by the high-prieſt Iſſachar, who cruelly upbraided him for his infecundity. Joachim was ſo confounded to ſee himſelf treated in this manner by the high-prieſt, that he durſt return home no more. He went and concealed himſelf in the country, among his ſhepherds, and was there comforted by an angel, who came to tell him, that he ſhould have a daughter by his wife Anne, that ſhould be called Mary. This angel went immediately to tell the ſame news to Anne, who was lamenting and weeping, not knowing what was become of her huſband. This angelical news was no doubt very acceptable to her; for ſhe very much grieved at her having no children [*B*]. Many believe, that a bare kiſs of her

[*A*] *Joachim, husband of St Anne.*] Here is his genealogy: Levi, of the tribe of David, was the father of Panther, Panther was the father of Barpanther, who was the father of Joachim (1). Some have ſaid, that Joachim did not deſcend from David, but from the tribe of Levi, and even that he was a prieſt. The Manichees grounded an objection upon this, which St Auguſtin (2) has examined.

[*B*] *She very much grieved at her having no children.*] She found her ſelf deprived of a certain honour that was paid to mothers according to the laws; upon which ſhe had recourſe to extraordinary prayers, that ſhe might partake of that honour: ſhe entered into the holy of holies, and made earneſt ſupplications to GOD, repreſenting, that ſhe had done nothing againſt the law, and therefore ought not to be excluded from the privileges

(1) Joannes Damaſcenus, de Fide Orthod. lib. iv, cap xv, apud Barronium Apparatu, n. 42.

(2) Contra Fauſt. Manich. lib. xxiii, cap. ix. *See the remark* [*D*], *citat.* (11).

her huſband impregnated her; but others affirm, that the common way was made uſe of [C]; for otherwiſe, ſay they, the birth of Jeſus Chriſt would not be ſo wonderful as we hold it. What is moſt wonderful is, that though we know nothing for certain of the name, qualities, and hiſtory of the father and mother of the holy Virgin [D], yet all this that I have

privileges which the law gave to women, who had children. Her prayer was heard; God giving her to underſtand, that ſhe ſhould bear a child (3). St Gregory Nyſſen relates this ſtory, which he read in an apocryphal book. They who know that none entered into the holy of holies, but the high-prieſt himſelf, and that he was not permitted to enter into it but once a year, need not have the falſity of this ſtory repreſented to them. If St Anne prepared herſelf on one hand, her huſband did no leſs on the other; for he faſted forty days upon a mountain, in order to obtain of God the deſired poſterity (4). See in the following remark, the words of St Epiphanius.

[C] *Others affirm, that the common way was made uſe of.*] St Bernard maintains, that it is the opinion of the church. ‘ Si licet, *ſays he* (5) loqui quod Eccleſia ſentit, (& verum ipſa ſentit) dico glorioſam de Spiritu Sancto concepiſſe, non autem conceptam fuiſſe: dico peperiſſe virginem, non tamen partam à virgine. Alioquin ubi erit prærogativa matris Domini qua ſingulariter dicitur exultare & munere prolis & integritate carnis, ſi tantundem dederis & matri ipſius? Non eſt hoc Virginem honorare, ſed honori detrahere. —— *If I may be allowed,* ſays he, *to ſpeak what the church thinks, (and what ſhe thinks is truth) I ſay that the moſt glorious Virgin conceived by the* HOLY GHOST, *but was not conceived of it. I ſay that ſhe brought forth though a virgin, yet not that ſhe was born of a virgin. If it were otherwiſe, where would be the prerogative of the mother of our Lord, by which ſhe is ſaid ſingularly to rejoice, both in her offſpring, and in the purity of her body, if as much ſhould be granted to her mother? This is not to honour the Virgin, but to take from her honour.*’ Pelbartus of Temeſwaer, notwithſtanding his bigotted credulity, embraces St Bernard's opinion. ‘ Simplicibus quibuſdam tribuit hanc opinionem quod *Anna conceperit per ſolum oſculum Joachim.* Agnoſcit tamen eam de *viro concepiſſe concubitu matrimoniali* (6). —— *He atttributes to ſome fooliſh people this opinion, that* Anna conceived by a bare kiſs of Joachim. *However he acknowledges that* ſhe conceived by her huſband, as married people do.’ The error of the pretended virginity of St Ann, is very ancient; for St Epiphanius was obliged to confute it. Εἰ γὰρ Ἀγγέλους προσκυνεῖσθαι οὐ θέλει, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὴν ἀπὸ Ἄννης γεγεννημένην, τὴν ἐκ τοῦ Ἰωακεὶμ τῇ Ἄννᾳ δεδωρημένην, τὴν δὶ εὐχῆς, καὶ πάσης ἐπιμελείας κατὰ ἐπαγγελίαν πατρὶ, καὶ μητρὶ δοθεῖσαν, οὐ μὲν ἑτέρως γεγεννημένην παρὰ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων φύσιν, ἀλλὰ καθὼς πάντες ἐκ σπέρματος ἀνδρὸς, καὶ μήτρας γυναικὸς; εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ τῆς Μαρίας ἱστορία, καὶ παραδόσεις ἔχουσιν, ὅτι ἐῤῥέθη τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῆς Ἰωακεὶμ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ὅτι ἡ γυνή σου συνειληφυῖα, οὐχ ὅτι ἄνευ συζυγίας τοῦτο ἐγένετο, οὐδὲ ὅτι ἄνευ σπέρματος ἀνδρός. Nam ſi ne Angelos quidem adorari permittit, quanto minus id Annæ filiæ tribui conceſſerit, quam illi è Joacimo Dei bonitas indulſit? quam precibus, omnique animi ſtudio, ac contentione, parens uterque promeruit? ita tamen ut non aliam quàm cæteri mortales naſcendi conditionem habuerit; ſed, ut illi, è virili ſatu, ac matris utero prodierit. Quamvis autem ex Mariæ hiſtoria, ac Traditione illud habeatur: Joacimo ejus Patri divinitùs hoc in deſerto nunciatum fuiſſe, uxor tua concepit; non ita tamen accipiendum eſt, quaſi hoc citra nuptialem conſociationem, ac virilem ſatum acciderit (7). —*For if he permit not the Angels to be adored how much leſs will he allow that honour to the daughter of Anna, whom* GOD *in his great mercy gave to Joachim, whom by prayers, by earneſt entreaties, and by extraordinary piety, her parents obtained? yet ſo as that ſhe was not born in any other manner than the reſt of human race, ſpringing from the ſeed of her father, nouriſhed in the womb of her mother, for though we have it in the hiſtory of Mary, and by tradition, that Joachim her father had it revealed to him from heaven, in the deſert, thy wife has conceived; yet are we not to underſtand thereby, that this happened without any conjugal converſation, or excluſive of the ſeed of man.* The cavalier Bori had a ſtrange thought concerning the conception of the Virgin, he believed that St Joachim was impotent, and that the Holy Ghost did incarnate itſelf with the Virgin Mary in the womb of her mother, who by that means remained a virgin after ſhe had born her child. ‘ Cadde in propoſizioni più ridicole, inſegnando che la Vergine non era ſtata concetta con ſeme umano, mà per opra divina, avendo lo Spirito Santo pigliato carne nel ventre di S. Anna, e partorita dalla medeſima, che aſſeriva che nel parto era rimaſta Vergine, e tale eſſere ſtata avanti il parto, e aſſicurando che S. Gioachino foſſe ſtato impotente alla conſumazione del matrimonio (8).’

[D] *Though we know nothing for certain of the name, qualities, and hiſtory of the father and mother of the Holy Virgin . . . .*] St Epiphanius, who flouriſhed in the year 370, is the moſt antient author, that tells us the names of the Holy Virgin's father and mother. It is true, that he pretends to have received from the tradition and hiſtory of the Virgin Mary, what he ſays concerning the prayers of Joachim and St Anne, and the revelation of the angel (9); but does not he himſelf confeſs, that there went about very abſurd traditions concerning the birth of Mary? does he not quote a book upon this matter, in which were abominable things (10)? Does he not ſay, that the reaſon aſſigned there of Zachary's loſing his ſpeech in the temple, was becauſe he had ſeen a man in the ſhape of an aſs? He was preparing to go out, and to ſay, *Woe be to you, what deity do you worſhip?* But that deity, to hinder him, made him ſpeechleſs: when he had recovered the uſe of his ſpeech, and revealed what he ſaw, he was killed. St Epiphanius adds, that they found in the ſame book, that the reaſon why the legiſlator had ordered the high-prieſt to wear little bells, was this, that this deity might have time to hide himſelf, that he might not diſcover his figure of an aſs; ſo that to prevent being ſurpriſed, the ſound of the bells was to give him warning, that the high-prieſt was coming. I am ſenſible that all traditions do not deſerve to be rejected like theſe; but however, we have no ſolid reaſon to aſſure us, that thoſe which St Epiphanius has eſpouſed, had any good foundation. This is ſo true, that St Auguſtin makes no ſcruple to take thoſe traditions which made Joachim, the Holy Virgin's father, a prieſt, for uncertain and apocryphal. ‘ Quod de generatione Mariæ Fauſtus poſuit quod patrem habuerit ex tribu Levi ſacerdotem quendam nomine Joachim, quia Canonicum non eſt, non me conſtringit (11).’ He adds, that it was poſſible for one and the ſame perſon to deſcend from two tribes; and concludes, that if he was obliged to pay any deference to apocryphal writings, he would thus reſolve the objection of the Manichee: ‘ Hoc ego potius vel tale aliquid crederem, ſi illius apocryphæ ſcripturæ ubi Joachim pater Mariæ legitur, autoritate detinerer, quam mentiri Evangelium in quo ſcriptum eſt, &c.

Would you have any other proofs of the uncertainty of theſe traditions, do but conſider Baronius's conduct, he has rejected part of the things that are ſaid concerning the father and mother of the Holy Virgin; he ſays in expreſs words, that the book fathered upon St Jerome, is the work of an unknown and ignorant perſon, who was incapable of avoiding manifeſt falſities. ‘ Non tantum eam Hieronymi non eſſe dixerimus, ſed auctoris plane ut ignoti, ſic prorſus imperiti, qui in ea condenda & conſcribenda non novit aperta vitare mendacia, dum ait illis temporibus quibus ea acciderunt fuiſſe Iſachar ſummum pontificem (12). He declares, that though that book has many truths in it, he will not build upon it (13). He therefore overturns one part of the foundation. You may ſee how Caſaubon overturns the other: he ſhews, that the book *de Nativitate S. Mariæ*, falſly attributed to St Jerome, was written by a Manichee, and abounds with impious and impertinent things. *A peſtilentiſſimo hæretico profectum, poſtremo nugarum & impietatum eſſe plenum* (14). He wonders that the Jeſuit Chriſtopher de Caſtro durſt declare for ſuch a book, the impoſture whereof was ſo well known to Eraſmus, Melchior Canus, Sixtus Senenſis, and Baronius.

(3) Gregorius Nyſſenus, Orat. in Natal. Domini, apud Baronium, ubi ſupra, n. 44.

(4) Sophronius apud Rivetum, Apolog. pro Sanctiſſ. Virg. Maria, cap iii, Oper. Tom. III, pag. 605, col. 2.

(5) Bernard. Epiſt. clxxiv, ad Canon. Lugdun. apud Rivetum, ibid. pag. 608.

(6) Stellarii coronæ, lib. iv, Part. II, artic. i, apud Rivetum, ibid.

(7) Epiphanius Adverſ. Collyridianos, pag. m. 1062.

(8) Relazione della Vita del Cavagl. Borri, pag. 351.

(9) *See his words in the foregoing remark.*

(10) Γέννων μὲν γὰρ Μαρίας βιβλίον τί φασίν εἶναι, ἐν ᾧ δεινά τε καὶ ὀλέθρια ὑποβάλλοντες τινα ἐκεῖσε λέγουσιν. Cujuſmodi eſt qui de progenie Mariæ liber inſcribitur, in quo horribilia quædam ac deteſtanda illorum dicta continentur. *Epiphan. adv. Hæreſ. pag.* 94.

(11) Auguſtin. contra Fauſtum Manich. lib. xxiii, cap. ix, apud Rivetum ubi ſupra, pag. 604, 605.

(12) Baronias, ubi ſupra, n. 44.

(13) Nec innitimur ſcriptioni illi quæ hactenus Hieronymi nomine ad Cromatium & Heliodorum ſcripta vulgata eſt, nam licet in ea complura veritate conſtantia conſcripta reperiantur, quæ à dictis auctoribus ſibi vindicent auctoritatem & fidem, tamen, &c. *Id. ibid.*

(14) Caſaub. Exerc. ad Baron. I, n. 15, pag. m. 90.

I have mentioned, has been aſſerted, and feaſts have been conſecrated to St Joachim, and his wife [*E*]. Some (*a*) have believed that ſhe had three daughters by her marriage; others, that St Anne was married three times; and that ſhe had one daughter by every huſband.

us. He cites a paſſage out of it, which ſupplies me with a ſtrong proof. ‘ Illud liberè dico quod fidelium neminem negaturum puto; ſive hæc vera ſunt, ſive ab aliquo conficta ſacroſancta S. Mariæ miracula præceſſiſſe; maxima conſecuta fuiſſe; & idcirco ſalva fide, ab iis qui Deum facere iſta poſſe credunt, ſine periculo animæ ſuæ credi & legi poſſe (15).—— *This I ſpeak freely, and I believe none of the faithful will deny it whether theſe miracles of the holy Mary were true, or whether they were forged before-hand, mighty things followed after, and in reſpect to theſe, they who believe that to* GOD *belongs the power of doing ſuch things, may ſafely, and without peril of their ſouls read and receive them.*’ Theſe are not the words of the Manichean Seleucus (16), the author of the book, but of the Latin tranſlator; and it is worth while to obſerve, that he confeſſes there are many falſities in the book he tranſlates. ‘ Impietas iſtius Pſeudohieronymi excuſari ſalvo pudore non poteſt: nam quum fateatur, Seleucum, ſive Leucium de doctrina Apoſtolorum multa eſſe mentitum; ea tamen defendit, quæ ſunt ab eodem hæretico ſcripta de virtutibus & miraculis eorum. Poterat-ne hic planus apertiùs oſtendere, nullam ſibi eſſe curam veritatis, neque ullum ſe inter falſum & verum ſtatuere diſcrimen? Addit de eo ipſo libro quem vertebat: *ita & his multa non vera de corde ſuo confingit* (17). —— *The impiety of this falſe-Jerom, cannot, with any modeſty, be excuſed; for altho' he confeſſes, that Seleucus, or Leucius, told many lies, as to the doctrine of the Apoſtles, yet he defends thoſe things which that Heretic has written concerning their virtues and miracles. Was it poſſible for him to have ſhewn more plainly, that he had no regard to truth, nor made any difference between truth and falſehood? He adds alſo, in reſpect to the book he tranſlated:* He inſerts many other things of his own head which are not true.’ Do we need any more towards a full conviction of the uncertainty of all theſe traditions. That which St Gregory Nyſſen alledges, is palpably falſe (18). As to Nicephorus Calliſtus, Germanus patriarch of Conſtantinople, John Damaſcen, *&c*, they deſerve no credit, becauſe they lived in an age too remote from the fountain-head, to have theſe traditions uncorrupted. Beſides every one knows, that Nicephorus is a fabulous and injudicious writer (19). We are not obliged to believe that he has rightly quoted Hippolytus biſhop of Porto. However, what he cites out of him, contains ſome falſities, as Caſaubon ſhews. See the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* (20). Rivetus is in the right to think it ſtrange, that Richard Mountague ſhould aſſent to moſt of the ſtories which Bernardinus of Buſti, Pelvartus of Temeſwaer, Coſterus, and ſuch like writers have adopted concerning our St Joachim (21).

I wonder how the abbot de Marolles could pay ſo much deference to the above-mentioned traditions. See the 235th page of his Memoirs.

[*E*] *Yet feaſts have been conſecrated to St Joachim and his wife.*] The huſband arrived to that honour later than the wife: it was not given him before the ſecond of December, 1622. The day appointed for him is the twentieth of March (22); but the feaſt of St Anne was inſtituted in 1584. At firſt it was not neceſſary by a neceſſity of precept to abſtain from work: It did not arrive to that prerogative till the year 1622 (23). In all other things the worſhip of St Joachim is very inferior to that of his wife. She is the patroneſs of an order of nuns, called the *Daughters of St Joſeph* (24), and there is much talk of her miracles. The village of Ker-Anne, in the dioceſe of Tannes in Bretagne, is very famous upon that account, and eſpecially, ſince an old image of this ſaint has been dug up, which had been long hid under ground. It was revealed to a huſbandman in the year 1625, where this image was to be found. As ſoon as it was dug up, it performed abundance of miracles. They were quickly in a condition to build her a fine church; the alms of devout ſouls, who flocked thither from all parts, furniſhed enough for the expence. The biſhop of Vannes procured from Rome the neceſſary indulgences for thoſe that ſhould viſit this image; and gave the direction of this new church to the reformed Carmelites, and permitted brother Hugh of St Francis, one of them, to publiſh the miracles which had been lately wrought in thoſe parts (25).

JOAN, Queen of Naples. See NAPLES.

JOB, whoſe patience has been deſcribed in one of the canonical books of the old Teſtament. Not to repeat what we find in Moreri, I content myſelf with obſerving ſome errors. It is a miſtake to affirm, that the Turks have a great veneration for the ſepulchre of this holy man [*A*], the firſt judge of Solomon's court [*B*]. It is a ſcandalous

[*A*] *It is a miſtake to affirm, that the Turks have a great veneration for the ſepulchre of Job.*] Here is a paſſage of Sir Paul Ricaut (1). ‘ It is the cuſtom of the Turks, as often as there is a new emperor, to conduct him with all imaginable pomp, to the place of the ſuburbs of Conſtantinople, which they call Job, where there is an antient ſepulchre of a certain prophet, or holy man, whom the Turks, who have no knowledge of antiquity or hiſtory, pretend to be the ſame Job, who for ſo many ages has been a pattern of conſtancy and patience.’ The French tranſlator of Sir Paul Ricaut, makes an obſervation upon theſe words, that deſerve to be mentioned: ‘ I believe, *ſays he* (2), that ſome Turks, unacquainted with Hiſtory and Chronology, may take the ſepulchre of Job, which is under the walls of Conſtantinople, for that of the holy man, whoſe hiſtory is related in the old Teſtament; but the Mahometan hiſtorians tell us themſelves, that this ſepulchre was built for another Job, who was a Mahometan, and one of the companions of Mahomet. He was killed at the ſiege of Conſtantinople, which was attacked by Jezid, ſon of the calif Moavias, in the fifty ſecond year of the Hegira, or the ſix hundred and ſeventy ſecond of Jeſus Chriſt. This is what Elmacinus obſerves in his hiſtory of the Saracens, chap. 7. book 1, and though Elmacinus was a Chriſtian, yet he only relates what he found in the Mahometan Hiſtorians, which he owns to have abridged.’ One of the moſt learned rabbies of the XVIIth century has been in the ſame error with theſe ignorant Turks; for he affirms (3), ‘ that the Mahometans have ſtill a great veneration for the ſepulchre of Job, which is at Conſtantinople (4). ‘ . . . . . Doubtleſs he did not know that it is the ſepulchre of a different Job, from that of the old Teſtament, and he was ſo ridiculous as to believe, that all the Mahometans took it for the ſepulchre of this holy man.’

[*B*] *The firſt judge of Solomon's court.*] Here is another paſſage of Sir Paul Ricaut. ‘ The Turks, *ſays he* (5), ſo confound hiſtory for want of underſtanding Chronology, that they ſay Job was the firſt judge of Solomon's court, and that Alexander the Great was the general of his armies.’ Here is a good criticiſm upon theſe words (6). ‘ The Engliſh author has taken this from Busbequius, but has not well underſtood his meaning. For Busbequius does not ſay that the Turks believed Job to be the firſt judge of Solomon's court, and Alexander to be the general of his army; but only that they underſtand Chronology and Hiſtory ſo little, that if ſuch a thing ſhould come into their heads, they would make no ſcruple to affirm, that Job was the firſt judge of Solomon's court, and Alexander the Great the general of his army. There is a great deal of difference betwixt theſe two things.’ See Busbequius, epiſt. 1. Sir Paul Ricaut's error has already crept into ſome books (7).

[*C*] *It*

(*a*) *See* Baronius, in Apparatu, n. 41.

(15) Id. ibid. pag. 91.

(16) *Others call him* Leucius, *or* Leontius. *Id. ib.*

(17) Id. ibid.

(18) *See, above, remark* [*B*].

(19) Nicephorum hunc fabuloſiſſimum eſſe ſcriptorem, & judicii in literis nullius, ſatis notum eſt eruditis. *Caſaub. ubi ſupra.*

(20) Pag. 143, & ſeq. *of the eleventh Tome.*

(21) Rivet. Apolog pro S. S. Maria, cap. iii, Oper. Tom. III, pag. 607.

(22) Spondanus, Annal. ad ann. 1622, n. 1.

(23) Id. ibid.

(24) *See the book intituled,* Les grandeurs de Sainte Anne. *It is mentioned in the* Bibliotheque Univerſelle, Tom. XI, pag. 141.

(25) *Taken from* Spondanus, ad ann. 1625, n. 3.

(1) *Ricaut's Preſent State of the Ottoman Empire, tranſlated by Beſpier, book i, pag.* 16.

(2) Beſpier, Remarques curieuſes ſur l'Etat Preſent de l'Empire Ottoman, pag. 4.

(3) Menaſſeh Ben Iſrael de Reſurrect. Mortuor. lib. i, cap xvi, apud Beſpier, ibid. pag 5.

(4) Beſpier, ibid

(5) Ricaut, ubi ſupra.

(6) Beſpier, ubi ſupra, pag 6.

(7) *Berreman has copied it in his* Variæ Lectiones, pag. 260.

lous impudence to ſay, that Job's diſtemper was the pox [*C*]. I confeſs, that in the church of Rome, he is the patron of thoſe who have the pox [*D*]; but this does not prove the other ſuppoſition. He was worſhipped in that church before the pox was known in Europe [*E*]. Tertullian is in an error, to ſay, that Job left no poſterity. See thereupon Mr Spanheim *(a)* in his hiſtory of Job, which is a very good book.

(a) Frideric. Spanhemius, F. Hiſtoria Jobi, cap. xv, pag. 481.

[*C*] *It is a ſcandalous impudence to ſay that Job's diſtemper was the pox.*] Guy Patin names two famous authors who have ſaid this. Theſe are his words: (8) 'Pour 'repondre à ce que vous me mandez, je vous dirai que Bolduc Capuchin a écrit auſſi bien que Pineda 'Jeſuite Eſpagnol que Job avoit la verole. Je croirois volontiers que David & Solomon l'avoient auſſi. '—— *In anſwer to your queſtion, I will tell you that* '*Bolduc, a Capuchin, and Pineda, a Spaniſh Jeſuit,* '*have affirmed, that Job had the pox; I could eaſily* '*believe that David and Solomon had it alſo.*' Note, that it may be ſaid, that Job had this ugly diſtemper, without having committed any act of impurity that had brought it upon him.

[*D*] *He is the patron of thoſe who have the pox.*] Conſult *Molanus's Diarium Medicorum Eccleſiaſticum*, where you will find theſe words under the tenth of May, which is St Job's day. 'Volunt nonnulli Sanctum 'Job peculiarem patronum eſſe eorum qui lue venerea laborant aut eam curant (9). —— *Some ſay* '*that St Job is the particular patron of theſe that have* '*the pox, or that cure it.*'

[*E*] *He was worſhipped . . . . . before the pox was known in Europe.*] The ſame Molanus cautions us not to admit of Agrippa's error, who ventures to ſay, that the pox was the cauſe of Job's canonization. Before this, ſays Molanus, there was at Venice a church, and a feaſt appointed for this holy man, who from Charlemagne's time has been inſerted in the Martyrology. 'Cavendus eſt H. Cornelius Agrippa, qui vane ſcripſit 'luem Veneream Job in divos retuliſſe. Quaſi non 'multo ante Veneti memoriam ejus & templo & feſto 'die celebrarint, conſtet quoque Uſuardum Caroli Magni 'ætate & Wandelbertum non multo poſt, Martyrologiis ſuis eum inſeruiſſe. Et à Græcis ad ſextum 'diem Maii notatur ſanctus & juſtus Job, qui multa 'contra Satanam certamina ſuſtinuit (10). —— *We are* '*to take care therefore, of believing what H. Cornelius* '*Agrippa has vainly written, that the Venereal diſeaſe* '*brought Job into the number of the ſaints. Though a* '*long while before, the Venetians had celebrated his memory, by dedicating thereto both a church and feaſt* '*day, and it is certain that Uſuardus, in the time of* '*Charles the Great, and Wandelbertus, a little after,* '*inſerted his name in their Martyrologies: and by the* '*Greeks, the ſixth day of May is diſtinguiſhed in honour of holy and righteous Job, who ſuſtained many* '*and ſharp conflicts with Satan.*' A famous Proteſtant divine, who has in ſome meaſure taken Agrippa's part in this reſpect, obſerves, that there is at Utrecht an hoſpital, where they take care of thoſe that are infected with the pox, and that it goes by the name of Job. 'Dici poteſt ad defenſionem Agrippæ, 'Jobum inter divos tutelares & quidem fœdi iſtius morbi, poſt ejuſdem morbi exortum, demum fuiſſe relatum. Quidquit ſit, tanquam divus alexicacus ab hujus morbi myſtis, annuente Romana Eccleſia ſalutatur. Hinc in hac urbe Xenodochium S. Jobi olim 'dominante papatu conſtitutum, ubi illo morbo laborantes curari ſolent (11). —— *This however may be* '*ſaid, in defence of Agrippa, that Job was received* '*into the number of tutelar ſaints, and even of that* '*filthy diſeaſe he mentions, within a ſhort time after* '*it's firſt breaking cut. However it be, he is addreſſed for the cure of all evils of this kind, with* '*the conſent of the Romiſh church, and hence it is,* '*that a hoſpital, erected in this city, was put under* '*his patronage, becauſe perſons inflicted with this diſeaſe, were received into it, and cured there.*' It was not long ſince the queſtion was diſcuſſed at Rome, whether Job and the other ſaints of the old Teſtament, deſerved the worſhip that is paid to canonized ſaints, and whether altars ought to be built to them. Conſult upon this *Acta Sanctorum Maii* (12).

(8) Patin, Letter cccLxviii, pag. 102, *of the third Tome.*

(9) Molanus, in Diario Medicor. pag. 68.

(10) Id. ibid. pag. 69.

(11) Giſb. Voët. Diſputat. Theol. Tom. III, pag. 435, 436.

(12) *There is a diſſertation upon this in the Appendixes to the ſixth and ſeventh volumes. See alſo* Journ. des Sçav. March 5, 1703, *in the extract of a book of Mr Baillet.*

JODELLE (Stephen) a French and Latin poet in the XVIth century, was of Paris *(a)*. He was one of the Pleiad invented by Ronſard *(b)*. Some make him the firſt inventer of French verſes compoſed like the Latin, according to the quantity of ſyllables; but others aſcribe this to Baif *(c)*. It makes little for their glory to ſettle the truth of this matter; for that invention quickly fell into contempt. There is more reaſon for pretending, that Jodelle was *the firſt Frenchman, who gave in his language tragedy and comedy in the ancient form* *(d)*. He had an incredible facility in making verſes [*A*], and poſſeſſed ſeveral other talents. He was an orator, underſtood Architecture, Painting, and Sculpture, and was well skill'd in managing arms *(e)*. He made profeſſion of being a man of the ſword *(f)*. His birth gave him that privilege [*B*]. He died in July 1573, being forty one years of age. See the margin (*g*). His friends publiſhed a collection of his works the following year *(h)*. It has been wrongfully ſaid that he died with hunger, as a puniſhment for his impieties [*C*], and he has been falſly cried down as a pagan

(a) La Croix du Maine, & du Verdier, Bibl. Françoiſe.

(b) Baillet, Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, artic. 1342. Menage, cap. cx, *of the* Anti Baillet.

(c) See the Anti-Baillet, chap. cxi.

(d) Du Verdier, Bibliotheque Françoiſe, pag. 285. *See alſo* Paſquier, Recherches, lib. vii, chap. vii.

(e) Du Verdier, ibid.

(f) Id. ibid.

(g) Mr Varillas is miſtaken when he ſuppoſes, *Hiſt. de Henri III, livr. xii, pag. m.* 267, that Jodelle was living under the reign of Henry III. He ſays, that the ſeven French Poets, *who were called the* Pleiad, *having made merry for a whole month at that prince's charges, in a tavern near a gate of Neſle, went out ſinging:* Long live tyranny, we have ſpent thirty ſix thouſand livres.

(h) Du Verdier, ubi ſupra, pag. 284, 285.

[*A*] *He had an incredible facility of making verſes.*] This I have from du Verdier Vau-Privas (1), in theſe words. 'He was admirable in one thing, which is al'moſt incredible, *viz.* that all his compoſures were 'quickly made, without ſtudy and pains; and we can, 'with ſeveral perſons that are now living, teſtify, 'that the longeſt and moſt difficult tragedy or comedy 'has not taken him up above ten mornings: nay, the 'comedy intituled *Eugene*, was made at four ſittings. 'He has been ſeen in his youth to compoſe and 'write in one night for a wager, five hundred good 'Latin verſes, on a ſubject given him on the ſpot. 'All his ſonnets, even thoſe that were meerly accidental, were made by him as he was walking, and amuſing himſelf with other things, ſo ſuddenly, that 'when he pronounced them, people thought he had 'not yet began them.' We need not wonder then at his numerous productions. It is ſaid that he compoſed about ten thouſand verſes upon the paſſage of the *Rubicon* (2). If his friends had publiſhed all his pieces, how many thouſands of verſes would they have amounted to? he made all ſorts of verſes, elogies, odes, ſonnets, ſongs, inſcriptions, and canticles (3). He made a *Poem againſt the ſin of Sodomy* (4).

[*B*] *His birth gave him that privilege.*] He was a gentleman who had a lordſhip; for he took the title of Seigneur du Lymodin (5). I believe it was a patrimonial eſtate.

[*C*] *It has been wrongfully ſaid, that he died with hunger, as a puniſhment for his impieties.*] Voetius relates (6), that upon his reading in Honſdorf's *Theatrum*, that Stephen Jodelle, a French Poet, an Epicurean and an Atheiſt, ſpent all his eſtate, and died of hunger (7), he carefully inquired whether the thing was true; but that his library could give him no light into it, which obliged him to conſult Rivetus. By which means he found that there was no track of Atheiſm to be ſeen in Jodelle's works; but on the contrary, ſeveral tokens of Orthodoxy; and that poſſibly, the

(1) Bibliotheque, Françoiſe, pag. 286.

(2) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. pag. 78.

(3) Du Verdier, ubi ſupra.

(4) La Croix du Maine, ubi ſupra.

(5) Du Verdier, ubi ſupra, pag. 285. *See alſo* la Croix du Maine, ibid.

(6) Voët. Diſput. Tom. I. pag. 137.

(7) Meminit *Honſdorf.* dicto *libro exemplorum ad Decalogum*, Lipſiæ in fol. ann. 1570, Edit. dilapidatis bonis Stephani Jodelli Gallici Poëtæ, quem Epicureum & Atheum inedia confectum dicit. *Voëtius, ibid.*

a Pagan, becauſe in a carnival ſport his friends ſacrificed a goat to him [*D*]. I dare not give credit

accuſation of impiety, which was charged upon him, had no other foundation than the ſacrifice of a goat (8), which was offered to Jodelle, as being the head of the tragic Poets ; and was only a meer ſport, if we will believe the author of Ronſard's life. Nevertheleſs, Rivetus durſt not determine whether for that one action Jodelle does not deſerve to be reckoned an Atheiſt. Voetius acquieſces in that judgment : he grants with his friend, that if there be no more authentic proofs of Jodelle's Atheiſm, one cannot affirm that he was guilty of it ; but in the mean time he will not acquit him, and leaves it as a diſputable thing. *In medio relinquit (Rivetus) an ob idem factum Atheus ſit dicendus, niſi aliunde alia authentica teſtimonia ſuppetant. In cujus ſententia & nos acquieſcimus* (9). It is not probable that the compiler Honſdorf, goes upon this pretended ſacrifice : he gives Jodelle the character of a debauchee, who had ſquandered his eſtate. It is therefore upon an habitual ſin that he goes, and not upon the farce of a pretended ſacrifice ; a thing done but once, and which may be as well imputed to the other wits of whom Honſdorf ſays not a word, as to Jodelle. We may therefore ſay, that this compiler of examples of the divine juſtice, is groſsly miſtaken ; and yet we ſee two famous divines, who equal his accuſation, though deſtitute of all ſorts of proof, againſt the teſtimonies of orthodoxy, which appear in the books of the accuſed : they fancy themſelves equitable enough, provided they neither condemn nor acquit him. How little do they follow theſe maxims, 'Quilibet præſumitur bonus donec probetur malus. Actore non probante abſolvitur reus ? —— *Every man is preſumed to be good till he be proved to be bad. A man is acquitted if the crimes he was charged with cannot be proved.*' We muſt take notice, that Honſdorf's tranſcribers, or thoſe whom he has tranſcribed, be they never ſo numerous, do not amount altogether to the authority of a ſingle witneſs, while they quote no body, or only cite one another (10). For the reſt, I do not pretend to deny that Jodelle died poor (11). I do not know but Gentillet was the firſt original of all thoſe compilers, who have mentioned Jodelle, as an inſtance of divine vengeance upon impious men. 'We might alledge, *ſays he* (12), infinite examples of the judgment and vengeance of GOD, exerciſed againſt Atheiſts, deſpiſers of GOD and religion, even of our own time ; as for inſtance, the tragic Poet Jodelle, who made a true tragical end ; for having eaten up his patrimony like an Epicure, he died miſerably of hunger.' I have found part of theſe words in a book printed at Morges, in the year 1581, intituled, *Punitions & jugemens de Dieu, &c.* and in a book printed in 1586, and written by John Chaſſanion, of Moniſtrol, in Vellay, with this title, *Memorable Hiſtories of the great and wonderful Puniſhments and Judgments of GOD, &c.* (13).

[*D*] *His friends ſacrificed a goat to him.*] Claudius Binet (14) tells us, how this farce was acted. 'They (15) blamed him, amongſt other things, for having ſacrificed a goat to Jodelle, in the village of Hercueil (16) ; but he gives a ſufficient anſwer to that particular accuſation, which is this. Jodelle cauſed the tragedy of Cleopatra to be acted before the king, which every body ſo applauded, that ſome days after, when the whole club of the Poets were together in that village, to paſs away the time, and enjoy themſelves in the licentious days of the carnival, every one of them made ſome verſes in imitation of the Bacchannalia of the antients. A goat happened to go in the ſtreet, which gave them an opportunity to play the fool, as well becauſe he was formerly ſacrificed to Bacchus, as becauſe they had a mind to offer him to Jodelle, as a recompence for his tragedy, according to the antient cuſtom, to which the Chriſtians themſelves, and eſpecially the Poets, have recourſe now and then, not out of any belief, but by way of alluſion : and that which gave occaſion to believe ſomething of it, was the verſes and pranks of thoſe Poets, which were publiſhed, particularly the Dithyrambics of Bertrand Berger, a Dithyrambic Poet, in which were theſe verſes. . . . . . . All this was but fiction and maſquerade.' Perhaps the reader will not be diſpleaſed to find here Ronſard's anſwer, which Binet has only pointed at. Here it is.

Tu dis en vomiſſant deſſus moy ta malice,
Que j'ay fait d'un grand Bouc à Bacchus ſacrifice :
Tu ments impudemment : cinquante gens de bien
Qui eſtoient au banquet diront qu'il n'en eſt rien.
Muſes qui habitez de Parnaſſe la crope,
Filles de Jupiter, qui allez neuf en trope,
Venez & repouſſez par vos belles chanſons,
L'injure fait à vous & à vos nouriſſons,
Jodelle ayant gaigne par une voix hardie
L'honneur que l'homme Grec donne à la Tragedie,
Pour avoir en hauſſant le bas ſtile François,
Contenté doctement lea oreilles des Rois.
La brigade qui lors au ciel levoit la teſte
(Quand le temps permettoit une licence honneſte)
Honorant ſon eſprit gaillard & bien appris,
Luy fit preſent d'un Bouc, des Tragiques le prix.
Jà la nappe eſtoit miſe, & la table garnie
Se bordoit d'une ſaincte & docte compagnie :
Quand deux ou trois enſemble en riant ont pouſſé
Le pere du troupeau à long poil heriſſé :
Il venoit à grands pas ayant la barbe peinte,
D'un chapelet de fleurs la teſte il avoit ceinte,
Le bouquet ſur l'oreille, & bien fier ſe ſentoit
Dequoy telle jeuneſſe ainſi le preſentoit :
Puis il fut rejetté pour choſe meſpriſée
Apres qu'il eut ſervy d'une longue riſée,
Et non ſacrifié, comme tu dis menteur,
De telle faulſe bourde impudent inventeur (17).

1.

In the height of your malice you tell it about,
That one day to Bacchus I offer'd a goat.
Why, good Sir, you lie, full fifty were there,
And ſaw no ſuch thing, as they all will declare.

2.

Ye Muſes who dwell on Parnaſſus's top,
Ye daughters of Jove, who run nine in a troop,
Come hither and lend me your aid to chaſtize
Whoever or you, or your ſcholars, belies.

3.

Jodelle having reach'd in the tragedy ſtrain,
That point of perfection the Greeks did ordain,
While his muſe in French verſe, with ſuch energy ſings,
As well might content an audience of kings.

4.

A brigade of bright wits, on this triumph thought fit
To make uſe of that freedom the age doth permit ;
And as the reward of his skill they deviſe
To preſent him a GOAT . . . *the old tragedy prize.*

5.

The cloth being laid, and the table deck'd out,
And a circle of honeſt and wiſe men about,
The old head of the herd, with form was brought in,
By folks who ne'er dreamt that their joke was a ſin.

6.

With a motion moſt ſolemn, the Goat *too appear'd,*
His head crown'd with ribbons, and painted his beard ;
At his ear ſtuck a noſegay, thus ſtalking along,
He ſeem'd joy'd with his honours, and pleas'd with the
throng.

7.

At length the poor Goat *was allow'd to turn tail,*
When long they had laugh'd, and the jeſt was grown
ſtale,
Nor never was offer'd, as you folks perſuade,
And baſely report the vile lie you have made.

Of

---

(8) *See the following remark.*

(9) Voëtius, ubi ſupra.

(10) *You will find the following paſſage in Konig's* Bibliotheca, *at the word* Jodellius: *Georgius Richterus Gorlicenſis in Axiom. Eccleſ. n.* 108, *ſeqq habet :* Memoria noſtra Jodellius, tragœdiarum ſcriptor, tragicum exitum invenit : nam luxu, ganea, ſtupris, ex Epicureorum diſciplina, patrimonium cum conſumpſiſſet, miſerrimo genere mortis fame periit.

(11) *See the article* FINÆUS, *remark* [*D*], *at the end.*

(12) Gentillet, Diſcours ſur les moiens de bien Gouverner contre Nicolas Machiavel, Part. II, pag. 179. Edit. 1576.

(13) *Book ii, chap. xxiv, pag.* 170.

(14) *In Ronſard's Life, pag. m.* 139.

(15) *He ſpeaks of two miniſters, who had writ againſt Ronſard.*

(16) *I think it ſhould be* Arcueil.

(17) *Ronſard, in the Anſwer to ſome miniſters, pag.* 92, *of the ninth Tome of his works, Edit. of* Paris, 1604, *in* 12mo.

credit to what I have read in Beza's life [*E*]. You will find a great many things relating

Of whatever party a man may be, he carries things too far; and we are often impoſed upon by popular reports. The miniſters did raſhly give credit to the ſtories that were ſpread concerning Jodelle's goat: and becauſe Ronſard ſet up for a perſecutor, for he wrote againſt the Proteſtants, and fell upon them at the head of the militia, they upbraided him with the ceremony of the goat, putting the worſt conſtruction upon it. They called it a Pagan ſacrifice, and maintained, that the goat had been ſacrificed to a falſe god. It was a calumny, but they were not the inventers of it. I ſhall quote Scaliger, who ſays, that a prieſt gave birth to that impoſture; and it is to be obſerved, that he has rejected this pretended ſacrifice as a fable. I know not whether he remembered, that ſome miniſters had accuſed Ronſard of it; but I know very well, that he believed his adverſary Scioppius had brought him (Scaliger) upon the ſtage with the others. Theſe are his words.

‘Aſt illud, quod adjiciemus, omnia portenta amphitheatrica ſuperat. *Pariſienſes illos amicos tuos imitaris, quos Dionyſia agitaſſe, & hircum immolaſſe fama eſt.* Dionyſia agitare, dicit eſſe hircum immolare. Hujus enim inſimulati ſunt illi, de quibus nunc agitur. Veſpillonis filius, qui nunquam Lutetiæ fuit, in media Suburra habitans Romæ, unde hoc mendacium expiſcari potuit, niſi à quibus reliqua portenta didicit? Quos putat Dionyſia agitaſſe, vel hircum immolaſſe, ut illi perſuaſerunt qui verum dicere, etiam ſi velint, non poſſint, ii ſunt, Petrus Ronſardus, M. Anton. Muretus, Janus Baïfius, Remigius Bellaqueus, Stephanus Jodellus, Nicol. Deniſottus, Joan. Auratus, alii, omnes poëtæ, præter Patoletum, qui in hiſtoriis conſcribendis omne ſtudium ſuum collocarat. Quos tam falſum eſt adeo execrandum, nefandum, impium facinus feciſſe, quam certum eſt, impune illis futurum non fuiſſe, ſiquidem jam Chriſtianæ pietatis, quam exiſtimationis ſuæ obliti tam deteſtabile ſcelus in ſe admiſiſſent. Si illi docti viri viverent, fur non inultum tuliſſet. Porro tam impudentis calumniæ auctor fuit ſacrificulus Gentiliaci vici, in quo illi doctiſſimi viri de conſtituto coierant, ut de ſymbolis eſſent. Totum drama exponerem, ſi opus eſſet, ut Joſephus me docuit, qui illud ad unguem tenet (18). —— *But what we are going to relate exceeds all the wonders of the amphitheatre.* You imitate thoſe friends at Paris, who are reported to have held feaſts in honour to Bacchus, and to have ſacrificed a goat to him. *To celebrate the Dionyſia he ſays was to ſacrifice a goat, and this is what is inſinuated of thoſe of whom we are ſpeaking. The ſon of an Undertaker who never was at Paris, but lived in the middle of the Suburra at Rome, where could he pick up ſuch a ſtory as this, but from thoſe who told him the reſt of his wonders? Thoſe whom he thought to have kept theſe feaſts, and to have ſacrificed a goat being ſo perſuaded by perſons who could not tell him truth if they would, were Peter Ronſard, M. Anthony Muret, Janus Baïf, Remy Belleau, Stephen Jodelle, Nicol. Deniſot, John Dorat, and others, all poets except Patolet, who had applied himſelf wholly to writing hiſtory. That theſe were guilty of ſo execrable a villany, is a fact as falſe as it is certain that they would never have eſcaped unpuniſhed, if forgetting their duty as Chriſtians, and what they owed to their own reputations, they could have ſuffered ſo deteſtable a thing to have entered their hearts. If theſe learned men were living, this fellow would not have eſcaped ſo. The author of this impudent calumny was a prieſt in the village of Chantilly, where theſe learned men uſed to meet and converſe together. I could explain the whole affair, if there was a neceſſity for it, as Joſeph Scaliger himſelf told it me, who had the ſtory at his fingers ends.*’ All goes well hitherto; I wiſh what follows was as juſt. ‘Sed ponamus verum eſſe. Quid hæc ad Joſephum, qui tunc puer Burdigalæ primis rudimentis Latini ſermonis initiabatur? An quia ſexto poſt, ſeptimo, & octavo anno omnes, præter Jodellum, illos vidit, & familiariter novit, ideo ejuſdem criminis poſtulandus erit? Hoc modo oporteret omnes, qui Muretum norunt, Dionyſia agitaſſe, hoc eſt, majorem partem eorum, qui hodie Romæ agunt. Quanta invidia Joſephum premerent, ſi verum crimen haberent, quod illi objicerent, quum aliorum facta, eaque falſa illi exprobrentur (19)? —— *But admitting all this to be true, what has all this to do with Scaliger, who was at that time a boy learning the rudiments of the Latin tongue at Bourdeaux? or becauſe ſix, ſeven, or eight years after he ſaw and was intimate with all thoſe perſons except Jodelle, muſt the ſame crime therefore be imputed to him? at this rate, all who knew Muret muſt be ſuppoſed to have ſacrificed to Bacchus, which will tarniſh the reputation of the major part of the preſent inhabitants of Rome. With what joy would they attack Scaliger if they had any real crime to object to him, who thus impute the crimes of others, and thoſe too which have not in them any ſhadow of truth.*’

The heat of the diſpute diſturbed Scaliger's head; he goes about to clear himſelf from a thing he was not accuſed of; he complains of being calumniated when he is not, and ſo he himſelf becomes a ſlanderer (20). When it is ſaid that a man imitates the faults of his good friends, it is not preſumed that he was with them in a certain place, where they have committed ſome crime; on the contrary, it is ſuppoſed he was not with them, for if he had been, he would be called an accomplice, and not an imitator. It is not therefore true that Scioppius involved Scaliger in Jodelle's buſineſs (21), and conſequently Scaliger ſhould not have complained of it, nor alledged his being in another place.

[*E*] *I dare not give credit to what I have read in Beza's life.*] I find in it, that Stephen Jodelle, one of the poets of the French Pleiad, made a ſtanza upon Beza's being ſtruck with the plague whilſt he was tranſlating the Pſalms. The ſtanza runs thus:

Beze fut lors de la peſte accueilli
Qu'il retouchoit cette harpe immortelle.
Mais pourquoi fut Beze d'elle aſſailli?
Beze aſſailloit la peſte à tous mortelle (§ α).

The plague o'er Beza did prevail
While he to ſacred ſong inclin'd.
Why did the plague this man aſſail?
He aſſail'd the plague of human kind.

Antony la Faïe, who wrote the life of this miniſter (22), gives Jodelle the firname of Modilinus. *Stephanus Jodellus Modilinus*, ſays he, *non poſtremus inter poëtas Pleiadis Gallicæ*, &c. One may eaſily perceive that *Modilinus* was put in for *Limodinus*, a title belonging to Jodelle, on account of his lordſhip (23). But as this ſtanza is aſcribed to one Stephen de Modelin in ſeveral editions of the Pſalms, where it is placed with the epitaph of Clement Marot, compoſed by the ſame Modelin, I queſtion whether it be Jodelle's. For ſuch a poet ſhould not have been called Stephen de Modelin. On ſuch occaſions as theſe, it is not uſual to make a man known by an anagram. But I have a ſtronger reaſon than this. Beza was at Lauſanne when he was ſeized with the plague; and was then looked upon in France as an apoſtate. The perſecution was terrible againſt the Reformed; can we then believe that a poet, who profeſſed himſelf a Catholic, would have compoſed an obliging ſtanza, in Beza's praiſe, ſo agreeable to the taſte and ſtile of the Reformers? that which is certain is, that the opinion of Antony la Faïe has been followed by Andrew Rivetus (24), and Jeremiah de Pours (25).

[(§ α) It is very poſſible, that this Tetraſtich was compoſed by Jodelle when he was very *young*. At that time he profeſſed the Reformed Religion, in Geneva; where by that wonderful fertility of genius, which, even in off-hand compoſitions, is aſcribed to him under the letter A. by Du-Verdier-Vau-Privas, one night among others, he was ſeen to have compoſed after this manner an hundred Latin verſes, *in which he decyphered the maſs, with ſuitable railleries*, ſays a Proteſtant author of that time. According to all probability, Jodelle's poetry met with no great encouragement at Geneva, ſince on a ſudden he was ſeen to retake the road to Paris, and the way of that maſs, he had ſo much cried down by his Latin verſes *. For the reſt, as the Romiſh religion was become in nothing better, ſince Jodelle had thought proper to embrace it, that might be the reaſon why the Proteſtants, whom he had left, treated him as *impious*, and even lating to this poet in the place which I have quoted out of Stephen Paſquier.

---

(18) Scaliger, in Confutat. Fabulæ Burdonum, pag. m. 338, & ſeq.

(19) Id. ibid. pag. 340.

(20) *See the eighth Tome of the* Morale Pratique des Jeſuites, chap. xviii.

(21) Pariſienſes illos amicos tuos imitaris.

(22) *Melch. Adam has inſerted the greateſt part of it in his Lives of ſuch divines as were not Germans.*

(23) *He was lord of Lymodin.*

(24) *He writ to Voëtius, that Stephen Jodelle had praiſed the tranſlation of the* Pſalms, *and even imparted to him the Stanza.* Voët. ubi ſupra.

(25) *In the ſecond book of the* Divine Melody, pag. 586, *he inſerts the ſtanza, and aſcribes it to Stephen Jodelle Modelin.*

* Memoirs of the State of France, &c. Vol. I, fol. 178, verſo.

even as an *Atheiſt*; to which, *thirty ſonnets*, which he made immediately after the maſſacre of Paris, to charge the miniſters with having occaſioned the puniſhments, wars, and maſſacres, which had been ſeen in France ſince, and upon account of the Reformation, contributed not a little. *It is ſaid*, continues the ſame author, *that Jodelle had a round ſum of crowns for theſe ſonnets*; which then he muſt have ſpent in leſs than a year, if it be true, as is pretended, that, in the month of July following, he died of hunger and poverty. As for *Madelin* or *Modilin*, perhaps Jodelle thus anagrammatized the name of his lordſhip, either following the practice of the times, or not to appear plainly the author of the Tetraſtich, in which the Romiſh religion is cenſured, and Beza commended. REM. CRIT.]

JOHN (SAINT) the Evangeliſt. Not to mention here what is to be found in Moreri, or in Mr de Tillemont *(a)*, I ſhall only ſay, I. That in St Auguſtin's time, there went about a ſilly tradition concerning the condition St John was in [*A*]. II. That there is nothing more abſurd than what has been ſaid againſt the author of the tranſlation of the new Teſtament of Mons [*B*], under the falſe pretence, that decency did not allow this holy apoſtle, and the Virgin Mary to lodge in the ſame houſe. III. That what has been anſwered to Mr Mallet hereupon, deſerves to be mentioned [*C*]. IV. That

[*A*] *A ſilly tradition concerning the condition of St John.*] 'Never was any people ſo credulous about traditions as the Aſiatics, and in particular the Epheſians. St Auguſtin relates upon this ſubject a very particular thing, which plainly ſhews the exceſs of their credulity, and the folly of their traditions. He ſays, that ſome Epheſians *, or ſome perſons that came from Epheſus, men of great ſenſe and merit, and who were not credulous, *non levibus hominibus*, had aſſured him, that St John was not dead; that indeed he was buried at Epheſus, but that he was in his grave as a man that ſleeps in his bed; and that as we ſee the bed-cloaths move up and down, according as a man in his ſleep breathes, ſo the earth of the grave wherein St John was buried, was ſeen to riſe and fall in ſuch like intervals.' Can any thing be more impertinent than ſuch a ſtory (1).' I have juſt now read that Mr de Tillemont is blamed for relating this ſtory, and ſeveral others like it. There would be reaſon to blame him, if he did relate it as a truth; but this he does not do (3). It is a fault then to cenſure him; for a collection of errors is a moſt uſeful part of hiſtory. I confeſs, he ſeems to believe the ſtory of the manna of our apoſtle's grave (4).

[*B*] *Nothing is more abſurd than what has been ſaid againſt the author of the tranſlation of the new Teſtament of Mons.*] I begin with the Greek text: Καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ὥρας ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν ὁ μαθητὴς εἰς τὰ ἴδια, that is to ſay, according to the verſion of Mons, *and from that hour the diſciple took her into his houſe*. See how this tranſlation of that paſſage has been criticiſed: 'It is certain that St John, who had embraced the ſtate of the evangelical poverty, had no houſe to receive the mother of GOD; and though he had one, there are many reaſons of decency and honeſty, which eaſily perſuade us, that the Virgin would not have thought it proper to retire thither. This conduct might even have had ill conſequences in the times to come; for ſcandalous eccleſiaſtics would have been glad to juſtify themſelves by ſo noble an example of the dwelling of the youngeſt and the chaſteſt of all the apoſtles, with the moſt modeſt and innocent of all virgins. And this apprehenſion is not groundleſs; for St Epiphanus, who ſeems to approve the thought of the Mons tranſlators, had the ſame fear, and he aſſures that ſome libertines had already pretended to cover their ſcandalous conduct with the example of the virgin's abode with St John. In the ſeventy eighth Hereſy, where he ſpeaks of this abode, *Vereor*, ſays he, *ne hoc ipſum, quod dicimus, fraudi ſit aliquibus, ut at contubernales & dilectas, quas vocant fœminas, retinendas, quod genus peſſimo ſibi errore animi, machinati ſunt, fucum inde aliquem, & colorem arceſſiſſe videantur* (6).'

[*C*] *That what has been anſwered . . . . . deſerves to be mentioned.*] For it contains general and very inſtructive principles, for ſuch as will judge of things according to their true differences. I do not inſiſt upon the anſwer which relates to the objection of the evangelical poverty: I only ſet down the confutation of the other point. 'It is very ſtrange, *ſays Mr Arnauld* (7), 'that Mr Mallet has not ſeen what has been obſerved by the interpreters of the Scripture, upon a ſubject which might have appeared much more ſcandalous. It is that of the Apoſtle, carrying with them a Chriſtian woman to take care of their ſubſiſtence. Nevertheleſs St Paul 1 *Cor*. xv. 5. ſays (8) that they had that power, and made uſe of it: whereupon Eſtius make this moſt judicious reflexion, which ſhews the true principles, by which we ought to judge of this kind of things, which Mr Mallet ſhould have known before he undertook to ſubject the Virgin to his falſe rules of decency. "*If you* ask, ſays this learned divine, how the Apoſtles could without ſcandal take along with them women that were not their wives. I anſwer, that this cuſtom was ſo well eſtabliſhed among the Jews, that our Saviour himſelf did not think it amiſs to do it. This was not practiſed except by women, whoſe chaſtity and piety were ſo well known and experienced, as to leave no room for any ill ſuſpicion. To which it may be added, that the Apoſtles led ſo edifying a life, and had obtained ſuch a reputation of holineſs, that tho' theſe women attended them, no one durſt make an ill judgment of them, as the Jews never ſuſpected any thing of that nature, with reſpect to our Saviour, as much diſpoſed as they were to ſlander and calumny." Nothing can be more reaſonable, and indeed it is by this we ought to judge that a thing which might give offence, when it is not attended with favourable circumſtances, that leave no room for evil ſuſpicions, is truly edifying when it is attended with thoſe circumſtances. Now when will the conſideration of an experienced holineſs be able to ſtop the mouth of calumny, and even to prevent ſuſpicions in the ſhalloweſt minds, and thoſe that are moſt apt to be prepoſſeſſed by the leaſt appearances, if the veneration which the faithful have always had for the mother of JESUS CHRIST, and for his moſt dear diſciple had not had the power to make every body look upon their living together, in conſequence of the command received from their dying Saviour, as a moſt holy and moſt innocent thing . . . . Mr Mallet (9) is the firſt and only man who has had ſo mean a notion of the holineſs of the Virgin, and of the opinion the church has entertained of her, as to imagine, that being above fifty years of age, ſhe could not live with an Apoſtle, without ſtaining her reputation, and that it was an example of dangerous conſequence, as being capable of authorizing the ſuſpected living together of women and eccleſiaſtics, which is forbidden by the canons. For thus far he carries his extravagant imaginations againſt the honour of the Virgin, But if the authors of thoſe canons had been ſo exceſſive in their ſuſpicions, as this cenſurer of the Virgin and St John, why did they except out of their prohibitions, ſuch perſons as mothers, ſiſters, and nieces? Is it becauſe they thought inceſts were abſolutely impoſſible? No certainly: but becauſe being guided by the ſpirit of GOD, and knowing that in point of general laws, all exceſs ought to be avoided, and a wiſe moderation obſerved, which obliges to overlook what ſeldom or never happens, they judged on the one hand, that there was no need of great virtue to avoid being tempted with the ſight of thoſe perſons, becauſe natural modeſty is ordinarily ſufficient to prevent the motions of an impure affection upon their account; and on the other hand, that the proneneſs of men to judge ill of their neighbours, doth not commonly go ſo far, as to impute to them ſuch black crimes, without very evident proofs: ſo that they did not believe, that, upon

'theſe

(*a*) Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire Eccleſ. Tom. I. p. 910, & ſeq. Bruſſels, in 12mo.

* Auguſt. Comment. in Joan. in hæc verba, Diſcipulus ille non moritur.

(1) *The abbot Faydit*, Extrait d'un Sermon prêché le jour de St Polycarpe, pag. 30.

(2) Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Sçavans, *for May*, 1695, pag. 427.

(3) *See* Tillem. Memoir. pour ſervir à l'Hiſt. Eccleſ. Tom. I, pag. 947.

(4) Ib. pag. 945.

(5) The Goſpel of St John, chap. xix, ver. 27.

(6) Mallet, Examen de quelques Paſſages, pag. 321, *of the third edition*.

(7) Nouvelle defenſe de la Traduction, pag. 430.

(8) *It is in the fifth verſe of the ninth chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, and not in the fifteenth chapter, as Mr Arnauld quotes it.*

(9) *See the abbot Faydit*, ubi ſupra, pag, 37, *he proves*, ibid. pag. 36, *that the Holy Virgin did not go with St John to Epheſus, he proves it I ſay, becauſe Celſus, who has ſo much ſlandered her, would have reflected on that journey, which however he has not jeſted upon.*

IV. That the way it is pretended St John juſtified his cheriſhing of a partridge is very natural [*D*]. V. That there are ſome people who pretend that the marriage in Cana where the water was changed into wine was his own [*E*], and that upon ſight of that miracle, he renounced marriage to live in celibacy all his life.

'these occaſions, there was any ground to fear any 'ſuch thing, or the ſuſpicion of it.'

[*D*] *His cheriſhing of a partridge is very natural.*] A Huntſman was aſtoniſhed to ſee this great apoſtle, ſo venerable for his age and virtue, ſtoop to ſuch an amuſement. The apoſtle asked him whether he always kept his bow bent. He anſwered that would be the way to make it uſeleſs. *If*, replied St John, *you unbend your bow to prevent it's being uſeleſs, ſo do I with reſpect to my mind for the ſame reaſon.* I do not believe that this ſtory is very certain; but I fancy that they who never heard of it will not be diſpleaſed to know that ſuch a thing is related. The author of the tract *De ludicra dictione* has inſerted it in his work. His phraſes being nervous, will not be unacceptable to the learned readers. Let us therefore entertain them therewith. *Nec malus, ut opinor, interpres Chriſti conſiliorum & voluntatum Joannes diſcipulus, qui ad leves luſus atque oblectamenta puerorum deſcendit ipſe jam ſenior, atque exemplo præivit, quatenus interjungere, & ex quotidianis occupationibus reficere ac recreare mentem licet. Hunc, manſuefactæ perdici blande & ſuaviter alludentem, quidam cum arcu & ſagittis venator offendit. Quod eum facere cum vehementer miraretur, hominem id ætatis, ſpectatum & cognitum diuturna virtute: ſenſit Joannes, & interrogavit, an illum ipſum, quem gereret, arcum haberet ſemper intentum. Cui ille, Nequaquam vero, inquit: flacceſcat enim arcus, & molliatur intentione perpetua, inutiliſque fiat. Tum Joannes, Tu, mi homo, arcum remittis ac relaxas, ne inutilis ſit: ego animum, ne ſit inutilis* (10).

[*E*] *Some people pretend that the marriage in Cana .... was his.*] The curious and learned Thomaſius will ſupply me with all the materials of this remark. I ſhould be glad to have the theſis which he cauſed to be maintained (11) concerning St John's glaſs: but I have only the preface of it (12), from which I learn a cuſtom that I was ignorant of; which is that at great entertainments, they fill out to the gueſts a glaſs of wine, which they call the glaſs, or cup, of St John. This is not without ſome mixture of ſuperſtition, which has derived it's original from a legend, wherein we find that St John having ſwallowed poiſon by the order of Ariſtodemus found no inconvenience from it. This is the reaſon doubtleſs, why the Painters repreſent him with a cup in his hand. I proceed to the marriage of Cana.

The Legendaries ſuppoſe. I. That St John the Evangeliſt, and Mary Magdalen were the two betrothed perſons (13). II. That both of them agreed not to conſummate the marriage, but to engage themſelves to a perpetual virginity. III. That as ſoon as St John ſaw the miracle of water converted into wine, he conſecrated himſelf to the ſervice of Jesus Christ, and left his bride (14). IV. That Jesus Christ went on purpoſe to the wedding to prevent the accompliſhment of the marriage (15). One thing perplexes them, which is that the virginity of St John could not arrive to the higheſt degree of perfection, if he had a deſign to marry; for perfect virginity requires that a man ſhould always have reſolved to contain himſelf. 'Videbatur ejus (*virginitatis*) laudem 'hæc fabula non tollere quidem, labefactare tamen, 'aut in gradum inferiorem detrudere, cùm ea demùm 'numeris omnibus abſoluta perhibeatur virginitas, quam 'perpetua incorruptionis nunquam corrupta meditatio 'pariat (16).' In anſwer to this difficulty, they ſay, among other things, that the divine providence directed the thing ſo, to heighten the glory of St John's virginity: ſince thereby it became altogether like that of the Holy Virgin, and was conſecrated, being joined with marriage, which is one of the ſeven ſacraments. 'Quin ergò potiùs ita cogitemus, decuiſſe, ut eodem 'virginitatis gradu collocaretur Apoſtolus, quo Virgo 'mater, quæ ipſi erat à Chriſto morituro commendanda? Quid, quod ita demùm conſecrari virginitas 'cenſenda eſt, ſi cum ceremonia matrimoniali conjungatur? Neque enim virginitas, ſed conjugium eſt in 'numero ſacramentorum (17).' I muſt not forget to ſay that Baronius and Molanus reject theſe traditions of the Legendaries. Thomaſius cites their words (18), and ſays probably enough, that Abdias's book was the firſt original of theſe idle tales. That ſuppoſititious Abdias affirms, that Jesus Christ thrice diſſuaded St John from marrying. In two prefaces upon the goſpel of that Apoſtle, it is only ſaid in general, that Jesus Christ diſſuaded him from it: thoſe prefaces (19) are falſly aſcribed, one to St Jerom, and the other to St Auguſtin. As there never were bolder authors than the compilers of the lives of Saints, they have reſolved to be more deciſive than the authors of theſe two prefaces; and to that end they have ſuppoſed the time and the place, that is to ſay, the wedding at Cana, where Jesus Christ freed his diſciple from the conjugal bond. Thomaſius does in no wiſe diſpute the virginity of this Apoſtle; it is grounded upon a pretty good tradition, teſtified by St Jerom, St Auſtin, St Epiphanius, &c. But Baronius was in the wrong to cite Ignatius, who only ſpeaks of St John the baptiſt (20).

(10) Vavaſſor, de Ludicra Dictione, pag. 285.

(11) *The thirtieth of January*, 1675.

(12) *Printed with ſeveral others, at Leipſic, in* 1681. *See the Journal of Leipſic*, 1682, *pag.* 51.

(13) Molanus, lib. iv, de Hiſt. Sacrar. Imaginum, cap. xx, pag. 428, apud Thomaſium præfat. 78, pag. 511.

(14) Haymo, part. Hiemal. Homil. pag. 207. Baronius, Tom. I, Annal. ad ann. 31, n. 30, apud Thomaſ. ibid. pag. 512.

(15) Meffret, de Sanctis Serm. XXX, fol. 53, apud eumdem, ibid.

(16) Thomaſius, ibid, *quoting* Pelbartus, de Temeſwar de Sanct. Serm. XXX.

(17) Thomaſius, ibid. pag 513, *quoting the ſame* Pelbartus, ibid. & Franc Maro, Serm. de Sanctis, pag. 30.

(18) *Taken from the above quoted places.*

(19) Quas conjunctas exhibet quarta pars Gloſſæ in Biblia ordinariæ. *Thomaſ. ubi ſupra, pag.* 516.

(20) *See the proof of it*, apud Thomaſ. ibid. pag. 518.

JOLY (Claudius) chanter and canon of the church of Notre Dame at Paris, and official to the archbiſhop, was a very worthy and learned man. He had a canonry conferred on him in the year 1631, upon the reſignation of Mr Loiſel, his uncle by the mother's ſide, and counſellor in the parliament of Paris. He was carried to Munſter by the duke of Longueville plenipotentiary of France for the general peace of Europe, and faithfully aſſiſted him with his advice and counſels. He took a journey to Rome during the commotions of Paris. He was made official the firſt time by the cardinal of Rets, after the death of John Francis de Gondi archbiſhop of Paris, and afterwards by the chapter during the vacancy of that ſee, and laſtly by the preſent archbiſhop (*a*). He died at Paris the fifteenth day of January 1700, being ninety three years old (*b*). He enjoyed in his great age very good health, and the perfect uſe of all the faculties of his ſoul.

(*a*) *I write this in the year* 1700.

(*b*) *Taken from the* Mercure Hiſtor. *for February* 1700, pag. 205.

JONAS, one of the Jewiſh prophets. Since moſt of the things relating to him may be found in two other Dictionaries (*a*), I will only inſiſt upon a few particulars. Some Rabbies (*b*) have been ſo ſilly as to ſay, that being firſt ſwallowed by a male fiſh, he was afterwards diſcharged into the body of a female. Not finding himſelf preſſed in his firſt priſon, ſay they, he had no recourſe to the invocation of God; upon which the male fiſh had orders to diſgorge him into the ſtomach of a female, which was great with young (*c*). He there found himſelf very much ſtraitened, and made the excellent prayer which is ſtill extant (*d*), and which appeaſed the wrath of Heaven. They who confute that ſtory by this argument, that a whale which was impregnated would not have preſſed Jonas, unleſs he had lodged in her womb, make but a weak

(*a*) That of Moreri and the Dictionary of the Bible, by Mr Simon a prieſt.

(*b*) Solomon Jarchi, apud Martinum Lipenium in Jonæ Periplo thalaſſio, fol. B. verſo, Edit. 1678, in 4to.

(*c*) Ut ex impraegnat one & alvi tumore in anguſtias virum Dei redigeret. *Id. ibid.*

(*d*) It is in the ſecond chapter of Jonas.

objection [*A*]. We have ſeen in another place (*e*) that the heathen poets have told a ſtory of their Hercules ſomewhat reſembling this. They ſtole it from the ſacred ſtory, and falſified it, according to their fancy. This is at leaſt the common opinion of our authors (*f*). The ancient fathers thought it ſtrange that the Heathens ſhould reject this hiſtory of Jonas, after having adopted the fable of Hercules.(B) Thoſe who ſay that this prophet

[*A*] *They who ſay that a whale great with young would not have preſſed Jonas, unleſs he had been lodged in her womb, make but a weak objection.*] Here is a man, who thinks he has Rabbi Jarchi at his mercy, when he asks him, ‘ Nunquid *arbitraberis in uterum quoque imprægnatæ balænæ immiſſum eſſe* Prophetam, ut ex fœtus piſcini multitudine coangustaretur? In *ſtomachum ceti* credo *deſcendiſſe Jonam non in matricem ejuſdem.* Quomodo itaque Jonæ in ventriculo latenti plus anguſtiarum ex uteri intumeſcentia poterat ſurgere (1)? —— *Do you* believe that the prophet was thruſt into the womb of a pregnant whale, *that he might there be ſqueezed among the multitude of her young ones? I believe that* Jonah deſcended *into the* ſtomach, *and not into the* matrix *of that fiſh. How then could Jonah lying in that ventricle, be ſtraitned for room, by the ſwelling and preſſure of the womb of the whale?*’ Theſe queſtions ſpoil Lipenius's good cauſe: and give the Rabbies room to take off the ridicule to which they deſigned to expoſe them, they would ridicule him in their turn, if they ſhould ask him how he came to be ignorant of a thing which is known to every body *viz.* that the dilatation of the Uterus preſſes and ſtraitens the bowels and the ventricle, and ſometimes hinders conſiderably the reſpiration.

[*B*] *The antient fathers thought it ſtrange, that the Heathens ſhould reject this hiſtory of Jonas, after haveing adopted the fable of Hercules.*] Here is a fine paſſage of Theophilact. ‘ Devoratur ergo à ceto Jonas, treſque dies ac totidem noctes in eo permanet vates: quæ res omnem excedere fidem audientibus videtur, maxime iis qui ex Græcorum ſcholis ſapienteque doctrina, ad hanc hiſtoriam accedunt. Quos equidem non ſatis demirari poſſum qui fiat quod hæc non intelligant, cum ſuis ipſorum alis capiantur. Apud ipſos enim nonnihil tale de Hercule narratur: nempe quod & ipſe à balæna devoratus, incolumis remanſerit, niſi quod tantummodo depilatus redierit, idque ob ingenitum & internum belluæ calorem. Aut igitur noſtra ſuſcipiant, aut ſua rejiciant (2). —— *Jonas therefore was ſwallowed by a whale, he remained therein three days and three nights, which fact ſeems to exceed the faith of the hearers, eſpecially thoſe who come from the Greek ſchools, and the ſtudy of the ſciences, to the conſidering this hiſtory. Yet I cannot ſufficiently admire at them. for pretending not to underſtand this, when they are ready to receive things of the ſame kind from their own writers. For by them a thing of the ſame kind is related of Hercules,* viz. *that he alſo was ſwallowed by a whale, and remained ſafe in her belly excepting only that he loſt his hair, when he came out from the ſtrong inward heat of the creature, let them therefore either receive our fact or reject their own.*’ I doubt not but Theophilact would have found among the Greeks ſeveral perſons, who would have taken him at his word with all their heart. The Philoſophers and learned men of Greece would have anſwered: we accept of your terms; you would either have us re-reject the ſtory of Hercules, or adopt that of Jonas: we reject them both. But becauſe a great number of Heathens would have condemned this alternative, and maintained that in believing what the poets ſaid of Hercules, they might ſtill laugh at the Jewiſh ſtory of Jonas; it is certain that Theophilact's thought is very ſolid, and admirably ſhews the fooliſh prejudices of the Heathens. I proceed to St Auguſtin. He had a great love for a Heathen (3), and writ many letters to him, ſome of which remained unanſwered. This ſilence made him think that the other was no longer willing to keep correſpondence with him (4). Wherefore deſiring to anſwer ſome difficulties, which this Heathen had propoſed to the prieſt Deogratias, he wrote directly to this prieſt. By this anſwer we ſee that the Pagans made themſelves very merry with the hiſtory of Jonas. ‘ Poſtrema quæſtio propoſita eſt de Jona, nec ipſa quaſi ex Porphyrio (5), ſed tanquam ex irriſione paganorum (6). —— *The laſt queſtion propoſed concerning Jonah is not put as if made by Porphyry, but as from the deriſion of the Pagans.*’ The method of St Auguſtin's refuting this objection of his friend, is very proper. Either, ſays he, we muſt deny all the miracles of God, or acknowledge we have no reaſon to reject this. Should we believe the reſurrection of Jesus Christ, if we were afraid of the railleries of the infidels (7)? And ſince our friend has not ſuppoſed any doubts about our admitting the reſurrection of Lazarus and that of Jesus Christ, I very much wonder he ſhould look upon the adventure of Jonas as incredible. Is it eaſier to raiſe a dead man from the grave, than to preſerve a man alive in the belly of a great fiſh (8)? Will it be ſaid that the digeſtive faculty of the ſtomach cannot be ſuſpended? but they would urge us with a more conſiderable objection, if they ſhould alledge the three men who received no harm in the furnace of Babylon. If they will reject alſo that ſuſpenſion of the fire's activity, and all the other miracles of ſcripture, we muſt have recourſe to another conſutation. For the infidels ought not to form doubts about one particular fact, but they muſt either believe or reject in general all the facts of the ſame nature, even thoſe that appear ſtill more incredible. They would not be ſo nice with reſpect to Apuleius, or Apollonius Tyaneus; they would not droll; on the contrary, they would, with an air of inſolence, cry up their triumphs, if what we ſay of Jonas was aſcribed to the power of either of thoſe Heathens. I do not give a verbal tranſlation, but only a general notion of St Auguſtin's reaſons; and therefore for the ſake of thoſe who underſtand the Latin tongue, I will ſet down the greateſt part of the original. ‘ Sed habent revera, quod non credant in divino miraculo, vaporem ventris, quo cibi madeſcunt potuiſſe ita temperari, ut vitam hominis conſervaret! Quanto *incredibilius* ergo proponerent, tres illos viros, ab impio Rege in caminum miſſos, deambulâſſe in medio ignis illæſos? Quapropter ſi nulla iſti divina miracula volunt credere, aliâ diſputatione refellendi ſunt. Neque enim debent unum aliquid tanquam *incredibile* proponere, & in quæſtionem vocare; ſed omnia, quæ vel talia, vel etiam mirabiliora narrantur. Et tamen ſi hoc, quod de Jona ſcriptum eſt, Apulejus Madaurenſis, vel Apollonius Tyaneus feciſſe diceretur, quorum multa mira, nullo fideli auctore, jactitant; [quamvis & dæmones nonnulla faciant angelis ſanctis ſimilia, non veritate ſed ſpecie, non ſapientiâ ſed planè fallaciâ]: tamen ſi de iſtis ut dixi, quos magos vel philoſophos laudabiliter nominant, tale aliquid narraretur, non jam in buccis creparet *riſus*, ſed typhus (9).’ This method of confounding the Heathens, will perhaps appear to ſeveral perſons more ſolid, than that which St Auguſtin made uſe of in another book, where after having ſaid that thoſe who laughed at the ſtory of Jonas, did not queſtion the truth of what is ſaid of Arion, he propoſes this difficulty, whether the ſtory of Jonas be not more incredible. Yes doubtleſs, anſwers he; becauſe it is more miraculous: and it is more miraculous, becauſe it manifeſts a greater power. *Verum illud noſtrum de Jona incredibilius eſt: plane incredibilius, quia mirabilius, & mirabilius, quia potentius* (10). Theſe are witty conceits, will ſome ſay, and pretty thoughts, but not good arguments: for from hence it would follow, that the more impoſſible a thing appears to be, the more credible it is. The fable of Arion was this, that in order to ſave his life, he was forced to caſt himſelf out of the ſhip in which he was returning from Italy into Greece, and that he fell upon a dolphin which carried him to the ſhore. I do not ſay this in favour of thoſe who have never heard of it, for there are ſcarce any ſuch perſons; but in favour of thouſands of people who do not remember it, and would be ſorry, not to ſee at one view the difference betwixt the adventure of Arion and that of the prophet Jonas.

Reflexion on one of the effects of prejudice.

Let us conſider a little the partial conduct with which St Auguſtin upbraids the Heathens. It affords an inſtance of one of the moſt ridiculous effects of prepoſſeſſion. The managers of the Pagan religion had

fed

(*e*) In the remark [*O*] of the article HERCULES.

(*f*) See Voſſius de Orig & Progr. Idolatr lib. ii, cap. xv, pag. 381, 382. Edit. Francof. 1675, in 4to.

(1) Martinus Lipenius, in Jonæ Periplio thalaſſio, folio B 2.

(2) Theophil. in Jonam, cap. ii.

(3) See the forty ninth Letter of St Auguſtin, at the beginning.

(4) Non inconvenienter arbiter eum quem video mihi reſcribere noluiſſe, nihil ſibi à me ſcribi voluiſſe. *Auguſt. Epiſt. xlix, pag. m.* 195.

(5) Lipenius is therefore miſtaken when he ſays, *in Periplo thalaſſio Jonæ, folio A* 3, *verſo*, that St Auguſtin diſputes ſtoutly againſt Porphyry in that place.

(6) Auguſt. ubi ſupra, pag. 207.

(7) Si fides Chriſtianorum cachinnum metueret paganorum *Ib. p.* 207, 208.

(8) Niſi forte facilius putat mortuum de de ſepulcro reſuſcitari quam vivum in tam vaſto ventre belluæ potuiſſe ſervari. *Id. ibid. pag.* 208.

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. i, cap. xiv.

prophet came out of the fiſh's belly in the port of Nineveh [*C*], are but little ſkilled in Geography; nor is it probable that he came out of it upon the coaſt of the Euxine [*D*], or of the Red-Sea [*E*]. It is much more credible he was caſt upon the dry land near the city of Joppa where he took ſhipping. Some confirm this conjecture by the fable of Andromeda; for they pretend (*g*) that Jonas's adventure laid a foundation for the poetical accounts concerning Andromeda's being expoſed to the fury of a ſea-monſter, which happened near Joppa (*h*). See the margin (*i*). Here is another idle ſtory of the Rabbies. The ſay (*k*) that the fiſh which ſwallowed Jonas had ſeven eyes, which ſerved as ſo many windows for the Prophet to ſee all that was in the ſea, and amongſt other things, the way which the Iſraelites took in croſſing the red-ſea. Thoſe who ſay that Jonas is the ſame young man who was ſent by Eliſha to Jehu [*F*], to give him the royal unction, deſerve not to be believed. In St Jerome's time the tomb of Jonas was ſtill ſhewn at the place of his birth (*l*). Mr Simon (*m*) affirms, that the Turks have *built a very fine moſque to the honour of* Jonas, *in which there is a miraculous lamp, that burns continually without any oil or other liquor, if he will give credit to their reveries.* He ſays that this moſque is *in a little village* (*n*), *built to the honour and under the name of this Prophet.* Mr d' Herbelot (*o*) ſays nothing of all this, though he relates many things which the Mahometans report concerning Jonas. I will name a modern author, who, according to Moreri, made *a moſt ingenious poem* upon the hiſtory of this Prophet [*G*].

(*g*) *See* Lipenius, ubi ſupra, fol. A 3.

(*h*) Plin. lib. v, cap. xiii, pag. m. 567, & xxxi, pag. 613, & lib. ix, cap. v, pag. 283.

(*i*) Hadrian Serieckius, *Originum Indice III, fol. p. verſo,* falſly believes, that it appears from the third verſe of the third chapter of Jonas, that the fiſh vomited up that prophet at the diſtance of three days journey from Nineveh, and that he went thither in one day.

(*k*) Apud Lipenium, ubi ſupra, fol. C. 1, verſo.

(*l*) That is in Ghath-Chepher, near mount Thabor *Lipen. ubi ſupra; fol. præced.* He quotes St Jerome, *Proœm. in Jonam.*

(*m*) Simon, Diction. de la Bible, pag. 433.

(*n*) In the tribe of Zabulon.

(*o*) D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. pag. 495.

ſed the minds of the people with abundance of fables for many ages, and they would not have ſuffered that it ſhould be examined whether they were poſſible, or that they ſhould be deemed incredible. But when the Chriſtian miracles were propoſed to them, they ſet up for Philoſophers, they alledged impoſſibilities, they made uſe of all ſuch arguments as might be oppoſed to the current of a fooliſh credulity, and ridiculed the believers. What inconſiſtency, and partiality is this? The Chriſtian communions diſcover one againſt the other ſomething of this ſpirit. If the Greek church boaſts of ſome miracle, which ſhews that Neſtorius's ſchiſm is diſpleaſing to God; the Neſtorians leave no ſtone unturned to repulſe that attack. But as to the prodigies, that are proper to convict the Greek church of injuſtice, they blindly believe them without examination, and think it very ſtrange, that their adverſaries ſhould make any ſcruple about them. It is well known how eaſily the Roman Catholics give their aſſent to an infinite number of miracles. They piouſly believe thouſands of ſtories which are daily publiſhed, and look upon the moſt plauſible reaſons of thoſe who deny them as meer cavils of obſtinate Heretics. But if they hear that the Proteſtants ſpread abroad any miracles, they aſſume a quite different ſpirit. They have recourſe to all the common places by which the incredulous defend themſelves. They deny they fact, they challenge the witneſſes, they reproach them with impoſture, or a diſtempered brain. If they cannot deny the fact, they explain it by natural cauſes, and collect from the Naturaliſts, and the relations of travellers, a thouſand like events. In a word, what they call wrangling, obſtinacy, and an oppoſition to good ſenſe, becomes a moſt ſolid and reaſonable confutation of a falſity; for they make uſe of the ſame common-places that the Proteſtants had employed againſt the monks. There are every where perſons who readily believe what is grateful to them, and are the hardeſt in the world to be perſuaded of a thing that is unacceptable to them. If they alledge the reaſons of their incredulity, they cannot endure that they ſhould be thought wrong; and if you alledge the ſame reaſons againſt them another time, they cannot endure that they ſhonld not be allowed the liberty of ridiculing them. This is the way of human life: it is almoſt an unavoidable effect of prepoſſeſſion, two weights and two meaſures. And if this could not be avoided without laying aſide prejudices, the remedy would perhaps be worſe than the diſeaſe.

[*C*] *Some have ſaid this prophet came out of the fiſh's belly, in the port of Nineveh.*] Sulpicius Severus fell into a geographical blunder; 'Exceptus à ceto, 'marino monſtro, ac devoratus poſt triduum fere Ni-'nivitarum littoribus ejectus, juſta prædicat (11). — '*Taken up by a whale, a ſea monſter, and ſwallowed, 'he was, after three days, thrown upon the ſea ſhore 'near Nineveh, and preached righteouſneſs.*' The learned Druſius perceived no fault in commenting upon theſe words, but only ſays, that the ſcripture does not tell us upon what ſhore the fiſh diſgorged the prophet (12). The other commentators upon Sulpicius, and particularly Hornius have perceived the fault, and ſo has Mr Lipenius; but he is groſly miſtaken in chronology, as believing that Sulpicius Severus Corrowed this from St Gregory's morals (13). This Pope flouriſhed 150 years after Sulpicius. Mr Simon has tranſcribed the fault of the later: *A whale,* ſays he (14), *received Jonas in it's bowels . . . . . and proved a much ſafer veſſel than the firſt he was in, and put him a ſhore, or rather vomited him up, the third day in the port of Nineveh.* Note, that Nineveh was built upon the river Tigris, which has no immediate communication with the Mediterranean ſea. Beſides, there is not water enough for ſuch a fiſh in this river at the port of Nineveh. This reaſon, together with the ſurprizing miracle, we muſt ſuppoſe, if we ſay that the whale went into the ocean, and doubled the cape of Good Hope, and entred into the mouth of the Tigris, and made that prodigious compaſs in three days. takes away all ſorts of ſubterfuge from ſuch as would excuſe Sulpicius Severus. That notion never came into his mind; he honeſtly believed that Nineveh was ſituated upon the Mediterranean ſea, and erred for want of ſkill in Geography.

[*D*] . . . . . *It is not probable that he came out upon the coaſt of the Euxine.*] Joſephus (15) relates this tradition; which has been followed by many moderns (16), tho' it claſhes with probability, and multiplies prodigies; for according to natural laws, a fiſh of that ſize cannot convey itſelf in ſo little a time from the Phenician Sea to the Black ſea. Beſides, the journey that Jonas was to make, either to return into Judæa, before he went to Nineveh, or to go directly to Nineveh, would have been too long and too difficult.

[*E*] . . . . *Or upon the coaſts of the Red Sea.*] Lipenius (17) attributes this opinion to Pineda, and to the Rabbies: and it is no difficult thing for him to confute it; for the whale muſt have entered into the ocean, and have gone round Africa. See the remark [*C*] towards the end.

[*F*] *Thoſe who take him for the ſame young man, who was ſent by Eliſha to Jehu* (18).] This is what the Rabbies do, and after them Mariana and Tarnovius (19). *If this was ſo, he muſt have been then above an hundred years old.* They are Mr Simon's words in his Dictionary of the Bible, which are very obſcure; for we do not know to what the word *then* relates. Does it relate to the time of Jehu's unction? Grammar will have it ſo, but the ſenſe will be abſurd. Does it relate to the time of his voyage to Nineveh, or to the reign of Jeroboam, the ſecond of that name? gueſs it if you can.

[*G*] *I will name a modern author, who, according to Moreri, made a moſt ingenious poem on the hiſtory of this prophet.*] He was a Gaſcon and a miniſter, named Coras. He was chaplain to marſhal de Turenne for ſome campaigns; afterwards he had a church in the lower Guienne, and there he turned Papiſt, and had a conſiderable office in the preſidial of Montauban. He publiſhed a book before he changed his religion, in which, if I well remember, he maintained, that the Proteſtants could not be re-united to the Roman church. He publiſhed another to confute this after his abjuration. The four poems, which he publiſhed upon the hiſtories of the Bible (20), ſold well enough, though Mr Boileau, ſays the contrary in his ninth ſatire.

---

(11) Sulpicius Severus, Hiſtor. Sacr. lib. i, pag. m. 79.

(12) Druſius, in Sulpic. Severum, pag. 179.

(13) Sulpicius Severus. . . . *ex S. Gregorio, lib. vi. Moral cap. xii,* arbitratur Jonam eſſe expoſitum in littoribus Ninevatarum. *Lipen. ubi ſupra, cap. iii.*

(14) Simon, Diction. de la Bible, pag. 432, 433.

(15) Joſeph. Antiq Judaic. lib. ix, cap. xi, fol. 355, verſo.

(16) *See* Lipen. ubi ſupra.

(17) Lipen. ubi ſupra, fol. C 1, verſo. *He quotes Pineda,* lib. iv, de rebus Solomonis, cap. xii.

(18) II Kings, chap. ix, ver. 1.

(19) Hebræi in Seder Olam, & ex iis Jo. Mariana in Scholiis, Bibl. & D Joh. Tarnovius Comm. Jon. pag. 2. *Lipenius, ubi ſupra, fol. B.*

(20) Upon Jonas, David, Joſhua, and Sampſon.

Le Jonas inconu ſeche dans la pouſſiere,

Le David imprimé n'a point veu la lumiere.

The Jonas uncall'd for, is bury'd in night,

And David, tho' printed, has ne'er ſeen the light.

The enemies of Coras ſent him by the poſt to Montauban, a pretended letter from his Bookſeller at, Paris, in which he was deſired to vindicate himſelf againſt Boileau; becauſe ſince the publication of his ninth ſatire, no body bought his poems. He was provoked with that inſult, and publiſhed a very violent piece againſt his critic. He made ſome verſes againſt Racine, in the year 1675. You will ſee in the Menagiana (21), a very pretty epigram of Racine againſt him. Note, that he was deſcended from the famous Civilian John Coras, counſellor in the parliament of Toulouſe, one of the Proteſtant martyrs; for he was hanged for his religion at Toulouſe, in his counſellor's habit, in the year 1572 (22).

JONAS (ARNGRIMUS) an Iſelander, made himſelf eſteemed in the XVIth and XVIIth centuries by the works he publiſhed. He was ſtill alive in 1644, being above ninety years of age (*a*). Four years before, he was married a ſecond time to a young woman. He was a learned and good man, and in great eſteem among all the learned. He had been coadjutor to Gundebrand de Torloc, biſhop of Hole in Iſeland (*b*). This Gundebrand was an Iſelander, a man of great learning and probity (*c*). He had been a diſciple of Tycho Brahe, and was a good Aſtrologer. After his death Arngrimus refuſed the biſhopric of Hole, which the king of Denmark offered him (*d*): he begged the king to *excuſe his accepting of it, both to avoid being envied, and to proſecute his ſtudies with greater tranquillity*. Moſt of the books he publiſhed [*A*], are hiſtories, and deſcriptions of Iſeland, or apologies for his nation. Bleſkenius had ſaid ſeveral things to their diſadvantage, both with repect to witchcraft [*B*], and laſciviouſneſs [*C*]. Arngrimus confuted him.

He

[*A*] *The books that be publiſhed.*] I ſhall mention all thoſe that I find in the catalogues of Albert Bartholinus, *Idea veri Magiſtratus, Copenhagen*, 1589, *in 8vo. Brevis Commentarius de Iſlandia*, at the ſame place, 1593, *in 8vo. Anatome Bleſkeniana*, at *Hole*, in *Iſelanders*, 1612, in 8*vo*, and at *Hamburgh*, 1618, in 4*to*. *Epiſtola pro patria defenſoria*, at the ſame place, 1618. Ἀποτριϐη *Calumniæ*, at the ſame place, 1622, in 4*to*. *Chrymogæa* (1), *ſeu rerum Iſlandicarum libri tres*, at the ſame place 1630, in 4*to*. *Vita Gudbrandi Thorlacii*, at the ſame place, 1630, in 4*to*. *Specimen Iſlandiæ Hiſtoricum, & magna ex parte Chrographicum*, at *Amſterdam*, 1643, in 4*to* (2).

A learned man, who has publiſhed the treatiſe of Albert Bartholinus, with hiſtorical and critical additions, informs me, that the *Anatome Bleſkenia*, is a confutation of a book printed at Leyden, in the year 1607, and intituled, *Iſlandia, ſeu deſcriptio populorum & memorabilium hujus Inſulæ*; that the *Crymogæa* was written in the year 1603, and printed at Hamburgh, in 1609, with a map of Denmark, and without it in 1610; that the *Specimen Iſlandiæ Hiſtoricum*, contains an apology for the author's opinion againſt the reaſons of John Iſaacius Pontanus. Our Arngrimus Jonas maintained that Iſeland did not begin to be inhabited till towards the year 874, and ſo cannot be the antient Thule (3). Pontanus thought it a little ſtrange, that Arngrimus Jonas ſhould write an apology for an opinion, that was leſs glorious to Iſeland, than the contrary one; nevertheleſs, he ſpoke of this learned Iſelander with all ſorts of civility, and marks of eſteem. See the letter which he wrote to Stephanus, the firſt of July, 1638 (4). Mr Mollerus (5) gives us the titles of ſome of our Jonas's works, which had been omitted by Albert Bartholinus, ſome of which have been publiſhed, and others not.

[*B*] *Bleſkenius had ſaid ſeveral things to the diſadvantage of Iſland, with reſpect to their witchcraft . . .*] Belſkenius ſays, that the Iſelanders ſell the wind, and that he has experienced it (6). Arngrimus laughs at this; for he ſays, ‘that the ſeamen of Iſeland know over-night, by the diſpoſition of the air, what wind and weather there will be the next day; and that when they conjecture there will be ſuch a wind, as a ſtranger waits for to go off, they go to him, and engage to ſell him this wind: which they do in this manner. They aſk the ſtranger for his handkerchief, in which they pretend to mutter ſome words, and immediately tie the handkerchief with a knot (7), as if it were for fear the words pronounced ſhould fly away. After this they give him the handkerchief thus tied, and adviſe him to keep it carefully, as he receives it, aſſuring him that he ſhall have a good wind during his voyage. Now it ſometimes happens, that this wind blows the next day; but moſt frequently it changes after the ſtranger is gone, and is out at ſea . . . . If it happens but once in a hundred times, that the wind carries a ſtranger to the end of his voyage, that ſingle chance authoriſes the error, notwithſtanding a hundred contrary experiments, and the error is ſpread by him, who confidently ſays, becauſe he believes it, that he bought the wind in Iſeland, and that this wind has carried him ſafe home.’ The ſame Bleſkenius relates (8), ‘that there are ſome magicians in Iſeland, who have the power to ſtop ſhips in full ſail in the open ſea: he ſays alſo, that they who are thus ſtopped, make uſe of ſome ſtinking fumigations for a countercharm (9), which he deſcribes; with which, *ſays he*, they that are ſtopped, drive away the devils that ſtop them, and the ſhips being uncharmed, reſume their courſe.’

[*C*] . . . . . . *and laſciviouſneſs.*] ‘Bleſkenius ſays, that the Germans, who trade into Iſeland, ſet up tents near the harbours where they land, and there expoſe their merchandizes, which are cloaks, ſhoes, looking-glaſſes, knives, and abundance of baubles, which they exchange for commodities of the Iſelanders. The young women, which are very fair in this iſland, but ill clad, come and offer themſelves to the Germans who have no wives, for bread or biſcuit, or any thing elſe of ſmall value. The fathers themſelves preſent their daughters to the ſtrangers; and if they are got with child, it is a great honour to them. This makes them more reſpected and courted by the Iſelanders than the others, and ſeveral ſtrive who ſhall have them. When the Iſelanders have bought, that is, bartered for wine or beer with the foreign Merchants, they invite their relations and friends, and neighbours, to drink both; and they never leave off till they have drank it all. They ſing, as they are tippling, the heroic actions of their captains . . . . It is reckoned an incivility among them, to go from the table, when they drink, to make water. The young women, which, as I have ſaid, are not ugly in this country, ſlip under the treſtles, and hand the chamber-pot to the drinkers. Arngrimus Jonas ſays this is a falſe and abuſive banter, and is very angry with Bleſkenius for ſcandalizing the maids of Iſeland. The good man cannot bear to ſee his countrymen contemptuouſly treated, and repreſented as barbarians (10).’ If it was ever lawful for an apologiſt to fall into a paſſion, that of Arngrimus cannot be blamed; for it is not probable that the goſpel, which has been for ſo many ages planted in that iſland, could leave a people in ſo great a brutality; nor, in caſe religion had made ſo little progreſs among the Iſelanders, that the king of Denmark would ſuffer them to inſult the laws of public decorum with impunity. The cuſtom of their feaſtings does not ſeem to be fairly related; matters are amplified to make the reader laugh. Was ſuch a piece of ſervice, or ſo extravagant a lazineſs ever heard of? thoſe people not only will not riſe from table to make water, but will not ſo much as move their hands. For this the ſtory leads us to; elſe why is it ſaid *the young*

---

(21) Page 300, of the firſt Dutch edition. It is alſo to be found in the ſecond *Factum*, or Caſe, of Furetiere, pag. 13, of the Dutch edition, as being aſcribed to Mr de la Fontaine.

(22) *See* d'Aubigné, Hiſt. Univerſ. Tom. II, livr. i, cap. v, pag. m. 560.

(*a*) La Peyrere. Relation de l'Iſlande, pag. 55, 56.

(*b*) Id. ibid. pag. 55.

(*c*) Id. pag. 5, & 55.

(*d*) Idem, pag. 55.

(1) It ſhould be *Crymogæa*.

(2) Taken from Albert Bartholinus's treatiſe, *de Script. Danorum*, *pag.* 12.

(3) *Taken from* Mollerus, Hypomn. ad Barthol. de Script. Danorum, pag. 165, 166.

(4) It is the cxxii^d of thoſe which Mr Matthæus, publiſhed at Leyden in 1695. See page 325, of that collection of Letters, and likewiſe pag. 210.

(5) Moller. ubi ſupra, pag. 166.

(6) La Peyrere, Relation de l'Iſlande, pag. 28.

(7) See a ſtory related by Charles Ogier, pag. 433, of his *Iter Polonicum*.

(8) La Peyrere, ubi ſupra, pag. 31.

(9) *See the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, *for February* 1685, pag. 135.

(10) La Peyrere, ubi ſupra, pag. 23, 24.

He died in the year 1649 (*e*). He had been paſtor of the church of Melſtad, and prefect of the neighbouring churches in the dioceſe of Hole (*f*).

(*e*) *See* Mollerus, Hypomn. ad Albert Barthol. de Script. Danor. pag. 164.

(*f*) Id. ibid.

women ſlip under the treſtles. The chamber-pot might eaſily be given to the gueſts without that, if all the buſineſs was to ſave them the trouble of riſing. If what Bleſkenius tells us were true, jealouſy would not be an uſeleſs thing in the world (11).

(11) See the New Letters againſt Maimbourg's Hiſt. of Calviniſ. pag. 542, *& ſeq.*

AN objection drawn from the impudence of ſome nations.

If it were lawful to lye in favour of truth, we muſt deny all that is related of the impudence of ſome nations: for libertines draw a great advantage from there being, they ſay, certain nations, which annex no infamy to the proſtitution of women. This is true of the Iſelanders, according to the narrative of Bleſkenius; nay, they go much farther; for they look upon the big belly of a girl, who proſtitutes herſelf to ſtrangers, as honourable, and fathers look upon themſelves as very happy, when foreigners accept of the offer they make of their daughters maiden-heads. Where then, would they aſk, is that natural impreſſion, which enables all men to diſtinguiſh between right and wrong? there are even Chriſtian nations, which not only diſregard chaſtity in practice, but have even loſt the theory of it: whence it follows, that, in this reſpect, they are not conſcious of what is naturally right. Does not this ſhew, that the ideas of virtue depend upon education and cuſtom, and not upon a natural impreſſion? and how will you cure theſe people, whoſe conſcience is dead? for if it be poſſible, that, with the notions of right and wrong, the conſcience may unhappily be lulled aſleep, muſt not this neceſſarily happen where theſe notions are extinct? it is not neceſſary to reply to this objection, becauſe Arngrimus Jonas denies the fact. To him we muſt refer all thoſe, who would take advantage of his adverſary's narrative. And if they alledge matters of facts, they ſhall then be anſwered.

JORNANDES, originally a Goth, was biſhop of Ravenna about the middle of the VIth century . . . . His hiſtory of the Goths tranſlated into French, was printed at Paris in the year 1703, and dedicated to the king of Sweden (*a*).

(*a*) See the Memoirs of Trevoux, January 1704, art. vi, of the French edition.

JOUBERTUS (LAURENCE) counſellor and phyſician in ordinary to the king, and to the king of Navarre, firſt regent doctor, chancellor, and judge of the univerſity of Montpellier, was born at Valence in Dauphiné, the ſixth of December 1529 (*a*). He was a diſciple of Silvius at Paris, and of Argenterius beyond the Alps (*b*); and he made himſelf famous by the lectures he read at Montpellier, as profeſſor, and much more by the books he publiſhed. The world had ſuch a notion of his capacity, that *Henry* III. being extreamly deſirous to have children, ordered him to come to Paris, ſo much he hoped, that the ſkill of this phyſician would remove all the obſtacles, that rendered his marriage unfruitful (*c*). His hopes were diſapointed. Joubertus died at Lombez [*A*] the twenty-ninth of October 1582. He publiſhed a great number of books [*B*] in Latin and French. That which he intituled *Popular Errors*, raiſed a great cry againſt him, becauſe he ſpoke too freely upon ſeveral nice matters [*C*]. One thing in particular was thought

(*a*) La Croix du Maine, pag. 285.

(*b*) Sammarthan. Elog. pag. m. 75.

(*c*) Eum in aula vidimus à Rege Henrico III, evocatum, cum pius ille Princeps prolis in publicam utilitatem ſuſcipiendæ cupidus, maximam voti ſui ſpem in ejus induſtria nequidquam collocaſſet *Id. ib. pag.* 76.

[*A*] *Joubertus died at Lombez*] This we learn from la Croix du Maine. He adds, that Lombez is ſeven leagues from Toulouſe, and becauſe it is not on the ſide of Languedoc, but on the ſide of Guienne, it is plain Sammarthanus is miſtaken (1), when he ſays, that Joubertus died as he returned from Toulouſe to Montpellier. The town of Lombez is at a great diſtance from that road. Moreri is ſtill more to blame than Sammarthanus, as thus: He ſays, as he had read it in la Croix du Maine, that this Phyſician died at Lombez, and he adds to it what he had read in Sammarthanus, that Joubertus died as he *returned from Toulouſe to Montpellier*. The joining of theſe two things proves him guilty of a Geographical ignorance, which cannot be charged upon Sammarthanus, who ſaid nothing of Lombez. A man runs the hazard of committing many errors, when he mixes the extracts of different writers, without correcting their inconſiſtencies. I do not mention the Chronological blunder that is found in Moreri; it is plainly either an error of the preſs, or a want of attention. You will find in Moreri, that Joubertus was born in 1629; that he made himſelf famous in the XVIth century; that he died in 1682, and that du Verdier Vau-Privas, and la Croix du Maine, ſpeak of him in ſome works (2) they publiſhed in the year 1584, which have never been reprinted.

FAULTS of Moreri.

[*B*] *He publiſhed a great number of books.*] His Latin treatiſes make two volumes in Folio, in the Frankfort editions of 1582, 1599, and 1645. One of the moſt conſiderable, is a collection of paradoxes, againſt which ſeveral Phyſicians (3) have written. He did not fail to reply to them. I obſerve, that his treatiſe of the Pancreas was written in French, though when he publiſhed it, he put it in the title, that John Paul Zangmaiſtre, a gentleman, born at Ausburg, who was Laurence Joubertus's ſcholar, had tranſlated it into French, from *the ſaid Joubertus's Latin* (4).

[*C*] *He ſpoke too freely upon ſeveral nice matters.*] Perhaps the queſtions about virginity, and generation, were never handled in French in ſo plain terms. He ſo much enlivened that ſubject, that he produced three atteſtations made by ſworn matrons, who had been ordered by the judges to ſee whether ſome maids that complained of having been raviſhed, complained wrongfully. The firſt of thoſe atteſtations was made in Bern; the ſecond at Paris, and the third at Carcaſſonne. The firſt declares the complaining damſel to be a virgin; the other two, that ſhe had been deflowered. Jobertus curiouſly compares together the terms the matrons made uſe of. A book was printed in Holland, in 1686, intituled, *Tableau de l'Amour conſideré dans l'état du Marriage. —— The Picture of Love conſidered in the State of Mariage* (5). The author calls himſelf Salocini, a Venetian Phyſician; but it is known that his name is Nicolas Venette, and that he is a Phyſician of Rochelle (6). He produces the like atteſtations, and Furetiere took from him what he ſaid under the word *Pucelage* [*Maidenhead*]. To return to Joubertus, he was was taxed with inventing theſe atteſtations: 'He well confutes this, in an epiſtle to his 'friends, naming him that ſupplied him with thoſe 'of Paris and Bern. As for that of Carcaſſone, I know 'that he had it from one that was principal ſecretary 'to Mareſchal Dampville, who often recited it for diverveſion. Mr Joubert has much ado to underſtand 'the terms theſe midwives uſe, in order to apply them 'to the differnt parts of the member which diſtinguiſhes the ſex. For he does not find there ſo many 'parts as the matrons do. In the public anatomies we 'ſhew ſixteen or ſeventeen of them; which I ſhall 'name as they occur to me, *&c.* (7).' La Croix du Maine obſerves, 'that ſome ſay, that Joubertus ſpoke 'too freely, and alledged ſome paſſages too obſcene in 'ſome of his works, particularly in his learned books 'of popular errors; but if he has uſed, *ſays he*, ſome 'terms too ticklish for nice ears, he was forced 'to do it, if he meant to be underſtood, and make 'his books profitable to his reader.' Scævola Sammarthanus is in the right to ſay, that this did the author an injury (8). Joubertus himſelf was aware of it; for he laid that work aſide, and as to what was already publiſhed, he endeavoured to anſwer ſome complaints. He was blamed for dedicating his book 'to 'the queen of Navarre, a moſt virtuous, generous (9) 'princeſs, a true mirrour and pattern of honour, ſince 'he was to treat at the beginning of his book of obſcene

(1) In Elog. pag. m. 76.

(2) *Intituled*, Bibliotheque Françoiſe.

(3) Thomas Jourdain, Franç. Valleriola, Bruno Seidelius.

(4) *See* La Croix du Maine, pag. 255.

(5) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Oct. 1686, pag. 1221. *It has been tranſlated into Dutch. See the* Boekzaal *for the month of Auguſt*, 1695.

(6) *The* Journal des Sçavans, May 13, 1686, pag. m. 188, *makes mention of him.*

(7) B. Cabrol, Apolegetical Epiſtle, prefixed to the ſecond part of Lawrence Joubert's Vulgar Errors.

(8) Futurus tamen cautior, ſi contentus iis, quæ in uſum eruditorum ſermone Latino componebat, à ſcriptionibus Gallicis abſtinere maluiſſet. Naturam enim pro conceſſa Medicis facultate liberius evolvens, temere ſe in plebis imperitæ cenſuram atque riſum objecit. *Sammarth. ubi ſupra, pag.* 76.

(9) She was not a novice in thoſe matters, if d'Aubigné's ſatires may be credited.

thought ſtrange, that he dedicated this book to the queen of Navarre, the wiſe of Henry IV. But all this buſtle was ſo far from hindring the ſale of the book, that it very much contributed to make it ſell the better [*D*].

This work was to contain ſix parts [*E*], each of them divided into five books; but he publiſhed only the firſt, and part of the ſecond. I will mention a particular, which ſhews that Joubertus was modeſt [*F*], and that he very well knew the bounds of human knowledge.

I have ſaid, after la Croix du Maine, that he was born the ſixth of December 1529; but I muſt add, that we read round his print, that he was in his fortieth year in 1570, which proves, that he was born 1530. Rondelet, whoſe favourite diſciple he was, and whom he ſucceeded, in the year 1567, as Regius Profeſſor of Phyſic at Montpellier, truſted his manuſcripts with him on his death-bead, and deſired him to reviſe, correct, and publiſh them (*d*). Joubertus carried this place of Regius Profeſſor, after having maintained a diſpute for four days on ſeveral theſes, which have been printed with ſome others of his tracts at Lyons in 1571. There are among theſe tracts ſome remarks which clear up ſome paſſages of his paradoxes [*G*]. He innovated in the French orthography [*H*].

‘ ſcene matters, writing of conception, generation, big bellies, and child-bearing (10).’ He anſwered that complaint in the ſecond edition; for beſides the excuſes which he and Lewis Bertravan alledged, ‘ he changed the dedication, and preſented the whole proceſs to Mr de Pibrac, chancellor of the ſaid lady, to pick out ſuch things as her majeſty might know, and judge of without any ſcruple; the ſaid Mr de Pibrac reſerving the reſt to himſelf, as being more ſuitable to his condition (11).’ There was another complaint made againſt him. ‘ All this, *ſaid ſome* (12), would have been better in Latin than in French; ſuch diſcourſes not ſounding ſo ill in a dead, as in a vulgar tongue: beſides women and maids who are moſt aſhamed of it, would have known nothing of it.’ Cabrol anſwers what follows (13), ‘ the Sieur Joubert has ſufficiently anſwered this in his epiſtle to his friends, wherein he ſhews, that the chaſteſt women in the world, may read it, and will learn nothing but virtuous things from it, and their conjugal duty; and their husbands too. As for maids, they cannot underſtand what is ſaid in it concerning the works of the fleſh, if they be maids in body and ſoul, as one may ſay. But to ſatisfy every body he has ſince left out whatever might give offence to the moſt ſcrupulous conſciences; as knowing, we are not only to abſtain from evil, but alſo from the appearance of it.’ All theſe reaſons are not good; and ſome of them pitiful.

[*D*] *The buſtle they made about this book . . . . contributed to make it ſell the better.*] I ſhall cite Joubertus's apologiſt. ‘ The treatiſe of Vulgar Errors, *ſays he*, (14), has been printed in four ſeveral places in half a year, namely, at Bourdeaux, Paris, Lyons, and Avignon; and the leaſt impreſſion in every place was 1600 copies. This book has had ſo great a reputation, that being at firſt but ten or twelve pence price, it was afterwards ſold for a crown, and even for four livres: juſt as in times of ſcarcity (a ſort of famine) the price of corn riſes every day. Nay, the Bookſellers and Printers are importuned for the reſt of the work; and the author is daily deſired to publiſh the reſt of it; at leaſt five books at a time (if he will not do it all at once) according to the diviſion he made of it, beſides what he promiſes. But he is ſo diſguſted, and full of reſentment, upon the aforeſaid cenſures, being a man of great ſpirit, and extreamly jealous of his honour, that he has often thought, as I know very well, to burn all that he has done of it. What a loſs it would be!’

[*E*] *This work was to contain ſix parts.*] When he publiſhed the firſt, he added a table, containing the diviſion of the whole work, and the titles of the chapters in every book. But becauſe it was not he, who put the ſecond part to the preſs, it does not agree with the plan he had publiſhed. It is not divided into five books; and the twenty five chapters it contains, do not correſpond with thoſe of the plan, either as to the number or the ſubject; you will ſee the reaſon of it in theſe words of Cabrol. ‘ He could not as yet be prevailed upon to condeſcend to the publiſhing of the other parts; which he keeps ſo cloſe, that there is no ſeeing or reading of them. Now, ſeeing his reſolution (not to ſay obſtinacy) I went about to print ſome chapters, which I formerly had of him, having done me the favour to explain to me ſome propoſitions, upon which I deſired his explanation and advice. They are not many, but moſt of the chapters are very long, and contain ſeveral heads, ſo that ſhould we divide them into particulars, they would ſcarce be leſs than thirty. Mr Joubert made the firſt draught of them, long before he publiſhed the firſt part of his Vulgar Errors: they are certain ſubjects, which have ſince been diſpoſed by their author in the diviſion of the whole work, both general and particular, to ſerve, one for the ſeventh book, another for the eleventh, ſeventeenth, twentieth, twenty third, twenty fifth, twenty ſixth, and ſo on to the thirtieth. I have not troubled myſelf much about their order, ſince we can have nothing elſe at preſent from the author, as he had promiſed (15).’ The ſame Cabrol ſays (16), that while he cauſed this to be printed, *as it were by ſtealth*, he was ſurprized at the Printer's by Mr Joubert, *who took my enterprize*, adds he, *very heinouſly*. ‘ Neverthele ſs, when he underſtood, that I deſigned to preſent you with it, he . . . . permitted . . . . . the Bookſeller to go on, giving him beſides two fine diſcourſes tranſlated from his Latin paradoxes, by Iſaac Joubert, his eldeſt ſon.’ Note, that Gaſper Bachot, Counſellor and Phyſician to the king, publiſhed, in 1626, a book which he had written long before, to finiſh Lawrence Joubertus's deſign as to the third part of his Vulgar Errors (17). He kept to the chapters of the books, according to the order he found them in, in the table added to the firſt part; but *he modelled them his own way, without ſwearing in verba Magiſtri* (18). This book of Gaſper Bachot, is intituled *Erreurs Populaires touchant la Medicine, & regime de Santé*. This author is not to be found in *Lindenius Renovatus*.

[*F*] *I will mention a particular which ſhews, that Joubertus was a modeſt man.*] Gaſpar Bachot, whom I mentioned in the foregoing remark, was made doctor of Phyſic in 1592 (19). He gloried to have maintained his theſis againſt all opponents, and he looked upon his *Doctorſhip* as *the trophy of his victory*. *But as ſoon as I read your anſwer* (he writes this to Mr de Lorme, Phyſician in ordinary to Lewis XIII, and firſt Phyſician to the queen-mother (20), *in which you acquainted me, that the late Mr Joubert, your colleague and friend, uſed to ſay of himſelf* ter Doctor, nunquam futurus doctus; *who being learned, and having obtained that laurel in three different univerſities, whilſt he was admired by every body, could not ſatisfy himſelf. I began from that time to have ſuch a diſtruſt of myſelf, that I thought all my former labour uſeleſs, without hoping to grow learned, ſince ſo great a perſon, like another Socrates, confeſſed his inſufficiency, or the fear of his not being able to arrive to the end of his wiſhes.* Note, that he ſays, that Mr Joubert *had learned his profeſſion in Montbriſon* (21), *and in the adjacent country, and lived there* when his Decades were dedicated *to Papon, a renowned Civilian, the glory of that town* (22).

[*G*] *There are . . . . . ſome remarks, which clear up ſome paſſages of his paradoxes.*] He had maintained in his ſecond paradox, that it is poſſible a man may live a long time without eating and drinking. This propoſition gave offence, as inſinuating, that Moſes, Elias, and JESUS CHRIST, faſted forty days without any miracle. He anſwered properly to this objection; for his anſwer was approved by John de la Place, miniſter of Montpellier. This miniſter's approbation did not appear in the French tranſlation of this piece of Joubertus; but we find it in the Latin edition of his

---

(*d*) See the epiſtle dedicatory of Joubert's *Queſtion. Medic.*, page 104, of the third part of his *Opuſcula*, and a letter of Poſthius, *ibid pag.* 154.

(10) Cabrol, ubi ſupra.

(11) Id. ibid.

(12) Id. ibid.

(13) Id. ibid.

(14) Id. ibid.

(15) Cabrol, ubi ſupra

(16) In the epiſtle dedicatory to Mr de Villeroy.

(17) At Lyons, for Bartholomew Vincent, in 8vo.

(18) See Bachot's preface.

(19) See his letter to Mr de Lorme, prefixed to the book concerning Vulgar Errors.

(20) Ibid.

(21) A town of the country called Forez.

(22) That is, of Montbriſon.

his *Opuſcula*, publiſhed at Lyons, in 1570 (23). This confirms what is ſaid in another place (24), that Joubertus was a Proteſtant.

It muſt be obſerved, that in explaining what gave offence, he had regard only to good ſouls, who, thro' a delicacy of conſcience, and too little acquaintance with Philoſophy, were eaſily alarmed. But as to thoſe, who, through malice, diſcovered poiſon in his works, he left them to the hardneſs of their hearts. ‘ Hujus enarrationis, *ſays he* (25), vel ſolo argumento vel demonſtrationibus commoveri poſſe hominum duo genera, facile præſentio. Unum eſt naturalis Philoſophiæ & Medicinæ imperitum, ſimplicitatis & pietatis nomine venerandum: qualis plebecula & quicunque in æſtimandis rerum cauſis ſtudium non adhibent. Alterum *διαϐολικὸν*, quod etiam quæ bene dicta eſſe novit, impudentiſſimis calumniis inſectatur. Hoc, quia explicationem non expectat, & quæcunque impura ſua mente excipiuntur depravat, ſuoque veneno inficit, me nihil moratur. Alteri verò benignè & candidè ſatisfaciendum puto.’ He had been very ſenſibly affected with the accuſations of theſe perſons, ſince he wiſhes, that GOD would give him the patience and ſerenity, which are neceſſary, when one is expoſed to the rage of their ſlanders. His words diſcover a heart full of reſentment, and dart thunder at his cenſurers. Thus he concludes. ‘ Hæc διαϐόλȣς κακοδαίμονας ab iſtius enarrationis prophanatione avertant, quibus eſt peculiare etiam ſacram paginam corrumpere, & in alienum peſſimumque ſenſum detorquere, impudentiſſime mentiri, & maledicere, animorum concordiam diſſolvere, inimicitias colere, invidiam crepare, & nunquam non quibus nocere queant modos excogitare, piiſque omnibus eſſe infeſtiſſimos. DEUS miſericors parcat hominibus quicunque ab ejuſmodi furiis agitati, earumque veneno afflati & infecti, ſimilem naturam induunt & referunt: quoſque ab iſtis nequiſſime tractari patitur, patientia (quæ omnia vincit) & manſuetudine bene muniat. Amen (26). —— *Let this ſtop theſe ſlanderers from prophaning that narrative, whoſe buſineſs it is to corrupt the ſacred page, and pervert it to another, and that the worſt ſenſe, to lie moſt impudently, and calumniate, to break friendſhips, foment enmities, invent all methods to do miſchief, and to purſue with hatred all good men. May GOD of his mercy ſpare ſuch men as, acted by the ſame madneſs, and infected by their poiſon, imitate their nature: and may he fortify with patience (which ſurmounts all difficulties) and with mildneſs, thoſe whom he ſuffers to be miſuſed by them. Amen.*’

[*H*] *He innovated in the French orthography.*] For he wrote *jantil*, *accion*, *parfet*, *æmer*, inſtead of *gentil*, *action*, *parfait*, *aimer*. He likewiſe made a difference between the *v* conſonant and the *u* vowel, and would have *the conſonant* (27) *written differently from the other* (28).

JOVIAN, emperor of Rome, came to this dignity by the choice of the army in the year 363, after the death of Julian the apoſtate. He was more conſiderable for the merit of count Varronian, his father, than for his own (*a*); for he was as yet very young, and ſerved ſtill in the companies of the life-guards [*A*]. Moſt things relating to him, being in Moreri's Dictionary, I ſhall only mention two particulars which are not there. The firſt is, that Jovian concluded a peace ſo ſhameful and diſadvantageous to the Roman empire, that he expoſed himſelf to the murmurs and banters of the public [*B*]. The ſecond

[*A*] *He ſerved ſtill in the companies of the life-guards.*] In ſaying this, I have chiefly in view theſe words of Eutropius: ‘ Poſt hunc (*Julianum*) Jovianus, qui tunc DOMESTICUS MILITABAT, ad obtinendum imperium conſenſu exercitus electus eſt, commendatione patris quàm ſua militibus notior (1). —— *After this (Julian) Jovian then in the troops of the houſhold, was elected to the empire by the conſent of the army, procured rather by what the ſoldiers knew of his father than himſelf.*’ But it muſt be obſerved that the expreſſions of this author, are not preciſe enough, aud that they ought to be rectified by thoſe of another hiſtorian, which more expreſsly ſhew the degree to which Jovian was arrived. ‘ Jovianus eligitur Imperator Domeſticorum ordinis primus paternis meritis mediocriter commendabilis (2). —— *Jovian is elected emperor out of the houſhould troops, a perſon moderately eſteemed on account of his father' merit.*’ As military employments have not at preſent the ſame order, or the ſame diſpoſition, as in that, age, it would be difficult to find a word that ſignifies exactly what is meant by *domeſticorum ordinis primus*, or *primicerius domeſticorum* (3); but we may very well preſume that thoſe words do not ſignify, that Jovian was the chief, or captain, of the guards called *domeſtici*, for the true name of their captain was *Comes Domeſticorum* (4). It is ſaid in Moreri's Dictionary, that Jovian was *captain of the Pretorian guards*, when he refuſed to abjure Chriſtianity under Julian the apoſtate. This is taken from Socrates the hiſtorian, who making uſe of the word χιλίαρχος (5), does not authorize Moreri's phraſe. Obſerve that Theodoret affirms (6) that Jovian had no employment in the army when he was made emperor. Ammianus Marcellinus, who ſays the contrary, is more to be credited, for he was upon the ſpot.

[*B*] *Jovian concluded a peace ſo ſhameful and diſadvantageous . . . . that he expoſed himſelf . . . . to the murmurs and banters of the public.*] He gave up to the Perſians five provinces, with ſome places that were a ſtrong rampart to the Roman empire. Amongſt others, the important town of Niſibis, and that of Singara (7); and with difficulty he obtained liberty for the inhabitants to retire into the Roman territories (8). He obliged himſelf not to give any aſſiſtance to the king of Armenia, who had conſtantly been a good and faithful friend of the emperor's. This was, ſay the hiſtorians, a ſort of impiety, and the ruin of this faithful friend, and the loſs of Armenia. ‘ Quibus exitiale aliud acceſſit & impium, ne poſt hæc ita compoſita, Arſaci poſcenti contra Perſas ferretur auxilium, amico nobis ſemper & fido . . . Unde poſtea contigit, ut vivus caperetur idem Arſaces, & Armeniæ maximum latus Medis conterminans, & Artaxata inter diſſenſiones & turbamenta raperent Parthi (9). —— *To which was added a condition equally fatal and impious, to wit, that after this peace no aſſiſtance ſhould be given to Arſaces againſt the Perſians, though he was our old and faithful ally . . . . Hence it fell out that Arſaces was afterwards taken alive, and a great part of Armenia bordering on Media, together with Artaxata, in the midſt of theſe diſſenſions and diſturbances, were ſeized upon by the Parthians.*’ Nothing can be more moving than the deſcription of the condition the inhabitants of Niſibis found themſelves in, when they ſaw they were forced to remove to another place (10). Their intreaties to Jovian not to force them to leave their country, were enough to break ones heart; and yet he had no regard to them, alledging the engagement of his word, and the fear of perjury: but it was believed he did not aſſign the true cauſe of his fear. ‘ Et hæc quidem ſuppliciter ordo & populus precabatur; ſed verbis loquebantur incaſſum, Imperatore, ut fingebat alia metuens, perjurii piacula declinante (11).’ It was thought he only kept his word, becauſe he feared that if he ſtaid in that country, and ſhould have any new quarrels with the Perſians, he ſhould have a competitor for the empire. They were perhaps in the right to ſay this; but at the bottom the Roman hiſtorians are much to blame for complaining of his punctual execution of the treaty of peace. Here is a paſſage of Eutropius, who cenſures him for it, and makes his great fault to conſiſt in that; for otherwiſe he owns that Jovian was obliged by a ſort of neceſſity, to conſent to thoſe ignominious conditions, which were never before impoſed on the Roman people. ‘ Jam turbatis rebus, exercitu, quoque inopia laborante uno à Perſis atque altero prælio victus (*Jovianus*) pacem cum Sapore neceſſariam quidem, ſed ignobilem fecit, mulctatus finibus, ac nonnulla imperii Romani parte tradita: quod ante eum annis mille centum & duobus de-viginti fere, ex quo Romanum imperium conditum erat, nunquam accidit. Quinetiam legiones noſtræ ita & apud Caudium per Pontium Teleſinum, ita & in Hiſpania apud Numantiam, & in Numidia ſub jugum miſſæ ſunt, ut

‘ nihil

---

(23) At Page 139, Part II.

(24) In remark [*A*] of the article VIRETUS.

(25) Jouberti, Opuſcul. Parte II, pag. 136.

(26) Jouberti Opuſcula, pag. 156, 157.

(27) Compare the News from the Republic of Letters, July 1704, art. viii.

(28) Taken from Sorel, at page 114, of the Perfection of Man.

(*a*) Suidas, in Ἰοβιανῷ. *See alſo Eutropius's words in the remark* [*A*].

(1) Eutropius, lib x, pag. m. 123.

(2) Amm. Marcellin. lib. xxv, cap. v, pag. m. 430.

(3) Hieron. in Chron. *uſes theſe words.*

(4) Vide Valeſium, in Amm. Marcell. lib. xiv, cap. x.

(5) Socrat. Hiſt. lib. iii, cap. xxii.

(6) Theod. Hiſt. lib. iv, cap. i.

(7) Vide Valeſium in Amm. Marcellin. lib. xxv, cap. ix, pag. 439.

(8) Amm. Marcell. ibid. cap. vii.

(9) Id. ibid. pag. 434.

(10) *See* Marcell. ibid. cap ix.

(11) Id. ibid. *See alſo the Alexandrian Chronicle.*

ſecond is, that he did not approve the uſing of violence for the extirpation of ſects

‘ nihil tamen finium traderetur. Ea pacis conditio non ‘ penitus reprehendenda foret, ſi fœderis neceſſitatem, ‘ cum integrum fuit, mutare voluiſſet: ſicut à Romanis omnibus his bellis, quæ commemoravi, factum ‘ eſt. Nam & Samnitibus, & Numantinis, & Numidis confeſtim bella illata ſunt: neque pax rata fuit ‘ (12). ——— *All things being in confuſion, the army ‘ in want of proviſions, and himſelf twice defeated by ‘ the Perſians, he at laſt made a peace with Sapor, ‘ neceſſary indeed, but ignoble, the frontiers being ſtraitened, and a part of the Roman empire lopped off, ‘ which in the ſpace of* 1118 *years, that is, from the foundation thereof, to his time, had never happened, for although our legions paſſed under the yoke by the command of Pontius Teleſinus, and in Spain at Numantia, ‘ and again in Numidia, yet was never any part of the ‘ Roman territory given up. However, even this condition of peace would not have been altogether blameable, if when he had it in his power he had remedied ‘ it, as the Romans did on each of the occaſions before ‘ mentioned. For againſt the Samnites, Numantians, and ‘ Numidians, the war was ſtill carried on, and no ignominious treaty ever ratified.*’ You ſee that he is cenſured for not having imitated the antient Romans, who without any delay attacked the nations, which had obliged them to accept of a ſhameful capitulation, but had never made them loſe an inch of ground. And ſince he was cenſured, though he reigned but ſeven or eight months, for not repairing the diſgrace and loſs this peace brought along with it, it is plain they would have had him break theſe articles a few days after they were concluded, and as ſoon as his army was ſupplied with proviſions, and in a place of ſafety: but were not theſe politics manifeſtly unjuſt? Suppoſe that after a very prejudicial peace which neceſſity has extorted, it may be lawful to ſeek an occaſion of relief; muſt one not let ſome time paſs and wait for pretences and conjectures which time never fails to ſupply? You ſee that even according to the corrupt maxims of politics, Jovian would have been guilty of a horrible treachery, if he had done what the hiſtorians blame him for having omitted. The three examples alledged by Eutropius are not like this. The ſenate and the people might lawfully break the agreement of their generals; but Jovian who concluded the peace, knew no ſuperior, he was ſole maſter. Note, that what went moſt to the heart of the true Romans, was the yielding of a country which did belong to the empire; for they pretended, that the like had never been ſeen before; and it was ſo little conſiſtent with their maxims to ſuffer their ſtates to leſſen, that they allowed the honour of a triumph only to thoſe who extended their frontiers: it was refuſed to ſome generals who had done great actions, but without any other fruit, than recovering what had been loſt before. Read the deſcription of this Roman grandeur in theſe words of Marcellinus. ‘ Illud tamen ad medullas uſque bonorum pervenit: ‘ quòd dum extimeſcit æmulum poteſtatis, dumque in ‘ animo per Gallias & Illyricum verſat, quoſdam ſæpe ‘ ſublimiora cœptaſſe, famam adventus ſui prævenire ‘ feſtinans, indignum imperio facinus amictu perjurii ‘ fugiendi commiſit, Niſibi prodita: quæ jam inde à ‘ Mithridatici regni temporibus, ne Oriens à Perſis occuparetur, viribus reſtitit maximis. Nunquam enim ‘ ab Urbis ortu inveniri poteſt annalibus replicatis, ut arbitror, terrarum pars ulla noſtrarum ab Imperatore ‘ vel Conſule hoſti conceſſa: ſed ne ob recepta quidem quæ direpta ſunt, verùm ob amplificata regna ‘ triumphalis gloria fuiſſe delata. Unde P. Scipioni ob ‘ recuperatas Hiſpanias, Fulvio Capuâ poſt diuturna ‘ certamina ſuperatâ, & Opimio poſt diverſos exitus ‘ præliorum, Fregellanis tunc internecivis hoſtibus ad ‘ deditionem compulſis, triumphi ſunt denegati. Id ‘ etiam memoriæ nos veteres docent, in extremis caſibus icta cum dedecore fœdera, poſtquàm partes verbis juravere conceptis, repetitione bellorum illico diſſoluta: ut temporibus priſcis apud Furcas Caudinas ‘ ſub jugum legionibus miſſis in Samnio, & per Albinum in Numidia ſceleſtè pace cogitata, & auctore turpiter pactionis feſtinatæ Mancino dedito Numantinis ‘ (13). ——— *That act pierced all good men to the very ‘ heart, that while he dreaded a rival in power, he ‘ paſſing through the Gauls and Illyricum, meditating ‘ what greater things others had done, endeavouring ‘ to prevent by his coming the fame of his approach, he, ‘ under colour of avoiding perjury, did what was unworthy of the empire, in delivering up Niſibis, which, ‘ from the time of Mithridates's reign, that the Perſians might never enjoy the eaſtern parts, had been obſtinately defended. Nor is it to be found in the Annals from the very building of Rome (as I apprehend) ‘ that any part of our dominions hath been yielded to ‘ the enemy, by either general or conſul; nay, triumphal honours were reſtrained, and not allowed for the ‘ recovering provinces, but for adding to the territories ‘ of the commonwealth. On this account P. Scipio for ‘ regaining Spain, Fulvius after the reduction of Capua, ‘ which ſuſtained a long ſiege, and Opimius after ſeven ‘ battles, compelling the Fregellani, our invetgrate enemies, to ſurrender, were all of them denied triumphs. ‘ It has alſo been tranſmitted to us from our anceſtors, ‘ that in caſes where ignoble terms were ſubmitted to, ‘ after the parties had confirmed the covenant with ‘ oaths, they were however thought to be diſſolved by ‘ an immediate carrying on of the war, as in old time ‘ after the legions at Samnium, were compelled to paſs ‘ under the Fork, and Albinus in Numidia made a moſt ‘ ſcandalous peace, and Mancinus, author of an ignominious treaty with the Numantines, was delivered up to ‘ that people.*’ Obſerve that the remark [*D*] muſt be conſidered as a conſequence of this; for I there examine whether Eutropius and Ammianus Marcellinus had reaſon to affirm what they ſay.

How people are commonly affected, with reſpect to war and treaties of peace.

If we reflect never ſo little upon the temper of nations, and eſpecially on the condition that Chriſtians and Heathens were then in, we ſhall eaſily believe that the emperor Jovian became odious and contemptible, and the ſubject of many ſatires. The people fear and hate war; they love and deſire peace, and with good reaſon; for they ſuffer the greateſt inconveniencies of the war; nevertheleſs they are afflicted at a treaty of peace, that diſgraces the nation, and deprives it of a frontier, that was a ſafe barrier to it, and made it formidable to it's neighbours. Victories and conqueſts rejoice the meaneſt peaſants, and make them more patiently bear the burden of the war. Taxes and impoſts are moſt eaſily forgotten when the war is attended with good ſucceſs, and with an advantageous peace. Every one has a ſhare in the glory of the nation; but the thought that the enemies will grow haughty, contemptuous, and inſulting upon their terminating the war by a peace wholly to their mind, overwhelms them with grief and indignation. Muſt ſo many charges and expences, ſay they, go for nothing? *&c.* See above (14) the murmurs of the French againſt the peace of Cateau. Never were people in a better capacity to ſhew the like indignation than under the empire of Jovian. There was great emulation betwixt the Chriſtians and the Heathens. The latter had juſt loſt an emperor whom they loved, and from whom they expected mighty things; they flattered themſelves with the hopes, that his expedition againſt the Perſians would be advantageous and glorious, and they ſaw that death having deprived him of theſe fine triumphs, he was ſucceeded by a Chriſtian prince, under whom things were reduced to a miſerable condition. To murmur againſt ſuch a prince, to cenſure and ſatirize him, was to gratify many paſſions at once; it was heightening Julian's glory, and making the Chriſtians aſhamed; it was ſacrificing to the idol of political vanity, and to their zeal for religion. They failed not to act according to theſe ſeveral principles: they made verſes and parodies to abuſe Jovian (15). The libellers of Antioch diſtinguiſhed themſelves; they diſperſed their libels againſt him in the ſtreets, and poſted up others; they turned him into ridicule, by applying to him ſome places of the Iliads, and amongſt others that of the third book (16), where Paris is ſo roughly treated by his brother Hector; and that of the ſecond book (17), where Ulyſſes threatens Therſites to ſtrip him naked, and ignominouſly to drive him away.

Εἰ μὴ ἐγώ σε λαϐὼν, ἀπὸ μὲν φίλα εἵματα
  δύσω
Χλαῖναντ', ἠδὲ χιτῶνα, τά τ' αἰδῶ ἀμφικαλύπτει
Αὐτὸν δὲ κλαίοντα θοὰς ἐπὶ Πέρσας ἀφήσω.

Niſi

---

(12) Eutropius, ubi ſupra.

(13) Amm. Marcellin. lib. xxv, cap. ix, pag. 439, 440.

(14) *In the remarks* [*C*], [*G*], *and* [*H*] *of the article* HENRY II. *See also the remark* [*P*], *of the article* HENRY IV.

(15) Suidas, in Ἰοβιανῷ.

(16) Ver. 39.

(17) Ver. 261.

ſects [*C*]. Some authors ſay, that before him the Romans never gave up any part of the empire by a treaty of peace [*D*]. Others maintain, that they who ſpeak thus are miſtaken. I will examine this in a remark, and will alſo produce what the fathers of the church have

Niſi ego te captum, & caris veſtibus exuam,
Lænaque & tunica & *veſtibus* quæ pudenda circumtegunt,
Ipſum vero *te* plorantem celeriter ad Perſas remittam (18).

Thee will I ſeize, and of thy robes diſpoil,
Thy gown, thy tunic, even the needſul veſt
Which modeſty requires, and naked then
I'll laſh thee howling to the Perſians back.

An old woman, who ſaw him well made and handſome, and heard that he had no genius and no ſenſe (19), cried out, his folly is as great as his ſtature (20). Suidas, who tells us all theſe things, had ſaid before, that this emperor knew nothing; that he had no education, and that he loſt by his lazy negligence what nature had given him. Ἀμελέτητος δὲ ὢν, καὶ ἄγευστος παιδεύσεως, καὶ ἣν εἶχε φύσιν διὰ ῥαθυμίαν ἠμαύρου καὶ ἠφάνιζεν. *Sed incultus & doctrinæ prorſus expers*; quam ne guſtarat quidem. *Quinetiam quod habebat ingenium, id per ignaviam obſcurabat, & delebat* (21). Eutropius and Ammianus Marcellinus ſpeak not after this manner. *Vir alias neque iners neque imprudens* (22). ſays one. We ſhall ſee the words of the other at the beginning of the remark [*E*].

[*C*] *He did not approve the uſing of violence for the extripation of ſects.*] The Philoſopher Themiſtius gives him an encomium which does not agree with the acccounts we find in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. He praiſes him for permitting all men to ſerve GOD in their way, and fixing by that means the inconſtancy of thoſe flatterers, who had changed their religion, juſt as the imperial purple had changed hands whom he compares to the Euripus (23). Θαυμάζει τὸν βασιλέα, ὡς τὸ ἐφεῖναι θρησκεύειν ὡς ἕκαστοι βούλονται, νικήσαντα τῶν κολάκων τοὺς τρόπους· οὓς καὶ διασύρων πάνυ γελοίως ἔφη, ἐλέγχεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἀλουργίδα, οὐ Θεὸν θεραπεύοντας· μηδὲν τε διαφέρειν αὐτοὺς Εὐρίπου, νῦν μὲν ἐπὶ τάδε· νῦν δὲ εἰς τοὐναντίον τὰ ῥεύματα μεταβάλλοντος. *Imperatorem magnis effert laudibus, ob id quod conceſſa cuique libera facultate colendi numinis prout vellet, adulatorum mores compreſſerit. Quos quidem facete perſtringens, ait experimento cognitum eſſe, illos non Deum ſed purpuram colere: planeque ſimiles eſſe Euripo, qui modo in hanc, modo in illam partem fertur* (24). Themiſtius ſpoke in this manner in his oration upon Jovian's conſulſhip. Which ſignifies, that the emperor did not forbid the Heathens to worſhip their Gods in their old way; and yet we learn from Socrates the hiſtorian (25), that all the temples of the Heathens were ſhut up, and that theſe idolaters concealed themſelves, ſome in one place, and ſome in another; that the Philoſophers left off their habit, and that the ſacrifices, which had been ſo frequent in Julian's time, ceaſed. It muſt be ſaid then, that Themiſtius uſed an hyperbole, that was only grounded upon Jovian's moderation to Heretics, and which perhaps was a crafty inſinuation to tolerate all religions in the ſame manner. That which is certain, is, that this prince ſeeing himſelf courted by all the Chriſtian ſects, every one deſiring to gain him, declared for the orthodox party, as to the conſubſtantiality of the word (26), but he did not give way to the requeſt of expelling from their churches ſuch as were of another opinion (27), and he anſwered that he hated diſputes, and that he loved and eſteemed the lovers of peace and concord. He deſigned by his gentleneſs and mildneſs to extinguiſh all the ſchiſms of the church; for which reaſon he gave out, that he would perſecute no body, and that he would love and honour eſpecially ſuch, as expreſſed the greateſt zeal for the re-eſtabliſhment of peace. Ὁ μέντοι βασιλεὺς πρόθεσιν εἶχε, κολακείᾳ καὶ πειθοῖ τῶν διεστώτων τὴν φιλονεικίαν ἐκκόψαι, φήσας μηδενὶ ὀχληρὸς τῶν ὁπωσοῦν πιστευόντων ἔσεσθαι· ἀγαπήσειν δὲ καὶ ὑπερτιμήσειν τοὺς ἀρχὴν τῇ ἑνώσει τῆς ἐκκλησίας παρέξοντας. *Cæterum Imperator id ſibi propoſuerat, ut diſſidentium jurgia blanditiis & leni verborum perſuaſione extingueret, ajebatque ſe nemini omnino qualiſcunque fidei eſſet moleſtiam exhibiturum: eos tamen præ cæteris amaturum atque in pretio habiturum, qui reparandæ in Eccleſia pacis auctores ac duces ſe præberent* (28). I muſt obſerve that he made a ſevere law againſt thoſe who ſhould endeavour to marry the Nuns, or behave themſelves immodeſtly to them; for he ordered them to be puniſhed with death (29). He was induced to this ſeverity that he might ſuppreſs the audaciouſneſs that was uſed in Julian's reign, in marrying the Nuns, and employing ſometimes force, and ſometimes perſuaſions to corrupt them (30).

[*D*] *Some authors ſay that before him the Romans never gave up any part of the empire by a treaty of peace.*] The paſſages of Eutropius and Ammianus Marcellinus before alledged (31), are a manifeſt proof that this was the common diſcourſe. Caſaubon (32) pretends that they who ſpoke thus, ſaid a thing that was not true: he grounds himſelf upon the emperor Hadrian's abandoning three provinces (33), and Diocleſian's ſtreightening the bounds of the empire. 'Diocletianus .... Auguſti preceptum, Hadrianique 'exemplum ſecutus, imperii, fines à meridie ſupra Ægyptum arctavit, auctor Procopius in Perſicis. Idem Imperator reliquit & Daciam à Trajano conſtitutam, ſublato exercitu & provincialibus; *deſperans 'eam poſſe retineri*, Vopiſcus ait. —— *Diocleſian ... 'following the direction of Auguſtus, and the example of Adrian, ſettled Egypt as the ſouth boundary 'of his empire, as Procopius informs us in his Perſian hiſtory. The ſame emperor, as Vopiſcus ſays, abandoned Dacia, tho' ſettled by Trajan, removing the 'army and the provincial officers, becauſe he* deſpaired of keeping it.' But Valeſius (34) ſhews a great difference betwixt what theſe emperors and Jovian did. The latter gave up ſome provinces by a treaty of peace, and as it were by way of ranſom; the others voluntarily abandoned a country, the keeping of which was too chargeable. This was to follow the maxims of prudence, and not like Jovian to ſubmit to the laws of the conqueror. And therefore there was no reaſon for cenſuring Marcellinus's words, as Caſaubon, Lindenbrogius (35) and Coqueus (36) have done; and it is certain that Jovian introduced a novelty. It is generally agreed that it was a ſcandalous thing (37): the Chriſtians and Heathens did not diſpute on that point; but only differed with relation to this emperor's juſtification. The Chriſtians endeavoured to clear him, and the Heathens to condemn him. We have ſeen above (38), that a Heathen hiſtorian cenſures him, not for conſenting to the the treaty of peace, but for obſerving the conditions of it. This is an unjuſt, and abominable cenſure. If neceſſity obliged him to make a peace, as this author and all others acknowledge, he ought to be excuſed; for neceſſity has no law.

Neceſſitas, cujus curſus tranſverſi impetum
Voluerunt multi effugere, pauci potuerunt (39).

With rapid tide neceſſity rolls on,
And tho' all fly, yet few it's rage can ſhun.

And when once he is juſtified upon this point, the reſt goes off of itſelf. The exact obſervation of a treaty of peace ſolemnly ſworn, deſerves not to be condemned. Ammianus Marcellinus is a more dangerous cenſurer than Eutropius; he was an eye-witneſs, and relates things in ſuch a manner, as to give to underſtand (40) that Jovian unneceſſarily engaged himſelf in that neceſſity, and that the confuſion the Perſians had reduced him to, was not ſo great, but that it had been better to have tried the fortune of the war, than to accept thoſe ignominious conditions. He accuſes him of downright cowardice, and of lending an ear to the flatterers who diſcouraged him. 'Et cùm pugnari decies 'expediret, ne horum quidquam dederetur: adulatorum globus inſtabat timido Principi, Procopii metuendum ſubſerens nomen, eumque adfirmans, niſi 'rediret, cognito Juliani interitu, cum intacto milite 'quem regebat, novas res nullo renitente facilè moliturum. Hac pernicioſa verborum ille aſſiduitate nimia ſuccenſus, ſine cunctatione tradidit omnia quæ

---

(18) Id. ibid.

(19) Id. ibid.

(20) Ὅσον μῆκος, καὶ βάθος ἡ μωρία. Quanta longitudo & profunditas eſt hujus corporis, tanta etiam eſt ejus ſtultitia. *Id. ib.*

(21) Id. ibid.

(22) Eutrop. lib. x, ſub fin.

(23) *See the* Penſées deverſes ſur les Cometes, pag. 244.

(24) Socrates, Hiſt Eccleſ. lib. iii, cap. xxv, pag. m 205.

(25) Id. ibid. cap. xxiv.

(26) Id. ibid. & cap. xxv.

(27) Id. ibid. cap. xxv.

(28) Id. ibid. pag. 204, 205.

(29) Sozomen. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. lib. vi, cap. iii.

(30) Id. ibid.

(31) *In the remark* [*B*].

(32) Caſaubon. Not. ad Spartian. vit. Adriani, cap. v, pag. m. 47.

(33) *See, above, remark* [*G*], *of the article* HADRIAN (PUBLIUS ÆLIUS.)

(34) Valeſ. in Amm. Marcell. lib. xxv, cap. ix, pag. m. 439, 440.

(35) Lindenbr. in Ammian. Marcell. ibid.

(36) Leonardus Coqueus in Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. iv, cap. xxix.

(37) Poſt ... pudendæ pacis icta fœdera. *Amm. Marcell. lib. xxvii, cap. xii. See alſo* Agathias, lib. iv. Socrates, lib. iii, cap. xxii. Zonaras, &c.

(38) *In the remark* [*B*], *citat.* (12).

(39) Laberius, apud Macrobium Saturn. lib ii, cap. vii. *See alſo the words of Horace, above, citation* (11) *of the article of the third duke of* GUISE.

(40) Amm. Marcell. lib. xxv, cap. vii, pag. 433.

have ſaid concerning that peace of Jovian (*b*). I add, that he was a very tall man, zealous for orthodoxy, but very much addicted to wine and women [*E*]. Thoſe are rather to be believed, who ſay he wanted neither activity nor prudence and knowledge, than

‘ petebantur (41). —— *And when it was more eligible to have ſought ten battles than to have made ſuch conceſſions, a crowd of flatterers deluded the timorous prince, whiſpering that the very name of Procopius was to be feared, and warmly affirming that he knowing of the death of Julian, unleſs the emperor returned with his whole army, might eaſily, and without reſiſtance change the face of affairs: overcome with the pernicious aſſiduity of theſe counſellors, he, without conſideration, gave up every thing that was demanded.*’ Agathias (42) charges him plainly with the ſame weakneſs. The Chriſtians, to excuſe Jovian, carefully obſerved, that Julian the Apoſtate was the principal cauſe of all this misfortune, ſince his raſhneſs was ſo great, as to burn all the veſſels that ſhould have ſerved to tranſport the proviſions; for hence proceeded that horrible ſcarcity, which obliged Jovian to a ſhameful capitulation (43). ‘ Cujus vanis deditus oraculis erat (*Julianus*), quando fretus ſecuritate victoriæ naves quibus victus neceſſarius portabatur, incendit. Deinde fervidè inſtans immodicis auſibus & mox merito temeritatis occiſus, in locis hoſtilibus egenum reliquit exercitum, ut aliter inde non poſſet evadi, niſi contra illud auſpicium Dei Termini, de quo ſuperiore libro diximus, Romani imperii termini moverentur. Ceſſit enim Terminus deus neceſſitati, qui non ceſſerat Jovi (44). —— *To which vain oracles he* (i. e. Julian) *was addicted, when, as if ſecure of victory, he burnt the ſhips with all their proviſions on board. Afterwards advancing with immoderate boldneſs, and having by his timerity merited that death which he received, he left his army in want of all things in countries poſſeſſed by the enemy, from whence it was impoſſible for them to eſcape; if, contrary to the command of the god Terminus mentioned in the former book, the limits of the Roman empire had not been changed. Thus the god Terminus yielded to neceſſity, who had not yielded to Jove.*’ You ſee in theſe words of St Auguſtin all the fault laid upon Julian, and moreover a jeſt upon the Heathen religion, in that the immobility of the god Terminus had proved falſe upon that occaſion (45). The Pagans might have ſaid, that it was no wonder that this deity had not acted in favour of Jovian, as being a rebel againſt the gods of Rome; but that ſubterſuge might eaſily have been refuted: for it would ſtill be true, that it was a fallacious promiſe, which the Romans pretended the god Terminus had made, that the boundaries of the empire ſhould never be leſſened. Now this is what St Auſtin deſigned to prove againſt the Heathens.

Note, by the by, how prudent the conduct of the antient Romans was: they deſigned to make conqueſts; and there is nothing more neceſſary for ſuch a deſign, than not to reſtore by a peace, what was gained by the war: for in vain you take towns and provinces, you will never be the greater for it, if you are obliged to reſtore them by the articles of peace. The Romans to ſucceed in the project of forming a vaſt empire, ſpurred their generals by motives of glory, and ſcruples of religion, to gain new countries, and not to loſe the conqueſts they had once made. They never granted a triumph to ſuch as did no more than recover what the enemy had taken (46), and they gave out, that it was violating the religion of the god Terminus, and his ſacred auſpices (47) to yield up the frontiers of the empire. The Turks propoſing to make vaſt conqueſts, and to lay the foundation of a great empire, have more particularly brought in religion into that deſign; for they ſaid that it did not permit them to reſtore a a town wherein there was a moſque, to it's firſt poſſeſſors. For which reaſon they made great haſte to build a moſque in their new conqueſts. This was to engage themſelves to keep them in making peace, and to oblige the governours of a town *to defend themſelves by a principle of conſcience, with extraordinary obſtinacy* (48). But they have lately experienced the uſeleſſneſs of this nice policy. The treaty of Carlowitz, concluded in the year 1698, has expoſed them to the ſame raillery that St Auguſtin made uſe of againſt the Roman god Terminus, who gave way to neceſſity under Jovian the emperor. The Sultan has been obliged to yield up a great number of places with moſques in them, to the Chriſtian princes. In vain it was repreſented to him that this was offending againſt the maxims of his religion; there was a neceſſity for doing it, and of two evils, the leaſt was to be choſen.

[*E*] *He was a very tall man, zealous for orthodoxy, but very much addicted to wine and women.*] See him here drawn by a Pagan hiſtorian (49). ‘ Incedebat motu corporis gravi, vultu lætiſſimo, oculis cæſiis, vaſta proceritate & ardua, adeo ut diu nullum indumentum regium ad menſuram ejus aptum inveniretur. Et æmulari malebat Conſtantium, agens ſeria quædam aliquoties poſt meridiem: jocarique palam cum proximis adſuetus. Chriſtianæ legis idem ſtudioſus, & nonnunquam honorificus, mediocriter eruditus, magiſque benivolus, & perpenſiùs, ut apparebat ex paucis quos promoverat, judices electurus: edax tamen, & vino Venerique indulgens: quæ vitia imperiali verecundia forſitan correxiſſet. —— *He walked with becoming gravity, his countenance was very pleaſant, his eyes grey, his ſtature large, inſomuch that it was ſome time before a royal robe could be found fit for him to wear. He ſeemed to imitate Conſtantius in talking of ſerious things, in the afternoon, diſcourſing however ſometimes very pleaſantly, even in public to thoſe about him; ſtrongly attached to the Chriſtian religion, in many things worthy of honour, moderately learned, but very benevolent, and choſe the judges with great care, as appeared by the few he promoted; a great eater however, and ſomewhat addicted both to wine and women, which vices, notwithſtanding, he might have corrected, and put on a modeſty worthy of his dignity.*’ Zonarus, who was a Chriſtian and a monk, took from Ammianus Marcellinus the greateſt part of this character, ſpeaking of that emperor. Ὁ μὲν Ἰοβιανὸς, ſays he, εὐσεβὴς ἦν περὶ δόγμα καὶ ἀγαθοθελής. οἴνου δ' ἥττητο καὶ ἀφροδισίων. καὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἀναδρομὴν εὐμήκης, καὶ γραμμάτων οὐκ ἄπειρος. Jovianus quidem religioſus fuit erga Chriſtianam fidem, & benevolus. Vino tamen, Venerique indulgens. Procerus ſtatura, nec litterarum expers. —— *Jovian was indeed ſtrongly addicted to the ſupport of the Chriſtian faith, and of a benevolent diſpoſition. Prone both to wine, and women. Of a large ſtature, and not ignorant of letters.* Here then you ſee an emperor very religious as to his opinions, but a great drunkard, and a whoremonger. He gave two ſtrong proofs of his zeal for the goſpel, before he aſcended the throne; for in the firſt place, he ſhewed himſelf very ready to renounce his poſt, rather than his religion (50), when Julian commanded the officers of his troops to embrace Paganiſm, or to reſign their employments. In the ſecond place he would not accept of the empire, till having declared that he was a Chriſtian, and that he would not command Heathens, the ſoldiers had declared that they were Chriſtians (51). He had then the reſolution of renouncing for the love of God, not only a ſmall employment, but alſo the greateſt dignity that was then in the world. He was capable of preferring his religion before the Roman empire; but his conſcience, which was ſo nice in this reſpect, could not move him to leave off drinking and women. He could quit for his religion all other things but thoſe two. What an odd thing is this! what a combination of good and evil in the ſame man! There are in all ages many who leave their country for their religion, their eſtates, their employments, and their friends and relations, who yet cannot bring themſelves to renounce Venus and Bacchus. Never believe that Jovian's orthodoxy was imperfect; but he perſuaded that he very well knew, that drunkenneſs and lewdneſs are forbidden by God, and that the ſame religion which condemned the Heathen idolatry, condemned drunkenneſs and the diſorderly love of women. Note, that he was as great an eater as he was a drinker; and it has even been ſaid, that he died of eating too much. *Multi exanimatum opinantur nimia cruditate: inter cœnandum enim epulis indulſerat* (52). Other reaſons of his death were alledged (53), *viz.* the vapour of a chamber over-heated, poiſon (54), *&c.* But this which follows was alledged by the Chriſtians themſelves: Ἐτελεύτησεν, ἢ ἀφειδέστερον, ὥς τινες λέγουσι, δειπνήσας, ἢ ὑπὸ τῆς ὀδμῆς τοῦ οἰκήματος. *Obiit*

(*b*) *See the remark* [*D*].

(41) Id. ibid. pag. 434.

(42) Agathias, lib. iv.

(43) *See the ſecond Oration of Gregory Nazianzen againſt Julian the Apoſtate. See alſo Socrates,* lib. iii cap. xxii, pag. 196.

(44) Auguſt de Civitat. Dei, lib. v, cap. xxi, pag. m. 554. *See alſo* lib. iv, cap. xxix.

(45) *See Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, lib. iii, cap. xcii.*

(46) *See the remark* [*B*], *citat.* (13).

(47) *See St Auguſtin*, de Civit. Dei, lib. iv, cap. xxix.

(48) Ricaut, Preſent State of the Ottoman Empire, lib. ii, cap. iii, pag. m. 320.

(49) Amm. Marcell. lib. xxv, ſub fin. pag. m. 443.

(50) Socrat. lib. iii, cap. xxii.

(51) Id. ibid.

(52) Eutropius, ubi ſupra. *See alſo* Ammian. Marcellin. ubi ſupra, pag. 443.

(53) Alii odore cubiculi, quod ex recenti tectorio calcis, grave quieſcentibus erat: quidam nimietate prunarum, quas gravi frigore adoleri multas juſſerat. *Id. Eutrop. ibid. See alſo* Ammian. Marcellin. ibid.

(54) *See* Valeſ. in Amm. Marcellin. ibid.

than ſuch as make him effeminate, very ignorant, and ſtupid (c); for he ſhewed his vigilance in preventing the tumults and competitions, which he feared the news of his election might raiſe in the weſtern provinces of the empire (d). The meaſures he took for it were well concerted, though he could not hinder the true news of the ill condition of the eaſt from coming before the falſe news he ordered to be ſpread every where, to conceal the advantages obtained by the Perſians [F]. His father, who had left the ſervice in order to live quietly in his houſe (e), had not time to riſe to the dignity which was deſigned for him; he died before Jovian had executed his reſolution of making him his colleague in the conſulſhip (f). This dignity was conferred on a child (g), *viz. Varronianus* the ſon of Jovian and of Charis the daughter of *Lucilianus* (h). Jovian's reign was very ſhort; for it laſted but eight months.

(c) *See the remark* [B], *towards the end.*

(d) *See* Ammianus Marcellin lib. xxv, cap. viii.

(e) Ammian. Marcellin. lib. xxv, cap. v.

(f) *See* Valeſius, in Marcell. lib. xxv, cap. ult.

(g) Ammian. Marcellin. ibid. cap. x.

(h) Id. ibid. cap. viii, pag. m. 436.

Obiit ſive quod intemperantius, ut quidam ajunt, cœnaverat, ſeu præ odore cubiculi (55). Have you obſerved Marcellinus's conjecture? He ſays, that Jovian would perhaps have corrected, by the conſideration of his imperial dignity, his intemperance and lewdneſs. This is a judicious thought, tho' conſidering things in general, and according to experience, the ſovereign power does not ſeem to be a good ſchool of ſobriety and continence for ſuch as naturally love ſenſual pleaſures: on the contrary, it ſeems much more proper to increaſe the diſeaſe than to cure it, the means of ſatisfying ones pleaſures, being greater and more numerous. But if it be true, that exceſs in eating was the cauſe of the death of Jovian, and if what we read in Suidas be not fabulous, Marcellinus's conjecture is very doubtful. Suidas (56) relates, that Jovian, at the inſtigation of his wife, cauſed a very fine temple to be burnt, which Hadrian had conſecrated to Trajan, and the library which the emperor Julian had ſet up in it. He adds that Jovian's concubines ſet fire to it, and laughed at it. This action is very much like the debauchery of Alexander (57) and Thais the courtezan.

[F] *He could not hinder the true news . . . . . from coming before the falſe news he ordered to be ſpread every where, to conceal the advantages obtained by the Perſians*] It is one of the moſt neceſſary artifices of policy to deceive the people with falſe relations, when there is no good news to tell them (58). It is a difficult thing, I confeſs, to ſtop the courſe of bad news, when it is but too true; but one muſt do what can be done, and Jovian did not forget that ſtratagem. 'Juſſum eſt autem ad implenda hæc perrectu'ris, extollere ſeriem geſtorum in melius, & rumores 'quaquà irent verbis diffundere, concinentibus pro'cinctum Parthicum exitu proſpero terminatum . . . . '(59). Hos tabellarios ſama prægrediens, index triſti'orum caſuum velociſſima, per Provincias volitabat & 'gentes; maximéque omnium Niſibenos acerbo dolo're perculſit, cùm urbem Sapori deditam comperiſ'ſent (60). ——— *It was but fit that thou who were 'concerned to bring theſe things about, ſhould endeavour 'to give a better turn to the ſtory of theſe tranſactions, 'and by diſperſing artful rumors through the pro'vinces, encourage the people to believe that affairs 'with the Parthians had been terminated with ſuc'ceſs . . . . But fame, the quickeſt meſſenger of ill 'news, ſoon got the ſtart of theſe carriers, and flew 'with them throughout the whole empire: the Niſi'benians were of all others ſtruck with the ſharpeſt 'grief, when they underſtood that their city was to 'be delivered up to Sapor.*' Theſe words of Marcellinus are remarkable, *fama index triſtiorum caſuum velociſſima*; They inſinuate that fame never flies ſo ſwift, as when it has unlucky news to bring; and therefore it deſerves with greater reaſon to be characterized as it has been.

Fama, malum quo non aliud velocius ullum:
Mobilitate viget, vireſque acquirit eundo (61).

Fame, the great ill, from ſmall beginnings grows.
Swift from the firſt; and every moment brings
New vigour to her flights, new pinions to her wings.

DRYDEN.

(55) Sozomen. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib vi, cap. vi.

(56) Suidas, ubi ſupra.

(57) *When he ſet fire to the city of Perſepolis.* See Quintus Curtius, lib. v, cap. vii.

(58) *See the remark* [B], *of the Diſſertation concerning Libels at the end of this Dictionary.*

(59) Ammian. Marcellin. ubi ſupra, cap. viii, pag. 436.

(60) Id. ibid. pag. 437.

(61) Virgil. Æneid. lib. iv, ver. 174.

JOVIUS (PAUL) was born at Como in Italy, in 1483, got a great reputation by his writings, and the biſhopric of Nocera (a); but he was looked upon as a mercenary writer; ſo that no great credit is given to his hiſtories [A]. It is ſaid, that he was not

(a) *Pope Clement VII gave it him.*

[A] *No great credit is given to his hiſtories.*] James Gohorri made no ſcruple to ſay, that the adventures of Amadis de Gaul, may appear as true as the hiſtories of Paul Jovius. 'Illud certe ad ſempiternam memo'riam teſtatum reliquit Gorræus Pariſienſis, qui quas 'finxit (1) Amadiſi fabulas non minus veras ac proba'biles quam Jovii ſcripta fore confidit (2). —— *Go'borri, a Pariſian, has left it as a thing certain to 'poſterity, that the fables framed by him concerning 'Amadis, had in them as much truth and probability, 'as was contained in Jovius's hiſtorical writings.*' Thuanus has not made uſe of that hyperbole, but he ſays enough to let us know the eſteem that writer was in. 'Cum alioqui homo gratioſus ſe paſſim obnoxium 'prodat, eoque nomine ipſi in pleriſque rebus fides 'derogetur, quod ad gratiam & in odium ſcripſiſſe, '& venalem calamum habuiſſe fere omnibus perſua'ſum ſit (3). —— *When a man, otherwiſe in good eſteem, 'lays himſelf open in many particulars, and falſifies 'almoſt every fact he relates, it is no wonder if moſt 'people are perſuaded that he wrote out of paſſion and 'prejudice, and with a venal pen.*' To which you may add the following paſſage of Voſſius, who ſays that Paul Jovius had in ſome manner ſet up a bank: he promiſed an antient genealogy, and an immortal glory, to all the ſcoundrels that paid him well for his pains, and he traduced all others who would not pay him for his lies. *Quam fluxæ etiam fidei patrum ævo fuit Paullus Jovius? quem conſtat in aula Henrici ſecundi quibuſque terræ filiis bene de ſe merentibus generis claritatem ac perpetuum nomen pollicitum: contraque maledice eos traduxiſſe qui venali hiſtorico morem non gererent* (4). We ſhall ſee in the following remark, from whence this is taken. He had offered his pen to Don John III, king of Portugal; and becauſe his offers were not accepted, he paſſed over in ſilence a victory of the Portugueſe. Had he had a good ſalary for writing the hiſtory of Portugal, he would have forged imaginary victories, ſo far would he have been from ſuppreſſing the true one. He has been therefore juſtly cried down. The hiſtorian of Emanuel's life ſays thus. 'Victoria fuit præclara: quam tamen Pauſſus Jovius cum 'de Sultani claſſe hac in Indiam contra Luſitanos de'lata narraret, ſilentio ſuppreſſit, iratus videlicet, quod 'cum Luſitanæ hiſtoriæ ſcribendæ munus Joanni, hujus 'nominis tertio, Luſitaniæ regi venale proponeret, rex 'optimus non illum muneribus Indicis ad res Luſita'norum virtute geſtas monimentis illuſtrandas invita'vit (5). ——— *This was a very famous victory, which 'however Paulus Jovius, writing of the great fleet of 'the Sultan's, ſent into India againſt the Portugueſe, 'paſſes over in ſilence, being angry that when he had 'made an offer to John III, king of Portugal, of 'hiring out his pen to celebrate the glory of his peo'ple, that great prince neglected, by Indian preſents, 'to retain him for that purpoſe.*' He has had the fate of all liars; he is hardly believed when he ſpeaks truth. The worſt of all is, that his lies have been more profitable to him, than the love of truth has been to ſincere hiſtorians. This complaint of Bodin is very well grounded. 'Non quod multa non ſint verè & elegan'ter ab eo ſcripta: ſed hunc mendacii fructum tulit, 'ut etiam cùm vera ſcribit, ſuſpectus habeatur. Hoc 'tamen acerbius eſt ac indignius, quòd cum hiſtoriam 'venalem proſtituiſſet, uberiores tulit mendacii fructus, 'quàm quis alius vera ſcribendo (6). ——— *Not but 'that there are many things truly and elegantly deſcribed 'in his writings, but then he reaps this fruit from his 'lying*

(1) *Bodin does not expreſs himſelf well: Gohorri was only the tranſlator of Amadis.*

(2) Bodinus, in Methodo Hiſtor. cap. iv, pag. m. 71.

(3) Thuan. lib. xi, ſub fin. pag. m. 235.

(4) Voſſius de Arte Hiſtor. cap. ix, pag. 48.

(5) Oſorius de Rebus Emmanuëlis, lib. vi, fol. m. 179.

(6) Bodin, ubi ſupra, pag. 73.

not much aſhamed to own it [*B*], and that he ingenuouſly confeſſed that he praiſed or blamed people according as his favour was cultivated or neglected. No Man did ever aſk for preſents with leſs reſerve than he [C]. You will find in Moreri what Thuanus relates concerning this author's ſpite againſt Anne de Montmorenci. Brantome ſpeaks of it more at large [*D*]. It is ſaid, that Paul Jovius complained of having loſt ſome books of his hiſtory in the ſacking of Rome, only becauſe he did not find it his intereſt to publiſh them. He was not accounted a man of good morals [*E*], and was charged with being

lying, that he is ſuſpected even when he tells truth. Yet what is ſtill more bitter and unworthy, though he proſtituted his pen in writing hiſtory, yet he got more by telling lies, than another man would have done by relating the bare truth' This man was not in a capacity to write a good hiſtory, for when he could ſay the truth, he had no mind to it, and when he had a mind to it, he could not; he had no good memoirs, except for the tranſactions in Italy. This is what Bodin ſays, becauſe Paul Jovius had not travelled, nor been preſent at the events, but had attended the court of the Popes for thirty ſeven years. ‘ Cum rumoribus fidem habuerit, nec conſilia principum nec conciones, nec epiſtolas, nec res geſtas, nec ulla publica monumenta viderit: ſic tamen ſcribit quaſi rebus interfuiſſet, nec ullum dubitationi locum relinquit. Quæ igitur veriſſime ſcribere potuit, noluit; puta res in Italia geſtas: quæ voluit, non potuit; ſcilicet externa (7).— *As he gave credit to flying ſtories, and had no acquaintance either with the councils of princes, ſpeeches, epiſtles, public tranſactions, or records, he yet writes as if he had perfectly known all things, and leaves no room for doubt. What he could have written truly, he would not, I mean the affairs of Italy: what he would, he could not; that is, things done abroad.*' This to me ſeems no impediment to his collecting good memoirs about other countries. Beſides, Paul Jovius boaſts of the ſieges and battles he has ſeen, &c. (8). See, in the remark [*F*], another paſſage of Bodin, and the judgment of Juſtus Lipſius upon our author, whom he taxes with an extream partiality (§ α).

[(§ α) James Gohorry has tranſlated into French the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth books of Amadis, if his work may be called a tranſlation *, for he has added ſo many things to the original, that he may be as much accounted the author of theſe books, as the tranſlator. To this the words of Bodin allude. REM. CRIT.]

[*B*] *They ſay he was not much aſhamed to own it.*] Bodin affirms, that Paul Jovius being asked, why he told ſo many lies, and ſuppreſſed true events? anſwered, that he did it in favour of his friends; that he knew well enough, that the preſent age would give no credit to his hiſtories, but that poſterity would not doubt of what he ſaid. *Cum autem rogaretur cur ſimularet falſa, vera diſſimularet, amicorum gratia id à ſe factum reſpondit; ac tametſi ſuperſtites intelligeret ſuis ſcriptis fidem derogaturos, attamen intelligebat infinitæ poſteritati credibilia fore quæ ſibi ſuiſque popularibus laudem eſſent allatura* (9). Some will have it that he made anſwer: ‘ A hundred years hence there will remain no proof to convict me of falſhood: and therefore what ſhall be read in my hiſtory, will be neceſſarily looked upon as true. *Anzi mi vien detto, che eſſendo biaſimato il Giovio della infedeltà della ſua hiſtoria, egli la confeſſò, ſoggiungendo però, che ſi riconfortava, ſapendo, che dopò lo ſpatio di cento anni, non vi ſarà più alcuna memoria in contrario; onde veranno i poſteri neceſſariamente à dare indubitata fede à ſuoi ſcritti* (10).' Some ſay (11) he bragged that he had a pen of gold, and another of iron, one for the princes who were bountiful to him, and the other againſt thoſe princes from whom he received nothing. It is ſaid alſo, that he confeſſed, that the reaſon why he ſuppreſſed the three books, where he ſpoke of Antony de Leva, was becauſe that famous general made him no preſent, and that he reſolved an ungrateful man ſhould have no place in his work. *Quis neſcit quanta fuerit virtus Antonii Levæ Hiſpani ducis, ut ſolus dici, aut cum paucis Imperator appellari noſtri temporis poſſit: tamen nequiſſimus hiſtoricus* (12), *ſeu potius fabulator, quod pecunias non dediſſet, maluit totam corrumpere hiſtoriam, treſque libros qui illi debebantur intermittere, ne (ut ajebat) ingratum inſereret hiſtoriæ* (13). It is ſaid, that at the court of Henry II he promiſed an illuſtrious genealogy to any one that would pay him for it, and threatned to ſlander all thoſe that ſhould croſs him in his deſign of getting money. *Paulus Jovius, me puero, in aula Henrici ſecundi obſcuriſſimo cuique claritatem generis mercede pollicebatur, maledicentia ulturus qui ejus nundinationi adverſaretur* (14). For my part, I can ſcarce believe, that he confeſſed the things I have been relating. I find he boldly declares, that he printed his book in the life-time of the perſons concerned, becauſe he does not fear to be convicted of any falſhood, which he could not avoid, if he was not a faithful hiſtorian (15).

[*C*] *No man did ever ask for preſents with leſs reſerve than he.*] ‘ His begging trade (16) puts me in mind of that of Paul Jovius, who craved ſtill more openly and more meanly than he. I have read ſome letters of his, which are admirable in that kind. In ſome of which he proteſts, that if the cardinal de Lorrain did not pay him his penſion, he will ſay that he is no longer of the race of Godfrey, who gave the archbiſhopric of Tyre to a pedant. In others, he begs two horſes of the Marquis of Peſcara, and deſires him for that effect to ſtrike the ground more ſtoutly than Neptune did. In others, he deſires a lady to ſend ſome ſweet-meats from Naples, becauſe he begins to be weary of eating new laid eggs, &c. (17).'

[*D*] *Thuanus relates the ſpite of Paul Jovius againſt Anne de Montmorenci. Brantome ſpeaks of it more at large.*] Though Brantome's paſſage be ſomewhat long, I will give it intire. ‘ I have heard a great man ſay, that he had ſeen in the firſt Latin impreſſion of Paul Jovius (I know not how true it is) a little touch, wherein it is ſaid, that at the very ſame time the Grand Seignior, Sultan Soliman, put to death his great favourite Ibrahim Baſha; the king of France put out of his favour his great favourite, the conſtable de Montmorenci: but why, *ſays he*, did not he put him to death; as the other did Ibrahim, or Hibraun Baſha? It was not, *ſaid he*, but that he had as well deſerved it: (and hereupon he ſpecified ſome impertinences, that are not worth mentioning, and which are falſe) but becauſe this great king was good and merciful, and the other was a cruel tyrant. I do not know whether that Latin edition, has this; but this gentleman affirmed it to me. This is not in the French verſion, and no credit is to be given to it; for the ſaid Paul Jovius ſpoke it, if he did ſpeak it, as a paſſionate man, and diſſatisfied with the Conſtable, who, when he was recalled by king Henry, and went about to regulate the king's houſhold, as it was his office, found among the penſioners of the late king, a conſtant penſion of five hundred crowns, given to the ſaid Paul Jovius, which he immediately ſtruck out, giving the king to underſtand, that it was money ill employed, he being more in the Emperor's intereſt than in the French, and a great liar. The ſaid Paul underſtanding that his penſion was cut off, fell a babbling againſt the Conſtable, and railing bitterly againſt him. This it is to have to do with a virulent tongue and pen, which, when provoked, ſpare nothing. Some ſay that the Conſtable, in the time of his diſgrace, had read this, which this ſpark had written rather to pleaſe the king, than for any reaſon, as generally ſuch writers are flatterers, and time-ſervers for their belly's ſake; and that therefore, when the Conſtable was recalled, he paid him off, and had done worſe, if he could have done it; for it is a great trouble for a valiant and noble man, like him, to be thus abuſed, and expoſed by a writer, without any reaſon (81).' Some ſay, that Jovius's ſpite proceeded only from his not obtaining ſome things which he impudently asked of the Conſtable. *Quod quidem expertus eſt Annas Mommorantius Comes Stabuli Franciæ traductus à venali hiſtorico, non aliam ob rem quam quod neſcio quid impudenter petens, repulſam tuliſſet* (19). I ſhall obſerve by the bye, that Francis I. had no reaſon to repent the penſion he gave Paul Jovius; for he appeared in the writings of his penſioner more like a conqueror than a conquered prince. It is ſaid, that Charles V made that complaint (20).

[*E*] *He was not accounted a man of good morals.*] Cardan taxes him with leudneſs. ‘ Hic noſter hiſtoricus, being very remiſs in reciting his breviary. His ſtyle was bright, but not hiſtorical or correct enough [*F*]. His inſincerity is not the only fault he is cenſured for in his hiſtories (*b*), which of all his works is that he has taken moſt pains in [*G*]. It cannot be denied

---

(7) Id ibid.

(8) *See the epiſtle dedicatory of his hiſtory.*

* *See the epiſtle dedicatory of his tranſlation of the thirteenth book.*

(9) Bodin, ubi ſupra, pag. 73.

(10) Stefano Guazzo della Civil Converſatione, lib. ii, pag. m. 242.

(11) Teiſſier, Addit. to the Elog. Tom. I, pag. 67.

(12) Paul. Jovius.

(13) Cardanus in Apolog. Neronis.

(14) Joſeph Scaliger, Epiſt. de Vetuſt. Gentis Scaligeræ, pag. 3. *Voſſius, without doubt, took from thence what he ſays above, citation* (4).

(15) Abſoluto tandem opere id in publicum edere non dubitem, magno hercle incorruptæ veritatis argumento: quandoquidem plerique eorum, qui hæc bello paceque geſſerunt, adhuc vivant, ac idcirco gravi exiſtimationis meæ cum periculo mentientem refellere poſſint. *Jovius, Præfat. Hiſtoriæ ad Coſmum Medicen.*

(16) That is of a man, whom Balzac calls John James. He means the ſame perſon, who made Mr Peireſc's Funeral Oration at Rome.

(17) Balzac's ninth letter to Chapelain, book iii, pag. m. 114.

(18) Brantome, Elog. de François I, *in the firſt Tome of his* Memoirs, pag. 228.

(19) Joſeph Scaliger, ubi ſupra.

(20) Cum aliquando Cæſar noſter legeret victoriam quam de Gallis habuerat, dixit profecto non meam, ſed Gallorum Regis victoriam hic ſcripſit, indicans, ex pecuniis acceptis à Rege quanta mendacia inſeruiſſet Hiſtoriæ. *Cardanus. in Apologia Neronis.*

‘cus, *ſays he* (21), admirandus profecto magis aliis (22) qui tametſi ſenex, parum abſuit, quin pepererit *. Sed & id deteſtabilius, quod cum eſſet etiam Antiſtes, gaudebat numerari (23) procos adoleſcentulos. —— *Our hiſtorian was certainly to be admired more than the others, who, though he was old, wanted little of bringing forth. And what is yet more deteſtable, when he was even riſen to the rank of a prelate, he delighted in being reckoned among briſk ſuitors.*’ Cardan's marginal note has ſomething very ſtrange in it, which is, that Paul Jovius was * an Hermaphrodite. Imperialis (24) owns that this author was accuſed of leading a licentious life, and of being very negligent in his prayers, and in repeating his Breviary.

[*F*] *His ſtile was bright, but not hiſtorical or correct enough.*] Scaliger ſpeaks thus of it. Paulus Jovius ‘mendaciſſimus & Guicciardino inferior, nimis affectato & luxuriante ſtylo, potius quam caſtigato utens (25). —— *Paulus Jovius, a flagrant liar, and inferior to Guicciardine, uſing an affected and luxuriant rather than a pure ſtile.*’ Roland Mareſius ſpeaks of it with the utmoſt contempt, and even ſays it is full of barbariſms. ‘Quantum ſentio, *ſays he* (26), non bonus eſt hiſtoriæ ſcriptor (*Paulus Jovius*) nec judicio ſatis valet: qui ſi vernaculè ſcripſiſſet, nullo in numero haberetur. Latinus enim ſermo quaſi fucus quidam labes illius multas contegit: qui prima ſpecie elegans videtur, nam belle ſonat, & quibuſdam imponit, mihi non item. Vix enim Latinus eſt, certè minime purus, totuſque idiotiſmis ſcatet; nihil fere proprie effert, ſed plerumque ϖεριφραστικῶς loquitur, nec pene ulla vox eſt ſine epitheto. —— *For my part, I take him to be no good writer of hiſtory, and of a very indifferent judgment, who, if he had wrote in his own language, would not have been at all regarded, for the Latin tongue, like a kind of varniſh, covers a great many of his faults, in as much as at firſt ſight it ſeems elegant, becauſe it ſounds well, which impoſes upon many, but not upon me. For after all it is ſcarce Latin, far from being pure, every where abounding with idiotiſms; hardly any thing properly expreſſed, too much circumlocution every where, and ſcarce a word without an epithet tacked to it.*’ They are two very competent judges, and therefore it is ſomewhat ſtrange that Lipſius ſhould ſpeak ſo much in praiſe of Jovius's ſtile. Muſt we not conclude from it, that the taſte of the beſt critics is not uniform upon a ſubject, about which there ought to be no different opinions? Thoſe who know the rules of eloquence, and of the art of hiſtory, ought to agree, either in praiſing or condemning the ſtile of a writer. But let us ſee what character Lipſius gives of Paul Jovius (27). ‘Paulus Jovius multorum judicia magis acerba quam libera experitur. Acriter valde in virum eunt. Ego de eo ſic cenſeo, ſtilo bonum gravemque eſſe & plane ad hiſtoriam: judicio ac fide ambiguum. Ubi affectus non diſtrahunt, rectum, ubi illi adſunt, obnoxium. Ad gratiam ſcilicet ſe dat & auram. Laudationum nec cauſſam ſæpe habet, nec modum. Genti ſuæ, Vaſtio, Medicæis nimis ex profeſſo addictus. His quidem ita ut Laurentium Medicen parricidii reum velut apud judices agat. Orationibus quoque aut frigidus interdum, aut ineptus. Laudandus tamen legenduſque ob multiplicem & variam rerum ſeriem, quas redegit compoſite & dilucide in unum hiſtoriæ corpus (28). —— *Paul Jovius has met rather with ſevere than free cenſures from many. They are generally too angry with the man. My judgment of him is this, his ſtile is good, ſolemn, and fit for hiſtory: his judgment and his credit doubtful. Where his paſſions do not draw him aſide, he writes truth, where they intermix, he is not to be defended, for he gave himſelf up to acquire favour and applauſe. His panegyrics have very often, neither juſtice, nor meaſure. To his own nation, and to Gaſton de Medicis, too much, and too profeſſedly addicted. This appears clearly from his defending Laurence de Medicis, though a parricide, as if before the judges. His orations are frequently cold, or little to the purpoſe. However, he is to be commended and read for the ſake of that multiplicity of matters which he has reduced into a regular ſeries, and digeſted neatly, and clearly into a hiſtory.*’ Lipſius's obſervation concerning the cold and impertinent harangues that Paul Jovius has inſerted in his hiſtory, puts me in mind of Bodin, who laughs at him for making ſoldiers ſpeak like ſcholars declaiming in the ſchools: ‘Præſertim in concionibus, epiſtolis, fœderibus, decretis quæ Jovius pro arbitratu fingit, in quo tamen decorum ita confudit, ut imperiti milites ipſius Alciati ſui laudatoris judicio, declamatores ſcholaſtici eſſe videantur (29). —— *In ſpeeches, epiſtles, leagues, decrees eſpecially, which Jovius feigns at pleaſure, he ſhows ſo little regard to decorum, that even ignorant ſoldiers, in the opinion of Alciatus, his panegyriſt, declaim like ſcholars.*’ I am perſuaded that my readers will be pleaſed to ſee here Alciatus's own words, which Bodin goes upon. ‘Id à te præcipue deſiderabam, ut ad illud quod Græci ϖρέπον vocant, non abſurdè reſponderes. Sicuti in ea oratione animadvertebam, quæ à Marconio gregario milite, ad legiones jam planè conſternatas & ad ſeditionem ſpectantes habebantur, quum Solymano Pannoniæ finibus excedente, Carolus Cæſar Vienna profectus in Italiam rediret. In ea ſiquidem concione omnes artis nervos numeroſque ita expreſſiſti, ut ille Marconius nequaquam ab aratro Volaterrani agri ad ſigna vocatus, ſed ex ſchola Ciceronis & Hermogenis ad ſuggeſtum raptus eſſe videatur, quum paſſim exactæ eloquentiæ ſchemata interniteant, quæ peroranti turbam parêre coëgerint (30). —— *This eſpecially I would put you in mind of that you offend not againſt what the Greeks call* Decorum, *as I obſerved to you in regard to that ſpeech which you have put into the mouth of Marconius, a common ſoldier, and addreſſed to his fellows when the legions were about to mutiny on Sultan Solyman's paſſing the boundaries of Pannonia, when the emperor Charles leaving Vienna returned to Italy. For in that harangue all the art, ſtrength, and harmony of Rhetoric, are ſo expreſſed, that this Marconius, inſtead of ſeeming to have been taken from the plow at Volaterra, appears rather to have been forced from the ſchool of Cicero and Hermogenes to mount the pulpit: all the beauties of an exact eloquence glittering in his diſcourſe, and as it were compelling the people to fall in with the ſentiments of ſo excellent a ſpeaker.*’

Note, that theſe words of Lipſius, *Laurentium Medicen parricidii reum velut apud judices agat*, have been thus tranſlated by Mr Teiſſier (31), *He vindicates Laurence de Medicis from the crime of parricide, as if he was pleading for him before his judges.* Paul Jovius doth juſt the contrary; he pleads as the advocate of this Lawrence's accuſer would do (32). Doubtleſs Mr Teiſſier thought, that the great Lawrence de Medicis is here meant, who was the patron of the learned in the XVth century; but this concerns another Lawrence, who aſſaſſinated Alexander de Medicis in the year 1537.

[*G*] *His hiſtory is of all his works that which he has taken moſt pains in.*] It is the firſt work he compoſed, and the laſt he publiſhed. He formed the deſign of it in the year 1515, and continued the execution of it all his life. He took for his ſubject all that happened in his own time all over the world, beginning at the year 1494, which was that in which the French conquered Naples under Charles VIII. This hiſtory contains forty five books, and reaches to the year 1544. But there is a conſiderable chaſm from the nineteenth book to the twenty fourth, incluſively (33). Thoſe ſix books, which reached from the death of Leo X, to the ſacking of Rome in 1527, contain but a ſhort ſummary of the events. He loſt in the ſacking of Rome, what he had compoſed upon that part of his hiſtory (34), and he would neither do it again, nor finiſh what was wanting. He was diverted from it chiefly for two reaſons: one was, that he would have incurred the terrible anger of ſome people; the other was, that he would not exerciſe his pen upon a ſubject that was ignominious to Italy. ‘Peritos medicos imitatus, carcinomata deſperatæ curationis, quæ ſi attrectes, & acri medicamine laceſſas, in immenſum furere, & peſtifera edacique ſerpigine mortem afferre ſolent, naturæ relinquenda, neque his ullo pacto manum admovendam judicavi. Quamobrem exiſtimationi ſalutique meæ conſulens, diræ tempeſtatis materiam, tanquam abominabilis impiique operis, mini-

---

(*b*) *See the remark* [*F*].

(21) Id. ibid.

(22) That is, more admirable than the hiſtorians whom Cardan had before named, and taxed with ſeveral vices.

* Quippe Hermaphroditus.

(23) Theſe words are thus printed in my edition: I think the word *inter* has been left out.

(24) In Muſæo Hiſtorico, pag. 7.

(25) Scaligerana prima, p. m. 95.

(26) Rolandus Mareſius, Epiſt. xli, lib. i, pag. m. 184.

(27) Lipſius Not. ad 1. lib. Politic. cap ix, pag. m. 218.

(28) La Popeliniere Hiſt. des Hiſtoires, livr. vii, pag 403, *without mentioning Lipſius, has only tranſlated this, giving his judgment about Paul Jovius: Nay, he did not underſtand theſe words* laudationum nec cauſſam ſæpe habet, nec modum: *for he renders them thus,* he obſerves neither the cauſes nor the means in his praiſes.

(29) Bodin. ubi ſupra, pag. 72.

(30) Alciatus, Epiſt. ad Paulum Jovium in limine Hiſtoriarum Jovii.

(31) Additions to the Elogies out of Thuanus, Tom. I, pag. 65.

(32) See book xxxviii of Paul Jovius's Hiſtory.

(33) Note, that there is alſo a chaſm from the fourth book to the tenth, incluſive. See his advertiſement at the end of the fourth book.

(34) Fatali illa ſub Clemente VII, urbis æternæ clade nonnulli libri in ſchedis tantum deſcripti illi deperiere, haud ſine ſuo dolore maximo. *Baſilius Johannes Heroldus, Epiſt. Dedicatoria Ope. Jovii.*

nied that this author was a man of parts, and that we find in his books many curious things. He died the eleventh of December 1552 (*c*) at Florence; whither he had retired very much diſcontented with the court of Rome, becauſe he could not obtain the biſhopric of Como [*H*]. He had a brother called BENEDICTUS JOVIUS, who

‘me attingendam arbitratus ſum, quando hæc adverſæ fortunæ accepta vulnera, inſaniæque noſtræ detrimenta, non modo non prodenda poſteris, ſed pro virili occultanda eſſe videantur: Ea ſiquidem, quæ Italicum nomen dedecorent, neque memoria recoli ſine dolore, neque ſine uberrimis lachrymis ſcribi, nec ſine flagitio pudoreque poſteris enarrari queunt (35). —— *I have learned to imitate thoſe skillful Phyſicians, who ſay of Cancers deſperate, and beyond the reach of cure, that if you handle them, and apply ſharp medicines, they will grow exceſſively painful, and ſpreading with a peſtiferous corroſion are wont to bring on death; and conſequently ought to be left to nature, and by no means to be meddled with. Wherefore conſidering my character and my health, I am determined to paſs over that unhappy ſubject, which (as an abominable and impious work whereby others received wounds from our madneſs) ought inſtead of being tranſmitted to future times to be ſtudiouſly concealed: ſuch things as would reflect diſhonour on the Italian name, I cannot bring back to my memory without pain, or write without ſhedding a flood of tears, nor without a mixture of wickedneſs and ſhame can be delivered to poſterity.*’ We have ſeen above (36), that this chaſm has been much reflected upon to his diſhonour. It is a remarkable thing, that though he had alledged theſe two reaſons as a very good apology, yet in the following page he promiſed to publiſh in a little time, that part which was wanting to his hiſtory. ‘Quod ſi mihi quanquam pedibus capto, atque adeo graviter ſeneſcenti. Deus magnus fatalis horæ ſpatium extendat, perpetua procul dubio lucubratione enitar, ut totum id quod in clade urbis ereptum, vel à me poſtea contumaci quadam indignatione prætermiſſum fuit, non diu à bonis mortalibus deſideretur (37). —— *But if notwithſtanding my lameneſs and the heavy load of encreaſing old age, the almighty GOD ſhall be pleaſed to put off my laſt hour, I ſhall without doubt employ my pen continually, that whatever I loſt in the ſacking of Rome, or has been ſince then, with a kind of obſtinate indignation by me concealed, ſhall no longer be deſired in vain by good men.*’ Beſides, he tells us, that he has filled up that chaſm, with the particular lives he has publiſhed. The preface from whence I have taken theſe particulars, was written at Piſa the firſt of May, 1552. It is the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the ſecond volume of his hiſtory. The author died in December following, and had not the ſatisfaction of ſeeing the third and laſt volume out of the preſs. He cauſed his work to be printed at Florence. For the reſt, he who ſays that it was the firſt work that Paul Jovius compoſed, is wretchedly confounded in his calculations. He ſays, that the author began to write it in the year 1515, when he was about thirty years of age, and that he died being near ſeventy five years old, and that during the thirty ſeven years, that he ſpent upon it, his fortune was very much unſettled. ‘Cum enim anno à nato CHRISTO qui numerabatur MDXV, ætatis autem ſuæ circa trigeſimum, ea quæ poſt annum MCDXCIV, per totum orbem terrarum geſta eſſent, atque ſe vivo gererentur, animo complexus fuiſſet, illud Hiſtoriæ opus, omnium ſuorum primùm exorſus fuit, licet omnium poſtremum illud ediderit, eique quinque fermè annis ſeptuagenario major immortuus eſt. Triginta itaque illis ac ſeptem annis quibus hiſtoriam concinnavit, varia & ipſe fortuna (uti fieri ſolet) jactatus JOVIUS (38). —— *For as in the year* 1515, *from the birth of* CHRIST, *and in the thirtieth of his own age, he reſolved in his own mind to write the hiſtory of things which happened throughout the whole world, from the year* 1494, *or were tranſacted in his life-time. He made this work the firſt he ever entered on, though he publiſhed it the laſt, and died ſoon after almoſt ſeventy five. Thirty ſeven years therefore which he ſpent in writing this hiſtory, brought (as is uſual) many turns and changes in the affairs even of* JOVIUS *himſelf.*’ We may reckon here three faults. I. A man that is employed in a thing from his thirtieth to his ſeventy fourth year, labours at it forty four, and not thirty ſeven years. II. Paul Jovius dying in the year 1552, lived not above ſeventy four years, if it be true that in 1515, he was not above thirty: he would have lived but ſixty ſeven years, or thereabouts. III. Paul Jovius's epitaph (39) gives him ſixty nine years, ſeven months, and twenty two days; it is not therefore true that he lived near ſeventy five years, and it is ſpeaking inaccurately to ſay, that he was about thirty years of age in 1515.

I ſhall occaſionally obſerve, that the book *De Piſcibus Romanis*, is the firſt that Jovius publiſhed (40). He dedicated it to Cardinal Lewis de Bourbon. The Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from the Vatican, the twenty ninth of March 1524. He then propoſed to himſelf, a thing which he did not execute, which was ſpeedily to put to the preſs the firſt decad of his hiſtory. *Exibit in publicum propediem hujuſmodi laborioſiſſimi operis prima decas, non ſine aliqua ſpe immortalitatis* (41).

Alcyonius commends it in a book which was printed in the year 1522; but this ought not to ſerve for a proof of it's being printed; he might mention it, as having read it in manuſcript. Theſe are his words. ‘Quam etiam ſcribendi laudem, feliciſſime conſecutus eſt Paulus Jovius tuus, in ea decade, qua res omnes complexus eſt, quæ toto terrrarum orbe geſtæ ſunt, poſtquam Carolus VIII. Rex Galliæ cum Maximis Copiis tranſgreſſus Alpeis tranquillum Italiæ Statum perturbavit, & prima funeſtiſſimorum in Italia Bellorum jecit ſemina. Hiſtoria enim hujus Clariſſimi Scriptoris, omnes Elegantiæ flores, omnia Eloquentiæ lumina habet, & mira Orationis Claritate ſplendeſcit (uſque eo omnia ornate narrantur) & regiones aut pugnæ admirabiliter deſcribuntur, & conciones hortationeſque prudenter & graviſſime interponuntur. Denique illius auctor, varietate, evagationibus, amplificationibus, digreſſionibus non minus præſtantis Hiſtorici quam eximii Oratoris laude, ab omnibus decorari debet (42), —— *Which art of writing your Paul Jovius has moſt happily reached in that Decade, wherein he comprehends the hiſtory of whatever happened throughout the world, after Charles VIII, king of France, paſſing the Alps with a great army, firſt diſturbed the peace of Italy, and ſcattered the ſeeds of thoſe unhappy wars which ſo long rent that country. For the hiſtory of this moſt excellent writer abounds with all the flowers of elegance, all the luſtre of eloquence, and ſhines with wonderful clearneſs of expreſſion (every thing being ſo exquiſitely related) countries and battles ſo admirably deſcribed, ſpeeches and harangues ſo prudently, and with ſuch propriety, inſerted. In a word, this author for his Variety, his Epiſodes, Amplifications and Degreſſions, deſerves from every one to be no leſs commended as an Orator, than admired as an Hiſtorian.*’

[*H*] *He could not obtain the biſhopric of Como.*] This appears from a letter which Andrew Alciatus wrote to him (43). It is dated from Pavia, the ſeventh of October 1549, and is an anſwer to a letter, which Paul Jovius had wrote to him to acquaint him with his diſcontent, and deſign of leaving Rome, and betaking himſelf to Florence. ‘Scribis te gravi injuria permotum, Urbe (quod nunquam fieri poſſe putaram) propediem exceſſurum, ne diutius acceptæ contumeliæ deformis teſtis in ea aula ſpecteris, in qua per multos annos (uti mihi videtur) cum aureæ mediocritatis bonis planè beatus, tum ſtudiorum tuorum Authoritate clarus hactenus fuiſti. Mirum profectò videri poteſt, quòd tibi doctrinæ aç ætatis honore majora promerito, in petitione Pontificatus patriæ tuæ Paulus Pontifex quendam prætulerit. At quem hominem? qui Comi neque natus, neque unquam viſus ſit, & qui (ſicut à multis audio) ex arcanis cubiculi ſordibus in lucem repente ſit productus. —— *You write to me, that, moved by a heavy injury done you, you have thoughts of leaving Rome (a thing I thought would never have come to paſs) that you may not remain an uneaſy witneſs of the wrong done you in that court where (as I apprehend) you have for many years enjoyed the bleſſings of a golden mediocrity, as well as a juſt reſpect flowing from the importance of your ſtudies. I am therefore, I confeſs, ſurprized that to a perſon, who, like you, has both learning and years to*

‘*plead*

(*c*) Reuſner, in Diario Hiſtor. pag. 185.

(35) Jovius, Præfat. Tom. II, Hiſtoriarum.

(36) In remark [*B*].

(37) Jovius, ubi ſupra, ſub fin.

(38) Baſil. Joh. Heroldus, ubi ſupra.

(39) Apud Paulum Freherum, Theatr. pag. 1454, & apud Pope Blount, Cenſ. Author. pag. 449, *where, inſtead of twenty two days, there is twelve days. Thuanus ſays twenty two.*

(40) Herold, *ubi ſupra*, who tells us in what order the ſeveral books of that author were publiſhed.

(41) Jovius, Epiſt. Dedic. libri de Piſcibus.

(42) Petrus Alcyonius in Medice Legato poſteriore, pag. 103, Edit. Genev. 1624.

(43) It is prefixed to Paul Jovius's Hiſtory.

who wrote ſome books [*I*]. There was one PAUL JOVIUS, who in the council of Trent, gave his opinion in a curious manner upon the queſtion concerning Reſidence [*K*].

I muſt not forget that our Paul Jovius has been blamed for giving too much credit to aſtrological predictions, and ſuch like ſuperſtitions [*L*]. His elogies of illuſtrious men have

' *plead in his favour, Pope Paul ſhould prefer another* ' *to be biſhop in your country. And who is he that he* ' *has thus preferred? One neither born nor known at* ' *Como, but one (as I have been told by many) who from* ' *the dirty privacies of a bed-chamber, has been brought* ' *on a ſudden to make a figure in the world.*' This is well enough; this is ſpeaking freely enough of the holy father, he is not much better uſed in what follows: ' Quis in hoc Pontificem ἀμουσότερον non ' judicet: non enim hoſtis bonarum literarum & ' plane ferreus eſſe non poteſt qui te graviſſimarum ' rerum ſcriptorem intempeſtive contempſerit . . . . ' Dices te indigne deceptum ab inveterati aſtus ſene ' principe, qui blandis promiſſis vota tua honeſte concepta inique fefellerit. —— *Who will not look on this* ' *Pope as a foe to the Muſes, for can he be other than* ' *an enemy to literature, and a perſon of a ſtubborn* ' *diſpoſition, who could ſo unſeaſonably contemn a perſon* ' *like you, who have written on the moſt important affairs. . . . . You will ſay you have been unworthily* ' *deceived by the thorough-paced cunning of an old* ' *prince, who with fair promiſes beguiled thoſe wiſhes* ' *you had honeſtly conceived.*' I am afraid Thuanus is guilty here of a miſtake; he pretends that it was Clement VII who refuſed Paul Jovius the biſhopric of Como, and that his refuſal drew upon him ſome reflexions in the books of that hiſtorian. ' Cum ad Novocomenſem Epiſcopatum omnibus votis anhelaret, ' ſuæque erga Mediceam familiam, in cujus laudes ' proſuſus fuerat, obſervantiæ deberi id meritorum fiducia putaret, tamen ab eo obtinere non potuit: ' quod in cauſa fuiſſe plerique credunt, cur Clementem in Hiſtoriis avaritiæ & tenacitatis inſimulet (44). ' —— *As he earneſtly deſired to be promoted to the* ' *biſhopric of Como, and confidently believed it due to* ' *his merit for the praiſes which he had ſo profuſely beſtowed on the houſe of Medicis, but for all that miſcarried in his ſuit, ſome have imagined that on this* ' *account he taxes Pope Clement in his hiſtory with covetouſneſs and want of generoſity.*'

[*I*] *He had a brother called BENEDICTUS JOVIUS, who wrote ſome books.*] He was Paul's elder brother, and proved a kind of a father to him; it was he that educated him, and inſtructed him, and encouraged him to be an author; for having ſhewn him two of his works, *viz.* the hiſtory of Como, and a treatiſe of the actions and manners of the Swiſſes, he excited in him the deſire of writing a General Hiſtory. He led a very quiet and retired life, in the place of his birth, which he never left but to go to Milan to hear the lectures of a Greek profeſſor. He had learned that language of himſelf: but he deſired to learn to pronounce it, which was the occaſion of his only journey. He lived ſeventy three years in perfect health and vigour of body and mind. He deſigned a century of letters full of learning for the public; and his ſons were to have the care of publiſhing them, with ſome other compoſures which he left them, ſome tranſlations from the Greek, and ſome pieces of poetry (45). Their uncle expected this from their diligence (46), but I think there was nothing of this author printed beſides ſome Latin poems.

We are not to believe that PAUL JOVIUS, Junior, whereof many Latin verſes are to be ſeen in the elogies which our Paul Jovius compoſed, was Benedict Jovius's ſon. He was nephew to JULIUS JOVIUS, who was made coadjutor to his uncle (47) in the biſhopric of Nocera, the twenty firſt of Auguſt, 1551, and was biſhop of that place after him. Paulus Jovius junior, a good Poet, was made coadjutor to his uncle, Julius Jovius, in the ſame biſhopric, the twenty ninth of November, 1560, and was his ſucceſſor there. He kept that ſee twenty five years, and died in the year 1585 (48). I have ſaid elſewhere (49), that Paul Jovius was no Poet.

[*K*] *One PAUL JOVIUS gave his opinion in a curious manner upon the queſtion concerning reſidence.*] One of my friends, who heard me ſay all that I remembered of our Paul Jovius, repreſented to me, that I had forgot the moſt curious circumſtance. He was, ſaid he, one of the fathers of the council of Trent; and having no ſkill in Divinity, for he had been a Phyſician before he was made a biſhop, and never interrupted his ſtudy of human learning, I believe he did not diſtinguiſh himſelf in that aſſembly, when he was to give his opinion upon any point of doctrine. He had a great intereſt, not to ſuffer that the reſidence of biſhops ſhould be declared to be of divine right. This aſſertion ſo warmly maintained by ſome of the deputies, did not pleaſe him. He oppoſed it with reaſons taken from experience; he ſhewed, that the dioceſes, in which reſidence was obſerved, were no leſs diſorderly than others (50)); and he inſtanced upon the city of Rome. This friend ſhewed me immediately the 470th page of Father Paul, where I find what follows. ' If the abſence of the prelates was ' the true cauſe of abuſes, we ſhould ſee leſs corruption in the churches, where the biſhops have reſided ' in our time. For this hundred years the Popes have ' continually kept at Rome, and taken great care to ' have the people inſtructed; and yet after all, we do ' not ſee that city better governed. The capital cities ' of kingdoms, where the biſhops have always reſided, ' are more corrupted than ſome wretched places that ' have not ſeen their biſhops for a hundred years. ' And none of the antient prelates, that are preſent ' here, and have always reſided (for there are ſome ' ſuch) can ſhew us, that his dioceſe is better ordered, than thoſe of his neighbours, who never reſided. They who ſay that thoſe churches are ſheep ' without a ſhepherd, ought to conſider that curates ' have the charge of ſouls as well as biſhops; and yet ' theſe are only ſpoken of, as if there could be no true ' Chriſtians, but where there are biſhops. Some people in the mountains, who never ſaw one in their ' lives, might ſerve for a pattern to epiſcopal cities. ' We ought to praiſe and imitate the zeal and conduct ' of the fathers of this council under Paul, who have ' decreed ſome penalties againſt the prelates, to oblige ' them to reſidence, and have begun to remove the ' impediments, which kept them from their churches. ' Rather than flatter ourſelves with a vain hope, that ' reſidence will produce the reformation of the church, ' we ought to fear, that as we deſign at preſent to ' enforce reſidence, the incoveniencies (51) which ' will ariſe from it, may oblige our ſucceſſors to apply to them the remedy of abſence (52).' I eaſily undeceived my friend, by telling him, that the writer of the hiſtory of that council ſpeaks of one Paul Jovius, biſhop of Nocera, in the year 1562 (53), ten years after the death of Paul Jovius, who is the ſubject of this article.

[*L*] *He has been blamed for giving too much credit to Aſtrological predictions, and ſuch like ſuperſtitions.*] Martin del Rio having mentioned ſome things, which ſeem to prove, that Chiromancy and Aſtrology can reveal futurities, adds: ' Unus iſta omnia narrat Jovius *, ' nec uſquequaque indubitatæ fidei hiſtoricus, nec ſatis ' à ſuperſtitioſis & gentilium ne dicam opinionibus, ſaltem locutionibus, alienus (54). —— *Jovius only has* ' *told us all theſe things, an hiſtorian not deſerving* ' *always of credit, nor far enough removed from the* ' *belief of the ſuperſtitions and opinions of the Gentiles* ' *at leaſt in his expreſſions.*' He had before blamed him for having ſome reſpect for a remark of Amniomancy. This is the name they give to the art of divining by the inſpection of the membrane Amnios, wherewith a child is wrapped up in it's mother's womb. ' Sed & Jovius ne quid ſuperſtitionis omitterit, nimis ' hujuſmodi vanitatibus pro Epiſcopo deditus, in Ferdinandi Davali nativitate (*lib.* 1. *Piſcarii*) hujuſmodi ' pelle involutum ex utero prodiiſſe conſideravit (55). ' —— *But Jovius alſo that he might not omit any ſuperſtition, being, for a biſhop, too much addicted to* ' *ſuch vanities, informs us (ſpeaking of the birth of Ferdinand Davali) that he came from the womb, wrapped* ' *in ſuch a membrane as this.*' This membrane commonly breaks when the child is born, but ſometimes it is

(44) Thuan. lib. xi, pag. 235.

(45) Sed hæc & Græcæ traductionis non ignobilia opera cum lepidis poëmatibus eruditorum liberorum diligentia publicabit. *P. Jovius, Elog. cap. cvi.*

(46) Taken from Paul Jovius, *cap. cvi*, of his Elogies of Learned Men.

(47) That is, to our Paul Jovius.

(48) Taken from Ughelli, *Ital. Sacra, Tom. VII*, *pag.* 746.

(49) In the article of HADRIAN VI, remark [*D*].

(50) Compare with this what Brantome ſays in a paſſage which I have quoted in the remark [*N*] of the article FRANCIS I, to which you may add theſe words of Mezerai's Chronological Abridgment, pag. 434, of the ſixth volume. *They were ordered by a decree of parliament to go and diſcharge their duty in their biſhopricks; otherwiſe they ſhould be compelled to it by a ſeizure of their goods and equipage. But moſt of them lived ſuch diſorderly lives, that perhaps their abſcence was leſs ſcanda- than their reſidence would have been.*

(51) He pretends that if reſidence was declared to be of divine right, the biſhops would forſake their obedience to the Popes, and the prieſts their obedience to the biſhops.

(52) Fra-Paolo, Hiſt. du Concile de Trente, lib. vi, pag. 470, ad ann. 1562, *of Amelot's tranſlation. See pag.* 99, *of the Italian edition in* 4to.

(53) It is Paulus Jovius junior: I ſpoke of him above, towards the end of the remark [*I*].

* In Elogiis.

(54) Mart. del Rio, Diſquiſ. Magic. lib iv, cap. iii, Quæſt. v, pag. 278.

(55) Idem. ibid. cap. ii, Quæſt. [illegible], Sect. I, pag. 237.

have been thought *too ſharp and too biting* (*d*), but ſometimes they are too flattering. See the cenſure that a learned critic (*e*) paſſed upon him in his dialogue *De bene inſtituendis Græcæ Linguæ Studiis.* George Sabinus complains, that Jovius in his hiſtories is injurious to the Proteſtants of Germany, and particularly to Sigiſmund II, elector of Brandenburg. Conſult the letter that George Sabinus wrote to John Sleidan the firſt of September 1556 (*f*).

It is neceſſary to enlarge a little upon what I have ſaid of the firſt work that he publiſhed [*M*].

is preſerved whole, and this is taken for a ſign of good fortune: whence comes this proverb, *il eſt né coiffé*; (56) (*he was wrapped up in his mother's ſmock*). Paul Jovius curiouſly obſerved this circumſtance in the nativity of the marquis of Peſcara; and we have juſt now ſeen how he was cenſured for it by Martin del Rio. I add another proof of his fondneſs for Aſtrology. Having ſaid that there happened revolutions of religion all the world over towards the beginning of the XVIth century, he aſcribes it to the influence of the ſtars. I will tell this ſtory in the words of Florimond de Remond, becauſe they will acquaint us with a little trick of a tranſlator. ‘ Almoſt at the ſame time, ſays Jovius, that Iſmael poſſeſſed the empire of the Perſians, and changed the religion, mixing it with a new Mahometan ſuperſtition, there aroſe in Germany under the conduct of Luther that monſtrous Hereſy, which deſigned to deſtroy the Catholic religion, and all that antiquity had received, as the people had done in Perſia, bigotted with their new follies and ſuperſtitions. Whereupon, ſays he, I freely acknowledge that it came to paſs by a ſecret power of heaven, and a malignant influence of the ſtars, that at the ſame time, all the religions in the univerſe began to change; ſince not only the Mahometans, but alſo the Chriſtians, nay the idolatrous nations that are remoteſt from us, both in the Eaſt-Indies, and in the new world lately diſcovered in the Weſt, fell into new religions and opinions. This is what the Latin Jovius ſays. But in the French tranſlation the inſincerity of the tranſlator is remarkable; who paſſes over in ſilence all that Jovius ſays of this change of religions, and of that monſtrous Lutheran Hereſy that ſprung up in Saxony: this went to the heart of him. With what faithfulneſs do they handle the holy and ſacred books, who can thus lame, without any ſhame, the hiſtorians that are but juſt come into the world, only to ſuppreſs one word which touches Luther the father of all the Hereſies that diſturb Chriſtendom (57).’ Florimond de Remond cites the thirteenth book of Paul Jovius's hiſtory, where I find in *fol.* 239 *verſo* of the Straſburg edition 1556, that which follows: ‘ Nec multo poſt exarſit in Germania authore Luthero dira hæreſis, quæ populis, ut in Perſide acciderat, ad inſaniam verſis, Chriſtiani dogmatis placita, & veteres ſacrorum ritus vehementiſſimè conturbavit. Ita ut facilè crediderim ab occulta cœli poteſtate, malignoque ſyderum concurſu proveniſſe, ut religiones toto terrarum orbe enatis factionibus, uno tempore ſcinderentur, quand onon Mahometani modo Chriſtianique, ſed & remotiſſimæ gentes idololatræ, aut ſydera aut portenta pro Diis venerantes, cum in India quæ ad Orientem vergit, tum in Novo orbe ad Occiduam plagam reperto, novas ſacrorum opiniones induerint.’ I know no other French tranſlator of Paul Jovius's general hiſtory beſides Denys Sauvage. Was he a Proteſtant? And would he be guilty of the fraud which Florimond de Remond objected to the Reformed?

[*M*] *It is neceſſary to enlarge a little upon what I have ſaid of the firſt work that he publiſhed.*] I have ſaid (58), I. that it was the treatiſe *de Piſcibus Romanis*; II. that he dated the epiſtle dedicatory of it the twenty ſixth of March 1524; in the third place, that he then propoſed to put immediately to the preſs the firſt decade of his hiſtory. With regard to the firſt of theſe facts, I have quoted Heroldus, who has expreſsly ſaid, *illud* (ſcriptum) *quod* OMNIUM PRIMUM *edidit de Piſcibus Romanis.* — *That piece which he publiſhed* THE FIRST OF ALL HIS WORKS *concerning the Roman fiſhes.* The ſecond fact ſtood in no need of proof; every one may ſee it at the bottom of the epiſtle dedicatory; and I have proved the third by a paſſage of Paul Jovius. I have raiſed an objection to myſelf taken from Alcyonius affirming, in a work printed in the year 1522, that he had ſeen this hiſtorian's firſt decade. I have anſwered it as well as I could; but here is a new difficulty. Calcagnini informs us in a letter written from Rome under the Pontificate of Leo X (59), that Paul Jovius's firſt decade was publiſhed. ‘ Paulus Jovius . . . tam luculenter, tam docte, tam eleganter ſcribit noſtri temporis hiſtoriam, cujus decem libros JAM EDIDIT ut pudeat me de homine tam diſerto tam indiſerte ſcribere (60) —— *Paul Jovius writes the hiſtory of our time ſo clearly, ſo learnedly, and ſo elegantly, ten books of which* HE HAS ALREADY PUBLISHED, *that I am aſhamed to write with ſo little eloquence concerning ſo eloquent a writer.*’ If Calcagnini has good reaſon to ſay, that this firſt decade was printed, Paul Jovius would be guilty of the error charged upon me. It would be in vain to alledge that the date of the epiſtle dedicatory of the treatiſe *de Piſcibus Romanis* has been altered by the Printers; for it is certain, however it be, that this epiſtle was written under Clement VII, who was created Pope in the month of November 1523.

IPRES or YPRES, an epiſcopal town in the earldom of Flanders, has its name from a river that runs through it. It was at firſt only a caſtle. The Normans having deſtroyed it, count Baudouin the ſecond of the name, ordered it to be repaired in the year 880. Count Arnol fortified it in 901, and count Baudouin III. enlarged it many years after. New additions were made to it from time to time; ſo that in the year 1473, the town of Ipres included within its wall 1173 meaſures, each whereof was fourteen geometrical feet. It was beſieged by the inhabitants of Ghent, and by the Engliſh, in the year 1373, for the ſpace of nine weeks. Its ſtone walls were built in the year 1388, by the conſent of Philip the bold (*a*). The manufactures and dying of wool were in good perfection there at the end of the XIIth century, as appears by the teſtimonies of Guilelmus Britto (*b*). The French took it in the year 1648, and loſt it the year following. They retook it in 1658, and reſtored it to the Spaniards by the Pyrenean treaty. They retook it once more in the year 1678, and the Spaniards gave it up to them by the treaty of peace concluded at Nimegen the ſame year. The diſputes of Janſeniſm have rendered the name of the town of Ipres famous; Janſenius being ſcarce ever mentioned without obſerving that he was biſhop of that town. The relation betwixt that town and the controverſes of the Janſeniſts with the Jeſuits, is by this means known to all the world; and hence doubtleſs came that witty fancy of forging a pretended letter of the

---

(*d*) Balzac, Diſſertat. à Dom André de Saint Denis, *at the end of his* Socrate Chrétien, pag. m. 174.

(*e*) Henry Stephens Vide Crenium Animadv. Parte V, pag. 163.

(*f*) *It is the laſt of thoſe that have been printed with George Sabinus's Poems*, pag. 419, & ſeq. Edit. Lipſ. 1606. *See alſo* Crenii, Animadverſ. Part. VI, pag. 209.

(56) See Mr Drelincourt's treatiſe, of which an extract is given in the *Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres*, for July 1685, *art. xi*, *pag.* 815.

(57) Florimond de Remond, Hiſtoire de l'Hereſie, livr i, cap. iv, pag. m. 24.

(58) See the remark [*G*], towards the end.

(59) He died in the year 1521.

(60) Calcagninus, Epiſt. ad Jacob. Zieglerum, in Collectione Colomeſiana Clarorum Virorum Epiſtol. pag. 234.

(*a*) *Taken from* Valerius Andr in Topographia Belgica, pag 43, 44.

(*b*) Ipra colorandis gens prudentiſſima lanis. *Will. Britto Philippid. lib. ii.*

king to Mr Arnauld [*A*], dated from the camp before Ipres in 1678. Several copies of this letter were handed about; and I remember that ſeveral perſons, who were thought to have a very good judgment, found it ingenious: It was aſcribed to Mr Roſe ſecretary of the cabinet. I do not believe it has been printed, and therefore I am willing to publiſh it.

[*A*] *A pretended letter of the king . . . to Mr Arnauld.*] Here it is according to the copy I took of it, at the time it went about as a piece intirely new.

A letter of the king to Mr Arnauld on the ſiege of Ipres.

'Monſieur Arnauld. We are going to begin a ſiege, 'in which you might do us much ſervice with your 'intereſt. I have five propoſitions to make to the gen'tlemen of Ipres. The firſt is, that I am come into 'Flanders to do good to every body. The ſecond 'that the command I give them to ſurrender the town 'is not impoſſible. The third, that it is in their 'power to merit or not merit my favour. The fourth, 'that I have forces with me more than is ſufficient to 'make them obey my orders; and the fifth, that tho' 'they be never ſo much neceſſitated to ſurrender them'ſelves, they will do it with an entire liberty. The 'Queſtion is therefore to make them ſign theſe five 'five propoſitions, which include all the treaty of grace, 'that I deſign to ſhow them. I do not think, that 'they can elude my orders by the diſtinction *de Jure*, 'and *de Facto* (*between right and fact*). For as to the 'right, I have been ſo long uſed to take towns, that 'time alone might ſerve me for a preſcription in the 'Low-Countries, were I deſtitute of ſo many other 'indiſputable rights. They can therefore only inſiſt 'upon the fact, and I will convince them of this by 'thirty cannons, to which I defy them to anſwer ef'fectually; for they will pierce through all difficul'ties. By this you may judge, that I ſhall not be ſo 'long in making them ſign my five propoſitions, as 'you have been in ſigning thoſe of the Pope. Where'fore I order you to ſummon the ban and arriereban 'of the Janſeniſts, and to leave Paris immedi'ately to come at the head of them, in order 'to ſing *Te Deum*, upon the tomb of Janſenius, as a 'thankſgiving to God, for the happy ſucceſs of my 'five propoſitions. You may for a bon-fire bring a 'hundred copies of the *Miroir de la Pieté Chrétienne*, '(*Mirror of the Chriſtian piety*) to caſt theſe good Fle'mings into a holy deſpair of ever belonging again to 'Spain. Afterwards you ſhall go into England to manage 'there the lower houſe, which is very averſe to a peace. 'To conclude, I like your politics, and more ſtill 'your money, with which you uſe ſo advantageouſly 'to perſuade people to what you have a mind to. 'Hereby I am ſure we ſhall have a peace with En'gland and Spain, before you have it with the Je'ſuits. At the camp before Ipres the ſeventeenth of 'March 1678.

IRNERIUS (*a*), a German civilian, lived in the XIIth century. He is ſaid to be the firſt, that renewed the profeſſion of the Roman law, interrupted ever ſince the invaſion of the Barbarians. He had a great intereſt in Italy with the princeſs Mathilda, and having perſuaded the emperor Lotharius to order the Code and Digeſts to be read in the ſchools, he was the firſt that exerciſed that profeſſion in Italy. His method was to reconcile the anſwers of the Civilians and the laws, that ſeemed contrary to one another. He died about the year 1190 [*A*], and was buried at Bologna, where he had been profeſſor (*b*). The thing is carried farther; for it is ſaid that Lotharius abrogated all other laws, and ordered that Juſtinian's law ſhould reſume it's ancient authority at the bar [*B*]. The famous Calixtus, profeſſor of Divinity at Helmſtadt, maintains (*c*), that this is falſe, and has been followed in that by the learned Conringius his colleague (*d*). But Bertold Nihuſius wrote for the contrary opinion (*e*), and rudely handled Dr Calixtus. It is certain that the later has not tradition on his ſide; and that it makes Irnerius the

[*A*] *He died about the year* 1190.] I can hardly believe that he lived till that time; for in the firſt place Lotharius II lived but till 1138 at moſt: which plainly ſhews that Forſterus has been unexact; for he ſays that the reſtoration of the Roman law happened about the year 1150 (1). Why then ſhould we think that he has been more exact in his calculation about Irnerius's death? In the ſecond place this is ſaid to have been done in the year 1133 (2). Now who can believe that a thing of that importance could be executed by the counſels of a young man? It is a hundred times more probable, that Irnerius was ſucceſsful in his counſels by reaſon of the great authority he had acquired by his learning and wiſdom; and therefore he muſt have been at leaſt forty years of age. From whence it follows, that if he had lived till the year 1190, he would have lived near 100 years, and in that caſe Forſterus would be inexcuſable for not taking notice of ſo uncommon an age. To which I add, that a chancellor of the emperor is always ſomewhat elderly. Forſterus would be hard put to it, if one ſhould maintain, that Mathilda, with whom he ſays Irnerius had ſuch an intereſt, was that counteſs, who was ſo liberal to the Popes, and who died in the year 1115, or that queen of Italy who died in the year 1101 (3), and who was the wiſe of Conrad, the ſon of the emperor Henry IV, and the daughter of Roger king of Sicily.

During the diſpute that aroſe betwixt Dr Calixtus, and Bertold Nihuſius, to know whether our Irnerius renewed the ſtudy of the law, by the authority of the counteſs Mathilda, or by that of the emperor Lotharius II, the univerſity of Bologna was conſulted, and anſwered in favour of Nihuſius. We find in their anſwer, that it is a conſtant tradition that Irnerius began to teach the law at Bologna in the year 1128. This tradition is ſupported by the following ſentence on Irnerius's picture, which amongſt many others, is to be ſeen in the college of Bologna: *Irnerius omnium primus leges commentatus eſt anno MCXXVIII.* Nicolas Alidoſio in the preface of his boon intituled, *Li Dottori Bologneſi di legge Canonica è Civile*, affirms, that this doctor teaching Philoſophy at Bologna, received orders from the emperor Lotharius II to teach the Law, and that he began to do it about the year 1128. However there is ſome ground to believe, that he did it of his own accord, ſome years together, and that he was not authorized by the emperor's order till the year 1137 (4). It is certain he died before the year 1150, and not in 1190, for it is known (5) that James de Porta Ravegnana was Irnerius's ſucceſſor in his profeſſorſhip of the Civil-Law and that he taught it publickly at Bologna in the year 1150. See the author whom I quote (6).

[*B*] *It is ſaid that Lotharius ordered that Juſtinian's law ſhould reſume it's antient authority at the bar.*] Here is what Mr Heiſs ſays of it in his hiſtory of the empire under the year 1133. 'This ſolemnity being 'over, the emperor returned into Germany, where 'by the advice of one Werner Urſperg, othrewiſe 'Irnerius (7), who was very well ſkilled in the Civil'Law, he ordered that juſtice ſhould be done in the 'empire according to the Digeſts or Code, which had 'been out of uſe for five or ſix hundred years: ſo 'that this law was introduced into Italy and Germany, 'and afterwards into France and Spain, where the 'people before made uſe of their own particular laws 'and cuſtoms (8). Calviſius, without mentioning our Werner, ſays, under the year 1137, that Lotharius found in Apulia the Roman laws, that he gave them

---

(*a*) *He is alſo called* Wernerus, *or* Guarnerius.

(*b*) Ex Forſtero, Hiſt. Juris Civil. Roman. lib. iii, cap. vi.

(*c*) In libello de Morali Theolog.

(*d*) *Conſult the preface to his* Origo Juris Germanici, *printed in* 1643.

(*e*) *See the book which he intituled,* Irnerius, *publiſhed in* 1642.

(1) Incidit hæc revocatio & reſtitutio Juris Civilis in annum Chriſti 1150. *Forſterus, Hiſt. Juris Civil. lib. iii, cap. vi.*

(2) *See the following remark.*

(3) Mathias, Theatr. Hiſt. pag. m. 902.

(4) *See* Nihuſius, in Irnerio, pag. 13.

(5) Otto Murena, in Chronologia Laudenſi apud Baronium, ad ann. 1158.

(6) Nihuſius, *in Irnerio*, where he has inſerted the whole anſwer of the univerſity of Bologna.

(7) The Dutch edition ſays *Irnervis.*

(8) Antea homines Jure incerto utebantur, Jure nempe Romanorum corrupto, Jure item Longobardico & lege Salica. *Chriſt. Mathiæ Theat. Hiſtor. pag.* 921.

firſt reſtorer of the Roman law [*C*]. It is ſaid moreover, that it was he who moved the emperor Lotharius, whoſe chancellor he was, to introduce into the univerſities the creation of doctors, and that he drew up the form of it; from whence it came, that at that very time, Bulgarus, Hugolinus, Martinus, Pileus, and ſome others, who began to interpret the Roman laws, were ſolemnly promoted to their doctors degree. It was at Bologna that theſe fine ceremonies began; from thence they were received by the other univerſities, and proceeded from the faculty of Law, to that of Divinity. It is pretended, that the univerſity of Paris having adopted this cuſtom, made uſe of it the firſt time in behalf of Peter Lombard, who was made doctor of Divinity (*f*).

to the Piſans, and ordered they ſhould be explained, and put into practice in the tribunals of the empire. He adds, that this book was afterwards carried into the library of Florence. Another hiſtorian (9) ſays, this happened when that emperor marched againſt Roger king of Sicily, about the year 1135, and obſerves that the manuſcript of the Roman laws found in Apulia, wanting to be explained, Irnerius was commiſſioned for that pupoſe.

[*C*] *Tradition makes him the firſt reſtorer of the Roman law.*] This is what an author before cited ſays of him (10). ‘Irnerius primus legibus gloſſas ‘appoſuit, & ſuo exemplo cæteris illuminandi juris ‘exemplum dedit: unde LUCERNA JURIS dictus fuit ‘& inſtaurator legum Romanarum cognominatus. ‘——— *Irnerius was the firſt who wrote any gloſſes ‘on the laws, and by his example led others to ‘comment upon them, whence he was called* the lamp ‘of the law, *and was ſirnamed the reſtorer of the ‘Roman conſtitutions.*’ A great number of writers ſay the ſame thing.

ISAACITES (*a*).

ISAACITES (*a*). Under this name is mentioned the Rabbi Salomon Jarchi, in the Bibliotheca Rabbinica of father Bartolocci. I may therefore put under this name what is wanting in the article JARCHI. I ſhall therefore obſerve that the ſirname Raſci, which was given him, was compoſed of the initial letters of his names (*b*), as we learn from father Bartolocci (*c*). He adds, that this Rabbi was born at Lunir, a town in the province of Aquitain [*A*]; but that ſome make him a native of Troies in France, and place his birth in the year 1105. Iſaacites began his travels when he was thirty years of age. He ſaw Italy, afterwards Greece, Jeruſalem, and all Paleſtine, and then he went into Egypt, where he ſaw the Rabbi Maimonides. He proceeded into Perſia, Tartary, Muſcovy, and other northern countries, and at laſt came into Germany, from whence he came into his own country. He ſpent ſix years in theſe travels. He was married, and had three daughters, who were married to very learned Rabbies, who wrote many books. Some of his commentaries upon the Scripture have been tranſlated into Latin by the Chriſtians [*B*]. It is ſaid, that he was well ſkilled in Phyſic and Aſtrology, and in ſeveral languages, and that he died at Troies, being ſeventy five years old. His body was carried to Bohemia, and buried at Prague in the year 1180 (*d*).

[*A*] *Bartolocci ſays that he was born at Lunir, a town in the province of Aquitain.*] Bartolocci adds, that is a town in which there were Jews, as St Gregory witneſſes in the twenty firſt epiſtle of the third book (1). All this is full of faults; for in the firſt place he ſhould have ſaid Lunel, and not Lunir. II. Lunel is not in the province of Aquitain. III. Pope Gregory does not ſpeak of Lunel, or Lunir, but of Luna, an epiſcopal ſee in Italy. See above (2) the cenſure of an error of Hoornbeek. Here is another blunder. *Ibidem* (that is in the *Catena Cabalæ*) *Rabbi Joſeph Iachijà Auctor dicit quod natus ſit anno ab Orbe condito* . . . . 4865. *Chr.* 1105. *in Urbe Trevis, ſeu Trecis* (§ α) *in Gallia in provincia Narbonenſi, vel in Linguadoca* (3). Which is to pretend, that the town of Troies is in Languedoc, than which nothing can be more ridiculous. Note, that according to ſome rabbies, our Iſaacites died 1105 (4); but we have ſeen, that according to ſome other authors, this was the year of his birth. Chronological exactneſs was never the talent of the Jewiſh writers; and it is a ſtrange thing they have ſo ill fixed the time of their moſt famous doctors. Benjamin Tudelenſis (5), who died in the year 1173, highly praiſes the Jews of Lunel, and names ſome of their learned men, and among others Rabbi Solomon. Some ſay, (6), that he means Solomon Jarchi; and if you object, that this Solomon died in the year 1105, they will anſwer, that Benjamin Tudelenſis does not pretend that all the doctors he mentions, ſpeaking of what he ſaw at Lunel, were alive. I do not like this ſolution. It ſeems plain to me, that he ſpeaks of a Solomon that was then alive: We muſt therefore ſuppoſe either that it is a miſtake to place the death of Solomon Jarchi in the year 1105, or that the Solomon mentioned by Benjamin Tudelenſis, is not our Iſaacites. I could eaſily believe, that Conſtantin l'Empereur is miſtaken, when he ſays, that Benjamin meant Solomon Jarchi. If he had ſpoke of a doctor ſo famous as this was, he would have given him great encomiums, and he gives none to his Solomon. If you would have an inſtance of the bad Chronology of the Jewiſh authors, you need only conſider, that the ſame book (7), which makes Rabbi Solomon Iſaacites to be born in the the year 1105, affirms that Maimonides was born in Spain, in the year 1135, and that theſe two Rabbies had an interview in Egypt, though Solomon did not go thither till he was about thirty two years old (8). Note, that ſome (9) maintain, that Rabbi Solomon Iſaacites has not the ſirname of Jarchi in the Jewiſh books, and that it would be a difficult thing to find the time, the ſubject, and occaſion of that falſe ſirname, and that the Jews laugh at the Chriſtian authors for uſing it.

[(§ α) *Trecæ*, in the Latin of Bartolocci does not ſignify the town of Troyes in Champagne, but Treys in Provence. It is true the firſt is called *Trecæ* in Gregorius Turonenſis, but Thuanus who names the other *Trecæ*, calls *Tricoſſes*, the inhabitants of the latter. REM. CRIT.]

[*B*] *Some of his commentaries have been tranſlatea into Latin by the Chriſtians.*] His commentary upon Joel, and the Canticles, has been put into Latin by Genebrard. He publiſhed at Paris, in 1563, the verſion of the commentary upon Joel, and in 1570, that of the commentary upon the Canticles. Arnaldus Pontacus is the author of the Latin tranſlation of the commentaries upon Obadiah, Jonah, and Zephaniah (10). Henry Aquinus publiſhed the commentaries upon Eſther, with notes, at Paris, in the year 1522 (11).

YSE (ALEXANDER D') Miniſter of Grenoble, and afterwards profeſſor of Divinity at Die in Dauphiné, (*a*) *was a natural ſon in a family*——— *of which at preſent is* (*b*) *James d'Yſe de Saleon, Counſellor in the Parliament of* Grenoble. *This miniſter wrote a diſcourſe for the re-union of the two religions, in which he does not differ much from the principles*

(*f*) Mathias, Theatr. Hiſtoric. in Vita Lotharii II.

(9) Chriſt. Mathias, ibid. pag. 920, *who quotes* Chythæus, in Chron. pag. 309.

(10) Mathias, ubi ſupra.

(*a*) *Conſtantin l'Empereur*, Not in Itinerar. Benjam. Tutel. pag. 149, *ſays, that Solomon Jarchi was called* Iſacides, *because he was the ſon of Rabbi Iſaac.*

(*b*) R. Solomon Iſaacites.

(*c*) Bartol. Bibl. Rabbinica, Part. IV, pag. 378.

(*d*) *Taken from* Bartolocci, ibid. pag. 378, & ſeq.

(1) Bartol. Bibl. Rabbin. Part. IV, pag. 378.

(2) *Remark* [*A*], *of the article* JARCHI.

(3) Bartolocci, ubi ſupra.

(4) *See, above, citation* (1), *of the article* JARCHI.

(5) Benjamin. Tutel. Itiner. pag. m. 6.

(6) Conſt. l'Empereur, Notis in Itinerar. Benjam. Tutel. pag. 149.

(7) Catena Cabalæ. *See* Bartolocci, ubi ſupra.

(8) *See* Bartoloc. ibid.

(9) Andreas Acoluthus in Tractatu de Aquis amaris maledictionem inferentibus, pag. 3.

(10) Printed at Paris in the year 1656, in 4to.

(11) *Taken from* Bartolocci, ubi ſupra, pag. 380, 381.

(*a*) Allard, Biblioth. de Dauphiné, pag. 223, 224.

(*b*) *Mr* Allard *publiſhed this in* 1680.

ples of the Romiſh church (*c*). I ſhall give ſome extracts of it [*A*]. He would have been depoſed for that work, if the circumſtances of the times had not obliged the ſynod of that province to obſerve ſome temper [*B*]. The Proteſtants were ſatisfied with the declaration that Mr d'Yſe made before he died (*d*). The law-ſuit that was entered againſt him, on account of the money which had been raiſed for the Vaudois, was not attended with the troubleſome and diſgraceful conſequences, that a Catholic writer has publiſhed [*C*]. I learned

[*A*] *I ſhall give ſome extracts of it.*] This work is intituled, *Propoſitions & moyens pour parvenir à la reünion des deux Religions en France.* —— *Propoſals and methods for re-uniting the two religions in France.* The impreſſion was finiſhed the laſt of Auguſt, 1677. It contains ſix hundred and eight pages in 4to, and is divided into two parts. The author enlarges in the firſt, upon five conſiderations, which tend to incline the parties to mutual abatements, and the ſecond gives a long catalogue of the articles which they might agree in.

He cites (1) a Lutheran (2), who maintained that the Calviniſts fight with a ſhadow, when they confute a local preſence of JESUS CHRIST, and a natural manducation in the Lord's-ſupper. He cites another (3), who denies the ſame preſence and manducation, and maintains, that the body of JESUS CHRIST enters into the mouth, but not into the ſtomach. This Lutheran (4) confeſſes, that the Calviniſts receive the ſaving fruit of the ſacrament, provided they be morally in an invincible ignorance of their errors, but not if they continue in them againſt their conſcience, and with obſtinacy. Mr d'Yſe makes ſeveral reflexions upon the pacifical method of Father Maimbourg, and upon this objection, *viz.* that it follows from the doctrine of the Calviniſts, that all the Chriſtians, who have not followed Peter Valdo, John Hus, *&c.* are damned. His anſwers are almoſt the ſame with thoſe of Mr Jurieu (5), both with reſpect to the expedients of ſalvation, afforded to many perſons who inwardly renounced their errors, and with reſpect to the conſequence that is drawn in favour of thoſe, who, inwardly rejecting the falſe doctrines of Popery, remain ſtill in it's communion. To which purpoſe he ſpeaks of the permiſſion granted to Naaman, and of a national ſynod held at Paris, in the year 1559, which forbids to follow one's maſter into the Popiſh churches, tho' one does not bend the knee, and yet declares, that thoſe may be tolerated, who, like Naaman, and the duke of Saxony, publickly expreſs, 'that they will not pollute and defile themſelves with the idolatries, which are committed in the temples they frequent (6).' He ſays, that according to the Reformed, the univerſal church cannot err ſo far as to overthrow the articles of faith that are abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, and that if the thing be well conſidered, it will be found, that the Roman Catholics, whatever noiſe they make about it, aſcribe a leſſer infallibility to the church, than the Proteſtants; for, *ſays he*, cardinal Richelieu, book 2, chap. 2. inſinuates, that the univerſal church may err in fundamental points. He imputes to ſome Proteſtant divines an error which he calls a fundamental one, which is not to receive St John's Revelation, as a canonical book, and he confeſſes, that the primitive church did not receive it as canonical. It is true, he pretends, that that church erred out of ignorance, and not knowing the truth, but not out of obſtinacy, and denying it. The church, according to that cardinal, has been ignorant of ſome truths, which ſhe came to know in time, and defined afterwards as points of faith. The author adds, that in the references of the ſecond ſeſſion of the council of Trent, we find this queſtion, 'Whether general councils lawfully aſſembled, may err in the deciſion of points of faith.' The anſwer was, *It is a doubtful thing.* Touching again upon this in the 441ſt page, he ſays, that ſeveral doctors are there cited for the affirmative, and others for the negative. He had ſaid before (7), that the councils of Lateran, in 1180, and 1215, and ſome others, have been held *pro Eccleſiæ reformanda in fide & moribus*. He obſerves (8), that the Monks promiſing, according to the Roman pontifical, to obſerve a perpetual continence, as far as human frailty will permit, it is a proof that their vow is conditional; ſo that when the frailty of their nature will not permit them to preſerve their continence, they may marry without breaking their vow. He boaſts (9) of alledging nothing that is condeſcending on the part of the Catholics, but what is grounded on the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas, and other grave doctors, and that the condeſcenſion he uſes on the part of the Reformed, is grounded on what has been confeſſed by Calvin, and ſome other famous writers. From whence he infers, that private perſons in both communions, who would not ſubmit to the like condeſcenſions, would be unreaſonable. He produces hereupon the praiſes that ſome Popes, and ſome illuſtrious ſocieties have beſtowed upon Thomas Aquinas's doctrine; and as for the particular doctors, who have praiſed him, he refers us to a book, intituled, *The Diſputation of the Univerſity of Complutum on Dialectics.* He mentions alſo the approbations given to cardinal Richelieu's and the biſhop of Condom's books, and proves, that Calvin, Thomas Aquinas, *&c.* have made the conceſſions he ſpeaks of. He ſhews, that Calvin, Rivetus, and Bucanus, held the probability of the doctrine of a guardian angel; and as for what concerns the poſſibility of celibacy, he cites the national ſynod of Rochelle, 1571, which adviſes the wives of eccleſiaſtics relapſed into Popery, to have no commerce with them. That of Vitrai, 1588, does not approve that a man whoſe wife is become leprous, ſhould marry another. They adviſe him to pray to GOD, and to contain himſelf during his wife's life.

Though this book was printed with the conſent of ſome conſiderable perſons, the Monks obtained, that the copies of it ſhould be carried to the rolls of the Chatelet. They had ſeen ſome of them at a Binder's, and they made a great buſtle about it. It is at leaſt a piece of news, which was written to me in the year 1678, by a curious perſon, who was well informed of what concerns the Republic of Letters.

I make no doubt, that the fragments I have inſerted in this place, will be acceptable to the readers, becauſe it is a book but little known, and almoſt impoſſible to be met with.

[*B*] *The circumſtances of the times obliged the ſynod of that province to obſerve ſome temper.*] D'Yſe, 'who had been a miniſter at Grenoble, and who was actually profeſſor of Divinity at Die, wrote a treatiſe upon this ſubject, and imagined he had found the means of a perfect reconciliation. However his project had not the good luck to pleaſe the ſynod of his province, which forbid him to publiſh or communicate it. But D'Yſe prepoſſeſſed with the flatteries of Preſident de la Berchere, who filled him with hopes of great rewards, and mighty things, would not believe the ſynod. He took a journey to Paris, with ſeveral recommendations from the Preſident to the chief members of the council. The miniſters of the place having had notice of his deſign, endeavoured to have a ſight of his book, in order to diſcourage him from publiſhing it. They could obtain nothing. D'Yſe would not communicate it to them, but ſhewed it to the biſhop of Condom. That piece could not pleaſe the Catholics, becauſe the author made them too condeſcending; and under other expreſſions, kept moſt of the articles of the reformed doctrine: ſo that he returned without any approbation and recompence; having offended his brethren without gaining the good-will of their enemies. Nay, he was like to be involved in ſome criminal affairs, to pay him for his good intentions; but the Preſident, his protector, ſcreened him. As for the ſynod, they durſt not meddle with him upon that account, at a time when it was believed the court would be diſpleaſed with it. Without depoſing him therefore, a treaty was made with him, by which he was ſuffered to enjoy his Profeſſor's ſalary, but by way of diſcharge, he was deprived of the functions. He died ſome time after, and repaired the fault he had committed on that occaſion, by a declaration of his ſentiments, which was very edifying (10).'

[C] *The law-ſuit . . . . . . was not attended with the troubleſome and diſgraceful conſequences, which a Catholic writer has publiſhed.*] Mr Bernard (11) affirmed, *that when the duke of Savoy made war with his ſubjects of the vallies of Piedmont, the Reformed had raiſed a ſum of ſix or ſeven hundred thouſand livres, which*

(c) Allard, ubi ſupra, pag 224.

(*d*) *See end of the remark* [*B*].

(1) Propoſit. & Moiens, pag. 185.

(2) Alb. Grawerus, cap. iii, Polemicæ Sacræ.

(3) *Tobias Wagner, doctor of Divinity at Tubingen,* Inquiſit. Theol. in Acta Henotica.

(4) *See page* 526, *of the* Propoſitions & Moiens.

(5) *In his* Syſtem. de l'Egliſe.

(6) Propoſit. & Moiens, p. 331.

(7) Page 209.

(8) Ibid. pag. 366.

(9) Ibid. pag. 379.

(10) Hiſt. de l'Edit. de Nantes, Tom. III, Part. II, livr. xv, pag. 350, ad ann. 1677.

(11) Bernard, Explication de l'Edit de Nantes, apud Hiſt. de l'Edit de Nantes, ubi ſupra, Tom. III, livr. xi, pag. 60, ad ann. 1666.

I learned from a letter which I received in 1678, that Mr Cregut had publiſhed an Apology, in which he painted this miniſter in very black colours [*D*].

I add

which D'Yſe had received, and diſtributed; that he did not well diſcharge that adminiſtration; that he was proſecuted in the chamber of Grenoble to bring him to an account; that the conſiſtory, in order to put an end to the noiſe that was made about it, were forced to depoſe him; that they made him Principal of the college of Die, and named four miniſters to reviſe his accounts. There is nothing true in all this, except this one article, that D'Yſe had received the money deſigned for the relief of the inhabitants of the vallies, and that they took this opportunity to bring him into trouble, out of reſentment and revenge. You will find the ſequel of this affair in the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes. I ſhall only mention three or four particulars out it. *D'Yſe delivered his accounts towards the end of the year* 1656. Preſident Periſſol proſecuted him in the year 1665. This proſecution was carried on by degrees to the court made up of Proteſtant and Catholic judges. *D'Yſe had his cauſe pleaded in the court*, and gained his point. *The Preſident enraged at this affront, proſecuted the cauſe ſtill more violently, and his menaces, which neither the intreaties of his colleagues, nor the remonſtrances of the conſiſtory, nor the ſollicitations of the whole church, could put a ſtop to, obliged the conſiſtory not to depoſe D'Yſe, but to ſend him to Die in quality of profeſſor of Divinity. He had already performed the duties of that place, whilſt Cregut was forced, by the perſecution of the biſhop, to leave his profeſſorſhip. In the mean time the cauſe was removed into the court of Caſtres; and the Preſident incited as much as poſſible the inhabitants of the vallies to carry on the action againſt him. The conſiſtory made him give a new account, to put an end to that ſcandal; and they found but one article, amounting ſcarce to a denier per livre of the whole ſum, which he could not well account for. But his honeſty appeared*, &c. (12). The words which I ſuppreſs inform us, that he was only guilty of a little negligence; which was well for him, and he ought to be accounted a happy man for having failed only in that; for the handling of ſuch public gatherings is ſo dangerous an occaſion of ſinning, that a wiſe man ought never to engage in it, before he has made a frequent trial of his ſtrength. The cuſtody of this money is perhaps more difficult than that of a beautiful woman. The compariſon betwixt money and pitch, which is ſo common even among countrymen, is a very good one; one can hardly handle that fatal metal, any more than pitch, without ſoiling one's fingers. There was a terrible out-cry (13) againſt the ill management of the immenſe ſums (14), which were raiſed for the Vaudois; and I believe that, in all ſuch caſes, there has been, and there will be, occaſion to cry out; O how rare a thing it is to find a man who is not made of iron with reſpect to that loadſtone.

Abſtinens ducentis ad ſe cuncta pecuniæ (15).

From gold abſtaining; gold, that draws,
And ſubjects all things to it's laws.

We muſt ſeek for him with Diogenes's lanthorn, and if we deſign a crown for him, we may keep it long enough before we can find a man that deſerves it.

Regnum & diadema tutum
Deferens uni, propriamque laurum;
Quiſque is ingentes oculo irretorto
Spectat acervos (16).

Decreeing for that man alone
The crown, the laurel, and the throne,
Who can with unaverted eye
Sees heaps of ſhining metal lye.

[*D*] *Mr Cregut had publiſhed an apology in which he painted this miniſter in very black colours.*] It fell into my hands but a few days ago: the title of it is: *Apologia neceſſaria non minus quàm æquiſſima Antonii Creguti, contra accuſationem impræviſam, in expectatam & iniquam Friderici Spanhemii Profeſſoris Leydenſis.* It was printed at Amſterdam, in the year 1678, and contains forty eight pages, in 8vo. Mr Cregut (17) ſhews, that after the death of Stephen Blanc, who had been profeſſor of Divinity at Die, the academical ſenate charged Mr D'Yſe, the miniſter of the place, to fill the vacancy of the deceaſed till the next ſynod. Mr D'Yſe did ſo. The ſynod of the year following convened at Die, choſe Antony Cregut (18), profeſſor of Divinity. This choice was conditional and became definitive at the end of the year, by the judgment of the ſynod of Pragelas. Mr D'Yſe, who did the more earneſtly deſire that place, becauſe he had diſcharged the duties of it for ſome time, thwarted, as much as poſſible, the election of another; but not ſucceeding, he grew extreamly jealous of Mr Cregut, and ſought all imaginable means to prejudice him, though he always pretended to be his friend. He contributed, by his intrigues, to put a ſtop at Geneva, to the impreſſion of a Latin book of Mr Cregut (19), under pretence that the doctrine of it was falſe, and very dangerous. The author of it deſired, that the examination of his book ſhould be made only by the profeſſors of Geneva, that the whole matter might be tranſacted with leſs noiſe, and more judgment and expedition; but his requeſt was rejected, and his work was examined in the aſſembly of all the miniſters. He expected no good from it, and remembred the complaint of the emperor Hadrian: *The multitude of Phyſicians has deſtroyed me. Turba medicorum me perdidit.* They condemned two or three of his doctrines: this condemnation was communicated by his adverſary to the miniſters of the Greſivaudan (20) aſſembled in a body, and from that time, prejudices grew ſo violent againſt the author, that he was threatened with depoſition the next ſynod, which was to be held at Die. Mr D'Yſe not doubting that the quality of moderator of that ſynod, would powerfully enable him to execute his reſolutions, deſired to obtain it, and actually did. The firſt accuſation, concerned the aſſertions about Grace, which Mr Cregut had publiſhed. He offered his reaſons, and thought he had nothing to fear, when he ſaw the end of that firſt proceeding; but he was miſtaken; for ſome days after Mr D'Yſe having declared to the ſynod, that the miniſters of Geneva had cenſured ſome articles of the *Revelator Arcanorum* of Mr Cregut, put ſome queſtions to the author about the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's ſin. Mr Cregut was going to explain that matter; but he was preſently interrupted, upon pretence, that there was ſome other affairs which could not be put off. He waited for another opportunity to explain himſelf in the following ſeſſions, in caſe that diſpute ſhould be ſet on foot again; but he waited in vain. Mr D'Yſe plaid his part ſo maliciouſly, that he got his adverſary condemned, without giving him an opportunity to plead his cauſe. There was a famous diſputation in the Philoſophy-ſchool. The Jeſuits of that town, and ſeveral other perſons of the Romiſh clergy, were preſent at it, and it was very neceſſary that Mr Cregut, as rector of the univerſity, ſhould be there. Mr d'Yſe took that opportunity, drew up an act of condemnation, and got it approved at the end of the ſynod. Part of the miniſters were already gone, and the reſt were very deſirous to ſtay no longer. If the abſence of ſome members is favourable to thoſe who have an ill deſign the diſpoſition of the reſt who deſire to go home, is ſo too; for being in haſte to finiſh what remains, every thing is carried on in a hurry. Thus you ſee how innocence was oppreſſed, as Mr Cregut pretends. ‘Illo tempore (21) me abſente, inaudito, juſſo deputatis ſilentio, ſub finem Synodi, dum omnia tumultuario fiunt, Paſtoribus tunc vel abſentibus, vel abiturientibus Dizius ipſe bellum illum articulum non mihi, ſed ſibi ludibrium propinans, fabricavit, aſſumpto in tanto facinore ſuo Achate Rainaudo, digno patellæ operculo (22).’ He adds, that they ordered a great number of copies of that act to be made, to cummunicate them to all the Proteſtant world. ‘Verum illis non ſufficiebat calumnioſus articulus intra privatos parietes fabricatus ab inimicis, haud potuit ſatiari invidia malitioſa, niſi per totum Orbem Reformatum exemplaria illius articuli mitterentur, tam in Galliam quàm exteras nationes, Helvetiam, Ger-

‘maniam,

---

(12) Hiſt. de l'Edit. de Nantes, ubi ſupra, pag. 61.

(13) *See Mr Leti*, Critique ſur les Loteries, Part. II, pag. 108, & ſeq.

(14) The author of the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes, denies that the money raiſed in France, amounted to ſix or ſeven hundred thouſand livres, as Bernard will have it. It was at moſt, ſays he, but the third part of all the ſeveral ſums, and all the ſums did not amount to five hundred thirty thouſand livres. Mr Leti, *ibid. pag.* 110, ſays they amounted to three millions, and thoſe of France to ſeven hundred fifty thouſand livres.

(15) Horat. Od. ix, lib. iv.

(16) Idem, Od. ii, lib. ii.

(17) Cregutus, Apol. Neceſſar. pag. 11, & ſeq.

(18) He was miniſter at Montelimart.

(19) *Intitled*, Revelator arcanorum.

(20) A country near Grenoble, and one of the *Colloques* of the ſynodal province of Dauphiné for the Proteſtants.

(21) That is, whilſt he was preſent at the public diſputation, as rector of the univerſity.

(22) Cregut, ubi ſupra, pag. 26.

I add, that the churches of the vallies of Piedmont ſent him into England in Cromwell's time, to remove ſome difficulties concerning the collections of money made for the Vaudois; and that he was preſent in the national ſynod of Loudun, as deputy of the province of Dauphiné (*e*).

(*e*) *Taken from* Hiſtoire des Egliſes Vaudoiſes, *publiſhed by John Leger, at Leyden, in* 1569, *pag.* 205, *of the ſecond part.*

‘ maniam, Hollandiam, &c. Pædagogis ſuis jugiter occupatis ut plura Apographa deſcriberent (23).’ In fine, he ſays, that his book having been ſold, without any alteration made in it, ruined the trophies of his enemy, and convicted him of having extracted ſomething out of it, that manifeſted his envy and raſhneſs. ‘ Paulo poſt libro meo edito abſque vel apiculi immutatione, abortivus ac furtivus ille Dizii articulus cecidit coram meo Revelatore, ſicut Dagon coram arca fœderis. Et ne plura exempla proſeram, unum Rev. Antiſtitis Eccleſiæ Bernenſis D. Homelii erit mihi pro cunctis, dum eſſem Bernæ in illius Muſæo protulit è ſua Bibliotheca meum Revelatorem Arcan. & Dizii pravè & ſtolidè articulatum articulum arthritide laborantem, & dixit ſe contuliſſe cum locis Revelatoris, quem tunc præ manibus habebat, unde facta etiam inter nos collatione non poterat ſatis mirari ſtuporem, virus & invidiam compilatoris (24). — *Soon after my book had been publiſhed without the alteration even of an accent, the abortive and ſtolen work of D'Yſe fell before my* Revelator, *like Dagon before the ark of the covenant. And, not to multiply examples, I will be ſatisfied with that alone of Homelius, Antiſtes of Bern; who, when I was at Bern in his Muſæum, brought out of his library my* Revelator Arcanorum, *and D'Yſe's ſilly lame performance, and ſaid he had compared it with the paſſages of the* Revelator, *which he had then in his hand; upon which compariſon between us, he could not ſufficiently wonder at the ſtupidity, malice, and envy of the compiler.*’ He ſays (25), that having explained in ſome letters, the ſenſe of his propoſitions, and offered new explications, if thoſe already publiſhed were not ſufficient, the divines of Geneva, permitted the impreſſion of the *Revelator Arcanorum*, and took off the prohibition of ſelling the Theſes maintained at Die. He is contented to mention in general; the great trial above mentioned (26); but he ſays that Mr d'Yſe being ſhamefully expelled from the church of Grenoble, was admitted again into that of Die. *Ex Eccleſia Gratianopolitana turpiſſime ejecti . . . . . Ut Dizius fuerat potius intruſus quam vocatus, ita detruſus fuit. Non inquiro de crimine quod objiciebatur, eſſet piaculare. Deus novit. Acta ſunt publice in Parliamento litigata, quæ ad has uſque Oras pervenerunt . . . . . Ictu Maris a Naufragio ſervatus, Galli noſtri vulgo dicunt*, d'un coup de vent ou de tempeſte, *priſtinas ſedes recuperavit, in Portum Dienſem appellens ubi antea Miniſter fuerat, ibi cum ſuo Rainaudo, juvat meminiſſe laborum præteritorum* (27).

I do not vouch for the truth of theſe particulars alledging them only as a proof of my text, *viz.* that Mr Cregut has painted Mr d'Yſe in very black colours.

(23) Id. ibid.

(24) Id. ibid. pag. 27.

(25) Id. ibid. pag. 30.

(26) *In the remark* [*C*].

(27) Cregut, Apol. Neceſſar. pag. 30, 31.

ISLEBIANS. Thus they are called, who embraced the opinions of a Saxon divine, named John Agricola, a native of Eiſleben, and a diſciple and countryman of Martin Luther. I have ſpoke very largely of this **JOHN AGRICOLA** (*a*). He taught for ſome time a very falſe doctrine concerning the uſe of the Moſaical law. He miſtook St Paul's diſpute againſt the Jews, and the oppoſition which this great apoſtle of Grace ſo often made betwixt the œcononomy of works, and the œconomy of faith. Luther did ſo vigorouſly oppoſe the errors of Agricola, that he forced him to recant. Every one may know, why the name of Antinomians was given to the followers of this man. Their opinions have not been faithfully repreſented by their adverſaries; and there's no doubt but that Prateolus has much exaggerated what he ſays of them [*A*]. But this is nothing, if compared with Garaſſe's ſcurrility in his account of the pretended hereſies of the Iſlebians [*B*].

(*a*) *See his article, at the letter* [*A*], *pag.* 140.

[*A*] *Prateolus has much exaggerated what he ſays of them.*] He did not go to the fountain head, but only copied Staphylus,. Hoſius, and Lindanus. What he copies from Staphylus, may be reduced to this (1), that according to John Agricola, the law of God is altogether uſeleſs, that it is neither neceſſary before nor after our juſtification, and that men under the goſpel are not obliged to good works. What he takes from Lindanus, is much harſher: *viz.* that according to John Agricola, men may be righteous againſt their conſciences; and that an adulterer, an uſurer, a fornicator, or any ſuch great ſinner, ſhall be ſaved, provided he believe. *Antinomi à Johanne Iſlebio Lutheri cive ac diſcipulo exorti. Hi dogma ſequuntur legibus divinis contrarium* (*ait Querela Lutheri*) *legem operum rejicientes, finguntque homines contra conſcientiam juſtos eſſe. Aiunt enim, teſte Luthero lib. de Conciliis; ſi es Adulter, Scortator, Uſurarius, Avarus, aut aliis pollutus peccatis, ſi tantum credis, ſalvas es. Hactenus Lindanus* (2). I cannot believe this is a faithful acccount of Agricola's opinions.

[*B*] *Garaſſe's ſcurrility in his account of the pretended hereſies of the Iſlebians.*] It is an uſeful thing to let the reader ſee how bold ſome men are in their ſlanders; and therefore the length of this paſſage will not hinder me from inſerting it here. ‘ The Iſlebians, or Antinomians, otherwiſe called Nomomachi, foraſmuch as they oppoſe the law of Moſes, ſaying, in their articles of faith, that it is the torment of our ſouls, are the diſciples of a certain labourer, called Joannes Iſlebius, who, coming from the tail of the plough, *Triduo ſe Theologum profeſſus eſt*, as Melanchthon ſpeaks, writing againſt him. The principal reveries of theſe upſtarts are to be found in the book *de Libertate Chriſtiana*, written by Dr Paul Crellius, who was one of the chief ſupporters of that curſed ſect. I will only produce three of the moſt remarkable, taken word for word from their articles of faith. The firſt imports, that the goſpel, and the Old Teſtament, unleſs they are preached *viva voce, ſunt veteres calcei in angulo derelicti*, are like old ſhoes thrown by in a corner, when they can be no longer worn. But when the goſpel is preached, then it becomes like the ſhoes mentioned in the Canticles, *Quam pulchri ſunt greſſus tui in calceamentis tuis, filia principis*; — (*How beautiful are thy feet with ſhoes, O princes daughter!*) and in the CVIIth pſalm: *In Idumæam extendam calceamentum meum.* That is according to Beza's expoſition:

Contre Edom peuple glorieux
Je jetteray mes ſoluliers vieux.

. . . . *my ſhoe*
On Edom will I caſt.

‘ So that in their way of ſpeaking, preachers are Coblers, the holy Scriptures are old ſhoes; the pulpit, the ſhop wherein they are kept, and Lent and Advent the old ſhoes-fair.

‘ The ſecond propoſition of the Antinomians is ſtill more horrible; and I am very ſorry my words cannot expreſs the weight of my thoughts: It is expreſſed in theſe terms by Dr Crellius: *Qui quærit ſalutem in veteri lege quærit PEDICULUM IN SCABIE.* He that ſeeks his ſalvation in the law of Moſes, and the Old Teſtament, ſeeks a LOUSE in a SCAB, that is to ſay that the Salvation of our ſouls is like LICE and GOD is like a SCAB. I want words to expreſs my aſtoniſhment . . . . (3).

‘ The third maxim of the Nomomachi is quoted by Dr Crellius, in theſe words, *Moſes ad corvos abeat cum lege ſua, nam ſi non reſipuit, eſt dam-*

(1) Prateolus, in Elencho Hæreticorum, voce *Antinomi, pag. m.* 41. He ſays Staphylus took this from Agricola's notes upon the Goſpel of St John, and from Luther's *Antinomian* diſputes.

(2) Prateolus, ibid.

(3) Garaſſe, Curious Doctrine, book v, ſect. xvi, pag. 557.

‘ *natus ad omnes Diabolos.* —— *Let Moſes be hanged with his law, for if he did not repent he is damned to the pit of hell.* I appeal from the ſentence of the Antinomians, as being Moſes's advocate, and I find the Antinomian madneſs far exceeding that of the Manichees; for when they rejected Moſes, they pretended to have more honourable pretences, as St Auſtin relates in the fifteenth book againſt Fauſtus. Being asked why they rejected the Old Teſtament and the law of Moſes, they anſwered, with ſpecious words, and well adjuſted phraſes, that they therein practiſed the command of Jeſus Chriſt, who forbad his Apoſtles to put new wine into old veſſels: and that their church was like a young damſel, who receives no letters or *Billets doux* from her old lovers, that endeavour to corrupt her by promiſes: that is to ſay, their church neither receives nor acknowledges the old Teſtament, which is an old decayed wine, an old piece of tattered cloth, an old caſt-off-lover. And then they added as in triumph and inſulting our church: *Vos quidem pergite agere ut cœpiſtis, rudem pannum veteri veſtimento committite, novum vinum veternoſis utribus credite, duobus maritis nulli placituri ſervite, Chriſtianam fidem Hippocentaurum facite, nec equum perfectum nec hominem: Nobis ſoli Chriſto ſervire permittite.* Who, hearing this delicious impudence, theſe bewitching words, would not ſay, here are pious and holy ſouls; but it appears at the bottom, that the Manichees were meer ſcoundrels. It is true that as great ſcoundrels as they were, they had not ſo many lice, as the Antinomians (4).

ITALICA,

ITALICA, a town in Spain, was ſo called when Scipio Africanus gave it the form of a city (*a*). It grew very conſiderable, and was the birth-place of Trajan and Hadrian (*b*). It enjoyed a long time (*c*) the privileges of thoſe towns which were called *Municipia*, and afterwards it deſired to be in the ſame condition with thoſe which they called colonies. Hadrian wondered it ſhould deſire this change (*d*); for he looked upon the privileges of a *municipium*, as preferable to thoſe of a colony. Nothing remains of Italica but the ruins of it (*e*). Some authors place it near Seville in a place which at preſent is called Sivilla la Veja (*f*). I have ſaid in another place (*g*), that it did not appear to me, that it could be proved there ever was ſuch a town in Italy as Italica. I do not retract what I ſaid, though I know a very ſpecious objection may be made againſt it [*A*].

[*A*] *I know that a very ſpecious objection may be made againſt it.*] It is grounded upon a paſſage in Strabo, where we find that ſome people of Italy riſing and conſederating to make war againſt the Romans, made Corfinium their place of arms, and named it Italica. Μετονομασθεῖσαν Ἰταλικὴν, *Italicæ nomen indiderunt* (1). Note, that Corfinium was the capital town of the Peligni, and that this war was that which was called *Bellum Sociale* or *Marſicum*, or *Italicum*, and which began in the year of Rome 662 (2). It is very probable, that in theſe words of Diodorus Siculus, τὴν κοινὴν πόλιν Ἰταλίαν ὀνομάσαντες (3), it ought to be read Ἰταλικήν (4), and not Ἰταλίαν. Thus you ſee two good authors who witneſs, that the town of Corfinium was called Italica, when theſe people confederated againſt Rome. Velleius Paterculus might be alledged as a third witneſs, *caput imperii ſui Corfinium legerant*, ſays he (5), *quod appellarent Italicum*. There are ſome critics (6), who read *quod appellarunt Italicam*. Others (7) keep to *Italicum*. It matters not with me; the anſwer I have to make, does not want the more favourabler eading; for this is what I have to ſay. The name of Italica, which the allies gave the town of Corfinium, laſted no longer than the war: they gave it a new name, when they choſe it their common metropolis. They eſtabliſhed in it (8) a policy like that of Rome, whereby they ſhewed not only their emulation for the capital city of the Roman people, but alſo their reſolution to make themſelves independant. Since then the new name of Italica was a conſequence and a monument of their conſpiracy, it is not likely that the Romans would ſuffer it to remain. Corfinium reſumed it's former name, when the war was finiſhed in the year of Rome 664, and we do not find that it was called otherwiſe than Corfinium, ſince that time. Whence the error of thoſe appears, who pretend that the poet Silius Italicus was a native of Corfinium, and for that reaſon ſirnamed Italicus.

JUBA.

JUBA. Hiſtory makes mention of two princes of this name, whereof one was the father of the other. Moreri has ſpoken of them; but he has committed ſome faults [*A*], which

[*A*] *Mr Moreri . . . . has committed ſome faults.*] I. He ſays that Juba, the father, was king of Mauritania: This is falſe. In this Juba's time, the *Mauritania Cæſarienſis* belonged to Bocchus, and the Tingitana to Bogud. Some time after, that is, in the year 716, Bocchus poſſeſſed himſelf of the Tingitana. After his death his kingdom was reduced into a province in the year 721, as Numidia had been under Julius Cæſar (1). II. He ſays, that Juba, the ſon, was reſtored by Auguſtus to the kingdom of his father, that is to ſay, to Numidia. He ſhould have ſaid with Dion (2), that Auguſtus gave him ſome parts of Getulia, and the two Mauritania's; and that the beſt part of Numidia remained ſtill a Roman province. It is true that Strabo affirms (3) that Auguſtus reſtored Juba to the kingdom of his father, and that moreover he granted him Mauritania; but this Geographer limits the Roman province and the kingdom of Juba in ſuch a manner as ſhews (4) that Numidia belonged to the Romans. III. Moreri makes Pliny ſay, that Juba, the ſon, *found an herb, which his Phyſician Euphorbus called by his name Euphorbia.* This is not what Pliny ſays; his words are (5): *Invenit & patrum noſtrorum ætate rex Juba, quam appellavit Euphorbiam Medici ſui nomine.* The meaning of which is, that Juba found an herb, which from the name of his Phyſician, he called Euphorbia. It would be ſomewhat ſtrange that a Phyſician to the king ſhould have been ſo bad a courtier, as to give his own name to an herb, which the king his maſter had found. Yet this is what Pliny affirmed, if we believe Moreri. It would be much leſs ſtrange, that a king, who diſcovers an herb ſhould chuſe rather to give it the name of his Phyſician than his own. Which is what Juba did, if we depend on the teſtimony of Pliny whom I have cited; but there is reaſon to believe, that Pliny has not been ſo exact here as he ought to have been. What he ſays in another book is more credible, namely that Euphorbia was ſo called from the name of it's diſcoverer, who was the Phyſician of king Juba. He adds a thing, which well deſerved that Moreri ſhould take notice of it: which is, that Juba wrote a particular treatiſe upon this herb, in which he extolled the ſingular virtues of it. ‘Juba Ptolemæi pater, qui prius utrique Mauritaniæ imperavit, ſtudiorum claritate memorabilior etiam, quam regno, ſimilia prodidit de Atlante: præterque gigni ibi herbam Euphorbiam nomine ab inventore medico ſuo appellatam. Cujus lacteum ſuccum miris laudibus celebrat in claritate viſus, contraque ſerpentes, & venena omnia, privatim dicato volumine (6). —— *Juba, father of Ptolemy, who before reigned over both Mauritania's, more famous as a learned man than as a king, gave the ſame account of Atlas: and beſides, that there grew there the herb Euphorbia, ſo called from his Phyſician, who diſcovered it. The milky juice of which herb he wonderfully extols as an antidote againſt the venom of ſerpents, and all kinds of poiſon.*’ IV. I might obſerve as one fault Moreri's falſe quotations (7).

[*B*] *I ſhall*

---

(4) Id. ibid. pag. 559.

(*a*) Appian. in Ibericis, pag. m. 464.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Aulus Gellius, lib. xvi, cap. xiii.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) *See* Ludovicus Nonnius in Hiſpania, cap. xvii, pag. m. 64.

(*f*) Id. ibid. pag. 65.

(*g*) *See remark* [*A*], *of the article* HADRIAN (PUBLIUS ÆLIUS).

(1) Strabo, lib. v, pag. m 167.

(2) *See* Sigonius, in Faſtis, ad ann. 662.

(3) In Excerptis lib. xxxvii, apud Photium.

(4) *See* Caſaubon. in Strab. lib. v, pag. m. 94.

(5) Vell. Paterc. lib. ii, cap. xvi.

(6) Gerard. Voſſius, Not. in Patercul. ibid.

(7) Sigonius, de ant. Jure Italiæ, lib. iii, cap. i, fol. m. 100. Boëcler. Paterc. ibid.

(8) *See* Sigonius, ubi ſupra.

(1) *You will find all this proved in Father Noris's* Cenotaphia Piſana, pag. 235.

(2) Lib. liii, ad ann. 729.

(3) Lib. xvii, pag. 570.

(4) *See Father Noris*, ubi ſupra.

(5) Plin. lib. xxv, cap. vii, pag. m. 400.

(6) Plin. lib. v, cap. i, ſub fin. pag. m. 527.

(7) *He quotes Dion, in the forty firſt book, &* ſeq. *But he ſhould have quoted the forty third. He quotes* Pliny, lib. xxv, cap. i, *he ſhould have quoted the ſeventh chapter. He quotes the eighth book of Athenæus, which mentions only a Greek epigram of Juba: He ſhould have quoted the third and fourth books. He ſhould have quoted the ſeventeenth book of Strabo, and the ſecond book of Voſſius.*

which it is not improper to take notice of. I ſhall rectify but a few faults of other authors [*B*].

[*B*] *I ſhall rectify but a few faults of other authors.*] It ſeems Joſephus ſays that Juba, the ſon, had to wife Glaphyra, the widow of one of the ſons of Herod. See this woman's article (8) where we confute this. Father Salian thought that Juba died in the 759th year of Rome. Father Noris (9) has invincibly confuted him by this obſervation; Strabo wrote his thirteenth book a little after the year 771. Now in his ſeventeenth book he ſpeaks of Juba, as of a prince lately dead; Juba therefore did not die before the year 772, or thereabout. The ſame Strabo ſays elſewhere (10) that Juba lived in the reign of Tiberius. Now Tiberius began his reign but in the year 767. It ſeems that one may infer from a paſſage of Tacitus, that Juba was yet alive in the year 776 (11). Noldius is miſtaken in ſuppoſing, that Dion ſays that Auguſtus gave Egypt to Juba, beſides the kingdom of his father (12). There is nothing in Dion's words, that obliges us to refer the word ταύτην to Egypt, and it is certain it muſt be referred to the word Cleopatra. Dion's tranſlator has miſerably blundered. Ἥ τε Κλεοπάτρα Ἰόβα τῷ τοῦ Ἰόβου παιδὶ συνῴκησε. τούτῳ γὰρ ὁ Καῖσαρ τραφέντι τε ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ, καὶ συστρατευσαμένῳ οἱ ταύτην τε καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν τὴν πατρῴαν ἔδωκε. *Cleopatra autem Jubæ Jubæ filio in matrimonium tradita eſt. Hunc Jubam Cæſar in Italia educatum, ac ſuam militiam ſecutum, hoc regno* (*read* ea, Cleopatra ſcilicet) *& paterno etiam donavit* (13). Noldius citing the paſſage, in which Dion ſays (14) that Juba, inſtead of his father's kingdom, received of Auguſtus ſome parts of Getulia, and the dominions of Bocchus and Bogud, obſerves that Pliny has juſtly ſubſtituted in the room of thoſe dominions, both the Mauritanias. *Pro quibus rectè Plinius* Hiſt. Nat. V. c. I. *utramque Mauritaniam ſubſtituit, hoc eſt Cæſarienſem & Tingitanam.* Which is clearly to inſinuate this falſity, *viz.* that theſe two Mauritania's and the dominions mentioned by Dion, were not the ſame thing.

(8) *In the remark* [*B*].

(9) Ubi ſupra, pag. 238.

(10) Lib. vi, circa fin.

(11) *See the article* GLAPHYRA, *grand-daughter*, &c.

(12) Noldius de Vita & Geſtis Herodum, pag. 176.

(13) Dio, lib. li, pag. 520. *Leunclavius takes notice of this fault of Xylander in his edition of Dion Caſſius.*

(14) Id. lib. liv, pag. 580, ad ann. 729.

JUDEX (MATTHEW) one of the principal writers of the Centuries of Magdeburg, was born at Tippolſwald (*a*) in Miſnia the twenty ſecond (*b*) of September 1528. He ſhewed a great inclination for learning, upon which his father permitted him to go and ſtudy at Dreſden. He ſtaid not there long, but choſe rather to ſtudy in the college of Wittemberg, and afterwards in that of Magdeburg: He was in a wretched condition, when he came to this laſt town, being over-run with the itch, and without money. The way he took to live, was to beg alms by ſinging from door to door; but after he was known to be a hopeful young man, he was preferred to a tutor's place in the houſe of an advocate, who ſent him with his ſon to Wittemberg in the year 1546. He there took his maſter of arts degree, in October 1549. After which he returned to Magdeburg, and there taught the ſecond claſs ſome years; and afterwards he was miniſter of the church of St Ulric till the year 1559. He quitted not that employment till he went to be profeſſor of Divinity, in the univerſity of Jena. He continued in that profeſſorſhip only eighteen months; for that place was taken from him by order of John Frederic duke of Saxony, in the beginning of October 1561. He ſtayed ſtill half a year at Jena; and then ſpending almoſt as much time at Magdeburg, he retired to Wiſmar. He died the fifteenth of May 1564 [*A*] at Roſtoc, whither he went a few days before to aſſiſt at the promotion of ſcholars. He was a man of good morals, laborious, zealous, learned, and he wrote ſeveral books [*B*]. He had many perſecutions and vexations to go

(*a*) It is a place two German leagues diſtant from Dreſden.

(*b*) Andreas Schoppius, *ubi infra, citat.* (*c*), ſays that it was on St Matthew's day: and therefore he ſhould have ſaid the twenty firſt, and not the twenty ſecond.

[*A*] *He died the fifteenth of May* 1564.] I ſhould not make a remark upon this, if it were not to ſay, that authors are very careleſs with reſpect to the dates of the death of perſons, and other computations. I find in Paul Freherus's Theatrum (1) that our Judex died the eleventh of June 1564. This date is alledged upon the credit of the *Nomenclator Profeſſorum Ienenſium*, written by Hadrian Beyer. Mr Sagittarius (2) citing the ſame *Nomenclator*, places Judex's death on the ſame day as Paul Freherus: but I ſee in Micrælius (3) this death placed in the year 1587, which was the ſeventy ninth year of the deceaſed. There is in the margin, *Freber, p.* 202. It is hard to conceive, how ſuch an unfaithful quotation could creep into that place; and note, that Judex would not have lived ſeventy nine years, though he had lived till 1587, for he was born in 1528. It is affirmed in his life (4), that his death was the more regretted, becauſe he had not lived above thirty ſeven years. This calculation is not right; for ſince his birth was placed on the twenty ſecond of December 1528, and his death on the fifteenth of May 1564, it ſhould have been ſaid that he was not yet thirty ſix years old.

[*B*] *He was a man of good morals . . . . and wrote ſeveral books.*] He was of ſuch ſobriety, as not to eat ſo much in a week, as others, but of a moderate ſtomach, eat in two days; and his beſt friends could never obtain of him to drink more than to ſatisfy his thirſt (5). He was ſo averſe to pomp and luxury, that on his wedding-day he would not conſent, that his wife ſhould dreſs herſelf finely, and obliged her to content herſelf with very ordinary cloaths (6). His chaſtity was ſo great, that, before he married, ſome people thought that he was of a frigid or inſenſible conſtitution; and he confeſſed privately to his intimate friends, that he believed the cauſe of his ill ſtate of health, or at leaſt, that what increaſed his infirmities, was his ſtaying too long before he married. ‘Ante legitimum conjugium adeò pudicè vixit, ut à ‘nonnullis frigidus ſit judicatus, ac ipſe intimis ſit confeſſus, ſe judicare originem aut certè non leve ſuæ ‘adverſæ valetudinis incrementum inde exiſtere, quòd ‘non priùs duxiſſet uxorem (7).’ Yet he was married at twenty ſix years of age (8), when he was called to be miniſter of the church of St Ulric at Magdeburg. He married a maid of fifteen or ſixteen years of age, who was not rich. Some of his friends were angry, that he had married a wife who had neither years nor money enough; but he anſwered them, that he had always begged of GOD a wife, unexperienced in evil things, tractable, free from pride, *&c.* ‘Ægriùs tu‘lere amicorum quidam, quòd juvenculam & minùs ‘dotatam ſibi jungeret virginem, ſed iis reſpondit, ſe ‘ab adoleſcentia aſſiduè petiſſe à Deo, ut puellam bonis ‘prognatam, honeſtè educatam, virtutibus & pietate ‘ornatam, malarum rerum ætate adhuc imperitam, & ‘morigeram potiùs, quam natalibus elatam, delicatâ ‘& blandâ educatione ac converſatione malâ depravatam, ac dotibus & ornamentis fortunæ protervam, ‘ſibi dare dignaretur, ac ſe voti ſui compotem factum ‘in Dei providentia adquieſcere (9). —— *Some of ‘his friends took it amiſs, that he had married a young ‘girl without a fortune; but he anſwered them, that ‘he had made it his conſtant prayer to GOD from his ‘childhood, that he would beſtow on him a young woman, born of virtuous parents, virtuouſly educated, ‘good and pious, unacquainted with the vices and follies ‘of life, and of a complying temper, rather than one ‘who is proud of her family, ſpoiled through polite education and company, and inſolently vain of her qualifications and fortune; and that, being poſſeſſed of his ‘wiſh, he acquieſced in the providence of GOD.*’ He lived piouſly and comfortably with his wife a little above ten years, and had ſix children by her (10). She married the ſecond time Andrew Schoppius (11).

I ſhall

(1) Page 202.

(2) Sagittar. Introd. in Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. 247.

(3) Micræl. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. pag. 770. Edit. 1699.

(4) Andr Schoppius, Orat. de Vita Matth. Judicis apud Crenium Anim. Phil. & Hiſt. Part. VI, pag. 71.

(5) Schoppius, ibid. pag. 58.

(6) Id. ibid. pag. 58, 59.

(7) Id. ibid pag. 57, 58.

(8) Id. pag. 58.

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Id. ibid.

(11) Id. ibid. pag. 50.

go through during the courſe of his miniſtry (c) [C].

(c) *Taken from Andrew Schoppius*, in Oratione de Vita Matthæi Judicis. *It is to be found at the end of the ſecond part*, enarrationis Epiſtolarum Dominicalium Matthæi Judicis, Iſlebiæ 1578, in 8vo. *Mr Crenius has inſerted that Oration in the ſixth part of his* Animadverſiones Philol. & Hiſtor. pag. 49, & ſeq.

I ſhall now ſpeak of the books he wrote. He tranſlated into Latin the German book of Luther concerning the literal ſenſe of theſe words, *This is my Body.* He dedicated that work to the ſenate of Ratisbon, and confuted in the Epiſtle Dedicatory the fifteen main arguments of the Zuinglians. The title of a book he publiſhed in the year 1559 runs thus: *quod arguere peccata ſeu concionari pœnitentiam ſit proprium Legis & non Evangelii proprie dicti, Rationes & Argumenta.* His treatiſe *de Typographiæ inventione, & de prælorum legitima inſpectione*, was printed in the year 1566. His *Enarrationes Epiſtolarum Dominicalium* came out in the year 1578. He publiſhed ſix books of his own compoſing in High-Dutch. He and Wigandus jointly publiſhed ſome pieces, as (12) *Reſponſio ad Confeſſionem Majoris de Juſtificatione & bonis operibus. Reſponſio ad ſcurriles & blaſphemos fœtidi Rambocchii Rythmos Witebergæ impreſſos. De Adiaphoricis corruptelis in magno libro Actorum Interimiſticorum, ſub conficto titulo Profeſſorum Wittebergenſium edito, repertis, Admonitiones. Corpus Doctrinæ ex Novo Teſtamento, De Victorini Strigelii declaratione ſeu potiùs occultatione.* Andrew Schoppius adds this: *Item cum Illyrico, Muſæo, & Wigando miſit Epiſtolam ad quoſdam pios fratres de cauſſa Victorini. Et cum iiſdem ſe purgavit de fictis rationibus demiſſionis Jenenſis, quas charta ἀνώνυμος referebat* (13). He afterwards gives the titles of ſome German books, and of ſome Latin pieces that have not been printed. He obſerves (14) that Judex was well ſkilled in Muſic, and had ſome knowledge of the Mathematics. He was not ignorant of Aſtrology, and calculated ſome nativities. ‘ Judicia nativitatum ſibi, liberis ſuis & Embdenis (15) nonnullis ‘ compoſuit, atque figuras cœli, quas vocant, aliis rebus accommodatas erexit.’ He had ſtudied ſome time the Civil-law at Wittemberg: he could make Latin and Greek verſes, and he had a deſign to write an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of his own time (16). Every body knows that he had a hand in the two firſt centuries (17) of Magdeburg, and that it was a very great labour. He died very young, and had a bad ſtate of health for fifteen years together (18), and therefore it cannot be doubted that he was very ſtudious and laborious.

I ſhall occaſionally relate a thing, which may ſerve as a ſupplement to what we have ſeen above (19) concerning the hiſtory of theſe centuries. The three laſt were never publiſhed, though the centuriators had proceeded very far in them, and the Margrave of Brandenburg, duke of Pruſſia, had given orders to Andrew Stangewald to put the laſt hand to them, that they might be printed. *Andreas Stangewaldus . . . . ſibi ab inclyto Marchione Brandenburgenſi, Duce Boruſſiæ tùm temporis negotium datum eſſe confirmabat, ut reliquas tres centurias Eccleſiaſticæ Hiſtoriæ Magdeburgenſ. ab autoribus affectas jam penèque perfectas, perpoliret, atque ad editionem accuratè præpararet.* Mr Crenius (20) has publiſhed the letter, out of which I have taken this paſſage. It was found in a poſthumous work of Conrad Schluſſelburg printed at Roſtoc in the year 1624. He wonders how Mr Sagittarius forgot this particular; and he mentions another which he read in a work of the civilian Francis Baudouin (21): namely, that a French tranſlation of the centuries of Magdeburg was made at Geneva, with the ſame inſincerity, that appeared in the French tranſlation of Luther's commentary upon St Paul's epiſtle to the Galatians (22).

(12) In 1558.

(13) *Taken from* Andrew Schoppius, pag. 63, & ſeq.

(14) Id. ibid. pag. 56.

(15) He was tutor to the children of Levinus Embdenus a civilian of Magdeburg.

(16) Andr. Schoppius, pag. 56.

(17) Note, that he had a hand in the German tranſlation of the three firſt firſt centuries.

(18) Annis quindecim valetudine afflictiſſima. *Andr. Schoppius, pag.* 56.

(19) Remark [*H*], of the article ILLYRICUS.

(20) Crenius, Animadv Part. VI, pag. 72.

(21) *Viz.* His anſwer to Beza under the name of Michael Fabricius.

(22) Crenius, ubi ſuora, in Addendis, pag. penult.

[C] *He had many perſecutions and vexations to go through.*] He was one of thoſe that drew up the diſcipline of the church of Magdeburg, which was printed in the year 1554. He ſhewed himſelf very exact in procuring the obſervation of it, and refuſed the ſacrament to ſome impenitent perſons. Hereupon he was threatened to be beaten and trampled under foot (23). He was very much abuſed in the ſatires, that were made at Wittemberg againſt the centuriators. *Scurriles Neminiſtæ & Acolaſti Witebergenſes in famoſa illius laboris reprehenſione & acerba invectiva D. Judicem vocabant Judam & pullum filium aſinæ ſubjugalis* (24). He ſtrongly oppoſed the Synergiſts, whilſt he was profeſſor of Divinity at Jena. It was a powerful party, and they paſquined him, in an inſolent and ſlanderous manner. They made uſe of ſtones too; for there was a gang of rogues, who all the night long committed riots about his houſe, and threw ſtones at his windows. He was deprived of his employment, after having exerciſed it in the midſt of many troubles eighteen months. The pretence alledged for it was the publication of a German book, *De fuga Papatus, Of the Flight of Popery* (25); but one of the true cauſes was his oppoſition to the party, which was favoured at court (26). This party was that of Strigelius, a profeſſor, one of the heads of the Synergiſts, or ſticklers for human liberty. They did not fail to give out many reaſons or pretences for the depoſing of Matthew Judex, which were all confuted. He was accuſed, amongſt other things, of having diſperſed ſeveral copies of Balthaſar Winter's life, and he was required to diſcover the author of that ſatire, and to recover all the copies, and deliver them to the court. He anſwered that this work was no libel; that it was only the true narrative of the life and death of a faithful ſervant of God, that it was neceſſary to oppoſe the calumnies which the enemies of that pious man had ſpread, and to communicate it to the widow, and ſome others to comfort them. He did not think himſelf obliged to name the author; but he offered to anſwer to that affair before impartial judges, made up of laymen, and eccleſiaſtics. His adverſaries did not care for ſuch a tribunal (27). Leaving Jena he retired to Magdeburg with his friend Wigandus, and did not long enjoy the permiſſion the ſenate granted him to ſtay there. Some miniſters were arreſted, others were expelled by night from the town. He did not approve that conduct of the magiſtrates, and adviſed theſe afflicted miniſters to patience. He expoſed himſelf by this means to many ſlanders, and a burgher received orders not to let him his houſe. His father-in-law had a ſhare in the outrages, becauſe he had lodged him in his houſe. At laſt the ſenate commanded Matthew Judex to depart immediately from Magdeburg. His wife melting in tears, intreated the firſt burgo-maſter to permit her to ſtay at her fathers with her five children, till the rigour of the winter ſhould be over. She repreſented to them that her eldeſt ſon was but eight years old, and that the youngeſt was but three months, and beſides was ſick. All her intreaties and remonſtrances proved ineffectual; depart they muſt, and retire to Wiſmar thro' the ſnow (28). The Roman Catholics have been well pleaſed with the ill treatment of the centuriators of Magdeburg. I will only alledge the reflexion of a Jeſuit. *As for the four firſt authors of the centuries*, ſays he (29), *their fortune was very different from that of Baronius; for ſoon after they had publiſhed their work, they were baniſhed by the Lutherans themſelves, who could not ſuffer among them ſuch wicked men.*

(23) Ipſi verbera & conculcationem fœdiſſimam minati ſunt quod eos ad Baptiſmum & uſum Cœnæ non admiſerat. *Andr. Schioppius, ubi ſupra, p.* 62.

(24) Id. ibid. pag. 67.

(25) Id. ibid. pag. 63.

(26) The court of the duke of Weimar.

(27) Andr. Schoppius, ubi ſupra, pag. 68.

(28) Id. ibid. pag. 69.

(29) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Lutheran. Tom. II, pag. 179. Dutch Edit.

JUDITH, A Jewiſh woman, delivered her country invaded by Holofernes. You will find this hiſtory in Moreri, with ſome obſervations upon the perplexity, in which it involves the commentators. Of all the books that the Proteſtants have rejected as apocryphal, there is none that better deſerves that blot than this; for the beſt thing that can be ſaid of it is, that it is a pious romance [*A*]. It is not many years ſince, a learned Benedictin

[*A*] *It is a pious romance.*] Dom. Bernard de Montfaucon (1) obſerves that *the Proteſtants, to extricate themſelves out of all difficulties, have ſaid that this book is but a fiction or parable, and that ſome of them have affirmed it to be a tragedy.* I think the Proteſtants do not trouble their heads with removing theſe difficulties; for it is their intereſt they ſhould ſubſiſt and multiply in the moſt perplexing manner. By this they

(1) In the preface to the *Verité de l'Hiſtoire de Judith, Paris* 1690, *in* 12*mo.* The ſecond edition came out in 1692.

Benedictin wrote a book to ſolve the difficulties that are made againſt this hiſtory [*B*]. If he has not removed them, he has at leaſt ſupplied us with ſome uſeful illuſtrations. I remember to have ſeen a diſſertation (*a*), wherein, amongſt other arguments, this is inforced, that a book cannot be ſaid to be canonical, when it authorizes aſſaſſination. This puts me in mind of a thing concerning the aſſaſſin of William I. Prince of Orange [*C*]. Somebody has obſerved, that is a very ſignificant commendation of Judith to ſay that ſhe was never ill ſpoken of [*D*].

they ſhew they have reaſon to reject this book, and that the church of Rome take for a canonical book what is not ſo. I believe then that the author in ſaying this, did not attend to the ſyſtem of the Proteſtants; he thought they were no leſs concerned than the Catholics to maintain in that work the glory of the holy Spirit. When it cannot be maintained by reconciling a thing with hiſtorical truths, it is uſual to have recourſe to allegories, parables, the myſtical ſenſe, &c. And this the Proteſtants would do if they believed, this hiſtory to be divinely inſpired; but becauſe they do not believe it, it does not concern them to ſay that it is a parable.

[*B*] *A learned Benedictin wrote a book to ſolve the difficulties that are made againſt that hiſtory.*] You will ſee his name, and the title of his book in the foregoing remark. The method he has taken to preſerve to the hiſtory of Judith the rank that is given it in the church of Rome is more inſtructive and edifying, than that which is made uſe of by the Romiſh controverſiſts. The latter generally are contented to retort the objections. They endeavour to ſhew, that the difficulties raiſed by the Proteſtants againſt the apocryphal books, may be alledged againſt the canonical. But Dom Bernard de Montfaucon touches very ſlightly upon this, and makes it his buſineſs to give a direct anſwer. His whole recrimination is contained in theſe words: *Are there not many ſtories in the ſacred text, in which we find theſe and even greater difficulties, and yet for all that, no body goes about to deny the truth of them in the literal ſenſe? Is not the hiſtory of Eſther full of confuſion and difficulties, which it is hardly poſſible to get clear of? Did ever any one ſhew clearly and certainly, who is the Abaſuerus mentioned in that book, and in what time that hiſtory ought to be placed? Is it not as difficult to fix the time of the hiſtory of Ruth, and of the ruin of the tribe of Benjamin? And yet no body dares ſay, that they are parabolical or ænigmatical hiſtories* (2). I do not know whether he had ſeen Dr Raynold's objections, who, of all the Proteſtant writers, has handled the controverſy of the apocryphal books with the greateſt force.

[*C*] *This puts me in mind of a thing concerning the aſſaſſin of William I, prince of Orange.*] I mean that villain Balthazar Gerard, who killed him; for there were other aſſaſſins, who did only wound him. 'Tho' he was a ſtaunch Catholic, he craftily behaved like a Proteſtant. He went to ſermons and evening prayers, he had always Marot's pſalms in his hands, or ſome other Proteſtant book. He read alſo *du Bartas's Poetical Week*; and it was found that the place moſt worn out, was the ſtory of Judith murdering Holofernes (3).' There is no doubt but this woman's example may perſuade a great many people that it is a holy action, by means of a thouſand lies to get one's ſelf admitted to a prince who oppreſſes liberty and religion, in order to ſtab him as ſoon as an opportunity offers. In a word, this hiſtory being once taken for a canonical one, encourages aſſaſſins to make any attempt upon the life of kings, whom they hate, and furniſhes orators with a crown of glory, to put upon the head of the Clement's and Ravaillac's. Obſerve this paſſage of Maimbourg. 'The Leaguers publiſhed alſo in their books printed at Paris and Lyons, that an angel had declared to James Clement, that the crown of Martyrdom was prepared for him, when he ſhould have delivered France from Henry de Valois; and that having acquainted a learned Monk with his viſion, that Monk approved of it, aſſuring him that in ſtriking this blow, he would be no leſs acceptable to GOD, than Judith was in killing Holofernes. And becauſe his Prior, named Father Edme Bourgoing, was accuſed of being, of all the preachers of the League, the moſt paſſionate panegyriſt of that abominable parricide, directing his diſcourſe to him in the pulpit, and calling him the bleſſed child of his patriarch, and the holy martyr of JESUS CHRIST, and comparing him to Judith; it was not doubted but it was he, with whom this young man, who was under his tuition, had adviſed; and that he had afterwards confirmed him in his execrable deſign (4).'

[*D*] *She was never ill ſpoken of.*] The thought I ſpeak of, is to be found in an extract of a panegyric (5). The Abbot de la Chambre making the funeral oration of the late French queen (6), took for his text theſe words of the book of Judith, '*She made herſelf famous*, famoſiſſima, *in all things, and there was none that gave her an ill word; for ſhe feared GOD greatly.* It is perhaps the fineſt commendation that ever was given to a woman: for though notwithſtanding the prodigious detraction that has prevailed ſo long in the world, there are ſome women, that remain untouched by that implacable and inſatiable monſter; yet this good fortune rarely happens to thoſe who have otherwiſe a ſhining reputation, and who are, as the text ſays, *famoſiſſimæ*: ſo that we may boldly challenge all the Greeks and Romans to ſhew us a paſſage in their books, that in ſo few words gives us ſo great an idea, as that which the book of Judith gives us in the words before-mentioned. The addreſs that Homer made uſe of, to give his reader a great notion of the beauty of Helena (7), is certainly inferior to the plainneſs and ſimplicity of this Jewiſh author; and that which is moſt excellent in his way of praiſing, is, that he has included in his elogy the true cauſe and ſource of the virtue he has deſcribed: *ſhe had*, ſays he, *a great reputation in all things, and was ſecure from every evil tongue, becauſe ſhe was ſenſibly touched with the fear of the LORD.* It is upon this happy expreſſion of Judith's panegyriſt, that the Abbot de la Chambre built his funeral oration of the queen.'

Auſonius places it among the ſentences of one of the ſeven wiſe men of Greece, that a chaſte woman frights away calumny:

Quæ dos matronæ pulcherrima? vita pudica.
Quæ caſta eſt? de qua mentiri fama veretur (8).

He ſuppoſes that Bias had two queſtions to anſwer. The firſt was, *What is the nobleſt portion of a woman?* he anſwered, a chaſte life. The ſecond was, *What woman is chaſte?* he anſwered, ſhe whom fame dares not ſlander. Theſe rules are ſevere, will ſome ſay; for they condemn all women that have been expoſed to obloquy; and yet it is certain that there are moſt virtuous women, who have not been able to avoid them. It muſt be owned, that this maxim of Bias cannot ſerve as a general rule without exception; but generally it is a ſign of a very wiſe conduct, both as to the inſide and the outſide, to enjoy the reputation of a chaſte woman without any oppoſition or contradiction whatſoever. 'Magnus eſt pudicitiæ fructus pudicam credi; & adverſus omnes illecebras atque omnia delinimenta muliebris ingenii eſt veluti ſolum ac firmamentum in nullam incidiſſe fabulam (9). —— *It is of great advantage to chaſtity, to be thought chaſte; and never to have been ſlandered by report, is the bulwark of a female mind againſt all temptations and alurements.*' This is what the orator Porcius Latro ſaid, pleading for a huſband, who accuſed his wife of adultery, becauſe a rich foreign Merchant had made her his heir, and gave as the reaſon of it, his not being able to debauch her. The Advocate drew from thence one of his arguments: he maintained, that a woman became juſtly ſuſpected, when once her honour was attempted; for if ſhe was very chaſte, her refuſal might be read in her face, and her outward behaviour would baffle the hopes of a gallant, and diſcourage him from diſcovering his paſſion. She would refuſe him at leaſt with ſo much ſeverity, that he would

---

(*a*) Intituled, *Ficta Juditha*, &c. at Verona, in the year 1614, and written by Mirabilis de Bonacaſa, wherein the author ſhews, 1, that the book of Judith is apocryphal; 2. That Judith's action was wicked; and that Roſſæus Mariana, and other enemies of monarchy have no reaſon to take advantage of it. The true name of this Mirabilis de Bonacaſa, was Eberhard de Weihe; he was chancellor to prince Julius duke of Brunſwic. See *Placcius*, *de Pſeudonym. pag.* 166.

(2) Pag 283.

(3) Hiſt d'Alexandre Farneſe, Duc de Parme, livr, iii, pag. 205. *Printed in* 1692.

(4) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de la Ligue, pag. 358.

(5) *In the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, Decemb. 1684, art. viii, pag. 1041.

(6) *I write this the twentieth of Auguſt*, 1695.

(7) *See, above, remark* [*A*], *of the article HELENA, citat.* (7).

(8) Auſon. in Sept. Sapientum Sententiis ſeptenis verſibus explicatis, pag. m. 228.

(9) Seneca, Controv. vii, lib. ii, pag. m. 187.

never be ſo bold as to make a ſecond attempt. If ſhe is not afraid to be thought capable of the fault, ſhe will not fear to commit it. ‘ Matrona quæ ſe adverſus ſollicitantes aviam volet, prodeat in tantum ornata, ne immunda ſit: habeat comites ejus ætatis, qui impudicos, ſi nihil aliud, verecundia annorum removeant: ferat jacentes in terram oculos: adverſus officioſum ſalutatorem inhumana potius quam inverecunda ſit; etiam in neceſſariam reſalutandi vicem multo rubore confuſa longe ante impudicitiam neget ore, quam verbo: in hac ſervandæ integritatis custodia, nulla libido irrumpet. Prodite mihi fronte in omne lenocinium compoſita, paulo obſcœnius quam poſita veſte nudæ, exquiſito in omnes facetias ſermone, tantum non ultro blandientes, ut quiſquis vicerit, non metuat accedere. Deinde miramini, ſi cum tot argumentis pudicitiam proſcripſerit, cultu, inceſſu, facie, aliquis repertus eſt qui incurreret, & reti adulteræ ſe non ſubduceret. Internuntium, puto ſollicitantis ſe, arripi & denudari juſſit, & flagella & verbera, & omne genus cruciatus popoſcit in plagas deterrimi mancipii: vix imbecillitas muliebris manus continuit. Nemo ſic negantem iterum rogat . . . . . . (10). Quæpoteſt non timere opinionem adulteri, poteſt non timere adulterium (11). —— *A matron who would be inacceſſible to ſuitors, ſhould dreſs only ſo far as not to be dirty: ſhe ſhould chuſe for her companions perſons of ſuch an age, that reſpect to their years, if nothing elſe can, may deter the immodeſt: ſhe ſhould keep her eyes generally fixed on the ground: if an officious fellow offers to ſalute her, ſhe ſhould be uncomplaiſant rather than immodeſt; and, if ſhe be obliged to return the ſalute, it ſhould be with much bluſhing and reluctance: modeſty, thus guarded, is not expoſed to the attacks of luſt. Shew me the women, who diſplay all their charms, who behave more obſcenely than if they were to appear naked, full of gaiety and wit, and only not careſſing their admirers, in ſhort, inviting all comers: then wonder, if, when dreſs, behaviour, and countenance, conſpire to baniſh modeſty, ſome one be found to entangle himſelf in the adulterous net. She ordered the go-between, endeavouring to perſuade her, I ſuppoſe, to be ſeized and ſtripped, and demanded rods, and all kinds of torture, for the puniſhment of that villainous ſlave; ſcarce did a woman's weakneſs reſtrain her hands. A woman, who denies in this manner, is never asked again. . . . . She, who can bring herſelf not to fear the opinion of the adulterer, can get over the fear of the adultery.*’ Theſe maxims are too rigid and too ſtrained (12), and we ſhall be frequently very unjuſt, if we ſhould direct our judgments by them. But the advantage, happineſs, and glory, of our Judith, raiſe her virtue and good conduct to the higheſt degree. I ſhall occaſionally obſerve, that the morality of ſome Heathens was ſo auſtere, that they would not have a woman to give matter either for praiſe or reproach: that is, they would have her true merit to conſiſt in this, that ſhe ſhould not be talked of, and that no body ſhould ſpeak well or ill of her. Plutarch diſlikes this maxim, as we ſee in the beginning of one of his books: ‘ (13) I am not of Thucydides's opinion . . . . . concerning the virtue of women; becauſe he reckons her the moſt virtuous and the beſt, who is the leaſt ſpoken of, whether well or ill, imagining that the name of a woman of honour ought to be as much confined as her body, and never go abroad. I think Gorgias was more reaſonable, who would have the fame, and not the face of a woman to be publickly known. And, in my opinion, the law or cuſtom of the Romans was very good, which ordered, that women, as well as men, after their death, ſhould be publickly honoured at their funerals with the praiſes they deſerved.’ St Gregory Nazianzen was of Thucydides's opinion. Fear the praiſes of men, *ſaid he*, ſpeaking to a woman; this fear is the ornament of your ſex.

Ἄλλησιν τὰ περισσά, σὺ δ' ἅζεο χείλεσιν ἀνδρῶν,
Καὶ κληιζομένη, τῦτο γυναιξὶ κλέος.

Linque aliis vana: ac labiis vereare virorum
Commendari etiam, hoc fœmineum decus eſt (14).

Be others vain: ſhun thou the praiſe of men;
It is the ſex's nobleſt ornament.

To which may be added theſe words of Syneſius (15). Μίαν ἀρετὴν Ὄσιρις ᾤετο γυναικὸς εἶναι, τὸ μήτε τὸ σῶμα αὐτῆς, μήτε τὔνομα διαβῆναι τὴν αὔλιον. Unam virtutem Oſiris muliebrem eſſe cenſebat, ut neque corpus, neque nomen mulieris è veſtibulo exiret. —— *Oſiris thought it a woman's chief virtue to keep both her perſon and her name within doors.* What Syneſius aſcribes to Oſiris, is at the bottom the ſame thing that Plutarch aſcribes to Thucydides. Some have given it out as the opinion of Pericles. See theſe words of John della Caſa. ‘ Cujus quidem mulieris (Victoriæ Farneſiæ) modeſtia ac pudor ingenuus illud profecto præſtitiſſet, quod Periclem ajunt dixiſſe, primam in muliere laudem eſſe, ut ne de virtute quidem illius ulla ad viros fame emanet: ſed nulla ratione occultari tanta primariæ fœminæ virtus poteſt, quin ad viros quoque emergat, ac ſuo ipſa ſplendore ſe prodat (16). —— *The modeſty of which lady (Victoria Farneſe) was as great as that which Pericles ſpoke of, when he ſaid, a woman's chief praiſe ought to be, that the men have never heard of her virtue: but the ſo great virtue of a lady of quality can never be ſo concealed, but it will be known to the men, and diſcover itſelf by it's own luſtre.*’ But though an hundred perſons, as illuſtrious as theſe three (17), had vouched this maxim, we ſhould not be obliged to approve of it. This would be condemning women to a more rigid life than that of the Carthuſians; it would be impoſing on them the incloſure and ſilence of thoſe Monks, and forbidding them to receive any viſit in their cells. Now this is more than is impoſed upon the Carthuſians.

I conclude with this obſervation. The reputation of Judith, that reputation, I ſay, clean and free from ſuſpicion, and ſecure againſt evil fame, is an admirable proof of virtue and prudence. But it muſt not be from thence concluded, that every woman who has not that good fortune, and is ill ſpoken of, is guilty of imprudence at leaſt. It may be true that a woman has a regular conduct, and yet becauſe ſhe has for ſome good reaſons put off her waiting-woman, her chamber-maid, &c. ſcandalous ſtories ſhall be quickly forged. The diſgraced creature being malicious and revengeful, will apply to her miſtreſs's enemies, and give them myſterious inſinuations, as the ſpirit of ſlander ſhall ſuggeſt. Theſe lies ſhall be heightened, whiſpered about, flouriſhed and enlarged on; nay they ſhall be printed; and thus a perſon really innocent, ſhall not have the reputation of being ſo; ſo true it is, as I have ſaid in another place (18), that the appearance is ſometimes more difficult to obtain, than the reality. This depends upon our ſelves, the other depends on many cauſes that are not in our power. The Poet Plautus repreſents this thought very naturally in a ſcene, wherein he introduces two old men, Callicles and Megaronides talking thus:

ME. Quia omnes bonos, bonaſque accurare addecet,
Suſpicionem, & culpam, ut ab ſe ſegregent.
CA. Non poteſt utrumque fieri. *ME.* Quapropter? *CA.* Rogas?
Ne admittam culpam, ego meo ſum promus pectori:
Suſpicio eſt in pectore alieno ſita.
Nam nunc ego ſi te ſurripuiſſe ſuſpicer,
Jovi coronam de capite, è Capitolio,
Quod in culmine aſtat ſummo: ſi id non feceris,
Atque id tamen mihi lubeat ſuſpicarier:
Quî tu id prohibere me potes ne ſuſpicer (19)?
. . . .
CA. Exſpecto, ſi quid dicas. *ME.* Primum dum omnium,
Malè dictitatur tibi volgo in ſermonibus:
Turpilucricupidum te vocant cives tui.
Tum autem ſunt alii, qui te volturium vocant:
Hoſteſn' an cives comedis, parvi pendere,
Hæc cùm audio in te dicier, excrucior miſer.
CA. Eſt, atque non eſt, mihi in manu; Megaronides.
Qui dicant, non eſt: meritò ut ne dicant; id eſt (20).

ME. *Becauſe it behoves all good men and women to remove from themſelves all ſuſpicion, and guilt.*
CA. *They cannot do both.*
ME. *Why?*
CA. *Do ye ask? it is in my own power not to entertain guilt: the ſuſpicion of it lies in another's breaſt.*

---

(10) Seneca, ibid. pag. 186.

(11) Id. ibid. pag. 187.

(12) *See, above, remark* [O], *of the article* BLONDEL (DAVID).

(13) Plutarch. de Mulier. Virtut. pag. 242.

(14) Gregor. Nazianz. περὶ καλλωπιζομένων γυναίκων.

(15) Syneſius, Orat. I, de Providentia.

(16) Joh. Caſa, in Vita Petri Bembi, pag. 143.

(17) Oſiris, Thucydides, Pericles.

(18) *Above, at the end of remark* [H], *of the article* AMPHIARAUS.

(19) Plautus, in Trinummo, Act. I, Sc. II, ver. 41, pag. m. 732.

(20) Id. ibid. ver. 61, pag. 733.

breaſt. For, ſuppoſe now, I ſhould ſuſpect you of having ſtolen a crown, from Jupiter's head, out of the capitol; though you are innocent, if I have a mind to ſuſpect you, how will you hinder it? . . . . *I wait your anſwer.*

ME. *In the firſt place, you are ill ſpoken of by the people: your fellow-citizens call you a ſordid, covetous, fellow; others think you rapacious. Whether you plunder friends or foes, ſignifies little: when I hear theſe things ſaid of you, it grieves me exceedingly.*

CA. *It is, and it is not, in my power, Megaronides: what they ſay, is not in my power; but that they ſay it without foundation, is in my power.*

This concluſion is excellent: it does not depend upon me, anſwered Megaronides, to prevent being ill ſpoken of; it is only in my power, that it be not done deſervedly. Note, that there are an hundred accidents that may give birth to the ſame conſequences, as the malice of a ſervant turned out.

JULIA, wife of Septimius Severus, emperor of Rome, and daughter of Baſſianus, prieſt of the Sun [*A*], was born in Syria. The Aſtrologers had foretold that ſhe ſhould marry a king [*B*]; for which reaſon Severus, before he came to the empire, courted, and married her. He paid great deference to Aſtrology; and therefore believed that ſuch a marriage would be his ſecurity for aſcending, ſome time or other, to the throne. She was a woman of great parts, and capable of great things (*a*). Some ſay, that her huſband gave her a great ſhare in the government [*C*], though he was not very fond of her. She cultivated Philoſophy [*D*], and ſpent much time in hearing the diſcourſes of

[*A*] *She was daughter of Baſſianus prieſt of the Sun.*] This may be inferred from theſe words of Aurelius Victor (1). 'Caracalla Severi filius . . . . Baſſianus 'ex avi materni nomine dictus . . . . Hujus (*Heliogabali*) matris Semeæ avus Buſſianus nomine, fuerat ſolis ſacerdos, quem Phœnices unde erat, Heliogabalum nominabant (2). ——— *Caracalla, the 'ſon of Severus . . . . called Baſſianus after his grandfather by the mother's ſide . . . . Baſſianus, grandfather of Semea, mother of Heliogabalus, was prieſt 'of the Sun, whom the Phœnicians, whence he ſprung, 'named Heliogabalus.*' Semea (3) was the daughter of Mæſa: now Mæſa was ſiſter to Julia (4); therefore Baſſianus, the prieſt of the Sun, muſt be Julia's father. We cannot poſitively affirm whether Emeſa or Apamea was Julia's native country: for, according to ſome authors (5), her ſiſter Mæſa was of Emeſa: but according to others (6), ſhe was of Apamea. Lampridius (7) calls Julia *nobilem Orientis mulierem*; — *A noble woman of the eaſt*; but Dion (8) makes her a Plebeian, ἐκ δεμοτικοῦ γένους, *è genere plebio.*

[*B*] *The Aſtrologers had foretold that ſhe ſhould marry a king.*] Let us ſet down the words of Spartianus, that the readers may know what enquiries Severus chiefly made, when he reſolved to marry again he did not inform himſelf about the merit of the perſon, but the promiſes of her nativity. 'Quum amiſſa uxore aliam 'vellet ducere, genituras ſponſarum requirebat, ipſe 'quoque matheſeos peritiſſimus: & quum audiſſet eſſe in Syria quandam quæ id genituræ haberet ut regi jungeretur, eandem uxorem petiit, Juliam ſcilicet, & accepit interventu amicorum: ex qua ſtatim 'pater factus eſt (9). ——*Being deſirous, after the 'death of his wife, to marry another, and being himſelf a skillful Mathematician, he enquired into the 'nativities of thoſe he would have married; and hearing, that there was in Syria a woman, who was 'fated to marry a king, he ſought her in marriage: 'her name was Julia; whom his friends procured for 'him, and who ſoon made him a father.*'

[*C*] *Some ſay that her husband gave her a great ſhare in the government.*] 'She had in charge his 'memorials, letters, and petitions, of whatever conſequence they were, ſays Dion in the life of Caracalla. Which ſhews her great capacity: for ſhe gave 'her advice upon all important affairs: and yet he 'neither loved her much, nor ſhe him, as we ſee in 'Dion and Herodian, tho' ſhe commonly received 'this honour from him, to be named in his letters with 'praiſe and commendation, and even when he wrote 'to the ſenate, inſerting her name with his own and 'that of his armies, according to the ſtile of that 'time. And indeed ſhe kept her rank very well, 'paying no more deference, nor ſaluting with more 'reſpect the greateſt perſons of the empire than Severus or Caracalla did. However Caracalla coming 'to the empire, leſſened her authority, no ways 'yielding to her counſels, eſpecially when the fancy 'took him to put any perſon to death. But as to Severus, her husbannd, he was very much ſwayed by 'her advice and good ſenſe (10).' This is what Triſtan ſays: but it is certain that he is miſtaken, taking the father for the ſon. For what he relates, has no reſpect to Julia under the reign of her husband, but ought only to be underſtood of her, in the reign of Caracalla. There is no difficulty in the thing, if we conſider the words of Xiphilin (11). Οὐδὲ ἐπείθετο οὔτε περὶ τούτων οὔτε περὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῇ μητρὶ πολλὰ καὶ χρηστὰ παραινούσῃ. καίτοι καὶ τὴν τῶν βιβλίων τῶν τε ἐπιστολῶν ἑκατέρων, πλὴν τῶν πάνυ ἀναγκαίων, διοίκησιν αὐτῃ ἐπιτρέψας. καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν ἐπιστολαῖς ὁμοίως τῷ τε ἰδίῳ καὶ τῷ τῶν στρατευματῶν, ὅτι σώζηται, μετ᾽ ἐπαίνων πολλῶν ἐγγράφων. Τί γὰρ δεῖ λέγειν, ὅτι καὶ ἠσπάζετο δημοσίᾳ πάντας τοὺς πρώτους, καθάπερ καὶ ἐκεῖνος. Qua in re cæteriſque omnibus minimè obtemperabat matri juſta & utilia monenti, licet ei curam libellorum atque epiſtolarum utriuſque generis, præter admodum neceſſarias (12), commiſſet ejuſque nomen pariter cum ſuo & exercitus nomine poneret cum maximis laudibus in epiſtolis quas mittebat ad ſenatum, dum omnes valere ſcriberet: nec opus eſt referre ab hac omnes primarios viros ſalutari non ſecus quam ab illo conſueviſſe. ——— *In which thing, and in all others, he paid no regard to the prudent advice of his mother, tho' he entruſted her with the petitions and letters of both ſorts, except thoſe of the greateſt importance, and joined her name, giving her great praiſes, to his own, and the army's, in the letters he wrote to the ſenate, informing them that all were well: nor need I relate, that ſhe received the compliments of the great men, in the ſame manner as himſelf.* I obſerve that it was at her requeſt that her husband undertook the war againſt Peſcennius Niger, and Clodius Albinus (13).

[*D*] *She cultivated Philoſophy.*] Immediately after the words juſt read, Xiphilin affirms that Julia philoſophized notwithſtanding ſo much buſineſs. Ἀλλ᾽ ἡ μὲν καὶ μετὰ τούτων ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐφιλοσόφει. *Sed ea nihilo minus philoſophabatur.* He had ſaid in another place (14), that being perſecuted by Plautianus, who had a prodigious intereſt, ſhe began to cultivate Philoſophy, and to ſpend whole days with the Sophiſts: Καὶ ἡ μὲν αὐτή τε φιλοσιφεῖν διὰ ταῦτ᾽ ἤρξατο, καὶ σοφισταῖς συνημέρευσεν; *Quæ dum ob eam cauſam philoſopharetur, & tempus cum Sophiſtis tranſigeret.* Philoſtratus called her a Philoſopher: Ἀντωνῖνος, ſays he (15) ſpeaking of Caracalla, ἦν ὁ τῆς φιλοσόφου παῖς Ἰουλίας. *Antoninus vero filius erat Juliæ Philoſophæ.* Thus it ought to be read, according to the lucky conjecture of the learned Salmaſius (16). He has corrected another paſſage of Phlloſtratus, wherein we learn that the Sophiſt Philiſcus obtained a profeſſorſhip at Athens, by Julia's intereſt. It was ſhe that ordered Philoſtratus to write the life of Apollonius. Philoſtratus ſays ſo himſelf (17), and obſerves at the ſame time that this lady was a great lover of Rhetoric. Tzetzes mentions the ſociety of learned men that were about Julia. See the margin (18).

Mr Le Moyne has made two remarks, which deſerve to be mentioned. I. He wonders, that Scaliger, who made ſuch bold conjectures, durſt venture none concerning Antoninus, Julia's ſon, ſpoken of by Philoſtratus. II. He has confirmed by the words of Tzetzes Salmaſius's correction, which yet he ſeems never

(*a*) *See the remark* [*I*], *at the end.*

(1) Aurel. Victor, in Epitome, pag. m. 211.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 212.

(3) Or rather *Soæmis*, according to Herodian, *lib. v, cap. iii.*

(4) Herodian. ibid.

(5) Herodian. ibid. Julius Capitolinus, in Macrino, cap. ix, pag. m. 759.

(6) Dio, lib. lxxviii, pag. 902.

(7) Lampridius, in Alexandro Severo, cap. v, pag. 890.

(8) Dio, lib. lxxviii, pag. 899. Edit. 1606.

(9) Spartian. in Septim. Severo, cap iii, pag. m. 594, Tom. I. *See alſo* Lampridius, ubi ſupra.

(10) Triſtan, Comment. Hiſt. Tom. II, pag. 110.

(11) Xiphilin. in Epitome Dionis, in Caracalla, pag. m. 353.

(12) *Triſtan ſhould not therefore ſay that ſhe was intruſted with the petitions though they were never ſo important. He ſhould have made this exception, as Mr de Tillemont does*, Hiſt. des Empereurs, Tom. III. pag. m. 189, *unleſs it was about a very important thing.*

(13) Capitolinus, in Clodio Albino, cap. iii, pag. 689.

(14) In Sept. Severo, pag. 330.

(15) Philoſtratus, in Vitis Sophiſtarum, in Philiſco.

(16) Salmaſ. ad Spartian. in Vita Severi, cap. xviii, pag. m. 625.

(17) Philoſtrat. in Vita Apollin. lib. i, cap. iii.

(18) Εἷς τοῦ χοροῦ Ῥητόρων τε καὶ Γραμματευόντων τῇ Ἰουλίᾳ τῇ κραταιᾷ τελούσῃ Βασιλίδι. Unus illorum Rhetorum & Grammaticorum, qui Juliæ Imperatrici frequentes adeſſe ſolebant. *Tzetzes, Chil. VI, Hiſt. XLV.*

of the wits that made their court to her. It is pity it cannot be ſaid, for the honour and advantage of learning, that her virtue equalled her capacity; for the hiſtorians witneſs that her adulteries were a blot upon her huſband Severus [*E*]. Some authors ſay, that after the death of Severus ſhe contracted an inceſtuous marriage, by marrying Caracalla, her huſband's ſon [*F*]: but it is a miſtake [G]. She was no leſs the true mother of

never to have heard of. This is what he ſays as to Scaliger: *Sic Philoſtratus in vitis Sophiſtarum, in Philiſco,* ‘Ἀντωνεῖνος δὲ ἦν ὁ τȣ̃ φιλοσόφȣ παῖς Ἰȣλίας. Antoninus erat Filius Philoſophi Juliæ. *Ad quæ verba hærens & attonitus Scaliger,* Antonino Philoſopho alius filius quam Commodus, alia uxor præter Fauſtinam? Niſi legamus ὁ τȣ̃ Σεβήρȣ παῖς καὶ Ἰȣλίας. Hoc etiam tenuit ancipitem Tzetzem, nec mihi minorum movit admirationem. Quæ nos proponimus Chronologis eruditis, & Antiquitatis inveſtigatoribus, ut quærant, & nos doceant, quæ ingenue nos neſcire profitemur. *Sed mirum hic retuſum Scaligeri acumen, & moratam iſtam felicem audaciam, quæ loca, hoc multo difficiliora, tam ſtrenue & alacriter ſuperaverat* (19). As for the paſſage of Tzetzes, he makes uſe of it to ſhew that Philoſtratus did not ſay τȣ̃ φιλοσόφȣ; for if Tzetzes had read this in Philoſtratus, he would not have ſaid this author does not ſhew who the empreſs Julia was married to. Σύζυγος δ' αὐτὴ ȣ̓ φησὶ τινος ἦν βασίλεως. *Non dicit vero cujus Imperatoris illa fuerit conjux* (20). He might eaſily have underſtood that this Julia's huſband was either Marcus Aurelius, ſirnamed the Philoſopher, or Septimius Severus who was very much given to Philoſophical ſtudies, in imitation of Marcus Aurelius (21). *Philoſophiæ, declamandi, cunctis poſtremo liberalium deditus ſtudiis* (22). *Philoſophiæ ac dicendi ſtudiis ſatis deditus; doctrinæ quoque nimis avidus* (23). For the reſt, Mr le Moyne commonly gives to our Julia the ſirname Severa, according to ſome inſcriptions (24).

[*E*] *Her adulteries were a blot upon her huſband.*] Severus had acquired a great reputation both by his military and political actions; but he blaſted it by indulging his wife's debaucheries. Nay, it was ſaid, that he was not ignorant, that ſhe was engaged in a conſpiracy that was formed againſt him. *Huic tanto domi foriſque uxoris probra ſummam gloriæ dempſere: quam adeo famoſe amplexus eſt, ut cognita libidine ac ream conjurationis retentarit* (25). This is what Aurelius Victor affirms: and Spartianus ſays no leſs (26). Triſtan (27) does not think it probable, that ſhe ever conſpired againſt her husband: his reaſon is, that ſhe had too much ſenſe, not to know, that ſuch an attempt muſt muſt have been fatal, both to her ſelf and her two ſons. But it may be anſwered: I. that we frequently act againſt our true intereſts, when we have a mind to ſatiſfy a violent paſſion; as ſuppoſe the deſire of revenging an affront offered to Julia by her husband, or the deſire of delivering herſelf from an intolerable oppreſſion. II. That Julia might have ſo managed things, that the murderers of Severus would have given the empire to her ſon. This is not without precedent. Be it how it will, it cannot be denied, but ſhe found herſelf oppreſſed. Severus had ſo extravagant a kindneſs for Plautianus, that his intereſt was viſibly greater than his maſter's (28). Now Plautianus inveighed violently againſt Julia: he ceaſed not to blacken her to Severus; he cauſed informations to be made againſt her, and ſought for witneſſes to prove her guilty. He ſought for them, I ſay, by putting many women of quality to the rack. Ὥστε καί τὴν Ἰȣλίαν τὴν Αὐγȣ́σαν πρὸς τὸν Σεβῆρον ἀεὶ διέβαλλεν, ἐξετάσεις τε κατ' αὐτῆς, καὶ βασάνȣς κατ' εὐγενῶν γυναικῶν ποιȣ́μενος (29). *Ut etiam apud eum Juliam Auguſtam ſemper calumniatus ſit, & in eam ac de matronis nobilibus tormentis quæſiverit* (30). The hiſtorian who informs me of this, does not ſay that the empreſs ſought her deliverance by any conſpiracy againſt her husband; but only that this was the reaſon of her ſtudying Philoſophy. She cannot but be praiſed for taking that method of conſolation. The miſery of it is, that whilſt the favourite too inſolently abuſed his power, ſhe afforded him perhaps too many reaſons to accuſe her of adultery. I ſhall ſet down the anſwer that was made to her in Great Britain. She had followed her husband thither (31), and obſerving that the women of that iſland communicated their favours to ſeveral men without any ſhame, ſhe very ſharply bantered Argentocoxus's wife, who thus anſwered her: *We better ſatisfy the cravings of nature than your Roman ladies; for we publickly beſtow our favours on the worthieſt men, whereas you ſecretly commit adultery with the baſeſt fellows.* Μάλα ἀσείως Ἀργεντοκόξȣ τινὸς γυνὴ Καληδονίȣ πρὸς τὴν Ἰȣλίαν τὴν Αὐγȣ́σαν ἀποσκώπτȣσάν τι πρὸς αὐτὴν μετὰ τὰς σπονδὰς ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνέδην σφῶν πρὸς τȣ̀ς ἄῤῥενας συνȣσία, εἰπεῖν λέγεται, ὅτι πολλῷ ἄμεινον ἡμεῖς τὰ τῆς φύσεως ἀναγκαῖα ἀποπληρȣ̃μεν ὑμῶν τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν· ἡμεῖς γὰρ φανερῶς τοῖς ἀρίσοις ὁμιλȣ̃μεν, ὑμεῖς δὲ λάθρα ὑπὸ τῶν κακίσων μοιχεύεσθε. *Urbane imprimis Argentocoxi Caledonii uxor, Juliæ Auguſtæ quæ ipſam mordebat, initis fœderibus, quòd ipſæ impudenter cum maribus verſarentur, dixiſſe fertur,* Nos *(inquit) multo melius explemus ea quæ naturæ poſtulat neceſſitas, quàm vos Romanæ. Nam apertè cum optimis viris habemus conſuetudinem: vos autem occultè peſſimi homines conſtuprant* (32). If any one ask to what purpoſe the hiſtorian makes mention of this anſwer, I ſay it was on occaſion of a law the emperor had made againſt adultery; the execution whereof he was forced to neglect, becauſe the multitude of the accuſed (33) made the courts unwilling to meddle any longer with theſe trials. It muſt be confeſſed that this barbarous woman archly anſwered the empreſs's railleries: But let us have a care not to believe that the impudence of theſe Iſlanders was leſs blameable than the ſecret adulteries of Rome. They who commit an ill action in ſecret, retain the ideas of virtue, and pay ſome homage to them. But they who ſin without ſhame, have no regard to juſtice, either in the theory or practice (34).

Brantome mentions a circumſtance which I have not read in the antient hiſtorians. It contains the reaſon why Severus ſo patiently bore with his wife's leudneſs. Theſe are his words (35). ‘The emperor Severus was not much concerned for the honour of his wife, who was a public whore, and did not care to reform her, ſaying that her name was Julia, and that therefore ſhe ought to be excuſed, for as much as all the women that bore that name from all antiquity, uſed to be great whores, and to make their husbands cuckolds; as I know many ladies, bearing certain Chriſtian names (36), which I will not mention out of reſpect to our holy religion, who are commonly more ſubject to be whores than other women of other names, and few have been ſeen that were free from it.’

[*F*] *Some hiſtorians ſay . . . . . that ſhe married Caracalla.*] This error is not a ſtory of a late invention, but is found in Spartianus, and Aurelius Victor. See how Brantome relates it. ‘We further read of Julia, the ſtep-mother of the emperor Caracalla, that being one day, as it were, by careleſſneſs, half naked, and Caracalla ſeeing her, ſaid only theſe words; how gladly I would, if I might. She ſuddenly anſwered, you may if you pleaſe; do not you know that you are emperor, and that you are to give laws, and not receive them? Upon this fine ſaying, he married her, and lay with her (37). She muſt needs have been a great whore, ſince ſhe loved and married him, who ſome time before had killed her own ſon in her arms. She was doubtleſs a great whore, and had very mean thoughts, but it is a great matter to be an empreſs, and for ſuch an honour all is forgotten. This Julia was very much beloved by her husband, though ſhe was far advanced in years; but ſhe had loſt nothing of her beauty; for ſhe was very handſome, and very courteous, as it appears from her words, which highly encreaſed her grandeur (38).’ That the reader may ſee whether this ſtory has been flouriſhed, I will ſet down the words of the Latin authors who have mentioned this paſſage. *Intereſt ſcire,* ſays Spartianus (39), *quemadmodum novercam ſuam Juliam uxorem duxiſſe dicatur. Quæ quum eſſet pulcherrima, & quaſi per negligentiam ſe maxima corporis parte nudaſſet, dixiſſetque Antoninus,* Vellem, ſi liceret: *reſpondiſſe fertur,* Si libet, licet. An neſcis te imperatorem eſſe, & leges dare, non accipere? *Quo audito,*

(19) Stephanus le Moyne, in Prolegomenis Variorum Sacrorum, fol. * 25.

(20) Tzetzes, ubi ſupra.

(21) Amore Marci quem fuiſſe vel fratrem ſuum dicebat, & cujus Philoſophiam literarumque inſtitutionem ſemper imitatus eſt. *Spartian. in Geta, cap. ii.*

(22) Aurelius Victor, in Cæſar.

(23) Spartian. in Severo, cap. xviii, pag. 625, 626.

(24) *See* Triſtan, Comment. Hiſt. Tom. II, pag. 121.

(25) Aurel. Victor, in Cæſaribus. *Triſtan,* pag. 110, *has not well tranſlated this paſſage, he thought it ſignified that the debaucheries of Julia* very much tarniſhed the glory of Severus at home and abroad.

(26) Domi tamen minus cautus, qui uxorem Juliam famoſam adulteriis tenuit, etiam conjurationis conſciam. *Spartian. in Severo, pag.* 626, 627.

(27) Comment. Hiſt. Tom. II, pag. 100.

(28) Xiphilin. in Severo, pag. m. 329, 330.

(29) Id. ibid. pag. 330.

(30) *Caſeneuve, in his Remarks on the Letters of Philoſtratus,* pag. 19, *gives this in French from Suidas; but he commits a very great error.*

(31) *In the year* 208.

(32) Xiphilin, in Severo, pag. 343.

(33) *Three thouſand people had been indicted for adultery.*

(34) *See the article* JONAS (ARNGRIMUS), *remark* [*B*].

(35) Brantome, Dames Galantes, Tom. I, pag 33.

(36) *Theſe two verſes of Rutilius Numatianus, may be applied to this ſubject.*

Nominibus certos credam decurrere mores,
Moribus an potius nomina certa dari?

(37) Brantome, Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. 205.

(38) Id. ibid. pag 206.

(39) Spartian. in Caracalla, cap. x, pag. m. 730.

of Caracalla, than of Geta. She had the misfortune not to be able to keep peace betwixt her two ſons (*b*). Her induſtry, as great as it was, proved deficient in that reſpect. Geta was killed by Caracalla, in the arms of his mother Julia, who was wounded, and durſt

audito, furor inconditus ad effectum criminis roboratus eſt: nuptiaſque eas celebravit quas ſi ſciret ſe leges dare, vere ſolus probibere debuiſſet Matrem enim (non alio dicenda erat nomine) duxit uxorem, ad parricidium junxit inceſtum: ſiquidem eam matrimonio ſociavit cujus filium nuper occiderat. Aurelius Victor repreſents more clearly the artifice ſhe made uſe of. She was not ſo unpolitic, as to undreſs herſelf openly before Caracalla; ſuch an impudence might have diſguſted the young man; ſhe ordered it ſo, that it might paſs for a ſurprize; ſhe pretended not to know that Caracalla could ſee her in that poſture; ſhe pretended to be ignorant of his being where ſhe was undreſt. *Pari fortuna, & eodem matrimonio, quo pater; namque Juliam novercam .... forma captus, conjugem affectavit: cum illa factioſior, aſpectui adoleſcentis, præſentiæ quaſi ignara, ſemet dediſſet, intecto corpore, aſſerentique, Vellem ſi liceret, uti: petulantius multo (quippe quæ pudorem velamento exuerat) reſpondiſſet; Libet? plane licet* (40). I do not know where Vigenere found what he ſays, as to the circumſtance of the place. *The empreſs Julia*, ſays he (41), *was doubtleſs Severus's wife; for Antoninus Caracalla married her afterward, though ſhe was his ſtep-mother; and this inceſt came from his ſeeing her one day naked in the hot bath, through a private window, where he ſhewed himſelf; and ſhe asking him what he thought of it, he anſwered, I like you ſo well, that I ſhould be glad to have you, if it could be done lawfully. Are you, replied ſhe immediately, ſo ignorant as not to know, that every thing is lawful to you, who are the lord of the whole earth? And hereupon they proceeded to their tranſgreſſion.*

[*G*] ... *but it is a miſtake.*] It has been ſo clearly made out, that Moreri is inexcuſable, for having told this ſtory as a certainty. If he had read Triſtan's Commentaries, he would have ſeen ſufficient proofs of it's falſity; though it muſt be granted, that all the arguments of this author are not demonſtrative.

His firſt proof (42) is taken from the ſilence of the Greek authors, who have exactly deſcribed Caracalla's actions, without the leaſt flattery. Dion Caſſius lived at that time, and had great employments: he could not then be ignorant, whether Caracalla had or had not married Julia; and if he had known of ſuch a marriage, he would certainly have ſpoke of it, the better to defame this emperor, whom he does not appear to have deſired to ſpare in any thing. Since then he does not mention it, it is a certain argument of the falſity of this marriage. Herodian's ſilence confirms the ſame thing; Herodian I ſay, who relates many particular and diſgraceful things, and who lived much nearer that time, than they who vouch this pretended marriage.

The ſecond proof is drawn from our Julia's age. Triſtan ſuppoſes (43), that *at the time when they ſay her beauty made Caracalla deſire to marry her, ſhe was at leaſt forty five years old*; for *ſhe muſt have been ſeventeen or fifteen* (44) when ſhe married Severus: and as ſhe had Caracalla the firſt year of her marriage, and Caracalla was twenty ſeven years old when it is ſuppoſed he ſaw her naked, it follows, that ſhe was forty four or forty five years old. This author is in the right to ſuppoſe, that Julia was not the ſtep mother, but the true mother of Caracalla; no good objection can be made againſt this. Thoſe that might be made to leſſen the age of Julia, and againſt the conſequences that Triſtan draws from her being forty five years old, would be more conſiderable. Nothing hinders, will ſome ſay, but that Julia might be but fifteen years old, when ſhe married Severus, and it is probable that Caracalla married her the year after his killing Geta (45). Now Caracalla reigned ſix years after the death of his brother (46), and lived but twenty nine years in all (47); he might therefore marry Julia, when he was but twenty four years old, which being added to the ſixteen of his mother, when he was born, make but forty. Triſtan (48) will have forty four or forty five years ‘not to be an age, in which there could be ſo ‘much luſtre, vigour, and beauty, as to move him ‘ſo powerfully to love her, that he was obliged to ‘marry her, in order to ſatisfy his paſſion.’ One might inſtance ſome women, who at ſuch an age, and even older, have made princes paſſionately in love with them; but he might anſwer, that thoſe women made not their conqueſts all at once, by appearing naked. The charms of converſation, the artifices of love, and a thouſand pretty ways were their ſtrongeſt arms to conquer; and then I know not what addreſs of body and mind, enabled them to keep their conqueſts. The bare ſhewing of a body, that has undergone the influences of above forty years, is not a good expedient: it is not appearing with the beſt ſide; and therefore there is no probability, that ſo cunning a woman as Julia ſhould have taken this method to gain the love of Caracalla, or that if ſhe did, ſhe found her account in it. I go no farther: I believe this may be replied to; the reaſons that may be alledged upon ſuch a ſubject, being not of ſuch a nature as to leave no room for doubting.

Let us ſee the third proof. Dion (49) obſerves, that when Julia ‘knew of the death of her ſon, ſhe ſtruck ‘her breaſt (50) to cauſe her own death, by reviving ‘and irritating a cancer, which ſhe had for a long ‘time, and that it contributed very much to her ‘death afterwards; which ſhews how ridiculous they ‘are, who have forged this ſtory, that Julia ſhewed ‘herſelf naked to Caracalla, and that her nakedneſs ‘made him deſperately in love with her. For is it ‘likely, that this woman would have ſhewn herſelf ‘naked, being thus ulcerated, and that Caracalla, a ‘young prince, monarch of the world, who had the ‘choice of all that was fine and beautiful in ſo vaſt ‘an empire, could have been caught by this object, ‘as they repreſent it?’ There being nothing too difficult for a Sophiſt, ſome caviller might be found, who would tell Triſtan, that Julia did not ſhew her whole body (51). Spartianus ſays, that ſhe only ſhewed the better half of it. We may then ſuppoſe, that the part ſhe concealed was her breaſt, and ſo her cancer did not appear. Mr Chevreau could not make this objection; for he ſays that Julia *appeared before Caracalla, in a careleſs manner, and with a naked breaſt* (52). It would be to no purpoſe to examine, whether it is probable that a woman, who would ſhew herſelf naked, except ſome part, would make choice of her breaſt before all others to hide it. This, I ſay, would be to no purpoſe, ſince by ſuppoſing the cancer, there were particular reaſons that neceſſarily obliged Julia not to ſhew her breaſt. I therefore proceed to a third obſervation, which enervates the third proof of Triſtan: I ſay, that the cancer came upon her after her marriage with Caracalla. If it came a year after the marriage, ſhe might have had it four years when Caracalla was killed, and ſo Dion might ſay, that ſhe had it for a long time (53).

The fourth proof of Triſtan is this: Dion, who *perfectly knew Caracalla, obſerves, that he had been extremely enervated for a long time, and very unfit for that ſort of exerciſe; having brought himſelf to that paſs by his debaucheries*, ὕστερον γὰρ ἐξησθένησαν (54) αὐτῷ πᾶσα ἡ περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια ἰσχύς; *for*, ſays he, *the natural vigour, neceſſary for the ſervice of the ladies, was extinct in him the laſt years of his life* (55). It is not true that Dion obſerves, that Caracalla was enervated in that reſpect *for a long time*, and ſo the fourth proof lies open to the ſame inconvenience as the foregoing; for it may be anſwered, that this emperor exhauſted his ſtrength by his debaucheries, after his marrying Julia. Perhaps the reader will not be diſpleaſed to know, to what purpoſe Dion makes this remark. He had been ſaying, that Caracalla put four veſtals to death, and that he enjoyed one of them as much as his ſtrength would permit. The hiſtorian ſays afterwards what Triſtan has quoted, and adds, that this veſtal cried out, when ſhe was led to the place of execution, *The Emperor himſelf knows very well, that I have preſerved my virginity.* Τέσσαρας δὲ τῶν ἀεὶ παρθένων ἀπέκτεινεν, ὧν μίαν βίᾳ, ὅσα γε καὶ ἠδύνατο, ἠσχύνκει· ὕστερον γὰρ ἐξησθένησεν αὐτῷ πᾶσα ἡ περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια ἰσχύς. ἀφ' ὗπερ καὶ ἑτερόν τινα τρόπον αἰσχρουργεῖν ἐλέγετο. ἡ δὲ δὴ χόρη αὐτη περὶ ἧς λέγω, Κλωδία Λαί-

(*b*) Herodian. lib. iv, cap. iii.

(40) Aurel. Victor, in Cæſaribus, pag. m. 144. *See alſo* Eutropius, lib. viii. *and Oroſius*, lib vii, cap xviii, *who mention that inceſt.*

(41) *Vigenere, preface to Philoſtratus's pictures.*

(42) Triſtan. Comment. Hiſt. Tom II, pag. 113, & ſeq.

(43) Ibid. pag. 114.

(44) It is likely an error of the preſs for 18.

(45) He cauſed his wife, daughter of Plautianus, to be put to death, after he had got himſelf rid of Geta. *Herodian, lib. iv, cap. vi.*

(46) Herodian lib. iv, cap xiii, in fin.

(47) Triſtan. ubi ſupra, pag. 119. 148.

(48) Ibid. pag. 114.

(49) Id. ibid.

(50) *See the remark* [*I*].

(51) Se maxima coporis parte nudaſſet. *Spartian. ubi ſupra.*

(52) Chevreau, Hiſtoire du Monde, Tom. II, pag. 3[illegible]6. Dutch Edit. 1687.

(53) Ἐκ πάνυ πολλοῦ χρόνου. Jam multo tempore. *Dio, in Macrino, pag.* 362.

(54) It ſhould be ἐξησθένησεν.

(55) Triſtan, ubi ſupra, pag. 114.

durſt not afterwards expreſs the leaſt grief (*c*). If I miſtake not, the beſt expedient Caracalla made uſe of to comfort his mother, was to give her a good ſhare in the government [*H*]. This was a wonderful charm for this lady; and if ſhe had a mind to kill herſelf, when ſhe heard that Caracalla had been aſſaſſinated, it was not ſo much out of grief for her ſon's death, as becauſe ſhe feared to ſee herſelf ſoon reduced to the condition of a private perſon (*d*). And therefore ſhe thought no more of death, when ſhe obſerved that Macrinus, who ſucceeded Caracalla, uſed her well. But as ſoon as ſhe underſtood that he reſolved to reſent the injurious words ſhe had uttered againſt him, when ſhe heard of the aſſaſſination of Caracalla, ſhe ſtarved herſelf to death [*I*]. The title of Domna, which is given her, was the ſirname of a family [*K*]. There are ſome difficulties about the time of her marriage with Severus [*L*]. There are ſome inſcriptions (*e*), in

τα ὠνομάζετο· ἥ τις καὶ μέγα βοῶσα, Ὄιδεν αὐτὸς Ἀντωνῖνος ὅτι παρθένος εἰμὶ, ζῶσα κατωρύγη. *Veſtales occidit quatuor, ex quibus unam quantum in ipſo fuit, vitiavit: nam eum ad extremum vis in rebus Venereis defecerat, qua ex re dicebatur flagitia obſcœna alterius generis facere. Huic virgini Clodia Læta nomen fuit, eaque viva ſepulta eſt: quum tamen exclamaret ſcire ipſum Antoninum ſe virginem eſſe* (56).

I proceed to the fifth proof. *It is certain*, that if Julia had been his wife, *when ſhe died, her body would not have been depoſited firſt in the monument of the two brothers, Lucius and Caius Cæſar's, and afterwards in that of the Antoninus's with the bones of Geta, but with him* (57). This proof is very bad, and ſhews, that Triſtan did not know that Caracalla and Geta were in the ſame tomb. Geta was laid in the ſepulchre of Severus (58), that is to ſay, in that of the Antoninus's (59), and Caracalla was laid there too. *Corpus ejus Antoninorum ſepulchro illatum eſt, ut ea ſedes reliquias ejus acciperet quæ nomen addiderat* (60). His body was ſent to Rome, by the very order of his murderer (61). Others ſay, that Macrinus had it burnt, and put the aſhes in an urn, which he ſent to Julia (62).

The ſixth proof is very good; it is grounded on Julia's being the mother, and not the mother-in-law of Caracalla. This is plain from the teſtimony of Dion, a man of figure in the empire, and who had ſeen Severus, Julia, Caracalla, Geta, *&c.* a hundred times. Herodian ſays the ſame thing; and what can be more convincing upon this ſubject, than theſe words of Oppian? τὸν μεγάλη μεγάλῳ φυτήσατο Δόμνα Σεβήρῳ. Since Oppian, in a book which he dedicated to Caracalla, affirms, that Julia brought forth Caracalla, can there be the leaſt doubt of it? Can a cotemporary writer be miſtaken in ſuch a thing? And durſt he tell a lie in the face of all the court, about a thing which no body was ignorant of? Can any one be ignorant in a prince's court, whether his wife is the mother, or the ſtep-mother of his ſons? I ſay nothing of the inſcriptions, in which Julia is called Caracalla's mother (63). Now all thoſe who ſpeak of the pretended marriage of Julia and Caracalla, ſuppoſe that ſhe was his ſtep-mother, and therefore are not to be credited, as building upon a falſity. Nay, they fall into a contradiction. Does not Spartianus ſay ſomewhere, that Geta was a greater favourite of his mother than Caracalla? *Fratri ſemper inviſus, matri amabilior quam frater* (64). Would a man who ſhould make this remark, and yet believe Julia to be Geta's mother, and Caracalla's ſtep-mother, have common ſenſe? This is not the only argument, that Spartianus affords againſt himſelf (65). Aurelius Victor (66) affirms, that Caracalla died, being near thirty years of age: which cannot be true, if this emperor was not Julia's ſon. See the remark [*L*]. The ſame hiſtorian obſerves. that Caracalla having ſecretly lain with Semea, his couſin, had a ſon by her, who was the emperor Heliogabalus (67). If Caracalla was Semea's couſin, he was Julia's ſon. I muſt obſerve by the way, that Mammea, Semea's ſiſter, and Alexander Severus's mother, is called by Ulpian Caracalla's couſin (68). Thus we find here a cotemporary writer, who ſays, that Julia was Caracalla's mother.

[*H*] *Her ſon . . . . . gave her a good ſhare in the government.*] See what has been quoted out of Dion, in the remark [*C*]; and add to it what the ſame hiſtorian tells us, when he relates the tragical end of Caracalla. He ſays, that during Caracalla's expedition againſt the Parthians, Julia remained at Antioch, and received all the diſpatches, and communicated only to the emperor, ſuch as were material. Thus all the affairs of the ſtate went through her hands, and it was ſhe who judged, whether ſuch or ſuch letters written to the emperor, deſerved to be ſent to him or not. This is a proof of the truſt that Caracalla repoſed in her, and of the notion he had of her capacity. Ἐκεκέλευστο αὐτῇ πάντα τὰ ἀφικνούμενα διαλέγειν, ἵνα μὴ μάτην αὐτῷ ὄχλος γραμμάτων ἐν τῇ πολεμίᾳ ὄντι πέμπεται. *Cui mandatum erat, cuncta quæ mitterentur, diſcernere, ne ad Antoninum occupatum in terra hoſtili fruſtra multitudo literarum mitteretur* (69).

[*I*] *As ſoon as ſhe underſtood that Macrinus reſolved to reſent the injurious words ſhe had uttered againſt him, . . . ſhe ſtarved herſelf to death.*] Macrinus ſent her Caracalla's aſhes (70), and wrote a very obliging letter to her (71): he deſired ſhe might keep all her retinue, and have her guards, as before; which made her think no more of killing herſelf. Ἐπειθ' ὡς οὔτε τι τῆς βασιλικῆς θεραπείας καὶ τῆς τῶν δορυφόρων περὶ αὐτῇ φρουρᾶς ἠλλοιώθη, καὶ ἐκεῖνος χρηστά τινα αὐτῇ ἐπέστειλε, θαρσήσασα, τὴν τοῦ θανάτου ἐπιθυμίαν κατέθετο. *Sed poſtquam ille non modo nihil de regio famulatu ejus, aut de ſtipatoribus quos ſecum habebat cuſtodiæ cauſa immutavit, verùm etiam multa ad eam percommode ſcripſit, cœpit bona ſpe injecta deſiderium mortis deponere* (72). But when he underſtood, that ſhe had furiouſly inveighed againſt him, and formed factions, to make herſelf ſovereign in that country, like Semiramis and Nitocris; he ordered her immediately to depart from Antioch, and permitted her to retire whither ſhe pleaſed. Then Julia would live no longer; ſhe feared more than death the condition of a woman without authority. Some (73) doubt whether her death was voluntary; but Dion does not ſpeak of it doubtfully. He affirms (74), that ſhe ſtarved herſelf to death, which ſhe the eaſier effected, as having inflamed her cancer, by ſtriking her breaſt. Triſtan believes, that *ſhe ſtruck her breaſt to haſten her death, by irritating her cancer*; but I do very much queſtion whether this is the hiſtorian's meaning. I believe that Dion meant no more than this, *viz.* that this lady ſtriking her breaſt, whilſt ſhe was lamenting the death of her ſon, irritated the cancer (75). The general cuſtom of women, upon the news of a loſs like this, was not only to make lamentations, but alſo to beat their breaſts. Julia did as the reſt, but probably it was not with ſuch blows, as to deſign directly to die of them. Since ſhe is compared to Semiramis, ſhe muſt have been looked upon as a moſt ambitious and cunning woman. This laſt quality ſhe did not want, if we believe Dion Caſſius (76).

[*K*] *The title of Domna . . . . . was the name of a family.*] Triſtan (77) proves it very learnedly, and cenſures Ritterſhuſius (78), who thought that in this verſe of Oppian, Τὸν μεγάλη μεγάλῳ φυτήσατο Δόμνα Σεβήρῳ, the word Δόμνα is an *epithet borrowed from the Latin* Domina, and that the Poet *making it Greek*, inſerted it *with the licence of the eliſion of the Iota.* He criticiſes another fault of the ſame Ritterſhuſius, which is his believing that Oppian ſpeaks of Martia, Severus's firſt wife. See Menage (79), who cenſures Gentilis (80), who was guilty of Ritterſhuſius's firſt fault. See alſo Mr Spanheim (81), who finds the ſame fault in the notes upon Nicephorus Briennius.

[*L*] *There are ſome difficulties about the time of her marriage with Severus.*] Dion (82) affirms that Fauſtina, wife of Marcus Aurelius, prepared the nuptial chamber for Severus and Julia, in the temple of Venus, which was in the palace. *Now Fauſtina died in the eaſt, about the end of the year* 175 (83). Therefore Severus's and Julia's marriage was not later than that

(*c*) Xiphilin. in Caracalla, pag. 345, 346.

(*d*) Id in Macrino, pag, 362.

(*e*) *They are to be found in the ſecond volume of Triſtan's* Commentaires Hiſtoriques, pag. 117, 118.

(56) Xiphilin. in Caracalla, pag. 352.

(57) Triſtan. ubi ſupra, pag. 115. *He quotes no body. This is to be found in the fragments of Dion*, pag. 899, *of the edition of* 1606.

(58) Funus Getæ accuratius fuiſſe dicitur quam ejus qui à fratre videretur occiſas. Illatuſque eſt majorum ſepulcro, hoc eſt Severi. *Spartian. in Geta, cap. vii, pag. m.* 744.

(59) Urnulam auream . . . . Severi reliquias continentem eamdemque Antoninorum ſepulcro illatam. *Id. in Severo, cap. ult. pag.* 640.

(60) Id. in Caracalla, cap x, pag. 730.

(61) Capitolin. in Macrino, cap v, pag. 753.

(62) Herodian. lib. iv, cap. 13.

(63) *See* Salmaſius, in Spartian. cap. xx, pag. 633, *and Mr Spanheim*, de Præſt. Numiſmat pag. 628.

(64) Spartian. in Geta, cap. v, pag. m. 740.

(65) *See the remark* [*L*].

(66) Aurel. Victor, in Epit. pag. 212.

(67) Heliogabalus dictus Caracallæ ex Semea CONSOBRINA occulte ſtuprata filius. *Id. ibid.*

(68) Ulpian. lege ultima de Senat. apud Triſtan, pag. 117.

(69) Xiphilin. in Caracalla, pag. 357.

(70) Herodian lib. iv, cap. xiii.

(71) Xiphil in Macrino, pag. 362.

(72) Id. ibid.

(73) Herodian. ubi ſupra.

(74) Xiphilin. in Macrino, pag. 362.

(75) See the Fragments, pag. 899, of Dion's edition, 1606.

(76) Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις εἶχε καὶ τὸ πανοῦργον τῆς μητρὸς, καὶ τῶν Σύρων ὅθεν ἐκείνη ἦν. Inerat ei fraus & malitia matris, Syriorumque ex quibus illa orta fuerat. *Xiphilin. in Caracalla*, pag. 349.

(77) Triſtan. Comment. Hiſt. Tom. II, pag. 119, 120.

(78) Not in Oppiani Cynegetica.

(79) Amœnit. juris, cap. xxv, pag m 139.

(80) Lib. ii, Parergorum juris, cap. xxii.

(81) Spanhem de Præſtant Numiſmat. pag. 126.

(82) Xiphilin. in Severo, pag. 310.

(83) Tillemont, Hiſt. des Emper. Tom. III, pag. 389.

in which ſhe is called the mother of the camps, the mother of the country, and the mother of the Senate.

that year. Julia was quickly a mother; it is not known whether Caracalla was the eldeſt of her children, but that might well be. According to Spartianus, who makes him live forty three years, Caracalla was killed in the year 217, according to which reckoning he muſt have been born in the year 174. If you object to this author, that Caracalla's and Julia's marriage muſt be placed about the year 212, ſince it happened after the beginning of Caracalla's reign, which laſted but ſix years; and if you conclude from thence, that this marriage is a meer fiction, ſince Julia was then above fifty years old; he will anſwer you, that Julia was not the mother of Caracalla, and he will maintain, that ſhe was not married to Severus, till long after the year 174. And yet Dion affords us a ſtrong proof that Julia muſt have been at leaſt fifty years old, when it is pretended that her nakedneſs did ſo charm Caracalla. From what he ſays, we ought to ſuppoſe, that ſhe was married before the death of Fauſtina, and conſequently, that ſhe was at leaſt twelve or thirteen years of age, in the year 175. I am going to ſhew, that it is impoſſible, that Caracalla ſhould have been born the firſt year of Julia's marriage, if it be true, that this marriage happened before Fauſtina's death.

Spartianus ſays, 'that Caracalla was but five years 'old, when his father was governor of Illyricum, (which 'we cannot ſuppoſe before the year 190) and that he 'received the *Toga virilis* when he was deſigned con'ſul (that is at the end of the year 201, and ſo he was 'not then at moſt but in the beginning of his fifteenth 'year). He every where acknowledges, that Caracal'la was very young, when Severus came to the em'pire. He repreſents him as a child of two or three 'years of age at moſt at the birth of Geta, which was 'the twenty ſeventh of May, 189 (84).' All this is inconſiſtent with the forty three years he gives this emperor, when he was killed in 217. He therefore contradicts himſelf. Dion affirms, that Geta lived but twenty two years and nine months (85), and that Caracalla lived but twenty nine years (86). Now Caracalla lived but ſix years after the death of Geta (87), and he was killed in the year 217. Geta therefore muſt have been born in the year 189, and Caracalla in 188. Therefore there muſt have been many years from Julia's marriage to Caracalla's birth, if Fauſtina prepared the nuptial bed, as Dion relates it; and yet, according to Spartianus, Julia's marriage was quickly fruitful, and gave a ſecond ſon to Severus, a few years after the birth of the firſt. 'Ex qua (Julia) ſtatim pater factus 'eſt. A Gallis ob ſeveritatem & honorificentiam & 'abſtinentiam, tantum quantum nemo dilectus eſt. 'Deinde Pannonias proconſulari imperio rexit. Poſt 'hoc Siciliam proconſularem ſorte meruit, ſuſcepitque 'Romæ alterum filium (88). —— *Which Julia ſoon 'made him a father. He was exceedingly beloved by 'the Gauls, on account of his ſeverity, honourableneſs, 'and abſtinence. After that he was Proconſul of the 'Pannonia's: next he was Proconſul of Sicily, and had 'another ſon at Rome.*' There is a great deal of confuſion in all this. I know not whether a conjecture, which I advance at a venture, will be approved. Dion does not ſeem to me to ſay, that Fauſtina actually prepared the nuptial chamber, but that Severus dreamed ſhe had prepared it. This hiſtorian relates ſeven preſages of Severus's exaltation; and after having mentioned the ſix firſt, he adds, that they appeared to him in his ſleep (89); and afterward he ſpeaks of the ſeventh as of a fortuitous action, done when he was awake. In relating the ſix firſt, he does not always obſerve upon each in particular, that it was a dream; but he does it three or four times. This might have deceived the interpreters; for he does not obſerve it as to this action of Fauſtina, which is one of the ſix preſages: he relates it as a reality, I mean without cautioning that it was a dream. Now ſince he does the ſame with reſpect to ſome of the other preſages, which were manifeſtly a dream, and ſince, before he relates the preſage, which conſiſted in a real action, he gives notice, that all the preceeding preſages appeared in his ſleep; I think it may be concluded, that he makes the preparation of the nuptial bed in the temple of Venus, by Fauſtina, to be only the viſion of a man who ſleeps. I do not know whether ever the nuptial chamber of any perſon was prepared for him in a temple. It is eaſier therefore to come to Dion's aſſiſtance, than to bring off the other hiſtorian: nevertheleſs, ſome contradictions are objected to the latter, without much ground. This I am going to examine. obſerving firſt of all, that Mr de Tillemont ought not to have preferred this paſſage of Dion, to the hypotheſis that Spartianus leads us to (90). This hypotheſis is to ſay, that Severus married Julia, whilſt he commanded in Gallia Lugdunenſis, in the year 186. Some hiſtorians tell us (91), that Caracalla was born at Lyons.

An Examination of ſome contradictions objected to Spartianus.

Triſtan (92) alledges, as a proof of Spartianus's contradictions, theſe words of Caracalla's life. 'Hic ta'men omnium duriſſimus, & ut uno complectar verbo, 'parricida, inceſtorum reus, patris, matris & fratris 'inimicus (93). —— *He was the moſt cruel of men; 'in a word, he was guilty of parricide and inceſt, and 'hated his father, mother, and brother.*' But I do not think that he can hereby be convicted of contradiction, and of forgetting his hypotheſis; he might maintain, that he takes the word *mater*, according to the notion which he explains two pages before, 'Matrem enim (non alio dicenda erat nomine) duxit 'uxorem. —— *He married his mother; for ſhe could 'be called by no other name.*' And we ſee he does not forget the inceſt, in the words related by Triſtan (94). 'The ſame Spartianus mentions the rea'ſon, which Caracalla ſaid he had to kill his bro'ther, namely, that he deſpiſed their mother, and did 'not pay her the reſpect that was due to her. Which 'makes it manifeſt, that Spartianus, or he that he took 'it from, acknowledged her to be their common mo'ther. For he would have had no reaſon to be ſo 'enraged with this irreverence of his brother towards 'Julia, if ſhe had not been his mother, and the pretence 'had been as ridiculous, as it appeared barbarous, 'notwithſtanding all the other reaſons he invented to 'palliate his violence and his crime. This objection is not good: for in the firſt place, theſe words *matri eum irreverentem fuiſſe* (95), ſignify only, that Geta did not reſpect his mother; and they ought not to be tranſlated as if being ſpoken by Caracalla, they meant, *Geta does not reſpect our mother*. It is thus however, that Triſtan has underſtood them, which is his fault. In the ſecond place, it is a very ſpecious pretext to extenuate a murder, to ſay, that the perſon killed uſed his mother ill. An uſurper, who ſhould dethrone a prince, inſolent to his mother, would not fail to charge him with this crime, though he were no relation to the family dethroned. Cromwell and his party would have exhauſted all the common-places of rhetoric, if they could have reproached Charles I with ſuch an irreverence. Much more would this pretence be alledged, if a man was the ſon-in-law of a lady, ill treated by her own ſon. Such a man would ſay, that he thinks himſelf obliged to defend the rights of his father's widow, againſt all oppoſers whatſoever. In a word, he would alledge a hundred plauſible reaſons, and ſuch as might make an impreſſion; and I do not know what Triſtan meant when he called this a ridiculous pretence.

Here is a ſtronger objection againſt Spartianus. He ſays (96) that Caracalla being in his thirteenth year, was proclaimed by the ſoldiers, an aſſociate to the empire, upon the taking of Cteſiphon. He adds, that Severus returning into Syria, gave the *Toga virilis* to Caracalla, and named him his colleague in the conſulſhip, which they entered upon immediately. This conſulſhip falls in the year 202, and the taking of Cteſiphon, in the year 198. It is not therefore poſſible, that Caracalla, who was killed in the year 217, ſhould have lived ſo long as this hiſtorian affirms, that is, forty three years.

(84) Id. ibid. pag. 389, 390.

(85) Xiphil. in Caracalla, pag. 345.

(86) Id. ibid. pag. 358.

(87) Herodian. lib. iv, cap. xiii. *See alſo* Xiphilinus, in Caracalla, pag. 358, *who ſays, that Caracalla reigned ſix years, two months, and ſome days. Two days according to the edition of Dion Caſſius, in 1606.*

(88) Spartian. in Severo, cap. iv, pag. 594.

(89) Ταῦτα μὲν ἐκ τῶν ὀνειράτων ἔμαθεν. ὕπερ δὲ ἔς τε τὸν βασιλικὸν δίφρον ἔφηβος ὢν ἔτι ἀγνοίᾳ ἐνιδρύνθη. Quæ omnia quum ex ſomniis intellexerit Severus, tum id revera evenit, quod quum adhuc ephebus eſſet, conſedit in ſella principis per imprudentiam. *Xiphilin. in Severo, pag.* 310.

(90) *See* Tillemont, Tom. III, pag. 389, & Spartian. in Severo, cap. iii, & iv, pag. 594.

(91) Aurel. Victor, in Cæſaribus, pag. 211.

(92) Triſtan, ubi ſupra, pag. 119.

(93) Spart. in Caracalla, ſub fin. pag. 732.

(94) Triſtan, ubi ſupra.

(95) Spart. in Geta, cap. ii, pag. 709.

(96) In Severo, cap. xvi, pag. 616, 617.

JULIS,

JULIS, a town of the iſle of Cea, in the Ægean Sea. In this town (*a*) were born the Poet Simonides, the Poet Bacchylides, his nephew, the Sophiſt Prodicus, the Phyſician Eraſiſtratus, and a Philoſopher called Ariſto [*A*]. Valerius Maximus (*b*), relates a very ſingular thing, which he was witneſs of, when he paſſed through Julis in the retinue of Sextus Pompeius, who was going into Aſia, to exerciſe his proconſulſhip. I ſpeak of it elſewhere (*c*). When the four towns of this iſland were reduced to two, Julis was one of the two (*d*). It was built upon a mountain three miles from the ſea. The native country of ſo many great men, ought not to have been omitted by Moreri; nor left out in the Dictionary of Charles Stephens, by Mr Lloyd, who had done better to rectify this article [*B*], than to leave it out intirely.

(*a*) Strabo, lib. x. Suidas, Stephanus.

(*b*) Lib. ii, cap. vi.

(*c*) *In the article* ZIA, *remark* [C], *towards the end.*

(*d*) Strabo, ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *A Philoſopher called Ariſto.*] It is thus we ought to ſay, and not with Moreri (1), *the Philoſopher Ariſto*; for this expreſſion induces one to believe, that either there was but one Philoſopher of that name, or at leaſt, that he who was born at Julis, was incomparably more eminent than all the other Ariſto's, both which things are falſe.

[*B*] *Mr Lloyd . . . . . had done well to rectify this article.*] Charles Stephens had done well not to ſay ſo abſolutely, that the iſle of Cea was indifferently called Cia or Cos, and to examine better what he ſays, that there was a law in Julis, which ſentenced all people to death that were above ſixty years of age, and that the end of this law was to prevent the want of proviſions for the reſt. See what we ſhall ſay upon this in the remarks of the article ZIA.

(1) *At the word* Cée.

JULIUS II, created Pope the night between the thirty firſt of October, and the firſt of November, 1503, was nephew to Sixtus IV, and was called Julian de Ruvere (*a*). It is ſaid that he had been a water-man [*A*]. There was ſomething very remarkable in his election [*B*]; for, properly ſpeaking, it preceded the entrance of the cardinals

(*a*) *The Italians write it ſo.*

[*A*] *It is ſaid, that he was a water man.*] Eraſmus has inſerted this tradition in his Adages. ‘*A remo ad tribunal, ſays he* (1), Dici ſolitum ubi quis repente ab infima conditione provehitur ad honeſti muneris adminiſtrationem. Id quod haud ſcio an ulli contigerit fœlicius quàm Julio ſecundo. Nam fama eſt hunc juvenum ad ſtipem ſcalmum remo ſubigere ſolitum, & tamen à remulco non ſolùm ad tribunal, verumetiam ad ſummum illud rerum humanarum culmen evectus eſt. Nec contentus hoc faſtigio, pontificiæ ditionis pomeria multum protulit; longius etiam producturus ſi per mortis inclementiam vitam illi producere licuiſſet. ——— From the oar to the tribunal, *is proverbially ſaid, when any one is ſuddenly raiſed from a low condition to an honourable employment. I kn w not whether this happened more luckily to any one, than to Julius II. For it is reported, that, when he was a young man, he uſed to row for hire; and yet he was raiſed from a boat-man, not only to the ſeat of juſtice, but even to the higheſt of human honours. And, not ſatisfied with this elevation, he greatly enlarged the Papal authority, and would have carried it ſtill farther, had he not been prevented by death.*’ Father Theophilus Raynaud is miſtaken, in ſaying (2), that Eraſmus makes mention of the ſame thing in the explication of the proverb, *à ſcapha in triumphalem quadrigam.* It is not he, but Hadrian Junius (3), who explained this adage, and ſays: ‘Efferri poteſt de quovis è fæce hominum ad magnes opes dignitateſque provecto, quemadmodum Julius Ligur poſt ſedentariam operam in ducendo ſcalmo diu navatam, Sixti Pontificis beneficio inſignibus Eccleſiaſticorum honorum ornatus, tandem ad Pontificatum maximum emerſit. ——— *It may be ſaid of any Plebian raiſed to great riches and honours, ſuch as Pope Julius, who, after having long been employed in rowing a boat, was, by the favour of Pope Sixtus, raiſed to the honours of the church, and at laſt obtained the Popedom.*’ Anaſtaſius Germonius, archbiſhop of Tarentaiſe, has maintained, that all the ſtories concerning the birth of Sixtus IV, and Julius II, are falſe; and that Leonard de Ruvere, father of Sixtus IV, was a very noble knight, and that before the exaltation of this Pope, the family of Ruvere was in a flouriſhing ſtate. ‘Sixtus IV falſo jactatus eſt è plebeiis & piſcatoribus editus cùm patrem haberet Leonardum de Ruvere, Equitem nobliſſimum, ut obſervavit Anaſtaſius Germonius, exponens indultum Hieronymi Cardinalis de Ruvere §. Sixtus num. 28, qui etiam §. Magnis, de gentis Ruvereæ antiquo, (etiam ante Sixtum, ſplendore, agit diffuſiſſimè (4).’

Mr de la Monnoie (5) pretends, that Anaſtaſius Germonius, who only copies Onuphrius, cannot ſtand ‘againſt Philelphus, Baptiſt Fregoſus, Volaterranus, Corio, Eraſmus, Machiavel, Chaſſeneuz, Bandello, du Ferron, Maſſo, and ſo many others cited by Spondanus, in his continuation of Baronius, on the year 1471. n. 10.’ Bandello affirms, that Julius II. boaſted that he had ſteered a little veſſel. ‘Giulio ſecondo Pontefice, anchorche di baſſiſſima gente foſſe diſceſo, e non ſi vergognaſſe ſpeſſe fiate dire che egli da Arbizuola, villa del Savoneſe, haveſſe con una barchetta più volte, quando era garzone, menato de le cipolle à vendere à Genova, fù nondimeno huomo di grandiſſimo ingegno e di molto elevato ſpirto (6). ——— *Pope Julius II, though of mean extraction, and made no difficulty frequently to ſay, that from Arbizuola, a village in the Savoneſe, he many times, when a boy, carried onions in a boat to ſell at Genoa; nevertheleſs was a man of great parts, and an exalted genius.*’

[*B*] *There was ſomething very remarkable in his election.*] He was ſure of his election before the cardinals entred the conclave; ſo that he came into it Pope. He was an exception to the common proverb, that he who enters the conclave Pope, comes out cardinal, *Chi entra Papa, eſce Cardinale* (7). He had ſecured his faction, by ſo many promiſes, and had in his power ſo many means of enriching ſuch as would ſerve him, that it was not poſſible for him to miſs of the Papal dignity. Beſides the riches which he had already gotten, he had in hands thoſe of others: every one was eager to offer him money, and even their benefices; ſo that he ſaw himſelf in a capacity of promiſing more than was asked. Thus you ſee the iniquitous way by which he roſe to the pontificate. It is not a Proteſtant, but an Italian author that ſays it. ‘Ma molto più ve lo promoſſono le promiſſioni immoderate, & infinite fatte da lui a' Cardinali, a' Principi, a' Baroni, & a ciaſcuno, che gli poteſſe eſſere utile a queſto negotio, di quanto ſeppono dimandare: & hebbe oltra ciò facultà di diſtribuir danari, e molti beneficii, e dignità Eccleſiaſtiche, coſi delle ſue proprie, come di quelle d'altri: perche alla fama della ſua liberalità molti concorrevano ſpontaneamente ad offerirgli, che uſaſſe a propoſito ſuo i danari, il nome, gli ufficii, & i beneficii loro: ne fu conſiderato per alcuno eſſere molto maggiore le ſue promeſſe di quello, che poi Pontefice poteſſe, ò doveſſe oſſervare: perche haveva lungamente havuto nome tale d'huomo libero, & veridico, che Aleſſandro ſeſto, nimico ſuo tanto acerbo, mordendolo nell' altre coſe, confeſſava lui eſſere huomo verace; laqual laude, egli ſapendo, che NIUNO più facilmente inganna gli altri, che chi è ſolito, & ha fama di mai non gl'ingannare; non tenne conto, per conſeguire il Pontefícato, di maculare (8). ——— *But that which ſerued moſt in his aduauncement, was the promiſes immoderate and infinite, whiche he made to the cardinals, princes, and barons, and to all others whom he might make profitable to him in that action. Beſides he had the meane to diſtribute money, benefices, and ſpiritual dignities, aſwell ſuch as were his own, as thoſe that were the rightes of others, for that ſuche was the bruite and renowne of his liberalitie,*

(1) Eraſm. Adag. Chil. III, Cent. IV, n. 8[illegible], pag. m. 725.

(2) Theophil. Rainaud. Hoplotheca, Sect. II, Serie III, cap I, pag. m. 303.

(3) Hadr Junius, Adag. Cent. VI, n. 43.

(4) Theophil. Rainaud ibid. pag. 304.

(5) *In a manuſcript remark, which he has imparted to me.*

(6) Bandello, *Novel xxxi, of the firſt part,* fol. 229, verſo, *Mr de la Monnoie has furniſhed me with this paſſage.*

(7) Memoires des Intrigues de la Cour de Rome, *printed at Paris,* 167[illegible], *pag.* 20.

(8) Guicciardin, lib. v., fol. m. 165, verſo.

Cardinals into the conclave. He had gained the faction of the duke of Valentinois, by making him believe, that he was his father [*C*], and promiſing to treat him as his ſon. He did afterwards juſt the contrary. No man had ever a more martial ſpirit than he [*D*]. He was in perſon at the taking of towns, and appeared more fiery than thoſe who commanded his armies [*E*]. A great number of writers affirm, that he once threw

‘ *beralitie, that many made willing offers to him to diſpoſe as he beſt liked of their treaſures, their names, their offices, and benefices. They conſidered not that his promiſes were farre to great then, that beeing Pope, he was eyther hable or ought to obſerue, for that he had of ſo long continuaunce enioyed the name of iuſt and vpright, that Pope Alexander him ſelf his greateſt enemie, ſpeaking ill on him, in al other things could not but confeſſe him to be true of his word: a praiſe which he made no care to defile and ſtaine, ſo thende to become Pope, knowing that no man more eaſily beguileth an other, then he that hath the cuſtome, and name neuer to deceiue any* ‡. If he had not made uſe of this Simony, how could he have induced the cardinals to give him their voices. He, who had always diſcovered ſuch a turbulent and terrible temper, and got many enemies (9). Money brings every thing about; it made a Pope before they had met for the election: a thing never known before. ‘ Il Cardinale di San Pietro in Vincola potente d'amici, de riputatione, e di ricchezze, haveva tirati a ſe i voti di tanti Cardinali, che non havendo ardire di opporſegli quegli, che erano di contraria ſentenza, entrando in Conclave gia Papa certo, e ſtabilito; fu con eſſempio incognito prima alla memoria de gli huomini, ſenza che altrimenti ſi chiudeſſe il Conclave, la notte medeſima, che fu la notte dell' ultimo giorno d'Ottobre, aſſunto al Ponteficato (10). ——— *The cardinall S. Petri Ad Vincla mighty in frends, reputation, and riches, had drawn to him the voices of ſo many cardinals, that entring the conclaue, he was with an example all new and without ſhutting the conclaue, elected Pope the ſame night* †.’

[*C*] *He made the duke of Valentinois believe that he was his father.*] I have read this no where but in Varillas. This hiſtorian ſays (11), that the French accuſed Julius II ‘ of having aſcended St Peter's throne by two irregular ways, to wit by Simony (12) and deceit. To prove the Simony they inſtanced the benefices, and legations promiſed in the conclave, and given after the election to the cardinals, who were heads of the factions, and they ſpecified the ſums of money, which the other cardinals had received for the price of their voices. To demonſtrate the deceit, it was remonſtrated to the ſame Pope, that the Spaniſh cardinals being engaged by oath not to give their voices to any other, than him who was propoſed by the duke of Valentinois, the cardinal of St Peter in Bonds, who was ſworn enemy to this duke, ſuborned ſome perſons to perſuade him, that he was his father; that he had kept his mother when ſhe ſeemed only to belong to cardinal Borgia, who was afterwards Alexander VI; that the jealouſy the ſame Borgia conceived againſt him, was the only cauſe of the perſecution he had ſuffered from him for ten years together; but the buſineſs at preſent being to chuſe another Pope, if he would lend him his intereſt, he would treat him as his ſon. The duke of Valentinois gave credit to what was told him in confidence ſo far as to conſent, that the cardinals of his faction ſhould elect the cardinal of St Peter in Bonds, who failed not immediately after to deprive him of all Romagna and Umbria, inſtead of acknowledging him for his ſon.

[*D*] *No man had ever a more martial ſpirit than he.*] Here is what John le Maire Hiſtoriographer to Lewis XII ſays of him. ‘ Let us farther obſerve another wonderful difference in the end of this work; I mean the graciouſneſs and affability of the Sultan to the Moſt Chriſtian king, in compariſon of the rigour and obſtinacy of the preſent Pope, who being all over martial and ſour, and always in his armour, as if he would have his terrible and warlike actions ſpoken of, as thoſe of the great Tamerlane, emperor and Sultan of the Tartars, will continually carry on the war, which becomes him as little, as dancing does a hooded Monk. Yet he muſt not expect to make a new world wholly monſtrous, as he is attempting; for hogs will always feed on acorns, oaks will be deprived of their leaves in due time, and wood will be applied to ſuch an uſe as properly belongs to it. But the glorious ſtelliferous crown, and the eagle of Jupiter, which are bright celeſtial luminaries, fixed and unmovable, as Aſtrologers witneſs, will ſhine in the firmament as long as the world laſts (13).’ William Budæus called him a bloody ringleader of gladiators (14), and ſtrongly repreſented the ſcandal that Pope gave, who at ſeventy years of age appeared in a warlike habit, whilſt the people were going in proceſſion to beg peace of God. ‘ Cùm ſacerdos ſeptuagenarius Chriſti, Pacis conditoris & parentis Legatus, Bellonæ ſacris operaretur, cui cum generis humani luculento diſpendio litare contendebat. Idque tum, cùm profanum vulgus ad delubra pacis & concordiæ miſerabili ſpecie ſupplicationes inibat. Enimverò viſendum ſpectaculum, Patrem non modo ſanctiſſimum, ſed etiam ſenio & canitie ſpectabilem, quaſi ad tumultum Gallicum Bellonæ fama ſuos evocatos cientem: non trabea, non auguſtis inſignibus venerandum, non Pontificiis geſtaminibus ſacroſanctum, ſed paludamento & cultu barbarico conſpicuum; ſed furiali, ut ita dicam, confidentia ſuccinctum, fulminibus illis brutis & inanibus lucidum, eminente in truci vultu cultuque ſpirituum atrocitate (15). —— *When a miniſter of CHRIST, of ſeventy years of age, embaſſador of the Prince of Peace, was employed in ſacrificing to Bellona, to whom his vows were offered at the expence of the human race. And that, at a time when the populace were lamenting and making prayers in the temples of Peace and Concord. It was indeed a remarkable ſight, to ſee a moſt Holy Father, venerable for his old age and grey hairs, exciting his ſubjects to war, habited, not as a prince or Pope, but armed, and breathing nothing but rage and fury.*’ This is but a ſmall part of Budæus's vehement declamations againſt this Pope. You may ſee them at large in Flacius Illyricus, in the twentieth book of his *Catalogus teſtium veritatis*.

[*E*] *He was in perſon at the taking of towns, and appeared more fiery than thoſe who commanded his armies.*] Du Pleſſis Mornai adds nothing to the expreſſions of Guicciardin, when he ſays (16), ‘ being reſolved to attack Ferrara, he was adviſed firſt to take Mirandola, and being tired with the ſlow progreſs of that ſiege, which went not to his mind (*a thing not expected, and never known before) the vicar of CHRIST on earth* was there in perſon *againſt a Chriſtian town*, ſays *Guicciardin, and tho' old and ſick, was ſo obſtinate and impetuous in a war that he himſelf had raiſed againſt the Chriſtian Princes*, that nothing was done ſoon enough, he was always calling to the captains in a fury, having his quarters ſo near the battery, that two men were killed in his kitchen, notwithſtanding the remonſtrances the cardinals made to him of the diſgrace he brought both upon himſelf and his ſee.’ Monſtrelet (17) ſays on that occaſion, ‘ he deſerted St Peter's chair, to take the title of Mars the god of battle, to diſplay his three crowns in the field, and to ſleep in a watch-tower; and God knows what a fine figure theſe mitres, croſſes, and croſiers made, fluttering in the camp; the devil was not ſuch a fool as to be there, for benedictions were too cheap.’ Guicciardin does very well repreſent what concerns the ſiege of Mirandola; for he obſerves, that this Pope had no regard to the horrible cold of the ſeaſon, which retarded the works of the beſiegers. ‘ Parti il ſecondo dì di Gennaio (18) da Bologna accompagnato da tre Cardinali, e giunto nel campo, alloggiò in una caſettà d'un villano, ſottopoſta a' colpi dell' artiglierie de' nimici; perche non era più lontana dalle mura della Mirandola che tiri in due volte una baleſtra commune: quivi affaticandoſi, & eſſercitando non meno il corpo, che la mente, e che l'Imperio, cavalcava quaſi continuamente hora quà, hora là, per il campo, ſollecitando che ſi deſſe perfettione al piantare dell' artiglierie, delle quali inſino

‘ a quel

---

‡ Fenton's Tranſlation of Guicciardin's Hiſtory. Lond. 1579, pag. 314, 315.

(9) Il quale era notiſſimo eſſere di natura molto difficile, e formidabile a ciaſcuno; & il quale inquietiſſimo in ogni tempo, e che haveva conſumato l'eta in continui travagli; haveva per neceſſità offeſo molti, eſſercitato odii, e nimicitie con molti huomini grandi. *Id. ibid.* - - - *Who was knowen to be of a diſpoſition rigorous and terrible, and in whom was no expectation of reſt and tranquilitie, hauing conſumed his youth in continuall trauels, offended many by neceſſitie, and exerciſed hatreds agaynſt many great perſonages.* Fenton, ubi ſupra, pag. 314.

(10) Id. ibid. fol. 165.

† Fenton, ubi ſupra.

(11) Anecdotes de Florence, pag. 229, 230.

(12) As to the ſimony, ſee what I have quoted out of Guicciardin, above, in the remark [*B*].

(13) John le Maire de Belges, prologue to his treatiſe of Schiſms, pag. 2, of the edit. of Lyons, 1549, in folio.

(14) Cum interim ſub ipſo laniſta ſanguinario. *Budæus de Aſſe, apud Hotting. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Tom. V, pag.* 545.

(15) Id. ibid. apud eundem, Hottinger. ibid. pag. 546.

(16) Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 578.

(17) Mr du Pleſſis quotes Monſtrelet in the new additions; but it is a miſtake: for Monſtrelet died before the pontificate of Julius II, and is not the author of thoſe additions.

(18) Of the year 1511.

threw St Peter's keys into the Tyber [*F*], in order only to uſe St Paul's ſword: but as theſe writers copy one another, without citing any good original author, I would not adviſe any body to vouch for the truth of it. However, it may be ſaid, that if this Pope wanted the qualities of a good biſhop he had at leaſt thoſe of a conquering prince. He had great courage and a political head, by which he formed leagues, and broke them, according to the exigency of his intereſt. He made a moſt formidable one againſt the republic of Venice, and made uſe, among other things, of the thunder of his excommunications;

‘a quel giorno era piantata la minor parte, eſſendo impedite quaſi tutte l'opere militari da' tempi aſpriſſimi, e dalla neve quaſi continua (19). —— *He parted from Bolognia, the ſecond of Januarie accompanied with three cardinalls, And being come to the campe, the neceſſitye of the place, compelled him to be lodged in a litle countreye cottage, ſubiect and open to the artilleries of thennemies, for that it was no furthur from the walls of Mirandola, then a common crosbow will ſhoote at twiſe: there he diſpenſed with no trauell of his bodye, nor forbare any care or ſtudie of minde. There he was no leſſe prodigal of his authoritie, then of his preſence, and riding continually thorow, and about the campe, he had almoſt finiſhed the planting of thartillerie, whereof till that daye the leſſer parte could not be imployed for thimpediments, which the vnſeaſonable tyme and ſnowes gaue to all actions of warre* *.’ Complaining of his captains, he encouraged his ſoldiers with the hopes of plunder; for he promiſed them not to capitulate with the town, but to ſuffer them to ſack it. ‘Stette alla Concordia pochi giorni riconducendolo all' eſſercito la medeſima impatientia, & ardore; il quale non raffredò punto nel camino la neve groſſiſſima, che tuttavia cadeva del Cielo, nê i freddi così ſmiſurati che a pena i ſoldati potevano tollerargli: & alloggiato in una Chieſetta propinqua alle ſue artiglierie, e più vicina alle mura, che non era l'alloggiamento primo, nè gli ſatisfacendo coſa alcuna di quelle, che ſi erano fatte, e che ſi facevano; con impetuoſiſſime parole ſi lamentava di tutti i Capitani, eccetto che di Marc' Antonio Colonna, il quale di nuovo haveva fatto venire da Modena; nè procedendo con minore impeto per l'eſſercito, hora queſti ſgridando, hora quelli altri confortando, e facendo con le parole, e con i fatti l'officio del Capitano. Prometteva, che i ſoldati procedevano virilmente, che non accetterebbe la Mirandola con alcuno patto; ma laſcierebbe in poteſtà loro il ſaccheggiarla (20). —— *The Pope remeined not longe at Concorda, the ſame impatience and violence of mind cauſing him to returne, which firſt procured him to come to the campe; neither was his fury any thing abated by the hurtfull ſnowes that continually fell from heauen, whileſt he was in the fielde, nor his rigor the more reſtrayned by the ſharpe cold, whoſe bitterneſs the ſouldiours could not endure but with great payne: he was lodged in a litle church, neare to his artilleries, but ſomwhat nearer the wals then was his former lodging: and being diſcontented with all thinges, that either were already done, or ſtoode to be done, he complayned with bitter wordes againſt all his capteins, except only Mar. Anth. Colonno, whom he had newly ſent for from Modena: he trauelled with great impacience about the armie, enforcing him to perſuade a diligence in the men in whoſe ſlownes he tooke griefe, he accompliſhed both in wordes and action, the office of a Capteine, promiſing the ſoldiours for the reward of their vallours the ſpoyle of Mirandola, which he ſayd he would not take to compoſicion, but leaue it to their libertie to ranſecke or raunſom to their own profit* †.’ Mezerai (21) ſays, that the town being taken by compoſition the nineteenth of March (22), the Pope would be carried into it through the breach.

[*F*] *A great number of writers affirm, that he once threw St Peter's keys into the Tyber.*] Hitherto I have found no authority for this, beſides this Latin epigram of one *Gilbertus Ducherius Vulto* (23), *Aquaperſanus*.

In Gallum ut fama eſt, bellum geſturus acerbum,
Armatam educit Julius urbe manum:
Accinctus gladio, claves in Tibridis amnem
Projicit, & ſævus, talia verba facit:
Quum Petri nihil efficiant ad prælia claves,
Auxilio Pauli forſitan enſis erit.

Fame ſays, Pope Julius once the ſword did wield,
And, to engage the Frenchman, took the field.
Fierce, into Tyber's ſtream, the keys he threw,
Exclaiming loudly, as his ſword he drew:
Since, in my aid, thy keys, O Peter, fail,
Thy ſword, O Paul, in battle may avail.

It muſt be confeſſed, that this is a very weak foundation; for when a poet has a pretty thought, and finds no proper ſubject, that he may apply it to, he makes no ſcruple to ſupply the want of it, by his amplifications and fictions; and he will diſpenſe with the truth, rather than loſe a witty ſaying. *Poëtæ modo aliquid argute vel acute dicere videantur, plerumque verumne ſit an falſum propemodum non curant* (24). Be that how it will, this action true or falſe of Julius II, is to be ſound in many authors. One of the lateſt writers, in whom I have read it, relates it thus (25). ‘Percuſſo cum ipſis (*Venetis*) fœdere exercitum ſuum adverſus Imperatoris confœderatos Ferrarienſem & Ludovicum XII, Regem Francorum, iniquiſſimus & perfidiſſimus bellator eduxit (26) cum ea voce, quæ ipſum non S. Petri, ſed perditiſſimi & ſceleratiſſimi latronis ſucceſſorem eſſe commonſtravit. Cum exercitu enim Roma egreſſus, Petri clavem furibundus in Tiberim jactavit, adeoque, uti ingenioſe Bibliander concluſit, omne, quod à Sancto Petro ſe habere finxit jus, Tiberino flumini reſignavit; additis hiſce verbis: *Quia clavis S. Petri amplius nil juvat,* (evaginato gladio) *valeat gladius S. Pauli.* —— *Having made an alliance with the Venetians, this moſt unjuſt and perfidious warriour led his army againſt the emperor's allies, the duke of Ferrara, and Lewis XII, king of France, with an expreſſion, which denoted him rather the ſucceſſor of a moſt abandoned and wicked robber, than of St Peter. For, marching out of Rome with his army, he, in a rage, threw St Peter's key into the Tyber, thus reſigning to that river, as Bibliander ingeniouſly concludes, whatever power he pretended to have received from St Peter; adding theſe words;* ſince St Peter's key is of no farther uſe (*at the ſame time he drew his ſword*), let us try St Paul's ſword.’ I muſt not omit, that Hotman relates the ſame thing upon the credit of Arnold du Ferron, a Catholic hiſtorian. ‘Is eſt Julius ſecundus, *ſays he* (27), de quo & Arnoldus Ferronus, vir imprimis doctus, & Galliæ noſtræ hiſtoricus, & Burdegalenſis quondam Parlamenti Senator, itemque alii complures memoriæ prodiderunt: quòd cùm exercitu comparato Roma in Galliam, infeſto in Regem noſtrum animo, contenderet, ſuaſque armatas copias ipſe loricatus ex urbe per Tiberis pontem educeret, multis hominum audientibus hæc pronuntiavit: Quando nobis claves Petri nihil proſunt, age, gladium Pauli diſtringamus: ſimul claves, quas ſecum attulerat, in Tiberim projecit, gladiumque vagina eduxit. Qua de re notum illud vetus carmen eſt (28). —— *This is that Julius II, concerning whom Arnoldus Ferronus, a very learned man, and one of our hiſtorians of France, and formerly a member of the parliament of Bourdeaux, as alſo many others, have related, that, being incenſed againſt our king, and marching with an army from Rome into France, himſelf armed, as he paſſed out of the city by the bridge of the Tyber, he ſaid in the hearing of a great many: Since the keys of St Peter are of no uſe to us, come on, let us draw the ſword of St Paul; at the ſame time he threw the keys, which he had brought with him, into the Tyber, and drew his ſword. The epigram upon this is very well known.*’

I could never have believed, that Hotman could have been guilty of the unfairneſs of which I am going to convict him. I have conſulted Arnold du Ferron, and do not find that he recites Ducherius's epigram, as Hotman ſeems to ſay. The verſes he quotes are quite of another nature, and he adds to them the anſwer communications; but when he ſaw that the victory which the king of France, one of the heads of that League, obtained over the Venetians, did too much weaken that republic, he forſook his allies, and re-united himſelf with it. The emperor, and the king of France, equally diſſatisfied with him, endeavoured to bring him to reaſon, by a way always formidable to the Popes; which was, by the calling of a Council *(b)*. But he was not daunted at that, he proceeded ſeverely againſt this Council, and called another himſelf, which had the better of it, to which at laſt the king of France ſubmitted in a low manner [*G*]. It is true, that Julius II was then dead. The Sacred League which he formed in Italy, received a terrible check by the battle of Ravenna (*c*); and if they had known how to make uſe of that advantage, they would doubtleſs have humbled this haughty pontiff, whereas they permitted him to recover himſelf from that ſevere blow [*H*], by the little uſe they made of that victory, to which the powerful diverſions in his behalf contributed very much. He obtained great ſuccours from the Swiſs, and was very liberal of titles, and marks of honour towards the Cantons [*I*]. He died of a ſickneſs, full of vaſt deſigns [*K*], the twenty ſecond of February 1513. He

---

(19) Guicciard. lib. ix, fol. 262, verſo.

* Fenton, ubi ſupra, pag. 505, 506.

(20) Guicciard. lib. ix, fol. 263.

† Fenton, ubi ſupra, pag. 506.

(21) Abrégé, Chronolog. Tom. IV, pag. 455, ad ann. 1511.

(22) He ſhould have ſaid the twentieth of January.

(23) Du Pleſſis, pag. 580, quotes only that author, and calls him *Gilbertus Ducterius*. He was of Aigueperſe, in Auvergne. His Epigrams were printed at Lyons, in 1538.

(24) Papyr. Maſſo, in Vita Leonis X.

(25) Joan. Henricus Heidegg Hiſtoria Papatus, pag. 192, 193.

(26) Du Pleſſis, pag. 580, ſhould not have placed that expedition ſoon after his election to the Papacy.

(27) In Bruto fulmine, pag. m. 110, 111.

(28) It is Ducherius's epigram above mentioned. Hotman gives it at length.

(*b*) It was convened at Piſa, and then tranſferred to Milan, and at laſt to Lyons.

(*c*) On Eaſter-day, the eleventh of April, 1512.

anſwer which John Laſcaris made in favour of Julius II. I do not deny that he tells the ſtory of St Peter's keys being thrown into the Tyber; but he queſtions whether it be not a fiction. ‘ Quin vulgatum ‘ eſt, *ſays he* (29), Jocone Conficto an vero, ‘ quando Romani pictores Petro Claves, Paulo enſem tribuunt, illum in Gallos emiſſurum copias enſe accinctum & clavibus ad Tybrim profectum in ‘ aquas amnemque projeciſſe claves, hæc inferentem, ‘ quandoquidem nihil Petri claves prodeſſent, Pauli ‘ enſem (quem mox eduxerat) auxilio futurum. —— ‘ *It is commonly reported, whether jeſtingly or truly,* ‘ *that whereas the Roman Painters give Peter keys,* ‘ *and Paul a ſword, this Pope, about to lead an army againſt the French, armed with ſword and keys,* ‘ *and marching by the Tyber, threw the keys into the* ‘ *river, with this ſaying, ſince Peter's keys were of* ‘ *no ſervice, the ſword of Paul* (*which he preſently* ‘ *drew*) *ſhould aſſiſt him.*’ Is it conſiſtent with ſincerity to build ſuch a ſtory upon the authority of a great Catholic magiſtrate, and to ſuppreſs the declaration he made, that he knew not but it might be an impoſture? Moſt books are full of the like quotations, and we cannot take the trouble often to verify whether thoſe who cite the authors do it fairly; we cannot, I ſay, often take that trouble, without contracting a miſtruſt, which will oblige us to believe only our own eyes. If ſo famous an author as Francis Hotman gives himſelf ſo much liberty, what will not little authors do, who have nothing to loſe? We muſt then argue juſt contrary to him who cried out:

Quid Domini facient, audent cum talia fures (30)?

What will not maſters dare, when ſervants thus preſume?

[*G*] *The king of France ſubmitted in a low manner.*] This confirms what I have ſaid in another place (31), that princes hardly ever ended their quarrels with the Popes, but to their own confuſion. Lewis XII had called an aſſembly of the Gallican church at Tours, in the year 1510, to know whether he could in conſcience make war with Julius II. He was informed by that aſſembly ‘ that his cauſe was juſt, and that ‘ the Pope's was not, and that he might proceed to ‘ the offenſive part in his own defence (32).’ At his requeſt, and the emperor's, and *in execution of the decree of the council of Conſtance* (33), ſome cardinals had ſummoned a general council at Piſa; he and the emperor had approved by their Letters Patents (34) the calling of this council. He had protected the fathers that compoſed it, and who declared Julius ‘ ſuſ‘ ſpended from the adminiſtration of the pontificate, ‘ and forbad obedience to him (35).’ He had protected them, I ſay, againſt this Pope, who excommunicated and degraded them in his council of Lateran. Neverthleſs, this ſame king ſome time after declared, that he looked upon the aſſembly of Piſa, as a pretended council. His procurators, they are the words of the act (36), ‘ having in their hands ‘ the letters-patents of the Moſt Chriſtian King, ſealed ‘ with his ſeal, and ſigned by him, and diſpatched by ‘ his command, after the reverence and humility re‘ quired in ſuch caſes, have entirely departed from the ‘ pretended council of Piſa, and abſolutely renounced ‘ it, and freely, purely, and entirely adhered to the ‘ moſt holy council of Lateran, as to the only true and ‘ lawful one. And farther, according to their afore‘ ſaid procuration, they have promiſed that from thence‘ forth the Moſt Chriſtian King ſhall not give any fa‘ vour or aſſiſtance, in any manner whatever, to the ‘ ſaid pretended council of Piſa: nay, that all thoſe ‘ who ſhall be found in his city of Lyons, or other ‘ parts of his kingdom, territories, and lordſhips be‘ longing to him, perſiſting in their adherence to the ‘ pretended council of Piſa, ſhall be forced by him to ‘ retire in a month's time; and if any, of whatever ſtate, ‘ degree, dignity, or condition they be, whether ſecu‘ lars or eccleſiaſtics, do obſtinately refuſe to obey, he ‘ will expel them, and repute them ſchiſmatics, and as ‘ ſuch, upon any order of the aforeſaid Holy Father, ‘ purſue them with main force, if there is occaſion. ‘ And farther, the ſaid procurators have promiſed that ‘ the aforeſaid Moſt Chriſtian King ſhall effectually ‘ cauſe ſix prelates, and four doctors, or moſt eminent ‘ graduates among thoſe, that were in the ſaid pre‘ tended council at Piſa, to be deputed to our afore‘ ſaid holy father the Pope, in the name of the ſaid ‘ pretended council of Piſa, and repreſenting the body ‘ of all thoſe who adhered to it, to appear between ‘ this day and the firſt of January, in perſon before ‘ his Holineſs, in order purely and entirely to renounce ‘ and abjure the ſaid council of Piſa, after having ‘ asked and received the remiſſion and abſolution from ‘ his Holineſs, humbly and in a ſuitable form. And ‘ over and above, that they will adhere and incorpo‘ rate themſelves with the ſaid council of Lateran, as ‘ the true and undoubted one, both in their own name ‘ and in the name of their adherents. But if they ſhall ‘ refuſe to do this, the aforeſaid king ſhall give no ſuc‘ cours, aſſiſtance, or favour againſt the authority of ‘ the holy apoſtolical ſee, to any of thoſe that ſhall be ‘ found to favour or have favoured the ſaid pretended ‘ council of Piſa: on the contrary, he ſhall with all ‘ his power cauſe the ſentences, decrees, and cen‘ ſures of our Holy Father to be executed, even with ‘ force of arms, if there be occaſion, without any ‘ fraud or diſſimulation.’ This is what the prelates get who adhere to the intereſt of their prince in his quarrels with Rome: they are made a ſacrifice to the Pope, when their quarrels are ended. It is a wonder to me, that there are ſo many, who prefer their temporal before their ſpiritual prince.

[*H*] *They permitted him to recover himſelf from that ſevere blow.*] He recovered ſo well, that the ſame year the French were forced to abandon the Milaneſe. Nothing was ſo prejudicial to Lewis XII, as the ſuperſtition of Anne de Bretagne his wife. She filled her head with ſo many ſcruples, about the war that France made with the Pope, that ſhe retarded all the good deſigns of her husband (37).

[*I*] *He was very liberal of titles . . . . . . to the Cantons.*] ‘ Whereas his predeceſſors gave ſeveral privi‘ leges to the mendicant Friars, this Pope gave them ‘ to the Swiſs Cantons, who were the principal execu‘ tors of his lofty enterprizes, to whom he gave the ‘ perpetual title of *Defenders of the Eccleſiaſtical Li*‘ *berty*, with many *Bulls and Standards, and a Sword,* ‘ *and a Cap of Gold*, and other preſents, to oblige them ‘ to perform all his commands (38).’

[*K*] *He died of ſickneſs full of vaſt deſigns* (39).] This is what Guicciardin ſays (40). ‘ In queſti tali ‘ e tanti penſieri (*that is of engaging the king of England to make war with France, and of depoſing* ‘ *Lewis*

(29) Arn. Ferronus, in Ludovico XII, fol. m. 52, verſo.

(30) Virgil. Eclog. iii, ver. 16.

(31) In the article GREGORY VII, at the end of remark [*R*].

(32) Mezerai, Abr. Chronolog. Tom. IV, pag. 453.

(33) Id. ibid. pag. 457.

(34) In July 1511.

(35) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 462.

(36) It is to be found intire in Coëffeteau's anſwer to the *Myſtere d'Iniquité*, pag. 1221, & *ſeq.*

(37) *See Mezerai*, ubi ſupra, pag. 457, 460.

(38) Du Pleſſis Mornai, ubi ſupra, pag. 580. *See alſo* Heidegg. ubi ſupra.

(39) Varillas, Hiſt. de Louïs XII, livr. x, pag. m 217, & ſeq. *mentions ſeven.*

(40) Guicciard. lib. xi, fol. 325.

He was a lover of wine and women [*L*]; and he is accuſed even of the unnatural ſin [*M*]: and there is no ſort of crime but he is charged with, in a dialogue it is feigned he had with St Peter at the gate of Paradiſe [*N*]. The hatred he conceived againſt France

‘*Lewis XII, and of giving the kingdom to the firſt that could conquer it)* e forſe ancora in altri più occulti e maggiori (perche in un' animo tanto feroce non era incredibile concetto alcuno, quantunque vaſto, e ſmiſurato) l'oppreſſe dopò infermita di molti giorni la morte . . . . Principe d'animo, e di coſtanza ineſtimabile, ma impetuoſo, e di concetti ſmiſurati, per i quali che non precipitaſſe, lo ſoſtenne più la riverenza della Chieſa, la diſcordia de' Principi, e la conditione de' tempi, che la moderatione, e la prudenza: degno certamente di ſomma gloria, ſe fuſſe ſtato Principe ſeculare, ò ſe quella cura, & intentione, che hebbe ad eſaltare con l'arti della guerra, la Chieſa nella grandezza temporale, haveſſe havuta ad eſaltarla con l'arti della pace nelle coſe ſpirituali: e nondimeno ſopra tutti ſuoi anteceſſori, di chiariſſima, & honoratiſſima memoria, maſſimamente appreſſo a coloro, iquali, eſſendo perduti i veri vocaboli delle coſe, e confuſa la diſtintione del peſarle rettamente, giudicano che ſia più ufficio de' Pontefici, aggiugnere con l'armi, e col ſangue de' Chriſtiani, imperio alla Sedia Apoſtolica, che l'affaticarſi con l'eſſempio buono della vita, e col correggere, e medicare i coſtumi traſcorſi per la ſalute de quelle anime, per laquale ſi magnificano che Chriſto gli habbia conſtituiti in terra ſuoi Vicari (41). —— *In theſe conceptions no leſſe ſtraunge for their varietie, then great for the importance they drewe, and parhaps in other thoughtes, more ſecret and ſinguler (for in a mind ſo fierce and terrible, all ſortes of imaginations howe great and vayne ſo euer they be, are not incredible) after the continuation of his ſickneſſe for many days, he declined towardes death: . . . . . . he was a prince of incredible conſtancie and courage, but ſo full of furie, and unruled conceptions, that the reuerence that was borne to the churche, the diſcorde of princes, and the condition of times, did more to ſtaye him from his ruine, then eyther his moderation or his diſcreſſion: worthy, no doubt, of great glory, if eyther he had bene a prince ſecular, or if that care and intention which he had to rayſe the chuche into temporall greatneſſe by the meane of warre, had bene employed to exalte it by the mediation of peace, in matters ſpirituall: nevertheleſſe he was lamented aboue all his predeceſſors, and no leſs eſteemed of thoſe, who having eyther loſte the true conſideration of things, or at leaſt ignorant howe to diſtinguiſhe and peaze them rightly, iudged it an office more duely apperteining to Popes, to increaſe the iuriſdiction of the ſea apoſtolike by armes and blood of Chriſtians, then by good example of life and due curing and correction of corrupt maners, to trauell for the ſauing of thoſe ſoules, for whom they glory ſo much that Jeſus Chriſt hath named them his vicars in earth* *.’ How judicious is this, and what an admirable cenſure upon thoſe impatient doctors, who believe all to be juſt, provided the temporal grandeur of the church be improved by it! this in particular hits cardinal Palavicini, who ſpeaks ſo faintly of Julius IId's faults, and excuſes them by reaſon of the temporal advantage they brought to St Peter's patrimony. ‘Fu dotato, *ſays he* (42), di ſpiriti eccelſi, à tal che ſe foſſe ſtato principe di dominio ſol temporale, meriterrebbe d' eſſer contato fra gli Eroi . . . . . Certamente ſenza una tal ferocia non havrebbe ricuperato egli alla Chieſa il piu e'l meglio del ſuo dominio. —— *He was endowed with a high ſpirit, inſomuch that if he had been a temporal prince, he would deſerve to be put in the number of the heroes. . . . . Certainly had it not been for that fierceneſs, he had not recovered to the church the beſt part of her patrimony.*’

Paul Jovius (43) affirms, that Julius II died having a vaſt deſign upon the kingdom of Naples. *Hæc ingenti animo verum ægro corpore cogitantem, diuturnus fluentis alvi morbus intercepit* (44). It was ſaid that the title of deliverer of Italy, with which he ſuffered himſelf to be flattered, was but an empty name, whilſt the Spainards were poſſeſſed of Naples: *If GOD let me act*, anſwered he, ſtriking his ſtick upon the ground, *this ſhall not laſt long. Ad quod Pontifex quaſſato ſcipione quo innixus pavimentum infrendendo pertundebat, reſpondit brevi futurum, ut Neapolitani non iratis ſuperis externum jugum excuterent* (45).

[*L*] *He was a lover of wine and women.*] We are told of an exclamation of the emperor Maximilian: ‘(46) Good GOD! what would become of the world, if thou didſt not take a particular care of it, under the reign of ſuch an emperor as I am, who am but a poor hunter, and under that of ſo wicked and drunken a Pope as Julius II.’ Some hiſtorians obſerve, that this Pope invented a new name to accuſe the French of drinking too much wine, and diſcharging it immediately by urine; and they add, that this was his great vice. ‘Gallos in Univerſum novo nomine augens Romanam ſupellectilem, Micturivinos vocarat, quaſi immodicos vini potores quod mox emittendum eſſet, quo vitio ipſe maxime laborabat (47). —— *He gave the French the general appellation of* Micturovini [Wine-Piſſers] *thus adding a new word to the Roman language, implying that they were immoderate drinkers of wine, which was afterwards to be diſcharged; of which vice he himſelf was very guilty.*’ I proceed to his leudneſs. He had a daughter who was married to John Jordan de Urſinis, and he is brought in, ſaying in a dialogue with St Peter (48), that he had had the pox.

Note, that there is a fault in the words of Arnold du Ferron before-cited. He ſuppoſes that the Pope invented the Latin word *Micturivinus*, to ſignify the drunkenneſs of the French; but it was not in that language that Julius II expreſſed himſelf, but in Italian, and the word was *Piſciavini*. It is ſaid that one of his officers, a Norman by nation, told him one day, *Faith, Holy Father, you are then a true Frenchman, for you are one of the greateſt wine-piſſers on the earth* (49).

[*M*] *He is accuſed . . . . . . of the unnatural ſin.*] It is certain that Julius II is accuſed of this horrid crime. ‘We read in a book of our divines of Paris, of two young gentlemen abuſed by him, whom queen Anne, the wife of king Lewis XII, had recommended to cardinal de Nantes to conduct them into Italy (50).’ Probably du Pleſſis gives us here a tranſlation of theſe words of Wolfius. ‘Legitur in Commentario Magiſtrorum Pariſienſium (§ α), de Julio ſecundo Papa, quod duobus nobiliſſimi generis, adoleſcentibus, quos Anna Galliarum Regina Nanetenſi Cardinali informandos commiſerat, & aliis multis diaboliaca rabie (proh facinus) ſtuprum intulerit (51).’ This quotation ſeems too indeterminate; he ſhould have told us where, and in what time that book of the Paris doctors was printed. John Crepin, undertaking to relate this adventure, has fallen into an anachroniſm: ‘We read, *ſays he* (52), in a certain commentary of the doctors of Paris, againſt the Lutherans, that this Julius, inflamed with a diabolical rage, had his will of two young gentlemen of a noble family, whom queen Anne of France had ſent to Robert cardinal de Nantes, to be inſtructed by him.’ The doctors of Paris would have been far from inſerting ſuch a thing in a controverſial piece againſt the Lutherans; if they inſerted it any where, it is in the writings they publiſhed againſt Julius, under Lewis XII.

[(§ α) This citation of Wolfius is falſe. He ſhould have ſaid: *In Commentario* ſuper Articulos *Magiſtrorum Pariſienſium*: whence it had appeared that this *Commentary* being a piece of the new Lutherans, one might expect to find in it ſuch facts, as could not decently be advanced by the Sorbonne. That Commentary, to obſerve it by the by, is quoted by John Bale, in his Life of Clement VII, and it relates to the twenty five articles of the Sorbonne, publiſhed by Peter Gallandius, in 1543, and confuted by Calvin in his *Antidote*, &c. See Du Boulai, Tom. VI. pag. 384, 385, of his *Hiſtory of the Univerſity of Paris*. REM. CRIT.].

[*N*] *A dialogue which it is feigned he had with St Peter at the gate of paradiſe.*] It is a moſt ſatirical piece. Wolfius has inſerted it in his *Lectiones memorabiles* (53). Rivetus (54) affirms, that it was printed at Paris with the king's licence, in the year 1612, at the ends of the acts of the council of Piſa. The ſubſtance

---

(41) See a paſſage of Mezerai, in remark [*O*], citation (60).

* Fenton, ubi ſupra, pag. 632, 633.

(42) Iſtoria del Concilio, lib. i, cap. i, n. 5.

(43) Jovius, in Vita Alfonſi Ferrariæ Ducis, pag. m. 353, 354.

(44) Id. ibid. pag. 354.

(45) Id. ibid.

(46) Deus æterne, niſi vigilares quam male eſſet mundo! quem regimus nos, ego miſer venator, & ebrioſus ille ac ſceleratus Julius. *Du Pleſſis, Myſt. d'Iniquité*, pag. 580, *who quotes* Joachim Curæus Freiſtadienſis, in Annalibus, gentis Sileſiæ.

(47) Arnoldus Ferronus, in Ludov. XII, fol. 52, verſo.

(48) I ſpeak of that dialogue in the remark [*N*].

(49) I have this remark from Mr de la Monnoie.

(50) Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 581.

(51) Wolfius Lection. Memor. Tom. II, pag. 21.

(52) *In his* Etat de l'Egliſe, ad ann. 1513, pag. m. 512.

(53) Pag. 61, of the ſecond volume.

(54) Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, Part. II, pag. 634.

France, where he had found a good ſanctuary under the pontificate of Alexander VI, was ſo exceſſive, that he ordered that all the French which could be met with ſhould be killed [*O*], and promiſed a recompence to whoſoever ſhould execute his order. We are not to believe, that the wine and hams which he ſent to the king of England, were the true cauſe of the war of the Engliſh againſt France [*P*]. I do not know whether

ſubſtance of it is this. ‘Paulo poſti pſius mortem Vir quidam doctus in lucem emiſit Dialogum, quem inſcripſit, Julius, in quo Pontificem hunc horrendorum criminum inſimulat, nim. quod fuerit homo *palam ſceloroſus, temulentus, homicida, ſimoniacus, veneficus, perjurus, rapax, portentoſis libidinum generibus undique conſpurcatus, denique ſcabie, quam vocant Gallicam, totus coopertus* (55). —— *A little after his death, a certain learned man publiſhed a dialogue, which he intituled* Julius, *in which he accuſes this Pope of horrid crimes*; *for inſtance, that he was openly* miſchievous, a drunkard, a murderer, guilty of ſimony, a poiſoner, perjured, rapacious, defiled with monſtrous kinds of luſt, and laſtly, covered with what they call the French pox.’ Some ſay that Fauſtus Andrelinus (56) was the author of that ſatirical piece. Some aſcribe it to Eraſmus; Mr Placcius affirms, that ſeveral authors ſay this in the two places he quotes of Melchior Adam (57). I have conſulted thoſe two places, and have found no other teſtimony than that of Leo Juda. Thus Mr Placcius deceives us. Eraſmus was very much troubled, that ſuch a piece ſhould be aſcribed to him: he juſtifies himſelf very ſeriouſly in a letter. ‘Dialogi cujuſdam ſuſpicionem mihi moliuntur impingere. Is ut ex argumento ſatis conſtat, ſcriptus eſt in odium divi Julii Pontificis Maximi ſchiſmatis tempore, ſed à quo incertum, ante quinque annos deguſtavi veriùs quam legi. Poſt reperi in Germania apud quoſdam deſcriptum, ſed variis titulis. Quidam teſtabantur Hiſpani cujuſpiam eſſe, ſed ſuppreſſo nomine, rurſus alii *Fauſto* Poëtæ tribuebant, alii *Hieronymo Balbo*. Ego quid de his conjectem non habeo, ſubodoratus ſum quoad licuit, verum nondum perveſtigavi, quod animo meo faceret ſatis. Ineptiit quiſquis ſcripſit, ac majore ſupplicio dignus, quiſquis evulgavit. Ac miror eſſe qui ſolo Styli argumento mihi obtrudere parent, quum nec mea ſit phraſis, niſi prorſus ipſe mihi ſum ignotus, nec mirum ſit futurum, etiam ſi qui in oratione nonnihil referrent *Eraſmicum*, quum verſer in manibus omnium, & referimus fere, in quorum aſſidua lectione verſamur (58).’

[*O*] *His hatred . . . . . againſt France, ... was ſo exceſſive, that he ordered that all the French which could be met with ſhould be killed.*] ‘Julius's rage had no bounds; he had made a decree in the name of the council, to transfer the kingdom of France, and the title of *Moſt Chriſtian*, to the king England (59). As he was upon the point of publiſhing it, heaven taking pity of him and of Chriſtendom, called him out of the world, the twenty third of February. He died of an hectic fever, cauſed, as he ſaid, by the uneaſineſs he was under, that he could not bring the Venetians to come to an agreement with the emperor; ſo furious were his paſſions, and more ſuitable to the ſultan of the Turks, than to the common father of Chriſtians (60).' As for his order of murdering the French, I have read it only in the 109th, and 110th pages of Francis Hotman's *Brutum Fulmen*. ‘Si quæ patrum memoria, *ſays he*, in hoc regno contigerunt recordari volumus, primum hoc reperiemus: Ludovicum XII (at, quem Regem? qui Patris patriæ nomen ſummo bonorum omnium conſenſu adeptus eſt) urbes aliquot Italiæ, bello captas, Papæ Julii ſecundi ditioni adjunxiſſe. Papam intermiſſis aliquot menſibus hanc Regi pro accepto beneficio gratiam retuliſſe, ut non modo eum ſchiſmaticum & hæreticum pronuntiaret, proſcriberet, diris ſuis excommunicationum fulminibus inſectaretur, verum etiam Gallos omnes hoſtilem in modum cruciandos interficiendoſque curaret: præmium etiam percuſſoribus polliceretur peccatorum omnium veniam, & impunitatem, ſi quis vel unicum Gallum quoque modo trucidaret. . . . . . Quo nuntio (61) Julius accepto, tanto dolore atque iracundia exarſit, ut non modo Gallis omnibus aqua & igne interdiceret, verum etiam obvium quemque mactari, trucidarique imperaret: prœmiis etiam, ut dixi ſicarios ac percuſſores invitaret. —— *If we would call to mind what happened in this kingdom, in the memory of our fathers, we ſhall find the principal tranſaction to be this: that Lewis XII (but what king? one, who, by general conſent, obtained the name of father of his country) added to the dominion of Pope Julius II, ſome cities of Italy, taken in war: that the Pope, after ſome months, returned the king this favour, for the benefit he had received, that he not only pronounced him a Schiſmatic and Heretic, proſcribed and excommunicated him; but procured all the French to be tortured and ſlain in an hoſtile manner; and even promiſed a reward to thoſe, who ſhould aſſaſſinate but one Frenchman, together with pardon of all their ſins, and indulgencies. . . . . . . When Julius heard this news, he was ſo exaſperated, that he not only proſcribed all the French, but even enjoined thoſe, who ſhould meet them, to aſſaſſinate and make away with them: he alſo encouraged cut-throats and aſſaſſins, as I ſaid, by promiſe of rewards.*'

[*P*] *We are not to believe that the wine and hams . . . . were the true cauſe of the war of the Engliſh againſt France.*] Spondanus has been ſo unjuſt as to inſinuate this, and to jeſt upon it; and he pretends that Polydore Virgil ſaid nothing of it, to ſave at once the honour of Italy and England. Polydore was an Italian, and lived in England; he was therefore concerned in the glory of both theſe nations. Now he thought it unworthy of Italy to win people by ſuch alurements, and unworthy of England to ſuffer itſelf to be caught by ſuch a bait. Theſe are the words of the Annaliſt. ‘Feſtivum eſt quod refert Guicciardinus, appuliſſe hoc tempore in Angliam Pontificiam longam navem Falerno vino, caſeis, ſuminibuſque onuſtam, quæ nomine Pontificis Regi ac Principibus, Antiſtitibuſque donata, ab omnibus miro applauſu accepta ſunt: & plebem, quam plerumque non minus levia quam gravia movent, ad eam navem videndam ſumma cum voluptate accurriſſe, gloriantem antea nunquam in ea inſula navim ullam cum Pontificiis vexillis conſpectam. Quibus bellam gentem nobis depingit Guicciardinus, & vini acutique guſtûs appetentem, quibus ſciret Pontifex eam facile in partes ſuas trahi poſſe; ſicuti olim Narſes feciſſe dicitur *, ut Longobardos in Italiam alliceret; omnes generis Poma, aliarumque deliciarum irritamenta, quorum Italia ferax eſſet, mittens, ut pauperrima ſua rura deſerentes ad occupandam regionem cunctis refertam divitiis venirent. Eam verò rem adeò inſignem, & Regi, principibuſque, & antiſtitibus, ac populo maxime acceptam gratamque, cùm Polydorus Virgilius ſuæ hiſtoriæ Anglicanæ non inſeruerit; exiſtimamus, eum ut Italum, & in Anglia commorantem, utriuſque nationis gravitati parcere voluiſſe (62). —— *It is a merry ſtory, which Guicciardin relates, that a ſhip belonging to the Pope, loaden with Falernian wine, cheeſes, and Weſtphalia-hams, arrived at that time in England; which being made a preſent of, in the Pope's name, to the king, nobles, and prelates, was received by them all with wonderful applauſe; and that the common people, whom trifles affect no leſs than things of moment, flocked to ſee that ſhip with great pleaſure, boaſting that they had never before ſeen in that iſland any ſhip with Papal colours. Guicciardin tells us, that nation was fond of wine and high-ſeaſoned meats, by which the Pope knew he ſhould eaſily draw them to his party; as they ſay Narſes once did, to entice the Lombards into Italy, ſending them all kinds of fruit, and other delicacies, with which Italy abounds, that they might be induced to leave their own native poverty, and take poſſeſſion of a country full of all ſorts of riches. Now whereas Polydore Virgil has not inſerted in his Hiſtory of England this memorable fact, ſo highly acceptable to the king, nobles, prelates, and people, I take the reaſon to be, becauſe, being an Italian, and reſiding in England, he had regard to the gravity of both nations.*' Mezerai comes much nearer the truth; for he obſerves, that the Pope ſpurred on Henry VIII, with the ambition of protecting the true church. ‘The Engliſh, *ſays he* (63), were upon the point of breaking with the king. For the Pope had made them drunk with the vain-glory of defending the holy See, and with the flavour of delicious wines of all ſorts, with which he had ſent them a great ſhip laden, together with hams, ſauſages, and ſpices, to make them reliſh the better.' According to Varillas (64), it was from a motive of religion, whether it is poſſible to find a certain ſpeech, in which he was very ill treated. Varillas, who ſpeaks of it, is liable to cenſure [*Q*]. The hiſtory of Venice, written by Cardinal Bembo, is ſufficient to ſhew the paſſion, treachery, and prodigious ambition of Julius II, though this hiſtorian be leſs prolix upon it than Guicciardin.

---

(55) Joan. Zuinger, de Feſto Corporis Chriſti, pag. 140.

(56) *In the edition of Wolfius there is in the title* F. A. F. Poëtæ Regii libellus de obitu Julii ſecundi.

(57) A Deſiderio ERASMO Roterodamo conſcriptus eſſe diverſorum teſtimoniis confirmatur apud Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theolog. Germ. pag m. 95, *(it ſhould be 97)* & pag. 167 *(it ſhould be 197)* in Vitis Medicor. Germ *Placcius, de Anonymis*, n. 259, *pag.* 72.

(58) Eraſm. Epiſt. i, lib. xii, pag 575, 576

(59) Concitava il Re d'Inghilterra alla guerra: alquale haveva ordinato che per decreto del Concilio Lateranenſe ſe trasferiſſe il nome del Re Chriſtianiſſimo: ſopra laqual coſa era già ſcritta una Bolla, contenendoſi in eſſa medeſimamente la privatione della dignità, e del titolo di Re di Francia, concedendo quel Regno a qualunque lo occupaſſe. *Guicciard. lib. xi, fol.* 325. - - - - *He ſtyrred vp to make warre, the king of Englande, to whom he had transferred by publike decree of the councel of Latran, the name* of Chriſtianiſſimo, *whereof there was already a Bul written, and in it likewiſe was conteyned the priuation of the dignitie and name of the king of Fraunce giving his kingdom to who coulde occupie it.* Fenton, ubi ſupra, pag. 632.

(60) Mezerai, Abr. Chronol. Tom. IV, pag. 464, ad ann. 1513.

(61) That is, that he had been ſuſpended by the council of Piſa, transferred to Milan.

* Paul. Diacon. de Geſt. Longob. lib. i, cap. v.

(62) Spondanus, ad ann. 1512, n. 3, pag. m. 289, *where theſe words have been placed as a ſummary,* Quibus illiciis Pontifex ſibi Anglos benevolos reddiderit.

(63) Abregé Chronol. Tom. IV, pag. 459, ad ann. 1512.

(64) Varill. Hiſtoire de Louis XII, livr. viii, pag. 81.

This Pope was ſo tired with the plaiſters that his Surgeon put unſucceſsfully upon an ulcer, that he would no longer ſuffer him to dreſs it. The Surgeon, who had promiſed with an oath not to uſe any more that remedy, made uſe of an artifice, and cured it [*R*]. Bandel tells a ſtory that is pleaſant enough [*S*]. I have juſt now read in a French writer, that this Pope was ſo malicious as to invent a fable prejudicial to the memory of Gaſton de Foix, duke of Nemours, and which might increaſe the ſuperſtition of the people, to the diſadvantage of France. The ſtory was, that a ſerpent had been

religion, that an Engliſh biſhop ſounded an alarm for war the day after the feaſt (65), where the chief members of the parliament were treated with the good wines and excellent cheeſes which the Pope's ſhip had brought to London. This prelate repreſented, that Lewis XII was a perſecutor of the church, and that it 'would be an eternal diſgrace to the Engliſh nation to live in peace with the perſecutors of 'the holy ſee.' Varillas ſhould have a little better explained all the reaſons of this prelate, and not have been contented to give us to underſtand, that ſome political reaſons were added to thoſe religious motives. The Engliſh prelate urged no doubt, that Lewis XII would depoſe the Pope, only to create another in his room, who would permit him to conquer Italy. This certainly was the true ſpring that put Henry VIII in motion; he plainly perceived, that if no oppoſition was made to it, Lewis XII would reap all the glory of depoſing Julius II, the ſcourge of Chriſtendom, and of creating a new Pope devoted to him, and of ſubduing all Italy. Human policy and jealouſy do not ſuffer a prince to conſent to ſuch an aggrandizing of the glory and power of his neighbours; and for this reaſon Lewis XII ſaw the forces of England, Swiſſerland and Spain againſt him.

[*Q*] *Mr Varillas, who mentions a certain ſpeech . . . is liable to cenſure.*] He ſays (66), that Pompey Colonna, and Antony Sevelli, underſtanding that the Pope was fallen into 'a ſort of a ſwoon, that laſted 'four hours, and gave occaſion to believe he was 'dead . . . . . called (67) their friends together, run 'through the ſtreets, encouraged the townſmen to a 'ſedition, and led them to the town-hall, where Colonna, the moſt eloquent of the two, pronounced the 'moſt ſatirical ſpeech that is extant, againſt the Popes 'in general, and Julius in particular. He pretended, 'that they had moſt of them abuſed the ſovereign 'authority, ever ſince they had uſurped it; and 'reckoning up the towns that had heretofore been under tyrants, he concluded, that not one of them had 'been ſo ill treated as that of Rome. He entered into the particulars of the conduct of the late Popes, 'and dropt ſome things upon that ſubject, which it is 'not decent to relate.' Mr Varillas adds (68), 'that 'Guicciardin had written this ſpeech from the memoirs of two or three perſons that heard it; but it 'has been taken out of the body of his hiſtory. Nevertheleſs it is to be found printed by itſelf in Italian; and the French tranſlator who recovered it, 'reſtored it to the place it was taken from.' I have occaſion for another paſſage of this author, before I make my criticiſm: let us ſee the beginning of his preface (69). 'When, *ſays he*, I cauſed the eighth 'book of this hiſtory to be printed, I thought that the 'ſpeech of Pompey Colonna to the principal citizens 'of Rome, to oblige them to ſhake off the Pope's 'yoke, was a very rare piece. Indeed, I had never 'ſeen it, except in the king's library. But I have 'been informed ſince, that it has been reprinted by 'the care of the late Mr Wicquefort, at the beginning 'of the book he publiſhed with the title of *Thuanus* '*Reſtitutus*, and conſequently it is not hard to recover. 'It is true however, that the ſame Mr Wicquefort has 'acquitted himſelf, in that reſpect, but of one part 'of his duty to the public, ſince he has not mentioned the motives that occaſioned this ſpeech, which is 'the moſt inſolent that can be read; and whereas 'Guicciardin has been as negligent to relate them, the 'curious will perhaps not be diſpleaſed, if I ſupply 'the deficiency of theſe two hiſtorians. The firſt motive, *&c.*'

I can neither affirm nor deny that this ſpeech is in the French king's library; but I can ſay, that Guicciardin has never inſerted it in his hiſtory. He only ſpeaks (70) by the bye of the tumult theſe two perſons endeavoured to raiſe; and he does not ſay, that it was Pompey Colonna who made that ſpeech, as being the moſt eloquent. It is not true, that the French tranſlator has reſtored this ſpeech *to the place from whence it was taken.* If it was ſo, it would not be a rare piece, the French tranſlation of Guicciardin being a book common enough. It is not true, that it was reprinted by the care of Mr Wicquefort, at the beginning of *Thuanus Reſtitutus*; but this doubtleſs miſled Varillas. They have left out of the fourth book of Guicciardin a long diſcourſe concerning the manner how the Popes became temporal lords of part of Italy. The Proteſtants have preſerved this diſcourſe, and publiſhed it by itſelf a great many times (71). It is to be found (72) in Latin, Italian, and French, at the end of *Thuanus Reſtitutus*, printed at Amſterdam, in 1663, and it is in the place where it ought to be in the French tranſlation of Guicciardin, made by Jerom Chomedey, and printed at Geneva in the year 1593, with ſummaries and marginal notes, which breathe a true Proteſtant ſpirit (73). Varillas having heard ſome account of this diſcourſe, and ſomething concerning the ſpeech of thoſe who endeavoured to diſpoſe the Romans to an inſurrection in the year 1511, has confounded the one with the other (§ α).

[(§ α) Though Guicciardin has not inſerted in his hiſtory the ſpeech of Pompey Colonna, he has however given us an abſtract of it, which having been left out in moſt editions, was reprinted by Wicquefort at the end of his *Thuanus Reſtitutus*. Note, that the ſaid abſtract is alſo wanting in Fenton's Engliſh tranſlation, *pag.* 540. REM. CRIT.]

[*R*] *His Surgeon . . . . made uſe of an artifice which cured the ulcer.*] Naudé brings in this example in a diſſertation, where he enquires whether a patient ought to be deceived. 'Is (*celeberrimus Chirurgus Joannes* '*de Vigo*) dum nodum carnoſum Julii ſecundi contumaciorem in dies fieri, & Pontificem omne genus remediorum conſtanter reſpuere animadverteret, novam quamdam medendi rationem meditatus eſt: pannos ſiquidem veteres fruſtillatim conſcerptos unà cum 'panis ſiliginei mica molliore, & arſenici ſublimati in 'aquis roſarum & plantaginis excepti fomento, ad tertias in vaſe æneo decoxit, expreſſiſque demum illis, '& pulveris modo ulceri admotis, quod nullis deinceps unguentis ſe curaturum jurejurando receperat, 'brevi ſumma cum omnium admiratione Pontificem à 'gravi & moleſto affectu liberavit (74). —— *The famous Surgeon* Johannes de Vigo, *perceiving that* '*an ulcer of Julius II became every day more ſtubborn,* '*and that the Pope perſiſted in refuſing all manner of* '*remedies, hit upon a new method of cure: for he boiled together in a braſs kettle, for three hours, old* '*rags cut in pieces, with crums of fine bread, and a fomentation of arſenic ſublimed in roſe-water, and plantain; after which, drying them, and applying them* '*by way of powder to the wounds, to which he had* '*ſworn he would no longer apply plaiſters, he cured the* '*Pope in a very ſhort time of a troubleſome diſeaſe, to* '*the wonder of every one.*'

[*S*] *Bandel tells a ſtory that is pleaſant enough.*] 'The Germans, *ſays he* (75), having asked the Pope 'leave to eat fleſh upon St Martin's day, when it 'ſhould fall on a fiſh-day; Julius would not flatly deny 'them that favour, but granted it on condition they 'ſhould drink no wine the ſame day.' This was the ſame thing as a refuſal; there being more to be loſt than gotten by ſuch a favour.

[*T*] *He*

(65) Henry VIII gave that entertainment.

(66) Varillas, Hiſt. de Louis XII, lib. viii, pag. 8, ad ann. 1511.

(67) Ibid. pag. 10.

(68) Ib pag. 13.

(69) Of the third Tome of the Hiſtory of Lewis XII.

(70) Guicciardin, Livr. x, fol. 280. *See alſo Paul Jovius*, in Vita Leonis X, pag. m. 108.

(71) See the article GUICCIARDIN, remark [*A*].

(72) With two other paſſages that had been retrenched, one out of the third book of Guicciardin, and the other out of the tenth book.

(73) Written by la Noue.

(74) Naudæus, in Pentade Quæſt. Iatrophilologicarum, pag. 122. Edit Genev. 1647. *He quotes* Joan. de Vigo, lib. iii, Chirur Tract. II, cap. v.

(75) Bandel. ubi ſupra. *This is a remark of Mr de la Monnoie.*

been ſeen to come out of the duke of Nemours's tomb. The author who tells me this, ſpeaks very ill of that Pope [*T*].

[*T*] *He was ſo malicious as to invent a fable prejudicial to the memory of Gaſton de Foix . . . . . the author who tells me this, ſpeaks very ill of that Pope.*] I begin with the ſtory: ‘Non defuere qui prædicarent ſerpentem viſum de Fuxenſis tumulo ſibilum exilire, & hi maximè ſacrificuli; nam ab iiſdem ſæpè aliquid ſpectri novi intelligimus, ſed Phyſici mitiores (76). —— *Some there were who gave out, that a ſerpent was ſeen to ſpring out, hiſſing, from the tomb of De Foix, and thoſe chiefly prieſts: for we often hear from them of ſome new prodigy; but naturaliſts are kinder to us.*’ Note, by the way, that he ſays the prieſts were the principal promoters of the ſtory; and that it is a common thing with them to ſpread prodigies. I omit his quotation of Ælian and Sozomen (77), and will only take what relates to our Julius II. ‘Tales nugas in vulgus emiſerat malignitas Julii II Pontificis Rom. credulitas rudis dederat incrementum (78). —— *The malice of Pope Julius II, ſpread theſe fables among the people, who too credulouſly propagated them.*’ He relates afterwards how this Pope deceived cardinal George d'Amboiſe, and made Rome reſound with arms; and how he was delighted with ſatirical verſes againſt France. He forgave a Poet ſeveral crimes, and ordered him a good ſum of money for a diſtich, which we ſhall ſee below. ‘Verſiculis ad Gallorum ignominiam ſpectantibus mirè delectabatur: adeò ut poëtæ ſtateres aureos ducentos numerarit, præter delictorum abolitionem, qui hos vulgaſſet:

Julius evulſit Gallis cythereius alas:
Martius hic priſco Cæſare major erit (79).

—— *He was wonderfully delighted with verſes reflecting on the French; inſomuch, that he made a preſent of two hundred pieces of gold, beſides the pardon of his ſins, to the Poet, who had publiſhed the following:*

Julius, who pluck'd the Frenchmens wings, ſhall be
Greater than Cæſar of antiquity.

Forcatulus, my author in this remark, oppoſes to theſe two verſes a ſharp diſtich that was made againſt this Pope. ‘Eminuit in contrarium non inelegans Diſtichum, dignum, opinor, quod Catulli eſſet, non autoris incogniti:

Fæx Ligurum Romam, ponti fæx concutit armis
Julius, huic Brutum Gallia fortis alit (80).

—— *There was handed about a tolerably good diſtich to the contrary, worthy, I think, of Catullus, not of an unknown author:*

From France another Brutus ſoon ſhall come,
To ſhake this Julius, who with arms ſhakes Rome.

Some, continues he, obſerved, that the time was come in which another Julius, by profuſion of borrowed money, obtained the pontificate, and ſupplanted his competitors; but that this new Julius had nothing common with the other, as to learning, clemency, or honeſty; nor had nothing common with the Apoſtle St Peter, no, not as to the fiſhing-boat, ſince the Apoſtle employed it for an honeſt livelihood, but Julius in piracy. If you underſtand Latin you will ſoon ſee that I lend nothing to Forcatulus (81). ‘Nonnulli adjiciebant rediiſſe pro certo Julii ſeculum, quo ille nimirùm profuſa largitione Pontificatum indeptus fuerat conflato multo ære alieno, ſuperatiſque, ut Tranquillus ait *, duobus competitoribus ætate & dignitate potioribus . . . Julius demum qui nihil doctrinæ cum illo primo & perpetuo Dictatore commune habuit, nihil fidei & benevolentiæ, nihil cum Apoſtolo Petro ſanctitatis & prudentiæ, nihil morum (niſi forſan quòd Petrus in mari innoxiam piſcationem exercuit, ille aliquandiu, ut ajunt, piraticam) poſt novenne imperium, & ſi quid menſium excurrit, obſtinatum in Galliam animum ad Manes tulit (§γ).’

[(§γ) In the year 1511, Julius II interdicted the whole kingdom of France (except the duchy of Bretagne), and removed the fairs of Lyons to Geneva. This appears by the decree made in the third ſeſſion of the council of Lateran: ‘Anno M. D. XI. die nono Calendras Novembris, & anno ſequenti Idibus Auguſti, Franciæ Regnum, Lugdunum præcipuè, (Britanniæ Ducatu excepto) Eccleſiaſtico Interdicto ſubjecit, Nundinaſque Lugduni ſolitus habere in Genebenſem civitatem tranſtulit, ut refert Pontificium Diploma in tertia Seſſione Synodi Lateranenſis, in qua etiam hæc leguntur: *Damnationis alumnos Bernardinum Carvajal, Guillelmum Briſſonet, Renatum de Pria, & Fridericum de S. Severino, Cardinales, eorumque fautores ſacro Concilio approbante damnamus, reprobamus & deteſtamur.* Porro Julius Papa, qui antea Julianus, in hæc verba prorupit moriens, *Ut Julius Cardinalibus indulgeo Schiſmaticis, ut Julianus juſtitiæ rationem habendam judico:* id notatam eſt à Pariſio Craſſ. Cæremoniarum Sacelli Pontificii Magiſtro †. REM. CRIT.]

JULIUS III, created Pope the ſeventh of February 1550, was called John Maria del Monte. He was of low extraction, and a true ſoldier of eccleſiaſtical fortune. He roſe up ſtep by ſtep till he came to be preſident of the council of Trent [*A*]. He was a very voluptuous man [*B*], and paſſionately loved a young boy very ugly, and of very

[*A*] *He had roſe up ſtep by ſtep till he became preſident of the council of Trent.*] Not to ſpeak of his firſt advancements, I ſhall firſt obſerve, that he aſſiſted in the council of Lateran, and made a ſolemn ſpeech at the concluſion of it. He was archbiſhop of Siponto, auditor of the apoſtolical chamber, and twice governour of Rome. He was given for an hoſtage when Rome was ſacked by the troops of Charles V, and after his promotion to the cardinalſhip, he was frequently legate in the principal provinces of the eccleſiaſtical ſtate and at Bologna (1). ‘He took the name of Julius in memory of Julius II, who had raiſed his family by the promotion of Antony del Monte, his uncle, to the cardinalſhip, and from whom he obtained the archbiſhopric of Siponto. He was born at Rome, in that part of the town called del Parione; but his family was originally of Monte-San-Savino in Tuſcany, from whence he took the name of Monte, inſtead of that of Giocchi, which he bore before (2).’ He obtained of the duke of Tuſcany, the inveſtiture of Monte-San-Savino for his brother: he could not deny himſelf the pleaſure of ſeeing his family lord it in that place. *Impotens ſibi temperandi ab eâ voluptate quâ ſuos adſpiceret in illis dominantes inter quos educati fuerant æquales* (3).

[*B*] *He was a very very voluptuous man.*] Here is what Thuanus ſays of it. ‘Sub id tempus Julius III intemperantia vitæ magis quam ſenio effœtus fato conceſſit, qui Joanne Baptiſta Balduini fratris F. Mortuo, cum non ita a Fabiano juniore Baptiſtæ fratre, ſollicitaretur, totum ſe voluptatibus mancipaverat, parato ad delicias nobili illo receſſu, ſtructura & operibus antiquis admirando, in quo fere reliquam vitam à negotiis vacuus cum amicis ſui ſimilibus, inter ludos, aleam, comœdias, & quæ talia comitari amant, ſacro faſtigio indigna oblectamenta, continuatis nocti diebus tranſegit (4). —— *About that time died Julius III, through intemperance of life, not old age; who, after the death of John Baptiſt, nephew to Baldwin, being not ſo ſollicited by Fabian, younger brother of Baptiſt, gave himſelf up wholly to pleaſures, in that noble retirement, ſo famous for it's ſtructure and works of antiquity, in which he paſſed the reſt of his life, free from buſineſs, with friends like himſelf, diverting himſelf day and night with gaming, plays, and ſuch like entertainments, unworthy his ſacred dignity.*’

---

(76) Forcatulus, de Gallor. Imperio & Philoſophia, lib. iv, pag. m. 553.

(77) Lib. ix, cap. xvii, *concerning two ſerpents found in the ſepulchre of the prophet Zachariah.*

(78) Forcat. ubi ſupra, pag 554.

(79) Id. ibid. pag. 556.

(80) Id. ibid.

(81) Id. ibid.

* In Julio, cap. xiii.

† Petr. Frizon, in Gallia Purpurata, pag. 557. *Hæc tes Craſſus*, in Diariis Pontif.

(1) *Taken from* Palavicini, Hiſtor. Concil. Trident. lib. xiii, cap. x, n. 8.

(2) Amelot de la Houſſaye, in the margin of his tranſlation of Father Paul, pag. 280, *ex Onuphrio.*

(3) Palavicini, ubi ſupra.

(4) Thuan. lib. xv, pag. 306.

of very mean birth [*C*]. When he was made Pope, he gave him his cardinal's cap [*D*], and made a pleaſant anſwer, when the unworthineſs of the perſon was repreſented to him [*E*]. His diſcourſes had but little gravity in them, as appears from the

[*C*] *He paſſionately loved a young boy, very ugly, and of very mean birth.*] Some ſaid it was his ſon, others denied it, and told how cardinal del Monte having found this lad playing tricks with a monkey in the ſtreets, took him into his ſervice, becauſe there was no body but he that durſt play with that creature. This was the foundation of a kindneſs which afterwards grew a diſorderly paſſion. This lad had nothing in him but what was loathſome, only he had gotten a habit of buffoonry. Thomas Eraſtus relates this; theſe are his own words. ‘Habet puerum quendam, nigram, turpem, arrogantiſſimam beſtiam, ineptam, ignorantem & planè inertem, niſi quod nonnihil eorum quæ ſcurræ, dicteriorum in ore habet. In ſumma, corpore & animo monſtrum. Quis, unde, aut cujus ille puer ſit, tam ſunt variæ hominum ſententiæ & opiniones, ut nemo exploratum habere videatur. Animadverti ego quoſdam, qui filium arbitrabantur; & qui filium negabant, ingenioſè aliorum dicta refutare, atque in plateis repertum eduxiſſe è parvulo, propter ſimiam, cum qua præter illum nemo hominum ludere auderet. Ea re Cardinalem (aut Epiſcopum tum) ita delectatum, ut pro ſuo habuerit. Hunc puerum, miſer, ita amat perditè, ita deperit (dicitur autem alios omnes vincere ἐν τῇ παιδεραστίᾳ) ut nihil poſſit dici vehementius (5). —— *He has a boy, a black, filthy, inſolent brute, ſilly, and ignorant, and quite a fool, except that he can play the buffoon a little. Upon the whole, he is a monſter both in body and mind. Who he is, and whence he ſprung, no one knows. Some think him his ſon; and thoſe, who deny it, ingenuouſly come off, by ſaying, he found him in the ſtreets, and brought him up from a child, becauſe of his playing with an ape, which no one elſe dared to do: the cardinal* (*or biſhop, then*) *was ſo pleaſed, they ſay, with the ſight, that he took him for his own. He is the fondeſt imaginable of this boy, as indeed he exceeds all others in pederaſty.*’ Thuanus ſays a thing which confirms part of this: as firſt, that this boy was called *the monkey*, even when he had obtained the cardinal's cap. In the ſecond place, that he had his name, becauſe of his employment with the cardinal, his maſter, which was to look after a monkey. *Soluti ad omnem licentiam animi homo:* they are the words of this great hiſtorian, which give a very ill character of Pope Julius III. ‘Statim adepta dignitate qualis eſſet, omnibus manifeſtum fecit. Nam cum antiquæ conſuetudinis ſit, ut novus Pontifex galerum, cui velit, ſuum largiatur, eum juveni cuidam cui Innocentio nomen, quique, quod in familia ſimiæ curam gereret. Simiæ etiam poſt adeptam dignitatem nomen retinuit, cognomine etiam ſuo atque inſignibus attributis donavit (6). —— *Being addicted to every kind of pleaſure, he was no ſooner created Pope, than he diſcovered to every one his diſpoſition. For, it being an ancient cuſtom, that the new Pope gives his hat to whom he pleaſes, he gave it to a certain youth, whoſe name was* Innocentius, *and who, becauſe he had the care of a monkey in the family, retained the name of* Simia, *giving him his name and marks of honour.*’ See the notes upon the *Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy*, page 249, of the edition 1699.

[*D*] . . . . . *he gave him his cardinal's cap.*] We have juſt ſeen in Thuanus, that cardinal del Monte being Pope, immediately conferred his cap, his name, and (7) his arms upon a young fellow that was called Innocent, and took care of a monkey. Eraſtus, whom I have already cited, gives us a more particular account. This boy was left at Bologna, ſo that Julius III who would not bring him to Rome before he had made him a cardinal, and who wanted a little time to make that promotion reliſhed, was very uneaſy at his abſence, and endeavored to find a remedy for it. He was never gay and pleaſant, but when he heard of his Innocent, and enquired after him of all thoſe who could give an account of him. He ordered him to come near Rome, that he might have an opportunity to go and ſee him; and having ſent for him once ſecretly into the city, he expected him at the windows with all the impatience of a man, to whom his miſtreſs has promiſed a night. He was heard ſay, that the chief reaſon why he rejoiced for being Pope, was becauſe it gave him an opportunity of being a benefactor to Innocent; and that he thought himſelf leſs indebted to the cardinals for making him Pope, than for having conſented to the promotion of Innocent to a cardinal's hat (8). He appointed him his principal miniſter, and interceſſor for all thoſe that would obtain favours of him. ‘Dum Romæ poſt electionem commoraretur, (manſerat autem Innocentius, id ei nomen, Bononiæ) dicitur nunquam lætus fuiſſe, niſi dum aliquid de Innocentio intelligeret. Et audivi ego à gravibus viris, inter tam multos Bononienſes, qui Romam ſint profecti, neminem eſſe repertum, quem ſciret cum Innocentio, aut ſuſpicaretur fuiſſe, qui non interrogatus ab eo eſſet, quid, & quomodo Innocentius ageret. Poſt aliquot menſes propius Romam accedere juſſit, ut ad eum deambulatum aliquando Roma exire poſſet. Non enim potuit adduci, ut pateretur eum ingredi Romam, niſi galero rubeo eſſet ornatum turpe caput. Ab hac re plurimi Cardinales videbantur abhorrere, minimeque paſſuri, ut in Cardinalium numerum cooptaretur, quem ne hominem quidem eſſe cognoviſſent. Accerſivit igitur noctu aliquando in urbem clam, atque ita in feneſtris expectabat, ut ii ſolent, quibus amica, qua nihil habent in vita charius, pollicita eſt noctem. Dicitur dixiſſe; ſe lætari, quod in ampliſſimam illam poteſtatem eſſet collocatus, non tam ſua cauſa, quàm quòd poſſet bene de Innocentio mereri. Et tandem factus Cardinalis dixit, ſe pro beneficio magis Cardinalibus obſtrictum eſſe, quàm quòd ſe Pontificem eſſe voluerint. Præterea, ut qui aliquid à ſe velint, id per Innocentium eſſe impetrandum. Quemobrem Legati Civitatum, Principum & Regum ad puerum concurrunt, illi ſua negotia exponunt, ut is de rebus ſuis graviſſimis etiam ad Papam referat (9).’ Some ſatires were publiſhed at Rome, in which it was ſaid that this favourite, as ugly as he was, was a new Ganymede. The Pope made no myſtery of it; but ſometimes told the cardinals ſome ſtories of this boy's laſcivious tricks. ‘Romæ fama, erat, & libellis quoque perſcriptum fuit, à Jove Ganymedem foveri, licet deformem: ſed nec ipſe Pontifex hoc ad reliquos Cardinales diſſimulare, & per jocum fertur aliquando commemorare, quam ſit laſcivus adoleſcens & importunus (10).’ I ſhall ſpeak again of the adventures of this man in the remark [*M*].

[*E*] . . . . *and he made a pleaſant anſwer when the unworthineſs of the perſon was repreſented to him.*] I will make uſe of John Bodin's words. ‘The prince who exalts a worthleſs creature above men of merit, or that ſets him in the rank of the greateſt perſons, in doing good to one, does injury to all the reſt: As it was repreſented by the conſiſtory of cardinals to Pope Julius del Monte, when he gave his cardinal's cap to the young lad he loved; that it was a great diſhonour to admit him who had neither virtue nor knowledge, nor birth, nor eſtate, nor any other quality to deſerve, as they ſaid, to arrive to ſuch a dignity. But the Pope, who was very facetious, addreſſing himſelf to the other cardinals; what virtue, ſaid he, what nobility, what knowledge, what honour have you found in me, to make me Pope (11)?’ Was not this to make a jeſt of the Sacred College? And might not Cato's exclamation be applied to this Pope, *What a comical conſul have we* (12). Some report Julius's anſwer was thus: ‘pray what have you found in me, to do me the honour of making me Pope without deſerving it? Let us advance then this young man, and he will deſerve it (13).’ Theſe laſt words are a ſly jeer, and reprove a very common fault. When a man is poſſeſſed of an employment, he finds a thouſand flatterers, who give out, he has very well deſerved it. Montagne ſays ſomewhere ‡, that Antiſthenes once made the Athenians ſenſible of the abuſe committed in the promotions to public poſts; he adviſed them to give order, that their aſſes ſhould be made to plough as well as their horſes. It was anſwered him, that that animal was not made for it: ‘it is all one, *replied he*, all depends upon your decree; for the moſt ignorant and unqualified, that you employ, as commanders in your wars, fail not immediately to become highly meritorious, becauſe you employ them.’

---

(5) Thomas Luberus (qui Eraſtus poſtea voce Græca appellari amavit) in Epiſtola ad Pellicanum, apud Hottingerum, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. Tom. V, pag. 572.

(6) Thuan. lib. vi, pag. 121, col. 1.

(7) See the remark [*M*], in in the margin, citat. (30).

(8) Compare with this what is ſaid in the remark [*M*], citat. †.

(9) Eraſtus, apud Hottingerum, ubi ſupra.

(10) Sleidanus, Hiſtor. lib. xxi, fol. m. 609, verſo.

(11) Bodin, de la Republique, lib. v, cap. iv, pag. m. 748.

(12) Adjungit Plutarchus eum (Ciceronem) cum Murænam Conſul defenderet quem accuſaſſet Cato, ſcite excogitaſſe ſententias & præcepta Stoicorum in Catone, unde riſus ingens à corona pervenerit ad ſubſellia, ſubriſiſſe porro ipſum Catonem leviter atque ad conſeſſum dixiſſe, quam ridiculum, judices, habemus Conſulem. *Vaſſor de Ludicra Dictione, pag.* 329.

(13) John Creſpin, l'Eſtat de l'Egliſe, ad ann. 1550, pag. m. 551, ex Pauló Vergerio.

‡ Book iii, cap. vi.

the reflexion he one day made upon the anſwer of two cardinals [*F*]. The want of gravity was not his greateſt fault: it is ſaid that his diſcourſe proceeded ſometimes to prophaneneſs and blaſphemy; as when he excuſed his paſſion by inſtancing the anger that God expreſſed againſt Adam for an apple [*G*]. During the conclave in which he was elected, ſome of his letters were intercepted, which made it conjectured, that this future Pope would be a leud man; for thoſe letters were ſtuffed with the moſt extravagant obſcenities [*H*]. It is thought his money fruſtrated the election of Cardinal Pole, which had been concluded on, and the publication whereof was only deferred, becauſe they were afraid it would be an ill omen to notify it in the night (*a*). The medal which he ordered to be ſtruck after the death of Edward king of England, had for it's motto a ſentence of the holy Scripture, the application whereof proved falſe in a little time [*I*]. This Pope died the twentieth of February 1555, being about ſixty eight years

[*F*] *The reflexion which he one day made upon the anſwer of two cardinals.*] They found him in the court of his palace in a very indecent poſture; for by reaſon of the heat he had put off his cloaths, and was walking in his drawers. He obliged them to do the like, and afterwards asked them, what the people would ſay of them, ſhould they go and ſhew themſelves in that figure in the field of Flora, and the ſtreets of Rome? They would take us, anſwered they, for idle rogues, and would throw ſtones at us. Therefore, replied he, it is to our cloaths we are obliged for not being thought idle rogues: how much then are we indebted to our cloaths? ‘Cum aliquando exutis veſtibus, diploide & caligis tantùm indutus, in aula, quòd ferveret tempeſtas, obambularet, venerunt Cardinales duo, collocuturi cum ipſo. Quos ipſe ad exuendas veſtes ſuas, & deambulandum ſecum urgebat, mox autem nudos interrogabat: Quid ſi in Campo Floræ, aut per plateas nudi ſic deambularemus, quid oro populum exiſtimatis de nobis judicaturum? Reſponderunt: Judicarent nos eſſe nebulones, & conjicerent in nos rudera atque lapides. Excepit Pontifex: Ergo quod non habemur pro nebulonibus, id acceptum ferre debemus noſtris veſtibus. Quantum igitur, ô fratres, debemus illis noſtris veſtibus (14)?’

[G] *He excuſed his paſſion by inſtancing the anger that GOD expreſſed againſt Adam for an apple.*] The thing is thus, related in John Creſpin's book. ‘(15) He loved amongſt other diſhes, to eat hogs fleſh, and peacoks: but as his Phyſician had cautioned him againſt eating hogs fleſh, becauſe it was bad for the gout, with which he was often tormented, and yet he could not abſtain from it; the Phyſician ſecretly adviſed the ſteward to give orders that no hogs fleſh ſhould be ſerved in. As therefore it was omitted for ſome time, and the Pope perceived it, he asked the ſteward, where was his diſh of pork? The ſteward anſwered, the Phyſician had ordered that none ſhould be brought in. Upon which he exclaimed in this manner, bring me my diſh, (*al diſpetto di Dio) in ſpight of GOD*. . . . Seeing one day a peacock at dinner, which no body touched, keep, ſaid he, this peacock cold for my ſupper, and lay the table in the garden, for I ſhall have ſome company at night. As he was at ſupper, and ſaw hot peacocks brought to table, but not his cold one, which he had ordered to be kept for him, flying into a bitter paſſion, he uttered an execrable blaſphemy againſt God. Upon which one of the cardinals who ſate at table with him, ſaid, your holineſs ought not to be in ſo great a paſſion, for ſo little a thing. Julius replied, if GOD could be ſo very angry for an apple, as to turn our firſt father, Adam, out of paradiſe; why ſhould it not be lawful for me, who am his vicar, to be in a paſſion for a peacock, ſince a peacock is much more than an apple?’ They who will read this ſtory in two languages, may ſatisfy their curioſity by caſting their eyes on what follows (16): *Sæpiſſimè nequiſſimus iſte homo blaſphemiis illis uſus fuit quæ impuriſſimis lenonibus aliiſque deſperatæ malitiæ hominibus tunc temporis frequenter in ore fuerunt, ad quas animus totus quantus exhorreſcit, vid.* Al diſpetto di Dio, in contemptum (17) Dei, & Potta di Dio, i. e. ad vulvam Dei *&c. exemplum hujus rei proponit auctor libri cui titulus*, Lectura ſuper Canone de conſecr. diſt. 3. *ajens*: ‘Intellexi, portatam fuiſſe in Civitatem Paduæ quandam hiſtoriam, impreſſam Latine, Italicè, Germanicè, & Gallicè, in qua narratur, quòd Sanctiſſimus Dominus noſter Papa Julius III proximis diebus valdè fuit iratus cum Epiſcopo Ariminenſe, ejus Magiſtro domus, propter certum pavonem, & quum ſua prælibata Sanctitas bis blaſphemaſſet, primò dicendo, Potta di Dio, deinde Al diſpetto di Dio, quod fecit tanquam Johannes Maria de Monte, & ſic tanquam homo, non tanquam Julius III Papa, & Vicarius Chriſti, de quo ſupra dixi. Et quùm unus Cardinalis illi dixiſſet, quòd non deberet iraſci propter unam tàm parvam rem, id eſt, propter unum pavonem, tunc ſanctiſſimus D. Papa reſpondit; Si Deus fuit totus turbatus, & in magna ira & colera, propter unum pomum, & tanta mala fecit omnibus hominibus; quare non poſſum ego, qui ſum ſuus Vicarius in terris, iraſci cum meo magiſtro domus propter unum pavonem?’

[*H*] *Thoſe letters were ſtuffed with the moſt extravagant obſcenities.*] They were written the twenty ſixth of January 1550, to one Annibal Contin by Camillus Oliva a conclaviſt of the cardinal of Mantua, and accompanied with a little poem, in which the author filthily deſcribed his paſſion, and the vehement ardour, that made him wiſh to have his friend again. It is John Sleiden who tells this. ‘Dum in Conclavi res agitur, interceptæ fuerunt literæ, quas ex Cardinalis Mantuani familiaribus, quidam, Camillus Olivus, ad quendam ſuum Annibalem Continum, Januarii die XXVI, ſcripſiſſe ferebatur, & ſimul carmen lingua populari ſcriptum, ubi de ſua locutus affectione, & abſentis deſiderio, tam pudendis utitur verbis, ut ſine flagitio vix ea recitare liceat. Hinc jocus illorum, qui pontificem dicebant aliquem obſcœnum prænunciari, qui proditurus eſſet ex eo Conclavi, quòd ejuſmodi literas daret (18).’ An author above cited does not relate this paſſage without having firſt ſaid, ‘Vir doctus anonymus *in Epiſt. ad amicum* narrat, ex eo Conclavi, in quo creatus eſt Julius, interceptas fuiſſe literas alicujus ex Conclaviſtis, i. e. ex illis, qui ſolent aſſidere Cardinalibus, Papam electuris, quibus quidem literis non putet ullâ memoriâ unquam ſcriptas fuiſſe ullas obſcœniores, ſceleratioreſque. Nudis enim nefandiſſimiſque verbis illic agi cum cinædo, ſalvo honore, Has, fateri, ad ſe primum in Germaniam fuiſſe miſſas, ſed dare typis excudendas (ut multi voluiſſent) nunquam quidem ſe voluiſſe. *Paulo poſt addit*, Julium III valdè male audire in hoc obſcœniſſimo genere, (*Sodomitici nim. criminis*) ita ut neque a Cardinalibus abſtineat (19).’

[*I*] *A medal which he ordered to be ſtruck . . . had for it's motto a ſentence of the holy Scripture, the application whereof proved falſe in a little time.*] They expreſſed an extraordinary joy at Rome, for the death of king Edward; becauſe the princeſs Mary, who ſucceeded him, reſtored England to the obedience of the Pope; but the reaſons of that joy ceaſed in a little time. Queen Elizabeth re-eſtabliſhed the Reformation, and rendered that iſland one of the moſt flouriſhing kingdoms in Chriſtendom; ſo that the prediction of the medal was a meer chimera. ‘Eo inſaniæ Julius pervenit, ut in perpetuam rei memoriam excudi curaverit monetam, cujus altera pars ejus imaginem tricorniferam oſtentavit, altera inſcriptionem ejuſmodi habuit: *Gens & Regnum, quod non ſervierit tibi, peribit.* Sibi ſtolidè vindicans, quod Chriſto Eſaias. Sed diuturnum & ſtabile gaudium neutiquam fuit (20). ——— *Julius arrived to ſuch a pitch of madneſs, that he ordered a medal to be ſtruck to perpetuate the memory of the thing, on one ſide of which was a figure with three horns, and on the reverſe this inſcription:* The people and kingdom, which will not

---

(*a*) Poſt longam Cardinalium in conclavi diſceptationem, cùm, teſte in Muſeo Hiſtorico Johanne Imperiali, ὁμοψήφως Papa jam electus eſſet Reginaldus Polus, eamque electionem promulgare nocte appetente inauſpicatum duxiſſent iidem; nocte tranſacta & mutatis rationibus aureis Julius Papa ſubitò emerſit. *Heidegg. Hiſtor. Papatus*, pag. 233.

(14) Bullinger, in Vita MS. Julii III, apud Heideggerum Hiſt. Papatus, pag. 235.

(15) Ubi ſupra, pag 553.

(16) Joann. Zuingerus, in Tractatu Hiſtor. Theologico de Feſto Corporis Chriſti, pag. 146.

(17) *The word* contemptus, *does not expreſs the force of the Italian word* diſpetto: *it ſhould have been ſaid* invito Deo.

(18) Sleidanus, Hiſt. lib xxi, fol. m 609, verſo. *This is alſo to be found in Thuanus, in the Francfort edition*, 1625, lib. vi, pag 121.

(19) Joann. Zuingerus, ubi ſupra.

(20) Heidegger. Hiſt. Papatus, pag 238.

years of age (*b*). He pretended to be ſick [*K*]; and the better to deceive the world, he reduced himſelf to a courſe of Phyſic, which brought upon him a real diſeaſe, of which he died. It is ſaid, that there was ſo great an intimacy betwixt him and cardinal Creſcentio, that they had miſtreſſes in common; and that they maintained the children they had by them at a common charge [*L*], for want of knowing who was the true father. Each of them alſo paid his quota for the maintenance of theſe women. Cardinal Pallavicino extenuates as much as he can the faults of this Pope, but he does not confute what Father Paul ſays of them [*M*] I forgot to obſerve, that the court of

(*b*) Spondanus, ad ann. 1555, n. 43. *but Palavicini,* Hiſtor. Concil. lib. xiii, cap. x, n. 7, *ſays he was ſeventy years old.*

'ſerve thee, ſhall periſh: *fooliſhly arrogating to himſelf, what Iſaiah ſaid of* CHRIST. *But the joy laſted not long.*'

[*K*] *He pretended to be ſick.*] The reaſon of it was, becauſe he diſcovered, that the cardinals would refuſe to conſent to the requeſt, which his brother preſſed him to make to them. His brother paſſionately deſired the poſſeſſion of a town, and importuned the Pope perpetually on that account. That he might therefore have a pretence not to hold a conſiſtory, he pretended to be ſick. And to play this trick more artificially, he eat but little, and choſe ſuch food, as is fit for ſick people. This change of diet, they ſay, brought on him the diſtemper of which he died (21). This puts me in mind of Martial's Cælius:

Diſcurſus varios, vagumque mane,
Et faſtus, & ave potentiorum,
Cum perferre patique jam negaret;
Cœpit fingere Cælius podagram.
Quam dum vult nimis approbare veram,
Et ſanas linit obligatque plantas,
Inceditque gradu laborioſo;
(Quantum cura poteſt, & ars doloris!)
Deſit fingere Cælius podagram (22).

Tir'd with th' attendance, clients pay
At great mens levees every day,
Cælius pretends the gout: but ſee
Th' effect of this hypocriſy!
Whilſt he in flannel wraps his feet,
Or walks on crutches thro' the ſtreet,
He plays the counterfeit no more
But has the gout, he feign'd before.

Some ſay that the change of diet, was indeed the cauſe of his illneſs; but not that he reſolved upon it, in order to deceive the world: they ſay he hoped to deliver himſelf thereby from the intolerable pains of the gout. Others pretend, that an old diſtemper was the cauſe of his death, and acknowledge, that he was a man addicted to his pleaſures, who thought more of enjoying than exerciſing his pontificate. 'Sunt etiam qui dicant, eum veterano interiiſſe: cùm, ut idem etiam auctor narrat, externa quæque parum curans, fruendo potiùs quàm regendo Pontificatui incumberet, totuſque eſſet in extruendâ elegantiſſimâ ad voluptarios ſeceſſus extra portam Flaminiam Villâ Juliâ, cujus inſanire ſtudio videbatur; in quâ conviviis potiùs quàm publicæ procurationi vocabat (23).'

[*L*] *It is ſaid he and Creſcentio . . . . . had miſtreſſes in common, and that they maintained the children they had by them at a common charge.*] This I have from Thomas Eraſtus. 'Julius III Pontifex, *ſays he* (24), & Creſcentius fere omnes meretrices communes habuerunt, propriiſque ſumptibus neuter, ſed communibus aluerunt, atque ut breviter dicam, omnium ſcelerum ſocii extiterunt. Suſceperunt ex quadam muliere, honeſti viri Viterbienſis filiam, quam, quod neuter ſuam eſſe dicere credereque poſſet, ut matrem, ita filiam quoque communibus ſumptibus educandam tradiderunt, nuptuique dederunt Nobiliſſimo hujus urbis adoleſcenti, & inter Principeshujus urbis qui ſunt 40 conſtitutum voluerunt. ——— *Pope Julius III, and cardinal Creſcentio, had almoſt all the courtezans in common, and maintained them jointly; in ſhort, were companions in all manner of vices. They had a child by a certain woman, the daughter of a gentleman of Viterbo, which, becauſe neither of them could ſay or think it was his own, as they had the mother in common, ſo they educated the daughter at the joint expence of both, and married her to a noble youth of this city, whom they would have ranked among the princes of this city, who are forty in number.*' Here is a great exemption from jealouſy, which is a rare thing in that country.

[*M*] *Cardinal Pallavicino extenuates . . . . . the faults of this Pope, but does not confute what Father Paul ſays of them.*] He owns that this Pope loved to divert himſelf, but he adds that he equally loved application to buſineſs (25), he grants that he died being little eſteemed and loved (26); but he pretends, that his too free and familiar way of acting was the cauſe of it, becauſe not getting the public veneration, he made it believed that he was not a good Pope. He adds, that this judgment was unjuſt, and that if the faults of Julius III were more conſpicuous than his good qualities, they were not perhaps of ſo much conſequence as his virtues (27). As to the promotion of the young lad, he is contented to ſay (28), that it diſhonoured the firſt days of his papacy. He acknowledges that the birth of this man was ſo obſcure that it was ſtill unknown: But he pretends the affection cardinal del Monte had for him, was founded upon this, that he looked upon him as the ſon of his judgment. The meaning whereof is this; whilſt the cardinal was legate at Piacenza, he was pleaſed with the pretty carriage of a little boy, who often came near his table. He took this for a ſign of wit, and reſolved to raiſe this young plant at his own charge: and ſeeing the boy improving, he loved him more and more. He applauded himſelf for his happy conjecture; he looked upon him as the ſon of his judgment, a ſort of creature which we ſet a greater value upon than upon a child of our body. 'Oblectatus ex eo herus, ſibique plaudens, quod ſuâ quaſi perſpicacia plantam eximiam, adhuc minutulam, & in luto, diſcreviſſet, majori in puerum benevolentia incaluit, quâ illum proſequebatur veluti ſui judicii prolem, cujus filii pluris quam corporis ſoboles æſtimantur (29).' He would have his brother to adopt him; and when he was Pope, he raiſed him to the dignity of a cardinal, the thirtieth day of May 1550. He had made him ſtay till then in a village a day's journey from Rome. He gave him an income of twelve thouſand crowns: but did not then entruſt him with the adminiſtration of affairs. This new cardinal was ſcarce ſeventeen years of age: he ſhewed himſelf wholly unworthy of this honour, and it was neceſſary under the following pontificate to puniſh him for his debaucheries. This is all that Palavicino obſerves: he has cautiouſly forborn to criticiſe on Father Paul; who has moſt plainly ſhowed that the world looked upon this minion of Julius as his Catamite: prudence would not permit him to revive thoſe ideas. Wherefore he does not accuſe Father Paul of malicious ſlanders, but is contented to ſay, that he is miſtaken as to the time of the adoption (30), and as to the place where this young man firſt began to make himſelf acceptable (31). Let us ſee what Father Paul ſays. '(32) Julius immediately gave a ſpecimen of his future government, by ſpending whole days in walking in his gardens, and contriving the building of pleaſure houſes; and by diſcovering a great inclination to the pleaſures of life, and very little for buſineſs †, eſpecially for ſuch as he found difficult to manage. The embaſſador Mendoza well obſerving this humour, wrote to his maſter, that it would be eaſy to ſucceed in all his negotiations with this Pope, who being only for mirth and pleaſure, would turn any way, if he was put in fear. The opinion that was entertained of him, that he would prefer his private intereſt and affection before the public good, was ſoon confirmed by the promotion he made of a cardinal the thirty firſt of May, to whom he gave his hat, as is cuſtomary with the Popes. When he was but archbiſhop of Siponto, and governor of the town of Bologna, he took into his houſe a young boy, a native of Piacenza, whoſe original is not yet known. He took an affection

(21) Spondan. ad ann. 1555, n. 4, pag. 556, ex Onuphrio Panvinio. *Thuanus relates the ſame thing*, lib. xv, pag. m. 306.

(22) Mart. Epigr. xxxix, lib. vii.

(23) Spondan. ibid ex Eod.

(24) Apud Hottinger. ubi ſupra, pag. 574.

(25) Pronus ad laxamenta; ſed æque etiam ad negotia. *Palavic. Hiſt. Concil Trident. lib. xiii, cap. x, n.* 8

(26) Eſtimatione tenui, nec majore benevolentia mortuus eſt. *Id. ibid.*

(27) Nihilominus ut mea fert opinio, hæc de illo exiſtimatio fuit iniqua: ipſius quippe vitia majora quidem ad ſpeciem erant quam virtutes, ſed non fortaſſe ad pondus. *Id. ibid.*

(28) Id. lib. xi, cap. vii, n. 4.

(29) Id. ibid.

(30) Palavicino, *lib. xi, cap. vii, n.* 4, ſays that it appears from the Journal of Maſſarellus, ſecretary to the council, that the young boy was adopted, when he was one of the actors of a paſtoral, the ſecond of March, 154[illegible].

(31) Palavicino, *ibid.* ſays it was not at Bologna, as Father Paul will have it, but at Piacenza.

(32) Fra-Paolo, lib. iii, ad ann. 1550, pag. 28[illegible], *of Amelot's tranſlation.*

† Qui occupationibus totus intentus Cardinalis, veluti furtim, voluptates ſequebatur, Pontifex factus, votorum jam omnium compos, abdicata rerum cura, hilaritati & genio ſuo nimium indulſit. *Onupr. in Vita.*

of France offered this Pope's nephew a princeſs of the blood, and that this alliance was refuſed [*N*].

‘fection to him as if he had been his own child, and brought him to Trent, where he had like to have loſt him by a great fit of ſickneſs. But ſending him, by the Phyſicians advice, to Verona, for change of air, Innocent, (for that was this minion's name) recovered his health, and ſome time after returned to Trent. The day that he was to come, the legate went out of town as to take a walk, accompanied with a great many prelates, and meeting him, received him with all the exceſſive teſtimonies of joy and affection. Which gave much occaſion of diſcourſe whether it was an accidental meeting, or a thing deſigned to take him in the way. The legate uſed to ſay, that he loved him, as being the author of his fortune †, for as much as the Aſtrologers had predicted great wealth, and high dignities to this boy, which could never happen, but by his exaltation to the popedom. He was ſcarce made Pope, but Innocent was adopted by Baudouin del Monte, his brother, for his ſon: and afterwards having conferred on him many benefices, he made him a cardinal, as I have ſaid: which afforded matter enough for paſquins, and gave the courtiers an itch to ſpeak out the true cauſe of ſo ſurpriſing an action upon ſeveral conjectures drawn from paſſed accidents.’

† Onuphrius relates, that Julius ſaid he had been promoted to the pontificate for the care he had taken of that child. *Affirmans ſe ad tanti honoris decus evectum, ob ea beneficia quibus illum puerum affeciſſet.*

[*N*] *The court of France offered to this Pope's nephew a princeſs of the blood. But this alliance was refuſed.*] The Pope anſwered that marriages between perſons of ſo different a rank could not be happy; and as he acknowledged the royal houſe of France to be the nobleſt in the world, he acknowledged his own to be the meaneſt upon earth. However he did not give the true reaſon of this refuſal; for that which induced him to refuſe ſo glorious an alliance, was, the deſire of marrying his nephew to the great duke's daughter: which was more uſeful to him for the execution of what he was projecting in favour of his family. This we learn from Thuanus. ‘Julius, *ſays he* (33), ad ſcurrilitatem uſque feſtivus, & alienam ab innata deceſſoribus Pontificibus ambitione mentem præ ſe ferens, cum tamen interea Coſmi, ut proximi & ſuorum rebus utiliſſimi principis adfinitatem ultra modum expeteret, & Camertium principatum Fabiano deſtinaret, ut conditionem tam amplam eluderet, ſic Lanſacum urgentem dimiſit, ut diceret, quam ex nobiliſſima omnium, quæ uſquam fuiſſent, familia rex prognatus eſſet, tam ſe ac ſuos omnium, qui viverent, mortalium ignobiliſſimos agnoſcere; proinde nuptias, quæ inter pares melius coirent, inter inæqualeis adeo perſonas commode contrahi non poſſe. ——— *Julius being pleaſant even to buffoonry, and a ſtranger to the ambition of his predeceſſors, as he eagerly courted the alliance of Coſmo, a prince neareſt him, and moſt likely to be of advantage to his family, and deſigned the principality of Camercio for Fabian, diſmiſſed Lanſac, who importuned him, telling him, that as the king was of the moſt noble family that ever was, ſo he acknowledged himſelf and his family to be the moſt ignoble of men; therefore that marriage, which requires an equality of condition, could not conveniently be contracted between perſons ſo unequal.*’ Note, that one of the daughters of Coſmo duke of Florence, was betrothed to Fabian del Monte, who was Baudouin's ſon, and not yet marriageable. See Thuanus, book xiii. Palavicino, in the place above cited, obſerves, that Fabian was Baudouin's baſtard.

(33) Thuan lib. xiv, circa init. pag. m. 280, ad ann. 1554.

JUNCTIN (FRANCIS), in Italian, *Giuntino*, one of the famous Mathematicians and Aſtrologers of the XVIth century, was of Florence, but ſpent a good part of his life in Lyons (*a*), where he publiſhed ſeveral books [*A*]. His being doctor in Divinity (*b*), did not hinder him from being extremely addicted to judicial Aſtrology, and that with great credulity. I do not know in what year he died. He was fifty ſix years old when he publiſhed his commentaries upon Sacroboſco's ſphere, in the year 1577 (*c*). Deduce from thence the year of his birth. For the reſt, he deſcended ſometimes from the region of heaven, to divert himſelf with human diſcoveries; for he compoſed a diſcourſe upon the Epocha of Petrarch's amours (*d*). I have elſewhere ſpoken (*e*) of his horoſcope of Luther. We ſhall ſee, below, the particulars of his life, publiſhed by Poſſevin [*B*].

(*a*) *See la Croix du Maine, pag.* 101.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. pag. 194.

(*d*) *See the title of it in the remark* [*A*].

(*e*) *In the remark* [*B*] *of the article* LUTHER.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books at Lyons.*] He publiſhed there, in 1570, his *Tractatus judicandi revolutiones nativitatum*, in 8vo. Three years after he publiſhed his *Speculum Aſtrologiæ quod attinet ad judiciariam rationem nativitatum atque annuarum revolutionum, cum nonnullis approbatis Aſtrologorum ſententiis* (1). This work was in 4to, but in the edition of 1581, it became a Folio, by reaſon of the commentaries which were added to it, *in duos poſteriores Quadripartiti Ptolomæi libros innumeris obſervationibus referta* (2), & *certiſſimis Aphoriſmis (quatenus ex ſiderum poſitione liceat Chriſtiano more aliquid conjicere) ex probatiſſimorum Aſtrologorum ſcriptis depromptis inſignita.* His Latin commentaries upon Sacroboſco's ſphere, came out in 1577 (3). There was printed at Cologne, in 1580, a book, intituled *De Divinatione quæ fit per aſtra diverſum ac diſcrepans duorum Catholicorum ſacræ Theologiæ Doctorum judicium, ſcilicet Franciſci Junctini ac Joannis Lenſæi.* There are two French tracts of Junctin, *viz. A large diſcourſe upon the things wherewith the comet that appeared in November,* 1577, *threatens many princes, countries, and people of Chriſtendom.* At Paris, for Gervais Mallot, 1577 (4), and at Lyons, for Francis Didier, 1578, in 8vo (5), and *A Diſcourſe upon the reformation of the year, made by our Holy Father Pope Gregory XIII, with the reaſons of his taking away ten days, and the golden number*; at Lyons, 1582, in 8vo. He printed in the ſame city, in 1580, in 8vo, *Diſcorſo ſopra il tempo dello inamoramento del Petrarca. Con la ſpoſitione del Sonetto, Gia fiammegiava l'amoroſa ſtella* (6).

(1) *See the epitome of Geſner's* Bibliotheque.

(2) *This word refers to* commentaria.

(3) *Printed at Lyons,* apud Jo. Tornæſium. *Voſſius mentions only that edition: Du Verdier Vau-Privas mentions only that of* 1578, apud Symphorianum Beraud.

(4) La Croix du Maine, pag. 101.

(5) Du Verdier Vau Privas, Bibliotheque Françoiſe, pag. 404.

(6) Id. ibid. pag 404, 405.

[*B*] *We ſhall ſee the particulars of his life, publiſhed by Poſſevin.*] I knew him in France, *ſays he* (7), where he lived in exile; he applied himſelf to the pernicious ſpeculations of Aſtrology. He was a fugitive apoſtate; he had been a Carmelite, and promoted to the prieſthood, and even to be Provincial: he forſook his vows, and his profeſſion, and the Romiſh religion; but by the charitable advice of ſome devout perſons, he was in ſome meaſure brought back into the right way. He publickly abjured his hereſies in the church of the Holy Croſs at Lyons. And he gave reaſon to believe for ſome time, that he deſigned to labour for the advantage of the Catholic church. However, he did not retract the works he had made upon prognoſticating impieties (8); he was one of thoſe who putting their hand to the plough, and looking back, are not fit for the kingdom of heaven. He dealt in bills of exchange, lent money upon intereſt, and by that means got ſixty thouſand crowns, no footſteps whereof were found after his death. He had made a legacy of three thouſand livres to the Junti, to whom he had been corrector of the preſs. That teſtimony of his friendſhip did them no kindneſs. *Juntis honeſtiſſimis Typographis (in quorum ædibus ſæpe librorum correctionibus operam Lugduni poſuerat) mille aureos nummos cum moriens legaſſet, ii mihi faſſi ſunt, eos uti reliquos evanuiſſe; nimirum omnia perdita fuiſſe quæ perditus ille anxie hinc inde corraſerat* (9).’

(7) Poſſevinus, Biblioth Select. Tom. II, pag. m. 245.

(8) Non vidimus eum libros ſuos de impietate divinatrice retractaſſe. *Id. ib.*

(9) Id. ibid.

JUNGERMAN (**Godfrey**) made himſelf known by his learning in the beginning of the XVIIth century. He was born at Leipſic, where his father GASPAR JUNGERMAN [*A*], was profeſſor of Civil-Law. His mother was the daughter of the famous Joachim Camerarius of Bamberg (*a*), profeſſor likewiſe at Leipſic. Godfrey Jungerman underſtood the Greek tongue in perfection. The public is indebted to him for the firſt publication of Julius Cæſar's Commentaries in Greek [*B*]. He had already publiſhed his Latin verſion of Longus's Paſtorals, with notes (*b*). He printed in 1609 ſome remarks upon the treatiſe *de Equuleo* [*C*], which Magius had written in priſon. We have alſo ſome of his letters printed. He died the ſixteenth of Auguſt, 1610 (*c*), at Hanaw, where he had been a long time corrector of the preſs to Wechel's heirs [*D*].

(*a*) Bapenbergenſis. *I add this title to diſtinguiſh this Camerarius from his ſon Joachim Camerarius, who is ſirnamed* Norimbergenſis.

(*b*) *You will ſee a fault of Moreri, concerning Jungerman, in the article* LONGUS, *rem.* [*A*].

(*c*) Diarium Biograph. Henningi Witten.

[*A*] *His father* GASPAR JUNGERMAN.] It is probably he who is the author of ſome diſputes upon ſome points of law, which Draudius (1) mentions, and of a poem *De Cuſtodia Angelica*, mentioned by the ſame Draudius (2), and by Simler (3).

[*B*] *The public is indebted to him for the firſt publication of Julius Cæſar's Commentaries in Greek.*] He added to that verſion, aſcribed by ſome to Planudes, and of which the manuſcript that was in Mr Petau's Library, had been communicated to him by Bongars (4); I ſay, he added to it, not only his own remarks upon the Greek tranſlator, but alſo thoſe of ſeveral learned critics upon Julius Cæſar's Commentaries. This edition of Francfort, in the year 1606, in 4to, is very much eſteemed.

[*C*] *He printed ſome remarks upon the treatiſe* de Equuleo.] The Journal des Savans (5) ſpoke of theſe remarks with contempt, *as if moſt of them ran only upon trifles*; for example, *to know whether it ought to be ſaid* Equuleus, *or* Eculeus: but this cenſure is too haſty; for tho' this little point of orthography has been ſomewhat largely diſcuſſed by Jungerman, the Journaliſt ſhould not have judged of all the remarks by this, which beſides is not uſeleſs to the ſubject, nor unfit to pleaſe ſeveral perſons.

[*D*] *He was corrector of the preſs to Wechel's heirs.*] This we learn from ſome letters he wrote to Goldaſt (6). Wherein we find alſo that he was writing upon Julius Pollux; but this was known before, by the preface to his edition of Herodotus. He enriched that edition, with ſeveral pieces, and amongſt others, with ſeveral fragments of Cteſias. Mr Chevillier might have put him into the catalogue of learned men, who have been correctors of the preſs (7).

(1) Bibliotheca Claſſica, pag. 716.

(2) Ibid. pag. 1507.

(3) Epitome Bibl. Geſneri, pag. 258.

(4) *See the French epiſtles written to Scaliger, pag.* 368.

(5) *Of the ſecond of March* 1665, *pag. m.* 182, *Dutch Edit.*

(6) *See the collection of the Letters to Goldaſt, printed at Francfort, in* 1688, *and Gudius's Letters, publiſhed at Utrecht, in* 1697.

(7) Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris, pag. 195, 196.

JUNGERMAN (**Lewis**) born at Leipſic the fourth of July 1572, and brother to the foregoing, was an excellent Botaniſt. He betook himſelf early to the ſtudy of plants, and got ſuch a reputation by it, that he was offered in England the place of the famous Matthias Lobel, who died at London in the year 1616; but he choſe rather to live in Germany. He had already diſtinguiſhed himſelf by contributing very much to the work, intituled, *Hortus Eyſtettenſis*, which contains the figure and deſcription of all the plants of the biſhop of Eichſtet's garden; and he made a catalogue of all thoſe that grow about Nuremberg, the impreſſion whereof was taken care of by Gaſpar Hofman, in the year 1615. He was made profeſſor of Phyſic at Gieſſen, in the year 1622 [*A*], after having planted a garden, which did very much contribute to the ſcholars proficiency. He ſpent three years in that profeſſorſhip, and afterwards he had ſuch another with that of Botanics at Altdorf, in the year 1625. He continued in them to his death, which happened the ſeventh of June 1653, and during the twenty eight years of thoſe employments, he took ſuch care of the Phyſic garden, that he made it famous even in foreign countries. He had the more time to ſpend in this buſineſs, becauſe he neither married, nor had any amorous avocation: which has given occaſion to ſay, that he cannot be praiſed for his continence, ſince he had no occaſion for a woman; for continence is a virtue, which, according to Ariſtotle, ought to cauſe a conflict, of which there appeared no ſign in Jungerman's life (*a*). The panegyriſt of a Monk would have given the matter another face. This profeſſor left his library to the univerſity of Altdorf. I muſt not forget, that he took a wonderful delight in making anagrams [*B*]. I know not whether he was fond of judicial Aſtrology; but in the Programma, from which I take this article, it is very ſeriouſly obſerved, that

(*a*) In quo (*cœlibatu*) non eſt neceſſe continentiam prædicari, qua nulla in ipſo opus erat, virtus enim eſt cum lucta, Ariſtotele cenſore, conjuncta, cujus indicium nulla quæ unquam in hoc genere emicaret flamma, præbere animadverſa eſt. *Abdias Trew, Matheſ & Phyſ. Prof. & Rector Univerſitatis Altdorfinæ, in Programmate apud Henning. Witten Memor. Medicorum.*

[*A*] *He was made profeſſor of Phyſic at Gieſſen, in the year* 1622.] The rector of the univerſity of Altdorf has a little perplexed the Chronology, in his *Programma*. He pretends that Jungerman got ſo great a reputation during his profeſſorſhip at Gieſſen, that he was invited into England to ſucceed the moſt famous Botaniſt Lobel. This is to confound the time; for Lobel died in the year 1616, and Jungerman was not profeſſor at Gieſſen, but from the year 1622, to 1625. What likelihood is there that the Engliſh ſhould have left Lobel's place vacant ſix or ſeven years? doubtleſs they deſigned it for Jungerman a little after it was vacant; he had therefore acquired before his profeſſorſhip at Gieſſen, the reputation that procured him that great mark of eſteem the Engliſh had for him. Paul Freherus, who has given (1) an abſtract of that *Programma*, has on one hand better ſpecified the dates; but on the other, this ſerves only more clearly to diſcover the error of his calculation. Thus he ranges the dates. 'Doctor Med. *ſays he*, creatus, & ad Profeſſionem Med. 'publicam promotus eſt A. 1622. Hinc (2) per triennium ea nominis celebritate præfuit, ut in Angliam 'quo celeberrimi Botanici Matthiæ Lobelii ſucceſſor 'fieret invitaretur A. C. 1616. ſed ille Germaniæ conditiones prætulit. Ad deſcriptionem etiam Horti 'Eichſtettenſis tota Germania celebris laudabilem nec 'vulgarem operam contulit. ——— *He was created 'doctor and profeſſor of Phyſic in the year* 1622. *Three 'years afterwards, his great fame procured him an invitation into England, to ſucceed Matthias Lobel, 'the Botaniſt, in the year* 1616; *but he choſe to continue in Germany. He laboured ſucceſſfully in the 'deſcription of the* Garden of Eichſtet, *ſo famous all 'over Germany.*' This *Hortus Eyſtettenſis* was printed in the year 1613. Judge if theſe things are placed according to their time. Mr Witten's *Diarium Biographicum* ſuppoſes that our Jungerman was profeſſor at Leipſic, and afterwards at Altdorf. Make no ſcruple to correct it, by putting *Gieſſenſi* inſtead of *Lipſienſi*.

[*B*] *He took a wonderful delight in making anagrams.*] He publiſhed a collection of them at Gieſſen, in the year 1624, intituled, *Aulæum Academicum*, in 4to. We have two other works of his, namely, the catalogue

(1) Theatr. pag. 138.

(2) *It ſeems that this word* hinc, *which anſwers the word* cui *in the* Programma, *is an error of the preſs for* huic *But this error of the Printers has not put the order obſerved by the author in a worſe condition.*

that the humours of an Eryſipelas ſtopping on a ſudden, when Mars was retrograde, produced a ſcorbutic gangrene [*C*] in the extremities of his feet. Godfrey and Lewis Jungerman, had a brother named GASPAR, who was a man of letters. See the notes of Godfrey Jungerman upon the fourth chapter of the treatiſe *de Equuleo*.

catalogue I have mentioned in the text of this article, and another like it, intituled, *Cornucopiæ Floræ Gieſſenſis, &c.* Gieſſæ, 1624, in 4to.

[*C*] *It is obſerved . . . . . that the humours of an Eryſipelas produced . . . . . . a ſcorbutic gangrene.*] Theſe are the words of the *Programma*. *Cujus* (ereſipelatis) *fluxus conſueti ſubito ſubſiſtentes, gangrænam ſcorbuticam ante trimeſtre (circa motum Martis in loco Lunæ natalitio oppoſito tardum & retrogradum) in extremitate pedum pepererunt.* The Phyſicians of that time were wont to aſcribe much to the influence of the ſtars, in diſcourſing upon diſtempers.

JUNIUS (**Hadrian**) born at Horn in Holland [*A*] the firſt of July 1511 [*B*], was one of the moſt learned men of his age. He was the ſon of a burgo-maſter of great worth [*C*]; and he ſtudied firſt at Haerlem, afterwards at Louvain and Paris, and at laſt at Bologna in Italy, where he was admitted doctor of Phyſic. Being returned into his country, he went into England in 1543 (*a*), and was Phyſician to the duke of Norfolk, and afterwards to a great lady. He there wrote ſome books, and amongſt others a Greek and Latin Dictionary, in which he added above 6500 words. He dedicated it to king Edward in 1548; and becauſe he gave him the title of king, they moleſted him for it a long time after at the court of Rome. He was very much afflicted with that perſecution; for we ſee in his letters (*b*) to Lindanus, biſhop of Ruremond, and to cardinal Granvelle, that he paſſionately deſired that diſgrace might be taken off, with which he had been branded, ſince the cenſors had put his works in the catalogue of prohibited books. He wrote to the Pope about it, by the advice of Arias Montanus; and he prepared an apology, where proteſting that he had been always a good Catholic, he ſhewed that he could not avoid giving Edward the title of king (*c*). As he was a very good poet, he publiſhed in 1554, an epithalamium upon the marriage of Philip II with queen Mary (*d*). This perhaps would have been a conſiderable fortune to him, if England had remained quiet. He left it during the troubles [*D*], and confined himſelf at Horn; but the king of Denmark quickly ſent for him, to make him preceptor to the prince, his ſon (*e*). Junius not being able to reconcile

(*a*) See his Apology among his Letters, pag. 392, where he ſays that he went thither, when Charles V was before Landrecy.

(*b*) Pag. 388, 469.

(*c*) See his Letter to Vulcanius, pag. 124, where he boaſts of having ſlighted that diſgrace.

(*d*) Ib. pag. 214.

(*e*) See the remark [*E*].

Faults of Moreri, and the Tranſlator of Thuanus.

[*A*] *Junius . . . . . . born at Horn in Holland.*] Moreri, in the article of HADRIAN (Junius), ſays, that vulgarly his name was Jonghe, or Du Jon; and afterwards when he ſpeaks of Francis Junius, profeſſor at Leyden, he makes only his vulgar name to be Jonghe. There is nothing exact in this; for in the firſt place he ſhould have ſaid de Jonghe, and that only with reſpect to Hadrian Junius, ſince it is falſe, that in the Dutch tongue his name could be indifferently either De Jonghe or Du Jon. In the ſecond place it is falſe, that the vulgar name of Francis Junius was any other than Du Jon. It is ſaid in Thuanus's tranſlation (1), that Horn, the native place of Hadrian Junius, is a village of Guelderland. It is a great blunder, which I do not find in Thuanus of the Francfort edition, 1625. If the tranſlator found that fault in his edition, he is excuſable; but here is another thing to be cenſured. He ſays, that Junius leaving Haerlem becauſe of the ſiege, *went to Armuyden near Middelburg, where having in vain uſed great diligence and pains, to afford ſome remedy to the miſeries of that beſieged town, he was ſo troubled with the change of air*, &c. It is plain that *that beſieged town* neither relates to Middelburg nor Armuyden, but to Haerlem. Now it is very falſe that Junius thought of relieving *that beſieged town*, when he was at Armuyden; for he went not thither till Haerlem was taken. Thuanus (2) cannot be well excuſed for this miſtake: for though in writing Latin, there is no neceſſity to clear a period according to the ſtrictneſs of French Grammar: yet he would never have expreſſed himſelf as he did, had he thought that Junius did not go into Zeland, till after the taking of Haerlem. It cannot be ſaid that he there ſpeaks of the ſiege of Middelburg, or the ſiege of Armuyden, ſince theſe two places were not beſieged whilſt Junius lived in Zeland. Melchior Adam has tranſcribed Thuanus's fault. They ſhould have known that this Phyſician ſtaid ſome time at Delft, after the taking of Haerlem, before his going into Zeland.

(1) Apud Teiſſier, Addit. aux Eloges, Tom. I, pag. 479.

(2) Ad Armuydam juxta Mildeburgum in Mattiacis ſe contulerat, ubi cum fruſtra conſilio & diligentia ſua concivibus laborantibus opem ferre conatus eſſet, ex cœli mutatione . . . in letalem morbum incidit. *Thuan. lib. lxii.*

[*B*] *The firſt of July*, 1511.] This is what we find in the Life of Junius, prefixed to his epiſtles, *vitam hanc orditur Kalendis Julii, anni* 1511. Some pages after, we read that he died 'Die 16 Junii anno 1575. 'cum explevisset annum ætatis 63 qui magnus cli'mactericus annus Medicis vocatur. —— *He died the 'ſixteenth day of June, in the year* 1575, *when he had 'completed the ſixty third year of his age, which the 'Phyſicians call the great climacteric.*' Which ſhews that Thuanus and Melchior Adam are miſtaken, who make him die in his climacterical year. But becauſe this Life of Junius is not very exact, and the edition of the epiſtles (3) to which it is prefixed, is ſaid to have been printed in the year 1552, though it contains the epitaph of the author who died in 1575, and ſome of his letters dated in 1574, I would not rigorouſly condemn the Chronology of Meurſius, who places the birth of this learned man to the year 1512 (4). That which makes me ſay that his life (5) is not exact, is, that beſides the two dates I have mentioned out of it, I there find his epitaph, which imports, that he lived ſixty three years. If the author of this life thought the epitaph was right, he was in the wrong to place Junius's birth-day on the firſt of July, 1511, and to ſay that on the ſixteenth of June, 1575, he had compleated the ſixty third year of his age. On the other hand, when a man is full ſixty four years old within fifteen days, it is a great negligence to ſay that he is ſixty three years old, or that he has paſſed his ſixty third year. But whether there be little or much negligence in it, it is certain, that Moreri, Freherus, Melchior Adam, Sir Thomas-Pope Blount, and thoſe who place Junius's birth in the year 1513, are all thereby confuted. The edition of his letters is not very correct; and beſides they are not placed according to the time in which they were written, and no care has been taken to diſcover and ſupply the dates where they are wanting, which very often happens. Theſe two defects are but too common in ſuch ſort of collections.

(3) *I make uſe of an edition, printed at Dort*, apud Vincentium Caimax, in 12mo.

(4) Valerius Andreas, *Bibl. Belg.* and Bullart, *Academ. des Sciences*, have followed it.

(5) I cannot tell whether it be that, which Beverwyck promiſes in a Letter to Voſſius, dated the twelfth of June 1626. See the Letters written to Voſſius, *n.* 78, *pag. m.* 47.

[*C*] *He was the ſon of a burgomaſter of great worth*] The father of our Junius had not only been ſecretary, and afterwards five times burgomaſter of Horn, but alſo twice deputed to the court of Denmark, and once to Sweden, and other places. He was a man of learning, and wrote a Latin book, which was never printed, containing the original and growth of Horn (6.)

(6) Boxhornius, Theatr. Holland, pag. 373.

[*D*] *He left it during the troubles.*] For want of a better guide, I have followed the life of Junius, which is perfixed to his letters; though I am not ignorant that exactneſs will not ſuffer us to make this author live in England from the firſt time of his coming thither, till the troubles that happened after the marriage reconcile himſelf [*E*] either to the climate, or the genius of the inhabitants, retired in ſo abrupt a manner, as not to take his leave of the king. It is probable, this was in 1564 (*f*). He ſettled at Haerlem [*F*], where he practiſed Phyſic, and married, and was made principal of the college. The States of Holland commiſſioned him to write the hiſtory of that province, of which he would have acquitted himſelf honourably, and with greater exactneſs than he did, if he could have put the laſt hand to the work, which came out after his death, under the title of *Batavia* (*g*). When the Spaniards beſieged the town of Haerlem, he found a way to eſcape out of it, to attend the prince of Orange, who deſired to uſe his medicines. The town being taken in 1573, his library was pillaged, where he had left ſeveral works, which had coſt him a great deal of pains, and by which he hoped to immortalize himſelf. He might ſoon have put them in a condition to be publiſhed; which increaſed his grief. He went into Zeland, where the prince's recommendation procured him a public ſalary, for practiſing Phyſic in Middelburg: but the air of the country was very diſagreeable to him. He there got ſome diſtempers, which, together with his grief for the loſs of his library, occaſioned his death the ſixteenth of June 1575, being ſixty four years old wanting ſome days. His body was carried from Armuyden to Middelburg, where his eldeſt ſon cauſed him to be honourably buried, and compoſed his epitaph [*G*]. We have ſeveral books of his compoſing [*H*]. I will ſay ſomething of them in the laſt remark. He was deſigned for a Profeſſor's chair at Leyden [*I*], where the univerſity was, as

marriage of Mary with Philip II, for I ſee ſome of his letters (7) are dated from Haerlem, or Horn, in the year 1552, and at the beginning of 1554, which beſpeak a ſedentary man. Many of thoſe who have written lives, have ſtood very much in need of advice.

[*E*] *Not being able to reconcile himſelf.*] This appears from the three hundred and eighty fifth page of his letters, where he thus ſpeaks to Sambucus. 'Liberet mihi Polydori exemplo erumpere in hæc verba, 'adſum profectus Danica è caligine, niſi longinqui ac 'moleſti itineris ceu partus recordationem obliteraſſet 'jucundus amicorum reduci quotidie gratulantium '. . . . . . occurſus. —— *I might, after the example 'of Polydore, break out into theſe words: here I am, 'emerged from Daniſh darkneſs; had not the agree'able meeting of my friends, congratulating me daily 'on my return, blotted out the memory of a long and 'troubleſome journey, as of child-birth.*' He adds ſeveral reaſons for his refuſing the ſalary, and this was no inconſiderable one (8), which he might have enjoyed at Copenhagen. In another letter (9), he ſays, that he and his wife abhorred that country. In another he deſires an augmentation of his ſalary. I find there, that he was invited to be Phyſican to the king, but not to be tutor to the young prince.

[*F*] *He ſettled at Haerlem.*] The author of his life has not well diſtinguiſhed the times. He ſays that he ſettled at Haerlem, and married only after his return from Copenhagen. But I have proved (10) he returned from thence in the year 1564, and we ſee by a letter (11) which he wrote in 1559, that he had fixed himſelf at Haerlem a good while before, and that he was married to a handſome woman who brought him a fortune. The Epiſtle Dedicatory of his treatiſe *de Anno*, that of his tract *de Coma*, and that of his *Animadverſorum*, are dated from that town in 1556.

[*G*] *His eldeſt ſon compoſed his epitaph.*] Boxhornius having added an appendix to his *Theatrum Hollandiæ*, for the omiſſions he thought were to be ſupplied, amongſt other things inſerted this epitaph in great letters, but he let three faults creep into it, *velint* inſtead of *meruit*, 67 inſtead of 63, and 15 inſtead of 16, *Vixit ann. LXIIIX. obiit die XV.* &c.

[*H*] *We have ſeveral books of his compoſing.*] His chief works beſides thoſe already mentioned (12), are, *Animadverſorum libri ſex. Commentarius de Coma. Adagiorum ab Eraſmo omiſſorum centuriæ octo cum dimidia* (13). *Appendix ad Epitheta Textoris. Copiæ cornu, ſive Oceanus enarrationum Homericarum ex Euſtathii Commentariis collectus in unum volumen.* A *Nomenclator. Commentarius de anno & menſibus.* Several kinds of Latin verſes. The tranſlation of *Eunapius de vitis Sophiſtarum.* That of Heſychius Mileſius, that of Plutarch's table-talk (14). That of the queſtions relating to Phyſic, of Caſſius Iatroſophiſta, made and printed at Paris in 1541. (It is I believe the firſt of his works.) I mention not a great number of authors, whom he has illuſtrated with notes, as Nonius Marcellus, Plautus, Seneca, Pliny (15), Virgil, Horace (16). He had been a long time upon Suidas, and deſigned to dedicate it to the prince of Orange's ſon, as he owns to an Engliſh lord (17), whoſe good offices he deſires with that prince, in order to be gratified with a preſent before hand; for he underſtood as well as any body elſe how to make the beſt of an epiſtle dedicatory.

I have ſomething to obſerve concerning three of his works. I. The author of his Life ſays that the *Animadverſorum libri ſex* were loſt, when Haerlem was taken: I do not well underſtand what he means; for they were publiſhed by the author himſelf, and dedicated to Antony Perenot, biſhop of Arras, in the year 1556. Gruterus has inſerted them in the fourth volume of his *Theſaurus Criticus*. II. As for the *Appendix ad Epitheta Textoris*, it may be ſaid that Junius handled that matter with another ſort of learning than Textor, who committed very groſs faults in it. See ſome of them in Junius's letters (18). He looked upon it as a moſt profitable and painful work (19). III. His *Nomenclator* is in it's kind an excellent book. The choice of words in eight languages is no leſs a proof of Junius's learning, than of his indefatigable patience. It is ſaid (20) that he underſtood eight languages very well, Greek, Latin, Italian, French, Spaniſh, High-Dutch, Engliſh, and Dutch. His travels had done him great ſervice on that account: I find he had been in France, Italy, Germany, and England, but not in Spain, as Valerius Andreas (21), Moreri, and Freherus affirm. Colomiés has publiſhed (22) a little ſtory, which he had from Iſaac Voſſius; it ſhews that Junius neglected nothing to perfect his *Nomenclator*, and that he condeſcended to drink with Carters to learn the terms of their trade: beſides, I believe it appears from one of his letters (23), that he did not think it a great crime to drink plentifully without being drunk.

When I ſay that this *Nomenclator* is an excellent book in its kind, I do not pretend to deny, that there are faults in it, and very groſs ones (24); I only mean that the good things that are in it very much exceed what has been commonly publiſhed on that ſubject. Now in works of this nature, where it is impoſſible not to miſtake, perfection does not demand that an author ſhould be free from all faults. Such a book is like man: he is the moſt perfect that has the feweſt faults.

Vitiis nemo ſine naſcitur, optimus ille eſt qui minimis
urgetur (5).

[*I*] *He was deſigned for a profeſſor's chair at Leyden.*] It is Meurſius who ſays this; *Sub mortis tempus*, ſays he (26), *Academiæ naſcenti inter primos profeſſores deſtinatus, ſed inter ipſa initia morte abreptus inchoare munus non potuit.* Freherus (27) who tranſcribes this, without adding what univerſity is meant throws his readers into the dark, or into an illuſion; one would think that he means Middelburg, of which he had been ſpeaking, and that an univerſity had been lately founded there. I ſhall obſerve on this occaſion,

(*f*) See his Letters, pag. 385.

(*g*) Voſſius, de Scient Mathem. pag. 259. Pontus Heuter. lib. ii, de Vet. Belgio, cap. xxv.

(7) Pag. 339, 345, 348.

(8) It was a ſalary of four hundred rixdollars (*German crowns*), pag. 409.

(9) Ibid.

(10) See, above, citation (*f*).

(11) Pag. 179. See concerning his miſtreſs, pag. 109.

(12) In the body of this article.

(13) This book is placed among thoſe of Francis Junius, profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden, in the catalogue of the Bodleian Library.

(14) Huetius, *de Claris Interpretibus*, ſpeaks of thoſe tranſlations with great contempt.

(15) See his Life prefixed to his Epiſtles, and in Melchior Adam.

(16) See his Letters, pag. 5, 6.

(17) Epiſt. pag. 173. *See alſo* pag. 116.

(18) Pag. 406.

(19) Ib. pag. 116.

(20) Meurſius, Athen. Batav.

(21) Bibl. Belg. pag. 12.

(22) Opuſc. pag. m. 132.

(23) It is written to a biſhop, pag. 460.

(24) See what Crenius, *Animad. Phil & Hiſtor. Part. I, pag.* 31, *& ſeq.* quotes out of Gronovius, *&c.*

(25) Horat. Sat. III, lib. i, ver. 68.

(26) Athen. Batav. pag. 93.

(27) Theatr. pag. 1270.

as it were, juſt born, when he died. I have not yet had time fully to examine whether he at laſt turned Proteſtant [*K*].

It appears from one of his letters (*b*), that he put himſelf into a great paſſion, when he heard that one of his ſcholars had accuſed him of commanding his boarders not to go to church. He proteſts, on the contrary, that he forced them to go upon holidays; for he condemned to conſiderable fines thoſe who neglected to go. Elſewhere (*i*) he complains of his poverty, and that being loaded with debts, and obliged to equip himſelf, he had no money in his pocket.

occaſion, that nothing cauſes a greater obſcurity in books than the not taking pains to add the neceſſary ſupplements to what is taken out of other authors. A thouſand things are clear in the originals, which are unintelligible, when they are nakedly removed into another place.

[*K*] *I have not had time fully to examine whether he at laſt turned Proteſtant.*] That which holds me in ſuſpence is, a letter (28) that he wrote to the biſhop of Haerlem in 1573, to give him an account of the endeavours he had uſed to hinder this prelate's houſe from being plundered. He tells him, that he preſerved this Depoſitum, as well as he could, and that he gave it not up to the plunderers till he was overpowered, being threatened with immediate death, with a piſtol to his breaſt. He adds, that the impunity of theſe wicked attempts obliged him to ask leave to retire out of the town, which he obtained. It is certain he vigorouſly complained to the magiſtrates of the violence that had been done him (29), and that he told them the Spaniards would hardly be guilty of the ſame exceſſes, if they were maſters of the town. That which I do not underſtand, is what he tells this prelate, that to preſerve his houſe, it had been neceſſary to drive away the French, who prophaned every thing with a cruel rage, *excludendo barbaram & crudelem Gallorum omnia profanantium rabiem* (§ α). I do not take the *Index librorum probibitorum & expurgandorum* (30), wherein he is called a Calviniſt, and an author *damnatæ memoriæ*, to be a convincing proof.

[(§ α) Theſe were probably ſome remains of the Proteſtant troops, which being defeated in 1571, had followed Genlis into the Low-Countries *. Theſe were no longer thoſe Proteſtant ſoldiers, who in the firſt civil-war, appeared ſuch enemies to vice and all ſorts of violence. REM. CRIT.]

JUNIUS (*a*) (FRANCIS) profeſſor of Divinity (*b*) at Leyden, was born at Bourges the firſt of May 1545. He was of a noble family [*A*]. His father, who was a man of the Long Robe, found himſelf expoſed to many perſecutions for being ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm [*B*]. He expoſed his wife to horrid ſlanders, becauſe ſhe proved

[*A*] *He was of a noble family.*] WILLIAM du Jon, his grandfather, lord of Boſſardiniere near Iſſoudun, was enobled for the good ſervices he had done in the expedition into Navarre, when endeavours were uſed to reſtore John d'Albret unjuſtly deprived of his kingdom by Ferdinand of Arragon. He had alſo been a ſervant to the king (1). He left three ſons, the laſt whereof, called DENYS, ſtudied the civil-law, and took his degrees at Toulouſe. He performed his ſtudies but ill (2); for as he had a great ſpirit, he was always engaged in the quarrels of the ſcholars. In a word, he was a great dueliſt. He obtained the office of the king's counſellor at Bourges, as a reward of a bold action he had done. We ſhall ſee it in the following remark. He had nine children, of which our Francis Junius was one (3).

[*B*] *His father ..... found himſelf expoſed to many perſecutions for being ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm.*] The ſuperior of the Franciſcans of Iſſoudun preached ſo impudently againſt Margaret queen of Navarre, ducheſs of Berry, and ſiſter to Francis I, as to ſay, that becauſe ſhe was a Lutheran, ſhe deſerved to be ſowed up in a ſack, and to be thrown into the ſea. The magiſtrates of the place adviſed him not to be wanting in the reſpect, that was due to that princeſs; but he laughed at their advice, and went on preaching in the ſame ſtrain. Informations were made againſt him, and ſent to the king. The king being reſolved to puniſh him with the ſame puniſhment, to which he had adjudged the princeſs, ordered the monk ſhould be brought to him. The queen of Navarre interceding for him, obtained that the puniſhment ſhould be moderated. The difficulty was to ſeize that Monk, who had the mob on his ſide; ſo that the magiſtrates of Iſſoudun durſt not undertake the execution of his majeſty's orders. Denys du Jon, being returned from the ſchools where he had fought ſo many duels, declared that if his majeſty would give him a commiſſion to take the Monk, he would punctually execute it. This commiſſion being diſpatched for him, he put himſelf at the head of the archers, and in ſpite of the populace, he took the preacher out of the cloyſter, who was ſent to the gallies for two years. Du Jon by this ingratiated himſelf with Francis I, and the ducheſs of Berry; but he incurred the hatred of the people, and of the Franciſcans, and found himſelf expoſed to many calumnies, and threatenings, and involved in proceſſes, which ended at laſt in a cruel maſſacre, committed on his perſon. *Hæc prima fuit actio, quæ in gratiam Regis, ſororiſque Reginæ inſinuavit patrem: ſed apud illam inconſultam plebeculam & Franciſcanorum ordinem odia perpetua conciliavit; indigniſſimaſque calumnias, minas, criminationes, perſecutiones, damna, cruentam denique cædem patri apportavit* (4). He was accuſed of Lutheraniſm, and his maid was ſuborned to atteſt that he did not obſerve faſting days. *Et Franciſcanorum arte, & plebis imprudentia odioque maximo preſſus eſt ſub religionis ſpecie & Lutheraniſmi .... accuſatus, ſubornata ad eam rem ancilla quæ domi ſerviverat. Ea patrem à ſe viſum, quum diebus vetitis carnes ederet, pro teſtimonio dicebat falſo, ut matrem ſæpe audivi confirmantem* (5). He betook himſelf to flight, being unwilling to truſt himſelf with ſuch paſſionate people: they ſeized on his eſtate, and the queen of Navarre was obliged to ſupply him wherewithal to ſubſiſt for near a year. At laſt by the king's authority the accuſations were brought to nothing, and then du Jon obtained a place of counſellor, &c. 'Liberatus ab accuſatione pater auctoritate Regis, patrium ſolum repetit, atque immigrat in Biturigum metropolin, ubi cum laude ad exitum uſque vitæ Conſiliarii Regii & pro Tribuno militum honoribus à Rege collatis defunctus eſt: præter alia commoda honoraria, quæ à Regina ſorore illius & Biturigum Duce acceperat (6), —— *His father, being diſcharged from the accuſation by the king's authority, returns home, and goes to Bourges in Berry, where, to his death, he honourably diſcharged the offices of king's counſellor and colonel, conferred on him by the king; beſides other honorary benefits, which he received from the queen, his ſiſter, and the duke of Berry.*' Hear how he was killed. On *Corpus Chriſti* day, the Catholics of Iſſoudun, without any regard to the treaty of peace, which had been juſt concluded, committed a thouſand violences againſt the Reformed. The king diſpatched a commiſſion to Denys du Jon to inquire into that inſurrection, and to puniſh the authors of it. Du Jon repaired to Iſſoudun, accompanied only by three archers; he diſperſed the reſt in ſeveral places, before he entered the town, it being neceſſary to uſe prudence in ſo nice an affair. His precautions did him no ſervice; it was conjectured upon what account he came; the people ſeized on the gates, and beſieged the houſe of the commiſſioner. They broke into it, killed du Jon, threw him out at the window, dragged him along the ſtreets, expoſed him to the dogs, and publickly forbad (7) any to bury him (8). The king's council, out of indignation againſt this inſolence, ordered that the walls of Iſſoudun ſhould be demoliſhed, but Cipierre, and ſome other lords, got the decree changed, eſpecially becauſe the murthered commiſſioner had been ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm above twenty four years. The widow of the deceaſed deſiring to proſecute the murderers, got the hatred of a great many

---

(*b*) Epiſtol pag. 387.

(*i*) Ib pag. 149. See alſo pag. 254

(28) Pag. 497.

(29) Pag. 381.

(30) Pag. 476. Edit. 1607, in fol.

* Thuan. lib. li.

(*a*) His true name was Du Jon, and not *Jongbe*, as Moreri will have it.

(*b*) And not a Civilian, as Father Jacob ſays in his *Bibliotheca Pontif.* pag. 460.

(1) In cuſtodia & equili ... Ludovici XII, miniſtravit. *Franciſcus Junius, in Vita ſua, Tom. I, Oper. pag.* 6, *col.* 1.

(2) Hinc ab avo ſolennis literarum quas Dionyſio filio mittebat, & falſa inſcriptio, *Dionyſio dilecto filio miſſo ad ſtudendum*, pro eo quod alii vulgo inſcribunt, *ſtudenti. Id. ibid.*

(3) Taken from Junius's Life.

(4) Franciſcus Junius, ubi ſupra, col. 2.

(5) Id. ibid.

(6) Id. ibid pag. 7, col. 1.

(7) However a woman buried him in the night. *Id. ibid.*

(8) Taken from the Life of Franciſcus Junius pag. 14.

proved with child, whilſt it was believed he had fled away [*C*], and it was not known that he came once ſecretly to ſee her. Our Francis Junius was carefully educated, and became a very learned man, to which his natural modeſty, together with his great ambition [*D*], did not a little contribute. He began to ſtudy the civil-law under Hugo Donellus at thirteen years of age. Some years after he was ſent to Lyons, in order to join the embaſſador, whom the king of France ſent to Conſtantinople: but not arriving till after the departure of the embaſſador, he ſtaid at Lyons, and applied himſelf to his ſtudies with an incredible induſtry. Bartholomew Aneau [*E*], who was principal of the college of that town, gave him good advice about the right method of ſtudying. The young gentleman found himſelf expoſed to two very different temptations, to that of love, and that of impiety. He vigorouſly oppoſed the firſt; for he gave a box on the ear to a young woman, who came to careſs him [*F*]: but he

yielded

ny people, and ſpent her eſtate. *Hæc cædes conſilium Regis commovit plurimùm: & decretum de labefactendis muris totius oppidi in eo factum propter atrocitatem ſceleris, & periculoſiſſimum exemplum illius. Sed poſtea converſa eſt factionibus tota ratio conſilii: tum propter Sipierrii Gubernatoris & nonnullorum ex nobilitate procerum inveterata odia, tum propter religionis Pontificiæ Zelum, cujus odio indeſinenter flagraviſſe inde ab annis amplius viginti quatuor criminabantur patrem. Itaque cædem illam neceſſe habuit mater in Regis conſilio perſequi ex eo tempore: quo facto, cùm ipſa in ſe multorum concitavit odia, tum omnia fermè commoda quæ ex bellica licentia, furtis, rapinis, graſſationibuſque reſtabant ipſi, in hac perſecutione occupavit* (9).

I need not put any body in mind of the ill effects of a religious zeal. Thoſe who are poſſeſſed with it, juſtify a murder, and diſapprove the conduct of a woman, who deſires that thoſe who have murdered her husband ſhould be puniſhed. But I deſire my readers to conſider well one thing. Religion, which is looked upon all over the world as the ſtrongeſt ſupport of the ſupreme authority, and which would be actually ſo, if it was well underſtood and practiſed, is commonly that, which moſt enervates that ſame authority. There was nothing more juſt than the decree of Francis I, againſt the preacher of Iſſoudun; a man who had the impudence to treat the king's ſiſter ſo baſely in the pulpit. And yet not one magiſtrate durſt execute the king's orders againſt this mutineer, and when a gentleman has the courage to execute them, he expoſes himſelf to a thouſand perſecutions, and becomes ſo odious, that his murtherers are openly protected. The queen of Navarre, was the firſt who adviſed this gentleman to leave his country (10), ſince the execution of his prince's orders would expoſe him to the hatred of the bigots. An evident proof that the court did not think itſelf ſtrong enough to protect it's good ſervants perſecuted by churchmen. It is commonly ſaid that the miniſtry of the goſpel *eſt ipſis Angelis tremendum.* —— *Is formidable to the angels*; we may add *& ipſis quoque Regibus.* —— *And to kings alſo.* Read the hiſtory of the Romiſh church, and you will find that the greateſt princes have had more reaſon to fear the paſſions raiſed by the zealots, than the arms of the infidels: thus that very thing which ought to be the ſupport of the ſtate, is very often the greateſt obſtacle that ſovereigns meet with in the execution of their orders (11).

[*C*] *He expoſed his wife to horrid ſlanders, becauſe ſhe proved with child.*] It is an imprudence to venture the being ſo, when the husband is a fugitive; for if he ſhould die before he returned, and before the lying-in, and without owning that he is the father of the child, three things very poſſible, how could a woman juſtify herſelf to the public? but farther, is it nothing to give a handle to ill tongues, as the wife of Du Jon did? it will be ſaid that it is eaſy to talk ſo, when one is diſcourſing of it in cold blood, without conſidering the caſe of amorous people. After ſome months abſence, their love is ſo violent, that no conſideration can reſtrain them; paſſion hurries them along, and they are not able to hearken to any reaſon:

> Fertur equis auriga, neque audit currus habenas (12).
>
> *So the fierce courſers ſtarting to the race . . . .*
> *Nor reins, nor curbs, nor threat'ning cries they fear,*
> *But force along the trembling charioteer.*
>
> DRYDEN.

However it be, our Junius's mother was defamed upon that account, at which ſhe was moſt ſenſibly afflicted (13).

[*D*] *His natural modeſty, together with his great ambition.*] Theſe two paſſions do not ſeem to be conſiſtent one with another, and yet ſometimes they join together. Junius is an inſtance of it. He confeſſes, that in his younger years he wiſhed to be honoured and praiſed more than he ought to do, and that he could not ſuffer the praiſes, which were given to others. 'Natura me puerum ad honoris & laudis 'appetentiam plus ſatis accendente. Sic enim mala 'radix illa τῆς φιλοτιμίας in me germinabat, ut 'nec alienam laudem iſta ætate æquo animo ferre 'poſſem miſer, nec in mea exiſtimatione illa con'quieſcere quam mihi conciliabam pertinaciſſima di'ligentia.' On the other hand he acknowledges, that he was ſo timorous, and baſhful, that even when he was near fifty years old, he could not ſpeak to his own wiſe without bluſhing, and that he durſt hardly command his own domeſtics. 'Pudor ſummus qui me 'ad hanc uſque ætatem ſic preſſit, ut ruſticus magis 'ad omnia quam urbanus merito haberi poſſim . . . . 'Quid dicam niſi impudentem ferme pudorem eſſe 'qui me tantopore impeditum diſtinet, ut vix ſine pu'dore uxori res vulgareis enunciem, vix jam domi 'ſervitio imperem.' He pretends to have drawn great advantages from this baſhfulneſs; becauſe diſtruſting himſelf, he applied himſelf much more to improve by what he heard and ſaw (14); and he declares he would not acquaint his readers with his infirmity, if he did not believe, it would be a moſt uſeful leſſon of modeſty to youth. 'Hoc eo libentius prædico de 'infirmitate mea, ut juventus ab exemplo meo præ'ceptum hauriat ταπεινοφροσύνης atque modeſtiæ, ut 'certum fructum peritiæ certo judicio aſſequatur. Id 'enim teſtor, nihil mihi ſecundum benedictionem 'Dei tam commodaviſſe in rebus omnibus, quàm il'lam de me ipſo diffidentiam ex conſcientia infirmi'tatis & pudoris mei, & ſtudioſam aliorum, quibuſ'cunque adſui, obſervantiam.' That modeſty and rare humility which makes a man diſtruſt his own ſtrength, cannot be too much praiſed: but it is certain it is of no uſe to the making of one's fortune in the world; and if a father has a deſign that his children ſhould come to perferments, I would adviſe him rather to inſpire them with vanity and preſumption, than with diffidence of their own merit. Junius is perhaps the only perſon, who with reſpect to worldly advantages, was not the worſe for his modeſty. I do not pretend to affirm that arrogance is always uſeful: it ſometimes ruins young men, and hinders them from riſing; I ſpeak only of this in general, without regarding the exceptions.

[*E*] *Bartholomew Aneau.*] I have ſpoken elſewhere (15) of his Commentary upon Alciatus's emblems. He was called in Latin *Annulus*, or *Anulus*: he was a native of Bourges, and publiſhed ſeveral books (16). He was wickedly killed in the tumult of religion, where Junius had like to have loſt his life: his wiſe would have had the ſame fate, if the provoſt of Lyons had not ſaved her by impriſoning her (17).

[*F*] *He gave a box on the ear to a young woman who came to careſs him.*] This is a thing much more admirable than Theagenes's action (18), as being hiſtorical, whereas that of Theagenes is only a romantic fiction. Junius, intent upon his ſtudies, thought of nothing leſs, than of making love. In the mean time he was teazed for his want of gallantry, and it was repreſented to him, that he would never learn civility, if he did not fall in love. Theſe diſcourſes having no influence upon his conduct, they expoſed him to the careſſes of three or four young women,

who

An important reflexion upon the effects of falſe zeal.

---

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Felicius certe utiliuſque politicos honores geſturo, & Remp. adminiſtraturo, ſi poſt tam forte auſum honeſta & cauta migratione, quam ſæpe fieri Navarrena Regina & nonnulli Proceres cupiverunt, ut alibi Reip. inſerviret pater, ſibi proſpexiſſet. *Id. ibid. pag.* 6, *col.* 2.

(11) Compare what has been ſaid in the article ABDAS, remark [*B*].

(12) Virgil. Geogr. lib. i, ver. 514.

(13) Profugus pater clam ad matrem ſemel redierat, hinc gravida facta mater proſcindebatur à vulgo. tanquam ſi proſtituta fuiſſet pudicitia illius. Utroque hoc incommodo ſanctæ illius fœminæ animus oppugnabatur, objicientibus maligne quam plurimis tum Franciſcani illius reverſionem, tum graviditatem, ut ajebant, impudicam *Junius, in Vita ſua, pag.* 7, *col.* 1.

(14) Ex pudore hæc conſequuta ſunt inde à puero quod mihi ſemper ſim diffiſus, quod aliorum factis audiendis, ſermonibus obſervandis & advertendis in uſum meum ſtuduerim. *Idem, ibid. col* 2.

(15) Above, in the remark [*M*], of the article ALCIATUS, (ANDREW).

(16) *See* La Croix du Maine, pag. 32, & Du Verdier Vau-Privas, pag. 110, 111.

(17) See Junius's Life, pag. 10, col. ii.

(18) See the article HELIODORUS, remark [*C*].

yielded ſo much to the ſophiſtry of a libertine, that he found himſelf a perfect Atheiſt [G], after lending an ear to him for ſome days. He did not remain long in that unhappy condition; a tumult about religion, which obliged him to run away, in order to ſave his life, afforded him an occaſion of reſuming his firſt faith. His father recalled him to Bourges, and diſcovering ſomething of the opinions his ſon was imbued with, he gave him good inſtructions, and without ſeeming to know any thing of the matter, brought him to read the New Teſtament. The firſt words (c) that Junius met with, affected him [H] ſo ſenſibly, that he quickly grew out of conceit with whatever related not to piety. In the beginning of the civil-wars, he went to Geneva, for the ſtudy of the languages. As he carried but little money with him, and had none ſent him, he found himſelf reduced to extreme neceſſity [I]. At laſt he received wherewithal to deliver himſelf from his miſery, and to pay his debts; and hearing the tragical end of his father (d), he reſolved to get his livelihood by teaching youth. He undertook that employment at Geneva, which he diſcharged till he was ſent into the Low-Countries (e) to be miniſter of the Walloon church at Antwerp. He performed that office in the midſt of many dangers; for tho' he oppoſed the indiſcreet zeal of thoſe, who, without any lawful authority,

who impudently attacked him. They fell violently upon him, and omitted nothing to triumph over his modeſty. At laſt, he loſt his patience, and gave one of them a box on the ear; this blow cauſed a great noiſe in the houſe. The girl, who had received it, finding by the young man's look, that it was not by way of jeſt, but out of anger that ſhe had been thus uſed, fell a crying and lamenting. She was laughed at, and Junius too; but this made him odious to ſeveral people. Theſe are his own words. ‘Dies & noctes appetebant canes illæ promiſcuè, neſcium quid ſibi vellent, & gravitatis honeſtatiſque illius, quam in domo paterna videram, ſubinde recordantem. Neque id ſeorſim tentabant ſingulæ, verumetiam ternæ aut quaternæ ſimul conſertis manibus in me irruebant immodeſtiſſimè, ut perducto ad ſuam impuritatem animo meo de ſpoliis pudoris mei triumpharent. Tandem verò adeò me puduit illarum impudentiæ, ut quum una multis ſpectantibus me amatoriè eſſet a-dorſa palpo, ego contrà colaphum gravem ei impegerim: quem illa addubitans utram in partem acciperet, defixis oculis attenta reſpexit ad me, aliquantiſper obſervans aliquam mei animi ſignificationem: ut autem rem ſeriam à me eſſe vidit, tum illa vociferationibus & ejulatibus implevit domum, omniumque riſum imprudens in ſeſe, ſtultorum odia in me concitavit (19).’ He was ſo tired with thoſe temptations, that he had a thouſand times the thoughts of returning to his father, without taking leave of the people of the houſe, where his chaſtity ſuffered ſo many attacks; but he feared their reſentment, and the calumnies they might make uſe of, to diſparage him in his family.

[G] *He yielded ſo much to the ſophiſtry of a Libertine, that he found himſelf a perfect Atheiſt.*] By Bartholomew Aneau's advice, he had read *Cicero de Legibus*, and made collections out of it. In the mean while he received a viſit from a man, and heard him maintain with ſo many arguments, what Cicero alledges concerning Epicurus's rejecting a providence, that he gave way to that impious doctrine: which he did the more eaſily, becauſe it was the conſtant table-talk, and all the houſe rung with it (20). ‘Memini, quum libros M. Tullii de legibus per illud tempus, auctore & ſuaſore Anulo (de quo ante dixi) expenderem, & notas quaſdam in eos animadverſioneſque colligerem, venire hominem ad me, & illa Epicuri verba quæ libro primo extant (21), nihil curare Deum nec ſui, nec alieni, multis quàm diligentiſſimè confirmare: ad quæ ego non ratione judicioque certe reſpondebam: ſed aſſenſionem paulatim adhibens, ſentiebam venenum ſerpens, quod imbiberam, confirmari in me: & cum auctoritate hominis, tum argutis dictorum ejus præceps eò deferebar, ut meus animus in iſto malo hærens occalleſceret, totuſque fieret ἀναισθητός (22).’

[H] *The firſt words that he met with in the New Teſtament affected him.*] The thing is ſo edifying, and ſo likely to imprint a due ſenſe of the efficacy of the word of God, that I ought to ſet down the whole paſſage. ‘Hic ergo novum illud teſtamentum divinitus oblatum aperio: aliud agenti exhibet ſe mihi aſpectu primo auguſtiſſimum illud caput Joannis Evangeliſtæ & Apoſtoli, in principio erat Verbum, &c. Lego partem capitis, & ita commoveor legens, ut repente divinitatem argumenti, & ſcripti majeſtatem auctoritatemque ſenſerim longo intervallo omnibus eloquentiæ humanæ fluminibus præeuntem. Horrebat corpus, ſtupebat animus, & totum illum diem ſic afficiebar, ut qui eſſem, ipſe mihi incertus viderer eſſe. Recordatus es mei, Domine Deus mi, pro immenſa miſericordia tua, ovemque perditam in gregem tuum recepiſti. Ex eo tempore, quum in me Deus tam potenter Spiritus ſui virtute irruiſſet, alia frigidiùs & negligentiùs legere & tractare cœpi; de his verò quæ ad pietatem pertinent cogitare ampliùs, & ardentiùs in eis verſari (23). —— *Here therefore I open that new Teſtament, the gift of heaven: at firſt ſight, and without deſign, I light upon that moſt auguſt chapter of the Evangeliſt and Apoſtle St John,* In the beginning was the word, *&c. I read part of the chapter, and am ſo affected as I read, that on a ſudden I perceive the divinity of the ſubject, and the majeſty and authority of the writing, far exceeding all human eloquence. I ſhuddered, I was confounded, and was ſo affected that whole day, that I ſcarce knew myſelf. Thou didſt remember me, O Lord my God, for thy great mercy, and didſt receive a loſt ſheep into thy flock. From that time, when God had given me ſo great a meaſure of his holy ſpirit, I began to read other things with more coldneſs and neglect; and to think more of, and be more converſant with, thoſe things, which belong to piety.*

[I] *He found himſelf reduced to extream neceſſity.*] He gives a long account of it, whereof I will obſerve but theſe two things. Having only, upon the approach of the winter, a linnen doublet and a little cloak, he reſolved to imitate Cleanthes (24), that is, to get ſomething by the labour of his hands. He deſigned to work by the day, and turn pioneer in the ditches of Geneva. But he found a young man of his country, who relieved him. Standing in need of this help longer than he had a mind to, he was afraid of being burthenſome, and in that apprehenſion he brought himſelf to the making but one little meal once a day. This abſtinence laſted four months, and reduced him to ſuch a lean condition, that he was ſcarce able to bear the weight of his ſhirt. He would have died in a little time, if his friends had not prevailed upon him to eat a little more. ‘Ultro ad menſes quatuor jejunium ipſe indixi mihi, & horam prandii in ambulatione, legens & memoriam colens, meditans, orans occupavi: veſpere autem cœna frugali uſus ſum, plurimùm ſorbens bina ova, & mediocrem vini cyathum hauriens. Sed ex diuturna iſta & pervicace inedia paulatim me invaſit tabes, & ita exedit graviter, ut vires omnes exhauſtum corpus deficerent. Quod malum tum demum ſenſi, quum inſtantibus amicis & tabem meam ex vultu recognoſcentibus, ad majorem cibi copiam ſumendam veni, & vivere inſtituti liberalius: nam vel induſii ſolius onere prægravati mihi eſſe humeri videbantur (25). —— *I voluntarily enjoyned myſelf a faſt of four months, and ſpent the hour of dinner in walking, reading, and recollecting, meditating and praying: in the evening I ſupped ſparingly, for the moſt part on two eggs, and a moderate glaſs of wine. But this long and obſtinate faſting brought on me by degrees a conſumption, and quite exhauſted my ſtrength: which I then became ſenſible of, when, at the preſſing inſtances of my friends, who perceived my diſtemper by my looks, I betook myſelf to eating more plentifully, and began to live more freely; for my ſhoulders ſeemed loaden with the weight of my ſhirt alone.*’

(c) The beginning of St John's Goſpel.

(d) See the remark [B].

(e) In the year 1565.

(19) Junius, ibid. pag 9, col. 2.

(20) Iſta horribili impietate conſtrata erat quotidie menſa, perſonabat domus circumſtrepebant omnia aures meas, adeo ut jamque ad alia omnia obſurdeſcerem. Nam quum omnibus horis aliquid atrociter fieri videmus, aut audimus, inquit Tullius, etiam qui natura mitiſſimi ſumus, aſſiduitate moleſtiarum ſenſum omnem humanitatis ex animis amittimus: quum impie fieri aut dici, pietatis ſenſum. *Id. ibid. pag.* 10, *col.* 1.

(21) Here is a ſlip of memory: Junius took the firſt book *de Legibus*, for the firſt book *de Natura Deorum*.

(22) Junius, ubi ſupra.

(23) Ibid pag. 11, col. 2.

(24) Certum deliberatumque erat hebdomade proxime ſequutura . . . alternos dies in egerenda terra ad foſſam urbis, & in ſtudiis conſumere, Cleanthis exemplo, ut levarem inopiam meam. *Id. ibid.*

(25) Ibid. pag. 13, col. 2.

authority, broke the images, and pillaged the temples, he was accounted their inſtigator; which was the reaſon that they often attempted to impriſon him. He had the good fortune always to have timely notice of it, ſo as to avoid being taken. It was found expedient for him to go into the country of Limburg, where he continued his miniſterial functions with good ſucceſs, till the dangers he was expoſed to engaged the magiſtrates to adviſe him to retire into Germany. The curioſity that an old man had, deſerves to be known [*K*], it is ſo proper to ſhew the knavery of the perſecutors, and the fooliſhneſs of the people. Junius was received at Heidelberg by the elector Frederic III, with a great deal of kindneſs, and went to ſee his mother at Bourges; from whence returning to the Palatinate, he was made miniſter of a little church there (*f*). Some time after he was ſent by the elector to the army of the prince of Orange, during the unfortunate expedition of the year 1568. He was chaplain to that prince, till the troops had got into Germany; and then he returned to his church in the Palatinate, where he diſcharged his function till the year 1573, after which he was ſent for to Heidelberg by the Elector Palatine, to tranſlate the Old Teſtament (*g*). He was ſent to Neuſtadt in the year 1578, and at fourteen months end to Otterburg, where he ſtaid eighteen months; after which he returned to Neuſtadt, and read public lectures till prince Caſimir, adminiſtrator of the electorate, ſent for him to Heidelberg, to be profeſſor of Divinity. He returned into France with the duke of Bouillon, and waited on king Henry IV, who ſent him into Germany upon ſome buſineſs. He thought fit to paſs through Holland before he went to give an account of his commiſſion to Henry IV, and being invited to be profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden, he accepted the offer, having firſt obtained the conſent of the embaſſador of France (*h*). He diſcharged the functions of that employment with great ability, till the year 1602, when he died of the plague. He had an averſion for women; but, as he owns himſelf, he was puniſhed by God for it, in the four marriages he contracted [*L*]. He left ſome children [*M*]: he publiſhed many books [*N*]. Thuanus is very much miſtaken

[*K*] *The curioſity that an old man had, deſerves to be known.*] He had been made to believe, that Junius, the Heretical preacher, had cloven feet, and he was not undeceived, till he had viewed him from head to foot. It was in the preſence of a great company, who were met in hopes of hearing a diſpute between Junius and a Franciſcan. The place and hour for the conference were appointed; but the Friar went back, under pretence of having forgot ſomething. I have a hundred times heard ſuch ſort of ſtories, but never ſaw them before ſupported by a printed and authentic teſtimony. Which makes me ſet down Junius's own words. ‘Ridiculum eſt quod dicam, ſed tamen indicium horum ſimplicitatis, & mendaciſſimæ illorum impudentiæ. Quum in campo eſſemus, Franciſcani illius adventum exſpectantes, vir quidam ſenex frequentiam illam maximam quæ tum aderat perrumpens, copiam ſibi fieri videndi mei poſtulavit. Audito ſtrepitu rogabam quid rei eſſet. Cognito hominem eſſe mei videndi cupientem, monui ut daretur homini ad veniendum locus. Tum ille demiſſo vultu inde à pedibus ad verticem uſque obſervans diligentiſſimè conſtitutionem meam, erupit in hæc verba: eho, jamjam video non eſſe id verum, quod mihi de te fuerat enunciatum. Me autem dicente, quid ergo illud eſt? tibi, inquit, pedes fiſſos eſſe (26). —— *What I am going to relate, is ridiculous, but is an inſtance of the folly and lying impudence of theſe perſons. When we were in the field, expecting the coming of that Franciſcan, a certain old man, breaking thro' the crowd, demanded to ſee me. Hearing a noiſe, I asked what was the matter: and finding, that one deſired to ſee me, I deſired they would make way for him. Then he, caſting his eyes downward, and ſurveying me from head to foot, broke out into theſe words: now I am convinced, it is not true, what was told me of you. Upon asking him, what that was, he anſwered, he had been told, that I had cloven feet.*’

[*L*] *He had an averſion for women, but he was puniſhed by* GOD *for it, in the four marriages he contracted.*] Leſt I ſhould tranſlate his words wrong, I ſhall only ſet them down. ‘In conjugiis varie me duriterque exercuit Dominus. Nam quatuor uxores duxi hactenus: adeò me (qui prius propter canum impiarum ſcelera à fœminis abhorrebam, & functionis meæ ſtudio conjugium refugiebam pervicaciſſimè) caſtigavit Dominus, præpoſterum judicium meum tacitè exprobravit, & perjucunda optimarum fideliſſimarumque conjugum conſuetudine evicit peccatum, indignamque de ſexu fœmineo toto opinionem meam (27).’ He obſerves, that he loſt his firſt wife by the ignorance of a midwife, who ſpoilt her Uterus in delivering her of twins (28). ‘Harum primam injuria obſtetricis è vita ſuſtulit, quum ita corruptus in obſtetricatu fuiſſet illius uterus, ut annos amplius ſeptem indeſinente ſanguinis defluvio afflicta ſit atque exhauſta, incredibili cruciatu ipſius, & labore meo (29).’ The conſequences of this accident proved very unhappy, not only for the wife, but alſo for the husband, namely a continual loſs of blood for above ſeven years together. His ſecond wife died, being with child, the fifth day of a continual fever. The third died of a dropſy. The fourth was alive when he wrote this, about the year 1592. Afterwards ſhe died of the plague.

[*M*] *He left ſome children.*] By his ſecond wife, the daughter of John Cornput, ſecretary and burgomaſter of Breda, he had, amongſt other children, a daughter who was married to the learned John Gerard Voſſius, and a ſon named JOHN CASIMIR JUNIUS (30), who ſtudied Divinity, and was deſigned by his father for an Hebrew profeſſor, but that did not ſucceed. He quitted letters for the military profeſſion, at the ſollicitation of his uncle John Cornput (31), who made him lieutenant of his company. He died at Gertrudenberg. He publiſhed in Dutch an apology for the ſpeech of Sir Dudley Carleton, king James's embaſſador. It was in anſwer to James Taurin, an Arminian miniſter at Utrecht, who had confuted (32) that ſpeech. He left a ſon called FRANCIS JUNIUS, born at Embden, the twentieth of September 1624, who was profeſſor of the Civil-Law in the univerſity of Groningen (33). In the following article I ſhall ſpeak of another FRANCIS JUNIUS, a ſon of the Leyden profeſſor, by a third venter.

[*N*] *He publiſhed many books.*] His works of Divinity, collected together, make two volumes in folio, and contain, amongſt other things, I. A commentary upon the three firſt chapters of Geneſis, with an anſwer to the twenty two objections of Simplicius (34) againſt this holy book. II. An Analyſis of the Pentateuch, an explication of the prophecies of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Jonah. III. Sacred parallels, and notes upon the Revelation, and the epiſtle of St Jude. IV. Obſervations againſt Bellarmin, and upon the anathema of Gregory XIII againſt Gebhard Truchſes, archbiſhop of Cologne. He alſo publiſhed ſome notes upon Manilius and Cicero's epiſtles, and upon Tertullian, and a work of George Codinus Curopalates. He alſo tranſlated into Latin, Bodin's Demonomania, John du Tillet, Arnauld's plea againſt the Jeſuits, *&c.* He wrote an anſwer (35) in French, to Peter Charron's

---

(*f*) Scœnovienſis Eccleſiæ.

(*g*) Tremellius was his partner in that work.

(*h*) Taken from his Life, written by himſelf, and publiſhed by Merula, in 1595, and afterwards prefixed to his works. Melchior Adam has given us a large Abridgment of it. Moreri is miſtaken in quoting Merula, *in Deſcript. Vitæ Junii.*

(26) Ibid. pag. 20, col. 1.

(27) Ibid. pag. 21, col. 2.

(28) *They did not live.* Ex prima, *ſays he,* gemelli vix viderunt lucem.

(29) Junius, ibid. pag. 22, col 1.

(30) Godſon to prince John Caſimir, adminiſtrator of the Palatinate.

(31) He was governor of the citadel of Groningen: Meteren ſpeaks of him. *Vitæ Profeſſ. Groning. pag.* 224.

(32) His book is intituled, *Statera Orationis Carletoni*, &c.

(33) See the Lives of the Profeſſors of Groningen, pag. 224, 225.

(34) And not *Symmachus*, as Melchior Adam ſays, *in Vita Junii, pag.* 201.

(35) It was printed at Leyden, in 4to, in the year 1599.

miſtaken in what he ſays him [*O*]. Scaliger's memoirs, who hated Junius, very probably prejudiced this famous hiſtorian againſt him [*P*]. Junius did not deſerve the contempt that Scaliger had for him; the injuſtice of it is viſible. And when we conſider the praiſes that many great authors have given him (*i*), we find ourſelves more diſpoſed to pity than to indignation, with reſpect to that injuſtice. He was a learned and honeſt man; and otherwiſe ſo far from running things to an extremity, that he believed ſalvation

ron's Three Truths. I muſt not forget, that he underſtood the Greek and oriental tongues. He was the firſt that publiſhed George Codinus's book *De Officialibus Palatii Conſtantinopolitani, & officiis magnæ Eccleſiæ*. He added to it a Latin tranſlation with notes. He publiſhed two editions of this book, one in the year 1588, to which he put his name in Hebrew for he called himſelf Nadabus Agmonius (36). He dedicated it to the magiſtrates of Francfort. He dedicated the ſecond to Marquardus Freherus, who procured him ſome manuſcripts, by means whereof he filled up ſeveral chaſms of the former edition. He was preparing a third, which would have been exempt from ſome of the faults which had eſcaped him in the two firſt, and which were cenſured by the Jeſuit Gretſerus (37). What Voſſius obſerves againſt that critic, is very judicious; he does not deny that Gretſerus's book is a learned work, but he thinks that the good ſervice which Junius had done to the Republic of learning, has not been ſufficiently conſidered. Gretſerus makes it his only buſineſs to cenſure his faults; which is, ſays he, the epidemical diſtemper of the learned. 'Multa in iis ſunt, quibus etiam 'doctiſſimos doceat (*Gretſerus*). Nec pauca tamen, quæ 'pro Junio poſſim reponere. Sed hic eruditorum 'morbus eſt epidemicus: ut non tam cogitent quan'tum boni aliquis præſtiterit: quale eſt hic, quòd 'primus eum ſcriptorem Junius ſuâ linguâ edide'rit, Latine verterit, etiam illuſtrarit Notis; in qui'bus humani aliquid ſubinde, in tam arduo nego'tio, perpeſſum fuiſſe, nec ipſi negamus. Sed, ut 'dici ſolet, inventis aliquid ſuperaddere, vel, quando 'omnes ſumus homines, etiam errores obſervare, non 'eſt uſque adeò difficile (38). —— *There are many 'things in them, in which Gretſer may inſtruct the 'moſt learned; and not a few, which I can replace 'for Junius. But this is the epidemical diſeaſe of 'learned men: they do not enough conſider, what good 'any one has done; ſuch as Junius's publiſhing that 'author in his own language, tranſlating him into La'tin, and even commenting on him; in which labo'rious undertaking I do not deny that he ſometimes 'commits faults. But, as they ſay, it is not very 'difficult to improve upon diſcoveries, and to obſerve 'miſtakes, to which, as men, we are all liable.*' Junius had tranſlated the three books of Gelaſius Cyzicenus, concerning the council of Nice, and added notes to them (39). Voſſius (40) promiſed to get them printed. Junius tranſlated out of Greek into Latin, the books which are called Apocryphal: and from the Arabic, the Acts of the Apoſtles, and the eples of St Paul to the Corinthians. He tranſlated from the Hebrew, all the books of the Old Teſtament, not alone, but with Tremellius.

[O] *Thuanus is very much miſtaken in what he ſays of him.*]. Theſe are his words. 'Vir deſultorio in'genio qui multa conatus, an adſecutus ſit quod mo'liebatur, doctorum erit judicium. Lugduno Batavo'rum ubi diu profeſſus eſt, ob rerum novarum ſuſ'picionem ab Ordinibus Belgii exactus, ſicuti ſuo lo'co diximus, & Altorfii ubi defecit, à Norimbergen'ſi Rep. honorifico ſtipendio invitatus (41). ——— *A 'man of an inconſtant genius, who attempting many 'things, whether he ſucceded in what he undertook, 'the learned will judge. Baniſhed from Leyden, where 'had been long Profeſſor, by order of the States, on 'ſuſpicion of caballing, as I have related in it's place, 'and invited to Altorf, where he died, by the Repub'lic of Nuremberg, with the offer of an honourable 'ſalary.*' I do not examine whether Junius was juſtly cenſured for his levity, and for meddling with too many things. Voſſius, his ſon-in-law, has ſolidly juſtified him in this reſpect (42); but I ſhall obſerve after him (43), that Thuanus is ſtrangely miſtaken, in ſuppoſing, I. that Junius was expelled by the States of Holland, upon ſome ſuſpicions of a political cabal. II. That he was invited by the magiſtrates of Nuremberg, and that he died at Altorf. III. That he (Thuanus) has mentioned this exile under it's proper year. To begin with this laſt fault, I ſay, that Thuanus has not ſpoken of Junius, but of Donellus, in deſcribing the cabal which was diſcovered in the year 1587 (44). Junius was then in the Palatinate, and did not come to Leyden till five years after. No one is ignorant, that from the year 1592, till he died, he was profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden. It was Donellus who retired to Altorf, and died there (45).

[P] *Scaliger's memoirs . . . . . prejudiced Thuanus.*] It is Voſſius's conjecture (46), and it is very probable. Scaliger's hatred and fury againſt Junius, diſcovered themſelves both in his converſation (47) and letters. This is not ſo plain to every reader in his letters, becauſe Heinſius (48) who publiſhed them in the year 1627, put aſteriſms in the places, where Junius was abuſed, and left out the names; but the abuſes are not the leſs real for it. 'Hocce anno 'Heinſius noſter in lucem edidit Epiſtolas Scaligeri, 'in quibus non urbanatim ſed ruſticatim Junium tan'quam Cumanum aſinum tangit homo cætera mag'nus, ſed nimis malignus (49). ——— *This year our 'country-man Heinſius, publiſhed Scaliger's letters, in 'which that author, in other reſpects a great man, 'but too ill-natured, jeſts with an awkard kind of 'wit on Junius, calling him the aſs of Cumæ.*' Theſe are Voſſius's words: he had juſt been ſaying, that they had found in Junius's books, ſeveral groſs abuſes written with Scaliger's own hand. When a man proceeds thus far, what will he not do. 'Memor eram 'qualia ſuperſtes evomuerit adverſus Junium, cùm to'tus in fermento jaceret. Et meminiſſe ipſe potes. 'Adhuc in noſtris, & aliorum manibus verſantur co'dices Juniani, Scaligeri manu oppleti bellis illis e'logiis, ſimia, aſinus, cojone, & aliis id genus con'vitiis, βωμολόγῳ (*ſcurra*) non Scaligero dignis (50). '—— *I remembered how injuriouſly, in his life-time, 'he treated Junius, loading him with all manner of 'reproaches. And you yourſelf may remember it. Ju'nius's books are ſtill extant, filled by Scaliger's own 'hand with the fine encomium's of ape, aſs, and the 'like ſcurrilities, worthy of a buffoon, not of Scaliger.*' Note, by the way, that Scaliger did nevertheleſs beſtow many praiſes upon Junius's tomb (51). So true it is, that the verſes made upon the death of people, are a piece of the grand comedy, which is acted on the ſtage of the world. Note alſo, by the by, that Junius drew upon him the hatred of this great man, by the liberty he took of contradicting him ſometimes in points of Chronology, *&c.* Some young men threw oil into the fire, by reporting, in an invidious manner, what Junius ſaid of the other, either in his lectures or converſations. 'Scis quale fuerit illud maxi'mi Scaligeri ingenium. Non ferebat diſſentientem. 'Itaque ſemper eo nomine offenſior Junio fuit, quod 'in quibuſdam ad ſacram χρονολογίαν pertinentibus 'ac credo in aliis etiam nonnullis à ſe diſcreparet. 'Offenſam eam unus & alter diſcipulorum alebant, 'malignè interpretantes apud Scaligerum, quæ vel pub'licè docuiſſet Junius, vel privatim dixiſſet (52).' However it be, this is what made Voſſius (53) think that Thuanus had been prejudiced againſt Junius, by Scaliger's letters.

That thought kept him at firſt in ſuſpence, whether he ſhould make an apology for his father-in law againſt Thuanus, or no; for he foreſaw, that the ſon of this great hiſtorian would juſtify his father, by producing Scaliger's letters, which were injurious to Junius; and in that caſe Voſſius would have found himſelf obliged to write againſt Scaliger: but he found it more proper to conceal the faults of that great man, than to publiſh them. At laſt he took the method, that may be ſeen in the preface (54), which I have quoted. 'Si calamum adverſus Thua'num ſtringam, periculum video, ne filius Thuani, 'juvenis eruditus, & ut genere, atque opibus pollens, 'ita multis in Galliis carus, & maximis honoribus de'ſtinatus, quæ de imperitia Junii modeſtè Parens ſcrip'ſerit, ea apertè, & ſine circuitione prodita, oſtendat

à Magno

(*i*) *See* Colomeſius, Gallia Orient. pag. 95, & ſeq.

(36) And not *Aymonius*, as Placcius has it, *de Pſeudonymis*, *pag.* 220, who a little while after ſays *Cornelius*, inſtead of *Codinus*, and *apprehendit*, inſtead of *reprehendit*.

(37) *See* Voſſius, de Hiſtoricis Græcis, pag. 368.

(38) Voſſius, ibid.

(39) Ib. pag. 264.

(40) Ibid.

(41) Thuan. lib. cxxvii, ſub fin. ad ann. 1602.

(42) Voſſius, in Præfat. de Hiſtor. Latinis.

(43) Ibid.

(44) Thuan. Hiſtor. lib. lxxxviii, pag. 147.

(45) Idem. lib. c, pag. 405.

(46) Ubi ſupra.

(47) *See the* Scaligerana.

(48) See Voſſius's Letter to Grotius, amongſt thoſe of the Arminians, n. 448, pag. 726.

(49) Voſſius, in eadem Epiſtola.

(50) Ibid.

(51) See in Voſſius's preface to his book, *de Hiſt. Latin s.* the Latin verſes of Scaliger upon Junius's death.

(52) Voſſius, Epiſtola, lxv, pag. 105, Edit. Lond. 1693.

(53) See his Letter to Gomarus. It is the ſixty fifth.

(54) Operis de Hiſtoricis Latinis.

tion might be obtained in the church of Rome [Q]. He never underſtood better the deficiency of his knowledge, than when he was arrived to the higheſt pitch of his knowledge (*k*); which is a ſign of a good underſtanding.

à Magno Scaligero, Reip. literariæ dictatore, cui doctior orbis lubens eruditionis faſces ſubmittit. Hinc mihi nova cura, etiam tuendi eum adverſus Scaligeri calumnias, incumbet. Quem ego virum laudavi ſemper, ac porro laudare decrevi: non quia ejus impotentiam animi, aut maledicentiam ignorem; aut quaſi neſciam, quam multis in locis aliquid humanitus patiatur: ſed quia ejus tantæ virtutes, præclaraque adeo merita ſunt, erga hiſtoriam, ac bonas literas, ut propterea, quæ peccavit, cenſeam ei condonari, & æterna oblivione ſepeliri oportere (55). —*If I draw my pen againſt Thuanus, I ſee the danger, leaſt Thuanus's ſon, a learned youth, and not only of a good family and fortune, but dear likewiſe to many in France, and deſigned for the greateſt honours, ſhould ſhew that the great Scaliger, dictator of the Republic of Letters, whom the learned world readily acknowledges as it's ſovereign, declared openly, and without mincing the matter, what his father modeſtly wrote concerning the unskillfulneſs of Junius. Hence a new task will lie upon me, even of defending him againſt the calumnies of Scaliger; a man, whom I always praiſed, and have reſolved ſtill to praiſe: not that I am a ſtranger to his impotency of mind, or faculty of ſlandering; or that I am ignorant, that in many places he is himſelf in an error; but that I think his faults ought to be excuſed and entirely forgotten, on account of his great virtues, and uncommon merits, in reſpect to hiſtory, and claſſical learning.*' He ſpares the name of Scaliger in this preface, but not his perſon; it is true, that he gives him a ſtab in a very reſpectful manner. Theſe are his words. 'Acerbè adeo ut ſummus vir (*Thuanus*) pronuntiaret, fecit amicus ejus, vir cætera egregius; ſed, quod in aliis damnat, præſidens, planeque ἰδιογνωμων, καὶ αὐθεκαστος, ſæpe etiam turgens loliginis ſucco, ac ſi quis non per omnia aſſentiret, vehemens alieni nominis obtrectator: quo vitio non mediocriter fœdabat egregias, imo admirandas animi dotes. Non me ariolari hic, ſed certiſſima promere, multis poſſim indiciis comprobare: ſed ea ſunt viri illius merita, ut quædam ſatiûs ſit honoris cauſa taceri (56). —— *So bitterly, that the great Thuanus pronounced, his friend did it, in other reſpects an excellent man; but, what he condemns in others, confident, opinionated, and ſevere, and apt to detract from the merit of thoſe, who do not aſſent to him in every thing; with which vice he greatly ſullied his excellent parts. That this is not meer conjecture, but ſtrict truth, I can ſufficiently prove; but ſuch are this man's merits, that reſpect induces me to conceal ſome things.*' Nothing can be more moderate.

[Q] *He believed ſalvation might be obtained in the church of Rome.*] Nevertheleſs, he called her, as other miniſters did, the whore mentioned in St John's Revelation; but he ſaid that ſhe was ſtill the ſpouſe of the ſon of GOD; a ſpouſe, whoſe unfaithfulneſs JESUS CHRIST bears with, and whom he has not divorced. This did not pleaſe Beza, a great favourer of the monarchy of the Solipſi. Give me leave to call thus the communions, which believe that they only are in the way of Salvation. Junius gave a great latitude to the true church. Perhaps Mr Nicole did not know it (57). 'Doctiſſimus ſocer Junius cum nollet ab iis diſcedere, qui Romanam Eccleſiam cenſent eſſe meretricem Babylonicam, & tamen ſtatueret ſalvari in ea innumera millia, ajebat eſſe vivum corpus, ſed ulceribus obſitum: meretricem eſſe, ſed adhuc ſponſam Chriſti, vel conjugem, quia Chriſtus necdum ei miſerit libellum repudii. Sed non eo ſatiſfecit Genevenſibus: qui illam dicerent idololatricam, ac proinde neminem in ea ſalvari. Narravit mihi aliquando doct. Anthonius Thyſius, cum primam Genevam veniſſet, & ſoceri mei nomine multam ſalutem diceret D. Bezæ, illum continuo ſubjeciſſe; *Et quomodo valet cariſſimus frater Junius: vir eſt egregie de Eccleſiis noſtris meritus: quamquam in uno capite diſſentiat à nobis.* Id caput erat de Eccleſia: quam Junius negabat tam arctis limitibus concludi, ac multi volunt (58). —— *My learned father-in-law Junius, when he would not diſſent from thoſe, who think the Romiſh church to be the whore of Babylon, and yet laid it down, that great multitudes are ſaved in it, ſaid ſhe was a living body, but covered with ſores: that ſhe was a harlot, but ſtill the ſpouſe, or wife, of CHRIST, becauſe CHRIST had not yet ſent her a bill of divorcement. But this did not ſatisfy the Genevois, who ſaid ſhe was idolatrous, and that therefore no body was ſaved in her. The learned Anthony Thyſius once told me, that when he firſt came to Geneva, and had complimented Beza in my father-in-law's name, he immediately anſwered*; And how fares my deareſt brother Junius? he deſerves extremely well of our churches; though in one article he diſſents from us: *That article was concerning the church; which Junius would not have confined within ſuch narrow bounds, as many would.*'

This is what Voſſius ſays. He obſerves in another place, that Junius being much more free from prepoſſeſſion, than people generally are, uſed to ſay in his latter days, the longer I live, the more I diſcover my ignorance. 'Socer meus Fr. Junius, tanti cum à multis retro annis nominis foret, poſtremis tamen vitæ annis crebrò illud in ore habebat, magis & magis ſe in dies videre, quam multa ſe ſugerent. Ita ille, qui cum novellis Doctoribus ſociarat antiquos; qui etiam partium ſtudio non paulo minus laborabat quam vulgò fieri ſolet (59).'

JUNIUS (FRANCIS), ſon of the foregoing (*a*), was born at Heidelberg in the year 1589. His firſt deſign was to be a man of the ſword; but the truce which was concluded in 1609, for twelve years, made him take another reſolution; which was to apply himſelf to Literature. He travelled into France; from whence he went over into England in the year 1620. He was received in the houſe of the earl of Arundel, and lived there thirty years; after which he returned into Holland, and there went on with the ſtudy he had very much cultivated in England, I mean that of the northern languages [A]. He made an extraordinary progreſs in it. He was ſo paſſionately fond

[A] *He applied .... to the ſtudy of the northern languages.*] Having found in England ſeveral Anglo-Saxon books, he reſolved to make advantage of them; and knowing from the skill he got in the Anglo-Saxon language, that it would enable him to diſcover many etymologies for the illuſtration of the Dutch, Engliſh, and German tongues, he applied himſelf wholly to that ſtudy, and afterwards learnt the ancient language of the Goths, Franks, Cimbrians, and Friſons, whereby he found the etymology of ſeveral Italian, French, and Spaniſh, words: for the Goths, Vandals, Franks, Burgundians, and Germans, ſpread their language in the provinces which they conquered: there are ſtill ſome footſteps of them (1). He applied himſelf ſelf entirely to the writing of gloſſaries (2); and this is the pedigree he diſcovered. 'His omnibus linguis imbibendis cum ſatis diu inſudaſſet, vidit, quod & privatim apud omnes, quibus cum agebat de hac doctrina, tum publice teſtatus eſt, Gothicam eſſe matrem omnium cæterarum Teutonicarum linguarum, ex qua profluxerit vetus Cimbrica, monumentis Runarum poſteris tradita, nec non Suecica, Danica, Norwegica, Iſlandica, quibus, illius plagæ homines iſto tempore ſuas animi cogitationes explicant. Ex Anglo-ſaxonica, quæ & ipſa aut propago eſt Gothicæ, aut illius ſoror Germana, & ejuſdem matris filia, manavit Anglica, Scotica, Belgica, Friſica vetus. Ex Gothica & Saxonica orta eſt Francica, quæ Germanicæ

(*k*) See remark [Q], citat. (59).

(55) Voſſius, Epiſt. lxv, pag. 106.

(56) Voſſius, Præfat. de Hiſt. Latinis. *See alſo his Letter to Gomarus: it is the ſixty fifth.*

(57) See the preface to his treatiſe concerning the unity of the church, where he mentions ſome miniſters, who believed, that the true church is to be found in ſeveral communions.

(58) Voſſius, Epiſt. ad Hugon. Grotium. *It is the 57th in* Epiſt. Eccleſ & Theol. *of the folio edition,* pag. 818.

(59) Id apud Colomeſ. Gall. Oriental. pag. 96.

(*a*) By the third marriage contracted with Joan l'Ermite, daughter of Simon l'Ermite, lord of Betinſart, echevin of Antwerp, and related to Daniel l'Ermite, *de quo ſuo loco.*

(1) Taken from his Life, written by Mr Grævius, prefixed to the folio edition of his book *de Pictura Veterum.*

(2) Totus erat in contexendis Anglo-ſaxonicis, Francicis, & Cimbricis Lexicis ac Gloſſariis, & explanandis antiquiſſimis harum gentium ſcriptoribus. *Grævius, ibid.*

fond of this ſtudy, that underſtanding there were in Frieſland ſome villages, where the antient Saxon tongue was preſerved, he went and lived there two years. He returned into England in 1675, and having ſtayed two years at Oxford, he retired to Windſor to Iſaac Voſſius, his nephew, and died there within the ſpace of a year. The univerſity of Oxford, to which he bequeathed his manuſcripts, built him a very noble monument (*b*). I will ſpeak of the books he publiſhed [*B*]. He was not only a man of very great learning, but alſo of an excellent life. He was not obſerved to have any vitious paſſion. He did not mind the riches nor the honours of this world; his books were his only care: and perhaps no man did ever ſtudy more than he, without doing any prejudice to his health [*C*]. I ſhall ſet down a paſſage of Colomiés [*D*].

When I ſpoke of his ſtay at Oxford, and of the time of his death, I followed the account of Mr Grævius; but the ſame is not exact. I rectify it here by obſerving that Junius retired to Oxford in the month of October 1676, and continued there till the month of Auguſt 1677, when he went to Windſor upon the invitation of Iſaac Voſſius, his nephew, in whoſe houſe he died near that place, on the nineteenth of November 1677. He was ſick but a few days. He was buried in St George's chapel at Windſor (*c*).

(*b*) *Taken from his Life, written by Mr Grævius, and prefixed to his book* de Pictura Veterum, *in fol.o.*

(*c*) *Taken from* Athenæ Oxonienſis.

' manicæ ſuperioris parens eſt. Harum veterrimarum linguarum, & dialectorum, quæ ex illis ductæ ſunt, cognitionem invicto ſtudio, & incredibili aſſiduitate non primus tantum aſſecutus eſt, ſed & ſolus, viam ſecutus nullius ante tritam veſtigiis (3). —— *Having applied himſelf long enough to the acquiring all theſe languages, he diſcovered, as he both privately aſſured all whom he converſed with on this ſubject, and alſo publickly declared, that the Gothic was the mother of all the other Teutonic languages, whence flowed the old Cimbric, handed down to poſterity by the remains of the Runæ, as alſo the Swediſh, Daniſh, Norwegian, Iſelandiſh, in which the men of that country then expreſſed their thoughts. From the Anglo-Saxon, which itſelf is either a branch of the Gothic, or it's ſiſter, and daughter of the ſame mother, flowed the Engliſh, Scotch, Belgic, old Friſeiſh. From the Gothic and Saxon ſprung the Frankiſh, which is the mother language of Upper Germany. He was not only the firſt, but the only one, who, following an untrodden path, with invincible labour and pains, acquired the knowledge of theſe antient languages, and the dialects, which are derived from them.*'

[*B*] *I will ſpeak of the books he has publiſhed.*] In the year 1637, he put out a treatiſe *de Pictura Veterum*, which abounds with admirable literature. Afterwards he ſo enlarged it, that the ſecond edition that was made of it (4) is a pretty large folio, whereas the firſt was but a quarto of 318 pages. There are very few things in Greek and Latin authors concerning Painting, and the antient Painters, that have eſcaped the diligence of this author. In the year 1655, he publiſhed notes upon the *Francica Paraphraſis* of the Canticles, written by the abbot Willeram, and publiſhed the firſt time by Paul Merula. Being returned into Holland, after the two years that he had ſpent in Frieſland, he met with an old Gothic manuſcript, firnamed the Silver One (5); he applied himſelf entirely to the explication of it, and finiſhed it in a little time. He publiſhed therefore this Gothic paraphraſe of the four goſpels, with a Gothic gloſſary, to which he added an antient Anglo-Saxon verſion of the ſame goſpels, corrected from good manuſcripts, and illuſtrated with the notes of Thomas Marſhall. This is but a ſmall part of his works; that which remains to be printed is much more conſiderable. His gloſſary in five languages, in which he ſearches and explains the original of the Northern languages, contains eleven (6) manuſcript volumes, which Dr John Fell biſhop of Oxford ordered to be writ out fair to be ſent to the preſs. His commentary upon the harmony of the four goſpels by Tatian is very large, I ſay nothing of ſo many other books, upon which he has made notes (7). Conſult the catalogue of the manuſcripts which he left to the univerſity of Oxford. It is at the end of his life.

[*C*] *No man ſtudied more than he without any prejudice to his health.*] He roſe at four of the clock in the morning both in winter and ſummer, and ſtudied till dinner time. He dined at one, after dinner he uſed ſome exerciſe till three (8): He went again to his ſtudy at three, and left it not till eight to go to ſupper, and then he went to bed. He ſeldom went out; and when he did, it was upon ſome buſineſs. All this did not hinder him from enjoying a perfect health: he was never ſick. *Firma fuit valetudine, ut proſperrima per omnem ætatem ſine ulla corporis offenſione uteretur, quamvis totos dies à ſummo mane uſque ad noctem incumberet litteris, & rariſſime, nec unquam niſi negotiorum ratio id ei quaſi imperaret, prodiret in publicum* (9). Such a long ſolitude ſpent amongſt barbarous books, and wild words, and in making five Gothic or Teutonic Lexicons, did not in the leaſt leſſen his gaiety, no not in his old age: he was always free from peeviſhneſs, and affable to thoſe who viſited him, though he did not care to be interrupted. Mr Grævius deſcribes this in elegant terms. *In aſſiduitate tanta licet invitus admodum avocaretur ab his, quibus inſudabat, curis, tam longe tamen aberat omnis moroſitas ingeniique triſtitia, quæ ſolet eſſe propria iis, qui à luce hominum & celebritate alieniores omne tempus & operam domi ſuæ in doctrinæ & litterarum ſtudiis conſumunt, præcipue ſenes, ut nihil ſene noſtro fieri poſſet ſuavius & facilius* (10). The polite illiterate will doubtleſs believe that he was a very miſerable man; they had as good be condemned to the gallies as ſpend their lives as he did among his deſks, without taſting the pleaſures of gaming, love, good cheer, or converſation. *How can a man live*, ſay they, *without wine in the day time, and without women in the night*. But they are miſtaken, if they fancy their happineſs exceeds his. He was doubtleſs one of the happieſt men in the world, unleſs he had the weakneſs others have to be diſturbed about trifles: for as there are ſome people, who having no reaſon to be merry, find out chimerical pleaſures to amuſe themſelves (11); there are ſome, on the contrary, who cannot be moved with the moſt juſt cauſes of diſcontent, and yet diſquiet themſelves for ridiculous things, of which they ſhould be aſhamed to complain.

[*D*] *I will ſet down a paſſage of Colomiés.*] 'I knew at the Hague the learned Mr Junius, ſon of the famous Francis Junius, who was profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden. He is an old man near eighty, but ſtill very vigorous. He ſtudies thirteen or fourteen hours a day, and has lately publiſhed the four goſpels in Gothic, with a very learned gloſſary. He made me a preſent of this curious work, and told me, he would quickly print his book *de Pictura Veterum*, with the names and works of all the Painters of antiquity. It will be dedicated to the preſent earl of Arundel, who was his pupil, when he was in England library-keeper to this earl's father. I ought not to forget, for Mr Junius's glory, that Grotius highly commends his book concerning Painting, in the following letter (12).' That letter has been prefixed to the new edition of our Junius's book.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) *At Rotterdam, for Reinier Leers*, 1694.

(5) Qui argenteus dicitur, quoniam quatuor Evangelia litteris Argenteis Gothicis in illo fuerat deſcripta. *Grævius, ubi ſupra.*

(6) *There is XI in Junius's Life; but in the catalogue of the manuſcripts bequeathed to the univerſity of Oxford there is IX.*

(7) *Taken from his Life.*

(8) Hora prima prandebat, ſequente corpus exercebat, vel in area ſubdivali ambulando contentius, aut etiam ſubſultim nonnunquam currendo, aut, ſi id non ferret aſperior tempeſtas, per omnes ſcalas in cœnaculum aſcendendo valetudinis tuendæ cauſſa *Grævius, in Vita F. Junii*

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Id ibid.

(11) Dum careo veris, gaudia falſa juvant. *Ovid. Heroïd. Epiſt.* xiii, *ver.* 108. *Conſult Mr Dacier on Horace*, lib. i, Epiſt. viii, pag. 406, 410, 411.

(12) *Colomiés, in his* Opuſcula, pag. 116. Edit. Utrecht, 1669.

JUNO, ſiſter and wife of Jupiter, was the daughter of Saturn and Rhea. Her father being reſolved to devour his children, for fear they ſhould dethrone him, did not ſpare her any more than his two other daughters (*a*), whom he had already ſwallowed: but he was forced to diſgorge them ſome years after. They gave him a potion, which

(*a*) *Veſta and Ceres, Juno's eldeſt ſiſters.* Apollodor lib. i, pag. 4.

made him vomit up all the children he had devoured (*b*). And thus it was that Juno returned into the world. The circumſtances of her marriage with Jupiter are differently related. There is a tradition which ſays they loved one another, and lay together unknown to their father and mother [*A*], and it does not appear that ſhe kept her lover long in ſuſpence. But others ſay, that ſhe withſtood the ſollicitations of Jupiter like a maid of virtue and honour [*B*]; and that to avoid his further importunities, ſhe fled into a den. They add, that ſhe there met with a man, whoſe diſcourſe ſo ſoftened her heart in favour of Jupiter, that ſhe conſented to make him happy upon the ſpot (*c*). Others would perhaps confeſs, that this was the firſt time that Jupiter lay with her, but not the firſt time that ſhe lay with a man; for they pretend, that before Jupiter courted her, ſhe paſſed through the hand of Eurymedon, a ſtout and leud giant, by the ſame token, that he got her with child of a ſon, who was called Prometheus [*C*]. Jupiter did not know it till after he was married, and he diſcharged his revenge upon this baſtard under other pretences. Upon ſome other occaſions, the chaſtity of his wife appeared very doubtful to him [*D*]. He well deſerved it, whoſe gallantries were ſo common. There was ſcarce any animal, but he borrowed it's ſhape to get maidenheads. Every body knows that he metamorphoſed himſelf into a cuckoo, in order to compaſs his deſire with Juno [*E*]. This goddeſs preſided over marriages (*d*),

(*b*) Apollodor. ibid.

(*c*) *See the article* ACHILLES.

(*d*) *See the remark* [*Z*].

[*A*] *A tradition ſays that Jupiter and Juno lay together unknown to their father and mother.*] They who want a good proof of this matter, may find it in theſe words of the Iliad (1):

Ὡς δ' ἴδεν, ὥς μιν ἔρως πυκινὰς φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν,
Οἷον ὅτε πρώτιςον ἐμισγέσθην φιλότητι,
Εἰς εὐνὴν φοιτῶντε, φίλους λήθοντε τοκῆας.

Ut vero vidit, continuò illum amor prudentia præcordia cooperuit,
Perinde ac quando primùm miſti ſunt amore,
Ad cubile conſuetudinis gratiâ euntes, ſuis clam parentibus.

The god, whoſe lightning ſets the heav'ns on fire,
Thro' all his boſom feels the fierce deſire,
Fierce, as when firſt by ſtealth he ſeiz'd her charms,
Mix'd with her ſoul, and melted in her arms.

Pope.

Homer ſpeaks here of a certain occaſion, on which Jupiter, who had been married many ages to Juno, felt, as he ſaw her by chance, the ſame ardor, as when he lay with her by ſtealth the firſt time. I add to the teſtimony of a Greek Poet, that of a Latin one. It is a lover who ſpeaks; a lover, I ſay, who had found the critical minute (2), and is vexed that many before him had received the like gratifications by ſtealth.

Iſtius atque utinam facti mea culpa magiſtra
Prima foret: lethum vita mihi dulcius eſſet.
Non mea, non ullo moreretur tempore fama,
Dulcia cum Veneris furatus gaudia primus
Dicerer, atque ex me dulcis foret orta voluptas.
Nam mihi non tantum tribuerunt impia vota,
Auctor ut occulti noſter foret error amoris.
Jupiter ante ſui ſemper mendacia furti,
Cum Junone prius conjux quam dictus uterque eſt,
Gaudia libavit dulcem furatus amorem (3).

O! that my crime had taught her firſt the bliſs!
With pleaſure I had dy'd upon the kiſs.
My fame had liv'd, and future ages ſung
How firſt from my embrace love's tranſports ſprung.
In vain my impious wiſhes wou'd aſpire
To kindle in her breaſt the ſecret fire.
With Juno, tho' not yet his conſort, Jove,
Retir'd in private, ſtole the joys of love.

[*B*] *Others ſay that ſhe reſiſted the ſollicitations of Jupiter like a maid of virtue and honour.*] Her virtue was ſuch according to ſome, that if Jupiter had not found a remedy, inſtead of that which ſhe would not grant him, he would not have known what to do. But he went and ſat upon a mountain (4) as often as he was in the tranſport of his paſſion, which he calmed by that means (5). The author who furniſhes me with this ſtory, does not ſay whether Jupiter was then married to Juno, nor was it neceſſary to be ſo particular upon this ſubject: the moſt ſtupid readers will eaſily underſtand, that he was not married, and that he was in love with a cruel woman.

[*C*] *Eurymedon . . . . . got her with child of a ſon who was called Prometheus.*] You will find this ſtory in Homer's Scholiaſt (6). Jupiter's reſentment was not leſs violent againſt the father of the baſtard, than againſt the baſtard himſelf; for if Prometheus was put in chains, Eurymedon was caſt down into hell. I know not under what pretence Jupiter treated Eurymedon in that manner; but there is no queſtion, that he concealed the true cauſe of his anger: he had too much ſenſe to diſgrace himſelf by his revenge. His pretence againſt the baſtard was his ſtealing the celeſtial fire. The Scholiaſt (7) whom I cite has this from Euphorion.

[*D*] *The chaſtity of Juno . . . . appeared very doubtful to him.*] I will comment upon this text with the words of a modern author, who deſigning to prove, *that Jupiter was a notorious cuckold*, expreſſes himſelf thus: ‘ The giant Eurymedon had obtained the ‘ firſt favours of Juno his wife *, and not to ſpeak of ‘ the iſle of Samos, which was famous for the unchaſt ‘ amours of this goddeſs, do not we know that Jupi‘ter diſcovering a few days after his marriage, that ‘ ſhe would quickly be the mother of a child that was ‘ not his, ſhe knew how to wheedle him ſo as to ‘ perſuade him that ſhe had conceived of herſelf, and ‘ that ſhe had preſerved her virginity intire. She made ‘ him believe another time that ſhe was with child by ‘ eating wild lettuces. So that though the horns that ‘ were ſet upon his ſtatue in Libya, had not denoted ‘ him a cuckold, did not he deſerve that they ſhould ‘ have this ſignification, and to occaſion thoſe ways of ‘ ſpeaking, which have been ſo long in uſe, by the ‘ conſent of all nations (8)?’

[*E*] *Jupiter . . . metamorphoſed himſelf into a cuckoo in order to compaſs his deſire with Juno.*] To relate what is moſt curious upon this ſubject, I need only follow the diſpute of Coſtar and Girac. The foundation whereof is this: ‘ Jupiter was no leſs forgetful ‘ on many other important occaſions. Pallas complains ‘ in Homer that he did not think of wiſe Ulyſſes. ‘ Another upbraids him that in the eſtabliſhment of ‘ his houſhold, he had not conſidered cuckoldom, from ‘ which he had received ſo many ſignal ſervices (9) ‘ (§ *α*).’ They are Coſtar's words. His adverſary anſwers him, that this is a very unjuſt accuſation: ‘ For ‘ good Jupiter, *ſays he* (10), to ſhew the eſteem he ‘ had for cuckoldom, and the deſire of being a cuc‘kold, transformed himſelf into the bird of that name, ‘ when he courted his wife Juno. And afterwards to ‘ expreſs his gratitude, he commanded the Argivi to ‘ make a fine cuckoo of gold, and to perch him up‘on the ſceptre of Juno's ſtatue; with which this ‘ great goddeſs was not offended, having reaped at ‘ leaſt as many advantages from cuckoldom, as her huſ‘band had done. And even near the town of Her‘mione, there are two little mountains, one of which ‘ is called the Cuckoo Mountain, upon which in Pau‘ſanias's time † was ſeen a temple of Jupiter, and but ſhe ſhould not have had that employment. It was an ill omen, for ſhe led but an odd life with her huſband; and in ſpite of all the ſtrong reaſons, that engaged him to bear

---

(1) Lib. xiv, ver. 294.

(2) Et mecum tenera gaviſa eſt ludere in herba Purpureos flores, quos inſuper accumbebat Candida formoſo ſupponens brachia collo. *Valerius Cato, in Diris, pag.* 61, *Catalectorum veterum Poëtarum.*

(3) Valer. Cato, ibid.

(4) *Called* Leucate.

(5) Ὁ Ζεὺς ἀεὶ ἐρῶν Ἥρας ἐρχόμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρᾳ ἐκαθίζετο καὶ ἀνεπαύετο τοῦ ἔρωτος. Jovem ſemper Junonis amore captum ad ſaxum hoc acceſſiſſe, atque ei inſidendo amoris impotentiam ſedaſſe. *Ptol. Hephæſt. apud Photium, Cod CXC, pag. m.* 492.

(6) Ἥραν τρεφομένην παρὰ τοῖς γονεῦσιν εἷς τῶν γιγάντων Εὐρυμέδων βιασάμενος ἔγκυον ἐποίησεν· ἡ δὲ Προμηθέα ἐγέννησε. Schol. in Iliad. lib. xiv, ver. 295.

(7) Id. ibid.

* Didym. in Hom. Iliad xiv. Euſtath. ibid.

(8) Girac, Replique à Coſtar, ſect. lxiv, pag. m. 545.

(9) Coſtar, Defenſe des Ouvrages de Voiture, pag. m. 116.

(10) Girac, Réponſe à la Defenſe de Voiture, ſect. xxvi, pag. 194.

† In Corinth.

‘ over againſt it on the other mountain that of Juno. In Libya, the ſtatue of Jupiter Hammon had great horns upon it's head. Which was ſo agreeable to this god, that tho' ſtatues were erected to him over all the world, he only delivered oracles thro' this (11). He was ſo well pleaſed with his horns, that he obliged his deareſt friends to follow his example. Bacchus ‡ and Pan, the ſatires, the gods of the rivers, and many others did not fail to imitate him, Juno herſelf did the ſame, to ſhew that ſhe had ſome complaiſance for her huſband, and we ſtill ſee ſeveral medals of this goddeſs with horns. Diana and Venus wore them too as an ornament that wonderfully became a handſome face.’ This anſwer is learned, but it is falſe; for there is nothing in it that proves the point in diſpute. The ſtate of the queſtion is this: whether Jupiter honoured the huſbands, whoſe wives had gallants? Prove as much as you pleaſe, that he honoured the bird we call a cuckoo, and add moreover that he would have his ſtatues to be adorned with horns; ſay withal, that the other gods followed the ſame faſhion; you do not come near the point, becauſe at that time, the words cuckold and horns were not taken in the ſame ſenſe, that is given them at preſent. Beſides, to diſguiſe ones ſelf in the ſhape of a cuckoo, in order to ſucceed in one's enterprizes, would not even in our age be a ſign, that a man deſires to marry a galanting lady. My readers will eaſily imagine, that Coſtar was aware of the vanity of the anſwers that were made him: but if any one ſhould doubt of it, I ſhall quickly undeceive him by citing his own words. In which we ſhall ſee, that the affectation of making too great a ſhew of his reading, makes him mix with his replies, ſome things which ſpoil his cauſe. He begins with Jupiter's metamorphoſis into a bird, which bears the name of cuckoo; and here follows what he ſays of it (12).

[(§ α) It would be in vain to look for this ſtory in the writings of the Antients; Rabelais is the author of it, book III. chap. XXXII, but the ground of it is found in Plutarch, No 17. of his conſolation to Apollonius on the death of his ſon. Rem. Crit.]

‘ This old woman's ſtory, and that ridiculous invention of a grammarian abuſing his leiſure, (thus Eraſmus * ſpeaks of him) is took from a ſcholiaſt upon Theocritus, who ſays that Juno having left her companions to divert herſelf all alone and at liberty, after a long walk, laid herſelf upon the graſs in a fine place of mount Thronax. Jupiter, who ſaw her in that poſture, found her ſo handſome, that he immediately fell violently in love with her, and to eaſe his paſſion, put on the ſhape of a cuckoo, and raiſing an extreme cold in the air, all trembling and frozen, he threw himſelf into this goddeſs's arms; and then reſuming his uſual form, and promiſing to marry her, he received from her the ſatiſfaction he deſired. The cold that Jupiter rais'd upon that occaſion was not greater, than that of the ſilly jeſt of our learned author. In effect it appears, that it was not out of love to cuckoldom that Jupiter turned cuckoo, ſince neither among the gods nor among men, the name of that bird did ſignify at that time a huſband, whoſe wife was unfaithful to him. At leaſt, there is no ſign of it among the Antients: on the contrary, there are ſome women in Plautus, who call their huſbands *Cuckoos*, whom they ſurprized in adultery, and Juvenal † calls a poor fellow *Curruca* [*Hedge-ſparrow*], who had that injury done him; doubtleſs, becauſe that bird feeds the young cuckoos that are laid in it's neſt.’ Coſtar afterwards goes on to the conſideration of the horns, and expreſſes himſelf in this manner (13). *Has Mr de Girac ſeen any old manuſcript, which clearly proves that at that time horns were a ſign of cuckoldom? and you,* SIR (14), *who know every thing, can you ſhew me that theſe ways of ſpeaking,* to bear horns, and to ſet horns, *in the ſenſe that they are now taken in, are much more antient than Artemidorus, who flouriſhed under Hadrian? the horns of Jupiter Hammon were not thoſe of a cuckold, but of a fine ram, propheſying upon the ſands of Libya, as our Ronſard ſpeaks.* He examines in particular, the horns of thoſe deities which Girac had produced, and makes it evident that they had no relation to the condition of the huſbands, which we call cuckolds, and that they were not taken in complaiſance to Jupiter; and this is his concluſion (15). *If out of all this Mr de Girac can make any thing that may be ſerviceable to his deſign, I will not oppoſe him: but I am very much miſtaken, if he can ſucceed in it, and oblige me to acknowledge that Jupiter, when he ſettled his houſhould, did not forget cuckoldom, which had always been ſo ſerviceable to him.* This is a good concluſion; it is to bring things to the ſtate of the queſtion, and to make all the lines terminate in the center.

Let us conſider the reply. Girac thinks it very ſtrange that *Coſtar, ſhould treat this matter with a ſcholaſtic ſtrictneſs, and in a ſerious manner* (16). *He would have me to prove by demonſtration and authority,* that it was the love of cuckoldom, that made Jupiter a cuckold. *He is not ſatisfied, unleſs I ſhow him* ſome manuſcripts that clearly prove, that at that time horns were the marks of cuckolds. *Where is the juſtice of this man? he does nothing in all his writings but banter; he himſelf confeſſes that he cannot ſpeak a ſentence without the aſſiſtance of his beloved irony; and yet he will not ſuffer me to jeſt ſo much as once* . . . . . . Although my railleries *ariſe from my ſubject, and are ſupported by very fine antiquities; for is it not true that Jupiter was a downright cuckold, ſince the giant Eurymedon had obtained the firſt favours from his wife Juno?* You will find above (17) the ſequel of this paſſage: it would be needleſs to repeat it here; the paper it would take up, will be more uſefully employed in theſe two remarks. The firſt is, that though it be permitted to jeſt in a criticiſm; yet it is not permitted to reaſon wrong. You may be merry if you pleaſe, and ſpeak according as occaſion ſerves, either in jeſt or in earneſt; but be ſure not to advance a falſity, and never pretend, that by jeſting upon a falſe ſuppoſition, or by building railleries upon ignorance, you will either make good objections, or ſolid anſwers to an objection (18). My ſecond obſervation is, that the adventure of the giant, and the unfaithfulneſs of Juno, come too late. The author had ſaid nothing of them in his anſwer, and ſo they can make nothing againſt Coſtar, who was not obliged to govern himſelf, by what his adverſary ſhould ſay afterwards. They cannot bring Mr de Girac off, for beſides that he did not make uſe of them to ſupport his criticiſm, they cannot prove the thing in diſpute. Suppoſe Juno had an hundred intrigues, will this prove that Jupiter remembered cuckoldom, when he ſettled his houſhold? every body ſees that my firſt remark ruins Girac's cauſe, ſince all that he alledges is grounded upon a falſe ſuppoſition. He might be reduced to this troubleſome dilemma. If you was ignorant, that when Jupiter transformed himſelf into a cuckoo, huſbands diſhonoured by their wives unfaithfulneſs were not called cuckolds, and cornutes, your raillery is very impertinent; for according to your own rules, *a raillery is bad, when it is grounded upon the ignorance of things, which we are obliged to know* (19). If you knew that at that time ſuch ideas were not annexed to thoſe words, you are extreamly to blame for making uſe of proofs, whereof you know the falſity. Let us ſee the ſequel of his reply.

Notwithſtanding all this, ſays he (20), *our Sophiſt urges me to ſhew him, that when the father of the gods put on the ſhape of a cuckoo, the name of that bird ſignified a huſband, whoſe wife was falſe to him. I promiſe and ingage to ſatisfy him, if he proves by good authorities,* that Jupiter was formerly reproached, that in the ſettlement of his houſhold he had not thought of cuckoldom. *As for what relates to horns, that word in the ſignification I have given it, is more antient than is imagined. We learn from Nicetas, that the emperor Andronicus, to ridicule the inhabitants of Conſtantinople, and upbraid them with their wives lewdneſs, uſed to ſet up in the public places of that great city, the fineſt and largeſt ſtags heads, that could be found; and Artemidorus, who lived fifteen hundred years ago, makes uſe* †† *of the words,* to beſtow horns, *as a common proverb, which did not begin in his time* (21). *It would be an ill uſe of one's time, to ſeek the original of it, and to enquire whether it was in uſe in Jupiter Hammon's time. However it be, my adverſary,*

(11) *Coſtar,* Suite de la Defenſe, pag. 382, *confutes this in theſe words:* Ariſtotle ſays ſomewhere in his Rhetoric, that Hegeſippus being returned from Elis, whither he went to conſult the oracle of Jupiter, reſolved likewiſe to conſult that of Delphi, where he aſked Apollo this queſtion: *Will you be of the ſame opinion with your father? Dare you contradict him?* But Girac complains, in his *Reply, pag.* 551, that his words have been falſified: He clearly ſhews that he was not ignorant that Jupiter gave anſwers in other places; but that he gave none through his ſtatue except in Egypt.

‡ Cicer. I, de Nat. Deorum.

(12) Coſtar, Suite de la Défenſe, pag. 380.

* Equidem vix credo hanc fabulam apud veteres inveniri, ſed ſuſpicor ab otioſo quopiam Grammatico fuiſſe confictam: adeo ſapit anile quiddam.

† Tu tibi nunc *curruca* places, fletumque labellis Exorbes. *Sat. VI, ver.* 276.

(13) Coſtar, ubi ſupra, pag. 381.

(14) *He ſpeaks to Mr Menage.*

(15) Coſtar, ubi ſupra, pag. 386.

(16) Replique à Coſtar, ſect. lxiv, pag. 544.

(17) *In the remark* [*D*].

(18) Confer quæ ſupra, *in the remark* [C], *of the article* COLOMIE'S.

(19) Girac, Réponſe à la Défenſe de Voiture, ſect. xxvi, pag. 190. *See* Coſtar, Suite de la Défenſe pag. 381.

(20) Girac, Repl. pag. 545.

†† Lib. ii, cap. xi.

(21) *See Menage's Etymologies of the French Tongue in folio, at the words* cornes *and* cocu.

bear with her, after ſo many juſt occaſions of jealouſy, which he gave her, their quarrels were driven ſo far as a divorce [*F*]; and I believe, that before they came to that, he tried if by beating her he could bring her to reaſon. He hung her up once betwixt heaven and earth for ſome time [*G*]. If on one hand ſhe preſided over marriages and weddings,

adverſary, who pretends to be a ſubtle man, did not perceive, this time, that I laughed at him. This paſſage of Mr de Girac makes it plain, that he has loſt his cauſe: he does not find himſelf capable of proving what is denied him, and without which his criticiſm is inſignificant; he pretends that he deſigned to ridicule his adverſary. There is no writer but may uſe ſuch ſubterfuges, when he knows not what to anſwer: we ſhall ſee Mr Coſtar in his turn ſomewhat puzzled, His knowledge forſook him, when he made uſe of Eraſmus's authority, in a thing where Eraſmus was in the wrong (22). What was it to him if Jupiter was not metamorphoſed into a cuckoo? how came he not to ſee that this metamorphoſis is as credible as ſo many others we read in Ovid? does he not ſhew by his anger againſt thoſe who have related it, that he looks upon it as a thing advantageous to his adverſary; and does not he horribly deceive himſelf to his enemy's advantage? Girac did not fail to take advantage of it: conſider well what follows (23). 'Not being able to deny that I had very properly alledged Jupiter's metamorphoſis into a cuckoo; he calls that fable *an old woman's ſtory, and a ridiculous invention*; as if the change of the ſame god into a ſwan, a bull, and an eagle, had ſomething in it more ingenious and better; as if all fables in general were not equally frivolous, and this as well as others had not it's allegory and mythological explication. But when Mr Coſtar maintains, that *it is an invention of a grammarian making an ill uſe of his leiſure; that it is taken from a ſcholiaſt upon Theocritus*, and when he proves by the authority of Eraſmus, that *it is not to be found in any antient author*, what does he do but ſhew that he is ignorant in company, and that he reads authors only to learn their faults? in effect, I do not find any fable, that is mentioned by a greater number of celebrated authors, than this. And even the ſcholiaſt alledged by Mr Coſtar (ſo great is this man's ſtupidity) affirms that he took it from a tract †† which Ariſtotle had written concerning the temple of Hermione. Plutarch in like manner made mention of it in his book concerning rivers; Pauſanias ſpeaks of it in ſeveral places of his *Corinthiaca*; and Didymus, upon the fourteenth Iliad, relates it from Euphorio, a very antient author, not to cite the ſcholiaſt on the Greek epigrams, nor abundance of others, whoſe catalogue would be too tedious.' I omit the other things upon which Girac criticizes him learnedly and reaſonably, on the ſubject of horns and the cuckoo. The great number of good authors, who have ſpoken of this metamorphoſis of Jupiter, puts me in pain, out of kindneſs to Eraſmus. It were to be be wiſhed for his glory, that he had let that old ſcholiaſt alone. He had better have been aſleep, than writ ſuch a thing as this. Had he not read what Pauſanias ſays (24) concerning mount Thornax (25), which was called *Coccygius*, or *Coccyx*, from the time that Jupiter, transformed into a cuckoo, lay there with Juno? It is a mountain of Laconia. The ſame author ſays, that the reaſon why the Juno of Argus (26) bore a ſceptre with a cuckoo upon it, was becauſe Jupiter aſſumed the form of that bird, to lie with Juno. I do not believe that, adds Pauſanias; but nevertheleſs, *ſays he*, I thought I ought not to omit it. Κόκκυγα δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ σκήπτρῳ καθῆσθαί φασι, λέγοντες τὸν Δία, ὅτε ἤρα παρθένου τῆς Ἥρας, ἐς τοῦτον τὸν ὄρνιθα ἀλλαγῆναι, τὴν δὲ ἅτε παίγνιον θηρᾶσαι. τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, καὶ ὅσα ἐοικότα εἴρηνται περὶ θεῶν, οὐκ ἀποδεχόμενος γράφω, γράφω δὲ οὐδὲν ἧσσον. *Cuculum vero avem idcirco ſceptro ajunt impoſitum, quod virginis Junonis amore captus Jupiter, in eam ſe avem verterit, quam puella tanquam ludicrum captarit. Hæc ego,* & *quæ* his *ſunt ſimilia de dîs vulgata, etſi vera neutiquam exiſtimo, non putavi tamen negligenda* (27).

[*F*] *Their quarrels were driven ſo far as a divorce.*] Pauſanias (28) ſays, there were three temples of Juno at Stymphalum, a town of Arcadia. The firſt was called the temple of Juno, a maid; and the ſecond the temple of Juno, married; and the third the temple of Juno, a widow. Theſe three temples were built to her by Temenus, with whom ſhe had been educated. The laſt was built at the time that ſhe lived at Stymphalum, whither ſhe retired after her divorce. You will find in Charles Stephens's Dictionary, enlarged by Lloyd (29), by what means Jupiter cauſed Juno to return to him. He ſpread a report, that he was going to be married to Aſopus's daughter. This news made a greater impreſſion upon the provoked goddeſs's heart, than all Jupiter's intreaties. See the remark [*Q*], at the place where I relate the generation of Typhon.

[*G*] *He hung her up once between heaven and earth for ſome time.*] The reaſon of it was, that ſhe had raiſed a ſtorm againſt Hercules, Jupiter put her in mind of it, when he knew the tricks ſhe had plaid him during the ſiege of Troy. She knew ſo well how to charm him, and lay him aſleep in her arms, that Neptune had the time neceſſary to put the Trojan affairs in an ill condition. I ſpeak at large of this ſtratagem of Juno, in the following remark. Jupiter, who had given her ſo many ſweet words, and procured her great pleaſures, no ſooner knew the prejudice the Trojans had ſuffered, whilſt he had been lying with her, but he reprimanded her very ſharply. He threatned to whip her (30), and asked her, whether ſhe had forgot the time, when he faſtened an anvil to each of her feet, and ſuffered her to hang between heaven and earth in the ſight of all the gods, who in vain attempted to untie her; for he kicked from heaven to earth as many of them as he could catch.

Ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε τ' ἐκρέμω ὑψόθεν, ἐκ δὲ ποδοῖιν
Ἄκμονας ἧκα δύω, περὶ χερσὶ δὲ δεσμὸν ἴηλα
Χρύσεον, ἄῤῥηκτον; σὺ δ' ἐν αἰθέρει καὶ νεφέλῃσιν
Ἐκρέμω, ἠλάστεον δὲ θεοὶ κατὰ μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον.
Λῦσαι δ' οὐκ ἐδύναντο παρασταδόν; ὃν δὲ λάβοιμι,
Ῥίπτασκον τεταγὼν ἀπὸ βηλοῦ, ὄφρ' ἂν ἵκηται
Γῆν ὀλιγηπελέων.

An non meminiſti quando pependiſti ab alto, à pedibus autem
Incudes demiſi duas, circum manus autem vinculum miſi
Aureum, infrangibilem? tu autem in æthere & nubibus
Pependiſti, indignabantur autem dii per excelſum Olympum:
Solvere autem non poterant circumſtantes: quemcumque autem apprehenderem;
Projiciebam correptum de limine-*divino*, donec perveniret
In terram vix ſpirans (31).

Haſt thou forgot, when bound and fix'd on high
From the vaſt concave of the ſpangled ſky,
I hung thee trembling in a golden chain,
And all the raging gods oppos'd in vain?
Headlong I hurl'd them from th' Olympian hall,
Stunn'd with the whirl, and breathleſs in the fall.

POPE.

It was Juno's beſt way to appear ſubmiſſive: ſhe excuſed herſelf with falſe oaths, and promiſed to comply with the deſires of her huſband. The quarrel went no farther at that time. I ought not to forget, that Juno was the cauſe of the war of the Titans. She encouraged them to dethrone her huſband (32), and to reſtore Saturn, whom Jupiter had depoſed. Jealouſy

---

(22) *The paſſage of Eraſmus quoted by Coſtar, is in the explication of the Adage,* Scit quomodo Jupiter duxerit uxorem. *It is the twenty third of the IVth century of the IVth Chiliad, pag. m.* 914. *He obſerves that the Scholiaſt upon Theocritus relates this upon the credit of one Ariſtotle:* Adjungit fabulam quam retulerit Ariſtoteles neſcio quis. *From whence it appears that he did not believe, as Girac did, that this ſtory was mentioned by Ariſtotle, Alexander's tutor. Several Ariſtotles have writ books. See* Jonſius, de Hiſt. Philoſoph. pag. 61.

(23) Girac, Replique, pag. 546.

†† Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἑρμιόνης ἱερῷ ἰδιώτερον περὶ τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τῆς Ἥρας γάμου, &c. Schol. Theocr. in illum Verſ. Eid. xv, Πάντα γυναῖκες ἴσασι καὶ ὡς Ζεὺς ἠγάγεθ' Ἥρην.

(24) Pauſan. lib. ii, pag. 78.

(25) *So it ought to be called, and not* Θρόναξ, Thronax, *as we read in the Scholiaſt upon Theocritus. Meurſius is the author of that correction.* Miſcell. Lacon. pag. 310. *Coſtar follows Eraſmus, who ſays* Thronax.

(26) *It was a piece of Polycletus.* Pauſan. lib. ii, pag. 59.

(27) Id. ibid.

(28) Id. lib. viii, pag. 253.

(29) *He quotes Phylarchus* lib. xix. *But Natalis Comes,* Mythol. lib. ii, cap. iv, pag. m 133, *quotes* Dorotheus, in lib. ii, Narrationum fabuloſarum.

(30) Καί σε πληγῇσιν ἱμάσσω. Et te verberibus cædam. *Homer. Iliad. lib. XV, ver.* 17.

(31) *Ibid. ver.* 18.

(32) Hygin. cap. cl.

weddings, ſhe had, on the other, the management of their natural conſequences: I mean, that ſhe preſided over child-births, and over ſeveral things depending thereon [*H*]. Michael de Montagne did not well know the origin of an adventure, which he takes from Plato, and expreſſes himſelf a little too wantonly [*I*]. Authors do not agree about the place where

jealouſy was then ſtronger than ambition; for the indignation ſhe conceived when ſhe ſaw Epaphus (33) gratified with a kingdom, made her chuſe rather to be a dethroned goddeſs, provided her husband was ſo to, than to reign with him. But perhaps ſhe propoſed to herſelf a revenge, in which her ambition would be no loſer. She might hope that by preferring the intereſts of her father unjuſtly dethroned, before thoſe of her husband, who was an uſurper, ſhe ſhould have a ſhare in the government, under her father reſtored, and ſhould break for ever with Jupiter. We ſhall ſee hereafter (34) another conſpiracy ſhe ingaged in againſt her husband.

I cannot think of Juno hanging between heaven and earth, without propoſing to my readers a paſſage which I do not underſtand. Hyginus (35) relates, that Vulcan having forged golden ſhoes for Jupiter, and the other gods, Juno was no ſooner ſate down but ſhe found herſelf hung in the midſt of the air. Vulcan had notice of it, that he might come and looſe his mother whom he had bound; but he anſwered he had no mother. He had been kicked out of heaven, and was ſtill enraged for that ill uſage. Here are the Latin words. *Vulcanus Jovi cæteriſque Diis ſoleas aureas ex adamante cum feciſſet, Juno cùm ſediſſet ſubitò in aëre pendere cœpit. Quod cùm ad Vulcanum miſſum eſſet ut matrem quam ligaverat ſolveret, iratus quod de cœlo præcipitatus erat, negat ſe matrem ullam habere.* I commend the critics, who have made ſo many learned obſervations upon the firſt words of Hyginus (36); but I could wiſh, they had taught me, how by means of a pair of ſhoes, a woman as ſoon as ſhe ſits down, can find herſelf hanging in the air. I do not ſee how a chair or a throne can have that effect, and eſpecially upon a perſon bound. Methinks we may complain of this hiſtorian's want of judgment, Could he believe that the reader would be contented with ſo broken and falſified a narration? why did not he ſay, that as ſoon as Juno was ſate down, the floor of heaven ſplit aſunder, and her chair being no longer ſupported, fell towards the clouds, and ſtopped in thoſe ſpaces which are between heaven and earth. This had been intelligible to the reader. Servius tells the ſtory better; he ſays, that Vulcan made a chair, which Juno ſitting upon, could not riſe again (37), till ſhe had granted Vulcan's requeſt. It was to know, who thoſe were to whom he owed his life. ‘ Alii dicunt quod cum Vulcanus ‘ parentes ſuos diu quæreret, nec inveniret; ſedile ‘ fecit tale, ut cum eo qui ſediſſet ſurgere non poſſet; ‘ in quo cum adſediſſet Juno, nec poſſet exſurgere; ‘ Vulcanus negavit ſe ſoluturum omnino, niſi prius ‘ parentes ſuos ſibi monſtraſſet, atque ita factum eſt ‘ ut in Deorum numerum reciperetur (38). —— ‘ *Others ſay, that when Vulcan had ſought his parents* ‘ *a long time, and could not find them, he made ſuch* ‘ *a chair, that whoever ſat in it, could not get up out* ‘ *of it; in which Juno happening to ſit down, and* ‘ *not being able to riſe up again, Vulcan proteſted he* ‘ *would not free her, till ſhe had informed him who* ‘ *were his parents; by which means he was received* ‘ *into the number of the gods.*’ Conſult Pauſanias, and you will find, that Vulcan deſigning to be revenged of Juno, ſent her a throne of gold, to which ſhe found herſelf tied, as ſoon as ſhe ſate down on it (39). None but Bacchus could perſuade Vulcan to return into heaven (40); and he was even obliged to make him drunk to engage him in that voyage. The Athenians had a picture which repreſented Bacchus bringing Vulcan back to heaven (41): and the Lacedemonians had a piece of ſculpture, which repreſented the ſame Vulcan untying his mother (42).

[*H*] *She preſided over child-birth, and over ſeveral things depending thereon.*] When Terence ſuppoſes, that Glycerium the courtezan being in labour, made uſe of this prayer, *Juno Lucina fer opem, ſerva me, obſecro* (43); he manifeſtly ſhows, that Juno was the deity that preſided over that affair. She was called (44), *Opigena & Lucina*, under that function, *ſive te Lucinam quod lucem naſcentibus tribuas, ac Lucetiam convenit nuncupari* (45). She had other particular names given her, according to the different ſervices that were expected from her in theſe conjunctures; for ſhe was called Fluonia, as being able to prevent too great a loſs blood. *Fluoniam Junonem mulieres colebant, quod eam ſanguinis fluorem in conceptu retinere putabant* (46). She was called Februa, as preſiding over the ceremony of the purification of child-bed women. Theſe are the limitations which Martianus Capella gives to the ſirnames Fluonia and Februa: for he introduces Philology, who declares, that being a virgin, ſhe has no need of invocating the goddeſs Juno in thoſe two reſpects. *Nam Fluvoniam Februalemque ac Februam mihi poſcere non neceſſe eſt, cum nihil contagionis corporeæ ſexu intemerata pertulerim* (47). She might have wanted her help in another reſpect, ſince St Auguſtin affirms, that Varro ſaid that Juno preſided over the flowing of the menſtrual blood. *Ibi eſt & Dea Mena, quæ menſtruis fluoribus præeſt, quanvis Jovis filia, tamen ignobilis. Et hanc provinciam fluorum menſtruorum, in libro ſelectorum deorum ipſi Junoni idem autor aſſignat quæ in diis ſelectis etiam regina eſt: & hic tanquam Juno Lucina cum eadem Mena privigna ſua eidem cruori præſidet* (48). I know very well, that many authors make the goddeſs of child-births diſtinct from Juno; for ſome ſay, that Lucina was her daughter (49), and others affirm, that Diana was appointed to aſſiſt women in labour (50). But without inſiſting on the hypotheſis, that Lucina, Ilithya, Diana, Luna, and Juno, were the ſame deity (51), I ſay, it is very probable, that Juno was conſidered, as the chief of this function, and as having deputies, and ſubſtitutes in different places (52). If you will not therefore acknowledge her directly and immediately for the goddeſs Levana, who cauſed the new-born infants to be acknowledged by their fathers (53); nor for the goddeſs Rumina, who preſided over the acton of giving them ſuck; nor for the gooddeſs Cunina, who preſided over their cradles; nor for the goddeſs Nundina, who preſided over the impoſition of their name; nor for the goddeſs Vaticana, who preſided over their cries (54); nor for the goddeſs Fabulina, who preſided over the firſt looſnings of their tongue, that is, over the firſt words they pronounced; believe at leaſt; that all theſe goddeſſes were ſubdelegates to Juno, the ſuperintendant-general. The ſame ought to be ſaid of the goddeſs Proſa, and the goddeſs Poſtverta, who were worſhipped, that children might not take an ill poſture, when ready to be born. ‘ Quando contra naturam forte converſi (*pueri*) ‘ in pedes, brachiis plerumque diductis retineri ſolent: ‘ ægriuſque tunc mulieres enituntur. Hujus periculi deprecandi gratia aræ ſtatutæ ſunt Romæ duabus ‘ Carmentibus: quarum una Poſtverta nominata eſt, ‘ Proſa altera; à recti perverſique partus & poteſtate & nomine (55). —— *When the poſture of children in the womb happens to be unnatural, it is with* ‘ *difficulty their mothers bring forth. To deprecate* ‘ *which danger, there are two altars in Rome dedicated to the two Carmentas; one of whom is named* ‘ *Poſtverta, the other Proſa, from the power and name* ‘ *of a right and perverſe birth.*’

[*I*] *Montagne . . . . . expreſſes himſelf a little too wantonly.*] ‘ It was from ſome poet that was in great ‘ want, and very greedy of this ſport, that Plato had ‘ this ſtory. That Jupiter one day being in a violent ‘ fit of love, and not having patience till his wife ‘ had got into bed, tumbled her on the floor, and ‘ through the vehemence of the pleaſure, forgot the ‘ great and important reſolutions he had been taking ‘ with the other gods in his celeſtial court, boaſting ‘ that he had found that bout as good, as when he ‘ firſt got her maidenhead unknown to her parents (56). So far Montagne. He is to blame for aſcribing this notion to ſome poet greedy of amorous embraces, ſince Homer, the author of that ſtory, does plainly declare he does not think it probable, that a husband ſhould be in ſuch tranſports for his wife. Accordingly he ſuppoſes (57) that Juno was not ſatisfied with putting on her beſt attire, but beſides, had the policy to borrow Venus's Ceſtus, an inevitable charm, a philtre that never failed to produce it's effect. It is to the aſſiſtance of that loan, that he attributes Juno's power of

---

(33) He was a baſtard of Jupiter. Hygin. *ibid.*

(34) In the remark [*F*] of the article JUPITER.

(35) Hygin. cap. clxvi.

(36) In order to know whether we ought to read *folia*, or *ſoleas*. Whether one may ſay *aureas ex adamante*, and whether it were not better to ſay, *folia aurea nexa adamante*, or *folia ex auro & ex adamante*. See Hyginus of the Amſterdam edition, 1681.

(37) Compare what is ſaid of Theſeus, in the ſixth book of the Æneid, *Sedet æternumque ſedebit Infelix Theſeus*; and what the commentators ſay about the ſeat that he was placed upon. See Mr du Rondel concerning the Chenix of Pythagoras, pag. 95, & *ſeq*.

(38) Servius, in Eclog. iv, Virg. ver. 62.

(39) Pauſan. lib. i, pag. 18.

(40) Id. ibid.

(41) Id. ibid.

(42) Id. lib. iii, pag. 99.

(43) Terent. in Andr. Act. III, Sc. I.

(44) Feſtus, pag. m. cxxxix.

(45) Mart. Capella, de Nuptiis Philologiæ lib. ii. pag. m. 37.

(46) Feſtus, pag. m. lxiii.

(47) Mart. Capella, ubi ſupra.

(48) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. vii, cap. ii, pag. m. 618.

(49) Heſiod. in Theog. *See Meziriac upon Ovid's Epiſtles*, pag. 638, & ſeq.

(50) Catullus, Epig. xxxv. Horat Ode xxii, lib. iii, & multi alii.

(51) *See* Meziriac, ubi ſupra.

(52) *See* Kippingus, in Antiq. Romanis, lib. i, cap. i, n. xv, pag. m. 24, 25.

(53) This was performed by taking up the child which the midwife had laid on the ground.

(54) *See* Aulus Gellius, lib xvi, cap. xvii, *where he ſays after Varro*, Deus Vaticanus.

(55) Aul. Gell. lib. xvi, cap. xvi.

(56) Montagne, Eſſays, book i, chap. xxix, pag. m. 309.

(57) Iliad. lib. xiv.

where Juno was educated: ſome ſay it was at Samos (*e*): others ſay it was in the ocean [*K*]; but there was no town where ſhe was more honoured than at Argos [*L*]. She

of inſpiring her husband with ſo violent a fit of love. Several other things might have been cenſured in Montagne's ſtory (58), had not he had the prudence to quote Plato. Wherefore he is not to be called in queſtion on account of the faults of this Philoſopher; but we muſt apply ourſelves to Plato.

It is certain, that he unſaithfully relates Homer's ſtory: his words are theſe. Ἡ Δία καθευδόντων τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ὡς μόνος ἐγρηγορὼς, ἃ ἐβουλεύσατο, τούτων ϖάντων ῥᾳδίως ἐϖιλανθανόμενον, διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀφροδισίων ἐπιθυμέαν; καὶ οὕτως ἐκπλαγέντα, ἰδόντα τὴν Ἥραν, ὥστε μηδ' εἰς τὸ δωμάτιον ἐθέλειν ἐλθεῖν, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ βουλόμενον χαμαὶ ξυγγίγνεσθαι, καὶ λέγοντα ὡς οὕτως ὑπὸ ἐϖιθυμίας ἔχεται, ὡς οὐδ' ὅτε τὸ ϖρῶτον ἐφοίτων ϖρὸς ἀλλήλους--φίλους λήθοντε τοκῆας. Jovem cæteris tum Diis, tum hominibus dormientibus omnium quæ vigilando tractaverat rerum venerearumcupiditate oblitum, & uſque adeò viſa Junone perculſum eſſe, ut nec domum venire ſuſtinuerit, ſed ibidem humi congredi ſtatim voluerit, dicens vehementiori ſe cupidine inflammari, quàm olim cùm primum clam parentibus invicem congreſſi fuerunt (59). —— *Jupiter, the reſt of gods and men being aſleep, eaſily forgot all his counſels, thro' the deſire of venereal pleaſure, and was ſo ſtruck with the ſight of Juno, that he could not ſtay till he got home, but lay with her that inſtant on the ground, ſaying, he was fired with a more ardent deſire, that when they uſed to meet, unknown to their parents.* Plato means, that one of the things, for which Homer's poems ought to be prohibited, is, that we there find, that, whilſt the other gods and men are at reſt, Jupiter cannot ſleep for a lewd temptation, and forgets all the reſolutions he had made; and that upon the ſight of his wife, he is tranſported with ſuch a vehement paſſion, as prompts him to lie with her immediately, without giving her time to go to bed, &c. I ſay once more, Plato alters the ſtory: for Homer does not ſay, that the other gods were aſleep, or that men were at reſt. He ſays on the contrary, that the Greeks and Trojans were vigorouſly fighting, and that Neptune was in action againſt the Trojans. Neither does he ſay, that Jupiter forgot his reſolutions; he ſuppoſes that Jupiter was poſted upon the top of mount Ida, and that Juno ſeeing him there, formed a deſign of inſpiring him with a deſire of lying with her. He ſuppoſes, that in order to execute this project, ſhe went and waſhed her body, ſhe dreſſed and tricked up her ſelf, as fine as ſhe could, and provided her ſelf with Venus's girdle. Whereby he undertakes to deſcribe Jupiter as a very amorous god, since the moſt potent charms were contained in that girdle.

---- ἔνθα δέ οἱ θελκτήρια ϖάντα τέτυκτο.
Ἔνθ' ἔνι μὲν φιλότης, ἐν δ' ἵμερος. ἐν δ' ἀοριστὺς,
Πάρφασις ἥτ' ἔκλεψε νόον πύκαπερ φρονεόντων.

- - - - in eo autem delinimenta omnia incluſa erant:
Ibi inerat quidem amor, inerat deſiderium, inerat & amantium colloquium,
Blandiloquentia quæ furtim ſurripit mentem prudentium licet (60).

In this was ev'ry art, and ev'ry charm,
To win the wiſeſt, and the coldeſt warm;
Fond love, the gentle vow, the gay deſire,
The kind deceit, the ſtill reviving fire,
Perſuaſive ſpeech, and more perſuaſive ſighs,
Silence that ſpoke, and eloquence of eyes.

POPE.

I do not pretend to excuſe him: I grant that Plato moſt juſtly condemns him; for in ſhort, it is a moſt ſcandalous thing thus to play upon the chief of ones gods. For the reſt, the eagerneſs of Jupiter was not ſo great, but that it gave him time to repeat a long catalogue of his miſtreſſes. Some think that Homer does not place this ſtory well; it is not, ſay they, prudence in a husband to repreſent to his wife his unfaithfulneſs to her; this is not a good way of cajoling her. Others juſtify Homer, by reaſon that it muſt needs be very agreeable to a wife to hear her husband ſay, that he feels a greater paſſion for her, than he ever did for ſuch and ſuch miſtreſſes upon the firſt enjoyment. This is what Jupiter's declarations comes to:

Νῶϊ δ' ἄγ' ἐν φιλότητι τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε
Οὐ γὰρ ϖώποτέ μ' ὧδε θεᾶς ἔρος οὐδὲ γυναικὸς
Θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι ϖεριπροχυθεὶς ἐδάμασσεν,
Οὐδ' ὁπότ' ἠρασάμην Ἰξιόνιης ἀλόχοιο, &c.

Nos autem age in amore convertamur in lecto dormientes.
Non enim unquam mihi ſic deæ amor neque mulieris
Animum in pectoribus circumfuſus domuit.
Neque quando captus fui amore Ixioniæ uxoris, &c. (61).

Let ſofter cares the preſent hour employ,
And be theſe moments ſacred all to joy.
Ne'er did my ſoul ſo ſtrong a paſſion prove,
Or for an earthly, or a heav'nly love:
Not when I preſs'd Ixion's matchleſs dame ...

POPE.

I add, that Homer has preſerved decorum on Juno's behalf. He brings her in repreſenting to her huſband the inconvenience that might happen, if any god ſhould ſee them lying together upon mount Ida, and ſhould go and give others notice of it; but, ſaid ſhe, ſince you have a mind to it, let us go into your chamber. Jupiter did not conſent to that expedient, but he found another; which was to form about his wife a cloud ſo thick, that the ſun itſelf could not ſee thro' it, and it was under this cloud that he ſatisfied his paſſion. He did not *threw his wife upon the floor*, as Montagne ſays; but upon the hard ground, in an open place. It is true, the earth immediately ſent forth flowers and graſs (62), which ſerved inſtead of a good quilt. Neither Homer nor Plato make Jupiter ſay, what Montagne does, that *he was as much pleaſed at that time, as when he firſt lay with her unknown to her parents*. Homer ſays only (63), that Jupiter perceiving Juno, felt the ſame paſſion as when he went to lie with her the firſt time. I am willing it ſhould be ſaid, to excuſe Montagne, that he did not believe there was a great difference betwixt theſe two things.

[*K*] *Some ſay ſhe was educated at Samos, others ſay it was in the ocean.*] She herſelf affirms the latter, in her diſcourſe to Venus, when ſhe borrowed her Ceſtus (64). She tells her, that ſhe wanted it to reconcile the ocean with his wife Thetys, who had not lain together for a long time. Her gratitude for the good education ſhe had received with them, engaged her to make a voyage to reconcile them. She promiſes herſelf, that ſhe ſhall for ever be loved and eſteemed by them, if ſhe can perſuade them to lie in the ſame bed.

Δὸς νῦν μοι φιλότητα καὶ ἵμερον, ᾧ τε σὺ ϖάντας
Δαμνᾷ ἀθανάτους ἠδὲ θνητοὺς ἀνθρώπους·
Εἶμι γὰρ ὀψομένη ϖολυφόρβου ϖείρατα γαίης.
Ὠκεανόν τε θεῶν γένεσιν, καὶ μητέρα Τηθὺν,
Οἵ μ' ἐν σφοῖσι δόμοισιν ἐΰτρεφον ἠδ' ἀτίταλλον,
- - - - - - -
Τοὺς εἶμ' ὀψομένη, καί σφ' ἄκριτα νείκεα λύσω.

Ἤδη

(*e*) See the remark [*K*].

(58) See, below, citat. (62), (63).

(59) Plato, de Republica, lib. iii, pag. m. 612. [*A*].

(60) Homer. Iliad. lib. xiv, ver. 215.

(61) Homer. ibid. ver. 314.

(62) Id. ibid. ver. 347.

(63) His words may be ſeen in the remark [*A*], citat. (1).

(64) See alſo what ſhe ſays to Oceanus, and Tethys, *in Ovid. Metam. lib ii*, deſiring them to exclude the conſtellation of the Bear.

She was alſo much reſpected at Carthage [*M*], and at Olympia. There was in this laſt town ſixteen ladies appointed overſeers of the games, which were celebrated to her honour every five years. Three claſſes of young maids diſputed there the prize of the race,

Ἤδη γὰρ δηρὸν χρόνον ἀλλήλων ἀπέχονται
Εὐνῆς καὶ φιλότητος, ἐπεὶ χόλος ἔμπεσε θυμῷ, &c.

Da nunc mihi amorem & deſiderium, quo tu omnes
Domas immortales atque mortales homines
Vado enim viſura almæ fines terræ,
Oceanumque deorum parentem, & matrem Tethyn,
Qui me in ſuis ædibus magna curâ nutrierunt & educarunt,
- - - - -
Hos vado viſura, ipſis ut difficiles compoſitu lites dirimam.
Jam enim diuturno tempore inter ſe abſtinent
Cubili & amore, ira enim invaſit animum, &c (65).

Then grant me, ſaid the queen, thoſe conqu'ring charms,
That pow'r, which mortals and immortals warms;
That love, which melts mankind in fierce deſires,
And burns the ſons of heav'n with ſacred fires.
For lo! I haſte to thoſe remote abodes,
Where the great parents (ſacred ſource of gods)
Ocean and Tethys their old empire keep,
On the laſt limits of the land and deep.
- - - - - - - - - -
For ſtriſe, I hear, has made the union ceaſe,
Which held ſo long that antient pair and peace,
What honour, and what love ſhall I obtain,
If I compoſe thoſe fatal feuds again?

Pope.

Had ſhe had Venus's Ceſtus to her lot, that charm ſo effectual to change the conduct of married people, who lie by themſelves, ſhe had with much reaſon been made to preſide over marriages; but ſhe wanted to borrow the pacific method, and potent inſtrument of reconciliation: why was not this employment given to the goddeſs, from whom the Ceſtus was to be borrowed? I leave it to thoſe who are at leiſure, to enquire into the reaſons of it.

As for her education at Samos, conſult Pauſanias, who ſays, that the inhabitants of that iſland maintained that Juno was born there under a little tree, which they ſtill ſhewed (66). The temple of this goddeſs was very ancient (67). Every body remembers theſe words of the Æneid (68):

Quam Juno fertur terris magis omnibus unam,
Poſthabita coluiſſe Samo. . . . . . .

The iſle was called Parthenia, becauſe Juno was educated there, when ſhe was a virgin (69). There it was alſo, that her marriage with Jupiter was celebrated; whence ſhe came to be repreſented in her temple as a maid, that is a marrying, and the anniverſary of her feaſt was kept like a wedding. *Inſulam Samum ſcribit Varro prius Partheniam nominatam, quòd ibi Juno adoleverit, ibique etiam Jovi nupſerit. Itaque nobiliſſimum, & antiquiſſimum Templum ejus eſt Sami, & ſimulacrum in habitu nubentis figuratum, & ſacra ejus anniverſaria nuptiarum ritu celebrantur* (70).

[*L*] *There was no town where ſhe was more honoured that at Argos.*] The Argivi pretended, that Juno was bred up by the three daughters of the river Aſterion. One of them was called Eubœa; whoſe name was given to the mountain upon which Juno's temple was built: Eupolemus, a native of Argos, was the architect of it: In the porch of it ſtood the ſtatues of all the prieſteſſes of that goodeſs (71): their office was very conſiderable, as I have obſerved, ſpeaking of the unfortunate prieſteſs, who occaſioned the burning of the temple (72). Pauſanias ſays (73) ſhe made her eſcape to the altar of Pallas at Tegea, and that the indignation of the Argivi did not move them to throw down her ſtatue. He ſays, that the moſt antient image of the goddeſs was made of a wild pear-tree. It was carefully preſerved. Piraſus, the ſon of Argus, removed it to Tyrinthus; but the Argivi, having demoliſhed that town, reſtored it to the temple of Juno (74). See Benedictus upon Pin dar(75) concerning the games that were celebrated at Argos, in honour of this goddeſs. See alſo the commentators of Horace, upon theſe words of the ſeventh ode of the firſt book.

Plurimus in Junonis honorem
Aptum dicit equis Argos.

To honour Juno, many ſing
Argos, for horſes fam'd.

Silius Italicus, to ſhew Juno's fondneſs of Carthage, ſays that ſhe prefers it before Argos and Mycenæ.

Hic Juno ante Argos (ſic credidit alta vetuſtas)
Ante Agamemnoniam gratiſſima tecta Mycenem,
Optavit profugis æternam condere ſedem (76).

Theſe favour'd walls imperial Juno choſe,
To fix the exiles in ſecure repoſe.
This town ſhe honours with peculiar grace,
And Argos and Mycenæ muſt give place.

According to Homer (77) the three towns that Juno loved beſt, were Argos, Lacedæmon, and Mycenæ. It is ſtrange he ſays nothing of Samos, the only place that Virgil mentions, when he ſpeaks of the preference ſhe gave to Carthage.

I will ſay ſomething of the founder of Juno's temple at Argos, by which we ſhall diſcover the antiquity of this edifice. Phoroneus, the ſon of Inachus, cauſed it to be built; and was the firſt who armed this goddeſs, in recompence whereof, he was the firſt that reigned. *Phoroneus Inachi filius templum Argis Junoni primus fecit*, ſays Hyginus in his 225th chapter. And chapter 274, *Phoroneus Inachi filius, arma Junoni primus fecit, qui ob eam cauſam primus regnandi poteſtatem habuit.* Some critics inſtead of *arma* will have it read *aram*, or *ſacra*, but others maintain the common reading, and confirm it by a paſſage of Caſſiodorus, in the eighteenth chapter of the ſeventh book *Variorum*. See the commentators upon Hyginus in the Amſterdam edition, 1681. As for the antiquity of Phoroneus, ſee Scaliger, pag. 19. of his notes upon Euſebius's Chronicon. It is ſufficient to remember, that Phoroneus was cotemporary with Abraham, or wanted but little of it.

[*M*] . . . . *And ſo ſhe was at Carthage.*] I a long time thought that Virgil made uſe of a poetical licence, without any regard to hiſtory, when he repreſented Carthage as Juno's favourite city (78): Nor did I think my ſelf obliged to change my opinion, on reading in Ovid and Silius Italicus, the confirmation of Virgil's aſſertion; for one connot reaſonably doubt, that he was the occaſion of Ovid's making Juno ſpeak thus.

Pœniteat quod non ſovi Carthaginis arces,
Cum mea ſint illo currus & arma loco (79):

Repenting that I turn'd an angry eye
From Carthage, where my arms and chariot lye.

As alſo of Silius Italicus's aſſerting what we have ſeen above (80). But having conſidered other paſſages of ſeveral authors, I began to imagine that Virgil's hypotheſis was founded on tradition. Pſyche's prayer is not of the leaſt force with me: ' Magni Jovis germana, *ſays ſhe* (81), & conjuga: ſive tu Sami, quæ ' querulo partu vagituque & alimonia tua gloriatur, ' tenes vetuſta delubra; ſive celſæ Carthaginis, quæ ' te virginem vectura leonis cælo commeantem percolit, beatas ſedes frequentas: ſive prope ripas Inachi, ' qui te jam nuptam Tonantis, & reginam dearum ' memorat, inclytis Argivorum præſides mœnibus: ' quam cunctus oriens Zygiam veneratur, & omnis occidens

---

(65) Homer. Iliad. lib. xiv, ver. 198. *Juno repeats the ſame thing upon Mount Ida, when Jupiter aſks her whither ſhe is going.* Ibid ver. 301.

(66) Pauſanias, lib. vii, pag 209.

(67) Id. ibid.

(68) Lib. i, ver. 15.

(69) *Scholiaſt. Apollonii, in lib. iv.* He ſays upon the 187th verſe of the firſt book, that the Imbreſus, a River of Samos, was called Παρθένιος, becauſe Juno was brought up there when ſhe was a maid.

(70) Lactant. lib. i, cap. xvii, pag. m. 54. *See alſo St Auguſtin*, de Civitat. Dei, lib. vi, cap vii.

(71) Ex Pauſan. lib. ii, pag. 59.

(72) See the article CHRYSIS.

(73) Pauſan. ubi ſupra. *See alſo* lib. iii, pag. 86.

(74) Id. ibid.

(75) Pag. 142, 628.

(76) Silius Italicus, lib. i, ver. 26.

(77) Iliad. lib. iv, ver. 51.

(78) Æneid. lib. i, circa init.

(79) Ovid. Faſt. lib. vi, ver. 45.

(80) In the foregoing remark, citat. (76).

(81) Apuleius, lib. vi, Metam. circa init.

race, and came down to run at the Olympic games, and took almoſt all the time. The victorious ladies received a crown of olive. The ſame ladies made a *peplus* (*f*), which they conſecrated to this goddeſs every five years (*g*). For the reſt, Jupiter's unfaithfulneſs to his wife was ſo much the more inexcuſable, becauſe Juno had the ſecret of growing a maid again every year [*N*]. Her love for Jaſon has not been much talked of [*O*]. She with honour got out of the ſnares that Ixion had laid for her [*P*]. If we believe ſome authors, ſhe had no child by her huſband; and whenever ſhe conceived, ſhe

'cidens Lucinam appellat: ſis meis extremis caſibus 'Juno Soſpita, meque in tantis exantlatis laboribus 'defeſſam, imminentis periculi metu libera. —— '*Great ſiſter, and wife of Jove: whether thou inhabiteſt the antient temples of Samos, which glories to have given you birth, and nouriſhed you in infancy; or frequenteſt the happy ſeats of Carthage, which worſhips thy virgin deity, drawn by lions through the heavenly road: or, near the banks of Inachus, who now commemorates thee, wife of the thunderer, and queen of gods, thou preſideſt over the famed walls of Argos: whom the whole eaſt worſhips under the name of Zygia, and the weſt calls Lucina: be to me, in my greateſt difficulties, Juno the preſerver, and free me, tired with ſo great labours, from the fear of impending danger.*' This concerns Juno directly, and without ambiguity. Herodian's paſſage concerning Urania (82) of Carthage, does not ſeem to have the ſame weight; for it induces us to believe that this Urania was not Juno, but the moon. Now I do not conſider here the Theology of thoſe who reduce many of the Pagan gods into one; I only keep to the public notions, according to which, Juno was worſhipped as the ſiſter and wife of Jupiter, and as a diſtinct object from Minerva, Diana, the moon, Proſerpina, *&c.* For the reſt, I cannot think on the worſhip that was paid to this goddeſs in ſo many places (83), and with ſo much pomp, without believing there were mixed with it, I know not what impreſſions of the cuſtom, which is obſerved with reſpect to women. When a woman has a ſhare in the government, ſhe is much more attended, honoured, and reſpected, than a man in the ſame authority. Conſider how the wives of the governours of provinces are courted, when they are known to have a great intereſt. The honours that are paid to them exceed thoſe that are given their husbands. This is the practice of the earth, and it is carried into heaven. Jupiter was ſerved as a king, and Juno as an ambitious, haughty, and revengeful queen, who divided with him the government of the world, and aſſiſted in all his councils.

Οὔτε ϖοτ' εἰς εὐνὴν Διὸς ἤλυθε μητιόεντος,
Οὔτε ϖοτ' εἰς θῶκον ϖολυδαίδαλον, ὡς τοπάρος ϖερ,
Αὐτῷ ἐφεζομένη ϖυκινὰς φραζέσκετο βουλάς.

Nunquam ad cubile Jovis venit conſiliarii,
Nunquam ad thronum varium, ſicuti antea
Cum ipſo ſedens, ſapientia conſultans conſilia (84).

I dare ſay that the extravagances that Chriſtans are fallen into, towards the Virgin Mary, which go beyond all that the Heathens invented in honour of Juno, are owing to the ſame original, I mean to, the cuſtom of honouring women, and making court to them, with greater zeal and reverence than to the other ſex. We cannot be without women either in a civil or religious life. He that ſhould take from the Romiſh communion the devotion to ſaints, and eſpecially to her whom they call the queen of heaven, and the queen of angels, would leave a frightful gap in it: the reſt would fall in pieces, and would be *arena ſine calce, ſcopæ diſſolutæ.* Eraſmus blaming the cuſtom of ſaluting the Virgin Mary in the pulpit, after the beginning of the ſermon, ſays, *That it is contrary to the example of all the antients, who were rather to be imitated, than ſuch ſort of people, as perhaps to pleaſe women, have herein trod in the ſteps of the Heathens* (85).

[*N*] *She had the ſecret of growing a maid again every year.*] This ſhe did by only waſhing herſelf in a fountain (86). 'Juno took great care, *ſays the writer of a dictionary* (87), to waſh herſelf every year in the fountain Canathus near Nauplia, which at preſent is called Napoli di Romania, where ſhe conſtantly recovered her virginity, which made her beloved by Jupiter, '*Pauſan. lib.* 8.' It is not true that Pauſanias obſerves that ſhe hereby made herſelf beloved by Jupiter. He only ſays that the Argivi ſpoke of this return of Juno's virginity, and founded what they ſaid upon the practice of their occult ceremonies in the myſteries of this goddeſs. There are many writers, who quoting an author, are guilty of making him ſay whatever they think he ſhould have ſaid. This was the occaſion of imputing to Pauſanias what he did not ſay. The author of this falſe imputation, was probably full of what he had been relating: 'Diego de Torrez, in his hiſtory 'of the Cheriſs, ſays, that amongſt the felicities the 'Turks hope for in another life, they believe their 'wives will bring them new maidenhands, *cap.* 74.' The fountain of youth, ſo celebrated by our old poets and romancers, had not a virtue comparable to that of Canathus.

[*O*] *Her love for Jaſon has not been much talked of.*] Some authors ſay that Jaſon owed the friendſhip and protection of this goddeſs to a good ſervice he had done her, without knowing, who ſhe was. Juno diſguiſed like an old woman, deſired him to carry her over a river: he did it, and loſt one of his ſhoes by the bargain. But others ſay he owed to his beauty the intereſt he had in her. Juno could not withſtand ſo many charms, but grew paſſionately fond of that handſome youth. Ὅτι δὲ εὐπρεπὴς ἦν ὁ Ἰάσων δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ καὶ τὴν Ἥραν κατά τινας αὐτῷ ἐπιμανῆναι. *Jaſonem fuiſſe perpulchrum hinc patet, quod juxta quoſdam ipſa Juno inſano amore eum proſecuta fuerit* (88). Theſe are the authors who mention the other ſtory. 'Pelias ..... forte vidit Jaſonem nudo 'pede veniſſe, qui dum Junonem tranſmutatam in 'anus ſpeciem credens mortalem petentem per vadum 'fluminis transferret, alteram ex caligis in limo amiſerat (89), —— *Pelias .... happened to ſee Jaſon arrive, with one foot bare, who, whilſt he was carrying Juno, transformed into an old woman, whom he took for a mortal, acroſs a river, loſt one of his ſandals in the mud.*' You will find in Hyginus (90) the ſame particular more largely deſcribed, with the marks of gratitude which Juno gave him. Valerius Flaccus ſuppoſes that it was in very bad weather, that ſhe received this kindneſs; and he adds that Jaſon diſcovered her to be a goddeſs, by the fright that ſeized her, becauſe ſhe knew the thunder to be the voice of Jupiter, who called her home. It was therefore at a time of elopement: ſhe had left her husband, and had no great inclination to return.

Omnipotens regina, inquit, quam turbidus atro
Æthere cæruleum quateret cum Jupiter imbrem,
Ipſe ego præcipiti tumidum per Enipea nimbo
In campos & tuta tuli, nec credere quivi
Ante deam, quam te tonitru nutuque repoſci
Conjugis, & ſubita raptam formidine vidi (91).

Celeſtial queen, whom when tempeſtuous Jove
In ſtorms deſcended from the gloom above
In a thick cloud, unwittingly I bore
Thro' ſwoln Enipeus to a ſafer ſhore;
Nor deem'd thee goddeſs,
Till fear betray'd thee, from thy conſort fled,
And now recall'd by thunder to his bed.

[*P*] *She with honour got out of the ſnares that Ixion laid for her.*] Ixion having committed a parricide (92) of which he could find no body to abſolve him, received at laſt this good office from Jupiter himſelf. For which he was ſo ungrateful, as to attempt to graft horns on his benefactor's head: he fell in love with Juno, and earneſtly preſſed her to the point. But ſhe refuſed him, and complained of the affront to Jupiter, who deſiring to be witneſs of this baſeneſs, formed a cloud juſt like his wife, and left it to Ixion's diſcretion, who uſed it as amorous people uſed to do. Hence came

(*f*) A kind of gown or veil.

(*g*) Ex Pauſanias, lib. v, cap. xvi, pag. m. 417.

(82) It was ſaid, that her ſtatue had been conſecrated by Dido, when ſhe built Carthage. See *Herodian, lib. v, cap. vi.*

(83) I ſhall ſay in the remark [*Y*], ſomething concerning the temples ſhe had in Italy.

(84) See Homer in the Hymn to Apollo, where he ſays that Juno left her huſband for a year, by reaſon of Minerva's birth.

(85) Eraſmus in Eccleſiaſt. apud Colemiés, Rome Proteſtante, pag. 25.

(86) *Called* Canathus. *It was in* Peloponneſus. *See* Pauſanias, lib. ii, ſub fin. pag. 80.

(87) Cæſar de Rochefort. Diction. Général & Curieux, pag. 612, 613.

(88) Schol Pindari, in Pyth. Ode 4, apud Meziriacum, Not in Epiſt. Ovid. pag. 540.

(89) Servius, in Eclog. iv. Virgil. ver. 34.

(90) Hygin. cap. xxii. *See alſo* cap. xiii. Apollon. Rhodius, lib. iii, ver. 66.

(91) Valer. Flaccus, Argon. I, ver. 81.

(92) He had treacherouſly killed his wife's father.

ſhe did it in a manner altogether extraordinary [*Q*]: but ſhe had milk as is uſual; and this may well be ſuppoſed, ſince ſhe ſuckled a baſtard of her huſband's. He was obliged to uſe ſtratagems to bring her to it; and then they ſay was formed in the ſky what people call the Milky Way [*R*]. Some of thoſe who put the word *regina* in the number of Juno's epithets, are guilty of a childiſh error [*S*]; tho' under that name ſhe was the protectreſs of the Veientes (*b*), and placed at Rome upon one of the ſeven hills. I queſtion whether thoſe who ſay ſhe firſt began to favour the Romans in the ſecond Punic war [*T*], are in the right. She was honoured at Rome, under ſome other

came the race of the Centaurs. He boaſted afterwards to have lain with Juno; which, as is ſaid, putting Jupiter out of patience, made him throw him into hell, and condemn him to the puniſhment of the wheel (93). He did not act like a jealous huſband: for is there any Italian who would ſuffer his wife's galants to gratify their paſſion with her figure. He would hinder, if he could, their diverſion with her in imagination or in a dream.

[*Q*] *She always conceived in a manner extraordinary.*] According to the common opinion, ſhe was mother but of three children, Mars, Vulcan, and Hebe. As for Mars, ſhe conceived him by the touch of a flower, which Flora ſhewed her. She had a mind to be revenged of her huſband, who had produced Minerva without her aſſiſtance, and to ſhew him that ſhe could do as much without the concurrence of any male.

> Protinus hærentem decerpſi pollice florem,
>   Tangitur, & tacto concipit illa ſinu.
> Jamque gravis Thracen & læva Propontidos intrat,
>   Fitque potens voti, Marſque creatus erat (94).

> *I pluck'd the flow'r: it's wond'rous virtue ſuch,*
> *She touch'd it, and grew pregnant at the touch:*
> *Then enter'd Thrace, and the Propontic ſhore,*
> *Where, miſtreſs of her wiſh, god Mars ſhe bore.*

As to Vulcan, ſhe conceived him by the wind, by an influence like that of the Spaniſh mares (95). Ὅμοια δὲ τούτοις καὶ περὶ τῆς Ἥρας ᾄδουσιν ἄνευ τῆς πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα ὁμιλίας ὑπηνέμιον αὐτὴν παῖδα γεννῆσαι τὸν Ἥφαιςον. His autem ſimilia etiam de Junone canunt, nempe hanc citra virilem congreſſum ſubventaneo conceptu gravidam puerum edidiſſe Vulcanum (96). —— *They tell juſt ſuch another ſtory of Juno; namely, that, without the help of man, and being impregnated by the wind, ſhe brought forth Vulcan.* She became with child of Hebe, by feeding heartily upon lettuces. This daughter was the goddeſs of youth, and ſerved for a cup-bearer to the gods, till an unfortunate accident that happened to her at a great feaſt. She fell down, and ſhewed the gods all that was hid under her petticoats. She loſt her employment by that accident (97). I know that according to others, ſhe was the daughter of Jupiter and Juno, in the common way.

Natalis Comes ought here to be confuted, who probably has miſled ſome Lexicographers. He ſays that Juno reſenting the birth of Minerva, prayed heaven and earth, the celeſtial and infernal gods, to grant ſhe might be a mother, without the conjunction of a male. She ſtruck the ground with her hand, and at a certain period of time it brought forth Typhon (98). To prove this, he cites ſome Greek verſes, which manifeſtly ſignify that Juno brought forth Typhon. How well does he underſtand what he alledges?

> Ὃν ποτ' ἄρ' Ἥρη ἔτικτε χολωσαμένη Διῒ πατρὶ
> Εὖτ' ἄρα δὴ Κρονίδης ἐρικυδέα γείνατ' Ἀθήνην
> Ἐν κορυφῇ.

> Hunc (*Typhona*) irata Jovi patri Juno edidit olim,
> Quum fuit illius de vertice nata Minerva.

> *Juno, enraged, the monſter Typhon bore,*
> *When from Jove's head the blue-ey'd goddeſs ſprung.*

Homer in his hymn to Apollo tells this ſtory ſo plainly, that we may well wonder how ſo many authors came to take the one for the other. He ſays that Juno invoking heaven and earth, and all the infernal gods, to grant her a ſon, without the aſſiſtance of Jupiter, ſtruck the earth, and made it tremble, and took that earthquake for a good omen; upon which ſhe left her huſband a whole year, at the end whereof ſhe had a ſon who reſembled neither men, nor the gods: and this was Typhon.

> Ἡ δὲ ἔτεκ' οὔτε θεοῖς ἐναλίγκιον οὔτε βροτοῖσι,
> Δεινόν τ' ἀργαλέον τε Τυφάονα, πῆμα βροτοῖσιν.

> Hæc autem peperit neque diis ſimilem, neque mortalibus,
> Gravemque difficilemque Typhaona, damnum mortalibus (99).

[*R*] *Then the Milky Way was made in the ſky.*] It was Hercules ſhe gave ſuck to: but this child, whoſe ſtrength was already prodigious, ſo ſqueezed her breaſt, that ſhe could not endure it; and as ſhe haſtily ſnatched it from him, ſome of her milk dropped. From this matter was formed the circle, which the Greeks call γαλαξία, and the Latins *orbis lacteus*, *via lactea*, &c (100). The Poet Manilius has touched upon this fable:

> Nec mihi celanda eſt famæ vulgata vetuſtas
> Mollior: è niveo lactis, fluxiſſe liquorem
> Pectore Reginæ Divum, cœlumque colore
> Infeciſſe ſuo. Quapropter lacteus orbis
> Dicitur, & nomen cauſſa deſcendit ab ipſa (101).

> *'Tis fabled, that a milky liquor flow'd*
> *From Juno's breaſts, and ſtain'd the heav'nly road.*
> *From hence a Milky Way amidſt the ſtars,*
> *The name deſcending from the cauſe appears.*

Some ſay that the milk, which made this circle, fell from Hercules's mouth, who had ſucked Juno too greedily (102). Theſe ſtories ſuppoſe that Juno was then in heaven; but the Thebans did not allow that: they ſhewed the place where this goddeſs, deceived by Jupiter, gave ſuck to Hercules (103).

[*S*] *Some of thoſe who put the word* regina *in the number of her epithets, are guilty of a childiſh error.*] For they bring (104) for a proof of it a paſſage of Virgil (105), in which there is no particular epithet. The father of the people, the magnificent, the great, the juſt, the wiſe, *&c.* are epithets or titles of diſtinction given to certain princes; but that cannot be ſaid of the title of king of France: nor can it be ſaid of that of queen of France. Now Juno in theſe words of Virgil, is called the queen of the gods, juſt as Anne of Auſtria, wife of Lewis XIII, was called queen of France. Juno was the wife of Jupiter the king of the gods and of men, *Divum pater atque hominum rex* (106), as ſhe ſtiles him herſelf in the Æneid (107). Elſewhere (108) ſhe tells him, that he rules over all the gods, σὺ δὲ πᾶσι μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσεις. If proofs had been looked for in Livy, good ones might have been found there. See the following remark, where I relate what he ſays of Camillus, about the taking of Veii. Theſe words of Juvenal *niveam Reginæ cædimus agnam* (109), would have been a better proof, than what is pretended to be found in the firſt book of the Æneid.

[*T*] *I queſtion whether thoſe are in the right who ſay ſhe firſt began to favour the Romans in the ſecond Punic war.*] Camillus preparing to aſſault the Veientes, offered the tenth part of the booty to Apollo, and implored Juno, the protectreſs of the beſieged, to forſake them, and to come to Rome, where ſhe would

---

(*b*) *See the remark* [*U*].

(93) *Taken from* Natalis Comes, Mytholog. lib. vi. *Abating ſome few circumſtances, all this is to be found in* Diodor. Sicul. lib. iv, cap. 71. *See alſo* Lucian, in Deor. Dialogis, pag. 132, & ſeq. Tom. I.

(94) Ovid. Faſtor. lib. v, ver. 255.

(95) *See the article* HIPPOMANES, *at the end of this work.*

(96) Lucianus, de Sacrificiis, pag. 352, Tom. I.

(97) Servius, apud Lloyd, voce *Hebe.*

(98) Quæ cum manu humum percuſſiſſet, ſequenti poſtea tempore natus eſt ex ea terra Typhon, &c. *Nat. Comes, Mytholog. lib. vi, cap. xxii, pag. m.* 644. You will find the ſame thing in Lloyd's Dictionary.

(99) Homer. Hymn. in Apoll. ver. 351.

(100) Achilles Tatius, in Iſagoge ex Eratoſthene in Catameriſmo, apud Lloyd, voce *Juno.*

(101) Manilius, lib. i, pag. m. 24.

(102) *See* Philoponus, in I Meteor apud Philippum Cæſium, in Cœlo Aſtronomico-Poëtico, pag. 15.

(103) Pauſanias, lib ix, pag. 300.

(104) Franciſc. Pomey, in Pantheo Mythico, pag. m. 924.

(105) Aſt ego, quæ Divûm incedo regina, Joviſque Et ſoror, & conjux . . . *Virgil Æneid. lib. i, ver.* 46.

(106) Ariſtotle, *lib. de Morib* Θ, ſhews that Homer by theſe words, πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, which denote Jupiter, declares him to be king of the gods and of men. See *Virgil, cum notis Varior. Edit. Leyden,* 1680. *Æn. lib. i, ver.* 65.

(107) Æneid. lib. i, ver. 65.

(108) Iliad. lib. iv, ver. 61.

(109) Sat. XII, ver. 13.

other titles, as that of *Moneta* [U], *Soſpita*, &c. They were not contented to join with the inhabitants of Lanuvium in the year 416, in worſhipping her under this laſt title (i): ſhe had moreover a temple built to her in the *Forum Olitorium* in the year 560. Caius Cornelius

have a temple worthy of her. ‘Tuo ductu, inquit, (*Dictator*) Pythice Apollo, tuoque numine inſtinctus pergo ad delendam urbem Vejos: tibique hinc decimam partem prædæ voveo. Te ſimul Juno Regina, quæ nunc Vejos colis, precor ut nos victores in noſtram tuamque mox futuram urbem ſequare: ubi te dignum amplitudine tua templum accipiat (110). —— *Directed, and inſpired by thee, O Pythian Apollo, (ſaid the Dictator) I ſet forth to demoliſh the city Veii, and I dedicate to thee the tenth part of the plunder. I likewiſe ſupplicate thee, O Juno, who now inhabiteſt Veii, that thou wouldeſt follow us the conquerors to our city, hereafter to be thine own, where a temple worthy thy dignity awaits thee.*’ After the plundering of the town, they proceeded to the removal of the gods, and behaved themſelves with a great deal of reverence in it. One aſked the ſtatue of Juno, whether ſhe was willing to go to Rome: ſhe made a ſign that ſhe was; nay, it was pretended that ſhe ſaid yes. There was no trouble in removing her; one would have thought that ſhe put herſelf in motion to follow the victorious. Camillus conſecrated a temple to her, upon mount Aventinus (111), according to the promiſe he had made her. The words of Livy are ſo fine and remarkable, that all thoſe, who underſtand Latin, will be glad to read them, without the trouble of turning to that author. ‘Cum jam humanæ opes aſportatæ egeſtæque à Veiis eſſent, amoliri tum Deûm dona ipſoſque Deos, ſed colentium magis quam rapientium modo, cœpere. Namque delecti ex omni exercitu juvenes, purè lotis corporibus, candida veſte, quibus deportanda Romam Regina Juno aſſignata erat, venerabundi templum inire, primo religioſe admoventes manus: quod id ſignum more Etruſco niſi certæ gentis ſacerdos attrectare non eſſet ſolitus. Deinde quum quidam, ſeu ſpiritu divino tactus, ſeu juvenili joco, *Viſne Romam ire Juno?* annuiſſe cæteri Deam conclamaverunt: inde fabulæ adjectum eſt, vocem quoque dicentis, *Velle*, auditam. Motam certè ſede ſua parvi molimenti adminiculis, ſequentis modo accepimus levem ac facilem tranſlatu fuiſſe: integramque in Aventinum æternam ſedem ſuam, quò vota Romani dictatoris vocaverant, perlatam; ubi templum ei poſtea idem, qui voverat, Camillus dedicavit (112). —— *The wealth of Veii being removed, they began to carry off the dedications of the gods, and the gods themſelves, but more after the manner of worſhippers than ſpoilers. For a ſelect band of youth of the army, having waſhed their bodies, and being dreſſed in white garments, to whom the care of tranſporting the goddeſs Juno to Rome was aſſigned, entered the temple with reverence, at firſt religiouſly touching her: for, by the cuſtom of Etruria, a prieſt of a certain family had the ſole privilege of handling that ſtatue. But one of them, whether inſpired, or jeſtingly, ſaying,* Will you go to Rome, Juno? *the reſt cried out, that the goddeſs nodded: whence it was fabled, that a voice was likewiſe heard, which ſaid* Yes. *It is certain, ſhe was very eaſily removed, and tranſlated entire to mount Aventin, her everlaſting reſidence, whither the vows of the Roman dictator had invited her; where the ſame Camillus afterwards dedicated a temple to her.*’ Plutarch makes Livy ſay, that Camillus intreating Juno to come to Rome, touched her ſtatue, and that ſhe anſwered ſhe conſented to it, and would gladly follow him. Λιούιος δὲ φησιν εὔχεσθαι μὲν τὸν Καμιλλον ἁπτόμενον τῆς θεοῦ καὶ παρακαλεῖν, αποκρίνασθαι δὲ τινας τῶν παρόντων ὅτι καὶ βούλεται καὶ συγκαταινεῖ, καὶ συνακολουθεῖ προθύμως. *Livius tradit inter precandum attrectaſſe Camillum Deam & invitaſſe: inde velle & annuere ac ſequi libentem reſpondiſſe ex adſtantibus nonnullos* (113). Compare this with Livy's words, and you will clearly ſee that Plutarch has not underſtood them; or rather that he has quoted them without book, and that he has disfigured the circumſtances: and as he probably truſted to his memory on many occaſions, I fear that in ſeveral particulars, we find in his books not what he had read, but the notion, which the hiſtories he had read, left in his imagination. The prayers that Livy aſcribes to Camillus, with relation to Juno, were before the taking of Veii. How then could he ſay that Camillus prayed, laying his hand upon the ſtatue? What I am going to ſay, comes nearer to my text.

Plutarch adds, that they who maintain that Juno's ſtatue anſwered either by ſigns, or by words, that ſhe conſented to Camillus's petition, have a very ſtrong argument to alledge, that is, the proſperity of Rome: for that town, *ſays he*, ſo little as it was, could never have raiſed itſelf to ſuch an height of power, without the continual favour of a tutelary god. Οἱ δ' ἰσχυριζόμενοι καὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ βοηθοῦντες, μεγίστην μὲν ἔχουσι συνήγορον τὴν τύχην τῆς πόλεως, ἣν ἀπὸ σμικρᾶς καὶ καταφρονουμένης ἀρχῆς ἐπὶ μέγα δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως προελθεῖν δίχα θεοῦ πολλαῖς καὶ μεγάλαις ἐπιφανείαις ἑκάστοτε συμπαρόντος, ἀμήχανον. *Cæterum hoc miraculum adſtruentibus & defendentibus fortuna magnopere ſuffragatur urbis, quæ ex parvo & humili exordio, ſine numinis perpetuo ex multis & magnis ſignis præſentis favore, evadere ad eam gloriam & potentiam haudquaquam potuiſſet* (114). He believes therefore that Juno being removed from Veii to Rome, made the Romans proſper, and procured that train of victories, which rendered them ſo formidable: and therefore Jupiter's prediction, that Juno ſhould at laſt favour the Roman nation, muſt have been fulfilled in the year of Rome 359 (115).

> —— quin aſpera Juno,
> Quæ mare nunc terraſque metu cœlumque fatigat,
> Conſilia in melius referet, mecumque fovebit
> Romanos rerum Dominos gentemque togatam (116).
>
> —— *e'en ſhe, who now*
> *Embroils with anxious fear heav'n, earth, and ſeas,*
> *E'en ſullen Juno then ſhall bend her thoughts*
> *To better counſels, and with me promote*
> *Rome's lordly ſons, the nation of the gown.*
>
> TRAPP.

And yet, becauſe ſome Poets have been pleaſed to bring down this epocha to the ſecond Punic (117) war (118), the commentators rather depend upon this fiction, than upon the authority of the hiſtorians. I obſerve, that beſides the temple that Juno had at Rome upon mount Aventinus, ſhe had part of the temple of the capitol with her huſband and Minerva (119). The temple of Juno Moneta, which I ſpeak of in the following remark, affords me a good proof.

[U] *She was honoured at Rome . . . . under the title of Moneta.*] It appears from ſeveral paſſages of the antients (120), that the epithet *Regina* was given to that Juno whom Camillus brought from Veii, and to whom he built a temple on mount Aventinus. As for Juno Moneta, ſhe had her ſeat in the capitol. Valerius Maximus is perhaps the only author who has confounded theſe two Juno's. I doubt not but this is one of the miſtakes which are ſo plentiful in Valerius Maximus. ‘Nec minus voluntarius, *ſays he* (121), Junonis in urbem noſtram tranſitus. Captis à Furio Camillo Veiis, milites juſſu Imperatoris ſimulacrum Junonis Monetæ, quod ibi præcipua religione cultum erat, in Urbem tralaturi, ſede ſua movere conabantur. Quorum ab uno per jocum interrogata Dea, an Romam migrare vellet, velle ſe reſpondit. Hac voce audita, luſus in admirationem verſus eſt. Jamque non ſimulacrum, ſed ipſam cœlo Junonem petitam portare ſe credentes, læti in ea parte montis Aventini, in qua nunc templum ejus cernimus, collocaverunt. —— *Nor was the tranſlation of Juno to our city leſs voluntary. For Furius Camillus having taken Veii, the ſoldiers, being commanded by the general to tranſport to Rome the image of Juno Moneta, which was there particularly worſhipped, endeavoured to remove it, one of whom jeſtingly aſking the goddeſs, whether ſhe would go into Rome, ſhe anſwered, yes. Hearing this, their jeſting was turned into admiration. And now, believing that they carried not the image of Juno, but the goddeſs herſelf, they joyfully placed her in that part of mount Aventin, where we now ſee her temple.*’ What he ſays is ſufficient

---

(i) Livius, lib. viii, cap. xiv. *See the beginning of the remark* [Y].

(110) T. Livius, Dec. I, lib. v, cap. xxi.

(111) Tum Junoni reginæ templum in Aventino locavit dedicavitque matutæ matri. *Idem, ibid. cap. xxiii.*

(112) Id. ibid. cap. xxii.

(113) Plutarch. in Camillo, pag. 132. A.

(114) Id ibid.

(115) In which the town of Veii was plundered.

(116) Virgil. Æn. lib. i, ver. 279.

(117) Which began in the year of Rome 535.

(118) Quia bello Punico ſecundo, ut ait Ennius, placata Juno cœperit favere Romanis. *Servius, in hunc locum Virgilii.* See Silius Italicus, lib. xii, pag. m. 520. Horace, lib. ii, Ode i.

(119) *See Dauſqueius, upon* Silius Italicus, lib. x, pag. 435.

(120) Decretum eſt Junoni Reginæ in Aventino Junonique ſoſpite Lanuvii majoribus hoſtiis ſacrificaretur. *Liv. lib. xxii, init. See alſo* lib xxvii, cap. xxxvii, *where he deſcribes the ceremonies that were performed in honour of* Juno regina in Aventino. *They ſung an Hymn compoſed by the poet Livius.* Carmen in Junonem reginam . . . illa tempeſtate forſitan laudabile rudibus ingeniis, nunc abhorrens & inconditum ſi referatur.

(121) Valer. Maxim. lib i, cap. viii, n. 3.

Cornelius Cethegus, who had vowed it four years before, when he was conſul, and made war with the Inſubres (*k*), conſecrated it when he was cenſor (*l*). This temple was repaired in 663, which was occaſioned by a woman's dream (*m*). Juno's worſhip at Rome was very antient [*X*]. The honours ſhe received in other towns of Italy were very great [*Y*]. She wrought there many miracles. She had a temple at Falerii, before

ſufficient to ſhew his confounding things; for in another book (122) he ſays, that the temple of the goddeſs Moneta was in the capitol, in the place where Manlius's houſe had been. Now according to Livy, the temple that was built where that houſe ſtood, was conſecrated to Juno Moneta, at the time of the war with the Aurunci. It was conſecrated the year after, that is, in the year of Rome 413 (123). Ovid, in the ſixth book of the Faſti, perfectly agrees in this with Livy. The verſes in which he ſpeaks of it, inform us, that it was Camillus who conſecrated that temple. Hereupon a critic obſerves (124), that nevertheleſs Plutarch ſays nothing of this vow of Camillus, but is contented to ſay, that Manlius's houſe was raſed, and that the temple of the goddeſs Moneta was built in the place where that houſe ſtood. This critic doubtleſs thought, that the Camillus mentioned by Ovid, is the ſame whoſe life is written by Plutarch; he, I ſay, who mightily ſtrove to bring Manlius to puniſhment. I do not believe that Ovid was ſo groſsly miſtaken. He who conſecrated the temple of Juno Moneta, was Camillus the ſon. Therefore it is not to be thought ſtrange, that the hiſtorian of the father ſhould ſay nothing of this conſecration; but he may be blamed for his careleſs relation of the fate of Manlius's houſe. He ſays (125) that the Romans having demoliſhed it, ordered the temple of the goddeſs Moneta to be built in the room of it, and decreed, that from thenceforth no patrician ſhould live in the capitol. Is there any reader but would from ſuch a narration conclude, that theſe three things were performed at the ſame time? who could imagine, that this temple was not conſecrated till above forty years after Manlius puniſhment? there is ſomething in Cicero, that a little perplexes this matter; which is, that Juno, who had a temple in the capitol, was ſirnamed Moneta, becauſe ſhe adviſed the people of Rome to ſacrifice a big-bellied ſow. 'Scriptum à multis cum terræ motus, factus eſſet ut ſue plena procuratio fieret, vocem ab æde Junonis ex arca exiiſſe, quocirca Junonem illam appellatam Monetam (126). ——— *Many have recorded, that, there being an earthquake, a voice was heard from the ſhrine in the temple of Juno, commanding to ſacrifice a pregnant ſow; whence that Juno was called Moneta.*' According to this, it ought to be ſaid, that there was a temple of Juno in the capitol, before the dictator Camillus the ſon conſecrated the temple of Juno Moneta; or elſe it muſt be ſaid, that he only conſecrated a temple to Juno, but that in proceſs of time this goddeſs had the ſirname Moneta given her by reaſon of the advice ſhe gave in this temple. The firſt of theſe two hypotheſes has no foundation in any author; and the ſecond would charge the hiſtorians with an extream negligence, ſince they expreſsly obſerve, that the dictator Camillus conſecrated a temple to Juno Moneta, which was built in the ſame place where Manlius lived. Perhaps this obſcurity might be removed, by ſuppoſing that the place where Juno gave the advice, was the chapel which had been built for her in Jupiter's temple, in the Capitol (127). From that time ſhe might have been (128) ſirnamed Moneta, without having a particular temple with that epithet; but during the war with the Aurunci, Camillus would have built a temple to her under that ſirname, which ſhe had already. This would be an argument that ſhe had given advice to the people of Rome, before the year 413, and conſequently, that her friendſhip for Rome preceeded the ſecond Punic war. Roſinus (129) makes Cicero to ſay, that the earthquake which was the occaſion of Juno's adviſing the ſacrifice of a big-bellied ſow, happened before the Gauls took Rome. Cicero does not ſay this: Roſinus is in an error.

[*X*] *Juno's worſhip at Rome was very antient.*] Tatius, the colleague of Romulus, had appointed the honours that were to be paid to Juno Quiritia or Quiritis (130). We find that in the reign of Tullus Hoſtilius, the pontiffs being conſulted concerning the expiation of involuntary murders, erected two altars, and performed the ceremonies they thought proper to purify Horatius, who had killed his ſiſter. One of thoſe altars was conſecrated to Juno (131), and the other to Janus (132). It is ſaid (133) that before that time there was at Rome a temple of Juno, built by Numa Pompilius, who deſiring to gain the favour of this goddeſs, *forbad, by a formal law, all lewd women to enter into that temple . . . . . or even to touch it. Theſe are the words of the law.* Pellex ædem Junonis ne tangito. Si tangat Junoni agnum fœminam demiſſis crinibus cædito. *This was the reparation they were obliged to make, by ſacrificing a lamb to her, with their hair hanging loſe.* In a word, we may ſay, that it was not by too bold an hyperbole, that Virgil introduced Jupiter promiſing his ſpouſe, that the deſcendants of Æneas ſhould ſerve her more devoutly than all the other nations. This dialogue is one of the fineſt paſſages of the Æneid. Juno engages to perſecute Æneas no longer, and asks a favour as a recompence for her deſiſting. I adviſe my readers to go to the fountain head: I ſhall only produce theſe four verſes.

Hinc genus, Auſonio miſtum quod ſanguine ſurget,
Supra homines, ſupra ire Deos pietate videbis.
Nec gens ulla tuos æquè celebrabit honores.
Annuit his Juno, & mentem lætata retorſit (134).

This blended lineage, from th' Auſonian blood
Deriv'd, in piety you ſhall behold
Excelling men and gods; nor any race
Shall equal honours to your altars pay.
Juno aſſents, and pleas'd retorts her mind.

TRAPP.

[*Y*] *The honours ſhe received in other towns of Italy were very great.*] She was worſhipped under the title of Soſpita, with great devotion at Lanuvium, near Rome, in the Via Appia. The Romans were ſo fond of this worſhip, that their conſuls were obliged in the beginning of their conſulſhip, to go and pay their homages to this Juno. *Nolite à ſacris propriis Junonis Soſpitæ, cui omnes Conſules facere neceſſe eſt, domeſticum & ſuum Conſulem potiſſimum avellere* (135). When the inhabitants of Lanuvium were made Roman citizens, it was ordained that this worſhip ſhould be common to them with the people of Rome. *Lanuvinis civitas data, ſacraque ſua reddita cum eo ut ædes lucuſque Soſpitæ Junonis communis Lanuvinis Municipibus cum populo Romano eſſet* (136). There was a treaſure in the temple of this goddeſs, out of which Auguſtus took great ſums, and promiſed to pay intereſt for it (137). It is thought that this temple was founded by the Pelaſgi, who came originally from Peloponneſus, which opinion is ſupported by Ælian's calling this Juno of Lanuvium, Juno Argolica (138). Here is the attire of this goddeſs. 'Noſtram Soſpitam . . . tu nunquam ne in ſomnis quidem vides niſi cum pelle caprina, cum haſta, cum ſcutulo, cum calceolis repandis (139). ——— *You never ſee our goddeſs, Juno Soſpita, even in dreams, without her goat-skin, her ſpear, her ſhield, and her ſhoes, with the ends bent backwards.*' It is not obſerved in this paſſage, whether the goat's skin was adorned with horns; but there are very learned men who do not doubt of it. 'It is certain that Juno of Lanuvium had her head veiled with a goat-skin, ſet off with true horns, which is plainly to be ſeen in Goltzius's Roman medals, and in that mentioned by Vigenere, in his annotations upon Livy.' Thus Mr de Girac ſpeaks in the ſixty fifth ſection, and five hundred and fifty ſixth page of his reply. You will find in the margin of his book the following paſſage: *Romani Junonem Soſpitam colebant, cujus caput pellis caprina cum cornibus exornabat* *. Mind this: the ſerpent of the temple of Lanuvium was ſomething miraculous; it knew whether young women had loſt their virginity or not. See Ælian (140).

(*k*) Id. lib. xxxii, cap. xxix.

(*l*) Id. lib. xxxiv, cap. liii.

(*m*) Cicero, de Divinat. lib i, init. fol. 304, B, & fol. 311, B.

(122) Lib. vi, cap. iii, n. 1.

(123) Livius, lib. vii, cap. xxviii.

(124) *See* Valer. Maximus, cum notis Variorum, *put out by* Thyſius, lib. i, cap. viii, n. 3, pag. 105.

(125) Plutarch. in Camillo, pag. 148. C.

(126) Cicero, de Divinat. lib. i.

(127) *See* Dionyſ. Halicarnaſſ. lib. iv, cap. lxix. Dauſqueius, in Silium Ital. lib. x, pag. 435, *quotes ſeveral authorities.*

(128) It appears from Livy, *lib. iii, pag. m.* 79, that Juno, in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, was ſirnamed *Regina.*

(129) Antiquit. Rom. lib. ii, cap. vi.

(130) Dionyſius Halicarnaſſ. lib. ii, cap. lii.

(131) Overſeer of the ſiſters, ſays Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus; but ſhe is ſirnamed *Sororia, apud Feſtum, quem vide pag. m. cclxii, voce* ſororium tigillum.

(132) Id. Dionyſ. lib iii, cap. xxviii.

(133) *See Du Boulay's* Threſor des Antiquitez Romaines, pag. 149.

(134) Virgil. Æn. lib xii, ver. 838.

(135) Cicero, Orat. pro Muræna, ſub fin.

(136) Livius, lib. viii, cap. xiv.

(137) Appian. lib. v, de Bello Civil. pag. m. 399.

(138) Ælian. Hiſtor. Animal. lib xi, cap. xvi.

(139) Cicer de Nat. Deor. lib. i, cap. xxix.

* Lud. Nonnus, in Goltzii Græc.

(140) Ælian. Ubi ſupra. *See alſo* Propertius, Eleg. viii, lib. iv.

fore Rome was built. It was like that of Argos, and the ſame ceremonies were uſed in it as the Argivi had conſecrated to her worſhip. This we learn from Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus in the twenty firſt chapter of the firſt book.

I would

Juno **LACINIA**, whoſe temple was ſix miles from Crotona, was wonderfully famous. This temple was twice as large as the largeſt in Rome (141). It was covered with marble, part whereof was brought to Rome to cover the temple of Fortuna Equeſtris, which the cenſor Quintus Fulvius Flaccus was building : but as he came to a miſerable end, the ſenate ordered the marble to be carried to the ſame place it was taken from (142). Annibal did not execute the deſign of carrying away the column of gold, which was in the temple of this Juno (143). Pliny tells us, that the aſhes which were left on the altar of this goddeſs, being expoſed to all the violences of the weather, never moved from their place (144). Servius tells another miracle ; if any one engraved his name upon the marble covering of this temple, the Letters vaniſhed away when that man died. *In hoc templo illud miraculi fuiſſe dicitur, ut ſi quis ferro in tegula templi, ipſius nomen incideret, tamdiu illa Scriptura maneret, quamdiu is homo viveret qui illud ſcripſiſſet* (145). Livy ſpeaks of another miracle, which is, that the beaſts of every kind, that were conſecrated to this goddeſs, fed on the meadows of the temple, without any one's keeping, and retired at night of themſelves, being undiſturbed either by wild-beaſts or thieves. *Læta in medio paſcua habuit* (Lucus) *ubi omnis generis ſacrum deæ paſcebatur pecus ſine ullo paſtore : ſeparatimque egreſſi cujuſque generis greges, nocte remeabant ad ſtabula, nunquam inſidiis ferarum non fraude violati hominum* (146). He gives ſufficient intimation, that he would not ſwear to the truth of it ; and that the ſtory of the unmoveable aſhes had no greater certainty. They almoſt always, *ſays he*, aſcribe ſome miracles to ſuch ſort of places. *Miracula aliqua affinguntur plerumque tam inſignibus locis. Fama eſt aram eſſe in veſtibulo templi, cujus cinerem nullus unquam moveat ventus.* No body underſtands this better than the Chriſtian Monks. He adds, that this temple was famous, not only for it's holineſs, but alſo for it's riches (147).

It is no wonder, that there have been different opinions concerning the founder of this temple, and the occaſion of it's foundation ; for all people are inclined to invent a thouſand pretty things on ſuch matters. See Servius (148), who relates, amongſt other opinions, that king Lacinius cauſed it to be built, in honour to Juno, becauſe ſhe hated Hercules, whom he had refuſed to lodge. But if theſe variations ought not to ſurprize us, we cannot however but wonder, that authors are not agreed about the ſituation of this building. Livy places it ſix miles from Crotona : 'Sex ' millia aberat ab urbe (149) nobile templum ipſa urbe ' nobilius, Laciniæ Junonis, ſanctum omnibus circa ' populis (150). —— *Six miles from the city was a* ' *noble temple, more magnificent than the city itſelf* ; ' *ſacred, among all the neighbouring people, to Juno* ' *Lacinia.*' But Valerius Maximus ſays, it was at Locri, which is not the only point wherein he differs from Livy. His words are theſe : 'Q. Fulvius Flac' cus impune non tulit quod in cenſura tegulas mar' moreas ex Junonis Laciniæ templo in ædem For' tunæ Equeſtris, quam Romæ faciebat, tranſtulit. ' Negatur enim, poſt hoc factum, mente conſtitiſſe : ' quin etiam per ſummam ægritudinem animi expira' vit, cum ex duobus filiis in Illyrico militantibus, al' terum deceſſiſſe, alterum graviter audiſſet affectum. ' Cujus caſu motus ſenatus tegulas illico Locros re' portandas curavit : decretique circumſpectiſſima ſancti' one impium opus cenſoris retexuit (151). —— *Q. Ful*' *vius Flaccus ſuffered, for that, in his cenſorſhip, he* ' *transferred the marble tiles from the temple of Juno* ' *Lacinia, into that of Fortuna Equeſtris, which he was* ' *building at Rome : for, after this action, they ſay he* ' *never enjoyed his ſenſes ; nay that he even died of ex*' *treme grief, hearing that of two ſons, who ſerved in* ' *Illyricum, the one was dead, and the other dangerouſly* ' *ill. The ſenate, moved with this action, ordered the* ' *tiles to be carried back to Locri, and, by the moſt* ' *cautious ſanction of a decree, unravelled the cenſor's im*' *pious work.*' I have followed this narrative above, as to the motive that engaged the ſenate to reſtore the marble covering of the temple ; but I reſerved to myſelf the right of rectifying things as there might be occaſion, by Livy's account. You muſt therefore know, that this grave hiſtorian obſerves, that the cenſor Fulvius Flaccus was extreamly ſollicitous that the temple he built ſhould, neither in magnificence nor extent, come behind any in Rome. He thought a marble roof would give great luſtre to his edifice ; for which reaſon he ordered half of the temple of Juno Lacinia to be uncovered (152), which was ſufficient for his deſign. Having got that marble brought to Rome, he took care not to ſay what place they came from ; nevertheleſs it was publickly known, which occaſioned ſuch murmurs, that the conſuls were obliged to conſult the ſenate upon that affair. The ſenate ordered Flaccus to come before them, and having ſuffered him to be expoſed, for ſome time, to all ſorts of bitter reproaches, they unanimouſly reſolved, that the marble ſhould be carried back to Juno's temple, and that the goddeſs ſhould be appeaſed by what the ceremonies preſcribed. Livy's words have ſo charmed me, that I am perſuaded they will be very agreeable to the greateſt part of my readers : the expreſſion is admirable, and full of noble thoughts. 'Poſtquam cenſor rediit tegu' læ expoſitæ de navibus ad templum portabantur : ' quanquam unde eſſent ſilebatur, non tamen celari ' potuit : Fremitus igitur in curia ortus eſt ; ex om' nibus partibus poſtulabatur, ut conſules eam rem ad ' ſenatum referrent : Ut vero accerſitus in curiam cen' ſor venit, multo infeſtius ſinguli univerſique præſen' tem lacerare : *Templum auguſtiſſimum regionis ejus,* ' *quod non Pyrrhus, non Annibal violaſſent, violare pa*' *rum habuiſſe, niſi detexiſſet fœde ac prope diruiſſet.* ' *Detractum culmen templo, nudatum tectum patere im*' *bribus putrefaciendum. Cenſorem moribus regendis* ' *creatum, cui ſarta tecta exigere ſacris publicis & loca* ' *tuenda more majorum traditum eſſet ; eum per ſocio*' *rum urbes diruentem templa, nudantemque tecta æ*' *dium ſacrarum vagari, & quod, ſi in privatis ſocio*' *rum ædificiis faceret, indignum videri poſſet, id Deûm* ' *immortalium templa demolientem facere, & obſtrin*' *gere religione populum Romanum, ruinis templorum* ' *templa ædificantem : tamquam non iidem ubique Dii* ' *immortales ſint, ſed ſpoliis aliorum alii colendi exor*' *nandique.* Quum, priuſquam referretur, appareret ' quid ſentirent Patres : relatione facta in unam om' nes ſententiam ierunt, ut hæ tegulæ reportandæ in ' templum locarentur, piaculariaque Junoni fierent ' (153). —— *After the return of the cenſor, the tiles* ' *were carried from on ſhip-board to the temple ; nor* ' *could it be kept a ſecret from whence they came. A* ' *murmur aroſe in the ſenate : it was on all ſides de*' *manded, that the conſuls ſhould lay the matter before* ' *the ſenate. But when the cenſor, being ſummoned, ap*' *peared, the whole aſſembly fell upon him with more* ' *rage.* Was it not enough (*they ſaid*) that he had ' made no ſcruple to violate the moſt auguſt temple of ' that country, which both Pyrrhus and Hannibal had ' ſpared, but he muſt untile it, and almoſt demoliſh ' it : that the temple being uncovered, was expoſed to ' the injuries of the weather : that a cenſor, created ' for preſiding over the manners of the people, and to ' whom is committed, by the cuſtom of our anceſtors, ' the care of repairing and keeping up places of public ' worſhip ; went up and down through the cities of ' the allies, demoliſhing and untiling their temples, ' and ſhewing that indignity to the temples of the im' mortal gods, which would be thought ſcandalous to' wards the houſes of private perſons : that he had laid ' a burthen on the conſciences of the Roman people, ' building temples with the ruins of temples ; as tho' ' the immortal gods were not the ſame every where, ' but ſome were to be worſhipped and adorned with ' the ſpoils of others. *The ſentiments of the fathers ap*' *pearing before the queſtion was put, it was unanimouſ*' *ly agreed, that the tiles ſhould be carried back to the* ' *temple, and Juno appeaſed with offerings.*' The decree of the ſenate was not executed in all it's parts ; for they who were commiſſioned to ſee the roof repaired, reported, that no workman knew how to reſtore the marble pieces to their places, and ſo they were left in the court of the temple (154). Flaccus did not leave off building ; he made an end of the temple, and conſecrated it, and exhibited the Ludi Scenici for four days, and the Circenſes one day (155). Here is a notable difference betwixt Livy and Valerius Maximus, which

(141) See, below, citat. (152).

(142) Valer. Maximus, lib. i, cap. i.

(143) Cic. lib i, de Divinat. *See the article* SILENUS.

(144) In Laciniæ Junonis ara ſub dio ſita, cinerem immobilem eſſe perflantibus undique procellis. *Plin. lib. ii, cap. cvii.* Valerius Maximus, lib. i, cap. viii, in Exempl. Extern. n. 18, *ſays the ſame thing. See Livy hereunder.*

(145) Servius, in Æneid. lib. iii, ver. 552.

(146) Livius, lib. xxiv, cap. iii.

(147) Inclytum templum divitiis etiam, non tantum ſanctitate fuit. *Id. ib See alſo* Strabo, lib. vi, pag m 180.

(148) Servius, ubi ſupra.

(149) *In Valerius Maximus, publiſhed by Thyſius, pag. 27, they make Livy ſay, that the temple was in the town,* In urbe nobile templum, ipſa urbe erat nobilius.

(150) Livius, ubi ſupra.

(151) Valer. Maximus, lib. i, cap. i, n. 20.

(152) Profectus in Brutios, ædem Junonis Laciniæ ad partem dimidiam detegit, id ſatis fore ratus ad tegendum quod ædificaretur. *Tit. Livius, lib. xlii, init. cap. iii, pag. m* 809. This is the reaſon why I ſaid above, after Cluverius, *Ital. Antiq. lib. iv, cap. xv*, that the temple of Juno Lacinia was twice as large as the largeſt temple in Rome.

(153) Livius, ibid.

(154) Quæ ad religionem pertinent cum cura facta : tegulas relictas in area templi, quia reponendarum nemo artifex inire rationem potuerit, redemptores nuntiarunt. *Id. ibid.*

(155) Fulvius ædem Fortunæ equeſtris, quam Proconſul in Hiſpania dimicans cum Celtiberorum legionibus voverat, annos ſex poſtquam voverat, dedicavit, & ſcenicos ludos per quatriduum, unum diem in circo fecit. *Id. ibid. cap. x.*

I would gladly know whether any of the wiſe men among the heathens took notice of a thing, which methinks was not difficult to obſerve, which is, that no body did partake leſs of a happy life, a ſtate moſt eſſential to the divine nature (*n*), than the greateſt of the goddeſſes. We can ſcarce conceive a more miſerable condition than that of Juno. I do not conſider the character of her employments, though they were very toilſome and unpleaſant [Z], and have given juſt occaſion to turn the Theological ſyſtem

---

(*n*) Quæ nobis natura informationem Deorum ipſorum dedit, eadem inſculpſit in mentibus ut eos æternos & beatos haberemus. *Cicero, de Nat. Deor. lib. i, cap. xvii. See alſo* Ariſtotle, de Repub. lib. vii, cap. i, pag. m. 321. E. *See alſo the remark* [*N*], *of the article* SPINOZA, num. V.

---

which ſhews that the latter has done a great injury to the Roman ſenate; he ſuppoſes, that they neverthought of repairing the damage, till they had ſeen the prodigious vengeance that heaven had inflicted on the cenſor Flaccus. But Livy informs us, that the ſenate performed that pious and juſt action, upon the bare conſideration of the fact; and before they ſaw any ſign of the divine indignation. He does not deny the miſerable end of the cenſor: nay, he repreſents it more tragical than Valerius Maximus; for he ſays, that Fulvius Flaccus hanged himſelf, and he adds, that it was ſaid amongſt the people, that Juno had deprived him of his ſenſes. ‘Q. Fulvius Flaccus pontifex qui priore ‘anno fuerat cenſor . . . . fœda morte periit. Ex duobus filiis ejus qui tum in Illyrico militabant, nunciatum alterum deceſſiſſe, alterum gravi & periculoſo morbo ægrum eſſe. Obruit animum ſimul luctus, metuſque: mane ingreſſi cubiculum ſervi, laqueo dependentem invenere. Erat opinio, poſt cenſuram minus compotem fuiſſe ſui: vulgo Junonis Laciniæ iram ob ſpoliatum templum alienaſſe mentem ferebant (156).’ What concerns the taking away of the marble covering from Juno's temple, is ſaid to have happened the 579th year of Rome.

(156) Id ibid. cap. xxviii.

[Z] *The character of her employments, tho' they were very toilſome and unpleaſant.*] She had the ſuperintendance of marriages, and their conſequences. See Virgil's commentators upon theſe words:

Mactant lectas de more bidenteis,
Legiferæ Cereri, Phæboque patrique Lyæo:
Junoni ante omnes, cui VINCLA JUGALIA
CURAE (157).

(157) Virgil. Æn. lib. iv, ver. 57.

Selected victims, with accuſtom'd rites,
To Ceres law-giver, and Phœbus bleed,
And father Bacchus, but above the reſt
To Juno, who preſides o'er nuptial beds.

TRAPP.

They mention a hundred ſuch like paſſages, and the epithets *pronuba, jugalis,* ζυγία, γαμηλία, παράνυμφος, *&c.* which were given to Jupiter's wife, becauſe ſhe preſided over matrimonial engagements. See the following remark. This employment required great pains; the particulars of it were innumerable, and it was very difficult to perform it to her honour. If the buſineſs had been only to make matches, the difficulties would not have been ſo conſiderable: the diſpoſition of the ſubjects, and the inclination of nature, might have ſaved the director-general a great deal of pains; but a goddeſs of the firſt rank was engaged by the intereſts of her reputation and glory, to ſee that people ſhould marry well: I mean, that the ſorting of conditions and humours ſhould form an indiſſoluble bond of affection and concord, and therefore all marriages that were ill ſuited and unlucky, could not but give her a great deal of trouble, as being ſo many blots to her reputation, and juſt occaſions of reproaching her, that the pains they had taken to invoke and worſhip her, on the wedding-day, were all loſt labour. All thoſe who had a mind to abuſe her, had a fair opportunity; for, in ſhort, either ſhe did all ſhe could to procure happy marriages, or ſhe did not. If ſhe did, there was reaſon to conclude, ſhe was very unfortunate, ſince ſhe had an employment, which exhauſted all her ſtrength and induſtry; and yet ſhe could not avoid being unſucceſsful on a thouſand occaſions. That vaſt number of experiments, which ſhewed the uſeleſſneſs of her pains, was a proof either that ſhe had a ſubject to labour on that was very difficult, or that her power was very inconſiderable. In the firſt caſe, her misfortune, and the deplorable cruelty of her fate, or elſe her imprudence, were manifeſt; for if ſhe was not not at liberty to lay down her employment, in which doing her beſt, ſhe could not prevent ill ſucceſs on a thouſand occaſions, her fate was to be pitied. But if ſhe might have reſigned her office, and yet obſtinately continued in it, ſhe wanted judgment and prudence (158), and maintained herſelf unjuſtly in a function which exceeded her ſtrength, and which ſhe diſcharged to her diſhonour. It had been a poor excuſe to ſay, that her good deſigns were thwarted by the capriciouſneſs of another goddeſs.

(158) Metiri ſe quemque ſuo modulo ac pede verum eſt. *Horat. Epiſt vii, lib. i, ver. ult.*

Sic viſum Veneri, cui placet impares
Formas, atque animos ſub juga ahenea
Sævo mittere cum joco (159).

(159) Horat. Ode xxxiii, lib. i.

So Venus will'd, who binds in love's hard chains
Unequal forms and minds, and laughs at all their pains.

This had been to confeſs the limitation and dependance of her power, a mortifying confeſſion, beyond all that can be imagined for a goddeſs ſo haughty as Juno was. This was what might be ſaid, ſuppoſing that ſhe diſcharged her duty to the beſt of her power; but if it had been ſuppoſed, that ſhe could have ſucceeded better, ſhe would have been looked upon as guilty of extream negligence, or malice, and conſequently, as moſt unworthy of the honours that were paid her, and of the dignity ſhe was inveſted with. Theſe are reflexions, which the Heathens ſhould have made. Now the reſult of theſe thoughts is to determine, that her condition was very unhappy, whether by reaſon of the great pains her employment required, or becauſe of the ill ſucceſs they were attended with. Her dignity and her ſex, made her wonderfully ſenſible of contempt and diſgrace; and we cannot imagine, but ſhe had ſenſe enough not to be ignorant of what may be ſaid againſt her adminiſtration, and to believe that the other gods reflected upon her (160), and that if they had the complaiſance not to do it to her face, or not to tell her what was ſaid of her, they would not fail to aſperſe her behind her back, or at leaſt to think meanly of her. There needs no more to vex one that is touchy, ambitious, and proud: if he is ſenſible that his faults are known to others, that is enough to diſquiet him.

(160) *The Heathens believed that jealouſies, quarrels, diviſions, and ſuch like diſorders happened among the gods.*

All the reflexions I have produced might have been made with reſpect to Juno, as ſhe preſided over child-births. What a trouble was this! it was the way not to be at reſt one moment, and to be obliged to work in a thouſand places at once. This office is ſubject to many unpleaſant accidents. The induſtry of the beſt Surgeons does not hinder many children that come acroſs, ſome one way, and ſome another, from dying with their mothers. Theſe misfortunes were ſo many ſubjects of reproach for the cenſurers of Juno, who had been vainly invoked under particular and ſpecifical names, according to the exigency of the caſe (161). I know that it may be maintained with great probability, that all the deities who preſided over marriages, child-births, *&c.* ought not to be reduced to her alone, under different names; but on the other ſide, it is very likely, that all the other deities ought to be looked upon as the ſubſtitutes of the ſuperintendant-general: whence it follows, that the diſorders might be well placed to the account of the goddeſs Juno, as the bad adminiſtration of governors of provinces is imputed to the ſovereign, when he does not give a remedy for it. Beſides her having ſo many ſubſtitutes ſhew, that Juno's employment was thought too painful. Now all theſe ideas will make one form a diſadvantageous judgment of her. Add to all this, that two of the moſt glorious functions of this goddeſs's office were taken from her: for the care of reconciling married perſons

(161) *See the remark* [*H*].

ſyſtem of the Heathens into ridicule [*AA*]. I conſider the neceſſity ſhe found herſelf reduced to, of perſecuting the miſtreſſes and baſtards of her huſband, to ſeek ſome relief for the jealouſy that devoured her. She was as much poſſeſſed with this paſſion as could be expected from that haughty and imperious humour, which her quality of ſiſter and wife of the greateſt of the gods inſpired her with. This ſenſibility rendered her torment more inſupportable, and put her in a continual hurry to procure to herſelf the pleaſure of revenge. She omitted nothing to obtain it, and gave herſelf no reſt; but ſhe never had the ſatisfaction of a full and entire ſucceſs [*BB*]. She was always to begin again. We muſt not

---

ſons was committed to another deity, named Viriplaca (162); and the care of the converſion of thoſe women, who had not by their chaſte conduct deſerved their husbands affection, was committed to Venus Verticordia (163). What an affront was it to Juno to have her ſuperintendance of marriages thus diſmembered?

[*AA*] . . . . . *and have given juſt occaſion to turn the Theological ſyſtem of the Heathens into ridicule.*] The ſirnames of Pronuba, Jugalis, *&c.* which may be ſeen above (164), were not the only ones that were proper to Juno, as ſhe preſided over marriages; ſhe had alſo particular ſirnames grounded upon *her preſiding over the conduct of new brides, over their husbands houſes . . . . . . and over the unction, which the bride made upon the poſts of her husband's door . . . . and becauſe ſhe helped the husband to untie the* Zona virginalis (165). You will find thoſe ſirnames in theſe Latin words taken from a prayer that was made to Juno (166): *Interducam*, or *Iterducam*, *&* *Domiducam, Unxiam, Cinctiam* (167) *mortales puellæ debent in nuptias convocare, ut earum & itinera protegas, & in optatas domos ducas, & cum poſtes ungent, fauſtum omen affigas, & ſingulum ponentes in thalamis non relinquas.* It was not expected, that ſhe ſhould ſtop at the door of the nuptial chamber, but her aſſiſtance was alſo begged in the nuptial bed, where ſhe came under the title of *Dea mater Prema*, and *Dea Pertunda*, accompanied with *Deus pater Subigus.* Upon this St Auguſtin has ridiculed Heatheniſm; and as it was very difficult to uſe only grave conſiderations, upon ſuch a ſubject, he has ſhewn the impertinence of it in very free terms. 'Cum mas '& fœmina conjunguntur, adhibetur deus Jugatinus. 'Sit hoc ferendum. Sed momum eſt ducenda, quæ 'nubit, adhibetur deus Domiducus. Ut maneat cum 'viro, additur dea Manturna. Quid ultra quæritur? 'Parcatur humanæ verecundiæ: peragat cætera concu'piſcentia carnis & ſanguinis procurato ſecreto pudo'ris. Quid impletur cubiculum turba numinum: quan'do & paranymphi inde diſcedunt? Et ad hoc imple'tur, non ut eorum præſentia cogitata major ſit cura 'pudicitiæ, ſed ut fœminæ ſexu infirmæ novitate pavi'dæ, illis cooperantibus ſine ulla difficultate virginitas 'auferatur. Adeſt enim dea Virginenſis, & deus pater 'Subigus, & dea mater Prema, & dea Pertunda, & 'Venus, & Priapus. Quid eſt hoc? Si omnino labo'rantem in illo opere virum ab diis adjuvari oportebat: 'non ſufficiebat aliquis unus, aut aliqua una. Nun'quid Venus ſola parum eſſet, quæ ob hoc etiam dici'tur nuncupata, quod ſine ejus vi fœmina virgo eſſe 'non deſinat? Si ulla eſt frons in hominibus, quæ non 'eſt in numinibus? Nonne cum credunt conjugati tot 'deos utriuſque ſexus præſentes, & huic operi in'ſtantes, ita pudore afficiuntur, ut & ille minus mo'veatur, & illa plus reluctetur? Et certè ſi adeſt 'Virginenſis dea, ut virgini zona ſolvatur: ſi adeſt 'deus Subigus, ut viro ſubigatur: ſi adeſt dea Prema, 'ut ſubacta ne ſe commoveat, prematur, dea Pertunda 'ibi quid facit? Erubeſcat, eat foras, agat aliquid '& maritus. Valde inhoneſtum eſt, ut quod vocatur 'illa, impleat quiſquam niſi ille. Sed fortè ideo tole'ratur, quia dea dicitur eſſe, non deus. Nam ſi maſ'culus crederetur, & Pertundus vocaretur, majus 'contra eum pro uxoris pudicitia poſceret, maritus au'xilium, quàm Fœta contra Silvanum (169). Sed 'quid hoc dicam, cum ibi ſit & Priapus nimis maſcu'lus, ſuper cujus immaniſſimum & turpiſſimum faſci'num ſedere nova nupta jubebatur more honeſtiſſimo '& religioſiſſimo matronarum?' Theſe objections are very ſtrong, and I cannot conceive how the beſt apologiſts for the Pagan religion could have eluded them. The cenſure that St Auguſtin grounds upon the unneceſſary multiplication of beings, was alone ſufficient to confound them. What a diffidence of human ſtrength was it believe that Venus ſtood in need of three or four other deities? We only conceive that an apologiſt might have anſwered, that St Auguſtin was to blame for reproaching as a thing uſeleſs, and which left nothing for the husband to do, the joining of the goddeſs *Pertunda* to the goddeſs *mater Prema*; for according to that Theology, the one was not leſs or more neceſſary than the other, and neither of them excluded the operation of the married couple. There was then a little want of exactneſs in this part of St Auguſtin's objections. The common anſwer of the Heathens at that time was perhaps to ſay, that the objected multiplication, was only a multiplication of the names of the ſame deity. A poor anſwer, for the books of the antient Heathens afforded the confutation of it.

A Reflexion upon the fate of the Philoſophers, who were obliged to write in vindication of Paganiſm, and upon an inconveniency ariſing from the unity of religion.

Note, by the by, that the Philoſophers who undertook to anſwer the Chriſtian doctors, were very much to be pitied. They bore the puniſhment of the folly of others: the antient prieſts had committed the fault, by ridiculouſly tranſplanting the fictions of the Poets into the public worſhip; and the Philoſophers many ages after were forced to bear the ſhame of all theſe fopperies, and to torment themſelves to put by the thruſts, that pierced them through. If thoſe who framed ſo abſurd a worſhip, had had as dexterous and powerful adverſaries as St Auguſtin was, they would have been circumſpect, and not have given ſuch a free ſcope to their impoſtures: this is a diſadvantage of the unity of religion. It muſt be confeſſed that the diverſity of religions, has it's inconveniencies, and even ſuch as are dangerous; but then it prevents the progreſs of corruption, and makes each party more cautious.

[*BB*] *Her jealouſy . . . . put her in a continual hurry to procure to herſelf the pleaſures of revenge . . . but ſhe never had the ſatisfaction of a full and entire ſucceſs.*] Conſider the journey ſhe took from heaven to earth, upon ſuſpicion that a cloud which ſhe diſcovered, might probably be the canopy under which her unfaithful husband ſported with ſome damſel. She was not miſtaken, Jupiter was then in the arms of Io. He converted her into an heiſer, that his wife might not ſurprize him in the fact. Juno begged the heiſer, and ſet Argus to watch her, and afterwards ſhe tormented her with a fury that made her run over all the earth; and at laſt ſhe was forced to ſuffer Io to reſume her former ſhape, and to become the goddeſs Iſis (170). Conſider alſo the ſupplications Juno made to Tethys and Oceanus, when ſhe ſaw the ſame Caliſto among the ſtars, whom ſhe had changed into a bear. She had uſed the utmoſt violence againſt this miſtreſs of Jupiter; ſhe took her by the hair of her head, and threw her upon the ground (171). But let us hear her moneful complaints. Nothing can be more lamentable: ſhe is afraid that hereafter ſhe ſhall be continually affronted; ſince the efforts ſhe makes to revenge herſelf, terminate only in the glory of her enemies.

Eſt verò, cur quis Junonem lædere nolit,
Offenſamque tremat, quæ proſum ſola nocendo?
O ego quantum egi! quàm vaſta potentia noſtra eſt!
Eſſe hominem vetui; facta eſt Dea: ſic ego pœnas
Sontibus impono: ſic eſt mea magna poteſtas (172).

Who now can fear immortal Juno's hate?
Alas! I hurt not, but advance their fate.
My baffled pow'r muſt to a ſtrumpet bow:
A brute I made her; ſhe's a goddeſs now.
'Tis thus I puniſh, thus exert my pow'r.
- - - - - - - - - - - - -

She was once ſo overwhelmed with grief, becauſe ſhe could not revenge her ſelf, that ſhe made a voyage to the bottom of hell, to demand the aſſiſtance of the three furies.

---

(162) *See* Valer. Maximus, lib. ii, cap. i, n. 6, pag. m. 135.

(163) *See* Ovid. Faſtor. lib. iv, pag. m. 74.

(164) *At the beginning of the remark* [*Z*].

(165) Du Boulay, Threſor des Antiquitez Romaines, pag. 149, 150.

(166) Mart Capella de Nuptiis Philologiæ, lib. ii, pag m. 37, 38.

(167) *Here is a paſſage of Feſtus Pompeius, pag. xxxv.* Cinxiæ Junonis nomen ſanctum habebatur in nuptiis, quod initio conjugii ſolutio erat cinguli quo nova nupta erat cincta.

(168) Auguſtin. de Civit. Dei, lib. vi, cap. ix, pag. m. 599.

(169) *St Auguſtin had been ſaying, that ſome deities guarded the women lying in, leaſt the god Sylvanus ſhould come and torment them.* Mulieri fœtæ poſt partum tres Deos cuſtodes commemorat (Varro) adhiberi, ne Sylvanus Deus per noctem ingrediatur & vexet.

(170) *See Ovid in the ſecond book of the* Metamorphoſis.

(171) Arreptum prenſis à fronte capillis Stravit humi pronam. *Ovid. Metam. l b. ii, ver.* 477.

(172) Id ibid. ver. 519.

not reckon among the leaſt of her diſgraces, the misfortune ſhe had to loſe her cauſe in

Nil poterit Juno, niſi inultos flere dolores?
Idque mihi ſatis eſt; Hæc una potentia noſtra eſt (173)?

Are tears the injur'd Juno's ſole relief?
No remedy but this for all my grief?
- - - - - - -
- - - - - - -

Suſtinet ire illuc, cœleſti ſede relictâ,
(Tantum odiis iræque dabat) Saturnia Juno.
Quò ſimul intravit, ſacroque à corpore preſſum
Intremuit limen; tria Cerberus extulit ora,
Et tres latratus ſimul edidit. Illa ſorores
Nocte vocat genitas, grave & implacabile numen (174).

Thither ſhe haſtes, from heaven's æthereal gate:
(Such is the force of anger and of hate)
Where, as ſhe enter'd, and the threſhold preſs'd,
The portal trembled at the heavenly gueſt:
Grim Cerberus wide his triple jaws extends,
And the dark vault with tripling barking rends.
She calls the dreary ſiſters, and implores
Th' implacable, and unrelenting pow'rs.

If ſhe ever had any reaſon to be ſatisfied, it was when ſhe perſecuted the nymph Thalia (175), whom Jupiter had got with child. The only way that was left for this nymph to eſcape, was to be ſwallowed up in the bowels of the earth; but when the term was expired, the two children, that ſhe was big with, came out of the earth, and became afterwards two famous deities (176), which had a wonderful veneration paid them (177); and ſo Juno's joy was but very ſhort. She ſhewed herſelf ſuch an inexorable perſecutor of Hercules, that Porphyrius has compared her to the moſt wicked devils, that perſecute good men. Τὺς γὰρ Δαίμονας διαγράφων τῷ λόγῳ (ὁ Πορφύριος) λέγει πυ, τὺς φαυλοτάτυς Δαίμονας τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσι λόχυς καὶ ἐνέδρας καθίζειν, καὶ ἐξαίφνης ἐπιτίθεσθαι, καθάπερ ἡ Ἥρα τῷ Διονύσῳ καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ. *Dæmones enim oratione deſcribens* (Porphyrius) *alicubi ait: peſſimos Dæmonas bonis viris inſidias & pericula tendere, exque eos inſidiis aggredi, ut Juno ſcilicet Baccho atque Herculi* (178). What did ſhe get by it? Nothing but toil, diſgrace, and confuſion. She complained of it on the ſtage, in ſuch a manner as was able to ſoften the hardeſt hearts. Read theſe verſes of Seneca; in which ſhe declares, that ſhe is reſolved to leave heaven, ſeeing the multitude of the concubines and baſtards of her huſband. She expects to ſee Hercules aſcend thither, whom ſhe ſo often attempted to ruin, and who by that means made himſelf immortal.

Soror Tonantis (hoc enim ſolum mihi
Nomen relictum eſt) ſemper-alienum Jovem,
Ac templa ſummi vidua deſerui ætheris;
Locumque, cœlo pulſa, pellicibus dedi.
Tellus colenda eſt: pellices cœlum tenent (179).
- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -

Non ſic abibunt odia, vivaces aget
Violentus iras animus, & ſævus dolor
Æterna bella pace ſublata geret.
Quid bella? quidquid horridum tellus creat
Inimica; quidquid pontus aut aër tulit
Terribile, dirum, peſtilens, atrox, ferum;
Fractum atque domitum eſt, ſuperat, & creſcit malis;
Iraque noſtra fruitur: in laudes ſuas
Mea vertit odia, dum nimis ſæva impero,
Patrem probavi: gloriæ feci locum (180).

Siſter of Jove (that name alone is left me)
Exil'd from heav'n, I fly the cruel god,
Deſert the widow'd temples of the skies,
And yield my throne to harlots: earth, receive me,
Since whores command in heav'n, and rule the skies.
- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - -

Yet ſhall not here my keen reſentment ceaſe,
But my loud griefs ſhall wage eternal wars . . .
What wars? . . . whate're of horrid, dreadful, dire,
Of peſtilent, and fierce, earth, ſea, and air
Create, is broken and ſubdued by Jove:
The cruel conqueror enjoys my rage;
My hatred ſerves but to encreaſe his fame,
And my fierce rule but added to his glory.

The ſatisfaction of ſeeing the ruin of Troy, was but an inconſiderable conſolation for the torments ſhe had ſuffered, during the long reſiſtance of the Trojans; and ſhe quickly found herſelf obliged to undergo new fatigues in perſecuting Æneas, and preventing his landing in Italy. She left no ſtone unturned; ſhe went to Æolus to beg a tempeſt of him; ſhe cajoled him, humbled herſelf before him (181). Another time ſhe placed herſelf upon a cold cloud (182), and expoſed herſelf to the injuries of the air, during a battle between the party ſhe protected, and the party ſhe hated. This was loſt labour. Read what deſpair made her ſay, before ſhe had recourſe to Æolus.

Cum Juno æternum ſervans ſub pectore vulnus,
Hæc ſecum: Me ne incepto deſiſtere victam?
Nec poſſe Italiâ Teucrorum avertere regem?
Quippe vetor fatis. Pallaſne exurere claſſem
Argivûm, atque ipſos potuit ſubmergere Ponto,
Unius ob noxam, & furias Ajacis Oilei (183)?
- - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - -

Aſt ego, quæ divûm incedo regina, Joviſque
Et ſoror, & conjux, unâ cum gente tot annos
Bella gero; & quiſquam numen Junonis adoret
Prætereà? Aut ſupplex aris imponat honorem (184)?

When Juno in her breaſt,
Vindictive, feeding an eternal wound,
Thus with herſelf. And muſt I then deſiſt
Baffled? Nor can I back from Latium turn
This Trojan prince? Belike the fates forbid.
Cou'd Pallas drown the Greeks, and burn their fleet,
For Ajax' phrenzy? - - - - -
- - - - - But I, the queen
Of gods, the ſiſter and the wife of Jove,
With this one race ſo many years make war.
And who will Juno's deity adore
Henceforth? or honour on my altars lay.

Trapp.

This is but a ſpecimen of the hiſtory of this goddeſs; but it is ſufficient to ſhew that the heathens ſhould have looked upon her, as one of the moſt unhappy perſons that ever was in the world, and fit to be propoſed as a picture of extream miſery, as Prometheus on mount Caucaſus, Siſyphus, Ixion, Tantalus, the Danaïdes, and the reſt of the great ſinners delivered over to infernal puniſhments. There is nothing more true, than what Horace ſaid, that the moſt cruel tyrants have not been able to invent a more intolerable rack than envy (185): Which more eſpecially agrees to the jealouſy of marriage. What is it then, when joined with continual fatigues in the purſuit of an unſucceſsful revenge? a natural immortality does not ſweeten the bitterneſs of this ſad condition, but rather increaſes it; for the hopes that death will put an end to our pain and grief is a conſolation.

Nec finire licet tantos mihi morte dolores,
Sed nocet eſſe Deum, præcluſaque janua lethi
Æternum noſtros luctus extendit in ævum (186).

It is my curſe that I muſt never dye,
But drag a wretched immortality:

The

---

(173) Id. ibid. lib. iv, ver. 426.

(174) Ibid. ver. 447.

(175) *Others call her* Ætna.

(176) *They were called* Palici.

(177) *See* Servius, in Æneid. lib. ix, ver. 585. Lutatius, in Statium, Theb. lib. xii, ver. 157. Macrobius, Saturn. lib. v, cap. xix.

(178) Æneas Gazæus, in Theophraſto, pag. m. 43.

(179) Seneca, in Hercule Furente, ver. 1.

(180) Id. ver. 27.

(181) Virgil. Æn. lib. i.

(182) Qua ſpe gelidis in nubibus hæres? *Virgil. Æn. lib. xii, ver.* 796.
N c tu me aëria ſ lam nunc ſede videres
Digna indigna pati. . . . *Id. ib. ver.* 810.

(183) Virgil. Æn. lib. i, ver. 35.

(184) Id. ver. 46.

(185) Invidius alterius macreſcit rebus opimis. Invidia Siculi non invenere tyranni Majus tormentum. *Horat. Epiſt. ii, lib. i, ver.* 57.

(186) Ovid. Metam. lib i, ver. 661.

in a diſpute concerning beauty [CC]: the reſentment ſhe expreſſed for the affront which ſhe thought ſhe had received from Paris, the judge of that tryal, was very violent, and attended with a thouſand fatigues and many afflictions. This doubtleſs was a more ſmarting wound than that of the three pointed arrow, which ſhe received from Hercules

The gate of death is ſhut againſt my woe,
And thro' eternity my griefs muſt flow.

The pompous title of queen of heaven, the ſitting upon a fine throne, with a ſceptre in the hand, and a diadem on the head, is all inſignificant to the inward diſtempers of the ſoul. Nay, a perſon is more ſenſible of theſe misfortunes, when in the higheſt poſts and dignities. We may ſay at leaſt that diſcontent is like a fever, which is not more eaſily cured in a good bed than upon ſtraw.

Nec calidæ citiùs decedunt corpore febres
Textilibus ſi in picturis, oſtroque rubenti
Jactaris, quam ſi plebeja in veſte cubandu'ſt (187).

Nor ſooner health is to the rich reſtor'd,
In pomp extended on a ſilken bed,
Than to the lab'rer on his humble couch.

It is not riches that can drive away a fever, or the uneaſineſs of the mind.

Non domus, & fundus, non æris acervus, & auri
Ægroto domini deduxit corpore febres,
Non animo curas (188).

'Tis not in houſe, or farm, or heaps of gold,
To cure a fever in the owner's blood,
Or heal his cares.

Note, that if the Heathens did not make the reflexions, which I have ſet forth in the preceding remark and in this, they are wholly inexcuſable; for it was not only by the poets that they were informed of this unhappy life of Juno: the public worſhip had adopted thoſe ſtories, and monuments were found of them in their temples; the conſecrated ſtatues, the pictures of devotion, thoſe objects which are called the books of the ignorant, informed every body of the jealouſies of this goddeſs, *&c.*

[CC] *The misfortune ſhe had to loſe her cauſe in a diſpute concerning beauty.*] Minerva and Venus were her two competitors. Every body knows that Jupiter (189), not willing to ſit as judge in ſo nice a tryal, ordered theſe three goddeſſes to be conducted to mount Ida, in order to plead their cauſe there, and that Paris ſhould decide the diſpute. Juno dreſſed her ſelf as ſplendidly as was poſſible, and made great promiſes to Paris in caſe he adjudged the apple to her, which was to be the lot of the greateſt beauty. Minerva and Venus did their beſt both in dreſſing themſelves, and promiſing rewards to their judge. The trouble of tricking up themſelves, and making ſpeeches, was all to no purpoſe; Paris declared, that he would ſee them all naked before he pronounced his judgment.

Car voſtre diſcord giſt à vos formoſitez,
De contempler vos corps, vos naïves beautez,
Prudement diſcerner le choix, l'equipolance,
Laquelle eſt la plus belle in face, & corpulance.
Les Déeſſes alors eurent timidité,
Parce qu'il leur falloit monſtrer leur nudité.
Toutesfois à lombrage un peu ſe retirerent,
En lieu d'une antichambre, ou ſe deſhabillerent
A part l'une de l'autre, ou leurs Nymphes avoient
Qui honorablement en cela les ſervoient.
Quand eurent deſſublé eſcoffions & guimples,
Leurs couronnes tourets, deſtaché leurs eſpingles,
Morrion & chappeaux, ceintures, fermaillets,
Cheſnes, bagues, carquans, bullettes, bracelets,
Robes, & cotillons, leurs manteaux & cuirace,
Leurs habits pleins d' odeurs, de treſgrande efficace,
Toutesfois retenoient leurs eſcarpins dorez,
Bravement enrichis decoupez & ouvrez,
De peur que l'aigu bout des pointues herbettes
Leurs plantes n'offençaſt fort tendres & douillettes.
Ainſi nues eſtant toutes trois vont marcher
Devant le beau Paris, & droit ſi vont ranger (190).

Your quarrel from your beauties doth ariſe:
To guide my choice, your native charms diſplay,
That I may weigh them in an equal ſcale.
Fear ſeiz'd the goddeſſes, compell'd to ſhew
Their naked charms: together they retir'd,
And, in the covert of a ſhady bower,
Diſrob'd, aſſiſted by th' attendant nymphs.
And now each part of dreſs was laid aſide,
Girdles untied, and ev'ry pin pull'd out.
Head-cloaths, and ſtomachers, bracelets and rings,
Gowns, petticoats, and mantles, all perfum'd
And breathing heav'nly odour, lay confus'd.
Their ſlippers, richly gilded, they retain'd,
To guard their feet againſt the pointed thorns.
Thus, naked, before Paris they appear,
March in his ſight, and ev'ry charm diſcloſe.

The French poet who gives us this deſcription, forgets a very material thing, which is, that theſe three goddeſſes waſhed their bodies in a fountain. Euripides tells us this particular (191), and there are ſome epigrams on it in the Anthologia (192). Juno muſt therefore ſubmit to very diſagreeable conditions; for after all, ſhe made profeſſion of modeſty, ſhe was grave and majeſtical, ſhe knew how to maintain her rank, and yet ſhe found her ſelf obliged to ſhew her ſelf naked before a mortal: and the worſt of it was, that another appeared handſomer to the judge, and Venus obtained the golden apple. He did not make it appear, that he found any reaſon of preference in the face or ſhape of theſe three litigants: on the contrary, he declared, that whilſt he ſaw them dreſt, he thought them equally handſome. Having then pronounced againſt Juno, after comparing what their cloaths concealed, it was a ſign he diſcovered in her ſome notable imperfections. This might at leaſt be ſuſpected, and it could not but be a terrible mortification to this goddeſs (193). This was enough to make her mad. I wonder that Lucian has not beſtowed ſome of his biting wit upon it in his dialogue about the judgment of Paris. See the margin (194). Our Scarron has not been ſo diſcreet, ſee how he jeſts in the firſt book of his *Virgile traveſti*:

Ce que craignant la bonne Dame (195),
Et gardant encor en ſon ame
Le beau jugement de Paris,
Et l'inſupportable mépris,
Qu'en faveur de Venus la belle
Il eût pour Pallas & pour elle,
Outre qu'il avoit revelé,
(Heureux s'il n'euſt jamais parlé)
Qu'elle avoit trop longue mamelle,
Et trop long poil deſſous l'aiſſelle,
Et pour Dame de qualité
Le genoüil un peu trop croté:

This the good lady fear'd, we find,
And ſtill preſerving in her mind
The ſlight, which Paris put upon her,
And haughty Pallas' injur'd honour,
When he adjudg'd the queen of love
The golden prize, for which they ſtrove:
Beſides, that Paris had revealed;
A ſecret, he ſhou'd have conceal'd;

---

(187) Lucret. lib. ii, ver. 34.

(188) Horat. Epiſt. ii, lib. 1, ver. 47.

(189) *See* Lucian, in Dearum Judicio, pag. m. 161. Tom. I, Oper.

(190) *Chriſtopher Deffrans, Eſq; lord of la Jalaziere, and of la Chaſtonniere, near Nyort in Poictou, book xi, of his* Hiſtoires des Poëtes, fol. 225, verſo, *printed at Niort,* 1595. *He only puts here into verſe what John le Maire de Belges had ſaid in proſe.* Illuſtrat. de Gaule, lib. i, cap. xxxiii, pag. 108.

(191) Eurip. in Helena ver. 682, & in Andromach. ver. 283.

(192) *In the nineteenth chapter of the fourth book, pag.* m. 745, 746.

(193) *See, above, citat.* (18), *of the article* HENRY III.

(194) *Lucian, in* Deor. Dial. pag. 154, Tom. I, *did not forget to introduce Juno ſaying, that Diana revenged herſelf on Actæon for no other reaſon, but becauſe ſhe was afraid he would divulge the imperfections he had diſcovered, when he ſaw her naked.*

(195) *That is, Juno.*

Hercules in her right breaſt (*o*). It has been ſaid, that after the conſummation of her marriage, ſhe waſhed herſelf in a fountain ſituated betwixt Tigris and Euphrates, and that from that time the waters of that fountain had a moſt agreeable ſmell, which perfumed the Air round about it [*DD*]. Juno was handſome, and for that reaſon Jupiter's

That Juno's breaſts hung down too far,
Had near her arm-pits too much hair,
And, for a dame of quality,
Was not ſo clean about the knee.

An author, who flouriſhed in the beginning of the XVIth century, pretends, that Juno did not appear quite naked. *She and Minerva, ſays he,* (196) *being ſurprized with ſhame, and not willing to do it,* anſwered not a word, when it was ſignified to them, that they muſt be at *the pains of putting off their noble robes*, ſince the *diſpute lay in a compariſon of the beauty of their divine bodies, and in a prudent diſtinction of the preference of their illuſtrious members.* But Venus *the boldeſt of them, ſaid, that things were gone ſo far, that there was no denying of it, and began to untie her girdle.* ‘ Then Juno ſeeing this ſaid, ‘ certainly, Lady Venus, we have no mind to refuſe ‘ it, for fear of being baffled: but I think it is indecent for immortal and chaſte goddeſſes; for Pallas ‘ who is a maid, and for me, who am the wife of a ‘ king and emperor, to ſhew ourſelves naked to any ‘ mortal man, as little account as you make of it, as ‘ being uſed to keep company with men. But however ſince it muſt be done, we will not be the laſt ‘ . . . . (197) Queen Juno full of a matronal ‘ gravity, and modeſty, kept on none of all her ornaments; only ſhe took a fine ha[illegible]cheif, long, broad ‘ and thin, all hemmed with [illegible]nd ſilk fringes, with ‘ which one of her nymphs was decked. And ſhe put ‘ it upon her left ſhoulder hanging like a ſcarf, and ‘ tied in a knot upon her right ſide. And becauſe ‘ the ends fluttering in the air flew up whether ſhe ‘ would or no, by her motion, ſhe held one of her ‘ hands upon her breaſt, and the other lower.’ I believe this is a meer fiction of this author. Lucian inſinuates nothing like it. However it be, Juno expreſſed an extream reſentment for the deſperate affront that ſhe thought her judge had put upon her. This was a wound that bled for a long time, and diſquieted her mind all the reſt of her life.

Nec dum etiam cauſſæ irarum ÆVIQUE DOLORES
Exciderant animo: manet alta mente repoſtum
Judicium Paridis, ſpretæque injuria formæ (198).

Nor were as yet the cauſes of her rage,
And keen reſentments, by her reſtleſs ſoul
Forgotten: deep within her boſom lay
The judgment giv'n by Paris, and th' affront
Of her ſcorn'd beauty.

TRAPP.

I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that Macrobius is miſtaken in one of the differences he mentions betwixt Virgil and Homer. Theſe are his words: ‘ Nullum ‘ commemorationem de judicio Paradis Homerus admittit: idem vates Ganymedem non ut Junonis ‘ pelicem à Jove raptum, ſed Jovialium poculorum ‘ miniſtrum in cœlum à diis aſcitum refert, velut ‘ θεοπρεπῶς. Virgilius tantum deam, quod cuivis de ‘ honeſtis feminæ deforme eſt, velut ſpecie victam ‘ Paride judicante doluiſſe, & propter catamiti pelicatum totam gentem ejus vexaſſe commemorat (199).’ It is certain that Homer has mentioned Paris's judgment, and aſſigned it as the cauſe of Juno's implacable anger againſt the Trojans (200): it is not therefore true, as Macrobius pretends, that Virgil has departed from Homer upon this point. It would ſignify nothing here to ſay, that Euripides (201), and Coluthus (202) have mentioned the ſame judgment of Paris.

[*DD*] *She waſhed herſelf in a fountain . . . . . and that from that time the waters of that fountain had a moſt agreeable ſmell.*] Ælian has preſerved this ſtory. He ſays (203), that this fountain was tranſparent to the bottom, and that the inhabitants of the country, and the Syrians alſo, had among them the tradition juſt mentioned, and attributed to it the agreeable ſmell that was all round the place. Ἐς νῦν ὁ χῶρος εὐωδίαν αναπνεῖ, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀὴρ κύκλῳ ταύτῃ κίρναται. *Unde locus etiamnum ſuavem odorem ſpiret qui in vicinum etiam aërem circumquaque diſtribuitur* (204). This ſhews the character both of a ſuperſtitious and fabulous ſpirit. People are eaſily led to derive from a celeſtial origin all the ſingular properties that are found in certain places of the world; and as the heathens ſuffered themſelves to be abuſed with a chimerical, and fooliſh tradition of the amours and marriages of the gods, they believed that Juno, being willing to waſh her body the next day after her wedding, choſe a very clear fountain, and left there ſome marks of her preſence. Note, that according to Turnebus, they fancied that the divine beings made themſelves known by their ſmell (205).

Omnia finierat: tenues ſeceſſit in auras.
Manſit odor: poſſes ſcire fuiſſe Deam (206).

She ſpoke no more, and vaniſh'd in the wind;
The heav'nly fragrancy, ſhe left behind,
Betray'd the goddeſs.

This is what Ovid ſays, ſpeaking of Flora, and here follows what Virgil ſays, ſpeaking of Venus.

Dixit, & avertens roſea cervice refulſit,
Ambroſiæque comæ divinum vertice odorem
Spiravêre (207).

She ſaid, and, and as ſhe turn'd, her roſy neck
Shone bright; her hair a fragancy divine
Ambroſial breath'd.

TRAPP.

John le Maire de Belges follows this opinion; for he affirms (208), *that all terreſtrial beings kept ſilence and expreſſed a reſpectful admiration, during the appearance of the divine bodies* (209), *which had already perfumed the circumambient air with their fragrant, divine, and ambroſian odour.* The Heathens would have eaſily believed that the ſpittle, &c. of the gods, was roſe-water at leaſt. Balzac (210) obſerves, that the Poet Furius *makes Jupiter ſpit ſnow* (211); *and that another Poet makes Nectar enough to proceed from him to form the rivers of the golden age.* Balzac adds, ‘ that he whom Matthieu's hiſtory names the Chryſoſtom of France, ſaid, preaching before the late king ‘ Henry the Great: *Sir, though your majeſty ſhed* ‘ *pearls inſtead of tears, and ſpit emeralds, though rubies and diamonds proceeded from you whenever you* ‘ *ſneeſe and blow your noſe*, &c.’ It would not have been difficult to perſuade the Heathens, that the gods actually did all this. Thus children are made to believe that Urganda, for example, or ſome other fairy, getting her head combed, and asking *what is it that falls from my head?* heard with pleaſure this anſwer, *gold and ſilver.* Moſt of thoſe who believe this in their infancy, would believe it all their lives, if they were not undeceived when they are grown up, or if they ſaw that theſe things were the common opinion in matter of faith. There are many natural properties, which the traditions of the Chriſtian people attribute to miraculous cauſes, as the Heathens attributed to Juno the fragrancy of the fountain before mentioned. Behold, ſaid one to me one day, that little tract of land where the graſs is ſo pale: it was that way a martyr went, when he was led from the priſon to the place of execution. All the way he went bears the marks of it ever ſince. The wheat, the graſs, whatever is ſown there has a tincture of it, and never acquires the verdure which you ſee on the right and on the left. There

---

(*o*) *See Homer,* Iliad. lib. v, ver. 39°, & ſeq. *who ſays, it was a very painful wound.* Τότε κέν μιν ἀνήκεςον λάβεν ἄλγος. Tunc ipſam graviſſimus occupavit dolor.

(196) John le Maire de Belges, Illuſtrations de Gaule, & ſingularitez de Troie, livr. i, chap. xxxiii, pag. 108. Lyons, 1549, in fol.

(197) Id. ibid. pag. 109.

(108) Virgil. Æneid. lib. i, ver. 25. *See alſo the 36th verſe of the ſame book,* cum Juno AETERNUM ſervans ſub pectore VULNUS.

(199) Macrob. Saturn. lib. v, cap xvi, pag. m. 407.

(200) Homer. Iliad. lib. ult ver. 25, & ſeq.

(201) Eurip. in Troadibus, ver. 924, & in Helena, ver. 23.

(202) Coluthus de raptu Helenæ.

(203) Ælian. Hiſtor. Animal. lib. xii, cap. xxx.

(204) Id. ibid.

(205) Turneb. Adverſ lib xxx, cap xxxix. *I am not very well ſatisfied with the proofs he alledges, viz. the paſſage of Virgil, and that of Ovid, which I have ſet down.*

(206) Ovid. Faſtor. lib. v, ver. 375.

(207) Virgil. Æneid. lib. i, ver. 402.

(208) John le Maire de Belges, ubi ſupra, pag. 109.

(209) *That is, of Juno, Minerva, and Venus, naked before Paris.*

(210) Balzac, Entret V, cap. ii, pag. m. 88. *See the remark* [*HH*] *of the article* MAHOMET, *what the followers of that falſe prophet ſay of his ſweat.*

(211) Jupiter hibernas cana nive conſpuit Alpes.

Jupiter's adulteries may be ſaid to be the more inexcuſable [*EE*]. It would be meer wrangling to criticize Arnobius, who has judged of it in this manner. The ſuperſtition of the Romans was ſo great, that ſome women honoured Juno by pretending to comb her and dreſs her, and hold a looking-glaſs before her [*FF*]; but others were in little fear of her, for they went and ſeated themſelves in the Capitol by her huſband, fancying themſelves to be his miſtreſſes. See my laſt remark.

There is hardly a pariſh, where you will not hear ſuch ſtories. I wiſh ſome travellers would make a large collection of them. They are contented to collect what concerns great towns, but a collection of what concerns the country pariſhes would have it's value too. And hereupon I remember I heard a man of judgment ſay, that his taſte was not like that of an antient father, who wiſhed he had ſeen at Rome a triumph. I rather wiſh, ſaid he, I had been preſent for ſome months at the converſations of the Roman citizens, and that I knew how the women practiſed their devotions, and how they talked of Jupiter and Juno; what was their common diſcourſe on a wedding-day, on a day of child-birth, or of a general proceſſion, a day of Lectiſternium, *&c.* concerning the gods and goddeſſes, *Subigus* or *Subiga*, *Fabulinus*, *Pertunda*, and the reſt. Books do not teach us thoſe particulars, it is only by converſation that we come to the knowledge of them.

[*EE*] *Juno's beauty made Jupiter's adulteries more inexcuſable.*] It is thus Arnobius argued: 'Et quid 'Regi Saturnio matrimoniis fuerat cum alienis rei? 'Non illi fuerat ſatis Juno, nec ſedare impetum cupiditatum in regina poterat numinum, cum nobilitas eam 'commendaret tanta, facies, oris dignitas & ulnarum 'nivei marmoreique candores (212). —— *And what 'had Jupiter to do with other mens wives? Was not 'Juno enough for him; and could he not ſatisfy his luſt 'with the queen of the gods, ſo famed for her graceful 'air, beauty, and white hand?*' A cavilling Sophiſt might attack this argument of Arnobius, and ſay that at a certain period of time, the beauty of women loſes all it's charms with reſpect to their huſbands, the nature of things being ſuch, that they no longer affect us, after we are uſed to them, *ab aſſuetis non fit paſſio.* He would maintain, that this political axiom, that the beſt methods of preſerving dimin**i**on, are thoſe that have been made uſe of to obtain it (213), is falſe in the empire of beauty: for if beauty makes a conqueſt, it does not preſerve it; a huſband who fell in love only becauſe his miſtreſs was handſome, will not continue in love, becauſe his wife continues to be ſo: cuſtom hardens him againſt that ſort of charm, and he makes every day ſome ſteps towards inſenſibility: Some come ſooner to it, others later; but at laſt all arrive at it, and the affection which may be, and is frequently preſerved, is not grounded upon beauty, but upon other qualities. Experience ſhews that the huſbands, whoſe love is moſt laſting and ſtrong, are not for the generality thoſe who have handſome wives. Look elſewhere than in beauty for that charm, which unites the hearts, and keeps them afterwards united (214). A Sophiſt might heap up many other obſervations of the ſame nature; but after all, he ought to be looked upon as a caviller; for it is certain that Arnobius's remark is grounded upon a kind of common notion. All the neighbours are much more ſcandalized with the intrigues of a man, who has a handſome wife, than with thoſe of another, whoſe wife is ugly. A whole nation, though never ſo numerous, will be more indulgent to the galantries of a king, when the queen is deformed, and loathſome, than when he is married to a princeſs of a rare and excellent beauty. Some body has inſerted in the Scaligerana a ſtory which has ſome affinity with this. 'Porthaiſe, a famous preacher, preaching at Poictiers, 'and having heard of the debaucheries of a Phyſician, 'named Lumeau, who though he had a handſome 'wife, ſometimes went elſewhere, pointing at him one 'day, very pleaſantly in the pulpit, when having ſpoke 'againſt this vice in general, he came to particulars, 'he ſaid, nay, we have heard with great concern, 'that there are ſome men who are ſo profligate, as to 'commit adultery, though they have wives in their 'own houſes, who are ſuch, that for our part, we 'ſhould be well enough contented with them (215).'

[*FF*] *Some women honoured Juno by pretending to comb her* . . . . . *and hold a looking-glaſs before her.*] What a misfortune it is that we have not the book, in which Seneca condemned this baſe ſuperſtition, and many others like it. St Auguſtin has cited it. 'In Capitolium perveni, *ſaid Seneca* (216), pudebit publicatæ dementiæ, quòd ſibi vanus furor attribuit officii: alius 'nomina Deo ſubjicet, alius horas Jovi nunciat, alius 'lictor eſt, alius unctor, qui vano motu brachiorum 'imitatur ungentem. Sunt, quæ Junoni ac Minervæ 'capillos diſponant, longè à templo non tantum à ſimulachro ſtantes, digitos movent ornantium modo. 'Sunt quæ ſpeculum teneant . . . . Sedent quædam in 'Capitolio, quæ ſe à Jove amari putant, nec Junonis 'quidem, ſi credere poëtis velis, iracundiſſimæ reſpectu 'terrentur. —— *I came to the Capitol: you will be aſhamed of the public madneſs, which they practiſe under the notion of honouring him: one gives the god a 'liſt of names; another tells Jupiter the hour of the 'day; another is lictor, another anointer, who counterfeits the action of one that anoints. Some are employed in diſpoſing the hairs of Juno and Minerva, ſtanding at a diſtance, not only from the temple, but alſo 'from the image, and move their fingers as if they 'were adorning the ſtatues. Some women hold a glaſs . . . 'Some ſit in the Capitol, thinking Jupiter is love with 'them, nor are terrified with the ſight of Juno, though 'full of reſentment, if you will believe the Poets.*' We may confirm this by a paſſage taken from a book which is ſtill in being. 'Deum colit qui novit. Vetemus 'lintea & ſtrigiles Jovi ferre, & ſpeculum tenere Junoni (217). — *He worſhips a god, who knows how to 'worſhip him. I allow no one to carry napkins and combs 'to Jupiter, or to hold a glaſs to Juno.*'

(212) Arnobius, lib. iv, pag. m. 141.

(213) Imperium facile iis artibus retinetur quibus initio partum eſt. *Salluſt. in Prœm. Belli Catil.*

(214) Hæc res & jungit, & junctos ſervat amicos. *Horat. Sat. III, Lib. i, ver.* 54.

(215) Scaligerana, pag. m. 192.

(216) Seneca, contra Superſtitiones apud Auguſt. de Civitate Dei, lib. vi, cap. x, pag. m. 605.

(217) Seneca, Epiſt. xcv, pag. m. 396.

JUPITER,

JUPITER, the greateſt of all the Heathen gods, was the ſon of Saturn and Cybele. There was no crime, but what he was defiled with; for beſides that he dethroned his own father, that he caſtrated him, and bound him in chains in the deepeſt hell [*A*],

he

[*A*] *He dethroned his own father, . . . and bound him in chains in the deepeſt hell.*] Saturn was dealt with according to the *Lex Talionis*, ſince he had uſurped the empire of the world, which his father Cœlus poſſeſſed (1); but Jupiter was nevertheleſs guilty of a horrible uſurpation; it is not lawful to puniſh one crime by another; one cannot abſolve himſelf by imitating the wicked. It is remarkable that Cœlus was betrayed by his own wife; for it was the earth, heaven's wife, who excited her children to rebel (2), and who put a fickle into the hands of the youngeſt (3) which he made uſe of to caſtrate him. Saturn who had done that exploit, was treated ſo exactly in the ſame manner, that Jupiter uſed the ſame inſtrument to cut off his privy parts, as he had uſed for the caſtration of Cœlus (4). Note, that Saturn's party made a long reſiſtance: it was not vanquiſhed till after ten years war (5). Saturn being conquered, was loaded with chains, and thrown into Tartarus, the darkeſt and deepeſt dungeon of hell. It was as remote from the earth, as the earth is from heaven. Τόπος δὲ οὗτος ἐρεβώδης ἐστὶν ἐν ᾅδου, τοσοῦτον ἀπὸ γῆς ἔχων διάστημα, ὅσον ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ γῆ. *Is locus eſt ad Inferos tenebroſiſſimus, qui tantùm à terra diſtat, quantùm à cælo terram abeſſe ferunt* (6). The chains were not very heavy; for they were made of wool (7). He had every year ſome days of liberty allowed him, during the Saturnalia; a time in which ſlaves were permitted to do what they pleaſed (8). Some ſay, that Saturn eſcaped from priſon, and retired into Italy to king Janus. Others ſay, that his ſon was contented only to expel him. Virgil is of this laſt opinion:

> Primus ab ætherio venit Saturnus Olympo
> Arma Jovis fugiens, & regnis exul ademptis (9).

Firſt

(1) Apollodorus, lib. i, init.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) *It was Saturn.*

(4) Natalis Comes, Mythol. lib. ii, pag. m. 86.

(5) Apollodor, ubi ſupra.

(6) Id. ibid.

(7) Agathonymus in Perſide, apud Natal. Comitem, pag. 85.

(8) Age libertate Decembri, Quando ita majores voluerunt utere. *Horat. Sat. VII, lib.* ii, *ver.* 4.

(9) Virgil. *Æn.* lib. viii, ver. 319.

he committed inceſt with his ſiſters, daughters, and aunts [*B*], and even attempted to raviſh his mother. He debauched a great number of maids and wives; and to compaſs his deſigns, he borrowed the ſhapes of all ſorts of beaſts. He was guilty of the unnatural ſin; for he ſtole away the beautiful Ganymede (*a*), and preferred him to the office of cup-bearer to the gods, that he might have him at hand, as often as his heart deſired. Treacheries and perjuries, and in general, all actions that are

Firſt exil'd from Olympus Saturn came,
Flying his kingdom, and the arms of Jove.

Trapp.

But Statius is not, ſince he ſpeaks of the liberty that was granted to Saturn once a year.

Saturnus mihi compede exoluta
Et multo gravidus mero December,
Et ridens jocus, & ſales protervi
Adſint (10).

Come Saturn, from thy fetters looſed,
December, reeling in thy cups,
With pleaſantry, and wanton wit.

To which you may add theſe words of Arnobius (11): ‘ Numquid parricidii cauſa vinctum eſſe Saturnum, & ablui diebus ſtatis, vinculorum ponderibus & levari. —. *That Saturn was chained on account of parricide, and that he was waſhed, and freed from his chains, on certain days.*’ I forgot to ſay, that after the compleat victory that Jupiter's party had obtained, Apollo ſung upon his lyre a poem which he had made in praiſe of the conquerors. Tibullus informs us of this circumſtance in an elegy, which he inſcribes to Apollo (12).

Sed nitidus pulcerque veni, nunc indue veſtem
  Sepoſitam, longas nunc bene pecte comas,
Qualem te memorant, Saturno rege fugato
  Victori laudes concinuiſſe Jovi.

But come, adorn'd in all thy beauty's pride;
Reſume thy ſhining garment laid aſide;
Deck the long ringlets of thy flowing hair,
And in full majeſty of dreſs appear;
As erſt, when, Saturn driv'n from heav'n above,
You ſung the praiſes of the victor Jove.

The beſt allegories that may be found under theſe fables, is to ſay, that the Antients meant by them that ambition ſtifles all natural affection, and the duties of friendſhip and alliances (13), and that Poets and Orators are always ready to declare for the party that is uppermoſt.

[*B*] *He committed inceſt with his ſiſters, daughters, and aunts.*] He lay with his ſiſter Juno, without ſtaying till ſhe was his wife, and afterwards married her. I ſpeak of it in another place (14). He debauched his other ſiſter Ceres, and had Proſerpina by her. He lay with three of his aunts, namely, Themis, Dione, and Mnemoſyne. From his inceſt with the firſt came the Horæ and the Parcæ: by the ſecond he begat Venus, by the third the nine Muſes (15). Seeing his mother one day aſleep, he attempted to lie with her by ſurprize; but as ſhe awaked, and put herſelf in a poſture of defence; he made uſe of force, and would probably have accompliſhed his abominable deſign, if the ardour of his paſſion had not evaporated in his ſtruggle to overpower his mother (16). Arnobius very juſtly exclaims upon it: ‘ O rerum imaginatio indecora! ô habitus fœdus Jovis ad obſcœni certaminis expeditionem parati! Ergone ille rex mundi, cum incautus & properus obreptionis eſſet rejectus à furto, in impetum ſe vertit: & quum rapere voluptatem inſidioſa fraude non quivit, vi matrem aggreſſus eſt, & apertiſſimè cœpit venerabilem ſubruere caſtitatem? Colluctatus ergo diutiſſimè cum invita eſt, victus, fractus, ſuperatuſque defecit: & quem pietas dijugare ab infando matris non valuit appetitu, effuſa libido dijunxit (17)? — *O indecent image of things! O filthy poſture of Jupiter, prepared to enter the obſcence liſts! Did then this king of the world, when he could not compaſs his deſign by ſtealth, have recourſe to violence, and openly attempt his mother's chaſtity? He ſtruggled a long time with the unwilling goddeſs; but, vanquiſhed at laſt, was obliged to deſiſt; and, whom filial piety could not keep from impiouſly luſting after his mother, paſſion extinguiſhed prevented from accompliſhing his deſire.*’ He obſerves that the Heathens made advantage of thoſe vain efforts of Jupiter; for they ſaid, that a ſtone grew with child by him, and brought forth a ſon ten months after. ‘ Et ſane hoc loco frugalitatis magnæ viri, & circa res etiam Flagitioſi operis parciores, ne ſancta illa ſeminia fruſtra videantur effuſa, ſilex, inquit, ebibit Jovialis incontinentiæ fœditatem. Quid deinde, quæſo, conſecutum eſt, dicite? In ſinu medio lapidis, atque in illa cotis duritie informatus atque animatus eſt infans, Jovis magni futura progenies, &c (18).’ Such a ſort of propagation hath been obſerved about the attempts Jupiter made to debauch his daughter Venus. This maid, who was otherwiſe ſo bountiful in her favours to other men, made a vigorous reſiſtance to Jupiter. I explain this in the margin by the words of a modern author, which are ſomewhat coarſe (19). Arnobius makes mention of another wicked attempt of Jupiter, wherein he ſucceeded. But it is according to the opinion of thoſe, who ſaid that Ceres was the mother of this god. ‘ Quondam Dieſpiter, inquiunt, cùm in Cererem ſuam matrem libidinibus improbis atque inconceſſis cupiditatibus, æſtuaret, nam genitrix hæc Jovis regionis ejus ab accolis traditur, neque tamen auderet id, quod procaci appetitione conceperat, apertiſſima vi petere, ingenioſas comminiſcitur captiones, quibus nihil tale metuentem caſtitate imminueret genitricem: fit ex Deo taurus, & ſub pecoris ſpecie ſubſeſſoris animum atque audaciam celans; in ſecuram & neſciam repentina immittitur vi furens, agit inceſtius res ſuas, & prodita per libidinem fraude, intellectus, & cognitus evolat (20). —— *Jupiter, they ſay, once luſting after his mother Ceres (for the inhabitants of that country pretend ſhe was his mother) and not daring openly to gratify his deſires, ingeniouſly contrived to rob her of her chaſtity by ſurprize: he was transformed into a bull, and, concealing himſelf under that brutiſh form, attacked her, when ſhe was off her guard, committed the inceſt, and, being diſcovered by the luſtful action, fled away.*’ Ceres was angry to little purpoſe; that action made her big with Proſerpina, who went through the ſame trial as her mother: Jupiter got the maindenhead of Proſerpina, his daughter. ‘ Quam (*Proſerpinam*) cùm verveceus Jupiter bene validam, floridam, & ſucci eſſe conſpiceret plenioris, oblitus paulo ante quid malorum & ſceleris eſſet aggreſſus, & temeritatis quantum, redit ad priores actus: & quia nefarium videbatur ſatis, patrem cum filia comminus uxoria conjugatione miſceri, in draconis terribilem formam migrat: ingentibus ſpiris pavefactam colligat virginem, & ſub obtentu fero, molliſſimis ludit atque adulatur amplexibus (21). —— *Jupiter, ſeeing Proſerpina ſtrong, florid, and healthy, forgetting the crime he had a little before attempted, returned to his former practices: and becauſe it looked ill for a father openly to uſe his daughter as a wife, he took upon him the terrible form of a ſerpent: he wreathed his monſtrous folds about the affrighted virgin; and, under this ſavage appearance, embraced and toyed with her in the ſofteſt manner.*’ Meziriac (22) quotes ſeveral authors, who ſay, that Jupiter, transformed into a ſerpent, got the maidenhead of his daughter Proſerpina, by whom he got the firſt Bacchus, ſirnamed Zagræus. I will conclude this remark with a paſſage of Arnobius. ‘ Quid tantum, quæſo, *ſays he to the Heathens* (23), de vobis Jupiter iſte, quicumque eſt, meruit, quod genus eſt nullum probri infame, adulterium nullum quod in ejus non caput, velut in aliquam congeratis vilem luteamque perſonam? —— *What has this Jupiter, whoever he be, deſerved ſo greatly of you; he, who ſtuck at no crime, no adultery, like the vileſt of mortals?*’ This is to nonplus Paganiſm.

(*a*) *See the article* GANYMEDE.

(10) Statius, Silva VI, lib. i.

(11) Lib. iv, pag. m. 143.

(12) *It is the fifth of the ſecond book.*

(13) *Natalis Comes, who is very fond of allegories, ſpeaks thus, pag.* 85. Nulla ſunt enim vel naturæ vel amicitiæ, vel beneficentiæ ſatis firma vincula ubi majeſtatis & imperandi furioſum deſiderium invaſerit: illa omnia ſiquidem facillime conculcantur & proſternuntur.

(14) *In the remark* [*A*] *of the article* JUNO.

(15) Heſiodus, in Theogon. Apollodor. lib. i, pag. 9.

(16) Arnob. lib. v, pag. 161.

(17) Arnob. ibid. pag. 162.

(18) Id. ibid.

(19) *Nonnus, book xiv, ſays, that the other Centaurs were begotten by the ſeed of Jupiter which fell upon the earth when he wanted to lie with Venus, who reſiſted him.* Meziriac on Ovid, pag. 173.

(20) Arnob. ib. pag. 170.

(21) Ib. pag. 171.

(22) Ib. pag. 419. *He quotes Nonnus,* lib. v, & vi. *Arnobius,* lib. v. *Clemens Alexandrinus,* in Protreptico. *Tzetzes upon Lycophron. The Scholiaſt upon Pindar, in the ſeventh Iſthm. The author of the Great Etymologicon, at the word* Ζαγρεύς. *The Scholiaſt upon Ariſtophanes,* in Ran. *Diodorus Siculus,* lib. iii. *Arrianus,* lib. ii, de Expedit. Alexandri. *Hyginus,* cap. clv, & clvii. *Cicero,* lib. iii, de Nat. Deor.

(23) Arnob. lib. v, pag. 171.

are puniſhable by the laws, were familiar to him *(b)*. They had gone ſo far, as to ſay, that he devoured one of his wives [*C*]; and therefore nothing can be more monſtrous, than the religion of the Pagans, who looked upon ſuch a God, as the ſupreme governour of the world, and ſuited to that notion, the religious worſhip that was paid him. The fathers of the church have laid a great ſtreſs upon this argument, to prove the falſhood of the Pagan religion; and it may be ſaid, that this ſyſtem was very proper to corrupt morality [*D*]. I ſhall ſay nothing about the fables, that concern the birth or education

[*C*] *Some went ſo far as to ſay that he devoured one of his wives.*] Heſiod obſerves, that the firſt wife Jupiter married, was called Metis (24). Seeing her big with child, he devoured her, and became himſelf big with child by that means, and afterwards brought forth Minerva. ‘ Gravidam factam deglutivit, ut ſcripſit ‘ Joannes Diaconus his verbis: Καὶ ἔγκυον ταύτην ‘ ποιησάμενος, καταπίνει αὐτὴν, ἵνα μὴ ἄλλος ‘ τὶς τῶν θεῶν ἀποκυνθείη παρ᾽ αὐτῆς ἀναιδὴς ‘ καὶ ἀτάσθαλος: *quam cùm gravidam feciſſet, de‘ glutivit, ne quis alius Deorum naſceretur ex ea impu‘ dens ac fatuus.* Ex eo cibo mox ipſe Jupiter pro ‘ uxore gravidus factus Palladem armatam è capite pe‘ perit (25). ——— *Having got her with child, he de‘ voured her, as Joannes Diaconus has written in theſe ‘ words*: having got her with child, he devoured her ‘ leſt any other impudent and fooliſh god ſhould be ‘ born of her. *By this food Jupiter himſelf becoming ‘ pregnant, brought forth from out of his head the arm‘ ed Pallas.*’

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary, I have more exactly examined this, and I have found, that Natalis Comes advances nothing, but what is grounded upon the words of Joannes Diaconus, whom he cites. This Diaconus is a Greek author, and a Chriſtian, who compoſed allegorics and ſcholia upon Heſiod's poem, intituled Θεογονία, *the Generation of the Gods.* He poſitively ſays, that Jupiter having ſwallowed his wife Metis, brought forth Minerva, καὶ ταύτην καταπιὼν ἀποτίκτει ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ κεφαλῆς τὴν τριτογένειαν Ἀθηνᾶν. He makes uſe, I ſay, of theſe words immediately after thoſe contained in the paſſage of Natalis Comes, which I have quoted; and thereby he manifeſtly declares, that he would have it thought that Minerva ſprung from Jupiter's head, becauſe Metis being with child, had been devoured by Jupiter her huſband. But Heſiod does not lead us to this thought, nor does he ſo much as inſinuate, that the tragical end of Metis contributed to the birth of Minerva. Here follows the ſubſtance of what he ſays (26). Metis, Jupiter's firſt wife, was ready to be delivered of Minerva, but Jupiter hindred her; he uſed a flattering diſcourſe, which deceived her, and ſwallowed her into his belly. Cœlus and the earth had given him this advice, and had cautioned him, that unleſs he did it, he would loſe his ſceptre, ſince the deſtinies declared, that Metis after ſhe had brought the wiſe Minerva into the world, ſhould lye-in of a brave boy, who ſhould rule over the gods and men. Jupiter avoided the fatal blow; he ſhut up Metis in his bowels, before ſhe became a mother; he ſhut her up, I ſay, that ſhe might foretel him good and evil (27). He afterwards married Themis, by whom he had many children: he had alſo many by his miſtreſſes. He had by Eurynome the daughter of Oceanus, the three Graces; afterwards he lay with Ceres, who brought forth Proſerpina. After this he fell in love with Mnemoſyne, and made her the mother of the nine muſes. He had by Latona a ſon and a daughter, namely Apollo and Diana, and at laſt he married Juno, who brought him three children, Hebe, Mars, and Lucina; and as for himſelf, he conceived Minerva in his head, and was delivered of her. Thus you ſee, that if Heſiod had intended his readers ſhould think, that he meant that this birth of Minerva was an effect of Metis's being ſhut up in Jupiter's belly, he had done all that was neceſſary to fruſtrate his deſign; for he puts between this effect, and this cauſe, ſuch an interval as leads our thoughts to quite another thing from his intention. Let us ſay then, that he had no ſuch intention, or elſe, that he excelled in the ſhameful art of giving a wrong account of a thing, and expreſſing it obſcurely. Note, that if the nineteen verſes which we find in one of Galen's works (28), were Heſiod's, we could not blame this Poet for being too obſcure. It plainly appears from them, that the ſame Pallas, who was born from Jupiter's head, was conceived in Metis's womb. But it ought to be obſerved, that ſhe was not conceived, till after Metis had been ſwallowed up by Jupiter. This is a variation, which deſerves to be taken notice of. I add, that it is not probable theſe are Heſiod's verſes; for if they were, there would be in his poem of the Generation of the Gods a chaſm which the critics do not complain of. Galen is ſomewhat to blame, for not putting it out of doubt whether the pronoun αὐτὸς *ipſe*, which precedes the nineteen verſes, refers to Heſiod or Chryſippus. I believe it relates to the latter, and that this great Philoſopher, after he had produced Heſiod's verſes concerning Metis, cited thoſe of another Poet, in which the conception of Minerva was deſcribed ſomewhat differently. If you aſk me, to what end Chryſippus alledged theſe verſes of Heſiod, and the others, I anſwer, that it was to ſhew, that his opinion concerning the ſeat of the rational ſoul, was not contrary to the tradition of the birth of Minerva. He placed the rational ſoul in the heart, and yet Minerva, that is Reaſon and Wiſdom, was born from Jupiter's brain. This was the objection Chryſippus examined; he took advantage of the circumſtance of Minerva's being conceived by Metis, after ſhe was ſwallowed by Jupiter, and he maintained, that this ſignified, that reaſon was formed in the breaſt, and that the delivery of Minerva ſignified ſpeech, that is to ſay, that reaſon proceeds from the head, in as much as the mouth is the organ, by which the thoughts conceived in the heart, are outwardly produced. Galen (29) thinks it very ſtrange, that Chryſippus ſhould trouble himſelf to give a ſerious explication of poetical traditions (30). He cannot be too much blamed for ſpending his time ſo ill.

[*D*] *The ſyſtem of the Pagan religion was very proper to corrupt morality* (31).] ‘ Chriſtian authors have ‘ drawn potent arguments from theſe infamous actions ‘ of Jupiter, to convict the Heathens of the falſity of ‘ their gods; as may be ſeen in many places of La‘ ctantius, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Arno‘ bius, and ſeveral others. For beſides that ſuch horrid ‘ crimes are inconſiſtent with the deity, the Gentiles ‘ might thence take a juſt pretext for giving them‘ ſelves up to all ſorts of wickedneſs . . . . . not ‘ believing themſelves criminal, whilſt they imitated ‘ their gods. This is what Ion means in a tragedy of Euripides, that bears his name.

- - - Οὐκ ἔτ᾽ ἀνθρώπους κακῶς
Λέγειν δίκαιον, εἰ τὰ τῶν θεῶν κακὰ
Μιμούμεθ᾽, ἀλλὰ τοὺς διδάσκοντας τάδε (32).

Blame not the wretch, who imitates the gods,
But charge the crime on thoſe, who ſet th' example.

Meziriac makes this reflexion upon a paſſage of Ovid, where Phædra (33) obſerves, that inceſt was ſcrupled in the ruſtical time of Saturn, but that under the reign of his ſucceſſor, a woman might be permitted to lie with her ſon-in law. Jupiter, ſays ſhe, authoriſes all by his marriage with his ſiſter.

Nec quia privigno videar coïtura noverca
  Terruerint animos nomina vana tuos.
Iſta vetus pietas, ævo moritura futuro
  Ruſtica Saturno regna tenente, fuit.
Jupiter eſſe pium ſtatuit quodcunque juvaret,
  Et fas omne facit fratre marita ſoror

Let not the name of ſtep-mother affright;
What now ſeems wrong, when Saturn reign'd was
  right.
Jove teaches us, whate'er we like, to prove,
And bids a ſiſter meet a brother's love.

Ovid falls here into a very groſs miſtake (34), ſince it is certain that Saturn was married to his ſiſter, juſt

(*b*) *See the proofs which Natalis Comes gives for it,* Mythol. lib. i, cap. xviii, *and Arnobius, quoted below, in the remark* [*B*].

(24) Ζεὺς δὲ θεῶν βασιλεὺς πρώτην ἄλοχον θέτο Μῆτιν. Uxorem primam Metim ſibi Jupiter addit. *Heſiod. in Theog. ver.* 886.

(25) Natalis Comes, Mythol. lib. ii, pag. m. 90.

(26) Heſiod. in Theog. ver. 887, & ſeq.

(27) Ἀλλ᾽ ἄρα μιν Ζεὺς πρόσθεν ἑὴν ἐγκάτθετο νηδὺν, ὡς δή οἱ φράσσαιτο θεὰ ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε. Sed illam ſane Jupiter ante in ſuum condidit ventrem, Ut nempe ei indicaret dea bonumque malumque. *Id. ibid. ver.* 899.

(28) Galenus, de Hippocr. & Platonis, Placitis, lib. iii, cap. viii, pag. 131. Edit. Pariſ. 1679.

(29) Id. ibid. pag. 133.

(30) *See, above, citations* (49) *and* (68) *of the article* CHRYSIPPUS, *the Philoſopher.*

(31) *See Mr Arnauld, in the fifth* Denonciation du Peché Philoſophique, pag. 32.

(32) *Meziriac upon Ovid,* pag. 419, 420.

(33) In Epiſt. ad Hippolytum.

(34) *Meziriac, pag.* 419, *makes this obſervation.*

education of Jupiter (*c*). Moreri has mentioned ſomething of it; and this is to be found in a great many books, which ſchool-boys have daily in their hands. I ſhall only ſpeak of the eagle that brought him Nectar [*E*]. This particular is not ſo commonly known. Mr Charpentier does not faithfully relate a thing, for which he quotes Homer [*F*].

What the Heathens have ſaid of Jupiter's original; ſeemed to me for a long time ſo unaccountable, that the more I thought on it, the more monſtrous it appeared to me, and ſuch, in a word. as I could not apprehend how the Philoſophers could maintain it; but I have at laſt diſcovered, that they might be led into that error, by a ſort of reaſoning [*G*], the weakneſs whereof it was no eaſy thing for them to find out. They

did

as Jupiter was to his. One might add to the paſſage of Euripides, quoted by Meziriac, a hundred others of the ſame force. Nothing is more common in the antient poets, than to ſee people, in order to excuſe their crimes, maintain, that they have only imitated the gods, or that the gods have inſtigated them to do evil (35). But not to diſſemble the truth, it muſt be ſaid to the glory of the Heathens, that they did not live according to their principles. It is true, that the corruption of manners was very great among the Heathens; but many of them did not follow the example of their falſe gods, and preferred the ideas of virtue before ſo great an authority. What is ſtrange is, that the Chriſtians, whoſe ſyſtem is ſo pure, come but a little ſhort of the Heathens in their vices. It is a miſtake to believe, that the morals of a religion anſwer the doctrines of the articles of faith.

[*E*] *I ſhall only ſpeak of the eagle that brought him Nectar.*] A woman named Moero, author of a poem intituled Memory (36), ſays, that Jupiter, unknown to all the gods, was bred up in a cave in the iſle of Crete, by pigeons that brought him Ambroſia, and by an eagle that brought him Nectar. The Ambroſia came from the ocean, and the Nectar was drawn from a ſtone. Jupiter having dethroned Saturn, immortalized this eagle, and tranſlated it into the heavens.

Νέκταρ δ' ἐκ πέτρης μέγας αἰετὸς αἰὲν ἀφύσσων,
Γαμφηλῇ φορέεσκε [πετῶν] Διῒ μητιόεντι.
Τὸν καὶ νικήσας πατέρα Κρόνον εὐρύοπα Ζεύς,
Ἀθανατὸν ποίησε καὶ οὐρανῷ ἐγκατένασσεν.

Nectar verò ex ſaxo ingens aquila ſemper hauriens,
Advolans portabat conſulto prudentique Jovi.
Eam victo patre Saturno Juppiter altiſonus,
Immortalitate donatam, in cœlo habitare voluit (37).

[*F*] *Mr Charpentier does not faithfully relate a thing for which he quotes Homer.*] I ſpeak of Mr Charpentier of the French academy. He expected to harangue the king at the head of the academy, after the taking of Mons; but that prince would have no harangue at that time. That of Mr Charpentier was inſerted in the Mercure Galant for the month of May, 1691. We read in it, that the king is like Homer's Jupiter, againſt whom all the other gods are united, and who after having upbraided them with the vanity of their deſign, ſhews them by experience, that his force is not to be ſhaken; and whilſt they all pull againſt him, he lifts them up altogether with the globe of the earth. By his leave, Jupiter in Homer (38) does not put this in practice; he only boaſts of it, and threatens to do it.

The other gods were not perſuaded, that his boaſts were well grounded: they only believed, that in a ſingle combat he would be too hard for them. His menace appeared ridiculous to Mars, who remembred that it was not long ſince Neptune, Juno, and Minerva, having undertaken to ſeize Jupiter, and bind him, put him into a horrible fright, and had actually bound him, if Thetis had not had pity of him, and called to his relief Briareus with his hundred hands (39). If Mr Charpentier had known the ſatirical wit of our libel writers, he would probably have abſtained from compariſons. He would have thought on Lucian.

[*G*] *They might be led into this error, by a ſort of reaſoning.*] Let us ſee firſt of all, what Heſiod ſays of the genealogy of the gods (40). He begins with the Chaos; this is the firſt being he lays down; afterwards he brings in the earth and love: he adds, that Erebus and the Night were begotten by the Chaos and that Æther and the Day proceeded from the marriage of Erebus and Night; and that the Earth, without any marriage begot Heaven and the Sea, and afterwards being married to Heaven ſhe produced Oceanus, Rhea, Themis, Tethys, Saturn, &c. This extraordinary fruitful marriage gave but little comfort to the earth; for Heaven, her husband, ſhut up all her children as they were born. She encouraged them to revenge, and did it ſo effectually, that Saturn with a ſtroak of a ſcythe cut off his father's nameleſs parts, and caſt them into the ſea (41). They produced a froth, from which ſprung the goddeſs Venus. The children of Saturn and Rhea, were Veſta, Ceres, Juno, Pluto, Neptune, Jupiter (42). This is what I take from Heſiod's poem. Some other Genealogiſts (43) ſaid that Æther and the Day, children of Erebus and of the Night, were the father and mother of Heaven, and had for their brothers and ſiſters, Love, Fraud, Fear, Labour, Envy, Deſtiny, Old Age, Death, Darkneſs, Miſery, Dreams, &c. We have ſeen in another place (44) how Carneades made uſe of this genealogy to confute the Theology of the Stoics. I ſhall only ſay now, that according to this tree of conſanguity, there muſt have been neceſſarily ſome god, whoſe father was not a god; for if on one hand it had been granted to Carneades, that Heaven, Æther, the Day, Erebus, the Night, were gods, they would have denied on the other, that the Chaos, which was antecedent to all theſe divine beings, was a god, and conſequently they were forced to ſay, that the gods had been been made of a matter, which was not a god, and without an efficient cauſe which had the nature of a god. This is certainly a thought, which contradicts the moſt ſolid and the moſt evident notions of natural reaſon; nevertheleſs, ſome great Philoſophers have ſuppoſed the generation of the gods, and have aſſigned them a cauſe of their being, which was not a god. 'Anaximenes omnes rerum cauſas infinito aëri 'dedit, nec deos negavit aut tacuit: non tamen ab ipſis 'aërem factum, ſed IPSOS EX AERE ORTOS credidit '(45). —— *Anaximenes aſcribed the cauſes of all things 'to the infinite air, nor did he deny, or ſay nothing of 'the gods; yet he did not believe that the air was made by 'them, but that* THEY SPRUNG FROM THE AIR.' By theſe words of St Auguſtin, we better underſtand the doctrine of Anaximenes, than by theſe of Cicero: 'Anaximenes aëra deum ſtatuit, eumque gigni, eſſeque 'immenſum & infinitum, & ſemper in motu (46). —— '*Anaximenes ſuppoſed the air to be god, and that it 'was immenſe and infinite, and always in motion.*' Cicero does not ſeem to have well related the opinion of this Philoſopher; for ſince Anaximenes made the air the principle of all things, and aſcribed to it immenſity and infinity, we muſt believe, that he ſuppoſed it eternal, and unproduced, and that if he called it god under this notion, he did not believe the generation of god in that reſpect. When therefore he ſaid, that the infinite air was the cauſe of all beings, and that the gods themſelves were produced from it he did not aſcribe to it the name and nature of god, in the ſame ſenſe, that he aſcribed it to the gods, which owed their origin and exiſtence to the air. Perhaps he meant this: he was willing, in order to avoid all diſputes about words, to give the name of god to the immenſe and infinite air, which he looked upon as the principle of all things; but he did not pretend, that Saturn, Rhea, Jupiter, Juno, Neptune, Minerva, and the other gods, which the Heathens adored, were that air, or had produced it: he ſuppoſed on the contrary, that that air was their principle, as well as that of other beings which compoſe the univerſe. He gave this principle a perpetual motion, from whence it may

be

(c) *I ſhall ſay ſomething of it in the article* METHYDRIUM.

(35) *See the article* HELENA, *remark* [*C*].

(36) Athen. lib. xv, pag. 490.

(37) Id. ibid. pag. 491.

(38) *See the eighth book of the Iliad, at the beginning.*

(39) *Taken from* Lucian, in Deor. Dialogis, pag. 173, 174. Tom. I *See* Homer, Iliad. lib. i, ver. 398, & ſeq.

(40) Heſiod. de Deor. Generat. ver. 116.

(41) Id. ibid. ver. 180.

(42) Id. ibid. ver. 453.

(43) *See* Cicero, de Natura Deor. lib. iii, cap xvii.

(44) *Citation (87) of the article* CARNEADES.

(45) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. viii, cap. ii, pag. m. 711. *See, above, citat.* (15) *of the article* DIOGENES, *of Apollonia.*

(46) Cicero, de Natura Deorum, lib. i, cap. x.

did not believe, that any thing could be created, and acknowledged no ſubſtances wholly diſtinct from extenſion. Now when once theſe two hypotheſes are laid down, it is almoſt as eaſy to imagine, that a ſubtilized matter might become a god, as to believe the ſoul of man to be material, as moſt Philoſophers believed. See the remark [G]. There was in Arcadia a temple of God the Good. Pauſanias conjectures that it was conſecrated to Jupiter: his reaſon is becauſe that epithet ought to belong by way of pre-eminence

be concluded, that he took it for an immanent cauſe, which produced in itſelf infinite effects, without end; and he reckoned amongſt thoſe effects, not only the ſtars and meteors, plants, ſtones, and metals, but alſo the gods and men. Such a doctrine was at the bottom a meer Spinoziſm; for, according to this opinion, God, or the eternal and neceſſary being of Anaximenes, was the only ſubſtance, of which heaven and earth, the animals, &c. were but modifications. Thales perhaps was of ſuch an opinion, who taught that water was the principle of all things (47). Perhaps he called it god on that account. This was the god he meant, when he ſaid, that god having not been produced, was the oldeſt of all beings (48). He added, that the world being the work of God, was the beautifulleſt of all beings (49). Spinoza would acknowledge this; he does not deny that God is the cauſe of all things, that is to ſay, the immanent cauſe, which modifies itſelf a thouſand different ways, from whence reſults what we call the world, and the whole univerſe in general. If Thales ſaid alſo that the world is animated, and full of ſpirits (50), this ſignified perhaps, that water, the principle of all things, the unproduced god, had ſo modified itſelf, that it had formed a ſoul diſperſed through all the bodies, and the particular ſpirits like the gods, which were adored by the Heathens. This would help us to comprehend, what we have ſeen elſewhere (51), and which is doubtleſs very ſurprizing, namely, that Thales and the other Natural Philoſophers, who lived before Anaxagoras, explained the generation of the world, without interpoſing the direction of a divine intelligence. Thales and Anaximenes could not admit it, if they ſuppoſed, the one that water, and the other, that air was the principle of all things, a principle eternal, and unproduced; for though to avoid contention about words, they called this univerſal and uncreated principle, god, they could not conſider it as an intelligent cauſe antecedently to the particular beings, which it formed ſince it produced them in itſelf, and from itſelf, as an immanent cauſe, and not as a cauſe external, and diſtinct from it's matter. But becauſe Anaxagoras was the firſt (52) who acknowledged a ſpirit diſtinct from the matter of the world, a pure ſpirit, and unmixed with body, he muſt have reaſoned otherwiſe than the Natural Philoſophers his predeceſſors: he might ſay, arguing conſiſtently, that the world had been formed by the direction of a ſpirit, that diſentangled and put the parts of matter into order. His hypotheſis admitted an intelligence antecedent to the formation of the world; the other hypotheſes ſuppoſed nothing before the world, except the chaos, or water, or air, &c. And ſo they were to give a beginning to intelligent beings, as well as to the coarſeſt creatures. All things proceeded from the firſt principle by way of generation or production. Jupiter the greateſt of the gods, Saturn his father, and Heaven his grandfather, Æther his great grand-father, and all the genealogy upwards, was a particular being, which owed it's origin, birth, and exiſtence, to eternal and uncreated matter, the principle of all things, the chaos according to Heſiod, water according to Thales, and air according to Anaximenes. But, you will ſay, did not Thales acknowledge, that the gods knew the very thoughts of men (53). I anſwer, that we can only conclude from it, that he aſcribed a vaſt extent of knowledge to ſome of the beings, which the water had produced, and which were called Jupiter, Juno, Venus, Neptune, &c. Note, that Homer, who ſo pompouſly deſcribes the power of the gods, ſays, that all proceeded from the ocean.

> Ὠκεανόν τε Θεῶν γένεσιν καὶ μητέρα Τηθύν.
>
> Oceanumque Deorum parentem & matrem Tethyn (54).

The great and prodigious abſurdity of thoſe hypotheſes conſiſts in ſaying, that the gods, endowed with great knowledge, were formed from a principle, which knows nothing; for neither the chaos, nor the air, nor the ſea, are thinking beings. How then could they be the total cauſe of thoſe divine natures, which, in the ſyſtem of the Poets, and of the moſt antient Natural Philoſophers, know ſo many things? but though thoſe hypotheſes be never ſo falſe and abſurd, I no longer wonder, as I did, how they could be admitted by Philoſophers. Moſt of them ſuppoſed that the ſoul of man was material (55). They believed therefore, that it was formed of the ſubtileſt parts of the blood, or of the ſeed. Now when once this ſtep is made, one may go a great way in a little time. Set experience aſide; conſult only the ideas of the Theory, and it will not appear more eaſy for matter received in the womb to be converted into a child, who by eating and drinking grows into a man of great underſtanding, than for a child to be born of a tree. From thence a Heathen thinks it poſſible, that at the beginning men were born either from the mud of the earth, or from ſome liquor dropped from heaven (56). When this ſeems to be poſſible, it is eaſy to go on, and to believe what the Poets did of the birth of Venus (57). It is no longer thought ſtrange, that by the fermentation which cleared the chaos, or formed the different degrees of rarefaction and condenſation in the infinite extenſion, the ſtars ſhould begin to exiſt in the firmament, and the gods in heaven, as plants and animals on the globe of the earth. The common opinion of the Heathens about the divine nature made but a difference of more or leſs between the gods and men. Now in conſequence of this, nothing hindred them from imagining, that the fineſt and ſubtileſt parts of matter had conſtituted the gods, ſince thoſe which remained maſſive and groſs, and which as the lees and ſediments of all, had compoſed the earth, were nevertheleſs converted into men. Note, that they thought, that ſome ſpirituous particles falling from heaven, were ſufficient to animate theſe groſs and terreſtrial parts: hence it is that Lucretius acknowledged that living bodies have a celeſtial original.

> Denique cœleſti ſumus omnes ſemine oriundi
> Omnibus ille idem Pater eſt, unde alma liquenteis
> Humorum guttas Mater cum Terra recepit,
> Fœta parit nitidas fruges, arbuſtaque læta.
> Et genus humanum, & parit omnia ſæcla ferarum
> Pabula cùm præbet, quibus omnes corpora paſcunt,
> Et dulcem ducunt vitam, prolemque propagant.
> Quapropter merito Maternum nomen adepta'ſt (58).

> *Laſtly, we all ſpring from celeſtial ſeed:*
> *The univerſal father he, from whom*
> *When mother earth receives the watry drops,*
> *She teems with ſhining fruits, and flow'ring herbs,*
> *Gives birth to men and beaſts, and food prepares,*
> *By which they live, and propagate their race.*
> *Hence does ſhe juſtly claim a parent's name.*

We may infer from all this that there is nothing more dangerous or contagious, than to lay down a falſe principle. It is a bad leaven, which though it be but ſmall, may ſpoil the whole lump. One abſurdity once laid down, draws after it many others. If you only err concerning the nature of the human ſoul; if you falſly think that it is not a ſubſtance diſtinct from matter; that falſity will lead you to believe that there are gods, who at firſt were born from fermentation, and afterwards multiplied by marriage. I cannot conclude, without obſerving a thing at which I am amazed. Nothing appears to me grounded upon clearer and more diſtinct ideas than the immateriality of every thinking being, and yet ſome Chriſtian Philoſophers maintain, that matter is capable of thinking (59); and they are Philoſophers of great parts, and of pre-eminence to the greateſt of the gods [*H*]. It is certain that Jupiter's goodneſs was denoted by ſeveral names, under which he was adored. But he was likewiſe adored, under ſeveral names, which ſhewed how terrible he was. Nay, his quality of thunderer was denoted by the bare idea of his deſcent upon earth [*I*]. There were ſome places, where they ſaid he required human ſacrifices [*K*]. I ſhall ſay in another place (*d*), that the book intituled *Cymbalum Mundi* contains ſeveral jeſts upon Jupiter's actions; but I queſtion whether it is poſſible to go farther than Arnobius on ſuch a ſubject. The vivacity of his imagination flows like a torrent, and as he had lately been a profeſſed Rhetorician, there are no colours nor figures but what he animates his ſtile with. I relate in ſeveral places of this Dictionary ſome of his thoughts, and I have mentioned in one of them (*e*) his jeſt upon the great Jupiter for ſpending nine nights in getting a boy, who wanted only one night to get fifty maids with child. There is ſome probability that his memory failed him, and that he confounded things. He had read that Jupiter ſpent

---

(47) Diog. Laërt. lib. i, n. 27.

(48) Πρεσβύτατον τῶν ὄντων θεός ἀγέννητον γάρ· κάλλιστον κόσμος· ποίημα γὰρ θεοῦ. Antiquiſſimum eorum omnium quæ ſunt, Deus; ingenitus enim. Pulcherrimum mundus; à Deo enim factus eſt. *Id ibid. n.* 35.

(49) *See the foregoing quotation.*

(50) Τὸν κόσμον ἔμψυχον καὶ δαιμόνων πλήρη. Animatum mundum ac dæmonibus plenum *Diog. Laërt. lib. i, n.* 27. *See alſo* Ariſtotle, de Anima, lib. i, cap. v.

(51) *In the remark [D] of the article ANAXAGORAS.*

(52) *See the ſame remark.*

(53) Ἠρώτησέ τις αὐτὸν εἰ λήθοι θεοὺς ἄνθρωπος ἀδικῶν. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ διανοούμενος ἔφη. Interrogatus lateret ne Deos homo male agens: ne cogitans quidem, inquit. *Laërt. lib. i, n.* 36.

(54) Homer. Iliad. lib. xiv, ver. 201.

(55) *See* Plutarch. de Placit. Philoſophor. lib. iv, cap iii, pag 898, *and Ariſtotle in the firſt book de* Anima.

(56) *See, above, remark [B] of the article ARCHELAUS, the Philoſopher.*

(57) *See, above, remark [C] of the article DIOGENES, of Apollonia.*

(58) Lucret. lib. ii, ver. 990. *To which may be added theſe words of Virgil,* Georg. lib. ii, ver. 325. Tum pater omnipotens fœcundis imbribus æther Conjugis in gremium lætæ deſcendit, & omnes Magnus alit, magno com mixtus corpore, fœtus.

(59) *See, above, remark [L] of the article DICÆARCHUS, diſciple of Ariſtotle.*

(*d*) *In the article* PERIERS.

(*e*) *In the article* HERCULES, *citat.* (13).

of a moſt profound meditation. Can we depend after this on the clearneſs of ideas? but do not theſe Philoſophers ſee, that upon ſuch a foundation the antient Heathens might err ſo far as to ſay, that all intelligent ſubſtances, had a beginning, and that eternally there was nothing beſides matter: this was the opinion of the Philoſopher Anaximenes, as we have ſeen above. It was alſo the doctrine of Anaximander, his maſter (60). This inconvenience cannot be prevented by this corrective; namely, that matter becomes thinking, only by a particular gift of God. It would be true, notwithſtanding that in it's nature it is ſuſceptible of thought; and that to make it actually thinking, it ſuffices to put it in motion, or to order it's parts in a certain manner: from whence it follows, that an eternal, unintelligent, but moveable matter, might have produced both gods and men, as the Poets and ſome Heathen Philoſophers have fooliſhly given out.

[*H*] *Pauſanias conjectures . . . that the epithet, the good, ought to belong . . . to the greateſt of the gods.*] This thought of Pauſanias ſeems to me to be very good, and I think it will not be amiſs to ſet down this paſſage. Ἔστι δὲ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐν ἀριστερᾷ, Ἀγαθοῦ Θεοῦ ναός. εἰ δὲ ἀγαθῶν οἱ θεοὶ δωτῆρες εἰσίν ἀνθρώποις, Ζεὺς δὲ ὕπατος θεῶν ἐστιν, ἑπομένως ἄν τις τῷ λόγῳ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν ταύτην Διὸς τεκμαίροιτο εἶναι. Ad ejus viæ lævam Boni Dei ædes eſt. Quod ſi dii hominibus bonorum autores ſunt, deorum vero ſupremus eſt Jupiter, recte quidem hoc Jovis maxime proprium cognomen eſſe conjicere poſſis (61). ——— *To the left of that way is the temple of the good god. But if the gods are the authors of good to men, and Jupiter is the ſupreme god, we may well ſuppoſe this to be the peculiar appellation of Jove.* See, in the article PERICLES (62), ſeveral collections concerning the notions which the Heathens had of the goodneſs of Jupiter, and of the other gods.

[*I*] *Jupiter's goodneſs was denoted . . . . . but he was likewiſe adored . . . . . . nay, his quality of thunderer was denoted by the bare idea of his deſcent upon earth.*] Theſe two ſorts of epithets have been obſerved by Lucian. Ὦ Ζεῦ φίλιε, καὶ ξένιε, καὶ ἑταιρεῖε, καὶ ἐφέστιε, καὶ ἀστεροπητά, καὶ ὅρκιε, καὶ νεφεληγερέτα, καὶ ἐρίγδουπε· καὶ εἴ τι σε ἄλλο οἱ ἐμβρόντητοι ποιηταὶ καλοῦσι. *O Jupiter Philie, hoſpitalis, ſodalitie, domeſtice, fulgurator, juramenti præſes, nubicoge, grandiſtrepe, & ſiquid aliud tibi cognomen attoniti poëtæ tribuunt* (63). You ſee that Jupiter appears there firſt as the protector of friendſhip, as an hoſpitable, familiar, and domeſtic deity; and afterwards as the god of thunder and lightning. *&c.* You will find in Pauſanias in what places he was adored under the name of mild, μειλίχιος (64), the diſtributer of good things, ἐπιδώτης (65) *&c.* and under the name of thunderer, κεραύνιος (66). His title of καταιβάτης, is not leſs common both in books and upon medals, It ſignifies only *deſcendens*, coming down upon earth, if we conſider the Grammar of it; but uſe has determined it to the action of thundering. You need only read the diſſertation which Mr Burman (67) has publiſhed at Utrecht, in the year 1700, to be convinced, that this is the notion, under which Jupiter καταιβάτης was honoured. Not that it was believed, that he never deſcended upon earth, but to puniſh and to thunder; but they thought fit at laſt to ſettle the ſignification of it; either becauſe of the maxim, *à majori*, or *à nobiliori parte ſumitur denominatio*, or for other reaſons. The French have ſaid in one of their Opera's:

Jupiter vient ſur la terre
Pour la combler de bienfaits:
Il eſt armé du tonnerre;
Mais c'eſt pour donner la paix.

That is,

Jove comes on earth,
To heap bleſſings on it:
He is armed with thunder,
But 'tis to give peace.

I know not whether they have found that notion in the monuments of antiquity that are extant.

[*K*] *It was ſaid that he required human ſacrifices.*] There was ſcarce any temple of Jupiter, more celebrated than that which was built on mount Lycæus, in Arcadia. The tradition of the country imported (68), that he was educated upon that mountain by three nymphs, one whereof gave her name to a fountain, which had a wonderful property; for when any long drought waſted the fruits of the earth, they never failed of a plentiful rain, provided the prieſt of Jupiter Lycæus threw an oaken branch upon the ſurface of that fountain, after the requiſite prayers and ſacrifices (69). There was upon the ſame mountain, a court conſecrated to this god, and famous for wonderful qualities; for the men and the beaſts, that went into it, caſt no ſhade. Every body was forbidden to ſet his foot into it; and if any had the boldneſs to go in notwithſtanding the prohibition, he neceſſarily died before the year expired. Arcas having purſued as far as that place the bear, into which his mother was metamorphoſed, had been put to death with her, if Jupiter had not placed them among the ſtars. 'In ſilvis cum venaretur (*Arcas*) inſcius vidit matrem in urſæ ſpeciem converſam, quam interficere cogitans, perſecutus eſt in Jovis Lycæi templum: quo & qui acceſſiſſet, mors pœna erat Arcadum lege. Itaque cum utrumque neceſſe eſſet interfici, Jupiter eorum miſertus, ereptos inter ſidera collocavit (70). ——— '*Arcas, hunting in the woods, ſaw his mother, whom he knew not, transformed into a bear, whom, thinking to kill, he followed into the temple of Jupiter Lycæus, which, by a law of the Arcadians, it was death for any one to approach. It being therefore neceſſary they ſhould both be ſlain, Jupiter taking pity of them, ſnatched them away, and placed them among the ſtars.*' St Auguſtin informs us of what concerns the ſacrificing of infants. 'Nominatim expreſſit (*Varro*) quendam Demænetum, quum guſtaſſet de ſacrificio, quod Arcades immolato puero deo ſuo Lycæo facere ſolerent, in lupum fuiſſe mutatum, & anno decimo in figuram propriam reſtitutum, ad pugillatum ſeſe exercuiſſe, & Olympiaco viciſſe certamine (71). '*Varro has mentioned by name one Demænetus, who, having taſted of the ſacrifice, which the Arcadians, ſlaying a boy, were wont to offer to their god Lycæus, was turned into a wolf, and after ten years reſtored to his own form, and exerciſed himſelf at boxing, and came off victor in the Olympic game.*' This ſacrifice had a ſtrange effect, it metamorphoſed thoſe who taſted it into wolves. Porphyrius (72), obſerves, that the cuſtom of ſacrificing men in Arcadia at the feaſt of the Lupercalia, remained in his time. Note, by the way, that Saturn was not the only deity that delighted in human victims (73). Jupiter his ſon would not degenerate in that reſpect.

[*L*] *Jupiter*

---

(60) Anaximander infinitatem naturæ dixit eſſe è qua omnia gignerentur *Cicer. Academ. Quaſt. lib. ii, fol.* 211. B. Anaximandri opinio eſt nativos eſſe Deos, longis intervallis Orientes, Occidenteſque. *Id. de Nat. Deorum, lib. i, cap. x.*

(61) Pauſan. lib. viii, cap. 36, pag. 673.

(62) *In the remark* [*K*].

(63) Lucian. in Timone, init. Tom. I, pag. 57.

(64) Pauſan. lib. i, cap. xxxvii, pag. 90; lib. ii, cap ix, pag. 132; & cap. xx, pag. 154.

(65) Id. lib. viii, cap. ix, pag. 616.

(66) Id. lib. v, cap. xiv, pag. 412.

(67) *Intituled*, Ζεύς καταιβάτης, five Jupiter fulgurator. *Plutarch*, in Demetrio, *ſays the Athenians gave Demetrius the epithet* καταιβάτης.

(68) Pauſan. lib. viii, cap xxxviii, pag 678.

(69) Id. ibid.

(70) Hygin. in Aſtronomico, cap. 4, pag. m. 362. *See alſo* cap. i, pag. 357.

(71) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. xviii, cap xvii, pag. m 589.

(72) Porphyr. lib. i, de non edendis Animal.

(73) *See the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, n. 69.

ſpent nine nights in the production of the Muſes [*L*], and he applied this to a quite different ſubject, I mean, to the adventures of Alcmena. Authors, who have a quick and lively fancy, are ſubject to the like miſtakes. Jupiter made love both in heaven and upon earth, he took all that came, whether goddeſſes or women; it was all one to him. Arnobius did not forget this, and obſerved that the bodies of mortal women, though tranſparent with reſpect to Jupiter, had yet ſufficient charms to inſpire him with a leud paſſion [*M*]. It is not improper to obſerve, that the ridiculous ſtories which the poets had vented concerning that God, ſerved as a foundation for the Pagan religion, and that ſome grave men endeavoured to explain them either by allegories or by the principles of Natural Philoſophy; but their labour was as ridiculous as that of the poets [*N*], and

[*L*] *Jupiter ſpent nine nights in the production of the Muſes.*] Mnemoſyne, Saturn's ſiſter, having lain nine nights together with Jupiter her nephew, lay-in of the nine Muſes upon mount Pierius (74).

Τὰς ἐν Πιερίῃ Κρονίδῃ τέκε πατρὶ μιγεῖσα
Μνημοσύνη - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - -

Ἐννέα γάρ οἱ νύκτας ἐμίσγετο μητίετα Ζεύς,
Νόσφιν ἀπ' ἀθανάτων, ἱερὸν λέχος εἰσαναβαίνων·
Ἀλλ' ὅτε δή ῥ' ἐνιαυτὸς ἔην, περὶ δ' ἔτραπον ὧραι
Μηνῶν φθινόντων, περὶ δ' ἤματα πόλλ' ἐτελέσθη,
Ἡ δ' ἔτεκ' ἐννέα κούρας ὁμόφρονας, ᾗσιν ἀοιδὴ
Μέμβλεται.

Quas in Pieria Saturnio peperit patri mixta
Mnemoſyne - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - -

Novem enim ei noctes mixtus eſt prudens Jupiter,
Seorſim ab immortalibus, ſacrum lectum conſcendens.
Sed cum jam annus exactus, circumvoluta vero eſſent tempora
Menſium decreſcentium, dieſque multi tranſacti eſſent,
Ipſa peperit novem filias concordes, quibus carmen
Curæ eſt (75).

Begot by Jove on fair Mnemoſyne.
- - - - - - -
Nine nights apart from the celeſtial choir,
He climb'd the ſacred bed, and preſs'd the dame,
Who, when the year had fill'd it's circling courſe,
Bore the nine ſiſters, who preſide o'er verſe.

A ſcholiaſt upon Heſiod pretends that Mnemoſyne was Jupiter's daughter; but it is not thus that the words of that Poet ought to be underſtood. We muſt not find in them that the Muſes owed their birth to an inceſt ſo odious. The ſame ſcholiaſt propoſes a doubt to himſelf: How, *ſays he*, could Hercules get fifty one ſons in a night, whilſt Jupiter ſtood in need of nine days to beget the nine Muſes? he anſwers, that Jupiter not being ignorant, that the love of the Muſes arrives ſlowly to it's perfection, reſolved to make uſe of a perfect number. If this Scholiaſt deſerves no commendation for the ſolidity of his thoughts, he at leaſt deſerves to be praiſed for his brevity upon a ſubject, that might have afforded an allegoriſt infinite obſervations and moral precepts.

[*M*] *Arnobius . . . . . . obſerved that the bodies of mortal women, though tranſparent with reſpect to Jupiter, had ſufficient charms to inſpire him with a leud paſſion.*] Perhaps, *ſays he*, his adulteries might be tolerated, if he had minded only the goddeſſes; but what could he find worthy of him in human bodies? ought he not to have an averſion for thoſe objects, which are under the skin, and which are not hid from his piercing eyes? ought not the ſight to produce in him the ſame diſguſt, which the bare imagination can produce in all others (76)? 'Et tolerari forſitan male-'tractatio hæc poſſet, ſi eum ſaltem perſonis conjungere-'tis comparibus, & adulter à vobis immortalium con-'ſtitueretur dearum. In humanis verò corporibus quid-'nam quæſo inerat pulchritudinis, quid decoris, quod 'irritare, quod flectere oculos poſſet in ſe Jovis? Cu-'tes, viſcera, pituita, atque omnis illa proluvies inte-'ſtinorum ſub involucris conſtituta: quam non modo 'Linceus ille penetrabili acie poſſit horreſcere, verume-'tiam quivis alter ſola vel cogitatione vitare (77). O 'egregia merces culpæ! ô digna & pretioſa dulcedo, 'propter quam Jupiter maximus cygnus fieret, & tau-'rus, & candidorum procreator ovium! ——— *O 'egregious reward of guilt! O worthy and pretious 'pleaſure, for the ſake of which the ſupreme Jupiter be-'comes a ſwan, a bull, and a progenitor of fleecy ſheep!'* This objection of Arnobius is a good one, and a hundred times more forcible than if a great king was cenſured for debauching not only princeſſes but alſo the meaneſt women. I ſhall ſet down what Juno told Thetis, ſhewing her the reaſon of her affection for her.

Οὕνεκεν οὐκ ἔτλης εὐνῇ Διὸς ἱεμένοιο
Λέξασθαι (κείνῳ γὰρ ἀεὶ τάδε ἔργα μέμηλεν
Ἠὲ σὺν ἀθανάταις ἠὲ θνητῇσιν ἰαύειν.)

Propterea quod noluiſti Jovis quamquam optantis cubile
Uſurpare (quoniam hoc illi ſtudetur opus,
Ut vel æternas inſomnis vel amplectatur humanas) (78).

Becauſe you ſhunn'd th' embrace of amorous Jove,
He, who promiſcuouſly divides his love
With mortal nymphs below, and goddeſſes above.

[*N*] *Some grave men endeavoured to explain the ſtories of the Poets . . . . either allegorically, or phyſically; but their labour was as ridiculous as that of the Poets.*] We have ſeen in another place (79) how Cicero ridiculed the Philoſopher Chryſippus, who had taken great pains to reconcile the fables of the antient Poets with the Stoical Theology. Here is a paſſage that will give us a ſpecimen of that attempt: 'Hic locus à 'Zenone tractatus, poſt à Cleanthe, & Chryſippo plu-'ribus verbis explicatus eſt. Nam vetus hæc opinio 'Græciam opplevit, exſectum Cœlum à filio Saturno; 'vinctum autem Saturnum ipſum à filio Jove. Phy-'ſica ratio non inelegans incluſa eſt in impias fabulas. 'Cœleſtem enim altiſſimam, æthereamque naturam; id 'eſt, igneam, quæ per ſeſe omnia gigneret, vacare vo-'luerunt eâ parte corporis, quæ conjunctione alterius 'egeret ad procreandum. Saturnum autem eum eſſe 'voluerunt, qui curſum, & converſionem ſpatiorum, 'ac temporum contineret . . . . Saturnus autem eſt ap-'pellatus, quod ſaturetur annis: ex ſe enim natos co-'meſſe fingitur ſolitus, quia conſumit ætas temporum 'ſpatia, anniſque præteritis inſaturabiliter expletur. 'Vinctus eſt autem à Jove, ne immoderatos curſus ha-'beret, atque ut eum ſiderum vinculis alligaret (80). '—— *This topic was handled by Zeno, afterwards by 'Cleanthes, and explained at large by Chryſippus. 'For the old tradition obtained all over Greece, that 'Cælus was caſtrated by Saturn, and that Saturn him-'ſelf was bound in chains by his ſon Jupiter. There 'is an elegant phyſical meaning in theſe prophane fa-'bles: for they intended by them, that the celeſtial, 'ſupreme, and ætherial, that is fiery, nature was void 'of that bodily part, which ſtands in need of the con-'junction of another, in order to procreation: but by 'Saturn they meant that being, which contains the 'courſe and revolution of time . . . . And he is called 'Saturn, becauſe he is filled* (ſaturatur) *with years; 'he is ſaid likewiſe to devour his children, becauſe time 'conſumes it's ſeveral periods, and is filled, without 'being ſatiated, with paſt years. But he is bound by*

'Jupiter

---

(74) Heſiod. in Θεογον, ver. 135.

(75) Id. ibid. ver. 53.

(76) Arnob. lib. iv, pag. m. 142.

(77) *Compare with this the following words of Ovid.* Tunc animo ſigna quodcunque in corpore mendæ eſt, *&c. in Remedio Amoris, ver.* 417.

(78) Apollonius, Argon. lib. iv, ver. 793, pag. m. 453, 454.

(79) *Citat.* (49), *of the article CHRYSIPPUS, the Philoſopher.*

(80) Cicero, de Natura Deorum, lib. ii, cap. xxiv, xxv.

and terminated very often in ſerious impieties. See the remark [*N*], where I ſhall ſpeak

‘ *Jupiter, that he may not run to immoderate lengths, and that he may reſtrain him by the limits of the ſtars.*’ This is ſufficient to ſhew the folly of thoſe explications. We cannot read them without pitying the Philoſophers who have ſo ill employed their time; and if we deplore on one hand the miſchievous conſequences of the fictions of the Poets, and the unruly licentiouſneſs with which they have ſported upon a ſubject, that deſerved to be reverently treated; we cannot but be diverted, on the other, with their agreeable inventions, whilſt we conſider them as witty conceits. But when we ſee ſome Philoſophers very gravely undertake to find myſteries in theſe follies, we can no longer bear their extravagance: and theſe words may well be applied to them.

Turpe eſt difficiles habere nugas,
Et ſtultus eſt labor ineptiarum (81).

'Tis labour miſapply'd, and ill-judg'd toil,
When trifles only waſte our time and oil.

The greateſt miſchief is, that whilſt they endeavoured to avoid one impiety, they fell into another; for by rejecting the gods of the Poets, animated and living gods, they brought in others deſtitute of life and knowledge. Cicero upbraids them with it. ‘ Hic idem (*Zeno*) alio loco æthera Deum dicit eſſe, ſi intelligi poteſt nihil ſentiens Deus, qui nunquam nobis occurrit neque in precibus, neque in optatis, neque in votis. Aliis autem libris rationem quandam per omnem naturam rerum pertinentem ut divinam, eſſe affectam putat. Idem aſtris hoc idem tribuit, tum annis, menſibus, annorumque mutationibus. Cùm verò Heſiodi Theogoniam interpretatur, tollit omnino uſitatas perceptaſque cognitiones Deorum, neque enim Jovem, neque Junonem, neque Veſtam, neque quemquam qui ita appelletur, in Deorum habet numero: ſed rebus inanimatis, atque mutis per quandam ſignificationem hæc docet tributa nomina (82). —— *This ſame Philoſopher* (Zeno), *in another place, ſays the æther is God; if we can ſuppoſe an inſenſible God, who never occurs to us in our prayers, our wiſhes, or our vows. But, in other books, he ſuppoſes a certain divine reaſon diffuſed through the whole nature of things. The ſame Philoſopher aſcribes the ſame thing to the ſtars, to years, months, and the changes of years. But when he would explain Heſiod's Theogony, he quite takes away the uſual and received notions of the gods; for he neither allows Jupiter, nor Juno, nor Veſta, nor any ſo called, to be gods; but teaches, that theſe names are aſcribed, in a certain ſignification, to things inanimate and mute.*’ By theſe falſe interpretations they uſed men to take the arched skies for Jupiter. ‘ Hunc Ennius nuncupat ita dicens,

- - - - - - Aſpice hoc
Sublime candens, quem invocant omnes Jovem.

‘ Planiuſque alio loco idem,

Qui, quod in me eſt, exſecrabor hoc, quod lucet, quidquid eſt.

‘ Hunc etiam Augures noſtri, cùm dicunt, *Jove fulgente, tonante*: dicunt enim *cælo fulgente, tonante*. Euripides autem, ut multa præclarè; ſic hoc breviter:

Vides ſublime fuſum, immoderatum æthera,
Qui tenero terram circumjectu amplectitur:
Hunc ſummum habeto Divûm: hunc perhibeto Jovem (83).

‘ *This Ennius mentions in theſe words*;

- - - - - - - - *Look up, and ſee*
The azure vault, which we invoke as Jove.

‘ *And the ſame Poet more plainly in another place*;

I will curſe this that ſhines, be't what it will.

‘ *This our augurs mean, when they ſay, Jove lightening, thundering: for they ſay, the heaven lightening, thundering. But Euripides, as he expreſſes many things excellently well, ſo in brief this:*

See'ſt thou yon wide, extended, vault of heav'n,
Which clips around this earth: 'tis the great god,
Supreme of deities, 'tis Jove himſelf.

As for Juno they reduced her to the air, as Cicero informs us. ‘ Aër autem, ut Stoici diſputant, interjectus inter mare, & cœlum, Junonis nomine conſecratur, quæ eſt ſoror & conjux Jovis, quod & ſimilitudo eſt Ætheris, & cum eo ſumma conjunctio. Effeminarunt autem eum, Junonique tribuerunt, quòd nihil eſt eo mollius (84). —— *But the air, as the Stoics pretend, diffuſed between the ſea and the heaven, is conſecrated under the name of Juno, who is the ſiſter and wife of Jupiter, becauſe it reſembles both the Æther, and is cloſely united to it. But they effeminated it, and aſcribed it to Juno, becauſe there is nothing ſofter than air.*’ Whatever they might ſay, there was no avoiding of abſurdities or impieties in that ſyſtem. Which I prove thus: let us aſk theſe Philoſophers ſome queſtions. You believe that Jupiter ſo much celebrated by the Poets; and he whom you adore in the capitol, and every where elſe, is that great ſpace wherein we ſee ſo many ſtars; and that Juno, ſiſter and wife of Jupiter, ſo jealous, ſo haughty, and powerful, to whom the Argivi and other nations pay ſo many honours, is the air that encompaſſes the earth, and gets into the lungs of animals, and in which the clouds, the rain, *&c.* are formed? but is it not evident that this celeſtial ſpace, and this air, are a portion of the matter of the world, and that matter, as matter, cannot think? Do not we clearly know that the air has no more life or knowledge than ſnow and hail? If therefore Juno is nothing but the air, it is ridiculous to direct prayers, and offer ſacrifices to her; for ſhe hears and knows nothing, and therefore your doctrine overthrows religion; it is a material Atheiſm; you rob Juno of all her Divinity; you only leave her the vain and indeterminate name of a goddeſs; and you are more abſurd than Epicurus, ſince you worſhip an illuſive and imaginary name. Juno is only an inſtance; but Jupiter and Neptune, and all the other deities fall in the ſame manner, by the force of the ſame argument. If you ſay that you do not conſider the air as a meer body, when you maintain that Juno is the air, explain to me, I deſire you, what other notion you have of it. Do you pretend that the air is united to the goddeſs Juno, that ſhe is the ſoul of it, that the ſaid air is the body of the deity? But is not this to ſuppoſe, a ſort of animal, of which we have no idea? Does not the notion of an animal imply a conjunction of parts, which conſtitute one entire *continuum*? Does it not exclude what we call *diſcrete quantity*? And is it not certain that the parts of the air are continually ſeparating from one another, and that the leaſt ſtone that is caſt into it, makes a ſolution of it's continuity, which muſt be a very ſmarting wound, if the air be an animal? To what inconveniencies do you expoſe the Divinity of Juno, in making her the ſoul of the air? Does ſhe not perpetually receive an infinite number of wounds? If you anſwer me that this deity is united to the air, not to be it's ſoul, but only to influence it, you fall into another abſurdity, which is no leſs ridiculous, than if we ſhould ſay, that a pilot is a ſhip, and that a rider is a horſe. Will you anſwer, that there is a great deal of difference betwixt theſe things, ſince a pilot is not united to the ſhip, as Juno is to the air? Explain therefore that union, and obſerve how Ariſtotle puzzles you, when he ſays, it is againſt reaſon, that the air and fire ſhould be animals; but that if they have a ſoul, it is an abſurdity to ſay, they are not ſo. Conſider well theſe words: Διὰ τινα μὲν γὰρ αἰτίαν ἐν τῷ ἀέρι, ἢ ἐν τῷ πυρὶ οὖσα ἡ ψυχη, οὐ ποιεῖ ζῶον· ἐν δὲ τοῖς μικτοῖς, καὶ ταῦτα βελτίων ἐν τούτοις εἶναι δοκοῦσα; ἐπιζητήσειε γὰρ ἄν τις, καὶ διὰ τίνα αἰτίαν ἡ ἐν τῷ ἀέρι ψυχὴ, τῆς ἐν τοῖς ζώοις βελτίων ἐστὶ καὶ ἀθανατωτέρα. συμβαίνει δὲ ἀμφοτέρως ἄτοπον καὶ παράλογον· καὶ γὰρ τὸ λέγειν ζῶον τὸ πῦρ, ἢ τὸν ἀέρα, τῶν παραλογωτέρων ἐστί· καὶ μὴ λέγειν ſpeak of thoſe who ſaid that Juno was the air, and Jupiter the Æther.

---

(81) Martial. Epig. lxxxvi, lib. ii.

(82) Cicero, de Natura Deor. lib. i, cap. xiv.

(83) Id. ibid. lib. ii, cap. xxv.

(84) Id. ibid. cap. xxvi.

γειν ζῶα ψυχῆς ἐνέσης, ἄτοπον. Quam enim ob cauſam anima in aëre quidem vel igne ſi ineſt, non facit animal, in miſtis autem facit; præſertim cùm in illis videatur eſſe præſtantior! Quæret etiam quiſpiam quam ob cauſam anima ea, quæ eſt in aëre, præſtabilior eſt ac immortalior ea, quæ in animalibus ineſt. Utrobique autem emergit quoddam abſurdum & rationis egrediens metas, nam ignem aut aërem animal eſſe dicere, rationis egreditur fines, & aſſerere rurſus animalia non eſſe, ſi inſit in ipſis anima, perabſurdum eſt ſane (85). —— *If there be a ſoul in air or fire, why does it not conſtitute an animal, as well as in mixt natures, eſpecially as it ſeems to be more excellent in them? It may likewiſe be asked, why that ſoul which is in air, is of a more excellent and laſting nature, than that which is in animals. In both caſes, there is ſomething abſurd, and irrational; for to ſay that fire or air is an animal, is irrational, and again to aſſert they are not animals, if they have a ſoul, is certainly very abſurd.* Thus you find yourſelves between two precipices. If Juno is the ſoul of the air, and if the air and ſhe do not conſtitute an animal, it is an intolerable abſurdity; but if they compoſe an animal, it is both an abſurdity, and a horrible impiety. Carneades, with that ſtrength of reaſon which was his peculiar talent, confuted invincibly the pretended exiſtence of this kind of animal (86).

I ſhall conclude with an obſervation which Pauſanias has furniſhed me with. He tells us that he diſputed one day with a Sidonian in the temple of Æſculapius. That man maintained that the Phenicians were much more skilled than the Greeks, in matters relating to the deity, and in others alſo. They ſay, added he, that Æſculapius is the ſon of Apollo, and they do not ſuppoſe that he had a woman for his mother; for he is the air, the fountain of health, both for men and beaſts. Apollo, who is the ſun, is juſtly eſteemed Æſculapius's father, ſince by the viciſſitudes of the ſeaſons, which his motion brings about, he makes the air healthy. Pauſanias granted all this; but he maintained, that they did not belong to the Phenicians more than to the Greeks, and that it is manifeſt even to children, that the health of men is an effect of the ſun's motion (87). Judge by this of the orthodoxy of the Heathens. Thoſe who pretended to underſtand beſt theological doctrines, made it appear when they explained themſelves clearly, that they acknowledged no other gods, beſides the air, the ſtars, *&c.* This was at the bottom a true Atheiſm; it was to convert the neceſſity of nature into God. I have obſerved in Euripides, a paſſage in which Jupiter is invoked, without knowing truly what he was. He is ſaid to govern all things juſtly by occult ways; but he who ſpeaks theſe words, adds, that it is very difficult to know him, and that he knows not whether he be the neceſſity of nature, or human underſtanding. What a faith is this! A Spinoziſt would not much ſcruple to ſubſcribe to it.

῏Ω γῆς ὄχημα, κἀπὶ γῆς ἔχων ἕδραν,
῞Ος τις πότ' εἶ σὺ δυστόπαστος εἰδέναι
Ζεὺς, εἴτ' ἀνάγκη φύσεως, εἴτε νοῦς βροτῶν,
Προσηυξάμην σε, πάντα γὰρ δι' ἀψόφου
Βαίνων κελεύθου, καὶ δίκην τὰ θνήτ' ἄγεις.

O terræ vehiculum, & in terra habens ſedem,
Quicunque tandem es, imperveſtigabilis animis noſtris
Jupiter, ſive *es* neceſſitas naturæ, ſive mens mortalium,
Te invoco, omnia enim per arcanam
Vadens viam ducis mortalia juſte (88).

O vehicle of earth, in earth reſiding,
Whoe'er thou art, being unſearchable,
Neceſſity of nature, or the mind
Of mortals, I invoke thee, Jupiter,
Who human actions and events do'ſt guide,
Thro' fate's inextricable maze, aright.

(85) Ariſtotle, de Anima, lib. i, cap. v, pag. m. 485, Tom. I, Oper.

(86) *See his arguments in* Cicer. de Natura Deor. lib. iii, cap. xvii.

(87) *Taken from* Pauſanias, lib. vii, cap. xxiii, pag. 583.

(88) Hecuba, apud Euripidem in Troadibus, ver 884, pag. m. 107.

JUSTINIANI (Augustin), biſhop of Nebbio in the iſle of Corſica, was born at Genoa in the year 1470. He became a dominican the twenty fifth of April 1487, and applied himſelf to his ſtudies with ſo much earneſtneſs, and under ſuch able maſters, that he became a very learned man. He underſtood Philoſophy, Mathematics, Divinity, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldee. He taught in the province of Lombardy eighteen years with great advantage to his hearers; he was made biſhop of Nebbio the fifteenth of November 1514, at the recommendation of cardinal Bendinello Saoli, his couſin, and received his bulls before he knew the good offices this cardinal had done him. He aſſiſted at the council of Lateran, and oppoſed ſome articles of the Concordate agreed upon between France and the court of Rome. Nevertheleſs Francis I. invited him to Paris, and made him his almoner. He made uſe of this prelate's great skill to ſet up the ſtudy of the oriental tongues in the univerſity of Paris. Juſtiniani finding himſelf ſo near England, took a voyage thither, and was very much careſſed by Henry VIII. He collected a very fine library, and left it by his will to the republic of Genoa [*A*]. He made many reparations in his biſhopric, and increaſed the revenues of it; he ſo beautified his cathedral church, dedicated to the Holy Virgin, that Maracci placed him among her faithful ſervants. He alſo tranſlated into the vulgar tongue ſome Latin works, the reading whereof might be uſeful to clergy-men (*a*). He loſt his life at ſea, in paſſing from Genoa to the iſle of Corſica, in the year 1536 (*b*) [*B*]. He was not only a learned prelate, but

(*a*) Traſportando ancora da Latino in volgare de' libri per giovamento del ſuo Clero. *The abbot Michael Juſtiniani, ubi infra, pag.* 17.

(*b*) *Taken from the abbot Michael Juſtiniani*, gli ſcrittori Liguri deſcritti, pag. 16, & ſeq.

[*A*] *He collected a very fine library, and left it by his will to the Republic of Genoa.*] It was eſpecially valuable for the great number of antient manuſcripts in all languages, and ſciences, which he had collected with vaſt labour and expence. But ſome of them he had without any coſt or pains: I mean thoſe which Andreolo Juſtiniani, his grandfather, left him. It is remarkable that the republic made no advantage of this will; for thoſe manuſcripts are only to be found in the libraries of ſome private perſons, who, to conceal their theft, have taken off from the title pages the marks of that prelate. ' Benche al preſente non ſi trovi verun ' veſtigio di eſſi nel Palazzo publico, mà preſto diverſi ' particolari, che, per non eſſer ſcoperti, gli han levati nel frontiſpicio i contraſegni di quel buon Vecchio (1).'

[*B*] *He loſt his life at ſea . . . . in the year* 1536.] The abbot Michael Juſtiniani (2) proves this by the regiſters of dominicans of Genoa, and from the biſhopric of Nebbio's being given to cardinal Jerome Doria the fifteenth of November 1536. Voſſius ſays (3), it is not known whether Juſtiniani periſhed at ſea, or fell into the hands of the pirates; that it is only certain that he was never ſeen ſince the year 1530, when he embarked to go from Genoa to his biſhopric. I doubt not but he is miſtaken as to the year. Paul Jovius ſays in general, that it was never known, whether this biſhop was ſhipwrecked, or taken by the pirates of Barbary. ' In curſu fluctibus obrutus, aut à ' Pœnis prædonibus interceptus creditur, quum nullum uſquam naufragii, aut piratarum prædæ veſtigium ' apparuerit (4).'

[*C*] *The*

(1) Michael Juſtiniani, gli ſcrittori Liguri deſcritti, pag. 18.

(2) Id ibid.

(3) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Lat. lib. iii, cap. xii, pag. 681.

(4) Paulus Jovius, Elog. cap. cxxx, pag. 275.

but very laborious, as it appears by the works he compoſed, and by thoſe which he cauſed to be printed [*C*]. I mention them in a remark. He deſigned to publiſh a Polyglot Bible, and the Pſalter which he printed may be looked upon as part of it. He was at great charges for the edition, and finding that he could not get his money by the ſale, and that princes did not favour his deſign, he complained of the Ingratitude of his age [*D*].

[*C*] *The works he compoſed, and thoſe which he cauſed to be publiſhed.*] His *Precatio pietatis plena ad Deum omnipotentem compoſita ex duobus & ſeptuaginta nominibus divinis Hebraïcis, & Latinis cum interprete commentariolo*, was printed at Venice in the year 1513 in 8vo. He publiſhed there the ſame year *Æneæ Platonici de immortalitate animorum deque corporum reſurrectione aureus Libellus, cui titulus eſt Theophraſtus.* He publiſhed at Paris in 1520, in folio, *Chalcidii viri clariſſimi luculenta Timæi Platonis Traductio, & ejuſdem argutiſſima Explanatio* ; as alſo *Victoria Porcheti adverſus impios Hebræos in qua tum ex ſacris litteris, tum ex dictis Talmud, ac Caballiſtarum & aliorum omnium Authorum quos Hebræi recipiunt, monſtratur veritas Catholicæ fidei* ; moreover *Rabi Moſſæi Egyptii Dux ſeu Director dubitantium aut perplexorum.* He ſpent five years upon writing a hiſtory of Genoa, with an extream application ; but death did not permit him to put the laſt hand to it. It was publiſhed in the year 1537 (5). They pretend that his manuſcript was interpolated in ſeveral places, by the perſon who put it to the preſs. *Scriſſe gl' Annali della ſua patria, con grandiſſima diligenza, e ottima fedeltà i quali in molti luoghi dopo la morte di lui furono corrotti* (6). This is the teſtimony of Franciſco Zazzera, which is confirmed by George Juſtiniani, in an epiſtle dedicatory : ‘ Magnam profecto inde me voluptatem cepiſſe fateor, & in eodem plane ſenſu fuiſſe gaudeo ipſius nepotem Auguſtinum Juſtinianum, illum ſcilicet qui poſtea ad Nebienſem Pontificatum evectus, rerum noſtrarum Annales orditus eſt, quos poſt ejus obitum imperitus, omniſque eruditionis expers, horridos ſane & incultos, ut hodie leguntur, ex defuncti Schedis evulgavit (7). —— *I confeſs it gave me great pleaſure, and I rejoice that his grandſon Auguſtin Juſtiniani was of the ſame opinion, him I mean, who being afterwards advanced to the biſhopric of Nebbio, began the hiſtory of our affairs, which, after his death, an unskillful and illiterate perſon publiſhed, in the rude, unpoliſhed, manner we now read them, from the papers of the deceaſed.*’ Theſe interpolations of the manuſcript gave Paul Jovius occaſion to cenſure this hiſtory (8) ; but he is in the wrong to ſay, that the author made too much haſte in publiſhing it ; for it was not printed till after our Juſtiniani's death. Paul Jovius's words are very offenſive. ‘ Scribendæ patriæ hiſtoriæ negotium ſuſcepit, adeo ineptis ad id ingenii viribus, ut præcipitatæ editionis male audiendo pœnas daret (9). ——— *He undertook to write the hiſtory of his own country ; but was ſo unequal to the task, that he ſuffered in his character by a haſty edition.*’ I ſhall ſpeak hereafter of his Polyglot Bible. Here is a paſſage taken from his Life, written by himſelf, in which you will ſee a ſpecimen of his labours : ‘ Hò fatto imprimere in Parigi dodici opere in utilità de Studioſi ; hò tradotto più coſe in materna lingua per utilita di Chierici della mia Dioceſi, che ſono tutti ignari di lettere : hò tradotto l'Economico di Senofonte per inſtruttione di mia cognata, e de miei nepoti : hò deſcritto molto minutamente l'Iſola di Corſica per utilita della patria intitolata al Principe Andrea d'Oria, e meſſa poi la deſcrittione in diſtinta pittura hò donato al magnifico Ufficio di S. Georgio (10). —— *I have cauſed to be printed at Paris, twelve pieces for improving youth : I have tranſlated ſeveral things into Italian, for the benefit of the eccleſiaſtics of my dioceſe, who are all illiterate : I have tranſlated the œconomics of Xenophon, for the inſtruction of my ſiſter-in-law, and of my nephews : I have made a very exact deſcription of the iſland of Corſica, for the ſervice of my country ; inſcribed to the prince Andrea Doria, which deſcription I afterwards preſented to the office of St George.*’ The laſt work mentioned in theſe Italian words, is in the library of the Vatican. It is a manuſcript.

[*D*] *The Pſalter which he publiſhed . . . . . . he complained of the ingratitude of his age.*] It was printed at Genoa in the year 1516, in Folio, in eight columns, ‘ Quarum prima habet Hebræam editionem ; ſecunda Latinam interpretationem reſpondentem Hebrææ de verbo ad verbum ; tertia Latinam communem ; quarta Græcam ; quinta Arabicam ; ſexta paraphraſim, Sermone quidem Chaldæo, ſed literis Hebraicis conſcriptam ; Septima Latinam reſpondentem Chaldææ ; ultima vero, id eſt octava, continet Scholia, hoc eſt annotationes ſparſas & interciſas (11). ——— *The firſt of which has the text edition ; the ſecond the Latin interpretation anſwering to the Hebrew, word for word ; the third the common Latin ; the fourth the Greek ; the fifth the Arabic ; the ſixth the Paraphraſe, in Chaldee, but written in Hebrew letters ; the ſeventh the Latin anſwering the Chaldee ; but the laſt, that is the eighth, contains the Scholia, that is, ſcattered annotations.*’ The author dedicating it to Leo X, tells him, that he deſigns to publiſh the whole bible in that manner, and that he does not queſtion to go through it, if the Pope approves it, and promotes the impreſſion. This is the ſenſe of theſe words (12). *Quod ſi tu rem ipſam probaveris, & dignam editione duxeris, in promptu erit nobis univerſo operi manum extremam imponere, & utrumque inſtrumentum, iiſdem diſtinctum linguis, eademque ſerie & ſtructura, tradere impreſſoribus formandum*, &c. He intimated in a letter, that he wrote to cardinal Bendinello Saoli, that all the New Teſtament was finiſhed, and that the old would ſoon be ready, and he intreated him to get the whole work printed (13). He gave leave to Pellican, who was at Rome, in the year 1517, to tranſcribe the preface of his new Teſtament into eight languages, with the firſt verſes of St Matthew's goſpel (14). Geſner affirms (15), that he ſaw it, and the two letters which Juſtiniani wrote to that cardinal. He has alſo inſerted part of that preface in his Bibliotheque. This honeſt prelate was at great charges for the impreſſion of the Pſalter ; he cauſed two thouſand and fifty copies to be printed off, and preſented it to all the princes of the world, Infidels as well as Chriſtians ; he cauſed fifty to be printed upon Vellum ; he expected not only to be praiſed, but alſo to get a great deal by it ; and he had already deſigned his gain for the relief of his relations. He hoped that the good ſucceſs of this ſpecimen would engage the prelates and the princes to be open-handed for the impreſſion of the whole bible, but unfortunately he got nothing but praiſes. His Pſalter was commended, and not bought ; he had much ado to ſell the fourth part of the edition, and was not in a capacity of printing the reſt of his work. Let us hear his complaints (16). ‘ Feci ſtampare in Genoua alle mie ſpeſe con quel travaglio, e con quella ſpeſa, ch'ogni letterato può giudicare due mila volumi del Davidico Pſalterio in le predette cinque lingue Hebrea, Chaldea, Greca, Latina, & Arabica, parendomi di queſt' opera dover' acquiſtare gran laude, e non mediocre guadagno, il quale panſavo eſporre in la ſouventione di certi mei parenti, ch'erano biſognoſi, credendomi ſempre che l'opera doveſſi havere grande uſcita, e che i Prelati richi, ò Principi ſi doveſſero movere, è mi doveſſero ajutare in la ſpeſa di far imprimere li reſtante della Bibbia in quella varietà di lingue ; ma la credulità mia reſtò ingannata, perche l'opera fù da ciaſchedun laudata, ma laſſata ripoſare, e dormire, perche a pena ſi ſono venduti la quarta parte de i libri, come che l'opera ſia per valent huomini, e per ingegni elevati, che ſono al mondo rari, e pochi, e con ſtento puoti ricavar i danari, ch' haveva poſte in la ſtampa che furono in buona quantità, perche oltra i due mila volumi ſtampati in papero, ne feci imprimere cinquanta in carta vitelline, e mandai d'eſſi libri à tutti i Rè del Mondo, coſì Chriſtiani, come Pagani.’ Paul Jovius was ſo barbarous as not to pity his unhappy fate. Nay, he takes delight in inſulting him for it, and will not allow at leaſt, that he received the praiſes of the public. If we believe him, that honeſt biſhop was at great charges, and got neither money nor glory by it (17).

(5) At Genoa, in folio.

(6) Franciſco Zazzera, apud abbatem Mich. Juſtinian. ubi ſupra, pag. 19.

(7) Georgius Juſtinianus, in epiſt dedicat. Æneæ Platonici de Immortalitate Animæ, apud Michael. Juſtinian. ibid. pag. 19, 20.

(8) Michael Juſtiniani, ibid. pag. 17.

(9) Paul. Jovius, Elog. cap cxxx, pag. m 275.

(10) Aug. Juſtiniani, in his Life. It has been inſerted in his Annals of Genoa. *See the abbot Mich. Juſtiniani*, ubi ſupra, pag. 20.

(11) Geſner, in Biblioth. fol. 104, verſo.

(12) Auguſt. Juſtin. Præf. Pſalter. apud Geſner. ibid. fol. 105, verſo.

(13) In altera quoque epiſtola ad eundem, novum teſtamentum jam abſolutum eſſe teſtatur, vetus autem brevi futurum paratum : & hortatur ut curet totum opus prælis excudi. *Geſner. ibid.*

(14) Id. ibid.

(15) Ibid.

(16) *Auguſt. Juſtiniani, in the account of his Life*, apud Lancellotti di Perugia, Hoggidi, Part. I, diſiganno, xxvii, pag. 273, 274.

(17) Gravi quidem ſumptu & tenui cum laude quum impreſſa domi præalta volumina emptores rariſſimos invenirent, ſic ut temerè conceptam ſpem lucri inanes initæ rationes eluſerint. *Jovius, ubi ſupra.*

K

KECKERMAN (Bartholomew) a native of Dantzic, was profeſſor of Philoſophy there towards the beginning of the XVIIth century. He had been before profeſſor of the Hebrew tongue at Heidelberg. He wrote a great many books, in which he diſcovered more method than wit [*A*]. He was a Calviniſt. He died in the year 1609, being thirty eight years of age (*a*). His books are full of Plagiariſms, and have been pillaged by the plagiaries.

(*a*) Konig places his birth in the year 1571, and his death in the year 1609. Voſſius, *de Scient. Mathem. pag.* 262, ſays, he lived forty two years.

[*A*] *He wrote many books, in which he diſcovered more method than wit.*] He made ſyſtems of almoſt all the ſciences. Here is Voſſius's judgment of him. ‘ Parum idoneè judicat de eo (*Diogene Laërtio*) vir ‘ cæteroquin eruditus, ſed noveilorum ſcriptorum quam ‘ antiquitatis ſtudioſior Bartholomæus Keckermannus. ‘ Ait ille libro ſuo de hiſtoria, ſcripſiſſe Laërtium *lan-* ‘ *guidè & frigidè, ſæpè tamen non inutiliter.* Quæ ‘ frigida profectò laus eſt operis utiliſſimi & auro con- ‘ tra non cari. Quippe ex quo diſcere ſit cum alia ‘ tam multa ad hiſtoriam temporum pertinentia; tum ‘ præclara tot veterum apoththegmata quorum Kecker- ‘ mannus, malo ſanè exemplo, Eraſmum laudare mavult ‘ autorem, quàm Plutarchum, Laërtium & ſimiles (1). ‘ ——— *Bartholomew Keckerman, otherwiſe a very* ‘ *learned man, but more converſant in modern, than an-* ‘ *tient authors, paſſes a wrong judgment on Diogenes* ‘ *Laërtius. He ſays, in his book concerning Hiſtory,* ‘ *that Laërtius wrote* without life and ſpirit, but often ‘ uſefully. *This is in truth a cold commendation of a* ‘ *moſt uſeful and moſt valuable work. For we learn* ‘ *from it, not only many things relating to Hiſtory, but* ‘ *alſo many famous ſayings of the antients, which* ‘ *Keckerman, ſetting an ill example, chuſes rather to* ‘ *praiſe Eraſmus for recording, than Plutarch, Laërti-* ‘ *us, and ſuch like authors.*’

[*B*] *His books are full of plagiariſms, and have been pillaged by the plagiaries.*] I have mentioned in another place (2), the complaint of a Scotch writer, who had been pillaged by Keckerman. Another Scot (3) did juſt the contrary, he pillaged Keckerman, as Thomaſius obſerves in his collection of plagiaries (4). He charged (5) ſome other writers with the ſame fault, with reſpect to Keckerman.

(1) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Græcis, pag. 223.

(2) *In remark* [*F*] *of the article* *DONALDSON.*

(3) *Called* Andreas Aidius.

(4) Num. 349, pag 153.

(5) Ibid. n. 351.

KELLER (James), one of the beſt writers amongſt the Jeſuits of Germany towards the beginning of the XVIIth century, was born at Seckingen (*a*), in the year 1568. He became a Jeſuit in the 1588, and after he had taught Claſſical Learning, Philoſophy, Moral, and Scholaſtic Divinity, he was made rector of the college of Ratiſbon, and afterwards of that of Munich. The firſt of theſe two employments laſted two years; but he continued in the ſecond ſixteen years together. He was a long time confeſſor to prince Albert of Bavaria, and to the princeſs, his wife, and he was often conſulted and employed by the elector Maximilian in important affairs. He diſputed publickly with the moſt famous miniſter (*b*) of the duke of Newburg; and if we may believe his brethren, he had the better of him [*A*]. He publiſhed ſome books of controverſy [*B*], and ſeveral political pieces upon the affairs of that time. He appeared under

(*a*) *It is one of the four foreſt towns.*

(*b*) *Called* James Hailbrunner.

[*A*] *He diſputed . . . . . . with Hailbrunner, and if we may believe his brethren, he had the better of him.*] Alegambe and Southwell ſay, that James Hailbrunner found himſelf ſo preſſed in that diſpute, that he was almoſt reduced to ſilence, and that he fell ſick the night following, or pretended to be ſo, that he might not be obliged to enter the liſts again the next day. *Tam fortiter preſſus eſt, ut tantum non obmutuerit, morbumque reipſa nocte illa contraxerit, vel ne cogeretur iterum in arenam deſcendere, callide ſimularit* (1).

This conference, as to the ſubject, was much like that of Du Perron, and du Pleſſis Mornai; for it run upon the accuſation brought againſt the Lutheran miniſter, of having quoted ſeveral paſſages of the Fathers with a thouſand falſifications, in a High Dutch book, intituled, *Papatus Acatholicus*. The conference of Keller and Hailbrunner, was held at Newburg, in the month of June, 1615 (2), and if we may believe the Lutherans, the innocence of their miniſter appeared with the greateſt evidence. *Ex inſpectione & examinatione dictorum patriſticorum, innocentia Hailbronneriana luculentur patuit. Vid. Stratem. Theatrum hiſtoricum, pag.* 1111. *D. Dorſch. in Kircher. dev. prælim.* 100. *uſque* 106 (3).

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſome books of controverſy.*] Theſe are the titles of them: *Tyrannicidium, ſeu ſcitum Catholicorum de Tyranni internecione adverſus inimicas Calviniani Miniſtri Calumnias in Societatem Jeſu jactatas*, at Munich, 1601, in 4to, in Latin and High Dutch. *Papatus Catholicus, ſeu demonſtratio fundamentalis veritatis Eccleſiæ Catholicæ Romanæ contra Jacobum Hailbrunner*, at Munich, 1616, in two volumes in Folio, in High-Dutch. *Compendium ejuſdem operis*, in the ſame place, at the ſame time, in 4to. *Agonia ſeu ſudor mortualis Jacobi Hailbrunneri, hoc eſt refutatio Hailbrunneri qui extremam unctionem inſectatus fuerat ſcripto libro*, in the ſame place, 1618, in 4to, in High-Dutch. *Faſciculus olidus* 50 *floſculorum, id eſt abſurditas prædicantium in Colloquio* (4) *Ratisbonenſi*. He took the name of *Jacobus Silvanus* in this work, printed in the year 1604, in 4to (5). He took the ſame name in a book printed at Ingolſtadt, in 1607, and intituled, *Philippica in anonymum quendam prædicantem qui Societatem Jeſu mendaciis oneravit.* The writers of the Jeſuits Bibliotheca, have not mentioned this book of James Keller, Placcius (6) tells us, that it was an anſwer to a book in High Dutch, wherein the author had collected ſeveral paſſages taken from the ſeditious books of ſome Jeſuits The author of the collection confuted Keller's *Philippica*, in the year 1608: his anſwer is intituled, *Anti-Philippica*; it is a High-Dutch book, in which the author compleated the collection of the ſeditious things that are to be found in the writings of the Jeſuits (7). The author of theſe two collections was counſellor to the Elector Palatine, and his name was Michael Loeffenius (8). I have read in the third volume of the *Morale Pratique*, that our Keller is the author of *Cavea Turturis*. The reader will be glad to ſee here Mr Arnauld's own words

(1) Alegambe & Sotuel, in Biblioth Scriptor. Societatis Jeſu.

(2) Andreas Carolus, in Memor. Eccleſiaſt. ſæculi xvii, pag. 384.

(3) Id. ibid. pag. 385.

(4) *And not* Collegio, *as it is in* *Placcius*, de Pſeudonymis, pag. 261.

(5) *Taken from Alegambe and Southwell*, ubi ſupra.

(6) Placcius, ubi ſupra.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) Deckher. de Scriptis adeſpotis, pag. 153.

under a diſguiſed name, in the title of his political writings [C]. He died at Munich the twenty third of February 1631 (c).

(c) *Taken from Nathanael Southwell*, in the Bibl. Scriptor. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 373, 374.

words: '(9) Gravina . . . . . a learned Dominican, 'having complained with a great deal of modeſty in 'his *Vox Turturis*, that cardinal Bellarmin had ſpoke 'ſharply of the antient orders in his book *De Gemitu Columbæ*; and having repreſented that it was 'no wonder if they had abated of their auſterity in 'the ſpace of ſo many ages ſince their foundation: 'your father James Keller anſwered him haughtily in 'his book, intituled, *Cavea Turturis, ch.* 14. *Societati Jeſu non eſt periculum, ne poſt aliquot annorum 'centurias ſibi multum diſſimilis appareat. Habet enim 'aromata à putredine præſervantia.*——*The ſociety of 'the Jeſuits is in no danger of degenerating from itſelf after ſome centuries: it has ſpices and perfumes 'to perſerve it from putrefaction.*'

Mr Mayer aſcribes the *Cavea Turturis* to ſome other authors. His words are theſe. *Cui* (Voci Turturis) *etſi* D. Riedelius, *Eccleſiæ Landsbutanæ Decanus, aut ſub Riedelii nomine Jacobus Balde, Jeſuita,* Caveam Turturis *oppoſuiſſet, Gravina Vocem congeminantem Turturis publico dedit*, &c. (10).

[C] *He appeared under a diſguiſed name, in the title of his political writings.*] The bloody war, which deſolated Germany from the year 1618, to the peace of Munſter, was doubtleſs a religious war; for the league which the Proteſtants formed, againſt which the Roman Catholics oppoſed a league, whereof the elector of Bavaria was the head, owed it's birth to the ſuſpicions they had conceived, that the Imperial court, animated by the Jeſuits, had a mind to break the peace of Paſſau. The elector of Bavaria, a very able prince, would not ſuffer the Catholics to lie under that imputation. He cauſed ſome books to be publiſhed, in which the Proteſtants were accuſed of having confederated for pernicious deſigns, and particularly to oppreſs the Romiſh church. This accuſation came out in the year 1621, in a book intituled, *Cancellaria ſecreta Anhaltina, id eſt, Occulta Conſilia, Inaudita Propoſita, Periculoſæ adinventiones, & prodigioſæ Machinationes Capitum ac Directorum unionis correſpondentium in Germania, occaſione Rebellionis Bohemicæ ad ejuſdem Coronæ, & Imp. Rom. perniciem agitata. Poſt nuperam illam, omnibus poſteris memorabilem Victoriam Pragenſem, 8. Novemb.* 1620, *in Originalibus Scripturis ac documentis Cancellariæ Anhaltinæ, Divinâ Providentiâ deprehenſa.* The Proteſtant princes cauſed this book to be refuted, which was ſaid to have been compiled by William Jocher, counſellor to the elector of Bavaria, and by Dr Leickard (11). It was thought, that theſe princes made uſe, for that end of Volrad Pleſs, counſellor to the elector Palatine (12). Our James Keller believed it; for he confuted their confutation, in a work printed in the year 1624, and intituled; *Volradi Pleſſii* (13) *Heidelbergenſis olim Conſiliarii Ajax poſt oppugnatam fruſtra Cancellariam Anhaltinam in ſpongiam incumbens, ſive Appendix Cancellariæ Anhaltinæ, auctore Fabio Hercyniano J. C.* Alegambe, and his continuator, knew not, that Keller had taken the name of Fabius Hercynianus in this work. He had taken it, the foregoing year, in the anſwer to a book, publiſhed by Lewis Camerarius, in the year 1622, and intituled, *Cancellaria Hiſpanica: adjecta ſunt Acta publica, hoc eſt; Scripta & Epiſtolæ authenticæ, è quibus partim infelicis belli in Germania, partim Proſcriptionis in Electorem Palatinum ſcopus prætipuus apparet. Adjecti ſunt ſub finem Flores Stoppiani, ex Claſſico belli Sacri.* This work has another title after the index, *viz. Viva demonſtratio cauſſarum præſentis in Germania belli religionis ergo ſuſcepti.* Keller's anſwer to this book of Camerarius is intituled, *Litura, ſeu Caſtigatio Cancellariæ Hiſpanicæ, à Ludovico Camerario Excancellario Bohemico, Exconſiliario Heidelbergenſi, &c. inſtructæ. Auctore Fabio Hercyniano J. C.* There was a new edition of it in 1624, with this title: *Cancellariæ Anhaltinæ, pars ſecunda. In qua non ita pridem à quibuſdam edita Cancellaria Hiſpanica nervoſè ſimul & lepidè refutatur: tum ex quibuſdam interceptis ad Gaborem litteris, Hungaricorum qui ſequuti ſunt & adhuc durant motuum incentores ſeu auctores demonſtrantur. Auctore Fabio Hercyniano J. C.* Alegambe, and his continuator, were ignorant, that James Keller took this falſe name in the title of this work. They were not ignorant of it, with reſpect to two pieces, which were intituled: *Rhabarbarum domandæ bili quam in Apologia ſua proritavit Ludovicus Camerarius propinatum à Fabio Hercyniano J. C. anno* 1625. *Tubus Gallilæanus, hebeſcentibus Ludovici Camerarii oculis, in litura Hiſpanicæ Cancellariæ male advertentibus, ad clariùs videndum tornatus, à Fabio Hercyniano. Additis in fine teſtimonii cauſâ, & pro tubo, & pro Rhabarbaro, ipſius Camerarii epiſtolis anno* 1625. Nicolas Harſtein, anſwering the Ajax or the *Appendix Cancellariæ Anhaltinæ*, obſerves, that the Jeſuit, who was the author of it, was very much accuſtomed to diſguiſe himſelf. 'Nihil huic homini inſolens eſſe, 'ut veritatem, ita nomen ſuum pervertere & modo 'ſub Aurimontii (à matre ſua Goltbergera) modò ſub 'Didaci Tamiæ, modò ſub Fabii Hercyniani (à ſylva 'Hercynia, ſive Nigra, prope quam ſupra Baſileam 'in oppido Seckingen natus eſt) nomine ſallere, & his 'literis, J. C. quæ non Juriſconſultum, ut alias, ſed 'Jacobum Cellarium denotant, lectori imponere (14). '——*As he made no ſcruple of perverting truth, neither did he of falſifying his name; for ſometimes he 'diſguiſed himſelf under that of Aurimontius, from 'his mother Goltberg; ſometimes under that of Didacus Tamias; and at other times that of Fabius 'Hercynianus, from the foreſt Hercynia, or the black 'foreſt, near which, above Bazil, in the town of 'Seckingen, he was born: he likewiſe impoſed upon 'the reader by theſe letters J. C. which denote, not 'Juriſconſultus, as upon other occaſions, but Jacobus 'Cellarius.*' Theſe diſguiſes were unknown to the two Jeſuits, who compiled the Bibliotheque of the writers of their order. The ſame Nicolas Harſtein informs us, that James Keller was the author of the *Myſteria politica* (15), a work, which made a great noiſe (16), and which was very injurious to the court of France. But he aſcribes (17) to another Jeſuit a work intituled, *Secreta ſecretorum Calvino-Turcica*, the author of which had concealed himſelf under the name of *Honeſtus Cogmandolus*, He who anſwered him, in a book intituled, *Secreta Secretorum Turco-Papiſtica*, took the falſe name of *Juſtinus Juſtinopolitanus*, inſtead of *Ludovicus Camerarius*, his true name. The conteſts of writers about the affairs of the time, were then more grave, than they are in this preſent war (18), and as vehement in their kind, as thoſe of warriours. At preſent, we ſee hardly any thing but ſcurrilous ſatires.

(9) Arnauld, Morale Pratique, Tom. III, pag. 112.

(10) Jo. Frider. Mayerus, de Fide Bellarmini ſuſpecta, pag. 197, 198.

(11) Keller, in the *Appendix Cancellariæ Anhaltinæ*, ſays that this is falſe.

(12) Nicolas Harſtein denies it in the preface of his *Reſponſio Apologetica* to the Ajax of Fabius Hercynianus.

(13) Alegambe has miſtaken that name; for he ſays *Bleſſii*, and that he was chancellor. Father Southwell has not corrected thoſe two faults: he ſays *Bleſſii*, &c. Placcius, *de Anonymis, n.* 256, *pag.* 71, has not corrected them, and falſly places this work among the anonymous ones, not knowing that the author took the name of *Fabius Hercynianus*.

(14) Nicolaus Harſteinius; Sicamber, in Præfat Reſponſionis Apologeticæ, *printed in* 1625.

(15) Legat myſteria politica nuper à vobis, & quidem à te Jacobe Kellere (ut multorum fuit opinio) edita. *Nicol Harſtein. Apolog. pag.* 8. In the *Mercure François, Tom. XII*, that book is aſcribed to an Italian.

(16) *See the* Mercure François, Tom. XI, pag. 1062, & ſeq.

(17) Harſteinius, ubi ſupra, pag. 10.

(18) I write this in October, 1695.

KEPLER (JOHN) one of the greateſt Aſtronomers of his age, was born at Wiel in the country of Wirtemberg, the twenty ſeventh of December 1571. He began to ſtudy Philoſophy at Tubingen, in the year 1589, and two years after he ſtudied Mathematics in the ſame univerſity, under the famous Michael Mœſtlin. He made ſo great a progreſs in that Science, that, in the year 1595, he wrote an excellent book, which was printed at Tubingen the year following, with this title, *Prodromus Diſſertationum de proportione orbium cæleſtium, deque cauſis cœlorum numeri, magnitudinis, motuumque periodicorum genuinis & propriis, &c.* He had been already invited to Gratz in Stiria, to teach Mathematics (a). Tycho Brahe being ſettled in Bohemia, and having obtained of the emperor all ſort of conveniencies to perfect Aſtronomy, paſſionately deſired to have Kepler with him, and wrote to him ſo many letters upon this ſubject, that he engaged him to leave the univerſity of Gratz, and to remove into Bohemia with his family and library, in the year 1600 (b). Kepler in this journey got a quartan ague, which laſted ſeven or eight months, ſo that he could not do Tycho Brahe all the ſervices he was capable of. He was even not well pleaſed with the reſervedneſs with which Tycho

(a) *Taken from* Gaſſendus, in Vita Tychonis Brahei, lib. v, pag m. 451.

(b) Id. Gaſſend. pag. 4.6, & 459

Brahe treated him (*c*), for he did not communicate to him all his knowledge. And as that great Aſtronomer died in the year 1601, Kepler could not in that ſhort time be very uſeful to him, nor improve much by him. From that time Kepler had the title of Mathematician to the Emperor all his life (*d*), and acquired more and more great reputation by his works [*A*]. The emperor Rodolphus put him upon finiſhing Tycho's Tables (*e*), which were to be called Rodolphine (*f*). Kepler ſet heartily about them; but the king's treaſurers were ſo ill affected towards him [*B*], that he could not publiſh them till the year 1627. He died, in November 1630, at Ratiſbon, where he was endeavouring to get the arrears of his penſion paid him (*g*). LEWIS KEPLER, his ſon, a Phyſician at Koningſberg in Pruſſia, finiſhed the impreſſion of his father's *Somnium, Lunariſve Aſtronomia*; and he was in great fear that it would occaſion his death [*C*]. John Kepler's opinions

(*c*) Ib. pag. 460.

(*d*) *See the remark* [*F*].

(*e*) Gaſſendus, ubi ſupra, lib. vi, pag. 471.

(*f*) *They came out with that title.*

(*g*) Gaſſendus, ibid. pag. 472.

[*A*] *He acquired . . . . . a great reputation by his works.*] I ſhall only ſet down the titles of ſome of his books. *Harmonices mundi libri V. Apologia pro ſua harmonica mundi contra demonſtrationem analyticam Roberti de Fluctibus. De Cometis libri tres. Ad Vitellionem Paralipomena, quibus Aſtronomiæ pars optica traditur. Epitome Aſtronomiæ Copernicanæ. Aſtronomia nova, ſeu phyſica cæleſtis tradita commentariis de motibus ſtellæ Martis ex obſervationibus Tychonis Brahei. Chilias logarithmorum in totidem numeros rotundos. Supplementum Chiliadis logarithmorum. Nova Stereometria doliorum vinariorum & Stereometriæ Archimedeæ ſupplementum. Dioptrice. De vero natali anno Chriſti. Eclogæ Chronicæ de tempore Herodis Herodiadumque, baptiſmi, miniſterii, paſſionis, mortis & reſurrectionis Chriſti, deque tempore belli Judaici. Tychonis Brahei Hyperaſpiſtes adverſus Scipionis Claramontii Anti-Tychonem in aciem productus.* This is ſufficient to ſhew, that our John Kepler was not one of thoſe genius's who only move in a narrow ſphere; his activity extended to a great many objects. See, in the text of this article, the title of the firſt book he publiſhed. It is the ſame with his *Myſterium Coſmographicum*, and it is that which, of all his works, he moſt eſteemed. He was ſo charmed with it for ſome time, that he declared he would not renounce the glory of the diſcoveries of that book for the electorate of Saxony. ‘Thomas Lanſius in Mantiſſa orat. pag. 792. memorat, Keplerum aliquando à ſe rogatum, quem ex editis à ſe libris loco dignaretur præcipuo, primatum dediſſe Myſterio coſmographico, teſtatum in illo ſcripto quinque corporum regularium ſublime ſecretum tot ſæculis abſconditum pandi: inventum autem illud cum adhuc recens eſſet, tanti ſe feciſſe, ut, ſi eodem tempore Saxoniæ electoratus ſibi dono oblatus fuiſſet, addita conditione, alterutrum, aut donum ut inventionem repudiandi; ampliſſima, & tot metallorum copiis fœta provincia excidere, quàm invidenda & perpetuam gloriam ſecum ductura inventione carere maluerit (1). —— *Thomas Lanſius, in* Mantiſſa, orat. p. 792. *relates, that Kepler, being asked by him, which of his works he eſteemed moſt, gave the preference to the* Myſterium Coſmographicum, *affirming, that the ſublime ſecret of the five regular bodies, hidden for ſo many ages, was laid open in that work; and that he ſet ſuch a value on that diſcovery, being yet new, that, if at the ſame time, the electorate of Saxony were offered him, on condition of rejecting either the gift or the invention, he would prefer the immortal honour of that diſcovery to that large and rich country.*’

[*B*] *The treaſurers were ſo ill affected towards him.*] Wo to the learned, who depend on thoſe gentlemen, and cannot perfect a work without the good humour of the Intendants of the Finances; a ſort of men, who to ſerve their prince well, muſt tire his penſioners with a thouſand difficulties. They leave him by that means whilſt it coſts him but little, the glory of being liberal. I uſe Gaſſendus's expreſſions, to ſhew Kepler's diſſatisfaction. ‘Alacriter quidem ille ſe accinxit; verùm illæ brevi, ac aliæ deinceps, partim ex operis natura, partim ex tergiverſatione Præfectorum ærarii, ſubortæ fuere difficultates, ut priuſquàm Tabulæ perfectæ, evulgatæque fuerint, annus ſæculi XXVII. adventarit. Conqueſtus eſt certè ab annis II. ac III. configi ſe limis Præfectorum oculis; & cum anno IX. ſpecimen laboris inſigne, Commentaria de motibus Stellæ Martis edidiſſet, ac Rudolphus præter editionis impenſas, perſolvi illi confeſtim mandaſſet, tum ſtipendiorum reſidua, *quæ* inquit, *ad dua millia monetæ argenteæ majoris excreverant*, tum alia inſuper duo millia; expoſtulabat tamen adhuc biennio poſt, decreta Rudolphi in ſe munificentiſſima nullum eventum conſequi, ac ſe incaſſum facere ſumptus, pulſareque jam Cameræ Sileſiacæ, jam Imperialis ærarii fores (2). —— *He ſet about it with a good will; but he met with ſuch difficulties from time to time, partly from the nature of the work, and partly from the backwardneſs of the treaſurers, that, before the tables were compleated and publiſhed the twenty ſeventh year of the century was come. It is certain, he complained, from the ſecond and third years, of the cold looks of the Financiers; and when, in the ninth year he had publiſhed a noble ſpecimen of his works,* viz. *Commentaries on the motions of the planet Mars; and the emperor Rodolphus, beſides the expence of the publication, had ordered the immediate payment, both of the arrears of his penſion,* which, *he ſays,* amounted to two thouſand crowns, *and of two thouſand over and above; yet he complained two years after, that the bountiful orders of the emperor were fruitleſs, and that he knocked at the doors of the Imperial chamber, and that of Sileſia, to no purpoſe.*’ Kepler was no leſs diſcouraged by the Financiers under the emperor Matthias, than under Rodolphus (3). He had occaſion ſtill for his patience, under the reign of Ferdinand; but at laſt he received his arrears. ‘Perſeverarunt adhuc querelæ poſt exactum XIX. quo Ferdinandus Matthiæ ſucceſſit, etiamque poſt XXI, quo edidit partem doctrinæ Copernicanæ theoricam juxta quam deductio tabularum foret: quouſque optimus Imperator rebus licet nondum penitus compoſitis etiam vetera quæ Anteceſſores debebant ſtipendia perſolvit, ac ut neceſſarii ad maturationem editionemque operis ſumptus ſuppeditarentur mandavit (4). —— *His complaints ſtill continued after the year* XIX, *in which Ferdinand ſucceeded Matthias, and even after the year* XXI, *in which he publiſhed the theoretic part of the Copernican doctrine, according to which the tables were to be deduced: till at laſt that good emperor, tho' his affairs were yet unſettled, diſcharged even the debts of his predeceſſors, and ordered the neceſſary expences for compleating and publiſhing the work to be defrayed.*’ The payment of his penſion was interrupted; for the reaſon why he went to Ratisbon in the year 1630, was to ſollicit the payment of his arrears (5).

[*C*] *LEWIS KEPLER . . . . was in great fear that the publication of his father's* Somnium *would occaſion his death.*] The laſt work that Kepler compoſed, was the deſcription of the moon; he had not the ſatisfaction of publiſhing it, becauſe he died whilſt it was printing. James Bartſchius, his ſon-in-law, and his faithful follower in Aſtronomical opinions, took care of the book, and continued the impreſſion; but death interrupted it again. Lewis Kepler, the author's ſon, was ſo ſurprized at theſe accidents, that it proved a very difficult thing to perſuade him to meddle with this work. He feared he ſhould loſe his life in it, as his father, and brother-in-law had done; and his mother-in-law, John Kepler's widow, who was poor, and had many children, was obliged to uſe a great many intreaties and arguments to engage him to that undertaking. At laſt ſhe obtained her deſire. A learned Profeſſor of Utrecht made uſe of theſe circumſtances to cry down the doctrine of John Kepler concerning the world in the moon. ‘Unum, *ſays he,* præterire nequeo, quod ſpectat Selenographiæ Keplerianæ natales, unde jure merito male ominor Levaniæ, ejuſque incolis. —— *One thing I cannot omit, which relates to the nativity of Kepler's Selenography, whence I bode ill to Levania, aud it's inhabitants.*’ He relates the death of the author, and that of Bartſchius, and then adds: ‘Iſta vero ut intellexit Ludovicus Keplerus, Johannis filius, novercæ viduæ inopis ac liberis onuſtæ precibus atque erga patrium nomen affectu, vix vinci potuit ut li-

‘belli

(1) Konig. Biblioth pag. 444. in voce Keplerus.

(2) Gaſſendus, in Vita Tychonis Brahei, lib vi, pag. m. 471.

(3) Licet anno inſequente Matthias Rudolphi ſucceſſor & continuari ſtipendia, & exſolvi reſidua juſſiſſet, querebatur tamen anno XVI, exſpectare ſe adhuc mandatorum exoptatiſſimum effectum. *Id. ibid.*

(4) Id ibid.

(5) Cum . . . . anno XXX . . . ad Comitia Ratisbonenſia, ut ſtipendiorum reſidua poſtularet, ſe contuliſſet, incidit in ardentem febrim, ex eaque obiiſſe initio Decembris, ut certe ad Deoditum ſcripſit Beneggerus, cum & eximius Eichſtadius ad me ſcripſerit, fuiſſe eum catharro exſtinctum, quem apoſtemata quædam cerebri ob nimiam equitationem præceſſerant. *Id. pag.* 472.

nions are ſometimes very ſingular; one would think that he aſcribed to the earth a ſoul, endowed with ſenſe [*D*]. It is pretended, that he afforded very good hints to Des Cartes [*E*]. We may place him among thoſe authors, who have ſaid, that they

‘belli inchoatæ editioni abſolvendæ manum admoveret, territus (quod ipſe fatetur) improviſo & patris & affinis obitu, metuenſque ne cum illis in Levaniam relegaretur (6). —— *Lewis Kepler, the ſon of John, hearing of theſe accidents, was hardly prevailed upon by the intreaties of his mother-in-law, who was left a widow, poor, and burthened with children, and by filial affection, to finiſh the publication of the book, being alarmed (as he himſelf confeſſed) with the ſudden death of his father and brother-inlaw, and fearing leſt, with them, he ſhould be baniſhed to Levania.*’ I have hardly met with any author ſo violent againſt Kepler as Schoockius; as if this great mathematician had made himſelf the moſt ridiculous man in the world, by endeavouring to apply mathematical ſpeculations to Natural Philoſophy. I do not believe, that this deſign can ever ſucceed; for the object of Mathematics, and that of Phyſics, are things irreconcileable; the one is a quantity, which only exiſts in idea, and cannot exiſt any other way; the other exiſts out of our mind, and can never be really in it. However it be, I ſhall ſet down Schoockius's words: ‘Ubi Mathematicus, nemo eodem (*Johanne Keplero*) melior & ſubtilior, ubi vero Phyſicus, nemo eodem pejor atque ineptior, ut ſæpiſſime doleam, ſi non ingemiſcam, virum tam eximium, divinam illam Matheſin nugamentis ſuis Phyſicis adeo fœde commaculaſſe. Quid abſurdius enim vel febricitans anus in ſomnio videat, quam quod terra ingens animal ſit, quæ per montium crateres & caminos, ceu os aut nares, ventos exſpiret? & hoc tamen expreſſe docet, lib, 4. Harmonicæ, cap. 7. ubi ſerio quoque probare nititur, *quod terra cum cœlo ſympathiam colat, & naturali inſtinctu ſiderum poſituram cognoſcat.* Similiter in ſcripto de Motibus Martis fol. 173. contendit ſolem magnum magnetem, ſeu magneticum corpus eſſe, ſupra proprium centrum diurno motu circumactum, quod ſecundum ſpeciem quandam diffuſam, omnes reliquas Planetarum ſphæras commoveat, & in orbem agitet. Nec ſic Keplerus ſolum, per Matheſin imprudenter & infeliciter Phyſicæ applicatam, in errorum præcipitium ruit; ſed cum eo multi quoque alii quorum indicem alio in ſcripto, ſi Deo placuerit vitam prorogare, exhibebo (7). ——— *Where Mathematics were concerned, no one excelled John Kepler; where Natural Philoſophy, no one was ſo unskillful; inſomuch that I have often lamented, that ſo great a man ſpoiled that divine ſcience with his phyſical follies. For what greater abſurdity could a feveriſh old woman dream of, than that the earth is a huge animal, which breathes out winds through the chinks and crannies of the mountains, as thro' a mouth and noſe? Yet this he expreſly teaches, in the fourth book of his* Harmonica, *ch.* 7. *in which he gravely endeavours to prove, that* the earth maintains a ſympathy with the heavens, and perceives the poſition of the ſtars by inſtinct. *In like manner, in his treatiſe of the motions of Mars he contends, that the ſun is a large load-ſtone, or magnetic body, revolving by a diurnal motion on it's own centre, and giving motion to the whole ſyſtem of planets, by a certain diffuſed power. Nor has Kepler erred alone, by raſhly applying Mathematics to Natural Philoſophy; but many others with him, a catalogue of which, if God grant me life, I will give in another work.*’

[*D*] *One would think that he aſcribed to the earth a ſoul endowed with ſenſe.*] Voſſius obſerving the abſurdity of placing the earth among the gods, the earth, I ſay, which all the world took for a body, trampled under foot, and covered with all ſorts of filth, adds, that the wiſer ſort were well aware of this abſurdity, and ſaid, the earth was either an animal, or part of a great animal, called the world (8). Kepler, continues he, was not far from this opinion for he not only ſaid, that the diurnal motion of the earth proceeds from the earth, but alſo, that the earth perceives beforehand the appearance of comets, that it ſweats for fear of them, and that thence proceed great rains. ‘Audiamus eum loquentem libro de cometis anni poſt milleſimum & ſexcenteſimum ſeptimi, atque item duodevigeſimi: *Facultas mundi ſublunaris cometam* PERSENTISCIT, ET OBSTUPESCIT, *unaque facultates cæteræ omnium rerum ſublunarium.* Ac poſtea: *Facultas telluris, inſolenti Cometæ apparitione* CONSTERNATA, *uno terreſtris ſuperficiei loco multum exſudat vaporum, pro qualitate illius partis ſui corporis, hinc diuturnæ pluviæ, & eluviones* (9). —— *Let us hear what he ſays in his book of the comets of the years* 1607 and 1618: The faculty of the ſublunary world PERCEIVES the coming of a comet, and is TERRIFIED, and together with it the other faculties of ſublunary things. *And afterwards,* the faculty of the earth, AFFRIGHTED at the unuſual appearance of a comet, ſweats out a large quantity of vapours from one part of the terreſtrial ſurface, according to the quality of that part of it's body, whence proceed great rains.’ Gaſſendus obſerves, that, according to Kepler, all the ſtars are animated, and that, as animals move by means of their muſcles, the earth and the planets have alſo muſcles proportioned to their bulk, which are the inſtruments, by which they move. He gives the ſun a moſt noble and active ſoul, and will have it, that the beams of the ſun put the ſouls of the planets in action. ‘Adnoto dumtaxat Keplerum ita ſidera feciſſe animata, ac ut inſtrumenta motus in Animalibus ſunt fibræ digeſtæ per muſculos; ſic cenſuiſſe illum eſſe & in Terra, & in Planetis cæteris ingenteis fibras aliquas pro ratione molis cujuſque, per quas Anima vim ſuam motricem exerceat. Cenſuit verò etiam, præter ſpecialeis Animas, & vireis, quæ inſunt in cæteris, eſſe in ipſo Sole Animam nobiliſſimam potentiſſimamque, quæ dum Solem circa proprium axem (à centro Mundi propterea non diſcedentem) circumagit, immateriatas ſpecies (ſic enim appellat) irradiando, circumfundit, quibus, Planetæ velut correpti, ipſi Soli circumducantur (10). ——— *I only obſerve, that Kepler ſuppoſed the ſtars to be thus animated and as in animals the inſtruments of motion are the fibres digeſted thro' the muſcles, ſo he ſuppoſed there were in the earth, and the other planets certain large fibres, in proportion to their reſpective magnitudes, by which the ſoul exerciſes it's motive force. He believed likewiſe, that, beſides the ſouls and forces, which are in the reſt, there is in the ſun a moſt noble and powerful ſoul, which, whilſt it carries the ſun round it's own axis, keeping it thereby in the centre of the univerſe, darts all around* immateriated ſpecies *(ſo he calls them), which, ſeizing on the planets, whirl them round the ſun.*’ Here is what I quote out of Mr Leibniz, and obſerve, that it would be pretty difficult to confute Kepler's hypotheſis; for we are no more in a condition of knowing, whether the earth be animated, than a louſe is of knowing, whether we are living creatures. ‘Tantarum tamque conſtantium veritatum cauſas dare nondum potuit (*Keplerus*) tum quod Intelligentiis aut ſympathiarum radiationibus inexplicatis haberet præpeditam mentem, tum quod nondum illius tempore Geometria interior & ſcientia motuum eo quo nunc profeciſſent (11). ——— *Kepler could not yet aſſign the cauſes of ſuch great and conſtant truths, both becauſe his mind was perplexed with intelligencies and radiations of ſympathies, of which he could give no account, as alſo becauſe at that time, the interior Geometry, and the ſcience of motion, had not arrived to their preſent perfection.*’ A louſe is contented with feeding on what it draws from the ſurface of our bodies: it knows not whether we think, nor can it diſcover the ſecret ſprings that move us. Can we make more diſcoveries upon the queſtion, whether the earth thinks and whether it has ſenſations, which, like ours, determine certain inward ſprings to move themſelves in a certain manner?

[*E*] *It is pretended that he afforded very good hints to Des Cartes.*] ‘Kepler, ſays Mr Baillet (12), had particularly cultivated Aſtronomy and Optics, and tho' he left many things to be diſcovered, or perfected, yet it muſt be confeſſed, that the reading of his writings has not been uſeleſs to Des Cartes.’ In another place (13) he mentions three things, which ſeemed to have been common to Des Cartes and Kepler. ‘The firſt is the knowledge of the celeſtial vortices, which it is pretended Kepler had at leaſt a confuſed idea of, as well as Jordanus Brunus. The ſecond is, the explication of gravity, which Kepler gave they valued a production of the mind above a kingdom (*b*). Moreri has beeen guilty of more faults of omiſſion than of commiſſion [*F*].

---

(6) Gerardus de Vries, in Diſſertatione de Lunicolis, pag. 253, 254. *It is printed with the* Phyſiologia *of Daniel Voëtius, at Utrecht,* 1688.

(7) Martinus Schoockius de Scepticiſmo, lib. iv, pag. 387, 388.

(8) Voſſius, de Origine & Progreſſu Idolatriæ, lib. ii, cap. lxii, ſub fin. pag. m. 641.

(9) Id. Ibid.

(10) Gaſſend. Phyſica, Sect. II, lib. iii, cap. vi, Oper. Tom. I, pag m. 635.

(11) Act. Erudit. Lipſienſ. 1689, pag. 82, 83.

(12) Vie de Des Cartes, Tom. I, pag 226.

(13) In Tom. II, p. 542. *He quotes* G. G. Leibn. Tom. I, Act. Eruditor. Lipſ. *Indeed Mr Leibniz ſpeaks thus,* pag. 187. Cl. Speiſſius . . . notat ſolemne fuiſſe *Carteſio* præterire nomina autorum, & exemplum affert mundanorum vorticum, ad quos Jordanus Brunus & Johannes Keplerus ita digitum intenderint, ut tantum iſtud vocabulum ipſis defuiſſe videatur. - - - *Speiſſius obſerves, that Des Cartes was wont to conceal the names of authors, and he inſtances in the mundane vortices, which Jordanus Brunus and John Kepler, had ſo deſcribed that they ſeem only to have wanted the name.*

‘ firſt of all, by the compariſon of ſmall pieces of ſtraw, which, by the motion of water circulating in a veſſel, gather in the center. The third is the knowledge of Optics, in which Des Cartes has owned Kepler for his maſter in the year 1638. Here is the teſtimony he gave of it to Father Merſenne. He, ſays he *, who accuſes me of having taken the Ellipſes and Hyperboles of my Dioptrics from Kepler, muſt be ignorant or malicious. For as to the ellipſis, I do not remember, that Kepler ſpeaks of it; or, if he does, it is, no doubt, to ſay, that it is not the anaclaſtic, which he looks for. And as for the hyperbole, I remember very well, that he pretends to demonſtrate, that it is not that neither, though he ſays, it is not very different from it. Now I leave you to judge, whether I could learn, that a thing was true, from a man, who endeavoured to prove, that it was falſe. Which does not hinder me from acknowledging, that Kepler was my firſt maſter in Optics, and that he knew more of it than all thoſe that went before him. Mr Leibniz, whoſe words I have mentioned concerning the Vortices, ſays ſomething in another place about the ſubject of gravity. He pretends, that we are indebted to Kepler for the cauſe of that Phænomenon, and he accuſes Des Cartes of having made uſe of that excellent diſcovery, without aſcribing the invention of it to it's true author. ‘ Ipſi (*Keplero*) primum indicium debetur veræ cauſæ gravitatis, & hujus naturæ legis, à qua gravitas pendet, quod corpora rotata conantur à centro recedere per tangentem, & ideo ſi in aqua feſtucæ vel paleæ innatent, rotato vaſe, aqua in vorticem acta, feſtucis denſior, atque ideo fortius quam ipſæ, excuſſa à medio, feſtucas verſus centrum compellit; quemadmodum ipſe diſerte duobus & amplius locis, in Epitome Aſtronomiæ expoſuit; quanquam adhuc ſubdubitabundus, & ſuas ipſe opes ignorans, nec ſatis conſcius quanta inde ſequerentur; tum in Phyſica, tum ſpeciatim in Aſtronomia. Sed his deinde egregie uſus eſt Carteſius, etſi more ſuo autorem diſſimularit (14). —— *We are indebted to Kepler for the firſt diſcovery of the true cauſe of gravity, and the nature of that law, on which gravity depends; to wit, that bodies whirled round endeavour to recede from the centre in a tangent; and therefore, if ſtraws ſwim in water, and the veſſel be whirled round, the water, being driven into a vortex, and being denſer than the ſtraws, and therefore forced more ſtrongly than them from the centre, drives the ſtraws towards the centre; as he has expreſsly taught in two or more places, in his Abridgement of Aſtronomy; tho' ſtill expreſſing his doubts, and ignorant of his own ability, nor well aware what conſequences follow from thence in Natural Philoſophy, and eſpecially in Aſtronomy. But Des Cartes afterwards made an excellent uſe of this diſcovery, tho', according to cuſtom, he ſays nothing of the author.*’ See the biſhop of Avranches (15), who cites ſome paſſages of Kepler, accuſing Des Cartes of having ſtolen ſeveral things from this German.

[*F*] *Moreri has been guilty of more faults of omiſſion than of commiſſion.*] The faults of the firſt kind will eaſily appear to all thoſe, who will be at the pains of comparing his article with this; and much more, if it were compared with an article, containing thoſe things, which I have not obſerved. Here are his faults of commiſſion. I. The emperor, who ſucceeded Rodolphus, was not called Matthew, but Matthias. Theſe two names are very different, and no body ſhould have known it better than Moreri, who, as a prieſt, read every day his Breviary. Are not the feaſts of St Matthew and St Matthias diſtinct? II. He ſhould not have ſaid, that Kepler died about the year 1620, but in the year 1630. An error of ten years is inexcuſable in ſpeaking of a great man of our age. III. He ſhould not ſay, that John Kepler is different from Lewis Kepler, he ſhould ſay that Lewis Kepler was John's ſon. Moreri might eaſily have avoided the firſt fault, ſince Voſſius, whom he copied, ſpeaks thus: ‘ Primum Rodolphi Imperatoris, exinde MATTHIAE, tandem & Ferdinandi Cæſ. Mathematicus fuit (16). —— *He was Mathematician, firſt to the emperor Rodolphus, then to MATTHIAS, and laſtly to Ferdinand.*’ I ſhall occaſionally ſay here, that, before Kepler had that title, he had been profeſſor at Gratz in Stiria. His engagement with Tycho Brahe had like to have been broke, becauſe the States of Stiria did not approve of it (17). Tycho gave Kepler to underſtand, that he had procured him a greater ſalary at the court of the emperor, with the character of Mathematician to his Imperial majeſty, ſo that the loſs of his ſalary in Stiria ought not to ſtop him (18). Hereupon Kepler leſt the univerſity of Gratz. The emperor Rodolphus made him his Mathematician: but he obliged him to ſerve Tycho as an Arithmetician (19). I find, that the emperor Matthias gave Kepler a fixed ſettlement at Lintz, and that he ordered him a ſalary from the States of the Upper Auſtria, which was paid for ſixteen years. ‘ Neque enim ſibi ſatis eſſe, quod Cæſar etiam ante Imperium decreviſſet idoneam, fixamque ſedem Lincii; ac adjeciſſet exhibenda à Proceribus Auſtriæ ſuper Aniſanæ ſtipendia, quibus, donec res pacatiores evaderent, ſuſtentaretur; uti & fuit illis reipsâ per annos ſexdecim ſuſtentatus (20). You ſee the reaſon why Voſſius, ſpeaking of the Stereometry that was printed in 1617, calls Kepler ‘ Cæſaris Matthiæ & illuſtrium Ordinum Archiducalis Auſtriæ ſupra Onaſum Mathematicus (21). —— *Mathematician to the emperor Matthias, and the States of arch-ducal Auſtria, above the Onaſus.*’ I find alſo, that Walſtein ſettled Kepler at Sagan in Sileſia, and there it was that this Aſtronomer cauſed the continuation of his Ephemerides to be printed in the year 1630 (22). ‘ Deinceps autem anno xxx. poſt editas Sagani Sileſiorum (ubi Dux Meckelburgi Wulſtemius (23) ſedem illi tribuerat) Ephemeridas (24) ad Comitia Ratisbonenſia . . . . ſe contuliſſet.’

KERMATIANS, a ſect in Arabia. See the remark [*A*] of the article ABUDHAHER.

KESLER (ANDREW), a Lutheran Divine, was born at Coburg in Franconia, in the year 1595. He did not follow his father's profeſſion, which was that of a Taylor (*a*); he applied himſelf to ſtudy, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his wit, and the progreſs he made; which was doubtleſs the cauſe that John Caſimir, duke of Saxony, who had erected a famous ſchool at Coburg, gave him a penſion (*b*). This enabled him to maintain himſelf in the univerſity of Iëna, and afterwards in that of Wittemberg. In the later, he was admitted into the faculty of Philoſophy, and ſhewed by ſeveral theſes he maintained, that he was well verſed in Logic, and that he ſucceſsfully employed this ſcience in refuting the Socinians [*A*]. He was prevailed upon to leave Wittemberg

[*A*] *He was well verſed in Logic, and ſucceſsfully employed it in refuting the Socinians.*] He publiſhed a tract *de principiis Logicis quæ in Photinianorum librorum lectione occurrunt*, containing thirteen diſputations which he had maintained in the univerſity of Wittemberg. He dedicated it to his Mecænas prince John Caſimir of Saxony. The Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from Wittemberg the firſt of Auguſt 1621. He gave a ſecond edition of this work in the ſame town, in 1624, in 4to. It is intituled, *Logicæ Photinianæ examen, ſeu Principiorum Logicorum quæ in Photinianorum ſcriptis occurrunt, Conſideratio: cui præmiſſus eſt tractatus breviſſimus de illegitimo Photinianorum diſputandi modo, & legitima ratione pie philoſophandi.* A new edition

---

(*b*) *See the remark* [*A*], *at the end.*

* Tom. III, of the Letters, pag. 397.

(14) Acta Erudit. Lipſ. 1689, pag. 83.

(15) In Cenſura Philoſoph. Carteſianæ, cap. viii, pag. m. 216.

(16) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. pag. 198.

(17) Ex inopinato literas accepit quibus Keplerus inſinuavit non eſſe ſibi integrum pactis conditionibus ſtare, quod à Styriæ proceribus quorum in ære erat, undequaque non probarentur. *Gaſſend. in Vita Tychon. Brahei, lib. v, pag. 453, ad ann.* 1600.

(18) Id. ibid.

(19) Deducto ad Cæſarem Keplero, lætatus eſt Cæſar ipſum convaluiſſe, ac teſtatus eſt velle ſe eum quidem Mathematicum ſibi habere, ſed addictum tamen Tychoni, quaſi miniſtrum à calculis. *Id. ibid. pag.* 460, *col.* 1.

(20) Id. lib. vi, pag. 471, col. 2.

(21) Voſſius, ubi ſupra, pag. 340.

(22) Gaſſend. ibid. pag. 472, col. 2.

(23) So it is in my edition of Gaſſendus. It ſhould be *Walſteinius*.

(24) This is only to be underſtood of the ſecond part of the *Ephemerides*; for the firſt was printed at Lintz, in 1617.

(*a*) Spizelius, in Templo Honoris, pag. 155.

(*b*) Keſlerus, Epiſt. Dedicat. Logicæ Photinianæ Examinis.

Wittemberg (*c*), to accept of an employment (*d*) in the college of Coburg, and at the end of a year and half he was made paſtor and ſuperintendant of Eisfeld. He diſcharged this office well, and this was the reaſon why prince John Caſimir would not permit him to accept the ſuperintendance of all the churches of the country of Eiſenach. He took his doctor's degree, and accepted an invitation to Steinfurt. He was offered the ſuperintendance of the church: he declined it; but he readily accepted it after the misfortune he had to loſe his library, when the Imperial troops ſacked the town of Eisfeld in the year 1632. Beſide the ſuperintendance of the church, he had likewiſe at Steinfurt the direction of the college, when he was called to Coburg, to ſucceed the ſuperintendant of the churches. He diſcharged this employ with applauſe. His ſermons were very much followed on account of his eloquence and his doctrine. He was ſeized with an Apoplexy in the very pulpit (*e*), and died, after languiſhing ſome months, the fifteenth of May, 1643 (*f*). He compoſed ſome books [*B*], ſome in Latin, and others in German, only part of which have been publiſhed.

(*c*) Spizelius, ubi ſupr., pag. 156.

(*d*) *That of profeſſor of Logic.*

(*e*) *Taken from Spizelius*, ubi ſupra, pag. 156.

(*f*) Henn. Witte, in Diario Biographico.

edition of it in 8vo, was publiſhed at Wittemberg in the year 1642. Michael Wendelerus, profeſſor of Philoſophy (1), prefixed to it a ſmall preface, in which he placed among the Socinian authors Smiglecius, one of the Jeſuits who have the moſt ſtrongly refuted them. Keſler next attacked the Socinian Metaphyſics in a work, intituled *Metaphyſicæ Photinianæ partis generalis examen, ſeu principiorum ad generalem Metaphyſicæ partem pertinentium quæ in Photinianorum ſcriptis occurrunt, Conſideratio.* I have ſeen only the third edition of it, which is that of Wittemberg, 1648, in 8vo, but I conjecture, that the firſt is of the year 1623; for the Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from that town the tenth of March, 1623. The *Metaphyſicæ Photinianæ partis ſpecialis examen, ſeu principiorum ad ſpecialem Metaphyſicæ partem pertinentium quæ in Photinianorum ſcriptis occurrunt Conſideratio* apppeared, if I am not miſtaken, in the year 1626; for the author's Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from Eisfeld the fourteenth of January of that year. I have ſeen only the third edition, which is that of Wittemberg, 1648, in 8vo. He attacked likewiſe the Phyſics of the Socinians: the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his *Phyſicæ Photinianæ examen, ſeu principiorum Phyſicorum quæ in Photinianorum ſcriptis occurrunt, Conſideratio* is dated from Eisfeld the firſt of January 1628. I have ſeen only the edition of Wittemberg, 1656, in 8vo. There is a good deal of method and exactneſs in theſe writings.

[*B*] *He compoſed ſeveral books.*] We ſee the titles of them in Spizelius's *Templum Honoris reſeratum* (2), and in Henningus Witte's *Diarium Biographicum*; but without any mark of the time or place of the edition. I have remedied this fault as much as I could with regard to the books, which I have mentioned in the foregoing remark. I cannot go on with regard to the reſt, which are *Tractatus de Conſequentia: Quadriga Diſcurſuum Philoſopho-Theologicorum: Hiſtoria Epiphaniæ Dominicæ: Reſponſio belli ubiquiſtici Laurentio Forero oppoſita*, &c.

(1) At Wittemberg.

(2) At Pag 160, &c.

KILIANUS (CORNELIUS), a native of Brabant, was an excellent corrector of the preſs, for the ſpace of fifty years, at Plantin's Printing-houſe. He did not content himſelf with exactly correcting the proofs of other peoples works; but he wrote ſome books which were eſteemed [*A*]. He had no ill ſucceſs in making Latin verſes, as it appears from his Apology for the Correctors againſt Authors [*B*]. He died very old on Eaſter-day in 1607. Moſt of the things I have been ſpeaking of will be verified in the remark, wherein I inſert his epitaph [*C*].

[*A*] *He wrote ſome books which were eſteemed.*] Swertius (1) begins the liſt of them with theſe words. 'Scripſit *Etymologeticon Teutonicæ Linguæ*, ſive *Dictionarium Teutonico-Latinum à Juſto Lipſio* laudatum. Typis Moreti 1599, in 8vo. —— *He wrote an* Etymologeticum *of the Flemiſh tongue, or a Dictionary Flemiſh and Latin, cited by Juſtus Lipſius. Printed for Moret*, 1599, 8vo.' His other works are Latin verſes, and a Flemiſh tranſlation of Philip de Comines, and of Lewis Guicciardin (2).

[*B*] *His apology for the correctors againſt authors.*] It is an epigram of eighteen verſes, which we find in Beyerlinch's *Theatrum vitæ humanæ* (3). Mr Chevillier has inſerted it in his *Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris* (4), after having ſaid a thing, which deſerves to be mentioned, 'We will not however charge the Printers or Correctors with all the faults that are in the printed books. They have their excuſe upon the authors. Faults remain ſometimes in an edition through the ignorance, or negligence, of the writer, or the publiſher. He gives a very incorrect copy, which is faithfully printed, and conſequently with the faults of the manuſcript: but it happens, that the learned, who judge without flattery, cenſuring what deſerves it; he, who is not guilty, is accuſed, though the fault be entirely in the author. An excellent corrector of Plantin's preſs, called Cornelius Kilian, made an apology for the Correctors againſt the authors, who, being miſtaken for want of learning and judgement, and giving incorrect copies, do neverthleſs blame the innocent.'

[*C*] *I inſert his epitaph.*] It was made by Francis (5) Swertius, his friend, and conſiſts of theſe words: 'D. O. M. CORNELIO KILIANO Dufflæo, conſtantis laboris, & perennis induſtriæ laude ornato & amato viro. L. ann. Plantin. Typographiæ correctorem geſſit. Quam fideliter, perite, docte, ipſos rogate libros elegantia, nitore, fama æternæ artis primos. Nec ſemper alienos tractavit, cum & ſuos reliquerit, Latina oratione diſertus, verſificatu felix, patriam quoque eloquentiam excoluit, cultumque ejus & proprietatem revocavit. Obiit ætate operibuſque gravis M DC VII ipſo paſchatis feſto (6) —— *To the memory of the very induſtrious and beloved CORNELIUS KILIANUS. He was fifty years corrector of the preſs to Plantin; how faithfully, skillfully, and learnedly, the elegant and beautiful editions he was concerned in ſufficiently ſhew. Nor was he wholly converſant with other writers; ſince he left works of his own, being an eloquent Latiniſt, an happy Poet, and a reſtorer of the purity of his native tongue. He died full of years and works, in the year* 1607, *on Eaſter day.*'

(1) Athen. Belg. pag. 190.

(2) Deſcription of the Netherlands.

(3) Tom. VII, pag. 327.

(4) Pag. 203.

THE faults in books are not always to be imputed to the Printers.

(5) Mr Chevillier, pag. 106, calls him Peter.

(6) Franc. Swertius, Athen Belg. pag 189, 190.

KIRCHER (JOHN), a native of Tubingen in the duchy of Wirtemberg, ſtudied with great ſucceſs in the univerſity of his country, and raiſed very great hopes of himſelf; but, having choſen another ſort of life, and ſeeing no probability of a ſettlement in it, he changed the Lutheran for the Romiſh religion, and went into Hungary (*a*). This was about the year 1640. He publiſhed, according to cuſtom, the motives of his change, to which were made ſeveral anſwers [*A*]. I can proceed no farther in my account of him; and

(*a*) Joh. Georgius Dorſcheus, Epiſt. Dedicat. Hodegetici Catholici.

[*A*] *He publiſhed . . . . . . the motives of his change, ſo which were made ſeveral anſwers.*] The book he publiſhed is intituled, *Ætiologia in qua migrationis ſuæ ex Lutherana Synagoga in Eccleſiam Catholicam veras* and I ſhould be to blame, if I did not own it, ſince the learned Mr Baillet made no ſcruple to acknowledge, that he was ignorant of this perſon's adventures [*B*].

veras & ſolidas rationes ſuccinctè exponit, & perſpicuè, doctiſque omnibus & judicandi dexteritate pollentibus ritè, accuratè & modeſtè conſiderandas proponit. It was printed at Vienna in Auſtria, in the year 1640, and dedicated to Emeric Loſi, archbiſhop of Strigonia. This work turns upon theſe two hinges; one is, that the Lutheran religion ought to be quitted, becauſe it has no infallible authority to direct us to judge what we ought to believe: the other is, that Popery ought to be embraced, becauſe we find in it ſuch an authority (1). He was confuted. Conſult Mr Baillet (2) who will tell you, that John Conrad Schragmuller publiſhed an Anti-Kircher in High-Dutch in the year 1654. and that Abraham Calovius put out an *Examen Anti-Kircherianum* at Konigsberg in Pruſſia, in the year 1643. He does not there mention (3) the book of John George Dorſcheus, profeſſor of Divinity at Strasburg, though it may be reckoned an Anti Kircher. The title of it is; *M. J. Kircherus devius, ſive Hodegeticus Catholicus, quo oſtenditur M. Johannem Kircherum Tubingâ Wirtembergicum migrationis ſuæ ex ſynagoga, quam vocat, Lutherana in Eccleſiam Catholicam inſtitutione iviſſe, non qua eundum eſt ſed qua itur.* It was printed at Strasburg in the year 1641, in 12mo, and contains two parts, the running titles whereof are 1°. *Hodeget. Cathol. Antikirch. prælim.* 2°. *Hodeget. Cathol. Antikirch.* Dorſcheus maintains the perſpicuity of the ſcripture, which is the foundation of the Proteſtant faith, and ſhews, on the other hand, that neither the councils, nor the deciſions of the Popes, can be a good foundation of certainty. The citations take up more than half the book, and eſpecially in the places, wherein are examined Kircher's complaints, that the Proteſtants impute to the Catholic church all the impertinencies of particular authors. This book of Dorſcheus was anſwered by a German Jeſuit, called Henry Wangnereck, who publiſhed an Anti-Dorſcheus in the year 1653, and, in his turn, was confuted by an Anti-Vangnereck, which Balthaſar Bebelius (4) publiſhed by way of Theological Theſes in the year 1682.

[*B*) *Mr Baillet made no ſcruple to acknowledge, that he was ignorant of this perſon's adventures,*] As there is a good deal of wit in his confeſſion, I will relate at large what he ſays (5). ' You would have no occaſion to reproach me for it (6), if I could have diſcovered the regiſter of his baptiſm or burial. Of the four German Kirchers, whom I know to have been authors, and whereof two were Jeſuits, ours whoſe name was John, is he, whoſe life and employments I am leaſt informed of. I believe, that if he had died a Lutheran, Mr Henning Witten would have done him the honour to place him in his memoirs, with ſo many others, who did not deſerve it better than he; another of his fraternity would have made his funeral oration, or publiſhed an hiſtorical elogy on him. Perhaps alſo, if Kircher, when he turned from Lutheraniſm to the church of Rome, had become a monk, ſome Bibliographer, or other curious perſon of his order, would have been at the pains of collecting his actions and writings, and of placing him among the famous men of his order. But I have too good an opinion of your memory, to repeat what I have told you upon this ſubject in the article of the Anti-Cochleus, when you was deſirous to know, why the Proteſtant writers are generally better known to us than the Catholics, and why, among the latter, the Monks, of whatever order they be, are commonly better known than the other Catholics.'

KIRCHMAN (JOHN), famous for his works, was born at Lubec the eighteenth of January 1575. He ſtudied in his country till he was eighteen years of age, after which he went to Francfort upon the Oder, where he ſpent four years, conſtantly attending the lectures, and avoiding the amuſements and debaucheries, in which moſt ſcholars loſe their time [*A*]. He ſtudied afterwards in the univerſity of Iëna, and then in that of Strasburg. He deſired to travel into foreign countries; but having not ſufficient means for that, he was forced to refrain his deſire. He was not long under that conſtraint; for he was made governour to the ſon of a burgomaſter of Luneburg, and went with him into France and Italy. He returned into Germany in the year 1602; and, being at Roſtoch, he ſo well diſcovered his capacity, that he was made profeſſor of Poetry the year following. The work he publiſhed in the year 1604, *de Funeribus Romanorum*, procured him the reputation of a very learned man, and contributed, perhaps, to his meeting with a good match as readily as he deſired; for he had no leſs an inclination to increaſe the number of the inhabitants of the world [*B*], than that of his books.

[*A*] *He avoided the amuſements and debaucheries, in which moſt ſcholars loſe their time.*] It has been a diſpute for many ages, whether it be better to educate children at home, or to ſend them to the univerſities (1). There are reaſons on both ſides; but that which is moſt plauſible againſt ſending them to the univerſities, is the great danger of being drawn into debauchery. Studious ſcholars are very ſcarce; but thoſe who diſturb others, either by their bad example, their ſollicitations, or their railleries, are very numerous. See what is ſaid of our Kirchman, and of moſt of his ſchoolfellows. ' Ibidem per quadriennium fere ſubſtitit; non cibos & potiones tantum percolando, non Charadrii viam agendo, non ludicris aliorum exagitationibus, aut laſcivis Gynæcei luſtrationibus ſe oblectando, non ſcurrilibus Lurconum nugis optimum juventutis florem peſſime corrumpendo, quibus egregiis, ſcilicet! exercitiis, deplorato & exulcerato hoc ſeculo, maxima (2), proh dolor! Academicorum pars dedita eſt; ſed lectiones & diſputationes publicas diligenter viſitando, cum viris doctis familiariter converſando, & interdiu noctuque bonis literis, quibus animum totum applicuerat, ſtrenuè incumbendo (3). —— *He continued there almoſt four years, not ſpending his time in feaſting and diverſions, which is too much practiſed in moſt of our univerſities, but in attending public lectures and diſputations, in converſing with learned men, and applying himſelf with the utmoſt diligence to his ſtudies.*'

[*B*] *He had a great deſire to encreaſe the number of the inhabitants of the world.*] It is here neceſſary, more than in other places, to ſet down the very words of my author. ' Quemadmodum prole animi bonas litteras promovere ſtuduit Kirchmannus, ita etiam prole corporis humanum genus augere apud ſe conſtituit. Quamobrem eodem anno, quo Funera Romanorum publici juris fecit, iiſque nominis ſui funera planè exterminavit, vitæ ſociam ſibi elegit Virginem caſtiſſimam & pudiciſſimam, *Emerentiam, Joachimi Schellii*, Senatoris Roſtochienſis prudentiſſimi, filiam (4). ———— *Kirchman, as by the offſpring of the mind he endeavoured to promote learning, ſo by the offſpring of his body he reſolved to encreaſe the human race. Wherefore, the ſame year that he publiſhed the* Funerals of the Romans, *by which he immortalized his name, he took to wife a moſt chaſte and modeſt lady,* Emerentia, *the daughter of* Joachim Schellius, *a Senator of Roſtoc.*' Here you ſee a man, who very much regarded the public good; he confined not his zeal to the advantage of the Republic of Letters; he laboured alſo for that of the ſtate, by the procreation of children; he conſecrated both his body and mind, to the benefit of mankind. The learned Helena Piſcopia Cornara had very different notions; for, to ſhew, that ſhe trod in the ſteps of Minerva, the goddeſs of ſcience, who always preſerved her virginity, ſhe got herſelf admitted into the academy of Gli infecondi. But then the moſt learned Tiraquellus was an books. It was therefore very fortunate for him, to find a wife the ſame year that he ſet up for an author, eſpecially ſince the wife he met with made him attain the end he aimed at; for ſhe brought him children; beſides, ſhe lived with him with great union and concord [*C*]. Being looked upon as a man who educated youth well, and ſuffered not his boarders to commit any irregularity in his houſe [*D*], he had many ſcholars ſent him from the other towns of Germany; and at laſt, when the magiſtrates of Lubec ſaw, that their ſchool wanted a new rector, they intreated him to take upon him that employment. One of the reaſons that ingaged him to accept it, was, his fear of offending God, if he ſhould refuſe ſo lawful a requeſt [*E*]. He took poſſeſſion of that employment in the year 1613, and continued it all the reſt of his life, with wonderful induſtry, though he had the mortification of being expoſed to many ſlanders [*F*], under pretence, that the ſchool viſibly decayed. It is alledged that it was not his fault. He died the twentieth of March, 1643 (*a*). I will give a catalogue of his works [*G*].

---

(1) *Taken from Dorſcheus's* Hodegeticus Catholicus, pag. 1, & 329, 330.

(2) Baillet, in the firſt Tome of the *Anti*, *n.* 25, *pag.* 204, 205.

(3) Note, that he ſpeaks of it in the 267th page of the ſame Tome, but not under the notion of Anti-Kircher.

(4) Profeſſor of Divinity at Straſburg. See the *Acta Eruditor. in* 1682, *pag.* 249, and Mr Baillet, *ubi ſupra*, *pag.* 268.

(5) Baillet, ubi ſupra, pag. 206, 207.

(6) That is, for ſaying nothing of that Kircher's Life or Death.

(1) *See Quintilian*, Inſtit. Orat. lib i, cap. ii, *and Mr Dacier's Remarks upon the Life of Numa Pompilius, at the end, and the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *for June* 1700, *pag.* 886.

(2) See the remark [*D*], citat. (12). See likewiſe the article ERFORT, remark [*D*].

(3) Jacob. Stolterfhotus, Orat. Funebri Johannis Kirchmanni, apud Witten Memor. Philoſ. Orator. &c. pag. 525.

(4) Idem, Stolterfhotus, pag. 530.

an example to our Kirchman; for it is ſaid, he produced every year a book and a child. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (5), on the ſubject of Mrs le Fevre. The following words ſhew, that our Kirchman was not diſappointed in his good intentions. 'Quoniam vero præcipuus conjugii ſcopus quo Kirchmannus collimavit eſt procreatio liberorum . . . . . . etiam hunc ſcopum attigit, & conjugium ex benedictione divina uti jucundum, ita & fœcundum habuit. Ex uxore quippe ſuaviſſima, nunc proh dolor! Vidua mœſtiſſima, quinque liberos ſuſcepit, filios tres & filias duas (6). ——— *But, whereas the chief end of matrimony, at which Kirchman aimed, is the procreation of children . . . . . he attained this end, and, by God's bleſſing, met with a wife, both agreeable and fruitful. For ſhe brought him (though now a moſt diſconſolate widow) five children,* viz. *three ſons and two daughters,*'

[*C*] *They lived together with great union and concord.*] The funeral oration ſays, that for thirty ſeven years that their marriage laſted, they had no need of a reconciliation. 'Quod conjugium felicibus auſpiciis cœptum felici etiam ſucceſſu non caruit. Tanto enim amore hi conjuges ſe mutuo ſunt complexi, tantâ concordiâ ſeptem & triginta annos tranſegerunt, ut nunquam in gratiam redire, aut ad aram Bonæ Deæ litare neceſſe ipſis fuerit (7). — *Which match, happily begun, proved ſo in the end. For they lived together thirty ſeven years, in ſuch mutual affection, that they never ſtood in need of a reconciliation or had occaſion to ſacrifice at the altar of the Bona Dea.*' Pomponius Atticus had the like good fortune with his ſiſter, and with his mother (8), but not with his wife. The author of the funeral oration pretends that this conjugal concord proceeded from this, that both the husband and the wife well underſtood, that it was pleaſing to God and men, and that the inconveniencies of marriage, great enough in themſelves, ought not to be aggravated by diſſenſions, but rather ſweetened by an agreeable converſation. 'NIMIRUM uterque ipſorum probe intellexit, Deo hominibuſque gratum; ſi bene inter maritum & uxorem conveniat, nec conjugii moleſtias, alias ſat graves, odioſis rixis & acerbis concertationibus cumulandas, ſed ſuaviſſimâ potius oblectatione, & jucundiſſimâ converſatione leniendas eſſe (9).' Hereupon he makes a very pathetical wiſh: would to God, *ſays he* (10), that all thoſe, who do not live well together, would conſider this great truth. I do not believe this author has hit upon the true cauſe. This great truth is univerſally known; even thoſe families, where diſcord reigns moſt, are fully convinced of it: but they are not governed by this perſuaſion; and I queſtion whether the quarrelling part be not pitched upon as the leaſt inconvenient; they would be more tormented by their diſcontent and antipathy, if they kept them within their breaſt. Scolding is like tears (11); it aſſwages the grief, with which one is oppreſſed.

[*D*] *He permitted not his boarders to commit any irregularity in his houſe.*] There are ſome profeſſors ſo covetous, that, for fear of having their boarding cried down, they are very cautious how they croſs their boarders in their pleaſures. Young men, to revenge themſelves of the reſtraint they are kept under, would make their relations believe a thouſand lies, in order to remove to ſome other place. Kirchman did not govern himſelf by ſuch apprehenſions. 'Non enim Bacchanalia cum convictoribus ſuis Kirchmannus vivebat, non ſcyphos ad ordinem evacuabat; non ad menſuras ſine menſura vivebat, non noctem Baccho ut perviligem ducerent domeſticis ſuis permittebat, quemadmodum nunc nonnullos in Academiis Profeſſores & Juventutis cenſores, egregios ſcilicet! facere audimus; ſed ita in omnibus ſe gerebat, ut ſtudiis mores convenienter irent; ipſiuſque domeſtici, adeoque omnes litteris humanioribus addicti vivum haberent exemplum, ad quod vitam, mores, & res ſuas omnes examuſſim componerent (12). —— *For Kirchman did not revel with his boarders, did not put the glaſs about, did not live irregularly, did not ſuffer his family to ſit up all night drinking, as we are informed ſome profeſſors in our univerſities (excellent inſtructors of youth, truly!) do at preſent; but he always took care to poliſh the manners, as well as direct the ſtudies, of his pupils, and to ſet his family, and all men of letters, a lively example of good behaviour and conduct.*'

[*E*] *He was afraid of offending God, if he ſhould refuſe ſo lawful a requeſt.*] This is a proof of a very nice conſcience. Many reaſons diſſuaded him from leaving Roſtoch; but this is the firſt thing that he oppoſed to them. 'Contra vero ab hac parte non minus ſollicite ſecum perpendebat divinam & legitimam vocationem, quam ſi contemptim repudiaret, in graviſſimam Dei iram & certiſſimam ejus vindictam incurreret (13).' I think he was too ſcrupulous: his call was not like that of Abraham; and he might have refuſed to anſwer it, without any danger of provoking heaven.

[*F*] *He was expoſed to many ſlanders, under pretence that the ſchool . . . . . . decayed.*] When the ſcholars plaid any mad tricks, the rector was blamed, and publickly cenſured for it. 'Statim bonus Kirchmannus cum ſuis Collegis vapulabat, & neglecti officii ac diſciplinæ reus agebatur. Neque hæc cantilena in conviviis, tranſtris, & privatis congreſſibus tantum à vulgo, cui neque judicium, neque veritas, identidem canebatur; verum etiam in publico ſæpius Vir optimus acerbè perſtringebatur ab iis, quorum officium potius fuiſſet, Kirchmanni & Scholæ noſtræ cauſam agere, ipſiuſque Authoritatem & exiſtimationem, ſi qua à malevolis arroderetur, defendere (14).' He bore it patiently, and courageouſly deſpiſed thoſe injurious reflexions (15). His ſon-in-law enlarges much upon this, and, without denying that Kirchman had his faults (16), he maintains, that the decay of the college proceeded from introducing into the town the uſe of domeſtic tutors. 'Qui primum clancularios Præceptores in noſtram civitatem introduxit, quiſquis etiam fuerit, & quot domos tot ferè ſcholas in noſtra urbe aperuit, hunc violentas huic Lyceo manus intuliſſe, & ad proſternendum primo ictu petiiſſe, tam confidenter aſſevero, ut nihil confidentius. Quid præterea acceſſerit, & ſcholæ noſtræ fundamenta penè everterit, unuſquiſque ipſe ſecum reputet, in animo enim mihi non eſt omnia refricare, & Camarinam, quod aiunt, movere (17). —— *Whoever he was, that firſt introduced private tutors into this city, and opened in it as many ſchools as there are houſes, I will venture to affirm, that he laid violent hands on this Lyceum, and firſt attempted it's ruin. What farther contributed to it's downfall, every one will recollect; for I have no mind to rub up old ſores.*'

[*G*] *I will give a catalogue of his works.*] It is at the end of his funeral oration (18). *Oratio funebris Ampliſſimo Viro, Jacobo Bordingo, Conſuli Reipublicæ Lubecenſis, ſcripta*: Roſtochii 1616, in 4to. *De Funeribus Romanorum libri quatuor*: Hamburgi 1605, in 8vo. Lubecæ, 1623, 1637. Brunſvigæ, 1661. Francof. 1672,

---

(*a*) Taken from his Funeral Oration, pronounced by James Stolterfhotus, his ſon in law. Witten has inſerted it in the *Memoria Philoſophorum, pag.* 516.

(5) For Novemb. 1684, art. XII, pag. 977.

(6) Orat. Funebr. apud Witten, Memor. Philoſ. pag. 531.

(7) Id. ibid. pag. 530.

(8) See his article remark [*C*].

(9) Orat. Funebr. ubi ſupra, pag. 530.

(10) Utinam id ſecum probe volverent illi, qui conjugium, quod debebat eſſe caritatis vinculum, faciunt certamen, rixoſum, quo ſeipſos excarnificant, & quotidiana quaſi morte mulctant! Satius iſtis eſſet, nunquam matrimonium contraxiſſe, quam contractum tam fœde deturpaſſe. *Id. ibid. pag.* 531.

(11) Eſt quædam flere voluptas: Expletur lacrymis, egeriturque dolor. *Ovidius, Triſt. lib. iv, Eleg. iii, ver.* 37.

(12) Orat Funeb. pag. 533.

(13) Ibid. pag. 535.

(14) Ibid. pag. 540.

(15) Ut magni & nobilis erat animi, more magnæ feræ latratus minutorum canum ſecurus exaudiebat, & ut culicem, aut muſcam moleſte circumſtrepentem levi manu, & citra iracundiam abigimus: ſic ipſe perverſe judicantium calumnias ſine ulla triſtitia eludebat, probe intelligens, ſapientis virtutem per ea, quibus petitur, illuſtrari. *Ibid.*

(16) Ibid. pag. 542.

(17) Ibid.]

(18) Apud Witten, pag. 553.

1672, in 8vo. Ludg. Bat. 1672, in 12mo. *De ira cohibenda diſputatio:* Roſtoch. 1611, in 4to. *Oratio de vita & obitu Pauli Merulæ:* ibid. 1607, in 4to. & Ludg. Bat. 1672, in 12mo. Εὐχαεισήειον, *de Pacificatione Boitzenburgenſi ad Legatos Ordinum Unitarum Belgii Provinciarum:* Lubecæ, 1620, in 4to. *Oratio de vita & obitu Georgii Stampelii, Eccleſiæ Lubecenſis Superintendentis, habita:* ibid. 1622, in 4to. *De Annulis liber ſingularis:* ibid. 1623, Sleſvigæ, 1657. Francof. 1672, in 8vo. Ludg. Bat. 1672, in 12mo. *Rudimenta Rhetorica:* Bremæ, 1652, in 12mo. *Rudimenta Logicæ Peripateticæ:* Lub. 1669, & *ſæpius* in 8vo. *Tabulæ Logicæ & Rhetoricæ:* ibid. in Folio. *Genethliacon Illuſtriſſimi Principis, Adolphi Friderici, Ducis Megapolitani, Primogenito Filio ſcriptum:* ibid. 1624, in 4to. He deſigned to publiſh a manuſcript, with notes, which did not come out till 1684, by the care of his grandſon (19).

KIRSTENIUS (Peter) profeſſor of Phyſic at Upſal, and Phyſician extraordinary to the queen of Sweden, was born at Breſlaw, the capital city of Sileſia, the twenty fifth of December 1577. He learned, in his own country, Latin, Greek, a little Hebrew and Syriac, Natural Philoſophy, Anatomy, and Botany; after which he went to ſee the univerſities of Leipſic, Wittemberg, and Iëna; and, having improved much in four years time, under the profeſſors of thoſe three univerſities, he travelled into the Low-Countries, and into France. He had heard ſay, that, in order to be eminent in the practice of Phyſic, it was neceſſary to underſtand Avicenna; whereupon he was very deſirous to learn Arabic, for he knew that the tranſlation of that Phyſician's works was very bad. He therefore applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Arabic, and deſigned to read not only Avicenna, but alſo Meſue, Rhaſis, Abenzoar, Abukaſis and Averroës. He was confirmed in this deſign by Scaliger and Caſaubon, who thought him capable of maſtering that language, to the great advantage of the Republic of Letters (a). This inclination did not retard his deſire of travelling. He ſaw Italy, Spain, England [A], and ſpent ſeven years in his travels, before he came home again. He took his degree of doctor of Phyſic at Baſil, being twenty four years of age. A little after his return into Sileſia, he went to Iëna, and married there; afterwards he was invited by the magiſtrates of Breſlaw, to be director of their college, and ſchools. A fit of ſickneſs obliging him to quit that painful employment, which beſides he was weary of, he applied himſelf wholly to Phyſic, and the ſtudy of the Arabic. Nay, he gave the preference to that language [B], and made it appear, that he was born to ſucceed in it. He added a great deal of piety to the practice of Phyſic [C]. We are not told why he removed with his family into Pruſſia; but that removal proved advantageous to him; for it gave him an opportunity of being admitted into chancellor Oxenſtiern's houſe, who took him into Sweden, where he was honoured with the profeſſorſhip of Phyſic in the univerſity of Upſal, in the year 1636; and was alſo made Phyſician to the queen. He would have diſcharged much better the duties

[A] *He ſaw Italy, Spain, and England.*] The funeral oration ſtops there, and ſpeaks not of Kirſtenius's travels in Greece and Aſia. But they are mentioned in his epitaph. ‘ Neve huic ſatis fuit tot vidiſſe populos Europæ celeberrimos, ni matrem olim artium ‘ permearet Græciam, & Alcurani ſedem permigraret ‘ Aſiam, vinoſamque per Hungariam reverteret (1). ‘ ——— *Nor was he ſatisfied with ſeeing the moſt famous people of Europe: he travelled through Greece, ‘ formerly the mother of arts, and Aſia, the ſeat of ‘ Mahometiſm, and returned thro' Hungary, famous for ‘ it's wines.*’ Such travels were ſuitable to his intentions.

[B] *He even gave the preference to the Arabic.*] For he not only beſtowed on that ſtudy all the time that he ſtole from the practice of Phyſic, but alſo ſpent, upon the impreſſion of Arabic books, all that he ſaved out of his gain. ‘ Quicquid ſucciſivi temporis laborioſæ ‘ praxi Medicæ ſuffurari potuit, hoc excolendæ Arabicæ linguæ totum deſtinavit: adeo ut cum linguâ ‘ iſthæc, velut cæteræ, ſuperiorum facultatum, ut vocant, & imprimis Medicinæ miniſtra eſſe debuiſſet, ‘ contra praxis Medica iſti linguæ ſæpe ſerviret: dum ‘ quicquid herus inde lucri redundantis abradere potuit, illud Arabicæ typographiæ adornandæ, & monumentis in illa edendis impendit (2).’ His Panegyriſt had reaſon to ſay, that few men make ſuch an uſe of their gain. They, who have a profitable profeſſion, are infinitely more careful to buy lands, or put their money out at intereſt, or to eat and drink well, than to be at the expence of printing books. ‘ Raro ſane & laudando exemplo. Quales ſunt hujus ‘ ævi mores, plerique ſi rem faciant, aut fœnori eam ‘ locant, aut fundis emendis, aut gulæ deputant. In ‘ publicandis ingenii monumentis ſumptus facere, rem ‘ ſterilem eſſe credunt, & quæ nihil hæredem juvet (3).’ To the ſhame of learning, the profeſſors of it are wholly bent on growing rich in lands and money:

Dives agris, dives poſitis in fœnore nummis (4);

and they follow this bad maxim,

Vos ſapere & ſolos aio bene vivere, quorum
Conſpicitur nitidis fundata pecunia villis (5).

Wiſdom and happineſs is theirs alone,
Whoſe wealth in villas and eſtates is ſhewn.

[C] *He added a great deal of piety to the practice of Phyſic.*] This would be no leſs a rarity, than his diſintereſtedneſs, if the common reports concerning the religion of Phyſicians are to be believed. It is ſaid, that Kirſtenius expected nothing from remedies, without the divine aſſiſtance, and made the ſucceſs of Phyſic depend on the bleſſing of heaven. ‘ Auſpicium ſuorum laborum à pietate Chriſtiana fecit, quam Æſculapius ignorabat. Noſter autem ſenex ſciebat, virtutem herbarum & uſum medendi inutilem eſſe ſine ‘ virtute divina; itaque à Deo, cui ſoli eſt poteſtas ‘ ſumma in omnia à ſe creata, in ipſam vitam & mortem hominum, Medicinæ felicitatem & ſucceſſum petendum eſſe (6).’ Nay, it ſeems that commonly he did not undertake to cure his patients, till after they were reconciled to God (7). He uſed likewiſe to encourage them, by exhorting them to truſt in God, who in a moment can cure the moſt deſperate diſeaſes, unleſs he thinks fit to tranſlate his children from this vale of tears into heaven. ‘ Ægroti malo ex lege humanitatis indolebat, eumque bono animo eſſe Deoque fidere jubebat, etiam in morbo dubiæ ſalutis, quod ‘ cum Comico ſciret, bonum animum in re mala dimidium eſſe mali. Ægrotum jam à Medico deſertum, vel ſolo Dei nutu facile ad ſanitatem reduci ‘ poſſe, ſi Deo volenti, ipſi ſaluti eſſet. Aut ex hac ‘ calamitoſa vita ad meliorem transferri (8).’ He was very careful to frequent pious exerciſes; he began and ended the day with the reading of the Bible; and he had read that ſacred book ſixteen times from the beginning to the end. ‘ A Bibliorum lectione diem ordiens ‘ & claudens, multoties illa pervolutavit. Sedecies ‘ ab illo perlecta liberi ferunt (9). He died very piouſly (10).

[D] *He*

2

(19) *See the* Nouv de la Rep. des Lettres, February, 1685, art. II.

(a) Qui cum indolem hominis viderent, animum verbis & exemplis addiderunt, ut pertenderet, atque iſtas literas, quæ nondum inter Chriſtianos debitum cultum & nitorem accepiſſent, à barbarie vindicaret ac liberali manu aſſereret. Iſtud magno fore Reipub. literariæ bono, & ſibi ornamento illuſtriori. *Orat. Funebr. Kirſtenii, apud Witten, Memor. Medicor. pag.* 114.

(1) Apud Witten, Memoriæ Medicorum, pag. 122.

(2) Orat. Funebr. Kirſtenii, apud Witten, ibid. pag. 115.

(3) Ibid.

(4) Horat. Sat. II, lib. i, ver. 13.

(5) Idem, Epiſt. XV, lib 1, ver. 45, 46 *Compare the remark* [B] *of the article* HORSTIUS (James).

(6) Orat. Funbr. Kirſtenii, pag. 117.

(7) Ita ægroti non minus Deo reconciliati curationem aggrediebatur Ab ægrotis tamen invaletudine adhuc recenti quam ingraveſcente advocari malebat, præſertim in gravibus & acutis morbis *Ibid.*

(8) Ibid. pag. 118.

(9) Ibid. pag. 119, 120.

(10) Ibid. pag. 121.

duties of his profeſſorſhip, if the ſtrength of his body had been anſwerable to the vigour of his mind; but he was very much worn out, and lived but till the eighth of April 1640 (*b*). He publiſhed ſeveral books [*D*]. It is ſaid in his epitaph, that he underſtood twenty ſix languages.

(*b*) *Taken from his Funeral Oration delivered by John Loccenius, his colleague, profeſſor of the Civil Law. Witten has inserted it in his* Memoriæ Medicorum.

[*D*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] The following catalogue is to be found at the end of his funeral oration (11). *Decas Sacra Canticorum & Carminum Arabicorum ex aliquot MSS. cum Latina interpretatione.* Breſlæ, 1609. *Evangeliſtarum quatuor ex antiquiſſimo Codice MSS. Arabico Cæſareo erutæ.* Francof. 1609. in Folio. *Tria Specimina Characterum Arabicorum, nempe Oratio Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, Pſalm. L. &c.* ibid. 1609, in Folio. *Grammatica Arabica*, ibid. 1609, in Folio. *Liber Secundus, de Canone Canonis à filio Sina ſtudio, ſumptibus ac typis Arabicis, quâ potuit fieri fide, ex Aſiatico & Africano exemplari MSS. Cæſareo Arabicè per partes editus, & ad verbum in Latin. tranſlatus, notiſque textum concernentibus illuſtratus*, ibid. 1610, in Folio. *Epiſtola S. Judæ ex MSS. Heidelbergenſi Arabico ad verbum tranſlata, additis notis ex textuum Græcorum & verſionis Latinæ vulgaris collatione*, Breſlæ, 1611, in Folio. *Liber de vero uſu & abuſu Medicinæ*, Francof. 1610. & *Germanicè*, ibid. 1611, in 8vo. *Oratio Introductoria in Gymnaſio Uratiſlavienſium habita*, ibid. 1611, in 4to. *Notæ in Evangelium S. Matthæi, ex collatione textuum Arabicorum, Syriacorum, Ægyptiacorum, Græcorum & Latinorum*, Breſlæ, 1612, in Folio. Ὑποτύπωσις, *ſive informatio Medicæ artis ſtudioſo perutilis, aliquandiu in Pharmacopolio verſaturo Caſpari Peuceri, edita è MSS. Petri Kirſtenii.* Upſaliæ, 1638, in 8vo.

(11) Apud Witten, ubi ſupra, pag. 124.

KNOT (*a*) (EDWARD) an Engliſhman, born in Northumberland, turned Jeſuit at twenty ſix years of age; which was in the year 1606, being already a prieſt. He taught a long time at Rome in the Engliſh college; afterwards he was made ſub-provincial of the province of England, and, after he had exerciſed that employment out of the kingdom, he was ſent thither to perform the functions of provincial. That employment was twice conferred upon him. He aſſiſted in the quality of provincial at the general aſſembly of the order held at Rome in the year 1646, and was elected Definitor. He died at London the fourteenth of January, in 1656 (*b*). Alegambe placed, among the works of this Jeſuit, a piece which concerns the hierarchy [*A*], and diſpleaſed the biſhops. Southwell has left it out. We ſhall ſee in one of the remarks his catalogue of the books of Edward Knot [*B*].

(*a*) Vero nomine Matthias Wilſonus. *Sotuel, ubi infra.*

(*b*) Sotuel, in Bibl. Script. Soc. Jeſu, pag. 185.

[*A*] *Alegambe has placed, among his works, a piece, which concerns the hierarchy*] Alegambe ſpeaks thus. ‘Scripſit doctiſſimum libellum, qui ſub nomine Nicolai Smithei eſt editus hac epigraphe, *Modeſta & brevis diſcuſſio aliquarum aſſertionum D. Doctoris Kelliſoni, quas in ſuo de Eccleſiaſtica Hierarchia tractatu probare conatur*, ex Anglico in Latinum à Georgio Wrighto converſa, & plurimis Doctorum atque adeo Catholicarum Univerſitatum ſuffragiis approbata (1). —— *He wrote a very learned piece, which was publiſhed under the name of Nicolas Smith, with this title*; A modeſt and ſhort Examination of ſome Aſſertions of Dr Kelliſon, which he endeavours to prove in his Treatiſe of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, *tranſlated out of Engliſh into Latin by George Wright, and approved by ſeveral doctors and Catholic univerſities.*’ This book was printed at Antwerp, in the year 1631, in 12mo. I am ſatisfied, that moſt of my readers will be pleaſed to find here the occaſion and progreſs of this hierarchical diſpute. You muſt know then, that Richard Smith, biſhop of Chalcedon, having received the authority of an ordinary over the Catholics of England, in the year 1626, went into that iſland a little after. He undertook to extend his juriſdiction over the Jeſuits, and the other Regulars; but he met with ſo many obſtacles, that he was obliged to deſiſt, and to return into France. They perceived, that the charities, which were beſtowed upon this prelate, that he might keep up the dignity of his character, came no longer to them, which did not pleaſe them; therefore they formed a party ſo artfully, that they obliged the biſhop to retire. This retreat was quickly followed by a furious paper-war. The firſt that entered the liſts, was Dr Kelliſon, profeſſor at Doüay; he wrote in defence of the biſhop's authority. Knot, provincial of the Jeſuits, anſwered him under the name of Nicolas Smith (2). A little after, a book came out upon this ſubject (3), the author whereof took the name of Daniel à Jeſu, though his name was John Floyd. He was a Jeſuit, profeſſor at St Omer. The archbiſhop of Paris cenſured the books of both theſe Jeſuits: the Sorbonne, and the general aſſembly of the clergy of France, did the ſame: (4) *Which was ſo far from ſtopping the mouths of the Jeſuits*, that it engaged them to reprint their books in the Latin tongue, with great approbations. They publiſhed alſo a remonſtrance againſt the biſhop of Chalcedon, in the name of the Catholics of England. The ſecular clergy publiſhed, the ſame year, 1631, three pieces, in England (5), ‘in oppoſition to the Jeſuits, who were ſo far from quitting the field by reaſon of the number of their enemies, that they began a freſh combat againſt both the Sorbonne doctors, and the French clergy, under the feigned name of Hermannus Loemelius, whoſe chief author was the above-named Jeſuit Floyd, with the aſſiſtance of his brethren, as the diverſity of the ſtyle ſhews. And another book came out againſt the faculty of Paris, in vindication of Knot, or Nicolas Smith, with many approbations of biſhops, univerſities, and private doctors, and in vindication of the propoſitions of Ireland, which had been likewiſe cenſured at Paris. Another book came forth, under the name of Edmondus Urſulanus, whoſe true name was Macmahone, prior of the Franciſcan convent in Louvain. About the ſame time the Jeſuits publiſhed their cenſure (6) of the Apoſtolical Creed, in imitation of the cenſures, at Paris, againſt their doctrines (as though their doctrines were as certain as that, and themſelves as infallible as the apoſtles:) wherein they charge the biſhops, their enemies, with reviving old hereſies, and broaching new ones. The Jeſuits, having now done ſuch great things, triumph unreaſonably in all places, as having utterly overthrown their enemies, and beaten them out of the field: when, in a little time after, Hallier and Le Maiſtre, two doctors of the Sorbonne, undertake the quarrel againſt them; but none was ſo highly magnified, and infinitely applauded by the French clergy, as a perſon under the diſguiſed name of *Petrus Aurelius*; whoſe atchievements in this kind they celebrated, next to thoſe of the Pucelle d'Orleans, and printed all theſe works together at their own charge: and wrote a high elogium of him, which is prefixed to them. The ſecular clergy of England ſent him a letter of congratulation on his triumphs, ſubſcribed by John Colleton, dean of the chapter, and Edmond Dutton, ſecretary; wherein they ſadly lament the diſcords that have been among them here, and the hereſies broached by their adverſaries, occaſioned by them. The main of this controverſy related to the dignity, neceſſity, and juriſdiction of the epiſcopal order; as appears by the cenſures of the biſhops of France, and by Aurelius, who ſays, “* that although the diſpute began on occaſion of the biſhop of Chalcedon, and the Engliſh clergy, yet it was now carried farther, to wit, whether the epiſcopal order was neceſſary to the being of a particular church? whether it was by divine right, or no? whether confirmation might be given without biſhops? whether the epiſcopal order was more perfect than the monaſtical? whether the regulars were under the juriſdiction of biſhops (7)?”.

DISPUTE concerning epiſcopal juriſdiction between the Jeſuits and the other Catholics.

[*B*] *We ſhall ſee . . . . . Alegambe's catalogue of the books of Edward Knot.*] *Mercy and Truth*; *or, Charity maintained by Catholics.* It is a book printed at at St Omer, in 1634, in 4to, againſt Dr Potter, who had charged the church of Rome with want of charity, in maintaining, that Proteſtancy deſtroyeth ſalvation. *Chriſtianity maintained*, againſt the reply of Chillingworth, at St Omer, in 1638, in 4to. *A Direction to be obſerved by N. N.* (*i. e.* Chillingworth), at London, 1636, in 8vo. *Infidelity Unmasked: or, the confutation of a book of Mr Chillingworth, intituled, The Religion of Proteſtants, a ſafe way to ſalvation*, at Ghent, 1652, in 4to. His *Monita utiliſſima pro patribus Miſſionis Anglicanæ* (8), have not been printed. We may eaſily gueſs, that ſome political reaſons hindred the publication of this laſt book.

---

(1) Alegambe, Biblioth. Script. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 99.

(2) *A Jeſuit, who was lately dead.*

(3) *Intituled*, Apologia S. Sedis Apoſtolicæ quoad modum procedendi circa regimen Catholicorum in Anglia, 1631, in 8vo. *Alegambe, pag. 242, mentions it; but Southwell ſays nothing of it.*

(4) Stillingfleet, ubi infra, citat. (7), pag. 394.

(5) Idem, pag. 394, 395, 396.

(6) *See, above, remark* [*A*], *of the article* GEDICCUS.

* Petri Aurelii, Opera, Tom. I, pag. 62.

(7) *Taken from a book of Dr Stillingfleet, intituled*, A Diſcourſe concerning the idolatry practiſed in the Church of Rome. *London*, 1676, *pag.* 421, & ſeq. *See alſo the Letters, intituled*, Les Imaginaires, letter iii, pag. m. 49, & ſeq.

(8) *See Nathan. Southwell, pag.* 185.

KNOX (John) a Scotch miniſter, was one of the principal inſtruments in the work of the Reformation, in his own country, in the XVIth century. He had been a diſciple of John Major, one of the ſubtileſt ſchoolmen of that time; whoſe ſteps he followed ſo ſucceſsfully, in teaching ſchool Divinity, that, in ſome things, he was more ſubtile than he; but, having examined St Jerom's and St Auguſtin's books, he quite altered his taſte, betook himſelf to a plain and ſolid Theology, diſcovered abundance of errors, and publiſhed a confeſſion of faith, which made him paſs for a Heretic. He was impriſoned [*A*]; and, had he not fortunately eſcaped, he had died upon the ſcaffold. He retired into England, where he was ſo much eſteemed by king Edward, that he might have been made a biſhop: but he was extreamly angry when they offered him a biſhopric; he rejected it as a thing, that ſavoured too much of Antichriſtianiſm [*B*]. After the death of that prince, he left England, that he might not fall into the hands of the perſecutors, and retired to Francfort, and afterwards to Geneva, where he preached to the refugees of his country, and entered into a ſtrict friendſhip with John Calvin. He returned into Scotland in the year 1559, and laboured to eſtabliſh the Proteſtant doctrines with an extraordinary zeal, both by word of mouth and in writing. His enemies having expelled him from Edinburgh, he retired to St Andrews, where the devil raiſed him many enemies, and eſpecially when he oppoſed certain perſons, who conſpired againſt the royal majeſty (*a*). The news of the Paris maſſacre overwhelmed him with grief; but he quickly found himſelf comforted by the ſucceſs of affairs in Scotland. The baniſhed were recalled to Edinburgh and he among the reſt (*b*), where he reſumed the functions of the miniſtry. They granted him the colleague he deſired, and he inſtalled him, the ninth of November 1572, and this was the laſt ſermon that he preached. He fell ſick a little after, and, till the twenty fourth of November following, which was the day of his death, he was altogether taken up with pious diſcourſes to his wife, his ſervant, and thoſe who viſited him (*c*). He lived fifty ſeven years (*d*). Nothing can be more abuſive, than what Moreri ſays of our John Knox, from Spondanus. Thoſe paſſages have been left out in the Dutch editions. The misfortune is, that the epiſcopal clergy of England agree with the Popiſh authors

(*a*) Quo ut primum venit multos illi Satanas excitavit hoſtes, præſertim cum ſe illis qui contra regiam majeſtatem conſpirarant oppoſuiſſet. *Melch. Adam. in Vit. Theol. Exter. pag.* 138.

(*b*) *It does not appear, that Beza knew he had been expelled from thence.*

(*c*) *Taken from his Life in Melchior Adam*, ubi ſupra.

(*d*) Beza, in Iconibus.

[*A*] *He was impriſoned.*] Melchior Adam gives us here but a lame account, and in ſome things contrary to that of Beza. Let us rectify it, and ſay, that John Knox, not being contented with renouncing the ſchool divinity, but having alſo very freely cenſured ſeveral other things, was forced to leave Edinburgh, and eſcape to Hameſton, the only ſanctuary of the faithful at that time (1). He there (2) publiſhed a confeſſion of faith, the conſequence whereof was, that David Beton, archbiſhop of St Andrews, cauſed him to be condemned for contumacy, as a Heretic, and degraded him from the prieſthood (3), and that he would have been aſſaſſinated, had not a Scotch gentleman ſaved him. Great revolutions followed. This archbiſhop, who was alſo a cardinal, was killed: the French made themſelves maſters of the fortreſs of St Andrews: Knox fell into their hands, and obtained his deliverance, and betook himſelf to Berwick, an Engliſh town on the borders of Scotland. He there diſputed, according to Beza, with the biſhop of that place (4) *illius civitatis pſeud Epiſcopo*: their diſpute was referred to the parliament of England, who adjudged the victory to Knox. ‘Utroque ad ſupremum Angliæ ſenatum rejecto, (tum ‘autem Eduardus regnare cœperat) tantum effecit ut ‘victoria penes veritatem ſtante, damnaretur quidem ‘falſæ religionis pſeudepiſcopus, ipſum vero tum pie‘tas, tum diligentia magnopere commendaret (5).’ I cannot tell whether this diſpute was not the ſame with that which happened to John Knox in the dioceſe of Durham. He was obliged to ſpeak his thoughts concerning the maſs, and he expoſed, in a ſermon, with ſo much ſtrength, the blaſphemy and idolatry of that ſacrifice, that biſhop Tonſtal, and his doctors, could give him no good anſwer. I ſuſpect they have made two events of one. However, here is the proof of what I have ſaid concerning this ſermon. ‘Specimen ejus il‘luſtre depoſuit tum alias, tum anno 1550, in terra ‘Dunelmenſi: quando coactus coram Epiſcopo *Tonſtal‘lo* & ejus doctoribus ſuper Miſſa Pontificia opinio‘nem ſuam exponere; pro concione illius idololatrias ‘& horrendas blaſphemias tam ſolidis argumentis de‘monſtravit, ut adverſarii, quod vere opponerent, non ‘haberent (6).’ Perhaps, Knox's life (7), which I have not by me, if conſulted, would clear this matter. We ſhall, in the next place, ſee what the king did for him.

[*B*] *He might have been made a biſhop; but he rejected it as a thing, that ſavoured too much of Antichriſtianiſm.*] His zeal againſt the hierarchy appeared upon that occaſion, for this we find in Melchior Adam, at the 137th page of the lives of foreign divines. ‘Cum ‘Epiſcopatus de Regis voluntate Cnoxo eſſet oblatus, ‘indignabundus Cnoxus non ſolum honorem recuſa‘vit, ſed etiam Oratione gravi titulos illos improba‘vit, quaſi regni Antichriſtiani quiddam redolentes.’ His refuſal of ſuch an office is very much praiſed by Beza, who, doubtleſs, whatever ſome modern miniſters may ſay of it, was fully perſuaded, with his colleagues, that the equality of paſtors is of divine right, and that therefore the eccleſiaſtical hierarchy is a fundamental corruption. Here are ſome ſharp ſtrokes of Beza againſt epiſcopacy. ‘Inde Novocaſtrum ac de‘inceps Londinum ad Regem accito (Knoxo) quum ‘Epiſcopatus quidam offerretur, tantum abeſt ut illum ‘receperit, ut etiam in totam illam verè Satanicam ‘poteſtatem graviter ſit invectus, ut quæ divino jure ‘nullo nitatur, ac ne ex veteribus quidem canonibus ‘adminiſtretur: qua in re, etſi non obtinuit (quod ſi ‘in Anglia & alibi factum eſſet, id eſt ſi cauſa illa ‘Tyrannidis omnis Eccleſiaſticæ præcipua & primaria ‘eſſet ſublata, longè alia facies Eccleſiarum eſſet) con‘ſcientiam tamen ſuam ſingulari cum Chriſtianæ Mo‘deſtiæ exemplo liberavit (8). —— *Knox, being ſent ‘for by the king to Newcaſtle, and afterwards to Lon‘don, and being offered a certain biſhopric, was ſo far ‘from accepting it, that he inveighed heavily againſt ‘all that truly diabolical power, as not founded on di‘vine right, nor even ſupported by the antient canons: ‘in which though he did not prevail (which if it were ‘brought about in England, and elſewhere, that is, if ‘that principal cauſe of eccleſiaſtical tyranny, were ‘taken away, the church would wear a quite different ‘face) yet he diſcharged his conſcience with a ſingular ‘inſtance of Chriſtian modeſty.*’

[C] *The*

(1) Hameſtonum unicum tunc piorum aſylum perfugere cogeretur. *Beza, in Iconibus.*

(2) *And not at Edinburgh, as Melchior Adam affirms*, in Vitis Theol Exteror. pag. 137.

(3) *Melchior Adam is guilty of a conſiderable omiſſion, in not ſaying, that Knox was a prieſt.*

(4) *Berwick is not an epiſcopal town: Beza expreſſes himſelf wrong.*

(5) Beza, ubi ſupra.

(6) Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra, pag. 142.

(7) *Written by Thomas Smeton.*

(8) Beza, in Iconib. *A little after he has theſe words:* Non veram tantum doctrinam, ſed etiam veram & ad divini verbi normam exactam diſciplinam paſſim tum verbis, tum reipſa ſtatuerit. . . . . Sibi non in ulla gradus pſeud-Epiſcopatus tyrannide cui merito fuit inimiciſſimus, ſed in Evangelico miniſterio una cum reliquis Collegis & Preſbyteris æquo prorſus jure adminiſtrando, Joannem Lauſonium ſucceſſorem deſignatum amplexus. - - - *He eſtabliſhed not only true doctrine, but even true evangelical diſcipline, both in words and facts . . . Being deſervedly an enemy to every degree of epiſcopal tyranny, and rightly diſcharging his miniſterial duty, together with the reſt of his colleagues and preſbyters, he appointed John Lauſon to ſucceed him.*

thors in aſperſing him as an apoſtle, who eſtabliſhed his reformation by fire and ſword [*C*], and who taught the moſt ſeditious doctrines [*D*]. I have not been able to verify by the reading of his works, whether all that is imputed to him be true: but when I conſider the anſwers that are made for him [*E*], I cannot doubt, but that his opinions concerning

[*C*] *The biſhops of England agree with the Papiſts, in aſperſing him as an apoſtle, who eſtabliſhed his reformation by fire and ſword.*] Spondanus, having ſaid that Knox, an apoſtate prieſt and Monk, a corrupter of many women, and even of his mother-in-law, and a Magician, was returned into Scotland with full inſtructions from Calvin, in the year 1559, adds what follows. ‘Adeo prædicationibus ſuis & invectivis rem auxit, ut non ſolùm paſſim templa & monaſteria deſtructa fuerint, ſacra conculcata, imagines confractæ, ornamenta & bona expilata, exturbati monachi, ſacerdotes pulſi, Epiſcopi ejecti; verùm etiam omnis obedientia Regenti renunciata, omniſque auctoritas abrogata, & in quorundam, quos tanquam conſiliarios eligebant, tranſlata (9). —— *He ſo far prevailed by his ſermons and invectives, that not only churches and monaſteries were demoliſhed in many places, images broken to pieces, ornaments deſtroyed, the Monks, prieſts, and biſhops driven out; but all obedience to the Regent renounced, all authority abrogated, and veſted in certain perſons, whom he pitched upon as his counſellors.*’ He ſays in another place (10), relating the different opinions of thoſe, who voted concerning the deſtiny of queen Mary Stuart, that ſome, by Knox's advice, were for putting her immediately to death. Laſtly, he ſays, that king James recommended it to his ſon not to read Buchanan's libels, nor Knox's chronicle, but on the contrary to puniſh ſeverely ſuch as kept thoſe pernicious books, and to ſuppoſe, according to the doctrine of Pythagoras, that the ſouls of thoſe ſeditious authors were tranſmigrated into the bodies of ſuch as read them, or maintained their opinions, and that therefore they deſerved the ſame puniſhment, as would be juſtly inflicted upon thoſe authors, if they were raiſed from the dead. ‘Haud tamen famoſos libros Buchanani, aut Knoxii Chronica evolveret: ſed ſi quod ejuſmodi ſcriptum inveniret, cum ejus depoſitariis ex legis ſeveritate ageret. In eo Pythagoræ diſcipulum ſe profiteretur; ut exiſtimaret ipſos manes iſtorum ſeditionum flabellorum metampſychoſi quadam in eorum corpora tranſiſſe, qui eorum vel libros retinerent, vel dogmata defenderent: eoſque non minori ſupplicio plectendos, quàm ſi ipſi auctores jam à mortuis eſſent reſuſcitati (11).’ He cites the ſecond book of the *Baſilicon Doron*: I have conſulted it, and find nothing in it but what follows. ‘I do not mean thoſe hiſtories full of gall and invectives, thoſe defamatory libels, which ought neither to be read nor kept by your ſubjects under great penalties, which you ought to lay upon them. For in this caſe I would have you, as a diſciple of Pythagoras, believe that the ſouls of thoſe inſtigators of ſedition are paſſed into thoſe that keep their writings, and defend their opinions; who ought to be puniſhed neither more nor leſs than the authors themſelves.’ Theſe are king James's words; ſee the *Baſilicon Doron.* Spondanus goes beyond the bounds of an hiſtorian, when he makes king James expreſsly quote theſe two authors: he ſhould have been contented to ſay by conjecture, that this prince meant them. Let us ſee what the epiſcoparians cited by Brerley ſay; for, not being able to come at their books, I have been forced to depend on him, and to tranſcribe what he cites, whether in the body of the page or in the margin (12). ‘*Et primo quidem de Joanne Knoxio . . . . notum atque ipſorum Proteſtantium teſtimonio confirmatum eſt, eum poſtquam Geneva in Scotiam rediiſſet, Religionem vi & armis ad phantaſiam ſuam ibi reformare aggreſſum eſſe*, Cumque Caſtrum Sancti Andreæ clanculariis inſidiis occupaſſet *, & Cardinalem horrendo aſſaſſinatu in cubiculo ſuo occidiſſet, & ob id ſcelus a Regina Stryulingam ad jus dicendum vocatus fuiſſet †, nec compareret, perduellem declaratum eſſe. Ille vero audaciam non deponens, ſed confirmans, mox Perthæ turbas ciere. Magiſtratum Sancti Joannes & Dundeæ cum plebe ibidem tumultuante ut imagines, & Altaria, per omnes Eccleſias, & monaſteria, aliaque Religioſorum domicilia undique per circuitum diruerent, hortari: ipſe autem poſt concionem qua talia auditoribus ſuaſit, habitam, Carthuſianorum, Prædicatorum, & Carmelitarum Domos ſubvertere, Imagines & Altaria Fiſæ, Anguſæ, Mernæ, & aliis in locis deſtruere, & ſic omnes Religionis illius Eccleſias (novo ſcilicet modo) reformare pergebat. *Poſt hæc inquit Bancroftus (qui & ipſius Knoxii Chronicon citatis ipſis foliis ubi ſingula facta narrantur, in teſtimonium adducit* ⸸.) Alia vice coierunt reformatores ad Sancti Andreæ, ubi ex inſtigatione Knoxii pro concione tam fratrum Religioſorum domos, quam reliqua illius oppidi Monaſteria ſpoliarunt, dejecerunt, vaſtarunt. Idem Sconi, Stryulingæ, Lithquo, & Edenburgi patrarunt: Regina ob metum fugam capeſcente, duobus menſibus in campo caſtra metati ſunt, & monetæ cudendæ inſtrumenta diripuerunt, & factum defenderunt, &c. Reginam mentitam eſſe ſæpe conviciati ſunt, eamque indigniſſimis lædoriis onerarunt, eique obedientiam præſtare renuerunt, immo eam ‡ omni authoritate regali exuerunt, expreſſo inſtrumento ad id a Knoxio exarato. —— And firſt as to John Knox . . . . it is known, and confirmed by the teſtimony of the Proteſtants, that, after his return from Geneva into Scotland, he attempted to reform religion there, after his own fancy, and by force; *and, that having by treachery ſeized the caſtle of St Andrews, and barbarouſly murdered the cardinal, and being ſent for by the queen to Sterling, to anſwer for that crime, and not appearing, he was declared a rebel. But he, not in the leaſt terrified, ſoon after raiſed commotions at Perth. He exhorted the magiſtrates of St John and Dundee, together with the tumultuous mob, to demoliſh the images and altars in all the churches and monaſteries round about, together with other religious houſes: and he himſelf, after a ſermon, in which he adviſed his hearers to do ſo, deſtroyed the houſes of the Carthuſians, preaching Fryars, and Carmelites, and threw down the images and altars at Fiſe, Angus, Merns, and other places; and thus went on, in this new manner, to reform all the churches of that religion.* After this, ſays Bancroſt, (who alledges the chronicle of Knox himſelf, and the very pages, where each fact is mentioned, in proof of what he ſays). *Another time, the Reformers met at St Andrews, where, at the inſtigation of Knox, they pulled down, and plundered all the monaſteries of that town. They did the ſame at Scoone, Sterling, Lithgow, and Edinburgh. The queen flying away thro' fear, they encamped two months in the fields, and ſeized on the mint, &c. They often reproached the queen with a lie, inſulting her after a ſhameful manner, refuſing obedience to her, and even deprived her of the regal authority by an expreſs inſtrument drawn up by Knox.*’

[*D*] . . . . . *and who taught the moſt ſeditious doctrines.*] Let us hear Brerley again, page 625. ‘*Summa autem opinionis ejus, ut ex ſcriptis ſuis colligitur, & ex ipſo folio pro qualibet harum aſſertionum citato patet, his propoſitionibus (quas citat Bancroftus* ** *continetur,* †† Proceres tenentur ſi modo Rex nolit, Religionem reformare. Plebis ⸸⸸ eſt Religionem reformare. ‡‡ Deus conſtituit Proceres ad effrænes Principum appetitus coercendos. *** Principes ob juſtas cauſas deponi poſſunt. ††† Si Principes adverſus Deum ac veritatem ejus tyriannicè ſe gerant, ſubditi eorum à juramento fidelitatis abſolvuntur. *Cum pleriſque aliis id genus dogmatibus.* —— The ſum of his opinion, as is collected from his writings, and appears from the very leaf, cited for each of theſe aſſertions, is contained in theſe propoſitions, quoted by Bancroft; *The nobility are obliged, if the king will not, to reform religion. It is the buſineſs of the vulgar to reform religion. God appointed the nobility to reſtrain the unbridled appetites of princes. Princes may be depoſed for juſt reaſons. If princes behave themſelves tyrannically againſt God, and his truth, their ſubjects are abſolved from their oath of fidelity.* With many the like tenets.’ Compare with this the words of Petra Sancta, which ſhall be cited in the following remark.

[*E*] *When I conſider the anſwers that are made for him.*] The firſt thing I am to ſay, is, that thoſe, who defame the actions and opinions of our Knox, maliciouſly concerning the royal authority were ſuch as the epiſcopal clergy, and the Catholic party maliciouſly preſuppoſe, that he acted in concert with Calvin, and brought from Geneva the notions that he advanced in Scotland (13). With this view, they affect to produce the encomiums, which Calvin and Beza beſtowed upon him. We muſt hear Brerley, page 619. ‘ *Hinc Joan. Knoxius ſcholæ* ⸸⸸⸸ *Genevæ diſcipulus (quem Calvinus* ‡‡‡ Virum inſignem vocat & fratrem ſuum reverendum) *doctrinæ Calvini probe conſcius, ex opinione Calvini & aliorum quorundam Miniſtrorum Genevæ commorantium (teſte* * *Sutcliffo & Bancrofto) docuit:* Licere ſubditis ſi Principes nollent, immo ſi id opus eſſet, vi & armis Religionem reformare. *Hinc eſt quod licet doctrina & facta Goodmanni & Knoxii ſic conjurationi faveant, ut id nulla tergiverſatione celari poſſit, eos tamen ambos Calvinus* † fratres ſuos venerandos nominet, *& audacem Knoxii in eo genere temeritatem laudet* ⸸, quem egregiam Chriſto & Eccleſiæ operam navaſſe ait ‡, & ſe vehementer lætari dicit, quod tam fœlices & lætos progreſſus fecerit. —— Hence John Knox, a diſciple of the ſchool of Geneva, (whom Calvin calls *an excellent man, and his reverend brother*) being well acquainted with Calvin's doctrine, taught, agreeably to the opinion of Calvin, and other miniſters reſiding at Geneva, (as Sutcliff and Bancroft witneſs): that *ſubjects are at liberty, if princes refuſe, and there be occaſion for it, to reform religion by force.* Hence it is, that tho' the doctrine and actions of Goodman and Knox are ſo favourable to conſpiracy, that they cannot pretend to deny it, yet Calvin calls them both *his reverend brothers*, and commends the bold raſhneſs of Knox, *who*, he ſays, *was of great ſervice to Chriſt and the church, and he rejoices greatly*, he ſays, *at the happy ſucceſs of his endeavoars.*’ They do not forget that Beza, in Icones, calls him the apoſtle of Scotland. ‘ A quibus (*Anglis*), *ſays Spondanus under the year* 1559 n. 30. (14) ad Scotos tranſeuntibus primus occurrit magnus ille JOANNES KNOXUS, quem ſi Scotorum in vero Dei cultu inſtaurando velut Apoſtolum quendam dixero, dixiſſe me quod res eſt exiſtimabo, & ſequens vera ipſius vitæ narratio teſtabitur.’ Cardinal Richelieu, when he was yet but biſhop of Luſſon, publiſhed a book of controverſy, wherein he made great uſe of John Brerley's collections, and particularly in what relates to Knox's ſeditious opinions. I have conſulted the anſwers that were made to this book of the biſhop of Luſſon; but I confeſs, I could find nothing in them to make me ſuſpect the credit of Brerleys's citations.

---

(9) Spondanus, ad ann. 1559, n. 30, pag. 587.

(10) Ad ann. 1567, n. 3, pag. 690.

(11) Idem, Spon. ad ann. 1539, n. 7, pag. 456.

(12) Joannes Brerleius Sacerdos Anglus in Apologia Proteſtantium pro Romana Eccleſia, Tract. III, ſeq. ii, pag. 623, 624.

* *Vide Holinſhedi magnum Chron. ultimæ editionis, pag.* 340, *initio & fine*; *& Bancroft. in lib. Propoſitiones, &c. pag.* 15, *ante medium, ubi ait*: Horrenda illa Card. & Archiepiſcopi Sancti Andreæ, quippe qui & ante fuerat & tunc erat præfractus (novi ſcilicet Evangelii) adverſarius, & ejus cædes anno 1545 perpetrata, nuper ſcripto defenditur, tanquam facinus pium, aliique ad paria facinora audendum excitantur per Knoxium in Hiſtoria Scotiæ, pag. 187. - - - - *The horrid murther of the cardinal and archbiſhop of St Andrews, a zealous adverſary of the new Goſpel, perpetrated in the year* 1545, *has been lately defended in writing as a pious action, and others are exhorted to the ſame attempts by Knox, in his Hiſtory of Scotland.*

† Holinſhedus, ubi ſupra, pag. 366, b. lin. 14, 15, *&c.*

⸸ Bancroftus, in libro cui titulus, *Aſſertiones ſandaloſæ, &c. pag.* 12.

‡ *Ibid. pag.* 13, *initio, & Sutcliffus in Reſponſione ad libellum quendam ſupplicem, pag.* 193, *prope finem quærit à Puritanis*, Num rationes à Knoxio & Wollocko allatæ ſatis probarent, nempe Principem, ſeu Gubernatricem legitime conſtitutam, à ſubditis deponi poſſe, quemadmodum ipſi de facto Reginam Scotiæ gubernatricem regno abdicarunt? - - - *Sutcliff . . . demands of the Puritans, whether the reaſons, alledged by Knox and Wollock, ſufficiently prove, that a prince, or lawful governeſs, may be depoſed by the ſubjects, as they in fact dethroned the queen of Scotland.*

** In lib. cui titulus *Aſſertiones ſcandaloſæ, pag.* 14, 15.

†† Knoxius, Apellat. fol 25.

⸸⸸ Idem, ad plebem, fol. 49, 50.

‡‡ Idem, Hiſt. pag. 343.

*** Idem, Hiſt. pag. 371.

††† Idem, ad Angliam & Scotiam, folio 76.

Peter de la Vallade, miniſter of Fontenai le Comte, publiſhed a book at Rochelle, in 1619, in 4to, intituled, ‘ An apology for the epiſtle of the miniſters of the goſpel at Paris, inſcribed to the king; in anſwer to the book, written againſt them by Armand John du Pleſſis de Richelieu, biſhop of Luſſon: containing a ſummary deciſion of the principal controverſies of this time, concerning religion, by the authority of the ſcripture, and the teſtimony of the antient doctors of the church; with a brief defence againſt the reproaches, which are made againſt the Proteſtants, on occaſion of the troubles and wars, that have happened in France, Germany, Scotland, and Denmark. extracted for the moſt part from the hiſtory of James Auguſtus Thuanus, preſident in the parliament of Paris, or from the very hiſtorians alledged and approved by the biſhop of Luſſon.’ He quotes the very words of the objection. ‘ I could, *ſays the biſhop*, prove your opinion in this matter by a great number of authors, if what you teach upon this ſubject was as advantageous, as it is prejudicial to you. I am contented to deſire the reader to conſult a book intituled *Apologia Proteſtantium*, one of the moſt uſeful books that has been printed for a long time; in which he will find more paſſages upon this ſubject, and ſome, amongſt others, which prove, that ſome of your writers have written, that by divine and humane laws, it is permitted to kill impious kings; that it is a thing agreeable to the word of God, that a private perſon, by a ſpecial inſtinct, may kill a tyrant; a doctrine every way deteſtable, which will never enter into the thoughts of the Catholic church.’ Here follows the anſwer to that objection. ‘ There was no need here, where we are only concerned in the ſearch of truth, of ſuch rhetorical flouriſhes which are only fictions and falſities; for how is it poſſible, that he ſhould have ſo many authors at hand who make us guilty of ſo deteſtable a doctrine, and yet not produce one that ſpeaks a word of it? Nay, to produce the weak proof that he has advanced, he was forced as it were to run over all the earth, and to go into the other world among the ſavages, and bring Buchanan to life again, who had his birth there: And who, yet, never made profeſſion of Divinity. How is it credible, that the biſhop ſhould be ſo moderate as not to produce thoſe many authors, becauſe it is not to our advantage, but to our prejudice; ſince he has undertaken to write againſt us? It is a prevarication to conceal what is detrimental to one's Antagoniſt, and adverſe party, and to alledge what is advantageous to him. Such diſſimulations are not becoming a biſhop, who profeſſes to ſpeak the truth; he ſhould not have ſpared us, ſince the buſineſs was to make us acknowledge our fault in ſo important a point; he ſhould not have referred us to the *Apologia Proteſtantium*, which book I never ſaw, nor know where to find it, but I know very well, that the author of it, if he be one of ours, does not ſpeak as the biſhop ſays he does; but if he be one of their writers, he advances this of his own head, and has no good proof for it (15).’ It is manifeſt that this anſwer does not at all clear John Knox. Another miniſter (16), much more learned than he of Fontenai le Comte, anſwered the biſhop of Luſſon: he had (17) read John Brerley's book, and gives a ſatisfactory anſwer to the objections grounded on ſome paſſages of Calvin: but he forſakes John Knox, and maintains, that the encomiums, which Calvin and Beza give him, no ways concern his notions about the royal authority, nor his particular actions, in which ſome footſteps of rebellion might be found. This miniſter's words are theſe (18). ‘ As for Knox, Goodman, and Buchanan, the occaſion and time, in which they wrote, leſſen in ſome meaſure the odium of the doctrine, which they ſpread in Scotland, inconſiderately and againſt the truth; which their anger, natural to that nation, and the general troubles of the ſtate, hindered them from diſtinctly diſcovering; according to the cuſtom of men, who chuſe rather, even with ſharpneſs and obſtinacy, to defend an ill thing, in which they are engaged thro' paſſion, and without any ill will, than to confeſs what has been ill done, or ill contrived, either by themſelves or their party. Notwithſtanding thoſe exceſſes, they were all three great men, and in other things very ſerviceable; Buchanan particularly in tutoring the king of Great Britain, and the others in the work of the miniſtry, to which they ſhould have been entirely and wholly dedicated. Granting then that Calvin ** (in the letters that he wrote to them) called the two firſt *Brethren and excellent men*; and that Beza gave . . . . . the firſt . . . the title of Reſtorer of the goſpel in Scotland; doth this prove, that they ſubſcribed to their opinions concerning the ſupream authority of kings, or that they were communicated to them, or that they ſo much as knew what paſſed in Scotland after the change of religion, or that our adverſaries go upon good grounds, in affirming, againſt the truth, that *the books of Knox and Goodman were printed at Geneva with the approbation of Beza and Calvin.* If thoſe gentlemen are pleaſed to prove what they certify upon their bare word, and to aver, that the miniſters of Geneva communicated with the abovenamed in other than eccleſiaſtical things, or that they were informed of their particular opinions concerning the rights of kings, or that they truly underſtood, and afterwards approved, what they have taught concerning politics, then they ſhall have liberty to complain. But, on the contrary, it appears, from the letters cited in the biſhop of Luſſon's little book, that the miniſters of Geneva never gave, nor received advice from foreigners, except in matters purely eccleſiaſtical; and particularly (from thoſe, which Beza wrote to Knox) *that at Geneva they had no certain news of the Scotch tranſactions* . . . . If therefore Calvin, Beza, Whitaker, or ſome others of our religion, have called Knox and Goodman their brethren, it does not follow from thence that they adopted their opinions, but only that they called them ſo,

(13) *See* Spondan. ad ann. 1559, n. 30.

⸸⸸⸸ Sic Bancroftus in Aſſertionibus, ſeditioſis, pag. 10, initio.

‡‡‡ Calvin. in Epiſt. & Reſponſ. Epiſt. cccv, fine: & pag. 565, in concluſione illius Epiſtolæ quæ ad Knoxium ſcribitur, ubi ſic habet: *Vale eximie vir, & ex animo colende frater.* Et Beza, in Epiſt. Theolog. Epiſt. lxxiv, ſic habet: *Joanni Knoxio Evangelii apud Scotos reſtauratori, fratri, & ſymmiſtæ obſervando.*

* Vide hoc in Hiſt. Eccleſiæ Scotiæ per Vautrouielleirum, pag. 213, & citatur à Sutcliffo in Reſponſ. ad Libellum ſupplicem, pag. 102, & 71. In Aſſertionibus, &c. pag. 10.

† Calvinus, ut ſupra, ad ‡‡‡: & vide Calvin. Epiſt. cccvi, ubi eum *virum eximium* vocat, *fratrem colendum*, & *Knoxio coadjutorem fidelem.*

⸸ Calvinus, Epiſt. ubi ſupra, pag. 566, circa med. ait, Strenuè operam ſuam Chriſto & Eccleſiæ impendit.

‡ *Calvinus, ubi ſupra, Epiſt. cccv, Joanni Knoxio, pag.* 565, *ait:* Evangelium apud vos tam fœlices lætoſque progreſſus facere vehementer, ut par eſt, lætor: certamina vobis moveri non novum eſt, ſed eo clarius refulget Dei virtus, &c. quando ad reſiſtendum pares nunquam fuiſſetis, niſi à cœlis vobis opem tuliſſet, qui ſuperior eſt toto mundo.

(14) *Quoting Beza's own words.*

(15) La Vallade, Apologie, pag. 544.

(16) *David Blondel. His anſwer, printed at Sedan,* 1610, *in* 8*vo, is intituled:* Modeſte Declaration de la Sincerité & Verité des Egliſes Reformées de France.

(17) See his anſwer, pag 287.

(18) Blondel, pag. 294.

** There are but five Letters written to Knox, three of Calvin, and two of Beza: One of Calvin to Goodman, and one of Beza to Buchanan. There is not one word of advice about ſtate affairs to be found in any of them.

party charged him with. Some aſcribe to him a ſpirit of prophecy [*F*]. It is, doubtleſs, doing ſome ſervice to the memory of John Knox, to ſhew the extravagancies of thoſe, who have aſperſed his reputation. This obliges me to ſet down a paſſage of Thevet wherein we ſhall ſee ſuch groſs and outrageous abuſes [*G*], as will alone be ſufficient

ſo, with reſpect to the eccleſiaſtical office, with which they were inveſted. If they praiſed them, they did it only according to their knowledge, not becauſe they thought them impeccable; for it is not impoſſible, but that, *amongſt thoſe, who preach Chriſt* (as St Paul ſays to the Philippians) *ſome ſhould preach him out of envy and contention,* and mix the fervour of their zeal with their infirmities; amongſt which if the lord frequently accompliſhes his work, drawing light from darkneſs, and order from confuſion; it is that the glory of what is well done may belong to his conduct, and the evil to the imperfections of his inſtruments.' Is not this to acknowledge, that Brerley, and thoſe he quotes, have not calumniated Knox with reſpect to the opinions they impute to him?

Juſt as the biſhop of Luſſon had made uſe of John Brerley's collections, the Jeſuit Petra Sancta, ſome time after, made uſe of this biſhop's book, to object againſt du Moulin, what ſeveral Proteſtants had ſaid about the obedience of ſubjects. Here follows what he alledged againſt Knox (19); 'Si principes, *inquit* ††, adverſus Deum & veritatem ejus tyrannicè ſe gerant, ſubditi eorum à juramento fidelitatis abſolventur. *Idem præter alia multa.* Illud, *inquit,* audacter affirmaverim, debuiſſe Nobiles, Rectores, Judices, Populumque Anglicanum, non ſolùm reſiſtere & repugnare Mariæ illi Jezabel, quam vocant Reginam ſuam; verùm etiam de eâ & Sacerdotibus ejus, & aliis omnibus, quotquotei auxilium tulerunt, mortis ſupplicium ſumere, ut primùm cœperunt Evangelium Chriſti ſupprimere. ——— *If princes behave themſelves tyrannically againſt* GOD *and his truth, their ſubjects are abſolved from their oath of fidelity.* He goes on: *This I boldly aſſert, that the nobles, rulers, judges, and people of England, ought not only to have reſiſted that Jezabel, Mary, whom they call their queen, but even to have put to death her, and her prieſts, and all who were aſſiſting to her, as ſoon as ever they began to ſuppreſs the goſpel of* CHRIST.' What did Mr du Moulin reply? He made no mention of John Knox, but was contented to ſay, that Buchanan, whom the Jeſuit alſo ſpoke of, had only treated of the right of the Scotch, and that, if other authors had run into exceſs, it ought to be aſcribed to their particular temper, and not to the ſpirit of their religion (20). Rivetus, in his anſwer to the ſame Jeſuit, referred him to the two abovementioned books written againſt the biſhop of Luſſon, and expreſsly declared, that the Proteſtants diſapproved the opinions of John Knox, and of others like him, who had rather acted according to the ſpirit of their nation, than according to the ſpirit of their religion. Upon which he obſerves (21), that of the 105 kings, who reigned in Scotland before Mary Stuart, there had been three depoſed, five expelled, and thirty two killed. 'Nemini noſtrum probantur quæ vel ex *Goodmanno*, vel ex *Knoxo*, vel ex *Buchanano* in eam ſententiam deſcribuntur, quamvis eò uſque non procedant, quo Jeſuitæ proceſſerunt, vel alii qui in Gallia ſcripſerunt de *Juſta Henrici tertii abdicatione*, & etiamnum in Belgio foventur, ubi ſcribit Jeſuita Romanus. Id prætereà obſervandum eſt, ſi quæ duriſſimis perſecutionum temporibus à Scotis & Anglis nonnullis temerè ſcripta fuerunt, ea poſſe imputari non tam Religioni, quam nationum illarum, Scoticanæ præſertim, fervido ingenio, & ad audendum prompto: quod tamen valde mitigatum fuiſſe accenſa veritatis Evangelicæ luce, ex eo conſtat, quod ex centum quinque regibus ſuis, uſque ad Mariam, tres exautorarunt, quinque expulerunt, & triginta duos necarunt: quod ne religioni imputetur magis veſtra intereſt, quam noſtra (22).' After this, I may be allowed to believe, that Knox's books contain the propoſitions, which Brerley quoted out of them upon the credit of the epiſcopalians.

[*F*] *Some aſcribe to him a ſpirit of prophecy.*] Petra Sancta having mentioned the praiſes, which Calvin and Beza beſtowed upon Knox, adds (23), *à Witakero ex omnium Scotorum ſententia,* Spiritu Prophetico, & Apoſtolico præditus *appellatur.* David Blondel (24) ſays ſomething more particular; 'endowed with a prophetical ſpirit, by which as it is reported by thoſe of his nation he foretold many things that are come to paſs, as Whitaker obſerves in his writings.'

[*G*] *Here is a paſſage of Thevet, wherein we ſhall ſee groſs and outrageous abuſes.*] This man might paſs for a ſtripped Monk, though he always profeſſed himſelf a Catholic. No one can queſtion that he was a bad compiler. He was ſo little exact, that, when he undertook to write of the affairs of Scotland, he did not ſo much as give himſelf the trouble to obſerve the true names of perſons. You will ſee, that he knew not the right name of our John Knox. 'All this while, *ſays he* (25), the Scotch ſuffered not England to be at reſt; which happened, when Henry VIII plaid his pranks with chalices, relics, and other ornaments of the Engliſh churches: which tragedies and ſports have been plaid in our time in the kingdom of Scotland, by the inſtigation of Noptz, the firſt Scotch miniſter of the bloody goſpel. This diaphoriſt, who was fond of diſſentions, was not contented to tread in the ſteps of Luther, Zuinglius, and Farel, much leſs in thoſe of his maſter Calvin, who had lately redeemed him from the gallies of the prior of Capua, in which he had remained three years for his crimes, unlawful amours, and execrable whoredoms, and for his diſſolute life, and for having been convicted of parricide and murther, committed upon the perſon of James de Beton, archbiſhop of St Andrews, by the connivance and treachery of the earl of Ropphol, James Leſcle, John Leſcle their uncle, and William du Coy. This Simoniſt, who had been a prieſt before in our church, and fattened with benefices, which he ſold for ready money, ſeeing he could not prove his cauſe to be good, fell into the moſt horrid blaſphemy in the world. Firſt, he denied the power of GOD; he preached openly, that virginity was no better than marriage: which he had ſtolen from Luther's hereſy, out of his new Epithalamium. Likewiſe he induced many devout wives, and religious virgins, to proſtitute themſelves. He taught likewiſe, that we muſt reject, deſpiſe, and trample under foot the holy criſm, pull down images, take up and burn the bodies of ſaints, and ſeize the treaſures of the church. This is not all. He did not ceaſe for two years to animate the people to take up arms againſt the queen, to drive her out of the kingdom, which he ſaid was elective, as it had been in the days of Paganiſm. Could the greateſt Barbarians in the world ſay any thing more cruel and miſchievous . . . . . The Lutherans have temples and oratories; their miniſters ſing pſalms and ſay maſs; and, though it be different from ours, yet they add to it, *Kyrie Eleiſon*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, *Agnus*, and other prayers like ours. In like manner their miniſters in the time of divine ſervice, wear copes, chaſubles, and ſurplices like ours: being careful of their ſalvation, and of the public weal. Whereas the people of Scotland have lived theſe twelve years without law, without faith, without ceremonies, and without acknowledging either king or queer, any more than brutes, being better pleaſed with the fables of this rank hypocrite of Noptz, a man unfaithful to GOD and his country, than with the purity of the goſpel, the canons of the councils, and the doctrine of ſo many holy Greek and Latin doctors of the Catholic church. This fine preacher, after the deceaſe of his firſt wife, ſuddenly provoked with his venomous tongue the nobility of Scotland to ſet up againſt the clergy, more than he had done before; and then the clowns aſſaulted, plundered, burnt, and ruined the caſtles and houſes of the gentlemen, merchants, and others, who would not join in their debaucheries and murthers . . . . . It is certain, that this traitor, puffed up with the ſpirit of ambition, and prompted by the fleſh, came into ſo great credit and honour with the ignorant people of that country, that he married for his ſecond wife a gentlewoman of an antient family, related to the Scotch princes of the royal blood.' Are not authors, who write with ſo little judgment, well qualified to make us queſtion the truths they advance, ſuppoſe any ſuch eſcape them?

(19) Silveſter Petra Sancta, Not. in Epiſtol. Molinæi ad Balzacum, pag 104. *That book was printed at Antwerp, in* 1634, *in* 8vo.

†† In Admonit. ad Nobil. & Pop. Scot. atque Angliæ.

(20) Buchananus ſcripſit de jure regni apud Scotos, ſed hoc nihil ad Galliam, Angliam, Germaniam, Hiſpaniam. Nec ſi quis aliquid ſcripſit quod modum excedat, debet continuo adſcribi ejus religioni, potius quam ejus genio. Nam ejuſmodi libri quos citat Jeſuita, ſive veri ſive falſi, nullam præferunt fronte approbationem Doctorum. *Petrus Molinæus in Hyperaſpiſte, lib. iii, cap. xi, pag.* 492.

(21) *David Blondel had already obſerved it,* ubi ſupra, pag. 213.

(22) Rivet. in Caſtigation. Notarum, in Epiſtol. ad Balzacum, cap. xiii, n. 14. Oper. Tom. III, pag. 539.

(23) Petra Sancta, ubi ſupra, p. 105. *He cites* Witak. Contr. 2. q 5, cap. xiii.

(24) Blondel, ubi ſupra, pag 295. *He quotes Witaker*, de Eccl. q' 5, cap. xiii.

(25) Thevet, Coſmographie Univerſelle, livr. xvi, Tom. II, fol. 666.

ſufficient to prejudice us againſt whatever the Catholic writers have publiſhed concerning that great Scotch reformer. I wiſh it were as eaſy to confute the accuſation of a Lutheran, who charges him with inconſtancy [*H*].

[*H*] *The accuſation of a Lutheran, who charges him with inconſtancy.*] James Thomaſius, profeſſor of Leipſic, publiſhed a little diſcourſe, intituled, *Hiſtoria affectuum ſe miſcentium Controverſiæ de Gynæcocratia.* He there ſpeaks of the paſſions that attend the diſpute concerning the government of women; and he ſays, that this queſtion was warmly debated in the XVIth century, when Mary ſucceeded Edward king of England, and Elizabeth ſucceeded her ſiſter Mary. Thoſe two queens took oppoſite methods, as to religion; the one baniſhed the Non-Catholics, the other recalled them, and made the Reformation triumph. Thoſe, whom Mary had perſecuted, maintained, that it was contrary to natural right, and divine and human laws, that a woman ſhould rule over a whole nation; but their language was quite different under the reign of queen Elizabeth. See how Schluſſelburgius inſulted hereupon our Knox and others. ‘ Qui Calvini placita ſequerentur, his nihil erat magis exoſum fœmineo Mariæ regimine; iiſdem viciſſim, ubi ad clavum Reip. feliciter evectam conſpexiſſent Eliſabetham, nihil magis venerabilè, quàm Regina talis. Atque ut hoc de ſuo Schluſſelburgius *, magnæ conſtantiæ doctrinæque Theologus, largiatur mihi, ex eadem Calvini religione *Gilbius*, *Goodman* & *Knoxus*, (qui ſcilicet exilium ſuum Mariæ imputabant) *publicis libris* Genevæ impreſſis, *docuerunt, eſſe contrà jus naturale, divinum, & humanum, ut mulier etiam in rebus politicis regnet.* At ubi Mariæ imperium Eliſabetha excepiſſet, eximia & Pontificiorum hoſtis, & Calviniſequarum fautrix, protinus verſo remigio à Reformatis Anglis, non regina tantùm in temporalibus illa eſt proclamata, ſed etiam caput Eccleſiæ in ſpiritualibus. *Ita ſpacio duorum annorum* (ipſiſſima Schluſſelburgii verba recito,) *quod prius fuit Calviniſtis Genevæ moratis ipſiſſimum verbum* D E I, *mox atque in Angliam redierunt, mutatum eſt in verbum Diaboli.* Tantum videlicet potuit amor in religionem, quam ſub alterius fœminæ regno conculcatam viderent, ſub alterius reſurgentem, ut à perſonis in ipſum imperii genus deflectente ſe affectu jam proſcriberent Gynæcocratiam, jam dignitati ac famæ reſtituerent (26). ——— *To thoſe who followed Calvin's tenets, nothing was more odious than the female government of Mary; and the ſame perſons, when they ſaw Elizabeth happily raiſed to the throne, thought nothing more venerable than ſuch a queen. And as Schluſſelburgius, a divine of great conſtancy and learning, affords me this, ſo, out of the ſame religion of Calvin, Gilbius, Goodman, and Knox,* (*who imputed their baniſhment to Mary*) taught, in public books, *printed at Geneva,* that it was contrary to natural, divine, and human laws, that a woman ſhould govern even in political matters. *But, when Elizabeth ſucceeded Mary, an eminent adverſary of the Pope's, and favourer of the Calviniſts, immediately the Reformed Engliſh proclaimed her not only queen in temporal matters, but even head of the church in ſpirituals.* Thus in the ſpace of two years (*they are the very words of Schluſſelburgius*) what was before, to the Calviniſts reſiding at Geneva, the very word of God, as ſoon as they returned to England, was changed into the word of the devil. *Such was the force of of the love of religion, which they ſaw oppreſſed during the reign of one of theſe women, and reviving under that of the other, that, turning their affection from the perſons to the kind of government itſelf, they one while proſcribed female government, another time reſtored it to it's dignity and credit.*’ Thomaſius, who furniſhes me with theſe words, pretends that the Calviniſts of France changed alſo their maxims, after the perſecution they ſuffered under Charles IX: and he expreſly cites Lambert Danæus, who on the one hand declared againſt the monarchical power, and on the other for the authority of women, in favour of Elizabeth queen of England. ‘ Ut Anglico regimini præ Gallico faveret (*Danæus*) illud maxime fecit, quòd ſuæ ſectæ hominibus & ſub Elizabetha lautiſſima eſſet fortuna, & ſub Carolo Gallo vix aliud præter gladium, crucem, ignis exſpectandum. Notæ ſunt Pariſinæ nuptiæ † eo actæ eventu, ut ab illis maximè temporibus ſcriptores Galli peſtilentem inciperent in Politica doctrina ſectam ſive novam condere, ſive ſepultam reſuſcitare, quam ſolemus vocare Monarchomachorum. Huic nomen addixit etiam ſuum Danæus: ut mirari aliquis poſſit, quomodo ſcriptor ille, qui vix Regem æquo animo pati poſſet in ſolio Monarchico, ferre in eodem potuerit Reginam. Nempe vereor, ut non hic ſuas partes egerit hinc odium in perfidiam Galli, illinc amor tùm in feliciſſimam Eliſabethæ gubernationem ‡, tùm in Religionem Calvini, cui perſugium eâ tempeſtate in iſtâ inſulâ ſatis tutum erat (27). —— *Danæus, that he might favour the Engliſh government above the French, brought it about, that thoſe of his ſect ſhould expect the mildeſt treatment under Elizabeth, and nothing but perſecution under Charles. The Pariſian nuptials are well known, attended with this event, that, from that time eſpecially, the French writers began, in their politics, either to found a new ſect, or revive an old one, which we call antimonarchy men, or republicans. Danæus inliſted with this ſect: ſo that one might wonder, how this writer, who can ſcarce bear a king on the throne of monarchy, yet can bear a queen on it. I ſuſpect, that he is influenced, on the one hand, by reſenting the perfidy of the French king, and, on the other, by affection for the happy government of Elizabeth, and the religion of Calvin, which met with an Aſylum in that iſland.*’ It is certain, that, in that century, the general affairs whirled about in ſuch a manner, both in France and England, that each party changed their maxims. See the remark [*I*] of the article HOTMAN. The Roman Catholics, who ſpoke very ill of the government of women in the reign of Elizabeth, had very much commended it in the reign of queen Mary. Knox, and ſome others, on the other ſide, had the ſame inconſtancy. The Roman Catholics, under Charles IX, preached nothing ſo much as ſubmiſſion to the authority of the king (28); but they ſpoke and did quite the contrary in the time of the League, and their adverſaries thought it very ſtrange. I have read, in Savaron, a thing which I thought very curious (29). ‘ Pedro Corneio, a Spaniard . . . thinks it ſtrange and wonderful, that this town (30) ſhould have remained firm in it's fidelity to it's prince, and that the late troubles did not diſturb it's conſtancy, nor ſhake it's reſolution: ſince, *ſays he*, it is a very Catholic town, and beautified with a church, in which GOD is ſerved with great modeſty, ceremony, and muſic, and as much reverenced, as in any church I have ſeen.’ Generally ſpeaking, it is a proof, that the paſſions make men ſpeak either for or againſt the right of princes, to ſee the ſame people diſputing for the affirmative or negative, juſt as the intereſts of their cauſe happen to change.

* Lib. iv, Theol. Calviniſt. pag. 324, 325. Conf. Reſponſ. ad Calvin. & Bez. pro Franciſco Balduino, pag. 75.

(26) Jacobus Thomaſius, in Præfatione 56, pag. 328. Edit. Lipſ. 1681.

† Anni 1572.

‡ Hoc noſtro tempore (*inquit Polit. Chriſtian. lib. vi, cap. iii, pag.* 398) ELISABETHÆ, Sereniſſimæ Anglorum Reginæ, imperio nihil ulla unquam ætas vidit felicius & optatius. —— *At this time,* ELIZABETH *reigned with the greateſt glory and ſucceſs.*

(27) Thomaſ. ibid. pag. 331.

(28) *See the remark* [*E*] *of the article* SAINCTES.

(29) John Savaron, Traicté contre les Maſques, pag. 44. Paris Edit. 1611. *He quotes* Breve Relation de la Liga, en Brucellas en las caſas de Roger Velpio, 1591.

(30) Clermont in Auvergne.

KNUZEN (Matthias) a native of the country of Holſtein (*a*), arrived to ſuch a degree of extravagancy, as publickly to maintain Atheiſm, and undertook great journies to gain proſelytes. He was a reſtleſs man, who diſcovered his impieties firſt at Konigſberg in Pruſſia (*b*). He boaſted, that he had a great number of perſons of his opinion in the principal towns of Europe [*A*], and even ſeven hundred in the ſingle

(*a*) Oldenſworta Eiderſtadienſis. *Moller. Iſagoge ad Hiſtor. Cherſon. Cimbr. Part. III,* pag. 164.

(*b*) Tobias Pfannerus, Syſtem. Theologiæ gentilis, pag. 35.

[*A*] *He boaſted, that he had a great number of perſons of his opinion in the principal towns of Europe.*] Theſe are his words. ‘ Nemo homo mihi vitio vertet, ſi una cum meis gregalibus, (quorum innumerus mihi numerus Lutetiæ, Amſtelodami, Lugduni, in Anglia, Hamburgi, Hafniæ, nec non Holmiæ, imo Romæ & in contiguis locis adſtipulatur) *univerſa Biblia bellæ fabellæ loco habeam*, qua belluæ, id eſt, Chriſtiani, rationem captivantes, & cum ratione inſanientes delectantur (1). —— *No one will impute it to me as a crime, if, with my companions* (*an infinite number of whom, at Paris, Amſterdam, Leyden, in England*

(1) Apud Micrælium Syntagm. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. pag. 2291. Edit. 1699.

ſingle town of Iëna (*c*). His ſect was called the Conſcientiaries, becauſe he ſaid, there was no other God, religion, or lawful magiſtracy, than conſcience, which teaches all men the three precepts of Juſtice, *to do no injury*, *to live honeſtly*, *and give every one his due*. He drew up a ſummary of his ſyſtem, in a ſhort letter, of which ſeveral copies were ſpread [*B*]. It is dated from Rome. You will find it entire in the laſt editions of Micrælius. He diſperſed alſo ſome German writings (*d*). All this was confuted in the ſame tongue, by John Muſæus, a Lutheran profeſſor [*C*]. This ſect began about the year 1673.

A book was printed againſt Knuzen at Wittemberg in the year 1677 [*D*].

(*b*) *See, below, citat.* (4).

(*d*) Mollerus, ubi ſupra, p. 165.

'*England, at Hamburgh, Copenhagen, Stockholm, and* '*even at Rome, and the adjacent places, agree with me* '*in opinion*) I look upon the whole Bible as a fine invented tale, *with which the beaſts, that is the Chri*'*ſtians, captivating their reaſon, and running reaſon-mad,* '*are delighted.*' We muſt not imagine, that he uſed the ſtratagem of ſtate-conſpirators, who, to bring more people over to their party, always pretend they have a vaſt number of accomplices. It is more probable he ſpoke in this manner, becauſe that he was a hair-brained fool.

[*B*] *He drew up a ſummary of his ſyſtem in a ſhort letter, of which ſeveral copies were ſpread* (2).] Micrælius's continuator has reduced the contents of that letter to ſix articles. I. Non eſſe Deum neque Dia'bolum. II. Magiſtratum nihil æſtimandum, templa 'contemnenda, Sacerdotes rejiciendos. III. Loco 'Magiſtratus & loco Sacerdotum eſſe ſcientiam & ra'tionem cum conſcientia conjunctam, quæ doceat ho'neſte vivere, neminem lædere, & ſuum cuique tri'buere. IV. Conjugium à ſcortatione nihil differre. 'V. Unicam eſſe vitam: poſt hanc nec præmium 'nec pœnam dari. VI. Scripturam ſacram ſecum ip'ſam pugnare (3). ——— *I. That there is neither* '*God, nor Devil. II. That the magiſtrates are to be* '*looked upon as nothing, the churches are to be deſpi*'*ſed, and the prieſts rejected. III. That knowledge* '*and reaſon, together with conſcience, which teaches to* '*live honeſtly, to hurt no body, and give every one* '*his own, is in the room of magiſtrates and prieſts.* '*IV. That there is no difference between marriage and* '*whoring. V. That there is but one life: that after* '*the preſent there is neither reward nor puniſhment.* '*VI. That the Scripture contradicts itſelf.*' This ſyſtem, beſides its horrible impiety, is alſo plainly extravagant; for one muſt be ſtark mad, to believe that mankind can ſubſiſt without magiſtrates. It is true, they would not be neceſſary, if all men would follow the dictates of conſcience, which this impious man exhibits to us; but are they followed even in thoſe countries, where the judges puniſh, with the greateſt ſeverity, the injuſtice done to our neighbour? I do not know but it may be ſaid, that there is no impertinence, be it never ſo extravagant, but may teach us ſome truth or other. The follies of this German ſhew us, that the ideas of natural religion, the ideas of virtue, the impreſſions of reaſon, in a word, the light of conſcience, may ſubſiſt in the mind of man, even after the ideas of the exiſtence of God, and the firm belief of a life to come, are extinguiſhed in it.

[*C*] *He was confuted by John Muſæus, a Lutheran profeſſor.*] The author I have this from, obſerves, that Muſæus engaged in this work, to remove all ſuſpicions that might be entertained to the diſadvantage of the univerſity of Iëna: for this wretched man had boaſted of abundance of aſſociates there (4). That book of Muſæus contains a great many ridiculous things, concerning the life of this ſpark; but, if you would have a ſolid apology for the ſcripture againſt the blaſphemies of this man, you muſt have recourſe to the ſecond edition. And if you underſtand High-Dutch, conſult, as Mr Mollerus adviſes (5), the book, which he names (6), and obſerve his reflexion. He ſays, that if people continue to make their enemies ſuſpected of Atheiſm, as the author of this piece with a haſty zeal, and mixed with his paſſions, has done, they will afford matter enough to Mr Chriſtian Thomaſius, who is about an apology for thoſe, who have been unjuſtly expoſed to ſuch accuſations. The author of ſeveral Thoughts upon Comets has inſinuated (7) the deſign of ſuch a work, and given a curious idea of it. But let Mr Mollerus's words inform us of the malignity of ſuch ſort of accuſers. 'Quo in opere op'tandum eſſet ut Theol. celeberrimus (*Jo. Mullerus* '*Antiſtes Hamb.*) ſuo in Antagoniſtas odio minus indul'ſiſſet, nec per inſignem animi impotentiam, Schuppii 'τȣ̃ μακαρίτȣ Demegorias, piis omnibus commen'datiſſimas, & Chriſt. Hoburgii, ad extremum Atheiſ'mo contrarium, ſuperſtitionem ſc. & Enthuſiaſmum, 'proclivioris, ſcripta collo obtorto iis, quæ Atheiſ'mum vel occultant, vel quadamtenus promovent, 'aggregaſſet. Certe, ſi zelo hujuſmodi præcipiti, pri'vatiſque affectibus obnoxio, Theologi Atheomaſtiges 'ſibi inviſos in ſuſpicionem impietatis Atheiſmo affi'nis pergent adducere, vereor ne calamo Chriſt. 'Thomaſii ϖαῤῥησιαϛικῷ, Gabr. Naudæi (qui ma'giæ reis eſt patrocinatus) exemplo apologiam pro 'Atheiſmi falſo inſimulatis parturienti, campus ſe pan'dat ampliſſimus innocentiam illorum, cum hominum 'cordatorum applauſu, vindicandi (8). —— *In which* '*work, it were to be wiſhed, that the famous divine,* '*John Mollerus, Antiſtes at Hamburgh, had leſs in*'*dulged his hatred towards his adverſaries, and had* '*not perverſely, ranked among the writers, who conceal* '*Atheiſm, or in ſome meaſure promote it, the* Deme'goriæ *of Schuppius, ſo acceptable to pious men, and* '*the works of Chriſtopher Hoburgius, who is more in*'*clined to ſuperſtition and enthuſiaſm, the very reverſe* '*of Atheiſm. Certainly, if the divines, who write a*'*gainſt Atheiſm, go on, through ſuch a raſh and partial* '*zeal, to charge with atheiſtical principles thoſe whom* '*they hate, I fear, leſt, after the example of Gabriel* '*Naudé, who defended thoſe accuſed of Magic, the* '*free pen of Chriſtopher Thomaſius may find ample oc*'*caſion to juſtify, with the approbation of all ſenſible* '*men, the innocence of thoſe, who are falſly accuſed of* '*Atheiſm.*'

[*D*] *A book was printed againſt Knuzen at Wittemberg, in 1677.*] The title of it is, *Exercitationes Academicæ II de Atheiſmo* Renato des Cartes *&* Matthiæ Knuzen *oppoſitæ. Autore* Valentino Greiſſingio Corona-Tranſſylvano *Elector. Saxon. alumno.* This I have from a book of Caſpar Sagittarius (9).

(2) Hæc epiſtola plus millies deſcripta eſt. *Micral. ubi infra.*

(3) Micræl. Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. 2289. Edit. 1699.

(4) Blaſphemiis ſuis . . . . in ſolo oppido Jenenſi 700 cives atque ſtudioſos falſo jactabat adſtipulari. *Mollerus, Iſagoge ad Hiſtor. Cherſon. Cimbr. Part. III, pag.* 166.

(5) Ib. pag. 167.

(6) Atheiſmus devictus. *It was printed in the year* 1672. *The author calls himſelf Jo. Mullerus,* Antiſtes Hamburgenſis.

(7) *In the preface to the Addition printed at Rotterdam,* 1694.

(8) Mollerus, ibid.

(9) *Intituled,* Introductio in Hiſtoriam Eccleſiaſticam, pag. 8-9. *It was printed in* 1694, *in* 4*to*.

K O N I G (George Matthias) in Latin Konigius, profeſſor of Poetry, and of the Greek tongue, and library-keeper in the univerſity of Altorf, deſerves a place here in a particular manner; for I ſhould be ungrateful, ſhould I not acknowledge, that the book he publiſhed in the year 1678 (*a*) is of conſiderable uſe to me. I make no doubt that it is ſerviceable to a great many men of letters, notwithſtanding the cenſure that was paſſed upon it [*A*]. Our Konig died towards the end of the year 1698,

(*a*) *Intituled,* Bibliotheca vetus & nova, in fol. *I often quote it, and ſometimes I criticiſe upon it.*

[*A*] *The cenſure that was paſſed upon it.*] John Mollerus, a very learned man, who publiſhed at Hamburg, in the yeat 1691, an *Iſagoge ad hiſtoriam Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ*, had given us, four years before, *Cimbriæ literatæ Prodromus*, wherein, according to the liberty which ought to prevail among the ſubjects of the Republic of Letters, he freely ſpoke his thoughts as to the defects which he found in Konig's book. Daniel William Mollerus, an Hungarian, and profeſſor of Metaphyſics and Hiſtory, in the univerſity of Altorf, immediately oppoſed the Critic, and yet could not deny, but that part of the faults, obſerved by him, were real. Now ſee what the Critic in general pretends, as he explains himſelf in a preface (1). 'Innumeros in *opere* '*Konigiano* autores eſſe omiſſos, de Antiquis pauciſ'ſima ſatiſque confuſe in medium allata, è Recentio'rum,

(1) *In the preface to the* Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ.

1698, being eighty two years old (*b*). He was ſon of GEORGE KONIG (*c*), a native of Amberg, who died in 1654, after he had taught Divinity thirty eight years in the univerſity of Altorf.

'rum, etiam Polygraphorum Scriptis quamplurimis plerumque vix unius aut alterius factam mentionem, ac raro Synopticam aliquam de Autoris patria, ætate, ac vita, librique editi loco ac tempore, narrationem adjectam, manifeſtius eſt, quam ut latere lectorem eruditum, aut negari ab homine candido poſſit. Nomina etiam ſæpius, uti in Prodromo monui, & ſcripta falſa auctoribus eſſe attributa, circa patriam atque vitam illorum erratum, inedita pro editis venditata, & ex uno ſcriptore duos aut tres inepte procuſos, exemplis plurimis ὀφθαλμοφανερῶς poſſem oſtendere, ſi in expurgando hoc Augiæ ſtabulo tempus pariter atque operam vellem perdere, aut ſordes illius in præfationem hanc convectare. —— *That innumerable authors are omitted* in Konig's work, *that but few of the antients are produced, and thoſe very confuſedly, that of the moderns, even thoſe who have written many works, the writings of one or two at moſt are mentioned, and that there is ſeldom added a ſuccinct account of the author's country, age, and life, and of the time and place of the publication of his works, is ſo plain, that it cannot eſcape the learned reader, nor be denied by any man of candour. That he likewiſe aſcribes falſe names, and falſe works, to authors, as I obſerved in the* Prodromus, *that he miſtakes as to their country and life, that he pretends books were publiſhed, which never were, and ignorantly ſplits one author into two or three, I could demonſtrate by many inſtances, if I would loſe my time and my labour in cleanſing this Augean ſtable, or transfer it's filth into this preface.*' He adds, that, in this, he agrees in judgment with many learned men of the firſt rank. 'Agnoverunt eandem, quotquot ex chori literarii primiceriis, de Opere Konigiano, aut eadem mecum, aut his etiam aſperiora judicarunt. Petrus ſcil. Lambecius, non alio, quam Rhapſodi, titulo Autorem dignatus †, Dan. Georg. Morhofius ⸸, & (qui meum de eodem judicium ſuo verbotenus adjecit) Ἀκριβέϛατος Wilh. Ern. Tenzelius ‡, alii item complures, quorum verba allegare ſuperſedeo, cum rerum teſtimonia ipſi adverſario, nolenti volenti, veritatis confeſſionem extorſerint. Non audet enim is *Bibliothecam* hanc, cui patrocinatur, *veterem ac novam* pro accurata, aut tali, quæ Seculi applauſum mereatur, venditare, ſed fatetur *nomen* in iſta *interdum cum nomine eſſe confuſum, errata nonnulla commiſſa, & Autores aliquot omiſſos*, in qua ipſius confeſſione acquieſco. —— *The ſame has been acknowledged by ſuch learned men, as have paſſed the like, or even a more ſevere, judgment on Konig's work. To wit, Peter Lambecius, who thinks the author deſerves no other title than that of Rhapſodiſt; Daniel George Morhofius, and the moſt accurate William Tenzelius, who added, word for word, my judgment of this author to his own; with many others, whoſe words I forbear to alledge, ſince the force of truth has extorted a confeſſion from the very adverſary himſelf. For he dares not put off this work, which he patronizes, for an accurate performance, or ſuch as deſerves the applauſe of the age, but confeſſes, that the author ſometimes confounds names, that he has committed ſome miſtakes, and omitted ſome authors.*' Obſerve, that he does not rob Konig of the praiſe of an old profeſſor, who had done good ſervices to the Republic of Letters (2).

KOORNHERT (THEODORE) a native of Amſterdam, and ſecretary of the town of Haerlem, in the XVIth century, made himſelf famous by ſome writings that were very ſingular in point of religion (*a*). He is ranked amongſt thoſe Spiritualiſts or Enthuſiaſts, who believed, that all the ſects of Chriſtianity had been corrupted for many ages, and that, without an extraordinary miſſion, authorized by miracles, no body had a right to intrude into the functions of the goſpel miniſtry (*b*). Upon this footing, he publickly condemned Calvin and Luther's undertaking, though he acknowledged, that the church of Rome was no true church. He would have all Chriſtians of whatever ſect, (till it ſhould pleaſe God to raiſe Reformers, like the Apoſtles) unite under one form by way of *Interim*, or proviſionally [*A*], the model whereof was, that the Scripture ſhould be read to the people without offering any explication, or preſcribing any thing to the auditors by way of precept or prohibition, but only by way of advice.

[*A*] *He would have all Chriſtians ..... unite under one form, by way of* Interim, *or proviſionally.*] Hoornbeeck, who had read his Dutch book, explains this fancy. 'Iſte Coornhert paſſim ſuis libris ...... aliquod ſchema Eccleſiæ communis erigendæ proponit, in quâ, vel ſolus Scripturæ textus legeretur, abſque gloſſis & expoſitionibus, vel etiam admonitiones ex Scripturâ ſub aliorum judicio, non autem ex authoritate, aliquando fierent, ad modum alterius & novi Interim, uſque dum novâ divinâque ad extruendam aliam Eccleſiam miſſione accederent miniſtri, quales Apoſtoli fuerunt, Eccleſiam ex Chriſti præſcripto novam erecturi, qua jam divinâ miſſione ad erigendam per Reformationem aliam Eccleſiam omnes, juxta eum, careant. Tomo primo, pag. ult. in delineatione iſtius Eccleſiæ ſic loquitur: "Raro, aut nunquam utuntur hic humanis gloſſis, non quod peccatum ſit, ſed quia incertum, à ſole ad ſtellas, & à fontibus ad ciſternas recurrere. Atque ita etiam nemo hic ſibi (abſque certâ & ſpeciali miſſione) arrogat docendi officium, ut cum authoritate mandet vel prohibeat, benè quidem ut ſub meliori ſententiâ admoneat, idque ex Scripturâ (1)." —— '*This Coonhert in many parts of his works ..... propoſes ſome plan for erecting a common church, in which, the text of the ſcripture alone is to be read, without gloſſes and expoſitions, and admonitions out of the ſcripture to be ſometimes delivered as matter of advice, not authority, in the manner of a ſecond and new* Interim; *till miniſters ſhould come, ſuch as the apoſtles were, with a new and divine commiſſion, to found a new church, after the inſtitution of Chriſt; which divine authority, for erecting another church by a reformation, all, according to him, want. In his firſt volume, pag. ult. in delineating that church, he thus expreſſes himſelf: "Here they ſeldom or never, uſe human gloſſes; not becauſe it is unlawful, but becauſe of the uncertainty of running from the ſun to the ſtars, from ſprings to ciſterns. And thus alſo no one here (without a certain and ſpecial appointment) arrogates to himſelf the office of teaching, ſo as to command, or forbid, with authority, but fetches admonitions ſolely from the ſcripture."* This viſionary would have had the magiſtrates lay their injunctions on the preachers to ſay nothing but what was contained, word for word, in the ſcripture, and to oblige the laity, under the penalty of a fine, to lay aſide all their divinity books. You will ſee this more exactly in theſe Latin words (2): 'Hoc libello vel dialogo (3) ita ſententiam ſuam exponit: "exiſtimo, Magiſtratui ſignificandum, quæcunque ſcripta humana, gloſſas, dogmataque quid impuri, errores & ambages continere, à quibus omnibus immunis eſt Scriptura, certam pandens ſalutis viam. Quare reverenter rogandus eſſet, ut vellet, ad modum novi alicujus Interim, (& hoc ad tempus uſque quo concorditer decretum eſſet quæ doctrina ſequenda foret) omnibus Concionatoribus interdicere, ne è ſuggeſtu populum aliud quid docerent, prælegerent, dicerentve, præter clarum Scripturæ textum,

---

(*b*) Acta Eruditor. Lipſ. 1699, pag. 360.

(*c*) Konig, Biblioth. pag. 448. *See his Elogium in Witten's* Memoriæ Theolog. Renovatæ, Decade VIII, pag. 1100, & ſeq.

† V. locum celeberr. Tenzelii mox allegandum.

⸸ P. I. Polyhiſt. Litterarii, cap. xviii, pag. 202.

‡ In Colloquiis menſtruis vernaculis, M. Martio A. 1680, pag. 316, 317.

(2) Senis de re literaria bene meriti *elogium Konigio ob alios ejus Philologici argumenti libellos non invideo.* Molleros, Præfat. Iſagog.

(*a*) Hoornbeeck, Summa Controv. lib. vi, pag. m. 435.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(1) Hoornbeeck, Summa Controv. lib. vi, pag. m. 435, 436.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 436, 437.

(3) *Viz.* de minuendis Sectis.

advice. He did not believe, that, in order to be a true Chriſtian, one ought to be a member of any particular church, and he practiſed it accordingly [*B*]; for he neither communicated with the Catholics, nor with the Proteſtants, nor with any other ſect. He wrote with great aſſurance againſt the Reformed Religion, and particularly againſt Calvin and Beza (*c*), and was accounted ſuch a diſturber of religion, that the magiſtrates of Delft expelled him from their town, and the States of Holland decreed many things, upon which he complained, that the Inquiſition was renewed (*d*). Nothing appeared to him more contrary to reaſon and the Goſpel, than to perſecute thoſe, who are not of the religion of the ſtate. He wrote thereupon againſt Beza and Lipſius [*C*]. He died the

“ textum, citra unius ſyllabæ aut additionem aut demtionem, quomodo in Veteri Novoque Teſtamento ſolebat fieri. Hoc demum pacto ſectas evanituras. Præterea populo ſub mulctâ injungendum eſſet, ut omnes ſuos libros de Scripturâ tractantes, quæ ipſæ non eſſent mera Scriptura, ad manus Magiſtratus deferrent, ibique ſervarentur, ut vel redderentur poſtmodum ſuis Dominis, vel prout viſum foret, de illis diſponeretur. Hæc Coornhertus. —— ‘*In this book, or dialogue, he thus lays down his opinion:* “ *I think, the magiſtrate ſhould be told, that all human writing and gloſſes contain ſomething impure, errors, and intricates, from all which the ſcripture is free, which ſhews the true way to ſalvation. Therefore he is reſpectfully to be deſired to forbid all preachers to teach, read, or deliver any thing from the pulpit, to the people, beſides the plain text of the ſcripture, without adding, or taking away, one ſyllable, as was wont to be done in the Old and New Teſtament; and this, till it be unanimouſly decreed what doctrine is to be followed. By this means ſects will be at an end. Beſides, the people ſhould be obliged, under penalty, to give into the magiſtrate all their books of Divinity, but ſuch as are meer ſcripture, to be kept by him, and afterwards returned to the owners, or otherwiſe diſpoſed of, as ſhall be thought proper.*” *Thus Coornhert.*’

[*B*] *He did not believe, that ..... one ought to be a member of any particular church, and he practiſed it accordingly*] Not believing, that there was any Chriſtian ſociety upon earth, that was pure, and directed by true paſtors, he no where communicated at the Lord's table. He denied not, but that, for the ſecurity of the weak, there ought to be an external communion appointed; but he pretended, that no body ought to aſcribe to himſelf a heavenly miſſion, or teach the neceſſity of the uſe of the ſacraments. This is the ſum of the following Latin words. ‘ Coornhertus palam ſcribebat inter omnes ſectas ſe nullibi Chriſti Eccleſiam deprehendere; Romanum noſtrâ, quam ne quidem Eccleſiæ nomine dignabatur, meliorem eſſe, *Tom. I. in Dialogis, fol.* 484, nec S. Cœnam ullibi id circo participabat, quia veram Eccleſiam, & legitimos miniſtros ſcilicet deſiderabat: unde & communionis illam eſſe neceſſitatem, quæ vulgo docetur, negabat. *Tom. I. lib. Conſiſtorium*, in initio. *Tom. III. in Delineatione impartialis Eccleſiæ:* ubi ſtatim à principio docet, poſſe nunc quem eſſe verum Chriſtianum, utcunque non ſit membrum viſibilis alicujus Eccleſiæ: Rogatuſque, quid præſtaret, an extra viſibilem Eccleſiam vivere, quouſque ipſe Deus per certos Miniſtros Eccleſiam reſtauret; an Eccleſiam, infirmorum gratiâ, non valentium vivere abſque externâ illâ formâ, quin ad Sectarum partes prolabantur, colligere? reſpondit: prius quidem eſſe magis certum; at ſecundum videri ſibi neceſſarium. Collapſam quidem eſſe Dei Eccleſiam, ſed non apparere manifeſtum mandatum eam reſtaurandi: attamen ovile aliquod pro infirmis, adverſus varios lupos defendendis, ſub tali nempe libertate, qua nemo ſibi arroget, à Deo ſe ad docendum miſſum eſſe, & Sacramentorum Baptiſmi ac Cœnæ uſus relinquatur liber, pro infirmis habendum; nullum verò iſtorum urgeri debere præceptum, aut neceſſitatem (4). ———— *Coornhert openly declared in writing, that, among all the ſects, he no where found the church of Chriſt; that the Romiſh was better than ours, which he did not think worthy the name of a church; nor did he communicate with any, becauſe he could not find a true church, or lawful miniſters: whence he denied there was that neceſſity of communicating, which is commonly taught;* Tom. I. lib. Conſiſt. *at the beginning*: Tom. III. in Delineat. impartial. Eccleſ. *where he begins with laying it down, that one may, now, be a good Chriſtian, without being a member of any viſible church: and being asked which was the beſt, to live without the pale of a viſible church, till God ſhould reſtore it by proper miniſters, or to unite a church, for the ſake of the weak, who are unable to live without that external form, and muſt otherwiſe fall off to the ſects? he replied, that the firſt was more ſure; but that he thought the latter neceſſary: that the church of God was fallen; but that there did not appear an evident command to reſtore it; nevertheleſs, that there muſt be a fold for the weak, to defend them againſt the many wolves; to wit, under ſuch a liberty, that no one ſhould pretend a commiſſion from God to teach, and that the uſe of the ſacraments of Baptiſm, and the Euchariſt, ſhould be left free, for the ſake of the weak; but that no precept or neceſſity ſhould be pleaded for ſuch things.*’

[*C*] *He wrote concerning perſecution againſt Beza and Lipſius.*] There is ſomething to be found fault with in theſe words of Voëtius: ‘ Cornhertus qui Latino Dialogo contra Lipiſii politicam hanc cauſam agit eumdemque Dialogum poſtea contra Lipſii reſponſum (cui tit. adverſus Dialogiſtam) defendit, idem Belgico ſcripto *Proceſſum de Hæreticidio* edidit contra Bezam (5).— *Coornhert, who, in a Latin dialogue againſt Lipſius's Politics, pleads this cauſe, and afterwards defends the ſame dialogue againſt Lipſius's anſwer, intituled* Adverſus Dialogiſtam, *publiſhed, in Dutch, a piece againſt Beza, intituled,* Proceſſus de Hæretecidio.’ It is not true, that Koornhert's dialogue againſt Lipſius's Politics is in Latin: it is in Dutch (6). Voëtius himſelf acknowledges it in a paſſage which I ſhall preſently cite. Note likewiſe, that the title of that Dutch book anſwers to *Lis, ſeu Proceſſus de Hæreticidio.* Koornhert's Reply is in Latin (7); it had been larger, if he had lived longer (8). The title of it is: *Defenſio Proceſſus de non occidendis hæreticis contra tria capita libri IV Politicorum J. Lipſii: ejuſque Libri adverſus Dialogiſtam confutatio. Sub extremum mortis fatum per ſuæ patriæ libertatis ſtudioſiſſimum* THEODORUM VOLCHARDUM COORNHERT *conſcripta.* The edition I make uſe of is of Hanaw, 1593. If you deſire to ſee what perplexity Lipſius was thrown into by that reply, read what follows: ‘ Lipſius petitus libello Belgico à *Diederico Volckero Coornhert, poſtea libro, de Unâ religione dicto Died. Coornhert* repoſito addidit, ſe *veram & probam* intelligere: ſed non explicat, & explicaturum ſe negat, quænam ſit vera & proba religio. Hinc dictus Coornhertus in refutatione libelli Lipſiani anno 1591. tit. *Defenſio proceſſus de non occidendis hæreticis,* &c. ita conſtrinxit *Lipſium,* ut à Papiſticâ, aut Ethnico-Machiavellicâ (quarum alterutram pectore premebat, quamvis tunc Leidæ conciones publicas frequentaret) ſe liberare non potuerit. Et hanc unam putant ex cauſis præcipuis fuiſſe, cur ſtatione Leidenſi turpiter deſertâ hypocriſios larvam deponeret, ad partes hoſtiles transfugeret, atque ibi Papiſmi profeſſionem ſuſciperet (9). —— *Lipſius, being attacked in a Dutch book by Theodore Volcker Coornhert, afterwards in his book,* of the one Religion, againſt the ſaid Coornhert, *added, that he meant the* right *and* true *religion: but he does not explain, and declares he never will, which is the right and true religion. Hence the ſaid Coornhert, in the refutation of Lipſius's book in the year* 1591, *intituled,* Defenſio, *&c. drove Lipſius to ſuch extremities, that he could not clear himſelf from the Popiſh, or Heathen-Machiavellian, one of which he concealed in his breaſt, tho' at that time he frequented the public ſermons at Leyden. And this is thought to be one of the principal reaſons, why he ſhamefully left Leyden, threw off the maſk of hipocriſy, went over to the enemy, and openly profeſſed the Popiſh religion.*’ Add to this the remark [*B*] of the article LIPSIUS.

(*c*) Ex oppugnata in herbis Reformatione noſtrarum Eccleſiarum, præſertim noſtra Catecheſi, & probatâ ſibi nec noſtrâ Eccleſiâ, nec aliis, ſolum intentus carpendis omnibus, & magnis impetendis nominibus, Calvinum dico, Bezam, Danæum, Saraviam, alios, gloriam hinc inanem inter ſuos aucupatus fuit. *Id. ibid.*

(*d*) Voëtius, de Politia Eccleſiaſt. Tom. II, pag. 454.

(4) Hoornbeck, ibid. pag. 438.

(5) Voëtius, de Politia Eccleſ. Tom. II, pag. 386.

(6) Plebeia (ſcriptio) futilis, & concepta plebeio ſtilo. *Lipſius, in Præf. libri de una Religione adverſus Dialogiſtam.*

(7) He wrote it in Dutch; but his heirs procured it to be tranſlated into Latin.

(8) See the advertiſement to the reader, at the end of that Reply.

(9) Voëtius, ubi ſupra, pag. 433.

the twentieth of October 1590 (e), acknowledging the doctrine of Predeſtination, which he had ſo much oppoſed [D]. His works were publiſhed in the year 1630, in three volumes in folio. He began to ſtudy ſomewhat late [E]. Lewis Guicciardin (f), ſpeaks of an excellent Engraver, a native of Haerlem (g), whoſe name was THEODORUS COORNHERT. He is doubtleſs the ſame that is mentioned in Freherus's *Theatrum* [F], and who makes the ſubject of this article. This is all I could collect from ſome Latin books; and I was ready to ſend it to the preſs, with the ſix firſt remarks ſubjoined to it, not thinking to add any thing elſe, when, being informed that Coornhert's Life was prefixed, in Dutch, to his works, I procured ſome extracts to be made out of it, which have occaſioned the addition of what follows. They import, that Koornhert was born in 1522, of an antient and good family of Amſterdam; that he took a journey into Spain and Portugal when he was very young; that, at his return, he married againſt the intention of his father's will, and without conſulting his mother; that his wife having hardly any fortune, he was obliged to get into the ſervice of Renaud de Brederode baron of Vianen; that he became his ſteward, and got into his favour; but quickly left him, becauſe he could not reconcile himſelf to a court life; that he ſettled at Haerlem, and maintained himſelf by Engraving; that, having ſome ſcruples about ſome matters of Divinity, and thinking he could find them reſolved in St Auguſtin, and in ſome other fathers, he learned the Latin tongue at thirty years of age, wherein he made ſuch a progreſs, that he ſoon found himſelf able to tranſlate Tully's Offices, and ſeveral other books, into Dutch; that he underſtood Muſic and Poetry; that he was very good company at table, but his mirth was inoffenſive, and that he never exceeded the rules of ſobriety; that he loved to work, and made it a law to himſelf to be but ſix hours in bed; that he was made notary in 1561, and ſecretary to the town of Haerlem in 1562, and ſecretary to the burgomaſters of the ſame town in 1564; that in 1565 and 1566, he was frequently deputed to the prince of Orange, governour of Holland; that he had ſeveral conferences with Henry de Brederode upon the ſubject of the troubles [G] that began to riſe in the Low-Countries, and of the famous petition, that was preſented to the ducheſs of Parma in April 1566; that he was carried away by force from Haerlem, and removed to the Hague, where he endured a long and ſevere impriſonment; that there he wrote ſeveral poems in Dutch, that his wife, being perſuaded he would never have his liberty, endeavoured to catch the plague, that ſo, infecting him, they might both die together, that he ſeverely reprimanded her for it, and commanded her patiently to ſubmit to providence; that he vindicated himſelf ſo well, that he was releaſed, and only prohibited to go out of the Hague; that, underſtanding there were freſh orders come from Bruſſels to re-impriſon him, he privately retired to Haerlem, and afterwards into the country of Cleves, where he maintained himſelf

(e) See the advertiſement to the reader, at the end of his Reply to Lipſius. Note, that Konig has wrongly placed his death in the year 1599.

(f) Ludov. Guicciard. in Deſcript. Belgii, cap. de Antuerpia, pag. m. 118.

(g) He is miſtaken; for Coornhert was a native of Amſterdam.

[D] *He died ...... acknowledging the doctrine of Predeſtination, which he had ſo much oppoſed.*] He cried out, as he was dying, my God, from thee I have my ſoul; it is in thy power to ſave, or reprobate it, according to thy good pleaſure; I have no reaſon to complain. ‘Obiit a. CIϽ IϽ XC, & quod valde obſervandum, is qui tam impotenter de Prædeſtinatione multa, ſibi nequaquam intellecta, adverſus Theologos noſtros conſcripſit, ſub mortem, veritatem ejus in ſe ſentire & agnoſcere coactus fuit, ad Deum exclamans: “ſe animam ſuam ab eo poſſidere, quam Deo integrum ſit pro ſuo beneplacito ſervare, an reprobare, ſibi nil eſſe quod conqueratur.” Quod nil eſt, quam vim & ſummam prædeſtinationis divinæ in nobis aut ſalvandis, aut abjiciendis, pro Die ſummo in nos omnes arbitrio, proprio ſenſu confiteri, & in morte ſincerius teſtari, quam tot infrunitis & impetuoſis adverſus eam ſcriptis, per vitam (10). —— *He died in the year* 1590, *and, what is very remarkable, he, who had written ſo violently againſt our divines, concerning the doctrine of Predeſtination, which he did not well underſtand; at the time of his death was ſenſible of the truth of it, and forced to acknowledge it, crying out to God; “that he received his ſoul from him, which he might ſave, or damn, as he pleaſed, and that he had nothing to complain of.” Which is nothing elſe, but acknowledging, that he felt the force of the divine Predeſtination in ſaving, or rejecting us, according to his ſupreme authority over every one of us, and bearing teſtimony to it, at his death, with more ſincerity, than he had oppoſed it, in ſuch vehement writings, during his life.*’ This citation was neceſſary, conſidering the reflexions it contains, and may ſuggeſt.

[E] *He began to ſtudy ſomewhat late.*] ‘I have ſeen at the Hague, in Mr Van Beuning's library, the works of Theodore Volcard (11) Cornhert, in Dutch. He was an Enthuſiaſt, who had a very ready wit. He learned of himſelf Greek and Latin (12), at forty years of age, and made ſo great a progreſs in theſe two languages, that he tranſlated into Dutch any author he had a mind to. He wrote ſeveral treatiſes of Divinity, ſome of which have been confuted by Calvin and Danæus. He wrote alſo againſt Lipſius, who anſwered him, in his book *De una Religione*. The Hollanders ſpeak of him as of a wonderful man. He died in the year 1590, being ſixty eight years old (13).’ There are ſome exaggerations in this paſſage of Colomiés. I have read in a good author, that Koornhert was but thirty years old, when he began to ſtudy the Latin tongue (14). He never was a great maſter of it, and his writings have been in no great repute for this long time. Note, that Boxhornius (15) ſays moſt of the things contained in this paſſage of Colomiés.

[F] *In Freberus's Theatrum.*] There we ſee, that Theodorus Cornhertzius, an excellent Sculptor, exerciſed his art with praiſe at Amſterdam, where he was born, and left many works made upon the model of Martin Hemskerk, whom he imitated. He was alſo a good Poet; he died at Tergou, in the year 1590, being ſeventy eight years of age (16). This is our Koornhert: but it ſhould have been ſaid, that he lived ſixty eight years, and not ſeventy eight. See the margin (17).

[G] *He had ſeveral conferences with Henry de Brederode, upon the ſubject of the troubles.*] Koornhert had been ſteward to Renaud de Brederode, and had done him good ſervices. By that he diſcovered himſelf to the beſt advantage to Henry de Brederode, Renaud's ſon. He conferred with him at Vianen, and at Utrecht, Amſterdam, and Haerlem, about the means of preſerving the liberty of their country, and he engaged him to preſent to the ducheſs of Parma, the petition, which had ſuch remarkable conſequences. He was the author of the firſt Manifeſto that prince William publiſhed in his camp (18), the title of which was, *Advice to the inhabitants of the Low-Countries, for the law, for the king, and for the flock* (19). Bor, who mentions that Manifeſto, in the fourth book of his hiſtory, *Fol.* 182, declared to ſome people that he knew very well, that Koornhert had writ it (20).

(10) Hoornbeck, ubi ſupra, pag. 435.

(11) Volcard was his father's name, and not his own.

(12) It is ſaid in his Life, that Dr John Baſius, who was afterwards counſellor to the prince of Orange, taught him the Latin tongue. No mention is made of the Greek.

(13) Colomiés, Melanges Hiſtoriques, pag. 63.

(14) Vir ingenii quidem alicujus, ſed uti ὀψιμαθής (quippe ad annum demum ætatis XXX linguam Latinam cœpit addiſcere.) Ita, &c. *Hoornb. ubi ſupra.*

(15) Boxhorn. in Theatro Hollandiæ, cap. de urbe Amſtelodamo, pag. m. 263.

(16) Paul Freher. in Theatro, pag. 1483. *He quotes the* Academia Germ. Pictorum Joach. à Sandrart.

(17) Freherus ſhould have called him an Engraver, and not a Sculptor, and ſhould have ſaid, that he practiſed his trade at Haerlem, and not at Amſterdam.

(18) In December. 1566.

(19) It is the tranſlation of the Dutch title.

(20) Taken from the extracts, imparted to me, in Latin, out of the Dutch Life of Theodore Koornhert.

himſelf by his old trade of Engraving; that, the States of Holland having firmly reſolved to maintain their liberty againſt the Spaniſh tyranny, he returned into his country, and was honoured with the poſt of ſecretary to the States of the province; that endeavouring to oppoſe the diſorders committed by the ſoldiery, and being deputed to take information of them, he became ſo odious to the commanders of thoſe inſolent troops [*H*], that, to ſave his life, he thought fit to exile himſelf; that, having written to the prince of Orange, and to the States of Holland, the reaſons of his retreat, he took refuge at Embden; that, after things were reſtored to a better ſtate, he returned to Haerlem; that he engaged in diſputes, wherein he was oppoſed by the moſt zealous miniſters; that he publiſhed ſeveral pieces in defence of his cauſe, and maintained it by word of mouth, at Leyden, and at the Hague; that, to be the more ready to enter the liſts, he went and lived at the Hague; that, theſe verbal diſputes having been prohibited by authority [*I*], he often intreated the States, and the miniſters, and particularly at the ſynod

[*H*] *Being deputed to take information of the diſorders committed by the ſoldiery, he became ſo odious to the commanders of thoſe inſolent troops.*] The captains, who were conſcious of many extortions, bethought themſelves of a very effectual expedient, to prevent a diſcovery; which was to cry down Koornhert, as a dangerous Papiſt, and thereby expoſe him to a thouſand dangers. They found a very ſpecious pretence for it; for he was continually ſaying, that it was juſt, and for the intereſt of Holland, not to perſecute the Catholics, but to obſerve the promiſe, which the prince of Orange had made them concerning the free exerciſe of their religon, *&c.* The count de Lumei, who commanded the troops in Holland, was far from ſtanding to this promiſe. Koornhert very boldly condemned this conduct; whereupon he was diffamed, as a moſt accurſed favourer of Popery. The count de Lumei, to whom he had been repreſented in black colours, ſwore his deſtruction and gave orders to kill him. There was no ſafety for him in the highways of the country, nor in the ſtreets of the town: he had recourſe to the protection of the prince of Orange; but that was not ſufficient to ballance the great credit this count had with the ſoldiery. Wherefore Koornhert was obliged to retire into the country of Cleves (21). This happened in the year 1572. Note, that he favoured ſo little the cauſe of the Spaniards, that he was expreſsly excepted in the Amneſty, which Lewis de Requeſens cauſed to be publiſhed at Bruſſels, in the year 1574, for all thoſe who ſhould in two months time receive abſolution in the confeſſional of the prieſts (22). Here follows a paſſage, which ſhews, that he did not love the church of Rome, and yet was for granting the Papiſts liberty of conſcience.

The private exerciſe of their religion was forbidden in Holland, in 1581. Some among them employed Koornhert to draw up a petition addreſſed to the prince of Orange, by which they deſired to be maintained in the exerciſe of their religion, in the monaſteries of Haerlem, and in the temple, which the Proteſtants had quitted, after they became maſters of the great church. Koornhert, being obliged to appear before the burgomaſters of Haerlem, on account of that writing, delivered it into their hands, according to the order he had received, and declared, that he did not undertake the defence of it, any more than that of Popery, which he conſidered as a den of murder; but that, neverthelеſs,he was perſuaded, that it was a piece of injuſtice to break one's word with the Roman Catholics, and to force their conſcience. The burgomaſters gave this petition to the prince of Orange, who ſent it back to the States; theſe ſent for the burghers of Haerlem, who had ſigned it, and ordered them to cancel their names. They ordered alſo Koornhert to tear the draught of it; all which was executed (23).

[*I*] *Theſe verbal diſputes having been prohibited by authority.*] Here are ſome circumſtances of thoſe diſputes. They began at Delft, in the year 1578; and what occaſioned them was, that a certain perſon, who quitted the church of Rome, to embrace the Reformed, alledged ſuch reaſons for his change, as ſhewed he underſtood neither of them very well. Koonhert tells him very freely, *what remains to be examined, is, whether you have choſen a religion better than that you have left.* He was called to an account for this diſcourſe; for a clamour was raiſed about it, and it was odiouſly repreſented: which occaſioned the conference betwixt Koornhert, and two miniſters of Delft, which turned upon the notes of the true church. He undertook to prove, that the churches, which followed the doctrines of John Calvin, and Theodore Beza, were falſe; and he grounded himſelf upon three points; predeſtination, juſtification, and the puniſhment of Heretics. The conference was ſcarce begun, when the States of the province put an end to it: it was renewed by their order, and in the preſence of their commiſſioners, at Leyden, the fourteenth of April; but it laſted only a day and a half; Koornhert complaining, that his adverſaries made an ill uſe of the ſecular authority againſt him, retired. He boaſted, that he had reduced the two miniſters to their laſt ſhifts, though he was not permitted to attack them upon the third point (24); he pretended that his naming Calvin and Beza ſerved as a ſubterfuge to his adverſaries, becauſe the commiſſioners ſaid, that he knew very well, the States would not ſuffer the names of thoſe two Geneva miniſters to come into the diſpute, and that therefore he ought to expect their indignation. Finding himſelf thus threatened, he declared, he would not return to a conference, where he had not an entire liberty of ſpeech. The miniſters and commiſſioners failed not to appear at the place, where the diſpute began. They ſtaid for Koornhert, ſent to his lodgings, and took his abſence for a flight, and an undoubted proof of his defeat. The States of Holland cauſed the magiſtracy of Haerlem to forbid him to write any thing concerning that diſpute (25).

Some years after, he wrote againſt the Cathechiſm of Heidelberg, which was received by the Reformed Churches of Holland. He addreſſed this piece to the States of the province, and, with a prodigious boldneſs repreſented to them the miſchiefs of receiving this Catechiſm, and of the deſign, the miniſters had, ſaid he, of impoſing on every body the neceſſity of thinking and ſpeaking like themſelves. He deſired, that thoſe misfortunes might be prevented, and offered to prove what he advanced. The miniſters, on their part, preſented a writing to the States, full of complaints againſt Koornhert, and declared themſelves ready to juſtify their propoſitions. The States after mature deliberation, reſolved, with the approbation of the prince of Orange, to make Koornhert diſpute with the miniſters before fifteen deputies. Hadrian Saravia, profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden, was choſen to be a diſputant for the miniſters; a notary was appointed him, and another to Koornhert, that whatever ſhould be ſaid, on both ſides, might be authentically ſet down in writing. The diſpute began at the Hague, the twenty ſeventh of October, 1583, and continued to the third of November, when Koornhert deſired leave of the commiſſioners to go to Haerlem, to ſee his wife, who was upon her death-bed. The diſpute began again, the twenty eighth of November; but becauſe Saravia, for four days together, had dictated very long writings to his notary, the deputies reſolved to ſend Koornhert home, there to compoſe his anſwer. It were more polix than the writing of Saravia, and was confuted by a reply of the miniſters, that was much longer. The States finding, that one article, among fifty, that were to be examined, took up ſo many ſeſſions, thought there would never be an end of this affair, and interrupted the courſe of it. Koornhert boaſted of his victory, and that he had ſettled himſelf at the Hague, that he might be the more at hand to diſpute. The order of the States for interrupting the conferences, hindered not the parties from attacking one another in writing (26).

(21) Taken from the extracts, imparted to me, in Latin, out of Gerard Brandt's Dutch Hiſtory, Part. I, *lib ix, pag.* 535, *ad ann.* 1572.

(22) Ibid. ex lib. xi, pag. 553.

(23) Ibid. ex lib. xii, pag. 667, 668, ad ann. 1581.

(24) *Viz.* The puniſhment of Heretics.

(25) Ibid. ex pag. 597, ad ann. 1578.

(26) Ibid. ex lib. xii, pag. 693, 694, 695, ad ann. 1583.

ſynod of Tergou, to permit that they ſhould be continued and ended; that he preſented a petition upon this ſubject to the prince of Orange; that he ſtrengthened it with many arguments; that he beſought him to order it ſo, that, if his petition was rejected, he might at leaſt have leave to go on in modeſtly and chriſtianly confuting errors, and thereby enjoy the liberty of conſcience, which had been purchaſed with ſo much pains; that, in caſe of a refuſal, he begged, as the laſt favour, permiſſion to retire into ſome neighbouring country, in friendſhip with Holland, to ſpend the reſt of his days in finiſhing an Index to the holy Scriptures, upon which he had laboured twenty ſix years, and alſo to prevent the oppreſſion of his conſcience, the dangers of his perſon, the miſeries of poverty, and the ſcandal of the Reformed church; that he deſired to have a ſafe conduct; that he promiſed he would return to the Hague, to terminate the diſpute, when they ſhould think fit to recall him; that all his requeſts being rejected, he nevertheleſs publickly declared, that he found great errors in the Heidelberg Catechiſm; that he got many enemies by it; that he was diſparaged from the pulpit, and elſewhere; that he was loaded with invectives and calumnies; that he met with a great many troubles and vexations, this having prejudiced and provoked ſeveral people againſt him; that he always prudently and conſtantly bore up againſt this adverſity; that there is great probability that he was protected by the prince of Orange [*K*]; that no one at that time wrote ſo ſtrenuouſly as he for the liberty of the country, and for that of conſcience [*L*]; that his writings againſt the doctrine of Predeſtination and original ſin were ſtrengthened with ſo many arguments, that the conſiſtory of Amſterdam having ordered James Arminius to confute them ſome years after, this miniſter anſwered, that he did not ſee, that either he or any body elſe could anſwer them from Scripture (*b*); that, having almoſt finiſhed his Dutch verſion of Eraſmus's Paraphraſe (*i*), he was ſeized with a diſtemper, in which he ſignalized his patience, and held moſt edifying diſcourſes, till he expired, full of confidence in God, the twenty ninth (*k*) of October, 1590; that he was buried at Tergou (*l*); that he would neither be buried at Amſterdam, where he was born, nor at Haerlem, where he ſpent moſt of his time; that he has been praiſed by Iſaac Pontanus, in the deſcription of Amſterdam, and by Grotius, and even by Juſtus Lipſius his adverſary. This is what I gather from the Latin extracts, communicated to me out of Koornhert's Life, written in Dutch. Some other things there are, which I ſhall put in the remarks. I ſhall alſo make uſe of ſome Latin extracts, taken from Gerard Brandt's book, I mean the Dutch hiſtory which he wrote concerning the reformation of the Netherlands. They have been made by the ſame perſon, who imparted to me thoſe of Koornhert's Life, and who underſtands well the Dutch tongue, and is very exact. I think they may be depended on.

(*b*) See, below, the text of the article ARMINIUS, between citations (*b*) and (*c*).

(*i*) Upon the New Teſtament.

(*k*) I have quoted, above, an author, who ſays the twentieth, but probably this difference proceeds from that of the old and new Style, and from this, that when a man dies in the night between the nineteenth and twentieth day of a month, for inſtance, ſome ſay he died the nineteenth, others that he died the twentieth.

(*l*) In the great church, with a very honorable epitaph compoſed by his good friend Henry Laurence Spiegel. See Gerard Brandt's Hiſtory of the Reformation in the Netherlands, book xv, *ad. ann.* 1590.

The ſynod of South Holland being aſſembled at Tergou in Auguſt 1589, Koornhert, who lived in the ſame town, ſent a letter to the aſſembly, to offer them a freſh battle, The ſynod having read the letter, ſent it back to the author, and declared they had nothing more to do with him, and that, if he deſired any thing, he muſt addreſs himſelf to the States (27).

[*K*] *There is great probability, that he was protected by the prince of Orange.*] It is certain, that this prince, knowing him to be a man of parts, a great lover of liberty, and a great enemy to the Spaniards, thought him a fit man for the affairs of that time. He made uſe of his pen on ſeveral occaſions; he gave him ſeveral commiſſions; he deſired they would recall him from his exile (28); and one can hardly apprehend, how Koornhert could have withſtood his enemies, if he had not been under-hand ſupported by a very powerful and well-managed protection; for he obſerved no meaſures in relation to the public doctrine of the churches; he attacked the miſſion of their miniſters, condemned all ſects, and was for leaving an entire liberty to the Roman Catholics, which, conſidering the circumſtances of thoſe times, would have been very dangerous. His cenſure on the Cathechiſm of Heidelberg was ſo bold and inſulting, that, ſince the States of Holland, who had it examined by a profeſſor of divinity, and a miniſter, were contented to order, that the copies ſhould be put into the hands of the magiſtrates (29), he muſt needs have had a powerful ſupport. If the prince of Orange had been alive, when Koornhert went to live at Delft, I do not think the magiſtrates would have commanded him to depart in twenty four hours, as they did in the year 1588 (30). Some perſons tried to get him impriſoned for the reſt of his life; but the prince and the ſupream magiſtrates rejected that propoſal (31).

[*L*] *No one . . . . . wrote ſo ſtrenuouſly as he for the liberty of the country, and for that of conſcience.*] Whilſt he was at Santen (32) in a voluntary exile, in the year 1574, he drew up the plan of a book, to ſhew all Chriſtian princes, that the conduct of the provinces, which oppoſed the king of Spain, and the duke of Alba, was not a rebellion, nor a popular itch of pulling down images, but an emanation of the ſupreme authority, which the people have to defend their rights, their laws, and the liberty of conſcience. Add to this what I ſay in the remark [*H*]. The acts of the pacification of Cologne, begun in the year 1579, which were publiſhed at Delft, with the licence of the States, and with excellent notes by Haggai Albada, Koornhert's intimate friend, are thought to be the work of the latter. Euſebius Philalethes aſcribes all this to him, in a book printed in 1617. See likewiſe Koornhert's firſt treatiſe againſt Juſtus Lipſius. He wrote a piece in the year 1584, concerning the means of reſiſting the king of Spain, and he ſhewed, among other things, that it was neceſſary to put themſelves under the protection of France. Being perſuaded, that the Chriſtian peace was one of the moſt important doctrines of the Goſpel, and that it could not be maintained, but by reducing the truths neceſſary to ſalvation, to a ſmall number, and by permitting the difference of opinions with reſpect to other doctrines, he laboured with all his might to put things upon that foot. He took the advantage of the great Eraſmus's opinion (33), and agreed with two doctors of the Reformed church (34); and it ſeems, that prince William was ſomewhat inclined that way. Conſult the Hiſtory of Bor, book 21. fol. 107.

Koornhert was continually ſaying, that Luther, Calvin and Mennon, had ſtrongly attacked abundance of Romiſh errors, but that they had very ill ſucceeded againſt the dreadful and impious doctrine of forcing conſcience; and that, inſtead of oppoſing in the beſt manner, they had rather ſtrengthened it; every one having put it in practice, wherever they could become maſters, and created a new Papacy, by the erection of a ſchiſmatical church, which condemned all others. They have, ſaid he, encouraged the Papiſts, by this means, to continue their method, and have not only gained nothing againſt their perſecuting maxims, but have alſo introduced confuſions and ſchiſms, by taking away the liberty of prophecying (35). As for himſelf, he maintained, that no-body ought to be hated;

(27) Ibid. ex lib. xv, pag. 759, ad ann. 1589.

(28) *Taken from the extracts of Koornhert's Life.*

(29) Ibid.

(30) Extracts of Brandt's Hiſtory, *lib. xv, pag.* 757.

(31) Ibid.

(32) In the duchy of Cleves.

(33) In epiſtola ad Archiepiſcopum Panormitanum, Operibus Hilarii præfixa.

(34) Hubert Duyfhuis, and Taco Sybrand.

(35) That is, of profeſſing whatever is dictated by the conſcience.

and that all pious people, who, by faith in JESUS CHRIST, endeavoured to imitate him, are good Chriſtians, and that the magiſtrates ought to account all peaceable people, good ſubjects (36). He was ſo full of this hypotheſis, that, to the prejudice of his tranquillity and temporal intereſts, he made uſe of all his courage, parts, and learning to maintain it (37).

(36) Extracts of Koornhert's Life.

(37) The Dutch Diſtich, made by Peter Hooſt, to be put under Koornhert's print, imported, that he had been inſatiable of knowledge and liberty.

KORNMANNUS (HENRY) a German Civilian, author of ſome curious treatiſes [*A*], of which there are ſeveral editions. He lived in the beginning of the XVIIth century.

[*A*] *He is author of ſome curious treatiſes.*] That, which is intituled, *de Virginitatis jure Tractatus novus & jucundus, ex Jure civili, canonico, Patribus, Hiſtoricis, Poëtis, &c. confectus*; and that which is commonly printed with it, with this title, *Linea Amoris, ſive Commentarius in verſiculum Gl. viſus, colloquium, convictus, oſcula, factum*, have been often printed. The oldeſt edition I know of them, is of Francfort, 1610. It is a great and fruitful ſubject; but the author runs over it, and examines nothing to the bottom, and what he ſays is very common. He may pleaſe thoſe, who love brevity. His other works are, *Templum naturæ hiſtoricum, ſeu de natura & miraculis quatuor elementorum, De miraculis vivorum, ſeu de natura, proprietatibus, &c. hominum vivorum*, at Francfort 1614. *De miraculis mortuorum*, &c. It has been ſaid, that Kirchmannus, in his book *de Funeribus Romanorum*, borrows a great deal from this laſt work of our Kornmannus (1). And yet I do not find, that the book *de Miraculis mortuorum*, came out before the year 1610; whereas the book, intituled *de Funeribus Romanorum*, was printed in 1604. It is true, the author gave a new edition of it in 1625, and he might have made uſe of our Kornmannus's work for his additions. This we may examine another time, if we have leiſure.

(1) Anton. Borremans, Variar. Lection. cap. iv, pag. 32.

KORTHOLT (CHRISTIAN) doctor and profeſſor of Divinity at Kiel, was born the fifteenth of January 1633, at Burg in the iſle of Femeren (*a*). He was inſtructed both in piety and learning, with great care, at his father's houſe, and in the ſchool of Burg, till he was ſixteen years of age; after which he was ſent to Sleſwic, where he purſued his ſtudies for two years. He afterwards ſtudied in the college of Stetin, where he gave public proofs of his progreſs; for he maintained two Theſes (*b*), one *De veracitate & taciturnitate*, the other, *De natura Philoſophiæ, ejuſque in Theologia uſu*. He was author of the latter. Being come to Roſtoch, in the year 1652, he was a diligent attendant on the profeſſors lectures, and ſucceſsfully maintained two other Theſes (*c*), of which he compoſed the firſt. The death of his father obliged him to leave this univerſity, at the years end; but he returned thither ſome months after, and gave new proofs of his knowledge, both by the Theſis *de Chriſto* θεανθρώπῳ, which he compoſed, and publickly defended, and by the lectures he read at home in Logic, Metaphyſics, and Hebrew. He ſolemnly took his degree of doctor in Philoſophy, in the year 1656; and then he went to ſtudy in the univerſity of Iëna, where he acquired great reputation by the academical acts, in which he was ſometimes Reſpondent, and ſometimes Moderator, and by the private lectures he read upon Philoſophy, the Oriental tongues, and Divinity. He left the univerſity of Iëna, in 1660, and viſited thoſe of Leipſic and Wittemberg, and afterwards returned to Roſtock, where he ſhewed his capacity ſeveral ways; ſo that, in February 1662, he was made profeſſor of the Greek tongue. He took his doctor of Divinity's degree in November the ſame year. Not long before, his parts and learning diſcovered themſelves, in three diſputes with the Roman Catholics [*A*], in the preſence of Chriſtian, duke of Mecklenburg. He married on the twenty ſixth of April 1664, and was invited the following year to be ſecond profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſity lately founded at Kiel. He was created Vice-chancellor in the year 1666, and in 1675 he ſucceeded Peter Muſæus, who had the firſt Divinity chair. He was ſo deſirous to make this new univerſity flouriſh, and had ſo much gratitude for the kindneſs, which the duke of Holſtein, his maſter, ſhewed him, that he refuſed all the preferments that were offered him in ſeveral places, though they were noble and honourable. This prince procured him the profeſſorſhip of Eccleſiaſtical Antiquities, in 1680, and declared him perpetual Vice-chancellor of the univerſity in the year

(*a*) Near the Baltic Sea, in the country of Holſtein.

(*b*) That is, two diſſertations, and not meer poſitions.

(*c*) One was *de ſuppoſito & perſona*, and the other *de ſphæra activitatis*.

[*A*] *His parts and learning appeared in three diſputes with the Roman Catholics.*] Theſe are the particulars we find upon that ſubject in his funeral programma. ‘An. MDCLXI. à Sereniſſimo Duce ‘Mecklenburgico, CHRISTIANO, Principe eru‘ditione, facundia, comitateque ſingulari prædito, per ‘Cancellarium ejus, D. CHRISTOPHORUM ‘KRAUTHOFIUM, invitabatur in aulam Sue‘rinenſem, ad colloquium cum Pontificio Auſtriaco, ‘EGGEFELDIO, viro quidem docto, ſed admo‘dum ſupercilioſo, de religionis negotio, habendum. ‘Quod & in conſpectu multorum aulæ Procerum, ac ‘peregrinorum etiam, qui fortè tunc aderant, inſtitu‘tum, ac poſtero die cum alio Pontificio Polono, EL‘LERNIZKIO, continuatum eſt Stinchenburgi, ‘ipſo Principe præſente, qui eum illuc accerſitum cle‘menterque acceptum toto octiduo ſecum retinuit. A ‘quo & ſequenti anno MDCLXII. denuo ad certa‘men, cum Pontificio quodam Pariſienſi, cui nomen ‘de la BUISSON (1) erat, ibidem inſtituendum, ‘provocatus comparuit, in eoque de graviſſimis religio‘nis controverſiis cum omnium applauſu per aliquot ‘dies diſputavit. ——— *In the year* 1661, *CHRI‘STIAN, duke of Mecklenburg, a prince of ſingular ‘learning, eloquence, and affability, invited him, by ‘his chancellor, CHRISTOPHER KRAUT‘HOF, to the court of Suerin, to a conference, to be ‘held, concerning the buſineſs of religion, with EG‘GEFELD, a Roman Catholic of Auſtria, a learned ‘man indeed, but very ſupercilious. Which was begun ‘in the preſence of many of the courtiers, and alſo ſtran‘gers, and continued, the next day, with another Ro‘man Catholic, a Polander, named ELLERNIZK, ‘in the preſence of the prince himſelf, who, having in‘vited, and received him graciouſly, retained him with ‘him eight days. And being again called by the ſame ‘prince, the following year* 1662, *to diſpute with a Ro‘man Catholic of Paris, named du BUISSON, he ‘appeared, and diſputed ſome days, with univerſal ap‘plauſe, concerning the moſt important controverſies of ‘religion.*’

(1) It ſhould be *du Buiſſon*.

year 1689. He diſcharged the duties of all thoſe places, and of that of Vice-rector (d), (which fell five times to him) with great ability, application, and prudence. His death, which happened the thirty firſt of March, 1694, was a very great loſs to the univerſity of Kiel, and to the Republic of Letters, which he had enriched with a great number of books [*B*], to which he might have added many more, if he had lived longer. He left two ſons, who tread very worthily in his ſteps (*e*) [*C*].

[*B*] *He enriched the Republic of Letters with a great number of books.*] I have ſeen the catalogue of them, which was printed at Kiel in the year 1694. Some are in High-Dutch, and others in Latin. The titles of the Latin are theſe: Tractatus de Origine & Progreſſu Philoſophiæ Barbaricæ. Jenæ in 4. 1660. Tractatus de Perſecutionibus Eccleſiæ primitivæ, veterumque Martyrum Cruciatibus ibid. in 8. 1660. *Prodiit longe accuratior, & triplo auctior*, Kilonii ann. 1689. in 4. Valerianus Confeſſor, hoc eſt, ſolida Demonſtratio, quod Eccleſia Romana hodierna non ſit vera CHRISTI Eccleſia; deducta ex Valer. Magni, Capuccini, Apologia Anti-Jeſuitica. Roſt. in 12. 1662. *Opuſculum illud auctius Kilonii in* 4. *eſt editum* 1666. Diſſertatio de Neſtorianiſmo. ibid in 4. 1662. Tractatus de Calumniis Paganorum in veteres Chriſtianos. Roſtochii, in 4. 1663. *Longe auctior publicatus eſt Kilonii anno* 1668 *novoque planè habitu, in tres Libros diſtinctus, brevi, V. D. è Typographeo Kilonienſi proditurus eſt* (2). Exercitatio in Hiſtoriam Judith. Roſtoch. in 4. 1663. Exercitatio in Præfationem Hieronymi in Judith. ibid. in 4. 1663. Tractatus de Canone Scripturæ, Bellarmino, ejuſque propugnatoribus, Gretſero & Erbermanno Jeſuitis, oppoſitus. Roſtochii, in 4. 1665. Tractatus de Religione Ethnica, Muhammedana, & Judaica. Kilonii, in 4. 1665. Oratio de Scholarum & Academiarum ortu & progreſſu, præſertim in Germania, inter ſolemnia inaugurationis Academiæ Kilonienſis habita. Sleſv. in fol. 1666 Diſſertatio Hiſtorica de Philippi Arabis, Alexandri Mammææ, Plinii Junioris, & Annæi Senecæ, Chriſtianiſmo. Kil. in 4. 1667. Apologia pro Valeriano Confeſſore, adverſus Capuccinum Salisburgenſem, ibid. in 4. 1667. Tractatus de Variis Scripturæ ſacræ Editionibus. ibid. in 4, 1668. *Longe auctior vulgatus eſt Kilonii ann* 1686. Pſeudadelphia Heiniana, D. Johanni Heinio, Theologo Reformato Marpurgenſi, oppoſita, ibid. in 4. 1669. Tractatus de Lectione Bibliorum in linguis vulgo cognitis. ibid. in 4. 1670. *Reviſus & auctus Plœnæ recuſus eſt anno* 1692. Funus Eccleſiæ Romanæ in Clemente IX Papa defunctæ. ibid. in 4. 1670. Papa Utopicus. ibid. in 4. 1670. Tractatus de Origine & natura Chriſtianiſmi ex mente Gentilium. Kil. in 4. 1672. Apologia pro Valeriano Confeſſore, adverſus Chriſtianum Fabrum, Gallo-Sebuſianum. Kil. 4. 1673. Commentarius in Epiſtolas Plinii & Trajani de Chriſtianis primævis. ibid. in 4. 1674. Commentarius in Juſtinum M. Athenagoram, Theophilum Antiochenum, Tatianum Aſſyrium. Kil. in fol. 1675. *Auctior editus eſt Lipſiæ ann.* 1686. Diſſertatio de Viribus humanis in ordine ad Civilia & Spiritualia. Kil. in 4. 1676. Exercitatio anti-Salmaſiana de Pane ἐπιουσίῳ, quem in Oratione Dominica petimus. in 4. 1676. Diſquiſitiones anti-Baronianæ, ibid. in 4. 1677. De Tribus Impoſtoribus Magnis, liber, Edoardo Herbert, Thomæ Hobbes, & Benedicto Spinoſæ oppoſitus. Cui addita Appendix, qua Hieronymi Cardani & Edoardi Herberti de Animalitate Hominis opiniones philoſophicè examinatæ. ibid. in 8. 1680. Diſquiſitio anti-Baroniana peculiaris de Reliquiarum cultu. ibid. in 8. 1680. Tractatus de Vita & Moribus Chriſtianis primævis per Gentilium malitiam afflictis. ibid. in 4. 1683. Theſes Theologicæ XXV Diſputationibus publicis in Univerſitate Kilonienſi propoſitæ. ibid. in 4. 1684. *Prodierunt & ventilatæ ſunt altera vice* 1686, *ac rurſum anno* 1692. Tractatus de Proceſſu diſputandi Papiſtico. Cui ſubjuncta Diſſertatio de Hoſtiis Euchariſticis, ſive Placentulis orbiculatis, quibus in S. Synaxeos adminiſtratione utimur. ibid. in 4. 1685. Exercitatio de CHRISTO CRUCIFIXO, Judæis ſcandalo, Gentilibus ſtultitia, Credentibus autem Dei potentia & ſapientia. 1 Cor. 1. 18, 23, 24. ibid. in 4. 1686. Exercitatio de Atheiſmo Veteribus Chriſtianis, ob Templorum inprimis averſationem à Gentilibus objecto, inque eoſdem à noſtris retorto. Ibid. in 4. 1689. Silentium Sacrum, ſive, de Occultatione Myſteriorum apud veteres Chriſtianos Diſſertatio. Ibid. in 4. 1689. De Studio Belli ac Pacis Diſſertatio Theologica, in gratam memoriam redditæ divina clementia Cimbricis provinciis Concordiæ, teſtitutique feliciter Reverendiſſ. Sereniſſimique Sleſvici & Holſatiæ Ducis regnantis Dn. CHR. ALBERTI. Ibid. in 4. 1689. De actionibus Forenſibus Exercitatio Theologica. Ibid. in 4. 1690. Alexander Papa Octavus Pſeudonymus. Ibid. in 4. 1690. De Magnanimitate Ariſtotelica, Chriſtianæ Modeſtiæ aliiſque veris Virtutibus inimica, Diſſertatio. Ibid. in 4. 1690. De Schiſmate, ſuperiori ſeculo Proteſtantes inter & Pontificios enato, Diſſert. Hiſtorico-Theologica, ib. in 4. 1690. Apotheoſis Papæa. Ibid. in 4. 1691. In Canonem 6. Nicænum Cardd. Baronio & Bellarmino oppoſita Exercitatio. Ibid. in 4. 1691. Miſcellanea Academica. Ibid. in 4. 1692. Diſquiſitio de Pontifice Romano. Ibid. in 4. 1692. De Rationis cum Revelatione in Theologia concurſu. Ibid. in 4. 1692. De Veterum quorundam locutione illa: *Filius Dei aſſumpſit Hominem.* Ibid. in 4. 1692. De Nominibus, quibus per ludibrium & contemptum Chriſtiani olim à profanis appellati; deque Notis occultis, quibus iidem ſe inſigniviſſe crediti, Diſſertatio; addita Mantiſſa, qua diſquiritur: Num filiola, quam octo dierum infans enixa eſt, Baptiſmi capax. Ibid. in 4. 1693. De Sacris Publicis, debita cum reverentia præſentiſque Numinis metu colendis, Diatribe Aſcetica. Ibid. in 4. 1693.

Since his death, a tract has been publiſhed with this title, *Paſtor fidelis, ſive de Officio Miniſtrorum Eccleſiæ Opuſculum*, at Hamburgh, 1695, in 12°. See the *Acta Eruditor.* (3). They have alſo publiſhed his *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica Novi Teſtamenti*, at Leipſic in 1697, in 4. See the ſame Journal (4).

[*C*] *He left two ſons, who tread very worthily in his ſteps.*] He had ten children, five ſons, and five daughters, whereof four ſons and four daughters were living, when he died. The two eldeſt daughters were already married, one to Mr Lindeman, profeſſor of Phyſics and Metaphyſics at Roſtock, the other to Mr Paſch, profeſſor of Morality at Kiel (5). The eldeſt of the ſons, HENRY CHRISTIAN KORTHOLT, ſtudied Phyſic, and was then travelling in foreign countries. MATTHIAS NICOLAS KORTHOLT, and SEBASTIAN KORTHOLT, his brothers, had already given excellent proofs of their parts. JOEL JOHN KORTHOLT, the youngeſt of them all, ſtudied well, and was a man of fine hopes. ‘Natu minor, ‘*they are the words of the funeral programma*, JOEL ‘JOHANNES, pietatis & literarum ſtudio diligen‘ter incumbens, optimam de ſe ſpem excitat, quam ‘abunde jam impleverunt ætate profectibuſque multò ‘majores, MATTHIAS NICOLAUS, & SE‘BASTIANUS, pluribus præclaris bonæ indolis ‘ingeniique excellentis ſpeciminibus editis. —— *The* ‘*younger, JOEL JOHN, applying himſelf dili*‘*gently to piety and learning, raiſes the greateſt hopes* ‘*of himſelf, which MATTHIAS NICOLAS,* ‘*and SEBASTIAN, had already abundantly an*‘*ſwered, being much his ſeniors both in age and profi*‘*ciency, and having given many proofs of an excellent* ‘*diſpoſition and genius.*’ I have ſeen the diſſertation *de Poëtis Epiſcopis*, which Mr Sebaſtian Kortholt printed in the year 1699, and ſubmitted to the examination of the learned, *Examini Eruditorum publico*, when he was preparing to take his doctor's degree in Philoſophy (6). It is a very curious piece, and it ſhews the great reading of the author.

Since this was printed, I have ſeen two other pieces of his, on which I paſs the ſame judgment: one is intituled, *Diſquiſitio de Enthuſiaſmo Poëtico*, and was printed at Kiel in the year 1696, in 4to; the other, *De Puellis Poëtriis omiſſis ab Adriano Bailleto*, printed in the ſame place, in the year 1700. in 12mo. I have been informed alſo, that the author was made profeſſor of Poetry in the univerſity of Kiel, in February 1701, and that his brother (Matthias Nicolas) being invited to Gieſſen, to be profeſſor of Eloquence and Poetry in that univerſity, made his inaugural oration, the twenty ſecond of June 1700. He treated *De antiqua Eloquentia recentiorum perperam poſtpoſita a Carolo Peralto ſcriptore libri, cujus eſt titulus*, Parallele des Anciens & des Modernes, &c. This oration ſeemed to me to be very good. You may ſee the elogy of this profeſſor, in a letter from Mr Majus (7), dated from Kiel the twenty ſecond of May, 1700.

(*d*) It is, at the bottom the ſame thing with rector, becauſe there was no other rector at Kiel, but the prince himſelf, who founded that univerſity.

(*e*) Taken from his Funeral Programma, printed at Kiel, in 1694.

(2) It came out in 1668. See the *Acta Erudit.* for September, 1698, pag. 420.

(3) For January 1696, pag. 7, & *ſeq.*

(4) For September 1697, pag. 438.

(5) *He publiſhed in* 1695, Schediaſma de curioſis hujus ſæculi inventis quorum accuratiori cultui facem prætulit antiquitas. *He is reprinting it with great additions.*

(6) Pro ſummis in Philoſophia honoribus impetrandis.

(7) Jo. Burchardus Majus Eloquentiæ & Hiſtoriæ profeſſor primarius. *He is very famous for his writings.*

KOTTERUS (CHRISTOPHER) is one of the three fanatics, whoſe viſions were publiſhed at Amſterdam in the year 1657, with this title *Lux in Tenebris* [*A*]. He lived at Sprottaw in Sileſia. His viſions begun in June 1616. He fancied he saw

[*A*] *With this title*, Lux in Tenebris.] I have obſerved, in another place (1), the occaſion of this title and will not repeat it. This book was printed in the year 1657, at the expence of a rich patron (2) whom Comenius had found at Amſterdam. It contains the Revelations of our Chriſtopher Kotterus, thoſe of Chriſtina Poniatovia, and thoſe of Nicolas Drabicius. Comenius publiſhed an abridgment of it in 1660, with this title, *Revelationum divinarum in uſum ſeculi noſtri factarum Epitome*. He reprinted the whole work with this title. *Lux è Tenebris novis radiis aucta*, &c. This laſt edition contains the ſequel of Drabicius's revelations till the year 1666. A profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker, a Polander, called Nicolas Arnoldus, preſently wrote againſt this work, and replied to Comenius's apology. Mareſius, profeſſor of Divinity at Groningen, wrote againſt the ſame book, in his theſis *de tribus Videntibus*, in the year 1659; and when, ten years after, he publiſhed an anſwer (3) to a piece of Comenius concerning the Millennium, he reproached him more than once, and with great vehemence, for printing the pieces of thoſe three pretending prophets. This book, after ſome years, fell into oblivion and contempt; but when the Turks beſieged Vienna, in the year 1683, it was wonderfully ſought after. They, who had lodged the copies in garrets, where they had reſted a long time, fetched them out, and ſold ſeveral of them at a great price; and if the Turks had taken Vienna, I doubt not but they muſt have made a new edition of it, tho' the copies had been never ſo dear. They were very much inquired for in France, the count d' Avaux ſent ſome thither: and therefore we may very well wonder, that Mr Jurieu ſhould ſuppoſe, in the year 1691, that Drabicius was not known at Paris. This ſuppoſitition is inexcuſable, ſince, not long before, he himſelf had very much contributed to ſpread the name of that fanatic all over the world. Beſides he alledged this wrong ſuppoſition as a proof of a ſtate crime; for he pretended, that the *Avis aux Refugiez*, — *Advice to the Refugees*, making mention of Drabicius, could not have been written in France. Theſe are things, which my readers would ſcarce believe; wherefore it is neceſſary I ſhould prove them, by giving an account of what was replied to him. Here is the anſwer made by the author he accuſed (4).

'The firſt of his proofs is, that the *Avis aux* '*Refugiez, Advice to the Refugees*, was not written 'at Paris.' Now this he demonſtrates thus:

'He *, who wrote that advice, gives a particu'lar account, of Drabicius's prophecies; he ſaw 'them, read them, and knows all the particulars of 'them.

'But the learned of Paris ſcarce know the name 'of Drabicius.

'Therefore the author of the advice is not at 'Paris.

'If I ſhould deny the firſt propoſition, I am ſure 'he could never prove it; becauſe it does not ap'pear from the *Advice to the Refugees*, that the au'thor of it knew any thing more of Drabicius, 'than that he attempted to excite a war againſt the 'houſe of Auſtria. Any man of letters may know 'this without reading the books of that Prophet.

'But the ſecond propoſition is ſtill more palpably 'falſe. For, not to ſay, that, during the ſiege of 'Vienna, Drabicius's book was much talked of in 'France, and that many copies were ſent for from 'hence (I my ſelf was deſired by one of my friends, 'at Rouen, to ſend him one) who knows not, that 'the great encomiums Mr Jurieu beſtowed on the pro'phetical Triumvirate, I mean Chriſtina Poniatovia, 'Kotterus, and Drabicius, in a book † *more common* '*than Almanacks*, as he himſelf boaſts of it ‡, uſing the 'beſt compariſon that was ever ſeen; who knows not 'I ſay, that thoſe great encomiums beſtowed on Dra'bicius, and ſo likely to make this prophet talked of, 'have drawn upon the panegyriſt ſome very mortify'ing cenſures from the biſhop of Meaux ‡, and Mr Pe'liſſon **. in ſome books, publiſhed at Paris before the 'impreſſion of the *Advice to the Refugees*? Who 'doubts, that the ſatire intituled *L'Eſprit de Mr Ar*'*nauld*, ſo well known ſince the year 1684, raiſed a 'curioſity in abundance of Frenchmen to ſee Drabi'cius's propheſies, the ſcheme whereof Mr Jurieu 'draws †† there, in ſuch a manner as to promiſe the 'public, on one hand, from Drabicius, the ruin of the 'houſe of Auſtria, to the king of France the imperial 'crown, to the Turks the taking of Vienna, Carin'thia, and Stiria, and the deſtruction of the republic 'of Venice, and of the city of Rome, and to promiſe, 'on theo ther hand, in the name of the Proteſtants, *all* '*that they can do to accompliſh thoſe prophecies*?' The learned of Paris muſt have been very ſtupid, if they did not enquire after a book, of which Mr Jurieu has given the following notion. 'I found, *ſays he* (5), in the 'prophecies of Cotterus, Chriſtina, and Drabicius, 'publiſhed by Comenius, ſomething great and ſur'prizing. Kotterus, who is the firſt of theſe three 'prophets, is great and lofty; the images of his viſions 'are as noble and majeſtical, as thoſe of the antient 'prophets. They are alſo admirable well concerted; 'they are all of a piece; and there is no inconſiſtency, 'in them. It is inconceivable how a meer mechanic 'could have imagined ſuch great things without the 'aſſiſtance of God. The two years of Chriſtina's pro'phecy are, in my opinion, a train of miracles, as great 'as have happened ſince the Apoſtles: nor do we 'find any thing in the life of the greateſt prophets, 'that is more miraculous, than the adventures of this 'maid. Drabicius has alſo his ſublimity. But there 'is much more obſcurity and difficulty in him. Theſe 'three prophets conſpire in foretelling the fall of the 'antichriſtian empire, as what muſt very ſoon come to 'paſs. But then there are ſo many other things in 'them, which offend, that one cannot ſet his heart 'upon them.' If this had not raiſed a deſire of knowing Comenius's prophetical collection, at leaſt, thoſe would have had a curioſity, who had ſeen Mr Peliſſon's *Reflexions ſur les differens de la Religion*. For when a writer diſcovers a great deal of haughtineſs, it is impoſſible not to feel a ſecret pleaſure, when he happens to be mortified as Mr Jurieu was by theſe words of Mr Peliſſon. 'A prophet, and more than a 'prophet, a forerunner doubtleſs of the *Millenium*, 'which he declares to us, who at leaſt aſſumes the 'authority of reforming, correcting, and chaſtiſing, 'when he pleaſes, ſuch as he has formally acknow'ledged for prophets, and inſpired men *, a ſort of 'people, whom the event has already proved to be 'guilty of a hundred impoſtures, and who have been 'confounded in the ſight of all the world, by the tak'ing of Buda, tho' they had aſſured us, as from God, 'that it would never return to the Chriſtians by force 'of arms, but by a treaty with the Turks (6).' He gave (7) formal proofs of all this, by quoting the very words of Mr Jurieu (8), and the places where Drabicius expreſsly ſaid, that Buda ſhould never come out of the hands of the Turk, but in a peaceable way. When people are affected towards an author, as they were at Paris, with reſpect to Mr Jurieu, they are ſo well pleaſed to ſee him convicted either of impoſture, or Fanaticiſm, that they will ſeek for ſuch a conviction at the fountain head. *But is it true*, ſay they, *that Drabicius affirms ſuch a thing? may not one ſee it with one's own eyes, that there may remain no ſcruple, to leſſen the ridiculouſneſs of ſuch a ſcene?* Then they will ſeek a copy of Drabicius wherever they think it may be had; and if it cannot be met with, they will however keep his name in their memory.

It cannot be ſaid, that I digreſs from my ſubject; for, ſince it is a falſity in point of fact, to ſay that Drabicius's name was ſcarce known at Paris in 1690, it belongs to this Dictionary, and I was obliged to uſe all the proofs, that confute this falſity.

If Mr Jurieu had been contented to ſay, that, in compariſon of the noiſe Drabicius's name would have made in France, in caſe the Turks had taken Vienna, he was ſcarce known at Paris, when the *Advice to the Refugees* was written, I think he would not be in the wrong; for the taking of Vienna would have made Drabicius more talked of, than the grand viſier. The book, which Mr Jurieu wrote during the ſiege of that town, to praiſe and vindicate the three prophets of Comenius, by his illuſtrations, and learned commentaries, would have been tranſlated into ſeveral languages,
and

---

(1) In the article DRABICIUS, citat. (*r*).

(2) His name was Lawrence de Geer.

(3) *Intituled*, Antirrheticus, ſive defenſio pii zeli, &c. contra J. A. Comenium.

WHETHER the name of Drabicius was unknown in France in the year 1690.

(4) *In the* Cabale Chimerique, pag. 130, & ſeq. *of the ſecond edition.*

* Pag. 18.

† Accompliſſ. des Prophet. *printed in* 1686.

‡ XXI Lettre Paſtorale *of the year* 1689.

‡ Hiſt. des Variations, lib xiii, n. 41, *printed in* 1688.

** Reflex. ſur les Differens de la Relig. Part. II, *printed in* 1687.

†† Tom. II, pag. 291.

(5) *Preface to the* Accompliſſement des Propheties, *printed in* 1686.

* Chriſtopher Kotterus, of Sileſia. Chriſtina Poniatouſki, of Bohemia. Nicolas Drabicius, of Moravia.

(6) Reflexions ſur les Differens de la Religion, Part. II, ſect. xvii, pag. 435. Edit. Amſt. 1689.

(7) Ibid. pag. 501, & ſeq. *See alſo* Les Chimeres de Mr Jurieu, Part. IV, pag. 141.

(8) *Thoſe which I have quoted above out of the preface of the* Accompliſſement des Prophetics.

ſaw an angel in the form of a man, who commanded him to go and declare to the magiſtrates, that, unleſs the people repented, the wrath of God would do terrible executions. Tho' he had received this order ſix times ſucceſſively, he did not execute it; His paſtor and his friends diſſuaded him from it. But, in April 1619, believing he ſaw the ſpirit, which threatened him with eternal damnation, if he kept ſilence any longer, he diſcharged his commiſſion in a full aſſembly of the magiſtrates, the twenty ninth of Auguſt 1619. They laughed at him. The apparitions went on, and were followed by extaſies and prophetic dreams. The elector Palatine, declared king of Bohemia by the Proteſtants, was concerned in theſe viſions. Kotterus went to him at Breſlaw in December 1620, and acquainted him with his commiſſion. He went to ſome other places, and at laſt in 1625, to the court of Brandenburg (a) [B]. He got himſelf acquainted the ſame year with John Amos Comenius, who became a promoter of his propheſies (b) [C]. Now as moſt of thoſe things turned upon preſages of proſperity to the elector

and would have made Drabicius for a long time the diſcourſe of all companies. His performance came to nothing as to Drabicius's memory, by the raiſing of the ſiege: the great Sobieski, two or three hundred leagues off, deſtroyed a book, which was juſt ready to be put to the preſs. I began to know, during the ſiege of Vienna, how much I was miſtaken in believing, that, at laſt, the world was cured of the chimerical hopes, which they had ſo often grounded upon viſions. I every where met with people, that talked of nothing but of Drabicius's prophecies, and who built many caſtles in the air, ſo far as to deſtroy Babylon in a moment. They could not ſufficiently admire how Drabicius could gueſs ſo right with reſpect to Tekely. This is what I wanted them to ſay; for I made it appear, that Tekely, who was then the great actor of this opera, made no figure in Drabicius's book, which is a plain nullity. I queſtion not but the French had been very attentive, if the enterprize of the grand viſier had ſucceeded. They would gladly have lent their hand to the credulous concerning Drabicius's viſions, ſince they promiſed the empire to the king of France. It is therefore certain, that the name of this falſe prophet would have been incomparably more famous at Paris, if the Turks had taken Vienna.

PEOPLES tempers during the ſiege of Vienna, in 1683.

[B] *He was . . . in 1625 at the court of Brandenburg.*] The elector George William, hearing the great noiſe, that was made of Kotterus's Revelations had a mind to ſee him. He ordered the divines of Francfort upon the Oder to examine him; after which, he ſent for him twice to Berlin, firſt in the year 1625, and then in the year 1626. His renown, ſpreading as far as Strasburg, ſo ſtruck one of the burgomaſters, that he ſent a meſſenger into Sileſia, to intreat Kotterus, to explain to him ſixty two points, and to come to Strasburg, where he might more ſafely exerciſe his prophetical miniſtry. Kotterus anſwered his ſixty two queſtions, but excuſed himſelf from going to Strasburg, upon his having no commiſſion for it from the ſpirit, and ſuffered his picture to be ſent to the burgomaſter (9).

[C] *He got acquainted . . . . with John Amos Comenius, who became a promoter of his prophecies.*] After the edicts of the emperor, commanding the miniſters of Bohemia and Moravia, in the year 1624, to depart out of the country, it was reſolved in a ſecret aſſembly in March 1625, that the miniſters of Bohemia ſhould retire into Poland, and thoſe of Moravia into Hungary, and that, ſome ſhould be deputed with letters both into Poland and Hungary, to prepare a reception for them. Comenius was deputed to Poland, and, paſſing through Gorlitz in Luſatia, the governor of the young count Zerotin told him, as very comfortable news, that the ruin of Antichriſt was at hand, as it appeared from what the Holy Ghoſt had revealed to a good man of Sileſia, called Chriſtopher Kotterus. He mentioned, and read ſeveral paſſages of it, and, becauſe Comenius was too incredulous, he adviſed him to go to the place, and diſcourſe with the prophet. Comenius, paſſing through Sprottaw, deſired to ſee Kotterus: his wife anſwered him, that he was ſent for by the elector of Brandenburg. The paſtor of that place (10) confirmed the ſame thing to him; he aſſured him that Kotterus was a true ſeer, and gave him his revelations to read. Comenius, waiting till Kotterus's return, meditated on this manuſcript, and was amazed at it. Soon after, he ſaw Kotterus, performed his journey, returned quickly to Sprottaw, tranſlated the manuſcript of the revelations into the Bohemian tongue, and was fully convinced, that they proceeded from God. He returned into Poland, and took the prophet with him who told him in the way, that he knew by revelation, that there would be a council of all Chriſtendom, in which the Pope would be depoſed, and a canon made, forbidding every body hereafter to uſurp the title of univerſal biſhop. Comenius repreſented to him, that he had not read that article in the manuſcript: Kotterus anſwered, *I had no orders to write it, but however I have learned it.* Returning from Poland, Comenius parted from Kotterus, and went to Berlin, where he found, that, even among the refugees of Bohemia and Moravia, they paſſed very different judgments on this man: ſome held him for a true prophet, eſpecially when the poſt brought news, that the king of Denmark was raiſing troops. Others ſaid, he was a cheat, who, having ſpent his fortune, and not knowing how to live, ſet up for a Prophet. *Alii rurſum ex iiſdem meis ſcabioſiſſima de Cottero effutiebant: belluonem, rei ſuæ decoctorem, deſperationeque ad prophetandum adactum dictitantes, miraque de prophetiis ipſius mendacia inter ſe ſpargentes, mihique referentes* (11). This made Comenius uneaſy; but Chriſtopher Pelargus, ſuperintendant-general of the churches of Brandenburg, who had examined Kotterus by the elector's order, removed his doubts, by ſaying, that he ought not to queſtion that man's extraordinary miſſion (12), nor repent of his having tranſlated his revelations into the Bohemian Tongue. This tranſlation was not kept ſecret, as the author ſays he deſired; it was ſhewn to ſome perſons, who had it tranſcribed, and ſo the copies multiplied prodigiouſly in Bohemia: Nor is it any wonder, ſince that book promiſed a hundred triumphs to king Frederic. Some time after, it was printed, in the Bohemian tongue at Perna, in Miſnia, with commendations and marginal notes. But all the miniſters did not fall into the ſnare. Two of them, with ſome elders, found fault with the tranſcribing of that book; the intereſt of the true faith, and the danger which they were expoſed to, were the two reaſons that made them vote for the ſuppreſſion of thoſe chimeras, as being either an ingenious fiction, or the fantaſtical dreams of an Enthuſiaſt. 'Scriptum illud (ſive id ab aliquo ingenioſo confictum, ſive ab ipſo fanatico homine conſcriptum eſſet) ſupprimi petierunt. Duplex enim ſubeſſe periculum, & Conſcientiarum, ſi ſe homines à certo dei Verbo ad incerta id genus figmenta abduci paterentur, & Corporis atque vitæ, ſi hæc in adverſariorum veniant manus (13).' In the year 1626, the electreſs Juliana, mother to king Frederic, having acquainted a great lord of Moravia, who was as well as ſhe, a Refugee at Berlin, that ſhe had received a letter from the king her ſon, in which he enquired, whether he could have the prophecies of the man of Sileſia in writing, this great lord procured a copy of them, and, not being able to preſent it himſelf, becauſe he was ſick, he employed Comenius to do it, who was then at Berlin. Comenius, inſtead of delivering it to the electreſs, went directly to the king, who was then at the Hague, deſired audience, harangued him, and, amongſt other things, told him, that, ſince his majeſty and his children bore the principal part in that divine piece, they, who had this manuſcript, would have thought themſelves guilty of an abſurdity, if they had not communicated it to his majeſty. 'Cujus (*Cotteri*) omnia cum ſint in ſcriptum relata, ibidemque Majeſtas Veſtra, cùm Progenie ſuâ, tanquam primaria in hac Dei Comœdia introducitur Perſona; abſurdum viſum eſt illis, qui ea ſuis hactenus cuſtodierunt manibus, ad notitiam Majeſtatis Veſtræ hæc non deduci. Non

SOME particulars relating to the Hiſtory of the Revelations of Kotterus.

(a) Taken from his Revelations, publiſhed by Comenius.

(b) Comenius, Hiſt. Revelation. pag. 16, *& ſeq.*

(9) Comenius, in Epitome Revelationum, Append. III, pag. m. 209.

(10) His name was Abraham Mencelius.

(11) Comenius, Hiſt. Revelat. pag. 21.

(12) Vides hanc Bibliothecam meam (*inſtructiſſimam habebat, celeberrimus ob eam totam per Germaniam, quo me ſecretius hoc colloquium expetentem introduxerat*) omnes Authores, antiquos & recentes conſului, ut quid de quæſtione illa, Utrum poſt Chriſtum & Apoſtolos, obſignatumque Novi Fœderis Canonem, ullæ novæ admittendæ ſint, divinæ vel angelicæ, revelationes, ſentiendum ſit cognoſcerem? Sed nemo me ſcrupulis liberare potuit. Ego igitur ad preces converſus, ardentiſſime invocabam Deum (ſæpe etiam noctu ſurgens & me in faciem provolvens) ut ne pateretur illudi Eccleſiæ ſuæ orans. Poſt omnia vero tandem penſitata, divinitusque ſuggeſta, *non aliud habeo quod dicam, niſi* DEUM MISISSE ANGELUM SUUM, qui nuntiaret nobis ſervis ſuis ea, quæ oportet fieri cito: (*quæ ſunt Angeli verba* Apoc. 22, 6.) *Comenii, Hiſt. Revel. pag.* 21.

(13) Ib. pag. 23.

elector Palatine, and unhappineſs to his Imperial majeſty, it happened, that David Wachſman, the emperor's Fiſcal in the lower Sileſia, and in Luſatia, uſed all ſorts of means to ſeize Kotterus, whom he looked upon as a ſeditious impoſtor. Kotterus fell into his hands the ſecond of January 1627. He was examined, and put into a dungeon, and the ſentence of the court of appeals was expected from Prague. The Fiſcal received it the twenty fifth of April; but, as he died a little after, it is not known what it contained. Kotterus was releaſed from impriſonment, and permitted to be viſited by his wife and his friends; and at laſt he was put in the pillory [*D*], and baniſhed the dominions of the emperor, not to return upon pain of death. He went into Luſatia, which belonged to his electoral highneſs of Saxony, and there lived quietly till his death, which happened in the year 1647 (*c*). It is by an error of the preſs, that Moreri's Dictionary makes him ninety two years of age [*E*]. Comenius is inexcuſable for printing ſuch prophecies [*F*]. He knew, that part of them had proved falſe by the event. Since

‘Non quidem ut Majeſtati Veſtræ iſta præciſè credendi imponatur neceſſitas: ſed, Primùm, ut hæc apud Majeſtatem Veſtram tanquam in archivo ſacro aſſerventur, in futurum teſtimonium: nè, ſi demùm poſt completa prædicta hæc palam fiant, ex eventu ſic eſſe collecta, ſuſpicari quis, aut calumniari, poſſit. Deinde, ut occaſio ſit attendendi, num fortè divina providentia tales in eventus res diſponat. (Nam ſi de imminente rerum mutatione Politicos diſcurſus, vel Aſtrologicas prædictiones, aut ſimiles Prudentiorum conjecturas, cognoſcere non aſpernamur, cur hæc ab altiori venientia principio aſpernari libeat?) Curarunt itaque ex authentico deſcribi exemplar, quod Majeſtati Veſtræ per me humili cùm obſervantia exhibent: ſimulque exhibui (14).’ This is not meant, *adds he*, to impoſe on your majeſty the neceſſity of believing theſe things, but only to deſire, that you would preſerve them in your archives, to the end, that if they prove true, no body may object, that thoſe predictions were made after the event, and that you may alſo have an occaſion to obſerve, whether providence prepares the way to thoſe great revolutions.

Here the myſtery lies: they would have it, that princes, who are capable of executing a deſign, and intereſted in the execution, ſhould form it, in hopes of ſucceeding in it. This is frequently the firſt motive of our prophets, and apocalyptical commentators, and of thoſe, who favour them. But to return to the thread of the hiſtory.

Comenius was received, and diſmiſſed honourably, by king Frederic, and went into Bohemia, where Kotterus met him, in October 1626, and conferred with ſome miniſters and gentlemen (15).

Here is a paſſage, in which I find no exactneſs. ‘Quam turpiter vero in horum (*Cotteri & Drabicii*) & Chriſtinæ Poniatoviæ virginis Bohemæ conatibus, qui ejuſdem omnino farinæ erant, juvandis modo dictus Comenius ſe dederit, è Voëtii Diſpp part. 2. p. 1080. liquet (16). —— *How ſhamefully the ſaid Comenius promoted the attempts of theſe men* (Cotterus and Drabicius) *and of Chriſtina Poniatovia, a Bohemian lady, appears from Voëtius, Diſp. part.* 2. *pag.* 1080.’ These are Mr Hartnac's words, in his new edition of Micrælius's eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. He had been condemning the pretended prophecies of Kotterus, and Comenius, who publiſhed them; he had been ſaying, that Drabicius's hand and head were cut off, who well deſerved that puniſhment (17); and then he adds, that it appears, by the 1080th page of the ſecond tome of Voëtius's diſputations, that Comenius committed a moſt ſhameful fault in publiſhing the revelations of thoſe perſons. I have conſulted that place of Voëtius; but there is nothing relating to Comenius, either in the 1080th page, or in the following.

[*D*] *He was put in the pillory.*] Theſe are Comenius's words. ‘Poſt aliquot adhuc menſium deliberationem ignominiæ pœna affecerunt tali. Eductum carcere collocarunt ad cippum fori, ferreo adſtrictum collari, affixaque ſupra caput ſcheda, cui inſcriptum fuit: *Hic eſt Pſeudo-propheta ille, qui prædixit quæ non evenerunt.* Horæ ſpatio ſic ſpectaculo relictus, per Lictorem urbe fuit eductus, exireque patriâ, nec in Cæſaris ditiones redire ſub capitis pœna, juſſus (18). *After ſome months deliberation, they ſentenced him to this ignominious puniſhment. Being brought out of priſon, they ſet him in the pillory, with this inſcription over his head;* This is the falſe prophet, who foretold things, which have not come to paſs. *Being thus expoſed an hour, he was led out of the city by an officer, and commanded to quit his country, and not return into the emperor's dominions, on pain of death.*’

[*E*] *It is by an error of the preſs, that Moreri's Dictionary makes him ninety two years of age.*] His birth is placed there in the year 1585, and his death in 1647; he therefore lived 62, and not 92, years. But the Printers do often confound the figures 6 and 9.

[*F*] *Comenius is inexcuſable for printing ſuch prophecies.*] God forbid, I ſhould pronounce judgment on what paſſes in the heart of my neighbour: thoſe myſteries belong only to God: but on ſome occaſions, one may ſpeak one's thoughts upon appearances. Much more may I be permitted to relate hiſtorically, what others have thought of the conduct of Comenius. Whilſt he lived in Pruſſia, they deliberated about him in the courts of ſome princes, and it was made a caſe of conſcience, whether he did not deſerve the puniſhment, which the law of God decreed againſt falſe prophets. He was ſuſpected to have been counſellor and ſecretary to thoſe, who intended to make an irruption into Bohemia, which they would have executed, if the Engliſh (19) had furniſhed them with the ſupplies, which they demanded. He, and thoſe of his temper, were accounted the abettors of the war, which Ragotski, and the princes Radzivil, undertook againſt Poland. The delivery of the church of God from Papal tyranny, was the object that was ſet before their eyes, to make them take up arms. I ſay nothing, but what I have a good authority for: read theſe words of Arnoldus to Comenius. ‘Prævaricatio illa, quam dicis, tanti tamen non fuit, ut ſuper ea in aulis Principum deliberaretur, caſus conſcientiæ formati viris doctis decidendi mitterentur, an ſim falſus Propheta, & conſequenter, an in me pœna divinitus in falſos Prophetas ſtatuta animadvertendum non eſſet, quod de te in Boruſſia cum adhuc morarer perſcriptum memini, & forte autographum illarum literarum adhuc poſſideo. Tanti, inquam, non fuit illa prævaricatio, ut propter eam πολυπράγμων audirem, ac desertâ ſtatione mea Profeſſoria, Magnatibus pro flabello in concitandis motibus bellicis eſſem, uti de te rumor eſt, qui à manu & conſiliis intimis fuiſſe illis diceris, qui in Bohemiam irruptionem ante annos moliebantur, ſi modo annuiſſent illorum votis Angli ſollicitati. Ego id non dico, quanquam ſtylus literarum tuo non ſit abſimilis. Jam per rumores in Boruſſia (uti niſi me omnino ſallat memoria, illinc ad te perſcripſi,) audiveram, Principes Radzivilios & Rakocium à vobis fuiſſe inductos, qui arma contra Polonos capeſſerent, ſpe liberandæ Eccleſiæ à tyrannide Pontificia, cujus rei haud exigua paſſim in volumine illo triuno extant argumenta. Ego tamen non definio (20). — *Yet that prevarication you ſpeak of, was not ſo great, as to occaſion debates thereupon in the courts of princes, and caſes of conſcience to be drawn up, and propoſed to the deciſion of learned men, whether I am a falſe prophet, and conſequently, whether the puniſhment, appointed by God for falſe prophets, ought not to be inflicted on me; which I remember was written concerning you, whilſt I continued in Pruſſia, and, by chance, I ſtill have a copy of thoſe letters. I ſay, that prevarication was not ſo great, as to procure me the appellation of a* buſy meddling fellow, *who, deſerting my poſt of profeſſor, excite the great to take up arms; as it is rumoured of you, who are ſaid to have been the chief abettor of thoſe, who, ſome years ago, deſigned an irruption into Bohemia, if the Engliſh, whom they ſollicited, had aſſiſted them. I do not affirm this, though the ſtile of the letters is not unlike yours. I had already*

(*c*) *Taken from the Abridgement of his Revelations*, Append III, *and from the* Hiſt. Revelationum, pag. 21, 22.

(14) Ib. pag. 26.

(15) *Taken from the* Hiſtoria Revelationum, *publiſhed by Comenius in the year* 1659, pag. 15, & ſeq.

(16) Micræl. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. pag 1324. Edit. 1699.

(17) Interceptus in illo regno (*Hungariæ Drabicius*) capite manuque amputatis, libro quoque cui titulus, *Lux in Tenebris*, infami loco combuſto dignam pœnam luit. *Id. ibid. See citation* (18) *of the article* DRABICIUS.

(18) Hiſtoria Revelat. pag 28.

(19) *It was in Cromwell's time. See the article* COMENIUS, *remark* [*G*], *num.* VI.

(20) Arnoldus, in Diſcurſu Theologico contra Comenium, pag. 10.

Since his death, they have been more and more confuted by the courſe of affairs in Europe. The Turks, who, according to thoſe prophecies, were to deſtroy the houſe of Auſtria, have reſtored it to it's former luſtre, by their continual loſſes [G]. He made himſelf very much ſuſpected of having a deſign to kindle a war. The ſame ſuſpicions are

'*ready heard, from common fame, in Pruſſia* (*as, if I remember right, I acquainted you from thence by letter*) *that the princes Radzivil and Ragotski, had been induced by you to take up arms againſt the Polanders, in hopes of freeing the church from Papal tyranny; of which there appear very ſtrong proofs in that three-one volume, in many places. Yet I decide nothing.*' I do not wonder that Comenius was ſuſpected of political contrivances, and intrigues of war; for a divine, who travels as much as he did, and who has ſuch frequent buſineſs at the courts of princes, is a man, who is not much to be truſted. The electreſs, mother to king Frederic, inquires whether a collection of Kotterus's prophecies is to be had; the perſon, to whom ſhe makes her application, gets a copy tranſcribed, and, not being able to preſent it himſelf, deſired Comenius to do it: Comenius, who is at Berlin, and has but two ſteps to make, to preſent it to the electreſs, chooſes rather to go to the Hague, that he may give it with his own hand to king Frederic, and harangue him upon the contents of the book, which, at leaſt, ſaid he, would make him attentive to the occurrences. This looks very much like the contrivance of a prophetic faction (21). They foretel what they deſire ſhould be attempted, and then they leave no ſtone unturned, to engage in the enterprize ſuch as they think fit for it. It is very likely, that the great pains Comenius took, to re-unite the Proteſtants (22), proceeded from his deſire of forming a powerful party, that might accompliſh the prophecies with carnal weapons. There is another thing, which did Comenius ſome prejudice. He was a man of parts and learning; he argued very ſenſibly in other matters, and in theſe like a man of wit; there was nothing in him that looked like Enthuſiaſm. This made people believe, that he was not perſuaded of what he ſaid. There may be, and there is ſometimes, ſome impoſture in exſtatical grimaces; but thoſe, who boaſt of inſpiration, without ſhewing in their face, or by their words, that their brain is diſordered, and without ever being put out of their natural ſtate, are incomparably more to be ſuſpected of a cheat, than thoſe, who from time to time fall into convulſions, as the Sibyl more or leſs.

- - - - Deus, ecce, Deus: cui talia fanti
Ante fores, ſubito non vultus, non color unus,
Non comptæ manſêre comæ: ſed pectus anhelum,
Et rabie fera corda tument: majorque videri,
Nec mortale ſonans, adflata eſt numine quando
Jam propiore Dei (23). - - - - - -

He comes, the prieſteſs cry'd; I feel the God;
(Faſt by the ſacred portal as ſhe ſtood)
And now diſorder'd looks, and flowing hair,
Proclaim the wiſh'd-for inſpiration near.
Enthuſiaſtic fury ſwells her breaſt;
And now th' inſpiring pow'r appears confeſs'd.

At Phœbi nondum patiens immanis in antro
Bacchatur vates, magnum ſi pectore poſſit
Excuſſiſſe deum: tanto magis ille fatigat
Os rabidum, fera corda domans, fingitque premendo (24).

The prieſteſs raves within the ſacred bow'r,
And from her breaſt would fain diſlodge the pow'r.
Her efforts vain; his ſeat the God maintains,
And harder, as ſhe ſtrives, the ſtruggling Sibyl reins.

I am willing, that Comenius ſhould not be ſuſpected of any ſiniſter deſign. But what ſhall we ſay againſt thoſe who find fault with him for having publiſhed Kotterus's prophecies as being divinely inſpired, even after the event had proved them to be falſe (25)? I confeſs this ſeems to me inexcuſable. And, as for Drabicius, could it be imagined, that God inſpired him? If God had inſpired him, he would have had Ragotski to deſtroy the houſe of Auſtria, and to know, that heaven had deſigned him for that great work. But if this had been God's will, would he not have inſpired that prince with the deſire of making war againſt the emperor, or at leaſt with ſome credulity for Drabicius? here is a thing, which ſhews the conceitedneſs of Comenius. His ſon-in-law (26) deſired Arnoldus, profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker, to aſſiſt his father-in-law with his good advice, who ſeemed to heſitate about the impreſſion of the three prophets. Arnoldus adviſed him not to print them (27); the ſon-in-law gave the ſame counſel (28), which he grounded upon very ſtrong arguments. But how could Comenius adhere to the advice of two perſons, ſince he had no regard to the decree of the Poliſh churches, which, having examined the pretended revelations of Kotterus, and Chriſtina Poniatovia, condemned them to be ſuppreſſed for ever (29).

[G] *The Turks, who, according to thoſe prophecies, were to deſtroy the houſe of Auſtria, have reſtored it to it's former luſtre by their continual loſſes.*] See hereupon the indecent inſults of the author of the *Avis aux Refugiez.* —— *Advice to the Refugees.* 'It is certain, *ſays he* (30), that the glory and happineſs of his Imperial majeſty, in this war againſt the Turks, are wonderful; and that, to the eternal confuſion of the prophecies of your DRABICIUS, God has given greater ſucceſs to this prince, than to the emperor Charles V. This falſe prophet, more eager to curſe than Balaam, who even, when a neighbouring king importuned him with great promiſes, would do nothing raſhly, pronounced, for the ſpace of ſeveral years, againſt the houſe of Auſtria, the moſt terrible curſes he could think of, and devoted it, as we may ſay, to the furies and infernal gods, *Diris & numinibus infernis*, becauſe it had perſecuted your religion. But the event has ſhewn, that he did not underſtand that trade, and that he had no good hand at curſing. No man did ever deſerve leſs the encomium that was beſtowed upon Balaam, *He whom thou bleſſeſt ſhall be bleſſed, and he whom thou curſeſt ſhall be curſed*; and, if all your prophetical imprecations are like thoſe of Drabicius, people will be forward hereafter to deſire your curſes, and you will be ſought for with greater importunity to utter them, than the king of the Moabites uſed to make Balaam, the falſe prophet, curſe his enemies.' Since the impreſſion of that *Advice*, the ſucceſs of the emperor's arms has been ſometimes interrupted (31); but this has been but a ſhort reſpite for the Turks; their bad fortune quickly began again to diſplay all it's fury. She was near over-whelming them the laſt year (32); ſhe made them every where feel her indignation, in Dalmatia, in Hungary, in Poland, upon the Archepelago; and, if we may believe our news-writers, they loſt two naval battles, in a little time, laſt winter, though the victors did not think fit to purſue their victory, but rather to quit the iſle of Chios. The new Sultan raiſes in ſome manner the hopes of the Porte. They apply to him what Florus ſaid of Trajan (33); but hitherto it does not appear by the relations of our news-writers, that he has had great ſucceſs. And as for Tekeli, who, during the ſiege of Vienna, was given out for Drabicius's hero, we have lately been told in the Gazettes, that the Turks, weary of the obſtinate malignity of his ſtars, have ſhut him up in the ſeven towers.

This is what I was ſaying in the month of October 1695, whilſt we ſaw a kind of ſuſpenſion of the great and glorious fortune of the Imperial arms in Hungary. The Paris Gazettes daily amplified the victory which the Sultan had lately obtained; the other Gazettes continually diminiſhed it. It was not as yet known to what party, according to the news-writers, the conſequences of this battle would be favourable. The progreſs of the Turks would have confirmed the relations of Paris, and confuted thoſe of Holland and Germany. But they made none at all; they retired, a little after, into their own territories, without ſhewing themſelves as conquerors, and hereby the conteſt was ended, to the confuſion of the Paris Gazetteers. The fortune of his are entertained of a miniſter, whoſe prophecies are of a later date [*H*]. Advantage has been taken of ſome words, which he has dropped in his book, and by which it is pretended,

---

(21) *See, above, remark* [C], *towards the middle.*

(22) *He owns, in his book de* uno Neceſſario, *that one of the three labyrinths wherein he had intangled himſelf, were the* pſeudo-irenicum, ſive varie, noxie, prorſuſque exitioſe circa fidem diſſidentes Chriſtianos reconciliandi deſiderium. *See Spizelius, in Infelice Literato, pag.* 1025.

(23) Virgil. Æn. lib. vi, ver. 46.

(24) Ibid. ver. 77.

(25) *It was proved againſt him, from his own words, that he believed ſome of Drabicius's predictions to be falſe; that, for inſtance, which imported, that Comenius was to be preſent at the coronation of the king of Hungary at Preſburg.* Arnoldus, ubi ſupra, pag. 42.

(26) *His name was Figulus.*

(27) In Diſcurſu Theologico, pag. 5.

(28) Ibid. pag. 56.

(29) Cotterianæ & Poniatovianæ viſiones ut vanæ ad ſilentium & tenebras fuerunt ab illis condemnatæ. *Arnoldus, ibid. pag.* 28.

(30) Pag. 357.

(31) *For example, when the Turks retook Belgrade in the year* 1690.

(32) *I write this in October* 1695, *when our news writers tell us, that the loſs of the Imperialiſts at the battle of Lugos is very inconſiderable.*

(33) Quibus inertia Cæſarum quaſi conſenuit atque decoxit, niſi quod ſub Trajano principe movet lacertos, & præter ſpem omnium, ſenectus imperii, quaſi reddita juventute, revireſcit. *Florus, in Proœmio, Exl.*

his Imperial majeſty was uppermoſt afterwards, and eſpecially in 1697, by a defeat of the Ottomans, ſo compleat, ſo ſhameful, and pernicious to them, that there is hardly any like it in their annals. The Sultan who was there in perſon, was ſo mortified with this blow, that he thought of nothing but peace, and accepted it the year following, on what conditions they would preſcribe him, which were moſt glorious and advantageous to his Imperial majeſty. No falſe prophets did ever receive ſuch bloody affronts, as thoſe, which the prophecies, publiſhed by Comenius, received by this glorious treaty of peace. The emperor, whom they did ſo much threaten, mortified, humbled, and trod under foot the haughtineſs of the Ottomans, to whom they had promiſed ſo many conqueſts over the houſe of Auſtria. He added the luſtre of an advantageous peace, to the glory, which had attended his arms, and made him triumphant, by reducing the ſtrongeſt places, and gaining ſeveral battles. He does whatever he pleaſes in Tranſylvania; he has made a kingdom hereditary, which had been always elective (34), and is in poſſeſſion of that whole kingdom, whereas before he only poſſeſſed part of it. What ſhall we ſay of the advantages and glory he obtained by the treaty of Ryſwic, by the recovery of ſo many countries which had been taken from the empire, or his allies, and by the re-union of Friburg and Briſac to the hereditary ſtates of the houſe of Auſtria? if this prince is happy abroad, he is no leſs at home; fecundity, marriages, *&c.* make his family proſper; his ſecond ſon is to inherit almoſt the whole monarchy of Spain, by ſuch tranſactions as France itſelf has conſented to (35). Take warning by this confuſion of Comenius's falſe prophets, you, who have the confidence to threaten with the Apocalypſe thoſe that do not pleaſe you.

[*H*] *The ſame ſuſpicions are entertained of a miniſter, whoſe prophecies are of a later date.*] What I have ſaid of Comenius, I ſay alſo of a famous divine at Rotterdam, who has explained the prophecies of the ſcripture, pretending confidently to be inſpired. I do not pretend to judge of his heart, and I am willing it ſhould be believed, that he did not act againſt his conſcience; but no body ought to take it amiſs, if I ſay, that he has been ſuſpected to have no other deſign than to make people take up arms, and put Europe in a flame. They go upon this, that there appeared no ſign of confuſion in him, when the event gave the lye to his prophecies, in a moſt undeniable manner. ‘He had, *ſay they*, ſo great an opinion of his own parts and knowledge, that he would have fallen into a mortal diſcontent and humiliation, by ſo terrible a proof of illuſion and ignorance, as this would be; but, being inwardly convinced, that he was not deceived, he has preſerved the ſame good opinion of his underſtanding that he had before, and ſo the ill ſucceſs of a prophecy, which was a meer juggler's trick, has not humbled him.’ They build alſo upon this, that, like Comenius, he has attempted re-unite the Lutherans and Calviniſts (36), in hopes, ſay they, of increaſing the number of troops that ſhould attack Antichriſt. Once more, I am willing that this ſhould only be looked upon as a faithful account of what many ſay and think. Let us go farther, and ſee what one of his adverſaries has publiſhed (37). ‘One muſt needs be ſtupid, not to perceive ſo groſs an artifice, eſpecially when he ſeems to give you notice of it himſelf, and to ſay here and there, ſome things whereby he may diſcover his ſecret hereafter, and ſecure himſelf from your reproaches. *It is certain* ſays he in one place*, *that often prophecies, whether fictitious or true, have inſpired thoſe, for whom they were made, with a deſign of undertaking the things that were promiſed them.* Men of ſenſe need no more to make them underſtand his intention, and diſcover his views. And elſewhere: *one day, perhaps, the world ſhall know the principal reaſon that made me ſpeak ſo poſitively, and with ſo much aſſurance upon the explication of the prophecies.* We ſhall know it, moſt dear brethren, in the way he will then explain it. If he be under a miſtake, as one may well believe he is, he will tell you, *I had nothing but conjectures; but a good cauſe ought to be ſupported as well as it can, and our people were to be animated with ſome few hopes. I knew that prophecies, even ſuch as are fictitious, are wont to produce a like effect.* If, on the contrary, the preſent junctures, the jealouſy of nations, the indignation of the Proteſtant ſtates for their aſſaulted religion, the controverſies of France with the court of Rome, ſhould produce any important effect, which might give you new hopes; *I well knew*, would he ſay, *what I ſaid in the year* 1686; *an angel ſpoke to me: but if I had ſaid ſo then, I ſhould have been taken for an impoſtor; the angel himſelf forbad me to ſpeak of it. He ſpeaks to me ſtill and gives me liberty to declare it to you. Follow me; we are going to begin that kingdom of God, of which you doubted, and which, nevertheleſs, you begged of him in your daily prayer.*’ Were it true, that Jurieu is guilty of the impoſture, he is charged with, he would have been afraid, that the public had not been able to dive into his ſecret; and therefore, chuſing to preſerve the good opinion of his wit, at the expence of his honeſty, he would have dropped ſome words (38), that might diſcover the myſtery to the clear-ſighted.

The knaveries, that have been diſcovered amongſt the little prophets of Dauphiné, have occaſioned a large comment upon the paſſage of Mr Pelliſon, before cited. We need only read a book, intituled, *Hiſtoire du Fanatiſme de notre temps, &c. The hiſtory of the Fanaticiſm of our time, and the deſign there was of making the diſcontented Calviniſts in France riſe up in arms.* It was printed at Paris in the year 1692. Mr Brueys, the author of it, having collected together ſeveral paſſages out of Mr Jurieu's book, to prove, that this miniſter ſet up for a prophet, adds immediately; ‘However, it ought not to be imagined, that this miniſter was truly perſuaded himſelf of what he would perſuade others; he deſignedly affected to appear like a prophet. He knew well enough, that he was not; but he had a mind to impoſe upon the people, to make an inſurrection and to kindle a civil-war in the heart of this kingdom, in order to favour the deſign of our enemies. He was ſo full of this deteſtable project, when he compoſed his book of prophecies, that he himſelf cannot forbear diſcovering his deſign to the reader, who has never ſo little penetration. The time in which he wrote, the motives that induced him to it, and the ſtrokes, wherein he has inadvertently ſcattered ſome drops of the venom his heart was filled with, diſcover the deſign of this falſe prophet (39).’ I will not produce the proofs he has given of each of theſe remarks, but will only ſet down what he obſerves concerning the laſt. *Here is*, ſays he (40), *what he has let fall in ſome places of his book, which manifeſtly diſcovers, that he had no other deſign, than to cauſe an inſurrection of the people.* ‘The prophecies, which are in that piece, at firſt ſcandalized the moſt underſtanding men of his party; he ſays ſo himſelf, in the ſecond edition of his book. *Some* ſays he †, *believe, that the hopes I gave of a Reſtoration, in a few years, may be very prejudicial.* He attempts firſt to ſhew, that there is no reaſon to fear it, and then he adds: *It is certain, that often prophecies, whether fictitious or true, have inſpired thoſe, for whom they were made, with a deſign of undertaking the things that were promiſed them.* Could he declare more expreſly the intention he had of running the hazard of venting falſe prophecies, to make the malecontents of France riſe up in arms, and inſpire them with the deſign of procuring to themſelves the ſpeedy deliverance, which he promiſed them? Thoſe of his party were not only ſcandalized at his venturing to publiſh ſuch prophecies, but much more at his talking ſo poſitively. He himſelf informs us of it. *As to the reflexion*, ſays he ‡, *which ſo many people have made, that I ſpeak too poſitively of things, which I ſhould have propoſed as ſtrong conjectures: one day, perhaps the world ſhall know the principal reaſon that made me ſpeak ſo poſitively, and with ſo much aſſurance.* What then is this principal reaſon, which he dares not ſpeak and which, perhaps, the world ſhall know one day? Is it that he is truly perſuaded of the

‘ things

---

(34) That of Hungary.

(35) I write this in June, 1700, when the news-writers tell us of a treaty of a partion of the Spaniſh monarchy, agreed upon by France, England, and Holland.

(36) See the biſhop of Meaux's Addition to his *Hiſtoire des Variations.*

(37) Pelliſſon, Chimeres de Mr Jurieu, Part IV, pag. 184, 185, *of the Amſterdam edition.*

* *In the ſecond edition of the* Accompliſſement des Propheties, *at Rotterdam*, 1686, cap. xv.

(38) The two paſſages, for example, quoted by Mr Peliſſon out of the *Accompliſſement des Propheties.*

(39) Brueys, Hiſtoire du Fanatiſme, pag. 44.

(40) Ibid. pag. 51.

† Tom. I, *Addit. to the* Avis, *ſecond edition.*

‡ Tom. II, pag. 184.

pretended, he has diſcovered the ſecret of his deſign. They too much exaggerate what they impute to him [*I*]. My reader may judge of it by examining the paſſages I have

‘things he ſays? This is the only reaſon that ought to oblige an honeſt man to ſpeak poſitively. But if it be his reaſon why does he not ſay ſo? Is he afraid of ſpeaking the truth? Let us preſs him no farther upon it: he is more ſincere than we think; he has already told us this principal reaſon; does he not ſay, *that it is certain, that often prophecies, whether fictitious or true, have inſpired thoſe, for whom they were made, with a deſign of undertaking the things that were promiſed them.* This is his principal reaſon; we need not ſeek for another. This falſe prophet did not expect, that theſe two paſſages would be put together ſome time or other (41), he had ſeparated them on purpoſe in two different tomes: they are now placed together, and ſo naturally explain one another, that he muſt be blind, who cannot ſee, that, if Mr Jurieu ſpoke in ſo deciſive a manner of the approaching deliverance, which he promiſed the Proteſtants of France, it was becauſe he thinks, that often prophecies, whether fictitious or true, have inſpired thoſe, for whom they were made, with a deſign of undertaking the things that were promiſed them.

Mr Brueys ſeems ſo fully perſuaded, that he has diſcovered all the myſtery, that he repeats this obſervation more than once. Nay, he is ſo malicious as to put his reader in mind of the artifices of the Heathens. ‘This miniſter, ſays he, promiſed the Calviniſts the fall of Popery, and the approaching deliverance of their church; he promiſed them theſe things in the name of God, telling them they were contained in St John's Revelation. And therefore thoſe prophecies could not but inſpire thoſe, for whom they were made, with a deſign of undertaking the things that were promiſed them; becauſe there is nothing that has more force upon the minds of men, than religion; and every thing appears lawful to them, when they firmly believe, that God is on their ſide, and that they are only executing his orders. Thoſe who know what uſe the cunning Greeks and Romans made of their oracles, Diviners, Augurs, and of thoſe prieſts, whom they called Haruſpices, Feciales, Præpetes and Oſcines (42), whoſe functions conſiſted in foretelling the will of the gods, when they deliberated about any important affair; ſome by obſerving the entrails of the victims, others the ſinging, flying, or different motions of certain birds: thoſe, I ſay, who know of what uſe thoſe things were formerly, are not ignorant that men of ſenſe and judgment gave no credit to them, and uſed them only to poſſeſs the people and the ſoldiers with a deſire of undertaking what they promiſed them from their gods; but, at the bottom, it was nothing but what they themſelves had reſolved upon, before they conſulted their oracles. Here you ſee exactly the fictitious prophecies, and the pretended perſuaſion of Mr Jurieu (43).

I here renew the proteſtation I have already made which is, that I do not pretend to be a judge: I only relate what others ſay. It is true, I will not end this remark, without ſaying, that, in all times and countries, prophecies have been forged, to induce people to revolt. I could bring a hundred inſtances of it; but one will be ſufficient. The Spaniards, who rebelled againſt Charles V, ſpread a malicious prophecy, importing that there ſhould reign in Caſtile a prince named Charles, who ſhould ruin and burn the country; but that a ſon of the king of Portugal ſhould take poſſeſſion of Caſtile, and reſtore the kingdom to a good condition. The ring-leaders of the ſedition got this prophecy printed, and ordered every one of their abettors to keep a copy of it (44).

[*I*] *They too much exaggerate what they impute to him.*] If you conſider well Mr Brueys's words, you will find an artificial Rhetoric in them, which ought to be ſuſpected. ‘It is not poſſible for Mr Jurieu's beſt friends to diſown, that he publiſhed his predictions upon the Apocalypſe, only with a deſign of raiſing the diſcontented Calviniſts in France; that the league, which was then forming, finding the kingdom divided againſt itſelf, might more eaſily accompliſh it's utter deſtruction, and the Calviniſts might re-eſtabliſh their religion upon the ruins of their country.

‘Now reckon up, if you can, all the crimes and villanies of ſuch an execrable project; the artifices, fictions, and impoſtures, to ſeduce the ſimple; the profanation of Holy Writ, and its ſacred oracles; the impieties and blaſphemies againſt the holy Spirit; the violation of the moſt holy laws of Chriſtianity; the overturning the principles of the morality of Jeſus Chriſt; the contempt of the conſtant practice of the church, and of the examples of martyrs; the forgeting his own maxims; the precepts of revolt againſt the powers, which God has ordained; exhortations to ſubjects, to Chriſtians, to Frenchmen, to take up arms, and join with thoſe who have conſpired the ruin of their country; the horrible wiſhes he induces to make for the defeat of our armies, the plundering of the kingdom, the depopulation of our provinces, the burning of our towns, the effuſion of blood, and the murthers of their fellow citizens, friends, and relations. Laſtly, all the inhumanities and barbarities, that a civil and inteſtine war would have added to the moſt furious and bloody foreign war, that was ever known.

Tantum Religio potuit ſuadere malorum.

Such mighty ills religion cou'd perſuade.

‘Thus you ſee, to ſpeak of things as they are, the conſequences of Mr Jurieu's falſe prophecies, and the ſcope of the ſeditious writings of this famous defender of Calviniſm, who, to reſtore the public exerciſe of his religion in France, inſpires his party with great fury, and prompts them to greater cruelties, than the barbarous Mahomet cauſed heretofore to be committed for the eſtabliſhment of his Alcoran (45).

Here I muſt quit the character of a meer copyiſt, and take up that of critic. It is falſe any league was forming againſt France, when Mr Jurieu publiſhed his predictions; for they were given out in March, 1686, above two years before he had the leaſt ſuſpicion of what happened in the year 1688. So that the anachroniſm of his adverſary, is here a very groſs fault (46). If Mr Brueys had conſulted Mr Nicole, he would have been more equitable; he would not have been ignorant, that Mr Jurieu, in publiſhing his explication of the Apocalypſe, believed, that arms would have no ſhare in the events, which he predicted. See how Mr Nicole has done him juſtice (47). ‘Who would not, for inſtance, take for a menace of a very bloody war, theſe laſt lines of the preface to his Syſtem of the Church (48). *We ſhall quickly eſtabliſh truth upon the throne of falſhood, and the raiſing up of that, which has been caſt down, ſhall be performed in ſo glorious a manner, that it will be the aſtoniſhment of the whole earth.* Did ever an author write in ſuch a ſtrain? Who would not believe that ſuch a diſcourſe is to be followed by an army of a hundred thouſand Proteſtants combined together, to reſtore the pretended Reformed Religion in France? Mr Jurieu might even be charged with a ſtate-crime, and looked upon as a ſeditious man. It is therefore neceſſary to undeceive the world in this point, and to inform them, that this diſcourſe is no ways grounded upon any conſpiracy againſt France (49). All that he ſays here, by the by, in ſo dreadful a manner, is much leſs terrible being explained at large by his *Accompliſhment of the prophecies.* For there we ſee, that this glorious reſtoration of the pretended Reformed ſhall be made *without any, or with very little effuſion of blood* *, nay, that this will not come to paſs by an army of foreigners, nor by a multitude of miniſters, who ſhall repair into France, but by the effuſion of the ſpirit of God, which ſhall re-animate the extended bodies of Enoch and Elias, that is to ſay, according to Mr Jurieu ┼, the Proteſtants, who were formerly witneſſes of the truth, and who, having cowardly forſaken it, are at preſent deprived of life, and ſtretched out in the place of the city of Antichriſt, that is, throughout all France, the principal part, according to him, of the Antichriſtian empire.’

2 There

---

(41) Mr Brueys often repeats the conſequences, which he draws from the conjunction of thoſe two paſſages. *See eſpecially, pag.* 227, 230, 241.

(42) Thoſe two names, *præpetes* and *oſcines*, were not given to certain prieſts, but to certain birds, which ſerved for Divination.

(43) Brueys, Hiſt du Fanatiſme, pag. 230, 231.

(44) See, among the epiſtles of Antony de Guevara, that which the Amirante of Caſtile wrote to the inhabitants of Seville, in the year 1520. *It is the thirteenth of the third book. What I mention is* pag. m. 65.

(45) Brueys, ubi ſupra, pag. 241.

(46) This is not the only anachroniſm, that is to be found in Mr Brueys's book. He ſays, *pag.* 17, that Mr Jurieu being weary of writing controverſial books, and paſtoral letters, reſolved to take another courſe, and to ſet up for a prophet. This is wrong; for Mr Jurieu began to write his paſtoral letters, after he had publiſhed his prophecies. Mr Brueys, *pag.* 14, ſpeaks of a peace concluded in 1682: but he ſhould have ſaid in 1684.

(47) Nicole, preface to his book *de l'Unité de l'Egliſe*, pag. 24.

(48) This book of Mr Jurieu was printed the ſame year, that his *Accompliſſement des Prophetics* was.

(49) Nicole, ubi ſupra, pag. 25.

* Accompliſſ. des Propheties, pag. 206, 207. *See the* Accompliſſement des Propheties, Part. II, pag. 188, 189, 206, 221.

┼ Mr Jurieu, Part. II, pag. 175.

have quoted. The author of the Thoughts upon Comets maintains, that Drabicius's prophecies found little credit [*K*].

There is another thing, that Mr Brueys deſerves to be blamed for. He inſinuates (50), that Mr Jurieu is the oracle, that was conſulted, for the erecting of a ſchool (51), wherein children were to be taught to ſet up for prophets. See here the deſcription of that infamous ſchool: ‘ Could this be believed, unleſs one had ſeen it? This was the firſt time, that a ſchool was erected, in which the art of prophecying was taught, and to which they went to learn how to foretel things to come; and, after having gone through the neceſſary trials, they were perſuaded they received the Holy Ghoſt from the impure mouth of a ſacrilegious maſter, who pretended to breath it with a kiſs into the mouth of thoſe miſerable ſcholars (52).’ This is ſo horrible a deſign, that it ought never to be declared, or inſinuated, without good proofs, that a miniſter was ſo wicked as to ſuggeſt the model of it. Mr Brueys has given too great a ſcope to the conſequences he draws from Mr Jurieu's care to ſave the honour of the prophets of Dauphiné (53). ‘ He could never be prevailed with to revoke what he had publiſhed at firſt concerning this propheteſs (54), and he maintained it in all his letters with ſo much obſtinacy, that, even after God had retrieved that maid from her errors, and ſhe became a good and devout Catholic, and confeſſed to her judges how ſhe was ſeduced by Du Serre; this miniſter perſiſted in what he had advanced, was conſtant to his ſhepherdeſs, notwithſtanding her unfaithfulneſs, and had even the imprudence to ſay, ſpeaking of her, and of the other little ſleeping prophets, *that they might become rogues, but yet had been prophets.* . . . . . (55). This miniſter openly declared in favour of the little prophets, notwithſtanding what the honeſt people of his party could ſay to him; and maintained that their inſpiration was true, with an invincible, but affected, obſtinacy, as I have already obſerved, becauſe he had his views, and deſigned to get ſucceſſors in prophecy, as he had got forerunners (56). . . . . Ought we to (57) wonder after this, that Mr Jurieu could not reſolve upon forſaking thoſe, who had ſo much improved by his leſſons, and that, like a fond father, who does not ſee the imperfections of his children, he would never acknowledge the folly of thoſe, to whom he had given birth?’ The conſequences, that are drawn from hence, are not very juſt; for how many things are there, which men reſolve to maintain, when they find them already done, without knowing how wickedly they have been performed, which they would never adviſe, if they knew it, and if thoſe things were ſtill to be done? thus charity will have us to extenuate, as much as poſſible, the faults of our neighbour, and to ſuſpend our judgment, notwithſtanding the ſtrongeſt probabilities, if they do not amount to a good proof.

Mr Brueys's raſhneſs will more evidently appear, if it be obſerved, that, not contented to inſinuate his accuſation, he propoſed it in clear and affirmative terms, not only againſt the miniſter Jurieu, but alſo againſt many others. ‘ The moſt factious of the fugitive miniſters, *ſays he* (58), who burned with impatience to ſee again what they had left in France, conſidering, that the ſtratagem, contrived by Mr Jurieu, might advance their affairs, hearing with what greedineſs the malecontents of the kingdom received the prophecies, which promiſed them a ſpeedy deliverance, and perſuading themſelves, that there was no better expedient to bring on a revolt, thought they ought not to loſe ſo fair an opportunity of kindling a civil-war in the heart of the kingdom, which might give it a mortal blow, with a proſpect of ſeeing their religion riſe again upon the ruins of monarchy, which they believed at the very brink of deſtruction. And theſe were the ſame miniſters, who at firſt *made a great noiſe againſt his predictions, threatened to complain of them, and were angry he had ſpoken ſo affirmatively*; but the falſe prophet having imparted his ſecret to them, and giving them to underſtand, *that often prophecies, whether fictitious or true, have inſpired thoſe, for whom they were made, with a deſign of undertaking the things promiſed them*; and having told them in the ear *that principal and ſecret reaſon, which ſhould one day be known, and which made him ſpeak ſo poſitively*; they were quickly ſatisfied; his ſtratagem was approved in their ſecret council, and it was reſolved to propheſy, in order to cauſe an inſurrection.’ Here are two things to be cenſured; for, in the firſt place, no proof can be given, that the French miniſters had a hand in the horrid plot of thoſe ſeducers, who taught little children to pretend to inſpiration; and in the ſecond place, it is not true, that the French miniſters made a great noiſe againſt his predictions, and threatened to complain of them. Mr Brueys alledges that falſe ſuppoſition a hundred times over (59); tho' he has cited, at the 216th page a paſſage, which might eaſily have undeceived him. The paſſage is this: ‘ The other thing, which ſome have been offended at, *they are Mr Jurieu's words*, concerns the MILLENNIUM. Several divines OF THIS COUNTRY have murmured ſo far, as to threaten to complain of it.’ It is manifeſt, that thoſe loud murmurs came from the Dutch divines, and not from the French miniſters, and did not concern the promiſes of a ſudden deliverance, *&c.* but the Millennium, a doctrine which was moſt odious to the churches of Holland, and for which Mr Jurieu had been brought into trouble, had it not been for human ſupports. Notwithſtanding thoſe ſupports, complaints were made againſt him in the Walloon ſynod, who inſerted ſome words in an act, of which we may ſay what cardinal d'Oſſat ſaid of the ſtrokes of the ſwitch, which the deputies of Henry IV received (60).

[*K*] *The author of the* Thoughts upon Comets *maintains, that the prophecies of Drabicius found little credit.*] He was more equitable than the perſon cited in the remark [*G*]: he acknowledged, that the Proteſtants made no great account of Drabicius. ‘ The Proteſtants themſelves, *ſays he* (61), are not over-perſuaded, that Drabicius was a prophet. Many believe, that he was a Fanatic, who had his brain turned by reading the commentaries upon the prophecies of the Old Teſtament, and the Apocalypſe; that, being full of thoſe ideas, he looked upon the emperors of Germany as ſo many Pharaohs, Sennacheribs, Nebuchadnezzars, and emiſſaries of the great whore, *drunk with the wine of the wrath of her whoredom*; that he came at laſt to be perſuaded, that God had appointed him to command ſeveral princes to exterminate thoſe perſecutors. They who had ſuffered perſecution, and who thought that the divine providence would puniſh, ſooner or later, the authors of ſo barbarous a conduct, might probably believe Drabicius's viſions. Nevertheleſs, moſt of them made little account of them, eſpecially having experienced that he was deluded, and that he contradicted himſelf frequently in the moſt palpable manner, and ſuch as cannot be excuſed but by recurring to a multitude of gloſſes, which make the incredulous laugh more, than the ſincere confeſſion of that man's errors would; for by the help of ſuch gloſſes, multiplied as occaſion ſerves, there is no falſe prophet but may find an apology.’

(50) Brueys, ibid. pag. 79.

(51) *In a glaſs-houſe, ſituated upon a mountain of Dauphiné, called de Peyra.* Brueys, ubi ſupra, pag. 76, 77.

(52) Ibid. pag. 75, 76.

(53) Ib. pag. 98.

(54) *That is, the ſhepherdeſs of Cret.*

(55) Brueys, ib. pag. 106.

(56) *Mr Brueys had been ſaying,* pag. 39, *that Mr Jurieu,* as a great prophet, would have ſome forerunners, *viz.* Kotterus, Chriſtina Poniatovia, and Drabicius.

(57) Brueys, ib. pag. 145.

(58) Pag. 73.

(59) *See page* 30, 219, 220, 223.

(60) *We felt them no more than if a fly had gone over our cloaths. See the article of* HENRY IV, *citat.* (41).

(61) Pag. 785.

KRANTZIUS (ALBERTUS) a famous hiſtorian, born at Hamburgh [*A*], had

[*A*] *He was a native of Hamburg.*] And not of Bamberg, as Bellarmin (1), John Gerard (2), Chriſtian Matthias (3), David Blondel (4), and Hottinger (5) affirm. There can be no doubt about it, though a modern author has affected to ſuſpend his judgment. ‘ Res in aprico eſt poſita, ac proinde riſu digna ἐποχὴ Mart. Diſenbachii † nupera, qui litem de loco ejus natali fovere quam decidere putavit conſultius (6). —— *The matter is plain; and therefore the doubt of Martin Diſenbachius, who thought it better to keep up the diſpute concerning the place of his birth, than to decide it, is ridiculous.*’

---

(1) De Script Eccleſ.

(2) In Patrolog. pag. 673, apud Mollerum, Iſagoge ad Hiſtor. Cherſon. Cimbricæ, Part. I, pag. 95.

(3) In Theatro Hiſtor.

(4) De Johanne Papiſſa.

(5) Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Tom. IV, pag. 148.

† In Diſſertat de Morte Henrici VII, pag. 71.

(6) Mollerus, ibid.

had no ſooner gone thro' his claſſical learning in his country, but he went to travel. He ſaw the principal parts of Europe, and ſo ſtudiouſly cultivated the ſciences in his travels, that he became a very able man. He was doctor of Divinity, and of the Canon-Law, and profeſſor of Philoſophy and Divinity in the univerſity of Roſtoch. He was rector there in the year 1482 (*a*). Thoſe, who ſay he was a canon of Naumburg are miſtaken [*B*]. He went from Roſtoch to Hamburg, where he obtained a canon's place in the cathedral. He did not enjoy this preferment, as ſo many others do, like a ſluggard, but ſpent his time in preaching and reading lectures of Divinity. He was elected dean of the chapter in the year 1508, and performed the viſitation of the dioceſe with the diſpoſitions of a man reſolved to cure the diſorders he ſhould find in it. He did the ſame in the year 1514. He did many good ſervices to the town of Hamburg [*C*], and other Hanſe-towns; and got ſuch a reputation for ability and prudence, that the king of Denmark himſelf made him arbitrator in a conſiderable controverſy [*D*]. He died the ſeventh of December in the year 1517 [*E*], being very ſenſible, that the church ſtood in need of a reformation (*b*) [*F*]. He wrote ſeveral good books

[*B*] *Thoſe who ſay, that he was a canon of Naumburg, are miſtaken.*] Two very learned authors have affirmed it; but Mr Sperlingius, who is writing Albert Krantzius's Life, will ſhew their miſtake. ‘Sunt qui in Collegio etiam Canonicorum Numburgenſium aliquandiu vixiſſe, ac Diaconi partes obiiſſe perhibent, & hos inter Duumviri celeberrimi, Henr. Meibomius Jun. † ac Conr. Schurtzfleiſchius ‡. Sed falli eos, ac Krantzium Numburgum forte numquam videſſe, ſatis ſibi eſſe exploratum, Dn. Sperlingius nobis ſignificavit, in ipſa Krantzii Biographia prolixius ſententiam hanc impugnaturus (7). —— *Some pretend, that he lived for ſome time in the college of the canons of Naumburg, and officiated as a deacon; among whom are the famous Henry Meibomius the younger, and Conrard Schurtzfleiſch. But Sperlingius has informed me, that he is convinced they are miſtaken, and that, perhaps, Krantzius never ſaw Naumburg, and that he will more fully refute this opinion in the Life of Krantzius.*'

[*C*] *He did many good ſervices to the town of Hamburg,* &c.] Under pretence, that this town began, only in the year 1546, to have ordinary ſyndics, one cannot deny what is found in the Daniſh remonſtrance, in anſwer to the apology of the Hamburghers, in the year 1642, *viz.* that Albert Krantzius was ſyndic of Hamburg; for that title was given, in his time, to thoſe, whom the town deputed upon particular affairs. Now it is certain, that Albert Krantzius was deputed two or three times. He was at the aſſembly of Wiſmar, in the year 1489, in behalf of the Hanſe-Towns (8); and he went into France in 1497, to deſire a truce; and into England, in 1499, to deſire ſome privileges againſt pirates (9). This is what we learn from Mollerus in the book I have quoted: His proofs are in the margin.

[*D*] *The king of Denmark himſelf made him arbitrator in a conſiderable controverſy.*] This was in the year 1500. Read what follows (10): ‘Quantam vero, in reliqua etiam Cimbria, Prudentia & Integritate ſingulari ſibi conciliarit Autoritatem, vel inde perſpicies, quod A. 1500. Johannes, Rex Daniæ, & Fridericus, Dux Holſatiæ, Arbitri ipſi Honorarii Partes, in Controverſiis quæ cum Dithmarſis ſibi intercedebant, decidendis, deferre non dubitaverint *. — *What eſteem his ſingular prudence and integrity gained him in other parts of that country, appears from hence, that, in the year* 1500, *John, king of Denmark, and Frederick, duke of Holſtein, did not ſcruple to appoint him arbitrator in a diſpute between them and the Dithmarſi.*'

[*E*] *He died the ſeventh of December,* 1517]. This appears from his epitaph: it is therefore a miſtake to ſay, with Geſner's continuators, and Theodorus Zwinger, that he flouriſhed in the year 1520. Geſner ſhould not have been taxed with that fault by Mr Mollerus (11). The error of Father Fournier, a Jeſuit, and John Andrew Boſius, is much greater. The Jeſuit makes him die in 1569 (12), and the other in 1570 (13). Thoſe faults would not come near the blunder of a famous profeſſor of Oxford (14), if he took Albert Krantzius to be the ſame with Albertus Magnus, biſhop of Ratisbon. But Mr Mollerus, who taxed him with it, has acknowledged his miſtake, and acquits him clearly of the fault. No body had given him notice of it: he himſelf has diſcovered it, and confeſſes it publickly like an honeſt man. See the 738th and 739th pages of his treatiſe *De Scriptoribus Homonymis.*

[*F*] . . . . . *being very ſenſible, that the church ſtood in need of a reformation.*] He acknowledged this neceſſity, both with reſpect to doctrine and morals, if we may believe Melchior Adam. ‘Animadvertit in doctrina ejus temporis multum fuiſſe errorum & ſuperſtitionum: & mores Canonicorum ac monachorum acerrime reprehendit; eoſque in ordinem redigere conatus eſt. Sed cum id fruſtra ſe tentare videret: quod perverſitas illorum hominum munita eſſet auctoritate Pontificis, dixiſſe fertur: *nunquam poſſe eos reduci ad meliorem frugem, niſi prius à viris doctis expugnata arce.* Interrogatus cur ſeſe ipſe non opponeret tam craſſis erroribus, reſpondit: *ſe neque eruditione neque ætate parem eſſe tantis negotiis* (15). —— *He obſerved much of error and ſuperſtition in the doctrine of that time; and he ſeverely cenſured the manners of the Canons and Monks, and endeavoured to reform them. But, finding his endeavours fruitleſs, the perverſe behaviour of thoſe men being ſkreened by the Pope's authority, he is ſaid to have declared, that* they could never be brought to behave better, till ſome learned man ſhould beſiege and take their fortreſs: *And being asked why he himſelf did not oppoſe ſuch groſs errors, he replied, that* he was neither learned, nor young enough for ſuch an undertaking.' There is a thing in this paſſage, which puts me in mind of Teleſinus in Velleius Paterculus. This Teleſinus was general of the Samnites, and a very brave captain; he mortally hated the Romans, and approached Rome with an army of forty thouſand men, fully reſolved to puſh on; and to that end he continually animated the ſoldiers with theſe words: *It is neceſſary to deſtroy this city; for the wolves, that raviſh the liberty of Italy, will never be wanting as long as this foreſt ſubſiſts, in which they find ſhelter.* The words of Paterculus deſerve to be ſet down. *Circumvolans ordines exercitus ſui Teleſinus, dictitanſque adeſſe Romanis ultimum diem, vociferabatur eruendam delendamque urbem, adjiciens nunquam defuturos raptores Italicæ libertatis lupos, niſi ſilva, in quam refugere ſolerent, eſſet exciſa* (16). He did not argue amiſs. Krantzius was likewiſe of opinion, that, whilſt the court of Rome prevailed, it was impoſſible to ſuppreſs the corruption of the Monks and clergy. Here I muſt expoſe a notable piece of inſincerity in Moreri; for thus his fault ought to be called. He had read Melchior Adam, who ſays, that Krantzius, ſeeing Martin Luther's poſitions againſt the doctrine of Indulgences, cried out, ‘He has too powerful adverſaries; he will never ſucceed; I adviſe him to deſiſt from his enterprize, and to ſhut up himſelf in his cell, and ſay, Lord have mercy upon me (17).' What has Moreri done? he has curtailed this paſſage, and only given us the laſt words of it, which he underſtands as if Krantzius had condemned Luther's attempt. ‘Krantzius, *ſays he,* deplored, at the hour of his death, this unhappineſs (18), which he had foretold in his life-time. It is affirmed, that in that moment he often repeated theſe words, ſpeaking againſt the ſame Luther, *Frater, abi in cellam, & dic, miſerere mei Deus.*' Though we ſhould not attend to ſeveral paſſages of Krantzius's works, which teſtify his opinion of the corrupt ſtate of the church, the words, which he pronounced, when he ſaw the firſt poſitions of Luther, would alone ſufficiently acquaint

---

(*a*) Chytr. Part. I, Chronici Saxonici, pag. 496, & Petr. Lindebergius, lib. v, Chron. Roſtoch. cap. xi, apud Mollerum, ubi infra.

(*b*) *Taken from Mollerus,* Iſagoge ad Hiſtor. Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ, Part. I, pag. 95, & ſeq.

† In Introd. ad Hiſtor. Saxon. Infer. pag. 72.

‡ In Diſſ. de rebus Meclenburgicis, § 17.

(7) Mollerus, ibid. pag. 96.

(8) Petr. Lindeberg. Chron. Roſtoch. lib. iv, pag. 401, apud Mollerum, ibid. pag. 97.

(9) Haraldus Huitfeldius, Chronic Danic. Part. VI, pag. 1021, 1022, & Ad. Trathgerus, Chron. Hamb. MSto, apud Mollerum, ibid.

(10) Moller. ib. pag. 97, 98.

* Vide Huitfeldium, lib. c, pag. 1035, & Ant. Heimreichii Chronicon Dithmarſiæ, lib. ii, cap. v, pag. 126, 127.

(11) Moller. ib. pag. 99.

(12) Lib. iv, Notitiæ Orbis Geographicæ, cap. xiv, pag 132, apud Moller. ibid.

(13) In Diſſertat. de Comparanda Prud. & Eloq. Civili, n. 37.

(14) Degory Whear, in Relectionibus hiemalibus de methodo legendi Hiſtorias, pag. 252, 253, apud Mollerum, ibid. pag. 94.

(15) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Philoſophorum, pag. 34.

(16) Paterculus, lib. ii, cap. xxvii.

(17) Nihil effecturum eſſe contra tam potentes adverſarios: ſuum eſſe conſilium ut ab incepto deſiſteret. Frater, frater, inquit, abi in cellam tuam, & dic, miſerere mei Deus. *Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra.*

(18) *That is, Luther's attempt.*

books [G]; but all that are aſcribed to him are not his [H]. His reputation has been aſperſed by ſome critics [I].

quaint us with Moreri's prevarication. Conſider what follows (19). ‘Vitia quæ doctrinam & cultum Eccleſiæ Romanæ publicum deformabant, agnovit, &, quanto Emendationis eorundem deſiderio teneretur, cum locis Scriptorum ſuorum plurimis, tum Vocibus hiſce Cygnæis eſt teſtatus, quibus ſuum de Theſibus Lutheri Anti-Tezelianis, in Lectulo ſibi Emortuali oblatis, judicium expoſuit †: *Vera quidem dicis, Bone Frater, ſed nihil efficies: Vade igitur in Cellam tuam, & dic: Miſerere mei Deus.* ——— *He acknowledged the corruptions, which deformed the doctrine and public worſhip of the Romiſh church; and he ſhewed his zeal for reforming them, both by many paſſages of their writers, as alſo by theſe ſwan-like words, in which he declared his opinion of the Anti-Tezelian theſes of Luther, which were brought to him as he lay on his death-bed:* You ſpeak the truth, good brother, but to no purpoſe: go therefore into your cell, and ſay, Lord have mercy upon me.’ I will conclude this remark with a paſſage, which will teach us, that, if Flacius Illyricus has not made uſe of Albert Krantzius's authority againſt the church of Rome, in his *Catalogus teſtium veritatis*, the compilers, who followed him, made amends for that omiſſion; for they made a good collection of what they had read in Krantzius, that favoured their deſign. Nay, the editors of the Francfort editions have been at the pains of obſerving thoſe things in the marginal notes. Here is the paſſage I have promiſed (20): ‘Ipſi theologi Proteſtantium cordatiores Scriptoris hujus, licet Pontificii, atque adeo ἀλλοφύλου, Lectionem ſibi habent commendatiſſimam, & Arma ex illo depromunt, quibus adverſus Eccleſiæ Romanæ Hyperaſpiſtas haud infeliciter κατ᾽ ἄνθρωπον depugnatur, Invectivas ſcilicet in Vitia non Monachorum ſolum ac Canonicorum, ſed & Epiſcoporum atque Pontificum, παῤῥησιαστικάς, crebaſque de ſtatu Eccleſiæ & Aulæ Pontificiæ corruptiſſimo querelas. Quas uti à Matth. Flacio in *Catalogo Teſtium Veritatis* miror omiſſas, ita à Joh. Wolfio ⸸, Joh. Conr. Dieterico ‡, aliiſque Recentioribus, ſatis diligenter video eſſe congeſtas. Obſervationes etiam, quas Wechelianis Operum Krantzii editionibus acceſſiſſe diximus, Marginales loca ejuſmodi ſtudioſe notarunt; obelo viciſſim hanc ob cauſam notatæ, & Impietatis inſimulatæ, à Rob. Bellarmino *, Joh. Bona ** & Aub. Miræo ††, qui Textum etiam ipſum ab Hæreticis eſſe vitiatum affirmare non erubeſcit. ——— *The more ſenſible Proteſtant divines approve the reading of this author, though a Catholic, and borrow arms from him, with which they ſucceſsfully attack the champions of the Romiſh church; I mean, his invectives, not only againſt the Monks and canons, but even the biſhops and Popes, and his frequent complaints of the corrupt ſtate of the church, and the court of Rome. Which, as I wonder they were omitted by Flacius, in his catalogue of* The Witneſſes of the Truth, *ſo I find they are carefully compiled by John Wolfius, John Conrard Dietericus, and other moderns. Likewiſe the marginal obſervations, which I ſaid were added to the editions of the works of Krantzius by Wechel, conſtantly refer to theſe kind of paſſages, and are, for that very reaſon, ſtigmatized as impious by Robert Bellarmin, John Bona, and Aubert Miræus, who is not aſhamed to affirm, that the text itſelf has been corrupted by the Heretics.*’

[G] *He wrote ſeveral good books.*] I. A chronicle *Regnorum Aquilonarium, Daniæ, Sueciæ, & Norwegiæ.* Henry of Eppendorf, tranſlated it into High-Dutch from the manuſcript he found at Cologne (21), and publiſhed his verſion at Strasburg in the year 1545. He publiſhed the Latin text the year following, in the ſame town. A ſecond edition of it was made in the year 1562. John Wolfius, counſellor to the marquis of Baden, procured a third and a fourth at Francfort in the years 1575, and 1583 (22). II. The book intituled, *Saxonia, ſive de Saxonicæ gentis vetuſta origine, longinquis expeditionibus ſuſceptis, & bellis domi pro libertate diu fortiturque geſtis Hiſtoria; libris 13 comprehenſa & ad A. C. 1501. deducta.* The firſt edition is of Cologne 1520. John Soter or Heylius procured it, and dedicated it to Charles V. That work was printed in the ſame town in the years 1574, and 1595. The Wechels printed three editions of it at Francfort, in the years 1575, 1580, and 1621, which are preferable to the editions of Cologne. This work, tranſlated into High-Dutch by Baſil Faber, was printed at Leipſic in the years 1563, and 1582 (23). III. The book intituled *Vandalia, ſive Hiſtoria de Vandalorum vera Origine, variis Gentibus, crebris è patria Migrationibus, Regnis item, quorum vel Autores fuerunt, vel Everſores, Libris XIV. à prima eorum Origine, ad A. C. 1500. deducta.* The firſt edition, which is of Cologne, 1519, was followed by three others at Francfort (24). and one at Hanaw (25). The German verſion, printed at Lubec, in the year 1600, was done by Mark Stephen Macropus (26). IV. The book intituled *Metropolis*: it contains, in twelve books, the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Saxony, Weſtphalia, and Jutland, with the lives of the prelates, that, from the year 780 till 1504, poſſeſſed the twelve biſhoprics of that country. Joachim Mollerus, the younger, a native of Hamburg, counſellor to the dukes of Brunſwic, is the firſt who publiſhed this work. He did it, at Melanchthon's requeſt, from the author's original, which was the only manuſcript extant of that book: Henry Bucholz, biſhop of Lubec, had given it to this Mollerus's father. This firſt edition is of Baſil, by Oporinus, in the year 1548: it was followed by that of the year 1568, from the ſame preſs, and by two others (27) at Cologne (28), and three more at Francfort (29). V. The work intituled, *Spirantiſſimum opuſculum in officium Miſſæ in optimum Ordinem pro ſancta & ſuavi Sacerdotum Eccleſiæ inſtitutione digeſtum* (30); and the book intituled, *Ordo Miſſæ ſecundum ritum Eccleſiæ Hamburgenſis*, at Straſburg 1509, in folio. *Conſilium de ordine & privilegiis creditorum in bonis ſuorum debitorum.* It is inſerted in the fourth volume of the *Reſponſorum Juris*, printed at Francfort in the year 1572. *Inſtitutiones Logicæ, compendioſæ admodum, pariterque abſolutiſſimæ, nec minus Latinæ*, at Leipſic in the year 1517. *Grammatica culta & ſuccincta*, at Roſtoch 1506. There are in the library of Leipſic ſome treatiſes of Philoſophy of Albert Krantzius, which have not been printed (31).

[H] . . . . *all thoſe, which are aſcribed to him, are not his.*] He is not the author of the *Tractatus de Romanis Pontificibus, & præſertim de Victore II. alias Epiſcopo Eyſtettenſi*, which Father Jacob (32) aſcribes to him; nor of the Life of Anſgarius, which Geſner's continuators father upon him; nor of the *Scriptum de Imperii Romani interitu*, aſcribed to him by Scherzerus (33).

[I] *His reputation has been aſperſed.*] This motto, *Per convicia & laudes*, might ſuit him as well as many other great men. Several learned men (34) beſtow great encomiums upon him; but ſome critics uſe him very ſeverely. He is accuſed of venting many falſe ſtories, about the original of nations; of citing antient authors very wrong; of tranſcribing whole pages from other authors, without citing any body; and of falſifying the monuments of hiſtory, to gratify his paſſions. Mr Mollerus (35) names the authors of thoſe cenſures, and ſays ſomething in his vindication; he denies not, but that Albert Krantzius was a plagiary; he only endeavours to excuſe him from the practice of that age. ‘Solenne præterea ei eſſe fatemur, Eginhardum, Witekindum, Herm. Contractum, Adamum, Helmoldum, Arnoldum Saxonem, Albertum Stadenſem, Gobelinum, Blondum, Cornerum, alioſque veteres, de verbo ad verbum exſcribere, ac non Periodos ſolum, ſed & paginas atque Capita integra, in ſua inde ſcripta, nulla plerumque Autoris mentione adjecta, tranferre. Obſervatum id nobis in Accuratiori Narrationum de iiſdem Rebus Collatione: Obſervatum & ante nos Vellejo, Reineccio, Meibomiorum Trigæ, Voſſio, Malincrotio, Conringio, Bangerto, Sagittario, Schurtzfleiſchio, Madero, quorum Teſtimoniis Lectores meos nolo obruere (36). ——— *I confeſs likewiſe, that he frequently tranſcribes, word for word, Eginhard, Witekind, Hermannus Contractus, Adam, Helmold, Arnold the Saxon, Albertus Stadenſis, Gobelin, Blondus, Cornerus, and other antient authors, and that he borrows, not only periods, but even pages, and whole chapters, for the moſt part without mentioning from whence he takes them. I obſerved this in my accurate compariſon of different accounts of the ſame things: it was obſerved likewiſe, before me, by Vellejus, Reineccius, the Meibomii, Voſſius, Malincrot, Conringius, Bangertus, Sagittarius, Schurtzfleiſch, Maderus, with whoſe teſtimonies I will not trouble my readers.*’

(19) Moller, ubi ſupra, pag. 98.

† V. J. Balth. Schuppii, Speculum pœnitentiæ Niniviticæ, pag. m. 18, alioſque Theologos complures.

(20) Mollerus, ibid. pag. 110.

⸸ Cent. XV, Lect. memorabil. pag 963, 977.

‡ In Breviario Pontificum.

* In Libro de Script. Eccleſ. pag. 304.

** In Catalogo Autorum, Operi de Pſalmodia Divina præfixo.

†† P. I Biblioth. Eccl. pag. 278.

(21) *In the library of Reinhard, count of Weſterburg, dean of Cologne.*

(22) *Taken from Mollerus*, ubi ſupra, pag. 35.

(23) *Taken from the ſame*, pag. 100.

(24) *In* 1575, 1580, *and* 1601.

(25) *In the year* 1619.

(26) *Taken from Mollerus*, ibid. pag. 102.

(27) *In* 1574, *and* 1596.

(28) *Taken from Mollerus*, ibid. pag. 103.

(29) *In* 1575, 1590, *and* 1627.

(30) *It was printed at Roſtoch in* 1506.

(31) *Taken from Mollerus*, ibid. pag. 105, 106.

(32) Bibliothecæ Pontific. pag. 243.

(33) Apud Mollerum, pag. 107.

(34) *See the catalogue of them in Mollerus, pag.* 107, & ſeq.

(35) Ubi ſupra, pag. 111, & ſeq.

(36) Ibid. pag. 112.

KUCHLIN (John) miniſter and profeſſor of Divinity, was born in 1546, in a little town of the county of Heſſe, called Wettera. His father, a good and honeſt mechanic, tho' he had the charge of ten ſons and three daughters, whom he maintained only by the labour of his hands, deſigned to make a ſcholar of him; but he died before the young boy had made any coſiderable progreſs. The miniſter (a) of the place took care of him, the more willingly, becauſe he very much improved in Greek and Latin under Juſtus Wulteius, rector of the ſchool of Wettera. But when Kuchlin was fit to go to the univerſity, he had no little difficulties to overcome by reaſon of his poverty. However he was not diſcouraged, but reſolved to ſeek his fortune; and, to that end, he went to travel, as a young college-adventurer. He found nothing at Francfort. His landlord at Mentz carried him to the Jeſuits, who kept him no longer, than 'till they ſaw that he would not abjure the Proteſtant religion. All that he could find at Straſburg, was a letter of recommendation from John Sturmius to Brentius, who was profeſſor at Tubingen. But the latter did not keep him long, as thinking he was not ſufficiently prepoſſeſſed with the Ubiquitarian notions. Kuchlin went to Heidelberg with the ſame letter of Sturmius, where he at laſt found what he wanted; for Urſinus put him in a way of living, and going on quietly with his ſtudies. The univerſity of Heidelberg was then in a very flouriſhing ſtate. This young man made a great progreſs in ſix years; after which he was ſent to teach in the ſchool at Newſtadt [*A*], where, amongſt other colleagues, he had Fortunatus Crellius, and Frederic Sylburgius (*b*). At laſt he was admitted miniſter, and had the church of Tackenheim, which he faithfully ſerved till after the death of the elector Frederic in 1576, when Lewis, his ſucceſſor, expelled the miniſters, who would not turn Lutherans. Kuchlin, retiring into his country of Heſſe, and finding nothing there but diſcouragement, by the advice of his wife, took ſanctuary (*c*) in the great ark of the fugitives, I mean in Holland. He paſſed thro' Embden in 1577, and ſtaid there ſome time; from whence he was invited to Amſterdam to the office of the miniſtry [*B*]. He accepted it, and exerciſed it eighteen years: After which, he earneſtly engaged in the maſterſhip of a college of Divinity, which the States of Holland had erected at Leyden in 1591, and of which he had from that time the management for ſome months. It was in 1595, that he wholly left his church at Amſterdam, to fix in this college. He taught Divinity there till his death, which happened the ſecond of July 1606. He had married his two daughters to two learned men, Peter Bertius, and Feſtus Hommius (*d*). A collection was made, in one volume in 4to, at Geneva, in 1613, of all the theſes of Divinity, which he cauſed to be maintained at different times. Guy Patin has extreamly commended him, and a little too much, for he calls him *one of the moſt learned men of his age* (*e*).

(a) *John Pincier, brother-in law to the profeſſor Iperius, profeſſor of Divinity at Marpurg.*

(b) *He was his countryman, and relation.*

(c) *Meurſius, whoſe words are quoted in remark* [*B*].

(d) *Taken from his Funeral Oration, pronounc d by Luke Trelcatius. See alſo Meurſius*, Athen. Batav. pag. 182.

(e) *Patin, Letter cclviii, pag.* 427, *of the ſecond volume.*

[*A*] *He was ſent to teach in the ſchool at Newſtadt.*] The author of the *Diarium Biographicum* (1) ſays, that Kuchlin was rector of this ſchool; but his funeral oration, wherein ſuch a preferment would not have been omitted, ſays expreſsly, that he taught at Newſtadt, when Baſil Pithopœus was rector there. There is another fault in the ſame *Diarium*: it makes two different books of the *Diſputationes Theologicæ ad Catecheſeos Eccleſiarum Belgicarum explanationem*, and the *Diſputationes de Religionis Chriſtianæ præcipuis capitibus*. They are but one and the ſame book.

[*B*] *From whence he was invited to Amſterdam to the office of the miniſtry.*] Moreri did ſo little examine the authors he conſulted, that he conſidered only the firſt part of Meurſius's period. If he had read the whole period, he would have ſeen the quite contrary to what he affirms. He ſays, that Kuchlin *was miniſter at Embden and Groningen in the Low-Countries*; but it is certain he was not miniſter at Groningen. He had his choice of this town, and Amſterdam; and, though he had more inclination to the former than to the latter, yet he was perſuaded to chooſe the latter. Here are Meurſius's words (2). ‘ Inſtinctu uxoris quæ ‘ Belgica erat in Belgium abiit, Emdamque venit anno ‘ CIϽ IϽ LXXXVII. ubi cum operam aliquamdiu tam ‘ in ſchola quam in Eccleſia navaſſet, eodem tempore ‘ ab Amſtelodamenſibus & à Groeningenſibus evocatus ‘ fuit. Ille, cum propter Germanici idiomatis vicinitatem Groeningenſes præferendos judicaret, à clariſſimo viro D. Mensone Altingio graviſſimis rationibus permotus fuit, ut operam ſuam Amſtelodamenſi Eccleſiæ addiceret. ——— *At the inſtigation of* ‘ *his wife, who was a Dutch woman, he went into* ‘ *Holland, and came to Embden in the year* 1587, ‘ *where having officiated ſome time both as a ſchoolmaſter and a divine, he was invited, at the ſame* ‘ *time, by the inhabitants of Amſterdam and Groningen. But, though he preferred thoſe of Groningen,* ‘ *on account of the vicinity of the German idiom, yet* ‘ *he was perſuaded by* MENSO ALTINGIUS *to* ‘ *ſerve the church of Amſterdam.*’

It is alſo great careleſſneſs in the ſame Moreri to ſay, in general, that Kuchlin taught Divinity at Leyden. He ſhould have ſpecified, whether he did it in the quality of profeſſor of the univerſity, or of principal of the Divinity college. Meurſius would have very clearly explained it to him.

(1) Henningus Witte, ad ann. 1606.

(2) Athen. Batav. pag. 182.

KUHLMAN (Quirinus) one of the viſionaries of the XVIIth century. He was born at Breſlaw in Sileſia, the 25th of February 1651 (*a*), and gave great hopes by his early progreſs (*b*). But his ſtudies were interrupted by a ſickneſs he had at eighteen years of age (*c*). He was looked upon as a dead man the third day of his diſtemper. That day he had a terrible viſion. He fancied himſelf ſurrounded with all the devils in hell, and that at mid-day, being not aſleep. This viſion was followed by another of God himſelf, encompaſſed with his ſaints, and Jeſus Chriſt in the midſt of them. He then ſaw and felt unutterable things. Two days after, he had ſtill theſe ſort of viſions (*d*); and, when he was cured of his diſtemper, he perceived indeed a great change as to thoſe ſights, but he always ſaw a circle of light, which attended him on his left ſide (*e*) He had no longer any reliſh for literature. He (*f*) had ſometimes ſuch extaſies, that they hindered him from ſeeing and hearing thoſe that were with

(a) Epiſt. Theoſophicæ Leidenſes, pag. 11.

(b) *See his* Prodromus quinquennii mirabilis, pag. 10, 12, *and the fragments of the Letters prefixed to it by him.*

( ) Prodrom. quinquen. mirabilis, pag. 3.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 6.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 11.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 13, 14.

with him; and he formed the deſign of abundance of books, which were ſo many methods for learning every thing, without much trouble, and perfectly. At nineteen years of age, he left his native country, where juſtice was not done him, and went to viſit the univerſities. He publiſhed a ſecond edition of his epitaphs (g), a work he had compoſed at fifteen years of age; and he put out a treatiſe of Morality (h): but, as he made an extraordinary progreſs every day, he found the ſheets unworthy of him, which the Printer ſent him, his knowledge was ſo enlarged, while the book was printing (i). He made no account of the public lectures and diſputations in the univerſity of Iëna, and would have no teacher but the Holy Ghoſt (k). His deſire of ſeeing Holland was ſo ſtrong, as not to permit him to put off his journey till he might ſee what would be the iſſue of the war, which had proved ſo miſchievous to that country in 1672. He landed at Amſterdam (l) three days before the town of Naerden was retaken (m). He went to Leyden a few days after, and was not long there, before he met with the works of Behme [A], of whom he had never heard before. The reading of that author was caſting oil into the fire; he admired that Behme had propheſied things, which no body knew of but Kuhlman himſelf (n). There was at that time, in Holland, one JOHN ROTHE, who pretended to propheſy [B]. Kuhlman contradicted the proverb, that people

(g) Ib. pag. 25.

(h) *I think this book was intituled,* Moralis Heraldus Hiſtoricus.

(i) Prodom. pag 26.

(k) Ibid. pag. 30.

(l) *The third of November*, 1673.

(m) Prodrom. pag. 38.

(n) Id. pag. 40.

[A] *He was not long at Leyden before he met with the works of Behme.*] Jacob Behme, or Boehme, was an Enthuſiaſt, of whom I ſhall ſome time or other ſpeak more largely. He was born in a village of Germany, near Gorlitz, in the year 1575, and, when he had learned to read and write, he was taken from ſchool, to be a Shoemaker. He began to exerciſe his trade at Gorlitz in 1594. He fell into an extaſy for the ſpace of ſeven days, in the year 1600, if we may believe what he publiſhed in a book, intituled, *Aurora*. This book was preſented to the magiſtrates of Gorlitz, by George Richterus, dean of the paſtors of the place, as containing many errors of Paracelſus and Wigelius; for Behme had applied himſelf to Chymiſtry in his youth. The magiſtrates ſuppreſſed this *Aurora* as much as they could, and ordered the author to write no more. He was ſilent ſeven years; but when he found, that the director of the electoral laboratory had recommended him to ſeveral perſons at court, as a good Chymiſt, he lifted up his head, and boldly oppoſed George Richterus, and wrote above twenty books in five years time. He died the eighteenth of November 1624 (1). Many perſons ſuffered themſelves to be infatuated with this man's viſions. Kuhlman was not the leaſt of his admirers, as it appears from this paſſage (2): ‘Ejus (*Johanni Rothii*) inde veſtigia legit *Quirinus Kuhlmannus* Sileſius, Jacobi Bohemi ſimul propugnator, Calovii vero atque Scherzeri acerrimus inſectator. Sic enim Bohemo redivivo c. 12. *In Muſeo meo ſolus paucis diebus plura didici ex uno Bohemo, quam ab omnibus ævi ſapientibus ſimul auditis diſcere potuiſſem.* Et in præfat. Operis ejuſdem: *Inter innumerabiles viſiones accidit, ut erepto mihi ex muſeo millena luminum millia circa me exorientium intueri daretur.* Plura ejuſmodi legi poſſunt apud Calovium in Anti-Bohemo, cap. 32. & ſeq. ——— *Quirinus Kuhlman the Sileſian, trod in his* (John Rothe's) *ſteps, a follower at the ſame time of Jacob Boehme, but a ſtrenuous oppoſer of Calovius and Scherzerus. For thus he ſpeaks in his* Bohemus Redivivus, *ch.* 12. I learned more in a few days by reading only Boehme, by myſelf, than I could from all the learned men of the age put together. *And in the preface to the ſame work:* Amidſt innumerable viſions, it happened, that being ſnatched out of my Muſæum, I ſaw many thouſands of lights riſing all around me. *You may read more of the ſame in Calovius's Anti-Bohemus, ch.* 32, &c.’

[B] *JOHN ROTHE, who pretended to propheſy.*] He was a native of Amſterdam, and had always led a very regular life; but he early diſcovered a melancholy temper, and that he loved to change his religion (3). He was ſo charmed with Labadie, that he became a proſelyte to his ſect, and laboured might and main to procure him new diſciples; but, ſome time after, he ſeparated from him, and ſet up for the head of a party. He ſaid, that the glorious reign of JESUS CHRIST was at hand; and he was not contented with the functions of St John the Baptiſt, I mean of being forerunner and harbinger, but pretended to be the chief director of this great work, and more than ſtandard-bearer of this new world. ‘Hic *à Johanne Labadæo*, novo, ut videri volebat, Eccleſiarum Reformatore, morumque rigidiore caſtigatore, ſub intenſioris devotionis ſpecie, ita primum dementatus fuit, ut totus ei adhæſerit non tantum, ſed quoſcunque poſſet, ad familiam ejus novam pertrahere totis viribus allaborarit. Verum poſtea, eo quod parem forſan non ferret, nedum ſuperiorem, quo loco Labadæum novæ devotionis artificem & præconem habere tamen tenebatur, quamdiu civitati ejus adſcriptus eſſet, ſeceſſionem ab eo molitus eſt, glorioſum in Chriſto Regnum infando ſtrepitu in terris, magno illo vexillifero, multo felicius erecturus (4).’ He boaſted of his revelations; he promiſed wonders to ſuch as would liſt themſelves under his banner; he diſturbed the church and ſtate with his libels; but nothing came to paſs of what he had foretold; and, to compleat his misfortune, he was ſhut up in the priſon of Amſterdam. See this more at large in Mr Saldenus's Narrative (5). ‘Hinc numeroſas vacillantium animarum copias colligere, ſociis ſuis aureos montes promittere, Eccleſiam Rempublicamque libellorum famoſiſſimorum plauſtris conturbare, *Servum Dei Joannem* Prophetamque eximium ſeipſum indigitare, *Revelationum* tandem extraordinariarum univerſa volumina in vulgus ſpargere, neque erubuit neque deſtitit. At quis tandem omnium horum exitus?

Mons parturivit, natuſque eſt ridiculus mus.

‘Eorum, quæ prædixerat, nihil evenit; evenêre contra multa, quæ nec prædixerat nec præſagierat. Miſſo enim, quod erecturum ſe eſſe gloriatus erat, vexillo, & cum *De Raatiis, Someris, Richarſoniis*, novi Regni deſignatis Aſſeſſoribus, redux in Patriam factus, ſolutâ ſocietate tribunitiâ & ſchiſmaticâ, patriæ urbis δεσμωτηρίῳ incluſus eſt: impetratâ ſimul pleniſſimâ facultate & poteſtate, *Prophetias* ſuas ludicras & ridiculas reſumendi & retractandi, periculumque faciendi, num prædicere certiuſcule forſan poſſit, quo tempore & modo ex illo ſuo ergaſterio liberandus tandem ſit, quam multa alia prænunciavit. ——— *Hence he neither bluſhed, nor ceaſed to gather numerous forces of unſtable ſouls, to promiſe his companions mountains of gold, to diſturb the church and the ſtate with cart-loads of libels, to call himſelf* John the ſervant of God, *and a great prophet, and at laſt to diſperſe among the people whole volumes of extraordinary revelations. But what was the event of all this?*

The mountain labour'd, and brought forth a mouſe.

‘*Nothing of what he had foretold came to paſs; on the contrary, many things fell out, which he had neither foretold, nor foreſeen. For the ſtandard, which he had boaſted he would ſet up, being thrown away, and returning home, together with the* De Ratzs's, Somers's, *and* Richardſon's, *the deſigned aſſeſſors of his new kingdom, the tribunitial and ſchiſmatical aſſociation being diſſolved, he was ſhut up in his own country priſon; with full leave at the ſame time, to reſume and revive his ludicrous prophecies, and to try, whether he could not foretel with greater certainty, than he had done many other things, when, and after what manner, he ſhould be releaſed from his confinement.*’ Mrs *Bourignon* did not ſuffer herſelf to be ſeduced by the

(1) *Taken from* Micrælius, Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. 1449, & ſeq. Edit. 1699.

(2) Micræl. ibid. pag. 1324.

(3) Ut à prima lanugine ſumme melancholicus, ita in eligendis quas quoad religionem ſequeretur partibus inconſtans plane ac deſultorius. *Saldenus in otiis Theolog pag.* 194.

(4) Idem, Saldenus, ibid.

(5) Ibid pag. 195.

people of the ſame trade envy one another (*o*) [*C*]; for he wrote with the greateſt humility to this John Rothe (*p*). He called him a man of God, and John III, the ſon of Zacharias. He begged the aſſiſtance of his knowledge, and denounced woe to thoſe, who did not attend to him [*D*]. He dedicated to him his *Prodromus quinquennii mirabilis*, printed at Leyden in 1674, which was the forerunner of two volumes he deſigned to publiſh. He intended to put into the firſt the ſtudies and diſcoveries he had made, ſince his firſt viſion, till the year 1674. We ſhould have found in it a thouſand inventions, that would have aſtoniſhed all ages (*q*). The latter was to have been the key of *eternity*, *æviternity*, and *time*. He communicated his deſign to father Kircher; and, praiſing the fine works that Jeſuit had publiſhed, particularly the *Ars combinatoria*, *ſive ars magna ſciendi*, he gave him to underſtand, that he had only made the firſt draught of what he (Kulhman) deſigned to carry farther [*E*]. This Jeſuit anſwered

the whims of John Rothe; ſhe had a ſovereign preſervative againſt ſuch charms; ſhe would have her prophecy to be like the privileges of the gentlemen of Germany, who *hold immediately of the Empire*; ſhe would be propheteſs in chief, and hold only of God, without any ſubordination, without any collaterals. However it be, let us ſee what judgment ſhe made of John Rothe, and Kuhlman. 'Which (6) then particularly appeared on occaſion of a famous pretended prophet of Holland, who ſet up ſtandards, to liſt under them the twelve tribes of Iſrael, which he was to reſtore, and whom ſome honeſt people actually followed, beſides others, who, without following him, gave credit to his chimerical revelations. In ſome viſits that he made to her, ſhe eaſily diſcovered his illuſion, though he aſſured her he had a frequent commerce with the angels, and with God, and that he ſhould be for the future as a God to her, ſince God would only diſcover himſelf to her by his means. She was ſo weary of him, as to reſolve not to ſee him any more, nor to open his prophetical letters, which are at preſent ſealed up ſtill among her papers. She cautioned her friends to beware of him, becauſe undoubtedly he was not of God; for ſhe applied to God on purpoſe to know what he was; and God, to the queſtion ſhe asked, *Lord, is this man thy prophet?* anſwered, *No*; and to the ſecond queſtion, *Who is he then, Lord?* he anſwered her, *He is a preſumptuous man, over whom the devil hath a great power*. God had given her the ſame ſentiments of thoſe of his tribe, and particularly of one Quirinus Kuhlman, who lately printed a letter, which he addreſſed to this gentlewoman, to try whether he could jumble together the ſpirit of God, and the viſions of the devil, with which this falſe prophet has his head filled, roving up and down to ſeduce thoſe who deſerved to be ſeduced, by reaſon of the little eſteem they have for the truth, that comes from God (7).'

We find in Micrælius's Continuator (8), that John Rothe, being the ſon of a man, whoſe name was Zacharias, boaſted of being the forerunner of the ſon of God, with reſpect to the laſt judgment, and that, in the year 1668, he ordered, in king Melchiſedec's name, the emperor, all kings, and princes, to lay down their ſovereignties, for as much as the reign of Jeſus Chriſt was at hand: that he was examined in the year 1677, and ſhut up in priſon by order of the States of Holland and Weſt-Frieſland; and, that afterwards, being ſet at liberty, he was laughed at by every body, his prophecies being found contrary to the event (9). That author ſhould have added, that he was cured of his viſions, that he married, and became as other people. He is ſtill living whilſt I write this (10).

[*C*] *He contradicted the proverb, that people of the ſame trade envy one another.*] This was more edifying, take it altogether, than what we have ſeen ſince. We have ſeen two interpreters of the Apocalypſe write one againſt another, though they were agreed upon the pretended myſteries of the year 1689. But becauſe they met in that point of union, by different roads, each would maintain his hypotheſis, to the prejudice of his brother interpreter. This was not well; and, if the public had been leſs indulgent than it was, no body ought to have wondered at it.

[*D*] *He denounced woe to thoſe, who did not attend to John Rothe.*] He thundered out (11) 'Væ! væ! ſi prophetias ſervorum Dei ſpreveritis, ſeu Batavia olim mirabilis nunc miſerabilis ſprevit & moriens ſpernit. —— *Woe! woe! if you ſhall deſpiſe the prophecies of the ſervants of God, as wretched Holland deſpiſeth, and dying continues to deſpiſe them.* Hoc anno, *continued he*, & hujus anni una die veniet & mors & luctus & fames Babylonis Belgicæ, & igne exuretur cœleſti, quia validus eſt Dominus Deus damnans eam. —— *This year, and on one day of this year, the death, grief, and famine, of Belgic Babylon will be happen, and ſhe will burnt with fire from heaven, becauſe mighty is the Lord God, who condemns her.*' All this becauſe they had ſpoke much againſt John Rothe, and his viſions had been laughed at. Kuhlman maintained, that heaven had declared for that prophet, by the great ſtorm on the twenty fourth of March, 1674, and by the ruins that happened in ſeveral places the twenty firſt of May following (12). He referred to the Gazetteer, who mentioned them, and applied to his friend the famous words of an old Poet. 'O miſelli Theoſophiſtæ & Diabologi! nullis verbis, calumniis, invectionibus eluditis Prophetam, *nimium Deo dilectum*,

Cui militat æther,
Et conjurati veniunt ad claſſica venti (13).

—— *O miſerable Theoſophiſts, and diabolical ſpeakers, with no words, calumnies, or invectives, do you deceive the prophet*, highly favoured of heaven, for whom the æther fights, and under whoſe banners conſpiring winds enliſt.' He apoſtrophized in particular Amſterdam (14), where the wind had torn up many trees; and forgot not the thunder, which fell upon the great church at Utrecht; but eſpecially, he cried out miracle (15), becauſe it thundered on the twenty fourth of March, the day before John Rothe left Holland, whilſt there was ſtill ſome ſnow in the ſtreets, and ice in the canals. Theſe ſtorms, thunders, and lightenings, were, according to him, the fore-runners of the deſtruction of the country; and yet from that time the affairs of the United-Provinces went on better and better every day. It is not improper to obſerve all theſe things, in order to know the predominant ſpirit of ſuch people; they make an ill uſe of every thing, and find their pretended myſteries every where. We have inſtances of it of a later date.

[*E*] *He acquainted Father Kircher that he had only made the firſt draught* (16) *of what he (Kuhlman) deſigned to carry farther.*] Father Kircher did not ſtand to defend his works, nor pretended to be more knowing than Kuhlman. He ſtruck ſail before him, and declared, that, having written in a human way, he pretended not to equal thoſe who wrote by inſpiration. 'Quod porro de *arte combinatoria* cæteriſque *paradoxis meis, tum in polygraphia, tum in muſurgia*, jam publicæ luci traditis meliori modo fieri potuiſſe contendis, nil moror cum SCIENTIÆ TUÆ TAM SUBLIMIS ET θεοδάτης prorſus incapacem ineptumque me eſſe humili mentis obſequio fatear. Quæ ſcripſi ego, divina aſpirante gratia *humano more*, id eſt ſtudio & labore adquiſita ſcientia ſcripſi, non divinitus inſpirata aut infuſa, cujuſmodi puram inter mortales dari non exiſtimo. . . . . . . Non dubitem quin tu pro INCOMPARABILI INGENII TUI VASTITATE meis nugis & majora & admiratione digniora ſis proditurus. —— *As to what you ſay, that my* Ars Combinatoria *and* Paradoxes, *which are already publiſhed, might have been better performed, I confeſs it, and own, with great humility, my own incapacity for that* ſublime and celeſtial ſcience *you are maſter of. What I have written, I have written by the grace of God*, after a human manner, *that is, by knowledge acquired through ſtudy and labour, not divinely inſpired or infuſed, which is not to be expected,*

(*o*) Figulus figulo invidet, faber fabro.

(*p*) *His Letters to him, and thoſe he received from him, are printed with this title*, Theoſophicæ Epiſt. Leidenſes.

(*q*) Multa millena millia inventa omnem ætatem ad ſtuporem pro vocantia. *Pag.* 33.

(6) *That is*, God diſcovered to her, by experience, how far the preſumption and folly of men may go in conjunction with the illuſions of the devil; never ſuffering her to be ſeduced by them, for he inwardly diſcovered every thing to her. *Vie continuée d'Antoinette Bourignon*, *pag.* 293.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) His name is Daniel Hartnaccius.

(o) Micrælius, Hiſtor. Eccleſ. pag. 1324. Edit. 1699.

(10) In the year 1700.

(11) Ad calcem Epiſt Kirchero ſcriptæ, pag 51.

(12) Præfat. Prodromi.

(13) Ibid.

(14) In calce Epiſt. ad Kirch. pag. 52.

(15) Theoſoph. Epiſt. pag. 36.

(16) Innumeri ex arte combinatoria inveniri poſſe in Medicina Chymiaque, recte *paradoxis* tuis ſubjunxiſti, ſed hoc optarem (moneam liberè) *ut magis interna quam externa, nucleum quam corticem quæreres.* —— *That a great many things in Phyſic and Chymiſtry may be found by the* Ars Combinatoria, *you have rightly ſubjoined to your* Paradoxes; *but I could wiſh (I take the liberty to adviſe you)* that you would examine rather the inſide than the outſide, the kernel rather than the ſhell.

anſwered him civilly, and gave him good advice [*F*]; and particularly upon the deſign he had to write to the Pope [*G*]. The prophetical ſpirit had not made our Kuhlman inſenſible to the pleaſure of being praiſed; for there was no encomium written to him, either by thoſe, whom he had preſented with his books, or by others, but what he publiſhed in the front of his *Prodromus*. As for the praiſes that he beſtows upon his own writings, they are undoubtedly very great (*r*); but, as he declares, that all his knowledge proceeds from the incarnate wiſdom (*s*), I will not be poſitive, that it is a ſign of pride (*t*). I do not well know when he left Holland; but I have lately ſeen a book (*u*), wherein it is ſaid, that he wandered a long time in England, in France, and in the Eaſt [*H*]; and that at laſt he was burnt in Muſcovy, on the third day of October

‘ *expected, pure and unmixed, among men*. . . . . . *I doubt not but you are able, through* the wonderful capacity of your genius, *to produce works greater and more admirable than the trifles I have written.*’ Our prophet took this in earneſt, and was not ſenſible, that the Jeſuit laughed at him. He carefully publiſhed Father Kircher's anſwer, and uſed capital letters in the places where he thought himſelf praiſed.

[*F*] *Father Kircher gave him good advice.*] Kircher's ſecond letter makes it plain, that he knew the weakneſs of this man, and that he jeers him, when he ſays in a ſerious manner: ‘ Magna ſanè *ἄπιςα καὶ ἀνεκφώνητα* promittis, QUÆ UTI SUPRA OMNEM HUMANI INGENII CAPTUM LONGE CONSTITUTA SUNT, ITA EA QUOQUE A NEMINE HUC USQUE NON DICAM TENTATA, SED NEC COGITATA QUIDEM FUISSE AUDACTER AFFIRMO, atque adeo aliud mihi ſuſpicari non liceat, niſi talem te divino munere ſcientiam adeptum eſſe qualem ſacra Pagina de PROTOPLASTO & SALOMONE teſtatur: explico *Adamæam, Salomonicam*, verbo INFUSAM, nulli mortalium niſi Tibi ſoli notam, cæteris inexplicabilem ſcientiam. —— *You promiſe wonderful things*; which as they exceed all human capacity, ſo I boldly affirm they never were attempted, or ſo much as thought of, by any one before: *and therefore I can only ſuſpect, that, by a divine gift, you have acquired ſuch a knowledge, as the ſcripture aſcribes to* Adam *and* Solomon; *an Adamic, Solomean, in a word* infuſed, *knowledge, known to no mortal but yourſelf, and inexplicable to all the world beſide.*’ But what follows is charitable advice. All things well conſidered, Father Kircher adviſed him to keep that infuſed knowledge to himſelf, and not to expoſe himſelf to the railleries of an age ſo ſcoffing as this is. Indeed, our age ſeems to be more terrible to the Viſionaries than the preceeding ones. The biſhop of Meaux has touched upon it in one of his books; but I queſtion whether at the bottom the appearances are not fallacious (17). ‘ Quicquid ſit, *they are Kircher's words*, ego ſane conſiderato rei non parvi momenti negotio, pro ſingulari quo te proſequor affectu, etiam atque etiam quam obnixiſſimè contenderim, ne hanc tuam noviter obtentam ſcientiam Centraliſque abyſſi profunditatem ulli vana quadam jactantia oſtenderes, ne Tertii poſt Adamum Salomonis dicam & cum riſu nomen incurras. Potiſſimum hoc ſæculo ſarcaſtico, quo Criticaſtrorum, Thraſonum, & Sycophantarum non parvus eſt numerus qui aliud non moliuntur, quam ut glorioſos aliorum labores canino dente rodere, ſannis ludibriiſque exponere non ceſſent. ——— *Whatever it be, the friendſhip I have for you induces me, upon mature deliberation, earneſtly to adviſe you, not to boaſt of this newly acquired ſcience, leſt you be laughed at by the name of the Third Solomon ſince Adam. Eſpecially in this ſarcaſtical age, in which wou'd-be critics, braggadocios, and ſycophants are ſo numerous, who make it their buſineſs to ſnarl at the glorious labours of others, and to expoſe them to mockery and laughter.*’ And, to make greater impreſſion by his remonſtrances, he was pleaſed to tell him what had happened to himſelf; which was, that he had found by experience, that a man expoſed himſelf to many evils, when he raſhly and inconſiderately ſets up for an author. *Quanta malorum Ilias ex inconſiderata ſcriptione reſultet, ego jam* 40 annorum ſpatio, *quo in hoc* omnium gentium & nationum theatro, *meam utut poſſum perſonam ago, frequenti experientia comperi.*

[G] . . . . *and in particular upon his deſign* . . . . *to write to the Pope.*] Though Kuhlman fancied, that he was the man promiſed by Drabicius, and though he knew, that Drabicius's promiſes concerned the ruin of the Roman Antichriſt, yet he had a mind to write to the Pope. He thereupon conſulted Father Kircher, and expreſſed to him the paſſionate deſire he had of communicating to the ſovereign Pontif his great ſecrets for the good of Chriſtendom. *A te*, Reverendiſſime Pater, *peterem ne denegares mihi occaſionem præbere, qua* Pontificis Maximi *manibus propriis quædam Epiſtola à me inſignum obſervantiæ tranſmittenda traderetur* . . . . . *Vellem enim* arcana ponderoſiſſima *ad Chriſtianæ Eccleſiæ commodum ſingulariter proficua*, candido ore ſtiloque candido, *tam admirabili tempeſtate Pontifici communicare* amore Reip. Chriſtianæ impulſus. I do not know the particulars of the good advice, the Jeſuit gave him upon this ſubject; he left them out of the anſwer he received; for that paſſage was printed in the following manner: ‘ Quod denique de litteris ad ſummum Pontificem dandis, eidemque propriis manibus à me conſignandis Te cogitare ſcribis . . . . . quæ ſcribo ut quanta cautela & circumſpectione Romæ procedendum ſit cognoſcas. —— *As to your deſign of writing to the Pope* . . . . *which I tell you, that you may know with what caution and circumſpection affairs are to be carried on at Rome.*’ But he did not ſtrike out that part, wherein he was told, that his great work, dedicated to the Pope, would be applauded and admired, provided he left nothing in it, that might offend the cenſors of books, and took care not to pretend to an inſpired knowledge *ſilentio quoque ſuppreſſa divinitus Tibi inſpirata ſcientia.* This laſt counſel, though good in itſelf, was the leaſt likely to be reliſhed; for it is by boaſting of a divine illumination, that one may ſtrike the people with aſtoniſhment (18). Let us ſpeak a word concerning the knavery or folly of falſe prophets. About the time that Kuhlman was ready to write very reſpectfully to the Pope, for the good of Chriſtendom, he wrote to others, that he hoped to ſee quickly the deſtruction of the Papacy. This is the plain meaning of theſe words of Kuhlman, according to the ſtile of our Viſionaries. ‘ O Pontifex *Clemens X!* an ſigilli mei *duplicatum Quinarium X* excedes, mox orbis aſpiciet univerſus? In *Clemente I* Petro & Lino jure præterito Epiſcopatus Romanus incepit: in *Clemente X* quid futurum ſit tempus evolvet. ——— *O Pope* Clement X! *will the whole world hereafter ſee, whether you will exceed* the double Quinary X of my ſeal? *The biſhopric of Rome, Peter and Linus juſtly omitted, began in* Clement I: *what will happen under* Clement X, *time will ſhew.*’ I could name a man (19), who has been extreamly vexed, becauſe the public has been informed, that, whilſt he furiouſly inveighed againſt Lewis XIV, he wrote ſome letters to a duke, full of flattery towards that prince.

H [H] *He wandered a long time in England, in France, and in the Eaſt.*] I have lately found many little books of this Enthuſiaſt, printed at London at his own expence, ſome in 1681, and others in 1682. The firſt of them dated from London the 24th of June, 1681, is dedicated to Lewis XIV, with this familiar inſcription, *Salve Ludovice XIV. Rex Liligere, ſalve.* The author exhorts this prince to aſſert the Regale, which was the talk of that time, and acquaints him, that Drabicius had promiſed him the city of Rome (20). We find in this collection a letter, which he wrote from Lubec to Father Kircher, in February, 1676, *De ſapientia infuſa Adamæa, Salomonæaque*; and a piece, which he inſcribed to Mahomet IV, *De converſione Turcarum.* It is dated from Conſtantinople the firſt of Auguſt, 1678. The author ſets his myſtical ſeal to it at London, the firſt of May, 1681, and ſignified to the Sultan, that the comet, which appeared the preceeding winter, preſaged the converſion of all nations; and he congratulated his highneſs on having appointed a faſt throughout his empire.

‘ Aſpexiſti

(*r*) In quibus majora in omni ſcibili eruuntur, quam à nobis vel ullo homine expectantur. *Monit. ad Lector. in limine Epiſtol. ad Kircher.*

(*s*) Omnia quæ poſſideo ſapientiæ incarnatæ non mihi veniunt adſcribenda. *Ibid.*

(*t* *See the* Entretiens ſur la Cabale chime-ique, *printed in* 1691, *pag.* 109.

(*u*) Diarium Biographicum Henningi Witte, Tom. II. pag. 168.

(17) See the article ABARIS, remark [*I*].

(18) See the biſhop of Meaux's Commentary upon the Apocalypſe, Dutch Edit. pag. 429.

(19) Quem verſu dicere non eſt, Signis perfacile eſt. *Horat. Sat. V, lib i, ver.* 87. [The perſon intended here is Mr Jurieu. REM. CRIT.]

(20) A Deo data ſcientia ROMAM nunc cribrans à DRABICIO Tib olim promiſſa.

October 1689, for ſome predictions actually ſeditious (x). I do not know whether he cauſed his medal to be ſtruck, as ſome other new prophets have done; but the ſame book informs me, that his effigies came out, under which there are ſo many titles given him [*I*], that I believe the eaſtern monarchs hardly give themſelves more. If it be thought, that I ſpeak too ſeriouſly, and too copiouſly of him, I deſire it may be known, that there is a ſeriouſneſs, which upon ſuch things is worſe than jeſting; and it is requiſite the world ſhould be informed of the prodigious variety of Fanaticiſm. It is a more contagious evil than is imagined. The reading of Drabicius compleated the ruin of Kuhlman [*K*]. Thoſe, who have not the *Prodromus* of the latter, need only read three or four pages of Morhoſius's Polyhiſtor (y), where they will ſee the magnificent promiſes and vaſt projects of this Enthuſiaſt.

For the reſt, he was not one of thoſe inſpired men, who pretend to continence; he was married twice, if we may call a marriage, and not a concubinage, the commerce that is between a man and a woman, without obſerving the formalities preſcribed by the canon and civil laws. He underſtood well enough how to trick people out of their money, and he wrote to ſome perſons in a magiſterial and prophetic tone, that it was neceſſary for the advancing of the new kingdom of God, that they ſhould ſend him ſuch or ſuch a ſum, in default of which he threatned them with the moſt terrible puniſhments the avenging hand of the moſt High could inflict. Van Helmont was one of thoſe, who received ſuch letters; but he was wiſer than to pay any regard to them (z).

'Aſpexiſti ante aliquot menſes, *O Capitanee grandis ab Oriente Solis*, Cometam in-audite-ingentem, NUNTIUM REALEM REGNI JESUELITARUM, hoc eſt Reſtitutionis Populorum omnium ad Deum Unicum & Triunum. Bene Te, quod cor tuum coram Deo flexeris, & Proclamatione Diei pœnitentialis Catholici in Regnis tuis, inceperis adimplere Verba Dei ad Prophetam Drabicium: *Si Chriſtiani voluntatem meam in deſtruendo Antichriſtianiſmo, Doctrinaque prava & Idololatria exequi renuent, facient id Chriſtianis in opprobrium Turcæ & Tartari: quod horrori erit angelis meis & hominibus.* Macte iſtâ indole. — *You ſaw, ſome months before, O great Eaſtern leader, a comet of unuſual magnitude, A TRUE PROGNOSTIC OF THE KINGDOM OF THE JESUELITES, that is, of the reſtoration of all people to the one-three God. O! well is thee, that thou haſt turned thy mind before God, and, by proclaiming a general faſt throughout thy empire, haſt begun to fulfil the words of the lord to the prophet Drabicius:* If the Chriſtians ſhall refuſe to perform my will in deſtroying the kingdom of Antichriſt, and corrupt doctrine and idolatry, the Turks and Tartars ſhall do it, to the diſgrace of the Chriſtians; which will be an horrour to my angels, and to men.' He wrote to the Aga of Smyrna, the twenty eighth of June 1678 (21). Some months after, he dedicated to the Sieur Van Dam the myſtery of Kotterus's twenty one weeks, in which he declared, that the houſe of Auſtria was about to loſe the Imperial crown. By his piece intituled *De magnalibus naturæ ultimo ævo reſervatis*, inſcribed, *Ad adeptos magoſque orbis terrarum*, at Geneva the thirtieth of January 1682, it appears, that he was going into the Holy Land. His *Arcanum microcoſmicum* is dated from Paris the firſt of November 1681.

[*I*] *There are ſo many titles given him.*] Here is what I find in a book I have quoted (22): In effigie quam Andreas Lippius edidit, ita celebratur:

Alter Scaligerum, Taubmannus, Grotius, Opitz!
Barthius, Iſcanus, Gryphius, Muretus, Eraſmus!
Henoch, Joſephus, Davides, Joſhua, Moſes,
Elias, Daniel, Salomon, Eliſa, Johannes!
Cyrus, Alexander, Conſtantin, Karl, Fridericus!
Liligerus, Juvenis, Frigerans, Artiſta, Sophata:
O Pater hæc tua ſunt! Hæc ad te cuncta reflexit.

In the print publiſhed by Andreas Lipſius, he is thus celebrated:

Another Scaliger, Taubmna, Grotius, Opitz, Barthius, &c.

A little before, it is ſaid, that he ſometimes called himſelf LUDOVICUS LUDOVICI. The catalogue of his writings, as Mr Witte gives it, does not comprehend the *Epiſtolæ Theoſophicæ Leidenſes*; but then, it contains nine letters written to Father Kircher; beſides *Epiſtolarum Londinenſium Catholica ad Wickleſio-Waldenſes, Huſſitas, Zwinglianos, Lutheranos, Calvinianos*; beſides in High Dutch, *De cæleſti oſculo amoris, ſive cogitationes poeticæ ex Cantico Canticorum. Diſcurſus ſacri & profani de pulcerrimis virtutum floſculis. Mortalitas immortalis, ſive centum epitaphia. Caduceator Hiſtoricus. Neo-Behmius illuſtratus*, &c.

[*K*] *The reading of Drabicius compleated the ruin of Kuhlman.*] Kuhlman found in Drabicius's prophecies two paſſages, which he applied to himſelf (23). The firſt contains theſe words (24). 'Qui legit, intelligat! cum numerabitur QUINQUE finem accipient filii contumaciæ, conſpecto me poteſtatem habere in cœlos, terram, mare. —— *Let him, that readeth, underſtand: when* FIVE *ſhall be numbered, the ſons of contumacy ſhall have an end, it being ſeen that I have power over the heavens, the earth, and the ſea.*' Here follows the other (25): 'Abundantia benedictonis Te (*Drabicium*) parata expectat Wratiſlaviæ, ac ſi oculis videas tuis. —— *An abundance of bleſſing attends thee* (Drabicius) *at Wratiſlaw, as tho' you ſaw with your eyes.*' Add to theſe two paſſages, that which he took from the *Aſtrologico-Prophetical Prognoſtic*, written by Paul Felgenhaver in 1647, and publiſhed in 1655. 'Quantus error ſit pacis ſpes, illud nobis duplicatus QUINARIUS demonſtrabit, cum venerit poſt paucos dies. —— *How ill grounded are the hopes of peace, the double Quinary will ſhew, when it ſhall come after a few days.*' He imagined, that he was that double *Quinarius*, whom Felgenhaver had promiſed, being convinced of it by two reaſons; firſt, becauſe his name was Quirinus, ſecondly, becauſe, in 1674, it was five years ſince he had received an infuſed ſcience (26). He therefore believed, that then the time promiſed by Drabicius was come, *cum numerabitur quinque, finem accipient filii contumaciæ*; ſo that he hoped quickly to throw down Antichriſt and Babylon with his pen. Let us hear the Hallelujah's, which he ſung before hand: 'Corruet Antichriſtus proprio ſuo judicio, & Babylon excidium ſuum properabit cum admiratione populorum. Hallel. Quem Cæſares armis potentibus non debellavere, juvenis inermis debellabit in virtute Jeſu Chriſti prælians. Hall. Stant Mercatores Antichriſti horrore procul trementes, deflent interitum ſuum inſperatum ab inſperato timore futurorum. Hall. (27). —— *Antichriſt ſhall fall by his own judgment, and Babylon ſhall haſten it's ruin with the admiration of the people. Hallelujah! whom the emperors with powerful arms have not conquered, an unarmed youth ſhall ſubdue, fighting in the ſtrength of the Lord Jeſus. Hallelujah! the merchants of Antichriſt ſtand at a diſtance, trembling with horror; they lament their unexpected deſtruction thro' an unexpected fear of what is to come. Hallelujah!*' If I had not read this, I ſhould hardly have believed, that the extravagance of Fanaticiſm could have gone ſo far.

(x) Ob vaticinia quædam & ſeditionis motum concrematus. *Id. ibid.*

(y) From page 357, to pag. 361.

(z) I have this from ſome perſons, who knew Kuhlman.

(21) Kuhlman was then in the port of Smyrna, on board a French ſhip. He was ſtill at Smyrna the twenty ſeventh of October 1678, as appears from the letter, which he wrote to James Van Dam, the Dutch conſul.

(22) Diarium Biographicum Henningi Witte, Part. II, pag. 168.

(23) Epiſt. Theoſoph. pag. 2.

(24) Revelat. 594, Febr. 7, ann. 1664.

(25) Revelat. 608, May 24, 1664.

(26) Epiſt. Theoſoph. pag 2.

(27) This is what he wrote to John Rothe, the twenty fourth of April 1674, from Leyden. See the *Epiſt. Theoſoph. pag. ult.*

KYRIANDER (William) a German Civilian, after he had begun the ſtudy of the Civil-law in Germany, continued it in France and at Padua, and went afterwards to Venice, to add the practice to the theory, by frequenting the bar (*a*). He there undertook the tranſlation of a book of Leander Albertus [*A*], which was printed at Cologn in 1567. You will find in Moreri, that he was ſyndic of Triers, and that he publiſhed the Annals of that town [*B*]: But you will not find there, that he changed his religion, and that his book was much diſparaged by the Jeſuits upon this account [*C*].

[*A*] *He undertook the tranſlation of a book of Leander Albertus.*] This work contains the deſcription of Italy, and has not been deſpiſed by the learned. Read Voſſius, chapter 12, book 3, *De Hiſtoricis Latinis* (1), and *La Popeliniere*, pag. 414 of the *Hiſtoire des Hiſtoires*. Kyriander made uſe of three Italian editions of this work, which he tranſlated into Latin; but I wonder he ſays nothing of the edition, to which was added the Deſcription of the Iſlands that are near Italy. That edition was printed at Venice, *appreſſo Ludouico de gli Auanzi*, in the year 1561, in 4to. The tranſlator is very much to be blamed for not having made uſe of it, and for not adding to his work the Deſcription of the Iſlands.

[*B*] *He publiſhed the Annals of the town of Triers.*] It is a Folio printed at Deuxponts in the year 1603. Michael Hertzius does not mention this edition. He only mentions that of 1625, and pretends, that thoſe Annals begin with the year of the world 966 (2). Which carries them up to above ſeven hundred years before the deluge. Zeiller (3) might have taught him to ſay 1966, and not 966. In the ſecond Holland edition of Moreri's Dictionary, there is 1066; which goes back to near 600 years before Noah.

[*C*] *He changed his religion, and his book was much diſparaged by the Jeſuits upon that account.*] Maſenius ſpeaks of it thus: *Kyriander res Trevirenſium, ut fidem Deo Principique ſuo violarat, perverſè perſecutus eſt* (4).

(*a*) Kyriander, Præfat. Deſcript. Italiæ.

(1) Pag. m. 680.

(2) Hertzius, Bibliotheca Germanica, n. 464.

(3) De Hiſt. Part. II, pag. 81.

(4) Maſenius, in Dedicat. Compend. Hiſt. Trevir. apud Magirum, Eponymol. pag. 498.

L.

LABE (Loysa) a courtezan of Lyons, has been reckoned among the French authors, by la Croix du Maine, and du Verdier Vau-Privas. She flouriſhed at Lyons, in the reign of Henry II, in 1555 (*a*). Her works were printed there the ſame year [*A*]. She did not reſemble the courtezans in all things; for, if ſhe was, on the one hand, of their humour, in that ſhe would be well paid for her favours, ſhe had, on the other hand, ſome regard for learned men, which others have not; for ſhe beſtowed her favours on them *gratis*. Her character will be better known by the paſſage I ſhall quote [*B*].

(*a*) La Croix du Maine, pag. 291.

[*A*] *Her works were printed at Lyons, in* 1555.] They contain a dialogue in French proſe, intituled, *Le debat de Folie & d'Honneur* (*A debate between Folly and Honour*), and ſeveral poems of her own invention (1); beſides the *writings of ſeveral poets in her praiſe, in Greek, Latin, Italian, and French verſe* (2).

[*B*] *Her character will be better known by the paſſage I ſhall quote.*] I make no alteration in du Verdier's words. 'Loyſa Labe, *ſays he* (3), a courtezan 'of Lyons, (otherwiſe called the handſome Ropemaker's 'wiſe, being married to an honeſt Ropemaker) managed a horſe very well; for which reaſon, the 'gentlemen, who had acceſs to her, called her captain 'Loys; ſhe was a woman of a good and chearful 'wit, and tolerably handſome. She obligingly entertained in her houſe lords, gentlemen, and other 'perſons of merit, with diſcourſe, muſic, both vocal 'and inſtrumental, in which ſhe was admirably well 'skilled, reading of good Latin, Italian, and Spaniſh 'books, wherewith her cloſet was curiouſly furniſhed, and with exquiſite ſweet-meats. In fine, ſhe 'communicated to them privately the moſt ſecret 'pieces ſhe had: in a word, ſhe was free of her body 'to ſuch as paid for it: however not to all, not to 'mechanics, and men of mean condition, whatever 'money they might offer her. She loved learned 'men above all, who were ſo much in her favour, 'that thoſe of her acquaintance were preferred before 'any great lord, to whom ſhe would rather do a 'favour *gratis*, than to another for a great many 'crowns; which is contrary to the cuſtom of thoſe 'of her trade and condition.' This paſſage has been quoted in the continuation of the *Critique Generale de l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſme* (4), with the addition of this reflexion (5): 'Demoſthenes would have been glad, 'if the courtezan Lais had been like this; he would 'not have made a voyage to Corinth in vain, nor 'experienced,

Qu'à tels feſtins un auteur comme un ſot,
A prix d'argent doit payer ſon écot.

That at ſuch treats an author pays his ſcot,
And is no better dealt with than a ſot.

This woman at the ſame time honoured and diſhonoured learning: She diſhonoured it, whilſt, being an author, ſhe led the life of a courtezan; and ſhe honoured it, becauſe the learned were better received by her *gratis*, than the ignorant at any price.

(1) La Croix du Maine, pag. 291.

(2) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bibl. Françoiſe, pag. 822.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) Letter xviii, pag. 595.

(5) Ib. pag. 596.

LABERIUS (Decimus) a Roman knight and a Poet, had an admirable faculty at playing the part of a *Mime*. He durſt not refuſe Julius Cæſar, who was deſirous he ſhould come upon the ſtage to act one of thoſe pieces, tho' this was very unbecoming his condition, and his age. He excuſed himſelf the beſt he could in his prologue [*A*], and maliciouſly ſlipped in ſome ſtrokes againſt Cæſar [*B*]; which determined that

[*A*] *He excuſed himſelf the beſt he could in the prologue.*] Macrobius has preſerved it to us, and very judiciouſly obſerves, that a maſter, even when he intreats, uſes a ſort of authority, which there is no reſiſting (1). '*Laberium asperæ libertatis equitem* '*Romanum Cæſar quingentis millibus invitavit, ut* '*prodiret in ſcenam, & ipſe ageret mimos quos ſcriptitabat. Sed poteſtas non ſolum ſi invitet, ſed etſi* '*ſupplicet, cogit. Unde ſe & Laberius à Cæſare* '*coactum in prologo teſtatur his verſibus:*

Neceſſitas, cujus curſus tranſverſi impetum
Voluerunt multi effugere, pauci potuerunt,
Quo me detruſit pæne extremis ſenſibus?
Quem nulla ambitio, nulla umquam largitio,
Nullus timor, vis nulla, nulla auctoritas
Movere potuit in juventa de ſtatu:
Ecce in ſenecta ut facile labeſecit loco
Viri excellentis mente clemente edita
Submiſſa placide blandiloquens oratio?
Etenim ipſi Dî negare cui nihil potuerunt,
Hominem me denegare quis poſſet pati? &c (2).

'Cæſar prevailed upon Laberius, by a large gratuity 'to appear upon the ſtage, and act a part in his 'own farces. But power, not only when it invites 'but when it intreats, compels. And therefore Laberius excuſed himſelf in the prologue, as being 'compelled by Cæſar, in the following manner:

Neceſſity, which many would avoid, but few can, whither has it driven me, almoſt in the laſt ſtage of my life? whom neither ambition, nor bribes, nor fear; whom no power, no authority, could influence, in youth; behold how eaſily the courteous invitation of a great man unſettles! For can I, a man, deny him any thing to whom the gods themſelves can deny nothing?

[*B*] *He ſlipt in ſome ſtrokes againſt Cæſar.*] This we have from Macrobius (3). '*In ipſa quoque actione* '*ſubinde ſe qua poterat ulciſcebatur, inducto habitu* '*Syri, qui velut flagris cæſus præripientique ſe ſimilis* '*exclamabat:*

Porro Quirites! libertatem perdimus.

& paulo poſt adjecit:

Neceſſe eſt multos timeat quem multi timent.

'*Quo dicto univerſitas populi ad ſolum Cæſarem oculos* '*& ora convertit, notantes impotentiam ejus hac dicacitate lapidatam* —— During the action itſelf, 'he revenged himſelf in ſome ſort, in the character

(1) *Auſonius ſays more:* Quod eſt potentiſſimum imperandi genus, rogabat qui jubere poterat -- *Which is the ſtrongeſt kind of command, be entreated, who might have commanded.* Præfat. Centon. Nupt.

(2) Macrobius, Saturnal. lib. ii, cap. vii, pag. m. 342.

(3) Macrob. ibid. pag. 344.

that prince to mortify him a little, by preferring another poet before him [C]. Laberius was rallied by Cicero that day, (a) and he repaid him in his own coin [D]. He died ten months after Julius Cæſar (b). His verſes have not been ſo much deſpiſed by Horace, as it is thought [E]. Moreri has committed ſome faults [F].

(a) That is, on the day that he acted a play, out of complaiſance to Julius Cæſar.

(b) Euſebius, in Chronico.

‘ of Syrus, who, repreſenting one beaten with rods, and flying from puniſhment, cryed out :

Ye Romans ! We loſe our liberty,

and a litte after, he added,

He muſt neceſſarily be affraid of many, whom many fear.

At which words, the whole audience turned their eyes upon Cæſar, obſerving that he was ſtruck with this piece of ſatire.’ Father Briert hath not well obſerved this paſſage ; for he ſuppoſes, that Laberius did not offend Cæſar till a long time after. ‘ *Procedente tempore ipſum Cæſarem offendit, & maximè hoc verſu.*

Porro Quirites libertatem perdimus,

Item & iſto

Neceſſe eſt multos timeat, quem multi timent (4).

Afterwards he offended Cæſar himſelf, eſpecially by this verſe,

Ye Romans ! we loſe our liberty.

And by this,

He muſt neceſſarily be affraid of many, whom many fear.

[C] *Cæſar preferred another Poet before him.*] Here is another paſſage of Macrobius : ‘ Ob hæc in Publium vertit favorem. Is . . . . . productus Romæ per Cæſaris ludos omnes qui tunc ſcripta & operas ſuas in ſcenam locaverant provocavit, ut ſinguli ſecum poſita invicem materia pro tempore contenderent. Nec ullo recuſante ſuperavit omnes ; in quis & Laberium : unde Cæſar arridens hoc modo pronuntiavit :

Favente tibi me victus es Laberi à Syro:

Statimque Publio palmam & Laberio annulum aureum cum quingentis ſeſtertiis dedit: Tunc Publius ad Laberium recedentem ait : *Qui cum contendiſti ſcriptor hunc ſpectator ſubleva* (5). ——— *For this reaſon he turned his favour on Publius. This man . . . . during the celebration of Cæſar's games at Rome, appeared, and challenged all the dramatic Poets to contend with him, alternately giving each other a ſubject : and, no one refuſing him, he vanquiſhed them all ; among the reſt, Laberius ; whence Cæſar, ſmiling, ſaid :*

Favour'd by me, Laberius, by Syrus you are vanquiſh'd :

‘ *And immediately he gave the palm to Publius, and a gold ring, with 500 ſeſterces, to Laberius. Then Publius ſaid to Laberius, as he went away* ; defend him as a ſpectator, with whom as a writer you diſputed.’ Laberius, ſome time after, compoſed a Mime, in which he declared, that the fate of arms is as uncertain upon the ſtage as any where elſe ; and that, if he had loſt the firſt rank, the ſame diſgrace would happen to his ſucceſſor. ‘ *Sequenti ſtatim commiſſione, Mimo novo interjecit hos verſus :*

Non poſſunt primi eſſe omnes omni in tempore.
Summum ad gradum cum claritatis veneris,
Conſiſtes ægre ; & quam deſcendas, decides.
Cecidi ego, cadet qui ſequitur, laus eſt publica (6).

In his next new Mime he inſerted theſe verſes :

It is impoſſible always to excel : when you reach the ſummit of perfection, it is with difficulty you will keep your footing, and, when you deſcend, you will fall. I am falling, he who follows me, will fall ; praiſe belongs to the public.

Here follows a paſſage out of Aulus Gellius (7). ‘ C. autem Cæſarem ita Laberii maledicentia & arrogantia offendebat, ut acceptiores & probatiores ſibi eſſe Publii quam Laberii Mimos prædicaret. —— *Cæſar was ſo offended at the inſolent behaviour of Laberius, that he declared he preferred the Mimes, of Publius to thoſe of Laberius.*’

[D] *He was rallied by Cicero that day, and he repaid him in his own coin.*] After Laberius had acted his piece, Cæſar preſented him with a ring, and gave him leave to retire. Laberius went to look for a place among the knights ; but they ordered it ſo, that he could find none. Cicero, ſeeing him perplexed, ſaid to him, ‘ Recepiſſem te, niſi anguſte ſederem ‘ *I would make way for you, were I not crowded.*’ Mirum, ‘ *anſwered the other*, ſi anguſte ſedes, qui ſoles duabus ſellis ſedere (8). — *It is ſtrange you ſhould be crowded who generally ſit upon two ſeats.*’ Cicero killed two birds with one ſtone. He laughed at Laberius, and at the many ſenators of a new creation, *ſimul & illum reſpuens, & in novum ſenatum jocatus, cujus numerum Cæſar ſupra fas auxerat* (9). But the anſwer that was made him, taxed him with trimming (10), that is with neither being a good friend to Pompey, nor Cæſar. *Cicero male audiebat, tanquam nec Pompeio certus amicus, nec Cæſari, ſed utriuſque adulator* (11). I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that Macrobius has confounded the places of the knights with thoſe of the ſenators : he thought, that the ſenators ſate upon what was called the fourteen benches, which is a miſtake. ‘ Quod Cicero dixit, *niſi anguſte ſederem*, ſcomma fuit in C. Cæſarem, qui in ſenatum paſſim tam multos admittebat, ut eos quatuordecim gradus capere non poſſent (12). —— *Cicero, in ſaying*, if I did not ſit too cloſe, *reflected upon C. Cæſar, who admitted ſo many into the ſenate, that the fourteen benches could not contain them.*’ This was the place of the knights ſince the law of Roſcius Otho.

Sic libitum vano qui nos diſtinxit Othoni (13)

[E] *His verſes were not ſo much deſpiſed by Horace, as it is thought.*] Here are the words of Horace :

Nec tamen hoc tribuens, dederim quoque cætera, nam ſic
Et Laberi Mimos, ut pulcra poëmata mirer (14).

Nor, granting this, the reſt I ſhall allow ;
So might Laberius' Mimes, obſcenely gay,
For perfect pieces, in my judgment paſs.

Mr Dacier's note runs thus : ‘ Horace does not here condemn Laberius abſolutely, nor ſo much as cenſure his works ; but only ſpeaks by compariſon. Laberius's Mimes were agreeable ; but they were not fine and perfect poems. Nor were they made to that end ; for the Mimes had only obſcene jeſts in them. For which reaſon Ovid calls them *Mimos obſcœna jocantes*, and they were only deſigned to make people laugh. If Julius Scaliger had well underſtood Horace's meaning, he would not have condemned the judgment, that Horace makes of Laberius's Mimes (15).’

[F] *Moreri has committed ſome faults.*] I. The Prænomen of Laberius is not Decius but Decimus. II. He ſurvived Julius Cæſar ſo little a time, that there was no need of ſaying, *he lived in the reign of Auguſtus.* III. It is not true that he received preſents from Auguſtus. IV. And that Macrobius ſays it. V. It is falſe, that Cæſar made him a Roman knight. See what Laberius ſays in the prologue of the farce acted by him in complaiſance to that emperor.

Ergo bis tricenis annis actis ſine nota,
Eques Romanus Lare egreſſus meo
Domum revertar mimus (16).

Twice thirty years paſs'd without blemiſh,
I, who this morn came forth a Roman knight,
Shall home return degraded to a Player.

Which

(4) Briet. de Poët. Lat. pag. 12.

(5) Macrob. ubi ſupra, pag. 344.

(6) Ibid. pag. 345.

(7) Aul. Gellius, lib. xvii, cap. xiv.

(8) Macrob. ibid. cap. iii, pag. 329.

(9) Id. ibid & lib. vii, cap iii, pag. 582. *See alſo* Seneca, Controverſ. XVIII.

(10) Exprobrata levitate Ciceroni. *Macrob ibid.* Objiciens tanto viro lubricum fidei. *Id Macrob. lib. vii, cap. iii, pag.* 582.

(11) Seneca, ubi ſupra.

(12) Macrobius, Saturnal. lib vii, cap. iii, pag. 582.

(13) Juvenal. Sat. III, ver. 159.

(14) Horat. Sat X, lib. i, ver. 5.

(15) Dacier's Remarks upon Horace, Tom. VI, pag. 607.

(16) Macrob. ibid. lib. ii, cap vii, pag. 343.

Which is an undeniable proof, that he was a Roman knight independently of Cæſar. That which deceived Moreri, with many others (17), is, that Cæſar, at the end of the play, gave a ring to this farce-player, as we learn from Macrobius; but it is eaſy to find in that very place a proof of the juſtice of my cenſure. Here is the whole paſſage: ‘ Deinde cum Laberius in fine ludorum annulo honoratus à Cæſare è veſtigio in quatuordecim ad ſpectandum tranſiit, violato ordine, & cum detrectatus eſt EQUES Romanus, & cum mimus remiſſus, ait Cicero prætereunti Laberio, & ſedile quærenti, recepiſſem te niſi anguſte ſederem (18). ——— *At the end of the games, Laberius, being honoured with a ring by Cæſar, would have taken his ſeat on the fourteen benches, among the Roman knights as a ſpectator; but, being refuſed admiſſion, and looklng about for a ſeat, Cicero ſaid to him, as he paſſed by him; Laberius, I would make room for you, were I not crowded.*’ It is evident, that Macrobius ſays, that the order of the knights was diſhonoured two manner of ways. I. Becauſe a place was refuſed to a Roman knight. II. Becauſe a farce-player was ſent from the ſtage to the place, where the Roman knights ſate. From whence I neceſſarily conclude, that Laberius owed not his knighthood to the favour of Julius Cæſar. All that can be ſaid, is, that he diſgraced himſelf by his complaiſance in acting on the ſtage; and that he was re-habilitated by Julius Cæſar. The ring, that he received, may be looked upon as a new patent of nobility: but this does not excuſe Moreri. Seneca confirms what we have ſaid (19).

LABOURLOTTE (Claudius) one of the braveſt captains of his age, owed his fortune to his courage; for his birth was ſo mean, that it is ſtill a diſpute, whether he was a native of Lorrain, or of Franche Comté (*a*). It is ſaid, that he had been Barber to count Charles of Mansfeld [*A*]; and that he did him a ſignal piece of ſervice [*B*]. He went thro' all the military degrees, till he was made commander of the Walloon troops in the ſervice of the king of Spain (*b*). He was more fortunate than judicious [*C*]; for he never more willingly engaged in an enterprize, than when it was very dangerous (*c*). He was wounded on ſeveral occaſions [*D*], and at laſt he was killed with a muſket-ſhot, the 24 of July 1600, whilſt he was making an intrenchment betwixt

[*A*] *It is ſaid, that he had been Barber to count Charles of Mansfeld.*] This is ſaid by Bongars, in a letter written to Camerarius, the ſixth of Auguſt 1596, in which he ſent him ſome news about the ſiege of Hulſt. ‘ Some, *ſays he* (1), write, that Labourlotte has been killed in it (2); that man ſo famous for his bravery and courage. He was formerly Barber to count Charles of Mansfeld, who died in Hungary. The cardinal chiefly made uſe of Labourlotte's boldneſs, and Rone's counſel (3).’ He, who, in 1693, publiſhed the hiſtory of archduke Albert, does not ſay, that Labourlotte was a Barber; but he ſays nothing that can prove the contrary. ‘ His birth, *ſays he* (4), reſembles that of great men, which is frequently diſputed: Lorrain will have him to be her's; Burgundy claims him as her's. The name Claudius favours the Burgundians. Whatever country he be of, it is certain he is come of a good family. The many enemies he has had, are a demonſtration of his extraordinary merit. Envy, like the thunder, paſſes over ſhrubs, and falls upon lofty trees. They ſay he was of mean extraction, and that he handled the razor and the lancet, before he handled the ſword and the pike: but the unprejudiced ſpeak otherwiſe. They ſay, that indeed he knew good remedies for wounds; but that he was led to his ſtudy by curioſity and charity, and not by neceſſity.’ When d'Aubigné (5) relates, that Labourlotte was killed in a ſkirmiſh in the counterſcarp of fort Iſabella, which he had recruited and victualled, he adds, ‘ that he was lamented by the arch-duke, and his ſuperiors, and not by his equals; who, enraged with envy, could not bear, that merit ſhould make a colonel of a country Barber.

[*B*] . . . . *and that he did him a ſignal piece of ſervice.*] He delivered him from the trouble of a moſt unlucky marriage. An author, whom I have cited, will not believe it. His words are: ‘ It is ſaid, that he got into the favour of Mansfeld, by ridding him of his troubleſome wife; but I believe nothing of it; he was too honeſt a man to be guilty of ſo baſe an action (6).’ The action would certainly be very baſe, whatever pleaſure it might have given the count. What makes me ſay, that the incredulity of this writer might be ill grounded, is, that Grotius has hinted at that action; an evident ſign, that he did not think the ſtory that was ſpread to be a vain report. His words are worth relating, as informing us of the merit of the deceaſed, with ſome circumſtances well expreſſed. ‘ Huc (7) quoque ſe Claudius Burlota tranſtulerat, bonamque & extremam navavit operam; trajectus globo vir nobilis audaciæ, Lotharingus ortu, curandis olim vulneribus vitam toleraverat: mox per facinus haud honeſtum conciliatus Mansfeldio ferebatur, dictus uxorem ejus ſuſtuliſſe: ſed nactus honores, ita ſe geſſerat, ut mereri majora ſemper judicaretur, quo mors ejus nec luctu apud ducem, nec apud ipſius novitati invidentes gaudio caruit (8). —— *Hither likewiſe came Claudius Labourlotte, a man of remarkable boldneſs, and who had formerly lived by practiſing Chirurgery: afterwards he is ſaid to have got into the favour of Mansfeld by a diſhonourable action, I mean, by ridding him of his wife: but, being advanced to honours, he ſo behaved himſelf, that he was always thought to deſerve more; for which reaſon the general lamented his death, but thoſe, who envied his riſing greatneſs, rejoiced at it.*’

[*C*] *He was more fortunate than judicious.*] Here is what Father Gallucci ſays of him (9): ‘ Animoſus magis quam cautus, accerſere ſæpe non expectare mortem viſus eſt. —— *He was more brave than prudent, and was often ſeen to ſeek death, rather than expect it.*’ ‘ He would undertake any thing, and was terrified with no danger. He began a fight as if he was ſure of the victory. The bold attempts were committed to him. They, who did not care to be put upon ſuch hazards, or ſaw themſelves eclipſed by his ſucceſs, called him a fortunate fool, hardy fellow (10).’

[*D*] *He was wounded on ſeveral occaſions.*] At the ſiege of Noion, in the year 1593; at that of Ardres, in 1596; at that of Hulſt, the ſame year; and at the battle of Newport, in 1600. See Father Gallucci (11): I believe he is miſtaken as to the laſt wound. I have met with no other hiſtorian, that mentions it: and beſides, they all ſay, that Labourlotte, a few days after the battle, brought a conſiderable ſuccour to Newport, which contributed very much to the raiſing of the ſiege, that prince Maurice had laid to that place. As to the wound at Hulſt, it was not mortal, as Bongars will have it. What I have cited from him, in the firſt remark, was written the ſixth of Auguſt 1596: he was not undeceived twenty days after; for he affirms, in a letter of the twenty ſeventh of Auguſt, in the ſame year, that Labourlotte was dead of his wounds (12). Thus you ſee how the very miniſters of princes are ſubject to ſpread falſe news, and not quickly to know the falſity of them. They ought to be more circumſpect in that point, than the perſon I am ſpeaking of, whoſe ability otherwiſe deſerves great encomiums. But when we follow him cloſe, we cannot forbear ſaying, that he too lightly believed agreeable news, and was too haſty in imparting them to his friends. Here is another proof of it, taken from the ſame letter, in which he affirmed, that Labourlotte was dead: *You will probably rejoice, when you hear, that the king of Spain is dead, and that the Spaniards will not receive his ſon for their king, as being born of an inceſtuous marriage, Rideas etiam cum intelliges Regem Hiſp. mortuum, & filium repudiari ab Hiſpanis natum nuptiis inceſtis* (13). This is what he wrote to his friend, the ſixth of Auguſt 1596. At that time all the news diſadvantageous to Spain was as eaſily believed, as now (14) thoſe that are to the diſadvantage of France.

[*E*] *He was killed the twenty fourth of July* 1600.] The author of the hiſtory of archduke Albert ſays the twentyfifth of July, at page 138; but, at page 264, he inſerts

BONGARS a little credulous.

---

(17) Julius Cæſar liked him ſo well, that he made him a knight. *Dacier, ubi ſupra.*

(18) Macrob. ib. cap. iii, pag. 329.

(19) Divus Julius ludis ſuis mimum produxit (*Laberium*) deinde equeſtri illum ordini redditum juſſit ire ſeſſum in equeſtrio: omnes ita ſe coarctaverunt ut venientem non reciperent. *Seneca, Controv. XVIII, ſub fin.*

(*a*) See the remark [*A*].

(*b*) Patria Lotharingus, virtutis ſuæ ſuffragiis ex gregario milite per omnes militarium honorum gradus ad Tribunatum evectus. Vallones aliquot annos magna cum laude gubernavit. *Ang. Galluccius, de Bel. Gal. lib. xiii, pag. m.* 35.

(*c*) *See* Strada, Dec. II, lib. viii, pag. 513.

(1) Bongar's Letters, pag. 493, of the Hague Edit. 1695.

(2) It was not true. See, below, the remark [*E*].

(3) It is thus we ſhould tranſlate the *Roſnii conſilio* of Bongars, and not *du Roſni*, as is done in the tranſlation of his Letters.

(4) Hiſt. de l'Archiduc. Albert. livr. iv, pag. 263.

(5) Hiſt. Univerſelle, Tom. III, lib. v, chap. xix, pag. 729.

(6) Hiſt. de l'Archiduc Albert, livr. iv, pag. 264.

(7) That is, to fort Iſabella.

(8) Grotius, Hiſtor. de Reb. Belg. lib. ix, ad ann. 1600, pag. m. 572.

(9) De Bello, Belg. lib. xiii, pag. m. 35.

(10) Hiſt. de l'Archiduc Albert. pag. 264.

(11) In Hiſt. Belli Belg.

(12) Burlotta poſt Roſnium ex vulneribus obiit. *Bongarſii, Epiſt. pag.* 500. *Hague Edit.* 1695.

(13) Id. ibid. pag. 491.

(14) I write this in the year 1695.

betwixt Bruges and fort Iſabella. He had a great ſhare in the barbarous actions that the troops of the Amirante committed in the territories of the empire, in 1598 [*F*]. He left a ſon, who turned Dominican, and one daughter, who married Robert de Celles, baron de Foy, in the country of Liege near Dinant (*d*).

(*d*) Hiſt. de l' Archiduc Albert, *printed in* 1693. pag. 264.

inſerts Labourlotte's epitaph, which ſays the twenty fourth. This epitaph is uſeful to the hiſtory of this brave man; and therefore I ſhall ſet it down. ' He ' is buried at Lopogne, with this epitaph; here lies ' the noble and illuſtrious lord, Meſſire Claudius Labourlotte, knight, and counſellor of war to the king, ' colonel of twelve companies of Luxemburghers, lord ' of Bernſtein, Boncour, La Vallée, Lopogne, and ' Baſi. He was killed at fort Iſabella near Oſtend, ' the twenty fourth of July in the year 1600 (15).' I do not think this author has been a good tranſcriber; for, to give an epitaph faithfully, the leaſt letter ought not to be changed. The barbariſms and ſolecisms muſt be retained, if there be any; or the reader muſt be told, that one gives only the ſubſtance of it. Here is the epitaph, as the baron Le Roi gives it (16): I believe it differs very little from the original: *Icy giſt noble & illuſtre Seigneur Meſſire Claude de Labourlotte, Chevalier & du Conſeille de guerre, Colonel de douze compagnies Luxembourgeoiſes, Seigneur de Berleſtein, Seigneur de Boncourt, La Vallée, Loppoigne, Baſy: lequel à eſté tué lez Oſtende pour le ſervice de ſa Majeſté le 24, de Julette* 1600. *Priez Dieu pour ſon ame.*

[*F*] *He ſhared in the barbarous actions, which the troops of the Amirante commited .... in* 1598.] Their extortions and barbarities ſtrike with horror thoſe who read them in the hiſtories. See the deſcription that d'Aubigné has given of them in few words, in the nineteenth chapter of the fifth book of his third volume. *Some lords ſaying to Labourlotte*, adds he (17), *that the emperor and the German princes would reſent ſuch outrages, he ſhewed them a cow, and ſaid*, As much as that beaſt. Note, that the Amirante, who commanded thoſe troops, was Francis de Mendoſa, whom I have already mentioned (18).

[*G*] *He left a ſon.*] My author ſhould have ſaid, that Labourlotte left two ſons, Erneſtus and Francis; the firſt was lord of Loppoigne, and died without iſſue; the latter was a monk, and ſo the ſucceſſion of their father fell to their ſiſter. See the Topography of the Walloon Brabant (19).

(15) Hiſt. de l'Archiduc Albert, pag. 264.

(16) In Topographia Gallo-Brabantiæ, *printed at Amſterdam, in* 1693, *in folio, pag* 74.

(17) Pag. 718.

(18) *See, above, citation* (64) *of the article* G R E G O R Y *VII.*

(19) Le Roi, ubi ſupra, pag. 74.

LACYDES, a Greek philoſopher, born at Cyrene, was the diſciple of Arceſilas, and his ſucceſſor in the academy (*a*). Some pretend, that he followed not his maſter's doctrine; but I think they are miſtaken [*A*]. He was poor in his younger days; nevertheleſs he became famous by his diligent application to ſtudy: Beſides, he had a very engaging way of diſcourſing (*b*). He taught in a garden (*c*), which Attalus king of Pergamus had made [*B*]. He anſwered that prince, who ſent for him to court, that the pictures of kings were to be looked on at a diſtance (*d*). He taught Philoſophy twenty ſix years (*e*), and reſigned his employment to two of his ſcholars (*f*). He imitated his maſter in a very commendable thing, which was, that he loved to do good, without caring it ſhould be known [*C*] The love a Gooſe had for him is very remarkable [*D*]. He died of a palſy by drinking too much [*E*]. What Numenius relates of him, looks altogether like a pleaſant tale [*F*.] Moreri has committed very groſs

(*a*) Diog. Laërt lib. iv, n. 59.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) That garden was in the academy.

(*d*) Diog. Laërt. ibid. n. 60.

(*e*) Id. ib. n. 61.

(*f*) Id ib. n. 60.

[*A*] *Some pretend, that he followed not his maſter's doctrine; but I believe they are miſtaken.*] Diogenes Laërtius affirms, that Arceſilas was the founder of the ſecond academy, and that Lacydes was the founder of the third. Ἀρκεσίλαός ἐστιν ὁ τῆς μέσης Ἀκαδημίας κατάρξας πρῶτος. *Arceſilas primus mediam invexit Academiam.* . . . (1). Λακύδης ἐστὶν ὁ τῆς νέας Ἀκαδημίας κατάρξας. *Lacydes novæ Academiæ princeps fuit* (2). I had rather believe Cicero, who affirms that Lacydes retained Arceſilas's method, and that Carneades reformed it. ' Cujus (*Arceſilæ*) ' primo non admodum probata ratio .... proxime à ' Lacyde ſolo RETENTA eſt: poſt autem conficta à ' Carneade, qui eſt quartus ab Arceſila (3). Moſt authors agree, that Carneades was the founder of the third academy: they therefore ſuppoſe, that Lacydes adhered to Arceſilas's doctrine without any innovation. See the remark [*A*] of the article CARNEADES.

[*B*] *He taught in a garden, which Attalus, king of Pergamus, had made.*] Ὁ γοῦν Λακύδης ἐσχόλαζεν ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ, ἐν τῷ κατασκευασθέντι κήπῳ ὑπὸ Ἀττάλου τοῦ βασιλέως; καὶ Λακύδειον ἀπ' αὐτοῦ προσηγορεύετο. *Lacydes igitur in Academia ſcholam habebat in horto quem Attalus Rex fieri curaverat, Lacydiumque ab ipſo appellatus eſt* (4). If you add to this his deſire of having Lacydes at his court, you will eaſily perceive, that he loved Philoſophy. Menage is very much miſtaken; he applies (5) to this Attalus what Plutarch (6) and Juſtin (7) ſay of another Attalus's delight in Agriculture. This Chronological confuſion is ſomewhat ſtrange.

[*C*] *He loved to do good, without caring it ſhould be known.*] This was one of Arceſilas's good qualities, as we have ſeen in the remark [*I*] of his article. Here follows a paſſage of Plutarch (8): ' and what ' Philoſophy tells us, that children uſually reſemble ' their parents, we find in ſome meaſure verified in ' Arceſilas and Lacydes, one of his diſciples (9). For ' when Cephiſocrates was impeached of high-treaſon, ' and Lacydes, with ſeveral others of his friends, ſtood ' by him at his trial, the council for the ſtate deſired, ' that the priſoner's ring, wherein lay the principal evidence againſt him, might be produced in court; ' which Cephiſocrates hearing, dropt it ſoftly off his ' finger; and Lacydes, obſerving it, ſet his foot upon ' it, and hid it. Whereupon being acquitted, and going afterwards to pay his reſpects and thanks to his ' judges, one of them, who it ſeems, had taken notice ' of what had paſſed, told him, that his thanks were ' due to Lacydes, and ſo related the whole ſtory, ' when yet Lacydes had never mentioned it.'

[*D*] *The love a gooſe had for him is very remarkable.*] She followed him every where, within doors and without, in the day time, and in the night time. *Poteſt & ſapientiæ videri intellectus his* (anſeribus) *eſſe. Ita comes perpetuo adhæſiſſe Lacydi Philoſopho dicitur, nuſquam ab eo, non in publico, non in balneis, non noctu, non interdiu digreſſus* (10). When ſhe died, Lacydes made as noble a funeral for her, as if ſhe had been his ſon or his brother (11).

[*E*] *He died of a palſy, by drinking too much.*] Ἡ τελευτὴ δὲ αὐτῷ παράλυσις ἐκ πολυποσίας. *Mortuus eſt autem ex Paralyſi, quam ex immodica potione contraxerat* (12). Athenæus (13) tells us, that Lacydes and another Philoſopher called Timon, were invited for two days together to a feaſt; and that, in compliance to the humour of the company, they drank plentifully. Lacydes gave it over the firſt day, and retired when he perceived he had enough. Timon, ſeeing him go off, cried out, victory; but the next day he yielded firſt: he could not drink off the bowl that was brought him. Lacydes was even with him. This is a very ſcandalous thing. Philoſophers ſhould never contend for ſuch a victory: it is not only a fault to obtain it, but alſo to attempt it: and though the ignominy of the victor is greater than that of the vanquiſhed, yet the latter deſerves to be cenſured. How many Chriſtian Philoſophers, and even divines, have imitated Timon and Lacydes!

[*F*] *What Numenius relates of him, looks altogether like a pleaſant tale.*] Here is the ſubſtance of what he ſays (14). Lacydes diſcovered a great ſtingineſs in his way of living; he truſted nothing to his ſervants; his pantry (15) was inacceſſible to them; he put in, and took out of it himſelf, what there was occaſion for, and never left it open: but that he might not

(1) Diog. Laërt. lib. iv, n. 28. *See alſo the ſame author*, in Proœm. n. 14.

(2) Id. ibid. n. 59. *See alſo the ſame author*, in Proœm. n. 14.

(3) Cicero, Academ. Quæſt. lib. iv, cap. vi.

(4) Diog. Laërt. lib. iv, n. 60.

(5) Menage, in Diog. Laërt. lib. iv, n. 60.

(6) Plut. in Demetrio.

(7) Juſtin. lib. xxxvi.

(8) Plut. in Diſcrim. Adulat. & Amici, p. 63.

(9) Plutarch had been mentioning a concealed good action of Arceſilas.

(10) Plin. lib. x, cap xxii, pag. m. 408. *See alſo* Athenæus, lib. xiii, pag. 606.

(11) Ælian. lib. vii, Hiſt. Anim. cap. xli.

(12) Diog Laërt. lib. iv, n. 61.

(13) Athen lib. x, cap. x, pag. 438.

(14) Numenius, apud Euſeb. Præpar. Evang. lib. xiv, cap. vii, pag. 734, & *ſeq.*

(15) Τὸ ταμεῖον, *penus.*

groſs miſtakes [G.] The difference, that father Rapin finds betwixt Arceſilas and Lacydes, is a meer illuſion. Philoſophy, ſays he (g), was *reſtleſs* under the former, and

be troubled with the key, he put it in a hole (16), which he ſealed up, and then he threw his ſeal into the pantry (17) through the hole of the lock. His ſervants, having diſcovered this, eaſily, and as much as they pleaſed, tricked him. It was no difficult thing for them to get the key, and to place it again where he had put it, and to ſeal up the hole. They eat, they drank, they robbed him as they thought fit, and laughed at him into the bargain. He on his part very eaſily perceived the diminution of his wine and proviſions; and, not knowing where to lay the fault, he remembered the doctrine of Arceſilas, who taught, that our ſenſes and our reaſon comprehend nothing, and he attributed the Vacuum of his bottles and baskets to that incomprehenſibility. Thus he began to philoſophize, in Arceſilas's ſchool, againſt the certainty of human knowledge. Nay, he made uſe of that domeſtic experience, to prove, that he had reaſon to ſuſpend his judgment in every thing. I will not alledge a hear-ſay, ſaid he one day, gravely to one of his friends; I know by experience what I am going to tell you; I can ſpeak of it without any doubt. Hereupon he told him from one end to the other the adventure of his buttery. What, continued he, could Zeno ſay againſt an argument of this force, which has ſo clearly demonſtrated to me the *Acatalepſia?* Have not I reaſon to miſtruſt every thing, when, having ſhut, ſealed, unſealed, and opened again my pantry with my own hands, I cannot find what I had left in it? I only find my ſeal there, which will not permit me to believe that I am robbed. When he came to that part, his friend could hold no longer; he broke out into ſuch a fit of laughter, as made the Philoſopher perceive his blunder, and reſolve to look to his ſeal better. His ſervants did not trouble their heads about it; and whether they had learned from the Stoics, or elſewhere, to diſpute with him, they unſealed his key, without troubling themſelves to put the ſame ſeal on again. They put on another, and ſometimes none at all. It vexed him, when he ſaw their roguery; but they maintained they had never meddled with the ſeal, and that he had forgotten to put it on. He made long diſcourſes to let them ſee, that he well remembered he had ſealed it, and went ſo far as to ſwear it. You have a mind, anſwered they, to divert yourſelf, and to laugh at our ſimplicity. A Philoſopher, like you, has neither opinions nor memory; for you maintained the other day, that memory was an opinion. He confuted them with reaſons different from thoſe of the Academics; but they had recourſe to a Stoic, who taught them how to reply to their maſter, and to elude all his arguments by the doctrine of Incomprehenſibility, which they did with a great deal of pleaſant humour. The worſt of it was, that they continued to rob his proviſions, and Lacydes perceived, that his goods vaniſhed away every day. He found himſelf in great perplexity; his principles, inſtead of ſerving him, were againſt him, and he was forced to behave himſelf like the vulgar. All the neighbourhood was filled with his clamours and complaints. He proteſted by all the gods and goddeſſes, that he was robbed (18); at laſt he took the reſolution not to ſtir out, and to keep within ſight of his buttery-door (19). What did he get by diſputing with his ſervants? he made uſe of the method of the Stoics againſt them, and they anſwered him in the way of the Academics, and beat him with his own weapons. At laſt, reſolving to free himſelf once for all, from the intolerable perplexity he was in, he ingenuouſly told his ſervants; children, we diſpute one way in the ſchools, and we live another way in our houſes. Οὐδὲν δὲ εἰς οὐδὲν ὠφελῶν, ὑπειδόμενος οἷ τὸ σοφὸν αὐτῷ ἔρχεται, ἀπεκαλύψατο. Ἄλλως, ἔφη, ταῦτα, ὦ παῖδες, ἐν ταῖς διατριβαῖς λέγεται ἡμῖν, ἄλλως δὲ ζῶμεν. *Verum ubi nihil agit, ſecum ipſe cogitans, quo ſua ſibi verſutia recideret: tandem animi ſenſum palam ac ſine fuco aperiens, nimirum, inquit, famuli, aliter hæc in ſchola diſputamus, aliter vivimus* (20).

This is a pretty ſtory, and Mr de la Fontaine might have made it very diverting; but it is plain, that it has been forged by a pious fraud of the Stoics. This has been a method uſed at all times, and in all places; people have always endeavoured, and do ſo ſtill, to turn the doctrine and perſon of their adverſaries into ridicule; and to that end a thouſand fables are invented, if the leaſt pretence can be found to ſtrain maliciouſly the conſequences of their opinions. This paſſion has been ſo blindly indulged againſt the Sceptics, that not only ſincerity, but even probability has been laid aſide; for they never denied, that, in the ordinary conduct of life, men ought to truſt to the teſtimony of their ſenſes. They only denied, that the abſolute nature of objects is juſt the ſame as it appears to be. Note, that Diogenes Laërtius (21) is contented to obſerve, that our Lacydes, having ſealed the door of his pantry, threw his ſeal into it, and that his ſervants made uſe of the ſeal, to ſteal his proviſions, without being diſcovered by him.

[G] *Moreri has committed very groſs miſtakes.*] I. Inſtead of ſaying, that Lacydes's father *was a native of Cyrene,* he ſhould have ſaid, that Lacydes was born there. II. He ought not to have adopted Laërtius's error, concerning the foundation of an academy by Lacydes. III. He ought not to have placed his death *in the fourth year of the XXXVIth Olympiad.* This is no error of the preſs; for he adds, that it was the 113*th year of Rome.* If the Printers had omitted ſomething in the firſt calculation, they would not have erred ſo exactly in the ſecond. It is therefore certain that they followed the copy. Now what can be more abſurd, than to believe, that Arceſilas *lived in the CXXth Olympiad,* and that Lacydes, his diſciple, died the laſt year of the XXXIVth Olympiad (22)? IV. Though his death had been placed in the fourth year of the CXXXIVth Olympiad, it would ſtill be an error; for he died not till about the ſecond year of the CXLIſt. Here is the proof of it. Diogenes Laërtius obſerves, that Lacydes, who began to be the head of the academy, the fourth year of the CXXXIVth Olympiad, died after he had taught Philoſophy twenty ſix years. Ἐτελεύτησε δὲ σχολαρχεῖν ἀρξάμενος τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει τῆς τετάρτης καὶ τριακοστῆς καὶ ἑκατοστῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος, τῆς σχολῆς ἀφηγησάμενος ἓξ πρὸς τοῖς εἴκοσιν ἔτη. *Obiit autem cum ſcholam adminiſtrare cœpiſſet quarto anno centeſimæ trigeſimæ quartæ Olympiadis, viginti ſex annis in ſchola conſumptis* (23). V. It is an abſurdity to find in theſe words, that *Lacydes began to be in reputation . . . . . after he had taught for the ſpace of twenty ſix years* (24). VI. This can hardly be ſaid of any profeſſor; for if he ſpends twenty five years in his profeſſion, without eſteem, he runs the hazard, generally ſpeaking, of dying without any reputation.

Note, that Father Hardouin is miſtaken, as to the time of our Philoſopher's death. ‘Obiiſſe dicitur, ‘*ſays he* (25), anno 4 Olymp. CXXX. —— *He is ſaid* ‘*to have died in the fourth year of the CXXXth* ‘*Olympiad.*’ He cites the 120th page of Diogenes Laërtius, of the London edition, 1664, in Folio. But beſides that, we find there (26) the CXXXIVth Olympiad, and not the CXXXth, it is certain, that it concerns Lacydes's entrance on his profeſſion, and not his death. Father Labbé has committed but one of theſe two faults: he ſays (27), citing Diogenes, that the Philoſopher Lacydes died the laſt year of the CXXXIV Olympiad. It will be asked, whether it can be proved, that he did not die at that time? I anſwer, that there are two proofs to be given for it. The firſt is, that he was not the head of the academic ſchool till after Arceſilas's death (28), and we know, that Arceſilas was cotemporary with Eumenes, prince of Pergamus (29), who ſucceeded not Philetærus till the CXXIXth Olympiad. Father Labbé ſays ſo (30); the correſpondence of this Philoſopher with Eumenes, requires that he ſhould have lived till the CXXXth Olympiad. Which being ſo, it cannot be ſaid, that his ſucceſſor died the fourth year of the CXXXIVth Olympiad; for he taught twenty ſix years. My ſecond proof is drawn from this, that Attalus, king of Pegamus, cauſed the garden of the academy to be made, wherein Lacydes taught, and deſired to have that Philoſopher at his court. There is little probability, that theſe two things relate to the firſt year of his reign, that is, to the third year of and *contradicting* under the latter. It is certain, that it was never more contradicting, than under Arceſilas.

(g) Rapin, Reflex. ſur la Philoſophie, n. 8, pag. m. 326.

(16) *I do not keep to the Greek, in which there is* εἰς τι κοῖλον γραμματεῖον, cava quadam in arcula.

(17) Τὸ ταμεῖον, *penus.*

(18) Πεσὼν εἰς ἀμήχανον, τοὺς γείτονας ἐνεκράγει, καὶ τοὺς Θεοὺς καὶ ἰοὺ ἰοὺ, καὶ φεῦ φεῦ, καὶ νὴ τοὺς Θεοὺς, καὶ νὴ τὰς Θεὰς, ἄλλαι τε ὅσαι ἐν ἀπιστίας δεινολογουμένων εἰσὶν ἄτεχνοι πίστεις, ταῦτα πάντα ἐλέγετο βοῇ καὶ ἀξιοπιστίᾳ. Inops conſilii vicinos inclamare, appellare Deos: ſæpe hei mihi, pro facinus indignum, per Deos Deaſque omnes ingeminare, ac cætera id genus argumenta, quæ homini gravioribus in querelis, ubi fidem non impetrat ſine arte natura ſuppeditat. Quæ quidem omnia magno clamore deplorata, magnam utique probabilitatis ſpeciem oſtendebant. *Numen. apud Euſeb. ubi ſupra, pag.* 736. *B.*

(19) Οἰκουρὸς ἦν φίλος τοῦ ταμείου προκαθήμενος. Domi deinceps hærebat perpetuo, ac pro cellæ ſuæ foribus aſſidebat. *Id. ibid. This tranſlation ſeems to me to be better than that of Kuhnius, in his notes upon* Diog. Laërt. pag. 523. Semper amicum cellæ penuariæ cuſtodem domi reliquit.

(20) Id. ibid. C.

(21) Diog. Laërt. lib. iv, n. 59.

(22) Moreri ſays ſo, in Arceſilas.

(23) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, n. 61.

(24) Moreri quotes only Diogenes Laërtius.

(25) Harduinus, in Plinium, lib. x, cap. xxii, pag. 408.

(26) That is, in the Greek; for the Printers have left out *quarta* in the Latin tranſlation.

(27) Father Labbé, Chronol. Franc. Tom. II, pag. 301, ad ann. Romæ, 513.

(28) Diogenes Laërtius, *lib. iv, n* 60, ſays, that Lacydes is the only Philoſopher, who reſigned his chair during his life.

(29) Diog. Laërt. ibid. n. 38.

(30) Labbé, ubi ſupra, pag. 285.

of the CXXXIVth Olympiad (31). Let us ſay then, that Lacydes died not the following year; and let us remember, that, if he had taught but a few months in that garden, it would be an abſurdity to give him no other ſchool but that, and even to obſerve, that it had it's name from him. He muſt therefore have taught there ſeveral years, and conſequently he did not die a year after Attalus came to the throne. Seth Calviſius (32) has been guilty of the ſame fault as Father Labbé.

(31) See Father Labbé, *ibid. pag.* 300.

(32) Sethus Calviſius, ad ann. mundi, 3709, pag. m. 268.

LACISIUS (PAUL) a regular canon of the congregation of Lateran in the XVIth century, was of Verona (*a*). He taught the Latin tongue in the priory of St Fridian, at Lucca, whilſt Peter Martyr was prior there (*b*); and having reliſhed, with him, the doctrine of the Proteſtants, he followed him into Germany, where they openly profeſſed it in 1542. After they had been ſome time at Zurich, and at Baſil (*c*), they were invited to Straſburg by Martin Bucer, and by his means Peter Martyr was made profeſſor of Divinty, and Paul Laciſius, profeſſor of the Greek tongue (*d*). The latter died at Straſburg, I know not when (*e*). His Latin verſion of Tzetzes's Chiliads was printed, with the Greek, in 1546, at Baſil, by John Oporinus (*f*).

(*a*) Melch. Adam. in Vita Petri Martyris, pag. 33.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Id. ibid. pag. 36.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) Id. ibid. pag. 35.

(*f*) Epitome Biblioth. Geſner. pag. 657.

LÆVIUS, a Latin poet. It is not certainly known when he lived; but it is very probable, it was before Cicero's time. He wrote a poem, intituled, *Erotopægnia*, that is, Sports of Love. Aulus Gellius (*a*) cites two verſes from it. Apuleius (*b*) gives us ſix from the ſame poet, but does not ſay what work of his he takes them from. Lævius wrote a poem called the Centaurs. Feſtus cites it at the word *Petrarum*. I ſhall obſerve ſome miſtakes [*A*].

(*a*) Noct. Attic. lib. ii, cap. xxiv.

(*b*) In Apologia.

[*A*] *I ſhall obſerve ſome miſtakes.*] Since Voſſius (1) was appriſed of the two laſt citations, I mention, it is very ſtrange, he ſhould reckon Lævius among the Poets of whom we know no more, than that they lived before the days of Charlemagne. But this is a ſmall ſlip in compariſon of the blunder of an author (2), who has put in Aulus Gellius, Livius, for Lævius, and pretended that Aulus Gellius cited Livius Andronicus. How could he cite out of this Livius a paſſage, which concerns a law (3) made in the 656th year of Rome; how, I ſay, could he on this occaſion cite Livius Andronicus, who was a grown man in the 514th year of Rome? for one of his comedies was acted that year (4). The author I confute, pretends, that Nævius and Pacuvius flouriſhed after Livius Andronicus; but had he not ſeen a particular in Aulus Gellius, which manifeſtly proves, that this Livius could not be acquainted with the Licinian Law? Aulus Gellius tells us (5), that Nævius had ſome of his comedies acted in the five hundred and nineteenth year of Rome, and that he bore arms in the firſt Punic war.

(1) De Poët. Lat.

(2) Philippus Carolus, Animadverſ. in Aul. Gellium, pag. 162.

(3) It was the ſumptuary law of Licinius.

(4) It was the firſt that was acted in Rome. *See Cicero in Bruto.*

(5) Lib xvii, cap. xxi.

LAIS, a famous courtezan, was of Hyccara, a town of Sicily [*A*]. She was carried into Greece, when her country was plundered by Nicias the Athenian general. She ſettled at Corinth, which was the fitteſt town in the world for women of her profeſſion [*B*]; and there ſhe made ſo great a noiſe, that no courtezan had ever a greater reſort

[*A*] *She was of Hyccara, a town of Sicily.*] This we learn from Plutarch, when he ſpeaks of the taking of that town (1). The inhabitants were ſold, and Lais among the reſt, who was tranſported to Peloponneſus, being yet a virgin (2). Some moderns ſay, that ſhe was ſold at Corinth (3); but they have not conſulted Pauſanias, nor his tranſlator, who might have clearly taught them, that ſhe was ſold at Hyccara, and then carried to Corinth. Pauſanias perfectly agrees with Plutarch; he ſays as well as he, that ſhe was yet a young girl (4). Solinus is contented to make her a Sicilian (5), without ſpecifying the town ſhe was of; but Athenæus, in the thirteenth book, page 588, cites three authors (6), who expreſsly ſay, that ſhe was of Hyccara in Sicily. One of thoſe three writers obſerves, that ſhe went a ſlave to Corinth. Ἀφ' ἧς αἰχμαλώτου γενομένη ἧκεν εἰς Κόρινθον. *Ex quo* (oppido Hyccaris) *captiva Corinthum venit* (7). This condemns the moderns I have mentioned. Stephanus Byzantinus (8) ſays alſo, that ſhe was of Hyccara, and quotes (9) Syneſius, who called her Ὑκκαρικὸν Ἀνδράποδον, *Hyccaricum mancipium.* On the other hand, he cites (10) Neanthes, author of a book concerning illuſtrious men, who ſays, that ſhe was born at Craſtus, a town of Sicily. He alſo cites Timæus, as having ſaid, that ſhe was of Eucarpia in the ſame iſland: and yet we have ſeen, that Timæus, quoted by Athenæus, makes her a native of Hyccara; and ſince no body makes mention of a place in Sicily, called Eucarpia, I find Berkelius's conjecture (11) very probable, namely, that Stephanus Byzantinus made uſe of a copy of Timæus, where the tranſcribers had put Εὐκαρπία for Ὕκκαρα. Caſaubon (12) obſerves, that the country of Lais, like that of Homer, and of ſome other illuſtrious men, has not been well known; and he cites Solinus, who ſays, *Lais eligere patriam maluit quam fateri* (13). —— *Lais would rather chuſe than confeſs her country.* Caſaubon adds, that ſome will have her to be born at Pancarpia in Phrygia; but probably his memory failed him (14): he remembered confuſedly, that he had read, that ſome made her a native of Eucarpia in Sicily, a place which Stephanus Byzantinus mentions in the article of Eucarpia of Phrygia. This confounded his ideas; he fancied, that he had read, that Pancarpia, in Phrygia, was Lais's birth-place, according to ſome writers. Pinedo goes farther than Caſaubon, as to the parallel of Homer with this courtezan: he pretends, that ſeveral towns contended for the glory of having produced Lais (15).

[*B*] *Corinth . . . . . was the fitteſt town in the world for women of her profeſſion.*] However I do not believe all that is ſaid of her by Lotichius. He affirms, that the Corinthians, in their ſolemn prayers, begged of the gods to increaſe the number of the courtezans (16). He cites Athenæus, who ſays no ſuch thing. But this probably miſled Lotichius; he honeſtly depended upon theſe words of Eraſmus: 'Tantus *Corinthi* honos habebatur meretricibus, ut quemadmodum ex autoribus docet Athenæus, illic in templo Veneris proſtarent, atque in ſolemnibus precibus illud addi ſoleat, ut Dii augerent meretricum numerum. Quin & illud refert meretrices facto ſacro Veneri, civitatem extremo periculo laborantem ſervaſſe placata Venere (17). ———— *Harlots were in ſuch eſteem at Corinth, that, as Athenæus informs us from authors, they proſtituted themſelves there in the temple of Venus, and in ſolemn prayers they uſually added this petition, that the gods would increaſe the number of harlots. He likewiſe tells us, that the harlots, by ſacrificing to Venus, had ſaved the city in extreme danger.*' Eraſmus ſtrains the matter. Athenæus ſays only, that there was an antient law at Corinth, ordaining, that, when the town ſhould make ſupplications to Venus in any important affair, they ſhould ſummon as many courtezans as they could, that they might aſſiſt at the pomp of the proceſſion, and pray to that goddeſs, and remain the laſt in her temple (18). Eraſmus is right in his

(1) Plutarch. in Nicia, pag. 533. *See alſo* Plutarch. in Alcibiade, ſub finem.

(2) Ἔτι κόρην. Virginem etiamnum. *Idem, in Nicia, pag.* 533, C.

(3) Thomæus, de Varia Hiſt. lib. i, cap. lxxxi. *One of the commentators upon Alciatus's Emblems, pag. m.* 330. Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Diverſes Lecons, livr. iii, chap. vi, pag. m. 184.

(4) Παῖδα οὖσαν. Adhuc puellam. *Pauſan. lib. ii, pag.* 45.

(5) Solin. cap. v.

(6) Polemo, Nymphodorus, and Timæus.

(7) Polemo, apud Athen. ib.

(8) In voce Ὕκκαρον.

(9) In voce Εὐκαρπία.

(10) In voce Κραστός.

(11) In Stephan. voce Εὐκαρπία.

(12) In Athen. pag. 869.

(13) Solin. cap. v.

(14) *See Pinedo,* in Stephanum, voce Εὐκαρπία.

(15) Celebres meretrices urbes etiam ſi Diis placet illuſtrant: de qua (Laide) decertabant quædam civitates haud ſecus ac de Homero. *Pinedo, in voce* Κραστός. See the ſame Pinedo on the word Ὕκκαρον.

(16) Lotichius, in Petronium, pag. 232.

(17) Eraſm. in Proverb. Κορινθιάζεσθαι, id eſt, ſcortationibus ac luſtris indulgere, lenociniumque exercere. *It is the lxviiith Proverb,* Centur. III, Chiliad. IV, pag. m. 904.

(18) Athenæus, lib. xiii, pag. 573, ex Chamæleonte Heracleote, in libro de Pindaro.

reſort [*C*]. She had been informed by a kind of revelation, that ſhe ſhould be eminent, and get a deal of money ; for ſhe dreamed, that Venus appeared to her, to acquaint her with the arrival of ſome very rich cuſtomers [*D*]. The moſt illuſtrious Orators, and even the moſt auſtere Philoſophers, fell in love with her. Every one knows, that Demoſthenes made a journey to Corinth on purpoſe to lie with her ; but the price diſcouraged him [*E*]. It is alſo well known, what a paſſion Diogenes the Cynic had for her [*F*]. He found her very complaiſant, as poor and ſlovenly as he was, which is more to be admired than her great intimacy with the Philoſopher Ariſtippus, who was a very genteel and polite man. It is ſaid, that ſhe did not love him, and he was jeſted

his further account of the matter ; for it is true, that Athenæus ſays, it was believed, that the proſtitutes of Corinth had very much contributed to the ſafety of all Greece, by the prayers they put up to Venus, when Xerxes made his irruption. He adds, that the Corinthians promiſed Venus a certain number of thoſe creatures, if they obtained the favours they begged of her, and that Xenophon, the Corinthian, made a like vow, if he carried the prize at the Olympic games. Having obtained the victory, he punctually performed his vow, conſecrating twenty five young women to the ſervice of Venus, and preſenting them to this goddeſs, during the ceremony of the ſacrifice he offered to her, after his return from the Olympic games. Nay, theſe twenty five girls began the hymn that was ſung during the immolation of the victim. Concerning the whoredom of Corinth, ſee Eraſmus's Adages (19), where he cites a notable paſſage of Strabo (20).

This is ſufficient to make good my text, and at the ſame time to ſhew, that the Heathens could not ſay, that the abominations they publiſhed of their gods, were only poetical ſtories ; for here is a moſt flouriſhing city, which teſtifies by it's laws, and public worſhip, that it believes, that the courtezans by their proſtitutions, did an agreeable ſervice to Venus, and that their interceſſion with her was of the greateſt efficacy to prevent public calamities. It is a ſign they gave credit to the ſtories that were told of this goddeſs's adulteries.

[*C*] *No courtezan had ever a greater reſort.*] Of this Propertius (21) gives an expreſs teſtimony.

Non ita complebant Ephyrææ (22) Laidos ædes,
  Ad cujus jacuit Græcia tota fores.

Lais ne'er ſent ſuch ſighing crowds away,
Tho' at her doors all Greece enamour'd lay.

The expreſſions of Plutarch are as ſtrong as can be. He ſays, that Greece was inflamed with the love of Lais, that two ſeas fought for this woman (23), and that ſhe had an army of gallants (24). Ἴστε δήπουθεν ἀκοῇ Λαΐδα τὴν ἀοίδιμον ἐκείνην καὶ πολυήρατον ὡς ἐπέφλεξε πόθῳ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, μᾶλλον δὲ ταῖς δυσὶν ἦν περιμάχητος θαλάσσαις. *Inaudiviſtis haud dubie quid Laidi obtigerit. Nobilis illa & tam multis amata viris, quæ ſui deſiderio Græciam inflammavit, atque adeo de qua duo maria certaverant.* See her epitaph in the remark [*K*].

Mrs Jacquette Guillaume ſays, at the 77th page of her *Dames Illuſtres* (25), 'that one of the principal gallants of Lais, a public courtezan, erected to her a ſtatue like that of Pallas, with this inſcription : *To the divinity of Lais, for having triumphed over the wiſdom of all the Philoſophers, and the courage of all the conquerors.*' I wiſh ſhe had quoted ſome good author, or at leaſt ſome author, for it ; for her own authority cannot well be depended upon.

[*D*] *She dreamed, that Venus appeared to her to acquaint her, with the arrival of ſome very rich cuſtomers.*] It was Venus, ſirnamed Melænis, or the black, that appeared to her. She had a temple, with this title, in a ſuburb of Corinth (26). It has been thought, that this ſirname was given her becauſe, generally ſpeaking, men go about the multiplication of their kind by night (27), and not like beaſts by day (28). If this reaſon of the ſirname Melænis was a ſolid one, it does not ſeem that Venus, as black, ſhould have ſhewn herſelf in a dream to young Lais, who was not deſigned to mind the diſtinction of days and nights. However it be, this dream was mentioned by an Orator in one of his pleas : you need only read theſe words of Athenæus: ἢ καὶ Ἀφροδίτη ἡ ἐν Κορίνθῳ ἡ Μελανὶς καλουμένη, νυκτὸς ἐπιφαινομένη ἐμηνύεν ἐραστῶν ἔφοδον πολυταλάντων. ὡς Ὑπερίδης μνημονεύει ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἀρισταγόραν δευτέρῳ. Huic (*Laidi*) cum eſſet Corinthi, Venus Melænis ſive Nigella dormienti noctu ſe oſtendit, & adventum prænunciavit amatorum qui forent pecunioſiſſimi, ut memorat Hyperides Actione ſecunda contra Ariſtagoram (29). —— *When Laïs was at Corinth, Venus Melænis, or the black, appeared to her in a dream, and foretold the arrival of ſome very rich lovers, as Hyperides relates it in his ſecond oration againſt Ariſtagoras.*

[*E*] *Demoſthenes made a journey to Corinth on purpoſe to lie with her ; but the price diſcouraged him.*] This ſtory has been very prettily dreſſed up in French by Mr le Pays (30). 'Aulus Gellius tells it thus (31) : 'Lais Corinthia ob elegantiam venuſtatemque formæ grandem pecuniam demerebat : conventuſque ad eam ditiorum hominum ex omni Græcia celebres erant : neque admittebatur, niſi qui dabat, quod popoſcerat. Poſcebat autem illa nimium quantum. Hinc ait natum eſſe illud frequens apud Græcos adagium, οὐ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐς Κόρινθον ἔσθ' ὁ πλοῦς Quod fruſtra iret Corinthum ad Laidem qui non quiret dare quod poſceretur. Ad hanc ille Demoſthenes clanculum adit ; &, ut ſibi copiam faceret, petit : at Lais μυρίας δραχμὰς ἢ τάλαντον popoſcit. Hoc facit nummi noſtratis denarium decem millia. Tali petulantia mulieris atque pecuniæ magnitudine ictus expaviduſque Demoſthenes avertit ; & diſcedens, Ego, inquit, pœnitere tanti non emo. Sed Græca ipſa, quæ fertur dixiſſe, lepidiora ſunt, οὐκ ὠνοῦμαι, inquit, μυρίων δραχμῶν μεταμέλειαν. —— *Lais earned a great deal of money by the elegance and beauty of her perſon ; and many of the richer ſort flocked to her from all parts of Greece. But her price was very high. Hence they ſay aroſe that proverb, ſo frequent among the Greeks, that it was not every man, that could make a voyage to Corinth. Demoſthenes came privately to this lady, and asked the favour : but Lais demanded a whole talent. Demoſthenes, ſtruck with the inſolent demand, went away, ſaying, I am not for buying repentance ſo dear.*'

[*F*] *It is well known what a paſſion Diogenes the Cynic had for her.*] She obliged him to the full ; he kiſſed her *gratis*. This is what Ariſtippus's ſervant repreſented to his maſter, who laviſhed his eſtate upon that proſtitute. But Ariſtippus anſwered him ; I pay her well, not that others may not lie with her, but that I may do it. Ὀνειδιζόμενος ὑπὸ οἰκέτου, ὅτι σὺ μὲν αὐτῇ τοσοῦτον ἀργύριον δίδως, ἡ δὲ προῖκα Διογένει τῷ κυνὶ συγκυλίεται. ἀπεκρίνατο, ἐγὼ Λαΐδι χορηγῶ πολλά, ἵνα αὐτὸς αὐτῆς ἀπολαύω, οὐχ' ἵνα μὴ ἄλλος (32). Ariſtippus was the moſt obliging man in the world to his miſtreſſes ; he was not jealous of them, nor did he regard their beſtowing upon others the ſame favours he received. This is what he declared to Diogenes, who told him (33), 'You lie with a proſtitute ; either leave her, or be a cynic as I am. Do you think it abſurd, anſwered Ariſtippus, to lodge in a houſe, that has lodged many others, or to embark in a veſſel, which has carried many paſſengers ; No, replied Diogenes. Juſt ſo, ſaid Ariſtippus, it is no ways abſurd, to have to do with a woman, whom many others have known before (34).' Here is a diverting deſcription of the equipage, with which theſe two Philoſophers rambled about Lais's houſe, if we believe Taſſoni. 'Ma che bel vedere Diogene Cinico col Mantello di romagnuolo ſquarciato, e rappezzato, la barba ſqualida, ſenza camicia, e lordo, e pidocchioſo far dell' innamorato, paſſeggiando lungo la porta della famoſa Laide,

'e dall'

(19) Eraſm. in Proverbium, Non eſt cujuſlibet Corinthum appellere. *It is the firſt of the fourth Century of the firſt Chiliad, pag. m.* 132.

(20) Strabo, lib. vii, pag. m. 261.

(21) Propert. lib. ii, Eleg. vi.

(22) *That is, Corinthia ; for Ephyra was the antient name of Corinth.* Plin. lib iv, cap. iv.

(23) Plutarch, in Amatorio, pag. 767.

(24) Ἀποδράσασα τῶν ἄλλων ἐραστῶν κρύφα μέγαν στρατὸν. Magnum aliorum amatorum clam ſubterfugiens exercitum. *Id. ibid.*

(25) *That book was printed at Paris, in* 1665.

(26) Pauſan. lib. ii, cap. ii.

(27) Id. lib. viii, cap. vi.

(28) Confer quæ ſupra, *citation* (45) *of the article of the third duke of* GUISE.

(29) Athen. lib. xiii, pag 588.

(30) *In his* Amitiez, Amours, & Amourettes.

(31) Aul. Gell. Noct. Attic. lib. i, cap. viii, ex Sotionis Libro, cui Titulus, Κέρας ἀμαλθείας.

(32) Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 588.

(33) Id. ibid.

(34) *See the New Letters againſt Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm, pag.* 550. *There is in du Verdier's* Bibl. Françoiſe, pag. 989. *a pretty poem upon this, compoſed by Peter de Brach, a native of Bourdeaux.*

jeſted upon for it. The anſwer he made thereupon is very blunt [*G*]. Some ſay (*a*), that her emulation of another courtezan (*b*), made her give acceſs to the poor as well as to the rich, to ſignalize herſelf by the multitude of her admirers; but others maintain, that ſhe never beſtowed her favours at a cheap rate, till ſhe grew old [*H*]: ſome will have it, that ſhe then, only practiſed as a bawd [*I*]. Others ſay, that notwithſtanding

e dall' altra parte comparire il ſuo rivale Ariſtippo, tutto profumato, e attilato, ſputando zibetto, e mirarlo di torto, e levargli il muro; e la Signora ſtarſi alla geloſia, pigliandoſi guſto di vederli paſſeggiare al ſereno (35). ——— *But how diverting to ſee Diogenes the Cynic, with his torn, or patched, cloak, his greaſy beard, without a ſhirt, and ſlovenly, and louzy, act the lover, paſſing by the door, of the famous Lais, and on the other ſide appears his rival Ariſtippus, all perfumed, and dreſſed out, ſpitting civet; the lady in the mean time taking a pleaſure in ſeeing them walk backwards and forwards in the open air.*'

[G] *The anſwer he made thereupon is very blunt.*] *I do not think*, anſwered he, when he was told, that Lais did not love him, *that wine and fiſh love me, and yet I feed on them with a great deal of pleaſure.* This I learn from Plutarch: his words have not been well underſtood by Amiot; for he ſuppoſes, that Ariſtippus anſwered, *I neither love fiſh nor wine, tho' I live upon them with pleaſure.* You will find no ſuch thought in the Greek. Ἀρίςιππος τῷ κατηγοροῦντι Λαΐδος πρὸς αὐτὸν ὡς οὐ φιλούσης, ἀποκρινάμενος ὅτι καὶ τὸν οἶνον οἴεται καὶ τὸν ἰχθὺν μὴ φιλεῖν αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' ἡδέως ἑκατέρῳ χρῆται. *Ariſtippus qui Laïdem apud ſe vituperanti quod non amaret, reſpondit: A vino quoque & piſce non puto amari me, tamen utroque libenter veſcor* (36). On another occaſion, Ariſtippus gave an anſwer, which ſeveral authors have mentioned: it ſhews, that, tho' he often went to Lais, he was no ſlave to his paſſion: *Cum eſſet objectum habere eum Laïda, habeo, inquit, non habeor à Laïde* (37). The anſwer is ſhorter in Athenæus (38), ἔχω καὶ οὐκ ἔχομαι, *habeo & non habeor*. Several authors mention this anſwer. Diogenes Laërtius has it in the life of Ariſtippus; and Lactantius relates it thus: 'Ariſtippo Cyrenaicorum magiſtro cum Laide nobili ſcorto fuit conſuetudo, quod flagitium gravis ille philoſophiæ doctor ſic defendebat, ut diceret, multum inter ſe, & cæteros Laidis amatores intereſſe, quòd ipſe haberet Laidem, alii verò à Laide haberentur. O præclara, & imitanda bonis ſapientia: huic verò liberos in diſciplinam dares, ut diſcerent habere meretricem. Aliquid inter ſe, ac perditos intereſſe dicebat, ſcilicet, quod illi bona ſua perderent, ipſe gratis luxuriaretur. In quo tamen ſapientior meretrix fuit, quæ philoſophum habuit pro lenone, ut ad ſe omnis juventus doctoris exemplo, & authoritate corrupta, ſine ullo pudore concurreret (39). ——— *Ariſtippus, head of the Cyrenaics, had an intrigue with the famous harlot Lais; which that grave doctor of Philoſophy defended by ſaying, there was a great difference between himſelf and the reſt of Lais's lovers, for that* He had Lais, but Lais had them. *O Philoſophy, worthy the imitation of good men! A fit teacher, to train up youth to intrigues! There was ſome difference, he ſaid, between him and the abandoned; that is, they ruined their fortunes, and he enjoyed the pleaſure* gratis. *In which however the harlot was the better Philoſopher; for ſhe got a Philoſopher to pimp for her, and to ſet all the youth an example of following her without ſhame.*' The reflexion of this father of the church is very wrong; he does not ſeem to have underſtood the thought of the Philoſopher. Ariſtippus's meaning was this; *I go to Lais, I am in poſſeſſion of this right* (40); *but ſhe does not keep me in ſubjection; I remain ſtill maſter of this correſpondence; and I can leave it, whenever I pleaſe.* He meant not, as Lactantius ſuppoſes, that this commerce coſt him nothing. I have mentioned, above, the complaint of Ariſtippus's ſervant on account of the great expences his maſter was at to pleaſe Lais. I ought not to forget, that this Philoſopher dedicated ſome books to that courtezan (41).

[*H*] . . . . . *others maintain, that ſhe never beſtowed her favours at a cheap rate till ſhe grew old.*] Epicrates made very ſatirical verſes upon her. When ſhe was young, ſays he (42), ſhe was ſo haughty by reaſon of her wealth, that it was harder to get a ſight of her, than of Pharnabazus. But now ſhe is old, you may do with her what you pleaſe; ſhe drinks every where; ſhe indifferently admits the old and young; ſhe is grown ſo humble and good humoured, that ſhe offers her hand, to beg an alms. Athenæus gives us theſe verſes of Epicrates: he takes them from a book intituled *Anti-Lais*. Mr Baillet has forgot it in his collection of the Anti's. It is impoſſible to reconcile the authors who ſpeak of Lais. She was almoſt inacceſſible according to Epicrates, when ſhe was young. Another author ſays, ſhe was called Axine by reaſon of her rough humour, and becauſe ſhe exacted upon her lovers; ſhe asked too great a price (43), and gave no quarter (44), particularly to foreigners; for ſhe knew they could not ſtay long, and had no time to beat down the price, and that if ſhe took not from them a great ſum at once, ſhe would have no opportunity of recovering what ſhe ſhould abate. See the Greek words of Ælian, which I have quoted in the margin (45). Athenæus deſcribes her much more eaſy. He ſays that ſhe made no difference betwixt the poor and the rich, οὐ διακρίνουσα πλούσιον ἢ πένητα (46). She took nothing of Diogenes. Probably ſhe imitated the charitable Phyſicians, who take no fees of the poor; but ſhe made it up upon the rich, as ſeveral Phyſicians do, who take nothing of the poor.

[*I*] *Some will have it that ſhe, then, practiſed only as a bawd.*] There was no deity among the Heathens, that was ſerved more faithfully than Venus; for generally the proſtitutes kept on their trade, as long as it was poſſible; and when the wrinkles of old age deprived them of all lovers, they did not give over that ſervice; they betook themſelves to the teaching of ſcholars, and managing intrigues. This is what Claudian ſays of Lais.

Haud aliter juvenum flammis Ephyreïa Lais
E gemino ditata mari, dum ſerta refundit
Canities, dum turba procax, noctiſque recedit
Ambitus, & raro pulſatur janua tactu,
Seque reformidat ſpeculo damnante ſenectus,
Stat tamen, atque alias ſuccingit lena miniſtras,
Dilectumque diu quamvis longæva lupanar
Circuit, & retinet mores quos perdidit ætas (47).

So Lais, her once boaſted conqueſts o'er,
And doors with crowding lovers throng'd no more,
Turns bawd, and kindly leads the willing maid
Thro' each vile practice of her former trade.

This puts me in mind of the invalids or diſabled ſoldiers, who have been ſometimes mentioned in our Gazettes. When they can no longer bear arms, they are ſent upon the coaſts to exerciſe the militia. If you would have another compariſon, conſider the mule ſpoken of by a Greek hiſtorian (48). Having done long ſervices to the people of Athens, ſhe was exempted from labour, with permiſſion to go and paſture where ſhe pleaſed; but that ſhe might not be uſeleſs, ſhe went and placed herſelf before the waggons, and in ſome meaſure incouraged the beaſts of burthen that drew them. For which reaſon it was ordered, that ſhe ſhould be kept all her life at the public expence.

I ought not to forget a blunder of the moſt learned Barthius. He thought (49), that Syneſius gives us the hiſtory of Lais, in a letter, wherein he ſpeaks of a courtezan, who was at firſt concubine to a maſter of a ſhip, and then to a Rhetorician, and afterwards to a ſervant, and then a proſtitute, and at laſt a bawd. It is certain that Syneſius does not mean Lais, but the mother of a Rhetorician, newly married to Syneſius's niece: an under match, which was extreamly ungrateful to that author. Here is the whole paſſage. Πλὴν εἰ μή τι λέγουσιν ὅσοι καὶ τὸν νυμφίον ἡμῖν μητρόθεν ἀποσεμνύνουσι γενεαλογοῦντες αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν φήμῃ Λαΐδος. ἡ γὰρ Λαῒς ἔφη τις ἤδη λογογράφος, ἀνδράποδον, ἦν Ὑκκαρικὸν. ἐκ Σικελίας ἐωνημένον, ὅθεν ἡ καλλίπαις ἡ τεκοῦσα τὸν περιβόητον. καὶ αὐτὴ πάλαι μὲν ἐπαλλακεύετο ναυκλήρῳ δεσπότῃ. ἔπειτα μέν τοι ῥήτορι, καὶ τούτῳ δεσπότῃ. τρίτῳ μετ' ἐκείνους

(a) Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 588.

(b) Viz. Phryne.

(35) Taſſoni, Penſieri diverſi, lib. vii, cap. xi, pag. 228.

(36) Plutarch. in Amatorio, pag. 750. D.

(37) Cicero, Epiſt. xxvi, lib. ix, ad Familiares.

(38) Lib. xii, pag. 544.

(39) Lactant. lib. iii, cap. xv, pag. m. 184.

(40) Ἔχειν γυναῖκα. Græci dixerunt, ut Latini *habere mulierem*, de eo qui ad eam pro ſuo jure cum volebat, ventitabat . . . Latinæ dictionis exemplum habes apud Terentium in Andria Act I, Scen. I, ver. 58. *Quis Chryſidem habuit?* Qua de re Muretus, Variar. Lect. vi, 7. *Menag. ad Diog. Laërt. lib. ii, n.* 75.

(41) Diog. Laërt. lib. i, n. 84, 85.

(42) Epicrates, in Anti-Laide, apud Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 570.

(43) Ὅτι Λαῒς καὶ Ἀξίνη ἐκαλεῖτο. ἤλεγχε δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ ἐπώνυμον τοῦτο τοῦ ἤθους ἀγριότητα, καὶ ὅτι πολὺ ἐπράττετο, καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον παρὰ τῶν ξένων ἅτε ἀπαλλαττομένων θᾶττον. Lais etiam Axine nuncupata eſt. Quod ejus cognomen ingenii ſævitiam redarguebat, quodque nimium quæſtum exigeret, præſertim à peregrinis, eo quod ſtatim eſſent diſceſſuri. *Ælian. Var. Hiſt. lib xiv, cap. xxxv.* See alſo the fifth chapter of the twelfth book, wherein Ælian quotes Ariſtophanes Byzantinus for it.

(44) Neque admittebatur niſi qui dabat quod popoſcerat: poſcebat autem illa nimium quantum. *Aul. Gell. lib. i, cap. viii.*

(45) *Above, citation* (43).

(46) Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 588.

(47) Claudian. lib. i. in Eutrop. ver. 90.

(48) Plutarch in Vita M. Catonis.

(49) Barthius, Animadverſ. ad lib. i. Claudiani in Eutropium, ver. 95, pag 1201. Edit. in 4to.

withſtanding the pleaſure ſhe found in diſtinguiſhing herſelf by the great number of her admirers, ſhe left Corinth, where ſhe had always a crowd of galants, and went to Theſſaly in queſt of a young man with whom ſhe was paſſionately in love [*K*]. The women of that country conceived ſo much jealouſy againſt that beautiful woman, that they put her to a cruel death. They drew her into the temple of Venus, and there ſtoned her (*c*), or, according to others, killed her with the ſtools they found at hand. All authors do not agree, that ſhe died in that manner [*L*]. I have ſaid in another place (*d*), that ſhe performed her apprenticeſhip under the Painter Apelles; and indeed, it ſeems that he got her maiden-head, if we may depend on the authors I have alledged. See (*e*) how he anſwered thoſe, who laughed at him, under pretence, that he had choſen a novice: but if the matter be diſcuſſed, we ſhall have reaſon to doubt of this ſtory [*M*]. The conjecture of thoſe, who ſay, that there were two courtezans

ὁμοδούλῳ καὶ λάθρα τῇ πόλει. ἔπειτα λαμπρῶς τῇ πόλει, καὶ προὔστη τῆς τέχνης, ἧς ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἐργασίαν ὑπὸ χαλαρᾷ ῥυτίδι κατέλυσε, τὰς ἐν ἡλικίᾳ παιδοτρίβει, καὶ τοῖς ξένοις ἀντικαθίστησιν. Niſi forte aliquid dicunt qui & ſponſum nobis à matris genere verbis efferunt, genus ejus à famoſa illa Laide ducentes. Nam Lais (dixit jam quidam hiſtoriarum ſcriptor) mancipium fuit Hyccaricum, emptum ex Sicilia, unde nobis venit illa pulchrorum filiorum mater quæ celebrem illum peperit. Et ipſa quidem olim ſcortum fuit Naucleri heri, deinde, Rhetoris ſimiliter heri, tertii deinde poſt illos conſervi, & clam civitatis, deinde palam civitatis artique præfuit meretriciæ, à cujus opera poſtquam ob maturas rugas deſtitit, adultas jam puellas in ea inſtituit, hoſpitibuſque pro ſe ſubſtituit (50). ——— *Unleſs perhaps they ſay ſomething who extol the bridegroom on account of his maternal deſcent, pretending to derive it from the renowned Lais. For Lais (a certain hiſtorian ſays) was a ſlave of Hyccara, bought from Sicily, whence we have that mother of a beautiful offspring, who brought forth this famous man. And ſhe herſelf was formerly concubine to a maſter of a ſhip, next to a Rhetorician, in the third place to a fellow-ſervant, and privately to a whole city; afterwards ſhe publickly profeſſed the trade of a whore; and, when incapacitated by age, ſhe inſtructed young women, who ſupplied her place with ſtrangers.* Here you ſee a woman, of whom it might be affirmed, that the laſt ſtate was worſe than the firſt; for her proſtitution was leſs pernicious than her trade of procuring.

[*K*] *She went to Theſſaly, in queſt of a young man, with whom ſhe was paſſionately in love.*] What has been ſaid (51) of the poverty, and procuring trade of Lais, does not agree with what Plutarch ſays of her; for he affirms, that when this courtezan left Corinth, ſhe had there a great army of galants, and that the women of Theſſaly killed her only for the envy they bore to her beauty (52). The Theſſalian ſpark ſhe fell in love with was called Hippolochus, if we believe Plutarch, but Athenæus calls him Pauſanias (53). They both agree, that the temple of Venus, in which ſhe was killed, had a ſirname given it, which denoted that crime; it was ſirnamed according to Plutarch, the temple of *Venus Homicide*, Ἀφροδίτης ἀνδροφόνου, and according to Athenæus, the temple of Venus Profaned, ἀνοσίης Ἀφροδίτης. A tomb was built to Lais upon the river Peneus with this epitaph:

Τῆς δὲ ποθ' ἡ μεγάλαυχος Ἀνίκητός τε πρὸς ἀλκὴν
Ἑλλὰς ἐδουλώθη κάλλεος ἰσοθέου,
Λαΐδος, ἣν τέκνωσεν Ἔρως, θρέψεν δὲ Κορίνθος,
Κεῖται δ' ἐν κλεινοῖς Θετταλικοῖς πεδίοις.

Hujus aliquando, magnanima, & fortitudine invicta
Græcia, formâ deabus æquiparandâ, victa & in ſervitutem redacta eſt
Laïdis, amoris filiæ, alumnæ Corinthi,
Quæ in nobilibus Theſſaliæ campis ſita jacet (54).

Here the fam'd Lais lies, in death's cold arms:
Greece felt the pow'r of her exalted charms,
Love gave her birth, and Corinth's walls a place:
The fields of Theſſaly her aſhes grace.

Athenæus confutes thoſe, who ſaid, that ſhe was buried in a ſuburb of Corinth called Cranion. However it is true, that her monument was ſeen in that ſuburb (55), and nothing hinders but that it might be there, and in Theſſaly too: for, tho' the Corinthians had not her body, they doubtleſs erected a monument to her. They engraved upon it a lioneſs, whoſe fore-feet reſted upon a ram (56). See Alciatus's Emblems (57). According to Pauſanias, the galant, that Lais went to Theſſaly in queſt of, was called Hippoſtratus. For the reſt, I do not think Geuſius's conjecture to be ſolid. He believes, that the women of Theſſaly ſacrificed Lais to Venus, as having made herſelf odious to that goddeſs, by the ambition of equalling, and even eclipſing her. He grounds his conjecture upon their leading her to the temple of Venus, though they might have killed her in in other places. ' Veriſimile eſt, *ſays he* (58), quod ' hæc Lais ab invidis & furioſis iſtis feminis non ' ſimpliciter necata, ſed tanquam piacularis victima ' Deæ Veneri in ejus templo immolata fuerit; quia ' forma ſua & pulchritudine Veneris ipſius gloriam ' affectaſſe, imo obſcuraſſe, & ita indignationem & ' iram ejus in ſe excitaſſe videbatur. Nam quare ipſam non in alio loco, in foro, platea, vel ædibus ' occiderunt? quare ipſam in Veneris templo lapidibus ' & ſcamnis obruerunt, niſi propterea, ut Laida Veneris æmulam coram ipſa Venere in ſacrificium mactarent?

[*L*] *All authors do not agree, that ſhe died in that manner.*] Some ſay (59) that ſhe was choaked with an olive-ſtone; and ſo her death was much like that of Anacreon. Others pretend, that ſhe died in the venereal act (60). Which to one, who had devoted herſelf to the ſervice of the goddeſs Venus, was a glorious death; ſhe died in the bed of honour, and in ſignalizing her fidelity; juſt as when a warrior is killed in a battle. Some body has ſaid, that an emperor ought to die ſtanding (60*): but, according to the principles of the Pagans, a courtezan, to die gloriouſly, ought to be in a quite different poſture; and Lais, in her way, did what Veſpaſian adviſed emperors to do.

[*M*] *We ſhall have reaſon to doubt of this ſtory.*] Let it be remembred, that the birth of Lais ought to be placed in the fourth year of the LXXXIXth Olympiad, and that Apelles, being at ſea, was forced by a ſtorm to put in at Alexandria, under the reign of Ptolemy, the ſon of Lagus (61), which reign could not begin at fartheſt till the CXIVth Olympiad. The moſt convenient ſuppoſition for the authors of that ſtory would be to ſay, that Apelles was but twenty years old, and that Lais was twenty five at the time they ſpeak of, and that he put into Alexandria, the firſt year of Ptolemy's reign: and therefore he muſt have been born the firſt year of the XCIſt Olympiad. But then, would he not have been near ninety five years old, when Ptolemy, the ſon of Lagus, began his reign? And is it likely, that, at ſuch an age, he would have been in a capacity of bearing the ſea, and doing what he is ſuppoſed to have done at the court of Egypt? Would this great age have been paſſed over in ſilence by all the writers that remain? Theſe difficulties cannot be removed but by extending the time of Lais's virginity longer, that is, by ſuppoſing, that this Painter, at twenty years of age, entertained her, when ſhe was already forty or fifty five years of age. Now this is to ſuppoſe things quite contrary to probability, and to what we find in authors. It would be much more reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that Apelles was twice as old as Lais. It is highly probable, that ſhe began her filthy trade very early, and conſequently, that Apelles did not debauch her. Note, that the fountain of Pyrene, from whence, it is ſaid, he ſaw
her

(*c*) *See the remark* [*K*].

(*d*) *In the article APELLES, remark* [*E*].

(*e*) Ibid.

(50) Synefius, Epiſt. iii, pag. m. 21. *I make uſe of Thomas Naogeorgus's tranſlation, and the Baſil edition* 1558, *in* 8*vo*.

(51) *In the two foregoing remarks*,

(52) Ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτὴν αἱ γυναῖκες ὑπὸ φθόνου καὶ ζήλου διὰ τὸ κάλλος εἰς ἱερὸν Ἀφροδίτης προαγαγοῦσαι κατέλευσαν καὶ διέφθειραν. Ibi vero eam mulieres INVIDIA PULCRITUDINIS & æmulatione impulſæ, in templum Veneris adductam lapidibus obruerunt. *Plutarch. in Amatorio, pag.* 768, *A*.

(53) Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 589.

(54) Athen. ibid.

(55) Pauſan. lib. ii, pag. 45.

(56) Pauſan. ibid.

(57) *The ſeventy fourth, pag. m.* 329.

(58) Jacobus Geuſius, Theologus & Medicus Friſius, in Tract. de Victimis humanis, Part. II, pag. 482, 483.

(59) Ptolem. Hephæſt. apud Photium, pag. m. 472.

(60) Οὐχὶ Λαῒς μὲν τελευτῶσ' ἀπέθανε βινουμένη. Ac ne Lais quidem obierat jam: cum ſubigeretur mortua eſt. *Philetærus in Venatrice, apud Athen. lib. xiii, pag.* 587. *See* Bigar. de des Accords, livr. i, fol. 181 verſo, 182, & 191.

(60*) Imperatorem ait ſtantem mori oportere. *Veſpaſianus, apud Sueton. in Veſpaſ. cap. xxiv.*

(61) *See, above, citation* (9), *of the article APELLES.*

tezans called Lais [*N*], is grounded upon this, that every thing that is ſaid of Lais cannot be underſtood of the ſame woman, without contradicting chronology. There is no probability, that ſhe was the daughter of Alcibiades (*f*), or that ſhe was an author [*O*]. We have a very pretty epigram of Auſonius upon the looking-glaſs

her return, when he was ſtruck with her beauty, was at Corinth. Wherefore, if this ſtory were true, it muſt be concluded, that he made ſome ſtay in that town, which I do not believe any author has poſitively ſaid.

[*N*] *Some conjecture, that there were two courtezans called Lais.*] She I ſpeak of was removed to Corinth, when Nicias commanded the Athenian army in Sicily, that is, the ſecond year of the XCIſt Olympiad. She was then ſeven years old, if we believe Ariſtophanes's Scholiaſt (62). Now, ſince Demoſthenes durſt not go to Corinth, but *incognito*, in order to lie with Lais, he could not be a young ſcholar, but a man of a great reputation. He muſt therefore be ſuppoſed to have been at leaſt thirty years of age, and ſo Lais would have been then ſixty ſeven years old (63). Therefore there is no probability, that Domeſthenes would have been deſirous to ſee her, or that ſhe would have asked a great ſum of him. It was therefore another Lais, who asked Demoſthenes ſo much, There were therefore two courtezans called Lais. The difficulty would be very great, though we ſhould ſuppoſe, that Demoſthenes made this voyage to Corinth at about twenty years of age; for our Lais would have been then near ſixty. I find, that many authors build upon a paſſage of Athenæus, wherein it is ſaid, that Alcibiades was always attended by two concubines, namely Damaſandra, the mother of young Lais (64), and Theodota, who took care of his funeral, when he was killed in a town of Phrygia. This paſſage of Athenæus is of ſome weight; for it ſuppoſes there was a woman, called Lais before her who was the daughter of Damaſandra; nevertheleſs there remain great difficulties. In the firſt place, Athenæus, who ſays ſo many things concerning Lais, makes no diſtinction; he ſpeaks all along as if there never had been but one Lais. Does a man expreſs himſelf thus, when he is perſuaded, that there are two, and intends to inform his reader of it? ſecondly, Plutarch ſpeaking of Lais, the daughter of Alcibiades's concubine, ſays expreſsly, that ſhe was a native of Hyccara in Sicily, and that ſhe was brought a ſlave from thence. Ταύτης λέγουσι θυγατέρα γενέσθαι Λαΐδα, τὴν Κορινθίαν μὲν προσαγορευθεῖσαν, ἐκ δὲ Ὑκκάρων Σικελικοῦ πολίσματος αἰχμάλωτον γενομένην. *Hujus ferunt filiam fuiſſe Laidem, quæ dicta fuit Corinthia quum Hyccaris Siciliæ oppidulo fuerit captiva abducta* (65). Thus, according to Plutarch, the ſame Lais, whom Athenæus calls the younger, is ſhe who was born in Sicily before the XCIſt Olympiad; ſo that if ſhe, who asked ſuch a great price of Demoſthenes, is different from this, there muſt have been a third Lais; for ſhe, who in Athenæus's account, would be the firſt, muſt have preceded the Sicilian, who was ſold in Hyccara, the ſecond year of the XCIſt Olympiad, and would have been ſtill more incapable, than the ſecond mentioned by Athenæus, to receive a viſit from Demoſthenes. In the third place, the great ſum, demanded of this Orator, maniſeſtly ſuppoſes, that the courtezan was very young. A woman does not ſet ſuch a value upon herſelf, when ſhe is above thirty five years. Now, as there is a great probability, that Alcibiades's concubine was already the mother of Lais, when Alcibiades died, the firſt year of the XCIVth Olympiad, we muſt ſay, that Lais was at leaſt twenty years older than Demoſthenes; and at this rate, if this Orator, at thirty years of age, had made a voyage to Corinth, to lie with that courtezan, he would have been in love with a woman of fifty, who rated one of her nights at near 4000 livres (66). For my part, inſtead of admitting two Lais's, I had rather ſay, that the Greek authors, who were bad Chronologers (67), have applied to the courtezan of this name an adventure of Demoſthenes, which concerned another woman of pleaſure. Note, that, in another place, Athenæus ſays, that Alcibiades, being general of the army, had with him two concubines, Timandra, the mother of Lais the Corinthian, and Theodota the Athenian (68). This plainly intimates that Timandra was then the mother of Lais; and it is certain, that the ſame Lais, who was born in Sicily, was called the Corinthian. Plutarch ſays ſo expreſsly (69). Note alſo, that Athenæus calls Lais's mother ſometimes Damaſandra, and ſometimes Timandra, and aſcribes to Theodota the care of Alcibiades's funeral; but Plutarch ſays, that Timandra was the mother of Lais, and that ſhe buried Alcibiades (70).

[*O*] *It is not probable, that ſhe was an author.*] Pliny (71) mentions two things, which he had read in the writings of a woman called Lais. He names her the firſt time with Elephantis, and the ſecond time with Salpe, and a little after he makes mention of a midwife, called Sotira. It is known, that Elephantis had written ſome books full of obſcenities. See the remark [*P*] of the article HELENA, and Suetonius in the forty third chapter of the Life of Tiberius, and Martial in the forty third epigram of the twelfth book. Galen witneſſes (72), that Elephantis had written a treatiſe of Coſmetics. I have obſerved, in another place (73), the meaning of that word. Salpe was of the iſle of Lesbos (74), and had written a book of jeſts, or of ſports and diverſions; but there is no great probability, that Pliny alledged her with reſpect to that work. ‘ Lais & Salpe, *ſays he* (75), ‘ canum rabioſorum morſus, & tertianas quartanaſque ‘ febres, menſtruo in lana arietis nigri, argenteo ‘ bracchiali incluſo;’ that is, according to du Pinet's verſion, ‘ *Lais and Salpe, two very renowned courtezans, ſay, that, if we wrap up ſome menſtrual blood in the wool of a black ram, and put it in a ſilver bracelet, it is good for the bitings of mad dogs, and tertian and quartan ugues.*’ This is clearly to inſinuate, that theſe two women had written a book of medicinal receipts. Father Hardouin affirms, that Salpe wrote *De Remediis muliebribus* (76). The other paſſage of Pliny, in which Lais and Elephantis are joined, intimates the ſame thing. ‘ Quæ Lais & ‘ Elephantis inter ſe contraria prodidere de abortivis, ‘ carbone è radice braſſicæ, vel myrti, vel tamaricis in ‘ eo ſanguine exſtincto; item aſinas non concipere tot ‘ annis, quod grana hordei contacta ederint: quæque ‘ alia nuncupavere monſtrifica, aut inter ipſas pugnantia: cum hæc fecunditatem fieri iiſdem modis, quibus illa ſterilitatem prænunciaret, melius eſt non credere (77).’ That is, according to du Pinet's verſion, ‘ *As to what the courtezan Lais* †, *and the poeteſs Elephantis* ‡ *ſay of the menſtrual blood, and to cauſe a child to diſſolve in the mother's belly and of the coals made of the roots of cabbages, myrtles, or tamarisks, and extinguiſhed in the ſame blood, there is no reaſon to give any credit to it: for one of them contradicts the other. The ſame may be ſaid of what they tell us, that a ſhe aſs will not conceive for ſo many years, as ſhe has eaten grains of barley ſtained with the ſame blood. Theſe two courtezans ſay many monſtrous things upon this ſubject, to which we ought to give no credit; for what one of them ſays helps propagation, the other holds to be proper againſt it.*’ This tranſlator undertakes to decide a thing, which Pliny has not expreſſed. He ſays boldly, that the courtezan Lais is here ſpoken of; and doubtleſs he means her, who makes the ſubject of this article. If he had ſaid this, in a marginal note, he would have ſhewn himſelf leſs raſh; but he gives it as the true verſion of the words of the original, which is an inexcuſable boldneſs. Father Hardouin has been infinitely more reſerved; he confeſſes, that he does not know, whether Pliny cites one of the two courtezans called Lais, and he calls her Midwife, *obſtetrix*, whom Pliny quotes (78). If I did not find remedies for the tertian and quartan ague, in Pliny's words, but only for barrenneſs, and receipts for abortion, I ſhould be more inclined to believe, that he cites a book written by our Lais, or aſcribed to that famous courtezan; for there are hardly any people ſo well skilled in what can promote or prevent conception, or cauſe abortion, as thoſe of Lais's trade, a trade, that takes up the wretched art of doing a good turn to thoſe, who are afraid of diſgrace; a trade, in a word, which terminates in that, when age does no longer favour the other functions. But after all, I do not think it probable, that our Lais wrote books. However I would not deny, that thoſe, which are mentioned

---

(*f*) *See the remark* [*T*].

(62) Ad Plutum.

(63) *Demoſthenes was born in the fourth year of the XCVIIIth Olympiad.* See Exercitationes Palmerii, apud Lloyd, voce *Lais*, & apud Menagium, in Diogen. Laërt. lib. ii, n. 75.

(64) Τῆς Λαΐδος τῆς νεωτέρας μητέρα. Junioris Laidis matrem. *Athen. lib. xiii, pag.* 574.

(65) Plutarch in Alcib. ſub. fin. pag. 213, D.

(66) Lais μυρίας δραχμὰς ἢ τάλαντον poposcit, hoc facit nummi noſtratis denarium decem millia. *Aul. Gellius, lib. i, cap. viii.* Denarium decem millia, *make, according to Gaſſendus*, 3722 *livres*.

(67) *See Scaliger*, in Euſebium, n. 786, pag. m. 49.

(68) Athen. lib. xii, pag. 535.

(69) Plut. in Alcibiade, ſub fin. pag. m. 213.

(70) Ibid.

(71) Plin. lib. xxviii. cap. vii.

(72) Galen. in libris κατὰ τόπους.

(73) *Above, remark* [*A*], *of the article* CRITON, n. 4.

(74) Athen. lib. vii, pag. 321, 322.

(75) Plin. ubi ſupra, pag. 588.

(76) Harduin. in Indice Author. Plinii, pag. 128.

(77) Plin. ubi ſupra, pag 587.

† *She was a Sicilian courtezan, who retired to Corinth, where ſhe was ſo much in requeſt, that every Grecian prince thought himſelf happy if he could lie one night with her.*

‡ *She was a whore, who made herſelf talked of by the infamous verſes which ſhe wrote.*

(78) Harduin. ubi ſupra, pag. 117.

glaſs of this leud woman [P]. I forgot to ſay, that ſhe was ſo much in love with Eubates, that ſhe obliged him to promiſe her marriage [Q]; but he found a way of evading his engagement. As many charms as ſhe had, ſhe could not conquer the continence of the Philoſopher Xenocrates [R]. She defended herſelf one day very artfully againſt Euripides, who cenſured her with reaſon [S]. Tatian has upbraided the Heathens with the monument, that was erected to the debaucheries of this whore (g). He calls the Sculptor, who made it, Turnus; from whence we may conclude, that he was

(g) Tatian, contra Græcos, pag m. 170.

mentioned by Pliny, and ſet by him in oppoſition to thoſe of another leud woman, named Elephantis, were aſcribed to her. I queſtion, whether an honeſt matron, expert in ſecrets, and a Midwife by profeſſion, would have been called Lais; for this name, like that of Chryſis and Thaïs, and the like, was beſtowed upon the naughty tribe, in the works of the Poets. And it was doubtleſs in alluſion to that cuſtom, that a book was printed in France, towards the beginning of the XVIth century with this title, *A Dialogue of Aretin, wherein are related the lives, manners, and behaviours of Lais, and Lamia, courtezans of Rome*. Ariſtænetus calls his miſtreſs Lais (79). By that word is meant not only a woman he loved (80), but alſo a woman by whom he was beloved and favoured, without any reſerve; for he ſays, that her bones were almoſt flexible, and that the tracts of his embraces remained imprinted on them, as much almoſt as on the fleſh, which covered them. Οὕτω μὲν τοι σύμμετρα καὶ τρυφερὰ τῆς Λαΐδος τὰ μέλη, ὡς ὑγροφυῶς αὐτῆς λογίζεσθαι τὰ ὀστᾶ τῷ περιτυπτομένῳ δοκεῖν· τοιγαροῦν ταῦτα μικροῦ γε ὁμοίως δι᾽ ἁπαλότητα συναπομαλάττεται τῇ σαρκὶ, καὶ ταῖς ἐρωτικαῖς ἀγκάλαις ὑπείκει. *Cæterum tam concinna, tam delicata Laidi membra, ut preſſius adtrectans dicas lenta & ductilia oſſa. Nam ea fere una cum carne impreſſos digitos recipiunt tenerrima, ceduntque amplexis amatorum ulnis* (81).

[P] *We have an epigram of Auſonius upon the looking-glaſs of this leud woman.*) Auſonius does but tranſlate an epigram of Plato, which is in the *Anthologia*. He has done it very well:

Lais anus Veneri ſpeculum dico: dignum habeat ſe
  Æterna æternum forma miniſterium,
At mihi nullus in hoc uſus, quia cernere talem
  Qualis ſum nolo; qualis eram nequeo (82).

Venus, this glaſs I dedicate to thee;
Uſeleſs, alas! the utenſil to me;
My former face I can't, my preſent will not ſee.

This is to ſuppoſe, that Lais ſurvived her beauty, and that her looking-glaſs became to her an uſeleſs, and even unpleaſant utenſil. This agrees with the authors, I have mentioned in the remarks [H] and [I], but not with Plutarch. See the remark [K].

You will find, in the commentaries upon Alciatus's Emblems, ſome Latin verſes, in which Lais's complaints are prettily repreſented. They were grounded upon two reaſons: the firſt was, that ſhe found, herſelf impaired, when ſhe conſulted her glaſs; the ſecond was, that ſhe ſtill felt the flames of luſt; ſhe complained, that ſhe had all the laſcivious deſires of youth in a body almoſt decrepit. It was a ſad thing.

Et tamen idem animus ſtimulos ſub pectore eoſdem
  Et noto ſenſit fervida corda Deo;
Sic ſecum: Facie nimium vivacior, ô mens,
  Cur dudum hæc anus eſt, tuque puella manes (83).

Still the ſame pow'rful deity ſhe confeſs'd,
And the ſame paſſions warm'd her aged breaſt.
Then ſighing, thus ſhe ſaid: how ill we ſee
A youthful mind, and an old face, agree!

The truth is, that an old courtezan of Venice was repreſented under her name. 'Accepi pridem à viris 'Italici ſoli, id ſcriptum fuiſſe in quandam meretri'cem Venetam, quæ ætatis lapſo, ſeu decuſſo flore, 'quoties ſe in ſpeculo conſpiceret, fronte jam rugis 'obſita, miſere contabeſcebat, & nihilo ſegnius ardore 'tentiginis premebatur (84).' Horace has afforded this thought:

Dices, heu (quoties te ſpeculo videris alterum)
Quæ mens eſt hodie cur eadem non puero fuit?
Aut cur his animis incolumes non redeunt genæ (85)?

Oft as in the too faithful glaſs you ſpie
That alter'd form, you with a ſigh will cry;
O! that I thus had thought, e'er youth was o'er,
Or that theſe thoughts cou'd fleeting youth reſtore!

[Q] *She was ſo much in love with Eubates, that ſhe obliged him to promiſe her marriage.*] Her paſſion muſt needs have been very violent, ſince ſhe was willing to ſubmit to the laws of Hymen (86), which would not have permitted her to continue freely her proſtitution. She diſcovered to Eubates the deſire ſhe had to marry him. He pretended to give his conſent, fearing her ill offices: but he did not lie with her; he put off that affair till after the games, in which he was to diſpute the prize. He obtained it, and thought no more of his promiſe of marriage. He returned to Cyrene his country, contenting himſelf to take along with him the picture of Lais. He thought, by that means, that he ſhould be a man of his word. The wife he had at Cyrene thought herſelf obliged to recompenſe ſo noble a continence; for which reaſon ſhe erected a ſtatue to her huſband. I am afraid, that Ælian (87), who relates this ſtory, has loſt all the wit of it. Clemens Alexandrinus relates it in fewer words; but he calls the man Ariſtotle, whom Ælian calls Eubates; and he quotes the book of Iſter περὶ ἰδιότητος ἄθλων, *de proprietate certaminum*. He does not agree with Ælian in all the circumſtances. Ὅτε Κυρηναῖος Ἀριστοτέλης, Λαΐδα ἐρῶσαν ὑπερεώρα μόνος, ὁμωμοκὼς ἐν τῇ ἑταίρᾳ, ἦ μὴν ἀπάξειν αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα, εἰ συμπράξειεν αὐτῷ τινα πρὸς τοὺς ἀνταγωνιστάς, ἐπειδὴ διεπράξατο, χαριέντως ἐκτελῶν τὸν ὅρκον, γραψάμενος αὐτῆς ὡς ὅτι μάλιστα ὁμοιοτάτην εἰκόνα, ἀνέστησεν εἰς Κυρήνην. *Et Cyrenæus Ariſtoteles amantem Laidem ſolus deſpexit. Cum meretrici itaque juraſſet, ſe eam eſſe in patriam abducturum, ſi ei adverſus decertantes adverſarios in aliquibus opem tuliſſet, poſtquam id perfecit, lepide à ſe ſcriptum juſjurandum exequens, ejus quam ſimillimam Cyrenæ ſtatuit imaginem* (88).

[R] *She could not conquer the continence of . . . . Xenocrates.*] Lais laid a wager, that ſhe would oblige this Philoſopher to divert himſelf with her at a game of love. She pretended to be frighted, and, under that pretence, took ſanctuary in his houſe, and ſpent the night there; but he did not meddle with her. When ſhe was required to pay her wager, ſhe anſwered, that ſhe had not laid it about a ſtatue, but about a man. Thus an old interpreter of Horace (89) relates the ſtory. Diogenes Laërtius aſcribes this to the courtezan Phryne, and does not ſpeak of the wager. He ſays (90), that ſhe fled to Xenocrates's houſe, pretending, that ſome body purſued her; and as he had but one bed in the houſe, ſhe intreated the Philoſopher to let her have part of it. He conſented to it. After that, ſhe made other demands, which came to nothing. Whence it was, that when ſhe was asked, how things went, ſhe anſwered, ſhe had lain, not with a ſtatue, and with a man. Some ſay, that Xenocrates's diſciples one day put Lais into his bed, and that he was ſo fully reſolved to preſerve his continence, that he ſeveral times ſuffered inciſions to be made in his privy-parts, and fire to be applied to them. Ἔνιοι δὲ Λαΐδα φασὶ παρακατακλῖναι αὐτῷ τοὺς μαθητάς, τὸν δὲ οὕτως εἶναι ἐγκρατῆ, ὥστε καὶ τομὰς καὶ καύσεις πολλάκις ὑπομεῖναι περὶ τὸ αἰδοῖον. The Latin tranſlation runs thus, *Quidam verò diſcipulos Laidem illi injeciſſe in lectulum tradunt, illumque adeò fuiſſe continentem, ut cum ſe ad libidinem incitari præſenſiſſet, & ſecare & urere verenda ſæpe pateretur* (91). We ought not to be ſatisfied either with the Greek author or his tranſlator. The latter adds of his own head, that Xenocrates found in him the rebellion

(79) *See his firſt Letter, wherein he gives a very particular deſcription of the beauties of that miſtreſs.*

(80) Λαΐδα τὴν ἐμὴν ἐρωμένην. Amicam meam Laida. *Ariſtæn. Epiſt. i, lib i, init.*

(81) Id. ibid. pag. 6.

(82) Auſonius, Epigram. lv.

(83) Emblem. Alciati, pag. 330. Edit. Patav. 1661, in 4to.

(84) Ibid.

(85) Horat Ode X, lib. iv, ver. 6.

(86) Ἠράσθη αὐτοῦ θερμότατα καὶ περὶ γάμου λόγους προσήνεγκεν. Ardentiſſime amavit, & de matrimonio ſermonem intulit. *Ælian. Var. Hiſt. lib. x, cap. ii.*

(87) Ælian. ibid.

(88) Clem. Alexandr. Stromat. lib. iii, pag. 44.

(89) In Horat. Sat. III, lib. ii.

(90) Diog. Laërt. lib. iv, n.

(91) Id. ibid.

was a famous maſter in that art; and yet neither Pliny, nor Pauſanias, nor any other writer, make mention of him. I will make but one remark for the faults of Moreri, and thoſe of ſome other Dictionaries [*T*]. There never was a more extravagant boldneſs, than that of Antony de Guevara. He has vented a thouſand ridiculous falſities about Lais [*U*], as if he had found them in antient authors. I had almoſt paſſed over in ſilence the adventure of the Sculptor Myron [*X*].

rebellion of luſt (92); and as to Diogenes Laërtius, he does not tell us what became of Lais: he puts her in the Philoſopher's bed, without ſaying what ſhe did there, or how ſhe came out again, and, inſtead of finiſhing the narration of this particular adventure, he falls upon a general thing; that is, upon the remedies, which Xenocrates had ſeveral times made uſe of, to be proof againſt love.

[*S*] *She defended herſelf one day very artfully againſt Euripides, who cenſured her with reaſon.*] Euripides, with pen in hand, was going to compoſe ſomething in a garden. Lais, ſeeing him in that poſture, accoſted him, and asked him (93) what he meant by ſome words, which he had uſed in one of his tragedies (94), to denote, in general, a man, who does filthy actions. He was ſurprized at the impudence of this queſtion, and anſwered her, *You your ſelf are one of thoſe I mean* (95). She fell a laughing, and quoted a verſe (96) in which he ſaid, that an action was not filthy, unleſs he who did it thought it ſo, Τὶ δ' αἰσχρὸν εἰ μὴ τοῖσι χρωμένοις δοκεῖ, *Ecquid vero turpe eſt niſi qui utuntur ſic putent* (97)? We are not informed, whether Euripides was confounded by this argument *ad hominem*, or whether he made any reply; but it is certain, Lais could not have more handſomely brought her ſelf off, nor have more ſubtilly perplexed her cenſurer. This maxim would carry the Philoſophical ſin to the utmoſt point, and would be of dangerous conſequence; for which reaſon the Philoſopher Antiſthenes (98) corrected it in this manner, Αἰσχρὸν τόγ' αἰσχρὸν κἂν δοκῇ κἂν μὴ δοκῇ. *What is filthy is filthy, whether it appears ſo, or not, to thoſe who do it.* Stobæus aſcribes this correction to Diogenes the Cynic (99), and not to Antiſthenes, as Plutarch does (100).

There is reaſon to doubt of this converſation; for ſince Euripides died in the XCIIId Olympiad (101), when Lais could not be above fifteen or ſixteen years old, it is not likely, that he had any diſcourſe with her upon this point, or any other. We ſhall be the more eaſily convinced of it, if we conſider, that he ſpent his laſt years at the court of Archelaus, where no author ſays that Lais had ever been. Suppoſe, as much as you pleaſe, two courtezans of this name, you will never clear the matter; for the firſt muſt be ſhe, who was ſold, when Hyccara was plundered by Nicias. But, according to Ariſtophanes's ſcholiaſt, ſhe was then but ſeven years old. By this Chronology that ſcholiaſt raiſes a very conſiderable difficulty on the mention that is made of Lais in Ariſtophanes's Plutus, a comedy, that was acted at a time, when Lais could not as yet be famous (102). The difficulty will vaniſh, if it be ſuppoſed, that it ought to be read Nais, and not Lais in that play. You will find this correction in Athenæus (103). It is certain, there was a courtezan named Nais, and probably many authors have confounded her with Lais. Perhaps it was with Nais, that Euripides entered into diſcourſe.

[*T*] *I will make but one remark for the faults of Moreri, and ... ſome other Dictionaries.*] Moreri's firſt fault conſiſts in ſaying that Lais lived in the 420th year of Rome. She muſt then have lived about the end of the CXIth Olympiad: judge whether this can be ſaid of a perſon, who was removed from Sicily to Corinth, in the ſecond year of the XCIſt Olympiad. There is no recurring to the hypotheſis of two Lais's, ſince, beſides that Moreri ſpeaks only of one, he expreſsly ſays, that he ſpeaks of that Lais, who was a *native of a little town of Sicily called Hyccara.* This Lais is manifeſtly ſhe, who was ſeven years old, when Hyccara, her native town, was taken in the ſecond year of the XCIſt Olympiad. II. It is not true, that Plutarch ſays, *that it was believed, ſhe was daughter to Alcibiades.* Moreri cannot father this falſity upon Amiot; for it is plain, that in this phraſe *l'on dit que Laïs . . . eſtoit ſa fille* (104), the word *ſa* ought to be referred to Timandra, Alcibiades's concubine, and not to Alcibiades. There is no ambiguity in the Greek (105). How could Alcibiades be Lais's father, who went not into Sicily, but with Nicias? Was not Lais then ſix or ſeven years old? III. It is not true, that Lais *went to Alexander's camp*; ſhe had been dead a long time before Alexander was born. Amiot has occaſioned this fault: for, not underſtanding a paſſage of Plutarch (106), wherein ſome words are wanting, he tranſlates it, that Lais, *falling in love with Hippolochus . . . . left mount Acrocorinthus . . . . and went to the great camp of Alexander.*

Charles Stephens is miſtaken, in ſaying, that Lais removed from Sicily to Corinth, that her proſtitution might be more profitable to her. She was but ſeven years old, when ſhe went to Corinth, and ſhe went thither againſt her will, having been bought in Hyccara by a man, who carried her with him into Greece as a ſlave. This fault has not been corrected by Lloyd or Hofman. I can ſcarce believe, that Charles Stephens found in any good author what he ſays; I. That Lais, going into Theſſaly, ſo gained the love of the young men of the country, that they poured out wine before her door. II. That the Theſſalian women, out of envy, ſtabbed her, whilſt they were performing their devotions in the temple of Venus, at which the men could not be preſent. III. That this action drew upon Theſſaly a plague, which ceaſed not, till they had built the temple of Venus ἀλλοσία (107). Lloyd and Hofman have both of them theſe three particulars.

[*U*] *Antony de Guevara . . . . has vented a thouſand ridiculous falſities about Lais.*] I will not ſtay to refute them, and ſhall only mention a ſmall part of them. He ſays (108) that ſhe was born in the Iſle Bithrite in the confines of Greece; 'and, as the 'chroniclers have written of her, ſhe was the daugh'ter of a great prieſt of Apollo's temple, who lived 'at Delphos, a man greatly experienced in the art 'of Magic, by which ſcience he foretold the ruin 'of his daughter. Now this amorous Lais, was at 'the heighth of her glory in the time of the renown'ed king Pyrrhus. . . . . who, being a youth of ſix'teen or ſeventeen years of age, came into Italy to 'make war with the Romans . . . . This amorous 'Lais remained a long time in king Pyrrhus's camp, 'and with him ſhe came into Italy, and returned 'with him from the war . . . . and retired to the 'city of Corinth, to make her abode there, in which 'place ſhe was followed, and courted by many kings 'Lords, and princes.' He afterwards relates the adventure of Demoſthenes, and concludes with ſaying, that Lais died at Corinth at ſeventy two years of age. How can a man have the confidence to publiſh ſuch groſs falſities? There are above 130 years between the birth of Lais, and Pyrrhus's expedition againſt the Romans, and above forty betwixt the death of Demoſthenes and that expedition. And yet this impoſtor has impoſed upon men of ſenſe, for it was after him that Brantome vented many fables concerning Flora (109). I ſay nothing of Du Verdier Vau-Privas, who tells us, that Lais was a long time in king Pyrrhus's camp in Italy (110). He had read this in Guevara, and took it to be true.

[*X*] *The adventure of the Sculptor Myron.*] It is one of the ridiculous adventures of a grey-headed lover. Myron, venerable for his hoary head, went to Lais, to ask a night of her, but was ſent back without ſo much as being heard. He thought he had found the reaſon of her flight, and hoped, that if he ſhould offer himſelf with a brown head of hair, he ſhould be admitted. He thereof changed the colour of his hair, and returned to Lais: *What a fool you are* ſaid ſhe, *to come to ask a thing of me, which I have refuſed your father.* Auſonius tells the ſtory very prettily (111).

Canus rogabat Laïdis noctem Myron:
  Tulit repulſam protinus.
Cauſamque ſenſit: & caput fuligine
  Fucavit atra candidum.

---

(92) Cum ſe ad libidinem incitari præſenſiſſet.

(93) Τὶ βουλόμενος ἔγραψας ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ, Ἔῤῥ' αἰσχροποιέ. Quidnam poeta cogitaſti cum ſcriberes in tragœdia, Abi in malam rem αἰσχροποιέ. *Machon. apud Athen. lib xiii, pag.* 582.

(94) *In the* Medea, *where this verſe is to be found* Ἔῤῥ' αἰσχροποιὲ καὶ τέκνων μιαιφόνε.

(95) Σὺ γὰρ εἶναι τίς, ἔφη, δοκεῖς Αἰσχροποιός. Et tu porro, inquit, videris agere turpia. *Apud Athen. ibid.*

(96) *It is the fifth verſe of Euripides's* Æolus, *in Barnes's edition.*

(97) Machon. ubi ſupra.

(98) *See Brodæus*, Miſcellan. lib. vi, cap. xix.

(99) *See Leopardus*, Emendat. lib. i, cap. vi.

(100) Plutarch. de Audiend. Poët. pag. 33.

(101) *See the remark* [*EE*], *of this article.*

(102) Docte & acute dubium movet, aitque Ariſtophanem dicere ea quæ rationi temporum nequeunt convenire, quippe cum eo tempore, quo Plutum fabulam dabat, non potuerit Lais eſſe valde celebris, quippe quæ a Nicia imperatore capta ſit in Sicilia ſeptennis. *Valeſius, Not. in Notas, Mauſſaci ad Harpocrat. pag.* 124.

(103) Athenæus, lib. xiii, pag. 592. *See alſo* Harpocration, voce Ναΐς.

(104) *Amiot, in his tranſlation of the Life of Alcibiades, at the end.*

(105) Ταύτης λέγουσι θυγατέρα, γενέσθαι Λαΐδα.

(106) *In the Treatiſe of Love, pag. m.* 796. *Edit. in* 8*vo*, 1621.

(107) *The right word* ἀνοσία, *is in the Paris edition*, 1620.

(108) Ant. de Guevara, Epitres Dorées, livr i, pag. m. 262. *of the French tranſlation by Guterry.*

(109) *See the article* FLORA *(the ſecond) remark* [*F*].

(110) Du Verdier, Diverſes Leçons, livr. iii, cap. vi, pag. 185.

(111) Auſonius, Epigram. xvii, pag. m. 17.

Idemque vultu, crine non idem Myron,
  Orabat oratum prius.
Sed illa formam cum capillo comparans,
  Similemque non ipſum rata,
Fortaſſe & ipſum, ſed volens ludo frui,
  Sic eſt adorta callidum:
Inepte, quid me, quod recuſavi, rogas?
  Patri negavi jam tuo.

Old, hoary, Myron, ſetting age aſide,
One night of Lais ask'd, and was deny'd.
The cauſe he found, and black'd his ſilver hair,
And once more waited on the cruel fair.
By the chang'd colour of his locks deceiv'd,
The nymph addreſs'd him, not the ſame believ'd;
Fool that thou ar't, fondly to hope to gain
A favour, which your father ask'd in vain!

Coſtar has given a liſt of ſome witty ſayings, aſcribed to different perſons; amongſt which he has this anſwer of Lais: ' Spartian, *ſays he* (112), relates, that an old ' man, who was very grey-headed, having been de' nied ſome favour by the emperor Adrian, came to ' ask it again a few days after, having painted his hair ' of the fineſt black he could meet with. This prince, ' diſcovering the trick, wittily anſwered him, *What* ' *you ask of me, I have already denied your father.* ' Nevertheleſs, in Auſonius, it is the courtezan Lais, ' who makes this ingenious anſwer; and yet Athe' næus does not ſpeak of it, though he has ſo care' fully preſerved to us all the notable ſayings of that ' handſome lady.' If the conjecture of ſome moderns was right, we need not wonder that Athæneus ſays nothing of this witty repartee of Lais; for they pretend, that Auſonius invented it (113). I mean, that, knowing the emperor Hadrian's anſwer, he feigned that Lais made uſe of it, and made an epigram upon it. I believe this anſwer came rather from a woman, than from the emperor Hadrian; for one can hardly imagine any good reaſon, why an old man, after a refuſal, ſhould fancy, that, appearing as a man without grey hair, he ſhould obtain from this prince what he deſigned to ask of him. It is eaſy to conceive why he might hope for ſuch a thing, if he deſired a love-favour from a lady. We may ſay then, that the writers of Hadrian's hiſtory, men of little judgment and exactneſs, have confounded with his witty ſayings, thoſe which he only recited. He had read ſomewhere, what Lais is ſaid to have anſwered Myron: perhaps he had read, that this anſwer was made to ſome other old galant, by ſome other courtezan: he told the ſtory before his friends; the thing going from one hand to another loſt it's principal circumſtances, ſo that at laſt Hadrian was looked upon as the inventer of it (114).

I will not end this remark without ſaying, that Mr Coſtar praiſes this witty ſentence of Lais too much. I confeſs, the anſwer was ſmart, and fit to mortify the galant, and to give the courtezan the pleaſure of laughing at the old man; but, in ſhort, ſhe reaſoned very ill, and againſt the rules of her art. *I have refuſed the ſon, much more ſhould I refuſe the father*, is the principle of a woman of pleaſure; her argument turns upon this hinge: but here, on the contrary, Lais ſuppoſes, that, ſince ſhe has denied a decrepit old father, ſhe ought to deny his ſon, a young man, full of vigour. This is forſaking one's principle and fundamental rules.

To conclude, Myron could not be young, when Lais was in her glory: he flouriſhed in the LXXXVIIth Olympiad (115), ſeven or eight years before ſhe was born.

(112) Coſtar, Suite de la Defenſe de Voiture, pag. 55.

(113) Scaliger, in hunc locum Auſonii. Baptiſta Pius in Annotationibus poſterioribus, apud Vinetum in Auſonium, Epigr. xvii.

(114) Joca ejus plurima extant. Nam fuit etiam diçaculus. Unde illud quoque innotuit, quod quum cuidam caneſcenti quiddam negaſſet, eidem iterum petenti, ſed infecto capite, reſpondit, Jam hoc patri tuo negavi. *Spartian. in Hadrian. cap. xx.*

(115) Plin. lib. xxxiv, cap. viii, pag. m. 108.

LAMBECIUS (PETER),

one of the moſt learned men of his age, was born at Hamburg in the year 1628. He went early to ſtudy in foreign countries, at the expence of the learned Luke Holſtenius, his uncle; and he made ſo great progreſs, that, at nineteen years of age, he publiſhed a book (*a*), which was extremely applauded. He ſtaid eight months at Toulouſe with the archbiſhop Charles de Montchal, and two years at Rome with Cardinal Barberini. He was made profeſſor of Hiſtory at Hamburg, the thirteenth of January, 1652, and rector of the college of that town, the twelfth of January 1660. He had taken his doctor of Laws degree ſome years before in France. He had a thouſand vexations in his own country, as well becauſe his ſcholars would not obey him, as becauſe his enemies accuſed him of Heterodoxy, and even of Atheiſm, and ſharply cenſured his ſtudies and his works. The unfortunate marriage, which he contracted [*A*] in 1662, having compleated his miſfortunes, he gladly liſtened to the propoſals of the queen of Sweden, who adviſed him to retire elſewhere. He therefore left his wife and country, and took a journey to Vienna, from whence, having had the honour to wait on his Imperial majeſty, he went to Rome, and there made public profeſſion of the Romiſh religion. He had abjured the Lutheran long before [*B*]; tho' he made ſtill profeſſion of it. He returned to Vienna towards the end of the year 1662, and was very well received by the emperor, who made him firſt his ſub-librarian, and afterwards his firſt librarian, with the title of his Counſellor and Hiſtoriographer (*b*). He continued in that employment to his death, and acquired

(*a*) *Intituled,* Lucubrationum Gellianarum prodromus.

(*b*) D. 27. Novemb. 1662. Præfectura Biblioth. Auguſt. vicaria, A. autem ſequenti, 1663, d. 26. Maii, ſuprema ejuſdem qua Mat. Mauchterus Th. D. ſe abdicaverat, Ephoria, cum Conſiliarii atque Hiſtoriographi Cæſaræi titulo, eſt collata. *Mollerus*, ubi infra, citat. (3), pag. 539, *quoting a letter of Lambecius, which I ſhall cite in the remark* [*B*].

[*A*] *The unfortunate marriage, which he contracted.*] It may be ſaid of many learned men, that they behave themſelves with reſpect to marriage, as Pomponius Atticus did with reſpect to Poetry. ' Attigit quoque ' poëticen: credimus ne ejus expers eſſet ſuavitatis (1). ' —— *He touched upon Poetry: that he might, I ſup-* ' *poſe, have a reliſh of it's ſweetneſs?* They have a mind to try it, that they may know what pleaſure there is in it. But I do not think, that Lambecius had ſuch thoughts; for he married an old woman; and, as ſhe was very rich, it is probable he hoped only for the pleaſure of having a good eſtate. His hopes were quickly fruſtrated; the lady was ſo covetous, as not to ſuffer her husband to make uſe of her eſtate. She declared her mind ſo ſoon upon that point, that Lambecius had not been married above a fortnight, when diſcontented and weary of his condition, he left his houſe and his country, never to return again. Here follows my voucher. *Ad hæc adverſa poſtquam tædium Conjugii, inauſpicato A.* 1662. *cum Vetula Divite, ſed parca, atque avara* (*A.* 1690. *Hamburgi defuncta,*) *contracti, acceſſit, haud difficulter à Chriſtina, Suecorum Regina, Hamburgum delata, perſuaderi ſibi eſt paſſus, ut, duabus poſt nuptias Hebdomadibus vix elapſis, patriam & uxorem, d.* 14. *Apr. A.* 1662. *deſereret, ac Vindobonam commigraret* (2).

[*B*] *He had abjured the Lutheran religion long before.*] Nihuſius, a famous convert, was, in Holland, the director of Lambecius's ſtudies: he began his converſion; after which, the Jeſuit James Sirmond compleated it, at Paris. He would have engaged his proſelyte to take the habit of St Ignatius; but he could not perſuade him to it. Let us ſee the proofs that are given of theſe facts. ' Cœtui Eccleſiæ Romanæ publice ' ſe aggregavit *. Sacris enim ejus diu ante jam erat ' initiatus, cum in Batavia à Barth. Nihuſio, Apoſtata ' celebri, ac Studiorum ipſius Academicorum Ephoro, ' tum in Gallia à Jac. Sirmondo, Jeſuitarum doctiſſimo; ' ſed externa Lutheraniſmi Profeſſione Cives incautos ' hactenus feſellerat. Conſtat id mihi ex Illuſtris Gu' dii, quo familiariter ille apud Exteros eſt uſus, Nar' ratione, & Gallica, quam Idem aſſervabat, Claud. ' Sarravii, Senatoris Pariſienſis, ad Salmaſium Epiſtola. ' Huic enim ille jam, A. 1647. ſignificat, Lambecium, ' Holſtenii

(1) Corn. Nepos, in Vita Attici, cap xviii.

(2) Moller. Iſagoge ad Hiſtor. Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ, Part. III, pag. 538.

* V. Epiſt. ad Ren. Franc. Sluſium, libro i, Operis, de Bibl. Vindob. inſertam.

acquired a great reputation in it, by the books he publiſhed [*C*]. He was about many others, but had not time to finiſh them, dying in April 1680 (*c*) [*D*].

'Holſtenii ex Sorore Nepotem, à Sirmondo, in Jeſuitarum eum Societatem pertrahere conato, & Milleterio perſuaſum, ad Pontificios defeciſſe (3).'

[*C*] *He acquired a great reputation by the books he publiſhed.*] I ſhall ſay ſomething of thoſe he publiſhed before he was the emperor's librarian. The firſt was his *Prodromus Lucubrationum Gellianarum*, printed at Paris in the year 1647. The ſecond was, if I miſtake not, *Origines Hamburgenſes, ſive liber rerum Hamburgenſium primus ab V. C. & A. C.* 808. *ad A.* 1225. *Adjecta eſt tum duplex vita Anſgarii à Remberto & Gualdone ſcripta, ac notis Lambecii illuſtrata, tum diplomatum libri hujus hiſtoriam illuſtrantium Enneas* (4). He deſigned to continue this hiſtory to his own time; but he only publiſhed the ſecond book. *Liber ſecundus rerum Hamburgenſium ab A. C.* 1225. *ad A.* 1292. *una cum diplomatum vetuſtorum, lucem ei afferentium, Mantiſſa Chronologica & Auctario Lib. I. ab A.* 808. *ad A.* 1072. *Diſſertatione de Aſino ad Lyram, Monumento Ædis Cathedralis Sepulchrali inſculpto, Scriptorum Autoris Catalogo, & Epiſtolis tandem Joh. Chriſtiani, L. Baronis à Boineburg, & H. Conringii ad eundem encomiaſticis* (5). Here follows the judgment, that was made of thoſe two works by the author, whom I cite ſo often in this article. 'Ambo libri (in quibus, præter nimii in patriam Aſfectus veſtigia, paſſim obvia, & ab eodem ſubinde profluxerunt, *παροράματα* nihil facile reprehendas) ſumma diligentia & fide ſunt congeſti, & Narrationum ſingularum Veritas Locis Scriptorum ac Diplomatum Antiquiſſimorum, cum judicio ſelectis, confirmata (6). —— *Both books, (in which, except a too frequent partiality for his country, there is nothing to be found fault with) are compiled with the greateſt diligence and fidelity, and the truth of every narrative confirmed by paſſages ſelected with judgment out of writers, and antient Diplomas.*' Lambecius printed a book at Paris, in folio, in the year 1655, in which he diſplayed a great deal of learning. I mean his *Animadverſiones ad Codini Origines Conſtantinopolitanas, & ad Anonymi excerpta & ad Leonis Imp. Oracula.* I ſay nothing of his orations, which he publiſhed in the year 1660, nor of ſome other books of his: I proceed to that vaſt work he compiled at Vienna, which the reader may form a juſt idea of by theſe words of Mr Baillet. 'Though the catalogue of the manuſcripts of the emperor's library at Vienna be divided into eight volumes in Folio, it is not yet finiſhed, the death of the author having deprived us of ſo curious and important a work. Lambecius had undertaken, in that great work, the explication of the manuſcripts of that library, which he has done in a critical and hiſtorical manner; reſolving to lay out upon it all his learning and induſtry; in which he has very much diſtinguiſhed himſelf from all the catalogue-makers I have ſpoken of. It muſt be confeſſed, that there are abundance of very particular and curious things in this copious and ſplendid commentary: but the author might have included the ſubſtance of ſo many volumes in a narrower compaſs, if he had conſulted rather the income and leiſure of private perſons, than the magnificence and majeſty of his prince (7).'

[*D*] *He died in April*, 1680.] I keep to this date, becauſe herein I find Neſſelius (8) more to be credited, than thoſe who place Lambecius's death in September, 1679 (9). Perhaps we might eaſily reconcile Meibomius and Neſſelius, as to the day; for the twenty fourth of March, according to the old ſtile, belongs to the month of April, according to the new. But theſe two authors differ very much as to the diſtemper Lambecius died of; one ſays, that it was the plague, the other that it was the dropſy. *Henr. Meibomius Jun.* † *Peſte illum Viennenſi Epidemia obiiſſe perhibens, ad d.* 24 *Mart. A.* 1680. *Succeſſor autem ipſius, Dan. Neſſelius, qui Hydropem mortem ejus acceleraſſe teſtatur* ‡, *ad M. Aprilem ejuſdem A.* 1680 (10).

(*c*) *Taken from* Mollerus Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ, Part. III, pag. 537, & ſeq.

(3) Moller. ubi ſupra.

(4) *Printed at* Hamburg, *in the year* 1652, *in* 4to.

(5) *Printed at* Hamburg, *in the year* 1661, *in* 4to.

(6) Moller. ubi ſupra, pag. 541.

(7) Baillet, Jugemens des Sçavans, Tom. II, pag. 250.

(8) *He ſucceeded Lambecius in his place of library-keeper.*

(9) *Henningus Witte does it*, in Diario Biograph.

† In Introd. ad Hiſt. Sax. inf. pag. 62.

‡ In Supplemento Operis de Biblioth. Cæſar. ann 1690, edito. V. Tenzelii, Colloq. Menſtr. M. Oct. ann. 1690, pag. 946.

(10) Moller. ubi ſupra, pag. 540.

LAMBERT, biſhop of Liege, or rather of Maeſtricht. It is a common opinion, as I have ſhewn in another place (*a*), that he was killed by Pepin's order, at the ſuggeſtion of Alpaïde; but the thing is not certain. This is what I ſhall diſcuſs [*A*]. So

[*A*] *This is what I ſhall diſcuſs.*] I ſhall make uſe of the proofs alledged by the baron le Roi in one of his books. He is of opinion, that neither Pepin, nor Alpaïde, had any hand in St Lambert's murther, and he builds (1), I. Upon the ſilence of Godeſcalcus, a cotemporary writer. Here then is a negative argument, on which Dr John de Launoi lays ſo much ſtreſs. Godeſcalcus aſſigns no other reaſon for the murther of St Lambert, than the murther of two brothers related to Dodon. Theſe two brothers had uſed Lambert very ill; for which reaſon they were killed by two of his relations. Dodon, a potent lord, and of great intereſt with Pepin, would neither ſuffer this murther to go unpuniſhed, nor revenge himſelf upon inconſiderable perſons; he reſolved therefore to make away with St Lambert, for whoſe ſake his two couſins had been murthered. This was the only reaſon, according to Godeſcalcus, of this biſhop's death. He ſays nothing of Pepin or Alpaïde. II. Mr le Roi (2) obſerves, that the firſt, who imputed St Lambert's murther to Pepin, was a canon of Liege, called Anſelme, who lived in the XIth century. This canon failed not to ſay, as well as thoſe that lived before him, that Dodon cauſed St Lambert to be murthered, to revenge the death of his two relations; but he related alſo, as another tradition, what concerns Alpaïde's reſentment againſt this prelate. III. It is obſerved (3), that Sigebert (4) ſuppreſſed the ancient cauſe, mentioned by all authors, and ſpoke only of the new one, which Anſelme began to publiſh. Thus you ſee how errors ſucceſſively and gradually increaſe. The authors, who ſucceeded Sigebert, have ſaid nothing of the ancient cauſe, or elſe they have confounded it with the new, and added a hundred circumſtances to it, unknown to the firſt Hiſtorians (5). Baron le Roi cites very grave authors, who reject the new tradition, and anſwer the inſtance brought againſt Godeſcalcus's ſilence. They will have it, that the true cauſe of St Lambert's martyrdom was ſuppreſſed by him, to avoid provoking Pepin's ſucceſſors. Father Mabillon anſwers, that, ſince they durſt publiſh, that Charles Martel was damned, it might with the ſame boldneſs have been ſaid, that his father had cauſed a biſhop's death? 'Ut hæc ratio valuerit in Godeſcalco, inquit Mabillon, cur eam cauſam diſſimulavit Stephanus, qui ſub extremis Carolinæ ſtirpis regibus vivebat? Sane longe atrocior erat fabula de Caroli Martelli damnatione, quam tamen Hincmarus Remorum Archiepiſcopus, Adrevaldus, aliique Auctores, imperante Carolo Calvo Martelli abnepote, in vulgus jactare non dubitarunt. Unde omnino incertum videtur an Landebertus ob increpitum de pellicatu Pipinum cæſus ſit, at vero alienum omnino videtur à tanti principis bonitate & clementia ut cædis illius fuerit auctor (6). ——— *If this reaſon is of any weight in reſpect to Godeſcalcus, ſays Mabillon, why did Stephanus ſuppreſs that cauſe, who lived under the laſt kings of Charles's race? certainly, the fiction of Charles Martel's damnation was more odious, which nevertheleſs Hincmarus, archbiſhop of Rheims, Adrevaldus, and other authors, in the reign of Charles the Bald, great-grandſon of Martel, made no ſcruple to ſpread among the vulgar. Whence it ſeems altogether uncertain, whether Lambert was murthered for reproving Pepin on the account of whoredom; and it even ſeems quite inconſiſtent with the goodneſs and clemency of that prince, to have been the author of that murther.*' Father Jourdan, cited by Mr le Roi, makes no queſtion, but that Pepin married Alpaïde with all the uſual ceremonies, after he had divorced Plectrude. It is true, 'that the Chriſtian law forbad ſuch divorces and marriages; nevertheleſs, human laws permitted them at that time even among Chriſtians. Theſe ſecond marriages had nothing of ſhame or infamy in them (7).' This Hiſtorian obſerves (8), 'That Pepin and Alpaïde had been a long time parted, when Lambert was aſſaſſinated in the year 708. Alpaïde, *adds he*, had no hand in

(*a*) *In the article* ALPAÏDE.

(1) Jacobus le Roi, in Topogr. Hiſt. Gallorum, Brabant. lib. vii, cap. ii, pag. 250.

(2) Ibid. pag. 251, ex Carolo le Cointe Annal. Eccleſiaſt. Francorum, Tom. IV, pag. 476.

(3) Idem, le Roi, ibid.

(4) Sanctus Lambertus Pipinum Principem increpare auſus, quod pellicem Alpaïdem Plectrudi legitimæ uxori ſuæ ſuperduxerit, à Dodone fratre ipſius Alpaïdis Leodii martyrizatur. *Sigebertus, ad ann. Chriſti* 698. Quo mortem Sancti Lamberti male conſignat. *Jacobus le Roi, ubi ſupra, pag.* 251.

(5) Id. le Roi, ibid. pag. 252.

(6) Id. ibid.

(7) Jourdan. Hiſt. de France, & de la Maiſon Roiale, Tom. III, pag. 560, & ſeq. apud le Roi, ibid.

(8) Apud le Roi, ibid. pag. 253.

So many authors have written his Life, that it is diſfigured thereby [*B*]. I have only read that, which was printed at Liege in 1657, compoſed by the Sieur du Boſc de Montandré. The title of it is, *Le Courtiſan Chrétien*, &c. *The Chriſtian Courtier ſacrificed as a State Victim to the Paſſion of the Court: or St Lambert, biſhop of Tongres and Martyr, ſacrificed for the intereſts of Conjugal Honour.*

'in it, ſince ſhe was parted from Pepin at the beginning of the century, and retired into a monaſtery. '..... Ado was the firſt, who, 180 years after, 'imputed the death of that ſaint to Pepin and Alpaïde.' Hadrian Valeſius, cited by the ſame Mr le Roi, obſerves, that, notwithſtanding the canons, people married in thoſe days a ſecond wiſe, in the liſe-time of her that was divorced, and that Pepin made uſe of that cuſtom. He ſays however, that others maintain, that Pepin never divorced Plectrude, nor married Alpaïde, and that Beda favours this opinion. He is in the right to add, that it is probable, that out of flattery to Pepin's deſcendants, who reigned in France, Hiſtorians ſuppoſed, that Alpaïde was married (9).

(9) Certe haud parum ſimile veri eſt finxiſſe hoc in Principum ſuorum gratiam auctores, qui dominantibus Pippini poſteris ſcripſere, & Alpaïdem quæ viva Plectrude juſta & ligitima Pippini conjux eſſe non poterat, uxorem Pippini poſteriorem vocaviſſe, ne Carolus ex pellice ſuſceptus crederetur, ceu regio generi aliqua inde nota inureretur. *Hadr. Valeſius, Rerum Francicarum, Tom. III, lib. xxiii, pag.* 379, *apud le Roi, ibid.*

We find, in the ſupplement to Moreri's Dictionary, Mr Godeau's arguments againſt thoſe, who on this ſubject follow Sigebert's chronicle; but thoſe arguments do but create confuſion. One thing ſeems to me to be certain, that it is of no uſe as to the true cauſe of St Lambert's murther, to know whether Alpaïde was married in form, or whether ſhe remained a concubine; for ſince the church ſeverely condemned marriages contracted after a divorce, biſhop Lambert would not have failed to call Pepin's commerce with Alpaïde, a concubinage, though Pepin had married her. Thus, by ſuppoſing the marriage, their opinion, who ſay, that Pepin was cenſured, remains ſtill probable. And becauſe a prince's miſtreſs has generally more intereſt than a lawful wife, it is no ways neceſſary, that Alpaïde ſhould be married to Pepin, to apprehend, how ſhe could prevail with him to put the biſhop to death, who cenſured them. Father Jourdan's chronological reaſon is, in my opinion, the beſt that can be urged againſt Sigebert.

[*B*] *So many perſons have written his life, that it is diſfigured thereby.*] This is Father Mabillon's obſervation, which baron le Roi furniſhes me with. 'Sanctus Landebertus ...... plures habuit vitæ ſuæ 'ſcriptores, Godeſcalcum Diaconum Leodienſem ſupparem. Stephanum Epiſcopum Leodienſem ineunte 'ſæculo X. Anſelmum ejuſdem Eccleſiæ Canonicum 'medio ſæculo XI. Nicolaum itidem Canonicum, & 'Reinerum Monachum ſæculo XII. Denique Ægidium Aureæ Vallis Cænobitam medio ſæculo XIII. 'Felicior certe futurus ſi vel unicum eumque diligentem habuiſſet. At S. Landeberto, id quod pluribus ſanctis, accidit, ut dum auctores alius poſt alium ipſius res geſtas illuſtrare exornando amplificandove moliti ſunt; eas è contrario incertis ac fabuloſis 'narrationibus inepte obſcurarint atrocibuſque mendis 'fœdarint (10).——*The life of St Lambert has been 'written by ſeveral authors; Godeſcalcus, deacon of 'Liege; Stephanus, biſhop of Liege, in the beginning 'of the Xth Century; Anſelm, canon of the ſame 'church, in the middle of the XIth Century; Nicolaus 'likewiſe, a canon, and Renierus, a Monk, in the XIIth 'Century; laſtly, Ægidius, a Monk of the Golden 'Vale, in the middle of the XIIIth Century. It 'would have been certainly much better for St Lambert, had but one author, and he a careful one, written his life: but it has happened to him, as to many 'ſaints, that whilſt authors have ſucceſſively endeavoured to illuſtrate and ſet off their actions, they 'have unskillfully obſcured them with uncertain and 'fabulous accounts, and ſpoiled them by notorious miſtakes.'* This is the origin of ſo many impertinent falſhoods. The multitude of panegyrics and lives will always produce this effect: no body is contented with the wonders publiſhed by foregoing authors; they therefore invent new ones, much more in favour of the book, and it's author, than in favour of the hero, who makes the ſubject of the book.

(10) Mabillonius, in Commentario ad Vitam S. Lamberti, apud Baronem le Roi, ubi ſupra, pag. 251.

I muſt except the legendaries; for they have commonly more at heart the reputation of the ſaint, than any thing elſe; but the reaſon is, becauſe the greater it is, the more it will encreaſe the number of devotees, and pious charities. Here follows a fine paſſage of Ludovicus Vives, wherein he condemns the falſe zeal, which has ſtuffed the hiſtory of ſaints with ſo many fabulous ſtories. 'Quæ de iis ſunt 'ſcripta, præter pauca quædam, multis ſunt commentis fœdata, dum qui ſcribit affectui ſuo indulget, & non quæ egit divus, ſed quæ ille egiſſe eum 'vellet, exponit: ut vitam dictet animus ſcribentis 'non veritas. Fuere qui magnæ pietatis loco ducerent mendaciola pro religione confingere: quod & 'periculoſum eſt, ne veris adimatur fides propter falſa, '& minimè neceſſarium: quoniam pro pietate noſtra 'tam multa ſunt vera, ut falſa tanquàm ignavi milites atque inutiles oneri ſint magis, quàm auxilio (11). '——*The accounts of them, ſome few excepted, are 'full of fictions, whilſt the writer gives himſelf a 'ſcope, and ſets forth, not what the ſaint did, but 'what he would have had him done: inſomuch that 'the author's ſancy, not truth, dictates the life. Some 'have thought it great piety to lie a little for the 'ſake of religion: which is a dangerous thing (ſince 'what is falſe may deſtroy the credit of what is 'true,) and by no means neceſſary; ſince there are 'ſo many things true, that falſe accounts, like idle 'or uſeleſs ſoldiers, are rather a burthen than a 'help.'*

(11) Ludov. Vives, de Tradendis Diſciplin. lib. v, pag. m. 360 Vide etiam, lib. ii, pag. 90, 91.

LAMBERT (FRANCIS) a Franciſcan Monk, born at Avignon, was one of the firſt Monks in France, who renounced his order, to embrace Lutheraniſm. He arrived at Wittemberg in the month of January 1523 (*a*). He taught Divinity, and began by explaining there the prophet Hoſea. The Commentary he made on that prophet was printed at Straſburg in the year 1525, in 8vo. He dedicated it to Frederic duke of Saxony, and inſerted in his Epiſtle Dedicatory an account of the martyrdom of John Caſtellan, who had been burnt at Metz for having followed the Reformation. He added to the commentary on the fourth chapter of Hoſea a treatiſe *De arbitrio hominis vere captivo contra impios liberi arbitrii adſertores*. He had publiſhed in 1524 his commentary on the Song of Songs; and in dedicating it to Francis I, he obſerves that he had already ſent to that prince his treatiſe on marriage, *de ſacro & fideli Conjugio*, and that he had inſerted therein a letter, in which he acquaints him with his reaſons of abjuring Popery, and marrying (*b*): he publiſhed ſeveral other commentaries on the Scripture, and divers controverſial writings [*A*], which have been a long

(*a*) *See Seckendorf*, Hiſt. Lutheran. lib. ii, pag. 40.

(*b*) Ex Geſnero, Biblioth. fol. 249 *verſo*, & 250.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral other books.*] The Oxford catalogue contains the following: *Commentarii Evangelici in regulam Minoritarum, unde palam fit quid de Monachorum Regulis ſentiendum ſit in* 8vo. *Commentarii in Amos, Abdiam, Jonam, Micheam, Nahum, & Habacuc*, at Straſburg, 1525, in 8vo. *Farrago omnium fere rerum Theologicarum ſc. Paradoxa*, in 8vo. *De Fidelium vocatione in Eccleſiam & ad Miniſteria ejus, deque vocatione Mathiæ per ſortem*, in 8vo. *Exegeſis in Apocalypſin*, at Baſil, 1539, in 8vo. This edition of his Commentary on the *Revelations*, is not the firſt; for this is what Bullinger ſays: *Mr Francis Lambert, a man of learning and great piety, has taken great pains* on the Apocalypſe, *having publickly read that* a long time very little known. He was very much eſteemed by Luther [*B*]. I do not very well know when he left Wittemberg; but I believe it was in 1526, and I know that he ſettled at Marpurg, and that he was there profeſſor of Divinity, and that he died there the eighteenth of April, 1530 (*c*). He was one of the principal inſtruments employed by the Landgrave of Heſſe to introduce the Reformation in his dominions [*C*].

(*c*) Seckendorf, ubi ſupra, pag. 41. Freher, in Theatr. pag. 104.

that book in the famous univerſity of Marpurg, and afterwards compoſed and publiſhed ſeven books of expoſition, in the ſaid town, in the year 1528 (1). Geſner mentions a commentary of our Lambert on Joel, and on St Luke's Goſpel (2). The abridgment of Geſner ſpecifies, *Antithesis verbi Dei & inventorum Hominum. Confeſſio de Symbolo fœderis nunquam rumpendi quam communionem vocant, in qua ſpectari poteſt quid Marpurgenſi colloquio effectum ſit* (3). *De Prophetia, eruditione, linguis, deque litera, & ſpiritu. Commentarius de Cauſis excæcationis multorum ſæculorum. In Acta Apoſtolorum, & libros Regum. De cœlibatu regni filii perditionis. De differentia ſtimuli carnis & Satanæ nuncii.*

(1) Bullinger, preface to an hundred ſermons on the Revelations.

(2) Printed for the ſecond time, at Straſburg, 1525, in 8vo.

(3) Printed in 1530.

[*B*] *He was greatly eſteemed by Luther.*] That reformer ſpeaks of him in theſe terms, in a letter which he wrote to Spalatin: 'Adeſt Joannes ille Serranus vero nomine Franciſcus Lampertus, imaginibus quoque nobilis, inter Minoritas viginti annos verſatus, & generali verbi *(forte legendum eſt:* Generalis) (4) officio functus, ob perſecutionem exul, & pauper factus. De integritate viri nulla eſt dubitatio: teſtes ſunt apud nos, qui illum & in Francia & in Baſilea audierunt; tum Baſileenſis ſuffraganeus ille Tripolitanus, cum pellicano, dant illi pulchrum teſtimonium. Et quanquam nos abundemus Lectoribus optimis, tamen, ſi quid poterit, non abjiciemus: mihi per omnia placet vir, & ſatis ſpectatus mihi eſt, quantum homo ſpectari poteſt, ut dignus ſit quem in exilio paululum feramus & juvemus. Sed tu meam noſti facultatem, ut non ſit opis meæ illum alere, qui ipſe alienis vivo: videretur mihi Principi perſuadendum, ut jam non perdat, ſed in charitate Chriſto fœneret viginti aut triginta florenos, in eum collocandos, donec vel à ſuis tribulibus, vel proprio ſtipendio ſeſe ſuſtentet de labore ſuo (5). —— *Here is that Johannes Serranus, whoſe true name is Francis Lambert, of a noble family, who was twenty years a Franciſcan, and guardian of his order, but baniſhed by perſecution, and ſtripped of every thing. The honeſty of the man is unqueſtionable; we have here witneſſes of it, who heard him both in France and at Baſil; which teſtimony of his good character is confirmed by Tripolitanus, ſuffragan of Baſil, and Pellicanus. And though we abound in excellent lecturers, yet, if poſſible, we will not loſe him: I am thoroughly ſatisfied with the man, and think he deſerves to be aſſiſted. But you know my abilities, that it is not in my power to maintain him, who myſelf live upon alms. I think the prince ſhould be perſuaded to beſtow twenty or thirty florins on him (which would not be money thrown away, but lent to the Lord,) till he be ſupported by his relations, or maintain himſelf by his own induſtry.*' We learn from this paſſage, that our Lambert took the falſe name of *Johannes Serranus*, that he was of a noble family, that he had been a Franciſcan twenty years, that he had been in office in his order, that he had ſtaid ſome time at Baſil, and brought from thence a good teſtimonial of his probity. Luther (6) compoſed a preface to a book, which this Ex-Monk of Avignon publiſhed, *De Minoritarum Regula*. It appears by another letter of Luther, that this proſelyte, preparing to go to Zurich, to be nearer France, an attempt was made to procure him from the elector, the expences of his journey (7). If this letter of Luther was written to Spalatin in the month of Auguſt (8), 1523, we muſt believe, that Lambert changed his deſign, becauſe they gave him a poſt in the univerſity, and thus what Mr de Seckendorf adds, that he had neverthelеſs compoſed at Wittemberg, and dedicated to the elector, the expoſition of ſome of the prophets, and of the Song of Songs, and St Luke's Goſpel (9), would not be referred to it's true time, and there would be in it a *tamen* a little miſplaced. But it is probable, Luther wrote this in the month of Auguſt, 1526, whence we muſt conclude, that the *tamen* is very right, and that the journey to Zurich was put a ſtop to, becauſe Lambert was called into the country of Heſſe, as I am going to ſay.

(4) I ſhould think it ought to be read *Guardiani.*

(5) Luther. Epiſt. lib. ii, pag. 121, apud Seckendorf. Hiſt. Luther. lib. ii, pag. 40.

(6) See his Letters, lib. ii, pag. 128.

(7) Seckendorf, ubi ſupra.

(8) Seckendorf mentions this month, but does not ſay in what year.

(9) Scripſerat tamen Lampertus Wittembergæ & Electori dedicaverat, *teſte Chytræo, lib. xii, fol.* 346, Enarrationes in Prophetas aliquos, in Canticum Solomonis, & Hiſtor. Lucæ. *Id. ibid. Note, that he dedicated his Commentary on the Song of Solomon to Francis I; and that on St Luke to George Spalatin; ſo that Chytræus is miſtaken.*

[*C*] *He was one of the principal inſtruments employed by the landgrave to introduce the reformation in his dominions.*] He had been recommended to this prince as a man remarkable for his piety, wit, and learning, and able to confound and ſilence the Popiſh doctors. For this reaſon he deputed him to the ſynodical aſſembly, held at Hamburg, the twenty firſt of October, 1526. There Lambert expoſed to public diſputation, an hundred and fifty Lutheran propoſitions, and maintained them vigorouſly againſt the attacks of the guardian of the Franciſcans of Marpurg. The landgrave ſuffered every body to enter the liſts, and cauſed the reſpondent's theſes to be explained in German by his chancellor, when any one deſired it. After the diſpute, he ordered the Monks and Nuns to quit their convent; he appropriated their revenues to the ſupport of the univerſity of Marpurg, and of the hoſpitals; he ſettled Lutheran miniſters in the churches, and broke down the images. Lambert was choſen profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſity founded at Marpurg, in 1527 (10).

(10) Taken from Seckendorf, *ubi ſupra*, who cites Chytiæus. See alſo Paul Freher's *Theatrum, pag.* 104, and note, that, according to Freher, and ſeveral others, the univerſity of Marpurg was founded in 1526.

LAMECH, a deſcendant in a right line from Cain, was of the ſeventh generation, reckoning from Adam. The Holy Scripture (*a*) obſerves, that he had two wives, one whereof was called Adah, and the other Zillah, and it is believed, that this obſervation has a myſtery in it, ſince it ſerves to ſhew us the origin of Polygamy. It did not begin in the poſterity of Seth, who feared God, but in the corrupt and depraved poſterity of Cain, and by Lamech [*A*], who told his two wives, that he had killed a man. Such an origin, ſay they, muſt needs be ſcandalous. However it be, the marriage of this firſt tranſgreſſor of the law of Monogamy, eſtabliſhed in the terreſtrial paradiſe, did not bear the marks of reprobation, if we may judge of it by temporal bleſſings; for children proceeded from it, who had the skill of inventing

(*a*) Geneſis, chap. iv.

[*A*] *And by Lamech.*] The author of the *Polygamia Triumphatrix* was a very odd man; he ſpent his eſtate and his life in maintaining the lawfulneſs of Polygamy, and yet one wife would have been too much for him (1). He mightily commends Lamech's reſolution of marrying two wives (2), as an heroic action, and highly praiſes him, as being the firſt, who attentively examined that command of God, *encreaſe and multiply*, and who, having well conſidered it, made it his duty to obey it, according to the full extent of his ſtrength, by marrying two wives (3). No body durſt venture upon it before him; the remembrance of Eve's tranſgreſſion, and the conſideration of Adam's baniſhment, had made people timerous in that reſpect. Lamech was the firſt, who made that bold ſtep, with an heroic courage, without minding the difficulties that he was ſenſible of. He commented, not in words, but in actions, upon the text of the univerſal law, *encreaſe and multiply*; a law, which is a true commandment, and not a meer benediction (4). By this means he broke the ice, and gave a good example to thoſe that came after him. Obſerve here how this poor author was bigotted in favour of Polygamy; it was his darling notion; he thought that the Scripture mentions the double marriage of Lamech as an excellent exploit; whereas divines maintain with reaſon, that it was with a deſign to brand Polygamy in it's birth.

(1) *See the* Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres, April, 1685, art. i, & ii.

(2) Polygam. Triumph. pag. 188.

(3) Ibid. pag. 191.

(4) Ipſe autem inſuper habitis omnibus imminentibus & præconceptis difficultatibus heroico animo hoc primus auſus, & proprio facto verba legis catholicæ (creſcite & multiplicamini) non benedictoria tantum, ſed ſimul imperatoria, explanare, & bono exemplo omnibus ſuis poſteris præire voluit. Ibid.

venting many good things [*B*]. Now the inventers of arts were ſo much eſteemed, that moſt of them have been placed in the number of the gods. It was therefore a great glory, and conſequently a remarkable temporal bleſſing at that time, to have the wit that was neceſſary for invention; but it is no ſign, that God approved of Lamech's Polygamy. The ſcripture mentions only four of this man's children (*b*); but, according to Joſephus (*c*), he had ſeventy ſeven by his two wives. What he told his wives is a riddle to me [*C*]; I ingenuouſly confeſs, it is above my underſtanding. *I have ſlain a man*, ſaid he (*d*), *to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt; if Cain ſhall be avenged ſeven fold, truly Lamech ſeventy and ſeven fold.* Many pretend, that he meant he had killed Cain [*D*], and Tubal-Cain; for there is a common tradition, that Lamech, who had been a great lover of hunting, continued the ſport, even when by reaſon of his great age, he was almoſt blind (*e*). He took with him his ſon Tubal-Cain, who not only ſerved him as a guide (*f*), but alſo directed him, where and when he ought to ſhoot at the beaſt. One day, as Cain was laid among the thickets, Lamech's guide ſeeing ſomething move in that place, gave him notice of it; whereupon Lamech ſhot an arrow, and ſlew Cain. He was extreamly concerned at it, and beat his guide ſo much, as to leave him dead upon the place. This, ſay they, is the way to make ſenſe of his words, which run thus, according to the vulgar tranſlation, *Occidi virum in vulnus meum, & adoleſcentulum in livorem meum*; wherein he diſtinguiſhes his way of killing the man (it was by a wound) from his way of killing the young lad, which was by bruiſes, that made his body black and blue. There are a thouſand abſurdities

[*B*] *The ſkill of inventing many good things.*] Jabal and Jubal, the ſons of Adah, Tubal-Cain, and Naamah his ſiſter (5), whoſe mother was Zillah, are the four children of Lamech, that are mentioned in Scripture. Jabal invented tents; Jubal invented ſome muſical inſtruments: Tubal-Cain invented ſeveral inſtruments of braſs and iron. The holy ſcripture, which teaches us this, does not attribute any invention to Naamah; but, if we believe the Rabbins, ſhe invented the art of ſpinning and weaving (6).

[*C*] *What he ſaid to his wives is a riddle to me.*] It is no eaſy thing to know how the words of Lamech in the original ought to be tranſlated. The Geneva verſion makes uſe of the future tenſe, *I will ſlay*, and repreſents Lamech as a man, who was to receive a wound before he ſhould kill: but the Vulgar renders it, *I have ſlain*; and as for the wound, one cannot tell to whom it relates; for this phraſe, *Occidi virum in vulnus meum*, is a barbariſm, which means nothing in Latin, and may ſignify whatever we pleaſe, as ſoon as we depart from the rules of Grammar. Some interpreters, well skilled in the Hebrew language (7), tranſlate it neither by the preter-tenſe, nor by the future, but reduce it all to a conditional propoſition. *I would kill a man with a wound, and even a young man with a cudgel, or with my fiſt, if they would attack me.* Now what way is there of coming at the true conſtruction of a period, which is as much in the future as in the preter-tenſe, and as much in the optative as in the indicative mood. But though we could get clear of the matter in the grammatical ſenſe, we ſhould not be far advanced; it would ſtill remain to be conſidered, what Lamech meant, ſpeaking to his two wives; which is no little difficulty. Nothing ſeems more remote from probability than the thought of thoſe, who take all this to be a rodomontade of Lamech (8): others take it to be a menace that he would kill his wives, if they continued to vex him by their bawling and diſputes (9). But others, on the contrary, take it to be an interrogation, deſigned to remove their fears: they were afraid that ſome body would kill him: he bids them have a good heart. with theſe words, *Have I ſlain a man*, &c.

[*D*] *Many pretend, that he meant he had killed Cain.*] A commentator (10), otherwiſe a very judicious and learned man, is miſtaken here; for he thinks it is the moſt probable interpretation of Lamech's words. He brings two proofs for it. Firſt, ſays he, Cain's poſterity extended itſelf to the deluge, and yet Moſes confines it to Lamech and his ſons; of which doubtleſs there is no other reaſon than this, that Cain's Life ended in the generation of Lamech, who killed him. Second, ſays he, the only reaſon why Moſes has related the murther, committed by Lamech, is, to point out the miſerable death of Cain. I could confute theſe proofs ſeveral ways. but I ſhall only ſay, that Pererius ſuppoſes a thing, which has no probability, *viz.* that it was Moſes's intention to inform the world, that Lamech killed Cain. If he had had ſuch an intention, would he have left ſuch impenetrable darkneſs in the fourth chapter of Geneſis? Had the death of Cain any thing myſterious in it, which ought to have been involved in ſuch ænigmatical expreſſions? In truth, if it could be proved, that Moſes had a like intention, we ought to apply to him this verſe of the goſpel, *never man ſpake like this man* (11), and cry out, *tacui, Domine, quia feciſti*, I was ſilent, O Lord, becauſe it was thou that dideſt it. That would be unpardonable in an author not inſpired. For the reſt, I pretend not to oppoſe, in general, the thought of thoſe, who take for marks of inſpiration, in the relations of Moſes, certain ſingularities, which are of ſuch a nature, that it is not probable an author would ever have made uſe of them, if he had directed his own work (12).

[*E*] *There are a thouſand abſurdities in this ſtory, and the circumſtances that attend it.*] I. It is an ill-grounded ſuppoſition, to ſay, that Lamech was almoſt blind (13) with old age, whilſt Cain, his grandfather's grandfather, was ſtill alive. II. It is abſurd to make him go a hunting at an age ſo decrepit, that he could not ſee his game, and ſtood in need of a guide to tell him when he was to ſhoot an arrow. III. It is abſurd to ſuppoſe, that the reaſon, which induced him to talk in this manner to his wives, was their ill treatment of him at that great age; either becauſe they could not reſiſt his exceſſive laſciviouſneſs, or becauſe of the ill manners of his children (14). What probability is there, that, at ſo great an age, he could give occaſion to his two wives to complain of his too frequent careſſes? IV. It is abſurd to ſay, that, when Lamech had been guilty of this double murther, his wives refuſed to lie with him, as believing that the race of Cain was to come to an end, according to the oracle, after the ſeventh generation (15): this, I ſay, is abſurd; for God was ſo far from threatening Cain to deſtroy his deſcendants after the ſeventh generation, that he aſſured him, that *whoever ſhould kill him, ſhould be puniſhed ſevenfold*. It is ſtill more abſurd to ſay (16), that Lamech led his two wives to Adam, and that he deſired him to catechiſe them, upon their refuſal to lie with him, and that Adam, beginning to reprimand them, was interrupted in ſuch a manner, as put him to confuſion. *Does it become you*, ſaid they to him, *to teach us our duty? Let your cenſures fall firſt upon your ſelf, ſince for ſo many years you have lived apart from your wife's bed.* I omit the little conſiſtence there is between the age they make Lamech to be of, and his eagerneſs to make his two wives hearken to reaſon, with regard to matrimonial enjoyment. I do not ſay, that the pretended recrimination would have been better imagined, if Adam had cenſured Lamech at their requeſt, and upon the complaints of his two wives; but I ſay, that Adam and Eve's ſeparation from bed, after Abel's death, having laſted, according to the idle fancies of the Rabbins, but 130 years, it is abſurd to ſuppoſe, that Adam was reproached for it, as a thing that continued ſtill, when Cain was killed. Iſaac Voſſius has, upon this ſubject, confounded Lamech, who had two wives at one time, with

(*b*) See the remark [*B*].

(*c*) Antiq. lib. i, cap. ii.

(*d*) Geneſis, chap iv

(*e*) Vide Perer. in Geneſ. cap. iv, ver. 23. 24. Heidegg. Hiſt. Patriach. Tom. I, pag. 211.

(*f*) Others ſey, that his guide was one of his ſervants.

(5) Joſephus ſays, ſhe was the daughter of Tubal-Cain.

(6) Apud Genebrard, in Chron. & in margine verſionis Gallicæ Joſephi.

(7) Apud Rivetum. Oper. Tom. I, pag. 186.

(8) Vide Rivetum, ibid. pag. 187.

(9) Vide Heideg. Hiſtor. Patriarch. Tom. I, pag. 212.

(10) Pererius, in Geneſ. chap. iv, ver. 23, 24.

(11) John vii, 46.

(12) Nouv de la Rep. des Lettres, July, 1686, art. ii, *at the beginning.*

(13) *Some ſay he was quite blind. See* Polygamia Triumph. pag. 185.

(14) Hanc tradunt hiſtoriam, Lamechum in ſenectute male tractatum eſſe ab uxoribus, vel propter nimiam ejus libidinem atque laſciviam, vel propter truculenta filiorum ejus ingenia. *Pererius, ubi ſupra.*

(15) Gedalia, in Caten. Fab. & Hotting. Hiſt. Orient apud Lyſerum, Polyg. Triumph. pag. 192.

(16) Aben-Ezra, apud eumd.

abſurdities in this ſtory, and in the circumſtances that attend it [*E*]. Suidas will have Lamech to have killed two brothers of Enoch, and that he married their wives (*g*).

(*g*) Suidas, in voce Λάμεχ.

You will find a collection of many paſſages upon this in a theſis (*b*), that was maintained at Wittemberg in the year 1673, *ſub præſidio Jo. Wilhelmi Hilligeri.*

(*b*) De homicidio & vindicta Lamechi.

with Lamech the father of Noah. ‘Judæorum eſt fabella, *ſays he* (17), Lamechum de uxoribus conqueſtum eſſe apud Adamum, illum his juſſiſſe ut ad maritum reverterenter ac ſui facerent copiam. Iſtas reſpondiſſe Adamo ut ipſe prius ſuæ ſatisfaceret conjugi, à qua jam per centum & triginta annos propter ſcelus Caini eſſet ſeparatus. Verum quis adeo ſit hebes ut non videat narratiunculam hanc eſſe ineptiſſimam? Ex ea ſequeretur Lamechum qui à Setho ſeptimus fuit diu fuiſſe antequam Sethus naſceretur. —— *The Jews tell a ſtory, that Lamech complained of his wives to Adam, who commanded them to return to their husband, and obey him. That they replied to Adam, that he ſhould firſt make ſatisfaction to his own wife, from whom he had been ſeparated an hundred and thirty years, on account of Cain's wickedneſs. But who is ſo ſtupid, as not to ſee the folly of this tale? It would follow from thence, that Lamech, who was the ſeventh from Seth, lived long before Seth was born.*’ It is abſurd to ſuppoſe, that Tubal-Cain being yet a young lad, was killed by his own father; how could he have been the inventer of divers inſtruments of braſs, as the Scripture ſays he was? For the reſt, Joſephus ſays nothing of this pretended murther of Lamech; ſo that Toſtatus, who cites him for this old tradition (18), has erred through want of memory.

(17) Iſaac. Voſſ. Diſſert. de Ætate Mundi, cap. iv, pag. 14.

(18) Vide Pererium, ubi ſupra.

LAMECH, the ſon of Methuſelah, and father of Noah, was the ninth man from Adam incluſively (*a*). He lived 777 years. Iſaac Voſſius (*b*) complains, that Sigiſmund Gelenius has foiſted into the verſion of Joſephus a fact that is not in the Greek text of that Jewiſh hiſtorian, *viz.* that Adam was ſtill living in Lamech's time. This critic, in cenſuring this fault, has committed another; he has confounded Lamech, the father of Noah, with Lamech ſprung from Cain, as I have ſhewn in the laſt remark of the foregoing article.

(*a*) Geneſ ch. v.

(*b*) De vera Ætate Mundi, pag. 13, 14.

LAMIA, a Roman family. It was a branch of the houſe of the Ælii [*A*], into which probably it entered only by adoption; for it is ſaid to be deſcended from **LAMUS** (*a*) the ſon of Neptune, and king of the Læſtrygones, who lived in a town, which was afterwards called *Formiæ*. This is the opinion of Horace [*B*]. So antient a Genealogy as this, with which the Poet flatters his friend **ÆLIUS LAMIA**, is doubtleſs the reaſon why Juvenal, being willing to denote a lady of the firſt quality, made uſe of theſe words, *quædam de numero* LAMIARUM (*b*). It is very probable, that he, to whom Horace inſcribes the ſeventeenth ode of the third book, and whom he mentions, in ſeveral other places, with marks of eſteem, was the father of **LUCIUS ÆMILIUS LAMIA** (*c*), who died towards the end of the reign of Tiberius, in the 786th year of Rome, after he had been governor of Syria [*C*]; from whence he was recalled to be governor of Rome. He was honoured with the funeral rites of a cenſor (*d*). From him perhaps deſcended **ÆLIUS LAMIA**, the huſband of Domitia Longina, whom Domitian took from him. He put him to death ſome time after [*D*]. There was alſo one **LUCIUS ÆLIUS LAMIA**, who for having too zealouſly embraced Cicero's party againſt Piſo, was baniſhed. Afterwards he was made Ædile, and then Prætor, after the death of Cæſar, in the year of Rome 711. Some think it was he, who, being thought dead,

(*a*) Homer. *Odyſſ. lib.* x, *ver.* 81, mentions this Lamus, who, ſays he lived in a great town.

(*b*) Juven. Sat. VI, ver. 383.

(*c*) Glandorp, *Onomaſt. pag* 14, ſays, he is the ſame, who died in the year 786. He makes him live too long.

(*d*) See the remark [*C*], citat. (23).

[*A*] *It was a branch of the houſe of the Ælii.*] The Antonini, emperors of Rome, deſcended from that houſe; it contained ſeven or eight branches, that were all Plebeian; *viz.* the Cati, the Tuberones, the Galli, the Stilones, the Præconini, the Segani, and the Lamiæ (1). No one ſays, that the Ælii deſcended from Lamus king of the Læſtrygones; but this was ſaid of the Lamiæ; and therefore the latter muſt have entered by adoption into the family of the others.

[*B*] *This is the opinion of Horace.*] Theſe are his words (2):

Æli vetuſto nobilis ab Lamo,
Quando & priores hinc Lamias ferunt
  Denominatos, & nepotum
    Per memores genus omne faſtos:
Autore ab illo ducis originem
Qui Formiarum mœnia dicitur
  Princeps, & innantem Maricæ
    Littoribus tenuiſſe Lyrin
Late tyrannus.

Ælius, whoſe race from Lamus came,
Whence firſt aroſe the Lamian name;
From him your high deſcent you prize,
Who bade the walls of Formiæ riſe;
Who wat'ry Lyris taught t' obey,
And rul'd with wide-extended ſway.

The antient Romans were as ridiculous in point of Genealogy, as people are at preſent. How many families did they not ſay deſcended from a companion of Hercules, or ſome other perſon of the fabulous ages? Silius Italicus believed, that Lamus had reigned in Cajeta (3). See Bochart's Geographia Sacra (4).

[*C*] *LUCIUS ÆLIUS LAMIA .... governor of Syria.*] He had only the title of it, and did not keep it long; the injuſtice done him upon that occaſion proved glorious to him. ‘Extremo anni mors Ælii Lamiæ funere cenſorio celebrata, qui adminiſtrandæ Suriæ imagine tandem exſolutus urbi præfuerat. Genus illi decorum, vivida ſenectus; & non permiſſa provincia dignationem addiderat (5). —— *At the end of the year, the death of Ælius Lamia was honoured with ſuch funeral rites, as belonged to the dignity of cenſor; who, having laid down his imaginary government of Syria, was made Præfect of the city. He was of an honourable family: enjoyed a vigorous old age; and the not permitting him to enjoy the province turned to his honour.*’ He had commanded in Africa (6).

[*D*] *ÆLIUS LAMIA ..... Domitian put him to death ſome time after.*] I ſpeak of it in the article of **DOMITIA LONGINA**, where I cite the neceſſary authorities. Juvenal alludes to the death of this Lamia in the fourth ſatire.

Sed periit poſtquam Cerdonibus eſſe timendus
Cœperat, hoc nocuit Lamiarum cæde madenti (7).

Soon as the dread of Coblers he became,
Tho' wet with ſlaughter of the Lamian name,
He met his fate.

[1] See Glandorp. Onomaſt. pag. 10, & ſeq.

[2] Ode xvii, lib. iii, init.

(3) Et regnata Lamo Cajeta. *Sil Ital. lib. viii, ver* 530. See Dauſqueius's notes.

(4) Lib. i, cap. xxxiii.

(5) Tacit. Ann. lib. vi, cap xxvii, ad ann. 786.

(6) Id. lib. iv, cap. xiii.

(7) Juven. Sat. IV, in fine.

dead, ſo that fire was put to his funeral pile, recovered his ſenſes by the action of the fire [*E*]. Conſult Streinnius's Roman families, and Glandorp's *Onomaſticon* (*e*).

[*E*] *LUCIUS ÆLIUS LAMIA . . . . being thought a dead man . . . . recovered his ſenſes by the action of the fire.*] See what Valerius Maximus ſays of it: ‘ L. quoque Lamiæ prætorio viro æquè ‘ vocem fuiſſe ſuper rogum conſtitit (8). —— *L. La-* ‘ *mia likewiſe, of Prætorian dignity, was found to be* ‘ *alive, when on the funeral pile.*’ Pliny alſo makes mention of it (9).

LAMIA, a town of Theſſaly. It is chiefly memorable for the battle that was fought, in it's territory, between the Athenians, aſſiſted by the other Greeks, and Antipater, governor of Macedonia. It was after the death of Alexander. The ſucceſs of that battle was very fatal to the Athenians, and to ſeveral other towns of Greece (*a*). Suidas is miſtaken in ſaying, that Antipater loſt the battle (*b*).

LAMIA, the daughter of Neptune. The Greeks ſaid, that the Africans named her Sibylla; that ſhe was the firſt woman that propheſied; and that Jupiter had a daughter by her, named Herophyle, who was one of the Sibyls (*a*). Others ſay, that Lamia was a handſome African woman [*A*], by whom Jupiter had ſome children, and that Juno deſtroyed them all out of jealouſy; which threw the mother into ſuch a furious grief, that ſhe not only became ugly, but alſo ſo cruel, as to ſteal away children, and killed them (*b*). Hence doubtleſs came the popular tradition, which the Poets adopted upon the ſtage [*B*]. Lamia, or the **LAMIÆ**, were ſpoken of under another notion; for it was ſaid, that they could lay aſide their eyes, and reſume them when they thought fit. They took them out in their own houſes, and put them in again, when they went abroad. It is the emblem of curioſity and ſelf-love [*C*]. Philoſtratus repreſents them as very laſcivious [*D*]. I know not whether the fiſh **LAMIA** [*E*] had it's name from what the fables ſaid of the Lamiæ, or whether the latter owed their name to that fiſh. Moreri's faults are not conſiderable [*F*].

[*A*] *Several ſay, ſhe was a handſome African woman.*] Many authors agree in making Lamia a native of Africa. Doris, or Duris (1), does it; and ſo does Heſychius. Ariſtophanes's Scholiaſt (2) ſays, that ſhe was the daughter of Belus and Libya. Conſider this paſſage of Euripides.

Τὶς τοὔνομα τὸ ἐπονείδιστον βροτοῖς
Οὐκ οἶδε Λαμίας τῆς Λιβυστικῆς γένος;

Quis Africanæ neſciat Lamiæ genus
Infame nomen & tetrum mortalibus (3)?

Who knows not Lamia, thy deteſted race,
Moſt infamous, and Africa's diſgrace?

Diodorus Siculus relates, that Ophellas, king of Cyrene, going to meet Agathocles, who made war with the Carthaginians, found a cavern, wherein it was ſaid, that queen Lamia was born (4). Bochart (5) thinks, that the name Lamia is derived from the Punic word *labam*, or *labama*, which ſignifies ſtill, among the Arabians, *to devour*.

[*B*] *The popular tradition, which the Poets adopted upon the ſtage.*] It is upon this that Horace gives them good advice.

Ficta voluptatis cauſa ſint proxima veris,
Nec quodcumque volet, poſcat ſibi fabula credi,
Neu pranſæ Lamiæ vivum puerum extrahat alvo (6).

Fiction ſhou'd ſtill the ſemblance bear of truth:
Thus, ſhou'd unnatural Lamia eat a child,
And then diſgorge, alive, the human meal,
The tale improbable wou'd ſhock belief.

Philoſtratus ſays, that the Lamiæ were fond of human fleſh (7). Among the old womens ſtories, in ſome countries, there are many, in which fairies are mentioned, as great eaters of children.

[*C*] *It is the emblem of curioſity and ſelf-love.*] Conſult Plutarch (8), who ſays, that like Lamia, who was blind at home, and, when ſhe went out, took her eyes out of a box, in which ſhe kept them, every man is very intent upon the faults of his neighbour, but makes no uſe of his eyes to diſcover his own vices.

[*D*] *Philoſtratus repreſents them as very laſcivious.*] He ſays (9), that, out of a principle of leudneſs, they enticed the men, whom they deſired to devour, in a proper time and place; and that they eſpecially delighted to eat handſome boys, when they were grown fat and plump. It was not eaſy methinks, to grow fat in the ſervice of thoſe laſcivious creatures. Philoſtratus ſhould have thought of this difficulty. Perhaps one might apply to the preſent ſubject, the explication, which ſome have given of the fable of Diomedes king of Thrace, who fed his mares with the fleſh of his gueſts. The meaning of which is, according to ſome, that he forced them to ſatisfy the luſt of his daughters, till they had nothing left but ſkin and bones. ‘ Diomedes Thraciæ Rex cùm aliquot haberet filias ſalaciſſimas, cogebat hoſpites ut earum libidinem ſatiarent; dictus ob id equas humanis carnibus paſcere; equa enim & mulier ſolæ animalium appetunt marem etiam prægnantes, unde equiendi vocabulum, ut ait Ariſtoteles *, trahitur maledicto in fœminas procaces: comedunt verò carnes humanas, cùm viros exſugunt, & coitu emaciatos ad tabem perducunt; ut recte Solomon † à mulierum conſuetudine revocet adoleſcentes, ne fruſtrà gemere incipiant, poſteaquàm carnes ſuas conſumpſerint (10). —— *Diomedes king of Thrace, having ſome very leud daughters, obliged his gueſts to ſatiſfy their luſt; whence he was ſaid to feed his mares with human fleſh; for a mare, and a woman, are the only animals, who deſire the male, when pregnant; whence, according to Ariſtotle, leud women are ſaid, by way of reproach,* equire, to play the mare: *and they devour human fleſh, when they drain men, and waſte them away through copulation; ſo that Solomon rightly diſſuades young men from the company of women, leſt they begin to lament in vain, after they have conſumed their fleſh.*’

[*E*] *The fiſh LAMIA.*] It is a fiſh of a prodigious bulk and voracity. Some times the whole body of a man has been found in it's belly. See Mr Ray in his Hiſtory of Fiſhes, and the following remark, wherein I cenſure Calepin.

[*F*] *Moreri's faults are not conſiderable.*] I. Phavorinus, who is a modern author (11) ſhould not have been cited. II. Much leſs ought he to be cited before Suidas. III. Inſtead of ſaying, that the antients gave the Lamiæ the name of Lares, he ſhould have ſaid Larvæ. IV. He ought not to have cited Rhodiginus, but Philoſtratus, from whom he took all that he has ſaid of the Lamiæ (12). V. He ſhould however have cited the twenty ninth, and not the forty ninth book; for his *Antiquæ Lectiones* contain only thirty books. VI. He ſhould not have cited Pliny, ſince he has ſaid nothing of the fiſh he calls Lamia (13); and yet Moreri wanted an author, who had conſidered the Lamiæ as *extraordinary fiſhes*. This puts me in mind of a falſe citation, that I have obſerved in Calepin: Pliny is cited there, Lib. 29. Cap. 24. immediately after theſe words; ‘ Lamia item ‘ piſcis eſt (unde & Lamiarum ſtrigum nomen, quod ‘ ut

---

(*e*) Pag. 14, & ſeq.

(8) Val. Maxim. lib. i, cap viii. Rom. xii.

(9) Plinius, lib. vii, cap lii.

(*a*) Diodorus Siculus, lib. xviii. Pauſanias, lib. vii, pag. 215.

(*b*) Suidas, in Λάμια.

(*a*) Pauſanias, lib. x, pag. 327.

(*b*) Suidas, in Λάμια. *See what Aſpaſius* in Ariſt. de Morib. lib. vii, cap. v, *ſays of a Lamia in Pontus.*

(1) In Suidas, in voce Λάμια.

(2) In Pacem.

(3) Euripides, apud Bochart. Geograph Sacr. lib. i, cap. xxxiii.

(4) Ἄντρον εὐμέγεθες, κιττῷ καὶ σμίλακι συνηρεφὲς ἐν ᾧ μυθεύουσι γεγονέναι βασίλισσαν Λαμίαν. Vaſtum antrum hedera & taxo conſitum, in quo Reginam Lamiam natam eſſe fabulantur. *Diod. Siculus, lib. xx, apud Bochart. ibid.*

(5) Ibid.

(6) Horat. de Arte Poët. ver. 338.

(7) Σαρκῶν καὶ μάλιστα ἀνθρωπείων ἐρᾷν. Carnes appetere humanas imprimis. *Philoſtrat. in Vita Apollon. lib. iv.*

(8) Plut. de Curioſitate, init. pag. m. 515, 516.

(9) Ubi ſupra.

* Ariſtot. de Gener. Animal. lib. iv, cap v. Idem, Hiſt. Animal. lib. vi, cap. xviii.

† Prov. v, 11.

(10) Balthaſar Bonifacius, Hiſt. ludicra, lib. v, cap. ii, pag. m. 125.

(11) He publiſhed his Dictionary in the year 1523.

(12) Lloyd and Hofman ſeem to have been ignorant of this.

(13) Father Hardouin, *in hunc locum Plinii, lib ix, cap. xxiv,* thinks it is a kind of ray.

‘ ut Lamiæ ſint voraciſſimæ, à λαιμὸς guttur) tanto ‘ oris rictu tantæque voracitatis ut & loricatum hominem devoraſſe compertus ſit. Itaque de hoc intelligunt qui Jonam deglutierit. ——— *The Lamia, likewiſe, is a fiſh, of ſo wide a mouth, and ſo voracious, that it has been found to have devoured an armed man. This they tell you is the fiſh that ſwallowed Jonab.*’ Pliny ſays not a ſyllable of all this; however the ninth book ſhould have been quoted, and not the twenty ninth.

LAMIA, a celebrated courtezan, the daughter of an Athenian, named Cleanor (*a*). From a player on the flute, which was her profeſſion, ſhe became the concubine of Ptolemy I, king of Egypt; but, before that, ſhe had made her ſelf famous as a woman of pleaſure [*A*]. She was taken, with ſeveral of her companions, in the ſea-fight, wherein Demetrius Poliorcetes obtained the victory over that prince, near the iſle of Cyprus (*b*). Being brought to Demetrius, ſhe appeared ſo charming to him, though ſhe began to decline [*B*], that ſhe was afterwards his favourite miſtreſs. For this reaſon it was ſaid, that the others loved him, but that he loved her. He was jeſted upon on this account [*C*]. He ſo loaded her with riches, that ſhe found herſelf in a capacity of living at a very expenſive rate [*D*]. She was excellent at witty ſayings and repartees

[*A*] *She had made herſelf famous as a woman of pleaſure.*] Plutarch affirms it. Theſe are his words; Ἐν δὲ τούτοις ἡ περιβόητος ἦν Λάμεια, τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν σπουδασθεῖσα διὰ τὴν τέχνην, (ἐδόκει γὰρ αὐλεῖν οὐκ εὐκαταφρονήτως) ὕστερον δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς λαμπρὰ γενομένη. In his nobilis illa fuit Lamia, quæ initio propter artem fuit in pretio habita. Siquidem ſcienter tibia canebat. Poſt extitit commercio meretricio celebris (1), ——— *Among theſe, was that famous Lamia, who was at firſt eſteemed as an artiſt; for ſhe played skillfully on the flute. She afterwards became a famous courtezan.* When a woman is paid for ſinging, dancing, or playing upon inſtruments; I mean, when ſhe makes a trade of it on the ſtage, or in ſolemn aſſemblies, it is the high-way to debauchery. No wonder then, if our Lamia, from a player on the flute, became a courtezan. The tranſition is very natural.

[*B*] *She appeared charming to Demetrius, though ſhe began to decline.*] I ſhould have uſed more proper terms, to repreſent her old, if I had only conſulted Plutarch; but having read in Athenæus, that ſhe had a daughter by Demetrius (2), I thought the expreſſions were to be ſoftned. Theſe are the words of Plutarch: Τότε γοῦν ἤδη λήγουσα τῆς ὥρας, καὶ πολὺ νεώτερον ἑαυτῆς λαβοῦσα τὸν Δημήτριον, ἐκράτησε τῇ χάριτι καὶ κατέσχεν’ ὥστε ἐκείνης εἶναι μόνης ἐραστὴν τῶν δὲ ἄλλων γυναικῶν ἐρώμενον. Tunc verò etiam exoleſcente forma multo ſe minorem pellexit Demetrium, adeoque lepore devinxit & cepit eum, ut ab aliis mulieribus amaretur, unius illius eſſet amator (3). *At that time, tho’ in the decline of her beauty, ſhe enſnared Demetrius, who was much younger than herſelf, and ſo captivated him, that, tho’ beloved by other women he loved only her.* I ſhall ſet down another paſſage below (4), that is no leſs expreſs. It is commonly ſaid, that, in families, love deſcends much more than it aſcends; fathers love their children, more than children love their fathers. The ſame thing may be ſaid of the love of men to women; the men are commonly older than the women they love. But this rule admits of many exceptions, and even in royal families: witneſs the Dauphin, who fell in love with an old widow, under the reign of Francis I. I mention it in the article of DIANA of POITIERS. We ſee here a young king led captive by a woman much older than himſelf. Nor need we wonder at it, ſince an old courtezan, with ſome remains of beauty, ſupported with art and cunning, may ſtrongly captivate a young man. However it be, if Demetrius found great charms in Lamia, the firſt time he ſaw her, ſhe appeared no leſs charming to him in the privacies they had together: Φησὶ δὲ τὴν Λαμίαν τὸν βασιλέ’ εὐμελῶς κελητίσαι ἰπερεπαινεθῆναιθ’. *Idem ait Demetrium ab incubante Lamia concinne ſuaviterque ſubagitatum fuiſſe, & idcirco eam laudaſſe* (5). It was not only her agility, that made her ſo charming to Demetrius ſhe gave him amorous bites (6), which probably pleaſed that prince, as much as his paſſion for her diſpleaſed his friends. They could not diſſemble it; for, when his embaſſadors ſaw the ſcars, which Lyſimachus ſhewed them in his thighs and arms, they anſwered him that the king their maſter had ſome alſo in his neck, which were the effect of the teeth of the furious beaſt Lamia. We muſt know, that Lyſimachus had fought with a lyon, and ſhewed them the marks of the wounds he had received in that fight. The words of the original have more grace than the ſubſtance I give of them. Ἀφίκοντο γοῦν τινες παρ’ αὐτῷ κατὰ πρεσβείαν πρὸς Λυσίμαχον, οἷς ἐκεῖνος ἄγων σχολὴν ἐπέδειξεν ἔν τε τοῖς μηροῖς, καὶ τοῖς βραχίοσιν ὠτειλὰς βαθείας ὀνύχων λεοντείων. καὶ διηγεῖτο τὴν γενομένην αὐτῷ μάχην πρὸς τὸ θηρίον, ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου συγκαθειρχθέντι τοῦ βασιλέως. οἱ δὲ, γελῶντες ἔφασαν, καὶ τὸν αὐτῶν βασιλέα δεινοῦ θηρίου δήγματα φέρειν ἐν τῷ τραχήλῳ Λαμίας. Venerunt ad Lyſimachum aliqui ab Demetrio legati, quibus ille per otium altas in cruribus & brachiis ſuis leoninorum unguium cicatrices oſtendit, expoſuitque ſuam cum leone pugnam, quam ab Alexandro rege cum illo concluſus conſeruerat. Illi in riſum effuſi ſuum quoque regem prædicaverunt immanis feræ in collo ferre morſus Lamiæ (7). —— *There came to Lyſimachus certain embaſſadors from Demetrius, to whom he took an opportunity of ſhewing the deep ſcars in his legs and arms, which he had received in fighting with a lion, with whom, by Alexander's command, he had been ſhut up. They falling into laughter, ſaid, that their maſter could ſhew likewiſe the bites of a great beaſt, called Lamia, on his neck.*

[*C*] *He was jeſted upon on that account.*] People wondered to ſee Demetrius, who took a diſlike to his wiſe Phila, becauſe ſhe began to decline, become ſuch a ſlave to Lamia, who was already in decay (8). He one day asked Demo, what ſhe thought of Lamia, who was playing on the flute while they dined. *She is an old woman*, ſaid Demo. When the deſert was brought in, *You ſee*, ſaid he to Demo, *how many things Lamia ſends me. My mother*, anſwered Demo, *will ſend you more, if you will alſo lie with her* (9). Note, that ſhe was a courtezan, who had been concubine to Antigonus, Demetrius's father, and who was afterwards loved by Demetrius (10). Plutarch ſays ſhe was ſirnamed Mania; but Athenæus (11) ſpeaks of Demo and Mania, as being two diſtinct courtezans. There aroſe a violent hatred betwixt Lyſimachus and Demetrius, which gave Lyſimachus occaſion to reflect upon Demetrius's fondneſs for Lamia. She is, ſaid he, the firſt courtezan, that I ever ſaw taken from the ſtage. Demetrius anſwered, I will have him to know, that my whore is more honeſt than his Penelope (12). James Amiot has not underſtood this: he makes Lyſimachus ſay, *hitherto I have never ſeen a whore play in a tragedy.* Plutarch's words do not mean this. Λυσίμαχος λοιδορῶν εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα τῆς Λαμείας ἔλεγε νῦν πρῶτον ἑωρακέναι πόρνην προερχομένον ἐκ τραγικῆς σκηνῆς. *Lyſimachus inſectans eum ob Lamiæ amores, dictitabat nunc primum ſcortum ſe ex tragica prodiens* (13) *ſcena vidiſſe.* The beſt verſion would not clear this thought of Lyſimachus, if we were ignorant of a thing related by Athenæus (14); namely, that Demetrius had ſaid, that Lyſimachus's court reſembled a comic ſtage; none come out of, but ſuch as have only two ſyllables in their names. Thus he laughed at one Bithes, one Paris and ſome others, whoſe names were no longer, and who were Lyſimachus's chief favourites. When Lyſimachus heard this jeſt, he only anſwered, that he never ſaw at his court a whore taken from a tragic ſtage. He alluded to Lamia, who was a player on the flute (15), and conſequently of a profeſſion uſed in the acting of tragedies.

[*D*] *She found herſelf in a capacity to live expenſively.*] It is common for the miſtreſſes of kings to be fond of immortalizing their names by magnificent buildings. Lamia was of this humour; ſhe cauſed

(*a*) Polemo, apud Athenæum, lib. xiii, pag. 577.

(*b*) Plut. in Demetrio, pag. 895, E.

(1) Plut. in Demetrio, pag. 895. E.

(2) Δημήτριος δ’ ὁ Πολιορκητὴς οὐ δαιμονίως ἦρα Λαμίας τῆς αὐλητρίδος, ἐξ ἧς ἔσχε καὶ θυγατέρα Φίλαν. Demetrius Poliorcetes (*and not* Phalereus, *as it is in Athenæus's tranſlation*) Lamiam tibicinem amavit perditiſſime, ex eaque gnatam Philam ſuſcepit. *Athen. lib. xiii, pag.* 577.

(3) Plut. in Demetr. pag. 895. F.

(4) *In the remark* [*C*].

(5) Machon, apud Athen. ubi ſupra.

(6) *See, above, remark* [*A*] *of the article of the ſecond* **FLORA.**

(7) Plut. in Demetr. p. 901.

(8) Ἦν δὲ θαυμαστὸν ὅτι τῆς Φίλλας ἐν ἀρχῇ τὸ μὴ καθ’ ἡλικίαν δυσχεραίνων ἡττῆτο τῆς Λαμίας, καὶ τοσοῦτον ἤρα χρόνον ἤδη παρηκμακυίας. Mirum fuit eum qui Philæ deſtoreſcente ætate offenſus fuerat initio, ſuccubuiſſe Lamiæ, & tandiu jam vergentem annis dilexiſſe. *Id. ibid.*

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 578.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Σωφρονεστέραν εἶναι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόρνην τῆς ἐκείνου Πηνελόπης. Caſtius jactavit illius Penelope ſuum eſſe ſcortum. *Plut. ibid. pag.* 900. D.

(13) *There is* Prodeuntem *in Plutarch's tranſlation, which is a ſolœciſm, or a falſity.*

(14) Athen. lib. xiv, pag. 614.

(15) Τὴν αὐλητρίδα Λαμίαν λέγων. Innuens Lamiam tibicinam. *Id. ibid.*

tees [*E*]; and, as the Athenians carried their flatteries of Demetrius to the moſt extravagant impieties, they built a temple to this concubine, under the name of VENUS LAMIA [*F*], though, on a certain occaſion, they were very much diſcontented to ſee their money beſtowed upon this woman [*G*]. The Thebans committed the ſame impiety (*c*). The ſtory we read, in Athenæus, concerning Demetrius and Lamia, is not fit to be mentioned in a modern language [*H*]. I queſtion whether Ælian has exactly related what he ſays of theſe two perſons [*I*]. Plutarch tells us how Lamia animadverted on a judgment paſſed upon love matters [*K*]. What I have ſaid againſt Antony de Guevara about Lais, I repeat on the account of Lamia. He has publiſhed as many lies about the one, as about the other. Brantome has been impoſed upon by it [*L*]. Moreri is very ſhort upon this head; and therefore I have not

cauſed a moſt noble portico to be built in Sicyon, of which an author (16) publiſhed a deſcription. She one day gave a very magnificent entertainment to Demetrius. There was a book upon this ſubject (17). Χωρὶς δὲ τούτων αὐτὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἡ Λαμία τῷ βασιλεῖ παρασκευάζουσα δεῖπνον, ἠργυρολόγησε πολλούς. καὶ τὸ δεῖπνον, οὕτως ἤνθησε τῇ δόξῃ διὰ τὴν πολυτέλειαν, ὥστε ὑπὸ Λυγκέως τοῦ Σαμίου συγγεγράφθαι. δι' ὃ καὶ τῶν κωμικῶν τις οὐ φαύλως τὴν Λαμίαν Ἐλέπολιν ἀληθῶς προσεῖπε. *Præter hæc ipſa ſeorſum Lamia cœnam regi parans, à multis pecuniam conciliavit, atque ob immenſos ſumptus uſque adeo fuit illa celebrata cœna, ut eam Lynceus Samius mandaverit literis. Quamobrem Lamiam comicus quidam appoſite veram Helepolim vocavit* (18). Plutarch had been ſpeaking of the great ſums, which Demetrius had obliged the Athenians to give to Lamia (19); and he adds, that this woman beſides made many perſons give her money for the feaſt ſhe prepared for Demetrius.

[*E*] *She was excellent at witty ſayings and repartees.*] Athenæus ſays ſo. Ἦν δὲ, ſays he (20), Λαμία σφόδρα εὔθικτος καὶ ἀττικὴ πρὸς τὰς ἀποκρίσεις. Fuit quidem certe Lamia dicteriis ſalſa & acuta, prorſuſque in reſpondendo Athenienſis. —— *Lamia certainly had a keen wit, and was a perfect Athenian at a repartee.*

[*F*] *The Athenians . . . . . . built a temple to this concubine under the name of VENUS LAMIA.*] They built another to Leæna, concubine to the ſame Demetrius (21), and paid the ſame honour to the favourites of this prince. Altars, libations, and hymns, were not wanting. Demetrius was ſo ſurprized at it, that he openly ſaid, that there was then no citizen in Athens, that had any courage. His thought has been miſerably disfigured by Athenæus's tranſlator. He makes him ſay, that there would never be in hell an Athenian of a great ſpirit: *Admirante ipſo Demetrio quæ tum fierent, palamque dicente apud inferos nullum unquam futurum magni excelſique animi civem Athenienſem.* One letter, put in the room of two others (22), has occaſioned the prodigious change of this thought. Theſe are Athenæus's words: Ὥστε καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Δημήτριον θαυμάζειν ἐπὶ τοῖς γενομένοις, καὶ λέγειν ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ Ἀθηναίων γέγονε μέγας καὶ ἁδρὸς τὴν ψυχήν. This reflexion of Demetrius puts me in mind of an exclamation of Tiberius, ‘ Memoriæ proditur Tiberium, quotiens curia ‘ egrederetur, Græcis verbis in hunc modum eloqui ‘ ſolitum, *ô homines ad ſervitutem paratos?* Scilicet ‘ etiam illum, qui libertatem publicam nollet, tam ‘ projectæ ſervientium patientiæ tædebat (23). —— *It ‘ is related of Tiberius, that, as often as he went out ‘ of his palace, he uſed to expreſs himſelf in Greek ‘ words to this purpoſe*; O men prepared for ſlavery? ‘ *Even he, who was an enemy to the public liberty, ‘ was weary of ſuch ſervile patience.*’

[*G*] . . . . *tho' they were . . . diſcontented to ſee their money beſtowed upon this woman.*] Amongſt many violences, which the Athenians ſuffered from Demetrius, nothing vexed them more than the order he gave, that they ſhould pay him immediately 250 talents. He cauſed this tax to be raiſed with great rigour, and precipitation; and when the money was ready, he commanded them to pay it in to Lamia, and the other courtezans ſhe had in her train; this is, ſaid he, to buy them ſoap. Theſe words, and this uſe, was a greater vexation to the Athenians, than the loſs of their money. Ἰδὼν ἠθροισμένον τὸ ἀργύριον, ἐκέλευσε Λαμίᾳ καὶ ταῖς περὶ αὐτὴν ἑταίραις εἰς σμῆγμα δοθῆναι· ἡ γὰρ αἰσχύνη, τῆς ζημίας καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ πράγματος μᾶλλον ἠνώχλησε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. *Ubi coactum argentum vidit, Lamiæ juſſit id, cæteriſque meretricibus quæ circa eam erant, ad ſmegma præberi. Pupugit enim cives pudor magis quam jactura, & verba, quibus eſt uſus quam exactio* (24). At preſent we ſhould ſay pin-money, inſtead of ſoap. See the margin (25).

[*H*] *The ſtory, which we read in Athenæus, concerning Demetrius and Lamia, are not fit to be mentioned in a modern language.*] Judge of it by this Latin; ‘ De ‘ Lamia rurſum Machon hæc ſcribit, Demetrium aliquando inter pocula, varia genera unguentorum oſtentantem Lamiæ tibicinæ, ut illa non ita jucundè ‘ olere dixit, non nihil commotum & tanquam vellicatum, quòd improbans omnia petulantiùs illuderet, innuiſſe ut Nardinum quoddam afferretur, & ‘ cùm pudendum manu confricuiſſet, ac digitis contrectaſſet, dixiſſe, hoc Lamia olfacita, quantum à ‘ reliquis diſtet, cognoſces: illam verò ſubridentem reſpondiſſe, atque, ô miſer, omnium longè putidiſſimum ‘ hoc eſſe mihi videtur: regemque mox ſubjeciſſe, ‘ è regia tamen glande per Jovem eſt, ô Lamia (26).

[*I*] *I know not, whether Ælian has exactly related what he ſays of theſe two perſons.*] Demetrius, ſays he (27), who reigned over ſo many nations, went often in his arms, and with his diadem on his head to the courtezan Lamia. He would have very much diſgraced himſelf, if he had ſent for her; but he went very carefully to her houſe. I make leſs account of this prince, than of Theodorus the piper, who rejected Lamia's intreaties to viſit her. This is the ſtory of that author: which I cannot but ſuſpect; for Demetrius never ſaw Lamia, till ſhe was preſented to him, after the naval victory he obtained over the king of Egypt. Lamia was no longer a common woman; ſhe belonged to the king. If it be ſaid, that, after ſhe belonged to Demetrius, ſhe had her houſe a-part, and that therefore it is very poſſible, that Demetrius might be ſeen to viſit her; I anſwer, that he would not have gone to her as to a public courtezan, but as to a miſtreſs, whom he believed to be ſolely at his pleaſure, and whom he had enabled to have a fine houſe of her own. If it be ſo, Ælian's cenſure comes to nothing; for when once a prince is engaged in public concubinage, it is the ſame thing whether he goes to his miſtreſs, or ſhe comes to him: nay, it is more ſcandalous to ſee her lodged in his palace, than in a houſe of her own. I am perſuaded, that Lamia had her lodgings with Demetrius; and, if ſhe had not, Demetrius went not to ſee her, as a courtezan, who opened her doors to all comers. And yet this is Ælian's ſuppoſition, upon which he builds the morality of this chapter.

[*K*] *Lamia animadverted on a judgment paſſed on matters of love.*] The fact is this: Thonis (28), an Egyptian courtezan, had demanded a great ſum of a young man, who loved her: whereupon the bargain broke off; and the lover withdrew *re infecta*. He dreamed in the night, that he lay with that woman, which cured his paſſion. Thonis, underſtanding the whole myſtery, pretended, that the young man ought to pay her, and ſummoned him before the judges. Bochoris condemned the defendant to put the money in a purſe, which ſhe demanded, and to move it ſo that the ſhadow of it might fall upon Thonis. This judge meant by it, that opinion is but the ſhadow of truth, and that the young man's pleaſure in a dream was only the ſhadow of a real one. Lamia a competent judge in theſe matters, ſaid one day, that this judgment was unjuſt; becauſe the ſhadow of the purſe had not cured the courtezan's paſſion for the money, whereas the dream had cured the young man's paſſion (29).

[*L*] *Guevara has publiſhed as many falſities of Lamia as of Lais. Brantome, has been impoſed upon by him.*] He gives out (30) ſome maxims, as if they were Lamia's, which are only Guevara's fictions. *If we*

(*c*) Polemo, apud Athen. lib. vi, pag. 253.

(16) *His name was Polemo. See Athenæus, lib. xiii, pag.* 577.

(17) *Written by an author named Lynceus. See Athenæus at the beginning of the fourth book.*

(18) Plut. in Demetr. pag. 901.

(19) *See the remark* [*F*].

(20) Athen. lib. xiii, pag 577.

(21) Idem, lib. vi, cap. xiv, pag. 253.

(22) Ἐπ' ᾅδου, in inferis, *for* ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, ſua ætate.

(23) Tacit. Annal. lib. iii, cap. lxv.

(24) Plut. in Demetrio, pag. 901. A.

(25) *We read in Amiot's Plutarch this marginal note:* As for the *Lamiæ*, all the ſoap and all the water in the world would not clean or waſh thoſe, who perverted the uſe of the talents raiſed on the people, and employed them to purchaſe lands and lordſhips witneſſes of the leudneſs of ſuch harlots, execrable parts of commonwealths, and an eternal diſgrace to thoſe who follow them, and fit engines to pick the pockets of both great and ſmall.

(26) Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 577.

(27) Ælian. Var. Hiſtor. lib. xii, cap. xvii.

(28) *It was her Egyptian name The Greeks called her* Archidice *or* Archedice *See* Ælian. Var. Hiſt. lib. xii, cap. lxiii, *and Kuhnius's notes.*

(29) Ex Plut. in Demetr. pag. 901.

(30) Memoires des Dames Galantes, Tom. II, *towards the end.*

not many faults to charge him with [*M*]. I am ſurpriſed at a doubt of Mr Menage [*N*].

You will find a great commendation of this Lamia in a book *(d)* that Mr Baudelot publiſhed in the year 1698.

we muſt take the advice, ſays he (31), *of a courtezan, who was one of the moſt famous in former times, and very well skilled in her profeſſion*, viz. *Lamia who ſaid*, &c. One Francis Voilleret, Sieur de Florizel, counſellor, notary, and ſecretary to the king, houſe and crown of France, publiſhed (32), as true matter of fact, all the falſities he had read, in that Spaniſh author, concerning the three courtezans Flora, Lais, and Lamia. So true it is, that one bad author is enough to ſpoil many others.

[*M*] *Moreri is very ſhort upon this head, I have not many faults to charge him with.*] I. This expreſſion, *The Thebans conſecrated to her the temple of Venus Lamia*, is fallacious: it induces one to believe, that the Thebans had a temple of Venus Lamia, which they conſecrated to Demetrius's miſtreſs. Moreri ſhould therefore have ſaid, to avoid ambiguity, that the Thebans built a temple in honour of this miſtreſs, and called it the temple of Venus Lamia. II. It is not true, that Plutarch makes mention of this; he ſhould have cited Athenæus. Moreri had this falſe quotation from Charles Stephens (33).

[*N*] *I am ſurprized at a doubt of Mr Menage.*] He queſtions whether the courtezan Lamia is the ſame Athenian lady, that was kept by Demetrius Phalereus. *An eadem eſt ac illa nobilis femina quam amabat Phalereus* (34)? in calling her a noble woman, he builds upon theſe words of Diogenes Laërtius: Ἀλλὰ ἀστῇ καὶ εὐγενεῖ συνῴκει Λαμείᾳ τῇ ἐρωμένῃ. *Verum urbana ac nobili amica Lamia utebatur quam amabat.* If theſe words be pointed thus, one may very well deny, that Lamia, the miſtreſs of Demetrius Poliorcetes, was loved by Demetrius Phalereus; for the miſtreſs of Demetrius Poliorcetes was only a player on the flute, and conſequently was not of a noble family. Menage was in the right to cenſure Dalechamp, who has tranſlated theſe words of Athenæus, Δημήτριος δ' ὁ Πολιορκητὴς οὐ δαιμονίως ἤρα Λαμίας τῆς αὐλητρίδος thus, *Demetrius Phalereus Lamiam tibicinem amavit perditiſſime*; but he ſhould likewiſe have cenſured Aldobrandin, who ſays, that the Thebans, out of complaiſance to Demetrius Phalereus, built a temple to Venus Lamia, in order to honour the memory of his miſtreſs Lamia (35). Aldobrandin cites Cœlius Rhodiginus, *l.* 29. *c.* 5. Here are three things to be cenſured. I. It was not to pleaſe Demetrius Phalereus, but Demetrius Poliorcetes, that the Thebans built this temple. II. Aldobrandin ſhould have quoted Athenæus, and not Cœlius Rhodiginus. III. He ſhould have ſaid, that the Athenians had the ſame complaiſance as the Thebans.

(d) *Intituled*, Hiſtoire de Ptolemée Auletes, *&c. See the ſeventh chapter of the ſecond part, pag.* 317, & ſeq.

(31) Epitres dorées, livr. i, pag. m. 260, & ſeq.

(32) *In a book printed at London in the reign of king James I, and intituled*, Le Preau des Fleurs meſlées. *See the eighth chapter of the ſecond book*, pag. 244, & ſeq.

(33) Lloyd has left out the quotation of Plutarch. Hofman has done the ſame.

(34) Menag. in Diogen. Laërt. lib. v, n. 76, pag. 221.

(35) Thebanos autem Demetrio blandientes, Veneris Lamiæ templum excitaviſſe ut Lamiæ ab eo amatæ memoriam colerent, ſcribit Cœlius Rhodig. lib. xxix, cap. v. *Aldobrandin in Diogen. Laërt. lib. v, n*, 76. He can mean no body but Demetrius Phalereus of whom he had been ſpeaking.

LAMPONIANO (JOHN ANDREW) deſcended from an illuſtrious family of Milan (*a*), was one of three domeſtics of Galeazzo Sforza, duke of Milan, who conſpired againſt that prince, and killed him in St Stephen's church, the twenty ſixth of December 1476. It was Lamponiano that gave him the two firſt wounds. He pretended to remove the crowd, and to have letters to preſent to the duke. He was enraged againſt him on account of a law-ſuit [*A*], in which he could not prevail with this prince to interpoſe his good offices againſt his adverſary; he hoped to find his account in a revolution of the ſtate; and he wanted an after-game, for he had ſquandered away the greateſt part of his patrimony, and found himſelf as vain, and as much addicted to luxury as before. His two accomplices were Charles Viſconti, and Jerom Olgiati. The latter was engaged in this black conſpiracy by the glory, which a School-maſter, who hated the duke, repreſented to him in the murder of a tyrant [*B*]. As for

[*A*] *He was enraged againſt the duke of Milan on account of a law ſuit.*] The thing was thus, according to Paul Jovius: 'Ad audendum immane uſque 'adeo & periculoſum facinus vehementer incitabat 'illata ſibi injuria à Caſtellioneo Comenſium antiſtite, 'à quo ſacri latifundii poſſeſſione contra jus interrupta locatione, ſe perinique ſpoliatum querebatur. 'Totum autem ejus injuriæ odiique venenum vertebat in principem, qui à ſe ſuppliciter deprecante eam 'contumeliam, ſæpe rogatus adverſarium in extrahenda lite præpotentem, neque advertere, neque mollire 'voluiſſet (1). ——— *He was prompted to this great 'and dangerous attempt by the injurious treatment of 'the biſhop of Como, who, as he pretended, had unjuſtly robbed him of large poſſeſſions. He turned 'his whole reſentment of this injury againſt the prince, 'whom he had in vain petitioned againſt his too 'powerful adverſary.*' This puts me in mind of Philip King of Macedon, who was killed by a man (2), who could not obtain from him the revenge he deſired for a bloody affront (3). He thought no longer of revenging himſelf on the author of that affront, but on the prince, who did not do him juſtice (4).

[*B*] *Olgiati . . . . . was engaged . . . . . . by the glory which a ſchool-maſter, enemy to the duke, repreſented to him in the murther of a tyrant.*] His name was Cola Montanus, and he had been preceptor to Galeazzo Sforza, who, remembering, more than he ſhould have done, the laſhes he had received from his pedagogue, ordered him to be publickly whipped. *Hic cola quondam Galeacii pædagogus dirum in principem odium conceperat impotenti ejus contumelia percitus, quod ille puerilium verberum nimis memor, poſtquam adolevit, imperiumque ſuſcepit, ipſi Colæ tanquam immiti ſubagreſtique præceptori, acceptas olim plagas nudatis clunibus loro palam rependi juſſiſſet* (5). Cola, exaſperated with this affront, inflamed young Olgati with an ardent deſire of glory, by murthering the tyrant, and by that means reſtoring the liberty of his country. He extolled to the skies the merit of Brutus and Caſſius. In a word, it was he, who, by his vehement exhortations, inſpired him with the deſign of executing that horrid attempt (6). *Olgiatum penè imberbem, leviſſimumque adoleſcentem inani ſpe parandæ gloriæ inflaverat Cola Montanus literarii ludi magiſter; ſi occiſo tyranno patriam in libertatem aſſereret; ſæpe Caſſios & Brutos in ſchola magnis extollens laudibus, qui gloria ducti pulcherrimi facti conſilium olim ſuſcepiſſent* (7). So true it is, that a bad leſſon is able to do great miſchief, and that princes themſelves ought to take care not to be hated by inconſiderable men. There are few ſuch. Cola, being taken ſome time after, fell into the hands of Laurence de Medicis, who cauſed him to be hanged (8). The courage he inſpired into Olgiati, in hopes of an eternal fame, did not fail him at the place of execution. Olgiati and his comrade made their eſcape, by reaſon of the confuſion, which the aſſaſſination of the duke cauſed in the church: but becauſe no body durſt harbour them they were taken two days after. Their puniſhment was ſuited to their crime; and Olgiati expreſſed a great conſtancy: 'Olgiatus ipſe mirum 'viſu audituque veſana conſtantia obſtinatum animum 'in conſpectu carnificis gerens, ſeſeque in ipſa morte 'confirmans hæc contumaci ore protulit verba; collige te, Hieronyme, ſtabit vetus memoria facti; mors 'quidem erit acerba, ſed tormentum breve, atque 'ejus fama perpetua (9). ——— *Olgiati, maintaining 'a moſt wonderful conſtancy in the ſight of the executioner, and at the inſtant of death, ſpoke theſe obſtinate words; Courage, Jerom! the fame of thy 'action will live for ever; death is indeed bitter; 'but the torment is but ſhort, whereas the credit of 'it will be immortal.*'

The reader will, perhaps, be glad to find here ſome verſes, which he made in priſon. They are a proof

(*a*) Egnatius, Exempl. lib. iii, cap. ii, ſub fin. fol. m. 95, verſo.

(1) Paul. Jovius, in Elogio Galeacii Sfortiæ, lib. iii, Elog. pag. m. 244.

(2) *Called* Pauſanias.

(3) Pauſaniam Attalus mero onuſtum nefariis convivarum ludibriis expoſuerat. *Freinſhm. Supplem in Quint. Curt. lib.* i, *cap. ix.*

(4) Adoleſcens . . . odium ab auctore injuriæ in negligentem ejus vindicem convertit. *Id. ibid.*

(5) Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 245.

(6) Hujus Colæ diris cohortationibus conjurationem inchoatam ad exitumque perductam fuiſſe. Olgiatus ipſe ex queſtione per ſcripſit. *Id. ibid.*

(7) Idem, pag. 244.

(8) Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 247.

(9) Idem, pag. 246.

for Charles Viſconti he was moved to it by two powerful reaſons [C]. Lamponiano endeavouring to eſcape thro' the women, was killed by a Moor. His corps, biting the ground [D], was delivered to the mob (b), who made it their ſport for ſome time (c). Peter Crinitus made ſome verſes in praiſe of this aſſaſſin [E]. It is ſaid, that this duke of Milan had very good qualities (d), and that he governed like a good prince, without any notable fault, except a prodigious lewdneſs; which it was ſo much the eaſier for him to ſatisfy, becauſe the ladies of his court gloried in their galantries [F].

proof of his boldneſs, and contain an inſult upon the prince he had aſſaſſinated.

Quem non mille acies, quem non potuere phalanges
Sternere, privata Galeaz dux Sfortia dextra
Concidit, atque illum minime juvere cadentem
Aſtantes famuli, nec opes, nec regna, nec urbes.
Hinc patet humanis quæ ſit fiducia rebus,
Et patet hinc ſævo tutum nil eſſe tyranno (10).

Great Milan's duke, unconquer'd in the field,
To private violence at laſt muſt yield.
He fell; attending ſervants naught avail:
To ward the blow e'en wealth and kingdoms fail.
Learn hence, there is no truſt in human things,
Nor any ſafety for tyrannic kings.

[C] . . . . *as for Charles Viſconti, he was moved to it by two powerful reaſons.*] In the firſt place he was provoked to ſee that the Sforzas had uſurped the dominion, to the prejudice of his family. Secondly, he had a ſiſter, whom Galeazzo had debauched, and afterwards imparted to a handſome young man, who was his catamite. *Germanæ ſororis probro quam Galeaſius adamaret, atque ſubigeret, permovebatur: tanto indignantius quod eam decoro adoleſcenti, qui ætatis florem principi fruendum dediſſet, conciliaſſe & communicaſſe ſuſpicaretur* (11). This prince was reckoned ſo leud, that not only his amours were talked of, but alſo his pimping (12). We have here an inſtance of female compliance. Francis Viſconti's ſiſter, not content to gratify the duke with the uſe of her body, ſatisfied alſo the leudneſs of his catamites, when he pleaſed. Probably ſhe had no great difficulty in giving this mark of complaiſance to the duke, ſince it was in favour of a handſome young man.

[D] *His corps, biting the ground.*] I may uſe this phraſe in the literal ſenſe, ſince Paul Jovius expreſſes himſelf thus. 'Ipſius Lamponiani cadaver ſolum lingua & dentibus commordens jacebat (13). —— *The body of Lamponiano lay biting the ground with it's tongue and teeth.*'

[E] *Peter Crinitus made ſome verſes in praiſe of this aſſaſſin.*] They are in the ſecond book of his poems (14), and are intituled, *De virtute Joannis Andreæ Lamponiani Tyrannicidæ.* The ſix firſt run thus:

Parabat olim ſacra Bruti manibus
  Antiqua virtus Italum.
Ac forte lectam dum rependit hoſtiam
  Marti dicatam vindici,
Frontem retorſit illico ad acres Inſubres
  Mirata fortem dexteram.

Old Italy, for fortitude rever'd,
Once, ſacred rites to Brutus' ſhade prepar'd;
And, whilſt ſhe bid the choſen victim dye,
Sacred to Mars, th' avenging deity,
Perhaps ſhe look'd toward the Inſubrian land,
In admiration of th' advent'rous band.

We muſt not wonder, that Peter Crinitus praiſed this aſſaſſin; for we find an hymn (15) in praiſe of Balthazar Gerard (16), among the ſacred poems of Levinus Torrentius, biſhop of Antwerp. Among other elogies, this is to be found in it.

Morte inſerendus cælicolum choris
Æterno ab omni labe puram
Reddis ovans animam parenti.

Pure from all ſpot, triumphantly you die,
And join, by death, the chorus of the sky.

[F] *The ladies of his court gloried in their gallantries.*] The deſcription, which Paul Jovius gives of the corruption of the women of that country, is horrible. They looked upon chaſtity as an obſtacle to politeneſs; they thought, that the love of that virtue was not good breeding, and looked like the awkward air of a country-woman. In ſhort, they did not believe that lying with a prince was an action contrary to virtue; they pretended, that the way to raiſe their husbands above others, was to make them wear golden horns. Galeazzo, who was a handſome vigorous young man, and of a leud temper, found his account in it. Paul Jovius's words are much better than mine, therefore I inſert them here. *His artibus quum boni, ſplendidiſſimique principis nomen tueretur, premebant ejus famam intemperantes vagæque libidines. Nam ea tum erat ex multo ocio luxuriantis ſeculi conditio, in ipſis præcipuè nobilioribus matronis, ut totum pudicitiæ decus ab humanitate aulæ alienum prorſus & ſubagreſte putaretur, ideoque princeps ad licentiam libidinis proclinatus, & juventæ vigore venuſtateque oris ſupra omnes ſpectatu digniſſimus, procacibus fœminarum oculis & deſideriis cupidiſſimè deſerviret. Erat enim tum vulgatum inter fœminas, nullam ex principis concubitu fieri impudicam, earumque maritos qui ineptis hirci videri poſſent, ita excellere aureis cornibus, ut dignitate cunctos anteirent* (17). This is, doubtleſs, the utmoſt degree of corruption; for if any thing prevents chaſtity from being baniſhed out of the world, it is the annexing, with reſpect to women, an idea of diſgrace to the contrary vice (18). It is the main barrier, to ſtop a little the progreſs of leudneſs, and hinder it from over-flowing all mankind like the waters of the deluge, which ſpared but few perſons.

LANCELOT (CLAUDIUS), a Benedictin Monk, was a native of Paris (a). '(b) Having ſtudied very well in his youth, he was intruſted with the education of 'a young gentleman, and afterwards he retired to Port Royal des Champs, where he 'taught claſſical learning with great ſucceſs. Some years after, he turned monk in 'the abbey of St Cyran, where he was in great intimacy with the late abbot Barcos; at whoſe death that ſociety being diſſolved, and the monks diſperſed, Dom 'Claudius Lancelot was confined to the Lower-Bretagne, where he died two or 'three years ago (c).' He compoſed many good books [A], but did not put his name to them, and they were aſcribed in general to the gentlemen of Port-Royal.

[A] *He compoſed many good books.*] The *New Methods* for learning the Latin and Greek tongues: the *Garden of Greek Roots*: an Italian grammar: a Spaniſh grammar: a French tranſlation of Phædrus's Fables; and another of ſome Comedies of Terence: a treatiſe of the Hemina (1), the ſecond edition whereof, being much larger than the firſt, came out in the year 1688. *Laſtly, all the pieces and obſervations, that are to be found*

(b) Lamponianus inſultantis plebis & puerorum turbæ ad ludibrium conceſſus, injecto laqueo per cunctas urbis regiones raptatus eſt. *Jovius, ubi infra.*

(c) *Taken from Paul Jovius,* in Elogio Galeacii Sfortiæ.

(d) Jovius, ibid.

(10) Idem, pag. 247.

(11) Id. ibid. pag. 244.

(12) Principem enim in amore improbum atque adeo impudentem plerique vel falſo exiſtimabant, ut alienæ libidini lenocinii obſequium lubens præbere crederetur. *Id. ibid.*

(13) Id. ibid. pag. 246.

(14) Pag. m. 833.

(15) Hymnus, in laudem Baltaſaris Gerardi fortiſſimi tyrannicidæ.

(16) *He killed the prince of Orange in the year* 1584.

(17) Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 243.

(18) Confer quæ ſupra, *in remark* [C] *of the article* JONAS (ARNGRIMUS.)

(a) Vigneul Marville, Mêlanges d'Hiſt. & de Litterat. pag. 125.

(b) Id. ibid.

(c) *I take the meaning of it to be, that he died in* 1694, *or thereabouts.*

(1) *I have cited it in the remark* [A], *of the article* AUSTRIA (DON JOHN of).

found at the end of the Bible printed at Vitré, as an introduction to the underſtanding of the holy ſcripture (2). The author, from whom I have this, affirms (3), that the *Grammaire génèrale & raiſonnée*, which contains the grounds of the art of ſpeaking, is of Mr Arnauld's invention, and compoſed by Dom Claude Lancelot.

(2) Vigneul Marville, Mêlanges d'Hiſt. & de Litterat. pag. 126.

(3) Id. ibid. pag. 126.

LANDA (**Catherine**) ought to be reckoned among the learned women. She was very young, when, in 1526, ſhe wrote a Latin letter to Peter Bembus, which was printed amongſt thoſe of that writer (*a*), with his anſwer to it. Hilarion de Coſte (*b*), who miſcalls her **LAUDA**, obſerves, that ſhe was of Piacenza, and *very handſome, and the ſiſter of count Auguſtin Lauda, and wife of count John Fermo Trivulcio.*

(*a*) *It is the thirteenth of the ſixth book of Bembus's letters.*

(*b*) Hilar. de Coſte, Eloges des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. II, pag. 728.

LANDAU, a city of the Lower Alſace, near the river Queich, on the borders of the Palatinate, equally diſtant from Spire and the Rhine, was *mortgaged for a very ſmall matter to the biſhop of Spire by the emperor Lewis of Bavaria, in the year* 1308; *but, in the year* 1511, *it was redeemed by Maximilian I, and reſtored to all it's liberties* (*a*). It is one of the ten towns, that make up what is called the provoſtſhip or prefecture of Haguenau, towns, which, *excepting as to matters civil and criminal before the provoſt of Haguenau, pretend to hold immediately of the empire* (*b*) [*A*]. They

(*a*) Mercure Hiſtorique, Octob. 1702, pag. 388. *See alſo* Louïs du May, Etat de l'Empire, Dial. VIII, pag. m. 536, *and Munſter*, Coſmog. pag. 471.

(*b*) Du Val, Deſcript. de l'Allemagne, pag. 159.

[*A*] *It is one of the ten towns . . . which pretend to hold immediately of the empire.*] Mr Heiſs will explain this to us. ‘Haguenau, *ſays he* (1), is the firſt of the towns of Alſace dependant on the prefecture, the tribunal of which is eſtabliſhed in the ſame town. After the treaty of Munſter, the king of France, in imitation of the landgraves of Alſace, his predeceſſors, retained this provincial council, in which his great bailif, or lieutenant, preſided. But, as it has been entirely ruined in the laſt war, the moſt Chriſtian king has removed this council to Briſac. This town, as well as the other nine, at that time, acknowledged the king for protector, on the ſame terms as they acknowledge the emperor, and the princes of Auſtria, in that quality, without derogating from that *immediateneſs*, in virtue of which theſe ten towns pretend to continue free ſtates of the empire. But, as they have been convinced of the right of ſovereignty, with which the king of France has been inveſted, they have renounced this immediateneſs, and have entirely ſubmitted to his moſt Chriſtian majeſty. The other nine towns are Colmar, Schleſtat, Weiſemburg, Landau, Oberkheim, Kaiſerberg, Munſter in the valley of St Gregory, Roſheim, and Turcheim.’ They had not yet ſubmitted to this yoke in the year 1673. They were very far from it: you need only read theſe words of the duke de Navailles. ‘Intending to go to Briſac, I paſſed through Colmar. I there found, that the inhabitants, as being near ſo conſiderable a place as Briſac, affected an extraordinary independance. Their town was filled with all ſorts of warlike ammunitions and proviſions; they appeared little diſpoſed to receive, and ſubmit to, the king's orders. They took no care, with regard to me, to ſhew a proper reſpect to thoſe, with whom the king entruſted his authority. There were ſtill in that country, Scheleſtat, Haguenau, and four other little Imperial towns; they were very much united, always kept deputies at the diet, and were ever taking liberties contrary to the obedience, they owed to the king. And when I arrived at Briſac, theſe ſeven towns, which pretended to be Imperial, ſent deputies to me. Thoſe of Colmar were at the head, and ſpoke for the reſt. They harangued me in the ſame manner they had done my predeceſſors. They ſeemed to make uſe of expreſſions, which did not ſufficiently ſhew the ſubmiſſion they owe to the king, treating him only as their protector: I anſwered them, that he had, with regard to them, a ſtronger title; that he was their guardian, and that it belonged to him to regulate their conduct. I ſpoke to them with ſo much force, that the intendant, who was preſent, ſaid to me before them: Sir, if your predeceſſors had made them know their duty as you do, the king would have more authority in this province, and theſe gentlemen would not be at ſo great an expence in keeping deputies at the diet. Theſe deputies were thunder-ſtruck, and they fell upon their knees before me. I thought I ought to mortify them a little, I ſent the next day five hundred horſe to take the cattle at the gates of their towns. This opened their eyes, and ſhewed them their error in pretending to be independent of France. They came a ſecond time to ſpeak to me; but I would not hear them, and I ſent them word, that I muſt be going to Philipsburg (2).’ A little after, he tells the king, *that he had a fair opportunity to put Colmar, and the other towns, which call themſelves Imperial, on the proper footing* (3). The king immediately profited by this advice; for, going into Alſace, he ſeized on the towns of Colmar and Schelſtad (4). *The other towns ſurrendered upon a bare ſummons, on pretext, that the king had a right to thoſe places as great bailif of Haguenau, and that he ſeized them, to prevent the Imperialiſts from taking advantage of two ſuch convenient poſts, as thoſe two towns were* (5).

Whether the free towns of Alſace could retain their immediate holding of the empire, under a protector or guardian, who was king of France.

I remember there was great reaſoning about the reduction of theſe places, and that there were ſome, who ſaid, it was folly to pretend they could ſtill keep their liberty. It was not impoſſible, they ſaid, that they might be at once under the form of a commonwealth, and under the guardianſhip of the landgrave of Alſace, as long as this landgrave was a German; but, when he was king of France, there was a kind of neceſſity that they muſt, ſooner or latter, fall under his full authority. This followed from the order of political affairs, and the natural courſe of human things. A town could not be free, and at the ſame time acknowledge for it's protector, or guardian, a king, who might be at war with the emperor, or the empire. Can clients declare againſt their patrons? If they cannot lawfully, the prefecture of Haguenau muſt neceſſarily ſide with France in thoſe wars; and if it cannot juſtly do this, as being a part of the Germanic body, it muſt either declare againſt France, or deſire a neutrality. In the firſt caſe, the king of France had juſt as much right to ſubjugate Colmar and the other Imperial towns of Alſace, as the four foreſt-towns. In the ſecond caſe, it muſt be conſidered whether the towns of the prefecture of Haguenau were really deſirous to obſerve a neutrality, or only pretended to deſire it, with the ſole view of putting themſelves into the hands of the emperor's troops. If this be the ſole motive of their deſiring a neutrality, they muſt expect to be treated as a concealed enemy, who, in point of prudence, muſt not be allowed time to diſcover their ill deſigns. But, ſuppoſing that they ſincerely deſire to be neuter, it remained to be examined, whether they could maintain themſelves againſt the German troops, who would endeavour to oblige them to receive a garriſon. It is plain, they were not ſtrong enough to ſupport themſelves in a neutrality; and thus order will have it, that the king of France ſhould not ſuffer the Germans to have places of arms there, eſpecially conſidering that the Spaniards were at that time maſters of Franche Compté. The protector or guardian muſt ſupport his title, that his pupil may not declare againſt him. If this title obliged him to hinder any one from uſing the towns of Alſace ill, it authorized him to hinder any one from arming them to his prejudice; for it would be ſtrange indeed, if a monarch were obliged to protect a ſtate, which thought it ſelf obliged to declare war againſt him. The mutual obligations both lie under contradicts this; and, conſequently, thoſe who ſhould yield to France the protection of the Imperial towns of Alſace, would neceſſarily open a door to a full authority over them. The incompatibility of titles began from that

(1) Heiſs, Hiſt. de l'Empire, Part. II, pag. 452, Hague Edit. 1685.

(2) Memoires du Duc de Navailles, pag. 268, &c. Amſterdam Edit. 1701, ad ann. 1673.

(3) Ib. pag. 273.

(4) Mercure Hollandois, *of the year* 1673, pag. 479.

(5) Ibid.

They were yielded to France by the peace of Munſter to belong to it in the ſame manner as they had belonged to the houſe of Auſtria; but by degrees all reſtriction has ceaſed (*c*). Some have pretended, that the citizens of Landau have not *been cavillers*, and that they *maintained their town at a time when the others were pillaged* (*d*). This ſeems to me to imply, that, during the long war, which ended by the peace of Munſter, and in other ſuch like times, they were not unſeaſonably obſtinate in reſiſting the ſtrongeſt. They gave an inſtance of this compliance in the year 1634, as may be ſeen in Puyſegur's Memoirs (*e*). Another writer (*f*) obſerves, that they have not been ſubject to inteſtine diſſentions, and that they have always forbore provoking, by words or actions the neighbouring princes, and that, in 1552, the troops of Henry II, king of France, and thoſe of Albert of Brandenburg, did them a great deal of miſchief. The Sieur de Val affirms, that *the wine of Landau is the beſt Rheniſh wine that can be drunk* (*g*). This town was but moderately ſtrong at the time of the peace of Ryſwic, in 1697, but, ſoon after, it was fortified with all imaginable care. The famous Mr de Vauban employed his whole ſkill in it. The Imperialiſts, under prince Lewis of Baden, blocked it up in the month of April 1702, and opened the trenches the ſeventeenth of June following. The place was ſurrendered by capitulation the tenth of September. The king of the Romans arrived in the camp the twenty ſeventh of July [*B*]. What the news-writers publiſhed concerning this ſiege will give me occaſion to make ſome remarks [*C*], yet without expecting they will prove uſeful to thoſe

(*c*) *See the remark* [*A*].

(*d*) Du Val, Acquiſitions de la France, pag. 38.

(*e*) Memoirs de Puyſegur, pag. 113, 122, Dutch Edit. ad ann. 1635 (*it ſhould be* 1634).

(*f*) Munſter, Coſmogr. pag. 472.

(*g*) Du Val. Acquiſit. pag. 38.

that time to be propagated; and, if the emperor had eſtabliſhed places of arms at Colmar and Scheleſtad, in order to make irruptions as far as Dijon, and Lyons, no one would have commended France for ſuffering theſe towns to enjoy all their privileges, but would rather have laughed at her imprudence and ſimplicity.

People reaſoned almoſt after the ſame manner, when ſhe ſeized on Strasburg; a town, which neither would, nor could, always preſerve it's neutrality, and which ſurrendered it's bridge to the German armies *toties quoties*. It was a thorn in the foot, too big to be left there. One of two things muſt be, either that Strasburg ſincerely deſire a ſtate of neutrality, and religiouſly obſerve it, or that it be capable of making a reſiſtance, when any one would oblige it to declare for one ſide. Now nothing of this was true, ſaid theſe reaſoners. I believe they might be eaſily refuted by thoſe who teach the Civil-law in the univerſities.

[*B*] *The king of the Romans arrived in the camp the twenty ſeventh of July.*] The news-writers of his party gave out, that *the count de Melac*, governor of Landau, *ſent a trumpet to him, the ſame day, to compliment him, and to deſire him to let him know where he intended to fix his quarters, that they might not fire upon them; but that the intrepid monarch, having thanked him for his civility, ſent him word at the ſame time, that he might fire where he pleaſed; that his quarters were every where* (6). An officer of the garriſon of Landau relates this piece of news as follows (7). *The count de Melac ſent* a trumpet, the thirty firſt of July, *at eight of the clock in the morning, to the enemy's camp ..... to demand of the prince of Baden, where were the king's quarters: this prince informed the king of the Romans of it, who anſwered,* ‘ that his quarters were at Inphling; that he thanked him for the ſword he had ſent him (8); that he might fire every where, ſerving his king as he had hitherto done.’ It is certain, that, in this, the count de Melac acted as has been practiſed for a long time towards kings, who aſſiſt at a ſiege. The beſieged governor pays them this compliment. As to the anſwer of the king of the Romans, we muſt obſerve two things; the one, that the accounts of the two parties are not extremely different at the bottom; the other, that, being always gallant, it is eſpecially ſo, the firſt time it is uſed; for, when a king is informed, that another has made uſe of it, he thinks himſelf bound in honour to imitate, and, if poſſible, go beyond him. It is no longer a matter of choice, but a kind of neceſſity. I have been told, that the late William III, king of England, made uſe of this anſwer, when the governor of a place paid him this compliment. I know not whether it is true; but I know very well, that he never beſieged any place, the governor of which acknowledged him as king. Be it how it will, he was not the firſt author of this anſwer; for, to ſay nothing of thoſe, who may have made uſe of it before the year 1667, there is a printed proof, that it was uſed that year at the ſiege of Liſle in Flanders. Read what follows: *As ſoon as the count de Broüay, governor of the place, was informed, that his majeſty* (9) *was arrived in the camp, judging rightly that there was no farther room for feint, he made the citizens take an oath of fidelity, more than ten thouſand of whom proteſted they would periſh ſooner than ſurrender. He then ſent a compliment to his majeſty, offering him his choice of the fineſt houſes within one league round Liſle, and even whatever he wanted for his houſehold from out of the city, during the ſiege; and deſired to know, where he would fix his quarters, that he might give orders not to fire that way; but he added, that he entreated his majeſty not to take it ill, if he defended that place with the utmoſt vigour, for the ſervice of the Catholic king, his maſter. His majeſty, after having thanked the count de Broüay for his compliment, returned only this anſwer, that his quarters were all over his camp, and that the more obſtinate his reſiſtance was in oppoſing this conqueſt, the more glorious would be the ſucceſs of it to his majeſty* (10).

The king of the Romans gained great eſteem during this long ſiege; this firſt campaign was very much to his honour. The count de Melac, who *ſaw him*, the eleventh of September, *received from him great honours and great praiſes* (11). He ſupped the ſame night with prince Lewis of Baden, who paid him a thouſand civilities, and told him, that *it was believed in the Imperial army, that he dealt with the devil* (12), *to which the count de Melac replied,* ‘ that he dealt with him juſt as much as he, but that the prince's correſpondence was the better, ſince the devil had ſerved him beſt (13).’

[*C*] *What the news-writers publiſhed concerning this ſiege will give me occaſion to make ſome remarks.*] Thoſe of France continually ſaid, that it did not advance, that the garriſon repulſed every aſſault, and occaſioned the ſlaughter of an infinite number of Germans: the news-writers of the other party ſaid, on the contrary, that they eaſily carried every thing they attacked, that the Imperialiſts ſcarce loſt a man, and that the mines of the beſieged were always countermined, or that, if they were not, the enemy ſet fire to them ſo improperly, that they occaſioned no loſs. The author of the Mercure Galant reaſoned much on the conſequences, which might attend the conqueſt of this place. He pretended, that *it coſt* the emperor *at leaſt five or ſix millions* (14), and that *the number of troops, which periſhed before Landau, muſt amount at leaſt to* 15000 *men* (15). *I believe*, adds he, *that, were I to calculate the loſs, which the Germans confeſs in the journals they commonly make, I ſhould find, that it amounts to much more, though theſe journals are not faithful.* I know not what journals of the Germans he means; but I can ſcarce believe that he ſaw any other than thoſe, which they ſent to the Dutch news-writers, and which we ſee printed in the Hiſtorical Letters, and in the *Mercure Politique* of the Hague. Now by theſe journals it does not appear, that the Germans had more than 800 men killed, from the beginning of the ſiege to the beginning of September. We have not ſeen in theſe books the particulars of the following days to the capitulation of the place; but we may judge, that it would not contain above forty killed. The number of the wounded is incomparably greater according to theſe journals; and yet ſome

(6) Mercure Hiſt. Auguſt, 1702, pag. 159,

(7) Journal of the Siege of Landau, pag. 112, 113, Paris Edit. 1702.

(8) *It belonged to an officer, who had been taken priſoner in a ſally of the beſieged.*

(9) Lewis XIV.

(10) Dalicourt, la Campagne Royale ès années 1667, & 1668, pag. 78, 79, Paris Edit. 1668.

(11) Journal of the Siege of Landau, pag. 296.

(12) *Compare what is ſaid in remark* [*P*] *of the article AGRIPPA, num.* 1.

(13) Journal of the Siege of Landau, pag. 295, 296.

(14) Mercure Galant. Sept. 1702, pag. 338.

(15) Ib pag. 340.

gentlemen, or cure that fond credulity they know ſo well how to inſpire. They forgot

Dutch Gazettes, affirm, ſince the capitulation, that the number of the wounded was but double that of the ſlain. The latter amounted to a little more than 700, and the former, (of whom the moſt part were cured) to a little more than 1400. It is difficult to reconcile this with what the ſame Gazettes had ſaid, that, for want of infantry, they were at laſt obliged to make the dragoons ſerve, and, as moſt of the wounded died, it was believed, that the beſiegers made uſe of balls of a particular quality; but it is not my buſineſs here to reconcile the Gazetteers with themſelves; it would be almoſt as difficult as to reconcile the Gazetteers of the two parties; the queſtion is only to know, whether the journals of the beſiegers acknowledge the great loſs, which Mr de Vizé ſpeaks of. Let us obſerve, by the way, that a priſoner, whom the garriſon of Landau took the thirty firſt of July, affirmed, that the Germans *had already loſt near 2500 men, and that every one of them ſaid, the balls* of the beſieged *were all poiſoned, becauſe none of the wounded recovered* (16). The other news, which he told, is ſo falſe, that we ought to give very little credit to what he ſays concerning the loſs of the Germans.

Mr le Noble maintains, that they loſt, in this ſiege, 4 princes, 286 officers, and 12000 ſoldiers or thereabout (17). I believe, in reſpect to the 4 princes, he was deceived by this paſſage: ‘ The young prince ‘ of Bareith died the firſt of this month of the wound ‘ he had received before Landau, at the aſſault of the ‘ ſixteenth to the ſeventeenth of Auguſt. He is the ‘ fourth prince that the war has deprived us of in a ‘ very ſhort time, and whoſe death I am obliged to ‘ give notice of in this month only (18).’ A little more attention would have informed Mr le Noble, that the author there means the duke of Holſtein, the prince of Commerci, the count of Soiſſons, and the prince of Bareith; but the firſt loſt his life in Poland, the ſecond in Italy, and the fourth recovered of his wound, as he might have learned by the author's own retractation, which I ſuppoſe he miſunderſtood (19). Judge, I pray you, whether an author, who ſo groſsly miſtakes as to the number of princes killed at a ſiege, deſerves much credit in what he ſays concerning the number of officers and ſoldiers, who periſhed at it.

One cannot ſufficiently wonder at the ignorance, which the Paris Gazetteer, and the author of the Mercure Galant, have diſcovered of the ſtate of the ſiege (20). Thoſe who ſhould truſt to their relations, would ſwear, that, at the beginning of September, the affairs of the beſiegers were no farther advanced than at the beginning of July, and that they were even in a worſe condition by the frightful ſlaughter, which the garriſon made the twenty fifth, twenty ſixth, and twenty ſeventh of Auguſt, in repulſing the attacks of the Germans. Theſe are three imaginary attacks. We ſee the following words in a Mercure Galant dated the fourteenth of Auguſt (21). *It is an unheard of thing, that, after a ſiege of two mouths and a half, a great army ſhould not have yet taken any of the outworks of Landau.* This author might have talked after the ſame manner a month after, in reaſoning upon his own accounts, and thoſe of the Paris Gazette, which had ſaid nothing of any progreſs of the beſiegers ſince the above-mentioned date of the fourteenth of Auguſt. What is more ſurpriſing is, that the Paris Gazette of the ſixteenth of September, the day on which the ſurrender of Landau was known at Paris, went on talking in the ſame tone; inſomuch, that it prepared infinitely leſs for the news of the capitulation of the place, than that of the raiſing of the ſiege. We may ask hereupon, did theſe public news-writers know what paſſed before Landau, or did they not? If they believed the accounts they publiſhed, their ignorance was very groſs and inexcuſable; for from the firſt days of the month of September, there were private perſons in the provinces, who knew very well, that Landau could not hold out longer than the tenth at the fartheſt. We have ſeen in Holland letters which have expreſsly mentioned this piece of news. Is it not ſhameful, that public news-writers ſhould know leſs of the ſtate of a ſiege, than a meer conntry tradeſman? Is it not a reproach to them, to have no other lights than the report of deſerters, whoſe buſineſs it is to pleaſe by agreeable lies, and to gain by it an advantageous reception? If theſe news-writers were well informed of all that paſſed at Landau, their inſincerity was monſtrous and inexcuſable. Why did they ſo diſguiſe things? did they fear to cauſe an inſurrection in the provinces by a faithful account? This fear, which perhaps would be reaſonable in other countries, was ridiculous in that in which they wrote. I know not then to what to impute the perplexity they threw themſelves into by the neceſſity of finding ſome ſolution, when at laſt they were obliged to publiſh the unforeſeen news of the capitulation. They were ſo ſeverely handled (22) on the ſubject of the taking of Namur in 1695, that it is ſtrange they did not profit by it. I am of opinion, that the ſiege of important places will always be a troubleſome rock for the news-writers (23). I would have them always remember, that the taking of a place is not ſubject, like the gaining of battles (24), to hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm, and that therefore it is better to prepare the readers for it by degrees, than to overwhelm them with it all at once, when they leaſt expect it. *Tela prævifa minus feriunt.* The diſguſt at being impoſed upon aggravates the chagrin they feel on the ſudden news of a capitulation, which overthrows the hopes they had conceived. I ſay nothing of the inſulting raillery they are expoſed to, when at laſt they are obliged to confeſs the ſurrender of a place, before which the news-writers had made the enemy dance attendance, without allowing them to have made any progreſs. They become the jeſt of the news-writers of the oppoſite party (25).

Here is another very ſurpriſing thing. It was not known at the court of the elector of Bavaria what paſſed before Landau, and this may make us think, that Catinat knew no more of it. The garriſon beat the chamade the ninth of September (26), it was reduced to the utmoſt extremity, and the governour had remonſtrated to the council of war, from the fourth of September, that it was time to capitulate (27). It is pretended (28), that, about the twenty ſecond of Auguſt, he had ſent a man (29) *to the mareſchal de Catinat, to inform him, that he could hold out but eight days.* Nevertheleſs the French envoy at the court of the duke of Bavaria imagined, the ninth of September, that the taking of the town of Ulm would oblige the enemy to raiſe the ſiege. *His electoral highneſs,* he wrote word that day (30), *does not doubt but this will oblige them to abandon Landau . . . . when the junction* of his troops with thoſe of France *ſhall be once made, we ſhall cut out ſo much buſineſs* for the king of the Romans, and prince Lewis of Baden, *and ſo dangerous in this country, that they will not think Landau of importance enough to detain them on the other ſide the Rhine.* The elector of Bavaria wrote to the king of France, ‘ that a perſon, whom he had ſent ‘ to the Imperial camp before Landau, had brought ‘ him word, that that place could yet hold out fifteen ‘ days, ſo that it might be ſtill ſuccoured in time, ‘ after the ſurprize of Ulm (31).’ If theſe words may ſerve by way of conſolation or excuſe for the news-writers of Paris, I ſhall think my ſelf happy in having produced them.

Some of thoſe, who ſuffered themſelves to be deceived by the fabulous relations, which came from Alſace, have themſelves undeceived the public, whom they had led into miſtakes; for we find what follows in a work of the author of the Mercure Galant. ‘ As for the chimerical accounts, which have been ſpread ‘ about, of pretended ſallies, in which it was affirmed that we had killed two or three thouſand men, ‘ and of furious aſſaults made on the out-works of the ‘ place, in which they no leſs magnified the enemy's ‘ loſs, who gave theſe aſſaults with thouſands of men, ‘ no action of this nature really paſſed. The garri‘ ſon was not numerous enough to make ſuch kind ‘ of ſallies, and the enemy had not enough damaged ‘ the place, to give ſuch aſſaults: thus the ſituation ‘ of affairs at that time is a ſufficient anſwer to thoſe, ‘ who publiſhed theſe accounts, and were but too ‘ ready to believe them. None of all theſe actions, ‘ in the journal you have been reading, deſerve the ‘ name of battles (32).’

Let us conclude with this paſſage of the ſame author (33): ‘ It is indiſputably true, that no peace ‘ will be made, unleſs the emperor be obliged to give ‘ up this place (34), in caſe it be not retaken before

‘ that

(16) Journal of the Siege of Landau, *publiſhed by the author of the* Mercure Galant, pag. 121, 122.

(17) Le Noble, Entretiens Politiques, du mois de Novembre, 1702, pag. 17.

(18) Lettres Hiſtoriques, Sept. 1702, pag. 361.

(19) Ibid. Oct. 1702, pag. 431.

(20) *Note*, That I only repeat here the reflexions I have heard ſeveral perſons make, and that I am not anſwerable for the Incivility of their expreſſions.

(21) Mercure Galant, July 1702, pag. 375. *Note*, That Landau was not inveſted till about the fifteenth of June.

(22) *In a printed paper of thirty two pages, in 8vo, intituled,* A Letter to the Gazetteer of Paris, on the taking of Namur, by the author of Europe's Safety.

(23) *See remark [D] of the article Mahomet II.*

(24) That of Luzara, for inſtance, fought the fifteenth of Auguſt 1702, and which the writers of the two parties controverted with great variety of objections and anſwers, which can prove nothing to the diſadvantage of the French, without proving as much or more to the diſadvantage of the Imperialiſts.

(25) *See in the following remark the paſſage of the* Nouvelles des Cours de l'Europe.

(26) Journal of the Siege of Landau, pag. 240.

(27) Ibid. pag. 225.

(28) Mercure Hiſt. Sept. 1702, pag 317.

(29) *That man was ſeized by the beſiegers.* Ibid.

(30) Lettres Hiſt. Octob. 1702, pag. 415.

(31) *See the* Nouvelles des Cours de l'Europe, Octob. 1702, pag. 413.

(32) Journal of the Blockade and Siege of the Town and Fort of Landau, pag. 318. *Mr de Vizé is not the author of this Journal; but he has added to it reflexions from page 292 to the end.*

(33) Mercure Galant, Sept. 1702, pag. 346, 347.

(34) *That is, Landau.*

got not to reflect on it's long continuance [*D*]. The fourth article of the capitulation, has been thought very extraordinary, ſince the governor demanded in it, that the inhabitants

that time. Whenever the king has been willing to grant peace, this prince has given up, in confirmation of that ſame peace, the places which he had on the other ſide the Rhine, and it has been conſented to at the ſame time, that he ſhould keep all thoſe, which he was in poſſeſſion of on this ſide; and this has been taken for a rule, becauſe the Rhine forms a kind of barrier.' I am ſurprized, that an author, who talks thus, ſhould not know, that, by the peace at Nimeguen, France remained in poſſeſſion of Briſac and Friburg two important places on the other ſide the Rhine. I might add, that the peace of Munſter left her miſtreſs of Philipsburg, as well as Briſac. Where is then the rule this author ſpeaks of?

[*D*] *The news-writers did not fail to make reflexions on the long continuance of the ſiege of Landau.*] I need only produce the words of a very witty writer. He will afford us, not only a comment on my text, but likewiſe an illuſtration of the foregoing remark. ‘This ſiege is ſo far advanced, that we daily expect the news of a capitulation: the French reproach us with the ſlowneſs of this conqueſt; but I know not whether it be not more diſgraceful to her than to us. The prince of Baden wiſely judged that he ought to be ſparing of his men. With this judicious precaution, this able prince has not followed that furious and murdering way, which deſtroys ſo many brave men, and ſometimes the whole flower of an army. If Landau be ſurrendered, the troops of the Upper Rhine would have ſuffered no extraordinary fatigue, and would march out of the trenches as out of an encampment, ſtill freſh and ready for a new expedition. But, ſince the prince of Baden has by no means haſtened the execution of his deſign, it follows, that he has given the enemy all the neceſſary time to ſuccour the place: how comes it then, that they have not ſtirred? Does it not ſeem as if the prince of Baden affected to act without precipitation, the better to ſhew the weakneſs of France? This ſlow conduct in that general looks as if he would defy any one to prevent his ſtriking the blow. It were to be wiſhed for the honour of marſhal Catinat, or rather his maſter's, that the place had been taken in a few days. The ſiege is protracted; in the mean time the mareſchal, who ought to endeavour a ſuccour or a diverſion, keeps at a diſtance, entrenches himſelf, as if the noiſe of the cannon of the beſiegers affrighted him, and quietly ſuffers the town to be taken .... The French readily allow, that the length of the ſiege of Landau proceeds from the moderation and prudence of the prince of Baden. As they make a merit of every thing, and turn even their loſſes to the encreaſe of their reputation, they pretend, that this duration of the ſiege is ſolely owing to the vigorous defence of the beſieged. Will you believe their news-writers? The beſiegers fall before Landau like the leaves of a tree ſhook by a ſtrong wind towards the end of autumn; they loſe a thouſand men at the attack of a work, which they do not carry; if, the next day they become maſters of the poſt, they are driven from it the third day: you will ſee at laſt, they will talk of raiſing the ſiege .... Can any one advance ſuch groſs untruths? But can any thing be more injurious to the public, than to ſuppoſe them capable of acquieſcing in ſuch wretched impertinence (35)?' Thus does this witty author reaſon, in his news of the month of Auguſt 1702: let us produce what he ſays in that of the following month.

‘The town of Landau has at length changed it's maſter (36). .... An ill omen of what was to follow. In France, they took all poſſible precautions to lull the people aſleep, and make them believe this diſgrace would never happen. The news-writers never tired themſelves ſo much as on occaſion of the ſiege of Landau. If all that they publiſhed about the beſiegers were true, their army was but ſome broken remains, and nothing would be more aſtoniſhing than the ſurrender of the place. The Imperialiſts were knocked on the head without gaining any advantage; or, if they had the good fortune to carry a poſt, they were preſently driven from it. Theſe falſhoods at preſent do no honour to the count de Melac, or his garriſon. How did this brave governor all at once ſpoil his fine defence? What panic ſeized him? Should he not have crowned his valour, and tried the patience of the Germans to the utmoſt? A good commander capitulates only to avoid a general aſſault, and it is affirmed theſe beſieged had loſt nothing. Now that the town is taken, how will they gild the pill, that the people may ſwallow it, without perceiving it's bitterneſs (37)? ..... Let us not imagine, that the tranquillity, with which France has ſuffered Landau to be taken, takes off any thing from the glory of this conqueſt. It cannot be denied, that the beſieged made a vigorous reſiſtance; the long continuance of the ſiege proves it. If the French are to be believed in this matter, the weakneſs of the garriſon alone obliged them to ſubmit. His moſt Chriſtian Majeſty was told, that if the count de Melac could have been rein-forced with 1500 men, the place would have eſcaped. A melancholy conſideration, and which ſerves only to aggravate the misfortune! But how does this agree with the pretended good fortune of the beſieged in loſing but few men upon every attack? Was the garriſon then ſo ſmall? this would be an unpardonable neglect in a fortreſs of this conſequence. Let us compromiſe the matter. Both ſides were equally vigorous: if the Imperialiſts attacked the town with great courage and reſolution, the French anſwered them with no leſs valour and intrepidity, with this circumſtance, that the prince of Baden, willing to ſpare his troops, marched ſtep by ſtep, ſure to conquer, and defying all obſtacles (38).'

Let us make ſome remarks on the ingenious thoughts of this author, and ſay, in the firſt place, that, in the ſituation things were in, it were to be wiſhed, for the common good of his Imperial majeſty, and his allies, that the town of Landau had been taken after a ſiege of three weeks. Prince Lewis of Baden might have executed, after this, whatever he pleaſed: the French would not have been in a condition to croſs any of his deſigns: but the meaſures, which the length of the ſiege ſuffered them to take, broke thoſe of the Imperialiſts in ſuch a manner, that prince Lewis of Baden could execute nothing after the ſurrender of the town of Landau. The length of the ſiege gave France the advantage: the governor of the place received a letter from mareſchal Catinat, the tenth of Auguſt, in which he was directed *to hold out as long as he poſſibly could, to prevent the enemy from making other attempts during the remainder of the campaign; that this would be the moſt ſignal ſervice he could do the king* (39). Thus, the loſs which the beſiegers would ſuſtain of a great number of ſoldiers and officers, in vigorouſly puſhing on the attacks, would be made up with intereſt by the deſigns they might put in execution before the end of the campaign.

I ſay, in the ſecond place, that the thought of our news-writer, to wit that it would be diſgraceful to the count de Melac to have behaved in the manner the French accounts relate, is very juſt. This governor would have imitated the poets, who do wonders in the four firſt acts of a tragedy, but ſucceed very ill in the laſt, wherein good poets principally exert their genius, and for which they reſerve the moſt exquiſite ſtrokes (40). It cannot be denied, that the whole world ſaw with extreme ſurpriſe the concluſion of this ſiege. Even thoſe on the ſide of the beſiegers believed that it would be very bloody, and that the laſt aſſault would be fatal to many brave officers. On the contrary, it was found to be the eaſieſt thing in the world, and they knew not what to think of it, nor what would be the unravelling of the affair. The news-writers have ſaid many things on this occaſion not worth repeating. What is moſt probable, is, that the garriſon was too weak to ſtand the laſt aſſault. We learn by the journal of this ſiege, that, from the fourth of September, the count de Melac repreſented, *that there were many brave men in the garriſon; that it was for the intereſt of the king to preſerve them; that they wanted the moſt neceſſary things, as money, medicines, and proviſions; that theſe ſix days they had made broth for the ſick of horſe-fleſh, not reckoning the want of ammunition* (41). The ſame journal relates (42), that, when the enemy gave the

(35) Nouvelles des Cours de l'Europe, Auguſt 1702, pag. 179, &c.

(36) Ibid. Sept. 1702, pag. 314.

(37) Ibid. pag. 315.

(38) Ibid. pag. 318.

(39) Journal of the Siege of Landau, pag. 140, 141.

(40) Illud te ad extremum & oro & hortor, ut tanquam poëtæ boni, & actores induſtrii ſolent, ſic tu in extrema parte & concluſione muneris ac negotii tui diligentiſſimus ſis. *Cicero ad Quinctum fratrem, Epiſt. i, lib. i.*

(41) Journal, pag. 225.

(42) Ib. pag. 238.

inhabitants ſhould be maintained in the exerciſe of their reſpective religions, and that the Roman Catholic religion ſhould be preſerved in it's purity [*E*].

the laſt aſſault, *the beſieged were retired to the half-moon, near the bridge of communication.* Hence it was that the beſiegers met with little or no oppoſition.

In the third place, let us conſider theſe words; *was the garriſon then ſo ſmall? this would be an unpardonable neglect in a fortreſs of ſuch conſequence* (43). As ſoon as it was known, that the place was inveſted, the Dutch Gazetteers ſtrove to out do one another in publiſhing, that the garriſon was very ſmall, and that it wanted many neceſſaries. I know ſome, who blamed theſe gazetteers for thus leſſening the glory of prince Lewis of Baden. They will remedy this one time or other, replied another ſort; be in no pain about it; for, when the place ſhall be ſurrendered, they will not fail to publiſh a large liſt of ammunitions and proviſions found therein by the Imperialiſts: neither will they fail to give out, that the garriſon was very numerous at firſt, but that the greateſt part had periſhed by the ſword, or the fire of the Germans, by deſertions, and by ſickneſſes. It is not yet time to confeſs, that the place is well provided; the buſineſs is to make the readers expect that it will be ſoon taken.

I have wondered at the ſilence of the officer, who drew up the journal of this famous ſiege. He ſhould have told us the number of the garriſon, when the place was inveſted, and when it beat the chamade; but this he has not done. Thoſe, who find a myſtery in every thing, pretend, that, thro' a political flattery, he choſe rather to leſſen the glory of the garriſon, than to take off in the leaſt from the king's prudence. If he had ſaid, that the place was not provided with neceſſaries, or a good garriſon, he would have accuſed the king his maſter of a prodigious neglect, and given great honour to the long reſiſtance of the beſieged. Now it was better that theſe ſhould loſe part of the praiſes due to them, than that their common prince ſhould be expoſed to cenſure. This, ſay ſome, occaſioned this officer's ſilence. Others ſay, there was a way to have injured no body, which was to have obſerved, on the one ſide, that the garriſon and proviſions were very inſufficient, and, on the other, that the king had very wiſely judged them ſufficient, ſince, for reaſons capable of entirely ſatisfying political prudence, he had believed, that the elector of Bavaria would declare himſelf time enough to fruſtrate the deſign of taking Landau.

I have read in a news-writer, that *the garriſon* of this place *conſiſted of* 2200 *men, when it marched out,* and that *the French ſay, they loſt but* 412 *men, in the ſiege* (44). If this be true, it muſt have conſiſted, at firſt, of but 2612 ſoldiers, a number infinitely too ſmall for the defence of ſuch a fortreſs.

Let us not forget the remark of a news-writer of Paris (45). The beſiegers 'had ſtill much way to 'make, and many aſſaults to give, before they could be'come maſters of it in form; and they would have 'had ſtill more to do, and have loſt more men than 'they did, ... had it not been for the treache'ry of an Engineer, who came to their camp, and 'diſcovered to them ſeveral mines: thus the treachery 'of this Engineer, and the want of neceſſaries in 'the place, were the cauſe that the Germans be'came maſters of it.' The Dutch Journaliſts agree, that the fugitive Engineer did great ſervice to the Imperialiſts (46); but what they added appeared to be groundleſs, to wit, that 'he was intercepted attempting 'to return to the town, after having taken an exact ſur'vey of the works of the beſiegers. The prince of Ba'den would have had him hung up upon a tree with'out form of proceſs; but this Engineer having of'fered to dry up the ditches of the place, and to per'form other ſervices, if they would give him his life 'general Thungen remonſtrated, that it would be 'good to try that which he promiſed to do; and 'this opinion prevailed. Preſently he was put in 'irons, and informed, by the hang-man of the army, 'that he had nothing to do but to think in earneſt 'of executing his promiſes, in which if he failed, 'he ſhould be hung upon a gallows, which was 'ſhewed him (47).' It is not at all probable, that he had the leaſt intention of returning to Landau; he knew too well, that he ſhould be there condemned to the moſt ignominious puniſhment. The journal of the ſiege informs us, that, on the twenty ſixth of Auguſt, 'Mr de la Rouſſilaire, captain of the gates, 'had orders from the count de Melac to deliver to 'the executioner the orders of Ladoder (48), and 'to cauſe the effigy of the ſaid Ladoder to be hung 'on a gallows by the executioner, at the bottom 'of which was written; *The unworthy Engineer Lado'der, a traytor to his king and country.* A gallows 'was erected at the fort, in the half moon of the 'attack, where he was hanged in effigy (49).' The count de Melac was ſo incenſed againſt him, that, when he was to receive the hoſtages of the prince of Baden for the capitulation, *he ordered, that, notwithſtanding they had laid down their arms, if Ladoder appeared, they ſhould fire an hundred musket ſhot at him; but the hoſtages ſaid, that he had been wounded the evening before in the arm by a musket ball* (50).

The news-writer, who has obſerved, that the diverſion cauſed by the ſurpriſe of Ulm did not hinder the king of the Romans from taking Landau (51), forgot dates. How could the taking of Ulm, which was not known when Landau capitulated, retard the reduction of Landau?

[*E*] *The governor demanded, that the inhabitants ſhould be maintained in the exerciſe of their reſpective religions, and that the Roman Catholic religion ſhould be preſerved in it's purity?*] This article was obtained with this reſtriction, *conformably to the treaties of Munſter and Ryſwic.* The two points of the demand are ſurprizing, when one reflects that the king of France, who gives up Landau, and the emperor to whom he ſurrenders it, are two princes, who have ſhewed a great zeal for the extirpation of the Proteſtants, and the propagation of the Catholic religion. Was it neceſſary to demand of ſuch an emperor, that he ſhould maintain the Catholic religion in this place? Is it not a ſuperfluous care? Was it proper beſides to tye up his hands, to prevent him from aboliſhing hereſy? He might do it in a conquered town; for the law of arms permitted him this, unleſs the contrary were ſtipulated and agreed to by the articles of the capitulation. If his Imperial majeſty does not endeavour ſo effectually to re-unite this whole town entire to the body of the Papacy, as to re-unite it to the body of the empire, will not this be the fault of the king of France, who has made himſelf protector of the Heretics of Landau, by inducing the emperor ſolemnly to promiſe, that they ſhall not be troubled in the exerciſe of their religion (52)? He was in hopes, ſay ſome, that the place would be given up to him by the firſt treaty of peace. Are they aware, that, to avoid diſparity, and to act conſiſtently with his paſſed conduct, he mnſt rather wiſh to recover Landau entirely Catholic, than to recover it mixed with divers religions? and conſequently he ought to leave the Imperialiſts full liberty to make converts there by the beſt means they could. If he thought, that he ought not to allow them this liberty which might prove very inconvenient to the heretical inhabitants; if, in a word, he deſired to procure an advantage to thoſe inhabitants, what becomes of his zeal as a converter? What unequal, what irregular, conduct would not this be? But, at the bottom, his diſquietudes would be a little ſuperfluous; for he ought not to fear, in the preſent ſituation of things, that the emperor ſhould haraſs the Proteſtants of Landau: his Imperial majeſty has too great obligations to the whole party, and too much intereſt in keeping fair with it, to introduce the converting ſpirit into conquered places. One cannot therefore comprehend the motive of the fourth article of the long capitulation preſented to the beſiegers.

Some perſons, who, by dint of refining, plunge themſelves into viſionary notions, venture to ſay, that the court of France has ſo expreſsly ſtipulated the preſervation of the Romiſh faith, in order to ſhew that the Catholics of Landau ſtood in need of protection, under the dominion of an emperor devoted to the Proteſtants. What chimeras!

As to the purity, in which it is demanded that the Romiſh religion ſhall be preſerved, I have met with none who could explain to me what it meant; for, to pretend, that it was deſigned to prevent the introducing of Janſeniſm, or, on the contrary, the introducing of the ſuperſtitious practices and looſe maxims, with which the Jeſuits and Monks infect religion, this in truth would be the conceit of a viſionary. Did they then apprehend a kind of Samaritaniſm? Were they deſirous to guard againſt I know not what mixture of Lutheran or Calviniſtical opinions with the points decided in the council of Trent? I am clearly of opinion that this is chimerical; but I know not which way to determine about it.

---

(43) Nouvelles des Cours de l'Europe, Sept. 1702, pag. 318.

(44) Lettres Hiſt. Octob. 1702, pag. 432.

(45) *De Vizé, at the end of the* Journal of the Siege of Landau, pag 307.

(46) Lettres Hiſt. Sept. 1702. pag. 355.

(47) Ibid. pag. 359.

(48) *The name of the Engineer, who deſerted.*

(49) Journal of the Siege of Landau, pag. 204, 205.

(50) Ibid. pag. 243.

(51) Merc. Hiſt. January, 1703, pag. 6.

(52) *The author of the* Nouvelles des Cours de l'Europe, *has purſued this very finely in his month of September,* 1702, *pag.* 320, 321.

LANDO (Hortensio) a Phyſician, born at Milan, lived in the XVIth century. He is the author of ſeveral books, and he loved to publiſh them under falſe names. He is thought to be the author of a dialogue, publiſhed under the name of *Philalethes*, againſt the memory of Eraſmus. That conjecture ſeems to be well grounded [*A*]. He wrote two dialogues, which have been falſely aſcribed to Cardinal Aleander [*B*].

[*A*] *That conjecture ſeems to be well grounded.*] Here I ſhall perform a promiſe, which I made in the remark [*C*] of the article ERASMUS, by ſetting down the import of the Memoir which I have quoted in that place. *Herold believed, that a Phyſician, born at Piacenza, whoſe name was Baſſiano Landi, or Lando, concealed himſelf under the name of* Philalethes. *For my part, I rather believe it was Hortenſio Lando, a Milaneſe, and a Phyſician too, and a man of parts, who wrote ſeveral Latin and Italian books, in which he always affected to appear in a diſguiſe. He took the ſame name,* Philalethes, *in a dialogue, intituled,* Forcianæ Quæſtiones, *in which he examines the manners and genius of the ſeveral nations of Italy. It is true that, in this laſt dialogue, he calls himſelf* Philalethes Polytopienſis, *whereas, in the dialogue againſt Eraſmus, it is* Philalethes Utopienſis, *or* ex Utopiâ civis. *Which, ſo far from expreſſing any real difference, ſhews, on the contrary, that both theſe books are the productions of the ſame genius. He alſo called himſelf ſometimes* Hortenſius Tranquillus; *which Simler, the abridger and continuator of Geſner, has not obſerved, ſpeaking of Hortenſius Tranquillus, and Hortenſius Landus, as two different writers. We have a book of this Lando, intituled,* Un Commentario delle più notabili e moſtruoſe coſe d'Italia, *in 8vo. A diverting book; to which having not prefixed his name, he ſupplies that with a little advertiſement at the end, where he ſays:* Godi, lettore, il preſente Commentario nato del coſtantiſſimo cervello di M. O. L. detto per la ſua natural manſuetudine il Tranq. *Who ſees not that theſe three letters* M. O. L. *ſignify* Meſſer Ortenſio Lando, *& Tranq.* Tranquillo. *Next to this there is,* Un Catalogo de gli inventori delle coſe che ſi mangiano, e delle bevande ch'oggidi s'uſano; *at the end of which are theſe capital letters* SUISNETROH SUDNAL ROTUA TSE. *Which being read backwards, according to the order of the words make:* HORTENSIUS LANDUS AUTOR EST. *In the ſame manner at the end of his* Paradoſſi, *printed at Venice in 8vo,* 1544, SUISNETROH TABEDUL, *that is,* HORTENSIUS LUDEBAT. *It is therefore very probable, that it was not Baſſiano, but Hortenſio Lando, who was the author of the dialogue, which Herold anſwered: and what confirms me in this thought, is, that Hortenſio being to prove in one of his Parodoxes, that it is no diſhonour to be a baſtard, alledges, the example of many men of letters. Peter Lombard, Giaſon Maino, Longelius, Celio Calcagnini, and Eraſmus, ſpeaking of the latter in theſe words.* O quanti letterati hannoci ancora dato i furtivi abracciamenti, &c. hannoci dato un Eraſmo di Roterodamo, e per opra d'un valente Abbate ce lo dettero.

I muſt not forget the Collection of Letters, which he printed at Venice, *appreſſo Gabriel Giolito*, in 1548, in 12mo. It is intituled, *Lettere di molte valoroſe donne, nelle quali Chiaramente appare non eſſer ne di eloquentia ne di dottrina alli huomini inferiori.* There is at the end of it a ſhort advertiſement (1) of Bartholomæus Peſtaloſſa, Rhetus, which intimates that Hortenſius Lando collected theſe letters into one volume, at the requeſt of Octavianus Raverta, 'Qui ob inſignem animi pietatem Terracinæ Pontifex deſignatus eſt (2). —— *Who, for his remarkable piety, was nominated to the biſhopric of Terracina.*'

[*B*] *He wrote two dialogues, which have been falſely aſcribed to cardinal Aleander.*] The following paſſage was communicated to me by the author the foregoing remark. 'The two dialogues, one whereof is intituled, *Cicero relegatus*, and the other *Cicero revocatus*, were not written by Jerom Aleander, but by Ortenſio Lando, a Mileneſe, ſirnamed Tranquillo. They are dedicated to Pomponio Trivultio; and becauſe the inſcription of the epiſtle dedicatory is thus expreſſed, *Pomponio Trivultio*, H. A. S. D. Henry Lewis Chaſteignier, biſhop of Poitiers, thought that the letters H. A. ſignified *Hieronymus Aleander*. But they have been put there without any reaſon for it; or perhaps, by an equivocation, H. A. have been put for H. L. A. that is Hortenſius Landus, the true name of the author. Simler, the continuator of Geſner, attributes theſe dialogues to *Hortenſius Tranquillus Mediolanenſis*, whom he erroneouſly diſtinguiſhes from Hortenſius Landus; for *Landus* and *Tranquillus* are one and the ſame writer. He loved to diſguiſe his name, and yet deſired nothing more than to be known. *L'Autore della preſente opera*, ſays he under the name of Paulo Maſcranico, in an advertiſement to the reader, at the end of his Paradoxes, *il qual fu M. O. L. M.* ‡ *detto per ſopranome il Tranq.* At the end of his *Commentario d'Italia*, in another advertiſement to the reader, under the name of Nicolo Morra, he ſpeaks thus. *Godi Lettore, &c.* (3). At the end of his *Sermoni funebri delle beſtie*, he names himſelf at length, and without any diſguiſe *Hortenſio Lando ditto* † *il Tranquillo.* Now this Lando, or Tranquillo, owns, in his laſt paradox, the dialogue, *Cicero relegatus*, to be his work. "Non dubito certamente, *ſays he*, che molti non ſi habbino da maravigliara che ancora fatto non habbia la pace con M. Tullio, qual gia ſono poco meno di dieci anni ⸸ chio mandai con ſuo gran ſcorno in eſſiglio —— *I doubt not but many wonder I have not yet made peace with Cicero, whom, ten years ago, I ſent into ſhameful exile.*" And lower, "Quando ſcriſſo il dialogo intitolato Cicerone relegato. —— *When I wrote the dialogue intituled Cicero relegatus.*"

---

(1) *It is in Latin.*

(2) *I am beholden to Mr Des Maizeaux for theſe particulars.*

‡ *That is,* Meſſer Ortenſio Lando Milaneſe.

(3) *See the ſequel in the foregoing remark.*

† *So they ſay in Lombardy inſtead of* detto.

⸸ *The Paradoxes came out at Venice in the year* 1544; *and the Dialogues about Cicero at Lyons in* 1534.

LANGIUS (Paul) a German Monk, would ſcarce have been known by the chronicle he compoſed, if he had not inſerted in it ſome complaints againſt the vicious lives of Eccleſiaſtics, and beſtowed praiſes upon Martin Luther (*a*). Which has been the reaſon, why the Proteſtants have cited him a thouſand times. He was born at Zwicka in Voigtland, and became a Benedictin Monk in the year 1487, in the monaſtery of Bozau, near Zeits in Miſnia (*b*). The abbot Trithemius ſent him, in 1515, to rummage all the convents in Germany, in order to make a collection of all the manuſcripts that might ſerve to illuſtrate the hiſtory, or to enlarge the catalogue of eccleſiaſtical writers (*c*). Langius laboured alſo for himſelf in examining the libraries; for this was of great uſe to him, when he wrote his chronicle (*d*) [*A*]. It begins, according to Voſſius,

[*A*] *His chronicle.*] It is intituled, *Chronicon Citicenſe.* But this is no reaſon, why du Pleſſis ſhould call the author of it *Moine de Citique, Monk of Citique.* Coëffeteau, inſtead of correcting it, made uſe of the ſame words. Nor are thoſe of Rivet better, *Le Moine Citique, The Citique Monk.* See their paſſages in the remark [*C*]. Foreigners have great reaſon to complain, that the French do ſo disfigure proper

---

(*a*) *See* Wolfii, Lect. Memorab. Tom II, pag. 169, & ſeq.

(*b*) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Latin. pag. 644.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

(*d*) *Vignier*, Theatre de l'Antechriſt, *in the Index of the authors quoted.*

Voſſius, in the year 1468; but he is miſtaken [B]. Coëffeteau made uſe of a poor evaſion [C], when he anſwered the *Myſtery of Iniquity*, wherein ſome words of Langius were alledged. I do not think that to be a ſolid reflexion, which Andrew Rivet made with relation to Piſtorius, who publiſhed the chronicle of this monk, in the year 1583 [D]. Moreri's

per names, that they cannot be known. Voſſius makes this obſervation againſt the illuſtrious Thuanus (1). But here the miſchief does not conſiſt only in diſfiguring the name of a town, but in ſomething worſe; for, under pretence, that Langius compoſed the chronicle of a cathedral, he has a name given him, derived from that church. Now that name does not ſuit him.

[B] *Voſſius is miſtaken.*] This book of Langius is a chronicle of the epiſcopal church of Zeitz. The emperor Otho I. founded this cathedral in the year 968. Pope John XIII confirmed it (2). Langius extends his chronicle from the foundation of it, till the year 1515, and not only gives the hiſtory of the biſhops of Zeitz, but alſo ſpeaks of the other biſhops of thoſe parts.

[C] *Coëffeteau made uſe of a poor evaſion.*] Du Pleſſis Mornai does not forget the praiſes that Langius beſtowed on Martin Luther. 'Paul Langius, a Monk of Citique, and a diſciple of the abbot Trithemius, at the time that Luther began to appear; though he did not leave his monaſtery, yet he was very much moved, and gave him an incredible teſtimony: "This Martin, *ſays he*, was a conſummate, profound, and incomparable divine, who endeavoured to reſtore the holy Theology to the dignity of it's original, and to the firſt purity and innocence, ſincerity and ſimplicity of the goſpel, deriding all ſecular Philoſophy." . . . . . In another place, under the year 1503, adding to him Carloſtad and Melanchthon; "They handle, *ſays he*, and teach the holy Theology, giving the wheat of the word of God, without any chaff; that is, without mixing it with Philoſophy and ſyllogiſms. They above all kept to the goſpel of Chriſt, and to the apoſtle St Paul, whom they take for their patron and foundation; and to the ſtudy of learning, they add the fear of God, and the ſeeds of all virtues, which they ſow in the hearts of their diſciples, by words, examples, and books." And leaſt it ſhould be replied, that it was before Luther had oppoſed the Pope, ſee how he ſpeaks of him under the year 1520, after having diſcourſed of the abuſes and exceſſes of indulgences. "This man, *ſays he*, by his doctrine and admirable preaching, brought all indulgences to nothing. He diſſuaded the people from buying them, affirming, that they are no ways neceſſary to ſalvation, and do not procure the remiſſion of ſins, but make people careleſs of repentance, and of all good works, and even are an incentive to vice," He further ſays, "That the merits of Chriſt and his ſaints are not a treaſury of indulgences; ſince in the primitive church, and for above a thouſand years after, there was nothing written of them by the holy men and doctors of the orthodox church. So far were they then from entertaining ſo great an opinion of them, as they do now, from a deſire of wealth, which accrues from them. Moreover, he affirmed and proved, that the church of Rome is not, of divine right, the firſt, nor the head of other churches, &c. And therefore, *ſays he*, they hitherto perſecute him as another Athanaſius, eſpecially for having maintained this poſition, and ſome other important doctrines, which not only the Romans continue to impugn, but alſo very many learned men, eſpecially the Thomiſts; and yet this Martin, who is undoubtedly the firſt and wiſeſt divine of our age, has not been hitherto vanquiſhed, confirming and proving his doctrine by the teſtimonies of the goſpel, and of the apoſtle St Paul, and even by the original texts of the antient orthodox fathers (3)." Du Pleſſis does not forget the corrective, added by Langius to ſo many bold propoſitions. 'And thus, *ſays he*, this Monk ſpeaks, *non aſſertivè, ſed admirativè*, not to affirm any thing, but out of admiration, ſuſpending his judgment, like many others, till the matter be decided in a general council.' I put Langius's words in the margin (4). They fully ſhew, that he was a Catholic.

Here follows Coëffeteau's anſwer. 'What Mr du Pleſſis urges from Paul Langius, a Monk of Citique, and a diſciple of the abbot Trithemius, ſhews the ſincerity of the Proteſtants, and their fairneſs in the publication of authors. For they make Langius ſay ſeveral things concerning Luther, which are entirely contrary, not only to the doctrine, which Langius conſtantly profeſſed to his death, but alſo to what he wrote in the ſame chronicle, wherein are inſerted the praiſes of Luther. Poſſibly the Proteſtants fancy they can make us believe, that this author was both a Lutheran and a Papiſt, a Heretic and a Catholic. Otherwiſe, certainly, they cannot reconcile what they make him ſay, with his firſt writings. And let no body be deceived by the name of Piſtorius the publiſher, for though he turned Catholic, it was ſome time after, and he was ſtill a Proteſtant, when he publiſhed this chronicle, with ſome other works of the German writers. Nay, he ſays, that he had it from Henry Petreus, who lived at Baſil among the Heretics. Moreover, thoſe who were guilty of the impoſture, were fully perſuaded, that it would be difficult to believe, that Langius ſpoke ſo advantageouſly of the perſon and doctrine of Luther; for which reaſon they added a poor and inſipid ſubterfuge, making him ſay, that what he had written about it, was not *aſſertivè*, but *admirativè, not to affirm any thing but out of admiration, ſuſpending his judgment*, &c. One would think that Langius was in queſt of a maſter, and was yet unreſolved, what religion to embrace (5).' This is a poor anſwer, and it were better to ſay nothing at all, than to uſe it. Father Gretſer gave it up, and thought it more to the purpoſe to ſuppoſe, that good Langius, being extremely deſirous to ſport with a woman, looked upon Luther as a hero, that was to deſtroy celibacy. Let us ſee how the apologiſt for du Pleſſis anſwered this pleaſantry, and Coëffeteau's ſubterfuge. 'Paul Langius, a Monk of Citique, gives ſuch a noble and great character of Luther's doctrine, that our Monk cannot bear it, and accuſes the publiſhers of his work of having added to it all that is produced out of it upon this ſubject, meaſuring their corn by the buſhel of the Papiſts, who corrupt, with additions and mutilations, all the writings that come into their hands. And yet it has pleaſed God to remove that objection, in that it was publiſhed by a man, who was then brooding the apoſtacy, which he at laſt hatched: namely, Piſtorius, who would not have failed to diſcover afterwards this artifice, if he had done it, or any other that he knew of. Gretſer, who might have aſked him ſome queſtions about it, had not the impudence, though it be a predominant quality in him, to accuſe the publiſhers of any impoſture. He choſe rather to abuſe this poor Monk in theſe words. "It is this Langius, whoſe feet itched, at the firſt hearing of the Lutheran goſpel, to run from his monaſtery, thinking that the acceptable time was come, in which it ſhould be lawful for the Monks to throw off their cowls, and marry the nuns." At that time the Monks knew well enough how to lie with them, without marrying them, had they had no other itch. Coëffeteau is not ignorant, that they want no opportunity of ſcratching it elſewhere (6).' Theſe laſt words manifeſtly ſhew, that the common places, the miſſionaries make uſe of on account of the marriage of the reformers and Monks, who embraced the Proteſtant religion, are not ſo favourable to them as they imagine. It affords them a large field for declamation; they make an odious deſcription of the ſenſuality of thoſe proſelytes: but they are eaſily anſwered, becauſe it is but too true, that thoſe, who make a vow of celibacy, do not always obſerve it; and common ſenſe teaches, that, if the miniſters of the church have not the power to abſtain from women, it is better they ſhould allay their heat with their own wives, than thoſe of other men.

[D] *I do not think that to be a ſolid reflexion, which Andrew Rivet made.*] We have ſeen, that he pretends, that Piſtorius would have diſcovered his fraud, when he turned Papiſt. I believe he is miſtaken. If Piſtorius had interpolated Langius's manuſcript, he would

(1) Voſſius, de Arte Hiſtorica, cap. xii, pag. 69.

(2) Teſte Paulo Langio in Chronico Citizenſi quod à dicto anno (968) uſque ad annum 1515 deduxit Epiſcoporum Citizenſium & aliorum in vicinia antiſtitum res geſtas commemorans. *Aub. Miræus, in Geographia Eccleſiaſtica, pag.* 124.

(3) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 573.

(4) Porro quæ de Martini Lutheri doctrina diſſerui, non ſicuti diſcipulus illius aſſertivè, quod abſit, ſed potius admirativè poſui, utpote nullius adhuc juratus in verba magiſtri. Sed cum ſim & ego more ſuſpenſus multorum, quouſque per Oecumenicum univerſale & generale Concilium, quid in tam ardue re tenendum ſit, decretum fuerit paratus nihilo tamen minus, & modo & ſemper à recte ſapientibus doceri, quorum etiam, & potiſſimum Romanæ Eccleſiæ judicio hæc præſentia, & alia qualiacunque mea ſcripta, & corrigenda & examinanda ſubjicio: tametſi ego ſupra narrata non de Romanis, ſed Romanenſibus id eſt, non indigenis, ſed aliunde ad eam confluentibus, deſcripſerim *Langius, apud Wolfium, Lect. Memorab. Tom. II. pag.* 175.

(5) Coëffeteau, Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 1218, 1219.

(6) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, Part. II. pag. 633.

Moreri's faults are not conſiderable (*e*) [*E*].

(*e*) *They are in the firſt edition of his Dictionary.*

would never have boaſted of it. Such a confeſſion would have procured but an inconſiderable advantage to the church of Rome. Whether Langius praiſed Luther in the year 1520, or whether he diſpraiſed him, or did not mention him at all, is but a trifle at the bottom. But Piſtorius could not have diſcovered his cheat, without making himſelf contemptible to the Papiſts, and expoſing himſelf to the inſults of the Proteſtants, who would have found, in his own confeſſion, wherewithal to convict him of being a wicked man. People are not willing to own ſuch faults: they are too material.

[*E*] *The faults of Moreri are not conſiderable.*] He ſhould have called Langius's native place Zwicka, and not Zwickau (7). His monaſtery was called Bozau, and not Bozan. The miſtake of Paſtorius, inſtead of Piſtorius, is corrected in the Dutch editions. It ſhould not have been ſaid, that his chronicle begins in the year 1468; it is a miſtake of Voſſius, which I have already cenſured, and which Zeillerus has copied (8).

(7) *In the Moreri of Holland it is called* Zurickau.

(8) Zeillerus, de Hiſtoricis, Part. I, pag. 85.

LANGIUS (RODOLPH) a gentleman of Weſtphalia, and provoſt of the cathedral church of Munſter towards the end of the XVth century, diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his learning, and his zeal for the reſtoration of polite learning. He ſtudied firſt at Deventer, after which he was ſent by his uncle, the dean of Munſter, into Italy, and followed the greateſt maſters of literature, Laurentius Valla, Mapheus Vegius, Francis Philelphus, and Theodore Gaza. By this means he acquired a good taſte of the Latin ſtile both in verſe and proſe, and confirmed himſelf in it by ſeveral compoſitions. He took this journey in company with Maurice count of Spiegelberg, and Rodolph Agricola; and, after their return into Germany, they all three laboured to drive out barbariſm, and were the firſt, who, by their example, and their exhortations, brought into credit the beſt way of writing Latin, and of teaching that language. Langius, being ſent to the court of Rome, by the biſhop and chapter of Munſter, under the pontificate of Sixtus IV, acquitted himſelf very well of his commiſſion, and returned with the letters of that Pope, and of Laurence de Medicis, which gained him ſtill greater eſteem with thoſe who deputed him; and this put him in a condition the better to execute the deſign he had of making polite learning flouriſh, and baniſhing from the ſchools the barbariſms that reigned in them. He was forced to ſtruggle ſome years with thoſe who patronized it [*A*], and who pleaded, that it was dangerous to introduce a new method of teaching: but at laſt he overcame theſe obſtacles; and he prevailed on his biſhop to found at Munſter a ſchool, the direction of which was given to able perſons. He pointed out to them the method of inſtruction, and the books they were to explain, and gave them acceſs to his fine library. This ſchool, being thus eſtabliſhed a little before the end of the XVth century, became very flouriſhing, and ſerved Germany as a nurſery of literature till the revolutions, which Anabaptiſm cauſed at Munſter in the year 1534. Langius died in the year 1519, aged eighty years. He publiſhed ſome poems, which prove, that, before Conrad Celtes, Germany produced ſome famous Latin Poets (*a*) [*B*].

(*a*) *Taken from David Chytræus*, in Saxonia, lib. iii, pag. m. 80, *&c. See alſo his ſpeech*, de Veteris Saxoniæ Provincia ampliſſima quæ Weſtphalia hodie nominatur, pag. m. 108, *&c.*

Rodolph

[*A*] *He was forced to ſtruggle ſome years with thoſe who patronized barbariſms.*] The univerſity of Cologne oppoſed the commendable deſign of Langius; but he had in his favour the ſuffrages of the Italians; and this was an authority, which fully determined the biſhop of Munſter. You will ſee more particulars in theſe words of Chytræus (1). ‘Cauſam bonarum literarum & emendationis ſtudiorum doctrinæ barbaræ, paſſim in omnibus Collegiis & Scholis regnantium, majore cum fructu egit *(Langius)* tametſi aliquot adhuc annos reluctantibus veteris Barbariei patronis, ac nominatim Academia Colonienſi, quæ datis ad Conradum Ritbergenſem Epiſcopum, qui Henrico Swartzburgenſi ſucceſſerat, & ſummum Collegium, literis, uſitatum tot ſeculis inſtituendæ adoleſcentiæ & docendi rationem & libellos, in ſcholis retineri, & mutationes novas, & ſtudiis & diſciplinæ periculoſas, faveri flagitabant. Etſi autem erudite & graviter Conſilii ſui cauſas Rodolphus explicabat: tamen ad Italorum doctorum judicia ipſi provocare neceſſe fuit. Qui cum emendationem doctrinæ in ſcholis uſitatæ neceſſariam eſſe & Langium recte, Lovanienſes (2) perperam judicare, in reſponſis ad Epiſcopum ſuis pronunciaſſent; Epiſcopus qui Italorum, apud quos olim vixerat, cenſuram magni faciebat, facultatem aperiendæ novæ bonarum literarum ſcholæ Collegio dedit. ——— *Langius more ſucceſsfully pleaded the cauſe of polite learning, and a reformation of thoſe barbarous ſtudies, which prevailed in all the colleges and ſchools, though for ſome years he met with oppoſition from the patrons of the old barbarity, particularly the univerſity of Cologne, which, by letters to Conrad Ritbergenſis, biſhop, and ſucceſſor of Henry Swartzburgenſis, and to the ſupreme college, earneſtly intreated them to patronize the antient method of inſtruction in the ſchools, and to diſcountenance theſe innovations ſo dangerous to ſtudy and diſcipline. And although Rodolph with great learning and earneſtneſs explained the reaſons of his undertaking, yet he was forced to appeal to the judgment of the learned Italians; who, in their anſwers to the biſhop, having pronounced, that a reformation of the learning of the ſchools was neceſſary, and that Langius had judged right, but the univerſity of Louvain wrong; the biſhop, who paid a great deference to the opinion of the Italians, among whom he had formerly lived, gave the college power to open a new ſchool of humanity.*’

(1) David Chytræus, in Saxonia, lib. iii, pag. m. 80.

(2) As the author had not ſpoken of the univerſity of Louvain, but of that of Cologne, perhaps we ſhould read *Colonienſes*, and not *Lovanienſes*; but perhaps he had forgot to ſay, that the univerſity of Louvain wrote alſo to the biſhop of Munſter, to thwart the deſigns of Langius.

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſome poems, which prove, that, before Conrad Celtes, Germany produced ſome famous Latin poets.*] Let us cite the ſame evidence once more: ‘Primus autem Germaniæ Poëta, ipſius Rodolphi Agricolæ judicio, avorum ætate, aliquot ante Conradum Celten annis celebris, hic Rodolphus Langius fuit, editis, de excidio Hieroſolymæ poſtremo, de obſidione Noveſii, de Paulo Apoſtolo, de Maria Virgine, Poëmatis clarus. De quo condiſcipulo & æquali ſuo Hegius cecinit:

Jam ferre Poëtas
Barbarie in media Weſtphalis ora poteſt.
Langius hanc decorat majorum ſanguine clarus
Monaſteriaci lauſque decuſque ſoli
Primus Melpomenem qui rura in Weſtphala duxit
Cum caneret laudes, maxime Paule, tuas.

——— *But the firſt German Poet, in the opinion of Rodolph Agricola himſelf, in the time of our anceſtors, ſome years before Conrad Celtes, was this Rodolph Langius, famous for his poems, on the laſt deſtruction of Jeruſalem, the ſiege of Neus, the apoſtle Paul, and the Virgin Mary. He was ſchool-fellow and equal of Hegius, who thus celebrated him.*

Weſtphalia, which barbarity o'er-runs,
Can now produce Apollo's tuneful ſons.

Langius

Rodolph Agricola dedicated to Langius his Latin verſion of the Axiochus of Plato (*b*).

(*b*) Idem, in ea Oratione, pag. 108.

Langius exalts her glory, whoſe great name
To riſing Munſter gives immortal fame.
He firſt a temple to the Muſes rais'd,
And in Weſtphalian verſe the great apoſtle prais'd.

Note, that Chytræus, in making uſe of the word *editis*, declares that theſe poems were printed. Nevertheleſs the abridger of Geſner's Bibliotheque (3), who mentions ſome other poems of Langius, inſinuates ſome doubt; for he ſays, that Herman Hamelman, who acknowledges to have ſeen them, does not ſpecify whether they were manuſcripts, or printed works.

(3) Epit. Bibl. Geſneri, pag. m. 734.

LANGIUS (**Joseph**) a native of Keiſerſberg (*a*) in the upper Alſace, and profeſſor of Mathematics, and the Greek tongue at Friburg in Briſgaw, was writing his *Elementale Mathematicum* (*b*) in the year 1612, which was not printed (*c*), according to Voſſius, till five years after (*d*). Iſaac Habrecht, a Philoſopher and a Phyſician, enlarged it, and adorned it with notes and figures, and publiſhed it (*e*) in the year 1625. Langius had printed, at Straſburg, in 1598, a *Florilegium* [*A*], in 8vo, which was followed ſome time after, by a book in Folio, intituled *Polyanthea Nova* [*B*]. He lived ſeveral years in the Proteſtant communion, and then he embraced the Romiſh faith (*f*). I give the titles of his other books [*C*].

(*a*) Cæſaremontanus.

(*b*) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. pag. 388.

(*c*) *And yet the edition of* 1612 *is mentioned in the Catalogue of the Bodleian library.*

(*d*) *At Friburg.*

(*e*) *At Straſburg.*

(*f*) *See the preface to his* Polyanthea.

[*A*] *A Florilegium.*] It is an alphabetical collection of ſentences, apoththegms, compariſons, examples, and hieroglyphics. Such a book is of uſe to ſcholars, in dilating upon a theme. It might be alſo ſerviceable to learned men, if all the citations had been well collated with the originals; but little care has been taken of that. Our Langius was contented to tranſcribe the modern compilers, and among others Thomas Hibernicus (1), whoſe book, *Flores Doctorum*, abounds with faults.

[*B*] *Polyanthea Nova.*] The author, in this book, has followed the ſame method, as in the *Florilegium*. The Index of Spain corrects ſome places in it, and gives an account of the books intituled *Polyanthea*. I think it will not be amiſs to give the ſubſtance of that account. The firſt *Polyanthea* was printed in 1512 (2): it is the work of the Monk Dominicus Nanus Mirabellius, author of the *Monoteſſaron Evangeliorum*. The ſecond was compiled by a Bookſeller of Cologne, called Maternus Cholinus, and publiſhed in the year 1585 (3). He added to Mirabellius, all that he thought proper to be copied from three books, that had been publiſhed, I mean from the collection of Bartholomæus Amantius, and from the *Sententiarum opus abſolutiſſimum ex probatiſſimis auctoribus excerptum* (4), and from an anonymous book printed at Lyons. Cholinus, beſides, inſerted his own collections. The third, intituled *Polyanthea nova*, is the work of our Joſeph Langius, and was printed at Geneva in 1600, at Lyons in 1604, at Francfort in 1607, and ſeveral times ſince. The fourth, called *Polyanthea noviſſima*, is divided into twenty books, and differs from the third only in ſome additions. The fifth, called *Florilegium magnum, ſeu Polyanthea floribus noviſſimis ſparſa*, was publiſhed at Francfort, in 1621. What is new in this book, is owing to the induſtry of Franciſcus Sylvius Inſulanus. I have mentioned elſewhere (5) Gruterus's Supplements: they contain two volumes; ſo that the *Florilegium magnum* contains three volumes: the firſt is Sylvius Inſulanus's; the ſecond and third, printed at Francfort, in 1624, are Gruterus's.

[*C*] *I give the titles of his other books.*] An edition of Juvenal and Perſius at Friburg, 1608. *Tyrocinium Græcarum Literarum*, ib. 1607. *Adagia, ſive Sententiæ Proverbiales.*

(1) D'eterius nihil aliud in Langio reprehendit quam credulitatem, qua ſe ab Hibernico decipi paſſus eſt. *Thomaſius, de Plagio, n.* 482.

(2) *At Baſil, and then at Sarne, in* 1514*, and at Cologne in* 1539. Index libr. prohib pag. 726. Edit. 1667.

(3) *It was reprinted at Venice, in* 1592.

(4) *By Franciſcus Tertius*, ſeu de Tort, *of Angers. That work was printed at Paris, in* 1560, *and* 1580.

(5) *In the article of* GRUTERUS, (Janus), *remark* [*I*].

LANGLE (**John Maximilian de**) miniſter of the goſpel, was born at Evreux in 1590. He was made miniſter of the Reformed church at Rouën in 1615, being then but twenty five years of age. He diſcharged all the functions of his miniſtry for fifty two years with great reputation, piety, and eloquence. We have two volumes of his ſermons, one upon the eighth chapter of the epiſtle to the Romans, the other upon ſeveral texts of the Scripture, and a diſſertation, by way of a letter, in defence of Charles I, king of England. Seven years before his death, he fell into a palſy, which occaſioned an impediment in his ſpeech; notwithſtanding which, his ingenious and pious converſations were both pleaſing and edifying. He died in 1674, in the eighty fourth year of his age, leaving ſeveral children behind him [*A*], who inherited his merit and his virtue (*a*).

(*a*) *I publiſh this article juſt as it has been communicated to me.*

[*A*] *He left ſeveral children.*] **SAMUEL DE LANGLE**, his eldeſt ſon, was born at London, and was carried into France being one year old, where he conſtantly lived, till the laſt perſecution obliged him to retire into England. He was a miniſter almoſt in the ſame year of his age as his father, and jointly officiated with him in the church of Rouën, for twenty three years. He was afterwards invited to Paris in 1671, to ſerve the church that met at Charenton, and was very much eſteemed in both places for his gravity, his ſolid learning, and conſummate prudence, being an intimate friend of Mr Claude. The perſecutions of France, and particularly that which deprived fathers of their children, obliged him to retire into England. The univerſity of Oxford made him doctor of Divinity, without his asking it: and king Charles II gave him, as a teſtimony of his eſteem, a prebend in the abbey of Weſtminſter. He was born in 1622. He fell ſick in the ſeventy firſt year of his age, in June 1693, of a violent diſtemper, which laſted eight days, but hindered him not from preſerving all the ſtrength of his parts, continually making excellent diſcourſes to his relations and friends, and eſpecially to his children, to whom he had given the ſame education he received from his father. The public has yet ſeen no other writings of his, beſides a letter upon the differences between the Epiſcopalians, and Preſbyterians in England. Dr Stillingfleet, the preſent biſhop of Worceſter (1), printed it at the end of one of his books upon the ſame ſubject; but they have found, among his manuſcripts, a treatiſe concerning the Chriſtian truth, which he began ſome years before, and finiſhed a little before his death. It is hoped, that Mr de Langle, his eldeſt ſon, and a miniſter too, will publiſh it in a little time. He alſo made many critical obſervations upon ſeveral places of the ſcripture, and particularly on the Pſalms, which it is believed he would have publiſhed himſelf, if he had lived long enough to put them in order as he deſigned them (2).

As for the other children of John Maximilian de Langle, the memoir, I cite, ſays nothing of them.

(1) *He died in* 1699, *ſince the firſt impreſſion of this paſſage.*

(2) *A Memoir, imparted to me, which I print juſt as I have received it.*

LANGUET (Hubert), a native of Viteaux in Burgundy (*a*); became famous for his ability and virtue, in the XVIth century. Having read a book of Melanchthon in Italy, he was ſo deſirous of knowing that great man, that he went to viſit him in Germany. He contracted a very ſtrict friendſhip with him [*A*]. He charmed him with his fine converſation; for he had a very good memory, and an exquiſite judgment (*b*). He was a long time one of the chief counſellors to Auguſtus elector of Saxony (*c*); and, if we may believe Thuanus, he did not leave that court [*B*], till he was ſuſpected of being one of thoſe, who adviſed Gaſpar Peucer to publiſh an expoſition of the doctrine of the Euchariſt, agreeable to the Geneva confeſſion. This hiſtorian adds, that, having left the court of Saxony, he retired to the prince of Orange, and was employed in great affairs, and that, whilſt he applied himſelf to them, he fell ſick, and died at Antwerp, the thirtieth of September 1581, being ſixty three years old (*d*). He had a great ſhare in the eſteem of Mr du Pleſſis Mornai [*C*]. He is thought to be the author of the ſpeech, which was made to Charles IX, the twenty third of December 1570, in the name of ſeveral princes of Germany [*D*]. The famous treatiſe,

[*A*] *He contracted a very ſtrict friendſhip with Melanchthon.*] All that I have ſaid about this, is afforded me by Joachim Camerarius, in his life of Melanchthon. *Hunc* (Languetum) *lectio libri cujuſdam in Italia ubi tunc ipſe degeret, a Philippo Melanchthone compoſiti cupiditate incenderat videndi autorem illius, & ea ſtimulos perpetuo admovens perpulerat tandem ut in Germaniam veniret, & Wittembergam ſe conferret* (1). Languet came to Wittemberg in the year 1549 (2), and kept ſo cloſe to Melanchthon, that, excepting ſome journies from time to time, he never left him. *Neque ab ipſo diſceſſit. niſi interdum per intervalla quædam peregrinationum, quibus mirifice delectabatur, donec Philippi Melanchthonis vita in terris duravit* (3). Languet's converſation was admirable. He ſpoke learnedly of the intereſts of princes, and was thoroughly acquainted with the hiſtory of illuſtrious men (4). His memory never failed him as to the circumſtances of time, or proper names; and he had an extraordinary ſagacity at diſcovering the inclinations of people, and foreſeeing the event of things. He, who gives him this teſtimony, was particularly acquainted with him. *Neque ego*, ſays he (5) *audivi ullum alterum, qui tam prudenter & certo, & planè, dilucidè, diſertè, exponeret, quicquid narrare inſtituiſſet. Non ille in hominum nominibus falli, non indiciis temporum errare, non confundere rerum negotiorumque ſeriem. Erat autem in eo ſingularis ſagacitas in notandis naturis hominum, & conjiciendo, quo quiſque ſuopte ingenio deferretur, & quæ eſſet voluntatis inclinatio. Conſiliorum etiam ſolertiſſimus æſtimator, & eventuum futurorum proviſione admirabilis.*

I will add to this, what Mr de la Mare ſays, that about the year 1548, a German gave Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* to Languet; that Languet, having read that book four or five times in one year, during his travels, was freed from thoſe doubts, which had perplexed him a long time, and conceived an extraordinary eſteem for Melanchthon; that, having conſulted the chief divines of Leipſic, he embraced the Proteſtant religion, and put himſelf under the diſcipline of Joachim Camerarius, who taught the *belles lettres* in the univerſity of Leipſic; that he lodged in the houſe of that profeſſor; that, ſeeing the troubles of that country, he undertook a journey into Italy, till he might ſettle in Germany as ſoon as things ſhould be quiet there; that he ſtudied the Civil-Law a year at Padua, where he took his doctor's degree, and afterwards went to Bologna; and that, during that time, as Joachim Camerarius relates (6), he was ſo charmed with a new book of Melanchthon, that he wiſhed for nothing ſo earneſtly, as to return into Germany to ſee the author of that book, which he did in the year 1549. I find ſomething in this account, that is liable to a difficulty: for it is not natural, that a man, who had conceived ſuch an eſteem for Melanchthon, by the reading of his common-places of Divinity, that he took him for the only wiſe man in the world (7), ſhould make a journey to Leipſic, ſtay there, and embrace the Proteſtant religion, without going to ſee that divine; and that he ſhould not deſire to make him a viſit, till he had read another book of his at Bologna. It is not true, that Camerarius ſays, that this other book was the treatiſe *de Anima*, and that it made Languet reſolve to return into Germany. He expreſſes himſelf ſo, as to make one believe, that he means a firſt, and not a ſecond journey. *Perpulerat tandem ut in Germaniam veniret* (8). Laſtly, it is ſtrange, that, if Languet had been Camerarius's diſciple and his boarder at Leipſic in 1548, Camerarius ſhould ſay, that he did not come into Germany till 1549, out of a deſire of ſeeing Melanchthon, which proceeded from his reading a book of his in Italy. Either he, or Mr de la Mare, muſt be miſtaken. In all likelihood Camerarius's account is right; for Languet (9) himſelf tells him, that, having read in Italy Melanchthon's common-places, in the year 1547, and not thinking him ſufficiently clear about the Euchariſt, he reſolved to go and conſult the author, and that he ſaw him in 1549. Would he have ſpoke after this manner, if he had embraced the Proteſtant religion at Leipſic in 1548, and if Camerarius had been his profeſſor and landlord in the ſame year in the ſame town?

[*B*] *If we may believe Thuanus, he did not leave that court*, &c.] Thuanus ſpeaks of it too generally. The expoſition of the doctrine of the Euchariſt came out in the year 1573. Languet was not then at the court of Saxony, but at that of the emperor; and did not leave that employment till 1577. A letter which he writ from Prague the firſt of March 1577 (10), informs us, that he had obtained leave from his electoral highneſs of Saxony to retire whither he pleaſed. Ever after he held a great correſpondence with that elector, tho' he applied himſelf to the affairs of prince Caſimir, or of the prince of Orange. All this is proved by his letters, publiſhed in the year 1699.

[*C*] *He had a great ſhare in the eſteem of Mr du Pleſſis Mornai.*] That appears from this paſſage (11): ‘At his arrival at Antwerp, Mr du Pleſſis found his wife and children ſick; and a ſon whom God had given him, died immediately in his abſence; beſides he found Mr Languet, his particular friend, dead, whom Madam du Pleſſis, tho' ſick her ſelf, had attended to his laſt breath. His laſt words were: *That the only thing he was ſorry for, was, that he could not ſee Mr du Pleſſis again before he died, to whom he would have left his heart, if it had been poſſible. That he had deſired to live to ſee the world grow better; but ſince it ſtill grew worſe he had nothing more to do with it; that the princes of this time were ſtrange people; that virtue had much to ſuffer, and little to gain by them; that he very much pitied Mr du Pleſſis, who would feel a good deal of it, and would have a bad time to go through; but that he ſhould not deſpond, and God would aſſiſt him: he entreated her to requeſt one thing of him, that, in the firſt book he ſhould publiſh, he would make mention of their friendſhip.* This Mr du Pleſſis did, not long after, in a ſhort preface at the beginning of the Latin verſion of his book concerning the truth of the Chriſtian religion.’ What he ſays in praiſe of Hubert Languet in that preface, and what others have publiſhed upon the ſame ſubject, has been carefully collected by Voëtius (12). The epitaph alone is worth a panegyric. You will find it in the ſame Voëtius. Note, that Languet expreſſed a very great affection for Mr du Pleſſis at the time of the Paris maſſacre (13).

[*D*] *The ſpeech made to Charles IX, in the name of ſeveral German princes is aſcribed to him.*] Mr Colomiés gives a very ſolid proof of it in his *Mêlanges Hiſtoriques*

(*a*) Thuanus, lib. lxxiv, circa fin. ad ann. 1581.

(*b*) *See the remark* [*A*].

(*c*) Thuan. ibid.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(1) Joach. Camerar. in Vita Melancht. pag. m 333.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Ibid.

(4) Erat autem Philippo grata atque jucunda multarum magnarumque rerum, quas ille tenebat, commemoratio, & oratio de Regibus Principibuſque gubernationum, & aliis ſapientia, virtute, doctrina præſtantibus viris horum temporum. *Ibid.*

(5) Ibid.

(6) Quo tempore narrat in Philippi Melanchthonis Vita Joachimus Camerarius elegantis illius & multiplici eruditione referti de anima libri à Melanchthone non ita pridem ſcripti lectione Languetum tanta videndi auctoris cupiditate incenſum fuiſſe, *&c. Philib. de la Mare, in Vita Langueti, pag.* 10.

(7) Melanchthonem ab eo tempore tanti æſtimare, ut reliquos cæcutire & propriis affectibus indulgere judicaret, unum autem ſapere Melanchthonem. *Id. ibid. pag* 9.

(8) Camer in Vita Melanch. pag. m. 334.

(9) Languet, Epiſtol. xv, ad Joach. Camerar. pag. m. 27.

(10) *It is the twenty eighth of thoſe he wrote to Camerarius the ſon.*

(11) *Life of Du Pleſſis Mornai*, pag. 56, ad ann. 1581.

(12) Diſput. Theolog. Tom. IV, pag. 238, & ſeq.

(13) *See the Life of Mr Du Pleſſis, pag.* 22. *See alſo page* 12, *of the ſame.*

treatiſe, intituled VINDICIÆ CONTRA TYRANNOS, is aſcribed to him [*E*]. The Latin letters, which he wrote to Sir Philip Sidney, were printed at Francfort in 1633 (*e*). Thoſe he wrote in the ſame language to the Camerarius's, father and ſon, came out in 1646, and were reprinted with ſome others (*f*) in 1685. The fine preface (*g*), prefixed to thoſe letters, contains a noble encomium upon him.

A large collection of thoſe he wrote to the elector of Saxony, his maſter [*F*], during the courſe of his negotiations, was publiſhed at Hall in 1699. I muſt not forget what Thuanus relates of a converſation he had with him in 1579 [*G*].

(*e*) *See* Eſſais de Litterat. July 1702, pag. 23.

(*f*) *Which he wrote to Auguſtus, elector of Saxony.*

(*g*) *Made by Joachim Camerarius, grandſon of the author of the Life of Melanchthon.*

---

riques (14). He takes it from a letter of Languet to his hero Sir Philip Sidney, written from Vienna the firſt of January, 1574.

[*E*] *The famous treatiſe, intituled,* VINDICIÆ CONTRA TYRANNOS.] What I have ſaid above in the project of this Dictionary, at the word Brutus, is too long to be conveniently inſerted here. I have thought it more proper to place it at the end of this work by way of diſſertation.

Some ſay, he is the author of the book *de Furoribus Gallicis* (15), but without any good grounds (16). It was believed in his family, that he wrote the famous apology for the prince of Orange; which they inferred from his ſending a copy of it to each of his relations, as a thing of his own writing. Nevertheleſs Grotius (17) aſcribes this apology to another Frenchman, who was called Peter de Villiers (18).

[*F*] *They have publiſhed . . . . . . a large collection of letters he wrote to the elector of Saxony.*] Mr Ludovicus, profeſſor in the univerſity of Hall, procured that edition. We ſhould have been ſtill more indebted to him, if he had added an Index to it, and if he had taken care, that the faults of the Printers, or tranſcribers, in the proper names, had been more carefully corrected. It is a wonder he put no preface to that book, and that the editions of Germany being generally valuable for the indexes there ſhould be none in Languet's letters, which wanted it more than many other books; becauſe each letter contains ſeveral particular facts, which have no connection with a general ſubject. Here is the title of that book: *Arcana ſeculi decimi ſexti. Huberti Langueti, Legati, dum viveret, & Conſiliarii Saxonici Epiſtolæ ſecretæ ad Principem ſuum Auguſtum Sax. Ducem & S. R. I. ſeptemvirum. Ex* ΑΡΧΕΙΩ. *Saxonico deſcriptas primus à Muſeo edit Jo. Petr. Ludovicus.* The abbot Nicaiſe aſſured me, that the life of the author, written by Mr de la Mare, would be prefixed to it; but that did not prove true. It was publiſhed by itſelf in the town of Hall in 1700, in 12mo. If it had come to my hands ſoon enough, this article had been better and fuller. I refer you to Mr Bernard (19), who gives a very large and exact account of that piece: it is well written, and very curious.

[*G*] *We muſt not forget . . . . . . a converſation, which Thuanus had with him.*] He became acquainted with Languet at the Baden waters, in the year 1579, and was ſo charmed with the carriage and fine diſcourſes of that worthy man, that he thought he never could part from him. This is the encomium he beſtows upon him; which I relate, becauſe neither Voëtius nor Mr Teiſſier have mentioned it. 'Argentina Badam ventum, ubi Thuanus Languetum vacuum nactus ita mordicus per triduum ei adhæſit, ut ab eo divelli non poſſe putaretur. Ita candor hominis illum ceperat, inſigni probitate, judicio non ſolum in literis, ſed in publicis negotiis, quæ tota vita ſub variis principibus magna fide geſſerat, præditi, ad hæc rerum Germaniæ callentiſſ. ut Germanos ipſos res patrias ſuas doceret. Toto illo tempore cum eo aſſiduus, niſi quantum aquis ſumendis impendebat, cum multa didicit, tum breviculum manu ipſius perſcriptum, quod & nunc ſervat, poſtquam hinc diſceſſit, ab eo accepit, quo generalis Germaniæ ſtatus, ſicut hodie eſt, comitiorum jus, circulorum nemerus, conſiliorum ordo deſcribitur (20). '*From Strasburg he came to Baden, where Thuanus, finding Languet at leiſure, ſtuck ſo cloſe to him for three days, that it was thought he could not be parted from him: ſo taken was he with the candour of the man, his remarkable probity, and his judgment, not only in matters of learning, but alſo in public affairs, which he faithfully tranſacted, during his whole life, under various princes; add to theſe his thorough knowledge of the affairs of Germany, in which he was able to inſtruct the Germans themſelves. He ſpent that whole time with him, excepting as much of it as was employed in drinking the waters; during which he not only learned many things, but likewiſe received from him a ſmall manuſcript, which he ſtill keeps, deſcribing the preſent ſtate of Germany, the rights of the Diets, the number of the Circles, and the order of the Councils.*' He ſays, that Languet ſhewed him a German lord, who was at a window with his wiſe, and afterwards asked him with a ſmile, *If it was in your choice, would you prefer ſuch a handſome woman before the archbiſhopric of Cologne?* Thuanus, not knowing what was the drift of his queſtion ſaid nothing. Languet explained to him the myſtery, telling him, that this German lord was the count of Iſemburg, who had lately reſigned the archbiſhopric of Cologne to marry Joan de Lignes, ſiſter to the count of Aremberg. He added, that the ſuppreſſion of celibacy in Germany was inconvenient to the great Proteſtant lords; for whereas in the time of Popery, they made their daughters Nuns, with a certain proſpect of ſeeing them ſome time or other raiſed to the dignity of an abbeſs, in ſome very rich convent, they were obliged to marry them in a country where people multiply very faſt (21).

(14) Pag. 13, 14.

(15) De quo ſupra, *citat.* (44), *of the article* BEZA.

(16) *See Mr de la Mare*, in Vita Langueti, pag. 67, 68.

(17) Lib. iii, Annal. Belgic.

(18) La Mare, ubi ſupra. pag. 121, 122.

(19) *In the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, March 1701, pag. 286, & *ſeq.*

(20) Thuan de Vita ſua, lib. ii, init. pag. m. 1176.

(21) Filias offineis quibus homines proletarii abundant, matrimonio elocare teneantur. *Id. ibid.*

LANSBERGIUS (PHILIP) a Mathematician of the XVIIth century, was born in Zealand (*a*) in 1561 (*b*). He was miniſter of the word of God at Antwerp in 1586, and afterwards at Ter-Goes in Zealand for ſeveral years [*A*]: and at laſt being declared *emeritus*, he retired to Middleburg (*c*), where he died in the year 1632. The titles of his works will be ſeen below [*B*].

(*a*) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. pag. 341.

(*b*) Ipſe, Epiſt. Dedic. Uranometriæ.

(*c*) Voſſius, ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *He was miniſter . . . . . for ſeveral years.*] Voſſius (1) at page 237, ſays he was miniſter at Ter-Goes thirty nine years more or leſs, but at page 341, he ſays only twenty nine years. This is doubtleſs an error of the preſs; but I confeſs, it is uncertain whether it conſiſts in the ſubſtraction or addition of X. It is one of the two.

[*B*] *The titles of his works will be ſeen below.*] *Chronologiæ ſacræ libri VI.* printed in 1626. *Progymnaſmata Aſtronomiæ reſtitutæ*, printed at Middelburg in 1629. *Triangulorum Geometricorum libri IV.* printed at the ſame place in 1631. *Uranometriæ libri III.* printed at the ſame place the ſame year. *Commentationes in motum terræ diurnum & annuum, & in verum aſpectabilis cœli typum*, wherein he openly declares for the ſyſtem of Copernicus, and even pretends to perfect it. He wrote this work in Dutch; but it was tranſlated into Latin by Martin Hortenſius, and printed at Middelburg in 1630. Fromondus, a doctor of Louvain, confuted it in his *Ant-Ariſtarchus, ſive orbis terræ immobilis.* Lansbergius, who lived not long enough to reply, left a ſon, who anſwered Fromondus, and at the ſame time Morinus, Regius profeſſor at Paris, and a Dane called Peter Bartholinus. This anſwer, intituled, *Jacobi Lansbergii Medicinæ Doctoris Apologia pro commentationibus*, &c. printed at Middelburg in 1633, was confuted by a new book of Fromondus printed in 1634, with the title of Veſta, or Ant-Ariſtarchi Vindex. I think the diſpute ſtopped there.

(1) De Scient. Mathemat.

LARROQUE (Matthew de) in Latin *Larroquanus*, one of the moſt famous miniſters the Proteſtants have had in France, was born at Leirac a little town of Guienne, near Agen in 1619. The misfortune he had to loſe his parents juſt before he came of age, who for their rank and virtue were among the moſt eminent of their town, was followed ſoon after by the loſs of his patrimony, nor is it known by what accident, or by whoſe fraud it happened. This was ſo far from diſcouraging him, that it animated him more vigorouſly to ſeek conſolation in his ſtudies, and to add to his claſſical learning, the knowledge of Philoſophy, and eſpecially of Divinity. He made a very great progreſs in them, and was admitted miniſter with ap lauſe. He was obliged to go to Paris two years after his admiſſion into the miniſtry, in order to oppoſe the cavils of thoſe who endeavoured to ruin his church. He could not overcome them; but he met with favourable conjunctures on other accounts. He preached ſometimes at Charenton, and was ſo liked by the ducheſs de la Trimouille, that ſhe choſe him to be miniſter of the church of Vitré in Bretagne, and afterwards gave him many marks of a particular eſteem. The ſame did the prince (*a*) and the princeſs of Tarente, and the ducheſs of Weimar (*b*). He ſerved that church about twenty ſeven years, and applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the fathers with unparallelled ardour. He quickly gave public proofs of the progreſs he had made in it; for the anſwer he publiſhed to the motives of converſion of a certain miniſter (*c*), who had changed his religion, was full of their teſtimonies. The books he afterwards printed, extremely raiſed his reputation [*A*]. He contracted a very cloſe friendſhip with Mr Daillé and his ſon, which was kept up by a frequent correſpondence of letters. The journey he made to Paris, procured him the acquaintance of ſeveral learned men [*B*]. The church of Charenton reſolved to call him thither in 1669; but the envy of ſome falſe brethren was ſo violent, that they uſed all artifices to prejudice the court againſt him, inſomuch that his majeſty injoined that church to lay aſide their thoughts of him, notwithſtanding the deputy-general of the Proteſtants (*d*) offered to be anſwerable for the good conduct of Mr de Larroque. It was a very great concern to him to be ſlandered; but the teſtimony of a good conſcience was his remedy. He was invited to be both miniſter and profeſſor of Divinity at Saumur. He accepted the firſt employment, but refuſed the latter, as judging it prejudicial to the ſtudy of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, which was his favourite paſſion. He was preparing for his journey to Saumur, when the intendant of the province (*e*) forbad his undertaking it. He appealed

(*a*) *Son to the ducheſs de la Trimouille.*

(*b*) *Daughter of the ſame lady.*

(*c*) *Named Martin.*

(*d*) *The marquis de Ruvigni.*

(*e*) *Named Mr Voiſin.*

[*A*] *The books he afterwards printed, extremely raiſed his reputation.*] He publiſhed in 1665, an anſwer to a book of the gentlemen of Port-Royal, intituled *L' Office du St Sacrament*, &c. *the office of the holy ſacrament, or the tradition of the church concerning the Euchariſt, collected from the holy fathers, and other eccleſiaſtical authors.* This anſwer was very much eſteemed: ‘ Mirâ cum ſolertiâ nimis Catholicorum virorum, qui ut legentibus fucum farcrent SS. Patrum textum vel mutilaverant, vel pravo commento inquinaverant, pias fraudes vel impias dicam neſcio, retexit. Mirati ſunt omnes nihil inter reſpondendum illum fugiſſe, nihilque vindicandum intactum ſiviſſe, tantâ ſagacitate ac diligentiâ unum quodque expendens officium, ut in ejus meſſem nemo pedem, vel Spicilegii cauſa intulerit (1). —— *He with amazing ſagacity detected the pious, or rather impious frauds of the Catholic writers, who, to deceive their readers, had either corrupted the text of the holy fathers, or perverted it by their falſe comments. It was univerſally admired, that in his anſwer, nothing ſhould eſcape him, or be left untouched, which wanted vindication, while he diſcuſſed every particular with ſuch uncommon induſtry, and ability, as to leave no room for any one ſo much as to glean after him.*' As much as this book deſerved admiration, it did not come up to the excellent work which this author publiſhed ſome years after, with this title, *Hiſtoire de l' Euchariſtie.* There were two editions of it in leſs than two years, and it was tranſlated into Engliſh. The author did not put his name to the firſt edition; but he did to the ſecond, which is that of 1671. It is true, it appeared there under ſome diſguiſe by the Bookſeller's fault, who undoubtedly miſtook a *q*, for a *g*, in the author's manner of ſubſcribing his name (2). From whence it has happened that ſeveral controverſiſts of the Romiſh communion have named him *Larrogue*, inſtead of *Larroque.* He printed at Geneva in 1670, two Latin diſſertations, *de Photino & Liberio*, wherein, among other things, he ſhewed ſome errors of Petavius concerning the epocha of Photinus's condemnation. He confuted in a third diſſertation what Mr David had urged againſt the firſt. After this he engaged in the defence of his deceaſed friend Mr Daillé againſt two learned Engliſhmen. That book is intituled, Obſervationes in Ignatianas Pearſonii Vindicias, nec non in Beverigii Annotationes. —— *Obſervations on Pearſon's Vindication of Ignatius, and on Beveridge's Annotations.* He had almoſt finiſhed his reply to Dr Beveridge's anſwer, but being deſired by ſome of his friends to drop that diſpute, he readily complied with their requeſt. His book concerning the conformity of the diſcipline of the reformed churches of France with that of the primitive Chriſtians, came after thoſe I have mentioned, and and was followed by a treatiſe on the communion in both kinds, in anſwer to a book of the biſhop of Meaux. This is what we find in the life of the author prefixed to a poſthumous book publiſhed by Mr de Larroque his ſon in 1688. We find no mention there of the tract concerning the nature of the church, nor of that concerning the Regale; which too pieces muſt be added to the foregoing books. As to this poſthumous book it is intituled, Matthæi Larroquani Adverſariorum ſacrorum libri tres. Opus Poſthumum. Acceſſit diatriba de legione fulminatrice in qua expenduntur Veterum teſtimonia quibus hactenus hæc hiſtoria vera habita eſt. Authore Daniele Larroquano M. Filio. —— *Sacred Obſervations, in three books, by Matthew Lorroque. A poſthumous work. To which is added a diſſertation on the Thundering Legion: wherein are conſidered the teſtimonies of the antients upon which this hiſtory has been founded, by Daniel Larroque, the ſon of Matthew.* Mr de Larroque the ſon, who had already given proofs of his knowledge and ability, is the author of the diſſertation *De Legione fulminatrice.* He informs us that his father had undertaken an eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, and had finiſhed the three firſt centuries, and begun the fourth. It is to be hoped the public will ſome time or other be obliged with that excellent work.

[*B*] *The journey he made to Paris, procured him the acquaintance of ſeveral learned men.*] Among others Mr Juſtel, Mr Amproux (3), and Mr Conrart. They, and Mr Daillé and his ſon, and Mr Allix were the Proteſtants he had the greateſt affection for. He made himſelf known alſo to ſeveral learned men of the Romiſh communion, particularly to the abbot de Marolles and Mr de Launoi. Several letters of theſe two gentlemen, and eſpecially of the latter, were found among his papers (4).

(1) Daniel Larroquanus, in Vitæ ſumma Matthæi Larroquani, fol. ** 5.

(2) *Confer what has been ſaid above, remark* [*N*] *of the article* CAYET.

(3) *Counſellor in the parliament of Paris.*

(4) *Taken from his Life, prefixed to the* Adverſariorum libri tres.

[*C*] *He*

appealed againſt that unjuſt prohibition: the church of Saumur earneſtly ſollicited the neceſſary permiſſion, and obtained it; however, he did not think proper to make uſe of it, nor to enjoy a place in ſpite of the intendant. He continued therefore at Vitré, where his pen was not idle. Three of the principal churches of the kingdom, that of Montauban, that of Bourdeaux, and that of Rouën, deſired him for their paſtor. he accepted only the invitation of Rouën, where he ended his life, at ſixty five years of age, the thirty firſt of January 1684, after having eſtabliſhed his character not only as a learned man, but alſo as an honeſt man, and a good paſtor (*f*). He had united all theſe different characters [*C*], which are but too often divided. See his elogium in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, in the fifth article of the month of March, 1684.

(*f*) *Taken from the* Abridgment of his Life, *prefixed to the work, which Mr de Larroque his ſon publiſhed at Leyden in* 1688, *with this title*, Matthæi Larroquani adverſariorum ſacrorum libri tres.

[*C*] *He united all theſe different characters.*] I have referred you to his elogium in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des lettres.* I refer you alſo to the preface, from which I have taken this article, and from which I ſhall alſo borrow ſome verſes of Gregory Nazianzen. ‘ Id duntaxat ſubjungamus colophonem ‘ huic elogio impoſituri, quod de ſuo parente nimirum ‘ dicebat Gregorius Nazianzenus, etenim noſtro apprimè accommodari poteſt (5).

Ἦν μοὶ πατὴρ καλός τε κἀγαθὸς σφόδρα,
Γηραίος, ἁπλȣ̃ς τὸν τρόπον, ςάθμη βίȣ,
Πάτραρχος ὄντως Ἀβραάμ τις δεύτερος,
Ὢν ȣ̓ δοκῶν ἄριςος, ȣ̓ τὸν νῦν τρόπον.
- - - - - Χριςȣ̃ φίλος.
Ἔπειτα ποιμὴν, ποιμένων ὅτι κράτος.

Erat pater mi vir probus valdè, ſenex,
Simplexque, vitæ regula & certiſſima,
Patriarchus alter Abraham: non tam ſtudens
Fama eſſe, quam re vir bonus contra atque nunc (6).
- - - - - Chriſti cultor
Exinde Paſtor, ordinis decus & ſui.

‘ *I ſhall conclude this elogium with what Gregory* ‘ *Nazianzen ſaid of his father, being equally applicable to mine.*

So good, ſo reverend, my ſire appears,
So plain, ſo ſtrict in life, ſo full of years,
Another Abraham ſeems to tread the ſtage,
While in defiance to the preſent age,
Virtue, not fame, does all his thoughts engage.
- - - - - - - - - - - - -
A Chriſtian firſt, and then a prieſt became,
And much the order owes to his great name

(5) Daniel Larroquanus in ſumma Vitæ Matthæi Larroquani in fine.

(6) *It is an elogium given by Æſchylus to Amphiaraus. See the article* AMPHIARAUS, *remark* [*H*].

LASCARIS (Constantine) left Conſtantinople, his native place, in 1454, and retired into Italy. He was one of thoſe who reſtored in the Weſt the knowledge of the *Belles Lettres.* He taught this firſt at Milan, whither he was invited by Francis Sforza. After them he went to viſit cardinal Beſſarion at Rome, from whom he received ſeveral marks of friendſhip. He went afterwards to Naples, where he taught Rhetoric, and the Greek tongue with applauſe. At laſt he went to Meſſina, where he remained till his death. He drew a great concourſe of ſcholars thither, and among others Peter Bembus, who was promoted to the dignity of a cardinal, by Clement VII. He left his library to the ſenate of Meſſina: It was compoſed of excellent books, which he had brought from Conſtantinople. The ſenate had honoured him (*a*) with the right of freedom, and his funeral was ordered at the public charge. His marble tomb in the church of the Carmelites, has been ruined by the injuries of time, and never was repaired (*b*). Our Laſcaris is author of ſome books [*A*].

(*a*) *In* 1465.

(*b*) *Taken from* Jerom Raguſa, in Elog. Siculorum.

[*A*] *He is author of ſome books.*] They concern the Greek Grammar: Aldus Manutius printed them with ſome other ſmall pieces of the ſame nature in Greek and Latin. Beſides theſe, Laſcaris made a collection of the learned men, who flouriſhed antiently in Sicily (1).

(1) *The Jeſuit Jerom Raguza has inſerted it in his* Elogia Siculorum, *printed at Avignon, in* 1690.

LASCARIS (John) ſirnamed Rhyndacenus (*a*), was of the family of Laſcaris, which has produced ſome emperors of Conſtantinople. He took ſanctuary in Italy, after the deſtruction of the Eaſtern empire in the XVth century, and was very kindly received by Laurence de Medicis. This great favourer of learned men thought him proper to be employed in making a collection of the beſt books which were in Greece, and to that end deputed him to the Sultan [*A*]. This deputation had a happy ſucceſs,

(*a*) Perhaps from a town called Rhyndacus between the Helleſpont and Phrygia, mentioned by Stephanus Byzantinus.

[*A*] *Laurence de Medicis deputed him to the Sultan.*] Twice, if we may believe Paul Jovius, who adds that this Sultan loved Philoſophy, and had a particular eſteem for Laurence de Medicis. It is neceſſary to ſet down the words of that hiſtorian; for I muſt compare them with thoſe of Varillas. It is a point of criticiſm. ‘ Is (*Laurentius Medices*) tum ‘ abſolvendæ Bibliothecæ ſtudio tenebatur. Ob id ‘ Laſcarem, ad conquirenda volumina Byzantium cum ‘ legatione ad Bajazetem bis miſit: nec defuit ho‘ neſta petenti, nuſquam Barbarus Imperator, quippe ‘ qui erat totius philoſophiæ ſtudioſus, Averroiſque ‘ ſectator eximius, & de Laurentio privatim tanquam ‘ de illuſtri cultore virtutis, optimè ſentiret, quum ‘ paulò ante Bandinum percuſſorem fratris, fuga in ‘ Aſiam elapſum in catenis ad ſupplicium tradidiſſet ‘ (1); ſingulari quidem religionis, atque juſtitiæ ex‘ emplo; quòd ille immane ſcelus in templo auſus, ‘ merita pœna plectendus cenſeretur. Itaque Laſcares ‘ tuto abdita Græciæ perſcrutatus, quum patriæ opes ‘ victoribus ceſſiſſent, nobiliora divitiis antiquæ dig‘ nitatis volumina collegit, ut in Italia ſervarentur (2). ‘ *He* (Laurence de Medicis) *was then intent on com‘ pleating his library. For this purpoſe he twice deputed ‘ Laſcaris to Conſtantinople to Bajazet, nor did the ‘ Sultan diſcourage the well intended errand, being ‘ himſelf addicted to the ſtudy of Philoſophy, and a ‘ celebrated follower of Averroës, and having alſo a ‘ particular regard for Laurence's virtuous character, ‘ to whom he had a little before ordered Bandini to ‘ be delivered up in chains who had fled into Aſia, for ‘ the murder of his brother; an eminent inſtance of re‘ ligion and juſtice, in giving up an offender to condign ‘ puniſhment, for ſo horrid a crime committed in a ‘ church. Therefore Laſcaris being permitted to ranſac ‘ the hidden treaſures of Greece, though the riches of ‘ his country had been ſwallowed by the conquerors, yet ‘ he collected volumes of antiquity much more valuable* ‘ *than*

(1) Paul Jovius is here miſtaken; for it was not Bajazet II, but his father Mahomet II, who cauſed Bandini to be arreſted, and ſent him to Laurence de Medicis in the year 1478. *See Guillet's Hiſtory of Mahomet II*, Tom. II, pag. 320, & ſeq. *and* pag. 439 *Note*, That Mr Wicquefort is very much miſtaken in this matter: See his *Traité de l'Ambaſſadeur*, Tom. I, pag. m. 269.

(2) Jovius, Elog. cap. xxxi, pag. m. 74.

ceſs, for the Grand Seignor permitted Laſcaris to ſearch all the libraries, by which means an infinite treaſure of rare learning was tranſported into Italy. After that Laſcaris went into France, where he had the eſteem of Lewis XII, who ſent him to Venice, in quality of embaſſador [*B*]. He went from thence to Rome in the pontificate of Leo X, and

‘ *than riches, in order to their being depoſited in Italy.*’ Varillas thought this narrative of Paul Jovius was too dry, and therefore he has embelliſhed it with abundance of circumſtances, as if, inſtead of faithfully tranſlating another man's work, he had been employed to turn it into a romance. Here is his account (3): ‘ Laurence de Medicis received Laſcaris with open arms; and committed to him the care of his library: one day as they diſcourſed about the means of enriching it, Laſcaris recollected that Bajazet II, emperor of the Turks had an inclination for Philoſophy, and having cauſed Averroës's commentaries upon Ariſtotle to be explained to him, would probably not be unwilling to have the Peripatetic writings preſerved from the wreck of learning. Laurence de Medicis promiſed to furniſh him with all things neceſſary for a voyage to Conſtantinople, if he would engage in that deſign. Laſcaris took him at his word, and embarked without any other credentials, than what Laurence de Medicis gave him to his factors. However, he found acceſs to the Grand Seignor, and was introduced to his highneſs, who received him much better than he expected. They had a very long converſation, and Bajazet expreſſed to him all the eſteem, an infidel was capable of, for the virtue of Laurence de Medicis, and permitted him (on his account) to buy up all the manuſcripts which were to be ſold in his empire. His highneſs appointed perſons to conduct him to the places where he knew there had been libraries, and to prevent thoſe who had plundered them, from ſelling the books too dear. Thus Laſcaris had the conveniency of going through all Greece, and collecting thoſe rare volumes, which are ſtill preſerved, in the king's library. However, he brought only one half of them in the firſt voyage he made; becauſe the pleaſure of ſhewing his patron the authors he had recovered, and which were ſuppoſed to be loſt, would not let him ſtay from Florence any longer than two years. But Laurence de Medicis ſent him back three months after, deſiring him to continue his ſearch, wherever there had been learned men. Laſcaris waited again upon Bajazet, and received from him new civilities. He ſearched all Peloponneſus, and returned as it were in triumph, in a veſſel laden with the remainder of the ſpoils of the Greek tongue. But he had not as yet placed his manuſcripts in the ſumptuous building deſigned for them, when Laurence de Medicis died, and left Italy in a calm, which was not of long continuance. The French army entered Florence, and plundered the books as well as the other effects of the houſe of Medicis.’ Here are not only many circumſtances, which Varillas has forged to embelliſh and enlarge his ſtory, but alſo ſome falſifications; for he ſuppoſes, I. that Laſcaris had no credentials to the Grand Seignor. What is then the meaning of theſe words of Paul Jovius, *Byzantium CUM LEGATIONE ad Bajazetem miſit?* II. That the rare volumes collected by Laſcaris, are in the French king's library, the French army having plundered the books and other effects of the houſe of Medicis, in the time of Charles VIII. To confute this hiſtorian in this particular, we need only put him in mind, that he himſelf ſays in another book (4), that the houſe of Medicis was plundered by the Florentines, before the troops of Charles VIII, entered into Florence. He ſays expreſsly, that the Florentines *plundered the prodigious collection of ſtatues, pictures, BOOKS, and medals, which foreigners came to ſee with admiration in the palace of Medicis.* Note, that the books of this library, which may have been brought into that of the French king, were conveyed thither by another channel than the expedition of Charles VIII. This removal is more modern; ſee Father Jacob in his treatiſe of libraries: he will inform you that Catherine de Medicis *brought among other things* to Henry II, her husband, *the manuſcripts of the famous library of Medicis, which were put into the royal library, where they are ſtill preſerved* (5).

When it ſhall be proved that Varillas had any other authority than the elogies of Paul Jovius, for what he ſays of Laſcaris in his Anecdotes de Florence, I will ſee, whether I am wrong in accuſing him of being the inventer of moſt of the circumſtances he has mentioned. If he had met with what Jovius remarks, in another book, he would have given us a relation yet much more paraphraſtical: this would have been a ſcene full of decorations. Jovius relates that the baſha Cherſeoglis got leave for John Laſcaris to ſearch all the libraries of Greece, when, by order of Leo X, he went in queſt of old manuſcripts. ‘ Nec illud quidem erga literarum ſtudia eximiæ benignitatis officium prætermittendum videtur, quòd Laſcari, quem ſupra memoravimus Græcorum nobiliſſimo, pariter atque doctiſſimo antiquos codices juſſu Leonis decimi conquirenti, cunctas Græciæ bibliothecas impetrato ad id regio diplomate, liberè excutiendas aperuit (6). — *Nor muſt that good office of his to the Republic of Letters be forgot, in procuring for Laſcaris, that noble and learned Greek, whom I before mentioned to be ſent by Leo X, to ſearch for antient manuſcripts, the Grand Seignor's leave to examine all the libraries of Greece.*’ This hiſtorian had been ſaying that this baſha having turned Mahometan out of ſpite, preſerved in his heart the Chriſtian faith, and had a crucifix concealed in a cloſet, which he worſhipped in the night, when no body could diſcover him. He ſhewed his crucifix to John Laſcaris, who afterwards related all theſe particulars to Jovius. The diſguſt which induced him to an outward abjuration of Chriſtianity was this. He was going to be married to a great beauty, when his father falling in love with her, reſolved to take her from him, and marry her himſelf. This injury ſo enraged the ſon that he retired to the neighbouring garriſons of the Turks, and afterwards to Conſtantinople, where Bajazet gave him a very kind reception, and promiſed him one of his daughters in marriage. The young man turned Mahometan, quitted his name of Stephen, and took that of Achomat, and Cherſeoglis, and became ſon-in-law to Bajazet (7). What paraphraſes and flouriſhes ſhould we not have ſeen in the Anecdotes of Florence, if Varillas had come to the knowledge of this Latin paſſage? *Non, ut cæteri ferè omnes à prima pueritia per delectus Chriſtianis parentibus erepti, ſed jam planè vir* (Cherſeoglis) *ita à majorum religione diſceſſit, ut nunquam ex arcano veræ pietatis obliviſceretur. Is Cherſechii reguli in Illyrico, ad montem Nigrum filius, quum adamata ei ſponſa quæ erat è Stirpe Serviæ Deſpoti, ad paratas nuptias duceretur, concupivit eam illico, quod eſſet egregiæ venuſtatis: procaci oculo improbus pater, omnemque pudorem ſuperante libidine, ſibi ſtatim impotenter excluſo filio nuptias celebravit, fruſtra reclamantibus propinquis, qui id facinus filio contumelioſum patrique & domui infame deteſtabantur. Itaque juvenis tantæ injuriæ indignitate commotus, præcipitique actus deſperatione,* &c (8). I leave others to examine whether Jovius has not confounded the voyages which John Laſcaris made by order of Laurence de Medicis, with the voyage he ſuppoſes that he made into Greece under Pope Leo X. Bajazet died before the pontificate of Leo X, and I queſtion much whether Cherſeoglis had any great intereſt with the ſucceeding Sultan; and it is certain, he was never in ſo great a capacity of ſerving John Laſcaris, as in Bajazet's reign.

[*B*] *Lewis XII . . . . ſent him to Venice in quality of embaſſador.*] I find he ſent him thither in 1503, and 1505. See Peter Bembus in the Hiſtory of Venice (9), where he mentions the occaſion of thoſe embaſſies, and the ſubſtance of the embaſſador's ſpeech. Vianoli (10) affirms, that in 1507, the republic hearing of the league of Cambray, diſmiſſed Laſcaris embaſſador to Lewis XII, but how could this league be then known, which was not concluded till December 1508? See the margin (11).

What Mr de Wicquefort ſays of this embaſſy, is not very complaiſant. The Pope, ſays he (12), ‘ knew, when it was too late, the fault which he had been guilty of, in making choice of an impertinent and ridiculous miniſter. John Laſcaris, whom Lewis XII, ſent on an embaſſy to Venice in the year 1503, was not much better. He was deſcended from a family which had formerly given great princes to the empire of Conſtantinople, and was very learned, but knew nothing and made another voyage into Greece, from whence he brought ſome young gentlemen to be educated in the college which was founded on mount Quirinal, in order to preſerve the right pronunciation of the Greek tongue (*b*). He returned into France in the reign of Francis I [*C*], and having ſtaid there ſome time, he went to Italy again, and died at Rome of the gout, being about ninety years of age. He was buried in the church of St Agatha. Tho' he had no ſettled income, he had always wherewithal to ſupply his expences, and yet he was intirely regardleſs of his domeſtic concerns, and loved to live great. His indolence did not ſuffer him to compoſe many books (*c*) [*D*]. He underſtood Latin very well, and did not think it beneath him to be corrector of the preſs [*E*]. I muſt examine Gyraldus's relation [*F*]. I omitted,

---

(3) Varillas, Anecdot. de Florence, pag. 183.

(4) Varillas, Hiſtoire de Charles VIII, livr. iii, pag. 262, ad ann. 1494. Dutch Edit.

(5) Jacob, Traité des Bibliotheques, pag. 458.

(6) Jovius, Hiſtoriar. lib. xiii, fol. m. 256.

(7) Jovius, ibid. fol. 255, verſo.

(8) Id. ibid. fol. 255. *See alſo Melanchthon in the fifth book of Carion's Chronicle, pag. m.* 874.

(9) Lib. vi, fol. m. 144, verſo, & lib. vii, fol. 152.

(10) Hiſtoria Veneta, Part. II, pag. 76.

(11) I believe that, by way of anticipation, that author calls the alliances which were forming before the concluſion of the treaty of Cambray, the league of Cambray.

(12) Wicquefort, de l'Ambaſſadeur, liv. i, pag. m. 166.

‘ nothing at all of the affairs of the world. Beſides, he had a very mean preſence, and lived ſo very low and ſordidly, that inſtead of appearing like an embaſſador, and doing honour to the king, his maſter, he affected to imitate the falſe modeſty of thoſe who giving themſelves up intirely to contemplative Philoſophy, profeſs an affected poverty and ſomething of the manners of a Cynic. His commiſſion was the more difficult to execute, becauſe he had orders to borrow money, and to make an alliance, at a time when the inclinations of the ſenate were not at all in the French intereſt; becauſe the affairs of that king were not in a very good condition in Italy. *Laurence Suarez de Figueroa*, embaſſador from Ferdinand the Catholic king, who did not fail to make his advantage of the diſcontent of the republic, which could not bear *that king's ſending them a pedant inſtead of an embaſſador*, ſaid in full ſenate, that they might judge how the king of France would uſe them, if after the conqueſt which he pretended to make of the kingdom of Naples, he gained his ends, and could tyrannize over Italy as he pleaſed; ſince in his very troubles and neceſſities he deſpiſed the ſenate ſo much, as *to ſend them a Greek Philoſopher, who was juſt come from the college.*’

[*C*] *He returned into France in the reign of Francis I.*] Paul Jovius ſays nothing of it, which is the reaſon why Varillas ſaid nothing of it neither. His paraphraſe on that hiſtorian imports, *that Laſcaris not knowing what to do, engaged himſelf with Charles VIII. And that being a man fit for buſineſs, he had an embaſſy, given him to Venice, which he honourably diſcharged in the reign of that monarch, and of Lewis XII, his ſucceſſor. At laſt, Leo X being made Pope, invited Laſcaris to Rome to be one of his council* (13). This, according to Varillas, was Laſcaris's laſt employment; which is a manifold miſtake; for this Pope did not make him his counſellor, but director of a Greek college (14), and afterwards this learned man had ſome employment at Paris. I take it to have been that of the king's library-keeper, which I ground upon a letter, wrote by James Tuſanus to Angelus Laſcaris, the ſon of John, in which are theſe words (15). ‘Jani patris tui excellentem in Romana lingua, nedum veſtra, peritiam pluribus hic verbis ne fuſius perſequar, illud certe dicam: Græcæ literaturæ quantum uſu, quantum ſcientia præcellat, ex hoc intelligi vel maxime poſſe, quod eum ex cunctis veſtri generis hominibus de ſententia doctiſſimorum delectum princeps noſter Franciſcus accerſendum eſſe cenſuerit, ut Muſeo, quod in hac urbe longe omnium principe multo celeberrimum ſperamus excitatum iri, propediem, velut alter Apollo præſideat. ——— *I ſhall not mention particularly your father's great abilities in the Latin, much leſs in your own language, but cannot forbear obſerving, that his ſuperior knowledge in the Greek learning may be even moſt certainly demonſtrated from hence, that out of all your learned men our king Francis made choice of him to preſide like another Apollo over the library which is going to be eſtabliſhed in this great city.*’ Here follows a paſſage, which though not free from faults, will however ſerve for a proof of this matter: it is taken from James du Breul's Antiquities of Paris (16). *Emanuel Chryſoloras had Angelo Tifernas for his diſciple, who in the year* 1523, *being at Paris, inſtructed in the Greek tongue John Laſcaris, and William Budæus, two learned men, who have publiſhed many fine books, as Mr Genebrard witneſſes in his chronology, in theſe words:* Anno 1523. Chryſoloræ, qui primus litteras Græcas Florentiam Coſmo Mediceo Florentino Duce attulit, diſcipulus Tifernas in Franciam venit, Budæumque literas Græcas docuit. Deinde Janus Laſcaris mortuo Laurentio Mediceo Mœcenate ſuo. Atque inde literatura Græca, deſerta Italia ad nos migravit. *Now this Laſcaris and Budæus, as the ſame author teſtifies, were the firſt, at whoſe ſollicitation king Francis I, founded his library of Fontainebleau, and afterwards appointed royal profeſſors, as the ſame author ſays.* Laſcari & Budæo authoribus, Franc. I. Bibliothecam Fontenablæam inſtruxit, indeque anno 1530. linguarum & mathematum profeſſores. Nam cæteri ſunt adſcriptitii. There are many things to be cenſured in this paſſage. I. Tifernas was called Gregory and not Angelo. II. He died in the XVth century, how then could he come to Paris in 1523? Father du Breul had been ſaying that Chryſoloras, who died at Conſtance the fifteenth of April 1415, had taught him Greek. This was ſufficient to ſhew, that he did not live till the reign of Francis I. III. It is abſurd to pretend that John Laſcaris, a native of Greece learned the Greek tongue of an Italian (17). IV. It is a groſs ignorance to ſay, that in 1523, he and William Budæus were young ſcholars. Budæus was then fifty ſix years old, and was looked upon as the moſt learned man, and the greateſt Grecian in France. V. Genebrard's paſſage cited by du Breul ſignifies that John Laſcaris came into France after Tifernas, and after the death of Laurence de Medicis. He who cites it, did not underſtand it. Note, that Laſcaris returned into France in the year 1518 (18), and that he continued there in 1528 (19). Which ſhews that Moreri is guilty of a groſs fault, for he ſays that he died a little after Leo X, was made Pope.

[*D*] *His indolence did not ſuffer him to compoſe many books.*] He was deſired to make ſome verſions of the Greek authors, but he could hardly be perſuaded to tranſlate ſome tracts of Polybius concerning the art of war (20). I find in the catalogue of the Bodleian library, his book *De Veris Græcarum literarum formis, ac cauſis apud antiquos*, printed at Paris in 1536, in 8°. and his orations, printed at Francfort in 1573. Geſner (21) ſays that his Latin and Greek epigrams were printed at Baſil in 1537.

[*E*] *He underſtood Latin well, and did not think it beneath him to be corrector of the preſs.*] The paſſage of Eraſmus, which I have quoted in another place (22), ſhews, that John Laſcaris was maſter of the Latin tongue, Jovius gives him the ſame commendation. ‘Valebat Latina facundia, ita ut verſus, qui extant perſcriberet (23). —— *The verſes he has publiſhed prove him maſter of the Latin tongue.*’ Beſides theſe two teſtimonies, and that of Tuſanus (24), I could add ſome others, if it were neceſſary. Note, that Laſcaris was not pleaſed with the commendation given him by Eraſmus, in the dialogue intituled *Ciceronianus*. He joined with the malecontents, who wrote ſatirical verſes at Paris againſt the author of that dialogue (25). He was too exceptious and angry without reaſon; for theſe are Eraſmus's words: ‘De Jano (*Laſcare*) quoniam adhuc ſupereſt, dicendum eſt parcius. Morum comitate generis nobilitatem præ ſe fert, acri judicio vir, multæ in Epigrammatibus argutiæ: poterat inter Ciceroniani cognominis candidatos numerari, ni crebræ legationes ac Regum negotia revocaſſent hominem à Muſis (26). ——— *As to John Laſcaris, ſince he is yet living we muſt ſay the leſs of him. His great complaiſance ſhews his noble birth; he was a man of great judgment, and a fine writer of epigrams; and had not his frequent embaſſies and ſtate employments diverted him from his ſtudies he might have been reckoned amongſt the candidates for the Ciceronian honours.*’

As for his being corrector of the preſs, read theſe words of Henry Stephens (27): ‘Quid verò dicturos M. illum Muſurum & Janum Laſcarin putamus, in quibus primis Græcia reviviſcere cœpit, & qui principes in pandendo nobis ad linguæ Græcæ adyta itinere fuerunt? quid, inquam, dicturos remur, ſi, quum ipſi tantum honoris arti typographicæ detule-

‘ rint

(*b*) Taken from Paul Jovius, *in Elog. cap. xxxi.*

(*c*) Ex eodem, ibid.

(13) Varil. Anecdot. de Flor. pag. 184.

(14) See a Letter of Budæus, among thoſe of Eraſmus. It is the thirtieth of the ſecond book, pag. 156.

(15) Geſner. in Biblioth. fol. 39, verſo.

(16) Du Breul, Antiquitez de Paris, livr. ii, pag. 563. Paris Edit. 1639, in 4to.

(17) Tifernas was an Italian.

(18) See Eraſmus's Letters, book xi, n iv, pag. 548, & n. 5, pag. 549.

(19) See the ſame Letters, book xx, n. 72, pag. 1030.

(20) Paul. Jovius, in Elog. cap. xxxi, pag. 74.

(21) Geſner. Biblioth. fol. 39, verſo.

(22) In the remark [*A*] of the article MUSURUS.

(23) Jovius, ubi ſupra.

(24) Above, in the remark [*C*], citat. (15).

(25) See Eraſmus's Letters, pag. 1030, 1030, 1044, and elſewhere. *Edit. Londin.*

(26) Eraſm. in Ciceroniano, pag. m. 70.

(27) Henr. Stephan. in Artis Typog. Querimonia apud Almelovenium de Vitis Stephan. pag. 140.

I omitted, I cannot tell how, a particular very well worth obſerving, which is, that he ‘ firſt of all diſcovered, or at leaſt brought again into uſe, the capital letters of the Greek alphabet, in which he printed in 1449 ſome moral ſentences, and other verſes which he dedicated to Peter de Medicis, with a long epiſtle dedicatory, wherein he acquaints him with his deſign, and the pains he had taken in tracing out the true figure of theſe great letters from the moſt antient medals and monuments of antiquity *(d)*.

‘ rint, ut non indignam exiſtimarint cui ſuam operam navarent, fungentes munere correctorum (liceat enim de rebus typographicis typographicè loqui) eò rem deveniſſe videant, ut ſiquis, *&c.* —— *What think you would Muſurus and Laſcaris ſay, our firſt maſters and introductors of the Greek language? What would they ſay, think you, if after having honoured the Printing art ſo far themſelves as not to think it beneath them to do the office of corrector of the preſs they had lived to ſee matters brought to that paſs, that if any one,* &c.’ We may alſo add to this the words of Mr Chevillier (28): ‘ I believe Laſcaris was corrector of the preſs in the edition of *Avicenna*, printed at Lyons, in three volumes in folio, with the commentaries of James de Partibus, by John Trechſel, and John Cleym, in the year 1498, as I conjecture from the Epiſtle Dedicatory to John Ponceau, Phyſician to the king, which he prefixed to that book.’

[*F*] *I muſt examine Gyraldus's relation.*] It imports, that the family of Medicis being expelled Florence, Janus Laſcaris wandered about for ſome time, till Leo X, ſent for him to Rome, that after the death of this Pope he was ſent for into France by Francis I, who having made uſe of him in the fonndation of a college and library, deputed him to Venice, where he continued a long time; and that at laſt, after the death of Clement VII, he was perſuaded to come to Rome by the promiſes of Paul III, where he died ſoon after, leaving a ſon who was called Angelo (29). I obſerve here firſt a great omiſſion. Gyraldus ſays nothing of the embaſſy to Venice under Lewis XII. I further obſerve, that he ſuppoſes Francis I ſent Laſcaris to Venice, in the quality of Legatus (Embaſſador). I believe he is miſtaken. Note laſtly, that he did not know this learned Greek was at Rome in the year 1532, under the pontificate of Clement VII. See the twenty eighth letter of Bunel, wherein he ſays, that he ſaw John Laſcaris at Rome in that year (30).

LASICIUS (JOHN) a Poliſh gentleman *(a)*, made himſelf known in the XVIth century by the productions of his pen [*A*]. Genebrard has given him a very indifferent character. He makes him a perfect Proteus, a weather-cock in matters of religion. ‘ This man, *ſays he* (*b*), favoured the Trinitarians about the year 1565: but ſoon after became a Calviniſt, and after this a Bohemian or Picard brother [*B*], ‘ and

[*A*] *He made himſelf known by the productions of his pen.*] It is ſaid in Geſner's Epitome (1), that he compoſed a book in his mother-tongue, wherein he learnedly and effectually conſuted the new Samoſatenians and Arians, and alſo wrote a treatiſe againſt their errors in Latin, addreſſed to Duditius. The Oxford Catalogue takes notice of his book *de Diis Samogitarum, cæterorumque Sarmatarum & falſorum Chriſtianorum: item de Religione Armeniorum & de initio regiminis Stephani Batorii*, at Baſil, 1615, in 4to. His *Hiſtoria de ingreſſu Polonorum in Valachiam anno* 1572, *& Dantiſcanorum clades anno* 1577, at Baſil, 1582. His *veræ Religionis Apologia & falſæ Confutatio*, printed at Spires, in 1582, with *Collectio variorum Authorum de Ruſſorum, Muſcovitarum, & Tartarorum Religione, Sacrificiis, & Nuptiarum, ac Funerum ritu*. This is the work Genebrard ſpeaks of. It is proper to take notice, that there is to be met with in it, a Latin tranſlation which Laſicius made of a manuſcript given by the great duke of Muſcovy, in the year 1570, to a Proteſtant divine, who accompanied the king of Poland's ambaſſadors (2). ‘ Qui *(Johannes Rokyta)* Anno Chriſti 1570. juſſu ſeniorum ſuorum, Sereniſſimi Regis Poloniæ Legatos in Moſcoviam comitatus, ipſis à ſacris fuit Concionibus. Hic cum ipſo Magno Moſcoviæ Duce, Baſilio (vocatus in arcem Moſcovienſem die 10 Maii) colloquium habuit, & in magna Procerum gentis ejus frequentiâ fidei ſuæ rationem reddidit. A quo etiam (die 18 Junii) Librum Ruthenicis characteribus (quorum illic uſus eſt) enarratum, accepit, quo ſumma Religionis Moſcoviticæ continetur. Qui liber à Domino *Johanne Laſitio* Latio donatus Spiræ Nemetum Anno 1582 typis editus eſt, una cum Reſponſionibus, quibus Errores Moſcovitarum deteguntur & refutantur. —— *Who* (John Rokyta) *in the year* 1570, *was appointed to attend as chaplain to the king of Poland's ambaſſadors to Muſcovy. Here he had a conference with the great duke himſelf, Baſilius, being called into the caſtle of Muſcow, on the tenth of May, and gave an account of his faith before a large aſſembly of the grandees of that nation. From him he alſo received, on the eighteenth of June, a book written in Runic characters, which are there made uſe of, containing the ſum of the Muſcovite religion. Which book has been tranſlated into Latin by John Laſicius, and printed at Spires, in* 1582, *together with an anſwer in confutation of the Muſcovite errors.*’ Regenvolſius has ſaid the ſame thing. ‘ Hanc fidei Confeſſionem, à ſe, mandato Principis Moſchi, conſcriptam, Rokita toti Senatui ipſius, eo præſente exhibuit. Tum Moſchus Dux Reſponſionem, ad hanc Rokitæ Confeſſionem, libro eleganter in quarto Ruthenicis literis ſcripto, & pretioſè tela auro textâ ornato, comprehenſam; ei in manus porrexit. Author hujus Hiſtoriæ, vidit librum hunc, in Bibliotheca eximii cujuſdam Patroni. Colloquium hoc; & Quæſtiones ultrò citroque inter Moſchovitarum Principem, & Rokitam Miniſtrum habitas, deſcripſit Latino idiomate, Joh. Laſicius, in Theologia Moſchovitica, Spiræ Nemetum, An. 1582 editâ: cum refutatione ſuperſtitionum Ruſſicarum, & Evangelicorum, atque ipſius Lutheri defenſione (3). —— *Rokyta, at the command of the great duke of Muſcovy, drew up this confeſſion of faith, and, in his preſence, preſented it to the whole ſenate. Upon which that prince gave Rokita a book in quarto, elegantly written in the Runic character, and richly bound, containing an anſwer to his confeſſion. The author of this hiſtory ſaw the very book in the library of a certain eminent patron of learning. This conference, and the arguments which paſſed between the Muſcovite prince and Rokita the divine, have been publiſhed in Latin, by John Laſicius, in his Muſcovite Divinity, printed at Spires, in* 1582; *together with a confutation of the Muſcovite ſuperſtitions, and a defence of Lutheraniſm.*’ In the following remark will be mentioned another work of Laſicius.

[*B*] *A Bohemian, or Picard Brother.*] The preface before his hiſtory of the Bohemian Brothers, informs us (4), that at firſt he embraced the reformation according to the Zuinglian opinion, upon the leſſer Poland, being reformed by ſome divines from Zurich; that afterwards having heard that the churches of the greater Poland, which had ſhaken off the yoke of Popery, had ſome of them received the confeſſion of Augsburg, and others that of Bohemia, he enquired very particularly into the reaſons of this difference; that he made a viſit to the greater Poland, and after that to Bohemia, Germany, and France, where he examined every thing with great exactneſs; that no doctrine, or confeſſion of faith, pleaſed him ſo much as that of the Bohemian brothers, and that finding this ſubject had never been yet treated of, he undertook the hiſtory of it; that he employed himſelf in it ſeveral years, and compoſed a work divided into eight parts, and intituled *Origo, Progreſſus, Reſque tam proſperæ quam adverſæ nec non Mores, Inſtituta, Conſuetudineſque Fratrum Bohemicorum.* —— *The riſe, progreſs, proſperity, and adverſity, manners, inſtitutions, and cuſtoms, of the Bohemian brothers.* That about the year 1585, he ſent it to the churches in Bohemia, and deſired

---

(*d*) Naudé, Addit. to the Hiſt. of Lewis XI, pag. 303, 304.

(28) Chevil. Orig. de l'Imprimerie, pag. 194.

(29) *Taken from* Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus, de Poët. Suor. Tem. Dial. I, pag. m 552.

(30) Bunellus, Epiſt. xxviii, pag. 108. Edit. Toloſ. 1687.

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

(*b*) Genebr. Chronol. lib. iv, ad ann. 1582, pag. m. 786.

(1) Pag m 464.

(2) Martin. Grat. de prima Eccleſ. Unitatis Fratrum in Polonia Narr. *ad calcem* Jo. Laſitii Hiſtor. Fratrum Bohem. pag 381.

(3) Adrian. Regenvolſcius, Syſt. Hiſtorico-Chron Eccleſiarum Slavonicarum, pag 91.

(4) Fuit Laſicius ille gente Polonus, natalibus: *Eques*, dignitate eâ ut à Rege Stephano ad exteros Principes legatus adhiberetur: Religione vero *Evangelicus*, & Confeſſione *Helveticus*; quam ſcilicet Confeſſionem Polonia minor, Reformatores ſuos Tiguro nacta ſuam fecerat. *Præfat.* pag. 10.

‘ and in 1582, in a book he printed at Spires on the religion of the Muſcovites (c), ‘ he declares himſelf a Lutheran. It is to be feared, that the weight of his ſins will ‘ be ſo great that he will next year turn Mahometan, and afterwards Atheiſt. To this tends what he obſerves in p. 16. of that book, that there are a great many va‘ riations in the Hebrew, Greek and Latin manuſcripts of the ſcriptures, the Heretics ‘ having expunged ſome things and corrupted, altered, and added others, which he ‘ proves from the fine teſtimonies of Eraſmus, Beza, Caſtalio, Francis Lucas, and ‘ Francis Junius. He is ſtrangely incenſed againſt thoſe who hold Mahomet to be ‘ Anti-chriſt, and appropriate to him the number 666 mentioned in the thirteenth chap‘ ter of the Revelations, He declares himſelf the defender of all ſorts of intemperance ‘ (d): at which thoſe who had once ſeen him would ceaſe to wonder, for his groſs bulk ‘ ſhews him born only for his belly, if he were the ſame I had ſome knowledge of at ‘ Paris, and whom I furniſhed with arguments againſt thoſe of the Trinitarians, about ‘ the year 1567.’ This is what Genebrard ſays; but it will deſerve very little credit, if we conſider with what ſevere calumnies, he treated thoſe who were not Catholics. Laſicius travelled very much, and had the character of envoy of Stephen Battori, king of Poland. He was living in the year 1599. Theſe laſt particulars will be proved in the remark [*B*].

deſired them to publiſh it, after having made ſuch alterations and additions as they ſhould judge neceſſary; that not finding his expectations anſwered, he ſent a more correct copy of his work, in 1599, to the baron Charles of Zerotan (5), humbly beſeeching him to make uſe of his authority and purſe, in printing that manuſcript; but that all this had no effect. At laſt, one of the Bohemian brothers publiſhed the eighth book of this hiſtory of Laſicius, in 1649, with an abſtract of the other ſeven. This is the title of that edition: Johannis Laſitii nobilis Poloni Hiſtoriæ de Origine & Rebus geſtis Fratrum Bohemorum Liber octavus, qui eſt de moribus & inſtitutis eorum ob præſentem rerum ſtatum (6) ſeorſim editus. Adduntur tamen reliquorum VII Librorum Argumenta, & particularia quædam Excerpta. —— *The eighth book of Laſicius, a Poliſh nobleman's hiſtory of the origin and affairs of the Bohemian brothers, which treats of their manners and inſtitutions, publiſhed by itſelf on account of their preſent ſituation. To which are added, the arguments of the other ſeven books, with ſome particular extracts out of them.*

LATINUS (JOHN) a Moor by birth, was brought over into Spain, a little boy, and ſerved in the family of the duke of Sueſſa (a) [*A*]. The happy genius which was obſerved in him procured him the liberty of being inſtructed together with his young maſter; by which means he grew ſo learned, that being enfranchiſed, he obtained of the archbiſhop of Granada, the maſterſhip of the grammar-ſchool, belonging to the church of Granada. He worthily diſcharged that office for the ſpace of twenty years and as he was no leſs eſteemed for his virtue than for his parts, he met with a very advantageous match [*B*]. He publiſhed ſeveral poems (b) [*C*]. Some ſay, that Clenard

[*A*] *He ſerved in the family of the duke of Sueſſa.*] He ſays ſo himſelf, in an inſcription which is given us by Don Nicolas Antonio (1). ‘ Hæc Joannes Æ‘ thiops Chriſticola ex Æthiopia uſque infans advectus ‘ excellentiſſimi & invictiſſimi Gonſali Fernandi à ‘ Corbuda Ducis Sueſſæ, Gonſalvi magni Hiſpania‘ rum Ducis Nepotis ſervus, ab ipſo infantiæ lacte ‘ ſimul nutritus, cum ipſo à rudibus annis liberalibus ‘ artibus inſtitutus & doctus, & tandem libertate do‘ natus, Granatæ ab illuſtriſſimo pariter & reverendiſ‘ ſimo Petro Guerrero Granatenſi Archiepiſcopo ex‘ tra omnem aleam doctiſſimo, S. Eccleſiæ Granatæ ‘ cathedram Grammaticæ & Latini ſermonis accepit ‘ moderandam, quam per viginti annos fœliciter mo‘ deratus eſt. —— *Theſe John the Ethiopian, a Chri‘ ſtian, brought out of Ethiopia an infant, ſervant to ‘ the moſt excellent and magnanimous Gonzales Fer‘ nando de Corduba, duke of Sueſſa, grandſon to the ‘ great duke Gonzales, educated by him from a child, and ‘ inſtructed together with him in the liberal arts, being ‘ at laſt made free, he was appointed maſter of the ‘ grammar ſchool belonging to the church of Granada, ‘ by the moſt illuſtrious, as well as moſt reverend ‘ Peter Guerero, archbiſhop of Granada, where he ‘ taught the Latin tongue with ſucceſs for twenty years.*’ The Jeſuit Schottus is therefore miſtaken, who ſays, that our Moor learned Latin, by waiting upon Mendoza to the college (2). Our Latinus's maſter was not named Mendoza. You will find in Aubertus Miræus (3) almoſt word for word, what Schottus ſays of this learned Ethiopian.

[*B*] *He met with a very advantageous match.*] He married Donna Anna de Carleval (4): ‘ Charus om‘ nibus propter ingenii ac morum dotes, matrimonio in‘ ſuper honeſtæ nec ignobilis fœminæ ſupra conditio‘ nem ornatus (5). —— *He was ſo univerſally beloved ‘ for his learning and virtue, that a lady of a good ‘ family condeſcended to marry him.*’ It is ſaid he was a handſome man, which is, perhaps, as rare a thing, according to the taſte of the Europeans, as to ſee a Moor teach the Latin tongue (6). ‘ Lu‘ dum hic *(Granatæ)* parentum memoria aperuit ‘ (quis credat?) *Joannes Æthiops* genere, *Latinus* ‘ hinc dictus, at præſtanti forma & Muſicæ ac Poë‘ ticæ in paucis peritus (7). —— *In the memory of ‘ our fathers, John the Moor opened a ſchool here, ‘ (at Granada) from whence he was called Latinus, ‘ being very handſome in perſon, and ſomething ſkilled ‘ in Muſic and Poetry.*’

[*C*] *He publiſhed ſeveral poems.*] One upon the battle of Lepanto, another on the death of Pius V, and a great number of epitaphs. Their titles are: Auſtriados libri II, ſive de victoria navali Joannis Auſtriaci ad Echinadas Inſulas. De obitu Pii V, ejuſque in Philippum regem ſtudio. De auguſta regalium corporum ex variis tumulis in unum regale templum Eſcurialis tranſlatione, atque illinc in Granatenſe Reginæ Joannæ, Epigrammatum, ſive Epitaphiorum libri II. a Grenade 1576.— *The Auſtriad in two books; or, the Naval Victory of Don John of Auſtria, at Lepanto. Of the death of Pius V, and his affection for king Philip. Of the auguſt tranſlation of the royal bodies from their ſeveral ſepulchres, to the royal church of the Eſcurial, and from thence to queen Joan's church at Granada. Epigrams, or Epitaphs, in two books. At Granada,* 1576. The inſcription, which I have inſerted in the firſt remark, is taken from this laſt book; and as the author obſerves, that he was then fifty eight years old (8), one might expect to conclude from hence, the year of his birth. A man who is in his fifty eighth year, in 1576, muſt have been born in 1518. But we muſt take care how we reaſon in this manner; for though Latinus's epitaphs and epigrams were publiſhed at Granada, in 1576, it does not follow that the inſcription we ſpeak of, was made in that year. This conſequence would not hold, though we were ſure he was then alive; but it will be much leſs concluſive, if we ſuppoſe he died in 1573, as his epitaph imports (9). This we may be certain of, that ſince he died in 1573, that inſcription could not be made after that year; and conſequently the author muſt be at leaſt fifty eight years old in that year, and could not be born after the year 1515. Nicolas Antonio would deſerve cenſure for not having mentioned, if he could have

(c) *See remark* [*A*].

(d) Illic Gulæ, bibacitatis, voluptatis impudicitiæ Patronum agit. *Genebr. Chronol. lib. iv, pag.* 786.

(5) Who was ſoon after governor of Moravia.

(6) That is, on account of the corruption of manners of the Bohemian brothers in their diſperſion, which made it neceſſary to ſhew them how much they had degenerated from their predeceſſors.

(a) Gonzales of Corduba, grandſon to the famous captain of that name.

(b) *Taken from* Don Nicolas Antonio, Bibl. Hiſp. Tom. I, pag. 547.

(1) Nicol. Anton. Biblioth. Hiſpan. Tom. I, pag. 547.

(2) Hic dum Mendozium Heroa (*I think it is an error of the preſs, inſtead of* Herum) Granatæ in ludum literarium comitaretur, linguam Latinam eadem opera arripuit. *Schottus, Biblioth. Hiſpan. pag.* 450.

(3) De Scriptor. Seculi xvi, pag. 92.

(4) Nicol. Anton. ubi ſupra.

(5) Id. ibid.

(6) Granatæ linguam Latinam publice profiteri cœpit, ſtupendo exemplo in cathedra nigrum hominem Latine loqui. *Schottus, Biblioth. Hiſpan. pag.* 450.

(7) Ludov. Nonnius, in Hiſpania Illuſtrata, pag. 83.

(8) *Taken from* Nicol. Antonio, Bibl. Hiſpan. Tom. I, pag. 547.

(9) *It is to be ſeen in Nicolas Antonio, ubi ſupra, and in Moreri.*

nard brought him out of Æthiopia into Spain [*D*], and inſtructed him in the *Belles Lettres.* This is not true: it will be eaſy to ſhew their error. Moreri's miſtakes tho' few in number, are very groſs [*E*].

have done it, the year, in which Latinus ſaid he was fifty eight years old. I could wiſh, for the rarity of the thing, that our Latinus had found a place among Mr Baillet's Poets.

[*D*] *Some ſay, that Clenard brought him from Ethiopia into Spain.*] The author of the *Academie des Sciences* (10), tells us, that Clenard, departing from the court of Fez, 'was only followed by an Ethiopian, his diſciple, with whom arriving at Granada, 'in 1542, he wrote an elegant letter to the emperor Charles V, and died the ſame year, and left his 'Ethiopian diſciple (known by the name of John Latinus) ſo well inſtructed in learning, that he compoſed a fine Latin poem upon the victory . . . . . 'at Lepanto.' I have ſeveral reaſons to believe, that here are ſome falſities. I. Latinus ſays he was but a child, when he was brought from Ethiopia into Europe (11). This could not be true, if he came from Africa to Spain with Clenard, in 1542. He was then at leaſt twenty ſeven years old. II. He ſays, that from his childhood (12) he was educated and inſtructed with Gonzales Fernand de Corduba, his maſter, who at laſt gave him his liberty (13). Would he have ſpoken in this manner, if he had been indebted for all his learning to James Clenard, as Mr Bullart ſuppoſes? III. He ſays nothing which has the leaſt relation to Mr Bullart's account. My third obſervation perſuades me, that Aubertus Miræus is miſtaken in ſaying (14), 'Diſcipulum reliquit *(Clenardus)* Joannem Latinum 'Æthiopem (quod prodigii ſimile eſt) Rhetorem Illiberitanum, cujus Poëma exſtat panegyricum de navali Joh. Auſtriaci ad Echinadas Inſulas victoria.—— '*He (Clenard) left a diſciple, John Latinus, a Moor, '(which is almoſt a miracle) ſchoolmaſter at Granada, 'whoſe panegyrical poem on the naval victory of Don 'John of Auſtria, at Lepanto, is now extant.*' Doubtleſs Mr Bullart was deceived by this paſſage of Aubertus Miræus; but he has added to it a fault of his own, in ſuppoſing that Latinus was brought into Europe by James Clenard, in the year 1542. His error probably proceeded from this. Clenard ſays (15), that being ſent to Braga to ſet up a ſchool there, he produced his three Mooriſh ſervants before his ſcholars, and commanded them in Latin to perform certain poſtures. Theſe Moors had learnt, by his family converſation, Latin enough to underſtand what he commanded them in that tongue. 'Erant mihi Servuli 'tres, quos ſupra (16) nominavi, non ſane periti 'Grammatici, verum domeſtica conſuetudine tantum 'conſecuti, ut me perciperent, quicquid dicerem, & 'contra Latine reſponderent, licet identidem peccantes in Priſcianum. Hos in ludum productos, dialogos agere juſſi, ſpectantibus diſcipulis, & cum eis 'multis de rebus ſermonem miſcebam, attentiſſimo auditorio, adeo miraculi loco fuit, quod Æthiopes loquerentur Latine. *Heus, Dento,* inquam, *ſalta,* &c.' From this ſtory it might eaſily be concluded, that John Latinus was a diſciple of this learned Grammarian.

[*E*] *Moreri's faults are . . . . . very groſs.*] I. It is not true that Gonzales Fernand de Corbuba made our Latinus a ſlave, *when he was ſtill in his cradle.* The inſcription abovementioned (17), clearly intimates, that he and Latinus were almoſt of the ſame age; and therefore Gonzales, whilſt he was in his cradle, muſt have made expeditions into Africa, or by ſea, if it were true, that he made Latinus a ſlave. I would fain know why Moreri did not faithfully tranſlate his originals. He had the book of Don Nicolas Antonio before his eyes; why was he not contented to ſay, that Latinus was a ſlave to Gonzales Fernand de Corduba? does this ſignify, that Gonzales himſelf had taken this Ethiopian, and afterwards (18) brought him into Spain? II. Latinus's employment at Granada was not meerly to teach the young ſcholars of the cathedral. He publickly taught the Latin tongue to all comers; which was the cuſtom of the ſchools of cathedral churches, as Mr Joli ſhews in one of his books. III. It is a great piece of ignorance to tell us of a poem, intituled *Auſtriados* (19). This can admit of no excuſe from the original, ſince Nicolas Antonio does not uſe the genitive caſe *Auſtriados,* without adding *libros duos.*

(10) Bullart, Tom. I, pag. 287.

(11) *See the remark* [*A*].

(12) A rudibus annis.

(13) Et tandem libertate donatus.

(14) Aub. Miræus in Elog. Belg.

(15) Clenard, Epiſt. lib. ii, pag. 303.

(16) *This word refers to the following paſſage in page* 295. Præter Guilielmum miniſtrum tres ſervos adduxeram Æthiopes, Dentonem, Nigrinum & Carbonem; nam ſic eos nominavit Reſendius. . . . *Beſides my man William I brought with me three Mooriſh ſervants, Dento, Nigrinus, and Carbo; for ſo Reſendius has named them.*

(17) In the remark [*A*].

(18) This is a conſequence of Moreri's account.

(19) This fault has been corrected in the Dutch editions.

LAUDICE, ſiſter and wife of Mithridates, deſerves a place in the liſt of perſons of unhappy memory. Her huſband meditating a vaſt deſign, ſtole from his court in order to view incognito, with a very ſmall attendance, the ſituation of the places where he had determined to make war. Laudice hearing no news of him, fancied that he was dead, and would return no more; and inſtead of afflicting herſelf, gave herſelf up to the moſt filthy pleaſures. The return of her husband gave her great uneaſineſs; ſhe found it neceſſary to conceal her irregular conduct, and could contrive no better way of doing it, than by poiſoning Mithridates. She was preparing for it, but one of her ſervant-maids betrayed her, and diſcovered the whole affair. Mithridates made no ſcruple to put ſuch a wife to death (*a*). A modern author (*b*) falſly affirms, that this monarch was actually poiſoned by his wife; but that being accuſtomed to his antidote, he recovered, tho' not without difficulty. Thoſe who puzzle themſelves with what Juſtin ſays, that Laudice had lain in, in her husband's abſence [*A*], raiſe ſcruples out of nothing. I have ſpoken elſewhere (*c*), of another LAUDICE, ſiſter to this, and ſtill more wicked than ſhe. Juſtin is unjuſtly ſaid, to contradict himſelf in ſpeaking of theſe two women [*B*].

(*a*) *Taken from* Juſtin, lib. xxxvii, cap. iii, pag. m. 544.

(*b*) Chriſt. Matthias, Theatr. Hiſtor. pag. m. 28.

(*c*) In the article CAPPADOCIA, remark [*I*], num. 3, to *à lineâ.*

[*A*] *Laudice had lain in, in her husband's abſence.*] This lying-in was regular: Mithridates could not be offended at it; the computation of time allowed of his being father of the child which was born of Laudice in his abſence. What makes me ſay ſo is, that Juſtin obſerves, that this prince was congratulated at one and the ſame time, both for his return, and for the birth of a ſon (1). No body durſt have complemented him on a ſcandalous and notorious proof of his being a cuckold. Whence then, ſome will ask, came Laudice's uneaſineſs? probably ſhe was with child, or afraid of being ſo, from her having had commerce with her gallants after her lying-in. Here is the reaſon, that, to conceal her adulteries, ſhe endeavoured to deſtroy her husband. 'Laudice . . . . . cum periſſe 'eum crederet, in concubitus amicorum projecta, quaſi 'admiſſum facinus majore ſcelere tegere poſſet, venenum advenienti paravit (2). —— *Laudice . . . . 'having given up herſelf to her gallants, upon a ſuppoſition of her husband's death, to conceal one crime 'by a greater, prepared to poiſon him on his return.*'

[*B*] *Juſtin is unjuſtly ſaid to contradict himſelf.*] Freinſhemius charges him either with this, or with confounding hiſtory egregiouſly. *Aut contradicit ſibi auctor, aut hiſtoriam mire confundit* (3). His reaſon is, that Juſtin relates in other places: I. That (4) Laudice, the widow of Ariarathes, king of Cappadocia, was killed by her ſubjects, for poiſoning five of her children. II. That (5) Laudice, widow of Ariarathes, king of Cappadocia, was married to Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, whilſt her brother Mithridates was preparing to ſuccour her againſt the ſame Nicomedes, uſurper of Cappadocia, in prejudice of Ariarathes, ſon of the deceaſed king. This accuſation of Freinſhemius is without foundation; for Juſtin ſpeaks of two Laudice's queens of Cappadocia. The firſt had married one Ariarathes, who died in the war of Ariſtonicus, about the ſix hundred and twenty ſecond year

(1) Inter gratulationem adventus ſui, & filii geniti. *Juſtin. lib. xxxvii, cap. iii, pag.* 544.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Freinſhemius, in Juſtinum, lib. xxxvii, cap. i, pag. 548.

(4) Juſtin. lib. xxxvii, cap. i.

(5) Id. lib. xxxviii, cap. i.

of Rome. The ſecond was ſiſter to Mithridates, and wife of Ariarathes, who ſucceeded the former. Here is therefore neither contradiction, nor confuſion. Note, that Juſtin has been cenſured in ſome places where he is right, and paſſed over in ſilence, in a great many others, where he is wrong. The commentator, *in uſum Delphini*, has renewed Freinſhemius's accuſation.

LAUNOI (MATTHEW DE) one of the moſt violent Leaguers in France, had been ſeveral years miniſter of the Reformed church; but having committed adultery, and deſpairing of a relaxation of diſcipline on his behalf, he returned to the communion of Rome. I dare not affirm, what I have read in ſome famous authors, that he was a prieſt when he turned Proteſtant [*A*], but if he was not then one he certainly became ſuch, after his renouncing the communion of the Reformed. Though he had been branded at Sedan, for his adultery in the moſt ignominious manner [*B*], yet he was received with open arms by the Catholics. They made collections for him (*a*), they gave him a canonry in the cathedral of Soiſſons, and the cure of St Mederic at Paris (*b*). He made uſe of his tongue, his pen, and all the induſty he was maſter of, to foment the rebellion of the Pariſians (*c*); and made himſelf ſo conſiderable in the horrible faction of the ſixteen, that he preſided in all the aſſemblies which were held to conſult the death of Barnabas Briſſon, preſident in the parliament of Paris [*C*]. If he had not very narrowly eſcaped, he had kept company with thoſe whom the duke of Mayenne cauſed to be hanged for having promoted the execution of that great man (*d*). He retired into Flanders (*e*), where I believe he ſpent the reſt of his days. He publiſhed ſome books of controverſy, and among others one concerning the motives of his changing his religion [*D*], and an anſwer to the calumnies, he pretended the miniſters had ſpread againſt him. He is very weak in his anſwer to the accuſation of adultery [*E*]; and

(*a*) Memoires de la Ligue, Tom. VI, pag. 349.

(*b*) Memoires de la Ligue, ibid. *The other hiſtorians do not ſay that he had this cure given him.*

(*c*) Thuan. lib. xcv, pag. 280.

(*d*) Cayet, Chronologie Novenaire, ad ann. 1591.

(*e*) Id. ibid.

[*A*] *I dare not affirm . . : . . . that he was a prieſt when he turned Proteſtant.*] Thuanus affirms it. ‘Matthæus Launæus, *ſays he* (1), ſacri Sueſſionum collegii Sodalis, olim ſacerdos, & poſtea ejerata majorum religione doctrinam proteſtantium amplexus, paſtoriſque officio diu inter eos functus, uxore etiam ducta, cujus cum propter egeſtatem ætate jam inclinata tæderet, errore recantato ad nos redierat, ſed incerta fide, quam mox ut ſe vere Catholicum approbaret, factioſis addixit. ——— *Matthew Launoi, canon of the cathedral church of Soiſſons, formerly a prieſt, and afterwards renouncing the religion of his anceſtors, for that of the Proteſtants, having alſo married a wife, of whom he began to grow weary as he advanced into years, and became ſtraitened in his circumſtances, returned to us again, after having recanted his errors, and though at firſt not quite ſettled in his opinions, yet afterwards, to prove himſelf a true Catholic, he joined himſelf to the faction of the League.*’ The ſame thing is repeated in the ninety fifth book (2), with a very conſiderable addition: for in enumerating the reaſons, which had induced this man to leave the Proteſtants, the puniſhment he had to fear, on his being convicted of adultery, is not forgotten. He returned into the pale of the church, ſays Thuanus; whether he repented of his errors, or was weary of his wife, or feared the puniſhments which the Proteſtants inflict on thoſe who were convicted of adultery. *Rurſus ſeu pœnitentia ductus, ſive uxoris pertæſus, & adulterii pœnam, cujus convictus fuerat, metuens, ad ſacerdotium relicta uxore redierat* (3). I ſhall by and by mention another paſſage in Thuanus, where the ſame things are partly repeated. I paſs by theſe words of Du Verdier Vau-Privas (4): ‘Matthew de Launoi, firſt a prieſt, afterwards a miniſter of the pretended Reformed religion, is now returned into the pale of the Chriſtian and Catholic church.’ Thuanus's authority is ſufficient to prove what I advance. Let us ſee whether there is any room to doubt that Matthew de Launoi was a prieſt when he turned Proteſtant. The ſcruple I make, is built upon the ſilence of the man himſelf upon an occaſion, where one would think he ought to have mentioned his prieſthood. ‘I do not regard, *ſays he* (5), what they ſay of my calling, before they drew me out of the boſom of the Chriſtian and Catholic church, and of my deſerting my former office. For I have been always in public office and authority ever ſince I finiſhed my ſtudies; and notwithſtanding my youth, which was then very raw, and far from maturity, I behaved myſelf with credit and honour, to the ſatisfaction of thoſe with whom I was concerned, till ſome miniſters, and others of their ſect, turned my head with their illuſions and dreams. And the eſteem they had for me was ſuch, that as ſoon as I was liſted in their party, which was in the year 1560, they forced me to accept of an employment among them, in which they were ſo haſty, as not to give me any time to conſider of it, they were ſo affraid of loſing me. Nay, they obliged me to make but one probation ſermon; and even, as ſoon as they heard me enter upon the ſubject, being content with my beginning, they ordered me to ſtop, and admitted me among them, to ſend me into Champagne.’

[*B*] *He had been branded at Sedan, in the moſt ignominious manner.*] The Memoirs of the League ſay (6), that being convicted of having *got a couſin of his with child* at Sedan, where he exerciſed the holy miniſtry, *he was hanged there in effigy.*

[*C*] *He preſided in all the aſſemblies . . . . . which were held to conſult the death of Barnabas Briſſon, preſident in the parliament of Paris.*] See the *Chronologie Novenaire* of Peter Victor Cayet (7), where you will find a more particular account than in theſe words of Thuanus: ‘Matthæus Launæus qui olim Presbyter, poſtea ejerata majorum religione Miniſter uxorem duxerat, ejuſque pertæſus ad ſacra redierat . . . . . . principem locum in iis conciliabulis ſemper tenuit (8). —— *Matthew Launoi, who being firſt a prieſt, afterwards turned Proteſtant miniſter, and married a wife, of whom he grew tired, and returned to the church . . . . . . had always the chief hand in thoſe conſultations.*’ This proof is ſufficient for my purpoſe.

[*D*] *He publiſhed ſome books of controverſy, among others, one concerning the motives of his changing his religion.*] It is intituled, *The Declaration and Confutation of the falſe Suppoſitions and perverſe Applications of ſome texts of the holy Scriptures, which the miniſters make uſe of in theſe latter times to divide Chriſtendom; with an exhortation to the ſaid miniſters, to re-unite themſelves, and to bring their auditors to the Catholic, Apoſtolic, and Romiſh church, from which they ought not to have ſeparated . . . . by Matthew de Launoi, and Henry Pennetier, late miniſters of the pretended Reformed Religion, and at preſent returned into the pale of the Chriſtian and Catholic church: the whole digeſted, and divided into three books, by the ſaid de Launoi.* The Epiſtle Dedicatory (9) to king Henry III, tells us, that theſe two miniſters met in the borough of Guines, in the re-conquered country, the firſt of June 1576. *Pennetier being returned thither from England ſome time before, and the other newly come from Holland.* It was there, ſay they, that they drew up this work, and reſolved to make an open abjuration of their hereſies.

[*E*] *He is very weak in his anſwer to the accuſation of adultery*] He owned himſelf a *frail man, and liable to fall into that ſin* (10). He does not confeſs the fault he is accuſed of; but alledges, in his juſtification, only ſome little cavils. ‘My accuſers, *ſays he* (11), are wrong as to the time for want of a good memory;

---

(1) Thuan. Hiſtor lib. lxxxvi, pag. 112, ad ann. 1587. *See alſo* Maimb. Hiſt. de la Ligue, livr. i, pag. 55.

(2) Pag. 280, ad ann. 1589.

(3) Thuan. ibid.

(4) Bibliotheque Françoiſe, pag. 860.

(5) Defenſe de Matthieu de Launoi & d'Henri Pennetier, contre les fauſſes Accuſations & perverſes Calomnies des Miniſtres de Paris, Sedan & autres, pag. 43, 44. *That book was printed at Paris, for John du Carroi, in 1577, in 8vo.*

(6) Tom. VI, pag. 351.

(7) Tom. I, fol. 508, & ſeq. ad ann. 1591.

(8) Thuan. lib. cii, pag. 443, ad ann. 1591.

(9) *It is dated from Paris the twenty ninth of September, 1577.*

(10) Defenſe de Matthieu de Launoi, pag. 45.

(11) Ibid. pag. 47.

and as his conduct in the time of the league made him appear to be a profligate man, no credit ought to be given to the ſtories that he publiſhed againſt the Proteſtants [*F*]. That

‘mory; for in 1574, I was in Holland. They involve themſelves in ſeveral inconſiſtencies, *adds he*, they ſay, it was a young woman, who had been intruſted with me, by honeſt people, and fearing God; and afterwards they ſay, ſhe was a ſervant maid. Now there is a great deal of difference between the one and the other. For when a young woman is given in truſt, this ſuppoſes ſhe is of a good family, and has wherewithal to live, ſo that ſhe is not a ſervant maid of ſix or ſeven livres a year. Beſides, they had a mind to aggravate this pretended fact: for it would be a greater crime to corrupt a young woman of a good family, intruſted to one's care, than if it was a meer ſervant maid, who hires herſelf for wages, to ſerve and ſtay as long as her ſervice is liked, or till ſome other occaſion makes her leave her place.’ This is but a ſorry defence: I have cited an author above (12), who ſays that Launoi got his own couſin with child. It was probably a young woman ſent to him during the perſecutions of France, for then ſeveral Proteſtants fled to Sedan. Now as Launoi was not very rich, and his refugee had not perhaps wherewithal to pay for her board, it is probable enough that by reaſon of her domeſtic ſervices, ſhe was to him inſtead of a ſervant maid; and ſo without any contradiction, ſome might ſay, that he had lain with his ſervant maid, and others that he had lain with a young woman, that was intruſted to his care.

Here is another pretended contradiction. ‘They ſay, that being convicted of the fact before the conſiſtory, I confeſſed it to three or four of them; they are uncertain as to the number (13). But they do not ſay how I was convicted: It was not, *adds he* (14), by being ſurprized in the fact, by the judge himſelf, attended with his ſerjeants, and others of his court. It was not by unexceptionable witneſſes, for people do not call witneſſes on ſuch occaſions. It was not by a violent preſumption; for if they had had any, they would have very much tranſgreſſed, according to their own diſcipline. A preſumption is grounded either upon the too great familiarity of the parties, or upon the woman's being with child. If they grounded their preſumption upon familiarity, they ſhould have given us notice of it, in order to preſerve us by good remonſtrances from falling into ſin: ſo that they would be greatly to blame, for having ſuffered the evil to run on, without interpoſing by a brotherly charity, or requiſite cenſures. If they grounded their preſumption upon the maid's being with child, it is not ſufficient to accuſe me, much leſs to condemn me. It would be a fine law, if a ſervant maid ſhould commit a folly in her maſter's houſe, and be got with child, that the maſter ſhould be guilty of it. What reaſon is there for that? Fathers and mothers cannot ſometimes preſerve their own daughters, though they keep them cloſe. How then ſhould a maſter be accountable for a ſervant maid's being with child, whom he cannot always have under his eye? It would be much better to be one's own ſervant. Such a preſumption therefore is of no force. But when they ſaw that young maid of a good family, with child, as they ſay, they ſhould have ſent for her, and examined who had got her with child, and then they had known the truth. But they forgot to do it; and therefore they cannot alledge a preſumption, without condemning themſelves: and after all, it would be of no force.’ It would be eaſy to ſhew the weakneſs of this defence, would one be at the pains; but the thing not deſerving it, I only ſay, that though he had put this maid out of the way, they might have had convincing proofs of her being with child; ſo that he could take no advantage of her not being confronted and interrogated.

The following pretended contradiction is not much better than the former. ‘They ſay, that I have been convicted before their conſiſtory, which according to them, was compoſed of ſeventeen miniſters, and thirteen elders, who make thirty perſons. Now they maintain, that I was convicted by that confeſſion, which, ſay they, I made before three or four: It was not therefore their conſiſtory; for there would be twenty ſix or twenty ſeven perſons wanting (15).’ A vain and childiſh cavil. It was not pretended that he had confeſſed his fault before the whole conſiſtory; but that without confeſſing it before this aſſembly, it had been proved upon him; and it was added, that he had confeſſed the charge in particular to three or four perſons.

He complains (16) ‘that they equally condemned them both of adultery, and to the ſame penalties. Now adultery, as diſtinguiſhed from fornication, is committed between, or by, married perſons; and yet they ſay, ſhe was a maid; ſhe did not therefore commit adultery in that ſenſe.’ This is a pitiful argument; for to commit adultery, properly ſpeaking, there is no need that both the parties ſhould be married, it is ſufficient that one of them be ſo.

The laſt thing he objects, is the reſpect of perſons (17): he pretends, that they had ſhewed great indulgence to the like faults; he names the perſons and places; and whether he was willing to find a greater conformity between the crime he was accuſed of, and that whereof he accuſed ſome of his brethren, or whether he had other reaſons, ſome ſervant maids appear almoſt always in his recriminations. He names a miniſter, whoſe name was prefixed to ſome fine books, and who was called in Holland the *Schoon Predikant* (18); if we may believe him, this handſome miniſter made himſelf formidable to his landladies, by his attempts upon their ſervant maids, and admirably made uſe of the maxim of a Roman Poet.

> Ne ſit ancillæ tibi amor pudori (19).
>
> *Bluſh not to love an humble maid.*

I ſhall obſerve in the following remark, that Launoi was not a man honeſt enough to injure the perſons he ſlandered.

THE INCONSISTENCY of prohibiting marriage, and yet permitting the attendance of young maid ſervants.

Let us make a little digreſſion. Either clergymen ſhould be permitted to marry, or forbidden to keep young ſervant maids; for the prodigious concubinage of prieſts, which hath ſcandalized the public for ſo many ages, owes it's original to the permiſſion of having women about them, to manage their houſes. The intention of the ſuperiors was, that they ſhould confine themſelves to the buſineſs of ſervant maids; but they eaſily ſuffered themſelves to be perſuaded to ſerve to ſome other purpoſe: the office of a concubine ſeemed ſo convenient to them on all accounts (20), that their maſters had not much trouble to bring them to it. Since Luther's reformation, the prieſts have by degrees, grown leſs ſcandalous; but ſtill at this day their maids, unleſs they be very old, are very much ſuſpected to ſerve them doubly. Generally ſpeaking, in all religions, if any leud buſineſs happens, which occaſions complaints againſt unmarried churchmen, it is almoſt always on account of their maids. The reaſon is plain: the temptations on both ſides, and the opportunities of ſinning, offer themſelves more readily and conveniently: and hence it is doubtleſs, that the eaſy caſuiſts do very much extenuate the ſin of a maid got with child by her maſter. The Latin of the lower age, furniſhes us with a term in this caſe, which is very expreſſive. At firſt, the word *focaria* was taken in a good ſenſe; it ſignified a woman or a maid, who ſerved in the houſe, and dreſſed her maſter's diet; but afterwards it was made uſe of only to ſignify the concubines of the clergy (21): the reaſon was, that moſt of their maids continued indeed to be their cooks, but beſides that alſo lay with their maſters. Let us conclude, that it ought to be a rule of diſcipline in all countries not to permit young unmarried clergymen to keep young maid ſervants.

[*F*] *No credit ought to be given to the ſtories he has publiſhed againſt the Proteſtants.*] Though we ſhould paſs over the horrible crimes he committed during the League, we ſhould have reaſon to charge him with forgery, in regard to many things he relates of the miniſters, as being very remote from probability. He ſays (22) that the miniſters who fled to Neufchattel in Swiſſerland, being reſolved to ruin a young man, who had preferred the ſtudy of Phyſic to that of Divinity, accuſed him of many falſe doctrines; but that one of the moſt famous amongſt them, oppoſed their ill deſign: that they continued however, to proſecute this

---

(12) *In remark* [*B*].

(13) Defenſe de Mr de Launoi, pag. 47.

(14) Ib. pag. 48.

(15) Ibid. pag. 49, 50.

(16) Ib. pag. 50.

(17) Pag. 51, & ſeq.

(18) *That is, the handſome miniſter.*

(19) Horat Ode 4, lib. ii. *See the article* BRISEIS, *remark* [*E*].

(20) *Compare what is ſaid above with the remark* [*Z*] *of the article* ADRIAN VI.

(21) *See du Cange's Gloſſary at the word* focaria, pag. 460, 4 o. Edit. Pariſ.

(22) Defenſe de Matthieu de Launoi, pag. 38, & ſeq.

That which relates to two pretended demoniacs is the moſt ridiculous [G].

this Phyſician: 'Some calling him a Sorcerer, others an Anabaptiſt, others an Atheiſt. Others ſaid to him. How? Dare you ſay, that you do not believe the doctrine of Mr Calvin, by whoſe mouth we all ſpeak? He anſwering, that Calvin was a man ſubject to error as well as others: they immediately cried out, O curſed Philoſophy! O execrable blaſphemy! For to ſpeak againſt Calvin's doctrine, and againſt the intention and will of theſe venerable doctors, is in their opinion to ſpeak againſt God, and lie againſt the Holy Ghoſt; and they make no conſcience of proſecuting a man for it to death, if they can come at him (23).' What he makes theſe miniſters ſay concerning Calvin (24) is ſo far from the ſpirit and maxims of the Reformed church, and ſo inconſiſtent with the ſtile of the Proteſtants, that there needs nothing more to convince us, that he himſelf forged, and that very groſly, the ſlanders which he publiſhed. So that it can be no prejudice to the memory of thoſe concerned, if I take the liberty of inſerting here the following ſcandalous ſtory. 'The eldeſt Capel had, a little before, plaid ſuch another mad trick to a lady of a good family, who coming to Sedan upon buſineſs, did not care to be known. However, his over curioſity made him ſo bold, as to uſe the name and authority of the duke and ducheſs of Bouillon, to get into the chamber of the ſame lady, and to ſee her. At the ſame time, he plaid another prank, which diſcovered the height of his leudneſs, as well as madneſs. For coming out of church, moved with an odd ſort of devotion, he took a young gentlewoman by the arm, who was very handſome and modeſt, and of an honourable family, and deſired leave to ſpeak one word to her. This being granted him, he whiſpered her in the ear, Madam, being charmed with your good qualities, as well of body as of mind, and eſpecially with your wit, I take the liberty to beg a favour of you; but I would not by any means be denied. The lady anſwering, that ſhe could grant nothing, before ſhe knew what he deſigned to aſk; he ſaid to her, I would beg one hour of amorous diverſion with you: we can eaſily meet in a place, where there ſhall be no body but you and I. The poor gentlewoman perfectly aſhamed and amazed at the inſtruction given her by this reformed Philoſopher, juſt coming from ſermon, ran in haſte to her mother, to whom ſhe declared the whole matter: which the mother, by way of complaint, told me the ſame day (25).'

[G]. *That which relates to two pretended demoniacs is the moſt ridiculous.*] This is the ſtory in ſhort. Matthew de Launoi was a celebrated miniſter in 1562. Some Merchants of the Low-Countries heard him preach with ſo much ſatisfaction at Aï in Champagne, that they detained him at their houſes, as he was preparing to go for England. They admired both his language and diligence, for he often preached in ſix different places within the ſpace of twenty four hours. They made him their miniſter at Tournay. Whilſt he was there, it was reported that the exorciſms of the Catholic church had delivered ſeveral people poſſeſſed by the devil. This diſpleaſed the Calviniſts: they feared their ſect would be decried, if their miniſters had not the gift of driving out devils, which was conſpicuous in the Apoſtles, and was ſtill to be ſeen among the Papiſts. They therefore ſuborned two perſons, a man and a woman, and engaged them to pretend to be demoniacs, for a certain ſum, and a penſion for life. Theſe two perſons plaid their part very well; and hereupon Matthew de Launoi, who knew nothing of this contrivance, was deſired to go and undertake their relief. He went, and his prayers and ſermons proved ſo effectual, that theſe two demoniacs, after a great many fetches, managed according to direction, declared that the devil was gone out of their bodies. The miracle was publiſhed in all places, and procured de Launoi a very great veneration. The cheat was diſcovered ſome time after; becauſe the two perſons who had played the farce, not receiving the promiſed reward, brought their action againſt the ſeducers. A Weaver, and a Rope maker acquainted de Launoi with this in Holland in the year 1574 (26). This was the motive of his converſion, if we believe the Franciſcan Sedulius, who has inſerted this ſtory at length in his anſwer to the Alcoran of the Franciſcans, printed in 1607 (27). He ſays, that Matthew de Launoi being ſtill alive at Bruſſels, and writing ſeveral books againſt the Calviniſts, could vouch the truth of it (28). Spondanus has inſerted the ſubſtance of this fine ſtory in his Annals (29). There is no need of ſhewing the abſurdity of it; ſince all the world knows, that the Proteſtants profeſſedly decry all the miracles of the latter ages, and maintain that they were by no means neceſſary to juſtify the reformation. Apply here what I have ſaid in the remark [T] of the article CALVIN.

(23) Ibid. pag. 42.

(24) *See alſo what he relates in the ſecond book of his* Declaration *and* Refutation, fol. 136, verſo.

(25) Defenſe, pag. 35, 36.

(26) Non ante ſunt eæ technæ à Matthæo intellectæ, quam pecuniis non præſtitis litem movere debitoribus dæmoniaci cœperunt: totaque eſt ea fabula in Hollandia ad annum 1574. Matthæo à duobus, Chriſtiano de la Quennoillerie textore lini, & Joanne Walle, qui chordis nectendis vitam ducere conſueſſet, commemorata. *Sedulius, ubi infra, pag.* 283.

(27) Henr. Sedulius, Apologetic. adverſus Alcoranum Franciſcanorum, pag. 280, & ſeq. *He quotes* Florentius vander Haer de initiis tumultuum Belgicorum.

(28) Vivit hodieque Matthæus Bruxellæ Principum urbe Brabantiæ, & multa adverſus illos ſcribit, quibus mendacio pallente non poſſunt reſcribere. *Idem, Sedulius, ibid. pag.* 283.

(29) Ad ann. 1562, n. 50.

LAUNOI (JOHN DE) in Latin *Launoius*, doctor of Divinity in the univerſity of Paris, was born in a little village of Normandy near Coutances. He performed his ſtudies in Philoſophy and Divinity at Paris with ſo great ſucceſs, that he became a formidable diſputant. He was admitted a prieſt and doctor of Divinity in the year 1636 [A], nor did he make any uſe of theſe two characters to get money, and beg benefices [B], he had no other aim but to become learned; and to this end, he continued

[A] *He was made a prieſt and doctor of Divinity in the year* 1636.] I have not followed Moreri, who affirms, that John de Launoi *entered into holy orders in* 1634, *and took his doctor's degree in June the ſame year.* My reaſon is this. In the elogy of this doctor it is ſaid that he began his courſe of Divinity in 1633, and made ſuch a progreſs in it in two years time, that he exceeded ſome perſons of great parts and learning, and was exceeded by no body. It is added that he was promoted the following year to the prieſthood, and to his doctor of Divinity's degree. *Studium Theologicum ingreſſus eſt anno trigeſimo tertio ſupra milleſimum & ſexcenteſimum, illudque biennio integro ita percurrit, ut multos ingenio & eruditione præſtantes vinceret, & a nemine vinceretur. Ad ordinem ſacerdotalem anno inſequenti, & ad Theologiæ Magiſterium evectus* (1) I thought it proper to place *this following year*, after the two years of his ſtudy of Divinity; for if it be put immediately after the year 1633, it would follow, that this doctor had ſtudied Divinity one year as a ſcholar, after he had been admitted doctor. I would not however in this claim any preference of Mr Moreri; for the author of the elogy did not perhaps pretend to much exactneſs in theſe chronological punctilios. Has he not ſaid (2), that after John de Launoi had ſpent five or ſix years in the ſtudy of Philoſophy and ſcholaſtic Divinity, he began his courſe of Divinity, and ſpent two years in it? Is this expreſſing ones ſelf according to the ſtrict rules of exactneſs. But however negligent he may have been, have preferred his authority to that of Moreri.

[B] . . . . *nor did he make any uſe of theſe two characters to get money, and beg benefices.*] This requires a remark; for a perſon exempt from avarice and ambition, is ſo rare to be found, even amongſt doctors of Divinity, that when we meet with one, the public ought to be particularly acquainted with it. Such examples ought to be conſecrated: all poſſible care ſhould be taken to do them juſtice: this will prove an excellent inſtruction to the public; for it ſhews that providence does not entirely deliver up mankind to corruption. I ſay then that John de Launoi expreſſed from his youth a great indifference for the things of this world; which excellent diſpoſition did not change, when he grew older; for he then gave up to his brothers and nephews all his pretenſions to his father's eſtate (3), and would never hearken to the advice of his friends, who put him upon aſking for prebends and livings. To get rid of their friendly ſollicitations, he declared to them that he found himſelf neither qualified for ſinging nor preaching, and that he would not enrich himſelf with the wealth of the church, whilſt he could not do her any conſiderable ſervices by the functions of his miniſtry. 'Monitus aliquando ab amicis, ut pr-

(1) Elog. Launoii, pag. 2.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Omnem ab ineunte adoleſcentia exuerat opum cupiditatem, quam divina vox flagitiorum fontem appellat. Sed ad firmam ætatem cum perveniſſet, paternam hæreditatem, parvam illam quidem, fratribus nepotibuſque reliquit. *Ibid. pag.* 3.

tinued to purſue his ſtudies with extreme induſtry. He did not content himſelf with reading all ſorts of books; but reſorted to the moſt learned divines [*C*], in order to conſult them upon all the difficulties he met with (*a*). He received the moſt conſiderable improvement from the learned converſations of Father Sirmond [*D*]. It was not for his own particular ſatisfaction, but for the uſe of the public, that he heaped up ſuch a vaſt treaſure of learning; for there are very few divines who have publiſhed a greater number of books [*E*]. He made no ſcruple to attack ſeveral falſe traditions [*F*], and was one of the ſtrongeſt ſupporters of the privileges of the Gallican church. He extended his criticiſms even to ſubjects of devotion: and ſome ſaints would

‘ rœciam præbendamve vacantem, eo nomine peteret ab eo, cui conferendæ illius munus incumbebat, reſpondit, ſe huic utrique officio parum aptum eſſe à natura, cùm per latera parum firma, perque vocem minimè canoram, neque verba apud populum facere, neque pſalmos hymnoſque decantare poſſet. Ingerentibus nonnullis inde provenire non modicam copiam, quâ quis commodiùs ageret, continuò regerebat, ſe ſi jure illo uteretur, proſpicere, rem ita comparatam iri, ut Eccleſia ſibi opibus ſuis fructum magnum, ipſe nullum Eccleſiæ, aut certè exiguum, Miniſterio ſuo afferret, quod factum minimè ſane vellet, tanquam iniquum nimis & invidioſum (4).’ We need not wonder that he became ſo learned, ſince he applied himſelf to his ſtudies with a mind free from covetuouſneſs and ambition. How many people would be very eminent in learning, if the eager deſire of making their fortune did not continually divert them from their ſtudies? See what a poet ſays in regard to the impediments of his art.

> Ad hæc animos ærugo & cura peculi
> Cum ſemel imbuerit, ſperamus carmina fingi
> Poſſe linenda cedro, & levi ſervanda cupreſſo (5)?
>
> *Shou'd av'rice once diſtract the poet's head,*
> *He ſtill may write, but never can be read.*

I muſt not forget John de Launoi's will. The preface of it was very remarkable. After the common form, *In the name of God*, &c. it went on thus, *I ſhall quickly make an end of this will, for I have but little wealth* (6). Mr Menage has not mentioned all; it alſo gave the reaſon why the teſtator left but little wealth, that God had given him to underſtand that it was much harder for a Chriſtian to make a right uſe of riches, than to go without them (7). It is obſervable, that Mr de Launoi left more money behind him than he ever dreamed of his being found maſter of: an evident ſign of his little concern for riches. He never took the pains of counting his money: and ſometimes forgot where he had laid it. ‘ (8) Certum illum (9) fecit Launoius, plus penes ſe poſt obitum ſignatæ pecuniæ repertum iri, quàm præſtandis legatis requireretur; & revera longè plus repertum eſt, pluſque quam Launoius ipſe repertum iri crederet. Sed id tantum abeſt ut ei vitio verti poſſit; quin potiùs laudi duci debet, cùm illud omne quantumcunque fuerit, non avara manus aſſervaſſet uſquam, ſed contemptor opum animus domi projectum oblivioni penè dediſſet. —— *Launoi aſſured him he would find more money at his death, than would pay the legacies he ſhould leave, and indeed there was a great deal more found, than even Lannoi conld have imagined himſelf worth. But this was ſo far from being a fault, that it was rather a virtue, ſince the whole ſum, how great ſoever, had been careleſsly thrown by out of contempt, and not heaped up out of avarice.*’ We have here a proof that an indifference or extreme fondneſs for riches, may each produce the ſame effect: for there are ſome miſers who hoard up ſo much wealth, that they themſelves know not the extent of it (10).

[C] *He reſorted to the moſt learned divines.*] Nor was he contented with that; but conſulted, by way of letters, the learned men who lived in other parts of France, or in foreign countries (11); and when he went to Rome, it was not to ſee the antiquities, but to get acquaintance with the Litterati. Thoſe he moſt converſed with there, were Lucas Holſtenius, and Leo Allatius (12). ‘ Iter etiam ſuſcepit in Italiam, non quidem ut fluvios inſpiceret & maria, non ut urbes luſtraret, non ut vetera artium monumenta, novaſve ædificiorum moles mirabundus intueretur, ſed ut conſuetudine frueretur eruditorum (13).’

[*D*] *He received the moſt conſiderable improvement from the learned converſation of Father Sirmond.*] He propoſed his doubts to him; and was anſwered without heat or paſſion. That contentious way of diſputing about the ſciences, too common among the learned, was not the character of this Jeſuit. ‘ Suam ſeu percunctationem, ſeu ſententiam, de maximi momenti capitibus proponentem benigne audiebat perſpicaciſſimus & cordatiſſimus ſenex, mentem ei ſuam candide aperiebat, & cum eſſet ab omni quæ in ſcholis viget rixandi conſuetudine alienus, abſtinebat à contentione & pugna verborum, locoſque indicabat conciliorum aut patrum, quibus innixus ita ſentiret (14). —— *This moſt humane and underſtanding old gentleman gave him leave to propoſe his doubts, and opinions on ſubjects of the greateſt moment, and then returned his own ſentiments with all imaginable candour, and being himſelf an enemy to noiſy methods of diſputing in ſchools, he, without making any words or controverſy, freely pointed to the councils or fathers whereon his ſentiments were founded.*’ He readily diſcovered to his friend the authorities of the fathers and councils, upon which he grounded his opinions. Mr de Launoi examined them with great exactneſs, and went again to viſit Father Sirmond, who hearing him diſcourſe upon theſe matters, anſwered him; *At firſt I underſtood theſe things better than you, but now you are much more maſter of them than I* (15). No Jeſuit had a greater ſhare in his intimacy than de Launoi, which did not pleaſe the fraternity. ‘ Cum nullum haberet inter ſodales ſuos Sirmondus quocum fidentius loqueretur, de quo & ipſi nonnunquam conqueſti ſunt, crebrius inviſi vehementer optabat à Launoio cui nihil erat quod minus crederet quam ſibi (16). —— *Sirmond having none of his own ſociety, ſo much in his confidence, which they would all ſometimes complain of, was extremely preſſing upon Launoi to viſit him the oftner, to whom he loved to communicate every thing he knew.*’ The Menagiana has this paſſage. ‘ Father Sirmond ſaid of Mr de Launoi, that when he heard him ſay any thing that was good he went to write a book (17).’

[*E*] *There are very few divines who have publiſhed a greater number of books.*] See the catalogue of them in the hiſtory he publiſhed of the college of Navarre in 1677. His Bookſeller had often printed it by itſelf. The following nice remark ſeems to deſerve a place here. ‘ This (18) was his greateſt favourite of all his books, whether it was that he took pleaſure in this glorious teſtimony he had given the public, of his gratitude to that college of the faculty, which, he conſidered as his mother: or whether he was not altogether inſenſible of the pleaſure of ſeeing all his own works particularized in this book: For he had inſerted in it the catalogue of all his writings, which he choſe to do himſelf as well to make it more exact, as to explain more readily the titles, and ſubjects of his ſmalleſt books, and of all his letters in particular, wiſely judging, that any body elſe would be eaſily diſcouraged with their great number, and the large amplification of their titles (19).’

[*F*] *He boldly attacked ſeveral falſe traditions.*] As the arrival of Lazarus and Magdalen in Provence; the apoſtleſhip of Dionyſius the areopagite in Gaul; the cauſe of the retreat of St Bruno the founder of the Carthuſians; the viſion of Simon Stoch; the privileges of the Sabbatin bull. They whoſe intereſt it was to maintain thoſe opinions raiſed terrible out-cries againſt him. He was, according to them, an enemy to religion. ‘ Credi vix poteſt quantam initio invidiam his ſcriptis in ſe conflaverit; licet enim antiquam atque adeo genuinam traditionem propugnaret, ejuſque fidem, ut ipſe ſæpe ad locum Tertulliani alludens dicere ſolebat, ex temporibus aſſereret, tamen qui hiſtorias quas expungebat à teneris annis imbiberant,

---

(*a*) Ex Elogio Joannis Launoii, Typis vulgato Londini, 1685, in 8vo.

(4) Ibid.

(5) Horat. de Arte Poët. ver. 330.

(6) Menagiana, pag. 216.

(7) Præfatur ideo teſtaturum ſe de re tenui, quoniam à quo admotus fuerat ſtudiis ſublimioribus, ſingulari Dei beneficio intellexerat facilius eſſe homini Chriſtiano bonis carere, quam iis recte uti. *Elog. Launoii*, pag. 35.

(8) Ibid. pag. 36.

(9) *That is, the executor of his will.*

(10) Exilis domus eſt ubi non & multa ſuper ſunt & dominum fallunt, & proſunt furibus. *Horatius, Epiſt. vi, lib. i, ver.* 45. See what Horace ſays of Lucullus a little before.

(11) Elog. pag. 7.

(12) Ibid.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Ibid pag. 8.

(15) Tunc ejus ſolertiam & ſagacitatem ſuſpiciens Sirmondus, dicere ſolebat, Cum primum loqui hac de re cœpimus, erat in ea forſitan aliquid quod paulo melius perſpexiſſem quam tu: nunc vero cum eam accurate pertractaſti, nihil ſupereſt quod te fugerit, quodque plenius perfectiuſque non teneas, quam ego unquam tenuerim. *Ibid.*

(16) Ibid.

(17) Menagiana, pag. 223, *of the firſt Dutch edition.*

(18) That is, the Hiſtory of the College of Navarre.

(19) Baillet, Jugemens des Sçavans, Tom. II, n. 139, pag. 171.

would have been ſtruck ont of the Kalendar, if his arguments had been admitted. It is worth obſerving what Guy Patin ſaid upon it [G]. It was a favourable ſubject for

berant, quive illas credulæ plebi non ſine aliquo commodo ſuo ingerebant, eas ſibi eripi ægre patiebantur, nec qui id tentaſſet mitius incuſabant quam ſi ſirmiſſima religionis fundamenta convellere decreviſſet (20). ——— *It is ſcarce poſſible to conceive what a load of envy theſe writings at firſt drew upon him: for tho' he was a defender of the antient, and conſequently the genuine, tradition, and as himſelf often uſed to ſay, in alluſion to a paſſage in Tertullian, vindicated it's authority from the times; yet they who had believed from their youth the legends he had expunged, or who found their account in impoſing them upon the credulity of the people, could not bear the loſs of them with any patience, but cried out as violently againſt all attempts of this kind, as if the moſt important fundamentals of religion had been attacked.*' He was not in the leaſt affected with their clamours, but went on ſtill, and undeceived not only the learned, but alſo ſome of the vulgar. 'Vicit tamen inexpugnabili conſtantiâ Launoius hominum imperitorum, & malè feriatorum importunas inofficioſaſque querelas, & aniles eorum fabellas ita revicit, ut nullum jam patronum inveniant inter eos, qui aliquâ curâ veritatem indagant, multò pauciores quàm antea apud vulgum, & apud eos qui ne literas quidem norunt (21).' He vigorouſly attacked the Monks in two other points (22); for he demonſtrated the falſity of the pretended privileges, by virtue whereof they refuſed to acknowledge the juriſdiction of biſhops; and confuted the arguments on which they ground their claim to the adminiſtration of the ſacrament of penance. Here follows what the abbot de Marolles ſaid of him. 'He found the art of diſcovering the moſt hidden truths: and the lovers of them are as much pleaſed with him for it, as thoſe who are unqualified to diſcover or value them, are uneaſy at his having made ſuch glorious conqueſts. However they can reproach him with nothing: and it has not hitherto been poſſible for his adverſaries to convict him of the leaſt falſhood, or of one wrong inference from the teſtimonies of the writers concerning the points he has examined. It is true, what we have ſeen of him, is inconſiderable in compariſon of what we ought to expect from him, applying himſelf as he does to the moſt ſerious ſtudies upon important ſubjects: but the moſt learned will always benefit themſelves by the reading of his works, either by his method, or the certain diſcovery of truths, for which pure religion will have no leſs reaſon to glory, than infamous ſuperſtition to be concerned at it (23).

[G] *It is worth obſerving what Guy Patin ſaid upon it.*] 'I give you notice, that I have delivered a little packet to a young man of Lyons . . . . You will find in it, among others, Mr de Launoi's book, wherein he undertakes to prove, that there never was ſuch a ſaint as Renatus, nor any biſhop of Angers of that name. It is the ſame who has writ againſt Dionyſius the Areopagite, aſſerting that he never came into France; and againſt the ſcapulary of the Carmelites, and againſt Magdalen, pretending that ſhe never came into Province. He is a doctor of Divinity, a Norman, a man of a mean look, but learned, and eſpecially in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. Some here call him a deſperate and damned ſpirit, whom all ſhould avoid; who turns every year a ſaint out of paradiſe, and it is to be feared will at laſt expel God himſelf. Yet hitherto no body has anſwered him. One of his friends told me that he had long been a penſioner in the college of the Jeſuits (24), who made uſe of him to approve their books; but that at laſt, they had diſcarded him, for refuſing to give his approbation to a new doctrine they had a mind to publiſh (25).' What follows, is curious; I have it from Mr Menage, and it is he who ſpeaks (26). Mr de Launoi, *doctor of Divinity, of the faculty of Paris, pretends that ſeveral of our ſaints never exiſted: which occaſioned Mr Feramus to ſay of him* *,

Tu quoque, Launoï, veri indagator & index
Addita qui faſtis Numina falſa doces.

In ſearch of truth, Launoi knows no reſtraint,
Nor ſpares his pen one Legendary ſaint.

I made this Greek epigram upon it,

Τὸν Λαυνοῖον ὁρᾷς, ὃς σύρφετον Οὐρανιώνων
Ῥίψε, ποδὸς τεταγὼν ἀπὸ βηλȣ̃ Θεσπεσίοιο.

Launoi kicks down the ſcoundrels from above,
As Vulcan once was ſerv'd by Homer's Jove.

They ſay this laſt verſe is taken out of Homer, ſpeaking of Jupiter who kicked Vulcan out of heaven. But that is the very beauty of my epigram; it would be ridiculous, were this verſe my own: And I dare ſay it is thought very pretty for that application, on which Mr Daillé, the father, who was particularly converſant with Homer, has often congratulated me. The abbot Faydit has not obſerved that it is only the laſt verſe which Mr Menage has borrowed from Homer: he has quoted part of the firſt, as if it was to be found in the Iliad; and which is worſe, he pretends that Jupiter turned out the whole rabble of the gods. His words are theſe (27). 'Rome could not without indignation bear that Mr de Launoi, as learned as he he was, ſhould uncanonize five or ſix unknown ſaints, who in the times of ignorance had been introduced into the Breviary; and that like Homer's Jupiter, who turned out the whole rabble of the gods, with one kick on the breech, from heaven to earth, this doctor ſhould with one daſh of his pen diſcard from the throne of glory ſome ſaints whom Rome had too haſtily placed there.

- - - - Ὃ ϖέργυτον ȣ̓ρανιώνων
Ῥίψε ϖόδος τεταγὼν ἀϖο Βήλȣ Θεσπεσίοιο (28).

'She has cried out againſt this attempt, as the moſt horrid ſacrilege. His books have been delivered up to the Inquiſition, not being able to drag the author thither. She has decried him as a man of a ſuſpected faith, and an enemy to the ſaints.' It is certain that Homer ſays no more than, that Jupiter taking Vulcan by the foot, threw him down from heaven (29). If Mr Menage ſaid in converſation the ſame thing as the abbot Faydit, we muſt conclude from it, that he had not conſidered matters ſo narrowly, as when he took pen in hand for the public, or that he flouriſhed on that adventure in order to make it more agreeable, and more capable of the parallel. However it be, here is a paſſage out of the continuation of the Menagiana, wherein Homer is made to ſay what he has not ſaid. '(30) Mr Godefroy the Hiſtoriographer going abroad very early in the morning on New-years-day, met in Harp-ſtreet Mr de Launoi, who was going to the Sorbonne. He accoſted him, and ſaluting him, ſaid, a good morrow and a happy new year to you, Sir; what ſaint will you diſcard from heaven this year! Mr de Launoi, ſurprized at this queſtion, anſwered him; I diſcard no true ſaints from heaven whom God and their merit have placed there; but ſuch as the ignorance and ſuperſtition of the people have undeſervedly introduced thither, and without the approbation of God, and of the learned. This anſwer was the occaſion of the epigram I made upon Mr de Launoi, wherein I compare him to Jupiter in Homer who cleared heaven of the whole rabble of falſe gods, who had crept in amongſt the true ones, and who giving them a kick on the breech threw them headlong from his throne, and down from the ſtars to the earth (31).'

If it was not for fear of making too many digreſſions, I would ſay that it were to be wiſhed that ſeveral learned men were ſuffered to do what Mr de Launoi has done. The ſham ſaints are no leſs multiplied than the pretenders to nobility; ſo that as princes from time to time iſſue out commiſſions of inquiry, in order to reduce the uſurpers of quality to their proper Plebeian ſtate, the clergy ſhould appoint ſome commiſſioners, as rigid as Boiſſeau (32), to examine the titles and patents of ſaintſhip. If the troops of the church triumphant ſhould come to muſter before honeſt commiſſaries, there would be found a great many Fagots, not amongſt the ſoldiers but amongſt the great officers, I mean among the ſaints who are daily invoked. The for the jocoſe humour of this Phyſician and it furniſhed ſo fruitful a ſource of pleaſantry that ſeveral other perſons diverted themſelves with relating merry ſtories on that ſubject [*H*]. It was difficult for this learned divine to write ſo many volumes agaiſt the maxims of the Pope's flatterers [*I*], and againſt the ſuperſtitions, and pretended immunities

---

(20) Elog. Laun. pag. 10.

(21) Ibid.

(22) See his Elogy, from page 10 to page 18.

(23) The abbot de Marolles, *Memoires pag.* 160. See alſo his catalogue of the authors who preſented him with their books, under the name Launoi.

(24) There is no probability that he ever was their penſioner.

(25) Patin, Lett xlix, pag. 207, of the firſt Tome. It is dated the eighteenth of November, 1650. See alſo Letter cli, pag. 594, of the ſame Tome.

(26) Menage, Anti Baillet, Tom. II, pag. 216.

* In his Elegy upon the death of Mr du Puy.

(27) Extrait d'un Sermon preché le jour de St Polycarpe, pag 296.

(28) All the faults in this Greek, are probably errrors of the preſs.

(29) *Homer. Iliad. lib. i, ver.* 591. There is in the fifteenth book of the Iliad a paſſage, which might ſeem to be more favourable to the abbot Faydit; *ſee the article JUNO, citat.* (31), but at bottom it is not favourable to him.

(30) Suite du Menagiana, pag. 293, 294. Dutch Edit.

(31) The Greek diſtich follows here in the continuation of the Menagiana, with ſome faults probably of the Printers.

(32) Every one remembers the ſong:
For ſome time it has been,
None but nobles are ſeen,
Who through all our high roads,
Bring their parchments by loads,
To prove that their titles are true:
But Boiſſeau with his pow'rs,
Throws their claims out of doors,
Nor will read their long deeds,
But by minutes proceeds
To give each pretender his due.

The Kalender wants more to be reformed on that account, than with reſpect to the preceſſion of the equinoxes: and whereas a bare defalcation of ten days was ſufficient for this laſt reformation, the other would require a ſubſtraction by hundreds and thouſands. It is a long time that the year has been unable to afford a day for each ſaint; they muſt be heaped one upon another in the ſame places, ſo that we may now ſay with Juvenal,

> \- - - - - Nec turba deorum
> Talis ut eſt hodie, contentaque ſidera paucis
> Numinibus miſerum urgebant Atlanta minori
> Pondere (33).

> *E'er gods grew numerous, and the heav'nly crowd,*
> *Preſs'd wretched Atlas with a lighter load.*
> CREECH.

How many ſenators ſhould we find in the celeſtial court *vitio creati* (34), ſhould we proceed rigorouſly? See how many volumes the *Acta ſanctorum* already amount to? One might apply to them this common diſtich (35):

> Scripta giganteæ quorum ſub pondere molis
> Triſtior Encelado bibliopola gemit.

> *Such monſt'rous works the Bookſeller bemoans,*
> *And with Enceladus's torture groans.*

I would have this underſtood, without prejudice to the eſteem which is due to their learned compilers.

I muſt even acknowledge, to their honour, that they reject a great many fables, and that their ſincerity expoſes them every day to the ſame complaints which were made againſt Mr de Launoi. See Father Papebroch's anſwer (36) to the *Exhibitio Errorum* of Sebaſtian of St Paul, a Carmelite; you will there find that this Jeſuit has caſhired many intruders out of the kalender, and that upon very ſolid reaſons. Theſe intruders are not ſaints of a modern, but very ancient date. Cardinal Beſſarion, ſeeing at Rome the canonization of ſome perſons, whoſe lives he thought none of the beſt, cried out, that theſe new ſaints made him call in queſtion the old ones. *Aſſe che queſti ſanti moderni mi ſanno aſſai dubitare delli paſſati* (37). But we may ſay, that there is infinitely more certainty in the modern, than in many of the antient ſaints. We cannot doubt but the former lived on earth; and we have almoſt demonſtrative proofs, that the latter never did. A witty man ſaid the other day, in good company, that if he was to addreſs to the ſaints, he had rather chuſe the new comers, Capiſtran, for inſtance, or Thomas de Villeneuve, than St Catherine, or St Alexis. See the remark of the article PEREZ (JOSEPH). I ſhall obſerve below (38), that the work of the Jeſuit Papebroch incurred the diſpleaſure of the Inquiſition.

A canon of Paſſaw, a good preacher, and profeſſor of divinity in the XVth Century, ſaid in one of his ſermons, that if there were as many holy-days as minutes, the year would not afford one for each ſaint, and he quotes Durandus, biſhop of Mande, who obſerves, that there are above five thouſand ſaints for every day. 'Tanta (inquit ille *) eſt Sanctorum numeroſitas, quod totum tempus anni non ſufficeret etiam ſi ſingulis horis, etiam ſingulis minutis, ageremus feſtum unius Sancti; deinde Durandum citat. Quia ſicut dicit (inquit) Guilhelmus in rationali pro quolibet die pluſquam quinque millia Sanctorum concurrerent (39).' The author, who quotes the ſermon of the German canon, adds, that All-Saints day was appointed to ſupply the want of days in the year, and to prevent the diſpleaſure of thoſe ſaints, who might be angry for having no honour paid them. 'Quocirca quum Pontificiorum Divorum tanta illis authoribus fere infinitio ſit, in ſupplementum cultus Sanctorum feſtum omnium Sanctorum excogitatum eſt. Quoniam humani cultus illos appetentes eſſe ſomniant, & in ſuos cultores prolixos, ne omiſſis & præteritis Divis Stomachandi ulla cauſa ſit, quod ſuo cultu orbentur: ſic omnibus minutis etiam & manipularibus Divis, & non ſolum Patriciis & majorum Gentium, hoc omnium Sanctorum feſto & Supplemento ſatisfactum eſſe putant. Atque hoc Guilhelmi illius Mimatenſis Epiſcopi eſt, quaſi ſalutari hoc pharmaco omnium divorum repulſæ & offenſæ placari debeant.' Durandi verba hæc ſunt. † Propter ipſorum inquit multutitudinem feſtare de illis ſpecialiter non valemus. Ergo ut antea idem ait propter omiſſorum (inquit) feſtorum ſuppletionem inſtitutum eſt feſtum omnium Sanctorum (40). —— '*Therefore ſince the ſaints of the Pope's canonization are grown infinite, All-Saints day is contrived as a ſupplementary worſhip of them. Becauſe, as they are ſuppoſed to be very fond of being worſhipped, and to have a particular regard for their votaries, that there may be no room left for any of them to reſent the not being taken notice of, this feaſt of All-Saints is eſteemed a ſupplementary worſhip, not only of the higher, but alſo of the lower, and every particular claſs of ſaints. And this, according to the ſame William Durandus, biſhop of Mande, is a ſort of expiatory commemoration, neceſſary to appeaſe all the ſaints who have not been particularly recorded. Theſe are his words. Their number is too great to allow of particular holidays for them; and therefore, as the ſame author has obſerved before, in order to ſupply the want of theſe (ſays he) the general feaſt of All-Saints was inſtituted.*' Thoſe who make it their buſineſs to draw parallels, will not fail to remember, upon this occaſion, the precaution of the Athenians, who conſecrated an altar to the unknown gods (41), becauſe they were afraid of neglecting the worſhip of ſome revengeful deities, whoſe names and qualities they were ignorant of. They thought they had lately ſuffered for it; ſo that to play a ſure game (42), they reſolved to pay their homage even to the deities unknown to them. This was the way to forget none of the gods.

[*H*] *He furniſhed ſo many pleaſant ſtories, that ſeveral other perſons diverted themſelves with relating merry ſtories on that ſubject.*] Here is one of Mr de Vigneul-Marville: it is as good as that I have mentioned out of the Menagiana. 'Mr de Launoi was a terrible Critic, formidable both to heaven and earth: he has unſhrined more ſaints, than have been canonized by ten Popes. He ſuſpected the whole martyrology; and examined all the ſaints, one after another, as they do the quality in France. The curate of St Euſtachius in Paris, ſaid, "When I meet Dr de Launoi, I make a very low bow to him, and I ſpeak to him with my hat off, and with the greateſt reverence, for fear he ſhould take away my St Euſtachius, who has nothing to depend upon (43) (§ α)." Theſe laſt words are very true; and here is a paſſage of the Valeſiana, which confirms them. 'The life of St Euſtachius is likewiſe a heap of fables; and I am very much ſurprized that the largeſt pariſh of Paris ſhould have parted with the name of one of the moſt famous and illuſtrious martyrs we have, to take that of an unknown, and very ſuſpicious ſaint (44).' Mr Ancillon heard Mr Daillé ſay, 'that one day meeting him in Mr Cramoiſy's ſhop, a Bookſeller in Paris, they expreſſed a great friendſhip and eſteem for one another; and that as they parted, Mr de Launoi told him, *Sir, I ſtrike every month one ſaint out of the Breviary, do you ſtrike an error out of it* (45).' If Mr de Launoi ſpoke in that manner, it was only in jeſt; for the number of ſaints he pretended to degrade, will bear no compariſon with the months of his life. But he might, without any exaggeration, have affirmed the ſaints who are doubtful or fabulous, to be as numerous as the minutes of his long life. See the excellent Hiſtory of the Church, publiſhed by Mr Baſnage, in 1699, in two volumes in Folio. There (46) we find ſo many fabulous ſaints and martyrs degraded, that in compariſon of that ocean, Mr de Launoi's attempt is no more than a rivulet.

[(§ α) Theſe words have been omitted in the Paris edition, 1713. REM, CRIT.]

[*I*] *He . . . . . wrote . . . . againſt the maxims of the Pope's flatterers.*] To go to the very root of the munities of the monks, without creating himſelf a great many enemies. He experienced in his latter years that he had offended a formidable party. He was forbid holding aſſemblies in his chamber (*b*) [*K*], as he had done for a long time once a week; and his Printer was brought into trouble [*L*]. He patiently bore thoſe inſults, and ceaſed not to labour for the public: it may be ſaid that he died with his pen in his hand (*c*); for he not only had a book in the preſs during his laſt ſickneſs [*M*], but alſo corrected the proofs the day before he died. He was buried in the church of the Minimes, as he had ordered in his will; but the epitaph which was compoſed

---

(33) Juven. Sat. XIII, ver. 46.

(34) *See the* Valeſiana, pag. 48, 49. Dutch Edit.

(35) *See Balzac's* Oeuvres diverſes, Diſcours xvi, pag. m. 409.

(36) It was printed at Antw. in 1696, in 4to.

(37) Beſſario Cardinalis cum inter Divos inepta quadam ἀποθέωσει Romæ quam plurimos referri videret quorum vitam improbarat, ſe valde dubitare dixit utrum vera eſſent quæ ab antiquis prodita fuerunt. *Bodinus, Meth. Hiſt. cap. iv, pag. m.* 72. See in the remark [*F*], of the article BELLAI (WILLIAM) the application which has been made of thoſe words of Beſſarion.

(38) In the remark [Q], towards the end.

* Paul. Wan. Sermone de omnibus ſanctis.

(39) Michael Renigerus de Pii Quinti & Gregorii XIII, furoribus contra Eliſabetham Angliæ Reginam, cap. xiii, fol. 108. Edit London, 1582.

† Guil. Durand. Rubrica de Feſto omnium Sanctorum, lib. vii.

(40) Id. Reniger, ibid.

(41) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Jan. 1687, pag. 76.

(42) Ὑπὲρ πλείονος δῆθεν ἀσφαλείας. *That is to ſay,* for greater ſecurity. *Chryſoſtom. Homil. xxxviii, in Acta Apoſtol.* See ſeveral other paſſages in Meurſius's Treatiſe *De Piraeo, pag.* 42, &c.

(43) Vigneul Marville, Mêlanges d'Hiſtoire & de Litterature, pag. 266, 267. Edit. de Roüen, 1699.

(44) Valeſiana, pag. m. 48.

(45) Ancillon, Mêlange Critique de Litterature, Tom. II, pag. 329.

(46) See the pages referred to in the Index, at the words *Martyrs* and *Saints.*

the evil, in confuting the immunities the Monks pretended to, he thought it neceſſary to lay down this important truth, that the Pope can do nothing againſt the canons of councils. He wrote ſeveral letters upon that ſubject, which have been ſo well approved in England, and thought ſo proper to mortify the Ultramontains, that they have been reprinted at Cambridge (47). He principally attacked Bellarmin; the following account is given of his conqueſt over this great champion of the Pope's. 'In eo verò adverſarium inter alios nactus eſt Cardinalem Robertum Bellarminum, qui abſurdiſſima quæque Romanæ curiæ placita defendenda ſuſceperat. Si quæ porro in eorum confirmationem deſumpta ex ſacris libris teſtimonia adduxit, clariſſimè demonſtravit Launoius, fuiſſe ea in pravum detorta ſenſum, & aliter intellecta quàm ea ſanctiſſimi quique patres intellexerint, à quorum ſenſu in exponendis Scripturis recedere, nihil aliud eſt quam fideliſſimos duces, & à Tridentina Synodo datos aſpernari, & in errores omnes ſeipſum conjicere. Si quos etiam canones aut patrum textus laudat Bellarminus, eos plerumque interpolatos oſtendit Launoius, & mala fide relatos. Sicque hominem armis Scripturæ & traditionis nudatum exponit, velut nutritum in philoſophica palæſtra tyronem, qui adversùs invictam caſtrorum aciem irrito ridendoque conatu digladiatur; & tela ab Ariſtotele deſumpta juveniliter vibrat (48). —— *Upon this ſubject he found, among other adverſaries, cardinal Bellarmine, who had undertaken to defend the moſt abſurd maxims of the court of Rome. Launoi clearly demonſtrated, that the teſtimonies he had alledged out of ſcripture, in confirmation of them, were all miſ-interpreted, and taken in a quite different ſenſe from what all the Fathers had underſtood them in; the receding from whoſe authority in expounding the ſcriptures, was deſpiſing the moſt faithful guides, authorized by the council of Trent, and plunging head-long into all kinds of error. The quotations Bellarmine had made out of the canons and fathers, Launoi alſo proved to be interpolated and unfaithful. So that he ſtripped his adverſary of all his armour borrowed from ſcripture and tradition, and expoſed him naked, like a freſhman in the univerſity, ridiculouſly diſputing with a moſt able Profeſſor, and brandiſhing Ariſtotle's weapons with a childiſh hand.*' Reiſerius, a Lutheran miniſter (49), publiſhed a book, in 1685, which, ſtrictly ſpeaking, is only an abſtract of our Doctor's Letters. He has put two titles to it, which are both to our purpoſe. The running-title is, *Joh. Launoii Theol. Pariſ. Anti-Bellarminus*. But the title prefixed to the book is, *Johannes Launoyus Theologus & Sorboniſta Pariſienſis teſtis & confeſſor veritatis Evangelico-Catholicæ in potioribus fidei capitibus controverſis adverſus* Robertum Bellarminum & *alios quoſdam Sedis Romanæ Defenſores egregius & luculentus, nunc poſt obitum contra* Chriſtianum Lupum *Lovanienſem*, Immanuelem à Schelſtrate *Antverpienſem*, Natalem Alexandrum *Pariſienſem*, Dominicum Galeſium, & Franciſcum Marcheſium *Romanos, vindicatus*. The author of this book pretends, that John de Launoi is a perſon fit to be put in the appendix to Illyricus's *Catalogus teſtium veritatis*. Mr Couſin has taken it in his head, a little too late, to ſpeak of this book of Reiſerus, in his *Journal des Sçavans*; the firſt mention he has made of it, is in the journal of the 30th of July, 1696, and in that of the 6th of Auguſt following. Theſe two extracts are very proper to acquaint us with Mr de Launoi's character.

[*K*] *He was forbid holding aſſemblies in his chamber.*] Nothing was more innocent than thoſe aſſemblies; the converſation run only upon learning; however he was told, that the king deſired they ſhould be diſcontinued (50). The archbiſhop of Paris was thought to be the author of that affair, and there were ſome who took occaſion from thence to ſpeak ill of him. Mr de Launoi neither took that liberty himſelf, nor would ſuffer this charge to be laid upon the archbiſhop in his preſence; though he could not forbear ſaying, that if the accuſation were juſt, he muſt be guilty of the greateſt ingratitude. *Hos animorum motus utcunque ſedabat Launoius, reique acerbitatem, benigna ut poterat interpretatione leniebat. Abſtinebat ipſe ſemper ab omni atrocitate verborum, Archiepiſcopum nec incuſabat ipſe, nec incuſari ab aliis, carpive coram ſe patiebatur. Sed tamen cum vir eſſet candidiſſimi pectoris, diffiteri non poterat, quin ſi id præſtitiſſet Pariſienſis præſul, laboraret vehementer ingrati animi vitio, quo cætera omnia facile continentur* (51).

[*L*] *His Printer was brought into trouble.*] This happened in the year 1675; he was printing his book concerning Simony, wherein, amongſt other things, he writes againſt the Annates, and confutes the Jeſuit Azorius, who wrote a book towards the end of the XVIth Century, to clear them of Simony. The copies of this work of Mr de Launoi, were ſeized at the Printer's; thoſe which could be found were carried away, and he was forbid ſelling the reſt; but for a fine of fifty livres, that prohibition was taken off (52).

[*M*] *He had a book in the preſs during his laſt ſickneſs.*] Let us ſee what Mr de Vizé (53) ſays of him. 'It may be ſaid, that he died in a manner with pen in hand; ſince the day before he corrected the proofs of a book he had written in defence of the king's intereſts. It is an anſwer to an Italian writer, who ſome time before had printed a treatiſe in oppoſition to the right of ſecular princes, concerning the impediments to matrimony. Mr de Launoi had before maintained the quite contrary doctrine in a book publiſhed in 1674, wherein the rights of the king, and of all ſecular princes, are ſo ſolidly eſtabliſhed, that this work may be looked upon as one of the moſt uſeful to the ſtate. It was anſwered in Italy, and as this anſwer took from ſecular princes their eſſential right, which they have to capacitate or incapacitate their ſubjects for contracting matrimony, this great man was not ſilent, but was taking care, when he died, of the impreſſion of what he had wrote to confute the errors of the Italian author. Thus all his time was employed, either for the church, or for his prince; and he may be called, not only *the vindicator of the king's rights*, but alſo *the defender of the juſt authority of the biſhops, the deſtroyer of falſe privileges, and the aſſerter of the liberties of the Gallican church*.' The author of Mr de Launoi's elogy, does not agree with the Mercure Gallant, with reſpect to the book which was then in the preſs. It was not, according to him, an apology for the right of princes over marriages, but an anſwer to Father Alexander. He tells us, that Mr de Launoi began the treatiſe concerning the right of princes, at the requeſt of cardinal Bentivoglio. Mr de Launoi being at Rome, when they were examining in France, whether the marriage of the duke of Orleans, brother to Lewis XIII, with the princeſs of Lorrain, was valid, met with cardinal Bentivoglio in the library of the Dominicans, and propoſed to him this argument. If princes have had the power to make laws concerning the obſtacles to marriage, they have it ſtill, unleſs it has been taken from them. But they have had it, and it cannot be proved that it has been taken from them. Therefore. The cardinal deſired Mr de Launoi to write upon this ſubject, and to explain this argument. See the margin (54). The book was ſmall at firſt, but before it was publiſhed, in 1674, it grew very large. Dominic Galeſius, biſhop of Ruvo, in the kingdom of Naples, wrote againſt it. Mr de Launoi had no ſooner read the book of that prelate, but he undertook to refute it; he had ſcarce finiſhed that confutation (55), but he undertook to anſwer Father Alexander (56). His anſwer was almoſt finiſhed, when he was ſeized with the diſtemper of which he died in a few days. This laſt work was already in the preſs.

(*b*) Ex eodem Elogio, pag. 30.

(*c*) *See the* Mercure Gallant *for March* 1678.

(47) In the year 1689, in fol.

(48) Elog. Launoii, pag. 21.

(49) A native of Augſburg, and miniſter of St James's pariſh in Hamburg. His book is printed in 4to, and contains 862 pages.

(50) Elog. Launoii, pag. 30.

(51) Ibid. pag. 32.

(52) Elog. pag. 28, & ſeq.

(53) Mercure Gallant, March 1678, pag. 116, 117, Dutch Edit.

(54) It ſhould be inferred from thence, that Mr Ancillon is miſtaken when he ſays, pag 330 of the ſecond volume of the *Mêlange Critique de Litterature*, that Mr de Launoi wrote that book by order, both againſt his will and his opinion.

(55) Huic titulum eſſe voluit: *Indicis locupletiſſimi erratorum in libro ſcriptoris Itali contentorum.* Elog. pag. 33.

(56) Qui Annatas à Simoniæ labe liberandas ſuſceperat, & Summam Theologicam Thomæ Aquinati tanquam vero ejus auctori aſſerendam. *Ibid. pag.* 34. See concerning that work of Father Alexander, the *Journal des Sçavans, Novemb.* 18, 1675.

compoſed for him was not permitted to be put upon his tomb [*N*]. I forgot to obſerve that he died at the Hôtel d' Etrée [*O*], the tenth of March 1678, being above ſeventy ſeven years of age (*d*). He was a man, to whom the public is greatly indebted. Had he only publiſhed the book *De autoritate negantis Argumenti*, he would have done great ſervice to the Republic of Letters; for he has given a thouſand fine hints in that book, to diſtinguiſh truth from falſhood in hiſtorical matters. He had diſputes with ſeveral, and among others with father Nicolai a Dominican [*P*] and Mr Thiers (*e*).

He drew upon him the whole order of St Dominic, for having ſo freely attacked the reputation of Thomas Aquinas. The marks of reſpect, which his prudence and gravity made him intermix with his cenſures, did not prevent the reſentment of the Dominicans; for after all it could not be diſſembled, but that the angelical doctor was guilty of great ignorance, or inſincerity, in the notation of ſeveral paſſages deſigned for the confutation of heterodoxy. Father Baron endeavoured to juſtify Thomas Aquinas but was not very ſucceſsful in his attempt. I ſhall take occaſion on this head to make ſeveral obſervations [*Q*]. Father Alexander laboured with much greater ſucceſs to ſhew,

Hence it appears, that Mr de Vizé, and the elogiſt do not agree concerning the book which Mr de Launoi had in the preſs when he died.

[*N*] *The epitaph which was compoſed for him, was not permitted to be put upon his tomb.*] Mr de Launoi had made his will eleven years before he died, and he had deſired Mr Camus, firſt preſident in the court of aids, his old and intimate friend, to be his executor. Mr le Camus faithfully diſcharged that truſt, and deſired Mr le Clement, an ancient counſellor of the ſame court, to write an epitaph on the deceaſed (57). The Minimes having read and examined it, produced a letter from their general, ſignifying, that this epitaph could not be admitted, ſince it complimented de Launoi with having always maintained orthodoxy; and ſome time after they declared, that both the royal and eccleſiaſtical authorities had enjoined them not to ſuffer any inſcription in praiſe of Mr de Launoi. ‘ Ubi illam *(inſcriptionem)* expenderunt, attulerunt præpoſiti ſui generalis literas, quibus renunciabatur, nec probari nec recipi à ſe poſſe inſcriptionem, quâ Launoio laus defenſæ perpetuo veritatis, & optimæ famæ, maximæque venerationis apud probos quæſitæ tribuatur. Poſtea vetitum ſibi prædicarunt regia ſimul & ſacrâ auctoritate, ne ullum apicem in capella ſua extare ſinerent, quo Launoii nomen commendaretur (58).’ See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (59), and particularly a Letter to a prelate of the court of Rome, upon the decree of the Inquiſition of the ſeventh of December, 1690. I ſhall quote a paſſage out of it, which may be of uſe in the hiſtory of our doctor. The abbot, who wrote this letter, takes notice, that the court of Rome maintains it's rights with greater policy than the court of France: he obſerves, that the former recompenſes very magnificently thoſe that write in it's favour, but that the latter takes no notice of thoſe who aſſert the privileges of the Gallican church. ‘ However, *ſays the author of that letter*, if I might adviſe, poſterity ſhould know by ſome mark of honour, the eſteem which has been paid their merit, and the gratitude which has been ſhewn to their works. But you know how far this has been obſerved, with reſpect to one of your friends. We have not had a man of greater zeal for the doctrine of the clergy of France, nor more indefatigably ſtudious to illuſtrate and defend it, than honeſt Mr de Launoi, who beſides was remarkable for the ſtricteſt impartiality. What has been done to the honour of his memory? you very well know; they would not ſo much as ſuffer on his tomb, the few compliments his friends would have paid to his merit, and the ſervices he had done to the church of France. Nay, they did in a manner ſtop his mouth ſome years before he died, by forbidding him to continue certain conferences upon this ſubject in his houſe, where it may be truly ſaid, more were inſtructed to become defenders of our liberties, than in all other places beſide. Nay, it is a kind of miracle, that we have what he printed in his life-time, upon the ſuperiority of councils, and againſt the infallibility of Popes, and upon other ſubjects of this nature; and we owe it to his particular contrivance, which was to give it piece-meal in letters, which he wrote to different perſons, by that means avoiding the intolerable ſlavery of the cenſure of certain doctors of his time, without whoſe approbation, no book could be licenſed, and who ſeemed as if hired to put a ſtop to all good books, and to put their authors into deſpair.’

[*O*] *He died at the Hôtel d'Etrée.*] The Cardinal d'Etrée, when he was only biſhop of Laon, had in ſome meaſure ingroſſed Mr de Launoi to himſelf. See Mr de Marolles (60).

[*P*] *He had a diſpute with ..... Father Nicolai a Dominican.*] The Journal des Sçavans, mentions three works of this author. I. His two diſſertations *De concilio plenario quod contra Donatiſtas baptiſmi quæſtionem definivit* (61). II. His two diſſertations *De Baptiſmi antiquo uſu* (62). III. His book *De Jejunii Chriſtiani & Chriſtianorum abſtinentiæ vero ac legitimo ritu juxta veterem Eccleſiæ univerſalis uſum* (63). The firſt of thoſe three pieces is intirely againſt Mr de Launoi, who pretended that St Auguſtin meant the council of Arles, when he ſaid that the error of the Donatiſts about the nullity of the baptiſm of Heretics, was condemned in a general council. Mr de Launoi drew from thence a great many conſequences againſt the Ultramontains. The ſecond book of the Dominican does not concern him; it is a work of which the Proteſtants of France took advantage, becauſe it contains a formal condemnation of thoſe who force Infidels to be baptized. The third work of this Monk, is againſt Mr de Laucoi. Here is a paſſage out of the continuation of the Menagiana. ‘ I once told Mr de Launoi, that he had offended all the Jacobins by his writing againſt Father Nicolai, and that all of them would write againſt him. He anſwered me unluckily. I fear their penknife more than their pen (64).’

[*Q*] *Father Baron endeavoured to juſtify Thomas Aquinas, but was not very ſucceſsful in his attempt. I ſhall take occaſion on this head to make ſome few obſervations.*] Unprejudiced perſons would form this judgment of the ſucceſs of his diſpute, by only comparing his firſt piece with that of his adverſary. Much more would they do ſo by comparing Mr de Launoi's firſt and ſecond Reply, with the anſwer of Father Baron. I ſhall only mention the pieces of this controverſy. A letter of Mr de Launoi to Mr Faure (65), is that wherein he cenſures Thomas Aquinas. Father Baron's anſwer is contained in three paragraphs of the ſecond ſection of the firſt book of his apology for the Dominicans (66). Mr de Launoi's Reply is in a letter to Mr Fortin (67). I have not ſeen Father Baron's Reply; but I know that his adverſary refuted it in a letter dated from Paris the firſt of Auguſt 1667 (68). I know not whether this diſpute went any farther.

To give a ſmall ſpecimen of the judgment which the Monks formed of the genius of this Sorbonne doctor, I ſhall recite a few lines of Father Baron. ‘ Quiſquis hominem privatim, ſeu publicis ſcriptis intimius noverit, etiam ex amiciſſimis, non abnuet meum de illo judicium, aut verius votum. Optandum plane, ne mores ingenuos corrupiſſet nimio ſuarum cogitationum amore, & alios jure, vel injuriâ carpendi, in naturam inductâ conſuetudine. Unde ad minus, ut cætera omittam, illud incommodi accidit, ut magnum potius, quam bonum nomen videatur ambire, & doctiores viros voluiſſe inumbrare, neque, ut conveniebat ſapienti Theologo, ſatis cordi

‘ ſuerit

(*d*) Elog. pag. 37. *He could not therefore be born the twenty firſt of December, 1603, as Moreri affirms.*

(*e*) See what Mr Sallo, *Journal des Sçavans, March 16, 1665,* ſays concerning the book of Mr Thiers, againſt Mr de Launoi.

(57) It is in the Elogy, pag. 37.

(58) Elog. Laun. pag. 38.

(59) For September, 1686, pag. 1033.

(60) *You will find, in page 159, of his Memoirs, printed in 1656, the following words:* His eſteem for Mr de Launoi, doctor of Divinity, one of the greateſt men of this age for his learning and probity, is a ſign of his judgment. And indeed, having ſuch a man with him, he cannot be too careful of him: it is an ineſtimable treaſure.

(61) Journal des Sçavans, April 9, 1668.

(62) Ibid. December 10, 1668.

(63) Ibid. June 17, 1675.

(64) Suite du Menagiana, pag. 173. Dutch Edit.

(65) The firſt of the firſt part.

(66) From pag. 119 to 134.

(67) The ninth of the fifth part.

(68) The fourteenth of the ſixth part.

ſhew, that Thomas Aquinas is the true author of the ſum of Divinity, which is aſcribed

fuerit effatum illud medicorum, *malum bene poſitum ne moveto.* Plura enim ab heroicis Temporibus communi piorum opinione recepta, quæ nihil Fidei adverſa, pietati etiam opportuna, auſus eſt, longe debilioribus, quam niterentur argumentis laceſſere; nullo alio operæ pretio quam ex ſumma moroſitate comparati ſibi nominis, & juſtis poſſeſſoribus, ſaltem ex probabili opinione juris plerumque inique erepti (69). ——— *Whoever has had any intimate acquaintance, either with his perſon, or writings, even the beſt friend he has, muſt join with me in my judgment, or rather wiſh, concerning him. It were much to be wiſhed, that a too great fondneſs for his own notions, and an ill habit, which was grown natural to him, of cenſuring others right or wrong, had not ſo far corrupted his great parts. From whence aroſe this miſchief at leaſt, to mention no more, that he ſeems to have been ambitious of a great, rather than of a good, name, and deſirous of eclipſing men of ſuperior learning, without having ſufficiently at heart that maxim of the Phyſicians, which a wiſe Divine will never forget*, alter not a wrong method which has ſucceeded right. *For he has had the aſſurance to attack ſome traditions generally received by the faithful ever ſince the primitive times, which, without contradicting their creed, were even ſubſervient to their piety, and this he has done on far ſlenderer grounds, than thoſe on which they were founded; purely for the ſake of getting himſelf a name by his great cenſoriouſneſs, and taking away that of others, who are much better intituled to it, at leaſt according to the moſt likely opinion.*' In the next leaf he oppoſes the character of Thomas Aquinas to that of this Sorboniſt, and declares that Thomas would have made a ſcruple of conſcience, and been aſhamed of thoſe things, which Mr de Launoi gloried in. The angelical doctor, adds he, would never have diſturbed the French in their belief, that St Dionyſius the Areopagite was their firſt apoſtle; he would never have robbed the inhabitants of Provence, of the glory they claim from the arrrival of St Magdalen; nor the Carmelites of their deſcent from Elias, and of the ſcapulary of Simon Stoch, nor the monaſteries of their exemptions. He had better things to write; and even tho' he had met with ſome doubts, and a want of probability in theſe matters, he would have let them alone, and paid a due reſpect to thoſe traditions which promote piety, without doing prejudice to religion. ' Habebat meliora ſcribenda (*Divus Thomas*) & ſubodoratus etiam, ut erat emunctæ naris, aliquid incerti, aut minus veriſimilis, ex medicorum præcepto, malum bene poſitum noluiſſet primus movere: atque iſta longâ traditione rata & firma, quæ nihil obſunt fidei, proſunt etiam pietati, in diſputationem revocare, credidiſſet pertinere ad illius generis quæſtiones ab Apoſtolo damnatas, quæ lites generant, non ædificationem (70). ——— *Diſputes of this kind, he would have referred to thoſe condemned by the apoſtle, which produce ſtrife and not edification.*' If all the circumſtances ſet forth by this Jacobin were true, there is no doubt but John de Launoi was deſervedly condemned, as one, who, to make himſelf talked off, and to ſatisfy his ill nature, would oppoſe many general opinions, which had obtained time out of mind, to the advancement of piety, without detriment to faith, and were grounded upon proofs of infinitely more weight than his objections. This laſt circumſtance alone would be ſufficient to condemn an author, let his motives on other accounts be ever ſo juſt; for, undoubtedly, a long poſſeſſion deſerves ſo much reſpect, as to oblige us to maintain it, every thing elſe being equal. But if it be juſt to maintain it, when it's title is not inferior to the pretenſions of the innovators; how much muſt it be more ſo, to forbear all attempts to overthrow it, when it's reaſons are by far the ſtrongeſt? But this is not the caſe of our Sorbonne doctor: the traditions he oppoſes, have no good title, and his arguments againſt them are unanſwerable. Now in this caſe, it is plain, there is all the right in the world to bring the moſt general and antient opinions to a trial, eſpecially when their falſity keeps up a criminal devotion. I deſire it may be obſerved, that the reaſonings of this doctor were of ſuch force, as to undeceive abundance of people: but yet the abuſes have not been removed: things remain ſtill upon the ſame foot in Provence, and elſewhere.

A REFLEXION upon the unſucceſsfulneſs of Launoi's labours.

They tell you ſtill the ſame ſtories they told your anceſtors, and you ſee there the ſame worſhip, and the ſame ceremonies. This proves the difference there is betwixt private perſons and the public. Particular people are moſt of them one time or other undeceived, and yet the practice of the public remains the ſame. Cicero ſays there was not an old woman ſo ſilly as to give credit to the ſtories, which were formerly believed concerning hell; and he makes uſe of this remark to prove that fabulous traditions vaniſh away in time, but that true doctrines, and ſuch as are grounded upon the nature of things, are confirmed by age, and that this was the cauſe of the long continuance and increaſe of the worſhip of the gods. ' Videmus cæteras opiniones fictas, atque vanas diuturnitate extabuiſſe. Quis enim Hippocentaurum fuiſſe, aut Chimæram putat? quæve anus tam excors inveniri poteſt, quæ illa, quæ quondam credebantur, apud inferos portenta extimeſcat? *Opinionum enim commenta delet dies, naturæ judicia confirmat.* Itaque & in noſtro populo, & in cæteris, Deorum cultus, religionumque ſanctitates exiſtunt in dies majores, atque meliores (71).' Juvenal alſo complains, that the antient doctrine concerning hell, was no longer believed.

Eſſe aliquos Maneis, & ſubterranea regna,
Et contum & Stygio ranas in gurgite nigras,
Atque una tranſire vadum tot millia cymba,
Nec pueri credunt, niſi qui nondum ære lavantur.
Sed tu vera puta (72).

Ghoſts, Stygian lakes, and frogs with croaking note,
And Charon wafting ſouls in leaky boat,
Are now thought fables, to fright fools conceiv'd,
Or children, and by children ſcarce believ'd.
Yet give thou credit. TATE.

Thus you ſee a great change in the opinions of private perſons, and yet the public worſhip was ſtill the ſame, both in Juvenal's and Cicero's time. There were ſtill the ſame feaſts, proceſſions, and ſacrifices, not only in honour of the celeſtial gods, but alſo in honour of Pluto and Proſerpine, and the other infernal deities. This ſort of inconſtancy on one hand, and conſtancy on the other, will always be more or leſs obſervable. Some doctors of quicker ſight, and greater courage than their brethren, will undeceive abundance of private perſons, and yet cauſe no change in the public ceremonies. The ritual will laſt longer than the faith on which it was built. Too many people will find it their intereſt to maintain it, and will be induſtrious enough to ſucceed, though they can give no better reaſons for it, than thoſe alledged to Cotta in Cicero's book before cited. Among other things they urged to him the apparitions of ſome deities; and to prove the truth of theſe apparitions, they alledged the foundation of ſome temples, a decree of the ſenate, a proverb. I expected ſome arguments, replies he, and you bring only popular ſtories. ' Tum Lucilius: An tibi, inquit, fabellæ videntur? Nonne ab A. Poſthumio ædem Caſtori & Polluci in foro dedicatam, nonne S. C. de Vatieno vides? Nam de Sagrâ, Græcorum etiam eſt vulgare proverbium; qui quæ affirmant, certiora eſſe dicunt, quàm illa quæ apud Sagram. His igitur auctoribus nonne debes moveri? Tum Cotta, Rumoribus, inquit, mecum pugnas, Balbe: ego autem à te rationes requiro (73). —— *To this Lucilius: What can you eſteem theſe things fables? Do not you ſee a temple in the Forum dedicated to Caſtor and Pollux by A. Poſthumius, and a decree of the ſenate concerning Vatienus? And as to Sagra, the Greeks have a common proverb among them, who when they would aſſert a thing, ſay it is more certain than any thing in Sagra. Are not theſe authorities therefore ſufficient to convince you? To which Cotta: O Balbus,* ſays he, *you fight me with popular ſtories; but I expect you will give me reaſons.*' Mr de Launoi might have made uſe of the ſame anſwer, and of ſeveral others; but as I have already ſaid, there were too many people intereſted in oppoſing the innovation, and maintaining the common tradition. It looks as if

---

(69) Vincentius Baronius, Apolog. Ordin. Prædicat. lib. i, pag. 119.

(70) Id. ibid. pag. 121.

(71) Cicero, de Natura Deor. lib. ii, cap. ii.

(72) Juven. Sat. II, ver. 149

(73) Cicero, de Nat. Deorum, lib. iii, cap. v.

cribed to him (*f*). Mr de Launoi had propoſed ſome doubts upon that matter (*g*). Of all his antagoniſts none had leſs regard for him than Father Theophilus Raynaud [*R*]. I will

(*f*) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, *of the twelfth of November*, 1675, *pag.* 264, *Dutch Edit.* (*g*) Ibid. Auguſt 12, 1675, pag. 226.

---

they had well weighed the conſequences of the principle which Cicero has put into the mouth of one of his ſpeakers: I mean that they ſeem to have learned how to prove the truth of a tradition, from it's ſtanding the teſt of time, and maintaining it's ground for ſo many ages. It is laid down in Cicero, that an opinion ill-grounded can never grow old (74). 'Quid 'enim eſt hoc illo evidentius? quod niſi cognitum, 'comprehenſumque animis haberemus, non tam ſtabilis 'opinio permaneret, nec confirmaretur diuturnitate 'temporis, nec unâ cum ſæculis ætatibuſque hominum inveterare potuiſſet. Etenim videmus cæteras 'opiniones fictas, &c (75). —— *For what can be more 'certain than this? which if it had not been fully 'known and underſtood, could never have prevailed ſo 'long, as an eſtabliſhed opinion, nor been confirmed by 'length of time, and grown old, together with the 'ſeveral ages and ſucceſſions of men. For we ſee other 'opinions which are falſe, &c.*' Doubtleſs, the monks are led by ſome weightier motive than what this argument ſupplies, to oppoſe John de Launoi, and thoſe like him. Note, by the by, that the argument drawn from antiquity, is made uſe of in Cicero to prove a falſity, for it is there alledged to maintain the reality and exiſtence of the falſe gods of Paganiſm. It is therefore a principle which may lead into error; and yet the maxim, *Opinionum commenta delet dies*, might have been long ſince urged againſt the falſe worſhip of the antient Greeks and Romans, ſince there has been no country for many ages, wherein their religion, their Jupiter and their Juno, their Venus and their Neptune, *&c.* are acknowledged and adored. And thus their cauſe is loſt when once it is ſuppoſed, that, ſooner or later, time will deſtroy falſe doctrines. You may pleaſe to obſerve, that this principle can never be admitted as a certain proof, without firſt determining the duration ſufficient to diſtinguiſh truth from error. If a thouſand years ſuffice, every opinion which is a thouſand years old is true; but if no time be fixed, it is in vain to conclude, that a doctrine which has laſted four thouſand years muſt be taken for certain: no body knows what is to come, or whether the fifth millenary may not put a period to what has reſiſted the four preceding ones. A thought of Horace is applicable to this ſubject.

(74) Id. ibid. lib. ii, cap. ii.

(75) The reſt is quoted above, at citat. (71).

Scire velim, pretium chartis quotus arroget annus, *&c* (76).

How old then muſt a piece be, to be good?

(76) Horat. Epiſt. I, lib. ii, ver. 35.

I have one thing farther to obſerve. There is no likelihood that thoſe who follow the ſteps of John de Launoi can do any ſervice whilſt things are only carried on by way of a literary diſpute. The patrons of falſe devotion will never recede; they find their account too much not to abate an ace, and they are powerful enough to ſecure themſelves from any violence. The court of Rome will ſecond and ſupport them. The Romiſh church ſeems to have adopted the religion of the god Terminus of the Roman republic. This god never yielded a tittle, no not to Jupiter himſelf: which was a ſign, ſaid they, that the Roman people ſhould never recede, nor yield an inch of ground to their enemies (77). If any Pope ſhould be willing to ſacrifice ſomething to the reunion of the Schiſmatics, ſome inſignificant devotions, ſome ſuperannuated traditions, he might apprehend as great a murmur againſt him, as the Heathens made againſt the ſcandalous peace of the emperor Jovian (78). The Jeſuits, with all their power, have not been able to hinder the Inquiſition of Toledo from condemning ſeveral volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum*; and it is certain that ſtorm was raiſed only by the ſollicitations of the Carmelites, and other Monks, who were angry with Father Papebroch, and his aſſiſtants, for having rejected ſeveral acts, and old traditions, as apocryphal. They are to be commended for having merited this thunder-ſtroke, and will do well to deſerve others. The character of a Capaneus (79) in this reſpect would be a very good one,

(77) See, above, citation (44), of the article JOVIAN.

(78) See, above, remark [*B*] of the article JOVIAN.

(79) *Of whom Statius*, Theb. lib. x, *about the end, ſays*,
Paulum ſi tardius artus
Ceſſiſſent, potuit fulmen meruiſſe ſecundum.
*Whoſe fate had it one moment been delay'd,
Wou'd have deſerv'd the dreadful thunders aid.*

Du tonnerre dans l'air bravant les vains carreaux,
Et nous parlant de Dieu du ton de Des-Barreaux (80).

*To brave the threat'ning thunders dreadful tone,
And ſpeak of God as Des-Barreaux has done.*

(80) See, above, the remark [*A*], of the article BARBARA.

But by theſe ſort of encounters with the inquiſitors, they will render themſelves unſerviceable with reſpect to the reformation of public abuſes; their criticiſms, were they much more ſevere, could be of no farther uſe than for the inſtruction of private perſons. The diſeaſe is paſt cure. You ſee Father Mabillon has laid down ſome very good rules concerning the worſhip of ſome ſaints, and the judgment to be made of relics (81). What did he get by it? he was anſwered, *Phyſician, heal thy ſelf.* Reform firſt the worſhip paid, in ſome houſes of your order of St Benedict, to ſaints as dubious as any. He was told of the injury he did to the church, and the advantage he gave the Proteſtants (82). Is not this ſhutting the door againſt all his good deſigns? Mr Thiers ſets up againſt falſe relics, he examines where the bodies of the martyrs lie, he publiſhes ſome diſſertations upon the holy Tear of Vendôme, and upon St Firmin. All this is loſt labour. The king's council ſuppreſſed his book about St Firmin, as the biſhop of Amiens had condemned a letter, which he had publiſhed upon the ſame queſtion. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (83), and the third part of the *Bibliotheca volante*. The fruits of a diſcreet zeal are deſtroyed in the bud. They build upon this principle, that it is dangerous to abrogate old cuſtoms, that boundaries ought not to be removed, and that, according to the old proverb, *we ſhould leave the minſter where we find it* (84). The proſperity of the Chriſtian Rome, juſt like that of the Pagan Rome, is founded upon the preſervation of antient rites (85). Conſecrations muſt be complied with, religion will allow no alteration in them. *Sed illa mutari vetat religio, & conſecratis utendum eſt* (86). *In our days*, ſaid a ſub-prior of St Antony, *let us beware of innovations* (87).

(81) In his diſſertation about the worſhip of unknown Saints. *See Mr Baſnage, in the ſecond Tome of his* Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe, pag 1038, 1039, *and the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, Auguſt, 1698, pag. 372, & ſeq.

(82) See the ſame works, *ibid.*

(83) For March 1700, pag 356, and for April, 1700, pag 382.

(84) *See* Paſquier, Recherch. de la France, livr. viii, chap. xii.

(85) Moribus antiquis res ſtat Romana viriſque. *Ennius apud Cicer. citatum, ab Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib ii, cap. xxi.* Vide etiam Vulcatium Gallicanum in Avidio Caſſio, pag. 454, Tom. I.

(86) Quintil. lib. i, cap. vi, pag. m. 39.

(87) See the preface to the new editions of the Jeſuits Catechiſm, written by Paſquier.

[*R*] *Of all his antagoniſts, none had leſs regard for him than Father Theophilus Raynaud.*] You need only read his *Hercules Commodianus*, where you will meet with all the paſſion imaginable. Thoſe who will not be at the pains of reading it, but ſhall only conſider the following quotation, will eaſily perceive that our doctor was never ſo groſsly abuſed. 'Infruniti vir ingenii Joannes Launoyus, cui nihil adeo ſacrum fuit, 'quod non fœdarit ſcriptione aliqua petulanti ac pluſquam cenſoria. Cælitibus ipſis non pepercit, imo in 'hoc non ſemel coniſcavit . . . . Is cum in me quoque 'incurriſſet, urgente quodam inſomnioſo Marſya, qui 'ſua deliria, imò apertè hæretica commenta, contacta 'extremis propè digitis in eo Antemurali, ægrè tulit, 'ex perſona amici ac civis noſtri S. Theologiæ D. caſtigatus eſt; patefactis primum ejus fragoribus, quibus Herculem prætulit: Tum mendaciis, calumniis, 'loquacitate, ſcurrilitate, aliiſque fœminini generis maculis, quibus ſatyra verius quam ſcriptio ab eo in 'nos exarata, dehoneſtabatur: ita ut Commodi exemplo, Hercules ſimul terrificus, & fœmina, non niſi 'pellaciis ac dolis armata, apparere voluiſſe in ea lucubratione videatur. Quæ cauſa fuit, cur *Herculis 'Commodiani* appellatione viſus ſit inſigniendus (88). '—— *Launoi was of ſo pragmatical a turn, that nothing was ſo ſacred, which he did not pollute with his 'ſaucy, and more than ſatirical pen. He did not ſpare 'heaven itſelf, but has even here entered the liſts more 'than once . . . . The attack he thought fit to make alſo 'upon me, at the inſtigation of a certain conceited Marſyas, who was offended at my juſt touching in that 'out-work, upon his extravagant, and even heretical 'poſitions, has been revenged by a doctor in Divinity, 'my friend and fellow-citizen, after having firſt expoſed all that bluſtering with which he pretended to be 'another Hercules; and then the lies, calumnies, tautologies, ſcurrilities, and ſuch other female ill qualities, 'with which his piece, or rather ſatire againſt me was 'ſtained, ſo that in that work, after the example of 'Commodus,*

(88) Theoph. Raynaud. Syntag. de Libris propriis, num. 63, pag. 67. Apopompæi.

will not paſs over in ſilence (*b*) *that he had ſtruck out of his calendar St Catherine virgin and martyr, and ſaid, that her life was a fable, and to ſhew that he gave no credit to it, every year on this ſaint's day he ſaid a maſs of Requiem* (*i*). I muſt obſerve alſo, that his labours againſt the worſhip eſtabliſhed upon fabulous traditions have been of no ſervice as to the public (*k*). I ſhall mention the judgment paſſed on him by Mr de Vigneul-Marville [*S*]. Which will give me occaſion to relate a particular not much known, and which does not well agree with the little friendſhip there was between this doctor and the Jeſuits, and with his affection for Mr Arnauld. The fact is, that his opinion concerning Grace, was contrary to the doctrine of St Auguſtine (*l*).

(*b*) Valeſiana, pag. m. 36.

(*i*) Confer quæ Sebaſtianus Kortholtus memorat, pag. 9, Diſſertationis de puellis Poëtriis.

(*k*) *See the remark* [*Q*].

(*l*) *See the remark* [*S*], *towards the end.*

' *Commodus, to have deſigned acting the part of a terrible Hercules, at the ſame time with that of a woman armed only with female falſhood. Which was the cauſe of his being called Commodus's Hercules.*' This Jeſuit in another place compares him to Iſhmael. *Homo Iſmaelita, cujus manus contra omnes, Joannes Launoy* (89).

[*S*] *I ſhall mention the judgment paſſed on him by Mr de Vigneul-Marville.*] ' Whatever eſteem I have ' for Mr de Launoi, it muſt be confeſſed, that he ' had the predominant fault of critics, which is to obſerve no meaſure, and to defend the worſt cauſes ' with obſtinacy. His books of Extream-Unction, ' and of Ariſtotle's fortune, and ſome others, are good ' pieces; but it may ſaid in general, that this doctor ' in all his writings ſhews much more learning than ' judgment and good reaſoning. Commonly the ' principal ſubject is not what he handles beſt; but ' it is in incidental matters that he is ſo admirable, ' by which he frequently deceives the unattentive ' reader (90).'

The author of the *Journal des Sçavans*, has affirmed (91), that Mr de Launoi ' can be charged with ' nothing leſs juſtly than defending bad cauſes with ' obſtinacy. His particular character was to love truth ' above all things, to ſeek it without any prejudice, ' and freely to communicate it, when he had found it, ' *&c.*' Mr de Vigneul-Marville has *anſwered* (92) *that* ' there are two ways of loving truth; the one is to ' love it for it's ſake, the other, to love it in regard ' to oneſelf. . . . .' That St Auguſtin loved it for it's own ſake . . . . . ' that it is quite otherwiſe with ' the generality of critics, who only love truth either ' for the glory it gives to thoſe who firſt diſcover it; ' or which is more commonly the caſe, out of a ' capricious humour getting an aſcendant over them.' ' I will not ſay, *continues he*, that Mr de Launoi ' was one of thoſe adventurers, who go in queſt of ' truth, as knights errants formerly did of noble exploits. But then it muſt be confeſſed that a great ' many very learned men did ſometimes look upon ' him as a critic who overſhot himſelf, and did not ' always diſcover the truth he was ſo fond of. This ' will readily appear by caſting an eye on the learned, who have attacked him, or wrote ſevere replies ' to him.' One might have ſeen him *covered with the duſt of his daily combats, and with the bruiſes that he had received in the fight* (93). Nay, this author adds, that in Mr Arnauld's opinion he was not always orthodox: *he declared himſelf too freely for a Divine ſo much inferiour to St Auguſtin, of which the Proteſtants of the Arminian party, pretended to take great advantage.* This gives us to underſtand that he did not approve the hypotheſis of St Auguſtin about Predeſtination; but his opinion concerning that doctrine will be much better underſtood from the preface of a treatiſe which is not yet publiſhed; Mr Simon has inſerted it in one of his letters (94), and informs us that Dr de Launoi in that work condemns the opinion of St Auguſtin. This letter is not very advantageous to the doctor, and gives us a very mean notion of his learning. See the *Journal des Sçavans* of the fourteenth of November 1701, pag. 722, Dutch edit. and the Journal of Trevoux, of Auguſt 1703, pag 1313, edit. of France. The Journal of Trevoux of January 1704, article I, ſpeaks of a defence of St Auguſtin by Father Daniel againſt the diſſertation aſcribed to Mr de Launoi.

(89) Id. ibid. n. 72, pag. 70.

(90) Vigneul-Marville, Melanges d'Hiſt. & de Litterature, pag. 267.

(91) See the third Tome of Vigneul Marville, pag. 266. Roüen Edit.

(92) Id. ibid. pag. 267.

(93) Ibid. pag. 269.

(94) It is the thirty firſt of Mr Simon's *Lettres Choiſies*, printed at Trevoux in the year 1700.

LAURENS (ANDREW DU) in Latin *Laurentius*, profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Montpellier [*A*], chancellor of the ſame univerſity, and firſt Phyſician to Henry IV, died the ſixteenth of Auguſt 1609, as we learn from Guy Patin (*a*), with ſome other particulars, which are mentioned in Moreri's Dictionary, and which I therefore will not repeat. I content myſelf with ſupplying the defects left in that Dictionary. No particular mention is there made of the writings of Andrew du Laurens. I ſhall therefore obſerve that he publiſhed ſeveral, which were very much eſteemed, particularly his Anatomy [*B*], which has paſſed a great many editions, and was dedicated by him

(*a*) *Patin, Letter XXXI, pag. m.* 142, *of the firſt Tome. See alſo the twenty ſeventh Letter, pag.* 117.

[*A*] *Profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Montpellier.*] It is remarkable that before he was allow- to act as profeſſor, he was obliged to paſs thro' all his exerciſes again in order to take his doctor's decree a ſecond time. ' Cum Regio diplomate *Monſpelii* Medi ' cinam publicè docendi munus obtinuiſſet, admitti tamen non potuit, donec iterum factus fuiſſet primò ' Med. Baccalaureus, deindè Licentiatus, tandemque ' Doctor, & toties iterum de Medicina reſpondiſſet, ' quoties in Academia ex illius inſtituto opus fuit (1) ' ——— *Altho' he had obtained the king's grant of ' the Phyſic profeſſorſhip, yet he could not be admitted ' till he was again made firſt Batchelor of Phyſic, ' then licentiate, and laſtly doctor, and had gone quite ' thro' all the diſputations required by the conſtitutions ' of that univerſity.*' Riolanus confirms this. *The Sieur du Laurens*, ſays he (2), *being a doctor of Avignon, was obliged to wait at Montpellier, and there read a lecture, and commence doctor over again, as one but newly admitted.*

Patin was undoubtedly not acquainted with this particular, which he would certainly otherwiſe have mentioned with the following remark. ' Du Laurens . . . . . ' came to court with the counteſs of Tonnere, by ' recommendation he was made one of the king's four ' Phyſicians, and Regius profeſſor at Montpellier, a' gainſt the laws and ſtatutes of that univerſity, by an ' arrêt of privy-counſel, which he had much ado to ' get verified at Toulouſe (3).' Note that he founded a phyſic garden near one of the gates of Montpellier, where he placed this inſcription, *Argus eſto non Briaræus.* —— *Prefer the eyes of Argus to the arms of Briareus* (4).

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſeveral pieces which were much eſteemed, particularly his Anatomy.*] It was re-printed at Paris in folio in 1600, and at Francfort alſo in folio, the ſame year. Theſe two editions were followed by three others at Francfort, in 8vo, in 1602, 1615, and 1627. It is intituled, Hiſtoria Anatomica humani Corporis & ſingularum ejus partium, multis controverſiis & obſervationibus novis illuſtrata (5). —— *The Anatomical Hiſtory of the Human Body, and all it's parts, illuſtrated with many new controverſies and obſervations.* The word *novis* ſhews that the Paris edition was not the firſt. It followed that of Lyons in 1593, in 8vo, which is not half ſo large. I have ſeen two French tranſlations of the Paris edition; one by Francis Sizé and printed at Paris, in 1610, in 8vo: the other by Theophilus Gelée Phyſician at Dieppe, and printed at Paris in folio in 1613, together with ſeveral other pieces of du Laurens (6), tranſlated by the ſame hand, or which had been before publiſhed in French by the author himſelf (7), or which had been collected from his lectures *read publickly to the Chirurgeons in the univerſity of Montpellier, in the years* 1587, 1588. Theſe laſt pieces are on the gout the leproſy, and the ſmall pox. All the French pieces juſt mentioned have alſo appeared in Latin; they may be

(1) Paul. Freher. in Theatro, pag. 1323, *from the ſecond part of* Jani Jacobi Boiſſardi de Vit. Viror. doctorum.

(2) Riolan, Recherch des Eſcholes de Medicine, pag. 8. *See alſo*, pag. 167.

(3) *Patin, Letter XXVII, pag. m.* 117, *of the firſt Tome.*

(4) Paul. Freher. in Theatro, pag. 1323.

(5) *See* Lindenius renovatus, pag. 47. *The Lyons edit.* 1623, *is not there taken notice of.*

(6) *That of* Criſes, *divided into three books*, with the general method relating to the Prognoſtic and Criſes of Diſtempers; *and that on the* King's Evil, *in two books, the firſt of which* treats of the admirable virtue of curing this diſtemper by touching confered by the divine power only on the kings of France; *and the ſecond* explains the nature of the diſtemper, *&c.*

(7) *That* on the Preſervation of the Sight; *That* on Melancholy; *That* on Catarrhs; *And that* on Old Age.

him to Henry IV, in 1599. It is a miſtake to ſay he improved by his converſation with Aquapendente [C]. His country has not been rightly mentioned in *Lindenius renovatus* [D]. ANTONY DU LAURENS, his youngeſt brother, was an advocate in the king's council, and died in 1647, at eighty three years of age. He married Anne Robert, the daughter of Anne Robert the advocate, who was living in 1662

be ſeen in Tom. II, of Laurentius's works, publiſhed at Francfort in 1621, in folio, with the *Annotationes in artem parvam Galeni, & Conſilia Medica.* The piece on Criſes had been printed ſeparately in Latin at Francfort in 1596, and 1606, in 8vo (8). Lindenius renovatus takes no notice of the Latin edition of Laurentius's works publiſhed at Paris in two volumes in 4to, in 1627, by Guy Patin, author of the Latin tranſlation of ſome pieces written by Laurentius in his mother tongue.

The French tranſlation of the Anatomy, printed at Paris in 8vo in 1610, has no figures, but that of Gelée, in folio. The Printer gives this among other reaſons, for his ſuppreſſing them, that Laurentius ordered them to ‘ be added only to oblige ſome particular readers, not that he judged them neceſſary, but rather conducing to divert than inſtruct. Beſides, he himſelf declares, that he left the Printer of the Latin edition to take the figures from thoſe to be met with among common Anatomiſts, ſuch as thoſe of Paré and Guillemeau, Chirurgeons to our Moſt Chriſtian kings, or of Charles Stephens doctor of Phyſic in the ſame univerſity, which are in every bodies hands: ſo that if there be any faults in his figures, he deſires they may be imputed to the Painter and Engraver, and ſays, he has explained himſelf ſufficiently in his Anatomy, ſo as to need no aſſiſtance from figures; nothing further being required than a view of the annual diſſections, without which it is impoſſible to become a perfect Anatomiſt (9).’ Theſe particulars relating to the hiſtory of that work of du Laurens, I thought the reader would not be ſorry to find here.

I muſt add, that altho' this Phyſician was an excellent Anatomiſt, yet he could not help leaving room for criticiſing. Read the following words: ‘ All that is contained in the queſtions of Laurentius relates only to that part of Anatomy, which is truly phyſiological. In his Anatomy he has committed great errors, not ſuch as Collado and Laurembergius have taken notice of, which are in his queſtions, but in facts, and in the text of his Anatomical Hiſtory; which is ſo plainly proved, that every one who is the leaſt skilled in Anatomy muſt own he is not to be defended (10).’

This Callado, or rather Colladon, has carried his cenſure too far; for he pretends that there is nothing at all good in Laurentius's Anatomy. John Sperlingen profeſſor of Phyſic at Wittemberg has animadverted on this exceſſive paſſion. ‘ Hæc & plura ejuſmodi Collado, *ſays he,* quæ non hic ſaltem, ſed ubique contra Laurentium magno fervore ſcriptitat. Ubi ita ſe gerit, ut oculati videant omnes, non tam amore veritatis quam antiquitatis cordato huic contradixiſſe viro. Sed non abjicienda nova omnia, aliàs & ipſe hic Colladonis liber è medio tollendus & è bibliothecis foret exterminandus. Quem tamen multa bona, multa acutè excogitata continere, non imus inficias. Interim etiam non omnia in Laurentio falſa, ſed plurima vera, plurima non abſque inſigni legentium commodo ſcripta ſunt. Fallit Collado, cum inquit: *Laurentii Anatome tota mendis ſcatet, ut de eâ verè Prophetæ querimoniam poſſis queri, omnis princeps ægrotat, à vertice ad plantam pedis, & non eſt in corpore toto ſanitas: adeò omnes libri partes ineluibilibus errorum maculis imbutæ ſunt, ut neſcio, quâ creta aut cimolia abſtergi purgarique poſſint.* Fallit & cum ſcribit: *Docere vis, quæ non intelligis, quomodo id præſtabis? Non per te ſanè, non enim potes dare, quod non habes, ſed κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς, inſtar duræ & ſtupidæ cotis, acutum reddere quæ ferrum valet, exſors ipſa ſecandi. Non facies ſanè tuorum librorum lectores doctiores, imò ſi tibi fidant indoctiores: ſed tum deprehenſâ doctrinæ tuæ falſitate juſto perciti zelo, veræ & genuinæ medicinæ auxiliatrices manus afferent, præmium clarioris ſcientiæ eruncatis tuis ex ſuo aliorumque animis erroribus pernicioſiſſimis metent.* Ne quid nimis, Collado! Amicè tractandi publici boni cauſa qui laborant. Nævos ſi habent, & tegendi, & detegendi illi. Errare humanum ſed errata ſtylo atroci & lingua virulenta notare, ac è muſca elephantem facere inhumanum (11). —— *Theſe and a great many more of the ſame kind, which Colladon not only here, but every where elſe, objects againſt Laurentius with great heat. Diſcovering to all attentive readers by ſuch behaviour, that he has contradicted this judicious author, more out of love to antiquity than truth. But all new things are not to be rejected, otherwiſe this very book of Colladon's muſt be ſelf-condemned, and baniſhed from all libraries, which yet, we do not deny, contains many good and ſhrewd obſervations. Nor at the ſame time is all that Laurentius has written falſe; there are a great many things true, a great many by which the reader may be very much improved. Colladon deceives us when he ſays:* Laurentius's Anatomy abounds every where with errors, that we may apply to it the complaint of the prophet, every prince is ſick, from the crown of the head to the ſole of the foot, and there is no health in the whole body: all parts of his books are ſo full of ſpots of ſo deep a dye, that no Fullers-earth in nature can never take out. *He alſo deceives us when he writes:* you undertake to teach, what you yourſelf do not underſtand. But how is this to be done? Not by your own inſtruction, for you cannot give, what you have not, but by accident, like a hard and ſtupid whetſtone, which can give an edge to ſteel, tho' it has none of it's own. Your books will never make the readers wiſer, but on the contrary, if they credit you, more ignorant; till by diſcovering the falſity of your doctrine, they become influenced with a proper zeal to go over to the ſide of the true and genuine Phyſic, they obtain the prize of perfect ſcience, by eradicating out of their own and others minds your moſt pernicious errors. *You harp, Colladon, too much on this ſtring! They who labour for the public good, ought to be kindly treated. If they have any faults, they ought to be corrected, but not expoſed. To commit errors is natural, but to magnify them, and cenſure them, in a harſh ſtyle, and rude language, is unnatural.*

[C] *It is a miſtake to ſay he improved by his converſation with Aquapendente.*] We ſhall clear up this from an extract of a letter of Guy Patin. Mr Hofman (12) . . . . remarks ſomewhere that Laurentius has publiſhed a diſcovery in Anatomy, which he would never have thought of, if he had not learned it from Fabricius Aquapendente, at whoſe table he eat for ſome years. But this is very falſe; for Laurentius never ſtudied any where but at Paris under Duretus ſeven years . . . . So that he never was at Padua, as I am very well aſſured by being Phyſician for theſe ‘ twenty three years laſt paſt, to the family of Meſſieurs du Laurence, who are both counſellors, and one of them maſter of Requeſts, whoſe father was the younger brother of Andrew Laurentius, and died not above ten years ago of a quartan ague, at eighty ſeven years of age, from whom I had the opportunity of meeting with all the information I could deſire (13).

[D] *His country has not been rightly mentioned in Lindenius renovatus.*] The words of the author of that book are *Natus in Academia Monſpelienſi* (14), that is *born in the univerſity of Montpellier.* This expreſſion would be improper, even tho' the mother of Laurentius had been delivered of him in a college of Montpellier. But I am in doubt whether he was at all born in Montpellier. The author (15) quoted by Freherus affirms it. And it is no concluſive argument to the contrary, that he had a brother (16) born at Arles, for it is no extraordinary thing, that the children of the ſame father ſhould be born in two different places. We muſt wait therefore for a clearer proof of this point, as alſo of theſe words in Lindenius renovatus, *obiit in patria,* which mean that Laurentius ended his days at Montpellier; but in the mean time I have ſome ſuſpicion that he was born at Arles, ſince Guy Patin has intituled him *Arelatenſis* in his edition publiſhed in 1627.

---

(8) From Lindenius renovat, pag. 47.

(9) *Advertiſement to the reader, before the Anatomy tranſlated by Francis Sizé.*

(10) Riolan. Recherches des Echoles de Medicine, pag. 214, 215.

(11) Joh. Sperlingen, de Formatione Hominis in utero, pag. 123, Edit. Witt. 1641. *He quotes* Collado in Obſ. cap. xxxiv.

(12) *That is to ſay, Caſpar Hofman, profeſſor of Phyſic at Altorf.*

(13) *Patin, Letter XXVII, pag. 117. Tom. I, It is dated September 6, 1649.*

(14) Mercklin. in Lindenio renovato, pag. 47.

(15) Part. II, Vitarum Virorum doctorum Jani Jacobi Boiſſardi, apud Freherum in Theat. pag. 1323.

(16) *Honoratus du Laurens, archbiſhop of Ambrun. See his article in Moreri.*

1662 [*E*]. Mr DU LAURENS, counſellor in the parliament of Paris, was their ſon (*b*). LOUISA DU LAURENS, wife of Balthazar, maſter of the requeſts, and intendant of juſtice in Languedoc, was their daughter (*c*). We ſee in the Mercure Galant, that PETER DU LAURENS, doctor of the Sorbonne, formerly grand prior and vicar-general of the order of Clugni, died biſhop of Bellei on the ſeventeenth of January 1705, aged eighty nine, and that he was grandſon of Andrew du Laurens, firſt Phyſician to king Henry IV (*d*).

(*b*) *Taken from Patin, Letter CCLI, pag 389, and Letter CCLXXXII, pag. 508, of the ſecond Tome.*

(*c*) *Patin, Letter CCCLVI, pag. 59, of the third Tome.*

(*d*) *Merc. Galant, February,* 1705, *pag.* 162.

[*E*] *Anne Robert . . . . who was living in* 1662.] Patin affirms in a letter dated December 26, 1662 (17); that he had on that very day ordered Extreamunction, to be given to her, and that ſhe was then eighty ſeven years old, but he had ſaid elſewhere (18), that ſhe was but eighty one in 1661.

(17) *The CCLXXXII, pag.* 507, *Tom. II.*

(18) *In the CCLIſt Letter, pag.* 380, *of the ſame Tome.*

LAURENTIO (NICHOLAS), commonly called *Cola di Rienzo*, was, in the XIVth century, one of thoſe men whom the providence of God makes uſe of, from time to time, as a ſort of theatre, whereon is exhibited to view a repreſentation of the viciſſitudes and uncertainties of human life [*A*]. He was the ſon of a mean Vintner, and a Laundreſs. His application to ſtudy in his youth, and the natural ſtrength of his parts, made him very eminent. He became exceedingly eloquent, and had by heart all the fine paſſages of Cicero, Livy, Julius Cæſar, Valerius Maximus, and Seneca. He was extremely fond of antient inſcriptions, and underſtood the reading of them perfectly well. He obtained a Notary's place, which was at that time ſo well eſteemed, that gentlemen did not think it below them to execute it. The commiſſaries of the ſeveral diſtricts of Rome having deputed him to Pope Clement VI, who reſided at Avignon, he harangued him ſo eloquently that he gained the eſteem and favour of that Pontif, and the admiration of his court. This encouraged him to declame againſt the great lords of Rome, who oppreſſed the citizens. Cardinal John Colonna reſented it; but having better conſidered the matter, he deſiſted from doing him ill offices with the Pope. Laurentio grew ſtill hotter and hotter againſt thoſe petty tyrants of Rome; and one day he harangued in the Capitol with ſo much freedom againſt them, that he received, as ſoon as he had done, two boxes on the ear. One was from a lord of the houſe of Colonna, who was then chamberlain of Rome, and the other from Thomas Fortifiocca, ſecretary to the ſenate. He diſſembled the matter, and continued ſtill to harangue in the Capitol, and in ſeveral churches, and to deviſe emblems, all tending to ſhew the ill adminiſtration of juſtice. The perſons concerned took this for ſport, eſpecially when they ſaw that his orations were mixed with jeſts, and that he threatened ſome of them with capital puniſhment. In all likelihood they thought that he could do them no prejudice by reaſon of his extravagances, but they were miſtaken: for taking advantage of Stephen Colonna's abſence, who was marched out of Rome with his ſoldiers, to bring in proviviſions, he aſſembled the people, harangued them, made laws, expelled all the grandees out of the city, aſſumed the the power of judicature, and was declared tribune auguſt, and deliverer of the people in 1346. The faction of the exiles was incapable of withſtanding him, by reaſon of the little union there was among them; ſo that he diſpoſed of all things at his pleaſure, and ſaw himſelf at the head of a new Roman republic, in whoſe name he wrote to other ſtates, to the emperor, and to the Pope himſelf. The better to confirm his authority, he condemned a great many people to death, and among others, he cauſed Martin de Porto, one of the petty tyrants of Rome, to be hanged. He received embaſſies from ſeveral princes and republics, and boldly ſummoned the Pope to come and reſide at Rome, with the college of cardinals. He was ſo ſucceſsful in the war he undertook againſt the faction of the nobles, that he ſurpreſſed it intirely. But then he became like moſt of thoſe, who make inſurrections under the fair pretence of liberty. It is not the tyranny they hate, but the tyrants; they cannot bear, that any ſhould exerciſe the ſovereign power but themſelves. Laurentio had no ſooner overthrown the tyranny of others, but he became a tyrant himſelf; upon which he was treated, as he treated others. He was forced to make his eſcape, and they hanged him in effigy at Rome as a traytor. After concealing himſelf for ſome time, he went to the emperor, who permitted him, but without adviſing him to it, to go and pay his duty to the Pope. He was at firſt ill received, but after ſome months impriſonment, he followed the Pope's legate to Rome. He there raiſed his party to ſuch a heighth

[*A*] *As a ſort of theatre whereon is exhibited to view a repreſentation of the viciſſitudes . . . . of humane life.*] The heathens call this the ſport of fortune, but they might have added, that this play generally ends like a tragedy.

Quales ex humili magna ad faſtigia rerum
Extollit, quoties voluit fortuna jocari (1).

(1) Juven. Sat. III, ver. 39.

Such as dame fortune from the croud,
Advances in a merry mood.

Di quaſi pilas homines habent *.

* Plautus, in Captiv. Prol. v. 22.

The gods make men their tennis balls.

Ludit in humanis divina potentia rebus †.

† Ovid. de Ponto, lib. iv, Elog. III.

Our earth is but the jeſt of heaven.

That, which our Laurentio acted upon the great theatre of the world, had the ſame ſort of cataſtrophe.

- - - - Tolluntur in altum
Ut lapſu graviore ruant (2).

(2) Claudian in Ruffin lib. i, circa initium.

- - - - *They are advanced*
To make their fall the greater.

[*B*] *Some*

a heighth as to be juſt ready to commence war again with the Colonna's: but his ſeverity to the people, and his exactions, rendered him ſo odious, that they mutinied againſt him. He thought his eloquence would calm that tempeſt, as it had many others; but he was miſtaken: for notwithſtanding his ſhewing himſelf to the people, and haranguing them at his windows, they ſet fire to his palace. He attempted to eſcape in a beggar's habit, and was almoſt out of danger, when a certain little man diſcovered him. Another run him through the body with a ſword. They gave him a thouſand wounds; they dragged him through the ſtreets, and hung him up by the feet (a). He was two days in that ſituation, after which the Jews burnt his corps in the fields (b). Some of his writings are ſtill remaining [B].

[B] *Some of his writing are ſtill remaining.*] The letter he writ to thoſe of Viterbo is to be found in a book intituled, *Proſe antiche di Dante, Petrarcha, Boccaccio & altri nobili & virtuoſi ingegni.* Which contains alſo the harangues, that Pandolfus Francus, and Francis Baroncelli, his envoys to the republic of Florence, made to the Florentine ſenate. Some letters wrote by him to Charles king of the Romans, and to the emperor Lewis of Bavaria may be met with in the fourteenth Tome of Bzovius's Annals (3). Petrarch made a fine Italian poem in praiſe of Laurentio (4).

(a) *Taken from Proſper Mandoſio's* Bibliotheca Romana centuria II, n. 55.

(b) *This happened the eighth of September* 1353.

(3) Ad. ann. 1347.

(4) Ex Bibliotheca Romana Proſp. Mandoſii, Cent. II, n. 55.

LAZZARELLI (N.), a native of Gubio in Italy, was a very good poet. He was ſome time auditor, or judge in the Rota of Macerata, and afterwards dedicated himſelf to the church, and became a prieſt, and provoſt of Mirandola. He died in 1694, above eighty years of age. He publiſhed a book intituled *la Cicceide*, which has ſomething in it very ſingular. It is a collection of ſonnets, and of ſome other kinds of Poetry, in which he cruelly abuſes one Arrighini (a), a native of Lucca, who had been his colleague in the Rota of Macerata. He treats him as a perſon *wholly compoſed of genitals* (b). His verſification is wonderfully eaſy, natural, and fluent: his imagination ſurprizingly fruitful in fine and lively thoughts; but the ſubject is ſo obſcene, and treated with ſo much malice, and ſometimes prophaneneſs, as may juſtly give offence. The preface of his book contains ſome apologies which I ſhall mention [B].

(a) *The author of ſome pieces, and particularly of a volume* di conſigli criminali *to which he prefixed a print of himſelf. See page* 204 *of the* Cicceide.

(b) *It is an expreſſion of Balzac's See the* Chevræana, *pag.* 276 *of the ſecond part. Holland Edit.*

[A] *A book intituled la Cicceide hath ſomething very curious in it.*] I have only ſeen the ſecond edition of it (1), publiſhed in 1692. This is the whole title; *la Cicceide legitima: in queſta ſeconda impreſſione ordinatamente diſpoſta, notabilmente accreſciuta, e fedelmente rincontrata con gli Originali dell' Autore.* It contains two parts: the firſt called *le Teſticolate*, the ſecond *le Sghinazzate*. The perſon reflected upon in that work, is deſcribed by the name of Don Ciccio. Note, that Ciccio is a word the Neapolitans make uſe of, to ſignify Franceſco. The Romans inſtead of Ciccio ſay Cecco. The chief deſign of the author is to prove, that Don Ciccio is a Coglione. All the 318 ſonnets, which compoſe the firſt part of the Cicceide, terminate in that. It is the center of the ſphere of it's activity; I believe the ſecond part will make up the complement of the number 360, which is the common diviſion of a circle. There is nothing wanting in that ſphere of ſlander; it has all it's degrees, and they all terminate in the ſame point. Lazzarelli, with whatſoever he begins always ends with the Coglioneria of Don Ciccio. This is the burthen of all his ſongs. This is going too far, even beyond what Voiture could do in complimenting the great prince, to whom he wrote, *You who are a true Cæſar in wit and learning, a Cæſar in diligence, vigilance, and courage*, & per omnes caſus Cæſar, *you have deceived the opinion*, &c (2). Our poet turns his Ciccio on all ſides, and ſhews him every way,

Per varios caſus, per tot diſcrimina rerum (3),

and makes a Coglione of him *per omnes caſus*. He traces him from the moment of his conception to his death, and goes ſtill farther; for he jeſts upon his coffin, his burial, his epitaph, *&c.* He purſues him as far as Charon's boat, and engages he will be ferried over *gratis*; and even that he may go over without being ferried. He ſuppoſes Charon ſpeaking to him thus:

E' privilegio a pari tuoi conceſſo
Il poter ſenza imbarco, e pagamento
Havere a l'altro margine l'acceſſo;
Mentre un tondo C.... gonſio di vento
Galleggiando leggier, può da sè ſteſſo
Andar di là dal fiume a ſalvamento (4).

He left out of the ſecond edition the ſonnets which had been judged the moſt prophane, and had occaſioned the putting his book into the Index. They concerned Ciccio's baptiſm, confirmation, extreamunction and ſome other tickliſh ſubjects. I have a manuſcript copy of them, and am adviſed to inſert one here at leaſt; that they who cannot ſee the Cicceide, a peice but little known on this ſide of the Alps, may form an idea of Lazzarelli's genius. I have pitched upon the ſonnet concerning extreamunction (5).

L'oglio ſanto.

Da la febre, da l'aſma, e da l'uſcita,
Don Ciccio ritrovavaſi ammalato
E già ridotto in ſi cattivo ſtato
Che'l fean vicino all' ultima partita.
Quando, tal nuova il poverello udita,
Dimandò l'oglio ſanto, e gli fù dato
Rimanendo coſi fortificato
Per ſuo franco paſſaggio a l'altra vita.
Ma fatta il Parochian la ſua funzione
Per la mente uno ſcrupulo gli corſe
D'aver fallato nell' operazione.
Però che in vece d'applicar l'unzione
Sù i cinque ſentimenti egli s'accorſe
Ch' applicata l'havea ſopra un coglione.

[B] *The preface of his book contains ſome apologies, which I ſhall juſt mention.*] It ſeems to have been made by one of the author's friends, who proteſts, that he was very ſorry for the firſt impreſſion of this book, and that he had much ado to conſent to the ſecond, though it was in a better condition. His ſcruples were grounded upon ſome alluſions to the ceremonies of the church, and upon the oppoſition, that might be found between the duties of charity, and a ſlandering book. He adds, that this book is only a heap of flaſhes of wit, and a poetical rapture, notwithſtanding which the writer is really orthodox; that he ſubmits all thoſe compoſures to the cenſure of his ſuperiors, and that he deteſts whatever they ſhall judge blamable; that he hopes from the reader's equity, a juſt diſtinction between witty conceits, and an intention of offending; and laſtly, that though he writes ſomewhat licentiouſly, his actions are unblameable. This is only an imperfect account of his apology, and therefore I ſhall ſet down his own words (6). 'E à dire il vero è 'l'uno, e l'altro degli accennati motivi ſon degni di 'un animo, che profeſſa eſattamente i dettami del 'Chriſtianeſimo, nel quale ſi pregia l'Autore di vivere, 'proteſtando, che queſti ſuoi componimenti ſono un

'mero

(1) *Mr Sylveſtre, doctor of Phyſic, lent me a copy of it at his return from Italy in July* 1700, *and told me the particulars mentioned in this article.*

(2) *Voiture, Letter to the duke of Enguien after the battle of Rocroy, in* 1643. *It is the* CXLI*ſt Letter of Voiture.*

(3) Virgil. Æn. lib i, ver. 204.

(4) Cicceide, pag. 290.

(5) *These are the ſix laſt Verſes of the ſonnet, wherein he deſired him to aſſiſt at firſt maſs.* Jo t'en prego, Don Ciccio, inſtantemente
Che a me non lice far queſte fonzioni
Se tu medeſimo non vi ſei preſente,
Stante che le Canoniche Sanzioni
Prohibiſcono a tutti eſpreſſamente
L'uſo di celebrar ſenza coglioni.

(6) *Preface to the* Cicceide.

' mero sfogo di Poetico capriccio affatto diſcordanti dalla pietà dell' animo ſuo, imbevuto de' Sagroſanti Dogmi della Cattolica verità, come ſarà prontiſſimo ſempre à teſtificare co ſangue ſteſſo, e che gli ſottopone intieramente alla Cenſura de' Superiori, deteſtando adeſſo per all' hora tutto quello, che dal giudizio loro infallibile ſarà ſtimato per degno d'eſſer dannato. E riflettendo, che queſti ſono più toſto ſcherzi di una penna, per traſtullarſi, che ſentimenti d'un Cuore intento all' offeſa d' altri, ti prego à credere, ch' egli non mi havrebbe permeſſa mai la libertà di rimandarlo alle ſtampe, ſe non ſi fidaſſe dell' ingenuità del tuò Cuore, che ſaprà traſtullarſi coll' ingegno ſenza traſcorrere colla volontà à denigrare nè pur col penſiero la fama incorrotta del ſuo decantato Protagoniſta. Vivi dunque felice, mentr'io laſciar non voglio di ricordarti in difeſa dell' Amico, che ſe bene ſcrive con qualche licenza, può però dir di ſè ſteſſo: *Laſciva eſt nobis pagina, Vita proba eſt.*'

LELAND (JOHN), a native of London, ſo induſtriouſly applied himſelf to the ſearch of the Engliſh antiquities, and was thought ſo qualified to ſucceed in it, that king Henry VIII gave him a very good penſion, and the title of his Antiquary. That employment began and ended with him. That he might well diſcharge the duties of it, he went through all the counties of England, he examined all the ruins of old monuments, he peruſed the manuſcripts of convents and colleges; and having ſpent ſix years in his travels, and collected as many memoirs as was poſſible, he undertook ſeveral conſiderable works [*A*]: but he had not time to finiſh them, nor even to forward them. The court did not pay him the ſtipend that was due to him; and whether for this, or ſome other reaſons, he fell into a deep melancholy, which diſtracted him [*B*]. He died in that ſad condition. His manuſcripts are in the Bodleian library. They are undigeſted materials [*C*], that ſhew however his great capacity. But it is more clearly known by a book to which he put his laſt hand [*D*], and which deſerves to be printed (*a*). Camden has been accuſed of having made great uſe of Leland's manuſcripts (*b*). Dr Smith has confuted that accuſation.

I ought not to omit, that he ſtudied at Paris under Sylvius; that he began in 1534 to travel in ſearch of the Britiſh antiquities; that he abjured the church of Rome ſome time before his death, and that he died the eighteenth of April 1552 (*c*).

(*a*) *Taken from Camden's Life, written by Dr Thomas Smith*, pag. 28, & ſeq.

(*b*) Ibidem.

(*c*) *See, Pope Blount*, Cenſ. Author. pag. 442.

[*A*] *He undertook ſeveral conſiderable works.*] A book *De Topographia Britanniæ primæ, in quo vetuſtas etiam locorum quorum meminiſſent ſcriptores Romani, appellationes ſpiſſa caligine obſitas in lucem eſſet revocaturus.* Fifty books *De antiquitate Britannica, ſive de civili hiſtoria juxta comitatuum Angliæ & Walliæ, quæ tunc temporis obtinuerat, partitionem.* Six books *De inſulis Britanniæ adjacentibus.* Three books *De nobilitate Britannica.* This is what he promiſed in a petition he preſented to king Henry VIII, in the 37th year of his reign. This petition, intituled *Strena*, was publiſhed by Bale (1).

[*B*] *He fell into a deep melancholy, which diſtracted him.*] Let us make uſe of Dr Smith's nervous expreſſions. ' Proh triſtes rerum humanarum vices! proh viri optimi deplorandam infeliciſſimamque ſortem! non enim multo poſtquam fidem quod ſuſceperat præſtandi quaſi ſignatis tabellis obſtrinxiſſet, ſive operis promiſſi difficultatibus deterritus, ſive immenſis laboribus ſatigatus fractuſque, ſive dolore nimio & malancholiâ, quod fructum induſtriæ juſtæque expectationi parem nondum percepiſſet, fortè oppreſſus, ſive quacunque aliâ de causâ, abalienatæ mentis, nullis, è Religione & Philoſophiâ, nullis è Medicinâ petitis remediis ad priſtinum ſanumque ſtatum revocandæ, ægritudinem perpeſſus eſt; vaſtâ interim obſervationum, quas in Adverſaria ſine ordine & properante calamo, prout ipſi occurriſſent, congeſſerat, mole relicta (2). ——— *Sad viciſſitude of human affairs! deplorable and wretched condition of the beſt of men! for, not long after he had obliged himſelf, as it were under his hand, to perform what he had undertaken, whether deterred by the difficuities of the promiſed work, or tired and broken with immenſe labours, whether perhaps oppreſſed with too much grief, and melancholy, becauſe he had not found a reward equal to his induſtry and juſt expectation, or from what other cauſe ſoever, he ſuffered the loſs of his ſenſes, not to be reſtored by any remedies fetched from Religion, Philoſophy, or Medicine; in the mean time, leaving behind him a vaſt heap of obſervations, which he had thrown together in his* Adverſaria, *without order, and with a haſty pen, juſt as they occurred to him.*'

[*C*] *His manuſcripts . . . . . . are undigeſted materials.*] This appears by the laſt words of the paſſage I have juſt now quoted, but more particularly from the ſequel of it. ' Harum *(obſervationum)* quatuor libros, ut loquuntur, in folio, & ſeptem minoris formæ, manu Lelandi plerâque ex parte deſcriptos, in perpetuam ipſius memoriam Bibliothecæ Bodl. Oxon. dono dedit V. Cl. Gulielmus Burtonus, famæ ob editam *Agri Leiceſtrienſis deſcriptionem*, apud Antiquarios noſtros notiſſimæ. Reperitur quoque aliud volumen Collectionum Lelandi * in Bibliothecâ Cottonianâ. Non irritabo Lelandi manes, ſi dixero, totum opus, quod ſæpè tractavi, mirè confuſum, diſtractum, nulloque ordine digeſtum, limam ubique deſiderare, & tanquam corpus exſuccum, exſangue, animâque deſtitutum proſtare (3). ——— *The learned William Burton, well known to our antiquaries by his* Deſcription of Leiceſterſhire, *gave to the Bodleian Library, at Oxford, four manuſcript books of theſe obſervations in folio, and ſeven of a ſmaller form, written moſtly by Leland himſelf. There is found likewiſe another volume of Leland's collections in the Cotton Library. I ſhall not affront Leland's ghoſt, if I ſay, the whole work, which I have often looked over, is ſtrangely confuſed, incoherent, digeſted into no order; that it every where wants poliſhing, and is a meer bloodleſs, inanimate, body.*' I here inſert this author's judgment upon Leland's vaſt deſign. ' Vir minime vanus & omni procul oſtentatione profitetur, ſe multa & magna . . . . . quæ infinitam illius induſtriam, ſolertiamque, & excelſæ mentis, ad maxima quæque aſpirantis præclariſſimas cogitationes conatuſque abunde teſtantur, moliri (4). ——— *This writer, without any vanity and oſtentation, profeſſes, that he has in hand many and great undertakings . . . . . . which abundantly prove his very great induſtry, and diligence, and the excellent thoughts and attempts of his lofty and aſpiring mind.*'

[*D*] *A book to which he put his laſt hand.*] Dr Smith will tell us the ſubject and the merit of it. ' Quantus vero fuerit Lelandus, ſi non ex editis opuſculis Collectaneis, ſaltem ex eximio opere (quod perfectum reliquit) de *Scriptoribus illuſtribus Britannicis*, quod in publicam lucem exeat, digniſſimo, colligere licet (5). —— *How great a man Leland was, may be collected, if not from his miſcellaneous works, which are publiſhed, at leaſt from that excellent treatiſe, (which he left perfect) concerning* the famous Engliſh authors; *a treatiſe moſt worthy to ſee the light.*' And that one may judge of the piece by the pattern, he gives us Leland's collections about Simon Stoch. Dr Smith tranſcribed this article to ſend it to the Jeſuit Papebroch, the compiler of the *Acta Sanctorum.* The Catalogue of the Bodleian Library gives the titles of ſome of Leland's printed works. Mr Teſſier (6) ſhould have acquainted the public, that the book *De illuſtribus Britanniæ Scriptoribus*; *de Academiis Britannicis*; *de Typographia*, &c. Which he aſcribes to John Leland, is not printed. I fear he has put *Typographia* inſtead of *Topographia*, which will occaſion Leland's being placed among the authors, who have written concerning Printing.

(1) *Taken from Camden's Life, written by Dr Thomas Smith*, pag. 29.

(2) *Thomas Smith*, ibid.

* Sub Julio, cap. 6.

(3) Thomas Smith, ubi ſupra, pag. 30.

(4) Ibid. pag. 29.

(5) Ibid. pag. 31.

(6) In Biblioth. Bibliothecar. pag. 187.

LEMNIUS (Lævinus), a famous Phyſician, was born at Ziric-Zee in Zeland, the twentieth of May 1505 . . . . One of his principal works is that *de occultis Naturæ Miraculis* [*A*]. **WILLIAM LEMNIUS**, his ſon, practiſed Phyſic with ſuch ſucceſs, that Erric, king of Sweden, ſent for him to his court, and made him his firſt Phyſician (*a*). He was ſo faithful to that prince, that he was impriſoned, and put to death, in 1568, when Erric was dethroned (*b*).

[*A*] *One of his principal works is that* de occultis Naturæ Miraculis.] It has been printed I know not how often. Several editions are mentioned in *Lindenius renovatus* (1); but nothing is there ſaid of the firſt, which was that of Antwerp, *apud Guilielmum Simonem*, 1559, in 8vo. The work at that time conſiſted but of two books: it was dedicated by the author to Matthias Gallomontanus *ab Heeſuwiick, apud Metelliburgum Antiſtes*. The ſecond edition at Antwerp, for Plantin, 1564, in 8vo, contains four books, and was dedicated by the author to Erric, king of Sweden. The preface informs us, that Lemnius propoſed to add two books more to theſe four.

(*a*) *See the epiſtle dedicatory of the book* de occultis Naturæ Miraculis, *of the ſecond and following editions.*

(*b*) Melch. Adam, in Vit. Medicor. pag. 100.

(1) *That which I make uſe of is of Francfort*, 1593, *in 8vo*, apud Joh. Wechelum. *It is enlarged with ſome chapters, and to it is added the book* de Vita cum Animi & Corporis incolumitate recte inſtituenda, *which had never appeared before.*

LEMNOS, an iſle in the Ægean ſea near Thrace, and mount Athos [*A*], was famous upon ſeveral accounts. It was thus called from the great goddeſs, who was named Lemnos, and had maids ſacrificed to her (*a*). The Sinti, a people of Thrace, were the firſt that inhabited it (*b*). It had but two cities, one of which was called Hepheſtia, and the other Myrina (*c*). It's labyrinth was one of the four buildings of that kind mentioned by the Antients [*B*]. The inhabitants of Lemnos were the firſt who forged

[*A*] *Near . . . . . mount Athos.*] A great many authors have obſerved, that the ſhadow of this mountain extends as far as the iſle of Lemnos. ‘ Lemnos ‘ ab Atho LXXXVII mill. paſſuum. Circuitu patet ‘ CXII. M. D. paſſ. Oppida habet, Hephæſtiam & ‘ Myrinam, in cujus forum ſolſtitio Athos ejaculatur ‘ umbram (1). ——— *Lemnos is diſtant from Athos ‘ eighty ſeven miles: it is in circumference an hundred ‘ and twelve. It's towns are Hephæſtia and Myrina, ‘ into whoſe forum, at the Soliſtice, Athos throws it's ‘ ſhadow.*’ You ſee in theſe words of Pliny, that the diſtance from mount Athos, to the iſle of Lemnos, was eighty ſeven thouſand paces. Solinus takes but one thouſand from it (2). This does not agree with the obſervations of Belon, an eye witneſs, and conſequently more to be credited than Pliny. Theſe are his words. ‘ The iſle is more extended in length than ‘ in breadth, from eaſt to weſt, ſo that when the ſun ‘ is going to ſet, the ſhadow of mount Athos, which ‘ is more than eight leagues beyond it, falls upon the ‘ port, and over a point of the iſle, on the left ſide ‘ of Lemnos: a thing which we obſerved the twelfth ‘ day of June. For mount Athos is ſo high, that ‘ though the ſun was not very low, yet the ſhadow ‘ touched the left angle of the iſle (3).’ This teſtimony is ſufficient to convince us, that the antients had reaſon to ſay, that the ſhadow of this mountain reached the iſle of Lemnos; but that they did not well know the meaſure of that extent. It would be a diſtance of about thirty five French leagues (4), if we computed it by Pliny's eighty ſeven miles. What abatements muſt we make, ſince Belon ſays only ſomething above eight leagues? The following paſſage ſhews, that Plutarch was in the ſame error with Pliny. ‘ I know well, that neither ‘ you nor I have ever been in Lemnos; yet we have ‘ often heard that Iambic verſe, ſo frequent in every ‘ one's month,

Αθως καλύψει πλευρὰ Λημνίας βοός :

Mount Athos ſhall on either ſide
The cow in Lemnos planted hide.

‘ for the ſhadow of that mountain falls, it ſeems, ‘ on the image of a brazen heifer, which is in Lemnos, extending itſelf in length over the ſea, not leſs ‘ than ſeven hundred ſtadia; not that the mountain, ‘ which makes the ſhadow, is of that height as to ‘ cauſe it; but becauſe the diſtance of the light renders the ſhadows of bodies manifoldly greater than ‘ the bodies themſelves (5).’ The ſeven hundred ſtadia of Plutarch, are 87500 paces: ſo that he made the diſtance ſtill greater than Pliny and Solinus. Apollonius makes it equal to the ſpace that a ſhip can ſail from break of day till noon. Salmaſius proves, that according to the common eſtimation of the antient Geographers, this ſignifies 250 ſtadia (6), whence we may infer, that Apollonius leſſens the diſtance above half, which the others reckon between mount Athos, and the iſle of Lemnos, and yet that he ſuppoſes it much greater, than Belon found it; for eight French leagues makes only 160 ſtadia. Note, that Apollonius obſerves, that the ſhadow of mount Athos reached as far as the city of Myrina.

Ἠεὶ δὲ νισσομένοισιν Ἄθω ἀνέτελλε κολώνη
Θρηϊκίη, ἣ τόσσον ἀπόπροθι Λῆμνον ἐοῦσαν,
Ὅσσον ἐς ἔνδιον κεν ἐΰστολος ὁλκὰς ἀνύσσαι,
Ἀκροτάτῃ κορυφῇ σκιάει, καὶ ἐσάχρι μυρίνης.

Cæterum dubia luce pergentibus aperiebatur Athonis umbo
Thracius, qui Lemnum, licet tantum diſtantem,
Quantum inſtructior oneraria conficiat in meridiem,
Extantiſſimo inumbrat faſtigio, vel Myrinam uſque (7).

As by the doubtful light they ſteer'd their courſe,
The Thracian Athos open'd to their view;
Whoſe lofty ſummit throws a diſtant ſhade
Far as Myrina, in fam'd Lemnos' iſle,
Whoſe ſhores the ſpeedieſt veſſel ſcarce can reach,
'Ere that the ſun has finiſh'd half his race.

Salmaſius (8) quotes Stephanus Byzantius (9), to ſhew, that, according to Pliny and Solinus, the ſhadow of mount Athos, could not have reached the iſle of Lemnos: he objects againſt them, that, according to that writer, the ſhadow did not reach above 300 ſtadia; but he would have more ſollidly confuted them, and many others, by Peter Belon's teſtimony.

[*B*] *It's labyrinth was one of the four buildings of that kind, mentioned by the antients.*] The three others were that of Egypt, that of the iſle of Crete, and that which king Porſenna cauſed to be built in Tuſcany. Here ſollows a paſſage out of Pliny (10). ‘ De Ægyptio & Cretico Labyrinthis, ſatis dictum eſt. ‘ Lemnius ſimilis illis, columnis tantum centum quinquaginta mirabilior fuit: quarum in officina turbines ‘ ita librati pependerunt, ut puero circumagente tornarentur. Architecti illum fecere Zmilus & Rholus, ‘ & Theodorus indigena. Exſtantque adhuc reliquiæ ‘ ejus, cum Cretici Italicique nulla veſtigia exſtent.’ That is to ſay, according to Du Pinet's verſion, ‘ ſo ‘ much for the labyrinths of Egypt and Candy. That ‘ of Stalimene * was the ſame, except that it had an ‘ hundred and forty marble pillars more than the ‘ others, which were all turned with that eaſe, that ‘ one perſon could turn the lathe in which they were ‘ made, ſo finely poliſhed were the irons and axes that ‘ ſuſtained them. Moreover, it is ſaid, that Zmilus, ‘ Rholus, and Theodorus, which were of the ſaid iſle, ‘ made this labyrinth, of which there are ſome remains; and yet we cannot find the leaſt footſtep of ‘ that of Candy or of Tuſcany.’ This tranſlator ſuppoſes, that the three Architects of this labyrinth, were Lemnians; but the original affirms this only of Theodorus, who is, perhaps, the ſame who wrote a book concerning a temple of Juno (11).

[*C*] *Vulcan*

(*a*) Stephan. Byzant. voce Λῆμνος.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Plinius, lib. iv, pag m. 461.

(1) Plin. lib. iv, pag m 461, juxta Edit. Harduini.

(2) Solin. cap. xi, pag. 31.

(3) Belon, Obſervat. de Pluſieurs ſingularitez, livr. i, cap. xxvi, pag. 58, 59.

(4) *Our Geographers do uſually aſſign* 2500 *paces to a common French league.*

(5) *Plutarch of the face appearing in the orb of the moon, pag.* 935, *of Amiot's tranſlation.*

(6) Salmaſ. in Solinum, pag. m. 184.

(7) Apollon. Argon. lib. i, ver. 601, pag. m. 61.

(8) Salm. ubi ſupra.

(9) Steph. Byzant. voce Ἄθως.

(10) Plin lib. xxxvi, cap. xiii, pag. m. 305.

* *The iſle of Lemnos.*

(11) Eſt is fortaſſis quem de æde Dorica Junonis quæ eſt Sami, commentarium condidiſſe Vitruvius prodidit in præfatione libri vii. pag. 124. *Harduin. in Plinium, lib. xxxvi, cap. xiii, pag.* 305.

forged arms (*d*): which doubtleſs was one of the reaſons why the Poets ſuppoſed that Vulcan being thrown down from Heaven, fell into that iſland, where he was kindly received, and ſet up a forge (*e*) [*C*]. The place where he fell, was remarkable for a kind of earth which had great virtues. It cured Philoctetes who was bit by a ſerpent [*D*]. His diſagreeable ſtay in the iſle of Lemnos, whilſt the Grecians beſieged Troy,

[*C*] *Vulcan . . . . . fell into this iſland, where he . . . . . . ſet up a forge.*] Some authors ſay, that Jupiter threw him head-long, and that if the Lemnians had not received him in their arms, he would have loſt his life (12). But he himſelf ſays in Homer, that Juno threw him down, and that Eurynome and Thetis, the daughters of Oceanus, caught him, and prevented his being killed (13). He ſays in another place of the Iliad (14), that Jupiter took him by the foot, and threw him out of heaven, and that having been a whole day in coming down, he fell into the iſle of Lemnos at ſun-ſetting, that he was almoſt dead, and that the inhabitants took him up. Perhaps it will be ſaid, that Homer ſhould have been more careful not to contradict himſelf; but what he ſays implies no contradiction; he only relates two different adventures. Valerius Flaccus ſuppoſes, that Vulcan fell upon the ſhore of Lemnos, and that the inhabitants hearing his voice, ran to him, and gave him all manner of aſſiſtance, ſo that he had ever ſince a great affection for that iſland.

—— jam ſummis Vulcania ſurgit
Lemnos aquis, tibi per varios defleta labores
Ignipotens; nec te Furiis & crimine matrum
Terra, fugæ meritique piget meminiſſe prioris.
Tempore quo primùm fremitus inſurgere opertos
Cœlicolûm, & regni ſenſit novitate tumentes
Jupiter; ætheriæ nec ſtare ſilentia pacis:
Junonem volucri primam ſuſpendit Olympo,
Horrendum chaos oſtendens, pœnamque baratri.
Mox etiam pavidæ tentantem vincula matris
Solvere, prærupti Vulcanum vertice cœli
Devolvit: ruit ille polo, noctemque diemque
Turbinis in morem; Lemni cum litore tandem
Inſonuit: vox inde repens ut perculit urbem,
Acclivem ſcopulo inveniunt, miſerentque foventque
Alternos ægro cunctantem poplite greſſus.
Hinc reduci, ſuperas poſtquam pater annuit arces,
Lemnos cara deo: nec fama notior Ætnæ
Aut Lipares domus (15).

Vulcanian Lemnos riſes from the waves,
By thee, through numerous, varied, toils, bewail'd,
God of the fire: nor irks it thee, O land,
To keep in mind his flight, and former merit:
What time rebellion ſhook the throne of Jove,
And broke the peace of the ætherial court:
The ſire of gods, firſt, from Olympus' height
Suſpended Juno, to her frighted view
Diſcloſing chaos, and th' infernal pains.
Next Vulcan, who, with filial piety,
Strove to unloſe his trembling mother's chains,
He ſeiz'd, and hurl'd from heaven: in giddy whirls,
Both night and day, he fell, till Lemnos iſle
Receiv'd the panting god; whom, when his voice
Had reach'd the neighbouring town, the Lemnians found
Reclin'd againſt a rock: with pity ſtruck,
They kind refreſhment lend, to eaſe the god,
Lam'd by the rapid fall. The grateful deity,
Reſtor'd to heaven, and reconcil'd to Jove,
Favours the Lemnian iſle, equal in fame
To Lipare, or Ætna's burning hill.

Homer ſays that Lemnos was the beloved country of Vulcan.

Εἴσατ' ἴμεν ἐς Λῆμνον ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον,
Ἡ οἱ γαιάων πολὺ φιλτάτη ἐστὶν ἁπασέων.

Simulabt ſe iterum in Lemnum pulchrè fabricatum oppidum,
Quod illi terrarum multò chariſſimum eſt omnium (16).

Here follows a thing, which ſhews, that the moſt fabulous traditions will laſt a long time. Belon, who travelled in Turkey in the year 1548, informs us, 'that there is no inhabitant of the iſle of Lemnos, 'but knows ſomething of Vulcan's hiſtory; and as 'the little children of the iſle of Corſula will tell 'you the hiſtory of the Dolphin, as if it was a new 'thing; ſo every body in the iſle of Lemnos, relates 'the adventures of Vulcan, but in a different man'ner. For ſome ſay, that he and his horſe broke 'their thighs by their fall, and that he was imme'diately cured by the virtue of the earth on which 'he fell (17).'

[*D*] *The place where he fell was very remarkable for a kind of earth, which had great virtues. It cured Philoctetes who was bit by a ſerpent.*] Philoſtratus mentions a particular very different from the common tradition. He ſays, that Philoctetes was not tormented in the iſle of Lemnos, with the long pains that were ſo much talked of. 'That brave man, '*adds he* (18), was immediately cured by the earth 'of Lemnos, which is taken from the very place on 'which Vulcan fell from heaven; for it has the virtue 'of curing all ſorts of violent and furious diſtempers, 'and of ſtopping all bloody fluxes; but it cures not 'the biting of ſerpents, except that of the Hydra.' I ſhall ſet down ſome particulars taken from Peter Belon's obſervations, who travelled in that country towards the middle of the XVIth century. 'The 'antients, *ſays he* (19), had a kind of earth, which 'was accounted an excellent remedy for ſeveral di'ſtempers, and which at this day is as much uſed as 'ever. The Latins call it *Terra Lemnia*, or *Terra Sigillata*. It is ſuch a rarity, that embaſſadors, at 'their return from Turkey, do commonly take ſome 'along with them, to make a preſent of it to perſons 'of quality. It is good, among other things, for the 'plague, and for all manner of defluxions. There is 'ſome to be had at the Druggiſts, that goes by the 'name of *Terra Sagillata*, but is generally ſophiſtica'ted. The iſle of Lemnos is the only country where 'it is to be found.' He gives (20) the figure of ſeveral ſeals that are made uſe of to mark that earth, and adds (21), that all the 'ſeamen of a bark that came 'from Lemnos to Conſtantinople, aſſured him, that it 'was impoſſible to get any, but from the under-baſha 'of the iſland; and that if we had a mind to ſee it, 'ſuch as it is naturally, the only way was to go thi'ther; for the inhabitants are forbidden, upon pain of 'death, to export any. Moreover, they told me, 'that if any of the inhabitants ſhould ſell a ſmall 'cake of it, or was diſcovered to have any in his 'houſe, without the governor's knowledge, he would 'be ſeverely fined; for none is allowed to diſtribute 'it but the under-baſha, who rents the iſland, and 'pays a tribute to the Turk.' He got ſome body to carry him to the place out of which the earth is taken, and ſaw nothing but a ſloping hole (22), that was ſtopped, and he could never get it opened; for they never opened it but once a year, *viz.* on the ſixth of Auguſt, which they do with *great preparations and ceremonies.* 'This earth (Belon goes on) (23) ſhews 'how much ceremonies inhance the value of things 'that are vile and inconſiderable in themſelves; for 'though the earth I ſpeak of, has a great virtue, yet 'if it was ſo common that any one might be allowed 'to go and fetch ſome, it would be ſlighted. So that 'if any other vein of earth, like that of Cochino, had 'been found in ſome other part of that iſland, I do 'not queſtion but that the Greeks would ſcruple to uſe 'it, unleſs the Caloiers were preſent at the digging of 'it, and performed the uſual ceremonies; and if they 'had ſome like that of Cochino, they would hardly 'uſe or diſtribute it to others, if it had not been dug 'on the ſixth day of Auguſt; thinking that part of it's

(*d*) Hellanicus apud Scholiaſt. Apollonii, in lib. i, ver. 608, & Scholiaſtes Homeri in Iliad. lib. i, ver. 594.

(*e*) *See the remark* [*F*], *at the end.*

(12) Lucian. de Sacrific. pag. 354. Tom. I.

(13) Homer. Iliad lib. xviii, ver. 396, pag. m. 556.

(14) Id. ibid. lib. i, ver. 591.

(15) Valer. Flaccus, Argon. lib. ii, ver. 78, pag. m. 91.

(16) Homer. Odyſſ. lib. viii, ver. 283, pag. m. 230.

(17) Belon, Obſervat. lib. i, cap. xxix, pag. 68.

(18) Philoſtrat. in Heroicis. *I make uſe of Vigenere's tranſlation*, Tom. II, pag. 253, *of the 4to edition.*

(19) Belon, Obſervat lib. i, cap. xxii, pag. 51.

(20) Ibid.

(21) Ibid. cap. xxiii, pag. 54.

(22) Ibid. cap. xxviii, pag. 65.

(23) Ibid. cap. xxix, pag. 67.

Troy, was mightily ſung by the Poets [*E*]. Some other reaſons occaſioned the fiction I have mentioned concerning Vulcan; for it was ſaid that in former times flames frequently broke out of the earth in the iſland of Lemnos [*F*], particularly on the top of mount

it's virtue proceeds from the ceremonies that are practiſed upon ſuch an occaſion: nay, they would be apt to believe it has no virtue, unleſs they themſelves ſaw it dug up.' Nothing can be more judicious than theſe obſervations of Belon; and he alledges the two following examples. The Iris grows very plentifully in the mountains of Macedonia, and was to be had ‘ at a cheap rate; yet it was thought, that no body ſhould be allowed to gather it, but ſuch as were chaſt, and that the earth was to be watered three months before with holy water, in order to pacify it. Beſides, ſeveral other ſuperſtitions were to be practiſed, which have been deſcribed by Theophraſtus (24).' He proceeds to the antient ceremonies which concerned the earth of Lemnos. ‘ In the time of Dioſcorides, who wrote before Galen, it was an uſual thing to mix the blood of a he-goat with the earth, in order to make cakes of it. You muſt know, that ſome ceremonies were uſually performed in the killing of goats conſecrated to Venus, who, as the fables have it, produced an ill ſmell, like that of goats, in the women of Lemnos. Whereupon their husbands having expreſſed a diſlike of them, all the women, with a common conſent, killed all the men of the iſland. Which was the reaſon why the prieſteſs ſealed thoſe cakes with a ſeal on which was the figure of a goat, and therefore they were called *Sphragida ægos*, which ſignifies a goat's ſeal . . . . Galen being deſirous to know the truth of what was ſaid concerning that earth, as he came from Troy, (at that time called Alexandria, a Roman colony) in his way to Rome, paſſed by Lemnos, and inquired whether it was ſtill an uſual thing among the inhabitants to mix the blood of a goat with the earth before it was ſealed. But being in the very place I am ſpeaking of, he found that ſuch a practice was grown out of uſe. He gives an account of what was performed, when he was there, and ſays, that a prieſteſs threw here and there ſome wheat and barley upon the ground, and uſed ſome other ceremonies according to the cuſtom of the country, and then filled a cart with earth, and had it carried with her into the town of Hephæſtia. Galen ſays this and much more which we ſhall not recite for brevity ſake (25).' As for the modern ceremonies, he tells us *what had been confirmed to him by above ſix hundred men, who had ſeen them celebrated all their life-time.* ‘ The moſt eminent perſons of the iſland, both Turks and Greeks, with their prieſts and caloiers, meet together. The Greeks go to the little chapel called Sotira, and after the celebration of a maſs, according to the way of the Greeks, attended with prayers, they and the Turks go up the hill, which is only two bow ſhot diſtant from the chapel; and get the earth dug up by fifty or threeſcore men, till they have diſcovered the vein, and when they come to it, the Greeks fill ſmall ſacks with it, and give them to the under-baſha or vayvode, and when they have taken out as much of it as there is occaſion for, the ſame diggers immediately cover the earth. The under-baſha ſends the greateſt part of that which has been dug out, to the Grand Seignor at Conſtantinople, and ſells the remaining part to the Merchants . . . . Thoſe, who are preſent at the digging of it, may take a ſmall quantity of it for their own uſe, but dare not ſell it. The Turks are leſs ſcrupulous than the Greeks, and many other nations: they permit the Chriſtian Greeks to ſay their prayers upon the earth ſealed, in their preſence, and they themſelves join with them. And if what I have been told by the oldeſt inhabitants be true, this cuſtom of pitching only upon one day in the year, was introduced amongſt them, when the Venetians were maſters of Lemnos, and of the iſles of the Ægean ſea (26).' Stephen Albacarius, who was ſent into the iſle of Lemnos by Busbequius, on purpoſe to be informed of all theſe things, was more lucky than Belon; for he aſſiſted at the ceremonies. See the relation he gave of it to that illuſtrious embaſſador. See alſo *Egeo redivivo, ò ſia chorographia dell' Archipelago* of Francis Placentia, profeſſor of Geography at Modena (27).

Pliny (28) is very particular in his account of the *Terra Sigillata* of Lemnos; but he takes it to be a kind of vermillion, and confounds it with a red chalk which was dug up in the ſame iſland. See Salmaſius (29). You will find ſeveral particulars in the third chapter of the third book of Lewis Gyon's ſecond volume.

[*E*] *The diſagreeable ſtay of Philoctetes in the iſle of Lemnos . . . was ſung by the Poets.*] Some ſay that the Grecians ſent him thither, becauſe the prieſts of Vulcan were skilled in curing the bitings of ſerpents. ‘ Neque multo poſt Philoctetа cum paucis ubi curaretur in Lemnum inſulam mittitur, namque in ea ſacri Vulcani antiſtites inhabitare ab accolis dicebantur ſoliti mederi adverſum venena hujuſmodi (30).' He was left there till the ſiege of Troy was over, and he bore very impatiently the diſmal condition he was in.

- - - Non te, Pœantia proles,
Expoſitum Lemnos noſtro cum crimine haberet,
Qui nunc (ut memorant) ſylveſtribus abditus antris,
Saxa moves gemitu, Laërtiadeque precaris
Quæ meruit: quæ (ſi dii ſunt) non vana precaris.
Et nunc ille eadem nobis juratus in arma,
(Heu!) pars una ducum, quo ſucceſſore ſagittæ
Herculis utuntur, fractus morboque fameque
Venaturque aliturque avibus, volucreſque petendo
Debita Trojanis exercet ſpicula fatis (31).

Nor thee, great chief, whom Pœas' conſort bore,
Our guilt had left expos'd on Lemnos' ſhore:
Who now, in ſecret caverns hid, do'ſt groan,
Whilſt pitying rocks re-eccho to thy moan.
There do'ſt thou vent on curſ'd Ulyſſes' head
Dire imprecations, which the gods ſucceed.
Behold the wretched Philoctetes there,
Leader with us, and partner of the war,
Whoſe hands Alcides' fatal arrows bear;
Worn with diſeaſe, on birds thoſe ſhafts employ,
Which heav'n has deſtin'd for the fall of Troy.

The tragic Poets diſplayed all their eloquence upon this ſubject. Read theſe words of Cicero (32): ‘ Turpe putandum eſt non dico dolere (nam id quidem eſt interdum neceſſe) ſed ſaxum illud Lemnium clamore Philocteteo funeſtare.

Quod ejulatu, queſtu, gemitu, fremitibus
Reſonando mutum flebiles voces refert.

‘ —— *It ſhould be thought ſcandalous, I do not ſay to grieve (for that is ſometimes neceſſary) but to be always uttering complaints, like Philoctetes's Lemnian rock,*

Which, eccboing with complaints, with ſighs, and
groans,
Tho' mute itſelf, ſtill utters mournful ſounds.

See alſo Sophocles, in the tragedy intituled *Philoctetes.*

[*F*] *Flames frequently broke out of the earth in the iſle of Lemnos.*] Euſtathius mentions this as the reaſon, why the antients feigned that Vulcan fell into that iſland. Ὅτι πῦρ ἐκεῖ γῆθεν ἀνεδίδοτό ποτε αὐτόματον. *Quia olim ibi è terra erumpebat ſpontaneus ignis* (33). The Scholiaſt upon Lycophron, quoting Hellanicus's book concerning the foundation of Chios, tells us, that the firſt invention of fire and arms, was owing to a thunder-bolt that fell upon a tree in the iſle of Lemnos. This he ſays, upon ſome words of Lycophron, in which fire is called Lemnian (34). What has been ſaid of mount Moſychlus, is much the ſame with what has been reported of mount Ætna. See Heſychius and Nicander, and the Scholiaſt upon the latter, with the verſes he quotes out of Antimachus (35); and do not forget theſe words of Seneca.

Quæ

---

(24) Ibid. pag. 66.

(25) Ibid.

(26) Ib. lib. i, cap. xxix, p. 67.

(27) *That book is mentioned in the* Acta Eruditor. *for October* 1688, *pag.* 521.

(28) Plin. lib. xxxv, cap. vi.

(29) Salmaſ. in Solin. pag. 1157.

(30) Dictys Cretenſis, lib. ii, pag. m. 171. *See alſo Euſtathius*, in lib. ii, Iliados.

(31) Ovid. Metam. lib. xiii, ver. 45.

(32) Cicero, lib. ii, de fin. cap. xxix.

(33) Euſtath. in lib. i, Iliad.

(34) Τεφρώσας γυῖα λημναίῳ πυρί. Comburens artus igne Lemnio. *Lycophron. ver.* 227.

(35) *You may ſee them in Bochart*, Geogr. Sacra, lib. i, cap. xii, pag. m. 432.

mount Moſychlus. Two maſſacres were committed in that iſland, which gave occaſion to ſome proverbs (*f*). I have mentioned the firſt of theſe two maſſacres, in the article HYPSIPYLE; and that country had in time been wholly diſpeopled by it, if the Argonauts had not prevented it. The women had killed all the men, and had no mind to receive the firſt comers; for hearing that a ſhip was about to land upon their coaſt, they took up arms, and ran to the ſhore, fully reſolved to oppoſe the invaſion (*g*); but when they came to know that theſe foreigners were not the Thracians their enemies, and that it was a ſhip of the Argonauts, they ſhewed them all manner of kindneſs, and declared to thoſe brave men, that they might land in their country, provided they would take an oath to lie with them [*G*]. They accepted the condition, and were ſo

Quæ tanta nubes flamma Sicanias bibit?
Quæ Lemnos ardens? quæ plaga igniferi poli
Vetans flagranti currere in zona diem (36)?

What flame is this, that drinks Sicilian clouds?
What ardent Lemnos, this? What fiery clime
Of heav'n, permitting not the day to run
It's wonted courſe along the burning zone?

At this rate they might well ſay, that Vulcan had his forges in the iſle of Lemnos. Ἐν τῇ Λήμνῳ τὰ τοῦ Ἡφαίστου ἐργαστήρια. *In Lemno Vulcani fabriles Officinæ* (37).

[*G*] *Provided they took an oath to lie with them.*] This particular being contrary to the decorum, which the Poets uſually obſerve, I ought to produce a proof for it in the very words of my author; and therefore I ſhall ſet down this Greek paſſage: Αἰσχύλος ἐν ὑψιπύλῃ ἐν ὅπλοις φησὶν αὐτὰς ἐπελθούσας χειμαζομένοις τοῖς Ἀργοναύταις, μέχρις οὗ ὅρκον ἔλαβον παρ' αὐτῶν ἀποϐᾶσι μιγήσεσθαι αὐταῖς. Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἐν Λημνίαις καὶ μάχην ἰσχυρὰν αὐτὰς συνάψαι φησίν (38). The meaning of thoſe words, is, that the women of Lemnos took up arms, and continued to threaten the Argonauts, diſtreſſed by a ſtorm, till they ſwore that they would lie with them. Euripides ſays thoſe women fought with a great deal of bravery. This ſtory will hardly be credited by thoſe, who do not well weigh the circumſtances; but if we conſider on the one hand, that theſe women had deſtroyed all the men of that iſland, and on the other, that they reſolved upon ſuch a maſſacre, becauſe their husbands not being able to endure their ill ſmells, applied themſelves to other women, whom they made their concubines (39), the thing will appear highly probable. Nor can it be a wonder, that theſe women ſhould have been ſo forward in their advances, and that the Argonauts ſhould have diſcovered ſo little tenderneſs and galantry. The warlike equipage, and martial look of theſe women, were no inticing things. The cruel havock they had made of their fathers, husbands, ſons, and brothers, did certainly raiſe an abhorrence for them. Beſides the conſideration of the reaſon, why they had committed ſuch a ſlaughter, muſt needs have been an obſtacle to the love of the Argonauts; for they committed that horrid crime, becauſe their husbands grew out of conceit with them by reaſon of *their ſmell, which proceeded from their breath; but ſome ſay it proceeded from their arm-pits, which we call to ſmell rammiſh. Lactantius, upon the fifth book of Statius's Thebaid, follows this opinion, for he calls this ſmell of the Lemniades,* hircinum odorem. Dion Chryſoſtom ſays likewiſe to the ſame purpoſe in his thirty third oration. Λημνίων ταῖς γυναιξὶ, τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ὀργισθεῖσαν λέγουσι διαφθεῖραι τὰς μασχάλας. *As it is ſaid that Venus being exaſperated againſt the women of Lemnos, infected their arm-pits* (40). All things duly conſidered, one may eaſily perceive, that the antients did not tranſgreſs the rules of probability, when they ſuppoſed, that the companions of Jaſon had much ado to promiſe on the ſhoar of Lemnos, what they would have asked and offered in other places. The women who came to a parley with them, deſerved to be told what was ſaid by Catullus againſt one Rufus, who wondered that all the women he met with proved cruel.

Noli admirari, quare tibi fœmina nulla
 Ruſe, velit tenerum ſuppoſuiſſe femur.
Non illam raræ labeſactes munere veſtis,
 Aut perluciduli delitiis lapidis.
Lædit te quædam mala fabula, qua tibi fertur
 Valle ſub alarum trux habitare caper.
Hunc metuunt omnes; neque mirum, nam mala valde eſt
 Beſtia, nec quicum bella puella cubet.
Quare aut crudelem naſorum interfice peſtem:
 Aut admirari deſine, quur fugiunt (41).

Wonder not, Rufus, that thy fancied charms
Draw not a ſingle woman to thy arms.
By dint of dreſs the bus'neſs is not done;
A lady's favours are not that way won:
Nor, tho' the diamond ſparkles in her eyes,
Will that ſecure the meditated prize.
Wicked report does thy ſucceſs betray;
Beneath thy arm-pits lurks the goat, they ſay:
What woman, by a taſte ſo wretched led,
Wou'd take the ſtinking brute into her bed?
Or kill the ſtench, that greets their noſtrils thence,
Or wonder not, the ladies take offence.

Horace alledged a like reaſon to a woman, who complained that he was unkind to her.

Quid tibi vis mulier nigris digniſſima barris?
 Munera cur mihi, quidve tabellas
Mittis, nec firmo juveni, neque naris obeſæ?
 Namque ſagacius unus odoror,
Polypus, an gravis hirſutis cubet hircus in alis,
 Quàm canis acer, ubi lateat ſus.
Quis ſudor vietis, & quàm malus undique membris
 Creſcit odor, cum &c (42).

Woman, no more .... worthy an Æthiop's bed!
 Preſents, and letters, ſend no more,
 I am not what I was before,
To a whore's arms by youthful vigour led.

My noſe diſcovers latent ſtinks too well;
 No dog finds more ſagaciouſly
 Where haunts the briſly boar, than I
A Polypus, or fœtid arm-pits ſmell, &c.

Some there are who attentively conſidering theſe circumſtances, will judge perhaps, that the rules of probability had been better purſued, if the ſame conduct had been aſcribed to the Argonauts, which Auguſtus obſerved, when Fulvia propoſing to him peace or war (43), he choſe the latter. But it is certain, that probability has been ſufficiently guarded in the epiſode of Lemnos, the choice that the Argonauts made, being the more natural. Their ſhip lay in the road, and had been ſhattered by a tempeſt: they had occaſion for a port in Lemnos, and there was a neceſſity of their landing. This they could not do without fighting; and they had already experienced the valour of theſe women; who had fought couragiouſly, and had not been worſted. They muſt either renew the attack, or retreat, or take an oath that they would grant theſe women all they deſired. The retreat was ſcandalous, whether before the deciſion of a ſecond battle; or after a freſh attempt, as unſucceſsful as the former. What can be hoped from the expedition to Colchos, might all Greece ſay, when our heroes are baffled at the iſle of Lemnos, repulſed by ſilly women, and forced to fly? The tempeſt deſtroyed their hopes of any good ſucceſs in caſe of a ſecond battle. All then that remained,

(*f*) See Eraſmus, Chil. I, Cent. IX, n. 27, & Chil. II, Cent. X, n. 44.

(*g*) Apollon. Argon. lib. i, ver. 633.

(36) Seneca, in Hercule Oetæo, ver. 1360.

(37) Schol. Sophocl. in Philoct. ver. 1000.

(38) Scholiaſt. Apollon. in lib. i, ver. 773, pag. m. 79.

(39) See, above, remark [*A*], of the article HYPSIPYLE.

(40) *Meziriac, upon Ovid's* Epiſtles, pag. 557, 558.

(41) Catul. Epigr. lxx, pag. m. 157. *Ovid*, de Arte Amandi, lib. iii, ver. 193, *ſays*, Quam ſæpe admonui ne trux caper iret in alas, Neve forent duris aſpera crura pilis! *How oft have I adviſ'd ... To keep thy arm-pits ſweet, and thy legs free from hair?*

(42) Horat. Epod. Ode XII, ver. 1.

(43) See, above, the article of the firſt GLAPHYRA, remark [*C*]; and the article LYCORIS, remark [*F*].

ſo well pleaſed with the performance of it, that it ſeemed as if they had entirely forgot their expedition to Colchos: but Hercules, who kept on board the ſhip, upbraided them with their giving themſelves over to their pleaſures, and obliged them to re-imbark [*H*]. Some pretend, that they paſſed two or three years a-ſhoar with the women of Lemnos, and that the iſland was by this means re-peopled. The other maſſacre deſtroyed all the children begot by thoſe of Lemnos, on their Athenian concubines [*I*]. I ſpeak

mained, was to the ſubmit to neceſſity of the oath demanded. And perhaps, they thought that the cauſe of the averſion of the Lemnians was over, or in a great meaſure abated; and whatever might happen, they could quickly free themſelves from the ungrateful yoke, ſince nothing in particular was enjoyned them as to time or any other circumſtance. Theſe might be the conſiderations that obliged them to ſwear, and we muſt not believe they went upon equivocations, or mental reſervations, or upon the right which diſpenſes with an oath taken by force, & *metu cadente in conſtantem virum*. We ſhall ſee in the following remark, that they kept their promiſe very well.

[*H*] *Hercules who kept aboard his ſhip, upbraided them . . . . and obliged them to re-imbark.*] There is ſome room to wonder, that being ſo much given to the love of women as he was, he ſhould not divert himſelf, as well as the reſt, in the iſland of Lemnos; for though the Lemnian dames, for reaſons already mentioned, were none of the moſt tempting; yet we ſee no reaſon why he ſhould be nicer than the reſt of his companions. The oath they exacted, ſay you, carried ſome ſuſpicion with it, and ſince they could not think bare promiſes a ſufficient tye, he concluded they had an extreme miſtruſt of their own charms, and that ſomething was in the wind which he could not well gueſs at; in ſhort that it was not worth while to go a-ſhore. But once more, why ſhould he be ſo much more ſqueamiſh than the reſt, he who had as amorous a conſtitution as the beſt of them? I own I am at a loſs what to anſwer to this difficulty, and ſhall therefore take up with the bare matter of fact. Apollonius declares, that ‘ Hercules never would ſet foot in the iſland, but kept conſtantly aboard the ſhip Argos, that he might have a right ‘ to reprove his companions, who ſuffered themſelves ‘ to be drawn away by the careſſes of the Lemnian ‘ women, and never once thought of purſuing their ‘ enterprize; which he did with ſo much the more ‘ freedom, as he himſelf was not liable to the ſame ‘ imputation (44).’ Valerius Flaccus repreſents theſe young heroes ſo intent upon ſolacing the widows of Lemnos, that they think no more of re-embarking. They quite forget themſelves in the iſland; the game pleaſes them, and Hercules is forced to drag them thence by dint of reproach, and to ſpeak very ſeverely to Jaſon, chief of the enterprize.

Urbe ſedent læti Minyæ, viduiſque vacantes
Indulgent thalamis; nimboſque educere luxu;
Nec jam velle vias: Zephyroſque audire vocantes
Diſſimulant; donec reſides Tyrinthius Heros
Non tulit; ipſe rati invigilans atque integer; urbis
Invidiſſe deos tantum maris æquor adortis,
Deſertaſque domos, fraudataque tempore ſegni
Vota patrum; quid & ipſe viris cunctantibus aſſit?
O miſeri, &c. (45).

The joyfull Minyæ in the town remain,
Indulging in the Lemnian widows beds:
And now no more they think to quit the iſle,
Nor hear the winds, that call them to embark.
Their amorous ſtay with grief the hero ſaw,
Himſelf unhurt, and watching to depart:
Then ſtrives their ſleeping virtue to awake,
With thoughts of their own land, deſerted,
And their fond parents vows for their return,
Cheated by their delay; then chides them thus,
O wretched men, &c.

I obſerved in another place (46) that the beſt prize had fallen to Jaſon's ſhare; the queen of the iſland fell in love with him, and gave him the tendereſt marks of her eſteem. The remonſtrance of Hercules awaked theſe heroes: they re-imbarked without ſhewing any regard to the tears of their Lemnian ladies (47). Ovid (48) ſuppoſes that they tarried two whole years with them, but Apollonius informs us that their ſtay was much ſhorter, and this indeed is more likely, for had they paſſed two whole years in theſe delights there had been no need of ſtriking the lyre of Orpheus to draw them away, that powerful lyre, which the ſtones themſelves obeyed (49). Now it was found neceſſary to have recourſe to this machine, elſe they never had been able to tear themſelves from their wives of Lemnos.

Ἄλλῃ δ' ἄλλος ἔμικτο, καὶ ἐκλελάθοντο πορείης,
Εἰ μὴ ἀποτροπίοις ἐνοπαῖς θελξίφρονι θυμῷ
Ἡμετέρῳ θελχθέντες ἔβαν ποτὶ νῆα μέλαιναν,
Εἰρεσίην ποθέοντες, ἐπεμνήσαντο δὲ μόχθου,

Aliæque alius commiſcebatur, & obliti fuiſſent itineris ſui,
Niſi quidem revocatoriis monitis, ſuavique cantu
Noſtro perſuaſi, deſcendiſſent ad navem nigram,
Remigationem deſiderantes, recordatique fuiſſent laboris (50).

Immers'd in pleaſures, they had quite forgot
Th' intended expedition, had not I
By friendly admonition, and the ſound
Of my harmonious lyre, perſuaded them
Again to ſail, and reaſſume their toil.

Let us note an error of Barthius. He ſays, Ovid makes the Argonauts ſtay three years in this iſland, and thus he proves it (51): ‘ Sic enim ipſum penes ‘ Iaſoni ſcribit bona noſtra Hypſipyla.

Tertia meſſis erat, cum tu dare vela coactus,
Impleſti lacrymis talia verba tuis

‘ —— *For thus our Hypſipyle writes to Jaſon;*

'Twas the third harveſt, when compell'd to ſail,
Weeping, you thus beſpoke me . . . .

If he had taken notice of the foregoing verſe (52), he would have only ſaid two years; and this ſhews us how much it concerns writers not to run too faſt, but patiently examine what goes before, and what follows the places they deſign to allege. Three harveſts do not ſignify three years; they lie almoſt within the compaſs of two, as three ſundays within the compaſs of two weeks.

[*I*] *The other maſſacre was that of all the children begot by thoſe of Lemnos on their Athenian concubines.*] To give a juſt comment on this article, I muſt take notice (53), that the Athenians having expelled the Pelaſgi out of Attica, gave them the country which lies at the foot of the mountain Hymeſſus for a habitation (54). This was in recompence of the pains the Pelaſgi had taken in building the walls of the citadel of Athens. They cultivated the country which had been aſſigned them with ſo much induſtry, that of the worſt land thereabouts they ſoon made it the beſt. And this was the reaſon why the Athenians expelled them. The hiſtorian Hecatæus aſſigns no other reaſon for it. But they themſelves would never own this injuſtice; they pretended that their children of both ſexes (55) going to fetch water from the nine fountains, had a horrible affront put upon them by the Pelaſgi, who not content with that inſult, had made preparations for an irruption, and were convicted of it. The Athenians maintained that they might juſtly have put them to death, and that they had ſhew-

---

(44) Meziriac, ubi ſupra, pag. 585, 586.

(45) Valer. Flaccus, lib. ii, ver. 370, pag. m. 101.

(46) In the article **HYPSIPYLE**.

(47) *See* Valerius Flaccus, ibid. ver. 393, & ſeq.

(48) Ovid. in Epiſt. Hypſipyle.

(49) Ovid. Met. lib. xi, ver. 2, & 42.

(50) Orpheus, in Argonauticis, ver. 478, pag. m. 34.

(51) Barth. in Statium, Tom. III, pag. 228.

(52) Hic tibi biſque æſtas, biſque cucurrit hiems. . . . *whilſt here you ſtay, Two ſummers, and two winters paſs away.*

(53) Herodot. lib. vi, cap. cxxxvii, & ſeq.

(54) Herodotus calls it ſo; others ſay Hymettus.

(55) Herodotus obſerves that neither the Athenians, nor any other of the Greeks had ſlaves in thoſe days.

I ſpeak of it in one of the remarks. This iſland was very much infeſted with graſhoppers, and for that reaſon each inhabitant was taxed to kill a certain number of them, and they worſhipped the birds which deſtroyed them [*K*]. Great reſpect was paid here to Bacchus, and to Diana, but none to Venus [*L*], who, on her part, had never ſhewed
any

ed a great deal of clemency in having only expelled them. The Pelaſgi withdrew into ſeveral countries, and particularly into the iſland of Lemnos. They watched an opportunity to revenge themſelves; and as they knew the time of the Athenian feſtivals, they laid an ambuſh for the women of Athens, who were celebrating the feaſt of Diana at Brauron, carried off a great number of them, and afterwards made them their concubines. They had a great many children by them whom they brought up in the language and manners of Athens. Theſe children grew proud, and diſdained to keep company with thoſe that were born of Lemnian mothers; and if any of them happened to quarrel with another child who was a Pelaſgian by father and mother, they went in a body to his aſſiſtance, and affected a ſuperiority in every kind of reſpect. The Pelaſgi obſerving this, concluded that ſuch baſtards who knew from the very cradle how to form leagues againſt the legitimate children, and pretended to maſter them, might prove very dangerous one day. They therefore ſlew them all; and ſome time after they ſlew their Athenian concubines too. This tranſaction was followed by a notable ſterility, which extended equally to their wives, and to their fields, and to their flocks. They applied themſelves for relief to the oracle: Apollo ordered them to make all the ſatisfaction to the Athenians that they ſhould demand. They went to Athens and declared their readineſs and good intention; but when a country was demanded of them reſembling a table which was laid in the Prytaneum, and ſpread with all manner of good things they anſwered, *we will comply, when a ſhip ſhall ſail in twenty four hours from your conntry to ours, by a north-wind.* They thought they had promiſed nothing conſidering the ſituation of Athens with reſpect to Lemnos. Miltiades ſeveral years after ſeized on the Thracian Cherſonneſus, from whence he ſet ſail to Lemnos, and declared to the inhabitants that the condition of their promiſe was accompliſhed, and conſequently they were obliged to leave the country. The Hepheſtians obeyed, but the Myrinians reſiſted, alledging that the Cherſonneſus was not Attica. Miltiades beſieged them, and forced them to ſurrender. This is the account of Herodotus (56). His narrative is not altogether like that of Cornelius Nepos, with reſpect to the conqueſt of the iſle of Lemnos; for the latter (57) ſuppoſes that Miltiades before he ſubdued the Cherſonneſus, adreſſed himſelf to the Lemnians, ſummoning them to retreat voluntarily elſewhere, and that they made him the anſwer above mentioned; that having conquered the Cherſonneſus, he returned to Lemnos, and demanded the performance of the agreement, and that the Lemnians not daring to reſiſt him, yielded up the iſland. Cornelius Nepos calls them Carians, and not Pelaſgi. It appears from ſeveral places of Thucydides that the inhabitants of Lemnos, wereon the Athenian ſide, in the Peloponneſian war. They had then the ſame language and the ſame laws as the Athenians (58).

Note, that Herodotus obſerves that a Lemnian action among the Greeks, imported a crying ſin, on account of the maſſacre of the Athenian concubines, *&c.* and the barbarouſneſs with which the Lemnian women diſpatched their husbands, without ſparing even king Thoas. This is the true ſenſe of this hiſtorian's words, and it is without reaſon that a learned critic has found faults in them (59). *Verba Herodoti, ubi de Thoante ſermo eſt, omnino mendoſa ſunt.* Ενταῦθα ἔδοξέ σφισι κτείνειν τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀττικεῶν γυναικῶν. Ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ τοῦ ἔργου καὶ τοῦ προτέρου τούτου τὸ ἐργάσαντο αἱ γυναῖκες, τοὺς ἅμα Θόαντι ἄνδρας σφετέρους ἀποκτείνασαι, νενόμισαι ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὰ σχέτλια ἔργα μάντα Λήμνια καλέεσθαι (60). *Nemo enim de Thoante hoc tradidit. Igitur duæ voces,* ἅμα Θόαντι, *aut gloſſemata ſunt, aut corrupta eſt prior, & legendum,* παρὰ Θόαντος. Barthius does not explain his thought clearly: for we know not what he means by theſe words, *Nemo de Thoante hoc tradidit.* Does he mean that no body has ſaid that the Lemnian women, favoured or aſſiſted by Thoas, rid themſelves of their husbands? But this is not Herodotus's meaning. Does he mean that all authors agree that Thoas was not killed, and that therefore there is a fault in this paſſage of Herodotus, if it is pretended that he is here included in the number of the Lemnians killed by the women? But in this caſe he is miſtaken; ſince there are authors who ſay that the women underſtanding that Hypſipyle had not killed her Father Thoas, *they made ſo diligent ſearch that they found him and killed him* (61).

Eraſmus has committed ſome faults in abridging Herodotus's narration: he ſays (62) in the firſt place, that the Lemnians carryed off the Athenian women during the celebration of Minerva's feaſt at Brauron. He ſhould have ſaid Diana inſtead of Minerva. II. He adds, that the Athenian concubines would not ſuffer their ſons to marry the legitimate daughters of the Lemnians; Herodotus does not ſay ſo, but ſuppoſes theſe baſtards were killed before they were marriageable. Eraſmus's third fault is his affirming that after this maſſacre the Lemnians were afflicted with barrenneſs, peſtilence, and many other evils. Herodotus mentions only the barrenneſs of the earth, and of the women (63). IV. Eraſmus moſt falſly imputes to him the ſaying that theſe evils were partly the cauſe of the proverb *Lemnia Mala.* V. And that the other cauſe of it's origine, was, that the Lemnian women not able to bear the ſtench of their husbands, killed them all by the aſſiſtance of Thoas. It is true Herodotus occaſionally touches as one of the reaſons of the proverb, the ſlaughter theſe women made; but he does not ſay that their husbands ſtunk, and he affirms that Thoas was no more ſpared than the reſt. Benedictus in his Paraphraſe of Pindar, is groſly miſtaken, for inſtead of ſaying that the Lemnians were diſguſted at the ill ſmells of their wives, he affirms the women were incommoded with the ill ſmell of their husbands (64). This fault has not been corrected in the Oxford edition of Pindar 1698. The ſcholiaſt from whom Benedictus had taken a paſſage (65) not long before might have preſerved him from falling into Eraſmus's ſnare, Mr Moreri falls into it headlong, tho' he has not copied all the faults of this learned man. He has only catched at a very few facts which he met with in his Adages. *The Pelaſgi,* ſays he (66), *forced away the women of Athens, and had children by them, whom they afterwards killed, obſerving they had inclinations contrary to theirs. And the women killed their husbands by the aſſiſtance of Thoas.* Every one ſees that this is aſſigning the reaſon, in too indefinite and unlikely a manner, which induced the Lemnians to kill their baſtards. And plainly telling us that the action of theſe women ſucceeded the maſſacre of theſe baſtards; as extravagant a falſity as the pretended aſſiſtance of Thoas.

[*K*] *They worſhipped the birds which deſtroyed them.*] Here is a very curious paſſage (67). ‘In Cyrenaïca ‘regione lex etiam eſt ter anno debellandi eas, primo ‘ova obterendo, deinde fætum, poſtremo adultas: de‘ſertoris pœna in eum, qui ceſſaverit. Et in Lemno ‘inſula certa menſura præfinita eſt, quam ſinguli ene‘catarum ad magiſtratus referant. Gracculos (68) quo‘que ob id colunt, adverſo volatu occurrentes earum ‘exitio. —— *In the region of Cyrene, there is even a ‘law for deſtroying them three times in a year, firſt ‘by cruſhing their eggs, then their young, then the ‘full-grown: he, who leaves off, is puniſhed as a de‘ſerter. And in the iſland Lemnos, every one is ob‘liged to kill a certain number, and bring them to ‘the magiſtrate. They likewiſe worſhip Jackdaws, ‘who fly before them, when they go to deſtroy them.*’ Let us alſo hear Plutarch, tho' he differs from Pliny as to the kind of bird which the Lemnians adored. The Ægyptians ſays he (69), worſhipped the ox, the ſheep, and the Ichneumon, *on account of the ſervice and benefit they received by them, as the inhabitants of Lemnos honoured the larks, becauſe they found out the graſs-hoppers eggs and broke them.*

[*L*] *Great reſpect was paid here to Bacchus and Diana, but none to Venus.*] Thoas king of Lemnos was the ſon of Bacchus and Ariadne (70); no wonder
then

---

(56) Herod. ubi ſupra.

(57) Cornelius Nepos, in Vita Miltiadis.

(58) Thucydides, lib. vii, pag. m. 436.

(59) Barth. in Statium Theb. lib. v, ver. 328, pag. 167, Tom. III.

(60) *This is the Latin verſion of this Greek in the editions of Herodotus.* Itaque placitum eſt ut eos filios è matribus Atticis ſuſceptos necarent. . . . Ex hoc facinore, & illo ſuperiore ſeminarum, quæ viros ſuos una cum Thoante interemerunt, uſu rereceptum eſt per Græciam ut teterrima quæque facinora Lemnia appellentur. —— *Therefore they reſolved to deſtroy thoſe children, born of Athenian mothers . . . from this action, and that former, of the women who killed their huſbands, together with Thoas, it is become a cuſtom in Greece to call all wicked actions Lemnian.*

(61) See Meziriac upon Ovid's Epiſtles, pag. 561. See alſo pag. 558.

(62) Eraſm. Adag. Chil. I, Cent. IX, n. 27, pag. m. 302.

MISTAKES of Eraſmus, *&c.*

(63) Πιεζόμενοι δὲ λιμῷ τε καὶ ἀπαιδίῃ. Pariter fame & liberorum orbitate vexati. *Herod. ubi ſupra, cap. cxxxix.*

(64) Quin etiam in Lemnum venerunt (Argonautæ) . . . & cum Lemniadibus mulieribus quæ maritos omnes eorum graveolentia offenſæ, occiderant, rem habuerunt. *Paraphr. Pindar. Ode IV, Pyth. pag. m. 371.*

(65) Ad Stroph. γ Ode IV, Pyth. pag. m. 330.

(66) Moreri under the word *Lemnos.*

(67) Plinius, lib. xi, cap. xxix, pag. m. 528.

(68) *Father Harduin makes a good remark here:* Cornicularum, *ſays he,* e genere avis eſt gracculus veterum Latinorum: nos *Choucas* vocamus, ut recte Bellonius admonet, lib. vi, cap. iii, & vii.

(69) Plut. de Iſide & Oſiride.

(70) Ovidius, Epiſt. Hypſipyl. Apollon lib. i, Argon. & multi alii apud Mezir. ubi ſupra, p. 532.

any kindneſs to this country: A very great affront had been put upon her in this iſland of Lemnos; for here it was that Vulcan expoſed her linked with the god Mars (*b*); and here he gave all the gods the pleaſure of ſeeing her ſurprized in the fact. Homer is of another opinion; he lays the ſcene of this adventure in heaven (*i*). The Perſians conquered this iſland in the reign of Darius the ſon of Hyſtaſpes, and placed a governor over it, who treated the people inhumanly (*k*). Miltiades ſubdued it a long time after (*l*). Herodotus tells a ſtory on this occaſion, which is not eaſily reconciled with that of Plutarch [*M*]. Ubbo Emmius aſſures us, that the Amazons reigned in that iſland before the deſcendants of the Argonauts inhabited it (*m*). I ſhould be glad to know in what good author he had met with this. I find in Vitruvius, that the Romans beſtowed the revenues of it on the Athenians (*n*). If what Strabo wrote concerning it, had been preſerved to us, I do not doubt but we ſhould have found in him ſeveral curious particulars; but that part of this excellent Geographer's book, is loſt to us, and yet Mr Moreri (*o*) cites him as an author, who ſpeaks of it in a particular manner. Lemnos is at this day called Stalimene. The Turks beſieged it in the year 1475, and were obliged to raiſe the ſiege. It was on this occaſion, that a maid, called Marulla, manifeſted

then that the worſhip of Bacchus ſhould be well eſtabliſhed in this iſland. It was in a temple of this god that Hypſipyle concealed her father in the night of the maſſacre (71). Strabo informs us that the myſteries of Samothrace, and thoſe of Lemnos, had a pretty great conformity with the ceremonies the Bacchantes obſerved (72). For the reſt, this iſland was ſo fruitful in wine, that this alone might make it conſidered as a country conſecrated to that god. Quintus Calaber calls it *ἀμπελόεσσαν*, *vitibus abundantem* (73). - - - *fruitful in vines*. Our travellers, ſay it ſtill deſerves this epithet (74). As for the worſhip of Diana I ſhall content myſelf with pointing out the place where Plutarch tells us, that the Lemnians, being driven out of their iſland, carried about with them the image of Diana, which they had taken at Brauron (75). I ſhall obſerve alſo, that they ſtamped the figure of this goddeſs upon their *Terra ſigillata*. See Salmaſius, in his *exercitationes Plinianæ in Solinum*, *pag*. 1156. All the authors who ſpeak of the rage of the Lemnian women againſt their husbands, obſerve, that the bad ſmell, which rendered them ſo inſufferable, was an effect of Venus's anger, who ſaw herſelf neglected and deſpiſed in this iſland. See Apollodorus (76), Hyginus (77), Apollonius's Scholiaſt (78), *&c*. We have ſtill an error to cenſure in Barthius. He believes, that, in after-times, the Lemnians conſecrated an image of Venus, which was one of the moſt exquiſite ſtatues of antiquity. '*Venerem* 'etiam *Lemniam, ſays he* (79), inter pulcherrima ſimulacra cultam poſtea diſcimus ex Luciani Imaginibus. Item *Lemniam Minervam*, à Lemniis, dedicatam, quod omnium fuerit Phidiæ operum elaboratiſſimum, Pauſaniæ Atticis. —— *We learn from Lucian's* Images, *that the* Lemnian Venus *was afterwards* '*worſhipped among the moſt beautiful images: likewiſe from Pauſanias's Attics, that the Lemnians* '*worſhipped a* Lemnian Minerva, *the moſt elaborate of* '*all Phidias's performances*.' He has reaſon to ſay, that the Minerva which was Phidias's maſter-piece, was dedicated by the Lemnians. Pauſanias ſays, that for that reaſon ſhe had the ſirname Lemnian. See the 28th chapter of his firſt book; but Barthius is wrong, in diſtinguiſhing it from the image which Lucian mentions, and pretending that Lucian has ſpoken of a Lemnian Venus. He had indeed mentioned a Minerva ſo named. This cannot be diſputed, if we obſerve the remark he has made, that this was the moſt excellent piece of Phidias, and that to which he put his name (80).

[*M*] *Herodotus tells a ſtory on this occaſion, which is not eaſily reconciled with Plutarch*.] This laſt author ſays, that the Tyrrhenians, having ſeized the iſles of Lemnos and Imbros, ſtole away the Athenian women from Brauron, and had children by them. This race was expelled theſe iſlands by the Athenians, who looked upon them as half barbarous. This race ſet ſail towards Pelopenneſus, and landing at Tenarus, did good ſervices to the Lacedæmonians in the war with the Heilotes, and obtained in recompence the privileges of citizens, and the liberty of marrying into the families of Lacedæmon, but not the privilege of bearing public offices, or being admitted into councils. This excluſion made theſe people ſuſpected of a deſign to embroil the ſtate; and upon this their perſons were ſecured, and they were kept in cloſe confinement, till proofs were found out to convict them of the conſpiracy. Their wives obtaining leave to viſit them, changed habits with the men, by which means they got away, and left them in their ſtead. Having ſeized mount Taigetus, they joined with the Heilotes, and became ſo formidable to Lacedæmon, that it was thought proper to capitulate with them. Their wives were reſtored; and they had money and ſhips given them, and a promiſe of owning them as relations, and as a colony of Sparta, wherever they ſhould ſettle themſelves. They accepted the conditions, and ſome went and ſettled at Melos, others at Crete. The latter, after ſeveral battles, made themſelves maſters of Lyctus, and ſome other towns, and hence the inhabitants of Lyctus pretended, that by the mother's ſide they were related to the Athenians, and looked on themſelves as a colony of Lacedæmon (81). This is Plutarch's account. Thoſe whom he calls Tyrrhenians, and a little after Pelaſgi, are the very ſame whom Herodotus calls Pelaſgi. Theſe two names belong to the ſame people (82), and it muſt not be imagined, that the authors who have ſaid that the iſle of Lemnos was inhabited by the Tyrrhenians (83), differ from thoſe who ſay it was poſſeſſed by the Pelaſgi; ſo far then there is no difference between Herodotus and Plutarch: but when the latter affirms, that the poſterity of the Athenian women carried off from Brauron by the Tyrrhenians, who had ſettled in the iſles of Lemnos and Imbros, were expelled thoſe iſles by the Athenians, he contradicts Herodotus, who pretends, that the Lemnians themſelves deſtroyed all the children begot by them upon the Athenian women. Theſe two hiſtorians differ widely in point of time. The one (84) will have Miltiades expel the Lemnians, the other makes that expulſion much more antient, at leaſt confounds what he ought to diſtinguiſh. The hiſtory of theſe women, who procured the liberty of their husbands, relates to a time, in Herodotus, much earlier than Miltiades, and has not the circumſtances which are mentioned by Plutarch.

This is Herodotus's account (85). The inhabitants of Lemnos, who were deſcended from the Argonauts, were expelled this iſland by the Pelaſgi, who forced away the Athenian women from Brauron. They retired to the country of the Lacedæmonians, and informed them, that they were the poſterity of the Argonauts, and that being driven out of their country, they returned to their anceſtors, and begged leave to live among them. The Lacedæmonians remembering that Caſtor and Pollux had been in Jaſon's expedition, gave theſe fugitives a kind reception, allowed them lands, and incorporated them into their tribes. Theſe refugees contracted new marriages, having firſt parted with the wives they had brought from the iſle of Lemnos, to ſome of their neighbours. It was not long before they grew proud, would domineer, and became guilty of every ill action. They were impriſoned, and their death reſolved on, but the wives ſaved them by changing habits, as I mentioned before. The deſign was ſtill continued, of putting them to death, but Theras, who was preparing to found a colony, interceeded for them, and promiſed to take them away with him, and prevent any further danger. His requeſt was granted. Moſt of them diſperſed themſelves, the reſt followed Theras, who

---

(*b*) *See the Scholiaſt of Statius*, in Theb. lib. v, ver 59.

(*i*) Homer. Odyſſ. lib. viii,

(*k*) Herodot. lib. v, cap. xxvi, xxvii.

(*l*) Idem, lib. vi, cap. cxl.

(*m*) Ubbo Emmius, lib vii, de Veteri Græcia, pag. 147. *Note, That if he goes upon what Strabo*, lib. xi, pag. 348, *relates, that the Amazons had built the city of Myrina, his foundation is bad; for there were ſeveral cities called Myrina.*

(*n*) Vitruv. lib. vii, cap. vii.

(*o*) *Under the word* Lemnos.

(71) Valer. Flaccus, lib. ii, ver. 254.

(72) Strabo, lib. x, pag. 321.

(73) Quint. Calab. lib ix, ver. 337.

(74) *See* Belon, ubi ſupra, lib. i, cap. xxv.

(75) Plutarch. de Virtutib. Mulier. pag. 247.

(76) Lib. i, pag. m. 55.

(77) Cap. v.

(78) In libr. i, ver. 209.

(79) Barth. in Statium, Tom. III, pag. 166, 167.

(80) Lucian. in Imagin. pag. v, Tom. II.

(81) *Taken from* Plutarch. de Virtut Mulier. pag. 247.

(82) *See* Cluverius in Italia antiqua lib. ii, cap. i, & Strabo, lib. v, pag. 153.

(83) Schol. Apollonii, in libr. i, ver. 608.

(84) That is to ſay, Herodotus.

(85) Herodot. lib. iv, cap cxlv, & ſeq.

manifeſted an extraordinary courage (*p*). Mr Moreri makes mention of it (*q*), but he falſely ſuppoſes, that ſhe lived in the XIVth century. He adds (*r*), that Mahomet II wreſted this iſland out of the hands of the Venetians. That is not exact, ſince he obtained it by a treaty of peace, in the year 1478 (*s*). The Venetians re-conquered it in the year 1656. The Turk recovered it the year following, after a long ſiege. I had like to have forgot the flower called Lychnis. See the margin (*t*).

(*p*) *See* Vianoli dell' Hiſtoria, Veneta, Tom. I, pag. 724.

(*q*) *Under the word Stalimene.*

(*r*) *Under the word* Lemnos.

(*s*) Vianoli, ibid, pag. 138.

(*t*) The flower Lychnis grew no where in ſo much perfection as in the iſle of Lemnos. It ſprung from the water in which Venus had bathed herſelf after having lain with Vulcan. *See Athenæus, lib. xv, pag.* 681. Compare with this, remark [*DD*] of the article JUNO.

who founded a colony in the iſland which bears his name (86). Note, that he had been tutor to Euriſthenes and Procles, the ſons of Ariſtodemus, one of the leaders of the Heraclidæ, who returned into Peloponneſus (87), and from thence conclude, that he flouriſhed ſix hundred years, or thereabouts, before Miltiades. Note alſo, that Pindar's Scholiaſt (88) relates the thing almoſt as Herodotus does, and that both obſerve, that Battus, deſcended from one of the Lemnians of Theras's colony, founded the city of Cyrene.

If any one ſhould ſay this is foreign to my ſubject, he would be to blame, and that for two reaſons; firſt, becauſe criticiſm requires, that I ſhould ſhew the differences between Herodotus and Plutarch; and next, I am obliged, as an Hiſtorian, to collect the adventures of the inhabitants of the iſle of Lemnos.

(86) The iſland of Thera.

(87) Herodot. lib. iv, cap. cxlvii.

(88) Scholiaſtes Pindari, in Ode IV, Pyth. ver. 88, pag. 218, Edit. Oxon. 1698. *He will have it, that the priſoners were delivered by their mothers.*

LENTULUS (Scipio) was a Neapolitan who forſook the Romiſh church and embraced the Reformed religion in the XVIth century. He was miniſter of Chiavenne, in the country of the Griſons, and he employed his pen in the defence of an edict which the Griſon leagues made in 1570, againſt the ſectaries (*a*) [*A*]. They failed not to attack this edict, with the arguments for toleration, which the Reformed themſelves alledged againſt the Roman Catholics, in the perſecuting countries: But our Lentulus anſwered theſe reaſons. He is the author of an Italian grammar, printed at Geneva in 1568 (*b*).

I add, that he preached ſometimes at Ferrara, before the ducheſs Renata of France (*c*); that he was afterward miniſter of the church of St John, in the vale of Luzerne (*d*); that he anſwered a book of the Jeſuit Poſſevin, who had been ſent to that place on the foot of a converter, in the year 1560 [*B*]; that he found himſelf greatly expoſed to the caprice

(*a*) Epitome Biblioth. Geſner.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Peter Gilles, Hiſt. Eccleſ. des Valées de Peidm. pag. 110.

(*d*) Idem, pag. 105.

[*A*] *He employed his pen in defence of an edict . . . . . . againſt the ſectaries.*] The epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque mentions this work of Lentulus, as a piece that was never printed. *Ejuſdem liber de jure Magiſtratuum in puniendis hereticis, quo Sylvii cujuſdam Epiſtolam hæreticis patrocinantem refutat nondum editus.* This you will find in the 744th page of that epitome, Zurich edition, 1583. At laſt the book was printed at Geneva, by John le Preux, in 1592, in 8vo. This is the title: *Reſponſio orthodoxa pro edicto Illuſtriſſimorum D. D. trium fœderum Rhetiæ, adverſus hæreticos, & alios Eccleſiarum Rheticarum perturbatores promulgato; in qua de Magiſtratûs authoritate & officio in coercendis hæreticis, ex verbo Dei diſputatur.* I know ſome perſons, who, having read in the Catalogue of the Bodleian Library, that Lentulus's apology for the edict of the Griſon leagues, was printed in 1502, over-ſtrained their imagination, to find what ſect this could be, which gave occaſion to that edict among the Griſons, in the beginning of the XVIth Century. They turned over many books, and even conſulted thoſe who had libraries, and who exhauſted themſelves in conjectures. At laſt, the true date of the edition was diſcovered, and a new inſtance given of the confuſions, into which the faults of the preſs caſt authors, on thouſands of occaſions. Mr Voëtius obſerves, that the Sectaries proſcribed by the edict of the Griſon leagues, were Arians, or ſomething worſe; and that Lentulus gave the particulars of their blaſphemies in his preface (1). He obſerves alſo (2), that Lentulus's orthodox anſwer, *pro edicto*, &c. confuted the complaints publiſhed by an anonymous author, in 1570, againſt the edict of the Griſons, and that it came out in 1573. This is very different from what is found in Geſner's epitome.

[*B*] *He anſwered a book of the Jeſuit Poſſevin, who had been ſent to that place on the foot of a converter, in the year* 1560.] Poſſevin had entered himſelf in the ſociety of the Jeſuits but a few months before, being then twenty ſix years of age (3). Therefore I am not ſurprized, that the Hiſtorian, who furniſhes me with what I am going to ſay, did not give him that title. The Pope having ſignified to the duke of Savoy, that it was neceſſary to uſe force, in order to convert the Heretics of the vallies of Piedmont, *it was reſolved in his highneſs's council*, to comply with the Pope's deſire: ' But that, to keep up ſome ſhew of ' proceeding regularly, ſome perſon, qualified to convince the accuſed of their errors, ſhould be once ' more ſent into the vallies, and according to the ſucceſs of this, to take the neceſſary meaſures: and for ' this buſineſs they made choice of Anthony Pouſſevin, ' commander of St Anthony de Foſſano (4), a man of ' great reputation among them, but who made it appear by his actions, he was not the man they took ' him for. His highneſs gave him his letters-patents, ' of the ſeventh of July, which declared him ſent ' to eſtabliſh preachers of Chriſtian doctrine in his dominions, and particularly in his vallies of Piedmont, ' with the neceſſary proviſions for their maintenance. ' Commanding, for this end, all, in eccleſiaſtical, or ſecular, office, ſyndics, communities, and, in general, all ' his ſubjects, to afford him all the neceſſary aſſiſtance ' for the execution of his ſaid commiſſion (5). This ' man, leaving Nice, where his highneſs was, went ' directly to Cavour . . . . . and having cauſed the ' people to be aſſembled in the principal church of ' the town, he mounted the pulpit, read for his text ' his letters of commiſſion, explained them by enlarging and exaggerating what he pretended he was ' going to do in the neighbouring vallies, to convince ' and confound the miniſters, to drive them away, to ' eſtabliſh in their room thoſe that ſhould preach up ' the Pope, to prove that the maſs was good, to make ' all the inhabitants of thoſe vallies go to it, and to ' denounce extermination concluded againſt all thoſe, ' who would not obey his orders (6).' He went and did the ſame thing at Bubiano, in the valley of Luſerne, and at Luſerne, ' the capital of the valley ' . . . . . and ordered the leaders of the Reformed ' to attend him the twenty ſixth of July.' He came to the aſſembly, ' aſſiſted by a great number of the ' nobility, magiſtrates, and other principal men of his ' religion, where he laid before them the reaſons of ' his coming, and ordered the letters of his commiſſion to be read: afterwards he ordered to be read ' the letters and petitions, which the Reformed had ' written to his highneſs and his council, which he ' had brought back with him, and demanded of them, ' *Whether they owned the ſending ſuch writings, and* ' *whether they would obſerve what they had promiſed* ' *in them?* They anſwered, *Yes* (7).' He alledged ſome reaſons to prove the Maſs: the miniſters having propoſed to him their difficulties, ' he fell into exclamations,

(1) Giſbert. Voëtius, Polit. Eccleſ. Tom. II, pag. 539.

(2) Ibid. pag. 386.

(3) *See* Alegambe, pag. 42.

(4) Alegambe, *pag.* 41, obſerves that cardinal Hercules de Gonzaga had given Poſſevin the commandery of St Anthony de Foſſano, *S. Antonii, apud Foſſanum Præceptoria donatus.*

(5) Peter Gilles, Hiſt. Eccleſ. des Egliſes Reformées des Vallées de Piedm. pag. 101, ad ann. 1560.

(6) Gilles, Ibid, pag. 102.

(7) Ibid. pag. 103.

caprice and perſecution of Caſtrocaro, who commanded in the vallies of Piedmont; that this obliged him to look out for another reſidence in 1565, and that he retired *to Chiavenna, in the country of the Griſons, where he continued the exerciſe of his miniſtry to his death* (e). His Apology for the Edict, which the Griſons had publiſhed againſt the Heretics, ought not to ſurprize any one, on pretence that he had been formerly perſecuted himſelf; for nothing is more common than to ſee perſons, who have fled for their religion, ringing the alarm againſt the ſects.

'mations, and abuſive language, with unbounded rage; at which thoſe who attended him appeared very much grieved and aſhamed, ſeeing that one of ſuch great reputation among them, could not produce any one reaſon in defence of their religion, nor any thing to convince the other party of error, and beſides had ſhewed himſelf ſo immoderate and abuſive. As for him, coming a little to himſelf, he ſaid, *that he was not come to diſpute with the miniſters, but to drive them away, and eſtabliſh other preachers in their room, according to his commiſſion*; and without hearing, or anſwering any thing elſe, he ordered M. Anthony Malingre, Notary of Bagnol, to draw up, in form, his command to the ſyndics and communities, *and in their perſons to all the other inhabitants of the ſaid places reſpectively*, to drive all the Lutheran miniſters away, who preached there, without any more hearing them in public, or private, and beſides to receive and hear the preachers, whom he ſhould ſettle among them, as ſoon as the miniſters ſhould be gone, and to provide them a fit habitation and maintenance, under the penalties contained in his highneſs's edicts, ordering them to report to him the reſult of their deliberation in three days (8).' The ſyndics gave in their anſwer to him, to which he replied, 'the fifth of Auguſt, by a long letter, telling them, *That his commiſſion tacitly implied authority to drive away the paſtors, becauſe he was commanded to eſtabliſh other preachers, which he could not do, whilſt the miniſters continued there, who would always be contradicting what his preachers ſaid and did.* His letter was enlarged with ſtrong exhortations to the Reformed to return to the church of Rome, with many promiſes to thoſe who did it voluntarily, and without ſtaying till they were compelled to it. He joined to this letter another writing, by which he endeavoured partly to repair the breach he had made in his reputation, in the aſſembly of the twenty ſixth of July: for he had collected ſome few paſſages of holy ſcripture, and a few more of the doctors of the antient church, in proof of ſome parts of the maſs, and alſo of the practice of celibacy among the clergy: but Scipio Lentulus, a Neopolitan, paſtor of the church of St John, wrote a learned anſwer to him, which was ſoon after printed: in which he ſhews Poſſevin's ignorance in the arguments he produced, and how widely the new Romiſh church, in ſuch things, erred from the right way (9).'

'The moſt reverend Poſſevin (the very greateſt men of his party adorn him with this title) ſeeing that he could not repair the breaches made in his reputation, neither by his writings, nor his words, addreſſing himſelf to thoſe, who knew how to anſwer him, he entirely left them, and went and diſcharged his indignation on the poor faithful, ſcattered and diſperſed among the Papiſts at the very bottom of the vallies, and eſpecially at Campillon and Fenil. He impriſoned their perſons, and plundered the effects of the ſaid Reformed. . . . The greateſt part of them fled: but thoſe, who ſuffered themſelves to be taken, were ill uſed. Some were ſo weak as to abjure the Proteſtant religion in the church of Campillon, on the fifth of Auguſt, in preſence of all the aforeſaid, who cauſed acts to be drawn up of it with great ſolemnity: then they ſet them free, and reſtored to them their plundered effects, of whom the better part returned afterwards to the right way (10). . . . . The month of Auguſt was almoſt wholly taken up in ſuch extortions . . . . Pouſſevin returned to the duke's court, the beginning of September, and, by his injurious and calumnious reports, cauſed a reſolution to be taken, to proceed againſt the Reformed of the vallies, by force of arms (11).'

A ſtrange way this of converting Heretics!

LEO I, ſirnamed the Great, took poſſeſſion of the papacy, the tenth of May, 440. He was a man of great abilities and courage, a great maſter of Eloquence, and well ſkilled in affairs. Nor did he want opportunities of diſcovering his great talents: he found exerciſe enough for them, from the Hereſies he had to engage, and the ravages committed in the Roman empire. His zeal againſt the Manicheans, the Priſcillianiſts, Pelagians, Neſtorians, and Eutychians, was wonderfully ſeconded by the penal laws of the emperors, executed with great ſeverity. He did not diſapprove the extending them, even to the effuſion of blood [*A*]. His deputation to Attila, produced very good effect [*B*]: But the miracle which is added to it, is a meer fable

[*A*] *He did not diſapprove the extending them even to the effuſion of blood.*] You will quickly have the proof of this in a paſſage of Mr Maimbourg. It relates to the capital puniſhment inflicted on Priſcillian, and ſeveral of his followers, and the exile to which many others were condemned, which Sulpitius Severus highly diſapproved, as a thing of *moſt pernicious example*. 'Becauſe he believed nothing like it had been ſeen before. As to the point of baniſhment, no body can deny but he is in the wrong. For all the world knows that Conſtantine baniſhed the biſhops who refuſed to ſubſcribe the condemnation of Arius; that he puniſhed alſo with exile, as did the other emperors after him. As to the penalty of death, it is true it had not hitherto been inflicted on Heretics; not but this ſeverity may be very juſtly exerciſed againſt them, as in aftertimes it frequently has. And not to ſpeak of thoſe who have proved in their writings, that it was not only lawful, but very expedient, to treat Heretics after this manner, we need only ſee what St Leo has written upon it, when giving the neceſſary orders (as we ſhall cite him by and by) to act in Spain againſt the hereſy of Priſcillian, he praiſes Maximus for an action of this kind, and ſays *, *That the rigour and ſeverity of his juſtice againſt that Hereſiarch, and his diſciples, whom this prince put to death, was a great aſſiſtance to the clemency of the church. For though the church contents itſelf with that lenity of judgment, which the biſhops exerciſe according to the canons, againſt obſtinate Heretics, and admits of no bloody executions, it is however much aided and ſupported by the ſevere conſtitutions of the emperors, ſince the fear of ſo rigorous a puniſhment ſometimes makes Heretics have recourſe to the ſpiritual remedy, to cure the mortal diſeaſe of their hereſy, by a ſincere converſion* (1).'

[*B*] *His deputation to Attila, produced a very good effect.*] As this is one of the fineſt paſſages in the life of this Pope, it deſerves to be a little enlarged on in this place. Attila had made himſelf maſter of Aquileia, and almoſt reduced it to aſhes: *He had ravaged all upon his march from Aquileia to Pavia and Milan.* He had made himſelf maſter *of theſe two great cities*, and had treated them *as he had the reſt, laying them both in rubbiſh* . . . . . (2). *So many diſmal meſſages arriving upon the back of one another at Rome, cauſed a great conſternation there* (3). The ſenate was aſſembled to deliberate whether the emperor ſhould quit Italy, as Ætius adviſed him: they could not reſolve what courſe to take. 'To defend Rome, in the condition it was, againſt that innumerable multitude of Barbarians, fable [*C*]. **His eloquence had not the ſame ſucceſs with king Giſeric, nor yet was it**

(e) Gilles, ibid. pag. 201.

(8) Idem, pag. 104.

(9) Ib. pag. 105.

(10) Ibid. pag. 106.

(11) Ibid. pag. 107.

* Profuit diu iſta diſtrictio Eccleſiaſticæ lenitati, quæ etſi ſacerdotali contenta judicio cruentas refugit ultiones: ſeveris tamen Chriſtianorum Principum conſtitutionibus adjuvatur, dum ad ſpiritale nonnumquam recurrunt remedium, qui timent corporale ſupplicium. *S. Leo, Epiſt. XCV, ad Turib.*

(1) Maimbourg's Hiſtory of the Pontificate of St Leo, *lib. i, pag.* 55, 56, *Dutch Edit.*

(2) Maimbourg, ibid. lib. iii, pag. 219, ad ann. 452.

(3) Idem, pag. 220.

‘ ans, ſeemed utterly impoſſible, to forſake it, and fly, and ſeek a ſanctuary ſomewhere elſe, was the laſt diſgrace to an emperor, who ought rather to die honourably, than live after ſo ſhameful a piece of cowardice. What then muſt be done? A medium was found between theſe two extreams, which was, to ſend an honourable embaſſy to Attila, to obtain peace of him, upon any tolerable conditions. This being reſolved on, it was thought that no one could better acquit himſelf of that employment, than the holy Pope Leo, to whom the ſtrength of his parts, his conſummate prudence, his addreſs, virtue, learning, and eloquence, joined with the dignity of ſovereign Pontiff, which rendered him venerable to all the world, had acquired the reputation of being univerſally acknowledged the greateſt man of his time. The emperor therefore conjured him to accept this employment, which he moſt willingly did to ſave the capital city of the empire, and the holy ſee, from the invaſion of the Barbarians. To honour the embaſſy, and the Pope, at the head of it, he had for his aſſiſtants two of the greateſt men of the empire, Avienus and Trigetius, one of which had been conſul, and the other prefect of Rome. Some ſenators were added to them, among whom was the father of Caſſiodorus, who, carried away by a filial affection in one of his epiſtles †, where he ſpeaks like an Orator, in making the encomium of his father, aſcribes to him all the honour, and effect of this important embaſſy. But in his chronicle, where he ſpeaks like an Hiſtorian, he unſays it again, and gives the whole glory to St Leo, as all other authors before him do (4).’ Attila gave a favourable reception to this embaſſy (5), ‘ in the neighbourhood of Mantua, not far from the place where the river Mincio diſcharges itſelf into the Po (6): and as ſavage as this prince was, he paid all kind of honours to the Pope. He favourably heard his ſpeech, which he ordered to be interpreted, and found it ſo fine and judicious, ſo forcible and moving; that this Attila, this ſcourge of God, this enemy of mankind, whoſe ſight alone ſtruck a terror into the moſt undaunted, and his very name made all the earth to tremble, was immediately ſoftened; of a ravening wolf, as he was before, he became gentle as a lamb, and immediately granted him the peace he deſired: and that without exacting any grievous conditions, promiſing inviolably to obſerve it on his part; after which turning his courſe, he marched back beyond the Danube, from whence he returned no more (7).’

[C] *The miracle whith is added to it, is a meer fable.*] If I alledged the authority of a Proteſtant writer, I ſhould ſtartle the tender minds of the Romiſh communion; wherefore I chooſe to cite a man who lived a long time among the Jeſuits, and is inclined to nothing leſs than favouring the Non-Catholics. His words are theſe (8).

‘ I know what is commonly ſaid to make the thing more wonderful, that Attila's captains aſking him the reaſon of his having honoured this Pope ſo far as to obey him in all his commands, this prince anſwered them trembling, that all the time Leo was ſpeaking, he ſaw a venerable old man ſtand by his ſide, who holding a naked ſword in his hand, threatened to kill him, unleſs he granted all that the Pope deſired. But I am obliged to ſay that one may diſpenſe with the believing any thing of it without being thought incredulous; indeed this viſion is not to be found in the Breviary of Paris, ſince our learned archbiſhop Francis de Harlay has reſtored it to it's genuine ſtate; having taken great care to retrench all that was apocryphal, or very uncertain in it; and to inſert for the leſſons, the fineſt pieces of the fathers, ſuch as are beſt ſuited to the ſubject, and to the feaſt which is celebrated. I ſhall boldly ſay then, that we may, without ſcruple, be of their opinion who do not give credit to this apparition: for antient authors, as Jornandes, Theophanes, Suidas, count Marcellinus, Caſſiodorus, Anaſtaſius, and others who have written of this embaſſy of St Leo, not to mention St Proſper who was then at Rome, and has related all the circumſtances of it, and St Leo himſelf who mentions it in one of his ſermons ⸸, ſay nothing of this viſion, which they would not have ſuppreſſed if it had been true. Very far from it; inſtead of attributing this condeſcenſion of Attila to the fear he had of this apparition, and this menacing ſword, they unanimouſly agree that it was an effect of the majeſtic preſence, and perſuaſive eloquence of St Leo, which ſoftened and ſubdued the heart of this Barbarian; and the holy Pope, who was far from glorying in it, declares it ought to be aſcribed, not to the influence of the ſtars, as ſome of the prophane would have it, but to the infinite mercy of God alone ‡ who ſuffered himſelf to be intreated by the interceſſion of his ſaints, and thereupon vouchſafed to ſoften and change the hearts of the Barbarians. Here is nothing in all this that intimates this viſion. That which has made it current of late, is it's being found in the hiſtory called Miſcella, which is falſely aſcribed to Paul the Deacon. But beſide that the antient editions of this compiler have it not, which ſhews it was added at pleaſure, without proof, or authority; beſide that this hiſtory contains many other palpable falſities, the apparition is mentioned in it only upon an uncertain report, in theſe terms *Ferunt poſt diſceſſum Pontificis interrogatum eſſe Attilam à ſuis*, &c. It is ſaid that after the departure of the Pope, Attila being aſked by his attendents, *&c.* I have reaſon therefore to ſay that we are at liberty to reject this viſion, and that we ought not to ſeek a further miracle in it, than what St Leo himſelf performed, in ſoftening and changing by his eloquence the heart of the moſt fierce and moſt formidable of all men; to ſuch a degree, that he obtained from him, on the ſpot, and without any conditions, a peace, and a promiſe to depart out of Italy. What is moſt remarkable herein, is, that this great man, who turned the hearts of theſe barbarous Infidels, with ſo much eaſe, ſhould be unable to do as much by his letters, with reſpect to Heretics.’ Theſe laſt words afford the hiſtorian a happy tranſition.

[*D*] *His eloquence had not the ſame ſucceſs with king Giſeric, nor yet was it wholly fruitleſs.*] The empreſs Eudoxia, Valentinian's widow, had been obliged to marry Maximus, who uſurped the throne after having cauſed Valentinian to be aſſaſſinated. This Maximus had the impudence to tell Eudoxia, that the paſſion he had to enjoy her, was the only motive which induced him to deſtroy the emperor. *Eudoxia, enraged at ſo villanous a declaration . . . . . ſent ſecretly one of her chief confidents to Carthage, to Giſeric king of the Vandals, who had made himſelf maſter of Africa, conjuring him by all the powerfulleſt motives ſhe could ſuggeſt, eſpecially by the eaſineſs of the enterprize, all being defenſeleſs at Rome as in full peace, to come with all expedition, and revenge the death of Valentinian, his ally, and deliver her from her oppreſſion under the tyranny of the moſt cruel, and villanous man alive* (9). *This Barbarian king, who had then in the port of Carthage a good naval force*, failed not to lay hold of the opportunity; he embarked his forces, and landed in Italy without the leaſt oppoſition; he advanced towards Rome, and had the pleaſure, *without ever drawing his ſword, to ſee the city ſurrender at diſcretion, all the gates being thrown open to him* (10). ‘ Then it was that St Leo ſeeing his poor flock expoſed to the fury of theſe wild beaſts, like the good ſhepherd who lays down his life for his ſheep, went forth and addreſſed himſelf to this Vandal and Arian king, whom he knew to be the mortal enemy of the Catholics, and eſpecially of the biſhops, on whom he had diſcharged all his fury in Africa, treating them with a barbarous cruelty, in a much more inhuman manner than any others. Nevertheleſs this cruel man, who was juſt ready to enter Rome, reſolved to deſtroy all with fire and ſword, ſtopped ſhort, at the ſight of this admirable Pontiff: and as if that auguſt and ſaint-like majeſty which ſhone in his face, had changed, all at once, the tyger's heart within him, into that of a reaſonable man, he paid him all the honour that was owing to the head of the church. He patiently heard all he had to ſay; and if his eloquence did not then work the ſame miracle that it wrought before upon Attila, in cauſing him to return from whence he came, yet it performed three others of a very remarkable nature. For it was ſo perſuaſive as to obtain a promiſe, that neither the inhabitants ſhould be put to the ſword, their houſes fired, nor the three principal churches prophaned, to wit the Conſtantian, that of St Peter

‘ in

---

† Variar. lib. i, Ep. iv.

(4) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, pag. 221.

(5) Tota legatione dignanter accepta, ita ſummi Sacerdotis præſentia Rex gaviſus eſt, ut bello abſtineri præciperet. *Proſper, in Chron. à Duchenio vulgato, apud Maimb. ibid. pag.* 223.

(6) Maimbourg, ibid.

(7) Ib. pag. 224.

(8) Id. ibid.

⸸ Serm. in Octa. Apoſtol.

‡ Quorum precibus divinæ cenſuræ flexa ſententia eſt. Non ſicut opinantur impii ſtellarum affectibus, ſed ineffabili Dei omnipotentis miſericordiæ deputantes, qui corda furentium Barbarorum mitigare dignatus eſt. *Miſcell. lib.* xv.

(9) Maimbourg, ibid. lib. iv, pag. 246, ad ann. 455.

(10) Id. ibid. pag. 247.

it wholly fruitleſs [*D*]. They who ſay he cut off his own hand [*E*], on having felt ſome irregular motions whilſt a woman kiſſed it, and add that he recovered it by the ardency of his prayers, vent two falſities. The beſt edition of his works is that of Father Queſnel (*a*). Some of the books aſcribed to him in that edition, are attributed by other authors to St Proſper [*F*]. A learned diſpute has been ſtarted upon this matter. A famous miniſter has a little embaraſſed himſelf by placing the Epocha of Antichriſt in the pontificate of St Leo [*G*]. This Pope died in 461.

in the Vatican, and that of St Paul without the walls. He kept his word: and having given Rome to be plundered by his ſoldiers for fourteen days together, he returned in his ſhips laden with ſpoils, and with rich priſoners, to be ſet to ranſom; among whom was the empreſs Eudoxia, and the princeſſes Eudocia and Plæcidia, her two daughters, whom he treated perfectly like a generous man.’

[*E*] *Some ſay that he cut off his own hand,*] It is ſaid that a devout and handſome woman, was, according to cuſtom, admitted on Eaſter-day to kiſs this Pope's hand: he perceived I know not what emotions which ſavoured too much of fleſh and blood, and thought himſelf obliged to obey the precept of Jeſus Chriſt in the rigor of the letter. *If thy hand offend thee cut it off* (11). But being by this mutilation, rendered incapable of ſaying maſs any more, there aroſe a murmuring among the people, which made him earneſtly beg of God the reſtitution of his hand; it was granted him; and from that time, ſay they, the cuſtom of kiſſing the Pope's hand was changed into that of kiſſing his feet. Others ſay, that St Leo cut off his hand under the reproaches of his conſcience, for having conferred holy orders on an undeſerving perſon. ‘ Cùm autem ſanctus Leo eam ob cauſam ſacrificare deſiiſſet, idque in populo Romano murmur non leve excitaret, impetravit à Deo ardentiſſimis precibus, ut manus abſciſſa ſibi reſtitueretur. Ex eo tamen tempore, abolito uſu manibus Pontificis oſcula figendi, inductus eſt uſus figendi oſculum pedibus. Scribunt hæc de ſancto Leone varii, ac nominatim Sabellicus, l. 5. Andreas Eborenſis, tit. de Caſtitate, ac Majolus, lib. i. de irregularit. c. 14. n. 4. qui addit aliquos aſſerere, contigiſſe ut ſanctus Leo manum ſibi abſcinderet, actus ſancto erga ſe odio, ob male impoſitas alicui manus, & præcipitem indigni hominis initiationem (12). —— *But when St Leo ceaſed, upon that account, to perform ſacred functions, and the people of Rome began to murmur greatly at it, he obtained of God by the moſt ardent prayers, that his hand, which had been cut off, might be reſtored. From that time, the cuſtom of kiſſing the Pope's hands being aboliſhed, the practice of kiſſing his feet was introduced. Several authors give this account of St Leo; particularly Sabellicus, in his fifth book; Andreas Eborenſis in his ſection of Chaſtity; and Majolus in his firſt book concerning Irregularity, ch.* 14. *n.* 4. *who adds, that ſome aſſert, St Leo cut off his own hand, through an holy deteſtation of himſelf, for having raſhly conferred orders on an unworthy perſon.*’ The author from whom I take theſe words baniſhes this ſtory to the land of fables, and obſerves that the cuſtom of kiſſing the Pope's hand on Eaſter-day, has not been interrupted to either ſex: and as to the ſcruple about the ordination raſhly conferred, he gives this account of the origin of it (13): ‘ Quod ad eos attinet qui hanc narrationem referunt ad manus indigno appoſitas, videntur adducti ad hanc fabellam de ſancto Leone confingendam, ex lectione revelationis ex Moſcho deſcriptæ capite 149 Prati ſpiritualis. Quod ſcilicet ſancto Leone pro peccatis ſuis ferventer precato, apparuerit ei B. Petrus, dicens exoraſſe ſe ei omnium erratorum veniam, ſalva diſcuſſione peccatorum, ſi quæ fuiſſent ab eo admiſſa ob indignorum ordinationem. At aliud eſt quod hac revelatione continetur, aliud quod habet fabuloſa calumnia quam retulimus. —— *As for thoſe, who refer this narrative to his conferring orders on an unworthy perſon, they ſeem to have been led to this fiction concerning St Leo, by reading the revelation deſcribed out of Moſchus, in his* Spiritual Meadow, *ch.* 149. *To wit, that St Leo having prayed fervently for his ſins, St Peter appeared to him, telling him, that he had obtained for him pardon of all errors, except that of ordaining unworthy perſons. But the fabulous calumny, we have related, differs from what is contained in this revelation.*’

Some ſay that the hand which Leo cut off, to extinguiſh a laſcivious flame, *ut libidinis ignem reſtingueret* (14), was reſtored him by virtue of a picture of the holy virgin (15), and that this picture was of St Luke's painting. St Antonine and many others relate this, and yet Baronius can hardly believe it (16).

[*F*] *Some of the books aſcribed to him, are attributed by other authors to St Proſper.*] Father Queſnel pretends that the two books concerning the calling of the Gentiles; the letter to Demetriades, and the chapters concerning grace and free-will, are not St Proſper's, as is commonly believed, but St Leo's. See the book (17) intituled, *De veris Operibus SS. Patrum Leonis Magni & Proſperi Aquitani, Diſſertationes criticæ, quibus Capitula de Gratia, &c. Epiſtolam ad Demetriadem, nec non duos de Vocatione omnium Gentium libros Leoni nuper adſcriptos abjudicat, & Proſpero poſtliminio reſtituit Joſephus Antelmius, Presbyter, & Canonicus Eccleſiæ Forojulienſis.* The abbot Antelmi has ſtrongly oppoſed this pretenſion, and maintained that St Proſper is the true author of the ſermons which go under St Leo's name. What is obſervable in this diſpute, is, that both parties alledge the conformity of ſtile; one to prove that theſe works are St Leo's, the other, that they are not his but St Proſper's (18). The pains the abbot Antelmi has been at, on this occaſion, is very remarkable: he has made tables in two columns, in which he compares ſeveral paſſages of St Proſper, taken from the books which are confeſſedly his, with other paſſages out of thoſe which are diſputed, and ſhews a great conformity betwixt the reſpective places of one and the other. Theſe parallels, with regard to St Leo's ſermons, ſhew us *a way of ſpeaking ſo peculiar, expreſſions, and turns ſo ſtudied and ſo compoſed, that it ſeems impoſſible they ſhould be conceived but by one and the ſame perſon* (19). All this hinders not Mr du Pin's ſaying *that the abbot Anthelmi's ſyſtem upon the ſermons which bear the name of St Leo, ſeems to him chimerical, and that the proofs he brings are extreamly weak* (20). Nay Mr du Pin denies the conformity of ſtile, alledged by Mr Antelmi, and the conſequence he would draw from it. ‘ If ſome perſon would be at the pains of comparing the paſſages alledged by him, he muſt find that there is no conformity of ſtile betwixt the two authors, though we meet with the ſame words in both. And beſides, though there ſhould be ſome ſmall reſemblance of ſtile between St Proſper's writings and thoſe of St Leo, ſhould not we have more reaſon to ſay that St Proſper had imitated his maſter, whom he often heard diſcourſe, and preach, whoſe ſermons he had read, and perhaps copied to preſerve them *in ſcrinio Romanæ Eccleſiæ*, ſuppoſing he was notary of the church of Rome (21).’ Here is a fact which confirms ſome reflexions in the dialogues on the chimerical cabal (22).’ See the article ERASMUS (23), and that of JULIUS II (24).

[*G*] *A famous miniſter has a little embarraſſed himſelf, by placing the epocha of Antichriſt in the pontificate of St Leo.*] He is going to be driven much farther. ‘ According to him, idolatry in the days of St Leo was great enough in the church to make it an Antichriſtian church, and Leo himſelf Antichriſt, and yet the ſame miniſter had wrote the following words in his thirteenth letter of this year. *Whilſt Antichriſt was little, he did not deſtroy the eſſence of the church. Leo . . . . and ſome of his ſucceſſors were good men, as far as goodneſs and piety are conſiſtent with an exceſſive ambition. It is certain alſo, that in his time the church was engaged VERY FAR IN THE IDOLATRY of creature worſhip, which is one of the characters of Antichriſtianiſm: and though theſe evils were not yet extream, nor ſuch as might have* DAMNED *the perſon of Leo, who had otherwiſe good qualities; yet they were enough to begin Antichriſtianiſm.* You ſee then that a man is not damned though he be an idolater, and *not only an idolater, but even engaged very far in the idolatry of creature-worſhip.* If a man be not of the number of the ſaints, and tho' we muſt raſe St Leo

---

(*a*) *Printed at Paris in the year* 1675. *See the* Journal des Sçav. Febr. 17, 1676, *and Du Pin's* Bibliotheq. Tom. III, Part. II, pag. 164. Holland Edit.

(11) Fuerunt qui ſcriberent eum piæ mulieris ſpecie præſtantis, oſculo manui Pontificiæ religioſè admoto perculſum, muliere neque participe, neque conſcia, cœni aliquid contraxiſſe. *Theoph. Raynaud. Hoplothec. Sect. II, Serie III, cap. x, pag. m.* 361. Cum ipſo die Paſchatis, pro more recepto, mulierculam ad figendum manui ſuæ oſculum admiſiſſet, humanum quippiam paſſus, manus illius abſciſſione ſe multavit: ſecutus illam Chriſti vocem. *Si manus tua ſcandalizat te, abſcinde eam.* Id. ib. Serie III, cap xx, pag. 409.

(12) Id. pag. 409.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Paulus de Angelis, ubi infra.

(15) Paulus de Angelis, in Deſcript. Baſilicæ S. Mariæ Majoris de urbe apud Daniel. Papebroch. Reſp. ad exhib. Error. pag. 14.

(16) Papebroch. ibid.

(17) Printed at Paris, in 4to, in 1689.

(18) *See the* Journal des Sçav. 1689, pag. 290, 204, 301, 321. Dutch Edit.

(19) Ibid. pag. 321.

(20) Du Pin, Biblioth. Tom. III, Part. II, pag. 157.

(21) Id. ibid. pag. 158.

(22) Pag. 100, and the following.

(23) In the remark [*Y*].

(24) In the remark [*N*].

out of this catalogue, he may at leaſt be of the number of good men; and the ſin of idolatry is not ſo extreme as that he ſhall forfeit ſalvation by it. Let us urge this matter farther. We have proved in the book of Variations and elſewhere †, from the expreſs words of St John ‡, that the beaſt and Antichriſt have blaſphemed and been idolatrous from their birth, and during the whole courſe of the 1260 days of their continuance. The miniſter would fain have diſſembled this, that he might not be obliged to charge theſe crimes on the times and perſon of St Leo, St Simplicius, St Gelaſius, and other holy Popes of the Vth century: but at laſt he is forced to ſpeak it out ‡. *It is certain,* ſays he, *that all the characters of the beaſt commenced from that time. The Gentiles or Pagans began in the days of Leo to trample the church of God under foot: for Paganiſm which is the worſhip of creatures entered into it. Then began the blaſphemy againſt God and his ſaints; for to take from God his true worſhip, to give it to the creature, is blaſpheming againſt God.* Thus you ſee Antichriſtian blaſphemy and idolatry eſtabliſhed under St Leo; he himſelf could not be exempt from it ſince he was the very Antichriſt; and indeed it is certain, that he honoured relics, and aſked the aſſiſtance of the prayers of the ſaints no leſs than others. Here then we find not only an idolater, but the head of the Antichriſtian idolatry in the number of the elect, and that idolatry hinders not ſalvation (25).’ As this is a diſpute between private perſons, and not a controverſy upon the general doctrines of two communions, I may be allowed to ſay that the perplexed author made the beſt choice he could in humane prudence; which was to be ſilent: he would not even ſeem to know that his confuſion had been expoſed to the eyes of the public.

† Var. XIII, n. 21. Apocal. *Advice to the Prot.* n. 27, 28, pag. 612, 613.

‡ Apoc. XI. 3. XII. 6. 14. XIII. 5. 6.

‡ Lett. XIII, pag. 99. 2. c.

(25) The biſhop of Meaux's third Advice to the Proteſtants upon the Letters of the miniſter Jurieu againſt the Hiſtory of Variations, p. 86. Edit. Holland.

LEO X, elected Pope the eleventh of March 1513, was called John de Medicis. He had been honoured with a cardinal's hat at fourteen years of age by Pope Innocent VIII, and a long time after, with the dignity of legate by Pope Julius II. He diſcharged the functions of it in the army which was beaten by the French near Ravenna in the year 1512. Here he was taken priſoner; and during his confinement he made a wonderful experiment of the force of ſuperſtition, even over the minds of common ſoldiers [*A*]. It is thought that nothing contributed more to his elevation to the Popedom, than the wounds he had received in the combats of Venus [*B*]. His expences were exceſſive on the day of his coronation [*C*]; and he led a life little ſuitable

[*A*] *He made a wonderful experiment of the force of ſuperſtition, even over the minds of ſoldiers.*] The ſoldiers who had vanquiſhed him expreſſed ſo great a veneration for him, that they humbly begged pardon for their victory, beſeeched him to give them abſolution, and promiſed never to bear arms more againſt the Pope. This I learn from cardinal Palavicino after his having obſerved, that, in contempt of the royal authority, the Milaneſe looked upon the cardinals of the aſſembly of Piſa with averſion. *In Milano con vilipenſione dell' autorità Reale furon ricevuti non come Cardinali, Grado riveritiſſimo nella Chriſtianità, mà come huomini peſtiferi e ſcelerati, e comete di ſciagura ne' paeſi dove giugneſſero. Anzi, non oſtante che i Franceſi riportaſſono la memorabil vittoria di Ravenna, e conduceſſero prigione à Milano il Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici Legato dell' Eſercito pontificio, che poi aſſunto al Pontificato preſe il nome di Leon Decimo; non ſi tennero i ſoldati vincitori dall' andare con incredibil frequenza à venerar come Legato del Vicario di Chriſto il lor prigioniero; ricevendone l' aſſoluzione ch'egli havea podeſtà di dar loro per haver combattuto contro alla Chieſa, con promeſſione d'aſtenerſene per innanzi* (1).

[*B*] *Nothing contributed more to his elevation to the Popedom, than the wounds he had received in the combats of Venus.*] I have ſo often given the reaſon why I chooſe rather to cite Catholic than Proteſtant writers on ſuch occaſions, that without further preamble, I ſhall here produce the words of a French hiſtorian, and a bitter enemy to the Proteſtants (2). ‘Three months had not paſſed ſince the return of cardinal de Medicis to Florence, when the death of Pope Julius II, obliged him to leave that town and go to Rome. He was carried in a horſe litter by reaſon of an impoſthume in thoſe parts, which modeſty will not allow us to name, and travelled ſo ſlowly, that the Pope's obſequies were over, and the conclave ſitting, when he arrived there, ... (3). The conclave had not ended ſo ſoon as it did, the young and old cardinals perſiſting in contrary opinions with equal obſtinacy, if an odd accident had not brought them to agree. The cardinal de Medicis being extreamly hurried by the number of viſits he made every night to the cardinals of his faction, his ulcer broke and the matter which came from it, ſent forth ſuch a ſtench, that all the cells which were ſeparated only by ſlight partitions, were perfectly poiſoned by it. The old cardinals, whoſe conſtitutions were leſs capable of bearing the malignancy of a corrupted air, conſulted the Phyſicians of the conclave, to know what they ſhould do; theſe Phyſicians who had ſeen cardinal de Medicis, and judged of his ſtate more by the ill humours which flowed from his body, than by that ſtrength of nature which drove them out, anſwered, being firſt gained by the promiſes of Bibiana, that cardinal de Medicis had not a month to live. Their paſſing this ſentence of death upon him was the cauſe of his being choſen Pope, the old cardinals who thought to out-wit the young, agreeing to give them a ſatisfaction, which could not as they preſumed, laſt very long. They waited upon them and let them know, that they at laſt yielded to their obſtinacy, on condition they would remember to do the like for them another time. Thus cardinal de Medicis was elected Pope, upon a falſe information, being not full thirty ſix years old; and as joy is one of the moſt ſovereign remedies, he ſoon recovered ſo perfect a ſtate of health, that the old cardinals had occaſion to repent of their being over credulous.’ Not to conceal any thing, I am obliged to acquaint my reader, that Paul Jovius does not place this ulcer in the place where Varillas does; but in the fundament (4) which would not ſuppoſe a diſgraceful cauſe: and with the ſame ſincerity I add, that this Pope aſcended the throne with a great reputation of chaſtity, if we believe Guicciardin (5), and was reckoned very continent from his youth, if we credit Paul Jovius. ‘Conſtat tamen eum, quod à primâ adoleſcentia opinione omnium ſummam continentiæ laudem fuiſſet adeptus, non importuna quædam pudicitiæ, caſtitatique præſidia quæſiviſſe; quando nequaquam priſtinæ vitæ more tam multis delicatiſque obſoniis uteretur (6). —— *It is certain however, that having gained a great reputation for continency from his youth, he ſought out no very troubleſome guardians of his chaſtity and modeſty; ſince he did not eat ſo luxuriouſly, as formerly.*’ Whence we muſt conclude that the Papal dignity was that which ruined Leo the tenth's good morals: he grew vicious when he ſhould have grown virtuous; and laſtly, I obſerve, that the ſenſe in which I alledge Varillas's words, and which Mr Seckendorf gives them (7) is gathered only from conſequences, and ſuch as do not neceſſarily follow from them.

[*C*] *His expences were exceſſive on the day of his coronation.*] He would be crowned upon the ſame day on which he loſt the battle of Ravenna, and his liberty, the year before, and rode the ſame Turkiſh horſe which he rode on the day of that battle; he ranſomed him from the French; and as he loved him mightily, he had him very carefully kept, and pampered to an extream old age. *Vectus eſt etiam in pompa illo eodem equo Thracio in quo ad Ravennam captus fuerat, quem ab hoſtibus pecunia redemptum ita adamavit, ut poſtea uſque ad extremam ſenectutem ſumma cum indulgentia alendum curarit* (8). And as his head was filled with the magnificences of antient Rome, and the triumphal days of the antient conſuls, he endeavoured to revive thoſe fine ſhews, and was ſo

(1) Palavic. Iſtoria del Concilio di Trento, lib. i, cap. i, n. 2, pag. m. 47. *See alſo Paulus Jovius*, in Vita Leonis X, lib. ii, pag. m. 110.

(2) Varillas, Anecdotes of Florence, lib. vi, pag. 253.

(3) Id. ibid. pag. 257.

(4) Propter innatum ab ima ſede abſceſſum Romam modicis itineribus ad comitia contendit. *Jovius, in Vita Leonis X, lib. iii, pag.* 126. Fuere qui exiſtimarent vel ob id ſeniores ad ferenda ſuffragia facilius acceſſiſſe, quod pridie diſrupto eo abſceſſu qui ſedem occuparat, tanto fœtore exprofluente ſanie totum comitium impleviſſet, ut tanquam à morifera tabe infectus, non diu ſupervicturus eſſe vel medicorum teſtimonio crederetur. *Id. ibid. pag,* 128.

(5) See the remark [*O*].

(6) Jovius, ibid. pag. 193.

(7) Hiſtor. Lutheran. lib. i, pag. 190, col. i, n. 3, & col. 2, litera E.

(8) Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 129, 130.

table to a ſucceſſor of the apoſtles, and perfectly voluptuous [*D*]. He took too much pleaſure in hunting. It is ſaid his eye at this ſport, was ſurprizingly quick [*E*]. As he

well ſerved in this deſign, that ſince the irruption of the Goths, there never was ſeen in Rome any thing more magnificent than his coronation. See the deſcription of it in Paul Jovius (9). He agrees with Guicciardin (10), that the expence of it amounted to an hundred thouſand ducats. Father Gretſer cenſures Mr du Pleſſis for ſaying it coſt a million, *nec mitius agit Pleſſæus cum Leone X. quem* die coronationis ſuæ decies centena aureorum millia, *hoc eſt ut vulgo loquimur* millionem *conſumpſiſſe ſcribit* (11). This is found in the Latin edition which Father Gretſer made uſe of. But in the French edition which I uſe, Mr du Pleſſis Mornai mentions only the hundred thouſand ducats of Guicciardin.

[*D*] *He led a life . . . . . . wholly voluptuous.*] Paul Jovius cannot be accuſed of being too ſparing of his incenſe to Leo X; but on the other hand, it muſt be owned, he explains himſelf clearly enough upon the vices of this Pope, not to leave an intelligent reader in ſuſpence: The pleaſures, ſays he, into which he too frequently plunged himſelf, and the leud actions objected to him, tarniſhed the luſtre of his virtues. He adds, that a temper more eaſy and complaiſant, than vicious, caſt him into this precipice, having about him ſuch people, as inſtead of admoniſhing him of his duty, only talked to him of diverſions. The original is more nervous than the abſtract I give of it and therefore I ſhall deliver it in Paul Jovius's words. ‘Has præclaras liberalis excelſique animi virtutes, cum nimia ſæpe vita luxuria, tum objectæ libidines obſcurabant: ita tamen, ut jucunditate blandæ faciliſque naturæ potius, ac regia quadam licentia, quàm certo depravati animi judicio in ea vitia prolabi videretur, quum frequenti blandientium turba cubiculi fores obſeſſæ paucos admitterent, qui alioqui docilis verecundique hominis ſolutos mores cohiberent, amicorum optimis ad ea conniventibus, ac libenter ſeſe illecebrarum miniſtris immiſcentibus, ne gratiam apud ſummos principes in lubrico poſitam in diſcrimen adducerent, ſi ingratum auribus potentium reprehenſionis officium honeſtatis atque benevolentiæ ſpecie ſuſcepiſſent. Verùm hominem hilaritati humaniſque ſenſibus facile ſervientem mirum in modum incitabant plerique Cardinales opibus ætateque florentes, qui illuſtri loco nati, ac liberaliter educati, regio luxu vitam in venationibus, conviviis, atque ſpectaculis libentiſſimè traducebant (12).’ A little after he owns, that this Pope was charged with the crime of Sodomy (13): ‘Non caruit etiam infamia quòd parum honeſtè nonnullos è cubiculariis (erant enim è tota Italia nobiliſſimi) adamare, & cum his tenerius atque liberè jocari videretur. Sed quis, vel optimus atque ſanctiſſimus princeps in hac maledicentiſſima aula lividorum aculeos vitavit? & quis ex adverſo tam malignè improbus ac invidiæ tabe conſumptus, ut vera demum poſſet objectare, noctium ſecreta ſcrutatus eſt? —— *He was reflected upon likewiſe for ſhamefully intriguing, and uſing great freedoms with the pages of his bed-chamber, who were the flower of all Italy. But what prince, tho' the beſt and moſt holy, ever eſcaped the ſting of envy in this cenſorious court? and who, on the other hand was ſo malicious, and envious, as to ſearch out what paſſed in the night, that he might have foundation for cenſure?*’ I omit what is told us of the luxury of his table, and the buffoonries acted at it. ‘Mire quoque favit Pogio ſeni, Pogii hiſtorici filio itemque Moro nobili à gulæ intemperantia, articularibus doloribus diſtorto, & Brandino equiti, Marianoque ſannioni cucullato facetiſſimis helluonibus, & in omni genere popinalium delitiarum eruditiſſimis . . . . . . Verum feſtiviſſimis eorum facetiis, ſalſiſque & perurbanis ſcommatibus magis quam ullis palati lenociniis oblectabatur (14).’ I have touched upon this in the article of HADRIAN VI (15), Leo the tenth's ſucceſſor, and reformer of his luxury, as we are going to ſee. ‘The other day the equerries, of the deceaſed Pope Leo, deputed one of their number, and ſent him to the Pope to ſpeak to him in behalf of them all: the Pope inquired how many they were in the retinue of Leo; he anſwered, an hundred. Adrian ſigning himſelf with the ſign of the croſs, as aſtoniſhed at ſuch a ſuperfluity, ſaid, that four were enough for him, but that he was content that twelve ſhould be placed upon the liſt, ſince ſo many were neceſſary to exceed the number of thoſe which the cardinals kept. In ſhort, it's the common opinion that this Pope will be a good husband, and caſh-keeper for the church, which is in truth very neceſſary, conſidering the prodigality of his predeceſſor.’ This is what we find in a letter of Jerome Negro written from Rome the firſt of September 1522, it is inſerted in Ruſcelli's collection, tranſlated by Belleforeſt.

[*E*] *It is ſaid his eye at hunting was ſurprizingly quick.*] This we ſhall ſpeak of after having taken notice of Leo the tenth's violent paſſion for hunting. He was wonderfully pleaſed with it; he underſtood and obſerved the laws of it much better than thoſe of the goſpel, and he could not bear any one ſhould diſturb his ſport; he had no mercy on thoſe, who through imprudence, or otherwiſe, occaſioned the eſcape of the game. He gave them all manner of ill language. He was ſo much out of humour when the chace did not ſucceed, that no body durſt then aſk him a favour; but tranſported with joy, if it ended luckily; and theſe were the favourable moments (16) for obtaining whatever was deſired of him. Paul Jovius relates this very elegantly. ‘Venationibus & aucupiis nobilioribus adeò perdite ſtudebat, ut ſpurciſſimas ſæpe tempeſtates inſalubreſque ventos, & frequentia manſionum ac itinerum incommoda obſtinatè contemneret . . . . (17) In venando autem ſicuti præcepta artis ad normam exactioris diſciplinæ patientiſſimè obſervare erat ſolitus, ita ſeveritatem aſperè admodum vir alioqui leniſſimus ſemper exercuit; in eos præſertim, qui petulanti diſcurſu aut vocibus temerè editis improviſa feris effugia præbuiſſent: ita ut claros ſæpe viros acerbiſſimis contumeliis oneraret. At ſi quando imperitia, vel fortuito errore hominum, aut feris ſubtiliore aliquo inſperatæ fugæ compendio ſervatis, vel iis denſo in nemore contumacius latentibus infeliciter venaretur, incredibile eſt quali vultus animique habitu dolorem iracundiamque præferret. Propterea amici familiares ea temporis momenta provocandæ liberalitati maxime adverſa ſedulo devitabant: quando aliàs ſecundum opimam venationem, ac præſertim vario ac inſigni labore aliquo nobilem, maxima beneficia incredibili benignitate collocaret (18). —— *He was ſo fond of hunting and fowling, that he obſtinately deſpiſed the fouleſt ſtorms, unwholeſome winds, and all the inconveniences of journeying . . . . But in hunting, as he was moſt exact in obſerving the rules of the art, ſo he exerciſed the greateſt ſeverity, tho' otherwiſe of the mildeſt diſpoſition, eſpecially towards thoſe, who, by their raſh noiſe and clamour, gave the game an opportunity to eſcape; inſomuch that he often bitterly chid men of diſtinction. But if it happened, either thro' unskilifullneſs, or miſtake, or that the game unexpectedly made it's eſcape, or could not be rouzed, that he was unſucceſsful in hunting, it is incredible what grief and anger he diſcovered in his countenance and temper. Therefore his intimates never asked any favours of him at that unlucky time: whereas, when his hunting was ſucceſsful, or remarkable for the variety and uncommonneſs of the toil, he beſtowed the greateſt favours with incredible liberality.*’

As to his ſight, here is a paſſage which I take from a book of the Sieur des Accords (19). ‘Pope Leo having cauſed theſe numeral letters to be written, to ſignify the year of his Pontificate, they were thus interpreted, M CCCC LX. *Multi Cardinales cæci crearunt cæcum Leonem decimum.* Now I muſt ſay, by the way, that I do not know why he ſhould be called blind ſince by the help of glaſſes he could ſee hawks, vultures, and eagles, at the higheſt ſoar; but on the other hand, whenever he read, he clapped the paper to his noſe, and even then could hardly diſtinguiſh a letter; as Lucius Gauricus informs us, in his *Schematibus Celeſtibus.* Which puts me in mind of a certain honeſt curate who cannot read the church books of the faireſt character, without ſpectacles, and yet ſhall diſtinguiſh the ſmalleſt dice, and is never to be put upon.’ Paul Jovius confirms this but in part; for he ſays, that Leo read the ſmalleſt print with great eaſe, when he

(9) Ubi ſupra.

(10) Guicciard. lib. xi, fol. m. 326, verſo.

(11) Gretſer. in Exam. Myſter. Pleſſæani, pag. 561, *citing page* 618, *of the Myſtery.*

(12) Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 188.

(13) Id. ibid. pag. 192.

(14) Id. ibid. pag. 191.

(15) Citat. (68).

(16) Molles aditus, & quæ molliſſima fandi Tempora. *Virgil. Æn. lib. iv, verſ.* 423, & 293.

(17) Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 196.

(18) Ibid. pag. 197.

(19) Des Accords, Bigarrures, cap xii, fol. m 105, verſo.

he had been taught by preceptors (a), who inſtructed him thoroughly in the *Belles Lettres*, he loved and protected men of wit and learning. He favoured the poets in a particular manner, and that without preſerving always the gravity which his character required [*F*]. This appeared on ſeveral occaſions, and even in the privileges he granted

he brought the paper near his eye. 'Subtrahebant magna ex parte oris ſuavitatem, obeſæ malæ & oculi extantes, convolutique & hebetes, verum ſi ad pupillam inſpicienda propius admoveret, ſupra fidem acutiſſimi: ſupplices enim libellos, vel minutiſſimis literis, & crebris ſyllabarum compendiis properanter exaratos celerrimè & diſtinctiſſimè lectitabat: admota autem criſtallo concava, oculorum aciem in venationibus & aucupiis adeò latè extendere erat ſolitus, ut non modo ſpaciis & finibus, ſed ipſa etiam diſcernendi felicitate cunctos anteiret (20). ——— *What took off greatly from the ſweetneſs of his countenance, was, his puffed cheeks, and his eyes, which were prominent, rowling, and dim, but moſt ſharp, when he brought any thing very near to the pupil: for he read very faſt and diſtinctly petitions written in the ſmalleſt characters, and with frequent abbreviations: and, by the uſe of a concave glaſs, he ſo extended, the ſight of his eyes, in hunting, that he excelled every one, not only in ſpace and bounds, but even in the happineſs of diſcerning.*' I have juſt conſulted Luke Gauric's book, that des Accords cites, and do not find he ſays, that Leo X. could not ſee when *he clapt the paper cloſe to his noſe.* Let us cite Gauric, and admire the impertinence of his attributing to the planets the different qualities of the right and left eye of this Pope. 'Sol cum ſtellis nebuloſis, oculi dextri aciem penitus hebetavit cum multis lineis tranſverſis. Luna in ſexta cœli ſtatione ſub Geminorum aſteriſmo ad Martis tetragonam radiationem defluens, oculi quoque ſiniſtri lucem impediebat, adeo quidem quod nec legere, neque aliquid intueri poterat abſque conſpicillo magno cryſtallino, non autem illius aciem prorſus deſiderabat, quoniam ſalutaris Stella Jovis, Lunam trigonica radiatione intuebatur, & ita literas lectitabat naſo proximiores & oculo, ſed cum illo vitreo ocello ſuſpiciebat Accipitres, Aquilas, Aſtures, altius volitantes, & longe melius quam alii venatores, ibatque ſæpius ad venationes Leporum, Caprearum ſilveſtrium, & Vulpium, illaſque optime conſpiciebat, quæ à canibus leporariis & moloſſis capiebantur (21). —— *The ſun, with nebulous ſtars, entirely dim'd the ſight of his right eye, with many tranſverſe lines. The moon, in the ſixth houſe, in Gemini, applying to the quartil of Mars, impaired likewiſe, the ſight of his left eye, inſomuch that he could read nothing without a large cryſtal glaſs; yet he did not wholly want the ſight of it, becauſe the ſalutary ſtar Jupiter was in trine to the moon; and thus he read letters by bringing them near his noſe and eyes; and, by the help of a cryſtal glaſs, he diſtinguiſhed hawks and eagles, in their higheſt flight, much better than other ſportſmen; beſides, he often hunted hares, goats, and foxes, and had a clear ſight of them, when caught by the hounds or maſtives.*'

[*F*] *He favoured the poets . . . . without preſerving the gravity which his character required.*] The pleaſures he allowed himſelf with them, ſometimes degenerated into buffoonry. Quernus, who had been ſolemnly crowned, and promoted to the honour of Poet Laureat, was little better than a merry-andrew. He uſed to come to Leo the tenth's dinner, and eat at the window, the morſels which were conveyed to him from hand to hand. They gave him the Popes wine plentifully, but upon condition, that he would make extempore verſes on the ſubjects that were given him. He was obliged at leaſt to furniſh a diſtich; and if he failed, or if his verſes were good for nothing he was condemned to drink a great deal of water with his wine (22). 'Fuit diu inter inſtrumenta eruditæ voluptatis longe gratiſſimus, quum cœnante Leone porrectis de manu ſemeſis obſoniis, ſtans in feneſtra veſceretur, & de principis lagena perpotando, ſubitaria carmina factitaret; ea demum lege, ut perſcripto argumento bina ſaltem carmina ad menſam, tributi nomine ſolverentur, & in pœnam ſterili vel inepto longe dilutiſſime foret perbibendum (23).' Sometimes alſo the Pope made extempore verſes with his arch-poet, which ſet all the company a laughing. What want of gravity was this! 'Ab hac autem opulentia hilarique ſagina, vehementem incidit in podagram; ſic ut belliſſimè ad riſum evenerit, quum de ſe canere juſſus, in hunc hexametrum erupiſſet;

Archipoëta facit verſus pro mille poëtis,

'Et demum hæſitaret, inexpectatus Princeps hoc pentametro perargute reſponderit;

Et pro mille aliis Archipoëta bibit.

'Tum verò aſtantibus obortus eſt riſus: & demum multo maximus, quum Quernus ſtupens & interritus, hoc tertium non inepte carmen induxiſſet:

Porrige, quod faciat mihi carmina docta Falernum.

'Idque Leo repente mutuatus à Virgilio, ſubdiderit,

Hoc etiam enervat, debilitatque pedes (24).

'—— *This high feeding brought on him a ſevere gout; during which he would be very merry with his Poet Laureat; who, being ordered to make verſes on himſelf, broke out into this line;*

The Laureat for a thouſand Poets writes;

'*and ſtopping ſhort, the Pope unexpectedly and wittily ſubjoined this line;*

And for a thouſand more the Laureat drinks.

'*Upon which the company laughed, and afterwards exceſſively, when Quernus undauntedly, and aptly enough, repeated this third line;*

Give me Falernian, to inſpire my muſe;

'*To which Leo, borrowing from Virgil, immediately added;*

This alſo weakens and unnerves the feet.

One day a Poet preſented him with ſome Latin verſes in rhime; the Pope, to divert himſelf, gave him no other recompence than an extempore flight, containing an equal number of verſes in the ſame rhymes. The Poet, vexed to ſee that Leo gave him nothing, returned the following diſtich:

Si tibi pro numeris numeros fortuna dediſſet,
Non eſſet capiti tanta corona tuo.

Had fortune thus thy verſe with verſe repaid,
The tripple crown had not adorn'd thy head.

Hereupon the Pope extended to him his uſual liberality (25). By this we may ſee, that he turned every thing to his diverſion. But here is a paſſage that clearly diſcovers the buffooning ſpirit, which then reigned in the Pope's palace. A man having ſomething to aſk of Leo X, and finding himſelf amuſed for ſeveral days with ungrateful delays, which made him deſpair of being introduced, bethought himſelf of this ſtratagem. He acquainted Leo's great chamberlain, that he had the admirableſt verſes to ſhew the Pope, that ever were made. The chamberlain, tranſported with joy, goes immediately to the Pope, and tells him, he had light on the very top of fools, and the fitteſt thing alive . . . . . to divert him. It was the way of Leo's courtiers, to find out ſuch as were half crazy, and compleat the diſorder of their brains, for the diverſion of the head of the church (26). But they were the cullies of the pretended Poet I ſpeak of. For when he was admitted to the Pope's preſence, he let him know the true reaſon which induced him to counterfeit a crack-brained Poet, and declared his real buſineſs. They who underſtand Latin, will read this with more ſatiſfaction, in the words of granted to Arioſto's poems (b). In a word, let us ſay, that ſcholars and buffooons, equally ſhared his friendſhip [*G*]. He had not the ſame reliſh for Theological ſtudies [*H*]. I will not vouch the ſtory which is told, viz. that he once ridiculed the whole Chriſtian doctrine as a mere fable [*I*]. He had the induſtry to ruine the council

---

(a) Among others, Peter Æginета, a Greek by birth, who explained Ariſtophanes at Bologna, and had taught him the Greek tongue. See the Letters of Langius, pag. m. 473.

(20) Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 211.

(21) Lucas Guaricus Geophonenſis, Epiſcopus Civitatenſis in tractatu Aſtrologico in quo agitur de præteritis multorum hominum accidentibus per proprias eorum geni turas ad unguem examinatis, fol. 18, verſo Edit. *Venetæ, apud Curtium Trojanum Navo*, 1552, *in* 4to.

(22) Jovius, in Elog. cap. lxxxii.

(23) Id. ibid. pag. 191.

(24) Ibid.

(25) Taken out of a book, intituled, *La Sage folie*, tranſlated from the Italian of Antonio Maria Spelta, Hiſtoriographer to the king of Spain, and printed at Rouën, 1635, Part. I, pag. 103, 104.

(26) *See* Paulus Jovius, in Vita Leonis X, lib. iv, pag. 189, 190, *where he ſpeaks of the Muſician Taraſcon, and the Poet Baraballus. See below, citat.* (58), *and the following* *.

of Nicius Erythræus. ‘Hoc hominum ridicule inſanientium, genere non minimum delectabatur Leo X. Pontifex Max. cujus Gnathones, quos circa ſe habebat, dabant operam ut eos, quibus levis mens eſſet, ad inſaniam adigerent, ſeque eos eſſe, qui non eſſent, arbitrarentur. In quo mirabiliter luſus eſt à quodam, cui petenti aditum conveniendi non dabat: qui cùm multos dies expectaſſet, atque omnes ad Pontificem allegationes difficiles, omnes aditus arduos intercluſoſque videret, ſeducto Pontificii cubiculi præfecto in aurem dixit, ſe eſſe poëtam, ſolum præter cæteros, qui ſua vellet carmina Pontifici tradere, quibus lectis obſtupeſceret, horreret, ad incredibilem admirationem efferretur. Quo ille audito, ventis atque avibus ocius advolavit in Leonis cubiculum, atque hilaritate lætitiaque redundans, Invenimus, inquit, perfectæ inſaniæ hominem, qui tibi voluptati maximæ erit. At ille ſine mora intromiſſus, ex illis ſe integumentis ſimulationis evolvit, cauſam, cur inſaniam ſimulaſſet, aperuit, negotium, quod volebat, expoſuit. Itaque ille deridiculo eos habuit, quibus ludendus tradebatur (27).’ Was it keeping the decorum of the Papacy to expedite a Bull ſo favourable to the poems of Arioſto? cardinal Hippolyto d'Eſt, to whom the Orlando Furioſo of this Poet was dedicated, judged very well of it, when he asked the author, *Meſſer Lodoïco dove Diavolo havete pigliato tante coionerie,* — *Where the devil could you find ſo many fooleries?* Leo X. was infinitely more debonaire to this author. ‘Almoſt at the ſame time that he thundered his anathema's againſt Martin Luther, he was not aſhamed to publiſh a Bull in favour of the prophane poems of Lewis Arioſto, threatening thoſe with excommunication who found fault with them, or hindred the profit of the Printer (28).’ We ſhall ſee elſewhere (29) that he was a great admirer of burleſque pieces.

[G] *Scholars and buffoons equally ſhared his friendſhip.*] The Hiſtorian, Peter Matthieu, having ſaid, that *Leo X loved buffoons, as much as the learnedſt men in Italy, and changed his humour from one extream to another* (30), alledges theſe words of Peter Aretin. ‘E beato colui che e pazzo e ne la pazzia ſua compiace ad altri e a ſe ſteſſo. Certamente Leone hebbe una natura da' ſtremo à eſtremo, e non ſaria opra da ogniuno il giudicare chi piu gli dilettaſſe, o la vertu de i dotti, o le ciancie de i buffoni, e di cio fa fede il ſuo haver dato à l'una e à l'altra ſpecie eſſaltando tanto queſti quanto quegli. ——— *He is happy who is a fool, and in his folly pleaſes both others and himſelf. Certainly Leo was, in extremes, and it would be a difficult matter to judge which pleaſed him beſt, the ſcience of the learned, or the jeſts of the buffoons, and this appears by his favour to theſe two ſorts of men, praiſing the one as much as the other.*’ Peter Matthieu, who ſo often cites the ſame Aretin, took much more pains than Mr Menage (31).

[H] *He had not the ſame reliſh for Theological ſtudies.*] Cardinal Palavicino could not deny it; he honeſtly confeſſes, that Leo X valued thoſe more, who underſtood Mythology, the antient Poets, and profane learning, than thoſe who underſtood Divinity, and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. His words, which are more frank, and have leſs of the biaſs than uſual, are theſe. ‘Gli oppone il Soave, ch'egli haveſſe maggior notizia di lettere profane che ſacre ed appartenenti alla religione: nel che io non gli contradico. Havendo Leone ricevuto da Dio un ingegno capaciſſimo e ſingolarmente ſtudioſo; ed appena uſcito dalla fanciullezza veggendoſi poſto nel ſupremo Senato della Chieſa; mancò al ſuo debito con traſcurar nella letteratura una parte non ſolamente la più nobile, mà la più proporzionata al ſuo Grado. E s'accrebbe tal mancamento quando in età di trentaſett'anni coſtituito Preſidente e Maeſtro della religione, non ſolo continuò di donarſi tutto alle curioſità degli ſtudii profani; mà nella Reggia della medeſima religione con maggior cura chiamò coloro à cui foſſer note le favole della Grecia e le delizie de' Poeti, che l'Iſtorie della Chieſa, e la dottrina de' Padri. Non laſciò ei veramente di rimunerar la Scholaſtica Theologia, onorandola con la Porpora in Tommaſo di Vio, in Egidio da Viterbo, e in Adriano Florenzio ſuo Succeſſore, e coll' ufficio di Maeſtro del Sacro Palazzo in Silveſtro da Prierio; le cui penne illuſtrarono immortalmente quella ſacra diſciplina. Mà nè co' Theologi uſò di converſare come co' Poeti: ne promoſſe l'erudizione ſacra come la profana; laſciando la Chieſa in quella ſcarſezza in cui la trovò di perſone che dopo l'infelice ignoranza di molti ſecoli rauvivaſſero la prima, come ſi rauvivava già la ſeconda (32). ——— *Father Paul objects, that he was better acquainted with prophane letters, than with ſacred or religious learning; which I do not deny. God had endowed Leo with a great genius, and a ſingular induſtry; and being yet but a youth, he ſaw himſelf placed in the ſupreme ſenate of the church, but he neglected that part of literature, not only the moſt noble, but moſt ſuitable, to his ſtation; and this neglect increaſed, when, at the age of thirty ſeven years, being appointed head and maſter of religion, he not only continued to give himſelf up to the curioſity of prophane ſtudies; but for the regulating of the ſaid religion, did rather call to him thoſe who were acquainted with the fables of Greece, and the delights of the Poets, than thoſe who knew the hiſtory of the church, and the doctrine of the Fathers. He nevertheleſs favoured ſcholaſtic Divinity, in honouring with the purple Tommaſo di Vio, Ægidio da Viterbo, and Adriano Florenzio, his ſucceſſor, and in appointing Silveſter da Prierio, maſter of the ſacred palace; who, by their writings, have acquired an immortal glory, in illuſtrating that ſacred ſcience. But he did not converſe with the Divines, as he did with the Poets; nor encouraged the ſacred erudition, as the prophane; leaving the church in the ſame want, he found her, of learned men, who, after the unhappy ignorance of many ages, ſhould revive the former as they did the latter.*’ It were to be wiſhed, that theſe two Hiſtorians always agreed ſo well.

[I] *He ridiculed the whole Chriſtian doctrine, as a meer fable* (§ α).] The tradition is, that ſecretary Bembo alledging ſomething from the goſpel, he anſwered him, it is well known of old, how profitable this fable of Jeſus Chriſt has been to us. *Quantum nobis noſtriſque ea de Chriſto fabula profuerit ſatis eſt omnibus ſeculis notum.* This ſtory is found in the *Myſtery of Iniquity* (33), and in abundance of other books: but ſtill without being ſupported by citations, or having any other foundation than the authority of Bale: ſo that three or four hundred authors, more or leſs, who have ſaid this, copying one another, ought to be reduced to Bale's ſingle teſtimony; a teſtimony manifeſtly exceptionable, ſince he wrote in open war againſt the Pope, and againſt the whole Romiſh church. No tribunal in the world would receive the depoſitions of ſuch a witneſs, ſwearing that he has ſeen or heard ſo and ſo, for when once the perſon appears to be his enemy againſt whom he depoſes, the challenges of the accuſed party are declared valid. Since books of controverſy then are pieces which the parties produce in a ſuit pleaded before the public, it is certain that the teſtimony of a Proteſtant diſputant, upon a fact which reflects upon the Pope, or the teſtimony of a Popiſh diſputant, on a fact reflecting on the Reformers, ought to be reckoned as nothing. The public, which is judge of the proceſs, ought to reject all theſe teſtimonies, and have no more regard to them, than to things which never happened. Private perſons are permitted, if once perſuaded of the probity of Bale, to believe what he affirms; but they ought to keep their perſuaſion to themſelves, and not produce it to public view, as a juridical proof againſt their adverſaries; which, in my opinion, is a thing not ſufficiently obſerved.

[(§ α) It was under the pontificate of Leo X, that Ulric de Hutten publiſhed his dialogue, intituled *Trias Romana.* Now ſee how he ſpeaks in that ingenious ſatire againſt the court of Rome: ‘Tria, VADISCUS ait, pauciſſimi Romæ credunt, animarum immortalitatem, communionem Sanctorum, & infernorum pœnas. ERNH. Perſuaſit. Exiſtimo enim, ſi animam crederent immortalem, utique eam excoleret quiſque ejuſque commodis inſerviret, nunc corporis volup-

‘tatem

(b) *See the remark* [*F*], *towards the end.*

(27) Janus Nicius Erythræus Pinacoth. II, cap. xxxiii, pag. 110.

(28) David Blondel's Examination of Pope Innocent the tenth's Bull, pag. 3.

(29) In the remark [*B*], of the article MACHIAVEL.

(30) Matthieu's Hiſtory of Henry IV, livr. vii, *Tom. II, pag. m.* 716.

(31) See, above, citat. (46), of the article ARETIN (PETER).

(32) Palavic. ubi ſupra, cap. ii, n. 2, pag. 50.

(33) Cardinal Bembo, ſecretary (*theſe two qualities do not well agree, Bembo was not a cardinal under Leo X*), quoting a paſſage out of the Goſpel to him, upon ſome occaſion, he was ſo preſumptuous as to tell him, what a deal of ſervice has this fable of Chriſt done us, and our whole college. *Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag.* 584.

council, which the emperor and the king of France had ſet up againſt Julius II, and he made the council of Lateran triumph; for he obtained of Lewis XII, all the ſubmiſſions he could deſire (*c*). He obtained of Francis I, a much more ſolid advantage by the concordat, concluded between them in the year 1515. This did not make him more favourable to France. He formed leagues againſt her, and took that affair ſo

‘ tatem in tantum ſectantur, ut animam premant modis omnibus. Illam verò beatorum communionem ſi quid facerent, etiam ejus participes eſſe vellent. Porrò de pœnis Infernorum vel verbum dicere inter præclaros hos Quirites pro anili eſt FABULA *.’ This may be the original of that ſtory. REM. CRIT.]

They tell another ſtory, which lies open to the ſame battery as the former. It is ſaid, that Leo hearing two men diſpute, one whereof denied, and the other affirmed, the immortality of the ſoul, pronounced, that the affirmative ſeemed true, but that the negative was more proper to give a man a chearful countenance. ‘ Leonis X. Papæ dictum refert *(Lutherus)* qui audita diſputatione in qua unus immortalitatem animæ defendebat, alter oppugnabat, dixerit, *tu quidem vera videris dicere, ſed adverſarii tui oratio facit bonum vultum*, id eſt lætiorem mentem (Ital. *buona cera*) ex Epicuri ſcilicet ſententia.’ Luther is the man who ſays this (34). We may, if we pleaſe, believe he ſpoke truth, but we ought not to alledge his teſtimony; he is a perſon at war with the Pope; he is an enemy perſecuted and anathematized; the judicial practice requires, that his teſtimony ſhould be rejected, and even his oath not admitted; he ought either to prove what he ſays, or ſay nothing. A famous profeſſor of Divinity at Zurich, relates this ſtory, upon the teſtimony of a book (35), as exceptionable as Luther himſelf. ‘ Qualis fuerit Leo . . . . conſtabit . . . . . ſi de ejus . . . . . . impietate & atheiſmo nonnihil attexuerimus. Ille ſcilicet ὁμόψηφος Joannis XXIV. animam in corporis domicilio ſic inſinuatam ſtatuentis, ut extra illum carcerem non duret; juſſit aliquando (uti *Recuſat. Synod. Trid. par.* 2. *cauſ.* 8. *pag.* 266. comprobatum videre eſt) perſonatos Philoſophos duos, ceu moriones ex adverſo ad menſam aſſiſtere; quos animi gratia de immortalitate animæ diſputantes audiret; alterum qui affirmaret, & qui impugnaret, alterum. Cumque finita diſputatione judicium in arbitrium Pontificis hi rejicerent; ille ſic definita ſententia controverſiam diremit: *Etſi tu*, inquit ad affirmantem, *pulchras & bonas rationes habeas; tamen ego ſententiam hujus*, negantis, *probo, ceu firmiorem, & quæ faciat bonum vultum* (36). —— *The character of Leo will appear, if I add ſomething concerning his impiety and atheiſm. This Pope, being of the ſame opinion with John XXIV, who laid it down, that the ſoul could not exiſt ſeparately from the body, gave orders one day (as may be ſeen in* Recuſat. Synod. Trid. par. 2. cauſ. 8. pag. 266.) *for two perſonated Philoſophers to ſtand oppoſite to each other, like buffoons, at a table, and to diſpute in his preſence concerning the immortality of the ſoul, the one to maintain it, the other to oppoſe it. The deciſion of the diſpute being referred to the Pope, he gave this ſentence,* Though you, *ſaid he to the affirmer*, have fine and good reaſons, yet I approve this man's (*the denyer's*) opinion, as the better grounded, and more plauſible.’ He afterwards relates the anſwer, that it is pretended he made Bembus; and as he well perceived that things of this nature want to be proved by the teſtimony of Catholic authors, ſee how he orders it; he alledges the nephew of the famous count of Mirandola. ‘ Et ne ab hæreticis hæc conficta clamitent οἱ ἐξ ἐναντίας, ejus rei αὐτόπτην & αὐτήκοον (37) teſtem damus, qui & ſcire debebat, & cauſam cur mentiretur non habebat, Johannis Pici, Mirandulani Comitis nepotem ex fratre minimè degenerem, qui in illo Piſani & Lateranenſis Conſilii conflictu, quæſtionem tractans, *utrùm Concilia vel Pontifices errare poſſint*, inter alia de Leone hoc loquens: *Meminimus*, inquit, *Pontificem creditum & adoratum, qui nullum Deum credens, omne infidelitatis* (ἀθεότητος) *culmen excederet: peſſimaque ejus opera in coëmendo Pontificatu, in omnigenis ſceleribus exercendis, id ipſum teſtabatur: ſed & peſſima quoque dicta confirmabant. Namque faſſum eum affirmabatur domeſticis quibuſdam, nullum ſe Deum aliquando, etiam dum Pontificiam Sedem teneret, crediſſe*, quæ ejus verba libro *de fide & ordine credendi, theorem.* 4. *pag.* 259, 260. *legere eſt* (38). —— *Aud that the adverſaries may not cry out, that theſe things are the fiction of Heretics, I give you an eye and ear-witneſs of the thing, who both ought to know, and had no reaſon to tell a lye; I mean the nephew of John Picus, count of Mirandola, who, in that conflict of the council of Piſa and Lateran, treating of the queſtion,* whether councils or Popes can err, *and, among other things, ſpeaking of Leo, ſays as follows:* I remember a Pope believed and adored, who himſelf not believing a God, went beyond the utmoſt pitch of Atheiſm: which not only his vile actions, ſuch as buying the Popedom, and being guilty of all manner of wickedneſs, but his very words, confirmed the truth of. For it was affirmed, that he confeſſed to ſome of his domeſtics, even while he ſate in the Papal chair, that he diſbelieved the exiſtence of God: *which words of his you may read in the book* de fide & ordine credendi, theorem. 4. pag. 259, 260.’ It will, perhaps, not be unacceptable to find here more at large, John Francis Picus's account. ‘ Treating alſo the queſtion, *whether councils or Popes may err*, which, from his own notion, may be eaſily decided, ſince he pre-ſuppoſes that they may ſwerve from the holy ſcriptures, he tells us that ſeveral councils have actually erred, ſeveral Popes fallen into Hereſy: it often happening, that he who was looked on as ſupream head of the church, either did not rightfully preſide, or was not capable of ſo doing: for, *ſays he*, I. Hiſtory informs us, that a woman was made Pope; and I remember, that in our age a learned man, approved in his morals, and dignified with honours in his order, pronounced, though not publickly, that he who was reckoned Pope, was not ſuch, becauſe he had exerciſed the Pope's office before he was elected by two parts in three of the cardinals, againſt the laws of the church, which decree, that ſuch a man, not only is not Pope, but is even abſolutely unqualified, and incapacitated for the office, as being under an anathema. II. We remember alſo another choſen and adored as Pope, who yet, in the opinion of many great men, neither was, nor could be ſo, becauſe he did not believe a God, and was arrived at the higheſt degree of Infidelity, which he teſtified by his moſt wicked actions, having bought the Popedom and exerciſed in it all manner of iniquity, and even confirmed it by his moſt deteſtable ſayings; for it was affirmed, that he confeſſed to ſome of his domeſtics, that at the very time he poſſeſſed the pontifical ſee, he did not believe a God. III. We have heard of another, who declared to one of his friends, when alive, that he did not believe the immortality of the ſoul; but being dead, he appeared to him, as he was awake, and declared, that he experienced an immortality, being condemned to eternal fire by the juſt judgment of God (39).’ Mr Du Pleſſis thought that the firſt of theſe three things related to Julius II, and the ſecond to Leo X. Coëffeteau (40) only anſwered, *that Du Pleſſis entering into the conſcience of all mankind*, had made this application *without proof or judgment*; but Gretſer anſwered better: he ſhewed that none of theſe three things concerned Leo X. Since John Francis Picus's book was printed in the pontificate of Julius II (41). Mr Rivet acquieſced in this cenſure: theſe are his words. ‘ As to the application made by our author to Julius II, and Leo X, of what he ſaid of ſome Popes, that many great men did not look upon them as ſuch, for the reaſons he gives, it matters not at bottom, to whom the packet is addreſſed, provided it is certain, that it is to the Popes, of one of which he ſays, that it was maintained, *he believed no God, that he was at the utmoſt degree of Infidelity, and even declared, that he did not believe a God.* If you will exempt Leo X (of whom poſſibly he might not have ſpoke, becauſe he dedicated his books to Julius, unleſs he enlarged them afterwards, as is uſually done) yet it cannot be denied as to Alexander VI.’ There was in him, ſays Guicciardin *, neither truth, nor faith, nor religion.

(*c*) See the article JULIUS II, remark [*G*].

* Paſquillor. Tomi duo Eleutherop. 1544, Tom, II, pag. 258.

(34) Comment. in cap. xix. Geneſeos, verſ. 13, fol. 132, apud Seckendorf. Hiſtor. Lutheran. lib. iii, pag. 676, col. 1.

(35) *Intituled*, Recuſatio Synodi Tridentinæ. *See the article* TUPPIUS.

(36) Heidegger. Hiſtor. Papatus, pag. 204, 205. *He may have found this very near word for word in the* Tuba Pacis, *of Bernegerus*, pag. 272, 273, Edit. 1624.

(37) And yet what Mr Heidegger advances, is not mentioned by the nephew of John Picus, as a thing which they ſaid a Pope had confeſſed. He does not ſay that he had heard it from the Pope himſelf.

(38) Heidegg. ubi ſupra, pag. 205.

(39) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 590.

(40) Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 1233.

(41) Intolerabilis porro & plane diabolica calumnia eſt, cum ſcribit Pleſſæus, ea quæ Theoremate quarto Joannis Franciſci continentur, de quodam Pontifice, qui domeſticis confeſſus fuerit, *nullum ſe Deum aliquando, etiam cum cathedram Pontificiam teneret, crediſſe*, ad Leonem X pertinere; nam Joannes Franciſcus Picus edidit Commentarium *de Fide & Ordine credendi* ante Leonis Pontificatum; inſcripſit enim Julio II. Quomodo igitur relatione illa ſeu hiſtoriæ ſeu fabellæ Leonem X denotare potuit? *Gretſer. in Examine Myſter. Pleſſ. pag.* 573.

* Hiſt. of Italy, book i.

ſo much to heart, that having received the news of the misfortunes of the French, he died, it is ſaid, of meer joy (*d*) [*K*]. Not but there are writers who affirm he was poiſoned. He did not always behave in a manner agreeable to the emperor Maximilian [*L*]. The ſordid traffic to which he reduced the diſtribution of indulgences [*M*], gave birth to Luther's Reformation, as every body knows. Some ſay, he ſpoke honourably of this reformer in the beginning [*N*]. I do not find, that Guicciardin

gion. This is what Mr Rivet ſays (42). Note, that Simony, or the purchaſing the Popedom, is not imputable to Leo X, if we believe Guicciardin (43).

If Mr Heidegger, who had ſo good a memory, had remembered this, he would not have believed, that John Francis Picus was a witneſs of the impieties of Leo X. His miſtake may and ought to ſerve for a leſſon to many others. Let us conclude, that the duty of a good judge permits not to give ſentence againſt this Pope, while we have no ſtronger depoſitions. We ſhall ſee in the other remarks (44), whether his apologiſts reaſon right.

[*K*] *Having received the news of the misfortunes of the French, he died, it is ſaid, of meer joy.*] ‘ Having rekindled the war between the emperor Charles and the king of France, in order to drive the French out of Italy, the news was brought him, at one of his country ſeats, called Maliagno, of the taking of Milan, and Parma from them, which gave him ſuch an exceſs of joy, that he was ſeized with a ſlight fever that very night, of which he died a few days after (45).’ Theſe are Mr Du Pleſſis's words. All Hiſtorians agree, that Leo X received this good news with a wonderful ſatisfaction, but I do not find many who ſay, that this pleaſure cauſed his death; and though they ſhould affirm it, I ſhould not believe it; for they who die of joy, die ſuddenly, oppreſſed, according to all appearance, by too great an effuſion of blood into the ventricles of the heart. If the firſt impreſſions of a violent joy be withſtood, as was done by the Pope, a man is better afterwards, inſtead of being ſeized with a dangerous fever when other reaſons do not occaſion it. John Creſpin's account ſeems much more probable, who ſuppoſes that Leo the tenth's death was ſudden, but not of that ſudden kind which is occaſioned by an exceſs of joy. ‘ Hearing that the French were beaten at Milan by the emperor's forces, and driven out of Italy, which indeed was not done without his help: as he was drinking and making merry, and wonderfully rejoiced at the news, it is ſaid that he ſuddenly gave up the Ghoſt, he who believed neither a heaven nor hell after this life (46).’ Sannazar's diſtich (47), alledged by this author, favours the ſuppoſition of ſudden death; but yet it is certain, that the diſtemper Leo died of, laſted ſome days (48). Famien Strada has given two relations of this Pope's death (49), one in Livy's ſtile, the other after the way of Tacitus. They are fine and well wrought.

I muſt here obſerve a blunder of Guicciardin's tranſlator. ‘ News came, *ſays he*, that Pope Leo died, the firſt day of December, a ſudden death. For having received in his Villa of Magliano, where he often went to divert himſelf, the news of the taking of Milan, he fell into ſuch an exceſſive joy, that that very night he was ſeized with a ſlight fever; and being carried to Rome the day after, though the Phyſicians at firſt made light of his diſtemper, he died within a few days, not without ſuſpicion of being poiſoned (as was ſaid) by Barnabas Maleſpina, his chamberlain, who was appointed to give him his drink (50).’ What an abſurdity is it to ſay almoſt in the ſame period, that a man died *a ſudden death*, and that he died of a ſmall fever, ſlighted at firſt by the Phyſicians. Guicciardin was not capable of ſuch a blunder, he did not ſay this death was ſudden (51), nor has he connected the Pope's great joy with the fever (52), as the cauſe with it's effect. This connexion is more than a poetical licence of the tranſlator. Note, by the way, what cloſe regard is to be had to the words of the original, when we would faithfully tranſlate.

[*L*] *He did not always behave in a manner agreeable to the emperor Maximilian.*] He had conceived good hopes of Leo X, but when he was informed of this Pope's correſpondence with the French, he ſaid, ‘ If this Pope had not deceived me, he would have been the only Pope, whoſe honeſty I ſhould have had reaſon to commend (53).’

[*M*] *The ſordid traffic to which he reduced the diſtribution of indulgences.*] They made of it a kind of monopoly, and indulgences were let out to farm; the commiſſioners appointed for the collection of the ſums, bought their commiſſions of the Pope, after which they ſtuck at no kind of exaction, and obſerved decorum ſo little, that the powers for releaſing ſouls out of Purgatory were played for in the taverns, as we are aſſured by Guicciardin, ‘ Haveva ſparſo per tutto il mondo, ſenza diſtintione di tempi e di luoghi, indulgentie ampliſſime, non ſolo per poter giovare conceſſe quelli, che ancora ſono nella vita preſente, ma con facultà di potere oltra queſto liberare l'anime de' defunti dalle pene del Purgatorio: lequali, perche era notorio che ſi concedevano ſolamente per eſtorquere danari da gli huomini; & eſſendo eſſercitate imprudentemente da Commiſſarii deputati a queſta eſattione, la più parte de' quali comperava dalla Corte la facultà di eſſercitare; haveva concitato in molti luoghi indignatione, e ſcandalo aſſai, e ſpecialmente nella Germania, dove a molti de' miniſtri era veduto vendere per poco prezzo, ò giocarſi ſu le taverne la facultà del liberare l'anime de' morti dal Purgatorio (54). —— *He has diſperſed all over the world, without any regard to time or place, indulgences, not only for this life, but to deliver the ſouls of the dead from the pains of Purgatory: which as it was notorious they were only granted to pick peoples pockets, and were levied by commiſſioners, who for the moſt part were appointed by the court of Rome, occaſioned in ſeveral places, great indignation and ſcandal, eſpecially in Germany, where they ſold them for a trifle, and the power of delivering a ſoul from Purgatory was played for at hazard in taverns.*’ The diſcontent of the people grew greater, when it was known to what uſe theſe ſums were deſigned: almoſt all the money that was raiſed by them in Germany, being converted to the uſe of the Pope's ſiſter.

[*N*] *Some ſay he ſpoke honourably of this great reformer in the beginning.*] This particular had hardly been known, if Colomiés had not mentioned it: Mr de Seckendorf (55) learnt it from him, being told by a counſellor of Spires, that it was to be found in Colomiés's *Opuſcula*, the paſſage is this. ‘ Mr Voſſius having told me that he remembered, he had read in Bandel's Tragical Hiſtories, an elogy given to Luther by Pope Leo X; I went immediately into his library, where turning over the hiſtories of this author, ſee what I found in the preface to the twenty fifth novel of the third part. Nel principio che la Setta Lutherana comincio à germogliare, eſſendo di brigata molti Gentilhuomini, ne l'hora del meriggio, in caſa del noſtro virtuoſo Signor L. Scipione Attellano, è di varie coſe raggionandoſi, furono alcuni che non poco biaſimarono Leone X Pontefice, che ne i principii non ſi metteſſe remedio, à l'hora che Frate Silveſtro Prierio, Maeſtro del ſacro Palazzo, gli moſtrò alcuni puncti d'hereſia che Fra Martino Lutero haveva ſparſo per l'opera, la quale de le Indulgentie haveva intitolata; percioche imprudentemente riſpoſe, che Fra Martino haveva un belliſſimo ingegno, e che coteſte erano invidie Frateſche. —— *When the Lutheran ſect began to appear, ſeveral gentlemen being in the houſe of our worthy Scipione Attellano, and diſcourſing about divers things, ſome of them very much blamed Pope Leo X, for not having taken timely care, when Silveſter Pierio maſter of the ſacred palace, ſhewed him ſome heretical doctrines which Frier Martin Luther had vented in his book concerning Indulgences; but indiſcreetly anſwered that Frier Martin had a fine genius, and that theſe ſurmiſes were monkiſh jealouſies.* Words which Sleidan would not have failed placing in the front of his hiſtory, if he had known them (56).’

(*d*) In the beginning of December 1521.

(42) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, Part. II, pag. 646.

(43) See the remark [*O*].

(44) In the remarks [*P*] and [*Q*].

(45) Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 590.

(46) John Creſpin, Etat de l'Egliſe, ad ann. 1521, pag. m. 516.

(47) Sacra ſub extrema ſi forte requiritis hora Cur Leo non poterat ſumere? vendiderat. —— *If you aſk, why Leo, at the hour of death, could not receive the ſacraments? He had ſold them.*

(48) *See* Paulus Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 209.

(49) Proluſ. Academic. II, lib. ii, pag. m. 247, & ſeq.

(50) *Homodey, tranſlation of Guicciardin*, lib. xiv, cap. xiv, fol. 143, ad ann. 1521.

(51) Mori di morte inaſpettata. - - - *He died unexpectedly.* Guicc. lib. xiv, fol. m. 415, verſo.

(52) Ricevutone incredibile piacere; ſoprapreſo la notte medeſima di picciola febbre, e fattoſi il giorno ſequente portare à Roma, &c. *Id. ibid.*

(53) Niſi me hic quoque Papa fefelliſſet, ille unicus eſſet cujus bonam fidem laudare poſſem. *See Seckendorf*, Hiſt. Lutheran. lib. i, pag. 43, col. 1. *See alſo Heidegger*, Hiſt Papatus, pag. 201.

(54) Guicciard. lib. xiii, fol. 395, verſo. *See Fra-Paolo*, lib. i.

(55) Hiſtor. Lutheran. lib i, pag. 40, col. 2. littera b.

(56) Colomiés, Recueil de Particularitez, pag. m. 111.

ciardin abuſes this Pope ſo much as Mr Varillas inſinuates [*O*]; but Paul Jovius's apology to me ſeems very weak [*P*]: It has given room to queſtion, whether he ought

[*O*] *I do not find that Guicciardin abuſes this Pope ſo much as Mr Varillas inſinuates.*] This author wrote a great many books againſt the houſe of Auſtria, which would have been printed perhaps, if Mr Colbert had not repreſented, after the Pyrenean treaty, that it would look ill to diſoblige the Spaniards by allowing the impreſſion of ſo many injurious volumes. We have ſeen the plan of this great work, in a book called *La Politique de la Maiſon d'Auſtriche* (*The Politics of the houſe of Auſtria*). The author ſets out by a kind of apology for the liberty he has taken in touching the vices of princes. ‘I only, *ſays he* (57), imitate the ſtile, and copy the reverſe of the picture, which Livy has given of Hannibal †, and I have even come ſo much ſhort of others in this point, that no perſon of what condition ſoever is found ſo ill treated in my book, as Pope Leo X is, in the elogy which Guicciardin has made of him ⸸, and for which he has no where been cenſured as I can find ‡.’ It is manifeſt this elogy of Leo X is here alledged as a very ſatirical piece, otherwiſe it would be abſurd to propoſe this inſtance. Now it is certain there is nothing in Guicciardin that anſwers this idea. The twelfth book cited by Mr Varillas is leſs to his purpoſe than the two following. It is in the thirteenth book, that we find the deſcription of the trade of indulgences, as we have ſeen above, and in the fourteenth the cenſure of this Pope's extravagant expences, and his inclination to the diverſions of Muſic and Farces (58). ‘Egli per natura dedito all'ocio, & a' piaceri, & hora per la troppa licenza, e grandezza alieno ſopra modo dalle facende, immerſo ad udire tutto'l giorno muſiche, facetie, e buffoni *, inclinato ancora troppo più che l'honeſta a piaceri; pareva doveſſe eſſere totalmente alieno dalle guerre. —— *He naturally loved an idle and voluptuous life, and now being exalted to that high ſtation he was averſe to affairs, the whole day being ſpent in hearing Muſic, jeſts, and buffoonries, and being exceſſively given to his pleaſures; it was thought he would be intirely averſe to the war.*’ Laſtly, we find in the ſame book a general judgment on the conduct of this Pope; it is mixed with praiſes and cenſures, and can neither be reckoned ſatirical, nor even diſreſpectful. Theſe are Guicciardin's words. ‘Principe nel quale erano degne di laude, e di vituperio molte coſe, e che ingannò aſſai l'eſpettatione, che quando fu aſſunto al Ponteficato s'haveva di lui; concioſia ch' e'riuſciſſe di maggior prudenza, ma di molto minore bonta di quello ch'era giudicato da tutti (59). —— *A prince who was endowed with ſeveral good and bad qualities, and deceived the expectation they had of him when he was raiſed to the Papal chair; for he ſhewed more wiſdom, but leſs goodneſs than was expected by the world.*’ When this hiſtorian ſpeaks of Leo the tenth's election, he does it in a manner very much to the glory of this Pope. He owns he was free from Simony, and all other evil ſuſpicions, and that the reputation of the elected cardinal, ſtood very well in point of morality. ‘Senti di queſta elettione quaſi tutta la Chriſtianità, grandiſſimo piacere, perſuadendoſi univerſalmente gli huomini che haveſſe a eſſere rariſſimo Pontefice, per la chiara memoria del valore paterno, e per la fama che riſonava per tutto della ſua liberalità, e benignità, ſtimato caſto e di perfetti coſtumi, e ſperandoſi che a eſſenpio del padre haveſſe a eſſere amatore de letterati, e di tutti gli ingegni illuſtri: laqnale eſpettatione accreſceva l'eſſere ſtata fatta l'elettione candidamente ſenza ſimonia, ò ſoſpetto di macula alcuna (60). —— *This election was exceedingly acceptable to almoſt all Chriſtendom, every body being perſuaded that he would prove an excellent Pope, from the illuſtrious memory of his father's valour, from the general opinion the world had of his liberality, humanity, chaſtity, and good morals, and hoping that in imitation of his father he would be a lover of the* literati, *and of all illuſtrious men: which expectation was increaſed, becauſe his election was made without Simony, or ſuſpicion of any unfair dealing.*’ See in the remark [*R*] the contradiction Varillas falls into.

[*P*] *Paul Jovius's apology to me ſeems trifling.*] The methods this author takes to juſtify Leo X, may be reduced to four. I. He pretends that it was not from a vicious nature, but a gentle, eaſy, and magnificent temper, that this Pope, beſet by a voluptuous crew, engaged a little too far in pleaſures (61). This is but a poor excuſe: there are a great many proſtitutes, who may be juſtified upon this principle. They are not naturally wicked, brutal, and cruel; a great ſtock of good-nature, eaſy temper, and complaiſance, makes them fall into the ſnare of the tempter. I ſhall by the way, obſerve, that Politian has ſaid wonders of Leo X. This he did in a letter he wrote to Pope Innocent VIII, when this youth was made a cardinal. ‘Ita natus & factus, ita altus atque educatus, ita denique eruditus atque inſtitutus hic eſt, ut nemini ſecundus ingenio, nec æqualibus induſtria, nec preceptoribus literatura, neque gravitate ſenibus conceſſerit. Nativa in eo probitas, & genuina: diligentia quoque parentis ita impenſe culta eſt, ut ex illius ore non modo non verbum dictu fœdius, ſed ne levius quidem unquam aut etiam licentius exciderit. Non actio, non geſtus, non inceſſus in illo notatus: non aliud poſtremo quod in deteriorem partem conſpiceretur. Sic in viridi ætate cana maturitas, ut qui loquentem ſenes audiant, proavitam in eo, nos paternam certe indolem agnoſcamus. Cultum pietatis & religionis pene etiam cum lacte nutricis exſuxit: etiam tum ab incunabilis ſacra meditatus officia (62). —— *This young man is ſo formed by nature and education, that, being inferior to none in genius, he neither yields to his equals in induſtry, nor his teachers in learning, nor old men in gravity. He is naturally honeſt; and ſo ſtrictly educated, that he never lets fall an immodeſt, or even a light, expreſſion. He does not diſtinguiſh himſelf by his action, geſture, or gait, or by any thing elſe that may give an ill impreſſion of him. Though a young man, his judgment is ſo mature, that even the old reſpect him as a father. He ſucked in piety and religion even with his nurſe's milk, preparing himſelf for the ſacred office even from his cradle.*’ Paul Jovius ſays in the ſecond place, that if Leo be compared with his predeceſſors, he will be found very chaſt. ‘Si aliqua ex parte eo nomine ſugillari inclyta virtus potuit, Leo certè cum ſuperiorum principum fama comparatus æſtimatione rectiſſima continentiæ laudem feret (63).’ This excuſe is no better than the former. III. He ſays, that this Pope having had a good reputation as to continence, precautioned himſelf afterwards againſt the attacks of impurity, by renouncing high food, and by regular faſtings. ‘Conſtat tamen eum, quod à prima adoleſcentia opinione omnium ſummam continentiæ laudem fuiſſet adeptus, non importuna quædam pudicitiæ caſtitatique præſidia quæſiviſſe: quando nequaquam priſtinæ vitæ more tam multis delicatiſque obſoniis uteretur: Itemque animo verè pudico die Mercurii carnes non edere, die autem Veneris nihil guſtare præter legumen & olera, ac die demum Saturni cœna penitus abſtinere, incorrupta lege inſtituiſſet (64). —— *It is certain however, that, having gained a great reputation for continency from his youth, he ſought out no very troubleſome guardians of his chaſtity and modeſty; ſince he did not eat ſo luxuriouſly as formerly: for on Wedneſdays he eat no fleſh, and on Fridays only pulſe and herbs, and on Saturdays faſted all day; and this way of life he religiouſly obſerved.*’ This is better than all the reſt. IV. Laſtly, he ſays, that we ought to make a great difference betwixt the vices, which belong to a ſovereign as ſuch, and thoſe which belong to him as a man. And he alledges the emperor Trajan ſo beloved of the Roman people, that it was the height of their wiſhes that the ſucceeding emperors ſhould reign as well as he; and yet no one was ignorant of the ſodomy and drunkenneſs of Trajan. His meaning is, that Leo the tenth's vices were not repugnant to the qualities of a good ſovereign, but to thoſe of a good Chriſtian only, and therefore the irregularities of his youth ought to be pardoned, ſince they did not hinder his being a good prince. ‘Alia principis, alia hominis eſſe vitia quis neſcit? hæc uni privata conditione quum noceant, etiam aliquibus fortaſſe proſunt; illa verò ab dira poteſtate, & luctum & calamitatem univerſis mortalibus apportant: idque veriſſimum eſſe conſtat præclaro quondam populi Romani teſtimonio, qui neminem ſibi principem Trajano meliorem exoptavit, ought to be reckoned an Atheiſt (*e*). The other apologiſts have not ſucceeded much better [Q]. There is no need of confuting Mr Varillas, but by himſelf. I ſhall produce

---

(57) Varillas, Politique de la Maiſon d'Autriche, chap. lxxii, lxxiv. Hague Edit. 1688.

† *In his twenty firſt book.*

⸸ *In the twelfth book of his Hiſtory.*

‡ *Not even by Beny.*

(58) Lib. xiv, fol. 398, verſo.

* Quali ſorte di buffonerie, e di facetie piaceſſero a Papa Leone; ſi può raccoglier dal l. 4. della vita di lui del Giovio: dove pone, che furon recitate Comedie ſi fece prefeſſion di fare impazzire huomini & altre piacevolezze tali: onde il Taraſcone ſi perſuaſe d'eſſere gran Muſico, il Baraballo fu laureato Poëta, e mandato ſu l'Elefante, & i Paraſiti furon ſommamente favoriti. - - - *What ſort of buffoonries beſt pleaſed Pope Leo, may be inferred from the fourth book of his Life, written by Paul Jovius: who ſays, that they acted plays and farces, made it their buſineſs to humour ſome ſelf-conceited men, to the higheſt extravagance; and did ſuch other pieces of pleaſantry; whereupon Taraſcone fancied himſelf a great Muſician, Baraballo was made Poet Laureat, and rode upon the elephant, and the Paraſites were in very great favour.*

(59) Guicciard. ibid. fol. 416.

(60) Idem, lib. xi, fol. 326.

(61) *See, above, the words of Paul Jovius, remark* [*D*], *citat.* (12).

(62) Politian, Epiſt. v, lib. viii.

(63) Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 192.

(64) Ibid. pag. 193.

'exoptavit, quanquam eum illicitæ libidinis ac ebrietatis cenſura notaſſet. Sed demus aliquid humanitati Leonis, uti in ſumma licentia fervidæ ætatis ac proſperæ valetudinis æſtum ægerrimè ſuſtinenti, poſtquam in magnis ſalutaribuſque virtutibus optimi atque benefici cognomentum facile meruerit (65).'

Generally ſpeaking, this author's maxim is true: it is very poſſible for a prince to be an honeſt man, and at the ſame time but a poor king; that is, a king, who cannot maintain the vigour of the laws, nor remedy the diſorders of the ſtate, On the other hand, it is very poſſible for a prince to be an ill obſerver of thoſe rules of morality, which preſcribe the duties of private perſons, and yet be a good king, that is, a king, who maintains order in his ſtate, and wiſely diſtributes puniſhments and rewards, without being burdenſome to his people, by impoſts, and pecuniary edicts. But it is very rare, that a voluptuous and prodigal prince, ſuch as Leo X was, is a good prince; to ſupply his expences, he muſt be burdenſome to his ſubjects, and commonly he diſtributes his favours, according to the humour of the miniſters of his pleaſures, and conſequently to unworthy perſons, whoſe evil adminiſtration he has not time to puniſh, being too much taken up with his pleaſures, to allow the functions of royalty that application which they demand. It were eaſy to ſhew, that Leo the tenth's ſubjects were ſufficiently loaded. Beſides, it is not conſidered, that Leo's principal dignity was of a ſacred and eccleſiaſtical nature. So that to know whether he diſcharged his duty, the great queſtion is not, whether he has done what his temporal dignity demanded, it being impoſſible to juſtify him, without ſhewing, that he diligently acquitted the duties of his other dignity, that is, obſerved the precepts of the Goſpel, and omitted nothing to recommend the practice of them to others. This was his principal function, and here his apologiſt is forced to forſake him. 'In his vero quæ rem divinam reſpicerent nequaquam ſecunda fama prægravari eſt viſus. Nam indulgentias vetera Pontificum ad parandam pecuniam inſtrumenta adeo plene atque affluenter provinciis dedit, ut fidem ſacroſanctæ poteſtatis elevare videretur (66). —— *As to divine matters, his character has ſuffered not a little: for he was ſo laviſh of indulgences (thoſe old inſtruments, by which the Popes get money) that he ſeems to have leſſened the credit of the holy authority.*'

A Reflexion on the uniting the ſpiritual and temporal authority in one perſon.

I muſt upon this occaſion ſay, that this blending the temporal with the eccleſiaſtical authority, in the ſame perſon, is generally the ruin of the evangelical ſpirit. This combination had place among the Pagans, and was not unſerviceable to the temporal good of religion.

Rex Anius Rex idem hominum Phœbique ſacerdos (67).

Anius, at once a king, and Phœbus' prieſt.

It has remarkably ſerved the ſame ends in Chriſtianity; but has produced an extreme corruption of manners. The eccleſiaſtical character ought to prevail, and be predominant, ſince the other dignity is only an acceſſory; and yet it is almoſt always ſwallowed up by it's colleague. The joining theſe two together, is like the joining a dead carcaſe to a living body; a fatal conjunction, where the dead communicates it's ſtench to the living body, and receives no vital influence from it.

Mortua quinetiam jungebat corpora vivis.
Componens manibuſque manus, atque oribus ora,
(Tormenti genus) & ſanie, tabeque fluentes
Complexu in miſero, longa ſic morte necabat (68).

The living to the dead the tyrant join'd,
With hands to hands, and mouth to mouth, confin'd,
There, ſmear'd with blood and putrid gore, to lie,
And in the dire embrace to groan, and die.

The world, the fleſh, the weak part draws after it the reſolutions, and the concluſions, juſt as in a ſyllogiſm, the weakeſt of the premiſes, is the rule of the conſequence (69). The author of the *Critique Génèrale* (70) mentioning the diſtinction, between a Pope ſpeaking *ex Cathedra*, and the ſame Pope, ſpeaking in another manner, has related the witty ſaying of a peaſant in the electorate of Cologne. I had a long time thought, that this witty ſaying was preſerved only by tradition, but I was miſtaken. It has been printed in grave books for above an age. Duaren has inſerted it in one of his books (71), and copied it from Fulgoſius (72). Here is the whole ſtory; it is true, that an elector of Cologne is not expreſsly named in it. 'There goes a pleaſant ſtory of a German husbandman, who being at work in his field, ſaw his biſhop paſs by, attended by a train more becoming a prince, than one who calls himſelf the ſucceſſor or deputy of an apoſtle; being highly ſcandalized at it, he could not forbear laughing, and laughed ſo loud, that the reverend gentleman would needs know the reaſon of it. The husbandman anſwered in his natural way, that is, as a true and plain perſon; I laugh when I think of St Peter and St Paul, and ſee you in ſuch an equipage. How is that, ſaid the biſhop? Do you aſk how, ſays the clown? Why they were ill adviſed to walk alone on foot throughout the world, when they were the heads of the Chriſtian church, and lieutenants of Jeſus Chriſt, the king of kings, and thou, who art only our biſhop, go ſo well mounted, and have ſuch warlike attendance, that thou reſembleſt more a prince, than a paſtor of the church. To this his reverence replied, but my friend, thou doſt not conſider, that I am both a count and a baron, as well as thy biſhop. At which the ruſtic laughed more than before; and the biſhop aſking him the reaſon of it, he anſwered, yea Sir, when the count and baron, which you ſay you are, ſhall be in hell, where will the biſhop be? This confounded the right reverend, who proceeded on his journey without anſwering a word (73).'

[Q] *The other apologiſts have not ſucceeded much better.*] Let us ſay a word or two concerning the manner that ſome authors have endeavoured to juſtify Leo X, with reſpect to irreligion. Coëffeteau (74) only alledges theſe words of Onuphrius Panvinius (75). Erat rerum divinarum diligens obſervator. - - - *He was a diligent obſerver of religious ceremonies.* Rivetus (76) replies, that there 'are many profane, and many Atheiſts, who exactly obſerve the ceremonies to conceal their impiety under theſe leaves, who amongſt friends ſay, they do it *ad morem, non ad rem, legibus juſtæ, non diis gratæ.* Sannazar, who makes him die without receiving the ſacraments, becauſe he had ſold them before, does not repreſent him ſuch as Onuphrius would paint him to us.' Note that Sannazar does not pretend, that Leo refuſed the ſacraments. If this Pope did not communicate, *&c.* on his death-bed, it was becauſe of his delirium. James Gretſer, beſides Panvinius's words, alledges Leo the tenth's Bull, againſt Luther. Bulla qua Leo Lutheri errores damnat immanem hanc Pſeudologiam perſpicuè redarguit (77). - - - - - *The Bull, by which Leo condemns the errors of Luther, plainly confutes this falſehood.* This is pitiful; for though this Pope had had no religion, he would however have followed the ordinary ſtile in his Bull, and have expreſſed great zeal againſt a Heretic, who diſputed with him an authority on which all his temporal happineſs depended. Palavicino (78), endeavouring to anſwer the reproach which Father Paul caſt upon this Pope, of having no regard for religion (79), does three things; he alledges 1. Politian's teſtimony (80); 2. The faſts of the Pope. 3. The majeſty and good grace, with which Leo celebrated maſs. The ſecond of theſe three, if the fact be really ſo, as Paul Jovius has related it (81), is in my opinion, a good proof of religion, when we well conſider the circumſtances. The firſt ſignifies nothing, for children to a certain age, are firmly perſuaded of the truth of the leſſons of their catechiſt, and raiſe no objections againſt them. If they become irreligious, it is when they are their own maſters, and corrupt themſelves by a bad converſation, or by a wrong way of philoſophizing. The laſt thing is rather a talent of the body

---

(*e*) Voëtius, Diſputat. Tom. I, pag. 204.

(65) Jovius, ibid. pag. 192, 193.

(66) Jovius, ibid. pag. 193.

(67) Virgil. Æn. lib. iii, ver. 80.

(68) Id. lib. viii, ver. 485.

(69) Concluſio ſequitur debiliorem partem - - - *The concluſion follows the weaker ſide.*

(70) Tom. II, pag. 161, *of the third edition.*

(71) De ſacris Eccleſ Miniſter. lib. i, cap. iv.

(72) Bapt. Fulgoſ. factor. & dictor. memorab. lib. vi, cap. ii, fol. m. 198.

(73) *Peter Viel, a doctor of the Sorbonne, in his treatiſe of Simony, chap. vi.*

(74) Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité pag. 1227.

(75) In Vita Leonis X.

(76) Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſt. d'Iniquité, Part. II, pag. 640.

(77) In Examine Myſt. Pleſſ̈ean, pag. 563.

(78) Iſtor. del Concilio, lib i, cap. ii.

(79) Sarebbe ſtato un perfetto Pontefice, ſe con queſte haveſſe congiunto qualche cognitione delle coſe della religione, & alquanto piu d'inclinatione alla pietà: dell' una & dell' altra delle quali non moſtrava haver gran cura. *Fra-Paolo, Iſtor. del Concilio, lib i, pag.* 5.

(80) See the remark [*P*], citat. (62).

(81) See the remark [*P*], citat. (64).

produce a long paſſage from his Anecdotes, containing in ſhort a pretty juſt character of Leo X [R], from whence I deſire my reader to fill up what is wanting in the body of this article. Mr Varillas is alſo miſtaken with reſpect to Paul Jovius [S].

Men of letters, of what religion or nation ſoever are bound to praiſe and bleſs the memory of this Pope, for the care he took to recover the manuſcripts of the antients; he ſpared neither pains nor coſt in ſearching for them, and procuring very good editions. I have two anecdote letters, which are a proof of this [T], and which the reader

body, than a ſign of the perſuaſion of the ſoul. Let us ſee what Paul Jovius ſays. ‘ Sacra confecit, ſingulaque ceremoniarum obivit munia ſingulari cum majeſtate, ut non falſo nemo ſuperiorum Pontificum eo auguſtius & decentius ſacrificaſſe diceretur (82). *He performed religious ceremonies with a majeſty and decency beyond any of the Popes his predeceſſors.*’ It is very probable, that Onuphrius means no more when he ſays, he was *rerum divinarum diligens obſervator, & ſacris ceremoniis deditus*. A proof of religion abſolutely equivocal.

[R] *I ſhall produce a long paſſage from his Anecdotes, containing in ſhort a pretty juſt character of Leo X.*] We find it in the preface of this book, and is as follows. ‘ Guicciardin . . . repreſents * this Pope as an accompliſhed model of modern policy, and the greateſt ſtateſman of his age. He ſets him above king Ferdinand the Catholic, and makes him triumph in his youth over all the artifices of this old uſurper. It is to him he attributes the ſecret of getting all his deſigns ſeconded by the councils of Spain, whether they would or no. After having eſtabliſhed theſe wonderful principles, there are no ſhining virtues, but what heighten the picture of Leo X. He forms at twelve years of age, when he was made cardinal, thoſe vaſt projects, which he executed afterwards, when he was exalted to the chair of St Peter. He negotiates with the ſtates of Venice to ſave the ruins of his houſe, which had not power to withſtand the fortune of our Charles VIII. He changed not his reſolution upon ſeeing his brother loſt in the paſſing of a river. He had no other thoughts than the educating the only ſon which this brother had left in the cradle; upon which he returns to Rome, where his intrigues recommended him to the favour of Pope Julius II, and occaſioned his being choſen legate in the army deſigned to drive the French out of Italy. He is taken priſoner at the battle of Ravenna, but makes his eſcape in an unlucky juncture for him, Julius happening juſt then to die: he enters into the conclave, where he takes ſuch advantage of the caprice of the young cardinals, who were obſtinately bent on making a Pope of their own age, that he procured their votes in favour of himſelf. He joins with the Spaniards, and manages their friendſhip, as long as it is uſeful towards re-eſtabliſhing his family in the principal functions of the magiſtracy of Florence; but as ſoon as fortune turns her back upon them, and he finds they are not inclined to ſee him uſurp the duchy of Urbino, and inveſt his nephew with it, he treats with the French upon that condition; he draws up the famous Concordat, in which he baffles the ſtratagems and long experience of the chancellor Du Prat; he careſſes Francis I, as long as that king is in a condition of doing him ſervice; but no ſooner obtains of him all he deſired, but he quits him to reconcile himſelf with Charles V. He projects a new league with him, to re-eſtabliſh the Sforza's in the duchy of Milan. He ſucceeds in it better than he expected, and conceives a joy on the news of his ſucceſs, which occaſioned his death.’

[S] *Mr Varillas is miſtaken with reſpect to Paul Jovius.*] This hiſtorian, if we believe Mr Varillas, has not ſo much written a hiſtory as an invective with reſpect to Leo X. ‘ Paul Jovius, *ſays he* (83), repreſents him as a violent man, who would carry every thing by main force. He aſcribes to him the ſame warlike humour, as his predeceſſor Julius II had; he makes him even before his exaltation conceive a diſdainful contempt for the reſt of the ſacred college, founded on an imaginary precedency of the houſe of Medicis, before all the reſt in Italy; he makes him carry on this contempt to all ſplendid actions, and even the moſt auguſt ceremonies. He takes him to be the ſource and ground of the obſtinate war againſt the duke of Urbino, and the other quarrels which happened through the whole courſe of his Pontificate. In a word, he will have vanity, but an haughty and ſhocking vanity to have been his ſtrongeſt paſſion. If you deſire to know how Paul Jovius came to penetrate ſo far into the ſoul of Pope Leo, as to be able to pronounce ſuch a deciſive judgment, he anſwers himſelf before-hand, that he had been the creature of this Pope; that it was he who made him quit the profeſſion of Phyſic, and the pretenſions to a chair at Padua, to engage in the eccleſiaſtical ſtate; who made him biſhop of Como, and choſe him for his confident and aſſiſtant, in the councils wherein the moſt important and ſecret reſolutions were taken; who engaged him to write the hiſtory of his time, who employed his good offices for him in France and Spain, that authentic pieces might be communicated to him, ſuch as were neceſſary for the perfecting his work; and who diſcovered himſelf to him without reſerve, in frequent and familiar converſations.’ Our preceeding remarks ſhew, that Paul Jovius does not conceal the faults of Leo X, but it is certain, that the vice of which Mr Varillas ſpeaks, is that of all others, which Paul Jovius the leaſt imputes to him; it is even true that he attributes to him the contrary virtue. ‘ Pontifex, *ſays he* (84), cujus mite ingenium facilemque naturam in ſpecimen cæterarum virtutum omnes illo tempore laudabant, clementius agendum ſibi . . . . exiſtimavit. —— *The Pope, whoſe mild temper and eaſy diſpoſition were at that time univerſally extolled, as a ſpecimen of his other virtues, thought he ought to ſhew a little clemency.*’ This author was never biſhop of Como; nor did he obtain the epiſcopal dignity from Leo X, but Clement VII (85). This intimate confidence, and admiſſion into the moſt ſecret councils, ſeems to me a romantic fiction, I have not found the leaſt footſteps of it in the writings of Paul Jovius.

[T] *I have two anecdote letters which are a proof of it.*] They were communicated to me by Mr de Seidel privy-counſellor to his Pruſſian majeſty; he has inherited a very fine library of his father's, and hath conſiderably increaſed it, eſpecially with ſcarce books, and manuſcripts; he brought ſeveral from Greece, in a journey he made thither, and he very well deſerves ſuch a treaſure; for he is a learned man, and takes a great deal of pleaſure in favouring the ſciences. The copy he was pleaſed to ſend me of theſe two letters of Leo X, is faithful and exact, he has the originals by him, written in Sadolet's own hand. I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that they have printed in the *Nova literaria Maris Baltici & Septentrionis* (86), for the month of November 1699, a letter written on a ſubject of the ſame nature to his Daniſh majeſty, by Leo X, the eighth of November 1517. Mine are as follow:

(82) Paul. Jov. in Vita Leonis X, lib. iv, pag. m. 212.

* In the twelve firſt articles of his hiſtory.

(83) Preface to the Anecdotes of Florence. He cites Paul Jovius in his book, and the particular elogy of Leo X. Two unexact citations; for the general hiſtory of Paul Jovius comprehends ſeveral books; and he has not wrote a particular elogy on this Pope; but the hiſtory of his Life.

(84) Jovius, Hiſtoriar. lib. xi, ſub fin. *See him alſo*, in Vita Leonis X, pag. m. 109.

(85) The thirteenth of January, 1528, according to Ughelli, *Ital. Sacra, Tom. VII, pag.* 744.

(86) Pag. 348.

reader will undoubtedly be glad to find here.

Venerabili Fatri Alberto Moguntin. & Magdeburgen. Archi-Epiſcopo, Adminiſtratori Halberſtaten. Principi Electori ac Germaniæ Primati.

LEO PP. X.

Venerabilis Frater, Salutem & Apoſtolicam benedictionem. Mittimus dilectum filium Joannem Heytmers de Zonvelben, Clericum Leodienſis diœceſeos, noſtrum & Apoſtolicæ ſedis Commiſſarium ad inclitas Nationes, Germaniæ, Daniæ, Suetiæ, Norvegiæ & Gothiæ, pro inquirendis dignis & antiquis libris qui temporum injuria periere, in qua re nec ſumptui nec impenſæ alicui parcimus, ſolum ut ſicut uſque a noſtri Pontificatus initio propoſuimus, quod altiſſimo tantum ſit honor & gloria viros quovis virtutum genere inſignitos præſertim literatos, quantum cum Deo poſſumus, foveamus, extollamus ac juvemus. Accepimus autem penes Fraternitatem Tuam, ſeu in locis ſub illius ditione poſitis eſſe ex dictis antiquis libris, præſertim Romanarum Hiſtoriarem non paucos qui nobis cordi non parum forent. Quare cum in animo nobis ſit tales libros, quotquot ad manus venire potuerint in lucem redire curare pro communi omnium literatorum utilitate, Fraternitatem Tuam ea demum qua poſſumus affectione hortamur, monemus & enixius in Domino obteſtamur, ut ſi rem gratam unquam facere animo proponit, vel eorundem librorum omnium exempla fideliter, & accurate ſcripta, vel quod magis exoptamus ipſoſmet libros antiquos ad nos tranſmittere quanto citius curet, illos ſtatim receptura, cum exſcripti hic fuerint juxta obligationem per Cameram noſtram apoſtolicam factam, ſeu quam dictus Joannes Comiſſarius noſter præſentium lator ad id mandatum ſufficiens habens nomine dictæ Cameræ denuo duxerit faciendam. Et quia dictus Joannes promiſit nobis ſe brevi daturum trigeſimum tertium librum Titi Livij de bello Macedonico, illi commiſimus ut eum ad manus Tuæ Fraternitatis daret, ut ipſe quam primum poſſet per fidum nuntium ad nos, vel dilecto Filio Philippo Beroaldo Bibliothecario Palatij noſtri Apoſtolici mittat. Quoniam vero eidem Joanni certam ſummam pecuniarum hic in urbe enumerari fecimus pro expenſis factis & fiendis, & certam quantitatem debemus, volumus, & ita Fraternitati Tuæ committimus & mandamus, ut poſtquam acceperit prædictum librum Titi Livii ipſi Joanni ſolvat ſeu ſolvi faciat centum quadraginta ſeptem ducatos auri de Camera ex pecuniis indulgentiarum conceſſarum per illius Provincias in favorem fabricæ Baſilicæ Principis Apoſtolorum de urbe; quam quidem pecuniarum ſummam in computis Tuæ Fraternitatis cum Camera Apoſtolica admittemus, prout in præſentia per præſentes admittimus & admitti mandamus. Juvet præterea eundem Joannem ſalvis conductibus litteris & auxiliis, & illi per Provincias ſuas aſſiſtat pro libris extrahendis, & pro illo etiam fide jubeat, ſi opus eſt, pro dictis libris intra certum tempus a nobis reſtituendis & ad ſua loca remittendis. Quod ſi Fraternitas Tua fecerit, ut omnino nobis perſuademus, & ingens nomen apud Viros literatos conſequetur, & nobis rem gratiſſimam faciet. Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum ſub annulo Piſcatoris die XXVI. Novembris M D XVII. Pontificatus noſtri anno quinto.

JA. SADOLETUS.

To our Venerable Brother, Albert, archbiſhop of Mentz and Magdeburg, adminiſtrator of Halberſtadt, electoral prince and primate of Germany.

LEO PP. X.

Venerable Brother, Health and Apoſtolical Benediction. We ſend our beloved ſon John Heytmers de Zonvelben, eccleſiaſtic of the dioceſe of Liege, commiſſary of the Apoſtolical ſee to the illuſtrious nations of Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Gothland, to ſearch for valuable and ancient books that have been loſt through the injury of time, in which buſineſs we ſpare no expence, only that, as we have determined from the very beginning of our Pontificate, ſolely with a deſign to promote the honour and glory of the moſt high, we may, by God's aſſiſtance, cheriſh, promote, and ſerve famous men of all ſorts, eſpecially the learned. We have been informed, that, of the ſaid ancient books, there are not a few, in poſſeſſion of your fraternity, or in the places ſubject to your juriſdiction, eſpecially relating to the Roman hiſtory. Wherefore, intending to procure the publication of as many ſuch books as can come to our hands, for the common good of all learned men, we affectionately exhort your fraternity and earneſtly entreat you in the Lord, that, if you ever propoſe to do a grateful action, you would tranſmit to us as ſoon as poſſible fair and correct copies of all thoſe books, or which we rather wiſh, the books themſelves, which ſhall be returned you, as ſoon as tranſcribed here, according to an obligation drawn up by our apoſtolical chamber, or ſuch as the ſaid John our commiſſary, bearer of theſe preſents, ſufficiently inſtructed for that purpoſe, ſhall think fit to be drawn up in the name of the ſaid chamber. And becauſe the ſaid John has promiſed in a ſhort time to give us the thirty third book of Livy, of the Macedonian war, we have commiſſioned him to give it into your fraternity's hands, to be tranſmitted as ſoon as poſſible by a faithful meſſenger, to us, or our beloved ſon Philip Beroaldus, Librarian of our apoſtolical palace. But becauſe we have ordered to be paid, here in the city, to the ſaid John, a certain ſum of money, and are indebted to him a certain quantity, for expences already made and to be made, we will, and authorize, and command your fraternity, after he ſhall have received the ſaid book of Livy, to pay, or cauſe to be paid, to the ſaid John 147 gold ducats of the chamber, out of the money ariſing from indulgences granted through thoſe provinces, in favour of the royal Fabric of the prince of the Apoſtles; which ſum we will allow in the accounts between your fraternity and the apoſtolical chamber, as at preſent we do allow, and order to be allowed. You are likewiſe to aſſiſt the ſaid John with ſafe Conducts, Letters, and Aids, and help him, thro' your provinces, in coming at books, and, if occaſion be, engage your word for him, that the books ſhall be returned within a certain time, and ſent back to their places. Which if your fraternity ſhall do, as we are fully perſuaded you will, you will acquire a great reputation among learned men, and perform a thing the moſt acceptable to us. Given at Rome, at St Peter's under the fiſherman's ring, November 26. 1517. in the fifth year of our Pontificate.

JA SADOLET.

This is the firſt of the two letters; here is the ſecond. There is ſomething in it, which may incline us to think, that the entire hiſtory of Livy was then in being. Mr de Seidel has been credibily informed, that it is believed that a canon of Magdeburg, who was one of the miniſters of ſtate to the marquis Joachim Frederic, adminiſtator of that archbiſhopric, took an advantage

vantage of the confuſion things were then in, and carried away ſeveral manuſcripts out of the public library, particularly this Livy, to enrich his own. His heirs preſerved it, but they concealed the manuſcripts, becauſe they had come unjuſtly by them. At laſt the whole was deſtroyed, when the town was pillaged in the year 1631.

Venerabili Fratri noſtro Alberto Archiepiſcopo Moguntin. Principi Electori & Germaniæ Primati.

LEO PP. X.

Dilecti filii (87) Salutem & Apoſtolicam benedictionem. Rettulit nobis dilectus filius Joannes Heytmers de Zonvelben Clericus Leodienſis diœceſeos quem nuper pro inquirendis antiquis libris, qui deſiderantur ad inclitas nationes Germaniæ, Daniæ, Norvegiæ, Suetiæ & Gothiæ noſtrum & Apoſtolicæ ſedis ſpecialem nuncium & Commiſſarium deſtinavimus, a quodam, quem ipſe ad id ſubſtituerat, accepiſſe literas, quibus ei ſignificat in veſtra Bibliotheca reperiſſe Codicem antiquum, in quo omnes Decades Titi Livii ſunt deſcriptæ, impetraſſeque a vobis illas poſſe exſcribere cum originalem codicem habere fas non fuerit. Laudamus profecto veſtram humanitatem & erga ſedem Apoſtolicam obedientiam. Verum, dilecti filii, fuit nobis ab ipſo uſque Pontificatus noſtri initio animus, Viros quovis virtutis genere exornatos, præſertim literatos, quantum cum DEO poſſumus, extollere ac juvare. Ea de cauſa hujuſcemodi antiquos & deſideratos libros, quotquot recipere poſſumus, prius per viros doctiſſimos, quorum copia DEI munere in noſtra hodie eſt curia, corrigi facimus, deinde noſtra impenſa ad communem eruditorum utilitatem diligentiſſime imprimi curamus. Sed ſi ipſos originales libros non habeamus, noſtra intentio non plane adimpletur, quia hi libri, viſis tantum exemplis, correcti in lucem exire non poſſunt. Mandavimus in Camera noſtra Apoſtolica ſufficientem præſtare cautionem de reſtituendis hujuſcemodi libris integris & illæſis eorum Dominis, quam primum hic erunt exſcripti, & dictus Joannes, quem iterum ad præmiſſa Commiſſarium deputavimus, habet ad eandem Cameram ſufficiens mandatum, illam obligandi ad reſtitutionem prædictam, modo & forma quibus ei videbitur. Tantum ad commodum & utilitatem Virorum eruditorum tendimus; De quo etiam dilecti filii Abbas & Conventus Monaſterii Corvienſis Ordinis S. Benedicti Padebornenſis diœceſeos noſtri locupletiſſimi poſſunt eſſe teſtes, ex quorum Bibliotheca cum primi quinque libri Hiſtoriæ Auguſtæ Cornelii Taciti qui deſiderabantur, furto ſubtracti fuiſſent illique per multas manus ad noſtras tandem perveniſſent, nos recognitos prius eoſdem quinque libros & correctos a Viris prædictis literatis in noſtra Curia exſiſtentibus, cum aliis Cornelii, prædicti operibus, quæ extabant noſtro ſumptu imprimi fecimus. Deinde vero, re comperta, unum ex voluminibus dicti Cornelii, ut præmittitur, correctum & impreſſum, ac etiam non inordinate ligatum, ad dictos Abbatem & Conventum Monaſterii Corwienſis remiſimus, quod in eorum Bibliotheca loco ſubſtracti reponere poſſent. Et ut cognoſcerent ex ea ſubtractione potius eis commodum quam incommodum ortum, miſimus eiſdem pro Eccleſia Monaſterii eorum indulgentiam perpetuam. Quocirca vos & veſtrum quemlibet, ea demum qua poſſumus affectione in virtute ſanctæ obedientiæ monemus, hortamur, & ſincera in Domino caritate requirimus, ut ſi nobis rem gratam facere unquam animo proponitis, eundem Joannem in dictam veſtram Bibliothecam intromittatis, & exinde tam dictum codicem Livii, quam alios qui ei videbuntur per eum ad nos tranſmitti permittatis, illos

To our venerable brother, Albert, archbiſhop of Mentz, electoral prince and primate of Germany.

LEO PP. X.

Beloved Sons, Health and Apoſtolical Benediction. Our beloved ſon John Heytmers de Zonvelben, eccleſiaſtic of the dioceſe of Liege, whom we lately appointed ſpecial Nuntio and commiſſary from us, and the Apoſtolical See, to the illuſtrious nations of Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Gothland, to ſearch after ancient books, has informed us, that he has received letters from a certain perſon, whom he had appointed for that purpoſe, in which he acquaints him, that he had found in your library an ancient book, containing all the decads of Livy, and that he had obtained your leave to tranſcribe them, not being allowed to have the original book. We commend your humanity and obedience to the Apoſtolical See. But, my beloved ſons we reſolved, from the very beginning of our Pontificate, to promote and favour, with God's aſſiſtance, all men of merit, eſpecially learned men. With this view, we procure theſe kind of antient books, ſo much wanted, as many as can come to our hands, to be firſt corrected by very learned men, of which there are many, by the gift of God, in our court, and afterwards to be carefully printed, for the common benefit of the learned. But if we have not the original books themſelves, our deſign will not be fully anſwered, becauſe theſe books, the copies only being ſeen, cannot be publiſhed correctly. We have given orders in our apoſtolical chamber, that a ſufficient ſecurity be given, that theſe books ſhall be reſtored whole and uninjured to their owners, as ſoon as they ſhall have been here tranſcribed, and the ſaid John, whom we have again deputed as commiſſary for the aforeſaid purpoſe, has a ſufficient order to the ſame chamber, to oblige it to the ſaid reſtitution, in the manner and form he ſhall think proper. We only aim at the benefit and advantage of learned men. Of which our beloved ſons, the abbot and convent of the monaſtery of Corvey, of the order of St Benedict of Paderborn, are ample witneſſes; out of whoſe library when the five firſt books of the Roman hiſtory of Cornelius Tacitus were ſtolen, and through many hands came at laſt into ours, we took care to have them firſt corrected by the aforeſaid learned men reſiding in our court, and were at the expence of printing them with the reſt of the works, which were extant, of the ſaid Tacitus. Afterwards, the matter being diſcovered, we ſent one of the volumes of the ſaid Tacitus, corrected, printed, and handſomely bound, to the ſaid abbot and monaſtery of Corvey, to be placed in their library in the room of that, which was ſtolen. And that they might know, that this theft turned rather to their advantage than diſadvantage, we ſent them a perpetual indulgence for the church of their monaſtery. Wherefore, with the utmoſt affection, and in virtue of holy obedience, we exhort, and, with ſincere charity in the lord, require you and any of you, that if you ever intend to oblige us, ye would admit the ſaid John into your library, and ſuffer him to tranſmit to us from thence both the ſaid book of Livy and others, that he ſhall think proper, which ſhall be

(87) Mr de Seidel believes, that this letter was writ to the canons of Magdebourg, ſince Albert of Brandenburg was archbiſhop of Mentz, as well as of Magdebourg.

illos eoſdem omnino recepturi, reportaturique a Nobis prœmia non vulgaria. Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum, ſub annulo Piſcatoris, die prima Decembris MDXVII. Pontificatus noſtri anno quinto.

JA. SADOLETUS.

be returned you by us, together with no common reward. Given at Rome, at St Peter's under the Fiſherman's ring, Dec. 1. 1517. *in the fifth year of our pontificate.*

JA. SADOLET.

LEON (Aloisio, *or* Lewis de) in Latin *Legionenſis*, profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſity of Salamanca (*a*), ſon of a gentleman of Caſtile, entered into the order of the Hermits of St Auguſtin the twenty ninth of January 1549 (*b*). He underſtood Greek and Hebrew well, and diſcovered a great deal of dexterity in explaining the holy ſcripture in his lectures. In 1588, he drew up the rules of the bare-footed monks, who began to appear under the name of Recollects. He was made vicar-general of the order, and provincial, the twenty ſecond of Auguſt 1591, and he died the day after [*A*] at Madrid, at ſixty four years of age. He had heen engaged in a very troubleſome affair before the tribunal of the Inquiſition; but he had extricated himſelf with honour, after ſome years captivity (*c*) [*B*]. I doubt not that this occaſioned an explanation that he made of a verſe in Solomon's Song [*C*]. His Latin Commentary on that book of Scripture was printed at Salamanca in the year 1589 (*d*). He publiſhed it likewiſe in Spaniſh (*e*). There are ſome other books of his writing [*D*], which have made it wiſhed that the reſt of his works were publiſhed (*f*).

(*a*) Schottus, Biblioth. Hiſpan. pag. 266.

(*b*) Philippus Elſſius, Encomiaſt. Auguſtin. pag. 443.

(*c*) *Taken from Elſſius*, ubi ſupra.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) Schottus, ubi ſupra, pag. 265.

(*f*) Ibid.

[*A*] *He was made vicar-general and provincial the twenty ſecond of Auguſt* 1591, *and died the next day.*] For all this they ſay, that he governed the province well, and that he gave riſe to a more ſtrict obſervance. ‘ Vicarii Generalis officio, & Provincialis munere 1591. 22. Auguſti honoratus, Provinciam laudabiliter rexit, arctioriſque vitæ initium fuit . . . . . Obiit . . . . . altero ab electionis die in Provincialem (1).’ Who could imagine an author ſhould be capable of ſuch a narrative as this? I know not whether Elſſius did not mean, that Lewis de Leon had been ſome years vicar general of the order, but that he was made provincial only the day before his death. By this we ſhould eaſily underſtand, that this Auguſtin diſcharged his office very worthily: but Elſſius's narrative will however be very defective.

[*B*] *He had been engaged in a very troubleſome affair before the tribunal of the Inquiſition; but he had extricated himſelf with honour after ſome years captivity.*] Let us quote an apologiſt of the archbiſhop of Sebaſte (2). ‘ Father Aloyſio de Leon an Auguſtin, ... Profeſſor of Scripture at Salamanca, was near five years a priſoner in the Inquiſition of Spain. But having at laſt found an equitable judge, he came out innocent, was re-eſtabliſhed in his office, and entered Salamanca in triumph, which covered his unjuſt cenſurers with confuſion.’ Elſſius makes the impriſonment of this Salamanca profeſſor laſt but two years, and he takes a pleaſure in deſcribing the circumſtances of his glorious re-eſtabliſhment. ‘ Edidit Heroicum ſpecimen præclaræ patientiæ, & magni animi indicium. Cum enim aliquorum invidia S. Inquiſitioni delatus ſimulque conſtrictus, ejuſdem carceribus biennium integrum detentus fuiſſet, tandem infracti animi vir, publico triumpho, cum palma & laurea educitur, ac veſte candida, in ſignum innocentiæ, amictus, præcone præeunte, deducitur, priſtiniſque honoribus, titulis, ac Profeſſioni Theologicæ reſtituitur. Primam vero lectionem, poſt tenebras, ut auſpicabatur, pleno conceſſu ad novitatem evocato, inquit: *Dicebamus heſterna die* (3). —— *He gave an heroic inſtance of patience and fortitude. For being accuſed by ſome envious perſons to the Inquiſition, and impriſoned two whole years, this brave man was at laſt brought out in public triumph, dreſſed in white, as a ſymbol of his innocence, and preceded by an herald; and was reſtored to his former honours, titles, and Divinity-profeſſorſhip. The firſt lecture he read after his impriſonment, before a numerous audience, he began thus:* We ſaid yeſterday.’

[*C*] *His impriſonment occaſioned an explanation which he made of a verſe of Solomon's Song.*] I ſpeak of the verſe, in which the ſpouſe ſays: *The watchmen that went about the city found me, they ſmote me, they wounded me; the keepers of the walls took away my vail from me* *. Aloiſio de Leon pretends, that the ſpouſe ſpeaks thus in the perſon of good Chriſtians perſecuted *by the eccleſiaſtical powers* (4). He obſerves, that *theſe kind of vexations are proofs the moſt hard and difficult to be ſupported, and which God often reſerves for the moſt perfect.* ‘ It may perhaps be thought ſtrange, *adds he*, that the ſpouſe always meets with the watchmen in her way, from whom ſhe not only receives no aſſiſtance, but even receives injuries and bad treatment. Is it to be believed, that thoſe who are appointed to preſide over the faithful, and who govern the churches of God (for they are to watch the city and it's walls) inſtead of affording them the leaſt ſuccour, often afflict and perſecute good men, and thoſe who love God moſt? Yet this is what all that follows in this divine ſong obliges me to believe. And certainly, as there is nothing better, nothing more uſeful to ſalvation, than good biſhops, who faithfully diſcharge the duties of their ſacred miniſtry, on the contrary unjuſt and wicked paſtors, who make the authority, they have received, to govern the people of God, ſubſervient to their deſigns and intereſts, are hurtful to all in general, and principally to the beſt men, and the greateſt ſaints, and are good for nothing but to ruin them. There has always been a great number of theſe paſtors in the church, and it is to them, that this verſe of the Canticles, which I explain, is to be applied.’ He ſays ſeveral other things in the ſame ſtrain, and more home: they may be ſeen in French in the work that I quote (5). I would fain know whether any commentator, well ſatisfied with his biſhop, and who has always been of the ſtrongeſt party, has explained in the ſame manner theſe words of Solomon's Song. Perſecution ſharpens the wit, and makes a man wonderfully clear-ſighted in diſcovering the myſtic ſenſe.

[*D*] *There are ſome other books of his writing.*] A treatiſe printed at Salamanca in 1590, *de utriuſque agni typici ac veri immolationis legitimo tempore*, in which he maintains, that the Paſcal lamb was ſlain the fourteenth of the moon (6), and that Jesus Christ, who conformed himſelf to this practice in celebrating the Paſſover, was crucified on that ſame day (7). A treatiſe *de probæ matriſfamilias officio*; another *de divinis Nominibus* (8). A commentary on the twenty ſixth Pſalm (9). Note, that this writer is one of thoſe, who apply to Mahomet the predictions of the Apoſtles concerning Antichriſt (10).

(1) Philippus Elſſius, in Encomiaſt. Auguſtin. pag. 443.

(2) Sincere Advice to the Catholics of the United Provinces, on the decree of the Inquiſition of Rome, againſt the archbiſhop of Sebaſte, pag. 22, 23, Edit. 1704.

(3) Elſſius, ubi ſupra.

* Cant. v, 7.

(4) See the Sincere Advice, &c. pag. 6, 7.

(5) Ib. pag. 8, 9.

(6) That is to ſay, the evening of the day which we ſhould call the thirteenth.

(7) Schottus, Biblioth. Hiſpan. pag. 266.

(8) Id. ibid.

(9) Printed at Salamanca, in 1580, and 1585. *Elſſius, Encomiaſt. Aug. pag.* 443.

(10) *See* Heidegg. in Myſter. Babyl. Magnæ, pag. 70, Tom. I.

LEON (Peter Cieça de), author of a Hiſtory of Peru. He left Spain, his native country, at thirteen years of age, to go into America, where he ſojourned ſeventeen years (*a*). He ſaw there ſo many curious things, that he reſolved to give an account of them. I ſhall mention ſome of them if it be only to ſhew the injuſtice of thoſe who pretend that the Chriſtians firſt taught the people of America to

(*a*) Cieça in Proemio.

be wicked [*A*]. This cannot be ſaid without a great many reſtrictions, poſſibly in ſome countries of this new world, the ſtupid and ſimple inhabitants might honeſtly and frugally have followed the laws of nature, and learned deceitfulneſs and debauchery by their commerce with the Chriſtians; but, generally ſpeaking, the corruption of the Americans was ſo brutal and enormous, that we cannot ſufficiently deteſt it. The deſign

[*A*] *I ſhall mention ſome of them, if it be only to ſhew the injuſtice of thoſe who pretend, that it was the Chriſtians firſt taught the people of America to be wicked.*] He ſays, that the grandees in the valley of Nora, endeavoured to take from their enemies, as many women as they could, that they lay with them, and fed the children they had by them, very delicately to the age of twelve or thirteen; when finding them well fatted, they killed and eat them. This among them, was reckoned a moſt delicious banquet (1). Let us hear what treatment the inhabitants of this country gave their priſoners of war. They reduced them to the condition of ſlaves, they obliged them to marry, and eat all the children that were the fruit of thoſe marriages, and afterwards eat the ſlaves themſelves, when they were no longer able to beget children. 'Mangiavano i figlivoli de quei ſchiavi, & poi mangiavano gli iſteſſi ſchiavi quando erano tanto vecchi, che non potevano generare (2).' The firſt time the Spaniards entered this valley, a lord called Nabonuco, came in a friendly manner to ſee them, attended by ſome women; night being come, two of them did lie at full length, on a carpet, another laid herſelf a-croſs to ſerve as a pillow to Nabonuco, while the two others ſerved him for a mattras. He laid himſelf along upon the two firſt, and taking another woman by the hand, who was very handſome, was asked what he deſigned to do with her; he anſwered, he deſigned to eat her, and alſo to feed upon a child which ſhe had (3). The author obſerves, that in the country of Quito, the women tilled the ground, and took care of the harveſts; and that the men employ themſelves only in ſpinning, and houſe-keeping (4). They worſhipped the ſun in Peru, and one of the principal acts of adoration, was the offering him ſix teeth, which the votaries had pulled out of their heads (5). There were ſeveral provinces in that country, where the ideas of honour, as to chaſtity, were wholly extinguiſhed. One of their diverſions was ſinging the brave actions of their anceſtors; this they did dancing to the ſound of a drum, and drinking till they were drunk; then they took out the woman they liked beſt, and enjoyed her, and no body found any fault with it. 'Alcuni pigliano quelle donne, che gli piacciono, & condottele in certe caſe, Sfuocano con quelle la lor luſſuria, non ſe lo recando a biaſmo, perche non conoſcono qual dona ſi conſerva con la verecondia, ne tengono conto di honore, e manco riguardano al mondo (6).' Thus we ſee what we are to think of thoſe who ſpeak ſo much of the good morals of the Americans, and pretend, we have taught theſe nations to be wicked, ſince we carried the light of the goſpel among them. The moſt debauched Spaniards had never ſeen in their own country, what they ſaw in the new-found-world, women running after them in furious tranſports of luſt, and provided with ſome uncommon philtres to heighten the pleaſure. Here follows ſome Italian lines upon it. 'Nell' Iſtorie del l'Indie narra Amerigo Veſpucci d'eſſer capitato ad una certa coſta, dove trovò femmine di tanta libidine, che come ſpiritate correvano dietro a' ſuoi marinari, perche uſaſſero con eſſo loro; e dice, che havevano un ſugo di non ſo che erba, col quale bagnando le parti genitali de gli huomini, non ſolo cagionano, *ut citius, ac ſæpius erigerent, ſed etiam quod eorum penis in inſolitam excreſceret magnitudinem:* il che piaceva loro mirabilmente (7).'

Here is ſomething ſtill worſe. The author informs us, that in the province of Carthagena, the men look on the bride's having her maidenhead, as a fault, and refuſe to conſummate the marriage, till ſhe has been well cleanſed of that ſpot, by her relations, or by her friends. In ſome places they leave this good office to be performed by the mother; but for fear of deceit they will have the operation done in the preſence of witneſſes. 'In certe parti della provincia Cartagena, quando maritano le figlivole, & che la ſpoſa deve andare a marito, la madre della giovane in preſentia d'alcuni ſuoi parenti le toglie la virginità con le dita, ſi che riputavano, che fuſſe piu honoro mandarla à marito coſi corrotta, che con la ſua virginità. Ma tra queſti coſtumi uſati da loro, era miglior di alcune terre, che i parenti, ò amici toglievano la virginità alla giovane & con queſta conditione, la maritavano, & il marito la riceveva (8).' Diodorus Siculus, aſcribes the ſame humour to the iſles which we at preſent call Majorca and Minorca (9). He affirms, that in the celebration of their marriages, the husband did not enjoy the bride till all the relations and friends, who were invited to the wedding-feaſt, had enjoyed her round, each according to the rank which his age gave him (10). It is very ſtrange, that a nation ſo laſcivious (11), ſhould be ſo little jealous; for, generally ſpeaking, the more people are inclined to this brutal pleaſure, the more ſubject they are to jealouſy. Witneſs the Turks and Moors. The latter are the fartheſt in the world from this humour of the Americans of the province of Carthagena: there is nothing they inſiſt on in the bride ſo much, as that ſhe ſhould have her maidenhead, and if they are not well convinced the day after the marriage, that they have had it, they ſend her back to her parents. See Maroc's Voyages, publiſhed by Mr de St Olon, in the year 1694. There lives a people on the borders of the Red-Sea, who are jealous, to a degree of phrenzy, they are not ſatisfied, unleſs precautions are taken, from the very cradle, which oblige the bridegroom to begin by a kind of chirurgical operation. Cardinal Bembo's Latin will let us into the meaning of this. 'Aliis poſt hos relictis populis, mare rubrum ingreſſi, complures nigrorum item & bonorum hominum, ac bello fortium civitates adierunt: qui natis ſtatim fœminis naturam conſuunt, quoad urinæ exitus ne impediatur: eaſque cum adoleverint, ſic conſutas in matrimonium collocant; ut ſponſi prima cura ſit conglutinatas atque coalitas puellæ oras ferro interſcendere: tanto in honore apud homines barbaros eſt non ambigua ducendis uxoribus virginitas (12). —— *Paſſing by other people after theſe, and entring the Red-Sea, they touched at ſeveral towns inhabited by blacks, but men of virtue, and brave in war: who, immediately upon the birth of a female child, ſow up nature, ſo as only to leave a paſſage for the urine, and, when they grow up, give them thus ſowed up in marriage; ſo that the husband's firſt care is to cut a paſſage with an inſtrument; ſo careful are theſe Barbarians to be ſure of a maiden-head, when they marry.*' How can man be ſubject to follies ſo diametrically oppoſite!

Let us return to the Americans. The moſt part remove the grievances themſelves, which their married ſtate might be ſubject to, if the women contracted came maids to the nuptial bed. One would think they were reſolved to truſt only to themſelves; they leave nothing to do for the relations or friends, I mean, that before ever they ſpeak of contract, or marriage, they do all they have a mind to with thoſe they afterwards marry. 'Si maritavano alla foggia de i lor vicini: & odo dire, che alcuni, o la maggior parte, prima chè ſi maritino, togliono la virginità à quelle, che s'haveano da maritare, meſcolandoſi con quelle luſſurioſamente (13).' For the reſt, this contempt of virginity is not the general taſte of the Americans. There are ſeveral American nations, where the huſbands require it; but the greateſt part do not find it, they come too late. 'La maggior parte de gli Indiani ſi maritano con le figlivole & ſorelle d'altri, ſenza ordine, & pochi trovano le mogli vergini (14).' What the author obſerves concerning Sodomy, is horrid; it was openly and publickly practiſed. 'Non oſtante c'haveſſino molte donne belliſſime, tuttavia (ſi come da loro inteſi) uſavano publicamente il triſto vicio della ſodomia, & anco ſe ne vantavano alla ſcoperta (15).' There were even temples in which it was committed as a pious action (16); an abomination unknown to the Paganiſm of antient Greece, though the proſtitution of women, in honour of the gods, was very common. I have not obſerved in Cieça, that there were any nations in this new world, who did not cover their ſecret parts; but other relations poſitively affirm it, and with this very ſtrange circumſtance, that thoſe of the female ſex, who had their virginity,

(1) Pedro Cieça, Hiſtoria del Peru, cap. xii, fol. m. 23.

(2) Id. ibid. fol. 23, verſo.

(3) Id. ibid fol. 24.

(4) Id. ibid. cap. xl, fol. 78, verſo.

(5) Id. cap. xlix, fol. 99.

(6) Id. cap. xli, fol. 82, verſo.

(7) Alleſſandro Taſſoni, Penſieri diverſi, lib. v, cap. xxx, pag. 145.

(8) Cieça, cap. xlix, fol. 99.

(9) Their old name was Baleares.

(10) Diod. Sicul. lib. v, cap. xviii.

(11) The Baleares were ſo laſcivious, that when a Corſair brought women to be ſold, they gave three or four males for one female. *Id. ibid. cap. xvii.*

(12) Petrus Bembus, Hiſtor. Venet. lib. vi, fol. m. 130.

(13) Cieça, cap. xlix, fol. 99.

(14) Idem, cap. xix, fol. 37, verſo.

(15) Idem, cap. xlix, fol. 99, verſo. *See alſo,* cap. lii, fol. 104, verſo.

(16) Idem, cap. lxiv. fol. 128.

ſign of our Cieça was to give an entire Hiſtory of Peru, in four parts (*b*): we do not know whether he finiſhed them all; but his firſt part was printed at Seville in the year 1553. He began it in 1541, and finiſhed it in 1550 (*c*). He was at Lima, the capital of the kingdom of Peru, when he put the laſt hand to it, and was then thirty two years of age (*d*). This book has been tranſlated into Italian [*B*].

virginity, concealed nothing, and only thoſe who had loſt it, covered their natural parts. 'Hiſpanis ulteriora tentantibus, terra eſt objecta, continens paulo minus decies centena millia paſſuum ab Hiſpaniola protenſa meridiem verſus: atque in ea populi ſub rege bellum cum finitimis gerente occurrerunt: quorum fœminæ virum paſſæ nullam partem corporis, præter muliebria, virgines ne illam quidem tegebant (17).' This is very ſurprizing, ſince the laws of decency are every where more relax for married women than for maids.

Note, that this aſtoniſhing corruption, which had extinguiſhed the laws of humanity and modeſty, and had ſunk theſe people into the cruelty and ferocity of canibals, and the moſt monſtrous laſciviouſneſs, had not extinguiſhed or ſtifled the ideas of religion. They believed the immortality of the ſoul: this appears by all their funeral ceremonies (18); they adored the ſun (19), they believed a creator of all things (20), they offered ſacrifices to their idols, and even ſpared not human blood in them (21). The author obſerves over and over, that they worſhip the devil; but it is under the notion of a being extreamly powerful, and which, notwithſtanding it's wickedneſs, has ſomething in him of the divine nature. 'Indiani di Tacunga credono l'immortalità dell' anima, quanto intendiamo da loro, & che vi ſia un Creatore del tutto. Conſiderando la grandezza del cielo, il muovimento del Sole, della Luna, & altre coſe maraviglioſe, quantunque acciecati dal Demonio, credono, che eſſo habbia poſſanza in ogni coſa. Benche alcuni conoſcendo le ſue malvagità, & come è ſempre buggiardo, & gli tratta peſſimamente, lo hanno in odio, ma pur l'ubbidiſcono per timore, credendo, che ſia in lui qualche Deità (22). —— *The Indians of Tacunga believe the immortality of the ſoul, as they ſay, and that there is a creator of all things. Conſidering the vaſt extent of the heavens, the motion of the ſun, the moon, and other wonderful things, though blinded by the devil, they believe that he has power over all things. Some, knowing his malice, and that he is always a lier, and uſes them very ill, hate him; yet they obey him out of fear, believing that there is ſomething divine in him.*' He obſerves, that the prieſts live a holy life, and are much reſpected (23).

[*B*] *That book has been tranſlated into Italian.*] Nicolas Antonio (24) obſerves, that the Spaniſh edition of Seville, 1553, in folio, was followed the year after, by that of Antwerp, in 8vo, and by an Italian edition of Rome, 1555, in 8vo. He ſays, that Auguſtin de Gravaliz is the author of the Italian verſion. I add, that it was printed at Venice, *appreſſo Giordano Ziletti*, in the year 1557, in 8vo. This is the edition I make uſe of, and the name of the Printer in the title, but I find in the laſt page theſe words: *In Vinegia, appreſſo Domenico de Farri, ad inſtantia di M. Andrea Arrivabene MDLVI.* Nicolas Antonio did not know of this edition. He ſays, that the other parts of this hiſtory were impatiently expected (25).

LEON (Gonsalez Pontius de), was of Seville, and lived in the XVIth century. He reſided at Rome in the year 1585, and he there publiſhed, in Latin, an Anſwer (*a*) to a book, which a Proteſtant of Germany, named Leonhart Waramund, had written in defence of Gebhard Truchſes, archbiſhop of Cologne. He was very warm in this Anſwer; and, according to the practice of thoſe times, he loaded his adverſary with a thouſand reproaches. He does not write ill in Latin for a Spaniard [*A*], and he does not want learning.

[*A*] *He does not write ill in Latin for a Spaniard.*] I will not ſay, that there have been no Spaniards, who have underſtood the Latin language very well, and have uſed it with purity and eloquence. My meaning is that generally the writers of that nation, are too negligent in that reſpect. Some of them even diſregard the Orthography, and put an *v* for a *u*, and a *y* for an *i*. I will give this inſtance of it. 'Cujus (*rei maritimæ*) itidem polytica tractatio, diſpoſitio, & Archiguvernatio à Magno Philippo noſtro Hiſpaniarum Rege..... tuæ ſolicitudini & prudentiæ emandata prædicatur.' Theſe are the words of the licentiate John Baptiſt *de Urquiola & Elorriaga*, in a preliminary epiſtle of a treatiſe of Civil-law (1), printed in 1663 (2), and dedicated to Don Franciſco Ramos del Manzano. He always writes *Lypſius* inſtead of *Lipſius*.

LEONCLAVIUS (John), one of the moſt learned men of the XVIth century, was born in Weſtphalia, and was a gentleman. He ſpent near two years in the court of the duke of Savoy, on the affairs of Lazarus Suendius (*a*); and afterwards travelled a long time in the retinue of baron Zerotini. He lived alſo ſome ſome years in the family of the baron of Kiltz. He had been invited to Heidelberg, to be Greek profeſſor; but the death of prince Caſimir made that invitation uſeleſs (*b*). During his ſtay in Turkey, he collected excellent materials for the compoſing the Ottoman Hiſtory; and it is to him the public is indebted for the beſt accounts we have of that empire [*A*]. He had joined to the knowledge of the learned tongues, that of the Civil-Law,

[*A*] *The public is indebted to him for the beſt accounts we have of that empire.*] Hear what Thuanus ſays of him. 'Juris Romani Græcique conſultiſſimo, & rerum Turcicarum apprime perito; ad quas linguæ ipſius Byzantina peregrinatione comparatam cognitionem, exactam ultimæ hiſtoriæ Græcæ lectionem, & acre ac admirandum judicium attulit, quod non ſolum ſcriptis ab ipſo dum viveret publicatis, ſed in iis quæ poſt mortem ejus edita ſunt, elucet. —— *He was thoroughly converſant in the Greek and Roman law, and particularly skilled in Turkiſh affairs, to the ſtudy of which he brought a knowledge of the language itſelf, acquired by travelling to Conſtantinople, an exact reading of the later Greek hiſtory, and an acute and wonderful judgment; which appears not only from the works he publiſhed in his life-time, but alſo from thoſe, which came out after his death.*' Leonclavius has written *Hiſtoriæ Muſlimanicæ Turcarum libri* 18. *Apologetici duo, prior eſt libitinarius index Oſmanidarum; poſterior continet epiſtolas de rebus Turcicis. Commonefactio de præſenti rerum Turcicarum ſtatu. Annales Turcici cum ſupplemento, & pandectis hiſtoriæ Turcicæ* (1). This laſt work is properly the tranſlation of a book written by the Turks themſelves; I mean of the Turkiſh annals, which Jerome Beck of Leopoldſdorf, Ferdinand's embaſſador, brought from Conſtantinople in 1551. Ferdinand cauſed them to be tranſlated in High-Dutch, by John Spigelius (2), and afterwards Leonclavius tranſlated them into Latin (3).

2

[B] The

(*b*) *See* Nicol. Anton. Biblioth. Script. Hiſpan. Tom. II, pag. 146.

(*c*) Cieça, in fine operis.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(17) Petrus Bembus, ubi ſupra, fol. 127, verſo.

(18) *See Cieça*, cap. viii, xlviii, li, & paſſim alibi.

(19) Idem, cap. xliii, fol. 87, & cap. xlix, fol. 99.

(20) Id ibid.

(21) Idem, cap. iv, fol. 8, verſo & cap. xx, fol. 39.

(22) Idem, cap. xli, fol. 82, verſo.

(23) Ibid.

(24) Nicol. Anton. Biblioth. Script. Hiſpan. Tom. II, pag. 146.

(25) Reliquæ valde ab omnibus deſiderantur.

(*a*) It is in 4to, of 185 pages.

(1) *Intituled*, Repetitio ſolemnis ad l. unic. C. de Claſſic. tit. xii, lib. xi.

(2) At Salamanca, in 4to.

(*a*) He was general of an army.

(*b*) *Taken from* Melchior Adam, in Vitis Philoſophorum, pag. 379.

(1) Thuan. lib. civ, ſub fin.

(2) Interpreter of the Turkiſh language to Ferdinand.

(3) Annales etiam *Sultanorum Othmanidarum*, à Turcis ſua lingua ſcriptos, & ſtudio Hieronymi Beck à Leopoldſdorf Conſtantinopoli advectos, juſſuque Ferdinandi Cæſaris interprete Turcico J. Spiegel Germanice tranſlatos, Leonclavius Latine redditos illuſtravit & ad annum 1588, uſque auxit. *Melch. Adam. in Vitis Philoſophor.* pag. 380.

Law, which enabled him to make a good tranſlation of the Baſilica [*B*]. His other verſions were eſteemed, though the critics have pretended to find many faults in them [*C*]. What he publiſhed of Cæſarius, put James de Billy into a violent paſſion [*D*]. He died at Vienna in Auſtria in June 1593 (*c*), near ſixty years of age (*d*).

(*c*) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra.

(*d*) Thuan. Hiſt. lib. civ. ſub fin.

[*B*] *The tranſlation of the Baſilica.*] I mean, the Abridgment of the *Baſilica*: his work is intituled *Verſio & Notæ ad Synopſim LX Librorum Baſilicon, ſeu univerſi Juris Romani, & ad Novellas Imperatorum.* It was printed at Baſil in the year 1575. Melchior Adam ſpeaks thus of it (4): ‘ Evulgavit cum annotationibus ſexaginta librorum *βασιλικῶν*, hoc eſt univerſi Juris Romani auctoritate principum Romanorum in Græcam linguam traducti, Eclogam ſive Synopſim ante non viſam: item Novellarum antea non publicatarum librum. —— *He publiſhed ſixty books of βασίλικα, that is of the Univerſal Roman Law, tranſlated, by the authority of the Roman emperors, into the Greek tongue; an Eclogue or Synopſis never before ſeen; likewiſe a book of Novels, never before publiſhed.*’ Mr Teiſſier muſt give me leave to obſerve, that his manner of reciting this title may miſlead the reader: *he has alſo publiſhed*, ſays he (5), *ſexaginta libros βασιλικῶν, Eclogam ſive Synopſim, & Novellas cum notis.* This is mentioning the *Baſilica* intire, and another book intituled *Ecloga ſive Synopſis*, and conſequently multiplying and confounding things. The ſame author citing Melchior Adam affirms, that Scaliger *calls Leonclavius the moſt learned Civilian of his time, and ſets him even above the great Cujas* (6). Melchior Adam ſays not a word of it; and beſides what we find in Leonclavius's praiſe in the Scaligerana, is much beneath this character. ‘ Leunclavius has written the beſt concerning the Turks.’ ‘ Leunclavius fuit Weſtphalus, ſed non Barbarus: bene intellexit Græca Conſtantinopolitana & inferioris ævi, omnia ejus ſcripta ſunt utilia, imo neceſſaria; Græca Juriſconſultorum intellexit, ſed Autorum Veterum non intellexit, ut H. Stephanus, qui paulo ante obitum multa ſcripſit ad me contra Leunclavii editionem Xenophontis. Leunclavius habebat ſcorta ſecum. Cluſius eum novit famliariſſimè (7). —— *Leunclavius was a Weſtphalian, but not a Barbarian: he well underſtood the Conſtantinopolitan Greek affairs, and thoſe of the laſt age of the empire: all his works are uſeful, nay neceſſary: he underſtood the Greek of the Civilians, but not of the antient authors, as Henry Stephens, did, who, a little before his death, wrote many things to me againſt Leunclavius's edition of Xenophon. Leunclavius kept miſtreſſes: Cluſius was intimately acquainted with him.*’ Thus ſpeaks the ſecond Scaligerana. Leonclavius's learning is more praiſed in it than his morals, ſince we are here informed that he kept whores in his houſe. Let us not forget his *Jus Græco-Romanum* (8) in two volumes in folio, and his *Notæ ad Paratitla ſeu ad Collectionem Conſtitutionum Eccleſiaſticarum* (9) in 8vo.

[*C*] *His other verſions were eſteemed, though the critics have pretended to find many faults in him.*] ‘ He is one of the moſt famous tranſlators, that Germany ever produced. He has given us the verſion of Xenophon reviſed three times; that of Zoſimus; of the annals of Conſtantine Manaſſes; of thoſe of Michael Glycas; of the abridgment of the ſixty books of the Baſilica; and of ſeveral works of St Gregory Nazianzen . . . . . . He has alſo corrected Xylander's Verſions of Dion, and that of Chalcondyle by Clauſar (10).’ Mr Baillet, whoſe words theſe are, informs us alſo of the praiſes, Mr Huet has given this tranſlator. They are very advantageous. The notes on Zozimus, in the Engliſh edition, 1679, do not give ſuch an idea of this man's capacity. Henry Stephens ſeverely criticized his tranſlation of Xenophon (11), and was expoſed to ſeveral complaints of his adverſary. Mr Baillet mentions this diſpute; this is what Melchior Adam tells us of it. ‘ Litem tamen ei ſuper iſta interpretatione Xenophontea criticam & Grammaticam movit *Henricus Stephanus*, vir & typographus clariſſimus, edita in ejus errores inſignes inquiſitione autoſchediaſtica. Contra & Leonclavius de Stephano conqueritur, quod contra fidem datam, & præter officium viri boni, Xenophontis à ſe Latine redditi exemplar, ſicut & Zoſimi, detinuerit. Et faſſus eſt Stephanus, accepiſſe ſe illam Xenophontis verſionem ab annis circiter octodecim: poſt tredecim aut quatuordecim amplius annis ſibi non viſam, ſed cum è ſua ſuppellectile libraria, militum incuria, belli tempore aliquot libri incendio periiſſent: neſciviſſe, an in illorum numero Xenophon à Leonclavio verſus, fuiſſet. Tandem, interjecto anni amplius ſpacio, librum inventum fuiſſe, ſitu obſitum, & membrana craſſa, qua involutus erat, conſervatum (12). —— *Henry Stephens, a famous Printer, had a critical and grammatical controverſy with him about that interpretation of Xenophon, and publiſhed extemporaneous remarks on his egregious blunders. Leonclavius, on the other ſide, complains of Stephens, for detaining, contrary to promiſe, and the duty of a good man, the copy of his tranſlation of Xenophon, as alſo of Zoſimus. And Stephens owned, that he had received that tranſlation eighteen years before; that after thirteen, or fourteen, years at moſt, he ſaw it no more; but that, during the war, when ſome books of his library, through the careleſſneſs of the ſoldiers, were burnt, Leonclavius's tranſlation of Xenophon, for ought he knew, might be among them. That at laſt, in a little more than a year's time, the book was found, mouldy, and preſerved by the thick parchment, in which it was bound.*’

[*D*] *What he publiſhed of Cæſarius, put James de Billy into a violent paſſion.*] Leonclavius publiſhed four dialogues (13) of Cæſarius, brother to St Gregory Nazianzen, which he had tranſlated into Latin. It is diſputed whether this work ought to be aſcribed to Cæſarius. Father Labbé has referred that inquiry to another time. ‘ Plura, *ſays he* (14), adverſus Leunclavium primum eorum (*dialogorum*) editorem declamavit Jacobus Billius Prunæus præfatione in decimam orationem ſancti Nazianzeni, quæ alias expendemus accuratius.’ Lambecius (15) eſpouſes Leonclavius warmly againſt James de Billy's invectives.

(4) Ibid.

(5) Teiſſier, Addit. aux Eloges, Tom. II, pag. 187.

(6) Teiſſier. ibid. pag. 186.

(7) Scaligerana, pag. m. 139.

(8) Græcè & Latinè, à Francfort. 1596.

(9) At Francfort, 1593.

(10) Baillet, Jugemens des Sçavans, Tom. IV, n. 833, pag. 457.

(11) See, above, citation (7), the paſſage of the Scaligerana.

(12) Melchior Adam, ubi ſupra.

(13) De Quæſtionibus & Reſponſis Philoſophicis, præcipuæ vero Theologicis.

(14) De Scriptor. Eccleſ. Tom. I, pag. 217.

(15) Lambecius, Biblioth. Cæſar. lib. iv, pag. 31, & ſeq.

LEONICENUS (Nicolas), was born at Vicenza, in Italy, in 1428. He taught Phyſic in the univerſity of Ferrara for above ſixty years (*a*). He was not only excellent in his profeſſion; but alſo very well verſed in the *Belles Lettres*. He was the firſt that tranſlated Galen's works into Latin (*b*). As admirable as his learning was, his virtue was much more ſo. No body could be more diſengaged from the pleaſures of ſenſe. Sobriety, chaſtity, and an averſion to avarice, were the diſtinguiſhing virtues of his life [*A*]; and it was to this great purity of manners, that he attributed the vigorous health he enjoyed [*B*] to an extream old age; for he lived ninety ſix years [*C*]. His merit

(*a*) Mercklin. in Lindenio renovato, pag. 837. *See alſo Konig*, Biblioth. pag. 463.

(*b*) Primus Græca Galeni volumina Latinè interpretando ſtudioſis perdiſcenda demonſtravit. *Jovius*, *Elog. cap. lxx.*

[*A*] *Sobriety, chaſtity, and an averſion to avarice, were the diſtinguiſhing virtues of his life.*] If he had not been of a gay humour, and ſmiling countenance, he might have paſſed for a true Stoic. He eat little, ſlept little, abſtained from wine and women; all diſhes were alike to him; he took without choice whatever food was ſet before him, and could hardly diſtinguiſh one piece of money from another: ‘ Cibi & vini maxime abſtinens, ſomnique minimi, præſertim verò Veneris continentiſſimus, uſque adeò mollioris vitæ voluptates abdicavit, ut pecunias, luxuriæ inſtrumenta, nec agnita quidem monetæ nota contemneret; oblatum, & nulla delectum cura cibum caperet; nec unquam de fortuna quereretur. . . . . . eum hercle perfectum Stoicum putaſſes, niſi honeſto ori liberalis hilaritas affuiſſet (1).’

[*B*] *It was to this great purity of manners that he attributed the vigorous health he enjoyed.*] This Paul Jovius tells us as from his own mouth. ‘ Quum ego aliquando comiter ab eo peterem, ut ingenuè proferret, quonam arcano artis uteretur, ut tanto corporis atque animi vigore vitia ſenectutis eluderet: vividum, inquit, ingenium

(1) Jovius Elog. cap. lxx, pag. m. 162.

merit muſt needs have been illuſtrious, ſince the two Scaligers mention him with commendation [*D*]. I queſtion whether we are to believe what one of them ſays, that Leonicenus being afflicted with the Falling-ſickneſs in his youth, was ſo weary of his life, that he had like to have laid violent hands on himſelf [*E*]. This able Phyſician wrote ſeveral good books [*F*] ; and was a very good Poet [*G*]. He died in 1524. He ſet up for a great critic on Pliny, which did not pleaſe his diſciple Calcagninus, whoſe words

ingenium perpetua, Jovi, vitæ innocentia, ſalubre verò corpus, hilari frugalitatis præſidio facilè tuemur (2). —— *When I once courteouſly intreated him, ingenuouſly to tell me, by what ſecret art he preſerved his health both of body and mind, and eſcaped the inconveniencies of old age; Jovius, ſaid he, we eaſily preſerve the mind's health, by a perpetual innocence of life, and that of the body, by the chearful defence of temperance.*' He had been ſaying (3), that Leonicenus, at ninety years of age, had all his ſenſes perfect, and a very ſtrong memory ; that he walked without a ſtick, and did not ſtoop, though very tall. Obſerve well, that a virtuous life has not always the effect, which Leonicenus aſcribes to it. There are thoſe, who might diſpute the crown of chaſtity and ſobriety with him, and whoſe conſcience was as clear as his, whoſe days notwithſtanding have been few and evil, they lived but a ſhort while, and yet were often ſick.

We will add to Paul Jovius another witneſs. I have read a paſſage in Melchior Adam, by which one might gather, that Leonicenus had told Paul Langius, his diſciple, that he took the chaſtity of his youth to be the cauſe of his long life. ‘ Audivit in Italia *(Joannes Langius)* . . . . . Nicolaum Leonicenum, Dioſcoridis illuſtratorem : qui annum ætatis attigit *nonageſimum ſextum,* cùm ampliùs *ſexaginta* annos *Ferrariæ* docuiſſet. Hic dixit, *ſe viridi vegetâque uti ſenectâ, quia caſtam juventutem virili ætati tradidiſſet :* ediditque opuſculum, in quo *omnibus ægris ſalutem & vitam reſtitui conciliarique poſſe* docuit (4). —— *John Langius heard, in Italy, Nicolas Leonicenus, the interpreter of Dioſcorides, who was ninety years old, having taught ſixty years at Ferrara. This Phyſician ſaid, that* he enjoyed a ſtrong and healthy old age, becauſe he had lived chaſtly in his youth, *and publiſhed a book, in which he taught, that* health and life might be reſtored to all ſorts of ſick perſons.' You ſee in this paſſage, that he was the author of a book wherein he maintained, that all kind of diſtempers were curable. Undoubtedly he excepted that of old age, at leaſt acknowledged this diſeaſe incurable. He had the experience of it ; for obſerve what Langius, an eye-witneſs, ſays of him. ‘ Ferrariam igitur venimus, ubi Leonicenum, elegantioris medicinæ illuſtratorem, edentulum fere, & jam ex ſenio maraſmo tabeſcentem, convenimus : quem ſenile ætatis ejus decus reveriti, perplexis de erroribus Plinii problematibus obtundere nolebamus (5). —— *We arrived at Ferrara, where we met with Leonicenus, the improver of the more elegant practice of Phyſic, almoſt toothleſs, and wearing away with old age, whom, out of reverence for the dignity of his years, we would not diſturb, by propoſing difficult problems of Pliny to him.*' The letter, in which Langius ſays this, is without date : and therefore we cannot judge by it, whether Paul Jovius is miſtaken as to the vigour he aſcribes to old Leonicenus.

[*C*] *He lived ninety ſix years.*] Naudæus is miſtaken, when he makes him live above a century. I ſhall give his own words, becauſe they contain ſome other very curious particulars. ‘ Hippocrates, Galenus, Avenzoar, Leonicenus, cogitate vos quantum tempore, loco, vivendi ratione inter ſe diſcrepantes, hoc uno vitæ termino plane conveniunt, quem omnes ultra centeſimum annum protraxêre (6). —— *Hippocrates, Galen, Avenzoar, Leonicenus, though differing in time, place, and manner of living, yet agree in their term of life, which each protracted to above an hundred years.*'

[*D*] *The two Scaligers mention him with commendation.*] See in what terms , ‘ (7) Leonicenus à patre ſemper imprimis commendatus, & Medicorum ſui temporis facile princeps judicatus. —— *Leonicenus was particularly commended by Scaliger the father, and eſteemed by him the greateſt Phyſician of his time.*' Thus ſays the father : let us now hear the ſon. ‘ De eo viro non niſi honorificè prædicare debemus, vel eo nomine quod primus Philoſophiam & Medicinam ipſam cum humanioribus literis conjunxit. Primus enim ille nos docuit, homines qui ſine bonis literis Medicinam tractant, eſſe ſimiles iis qui in alieno foro litigant (8). —— *We ought never to ſpeak of this man without reſpect, if it were but for this reaſon, that he was the firſt, who united Philoſophy and Medicine with polite learning. For he firſt taught us, that men, who, without learning, apply themſelves to medicine, are like thoſe, who go to law at a ſtrange bar.*'

[*E*] . . . . *one of them ſays, that Leonicenus being afflicted with the Falling-ſickneſs in his youth, was ſo weary of life, that he had like to have laid violent hands on himſelf.*] ‘ Mirum præterea, *continues he,* accepi de viro. A pueritia, imo à cunabulis ipſis, ad 30 annum morbo comitiali adeo tentabatur, ut cum ad ſe redierat, pertæſus vitæ pene ſibi manus afferret. Sed poſt trigeſimum annum plane eo malo defunctus, omnibus membrorum ac ſenſuum officiis integer, nulla morbi ſuſpicione ad 94 annum pervenit. Et ſi bene memini, triduo antequam decederet è vita, operam dederat lectioni. —— *I have heard a ſtrange particular of this man. He was ſo troubled from his youth, nay even from his cradle, to his thirtieth year, with the Falling-ſickneſs, that, when he came to himſelf, he was ſo tired with life, as almoſt to lay violent hands on himſelf. But after his thirtieth year, being entirely free from that diſtemper, and having all his limbs and ſenſes entire, he reached his ninety fourth year, without ſuſpicion of any diſeaſe : and, if I remember right, he read lectures but three days before he died.*' Here is a condition to be envied ; not becauſe Leonicenus lived ninety ſix years ; that alone was a poor thing, and rather a curſe than a bleſſing ; but becauſe he had preſerved to this old age the uſe of his underſtanding, his memory and his ſenſes, and that his laſt ſickneſs was very ſhort (9).

[*F*] *Leonicenus wrote ſeveral good books.*] The tranſlation of ſeveral tracts of Galen, of Hippocrates's Aphoriſms, and Ariſtotle's firſt book *De partibus animalium. De Plinii & plurium aliorum Medicorum in medicina erroribus. De tribus doctrinis ordinatis ſecundum Galeni ſententiam. De formativa virtute. De dipſade & pluribus aliis ſerpentibus. Quædam de herbis & fructibus, animalibus, metallis. De morbo Gallico, ſive Neapolitano. Contra ſuarum tranſlationum obtrectatores apologia.* A book intituled *Antiſophiſta,* which made Paulus Jovius ſay (10), that ‘ nemo errores Sophiſtarum importuna garrulitate cuncta fœdantium eloquentius atque validius confutavit (11) *(quàm Leonicenus).* —— *No one has more eloquently and forcibly confuted the errors of the Sophiſts, who ſpoil every thing by their impertinent garrulity, than Leonicenus.*' He tranſlated into Italian, Dion's Hiſtory, and Lucian's dialogues, to oblige Hercules, duke of Ferrara, who did not underſtand Latin (12). I forgot his treatiſe *De vipera,* againſt which Rhodiginus tells us, a learned man has written (13). ‘ Nec me fallit ex eruditioribus quemdam edito etiam libello Maraſſum à vipera diſparaſſe, quo Nicolai Leoniceni viri undecunque ſcientiſſimi (14) placita uberius de hujus animalis natura convellat.

[*G*] *He was a very good Poet.*] This Giraldi aſſures us. ‘ Erat & Leonicenus merito inter poëtas collocandus, nam cùm ſenex optimos verſus faceret, & interdum è Græco in Latinum transferret, tum in juvenili ſua ætate non modo meditatos argutè & doctè compoſuit, ſed etiam ut ſæpè mihi memorare ſolitus fuit, ex tempore & impræmeditata carmina cecinit (15). —— *Leonicenus might deſervedly have been ranked among the Poets ; for, both in his old age, he made excellent verſes, and ſometimes tranſlated out of Greek into Latin, and alſo in his youth he not only compoſed ingeniouſly and learnedly, but even, as he often told me, repeated verſes extempore.*'

[*H*] *He*

(2) Ibid. pag. 163.

(3) Pervenit ad nonageſimum annum integerrimis ſenſibus, vegetaque memoria, nec incurva quidem cervice, quum eſſet ſtaturæ celſioris & ſine ſcipione venerabilis. *Id. ibid.*

(4) Melch. Adam, in Vitis Medicor. pag. 140, 141.

(5) Joannes Langius, Epiſt. Medicin. II, lib. ii, pag. m. 472.

(6) Naudæus, in Pentade quæſt. Iatrophilolog. pag. m. 44.

(7) Scaligerana prima, pag. m. 97.

(8) Joſeph. Scaliger, Ep. xix, pag. 104.

(9) I ſpeak thus, having a regard to the paſſage of Scaliger and not to that of Langius.

(10) Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 162.

(11) *He ſays alſo, that* Imperitorum latratibus publicatis ſumma eloquentia commentariis occurrerat. *Ibid.*

(12) Id. ibid. pag. 163.

(13) Cœlius Rhodigin. Antiq. Lect. lib. vi, cap. xvi, pag. m. 298.

(14) He calls him *noſtri temporis plane coryphæus,* in book xxvi, chap. xxx.

(15) Lilius Gregor. Gyraldus de Poëtis ſuorum Tempor. Dial. II, pag. m. 564.

words I ſhall cite [*H*]. They are much to the honour of Leonicenus.

He did not apply himſelf to the practice of Phyſic; and being aſked the reaſon, he anſwered, that he did more ſervice to the public by teaching other Phyſicians, than if he himſelf made viſits to the ſick (*c*).

When I ſaid that he was born at Vicenza, I followed the herd of writers; but I ſhould have ſhewn their error. They have not underſtood the meaning of the epithet *Vicentinus* which he gives himſelf: it ſignifies only that he was born in the Vicentine. The place of his birth is called *Lunigo* in Italian (*d*) and *Leonicum* in Latin: this is the reaſon why he took the ſirname *Leonicenus*.

(*c*) Idem mihi reſpondit Nicolas Leonicenus Ferrariæ, demiranti cur artem medicandi quam profitebatur ipſe non exerceret, plus, inquit, ago docens omnes medicos. *Eraſm. Apophtheg. lib. iii, pag. m.* 163.

(*d*) Leandro Alberti, Deſcritt. di tutta Italia, folio m. 470.

[*H*] *He ſet up for a great critic on Pliny ..... I ſhall cite the words of Calcagninus.*] They are found in a letter he wrote to Eraſmus, the ſixth of July, 1525. ‘Leonicenus medicus, *ſays he* (16), jam menſes aliquot hunc vitæ mimum abſolvit, vir ad æternitatem natus, quem ego ultimum heroum & aurei ſeculi reliquias appellabam. Ex illa enim ætate quæ magnum habuit ingeniorum proventum, & *Hermolaos, Politianos, Picos, Merulas, Domitios* nobis tulit, hic ultimus deceſſit jam propè centenarius, integris, quod mirum videri poſſit, adhuc ſenſibus. Multa ſcripſit, multa vertit è *Græcis*, multa in *Sylva* medica jam conclamata nobis reſtituit. Adverſus barbaros medicos perpetuas inimicitias exercuit: quin & *Plinium*, à quo propoſito fruſtra hominem ſæpe deterrui, inclementer nimis ſemper inſectatus eſt. Denique quod paucis contigit, vivens poſteritatem ſuam vidit: ejus obitum acerbè tuli, tum privato nomine, fuerat enim mihi præceptor, tum publico: videbam enim rem Latinam ejus morte inſignem plagam accepiſſe. —— *Leonicenus, the Phyſician, has been ſome months dead, a man of immortal reputation, whom I uſed to call the laſt of heroes, and remains of the golden age. For in that century, which produced ſo many great men, the Hermolaus's, Politians, Picus's, Merula's, and Domitius's, he died the laſt, at almoſt an hundred years of age, and, which may ſeem ſtrange, with all his ſenſes perfect. He wrote many things, tranſlated many things out of the Greek, and revived many things in Phyſic, which had been loſt. He was perpetually at variance with barbarous Phyſicians: he alſo cenſured Pliny too ſeverely, from which undertaking I in vain diſſuaded him. Laſtly, what happens to but a few, he lived to ſee his own poſterity: his death greatly afflicted me, upon a private, as well as a public, account; for he had been my tutor, and I foreſaw the loſs the Latin language, and learning, would ſuffer by his death.*’

(16) Apud Eraſm in Epiſt. liv. lib xx, pag. 1019. *Mr Pope Blount attributes this to Eraſmus.*

LEONIN (Elbert or Engelbert), in Flemiſh *de Leew*, a native of the iſle of Bommel in Guelderland, was one of the ableſt Civilians of the XVIth century, and verſed in ſtate affairs. He ſtudied firſt in his native country, then at Utrecht, afterwards at Emmeric, and laſtly at Louvain. He did not confine himſelf to the ſtudy of the *Belles Lettres* in this laſt town, under the learned Peter Nannius, but alſo applied himſelf to the Civil-Law, and became a Licentiate in that faculty in 1547. He afterwards went to Arras to learn the French tongue, returned to Louvain at the year's end, and married a daughter of the firſt profeſſor of the Civil-Law [*A*]. A profeſſor's chair of the Canon-Law becoming vacant on the ſecond day of his marriage, he was promoted to it. He diſcharged that office worthily, and grew famous as well by his lectures, as by his anſwers to ſeveral Law caſes ſent him from all parts of Europe. He ſucceeded Gabriel Mudæus firſt profeſſor of Civil-Law in 1560, and from that time ſaw his reputation daily increaſe; inſomuch that the great lords and magiſtrates of the Low-Countries did conſult and honour him. Even thoſe who were at variance among themſelves, agreed in intruſting him with their moſt ſecret affairs and differences, and refuſed not his arbitration, tho' the obſtinacy of their hatred rendered ineffectual his endeavours to reconcile them. He had the honour to be intimately beloved by the prince of Orange; and this was one reaſon, why he would never re-ingage in the party of the king of Spain, after he had once embraced that of the lords and provinces aſſociated in defence of their liberty. I ſhall give his other reaſons below [*B*]. He was choſen chancellor of Guelderland

[*A*] *He married at Louvain, a daughter of the firſt profeſſor of the Civil-Law.*] Her name was Barbara de Haze (1). If her huſband deſerved the ſirname Longolius on account of his tallneſs (2), ſhe deſerved a particular ſirname on account of her long life. Valerius Andreas tells us, ſhe lived fifty two years with her huſband, and thirty ſix a widow (3). She was twelve at leaſt when ſhe married. Add theſe numbers together, and they will make an entire century. There will be no error in the calculation, though there is in Valerius Andreas's way of reckoning: according to him we muſt allow at leaſt a year between the licence and the marriage of Leonin: the licence was taken out in 1547: Leonin muſt be married then in the year 1548, now he died in 1598. How then can it be ſaid that he lived fifty two years with his wife? all this I know appears from his epitaph (4); but we ought to conclude from it, that he married Barbara de Haze, in 1546, and Valerius Andreas is to be blamed for not ſeeing his falſe computation.

[*B*] *I ſhall give his other reaſons below.*] We find in him a rare example of conſtancy, for being once ingaged with the States, he unalterably continued the ſame courſe to his death, though a zeal for religion did not tie him to them. It is no extraordinary thing to ſee people die in the party they have eſpouſed at the beginning of a faction or revolution; but if the train of ſuch an enterprize has been long and perplexed, one while favourable, another diſadvantageous, you commonly ſee the ſame perſons quit and re-eſpouſe three or four times the ſame party, and it is a meer chance if, ſometimes, they end as they begin. Death ſeizes them, when they are returned to their firſt ſtarting place: ſome years more would have cauſed them to repair perhaps to the oppoſite ſtandard. The ſureſt way of preventing change, is either to embrace, out of an ardent zeal for religion, the revolting party, or ſo to irritate one's prince, as to leave no room for confiding in the amneſty promiſed; nothing of all this was the cauſe of Leonin's conſtancy, which was very long and without interruption. What then were his motives? they were theſe. He enjoyed the intimacy and particular friendſhip of the prince of Orange. This made him ſuſpected by the royaliſts and by the king himſelf. They believed he was an accomplice in the rebellion; this however, ſays he, was a falſhood (5), but he did not think fit to truſt thoſe who falſely ſuſpected him. Beſides he was a counſellor of ſtate to the new republic, he had been truſted in the greateſt affairs: he thought therefore it would be perfidious to reveal them to the other party, as he muſt have done, if he had changed ſides (6). Beſides he was of Solon's opinion, that in civil wars, an honeſt man ought to embrace the weakeſt ſide, and the moſt expoſed to danger. ‘Sed & Solonis dictum, inquit, ac conſilium ob oculos habebam, quod bonus vir in civilibus diſſenſionibus partem eligere debeat inferiorem, & magis periculoſam (7).’ A man muſt be a thorough Philoſopher

(1) Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag. 197.

(2) Id ibid.

(3) Vixit in primo atque unico matrimonio annos quinquaginta duos. Superſtes vidua Bruxellam ad ſuos reverſa annis XXXVI. marito ſupervixit. *Id. ibid. pag.* 192.

(4) *It is to be found at length in the* Athenæ Belgicæ *of* Swert, *pag.* 225, 226.

(5) Veniſſet in ſuſpicionem apud Regios, atque etiam regem ipſum alicujus molitionis contrariæ, & quod deterius, ſeditioſorum conſiliis conſentire diceretur, quod à ſe ſcribit fuiſſe alieniſſimum. *Valer. Andr. ibid. pag.* 198.

(6) Id. ibid.

(7) Ibid.

land after the departure of archduke Matthias in 1581. He was one of the embaſſadors of the States to the king of France after the death of the prince of Orange in 1584, he made a ſpeech at the audience they had of Henry III (*a*), and in the conferences concerning the offer of the ſovereignty. He harangued at the Hague, in the name of the ſame States, the earl of Leiceſter, whom the queen of England had given them for governor. He inſinuated himſelf into the good graces of this earl, and the other Engliſh lords, and adviſed them to exerciſe their authority with moderation; but contrary counſels prevailed. He died at Arnheim the fourth (*b*) of December 1598, in the ſeventy ninth year of his age (*c*). He never profeſſed the Proteſtant religion, and behaved himſelf ſomewhat too freely on this head [*C*]. We have ſeveral books of his writing [*D*].

(*a*) *See an abſtract of his ſpeech in Strada,* de Bello Belgic. Dec. II, lib. v, pag. m. 333, 334.

(*b*) *His epitaph,* in Swert. Athen. Belg. pag. 225, *ſays that it was the ſixth.*

(*c*) *Taken from Valerius Andreas,* Biblioth Belg. pag. 179, & ſeq.

ſopher, to give ſuch advice, and much more ſo to follow it. But how comes it, that Solon did not adviſe to adhere to the reaſonable ſide? I believe we may anſwer for him, that each of the contending parties, in a republic, pretend the public good, and that with ſuch a train of objections, and anſwers, that private perſons cannot eaſily diſtinguiſh the right from the wrong. What remains then, but to engage in the leaſt powerful faction? It is not ſo hard to diſtinguiſh it. It ought to be preferred not only becauſe it is generous to aſſiſt the weak againſt the ſtrong, but becauſe the temptation to commit acts of injuſtice is greater in the prevailing, than in the weaker faction. You will ſay that the latter would not be more moderate than the other, if it had equal power. I grant it; but as long as inability deprives it of occaſions to tyrannize, you ought to balance and avoid being an abettor of violences. If it becomes uppermoſt, quit it, for fear it ſhould draw you into oppreſſive methods in it's turn. This, by the by, and on occaſion of Solon's maxim, and with the corrective I have joined to it, *viz.* that at the bottom, you know not who is right and who is wrong.

[*C*] *He behaved ſomewhat too freely on the ſubject of religion.*] He would have religion reduced to a great ſimplicity, and all left to the judgment of God and the angels, that exceeds the reach of human underſtanding. We ought, ſays he, to admire and adore the Deity rather than define it. Let us baniſh from the republic ſubtile diſputations. 'Ego ſimplicem religionem amplectendam ſemper prædicavi, & etiam 'nunc prædico, prorſus divina & humani ingenii captum excedentia, divinitati & ſecreto Dei atque Angelorum judicio relinquens: honorandam potiùs & 'admirandam divinitatem quàm definiendam judicavi. 'Enixè laboravi, ut nimiùm ſubtiles diſputationes è 'Republica ejicerentur, de quo memini in Oratione ad 'Ordines habita, quæ poſt primam Centuriam Conſiliorum meorum impreſſa eſt (8). —— *I always declared for ſimplicity in religion, and now alſo declare 'for it, leaving divine things, and ſuch as exceed human comprehenſion, to the Deity, and the ſecret judgment of God and angels: I have thought the Divinity 'ought to be honoured and admired, rather than defined. I have laboured hard to baniſh from the commonwealth ſubtle diſputations; which I mention in an 'oration delivered before the States, and which is printed 'after the firſt century of my Conſilia.*' St Aldegonde found him amiable in all reſpects, except that he had too great an averſion to Theological ſubjects: you are ſhipwrecked, ſays he, writing to him, on thoſe maxims, *do no injury, live honeſtly,* &c. To me this looks like making the labours of the prophets and apoſtles quite uſeleſs. 'Elbertus Leoninus, Haggeus Albada, 'aliique inter proceres religioni reformatæ nunquam nomen dederant. Ille honeſtate civili contentus, religionem omnem ſuſque deque habebat: uti eum ipſi 'graphicè deſcripſit Phil. Marnixius in ſelect. Epiſt. 'Belgarum centur. 2. ep. 44.' "Nihil enim eſt in te "quod non ſit ſuaviſſimum, ſi hoc unum demas, quod "nimium es atheologus. Dum enim tuis illis formulis, quid dico formulis? imo oraculis, Neminem lædere, honeſtè vivere, aliiſque tanquam ſcopulis inhæreſcis, videris mihi Apoſtolorum omnium ac Prophetarum laborem omnem propè inanem ducere (9)." '—— *Elbert Leonin, Haggai Albada, and others among the nobles, never embraced the Reformed Religion. The former, ſatisfied with civil honeſty, eſteemed all religions alike; as Phil. Marnixius,* in ſelect. 'Epiſt. Belg. cent. 2. ep. 44, *has deſcribed him to 'himſelf.*' "*There is nothing in you but what is moſt "pleaſing, except that you pay too little regard to Divinity: for whilſt you adhere to thoſe formularies, "(why do I ſay, formularies?) thoſe oracles, injure no "one, live honeſtly, you ſeem to me to eſteem the labour of all the apoſtles and prophets as vain and "uſeleſs.*" The place where Grotius ſpeaks of three illuſtrious men, who died in the Low-Countries in 1598, deſerves our notice. The two firſt (10) beginning with public affairs, grew old in a retreat, But the third called from the obſcurity of his cloſet to the acquaintance of great men, ſpent the reſt of his life in public employments. He ſpeaks of our Leoninus, and ſays he was a man, who derived from nature, what the precepts of the old Philoſophers aimed at; he was in a manner free from paſſion, he followed the republican party, not through intereſt or prejudice, but becauſe he found himſelf engaged in it. 'Elbertus 'Leoninus in umbra ſtudiorum quondam educatus, & 'ante pacem Gandavenſem regiarum partium miniſter, 'tunc ſummus Geldriæ juridicus conſiliis publicis immoriebatur, homo natura conſecutus, quo veterum 'magiſtrorum præcepta nituntur, ut affectu pene omni vacaret, adeo quidem, ut partes quoque non ſtudio 'ullo, ſed quia ſic invenerat, ſequeretur (11).'

[*D*] *We have ſeveral books of his writing.*] Moſt of them came out after his death: as we may know by the dates added to the following titles: *Centuria conſiliorum* at Antwerp 1584 in folio. We ſee at the end of this work *Oratio habita in conventu Ordinum Generalium, Antverpiæ anno* 1579, *tempore Colloquii Colonienſis, de bello, religione, & pace per Belgium.* His ſeven books *Emendationum ſive Obſervationum,* were printed at Arnheim in 1610, in 4to. *Prælectiones ad tit. Cod. de jure Emphyteutico,* at Francfort 1606. in 8vo. *ad lib.* 9. *Cod. in quo tituli & leges omnes ad inſtar proceſſus criminalis explicantur,* at Cologne 1604. in 4to. *Commentarius ad tit. D. de uſufructu,* Lichæ 1600. in 8vo. His diſſertation, *de trapezitis Belgii vulgo Lombardis* was publiſhed by Boxhorn (12). I omit ſeveral books he deſigned for the preſs (13), which were left in the cuſtody of Elbert Zoſius, his grandſon (14), advocate of Utrecht.

(8) Valer. Andr. ubi ſupra, pag. 199.

(9) Voëtius, de Politia Eccleſ. Tom. II, pag. 458.

(10) *The count de Culembourg, and St Aldegonde.*

(11) Grotius, Hiſtor. de rebus Belgicis, lib vii, pag. 506. Edit. Amſtel. 1658, in 12mo.

(12) *Taken from Valerius Andreas,* ubi ſupra, pag. 199.

(13) *Valerius Andreas,* ibid. *gives the titles of them.*

(14) E filia nepos. *Id. ibid.*

LEONTIUM, an Athenian courtezan, made herſelf famous, firſt by her leudneſs, and next by her application to the ſtudy of Philoſophy. The ſecond of theſe would have repaired the diſgrace of the firſt, if Leontium had renounced her amorous intrigues, when ſhe betook herſelf to Philoſophy; but it is ſaid ſhe abated nothing of her pleaſures; and that becoming Epicurus's diſciple, ſhe proſtituted herſelf to all the ſcholars of that Philoſopher. It is ſaid too that he himſelf came in for a ſhare, and that he made no ſecret of it (*a*). They who pretend that the ſlanders raiſed on his morals, are a malicious impoſture of his enemies, do not own there paſſed any thing diſhoneſt betwixt him and Leontium; but they cannot deny that he has expreſſed a deal of friendſhip for her in his letters (*b*). This they can grant without leaving room for ill conſequences. She was either the wife or the concubine of Metrodorus, and had a ſon by him, whom Epicurus in his laſt will recommended to his executors. This furniſhes us with a proof

(*a*) *Taken from* Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 588. *I have quoted his own words in the article of* EPICURUS, *citat.* (92).

(*b*) *See Diogenes Laërtius, lib.* x, *n.* 5.

against

againſt the letter, in which it is ſuppoſed ſhe complains of the moroſe and diſguſtful humour of this old gallant (c). Some take her for the ſame Leontium, who was miſtreſs to the Poet Hermeſianax [*A*]. It is more certain that ſhe applied herſelf in good earneſt to Philoſophy [*B*], and even became an author [*C*]. Note, that her Metrodorus was one of the chief diſciples of Epicurus. She had a daughter, who carried herſelf very ill, and died a violent death, as we ſhall ſee below [*D*].

I know not from whence Ludovicus Vives borrowed the reaſon he gives why ſhe wrote a book againſt Theophraſtus. He pretends ſhe did it becauſe that Philoſopher had publiſhed ſeveral good things relating to marriage [*E*].

[*A*] *Some take her for the ſame Leontium, who was miſtreſs to Hermeſianax.*] Athenæus (1) ſpeaks of this miſtreſs, and even produces ſeveral verſes, taken from the third book of the elegies, which Hermeſianax had wrote in praiſe of Leontium. Mr Menage (2) is of opinion, that ſhe is the ſame with Epicurus's good friend; and therefore cenſures Voſſius for placing (3) Hermeſianax in the number of the Poets, whoſe age is unknown. This Poet's verſes, preſerved by Athenæus, contain a long liſt of amorous perſons, and it is probable the whole work turned on that ſubject; for Antoninus Liberalis (4) has taken from the ſecond book of theſe elegies a love hiſtory. Parthenias has taken from the ſame Poet the fifth and twenty ſecond of his ſtories. As to the twenty ſecond, he cites Hermeſianax in general, but as to the fifth, he cites him thus Ἑρμησιάναξ Λέοντι. It is evident, that we muſt read Λεοντίῳ, and not Λέοντι (5). Mr Menage adds that Hermeſianax writ an excellent poem upon his native city Colophon, mentioned by Pauſanias (6). Doubtleſs Voſſius miſled Mr Menage by theſe words; ‘ Hermeſianax Colophonius, poëta Elegiacus de patria Colophone egregium carmen condidit, ut ex Pauſania cognoſcere eſt (7).’ Pauſanias leaves no room for aſcribing ſuch a performance to him. He only ſays he does not believe Hermeſianax was alive, when Lyſimachus deſtroyed the city of Colophon; for, adds he, Hermeſianax would certainly have lamented the ruin of this city in ſome part of his poems. Ὡς Φοίνικα ἰάμβων ποιητὴν Κολοφώνιον, θρηνῆσαι τὴν ἅλωσιν. Ἑρμησιάναξ δὲ ὁ τὰ ἐλεγεῖα γράψας οὐκ ἔτι (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν) περιῆν· πάντα γάρ που καὶ αὐτὸς ἂν ἐπὶ ἁλούσῃ Κολοφῶνι ὠδύρατο. *Phœnix Colophonius ïamborum ſcriptor eam exciſionem deploravit; nam Hermeſianacta qui elegos ſcripſit, ad illud uſque tempus ſuperſtitem fuiſſe non crediderim, neque enim is in aliqua carminum ſuorum parte exciſam Colophonem non defleſſet* (8). You ſee he had been ſpeaking of the Poet Phœnix, a native of Colophon, who had written lamenting verſes on that ſubject. We may collect from this paſſage of Pauſanias, that Hermeſianax was cotemporary with Epicurus, and therefore Chronology may very well allow them both to have loved the ſame Leontium. Pauſanias would not have expreſſed himſelf as he did, if this elegiac Poet had preceded Epicurus many years. Note, that this Lyſimachus, who deſtroyed Colophon, is one of thoſe who ſhared the conqueſts of Alexander.

[*B*] *She applied her ſelf in earneſt to Philoſophy.*] Hence it was that the Painter Theodorus drew her in a meditating poſture. *Leontium Epicuri cogitantem* (9).

[*C*] *She became an author.*] She wrote againſt Theophraſtus, who was one of the ſtrongeſt pillars of Ariſtotle's ſect, and the ornament of his age. Cicero tells us, that this book was very politely written. ‘ Non modo Epicurus, *ſays he* (10), & Metrodorus, & Hermachus contra Pythagoram, Platonem, Empedoclemque dixerunt, ſed meretricula etiam Leontium contra Theophraſtum ſcribere auſa eſt, ſcito quidem illa ſermone & Attico, ſed tamen tantum Epicuri hortus habuerit licentiæ, & ſoletis queri.’ Theſe laſt words have exerciſed the critics; they conſtrue them ſeveral ways, and I queſtion whether any of them has hit on the right; however, we know the drift of the author. He would exaggerate the licentiouſneſs of Epicurus's ſchool; and the better to effect this, he alledges the boldneſs of Leontium, a leud woman who durſt write againſt Theophraſtus. But Cicero, as great an Orator as he was, has not been ſo happy as Pliny, in giving a lively idea of the indignity he conceived in Leontium's enterprize. We learn from Pliny, that this woman's boldneſs occaſioned a proverb, the meaning of which was, that there was no remedy but a rope, if men of the greateſt parts were inſulted at this rate. ‘ Ceu vero neſciam adverſus Theophraſtum, hominem in eloquentia tantum ut nomen divinum inde invenerit; ſcripſiſſe etiam feminam & proverbium inde natum ſuſpendio arborem eligendi (11).’

[*D*] *She had a daughter, who . . . died a violent death as we ſhall ſee.*] She was called Danaë; in point of gallantry ſhe followed her mother's ſteps, but I do not know whether ever ſhe troubled her head with Philoſophy. Athenæus ſays nothing of it, and he is the only author, from whom I learn any thing of her. He ſays (12) ſhe took up the profeſſion of a courtezan, and became concubine to Sophron, governor of Epheſus. She inſinuated herſelf alſo into the favour of Laodice, even ſo far as to be her oracle and confident. Underſtanding that Laodice deſigned to put Sophron to death, ſhe made a ſign to him to retire. He underſtood the danger of which ſhe gave him notice; and pretended to have forgotten ſomething, without which he could not anſwer to the point, upon which he was examined. He obtained time to recollect himſelf, but he appeared no more, and eſcaped by night to Corinth. Laodice had no ſooner diſcovered, that Danaë was the cauſe of his eſcape, but ſhe condemned her to the precipice; Danaë knowing her death unavoidable, was haughty enough not to anſwer to Laodice's queſtions; but ſhe was not ſilent, when ſhe went to the place of execution; ſhe dropt a moſt inſolent murmur againſt providence. *It is not without reaſon*, ſaid ſhe, *that ſeveral perſons deſpiſe the gods; the only recompence they give me for ſaving the life of my huſband, is a precipice: whilſt Laodice, who has murthered her's, enjoys great honours.* Ἀπαγομένην δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν κρημνὸν εἶπειν, ὡς δικαίως οἱ πολλοὶ καταφρονοῦσι τοῦ θείου, ὅτε ἐγὼ τὸν γενόμενόν μοι ἄνδρα σώσασα, τοιαύτην χάριτα παρὰ τοῦ δαιμονίου λαμβάνω. Λαοδίκη δὲ τὸν ἴδιον ἀποκτείνασα, τηλικαύτης τιμῆς ἀξιοῦται. *Cum ad præcipitium duceretur, dixiſſe, a multis non injuria Deos contemni. Nam quod, inquit, virum meum ſervavi, hanc mihi gratiam Dii rependunt; quod autem Laodice maritum ſuum interfecerit, in maximo honore eſt* (13).

[*E*] *Vives pretends, that ſhe wrote her book againſt Theophraſtus, becauſe that Philoſopher had publiſhed ſeveral good things relating to marriage.*] It is probable ſuch pieces would diſpleaſe a woman, who was never married, and entertained gallants; but this probability would not excuſe Ludovicus Vives, if, without having read the fact in any author worthy of credit, he gave it for certain, as he does in theſe words: ‘ Novum malis non eſt, odiſſe bene monentes: ſed in hoc ipſo materiæ genere Theophraſtus, quum de conjugio graviſſime multa ſcripſiſſet, meretrices in ſe concitavit: & proſiliit Leontium, Metrodori Concubina, quæ adverſus tantum & facundia & ſapientia virum, librum ſine mente, ſine fronte evomeret (14). *It is no new thing for the vitious to hate thoſe who give good advice: hence Theophraſtus, having wrote many excellent things concerning matrimony, brought the harlots upon him; one of whom, Leontium, the concubine of Metrodorus, wrote a fooliſh and impudent book againſt that eloquent and wiſe author.*’ This particular is neither remarked by Cicero, nor by Pliny, when they ſpeak of the book, which Leontium publiſhed againſt Theophraſtus (15). For this reaſon it ſhould not have been advanced without a good authority. This is infinitely leſs neceſſary with reſpect to facts, which we meet with every where. I will obſerve by the way, that the French tranſlation of this work of Vives, by Anthony Tiron, and by order of Plantin, in 1579, does not contain this paſſage, nor ſeveral others. This ſurprizes me; for I ſuppoſe the occaſion of theſe omiſſions was, that Plantin did not make uſe of the editions, which Vives had reviſed and enlarged.

(c) *See the article of* EPICURUS, *remark* [*I*].

(1) Lib. xiii, pag 597.

(2) Menagius, Hiſtor. Mulierum Philoſopharum ad calcem Diogenis Laërtii, pag. 498, n. 70.

(3) In Tractat. de Poët. Græcis.

(4) Metamorph. cap. xxxix.

(5) *See Voſſius*, de Hiſt. Græc. pag. 374.

(6) Eſt autem Hermeſianax ille, idem qui de patria Colophone egregium carmen condidit Pauſaniæ memoratum. *Menagius, ubi ſupra.*

(7) Voſſius, de Poëtis Græcis, pag. 90.

(8) Pauſanias, lib. i, pag. 8.

(9) Plinius, lib. xxxv, cap. xi, pag. m. 236.

(10) De Natura Deorum, lib. i, cap. xxxiii.

(11) Plin. in Præfat.

(12) Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 593.

(13) Id. ibid. ex Phylarcho.

(14) Ludov. Vives, in præfat. Tract. de Fœmina Chriſtiana, pag. m. 172.

(15) *See the remark* [*C*].

LEONTIUS.

LEONTIUS, an Athenian Philoſopher towards the end of the IVth century, had a daughter whom he inſtructed in the ſciences, and made her very learned. Perceiving alſo, that ſhe no leſs diſtinguiſhed herſelf by the advantages of the body, than by the talents of the mind, he believed her learning and her beauty might very well ſerve her for a fortune. For this reaſon he left her nothing in his will, dividing all he had between his two ſons. This injuſtice of Leontius, was the occaſion of her coming to the empire; for ſhe it was, who under the name of Athenais, appeared ſo amiable to the emperor Theodoſius, and the princeſs Pulcheria, that Theodoſius married her. The ſuit ſhe commenced againſt her brothers, on account of her father's will, obliged her to implore Pulcheria's protection; and hence came her good fortune (*a*). Father Garaſſe has given a wrong account of this [*A*]. Conſult the diſſertation which I cite (*b*).

(*a*) *See in Menage,* Hiſtoria Mulierum Philoſopharum in calce Diogenis Laërtii, pag. 490, *the entire paſſages of the* Auctor Chronici Paſchalis, *of Socrates, of Evagrius, of Nicephorus, concerning the conſequences of the will of Leontius.*

(*b*) Sebaſt. Kortholtus de puellis Poëtriis, pag. 12, & ſeq.

[*A*] *Father Garaſſe has given a wrong account of this.*] God ſeems to act, ſays he (1), ‘as formerly did the Philoſopher Leontius, who having three daughters, one of exquiſite beauty, and the two others much deformed, left no fortune to the firſt, but only her beauty, ſaying, ſhe was the beſt provided for, as in effect ſhe was, for her beauty made her an empreſs, and gave all his eſtate to the other two, ſaying, that with all that, they would have enough to do to find husbands; for as to lands which are of themſelves beautiful, good and fruitful, God gives them no other dowry, *&c.*’ All the authors, who ſpeak of Athenais, give her two brothers, and not two ſiſters, ſo that it is an inſufferable licentiouſneſs in a modern author, not only to change brothers into ſiſters, but to make them frightfully ugly, and put diſobliging words into their father's mouth.

(1) Somme Theologique, livr. ii, pag. 182.

LEOVITIUS (CYPRIAN)

LEOVITIUS (Cyprian), a famous Aſtronomer, was born in Bohemia. He pretended to Aſtrological predictions, but had no ſucceſs in them. Bodin has cenſured him ſeverely [*A*]. Lewis Guyon, copying Bodin as a true plagiary, knew not how to make uſe of what he ſtole [*B*]; but he tells a ſtory pleaſant enough about the fright Leovitius put people in by his falſe prediction of the end of the world [*C*]. This great Aſtrologer

[*A*] *Bodin has cenſured ſeverely.*] His words are theſe (1). ‘Leovitius had foretold as a certainty, that the emperor Maximilian ſhould be monarch of all Europe, to puniſh the tyranny of the other princes . . . . . which is not yet come to paſs, and there is no great likelihood it ever will. But he did not foretel what happened a year after this prophecy, that Sultan Solyman ſhould beſiege and force the ſtrongeſt place of the empire, nay of Europe (2), in the ſight of the emperor and Imperial army, without the leaſt oppoſition. . . . . It is very ſtrange, that Leovitius ſhould ſee nothing of the great changes which have happened in his three neighbouring kingdoms; how could he foreknow the end of the world, which has not been revealed to the angels? The only reaſon he gives is this, that the religion of Jeſus Chriſt, and the world, muſt end under the watery triplicity, ſince Jeſus Chriſt was born under it; hereby ſuppoſing a ſecond deluge; which is no leſs impious than ignorant, whether we follow the maxims of Aſtrologers, who agree, that no planet ever ruined it's own houſe: Now it is certain, that Jupiter is in Piſces in the great conjunction of the year MDLXXXIII, and LXXXIV, and that the conjunction of theſe two planets is always amicable: or whether we take the authority of Plato in Timæus, and that of the Hebrews, who ſay, that the diſſolution of the world is cauſed ſucceſſively, firſt by water, and afterwards by fire.’ Add to this paſſage, that of the 554th page (3), where we ſee, that this Aſtrologer had preciſely fixed the end of the world to the year 1584. ‘Since he has ſo poſitively aſſerted it, that it cannot be any ways doubted, why would he calculate Ephemerides for thirty years after the end of the world?’ This is a queſtion which Bodin (4) asks with a great deal of reaſon. But this ſuppoſes, that Leovitius's Ephemerides extended to the year 1614. Yet Geſner's Epitome, Thuanus (5), and ſeveral others, affirm, that they reached only to the year 1606. They were printed at Augsburg in 1557. As to his *Prognoſticon in viginti annos*, it was printed in 1564, and tranſlated into French the year following. This is the book Bodin means, when he charges Leovitius with ignorance about the taking of Sigeth.

[*B*] *Lewis Guyon, copying Bodin . . . . . did not know how to make uſe of what he ſtole from him.*] The twenty third chapter of Guyon's third book (6), contains ſcarce any thing but what is taken from Bodin, both as to the facts as well as the expreſſions, and yet Bodin is not ſo much as once named by him. Beſides, Lewis Guyon makes a very ill uſe of Bodin's obſervations; I will give but one inſtance of it. Leovitius (7) *had foretold,* ſays he (8), *as a certainty, that Maximilian the emperor ſhould be univerſal monarch of Europe, to chaſtiſe the tyranny of other princes . . . . . . which is not yet come to paſs, and there is no great likelihood it ever will.* Theſe are Bodin's expreſs words; they were good ſenſe in the original; but they are abſurd in the tranſcriber; for, when Guyon made uſe of them, Maximilian the emperor had been a long time dead (9). Was it not ſmartly ſaid then, that *there was no great likelihood* he ſhould ever be univerſal monarch of Europe? Bodin, who uſed theſe words in his French edition, becauſe Maximilian was then alive, took care to leave them out in the Latin edition which he was preparing (10), after this emperor's death.

[*C*] *Guyon tells a pleaſant ſtory about the fright Leovitius put people in by his prediction of the end of the world.*] Let us make uſe of Lewis Guyon's words. ‘In the year 1584, a rumour was ſpread almoſt throughout Chriſtendom, that the world ſhould certainly be at an end that year: all the Aſtrological mathematicians had affirmed it in their Almanacks, and many curates and preachers told it to their congregations; which put the people into ſuch a fear, that multitudes received the holy ſacrament, having firſt faſted and confeſſed their ſins. In ſome boroughs of this country, and of the Marche, which I forbear to name, the people even made their wills, and I, happening to be by, let them underſtand, that, if all periſhed, there would be none to inherit; and beſides, that all their goods muſt periſh too. Pantagruel made the ſame remonſtrance to Panurge, who, being toſſed at ſea in a dreadful ſtorm, and ſeeing the danger which he had not been uſed to, deſpaired of eſcaping, and inſtead of labouring like the reſt, to cut down the maſts, lower the ſails, and throw the lading over-board, talked only of making his will, and roared and ſwore for pen, ink, and paper; but Pantagruel reproved him, telling him, either we ſhall all periſh, or all be ſaved; if all periſh, who ſhall carry your will to your relations? If all are ſaved, your will ſignifies nothing. At the ſame time, the poor ignorant people kept ſolemn faſts month after month, and gave great part of their goods to the prieſts, in order to prolong the time of the great and laſt judgment. This opinion proceeded from Cyprian Leovitius, a German (11).’ Here is an author, who inſinuates, that the prieſts artfully kept up this terror, on purpoſe to procure to themſelves gifts; they fiſhed in troubled water; they know how to make their advantage of every thing. I like his obſervation on the contradiction the people fell into. They firmly believed the end of the world, and yet made their wills; what an abſurdity is this? I wonder Mr Petit (12) could mention two or three predictions

(1) Bodinus de Republica, pag. 638. Edit. 1601, in 8vo.

(2) *That is to ſay,* Sigeth. *See Bodin,* ibid.

(3) *Cyprian Leovitius affirms in his writings, that the end of the world will happen in the year* 1584. Procul dubio, *ſays he,* alterum adventum filii Dei & hominis in majeſtate gloriæ ſuæ prænuntiat. *Bodin, ibid. pag.* 554.

(4) *Ibid.*

(5) *Thuan. lib. lix, pag.* 109.

(6) *Guyon in the ſecond volume of his* Diverſes Leçons, pag. 577, & ſeq.

(7) *Thus he always calls him.*

(8) Guyon, ubi ſupra, pag. 583.

(9) *Lewis Guyon dates the epiſtle dedicatory of the ſecond volume the firſt of June* 1613. *Maximilian died in* 1576.

(10) *In the year* 1583. *See his* Republic *in Latin,* lib. iv, pag. m. 625. Edit. 1601, in 8vo.

(11) Guyon, ubi ſupra, pag. 577, 578.

(12) *Petit, Intendant of the fortifications,* Diſſertat. ſur la Nature des Cometes, pag. 337, 338.

Aſtrologer died at Lawingen in 1574 (a) [D]. His death ſaved him ſome ſhame.

(a) Bucholcer, in Ind. Chronol. pag. m. 639.

predictions of this nature, made by Stoffler and Regiomontanus, and forget this of our Leovitius.

A man of a great deal of wit and learning, and a profeſſor in the Mathematics, has lately communicated to me an extract he has made of a book of this Aſtronomer. I make no alteration in his letter. ‘I have met with a ſmall book in 4to, of Leowicz's, *De conjunctionibus magnis inſignioribus ſuperiorum planetarum*, &c. *in quarta monarchia cum eorumdem effectuum hiſtorica expoſitione.* He obſerves the conjunctions of Saturn and Jupiter from our Savour's time, and a little before, to the year 1564, and adds ſome particulars from hiſtory, which he pretends had a relation to the circumſtances of theſe great conjunctions. He afterwards makes his prognoſtics and predictions for the following years, to the year 1584. Here, and every where elſe in the book, he finds a thouſand great events, with which he honours the eclipſes, comets, and conjunctions; a notion unworthy a perſon of good ſenſe. Laſtly, he foretells the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Piſces, in May 1583, and the conjunction of almoſt all the planets in Aries, about the latter end of March, and the beginning of April 1584, attended with an eclipſe of the Sun in the twentieth degree of Taurus: he doubts not but all this will bring on a comet, and the comet produce the end of the world, at the end of the watery, and the beginning of the fiery Trigon. He gives an admirable reaſon for it, which has been contradicted by experience. The world, ſays he, began by the conjunction in the fiery Trigon, therefore it will end by the watery Trigon, I anſwer, 1. *Nego antecedens.* 2. *Nego conſequentiam.* This is not all; the year 1584, or, at lateſt, the year 1588, is the end of the watery Trigon, therefore the world will end at that time; for it were not worth while to wait 800 years more for another watery Trigon, and the entire revolution; beſides that the world at that rate would laſt near 6400 years, which is manifeſtly againſt the prophecy, *quod cum prophetia manifeſte pugnat*, &c.’

[D] *He died at Lawingen.*] It is a town of Swabia upon the Danube. Leovitius made it his ordinary abode. Here Tycho Brahe made him a viſit in 1569, and had much diſcourſe with him at table about Aſtronomy (13). Thuanus is miſtaſten as to the town Leovicius died in: he ſays it was at Augſburg (14).

(13) Gaſſendus, in Vita Tychonis Brahei, lib. i, pag. 391, Tom. V, Operum. *He calls this town* Lauginga.

(14) Ubi ſupra.

LERI (JOHN DE), a Proteſtant miniſter was of Burgundy *(a)*. He was a ſtudent at Geneva, when he heard that Villegagnon deſired ſome paſtors might be ſent him to Braſil. He made that voyage with the two miniſters, which the church of Geneva ſent thither in 1556. They arrived at the iſle of Coligni under the tropic of Capricorn, in March 1557. Leri left that country, with ſome others, the fourth of January 1558, and arrived at the port of Blavet, in May the ſame year *(b)*. He wrote a relation, or account of this voyage [*A*], which has been commended by Thuanus *(c)*, and Leſcarbot has inſerted the abſtract of it in his Hiſtory of New France. He was admitted miniſter after his return from America. I cannot juſtly tell where he exerciſed his miniſtry, but I know he was at Sancerre, when that town was taken, in 1573. He publiſhed a relation of this ſiege, and the cruel famine the beſieged underwent. The mareſchal de la Châtre gave him a paſs to go where he pleaſed, even before the capitulation was ſigned *(d)*. He went to Bern, and met with a good reception from Mounſieur de Coligni, ſon to the admiral, for which he expreſſed his thanks, by dedicating to him the relation of his voyage to Braſil. I have not yet been able to diſcover the reſt of his adventures. La Croix du Maine has committed three faults [*B*].

I have ſeen his memorable hiſtory of the town of Sancerre. It was printed in 8vo, in the year 1574, and contains 253 pages. The abridgment, which was publiſhed in Latin at Heidelberg, *apud Joannem Mareſchallum*, in 1576, contains but 50 pages in octavo.

(a) A native of Margel, in the dutchy of Burgundy.

(b) Conſult his relation.

(c) Thuan. lib. xvi, pag. m. 335. *See alſo Varillas,* Hiſt. de l'Hereſ. lib. xxi, pag. 18.

(d) Hiſtoria de Sancerri obſidione, pag. 47, 48. Edit. Heidel. 1576.

[*A*] *He wrote a relation of this voyage.*] The account he gave of this country, made his friends deſire him to publiſh a book on this ſubject. He finiſhed it in the year 1563, and gave his manuſcript to a friend who ſent it back to him by ſome perſons from whom it was taken at one of the gates of Lyons. Not being able to recover it, and giving it for loſt, he ſet about compoſing it anew, and loſt it a ſecond time; for, eſcaping from Charité, upon the Loire, and making the beſt of his way to get into Sancerre, at the time of the maſſacre of St Bartholomew, he left all his books and papers expoſed to the pillage. Yet he recovered his firſt work at Lions, in 1576, at a time when he leaſt expected it, and publiſhed it the year following (1). There were ſeveral editions of it. I make uſe of the third, which is that of the year 1594, *for the heirs of Euſtachius Vignon.* I have cited many things from it in this Dictionary (2). One obſervation, which this author makes, has been much taken notice of (3); *viz, that, in regard of what is called religion among other nations, it may confidently be affirmed, that thoſe poor ſavages have none, and not only ſo, but that, if there be a nation, which lives without God in the world, it is truly this* (4). The miniſter Peter Richier confeſſes as much in a letter he wrote from this country. He expreſſes in it his concern to ſee no likelihood that theſe people will ever be converted to the goſpel, ſince they are not only ignorant of the difference between vice and virtue, but even of the exiſtence of a God. ‘Bonum à malo non ſecernunt; denique vitia quæ natura in cæteris gentibus naturaliter arguit, loco virtutis habent. Saltem vitiorum turpitudinem non agnoſcunt, adeo ut hac in re à brutis parum differant. Cæterum quod omnium perniciociſſimum eſt latet eos an ſit Deus, tantum abeſt ut legem ejus obſervent, vel potentiam & bonitatem ejus mirentur: quo fit ut prorſus ſit nobis adempta ſpes lucrifaciendi eos Chriſto: quod ut omnium eſt graviſſimum, ita inter cætera maxime ægri ferimus (5).’ But, adds he, it will be objected, that they are a *Tabula raſa*, which will eaſily receive a tincture of the goſpel, as having no contrary impreſſions. To this he gives no other anſwer, than that the difference of language is a great obſtacle, and that the interpreters, they muſt employ, were Papiſts. ‘Audio quidem qui mox objiciet eos tabulam raſam eſſe quæ facile ſuis poſſit depingi coloribus, quod nativo hujuſmodi colorum ſplendori nihil habeat contrarium. Sed norit ille quantum impediat Idiomatum diverſitas. Adde quod deſunt nobis interpretes qui Domino ſint fideles (6).’

[*B*] *La Croix du Maine has committed three faults.*] I. He ſays (7), that John de Leri was miniſter at Geneva in 1558. II. That his book is the tranſlation of the hiſtory of a voyage to Braſil. III. That this voyage was made in 1555.

(1) *Taken from the preface of John de Leri.*

(2) *In the articles* RICHER *and* VILLEGAGNON.

(3) *See le Fevre of Saumur, preface of his treatiſe of ſuperſtition.*

(4) *John de Leri, preface.*

(5) *Richier, in a letter dated from Antartic France, March, 31,* 1557. *It is the ccxxxviith among Calvin's Letters.*

(6) Richier, ib. *Compare with this the* Thoughts on Comets, n. 119, &c.

(7) La Croix du Maine, Bibl. Franç. pag. 237.

LESBOS.

LESBOS, an iſland of the Ægean ſea, near the Helleſpont, and the continent of Aſia, was famous for it's good wines (*a*), it's marble (*b*), the fertility of it's ſoil, the illuſtrious men it had produced [*A*], and for many other things. Cadmus, or Cadmilus, one of the Cabiri, inhabited it, and there became the father of Prylis, who was an extraordinary ſoothſayer, and very ill affected to the Trojans (*c*). It held the ſeventh place among the great iſlands of the Mediterranean ſea [*B*]. The Greeks, under the conduct of Graus, great-grandſon of Oreſtes, the ſon of Agamemnon, ſettled a colony there (*d*), which grew ſo flouriſhing, that this colony, and the city of Cumæ, were looked on as the metropolis of all the Greek colonies, which made up Æolia, and were in all about thirty in number (*e*). Panſanias pretends, that Penthilus, ſon of Oreſtes, was he that made himſelf maſter of the iſland of Leſbos (*f*). It had gone under ſeveral names: Pliny mentions ſix (*g*), and yet omits that of Iſſa, which Strabo (*h*) and Heſychius have both obſerved. It had nine conſiderable towns; but in Strabo's and Pliny's time, there ſcarce remained four, namely, Methymne, Ereſus, Pyrrha, and Mitylene (*i*). The Leſbians forſook the Athenian intereſt in the Peloponneſian war, and were rigorouſly puniſhed for it. The ſentence, which condemned to death all the males of Mitylene, above the age of ſixteen, was very near being executed; but, by good fortune, the counter-order of the Athenians arrived when they were preparing themſelves for that ſlaughter. Thucydides gives a very particular account of it (*k*). Some aſcribe to the Leſbians an invention of ſo abominable a nature, that we want words to expreſs it [*C*]. Few people have mentioned the oracle of this iſland [*D*]. It is called at preſent

(*a*) Plin. lib. xiv, cap. vii & xv. *See Cerda on Virgil's* Georg. lib. ii, ver. 90.

(*b*) Plin. lib. xxxvi, cap. vi.

(*c*) *See the remark* [*B*].

(*d*) Strabo, lib. xiii, init. pag. 400.

(*e*) Id. ibid. pag. 428.

(*f*) Pauſan. lib. iii, cap. ii, pag m. 207.

(*g*) Plin. ubi infra.

(*h*) Strabo, lib. i, pag. 41.

(*i*) Plin. lib. v, cap. xxxi, pag. m. 621.

(*k*) Thucydid. lib. iii.

[*A*] *It was famous for the illuſtrious men it had produced.*] Pittacus, one of the ſeven wiſe men, the poet Alceus, the famous Sappho, the Rhetorician Diophanes, the Hiſtorian Theophanes, were natives of Mitylene, as alſo Potamon, Lesbocles, and Crinagoras. Ereſus was the birth-place of Theophraſtus and of Phanias, the diſciples of Ariſtotle. The Muſician Arion, whoſe adventure is ſo celebrated, was of Methymne. Amongſt the famous Leſbians are alſo reckoned the Hiſtorian Hellanicus, Terpander the Muſician, and Callias, the interpreter of Alceus and Sappho's verſes (1). This is the catalogue Strabo has left us. The poet Leſches is omitted in it, who was author of a ſmall Iliad, and a native of Lesbos (2).

(1) *Taken from Strabo*, lib xiii, pag. 424, 425.

(2) Euſebius, in Chron.

[*B*] *It held the ſeventh place amongſt the great iſlands of the Mediterranean ſea.*] Conſult Mr Bochart (3), who produces on this ſubject the teſtimonies of a great many writers. This gives him ground to derive the word *Lesbos* from the Phenician; for he finds, that this word ſignifies, *ad ſeptimam* (ſubintellige) *inſulam*: and ſuppoſes, that at firſt the Phenicians gave this name to a town in the iſland, and afterwards to the iſland itſelf. He proves by the authority of Stephanus Byzantinus, that Lesbos, one of the five towns of the iſland, was the reaſon of the iſland's being called Lesbos. His conjuctures are learned and refined; but methinks the Phenicians needed more time to diſcover, that this was the ſeventh of the large iſlands of the Mediterranean. Such a knowledge ſuppoſes voyages and compariſons between Sicily, Sardinia, and the other iſlands, which make up this pleiad, or ſeptenary number, and we do not find that they, who ſeek new countries or habitations, and ſettle in them, wait any conſiderable time before they give names to them. Mr Bochart does not alledge the words of Lycophron, which teach us, that Cadmus lived in this iſland. He owns, this Cadmus is not the Phenician; but Mercury, one of the Cabiri. Let us produce Lycophron's paſſage:

(3) Bochart. Geogr. Sacr. lib. i. cap. ix, pag. m. 415, 416.

> Ὡς μή σε Κάδμος ὤφελ' ἐν περιῤῥύτᾳ
> Ἴσσῃ φυτεῦσαι δυσμενῶν ποδηγέτην,
> Τέταρτον ἐξ Ἀτλαντος ἀθλίου σπόρον,
> Τῶν αὐθομαίμων συγκατασκάπτην Πρύλιν,
> Τόμουρε πρὸς τὰ λῷστα νημερτέστατε.

> Utinam te, Pryli, Cadmus in inſula
> Iſſa non genuiſſet, hoſtium ducem,
> Quartum ex Atlantis miſeri ſemine,
> Cognatorum tuorum everſorem,
> Vatem ad optima veriſſimum (4).

> *O that fam'd Cadmus had not given thee birth,*
> *Prylis, in Iſſa's iſle, to head the foe,*
> *Fourth in deſcent from wretched Atlas' ſeed,*
> *Of thy own race and family the ſcourge,*
> *Fam'd, with prophetic truth, events to ſcan.*

(4) Lycophr. ver. 219, pag. 30. Edit Oxon. 1697.

It is plain, the Poet ſpeaks of a Cadmus different from Europa's brother, and that he means Mercury by this name; for he makes him the grandſon of Atlas, and father of Prylis. The commentary of Iſaac Tzetzes informs us (5), that Lycophron, in this place, uſes the word Cadmus, by an abbreviation, inſtead of Cadmilus, which he had made uſe of in the 162d verſe, and which is the name the Bœotians gave the god Mercury (6). It tells us alſo, that Mercury had a ſon called Prylis, by the nymph Iſſa, who, being gained by Palamedes's preſents, foretold to the Greeks, when they landed at the iſland of Lesbos, that a wooden-horſe ſhould be the engine, by which they ſhould ſubdue the city of Troy.

(5) Tzetz. in Lycophr. ver. 223.

(6) Id. ibid. ver. 219.

[*C*] *Some aſcribe to the Lesbians an invention of ſo abominable a nature &c.*] I ſhall not only forbear deſcribing it in any words of our own language, but even avoid repeating in Latin, what very grave writers have ſaid to make part of it underſtood. However, ſince the great Eraſmus thought it allowable to inſert in his collection of Adages, that amongſt the reſt, which aroſe from their abomination, I may be permitted to copy ſome paſſages of his reſearches. ‘Aiunt ‘*ſays he* (7), turpitudinem quæ per os peragitur, fel‘lationis opinor, aut irrumationis, primum a Lesbiis ‘authoribus fuiſſe profectam, & apud illos primum ‘omnium fæminam tale quiddam paſſam eſſe. In‘terpres hujus rei teſtem citat Theopompum in U‘lyſſe . . . & Stratidem in Troilo.’ By *Interpres* he underſtands Ariſtophanes's ſcholiaſt upon theſe words of the comedy, called *Veſpæ*, μέλλουσαν ἤδη λεσβιεῖν τοὺς ξυμπότας, *quæ combibones jam ſuos contaminet.* I do not think he has hit upon Ariſtophanes's thought with reſpect to theſe words: Δοκεῖς δέ μοι καὶ λάβδα κατὰ τοὺς Λεσβίους, *mihi at videre labda juxta Lesbios* (8). The ſenſe he gives them ſeems cold and forced. Nor is it any wonder he has ſucceeded no better upon this paſſage, ſince Mr le Fevre of Saumur explains it two ways, and that rather by conjecture, than by any piece of learning proper to explain it. ‘Alludit, *ſays he* (9), ‘ad ſœditatem Lesbiam. [Tanta mihi prurigine vi‘deris correpta ut vel medium virum glubere, *tenta* ‘*viri vorare* poſſis] fortaſſe id etiam eo dictum eſt ‘quod eam divaricatis cruribus decumbentem vide‘ret.’ Galen has mentioned the Lesbian filthineſs, but without explaining what it was. He did not think it neceſſary, at a time when every body underſtood this expreſſion; but a great many Greek words are grown already almoſt unintelligible in the courſe of many ages, and it makes the critics ſweat to gueſs what the ancients meant by them. The learned Mercurialis endeavoured to find the meaning of this paſſage of Galen. ‘Galenus, *ſays he* (10), 10 de Simp. med. ‘cap. 1. Xenocratem damnans, quòd ſtercora ægris ‘voranda daret, probrum ait gravius eſſe, κοπροφάγον, ‘id eſt, ſtercorivorum audire, quàm fellatorem, aut ‘cinædum. Subjungit deinceps: καὶ τῶν αἰσχρουργῶν ‘μᾶλλον βδελυττόμεθα τοὺς φοινικίζοντας, ‘τῶν λεσβιαζόντων. Qui verò ſint phœniciſſantes, ‘& Lesbiaſſantes apud ipſum, nullibi explicatum ha‘betur.

(7) *Eraſmus on the proverb* Λεσβιάζειν. *It is the ſeventieth of the VIIth century of the IIId Chiliad*, pag. m. 795.

(8) Ariſtoph. in ἐκκλησιαζούσαις.

(9) Tanaquillus Faber, in hæc verba Ariſtophanis λάβδα κατὰ τοὺς Λεσβίους. Epiſt. lib ii, pag. 267, 268.

(10) Hieron. Mercurialis variarum lectionum, lib. iv, cap. xiii, pag. m. 221, 222.

ſent Mitylene; I ſhall ſpeak of it under that word, and collect ſeveral things, which I omit here.

'betur. Ego itaque reperio, ſpurciſſimam quandam 'apud Phœnices libidinis ſpeciem extitiſſe, qua viri '* * * lingebant, quave interdum impuriſſimos ho-'mines Romanos uſos eſſe memoriæ mandatum eſt. 'Nam Seneca . . . . . Hos cunnilingos frequentiſſimè 'diffamatos, apud Martialem eſt reperire: qui for-'taſſe phœniciſſare dicebantur, quòd labia ſanguine, 'rubea ſæpiſſimè gererent, unde Martialis. . . . . 'Jam verò λεσϐιάζειν, quid eſſet, ab aliquibus ex-'plicatur, obſcœnum fuiſſe turpitudinis genus, quo 'viri inguina puerorum, vel virorum ore & labiis 'tractabant, irrumationem aliàs vocatam, & ſicuti phœ-'niciſſantes labra rubicunda ſibi reddebant, ſic leſ-'biaſſantes alba. Ob quod Catullus ad Gellium:

> Neſcio quid . . . .
> . . . .

'Heſychius tamen aliter videtur ſenſiſſe, ſed qua au-'toritate aut ratione ductus, ignoro.' I have ſuppreſſed ſome words and paſſages in this place of Mercurialis: not that I pretend this learned Phyſician had not a right to ſpeak out as he has done; a commentator or interpreter, who only makes uſe of the authority of ſuch a writer as Martial, known to all the Republic of Letters, is not to be blamed. Either we muſt baniſh the antient authors, or, in the explication of a difficult paſſage, ſuffer their own words to be produced. However, I was loath to cite the paſſages from Mercurialis entire; we muſt ſome times ſubmit to the ſcruples of the mode.

[*D*] *Few people have mentioned the oracle of Lesbos.*] Philoſtratus, if I miſtake not, is the only perſon, who gives us an account of it. He ſays (11), Philoctetes departed voluntarily from the iſland of Lemnos, after Diomedes and Neoptolemus, ſons of Achilles, 'had required it of him, in the name of all 'the Grecian army, and declared the anſwer the 'oracle of Lesbos had given, concerning his arrows; 'for, adds Philoſtratus, the Greeks make uſe of their 'own country oracles, as that of Dodona, the Py-'thian, and all others, in vogue and reputation, 'where approved predictions are delivered, as thoſe 'of Bœotia and Phocis: but as Lesbos was not far 'from Troy, the Greeks, at the ſiege, ſent to the 'oracle, which was there diſpenſed by Orpheus. For, 'after the bloody murther committed on him by the 'Thracian women, his head, arriving at Lesbos, 'lighted on a rock there: from this rock the oracu-'lar anſwers were given, whither not only the Leſ-'bians, but the other Æolians alſo, and the Ioni-'ans their near neighbours, and even thoſe about 'Babylon, reſorted for advice; for he foretold a-'bundance of things to the kings of Perſia, and to 'the elder Cyrus among the reſt, to whom it is ſaid 'he gave this anſwer, *What is mine, O Cyrus, is 'thine*, hereby intimating, that he ſhould become 'conſiderable among the Odryſians, and all over Eu-'rope. In reality, Orpheus heretofore obtained great 'conſideration and credit by his mighty wiſdom and 'knowledge, as well with the Odryſians, as among 'all the other Greeks, who celebrated his myſteries. 'But by this anſwer, he farther intended to ſignify 'what ſhould finally befal Cyrus; who venturing be-'yond the Danube, to ſubdue the Maſſagetes, and 'Iſſedonians, nations of Scythia, died by the hands of 'a woman, who commanded them, and who cut off 'his head, as the Thracian women had formerly ſer-'ved Orpheus (12).'

(11) Philoſtratus in Heroicis, in Philocteto.

(12) Here is an example of the ambiguous anſwers of the oracles of Paganiſm; for what can be more ſtrained than the interpretation of the anſwer to Cyrus?

LESCARBOT (MARK), an advocate in the court of parliament, has written a Hiſtory of New France [*A*]. He had lived for ſome time in that country. He afterwards attended Peter de Caſtille, ambaſſador from Lewis XIII to Swiſſerland. And as he took a delight in writing accounts of the countries, in which he travelled, he wrote a deſcription of the thirteen cantons in heroic verſe, and publiſhed it at Paris in 1618. He was born at Vervins (*a*).

(*a*) Leſcarbot, Hiſt de la Nouv. France, lib. ii, chap. v, pag m. 379.

[*A*] *He wrote an hiſtory of New France.*] It contains *an account of the navigation, diſcoveries, and ſettlements, made by the French in the Weſt Indies, and New France, with the approbation and authority of our Moſt Chriſtian Kings; and their different fortunes in the execution of theſe things, for an hundred years paſt, to this preſent time. Wherein is compriſed the moral, natural, and geographical hiſtory of the ſaid province; with maps and draughts of it.* I uſe the ſecond edition, which is that of Paris, by John Millot, of 1611, in 8vo. This work is curious enough: the author intermixes with it many learned obſervations. He begins with the deſcription of the voyage of John Verazzan, a Florentine, who was ſent into America by Francis I, in 1524. This was the firſt voyage into that part of the world, under the protection of the crown of France.

LESLEY, an illuſtrious family of Scotland, deſcended from one of the chief gentlemen who came over from Hungary into England, and from thence into Scotland [*A*], with queen Margaret (*a*), about the year 1067 (*b*). His name was **BARTHOLOMEW**; he married one of this queen's maids of honour, and had a ſon by her called Malcolme. Some ſay that his wife was the queen's own ſiſter. He got the eſteem of the king of Scotland, and received diſtinguiſhing marks of it [*B*], for having,

(*a*) She has been canonized; it is ſhe they call Saint Margaret. See the article DRUMMOND, in the text, at the beginning.

(*b*) Malcome III reigned then in Scotland.

[*A*] *An illuſtrious family of Scotland, deſcended from one of the chief gentlemen who paſſed from Hungary into . . . . Scotland.*] He is ſaid to be deſcended from a moſt antient Hungarian family, and particularly from one Leſley, who was ſon-in-law to an emperor. 'Originem ſuam duxiſſe aſſeritur ex pervetuſto ſan-'guine Hungarico. & ſpecialiter à Leſlæo quodam, 'qui, ut antiquiſſima referunt Familiæ monumenta, 'perhibetur exſtitiſſe magnus Imperatoris Locumte-'nens, cujus etiam filia ei in thori conſortem eſt 'conceſſa. Ab hoc porro vetuſto Leſlæorum cog-'nomine varia ad hæc uſque tempora loca in Hun-'garia ſuum nomen derivarunt, quæ inter LESLINIA, 'LESSILIA, LELES ac alia temporum viciſſitudine de-'nominationem immutantia poſſunt recenſeri (1). —— '*It is affirmed, that he deſcended from a very antient 'family of Hungary, and eſpecially from one Leſley, who, 'as the moſt antient monuments of the family relate, was 'the emperor's great lieutenant, and even married his 'daughter. From this antient name of the Leſley's ſe-'veral places in Hungary, to this time, derive their 'names, among which may be reckoned* LESLINIA, '*LESSILIA*, *LELES*, *and others, allowing 'for ſome alteration in the name through length of 'time.*'

[*B*] *He received very diſtinguiſhing marks of it.*] The method king Malcome took to know the lands he ſhould allot him, has ſomething ſingular in it. He ordered our Bartholomew to ride a whole day towards the north, and bait his horſe in every county, and he gave him all the lands for a mile round the place, where the horſe baited (2). Here is the Latin account, in which we ſhall find this reward, and ſeveral others. 'Fuit Bartholomæus tantæ æſtima-'tionis apud Regem Malcolmum, præſertim ob arcem 'Edinburgenſem valide à ſe munitam, & ſtrenuè dein 'propugnatam; ut eum non ſolum Equitem Aura-'tum creârit, & toto vitæ tempore dictæ arci præ-'fecerit; ſed præterea in præſtitorum obſequiorum 'mercedem ei conceſſerit; ut, ubi DUMFERMILINGO 'ſeptentrionem

(1) Laurus Leſlæana, pag. 1. See the whole title of this work in the body of this article in the margin, citation (*c*).

(2) *Compare what has been ſaid in the article* HAY, *remark* [*A*].

having, among other actions, built, and bravely defended the fortreſs of Edinburgh. He died loaded with years, and covered with glory, in 1120. His ſucceſſors in the right line lived in ſplendor, as well by the new benefits conferred on them by their princes, as by the marriages, which allied them to the nobleſt families, down to DAVID LESLEY, who was the eighth from Bartholomew. This David, after having bore arms in Paleſtine againſt the Saracens, for ſeven years, returned into Scotland, and, though he was eighty years old, married, and had a ſon, who was the firſt that had the title of baron of Leſley. His iſſue failed in the ſeventh generation, in the perſon of GEORGE, baron of LESLEY, who died very much in debt. His widow married John Forbes, who paying off the creditors, became poſſeſſed of the barony of Leſley (*c*). All the LESLEYS now in being, deſcend from two collateral branches; that of ROTHES and that of BALQUHANE. The branch of Rothes began in NORMAND LESLEY, brother to David, and advanced itſelf wonderfully in riches and honours. *GEORGE*, great-grandſon to Normand, was the firſt who had the title of earl of *ROTHES* (*d*). The right male line of his deſcendants became extinct, in 1681, by the death of *JOHN ROTHES*, whom king Charles II created duke, and raiſed to the greareſt poſts [*C*]. The collateral branches are very numerous [*D*], from one of which deſcended *JAMES LESLEY*, who ſignalized himſelf in the ſervice of the Great Duke of Muſcovy, where he was colonel. As for the branch of Balquhane, it began in the perſon of *GEORGE*, ſecond ſon to *ANDREW*, which Andrew was the ſixth lord Leſley from Bartholomew the founder of the family. *GEORGE*, firſt baron of Balquhane, obtained ſeveral lordſhips in grant from king David Bruce, and died in the year 1351. His poſterity, ſubdivided into ſeveral branches [*E*], has produced a great many perſons of diſtinguiſhed merit. It reckoned three generals of armies at the ſame time; one in Scotland [*F*], one in Germany [*G*], one in Muſcovy (*e*) [*H*]. I ſpeak of them in the remarks.

(*c*) *It ſtill belongs to the family of Forbes.*

(*d*) *His predeceſſors were only barons.*

(*e*) *Taken from a book printed at Grats, in* 1692, apud Hæredes Wildmanſtadii, *and intituled,* Laurus Leſlæana explicata, ſive clarior enumeratio perſonarum utriuſque ſexus cognominis Leſlie, una cum affinibus, titulis officiis, dominiis, geſtiſque celebrioribus breviter indicatis, quibus à ſexcentis & amplius annis proſapia illa floret, ex variis authoribus, manuſcriptis, & teſtimonii fide dignis in unum collecta.

‘ ſeptentrionem versùs ſuper eodem equo unâ die iter ageret; intra quamcunque Provinciam ad pabulandum ſemel deſcenderet; eum totum circumcirca agrum ad mille paſſus hæreditario jure ſuum faceret. Primò itaque deſcendit ad FECHIL, nunc dictum LESLIE in Fifa; alterâ vice apud INNERLEPAD in Anguſia; tertiò apud FESKIE, ſeu ESKIE in Mernia; quartò apud CUSHNIE in Marria; & ultimatim demum ad locum dein LESLIE nuncupatum in Gariotha, ubi equus defecit: reducem cum Rex interrogaret ubi equum reliquiſſet, reſpondiſſe ei dicitur, *At the Leſſe Ley beſide the mair*: Latine: *In campo minori prope majorem*, tunc Rex advertens locum cognomini convenire: *Lord LESLEY ſhalt thou be, and thy heirs after the*. Latine: *Dynaſta de LESLEY eris tu, & hæredes tui poſt te*: ſimulque donationem omnium illarum poſſeſſionum illi confirmavit: quam & ratam habuit Alexander primus, ejus filius; uti hac ſuper re adhuc tempore Joannis LESLÆI Epiſcopi Roſſenſis extabat diploma Regium apud Baronem de LESLIE; multique ex his fundis etiamnum à Comite de ROTHES LESLIE, ceu ſuperiore ſuo dependent (3). —— *Bartholomew was in ſuch eſteem with king Malcolme, eſpecially for building, and then ſtrenuouſly defending, the fortreſs of Edinburgh, that he not only created him a knight, and made him governor, during life, of the ſaid fortreſs, but granted him likewiſe, as a reward of his ſervices, that, taking one day's journey from Dumferlin, northward, on the ſame horſe, in whatever county he ſtopped to bait, he ſhould poſſeſs for ever all the lands a mile round. Firſt then he arrived at FECHIL, now called LESLEY, in Fife; next to INNERLEPAD, in Angus; thirdly to FESKIE, or ESKIE, in Merns; fourthly to CUSHNIE, in Mar; and laſtly to a place called from that time LESLEY, in Garioth, where his horſe failed: on his return, when the king asked him where he had left his horſe, he is ſaid to have anſwered,* at the Leſſe Ley beſide the mair: *then the king, taking notice that the place anſwered his name, ſaid,* Lord LESLEY ſhalt thou be, and thy heirs after thee; *and at the ſame time confirmed to him the donation of all theſe poſſeſſions; which Alexander, his ſon, likewiſe ratified, as ſtill appears by a royal diploma to the baron of Leſley, in the time of John Leſley, biſhop of Roſs; and many of theſe eſtates ſtill hold of Leſley, earl of Rothes, as their lord.*’

[*C*] *John Rothes, whom king Charles II created duke, and raiſed to the greateſt poſts.*] This John Rothes had married Ann Lindſay, daughter to the earl of Crawford: he had only two daughters by her: the eldeſt was married to the earl of Haddington (4), and the youngeſt to the marquis of Montroſe, and afterwards to John Bruce, baron of Kinloſſe. The ſon of the eldeſt took the name and arms of Leſley, and will be earl of Rothes after the death of his mother (5). The titles and places, with which king Charles II honoured John earl of Rothes, are theſe. ‘ Hic Joannes poſt infelicem pugnam ad WORCESTER diu in Anglia captivus detinebatur; Rege dein Carolo ſecundo ad Regna reverſo, factus eſt primò Regiarum excubiarum Præfectus, mox theſaurarius, & omnium Scoticarum copiarum Generalis, paulo poſt ſupremus Commiſſarius, ac demum uſque ad mortem magnus Regni Cancellarius; creatus fuit ab eodem Rege Dux de ROTHES, & Marchio de BAMBRIGH, &c. quæ dignitas etiam ad mares poſteros devoluta fuiſſet, niſi eis caruiſſet. —— *This John, after the unfortunate battle of WORCESTER, was kept priſoner a long time in England; but, after the Reſtoration, king Charles made him colonel of the guards, then treaſurer, and generaliſſimo of all the Scotch forces, afterwards head commiſſary, and at length great chancellor of the kingdom to his death: he was created by the ſame king duke of ROTHES, and marquis of BAMBRIDGE, &c. which dignity would have deſcended to his male poſterity, if he had had any.*’

[*D*] *The collateral branches are very numerous.*] That of the lords of Lindors; thoſe of the lords of Newmarket; that of the barons of Newtown; thoſe of the lairds of Finros, Burdsbank, Aikenway, and of Pitnamon (6).

[*E*] *The poſterity of the baron of Balquhane, ſubdivided into ſeveral branches.*] Beſides the direct line, there is the branch of the lairds of Kincragie; that of the barons of Wardes; that of the lairds of Bucharne; that of the lairds of Cliſſon; that of the lairds of Newleſlie; that of the lairds of Kininvie; and that of the barons of Pitcaple; that of the lairds of Crichie; and that of the earls of Roſs (7).

[*F*] *It reckoned three generals of armies at the ſame time; one in Scotland.*] He was of the branch of Kininvie, ſon to George, laird of Drumvir. He learned the art of war in Germany, and had very great employs in the armies of the king of Sweden. When he returned into his own country, he was appointed generaliſſimo of all the Scotch forces. He was created earl of Levin by king Charles I, and died in 1650, at ſeventy years of age. His grandſon ſucceeded him, and left only daughters (8).

[*G*] . . . . . *one in Germany.*] His name was Walter, and ſon of John, the tenth baron of Balquhane. He went young into Germany, and entered himſelf in

(3) Laurus Leſlæana, fol. 4.

(4) *He is of the family of Hamilton.*

(5) Laurus Leſlæana.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ibid.

(8) Ibid.

remarks. The famous biſhop of Roſs, in the reign of Mary Stuart, was of this family [*I*]. Moreri ſpeaks of him under the word *Leſley*.

in the ſervice of the emperor. The ſervice he did his Imperial Majeſty, when Walſtein was killed, obtained him a regiment, and ſeveral other favours. Ferdinand III made him count of the empire, marſhal de camp general, privy counſellor, and governor of a province (9). He was embaſſador for his Imperial Majeſty at Rome, and in other courts, and was ſent to the Porte for the ratifications of the peace, concluded in 1664. He had been made knight of the golden fleece before. The Jeſuit Paul Tafferner, his confeſſor, has publiſhed a relation of that embaſſy to Conſtantinople. Count Walter Leſley died at Vienna, the fourth of March, 1667, in the ſixty firſt year of his age. He was married to Anne-Frances of Dietrichſtein, daughter to prince Maximilian of Dietrichſtein, high-ſteward of the emper's court; but, having no child by her, he made his nephew James, ſon to Alexander, fourteenth baron of Balquhane, his heir. He had ſent for him long before into Germany, and had been an excellent patron to him. This nephew roſe from the loweſt military degree, to the poſt of mareſchal de camp general. He married Mary Thereſe of Liechtenſtein, daughter to prince Charles of Liechtenſtein, duke of Troppau, by whom he had no children. He left all his eſtate to two nephews (10). Theſe are the titles that are given him in an epiſtle dedicatory (11). ‘Jacobo S. R. I. Comiti de Leſlie, Libero Baroni de Balquhane, Domino Neoſtadii ad Mettoviam; Pettovii, Perneg, &c. S. C. M. Camerario, & Conſiliario Actuali Intimo, Conſilii aulæ Bellici Int. Auſt. Præſidi, Generali Campi Mareſchallo, Pedeſtris Regiminis Colonello, &c.’ The following elogy is given him in the ſame epiſtle. ‘Tu ex viginti, quibus per Germaniam, Hungariam, Belgium interfuiſti præliis, nunquam victus, plerumque victor diſceſſiſti: Intra ultimum tantùm biennium quo ante graviorem ægritudinem *Tuam* caſtra frequentare licuit, Viennam introducto opportunè præſidio imminentem contra hoſtem providè muniviſti, & allatis poſtmodùm a *Te* ipſo inter primos, ſuppetiis ejus eliberationem inſigniter promoviſti, Tartaros a ſuperiore Auſtria non ſemel fortiter rejeciſti; Virouitizam, Breſovizam, Slatinam, aliaque propugnacula, barbaris cæſis, & Cæſareis finibus longe lateque in Sclavonia propagatis feliciter expugnaſti; pauca *Tuorum* millia ad Ternavizam contra Ottomanici exercitus robur rarâ induſtriâ, & fortitudine ſervaſti; ac demum ad Gloriæ *Tuæ* cumulum Pontes Eſſeckianos, & civitatem inter hoſtes cum exigua militum manu plurium dierum confecto itinere flammis injectis audacter inceneraſti, feſtiviſque quaſi ignibus *Tuos* Triumphos adornaſti: Quòd ſi biennio ſolùm tot, & tantas Laureas meſſuiſti; quot hactenus, & quantas meſſuiſſes, ſi infirma *Tua* valetudo permiſiſſet? ——— *In twenty battles, fought by you in Germany, Hungary, and Holland, you generally came off victorious, but never were vanquiſhed. Within the laſt two years, before your want of health kept you from the field, you ſecured Vienna from an impending foe, by opportunely throwing in ſuccours, and afterwards, at the head of a reinforcement, remarkably promoted it's deliverance: more than once you bravely drove the Tartars from the upper Auſtria: you ſucceſsfully beſieged Virouitiza, Breſoviza, Slatina, and other fortreſſes, deſtroying the Barbarians, and extending the emperor's dominions in Sclavonia: with uncommon induſtry and valour, you ſaved a few thouſands of your own men, at Ternaviza, againſt the whole force of the Ottoman army; and, to crown your glory, with a handful of men, and after a march of many days, you boldly ſet fire to the bridge and town of Eſſeck, in the very midſt of the enemy, and adorned your own triumphs as it were with feſtal fires. If, in two years only, you reaped ſo many laurels, how many would you have gathered by this time had your health permitted?*’

[*H*] . . . . . *One in Muſcovy.*] His name was Alexander; he was of the branch of Crichie. He came to be general, after a long ſeries of great ſervices done the dukes of Muſcovy in their armies, and was made governor of Smolenſko. He died in the year 1661, at ninety five years of age. There were at that time in Muſcovy ſeven colonels, ſeveral captains, and other inferior officers of the name of Leſley (12).

[*I*] *The famous biſhop of Roſs . . . . . was of this family.*] He was deſcended from Malcolme, ſon of Andrew, third baron of Balquhane. His father was a learned Civilian, who, after he had travelled into Italy, France, the Netherlands, and England, died the ſixteenth of March 1554. The prelate we ſpeak of had a great ſhare in the eſteem of queen Mary; ſhe made him a counſellor in the ſupreme court of Scotland, afterwards a member of her privy council, and employed him in ſtate affairs. He was appointed coadjutor of the abbey of Lindors, and at laſt biſhop of Roſs. He did great ſervices to this princeſs, and was impriſoned in England on her account, tho' an embaſſador from the king her ſon. He negotiated her liberty at Rome, at Vienna, and at ſeveral other courts, and afterwards died at Bruſſels in 1595. He wrote ſeveral books, and, amongſt others, a Hiſtory of Scotland (13).

LESSEVILLE, (EUSTACHIUS LECLERC DE) biſhop of Coutance, was ſon of *NICOLAS LECLERC DE LESSEVILLE*, lord of Thun, and Eucquemont, who died dean of the chamber of accounts; and of Katherine de Boulanger, ſiſter to the preſident le Boulanger, who had been provoſt of the merchants, and died in the grand chamber as he was giving his opinion. As Nicolas Leclerc de Leſſeville had ſeveral children, and that Euſtachius was only the third, having before him, *ANTONY*, lord of Eucquemont, who died young, and *CHARLES*, who died dean of the Great Council, he reſolved to be an eccleſiaſtic, and went to ſtudy in the Sorbonne, which was not uſual at that time for perſons of quality. He was not full twenty years of age, when he was nominated rector of the univerſity; and it was he who firſt made the univerſity to go in coaches, whereas before they always walked. Which made Henry IV ſay, that his eldeſt daughter, meaning the univerſity, was a very dragletail. Euſtachius had ſo ſtrong a call to the church, that he was ordained prieſt before he had any title to a benefice. He was doctor of the houſe and ſociety of Sorbonne, and quickly after Lewis XIII choſe him one of his almoners in ordinary. He afterwards treated about a place of counſellor in parliament; and was preferred to the cure of St Gervais at Paris, in the times of the troubles, which ſaved him his life: for, being in the town-houſe with ſeveral deputies, both of the parliament and of other ſocieties, and the people, as all the world knows, having roſe up in arms, and murdered ſeveral deputies, and amongſt others, the Sieur le Gras, maſter of requeſts, who had married his ſiſter whom we ſpeak of, ſome watermen and others of the rabble thought it their duty to reſcue their paſtor. Accordingly they forced their way through the reſt of the mob, and carried him off out of the midſt of the aſſembly, and conducted him to his houſe in ſafety. Some time after, he was preferred to the abbey of St Creſpin near Soiſſons, and the barony of St Ange, and was made honorary canon of the chapter of Brioude, which gives the title of count. At laſt the king gave him the biſhopric of Coutance, vacant by the ceſſion of Claude Auvri, treaſurer to the holy chapel at Paris. Tho' he did not live long after, yet he failed not to gain the eſteem and friendſhip of all his dioceſe, where his name is ſtill in veneration. He was particularly diſtinguiſhed by a great capacity, and a profound knowledge in Divinity and Law. As he was doctor of the Sorbonne, and had been fourteen years counſellor in parliament, he was equally verſed in both theſe ſciences, which made him arbiter of the moſt important affairs of the province. He died at Paris, the fourth of December 1665, during the aſſembly of the clergy, to which he was deputed, and was buried in Auguſtins, in the burying place of his anceſtors. Leclerc de Leſſeville bears azure, three creſcents, or, (*a*).

---

(9) Supremus confinium Sclavoniæ ac Petriniæ Præfectus.

(10) Laurus Leſlæana.

(11) *That of the* Laurus Leſlæana, *written in* 1692.

(12) Laurus Leſlæana, ibid.

(13) Ibid fol. T. *It is cited under the name of* Joannes Leſlæus.

(a) A Memoir, publiſhed juſt as it was communicated.

LESTRYGONS,

LESTRYGONS, or rather *Læſtrigons*, were a very brutal people, ſituated in Italy, near Cajeta. Their capital city bore the name of Formiæ (*a*) [*A*]. Homer calls it Læſtrygonia, or the city of Lamus (*b*). It is becauſe Lamus king of the Leſtrygons, and ſon of Neptune, built it (*c*): his dominions were pretty large (*d*). Antiphates, who reigned there, when Ulyſſes landed there, was a cruel man, who would have eaten all Ulyſſes's deputies [*B*], if they had not eſcaped, after having ſeen the ſad fate of one of them (*e*). It is certain the Leſtrygons paſſed for man-eaters [*C*]. Moreri, inſtead of ſaying this, obſerves, that *they eat raw fleſh*. It is not known whether they paſſed from Sicily into Italy, or from Italy into Sicily; but we cannot doubt of their ſettlement in Sicily, becauſe the country round the city Leontium was called *Campi Læſtrygonii* [*D*]. Ovid ſuppoſes they were originally Greeks (*f*). It is certain, that Homer compares them to giants; but this is no reaſon why Bozius ſhould ſay, that, according to the fabulous accounts, they made war upon the gods, that Hercules fought with them, that they were deſtoyed by thunder, that the plains, ſituated

(a) Se the verſes of Horace, which I quote in the remark [B] of the article LAMIA, a Roman family.

(*b*) Homer, Odyſſ. lib. x, ver. 81.

(*c*) Euſtath. in Homer. ibid.

(d) See Horace, Od. xvii, lib. iii, & Sil. Ital. pag. m. 368.

(*e*) Homer. Odyſſ. lib. x, ver. 117.

(*f*) Ovid. Faſt lib. iv, ver. 69.

[*A*] *Their capital city was that which bore the name of Formiæ.*] Cicero puts it paſt doubt; for he applies to the city of Formiæ, the epithet which is given by Homer, to the city where Lamus and Antiphates reigned. 'Si in hanc τηλέπυλον veneris 'Λαιϛρυγονίην (1) (Formias dico) qui fremitus Hominum? quam irati Animi (2)? —— *If you come 'to Læſtrygonia with widely diſtant gates (by which 'I mean Formiæ) how tumultuous the inhabitants? 'what enraged minds?*' See alſo Horace, Ode XVII, of the third book, and add to it theſe words of the preceeding ode.

Nec Læſtrygonia Bacchus in amphora
Langueſcit mihi;

Nor does my wine grow old in Leſtrygonian casks:

By which he means the Formian wine. Pliny is very poſitive: 'Oppidum Formiæ, Hormiæ prius 'olim dictum: exiſtimavere, antiqua Læſtrigonum ſe-'des (3). —— *The city of Formiæ, formerly called 'Hormiæ, and thought to be the antient ſeats of the 'Leſtrygons.*'

[*B*] *Antiphates . . . would have eaten all Ulyſſes's deputies.*] I deſire leave to give this name to the three men, whom he ſent to view the country. You are going to ſee, that Antiphates eat one of them, and that he ſpent his fury on Ulyſſes's ſhips, ſo that but one of them eſcaped.

Inde Lami veterem Læſtrygonis, inquit, in urbem
Venimus: Antiphates terra regnabat in illa.
Miſſus ad hunc ego ſum, numero comitante duorum:
Vixque fuga quæſita ſalus, comitique, mihique.
Tertius è nobis Læſtrygonis impia tinxit
Ora cruore ſuo: fugientibus inſtat, & agmen
Concitat Antiphates, coëunt, & ſaxa trabeſque
Conjiciunt: merguntque viros, merguntque carinas.
Una tamen, quæ nos ipſumque vehebat Ulyſſen,
Effugit (4).

To Lamus' antient Leſtrygonian town
We came: Antiphates then wore the crown.
To whoſe dire court, by great Ulyſſes ſent,
Myſelf, with only two companions, went;
Whence two alone eſcaped by timely flight;
The third he ſeized, and mangled in our ſight:
We ſaw him cruelly the limbs devour,
And ſmear his impious lips with human gore.
We fly; the horrid Leſtrygonian crew,
With fell Antiphates, our ſteps purſue,
Quite to the ſtrand; thence ſtones and timber throw,
And ſink our men, and ſhips that rode below.
One only bark, which wiſe Ulyſſes bore,
Eſcap'd from the inhoſpitable ſhore.

Hence this barbarous Leſtrygon has been alledged as an example of cruelty and inhoſpitality.

Quis non Antiphaten Læſtrygona devovet?

Who curſes not the Leſtrygon Antiphates?

Says Ovid in the ninth elegy of the ſecond book *de Ponto*. In another place he expreſſes himſelf thus:

Nec tu contuleris urbem Læſtrygonis unquam
  Gentibus, obliqua quas obit Iſter aqua (5).

Nor ſet the Leſtrygonian town 'gainſt thoſe,
'Round whoſe fair walls the winding Iſter flows.

I omit ſeveral other paſſages, and content myſelf with theſe verſes of Sidonius Apollinaris.

Biſtonii ſtabulum regis, Buſiridis aras
Antiphatæ menſas, & Taurica regna Thoantis
Atque Ithaci ingenio fraudatum luce Cyclopem (6).

The ſtable of the Thracian king; thy altars,
Buſiris; and, Antiphates, thy table;
The Tauric realms of Thoas; and the Cyclops
By crafty Ithacus deprived of ſight.

[*C*] *The Leſtrygons have paſſed for man-eaters.*] Add to the proofs alledged in the foregoing remark theſe words of Pliny: 'Eſſe Scytharum genera, & 'quidem plura, quæ corporibus humanis veſcerentur, 'indicavimus. Id ipſum incredibile fortaſſe, ni co-'gitemus in medio orbe terrarum, ac Sicilia & Ita-'lia fuiſſe gentes hujus monſtri, Cyclopas & Læſtry-'gonas (7). —— *That there are ſeveral Scythian na-'tions, which feed on human fleſh, I have ſhewn: 'which might ſeem incredible, did we not know, that 'in the middle of the world, even in Sicily and Ita-'ly, are to be found ſuch monſtrous people; I mean 'the Cyclopes, and Leſtrygons.*

[*D*] *The plains of the city Leontium are called* Campi Læſtrigonii.] See Pliny (8), and his commentator Father Hardouin, who cites a paſſage of Polybius, where it is ſaid, that thoſe, who had poſſeſſed the territory of

(1) *That is to ſay,* Longe-diſtantes habentem portas Læſtrygoniam. *Theſe two Greek words are taken from Homer.* Odyſſ. lib. x, ver. 82.

(2) Cicero, ad Attic. Ep. xiii, lib. ii.

(3) Plinius, lib. iii, cap. v, pag. m. 325.

(4) Ovid. Metam. lib. xiv, ver. 233. *This is taken from the tenth book of the Odyſſey.*

(5) Ovid. Eleg. X, lib. iv. De Ponto.

(6) Sidon. Apoll. Carm. xxii, pag. m. 170.

(7) Plinius, lib. vii, cap. ii, pag. m. 6.

(8) Id. lib. iii, cap. viii, pag. 344.

ſituated between Mount Veſuvius and Puteoli, were called *Phlegræi Campi* on that account, and that the flames of Mount Veſuvius proceed from the fire, which burns the Leſtrygons in hell. He pretends, that Homer, Pindar, Polybius in his ſecond book, and Strabo in his fifth book, affirm theſe things (*g*). He is miſtaken; the Leſtrygons did not cultivate land; but they had cattle (*h*). Homer ſhewed himſelf very ignorant of the globe, when he placed them in a climate, where the nights are very ſhort (*i*). It is not true that Thucydides believed, that the Leſtrygons were a fabulous people (*k*): he only ſays, that Hiſtorians tell us, that the moſt antient inhabitants of Sicily were the Leſtrygons, and the Cyclops; but that he has nothing to obſerve concerning their origin, and that he neither knows whence they came, nor what became of them (*l*).

(*g*) *See Thomas Bozius's book,* de Italiæ ſtatu antiquo & novo adverſus Machiavellum, pag. m. 64.

(*h*) Homer. Odyſſ. lib. x, ver. 85.

(*i*) Homer ibid. ver. 86.

(*k*) Britannicus, in Juven. Sat. XIV, ver. 20; *affirms it notwithſtanding.*

(*l*) Thucyd. lib. vi, init. pag. m. 410.

of Leontium, were called Leſtrygons. He cites alſo theſe words of Silius Italicus:

Prima Leontinos vaſtarunt prælia campos
Regnatam duro quondam Læſtrygone terram (9).

The war laid waſte Leontium's plains, where once
The barbarous Leſtrygon his empire held.

See the notes of Dauſqueius on theſe words of the ſame poet,

Poſt dirum Antiphatæ ſceptrum, & Cyclopea regna (10).

After Antiphates's dreadful ſway,
And the Cyclopean rule.

(9) Silius Ital. lib. xiv, ver. 127, pag. m. 591.

(10) Id. ver. 33, pag. 581.

LEUCAS was at firſt a peninſula, joining to the continent of Acarnania (*a*), but became an iſland by the induſtry of the Corinthians (*b*). They cut the iſthmus, and built a city upon the canal, which they called Leucas, whether they tranſported the inhabitants of the town of Neritus. This undertaking did not much promote Navigation (*c*); and if we believe Pliny, the ſands, driven in by the winds, reſtored the iſthmus [*A*]. In the article of SANCTA-MAURA (*d*), we ſhall ſpeak of its preſent ſtate. As to it's antient ſtate, if any circumſtance of it deſerves to be related, it is I think, the ceremony of the *Leap* [*B*]. There ſeems to have been a ſet

(*a*) Strabo, lib. i, pag. 40, & lib. x, pag 311.

(*b*) Cypſelus had ſent them to ſettle colonies on this coaſt.

(*c*) See Caſaubon upon Strabo, *ad pag.* 311.

(*d*) The name of the iſland Leucas at this day.

[*A*] *If we believe Pliny, the ſands reſtored the iſthmus.*] He ſeems to fall into a contradiction here for, in the ninetieth chapter of the ſecond book, he reckons Leucas among the countries, which had been ſeparated from the main land by the violence of the ſea; in another place (1) he attributes it to the labour of the inhabitants. 'Leucadia ipſa peninſula 'quondam Neritis appellata, opere accolarum abſciſſa 'à continenti, ac reddita ventorum flatu congeriem 'arenæ accumulantium. —— *The peninſula of Leucas, formerly called Neritis, cut off from the continent by the induſtry of the inhabitants, and reunited to it by the force of winds accumulating heaps of ſand.*' Strabo, in the two places I have quoted (2), favours him as to the laſt paſſage, but not as to the firſt. Ovid (3) ſeems more favourable to him in reſpect of the firſt, than the laſt, when we conſider what he makes Pythagoras deliver concerning the changes of nature.

Leucada continuum veteres habuere coloni,
Nunc freta circumeunt. Zancle quoque juncta fuiſſe
Dicitur Italiæ, donec confinia pontus
Abſtulit, & media tellurem reppulit unda.

Leucas was part o' th' continent of old;
Now ocean round it's ſea-girt coaſt is rowl'd:
So Zancle, torn from the Italian ſtrand,
By forceful waters, left it's parent land.

After all, we cannot entirely excuſe Pliny, not even by Father Hardouin's kind expedient, who would have it acknowledged, that Leucas had been twice rejoined to the continent, becauſe, at the time of the Roman war with Philip king of Macedon, Leucas was a peninſula (4), and, in Livy's and Strabo's time, it was an iſland. By this rule Leucas muſt have been an iſland all the time betwixt this Roman war, and the reign of Auguſtus, and became a peninſula again, and continued ſo all the time betwixt Auguſtus and Pliny. If it had been made an iſland by the violence of a tempeſt, he ſhould not have obſerved a counteraction betwixt the labour of the inhabitants and that of the winds (5). It muſt therefore be ſaid, that the inhabitants made their country an iſland. But in this caſe, how ſhall we reconcile what Pliny had ſaid in the ninetieth chapter of the ſecond book *perrupit mare Leucada?* - - - *the ſea broke through Leucas.* This event muſt doubtleſs have preceeded the war againſt king Philip; but in theſe former times, we find it was the Corinthians, and not the ſea, which cut the iſthmus of Leucas.

(1) Plin. lib. iv, cap. i.

(2) In the margin of the text, at the beginning.

(3) Metamorph. lib xv.

(4) Ex Livio, lib. xliii.

(5) Opera accolarum abſciſſa continenti ac reddita ventorum flatu. *Plin. ubi ſupra.*

[*B*] *The ceremony of the Leap.*] There ſtood upon the promontory of Leucas a temple of Apollo, and there was an ancient cuſtom (6) that annually, on the feſtival of this god, a criminal ſhould be thrown from the top of this promontory, in order to avert all impending evils. However they faſtened a great many feathers and live birds to the criminal, whoſe flight, it was hoped, would break the violence of the wretch's fall. They endeavoured to catch him at the bottom in ſmall barges lying round in a circle, and if he was ſaved, they only baniſhed him. All this was enacted by public authority, and for the public good; but there were private perſons, who volutarily leaped from the precipice, to put an end to the pains they ſuffered from love. Whence this place was called the Lover's Leap (7). Strabo informs us, on Menander's authority, that Sappho, deſperately in love with Phaon, who ſlighted her, was the firſt, who took the leap of Leucas: He cites Menander's verſes; but probably he had not quoted the whole paſſage: for, by what he has quoted, it does not appear that Sappho was the firſt, who took this dangerous leap. Beſides, Strabo does not come over to this poet's opinion: He ſays, that they, who have moſt exactly ſearched into antiquity, declare that Cephalus was the firſt, who made tryal of that deſperate remedy, when he was in love with Ptaola. An author (8), whom Photius has given ſome extracts of, traces the origin of this practice. He ſays, that Venus, after the death of Adonis, ſought him every where, and found him at laſt at Argos, in the iſle of Cyprus, in the temple of Erithian Apollo. As ſhe made no ſecret to this god of her paſſion for Adonis, he led her to the rock of Leucas, and bid her throw herſelf headlong from that precipice. She took his advice, and finding herſelf cured of her paſſion, ſhe deſired to know the reaſon of it. Apollo anſwered, that, by virtue of his gift of prophecy, he had diſcovered that Jupiter, finding himſelf ſmitten with the love of Juno, came conſtantly to ſit upon this rock, and thus abated the violence of his flame. He adds, that numbers of both ſexes had been cured of their love by leaping from the top of this mountain. Photius gives us a long catalogue of perſons, who had recourſe to this remedy. Some found themſelves cured, others loſt their lives by it. I have not met with Calyce among them, and am the leſs ſurprized, becauſe he omits the unfortunate Sappho.

(6) Strabo, lib. x, pag. 311.

(7) Propterea dicebatur locus ille ἅλμα τῶν ἐρώντων. *Scalig. in Auſon. Cupid. crucif.* Τὸ ἅλμα τὸ τοὺς ἔρωτας παύειν πεπιστευμένον. Saltus quo finiri amores creditum eſt. *Strabo, lib. x, pag.* 311.

(8) *Ptolemy, ſon of Hephæſtion,* apud Phot. Bibl. n. 191, pag 491.

ſet of people, who engaged themſelves, as if they had been hired to it, to give this ſpectacle every year [*C*].

pho. She tells us in a letter that Ovid has written as her ſecretary, that Deucalion, in love with Pyrrha the coy, took the leap of Leucas, without hurting himſelf; upon which his paſſion wore off, and Pyrrha began to love him in her turn.

Hinc ſe Deucalion Pyrrhæ ſuccenſus amore
Miſit, & illæſo corpore preſſit aquas.
Nec mora: verſus amor tetigit lentiſſima Pyrrhæ
Pectora; Deucalion igne levatus erat (9).

His breaſt from love's tyrannic pow'r to free,
Deucalion leap'd unhurt, into the ſea:
The force of love a different way was turn'd;
Deucalion cool'd and thoughtleſs Pyrrha burn'd

Several (10) have mentioned this ſtrange remedy of love, and others have even ſaid, that ſome took this leap for another thing, namely to learn news of their relations.

I have ſaid, that Calyce is not to be found in the catalogue of the Leucas-leapers. She had fallen in love with a young man called Evathlus, and in vain ſollicited the goddeſs Venus to bring about their marriage. Evathlus perſiſted in his obſtinate coldneſs, and Calyce threw herſelf down the precipice of Leucas (11). I believe, if the account were faithfully caſt up, we ſhould find that more women than men had taken this deſperate leap.

[C] *There ſeems to have been a ſet of people who engaged themſelves every year . . . . . to give this ſpectacle.*] A paſſage of Servius has furniſhed Vinet with this conjecture (12). Servius's words are theſe: 'Fœminas in ſui amorem trahebat (*Phaon*) in queis fuit una quæ de monte Leucate, cum potiri ejus nequiret, abjeciſſe ſe dicitur; unde nunc aucturare ſe quotannis ſolent qui de eo monte jaciunt in pelagus (13).' Vinet thinks this paſſage ought to be reſtored thus, *unde nunc auctorare ſe quotannis ſolent qui ſe de eo monte jaciunt in pelagus*; and that this may ſignify, that there were ſome, who ventured for a ſum of money to take this leap, as others articled at ſuch a price to kill one another on the amphitheatre. The curious will do well to ſearch to the bottom of this particular. It is certain they engaged themſelves by a vow to take this leap; as appears by the anſwer of a Lacedæmonian, who was inſulted for drawing back at the ſight of the precipice. *I knew not*, ſaid he (14), *that my vow would ſtand in need of another vow ſtill greater*. Menander's verſes, cited by Strabo (15), ſhew that Sappho made a vow to Apollo before ſhe threw herſelf down, that is, probably, ſhe conſecrated this action to the god. I forgot to ſay, that there were two verſes of Anacreon concerning the Lover's-leap. Scaliger mentions them (16); but I think that they who ſay Hepheſtion has preſerved them (17), are miſtaken.

LEUCIPPUS, a Greek Philoſopher. The place of his birth is not agreed on; but almoſt all authors own him to have been the inventer of the Atomical ſyſtem; ſo that we muſt not rely upon Poſidonius's teſtimony [*A*]. It cannot be denied, that in ſome things, the carteſian ſyſtem reſembles that of Leucippus [*B*]; and Epicurus is to blame in not having acknowledged how much he was indebted to this Philoſopher's

[*A*] *We muſt not rely upon Poſidonius's teſtimony.*] According to which, we muſt believe that a Phœnician Philoſopher called Moſchus, who lived before the ſiege of Troy, was the inventer of atoms; for ſee what Strabo tell us. Εἰ δὲ δεῖ Ποσειδωνίῳ πιστεύσαι, καὶ τὸ περὶ τῶν ἀτόμων δόγμα παλαιόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὸς Σιδονίου Μόσχου πρὸ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν χρόνων γεγονότος. *Imo ſi Poſidonio credimus, antiquum de atomis dogma Moſchi eſt, hominis Sidonii qui ante Trojani belli tempus vixit* (1). Sextus Empiricus obſerves the ſame thing, and in the ſame manner as Strabo, that is to ſay, citing Poſidonius, with I know not what ſigns of diſtruſt, which does not appear in Strabo with reſpect to the other original doctrines of Phœnicia. Δημόκριτος δὲ καὶ Ἐπίκουρος ἀτόμους (*ſubaudi* ἔλεξαν εἶναι τὰ τῶν ὄντων στοιχεῖα) εἰ μή τι ἀρχαιοτέραν ταύτην θετέον τὴν δόξαν. καὶ ὡς ἔλεγεν ὁ Στωϊκὸς Ποσειδώνιος, ἀπο Μόσχου τινὸς ἀνδρὸς Φοίνικος καταγομένην. *Democritus vero & Epicurus atomos* (dixerunt eſſe rerum omnium elementa) *niſi ſi antiquiorem eſſe hanc doctrinam ſit ſtatuendum, & ut ait Stoicus Poſidonius, a Moſcho viro quodam Phœnice adductam* (2). If to this you add the fabulous ſpirit, which Cicero has diſcovered in the manners of his maſter (3), you will be of the opinion of the learned Dr Thomas Burnet, who does not believe, that Moſchus ought to be acknowledged the inventer of the hypotheſes maintained by Leucippus and Democritus. 'Vides rem totam in unius Poſidonii fidem referri, & de hujus fide utrumque authorem ſubdubitare; cum itaque *Atomorum* hypotheſin invexiſſe *Lucippum* aut *Democritum* multo plures & probatiores fidei teſtes affirment; & inter alios hujus ipſius *Poſidonii* diſcipulus *Cicero*: his ego libentius aſſentior; maxime, cum idem *Cicero* huic philoſopho *falſidici* notam adjicere non vereatur: *Quædam etiam Poſidonius, pace magiſtri dixerim comminiſci videtur* (4). ——— *The whole matter, you ſee, reſts upon the ſingle authority of Poſidonius, and that both authors doubt a little of his credit: when therefore much the greater number, and thoſe the moſt to be depended upon, among whom is Cicero, the diſciple of this very Poſidonius, affirm, that Leucippus, or Democritus, brought in the hypotheſis of atoms, I readily aſſent to them; eſpecially, ſince the ſame Cicero does not ſcruple to call this Philoſopher a* Falſifier: Poſidonius likewiſe, with reſpect to my maſter I ſpeak it, ſeems to have invented ſome things.' Perhaps Poſidonius was a little touched with the diſtemper, which reigns in all ages. We take, as much as in us lies, the glory of an invention from thoſe who boaſt of it, or are not of our party, and had rather find another inventer, in the remoteſt times and places.

[*B*] *We cannot deny, that in certain reſpects, the Carteſian ſyſtem reſembles that of Leucippus.*] The diſtemper, I have been mentioning, appears in our age, with reſpect to Mr Des Cartes. They endeavour to rob him of all the glory of the invention, and divide it among other Philoſophers, antient and modern. I enter not into that enquiry; but only ſay that, in ſome things, there is reaſon to believe he has only revived old notions. For example, is not the hypotheſis of the Vortices Leucippus's? the learned Huetius moſt clearly proves it. 'In varios vortices, *ſays he* (5), ſive mundos primam rerum materiam diſtribuerunt Leucippus, Democritus & Epicurus: unde exiſtimemus meritone in vorticum horum inventione tantum ſe jactet Carteſiana Schola. Ac de his quidem manifeſta res eſt apud Diogenem Laërtium & Heſychium Illuſtrium. Ajebant * enim corpuſcula ex infinitate ſimul collecta, Δίνην ἀπεργάζεσθαι; vorticem efficere; & κατὰ τὴν τοῦ μέσου ἀντέρεισιν περιδινεῖσθαι, εἱλεῖσθαι, συστρέφεσθαι, *renitente medio circumvolvi:* ex hac vertigine particularum ſeceſſiones & conjunctiones oriri; ex conjunctionibus enaſci *globoſum acervum*, σύστημα σφαιροειδές. ——— *Leucippus, Democritus, and Epicurus, divided firſt matter into various vortices, or worlds: whence we may judge, whether the ſchool of Des Cartes deſervedly pretends to the invention of theſe vortices. The matter is made plain, with reſpect to theſe, in Diogenes Laërtius, and Heſychius Illuſtrius. For they ſaid, that Corpuſcles, collected from infinity, formed a vortex, and that from this whirl of particles aroſe ſeparations and conjunctions, and from conjunctions a ſpherical maſs.*' We find beſides, in Leucippus's ſyſtem, ſome hints of that grand mechanical principle, which Mr Des Cartes ſo effectually employs, namely, that *bodies, in a circular motion, remove from the center as much as poſſible.* The antient Philoſophy teaches, that the more ſubtile atoms ſhoot themſelves as it were towards the void ſpace (6). Mr Des Cartes ſhould have given his ſubtile matter ſopher's invention (a) [C]. They, who have ſo much ridiculed the invention of Atoms, have not diſtinguiſhed with all the exactneſs that is neceſſary [D]. I have

---

(9) Ovid. Epiſt. Sapph. ver. 167.

(10) Ampelius, in libro Memoriali, cap. viii. Athenæus, lib. xiv, cap. iii. Servius, in Eclog. viii, ver. 59, & in Æneid. lib. iii, ver. 274, & 279. Vid. Scaliger. & Vinet. in Auſon. Cupid. crucif.

(11) Steſichorus, apud Athen. lib. xiv, cap. iii, pag. 619.

(12) In Auſon. Cupidin. crucif.

(13) In Æneid. lib. iii, ver. 279.

(14) Plutarch. in Apophth. Lacon.

(15) Lib. x, pag. 311.

(16) In Cirin Virg. pag. 69.

(17) Mr de Longepierre's Life of Sappho.

(1) Strabo, lib. xvi, pag. 512.

(2) Sextus Empiricus adverſus Mathematicos, pag. 367.

(3) Cicero had been the diſciple of Poſidonius.

(4) T. Burnetius, Archæol. Philoſ. lib. i, cap. vi, pag. 314. Edit. Amſtel. 1694.

(5) Petrus Daniel Huetius, Cenſura Philoſophiæ Carteſianæ, cap. viii, pag. m. 213, 214.

* Laërt & Heſych. in Leucippo, Democrito, & Epicuro.

(6) Τὰ μὲν λεπτὰ χωρεῖν εἰς τὸ ἔξω κενὸν ὥσπερ διαττόμενα· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ συμμένειν. Exilia quidam ad exterius vacuum contendere velut diſſultantia: cætera conſiſtere. *Diog. Laërt. in Leucippo, lib. ix, n.* 31.

matter this quality, if he had kept to his own principle; but, by a conſequence, which we cannot ſufficiently wonder at, he forces to the center of the vortices this ſubtile matter, and to the circumference the more maſſy globules (7). I have ſpoken elſewhere (8) of thoſe, who ſay, that, in reſpect of the vortices, and the cauſes of gravity, Des Cartes is only Kepler's tranſcriber. They ought to add, that Kepler is the tranſcriber of Leucippus.

[C] *Epicurus is to blame in not acknowledging, that he was indebted to the inventions of Leucippus.*] It is the failing of moſt great wits; they will not eaſily acknowledge, that they are indebted for their notions to the lights of others; they would have it thought, that they have drawn all from their own ſtock, without any other maſter than their own genius. Epicurus has been reproached with having only reformed in ſome reſpect the ſyſtem of Democritus, of which Leucippus was the inventer. All this is teſtified by Cicero. 'Iſta enim à vobis quaſi dictata redduntur: quæ Epicurus, oſcitans hallucinatus eſt, cum quidem gloriaretur, ut videmus in ſcriptis, ſe magiſtrum habuiſſe nullum: quod & non prædicanti, tamen facile crederem: ſicut mali ædificii domino glorianti, ſe architectum non habuiſſe . . . . . Xenocratem audire potuit: quem virum? dii immortales! & ſunt qui putent audiviſſe, ipſe non vult. Credo plus nemini. Pamphilum quendam, Platonis auditorem, ait à ſe Sami auditum . . . . . Sed hunc Platonicum mirificè contemnit Epicurus: ita metuit, ne quid unquam didiciſſe videatur. In Nauſiphane Democriteo tenetur: quem cùm à ſe non neget auditum, vexat tamen omnibus contumeliis. Atqui ſi hæc Democritea non audiſſet, quid audierat? Quid eſt in phyſicis Epicuri non à Democrito? Nam etſi quædam commutavit, ut, quod paulo ante de inclinatione atomorum dixi; tamen pleraque dicit eadem; atomos, inane, imagines, infinitatem locorum, innumerabilitatemque mundorum, eorum ortus & interitus, omnia ferè, quibus naturæ ratio continetur (9). —— *These things are delivered by you as dictated; in which the negligent Epicurus was deceived, when he boaſted, as we ſee in his writings, that he never had a maſter; which I ſhould eaſily believe, if he had not ſaid ſo, as I ſhould the owner of a bad houſe, who ſhould boaſt he had employed no architect . . . . . He might have heard Xenocrates: Gods! how great a man! and ſome think he did hear him, though he himſelf denies it. I give more credit to no one. He pretends he heard one Pamphilus, a follower of Plato, at Samos . . . . But Epicurus wonderfully deſpiſes this Platonic; ſo afraid is he to ſeem to have ever learned any thing. When he cannot deny, that he heard Nauſiphanes the Democritean, he loads him with all kinds of abuſe. But, if he was not brought up in Democritus's ſchool, where had he his inſtruction? What is there in the Phyſics of Epicurus, which is not fetched from Democritus? For though he altered ſome things, as what I juſt now mentioned of the inclination of atoms, yet he advances many things the very ſame; atoms, a void, images, infinite ſpace, and innumerable worlds, their birth and deſtruction, and almoſt every thing relating to the ſyſtem of nature.*' Father Leſcalopier obſerves, that Heraclitus had alſo boaſted, that he was indebted to no body for his knowledge, and thereby diſcovered, that he thought it no diſgrace to have a ſpice of the ſacred diſeaſe, that is, arrogance (10). A ſtrange name for pride! One could forgive it in thoſe, who knew the pride of eccleſiaſtics, under the Popes of Rome. If any ſort of vanity deſerves this name, it is ſurely that of certain perſons, who boaſt, on ſome occaſions, that they owe their knowledge neither to reading, nor to the lectures of profeſſors. You ſet up then, we may tell them, for inſpiration.

[D] *They who have ſo much ridiculed the invention of atoms, have not diſtinguiſhed with all the exactneſs that is neceſſary.*] Lactantius lays out all his ſtrength in confuting Leucippus's hypotheſes, as well with reſpect to the origin and direction of the atoms, as to their qualities. He has done very well on the firſt point, but wretchedly on the ſecond. The epithets of madman, dreamer, viſionary, are due to whoever imagines, that a fortuitous concourſe of infinite corpuſcles produced the world, and is the continual cauſe of generation. But if we give the ſame names to thoſe, who maintain, that all bodies are formed from a various combination of atoms, we manifeſtly diſcover, that we have no taſte, nor idea of true natural Philoſophy. We muſt own, then, that in the following words of Lactantius there are good and bad objections: which proceed from his confounding things, which he ought to have diſtinguiſhed. 'Non eſt, inquit, providentiæ opus, ſunt enim ſemina per inane volitantia, quibus inter ſe temerè conglobatis univerſa gignuntur, atque concreſcunt. Cur igitur illa non ſentimus, aut cernimus? Quia nec colorem habent (inquit) nec calorem ullum, nec odorem: ſaporis quoque & humoris expertia ſunt, & tam minuta, ut ſecari, ac dividi nequeant. Sic eum, quia in principio falſum ſuſceperat, conſequentium rerum neceſſitas ad deliramenta perduxit. Ubi enim ſunt, aut unde iſta corpuſcula? Cur illa nemo præter unum Leucippum ſomniavit? A quo Democritus eruditus hæreditatem ſtultitiæ reliquit Epicuro. Quæ ſi ſint corpuſcula, & quidem ſolida, ut dicunt, ſub oculos certe venire poſſunt (11). —— *It is not,* ſays he, *the work of providence; for there are ſeeds flying through the void, which, uniting at a venture, form all things. Why then do we not perceive them? Becauſe,* ſays he, *they have neither colour, heat, nor ſmell; they are likewiſe void of taſte and moiſture, and ſo ſmall that they cannot be cut or divided. Thus from from falſe principles he is neceſſarily driven to abſurd conſequences. For where, or whence, are theſe corpuſcles? Why did no one, but Leutippus, ever dream of them? By whom Democritus being inſtructed left the inheritance of folly to Epicurus. Which corpuſcles, if they really exiſted, and were ſolid, as they pretend, would certainly be viſible.*' He dilates upon theſe objections in another book. 'Primum minuta illa ſemina, quorum concurſu fortuito totum cohæſiſſe mundum loquuntur, ubi, aut unde ſint quæro. Quis illa vidit unquam? quis ſenſit? quis audivit? An ſolus Leucippus oculos habuit, ſolus mentem? qui profecto ſolus omnium cœcus, & excors fuit, qui ea loqueretur, quæ nec æger quiſquam delirare, nec dormiens poſſit ſomniare. Quatuor elementis conſtare omnia Philoſophi veteres diſſerebant. Ille noluit, ne alienis veſtigiis videretur inſiſtere; ſed ipſorum elementorum alia voluit eſſe primordia, quæ nec videri poſſint, nec tangi, nec ulla corporis parte ſentiri. Tam minuta ſunt (inquit) ut nulla ſit acies ferri tam ſubtilis, qua ſecari, ac dividi poſſint: unde illis nomen impoſuit atomorum. Sed occurrebat ei, quòd ſi una eſſet omnibus, eademque natura, non poſſent res efficere diverſas, tanta varietate, quantam videmus ineſſe mundo. Dixit ergo levia eſſe, & aſpera, & rotunda, & angulata, & hamata. Quanto melius fuerat tacere, quam in uſus tam miſerabiles, tam inanes, habere linguam. Et quidem vereor, ne non minus delirare videatur, qui hæc putet refellenda. Reſpondeamus tamen velut aliquid dicenti. Si levia ſunt, & rotunda, utique non poſſunt invicem ſe apprehendere, ut aliquod corpus efficiant, ut ſi quis milium velit in unam coagmentationem conſtringere, levitudo ipſa granorum in maſſam coire non ſinat. Si aſpera, & angulata ſunt, & hamata, ut poſſint cohærere, dividua ergo, & ſecabilia ſunt; hamis enim neceſſe eſt, & angulis eminere, ut poſſint amputari. Itaque quod amputari, ac divelli poteſt, & videri poterit, & teneri (12). —— *In the firſt place I aſk, where and whence are thoſe ſeeds, by whoſe fortuitous concourſe they pretend the whole world is formed? Who ever ſaw them? Who ever perceived or heard them? Had Leucippus alone eyes and underſtanding? rather he alone of all men was blind and ſtupid, who talked of things more vain and empty than a ſick man's dreams. The antient Philoſophers taught, that all things were made out of four elements. Leucippus would not allow it, that he might not ſeem to tread in the ſteps of others; but of the elements themſelves he pretended that ſome were primordial, which could neither be ſeen, touched, nor felt by any part of the body. They are ſo ſmall,* ſays he, *that there is no edge fine enough to cut and divide them; whence he gave them the name of atoms. But there lay an objection againſt him, that, if they were all of one and the ſame na-*

(a) Far from acknowledging this, he denied there ever had been ſuch a man as Leucippus. See *Gaſſendus, in Vita Epicuri, lib. v, cap. i.*

(7) See the Journal of Leipſic, 1689, pag. 187, 188.

(8) In the article KEPLER, remark [*D*].

(9) Cicero de Natura Deorum, lib. i, cap. xxvi. *Others reproach Epicurus with the ſame thing.* See Gaſſend. in ejus Vita, lib. i, cap. iv, & lib. v, cap. i, & ii.

(10) Heraclitus, apud Laërtium, lib. ix, de Vitis Philoſophorum . . . putidiuſcule jactat neminem ſe audiviſſe, per ſe quæſiviſſe omnia, & à ſe didiciſſe: ut qui nihil ſciret adoleſcens, vir nihil ignoraret; cum tamen Xenophanem audiviſſet. Nimirum ſibi dedecori non duxit, ſacro morbo teneri; ſic enim arrogantiam Heraclitus ipſe vocitabat, ἱερὰν νόσον. *Leſcalopier Comment. in Cicer. de Natura Deor. pag.* 101.

(11) Lactantius, Divinar. Inſtitut. lib. iii, cap. xvii, pag. m. 190.

(12) Id. lib. de Ira Dei, cap. x, pag. 533.

I have often wondered, that Leucippus, and thoſe who have trod in his ſteps, never thought of ſaying that each Atom had an inherent vital principle. This ſuppoſition would have delivered them from a great part of their perplexity [*E*], and there is as much

' *ture, they could not form different things, with ſo great a variety as we ſee in the world. He pretended therefore, they were ſmooth, rough, round, cornered, and hooked. How much better would it have been to have ſaid nothing, than to talk ſo wretchedly and impertinently? And I fear it will be thought no leſs impertinent to undertake to refute this opinion. However let us reply as if he had really ſaid ſomething. If theſe atoms are ſmooth and round, they cannot unite into one body; juſt as if any one ſhould endeavour to unite millet into one maſs, the very ſmoothneſs of the grains would prevent a coalition. If they are rough, and cornered, and hooked, that they may be capable of ſticking together, they muſt be likewiſe diviſible and ſecable; for they muſt have hooks and points, which may be cut off; what therefore may be cut off, and torn away, may be both ſeen and felt.*'

A man would be laughed at in our days, who ſhould make ſuch objections; for ever ſince the chimerical qualities invented by the ſchoolmen, have been rejected, the only remedy left is that of admitting inſenſible parts in matter, whoſe figure, angles, hooks, motion, and ſituation, conſtitute the particular eſſence of the bodies, which ſtrike our ſenſes. Cicero has introduced an interlocutor, who has ſhewed Lactantius the error of not uſing diſtinctions; for he aſcribes the ſame qualities both to the figure of the atoms, and to their fortuitous concourſe (13). The moderns have diſtinguiſhed better; they reject the eternity of atoms and their fortuitous motion; but, keeping, in all other points except this, to the hypotheſis of Leucippus, they make an admirable ſyſtem of it. This is what Gaſſendus has done, who differs not from Des Cartes, about the principles of bodies, only as he retains a vacuum. Lactantius's objections againſt the indiviſibility of atoms are the weakeſt that can be made to the atomiſts; the followers of Ariſtotle and Mr Des Cartes propoſe much ſtronger; but, after all, they prove nothing more than the poſſible diviſion of all ſorts of extenſion; for as to the actual diviſion, all ſects are obliged to ſtop ſomewhere. It is plain there are neceſſarily innumerable corpuſcles, which are never divided, and this alone is ſufficient to invalidate Lactantius's objections by way of retortion. Would we make a ſound judgment of Leucippus's ſyſtem, we muſt follow that of Dr Thomas Burnet. Here is what he ſays of it (14): ' Ad hanc ſectam Eleaticam aggregari ſolent *Leucippus* & *Democritus*, viri celebres & eximii, qui hypotheſin *Atomorum* invexerunt: quæ licet, mea ſententia, falſa ſit & male fundata, dedit tamen occaſionem philoſophandi ſtrictius & accuratius. Hi enim non quærunt corporum principia, aut agendi vires inter *numeros*, *proportiones*, *harmonias*, *ideas*, *qualitates*, aut *formas elementares*, ut ab aliis factum eſt: ſed ipſa adeunt corpora, eorumque conditiones Phyſicas & Mechanicas examinant, motum, figuram, partium ſitum, tenuitatem aut magnitudinem, & ſimilia: & ex his cujuſque virtutes æſtimant, actiones definiunt, effecta explicant, idque recte ſolideque, ut mihi videtur, hucuſque. Quod vero has minutias indiviſibiles eſſe vellent, aut innatum impetum habere, aut inclinationes ad certa loca, aut denique inanibus ſpatiis disjungi, hæc & hujuſmodi, non tantum gratis dicta ſunt, ſed etiam claræ rationi refragantur. Utcunque, cum viam aperuerint ad ſaniorem diſſerendi methodum circa res phyſicas, & in hac parte de republica literaria non male meruerint, illos laude ſua ne fraudemus. ——— *To this Eleatic ſect Leucippus and Democritus are uſually referred; famous men, who firſt invented the hypotheſis of atoms: which, though in my opinion, it be falſe and ill-grounded, yet gave occaſion to philoſophize more ſtrictly and accurately. For theſe men do not look for the principles of bodies, or their power of acting among* numbers, proportions, harmonies, ideas, qualities, *or* elementary forms, *as others have done; but they go to the bodies themſelves, and examine their phyſical, and mechanical ſtates, motion, figure, ſituation of parts, ſmallneſs, or magnitude, and the like: and from theſe they eſtimate the virtues of each, define their actions, explain their effects, and that rightly and ſolidly, I think, hitherto. But whereas they will have theſe ſmall parts to be indiviſible, to have an innate tendency to certain places, and laſtly to be diſunited in empty ſpaces, theſe and the like ſuppoſitions are not only without foundation, but even contrary to reaſon. However it be, ſince they opened a way to a more ſound method of reaſoning upon natural things, and in this reſpect deſerved well of the learned world, let us not rob them of the praiſe that is due to them.*'

[*E*] *This ſuppoſition would have delivered them from a great part of their perplexity.*] They might then have given ſome ſort of anſwer to an objection, which they have never been able to ſolve; it is that, which Plutarch propoſes to Colotes the Epicurean (15), and which Galen has urged with great force, as we have ſeen above (16). It conſiſts in this; that every atom being deſtitute of a ſoul, and ſenſitive faculty, it is evident no combination of atoms can become an animate and ſenſitive being. But if every atom had a ſoul and ſenſation, we might eaſily conceive how a combination of atoms ſhould make a compound capable of certain particular modifications, as well with reſpect to conſciouſneſs and ſenſation, as with reſpect to motion. The diverſity, obſervable betwixt the paſſions of rational and irrational creatures, might in general be explained by theſe different combinations of Atoms. It is therefore very ſurprizing, that, tho' Leucippus overlooked the intereſts of his ſyſtem in this point, thoſe who came after him ſhould be ſo blind as never to have added ſo material an article; for the eaſineſs of improving the inventions of others, and the ſtreſs of the diſpute might very well have enabled them to carry their views farther than Leucippus had done. There is ſome reaſon to believe that Democritus had in ſome meaſure remedied that great defect in this hypotheſis. The paſſages, I have quoted in another place (17), ſeem to intimate, that he aſſigned a ſoul to every atom, which is confirmed by the teſtimony of Plutarch: ' Democritus ſuppoſes that all things are endued with ſome kind of ſoul, even carcaſſes themſelves, for as much as they manifeſtly partake of ſome degree of heat and ſenſation, the greateſt part being evaporated.' Ὁ δὲ Δημόκειτος πάντα μετέχειν φησὶ ψυχῆς ποιᾶς· καὶ τὰ νεκρὰ τῶν σωμάτων, διότι ἀεὶ διαφανῶς τινος θερμοῦ καὶ αἰσθητικοῦ μετέχει τοῦ πλείονος διαπνεομένου. *Democritus porrò omnia ait quandam habere animam, etiam cadavera: quòd hæc ſemper perſpicuè aliquid obtineant caloris & ſenſus, majori parte exſpirata* (18). But as none of Democritus's writings are preſerved to us, it is no eaſy matter to give a juſt and exact ſummary of his thoughts on this head; and beſides, we know that this notion has not been followed by the ſect of the atomiſts. Neither Epicurus, nor his ſucceſſors, ever maintained that atoms were indued with life or ſenſe, and they have conſidered the ſoul as a compound of ſeveral parts. They maintained that all ſenſation ceaſed by the diſunion or analyſis of the parts of this compound. See below (19) the diſcuſſion of a critical remark of Plutarch upon Epicurus. They would have found another great advantage in the hypotheſis of animated atoms; for their indiviſibility might have furniſhed them with ſome anſwers to an unſurmountable objection, to which their opinion is expoſed, who maintain, that matter may think, that is, be capable of ſenſation and knowledge. This objection is founded on the unity, properly ſo called, which muſt belong to thinking beings; for if a thinking ſubſtance were no otherwiſe one, than as a globe is one, it would never ſee a whole tree; it would never feel pain upon the blow of a ſtick. To convince you of this, let us conſider the figure of the four parts of the world upon a globe; you will ſee nothing on this globe which contains all Aſia, or even a whole river. The part, which repreſents Perſia, is not the ſame with that which repreſents the kingdom of Siam; and you diſtinguiſh a right ſide and a left in that part, which repreſents the Euphrates. From hence it follows, that if this globe was capable of knowing the figures it is adorned with, it would contain nothing which could ſay, *I know all Europe*, *all France*, *all the town of Amſterdam*, *all the Viſtula*; each part of the globe could only know that portion of the figure, which fell to it's lot; and as this portion would be too ſmall to repreſent any one place entire; the globe's capacity

FROM hence, that each atom is inanimate, it follows that no collection or combination of atoms can become a ſenſitive being.

THAT which thinks ought to be indiviſible. The advantage, which the ſyſtem of Leucippus would have had by aſſigning a ſoul to each atom.

---

(13) Iſta enim flagitia Democriti, ſive etiam ante Leucippi, eſſe corpuſcula quædam levia, alia aſpera, rotunda alia, partim angulata, curvata quædam & quaſi adunca: ex his effectum eſſe cœlum atque terram, nulla cogente natura, ſed concurſu quodam fortuito. *Cicero, de Nat. Deor. lib. i, cap. xxiv.*

(14) Archæolog. Philoſoph. lib. i, cap. xii, pag. m. 378.

(15) Plut. adv. Coloten, pag. 1111.

(16) Citat. (68), of the article EPICURUS.

(17) In remark [*P*] of the article DEMOCRITUS.

(18) Plut. de plac. Philoſoph. lib. iv, cap. iv, pag. 908, F.

(19) In remark [Q] of the article LUCRETIUS.

much foundation for it as for the eternity, and inherent motion, which they attribute to their indiviſible corpuſcles. Let us obſerve, that there was a ſect of Philoſophers in the

capacity of knowing would be entirely uſeleſs; no one act of knowledge could reſult from that capacity; at leaſt it's acts of knowledge would be very different from thoſe which we experience; for theſe repreſent to us all the object at once, a whole tree, a whole horſe, *&c.* An evident proof, that the ſubject, affected with the whole image of theſe objects, is not diviſible into many parts, and conſequently that man, as a thinking being, is not corporeal, or material, or divided, or compounded of many beings. If he were, he would be perfectly inſenſible of the ſtroke of a ſtick, ſince the pain would divide itſelf into as many particles as the member ſmitten conſiſts of. But theſe members conſiſt of infinite particles; ſo that the portion of pain, which belonged to each part would be too ſmall to be perceived or felt. If you anſwer that each part of the ſoul communicates it's paſſions to the reſt, I am ready to make you two or three replies, which will throw you back again into the mire.

I would tell you, in the firſt place, that it appears no more poſſible for the parts of a globe to communicate their pain, than to communicate their motion. Now it is moſt certain, that each part preſerves that quantity of motion, which falls to it's ſhare, and communicates nothing of it to others. Puſh a globe; the motion you communicate to it equally diſtributes it ſelf to all the particles of this moveable, to each according to it's bulk; and from that time forward, till the globe leaves moving, there is no new diviſion made of this motion among it's parts. Why then ſhould you ſuppoſe any other law with reſpect to thought; for inſtance, with reſpect to the pain you might excite in this globe by a kick with the foot? Ought you not to ſay, that this pain diſtributes itſelf through the whole globe, and that each part of the globe partakes of it, in proportion to it's magnitude, and retains what falls to it's ſhare? In the ſecond place, I deſire your anſwer to this ſhort queſtion. How does the part A of the ſoul communicate it's pain to the parts B and C. Does it transfer it by fairly diveſting itſelf, in ſuch a manner, that the ſame numerical pain, which was lately in the part A is now found in the part B? If ſo, it deſtroys a moſt certain and true maxim, *That accidents do not paſs from one ſubject to another* (20). Beſides, it deſtroys your own ſuppoſition. Your deſign is to ſhew, that the pain of a kick with the foot muſt be very ſmart, though divided into infinite portions, and you ſuppoſe that the portion, which falls to one part of the ſoul, quits that part, and fixes on another. But this way of communicating will not augment the ſenſation; for if, as faſt as one part of the ſoul communicates it's pain, it loſes it; an increaſe to that degree, which we call intenſive (21), is infallibly prevented, and thus the difficulty ſubſiſts in it's full force. One cannot conceive why a pain, becauſe divided into infinite parts, ſhould be an inſupportable ſenſation. You will ſay then, that one part of the ſoul communicates it's pain to the reſt, and yet retains it, that is to ſay, produces in the neighbouring parts a ſenſation like it's own. But my objection reverts. This like ſenſation produced a-new, is it not received into a ſubject diviſible *in infinitum?* it will conſequently then divide itſelf into infinite parts, after the manner of the firſt, and by this diviſion each ſubject, or each part of the ſubſtance, will have only a degree of pain ſo ſmall, ſo inſignificant, as not to be felt. Now experience teaches us quite the contrary. My third reply ſhall be, that you introduce into the world an infinite number of needleſs things. You can never bring your notion to bear, but by ſuppoſing a thing inconceivable, to wit, that the image of a horſe, or the idea of a ſquare, being received into a ſoul compoſed of infinite parts, preſerve themſelves entire in every part. This is the abſurdity of the intentional ſpecies, which the ſchoolmen dare hardly any longer advance. It is an abſurdity greater than that of thoſe doctors, who ſay the ſoul is all in all the body, and all in every part (22). But I let that paſs, and only aſk you, whether your ſuppoſition does not manifeſtly include this monſtrous abſurdity; that, in a famiſhed dog, there are infinite ſubſtances, which feel the gnawings of hunger, and, in a man who reads there are infinite things, which read and know each what they read. Nevertheleſs, we all know by experience, that there is only one thing in us, which knows that it reads, that it is hungry, that it feels pain or joy, *&c.* To what end then ſerves this infinite number of ſubſtances, which read in every reader, which hunger and thirſt in every animal, *&c.* This conſequence you cannot deny, ſince, to deliver yourſelf from the inconveniencies, to which you are expoſed by the diviſion of thought into as many parts, as there are parts in the ſubſtance of a material ſoul, you are forced to anſwer, that the parts of the ſoul, by reciprocally communicating their modifications, preſerve the ſenſation entire in every part. This puts me in mind of a very good argument, which a ſect of Philoſophers, whom I ſhall mention in the following remark, employed to maintain the ſpirituality of God. If God is a body, ſay they, the perfection of his being is found either in all the individual ſubſtances of his body, or in one alone. If in all, there are then many Gods; if only in one, the reſt are ſuperfluous. 'Si Deus eſt 'corpus, tùm Divinitas & Veritas ejus perficietur 'vel in univerſalitate & complexu Subſtantiarum indi'viduarum corporis illius, quod habet, vel in unâ 'tantùm. Si perficiatur in una, tùm nulla eſt utilitas 'reliquarum, ſed ſunt ſuperflua: nullaque eſt ratio 'eſſentiæ illius corporis, *(quia una ſubſtantia indivi'dua non poteſt corpus conſtituere).* Si in omnibus & 'ſingulis perficiatur tùm erunt Divinitates multæ, non 'verò Deus unus. Atqui verò jam demonſtrârunt, 'Deum eſſe unum. Ergo (23).' You will tell me, perhaps, that the ſoul does not ſee all the parts of a horſe at once, but one after another; that this ſucceſſion is ſo quick, that it is imperceptible, and that the impreſſion, received the firſt inſtant, laſts long enough to be united with the impreſſion of the following inſtants; whence it happens, that the ſoul believes it ſees the parts of an object, which really act no longer upon it. Thus the ſoul thinks ſhe ſees a circle of fire; when one turns round a flaming ſtick. She ſees the parts of this circle ſucceſſively, and yet ſhe thinks ſhe ſees them all at once. Which proceeds from hence, that the impreſſion, ſhe has received, laſts longer than the action of the object. I anſwer, that this ſubterfuge will not bring you off. It ſignifies nothing againſt my laſt, nor even againſt ſome of my former objections; it can only ſerve to dazzle a little on account of the diſproportion between the greatneſs of the object, and the ſmallneſs of the thinking ſubſtance. But after all, what could you reply, ſhould I ſay, that, when a man attentively beholds an immoveable body, a wall for example, the ſame part of the object, which ſtruck him the firſt of theſe imperceptible inſtants you mention, muſt ſtrike him every following inſtant; for no reaſon can be aſſigned, why it ſhould ceaſe acting on the ſoul. It acts then at the ſame time with all the other parts; but tell me, if you can, how the image of a wall can be fitted all entire, and at the ſame inſtant, to a ſubject diviſible *in infinitum.* This, and ſeveral other arguments, to be ſeen in the writings of ſome moderns, invincibly prove that thought is incompatible with a compound being (24).

WHETHER the perception of a body is formed ſucceſſively in the ſoul.

I have enlarged on this matter, on purpoſe to confirm what I had before laid down, that Leucippus, Epicurus, and the other Atomiſts, might have guarded againſt ſeveral unanſwerable objections, if they had bethought themſelves of giving a ſoul to every atom. They would thereby have united thought to an indiviſible ſubject, and they had as good ground to ſuppoſe atoms animated, as to ſuppoſe them uncreated, and endued with a moving virtue. It is as difficult to conceive this virtue in an atom, as that of ſenſation. Extention and ſolidity conſtitute the whole eſſence of an atom in our idea. The power of moving is not included in it. It is as foreign and extrinſic to body and extention, as that of knowledge. Why then, ſince the Atomiſts ſuppoſed in their corpuſcles a ſelf-moving force, would they rob them of thought? I know they could not have avoided all difficulties, by aſcribing it to them: they might ſtill have been preſſed with invincible objections (25). Yet there had been ſome glory in parrying a thruſt here and there. Let us obſerve, that very great Philoſophers have made the principal properties of the ſoul to conſiſt in a ſelf-moving power the Eaſt, who admitted the hypotheſis of atoms, and a vacuum [*F*]; but they amended, it for they aſcribed to God the creation of thoſe atoms. Let us alſo obſerve that the vacuum, which Gaſſendus had reſtored, and Des Cartes overthrown, gains ground daily, and becomes the favourite doctrine [*G*] of the moſt famous Mathematicians.

---

(20) Accidentia non migrant de ſubjecto in ſubjectum.

(21) The ſchool Philoſophers call *extenſive* the propagation of a quality in different parts of the ſubject, an *intenſive*, the acquiſition of new degrees of a quality in the ſame part of the ſubject.

(22) Tota in toto & tota in ſingulis partibus.

(23) Moſes Maimonides in Doctore peplexorum, Part. I, cap. lxxvi, pag. m. 176.

(24) See, above, the article DICÆARCHUS, citation (58). No one, in my opinion, has treated this important queſtion about the immortality and indiviſibility of whatever thinks, more ſublimely and ſolidly than Dom. Francis Lami, a Benedictin of the congregation of St Maur, in his excellent work of the knowledge of one's ſelf.

(25) See thoſe, which St Auguſtin propoſes in his 56th Epiſtle, *pag. m.* 273, *& ſeq.*

power (26). It is by this attribute they have characterized and defined it. Would any one then have thought it ſtrange, that they, who gave to atoms the principle of motion, ſhould give them a ſoul too?

[*F*] *There was a ſect of Philoſophers in the eaſt, who admitted the hypotheſis of atoms, and a vacuum.*] The famous Rabbi Maimonides, ſpeaks at large of this ſect of Philoſophers. They are called *The Speakers* (27). They principally exerciſed themſelves on theſe four points (28). I. That the world is not eternal. II. That it was created. III. That it's creator is one. IV. That he is incorporeal. This Rabbi mentions the twelve principles they laid down for their foundation. The ſecond of which was, that there is a vacuum, and the third, that time is made up of indiviſible inſtants. It does not appear, that their atoms were like thoſe of Leucippus; for they gave them no magnitude, and made them all exactly alike (29). Maimonides preſſes them hard (30) on their being forced to deny, that one moveable went faſter than another, and that the diagonal of a ſquare was longer than one of it's ſides. Theſe difficulties obliged them to ſay that the ſenſes deceive us, and that we muſt truſt to reaſon alone (31). Some even went ſo far, as to deny the exiſtence of a ſquare figure (32). Let us ſay, by the by, that they might have retorted theſe difficulties upon their adverſaries, and let us challenge all the patrons of diviſibility *in infinitum*, to anſwer the arguments, which prove that the diagonal of a ſquare is not longer than one of the ſides. For the reſt, theſe Arabian Philoſophers ſuppoſed in part, what I have ſaid Leucippus ought to have done; they taught, that every atom of animate bodies was animated, and every atom of ſenſitive bodies ſenſitive, and that the underſtanding reſided in an atom. There was no diſpute among them on this point; but as to the ſoul, they divided into two opinions about it; ſome ſaid, ſhe was lodged in one of the atoms, of which man, for example, is compoſed. Others compounded her of many very ſubtile ſubſtances. They were divided much the ſame as to knowledge. Some placed it in a ſingle atom, others in each of the atoms, which conſtitute the knowing perſon. ‘(33) Vita, ex ipſorum ſententia, exiſtit in unaquaque particula corporis viventis. Ita dicunt, quamvis particulam Animantis ſenſu præditi, ſenſilem quoque eſſe. Nam *Vita, Senſus, Intellectus*, & Sapientia *ipſis ſunt Accidentia*, non minus quàm Nigredo & Albedo. *De Anima diſſentiunt*. Quidam ſtatuunt, Animam eſſe accidens exiſtens in uno aliquo atomorum illorum, è quibus homo verbi gratiâ compoſitus eſt; totum autem compoſitum vocari Animatum, quia ſubſtantia illa individua vel atomum illud in eo continetur. Alii dicunt, Animam eſſe compoſitam ex multis ſubtiliſſimis ſubſtantiis accidens quoddam habentibus, quo uniantur & conjungantur, & animata (34) fiant, ſubſtantiaſque illas cum ſubſtantiis corporis commiſceri. Ex quibus vides, illos Animam quoque inter Accidentia referre. Intellectum quod attinet, unanimi conſenſu affirmant, quòd ſit accidens in ſubſtantia quadam individua totius Intelligentis. *De Scientia* hærent, an ſit accidens exiſtens in unaquaque ſubſtantia individua ſcientis, an in una tantum?’

[*G*] *The vacuum . . . . became the favourite doctrine of the moſt famous Mathematicians.*] Plutarch affirms (35), I. That a vacuum was rejected down from Thales to Plato. II. That Leucippus, Democritus, Demetrius, Metrodorus, and Epicurus, admitted an infinite vacuum. III. That the Stoics taught, that all was a plenum in the world, and beyond it an infinite vacuum. IV. That Ariſtotle acknowledged, beyond the world, only ſo much vacuum, as was ſufficient for the heavens to breathe in; adding, that the heaven is fire. I do not know where Ariſtotle has taught this doctrine; but I know where he has denied, that there are bodies beyond the heaven (36), which ſuppoſes his admitting an infinite vaccum beyond the world; for nothing could be more abſurd, than to ſuppoſe, above the higheſt heaven, a void and finite ſpace. Note, that he teaches in the ſame place, that there is neither place, nor vacuum, nor time, above the higheſt heaven; however, it is a meer queſtion about a word; for he rejects the vacuum, only as defined to be a ſpace, which contains no matter, but which may contain it. He maintained, that it was not poſſible, there ſhould be bodies above the world; therefore he could not admit a vacuum according to that definition; but he had doted, if, taking the void, ſimply and generally, for whatever contains or incloſes no body, he had ſaid, that, beyond the laſt celeſtial ſphere, there was no void. Chriſtian Philoſophers, profeſſing his doctrine, have taught, what Plutarch attributes to the Stoics, that all is full in the world, and that beyond it there is an infinite void. This they call the imaginary ſpace, and do not believe it to be a vacuum properly ſo called, though it includes no body; for by a vacuum, or void, they underſtand the ſpace, which containing no body, is yet ſurrounded by bodies on all parts. It is manifeſt, that this definition belongs not to the imaginary ſpace. As to the plentitude of the world, they have admitted it as a fundamental point, dear and precious to nature; ſince they have ſaid, that it has ſuch a horror for a vacuum, that it will rather violate it's own laws, than ſuffer it to inſinuate itſelf any where. It makes light bodies deſcend, and heavy bodies aſcend, as often as a vacuum threatens it, ſay they, theſe motions are contrary to her own laws, and do violence to the elements: but what ſhall we do in this caſe? is it not lawful and juſt, of two evils, to chuſe the leaſt? the modern Philoſophers have ſufficiently ridiculed theſe viſions. Galileus, and his ſucceſſor Torricelli, revived the doctrine of a vacuum; Gaſſendus, the great reſtorer of Leucippus's ſyſtem, brought it into faſhion, and pretended to have proved it demonſtratively. Mr Des Cartes declared for a plenum, and carried the thing much farther than Ariſtotle's followers had done; for he not only maintained, there was no vacuum, but alſo, that it was abſolutely impoſſible there ſhould be any; he went upon this, that the vacuum, having all the properties, and all the eſſence of body, that is, the three dimenſions, it were a contradiction in terms to pretend, that the vacuum is a ſpace without body. The identity he eſtabliſhed between ſpace and body, was thought by moſt people a great paradox; they cried out, that he detracted from the divine omnipotence, as teaching, that God himſelf could not by a miracle effect, that a veſſel, remaining a veſſel, ſhould not be filled with ſome matter. This is doubtleſs a conſequence of his doctrine, but which does not ſtrike at the omnipotence of God; the queſtion is not concerning his omnipotence, but only whether whatever has three dimenſions be body. Many have thought Mr Des Cartes's arguments very ſolid, and believed that, by the help of his ſubtile matter, motion and plenitude might be eaſily reconciled, and they have found a paralogiſm in the pretended demonſtrations of Mr Gaſſendus (37). Thus the reign of the plenum ſeemed to be better eſtabliſhed than ever, when, to our great ſurprize, we have ſeen ſome great Mathematicians of the contrary opinion. Mr Huygens has declared for a vacuum (38): Mr Newton * has taken the ſame ſide, and hath ſtrongly oppoſed this hypotheſis of Mr Des Cartes, as inconſiſtent with motion, levity, and ſome other phænomena (39). Mr Fatio is of Mr Newton's opinion, and I have heard him ſay, that the exiſtence of a vacuum is not a problem, but a thing certain, and mathematically demonſtrated. He added, that the void ſpace is incomparably greater than the full. This new ſect, patronizing a vacuum, conceives the univerſe as an infinite ſpace, in which are ſcattered ſome bodies, which, in compariſon of that ſpace, are no more than as ſome ſhips diſperſed here and there on the ocean. So that they, whoſe ſight ſhould be good enough to diſtinguiſh what is full from what is void or empty, would cry out,

> Apparent rari nantes in gurgite vaſto (40).
>
> *Few, ſcatter'd, floating on the waſt abyſs.*
>
> TRAPP.

What perplexes the new patrons of a vacuum, is, that they find the Carteſian arguments againſt the nothingneſs of ſpace ſo very ſtrong, that they dare not maintain, as the ſchool Philoſophers do, that ſpace

---

(26) *See* Ariſtot. de Anima, lib. i, cap ii, & Plut. de placitis Philoſophor. lib. iv, cap. ii.

(27) See the marginal note of Buxtorf, at the beginning of the ſixty ninth chapter of the firſt part of his tranſlation of *More Nevochim, ſive Doctoris perplexorum*, of Moſes Maimonides.

(28) Maimonides, ibid. cap. lxxiii, pag. 148.

(29) Id. ibid. pag. 149.

(30) Ibid, pag. 150.

(31) Ibid. pag. 151.

(32) Ibid.

(33) Id. ibid. pag. 152, 153.

(34) I believe it ought to be read *Animata*, and ſo the opinion of theſe Philoſophers would be, that each part of the ſoul is animated.

(35) Plut. de placit. Philoſoph. lib. i, cap. xviii, pag. 883.

(36) Ariſtot. de Cœlo, lib. i, cap. ix, pag. m. 348.

(37) See the Art of Thinking, Part III, chap. xviii, n. 4. pag. m. 328, & *ſeq.* and note, that Ariſtotle, *lib. iv, Phyſ. cap. vii, pag.* 286, gives a ſketch of the anſwers, which Meſſ. of Port-Royal make to Gaſſendus.

(38) See his Diſcourſe on the Cauſe of Gravitation, pag. 162.

* Sir Iſaac Newton.

(39) Newton. Philoſ. Natur. Princ. Mathem. pag. 411.

(40) Virgil. Æn. lib. i, verſ. 118.

is a pure privation. When therefore they are asked, what theſe ſpaces are, which have really three dimenſions, are diſtinct from body, and ſuffer themſelves to be penetrated by bodies, without making any oppoſition, they know not what to anſwer, and are almoſt induced to adopt the chimera of ſome Peripatetics, who had the boldneſs to ſay, that ſpace is nothing but the immenſity of God (41). This would be a very abſurd doctrine, as Mr Arnauld has ſhewn in the books (42), wherein he pretends, that Father Mallebranche ſeems to attribute to God a formal extenſion. Note, that Mr Hartſoecker, a good Natural Philoſopher and Mathematician, has taken the middle way between Des Cartes, and the new followers of a vacuum; for if, on one hand, he pretends, that motion is impoſſible in the Carteſian ſyſtem, on the other ſide he will have the fluid expanſe, in which bodies float, and ſcud at their eaſe, not to be pure ſpace, or penetrable extenſion (43).

From this we may collect two things. One is, that theſe great Mathematicians, who demonſtrate a vacuum, give the Sceptics greater pleaſure, than they imagine. Obſerve how. The mind of man has no ideas more clear and diſtinct than thoſe of the nature and attributes of extenſion. This is the foundation of Mathematics. Now theſe ideas manifeſtly ſhew, that extenſion is a being, which has *partes extra partes*, and which conſequently is diviſible and impenetrable. We know by experience the impenetrability of bodies; and, if we ſeek the origin and reaſon of it *à priori*, we find it with the utmoſt perſpicuity in the idea of extenſion, and of the diſtinction of the parts of extended being, and cannot poſſibly conceive any other foundation of it. We conceive extenſion, not as a genus, which contains under it two ſpecies, but as a ſpecies, which has under it only individuals (44). Whence we conclude, that the attributes, found in any one extenſion, are found alſo in every other. In the mean time, here are Mathematicians, who demonſtrate a vacuum, that is an indiviſible and penetrable extenſion, ſo that a globe of four feet diameter, and the ſpace it fills, which is alſo of four feet, are no more than four feet of extenſion. There is therefore no truſting to any clear and diſtinct ideas, upon which our minds can reſt, ſince that of extenſion is found to have miſerably deceived us. This idea had induced us to believe, that whatever is extended has impenetrable parts; but here is now a ſpace mathematically demonſtrated, a ſpace, I ſay, with three dimenſions, which is immoveable, and which ſuffers other dimenſions to paſs and repaſs, without moving itſelf, or opening for them. The ſecond thing I have to ſay, is, that Spinoza's ſyſtem is but ill adapted to this two-fold extenſion in the univerſe, one penetrable, continued, and immoveable, the other impenetrable, and ſeparated into parcels, which are ſometimes diſtant a hundred leagues from one another. I believe the Spinoziſts would find themſelves ſtrangely puzzled, if they were forced to admit Mr Newton's demonſtrations.

I mentioned, above (45), an obſervation of the Philoſophers of the ſect of the Speakers. The Rabbi Maimonides confutes it after this manner (46): 'Hanc
'rationem ſi conſideraveris, invenies illam ſuperſtru-
'ctam eſſe propoſitioni ipſorum primæ & quintæ, ac
'proinde nullius eſſe ponderis. Poteſt enim illis dici,
'Corpus Dei non eſt, ut dicitis vos, compoſitum ex
'conjunctione particularum ejuſmodi individuarum,
'quales Ipſe creavit; ſed eſt corpus unum continuum,
'nullam niſi in Cogitatione admittens diviſionem.——
'*If you conſider this reaſon, you will find that it*
'*is built upon their firſt and fifth propoſitions, and*
'*therefore is of no weight. For they may be told*
'*The body of God is not, as you ſay, compoſed of*
'*a conjunction of ſuch individual particles as he*
'*himſelf created; but is one continued body, admit-*
'*ting of no diviſion but in idea.*' The anſwer, this Rabbi ſuppoſes might be made, is not very wide of their poſition, who admit a poſitive ſpace, which is the Deity itſelf.

(41) See de Rodon, in the ſixth chapter of the firſt part of his Phyſics abridged, pag. m. 35.

(42) Among other writings of his, ſee his Defence, printed in 1684.

(43) Hartſoecker, Principles of Phyſics, chap. I.

(44) See the Defence of Mr Arnauld, Part. V, pag. 351, and the following.

(45) Citat (23).

(46) Moſes Maimonides, ubi ſupra, pag. 176.

LEUWENTZ, a town of Hungary, I mention it only to correct two groſs faults in the Supplement to Moreri [*A*].

[*A*] *I mention it only to correct two groſs faults in the ſupplement to Moreri.*] I. To affirm, that this town depends on the archduke of Auſtria, is to deceive the reader; for it is ſuppoſing, either that this town is annexed to the archduchy of Auſtria, or that it belongs to a prince diſtinct from his Imperial Majeſty, and yet known by the title of archduke of Auſtria. Both of which are falſe. Nothing was eaſier than underſtanding this phraſe of Mr Baudrand, which has been miſ-underſtood, *ſub dominio Auſtriacorum etiamnum*. Mr Baudrand had wrote his Dictionary (1) before the loſſes, which the Turks had ſuffered in Hungary, and whilſt they were in poſſeſſion of their laſt conqueſts, and particularly of Neuhauſel, of which he had been ſpeaking. For which reaſon he thought himſelf obliged to obſerve, that the houſe of Auſtria was ſtill in poſſeſſion of Leuwentz; for, having ſaid before, that this town depended on the government of Neuhauſel, he led his readers to believe, that this place belonged to the Turks, ſince the ceſſion of Neuhauſel, by the treaty of 1664. The ſecond fault is moſt abſurd. Mr de Souches, who beat the Turks at Leuwentz, in 1664, was not *General of the French*, though he was a Frenchman. He ſhould here have diſtinguiſhed theſe two things the more carefully, becauſe the French had extreamly magnified the part they had in the defeat of the Turks at the paſſage of Raab, in 1664. Mr Baudrand is ſecure from this criticiſm, though his phraſe, *Grandi clade affecti fuere à Souchio Duce Gallo*, is a little too equivocal.

(1) It was printed at Paris, 1682.

LEWIS VII, king of France, was crowned at Rheims the twenty fifth of October 1131 (*a*), and reigned with his father till the firſt of Auguſt 1137, and afterwards alone till the month of September 1180. He married Eleanora daughter and heireſs to William, the IXth of that name, duke of Guienne, in the year 1137 (*b*). This princeſs was a great match, both on account of her beauty and of the fine provinces her father had left her; but it is pretended ſhe was very leud, and that her huſband had very good reaſons to diſſolve the marriage, if human prudence could have ſuffered him to renounce the poſſeſſion of Eleanora's great eſtates by this divorce. All Hiſtorians blame him for being more jealous than politic; for at laſt not being able to bear the weight of his jealouſy, and the diſhonour he pretended his wife's irregular life brought upon him, he *earneſtly ſued for a divorce, and obtained it by the ſentence of the prelates of the kingdom, aſſembled at Baugency, in the year* 1152 (*c*). He did what Marcus Aurelius would have done in the like caſe; but he had acted a wiſer part if he had imitated that emperor [*A*], and in conſideration of the dowry, ſtifled all thoughts

(*a*) Mezeral Abregé Chronol. Tom II, pag. m. 554.

(*b*) Id. ibid. pag. 557.

(*c*) Id. ibid. pag. 570.

[*A*] *He had acted a wiſer part, if he had imitated Marcus Aurelius.*] When it was repreſented to this emperor, that ſince he would not put his wife to death, whoſe debaucheries were arrived to the utmoſt pitch of infamy, he ought to divorce her: he anſwered, but if I do that, I muſt reſtore her portion, that is, I muſt diveſt myſelf of the empire. *Fauſtinam ſatis conſtat apud Cajetam conditiones ſibi & nauticas & gladiatorias elegiſſe: de qua quum diceretur Antonino Marco, ut repudiaret, ſi non occideret, dixiſſe fertur,* Si uxorem dimittimus, reddamus & dotem. *Dos autem quid erat, niſi imperium quod ille ab ſocero, volente Adriano adoptatus, acceperat* (1)? This anſwer very well became an emperor who was a Philoſopher,

(1) Capitolinus, in Marco Aurel. cap. xix, pag. m. 362, Tom. I.

thoughts of a ſeparation. He reſtored to the divorced princeſs all that belonged to her; and thereby put his moſt dangerous neighbour in a capacity of oppreſſing France; for the king of England (*d*) preferring the intereſts of his grandeur before the ſhame of marrying a divorced and diſgraced princeſs [*B*], went as we may ſay poſt to Bourdeaux (*e*), when ſhe was offered to him after the ſeparation, and preſently concluded the marriage. He ſacrificed without any difficulty, and even with a great deal of pleaſure, the nicety of a point of honour to ambition. The king of France had taken Eleanora along with him into Aſia, where, as if Europe were not a large field enough for her gallantries, it is ſaid, ſhe compleated the ruin of her reputation [*C*], being little affected with the ſanctity of the places ſhe went to ſee, with the princes of the cruſade.

loſopher. We here ſee that Marcus Aurelius knew how to reconcile theſe two characters. If he had kept the empire after the divorce, he had done an unjuſt action, and had but ill maintained the character of a Philoſopher. If he had choſe to be reduced to a private condition, rather than be a cuckold, he had ſhewn a contempt of greatneſs and authority, and ſo would have ill maintained his character of emperor. The juſtice of his maxim was not unknown to Burrhus, Nero's governor; for when this prince would have divorced Octavia, the emperor Claudius's daughter, Burrhus endeavoured to diſſuade him from it, by telling him, that if he divorced her, he muſt reſtore her the empire (2). We have here a king of France, who practiſed this principle ſo conſcientiouſly, that we may ſay he was ſcrupulous not only beyond what a prince ought to be, but beyond what any private perſon would have been. To prove this, I ſhall ſet down the words of a modern Hiſtorian, a great favourer of Eleanora, 'She retired, *ſays he* (3), immediately to her 'dominions of Guienne, from which the king withdrew his garriſons, without retaining any one place; 'though having two daughters by that marriage, 'which he kept with him, it ſeems he might, under pretence of ſecuring their pretenſions to the 'ſucceſſion, have ſeized on the fortreſſes of the duchy. 'Poſſibly he might have acted this out of policy, to 'prevent the revolt of Guienne, where the people, turbulent and jealous of their rights, would never have 'ſuffered him to make himſelf maſter to the prejudice of their lawful ſovereign; ſo that he judged 'it prudenteſt to wait till the death of this princeſs, ſhould put her daughters in poſſeſſion. Perhaps too it was a pure nicety of conſcience; not 'believing he could juſtly retain the eſtate of a princeſs he had divorced. Beſides, he had lately loſt 'two of the ableſt men of his kingdom; the abbot 'Suger, and the count de Vermandois, who died in 'the ſame year; and as they had the whole management of the kingdom, whilſt he never concerned 'himſelf with it, he was in as great a perplexity at 'their death, as a man whom his guides forſake in 'the midſt of a foreſt. So much it imports a ſovereign to be timely inſtructed in the intereſts of 'his ſtates, and to govern by his own underſtanding, 'and not by that of his miniſters. However, queen 'Eleanora was very happy, that Lewis VII, being 'more a monk than a king, liſtened to the ſcruples 'of his conſcience, rather than the motives of ambition.' I have retrenched nothing from this paſſage; there is a juſtneſs of thought runs through the whole, proper to inſtruct the reader. Another modern writer reaſons upon the motives of Lewis VII, without mentioning any ſcruples of conſcience. Here is what he ſays: 'Lewis being returned from the 'Holy-Land, had diſannulled his marriage with Eleanora of Aquitain, under pretence that they were 'near relations, but indeed to puniſh this queen, 'for a ſuſpected gallantry of her's in the eaſt, with 'a Turk named Saladin, and for other debaucheries, 'too public to be kept ſecret. Pure diſcontent put 'him upon this divorce, with ſo little precaution, 'that againſt all the rules of policy, he ſent back Eleanora into her own country, which he reſtored to 'her; not thinking, perhaps, that either there was 'any man ſo venturous as to marry a princeſs he had 'divorced, or any prince ſo little nice, as to take a 'diſgraced woman, by whom he had had two daughters. 'The event ſhewed he was miſtaken. Henry, then 'duke of Normandy, overlooked this ſcruple, to vex 'Lewis, and add Guienne to ſo many other fine 'territories which he poſſeſſed in France; by which 'he ſaw himſelf in a fair way to be one day as 'powerful as the king (4).' Add to this a paſſage of Mezerai, which I cite in the following remark.

For the reſt, I pretend not to draw a parallel between Fauſtina and queen Eleanora; the greateſt detractor cannot ſay that of the latter, which hiſtory ſays of Fauſtina. She went herſelf to chuſe her galants on the ſea-ſhoar, among watermen and mariners, and that becauſe they commonly went naked (5). My meaning is eaſily underſtood.

[*B*] *The king of England preferred the intereſts of his grandeur, before the ſhame of marrying a divorced and diſgraced princeſs.*] A paſſage of Mezerai will inform us of two things which will amaze good men, and men of honour; the one will be ſurprized, that the king of France ſhould pay ſo much deference to the ſevere laws of the Goſpel: and others, that a preſumptive heir of England, ſhould not pay enough to the laws of worldly honour: 'Lewis VII, 'being returned from the Holy-Land, was willing 'to get rid of his wicked wife, though he had had 'two daughters by her, Mary and Alix. To this 'end having declared to the Pope, that ſhe was related to him in a prohibited degree, he aſſembled 'a council at Baugency, where the biſhops being 'ſecretly acquainted with the true cauſe of this divorce, pronounced the marriage null: Eleanora 'having as paſſionately deſired it as he, becauſe, as ſhe 'ſaid, he was more a Monk than a king. And truly 'it was well for her that he was; for if he had not 'been ſomewhat monkiſh, he would have treated 'her in another manner, and not have been ſo conſcientious, as to reſtore her Guienne and Poitou; but 'have confiſcated them for her crime, and for the reſt 'have favoured her with her life, if he had thought 'fit. But we need not wonder that he committed 'ſuch a groſs fault in point of policy, in which he 'had little experience, having always truſted the adminiſtration, in a word, all the government and 'management of affairs, to his miniſter, the abbot 'Suger, who died the year before, had left him as 'much bewildered, as a man who loſes his guide in 'a deſert and unknown country. Moſt honeſt men 'will think this ſcrupulous reſtitution ſtrange, and 'men of honour will alſo wonder to ſee that Henry, 'to whom Stephen, having no children, had bequeathed the kingdom of England, ſhould marry this 'princeſs, whoſe debauchery was ſo public, that the 'king could not think any private gentleman would 'have had the meanneſs to diſhonour his family with 'her (6).'

[*C*] *He carried his wife into Aſia, where it is ſaid ſhe compleated the ruin of her reputation.*] Father d'Orleans had been telling us, that ſhe was ſuſpected of a gallantry with a Turk, named Saladin. This wants a farther explanation, ſuch as an Hiſtorian, this queen's apologiſt, has given. During Lewis VIIth's abode at Antioch, the queen wrote to Saladin for the 'liberty of one of her relations, whom ſhe loved much, 'and backed her letter with a conſiderable ſum for 'his ranſome (7). . . . . . He granted the queen the 'liberty of her relation, without taking the ranſome, 'and made a very ingenious and civil anſwer to her 'letter (8). *The priſoner was the bearer of it, and 'delivered it to the queen*, without ſaying any thing 'to the king. *He often talked of Saladin's generoſity* to the queen, and every where praiſed his genteel carriage, and great merit, with ſuch exaggerations as are natural to thoſe who ſpeak of a benefactor. The king was advertiſed of it, and was 'willing to know the circumſtances of that adventure. 'The ſecret the queen had made of her negotiation 'with Saladin, appeared ſuſpicious to him, and the 'proceeding of the Sultan ſeemed ſo extraordinary 'for a Turk, that he could not believe his generoſity

---

(*d*) *This was Henry II. He was not king as yet.*

(*e*) De Larrey, Heritiere de Guienne, pag. 61.

(2) Καί τοι τοῦ Βούῤῥου ἐναντιουμένου αὐτῷ καὶ κωλύοντος ἀποπέμψασθαι, καί ποτε εἰπόντος: οὐκοῦν καὶ τὴν προῖκα αὐτῇ, τουτέστι τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἀπόδος. Burrho illi quidem reſiſtente, & prohibente illam repudiari, & illi dicente: dotem igitur ei, hoc eſt, principatum redde *Xiphilin. in Nerone.*

(3) *Mr de Larrey, in his* Heritiere de Guienne, pag 60, ad ann. 1152.

(4) *Father d'Orleans, Hiſtory of the Revolutions of England*, Tom. I, pag. 153, 154.

(5) Cujus (M. Aurelii Antonini) divina omnia domi militiæque facta conſultaque: quæ imprudentia regendæ conjugis attaminavit: quæ in tantum petulantiæ proruperat, ut in Campania ſedens amœna littorum obſideret ad legendos ex nauticis quia plerumque nudi agunt, aptiores. *Aurel Victor. in Cæſaribus, pag. m.* 131.

(6) Mezerai, Hiſt. of France, Vol. II, pag. 103.

(7) De Larrey, ubi ſupra. pag. 45.

(8) Ibid. pag. 46.

cruſade. I ſhall recite what Brantome ſays of it [D]. The diſcontents ſhe gave her huſband

ſity was diſintereſted. He thought an adventurer, ſuch as Saladin was, and head of the robbers, ſuch as the Turks then were, incapable of ſo generous an action, had he not deſigned to make himſelf amends by ſomething more advantageous than the ranſome he had refuſed. He made no long enquiry into what might be his deſign. What was told him of the genteelneſs and bravery of Saladin, of the letter the queen had written to him, and of the anſwer he had given her, made him look upon the queen as a woman who had betrayed him, and who held a criminal correſpondence with Saladin. He made no reflexion upon the diſtance of places, nor the quality of the perſons which rendered this commerce impoſſible, but fancied that this Sultan might come diſguiſed to Antioch, and that the queen ſaw him at her uncle's. Add to this, that this princeſs, provoked by his ſuſpicions, took no care to cure him of them; but puſhed on by her uncle, who was reſolved to revenge a repulſe the king had given him, inſtead of a meek behaviour and complaiſance, expreſſed a great contempt for him, and propoſed the diſſolving their marriage, which the relation, ſhe ſaid, between them made unlawful. Then it was, that the king feared, ſhe would quit him the firſt opportunity, to follow her gallant, and it was the fear he had of this, that made him ſend her away in a hurry from Antioch, not doubting, after ſuch a propoſition, but ſhe had formed the deſign. This is what Hiſtory informs us concerning this adventure, which might give occaſion to the jealouſies of ſo weak and ſuſpicious a prince as Lewis VII, but which cannot juſtify the calumnies, with which ſome Hiſtorians have blackened this queen's innocence.'

I grant, with Mr de Larrey, that the calumnies founded on this adventure, as if Saladin (9) had actually lain with queen Eleanora, are frivolous; but I do not think with him, that Lewis VII betrayed any ſymptoms of a weak and ſuſpicious prince in being perſuaded there was a myſtery of iniquity in the caſe; the moſt reſolute and the greateſt prince would have had a juſt occaſion to be alarmed. The moſt reſerved Hiſtorians acknowledge, that this princeſs was *a coquette* (10), *and burned with luſt and ambition*. Some months after her divorce, ſhe married *Henry duke of Normandy, and preſumptive heir of England, a prince young, ardent, red-haired, and very capable to ſatisfy all her deſires* (11). She was in love with him before ſhe was divorced, and it was that paſſion that prompted her to preſs the diſſolution of her marriage, as Mr de Larrey confeſſes (12). From a like motive ſhe was likely enough to run after Saladin (13). I have read in a book of the lady de Villedieu, a paſſage that I think remarkable, and which I ſhall ſet down without warranting the truth of it. 'Hiſtory has ſo celebrated this princeſs's beauty, that it would be a vain attempt to deſcribe it. She it was that charmed the fierceneſs of the brave Saladin, general of the Saracen army (14), and who having given him to underſtand, that ſhe believed no proteſtations of love, but in her own tongue, forced this great captain to that ſurprizing effect of love, as to learn the French tongue in a fortnight (15).'

Mr de Larrey doubtleſs will not take it ill, after I have owned with him, that there is no likelihood Eleanora had to do with the great Saladin, if I advertiſe my reader, that good Hiſtorians, who ſpeak of this queen's diſorders, do not ſuppoſe her lover was the ſame Saladin, who made himſelf ſo famous by his conqueſts. They ſay then, that the perſon ſhe had an affair with in Antioch was one Saladin, *a baptized Turk* (16). Others, without mentioning the converſion of this perſon, ſimply ſay, that he was *a Turk named Saladin*. And there are ſome who ſpeak as if he had never been baptized, and they deſcribe her *running after a Turkiſh ſoldier, whom ſhe had made the object of her paſſion, in contempt of her religion and dignity*. It is Mr Larrey himſelf, who ſpeaks thus in his advertiſement to the reader. All this manifeſtly inſinuates, that the great Saladin is not the perſon in queſtion, for a good Hiſtorian could not, in ſpeaking of ſo great a man, make uſe of the phraſe *one Saladin*; *a Turk named Saladin* (17). For the reſt, when this queen carried herſelf ſo ill in Antioch, Saladin was not Sultan of Iconium, as Mr de Larrey ſuppoſes (18), nor do I think that country was ever one of his conqueſts. He married one of his daughters a long time after to Melich, the Sultan of Iconium's ſon (19). This does ſome prejudice to Eleanora's apology.

John Bouchet, in his annals of Aquitain, affirms, that Lewis VII ſuſpected his wife deſired to marry the Sultan Saladin, and that that reaſon was alledged by the king when they treated of the divorce. 'Some have written, that if the ſaid king Lewis had not brought away his wife Eleanora, ſhe had formed a deſign, by the advice of her uncle duke Haymond, to quit the king, and marry the Sultan Saladin; by which means the ſaid duke Haymond would have recovered all his lands: he did this out of revenge, becauſe the ſaid king Lewis had refuſed to aſſiſt him to recover them; but he ſaid nothing to Eleanora of it, till he was in France, as we ſhall ſee afterwards (20).' Let us ſee what is contained in the place he refers to (21): 'The council being aſſembled, the matter was put in debate by the archbiſhop (22) of Langres, who was alſo ſummoned thither, ſpeaking thus; you know, gentlemen, what our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt formerly ſaid, that man cannot ſeparate thoſe, whom God has joined in marriage; however, he excepts one caſe, which is when one or the other commits adultery; for if that happens they may be diſſolved and ſeparated. Now gentlemen, it is true, as the king commands me to ſay, that in a voyage beyond the ſeas (from which, thanks to God, he is returned) through the great love he had to Madam Eleanora his wife, he took her along with him, as well to viſit the ſacred places of Jeruſalem, as to ſee Haymond, the duke of Antioch, her uncle, by whoſe means the king expected to have ſuccours and aſſiſtance in the ſaid country, to perfect his enterprize; nevertheleſs, the ſaid lady, without occaſion, cauſe, or reaſon, and from meer levity, deſigned to deſert the king, her huſband, and give herſelf up to Sultan Saladin, whoſe picture ſhe had ſeen, and thus betray the king and his whole army, and all this by the counſel of the ſaid Haymond her uncle. Which wicked and damned enterprize was not executed, as God would have it, by the great diligence the king made to retire from that danger, which he never declared to the ſaid lady. However, he has always laid this fact to heart, and can in no wiſe truſt in her, and would willingly be divorced, if he ſaw the thing were reaſonable, and that God would not be offended by it. For, as he ſays, he can never be aſſured of the children that may proceed from her.' The author adds, that the *archbiſhop of Bourdeaux*, deſiring that her divorce might be grounded on ſome other reaſon, *beſides the petulancy and ill intentions, the ſaid lady Eleanora was charged with*, propoſed *another more honourable medium*, which was, that the king and ſhe were relations, and *that in the degrees prohibited*. This overture was accepted, and the diſſolution of the marriage founded upon it. The queen informed of what had paſſed, 'fainted away from the chair ſhe ſat in, and was ſpeechleſs above two hours; nor could ſhe cry, nor open her teeth. And when ſhe was a little come to herſelf, ſhe began with her clear and beautiful eyes to look upon thoſe who had told her the firſt ſad news, and ſaid to them, &c. (23).'

[D] *I ſhall ſet down what Brantome ſays of it.*] He ſpeaks ill of Eleanora; he blames Edward III for having confined his mother in a caſtle for her love-intrigues. 'A ſlight offence, *ſays he* (24), ſince it is natural; and having converſed with military men, and uſed herſelf ſo much to ramp with them among arms, tents, and pavillions, it was hardly poſſible for her to contain, from playing the ſame pranks within the curtains, as this often happens; I refer myſelf to our queen Eleanora, ducheſs of Guienne, who attended the king her huſband beyond ſea, and to the holy-war, and who, by frequent converſing among arms and the ſoldiery, gave herſelf ſuch a looſe as at laſt to have to do with the Saracens; for which the king divorced her, which coſt us dear. Conſider, that ſhe had a mind to try whether theſe warlike men were as brave champions in a chamber, as in the field of battle, and that poſſibly it was her humour to love valiant men, for one valour attracts another, like virtue; nor did he ſay amiſs,

(9) *That is to ſay, the conqueror Saladin.*

(10) Mezerai, Abr. Chronolog. Tom. II, pag. m. 566.

(11) Ibid. pag. 571.

(12) Heritiere de Guienne, pag. 59.

(13) *Suppoſing that at this time he were Sultan, or at the head of a great army, which I confute below.*

(14) *Saladin was general of the Turks, and not of the Saracens.*

(15) Annales Galantes, Part. I, pag. 31, Edit. Holland. 1677.

(16) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. II, pag. 102.

(17) *Compare what is above, remark* [*A*] *of the article* EPICURUS.

(18) Pag. 44, 45.

(19) *See Maimbourg*, Hiſt. des Croiſades, livr. v, Tom. II, pag. 177. Edit. de Holl. ad ann. 1190.

(20) Bouchet. Annales d'Aquitaine, fol. 78. Edit. de Poitiers, 1557, in fol.

(21) Id. ibid. fol. 79. ad ann. 1152.

(22) *He ſhould have ſaid biſhop.*

(23) Bouchet, Annales d'Aquitaine, fol. 80.

(24) Brantome, Memoires des Dames Galantes, Tom II, pag. 311, 312.

band in that cruſade, were not the leaſt diſgraces that expedition expoſed him to. St Bernard had not promiſed theſe ill events [*E*]; on the contrary, he had fed him with hopes of great victories; and was ſo little concerned at the murmurs raiſed againſt him, that had it not been for perſons leſs zealous, and conſequently more capable of reaſoning aright upon the conſequences, he had engaged in a ſecond expedition (*f*). Lewis had reaſon to repent all his life, of the fault he had committed, in ſuffering the inheritance of the duke of Guienne, to come into the hands of the Engliſh. To oppoſe the king of England, he was forced to take a conduct moſt unjuſt in itſelf, and of ill example to all kings; which was to excite this prince's ſons to rebel againſt their father, and to protect them in their rebellion. But this he did ſo faintly, and with ſo little ſucceſs, that he contributed more to the glory of his enemy, than he injured him. Eleanora was very much diſſatiſfied at her ſecond marriage. She was at leaſt as jealous of the ſecond huſband [*F*], as the firſt had been of her. But the ſecond was much harſher than the firſt; he put her in priſon, and kept her cloſely confined all his life, as the reader will ſee in our remarks, with the ſequel of this queen's hiſtory [*G*]. Lewis died on the eighteenth or twentieth of September 1180 (*g*). Two years

(*f*) *See the remark* [*E*], *towards the end.*

(*g*) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 583.

'amiſs, who ſaid, that virtue reſembled lightening, which penetrates every thing.' See the ſequel of that paſſage in the margin (25).

[*E*] *St Bernard had not promiſed theſe ill events.*] Being ordered to preach up the cruſade throughout all Chriſtendom, he began in France. 'He aſſembled a national council at Chartres, in which he was choſen Generaliſſimo of that expedition; but he refuſed that office, contenting himſelf to be the trumpeter of it; he publiſhed it every where with that vehemence and aſſurance of ſucceſs, and, as was believed, with the working ſo many miracles, that the cities and towns were deſerted, and all people liſted themſelves for this war (26).' The emperor Conrad ſet out with an army of ſixty thouſand horſe, and arrived at Conſtantinople towards the end of March 1147 (27). Lewis began his march the ſecond week after Whitſuntide the ſame year, and arrived in Syria, in Lent 1148. Emanuel the emperor of Conſtantinople, cauſed plaiſter and lime to be mingled with the flour which he furniſhed to Conrad, 'and gave him guides, who after having led the army by long circuits, in which it conſumed all its proviſions, delivered it half dead and languiſhing, into the hands of the Turks, who cut it all to pieces, inſomuch that the tenth part did not ſurvive (28).' Lewis ran the ſame risk as Conrad; however, he eſcaped more by good fortune than prudence. 'He gained a battle in paſſing the river Meander; but he reaped no advantage by it; for after this, not ſtanding upon his guard, he received a notable check at the defile of a mountain. At laſt he came to Antioch, whereof Raymond, the queen's uncle by the father's ſide, then held the principality.' Here it was that he diſcovered his wife's commerce with Saladin, and was tempted to diſſolve his marriage. 'He found no other remedy to avoid this ſcandal, but to take his wife by night from Antioch, and ſend her away before him to Jeruſalem.' He and Conrad beſieged Damaſcus, and ſucceeded in this enterprize as ill as in all the reſt, 'thro' the prodigious treachery of the very Chriſtians of the country. Therefore theſe two princes deteſting their villany . . . . thought only of returning (29). Lewis being on board his veſſels, met on the road the naval force of theſe traitors, who laid in wait to take him. As they were engaged, or even, according to ſome authors, as they led him priſoner, it happened by good fortune, that the army of Roger, king of Sicily, their capital enemy, conducted by his lieutenant, arrived, who quickly cauſed them to releaſe their priſoner, having burnt taken, and ſunk abundance of their veſſels (30).' The ill ſucceſs of this cruſade, 'which made ſo many widows and orphans, ruined ſo many families, and diſpeopled ſo many countries, raiſed murmurs and reproaches againſt St Bernard's reputation (31), who ſeemed to have promiſed a quite different event. So that when the Pope, two years after would have had him preach up another cruſade, and oblige him to go in perſon to the Holy Land, in order to draw a greater number after him; the Ciſtercian monks broke all his meaſures for fear of a ſecond misfortune, which might have been greater than the firſt (32).'

[*F*] *Eleanora was . . . . . jealous of the ſecond huſband.*] Let us uſe the expreſſions of a modern Hiſtorian already cited (33). 'Queen Eleanora, the woman of all the world, whom it leaſt became to be jealous of her huſband, was extravagantly ſo, and had reaſon for it. Henry was a man of ill fame, with reſpect to women, and the monument we have remaining of the famous Roſamond, is a teſtimony to poſterity, of this prince's leudneſs. She who, at the time I ſpeak of, inflamed this queen's jealouſy, was Alix of France, betrothed to prince Richard, and given as her ſiſter Margaret, to be educated by her father-in-law, who was fallen in love with her. Exaſperated at this paſſion, and at the ſame time, by the fear, that if the ſon was vanquiſhed, the father being enraged, might come to ſome extremity againſt him, Eleanora knew ſo well how to perſuade Richard and Jeoffry, that it was their intereſt not to quarrel with their elder brother, that ſhe engaged them to enter into the confederacy of the malecontents.' That all my readers may underſtand this, I ought to obſerve, that the king of England's eldeſt ſon, by queen Eleanora, was in rebellion againſt him. He had ſtolen the princeſs Margaret of France, daughter to Lewis VII, who was to be his wife, and whom the king of England educated in his own court. According to ſome hiſtorians (34), it was ſhe, that raiſed Eleanora's jealouſy, and it was Eleanora (35), who excited her eldeſt ſon to this rebellion, as afterwards ſhe engaged her two younger ſons to join with their elder brother. This plot was hatched, whilſt the king was in Ireland. As ſoon as he returned into England, 'the firſt thing he did was to ſhut up Eleanora in a cloſe priſon, where ſhe remained all the time her huſband lived, and very dearly paid for the ſatiſfaction ſhe had ſought in a revenge, which neither did juſtice to the rights of the throne, nor thoſe of the conjugal engagement (36).'

[*G*] *He kept her priſoner all his life as the reader will ſee . . . . with the ſequel of this queen's hiſtory.*] Eleanora was a priſoner till the death of the king her huſband. This prince died in 1188. Richard, his third ſon, ſucceeded him. He was then in France, where he had been engaged in a furious war againſt his father. The firſt thing he did after his return into England, *was to deliver queen Eleanora, his mother, who had been a priſoner ſixteen years* (37). He made her regent of the kingdom (38) whilſt he went into the Holy-Land. The jealouſy which ſtill cankered in her ſoul, induced her to make a voyage to Navarre to ſeek a wife for the king her ſon. To underſtand this, we muſt know 'that it was told *this queen*, in priſon, that Henry deſigned to divorce her . . . . in order to marry the princeſs Alix (39). The fear of this made her hate this princeſs mortally; and when ſhe was in a way to revenge her ſelf, ſhe carried things to an extremity. As ſhe had a great aſcendant over Richard, ſhe endeavoured to put him out of conceit with this match, by giving him ſuſpicions of his father's conduct with this young princeſs, and ſeeing that her ſuſpicions were not ſufficient, ſhe added, that Henry had debauched her, and had had a ſon by her. At laſt, fearing that the charms of ſo fine a princeſs would be more prevalent in Richard's heart than her words, ſhe made all the haſte ſhe could to marry him to another. For this reaſon ſhe went to the court of the king of Navarre, deſigning to match Richard with the princeſs Berengaria

(25) This queen Eleanora was not the only one who accompanied in that holy war the king, her huſband, but before her, with her, and afterwards, ſeveral great princeſſes and ladies, with their huſbands, did croyſe themſelves; but did not croyſe their legs, which they opened and ſtretched in good earneſt. So that ſome ſtayed there, and others returned very expert. And under the cover of viſiting the holy ſepulchre, among ſo many arms made love in good earneſt: and indeed, as I have ſaid, arms and love agree very well together, ſo ſtrong and well cemented is the ſympathy.

(26) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 564, ad ann. 1146.

(27) Id. ibid. pag. 565.

(28) Ibid. pag. 566.

(29) Ibid. pag. 567.

(30) Id. ibid. ad ann. 1149.

(31) *See the article* BERNARD, *remark* [*F*].

(32) Mezerai, Abr. Chronolog. Tom. II, pag. 568.

(33) *Father d'Orleans, Revolutions of England*, Tom. I, pag. 186, ad ann. 1172.

(34) De Larrey, ubi ſupra, pag. 86.

(35) Idem, pag. 87.

(36) Id. ibid. pag. 90, ad ann. 1173.

(37) Idem, pag. 137, ad ann. 1189.

(38) Idem, pag. 141, ad ann. 1189.

(39) Daughter to Lewis VII, who not being at age, was affianced to Richard, and put into the hand of Henry, till ſhe ſhould be marriageable.

years after he had made a pilgrimage into England. He had made ſuch another to St James of Galicia, not in 1152, as Mezerai affirms, but in 1155 [*H*]. He cauſed his

‘Berengaria, having obtained permiſſion to negotiate this treaty before ſhe left England. It was not difficult for her to accompliſh it, having ſo much addreſs as ſhe had, and the match beſides appearing to the king of Navarre ſo advantageous, as it really was (40).’ Afterwards ſhe conducted the princeſs of Navarre into Sicily to her ſon, who conſummated the match before he ſet ſail to the Holy-Land. Eleanora returned into England, from whence ſhe went over into Germany in 1194, to deliver Richard, who was made a priſoner by the duke of Auſtria (41). Richard dying in 1199, ſhe formed cabals for devolving the crown upon her ſon John, earl of Mortaing, to the excluſion of Arthur her grandſon, tho' ſhe had more affection for Arthur than for John, and tho' ſhe was perſuaded, that John's pretenſions were unjuſt (42). But her ambition was the only rule of her conduct. ‘She apprehended that if Arthur ſhould come to reign, he would ſuffer himſelf to be governed by the ducheſs Conſtantia, his mother, a woman of ſolid ſenſe, and excellent courage, who would not give her any ſhare in the authority. Thus ſhe preferred the earl of Mortaing before him, a prince without faith or honour, becauſe ſhe believed, that having need of her ſupport, he would let her reign in conjunction with him (43).’ This earl is the ſame who was called *John ſans terre (John without land)*. By the peace he made with Philip Auguſtus, king of France, in 1201, it was ſaid that the Infanta of Caſtile his neice, ſhould marry Lewis, Philip's only ſon. ‘Queen Eleanora, notwithſtanding her great age, went in queſt of this Infanta, her grand-daughter, to the court of Toledo, and brought her into Normandy (44).’ She was beſieged in Mirebeau, by prince Arthur her grandſon, in the year 1202. But John without Land ſuccoured her, and took this prince priſoner, and murthered him ſome time after. He durſt not do it, they ſay, whilſt Eleanora lived. This queen died, loaden with years and ſins. Let us uſe Mezerai's expreſſions. ‘This woman, conſummate in all ſorts of wickedneſs, lived above eighty years, kept up a war for above ſixty years, and ſettled a hatred betwixt France and England, that has continued above three ages; ſo that with reaſon we may ſay of her what the Greek Poet ſaid of Menelaus's wife, *that we have ſuffered* not a 10, but a 400 years *fire and ſword by means of this woman* (45).’ Her fruitfulneſs deſerves but part of the epithets which are given to the fecundity of Julia, Auguſtus's daughter (46), for Eleanora's ſons had a great complaiſance for their mother's paſſions, they revolted againſt their father at her deſire; and they who reigned ſuffered her to enjoy the regency; but otherwiſe they brought a thouſand miſeries upon their country. They had hearts like lions; but then it was not ſo much a true courage, as a hardineſs determined to deſpiſe the maledictions of fame, and behold with an unconcerned eye, the moſt atrocious crimes. In a word, they neither did honour to France, from whence they deſcended originally, both by father and mother, nor to England, the inheritance of their father. Eleanora's death is placed on the thirty firſt of March 1204 by Moreri, who adds, that coming out of priſon in 1194. *She retired into a monaſtery, and died in that of Fontevraud.* He is miſtaken five years, as to the time ſhe came out of priſon, and much more as to the retirement he attributes to her; for after her liberty, ſhe ſhewed her ambition as much as ever, her intriguing ſpirit, her jealouſy and vindictive humour. But it is true, that ſhe deſired to be buried at Frontevaux, and took the vail of the order (47). She was a great benefactreſs to that houſe (48), for which reaſon ſhe is repreſented in the obituary of Frontevaux, as one of the moſt virtuous princeſſes in the world. So certain it is, that in order to obtain of theſe honeſt monks teſtimonials of a good life, in the midſt of a conduct ſo ſcandalous, that the moſt flattering hiſtory dares not conceal it, it is enough to enrich them. See the remark [*I*] of the article of St GREGORY. ‘Migravit à ſeculo domina Alienoris Regina Franciæ & Angliæ, Duciſſa Aquitaniæ, quæ nitore Regiæ ſobolis ſuæ mundum illuſtravit. Nobilitatem generis, vitæ decoravit honeſtate, morum ditavit gratia, virtutum floribus picturavit, & incomparabilis probitatis honore, ferè cunctis præſtitit Reginis mundanis (49). —— *Eleanora, queen of France and England, and ducheſs of Aquitain, departed this life, who by the ſplendor of her royal race, was an ornament to the world; ſhe graced her high birth by the regularity of her life, enriched it by the gracefulneſs of her manners, embelliſhed it by the flowers of her virtue, and by the honour of an incomparable probity excelled all worldly queens.*’ I am ſorry Father de la Mainferme has not marked the day and year of Eleanora's death; for if it be the thirty firſt of March, 1204, as Moreri affirms, it follows that Mezerai and Larrey are miſtaken, in ſaying that John without Land durſt not kill his nephew Arthur in his mother's life-time, Mr Pinſſon des Riolles, whom I deſired to conſult Father de la Mainferme, informed me that this monk was dead, and that Father Labbe in his Genealogical Tables (50), and Father Anſelme in his Hiſtory of the Royal Family of France (51), mark the time of Eleanora's death, as Moreri does.

It muſt not be forgotten that this princeſs has been put in the catalogue of learned women. ‘Anno CIↃCCIII. obiit Aleonora Regina . . . . Ab eruditione ac prudentia multum celebrata eſt. Scripſit epiſtolas ad Cœleſtinum Papam, Henricum Cæſarem, Richardum & Joannem filios. Vide plura apud Matthæum Pariſium, nec non Balæum. —— *In the year 1203 died queen Eleanora . . . . celebrated for her learning and wiſdom. She wrote letters to Pope Celeſtin, the emperor Henry, Richard and John her ſons. See more in Matthew Paris, and alſo in Bale.*’ Thus Voſſius ſpeaks at the eighty ſecond page of his treatiſe *de Philologia*, in the Amſterdam edition, 1650. It is among the additions to his book. He did not know this particular, when he wrote the ſecond chapter, where he gives a long catalogue of learned women.

[*H*] *He made a pilgrimage into England . . . . and another to St James of Galicia . . . . in* 1155.] Let us make uſe of Mezerai's words. ‘As the devotion to the relics of St Thomas à Becket, increaſed by the example even of king Henry himſelf, who of his perſecutor was become his votary; king Lewis went over into England, paid his devotions at his tomb, and left magnificent marks of his piety (52).’ That prince had made a pilgrimage before. Let us hear what Mezerai ſays (53). ‘It was not lawful for the kings of France, as Yves de Chartres ſays, to marry baſtards. Now it was reported, that Conſtantia (54) was one. For this reaſon Lewis, two years after his marriage, deſired to enquire into it, and under pretence of going in pilgrimage to St James's in Galicia, he paſſed through the court of his father-in-law, the moſt magnificent prince of his time, who received him, and treated him royally at Burgos, and removed the ſcruple he had in his mind.’ This ſhews that devotion was one of the principal qualities of Lewis VII. ‘He was unfortunate in his greateſt enterprizes, *ſays Mezerai* (55), and too ſlack in affairs that demanded vigour; but as pious, charitable, good, equitable, liberal, and valiant, as any prince of his age; yet two faults may be laid to his charge, one againſt prudence, in having divorced his wife; the other againſt the laws of nature, in having ſupported the rebellion of king Henry's children againſt their father.’ Devotion and piety are undoubtedly the greateſt of all virtues. A prince can no more diſpenſe with them than a private perſon, and if he chuſes to fulfil the duties they enjoin rather than preſerve his dominions, he is, in the ſight of God, one of the greateſt men on earth; but it is certain, that, according to the courſe of human affairs, nothing is more likely to ruin a nation, than the ſcrupulous conſcience of the ruler. If his neighbours acted like him, we might expect from his piety, the greateſt happineſs that a people can enjoy; but if whilſt they practiſe all the tricks of ſtate policy, he preremptorily refuſes to take the leaſt ſtep beyond the ſevere rules of the goſpel morality, both he and his ſubjects will infallibly be a prey to other nations, and all the world will ſay, he was fitter for a monaſtic life, than to wear a crown, and that he would do well to yield his place to a leſs ſcrupulous prince. *Exeat aula. Qui volet eſſe pius* (56):

A REFLEXION on ſcrupulous princes.

(40) De Larrey, Heritiere de Guienne, pag. 155.

(41) Idem, pag. 210.

(42) Idem, pag. 240.

(43) Ibid. *See alſo Father d'Orleans*, ubi ſupra, Tom. I, pag 281.

(44) De Larrey, ubi ſupra, pag. 241.

(45) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. II, pag. 139.

(46) Reverſus inde filiam Cæſaris Juliam quam in matrimonio Marcellus habuerat duxit uxorem, feminam neque ſibi neque reipublicæ felicis uteri - - - *Agrippa being returned from Aſia, married Julia, Cæſar's daughter, who had been Marcellus's wiſe; a princeſs whoſe fecundity was neither advantageous to herſelf, nor to the commonwealth.* Paterculus, lib. ii, cap. 93.

(47) Ad ultimum tanto nobis affecta eſt vinculo ſinceriſſimæ dilectionis, quæ religiones alias quaſi reſpuens, velamen noſtri ordinis ſuſcipere, & in noſtra præelegit eccleſia ſepeliri. *Ex Necrologio Fontis Ebraldi apud, Patrem de la Mainferme, Clypeo naſcentis Ordinis, Diſſertat.* III, *pag.* 159.

(48) See the book of de la Mainferme, ibid.

(49) Ex Necrologio Fontis, Ebraldi, apud la Mainferme, ibid. pag. 158.

(50) I have found this to be true. See the Genealogical Tables of this Jeſuit, pag. 49, Edit. of Paris, 1664.

(51) I have found this to be true. See the *Hiſtoire de la Maiſon Roiale*, pag. 78.

(52) Mezerai, Abregé Chronol. Tom. II, pag m. 582, add ann. 1178.

(53) Ibid. pag. 571. add ann. 1152. *but he ſhould have marked the year* 1155.

(54) Daughter of Alphonſo VII king of Caſtile, married to Lewis in 1154.

(55) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 583.

(56) Lucan. lib. viii, ver. 493.

his ſon Philip to be crowned at Rheims, the firſt of November, 1179. He had him by Alix of Champaigne, his third wife. I have not given a chronological account of his actions, becauſe it may be found in Moreri.

This maxim eſpecially regards the head of a court. I ſpeak not of the piety, which conſiſts in building magnificent churches, in extending the limits of his religion by force of arms, and extirpating ſects. This kind of piety is ſometimes (57) ſubſervient to the temporal good of a prince, to his greatneſs and conqueſts. I ſpeak of a piety, that will not make uſe of the oblique ways of policy; I ſpeak of a conſcience that always prefers the honeſt before the profitable, and that rejects all the maxims of the art of reigning, which are contrary to exact probity. This virtue is doubtleſs prejudicial to a temporal intereſt, becauſe it allows not the reſiſting the attacks and cabals of the enemy. Lewis VII is an inſtance of it (58), tho' it muſt be owned that his ſcruples were of a very particular nature; for they hindered not his encouraging children to revolt againſt their fathers, and protecting them in that rebellion; but they would not ſuffer him to marry a baſtard; they forced him to make a voyage, to know whether his wife was the lawful daughter of king Alphonſus. He was afraid of offending againſt the laws of the kingdom. Why did he not fear to offend againſt the law of God, which commands children to honour their fathers?

I conclude with a paſſage of Mr Amelot de la Houſſaye, in which he cites Machiavel. 'The man, *ſays he, in the fifteenth chapter of his Prince,* who profeſſes himſelf a perfectly honeſt man, amongſt ſuch numbers as are otherwiſe, will be ſure to be ruined. There is therefore a neceſſity that the prince, who would ſtand his ground, ſhould learn the faculty of not being good, when he ought not to be ſo *. *And in his eighteenth chapter, after having ſaid that the prince ought not to keep his word, when it is againſt his intereſt, he frankly confeſſes that* this precept ſhould not be given, if all men were good; but there being ſo many wicked and deceitful, it is for a prince's ſecurity to know how to be ſo too. *Without which he might loſe his dominions, and conſequently his reputation; it being impoſſible that a prince, who has loſt the one, ſhould preſerve the other* (59).' Some pages after he ſpeaks thus: 'Some Maxims of ſtate are to be more equitably interpreted than is uſually done, the practice whereof is become almoſt abſolutely neceſſary, thro' the wickedneſs and perfidiouſneſs of men. Add to this, that princes are of ſuch refined policy, that he who at preſent would act like a downright honeſt man with his neighbours, would quickly be their dupe.'

(57) This reſtriction was neceſſary; for ſometimes this piety brings great prejudice to the moſt powerful princes: the houſe of Auſtria has felt it, France feels it.

(58) See Maimbourg's *Hiſtoire des Croiſades, livr. iii, pag m.* 357, & *ſeq.* where he ſhews, that the ſcruples of this monarch were the cauſe of the ruin of all his affairs in the expedition to the Holy Land.

* Plutarch ſays, that if to reign well one muſt abſolutely diſcharge all the duties, and obſerve all the rules of juſtice, Jupiter himſelf would not be able to do it.

(59) Amelot, preface to his tranſlation of Machiavel's Prince, pag 3.

LEWIS XI, king of France, was born at Bourges, in 1423. He ſucceded Charles VII, his father, in the year 1461. He was a prince well verſed in the art of reigning. He was conſummate in the intrigues of policy, which he very happily employed to deliver himſelf out of a thouſand perplexities; but they ſometimes confounded him (*a*), which is the leſs to be wondered at, when we conſider that he was not uniform in his conduct, but ran from one extream to another [*A*], being reſerved to exceſs, for the moſt part, and too open on ſome occaſions. It was juſtly ſaid of him, that he made himſelf *as conſiderable by his vices, as by his virtues, being apt in the one as well as the other, to run into extreams* (*b*). He was neither a good ſon, nor a good father, nor a good brother, nor a good huſband. At ſixteen years of age he ſet himſelf at the head of a party, and being forced to return to his duty, he watched for other occaſions of revolt, and perſiſted in theſe courſes till the death of his father [*B*], and even afterwards diſcovered his unnatural temper in a ſcandalous manner [*C*]. He took no care of

(*a*) *See Varillas,* Hiſt. de Louïs XI, livr. x, pag. m. 333, 334.

(*b*) Paſquier, Lettr. livr. iii, pag. m. 154.

[*A*] *He ran from one extream to another.*] Here follows what an hiſtorian ſays of him. 'He was the ableſt prince in the world, to bring men over to his opinion, to diſcover the ſecrets of his enemies, to perplex them with diſtruſts, and divide the moſt united; but in his mirth, was incapable of keeping in his ſecrets; every thing ſlipped from him, and he was more ſubject to commit faults, than able to repair them, which he did by all manner of ways, and more frequently by bad than good means (1).

[*B*] *He ſet himſelf at the head of a party . . . and watched for other occaſions of a revolt, and perſiſted in theſe courſes till the death of his father.*] Charles VII made a regulation, which neither pleaſed the great men, nor the officers who were fattened by the miſery of the people: they interrupted it by a dangerous commotion, which was called *la Praguerie.* The dukes of Alençon, Bourbon and Vendome, the baſtard of Orleans, and ſeveral others, were concerned in it, they complained that the king put the government in the hands of two or three private perſons; and hereupon made a league againſt his miniſters. La Trimouille himſelf, who was diſgraced, joined with them, reſolving to return to court at any rate (2).' To add more weight to this conſpiracy, the faction ſet the Dauphin at the head of them, giving out, that they only deſigned *the reformation of abuſes,* and to order it ſo, that *all things for the future ſhould be managed by this prince's authority, regulated by the adviſe of the princes of the blood* (3). They wrote *letters in his name to the towns of Auvergne, and other provinces where they thought theſe deſigns might be approved. . . . . . But all the towns abominated this revolt* (4); and as the king was vigilant, and attacked the conſpirators, where-ever they appeared, they were forced to have recourſe to his clemency, and deliver up the Dauphin. This commotion was quelled *in leſs than nine months* (5). This ſhews their compariſon to be juſt, who liken the people to coquets. There are ſome days in which they are not to be moved with ſighs or preſents; the next day they come to hand without any trouble. We may alſo ſay, that there are conjunctures in which the moſt plauſible manifeſto's of thoſe who take arms againſt their ſovereign, ſhake not the fidelity of the people: at other times half theſe pretences would be ſufficient for an entire revolution.

The king having pardoned his ſon, kept him near his own perſon, and watched him narrowly. He took him with him on ſome expeditions, and ſent him upon others, and gave him opportunities of obtaining a great reputation, eſpecially by the defeat of four or five thouſand Swiſſers near Baſil (6), who defended themſelves very bravely. He diſtruſted his ſon's natural temper, and kept him ſomewhat ſhort; but the young prince too haughtily took head; and it is ſaid, that he gave a box of the ear to the beautiful Agnes, the king's miſtreſs (7). This joined with other things, obliged his father to ſend him into Dauphiné for four months (8). The Dauphin went thither in a menacing manner: he carried himſelf with a great deal of haughtineſs, and committed intolerable extortions (9). He had intrigues with the neighbouring princes, and thought of returning no more to court; he received orders to return, and did not obey them; and knowing that Charles VII was taking meaſures to ſecure him, he eſcaped to the duke of Burgundy's court, *and thereby made himſelf ſo much dreaded, that his father haſtened his own death, by too great an abſtinence, upon the bare apprehenſions of poiſon* (10). Mezerai juſtly ſays, that Charles VII might have been called happy, *if he had had any other father, or any other ſon* (11).

[*C*] *He diſcovered his unnatural temper, in a ſcandalous manner, after the death of his father.*] This death 'gave him too great a joy to be kept within his own breaſt, and he gave ſuch marks of it, as could not but make the government of ſo unnatural a ſon to be feared. He rewarded him that

brought

(1) Mezerai, Abrégé Chron. Tom. III, ad ann 1472. pag. m. 322.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 258, 259, ad ann. 1440.

(3) Matthieu, Hiſtoire de Louïs XI, livr. i, chap. vi, pag. m. 18, 19.

(4) Id ibid chap. vii, pag. 20.

(5) Id. ibid. chap. xi, pag 28, ad ann. 1440.

(6) *In the year* 1444.

(7) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, chap. 20, pag. xlviii. *He cites Robert Guaguin.*

(8) Id. ibid. pag. 50.

(9) Id. ibid. pag. 52.

(10) Varillas, Hiſt. de Louïs XI, livr. xi, pag. 360.

(11) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 284, ad ann. 1461.

of the education of his ſon, and married his daughters in ſuch a manner, as ſhewed he had no concern for their welfare [*D*]. It is pretended that he put his brother to death [*E*], and it is certain he had miſtreſſes and baſtards [*F*]. The peace he made with

‘brought him the firſt news of it, beyond his expectation. He wore mourning but one morning, and appeared in cloaths of a white and carnation colour after dinner the ſame day. He even forced the courtiers, who haſtened to join him at Guenap, to follow his example, ſince he would not ſuffer them to come into his preſence, with cloaths of a different colour from his own (12).’ Another Hiſtorian ſays, that from this king's, *firſt behaviour* it was concluded, ‘that he would embelliſh the beginning of his reign with other trophies, than clemency; he diſcarded almoſt all the officers and ſervants of king Charles his father; being wonderfully pleaſed to undo what he had done, to pull pown what he had built, and to build what he had pulled down (13).’ It is obſerved (14), ‘that he puniſhed his father's Phyſician, becauſe, following the rules of his art, he had obliged the ſick king to eat.’ He who informs me of this, adds, ‘That the pretence Lewis XI pleaded of rendering hereby the authority of the ſovereign inviolable to the laſt, is not allowable. He is in the right; but if he fancied that it was the true motive of this prince; if he believed, I ſay, that he was willing to take example by Domitian's temper, he is miſtaken. ‘Ut domeſticis perſuaderet ne bono quidem exemplo audendam eſſe patroni necem, Epaphroditum à libellis, Capitali pœna condemnavit (*Domitianus*) quod poſt deſtitutionem Nero in adipiſcenda morte manu ejus adjutus exiſtimabatur (15). —— *To perſwade his domeſtics that men ought never to attempt upon the life of their patron, tho' inſtances were produced that the ſame had been juſtly done, Domitian condemned Epaphroditus his ſecretary to die, becauſe it was thought he had aſſiſted Nero when he killed himſelf.*’ The Phyſician was puniſhed only becauſe Lewis XI had an averſion for a perſon, who had endeavoured to ſave Charles the ſeventh's life.

[*D*] *He took no care of the education of his ſon, and he married his daughters in ſuch a manner as ſhewed he had no concern for their welfare.*] He ‘was an ill father, and tho' he had had his only ſon ſo late, who was afterwards Charles VIII, that there was no probability this young prince ſhould ever give him the ſame diſturbances, that he remembered he had formerly given Charles VII, nevertheleſs he looked upon him as a formidable perſon. He took no care of his education; he placed none but mean perſons about him; he had him bred up in ſloth and pleaſures; and the only maxim he taught him, was, that a man was incapable of ruling, that did not know how to diſſemble. Anne of France, his eldeſt daughter, was perfectly beautiful, but ſhe had abundantly more wit than he was willing ſhe ſhould have had; and it was to humble her, that he married her to a younger brother of the houſe of Bourbon, of a genius ſo mean, that his majeſty had no reaſon to fear, he ſhould enter into any intrigues againſt his ſervice. Jane of France, his ſecond daughter, was ſo deformed, that the Phyſicians affirmed, ſhe would never have children; nevertheleſs he conſtrained the duke of Orleans, the firſt prince of his blood, to marry her, tho' he had reaſon to foreſee ſhe would be unhappy with him (16).’ He had obliged himſelf to give the duke of Calabria a force ſufficient to recover the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, ‘together with his eldeſt daughter in marriage; but of the temper he was of, he was far from chuſing ſo worthy a man for a ſon-in-law. He performed neither of theſe promiſes. . . . . . The count de Beaujeu was preferred before this duke, for no other reaſon, but becauſe he was beneath him in merit and valour; but the fortune of this younger brother of the family of Bourbon, was not bettered by marrying Anne of France. A contract of marriage was preſented him to ſign, which would have made over all the eſtates of this houſe to his wife, had not he been adviſed to evade it by ſome words which were not taken notice of; and as long as the king his father-in-law lived, he employed him only in affairs that were odious. . . . . . And after all, never did him any good (17).’ Peter Matthieu (18), obſerves, that Lewis XI, hated his daughter Jane, becauſe *ſhe was black, little, and crooked.* The lord Leſquiere, her governor, frequently hid her under his long robe, when the king met her, that he might not be afflicted at the ſight of her.

[*E*] *It is pretended that he put his brother to death.*] Let us again comment on this in Varillas's words. ‘Tho' Lewis by the advice of Francis Sforza had inveſted his brother with the duchy of Normandy, yet he took it away from him a little after *the league for the public good* was broken, and gave no other reaſon for it, but that this province was then one third of the revenue of France, and that his younger brother would be too rich, ſhould he enjoy it. He choſe rather to give him Guienne; but he ſo repented it afterwards, that the author, of the Hiſtory of Aquitaine, and the abbot of Brantome, pretend, he got his brother poiſoned by the abbot of St John d'Angeli (19).’ I have elſewhere cited (20) Brantome's words, and will not repeat them here. See alſo Peter Matthieu, in the Hiſtory of Lewis XI (21).

[*F*] *He had miſtreſſes and baſtards.*] I obſerve this as the proof of the character I have given him of an ill husband. He was twice married; the firſt time to Margaret Stuart, daughter to James I, king of Scotland, in 1436. She died at Chaalons upon the Marne the twenty ſixth of Auguſt, 1446 in the twenty ſixth year of her age (22). Hall and Grafton, two Engliſh hiſtorians, affirm, that ſhe diſguſted her husband by her ſtinking breath (23). Buchanan is very angry with them, and confutes them, in the firſt place, by Monſtrelet, who ſays ſhe was handſome and virtuous; in the ſecond place, by a Scotch author, who went into France with her, and never forſook her as long as ſhe lived. He has left it in writing, that ſhe was beloved by her father-in-law, her mother-in-law, and her husband, and was highly extolled in a piece of poetry made upon her death. Monſtrelet's teſtimony does not confute the Engliſh hiſtorians: a woman that is handſome and virtuous, may however be diſguſtful in that reſpect which they alledge. The teſtimony of the Scotch author is ſuſpicious; a domeſtic does not think himſelf obliged to publiſh, that his miſtreſs was hated in the family of her husband, and makes no ſcruple to ſay the contrary: it is a common-place of praiſe. Funeral encomiums are no argument againſt the ill humour of a husband. It might be proved by modern examples, that princeſſes much diſſatisfied with their husbands and father's-in law, have been praiſed after their deaths, in the moſt magnificent ſtrains by Poets and Preachers. However let us ſee Buchanan's words: ‘Quantam illam exiſtimabimus vel mentiendi licentiam, vel maledicendi libidinem, qua, in ejuſdem Regis filiam, utuntur: quam, ob oris graveolentiam (nihil enim in mores, homines alioqui tam impudentes, audebant confingere) marito ſcribunt fuiſſe ingratam? At Monſtreletus illorum temporum ſcriptor æqualis, & probam fuiſſe, & formoſam, memoriæ prodidit; & qui librum Pluſcartenſem ſcripſit, eique Reginæ, & naviganti & morienti, fuit comes, ſcriptum reliquit, eam, dum vixit, egregie caram ſocero, ſocrui, & marito fuiſſe, epitaphiumque carmen, omni laude plenum, Gallicis verſibus, Catalauni ad Matronam (quo in oppido deceſſit) fuiſſe publicatum, quod in Scoticum Sermonem verſum, plerique noſtrorum adhuc habent (24). —— *How great muſt we think that liberty of falſifying or deſire of ſlandering to be, which they uſe againſt the daughter of the aforeſaid king! For whereas ſuch men, otherwiſe impudent enough, had nothing to alledge againſt her morals, they write that ſhe was unacceptable to her husband, becauſe of her ſtinking breath, whereas Monſtrelet, a cotemporary writer, doth affirm that ſhe was virtuous and beautiful. And he who wrote the Pluſcartine book, and who waited on that queen, both at ſea and at her death, has aſſerted, that as long as ſhe lived ſhe was very dear to her father and mother-in-law, and to her husband; and that her epitaph full of her praiſes, in French verſe, was publiſhed at Chaalons on the Marne, where ſhe died, and being afterwards tranſlated into Scotch verſe, moſt of our country-men have it by them to this day.*’

---

(12) Varillas, ubi ſupra, livr. x, pag. 344, 345.

(13) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, livr. ii, chap. iv, pag. 86.

(14) La Mothe le Vayer, Iſtruct. du Dauphin, pag. 43, 44. Tom. I.

(15) Sueton. in Domit. cap. xiv.

(16) *Varillas*, ubi ſupra, pag. 361. He particularizes in his epiſtle dedicatory, the ill education of Charles VIII.

(17) Varillas, ubi ſupra, pag. 362. *See alſo* pag. 325.

(18) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, livr. x, chap. xi, p. 606.

(19) Varillas, ibid. pag. 364.

(20) *In the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, pag. 462.

(21) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, livr. v, chap. xvii, pag. 256.

(22) Anſelme, Hiſt. Genealog. de la Maiſon de France, pag. 125.

(23) *See Buchanan*, in Hiſt. Scotiæ, lib. x, pag. m. 356.

(24) Buchanan, ibid. pag. 357.

with England in 1475, was more uſeful than glorious; he was jeſted on for it, but at bottom was excuſable [*G*]; for conſidering the great number of potent enemies he had to fear, it was better to be ſubmiſſive than to be haughty in that juncture. Of two evils the leaſt is to be choſen; it was an act of prudence; and a man ought not to pretend to a Roman courage out of ſeaſon. Lewis XI raiſed a great deal of money in his kingdom, and trampled much more on his ſubjects than his predeceſſors had done, and yet his perſonal expences were ſo ſmall, that he cannot be acquitted of ſordidneſs [*H*]. Thoſe

'*day*.' Mezerai affirms that Louis XI could never love his firſt wife, becauſe of ſome ſecret imperfection and ſo had no children by her (25). His ſecond wife was Charlotte of Savoy. This ſecond marriage 'was conſummated at Namure in the year 1457. She was very ill treated by her husband for many years together, and died at Amboiſe the firſt of December 1483, being thirty eight years of age (26).' I know not therefore for what reaſons Mr Varillas had recourſe to the ſilence of the Hiſtorians of Savoy. 'Lewis *ſays he* (27), was liable to a fickleneſs in love . . . . . . We have read in the king's library three contracts of marriage, which he ſigned in favour of ſo many of his natural daughters . . . . . but bating that, the Hiſtorians of Savoy, do not charge him with having uſed queen Charlotte his wife unkindly.' The following paſſage of Peter Matthieu will ſhew, ſhe was not very happy. 'In the firſt year of his abode there, Charlotte of Savoy was brought to Namure, to conſummate the marriage that had been treated five years before. A marriage which being made with reluctancy, was conſequently without love. When the duke of Burgundy gave the Dauphin his penſion of twelve thouſand crowns, Oliver de la March writes, that it was upon condition he ſhould marry her, which ſhews he had no great inclination to it. She brought him a ſon whom he called Joachim . . . . . The child died immediately after, which gave the father extream ſorrow, who not being yet poſſeſſed with the jealouſies which age brought upon him, deſired to ſee him a man, knowing that children, who are born late, are orphans betimes. The loſs of this child, who was the firſt that made him a father touched him ſo ſenſibly, that he made a vow, as Philip de Comines ſays, never to know any other woman but his own wiſe, and yet in ſeveral places of his chronicle, we find him amongſt the women, ſome of which were proſtitutes, and others married, and that to husbands of mean fortune raiſed to employments, with abundance of other inſtances of this kind, which do not beſpeak a continence equal to that of Alexander (28).' We ſhall ſee, below (29), the particulars of his galantries; but that which is ſufficient to convince us, that Charlotte of Savoy was not very happy, is, that her husband, at his death, admoniſhed his ſon not to truſt her; for, ſays he, I have always found that ſhe favours the Burgundians (30); judge whether he could love her, though he believed her otherwiſe good and virtuous. Mezerai, having ſaid of this king's firſt wife, what we have ſeen above, adds, *he would very ſeldom have viſited the ſecond, only in hopes of having an heir* (31). Obſerve well what follows: 'Every thing gave king Lewis apprehenſions; he always kept his wiſe at a diſtance, and in his laſt years baniſhed her into Savoy (32).' Philip de Comines obſerves, *that this queen was none of thoſe in whom her husband could take great pleaſure, but however was a very good lady* (33).

[*G*] *The peace he made with England was more uſeful than glorious; he was jeſted upon for it, but at bottom was excuſable.*] I am going to cite an author who is none of the moſt celebrated; but what then? It ſuffices that he ſpeaks good ſenſe. 'We find, *ſays he* (34), that Lewis XI, king of France, having too many affairs upon his hands, demanded peace of Edward IV, king of England, as ſoon as he underſtood he was entered into Picardy, and bought it very dear, little minding that the count de Lude, and others of his favourites, called him the cowardly king, as the politician Angevin has written, becauſe he only made that peace to diſunite and weaken his enemies, whilſt he might fortify himſelf to defeat them one after another afterwards, and maſter them, as he did for the moſt part . . . . (35). The Romans would rather have loſt their dominions, than have had ſuch a thought: for it never appears during the ſpace of 700 years, in which they made war with all nations, that they ever ſued for peace, except to the Gauls, who beſieged them in the Capitol, after having burnt their city, for which they revenged themſelves quickly after, and to Coriolanus. On the contrary being overpowered by king Perſeus, they would not grant the conqueror a peace, unleſs he ſubmitted himſelf and his kingdom to their mercy, altho' he offered to pay them tribute. And when king Pyrrhus, after having obtained ſome victories, and received ſome loſs, ſent his embaſſadors to Rome to treat of peace, according to the cuſtom of great princes who are in a foreign country; anſwer was made that he muſt firſt depart Italy, otherwiſe there could be no mention of peace, which was the anſwer of a magnanimous people, who perceived themſelves able to make head againſt the enemy: a thing which would ill become a weak prince who ought, as a wiſe pilot, to lower his ſails, and obey the tempeſt he cannot avoid, that he may get ſafely into harbour, and not make neceſſity miniſter to ambition; like the Vaivod of Tranſylvania, who confidently and openly ſaid, that he would chuſe to be a ſlave to the Turk, rather than an allie to Ferdinand, which happened to be his fate.' Peter Matthieu relates, 'That Edward had taken twelve members of the houſe of commons along with him, who by this time were weary of the war, and of lying in the field like the ſoldiers; theſe approved the propoſals of peace, and ſaid that if it was juſt and reaſonable, it would be imprudent to refuſe it, and that they ought to be ſatisfied with having reduced the king of France, to ſue for peace of the king of England, foraſmuch as a great king cannot be more humbled, nor deſcend lower, than to ſue for peace of his enemy (36).' This was doubtleſs a very great mortification to France; but the circumſtance of the time would allow no other methods without expoſing the ſtate to greater evils. Read theſe words of Philip de Comines: 'I believe a great many may think that the king debaſed himſelf too much: but wiſe men may judge by what I have ſaid, that this kingdom was in great danger, if God had not interpoſed his hand; who diſpoſed the mind of our king to make ſo wiſe a choice (and much confounded that of the duke of Burgundy, who committed ſo many errors as you have ſeen) in this matter, after having ſo much deſired what he loſt by his own fault. We had at that time a great many ſecret heart-burnings amongſt us; from which great miſchiefs would have enſued to this kingdom, and that quickly too, if this reſolution had not been taken, and that without delay, both with regard to Britany and other parts (37).

[*H*] *He cannot be acquitted of ſordidneſs.*] This is what we find in a book of La Mothe le Vayer: 'Scandalous parſimony the oppoſite to prodigality, is perhaps equally blameable. Lewis XI made himſelf contemptible by his vile habit, and his greaſy hats, which hiſtory upbraids him with: and we cannot read without indignation in the regiſters of the chamber of accounts, an article of twenty pence for two new ſleeves, to mend one of his doublets, with another of fifteen farthings to greaſe his boots (38).' Here a paſſage of Mezerai will very conveniently come in. 'The deciſive ſentence of Lewis XI did as little ſatisfy either party (39) as his interview with Henry king of Caſtile ſatisfied either French or Spaniards. The latter laughed at the penuriouſneſs and at the low and ſilly mien of king Lewis, whoſe coat was of coarſe cloth, ſhort and ſtreight †, and wore a leaden image of the Virgin Mary, on his bonnet; the former were ſhocked at the Caſtillian arrogance, and at the pride of the count de Lodeſme, Henry's favourite (40).' La Mothe le Vayer and Mezerai borrow theſe particulars from John Bodin; for thus he ſpeaks: 'There may be parſimony without leſſening the majeſty of a king, or the dignity of his houſhold, or debaſing his greatneſs, 'which

(25) Mezerai, Tom. III, pag. 350.

(26) Anſelme, ubi ſupra.

(27) Varillas, ubi ſupra, pag. 363, 364.

(28) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, livr. i, c. xxv, p. 59, 60.

(29) *In the remark* [*K*].

(30) Matri ne credito, cum enim Sabaudienſis ſit Burgundis favere mihi ſemper viſa eſt: alioquin bonam & pudicam illam ſum arbritratus. *Gaguin. Hiſt. of France, lib. x, fol.* 288.

(31) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. III, pag. 350.

(32) Ibid. pag. 343, ad ann. 1481.

(33) Comines, livr. vi, chap. xiii, pag. 406.

(34) Honorat de Meynier, Reſponſes libres aux Demandes curieuſes, pag. 590.

(35) Ibid. pag. 591, 592.

(36) Father Matthieu, Hiſt. de Louïs XI, livr. vi, chap, xix, pag. 317.

(37) Philippe de Comines, livr. iv, chap. vii, pag. m. 222, ad ann. 1475.

(38) La Mothe le Vayer, opuſcules, Part. I, pag. 83, *of the eighth Tome of his works.*

(39) That is to ſay, John king of Arragon, and Henry king of Caſtile.

† Short habits were ridiculous for people of quality.

(40) Mezerai, Abr. Chronol. Tom. III, pag. 290, ad ann. 1462.

Thoſe of his houſhold were as poor in proportion. The ſame may be ſaid of his embaſſies [*I*]; but in other reſpects he was prodigal (*c*), and retained penſioners in moſt foreign courts which coſt him dear. He ſpent a great deal in ſpies, upon hunting, and upon the ladies [*K*], and rewarded thoſe liberally, who were the firſt meſſengers of great news. He gave four hundred marks in ſilver to Philip de Comines, and to the Seigneur de Bouthage, who brought him the firſt news of the battle of Morat (*d*). He ſaid, *I will give as much to any one, who will bring me ſuch a piece of news* (*e*). He often uſed to diſcourſe of the iſſue of affairs before he had any account of it (*f*). This is a ſign of his impatience, and we need not wonder, after this, that he was the firſt king who ſettled the poſts (*g*). He made his ſoldiers pay their quarters punctually, and ſeverely forbid them to do any injury, and puniſhed the diſobedient with the utmoſt rigour. This was the reaſon why his kingdom, tho' very much loaded with taxes, did, notwithſtanding, grow rich [*L*]. The enacting that law, which makes Miſpriſion of treaſon

which ſometimes is the cauſe of the contempt of ſtrangers, and rebellion of ſubjects; as it happened to king Lewis XI, who having almoſt expelled the gentlemen of his family, employed his Taylor for his herald at arms, his Barber for embaſſador, and his Phyſician for chancellor, (as one Antiochus, king of Syria, made Apollophanes, his Phyſician, preſident of his council ‡) and to mock other kings, he wore a greaſy hat, and the coarſeſt cloth; and even in his chamber of accompts was found, &c. . . . Nevertheleſs he heightened the taxes three millions a year, beyond his predeceſſor, and alienated a great part of the crown lands (41).' Here is what he had ſaid in another place of the ſame book (42): 'The king of Egypt having ſeen Ageſilaus rolling in a meadow, clad in a plain cloak of poor cloth, and lean, little, and lame, made no more account of him, than was made of king Lewis XI, who being choſen arbiter of a difference between the kings of Navarre and Caſtile, the Spaniards at the meeting ridiculed the French and their king, who looked like ſome pilgrim of St James of Compoſtella, with his greaſy hat edged with images, and his jacket of a tan colour cloth, and who had no majeſty in his face, no more than in his manners; and his train accoutred like himſelf, for he could not endure to ſee any body finely dreſſed; whereas the king of Caſtile, and his retinue, came richly habited, and their horſes bravely capariſoned, ſhewing a certain Spaniſh grandeur, which made the Frenchmen look like their valets.' We ſhall ſee below (43) that we may trace this to an author who lived before Bodin, and whom Varillas did not underſtand.

[*I*] *The expences of his houſhold . . . . . and of his embaſſies.*] Theſe are the words of Peter Matthieu, who wrote in the reign of Henry IV. 'The expences of his houſhold (44) were much inferior to thoſe of ſome lords of that time . . . . . by the accounts it appears, that they were augmented according to the years, the affairs, and journeys. They did not exceed thirty ſix thouſand livres till the year 1480, when they came to 43619 livres. In the year 1481; they were 66680 livres; and in the laſt year of his life 80603 livres. Nevertheleſs he never ſtirred from Pleſſis from the eighth of November to the ſeventh of September the year following, when he was carried to his grave at Nôtre-Dame de Clery. The number of ſervants for the ordinary ſervice of that expence, was not great, their wages were ſmall in compariſon of what they are in our days. They ſerved all the year, and the year began in October. None were in the liſt of his voluntary penſions but theſe following. Two chaplains at ten livres a month each, and a clerk of the chapel at a hundred ſols. A valet de chambre to the king at ninety livres a year. Four clerks of of the kitchen at 120 livres a year each. An overſeer of the roaſt, the pottager, the ſaucemaker, the maſter cook, a diſpencer of the armoury, two valets of the ſumpters, at ten livres each a month. Two ſcullions of the kitchen at eight livres a month; a Porter, a Paſtry-cook, a Baker; two Coachmen, each at ſixty livres a year; a groom of the ſtables, and two of his aſſiſtants at twenty four livres a month; a mareſchal of the forges at 120. The maſter of the chamber of the king's revenues 1200 livres, and the comptroller five hundred ‡. The gowns of the valets coſt but fifty ſols, and the cloaks of the Clerks, Notaries, and Secretaries, of the houſe and crown of France, but twelve livres (45).'

We have already ſeen that this prince employed his Barber on embaſſies. He made him a nobleman by patent in 1474, inveſting him with the county of Meulant, and changed his name from *Oliver the Devil* into that of *Oliver le Daim* (*the Deer*) (46). He ſent him on an embaſſy to the heireſs of Burgundy, who laughed at him: what, ſaid ſhe, have I to do with a Phyſician, I am very well (47). Mr de Wicquefort has mentioned this deputation of *Oliver le Daim* (48).

[*K*] *He ſpent a great deal . . . . upon hunting, and upon the ladies.*] 'Lewis's two predominant paſſions were for hunting and the ladies (§ α); and it is obſerved that his liberality ran into an inconceivable exceſs, as often as he had a mind to gratify either of theſe two paſſions. As for the firſt, he kept a prodigious number of huntſmen, falconers, hawks, and hounds, and was ſo ſollicitous of hindring thoſe who had the right of hunting, from exerciſing it under any pretence whatever, that it was more dangerous to kill a ſtag than a man . . . . When he parted from Lyons, after he had received certain advice of the defeat of the duke of Burgundy at Morat, he took with him, to the great ſcandal of good people, from this city, to that of Paris, two miſtreſſes *, one called la Gigonne, a widow, and the other la Paſſefilon, a Merchant's wife. Immediately after the prince of Orange had made him maſter of the duchy of Burgundy, he ſent for a young lady, a perfect beauty, called Hugete de Jaquelin who was at Dijon. But before all this we find in the king's library three contracts of marriage, which are ſo many teſtimonies of his incontinence, ſince he there appears in quality of a father of three natural daughters, and matches them without diſguiſing the matter (49).' Peter Matthieu tells us that this prince was at great expences for his amours, even when he was reduced to the neceſſity of borrowing. 'I have ſeen in the accounts of the chamber of the revenues, that being on a progreſs to Arras, he borrowed of one of his ſervants, called James Hamelin, the ſum of *three hundred and twenty livres, ſixteen ſols, and eight deniers, to employ in his pleaſures and delights*, and ſending for a gentlewoman of Dijon, called Huquette Jaquelin, widow to the deceaſed Philip Chamarges, in Auguſt 1479, **, one of his Carvers, who went to fetch her, advanced the charges both of her journey and of the ſtay that ſhe made at Tours (50).' Note, that at that time twenty ſols went farther than two piſtols at preſent.

[(§ α) In the library of St Elizabeth at Breſlau there is a manuſcript hiſtory of king Charles VII, and Lewis XI, from the year 1410 to 1483. The author, who has not put his name to it, but in his preface, boaſts to have had in his youth ſeveral converſations with king Charles VII, ends his work with the epitaph of Lewis XI;

Perfidia inſignis, hinc uſque ad Tartara notus;
Formoſi oppreſſor pecoris, nequiſſimus ipſe.

REM. CRIT.

[*L*] *This was the reaſon that his kingdom . . . . . did notwithſtanding grow rich.*] Thus you ſee how the ill qualities of a monarch are ſometimes compenſated with others, which, all things conſidered, make the people as happy as under a good and well-natured ſovereign (51). What Tacitus ſays, that the diſorders of government are interrupted by good princes who ſucceed bad ones; and that this makes a compenſation,

---

(*c*) *See Matthieu, in his Life*, lib. xi, pag. 699, 700.

(*d*) Ibid. p. 700.

(*e*) Id. ibid. *He cites Philip de Comines.*

(*f*) Id. ibid.

(*g*) Id. ibid. pag. 696.

‡ Polyb. lib iii.

(41) Bodin, de la Republique, livr. vi, cap. ii, circa fin. pag. m. 909.

(42) Ib. livr. iv, cap. vi, pag 631.

(43) *In the remark* [*X*].

(44) *That is to ſay, of Lewis XI.*

‡ *King Lewis XI having added 300 livres to the ſalary of Martin Berthelot, maſter of the chamber of the king's revenue; the chamber of accounts would not allow it without an expreſs order of the king, which was given at Paray le Moynet the 6th of April* 1481.

(45) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, lib. xi, pag. 647.

(46) La Roque Traité de la Nobleſſe, chap. xcvi, pag. 338.

(47) Oliverius Dandus Legatus Ludovici XI. ad Mariam Burgundiam ab ea ludibrio habitus: ipſa enim quæſivit quid ſibi opus medico cum optime valeret quia erat tonſor ſeu chirurgus. *Id. ib. He relates this as from Gaguin, but I do not find it in the Annals of that author.*

(48) Wicquefort, de l'Ambaſſadeur, livr. i, chap. vii, pag. 160, & livr, ii, chap. ii, pag. 26.

* *In the manuſcripts of Meſſ. du Puy.*

(49) Varillas, ubi ſupra, lib. x, pag. 324.

** *This expence from the firſt of Auguſt to the eleventh of December, amounts to* 298 *livres.*

(50) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, lib. xi, pag. 707.

(51) *See, above, remark* [*BB*] *of the article Henry II.*

treaſon a capital crime, is aſcribed to him [*M*]. He was ſubject to ſome caprices and humours

is a good thought. *Vitia erunt donec homines, ſed neque hæc continua, & meliorum interventu penſantur* (52). But we may go farther, and ſay, that in the ſame perſon the good and the bad qualities ſometimes ſo counterpoize one another, that more public advantages reſult from it, than from a certain uniform goodneſs. Lewis XI levied too much money upon his ſubjects, but he made that money circulate; for his troops were obliged to pay exactly for whatever was neceſſary for them, and he never ſuffered them to ſteal or pilfer. Let us uſe the plain and antique ſtyle of John Bouchet (53). *He would have juſtice adminiſtred, the church revered and not pillaged; and he delighted in adorning images and churches; and he ordered his ſoldiers exactly to be paid their wages, which his treaſurers could not fail in without peril of the halter. He had a long time in his pay above four thouſand men of arms, and a great number of foot, called Frank archers, with whom the earth was quite covered, from Bourdeaux to Picardy. Amongſt whom there was ſo good order and military diſcipline, that no violence was known to be done to the poor people, except in one place, where they ſtole ſome bees, and in another, where they filched a couple of pullets, for which the malefactors were immediately hanged, though they were men of arms. For this reaſon, tho' the people were burdened with great taxes and ſubſidies, and the king levied upon them four millions, ſeven hundred thouſand livres in taxes and ſubſidies yet the kingdom of France was rich, becauſe the money which the people gave, paid the ſoldiery, and the ſoldiery afterwards gave part of what they had received back, for what they had, and ſo a farthing did not go out of the kingdom.* For *this wiſe king never endeavoured to have two crowns, nor an imperial ſcepter,* Here you may obſerve a *for* well placed; nothing exhauſts a kingdom more than the deſire princes have of making creatures in foreign countries, either for conqueſt by election, or any other conqueſt. Note that in all this John Bouchet contradicts the other Hiſtorians, who affirm, that Lewis XI much impoveriſhed his ſubjects (54), and employed a great deal of money in maintaining penſioners and intelligencers in foreign countries.

[*M*] *The law that makes miſpriſion of treaſon a capital crime, is aſcribed to him.*] This text is not unworthy the readers curioſity, but the comment much more deſerves it, as containing very particular circumſtances of Thuanus's trial *. I ſhall only be the count de Brienne's tranſcriber, who was miniſter and ſecretary of ſtate. ‘ The true occaſion of my intimacy with the chancellor, *ſays he* (55), was the promiſe he made to me, and which he faithfully kept, of contributing all he could to the deliverance of Thuanus; and indeed he acted with ſo much zeal in it, that though there was a law made in Lewis the eleventh's time, declaring, that whoever ſhould have notice of a conſpiracy formed againſt the king's perſon, or eſtate, and did not come and reveal it, ſhould be puniſhed as the author of the crime, and incur the ſame penalties of loſs of life and eſtate; though I ſay a magiſtrate as well verſed as the chancellor, in the knowledge of our king's ordinances, could not be ignorant of one of this importance, yet he diſſembled the knowledge of it, and carried himſelf on this occaſion, as if he made no account of that law; for after having often adviſed Thuanus, when he was examined and gave way to his lively and briſk temper, to give himſelf time to hear what was asked him, and to conſider what he ought to anſwer, he did not ſtick to declare even to cardinal de Richelieu (to prepare him for Thuanus's acquittal), that he found no law which condemned to death a perſon who had knowledge of a conſpiracy formed againſt the ſtate, unleſs he was an accomplice in it; that as to the accuſed, it appeared indeed that Fontrailles, at his return from Spain, had given him ſome intelligence, but that he diſapproved the deſign, and blamed this gentleman for having ſerved as an inſtrument to engage Monſieur in ſo odious a buſineſs. Cardinal Richelieu, ſurprized at this diſcourſe, conſulted with ſome of the commiſſioners of the chamber, one of which having quoted the ordinance I have mentioned, he cauſed it to be tranſcribed from the body of the law, and ſhewed it to the chancellor himſelf; but though he was preſſed ſo by this miniſter (whoſe way of acting on ſuch occaſions is but too well known) yet he could not be brought off from the reſolution he had taken of diſcharging the accuſed; but went on to invalidate that ordinance, ſaying, that it was not in uſe in the parliament of Paris, where he had been bred. I cannot diſown but when the votes were taken, he was of the ſide of the ordinance; but as his vote could not abſolve Thuanus, ſo it was not that which cauſed his condemnation, and every one who knows the duty of a preſident will acknowledge, that he cannot depart from a law, which all the judges declare valid, much leſs from a majority of opinions when given in form; it is alſo a great error, and which I am, with all the Lawyers, very far from entertaining, that it is in a judge's power, as a pacific arbitrator, to pronounce according to equity, and not according to the rigour of the law; for beſides that his oath obliges him to do juſtice, the character of a judge does not appoint him maſter, but only preſerver and miniſter of the laws and ordinances.’

This being not only an hiſtorical but a critical Dictionary, I may be allowed to make ſome reflexions on this narrative of the count de Brienne. I ſay then, that there are ſome paſſages in it, which methinks make not much for the honour of the chancellor. That which is alledged in his excuſe, *of being for the ordinance*, has a great deal of weight; but on the other hand, it may be employed as a conviction againſt him; for if he ought to be the *miniſter of the laws and ordinances*, he ought not to have attempted to have brought off Thuanus, that is, to invalidate the ordinance of Lewis XI. He ſhould either have refuſed the function of judge, or have diveſted himſelf of all friendſhip, as well as hatred for the accuſed perſon; and have had no other view than the diſcovery of the fact, and giving his ſuffrage according to the ordinance. Inſtead of this, we are told here, that he ſeemed to be ignorant, that there was any law which affected the criminal; and being advertized that there was, he anſwered, *that it was not in uſe.* Why then did he conform to it, in giving his vote? For what end was he the preſerver and miniſter of the laws? He could not be excuſed, either of oppreſſing innocence, or of prevarication; for if the law of Lewis XI was obſolete and out of uſe, Thuanus could not be reckoned an infringer of the laws, but muſt be declared innocent. But if in pronouncing him guilty, nothing was done but according to law, it follows, that the ordinance of Lewis XI had preſerved it's force, and conſequently, that the chancellor diſcharged the duties of his place very ill, in endeavouring to make it believed, that there was no law of this nature in France, and when he could not deny it, then alledging, that it was not obſerved in the parliament of Paris. There is reaſon to ſuſpect, that this was a ſubterfuge, and that he only ſpoke thus, that he might not be reckoned ignorant of an ordinance of Lewis XI; for how is it probable, that the parliament of Paris ſhould diſpenſe the ſubjects from the obligation of revealing treaſon? This obligation ſeems inſeparable from the oath of allegiance to the ſovereign. Mr du Maurier (56) relates, that one of Barnevelt's ſons was beheaded at the Hague, for *being privy to the conſpiracy* his brother had formed againſt prince Maurice, and *not revealing of it; having not been accuſed by any of the conſpirators who were executed in great numbers in all the towns of Holland . . . .* (57). *He had the ſame fate as Francis Thuanus, who died for not revealing the deſign that Mr de Cinq Mars, great maſter of the horſe of France, had communicated to him. Du Puy's noble relations, cauſed a diſcourſe to be printed on this ſubject, wherein, to prove the iniquity of the ſentence, amongſt other paſſages, they made uſe of this of Gigas, a Milaneſe Lawyer.* Qui conſilium adverſus Majeſtatem Principis initum cognoverunt, nec probare poſſunt, non tenentur revelare: & qui tales condemnant, non ſunt Judices, ſed carnifices. *They who know a conſpiracy againſt a ſovereign, and cannot prove it, are not obliged to reveal it; and they who condemn ſuch, are not judges, but murderers.* By this Milaneſe Lawyer's favour, Thuanus's judges did their duty (58), but the court did not; for never any fault of that kind was more worthy of pardon than

SOME particulars relating to the tryal of Thuanus.

[*Francis Auguſt Thuanus, ſon to the great Thuanus. He was beheaded in 1641, for not diſcovering Mr de Cinq Mars's treaſonable deſigns. REM. CRIT.]

(52) Tacit. Hiſt. lib. iv, cap. lxxiv.

(53) Bouchet, Annales d'Aquitaine, fol m. 164, verſo.

(54) *See the remark* [*Q*].

(55) Réponſe aux Mémoires de Mr le Comte de la Chaſtre, pag. m. 20, & ſeq.

(56) Du Maurier, Mémoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de Hollande, pag. 373.

(57) Id. ibid. pag. 374.

(58) *See the article* NERO.

humours, which were very ſingular, and theſe were ſometimes the rule of his favours [*N*]. As he was infinitely deſirous of prolonging his life, no perſon experienced his liberality more than his Phyſician. He gave him an abſolute authority over him [*O*]. He was very

than Thuanus's (§ α). I am not ignorant of the fine diſtich which Mr Menage falſely aſcribes to Grotius (59). Mr Zuylichem is the author of it; it is the end of an epigram of eight verſes intituled *Epitaphium Fr. Auguſti Thuani*. See page 180 of his *Momenta deſultoria*, in the Leyden edition, of 1644, 8vo.

[(§ α) Peter de Puy (Puteanus) has written a vindication of Francis Auguſt Thuanus, wherein he proves that the ſentence againſt the ſaid Thuanus was not only contrary to all Civil laws, but even to the laws made in France; and that the judges were influenced and corrupted by cardinal Richelieu, who had a perſonal hatred againſt him. Mr Buckley has inſerted this valuable piece, in the ſeventh volume of his excellent edition of Thuanus's hiſtory of his own times. REM. CRIT.]

[*N*] *He was ſubject to ſome caprices and humours, which were very ſingular, and theſe were ſometimes the rule of his favours.*] He once commanded 'the abbot 'of Baigne, a man of great wit, and who had the art 'of inventing new muſical inſtruments, and always attended the king, and was in his ſervice, to get him 'a conſort of ſwines voices, thinking it impoſſible. 'The abbot was not ſurprized, but asked money for 'the performance; which was immediately delivered 'him, and he wrought a thing as ſingular as ever was 'ſeen. For out of a great number of hogs, of ſeveral ages, which he got together, and placed under a 'tent or pavillion, covered with velvet, before which 'he had a table of wood, all painted, with a certain 'number of keys, he made an organical inſtrument, 'and as he plaid upon the ſaid keys with little ſpikes, 'which pricked the hogs, he made them cry in ſuch 'order and conſonance, as highly delighted the king 'and all his company (60).' Bouchet adds to this the ſtory of a Scullion. The king, *dreſſed in a very plain woollen gown* went one day *into the kitchen*, and asked a boy that turned the ſpit ſome queſtions, who not knowing him, anſwered; 'I am a native of Berry, 'ſuch a one's ſon, and my name is Stephen; I ſerve 'the king here in mean quality, and yet I get as much 'as he. The king asked him what the king got? 'His expences (ſaid the boy), and by my faith, I will 'have my expences of him, as he has of God, and he 'will carry away no more than I. The king (who 'ſometimes raiſed people in a frolic) was pleaſed with 'the anſwer, and Stephen made his fortune by it; 'for the king made him his Valet de Chambre, and 'he grew very rich. Some ſay this was Stephen the 'Uſher, who was ſo loved by the king, that when at 'any time he gave him a box on the ear in anger, 'he pretended to be ſick, and a dying, and immediately the king gave him a thouſand, or two thouſand crowns. This king was very familiar with thoſe 'he loved; and deſpiſed royal pomp and coſtly 'cloaths; he eat and drank always in the hall, with 'all his lords and gentlemen, and they who drank 'beſt, and they who had any laſcivious jeſt upon women, were very welcome (61).' One day, as he entered into a church, whilſt the great bell went, he ſaw a poor prieſt ſleeping before the door, and enquiring if any body was dead, he was told that a canon was dead, whoſe benefice was in his majeſty's nomination, he ordered the prieſt to ſucceed him, to verify the proverb, *that he who is happy his good fortune comes when he is aſleep* (62). Let us add to all this, a paſſage of Stephen Paſquier. *Now, though Lewis XI pretended to great zeal for religion and piety, yet he uſed them ſometimes according to the convenience of his affairs, ſometimes out of a wonderful ſuperſtition; thinking all things were lawful to him, when he had performed ſome pilgrimage. In ſhort, a man of arbitrary humours, by means of which, right or wrong, he put in, and out, what officers he pleaſed, and upon the ſame foot, ſometimes ran into fooleries and impertinencies, in which he would not be contradicted. As when he ordered all the birds of Paris that could ſpeak, to be brought into his chamber to divert himſelf with their gibberiſh* (63).

The Jeſuit Garaſſe has cenſured theſe words of Paſquier, and made himſelf ridiculous. *For a ſubject*, ſays he (64), *to take the boldneſs of thinking, ſpeaking, and writing, that his king was a* fool, or ſubject to fooleries and impertinencies, *is ſuch an extravagance and inſolence, as deſerves chaſtiſement* . . . . . (65). *I remember this device of ſome old ſlanderers, who to ſtain the honour of a brave emperor, ſaid of his religion, that* aliam ſibi aliam ſervabat imperio, *that he had two religions in his ſleeve, one for ſhew, and another for conſcience, one for the cloſet, another for the hall, one for himſelf, and another for his ſubjects* . . . . (66). *That a ſubject ſhould deſcribe his king as a libertine, who plays with God and religion, and makes Theramenes's buskins of both, and takes pilgrimages to canonize his impieties: I queſtion whether the miniſters have written ſo much of Charles IX* . . . (67). *This is a ſymptom of ill-nature, and a very wild diſpoſition.* The anſwer that was made to this invective of Garaſſe, could not but confound him; he was ſhewed what was the duty of an hiſtorian (68), and it was maintained againſt him, that the firſt ſcandal proceeds from him who commits the evil, not from him who relates it, and that Paſquier ſaid nothing but what he had found in the hiſtories of Lewis XI. They did not forget the words of Tacitus (69), which teach us, that the chief deſign of an hiſtorian ought to be the preſerving the memory of good actions, and making poſterity dread the infamy of bad ones.

I omit the four ſtories related in Eraſmus's Colloquies; for though they denote a very ſingular and unequal method of rewarding, they are rather good proofs of the dexterity at diſtinguiſhing the artifices of a ſharper, or true merit, than ſigns of an odd and whimſical humour. Let us only give the ſubſtance of one of theſe four ſtories (70). A countryman, at whoſe houſe Lewis XI, in the time of his diſgrace, had ſometimes eaten turnips, was very well recompenſed for the preſent he made him of a large turnip, after he was upon the throne. This made a lord of the court believe, that if he gave the king a fine horſe, he ſhould receive a magnificent reward, but the king only ordered him the countryman's turnip.

[*O*] *As he was infinitely deſirous of prolonging his life . . . . he gave his Phyſician an abſolute authority over him.*] Concerning this paſſage, ſee the *Miſcellaneous Thoughts upon Comets* (71), and add to them this reflexion. It is believed, that his devotion for St Servatius, was founded upon this ſaint's long life. The legendaries ſay, that he lived three ages, others are content to give him a biſhopric, which he enjoyed above ſixty years. 'Inſitâ, Belgarum maxime populis opinione, affinem illum Chriſti, ejuſque ſupparem temporibus extitiſſe atque inde tertiam explevisſe hominum ætatem; ſive ita fuerit, neque 'enim deſunt, affirmare hoc auſi, ſeu potius ex longiſſima Epiſcopatus ſui præfecturâ, nam ultra ſeptuaginta annos illam extendit; prodigialiter annoſum ac 'triſeclisenem planè crediderint. Ut hinc ſuſpicari 'fortè quis poſſit Ludovicum Undecimum Galliæ Regem ideò ſibi ornandum delegiſſe Servatii templum, 'ut ab eo inter Divos maximè longævo, longam ipſe 'vitam, cujus erat producendæ cupientiſſimus, impetraret (72). ——— *The people, eſpecially in Flanders, 'believe that St Servatius was Chriſt's kinſman, and 'his cotemporary; and that he lived thrice the age of 'man; whether this be really true, as ſome dare to affirm, or rather that it was ſaid ſo on account of the 'long duration of his epiſcopacy, which laſted more 'than ſeventy years. And this may be the reaſon, why 'Lewis XI king of France, took ſuch particular care to 'adorn the church of that ſaint; that by his interceſſion, he might obtain the prolongation of his life, 'which he earneſtly deſired.*' Let us not forget this. 'Lewis XI had often ſaid in his life-time, that in 'whatever extremity he ſhould be, they ſhould never 'pronounce on him the word of death, thinking it 'too harſh for the ear of a king . . . . They who had 'the charge of his conſcience, expected, that he finding himſelf dying, ſhould acknowledge it. A Divine, his Phyſician, and Mr Olivier, took a reſolution to ſignify his condition to him. They went to 'him boldly, and with little reſpect, as people who 'had added impudence to the meanneſs of their condition; and their ſpeech was in theſe words: *Sir, we 'are obliged to diſcharge our conſciences, confide no longer in this holy man, nor in any thing elſe: for aſſuredly* very credulous as to Aſtrology; but I know not what to think of a ſtory related by certain authors, that at laſt he preferred an aſs to his Aſtrologers [*P*], and ſwore that animal ſhould ever after be his oracle, before the beſt of the tribe of Aſtrologers. I ſhall not repeat what I have ſaid in another place (*b*), concerning the hypocriſy of his devotion. Paſquier has made a right judgment on it, and could not in juſtice be cenſured for what he had ſaid upon that point, and ſome others (*i*). There never was a king in France, whoſe cruel conduct and extortions came ſo near to tyranny, as thoſe of Lewis XI [*Q*]. We ſhall ſee in another place of this Dictionary (*k*); what an abſolute

---

(59) *Theſe two verſes of Grotius on the death of Thuanus, are excellent,* O legum ſubtile nefas, quibus inter amicos Nolle fidem fruſtra prodere, proditio, eſt. *O wretched ſubtilty of the laws, which declare it treaſon to refuſe betraying a friend.* Menagiana, pag. m. 313, 314. *Note, that Grotius,* Epiſt. 627, Part. I, pag. 945, *mentions that he had been informed of the opinion of Gigas, &c.*

(60) Bouchet Annales d'Aquitaine, fol. 164.

(61) Id. ibid. verſo.

(62) *Pierre Matthieu,* Hiſt. de Louïs XI, livr. xi, pag. m. 722, *ſays, that Corrozet relates this ſtory. Du Verdier Vau-Privas, page* 959 *of his* Bibliotheque Françoiſe, *attributes this to Francis I, but ſince he ſays, he was informed, that this paſſed in the church of Noſtre Dame de Clery, we ought to believe, that they gave him* quid *for* quo: *for Lewis XI frequented this church.*

(63) Paſquier, Lettr. livr. iii, Tom. I, pag. 154, 155.

(64) Garaſſe, Recherche des Recherches, pag. 79.

(65) Id. ibid. pag 83.

(66) Id. ibid. pag. 85.

(67) Id. ibid.

(68) *See* la Défenſe pour Eſtienne Paſquier, livr. ii, ſect. vi, pag. 181, & ſeq.

(69) Præcipuum munus annalium reor, ne virtutes ſileantur, utque pravis dictis factiſque ex poſteritate & infamia metus ſit. *Tacit. Annal. lib. iii, cap. lxv.*

(70) Eraſm in Colloquio cui titulus *Convivium fabuloſum*, pag. m. 345.

(71) *At page* 462.

(72) Famianus Strada de Bello Belg. Decad. II, lib. ii, init. pag. m. 69.

'*ſurely you are no man for this world, take care of your conſcience, for there is no remedy.* Each of them ſpoke ſome ſuch ſhort ſentence, to let him know, that they were all of the ſame opinion concerning his death. He anſwered, *I hope God will aſſiſt me, I am not perhaps ſo ill as you imagine* (73).' What ſhall we ſay of the careſſes he made to Francis de Paul? 'He flattered him, ſupplicated him, threw himſelf on his knees before him, built two convents of his order, the firſt in the park du Pleſſis les Tours, the ſecond at the foot of the caſtle of Amboiſe, that he might prolong his days for him (74).'

As to the authority of his Phyſician, read theſe words. Lewis XI 'changed his ſervants every day, and was ſubject to the roughneſs of John Cottier, his Phyſician, to whom he gave 10,000 crowns a month, durſt refuſe him nothing, and promiſed him all he could deſire, provided he would drive away the terrible phantom of death †, at the mention whereof he would cover his face in bed. This Phyſician ſometimes told him in a bravado, *I know well enough, that ſome morning or other you will ſend me packing as well as the reſt, but I ſwear by God, that you ſhall not live eight days after.* This poor prince, inſtead of treating him as Maximin did his ⸸, gave him all he deſired, biſhoprics, benefices, and offices (75).'

[*P*] *They ſay . . . . . . he at laſt preferred an aſs to his Aſtrologers.*] The ſtory is this, which I relate word for word, as I find it in a book printed at Lyons, in the year 1650 (76). 'Lewis XI, having a moſt famous Aſtrologer in his court, and intending one day to go a hunting, aſked him, whether it would be fair weather, or whether he did not ſuſpect it would rain, who, having conſulted his aſtrolobe, anſwered, that the day would be fair and ſerene; the king determined therefore to purſue his deſign; but having rode out of Paris, and coming near the foreſt, he met a Collier driving his aſs, laden with coals, who ſaid, that the king would do well to go back, becauſe in a few hours there would be a great ſtorm; but as what ſuch people ſay is but little regarded, the king made no account of it, but rode into the foreſt, and was no ſooner there but the day grew dark, thunder and lightening came on, and the rain fell in ſuch abundance, that every one endeavouring to ſave himſelf, the king was left alone, who had no recourſe but to his horſe's ſwiftneſs, to eſcape this misfortune. Next day the king having ſent for the Collier, aſked him where he had learned Aſtrology, and how he could ſo exactly foretel what weather ſhould happen; the Collier anſwered, Sir, I was never at ſchool, and indeed I can neither read nor write; nevertheleſs, I keep a good Aſtrologer in my houſe, who never deceives me; the king being amazed, aſked him what was his Aſtrologer's name, upon which the poor man, quite abaſhed, anſwered, Sir, it is the aſs which your majeſty yeſterday ſaw me driving, loaden with coals; as ſoon as bad weather is coming, he hangs down his ears forward, and walks more ſlowly than uſual, and rubs himſelf againſt the walls; by theſe ſigns (Sir) I certainly foreſee rain, which is the reaſon that yeſterday I adviſed your majeſty to return home: the king hearing this, caſhiered his Aſtrologer, and gave a ſmall ſalary to the Collier, that he might make much of his aſs, ſaying: *Vivit enim Dominus, quia deinceps alio non utar Aſtrologo, quam carbonarii aſino.* —— *For the future, ſaid he, with an oath, the Collier's aſs ſhall be my Aſtrologer.* Alas, poor Aſtrologers, what will become of you, if an aſs knows more than you?' I have ſaid elſewhere (77) that Angelo Cattho, who had been this king's Aſtrologer and Phyſician (78), arrived to great honours. You will find in Peter Matthieu, the names of this king's other Aſtrologers. It is ſaid, that one of them propheſied, that a lady whom the king loved would die in a week's time. The thing happening, Lewis XI ſent for him, *and commanded the people about him not to fail, at a ſignal he ſhould give them, to take the Aſtrologer and throw him out at the window. As ſoon as the king ſaw him: you that pretend, ſays he, to be ſuch a wiſe man, and know ſo perfectly the fate of others, inform me a little what will be your own, and how long you have to live? whether the Aſtrologer was ſecretly adviſed of the king's deſign, or whether he knew it by his ſcience:* Sir, *anſwered he, without expreſſing any fear,* I ſhall die three days before your majeſty. *The king was ſo far from having him thrown out at the window after this anſwer, that, on the contrary, he took particular care not to ſuffer him to want for any thing, and did all that he could to retard the death of a man, which his own was ſo cloſely to follow* (79). This Aſtrologer was no leſs ingenious than he who delivered himſelf from a like danger in Tiberius's time. Who being aſked what the ſtars predicted to him that day; anſwered, after ſome artificial preambles, that he found himſelf threatened with an extream danger. This anſwer was the reaſon, not only of his not being thrown from the top of the houſe, as it had been reſolved, in caſe his ſcience ſhould be found fallacious, but alſo of Tiberius's honouring him with his confidence (80).

[*Q*] *There never was a king in France, whoſe cruel conduct and extortions came ſo near to tyranny.*] *Had Comines deſigned to give the pourtaiture of a cruel prince, he could have employed no ſtronger colours than thoſe which deſcribe his rigorous priſons, his iron cages, and nets* ‡. *He ſays,* they were made of wood, covered with plates of iron: that he had got ſome Germans to make very weighty and terrible irons to put on the feet, and in which there was a ring to put one foot in, very hard to be opened, like an iron collar, with a thick and heavy chain, and a great iron ball at the end, very heavy, and theſe were called the king's nets. . . . . *The reign of this prince was terribly tempeſtuous; it cannot be ſaid of it as of that of Antoninus, that it was not ſtained with blood* *. *Triſtan, his grand provoſt, who as juſtly deſerved by his barbarous and ſevere conduct, the name of Triſtis, as Maximin did, was ſo ready to execute his rigorous commands, that he ſometimes deſtroyed the innocent with the guilty, and always diſpoſed this prince rather to uſe the ſword to puniſh offences, than the bridle to reſtrain men from offending. . . . . Claude de Seyſſel could ſay nothing more ſevere on the memory of this prince, than what he writes,* that about the places where he was, were ſeen a great number of people hanging on trees, and the priſons, and other neighbouring houſes, full of priſoners, which were often heard, both by day and by night, to cry out for the torments they endured, beſides thoſe who were ſecretly caſt into the rivers (81). *The ſame Hiſtorian obſerves* (82), that Lewis XI carried his abſolute power to exceſs. His provoſt went and took the priſoners who were in the palace-goal, and cauſed them to be drowned near the *Grange aux Mercier*, ... (83) *Beſides the examples of the contempt of juſtice, which are often ſeen in ſeveral parts of the hiſtory of Lewis XI, in which we find trials begin by execution, and executions without example* **; *it ſays, that in many proceſſes, he would have juſtice done according to his own humour, and would not truſt to thoſe, who had the diſpenſing of it. A place alſo is ſtill ſhewn at Pleſſis lez Tours, where he concealed himſelf to watch his provoſt, when he examined the priſoners* . . . . . . (84) *There were repreſented to the ſtates which were held after his death, ſeveral ſorts of injuſtices, which, during his reign, had afflicted the people, every one complaining that he had not taken care to maintain the rules of juſtice.*

(*b*) *In the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, n. 152, 154. *See alſo* Varillas, ubi ſupra, pag. 330.

(*i*) *See the remark* [*N*], *towards the end.*

(*k*) *In the article* VAQUERIE, *remark* [*A*].

(73) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, lib. x, pag. 598, 599.

(74) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 348, ad ann. 1483.

† Alexander, tyrant of Pharos, lived in ſuch fears, that the chamber where he lay, was guarded by two terrible maſtiffs, and there was no coming to it but by a ladder.

⸸ Maximin ordered his Phyſicians to be put to death, becauſe they could not cure him.

(75) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, pag. 593. *See alſo Mezerai*, ubi ſupra, pag. 347, *where he ſays*, that James Coctier ſnubbed him like a foot boy, and got out of him 55000 crowns, and a great many other favours in five months time.

(76) *Marcel in the ſecond book* de la Sage folie, *chap. vii, pag. m.* 107, & ſeq.

(77) *In the article* CATTHO.

(78) *See above the remark* [*A*], *of the article* CATTHO.

(79) Bourſault, Nouv. Lettres, pag. m. 394, 395.

(80) *See* Tacit. Annal. lib. vi, cap. xxi.

‡ The cardinal de la Balue, who invented the iron cages, was the firſt who was ſhut up in them, and lived in them fourteen years. *Lacum fodit & aperuit eum, & incidit in foveam quam fecit.*

* The reign of Antoninus was ſo mild, that Herodian calls it, ἀναίματον, that is to ſay, unbloody.

(81) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, livr. xi, chap. vi, pag. 654, & ſeq.

(82) Ibid. pag. 672.

(83) Ibid. pag. 678.

** Strange ſtories are told of his executions. The chronicle ſays, that on Thurſday, the eighth of October, Triſtan the Hermit, cauſed a man to be drowned in the Seine, called Sylveſter the Monk, a native of Auxerre.

(84) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, pag. 679, 680.

lute ſubmiſſion he required of the parliament of Paris. For the reſt, he had eminent qualities, and ſuch as were abſolutely neceſſary to him; for without theſe he never could have maintained the monarchy againſt domeſtic and foreign enemies, againſt ſo many factions of his own ſubjects, and the rude attacks of the duke of Burgundy, ſeconded by England. He not only preſerved his dominions in the midſt of ſo many attempts, but alſo enlarged them; for he re-united Anjou, Maine, and the duchy of Burgundy to the crown, and acquired Provence *(l)*. It was in his power to have added to it all the eſtates of the houſe of Burgundy, by matching the heireſs with the Dauphin [*R*]; but a ſurpriſing

juſtice. It was ſaid in that aſſembly, that the king had raiſed to offices of judicature, men without ability and experience, and that blank commiſſions were ready drawn to inſert the names of thoſe who bid moſt, which were given to ſoldiers, huntſmen, foreigners, and illiterate people; that they might exerciſe them by others, and reap the profit of them; that the ſecretaries of the chancery exacted exceſſive fees at their diſcretion, and that for the ſeal to confirm a privilege to a city, they had exacted four hundred golden crowns. Then letters of appeal to the chancery and parliament, were denied to thoſe who had recourſe to the ſupreme juſtice of the king, againſt the injuſtices and oppreſſions of inferior judges; that they who adminiſtered juſtice in the parliaments, exacted great and exceſſive fees to re-imburſe themſelves for the offices they had bought; that ſeveral had been accuſed of crimes of which they were innocent, and the accuſers rewarded with the confiſcation of their eſtates, and ſometimes commiſſioned to try them, or to name what commiſſioners they thought fit; that the number of ſerjeants was multiplied in ſuch a manner, that in the Bailliwics and Seneſchalries, in which there were wont to be only twenty or thirty, there were in his reign an hundred, or double the number. Many lords and others addreſſed themſelves to this aſſembly for the reſtitution of their goods, lands, and offices, of which they had been deprived. It was repreſented to the ſame eſtates, *that men, women, and children, were in ſeveral places forced, for want of beaſts, to labour with the plough to their necks, and that by night, for fear the day might expoſe them to the commiſſioners of the taxes* (85).

We will finiſh this remark with a paſſage of Mezerai. *Comines,* ſays he (86), *deſcribes him to us very prudent in adverſity, admirably skilled at penetrating the intereſts and deſigns of men, and at drawing and turning them to his own ends, furiouſly ſuſpicious and jealous of his power, moſt abſolute in his will, who never pardoned, and who terribly trampled his ſubjects under foot, and yet with all this, the beſt prince of his time. He had put to death above four thouſand perſons by different puniſhments, which he ſometimes delighted to ſee. Moſt of them had been executed without form of law, ſeveral drowned with a ſtone tied to their necks, others precipitated going over a ſwipe, from whence they fell upon wheels armed with ſpikes and cutting inſtruments; others were ſtrangled in dungeons; Triſtan, his companion, and provoſt of his palace, being judge, witneſs, and executioner.*

[*R*] *It was in his power to have added to his crown, all the eſtates of the houſe of Burgundy, by matching the heireſs with the Dauphin.*] The princeſs Mary, heireſs of all theſe eſtates, had a deſire to be married to the Dauphin, and negotiated this affair by her principal counſellors. They removed all the difficulties that Lewis XI propoſed to them: his ſon, he ſaid, was not yet nine years old; he was extraordinary little for his age; his conſtitution could not either be more weak or more tender than it then was. Nothing was more dangerous for him than an early marriage (87). They replied, *that the affairs of that princeſs would not admit any delay of her marriage; but that when it ſhould be accompliſhed with the Dauphin, there might be ways found to retard the conſummation, as long as it might be judged prejudicial to either of the parties. That Mary of Burgundy had declared, ſhe would willingly wait as long as they thought convenient; but that her ſubjects had at preſent occaſion for a maſter. The king replied, that the means they ſpoke of were not infallible; and that in the mean time, the health of his only ſon was ſo precious to him, that he could not expoſe it to a danger ſo great for a young prince, as that of a preſent marriage to a young lady, who was but too capable of conſummating it. The Flemings in vain endeavoured to convince Lewis, that his fear was imaginary, and not being able to effect it, they made him a ſecond propoſition, which was no better received than the firſt* (88). This was the marriage of the princeſs to Charles count of Angouleme (89). The king was ſo blind as to ſlip this the moſt glorious and advantageous opportunity that heaven could have offered him. *His hatred for the duke of Burgundy was extreme, and capricious in it's exceſs. It did not ſtop at his perſon, but extended to that of his daughter, for this only reaſon, that the duke was her father. This daughter had never done Lewis any injury, and yet he was ſo little equitable on her account, as to chuſe, that the eſtates ſhe inherited ſhould be poſſeſſed by ſtrangers, rather than ſecure them in a lawful way, ſuch as by marriage* (90). This ſhews, that the paſſions of monarchs do not always turn with the wind of their intereſt. They are accuſed of this fault, and ſuppoſed to diveſt themſelves of friendſhip and hatred, with the greateſt eaſe, when their grandeur requires it; this may be true, generally ſpeaking, but they all have, like other perſons, ſome ſecret paſſions, or certain antipathies, which, on ſome occaſions, do not permit them to govern themſelves otherwiſe than according to this diſpoſition; to which they ſacrifice their glory, their prudence, and moſt valuable intereſts. Philip de Comines aſcends to a higher cauſe, and deſerves to be heard.

Notwithſtanding that Lewis XI was thus free from all apprehenſions, God permitted him not to take this matter, which was ſo great, by the moſt uſeful handle; and God ſeems to have ſhewn then, as he has done ſince, that he would rigorouſly perſecute this houſe of Burgundy, both in the perſon of the lord of it, and of the ſubjects having their eſtates in it. For all the wars which they have had ſince, would not have happened, if the king our maſter had taken things by the end he ſhould have done, to compleat their happineſs, and unite to his crown all theſe great lordſhips, to which he had no right. Which he ought to have done by ſome treaty of marriage, or have attracted them to him by good and true friendſhip; which he eaſily might have done, conſidering the great deſpair, poverty, and weakneſs, in which theſe lordſhips were. By doing which, he had retrieved them from great troubles, and at the ſame time had ſtrengthened his own kingdom, and ſecured it by a laſting peace (91). . . . . . *When the duke of Burgundy was yet alive, the king often talked to me of what he would do, if the duke ſhould die, and he ſpoke very rationally at that time, ſaying, that he would endeavour to marry his ſon (who is our king at preſent) to the duke's daughter, (who ſince has been ducheſs of Auſtria) and if ſhe would not hearken to it, becauſe the Dauphin was much younger than ſhe, he would endeavour to marry her to ſome young lord of his kingdom, to keep her and her ſubjects in friendſhip, and to recover without contention, what he pretended a title to; and the king was ſtill in this mind, till a week before he heard of the death of the duke. But this wiſe reſolution, I ſpeak of, began to change a little, the day that he knew of the death of the ſaid duke of Burgundy* (92). He expreſſes himſelf ſtill more fully in the following chapter, for he expreſly ſays, that God blinded this prince, in order to puniſh thoſe who did not deſerve to be happy. ‘Our king's underſtanding was ſo great, that neither I nor any one ‘elſe in the company could ſee ſo clearly into his ‘affairs as he himſelf; for, doubtleſs, he was one of ‘the wiſeſt and moſt ſubtle princes of his time. But in ‘theſe great affairs, God diſpoſes the hearts of kings ‘and great princes, (which he holds in his hand) to purſue methods ſubſervient to the works which he deſigns to bring about in due time. For, without ‘doubt, if it had been his will, that our king ſhould ‘continue the reſolution which he himſelf had taken ‘before the duke of Burgundy's death, the wars ‘which ſince have followed, and thoſe which are ‘waged at this day, would all have been prevent-

---

(l) Matthieu, Hiſt. de Louïs XI, lib. x, pag. 601.

(85) Matthieu, ibid. pag. 711.

(86) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 348, 349.

(87) Varillas, ubi ſupra, lib. viii, pag. 167.

(88) Id. ibid. pag. 168.

(89) Who was the father of Francis I, ſo that by this marriage theſe countries would have been ſoon united to the crown of France. See Mezerai, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 332, but as Lewis XI could not foreſee this, there is no ground to blame him on this account, for he had ſolid reaſons againſt aggrandizing the princes of the blood. *See the article* BURGUNDY (MARY), *remark* [*B*].

(90) Varillas, ubi ſupra. pag. 172.

(91) Philippe de Comines, lib. v, cap xii, pag. m. 300, ad ann. 1476.

(92) Id. ibid. pag 301.

ſurpriſing fatality ſo infatuated him in this point, that he could not ſacrifice a perſonal paſſion to the moſt ſolid advantage he ever could have procured France, for the preſent and the future. He was blamed for ſuffering his enemies to make conqueſts in Germany, and for prolonging a truce, which gave them opportunities further to aggrandize themſelves. This cenſure was ill-grounded [*S*]. He died the thirtieth of Auguſt 1483, after ſuch tedious and ſevere diſtempers of body and mind [*T*], that there is hardly a human

'ed; but we were not yet worthy on either ſide 'to obtain that long peace which was prepared for us; 'and hence proceeds the error our king committed, and 'not from any defect in his underſtanding; for, as 'I have ſaid before, he was a very great man (93).' Nothing can be more judicious than this diſcourſe. We muſt ſay of this falſe ſtep of Lewis XI, what the Phyſicians ſay of ſome diſtempers, that there is ſomething ſupernatural in them, ϑεῖον τε. Herodotus would ſpeak out more frankly than any other; he who conceived the Deity as a jealous and malignant nature (94); for the event has ſhewn, that it was for the puniſhment of the people, that God permitted not the marriage of Mary of Burgundy and the Dauphin to take effect. They have ſuffered for the fooliſh politics of Lewis XI. It could never be ſaid more truly,

Quicquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi (95).

The people ſuffer when the prince offends.

The marriage of this princeſs with Maximilian of Auſtria, was the original of a war, which has laſted above two hundred years, and which in all probability will laſt much longer. It has been ſometimes interrupted by the low condition of the combatants, only to return like intermitting fevers, when the diſſipated humours have had time to recruit. Hence we may derive thoſe rivers of blood, thoſe repeated burnings, ravagings, and deſolations. There is reaſon to wonder how a country of ſo little extent has been able to furniſh for two ages an ample theatre of war (§ α) to ſo many nations (96): France and the houſe of Auſtria, the principal parties, who have diſputed this piece of ground, have engaged moſt of the Chriſtian princes in their quarrel; for whenever the balance of power has been on the ſide of the latter, the former has been ſeconded in it's attacks; and when the former has been but too likely to conquer, the other has veen vigorouſly aſſiſted. The Eaſtern nations, who know not the nature of the country, nor the concurrence of obſtacles, laugh, that ſo many battles gained, and ſo many towns taken, ſhould not decide this quarrel. The conqueſt of three or four provinces, is, with them, the buſineſs of a very few years; their hiſtorians, ſpend but three or four pages in relating it. What would they ſay, ſhould they know that two camels could not carry all the hiſtories, that have been written upon the wars of the Low-Countries? The hiſtorians of the troubles which occaſioned the erection of the republic of the United Provinces are ſo numerous, that when Mr Varillas came to Paris, no body but Mr Naudé was capable of giving a catalogue of them (97). And yet theſe are but a very ſmall part of the wars of the Netherlands, ſince Charles VIII. It is ſaid that a Turkiſh emperor *deſiring to ſee, in a map, the little territory that maintained ſo long a war againſt ſo potent a monarch* (98), *ſaid, that if it were his buſineſs, he would ſend a good number of Pioneers, and make them ſhovel that little point of land into the ſea* (99). Theſe people doubtleſs pity both thoſe who have loſt ſomething, and thoſe who have not taken all in ſo long a ſeries of wars. They do not think it glorious to fight ſo often for the ſame towns; they take and reſtore them two or three times in the ſame reign, and ſo they are always to begin again. But what would they ſay, had they genius enough to reflect upon the conſequence of theſe loſſes? The houſe of Auſtria would not by this time have had a foot of ground in this country, if it had not loſt half of it in the ſixteenth century. It has experienced the truth of this maxim of the antients, that half is better than the whole (100). What it loſt then has ſerved, and will always ſerve, to ſave the reſt; without this, it would at this time neither have what it has preſerved, nor what it could not recover. The poor Flemings, as Comines very well ſaid, are always the ſufferers; whereas by the marriage of their princeſs with the Dauphin, they had probably only ſeen war at a diſtance; it would have been kept out of their frontiers, which is an ineſtimable advantage. As long as there is an inch of ground to be gained, they will always be the ſuffering party; this will be a conſtant and infallible ferment of new wars.

[(§ α) The ſame has been ſaid of Italy long ago, 'Et Galli & Helvetii, & Hiſpani & Teutonici, omnes eorum pugnas veniunt committere in Italiam, 'cum maximo Italorum diſcrimine. —— *The French, 'and the Swiſs, the Spaniards, and the Germans, 'they all come to fight their battles in Italy to the 'great danger of the Italians.*' Says John Nevizanus in his *Sylva Nuptialis*, Lib. IV, num. 136. REM. CRIT.]

[*S*] *This cenſure was ill grounded.*] It was indeed ſpecious; for, generally ſpeaking, it is true policy to oppoſe the conqueſts of an ambitious and well armed neighbour. But there is no rule without an exception, and there are circumſtances in which inſtead of croſſing an enemy in his enterprize, we ought not to hinder him from engaging in it: as for example, when we foreſee that ſuch a one will be hampered, and that the conſequences of this may be of advantage to us. This was the duke of Burgundy's caſe, when having conquered the duchy of Guelderland, he formed new projects againſt the empire. Let us hear a man that underſtood this matter admirably. 'The 'ſaid duke prolonged his truce with the king, and 'ſome of the king's ſervants thought, that he ought 'not to have prolonged it, nor have given ſo great 'advaatage to the duke. This ſeemed rational enough, 'but they did not underſtand this matter, for want 'of experience, and duly weighing circumſtances. 'There were others who ſaw farther into it than they, 'and who had more experience, as having been upon the places, who told the king, that that truce 'was wiſely made, and that he ought to ſuffer the 'ſaid duke to daſh himſelf againſt the Germans (an 'enterprize ſo great and daring, that it was almoſt 'incredible) ſaying, that when he had taken one place, 'or ended one quarrel, he would ſoon engage himſelf in another, and that he was not a man, ever 'to be contented with the ſucceſs of any undertaking '(in which he was oppoſite to the king; for the 'more he was * embroiled, the more he would embroil himſelf) and that there was no better way 'of being revenged on him, than letting him go on 'his own way, and even giving him ſome ſmall aid, 'without giving him ſuſpicion of any deſign of 'breaking this truce: for conſidering the greatneſs 'and power of Germany, it was not poſſible but he 'muſt ſoon be utterly ruined. For the princes of 'the empire, though the emperor was a man of little virtue, would ſee it done; and ſo it happened in 'the iſſue to the ſaid duke (101).

[*T*] *He died . . . after tedious and ſevere diſtempers of body and mind.*] He who ſupplies me with the proofs of this, is ſo valuable a witneſs, that it is not poſſible to have a better; for it is Philip de Comines. He tells us that the king, his maſter fell ſick at Forges near Chinon, in March 1480 (102). *He intirely loſt his ſpeech, his ſenſes, and his memory . . . . Two or three days after he began to recover his ſpeech, and his ſenſes . . . . As he found himſelf ſomewhat better he began to enquire, who they were that had hindered him by force from going to the window? They told him the truth, and he immediately expelled them his family; ſome he turned out of their places, and never would ſee them more. Others . . . . he only diſmiſſed* (103). *The reaſon of all this was, that there was nothing he ſo much dreaded as the loſing his authority.* What torment, what puniſhment was this? *This diſtemper held him about fifteen days, and he recovered perfectly as to his ſenſe and ſpeech; but continued very weak, and in great apprehenſions of a relapſe* (104). *He accordingly relapſed the year following, and loſt his ſpeech a ſecond time, and was thought*

---

(93) Id. ibid. cap. xiii, pag. 353.

(94) *See the article* PERICLES, *remark* [*I*].

(95) Horat. Epiſt. ii, lib. i, ver. 14.

(96) *See Strada, in the beginning of his Hiſtory of the wars of the Low-Countries: he ſays, among other things, that Mars makes viſits to other countries, but keeps his ordinary reſidence here:* Plane ut in alias terras peregrinari Mars, ac circumferre bellum, hic armorum ſedem fixiſſe videatur.

(97) *Varillas, preface to the fifth Tome of the Hiſtory of Hereſy.*

(98) Viz. *Holland againſt the king of Spain.*

(99) *Remarks on a diſcourſe of the Sieur de Gremonville, pag.* 68. *The author of the* Religio Medici *had ſaid the ſame thing before,* lib. i, ſect xvi, pag. m. 96. De qua (Hollandia) ſuperbe ſatis tyrannus Turcicus, ſi quantum Hiſpano moleſtiæ negotiique ab illa ortum eſſet, ſibi obtigiſſet, miſſurum ſe fuiſſe dixit qui ligonibus furculiſque in mare conjicerent.

(100) Πλέον ἥμισυ παντός. Dimidium plus toto. *See Eraſmus*, Chil. I, Centur. IX, n. 115, pag. m. 318, 319.

* Underſtand this of the duke.

(101) Philippe de Comines, livr. iv, chap i, pag. 195, 196, ad ann. 1474.

(102) Ibid. livr. vi, chap. vii, pag. m. 377.

(103) Ibid. pag. 378.

(104) Ibid pag. 379.

a human creature ſo barbarous as to wiſh his bittereſt enemy the like. He may well be reckoned in the the number of the princes, whoſe bad fortune much exceed their good

to be dead for two hours . . . . They devoted him to St Claude . . . . immediately his ſpeech returned and he walked about the houſe in a very weak condition (105). *He made a journey to St Claude, and returned to Tours, and ſhut himſelf up, ſo that few could ſee him, and grew wonderful ſuſpicious of every body, and jealous, leſt they ſhould take away or diminiſh his authority* (106) . . . . *He did a great many ſtrange things, for which they that ſaw them, thought him bereft of his ſenſes; but they did not know him . . . . he knew that he was not beloved by the great perſons of the kingdom, nor by many of the meaner ſort, and he had ſo taxed the people, as never king did* (107) . . . . *ſo that it is no wonder if he had diſtracted thoughts and imaginations, and fancied he was not wiſhed well, and had great fears on that account . . . . In the firſt place hardly any one came to Pleſſis du Parc, (which was the place where he reſided) except his domeſtics and his archers, which were four hundred, a good number of them being always upon the guard, and walking before the palace, and guarding the gate: No lord or great perſon lodged within the court, and but few of the great lords were ever admitted: Nobody came near him but Monſeigneur de Beaujeu, the preſent duke of Bourbon, his ſon-in-law; he encompaſſed the caſtle of Pleſſis, with an iron palliſade, and fortified the entrance into the ditches of Pleſſis with forked iron turn-pikes; he alſo cauſed four pieces of ordnance to be made, all of maſſy iron, and port-holes to ſhoot through, and it was a majeſtic piece of work, and coſt above twenty thouſand livres: and laſtly, he placed there forty croſs-bow men, who day and night were in theſe ditches, and had orders to ſhoot at any man who approached them, till the gate was open in the morning: he fancied moreover that his ſubjects were ſomewhat forward to aſſume his authority when they ſaw an opportunity* (108). Comines having amply ſpoken of Francis de Paula goes on (109), ‘ Our king was in Pleſſis, attended by very few, except archers, and under the ſuſpicions before mentioned; but he had taken all imaginable precaution; for he left no man either in the neighbourhood or town, of whom he had a ſuſpicion, but ſent them all away, under a guard of archers. Nobody ſpoke to him of buſineſs, but ſuch as concerned him moſt: he looked more like a dead than living man. He was grown ſo lean that no body could have believed it; he cloathed himſelf richly, more than ever he uſed to do wearing only robes of crimſon ſattin, furred with fine ſables, and gave ſome to whom he thought fit, without their aſking: for no body durſt aſk any thing, or ſpeak to him; he ordered ſevere puniſhments, to render himſelf dreaded, and for fear his ſubjects obedience ſhould ſlacken; for ſo he told me himſelf. He diſmiſſed officers, and diſbanded ſoldiers, leſſened ſome penſions, and took away others; and he told me a few days before his death, that he ſpent his time in placing and diſplacing people, and got himſelf more talked of in the kingdom than any king ever was, and this he did for fear they ſhould think him dead; for as I have ſaid, few ſaw him: but when his actions were talked of, every one was in ſuſpence and could ſcarce believe he was ſick; he cauſed all ſorts of beaſts to be brought him from foreign countries, and gave a prodigious price for them; and all this to amuſe the people that they ſhould not think he was ſick (110).’ The hiſtorian compares (111) *the evils and pains king Lewis ſuffered to thoſe he had made others ſuffer*; becauſe, ſays he, *I hope that the miſeries he ſuffered before his death . . . . will prepare his way to heaven, and be part of his purgatory.* He reckons amongſt thoſe evils, the indiſcretion of thoſe who pronounced him a dead man. *What a thunderſtroke was it to him to hear this news, and this ſentence? for never man feared death more, or endeavoured more to find a remedy for it; and he had all his life-time ſaid to his ſervants, and to me among others, and prayed, that if ever we ſaw him in extremity, we ſhould ſay nothing to him, except*, ſpeak little; *and that we ſhould only bring him to confeſs, without pronouncing that cruel word death: for he did not ſeem to have courage to hear ſo cruel a ſentence* (112). . . . . *you ſee then how indiſcreetly his death was ſignified to him. Which I was willing to relate . . . . in order to ſhew, that the miſeries he endured were very great, conſidering his temper, who exacted more obedience than any one elſe in his time, and who had had more paid him. So that the leaſt word of an anſwer, contrary to his inclination, had been a great puniſhment for him to endure: ſome five or ſix months before his death, he was ſuſpicious of all men, and eſpecially of all who were worthy of authority; he was afraid of his ſon, and cauſed him to be ſtrictly guarded. No body either ſaw or ſpoke to him, except by his command; he was, ſuſpicious at laſt of his daughter, and ſon-in-law the preſent duke of Bourbon, and would know what people entered Pleſſis with them; at laſt he broke off a council, which the duke of Bourbon, his ſon-in law, held there by his command. When his ſon-in-law and the count de Dunois came back from reconducting the embaſſy, which was come to the wedding of the king, his ſon, and of the queen, at Amboiſe, and entred Pleſſis, and much people along with them, the king, who cauſed the gates to be well-guarded, being in the gallery, which looks into the court of Pleſſis, ordered one of the captains of his guards to be called to him, and commanded him to go and examine the attendants of the ſaid lords, whether they had not coats of mail under their cloaths; and that he ſhould do it, as by diſcourſing with them, without making too much ſhew of it. Judge then, whether he who had made ſo many people live in ſuſpicion and fear of him, was not well recompenſed; and who were thoſe that he could truſt, ſince he was jealous of his ſon, his daughter, and his ſon-in-law. I ſpeak not this on his account only. But for all other princes who deſire to be feared, they never meet with the requital of it till old age: for penance they fear every body: and what torment was it for this king to be troubled with this fear, and theſe paſſions* (113)? Afterwards the author mentions (114) the ſlavery in which the Phyſician kept this prince, and having deſcribed (115), the precautions the king took to ſecure himſelf in a houſe ſurrounded with great iron grates, &c. &c. He goes on (116), ‘ Is it poſſible to keep a king in ſafer cuſtody, or in a ſtricter priſon, than he kept himſelf? The cages, in which he kept others, were about eight foot ſquare, and he that was ſo great a king, had only the ſmall court of a caſtle to walk in, though he ſeldom came there, but kept in his gallery without going from thence, except through the chambers; and went to maſs without paſſing through the aforeſaid court. Would not one ſay, that this king ſuffered as well as others? who thus ſhut up himſelf, and had guards about him, who was thus in fear of his children, and of all about him, and of his relations, and who changed continually his ſervants which he had brought up, and who had all their dependance upon him, ſo as to confide in none of them, but thus condemn himſelf to ſuch ſtrange confinements, and encloſures?’ What he ſays in the thirteenth chapter is wonderful. ‘ The poor and the vulgar ought to place but little hope in any thing in this world, ſince ſo great a king has ſuffered and laboured ſo much, and at laſt left all, unable to keep off death one hour, with all the diligence he employed to do it. I have known him, and have been his ſervant in the flower of his age, and in his greateſt proſperities; but I never ſaw him without trouble and care. Above all pleaſures, he loved hunting and hawking in it's ſeaſon, but he took not ſo much pleaſure in this, as in dogs (117). . . . . And even in hunting he had almoſt as much trouble as pleaſure; for he took great pains at it, he kept up with the ſtags, and roſe very early, and rode ſometimes a long chace, and would not leave the ſport whatever weather it might be; and thus he ſometimes returned very weary, and almoſt always in a fret with ſome body or other . . . . He was continually at this ſport, and lodged in the villages till ſome news came of a war; for moſt commonly every ſummer, there was ſomething to do betwixt the duke of Burgundy and him, and in the winter they made a truce (118) . . . Thus the pleaſures he took were but for a ſhort ſeaſon of the year, and were very laborious to his perſon, as I have ſaid; at the time that he

‘ repoſed

(105) Ibid. pag. 380.

(106) Ibid. pag. 381.

(107) Ibid. pag. 382.

(108) Ibid. pag. 383.

(109) Ibid. chap. viii, pag. 386.

(110) Ibid.

(111) In the twelfth chapter of the ſixth book, pag. 397, & ſeq.

(112) Id. ibid. pag. 399.

(113) Ibid. pag. 400.

(114) Ibid pag. 401.

(115) Ibid. pag. 403.

(116) Ibid. pag. 404.

(117) Id. ibid. chap. xiii, pag. 405.

(118) Id. ibid. pag. 406.

good fortune (*m*). He performed an act of religion, upon which a modern author has had ſome thoughts, which deſerve to be examined [*U*]. They who ſay he was an illiterate

(*m*) *See, below, citat.* (121), *the words of Comines.*

repoſed himſelf, his underſtanding was at work; for he had buſineſs in a great many places: and as willingly concerned himſelf in the affairs of his neighbours as in his own. When he was in war, he longed for a peace or a truce; when he had made a truce, he could hardly endure it: he concerned himſelf with many little things in his kingdom, which he needed not to have done; but ſuch was his temper, and ſo he lived (119).' The life of this prince, before he was king, was not very happy. Comines ſhows it (120), after which he makes this concluſion: 'Now in what time of his life could it be ſaid he enjoyed any pleaſure, conſidering all the things above-mentioned? I believe that from his infancy to his grave, he had nothing but anguiſh and fatigues; and that, if all the good days of his life, in which he had more joy and pleaſure than labour and trouble, were reckoned up, they would be found but very few; and that there would be twenty of pain and labour, for one of eaſe and pleaſure (121).'

There is no reader ſo ſtupid as to want a comment upon what I have been relating; every one is able to imagine that there is no condition more miſerable than that of a ſick prince, who dares not own he is ſo, who ſuſpects every thing, and is forced to uſe a thouſand ſtratagems, to perſuade people he is not dead. Note, that Philip de Comines ſhews, by the example of four great princes (122), who died in his time, *that man is but an inconſiderable thing, that this life is ſhort and miſerable, and that grandeur is nothing* (123).

[*U*] *He performed an act of religion, upon which a modern author has had ſome thoughts which deſerve to be examined.*] Lewis XI made a contract, which was called *the donation of Lewis XI, to the Virgin Mary of Boulogne, of the right and title to the fief and homage for the county of Boulogne, on which the county of St Paul depends, to be paid before the image of the ſaid lady by his ſucceſſors, in* 1478 (124). The abbot of St Real pretends, that 'all antiquity, whether Greek or Roman, never ſaw any man pretend to honour himſelf before the people, by beſtowing bounties on the gods .... and that this refined devotion was reſerved for Lewis XI (125).' He maintains (126), *that an exceſs of this nature in ſuch a one as he was, ought rather to be reputed an artifice, than an extravagance.* ..... (127) *That this action, however bold it appears, ought to be looked upon by us as the fruit of a conſummate wiſdom, and a long experience of the judgments of men: that there is nothing extraordinary in a prince's conſecrating .... the revenue of lands to the ſervice of God and his ſaints, to the uſe of his miniſters, to the ornament of their temples and their altars, nor even in putting his eſtates under their particular protection* .... (128). *That all this is agreeable to reaſon; but not ſo as to make choice of celeſtial powers for the objects of our liberality: that inſtead of asking any thing of them, or pretending to have received from them, one ſhould take upon him to be their benefactor; as if they had need of our benefactions, as much as we have need of theirs; and could actually enjoy them as we can theirs, their light and intelligence, when they pleaſe to communicate ſome rays of them. That however this has had a good effect; for* (129) *though Lewis XI made open profeſſion of inſincerity, as we ſee by his motto, yet it does not appear that at that time any one ſuſpected the leaſt artifice in ſo extraordinary a devotion. So true it is .... that the bare ſhadow* 'of an imaginary intereſt, that heaven has in ſuch ſort of actions, and the ſanctity of names, that are mingled with them, may ſo blind the world, as to hinder it from perceiving the extravagance and mockery. This is wonderful; but it ſerves the better to diſcover the nature of the human mind by it's weak and whimſical ſide, that no one ſhould at that time reflect on the extravagance of a man's contracting with the holy Virgin, juſt as one man does with another, and making her at leaſt, in fiction, accept of a preſent which he remained as much poſſeſſor of after this pretended liberality as before. For, after all, were the Bailiffs, Provoſts, and other officers of the county of Boulogne, tho' they had been called the Virgin's Bailiffs, Provoſts, and officers, leſs obliged to obey the king? Did the church of Boulogne enjoy the revenue of the land, ſo that ſhe was better ſerved than before? Was the king ever the leſs count of it, for having given this county to the Virgin? Not at all? Did not the people at that time ſee this as we ſee it? they might if they had pleaſed; but Lewis XI ſaw all theſe things much better than they or we. In the mean time, this prince, ſo dextrous in the uſe of all the inſtruments of policy, who had ſo profoundly ſtudied that of religion in particular, and plaid this engine in all the known methods, thought he might ſafely try it this one way more, when once he had invented it, and carry it ſo far without danger; he judged in ſhort that his people were capable of bearing with it. He muſt have been well acquainted with their nature, to venture ſo far.' I do not copy any of the reſt of this long paſſage, though it be very ſolid.

I find in ſome reſpects a great deal of ſolidity in theſe reflexions; but conſidering the practice that has prevailed in all times, and which the abbot of St Real has commended, I do not find any thing wonderful in this conduct of Lewis XI, nor any reaſon to ſuſpect more artifice in it, than in the reſt of his devotions. The Heathens made donations to their gods, not only of precious ſtones, and of veſſels of gold and ſilver, but alſo of lands (130). The Catholics daily give the holy Virgin, ſome a pearl-necklace, others a crown, or a robe beſet with diamonds, *&c.* They diſſeize themſelves of the property of theſe goods, and convey them to the mother of the ſon of God. Why will not you allow then, that a man may as well convey the title of ſovereign of a certain fief to her? Is it ſtrange that Lewis XI ſhould declare himſelf her vaſſal, her liege-man in reſpect of a county whereof he was ſovereign? What mighty wonder is it, that he ſhould from henceforth command homage to be paid this ſaint? I own he reſerves to himſelf the profitable demeſnes, and all the other advantages of poſſeſſion; but this hinders not his granting away an honourable right; and the conveyance he makes of it comes under the ſame ſpecies of liberality, as the gift of a heart of ſilver, or a crown glittering with precious ſtones. The inſtrument of this conveyance, hung up in a church in letters of gold, would be as glorious an ornament as a ſtatue of ſilver. Wherein then lies the extraordinary whimſicalneſs of Lewis the eleventh's devotion? and why muſt it be ſaid, that he would not have had the boldneſs thus to impoſe upon the public, if he had not profoundly known the folly and weakneſs of the people. If he had conſecrated to the holy Virgin the revenue of this fief, to be employed to the uſe of eccleſiaſtics, and the adorning of altars, he had practiſed a ſort of devotion, which the abbot of St Real had judged very ſolid (131). This therefore is a laudable way *to chuſe the celeſtial powers* for the objects of our liberality; it ought therefore to be permitted, to offer them the ſovereignty of an eſtate, and to convey it to them, in order to hold it from them, back again, by fealty and homage; for this right is what a man may as well diveſt himſelf of, in honour of them, as of the revenues of that eſtate. Remember that the victims ſacrificed to the gods, and all the other offerings of devotion, were always conſidered as a preſent, and that the prieſts employed them neither for food, nor any other uſe, otherwiſe than in quality of the miniſters of thoſe celeſtial powers. They were not the proprietors, they were only the uſufructuaries, and that by a kind of ſecondary conveyance. The firſt conſiſted in this, that the man who offered a victim, or any thing elſe, gave up to the gods all the right he had in it. The ſecond in this, that the gods transferred to their miniſters the adminiſtration and uſe of theſe offerings, So that at bottom, the conduct of Lewis XI had nothing extraordinary in it, as not being a liberality of a new invention, and we need not wonder that his ſubjects were not offended at it. It is true, he might have been cenſured, becauſe his donation alienated nothing from him; for he ſtill remained maſter of the land, he reſerved the real profits, *&c.* wholly to himſelf. But they would be to blame, in imagining that he ſought only to deceive; this act of religion might in him be as ſincere as any other. It is very probable he believed he had made a donation

(119) Ibid. pag. 407.

(120) Ibid. pag. 407, 408.

(121) Ibid. pag. 408.

(122) Charles duke of Burgundy, Edward IV, king of England. Matthias king of Hungary, and Mahomet II, emperor of the Turks.

(123) Comines near the end of the ſixth book.

(124) See the treatiſe of the Uſe of Hiſtory by the Abbé de St Real, printed at Paris in 1671, pag. 235, 236.

(125) Ibid. pag. 233, 234.

(126) Ibid. pag. 235.

(127) Ibid pag. 237.

(128) Ibid. pag. 238.

(129) Ibid pag. 240.

(130) As to Bellona round the temple of Comana, and to Venus round the temple of Eryce, *&c.*

(131) Read page 238 of his book. I have quoted his words above, citat. (128).

terate man, and no way countenanced learning, have been ſufficiently confuted by Gabriel Naudé (*n*). I do not give a chronological ſeries of his principal actions; this you will find in Moreri, copied almoſt word for word from Father Anſelm (*o*); this ought alſo to be underſtood of the other French monarchs. Mr Varillas is miſtaken as to the cauſe he alledges of the antipathy between the French and Spaniards [*X*]. He has ſucceeded pretty well in diſcovering the machinations of the war againſt Lewis XI, and the arts by which they were defeated, and that terrible conſpiracy was deſtroyed (*p*). That ſubject was ſuitable to his genius, and the turn he had given to his ſtudies: but there is a little book, where we ſee more diſtinctly the plan of this enterprize, and the means uſed by that prince to defeat it [*Y*].

The reflexions of Mr Joly (*q*), on the life of this king, are very judicious. I ſhall recite a paſſage of it, which will give me occaſion to rectify a remark concerning the *Rozier des Guerres*, *the roſe-tree of the wars* [Z].

donation which would highly pleaſe the holy Virgin, diſpoſe her to protect him, and be liberal of her favours towards him; his principles and acts of piety might all be wrong, and yet attended with a ſincere perſuaſion of mind; one proof of this is, that he never durſt ſwear falſly upon the croſs of St Laud (132), being ſtruck with a vulgar tradition, *that they who ſwore upon this croſs, and were perjured, died a miſerable death before the year's end* (133). The conſtable of St Pol prayed him to ſwear upon that croſs, *that he would neither do, nor ſuffer any other to do him any harm* (134). The king anſwered, *that he had ſworn he never would take that oath, for any man alive; but that there were no other oaths; but he would willingly take to ſatiſfy him* (135).

I wiſh this reflexion may ſerve as a warning to all my readers, that there are no thoughts ſo much to be ſuſpected, as thoſe which are put off in an aſſuming manner, and with a majeſtic tone. The foregoing reflexions of the abbot of St Real are, of this kind, the fitteſt in the world to dazzle; but diveſt them of their ornaments, and take a near view of them, and you will find nothing ſolid in them.

[*X*] *Mr Varillas is miſtaken, as to the cauſe of the antipathy between the French and Spaniards.*] 'Moſt of the accounts both French and Spaniſh, that were publiſhed upon occaſion of the interview of Lewis with Henry IV, king of Caſtile, aſſign for a reaſon of the ſtrange change that happened there, Lewis's extream negligence in dreſs, unbecoming the dignity of a prince of his rank; and to ſay the truth, before that interview, the French and Caſtilians practiſed, towards each other, all the duties of good neighbourhood. They mutually ſuccoured each other, and performed all the good offices that decency and charity required (136).' Mr Varillas gives ſeveral inſtances of it, after which he goes on in this manner, 'but when the court of Henry IV, king of Caſtile, which appeared in ſo magnificent an equipage, that the like was never ſeen, nor any thing near it, for three or four hundred years before, ſaw Lewis dreſſed in a drab de Berry, that was not new, and his head covered with an old hat, which had nothing remarkable in it but a leaden image of the Virgin, that was ſewed to it; the Caſtilians conceived ſuch a contempt for the French, on account of their king, that they took the firſt opportunity of breaking with them; and the antipathy betwixt the two nations, may be dated from that time, which has ſince become immortal (137).'

I doubt not but Mr Varillas would have been hard put to it, to ſhew us any accounts of this interview, which ſay, that the hatred that has laſted ſo long between the French and Spaniards, is derived from thence. I am certain Philip de Comines is the firſt who has made reflexions thereupon, and that almoſt all other writers are his tranſcribers in this particular; but he is far from giving any ground for the pretended diſcovery of Mr Varillas. He has made a digreſſion (138) tending to ſhew that the interview of princes *is more prejudicial than profitable*. He gives ſeveral inſtances of it, the firſt whereof is the interview of Lewis XI, and the king of Caſtile: 'Thus theſe two nations, *ſays he* (139), which had been ſo ſtrictly allied, ridiculed each other. The king of Caſtile was ill-favoured, and his dreſs diſpleaſing to the French, who laughed at it. Our king was dreſſed in a ſhort jerkin, and ſo mean that nothing could be more ſo; and ſometimes he wore very ſorry cloth, and a ſorry hat, different from the reſt, with a leaden image tacked to it. The Caſtilians laughed at it, and ſaid it was out of ſtingineſs. Thus, in effect, that interview broke up, with ſcoffing and ſatire on both ſides, and thoſe two kings afterwards never loved one another.' What he has ſaid of the interview of the emperor and Charles duke of Burgundy, is equally ſtrong (140). Should we hence conclude, that the Germans and Burgundians have hated one another ever ſince? Would not this be falſe? Were not they good friends, after the death of the duke of Burgundy? Did not they act in concert againſt France? We ſhould have ſeen the ſame betwixt the French and Caſtilians, had not ſtronger reaſons intervened than the diſcontent at this interview. Caſtile, Arragon, and ſeveral other eſtates of Spain were re-united: and hence proceeded the hatred of the French and Spaniards; for ever ſince that re-union, France has been obliged to act either upon the offenſive or defenſive againſt Spain.

[*Y*] *There is a little book where we ſee more diſtinctly the plan of this enterprize, and the means uſed by that prince to defeat it.*] It was printed in the year 1694, under the title of Miroir hiſtorique de la Ligue de l'an 1464, où peut ſe reconoître la Ligue de l'an 1694, pour y decouvrir ce qu'elle a à craindre des propoſitions de paix que la France lui fait. Par l'Auteur du Salut de l'Europe. —— *An hiſtorical Mirrour of the League in the year* 1464, *where the League of the year* 1694 *may view itſelf, in order to diſcover what it has to fear from the propoſitions of peace which France has made to it. By the author of the Safety of Europe.* You ſee that he who publiſhed this book, deſcribes himſelf not by his name, but by a preceding piece, intituled Le Salut de l'Europe conſideré dans un état de criſe, avec un Avertiſſement aux Alliez ſur les conditions de paix que la France propoſe aujourd'huy, par l'Auteur de la Reſponſe au Diſcours de Mr de Rebenac. —— *The Safety of Europe conſidered in a ſtate of Criſis, with an advice to the allies on the conditions of peace which France now propoſes, by the author of the anſwer to the diſcourſe of Mr Rebenac.* This anſwer (141), which contains 117 pages in 8vo, was publiſhed in the year 1692, and was very much reliſhed by the enemies of France: which doubtleſs is the reaſon that the author made it his diſtinguiſhing title and character at the head of his ſecond performance, which he intituled *Le Salut de l'Europe, &c.* Since that ſecond piece, he no longer deſcribed himſelf by his firſt title, but by that which he founded on his *Salut de l'Europe*. I do not know whether he is the author of two pieces which appeared in the year 1694, one under the title of Avis d'un Amy à l'Autheur du Miroir hiſtorique de la Ligue de l'an 1464. —— *Advice from a friend to the author of the Hiſtorical Mirrour of the League of the year* 1464; and the other under the title of Penſées ſur l'Avis d'un Amy à l'Auteur du Miroir hiſtorique de la Ligue de l'an 1464. —— *Some Thoughts on the advice from a friend to the author of the Hiſtorical Mirrour of the League of the year* 1464. I only know that he continued to deſcribe himſelf by his ſeſecond quality, in a piece which came out in the year 1695, intituled, *Lettre au Gazettier de Paris ſur le Siege de Namur, par l'Autheur du Salut de l'Europe.* He ſeems to know pretty well the character of Lewis XI.

[Z] *I ſhall recite a paſſage of it, which will give me occaſion to rectify a remark concerning the* Rozier des Guerres.] 'We deſire to have a prince who is addicted to the Catholic truth, but of whom it cannot be ſaid what the holy biſhop of Geneva ſaid of ſome body reſembling Lewis XI, that he *was a good Catholic, but a very bad Chriſtian.* We muſt however ſay this of Lewis XI, which, in my opinion, is the

---

(*n*) *See his book, intituled,* Additions à la Hiſtoire de Louïs XI.

(*o*) *Intituled,* Hiſtoire de la Maiſon Roiale de France.

(*p*) *See his Hiſtory of Lewis XI, book iii, and iv.*

(*q*) *See the preface of his* Codicille d'Or, pag. 26, & ſeq. Edit. 1666.

(132) It is at Angers.

(133) Matthieu, ubi ſupra, lib. vi, cap. xvi. pag. 309. *See alſo Varillas, in the preface to his Hiſtory of Lewis XI.*

(134) Idem, Matthieu, ibid.

(135) Ibid.

(136) Varillas, ubi ſupra, lib. x, pag. 323.

(137) Id. ibid. pag. 314.

(138) It is the eighth chapter of his ſecond book.

(139) Comines, ibid. pag. 105.

(140) From that time they never loved each other, neither they nor their people. The Germans deſpiſed the pomp and ſpeech of the ſaid duke, attributing it to pride. The Burgundians deſpiſed the ſlender retinue of the emperor, and their poor habits. *Id. ibid. pag.* 105, 106.

(141) I have cited it in the remark [*I*], of the article FRANCIS I.

‘ fineſt and moſt royal action of his life, that he ſeriouſly acknowledged his faults before he died, as we are aſſured by Comines. And to hinder his ſon, who was afterwards Charles VIII *, from falling into the ſame faults, he left him an inſtruction, under the name of *Rozier des Guerres*, which having been found in the caſtle of Nerac, has been publiſhed by Mr d'Eſpagnet, preſident of the parliament of Bourdeaux, in 1616, where he particularly recommends to him to make himſelf more loved than feared, conſidering that he had chiefly erred in that important point (142).’

You ſee that Mr Joly does not poſitively ſay, that Lewis XI compoſed that Inſtruction himſelf, and yet inſinuates that he did ſo. The title of the book in the edition of the preſident d'Eſpagnet (143) is ſtill more fallacious. I ſaid in the preceding editions of this Dictionary (144), that Mr d'Eſpagnet believed that Lewis XI was the author of this book; but I have blotted it out. I ſhould have expreſſed myſelf with ſome reſtriction, ſince he only believed that this prince had *ſome hand in it* (145).

* In 1484.

(142) Joly, preface to the *Codicille d'Or*, *pag.* 3[illegible].

(143) Le Rozier, des Guerres, COMPOSE' par le feu Roi Louïs XI de ce nom pour Monſeigneur le Dauphin, Charles ſon fils. - - *The Rozier des Guerres, compoſed by the late king Lewis XI for his Royal Highneſs prince Charles, his ſon.*

(144) In the remark [*B*] of the article ESPAGNET.

(145) See the preface of Mr d'Eſpagnet.

LEWIS XII, king of France, great-grandſon to Charles V [*A*], ſucceeded Charles VIII, on the ſeventh of April 1498. He had the title of duke of Orleans, and had gone through many diſgraces in the reign of his predeceſſor. Nor paid he all the ſubmiſſion due to his ſovereign: for he had taken up arms againſt him, and was taken priſoner in a battle gained againſt thoſe of Brittany, by the army of Charles VIII (*a*). He was in love with the heireſs of Brittany, and hoped to marry her; but he had not that ſatisfaction till after the king his predeceſſor's death, and it obliged him to an action altogether odious and unjuſt, to wit, the diſſolving his marriage with the princeſs Jane of France [*B*]. His reign was remarkable for great events, ſome proſperous, and others unfortunate [*C*]; but take him all together, he was one of the greateſt men that had been

(*a*) This was the battle of St Aubin du Cormier, gained on the twenty eighth of July, 1488.

[*A*] *He was great-grandſon to Charles V.*] He was ſon to Charles duke of Orleans, who was ſon to Lewis of France, duke of Orleans, aſſaſſinated in Paris by his uncle the duke of Burgundy, the twenty third of November, 1407 (1). This Lewis, ſon of Charles V, had married Valentina of Milan; ſo that Lewis XII, grandſon to Valentina, had the juſteſt pretenſions in the world to the duchy of Milan, and yet he could never maintain himſelf in that country.

[*B*] *He was obliged to diſſolve his marriage with the princeſs Jane of France.*] She was daughter to Lewis XI, and ſiſter to Charles VIII. She was married at twenty two years of age, to our Lewis, in 1476. She behaved herſelf very well with reſpect to him whilſt he was in diſgrace, and it was ſhe, who, by her entreaties, brought him out of priſon, in 1491 (2); but that was not ſufficient to balance, in her husband's heart, the violent inclination he had for Charles the eighth's widow: this was Anne of Brittany. He had loved her, and was beloved by her, before ſhe married Charles; therefore, to gratify his paſſion for her, he cauſed his marriage to be annulled, and promiſed ſuch rewards to Pope Alexander VI, that he obtained of him all he had a mind to. There are few but believe he was perjured, in maintaining he had not known her, ‘ He proteſted he had married her by force, fearing the indignation of Lewis XI, her father, who was a man of an abſolute will, but that he had never known nor touched her (3).’ This Brantome ſays, but he adds, ‘ I believe her husband, as I have heard ſay, had known her very well, and ſenſibly touched her, though ſhe was ſomewhat deformed in her body; for he was not ſo chaſte as to abſtain, having her ſo near him, and ſo cloſe to his ſide, conſidering his temper, which was a little luſtful, and very prone to the pleaſures of Venus, as his predeceſſor had been; but he was minded to recover his firſt love, which was queen Anne, and that fine duchy, which threw great temptations into his ſoul, and therefore he divorced that princeſs, and his oath was believed and received by the Pope, who gave him a diſpenſation, which was received by the Sorbonne, and by the court of parliament of Paris (4).’ Mr Varillas will give us the particulars of the injuſtices which were committed in this affair. ‘ Lewis XII had ſollicited * the diſſolution of his marriage with Jane of France, daughter and ſiſter to the two laſt kings, though he was obliged to her for his liberty and life; he had ſworn before the commiſſioners of the holy ſee, that the marriage had not been conſummated, though this princeſs had ſworn the contrary; and the miracles ſhe afterwards wrought, ſeem to confirm the truth of what ſhe had ſaid; he had maintained, in writing, other facts upon this ſubject, which were not more probable: he had corrupted, by his money, the ſecretary of the legate **, and underſtanding, from him, that the permiſſion to marry again was expedited, he married the queen, without waiting till this permiſſion came to his hands, which was the cauſe of the legate's poiſoning his ſecretary (5).’ Even thoſe who will not allow that this princeſs wrought miracles, will be obliged to acknowledge, that ſhe lived an exemplary life after her divorce, and that her moderation under ſo ſenſible an injury was wonderful; for which reaſon her word is more to be depended on than the oaths of her husband. For it is certain that ſhe declared to the commiſſioners, with all that modeſty which her virtue and her ſex required, that the marriage had been conſummated. *Jane of France being interrogated in her turn upon the ſame articles, anſwered. . . . . . . That modeſty would not permit her to explain herſelf clearly upon the third article* (6), *and nevertheleſs that her conſcience did not ſuffer her to aſſent to it* (7). If it were true, as a Jeſuit affirms, that great prodigies were obſerved upon the diſſolution of the marriage, no one could doubt of the injuſtice and perjury of Lewis XII. The declaration of this divorce ‘ was followed, or at leaſt attended, with terrible prodigies, as earthquakes, ſtorms, tempeſts, thunder, and, above all, with ſo great a darkneſs, that, in the day time, *ſays this author* (8), they were obliged to make uſe of torches, to be able to read the ſentence of ſeparation and nullity of the marriage (9). Theſe are ſurprizing events, of which the cotemporary writers ought not to have been ſilent; their general ſilence would have been a ſtranger prodigy than the reſt. However, it is plain they have ſaid nothing of them; for if they had, the knowledge of a thing of this nature would not have been ſo ill preſerved, as that almoſt every one ſhould look upon it as a new diſcovery in the Jeſuit's book. We ſhall here mention a reflexion of a modern author: ‘ How is it poſſible, *ſays he* (10), that an event of this nature ſhould be unknown to Brantome, or Mr Varillas, who have known or read ſo many ſecret memoirs? we may obſerve this ſmall difference between the two, that the latter ſays expreſsly, queen Jane wrought miracles; whereas the firſt only ſays, *ſhe was reckoned a ſaint, and almoſt a worker of miracles.* In matters of this kind, the farther we are removed from the fountain head, the more we know.’ Note, that ‘ the people of Paris murmured openly, at the king's divorcing the *daughter of Lewis XI, and* that there were ſcrupulous doctors, who blamed him in the pulpits (11).’ Judge then whether the prodigies would have paſſed in ſilence. It might be ſaid that ſince Brantome's death, ſeveral miracles were wrought at the queen's tomb (12), and therefore Mr Varillas might be more poſitive than he. Be it how it will, the ſentence that declares the marriage null, being pronounced the twenty ſecond of December, 1498 (13), the king married Anne of Brittany the eighth (14) of January following.

[*C*] *His reign was remarkable for great events . . . unfortunate.*] Among Lewis the twelfth's greateſt misfortunes, muſt be reckoned the loſs of the kingdom of Naples, and that of the Milaneſe. He was the dupe of the king of Arragon, as to the firſt of theſe loſſes; but it could not be wholly attributed to the frauds of the court of Spain. The French were beaten in ſeveral engagements,

(1) F. Anſelme, Hiſtoire Genealogique, pag. 178.

(2) Id ibid. pag. 129.

(3) Brantome, Memoires des Dames illuſtres, pag. m. 277.

(4) Id. ibid. pag. 238.

* In the manuſcript volume in the king's library, which contains the proceſs concerning the diſſolution of the marriage of Lewis XII with Jane of France.

** Cæſar Borgia.

(5) Varillas, Hiſt. de François I, livr. i, pag. 8. Hague Edit. 1690.

(6) Which was that Lewis XII abſtained from conſummating the marriage *Varillas, Hiſt. Louïs XII, lib. i, pag.* 21.

(7) Ibid.

(8) Louis de Bony.

(9) Journal des Sçavans, Auguſt 7, 1684, *in the Extract of the Life of Queen Jane of France, written by Lewis de Bony, a Jeſuit.*

(10) Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres, Sept. 1684, pag. 755.

(11) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. IV, pag. 418.

(12) Hilarion de Coſte, *Eloges des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. II, pag* 20, ſays, that Lewis XIII, having heard that God works continual miracles at the tomb of queen Jane, wrote ſeveral times to the Pope deſiring that he would declare her bleſſed, and that the Pope named commiſſioners to take information of the miracles.

(13) Anſelme, ubi ſupra, pag. 126.

(14) Id. ibid. pag. 128. *Mezerai*, ubi ſupra, *ſays the eighteenth.*

been ſeen for ſome ages. The republic of Venice being grown very powerful, and the haughtineſs great power is attended with, having appeared too much in her conduct, ſeveral ſtates confederated to bring her to reaſon [*D*]. Lewis XII, who came into this league, had almoſt the ſole glory of humbling this State [*E*], which was grown formidable and odious to all it's neighbours. After ſo noble a ſucceſs, a league was formed againſt this monarch, by the intrigues of a Pope (*b*), who was not only a great warrior, but alſo a refined Politician. Lewis ſo confounded this confederacy, that if the duke de Nemours had not been killed in the battle of Ravenna, this haughty and warlike Pope

engagements, ſo that it may be ſaid the court of France ſuffered itſelf to be wretchedly impoſed upon by that of Spain, and that the French ſoldiers ſuffered themſelves to be beaten by the Spaniſh ſoldiers. The bad conduct of Lewis the twelfth's generals, the manifeſt cauſe of theſe diſgraces, is no ground of comfort or apology, but rather another mortification for this prince, as ſhewing that he made an ill choice of thoſe he employed. The other loſs, to wit, that of the Milaneſe, plainly manifeſted the ſame defect: he gave the government of it to a man very much hated (15), and who in that poſt made himſelf more odious than he was before; and who, among other faults, committed that of ſuffering the French to provoke the jealouſy of the inhabitants, by the liberties they took with the women (16). Yet he had the ſatisfaction of quickly recovering the Milaneſe, for which he was indebted to a piece of treachery, which is very rare among the the Swiſſers (17); but he never could repair the other loſſes in this country. In vain he raiſed great armies, to revenge himſelf on the king of Arragon; he miſcarried every where, both in Italy, Biſcay, and Rouſſillon. The diſcontent occaſioned *by ſo many bad ſucceſſes, the loſs of his reputation, and the inability to diſcover all theſe Spaniſh deceits, was ſo great, as to bring upon him a ſickneſs which reduced him to the laſt extremity* (18).

[*D*] *Several ſtates confederated againſt the republic of Venice, to bring her to reaſon.*] Lewis was highly provoked againſt the Venetians by twenty affronts that they had put upon him (19). The Pope, the emperor, and the king of Spain, *hated them no leſs for different cauſes, and particularly becauſe they had encroached upon the territories of each of them* (20). All theſe princes formed a league with that ſecrecy againſt them at Cambray, in the year 1508 (21), that, as dextrous as they were, they knew nothing of it till it began to be executed (22). The French embaſſador (23) declaims againſt them in a terrible manner, in a ſpeech he made before the emperor Maximilian, in the year 1510. He ſet forth *the origin, progreſs, deſigns, artifices, and political maxims, of this republic* (24). But it muſt be remembred, that an Orator who will excite his auditory to war, is not much concerned about hiſtorical exactneſs. However it be, this republic hath been already ill treated otherwiſe than by words. This we ſhall ſee in the following remark.

Note, that John le Maire de Belges, Judiciary and Hiſtoriographer to queen Anne of Brittany, wife to Lewis XII, wrote a book at leaſt as ſatirical as the embaſſador's oration; he intituled it, *The Legend of the Venetians*. He obſerves in his prologue, that the intire ruin of their republic was then held as a certainty, and that they alledged *certain prophecies* (25), *oracles, and ſoothſayings, on that ſubject, and aſtrological prognoſtications, appearances of ſigns, ſtrange eclipſes, comets, lightenings, earthquakes, monſters, portents, and divers preſages. . . . . I have given myſelf the trouble,* continues he, *to make a collection and an abridgment of all the Venetian hiſtories and chronicles, which I have reduced to three principal points; by which I have found, that if any prophecies, divinations, or prognoſtics of their ruin have been divulged, it has been by the foreſight and pre-admonition of the juſt judgment of God, which I pretend to prove by the abovesaid three points or articles.* It is uſeful to obſerve this, becauſe it ſerves to diſcover, I. The oſtentation of nations, who ſee a ſucceſsful beginning of their enterprizes. II. The credulity with which people collect and apply prognoſtics. III. The quickneſs wherewith providence confounds thoſe proud and ſuperſtitious diſcourſes; for the republic of Venice ſoon recovered itſelf.

[*E*] *He had almoſt the ſole glory of humbling this ſtate.*] ‘The Venetians ſaw him beyond the Alps, with forty thouſand men, beginning the war with them, and the Pope at the ſame time thundering againſt them his excommunications, which make great impreſſion upon people, when ſeconded by the terror of arms. The king, having paſſed the river Adda, purſued their army ſo cloſely, as to fight it the fourteenth day of May, and gained that memorable battle of Giera-d'Adda, near the village of Aignadel, four miles from Caravaz. Their infantry were all cut to pieces, and their general, Alviana, having loſt an eye, was taken priſoner. In a fortnight's time, the king, almoſt without ſtriking a ſtroke, reduced all the places they kept from him. He might alſo have taken Vicenza, Padua, Verona, Trevis, and all the places that belonged to the empire, or the houſe of Auſtria, if his juſtice had not exceeded his ambition. He ſent back the deputies of all theſe towns, who brought him the keys, to the emperor, who received them under his obedience, and put garriſons in them. The Pope had ſent an army of ten or twelve thouſand men, into Romagna (26). . . . . . . King Ferdinand had only a ſmall naval force in the gulph, and hoped to make his advantage, as he did, of the labour, and at the expence of the French. Now the loſs of the ſingle battle of Aignadel, put the ſtate of Venice into ſuch a conſternation, that deſpairing to keep any thing on the *Terra Firma*, they reſolved to ſhut themſelves up in the iſlands of their gulph, and in this deſpair commanded all the governors of the places that had belonged to the Pope, or Ferdinand, to open their gates to them, and recalled their magiſtrates from Verona, Padua, Vicenza, and other places, to which the emperor had pretenſions. Thus you ſee how theſe three potentates, by the valour of the French, rather than by their own forces, recovered all that had been taken from them: and how the ambition of the Venetians, by keeping no bounds, ſaw thoſe of their dominions in a ſmall time reduced to the very brink of their canal (27).’ You will tell me, it is a French Hiſtorian that ſays this, who may be ſuſpected to flatter Lewis, in attributing to him all the effects of the league of Cambray. Let us therefore cite Paul Jovius, who acknowledges that the emperor had ſent little more than envoys, when the French army had already confined all the Venetian forces within their canals. This Hiſtorian, to excuſe the Pope for abandoning the league, and re-uniting with the Venetians, repreſents his action as the only means of preſerving Italy. He does not ſay, that there was any thing to be apprehended from the emperor, or the king of Spain, but only ſpeaks of Lewis XII. His expreſſions are very ſtrong. ‘In præaltis animi receſſibus graviores cauſæ pontificem cunctis ſenſibus peracrem, ſtrenuum, indomitum, vehementer excitabant, ut ſaluti Italiæ maturè proſpiceret, diligentiſſimeque caveret, ne deletis Venetis, impotenti demum barbaro foret ſerviendum. Namque Ludovicus ubi uno ſecundo prælio Venetas opes contrivit, ac ademptis tot urbibus continentis, gentem adverſo rerum ſucceſſu conterritam intra paludes, ipſaſque Venetias circumflui maris beneficio permunitas compulit, cunctis formidandus evaſerat: præſertim quum ad id bellum Maximilianus Cæſar nihil ferè præter legatos & Auguſti nomen attuliſſet. Noverat Julius Galli regis ingenium proferendi imperii maximè avidum: noverat inexhauſtas Gallorum opes; videbat florentiſſimum Mediolanenſium imperium exactis Sfortianis Galliæ attributum; Ligures verò ſuos, armis planè domitos, ac arce cervicibus impoſita in ſervitutem redactos. Porro Venetos, quorum toto orbe terrarum paulò antè ſumma & inveterata fuiſſet auctoritas, unius horæ momento, copiis, imperio, ac dignitate penitus eſſe ſpoliatos. Quibus rebus adductus (uti pium æquiſſimumque & verè Italum pontificem

(*b*) Julius II. See his article.

(15) To Trivulcio.

(16) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 420, ad ann. 1500.

(17) They betrayed Lewis Sforza into the hands of the French, though they were in his pay. See Mezerai, *ibid. pag.* 421, *ad ann.* 1500.

(18) Mezerai, ibid pag. 439, ad ann. 1504.

(19) Ibid. ad ann. 1507.

(20) Id. ibid. ad ann. 1507.

(21) Id ibid. ad ann. 1508.

(22) Ibid. pag. 447.

(23) Louïs Helian.

(24) See the preface to this oration, in the French tranſlation publiſhed in 1677, and joined to the French tranſlation of *Squittinio della liberta Veneta*. All this was reprinted in Holland, together with the Hiſtory of the Government of Venice, written by Mr Amelot de la Houſſaye.

(25) He ſpecifies a good number of them.

(26) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, ad ann. 1509.

(27) Id. ibid. pag. 448.

Pope had been forced to ſeek a ſanctuary out of Rome [*F*]. France would even have cauſed him to be depoſed, notwithſtanding the death of the duke de Nemours, if almoſt all Europe had not conſpired againſt her. Never was ſeen againſt a ſingle kingdom, ſuch a multitude of enemies [*G*]; ſo that it muſt be confeſſed, France ſaw itſelf reduced to great extremities (*c*). But beſides that it was very glorious for Lewis XII, to have been ſo much the terror of his neighbours, as that they ſhould believe it impoſſible, without an unanimous oppoſition, to ſtop his career; he had alſo the glory of diſſolving this formidable league by his negotiations [*H*]. The peace he made with the Engliſh,

‘ pontificem decebat) Venetos, ne ſe tantis fluctibus obrutos, planè demerſos, ac penitus extinctos vellet, ſuppliciter deprecantes, ſublevandos cenſuit (28). ——— *Some important reaſons induced the Pope, an active, ſtout, and reſolute man, to provide betimes for the ſafety of Italy, and uſe his utmoſt diligence, leſt when the Venetians were ruined, Italy ſhould be ſubjected to a fierce barbarian. For Lewis having in a battle overthrown the forces of the Venetians, and taken many towns on the continent, they being affrighted by their misfortunes, had reſolved to retire to the iſlands of their gulph; ſo formidable was this prince become to every body: eſpecially ſeeing that the emperor Maximilian, had contributed nothing to this war, but embaſſadors and the Imperial name. Julius knew how deſirous the French king was to extend his dominions, he knew the inexhauſtible riches of France, he ſaw that the flouriſhing ſtate of Milan, by the expulſion of the Sforza's, was fallen into the hands of the French; that the Genoeſe had been ſubdued, and were bridled by ſome fortreſſes; moreover, that the Venetians, who ſome time before had a vaſt power all over the world, had, in one hour's time, been ſtripped of their troops, dominions, and authority. By which things being moved (as became a moſt equitable and truly Italian Pontiff) he thought fit to aſſiſt the Venetians, who humbly intreated him not to ſuffer them, after having endured ſo many calamities, to be utterly ruined.*’

[*F*] *If the duke of Nemours had not been killed . . . . . the Pope would have been forced to ſeek a ſanctuary out of Rome.*] Even before Gaſton de Foix (29), that thunderbolt of war, who probably would have excelled the two Scipio's, if he had lived as long as they; before, I ſay, he had gotten the victory of Ravenna, Julius II was upon the point of leaving Rome, that he might not fall into the hands of the French; and he had abandoned it, if Lewis XII had not ſuffered himſelf to be inchanted by the charms of ſuperſtition. This we learn from Mezerai. *In this conſternation, ſeeing no ſecurity for him in Rome, if the victorious army of the king advanced, he had thoughts of propoſing an accommodation, but when he found that the king, tired with troubleſome ſcruples of his wife, had given orders to Trivulcio, to make an attempt upon the lands of the church, he ſhewed himſelf more intractable and implacable than ever* (30). The victory of Ravenna caſt Rome into a like conſternation, though the commander, who was moſt to be feared, had loſt his life in the battle. And the Pope was intreated to embark as ſoon as he could, and betake himſelf to flight (31). The charms of the ſame ſuperſtition, gave him new confidence once more, and delivered him. *The aſtoniſhment was ſo great in Rome, that the cardinals in a body came and deſired the Pope to make peace with the king. Ferdinand and the Venetians having given him ſome courage, he had recourſe to his ordinary artifices, which were to amuſe the king, by propoſitions of accommodation, and to employ the queen, who, by motives of conſcience, careſſes, intrigues, and importunities, frequently diſarmed him, and cooled his courage* (32). Who would not pity the fate of Lewis XII, who had ſo dangerous a domeſtic enemy, in the perſon that was moſt dear to him? this is a ſtrong confirmation of what I have ſaid above (33), concerning the ſcruples of Lewis VII. Nothing is ſo capable of ſtopping an arm ready to lay an enemy under foot, or reaching to gather the fruits of an important victory, as the artifices or bigottry of a confeſſor. It is ſaid indeed, that Lewis XII once impoſed ſilence on his wiſe, who continually importuned him; *What, Madam,* ſaid he, *do you think that you are wiſer than ſo many famous univerſities, who have approved the council of Piſa? do not your confeſſors tell you, that women are to be ſilent in the church* (34)? but what could it ſignify to ſay this once? a woman ſo tenderly beloved by her huſband, as Anne of Bretagne was, is not diſcouraged at three or four refuſals. She ſtill returns to the charge, till her demands are granted. Theſe are birds of the bed, or the night, whoſe warbling is much to be feared, it perſwades ſooner or later. The hiſtorian whom I have cited, obſerves, that *ſome monks,* who governed this queen's conſcience, *ſo filled her ſoul with ſcruples, that ſhe never ceaſed to importune her huſband* (35). Had Juvenal known ſuch things, he would have bid people beware more of the ſuperſtititions, than of the pedantry of a wiſe.

> Non habeat matrona tibi quæ juncta recumbit,
> Dicendi genus; aut curtum ſermone rotato
> Torqueat enthymema, nec hiſtorias ſciat omnes (36).

> *O what a midnight curſe has he, whoſe ſide*
> *Is peſter'd with a mood and figure-bride!*
> *Let mine, ye gods! (if ſuch muſt be my fate)*
> *No logic learn, nor hiſtory tranſlate.*

The queen we ſpeak of, ſo obſtinately maintained her point, that her huſband was forced to grant her all ſhe deſired, that is, to ſubmit meanly to the court of Rome, Here is another paſſage of Mezerai (37). ‘ The ſpirit of the king bore up againſt all theſe adverſities, but he had one domeſtic trouble, which was greater than what all his enemies gave him. This was his own wife, who touched with ſcruples common to her ſex, could not ſuffer him to be at variance with the Pope, or to ſupport a council againſt him. As ſhe continually teized him upon theſe two points, he was frequently forced for peace ſake, to ſtop the progreſs of his arms, when his affairs went beſt, and he was upon the point of bringing Julius to reaſon. At laſt, being totally vanquiſhed by her importunities, and by the remonſtrances of his ſubjects, whom ſhe excited on all ſides, he renounced his council of Piſa, and adhered to that of Lateran, by his proxies, who cauſed his mandate to be read the eighth ſeſſion, the fourteenth of December, the Pope preſiding in it (38).

[*G*] *Never was ſeen againſt a ſingle kingdom, ſuch a multitude of enemies.*] Lewis had at the ſame time a war to maintain, againſt the Pope, the republic of Venice, Spain, and England; or againſt the Pope, England, the emperor, and the Swiſs; and for an over-charge, he was to ſupport a miſerable dethroned king (39), who brought him no other aſſiſtance but the juſtice of his cauſe, which ſignified nothing: this is a common caſe enough.

[*H*] . . . . *he had the glory of diſſolving this formidable league by his negotiations.*] ‘ (40) France was then in greater danger than it had been of a long time before. For, on one hand, the Swiſs, extreamly fluſhed with the victory of Novara, entered it by the dutchy of Burgundy, and he (41) with the Engliſh, attacked it on the ſide of Picardy. The Switzers beſieged Dijon with twenty five thouſand men, to which the emperor had joined the nobility of Franche-Comté, and ſome German cavalry, commanded by Ulric duke of Wirtemberg. La Tremouille having defended it ſix weeks, thought it more adviſable to divert the courſe of this torrent, which after the taking of the place would have overflowed all to the gates of Paris, than render it more violent by oppoſition. He entred into a negotiation with them, and managed it ſo well, as to ſend them back into their own countries, undertaking that the king ſhould pay ſix hundred thouſand crowns, and renounce the council of Piſa, and the duchy of Milan. He had no expreſs orders to grant them

---

(*c*) See the remark [*H*].

(28) Paul. Jov in Vita Leonis X, lib. ii, pag. m. 73, 74.

(29) He is the ſame with the duke de Nemours.

(30) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 457, ad ann. 1510.

(31) Erant plerique adeo mente conſternati, ut Julio veluti deſperatis rebus ab Oſtia triremibus fugiendum eſſe trepide ſuaderent. *Jovius, in Vita Leonis X, lib. ii, pag.* 107.

(32) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 460.

(33) In the remark [*H*] of the article Lewis VII.

(34) Mezerai, Hiſt. da France, Tom. II, pag. 890, 891.

(35) Ibid, pag. 891.

(36) Juvenal. Sat. VI, ver. 445.

(37) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 469, ad ann. 1513.

(38) See the article JULIUS II, remark [*G*].

(39) John d'Albert, king of Navarre.

(40) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 467, ad ann. 1513.

(41) That is to ſay, the emperor.

Engliſh was a deciſive ſtroke. It is true, that by accident it became fatal to him, having engaged him in a marriage, which did him more prejudice, than an army of an hundred thouſand men could have done: for this prince having married Henry the eighth's ſiſter, a very lovely princeſs, gave himſelf up too much to the pleaſures of matrimony [*I*]. He did not proportion his conjugal benevolence, either to his own ſtrength or age, but to the youth of his wife. Having only daughters, he earneſtly deſired that ſhe might give him a ſucceſſor. He quickly wore out, in that exerciſe, his weak conſtitution. He conſummated the marriage the tenth of October, 1514 (*d*), and died of a looſeneſs the firſt of January 1515 (*e*), in the fifty third year of his age (*f*), without being able, by ſo many efforts ſo prejudicial to his life, to get the queen with child. This was very happy for France; for if the queen had brought him a ſon, inſtead of Francis I. they would have had an infant-king, who would have been a weakly prince all his life [*K*]. Lewis XII was ſo inclined to eaſe his ſubjects, that he deſerved the ſirname of *Father of the People*, an elogy a thouſand times more glorious than that of *Great*, *Auguſt*, *Magnificent*, *Hardy*, *&c.* He bore ſatires againſt his own perſon with patience, but not againſt the queen [*L*]. He paſſionately loved this princeſs, and had

ſuch

'them theſe conditions; but he thought he ought to do it to ſave France, and gave them ſix hoſtages, two lords, and four citizens (42). . . . . At the ſame time, towards the middle of July, the emperor and the king of England had beſieged Terouenne with above 50000 men. The French army ſucceſsfully enough, threw a convoy of proviſion and ammunition into the ditches; but upon their return, not being ſufficiently upon their guard, they were charged and routed. The battle was fought the eighteenth of Auguſt, near Guinegaſte. It was called the *battle of the ſpurs*; becauſe, on that occaſion, the French made more uſe of their ſpurs than of their ſwords.' Terouenne capitulated fifteen days after (43). Tournay quickly ſurrended. The peace therefore came very ſeaſonably: it was concluded at London the ſecond of Auguſt 1514 (44).

[*I*] *He gave himſelf up too much to the pleaſures of matrimony.*] Guicciardin and Paul Jovius make this obſervation. 'Cœlibi Ludovico, *ſays the latter* (45), ſupra ſolenne pacis ac amicitiæ fœdus, Maria Henrici regis ſoror eximiæ venuſtatis virgo deſpondetur. Qua in Galliam perducta, Ludovicus incredibili ſumptu & mira ludorum varietate nuptias celebravit. Sed dum ætatis & valetudinis quæ ei tum erat tenuiſſima, penè oblitus, intemperantius (ut ferunt) procreandis liberis operam daret, concepta edaci febricula non multos poſt dies interiit. —— *The peace being made, Lewis who was a widower married Mary, ſiſter to Henry, a young princeſs of an exquiſite beauty; as ſoon as ſhe arrived in France, Lewis celebrated his nuptials with incredible expences, and an admirable variety of entertainments. But not conſidering his age, and his conſtitution, which was then but weak, he indulged too much, as they ſay, his deſire of begetting children; and falling ſick of a fever, died a few days after.*' Theſe are Guicciardin's words: 'Il re di Franchia, mentre che dando cupidamente opera alla bellezza eccellente & alla età della nuova moglie, giovane di diciotto anni, non ſi ricorda dell' età ſua, e debilità della compleſſione, oppreſſo da febbre, e ſopravenendogli accidenti di fluſſo, parti quaſi repentinamente della vita preſente, havendo fatto memorabile il primo giorno dell' Anno MDXV con la ſua morte (46). —— *While the king of France was wholly taken up, with the charms and youth of the new queen, who was but eighteen years old, without regarding his age, or his weak conſtitution, he fell ſick of a fever, attended by a flux; which very ſoon put an end to his life, and rendered memorable, the firſt day of the year 1515 by his death.*' Mezerai agrees with theſe two Italians. 'Many believed, *ſays he* (47), that his too much careſſing the young queen, was the cauſe of his death.' Mr Varillas obſerves, 'that the Phyſicians and courtiers, who ſaw him marry again, unanimouſly foretold, that he would not long ſurvive this ſecond marriage (48).'

[*K*] *If the queen had brought him a ſon . . . . they would have had an infant-king, who would have been a weakly prince all his life.*] We do not lay down this as certain, but only as probable, grounding on the reaſon aſſigned by good authors, of the infirmities of Charles VIII. 'There is no reaſon to doubt, but Charles VIII was of as weak a conſtitution, as we have ſaid, ſince Comines aſſures us *, that this prince was always *infirm in body and mind*, and Gaguin † has gone farther than he, in ſaying, teneris atque imbecillibus membris adeo Carolus fuit, ut ſedulo duci illum & geſtari molliter priuſquam ſolide incedere oportuerit. —— *Charles was of ſo weak and crazy a conſtitution, that they were obliged to lead or carry him, with a particular care, before he was able to walk ſteadily.*' Which we may reaſonably believe, proceeded from the great age of his father, ſince, according to Dominicus Mencinus's obſervation,

Pronus ⸸ in canos Ludovicus annos
Cum daret vires animo ſenectus
Corpori auferret, meruit decoram
Gignere prolem:

He was old and infirm when he had children.

'Now among the infirmities of old age, this has been always reckoned one of the principal,

‡ Coïtus jam longa oblivio, vel ſi
Coneris, jacet exiguus cum ramice nervus.

His taſte not only pall'd to wine and meat,
But to the reliſh of a nobler treat;
The limber nerve in vain provok'd to riſe,
Inglorious from the field of battle flies.

'Inſomuch that after the uſe of medicines called by the Phyſicians *Entatica*, and a thouſand amorous careſſes,

- - - - - Incendi jam frigidus ævo
Laomedontiades, vel Neſtoris hernia poſſit,

Which might old Priam or Neſtor revive:

'a good off-ſpring cannot be expected from this conjunction, becauſe, as Galen affirms **: Quæ florentem ætatem vel præcedunt ætates vel ſequuntur, aut plane ſemen non effundunt, aut certe infœcundum, aut male fœcundum emittunt. —— *The time which preceeds or follows the vigour of man, is not proper to beget ſound and healthy children.*' Which in effect was found true in Charles VIII, who had all the infirmities abovementioned from the old age of his father (49).

[*L*] *He patiently ſuffered the ſatires againſt his own perſon, but not againſt the queen.*] For this we will cite Brantome's memoirs; 'The king, *ſays he* (50), had that conſideration for Anne of Brittany, his wife, that being one day told how the clerks of the Baſoche du Palais, and the ſcholars had acted plays, into which they brought the king and his court, and all the grandees, he made no more of it, than to ſay that they muſt have their paſtime, and that he allowed them to ſpeak of him and his court, but however not diſreſpectfully; and above all, that they ſhould not ſpeak of the queen, his wife, in any manner whatever; otherwiſe he would have them all hanged.' Thus you ſee what honour he paid her. I add to this paſſage

theſe

(*d*) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. IV, pag. m. 470.

(*e*) Beginning the year from the firſt of January.

(*f*) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 471.

(42) *Mezerai ſays here*, That the king having refuſed to ratify the treaty, they ran a great riſk of loſing their heads. The fear the Swiſs were under of loſing the great ſums which he offered them, ſaved the life of theſe innocent perſons.

(43) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 468.

(44) Ibid. pag. 470.

(45) Paul. Jov. in Vita Leonis X, lib. iii, pag. 146. *In the fourteenth book of his Hiſtory ſpeaks thus:* Sed Rex ætate provecta . . . quum intemperantius puellaribus complexibus indulſiſſet, in febrim incidit, nec multo poſt invaleſcente etiam profluvio ventris extinctus eſt.

(46) Guicciard, lib. xii, fol 351, verſo.

(47) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. II, pag. 872.

(48) Varillas, Hiſt. de Louïs XII, livr. xi, pag. m. 387.

* Book viii, chap. xiii.

† Initio, lib. xi.

⸸ In Carmine de prima ætate Caroli VIII.

‡ Juvenalis, Sat. X, ver. 204.

** Initio 2, de ſanit. tuenda.

(49) Naudé, Additions à l'Hiſtoire de Louïs XI, pag. 41.

(50) Brantome, Memoires des Dames Illuſtres, pag. 11.

ſuch regard for her, as was prejudicial to his kingdom. She filled him with ſcruples which had ill effects (*g*), and which ſtrengthened Julius II, the moſt mortal enemy that ever France had in Italy: excepting this, ſhe was a great queen, and of rare chaſtity [*M*]. They recite ſeveral witty ſayings of Lewis XII (*b*). I ſhall only mention one of them [*N*]. I ſhall alſo give the deſcription of his perſon [*O*], as we find it in a book of

(*g*) See the remark [*F*].

(*b*) *See Mezerai,* Hiſtoire de France, Tom. II, pag. 873, 874, *and Varillas,* Hiſtoire de Louïs XII, livr. xi, pag. 395, & ſeq.

theſe words of Coſtar. ‘Our Lewis XII, who deſerved the title of *Father of his people,* was not he brought upon the ſtage in his good city of Paris, and repreſented as an inſatiable miſer, who drank in a great gold goblet, without being able to quench his unreaſonable thirſt? He praiſed the invention, and made himſelf merry with it, and perhaps was glad that his love of riches, which had never given the leaſt of his ſubjects occaſion to weep, furniſhed them with a matter of laughter and agreeable diverſion (51).’ In general this monarch was of ſo ſweet and debonaire a temper, that the rigour he exerciſed againſt the duke of Milan, was thought to be a divine judgment. ‘He cauſed him to be removed from Lyons to Loches, where he was ſhut up for ten years together to his death, with a rigour ſo contrary to the mercy of this good prince, that it was believed to be a viſible chaſtiſement of God (52).’ This miſerable duke of Milan was ſhut up in an iron cage, where he had not ſo much as the comfort of being able to read or write. This one ſevere action made many conclude, that Lewis XII was of a cruel temper. ‘Eum tamen pervicacis obſtinatæque naturæ, & proinde ſævum & inexorabilem plerique exiſtimarunt, vel ob id præcipue, quod Lodovicum Sfortiam erepto omni ſcribendi, & quæ cuperet legendi ſolatio, ferrata in cavea omnium miſerrimum mori coëgiſſet (53).

[*M*] *His wife . . . . was a great queen, and of rare chaſtity.*] You may ſee her elogy in Brantome (54), and in Hilarion de Coſte (55); I only point out theſe authors; but I ſhall do more as to Peter de St Julian, I ſhall copy him concerning a very curious fact: ‘Queen Anne, *ſays he* (56), ducheſs of Brittany, and Madam Anne of France, ducheſs of Bourbonnois, (the former twice queen of France, and the latter daughter to king Lewis XI, and regent in France, during the minority of king Charles VIII her brother) ſo virtuouſly baniſhed immodeſty, and planted honour in the hearts of the ladies and gentlewomen, citizens wives, and all other ſorts of French women, that they who were known to have blemiſhed their honour, were ſo diſgraced and diſcarded, that the virtuous women would have thought they injured their reputation, ſhould they ſuffer them in their company.’ I do not think there is a ſurer way to make modeſty flouriſh than this. If once it were the faſhion for all women of good reputation to refuſe the company of thoſe who were ſuſpected of gallantries, would any of our ladies venture to diſcredit themſelves? It would be very eaſy, in my opinion, for queens to place their ſex upon a good foot; they need only baniſh the ladies their preſence, who were accuſed upon good grounds; in a word, they need only imitate Anne of Brittany. A modern author (57) points out the moſt fruitful ſource of the corruption of our age, when he ſays, that whereas heretofore a woman who was jealous of her reputation, would have ſcrupled the company of another, whoſe virtue was ſuſpected, at preſent the ſame reſpect is ſhewn to thoſe of an irregular conduct, as to thoſe of a regular. It is diſcouraging virtue, to rob it of it's temporal recompence (58), which is done by paying the ſame reſpects and civilities to a woman of a tattered reputation, as to another of virtue and honour: but, this is almoſt the paſs that things are come to. ‘In effect, what can we inſtance that is eaſier obtained by thoſe who are continually on their guard, than by others who are under ſome diſgrace? Do the former go more confidently than others to great feaſts, or ceremonial meetings, or do they receive greater civilities at them? Is it any obſtacle to a great marriage ſettlement, that one has been the diſcourſe of a whole nation? Is one leſs praiſed in an epiſtle dedicatory, or a funeral ſermon? By no-means; and we may ſay with Solomon upon all this, that the ſame thing happens to him that ſacrificeth, and to him that ſacrificeth not (59). See the remark [*C*] of the article GONZAGUE (ELEONORA DE).

But to return to queen Anne of Brittany: her chaſtity was not unſerviceable to the ſupporting her haughty humour. Theſe are the words of one of her panegyriſts (60). ‘I am not ignorant that ſome ‡ have written, that this good king finding his princeſs was very fond of ruling, let her quietly govern her duchy of Brittany; and underſtanding that ſhe was carrying on ſome intrigues againſt his inclination and ſervice, he would not however reſent it, ſaying, to thoſe that preſſed him to it: Some allowance is to be made to a chaſte woman.’ There are thoſe who had rather their wives were given to galantry, provided they were ſubmiſſive, than have them chaſte, and imperious with all (61). Lewis XII was not of this humour. See the tenth ſatire of Boileau, in the place, where he ſpeaks of the price, at which a virtuous wiſe knows how to rate her modeſty.

[*N*] *I ſhall only mention one of his witty ſayings.*] ‘After the league of Cambray, the Venetians made a deputation to him to endeavour to bring him off. The ſenator, who was the chief of the embaſſy, made him a ſpeech full of the wiſdom of their republic; and Lewis, who would neither contradict, nor grant what he asked, anſwered pleaſantly, I will play ſuch a number of fools againſt your wiſe men, that all their wiſdom ſhall not be able to reſiſt them; for our fools are a ſort of people that ſtrike on all ſides, without minding where, or hearkening to any reaſon for it (62).’ He might well ſay that he would oppoſe fools to the Venetians: for all that the French did in Italy under Charles VIII, and Lewis XII, was an effect of that martial fury, which foreigners themſelves own to be the temper of the French ſoldiers at the firſt onſet. That ardor and briskneſs did produce very good ſucceſſes; but as their generals were not men of judgment, and very little conduct was then obſerved in the affairs of France, their conqueſts were as ſoon loſt as gained. There was not much prudence at that time, either in the head or members of the council. This it was that ſaved Italy, as has been lately acknowledged by a famous profeſſor of Frieſland. ‘Si Carolus VIII & Galli tum temporis ita fuiſſent animati, ſicut eſt *Ludovicus* XIV & ejus conſilium, cujus inſtituta rationeſque fere ſunt mathematicæ, actum fuiſſet de Italia, cujus nulla amplius erat vis militaris. Sed ut Galli hanc expeditionem impetu magis quam conſilio, fati non prudentiæ ductu ſuſceperant & executi erant, ita mirum non eſt, idem fatum, deficiente conſtantia, illos deſtituiſſe (63). —— *If Charles VIII and the French at that time, had been as active as Lewis XIV, and his council, whoſe deſigns and meaſures are almoſt mathematical; Italy had been loſt, it having no longer any military forces: but as the French had undertaken the expedition out of impetuoſity, rather than deliberation, and left the conduct of it to fate, rather than prudence, it is no wonder if the ſame fate, when they had no ſteadineſs, did forſake them.*’

[*O*] *I ſhall alſo give the deſcription of his perſon.*] Naudé has inſerted it in his additions to the hiſtory of Lewis XI (64), and obſerves, that *he found it in a very ſcarce book, which was printed* 120 *years ago* (65). We ſhall ſee the title of it in the margin (66). ‘Caput non magnum, acutum, frons anguſta, oculi groſſi eminentes, facies macra, capilli curti nares amplæ & elevatæ, labra groſſa, & mentum acutum, collum curtum & ſubtile, humeri anguſti, manus & brachia ſubtilia & longa, epiglottis eminens, furcula pectoris ſtricta, pectus anguſtum, ſtatura potius curva quàm erecta, corpus colericum, & motus oculorum velox & ſurſum revolventes ſe, & crura ſubtilia. — *His head was little and long, his forehead narrow, his eyes large and prominent, his face lean, his hair ſhort, his noſtrils large and elevated, his lips were thick, his chin was ſharp, his neck ſhort and ſmall, his ſhoulders were narrow, with long and ſmall arms and*

(51) Coſtar, Lettres, Tom. I, pag. 728.

(52) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, pag. 421, ad ann. 1500.

(53) Paul. Jov. Hiſtor. lib. xiv, ſub fin.

(54) Ubi ſupra, à pag. 1, uſque ad 31.

(55) Vies des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. I, *at the beginning.*

(56) Peter de St Julien, Antiquitez de Maſcon, apud Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, pag. 54, 55.

(57) La Chetardye, Inſtruction for a young Princeſs. See the *Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, Octobre,* 1685, *Art. I, pag.* 1075.

(58) Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, ibid. pag. 1076.

(59) Ibid.

(60) Hilar. de Coſte, ubi ſupra, Tom. I, pag 6.

‡ A. Ferron, and other hiſtorians.

(61) Malo Venuſinam quam te Cornelia, mater Gracchorum, ſi cum magnis virtutibus affers Grande ſupercilium. *Juvenal. Sat. VI, ver.* 166.

(62) Varillas, Hiſt. de Louïs XII, livr. xi, pag. 397. *See, above, citation* (45). *of the article* HOSPITAL (MICHAEL DE L').

(63) Ulricus Huber, Hiſtoriæ Civilis, Tom. II, pag. 112, 113, Edit. Franck. 1692.

(64) Pag 44.

(65) This book of Naudé was printed in 1630.

(66) Bartholomæus Cocles, lib. ii, Phyſiog. quæſt. xv.

of Bartholomew Cocles.

‘ *and hands, his epiglottis prominent, his breaſt narrow, his body rather ſtooping than ſtrait, his complexion choleric, the motion of his eye quick and rolling upwards, and his legs ſmall.*’

LEWIS XIII, king of France, ſon and ſucceſſor to Henry the Great, was born at Fontainbleau, the ſeventeenth of September, 1601, and began his reign the fourteenth of May, 1610. If the ten firſt years of his reign were diſturbed by ſeveral factions, which ſometimes degenerated into Civil-wars [*A*], the twenty three others were no leſs agitated by religious or foreign wars: ſo that what Job ſays in general, of all men, is applicable in a more particular manner to this prince *(a)*. His reign, which was ſo much diſturbed by wars, was extreamly glorious; nor had France for a long time gained ſo many ſignal victories. And yet in the midſt of all theſe triumphs and glories, this monarch was very unhappy [*B*]: for his own family occaſioned him perpetual vexations.

[*A*] *His reign . . . . was diſturbed by various factions which ſometimes degenerated into Civil-wars.*] When a man examines the hiſtory of Lewis the thirteenth's reign, from the beginning to the end, he is a thouſand times tempted to aſk himſelf theſe queſtions: *But is it true, that I am reading the tranſactions in France? Have I not before me a book, wherein the writer, from a romantic fancy, has thought fit to characterize a mutinous people, a nobility inclined to rebellion, and to publiſh theſe characters under the name of France, to conceal that of ſome other nation?* A man is the more tempted to aſk theſe queſtions, who ſuffers himſelf to be prejudiced, either by the railleries of ſtrangers, who repreſent the French as the idolaters of monarchy and of their monarchs, or by the elogies which ſeveral French authors beſtow upon their own nation, as if naturally dutiful to their kings, with an unparallelled zeal and loyalty. Nothing is falſer than theſe railleries of foreigners, and encomiums of French pens. The author of Mr de Louvois's Political Teſtament, knew the genius of the nation much better; he lays it down, that the only and true way for France to avoid Civil-wars, is the abſolute power of the ſovereign vigorouſly ſupported, and armed with all the neceſſary force to make it feared. ‘ As for turbulent and rebellious people, *ſays he* (1), it is certain there have been as many ſeen in France, in the preceding reigns, and in the beginning of your majeſty's, as in any other country.’ He eſtabliſhes the ſame maxim, when he makes this obſervation concerning the Engliſh (2): ‘ It is well known what diſpoſition they are of at bottom, they are as inconſtant and unruly as other nations; but when all is ſaid, they are not more ſo: it is the occaſions and the form of their government, the impunity and the means that are left in their hands, which make them turbulent. We ſhould ſee, in other ſtates, ſubjects who are the moſt ſubmiſſive, grow mutinous and factious, if the prudence, the authority, and vigour of their ſovereigns, did not keep them under, and cut off all opportunities.’ Conſider how he reaſons upon the difference there is in France, betwixt this and the preceding reigns. ‘ What is become at preſent of thoſe multitudes of turbulent and ſeditious ſpirits? Have they not all the pretences they ever had? Do not the wars and other expences, with which your majeſty is obliged to maintain the luſtre of your glory, oblige you to impoſe upon the people more exceſſive taxes, than ever were raiſed by Lewis XI. Have not the Proteſtants been more provoked than under Charles IX, and Lewis XIII? Is not the nobility heavier laden than ever? Does not the clergy contribute to the neceſſities of the ſtate more than ever they have done, either in this age or in all ages paſſed? And has not your majeſty as many controverſies with the ſee of Rome as any of your predeceſſors ever had? and yet all is quiet and ſubmiſſive; there is no revolt or treaſon heard of. War and confuſions are kept off at a diſtance; whereas heretofore they were at home and in our bowels . . . . (3). Whence proceeds this difference? . . . . Whence comes this change? From the difference wherewith your majeſty manages the royal authority; from your prudence to make a right uſe of it, from your skill in riding that brute beaſt the people, which being unbridled, would run at random every way, whither it's inſtinct drove it; but which is inſenſibly accuſtomed to be governed by bit and bridle, and moves ſurer where it feels an even and ſtrait rein. It is abſolute power that is the true and only curb to check the intemperate heat of a blind and capricious multitude (4).’ He ſays in another place (5), ‘ that the limited authority of a king, and of republics, has more inconveniencies, and is ſubject to more ill conſequences to the ſtate and people than arbitrary power. Factions, ſeditions, tumults, civil wars, frequently do more miſchief in one year, than all the exceſſes of an abſolute monarch can cauſe in a whole life.’ He may be miſtaken with reſpect to ſome countries; but there is no probability that he is miſtaken as to his own nation, which is of ſuch a genius, that the worſt ſtate that can befal it, is to live under an effeminate and weak government; in that caſe every gentleman is the tyrant of his village; every great lord is the tyrant of his lordſhip, and nothing but ſeditions and inſurrections are to be heard of (6). Read the Hiſtory of France, and eſpecially obſerve the minorities, and you will be convinced of what I have been ſaying; you will find that the character of this nation is the very ſame that Mr de la Bruyere gives of children. See the margin (7).

[*B*] *In the midſt of ſo much . . . glory, this monarch was very unhappy.*] A modern author, deſigning to ſhew the vanity of human proſperities, makes uſe of two great examples; he runs over the life of Auguſtus, and then proceeds in this manner (8): ‘ Let us come to the ſecond inſtance, and behold the moſt glorious potentate of this age, with ſuch a ſeries of the bleſſings of heaven, as all the earth has reaſon to be aſtoniſhed at. One may eaſily judge that I mean Lewis XIII, whoſe proſperities doubtleſs will be admired by thoſe who come after us, if they judge of them by the luſtre of his heroic actions, by the number of his trophies, by the extent of his conqueſts, and by the greatneſs of his triumphs. In effect, whether you conſider the monſters he has ſubdued at home, or caſt your eyes on the advantages he has every where reaped abroad, you will be forced to confeſs, that France never had a more fortunate king than he. There is not a frontier but he has far advanced into his enemies country. France has ſubdued the pride of thoſe who envied her, and confounded their deſigns. And if you obſerve what has paſſed on the ocean, as well as the Mediterranean, you will conclude, that all the elements fought for us, under the command of this prince. Now the inſtances of his good fortune were no leſs conſpicuous in his domeſtic affairs; and here doubtleſs he had great advantages above Auguſtus on that account. God gave him for a companion of his bed, a princeſs, whoſe ſingular goodneſs, together with many other extraordinary and truly heroical virtues, might have made her beloved, though ſhe had not been in other reſpects one of the moſt perfect and moſt agreeable perſons of her time. He ſaw himſelf the father of two ſons, moſt worthy of his affection; as being ſo beautiful and well formed by nature, that he could not wiſh them more accompliſhed; beſides the ſeaſon in which he had them, ought to have rendered them ſtill more dear to him. He was reſpected by all the world; and on what ſide ſoever he turned himſelf in his Louvre, he ſaw nothing but teſtimonies of love and reverence. Could any thing then be wanting to his felicity, to make it more entire, if we judge by appearances? And yet with all this, what ſhould we ſay, if by his own confeſſion, he never ſpent one day without ſome mortification, nor ever taſted in his life a joy that

was

(a) *See Job, chap. vii, ver. 1.*

(1) Teſtament Politique de Mr de Louvois, pag. 388.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 343.

(3) Ibid. pag. 388, 389.

(4) Ibid. pag. 392, 393.

(5) Ibid. pag. 383, 384.

(6) See the paſſage of Coſtar in the remark [*T*].

(7) The only care of children is to find out their maſter's blind ſide, and that of the perſons they are ſubject to: as ſoon as they have made this diſcovery they get the better of them, and uſurp an aſcendant over them, which they never part with, for what did firſt deprive us of our ſuperiority over them is what always hinders us from recovering it. *La Bruyere, Caracteres de ce Siecle, pag.* 438, 439. *Paris Edit.* 1694.

(8) La Mothe le Vayer, Diſcours de la Proſperité, Tom. VIII, *of his Works*, pag. 328, & ſeq. Paris Edit. 1681, in 12mo.

vexations. He could not confide either in his mother, wife, or brother [*C*]; three perſons who ſuffered themſelves to be governed by turbulent, factious, and ill-deſigning men. His very ſiſters were againſt him, eſpecially ſhe whom he had married to the king of England: for ſhe received with open arms all the malecontents, and cheriſhed her

'was not daſhed with the bitterneſs of diſcontent? I 'ſhall here take care, not to commit the fault of him, 'whom the Athenians treated ſo ill for having obliged 'them to deplore a ſecond time the misfortunes of 'their allies, by repreſenting them on the ſtage. And 'indeed, my imprudence would be greater than his, 'if I ſhould at preſent enlarge on ſo ungrateful a ſubject, as would be that of the ſorrows, and continual 'inquietudes of this monarch. But however, ſince 'his laſt words at the point of death, which the Civilians call ſacred, and which are reckoned oracles in 'mouths leſs ſincere than his, have aſſured us, that 'his ſatisfactions were never pure, nor his pleaſures 'exempt from ſadneſs and affliction, may we not 'well conclude, that all his happineſs, as well as that 'of Auguſtus, had nothing real in it, and was only of 'the nature of thoſe things, which ſubſiſt no where 'but in opinion?' I make no reflexions on this long paſſage, though it were eaſy perhaps to find in it ſome ſubject of criticiſm; I ſhall content myſelf with obſerving, that we here ſee the moſt convincing proof imaginable of my text. Lewis XIII confeſſes he was unhappy; no body could know this ſo well as himſelf, and he had no reaſon to diſſemble, in the condition he was in. See in the remark [*E*], my citation from Mr le Laboureur.

La Mothe le Vayer ſays one thing, which obliges me to give a ſhort ſupplement. 'Auguſtus, *ſays he* '(9), had the mortification to leave for his heir to the 'greateſt part of his eſtate, and ſucceſſor to the empire, the ſon of his mortal enemy' This is falſe (10); but it is very true, that Lewis XIII, left the regency of his kingdom to a perſon he heartily hated, and conſequently his mortification was greater than that of Auguſtus. It is eaſily gueſſed why this author did not carry on the parallel between the misfortunes of the Roman emperor, and thoſe of the king of France on this head. The following remark will acquaint us with the little affection Lewis XIII had for his wife, whom yet he declared regent.

[*C*] *He could not confide either in his mother, his wife, or his brother.*] Here is matter enough for dividing this remark into three parts.

I. Lewis XIII, for the good of his kingdom, that is, to deprive factious ſpirits, of the means of forming dangerous cabals, was forced to give order for his mother to depart France; nor did he come to theſe extremities, till after he had gone thro' a long courſe of diſturbances, in which the royal authority was very ill uſed. It was neceſſary more than once to ſubdue, by force of arms, the partiſans of Mary de Medicis.

II. As to his wife, I refer you to the memoirs of the duke de la Rochefoucaud. 'I have been aſſured 'by Mr Chavigny himſelf, *ſays this duke* (11), that 'waiting upon the king, from the queen, to beg pardon for whatever ſhe had done; and even for what 'had diſpleaſed him in her conduct, beſeeching him 'particularly not to believe, that ſhe had any hand in 'the affair of Chalais, or had ever liſtened to any propoſitions of marrying Monſieur, after Chalais ſhould 'have made away with the king; his majeſty anſwered 'Monſieur de Chavigny, without any emotion, in the 'condition I am in, I muſt pardon her, but I muſt not 'believe her.' Note, that the king was at the point of death when he ſpake theſe words. It is a time, in which men generally ſpeak what they think, eſpecially in matters where a lie is of no uſe to them. We muſt conclude then, he died fully perſuaded, that his wife was an accomplice in a moſt horrid conſpiracy, in which it was reſolved to take him off, and to marry her to the duke of Orleans his ſucceſſor. Now as the affair of Chalais happened in the year 1626, judge whether this prince lived a few years in diſtruſts, with reſpect to this queen, and in the anguiſh of a melancholy reſentment. Nor ought it any longer to be thought ſtrange, that ſhe continued barren for ſo many years. Could the moſt incontinent husbands reſolve to approach their wives, if they believed them guilty of ſo black a treaſon? It would require a great deal of time for a prince to digeſt this thought: his confeſſor muſt return again and again to the charge (12), even though a long courſe of years ſhould have allayed the wound. Whether Lewis XIII was in the right or no, it was the ſame thing. His heart equally ſuffered. The duke de la Rochefoucaud ſays (13), that the king, when he gave this anſwer to Mr de Chavigny, believed, that the queen was ſtill in a correſpondence with the Spaniards, *by means of Madam de Chevreuſe, who was then at Bruſſels.* He obſerves alſo, that they were obliged to play an hundred engines, in order to procure the regency for the queen. 'She believed the king very far from ſuch a thought, 'conſidering the little inclination he had ever ſhewn 'for her (14). . . . . She and Monſieur, who had had 'but too many proofs of the king's averſion, and who 'almoſt equally ſuſpected, that he deſigned to exclude 'them from the management of affairs, ſought all 'poſſible ways to obtain it (15).' She never would have obtained the regency, if the king muſt have left her in full authority; but in hopes of leaving her only the ſhadow of it, he paſſed the declaration (16). 'He could not conſent to declare her regent, 'nor could he reſolve to divide the authority betwixt 'her and his brother. The correſpondence of which 'he ſuſpected her, and the pardon he had lately granted Monſieur for the treaty of Spain, held him under 'an irreſolution, which perhaps he could not have overcome, if the conditions in the declaration which 'cardinal Mazarine and Monſieur de Chavigny propoſed, had not furniſhed him with the expedient, he 'ſought to leſſen the power of the queen, and to make 'her in ſome meaſure dependant upon the council he 'deſigned to eſtabliſh (17).'

III. As to his brother, all the world knows his falls and relapſes; he was engaged in all ſorts of conſpiracies, whole provinces made inſurrections in his favour; he correſponded with Spain. In a word, ſince the king believed him an accomplice in the affair of Chalais, he could not chuſe but look upon him with an evil eye: this object brought to his remembrance, that a deſign had once been formed to take away his life, and marry his widow to the duke of Orleans, who was to have ſucceeded him. I do not know whether jealouſy, mixed with all the other diſcontents of Lewis XIII, but it is poſitively ſaid, that the queen was highly civil to the duke of Orleans Let us hear what ſome memoirs, publiſhed in 1685, inform the world (18). 'Monſieur made his court daily to the 'queens, who reſided at Paris during the ſiege of 'Rochel, carrying himſelf with a great deal of freedom, even to the reigning queen with whom he had 'always been in a good underſtanding, and never obſerved much ceremony. When ſhe came into France, 'ſhe called him, Monſieur, both ſpeaking to him, and 'of him, and always continued that ſtile, with which 'ſome found fault, for in writing to him, ſhe only 'called him her brother. During the ſhort journey 'that the king made to Paris, Monſieur having met 'the queen one time as ſhe was coming from a nine 'days devotion to obtain children, told her, by way 'of raillery, *Madam, you have been ſolliciting your* '*judges againſt me, I conſent you ſhould carry your cauſe,* '*if the king has intereſt enough.*' As he is repreſented in theſe memoirs, he had ſome need of the advice that was given the duke of Valois (19). The ſame book acquaints us, that the king was at leaſt as much diſpleaſed at his brother's having children, as at the barrenneſs of the queen. Here what alarms were given him upon the marriage of the duke of Orleans with the heireſs of Montpenſier. 'Tronſon, 'ſecretary of the cabinet, and ſome other particular 'ſervants of the king, who only conſidered the intereſt of his royal perſon, and not that of the ſtate, 'having repreſented to the king of what dangerous 'conſequence it was to him to marry Monſieur his 'brother to a rich heireſs, allied as ſhe was to the 'houſe of Guiſe, which had heretofore aſpired to the 'crown, and with ſo large a revenue as was ſettled 'upon him; by which means, his majeſty, having no 'iſſue, would only be conſidered as a languiſhing 'king, and the court, which is wholly conducted by

'intereſt,

(9) Ib. pag. 329.

(10) Tiberius, ſucceſſor of Auguſtus, was the ſon of a perſon, who, indeed, declared againſt Auguſtus, during the war of Perugia, and afterwards endeavoured to form a party in favour of Pompey's ſon, and laſt of all, joined with Marc Antony; but ſoon after made his peace with Auguſtus, and even yeilded his wife to him. *Sueton. in Tiberio, cap. iv.*

(11) Memoires de Mr de la Rochefoucaud, pag. 5.

(12) See the article CAUSSIN, remark [*B*].

(13) In his Memoirs, pag. 3.

(14) Memoirs de la Rochef. ibid.

(15) Ibid pag 4, & 5.

(16) Ibid pag 4.

(17) See, on all this the remark [*BB*].

(18) Memoirs of the late duke of Orleans, containing all that has paſſed in France, from the year 1608, to 1636. At Amſterdam, by Peter Mortier, 1685, in 12mo.

(19) See the article of FRANCIS I, remark [*B*].

her huſband's inclination for the intereſts of Spain. Lewis XIII, having not a head ſtrong enough to reign by himſelf, and ſuffering himſelf to be always led by favourites, furniſhed but too many pretences to reſtleſs ſpirits; and if in the neceſſity he found himſelf of depending on his miniſters, he had not at laſt fallen into the hands of the Great Cardinal Richelieu, he had run the riſk at leaſt of his crown [*D*]; but this able miniſter being obliged by his own intereſt to ſupport the authority of his maſter, applied himſelf with ſo much vigilance to diſſipate the conſpiracies, that he ſoon made them all vaniſh into ſmoke. Some great men were beheaded; but this ſeverity was abſolutely neceſſary at that time [*E*]. Clemency, ſo uſeful on many other occaſions, had been very

'intereſt, would abandon him, to go over to Monſieur, as a vigorous prince, who quickly promiſed iſſue, upon which every one would ſound his hopes, and form deſigns, which muſt needs be to the prejudice of his royal perſon. His majeſty was hereby ſo affected with jealouſy, that father Souffran, his confeſſor, coming to wait on him one morning in his cloſet, his majeſty juſt riſing out of his bed, threw himſelf on his neck all in tears, telling him, that he knew, to his coſt, that the queen his mother would remember all her life, what paſſed at the death of mareſchal d'Ancre, and that the advantages ſhe procured to Monſieur, permitted him not to doubt, but that ſhe loved him much more than himſelf. The Father being much ſurprized at this diſcourſe, endeavoured gently to remove this diffidence in the king's mind, and aſſured him to the contrary, *&c.* (20).' He was pacified, and the marriage was concluded (21); from which quickly proceeded a daughter: all this vexed the king, and it was a happineſs to him, that his ſiſter-in law died a little after her lying-in: however, he appeared to be much afflicted by it. See the margin (22). He was afterward very far from conſenting to a ſecond marriage of his brother (23).

[*D*] *If he had not fell into the hands of . . . . . . Richelieu, he had run the risk at leaſt of his crown.*] They who beſet the two queens and monſieur, had no expectations under the miniſtry of cardinal de Richelieu, but hoped for every thing, if his royal highneſs ſhould aſcend the throne. There were two ways of placing the crown upon his head; one by making away with the king, and the other by treating him like Don Alphonſo, king of Portugal. The ſecond could not eaſily be executed, in a nation ſo jealous of it's fundamental laws (24), and under ſo vigilant and able a miniſter as cardinal de Richelieu. Therefore the other expedient was agreed on, if it be true, that Chalais had the deſign above-mentioned (25), in the paſſage of the duke de la Rochefoucaud. It was impoſſible to convince a great many people, but there was a moſt horrible myſtery of iniquity in agitation, to give at once the crown and the queen to the duke of Orleans. I know not what to think of it. See the Life of cardinal Richelieu, printed at Amſterdam, in 1694. Tom. I. pag. 304.

[*E*] *He was forced to behead ſome great men; but this ſeverity was . . . . . neceſſary at that time.*] Of all thoſe that were beheaded for rebellion in the reign of Lewis XIII, none was ſo much lamented as the duke of Montmorenci (26). And truly he was a lord of great merit, adored in Languedoc, his government, and admired by all France, as appeared by the zeal with which they ſollicited his pardon. But this was the very thing, which, in good politics, ought to induce the king, not to pardon his treaſon. It was dangerous to let a perſon live who was ſo generally admired, and who might ſo eaſily draw all Languedoc into a ſecond rebellion. Had he done it at the time that the Spaniards beſieged Leucate (27), what would have become of France? do not tell me that gratitude would have fixed him to this prince's ſervice, or the weakneſs he had diſcovered in the duke of Orleans have cured his fondneſs of revolting in favour of him. Theſe are poor reaſons. The duke of Montmorenci, received into favour, would never have been able to bear the power of the cardinal, and would have taken his meaſures a ſecond time to deſtroy him. He would have taken advantage of the teſtimonies, the grandees and provinces had given him of their extraordinary eſteem, during his impriſonment, *&c.* There was a neceſſity of uſing great ſeverities, under a reign in which the French nobility were ſo familiarized to this ſort of conſpiracies, inſurrections, and correſpondencies with Spain, that one would think that the idea of infamy, or even of a fault, did not enter into this ſort of crimes. It would be in effect turning a monarchical government into anarchy, to let ſuch abuſes go unpuniſhed. Mr le Laboureur relates a thing which is very curious; to wit, that the king conſented to the duke of Montmorenci's death, only from a ſpirit of ſervitude. I will give the whole paſſage; becauſe it ſerves to ſhew, that Lewis XIII, with a ſceptre in his hand, and the crown on his head, was under greater conſtraints, and more unhappy, than if he had had irons on his feet. 'This reflexion ought eternally to renew the tears of France, upon the fate of Henry duke of Montmorenci, and Damville, admiral and mareſchal of France, only ſon to this conſtable, who fell rather by misfortune than inclination, into a ſmall fault, and who was overwhelmed with all the rigour of the laws; though it had no ill conſequences, and there was no danger of any ill effect from it: I ſay farther, though the king was to loſe by it the ornament and glory of his court, the honour of his nobility, and delight of his kingdom, and what ſtill ought to be more dear to a great prince, the moſt auguſt and worthy ſubject of clemency that will ever be ſeen. I have it from the mouth of the late prince of Condé, that Lewis XIII, expreſſed to him his ſorrow on his death-bed, not with tears, but with ſobs, and conjured him to believe, that violence had been done him in that unhappy journey to Toulouſe, which he made againſt his will, and where againſt his reſolution, he was overpowered by a multitude of pretences, or rather deluſions of ſtate, which diſappeared after that fatal tragedy, and left him under a moſt ſtinging uneaſineſs, which he had ever ſince concealed in his boſom. Ah! my couſin, ſaid he to him afterwards, this is not to reign, but rather to be the ſlave of tyranny, at leaſt to feel all the pains of it in a lawful royalty, to hear only finiſter reports, and to be always in diſtruſt of thoſe who are neareſt to us, of our principal officers, and of thoſe on whom we place our affections; and to ſubmit and regulate our conduct, by the phantoms of politics, which are frequently only another's private intereſt (28).'

There are, I queſtion not, many truths in this diſcourſe. I am perſuaded that cardinal Richelieu, more than once, repreſented to the king, his maſter, the deſigns of his rebellious ſubjects, greatly heightened and exaggerated; for in the numerous conſpiracies that were formed in this reign, there were many that deſigned only the ruin of the cardinal, and meant no harm either to the perſon or authority of the prince; and yet his eminence had the policy to inſinuate (29), and even to perſuade him, that they were contriving to take the crown from him, and give it to the duke of Orleans. Hence it was that this prince was brought to conſent to the taking off ſo many heads. He afterwards found he had been impoſed upon, and ſecretly lamented it. He was to be pitied; but it is very probable, that he was ſenſible he could not deliver himſelf from one ſlavery, without ſubmitting to another yoak, ſtill more incommodious; and this was the reaſon that hindered his diſplacing the cardinal, though he really hated him. The removing of this miniſter would have delivered the king bound hand and foot, into the power of the duke of Orleans. They might perhaps have left him the title of king; they might have governed in his name; but all affairs would have been managed according to the caprice of this duke's favourites. It would have been a ſtrange government. The two queens and their creatures, the duke of Orleans and his, would have perplexed and confounded every thing, and no great deſign could have been formed for the glory of the monarchy, and againſt the interests

(20) Memoirs du Duc d'Orleans, pag. 41.

(21) In the year 1626.

(22) Though the king found his account in that loſs, and that he was probably leſs ſorry by reaſon of the jealouſy he had entertained of that marriage, which the pregnancy of madam had afterwards much increaſed, being free from all his fears, his majeſty nevertheleſs expreſſed a great concern, for he had always had a particular eſteem for the virtue of that princeſs, but he was not ſorry that ſhe had only left a daughter. *Memoirs du Duc d'Orleans, pag.* 59.

(23) Ib. pag. 72.

(24) Note, that tho' this nation is as ſubject as any to revolts, yet there is always a powerful party which adheres to the rightful prince in all civil wars.

(25) Citat. (11).

(26) He was beheaded at Toulouſe in 1632. See his elogy, and lamentation on his death, in the *Mémoires du Sicur de Pontis, Tom. II, pag.* 44, *& ſeq. Edit. Amſt.* 1694.

(27) In the year 1637.

(28) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtelnau, Tom. II, pag. 152.

(20) The conſtable de Luines had made uſe of the ſame ſtratagem before he had put it into the king's head, that Mary de Medicis would uſe him as Catherine de Medicis had treated Charles IX. *See the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes, Tom. II, book vi, pag.* 288.

very pernicious in this. We muſt not believe thoſe who dare affirm, that people were put to death, whoſe only fault conſiſted in their having had the misfortune to diſpleaſe the prime miniſter [*F*]. They would perhaps ſpeak more reaſonably, and the charge would

reſts of Spain; and if any glorious events had happened, the king would have ſeen the duke, his brother, carry away all the honour of them; a cruel ſubject of jealouſy, and a thouſand times harder to bear, than the aſcendant of the cardinal. We are not ignorant how often jealouſy of authority, made Lewis XIII uneaſy. He fell ſick, when he was told, that the Engliſh had landed in the iſle of Rhe; and could not go in perſon to the coaſt of Poictou. *He was adviſed to ſend Monſieur thither as his lieutenant-general* (30). Monſieur's firſt enterprize having not ſucceeded well, the king wrote to him 'a letter full of reſentment, for having ſo lightly expoſed the troops, without any occaſion, and againſt the expreſs orders of his majeſty, which were only to keep things at a ſtand, and to hazard nothing till his arrival. Perhaps, if Monſieur had ſucceeded in his firſt enterprize, he would have given greater diſcontent; and it is believed that that fear made the king anticipate the time of his perfect recovery, that he might appear in his camp as ſoon as poſſible (31). Here follows a ſtill greater effect of the ſame jealouſy. 'The king having declared the duke of Orleans general of the army in Italy †, at the ſollicitation of the queen, his mother, afterwards repented his having given him this command, from an apprehenſion, that his brother might reap a great deal of glory in Italy, which would eclipſe his own. This thought ran in his head to ſuch a degree, that it even broke his ſleep. Coming to Chaliot ‡, where the cardinal was, he told him he could not ſuffer his brother to be generaliſſimo of the army in Italy, and that a way ſhould be found to remove him from that poſt. The cardinal anſwered, that he knew but one way of getting this command out of the duke of Orlean's hand, which was, that the king ſhould go himſelf into Italy; but if he took that reſolution, it was neceſſary to depart in eight days at fartheſt. The king ſaid he would do it, and immediately prepared for his expedition (32).' A man muſt know but little of princes, to deny that the jealouſy they conceive againſt their ſons or brothers, and in general againſt their ſucceſſors, is not a more afflictive evil, than the chagrin of depending too much on the firſt miniſter. See in Brantome (33), the furious jealouſy of Charles IX, againſt his brother the duke of Anjou, general of the troops, that beat the Proteſtants at Jarnac, and at Montcontour. There is no doubt but it was a leſs evil for Lewis XIII to be governed by cardinal Richelieu, than it would have been to ſee his brother, his mother, or his wife, in too great credit at court. The creatures of theſe three perſons were only capable of forming little court intrigues, which would have ruined the general affairs. So that the good of the kingdom required, that ſeverity ſhould be uſed againſt the heads of the rebels, who would put the government into hands which were too much in the intereſt of the Spaniards (34).

[*F*] *We muſt not believe thoſe who dare affirm, that people were put to death, whoſe only fault conſiſted in their misfortune to diſpleaſe the prime miniſter.*] The author of the memoirs of Mr d'Artagnan affirms, that the mareſchal de Marillac, and ſeveral others, were judged and condemned by commiſſioners, *though no other crime could be imputed to them, but their having preſumed to diſpleaſe the cardinal* (35). He afterwards relates, what we have ſeen above (36), concerning the prieſt Grandier, and then adds, *St Preuil's caſe exactly reſembled that of this unfortunate prieſt; a thouſand and a thouſand witneſſes were produced againſt him, both from the government of Dourlens, which he had enjoyed before that of Arras, and from ſeveral other places. Le Meunier was often confronted with him, but though all his crime, as well as Grandier's, conſiſted only in diſpleaſing the higher powers, he nevertheleſs loſt his head* (37). Obſerve here three great falſhoods: for if we examine, without prejudice, all the parts of mareſchal de Marillac's trial, we ſhall eaſily ſee, that he was guilty of infinite extortions and depredations, and within the ordinance, *which condemns thoſe guilty of peculation, to the confiſcation of body and goods* (38). It is true, that interpreting this law in the moſt mild and favourable ſenſe, by the confiſcation of body, might be underſtood the loſs of liberty, and not of life, but from the judges not taking it in the milder ſenſe, but following the moſt ſevere interpretation, it does not follow, that the mareſchal was innocent, and that all his crime conſiſted in having rendered himſelf diſagreeable to cardinal Richelieu. Many irregularities are alledged in his trial (39), and all to prove that the commiſſioners were bribed, and that the innocence of the accuſed was oppreſſed; but we muſt know alſo, that other authors affirm the trial was agreeable to the exacteſt forms of law (40). Conſider well Mr du Chaſtelet's obſervations upon the life and condemnation of marſhal de Marillac; it is an anſwer to a libel which the cardinal's enemies had publiſhed. We ſhould be too raſh, either to believe without examination what they maintained, or the narratives of his friends in favour of him; the ſatires on one ſide are as much to be ſuſpected. as the flatteries on the other. Let us miſtruſt both, and determine nothing till after a thorough diſcuſſion of the facts; let us alſo diſtruſt that natural biaſs we all have to preſume in favour of thoſe, who incur the diſgrace of a too potent miniſter. 'It is a fault too common in thoſe who are not called to the helm, to endeavour to croſs the ſteerage; and as if the confidence of the prince, and the favour of the people could not be united in the ſame ſubjects, we ſee not a man in place, or who has the leaſt ſhare in the conduct of affairs, whoſe perſon and actions are approved till after his death or diſgrace. The various accidents of the marſhal de Marillac's life, and the different affections towards him according to his fortune, furniſh our age with a certain proof of this antient maxim. All France found fault with the choice the king made of him, ſpoke publickly of his depredations, blamed his promotion to honours, ſaid he wanted courage, and could obſerve no merit nor quality in him worthy ſo high an advancement. As ſoon as his majeſty was reſolved to puniſh him, and for weighty reaſons withdrew his protection, his former accuſers ſupported him againſt juſtice, affirmed he was innocent, worthy of his employments, and ſo well ſtored with valour and piety, that he deſerved every thing except his fall (41).' Thus Mr du Chaſtelet ſpeaks, at the beginning of a book I have cited above. It is ſaid that cardinal Richelieu underſtanding that the commiſſioners had paſſed the ſentence of death upon him cried out: 'It muſt be owned that God grants an underſtanding heart to judges, which he does not give to other men, ſince they who have tried the marſhal de Marillac, have diſcovered actions in him worthy of death; I did not believe there was enough againſt him to whip a page for (42).' If I had heard the cardinal ſay this, I ſhould believe he ſpoke it. Many people believe that he very well knew that in a conference, wherein it was debated what courſe ſhould be taken with the cardinal, this marſhal had given his vote for killing him; it is even ſaid, that he offered his hand for ſuch an exploit (43). Such a man as this would have been actually puniſhable, and would have appeared ſo eſpecially to the cardinal.

As to what concerns St Preuil, the memoirs I have cited are much more unreaſonable: he was a gentleman of Angoumois, who had raiſed himſelf by an extraordinary bravery; as nice on the point of honour, and the reputation of a good duelliſt and bold cavalier, as he was little conſcientious in point of debauchery and extortion. It is confeſſed in Mr d'Artagnan's memoirs, that he had run away with a married woman. Who after this will venture to ſay, *that his crime only conſiſted in having diſpleaſed the higher powers*? Is not a rape puniſhable with death by the laws of the kingdom? Are not they who ſteal a woman, though with her own conſent, reputed, in France, worthy of death? St Preuil, with much more reaſon, had incurred the ſame puniſhment, having carried off a woman whoſe huſband was ſtill alive. I paſs over his extortions and violences, of which he was convicted, and which were ſo much the more odious as he commanded in a place but lately reduced under the French power, and which was to be reconciled to their new dominion, by a moderate adminiſtration. The

(30) Memoires du Duc d'Orleans, *printed in* 1685, *pag.* 81.

(31) Ib. pag. 83.

† Baſſomp. Mem. Tom. II, pag. 521.

‡ The third of January.

(32) Hiſtory of cardinal de Richelieu, printed at Amſterdam, 1694, Tom. I, pag. 436, ad ann. 1629.

(33) Memoires, Tom. IV, pag. m. 3. *In the elogy of Charles IX.*

(34) See in the remark [*T*] the words of Coſtar.

(35) Memoires de Mr d'Artagnan, pag. 160.

(36) Citat. (8) of the article LOUDUN.

(37) Memoirs de Mr d'Artagnan, pag. 161.

(38) See the Hiſtory of Cardinal Richelieu, printed at Amſterdam, 1694, Tom. II, pag. 49.

(39) Ibid. pag. 49, 50.

(40) See the Miniſtry of Cardinal Richelieu, *Tom II, pag.* 302, *& ſeq. Dutch Edit.*

(41) Du Chaſtelet, Obſervat. ſur la Vie & la Condemnation du Marêchal de Marillac, init.

(42) See the abbot de Marolles, in his Abridgment of the Hiſtory of France. See alſo the Hiſtory of Cardinal Richelieu, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 52.

(43) See the Memoirs of du Maurier, pag. 369.

would be ſevere enough, ſhould they ſay, there were ſome beheaded, whoſe crimes had all gone unpuniſhed, if they would have adhered to his intereſt. They who ſpake equitably, were content to complain in behalf of ſome of theſe unhappy perſons, that the court had ſubjected them to the moſt ſevere interpretations of the law, and had not pardoned them. They who liſtened only to their paſſion, extended their complaints and revenge even to the judges themſelves, which could not be juſt with regard to him, who preſided in the trial of the duke of Montmorenci [*G*]. Notwithſtanding the domeſtic conſpiracies the cardinal had to ſtruggle with, he omitted not applying himſelf uſefully to foreign affairs. He procured the king, his maſter, the glory of humbling the houſe of Auſtria, which was the terror of all Europe. To induce him to make war with Spain, he removed the ſcruples of conſcience which had reſtrained him before [*H*]; for as Lewis XIII hated the Proteſtants, he could not eaſily bring himſelf to diſturb the houſe of Auſtria, which was then ſtruggling with them. The cardinal turned him

The truth of this maxim of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, was never more manifeſt than in the reign of Lewis XIII. *In cauſis majeſtatis hæc natura eſt, ut videantur vim pati etiam quibus probatur.* It is uſual on all trials for crimes againſt the ſtate, that even they who are duly convicted, are thought to have been oppreſſed (44).. Moſt people are ſo indolent as not to give themſelves the trouble of examining who is in the right, or who is wrong, however they will be judging of things, and in order to do it the cheapeſt way, they take up with probability, and think it very likely that they who have the greateſt power are the unjuſt ſide. Dion Chryſoſtome has made this obſervation; Οὐ γὰρ ἃ ποιοῦσιν ἔνιοι σκοποῦσιν, ἀλλὰ τίνες· ὄντες οὐδὲ τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας, ἢ βιαζομένους ἐθέλουσιν ἐξετάζειν πολλάκις, ἀλλ᾽ οὓς εἰκὸς βιάζεσθαι τῷ δύνασθαι πλέον. *Quidam enim non conſiderant quæ faciant, ſed qui ſint; neque injuriam facientes, neque violentiam paſſos volunt examinare plerumque, ſed quibus veriſimile ſit injuriam fieri ab iis qui plus valent* (45). A compaſſion for the miſerable, and the envy men bear to men in power, are a ſource of deception. Τοῖς μὲν γὰρ δυστυχήσασιν ἔλεος, τοῖς δὲ κρατήσασι φθόνος παρακολουθεῖ· καὶ τὸ μὲν ἡττηθὲν, τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀδικεῖσθαι, τὸ δὲ νικῆσαν, ἀδικεῖν δοκεῖ. *Quippe infelices miſericordia, potentes invidia ſequitur: ac victus accepiſſe, victor attuliſſe injuriam videtur* (46). But that which gives occaſion to this, is the too frequent experience that they who are in authority, are apt to abuſe it, to revenge themſelves on their enemies by oppreſſing them with falſe accuſations.

[G] . . . *this could not be juſt with regard to him, who preſided in the trial of the duke of Montmorenci.*] It was Mr de Chateauneuf keeper of the ſeals. He was in diſgrace, when Lewis XIII died, and great endeavours were uſed to recal him after the prince's death; but cardinal Mazarin oppoſed it to the utmoſt, 'in which he was wonderfully aſſiſted by Madam the princeſs, who upon an additional pride occaſioned by the victory of Rocroy, thought every thing due to her, and preremptorily publiſhed that all their family would retire from court, if the queen reſtored a man to the council, who had preſided at the condemnation of the duke of Montmorenci her brother (47).' Could any thing be more unjuſt than this princeſs's pretenſion? Did Mr de Chateauneuf deſerve to be expoſed to the leaſt reſentment of the duke of Montmorenci's ſiſter and relations? Could he poſſibly avoid preſiding at this trial? Did not his place require him to accept of this commiſſion from the king? And could he be of a different opinion from that of all the judges, who, notwithſtanding the vehement deſire they had to ſave the duke of Montmorenci's life, gave all their votes for the ſentence of death. The prince of Condé, his brother-in-law, and the princeſs of Condé, his ſiſter, had they been his judges, could not have given their opinion otherwiſe than Mr de Chateauneuf did. Nothing is more evident, than that a governour of a province, who rebels againſt his king, and gives battle to the king's troops, and is taken priſoner in ſuch a battle, deſerves death. It was evidently true, that Mr de Montmorenci's caſe was this: the proofs were as clear as the day, beſides his own confeſſion. There remained therefore no ſhadow of uncertainty, either upon the queſtion of right, or that of fact, and therefore there could be no difference in opinion; the princeſs therefore had no reaſon to complain of Mr de Chateauneuf, and yet ſhe expreſſed her reſentment openly, as if it had been a reaſonable thing; ſo true it is, that the great ſuffer themſelves to be blinded by their haughty paſſions, ſo far as to glory in that which is really a vice, and a lamentable weakneſs.

[H] *The cardinal Richelieu removed from the king thoſe ſcruples of conſcience which had reſtrained him before from attacking Spain.*] Mr Silhon informs us of this: 'How juſt ſoever, *ſays he* (48), was the ground of this rupture (49), they had heſitated upon it, but for the violent inſtances of the Dutch, and the zealous offices of ſome friends they had near the king and cardinal Richelieu, the king was averſe to it upon religious ſcruples, which were removed by an aſſembly of doctors, ſummoned upon this occaſion.' This prince's diſpoſitions in his alliances with Proteſtants will be better known, if we conſult the *Muſæum Italicum* of two famous Benedictines. 'They had the ſight of a letter of the late king Lewis XIII, in cardinal Francis Barberini's library. Pope Urban VIII, had complained to his majeſty of his alliance with the Swedes, whoſe victorious arms at that time ravaged Germany. The king ſecretly anſwered the Pope with his own hand, and offered to break off his alliance with the Swedes, provided the Catholic king would ceaſe to protect the duke of Orleans, who was then retired to Bruſſels, and would join his forces with thoſe of France, to turn them againſt the Proteſtants of Germany and the French Huguenots. His holineſs communicated the king's letter to the Spaniſh embaſſador, who wrote about it to Madrid, and received no anſwer. Had it not been for this original letter the public would have been unacquainted with this curious piece of our hiſtory (50).' This paſſage is taken from Mr Couſin's journal. Add to this what we find in one of Mr Gallois's journals, which will inform us, that if Lewis XIII had followed his own inclination, he would have ſuffered the Proteſtant religion to be deſtroyed by the emperor in Germany, ſince before the miniſtry of cardinal Richelieu, he did great ſervices to the Catholic cauſe in the empire. Here follow the words of Mr Gallois in the abſtract he gives of the embaſſy of the duke of Angouleſme, the count of Bethune and Chateauneuf, ſent by Lewis XIII into Germany, in 1620. 'The motive of this embaſſy was as glorious to France, as the ſucceſs of it was advantageous to the houſe of Auſtria. Ferdinand II ſucceeding to the empire, ſaw himſelf diſpoſſeſſed of the crown of Bohemia by the prince Palatine, and of that of Hungary by Bethlen Gabor. He ſaw at the ſame time the upper Auſtria revolted, and moſt of the Proteſtant princes in arms againſt him. The king might have peaceably waited the ruin of a prince, whoſe deſigns could not but be ſuſpected to him; but becauſe the Catholic religion might have ſuffered ſome diminution in Germany by the loſs of this prince, he choſe rather to ſupport him in his fall, than to ſuffer religion to fall along with him. He offered him a powerful aſſiſtance, and at the ſame time to ſuccour him with his counſels, and the authority of his name; he ſent the duke of Angouleſme, and Meſſieurs de Bethune and Chateauneuf, embaſſadors into Germany. Upon their arrival they made the treaty of Ulm, by which a ceſſation of arms was concluded betwixt the Catholics and the Proteſtants; which was the cauſe of gaining the battle of Prague, and afterwards of the re-eſtabliſhment of the emperor's affairs (51).' Do not imagine that this language is an artifice of the journaliſt; for the Proteſtants acknowledge (52): that this embaſſy was very ſerviceable to the emperor, and prejudicial to the princes, who were confederated againſt the houſe of Auſtria.

[*I*] *It*

(44) Vulcatius Gallicanus, in Avidio Caſſio, pag. m. 445, Tom. I, Hiſtor. Auguſtæ Script.

(45) Dio Chryſoſt. Orat. 34.

(46) Herodian. lib. iv, cap. v, pag. m. 187. *See the paſſage of Salluſt, cited in the* Critique Generale du Calviniſme de Maimbourg, pag. 299, Edit. 3.

(47) Memoirs de Mr de la Chaſtre, pag. m. 333.

(48) Silhon, Eclairciſſement de quelques difficultez touchant l'Adminiſtration du Cardinal Mazarin, lib. i, pag. 127. Edit. de Holl. in 12mo.

(49) *That is to ſay, the declaration of war againſt Spain in* 1635.

(50) Journal des Sçavans, Jan. 26, 1688, pag. 249, 250, Dutch Edit.

(51) Ibid. March 7, 1667, pag. m. 95.

(52) *See Wicquefort*, Traité de l'Ambaſſadeur, lib. i, pag. 448, & lib. ii, pag. 426.

him from theſe views of religion, and engaged him in a league with Holland. This was concluded in the year 1635, and at the ſame time war was declared againſt Spain. People will not allow that the preſſing ſollicitations of the United Provinces, was that which overcame the repugnancy of the French to this league. On the contrary, it is pretended, that it was the French who expreſſed the greateſt earneſtneſs for it [*I*]: Some ſay that the cardinal drove on this affair too faſt (*b*), and ground themſelves on the perplexity he was in the very ſecond campaign; but they do not conſider, that the ſublimeſt human underſtanding could never have foreſeen, that the firſt campaign would have gone as it did: it began with a compleat victory over the Spaniſh army, and according to all appearance muſt have diſabled them for ſeveral years: and yet in the iſſue was the pitifuleſt campaign that ever was [*K*]. The French have long ſince imputed the

fault

(*b*) *See the Memoirs of Montreſor*, Tom. I, pag. 74, & ſeq. *where the cardinal is much blamed.*

[*I*] *It is pretended it was the French expreſſed the greateſt earneſtneſs for it.*] Mr Huber, who has been ſome time dead (53), profeſſor of Law in the univerſity of Frieſland, pretends (54) that the court of France, fully reſolved upon the war, politickly concealed that deſign as long as the duke of Orleans was at Bruſſels. She made herſelf be courted by Holland, and this game laſted above a year; but after the return of the duke, and the defeat of the Swedes at Nortlingen, cardinal Richelieu expreſſed an earneſt deſire to enter into a league with Holland. ‘Neque tamen aliter ſe commiſere, quam ubi præter *Suecos*, etiam *Belgas fœderatos* ſtabili & fidenti fœdere ſibi conjunxiſſent, à quo multi in *Hollandia* imprimis, adhuc erant alieni. Mirum eſt, quanto ſtudio & fervore *Richelius* extremo tempore, *cum prius ſe rogari paſſus eſſet*, in hoc fœdere fabricando verſatus ſit, quod tandem confectum die 8. *Februar.* MDCXXXV (55).’ If you believe the French, the cardinal was not drawn out of his irreſolution but by the meer force of the engines the Hollanders played. We have already heard Mr Silhon (56) upon this; the following paſſage will tell us much more of it. ‘That which drew us out of that ſtate of uncertainty, and turned the ſcale againſt ſeveral conſiderations which were of weight in the king's and cardinal's mind, was the truce the Hollanders gave clearly to underſtand they would make, unleſs we reſolved on a war. The conſequences of this truce (if it had been made) were doubtleſs to be feared by us and our allies, but not ſo much as was then apprehended at court, and as father Joſeph and Charnaſſé, who laboured mightily at this wheel, endeavoured to repreſent it . . . . . The preſents which were not ſpared on the part of the States, during this purſuit, and afterwards, removed all the obſtacles that ſtood in the way. Beſides this, as the fear of the inconveniencies, with which the truce threatened us, had been the moſt powerful motive to make us hearken to the war, the hopes of the fruits we might reap by it, was no ſmall charm to draw us in. Almoſt one half of what Spain poſſeſſes in the Netherlands, was to have accrued to us by the articles of the treaty, and the diviſion between the Hollanders and us, was drawn up ſo nicely, that each had what lay moſt convenient for him in this imaginary ſpoil. With theſe engines they worked juſt as they pleaſed, and the zeal we manifeſted to follow all their motions was ſo great, that whereas they would have given us money to oblige us to break, if we had kept up the market, they obtained a great ſum from us, and would not receive it except in fifteen penny pieces and by weight, that they might more advantageouſly convert it into their own country coins. The beſt of all was our conſenting that the prince of Orange ſhould have the whole management of the war, and that our generals ſhould be only his ſubalterns, and receive their commands from him (57).’

[*K*] *It was the pitifuleſt campaign that ever was.*] Let us hear an hiſtorian who is neither a Frenchman nor a Hollander, nor Spaniard: ‘As the French, *ſays he* (58), marched towards Maeſtricht with above thirty thouſand men, and forty pieces of canon, prince Thomas with ſome troops which were not very ſtrong, attempted to diſpute their paſſage at Aveſneſs (59), where he was beaten, and loſt a great many men. Afterwards the victors advancing without oppoſition, joined the prince of Orange, who expected them with twenty thouſand foot, ſix thouſand horſe, and eighty pieces of canon. This army appeared terrible, both for it's numbers and valour, and the world was already in expectation of ſucceſſes anſwerable to the greatneſs of it's forces.’ But what were it's exploits? It forced a little pitiful town (60), where horrid barbarities were committed (61). ‘It pretended to march to Bruſſels; but the prince of Orange having retarded the march, gave the Spaniards time to come up with their army to it (62). It beſieged Louvain with the following ſucceſs (63): ‘The boldneſs of the aſſailants having been at firſt a little checked, the French army began to diſperſe; for the Hollanders ordering proviſions to be punctually brought from the neighbouring places for their own troops, did not leave enough for the French, who tho' by their bravery and ſtrength they might have ſurmounted all other perils, yet experienced that hunger was an invincible enemy. A great part died for want of bread, a greater part deſerted, who were afterwards killed by the peaſants; ſo that their forces being extreamly weakened, and proviſions failing, the generals agreed upon the neceſſity of raiſing the ſiege, and permitting of all to eſcape the beſt they could. The commanders and the remnant of the French army were reduced to come and take ſhipping in Holland, where the people laughed at them, ſeeing no more remain of a great army, which expected important conqueſts, than a handful of diſpirited people all in confuſion, and forced to take ſanctuary among their allies . . . (64). The French army was no ſooner diſperſed, but the terror, which before ſeized the provinces depending on Spain, ſeized the Hollanders in their turn, and pierced them to the heart. The count of Embden ſurprized the fort of Schenk . . . . which opens a paſſage into the heart of Holland. The prince of Orange, without loſing time, went to lay ſiege to it.’ Mr Nani commits a groſs fault here, he ſuppoſes, on one hand, that the Spaniards did not take the fort of Schenk till after the diſperſion of the French troops; and on the other that the French had no ſhare in the re-taking of this fort. Theſe are all falſhoods (65); Silhon ſpeaks of them in a quite different manner: ‘But farther, ſays he (66), *having firſt related the inſincerity of which he accuſes the* Hollanders, as if fortune had meant to put an opportunity into our hands of revenging our ſelves generouſly on the Hollanders, and returning good, for the ill which they had done us; ſhe permitted the Spaniards to ſurprize the fort of Schenk in the Betau, that is to give them entrance into the very bowels of Holland, ... (67). In theſe hard and melancholy circumſtances France was not wanting to them; and without remembering the treatment our army had met with from them, ſent orders to marſhal de Breze, who was the only commander left, not to ſeparate from the prince of Orange till the reduction of the fort of Schenk, which was done ſeveral months after it's attack.’

But here follow more myſterious reflexions. I have read in a book printed in 1664 (68), that the French complained that the Hollanders had ſuffered the fort of Schenk to be taken, in order to have a pretence of ſeparating the armies, whoſe conjunction gave them umbrage. Here follows the words of this book (69): ‘If you will believe the French they will give another account of it; for they ſay that this loſs was ſuffered by the conſent of the ſtates who being jealous to ſee the forces of ſo potent a king come too near their frontiers, let this fort be loſt on purpoſe, that they might have a pretence of ſeparating from the French army, to re-take the key of their country; and in maintenance of their poſition they alledge two reaſons, the firſt is, that no conſiderable garriſon was left in it, and that two men of war had retired the very day it was taken. The ſecond, that they deſignedly ſtarved their army; ſo that of forty thouſand men, there returned not above five thouſand into France; which words are not to be taken for an article of faith.’

[*L*] *The*

(53) *I write this the ſeventh of December*, 1695.

(54) Quanquam Gallis erat fixum animo, rebus *Hiſpanorum* labefactatis, ſpe certa magnorum progreſſuum, *in bellum adverſus illos erumpere*, tam callide tamen hoc conſilium diſſimularunt, ut à *Fœderatis*, quos interim modicis fovebant ſubſidiis, per *integrum annum ſequentem* ſe rogari & obſervari ſuſtinuerint. Priuſquam animum & arma detegerent, facto opus eſſe judicarunt, ut *Regis fratrem* cum matre *Bruxellis agentem*, ſibi reconciliarent, eumque in Gallia complecterentur. *Ulric. Huber, Hiſt. Civilis, Tom. III, pag.* 180.

(55) Ulric. Huber, ibid. pag. 182.

(56) *In the remark* [*H*], *citat.* (48).

(57) Silhon, ubi ſupra, pag. 127, 128.

(58) Baptiſte Nani, Hiſtoire de la Republique de Veniſe, Tom. IV, livr. x, pag. 7, Holland Edit. 1682.

(59) *He ſhould have ſaid* Avein

(60) Tillemont.

(61) *Plunder, murder, the raviſhing of women, and even of nuns, and the profanation of holy things, were dreadful. De Pontis attributes all this to the Dutch troops. The Spaniſh writers declaim very much upon it, to make the French odious. See the dicourſe which Don Franciſco de Quevedo addreſſed to the king of France.*

(62) Nani, Hiſt. de la Republique de Veniſe, Tom. IV, lib. x, pag. 7.

(63) Ibid. pag. 8.

(64) Ib pag. 10.

(65) *Read de Pontis and Puyſegur, who ſerved in the French army, you will find that the French were employed in the ſiege of Fort Schenk.*

(66) Silhon, ubi ſupra, pag. 133, 134.

(67) Ibid pag. 134, 135.

(68) *Intituled*, Apologie pour la Maiſon de Nauſſau, ou Refutation des Calomnies contenuës au livre intitulé, *De Stadbolderlijke Regeeringe, by P. L. J.*

(69) *Pag.* 295.

fault to the prince of Orange [*L*], generaliſſimo of the army, and have alſo ſaid, that cardinal Richelieu, with all his great genius, was deceived by the Hollanders [*M*]. The famous cavalier Nani has given too far into theſe French notions, as a Frieſland Civilian has ſhewn [*N*]. Lewis XIII died the fourteenth of May 1643, after a tedious

[*L*] . . . . *the French have imputed the whole blame to the prince of Orange.*] I do not cite the authors that have written ſince the year 1672; neither de Pontis (70) who repreſents this prince extremely vexed at the victory of Avein; nor abbot Bizot (71), who accuſes Holland of having acted a treacherous part at the ſiege of Louvain, and on ſome other occaſions. I ſhall cite a book printed in 1651, which ſpeaks after this manner (72): ‘ The Hollanders did not wait long to make us feel the effects of this jealouſy. The gaining the battle of Avein which attended the firſt motion of our arms, contrary to the expectation of all the world, no leſs alarmed them, than the Spaniards, who loſt it; and for fear this advantage ſhould draw others after it, as is uſual, and that our generals, marſhal Chaſtillon and marſhal Brezé, ſhould puſh the victory farther, the prince of Orange ſent them orders to come and join him. However, if Chaſtillon, who acted honeſtly in the things he was concerned in, had been hearkened to, they had gone and beſieged Namur, and there made a good eſtabliſhment, notwithſtanding the orders of the prince of Orange. But Brezé, who was in the confidence of the cabinet, and in the ſecret of affairs, oppoſed him, and made his colleague reſolve to obey their generalliſſimo according to the intention of the court. This was the firſt ſeed of diviſion, which afterwards ſo ripened between theſe two generals, that they came at laſt to draw their ſwords one againſt the other. . . . . (73). The prince of Orange marched our army ſo long about, without any other action except the ſiege of Tirlemont, and left it ſo deſtitute of ſubſiſtence, tho' he was obliged to furniſh it (74), that it mouldred away of itſelf; or rather we may ſay, that for want of ſuccouring it the Hollanders deſtroyed it without fighting, and had the ſpoils of it, which was very great and rich, almoſt for nothing. Beſides this, the conduct of the prince of Orange, and the tedious round-about marches of his army and ours, without any meaning or deſign gave the Spaniards leiſure to recover from the conſternation the battle of Avein had caſt them into, and to call a potent aſſiſtance from Germany, which put us almoſt upon the defenſive.’

Let us copy here a paſſage from a work I have often cited: ‘ much about the ſame time came the news of the defeat of Prince Thomas at Aveins, which cauſed a great conſternation in all the country; the French army afterwards advancing to the very gates of Bruſſels, never was ſuch a terror known among theſe people. The cardinal infant had already cauſed the moſt precious furniture of the palace to be removed to Antwerp, and ordered all his army to line the canal, being reſolved to abandon Bruſſels himſelf, if hunger and Picolomini, who arrived with the German ſuccours, had not forced our army to retire. It was alſo ſaid, that the prince of Orange was not overjoyed to ſee them ſo far advanced into the country. The queen-mother and Madam, were already fled to Antwerp, where their officers were forced to conceal themſelves a good while, to avoid the fury of the people, who deteſted the French nation ſince the ſacking of Tirlemont (75).’ What might not a general have done, who had known how to make uſe of this ſtrange conſternation, which had ſeized the court of Bruſſels? A Roman conſul in the like caſe would have given a good account of a whole province, before the end of the year.

[*M*] *Cardinal Richelieu . . . . was deceived by the Hollanders.*] They ‘ were to attack the Spaniſh provinces with fifty thouſand foot, and ten thouſand horſe . . . . they had divided the conqueſts after this manner: Luxemburgh, Namur, Hainault, Artoiſe, and Cambreſis were to be the portion of France, with a part of Flanders on this ſide the line that was to be drawn from Blachembergt, betwixt Bruges and Dam, including in it Ruremond. The reſt was to fall to the States of Holland, which promiſed to leave the Catholic religion, in poſſeſſion of the places where it was eſtabliſhed. It was agreed alſo to make neither peace nor truce, but with joint conſent, and to enter into no accommodation nor treaty, till the Spaniards were intirely driven out of the Low-Countries. They were to beſiege the places alternately, firſt one of thoſe that was deſigned for France, and then one of thoſe aſſigned to Holland; and to leave the generals of the army the choice of attacking, which they thought fit. They were beſides this to maintain jointly a naval force at ſea. France was to declare war with the emperor, or any other prince, who upon this occaſion ſhould attempt to diſturb the States of the United Provinces (76).’ This occaſions a dilemma; either cardinal Richelieu was perſuaded that the Hollanders would obſerve this treaty, or he was not. If he was perſuaded of it, where was his underſtanding? Does not the leaſt common ſenſe dictate, that it was incomparably more the intereſt of Holland, that Spain ſhould preſerve a part of the Low-Countries, than that they ſhould be intirely divided betwixt France and the United Provinces? If cardinal Richelieu did not think that Holland was ſimple enough to conſent, that Spain ſhould loſe all this country, he was very ſimple himſelf to make a treaty, which he knew Holland would never execute, and which the public good, the ſovereign law of ſtates, could never permit them to execute. I confeſs, that it is hard to draw the cardinal out of this labyrinth, and not to ſee, that he committed a groſs blunder, unleſs we ſay, that the poor condition the Swedes were reduced to, and the barbarous affront France had received, by the detention of the archbiſhop of Treves, would not ſuffer this crown to leave Spain at reſt, but ingaged it in a league with Holland upon conditions, which it knew would never be intirely executed. The preſent evil required, that France ſhould be ſatisfied with the execution of one part, and let time work out the reſt. Here follows Mr Silhon's reflexions (77).

‘ The Hollanders by this means (78) compaſſed two points, which were very much to their advantage; one was the embarking us in the ſame war they were engaged in, which it was in all appearance impoſſible for them ever to get out of but by a peace, which would make them be acknowledged for ſovereigns, by thoſe who looked on them as ſubjects; which was what was propoſed in their treaty with us. The other, that though the diviſion agreed on, if it came to be accompliſhed, muſt be an eternal principle of jealouſy; and they muſt believe, that the having us for their neighbours, inſtead of the Spaniards, was only changing their fears, and perhaps making their condition worſe; yet they thought it more eligible to expoſe themſelves to a certain evil, againſt which there were many remedies, to obtain a preſent and very important good, namely, that of making us partners in their fortune; that is to ſay, of giving themſelves by this alliance, a more firm and ſolid baſis than they had before. It is true, they would have allowed us to make our ſelves maſters of the maritime towns, which were ſo fatal to their commerce in the hands of the Spaniards, or even of ſome other places which were frontiers to ours. But for us to eſtabliſh ourſelves in the heart of Flanders, and in the places which were near them, was that which made them uneaſy, and which they hoped the courſe of the war would hinder of itſelf, or that they themſelves ſhould find means to divert it, either by ceaſing to act againſt the Spaniards, and employing, as they always did, a great part of their forces; or taking an opportunity of reconciling themſelves to them, under any plauſible pretence, which the ſtate of affairs might offer.’

[*N*] *A Frieſland Civilian has ſhewn it to the cavalier Nani.*] This cavalier imagined, that prince Frederic Henry ſuffered the French army to periſh, to revenge himſelf of an injury he had received from cardinal Richelieu; and that he ſought an occaſion of

(70) De Pontis, Memoires, Tom. II, pag. 76, 77.

(71) Hollande Metallique. *See the* Journal des Scavans, January 10, 1688, pag. 237. Edit. Holl.

(72) Silhon, ubi ſupra, pag. 131.

(73) Ibid. pag. 133.

(74) *Mr Huber denies this. See the remark* [*N*], *citat.* (80).

(75) *Memoires of the Duke of Orleans, pag.* 271, 272.

(76) Nani, ubi ſupra, pag. 5.

(77) Silhon, ubi ſupra, pag. 130, 131.

(78) *That is to ſay, by the treaty concluded with France.*

dious ſickneſs, and ſo weary of his condition, that he ceaſed not to repeat theſe words of holy Job, *Tædet animam meam vitæ meæ* (c). He had been a lover of war, and perſonally aſſiſted in ſeveral fine expeditions. He bore the ſirname of *Juſt*; a title, which, according to the maxim of the antients, includes all moral virtues (*d*). He never loved reading, after they had diſguſted him by making him read a book which he diſliked [*O*]. We may ſay, generally ſpeaking, that he had not been well inſtructed in learning, and that he never loved it [*P*]. And yet, upon ſeveral occaſions, he diſcovered

making it appear to all Europe, that himſelf was the greater genius of the two. *There is no doubt,* ſays he (79), *but that as the United Provinces had agreed to all the articles which obliged the French to an open rupture with Spain, they feared nothing ſo much, after the obtaining their deſires, as having them for their neighbours, under the pretence of friendſhip. To the general intereſt of Holland, were added the particular reſentments of the prince of Orange, againſt Richelieu; for the latter, though he outwardly profeſſed a friendſhip for the prince, and an intimacy with him; had endeavoured, but a few years before, by ſome ſecret practice, to make himſelf maſter of Orange, a town whereof the eldeſt ſons of the houſe of Naſſau bear the name, and which is ſituate towards Dauphiné; but as this deſign did not ſucceed, the cardinal concealed the thing as much as poſſible, and prevented it's being talked of. Frederic Henry on his part diſſembled this injury with as great artifice as had been uſed to ſuppreſs it, and waited a favourable occaſion to revenge himſelf. At laſt this prince found the means to make the people ſay of him, that if by the taking of ſeveral places of importance, he had obtained the reputation of great courage and military experience, he could not be denied in the world, the praiſe of a great and conſummate politician, ſince he outwitted Richelieu: however, Richelieu ſeeing a neceſſity for the alliance of the Hollanders, and the friendſhip of this prince in the war he had undertaken, deſpiſed leſſer revenges to apply himſelf to the greater.* Let us ſee Mr Huber's anſwer.

I. He ſays, that if the French wanted proviſions, it was their own fault; why did not they provide magazines? The treaty did not import, that Holland was to furniſh them with the neceſſary proviſions (80); that if the ſuttlers choſe to ſell their goods to the Hollanders rather than to the French, it was becauſe the latter wanted money, and obſerved no diſcipline (81). II. That it was in the Hollanders power to remove the king of France's territories from their frontiers, by making peace with Spain, and that the hatred they had for the Spaniſh nation, did not give them time to reflect upon the evil of being next neighbours to France (82), and that after all cavalier Nani judges of their manners by the myſterious artifices of Italy. *Non eſt dubium quin* Nanius *Belgarum ingenia moreſque ſecundum* Italos *eorumque profundas artes æſtimet* (83). III. That the prince of Orange being generaliſſimo of the two armies, and having earneſtly endeavoured to bring this league to a concluſion, there is no probability, that to revenge himſelf of ſome practices of the cardinal, he would deprive himſelf of the glory of a proſperous campaign, nor expoſe the republic to the reſentment of ſo neceſſary and formidable an ally. IV. Laſtly, that the alliance having ſubſiſted for twelve years, the French never complained of this pretended perfidy. *Arauſionenſis ſummo ſtudio belli ſocietatem procuraverat. Imperium in ipſum Gallorum exercitum ſuo conjunctum acceperat, ut omnis gloria in ipſum redundaret: hoc unice in eam gratiam, ut propter evanidas in Arcem* Arauſionenſem *inſidias à Richelio propoſitas, Regem potentiſſimum deformi proditione lethaliter offenderet? Remque publicam tunc ejus amicitiæ indignam daret præcipitem, & Societatem tanta Principis ipſius cura ſtudioque contractam incontinenti abrumperet? Quid enim aliud ab immani proditione perfidiaque poterat expectari? Cum tamen eadem Societas per duodecim annos continuata ſit, nec quicquam ejuſmodi tunc temporis vel unquam poſtea Galli de fœderatis Belgis, etiam cum irati eſſent, conqueſti fuerint* (84),

I do not think we can oppoſe to theſe reaſons of Mr Huber, what Mr du Maurier relates concerning the uneaſineſs which prince Frederic Henry gave to cardinal Richelieu, in order to be revenged for the enterprize he had formed upon the principality of Orange. This author ſays (85), *that the prince concealed his reſentment in his heart, and waited for a favourable opportunity to expreſs it, which happened to preſent not long after; for . . . .* (86) *the army of France having totally routed the Spaniſh forces at Avein, joined the prince of Orange, after having pillaged a part of Brabant; but the prince, who always had at heart the affair of Orange, and who liked the neighbourhood of the French, no better than that of the Spaniards, by a ſcarcity of proviſions and ſubſiſtance, ruined our victorious army, which, retiring into Holland, after the raiſing the ſiege of Louvain, under the pretence of the approach of Picolomini with the German army, periſhed there for the moſt part, of hunger, poverty, and diſeaſes, the ſixth part not returning into the kingdom. The prince of Orange looked upon cardinal Richelieu as a reconciled enemy, who courted him only becauſe he had a neceſſary occaſion for him; and therefore, underhand, gave him all the diſcontents imaginable, favourably receiving all thoſe who were diſgraced in France, and honouring them with the nobleſt employs, and even with his intimacy; among others, Mr Hauterive, and Mr Beringhen, whom he reſpected as much to vex the cardinal, as for any merit of theirs; and cardinal Richelieu, as potent as he was, ſaw himſelf obliged to ſwallow theſe pills, his affairs neceſſarily requiring a diverſion on the part of Holland . . . . . .* (87) *Thus he continued to court the friendſhip of the prince of Orange, and it was agreed, that each ſhould forthwith attack the common enemy on his ſide. From that time he kept up a faithful and perfect correſpondence with the prince; and the prince, who was ſufficiently revenged, and drew great advantages from the alliance with France, afterwards executed the treaties ſincerely.* It is manifeſt, that this is only a copy of the cavalier Nani's ſlanders; and beſides, as du Maurier's memoirs were wrote after the year 1672, they were not fit to be alledged as an authority. However, we may by this fact ſee to what great misfortunes a king is expoſed, when he is ſerved by a prime miniſter, who is perſonally hated in the country of his allies. Lewis XIII would have had the fatal experience of it; they would have ſacrificed his armies, to the paſſion of being revenged on his cardinal. This ſacrifice would have been a very ingenious way of revenge; for nothing is more likely to ruin a prime miniſter, than the bad ſucceſs of a war. But let us not believe all this ſyſtem of the Venetian Hiſtorian, and Mr du Maurier.

[*O*] *They gave him an averſion to reading, by making him read a book he diſliked.*] *Lewis XIII, not being conducted according to his inclinations, nor by the way his genius led him to, was ſo tired with the uſeful, but diſagreeable, reading of Fauchet's Antiquities, that it gave him a general and inveterate averſion for all ſorts of books, which could not be cured to his life's end.* The author from whom I borrow theſe words (88), cites Gomberville, *in the Doctrine of Manners,* and places this fact under the twenty fourth of March. I know not why he choſe that day. See the Menagiana, where you will find what follows (89): *Mr de Gomberville, of the French academy, was ſon to the Buvetier, (or maſter of the victualling-office) of the chamber of accompts. He has written in his* book concerning the Doctrine of Manners, *that what diſcouraged Lewis XIII from ſtudy, was their giving him Fauchet's Hiſtory of France to read. The bad language of this author gave him a diſguſt, though otherwiſe there were ſome good things in him.*

[*P*] *He had not been well inſtructed in learning, and he never loved it.*] Mr le Vaſſor, who has publiſhed the firſt volume of the Hiſtory Lewis XIII, obſerves, with wonder, that he has found but *few things* concerning this king's *education* (90). He ſays, that the governor (91) whom Henry IV appointed him, had not *qualities equal to that important employ, and* that the *picture an author* (92) *has lately given us, of the extravagant and romantic amours of the wholly Epicurean*

(c) *My ſoul is weary of my life.* Job x, 1.

(*d*) 'Εν δὲ δικαιοσύνῃ συλλήβδην πᾶσ' ἀρετή ἐστιν. In juſtitia autem comprehenſim omnis virtus ineſt. *Theognis, ver.* 147.

(79) Nani, ubi ſupra, pag. 9.

(80) In fœdere non erat comprehenſum, ut *Belgæ* in hoſtili ſolo *Gallis* de commeatu proſpicerent; id ipſis incumbebat pro ſe, uti *Belgæ* pro ſuis id ſatagerunt. *Ulricus Huber, Hiſtoria Civilis, Tom. III, pag.* 188.

(81) Si negotiatores *Belgis* quam *Gallis* vendere maluerint, ac inde *Gallorum* inopia ſit orta, id horum rapinis & ſtipendiorum defectui imputandum. Si hac fiducia *Brabantiam* ingreſſi ſunt, quod *Batavi* illos alerent, male rationem putaverunt. *Id. ibid.*

(82) Nihil eſt certius quam odium *Hiſpanicæ gentis* pleriſque *Belgis* tum nequedum permiſiſſe ut *quantum à Gallorum vicinia periculum immineret*, ad animum revocarent. *Id. ibid. pag.* 189.

(83) Id. ibid.

(84) Id. ibid. pag. 189, 190.

(85) Du Maurier, Memoir pour l'Hiſt. de Hollande, pag 321.

(86) Id. ibid. pag. 322.

(87) Id. ibid. pag 324.

(88) *Father David l'Enfant, a Dominican,* Hiſt. Generale de tous les Siecles de la nouvelle Loi, *Month of March pag.* 160.

(89) Menagiana, pag. 219, *of the firſt Dutch Edit.*

(90) Le Vaſſor, Hiſt. de Louis XIII, Tom. I, pag. 667.

(91) Gilles de Souvré.

(92) *Vigneul de Marville, in his* Melanges d'Hiſtoire & de Litterature. *See alſo the firſt Tome of the* Chevræana, pag. 292, & ſeq. Edit. Holland.

vered a great delicacy of wit [*Q*]. I ſhall tranſcribe the character given him in the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes [*R*]. The ſame reaſon which, in ſeveral other articles, hinders my relating a ſeries of actions, according to the order of time, has hindered my doing ſo here; which is, that I would not repeat what is to be found in Moreri. I am ſurprized, that he ſhould forget the ſolemn act, by which Lewis XIII put his perſon and kingdom under the protection of the holy Virgin (*e*). Mr Godeau exerciſed his muſe on this ſubject, with little judgment. A learned critic attacked him upon it with great force [*S*]. I forgot

(*e*) *See the remark* [*S*].

curean life and death of Vauquelin des Yvetaux, firſt preceptor to Lewis XIII, is a certain proof, that Henry IV, who had made choice of him, was not a good judge of men of merit (93). He adds, that a year after the death of Henry IV Vauquelin loſt this employment, *through the jealouſy of ſome people, and that Nicolas le Fevre ſucceeded him, a man diſtinguiſhed for his learning and piety, and died a year after, and that Fleurance Rivaut, an able Mathematician, ſay they, aſcended from the poſt of ſub-preceptor, to that of preceptor in chief. A young man,* continues he, *who paſſes through ſo many different hands, ſeldom makes any great proficiency.*

It is certain, that Nicolas Vauquelin, Sieur des Yvetaux, had wit and learning. He was ſon to Mr de la Freſnaïe, *preſident to the Bailliwic, and preſidial ſeat of Caen, in the year* 1605, *of whom a great collection of verſes had been printed at Caen* (94). Nicolas le Fevre was of Paris, a man of great merit, and of an exact, profound, and extenſive knowledge, great probity, and incomparable modeſty. Moreri's article of him is good. See alſo the elogies, which Caſaubon hath given him (95). He was choſen by Henry IV to inſtruct the prince of Condé (96), but not to be preceptor to the Dauphin, as le Grain affirms (97). He was raiſed to this preferment, under the regency of Mary de Medicis (98). He died the third of November, 1612, aged ſixty eight years and ſome months. But let us ſuppoſe, as much as you pleaſe, that both he and des Yvetaux were men of great merit, and that the quality of a good preceptor, a quality more rare than that of preceptor is common, was united in them to that of being learned: we could not thence conclude, that Lewis XIII had been well educated; for they were but a very ſmall time directors of his ſtudies. We ſhould know how they acquitted their charge, who came after le Fevre. We cannot be over-prejudiced in their favour, when we conſider, that they perſiſted in making him read Fauchet's works, which diſguſted him. This was not the way to form his taſte, but diſcourage him. It is ſaid however, that he grew very nice upon the point of eloquence, and that the haranguers of that time infinitely diſpleaſed him, though his own encomiums were the ſubject matter. Here is my witneſs (99): *Always to praiſe, always to admire, and to this purpoſe to make uſe of periods a mile long, and exclamations that reach the ſkies, vexes even thoſe whom we praiſe and admire. The victorious complain of it in the midſt of their triumphs. And I know from good hands, that the late king beholding himſelf one day in a glaſs, and wondering at the great number of his grey heirs, charged them upon the complimenters of his kingdom, and their long periods. He ſaid to the perſon from whom I have it, theſe remarkable words,* I fancy, it is the harangues that have been made me ſince my coming to the crown, and particularly thoſe of Monſieur le **** that have made me grey ſo ſoon.

[*Q*] *On many occaſions he diſcovered great fineneſs of parts.*] If what Balzac has been telling us, does not ſeem a good commentary upon this text, what will you ſay after reading theſe words of the chevalier de Meré? *How comes it then that this court is ſo different from what it was heretofore? Henry the Great, who judged well of every thing, though he had hardly ſtudied any thing but military affairs, and the late king, in my opinion, have not a little contributed to it. This prince, whom we have ſeen, had a delicate wit, and ſaid excellent things. Can any thing be more agreeable than this ſaying:* put on your hat, Brion; my brother gives you leave. *And ſo many others which I could cite. As he loved good raillery, he very much diſliked that which was bad; and the C. D. R. had like to have been diſgraced, for having written to M. D. E. in a kind of raillery, though all the guilt of it conſiſted in it's being dull* (100). A great many readers will better underſtand the meaning of, *Put on your hat, Brion,* &c. if I tell the ſtory a little at large, as Mr Bourſault has related it. 'The late duke of Orleans, Gaſton of 'France, was ſo jealous of the rights belonging to 'his quality, that upon this head, he never excuſed any body. To have the pleaſure of ſeeing the 'princes of the blood uncovered before him whenever 'he found an opportunity of ſpeaking to them, he 'kept them as long as poſſibly he could, and never 'uncovered himſelf one ſingle moment, for fear of 'forgetting his own quality. Lewis XIII going one 'day from Paris to St Germain, in the exceſſive heat, 'in company of the duke of Orleans, the lords, who 'were bare-headed at the ſides of the coach, were 'hardly able to bear the violence of the ſun. The 'king perceiving how they ſuffered, had the good 'nature to ſay to them; *Cover yourſelves, gentlemen, 'cover yourſelves, my brother gives you leave* (101).'

[*R*] *I ſhall tranſcribe the character that is given him in the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes.*] 'He was 'jealous of his power even to exceſs, though he 'could neither underſtand nor enjoy it. He could 'never, in the whole courſe of his life, either exerciſe it himſelf, or ſuffer it in the hands of another. 'It was equally impoſſible for him not to raiſe his 'favourites to an exceeding power, and to bear with 'them in the grandeur, to which he himſelf had 'raiſed them. By enriching them, he made them diſagreeable to him. The exceſs of his complaiſance to 'them, was the firſt degree of his hatred; and I do 'not know, whether we can find in his hiſtory, the 'example of a favourite, whoſe death or fall he lamented. But he always concealed his ſentiments; 'and becauſe he communicated them to few people, 'they who will have the conduct of princes to be always 'myſterious, accuſe him of a black and profound diſſimulation. To ſay the real truth, the reaſon of his 'ſilence was, that he neither truſted himſelf, nor any 'body elſe; and was very timerous and weak. Almoſt all that have ſpoken of him, acknowledge he 'had courage; that in danger he loſt not his judgment; that he loved and underſtood war; that he 'was maſter of much fine knowledge; but that he 'had not the art of reigning (102).' This picture ſeems pretty well drawn to the life.

[*S*] *A learned critic attacked Mr Godeau with great force.*] The king's declaration concerning this act of devotion to the holy Virgin, is dated the tenth of February, 1638. You will find it entire in the French Mercury (103); I will only take this part of it: 'FOR THESE CAUSES we have declared, 'and do declare, that taking the moſt holy and glorious Virgin, for the ſpecial protectreſs of our kingdom, we particularly conſecrate to her our perſon, 'our ſtate, our crown, and our ſubjects, beſeeching 'her to inſpire us with a holy conduct, and to defend this kingdom ſo carefully againſt the efforts 'of all it's enemies, that whether it ſuffers the ſcourge 'of war, or enjoys the calms of peace, which we beg 'of God with all our heart, it may never depart 'out of the ways of grace, which lead to thoſe of 'glory. And that poſterity may never fail to purſue our deſires upon this ſubject, for the immortal 'remembrance, and in teſtimony of the preſent conſecration, which we make, we will cauſe the great 'altar of the cathedral church of Paris to be built 'anew, with an image of the Virgin embracing her 'precious ſon in her arms, deſcended from the croſs; 'we will be repreſented at the feet of the ſon and of 'the mother, offering them our crown and ſcepter. 'We admoniſh the archbiſhop of Paris, and enjoin 'him, that he annually, on the day and feaſt of the 'Aſſumption, make a commemoration of our preſent 'declaration, in the high maſs, which ſhall be ſaid in 'his cathedral church, and after the veſpers of the 'ſame day, that a proceſſion be made in the ſaid 'church, at which all the ſovereign companies ſhall 'aſſiſt, and the body of the city, with equal ceremony, 'as is obſerved at the moſt ſolemn general proceſ'ſions.

(93) Le Vaſſor, ubi ſupra, pag. 668.

(94) *The Abbot de Marolles, in his liſt of authors, who had preſented him with their books.*

(95) Caſaub. Exercit. xvi, in Baron. cap. lxxx, pag. m. 551.

(96) Continuat. Thuani, pag. 318.

(97) Le Grain, Décade de Louis XIII, pag. 2.

(98) Contin. Thuani, ibid.

(99) Balzac, Avant-propos du Socrate Chriſtien, fol. ciiij.

(100) Chevalier de Meré, Traité de l'Eſprit, pag. 23. Edit. de Hollande.

(102) Bourſault, Lettres Nouvelles, pag 381. Edit. de Holl.

(103) Hiſtoire de l'Edit. de Nantes, Tom. II, lib. v, pag. 220.

(103) Tom. XXII, pag. 284, & ſeq. *See the* Hiſtoire de l'Edit. de Nantes, Tom. II, pag. 578.

I forgot to ſay, that the royal authority was more powerfully exerted under the reign of Lewis XIII, than it had ever been in France [*T*]; and I do not believe the parliament of Paris

‘ ſions. Which we will alſo have done in all churches, both parochial and monaſterial of the ſaid city and ſuburbs; and in all towns, boroughs, and villages, of the ſaid dioceſe of Paris. We in like manner exhort all archbiſhops and biſhops of our kingdom, and at the ſame time enjoin them, to cauſe the ſame ſolemnity to be celebrated in the epiſcopal churches, and other churches of their dioceſes.’

Mr Godeau made a hymn upon this occaſion, in which the king, ſpeaking to the Holy Virgin, ſets off the extraordinary merit of cardinal Richelieu, and acknowledges him not only as his colleague, but as a colleague who watched in order to let his aſſociate ſleep. The Jeſuit (104) who cenſured Mr Godeau, exceeded the bounds of modeſty and moderation; but at the bottom he had reaſon for cenſuring this conduct. I will give you his cenſure ſomewhat at large, and do not fear being blamed for it, as I may poſſibly be for ſeveral other citations out of books, which are very common; for this Jeſuit's book is ſcarce known, and hardly to be met with. We will therefore boldly cite a large piece of it, which will inform us, that Lewis XIII did not love to have his firſt miniſter praiſed at his own coſt. He was ſenſible of his dependance, but he did not care that any body ſhould know it, and it is even certain, that the cardinal dextrouſly managed his maſter's delicacy, both in his words, and his external conduct. So that Mr Godeau made uſe of flatteries, which were neither agreeable to decorum, nor to prudence (105). ‘ Cùm Ludovicum XIII offerentem ſe ac regnum Mariæ Virgini, induceret, huic de iſto ſermonem affinxit, qui totus abhorreat à regis ſenſu & conſuetudine, Cardinalis prudentia, ac voluntate, rei natura. Quid attinuit à rege, ſanctis ac religioſis ſuis ad Dei matrem precibus, cujuſquam mortalis laudes admiſceri? quid neceſſe fuit, minutè atque enucleatè exaggerari? quid convenit tam multis in tam exiguo carmine? . . . . . . Verùm remitto peſſimi poëtæ errata, atque condono. Quis hoc, Antoni, tibi ignoſcat, vel civis bonus, vel vir non exeors, quòd regi ſocium & conſortem regni invidioſiſſimè addidiſti?

(104) Francis Vavaſſeur diſguiſed under the name of Candidus Heſychius.

(105) Anton. Godellus, Epiſcopus Graſſenſis, utrum Poëta, pag. 82, & ſeq.

Tandis * *qu'un ſi ſage Miniſtre*
Avec moy tiendra le timon.

* Pag. 136.

‘ Quid ais, perduellis? *Tenir le timon avec le Roy*, tenere clavum & principatum cum rege pariter? neque eſt enim iſtuc pro regem agere, ſed unà cum rege regem eſſe. Quod ſi de filio regis unico, herede proximo & vero, patre vivo, dicas, crimen imminutæ majeſtatis incurras: Cùm de alieno, de cive, de adminiſtro, de eo, qui hoc ſine ſcelere cogitare non auſit, dixeris; omni culpa, reprehenſione, pœna liber ſis? Neſcis quàm retinens Ludovicus auctoritatis? quàm nihil hujus perferens, unde peti vel tantulum majeſtas videretur? quàm gnarus iſtorum cardinalis, neque quidquam tam verens, quàm ne quis iſtiuſmodi parum conſideratus ſermo & improbus ac ſeditioſus ad aures regis accederet, aut in vulgus ſerperet? ut mirum ſit, ni apud utrumque, ſi modo legere ſcriptiunculam iſtam tuam curavit, graviter offenderis. Præſertim cùm nihil excuſare poſſes, neque hoc tibi imprudenti excidiſſe, neque ullis verſus anguſtiis, ac neceſſitate coactum feciſſe; cui tam facile fuerit tam apertum nefas advertere, & invidiam verbis atque aſperitatem vel tollere omnino, vel ſic mitigare: *Tandis qu'un ſi ſage Miniſtre Deſſous moy tiendra le timon* . . . . Quod ſequitur, ſatis ridiculum, eumdem Cardinalem unum opponi inferis ac dæmonibus cunctis: ** *Les enfers n'ont point de demon, dont je craigne rien de ſiniſtre.* Et hoc arrogans ac propè impium. † *C'eſt par luy que tout m'eſt poſſible.* Nempe ſi Cardinalis affuiſſet, non eſſet rex mortuus. Vitandum ſane fuit, ut ne id uſurpares, in quo aperta aſſentatio minimum eſt, quod reprehendatur, illum ipſum regem futurum fuiſſe, niſi regi adjutor & comes adjunctus eſſet. ‡ *Et vous en euſſiez fait un Roy, &c.* Non poſſum verò tibi, Godelle, non ſuccenſere, quòd in tam effuſis adminiſtri regii laudibus, regem deprimis, & nobis exhibes ſomniculoſum, ac nihil agentem, qui hoc etiam confiteatur de ſe:

** Pag. 135.

† Pag. 137.

‡ Ibid.

Je ‡ gouſte en repos le ſommeil, *&c.*

‡ Ibid.

‘ Quem porrò regem? vigilantiſſimum, laborioſiſſimum, patientia injuriarum cœli ac terræ inſignem, qui multiplici & diverſa in ultimas regni oras expeditione, valetudinem & corpus amiſit, neque vitam longiùs, quàm in quartum & quadrageſimum annum produxit (106). — *When he introduces Lewis XIII, offering himſelf and his kingdom to the Virgin Mary; he ſpeaks in ſuch a manner as is abſolutely repugnant to the king's deſign, and conſtant manner of behaviour, to the prudence and intention of the cardinal, and even to the nature of the thing. For what grounds did his majeſty give him to mix with his moſt religious and pious prayers to the mother of GOD the praiſes of any mortal? What neceſſity was there for exaggerating, or diſtinctly, and minutely dwelling upon them? Why this waſte of panegyric in ſo ſhort a poem . . . . But theſe errors of that wretched Poet, I forgive and paſs by. But who, Mr Godeau being either a good ſubject, or a man of any ſpirit, will not obſerve that you have moſt invidiouſly given the king a partner and aſſociate in power.*

(106) *Father Vavaſſeur is miſtaken: Lewis XIII lived but forty one years, and about eight months.*

While this ſtateſman grave and great
Guides with me the helm of ſtate.

‘ *What ſay'ſt thou, traitor?* Hold the helm with the king, *to poſſeſs equal power and authority with his prince? For this is not to act as a viceroy, but to be a king as well as his maſter. If you had ſaid this of the king's only ſon, the next and indubitable heir of the crown, in the life-time of his father, you had certainly treſpaſſed upon majeſty; but when you ſay this of another, of a ſubject, a ſervant of the crown, one who cannot entertain a thought of this ſort without guilt, do you either think yourſelf innocent, or that you ſhall eſcape without reproof? Are you ignorant that Lewis ſtill retains his authority? That he is extreamly nice in theſe things, and will not bear the leaſt encroachment on his power, that the cardinal, well verſed in ſuch things, fears nothing more than that ſuch wicked and inconſiderate ſpeeches, ſhould either come to the king's ear, or be diffuſed among the people, ſo that it is to be wondered, if either of them thought your poem worth reading, you did not grievouſly offend both, eſpecially when you have no excuſe left, and cannot palliate your imprudence, by pretending that this dropped from you unawares, or that your verſe required it, and that you were under a neceſſity of writing in that manner, ſince it was ſo eaſy, ſo natural to obſerve the rancour and miſchief of theſe words, and to have taken the roughneſs away, or to have ſoftened them in this manner:* While ſo wiſe a miniſter under me holds the helm. . . . . *What follows is ridiculous enough, the cardinal alone is made a match for hell, and all the powers of darkneſs.* I fear not what hell or the devil can do againſt me. *And again, what is not only arrogant, but impious.* Thro' him every thing is to me poſſible. *So then if the cardinal had been preſent the king had not died. It was fit to omit a paſſage, in which open flattery is the leaſt thing which deſerves reprehenſion, and wherein it is ſaid, that he would have been a king if he had not been an aſſiſtant and coadjutor to the king.* And you yourſelf had been a king, &c. *Neither can I avoid being angry with you,* Godeau, *becauſe in ſuch a torrent of praiſes as you have beſtowed upon the royal ſervant, you at the ſame time depreſs the king, and repreſent him to us a drowſy indolent prince, nay make him confeſs this of himſelf:*

In peace I ſleep my time away.

‘ *But what king was this? One the moſt vigilant, the moſt indefatigable, the moſt patient under the injuries of the weather, and who, by frequent journies into the moſt diſtant parts of his dominions, impaired his health, and waſted his body, nor could produce his thread of life, to a greater length than forty four years.*’

[*T*] *The royal authority was more powerfully exerted . . . . than it had ever been in France.*] A remarkable thing! The royal power was more ſtrongly eſtabliſhed

Paris ever ſuffered a more ſhameful mortification, than what it was forced to ſubmit to in 1631 [*U*]. It is true, this illuſtrious body ſeemed a little to have forgot it's duty, and had the miſfortune to ſuffer it ſelf to be carried away by the artifices of ſome factious ſpirits. I ſhall examine perhaps in another place (*f*), the Horoſcope, that is found in Sulli's Memoirs.

It is very probable that Lewis XIII was not ſorry for the death of cardinal Richelieu; for he was a man he feared but loved not; and whom he would have been gladly rid of, if powerful reaſons had not prevailed. He imagined, amongſt other things, that his troops being

eſtabliſhed under a prince who neither enjoyed authority nor abſolute liberty himſelf, than it had been under monarchs leaſt depending on their miniſters, and the beſt ſkilled in the art of Governing. It is properly under Lewis XIII, and not in the reign of Lewis XI, that the kings of France had their manumiſſion. This muſt be aſcribed to cardinal Richelieu; it is he that began the work of arbitrary power, and carried it on pretty near to perfection; but not ſo near, as was then complained of; the ſucceeding time has ſhewn, that ſeveral things were wanting to this work, which have been ſince added, or are adding at preſent. The people and magiſtrates were ſenſible of this innovation, and murmured at it (107); it was the ſubject of a thouſand diſcourſes. Coſtar argued once againſt a politician, who maintained, ‘that no princes were more dangerous, than ſuch as a Latin Poet (108) calls *nimium reges, ſovereigns that are too much ſovereigns; and kings that are too much kings.*’ They who would ſee Mr Coſtar's reaſons, need only read the laſt letter of his Dialogues: ‘Under weak reigns, *ſays he* (109), foreign and domeſtic wars are inevitable. If a king is not abſolute at home, it is impoſſible he ſhould be feared abroad, and the contempt which his enemies will have of his forces will neceſſarily excite their ambition and their avarice . . . Provided the cardinal be ſuffered to act, provided God deſigns not only to have ſhown him to mankind, but to ſuffer us to enjoy for many years the great preſent he has made us by giving him to the world; all theſe little taſſel-hawks of kings, which in ſome ſort divided the kingdom (110), will ſee their tyranny at an end; and if they are any farther conſiderable, it will not be for the power of doing ill, but only for the merit of their perſons, and the uſefulneſs of their ſervices. . . . . The people for a long time have been compared to the ſea (111), which is naturally calm and ſmooth, unleſs diſturbed by the violence of the winds; but our wiſe pilot has found out a way of binding them, ſhutting them up, and maſtering them: ſo that in the condition he has placed us, if any trouble or ſedition could poſſibly riſe, for want of heads to conduct and ſupport it, the remedies would be as eaſy as the cauſes would be light; for this multitude we ſpeak of is a monſter, whoſe heart as well as brains is in it's head. And Tacitus has ſaid of the populace, *that without a guide*, it trembles, is frighted, and ſtunned: *Vulgus ſine rectore, pavidum, ſocors.*’ Thus he apologizes for the ſentences of baniſhment and death, to which recourſe was forced to be had to diſperſe the factions. ‘In the inteſtine diſeaſes, *adds he* (112), with which France laboured, there was a neceſſity to repeat bleeding to ſave it's life.’

[*U*] *I do not believe that the parliament of Paris ever ſuffered a more ſhameful mortification than in* 1631.] The king being adviſed of the preparations for war, which were made in favour of the duke of Orleans, almoſt throughout the kingdom (113), and that Burgundy was to be the principal ſeat of the rebellion, he flew thither to quaſh it. This diligence obliged the duke to retire (114) into the Spaniſh territories with his abettors. Theſe were declared guilty of treaſon. The declaration having been recorded in the parliament of Burgundy (115), was ſent to the parliament of Paris, where the opinions *were ſo divided, that there was a decree of diviſion, inſtead of a decree of verification* (116). ‘Whereupon the king being returned to Paris, was obliged, that he might not let ſuch an irregularity paſs without due correction, to ſend for the parliament to the Louvre, with orders to come thither on foot, as culpable, and in a condition of receiving the reprimand they deſerved, in order to give them to underſtand that it was not their province to deliberate about affairs of ſtate; that he did not ſend them the declarations he made upon this ſubject for any other end but only to publiſh them, regiſter them, and cauſe them to be obſerved by the people, and that the declaration in queſtion ought to have been publiſhed with ſo much the leſs difficulty, as there is a great difference betwixt a commiſſion which is delivered for the trial of any perſon; and a declaration which is publiſhed by his majeſty, to let his ſubjects know who they are he complains of, the reaſons he has for ſo doing, and for which they are guilty of high treaſon; conſidering moreover that in a declaration of this kind, his majeſty allows them a certain time, during which they may obtain the favour of his clemency, if they have recourſe to it, and even after that all the formalities neceſſary in criminal cauſes are obſerved, before condemnation. This was done in the Louvre, the king ſitting in his council, and the parliament in a body, kneeling in his preſence; and after the keeper of the ſeals had given them to underſtand from his majeſty, that they had no authority to judge of the declarations of ſtate that were ſent to them, he tore with his own hands the decree of diviſion which had been entered in the regiſters, and commanded to ſubſtitute in it's place that of his council, by which he annulled it, with prohibition to deliberate for the future upon ſuch like declarations: and finally to expiate the fault of this body upon ſome particulars; the preſidents Gayan and Barillon, and the Sieur Leſne, counſellor, were commanded by the king's order to remove for ſome time from Paris, and were ſuſpended from the exerciſe of their employments, for having ſpoken of his actions, and the conduct of the ſtate with too little reſpect (117).’

In foreign countries a great many people, imagine that the excluding the parliaments of France from a ſhare in the ſovereignty is a new thing; there are many Frenchmen under a like miſtake. It will not be amiſs therefore to ſhew here by certain and indiſputable facts, that the parliament of Paris has for a long time had the bounds of it's juriſdiction declared, and that upon the foot of an antient cuſtom. The parliament being in the Louvre, in 1631, in the poſture above-mentioned (118), *the keeper of the ſeals, de Chaſteauneuf highly blamed* the proceedings of the parliament of Paris, *and proved to them, by many reaſons*, AND BY DIVERSE EXAMPLES, *that the parliament neither can nor ought to take cognizance of any but private affairs, and differences betwixt man and man, and not meddle with the affairs of ſtate, of which the ſovereign reſerves the ſole cognizance to himſelf. That even in the buſineſs of trials of princes, dukes, and other officers of the crown, for their male-adminiſtration in the direction of the finances, and the management of the ſtate, to the end that the parliaments may take cognizance of them, it is neceſſary the king ſhould ſend them an expreſs commiſſion, which in that caſe extends their ordinary juriſdiction; or elſe that his majeſty aſſiſt in perſon, and authorize by his preſence the inſtruction of theſe extraordinary proceedings. That moreover, there being a great difference between a commiſſion to make out a trial, and a declaration, only mentioning thoſe the king complains of, it was never doubted, but the parliaments ought to take cognizance of the cauſe, before they judge upon a commiſſion; and that on the contrary, they are obliged, without any delay or deliberation, to record a declaration, which always leaves criminals a certain time, in which they may return to their duty, and thereby ſtop the proceeding any further in their proſecution. The remonſtrance of the keeper being at an end, the king ordered the regiſter of the court to be brought him, and the leaf ſhewn him, wherein was the decree of diviſion, which he himſelf tore out, and inſtead of it, cauſed the decree of the council to be inſerted the ſame day, the twelfth of May; by which* moſt expreſs prohibitions were made to the ſaid court of parliament, ever after to deliberate upon ſuch like declarations,

(*f*) *See the article* RIVIERE.

(107) *See the* Memoires Marolles, pag. 143.

(108) Manilius.

(109) Coſtar, Entretiens avec Voiture, pag. 563.

(110) Confer quæ ſupra, *remark* [*A*] *of the article* GUISE (LEWIS).

(111) *See, above, citat.* (75) *of the article* EDWARD IV.

(112) Coſtar, ubi ſupra, pag. 565.

(113) *See the* Miniſtere du Cardinal de Richelieu, Tom. I, pag. 207.

(114) *To Bezançon.*

(115) Miniſtere de Richelieu, Tom. I, pag. 215.

(116) Auberi, Hiſtoire du Cardinal de Richelieu, livr. iv, chap. xvii, pag. m. 303, 304.

(117) Miniſtere du Cardinal de Richelieu, ubi ſupra, pag. 218, 219.

(118) Auberi, ubi ſupra, pag. 304.

being commanded by the creatures of his eminence, he could not diſpoſe of them as he pleaſed [*X*] if he broke intirely with him. He was often ſollicited either to give orders, or give leave, to kill that cardinal [*Y*], but could never be brought to it. Nor would he even

clarations, concerning affairs of ſtate, it's adminiſtration and government, at the peril of loſing their places, and greater if neceſſary; and for the fault committed in this inſtance by the ſaid court, it was ordered, that the ſaid letters of declaration ſhould be withdrawn from it, with moſt expreſs inhibitions, to take any juriſdiction or cognizance of their contents. No body was ever better acquainted with the laws of the kingdom, than chancellor de l'Hoſpital; and yet obſerve how he makes Charles IX ſpeak (119). Bodin will tell you, that this prince made a decree the twenty fourth of September, 1563, forbidding the parliament of Paris to put it to the queſtion, whether they ſhould or ſhould not record the edicts his majeſty ſent them (120). Francis I. made a like ordinance in the year 1528 (121).

[*X*] *He imagined that his troops being commanded by the creatures of the cardinal, he could not diſpoſe of them as he pleaſed.*] Mr d'Artagnan's memoirs inform us that Cinq Mars, the king's favourite, conceived a great averſion for cardinal Richelieu, after he had obſerved that his eminence prevented his marrying a princeſs. He endeavoured to induce the king to diſmiſs this miniſter, and *he thought he had obſerved that if his majeſty did it not, it was not ſo much for want of good will, as becauſe* he was afraid of him. *His majeſty had anſwered, when he ſpoke to him of it, that what he propoſed was very difficult, that he did not conſider that this miniſter was maſter of all the places of his kingdom, and of all his forces both by ſea and land; that they were his relations and friends who commanded them, whom he could cauſe to revolt againſt him, both as often and as long as he pleaſed* (122). Let us add here a reflexion: the favourites of princes, or thoſe who have the greateſt ſhare in the government, labour commonly with an incredible diligence to procure to themſelves, or their relations the moſt profitable and honourable employments. One would ſay, that they look upon themſelves as the heirs of mankind: there is no place vacant, but they beg it for themſelves or for ſome of their creatures. Some there are who attribute this only to an inſatiable avarice, and an unbounded ambition; but it is certain, that if in the beginning theſe are the only motives of this conduct, prudence obliges them to continue it after; for the enviers and the enemies of a prime miniſter daily increaſe in proportion to his authority; he has therefore new and hourly occaſions to make himſelf ſupports and ramparts; for which reaſon he inceſſantly turns out of places perſons who are ſuſpected, and advances ſuch as devote themſelves to his fortune. Cardinal Richelieu maintained himſelf this way, and ſo ſtrengthened his power, that it laſted longer than his life. You have ſeen in the paſſage of Mr d'Artagnan's memoirs, that this hindered the king from gratifying his own deſire of ruining him. Obſerve now from theſe words of the duke de la Rocheſoucaud, in what condition affairs were, after the death of his eminence (123): *I came to court, which I found as ſubmiſſive to his will* (124), *after his death, as in his life-time. His relations and creatures had the ſame advantages that he had procured them; and by an effect of his fortune, of which few examples are to be ſeen, the king who had hated him, and wiſhed his deſtruction, was obliged not only to diſſemble his ſentiments, but alſo to authorize the diſpoſal the cardinal had made in his will, of the principal employments, and of the moſt important places of his kingdom. He farther choſe cardinal Mazarine to ſucceed him in the government of affairs, and thus he was aſſured of reigning more abſolutely after his death, than the king his maſter had been able to do for the thirty three years that he wore the crown.* But to omit nothing, it muſt be obſerved, that it was for the king's intereſt at that time, that the armies and fortified towns ſhould not be under the direction of the cardinal's enemies. This miniſter's abilities could not have been ſufficient to ſupport him, had it not been for the good ſucceſſes which attended the king's arms; he muſt neceſſarily have fallen if Lewis the thirteenth's wars had been unſucceſsful. It was therefore the intereſt of his enemies, that the Spaniards ſhould triumph, and put the kingdom in continual frights. What had not France to fear, if the French generals had wiſhed the ruin of the cardinal, and if their particular fate had not depended upon that of the miniſter? They who wiſhed his ruin, were wonderfully pleaſed with the ſucceſſes of the Spaniards in 1636. And the count de Soiſſons, a prince of the blood, performed his duty very ill, when it was neceſſary to oppoſe their progreſs; for he would not have been ſorry if they had ſucceeded ſo far as to force the king to ſacrifice the cardinal to the public indignation. *We could never have believed,* theſe are the words of the king's declaration (125), *that after we had pardoned the count de Soiſſons, our couſin, the ill behaviour he had been guilty of towards us, in the year* 1636, *when we truſted our arms in his hands; that he would have embarked himſelf again,* &c. See what has been ſaid above (126), concerning the raiſing the ſiege of Fontarabia.

We have ſeen in the beginning of this remark, that cardinal Richelieu proved Cinqmars, by oppoſing his marriage with a princeſs. Not to engage the reader in the trouble of conſulting another book, we will ſay here that this princeſs was the ſame Mary de Gonzaga, who married the king of Poland ſome time after. She had been courted by the duke of Orleans, his majeſty's only brother; but the queen-mother, to prevent the match, cauſed her to be ſent to the Bois de Vincennes (127). This detention ended a little after by the king's order, who promiſed his brother, in 1631, that he ſhould have leave to marry her (128). The duke of Orleans made no advantage of this conſent; he meditated a rebellion, which was quaſhed in it's birth, and he retired into foreign countries, and engaged himſelf to a ſiſter of the duke of Lorrain. One of the ſix things which gave Cinqmars an implacable averſion to cardinal Richelieu, was, that in ſpeaking of the princeſs Mary de Gonzaga, he added, that his mother had a mind to marry him to her. *Your mother,* anſwered his eminence, *is mad, and if the princeſs Mary has ſuch a thought, ſhe is madder than your mother; when ſhe has been propoſed as a wife for Monſieur, would you have the vanity and preſumption to pretend to her? It is a ridiculous thing* (129). Note, that the author of the Galantries of the kings of France, has vented a thing deviliſh ſatirical concerning the amours of Cinqmars.

[*Y*] *He was often ſollicited to give orders or give leave to kill the cardinal.*] I have mentioned in the preceding remark, Lewis the thirteenth's anſwer to the propoſition of diſmiſſing the cardinal. This anſwer made his young favourite conclude (130), *that when he ſhould have killed the cardinal, the king, inſtead of revenging him, would be the firſt that would be pleaſed at the deliverance.* Thus continually fortifying his reſolution of ſacrificing this firſt miniſter, he endeavoured to engage Treville in the execution: '(131) but Treville, who was wiſe and prudent, anſwered him when he ſpoke to him of it, that he had never been concerned in any aſſaſſination, and that it was as much as he could do if his majeſty ſhould declare to him, that the good of the ſtate depended on it. Cinqmars replied, that if nothing was wanting but that, the thing ſhould be quickly done, even before he was two days older, and only deſired his promiſe on that condition. Treville gave him his promiſe without making much reflexion on what he did; in the mean time, whether he only did it becauſe he believed the king would never conſent to ſuch a thing, he who was daily ſhewing how much diſturbed he was for having cauſed the marſhal d'Ancre to be taken off as he had done, or whether he gave too much way to his reſentment, Cinqmars had no ſooner his word for it, but he ſounded the king upon the matter. The king, who was plain and ſincere, acknowledged that he ſhould not be very ſorry to be rid of his eminence, not thinking on what deſign he made that propoſition. He thought that what he ſaid to him was only a thing at random, as when one is asked whether he would be glad or ſorry that this or that ſhould happen. However, Cinqmars taking advantage of this anſwer, went back to Treville . . . and deſired him to ſound the king . . . Treville ſpoke to his majeſty upon this ſubject that very day. He anſwered even after the death of this miniſter, ſuffer his family to loſe any of it's luſtre; and it was believed, he deſigned by this, to perſwade the world that he had not raiſed it out of a ſlaviſh condeſcenſion [*Z*]. The ſame reaſon ſhould have induced him to leave in priſon, or baniſhment, the perſons which the cardinal had put out of his majeſty's favour; yet perceiving himſelf near his end, he conſented to the liberty or return of moſt of them. It is ſaid ſome œconomical motives mingled in this affair [*AA*]. The ſhort time that he ſurvived

---

(119) *See, above, remark* [*K*] *of the article* HOSPITAL (MICHAEL DE L').

(120) Bodin, de Republ. lib. iii, cap. i, pag. 389. Edit. Latinæ 1600.

(121) Id. ibid.

(122) Memoires d'Artagnan, pag. 180.

(123) Memoires de Mr de la Rochefouc. pag. 2. *See the remark* [*Z*].

(124) *That is to ſay, cardinal Richelieu.*

(125) *Dated June* 8, 1641. *See the Memoirs of Montreſor,* pag. m. 367, 368.

(126) *In the remark* [*D*] *of the article* FONTARABIA.

(127) Auberi, Hiſt. du Cardinal de Richelieu, livr. iv, chap. vi, pag. m. 269, & 270, Tom. I.

(128) Id. ibid. cap. xvi, pag. 298.

(129) *See* Journal du Cardinal de Richelieu, pag 208, Edit. 1648, in 12mo.

(130) Memoires d'Artagnan, pag. 181.

(131) Ibid.

‘ anſwered nothing but what was agreeable enough to what Cinqmars had endeavoured to perſuade him . . . . . (132) Cinqmars who had the art of deceiving, and putting off a look or a wink for an aſſertion, thought that inſtead of making Treville repeat what he had promiſed, it was enough to make the king declare to him the ſame thing he had ſaid. Treville who had heard the king ſay as much, not once, but an hundred times before, was not ſo thoroughly ſatisfied as he imagined; he deſired that his majeſty would explain himſelf more poſitively upon it; and the thing being ſpun out till his departure, it was reſolved to execute their deſign at Nemours. The one engaged only upon the other's promiſe, which he conſtantly made of the king's declaring himſelf; and the other made him this promiſe only, becauſe he thought to amuſe and inſenſibly oblige him to do the thing, without making much reflexion on it. When the court was come to Melun (133), Treville challenging Cinqmars with his promiſe, he refers him to Fontainebleau, where the king was to ſtay a day. He actually ſpoke of it to his majeſty, and preſſed him to conſent to it; but the king, deteſting the propoſition, anſwered, that he wondered he ſhould offer to ſpeak to him of it; Cinqmars concealed this from Treville, telling him that his majeſty's anſwer was, that hints were ſufficient, without obliging a king to give a poſitive command: That ſo did the marſhal de Vitry, when he took off the marſhal d'Ancre . . . . (134) Treville was not at all ſatisfied with this anſwer; and though all the meaſures were taken for this aſſaſſination, he broke it off, as ſoon as he ſaw the king would not conſent to it.’ After this the author relates, that Cinqmars had a dagger made to kill the cardinal, himſelf: that he *hanged it to the hilt of his ſword, as was the faſhion of that time*; that the cardinal having notice of the deſign ſtood upon this guard; *that chance, however, ordered it ſo* that he *was twice ſide by ſide with Cinqmars* on the road; *but whatever reſolution this favourite had taken, he was ſo confounded when he was to ſtrike the blow, that he had not the power to lay his hand to the poinard, which yet was made on purpoſe to take away his life.*

I do not pretend that every thing in Mr d'Artagnan's memoirs is to paſs for truth, but it is certain his eminence was perſuaded that Cinqmars had reſolved to execute this aſſaſſination at Lyons. See the letter he wrote to his majeſty the ſeventh of July, 1642 (135). *And it is plain from the king's letter, that Cinqmars made no ſcruple to make an attempt upon the life of the cardinal; and that he not only propoſed it to the king, as a thing neceſſary, but alſo offered to execute it himſelf; at which his majeſty was aſtoniſhed, and condemned ſo wicked a thought* (136). This furniſhes us with a good argument, to confute a falſe ſtory of Guy Patin; a world of people take it for a certain fact, and make a thouſand ſerious reflexions upon it; the thing ſounds ſo very ſtrange and ſurpriſing. Theſe are his words: *I have always in my thoughts the paſſage of the preſident Thuanus's hiſtory, where mention is made of Antony Richelieu,* commonly called the monk, *which coſt Thuanus's grandſon his life. He had much better not have written a hiſtory at all. Who can tell but in ſome age or other a tyrant may ariſe, who may let looſe his indignation againſt my family, to revenge ſome truth that I had ſpoken of his anceſtors? Thuanus had not loſt his head, if cardinal Richelieu had not ſought an occaſion of revenging himſelf upon the grandſon, for what the grandfather had written* (137).’ This he wrote the eighth of November, 1658. He perſevered in this notion, and repeated this obſervation writing to a friend, the thirty firſt of July 1669, only with this difference, that he took the cardinal's victim to be the hiſtorian's ſon, and not his grandſon. He then was better acquainted with the degree of relation. *The preſident Thuanus's hiſtory,* ſaid he (138) *is fine and more than fine; but it ſo diſpleaſed cardinal Richelieu, that it coſt the author's eldeſt ſon his life, who was a very worthy man, and this on account of a paſſage concerning Antony du Pleſſis de Richelieu, in the firſt tome under Francis II, in the year* 1560. . . . . *This paſſage begins thus.* Antonius Richelius vulgo dictus Monachus, *&c.* The facility with which ſo many people believe Guy Patin's aſſertion in theſe two paſſages, may convince us, that on ſome occaſions it is enough to make a thing be believed if it contains an exceſs of extravagance and crimes: it becomes credible on this very account, that it ſhocks good ſenſe and probability. But omitting that, let us reaſon a little upon it. It is certain, that Cinqmars had undertaken to deſtroy cardinal Richelieu; his eminence was convinced, that he intended to do it even by aſſaſſination. It is certain, that Thuanus was Cinqmars's intimate friend, at leaſt, that he was privy to the deſign of this favourite, as to the point of deſtroying the cardinal (139). Is not this ſearching for mid-day at twelve a clock (if we may uſe this proverbial phraſe), to go ſo far as the expreſſions of Thuanus the hiſtorian, in queſt of the cauſe of Thuanus's death, the confident of Cinqmars. Could the prime miniſter, as vindictive as he was, found his reſentment upon a phraſe of the father, when he knew his mortal enemy, had ſo much intimacy with the ſon. Muſt not the ſpirit of revenge have ariſen from that intimacy? Patin talks like a man who ſhould affirm, that Mævius having been cudgelled by Titius, chaſtiſed him only becauſe Titius's father had not ſaluted a relation of Mævius with reſpect enough (§ α).

[(§α) See Mr Buckley's edition of Thuanus's hiſtory of his own time, Vol. VII. §. X. pag. 97, 98. REM. CRIT.]

[Z] *Nor would he ſuffer the family of the cardinal to loſe any of it's luſtre . . . . . to perſuade the world that he had not raiſed it out of a ſlaviſh condeſcenſion.*] *It was believed, as ſoon as he was dead, that as the king had hardly ever loved him, his family would not long ſhine with that luſtre he had given it. But his majeſty, who foreſaw, that if he did ſuch a thing, it would be ſhowing too openly, as it had been often ſaid in the world, that this miniſter had always kept him as it were in tutelage, from which nothing but his death had freed him, he not only ſupported that cardinal's family, but gave it additional honours. He cauſed the Mareſchal de Brezé's ſon to be received as duke and peer into the parliament* (140). We have ſeen above (141), the duke de la Rocheſoucaud's obſervation concerning the power the cardinal's creatures were in, when he returned to court after his eminence's death. Mr de la Chaſtre has ſpoken of it in the ſame ſtrain (142).

[*AA*] *He conſented to the liberty or return of moſt of them . . . . . It is ſaid ſome œconomical motives mingled in this affair.*] *The king, whoſe diſtemper increaſed every day, being deſirous to give, at the end of his life, ſome marks of his clemency, whether out of devotion, or to ſhew that cardinal Richelieu had had a greater ſhare than he, in all the violences which had been committed ſince the diſgrace of the queen-mother, conſented to the return of the moſt conſiderable of thoſe who had been perſecuted; and he was the more willingly induced to it, as the miniſters, foreſeeing ſome diſorders, endeavoured to oblige perſons of condition, to ſecure themſelves againſt all that might happen in a revolution like that which threatened them. Almoſt all who had been baniſhed, returned* (143). The author I have this from, is very conſiderable, being a great lord, who was then upon the place, and who was as much diſtinguiſhed by his parts as by his birth. Another perſon of quality, and much concerned in the intrigues, will help to confirm our text: here follow his words which contain a ſatirical ſtroke upon the king (144): *Some time before, cardinal Mazarin and Monſieur de Chavigni had induced the king to ſet at liberty the mareſchals de Vitry and Baſſompierre, and the count de Cramail. The*

---

(132) Ibid. pag. 183.

(133) *The king ſet out for Rouſſillon, in* 1642.

(134) Memoirs d'Artagnan, pag. 184.

(135) *It is among the Memoirs of Montreſor, pag.* 203. *See alſo pag.* 190.

(136) Auberi, ubi ſupra, livr. vi, chap. lxxxiii, pag. 321.

A CONFUTATION of what Patin has ſaid of the cauſe of the death of Thuanus, ſon of the Hiſtorian.

(137) Patin, Lettre cxxiv, p. 486, Tom. I.

(138) Idem. Lett. ccccxcii, pag. 432, Tom. III.

(139) *This appears by the pieces of the proceſs.*

(140) Memoirs d'Artagnan, pag. 198.

(141) *In the remark* [*X*], *citat.* (123).

(142) La Chaſtre, Memoires, pag. m. 286.

(143) Memoires de la Rochefouc. pag. 7, & 8.

(144) Memoires de la Chaſtre, pag. 296, 297.

vived the cardinal, was perhaps the moſt uncomfortable of his whole life; for beſides his bodily infirmities, he had a great many troubles of mind. And as it is very probable, he was not ignorant of the queen's intrigues [*BB*], we may reaſonably believe that his mind
was

The means they made uſe of on this occaſion, deſerve to be mentioned, being pleaſant enough; for finding that his majeſty had not much inclination to it, they attacked him on his weak ſide, repreſenting, that theſe three priſoners were a great expence to him in the Baſtille; and that not being in a capacity of caballing in the kingdom, they might as well live in their houſes, where they would coſt him nothing. This took; the king being poſſeſſed with ſo extravagant an avarice, that all who had a demand of money upon him, were a burden to him; inſomuch, that after the return of Treville, Beaupuy, and others whom the late cardinal's reſentments on his death-bed had forced him to abandon, he ſought an occaſion of ſnubbing each of them, to deprive them of all hopes of being rewarded for what they had ſuffered for him. The liberty of the priſoners was followed by the recalling the exiles (145). Facts of this kind are ſuch, as many think moſt deſerving the readers curioſity. Wherefore I imagine the putting them in my Dictionary will be approved.

[*BB*] *It is very probable he was not ignorant of the queen's intrigues.*] Her conduct, from the death of cardinal Richelieu, to that of the king (146), ſhows that ſhe was very ambitious, and that it was not without reaſon, that the cardinal herein conforming to the ſenſe of his maſter, kept her ſhort; for had ſhe been ſuffered to meddle in public affairs, ſhe would have had her dependants and confederates, the ready way to multiply factions, which were already but too troubleſome. Let us ſhew in general, what ſhe did to obtain the whole regency, notwithſtanding the deſire and intention of the king her husband. The cardinal had remonſtrated to this prince, that conſidering *the laſt conſpiracy againſt the ſtate, in which Cinqmars had employed the name and authority of his royal highneſs, to give greater weight and credit to his faction . . . . it would not be proper, in caſe of his majeſty's deceaſe, to ſuffer the duke of Orleans, his brother, to aſſume the regency and government of the kingdom, much leſs the tutelage and education of the ſons of France* (147). The king very much approved this advice of the cardinal; and underſtanding on the *firſt or ſecond of December*, 1642, that the recovery of this firſt miniſter was deſpaired of, he made haſte to act according to this advice; ſo that on Wedneſday the third day of the month, he ſent for the preſidents of the parliament of Paris, and the attorney and ſolicitor general, and told them, ‘that he had cauſed a declaration to be drawn up, (in caſe God ſhould diſpoſe of him) to exclude the duke of Orleans, his brother, from the regency, whom he had already pardoned, even to the ſixth time, and to whom he did not think he ought, after this, to intruſt what was moſt dear to him, his kingdom and his two ſons: that the parliament muſt regiſter, as ſoon as poſſible, this declaration ſo important and neceſſary to the public tranquility (148).’ It was regiſtred the fifth day of the ſame month *to be fully and entirely executed* (149). The king's health declined every day, and no body judged he could live long: hereupon the court was filled with cabals and intrigues; ſome were very forward in offering their ſervices to the queen, others were contriving to reſtore the duke of Orleans to favour. Father Sirmond, the king's confeſſor ‘was induced to propoſe to him his brother's co-regency with the queen . . . . but this propoſition ſo violently diſpleaſed the king, that after having ſharply rejected it, and ſaid ſomething of it to the queen, he would hear his confeſſor no more, and diſmiſſing him, under another pretence, took father Dinet in his place (150).’ At laſt the king was reconciled both to the queen and the duke of Orleans. He made a declaration, in which ‘he appointed (God calling him to himſelf) the queen, his wife, to be regent, to have the education of their children, with the adminiſtration of the kingdom; and the duke of Orleans, his brother, to be lieutenant-general of the minor king, in all the provinces, under the authority of the queen. He orders that the queen-regent, and the lieutenant-general, ſhall determine nothing, without the advice and ſovereign council of the regency, compoſed of his couſins, the prince of Condé, and the cardinal Mazarin, and the Sieurs, Seguire, chancellor of France, Bouthillier, ſuperintendant of the finances, and de Chavigni, ſecretary of ſtate, all ſtiled miniſters of ſtate; and that the prince and the cardinal be the chiefs in the order as they are named, in the abſence of his royal highneſs. It is his pleaſure alſo, that every thing be deliberated and reſolved in his council, by the plurality of voices; and that by the ſame plurality, proviſion be made both for the moſt important employments, and principal offices of the crown, and alſo for the places of ſuperintendent of the finances, firſt preſident, and attorney-general in the parliament of Paris, and ſecretary of ſtate (151).’ This declaration being read aloud in his majeſty's chamber, in preſence of the princes, and the dukes, and peers, *&c.* the nineteenth of April, 1643. *The king ſigned it, and addreſſed the following poſtſcript*; This above is my moſt expreſs and laſt will, which I will have to be executed. *The queen and the duke of Orleans ſigned it likewiſe, after having promiſed and ſworn to each other, not to infringe it. Which was not done with reſpect to the queen, without a flood of tears, the teſtimonies of her grief and affliction . . . . . This being done, the deputies of the parliament were introduced. The king, ſick as he was, declared to them himſelf, that he had cauſed letters for the regency to be drawn, which he deſired might be ſpeedily regiſtred, to which purpoſe he would ſend the next morning Monſieur, his brother, and the prince of Condé, and the chancellor, the grand chamber. In effect, they were read and publiſhed the ſame morning, in a full houſe* (152). *The king's letter, which accompanied the declaration, enjoined the parliament to regiſter it without any delay or difficulty . . . Afterwards to take from the regiſters, the declaration againſt Monſieur the king's only brother, immediately to put it into the hands of the chancellor, to be cancelled or torn* (153). The queen, very much diſpleaſed with the limitations made to her regency, thought of nothing but how to get the declaration annulled, and the king had ſcarce cloſed his eyes, but ſhe was pompouſly conveyed to the parliament of Paris, to obtain a full and entire regency. It was the antient cuſtom, that the widows of the kings of France ſhould keep for forty days together in their chamber, without ſeeing ſun or moon till their husbands were buried (154). Anne of Auſtria, Lewis the thirteenth's widow, did not ſhut herſelf up in that manner; but went to Paris the next day after the death of the king her husband (155), and three days after appeared at the moſt pompous and ſplendid ceremony that could be ſeen at the parliament of Paris, and by the intrigues ſhe had formed before, cauſed the laſt will of the king to be annulled, that very declaration of the foregoing month of April, which ſhe had ſworn to obſerve, and which *had coſt ſo much labour and pains* (156), *and was undoubtedly the work of the chancellor Seguier . . . . and the firſt preſident Molé* (157).

It is obſervable, that one of the means which the queen's ſervants uſed to arrive at their ends, was to induce her to employ the creatures of cardinal Richelieu, and like a good Chriſtian to forget the injuries ſhe had received from them. *Montaigu, a devotee by profeſſion, mixing God and the world together, and joining to the reaſons of devotion, the neceſſity of having a miniſter inſtructed in the affairs of ſtate, added farther, (in my opinion) another conſideration, which abſolutely gained her, which was to repreſent to her, that cardinal Mazarin was the beſt qualified of any one to negotiate a peace, and that being born a ſubject to the king, her brother, he would make it advantageous for her houſe, which ſhe ought to endeavour to maintain in power; in order to make it a ſupport againſt any faction which might ariſe in France in the time of her regency* (158). No prophet could have ſpoke truer than Montaigu; for it fell out, that at ſixteen years end, cardinal Mazarine concluded the peace with Spain, ſo advantageous to that crown, and diſadvantageous to France, that the moſt intelligent have thought, that that conduct of his
was

(145) *See, at the* 309*th page of the ſame* Memoires de la Chaſtre, *the recalling of other exiles.*

(146) *See the Memoirs of de la Rochefoucaud, thoſe of Mr de la Chaſtre, and the Anſwer of the Comte de Brienne to the Memoirs of Mr de la Chaſtre.*

(147) Auberi, Hiſt. du Cardinal Mazarin, livr. i, pag. 124.

(148) Id. ibid. pag. 125.

(149) Id. ibid. pag. 127.

(150) Memoires de la Chaſtre, pag. 295.

(151) Auberi, Hiſt du Cardinal Mazarin, livr. i, pag. 128.

(152) Id. ibid. pag. 130.

(153) Id. ibid. pag. 127.

(154) *See, above, rem.* [*O*] *of the article* LORRAIN, *at the beginning.*

(155) *The king died at St Germain.*

(156) Auberi, ubi ſupra, livr. ii, pag. 149.

(157) *Mr Auberi,* ibid. *ſays, that Mr du Puy had furniſhed the memoirs, precedents, and authorities.*

(158) Memoires de la Chaſtre, pag. 317.

was toſſed with a thouſand diſturbances. The Dauphin himſelf vexed him without the leaſt deſign [*CC*]. We have not as yet ſeen a good hiſtory of his reign, which makes us impatiently wait for that, which Mr le Vaſſor has undertaken; the firſt volume of it (*g*), which reaches to the time of this prince's coming to age in 1614, has been well received by the publick.

The firſt addition I ſhall make to his article in this third edition relates to what I have ſaid concerning the little advantage which was got by the victory of Avein [*DD*].

(*g*) Printed at Amſterdam twice in 1700. The *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* have told us, that there have been two tranſlations of it into Engliſh.

was owing to the entreaties or commands of the queen-mother, in whom the king, her husband, had always obſerved a Spaniſh heart; the reaſon, in part, why he was willing that her regency ſhould depend on the council he joined with her (159). ‘Lewis the Juſt did not ſo much inſiſt upon precedents, as upon reaſon. He knew that the queen, his wife, underſtood nothing of affairs, and that ſhe could not have any experience in them, having never had any ſhare in the government. *As the regency*, ſaid he, *is a thing of great weight, and the queen has not the ability that is neceſſary for the reſolution of difficulties, inſeparable from government; we have thought fit to conjoin with her, and under her authority, a council that may determine.* Beſides, that which was particular on this occaſion was, that there being a rupture between the two crowns, the queen would be obliged to make war againſt her own brother, the Catholic king. Lewis XIII had heretofore upbraided her, that ſhe could not forget her country, and that ſhe intereſted herſelf too much in the news and affairs of Spain (160).’

[*CC*] *There was no body, even to the Dauphin, but vexed him without the leaſt ill meaning or deſign.*] Mr Bourſault having ſaid, that kings are ſo nice, that the leaſt thing wounds them, and that they who are moſt dear to them, are ſometimes thoſe who vex them moſt, gives this inſtance of it. ‘One day, as I was with the preſident Perrault, in his fine gallery, Monſieur de la Vrilliere, ſecretary of ſtate, came to ſee him, and from him I have the following ſtory. The king, who was then but Dauphin, was baptized at St Germain, the twenty firſt of April, 1643, being four years of age, ſeven months, and ſome days. Lewis XIII, could not aſſiſt at that ceremony; he was ſick, and died three and twenty days after. The Dauphin, as he came from baptiſm, was brought to the king, to whom he ſaid, that he had been juſt baptized. I am glad of it, my ſon, ſaid the king, but what is your name? *My name*, replied the young prince, *is Lewis the fourteenth*, without thinking on what he ſaid, and perhaps even not knowing the conſequence of it. And yet this anſwer afflicted the king: in the condition he was, he took it for an ill omen, and turning to the other ſide: *Not yet*, ſaid he, *not yet*. Some flatterer (for princes have the misfortune to have ſuch before they can ſpeak) had already poſſeſſed this royal infant with the great name he was ſoon to bear; which was the cauſe of this little mortification he innocently gave the king his father (161).’

[*DD*] *What I have ſaid concerning the little advantage they got by the victory of Avein* (162).] I cited Mr Silhon, who aſſures us, that the artifices of the prince of Orange, had hindred the French from making an advantage of that victory, and I have obſerved, that this author ſaid this in the year 1651, and that I would not cite thoſe who have written after the year 1672: I ſtill follow the ſame method, and this is the reaſon why I ſhall not at preſent alledge Mr de la Neuville, who ſaid (163), among other things, *that the prince of Orange had found means, without appearing to do ſo, to ſacrifice to his jealouſy the fineſt army that had been ſeen in that age* (164). But I may alledge the teſtimony of an Italian, whoſe book was printed the year 1640: It is count Galeazzo Gualdo Priorato, a well known Hiſtorian; he relates (165), that the French generals were of opinion, that inſtead of beſieging Louvain, they ſhould march directly to Bruſſels. That advice was followed, but the prince of Orange having found the execution difficult, retook the rout to Louvain, and ſhewed that the taking of that place would be very important. The Hiſtorian adds, that ſome people diſcovered an artifice in that proceeding, ſince it was believed, that the Dutch had rather have the Spaniards for their neighbours, than the French. *Queſta benche buona opinione, e uſcita di bocca d'un Capitano tanto prudente, nondimeno non tralaſciarono alcuni di diviſarla per artifitioſa; concioſia che gli Hollandeſi credevaſi, che amaſſero bene la corriſpondenza colli Franceſi per cavarne aiuti, ma non già la vicinanza, e maggior loro grandezza, perche ſtando quelle Provincie ſotto all' obedienza d'una Corona, la cui potenza era lontana, e diſunita, eſſi erano ſtati, e tuttavia vedevanſi baſtanti a difender la loro libertà: il che più difficile ſarebbe riuſcito loro, quando haveſſero havuto da fare con un Potentato di forze, e di Stato unito, e loro confinante* (166).

(159) See, above, citat. (16).

(160) Auberi, ubi ſupra, pag. 152, 153.

(161) Bourſault, Lettres Nouv. pag. 384, 385. Dutch Edit.

(162) See the remark [*L*].

(163) In his *Hiſtoire de Hollande depuis la Treve de 1609 juſqu'à la Paix de Nimegue en 1678*. That work in four Tomes in 8vo, was printed at Paris in the year 1693, and reprinted at Bruſſels in the year 1701. [Mr Baillet is the author of it, under the diſguiſed name of la Neuville.]

(164) Neuville, Hiſt. de Holl. Tom. II, pag. 254, *at the year* 1635. Paris Edit. 1693.

(165) Priorato, Hiſtoria delle Guerre di Ferdinando II, &c lib. x, *at the year* 1635, pag. 342, Edit. Venet. 1640, *in* 4to.

(166) Ibid pag. 343.

LICINIA, a veſtal, puniſhed for her leudneſs, about the 640th year of Rome. There were three veſtals all at the ſame time, who behaved themſelves ill. Lucius Metellus, the Pontifex Maximus, not having puniſhed this diſorder ſo rigorouſly as he ſhould have done, was proſecuted for his remiſſneſs on an impeachment of Sextus Peduceus, tribune of the people. The high prieſt condemned only one (*a*) of the three veſtals, and acquitted the other two (*b*). Licinia was one of the latter, tho' no leſs guilty than ſhe that was condemned. They were both mightily exclaimed againſt for the numbers of their galants, and they accuſed one another. At firſt, they had to do with but a few of their beſt friends, and that in great ſecrecy, declaring to each, that he was the only perſon, who had received the favour: afterwards, the number of ſharers increaſed, at a ſtrange rate; for the longer they lived in this diſorder, the eaſier it was to convict them of it. They had then reaſon to fear informers; and could think of no better way of obliging all to ſilence, than granting to all the laſt favour. This did not pleaſe the firſt galants: However, they durſt not make a noiſe; too loud complaints would only have betrayed them. The evil took ſuch a head, that the two veſtals made no longer any difficulty of giving themſelves up to ſeveral galants, and that in the knowledge of each other (*c*): and I believe that for ſome time they lived together in a good underſtanding, and that then Emilia introduced her brother to Licinia, and the latter introduced her brother to Emilia. However it be, it is certain, that each had the other's brother for galant (*d*); a great many of both ſexes, freemen and ſlaves, were privy to the intrigues of theſe veſtals; nevertheleſs, their crime remained a ſecret for a long time, as to what we call the public. At laſt, one Manius, who had been the firſt inſtrument or pimp to the amour, turned informer. He had not been made free, nor recompenſed according to his expectation; and beſides, was a man, who delighted in miſchief (*e*). I have already ſaid, that the high Pontif, the proper judge of offences of this kind, had not uſed the neceſſary ſeverity. The diſcontents, which his remiſſneſs had occaſioned, was

(*a*) She was called Emilia.

(*b*) Aſconius Pedianus, in Orat. pro Milone.

(*c*) See the *Excerpta* of Dion, tranſlated by Henry Valeſius, pag. 627, 628.

(*d*) Dio, ibid.

(*e*) Ibid.

the reaſon of giving Lucius Caſſius a commiſſion, to re-examine the proceſs [*A*]. He was a rigorous, inflexible judge, as I have ſhewn in ſpeaking of him. Licinia could not eſcape him: For how could ſhe hope to eſcape the ſentence of death, when Martia, her companion, who had but to do with only one Roman knight [*B*], could not eſcape? Caſſius's ſevere methods for the diſcovering and convicting the accomplices, were ſo extraordinary, that they were thought to have exceeded the juſt bounds (*f*).

[*A*] *Lucius Caſſius was commiſſioned to re-examine the proceſs* (1).] Aſconius Pedianus gives us this account of it: 'Ob quam ſeveritatem quo tempore Sextus Peduceus Tribunus plebis criminatus eſt L. Metellum Pontif. Max. totumque collegium Pontificum male judicaſſe de inceſtu Virginum Veſtalium, quod unam modo Æmiliam damnaverat, abſolverat autem duas, Martiam & Liciniam, populus hunc Caſſium creavit qui de eiſdem virginibus quæreret, iſque & utraſque eas & præterea complures alias nimia etiam, ut exiſtimatio eſt, aſperitate uſus damnavit. —— *On account of which ſeverity, when Sextus Peduceus, tribune of the people, accuſed L. Metellus, the Pontifex Maximus, and the whole pontifical college, of judging ill in relation to the leud actions of the Veſtals, in that they had condemned only Æmilia, but had acquitted two, Martia and Licinia, the people commiſſioned Caſſius to inquire into the matter, who not only condemned thoſe two, but many others likewiſe, uſing, as is thought, too great ſeverity.*' Inſtead of *alias*, I ſhould read *alios*; for the number of the Veſtals was too ſmall, to ſay, after the condemnation of two, that many others were condemned. We muſt ſay then, that *theſe many others* of Aſconius were the galants, the bawds, *&c.* of the Veſtals. Dion obſerves, that the criminal Veſtals involved abundance of people in their misfortune: Αἱ ἱέρειαι τὸ πλεῖστον αὐταὶ τοῦ τε ὀλέθρου καὶ τῆς αἰσχύνης ὦφλον, συχνοῖς δὲ δὴ καὶ ἄλλοις μεγάλων κακῶν αἴτιαι ἐγένοντο. ἥ τε πόλις ἅπασα ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐταράχθη. *Virgines Veſtales ipſæ quidem maximam mali ac dedecoris partem tulere, ſed tamen alios quoque plurimos in graviſſima mala conjecere, & univerſam civitatem ſuo ſcelere perturbavere* (2).

[*B*] *Martia, her companion, who had to do only with one Roman knight.*] If her companions had been as cautious as ſhe, it is probable, they might have violated their rule with impunity. Poſſibly even Martia would neither have loſt her reputation nor her life, if, to redreſs the remiſſneſs of the former judges, the too rigid Lucius Caſſius had not been commiſſioned. Μαρκία μὲν τῇ τε καθ᾽ αὑτὴν καὶ πρὸς ἕνα τινὰ ἱππέα ᾐσχύνθη· κἂν διέλαθεν εἰ μή περ ἡ ζήτησις ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἀρθεῖσα καὶ ἐκείνην προσκατέλαβεν . . . διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὰς κολάσεις οὐ μόνων τῶν ἐλεγχθέντων μίσει ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πάντων τῶν αἰτιαθέντων μίσει τοῦ συμβεβηκότος ἐποιήσαντο. Marcia quidem ſeorſim cum uno equite Rom. rem habuerat, ac fortaſſis latere potuiſſet, niſi latius porrecta quæſtio eam quoque involviſſet . . . . Itaque odio admiſſi tanti ſceleris non modo de convictis, ſed de omnibus qui delati erant ſupplicium ſumptum (3). —— *Marcia had to do with but one Roman knight, and perhaps might have eſcaped, had not the enquiry, being carried farther, involved her likewiſe. . . . . . Therefore, in deteſtation of the crime committed, not only thoſe convicted, but all thoſe informed againſt, were puniſhed.* It is a remarkable thing, and which ſhews very well the power of conſtitution, that the Veſtals fell into incontinence, in ſpight of the dreadful puniſhment, and prodigious infamy, they were expoſed to (4), and in ſpight of the actual puniſhment of their companions. Minutius Felix has touched upon this. 'Cum pæne in pluribus virginibus & quæ inconſultius ſe viris miſcuiſſent, Veſta ſane neſciente, ſit inceſtum vindicatum; in reſiduis impunitatem fecerint, non caſtitas tutior, ſed impudicitia felicior (5). —— *When inceſt was puniſhed in many Veſtals, who had indiſcretely proſtituted themſelves, the reſt eſcaped, not becauſe they were chaſter, but more fortunate in their amours.*'

LIEBAUT (JOHN) a native of Dijon, practiſed Phyſic at Paris in the XVIth century with ſome ſucceſs. He there married Nicole Stephens, a learned woman, and daughter to Charles Stephens [*A*]. He publiſhed ſeveral books [*B*], ſome of which were tranſlated into ſeveral languages, and often re-printed. He quitted Paris, I know not why, and returned into his native country [*C*], where he died I know not when.

[*A*] *He married Nicole Stephens, a learned woman, and daughter to Charles Stephens.*] La Croix du Maine (1) makes mention of three books ſhe had written, but were not printed. I. *An Anſwer to the Stanzas on Marriage, written by Ph. des P.* (2). II. *The Contempt of Love.* III. *An Apology for Women, againſt thoſe who undervalue them.* James Grevin (3) was in love with her, and courted her; and as he was a Poet, he writ verſes in abundance upon his amours, and in praiſe of his Nicole, whom he called Olympia. The volume of his love-verſes was for this reaſon called *Olympia*. This we learn from la Croix du Maine (4). Another ran away with the prey; for ſhe was married to our John Liebaut.

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] The Bibliotheque of Phyſicians, enlarged by Mercklinus, makes mention but of three books of John Liebaut. *Theſaurus ſanitatis paratu facilis*, at Paris by James du Puy 1577. *De præcavendis curandiſque venenis Commentarius. Scholia in Jacobi Hollerii commentaria in lib. vii. aphoriſmorum Hippocratis.* The moſt curious of his books have been forgotten, which are thoſe, that treat of the diſtempers of women, and of their *ornaments and beauties*. He wrote them in Latin. They were afterwards tranſlated into French; but the tranſlator found himſelf ſometimes obliged to omit ſome paſſages of the original (5), to avoid deſcribing things offenſive to modeſty. We ſhall ſee below, that Liebaut cannot be ſaid to be a meer tranſlator of an Italian Phyſician. He was no more indeed with regard to a German Phyſician, called Gaſpar Wolfius, whoſe four books of the Secrets of Phyſic and Chymiſtry (6) he tranſlated into French. He had a good ſhare in a book of Agriculture, which was much eſteemed, and of which there are many editions (7). This book is called *The Country-Houſe:* Charles Stephens was the firſt author of it. Liebaut, his ſon-in-law, corrected and enlarged it conſiderably. It was tranſlated into Engliſh, Flemiſh, and High-Dutch (8). Note, that the French tranſlation of the two books above-mentioned has been ſeveral times printed. I make uſe of the firſt edition, which is that of Paris, 1582, in 8vo, and I have an edition in twelves of the *three books of the Embelliſhment and Ornaments of the human body*. It is of Lyons, 1594. There are abundance of particulars in this work, whether relating to the characters of the beauty of each part of the body, or to the means of rectifying diſagreeable accidents. You there find a chapter (9) concerning the ſtink of excrements, and firſt of ordures. The author maintains, that this is a matter of importance; *therefore*, adds he, *to render a damſel amiable, and in all reſpects agreeable, and to crown her beauty with all the perfections that can be deſired in a handſome body, we ſhall enquire into the means of correcting the ſtink of her excrements, if exceſſive.* It were ridiculous to complain, that delicate ears are offended at ſuch diſcourſes: but Phyſicians would be ſtill more ridiculous, if they had regard to ſuch complaints. They are obliged to write in this manner; it is their profeſſion; Father Coton's reſerves (10) are no rule to them.

[*C*] *He returned into his native country.*] Here is a paſſage of Patin. 'As for John Liebaut, he was a Burgundian Phyſician, who never made his fortune here. He was ſon-in-law to Charles Stephens, who died in the Chatelet greatly in debt. After his death, Liebaut went to Dijon to lay his bones in his native country. His wife was called Nicole Stephens, ſhe was niece to the great Robert Stephens, who left Paris after the death of Francis I, finding himſelf deprived of his good maſter, and perſecuted by the Sorbonniſts, and retired to Geneva. Liebaut's book of the *Diſtempers of Women* is only a tranſlation of Marinello, who had written it in Italian, under the

---

(*f*) See, in the remark [*A*] the words of Aſconius Pedianus.

(1) See, above, the article CASSIUS LONGINUS (LUCIUS), remark [*B*].

(2) Excerpta ex Dione, pag. 626.

(3) Dio, ibid.

(4) *See the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, pag. 508.

(5) Minut Felix, pag. m. 236.

(1) Bibliotheque Franç. pag 358.

(2) Probably Philippe des Portes.

(3) Phyſician to the ducheſs of Ferrara.

(4) Ubi ſupra, pag. 187.

(5) For example, in the eleventh chapter of the ſecond book, pag. m. 243, he preſcribes ſome rules to huſbands that they may beget children.

(6) This work of Wolfius is in Latin. See la Croix du Maine, pag. 237.

(7) That, which I make uſe of, is of Roan, by David Berthelin, in 1666, in 4to.

(8) See the advertiſement to the reader. F. Anth Languier, prebend of Ries, is the author of it.

(9) It is the forty fourth of the third book.

(10) He has been commended for uſing very decent indirect words to expreſs the ordure of ſheep. See the Apology of Garaſſe, pag. 101.

‘ the title of the *Comara* (11).’ I know not how to reconcile this with la Croix du Maine's words. *Liebaut flouriſhes at Paris this year* 1584; for if he lived then at Paris, he did not quit it a little after Charles Stephen's death, which yet Guy Patin's words ſeem to import. Note, that Charles Stephens died in 1566. It is not true that Liebaut's book upon the *Diſtempers of Women* is only a tranſlation of *Marinello.* I have not the firſt edition of this Italian's book, but only that of Venice, *appreſſo Giovanni Valgriſio,* 1574, in 8vo. It is an edition, augmented and corrected (12), though not intituled *la Comara*, but *le Medecine partenenti alle infermita delle donne.* I have compared it with John Liebaut's book, and found it very different. It is true, the French author ſays ſeveral things, that were ſaid by the Italian: but after all, he cannot be reputed a meer tranſlator (13), Marinello had not the ſame ſcruples, as he who tranſlated John Liebaut's book: he explained a hundred things in the vulgar tongue, which he had better have ſuppreſſed or have written in Latin (14). Mercklinus did not know this work of John Marinello, nor that *de gli ornamenti delle donne,* publiſhed a ſecond time, by the ſame author, in 1574.

(11) Patin, Lettr. ccxcvi, pag. 572, Tom. II.

(12) This is the ſecond edition: the firſt is of the year 1563, and is intituled, in the Oxford Catalogue, *Trattato di tutte l'infirmita delle donne, come curarſi debbono que' mali che poſſono ſciogliere il legame del matrimonio.*

(13) See the article MARINELLO.

(14) See, for example, the 79th folio, where he gives ſome advice to a huſband who has no children, but would fain have ſome.

LIGARIUS (QUINTUS) lieutenant to Caius Conſidius, who commanded in Africa in quality of proconſul, acquitted himſelf ſo well in this poſt, that the people paſſionately deſired to have him for their governor when Conſidius was recalled. They obtained their deſire, and continued very well ſatisfied with the conduct of Ligarius. They would have made him their commander in chief, when they took arms at the beginning of the civil-war betwixt Cæſar and Pompey; but as he had a mind to return to Rome, he refuſed engaging in public affairs. He reſted for a while, after Publius Accius Varus had accepted that command (*a*). This is what Cicero ſets forth in his oration for Ligarius. He paſſes over other things in ſilence, and only confeſſes in general, that his party had embraced the intereſts of Pompey. It is probable that Ligarius had ſhewed himſelf very averſe to Julius Cæſar's deſigns, who neverthelеſs gave him his life (*b*), after the defeat of Scipio, and the other generals, who had renewed the war in Africa, in favour of that cauſe, which Pompey had defended. This favour did not prevent Ligarius's living concealed out of Italy. His brother and friends, and particularly Cicero (*c*), omitted nothing to obtain Cæſar's leave for his return to Rome; and they had hopes of accompliſhing it, when Tubero, in the midſt of theſe tranſactions, formally declared himſelf Ligarius's accuſer. Then it was that Cicero made that admirable oration for the accuſed, which in a very ſingular manner changed the intentions of Cæſar [*A*]. Ligarius was

(*a*) *Taken from Cicero,* in Orat. pro Q. Ligario.

(*b*) Hirtius de Bello Africano, pag. m. 467.

(*c*) Cicero, Epiſt. xiv, lib. vi, ad familiar.

[*A*] *Cicero pronounced for Ligarius that admirable oration . . . . . which changed the intentions of Cæſar.*] Nothing can be finer than this oration. Pomponius Atticus was charmed with it (1): Cornelius Balbus and Oppius admired it, and ſent a copy of it to Julius Cæſar (2). We cannot eaſily comprehend why the Civilian Pomponius ſhould praiſe it ſo coldly; ‘ Extat Ciceronis oratio, *ſays he* (3), ſatis pulcherrima, quæ inſcribitur pro Q. Ligario. —— *There is extant a good pretty oration enough of Cicero's for Q. Ligarius.*’ Beudeus thinks the word *ſatis*, ill placed before a ſuperlative. It is anſwered (4) that the poſitive is often put inſtead of the ſuperlative on ſuch occaſions. Very well, Pomponius's meaning then will be, that Cicero's oration for Ligarius is well enough. But this is a diſproportionate encomium, and too dry. Cicero out-did himſelf both in the compoſition and in the action, and perhaps the ſucceſs of his orations was never more remarkable. Cæſar did not deſign to acquit Ligarius, and yet he did it, unable to withſtand the emotions and workings in his ſoul, whilſt Cicero was ſpeaking. The accuſer was ſo vexed at the iſſue of his cauſe, that he renounced the bar (5), and betook himſelf to the profeſſion of the Civil-law. Let us examine a paſſage in the work of a Jeſuit upon the compariſon of Demoſthenes and Cicero. Conſult alſo the Chevræana (6).

‘ Cicero . . . . . undertook the defence of Q. Ligarius, his friend, accuſed of having born arms againſt Cæſar, tho' he was obliged upon ſeveral accounts to continue in his intereſts. Cæſar, who had already condemned him in his heart, having however a curioſity to hear Cicero, whom he had not heard of a long time, by reaſon of his preſence in the war, which he had now finiſhed, ſaid to one of his friends, who would have diſſwaded him, *What ſignifies it? Let us even hear him; my reſolution is taken, and nothing that can be ſaid for him ſhall alter it one way or other* †. But this Orator ſpoke with ſo much force in his friend's defence, that he moved Cæſar's heart in ſpight of all the oppoſition and the reſolutions he had taken not to ſuffer himſelf to be perſuaded: and Cicero ſaying ſomething of what paſſed at the battle of Pharſalia, in Cæſar's praiſe, this prince felt an extraordinary emotion throughout his whole frame; and, as if he had been perfectly enchanted by Cicero's diſcourſe, he let fall the paper he had in his hands. In fine, he was not able to reſiſt ſo many charms, nor that fine and delicate manner, in which he commended him ‡; and whatever reſolution he had taken to withſtand the Rhetoric of ſo powerful an Orator, he was forced to pardon Ligarius. I ſay nothing of a like favour, which Cicero obtained for king Dejotarus, and for his friend Marcellus from this ſame emperor, who was ſuch a maſter of his reſolutions, and ſo hard to be perſuaded (7).’

Father Rapin is here by no means guilty of the fault ſo incident to the Sieur Varillas, an Hiſtorian, who never related an adventure, as he found it in his authors, but flouriſhed and embroidered it after his own way; it is certain Plutarch expreſſed himſelf no leſs ſtrongly than this Jeſuit, as we may judge from the following words (8): ‘ It is reported, that, when Quintus Ligarius was proſecuted for having born arms againſt Cæſar, and Cicero had undertaken his defence, Cæſar ſaid to his friends, what hinders, but *that after ſo long a time* (9), we ſhould hear Cicero ſpeak? It being long ſince concluded, that Ligarius is an ill man, and our enemy. But when Cicero began to ſpeak, he wonderfully moved him, and proceeded in his ſpeech with ſuch a vehemence, and admirable grace, that Cæſar's countenance often changed; and it was very evident, that all the paſſions of his ſoul were in commotion. At length, the Orator touching upon the battle of Pharſalia, he was ſo tranſported, and agitated, that ſome of the papers he held fell out of his hands; and thus, being overpowered, he acquitted Ligarius.’ Let us note two miſtakes of father Rapin. He ſuppoſes that Cæſar *had not heard Cicero of a long time*; he is miſtaken; for a few months before, Cicero had ſpoken the oration *pro Marcello* before him. Here is the proof of it: ‘ Fac igitur, quod de hominine nobiliſſimo & clariſſimo, M. Marcello feciſti NUPER in curia, nunc idem in foro de optimis, & huic omni frequentiæ probatiſſimis fratribus. Ut conceſſiſti illum Senatui, ſic da hunc populo (10). ——— *As you lately pardoned M. Marcellus, at the requeſt of the ſenate; ſo now pardon this man, at the requeſt of the people.*’ It would be ſome excuſe to this Jeſuit, if we could ſay that he followed Plutarch's narration; but after all, it is no entire juſtification, ſince he has followed him in a falſe fact. I add, that it is not certain, that this Greek author imputes to Cæſar, what the Latin and other tranſlators predend he does: the Latin verſion, printed with Plutarch's original, runs thus: *Quid obſtat quin Ciceronem tanto intervallo audiamus dicentem?* This Latin anſwering to this Greek; Τί κωλύει διὰ χρόνου Κικέρωνος ἀκοῦσαι λέγοντος. The queſtion is, whether διὰ χρόνου in this place ſignifies, *after a long time*, or was abſolutely acquitted. He was no ſlave to notions of gratitude, for he became one of the accomplices of Brutus and Caſſius [*B*]. I ſhall have two faults to charge upon father Rapin (*d*).

---

(1) Cicero, Epiſt. xii, ad Attic. lib. xiii.

(2) Id. Epiſt. xix, ejuſdem libri.

(3) Pomponius, de Orig. Juris, lib. iii, cap. xii, pag. m. 421.

(4) See the notes of Rupert, in Pompon. *ibid.*

(5) Pompon. ubi ſupra.

(6) At the 75th page, Part. I, of the Holland Edit. but note, that this ſtory is told there with ſome ſmall alterations.

† Plutarch. in Ciceron.

‡ Nihil ſoles oblivisci, niſi injurias. *pro Lig.*

(7) Rapin. Compar. de Demoſthene & de Ciceron, chap. xvi, pag. 63, *Edit Holl.*

(8) Plutarch. in the Life of Cicero, pag. 880.

(9) This poſſibly is not Plutarch's meaning. *See, below, citat.* (11)

(10) Cicero, pro Ligario, cap xii, pag. 321. Edit. Græv. 1698.

or whether it would not be better rendered *a little time*, as the learned Fabricius has done: *Quid eſt cauſæ*, he tranſlates it (11), *cur Ciceronem orantem aliquamdiu non audiamus?* It may be objected perhaps, that this ſenſe is ſomewat abſurd, ſince Cæſar did not mean to hear a part of Cicero's oration, and go out of the aſſembly before he had made an end. I anſwer that διὰ χρόνȣ might, be a way of ſpeaking amonſt the Greeks, much like our Engliſh expreſſion *a little*. Now when one ſays, *Let us go a little to ſee ſuch a thing; Let us go hear this preacher a little; what hinders, but we may go and hear ſuch a one's funeral ſermon a little?* he does not mean *to ſee or hear by halves*, nor has he any deſign to go out of the church before the end of the ſermon. This methinks is the moſt natural idea we can fix to Cæſar's words. The other error of Father Rapin is his ſuppoſing, that Cicero obtained the ſame favour for king Dejotarus, and Marcellus, as for Ligarius. Nothing is more untrue; for, in the firſt place, he did not procure Dejotarus's diſcharge (12); and, in the ſecond place, it was not he, but the ſenate, that obtained Marcellus's pardon. The oration for Marcellus was only to give thanks for a favour, which Cæſar had granted at the requeſt of the whole aſſembly. See what Cicero himſelf relates in a letter to Sulpicius (13).

[*B*] *He was one of the accomplices of Brutus and Caſſius.*] Plutarch will not permit us to doubt of this. *Among Pompey's friends, there was one Caius Ligarius, whom Cæſar had pardoned, tho' accuſed for having been in arms againſt him. This man not being ſo thankful for having been forgiven, as incenſed at that power, which made him need a pardon, hated Cæſar, and was one of Brutus's moſt intimate friends. Him Brutus viſited, and finding him ſick,* O Ligarius, *ſays he,* what a time have you found to be ſick in? *At which words Ligarius raiſing himſelf, and leaning on his elbow, took Brutus by the hand, and ſaid, But,* O Brutus, if you are on any deſign worthy of your ſelf, I am well (14). Appian (15) reckons Quintus Ligarius amongſt thoſe, whom Brutus and Caſſius engaged in their conſpiracy, and relates (16), the manner how the two brothers, both called Ligarius, periſhed under the proſcription of the Triumviri.

(*d*) See the remark [*A*], towards the end.

(11) Fr Fabricius, in Peroratione Orationis pro Q. Ligario, pag. 233. Edit. Græv.

(12) See the remark [*D*] and [*E*] of the article DEJOTARUS.

(13) It is the fourth of the fourth book, *ad familiares*.

(14) Plutarch in Bruto, pag. 988. *Plutarch's giving him the name of Caius, is only a ſlip of Memory.*

(15) Appian de Bell. Civil. lib. ii, pag. m. 272.

(16) Id. ibid lib. iv, pag. 342, 343.

LIMEUIL (ISABELLA DE LA TOUR DE TURENNE (*a*), DEMOISELLE DE) maid of honour to Catherine de Medicis, verified by her conduct a witty ſaying in the Menagiana (*b*), *viz.* that the function of maid of honour to a queen is a very difficult part. She ſunk under the weight of it, in the face of the whole court; for ſhe lay-in at the queen's-palace without having been married. The Prince of Condé was the father of this child. A chronological diſpute aroſe hereupon [*A*]. And beſides, writers are divided

[*A*] *A chronological diſpute aroſe hereupon.*] This doubtleſs the too lovers never expected; they little imagined, that their careſſes ſhould afford matter of diſpute between authors a hundred years after; the fact is this. We will begin with theſe words of the General Criticiſm on the Hiſtory of Calviniſm (1). 'The prince of Condé, falling in love with one of the queen's maids, called Mademoiſelle de Limeuil, ſaid ſo many moving things to her, that they ſoon came to what we call the concluſion of the romance. She had a ſon by him, of whom ſhe lay-in, in the reign of Charles IX, the twenty fifth of May, 1561, in the very palace of the Louvre: but the queen, who at that time had occaſion for the prince to balance the overgrown power of the houſe of Guiſe, had compaſſion on humane frailty. Thus one of our wits ſpeaks of this adventure in a kind of romance, intituled, *The Prince of Condé.* where we find ſeveral other very curious ſtrokes of hiſtory, and very faithfully related. Another of the queen's maids had juſt ſuch another diſaſter about two or three years after. Catherine de Medicis, perceiving that the prince loved this young lady, reſolved to lay hold of this occaſion for penetrating into his deſigns; and therefore adviſed her, who probably had no need of incitements, not to over-act the part of a prude. Mezerai will tell you this ſtory much better than I †. *The queen endeavoured to captivate the prince of Condé by the charms of pleaſure, and by the lure of one of her maids of honour, who, ſparing nothing to ſerve her miſtreſs, found herſelf indiſpoſed for nine months, and was for ſome time the whole diſcourſe of the court, where ſuch ſort of accidents give more diverſion than ſcandal.* The prince had another intrigue of note with the widow of the mareſchal of St André, and had married her, if the admiral had not warded off the blow by propoſing another match. . . . (2). He made him ſuch remonſtrances ‡ as obliged him to break off, by the conjugal bond, all his pernicious engagements with the mareſchal's widow, who, endeavouring to enamour the prince, fell ſo in love with him, as to purchaſe her ſatisfaction at the price of her eſtate of Valery, which ſhe made him a preſent of.'

Several perſons have found two remarkable falſities in this account; for it is not true, that Mademoiſelle de Limeuil lay-in in the year 1561, and that another of the queen's maids of honour made the ſame ſlip with the prince of Condé ſome years after. Yet ſome opiniators maintain, that the date in the romance, cited by Mr Maimbourg's critic, is juſt; and conſequently, that the prince of Condé debauched two of Catherine de Medicis's maids of honour, one after another, in a ſhort time. This conſequence is moſt certain, if the author of the romance be not miſtaken; for it cannot be denied, that one of this queen's maids of honour lay-in in 1564, after her familiarity with the prince; but once more, the author of the romance tells an untruth. It is neither a fault of the preſs, nor a poetical fiction, but an hiſtorical falſity. The whole ſeries of the book maniſeſtly ſhews that the author ſpeaks of an intrigue, which preceded the impriſonment of the prince, and the ſentence of death paſſed upon him in November 1560. The author therefore alone is anſwerable for the number 1561 and not the Printer. It cannot be ſaid, that he antedated it deſignedly, from a liberty allowed in an epic poem, or in a romance; for, as his book has every where as exact dates, as thoſe of Mezerai, whether concerning the death of Francis II, and of the king of Navarre, or concerning the prince's pardon, *&c.* we muſt ſuppoſe, that he deſigned to give the true date of the young lady's lying-in. The circumſtances of the day, and month, and place, which he has carefully collected, confirm this opinion, ſince they ſignify nothing to the œconomy of the piece: he only touches upon them by the by, to quicken the attention of his reader, by a particularity ſeldom found in ſuch ſort of books. To what end ſhould he antedate her pregnancy two years? The romance gains nothing by it: the intrigue might have been carried on as well by laying the ſcene of it two years after. The tenor of the book maniſeſtly ſhews this. Our author therefore muſt have been deceived by his memoirs, in which 1561 had been put inſtead of 1564. I know thoſe, who, after ſome reflexions on this matter, have imagined, that the Demoiſelle de Limeuil was twice got with child by the prince, and that the author of the romance ſpeaks of the firſt pregnancy, and Mr Mezerai of the ſecond. I cannot think them in the right: for though the court of France was at that time very diſſolute, it cannot be conceived, that a maid of honour ſhould lye-in at the Louvre in 1561 and make the ſame falſe ſtep three years after in the quality of maid of honour. Some meaſures were

(*a*) Varillas, Hiſtoire de Charles IX, livr. v, pag. 600, Paris Edit in 12mo. 1684.

(*b*) Pag. 323, Dutch Edit.

(1) Critique Générale, Lettr. III, pag. 45, *of the third edition.*

† Mezerai, Abrég. Chron. ad ann. 1563. Thuan. lib. xxxv

(2) Critique Générale, ibid.

‡ Mezerai, ubi ſupra.

divided about the conſequences of this adventure [*B*]. Some pretend, that the young lady was expelled the court [*C*], and others, that ſhe loſt not the queen's good graces

were ſtill obſerved, and ſome regard had to the public. Brantome, who ſpeaks of this court, from his own certain knowledge, expreſsly affirms it (3). The moſt natural ſignification of his words is, that the maids of Catherine de Medicis had never a better time than while they lived with her, becauſe they had full liberty either to taſte of all the joys of marriage, or abſtain, provided they had the art and induſtry to prevent pregnancy. There was therefore ſome diſgrace to be feared, when they wanted this point of skill; for that queen acted almoſt like the Lacedæmonians, who did not puniſh the theft, but the want of cunning to conceal it. We ſhall preſently ſee, that Mrs Limeuil was diſgraced. They, who require proofs of it, form a horrible idea of Catherine de Medicis.

[*B*] *Writers are divided about the conſequences of this adventure.*] The beſt hiſtorians agree, that the queen-mother lent an hand to the amours of the prince, and of Mrs Limeuil. See, in the preceeding remark (4), a paſſage of Mezerai: It is taken from his chronological Abridgment: here is another from his great hiſtory (5). 'The queen, having gained 'nothing by this method (6) . . . bethought her of another more ſubtle, which was to gain the prince by the 'lure of love and pleaſures, by which the haughtieſt 'ſouls are captivated without a ſtruggle. She treated 'him with all the demonſtrations of a cordial friendſhip, and entire confidence; ſhe gave him the government of Picardy, the firſt ſubject of his diſcontent, and had all the reſpects paid him that are 'due to the firſt prince of the blood. Beſides this, 'ſhe had people ſuborned to amuſe him with all 'kind of diverſions; and the charms of the fair 'Limeuil, one of her maids, were ſo ſerviceable to 'her deſigns, that for ſome time he had laid aſide all 'thoughts of any thing but her; which his wife Eleanor de Roye, a woman of ſevere chaſtity, diſcovering, died of grief; an accident that gave the 'queen a deal of joy, becauſe this lady being of an 'imperious temper, and very zealous for the Huguenot religion, was the ſharpeſt ſpur to quicken the 'courage of the prince. But, on the other hand, 'the royal palace, and her ſelf, ſuffered great ſcandal 'from theſe love-intrigues; for Mrs Limeuil giving 'too much way to the prince's paſſion, was ſo imprudent, and ſo ill concerted her meaſures, as to 'lye-in in her wardrobe, in the face of all the world; 'for which reaſon ſhe diſcharged her with diſgrace, 'though ſhe could not hinder her ſpeaking ſomewhat 'too plainly of the occaſion of her misfortune.' Mr Varillas has not forgot this intrigue. Let us ſee what he ſays of it.

'Love entred into the cauſe, and ſeconded the 'artifices of the queen. Mademoiſelle de la Limeuil 'was the handſomeſt of her maids of honour, and 'the prince grew ſo fond of her, that the princeſs his 'wife, perceiving it, died of jealouſy. The queen, 'attentive to the leaſt occaſions of ſtrengthning her power looked upon this conjuncture as the moſt favourable that could ever preſent itſelf. She fancied that, 'as the Chatillons had engaged the prince in hereſy, 'by marrying him to their niece, ſo ſhe might 'reduce him to the communion of the church, by 'giving him a young lady to wife, who had the 'honour to be her relation, whoſe charms might fix 'his inconſtancy, and get out of him all the ſecret 'deſigns of Calviniſm. In this thought, ſhe ordered 'the young lady to omit nothing that might contribute to captivate the prince. But it was expoſing 'a moderate virtue to too great a riſque, to make it 'grapple with a lover, who took the leaſt advantages 'in love, as well as in war, to puſh things to an 'extremity. The lady, feigning a kindneſs for the 'prince, became in love with him in good earneſt, 'and, to her ſorrow, was not the only perſon at court, 'whoſe heart was inſenſibly engaged (7).' He afterwards relates the amours of the mareſchal de St André's widow, with this prince, and her extraordinary liberalities to him, and then adds (8): 'Mademoiſelle 'de Lemeuil made reflexions, very wide of the truth 'on ſo uncommon an adventure; ſhe ſuppoſed the 'prince leſs amorous, or more intereſted, than he 'really was, and imagined that, ſince he had accepted the eſtate of St Valeri, he deſigned, in good 'earneſt, to marry the mareſchal's widow, her jealouſy encreaſed, to ſuch degree, that, not having 'fortune enough to equal the liberality of her rival, 'ſhe reſolved to out-do her in granting the prince 'what was deareſt to her in the world: the pregnancy, which ſoon followed, made her ſhame 'public, and ſhe was ignominiouſly diſcarded the 'court.'

[*C*] *Some pretend, that the young lady was expelled the court.*] Mezerai and Varillas affirm it, and there is no room to doubt the truth of it. A ſatirical author is of the ſame opinion, in a writing that is very injurious to the queen-mother: he owns, that the young lady was ſent to a convent (9). Mr le Laboureur cites a fragment of this ſatire, which will ſtand properly enough in this place. I ſhall add to it Mr le Laboureur's preamble, becauſe it aſſigns another the cauſe of this prince's amour, and fixes the time when the lady was brought to bed (10). 'Amongſt 'the other news, there was a talk of the fair de 'L . . . . .'s lying-in, one of the maids of honour; 'upon which occaſion it may not be amiſs to obſerve, 'that, after the peace of Orleans, the prince of Condé, continuing at court, thought he could not better 'remove all ſuſpicions, than by plunging himſelf into the pleaſures of the times, and getting a miſtreſs. 'The queen, who thought it the ſureſt chain to 'bind him, was not diſpleaſed that this maid, of one 'of the firſt families of the kingdom, hearkened to 'his vows and offers of ſervice, not thinking perhaps, that this friendſhip would ever paſs the bounds 'of gallantry. But, whether the maid could not 'reſiſt his quality, and reaſons of ſtate conſpired together, or rather the eſteem of the prince; or that 'ſhe hoped one day to marry him, as it is ſaid he 'had promiſed her, in caſe Eleanor de Roy his 'wife, whoſe life was deſpaired of ſhould die, as it 'happened the ſame year, ſhe could not long hold 'out againſt ambition and love, and all was revealed 'by the birth of this ſon, during the progreſs to 'Lyons.' Thus ſpeaks this libel (11).

Puella illa nobilis
Quæ erat tam amabilis,
Commiſit adulterium
Et nuper fecit filium.
Sed dicunt matrem Reginam
Illi fuiſſe . . . . . .
Et quod hoc patiebatur
Ut Principem lucraretur.
At multi dicunt quod pater
Non eſt Princeps, ſed eſt alter,
Qui Regi eſt à Secretis
Omnibus eſt notus ſatis.

Contra hanc tamen Regina
Se oſtendit tantum plena
Cholera, ac ſi neſciſſet
Hoc quod Puella feciſſet,
Et dedit illi cuſtodes
Superbos nimis & rudes,
Mittens in Monaſterium
Quærere refrigerium.
Sed certè pro tam levi re,
Sic non debebat tractare,
At excuſare modicum,
Tempus, perſonam & locum.
Aliis non fit taliter
Quæ faciunt ſimiliter.

Pridie venit nuncium
Puellam eſſe mortuum,
Et fuit magna jactura
De tam pulchra creatura,
Quæ nunc eſt cum cœlitibus
Rogans Deum pro patribus,
Et ut Patri ſit melius.

---

(3) See the article GARNACHE, citat. (4).

(4) At citat. †.

(5) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. II, pag. 133, ad ann. 1564.

(6) That is, by endeavouring to ſow diſſentions between the prince of Condé, and the admiral de Chatillon.

(7) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, livr. v, pag. 346. Edit. Holl. ad ann. 1563.

(8) Id. ibid. pag. 348, 349.

(9) The marginal notes of Varillas's Hiſtory of Charles IX, in the Paris edit. in 12mo, 1684, book v, pag. 604, import, *that the queen had her conducted by one of her Valets de Chambre, called Gentil, to the convent of the Franciſcan nuns, in the town of Auſſonne.* I believe Mr D'Hoſier made thoſe notes.

(10) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtelnau, Tom. II, pag. 371.

(11) They were news in proſaic rhyme, addreſſed under the name of John Philoglutius, doctor of the Sorbonne, to maſter Pandolphus Verunculius, bachelor, July 9, 1564. *Le Laboureur, ibid. pag.* 369.

graces [*D*]. In a word, there are great variations on this head [*E*]. Be that how it will, ſhe was daughter to Giles de la Tour, lord of Limeuil (*c*); and was afterwards married to Scipio Sardini, baron of Chaumont upon the Loire, &c. a noble Luccheſe (*d*) [*F*]. She one day rebuffed the conſtable of Montmorency, the moſt terrible man in the world [*G*]. I ſhall

That noble maid, ſo ſweet and mild,
Late play'd the whore, and had a child.
Some ſay, to gain the prince, the queen
Herſelf contriv'd the amorous ſcene.
But others from this ſtory vary,
And lay it to the ſecretary.
Howe'er it be, the queen did rate her,
As ſhe had nothing known o' th' matter,
And to cloyſter ſent the fair,
To taſte of diſcipline ſevere:
But ſure the penance was too great
For ſuch a light offence as that.
What nymph has virtue at command
Such ſtrong temptation to withſtand?
She's dead; the lovely creature's ta'en,
To mix with the celeſtial train;
Where now ſhe prays that heaven's high pow'r
Wou'd bleſſings on her father ſhow'r.

'The queen was the more offended at this diſorder 'happening in her family, as it was too public to be 'concealed; but time wore it off, and the lady was 'married ſome time after.' The court came to Lyons, towards the middle of June, 1564. So that, ſince the lady lay-in, during the time of this progreſs, it may reaſonably be ſuppoſed, that her child was born the twenty fifth of May the ſame year. Therefore the author of the romance has gueſſed right at the day, though not at the year.

[*D*] . . . . *and others, that ſhe loſt not the queen's good graces.*] This is the opinion of the author of the forementioned romance. *The queen*, ſays he (12), *who at that time ſtood in need of the prince of Condé, to balance the over-grown power of the houſe of Guiſe, had compaſſion on human frailty.* He ſuppoſes, that the lady continued maid of honour to the queen, and that ſhe tried to diſſuade the prince from taking arms. 'Mademoiſelle de Limeuil, *ſays he* (13), 'companion of Mademoiſelle du Rouet (14), and maid 'of honour, as well as ſhe, with whom the prince of 'Condé had formerly lived, even to a familiarity, 'which for ſome time incommoded her, did all that 'was poſſible to change his paſſion for war, into 'a paſſion of another kind, in which the combat, to 'her knowledge, had ſomething much more agree'able. She knew his inclination, and, valiant as he 'was, ſhe doubted not but he was as ſenſible to 'love as glory. She wrote to him, and deſired him 'to conſider, that he was going to make war with 'a perſon, with whom he had ſome time been upon 'better terms, ſince her religion placed her in the 'number of his enemies.' This author is miſtaken; for it is certain, the queen put her in a convent, and ordered her to be cloſe confined (15). This ought not to be ſuppreſſed in the *Diſcours merveilleux de la vie de Catherine de Medicis.* Let us ſee what the author of this ſaitre obſerves concerning la Limeuil. He ſays (16), that the prince of Condé began to be in love with her during his confinement, and that this young lady 'was one of the maids the queen-'mother had ſet on to debauch him, every thing 'being lawful to ambition, provided it can compaſs 'it's deſigns.' Having mentioned the peace concluded the eighteenth of March, 1563, he ſays (17), that the queen, 'to deſtroy the prince of Condé's 'reputation with his party, conſtantly treated him at 'the expence of the honour of Limeuil, who grew 'big with child. And the queen, to put the beſt face 'upon it that ſhe could, pretending to ſtorm at Li'meuil, this young lady had the boldneſs to tell her, 'that ſhe only followed the example of her miſtreſs, 'and obſerved her commands.' This is all he ſays: ſincerity required that he ſhould have owned, that Limeuil was baniſhed and cloyſtered.

[*E*] *There are great variations on this head.*] In the *Diſcours Merveilleux*, it is ſaid, that the prince loved the lady Limeuil, from the time of his impriſonment, after the battle of Dreux: but Mr Mezerai, and Mr Varillas affirm, that his love commenced not till after the firſt peace. Varillas ſays, that the queen propoſed to marry her to the prince, and that the young lady flattering herſelf with the hopes of this honour, ſtuck at no means for attaining it; but the other Hiſtorian attributes the hopes of marrying the prince to the wife of the mareſchal of St André alone. Varillas ſays, that the prince was loved by both theſe ladies at the ſame time, and that they rivalled each other, the one beſtowing on him her eſtate, the other her maidenhead. Mezerai ſays nothing of this conteſt; he ſuppoſes (18), that the prince was a widower, when the queen projected a match between him and the mareſchal's widow: if ſo, what becomes of the rivalſhip mentioned by Varillas; that rivalſhip which made theſe two ladies ſtrive which ſhould be the moſt prodigal of her favours to the prince? This is only a chimera, according to Mezerai's opinion; for Eleanora de Roye was ſtill alive (19), when Limeuil lay-in: and thus, before the prince was a widower, this lady had left the court in diſgrace, and retired to a monaſtery. She did not therefore diſpute the point with the mareſchal's widow, nor oppoſe the preſent of her maidenhead to the grant of the eſtate of Valeri in Gatinois.

[*F*] *She afterwards married Scipio Sardini, baron of Chaumont on the Loire, &c. a noble Luccheſe.*] I truſt much more to the authors I have cited, than to the publiſher of the Galantries of the kings of France. 'Mademoiſelle de Limeuil, *ſays he* (20), having lain-'in, endeavoured to comfort herſelf for the loſs of 'the great hopes ſhe had conceived, by marrying 'Jeoffrey de Cauſac, lord of Fremon, who had loved 'her a long time, and whom ſhe had neglected, ever 'ſince her intrigue with the prince of Condé.' For the reſt, Scipio Sardini had been one of the Italian farmers of the revenues, who made their fortunes in France, under Catherine de Medicis. I have read a contract (21) paſſed between the clergy of France and him, the fourth of March, 1588, *for the offices of alternate receivers, and two comptrollers of the hereditary tenths in each dioceſe of this kingdom, and of other ſubſidies and duties.* He is there called the noble Scipio Sardini, a Luccheſe gentleman, *living in the city of Paris, in the pariſh of St Severinus.* It is doubtleſs the ſame Scipio Sardini, who took Baudius into his houſe, and allowed him a penſion (22); the ſame alſo, whom Baſſompierre ſometimes mentions in his memoirs, of whom I find this particular at the twenty firſt page of the Thuana. 'The life of Caſtruccio Ca'ſtracani de gli Interminelli, written by Aldo Ma'nucci, is very fine, and quite different from that 'written by Machiavel. . . . . . This life is very 'well worth the looking after: I never ſaw but one 'copy of it, and that was in the hands of the lord 'Scipio Sardini: he had it from one Interminelli, the 'ſame who had prevailed on Manucci to write this 'life.' I believe it is printed at Lucca, in 4to, in Italian. It is a fine piece.

[*G*] *She rebuffed the conſtable of Montmorency.*] I will tell the ſtory juſt as I find it in Brantome. 'One 'day at the ſiege of Roan (23), as the queen went 'to the fort of St Catherine of Rouën, attended with 'her maids of honour, the conſtable having ſaid ſome'thing to her, and taking his leave of her, met Ma'demoiſelle de Limeuil, one of the handſomeſt maids 'of the court, and who had wit at will, and he came 'on horſeback to ſalute her, intending to have ſome 'diſcourſe with her, and always called her his miſtreſs, 'and would ride cloſe by her ſide; for the good man 'was no enemy to beauty or love, either in words 'or deeds; for he had played ſome pranks in his youth, 'which I will not mention. Mademoiſelle de Li'meuil, who was not in her beſt humour that day, 'took little notice of him, for ſhe could be proud 'enough when ſhe pleaſed, and began to huff him 'ſtrangely, and bid him be gone about his buſineſs, 'who ſaid to her, Truly, my miſtreſs, I am going; 'you rebuff me ſeverely: it is but fit, anſwered ſhe, 'that you ſhould meet with ſomebody to rebuff you, 'ſince you make it your buſineſs to rebuff all mankind. 'Adieu then, ſaid he, my miſtreſs, I will leave you; 'for you have given me my own (24).'

[*H*] *I will*

(*c*) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtelnau, Tom. I, pag. 337, *compared with* Tom. II, pag. 371.

(*d*) Id. Tom. I, pag 327. *See alſo Varillas, ubi ſupra*, lib. v, pag. 612.

(12) Pag. 70, Edit. Holl. 1681.

(13) Pag. 132.

(14) Miſtreſs to the king of Navarre.

(15) See the Latin rhymes of the preceding remark.

(16) Diſcours merveilleux de la Vie de Cather. de Medicis, pag. m. 42.

(17) Ib. pag. 46.

(18) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. II, pag. 133.

(19) She died the twenty third of July, 1564. Madam Limeuil lay-in during the progreſs to Lyons. The court arrived at Lyons about the middle of June, 1564.

(20) Galant. des Rois de France, Tom. I, pag m. 255.

(21) It is inſerted the ſecond book of the Collections of Edicts, Orders, Agreements, and other matters relating to the clergy of France, *fol* 120, *& ſeq. Edit.* 1615, *in* 8*vo.*

(22) See the article BAUDIUS, citat. (8).

(23) Roan was beſieged in Autumn, 1562.

(24) Brantome in the Elogy of this Conſtable, Tom. II, of his Memoirs, pag. m. 71, 72.

ſhall ſet down a paſſage of Brantome, which is curious enough [*H*]. Her eldeſt ſiſter, maid of honour to Catherine de Medicis, died at court. Brantome ſpeaks of her [*I*].

[*H*] *I will produce a paſſage of Brantome concerning her, which is curious enough.*] I do not fear that the judicious will declare againſt my conjecture, when they have well examined the circumſtances of the following ſtory. It is difficult not to find in it Mademoiſelle de la Limeuil, and the prince of Condé.

‘(25) I have known another prince, but not ſo great (26), who, during his firſt marriage, and his widowhood (27), fell in love with a very handſome young lady, to whom he made, during his amours and careſſes, noble preſents of carkanets, rings, jewels, and abundance of other fine things, and, amongſt them, a very fine and rich looking-glaſs, in which was his picture. Now the prince happened to marry a very handſome and virtuous princeſs, who made him diſreliſh his firſt love, though they were equally beautiful. This princeſs intreated and teized her huſband to that degree, that he ſent to demand of his firſt miſtreſs, all the fine preſents he had made her. This was a heart-breaking to the lady; however, ſhe had a ſoul ſo great and noble, though ſhe was not a princeſs, but of one of the beſt families in France, that ſhe ſent him back all his preſents, and, amongſt the reſt, the looking-glaſs with his picture; but firſt, to grace it the more, ſhe took a pen and ink, and fixed a pair of horns to the temples of his forehead, and delivering all to the gentleman, ſaid to him; Here, friend, carry this to your maſter, which I ſend him juſt as I received it, having, for my part, neither added nor diminiſhed, though ſomething has grown to it ſince of it's own accord; and tell that fine princeſs, his wife, who has ſo much importuned him to demand what he had given me, that, if a certain lord in the world (naming him, as I could do, if I pleaſed) had ſerved her mother ſo, and re-demanded and reſumed what he had given her for lying with her, ſhe would be as poor in trinkets and jewels, as any lady at court; and her head, which is ſo loaded with them at the coſt of ſuch a lord, and heretofore of her mother, would be only decked with flowers out of the garden, inſtead of theſe jewels: but let her make her beſt uſe of them, I ſcorn to keep them. They, who knew this lady, would eaſily judge ſhe gave this anſwer; and ſhe told it me herſelf, for ſhe was very free of diſcourſe; however, ſhe had like to have come by the worſt, as well from the huſband as the wife, who were equally affronted; but they ought to blame themſelves; for why would they thus provoke and enrage this poor lady, who, it was ſaid, had earned theſe preſents dearly enough with the ſweat of her brow. This young lady being one of the fineſt and moſt agreeable perſons of her time, notwithſtanding the uſe this prince had made of her body, met with a very rich match, though not of an equal family; ſo that happening to upbraid one another with the honour which each had done the other, ſhe, who was ſo great, in marrying him; he anſwered her, I have done more for you, than you for me; for I have diſhonoured myſelf to retrieve your honour, meaning, that, as ſhe had loſt it when a maid, he had repaired it, by making her his wife.’

[*I*] *Her eldeſt ſiſter . . . . Brantome ſpeaks of her.*] In theſe words (28); *The elder Limeuil, at her firſt coming to court, happened to make a lampoon, (for ſhe ſpoke and wrote well) upon all the court; which however was rather diverting than ſcandalous; but aſſure yourſelf, ſhe* (29) *had her ſoundly jerked, with two of her companions, who were privy to it; and, but that ſhe had the honour to be related to her by the houſe of Touraine, allied to that of Bologne, ſhe had been ignominiouſly chaſtized, by the expreſs command of the king* (30), *who deteſted ſuch writings.* In his elogy of Catherine de Medicis, he obſerves that this young lady died at court. He tells us, in another place, a remarkable thing of her. ‘During her ſickneſs, *ſays he* (31), of which ſhe died, ſhe never left off diſcourſing; for ſhe was a great talker, and of a ſatirical wit, which ſhe exerciſed very ſeaſonably and well, and was very handſome withal: when ſhe came to her dying hour, ſhe called her valet (for each of the maids of honour had one) whoſe name was Julian, and who play'd very well on the violin. Julian, *ſaid ſhe*, take the violin and play, till you ſee me dead (for I am going) The Defeat of the Swiſſe, the beſt you can. And when you come to the word *all's loſt*, play it four or five times over in the dolefuleſt note you can; which he did, and ſhe aſſiſted him with her voice, and when they came to *all's loſt*, ſhe repeated it twice, then turning herſelf to the other ſide of the bed, ſhe ſaid to her companions, all's loſt this inſtant in good earneſt, and ſo expired. Here is a merry pleaſant death; I have this ſtory from two of her companions, who are worthy of credit, and who ſaw the ſcene.’ They, who would give a catalogue of perſons, who have died jeſting, muſt not forget this young lady.

(25) Brantome, Memoires des Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. 392.

(26) He had been juſt ſpeaking of the adventure of a certain very great ſovereign prince.

(27) I can ſcarce believe, that Mrs Limeuil continued her intrigue with the prince, after he was a widower; for he became ſo when ſhe was in a monaſtery.

(28) Brantome, Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. 366.

(29) That is to ſay, Catherine de Medicis.

(30) That is to ſay, of Henry II.

(31) Brantome, ubi ſupra, pag. 341.

LINACER (THOMAS) an Engliſh Phyſician, and one of the learnedeſt perſons of the XVIth century [*A*], ſtudied at Florence under Demetrius Chalcondylus and Politian, and ſo remarkably diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his modeſty and genteel behaviour, that Lorenzo de Medicis made him the companion of his childrens ſtudies. He lived afterwards at Rome, and was in great eſteem with Hermolaus Barbarus. Being returned to England, he was appointed preceptor to prince Arthur, eldeſt Son to Henry VII, and dedicated to him the Latin Verſion of Proclus's Sphere [*B*]. He was pitched upon with two other Engliſhmen (*a*) for the tranſlating of Ariſtotle: but this deſign was abandoned by his companions. He tranſlated ſome tracts of Galen into Latin, and publiſhed a learned work *de emendata Latini ſermonis ſtructura* (*C*). He was Phyſician to the king of

(*a*) Latimer & Crocinius.

[*A*] *One of the learnedeſt perſons of the XVIth century.*] Conſult Baillet and Pope Blount, who have collected the praiſes that had been given him, the former in the IVth Tome (1) of the Judgments of the Learned; the latter at the three hundred and ſeventy ſixth, and three hundred and ſeventy ſeventh pages of his *Cenſura celebriorum authorum.*

[*B*] *He dedicated to prince Arthur, the Latin verſion of Proclus's ſphere.*] Paul Jovius (2), and George Lilius (3), affirm it; and yet Eraſmus tells us, this book was dedicated to Henry VII, who made no account of it, becauſe an envious perſon had told him that it was not the firſt tranſlation of Proclus. ‘Thomæ Linacro peſſimè ceſſit quòd *Proclum* à ſe denuo verſum Regi hujus patri dicârat. *Andreas* quidam *Tolaſates* (4) præceptor *Arcturi* principis & in regnum paternum ſucceſſuri, niſi mors antevertiſſet, cœcus adulator, nec adulator tantum, ſed & delator peſſimus, Regem admonuit hoc libelli jam olim fuiſſe verſum à neſcio quo; & erat, ſed miſere. Hanc ob cauſam Rex & munus aſpernatus eſt, & in *Linacrum* velut in impoſtorem inexpiabile concepit odium (5). —— *Linacer ſucceeded very ill in dedicating his new tranſlation of Proclus to the king, this prince's father. One Andrew of Toulouſe, tutor to prince Arthur, who would have ſucceeded his father, if he had lived, a blind flatterer, and not only a flatterer, but a ſcandalous informer, told the king, that this book had been tranſlated before; and it is true, it had been; but wretchedly. For this reaſon the king not only rejected the preſent, but conceived an inveterate hatred to Linacer as an impoſtor.*’ Eraſmus tells us on this occaſion, a mad freek of Henry VII.

[*C*] *He publiſhed a learned work* de emendata Latini ſermonis ſtructura.] It was often printed. I have only the Venice edition, *apud Aldum*, 1557, in 8vo. The preface

(1) Pag. 84, & 85, & 371.

(2) Jovius, in Elog. Doctor. Viror. pag. m. 146.

(3) Georg. Lilius, in Elog. quorund. Anglor. pag. 93.

(4) He was an Auguſtin Monk, a native of Toulouſe, and whom he ought therefore to have called *Toloſas*, or *Toloſanus*. He is called *Bernardus Andreas*, in the Abridgment of Geſner, *pag. m.* 116; and in the *Encomiaſticon Auguſtinianum* of Philip Elſſius, *pag.* 124.

(5) Eraſ. Epiſt. xiv, lib. xxvi, pag. 1424.

of England, and the princeſs Mary, and bequeathed a houſe to the college of Phyſicians [*D*]. He died at the age of 64 [*E*], and was buried at London in St Paul's church (*b*). He had a benefice given him (*c*) in 1515, and went into prieſt's orders (*d*). Eraſmus commends him highly, but makes him guilty of the ſame fault as Paulus Æmilius [*F*]; that is,

---

(*b*) *Taken from* Paul Jovius, in Elog. Viror. Doctor. cap. lxiii. *See alſo* Lilius ad calcem Jovii Britanniæ Deſcript. pag. 92, & ſeq.

(*c*) Linacer ſacerdotio actus eſt pro quo omnes Muſas Fortunæ gratias egiſſe arbitror. - - - *Linacer was made prieſt, for which all the Muſes, I believe, gave Fortune thanks.* Epiſt. xxxix, lib. viii, inter Eraſmianas.

(*d*) Pope Blount, Cenſ. Author. pag. 377.

preface is wanting. It had been dedicated to the princeſs Mary, as we are aſſured in the following words (6): ‘ Sed & de emendata Latini ſermonis ſtructura, ex præſtantiſſimorum authorum obſervatione compoſitum volumen paulo antea, quàm vita excederet, publicavit, adſcripta præfatiuncula Mariæ Henrici Octavi ex Catharina Hiſpana conjuge filiæ, laudatiſſimæ indolis & admirabili virtutum omnium concentu ad omnem gratiam promerendam natæ Principi, cui renovato prudentiſſimi patris exemplo Henricus Rex Linacrum à tuenda ſanitate præfectum adhibuit. ——— *Beſides, a little before his death, he publiſhed a book,* De Emendata, *&c. from what the beſt authors had obſerved, with a ſhort preface to Mary, daughter of Henry VIII, a princeſs of great abilities and virtues, to whom king Henry, after the example of his moſt prudent father, aſſigned Linacer as her Phyſician.*’ Mr Baillet (7), citing the page, from whence I take this Latin, ſays, that the author relates, that Eraſmus and Budeus praiſed Linacer for having written this treatiſe. I do not find this in my edition.

[*D*] *He bequeathed a houſe to the college of Phyſicians.*] Theſe words are a tranſlation of thoſe of Goergius Lilius; *Londini obiit, honeſta domo in ea urbe Medicorum Collegio ex teſtamento relicta* (8). Paul Jovius expreſſes himſelf thus: *Honeſtam domum Londini Medicorum Collegio dedicavit* (9). Neither of them have been exact; for it ſhould have been ſaid, that Linacer built the College of Phyſicians at London, and was firſt preſident of it. This is what is affirmed in his epitaph (10). It is ſaid alſo, that he founded three public lectures in Phyſic, two at Oxford, and one at Cambridge.

[*E*] *He died as the age of ſixty four.*] I ſhould have ſaid that he died in February 1525, had I followed the account of an Engliſh author, which has been printed with Paul Jovius; for theſe are his words, ‘ Londini obiit . . . . ſepultus eſt in divi Pauli templo maximo, ad Septentrionalis portæ ingreſſum, eo fere tempore, quo Franciſcus Gallorum Rex ad Ticinum in Ciſalpinis pugnans, à Cæſareanis ducibus captus eſt (11). —— *He died at London . . . . was buried in St Paul's church, at the entrance of the north gate, about the time when Francis, king of France, was taken by the Imperialiſts, at the battle of Pavia.*’ But it is better to ſay, with Mr Moreri, that Thomas Linacer died the twentieth of October 1524. Pope Blunt ſays ſo too (12); and yet he mentions this Phyſician's epitaph, in which the day of his death is fixed to the ſeventh of October 1524.

[*F*] *Eraſmus highly commends him, but makes him guilty of the ſame fault as Paulus Æmilius.*] I paſs over the encomiums he has given him. They are to be found in his *Ciceronianus*, and in ſeveral places of his letters. I ſhall confine myſelf to his blaming him for having too nice a taſte. *Nec multum abfuit ab hoc vitio*, ſays he (13), after the words you have ſeen above (14), where he deſcribes the humour of the hiſtorian Paulus Æmilius, *Thomas Linacrus Anglus, vir undequaque doctiſſimus.* He wrote a letter to him in 1521, in which he intreats him not to make the public languiſh, and deprive it ſo long of the works which were impatiently expected from his pen. He tells him, that it is to be feared his conduct will be rather thought a cruelty, than a modeſt precaution. ‘ At tu, ſi mihi permittis, ut libere tecum agam, ſine fine premis tuas omnium eruditiſſimas lucubrationes, ut periculum ſit, ne pro cauto modeſtoque crudelis habearis, qui ſtudia hujus ſeculi tam lentâ torqueas expectatione tuorum laborum, ac tam diu fraudes deſideratiſſimo fructu tuorum voluminum. Fortaſſe terret te noſtrum exemplum, ſed etiam atque etiam vide, dum ſtudioſius vitas noſtram culpam, in diverſum deflectas (15). ——— *But, to be free with you, by ſuppreſſing your learned writings, you run the riſque of being thought cruel, inſtead of cautious and modeſt, in that you keep us ſo long in expectation of your works. Perhaps my example deters you; but take care, leſt, by carefully avoiding my fault, you run not into the contrary.*’ The fault our Linacer is blamed for is not very common with authors; and yet in ſome reſpects it may be thought too frequent; in general, it is not the bad or middling authors that are guilty of it, but the moſt excellent pens. It were to be wiſhed, that they, who publiſh ſo many bad pieces, and ill digeſted works, which are hardly of any uſe to the Republic of Letters, would overſtrain the maxim, *That one ought to let a writing lie by in his cloſet for nine years* (16). It were well if ſuch would run into an exceſs of delicacy, and never think they had finiſhed a compoſition. It rarely happens that they have a thought of this kind, though, if they frequently had, no one would be ſorry for it. But it is a misfortune that a moſt ingenious man ſhould be like that famous Painter, who never knew when his pictures were finiſhed, and whoſe failing Apelles knew ſo well: ‘ Cum Protogenis opus immenſi laboris ac curæ ſupra modum anxiæ miraretur (*Apelles*) dixit . . . . omnia ſibi cum illo paria eſſe aut illi meliora: ſed uno ſe præſtare, quod manum ille de tabula non ſciret tollere: memorabili præcepto, nocere ſæpe nimiam diligentiam (17). ——— *Apelles, admiring the too laboured and over-finiſhed work of Protogenes, ſaid . . . . . that himſelf either equalled, or was excelled by Protogenes; but that in one particular he exceeded Protogenes, in that the latter never knew when to have done: a remarkable precept, that too much diligence is hurtful.*’ Theſe words of Pliny are excellent; they contain a proverb, which Eraſmus applies to the learned, of Linacer's taſte, and teach us, that a too forced and obſtinate exactneſs often mars the whole work. I will give you Eraſmus's application of it. ‘ Peculiariter autem conveniet *(proverbium, manum de tabula)* in quoſdam ſcriptores plus ſatis accuratos, & moroſæ cujuſdam diligentiæ, qui ſine fine premunt ſuas lucubrationes, ſemper aliquid addentes, adimentes, immutantes, & hoc ipſo maxime peccantes, quia nihil peccare conantur (18). —— *The proverb* (manum de tabula) *is very applicable to certain writers, more accurate than enough, and auſterely careful, who are for ever altering their works, and offending in the very endeavour not to offend.*’ But what comes of this over ſcrupulous exactneſs? why, much loſs to the public, and much prejudice to the authors who aim at it. The public is too long deprived of the good it might reap from the compoſitions of great authors, even tho' they ſhould fall ſhort of the perfection which they might have given them; nay, it is often deprived of them for ever; becauſe they die, before they have diſpoſed of them in a method, from whence their friends, or executors, might draw any advantage. They, who compoſe with too difficult a judgment, and correct their productions with extream ſeverity, are at laſt diſcouraged by the labour, and afraid of touching their own work. They look on it as a rack, and painful buſineſs, and delay as much as poſſible the ſetting their hand to it; the remembrance of the fatigue they have been at in altering one page, makes them dread the event; ſo they ſuffer whole months to paſs without returning to the painful task; and thus, while we imagine that their book is far advanced, becauſe we know it has been in hand for ten or twelve years, nothing is found except perhaps ſome rough draughts, and disjointed pieces; and it often happens, that they die before the work has received it's form. Hereby they deprive themſelves of the glory they might aſpire to. Some are more happy; they are indefatigable, and by aſſiduous filing and poliſhing their compoſitions, without any intermiſſion, they at laſt find them worthy of public notice; but the pains they are at to pleaſe themſelves very often mars all; for there is a certain degree of correctneſs, beyond which nothing can be done, but what, inſtead of perfecting the work, and giving it more nerves and ſtrength, weakens and diſpirits it. ‘ Perfectum opus abſolutumque eſt, nec jam ſplendeſcit limâ, ſed atteritur (19).

REFLEXIONS on authors who over correct their works.

(6) Georgius Lilius, ubi ſupra, pag. 93.

(7) Baillet, Jugem. des Sçavans, Tom. IV, pag. 85.

(8) Georg. Lilius, ubi ſupra, pag. 94.

(9) Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 146.

(10) Apud Pope Blount, Cenſura Celebr. Author. pag. 377.

(11) Georgius Lilius, in Elogiis quorundam Anglorum, pag. 94.

(12) Pope Blount, ubi ſupra, pag. 377.

(13) Eraſm. Apophtheg. lib. vi, pag. m. 524.

(14) Citat. (2), of the article EMILIUS, (PAULUS).

(15) Idem, Eraſm. Epiſt. iii, lib. xiv, pag. 655.

(16) Nonumque prematur in annum. *Horat. in Arte Poët. ver.* 388.

(17) Plinius, lib. xxxv, cap. xiii.

(18) Eraſm. Chil. I, Cent. III, n. 19, pag. m. 105.

(19) Plin. Epiſt. xi, lib. v.

is, of being not eaſily ſatisfied with his own works, and reviſing and touching them over too often.

‘ —— *It is a perfect and finiſhed work; but the file, inſtead of brightening, has worn it away.*’ Pliny the younger, who uſes theſe words in one of his letters, makes uſe of the ſame thought in another place, to ſhew his friend the miſchief of an over-correctneſs. ‘ Diligentiam tuam in retractandis operibus valde probo. Eſt tamen aliquis modus, primum, quod nimia cura deterit magis, quam emendat; deinde, quod nos à recentioribus revocat, ſimulque nec abſolvit priora, & inchoare poſteriora non patitur. Vale (20). —— *I very much approve your diligence in reviſing your works. Yet is there ſome meaſure to be obſerved; firſt, becauſe too much care rather ſpoils, than amends; in the next place, becauſe it neither ſuffers you to finiſh one piece, nor begin another.*’ Quintilian, another great maſter, lays down the ſame principle, and explains it admirably, and declares, that a writing, by continual mending and new molding, loſes it's natural force. The ſound parts, ſays he, are cut off, the blood drained, and it looks like a body covered with ſcars: how fine is his expreſſion! ‘ Et ipſa emendatio finem habet. Sunt enim qui ad omnia ſcripta tanquam vitioſa redeant; & quaſi nihil fas ſit rectum eſſe quod primum eſt, melius exiſtiment quicquid eſt aliud, idque faciant quoties librum in manus reſumpſerint, ſimiles medicis etiam integra ſecantibus. Accidit itaque ut cicatricoſa ſint, & exanguia, & cura pejora. Sit igitur aliquando quod placeat, aut certè quod ſufficiat; ut opus poliat lima, non exterat (21).’ The Orator Calvus was an inſtance of this. He ſet up too ſevere a court of Inquiſition againſt his own writings, and by diſciplining them over rigorouſly, and to a degree of ſuperſtition, broke the conſtitution, and even the heart of them. ‘ Accuratius quoddam dicendi & exquiſitius afferebat genus: quod quanquam ſcienter eleganterque tractabat, nimium tamen inquirens in ſe, atque ipſe ſeſe obſervans, metuenſque ne vitioſum colligeret, etiam verum ſanguinem deperdebat. Itaque ejus oratio, nimia religione attenuata, &c. (22) ——— *He ſet the example of a more accurate and correct ſtile; in which though he excelled, yet, by too ſeverely criticiſing himſelf, and ſtudying, to avoid faults, he loſt real beauties. Thence his ſtile was weakened thro' too much niceneſs.*’ Quintilian calls it ſelf-calumny (23). Here is a metaphor, which a modern author has made uſe of on this occaſion. ‘ There are ſome barren wits, *ſays he*, who, having made an effort once in their life, never leave combing it, till they have plucked the very hairs off, and after all it proves an abortion (24).’ We may reckon Sannazar in the number of the moderns, who have been troubled with Calvus the Orator's diſtemper. ‘ We cannot forbear blaming this Poet's making his poem groan and cry under the file for ſo long together, and his having too much worn and weakened it, under pretence of poliſhing it more and more (25).’

The remarks I have made on this occaſion, will not be thought foreign by thoſe who conſider what I had to prove. I was to ſhew, that the pains Linacer took to ſatisfy himſelf in his compoſitions was a fault. This ſeeming a paradox, it was neceſſary to reaſon upon it, and to produce authorities. But I deſire it may be remembered, that this does not univerſally reſpect all thoſe, who vigorouſly apply themſelves to refine and reform their writings. They do well, and are very commendable, provided they run not into exceſs (26). The only thing that can with any colour of reaſon be blamed, *is the intemperance in this point. Non amo nimium diligentes*, ſaid a noble perſon among the antient Romans (27). I have two things to ſay before I conclude. There are ſome authors, who are a hundred times harder to be pleaſed in the beginning, than in the ſequel of their work. Raſures, blots, alterations, and other ſymptoms of a diſſatisfied judgment, appear chiefly in the firſt lines of the original. This has been obſerved in the manuſcript of a tract of Plato (28), and of that of Petrarch. Here is a paſſage of Muretus, in which Arioſto is taxed with the ſame nicety. ‘ Audivi à maximis viris, quique id facillime noſſe poterant. Ludovicum Arioſtum, nobiliſſimum nobiliſſime domus præconem, in duobus primis grandioris illius poematis ſui verſibus plus quam credi poteſt laboraſſe, neque ſibi prius animum explere potuiſſe, quam cum illos in omnem partem diu multumque verſaſſet. Idem accidit & nobiliſſimo Etruſcorum poetarum Franciſco Petrarchæ: cujus ex autographo, quod habuit vir præſtantiſſimus Petrus Bembus, facile cernitur, eum in limando ſecundo item poematum ſuorum verſu ſæpe ſudaſſe (29). ——— *I have been told by very great men, and ſuch as could very eaſily know it, that Lewis Arioſto took incredible pains about the two firſt verſes of that greater poem of his, nor was ſatisfied till he had turned them every way. The ſame happened to the famous Tuſcan Poet Francis Petrarch: from whoſe own manuſcript, in the hands of Peter Bembus, it is eaſily ſeen, that he took repeated pains in poliſhing the ſecond verſe of his poems.*’ Mr de Vigneul Marville ſays, ‘ there are writers, who are infinitely at a loſs how to begin, but run apace, when once the way is opened. The firſt lines of Thuanus's hiſtory coſt him more pains than all the reſt; but, when once he had conquered that difficulty, he made great ſpeed.’ The other thing I have to ſay, is, that there are authors, who, reviſing a work they deſire to reprint, are at greater pains, than at the firſt compoſition. They apply themſelves with more pleaſure and ſcrupulouſneſs to correct a printed copy, than a manuſcript. But for the moſt part it is loſt labour; for there are few, who compare editions, and, unleſs they be patiently and ſkillfully compared, the importance of the corrections is not perceived. Such a place of a ſecond edition, which contains no more lines than the firſt, or even not ſo many, is changed from lead to gold (30); but where are thoſe, who perceive this? I have ſpoke elſewhere (31) of thoſe, who write with difficulty, or without it, and I ſhall ſpeak of them again elſewhere (32).

(20) Id. ibid. Epiſt. xxxv, lib. ix.

(21) Quintil. lib. x, cap. iv, pag. m. 488.

(22) Cicero, in Bruto, c. lxxxii.

(23) Inveni qui Ciceroni crederent eum (*Calvum*) nimia contra ſe calumnia verum ſanguinem perdidiſſe. *Quintil. lib. x, cap. i, pag.* 475.

(24) Garaſſe, Apolog. pag. 313.

(25) Baillet, Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, Tom. III, pag. 142.

(26) *See Vigneul Marville, at the 224th page of his* Mélanges, Edit. Rouën, 1699.

(27) Scipio Africanus. *See Cicero*, de Oratore, lib. ii, fol. m. 84. A.

(28) *That* de Republica. *See* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus de Collocat. Verbor. cap. xciii, pag. m. 69.

(29) Muret. Variar Lect. lib. xviii, cap. viii, pag. m. 1207.

(30) Confer quæ ſupra, *remark* [*F*] *of the article* BALZAC.

(31) *In the remark* [*G*] *of the article* GUARINI.

(32) *In the remark* [*G*] *of the article* MALHERBE.

LINGELSHEIM (GEORGE MICHAEL) Preceptor, and afterwards counſellor to the elector Palatine (*a*), flouriſhed in the beginning of the XVIIth century. He was born at Straſburg (*b*). He has been reckoned the author of a book, intituled, *Idolum Hallenſe*, in which Lipſius is ſeverely handled [*A*]. He held a correſpondence by letters

(*a*) Scaligerana, pag. m. 141.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. m. 162.

[*A*] *He has been reckoned the author of a book . . . in which Lipſius is ſeverely handled.*] He ſent copies of it to his friends (1), and demanded their opinion of it with an eagerneſs, as if he had been the author. It was therefore excuſable to judge him the author of the *Idolum Hallenſe*. Scaliger, that great critic, went upon other reaſons; he thought he diſcovered Lingelſheim's genius in this work. *Autor de Idolo Hallenſi eſt Lingelſheim*, ſaid he (2). *He it was that ſent me a copy . . . . I diſcover in the* Idolum Hallenſe *the turns of Lingelſheim's wit; I know him very well; he ſent me the book, and deſired me to write him my judgment on it.* This was what he ſaid in converſation; he confirmed it in a letter he wrote to Lingelſheim, concerning the *Idolum Hallenſe* (3), in which he aſcribed this work to him, and commended him much for it; but he was afterwards informed, that Denaiſius was the author of it. *Lingelſheim*, ſaid he (4), *wrote to me, that Denaiſius, aſſeſſor of the Imperial chamber, is the author of the* Idolum Hallenſe; *and, becauſe he lives among the Jeſuits, he deſires not to be named.* Mr Placcius has very well obſerved, that the judgment of this top-critic was not always to be relied upon. ‘ Hac ſane vice erravit, & infeliciter criſin ſuam, quam ipſemet tantopere prædicare ſolebat, exercuit Heros ille Criticorum Hypercriticus (5). ——— *For this time at leaſt he was miſtaken; and this hypercritical hero of critics employed his judgment, which he ſo cried up, unſucceſsfully.*’ He cites Melchior Adam (6), who has aſcribed this work to it's true author Peter Denaiſius: he obſerves, that Colomiés was ignorant of the truth of this affair, having ſaid, in two places (7), that Lingelſheim was the author of this book. Baudius conjectured like Scaliger, affirming, that the public voice was agreeable to his conjecture; ſo true it is, that the ſkillfuleſt are ſubject to err, in conjectures of

(1) *See* Scaligerana, voce Lingelſhemius, *and the Letters of Lingelſheim, pag.* 194.

(2) Scaligerana, ibid.

(3) *See his Letters*, lib iv, Epiſt. cccxv.

(4) Scaligerana, voce Denaiſius.

(5) Placcius, de Anonymis, n. 51, pag. 18.

(6) In Vitis Juriſconſult. pag. 447.

(7) *In the key to the Letters, pag.* 153, & 185, Opuſculorum, edit. Ultraj. 1669.

ters with Bongars; but it is a miſtake to ſay, that he was his ſecretary, and that he publiſhed the letters they wrote to one another [*B*]. I have elſewhere (*c*) ſaid that he was the depoſitary of Thuanus's manuſcript.

(*c*) *In the article* CAMDEN, *remark* [*H*].

of this kind. 'Viro gravi & ſapienti Johanni Lingelſhemio officioſam ſalutem nunciari cupio. Conſentiens fama eſt eum eſſe auctorem libelli de Idolo Hallenſi adverſus Lipſium, & id ipſe conjeceram cum primum in manus meas venit. Non eſt quod patrem pudeat ſuæ prolis, cum non puduerit tantum virum tales nugas effutire in dedecus antepartæ famæ (8). —— *I deſire you would complement the learned Lingelſheim in my name. It is generally reported, that he is the author of the book intituled,* The Idol of Hall, *againſt Lipſius, and I gueſſed ſo when it firſt came into my hands. A father need never be aſhamed of his offspring, ſince ſo great a man was not aſhamed to publiſh ſuch trifles to the diſgrace of the character he formerly obtained.*' Mr Teiſſier (9) has followed the crowd. In all appearance, Lingelſheim told Bongars, that Denaiſius was the author of this *Idol of Hall*; ſee his 157th letter. For the reſt, this book was printed in 1605, in 4to, with this title, *Diſſertatio de Idolo Hallenſi Juſti Lipſii mangonio & phaleris exornato atque producto.* I have read in a letter of Lingelſheim (10), that Goldaſt was thought the author of this book, and that the *Amphitheatrum honoris* aſcribes it to Scaliger. Another letter of Lingelſheim informs us, that Goldaſt had the care of the impreſſion, and that this created him many enemies; for this book exaſperated the Jeſuits beyond meaſure. 'Quam gaudeo probari tibi ſcriptum de Idolo, certe omnium bonorum cum magno applauſu acceptus eſt; ſed facetiæ illæ ſcholaſticæ commoverunt noſtros Academicos, adeo ut Rector diſtractionem libelli edicto inhibuerit, & jam vindictam ſpirant magiſtri, eo quod nimis contumelioſus ſit interpres in totum ordinem, & quia Goldaſtum editorem hujus ludi ex typographo cognoverunt, & ſtilis & telis in illum inſurgunt, atque etiam aulicos in partes trahunt, quos nimis ruſticatim ille tetigerit (11). —— *I am pleaſed that you approve the book of the* Idol; *it meets with a general applauſe; but our Academicians are ſo offended at theſe ſcholaſtic jeſts, that the rector has prohibited the ſale of the book, and the maſters now breathe revenge, becauſe the commentator is too ſevere upon the whole order, and they know that Goldaſt publiſhed it; and they even draw the courtiers to their ſide, whom he has too bluntly attacked.*' In another letter he obſerves, that the Carmelite (12), who anſwered for Juſtus Lipſius, caſt a thouſand reproaches upon Bongars, and looked on him as author of the *Idol*. Lingelſheim would have had Bongars demand juſtice againſt him from the French embaſſador: 'Indignatus ſum quum reperi anagramma ſus obnigra, ubi monaſtico acumine ſuſpicionem ſuam prodit quaſi tu autor eſſes. Cogitavi, anne per Oratorem Regium qui Bruxellæ eſt, ſi eſt tibi amicus, negotium beſtiæ illi creari poſſet ob atroces injurias quas in te effundit, cum tamen author libri non ſis, & quam voluptatem in maledicendo cepit, eandem in lite moleſta & infamia quæ condemnatos injuriarum manet, perdat (13). —— *It moved my indignation, when I met with the anagram* ſus obnigra, *in which, with a monkiſh ſharpneſs, he betrays his ſuſpicion as if you were the author. I conſidered, whether you might not haraſs him by means of the king's embaſſador at Bruſſels, if he is your friend, in revenge for the reproaches he throws upon you, though you be not the author of the book, and rob him of the pleaſure he has taken in calumniating by the diſgrace attending thoſe who are convicted of calumny.*' Lipſius anſwered nothing: it was the beſt thing he could do; his friends turn this ſilence to his honour; they ſaid he generouſly deſpiſed his adverſary, and, like a maſtiff who keeps on his way, without turning aſide to worry a little cur that barks at him he would not leſſen himſelf by a conteſt with this anonymous author. This is the general way of ſpeaking, when people know not what to anſwer. 'Exinde maledicta acerbiora neſcio quis terræ filius, *Idoli Hallenſis* (ô Lucianeam blaſphemiam igne Tartareo expiandam!) titulo ementito, ſparſit in vulgus. Sed prudentoribus amicis ſuadentibus, LIPSIUS ſiluit, & judicio contemſit, atque adeò contemptu ſolo novum iſtum Porphyrium vincendum eſſe cenſuit. Sic fere generoſior moloſſus importunum catulum ſtolide adlatrantem præterit, nec dente aut pugna dignatur (14).'

[*B*] *It is a miſtake to affirm, that he was Bongars's ſecretary, and that he publiſhed the letters, which paſſed between them.*] I ſay this againſt the learned Mr Morhof, whoſe words are theſe (15): 'Bongarſii & Lingelheimii (16) epiſtolæ, editæ ſunt Argentor. ann. 1660. in 12 (17). Erat Bongarſius vir ſuo tempore magni nominis ſub Henrico IV, negotiis publicis ſæpe admotus . . . . Lingelheimius itidem vir in publica dignitate conſtitutus, & ad Helvetios legatus, olim Bongarſio ab epiſtolis literas Bongarſianas una cum ſuis publicavit; fuit enim inter illos commercium literarum mutuum. —— *The letters of Bongars and Lingelſheim were publiſhed at Strasburgh in* 1660, *in* 12mo. *Bongars was a man of a great reputation in the reign of Henry IV, being often employed in public affairs . . . . Lingelſheim likewiſe bore a public character, being ſent embaſſador to the Swiſs: he likewiſe publiſhed the epiſtolary correſpondence between himſelf and Bongars.*' Compare this with the Bookſeller's preface, and you will wonder how ingenious men ſhould be impoſed upon in ſo egregious a manner. The fate of authors is deplorable; for even when they fancy they apply their ſtrongeſt attention, they miſtake the ſenſe of a moſt eaſy paſſage: I much fear, this has often been my own misfortune. Here is what the Bookſeller of Straſburg declares before his edition. 'Leges hic Bongarſii & Lingelſhemii Epiſtolas multa eruditione & variis prudentiæ documentis plenas, beneficio Nobiliſſimi Ampliſſimæque dignitatis viri qui Inclytæ Reip. ad Helvetios legatus à clariſſimo viro Dn. Franciſco Veyrazio eas ut lucem viderent, accepit. Has venerandus hic ſenex qui in contubernio illuſtris Bongarſii duodecim annos, eidem ab epiſtolis vixerat, deſcripſit integras. —— *You will here read the learned and judicious letters of Bongars and Lingelſheim; for which we are indebted to a very great man, who, being embaſſador to the Swiſs, received them from the learned Francis Veiraz, in order to publiſh them. This venerable old man, who lived twelve years with the illuſtrious Bongars, and wrote his letters for him, tranſcribed them entire.*' The Bookſeller ſpeaks here of two perſons; of the firſt without naming him, and of the ſecond under the name of Francis Veiraz. The latter gave the letters to the other, who had been ſent on a deputation from the town of Straſburg to the Swiſs cantons. It is doubtleſs of Veiraz, that we muſt underſtand what the Bookſeller declares in the laſt part of the paſſage before-mentioned: it is he who was ſecretary to Bongars twelve years; it is he who copied the letters, which this Bookſeller publiſhed. Lingelſheim had been long dead, when they ſaw the light. Thus Mr Morhof is miſtaken ſeveral ways (18).

(8) Baudius, epiſt. x, Cent. II, pag. m. 167.

(9) Addit. aux Elog. Tom. II, pag. 383.

(10) *It is in the collection of Letters, written to Goldaſt, printed in* 1688, *pag.* 167.

(11) Lingelſheim, epiſt. lvii, ad Bongarſium.

(12) *He was called Anaſtaſius Cochletius. His book is intituled,* Palæſtra honoris D. Virginis Hallenſis pro Juſto Lipſio, contra Diſſertationem mentiti Idoli Hallenſis, 1607.

(13) Lingelſheim, epiſt. lxxvi, ad Bongarſium, pag. 228.

(14) Auber. Miræus, in Vita Lipſii, ad ann. 1605, pag. m. 24.

(15) Morhofius, Polyhiſt. lib. i, cap. xxiv, pag. 306.

(16) *He ſhould have ſaid* Lingelſhemii.

(17) *See the article* BONGARS, *remark* [*H*].

(18) *See the article* BONGARS, *citat.* (18).

LINGENDES (CLAUDIUS DE)

LINGENDES (CLAUDIUS DE) one of the moſt famous preachers of the XVIIth century, was born at Moulins in 1591, and became a Jeſuit at Lyons in 1607. He taught Rhetoric and the *Belles Lettres* for ſome time; but, as he had a wonderful talent for the pulpit, he applied himſelf moſtly to preaching, and got ſuch a reputation, that few preachers were thought to equal, but none to excel him (*a*). He was rector of the college of Moulins for eleven years, and afterwards provincial of the province of France. He was thrice deputed to Rome, to the general aſſemblies of the ſociety, and died at Paris, ſuperior of the profeſſed houſe, the 12th of April 1660 (*b*), not in the year 1666, as Moreri aſſures us. His ſermons were publiſhed after his death. I ſhall ſay ſomething of them

(*a*) Ea nominis celebritate per Galliam annis 36, ut qui eum illo in munere ſuperarit inventus ſit noſtra ætate nemo, & vix ullus qui æquaverit. *Natan. Sotuel, Biblioth. Script. Societat. pag.* 153.

(*b*) *Taken from Nathaniel Southwell, ibid.*

them that is very remarkable [*A*]. He publiſhed but two books [*B*].

[*A*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of his ſermons that is remarkable.*] I ſhall only ſet down what Mr Gallois has ſaid, ſpeaking of the ſermons upon all the Lent goſpels, by the reverend Father de Lingendes, printed at Paris in two volumes in Octavo, in 1666. 'It is very ſurprizing that Father de Lingendes, whoſe eloquence all France admired, ſhould never ſtudy his expreſſions, but was ſo unconcerned in this point, that he compoſed in Latin, the ſermons he was to preach in French: the truth is, this great man conſidered only the force of reaſoning, the vehemency of the paſſions and the nobleneſs of his figures; he was of the opinion of that antient, who looked upon a diſcourſe as finiſhed, when he had nothing to provide, but the words. After the death of this father, ſeveral of his ſermons were publiſhed, which were found written with his own hand, and there are already two editions of them (1). But that language not being underſtood by every body, a great many wiſhed they might ſee them in French. The thing ſeemed to be the eaſier, as there would not be ſo much as the trouble of tranſlating them. For his ſermons, having been copied by ſeveral tranſcribers, as he preached them, it was thought there was no more to do, but to collect and publiſh them juſt as they found them. Nevertheleſs, the diverſity, which appeared between the different copies of the ſame ſermons, ſhewed that they were not faithfully taken; it was therefore thought proper to tranſlate theſe ſermons from the original Latin, yet without neglecting theſe French manuſcripts, the expreſſions whereof have been retained as near as poſſible. The tranſitions have alſo been added, the poliſhing, and ſome few ornaments, with which the heat of diſcourſe furniſhed him, and which are found in all the manuſcripts of the writers, though not in the Latin text: ſo that the French edition is not a bare tranſlation of the Latin. But the difference between them is, that the Latin gives theſe ſermons juſt as the author wrote them; the French as they were delivered from the pulpit: the firſt ſhews the analyſis of the diſcourſe, the ſecond the parts joined together; the one is more uſeful to thoſe who would make ſermons, the other properer for thoſe who would only read them. The Latin edition is alſo much larger than the French. For of all the ſermons in the former, only the moſt excellent have been culled out, and juſt as many as are to make a courſe for Lent (2).'

[*B*] *He publiſhed but two books.*] One in Latin, and the other in French. *Votivum monumentum ab urbe Molinenſi Delphino oblatum anno*, 1639, in 4to. Counſels for the conduct of life.

(1) The firſt is of the year 1661, in 4to. Two years after they publiſhed ten ſermons of this Jeſuit on the Holy Sacrament, which were afterwards printed in French, as well as his Lent-ſermons.

(2) Journal des Sçavans, April 4, 1667, pag m. 154.

LINGENDES (JOHN DE) native of Moulins, and couſin to the former, was a celebrated preacher, and by that means roſe to the biſhopric of Sarlat, and afterwards to that of Mâcon. He made the funeral oration of Lewis XIII at St Denis. It was printed a little after (*a*). He was preceptor to the count de Moret [*A*], natural ſon to Henry IV in 1619. The poet de LINGENDES was his couſin [*B*]. This family is ſtill in being [*C*].

(*a*) *See the abbot de Marolles, in the catalogue of the authors who had preſented him with their books.*

[*A*] *He was appointed preceptor to the count de Moret.*] 'He did not ſtay long with him the firſt time; for by I know not what underhand management, againſt the intention even of Madam the counteſs of Moret, and her brothers the chevalier de Bueil, and de la Perriere, Croſilles was ſubſtituted in his place, who had formerly been the moſt agreeable perſon in the world to them. The count ſuffered this change, though he loved de Lingendes; but he did not hate Croſilles, and thought it beſt to obey the king chearfully . . . . . . Afterwards de Lingendes was reſtored (1).'

[*B*] *The Poet de* LINGENDES *was his couſin.*] Here is what the ſame abbot de Marolles ſays of him (2). 'He wrote with reputation in 1607, and 1610; and we have a poem of his upon the birth of the duke of Retelois, and that other ſo famous upon the baniſhment of Ovid, which is prefixed to Nicolas Renouard's tranſlation of the Metamorphoſis.' *By ſtriving to imitate Politian,* if we believe Colletet (3), *he became at laſt more polite in ſome of his pieces, than Politian himſelf.*

[*C*] *This family is ſtill in being.*] NICOLAS DE LINGENDES, brother to the biſhop of Sarlat, was ſteward of the king's houſhold. He was ſent into Spain to negotiate the marriage of Lewis XIII with Anne of Auſtria. His firſt wife was Mary d'Abra de Raconis, aunt to Charles de Raconis, biſhop of Lavaur, and he had by her CHARLES DE LINGENDES, ſteward to the king, ſub-dean of the knights of St Michael, and father to JOHN AUGUSTINE DE LINGENDES, captain of horſe (4).

(1) Memoires de l'Abbé de Marolles, pag. 42, 43, ad ann. 1619.

(2) *The catalogue of the authors, &c.*

(3) Art. Poët. Diſcours de l'Eloquence, pag. 33, apud Baillet, Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, n. 1448, pag. 134.

(4) *Taken from the* Mercure Galant for the month of June, 1689.

LIPPOMAN (ALOISIO) a native of Venice [*A*], was one of the learned prelates of the XVIth century. He diſcharged ſeveral nunciatures with the reputation of an able miniſter. The firſt was, as I take it, that of Portugal. He was biſhop of Modon, and coadjutor of Verona, when he was ſent from Bologna to Rome, together with ſome other prelates (*a*), to plead in the cauſe about tranſlating the council in 1548 [*B*]. He gave his opinion peremptorily in this aſſembly againſt the plurality of benefices, as Father Paul obſerves (*b*), who, beſides, gives him the commendation of having lived exemplarily (*c*). After the interruption of the councils (*d*), he was ſent nuncio into Germany in 1548, from whence Pope Julius III recall'd him two years after (*e*). The year following, he made him one of the three preſidents of the council (*f*). Paul IV ſent him into Poland in 1556, to ſtop the progreſs of the proteſtants (*g*). He preferred him to the biſhopric of Bergamo in 1558, and made him his ſecretary (*h*). Lippoman died the 15th of Auguſt 1559 (*i*). He publiſhed ſeveral books [*C*]. It is ſaid, that he exerciſed

(*a*) Palavic. Hiſt. Concil. Trid. lib. x, cap. xv, n. 2.

(*b*) Fra Paolo, Hiſt. du Concile de Trente, livr. ii, pag. m. 234, ad ann. 1547.

(*c*) Id. lib. iii, ſub fin. pag. 292, ad ann. 1551.

(*d*) Palavic. ubi ſupra, lib xi, cap. ii, n. 6.

(*e*) Id. ibid. cap. viii, n. 6.

(*f*) Id. ibid. cap. xiii, n. 1.

(*g*) Id. ibid. lib. xiii, cap. xiii, n. 2.

(*h*) Id. lib xiv, cap. vii, n. 4.

(*i*) Id. ibid. cap. ix, n. 4.

[*A*] *He was a native of Venice.*] Some ſay, he was of a very noble family (1): others, that it never was known who was his father. See the remark [*D*].

[*B*] *He was ſent . . . . . to Rome . . . . . . to plead in the cauſe about the tranſlating the council.*] The legates of the Pope, being unwilling to continue the council of Trent, would have it removed to Bologna, and ſome biſhops, not approving of that adjournment, remained at Trent. Hereupon the legates deputed a certain number of biſhops to the Pope, to give an account of their conduct. Lippoman was one of thoſe deputies (2).

[*C*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] The moſt conſiderable, if I miſtake not, are *Catena Sanctorum Patrum in Geneſim & in Exodum.* The *Catena in Geneſim*, was printed at Paris, in folio (3), 'by Charlotte Guillard, in the year 1546. It is a very good impreſſion. He came himſelf to Paris to ſpeak with the widow, and prevailed with her to poſtpone a great work (4), which the univerſity impatiently expected, to go on with the impreſſion of the ſecond volume, *Catena in Exodum*, which was finiſhed in 1555. It is printed in the ſame form, and with the ſame beauty, as the former. Theſe editions are intermixed with Greek, Hebrew, and all ſorts of good characters.

(1) Hic ſane illuſtri proſapia ortus, Patricius erat Venetus. *Sauſſaius, in Continuat. Bellarm. de Scriptor. Eccleſ. n.* 47.

(2) Palav. Hiſt. Concil. Trid. lib. x, cap. xv.

(3) Chevillier, Orig. de l'Imprimerie de Paris, pag. 149, 150.

(4) *The Greek Lexicon of James Tuſanus.*

ciſed great cruelty againſt the ſectaries, during his nunciature in Poland [*D*].

characters.’ I know not how to reconcile this with ſeveral good catalogues, which ſay, that the *Catena in Exodum* was printed at Paris, in the year 1550. Lippoman's other works are, *Catena in aliquot Pſalmos.* A compilation of lives of the ſaints, in eight volumes. *Confirmatione di tutti gli dogmi Catholici, con la ſubverſione di tutti i fondamenti delli moderni heretici,* at Venice, 1553. *Eſpoſitioni volgari ſopra il ſimbolo apoſtolica, il pater noſtro,* &c.

[*D*] *It is ſaid, that he exerciſed great cruelty againſt the ſectaries . . . . . . in Poland.*] According to the author, whom I am about to cite, Lippoman was the firſt apoſtolic nuncio, that was ſeen in this country. He put to death ſome Jews, to terrify the Heretics. He ſuborned and bribed certain accuſers, who made oath, that a woman had ſold an hoſt to ſome Jews, and that theſe miſcreants had, with the prickings of needles, drawn a vial of blood from it, to heal the wound of circumciſion. The king's order was ſurreptitiouſly obtained for burning them. They inſiſted on their innocence at the ſtake. The king, being informed how the matter was carried, conceived a great indignation againſt Lippoman. Neverthele∫s, a narrative of the whole affair was drawn up in the king's name, and ſent to Rome, to ſwell the catalogue of miracles in the archives. I ſhall ſet down the words of a Poliſh writer, who tells us this. He begins by reproaching Lippoman with his mean extraction (5). ‘ Primus id officii apud nos geſſit *Aloyſius Lipomanus* Venetus, homo, ut facta teſtantur, pervicax & crudelis. Quod tanto minus mirandum, quando *Aſperius nihil eſt humili cum ſurgit in altum.* Dicebatur enim eum incerto parte fuiſſe natum. Hunc quamprimum Nuncii Terrarum in Comitio viderent, extemplo eum compellarunt: *Salve progenies viperarum.* Talem ſe reipſa fuiſſe Lipomanus probavit. Videns enim dogma eorum de Sanctiſſimo, ut vocant, Sacramento in magno verſari diſcrimine, coacto Loviciam Pontificum omnis generis conventu, è re ſua judicarunt exemplum ſeveritatis, vel potius feritatis, ad incutiendum populo ſibi parenti metum, & diſſentientibus horrorem in aliquo ex infima vulgi fece ideoque impunius ſtatui. . . . . . Hinc impetu in Judæos quàm odio publico laborantes, tam innocentiæ præſidiis defectos, facto, tres è grege eorum & fœminam quandam Dorotheam Laziciam in vincula conjecerunt. Capita accuſationis hæc fuerunt: Laziciam cum de more ſolenni ante Paſchatos feſtum ad Sacram communionem accederet, occultatam in ore hoſtiam Judæis vendidiſſe: hos acubus eam confixiſſe: inde ampullam ſanguinis, quo ad ſanandum infantium circumciſorum vulnus opus habeant, collegiſſe. . . . . . (6). Mandata nomine Regio ad Borcum (7) per diſpoſitos equites miſere, ut Judæos ex mente Legati Apoſtolici & Spiritus S. (ſcilicet) concilium Lovicenſe regentis ad rogum damnaret. Lata in Judæos ſententia. “ Hi ad rogum deducti palam liberè dicere: Nunquam nos hoſtiam emimus vel acubus confiximus: Nos enim nequaquam credimus hoſtiæ ineſſe Dei corpus: Imò ſcimus Deo nullum corpus, ſanguinemve eſſe: & more Majorum credimus, Meſſiam non futurum fuiſſe ipſum Deum, ſed ejus unctum & Legatum: Compertum quoque habemus farinæ nihil ineſſe ſanguinis. Teſtamur ad ultimum nos nullo ſanguine opus habere.” His auditis crudelitatis Lipomanianæ & Pontificiæ adminiſtri picem ardentem ori miſerorum infuderunt. Tam horrendum omni ex parte facinus monumentis Romanis inſertum & pro miraculo vulgatum, Regis nomine, ad conciliandam rei fictæ fidem, adpoſito. Id ſcripti à Myſcovio traditum Regi, indignationem & iram ejus excivit, animumque à Lipomano avertit. Huic rex in os dicere non erubuit, ſe facinus illud imane deteſtari; & nequaquam adeò mente captum eſſe, ut hoſtiæ iſti ſanguinem ineſſe credat. ——— *Aloyſio Lipoman was the firſt, who bore this office among us; a man, as his actions teſtify, of perverſeneſs and cruelty. Which is the leſs to be wondered at,* as nothing is ſo inſolent as a mean man exalted to a high ſtation. *For it was ſaid, that it was not known who was his father. No ſooner did he appear in the aſſembly, but he was ſaluted, by the nuncios of the Palatinates, with,* Hail offspring of vipers! *And indeed Lipoman proved himſelf ſuch. For ſeeing their doctrine concerning the moſt holy ſacrament, as they call it, to be in danger, they, in a general aſſembly of the Roman Catholic prieſts at Lowitz, reſolved to make a ſevere example of ſome one among the vulgar, in order to terrify the reſt; which they thought they might the more ſafely do . . . . . Hence taking occaſion to attack the Jews, who were not only publickly hated, but deſtitute of the defence of innocence, they impriſoned three of them, together with a woman named Dorothea Lazinski. The heads of their accuſation were, that Lazinski, coming to the ſacrament before Eaſter, had ſold the hoſt, which ſhe kept concealed in her mouth, to the Jews; that the latter had pricked it with needles; and thence had collected a veſſel full of blood, which they wanted to cure the wounds occaſioned by circumciſion in infants . . . . . They ſent the king's mandate by horſe-men to Borcus, the governor, ordering him, in obedience to the decree of the apoſtolic nuncio, and the Holy Ghoſt (an't pleaſe you) preſiding in the council of Lowitz, to condemn the Jews to be burnt. Sentence was accordingly paſſed upon the Jews. When they were brought to the ſtake, they made this free and open declaration: “ We never bought the hoſt, nor pricked it with needles; for we by no means believe the body of God to be in the hoſt; nay, we know, that God has no body, nor blood; and, after the opinion of our fore-fathers, we believe, that the Meſſiah will not be God himſelf, but his anointed, and meſſenger: we likewiſe know full well, that there is no blood in bread-corn: and we affirm to the laſt, that we have no need of blood.” When they had ſaid this, the miniſters of Lipoman's and the Papiſts cruelty, poured burning pitch down theſe poor wretches throats: and this horrid act was inſerted in the Roman archives, and publiſhed as a miracle, the king's name being put to it, to gain belief to a fiction. The king being informed of the matter, by letters from Miſcouski, was enraged, and conceived great indignation againſt Lipoman. He even told him to his face, that he deteſted that abominable action, and that he never was ſo ſenſeleſs, as to believe there was any blood in that hoſt.*’ Du Sauſſai takes notice, that Lippoman was ſo hated by the ſectaries, that he had like to have loſt his liſe ſeveral times by aſſaſſinations (8). Spondanus (9) pretends, that the miracle, manifeſted at that time on the hoſt in the hands of theſe wretched Jews, was founded on three reaſons: the laſt was, that the nuncio Lippoman, vilified by the libels of the Heretics, and running the riſk of his life, ſtood in need of ſuch a providence, to procure him a greater authority. Staniſlaus Hoſius, biſhop of Warmia, expreſſed great indignation at Peter Paul Vergier, who dedicating a book to the king of Poland, had challenged Lippoman the apoſtolic nuncio to a public diſpute, whereof the king was to be judge (10).

LIPSIUS (Justus) was one of the learnedeſt critics that flouriſhed in the XVIth century. I could relate a great many curious things concerning him; but as others (*a*) have already collected them, and have not even forgot what relates to his education, and early attainments (*b*), I think my ſelf obliged to ſpeak only of their omiſſions. One of the greateſt faults Lipſius is reproached with, is his inconſtancy in point of religion [*A*]. They

[*A*] *One of his greateſt faults . . . . . . is his inconſtancy in point of religion.*] Dr Schluſſelburg's account will not ſtand amiſs in this page, which teaches us, that Lipſius reckoned it the ſame thing to be Lutheran, Calviniſt, or Papiſt. ‘ Talis ambiguæ Pelargicæ fidei erat Luciani ſimilis, cothurno verſatilior & Epicureus Philoſophus, *Juſtus Lipſius*, olim Collega meus & Profeſſor Oratoriæ facultatis in Univerſitate Jenenſi, in Thuringia, ubi magnum amatorem Lutheranæ religionis agebat, & jurejurando confirmabat, ſe doctrinam Lutheri ut unam, æternam & divinam veritatem agnoſcere, Romanique antichriſti idololatriam

(5) Staniſlaus Lubieniecius, Hiſt. Reformationis Polonicæ, pag. 76.

(6) Idem, Lubieniecius, ibid. pag. 78.

(7) *He was the governor of the place.*

(8) Tantum in odium ſectariorum incurrit, ut ab eis de vita ſit periclitatus frequenter, ſed Deo protegente incolumis reverſus. *Sauſſaius, ubi ſupra.*

(9) Ad ann. 1566, n. 7, pag. m. 564.

(10) *See the epiſtle dedicatory of Hoſius's work againſt the Prolegomena of Brentius.*

(*a*) Mr Teiſſier, Addit. aux Elog. de Mr de Thou, Tom. II, pag. 381, & 432. Bullart, Acad. des Sciences, Tom. II, pag. 193.

(*b*) Baillet, Enfans celebres, pag. 184.

They ground that reproach on this, that being born a Catholic, he embraced Lutheraniſm, whilſt he was profeſſor at Iëna (*c*). Afterwards, being returned into Brabant, he lived there as a Catholic, and then having accepted a profeſſorſhip in the univerſity of Leyden, made profeſſion of what they call Calviniſm. At laſt he quitted Leyden, and returned into the Spaniſh Netherlands, where he not only lived in the Roman communion, but even fell into an effeminate bigotry; which he diſcovered in his printed books [*B*.] The ſtrangeſt

---

idololatriam & blaſphemiam damnare. At Lugdunum Batav. veniens, fiebat Apoſtata, ut Pelargus, abnegabatque agnitam & adprobatam veritatem; quamvis hoc diffiteretur, dicens ſe Chriſtianum eſſe, nec Chriſtum deſeruiſſe, nec abnegaſſe. Id de hoc viro verè dicere & teſtari poſſum. Nam cùm ad ipſum anno Chriſti M.D.LXXXII. æſtivo tempore in reditu meo ex Antverpia, in Academia Leidenſi, ubi Profeſſor erat, inviſerem, ut veterem amicum, & ex illo quærerem, qui rationem reddere poſſet, defectionis ſuæ à vera Religione, quam Jenæ anno M.D.LXXII. confeſſus eſſet, à Chriſto, quem abnegâſſet & deſeruiſſet; reſpondebat mihi in domo ſua & in præſentia M. Henrici Latomi Eccleſiaſtæ olim Antverpienſis: Mi Schluſſelburgi, vetus amice & Collega; Ego Chriſtum non abnegavi, nec deſerui, licet hic Lutheranam doctrinam non profitear, & cum Calvinianis converſer. *Nam omnis Religio & nulla Religio ſunt mihi unum & idem. Et apud me Lutherana & Calviniſtarum doctrina pari paſſu ambulant.* Cohorreſcens ad hæc, dicebam: mi Lipſi, ſi ea in opinione manſeris, malè tecum agetur, facileque credo, cum hæc Religio æquè tibi probetur ac iſta, te tandem Pontificium futurum, qualis initio fuiſti. Ad quæ reſpondebat, ſibi perinde eſſe. Sicuti & evenit, teſte illius libro de invocanda Hallenſi Maria (1). —— *Of this unſettled Pelargic way of thinking in religion was that other Lucian, the ſubtle Epicurean Philoſopher, Juſtus Lipſius, formerly my colleague, and profeſſor of Rhetoric in the univerſity of Iëna, in Thuringia, where he pretended to be very fond of the Lutheran religion, and ſwore that he looked upon the doctrine of Luther to be the one, eternal and, divine truth, and condemned the idolatry and blaſphemy of the Romiſh Antichriſt. But, coming to Leyden, he apoſtatized, like Pelargus, and denied the truth he had acknowledged and approved; tho' this he diſowned, ſaying that he was a Chriſtian, and had neither forſaken, nor denied Chriſt. This I can with truth ſay and affirm of this man. For, when, in the year* 1582, *in the ſummer ſeaſon, upon my return from Antwerp, I paid him a viſit in the univerſity of Leyden, where he was profeſſor, and asked him what account he could give of his apoſtacy from the true religion, which he had confeſſed at Iëna, in* 1572, *and from Chriſt, whom he had denied and forſaken; he anſwered me in his own houſe, and in the preſence of Henry Latomus, formerly preacher at Antwerp; my friend Schluſſelburg, once my colleague, I have not denied nor forſaken Chriſt, tho' here I do not profeſs the Lutheran doctrine, but follow the Calviniſts.* For all religion and no religion are alike to me: and with me the Lutheran and Calviniſt doctrines walk an equal pace. *Being ſhocked at this declaration. I ſaid: my friend Lipſius, if you continue in this opinion, it will go ill with you; and I eaſily believe, ſince you are indifferent to both religions, that you will at laſt be a Papiſt, as you was at firſt. To which he replied, it was equal to him. And ſo it happened; witneſs his book concerning the invocation of the Virgin Mary of Hall.*' Obſerve, by the way, in theſe words, the extravagant zeal of a rigid Lutheran. Schluſſelburg calls the change from a Lutheran to a Calviniſt, apoſtacy, and the denying of Jeſus Chriſt. I might cite a great many writers, who, upon the chapter of religion, look upon Lipſius as a weather-cock; but let it ſuffice to produce here the judgment of Boeclerus, and the advice he gives young ſtudents. ‘ Non fuerit operæ pretium, *ſays he* (2), ſingula examinare, cum potius univerſim monendi ſint Juvenes ſtudioſi, *ne tales quæſtiones Lipſio velint magiſtro diſcere*, qui ubique ſibi ſimilis eſt, id eſt, *in Re Theologica aut quocunque modo ad Religionem pertinente lubricus, anceps, vagus, in omnes formas mutabilis:* qui modo aliquid largiri, modo adimere rurſum cupiat, id quod neceſſe eſt accidere homini vera religione ſerio nunquam imbuto, Sacrarumque litterarum penitus experti. —— *It would not be worth while to examine particulars, when young ſtudents are rather to be admoniſhed in the general*, not to ſtudy ſuch queſtions under the inſtruction of Lipſius, *who is every where conſiſtent with himſelf, that is*, in matters of Divinity, or any way relating to religion doubtful, wandring, and ready to take any ſhape: *who now conſents, now retracts; which muſt neceſſarily be the caſe of a man who never thought ſeriouſly about the true religion, and quite ignorant of the holy writings.*'

[*B*] *He diſcovered his bigotry in his printed books.*] One of theſe books is intituled, *Juſti Lipſii Diva Virgo Hallenſis: beneficia ejus & miracula fide atque ordine deſcripta* (3). Another is intituled, *Juſti Lipſii Diva Sichemienſis ſive Aſpricollis: nova ejus beneficia & admiranda* (4). He adopts the moſt trifling ſtories, and the moſt uncertain traditions that can poſſibly be found upon this ſubject. Some of his friends diſſuaded him from this attempt, alledging the uncertainty of theſe traditions, and the injury he would do himſelf; but all their counſels could not divert him from his enterprize: ‘ At mali aut moroſi quidam & pravè ſapientes non occultè deterrent aut improbant, tanquam à narrationibus parum certis, ut ajunt, & opinione ſæpe nixis. Non debere talibus obſoleſieri auctoritatem noſtram ſi quam habemus, diſſentio (5).' The verſes he made, when he conſecrated his ſilver pen to our Lady of Hall, are ſtrangely ſingular, as well on account of the praiſes he gives himſelf, as the exceſſive homage he pays to the holy Virgin. ‘ Ipſe *pennam* argenteam (nec potuit pretioſius quidpiam) in templo ante aram Virginis ſuſpendit, & pios hoſce verſus ſubſcripſit:

Hanc, DIVA, PENNAM interpretem mentis meæ,
Per alta ſpatia quæ volavit ætheris,
Per ima quæ volavit & terræ, & maris:
Scientiæ, Prudentiæ, Sapientiæ
Operata ſemper, auſa quæ CONSTANTIAM
Deſcribere, & vulgare; quæ CIVILIA:
Quæ MILITARIA, atque POLIORCETICA:
Quæ, ROMA, MAGNITUDINEM adſtruxit tuam:
Variaque luce ſcripta priſci ſæculi
Affecit, & perfudit: hanc PENNAM tibi
Nunc DIVA, meritò conſecravi LIPSIUS.
Nam numine iſtæc in choata ſunt tuo.
Et numine iſtæc abſoluta ſunt tuo.
Porrò ô benignitatis aura perpetim
Hæc ſpiret! & famæ fugacis in vicem,
Quam PENNA peperit, tu perenne gaudium
Vitamque DIVA, LIPSIO pares tuo (6).

‘ *He hung up with his own hands a ſilver pen (the moſt valuable gift he had) in the church, before the altar of the Virgin, and wrote under theſe pious verſes:*

GODDESS, *this* PEN, *my mind's interpreter,*
Which bent it's flight o'er earth, and ſeas, and skies,
Ever employ'd on ſcience, prudence, wiſdom,
Which dar'd deſcribe, and publiſh CONSTANCY;
Which treated both the arts of WAR *and* PEACE;
Which aggrandiz'd thy GREATNESS, ROME; *and ſpread*
A various light o'er works of ages paſt:
This PEN, *I,* LIPSIUS, *conſecrate to thee,*
And juſtly, ſince thy influence firſt inſpired,
And to perfection brought, thy Vot'ry's works.
O! ever ſmile propitious on the ſame,
This PEN *produc'd, and on thy* LIPSIUS, GODDESS,
Beſtow long life, and never-ceaſing joy.

(*c*) *This profeſſorſhip laſted a little more than a year.* Lipſius, Epiſt. lxxxvii. Cent. III, Miſcell. pag. m. 313. *He quitted Iëna the firſt of March,* 1574. Id. Epiſt. lxviii, Centur. ad German. & Gallos, pag. 702.

(1) Conradus Schluſſelb. in reſponſione ad calumnioſum ſcriptum Chriſt. Pelargi, apud Crenium, Animadv. Philol. & Hiſtor. Part. VII, pag. 54, 55.

(2) Boeclerus, Diſſertat. de Politicis Lipſii, cap. v, pag. 54, 55.

(3) *He compoſed it in* 1603.

(4) *He compoſed it in* 1604.

(5) Lipſius, Epiſt lix, Cent. V, Miſcellan.

(6) Aubert. Miræus, in Vita Lipſii, pag. m. 23.

ſtrangeſt thing of all in his conduct, and which has not been pardoned him, is, that living at Leyden in the external profeſſion of the Reformed Religion, he publickly approved the principles of perſecution, at that time exerciſed all over Europe againſt this very religion. He was ſtrangely confounded, when he was ſhewn the conſequences of his doctrine [*C*]; and

He left by his will his furred gown to the ſame, our Lady; which gave occaſion to ſay, that he made her this preſent, becauſe the miracles he had ſo much celebrated, were ready to die of cold (7). Some Proteſtants writ with great force againſt him; he let them talk on, and only anſwered one of them in a few words: See his *Rejectiuncula,* at the end of his *Virgo Aſpricollis.* He was deſired to defend himſelf againſt the author of the treatiſe *De Idolo Hallenſi* (8), and againſt Thomſon (9), who confuted him among other things about the *Virgo Sichemienſis*: but he refuſed to engage in theſe diſputes (10), and acted wiſely. See, in the remark [*E*], what Baudius ſaid of the books of devotion of this critic. See alſo remark [*N*].

It muſt not be forgot, that Lipſius was ſaid to have compoſed ſuch books only to convince the world, that he was not lukewarm and indifferent in religion, as many ſuſpected he was (11). It was alſo believed, that theſe works were pure injunctions, and that the Jeſuits extorted them from him. ‘ Κέρκωπες Lojolitæ precibus, quæ vim imperii apud ‘ Lipſium habent, hanc operam ab eo vel extorſerunt, vel eblanditi ſunt; vel utrumque. Nam ut ‘ ipſi hominem totum poſſident, ita ipſe illis εὐσχημόνως nihil negare poteſt (12). —— *The artful* ‘ *Loyolites* (Jeſuits) *either extorted this work from Lipſius,* ‘ *by intreaties, which with him carry the force of a* ‘ *command, or wheedled him into it; or perhaps both;* ‘ *for as he is entirely devoted to them, he can de-* ‘ *cently deny them nothing.*’ If this was his caſe, he might be compared, to hired mourners, who cried more bitterly than the relations of the dead. The Poet Lucilius takes notice of theſe.

. . . . . Mercede quæ
Conductæ flent alieno in funere præficæ
Multo & capillos ſcindunt, & clamant magis.

. . . . *As women, who for hire*
Mourn at the funeral of one unknown,
And greater marks of grief in public ſhew.

And Horace ſays little leſs:

Ut qui conducti plorant in funere, dicunt
Et faciunt propè plura dolentibus ex animo: ſic
Deriſor vero plus laudatore movetur (13).

As hired mourners, at a funeral, ſpeak,
And act, with more extravagance of grief,
Than thoſe, whoſe hearts a real ſorrow know,
So flatt'ring ſycophants more zeal betray,
Than real friends.

[*C*] *He was ſtrangely confounded, when he was ſhewn the conſequences of his doctrine of perſecution.*] See what is found hereupon in the Philoſophical Commentary upon, *compell them to come in* (14). ‘ I ‘ have ſeen another perplexity, which has relation to ‘ theſe matters, in a treatiſe of Juſtus Lipſius. This ‘ man, having been ruined by the wars of the Netherlands, found a very honourable retreat at Leyden, where he was appointed profeſſor; making no ‘ ſcruple of outwardly abjuring his Popiſh religion. ‘ During that time, he printed ſome books of Politics, ‘ wherein he advanced, among other maxims, that ‘ only one religion ought to be ſuffered in a ſtate, ‘ and no clemency uſed towards thoſe, who diſturbed religion, but that they ſhould be proſecuted with ‘ fire and ſword, that one member may periſh, rather than the whole body. Clementiæ non hic ‘ locus. *Ure, ſeca, ut membrorum potius aliquod quam* ‘ *totum corpus intereat* *. This was baſe, for a man ‘ entertained, as he was, by a Proteſtant republic, ‘ which had newly reformed it's religion; for this ‘ was openly approving all the rigours of Philip II, ‘ and the duke D'Alva. It was beſides a horrible ‘ impudence, and execrable impiety, ſince, on one ‘ hand, it might be concluded from his book, that ‘ only the Proteſtant religion was to be ſuffered in ‘ Holland, and, on the other, that the Heathens were ‘ to be commended for hanging the preachers of the ‘ Goſpel. He was taken up upon this head by Theodore Cornhert (15), and puſhed to great ſtraits; for ‘ he was obliged to anſwer by tacking about, and ‘ declaring, that theſe words, *Ure, ſeca,* were only a ‘ phraſe borrowed from Phyſic, to ſignify, not literally ‘ fire and ſword, but a very ſtrong remedy. All ‘ theſe tergiverſations are to be ſeen in his tract *De una* ‘ *Religione.* It is the moſt paltry book he ever writ, ‘ except the impertinent hiſtories and ſilly poems, he ‘ made in his old age, upon ſome chapels of the ‘ Virgin, his wit beginning to be moaped like that of ‘ Pericles, when he ſuffered his neck and arms to be ‘ tricked out with amulets, and womens noſtrums; ‘ being wholly infatuated by the Jeſuits, into whoſe ‘ arms he threw himſelf, when he ſaw, that this little paltry book was looked upon with an ill eye ‘ in Holland; this made him eſcape by ſtealth from ‘ Leyden. To return to this little book; it is a wretched rhapſody of paſſages, which authoriſe all the ‘ heathen impieties, on which was founded the horrible perſecution of the firſt Chriſtians, and of other ‘ paſſages, which ſay the quite contrary. And as the ‘ author durſt not avow the force of theſe two words, ‘ *Ure, ſeca,* he uſed ſome pitiful diſtinctions, which ‘ came to this, that Heretics ought to be put to death, ‘ but rarely and ſecretly; but as for fines, baniſhments, ‘ marks of infamy, and degradations, they ought not ‘ to be ſpared. All this falls to the ground, by the ‘ reflexions already made hereupon.’ By way of addition to this remark [*C*], we ſhall relate, more at large, what concerns the diſpute between Koornhert and Juſtus Lipſius.

Koornhert is not the only perſon, who treated him roughly on this ſubject. For the Jeſuit Petra Sancta, having made complaints againſt the author of the *Stricturæ* (16) *Politicæ* (17), the anſwer returned him was this (18): ‘ Conquereris de autore *notarum* ſive ‘ *ſtricturarum* in proditoriam *Juſti Lipſii* epiſtolam qui ‘ quum in Belgio fœderato vixiſſet, & Illuſtriſſimorum ‘ Ordinum ſtipendiarius fuiſſet, poſtquam inſalutatis ‘ hoſpitibus bene meritis abiiſſet, ſtylum in eos convertit, & adverſus Rempublicam eorum, conſilia ſubminiſtravit. Quis fuerit autor *ſtricturarum* illarum, ‘ ſeu *notarum* fateor me ignorare: ſed quiſquis ille ‘ fuerit, patriæ fuit amantiſſimus, & Lipſii fraudium ‘ callentiſſimus . . . . Neſcio an cui Lipſiana tantoperè placent, & qui verſibus delectari videris, libenter lecturus ſis eos quos anno 1579 præfixit ad Zelandos libro adverſus tenebrionem quendam. Editi ‘ fuerunt tum Leydæ apud *Andream Schoutenum,* & ‘ quo animo fuerit, aut eſſe finxerit, indicant. Audi ‘ illum,

Duplicia Heſperii rupiſtis vincla tyranni,
  Mattiaci: atque armis aſſeritis patriam:
Aſſeritiſque fidem, patriam ſed turbat Iberus.
  Ecce iterum, ecce fidem turbat hic ardelio.
Verum alii patriam: ſed tu Fugræe, tueri
  Perge fidem, & fidei qui faciunt tenebras,
Scriptis illucere tuis: ſunt vera Miniſtri
  Hæc munia, ingenio digna tuo & genio.

‘ Vides quo loco tum fuerit apud Lipſium Hiſpaniæ ‘ rex, quo Romana fides & religio: qui poſtea factus ‘ eſt *Religionis transfuga, infide & conſtantiam* ἀλλοπρόσαλλος, ut loquitur *Montacutus* (19). —— *You* ‘ *complain of the author of the* notes *or* ſtrictures *on the* ‘ *deceitful letter of* Juſtus Lipſius, *who, after having* ‘ *reſided in Holland, and been a penſioner of the* ‘ *States, and having left his benefactors without taking* ‘ *leave, turned his pen againſt them, and underhand* ‘ *gave advice againſt the intereſt of their republic.* ‘ *Who was the author of thoſe* ſtrictures *or* notes, *I* ‘ *confeſs I am ignorant; but, whoever he was, he was* *a great* and this was doubtleſs one of the reaſons, which obliged him to quit Holland. He was offered a profeſſorſhip at Piſa, with the promiſe of enjoying his liberty of conſcience [*D*]; but

---

(7) Cui Virgini Hallenſi moriens lacernam ſuam pelliceam teſtamento legavit: in quo, non potuit quin facetorum hominum urbanitatem incurreret; qui quidem ridicule, ſed non admodum religioſe, ideo lacernam pelliceam Virgini illi relictam ajebant, quod ejus miracula, quæ tantopere in cœlum laudibus efferebat, frigerent ad populum. *Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth. III, pag.* 6.

(8) *Mr Teiſſier,* Elog. Tom. II, pag. 383. *calls him Lingelmius; he ſhould have ſaid Lingelſhemius, who yet is not the author. See the article* LINGELSHEIM, *remark* [*A*].

(9) *Mr Teiſſier,* ibid. *calls him Thomaſon.*

(10) Miræus, ubi ſupra, pag. 24, 25.

(11) *See Crenius,* ubi ſupra, pag. 55, *who does not forget the paſſage of Scaliger, part of which is ſeen in the following citation. See alſo Patin's twenty ſeventh Letter.*

(12) Scalig. Epiſt. cvi, lib. ii.

(13) Horat de Arte Poët. ver. 431.

(14) Comment. Philoſ. Part. II, pag. 285, & ſeq.

* Civil. Doctr. lib. iv, cap. iii.

(15) *See the remark* [C] *of the article* KOORNHERT.

(16) *See, concerning theſe* ſtricturæ, *the remark* [E] *of the article* PUTEANUS.

(17) Prodiit etiam recentiſſime dum hæc ſcribo calumnia eadem de Societate noſtra in libello quem Auctor inſcribit, *Stricturas politicas,* & in quo imprimis acerbiſſime invehitur in Juſtum Lipſium. *Petra Sancta, Not. in Epiſtol. Molinai ad Balzaeum pag.* 96. Petra Sancta's book was printed in the year 1634.

(18) Rivet. Caſtigat. notarum in Epiſt. ad Balzacum, cap. xii, n, 14. Operum, Tom. III, pag. 535.

(19) *Rivetus, a little before, had ſaid,* Vide ſi placet *Expoſtulationem* Richardi Montacutii cum tuo *Roſweido,* in *Antidiatribis*: ibi Lipſii habebis latinitatem & eruditionem expenſam, & de ea judicium quod tibi non arridebit.

‘ *a great patriot, and ſaw thro' Lipſius's frauds. I know not whether you, who are ſo fond of Lipſius's works, and ſeem to take a pleaſure in Poetry, will be willing to read thoſe verſes, which, in the year* 1579, *he prefixed to a book againſt a certain obſcure perſon. They were then publiſhed at Leyden for* Andrew Schouten, *and ſhew what diſpoſition he either was, or pretended to be of. Hear him:*

The weſtern Tyrant's double chains are broke:
By arms your country bravely ye aſſert;
Religion too with vigour ye defend:
But the fierce Spaniard breaks your land's repoſe;
And lo! this wretch religion would diſturb.
Let other arms your country's battles fight;
This thine, Feugræus, to defend the faith,
And by your pen detect it's latent foes;
This task thy office, and thy genius ſuits.

‘ *You ſee what Lipſius then thought of the king of Spain, of the Romiſh faith, and of religion; who afterwards became* a deſerter of religion, faithleſsly, and thro' a wavering, uncertain, diſpoſition, *as Montague expreſſes it.*' Theſe verſes of Lipſius diſhonour his memory, when we compare them with his own confeſſion, that he was only a Proteſtant in appearance at Leyden, and that his heart was Catholic. Theſe are his words: ‘ Sed altera calumnia, *in religione mutavi.* Nego, in ſede veſtra, non in ſenſu fui, & ut in peregrinatione corporis non animi requiem illic elegi. In tempore, ut meum ingenium eſt, quiete-modeſteque me habui: an in ſacra aut ritus veſtros tranſivi? nec impudentia hoc dicet (20). —— *Another calumny is, that* I have changed my religion: *I deny it; I ſat with you, but did not think with you; and, as being upon a journey, I ſought the repoſe of my body, not of my mind. I behaved myſelf, as I always do, quietly and modeſtly. Did I go over to your religious rites? Impudence itſelf will not ſay this.*' Let him have done and ſaid what he pleaſed; he and all his apologiſts were unable to elude the proofs alledged, to ſhew that this ſtile anſwered his external profeſſion, as long as he paſſed for a Proteſtant. The author of the *Idolum Hallenſe* proves, that Lipſius, having proteſted, at Iëna before Tilemannus Heſhuſius, who was then (21), rector of the univerſity, that he ſincerely embraced the Lutheran religion, communicated publickly (22), and in a funeral oration of his, which had been printed, declared, that God had given to his church the houſe of Saxony, to ruin the peſt of the Papacy. ‘ De bello Smalcaldico locutus cauſæ bonitatem à Saxone, fortunam & martem ab Imperatore ſtetiſſe dicit & . . . . Saxonicam generoſam ſtirpem ad Dei hoſtes extirpandos, errores evertendos PESTEM PONTIFICIAM excindendam donatam divinitus & conceſſam ECCLESIAE eſſe (23). It is owned, that he never communicated while he was at Leyden; but it is proved (24), by ſeveral extracts of his letters, that, whilſt he lived there, he looked on the cauſe of the Spaniards as unjuſt, and wiſhed the ruin of it, and that many expreſſions fell from him, which beſpoke him a Proteſtant (25).

Here are ſome farther circumſtances of his controverſy with Theodore Koornhert. When his treatiſe of politics, wherein he approved perſecution on the account of religion, came out in 1589, Koornhert, a great ſtickler for toleration, writ him his opinion of this book, and replied to the anſwers he received, and at laſt publiſhed a book, with the title of *Proceſſus contra hereticidium & coactionem conſcientiarum.* He dedicated it to the magiſtrates of Leyden, ſent copies of it to the magiſtrates of other towns, and exhorted them to take great care of this writer's opinions. The publiſhing of this book vexed Lipſius; but, as he was a great ornament to the univerſity of Leyden, he obtained of the magiſtrates an act of complaiſance, which might have comforted him. They publiſhed at the town-houſe, that they did not accept of Koornhert's epiſtle dedicatory, and that this author, by dedicating his book to them, did them neither ſervice, nor honour, nor friendſhip; that they did not however prohibit his book, but permitted the inhabitants to read it, and at the ſame time adviſed them to read Lipſius's excellent anſwer. They declared, they had a very particular eſteem for this profeſſor. This act did not fully ſatisfy him, nor was he at all pleaſed at hearing, that Koornhert, being recovered from a long indiſpoſition, was preparing a reply. It is ſaid too, that by the favour of ſome towns, he endeavoured to get the States of Holland to forbid the anſwering his polical writings; but that Gerhard de Lange, Burgomaſter of Tergou, oppoſed it with this reaſon. ‘ If what Lipſius has written be true, he can be but weakly anſwered, and we ſhall be confirmed in the truth, by the very weakneſs of the writings that are publiſhed againſt him; but if any one diſcovers in them, what we do not now perceive, any falſity prejudicial to the country, what harm can there be to correct them?' Lipſius quitted Holland ſoon after, under pretence of taking a turn to the Spaw-waters, for the ſake of his health. Nor did he ever come back thither more, but returned to Popery, and proteſted in a letter, which he writ from Mayence (26), that he had always been of the antient religion, though he had profeſſed another, when he was in places, where the antient was not received. This made many believe him a hypocrite. Some were of opinion, that the diſcontent which Koornhert gave him, and the apprehenſion he had, that the Hollanders, might be worſted in the war againſt Spain (27), made him change ſides. However it be, Koornhert, detained in his bed, and ſeized with a diſtemper, of which he ſoon after died, failed not to go on with his reply, and to finiſh it. His executors got it tranſlated out of Flemiſh into Latin, and publiſhed it (28).

It muſt be obſerved, that Lipſius had let fall ſome words againſt the Spaniſh inquiſition in the firſt editions, but ſtruck them out of the following. Boeclerus had told him his own upon this, in the chapter *De nævis Lipſiani operis*, which is the fifth of his treatiſe *De Politicis Juſti Lipſii.* Read theſe words (29): ‘ Illud non omittendum eſt, quæ ſeipſum prodit damnatque Lipſius; æterno cum dedecore famæ, quam unam videtur in omni vita quæſiviſſe. Cum enim *in prioribus Politicorum ſuorum editionibus, lib.* iv, *cap.* iv. pro libertate religionis, *adverſus Pontificiam crudelitatem & Hiſpanicam inquiſitionem* (quam nemo bonus unquam probavit) quædam ſcripſiſſet: in poſterioribus editionibus, tanquam non à religione modo ſed à ſana ſimul mente defeciſſet, partim *omiſit ea* (ſcilicet quæ in *Freinſhemiana editione* reponuntur, n. 7, 9. 12). partim *ſimpliciter & ingenue dicta mutavit.* ———— *That muſt not be omitted, in which Lipſius betrays and condemns himſelf, to the eternal diſgrace of his fame, which ſeems to have been the ſole purſuit of his life. For, whereas,* in the former editions of his Politics, *book* iv, *chap.* iv. *he had written in defence of liberty of conſcience,* againſt the Popiſh cruelty and the Spaniſh Inquiſition; (*which no good man ever approved of*) *in the later editions, as if he had not only abjured religion, but even his ſenſes, he partly left out what he had written on that ſubject* (*to wit, what is replaced in Freinſhemius's edition*) *and partly altered what he had plainly and ingenuouſly ſaid.*' Boeclerus mentions ſome other alterations in this man's expreſſions.

[*D*] *He was offered a profeſſorſhip at Piſa, with a promiſe of enjoying his liberty of conſcience.*] Acidalius relates (30), that Mercurialis, the negotiator of this affair, told him, that the Great Duke had offered Lipſius a profeſſor's chair in the univerſity of Piſa, with the privilege of believing what he pleaſed in matters of religion, and that this prince had obtained for him a toleration at Rome. At the ſame time Acidalius adds, that a report was ſpread, that this profeſſor had embraced the Romiſh faith in Germany; and affirms, that Lipſius alledged no other reaſon for refuſing the chair at Piſa, than the infirmity of his health, and the diſtance of the place, *viæ longinquitatem, & valetudinis imbecilitatem.* He was far from alledging his being a Proteſtant; for he was readily enough diſpoſed to the public profeſſion of the Romiſh religion.

Yet

(20) Lipſius, in Rejectiuncula, ad calcem Virginis Aſpricollis.

(21) *That is, about Michaelmas,* 1572.

(22) Eamque profeſſionem ſacræ cœnæ ibidem uſu & communicatione publice obſignavit. *Diſſert. de Idolo Hallenſi, pag.* 17.

(23) Ib. pag. 16.

(24) Ib. pag. 22, & ſeq.

(25) Ib. pag. 17, 18.

(26) *He abjured before the Jeſuits of Mayence. He deſired his abjuration might be concealed for a while. See Miræus, in Vita Lipſii, pag. m.* 17.

(27) *See Grotius,* Hiſtor. lib. v, pag. m. 378.

(28) *Taken from ſome Latin Extracts communicated to me from the Flemiſh Hiſtory of the Reformation written by Gerhard Brandt,* pag 765, & ſeq. ad ann. 1590.

(29) Boeclerus, de Polit. Lipſii, pag. 55, 56.

(30) *In his ſecond Letter, written from Bologna, in January,* 1592.

but he refuſed that employment. He ſettled at Louvain, where he taught the *Belles Lettres* in a way that was much to his reputation; and he died there, the 23d of March, 1606, in his fifty ninth year. There were thoſe among the Proteſtants, who never would ſecond the paſſion of ſome of their brethren, in defaming this learned man [*E*]. He married a widow at Cologne about the year 1574, but had no children by her. Some ſay, ſhe was a very

Yet by this we ſee that he was looked on in Italy as a very good Calviniſt, ſince his liberty of conſcience was negotiated at Rome. There are two letters of Lipſius (31), from which we may infer, that Acidalius was well informed of what he ſaid; but they do not mention the offer of a liberty of conſcience.

[*E*] *There were ſome Proteſtants, who never would ſecond the paſſion of ſome of their brethren, in defaming this learned man.*] One Lydius, a miniſter, deſigning to publiſh the letters which his father had received from Juſtus Lipſius, was earneſtly entreated by Baudius not to do it; by Baudius, I ſay, who underſtanding, that Lydius perſiſted in his deſign, prepared to write againſt him, in favour of Lipſius. ‘Perſtat in incœpto, ut ſermonem tuum audio. Sed quia ſibi ſumit eam licentiam ut faciat quæ ſunt contra morem bonorum, contra fas gentium, contra jus humanitatis: faxo dicat ſe nactum, qui hac in parte cauſam amici & quondam doctoris indefenſam eſſe non patiatur (32). —— *He perſiſts in his deſign, as you inform me: but ſince he takes a liberty contrary to the behaviour of good men, contrary to the law of nations, and the rights of humanity, I will make him own he has met with one, who will avenge the cauſe of his friend, and (formerly) teacher.*’ Not that Baudius approved Lipſius's two books upon the miracles of the holy Virgin; on the contrary, he ſpoke of them with the utmoſt contempt; but, he thought that letters between friends ought to be an inviolable ſecret (33). ‘Non quod ejus Divas ullo colore defendi poſſe cenſeam, ſed interim non eſt tollenda è vita vitæ ſocietas, quod faciunt qui literas, hoc eſt amicorum colloquia abſentium, foras eliminant . . . (34) Deeſt ſcilicet hoſtis, & ſeges ac materies metendæ gloriæ non ſuppetit, niſi ex labe & ruina celebratiſſimi in literis viri, & honorifice à bonis nominandi, tametſi famam ſuam miſere decoxerit duplici illa publicatione Virginum, quibus ſæpe incolumi authore lumbifragium exoptavi (35). —— *Not that I think his goddeſſes can upon any pretence be defended; but in the mean time, ſociety is not to be broke in upon; which they do, who publiſh the private correſpondence of abſent friends . . . . There is no enemy, and pleaſe ye, nor any opportunity of earning fame, but by the diſgrace and ruin of the moſt learned of men, and of whom good men ought to make honourable mention; tho' he miſerably injured his character by that double publication of Virgins, towards whom I often declared my ill wiſhes during the life of the author.*’ Tho' Lydius was a great preacher, Baudius hoped to come off cheaply enough with him. ‘Etiamſi multum in concionibus valeas, vereor tamen ut hic ſtare poſſit. Fervida ingenia plerumque violentiam naturæ & profundam ambitionem velare ſolent præclaro ſchemate zeli, quod eſt evirriculum & mantile multarum fraudum. Sed non deſunt nobis rationes quibus ſæculo planum & perſpicuum fiet, *Quid ſolidum crepet & pictæ tectoria linguæ* (36). —— *Though he be a great preacher, I fear he will not maintain his ground on this occaſion. Men of paſſion often cover the violence and ambition of their nature under the fine pretence of zeal, that cloak of many impoſtures. But I can convince the world of the difference between ſincerity and hypocriſy.*’ In the ſame letter he informs us, that Scaliger took it very ill, that Thompſon ſhould write ſo violent a book againſt Lipſius. ‘Opus eſt ſane non ineruditum, & quod arguat ſcriptorem multæ lectionis: niſi quod ſupra modum modeſtiæ efferveſcit, quo nomine etiam ſerio reprehenſus eſt ab heroë Scaligero (37). —— *It is certainly no unlearned work, and argues a writer of great reading; except that he flies out beyond the bounds of modeſty: for which fault he is ſeriouſly reprehended by the hero Scaliger.*’ He ſays alſo, that he is a ſtranger to the laws of humanity, and the rights of literature, who fancies that the learned ought to eſpouſe ſtate wars, and differences in religion, one againſt another, and that, for his part, he ſhall never follow ſuch maxims, as long as he has a grain of good ſenſe left. ‘Non diſſimulo, nec unquam diſſimulabo, intercedere mihi cum Lipſio, extra cauſſam religionis & libertatis, ob quam publice bello decertamus, omnia jura ſummæ neceſſitudinis, quæ cum ullo mortali eſſe poſſunt. Nunquam litarunt Gratiis, & ignorant quid humaniores literæ, quid humanitas ipſa flagitet, qui ob eam rem teſtatas inimicitias promiſcue omnibus indicendas eſſe arbitrantur. In eo cenſu non erit Baudius, quamdiu ſanam animi mentem obtinebit (38). —— *I confeſs, nor will I ever deny, that, ſetting aſide the cauſe of religion and liberty, for which we publickly fight, there is the ſtricteſt friendſhip imaginable between Lipſius and myſelf. They, who think that a ſufficient reaſon for quarrelling with all the world, never ſacrificed to the graces, nor know what polite learning and humanity require. Baudius will never think in that manner, as long as he ſhall enjoy a ſound mind.*’ Gruterus, who had ſome of Lipſius's letters, would never communicate them to thoſe, who deſired them, with a deſign to make them public. He would not furniſh arms againſt the honour of this learned man. ‘Lipſii epiſtolas amici multi à me petierunt, quibus ſemper negavi, quod nollem quidquam ex iis depromi unde ei aliquid inureretur infamiæ (39). —— *Several of my friends have asked me for Lipſius's letters, whom I always refuſed, becauſe I was unwilling any thing ſhould be taken out of them, which might be made uſe of to injure his reputation.*’ But Lingelſheim (40) was not ſo nice, ſince, after he had made uſe of ſome of Lipſius's letters, which he had written to Camerarius from Iëna, he offered them to Goldaſt, to be printed (41). Goldaſt had already played Lipſius a trick, which I have mentioned in another place (42).

It muſt be owned, as Baudius ſays, that the laws of generoſity do not permit us to take advantage of what a man may have written as a ſecret to thoſe he correſponded with; the Heathens themſelves were not ignorant of this truth; for obſerve how Marc Antony was cenſured for reading before the ſenate ſome letters he had received from Cicero. ‘At etiam literas, quas me ſibi miſiſſe diceret, recitavit: homo & humanitatis expers, & vitæ communis ignarus. Quis enim unquam qui paulum modo bonorum conſuetudinem noſſet, litteras ad ſe ab amico miſſas, offenſione aliqua interpoſita in medium protulit, palamque recitavit? Quid eſt aliud tollere è vita vitæ ſocietatem, quam tollere amicorum colloquia abſentium? Quam multa joca ſolent eſſe in Epiſtolis, quæ prolata ſi ſint inepta videantur? quam multa ſeria neque tamen ullo modo divulganda (43)? —— *He even repeated letters, which he ſaid I ſent him, being a man void of humanity, and ignorant of common life. For who is there ſo little converſant with good men, as, upon a quarrel, publickly to produce and read the letters of a friend? What is it but to deſtroy ſociety, and put a ſtop to the correſpondence of abſent friends? How many jeſts are there in letters, which, when made public, will be thought inſipid? How many ſerious things are there, yet by no means fit to be divulged?*’ Several think that this excellent law may be diſpenſed with in favour of religion; that is, when it is in our power to decry a man who has written againſt our religion, or who by his revolt may ſhake the faith of the weak; and thus they make no ſcruple of publiſhing his very billets or notes, if copies of them fall into their hands. They would perhaps be more ſcrupulous, if they were themſelves the perſons, who had received them; for it is not ſo contrary to the law we ſpeak of, to publiſh a letter another has received, as one that is written to one's ſelf. See the advertiſement to *The General Conſiderations upon Mr Brueys's book*, printed at Rotterdam in 1684. There is a ſecret divulged in it, which Mr Brueys had written to a friend. See alſo the News from the Republic of Letters (44), in the extract of the dialogues of Photinus and Irenæus, wherein a letter of Mr Ranchin is inſerted. The Civilian Baudouin reproaches Calvin with having

(31) *The firſt of the century* ad Italos & Hiſpanos, *and the third of the third century* ad Belgas. *In this laſt, he ſays, that the Pope exhorted him to come to Rome.* Ipſe Pontifex caput noſtrum recenter nunc me Romam invitavit.

(32) Baudius, Epiſt. lvi, Cent. II, pag. m. 241.

(33) Id. ibid.

(34) Id. ibid. pag. 242.

(35) *See Patin, the twenty ſeventh Letter, pag. 114, of the firſt volume, where he cites du Moulin and Keckerman.*

(36) Baudius, ubi ſupra, pag. 241.

(37) Id. ibid. pag. 242.

(38) Ibid.

(39) Gruter. apud Quirinum Reuterum, Epiſt. cccxciii, inter eas quæ ad Goldaſtum ſcriptæ prodierunt, anno 1688.

(40) *See the Collection of Letters, written to Goldaſt, publiſhed in 1688, pag.* 391.

(41) *Goldaſt publiſhed ſome new Letters of Lipſius, under the title of* Lipſii λείψανα.

(42) *At the article* GOLDAST, *remark* [*I*].

(43) Cicero, Philipp. II, cap. iv.

(44) *Month of December*, 1685, *pag.* 1337.

very ill woman [F] ; but he affirms, he lived quietly with her. I know not whether I ought to take notice, that he wrote a very bad hand [G] ; and that his converſation and aſpect anſwered not the idea, the world had conceived of him [H]. His friends did not abandon him, after his death, to the cenſures of his adverſaries [I] : but it was difficult in many things to make his apology. I do not reckon in this claſs what Father Garaſſe thought himſelf obliged to cenſure (d). Lipſius found himſelf accuſed more than once of plagiariſm,

(d) See the remark [I].

---

having printed ſeveral letters he had written to him (45). See Father Queſnel againſt the ſentence of the archbiſhop of Malines, founded partly on his papers, which had been ſeized. He cites Nicol. de Clemangis, Epiſt. XLIII.

(45) Balduin. Reſpon. II, ad Jo. Calvin, pag. 56.

[F] *Some ſay, ſhe was a very ill woman.*] ‘The good man Lipſius, who had a naughty wife, has ſaid ſomewhere in *his Epiſtles*, that there is a fatality in marriage (46).’ Here is the paſſage which Patin refers to: ‘Uxorem duxi, *ſays Lipſius* (47), mei magis animi quam amicorum impulſu. Sed, ut ille ait (48), τὸ μὲν ἄρ πȣ ἐπέκλωσαν θεοὶ αὐτοί, *à Diis fataliter hoc decretum*, & concorditer ſane viximus, fructus tamen matrimonii, id eſt liberorum, exſortes. —— *I married more to pleaſe myſelf than at the inſtigation of my friends: but, as he ſays, it was ſo decreed; and indeed we live in concord, tho' without the fruit of matrimony, children.*’ It was believed by ſome, that Lipſius changed his religion purely from a principle of ambition, *and the importunity of his wife, who was ſtrangely ſuperſtitious.* Mr Teiſſier (49) aſſerts this upon Scaliger's credit, citing his 120th letter of the ſecond book. I my ſelf have converſed with thoſe, who have told odd ſtories of the croſs-grained humour of this woman. They had them from old men, who had ſeen Lipſius.

(46) Patin, Lettr. ccxciv, pag. 565, Tom. II.

(47) Epiſt. lxxxvii, Cent. III, Miſcell. pag. m. 313.

(48) *Here is what Aubert Miræus ſays, in the Life of Lipſius, pag.* 12. Sed ut ille ait, *ſic erat in fatis & fatalem viro fœminaque torum eſſe* Euripides olim monuit. Lipſius uſu didicit. - - - *But, as he ſaid,* Fate would have it ſo; and that marriages are governed by deſtiny *Euripides long enough ago affirmed, and Lipſius experienced.*

(49) Addit. aux Eloges, Tom. II, pag. 383.

Some Merchants of the Low-Countries told Florimond de Remond, in 1600, that Lipſius was married. He wiſhed him joy of it; but Lipſius anſwered him, that the thoughts of being congratulated at this time of day made him laugh, and that he had been a long time in the nooſe. ‘At de conjugio, quod tu à Mercurialibus noſtris audieras, quàm riſum mihi movit? Ego, vir optime, non recens in eam naſſam veni, ſed annos jam vigintiſex cuſtodia hæc me habet. Liberos tamen nullos genui, nec hunc conjugii fructum aut lenimentum Deus dedit (50). —— *As to my marriage, which it ſeems you have heard of, how does it make me laugh? My good friend, I am not a bridegroom, but have been married twenty-ſix years. Yet I have got no children, nor has God given me this fruit and conſolation of wedlock.*’

(50) Lipſius, Epiſt. lxxii, Cent. ad Germanos & Gallos, pag. m. 705.

[G] *He wrote a very bad hand.*] He confeſſes it himſelf, and thereby confutes thoſe, who pretended to have printed from the original the oration *de duplici concordia*; from the original, I ſay, very fairly written. ‘Ego belle & mundule ſcribo? *ſays he* (51), Vellem, ſed totam Europam teſtem καλλιγραφίας hujus habeo, & querelas quod autographa mea ægre vel non legant. — *I write a fair and neat hand! I wiſh I did; but appeal to all Europe for the beauty of my hand writing, and to the complaints that my munuſcripts are ſcarce, if at all, legible.*’ This is confirmed by a paſſage of Gabriel Naudé (52). ‘This worthy ſcholar of our Muretus M. Antonius Bonciarius of Perugia once complained, that he could read but two or three of the firſt lines of the letters Lipſius wrote to him; all the reſt was ſo horribly ſcrauled. Nancelius ſaid as much of Ramus's writing.’

(51) Lipſius, Epiſt. lxviii, Centur. ad Germanos & Gallos, pag. m. 701.

(52) Dialog. de Maſcurat, pag. 363.

[H] *His converſation and aſpect anſwered not the idea, the world had conceived of him.*] Here is Aubertus Miræus's teſtimony in this point (53). ‘In geſtu, cultu, ſermone modicus fuit: *adeo ut plerique, quibus magnos viros per ambitionem æſtimare mos eſt, viſo aſpectoque Lipſio quærerent famam, pauci interpretarentur* *. Conſtat certe exteros, quos ab ultimâ etiam Sarmatia, ejus videndi audiendique gratiâ (ut olim magni illius Livii) frequenter veniſſe ſcimus, cum Lipſium viderent, eumdem ſæpè requiſiviſſe. —— *His behaviour, dreſs, and converſation were mean:* inſomuch that many who are wont to eſtimate great men by the ſtandard of ambition, when they ſaw Lipſius, were diſappointed in their expectations: few formed a juſt idea of him. *It is certain, that foreigners, who came, we know, from fartheſt Sarmatia, for the ſake of ſeeing and hearing him (as formerly happened to the great Livy) found their ideas of him not anſwered.*’

(53) In Vita Lipſii, pag. 32.

* Tacit. in Vita Agricolæ.

[I] *His friends did not abandon him .... to the cenſures of his adverſaries.*] The Jeſuit Scribanius, as Lipſius always expected, appeared in his defence. ‘Heus importune qui jam abeuntem & majora magiſque ſeria meditantem, ſupervacuò laceſſis: ſi opus & uſui fuerit non deerit amica aliqua manus (& Carolum Scribanium ..... deſignabat) quæ Lipſium non patietur inultum (54). - - - *Let me tell you (you, who vainly attack him, departing, and meditating greater and more ſerious things) if occaſion ſhall be, there will not be wanting ſome friendly hand (he pointed at Charles Scribanius) which will not ſuffer Lipſius to go unrevenged.*’ See his *Orthodoxæ fidei controverſa*, his *Defenſio Lipſii poſtuma, &c.* Claudius Dauſqueius, a canon of Tournay, publiſhed, in 1616, a book intituled, *D. MARIÆ ASPRICOLLIS* ΘΑΥΜΑΤΟΥΡΓΟΥ *Scutum .... alterum item J. Lipſii Scutum: utrumque adverſus Agricolæ Thracii ſatyricas petitiones.* He means, that he anſwered a book, which George Thomſon, a Scotchman, publiſhed at London in 1606, with this title, *Vindex veritatis adverſus Juſtum Lipſium libri duo. Prior inſanam ejus religionem politicam, fatuam nefariamque de Fato, ſceleratiſſimam de fraude doctrinam refellit. Poſterior* ψευδοπαρθένȣ *Sichemienſis, id eſt Idoli Aſpricollis, & Deæ ligneæ miracula convellit. Uterque Lipſium ab orco Gentiliſmum revocaſſe docet.* See the remark [A] of the article LINGELSHEIM, citation (12). I ſpeak not of thoſe, who have attacked or defended him upon the ſubject of learning. Vincent Contarini, ſucceſſor to Sigonius in the chair of Padua, criticized him (55) learnedly enough in 1609, ‘circa frumentariam Romanorum largitionem & militare Romanorum ſtipendium. - - - - - - *In relation to the larges of corn among the Romans, and their military pay.*’

(54) Miræus, in Vita Lipſii, pag. 25.

(55) His book was reprinted at Weſel, in 1669, in 12mo.

Garaſſe, who gave him two bites, was ſturdily repulſed. He pretended (56), that Lipſius's doctrine about fate *is a mear chimera without the leaſt foundation*, and blamed him (57) for *having erected Mauſolæan monuments to his three little dogs, the firſt whereof was called* Mopſus, *the ſecond* Sapphirus, *the third* Mopſulus, *as is ſeen in the book intituled,* Deliciæ Chriſtiani orbis. *I cannot,* continues he, *approve all theſe ridiculous and prophane inventions, foraſmuch as this is plainly to declare, though the intention of authors may be very different,* Unus interitus eſt hominis & jumentorum, & æqua eſt utriuſque conditio. — *Men and beaſts die alike, and the condition of both is the ſame.* The cenſurer of this Jeſuit's *Doctrine Curieuſe* ſtrenuouſly maintains (58), that the deſtiny, taught by Lipſius, is conformable to Thomas Aquinas's notion. He ſays (59), that ‘Aubertus Miræus ..... did not forget the love that Lipſius had for dogs, and even the names of the three, which he cheriſhed above the reſt .... He had cauſed them to be painted in a piece, with the names, age, colour, and ſhag, of each, with ſome verſes underneath, wherein he had no leſs ingeniouſly, than pleaſantly, hit upon verſes and inſcriptions mentioned in the book called *Selectæ Chriſtiani orbis deliciæ*. This is what Garaſſe takes for a mauſoleum and an epitaph; ſo that whoever has his parrot painted, his dog, his cat, his wife, *&c.* with an inſcription or verſe, erects an epitaph, a mauſoleum to them.... As for the epitaph of Sapphirus alone, which is found in the ſaid book, *Selectæ deliciæ*, &c. It is a ſuppoſititious piece, which even the compiler, F. Swertius, durſt not place with the three inſcriptions, which are found under the title *Lovanenſia*, and which doubtleſs ſome one might eaſily have compoſed by Lipſius's inſcription on his dog Sapphirus, to exerciſe his wit, as plainly appears from the bare reading.’ The cenſurer adds, that the pretended prophaneneſs, which Garaſſe finds in it, is a chimera: he is pretty large upon this, and ſhews the impertinence of the reaſon, founded on the *unus eſt interitus*, &c. Mr des Marets (60), who thought this criticiſer of Garaſſe to be an anonymous doctor of the Sorbonne, is miſtaken: he

(56) Garaſſe, Doctr. Curieuſe, pag. 343.

(57) Id. ibid. pag. 904.

(58) Cenſure de la Doctrine Curieuſe, p. m. 159.

(59) Ib. pag 162.

(60) Samuel Mareſius, in Salute Reformat. adſerta, pag 56.

plagiariſm, but never would acknowledge, that he was juſtly accuſed [K]. A fit of ſickneſs he got at a feaſt, has been reckoned one of the greateſt dangers, he was ever expoſed to [L]. It is ſtrange, that a Latin ſtyle, ſo bad as his, ſhould found a new ſect in the republic of letters [M]. See in the margin a fault of Mr Teiſſier (e).

I have already ſpoken (f) of the contempt he drew upon himſelf by his hiſtories of the miracles of the Holy Virgin; but I knew not at that time what Joſeph Hall had publiſhed upon that ſubject. It deſerves to be related [N].

(e) Lipſius, after having lived to his forty fifth year in the Proteſtant religion, embraced the Catholic. *Teiſſier, Addit. aux Elog. Tom. II. pag.* 385. *Edit. d'Utrecht*, 1696. He was twenty five years old when he turned Proteſtant the firſt time.

(f) In the remark [*B*].

he ſhould have given him the name of Charles Ogier (§ α), and ſpared the title of *Sorboniſta*.

[(§ α) He ſhould have ſaid, *Francis* Ogier, brother of Charles. Rem. Crit.]

[K] *He was accuſed .... of plagiariſm, but never would acknowledge the juſtice of the accuſation.*] Muretus and Peter Faber were his principal accuſers. The parts of this proceſs have been diligently collected by Mr Thomaſius, in his treatiſe *de Plagio literario*; and by Mr Crenius in the ſeventh part of his *Animadverſiones Philologicæ & Hiſtoricæ*.

[L] *A fit of ſickneſs he got at a feaſt.*] Here is what Nicius Erythræus ſays (61): ‘ Sæpius in vita manifeſtum ‘ vitæ diſcrimen adiit; ter in puerili ætate . . . deinde ‘ lethali morbo pene ſublatus eſt Dolæ, quæ Sequano‘rum eſt Academia, ubi quum luculenta oratione Vi‘ctorem Giſelinum, inter medicos allectum, laudaſ‘ſet, ac ſtatim deinde, opiparo convivio exceptus eſ‘ſet, in quo, ut mos eſt illarum regionum, convivæ ‘ invitare ſe pluſculum ſolent, & in ſeſe largius merum ‘ invergere, repente, inſolito horrore correptus, cum ‘ febri domum rediit. —— *He had often been in dan‘ger of his life; thrice whilſt a boy . . . afterwards ‘ he was very near being taken off by a mortal diſtemper, ‘ at Dole, which is an univerſity of the Francöe Comte, ‘ where, having made a fine oration in praiſe of Victor ‘ Giſelinus, on his being admitted a Phyſician, and be‘ing afterwards ſplendidly entertained at dinner, on ‘ which occaſion the gueſts are apt to encourage one ano‘ther in eating and drinking a little too much, he was ‘ on a ſudden taken with a ſhivering, and returned ‘ home with a fever.*’ Lipſius, having made an oration at the promotion of this Phyſician, was doubtleſs conſidered as one of the principal heroes of the feaſt: they made him drink the harder, and had like to have killed him. The matter would not have been ſo ſtrange, had he been an Italian or Spaniard; for it is certain, that an academical banquet, or treat, upon taking a degree, in the northern univerſities, might be as dangerous to men of thoſe countries, as a ſet battle to a colonel, unleſs they are excuſed from pledging every health. But Lipſius was a Fleming: no matter for that; he was worſted; he was conquered in a tournament of Bacchus by thoſe of the Franche Comté. It had like to have coſt him his life. The moſt general rules have their exceptions.

(61) Pinacoth. III, pag. 6.

[M] *It is ſtrange that a Latin ſtile, ſo bad as his, ſhould found a new ſect in the Republic of Letters.*] ‘ Lipſius has put Cicero out of faſhion. When he was ‘ in requeſt, there were greater maſters in eloquence, ‘ than there are at preſent (62).’ Scaliger ſays this: an evident proof, that the ſect of the Lipſians was very much increaſed. But here we ought to cry out;

O imitatores, ſervum pecus, ut mihi ſæpe
Bilem, ſæpe jocum veſtri movere tumultus (63).

Ye imitators, ſlaviſh herd, how oft
The ſtir ye make excites my ſpleen! how oft
Provokes my laughter!

People muſt dote upon ill models, when they can prefer Lipſius's ſtile before that of Paul Manutius, or Muretus; a ſtile, which proceeds by ſtarts and bounces, and is full of points and ellipſes, before a ſtile ſmooth and flowing, and which unfolds every thought. Lipſius is the leſs excuſable, becauſe he changed from a good taſte to an ill one. He wrote well in his youth; as appears by a book he dedicated to cardinal de Granvelle (64), and by the funeral oration of the duke of Saxony. He degenerated as he grew old. ‘ His third century of Epiſtles, *ſaid Sca‘ger* (65), is good for nothing; he has forgot to ſpeak; ‘ I know not what Latin it is.’ A learned humaniſt thought he did his father, who was a famous divine, ſome honour, by ſhewing he expreſſed a contempt for the ſtile, which Lipſius had brought into faſhion. ‘ Imprimis vero faſtidiebat ſcribendi illam novam for‘mam, quam magnus cæteroquin vir Juſtus Lipſius ‘ ſæculo noſtro obſtruſit, quemque ſervum pecus imita‘tores plurimi arripuerunt, quamvis impari felicita‘te (66). —— *But he was particularly diſguſted at ‘ that new way of writing, which Juſtus Lipſius, ‘ otherwiſe a great man, forced upon our age, and which ‘ many have ſervilely imitated, but not with the ſame ‘ ſucceſs.*’ He relates the judgment, which James Pontanus, and Marc Velſerus made of the ſame ſtile. ‘ Nos Juſti Lipſii excellens ingenium, ſummamque do‘ctrinam ſuſpicimus, & prædicamus, nec de ſtudiis ‘ noſtris quemquam melius meritum ſtatuimus. Ab ‘ ejus autem idiotiſmo, & excogitata hæreſi in ſcriben‘do, pluribus, & opinor juſtis de cauſis refugimus, & ‘ horremus. Marcum Velſerum ipſi Lipſio amiciſſimum ‘ profitentem meis auribus audivi: malle ſe in ſcriben‘do Muretum, quam Lipſium poſſe exprimere. Adeo, ‘ cujus probabat ingenium, & ſcientiam ſummopere, ‘ ejus novitiam, & plus æquo exquiſitam & affectatam ‘ dictionem non probabat (67). —— *I applaud the ‘ great wit and learning of Juſtus Lipſius, and think ‘ no man deſerved better of the learned. But I ſhun ‘ and abhor, for many, and I think juſt, reaſons, his ‘ peculiarity of ſtile, and new manner of writing. I ‘ have myſelf heard Marcus Velſerus, a great friend of ‘ Juſtus Lipſius, declare, that he had rather imitate ‘ Muretus, than Lipſius; blaming his novel and af‘fected ſtile, at the ſame time that he highly applau‘ded his wit and learning.*’ He afterwards ſhews how Scaliger, being ready to give up the ghoſt, declared his abhorrence of that affectedneſs in ſtile. He muſt needs take it much to heart, ſince in that condition, in which his attention ought to have been fixed on objects infinitely more important, he would let the company know how much it troubled him. ‘ Jam in a‘gone mortis conſtitutus (ut refert Clariſſimus Daniel ‘ Heynſius, in Epiſtola ad Iſaacum Caſaubonum) hoc ‘ κακόηθες novi ſtili admodum execratus eſt. Sic ‘ enim de eo ſcribit Heynſius: *Juſti Lipſii affectatio‘nem in ſtilo vehementer faſtidire ſolebat: in iis præ‘ſertim, quæ ſenex ſcripſiſſet, & nonnunquam literas ‘ ejus cum indignatione legebat; eodem modo te quoque ‘ judicare, certo ſcio* (68). —— *Upon his death-bed ‘ (as Daniel Heinſius informs us, in a letter to Iſaac ‘ Caſaubon) he expreſſed his abhorrence of that itch of ‘ writing in a new ſtile: for thus Heinſius writes con‘cerning him:* He greatly diſliked Juſtus Lipſius's af‘fected ſtile; in thoſe pieces eſpecially, which he wrote ‘ in his old age; and he ſometimes read his letters with ‘ indignation: I know you judge of him in the ſame ‘ manner.’ Henry Stephens publiſhed a book of five hundred and ſixty pages againſt Lipſius's Latin (69); but this book is ſo full of digreſſions, that the author ſeldom comes to his point. However he gives us to underſtand, that he extremely diſapproved Lipſius's ſtile. See, in a book of Balzac (70), the *Viri magni judicium de imitatione Lipſianæ latinitatis*: ſee alſo the words of Grotius. ‘ Sua quadam eloquentia ple‘roſque alliciens *(Lipſius)*; nam cum floridum ipſi ‘ & profluens natura haud abnegaret, alterum maluit ‘ dicendi genus, conciſum quidem nec ſine feſtivitate, ‘ ſed vere novum obtentu antiqui: quod cum imita‘rentur quibus ingenii judiciique non idem fuit, ad cor‘ruptiſſima quæque deventum eſt (71). —— *Lipſius al‘lured many by his eloquence; for nature having formed ‘ him for a florid, copious, ſtile, he choſe another way ‘ of writing,* viz. *the conciſe, yet not without wit, but ‘ quite new; which when writers of inferior wit ‘ and judgment imitated, they fell into every thing ‘ vitious in writing.*’ There is no fear, that ſuch an affectation in French would ever make a ſect, though the preſident de Novion (72) ſhould return into the world.

(62) Scaligerana, voce Lipſius, pag. m. 143.

(63) Horat Epiſt. xix, lib. i, ver. 19.

(64) *His* Variæ Lectiones, anno 1566.

(65) In Scaligeranis, ubi ſupra.

(66) Philippus Pareus, in Vita Davidis Parei, pag. m. 18.

(67) Jacob. Pontanus e Soc. Jeſu Variarum Rerum, Quæſt. xxxi, apud Philippum Pareum, ibid. pag. 19.

(68) Philip. Pareus, ibid.

(69) De Lipſii latinitate (ut ipſimet Antiquarii Antiquarium Lipſii ſtylum indigitant) palæſtra prima.

(70) *At the end of his* Socrate Chrétien, pag. m. 228.

(71) Grot Hiſt. lib. v, pag. m. 378.

(72) His ſtile was laconic, ſententious, and unconnected.

[N] *What Joſeph Hall publiſhed concerning his Hiſtories of the Miracles of the Holy Virgin, deſerves to be related.*] Having given an account of a prodigy, which ſerved for the puniſhment of a provoſt, who had cauſed the tongue of a Proteſtant martyr to be cut out, he thus exclaims: ‘ Come now, Lipſius; ‘ go and write the new miracles of the goddeſs, and

‘ confirm

confirm the ſuperſtition by ſtrange events. All you, who have ſeen it, judge, whether ever the chapels of Hall and of Zichim, have produced ſo remarkable a thing. We every where meet with pilgrims going to pay their devotions towards theſe his ladies: I know not whether I ought to call them two ladies, or rather one in two ſhrines. If they are two, why do they adore but one of them? if they are but one, why does ſhe perform the cure at Zichem, which ſhe cannot at Hall? what great pity it is, that a genius ſo lofty and elevated to the laſt act of his life, ſhould be ſubject to raving. We have cheriſhed and admired, if need were, all the good fruits, and manly offspring of this brain: but who can bear theſe fooliſh virgins, the weak and abortive productions of doating old age? one of his greateſt favourites told me, having heard it from his own mouth, that the elder of theſe two virgins was begotten, conceived, brought into the world, and baptized, by him, in the ſpace of ten days: I believe it, and was not at all ſurprized at it. Theſe acts of ſuperſtition have an inviſible father and midwife; beſides, that it is not fitting that an elephant ſhould be three years begetting a mouſe. It was told me in the ſhop of his Moret, not without ſome indignation, that our king (73) having well conſidered the book, and read ſome paſſages of it, threw it upon the ground, with this cenſure, *Damnation to him who made it, and him who believes it*. I do not concern myſelf whether it be a true piece of hiſtory, or one of their fables: but I am certain, that this ſentence did not cauſe them ſo much diſcontent, as me joy (74).’

(73) James I, king of Great Britain.

(74) Joſeph Hall, Miſcellaneous Letters, Decad. I, pag. 77, *&c.*

LISMANIN (FRANCIS) a native of Corſica, doctor of Divinity, and a famous Franciſcan (*a*), entered into the Proteſtant church, but did not ſtop where he ought to have done; for he drove on to Arianiſm. This was done by degrees. He was confeſſor to Bonna Sforza, queen of Poland, and her preacher in the Italian tongue, &c. (*b*), [*A*], when John Triceſſius, a man of learning and quality, clandeſtinely ſowed the ſeeds of the reformation at Cracow (*c*). Liſmanin, much ſhaken by the reading of a book, the queen had given him (*d*), was confirmed in the ill opinion he had conceived of the church of Rome by ſome conferences with John Triceſſius (*e*), who beſides lent him the reformers books (*f*). He ſoon became ſuſpected of Hereſy, but managed it ſo artfully, that the biſhop of Cracow could never convict him of having Luther's and Calvin's books. He avoided the ſnares, which this prelate laid for him at Rome. Liſmanin went thither in 1550 to congratulate the new Pope Julius III, in the name of queen Bonna (g). The biſhop wrote to Rome that he was a ſecret Heretic, and that he ought to be caſt into priſon, and hindered from ever returning into Poland. This advice came a little too late; Liſmanin was already returned to the queen his miſtreſs. When he was arrived at Warſaw, where ſhe reſided, he received letters from Sigiſmond Auguſtus, king of Poland, her ſon, charging him to endeavour to pacify her; for ſhe was much provoked at this prince's marrying Barbara Radzivil [*B*]. He made three journies to bring about a peace between the two queens [*C*]. The king was ſo ſatisfied with him, that he promiſed him the

(*a*) Biblioth. Antitrinitariorum, pag. 34.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Hiſtoria Reformat. Polonic. pag. 18.

(*d*) Ib. pag. 23.

(*e*) Ex lectione concionum Barnardini Ochini Itali . . . à Regina Bonna ſibi oblatarum, totam religionem Romanam in ſuſpicionem traxerat. *Ibid.*

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 21.

(*g*) Ib. pag. 24.

[*A*] *He was confeſſor to the queen of Poland, and her preacher in the Italian tongue,* &c.] To explain this *etcetera*, I ſhall ſet down the liſt of all Liſmanin's titles: *Theologiæ Doctor, Monachus Franciſcanus. Circiter anno* 1546 *jam erat Bonæ Reginæ (matri Sigiſmundi Auguſti Regis) a concionibus Italicis & confeſſionibus ſacris: nec non Franciſcanorum ſeu Minoritarum in Polonia Provincialis, & omnium cœnobiorum monialium regulæ Claræ Ephorus, qui vulgò Commiſſarius dicitur: atque Parochus Chovienſis* (1).

[*B*] . . . . *that queen . . . . was provoked at this prince's marrying Barbara Radzivil.*] The author I cite, obſerves, that they who began the great work of the reformation in Poland, made a ſtrange falſe ſtep; they oppoſed this marriage of Sigiſmond, whilſt the biſhops, their greateſt perſecutors, gave their conſent to it. By oppoſing the prince's inclinations, and his darling paſſion, they gave him a diſlike to the reformation, while they, who applauded his marriage won his heart, and qualified themſelves for obtaining of him an abſolute liberty of perſecuting the Lutherans. ‘Impediebat veritatis in Regio corde progreſſum Induſtria & vigilantia aſtutiaque Pontificum Romanorum, latera Regia ſemper claudentium, aures ejus occupantium, inſignia Regni & cor Regis, cuſtodiam legum tenentium, oracula Regia edentium . . . . . & quod tum ferè maxime tempori & rebus eorum accommodum erat, matrimonium Regium cum Barbara Radzivilia, Staniſlai Gaofoldi Palatini Trocenſis relicta vidua, fœmina ad invidiam pulcherrimâ initum, approbantium & defendentium. Nam cum multi etiam ex illis qui veritati & reformationi favere cœperant, connubium illud, utpote cum privata & privatim, inconſulto Senatu, contractum deſtruerent, è contra Maciejovius ille, tùm Andreas Lebridovius . . . . . Epiſcopi, aliique Primores Pontificii illud adſtruerent, factum eſt, ut Rex averſum ab illis animum ac favorem in hos converterit . . . . . . Itaque boni illi Viri, Veritatis fautores graviter in eo, quod in hoc negotio Regi tanto conatu ſe oppoſuerint, erraverant: oſores verò ejus & adverſarii eorum contrariæ patri ſe applicantes Regis gratiam in ſe derivarunt. Adeò & hic verum apparuit illud Chriſti oraculum: *filios tenebrarum prudentiores eſſe in generatione ſua quàm filios lucis* (2). —— *What hindered the progreſs of the truth in the king's heart, was the induſtry, aſſiduity, and artifice, of the Roman Catholics, who were always about the king, engroſſed his ear, had the king's regalia and heart, had the cuſtody of the laws, and gave out his edicts . . . . . . and what greatly forwarded their intereſt at that time, was their approving and defending the king's marriage with Barbara Radzivil, relict of Staniſlaus Gaofold, palatine of Trockie, a moſt beautiful lady. For, when many, even of thoſe, who began to favour truth and the reformation, were for diſſolving that marriage, as having been contracted with a private perſon, privately, and without conſulting the ſenate, and, on the other hand, Maciejovius and Andreas Lebridovius . . . biſhops, and other Popiſh lords, were for confirming it, the king turned his favour and affection from the former to the latter . . . . . Thoſe good men therefore, favourers of truth, were greatly miſtaken in ſo ſtrenuouſly oppoſing the king in this affair; but it's haters, and their adverſaries, taking the contrary part, inſinuated themſelves into the king's favour: ſo that in this caſe likewiſe appeared the truth of that oracle of Jeſus Chriſt:* the children of darkneſs are wiſer in their generation, than the children of light.’ If it was not ſo advantageous, it was at leaſt more glorious to the reformers of Poland, to have been ſo impolitic.

[C] *He made three journies to bring about a peace between the two queens.*] His negotiation was more honourable than ſucceſsful; for if it pleaſed the king, it highly diſpleaſed the queen mother, who was nothing leſs than what her name ſignified (3). ‘Quo officio poſtquam ſuſceptis anno 1551. m. Januar. Febr. & Martio Cracoviam tribus itineribus majori cum Regis quam Reginæ Bonæ gratia (publicè enim in templo arcis, & in magna Aulæ frequentia, imprudens tamen, Rege ſcil. id procurante, Legationem conciliationis Reginarum ſocrûs & nurus peregit) perfunctus eſt, Rex ab eo tempore eum carum ſibi habuit (4). —— *After he had acquitted himſelf of this commiſſion (for which purpoſe he had undertook three journies to Cracow, in the year* 1551, *in the months of January, February, and March, more to the ſatisfaction of the king, than of queen Bona; (for he had publickly, in the great church, and in a full court,* negotiated

(1) Biblioth. Antitrinitar. pag. 34.

(2) Staniſlaus Lubieniecius, Hiſtoria Reformat. Polonicæ, pag. 21.

(3) Literas à Rege. . . . accepit, quibus ei mandavit ut Reginæ conſorti ſuæ conciliaret favorem matris ſuæ Reginæ Bonæ, cui cumprîmis nuptiæ illæ filii Regis erant ingratæ, & animum exaſperarant ſatis naturâ malignum. Nam non temere in eam quiſpiam luſit:

Qui tibi cunque Bonæ ſacris dum tingeris undis Impoſuit nomen, omnibus impoſuit. - - - *He received Letters from the king, in which he commanded him to reconcile the queen his wife to queen Bonna his mother, who was particularly diſpleaſed at the king her ſon's marriage, and, being naturally full of reſentment, was the more incenſed; for ſhe was not to be played upon with impunity:* Whoever, at thy baptiſm, impoſed on thee *(or gave thee)* the name of Bona *(or Good)* impoſed on *(or deceived)* every body. *Id. ibid. pag.* 36.

(4) Id. ibid. pag. 37.

the firſt biſhopric that ſhould be vacant. During theſe tranſactions, Lelius Socinus, who came into Poland in 1551 (b), adviſed Liſmanin to throw off his monk's habit, and retire into the reformed countries, and particularly into Swiſſerland. Liſmanin would have followed this advice, but that he found in the king's mind a ſtrong diſpoſition to a reformation. He cultivated theſe diſpoſitions, and received a commiſſion from him to travel, in order to acquire all the neceſſary knowledge for eſtabliſhing a better eccleſiaſtical government (i) [*D*]. He ſaw Italy, Switzerland, Geneva, Paris, and faithfully diſcharged his commiſſion; but being returned to Geneva, he there married a wife, by the advice of John Calvin and Socinus, and in ſpite of the moſt judicious remonſtrances of Budzinius, his ſecretary [*E*]. The king of Poland was ſo angry at this action of his, that he gave over

'*negotiated the reconciliation of the two queens, mother and daughter-in-law;) the king from that time made him his favourite.*' A panegyriſt of Bonna Sforza obſerves, that ſhe 'entered into the intereſts of the lords and palatines of Poland, who had not approved this marriage, refuſing to ſee either the king, her ſon, or his wife, who wore the Poliſh crown but a little while, dying ſuddenly at Cracow, not without ſuſpicion of poiſon. . . . . . By the death of queen Barbara, the diſſentions and troubles of the kingdom of Poland were pacified, and the king, and queen Bonna, his mother, reconciled (5);' but the hard words ſhe gave him upon that unequal match, returned by language of the ſame kind, quickly broke the peace. 'The queen, after their firſt reconcilement, often reproaching the king, her ſon, that he had married a ſecond time one that was no more than a gentlewoman, widow to a private gentleman, who was not of ſo good a family as that of Radzivil, from which this lady deſcended; Sigiſmond Auguſtus replied too warmly, that he had not ſo much diſhonoured the royal family of the Jagellons, and the crown of Poland, by marrying this beautiful lady publickly, and in the face of the church, in whom the graces of body and mind did recompenſe over and above what was wanting in her birth, or rather in the birth of her firſt husband Gaſtold, as ſhe, who married clandeſtinely, after the death of king Sigiſmond the Great, of ſacred and glorious memory, a man of mean condition, called Pappacoda (6).'

[*D*] *He received . . . . a commiſſion to travel, in order to acquire all the neceſſary knowledge for eſtabliſhing a better eccleſiaſtical government.*] Do not imagine, that his credential letters imported, that he had orders to furniſh himſelf with the beſt methods for reforming religion. He had received only a verbal order on this point, and the king did not deſire, that any accounts ſhould be given him of that matter in writing, but only by word of mouth. Notwithſtanding, Liſmanin writ to him about it. The pretence of his voyage was to buy ſeveral good books for the king's library. Nor was this only a pretence; for he was actually commiſſioned to buy books, and bought a great many, which he ſent to Poland (7). 'De negotio religionis amplius colloquentes, decreverunt, ut Liſmaninus, Miniſtri Regii (factorem vulgo vocamus) nomine, Bibliothecam Regiam ſumptibus ejus omni librorum genere inſtrueret, nec non viros doctos & pius adiret, Eccleſias varias, earum inſtituta & ritus ac regendi formas perluſtraret, deque omnibus his à reditu ſuo Regem inſtrueret . . . . (8). Liſmaninus Regi per Literas poſtea totum negotium expoſuit, contra ejus tamen mentem, qui reditum ejus & narrationem, vivæ vocis, non literas & mutam narrationem, expectabat (9).' Liſmanin ſhewed but little diſcretion and conduct in the execution of a deſign ſo important as this was. It muſt not be objected, that Sigiſmond Auguſtus never gave him ſuch a commiſſion; for it is eaſy to prove the contrary. The original letters, which ſeveral miniſters had encloſed to Liſmanin, and which he conveyed to the king of Poland, fell into the hands of Liſmanin's ſecretary, thirty years after the death of this prince, and were made public (10). It is certain, that Geſner, Bullinger, and Calvin, writ to this monarch, and that their letters, with many others, written to the Poliſh lords about the affair of the reformation, ran about the kingdom, and extreamly vexed the good Catholics. 'Urebat malevolos Liſmanini exemplum, ſed & miſſæ virorum præſtantium Conradi Geſneri, Henrici Bullingeri, tùm Joan. Calvini ad Regem literæ, quæ & ad Proceres Regni ac Equites veritatis Evangelicæ ſectatores ſcriptæ per ora & manus plurium ferebantur (11).' It is alſo certain, that his Poliſh majeſty anſwered the letters of, the three doctors I have named. 'Literæ illæ (12) ad Liſmaninum per Budzinium Miniſtrum ejus miſſæ fuere, qui & litteras Regias quibus Geſnero, Calvino & Bullingero reſpondit, ad eos pertulit (13).' My author complains of the perſon, who publiſhed John Calvin's letters. He accuſes him of having ſuppreſſed the praiſes, which Calvin gave Liſmanin in his letters to the king of Poland. 'Moneo amantes veri ex officio viri Chriſtiani & fidelis ſcriptoris, ut qua ratione in legendis celebrium Auctorum ſcriptis, circumſpectos eos eſſe oporteat, videant non bona fide in edendis illis Epiſtolarum gravium apographis ab infeſtis veritati hominibus actum eſſe. Nam ne quid diſſimulem; Epiſtola, quam ad Regem Auguſtum Calvinus Nonis Decembr. CIϽ IϽ LIV. dederat, ſatis cordate contra Pontificiam arrogantiam ſcripta, extat quidem inter Epiſtolas Calvini, pag. 139. ſed Liſmanini nomen initio Epiſtolæ parum candidè agens editor ejus omiſit (14). —— *I think it my duty, as a Chriſtian and a faithful writer, to admoniſh lovers of truth to be cautious in reading the works of celebrated authors, ſince certain enemies to truth have acted unfairly in the publication of thoſe letters, For, to conceal nothing, the letter, which Calvin wrote to king Auguſtus, the fifth of December* 1554, *full of warmth againſt the arrogance of the Roman Catholics, is extant indeed among Calvin's letters, page* 139; *but the editor has unfairly ſuppreſſed the name of Liſmanin in the beginning of the letter.*' He produces a letter of Calvin according to the tenor of the original: If you compare it with that which was printed, you will find many omiſſions in the latter; wherein this whole paſſage is left out (15); 'Equidem optimo viro & fideli ſervo Chriſti Franc. Liſmanino, quum à me conſilium peteret, auctor eſſe non dubitavi, ut iſthuc ſtatim concederet, ſi quis forte opera ejus uſus fuerit, ſaltem pio ejus deſiderio libenter ſubſcripſi: nec veritus ſum ne ejus profectio quaſi intempeſtiva Majeſtati Veſtræ diſpliceat, cujus præſentiam multis modis utilem experientia ipſa oſtendet. Quòd ſi palam à Rege ipſum proferri mox à primo ingreſſu nondum commodum videbitur, mihi tamen per ſacrum Chriſti nomen roganda ſuppliciter & obteſtanda eſt V. M. ut recte currenti ſaltem aliunde patefactam viam curet (16) —— *For my own part, when Francis Liſmanin, that very honeſt man and faithful ſervant of Chriſt, conſulted me, I made no ſcruple to adviſe him, immediately to repair thither, if perhaps his aſſiſtance might be wanted; at leaſt I readily came into his pious deſire nor did I fear leſt his going thither a little unſeaſonably ſhould diſpleaſe your majeſty, experience having ſhewed that his preſence is many ways uſeful. But if it ſhall not yet be thought proper, that he ſhould, upon his firſt entrance, appear openly as commiſſioned by the king, yet I humbly implore your majeſty, by the ſacred name of Chriſt, to countenance his right undertaking ſome other way.*' This is a convincing proof of the miſſion of Liſmanin, or rather of the commiſſion, which the king his maſter gave him to get intelligence among the reformers, and inſtruct himſelf in the beſt means for reforming Poland. At the ſame time, here is a deplorable inſtance of the frauds made uſe of in the printing of poſthumous books. Whatever diſpleaſes is retrenched. And who can aſſure us there are no additions and alterations made to them?

[*E*] *He married . . . . In ſpite of the moſt judicious remonſtrances of his ſecretary* (17).] I grant that our gentleman was ſtrongly perſuaded of the nullity of his vows, and that his ſpirit, no leſs than his fleſh, felt a repugnance to the law of celibacy. Yet it was but fit, he ſhould put off his marriage, till over his project of reformation, tho' Liſmanin had ſent him the letters of ſeveral miniſters upon this affair (*k*). The firſt ſynod, which was held in Poland (*l*) by the reformed, writ Liſmanin, who was then in Switzerland (*m*), a very obliging letter, deſiring him to return. He left Switzerland in 1556, and came back to Poland, where he concealed himſelf ſome time; for he was not ignorant, that there was a ſentence of proſcription againſt him (*n*). Several great lords interceded for him, ſo that he was ſuffered to ſhew himſelf. He did not at firſt declare for either of the two innovators, one of which (*o*) maintained, that Jeſus Chriſt was not mediator, according to the divine nature; the other (*p*) maintained the pre-eminence of God the Father. But after ſome conferences with Blandrata in 1558 [*F*], he began to doubt of the myſtery of the Trinity; and became ſo ſuſpected of Arianiſm, that he was accuſed in the conſiſtory of Cracow (*q*). He defended himſelf but ill, and as Blandrata had his favourers, and other diſputes had already divided mens minds, nothing but confuſion enſued in the ſynods. Liſmanin offered a medium for reconciling the parties; which was, that they ſhould ſtick to the authority of four fathers of the church (*r*), and for this end collected ſeveral paſſages from theſe fathers, which might ſerve for a ſanctuary to various interpretations. This project was rejected; whereupon Liſmanin retired to Konigſberg in Pruſſia, where he died miſerably about the year 1563 (*s*) [*G*]. Moſt of thoſe, who ſpeak of him, do not know his name [*H*].

(b) Hiſtoria Reformat. Polonicæ, pag. 40.

(c) Ibid. pag. 41.

(5) Hilar. de Coſte, Eloges des Dames Illuſtres, Tom. I, pag. 201.

(6) Id. ibid. pag. 204. *See the words of Thuanus, above, citat* (18) *of the article* ARRAGON (ISABELLA of).

(7) Libros juſſu & impenſis regiis coemtos, biennio poſtquam duxerat uxorem ad eum ſubinde miſit. *Lubieniecius, ubi ſupra, pag.* 43, 44.

(8) Id. ibid. pag. 41.

(9) Ibid. pag. 42.

(10) Nec non literas quas celeberrimi in Helvetia viri ad eum ſcripſere: quarum autographa 30 annis à morte Regis in manus Budzinii pervenerunt, ita ut ejus induſtriæ conſervationem illorum debeamus. Horum apographa hic omitto cum hæc jam dudum lucem viderint. *Idem, ibid. pag.* 44.

(11) Ib. pag. 55.

(12) That is to ſay, thoſe which the ſynod of Pinczow writ to Liſmanin.

(13) Lubieniecius, Hiſt. Reform. Polon. pag. 58.

(14) Ib. pag 44.

(15) Impreſſum exemplar cuncta iſta quæ videbis de Liſmanino omiſerit. *Ibid.*

(16) Ib. pag. 45. *This Letter of Calvin is dated the twenty fourth of December* 1555.

(17) *This title is given to Budzinius in the* Bibl. Antitrinit. pag. 55.

He

(*k*) Ibid. pag. 43.

(*l*) *At Pinczow, in* 1555. Id. Hiſt. Reformat. Polon. pag. 56.

(*m*) Ib. pag. 57.

(*n*) Ibid. pag. 65.

(*o*) *He was called* Francis Stancarus.

(*p*) *He was called* Paul Goneſius.

(*q*) Hiſt. Reform. Polon. pag. 118.

(*r*) *St Ambroſe, St Jerom, St Auguſtin, St Chryſoſtom* Ibid. pag. 168. *See the remark* [*I*].

(*s*) Hiſt. Reform. Polon. pag. 170.

---

he had given an account of his commiſſion to the king of Poland. All that is lawful is not expedient: the great matter is to time a thing well. Budzinius repreſented this maxim to his maſter, with great judgment, but found him inflexible, and could not prevail with him to defer his marriage. The Socinian, I am going to cite, judiciouſly cenſures this precipitation, and takes it ill, that Calvin and Socinus's counſels got the better of thoſe of Budzinius. ‘Quod tamen (*mandatum regis*) paulò poſt neglexit, poſtquàm Genevam reverſus, ne cum horrido cucullo in Poloniam rediret, uxorem duxiſſet, auctore Calvino & Lælio Socino (qui paulò poſtquam Cracoviæ ſementem veritatis jeciſſet, Genevam eodem anno redierat, quâ tamen mox, Calvini ingenium vel non ferens vel metuens, relictâ, Tiguri ſedem fixerat) ſed contradicente Budzinio, miniſtro ſuo, & ob oculos ponente Regis indignationem, qui eum ſumtibus ſuis in exteras regiones ad omnia perluſtranda & exploranda ablegarit, & tantorum conatuum alium eventum quàm Ablegati ſui, ejuſque Monachi, nuptias expectet, fide etiam promiſſi ſibi data, tum & ſucceſſum ejuſmodi matrimonii, quod magis ædificata ſubruere, quam aliquid ædificare poſſit, infauſtum; quod etiam reipſa eveniſſe ſuo loco videbimus. Sed ſurdo cecinit. Namque Monachus cœlibatum, & ſpiritu & carne meritò illum damnante, peroſus, & ad caſtas, intempeſtivas tamen, nuptias properans, quod inſtituit, effectum dedit, & accepta uxore, Genevæ manſit. Quod ejus factum Rex moleſte ferens ab incepto de exploranda religione reſiluit (18). *Which command of the king he ſoon after neglected, having, upon his return to Geneva, married a wife, that he might not go back a monk, into Poland: this he did by the advice of Calvin and Lælius Socinus (who, ſoon after he had planted the truth at Cracow, returned the ſame year to Geneva; from whence departing, either becauſe he could not bear, or ſtood in fear of, Calvin's diſpoſition, he fixed his reſidence at Zurich): but his ſecretary Budzinius remonſtrated againſt it, and ſet before him the king's reſentment, who had ſent him at his own expence into foreign countries, to examine and ſearch into every thing, and expected other conſequences of ſuch great undertakings, than the marriage of his agent, and him a monk: he put him in mind likewiſe of his promiſe, and repreſented to him the event of ſuch a marriage, which rather tended to pull down, than to build up; which really came to paſs, as we ſhall ſee in it's proper place. But Liſmanin turned a deaf ear to this remonſtrance. For, tho' a monk, hating celibacy, both fleſh and ſpirit deſervedly condemning it, and haſtening to a chaſt, tho' unſeaſonable marriage, he effected what he had deſigned, and, having taken a wife, continued at Geneva. Which action of his the king reſenting, laid aſide all farther ſearches about religion.*’ Correct a fault that is found in John Lætus's Univerſal Hiſtory. He ſays, that Liſmanin left the cloiſter of Cracow, with ſome other monks, to turn Proteſtant (19). Who would not think, on reading this, that this man, and, after him, ſome others of his fraternity, abjured their religion in Poland? whereas the thing was otherwiſe: the Franciſcans of Cracow, who turned Proteſtants, preceded Liſmanin (20). The latter diſſembled, and threw not off the maſk, till he was at Geneva, in his travels, under pretence of purchaſing books for his majeſty's library. His marriage occaſioned Florimond de Remond to ſay, ‘That Francis Liſinan, an apoſtate monk, who afterwards came near to the Alcoran, favoured theſe novelties more from a love for a woman he doted on, than for the ſake of the goſpel (21).’

[*F*] *He had ſome conferences with Blandrata in* 1558.] I know not whether Liſmanin had been a a patron of this Blandrata, before his travels above mentioned, and had introduced him to the queen of Poland as a good Phyſician; but this is certain, that he introduced him to a great prince after his return. ‘Ita fors tulit ut Blandrata, qui Medicinam diu in Polonia primum, deinde in Tranſylvania apud Reginas fecerat eò reverteretur: ubi nimium facilè illi aditus ad noſtros patuit, quantumvis à D. Joanne Calvino diligenter præmonitos: illum præſertim in illuſtriſſ. & præſtantiſſ. alioqui Principis cujuſdam gratiam inſinuante Liſmanino quodam Corcyrenſi, magnæ tum apud Polonicas omnes Eccleſias auctoritatis viro (22). —— *It ſo happened, that Blandrata, who had been Phyſician to queens, firſt in Poland, then in Tranſylvania, returned thither; where he had too eaſy acceſs to thoſe of our party, tho' diligently cautioned by John Calvin; one Liſmanin, a Corſican, a man of great authority at that time with all the Poliſh churches, recommending him to the favour of an otherwiſe moſt illuſtrious and moſt excellent prince.*’ I here obſerve a chronological error of Father Maimbourg. He ſays, that ‘Gentilis being gone to Poland, whither Blandrata had ſent for him, Lelio Socini, a Sieneſe, and Matthew Gribaldus, went to join him, and that Peter Stator . . . . . Liſmaninus . . . . Gomeſius (23). . . . . . . and Okinus, met them, openly to oppoſe the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt (24).’ He puts in the margin the year 1561; but it is certain, that Liſmanin returned into Poland five years before Gentilis was ſent for. It is farther certain, that this was not with deſign to attack the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt; for he did not appear to eſpouſe Arianiſm till after he had ſeen the diſputes of Stancarus, and conferred with Blandrata, who returned into Poland two years after him. As for Paul Goneſius, he did not go to join Gentilis; for he had been in Poland from the year 1556 (25).

[*G*] *He died miſerably at Konigsberg, about the year* 1563.] He was ſeized with a frenzy, and threw himſelf into a well, where he was drowned. Some ſay, that his wife, ſhrewdly ſuſpected of giving him horns, was the occaſion of this fatal accident. ‘Regiomonti ubi apud Ducem Boruſſiæ degebat in phreneſin lapſus, (cui à juventute obnoxius erat) in puteum decidit, atque ita ſubmerſus eſt, circa annum ut colligo, 1563. Budzinius cap. 29. hunc caſum narrans, dicit, cùm ea de re ſcrutaretur, relatum ſibi eſſe, uxorem ejus (quæ jam antea adulterio ſuſpecta erat) hujus interitus cauſam fuiſſe (26).’

[*H*] *Moſt of thoſe, who ſpeak of him, know not his name.*] We have cited one, who calls him Liſinan. Others call him Liſmannus (27), or Liſmanius (28).

(18) Lubieniecius, ubi ſupra, pag, 42, 43.

(19) Quibus adjunxit ſe Franciſcus Liſmaninus Corcyræus qui paulo ante relictis Franciſcanis Cracoviæ, eductis ſecum aliquot Monachis in ſocietatem Evangelii tranſiverat. *Jo. Lætus, Compend. Hiſtor. Univerſalis, pag.* m. 390.

(20) Lubieniecius, ubi ſupra, pag. 23.

(21) Florim. de Remond, Hiſt. of Hereſy, book iv, chap. viii, pag. m. 453.

(22) Beza, Epiſt. lxxxi.

(23) *He ſhould have ſaid* Goneſius.

(24) Hiſtoire de l'Arianiſme, l. vr. xii. p. 351, 352, Tom. III, Dutch Edit. *See a like anachroniſm in the article* BLANDRATA, *at the end of the remark* [*D*].

(25) Lubieniecius, ubi ſupra, pag. 111.

(26) Bibl. Antitrinit. pag. 35.

(27) Hoornbeek, Apparat. pag. 31.

(28) Spondanus, ad. ann. 1561, n. 33.

He writ ſcarce any thing [*I*].

[*I*] *He writ ſcarce any thing.*] Here is what we find, on this head, in the Bibliotheque of the Antitrinitarian writers (29). ‘ Literæ ad generoſum Dominum Staniſlaum Ivanum Karninſcium (30), datæ Pinczoviæ die 10 Septembris an. 1561. M. S. in quibus ſententiam Stancari oppugnat, ac multis teſtimoniis Patrum, probat, Patrem eſſe cauſam ac originem Filii, eoque majorem: porrò ſe ipſum ab Arianiſmo ſibi objecto purgat: Stancaro autem Sabellianiſmum imputat. Ab hoc tempore anſa ex hac Epiſtola arrepta, cœpit Gregorius Pauli, in Eccleſia Cracovienſi, fortius urgere eminentiam Dei Patris: prout refert Budzinius, qui dictam Epiſtolam operis ſui hiſtorici cap. 20. inſeruit. Brevis explicatio Doctrinæ de ſanctiſſima Trinitate, quam Stancaro & aliis quibuſdam oppoſuit, præmiſſa ad Regem Sigiſmundum Auguſtum Epiſtola apologetica Kal. Junii 1563. Cracoviæ ſcripta. Subſcripſerunt ei cum ipſo, Felix Cruciger Superintendens Eccleſiarum in minori Polonia, aliique circiter triginta Seniores & Miniſtri: inter quos erat, Gregorius Pauli Senior in ditione Cracovienſi. Apologia hæc excuſa eſt typis, anno 1565. — *Manuſcript letters to Staniſlaus Ivan Karninski, dated at Pinczow, the tenth of September* 1561, *in which he oppoſes the opinion of Stancarus, and, by many teſtimonies of the Fathers, proves, that the Father is the cauſe and origin of the Son, and therefore greater: moreover he clears himſelf from the charge of Arianiſm; and accuſes Stancarus of Sabellianiſm. From this time, taking a handle from this letter, Gregory Paul began more ſtrongly to urge the ſupremacy of God the Father, in the church of Cracow; as Budzinius relates, who inſerted the ſaid epiſtle in the twentieth chapter of his Hiſtorical Work, a ſhort explanation of the doctrine of the moſt Holy Trinity, written againſt Stancarus, and ſome others; to which is prefixed an apologetical epiſtle to king Sigiſmond Auguſtus, June* 1. 1563; *written at Cracow. It was ſubſcribed likewiſe by Felix Cruciger, ſuperintendant of the churches of Leſſer Poland, and about thirty other elders and miniſters; among whom was Gregory Paul, elder in the diſtrict of Cracow. This apology was printed in the year* 1565.’ The collection of paſſages, mentioned in the body of this article, was printed; but Lubieniecius had not ſeen it. I ſhall, for the ſingularity of the matter, recite the words, which ſhew Liſmanin's deſign of terminating the differences of the miniſters by the authority of the Fathers. ‘ Liſmaninus tamen ſtudia redintegrandæ concordiæ vel ſtabiliendæ rei reſumere: media ad hanc rem obtinendam idonea quærere: ad ultimum quatuor illorum Eccleſiæ quarti Seculi Doctorum, Ambroſii, Hieronymi, Auguſtini, & Chryſoſtomi auctoritatem quaſi partibus diſſidentibus conciliandis commodum medium proponere: hinc centonem ex illis conſuere. Id ſcripti, licet lucem viderit, videre mihi non contigit (31). — *But Liſmanin reſumed his deſign of reſtoring peace and unity; conſidered of methods for bringing it about; and at laſt propoſed the authority of theſe four doctors of the church, in the fourth century, Ambroſe, Jerom, Auguſtin, and Chryſoſtom, as a proper means to reconcile the diſagreeing parties; then made a collection out of thoſe writers. This piece, tho' publiſhed, never came to my hands.*’

(29) Bibl. Antitrinit. pag. 35. *See Beza's eighty firſt Letter*, pag. m. 297.

(30) *This Letter is printed in the* Hiſtoria Reformationis Polonicæ, pag. 119, & ſeq.

(31) Lubieniecius, ubi ſupra, pag. 168.

LISOLA (FRANCIS DE) became famous by his embaſſies to ſeveral courts of Europe. He was a native of Bezançon, and entred into the emperor's ſervice about the year 1639 (*a*). From that time to his death, he moſt zealouſly ſtuck to the intereſts of the Imperial court, and employed all the talents of his pen, and all the vigilance of an able ſtateſman, to the advantage of the houſe of Auſtria. He was not above thirty years old, when he was reſident in England from the emperor Ferdinand III (*b*). He diſcharged this employment ſo well, that he was continued in it above four years. He was envoy-extraordinary at the court of Spain, at the time of Philip IVth's death in 1665 [*A*]. The book, which he intituled *Bouclier d' Etat & de Juſtice*, — *The Buckler of State and Juſtice*, is a very good one [*B*]. Here he ſolidly anſwers what France had publiſhed *about the rights of the queen to ſeveral ſtates of the Spaniſh monarchy in the year* 1667. I do not doubt but he is the author of ſeveral pamphlets againſt France, which are commonly aſcribed to him; but I believe too, that ſeveral others are fathered on him, in which he was not concerned; the common artifice of Bookſellers to give a run to a pitiful piece. He made himſelf odious to France by this way of writing; and ſome Frenchmen have abuſed him in their pamphlets. They complain of his paſſionate ſatirical humour, which ſpared not the perſon of the Moſt Chriſtian king. He defended himſelf very ſeriouſly upon this head [*C*]. I do

(*a*) *In the preface to the* Denouement des Intrigues du tems, *printed in* 1672. *It is ſaid, that he had ſerved for thirty three years, without reproach, under two emperors.*

(*b*) Richard, Deſcription de la Franche Comté, *in the Atlas of Blaeuw.*

[*A*] *He was embaſſador-extraordinary at the court of Spain, at the time of Philip the fourth's death in* 1665.] The count de Chavagnac obſerves (1) that the baron de Liſola had put a ſtop to the concluſion of the marriage of the Infanta with the emperor, ‘ and had obliged the king, before his death, by an expreſs article, to keep up an army in the hereditary countries, to ſuccour Flanders, the Milaneze, and the emperor: count Marſin was to be general of it.’ The count de Chavagnac was to command under Marſin: he adds, that the baron received orders to go over into England (2), and went on board a pink at Barcelona, in order to go to Final; that he croſſed Piedmont, and came to Franche Comté with his wife and daughter (3), *who is one of the worthieſt perſons in the world* (4).

[*B*] *The book, he intituled, the Buckler of State and Juſtice, is a very good one.*] Here is what Mr de Lyonne writ about it to the king, his maſter; ‘ I had forgotten to ſay, concerning a book the Spaniards have publiſhed, intituled, *the Buckler of State and Juſtice*, (which muſt be of Liſola's compoſition) in anſwer to the tract concerning the right of the queen, that it is Van Beuningen's opinion, that this book has fully and convincingly deſtroyed all the king's pretenſions to the Franche Comté, Namur, Limbourg, Haynault, Artois, &c. ſo as no good reply can be made on our part; inſomuch that the king, as he ſays, has only remaining, his pretenſion to Brabant, by right of devolution; from whence he concludes, that he ought only to demand a ſatisfaction anſwerable to that pretenſion, and that, having promiſed it ſhould be moderated, he now draws this conſequence, that Franche Comté, and ſome other places, ought to ſatisfy his majeſty (5).’ The poſtſcript Mr le Tellier underwrit to this place of Mr de Lyonne's diſpatch, by the king's order, has theſe words. *There is ground to hope, that Van Beuningen's opinion concerning this book will not be followed.*

[*C*] *He defended himſelf very ſeriouſly upon this head.*] His words are theſe; ſpeaking of himſelf in the third perſon. ‘ He diſcovers in all his actions a very particular eſteem for the French nation; he acknowledges it to be one of the nurſes of arts and ſciences, polite in it's diſcourſe and writings, agreeable in converſation, fruitful of great men, abounding in good ſoldiers, induſtrious, brave, and laborious. His ſentiments of his moſt Chriſtian majeſty proceed even to admiration; he ſpeaks of him on all occaſions, with as much reſpect as his own ſubjects can do; he praiſes with all poſſible commendation the glorious regulations he has made in his kingdom, and if he could ſee him apply his great genius and power to leſs dangerous and more diſtant conqueſts, his moſt ardent wiſhes ſhould attend his deſign (6).’ Let us ſee

(1) Memoires du Comté de Chavagnac, pag. 246. Edit. Holland.

(2) Ibid. pag. 251.

(3) Ib. pag. 253.

(4) Ib. pag. 247.

(5) Memoires of Mr de Lyonne, intercepted by the garriſon of Liſle, the Sieur Heron, courier of the cabinet, carrying them from the army to Paris, in 1667, pag. 18, Dutch Edit. 1668, Patin, *Letter cccclxiii, p.* 357, *Tom III*, ſpeaks of this intercepting.

(6) Denouement des Intrigues du Tems, pag. 15.

do not think any one has written againſt him in a more ingenious and ſmart manner than Mr Verjus (c) [D]: it was to retort groſs injuries. Let us not forget, that Mr de Liſola was honoured with the title of baron. He died before the opening of the conferences of Nimeguen. He would doubtleſs have been plenipotentiary of his Imperial majeſty, and poſſibly would have been more ſucceſsful than his ſucceſſors, in retarding the treaty of peace. It is ſaid he was fitter to continue a war than to conclude it [E]; and he had ſuch a faculty of alarming mens minds, that he animated to a confederacy even thoſe, who had the greateſt inclination to ſtand neuter. I am far from affirming, what many have ſaid, that he made no ſcruple of diſperſing in ſeveral courts, as from intercepted letters, I know not how many ſchemes, and projects of alliances, and inſtructions to ambaſſadors, which ſhewed, that France deſigned to ſwallow up all Europe; which pieces, as they ſay, were forged in his own ſtudy. I would require ſtrong proofs of this, before I gave credit to it. Beſides, though theſe frauds paſs well enough upon the people, *ad populum phaleras*; would

pacific

(c) At preſent he is called Count de Crecy, and was one of the plenipotentiaries of France, at the treaty of Ryſwic, in 1697.

ſee how he juſtifies himſelf upon the ſubject of libels (7). ‘This writer accuſes him of an unreaſonable affectation to appear in public by his writings, and I can ſay, with all thoſe who know him, that it is one of his greateſt averſions: tho' in the whole courſe of his life, he has employed his leiſure hours in compoſing many works, from which he might have expected as great approbation, as from thoſe he was obliged to make public; yet the ſollicitations of his friends could never conquer the reluctance he ever had to the appearing in print, and, except the *Buckler of State*, which he was obliged to publiſh, with a diſpatch, which did not permit him to poliſh it as he could wiſh, no other piece of his writing has come out with his privity and conſent. It is true, the avarice of the Bookſellers has put them on collecting ſome indigeſted fragments of two or three other of his works, which they ſent to the preſs with ſo many faults, that the author himſelf can hardly know them; but he has reaſon to complain, that the malice of ſome, and the ignorance of others, frequently father on him off-ſprings, which he never produced (8), and which have characters ſo contrary to his, that if the world would do him juſtice, they would readily own, that they are ſuppoſititious.’

That I may not reſume this another time, let me here recite his anſwer to the reproaches of avarice and violence. ‘He attacks him in his greateſt ſtrength, when he charges him, in covert expreſſions, with being gained by the States, and acting through a principle of intereſt and ambition; this is miſunderſtanding both his genius, and that of the United Provinces. He is as little of a humour to receive, as they are to give; it is not the way of popular republics to be ſo profuſe .... (9). Indeed, every one knows the baron de l'Iſola's little application to his fortune, and that he is daily ſubject to the reproaches of his moſt intimate friends, for the extreme negligence he ſhews in his own concerns. The preſent condition he is in, after the fair opportunities he has had to enrich himſelf, evidently proves, that he has hitherto laboured more for the public than for himſelf. Some miniſters of France could give an authentic teſtimony of his way of receiving offers of that nature; all the Imperial court will teſtify in his behalf, that for above three years he has been ardently ſolliciting his maſter to grant him a little retreat, as the price of all his ſervices, in which he might ſpend the reſt of his days at eaſe, free from the hurry of affairs. If the offices of his enemies could procure him that happineſs with his maſter, to which he only aſpires, they might rid themſelves of him more handſomely, and with a better conſcience, than by that cowardly and unworthy way of abuſes and calumnies: I know, he would think himſelf obliged to their hatred, and would heartily ſay, *Salutem ex inimicis* (10).’ This is what concerns the accuſation of avarice; let us proceed to the ſecond head. ‘As to his conduct in public affairs, all the miniſters of the emperor can bear him faithful teſtimony, that he never propoſed any thing violent or unjuſt, and always promoted union and moderation, while France went upon the antient maxim, *Divide & Impera*. In all the controverſies that have come before him, he has employed his utmoſt pains and ſtudy in ſeeking ways of accommodation; he has reconciled the elector of Brandenburg and the king of Poland, and found no obſtacle to his negotiation, but what the miniſters of France were the authors of. All the world knows how much he facilitated the treaty of Oliva, with what earneſtneſs he laboured for thoſe of Portugal, and Aix la Chapelle, and the pains he took to ſtrengthen them, by a ſolid guaranty. He has frequently ſollicited defenſive leagues, which are the foundations of the peace and ſecurity of ſtates: he has always diſſuaded the offenſive, as much as poſſible, which may raiſe jealouſies, and create new troubles; nay, he grants, that he wiſhes the preſervation and welfare of the United Provinces, becauſe he looks upon them as the bulwark of the empire, the ſtrongeſt ſupport of the Netherlands, and the mediators and guarantees of peace (11).’

[*D*] *No one wrote againſt him in a more ingenious .... manner, than Mr Verjus.*] They aſcribe to the baron de Liſola a little book intituled, *la Sauce au Verjus* (12), a piece extremely ſevere againſt the perſon, whoſe name is alluded to. This alluſion, and the whole title of this libel, have highly diſpleaſed Father Bouhours: I ſhall relate ſomewhat at large what he has ſaid upon it; in which we ſhall find the proof of what I advance, that this writing was fathered on Mr de Liſola. ‘A punſter will not ſcruple to play upon a name in abuſive writings. He will intitle a libel, *la Sauce au Verjus*, and afterwards ſay, that *grapes, which can never ripen, are good to make verjuice. France approves theſe deſigns by her miniſter at the court of Brandenburg, and the ſauce is like to be none of the beſt, ſince they have put in it too much verjuice.* A man muſt have a very bad taſte, to be pleaſed with ſuch kitchen-wit. Nothing diſguſts more, than theſe inſipid alluſions, which have neither wit nor beauty in them; and I do not know, whether I ſhould not reliſh the impertinence of that famous preacher, altogether as well, who preaching before a great prince, and taking for his text, *Omnis caro fœnum*, began thus, Monſieur, *foin de vous, foin de moi, foin de tous les hommes, omnis caro fœnum* *. But to ſpeak ſeriouſly, the foolery of the miniſter of Vienna, and the preacher of Paris, are much alike: the one offends the majeſty of the empire, by a fooliſh and ridiculous pun, while he pretends to ſupport it; the other diſhonours the ſacred word of God, by a vile and buffoon expreſſion. Both affront the dignity of our language, which will not ſuffer abſurd and groſs jeſting (13).’

[*E*] *They ſay, he was fitter to continue a war, than to conclude it.*] It was therefore a moſt diſagreeable employment, which the emperor put him upon, during the war of Charles Guſtavus, king of Sweden, againſt Poland; for here is what Mr de Wicquefort tells us. ‘In the year 1655, during the rupture betwixt the crowns of Poland and Sweden, the emperor ſent to offer his mediation to the latter, by count de Pottingen, vice-chancellor of Bohemia. They had already begun to treat without a mediator: the Swedes were perſuaded, that the emperor's intention was rather to aggravate things, than reconcile them. They knew, that, if the negotiation muſt be carried on by mediators, thoſe could not be declined, who had already been employed at Lubec; that the emperor had endeavoured to oblige the Muſcovites to declare war againſt Sweden, and that Leſſinski, whom the king of Poland had ſent to Vienna, had obtained ſome aſſurance of ſuccours. The count arrived at Thorn in September; but the king being in perpetual motion, he could not ſpeak with him till the fifth of April the year following, and ſaw him no more after that time; and, coming with Liſola into the army of Poland, he himſelf renounced the title of mediator (14).’

[*F*] *He*

---

(7) Ib. pag. 12.

(8) *Compare with this theſe words of the 234th page.* He ſhews that he is but a bad judge of ſtile, when he attributes the letter of the States-General to the baron *de l'Iſola*. Good judges will not agree with him, and I ſhall not wonder hereafter, if the ignorant aſcribe ſo many falſe pieces to him, as they have hitherto done.

(9) Ibid. pag. 9.

LISOLA juſtified from avarice and violence.

(10) Ib. pag. 11.

(11) Ib. pag. 14.

(12) Printed in 1674.

[* It is a French pun, which can hardly be expreſs in Engliſh.]

(13) Bouhours, Remarques ſur la Langue Franç. pag m. 428.

(14) Wicquefort, Traité de l'Ambaſſadeur, Tom. II, pag. 239.

pacific princes ſuffer themſelves to be caught by them? He had the misfortune to diſguſt the king of Poland [*F*], as I ſhall ſay below, citing Mr de Wicquefort. He was believed to be the author, and principal director of the deſign, which was executed in Cologn on the perſon of prince William of Furſtemberg [*G*], during the conferences of the peace the fourteenth of February 1674.

[*F*] *He had the misfortune to diſguſt the king of Poland.*] Mr de Wicquefort tells us this, in a way which gives us ſome touches of our baron's character. 'I will add to the example of Appelboom (15), that of Francis Baron de Liſola, the emperor's embaſſador at Warſaw. This miniſter, who was a man of parts, had made himſelf at firſt very acceptable to the king and queen of Poland, and had done them important ſervices, till, ſeeing, in the year 1661, that the queen took upon her to elect a ſucceſſor in the king's life-time, and laboured to get a French prince elected, he openly enough oppoſed the intrigues that were carrying on, in order to it, amongſt the ſenators. The queen, who could not be ignorant of it, and, who was at leaſt as fit to reign as the king, cauſed the biſhop of Warmia, and the palatine of Pomerania, to tell Liſola, *that the cabals he made in the kingdom, hindered their majeſties from admitting him any more to audience.* Liſola, to ſound their intention, and to know whether there was any thing in it more than perſonal, and whether the prohibition extended to the negotiation he was employed in by the emperor, his maſter, demanded to ſee the king, who ordered him to be anſwered, that, if he had any propoſition to make, he might do it in writing. Liſola refuſed it, and gave advice of the whole matter to the court of Vienna, from whence an anſwer was returned, that the emperor was aſtoniſhed at the proceeding of the king of Poland, *and that, before he had taken a method ſo contrary to the good underſtanding, which ought to be betwixt neighbouring princes, and ſo near relations, and even to the law of nations, he ſhould have made his complaints.* The king of Poland wrote afterwards to the emperor upon this ſubject, and his reſident Veſpaſian Landſcoronski ſeconded by his offices the reaſons of the king, his maſter; but the emperor, whoſe intereſt it was to hinder the election of a French prince, approved the conduct of his embaſſador. However, conſidering that he could do him no more ſervice in a court, to which he was become unacceptable, he recalled him at his own inſtance, and under another pretence. Liſola departed without taking leave of the king and queen, and the emperor has ever ſince employed him in negotiations of the greateſt importance, to which he applied himſelf with great ability, though frequently with little ſucceſs (16).' The author of the *Curious Treatiſe upon the ſeizing of the Prince of Furſtemberg* (17), confeſſes, that Liſola was unfortunate; yet he gives him great encomiums; and, as all that he ſays is ſerviceable to the hiſtory of this baron, I ſhall produce a long fragment of it (18). 'Liſola believed theſe things; but we have our (19) evaſions it is true, that as he was feared whilſt alive, we are content to attack him after his death; which is neither generous nor honeſt, and ſhews our weakneſs or our fear .... I could give a hundred inſtances of it (20), if neceſſary, to ſhew, that this man was falſly accuſed by thoſe, who durſt not look him in the face, if he were alive. Mr d'Ambrun (21) ſpeaks more modeſtly, and all he objects to him, is, that he calls him an author, known *by his invenomed writings againſt France,* yet without cenſuring them; ſo ſtrong was his genius, and ſo admired by all who judged ſoundly of things. He had an inconceivable force of wit, a great preſence of mind, a vaſt penetration, a vaſt reach of underſtanding, dexterouſly aſſaulted, or defended himſelf, was a maſter of politics, acquainted with all it's ſprings, a man of zeal, wrote excellently and eaſily and ſhort, publiſhed curious pieces, when no body believed he had ſo much as begun them ... (22) but with theſe eſſential qualities, Liſola was unfortunate, and died perpetually thwarted, when the emperor, moved by his ſervices, and to make him a juſt recompence, recalled him to Vienna, feeding him with many fair hopes. He ſhone, being near his end, like the glare of a ſtar that vaniſhes away, after having enlightened all the earth.'

[*G*] *He was believed to be the author of a deſign, which was executed ..... on the perſon of prince William of Furſtemberg.*] The French always ſuppoſed, as an unqueſtioned fact, that the baron de Liſola was the promoter of this deſign. He is thought to be the true author of a book, which juſtifies that action. Deckherus thus ſpeaks of it. 'Gulielmi Principis Furſtenbergii detentio, ad Cæſaris authoritatem, tranquilitatem Imperii, Pacis promotionem, juſta, perutilis, neceſſaria: authore *Chriſtophoro* WOLTFANGO, Anno MDCLXXIV publicata, illuſtri ſtylo, experientia profunda, conſummata eruditione prorſus excellens, ab orbe erudito adſcribi meruit Præ-Illuſtri *Antonio* PERIANDRO, *Rhæto*; qui ſuceptam modeſtam nominis detectionem gratioſe interpretari non dedignabitur: Cauſa enim ibi pro honore Imperatoris & Salute Imperii magnifice defenſa; neque ſtyli Mars Venuſque PORTNERUM ſerio diſſimulare viſi; quamvis hodie Illuſtrem Dom. *Franciſcum Baronem* DE ISOLA, negotiatoribus irritæ pacis immixtum, authorem videre & eligere, maluerint (23). —— *The detention of William prince of Furſtenberg, juſt, uſeful, and neceſſary, to the authority of the emperor, the tranquillity of the empire, and the promoting of peace: being publiſhed by Chriſtopher* WOLTFANGUS *in the year* 1674; *and in beauty of ſtile, profound experience, and conſummate learning, altogether excellent, it deſerved to be aſcribed by the learned world to the moſt illuſtrious Anthony* PERIANDER, *a Griſon; who will not diſdain to interpret favourably the modeſt detection undertaken of the name: for the honour of the emperor; and ſafety of the empire, are therein pompouſly defended; and the ſtrength and beauty of the ſtile ſeemed to claim* PORTNER *as it's author; tho' at preſent, they chuſe to aſcribe it to Francis baron* D'ISOLA, *one of the miniſters for negotiating a peace.*' I ſhall occaſionally ſay, that he aſcribes to the ſame author an anonymous book againſt France, printed about the year 1673. His words are theſe: 'Eodem tempore prodiit *Conſilium ſtatus ſecretius Regis Galliarum,* Gallice & Germanice manifeſtatum: *die Franzoſiſche Rathſtube*; non ſine veri conjectura, ſuæque rei, inde ſpe, hinc metu, à Germanis arreptum, à Gallis cum indignatione rejectum: ut ex libello nuper in contrarium edito *Dominum Franciſcum Baronem de* ISOLA authorem incuſante, curioſo noſtræ Reipublicæ Vindici pateſcit (24). —— *At the ſame time was publiſhed, in French and German, the* Conſilium ſtatus, *&c.* die Franzoſiſche Rathſtube; *not without a conjecture of the truth; and greedily ſeized by the Germans, thro' alternate hope and fear, but rejected with indignation by the French: as appears to the curious defender of our republic, by a book lately publiſhed on the other ſide, accuſing the author* Francis baron de ISOLA.'

(15) Reſident of Sweden at the Hague, whom his maſter would not re-call, tho' the States in 1657, had declared they would not treat with him any longer.

(16) Wicquefort, ubi ſupra, Tom. I, pag. 301, 302.

(17) Printed in 1676.

(18) Traité Curieux, pag. 13.

(19) The author ſpeaks as if he was a Frenchman.

(20) That is to ſay, of embaſſadors puniſhed.

(21) He ſpeaks of Mr d'Aubuſſon, biſhop of Metz, who publiſhed a book concerning the right the king had to the ſucceſſion of Spain, in 1674. The words cited by him are in the preface. He looked on Liſola as the author of a pamphlet, printed at Liege, in 1674, intituled L'Orateur François. *It was a refutation of the harangue, which this prelate had made to the king at Metz, the thirtieth of July 1673.*

(22) Traité Curieux, pag. 16.

(23) Deckherus, de Scriptis adeſpotis, pag 160. Edit. 1686.

(24) Id. ibid. pag. 134.

LIVINEIUS, or **LIVINEUS** (JOHN) was born at Dendermonde; but becauſe in the firſt part of his life, he was brought up at Ghent, whence he originally ſprung, he gave himſelf the ſirname of Gandenſis. His mother was ſiſter of the learned Levinus Torrentius, biſhop of Antwerp. He ſtudied the *Belles Lettres* at Cologn, and Divinity at Louvain. He afterwards took a journey to Rome, and frequented the libraries, and principally that of the Vatican (*a*). He applied himſelf to the Greek language, which procured him the friendſhip of cardinal William Sirlet, and cardinal Antony Caraffa (*b*). He tranſlated into Latin ſome works of the Greek fathers, and if he had lived longer, he would

(*a*) Ex Val. Andrea Deſſel. Biblioth Belgic. pag. 527, 528. *See alſo David Lindanus, lib iii, de Teneræ monda, pag.* 244.

(*b*) Swert. Athen Belg. pag 444.

would have publiſhed a great many books [*A*]. He died at Antwerp the 13th of January 1599, at the age of fifty-two years, and was buried in the church of our Lady, where he had been chanter and canon (*c*). The Jeſuits bought his library very cheap.

[*A*] *He tranſlated into Latin, ſome works of the Greek fathers, and, if he had lived longer, he would have publiſhed a great many books.*] His Latin verſion of the treatiſes of Gregory of Niſſa, and of St John Chryſoſtom, *de Virginitate*, was printed at Antwerp, for Plantin, in the year 1579, in 4to. (1). That of the Catecheſis of Theodorus Studita, accompanied with Scholia, was printed after his death, by the care of Aubert Miræus, at Antwerp, in 1602, in 8vo (2). That of the diſputation of the emperor Andronicus, againſt the Jews, was printed at Ingolſtadt, by the care of Peter Stevart, in the year 1616, in 4to (3). He made corrections and notes on the twelve antient Panegyriſts, and this edition is of Antwerp, *typis Plantinianis*, 1599, in 8vo (4). He left among his papers a Latin tranſlation of the epiſtles of St Chryſoſtom, that of Euripides, and of Athenæus, *&c.* (5).

We ſhall have no good opinion, either of his capacity, or his latinity, if we conſult the three firſt chapters of the firſt book *Variarum Lectionum ex adverſariis Jacobi Gretſeri a Georgio Stengelio Selectarum* (6), or if we obſerve what the journaliſts of Trevoux have informed the public of. They ſay, that Mr Tollius had reaſon to treat *as unfaithful and childiſh* Theodorus Studita's Latin verſion of the Teſtament, which he inſerted with the Greek in his *Inſignia Itineris Italici*, in 1696. They add, 'that 'the tranſlator ſeems to have taken leſs pains to explain the Greek, than to render his own Latin 'inexplicable: he applied himſelf more to ſearch 'after uncommon Latin words, than to acquaint him'ſelf with the ſenſe of the Greek words:' but they are greatly ſurprized, that Mr Tollius ſhould 'miſtake a tranſlation in ſuch a ſtile as this, for a work 'of Father Sirmond, many of whoſe pieces *he con'feſſes* he had read. How came he not to perceive 'the difference between this obſcure, affected, latinity, 'and Father Sirmond's ſtile, which is always perſpi'cuous, nobly ſimple, and elegant without affecta'tion?' They obſerve, that 'the real verſion which 'this Father made of Theodorus Studita's Teſtament, 'was printed in the year 1696, in the edition of the 'works of Father Sirmond, in five volumes in folio: 'but that it had already appeared in the ninth volume 'of Baronius's Annals, at the year 826, number 50. 'That which Mr Tollius aſcribes to Father Sirmond, 'had been publiſhed ever ſince the year 1602, under 'the name of it's true author John Livineius.' They conclude, that it did not become Mr Tollius to exclaim, 'that he had diſcovered too late, that the 'learned Jeſuit underſtood neither Greek, nor Latin, 'and that the eſteem he is in, is owing only to pre'judice (7).'

In truth, it is a groſs miſtake, and which would give Mr Tollius great uneaſineſs, if he were alive. We may ſee by this, how dangerous a work criticiſm is; for if we are unacquainted with certain particular facts, all other points of knowledge will not prevent our judging wrong of things.

(*c*) David Lindanus, ubi ſupra.

(1) Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag. 528.

(2) Labbé, Differt. de Script. Eccleſ. Tom. II, pag. 403.

(3) Valer Andr. ubi ſupra.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) David Lindanus, lib. iii, de Teneræ monda, pag. 244.

(6) *This work was printed at Ingolſtadt, in the year* 1628.

(7) *Taken from the Journal of Trevoux, for July,* 1703, *art.* CXX, *pag.* 1128, *&c. Edit. of France.*

LIZET (PETER) firſt preſident in the parliament of Paris. I mention him, only to illuſtrate ſome things which Mr Moreri has not ſufficiently enlarged upon. They relate to Peter Lizet's diſgrace [*A*], and to his books of controverſy [*B*]. He died the ſeventh

[*A*] *Peter Lizet's diſgrace.*] It is ſpoken of in Moreri's Dictionary, in ſuch a manner, as to make ſome think, that the ducheſs de Valentinois, and the cardinal de Lorrain, were the promoters of it, as two different cauſes. This is miſleading the reader: for the cardinal and ducheſs ought to be conſidered, in this point, but as one ſole cauſe. The cardinal intereſted the ambition and avarice of this lady, in the deſign he had formed of diſcharging thoſe from places, who did not pleaſe him; and afterwards he picked a ſham quarrel with Peter Lizet, the conſequences of which were, that this firſt preſident quitted his place (1). The Guiſes were angry with him, becauſe he oppoſed the giving them the title of prince, in parliament (2); and beſides, the cardinal of Lorrain would have a man in that poſt, who ſhould refuſe him nothing. The quarrel he picked with Lizet was this: he accuſed him of having ſpoken inſolently in his majeſty's council. The foundation of the accuſation was, that Lizet would not give his vote ſtanding, and uncovered, in a council, where the cardinal preſided. He boldly declared, that he ſaw no perſon preſent, who deſerved ſuch a ſubmiſſion from him. But he did not maintain the firſt reſolution; he quitted his poſt, like a coward, and even went and threw himſelf at the cardinal's feet, ſetting forth his poverty, and ſupplicating his compaſſion (3). That poverty was to his glory, and, if he had not tarniſhed it by ſo mean a ſubmiſſion, he might be looked on as one of thoſe noble patriots, who appeared at the head of the firſt parliament of France. He was not maſter of a foot of land, after he had been twenty years firſt preſident; the very houſe where he lived was not his own. The compaſſion they had for his poverty procured him the abby of St Victor, by the ceſſion of Lewis de Lorrain, cardinal de Guiſe (4). Father du Breul, citing Thuanus, relates the thing, as if all this were tranſacted the ſame day, and at the ſame ſitting; but Thuanus ſays no ſuch thing, but inſinuates the contrary. However let us ſet down Father de Breul's words. 'The preſident Thuanus . . . . elegantly 'deſcribes the cauſe of this judge's quitting his place of 'firſt preſident, and accepting the abby of St Victor, 'whether he asked it, or whether it was offered him; '(for he could not be diſplaced, except for a crime 'puniſhable with death). Being called, *ſays he*, to the 'privy-council (where the cardinal de Lorrain preſided 'with an authority equal to that of a vice roy) and be'ing required to ſpeak his opinion frankly, anſwered, '*I ſee no body in this place, before whom I ought to 'give my opinion ſtanding, and uncovered.* At which 'the ſaid cardinal, finding himſelf touched, proceeded 'to ill language, calling him arrogant, and threatening 'him with the king's diſpleaſure. Which ſo ſhook this 'good old man of ſixty eight years of age, and too 'timorous, that he did not perſevere in his reſolute 'anſwer, but, on the contrary, threw himſelf at the 'cardinal's feet, and begged his pardon, *Ex viro con'greſſu primo, mulier poſteriore factus.* He did not 'however fail to aſſert his integrity and innocence, and 'to proteſt, that, in the three years he had been coun'ſellor in parliament, twelve years advocate to the 'king, and twenty years firſt preſident, he had not ac'quired as much land as his feet ſtood upon; and that he 'rented his very houſe of the abbot of St John des Vig'nes de Soiſſons, ſituate at Paris, in St James's Street, 'near St Yves's church. Which houſe retained the 'name of the ſaid abbey, till the time of the alienations 'of the eſtates of the church, when Monſieur James 'Legier, treaſurer to cardinal Charles de Bourbon the 'elder, purchaſed it (5).' Here are ſeveral things, which are not to be ſound in Thuanus, ſome of which are undoubtedly true; for it is certain, that Lizet was counſellor in the parliament of Paris three years, *&c.* His epitaph declares it. 'Qui olim ob heroicas animi 'ſui dotes, vir ſingulari memoria, & ſumma juris pru'dentia in ſupremum Pariſienſis centuriæ Senatum à 'Rege Lodoico XII. adſcitus, Senatoris munere tri'ennio functus eſt. Deinde Triumviratus Regii Ad'vocati munus XII. annis Duce Franciſco I. feliciter 'obivit. Ac demum ob ſuæ vitæ integritatem, in ſum'mum Curiæ Magiſtratum evectus, Juſtitiæ habenas XX. 'annorum curriculo ita moderatus eſt, ut qui Religioſæ 'domus Abbas, volente Henrico ſecundo, fieret, dig'nus omnium calculo videretur (6). ——— *Who, on 'account of his heroic qualities, being a man of a 'ſingular memory, and great skill in the law, was 'raiſed by Lewis XII to a ſeat in the parliament of 'Paris, which he held three years. Afterwards, he 'practiſed for twelve years with ſucceſs, as king's ad'vocate, under Francis I. And laſtly, being made firſt 'preſident, on account of his honeſty, he held the reins 'of juſtice with ſuch moderation, during a courſe of*

(1) Thuan. Hiſt. lib. vi, pag. 122, ad ann. 1550.

(2) *See the article* GUISE (CLAUDIUS), *citat.* (16) *and* (17).

(3) Lizetus qui ſe initio virum præbuerat, in conſtantia minime perſeveravit, verum ſe ad Lotharingi pedes humiliter abjecit, & ignavo metu perculſus turpiter magiſtratu ceſſit. *Thuan. ubi ſupra.*

(4) Du Breul, Antiquitez, de Paris, pag. 323. Edit. 1639, in 4to.

(5) Id. ibid. pag. 322.

(6) Id. ibid.

ſeventh of June 1554, at ſeventy-two years of age. Conſult his epitaph at the 322d page of the Antiquities of Paris. He took prieſt's orders in the year 1553 (a). I have ſpoken of him in the remark [*E*] of the article **BEDA**, on occaſion of the divorce of the queen of England. Conſult the notes upon Sanci's Catholic Confeſſion, at the 424th page of the edition of 1699, and the 185th and 507th pages of Henry Stephens's Apology for Herodotus (*b*), where he ſpeaks very ill of this preſident's morals.

' *twenty years, that, in the opinion of every one, he was* ' *deſervedly raiſed, by Henry II. to be abbot of a re-* ' *ligious houſe.*' By this epitaph Mr Moreri is convicted of two falſhoods, contained in theſe words. *He was made one of the king's council in* 1515 (7), *and two years after was honoured with the poſt of the king's attorney-general.*

[*B*] *His books of controverſy.*] Mr Moreri's indulgence could not ſtand it out here againſt the deciſive ſentence of Thuanus; he has acknowledged, that theſe books were *unworthy of Peter Lizet's reputation.* Let us ſee what Thuanus ſays of them; ' In quo *(Sanvi-* ' *ctoriano cœnobio)* reliquum ætatis exegit extrema ' clauſula minime priori vitæ & famæ reſpondente, ' dum litterarum ſacrarum homo rudis, Theologicis li- ' bris in illo otio ſcriptis ſe deridendum propinavit; ' quibus contrario ſcripto artificioſe ridiculo ſub Bene- ' dicti Paſſavantii nomine à Theodoro Beza, ut credi- ' tur, reſponſum eſt (8).' Father du Breul pretends, that Peter Lizet wrote part of theſe books of controverſy before his retreat to St Victor's. ' The ſaid Li- ' zet, *ſays he* (9), being ſtill the king's attorney, wrote ' a book, in which he demonſtrates, that the Bible ' ought not to be tranſlated into French. And while ' he was preſident he wrote ſix books, *De Mobilibus* ' *Eccleſiæ perceptionibus* (10). Afterwards he compo- ' ſed three books: the firſt concerning Auricular Con- ' feſſion, the ſecond, that a monaſtic life is not re- ' pugnant to the liberty of the goſpel. The third is ' intituled, Concerning the Blindneſs of our Age.' If Father du Breul be not miſtaken, Thuanus is guilty of a conſiderable fault. It is certain, that all theſe five books, which this Father gives the titles of, were publiſhed together in two volumes (11), after Lizet had retired to the abbey of St Victor; for there was an edition of them at Paris, in 1551, and another at Lyons, in 1552. The Oxford catalogue makes mention of the latter in theſe words, *De S. Scripturis in linguas vulgares non vertendis per modum dialogi. De auriculari confeſſione. De monaſtico inſtituto. De hujus Sæculi cæcitationi & circumventione. De mobilibus Eccleſiæ præceptionibus.* What I am going to copy, will increaſe the difficulties. ' Petri ' Lizetii Juriſconſulti, dum ſequentem componeret li- ' brum, in ſupremo Francorum conſiſtorio regii Ad- ' vocati, & poſtea Abbatis commendatarii Sancti Vi- ' ctoris, ſummique Senatus Pariſienſis Protopræſidis, ' de mobilibus Eccleſiæ præceptionibus tractatus, ſex ' libros continens. Ejuſdem de ſacris utriuſque inſtru- ' menti libris in vulgare eloquium minime vertendis, ' rudique pleb haudquaquam invulgandis, Dialogus ' inter Pantarcheum & Neoterum. Ejuſdem de auri- ' culari confeſſione, lib. 1. De monaſtico inſtituto, ' lib. 1. De hujuſce ſæculi cœcitate ac circumventione ' dialogus inter ſpiritalem & mundanum. Quæ omnia ' excudit Lugduni, in 4. Sebaſtianus Griphius, 1552 ' (12).' Soon after theſe books came out, Beza, who was then a young man, took a fancy to turn them into ridicule, by a very humorous burleſque, in which he ſuppoſes, that Magiſter Benedictus Paſſavantius, being ſent to Geneva, by Peter Lizet, to learn what was ſaid of his books, gives an account of his commiſſion. This piece ought to be placed among the *Juvenilia Theodori Bezæ.* See the new letters againſt Mr Maimbourg's Calviniſm, pag. 144, and the notes upon Sanci's Catholic Confeſſion, pag. 424. of the edition of the year 1699.

I hope it will not be thought amiſs to produce here Mr Arnauld's judgment upon Peter Lizet's work concerning the tranſlating the ſcripture into the vulgar tongue. ' There is but one point, *ſays he* (13), where- ' in they can, it may be, with any foundation com- ' plain, that I have unjuſtly treated Mr Mallet. Which ' is, that I may have mentioned him in ſome places, ' as if he was the firſt author of a great many imperti- ' nences, which I have ſince diſcovered he might have ' taken from a pitiful book, which I had not then ' ſeen. But I am willing to give them an example ' of what a man ought to do, when he has commit- ' ted a fault. I therefore acknowledge, that I was to ' blame to look upon Mr Mallet as the firſt author of ' all the extravagancies, his book is full of. Some ' indeed are his own, and thoſe are the groſſeſt. But ' I have diſcovered by the book I juſt now hinted at, ' that he often has only blindly followed five or ſix au- ' thors of the laſt age, whoſe works it is the ſcandal ' of ours to preſerve, ſo unworthy are they of the ' care that has been taken to reſcue them from that obli- ' vion, in which ſome of our anceſtors, wiſer than ' we, had ſuffered them to be buried.' Mr Arnauld here ſpeaks of a certain collection of ſeveral tracts, the firſt whereof is Peter Lizet's. He explains this in another book, in which he tells us (14), that the aſſembly of the clergy of France, made an order in the year 1660, ' at the requeſt of Mr d'Attichi, biſhop of ' Autun . . . . . . to print, at the expence of the ' clergy, a collection of authors of the laſt age, who ' have condemned the verſions into the vulgar tongue, ' both of the ſcripure and divine offices. And in- ' deed, *adds he*, this book was printed with this ſcanda- ' lous title. *Collectio quorundam gravium authorum,* ' *qui ex profeſſo, vel ex occaſione, ſacræ Scripturæ, aut* ' *divinorum officiorum, in vulgarem linguam tranſlatio-* ' *nes damnarunt.* And with this running-title, *Collectio* ' *autorum verſiones vulgares damnantium.* It is a ' medley of the moſt impertinent authors, that have ' written upon this ſubject, mingled with ſome good ' ones, but who ſay nothing of what the title of ' this collection imports, or who ſay quite the con- ' trary. It is a book of preſident Lizet's, which wholly ' turns upon this fooliſh notion, that, when the Bible ' was tranſlated into Latin, in the beginning of the ' church, there was two ſorts of Latin, one conform- ' able to the rules of Grammar, which was only un- ' derſtood by the learned, and the other not tied to ' thoſe rules, which was the only one the people un- ' derſtood, and that the Latin verſions of ſcripture ha- ' ving been made in this firſt ſort of Latin, was not pro- ' perly a verſion into the vulgar tongue; which this ' preſident, become an abbot, extends to all other ' languages.' Mr Simon (15) had nothing to ſay in defence of this bad writer.

The Epitomy of Geſner makes mention of two other books of Peter Lizet: one *De autoritate Eccleſiæ, & poteſtate Papæ*; the other *De Hæreticis, & eorum pœnis.* After his death was printed (16) his treatiſe *of the Method of proceeding, both in the Inſtitution and Deciſion of Criminal and Civil Cauſes, together with the Form and Manner of taking Informations in the ſaid Civil and Criminal Cauſes.* La Croix du Maine, who tells me this, did not know that Lizet died in 1554. He make him flouriſh in 1557 (17).

LOGES (**Mary Bruneau** (*a*), **Lady des**) was one of the moſt illuſtrious women of the XVIIth century. She was married, in 1599, to Charles de Rechignevoiſin, Eſq; lord des Loges, who, four years after, was made gentleman of the king's bed-chamber in ordinary. She died the ſeventh of June 1641, and was buried in a place ſhe had choſen her ſelf, at two hundred paces diſtance from la Pleau, a houſe in Limouſin. Her zeal for the Proteſtant religion, which ſhe made a conſtant profeſſion of all her life, her piety, and greatneſs of ſoul, appeared with a new luſtre, towards the end of her life; the laſt years whereof, and ſome others, had been exerciſed by ſeveral domeſtic troubles

---

(a) Du Breul, Antiq de Paris, pag. m. 322.

(b) *In the edition of Antwerp,* 1568.

(7) *Lewis XII died the firſt of January* 1515, *computing the years from the month of January.*

(8) Thuanus, ubi ſupra.

(9) Du Breul. ubi ſupra, pag. 323.

(10) *He ſhould have ſaid,* Præceptionibus.

(11) *You find in the* Bibliotheque *of Du Verdier Vau-Privas, pag.* 1018. Petri Lizetii Alverni Montigenæ, utroque jure conſulti, primi Præſidis in ſupremo regio Francorum Conſiſtorio, Abbatiſque commendatarii S. Victoris, adverſus Pſeudoevangelicam hæreſim libri ſeu commentarii IX. duobus excuſi voluminibus. Lutetiæ 4, apud Poncetum le Preux 1551.

(12) *This is copied from the* Supplementum Epitomes Bibliothecæ Geſnerianæ, Autore Antonio Verderio, pag. 44.

(13) *Arnauld, Preface of the book intituled,* Lecture de l'Ecriture Sainte. *This is the third Tome of his new Defence of the New Teſtament of Mons.*

(14) *Idem.* Defenſe des Verſions, contre la ſentence de l'Official de Paris, du 10 Avril, 1688, pag. 160.

(15) See his new Obſervations on the verſions of the New Teſtament.

(16) At Lyons, in 1567, by the care of Loys le Charon, a Pariſian. *La Croix du Maine, pag.* 403. Du Verdier Vau Privas does not ſpeak of this edition, but of that of Paris, 1555. The Catalogue of Thuanus's Library, *Part I, pag.* 248, mentions the edition of Lyons, 1577, in 12mo. The Catalogue of Oxford takes notice only of the edition of Paris, 1584, in 8vo, and aſcribes this book to M. P. Liſſet, as to an author different from Petrus Lizetus. This is a fault.

(17) La Croix du Maine, pag. 403.

(a) *And not* Blaineau, *as Hilarion de Coſte ſays in his* Eloge des Dames, Tom. II, pag. 669.

troubles [*A*]. This doubtleſs occaſioned her making juſt reflexions on the nothingneſs of creatures. She had nine children [*B*], and a ſiſter that was married to Mr de Beringhen [*C*]. The remarks will inform us, what eſteem ſhe was in, not only with the greateſt wits, ſuch as Malherbe and Balzac [*D*], but alſo with the greateſt princes [*E*]. We ſhall relate a curious ſtory, which Mr Menage has rectified [*F*]. Mr de Wicquefort obſerves, that Madam des Loges *had a great aſcendant over the duke of Orleans, for which reaſon, the aſſemblies were forbid, which were uſed to be held in her houſe* (b).

[*A*] *She met with ſeveral domeſtic troubles.*] It is the common fate of perſons of her ſex, who diſtinguiſh themſelves by a great genius, improved by ſtudy, if they engage in conjugal bonds. They ought not to do it; there are others enough beſides them, who would take care the race of mankind ſhould not fail. It is much if their country does not do them the ſame injuſtice, which Seneca ſpeaks of with regard to Cato (1), of not knowing the value of the treaſure it poſſeſſes. That which their country does not always do, a huſband does much leſs.

[*B*] *She had nine children.*] There were but five of them alive, three ſons and two daughters, when ſhe died. One of the ſons bore arms in Holland (2), and married a gentlewoman there, of the family of Vander Myle. There are only ſome daughters from that marriage.

[*C*] .... *and a ſiſter that was married to Mr de Beringhen.*] The marquis de Beringhen proceeded from this marriage, who died at eighty nine years of age, in March 1692, after having been for a long time firſt maſter of the horſe to the king. This alliance gave very illuſtrious grand-nieces to our Madam des Loges, by the marquis de Beringhen's ſiſters. The author of ſeveral books lately publiſhed, with the title of *Voyage d'Eſpagne*, &c. is one of them. There are two others (3), who, out of zeal to the Proteſtant religion, have quitted all the advantages of their country, and who, by their piety, give a luſtre to all the other excellent qualities that they are enriched with.

[*D*] *She was in great eſteem .... with Malherbe and Balzac.*] To have a juſt idea of the ability and wit of Madam des Loges, we need only conſider, that Malherbe *was one of her moſt aſſiduous courtiers, and conſtantly viſited her every other day* (4). Mentioning Malherbe, is mentioning a man, who never praiſed, nor hardly eſteemed, any body, and who is one of the firſt and greateſt maſters that has formed the taſte and judgment of our nation, with reſpect to ingenious performances. Balzac was at leaſt equal to Malherbe, and has perhaps more contributed than he to that politeneſs, which is ſpread over the kingdom; however, he was equally an admirer of the lady we ſpeak of. The letters he writ to her are a public teſtimony of it; and his eſteem for her, does as well appear by what he ſaid of her to his friends, as by what he wrote to her. He confeſſes, in one place of his works, that if he was grown more ſparing of his praiſes, he was chiefly obliged for it to the good advice ſhe gave him. '*The good Madam des Loges*, ſays he (5), *gave me ſome terrible reprimands upon this ſubject ſome time before her death. She upbraided me, that* I was the dupe of all reigns (*they are her very words*); that I laviſhed my praiſes upon all thoſe who made a ſhew of any worth; that I was too credulous with reſpect to others, upon the firſt glimpſe of goodneſs, the bare appearance of virtues, *and ſo forth.*' In another place (6), where he thunders againſt burleſque, which was grown too much in faſhion, to the great grief of thoſe, who had acquired glory by a grave ſtile, he does not think he has ſufficiently fulminated that fundamental hereſy in his empire, unleſs he condemns it by a decree of this lady. 'This ſort of raillery, *ſays he*, ſavours more of comedy than converſation, and more of farce than comedy. This is not rallying like a gentleman. Madam des Loges uſed to ſay, that ſhe ſhould be as pleaſed to ſee a drunken man, or bravado, acted ... Nay, more, ſhe ſaid, ſhe looked upon ſuch jargon, as ſhe would upon a wooden ſword by a man's ſide, and meal upon his face.' Mr de Bautru, *who was not naturally a great admirer* (7), doubtleſs admired this lady, ſince, to ſhew a man's want of addreſs, who could not profit by the converſation of the wits, by putting them upon things worthy of them, he makes uſe of theſe four examples:

Il mene aux Allobroges
Balzac, Boiſſat, Conac, & Madame Des-Loges (8).

I do not believe, that they, who are ſkilled in proofs, can doubt of the extraordinary merit of this lady, after having conſidered what I have ſaid.

[*E*] .... *but likewiſe with the greateſt princes.*] Balzac ſhall be my witneſs. 'If you do not know, *ſays he* (9), Urania, the nymph I have ſo much praiſed, and whom I bitterly lament, I muſt tell you, it is my good deceaſed friend, Madam des Loges, who in her life-time was called more than once, and by more than one academiſt, *the celeſtial, the divine, the tenth muſe*, &c. who was eſteemed within and without the kingdom, by crowned heads, by the demi gods of our age, by the duke of Orleans, the king of Sweden, the duke of Weimar, &c. I am of opinion, that the verſes, which celebrate her memory (I ſpeak of the eloquent Urania) are full as good as thoſe, which one Antipater, a Sidonian, made upon the death of the learned Sappho.'

[*F*] *I ſhall relate a curious ſtory, which Mr Menage has rectified.*] It is an adventure, which has been publiſhed two ſeveral ways. Mr de Balzac tells it thus, in his thirty ſeventh dialogue.

'Malherbe was one of the moſt aſſiduous in making his court to Madam des Loges, and viſited her conſtantly every other day. One of thoſe days, finding upon the table in her cloſet du Moulin the miniſter's great book againſt Cardinal du Perron (10), and being ſeized with a poetical enthuſiaſm upon the bare reading of the title, he called for pen, ink, and paper, and wrote down theſe ten lines:

Quoy que l'Auteur de ce gros livre
Semble n'avoir rien ignoré,
Le meilleur eſt toûjours de ſuivre
Le Prône de nôtre Curé.
Toutes ces doctrines nouvelles
Ne plaiſent qu'aux folles cervelles;
Pour moi, comme une humble brebis,
Sous la houlette je me range:
Il n'eſt permis d'aimer le change,
Que des femmes & des habits.

This author may pretend to know
More than a thouſand others do;
I follow what our parſon preaches,
Believing only as he teaches.
I leave theſe novelties to thoſe,
Who turn with ev'ry wind that blows.
My ſhepherd humble I obey,
Nor ever from his flock do ſtray.
No change a man of prudence knows,
But in his women, and his cloaths.

'Madam des Loges, reading Malherbe's verſes, and fired by honour and zeal, took the ſame pen, and on the other ſide of the paper wrote theſe other verſes:

C'eſt vous dont l'audace nouvelle
A rejetté l'antiquité,
Et du Moulin ne vous rapelle
Qu'à ce que vous avez quitté.
Vous aimez mieux croire à la mode:
C'eſt bien la foy la plus commode,
Pour ceux que le monde a charmez.
Les femmes y ſont vos idoles:
Mais à grand tort vous les aimez,
Vous qui n'avez que des paroles.

Tit

(b) Wicquef. Mémoires touchant les Ambaſſadeurs, pag. 552. Edit. Hague 1677.

(1) Quamdiu Catonem civitas ignoravit? reſpuit nec intellexit niſi cum perdidit. *Seneca, Epiſt. lxxix.* Theſe words are commonly quoted, as if Seneca had ſaid, *Catonem ſuum ſæculum parum intellexit.* See Coſtar's Letters, Vol. I, pag. 621.

(2) It is he of whom Mr Le Laboureur ſpeaks in his *Voyage de la Reine de Pologne*, when he ſays, pag. 68, *that among the French gentlemen employed in the army of the States*, who accompanied prince William, the only ſon of Frederic-Henry, prince of Orange, when he had audience of this queen at Amſterdam, *were the Sieurs de Beringhen, brother to the firſt maſter of the horſe to our Moſt Chriſtian King, and a colonel of Horſe.* See alſo, pag. 74.

(3) Their name is de la Luzerne: they are Refugees in Holland.

(4) Entretien xxxvii, of Balzac.

(5) Diſſertation at the end of the *Socrate Chrétien*, pag. 176.

(6) Entret. xxxviii.

(7) Coſtar, Lettres, Vol. I, pag. 137.

(8) Id. ibid. pag. 125.

(9) *In the thirteenth Letter of the ſecond book of the* Lettres choiſies: *he writes it to Mr Menage, ſending him at the ſame time the verſes he had made on the death of Madam des Loges. They are printed among his Latin poems. Here are ſome lines of them.*
Vidi ego progeniem Regum, capita ardua mundi
Uranies hauſtis obſtupuiſſe ſonis:
Borbonium genus & cognata è ſtirpe Navarræ
Reliquias; & cui Mantua ſceptra dedit.
Hanc coluit, lectæ captus dulcedine chartæ.
Ille tui victor magnus, Ibere, Getes,
Et dudum, patria dum præparat arma ſub urſa,
Miſerat huic cultus nuncia ſigna ſui.
Hujus & Ambroſios avida bibit aure lepores
Wymarius, magno non minor ipſe Gete.

(10) *That, which is intituled,* Nouveauté du Papiſme (*The Novelty of Popery*), *printed firſt at Sedan, in fol. in* 1627. *See the* Biblioth. Choiſie *of Colomiés, pag.* 38, 39.

'Tis you, who boldly dare decry,
And ſet aſide antiquity.
Good du Moulin, wou'd but reſtore
Thoſe doctrines you believ'd before.
But faſhion, guide of faith in chief,
Preſcribes the mode of your belief:
The moſt convenient faith, I grant,
For thoſe, whom worldly joys enchant.
'Tis women only you adore,
And bow to their almighty pow'r.
Yet vain your worſhip, ſince, at moſt,
But empty talking is your boaſt.

‘The concluſion of theſe two epigrams will doubtleſs pleaſe the prophane, and thoſe who ſet up for galants. For my part, I hold, that in matters of religion, the comic ſtile is always to be avoided. The firſt is not grave enough for a man, who ſpeaks in earneſt, and the other is too light for a woman, that ſpeaks to a man.’

Mr Menage thinking, that the matter thus happened, printed this ſtory in his obſervations upon Malherbe's poems, juſt as Mr de Balzac had told it. But mind what he has put at the end of this book.

‘Since this note was written and printed, I have been informed by Mr de Racan, that it was he, who made theſe verſes, which Mr de Balzac aſcribes to Malherbe, and that Madam de Gombaud made thoſe which he aſcribes to Madam des Loges, and that the thing happened in this manner. Madam des Loges, who was of the pretended Reformed Religion, had lent Mr de Racan, du Moulin the miniſter's book, called *le Bouclier de la Foi*, (*The Shield of Faith*), and had obliged him to read it. Mr de Racan, having read it, made this epigram upon it, which Mr de Balzac has altered in many places.

Bienque du Moulin en ſon livre
Semble n'avoir rien ignoré;
Le meilleur eſt toûjours de ſuivre
Le Prône de noſtre Curé.
Toutes ces doctrines nouvelles
Ne plaiſent qu'aux folles cevelles.
Pour moi, comme une humble brebis
Je vais où mon Paſteur me range,
Et n'ay jamais aimé le change
Que des femmes & des habits.

‘Having communicated it to Malherbe, who came to ſee him at that time, Malherbe wrote it with his own hand in du Moulin's book, which he returned at the ſame time to Madam des Loges, as from Mr de Racan. Madam des Loges, ſeeing theſe verſes written with Malherbe's hand believed them to be his; and as ſhe was extremely zealous for her religion, would not ſuffer them to remain unanſwered. She therefore deſired Mr de Gombaud, who was of the ſame religion, and of equal zeal, to anſwer them. Mr de Gombaud (I know it from himſelf) who believed, as Madam des Loges did, that Malherbe was the author of thoſe verſes, anſwered them by the epigram, which Mr de Balzac attributes to Madam des Loges, and which he thinks too light for a woman who ſpeaks to a man. This is not the firſt time that Mr de Balzac has aſcribed to this lady verſes ſhe had no hand in; for in one of his letters he makes her the author of the ſong of the dying lover, the burden whereof is,

Ah c'en eſt fait! je cede à la rigueur du ſort,
Je vais mourir; je me meurs; je ſuis mort;

'Tis done; my deſtiny is on my head;
I'm going to die; I die; and now I'm dead.

‘which was written by the deceaſed Mr Habert Ceriſi, one of the fineſt wits of our age.’

A SHORT Reflexion on the preceding paſſage.

Who ſees not in all this an inſtance of hiſtorical uncertainty? Mr de Balzac thought he had communicated to his friend a moſt certain fact, an incomparable piece of ſecret hiſtory, and infinitely valuable to all the lovers of what we call *perſonalities*. He had perſuaded all his readers of it. Mr Menage, having inſerted it in one of his books, was juſt upon diſperſing it far and wide, when by chance Meſſieurs de Racan and de Gombaud, being ſtill alive, diſſabuſed Mr Menage, before his obſervations upon Malherbe were ſold off; and thus the public came to be undeceived. If theſe two gentlemen had been dead, without ſpeaking of this to Mr Menage, or if they had ſpoken of it at another time, the firſt narration would perhaps ſtill have had intire credit. How many other facts are there, and much more important, which paſs from age to age, and from generation to generation, no body diſcovering their falſhood; for want of fortuitous occaſions, like the converſation of Mr Menage with Racan and Gombaud? However, Madam des Loges is cleared of compoſing verſes in too light a ſtrain. It cannot be denied, that Balzac was in the right, to think the end of the epigram too little conſiſtent with the modeſty and purity which ought to reign in all the writings of the fair-ſex. Not that we muſt eſpouſe the haſty and too rigid maxim of thoſe, who pretend, that a woman, who ſhould tax a man with having nothing but words, would as good as declare that ſhe was concerned ſhe had not got, or did not daily get from him, ſomething more real. This maxim is extravagant and falſe; but who would not wonder at Mr de Racan, if it were true, that he was the author of Malherbe's Life (11), printed with ſome little tracts in 1672; who would not wonder, I ſay, that he ſhould tell Mr Menage of Balzac's miſtake, and yet inſert all Balzac's ſtory (12) in Malherbe's Life, without rectifying it in the leaſt?

LOGNAC, or LOIGNAC, or LONGNAC, or rather LAUGNAC [*A*], made himſelf extreamly conſiderable in the reign of Henry III, and had a great ſhare in that prince's favour. He was brave, and in this point had firmly eſtabliſhed his reputation by ſome duels, and quarrels, which the houſe of Guiſe had brought upon him [*B*], and

[*A*] *LOGNAC .... or rather LAUGNAC.*] It will appear by the following remarks, that theſe four ways of writing this gentleman's name, are found in our hiſtorians. The laſt is, I think, the beſt, as being that which Dupleix, who was of the ſame country, has uſed; and it is known, that the dipthong *au*, is very common in the proper names of that country. This diphthong is pronounced like an *o* at Paris, and in the neighbouring provinces: and hence the authors put an *o*, and not an *au*, in the firſt ſyllable of the name of this favourite of Henry III. I ſhall obſerve by the way, that one muſt be very attentive, who would undeſtand the Latin tongue, ſpoken by the Pariſians; for they pronounce in the ſame manner *aurum* and *borum*, *auris* and *oris*, and thus of ſeveral other words.

[*B*] *He had eſtabliſhed his reputation by ſome duels, and quarrels, which the houſe of Guiſe had brought upon him.*] The baron de Biron (1) had a quarrel in 1585, ‘with the Sieur de Carency, eldeſt ſon to count de la Vauguyon .... for the heireſs of the houſe of Caumont, whom both pretended to. This quarrel ended by a duel of three againſt three; Biron, Loignac, and Janiſſac, on one ſide, killed Carency, d'Eſtiſſac, and la Baſtie (2).’ The author, I have this from, relates in another hiſtory (3); ‘that after the duke of Eſpernon was retired to Angouleme, the king having given the place of firſt gentleman of his chamber to the Sieur de Loignac, this gentleman was as a mark, at which, by the inſtigation of the duke of Guiſe, all the princes of the league diſcharged their envy. The chevalier d'Aumalle, a little before the death of the duke of Guiſe, returned to Paris, and, before he came there, had contrived a quarrel with the ſaid Sieur de Loignac, upon the ſubject of ſome amorous affair, which commonly happens amongſt young gentlemen. Loignac was brave, a man well ſkilled in arms, and who had come off in ſeveral duels; his quality of firſt gentleman of the bedchamber gave and in which he came off honourably. He was captain of the forty-five gentlemen [*C*], choſen for the greater ſecurity of Henry IIId's perſon. He was alſo maſter of the wardrobe *(a)*, and gentleman of the chamber to this prince *(b)*. It is generally agreed, That he encouraged him to rid himſelf of the duke of Guiſe [*D*], and was preſent at the execution; but as to the manner of his being an accomplice in it, it is not ſo generally agreed [*E*]; nor are the hiſtorians any better agreed about his diſgrace: for ſome only ſay, he was turned out becauſe he aſked a government; and others, That he had a government given him on purpoſe to remove him from court [*F*]; adding, that, by the treachery of

---

(11) Mr Menage, in his obſervations on Malherbe, cites this Life often, as written by Mr de Racan. Moreri knew nothing of it: he only ſays in his article of Malherbe, that this Life was attributed to Balzac.

(12) I have been told, that this narrative has been added by the licencioufneſs of the Bookſeller, to the Life of Malherbe, in the edition of 1672. The liberties Bookſellers take ought to be oftener inſtanced in, than thoſe of Poets, for they exceed them.

(1) He who was beheaded in 1602.

(2) *Taken from* Cayet, Hiſtor de la Paix, fol. 319, verſo.

(3) Cayet, Chronolog. Novenaire, Tom. I, fol. 109.

du

‘ gave him a right to fight duels with ſtrangers of the greateſt quality, and decline them with ſuch as were not of his own quality. This grudge therefore, and the picking a quarrel on a love affair, made Loignac conclude, that the duke of Guiſe, and the princes of the league, were reſolved he ſhould not long enjoy the advantages the king's favour gave him.' We find in d'Audiguier (4) more circumſtances, than in Cayet, of Biron's and Carenci's duel.

[*C*] *He was captain of the forty five gentlemen.*] Let us cite Mezerai, who tells the reaſon of raiſing this new company. ‘ Eſpernon raiſed to the higheſt degree of favour, in which Joyeuſe began to decline, ceaſed not to ſpur on the king to the ruin of the Guiſes; and they, in revenge, having ſworn his deſtruction, formed ſeveral conſpiracies to compleat it. He had the policy to perſuade the king, that they were all intended againſt his ſacred perſon; and by this means induced him to guard himſelf with the famous band of forty five, which he himſelf choſe perhaps with a deſign which the event will diſcover. They were all Gaſcons, whom the hopes of puſhing their fortune made capable of every thing. Lognac was their captain (5).'

[*D*] *It is generally agreed, that he encouraged Henry III, to rid himſelf of the duke of Guiſe.*] ‘ At the ſame time the duke of Nevers, and Lognac, captain of the forty-five, were continually exaſperating him; the duke of Nevers, becauſe he irreconcileably hated the duke of Guiſe, and Lognac, becauſe, having in ſome ſort ſucceeded to Eſpernon's favour, as a ſecond to Bellegarde, couſin german to this duke, he knew that the houſe of Guiſe, a conſtant enemy to favourites, would not long ſuffer him in this poſt (6).'

[*E*] *The manner of his being an accomplice in the murder of the duke of Guiſe, is not agreed on.*] Some authors ſay, that the duke ‘ ſeeing the council had not yet met, was paſſing to the king's chamber, and croſſing the gallery which led to it, and entering into his majeſty's chamber, he ſaw the Sieur de Longnac ſitting upon a trunk, his arms a-croſs without ſtirring. He had long ſuſpected, that the Sieur de Longnac had undertaken to kill him, and thinking that he was poſted there to attack him; he reſolved impetuouſly to fall upon him, and laying his hand to his ſword, drew it half out; but the Sieur de Longnac, and ſome others, ſeeing him make ſuch an attempt, at the king's chamber door, prevented him, and immediately threw him down, and diſpatched him with their ſwords, without giving him time to ſpeak a word. This is the opinion of thoſe who have written the hiſtory of theſe matters, as printed at Geneva (7); but the opinion of the league is quite contrary (8).' The relation I have mentioned above (9), imports, that Loignac ſtaid with his ſword (10) in the chamber, where the execution was to be performed, and where the king had placed eight of the forty-five. Theſe eight had each a dagger. The duke of Guiſe entering into the chamber, ſaluted thoſe that were there; ‘ who roſe up, ſaluted him at the ſame time, and followed him as out of reſpect; but when he was within two ſteps of the door of the old cabinet, ... he was ſuddenly ſeized by the arm by the Sieur Montſery, the elder . . . . . . who at the ſame time ſtabbed him with his own hand in the breaſt, ſaying, *ha! traytor, thou ſhalt die.* At the ſame inſtant the Sieur Des Effranats ſtarted up, and the Sieur de St Malines gave him another ſtab with his dagger in the breaſt, and the Sieur de Loignac run him into the loins (11).' Other relations ſay, ‘ that nine of the forty five came from behind the tapſtry, where they were concealed; and that the duke of Guiſe, ſeeing near the chimney, Longnac, whom he knew to be his mortal enemy, made ſome ſteps backward to draw his ſword; that he at firſt got rid of the aſſaſſins; and that Longnac, perceiving that he came directly to him, gave him a thruſt in the belly, on which he fell down, and died ſome moments after (12).' Davila ſuppoſes, that Lognac did not wound him at all, and that he only puſhed him back, ſeeing him come forwards to him; that after this repulſe, the duke, who had received ſeveral wounds, fell down, and died. ‘ Dopo molte ferite nel capo, e per ogni parte del corpo urtato finalmente da Lognac, al quale s'era impetuoſamente auventato, cadè innanzi alla porta della guardarobla, & ivi ſenza poter proferir parola fini gli ultimi ſoſpiri della ſua vita (13).' Thuanus affirms, that Loniac ſeeing him come up to him in a menacing poſture, oppoſed him with his ſword in the ſcabbard, and made him fall (14). He was only ſpectator of the tragedy, if we depend on Thuanus's relation. He was leaning on a trunk, when the duke diſingaged himſelf from the aſſaſſins, and came up to him, as it were, with a deſign to fall upon him: ‘ Cum in Monpeſatum Loniacum, qui cum Rogerio Bellagardio Termo in cubiculo aderat, arcæ genu altero innixum protenſis brachiis & contractis pugnis tendere videretur, quaſi ipſum petiturus (15).' Dupleix is more poſitive; he makes the eight alone do the execution. ‘ Laugnac not being one of thoſe, whom the king had choſen, did not ſtrike him, tho' he was particularly his enemy: However he had offered his majeſty to attack him in a ſingle combat. But the king thought there would be as much hazard as courage in that, and would not ſuffer him (16). I have read this laſt circumſtance in no other Hiſtorian; the offer made to Henry III of taking off the duke of Guiſe by a duel, being conſtantly aſcribed to Grillon. Davila relates, that Grillon making this offer, upon refuſing the commiſſion to kill the duke, left the king in an extreme perplexity, which laſted till Lognac had promiſed him to ſee the execution done. I relate the words of this Hiſtorian, becauſe they contribute to the hiſtory of our Laugnac. ‘ Laſciò il Rè grandemente dubbioſo di quello doveſſe operare, e ſtette in queſta perpleſſità ſino al giorno vigeſimo primo, nel quale confidato il negotio a Lognac uno de' gentilhuomini della camera ſua, il quale gia dal Duca di Gioioſa era ſtato introdotto alla Corte; e per la gratia per le maniere, e per la gentileſſa de' coſtumi gia cominciava ad avanzarſi al luogo de' Mignoni, egli ſenza molto riguardo promiſe con alcuni delli quarantacinque, che dependevano ſtrettamente da lui di eſeguire prontamente queſto fatto (17). ——— *He left the king in great perplexity, till the twenty firſt day, when, truſting the buſineſs with Lognac, one of the gentlemen of his chamber, who had been introduced to court by the duke of Joyeuſe, and had ingratiated himſelf by his polite behaviour, he immediately promiſed him, with the aſſiſtance of any one of the forty five, who depended upon him, to ſee it executed.*'

[*F*] *Some ſay, he was turned out becauſe he asked a government; and others ſay, that a government was given him on purpoſe to remove him from court.*] ‘ The Sieur de Loignac, a great favourite of the king . . . . importuned him to give him a government, and a place of ſecure retirement, becauſe of the enmity the houſe of Guiſe bore him: his majeſty asking him, if he had no other reaſon, than that, to ask of him a place of retreat; Loignac anſwered, no, and that the enmity of the houſe of Guiſe was reaſon enough. Get you gone immediately out of my court, ſaid the king to him, and let me never ſee you more, ſince you deſire any other ſecurity than being near my perſon; I have not been miſtaken in my opinion of you, I much ſuſpect that you are tainted with ingratitude, and have forgotten the obligations you are under for the benefits I have conferred on you. Loignac, receiving an anſwer from the king ſo contrary to his expectation, immediately left Blois, du Guaſt, he loſt his government, and was forced to retire to Gaſcony, his native country. He was there killed ſome time after. Thuanus and Davila ſeem to ſay, that he was with the king, when the monk, James Clement, aſſaſſinated that prince (*c*). I do not know whether

---

(a) *See the remark* [*F*], *citat.* (20.

(b) *See the remark* [*B*].

(4) D'Audiguier, l'Uſage des Duels, chap. xxxiii, pag 436, & ſeq.

(5) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. V, pag. m. 301.

(6) Id. ibid. pag. 324.

(7) That is to ſay, the Memoirs of the League, and the Hiſtory of the five kings.

(8) Cayet, Chronol. Novenaire, Tom. I, fol. 105, verſo.

(9) Citation (49) of the article HENRY III.

(10) *See* Marcel. Hiſt. of France, Tom. IV, pag. 630.

(11) Ibid. pag. 631, 632.

(12) Varillas, Hiſt. of Henry III. liv. xi, pag. 194, 195, Edit. of Holland.

(13) Davila, lib. ix, pag. m. 535.

(14) Loniacus enſem porrectum, ut erat vagina tectus, venienti objicit. cujus primo impulſu jam viribus animi & corporis linquentibus in tapetem ſubſtratum toto corpore concidit. *Thuan. lib. xciii, pag.* 246.

(15) Id. ibid.

(16) Dupleix, Hiſt. of Henry III, pag. m. 181.

(17) Davila, ubi ſupra, pag. 533.

‘ and paſſing through Amboiſe, retired into Guienne, where he was killed ſoon after by a piſtol-ſhot, as he came out of his caſtle, to go a hunting, by a gentleman his neighbour, with whom he had a quarrel (18).’ This is Peter Victor Cayet's relation, which at once ſhews what I have elſewhere promiſed (19), and is alſo an inſtance that Henry III, on ſome occaſions, knew how to ſhew reſolution and greatneſs of mind. The following relation is very different.

‘ The king, at the beginning of the year 1588, had made two maſters of his wardrobe, the lords de Bellegarde and de Longnac; the former from a natural affection he had for him; the latter at the preſſing inſtance of the duke d'Eſpernon: but as that affection, which ſprings from our own nature, takes deeper root, than the liking entertained upon the recommendation of others: ſo he began to be weary of Longnac, eſpecially after the death of the duke of Guiſe, and the more becauſe he had been the firſt, who induced the king to command this murder, which ſucceeded ſo unfortunately; ſo that from thenceforward he began to look on him with an ill eye. I can aſſure you of one thing, that, three weeks before he left the court, an experienced courtier ſaid to me: obſerve this gentleman; as good a face as he ſets upon the matter, he is totally routed. For entering publickly into the king's cabinet, to keep up his good opinion with the people, he immediately comes out by the back door, and retires to his chamber, quitting the field to Monſieur de Bellegarde. The king, who would not entirely diſcontent Longnac, had formerly given him the government of Anjou and Touraine; and he had often told him, that he ought to retire thither; but he, foreſeeing, that if he left his place, he ſhould only be a governor in parchment, and that they, who had the governments of the towns, would have all the power, remained ſtill at court with the king; who at laſt, not able to bear the ſight of him any longer, told him, that he had frequently enough declared how little ſatisfaction he received from his preſence; ſo that he might take his choice, either to go off immediately, or never appear before him more but on Fridays, a day he ſet apart to do penance. Longnac, ſeeing himſelf totally cut off from his maſter's favour, and no hopes of any longer reſpite, began to act the part of a deſperate man, who meditated nothing but revenge: a deſign, however, which he did not execute, but has ſince been very well managed by another hand. He poſted away one fine night, and retired to Amboiſe (20).’ This was a town of his government, and where *du Guaſt, whom he looked on as his creature* (21), commanded. He was very well received, and propoſed to du Guaſt the deſign of making an advantage of having the priſoners of Henry III in their power (22). The court ſuſpected this conſpiracy, and entered into a kind of negotiation to prevent the conſequences: Lognac proteſted, that he would moſt faithfully *preſerve the town, the caſtle, and the priſoners*, for the king. But *to ſay truth, he reckoned without his hoſt; for he had put a thought into du Guaſt's head, who knew very well how to make his advantage of it* (23). ‘ There were in the caſtle two companies; that of du Guaſt, and another . . . . . Du Guaſt, by a bold ſtroke of policy, gives a falſe alarm, and makes Longnac believe, that there were people ravaging on the other ſide of the bridge, who attempted to make themſelves maſters of it, and that it would not be amiſs to play them a trick. Longnac, whoſe hands itched to be doing ſomething, and who did not at all miſtruſt du Guaſt, undertook to clear the coaſt: he marches out of the caſtle, followed by the other company, and ſoon finds there was nothing at all in it. But at his return, thinking to enter at the place where he marched out, he found the gates ſhut againſt him, and all his company. You may judge what a miſerable condition he was in, to find himſelf firſt thruſt out of his maſter's favour, and next out of the only place where he propoſed to himſelf ſome conſolation in his diſgrace. Seeing himſelf thus tricked, he was forced to reſume the old road to his houſe in Gaſcony, and his company of ſoldiers, that of Blois. Du Guaſt excuſes himſelf (as I have learned from his own mouth) by alledging he had certain advice, that Longnac came to Amboiſe, with a deſign to kill him, and make himſelf abſolute maſter of the place. And that, to avoid this danger, he was willing to prevent him (24).’ We ſhall make a reflexion below upon this excuſe of du Guaſt.

Were I to chuſe between Victor Cayet's and Stephen Paſquier's accounts, I ſhould not imitate Mr Varillas, who gives the preference to the former, without ſaying one word of what is contained in the latter. He relates (25) the agreement made by du Guaſt with the league for delivering the priſoners, and the conditions upon which Henry III made that compact miſcarry, by granting du Guaſt conſiderable advantages, and then adds, that ‘ the counter blow of theſe two compacts rebounded upon Longnac . . . . . The king was inſenſibly grown cold to him; and though his majeſty had hitherto held the balance between Bellegarde and him, as he had formerly done between the dukes of Joyeuſe and Eſpernon; he now on a ſudden inclined wholly on Bellegarde's ſide, by refuſing Longnac the poſt of maſter of the horſe, to give it the other. The diſcontent this gave Longnac made him deſire his majeſty, too plainly . . . . . that for his loſt favour he would be pleaſed to give him a place of ſecurity for his retreat.’ Mr Varillas afterwards relates the anſwer which Cayet ſuppoſes the king made. This is all his account. How many eſſential circumſtances are here wanting; and what did he think of, in connecting Laugnac's diſgrace with the baſe dealing of du Guaſt? to what purpoſe is this? the omiſſion of facts, which might ſerve to connect theſe things, and furniſh a reaſonable tranſition to an Hiſtorian, is not the leaſt of his faults. Nothing is more worthy of a critic's intention, than ſuch omiſſions; and nothing more proper to mend the taſte and judgment of an author, than to be admoniſhed of this kind of miſtakes.

Obſerve theſe words of Thuanus (26): ‘ Tum, *that is when James Clement ſtabbed Henry III with a knife*, Mompeſacus, Loniacus, & Joannes Levius Mirapicenſis, qui aderant, hominem ictu regis attonitum ſuperanti ira penſum humi ſternunt, ſtatim innumeris vulneribus confoſſum interficiunt. —— *Then Mompeſat, Loniac, and John marquis de Mirepoix (who were preſent) in a rage, knocked down the aſſaſſin, who ſtood aghaſt when he had ſtruck the king, and, giving him innumerable wounds, killed him.*’ Davila ſays (27) that Mompeſat, Lognac, and the marquis de Mirepoix, gentlemen of the bedchamber, threw James Clement's body out at the window. I believe that, in both theſe Hiſtorians, the comma between the two firſt names is a fault: for Mompezat was one of our Lognac's names (28); but if they mean by their Loniacus, and Lognac, him whom I treat of in this article, they are in an error: he was no longer at court.

By the way, du Guaſt deſerved no credit, when he alledged the excuſe, which Paſquier relates. The action, he would excuſe, looked ſo black, ſo infamous, ſo perfidious, that there is no lie, but he muſt have invented to cover it. And it is the common cuſtom of thoſe, who are guilty of ſuch crimes, to maintain that, without that, they had been ruined, and that they had moſt certain advice of deſigns formed againſt their life. They do not always lie; but moſt commonly they do; and this is ſufficient to render all apologies of this kind ſuſpected of impoſture, unleſs they are built upon undoubted evidence. It was not impoſſible that Laugnac ſhould take meaſures to ſupplant the other; for there were few honeſt men at that time, either at court, or in the league; but the preſumption is wholly againſt du Guaſt; he was a diſhoneſt man, an arrant villain, and ſhewed it ſoon after; ſince, notwithſtanding all his obligations to Henry III, who had loaded him with favours, he treated with the league for the ſurrendering the priſoners, whom that prince had given him the charge of; and he had actually delivered them, if the king had not prevented him by advantageous offers. Unfortunate prince! who was obliged to recompenſe the

(*c*) *See the remark* [*F*], *citat.* (26) *and* (27).

(18) Cayet, ubi ſupra, fol. 133, verſo.

(19) At the end of the remark [*I*], of the article HENRY III.

(20) Paſquier, Letters, book xiii, pag. 65, &c. Tom. II.

(21) Id. ibid. pag. 66.

(22) The friends and relations of the duke of Guiſe.

(23) Id. ibid. pag. 67.

(24) Id. ibid.

(25) Varillas, ubi ſupra, pag. 205.

(26) Thuan, lib. xcvi, pag. 300.

(27) Davila, lib. x, pag. 586.

(28) Thuanus, above, citat (15), calls him *Monpeſatum Loniacum.*

whether the Laugnacs, who were killed in a duel in the reign of Lewis XIII, deſcended from him [*G*].

the moſt infamous treaſons of his ſubjects. Miſerable age! in which aſſaſſination, perjury, diſloyalty, were the ordinary ways to greatneſs; an age worſe than the Iron one, and of which every one might ſay,

Nunc ætas agitur, pejoraque ſecula ferri
Temporibus, quorum ſceleri non invenit ipſa
Nomen, & à nullo poſuit natura metallo (29).

With an ill grace the Iron age we blame;
Our own ſo baſe, no metal gives it name.

[*G*] *I know not whether the Laugnacs, who who were killed in a duel . . deſcended from him.*] D'Audiguier affirms it: he had heard ſay, that one of thoſe, who fought for the baron de Biron, ‘ was the laſt to conquer; but ‘ having at length got his enemy under, he gave him ‘ ſeveral ſtabs, without being able to kill him, ſo that ‘ he was forced to quit him alive, ſeeing his companions go off, though he continued alone on horſeback ‘ for ſome time, on purpoſe to ſee him die (30). If ‘ this was Loignac, *continues he*, he was puniſhed for ‘ it in his ſucceſſors; for the laſt Loignacs, father and ‘ ſon, were both killed in duels within theſe four or ‘ five years; one in Rouergue, by the baron de Megelas, and the other not far from Biſſetre, by the ‘ baron de Rabat (31). Two brave barons, who are ‘ no leſs diſcreet and courteous than brave, and who ‘ put an end to two brave men. I did not know the ‘ ſon; but the blood he drew by ſeveral wounds from ‘ him that killed him, teſtifies what he was. As for ‘ the father, I have ſometimes ſeen him in company ‘ with baron de Roqueſeuil (another of the braveſt men ‘ in the world) and at the deceaſed queen Margaret's, ‘ where he held extraordinary diſputes in Philoſophy, ‘ and greatly manifeſted his knowledge of good letters.'

(29) Juvenal. Sat. XIII, ver. 28.

(30) D'Audiguier ubi ſupra, pag. 439.

(31) This duel was fought in 1615. The preſident de Gramond ſpeaks of it, *lib. i, Hiſtor. Galliæ, pag. m.* 71.

LOLLIUS (MARCUS) conſul of Rome in the year 733. The emperor Auguſtus gave him great marks of his eſteem; for he not only honoured him with the government of a noble province (*a*) in the year 719, but made him alſo governor to Caius Cæſar, his grandſon, when he ſent this young prince into the Eaſt, to ſettle the affairs of the empire on that ſide. Lollius's conduct in this expedition betrayed the ill qualities, which he had all along politickly concealed under the falſe appearance of virtue. His diſſimulation was ſo well acted, that, tho' avarice was his reigning paſſion, he was ever thought impregnable to money [*A*]. The exceſſive free-gifts, which he extorted in his expedition with the young Cæſar, loſt him that falſe reputation (*b*). He diſcovered ſome other of his faults in the ſame employment; for, in order to make himſelf more neceſſary, he fomented the quarrel between Tiberius and Caius Cæſar [*B*]; and was ſuſpected of being a ſpy of the king of Parthia, to retard the concluſion of the peace. Caius diſcovered this treachery [*C*], when he came to diſcourſe with this monarch in an iſle of the Euphrates (*c*), which made him conceive ſuch an averſion for this governor, as drove him to deſpair; for he killed himſelf

(*a*) That which was made by annexing Galatia, Lycaonia, Iſauria, and Piſidia, after the death of king Amintas. See Father Noris, *Cenot. Piſan.*

(*b* See the remarks [*D*] and [*G*].

(*c*) Paterculus, lib. ii, cap ci.

[*A*] *He had been thought impregnable to money.*] Among other praiſes, Horace gives him this:

Non ego te meis
Chartis inornatum ſileri,
Totve tuas patiar labores
Impune, Lolli, carpere lividas
Obliviones: eſt animus tibi
Rerumque prudens, & ſecundis
Temporibus dubiiſque rectus;
Vindex avaræ fraudis, & ABSTINENS
DUCENTIS AD SE CUNCTA PECUNIAE,
Conſulque non unius anni,
Sed quoties bonus atque fidus
Judex honeſtum prætulit utili, ET
REJECIT ALTO DONA NOCENTIUM
VULTU: & per obſtantes catervas
Explicuit ſua victor arma (1).

My muſe ſhall conſecrate thy name,
Thy virtuous labours, and thy fame.
In ev'ry ſtate of things, we find,
In thee, a prudent, ſteady, mind:
Impregnable to bribes thou art;
No baſe corruption taints thy heart.
Nor does a ſingle year confine
Thy magiſtracy's ſcanty line;
But thy impartial, honeſt, ſoul,
Which no oblique attempts controul,
From av'rice and ambition free,
Bids thee perpetual conſul be.

Though a court-poet makes little conſcience of beſtowing elogies on men that are thought unworthy of them, yet we muſt believe, that Horace here governs himſelf by appearances; that is, that he proportions his praiſes to the eſteem the perſon praiſed was then in; for we learn from a famous hiſtorian, that this Lollius concealed his evil qualities to a wonder. ‘ Sub Legato M. Lollio homine in omnia pe‘ cuniæ quam recte faciendi cupidiore, & inter ſum‘ mam vitiorum diſſimulationem vitioſiſſimo (2). —— ‘ *Under the lieutenant M Lollius, a man in every* ‘ *thing more fond of money than of behaving well,* ‘ *and, under the higheſt appearances of virtue, the* ‘ *moſt vitious of men.*'

[*B*] *He fomented the quarrel betwixt Tiberius and Caius Cæſar.*] This we may infer from theſe words of Suetonius (3): ‘ Namque privignum Cajum orien‘ ti præpoſitum, cum viſendigratia trajeciſſet Samum ‘ (*Tiberius*) alieniorem ſibi ſenſit ex criminationibus ‘ M. Lollii comitis & rectoris ejus. —— *For Tibe*‘ *rius, having paſſed over to Samos, to pay a viſit to* ‘ *his ſon in-law Caius Cæſar, who had the care of the* ‘ *Eaſt, found his affections alienated from him by the ill* ‘ *offices of Marcus Lollius, his companion and governor.*' This appears ſtill more plain by the teſtimony, which Tiberius gave Quirinus, governor of Caius Cæſar. ‘ Datuſque rector C. Cæſari Armeniam obtinenti Ti‘ berium quoque Rhodi agentem coluerat, quod tunc ‘ patefecit in Senatu, laudatis in ſe officiis, & incu‘ ſato M. Lollio quem autorem C. Cæſari pravitatis ‘ & diſcordiarum arguebat (4). —— *And being ap*‘ *pointed governor of Caius Cæſar, who was ſet over*‘ *Armenia, he had made his court likewiſe to Tiberius,* ‘ *who reſided at Rhodes; which he then made appear* ‘ *in the ſenate praiſing his ſervices done to himſelf,* ‘ *and accuſing Marcus Lollius of inſtigating Caius Cæ*‘ *ſar to miſbehaviour and falling out with him.*'

[*C*] *Caius diſcovered this treachery.*] Conſider theſe words of Paterculus. ‘ Quo tempore M. Lollii quem ‘ veluti moderatorum juventæ filii ſui Auguſtus eſſe ‘ voluerat, perfidia & plena ſubdoli ac verſuti animi ‘ conſilia per Parthum indicata Cæſari (5), fama vul‘ gavit. —— *At which time the treacherous deſigns* ‘ *of Marcus Lollius, whom Auguſtus appointed his ſon's* ‘ *governor, being diſcovered by the Parthian to Caius* ‘ *Cæſar, were the ſubject of common converſation.*'

[*D*] *Lollius*

(1) Horat. Ode IX, lib. iv.

(2) Paterculus, lib. ii, cap. xcvii.

(3) Sueton in Tiberio, cap. xii.

(4) Tac't. Annal. lib iii, cap. xlviii.

(5) I place a comma after *Cæſari*, and not before, as Boëclerus does: but I ſhould rather read, as ſeveral do, *indicata, Cæſaris ira vulgavit.*

himſelf [*D*]. He had vanquiſhed the Beſſi in the year 738 (*d*), and, carrying the war immediately into Germany, received an affront there; but he had his revenge [*E*], and obliged the Germans to make peace. Marcus Lollius, his ſon, was conſul, we know not in what year, and left a daughter, who was wife to Caligula [*F*], as I obſerve in the remarks [*G*].

[*D*] *Lollius killed himſelf.*] This we learn from Pliny. ‘ M. Lollius infamatus regum muneribus in ‘ toto Oriente interdicta amicitia à C. Cæſare Auguſti ‘ filio venenum biberet (6). —— *Marcus Lollius, having loſt his reputation by receiving bribes from kings,* ‘ *all over the Eaſt, and being diſcarded from the friend-* ‘ *ſhip of Caius Cæſar, the ſon of Auguſtus, drank poiſon.*’ Solinus ſays the ſame thing (7). Paterculus, who was nearer that time, doubts whether Lollius killed himſelf: *Cujus mors intra Paucos dies fortuita an voluntaria fuerit ignoro* (8); but he ſays, that Lollius lived but a ſhort time after the interview of Caius Cæſar, and the king of Parthia. Suetonius ſeems to make Lollius live ſome time after his diſgrace; for he ſays, that Caius Cæſar, being angry with Lollius, was reconciled to Tiberius, and conſented, that he ſhould be recalled to Rome. *Is* (Caius Cæſar) *forte tunc M. Lollio offenſior, facilis exorabiliſque in vitricum fuit* (9).

[*E*] *He received an affront there, but had his revenge.*] The ſhame was greater than the loſs, in our Marcus Lollius's misfortune (10). The eagle of the fifth legion was loſt in it (11). Euſebius, not mentioning any diſgrace of Lollius, affirms, that the Germans were beaten in the fourth year of the CXCth Olympiad. Scaliger (12) pretends, that Euſebius is miſtaken, both as to the fact, and as to the year; but ſince Dion affirms, that the Germans, being informed of Lollius's warlike preparations, and the march Auguſtus was making with an army into Gaul, retired into their country, made peace, and gave hoſtages (13), it is probable, they had been beaten in an encounter, as Euſebius ſuppoſes.

[*F*] *His ſon was conſul* (14) . . . . *and left a daughter . . . . wife to Caligula.*] There are ſeveral authors, who ſay, that Lollius, governor to Caius Cæſar, was father to this young lady (15); but it is falſe. Lollia Paullina was grand-daughter to this Lollius. This we find in Pliny (16) in expreſs terms, and we may moreover ſolidly infer it from her competition with Agrippina, when the queſtion was about remarrying the emperor Claudius. All the ladies that were eminent for their birth, their beauty, and their riches, entered the liſts on this occaſion (17); at laſt the diſpute was reduced to this, whether Agrippina was to be preferred to Paullina, or to Ælia Petina. Judge then, whether this can agree with a woman about fifty years of age. Paullina could not be much younger, if ſhe was daughter to our Marcus Lollius who departed from Rome with his pupil, about the year 751, and died two years after; but the diſpute I ſpeak of was in the 801ſt year of Rome. It is not eaſy to decide, whether he, to whom Horace addreſſes the ſecond and eighteenth epiſtle of the firſt book, is the ſame, to whom he addreſſes the ninth ode of the fourth book. Mr Dacier, who affirms it, muſt ſuppoſe, that theſe three pieces are addreſſed to Marcus Lollius, governor to Caius Cæſar. He believes alſo, that Lollius had this charge, when Horace writ the eighteenth epiſtle to him, which he ſuppoſes we may date from the 742d year of Rome (18). There are two things to be obſerved againſt this. I. No hiſtorian makes mention of Lollius's having this charge, before this young prince was ſent into the Eaſt. II. It is no way probable that if Horace had written an epiſtle to the governor of Caius Cæſar, he would have hinted at nothing that related to this honour. Now it is certain, there is nothing in this epiſtle to ſhews us, that Lollius was judged worthy of having the education of the emperor's grandſon committed to him. Where is the poet, who would preſume to give advice to the governor of the preſumptive heir of a great empire, without inſinuating at leaſt, that he ſpeaks to a man moſt qualified to give leſſons to others upon Social Virtue (19), and who actually inſtructed a young prince, by the choice of a great monarch? For the ſame reaſon, I am perſuaded, that Lollius was not governor to the young Cæſar (20), when Horace addreſſed the ninth ode of the fourth book to him. Could the poet omit the compliments due to him on that head? Beſides, Horace addreſſes himſelf to a man, who had born arms in his youth, in Auguſtus's expedition againſt the Cantabrians.

> Militiam puer, & Cantabrica bella tuliſti,
> Sub duce, qui Templis Parthorum ſigna refixit,
> Et nunc, ſi quid abeſt, Italis adjudicat armis (21).

> *When young, you ſerved in the Cantabrian war,*
> *Under that chief, who in the Parthian temples*
> *His ſtandard fix'd, and now, if ought be wanting,*
> *To crown the glory of the Roman name,*
> *Adjudges it to the Italian arms.*

This people was ſubdued in the year 729, when our Lollius was governor of Galatia. Hence Father Noris (22) makes it appear that Horace wrote not the aforementioned epiſtle to Lollius, Caius Cæſar's governor. It will not avail Mr Dacier to ſay (23), that Aguuſtus undertook his firſt expedition againſt the Cantabrians in the 726th year of Rome, and that this expedition laſted four years, and that *Puer* often ſignified a grown man; and that Lollius's age was diſpenſed with, when he was made conſul in the year 732; all this doth not weaken Father Noris's proof. Let us ſay then, with this learned author, that Horace did not write the ſecond and eighteenth epiſtle of his firſt book to Lollius, Caius Cæſar's governor, as Glandorpius has pretended, at the 547th page of his Onomaſticon, but to this Lollius's ſon.

[*G*] *As I obſerve in the remarks.*] Here I ſhall give the article of LOLLIA PAULLINA, grand-daughter to our Marcus Lollius. Her firſt huſband's name was Caius Memmius Regulus, who was conſul, when Sejanus was put to death. Some time after, being at the head of an army (24), he received orders to bring his wife to Rome, to be married to the emperor Caligula, I ſay, to be married to him: for this prince, having heard, that Lollia Paullina's grand-mother had been a prodigious beauty immediately commanded Memmius to come to Rome, to give him his wiſe in marriage, and behave himſelf in the ceremony, as a father, who marries his daughter. ‘ Lolliam Paullinam C. Memmio Conſu‘ lari exercitus regenti nuptam facta mentione aviæ ‘ ejus, ut quondam pulcherrimæ, ſubito ex provincia ‘ evocavit, ac perductam à marito conjunxit ſibi.’ This is what Suetonius ſays in the twenty fifth chapter of Caligula's life; and here is what Euſebius ſays in his chronicle: ‘ Cujus Memmii Reguli uxo‘ rem duxit, impellens eum ut uxoris ſuæ patrem eſſe ‘ ſe ſcriberet (25). — *He married the wife of Memmius* ‘ *Regulus, obliging him to ſign himſelf his wife's father.*’ If you deſire to ſee a note of Caſaubon upon this place of Suetonius, read what follows, and remember, that what he relates from Dion, is in the fifty ninth book, pag 745. ‘ Ait Euſebius, *ſcriberet*, ‘ nempe in dotali inſtrumento, nam ut omnia acta ‘ legitime viderentur, omnia ſolennia ſunt ſervata. ‘ Maritus igitur pro patre fuit, qui eam Cajo deſpon‘ ſavit, dotem dixit, & ad novum maritum perduxit. ‘ Auctor Dio. Hinc intelligimus Suetonii ſequentia ‘ verba, *perductam à marito conjuxit ſibi.* —— ‘ *Euſebius uſes the term* ſcriberet (ſigned or ſubſcrib‘ ed himſelf) *to wit, in an inſtrument of dower; for* ‘ *that every thing might ſeem to be tranſacted in form* ‘ *of law, all the forms were preſerved. The huſband* ‘ *therefore acted the father; who betrothed her to* ‘ *Caius, aſſigned the dowery, and brought her to her* ‘ *new huſband. Dio tells us this. Hence we under-* ‘ *ſtand Suetonius's words* perductam, *&c.*’ This happened the 791ſt year of Rome. Caligula, quickly diſguſted with Paullina, divorced her under pretence of barrenneſs (26), and commanded her never more to have to do with any man. *Miſſam fecit interdicto cujuſquam in perpetuum coitu* (27). Nine years after this divorce, Paullina diſplayed all her charms, to ſupplant her rivals with the emperor Claudius, whom ſhe would gladly have married; but her faction was not ſo ſtrong as Agrippina's. ‘ Cæde ‘ Meſſallinæ

(*d*) Dio, lib. liv, pag. m. 612.

(6) Plin. lib. ix, cap. xxxv.

(7) Solin. cap. liii, pag. m. 85.

(8) Paterculus, lib ii, cap. cii.

(9) Sueton. in Tiberio, cap xiii.

(10) Lollianam (*cladem*) majoris infamiæ, quam detrimenti. *Id. in Auguſto, cap. xx.*

(11) Paterculus, lib. ii, cap. xcvii.

(12) Scalig. Animadv. in Euſeb. pag. m. 171.

(13) Dio, lib. liv, pag. m. 612.

(14) Tacitus ſays, *Annal. lib. xii, cap. i*, that Lollia Paullina was the daughter of M. Lollii conſularis.

(15) Solin, *ubi ſupra*, ſays it.

(16) Lib. ix, cap. xxxv, pag. m. 335.

(17) See Tacitus, cited in the following remark.

(18) Mr Dacier on Horace, Tom. X, pag 428, Edit. Holland.

(19) It is on this that the xviiith epiſtle of the firſt book of Horace turns. See the notes of Mr Dacier, *ibid Tom. IX, pag.* 146.

(20) Mr Dacier on Horace, *Tom. IV, pag. m.* 242, believes, that Lollius had already been poſſeſſed of this place.

(21) Horat. Epiſt. xviii, lib. i, ver. 55.

(22) Noris, Cenotaph. Piſan. pag 255.

(23) Remarks on Horace, Tom. IX, pag. 177.

(24) According to Dion, *lib. lviii, pag* 731, he was governor of Myſia and Macedonia.

(25) Euſeb. num. 2056.

(26) Τότε δὲ ἐκβαλὼν τὴν Παυλίναν προφάσει μὲν ὡς μὴ τίκτουσαν, τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς ὅτι διακορὴς αὐτῆς ἐγέγονει. Ad præſens vero exturbata Paulina ut ſterili, ſed revera quia ſatietas ejus ipſum ceperat. *Dio, lib. lix, pag.* 757, *ad ann.* 792.

(27) Sueton. in Calig. cap xxv.

Meſſallinæ convulſa principis domus orto apud libertos certamine quis deligeret uxorem Claudio cœlibis vitæ intoleranti, & conjugum imperiis obnoxio. Nec minore ambitu feminæ exarſerant, ſuam quæque nobilitatem, formam, opes contendere, ac digna tanto matrimonio oſtentare. Sed maxime ambigebatur inter Lolliam Paullinam, M. Lollii conſularis filiam, & Juliam Agrippinam Germanico genitam: huic Pallas, illi Calliſtus, fautores aderant: at Ælia Petina è familia Tuberonum, Narciſſo fovebatur. —— *The death of Meſſalina ſhook the emperor's houſe, a conteſt ariſing among his freed-men, who ſhould chuſe a wife for Claudius, who was grown weary of living ſingle, and was fitted for the government of wives. Nor did the ladies burn with leſs rivalſhip, each claiming the honour of his bed on account of birth, beauty, and wealth. But the greateſt rivalſhip lay between Lollia Paullina, daughter of Marcus Lollius, formerly conſul, and Julia Agrippina, daughter of Germanicus: Pallas favoured the latter, and Calliſtus the former; but Narciſſus eſpouſed the cauſe of Ælia Petina, of the family of the Tubero's.*' Thus Tacitus ſpeaks in the firſt chapter of the twelfth book of his annals. The favourite, that was for Paullina, alledged, that, as ſhe had no children, ſhe would be a very good ſtep mother to Claudius's children; ' Calliſtus, *continues the ſame Tacitus* . . . . longe rectius Lolliam induci quando nullos liberos genuiſſet, vacuam æmulatione, & privignis parentis loco futuram.' But the favourite, who acted for Agrippina, alledged better reaſons: ſo that Claudius declared for her. This triumph ought to have effaced the hatred, which Paullina's competition had excited in Agrippina's breaſt; yet the happy rival left no ſtone unturned to deſtroy the unfortunate; ſhe had her accuſed of conſulting the augurs, and the oracle of Apollo, about the emperor's marriage: the trial ended in a decree, which condemned Lollia Paullina to baniſhment, and the confiſcation of the beſt part of her eſtate. They left her but about 130 thouſand crowns. Tacitus's words, which I am going to cite, will tell us ſomething of Paullina's parentage. ' Atrox odii Agrippina, ac Lolliæ infenſa, quod ſecum de matrimonio principis certaviſſet; molitur crimina, & accuſatorem, qui objiceret *Chaldæos, magos, interrogatumque Apollinis Clarii ſimulachrum ſuper nuptiis Imperatoris*. Exin Claudius inaudita rea, multa de claritudine ejus apud ſenatum præfatus, *ſorore L. Voluſii genitam, majorem ei patruum Cottam Meſſallinum eſſe, Memmio quondam Regulo nuptam* (nam de C. Cæſaris nuptiis conſulto reticebat) addidit *pernicioſa in Rempub. conſilia, & materiem ſceleri detrahendam. Proin publicatis bonis, cederet Italia.* Ita quinquagies ſeſtertium ex opibus immenſis exuli relictum (28). —— *Agrippina mortally hated Lollia, becauſe ſhe had been her rival in the emperor's marriage: ſhe forged accuſations, and ſuborned an accuſer, to charge her with conſulting wizards, and the oracle of Apollo Clarius, concerning the emperor's marriage. Upon this Claudius, without hearing the accuſed, having enlarged upon her high birth before the ſenate, telling them that ſhe was daughter of a ſiſter of L. Voluſius, that Cotta Meſſalinus was her great uncle, and that ſhe had been formerly married to Memmius Regulus (for he purpoſely ſaid nothing of Caius Cæſar's marriage) added that it was neceſſary to prevent the ill deſigns of this lady againſt the government. Upon this, her goods were confiſcated, and ſhe was baniſhed Italy; and but* 130000 *crowns of her immenſe fortunes were left her.*' Agrippina's hatred being ſuch, as was not be ſatisfied without the death of her rival, cauſed her to be murthered in her exile (29); and, to be well aſſured, that it was Paullina's head, that was brought her, which ſhe could not eaſily diſtinguiſh, ſhe opened her mouth, knowing this lady had ſomething remarkable in her teeth. Ἤδη δὲ τινας καὶ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν γυναικῶν ζηλοτυπήσασα ἔφθειρε, καὶ τήν τε Παυλίναν τὴν Λολλίαν, ἐπειδ᾽ ἐλπίδα τινὰ εἰς τὴν τοῦ Κλαυδίου συνοίκησιν ἔσχηκεν, ἀπέκτεινε. τὴν τε κεφαλὴν αὐτῆς κομισθεῖσαν αὐτῇ μὴ γνωρίσασα, τό τε στόμα αὐτῆς αὐτοχειρίᾳ ἠνέῳξε, καὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐπεσκέψατο, ἰδίως πῶς ἔχοντας. *Multas illuſtres & nobiles fœminas nonnulla invidia perdidit: in quarum numero fuit Lollia Paulina: quæ ab ea propterea necata eſt, quod ſe Claudio nupturam eſſe aliquando ſperaverat: cujus caput ad ſe perlatum quum non agnoſceret, os ejus manu ſua aperuit, ut dentes inſpiceret quos illa non perinde ut cæteræ ſolent habuerat* (30). By the ſum that Paullina had left, we may judge ſhe was extremely rich; but we ſhall know this better, if we conſider the prodigious coſtlineſs of her clothes. Pliny, who had ſeen her, ſays, that even on occaſions, which were not the moſt pompous, ſhe wore in her dreſs, and on her head, jewels, to the value of four millions of crowns. ' Lolliam Paulinam, quæ fuit Caji principis matrona, ne ſerio quidem ac ſolenni cærimoniarum aliquo apparatu, ſed mediocrium etiam ſponſalium cœna, vidi ſmaragdis margaritiſque opertam, alterno textu fulgentibus, toto capite, crinibus, ſpiris, auribus, collo, manibus digitiſque: quæ ſumma quadrigenties H-S. colligebat: ipſa confeſtim parata nuncupationem tabulis probare. Nec dona prodigi principis fuerant, ſed avitæ opes, provinciarum ſcilicet ſpoliis partæ. Hic eſt rapinarum exitus: hoc fuit quare M. Lollius infamatus regum muneribus in toto Oriente, interdicta amicitia à Cajo Cæſare Auguſti filio venenum liberet, ut neptis ejus quadringenties H-S. operta ſpectaretur ad lucernas (31). —— *I have ſeen Lollia Paullina, who was Caius Cæſar's wife, not on a ſolemn occaſion, but at the celebration of ſome mean marriage, her whole head, hair, cap, ears, neck, hands, and fingers, covered with emeralds and pearls, to the value of four millions of crowns; the purchaſing of which ſhe was ready to prove by bills and receipts. Nor were they the gifts of a prodigal prince, but hereditary wealth, acquired by the plunder of provinces. This is the event of rapine: it was for this reaſon, that M. Lollius, who had loſt his reputation by taking bribes from kings all over the Eaſt, being diſcarded from the friendſhip of Caius Cæſar, the ſon of Auguſtus, poiſoned himſelf, that his neice, covered with the value of four millions of crowns, might make a ſhow at an entertainment.*' I have ſaid in another place (32) that archbiſhop Uſher is miſtaken, in ſaying, that this woman was married to Caius Cæſar, grandſon to Auguſtus.

(28) Tacit. Annal. lib. xii, cap xxii, ad ann. 802.

(29) In Lolliam mittitur tribunus, à quo ad mortem adigeretur. *Id. ibid.*

(30) Xiphilin in Claudio, pag. m. 153.

(31) Plin. lib. ix, cap. xxxv, pag. m. 335.

(32) *In the article of* CALIGULA, *remark* [*I*]. *Father Noris*, Cenotaph. Piſan. pag. 189, *has taken notice of this miſtake of Uſher.*

LONGIANO (Faustus da) an Italian author in the XVIth century, publiſhed a book on duelling, and ſome obſervations on Cicero, and on Roman coins. It is believed, that he had tranſlated Dioſcorides into Italian, before Matthiolus publiſhed a like verſion *(a)*. I have ſpoken elſewhere *(b)* of him, on occaſion of the tranſlation of a work of Guevara.

(a) Epit. Bibl. Geſn pag. 230.

(b) *In the remark* [*H*] *of the article* GUEVARA.

LONGOMONTANUS (Christian) *(a)* a great Aſtronomer, profeſſor of Mathematics at Copenhagen in the XVIIth century, and canon of Lunden, was born in 1562, in a village of Denmark *(b)*. In the beginning of his ſtudies, he run through all the inconveniencies, which generally attend ſcholars, who are as he was, the ſon of a poor peaſant [*A*]. He lived ſometimes with his father, ſometimes with an aunt, ſometimes with

(a) *And not* Chiſtopher, *as in Moreri, after Voſſius, and in the Oxford Catalogue, and in the* Diarium *of Witte.*

(b) Ab obſcura Cimbriæ Paræcia Longo-Montanus cognominatus fuit *Gaſſend. in Vita Tychon. Brah lib. iii, ſub fin. pag. m* 430.

[*A*] *He was the ſon of a poor peaſant.*] This mean condition did not hinder his immortalizing his father's name in the title page of his books; for he writes himſelf *Chriſtianus Longomontanus Severini filius.* This is rarely practiſed by the learned, but when the father has been a great man in the republic of learning. An adverſary, who would have pretended, that Longomontanus was not famous, might have told him, you explain a thing obſcure by another more obſcure, *obſcurum per obſcurius, imo per obſcuriſſimum.*

with an uncle, always grappling with ill fortune, and conſtrained to divide himſelf betwixt the labours of tillage, and the leſſons, which the miniſter of the place gave him. At laſt, when he had attained to fifteen years of age, he ſtole from his father's houſe, and went to Vibourg, where there was a college. There he ſpent eleven years, and, tho' he was forced to earn his bread by his labour, he followed his ſtudies with extreme application [*B*], and, amongſt other ſciences, made a great progreſs in Mathematics. After this, he viſited the univerſity of Copenhagen, and in a year's time got the eſteem of the profeſſors to ſuch a degree, that they earneſtly recommended him to the illuſtrious Tycho Brahe. This recommendation had a good effect. Longomontanus was very well received by this famous Aſtronomer, who then lived in the iſle of Huen. I ſpeak of the year 1589. He lived with him eight years, and was very uſeful to him, either in obſerving the ſtars, or in making calculations, and proved himſelf ſo exact, ſo able an Aſtronomer, and ſo laborious, that Tycho Brahe conceived a moſt particular eſteem and affection for him (*c*), and having quitted his own country, to ſettle in Germany, paſſionately deſired to have him along with him (*d*). This appears by letters he wrote to him in 1598, and 1599 (*e*). Longomontanus complied with this deſire of Tycho Brahe, and went to him at the caſtle of Benach, near Prague (*f*). He was a great help to him in all his aſtronomical labours; but being deſirous of a profeſſor's chair in Denmark, Tycho Brahe conſented to deprive himſelf of the company and ſervices of this diſciple, and gave him a diſcharge (*g*), filled with ſuch marks of eſteem, as turned greatly to his glory. Nor did he forget to furniſh him with large ſupplies for the expences of his journey. Longomontanus, returning into Denmark, fetched a great compaſs, to ſee the places, from which Copernicus had contemplated the ſtars (*h*). He met with a kind patron in the chancellor (*i*); and, after having for ſome time enjoyed an honourable employment in his family (*k*), he was promoted to the profeſſorſhip of Mathematics, in the univerſity of Copenhagen, in the year 1605. He diſcharged it worthily to his death, which happened the 8th of October 1647 (*l*). He had loſt his wife ten years before, who was ſiſter to Gaſper Bartholinus (*m*). The books he left behind him diſcover his great capacity [*C*]. He amuſed himſelf with finding out the ſquaring of the circle, and pretended he had found it: he was vigorouſly attacked on that account by an Engliſh Mathematician [*D*]. He altered ſomething in Tycho Brahe's ſyſtem

(*c*) Ex eodem Gaſſendo, ibid.

(*d*) Gaſſend. ibid. lib. v, pag. 452.

(*e*) Id. ibid.

(*f*) Id. ibid. pag. 456.

(*g*) *It is dated from Prague, Auguſt 4, 1600. See Gaſſendus,* ibid. pag. 459.

(*h*) In Poloniam per Sileſiam divertere ac inter redeundum invi ſere loca in quibus obſervaſſet Copernicus. *Id. ibid.*

(*i*) *He was called* Chriſtien Friis de Borrebye.

(*k*) Longomont. Epiſt. Dedicator. Aſtronomiæ Danicæ

(*l*) Gaſſend. ubi ſupra, lib. vi, pag. 473.

(*m*) Moller. Hypomn. ad Alb. Barthol. de Scriptis Danor. pag. 185.

[*B*] *Though he was obliged to earn his bread, he followed his ſtudies with extreme application.*] Here is what Gaſſendus ſays (1): ‘ Moratus illeic xi. annos partim induſtria victum parans, partim indefeſſo ‘ labore literis invigilans. ——— *He ſtaid there eleven ‘ years, partly earning his living by his induſtry, and ‘ partly applying himſelf with indefatigable diligence ‘ to learning.*’ He forgot, that Longomontanus taught in this ſchool of Vibourg (2). Here is a man, that may be compared to the philoſopher Cleanthes (3).

[*C*] *The books he left behind him ſhew his great capacity.*] Here is the catalogue of them (4): *Syſtematis Mathematici pars I. ſive Arithmetica*, Hafn. 1611 in 8vo. *Cyclometria è Lunulis reciprocè demonſtrata*, Hafn. 1612. Ham. 1627. Paris 1664, in 4to. *Aſtronomia Danica*, Amſtel. 1622 in 4to. 1640, 1663 in folio. *Inventio Quadraturæ Circuli*, Hafn. 1634, in 4to. *Coronis Problematica ex Myſteriis trium numerorum, &c.* ibid 1637, in 4to. *Problemata duo Geometrica*, ibid. 1638, in 4to. *Problema contra Paulum Guldinum de circuli menſura*, ibid. 1638 in 4to. *Rotundi in Plano, ſeu Circuli abſoluta Menſura*, Amſtel. 1644. in 4to. 'Ενέργεια *Proportionis ſeſquitertiæ*, Hafn. 1644. in 4to. *Controverſia cum Pellio de vera circuli Menſura*, ibid. 1645 in 4to. *Admiranda Operatio Trium numerorum*, 6, 7, 8, *ad Circ. menſurandum*, ibid. 1645, in 4to. *Caput Tertium Libri Primi de abſoluta menſura Rotundi Plani, unà cum Elencho Cyclometriæ J. Scaligeri & Appendice de defectu Canonis, &c.* ibid, 1646, in 4to. *Geometriæ Quæſita XIII de Cyclometria rationali & vera*, ibid. 1631, in 4to. *Introductio in Theatrum Aſtronomicum* ibid. 1639 in 4to. *Diſp. de Matheſeos indole*, ibid. in 4to. 1636. *Diſputationes Aſtronomicæ ſex.* ibid. in 4to. 1622. *De Chronolabio Hiſtorico, ſeu Tempore, Diſputationes tres*, ibid. 1627, in 4to. This is the liſt we find in Albert Bartholin's treatiſe *de Scriptis Danorum*. It is not compleat. There are many philoſophical, aſtronomical, and chronological diſſertations, wanting which Longomontanus had opened in diſputations, in his auditory, at ſeveral times. You will find the catalogue of them in a book, which Mr Mollerus has intituled, *ad librum Alberti Bartholini de ſcriptis Danorum poſthumum hypomnemata hiſtorico-critica paucula è plurimis ſelecta* (5). You will alſo find there (6), that Witte (7) had no reaſon to aſcribe to George Lewis Frobenius, Longomontanus's Cyclometry, printed at Hamburgh, without the name of the author, in 1627. The manuſcript of Longomontanus's apology which he made for Tycho Brahe, againſt Craigius a Scotch Phyſician, was depoſited in the hands of George Frommius, who ſucceeded him in the chair of Copenhagen (8). I do not think it was ever printed. Tycho Brahe preſſed him in 1598 to haſten the concluſion of it, than it might ever as an appendix to his treatiſe upon Comets (9); for it is was upon that ſubject that Craigius attacked him in the year 1592, in a book intituled, *Capnuraniæ reſtinctio, ſeu cometarum in ætherem ſublimationis refutatio* (10).

[*D*] *He pretended to have found out the quadrature of the circle, and was attacked by an Engliſh Mathematician.*] Mr Baillet has mentioned this diſpute. ‘ Mr Des Cartes *ſays he* (11), was drawn into ‘ an engagement among the chief Mathematicians of ‘ Europe, partaking in the famous diſpute, which aroſe ‘ that year betwixt Longomontanus and Pell, about the ‘ ſquaring of the circle. Longomontanus . . . . . had ‘ undertaken to demonſtrate the quadrature of the circle, that rock, on which the greateſt genius's have ‘ hitherto ſplit; nor was he more ſucceſsful in his attempt than others before him, notwithſtanding the ‘ good opinion he had entertained of his labour. ‘ Dr John Pell, an Engliſhman profeſſor of mathematics ‘ in the college of Amſterdam (12), immediately diſcovered a great deal of falſe reaſoning in it, and † ‘ ſeeing that the point of the difficulty conſiſted in ‘ the proof of one ſingle theorem, he firſt made the ‘ demonſtration of it by himſelf, and reſolved to propoſe the thing to all the ableſt Mathematicians of ‘ his acquaintance, and deſired their opinion of it. ‘ They who examined it ‡, and ſent him their demonſtrations, were Meſſieurs Roberval, le Pailleur, ‘ Carcavi, Mydorgius, and Father Merſennus, who ‘ was returned from his travels into Italy, about the ‘ beginning of July: lord Cavendiſh, and Mr Hobbes ‘ of England, John Adolphus Taſſius, a Mathematician ‘ of Hamburgh, John Lewis Wolzogen, a free ‘ baron of Auſtria, gentleman of the bed-chamber to ‘ the king of Poland, a Carteſian in Philoſophy, and ‘ a Socinian in religion; Father Bonaventure Cavalieri, an Italian, profeſſor of Mathematics at Bologna: Mr Golius, profeſſor at Leyden, and ſome ‘ other Dutch Mathematicians. Mr Des Cartes alſo ‘ ſent to Dr Pell, a ſhort demonſtation upon the ſame ‘ ſubject, which ſerved much to authorize what he ‘ had advanced againſt Longomontanus.’ Mr Mollerus reports (13), I. that Longomontanus boaſted, even in his

(1) Gaſſend. in Vita Tychon. Brah. lib. iii, ſub fin. pag. m. 430.

(2) Viburgi Scholæ Rector. *Witte, in Diario Biograph. ad ann.* 1647.

(3) Confer quæ ſupra, *citat.* (24) *of the article* JUNIUS (FRANCIS).

(4) Albert. Bartholinus, de Scriptis Danorum, *according to the edition of Mollerus*, 1699, *pag.* 25, 26.

(5) *Printed in* 1699. *See in it pag.* 188, 189.

(6) *At page* 187.

(7) In Diario Biographico, ad ann. 1645.

(8) Gaſſend ubi ſupra, lib. vi, pag. 473.

(9) Id. ibid lib. iv, pag. 452.

(10) Id. ibid. pag. 442, ad ann. 1595.

(11) Baillet, Vie de Des Cartes, Tom. II, pag. 274, ad ann. 1645.

(12) *He was ſo afterwards at Breda.*

† Vit. Hobbian. auctar. pag. 15, & 16.

‡ Lipſtorp. Specim. Philoſ. Carteſ. pag. 14.

(13) Jo. Moller. Hypomn. pag. 187.

ſyſtem. I think the reflexion of a modern author, upon the inconveniencies and motives of this kind of reform, worth relating [*E*].

his epitaph, that he had found out the quadrature of the circle, and that Gaſper Bartholinus made a poem, to congratulate him upon it; but that Thomas Bartholinus, Gaſpar's ſon, was of a different judgment, and found, in Longomontanus's enterprize, more ingenuity and labour, than good ſucceſs. II. That Claudius Hardy, counſellor in the Chatelet at Paris, refuted (14) Longomontanus's paralogiſms. III. that John Pell, this Daniſh Mathematician's chief antagoniſt, inſerted in his book what the moſt excellent Mathematicians of the age had communicated to him. *Quorum Suffragia, ac Demonſtrationes Theorematis, in cujus Probatione totius Controv. Cardo vertebatur, dubii, una cum Pelliana, in Joh. Pellii* Controverſiæ de vera Circuli Menſura, inter Longomontanum ac ſe An. 1644. exortæ, Parte I. Amſtelod. An. 1647. *in 4to. excuſa, occurrunt* (15). —— Whoſe ſuffrages, and demonſtrations of the doubtful theorem, on the proof of which the hinge of the whole controverſy turned, are to be found, together with Pell's, in the firſt part of *John Pell's controverſy with Longomontanus, in the year* 1644, *concerning the true meaſure of the circle.* Amſterdam, 1647, in 4to. Mr Mollerus had before obſerved, that Longomontanus's friends confuted his antagoniſts upon other points. Peter Bartholinus, his diſciple, anſwered, in 1632 (16), the objections of Martin Hortenſius, inſerted in the preface of Philip Lansbergius's commentary *de motu terræ diurno & annuo.* George Frommius, in his treatiſe *de mediis ad Aſtronomiam reſtituendam neceſſariis,* publiſhed in the year 1642, made the apology to the *Introductio in Theatrum Aſtronomicum*; a work that Longomontanus had publiſhed againſt John Baptiſta Morin, in 1639. But as to the quadrature of the circle, they could not juſtify him. His labours were not ſo ſucceſsful. ‘Haud æque felices fuerant Longomontani Conatus Cyclometrici, circa veram Circuli Quadraturam, Scopulum tot Ingeniorum Subtilium Naufragiis infamem (17). *Longomontanus's attempts to meaſure the circle, were not equally ſucceſsful, with regard to it's true quadrature, that rock on which ſo many ſubtle genius's have ſplit.*’

[*E*] *He altered ſomething in Tycho Brahe's ſyſtem. I think the reflexion of a modern author . . . . worth relating.*] ‘There was a fourth ſyſtem, which Longomontanus, one of Tycho Brahe's chief diſciples deſigned to bring into vogue, by taking ſomething from all the reſt, and endeavouring to avoid the ſtrongeſt objections againſt them. He ſaw, that, in that of Tycho, the inconceivable rapidity of the fixed ſtars, and, in that of Copernicus, the immenſe ſpace he put between the heaven of Saturn, and the fixed ſtars was ſcarce ſufferable; to remedy both which inconveniencies, he made a ſmall change in Tycho's ſyſtem, by giving the earth a diurnal revolution about it's own axis, by which means the planets, the ſun, and fixed ſtars, did not move round the earth in twenty four hours, but each planet made it's revolution gently from weſt to eaſt; and the fixed ſtars had their ſlow motion round their orbit in 25000 years, as the moon performs her's in twenty ſeven days, the ſun in a year, and others in proportion to their diſtance, and the greatneſs of their circle. But though this ſyſtem, which was only a ſmall reformation of Tycho Brahe's, without diſconcerting any of it's parts, might be defended by very good reaſons; yet becauſe of the little credit of it's author, and the great reputation of thoſe that preceeded him, very few applauded it; ſome holding, that if the earth be in the center, it muſt be immoveable; but if it does move, that it's motion muſt be like that of the other planets. In a word, it was believed, that, he who formed this ſyſtem upon the other two, which at that time divided all the learned, only did it through the natural inclination men have to be always refining upon others, though theſe reformations generally end in ſpoiling the whole; they who endeavour to reconcile two oppoſite opinions, taking a leſs reaſonable method, for the moſt part, than that which they refuſe to ſubmit to (18).’

Theſe laſt words are capable of a large and fine comment, which might be filled up with many reaſons and examples.

(14) *In his* Elenchus Cyclometriæ Longomontani, *printed at Paris in 4to, without the author's name.*

(15) Mollerus, ubi ſupra, pag. 188.

(16) *In his Apology* pro Obſervationibus & Hypotheſibus Tych. Brahei.

(17) Id. ibid. pag. 187.

(18) *Mr le Noble, baron de St George, in the ſecond Tome of the* Uranie ou des Tableaux des Philoſophes, chap. x, pag. 71, & ſeq.

LONGVIC (JAQUELINE DE) (*a*) ducheſs of Montpenſier, was a lady of great merit [*A*], and great intereſt [*B*], about the middle of the XVIth century. She was the youngeſt

[*A*] *She was a lady of great merit.*] Thuanus makes a very honourable mention of her. ‘Sub id tempus Jacoba Lonviana Montpenſerii uxor V. Kal. Sept. ex tabe deceſſit, virili animo & prudentia ſupra ſexum inſignis, quæ ſemper publicæ tranquillitati ſtuduerat, & ſi diutius vixiſſet, motus qui poſtea ſecuti ſunt impeditura credebatur (1). —— *About that time Jaqueline de Longvic, wife of the duke of Montpenſier, died of a conſumption; a lady of a manly genius and prudence above her ſex, who always conſulted the public tranquillity, and, if ſhe had lived longer, would, it is thought, have prevented the commotions, which afterwards followed.*’ The preſident de la Place gives her no leſs glorious a character. ‘If ſhe had lived longer, *ſays he* (2), it is thought ſhe would have prevented the enſuing troubles, becauſe ſhe was on the one hand well beloved, and in credit with the queen, and, on the other, the king of Navarre was very much obliged to her; who ſerved as a bond of union, and of peace, and amity, between them. She was a woman of good underſtanding, and very well verſed even in ſtate affairs.’ It was to her the archbiſhop of Vienne (3) addreſſed himſelf, as to the laſt reſort, when he ſaw they were going to ruin the princes of the blood, in the reign of Francis II. He diſpatched a perſon to her, to tell her, that, if ſhe did not keep the promiſe ſhe had made of oppoſing the deſigns of the houſe of Guiſe, all was loſt (4). The preſident de la Place, who relates this matter at large, has a ſmall fling by the by at the ducheſs; but he inſinuates, that it was more owing to the conſtable of Montmorency, than to her, that the miſchief was not remedied. ‘The ſaid lady of Montpenſier, *ſays he* (5), having heard his propoſition, though ſhe was ſomewhat timorous, diſmiſſed the ſaid perſon, who had ſpoken to her, to go to the bath of Aſpac (6), in the country of Liege; who paſſing to Meru, upon St Martin's day following, ſpoke to the ſaid conſtable, but to little purpoſe.’ We ſhall ſee below (7), that ſhe was blamed for having ruined all by the advice ſhe gave the king of Navarre.

[*B*] . . . . *and great intereſt.*] It is believed (8), that, had it not been for her intereſt, the duke of Bouillon would not have kept the government of Normandy, after the death of Henry II, as he did. But let us hear Brantome; he will tell us a great deal of this lady's intereſt. Having told the reaſons, why, in the reign of Francis I, the duke of Montpenſier had ſo little ſucceſs, with reſpect to his pretenſions to the eſtate of the conſtable Charles de Bourbon, he adds (9): ‘In king Henry's time, he enjoyed ſome part of it by means of Madam Jaquette de Long-Vic, of the family of Givry, deſcended from that of Chalon, and from the palatines of Burgundy. This lady, ducheſs of Montpenſier, in king Francis's reign, for reaſons and cauſes at that time talked of, the duke of Orleans ſerving her, what harm was there in all this? (Monſieur de Roſtain, who is ſtill alive, knows it well) had great credit at court; but ſhe could do nothing in this ſucceſſion for the reaſons I have given; beſides that ſhe was young, and at that time had not near ſo much wit as ſhe afterwards had. In king Henry's time, ſhe was in great favour; for ſhe grew more politic, and gained a great aſcendant over the queen. King Francis II came afterwards to the throne; and then too ſhe was in great power; for I have ſeen her manage ſo well the king and the queen, as twice with my own eyes to obſerve, that the king recommended the cauſe of the ſaid lady, who did all, and her huſband little, and ſollicited for her againſt his own intereſt. This was very common at court; inſomuch that once the cardinal of Lorrain, ſpeaking to the gentlemen

(*a*) Jacoba Lonviana in Thuan.

(1) Thuan. lib. xxviii, ad ann. 1561.

(2) La Place, de l'Etat. de la Relig. & Rep. livr. vi, fol. 215, verſo.

(3) Charles de Marillac.

(4) *See Thuanus, in the beginning of the twenty ſixth book, and the preſident de la Place,* ubi ſupra, fol. 100 verſo. *D'Aubigné,* livr. ii, chap. xxi, *is miſtaken in ſaying, that Marillac came himſelf to wait on the ducheſs.*

(5) La Place, ubi ſupra, fol. 101, verſo.

(6) *He ought to have ſaid of Spa.*

(7) *In the remark* [*I*].

(8) La Place, fol. 215.

(9) Brantome, Memoires, Tom. III, pag. 276.

youngeſt daughter to John de Longvic [*C*], lord of Givry, and was married, in 1538, to Lewis de Bourbon, the ſecond of the name, duke of Montpenſier (*b*). She was firſt favourite to Catherine de Medicis; and had ſhe been alive at the time, when this queen gave into intrigues, which had like to have ruined the kingdom, ſhe would perhaps have made her take better reſolutions (*c*). It is poſſible too, that her good counſels and addreſs might have had no effect on a ſoul of ſuch a temper, whoſe ambition was like a devouring fire. Be it how it will, ſhe died juſt before the breaking out of the great troubles on account of religion, the twenty-eighth of Auguſt 1561. She openly made appear, during a tedious ſickneſs, what her huſband had long ſuſpected of her; to wit, that ſhe was a Proteſtant [*D*]; and doubtleſs it was her private inſtructions, which ſowed in the ſoul of ſome of her daughters the ſeeds of reformation, which brought forth fruit ſome time after: for Frances de Bourbon, her eldeſt daughter, who was married, in 1558, to Henry Robert de la Marc, duke of Bouillon, openly profeſſed the Proteſtant religion, and the incredible pains her father took to reclaim her [*E*] produced no effect. Charlotte, this duke's fourth daughter, had been put into a convent, againſt her mother's opinion [*F*], who had a mind to marry her to the duke de Longueville. She was abbeſs of Jöüare; but as that kind of life did not comport with the inſtructions ſhe had received from her mother, nor perhaps with her own inclinations, ſhe eſcaped into Germany in 1572, where ſhe abjured Popery, and was married two years after to the prince of Orange. Of the three other daughters of Jaqueline de Longvic, and the duke of Montpenſier, two perſevered in

(*b*) *Father Anſelme*, Hiſt de la Maiſon Roiale, pag. 306.

(*c*) *See the remark* [*A*].

‘men of the robe in the name of the king, who had ſent for him to his palace of Cluny, when the king went to Orleans, recommended to them the right of the ſaid lady, (who was then preſent) even ſo far as to ſay, that the king would gratify her in that; that he renounced his part and right to that inheritance, and that he would have no part nor portion of it, and that they ſhould manage the matter as little to his intereſt as they could. In fine, this princeſs and prince, and their adherents, ſo laboured and ſollicited, and pleaded, that they have come in for a ſnack of every thing, except the duchy of Chaſtelleraut, which the former kings would never part with, but added to their own eſtate, which they ſince gave as a portion to their natural ſiſter legitimated, whom we have heard long called Madam de Chaſtelleraut, at preſent Madam d'Angouleſme.’

Upon this teſtimony I think I have a right to charge Father Anſelme with a falſhood, in ſaying (10), ‘that king Francis I. reſtored to the duke of Montpenſier a good part of the inheritance of the houſe of Bourbon, as the duchy of Chaſtelleraut, the county of Foreſts, and the barony of Beaujelois, and Dombes, and alſo the county of Montpenſier, which was afterwards made a duchy and peerdom, in 1538, to which was joined the dauphiny of Auvergne, with the lordſhip of Combraille, in the year 1543.’ Thuanus agrees incomparably better with Brantome, than with this father; for he affirms that Charles de Marillac wrote to the ducheſs, in 1560, that the time was come, in which ſhe was obliged to act againſt the houſe of Guiſe, ſince ſhe had recovered the country of Beaujolois and Dombes, and that ſhe had promiſed to act, provided right was done her husband as to the inheritance of the conſtable (11). It had been abſurd to talk to her in this manner, if the reſtitution had been made in Francis the firſt's time. I know not how we are to believe what Mr Varillas ſays (12), that the ducheſs fixed her husband in the intereſt of the Guiſes, who did not miſtruſt this duke, but ſuffered him to live at court, when they baniſhed thence the other princes of the blood, both becauſe they knew, he perfectly hated the Calviniſts, as alſo becauſe *all the world knew, that Jaqueline de Longvic, his wife, abſolutely governed him, and that this princeſs was ſo intimate with the queen mother, that ſhe would never do any thing, but what her majeſty pleaſed* (13). This was the place for this author to ſay what he has ſaid in the life of Charles IX, concerning this ducheſs's Huguenotiſm; but a man does not always know, when he writes one book, what he knows when he compoſes another, and hence come ſo many different hypotheſes of Mr Varillas.

[*C*] *She was youngeſt daughter of John de Longvic.*] Frances de Longvic, her elder ſiſter, was wife to admiral Chabot, and left ſome children (14). Father Anſelme therefore has very improperly ſaid, that Jaqueline was heireſs to John de Longvic. He gives the ſame title to Frances. The expreſſion would not be juſt, though their father's eſtate had been divided between them.

[*D*] *Her husband had ſuſpected . . . . . that ſhe was a Proteſtant.*] Let us ſee what the preſident de la Place ſays of it (15). ‘She deſired, that the duke de Longueville might marry her third daughter (16), deſigned by her father for a nun at Frontevault, to the great regret of the ſaid lady, as ſhe gave her huſband to underſtand in her laſt diſcourſes, diſcovering to him, what he had before ſuſpected, that ſhe was a Proteſtant, which ſhe had ſufficiently diſcovered during her ſaid illneſs, which was long, being at Fontainbleau, and the king at Rheims, in order to his coronation, where ſhe deſired a miniſter of the ſaid religion to confer with her about points of conſcience. Malo, being ſent to her, refuſed to adminiſter the ſacrament of the Lord's Supper to her, which ſhe deſired, foraſmuch as ſhe was alone, and had no body to communicate with her; arguing that this ſacrament was not inſtituted to be particularly adminiſtered, like baptiſm, but rather to be communicated to many of the faithful at once; with which, however, ſhe could not be contented, deſiring by any means to make declaration of the religion, in which ſhe reſolved to die.’ Thuanus (17) relates the ſame thing in ſubſtance. Mr Varillas (18) has purely and ſimply eſpouſed it: an evident ſign that he did not believe it was a Huguenot ſtory; for if he had he would have made a long parentheſis to tell us ſo.

[*E*] *Frances . . . . . her eldeſt daughter . . . . . Her father took incredible pains to reclaim her*] Among other things, he cauſed two doctors of the Sorbonne, and two miniſters, to diſpute before her, in July and Auguſt, 1566. This conference could not be held at Montpenſier houſe, becauſe this prince would oblige the miniſters not to pray to God before the action, which they would not conſent to. The conference therefore was broke off; but it was again agreed upon ſome time after, and executed at the houſe of the duke of Nevers. I ſpeak of it in another place (19). The two doctors were Simon Vigor; and Claude de Sainctes; the two miniſters were Spina and Sureau. They ſpent a great many words in replies, rejoinders, &c. and afterwards in printed accounts, in which each party aſcribed the victory to itſelf; but the ſucceſs of the miniſters was, that the ducheſs continued theirs, which was the prize of the conteſt. The contrary happened in the diſpute between the biſhop of Meaux, and Mr Claudé: Mademoiſelle de Duras adjudged the victory to the Catholic champion.

[*F*] *Charlotte . . . . . had been put in a convent, againſt her mother's opinion.*] This gives me an occaſion to touch upon a contradiction of Thuanus. He ſays in his twenty eighth book, that Jaqueline de Longvic was diſpleaſed at the cloiſtering of her daughter Charlotte, for two reaſons; one, that ſhe was deſigned for the duke de Longueville; the other, that ſhe had already ſhewn her repugnance to a religious life (20). In the fifty firſt book, he ſays, that ſhe bred her in the Proteſtant religion, but ſecretly, through fear of her husband;

---

(10) Hiſt. de la Maiſon Roiale, pag. 306.

(11) Mandatorum ſumma hæc erat, ut ipſa fidei datæ recordaretur, quamprimum bona mariti ex Caroli avunculi hæreditate à rege poſſeſſa recuperaſſet, daturam operam ut Guiſianorum conatus impedirentur, tempus veniſſe Belloiocenſibus ac Dumbaribus receptis quo fidem liberaret. *Thuan. lib. xxvi, init. La Place, fol.* 100, *ſays the ſame thing.*

(12) *In the argument to the twenty third book of the Hiſtory of Hereſy.*

(13) *Varillas.* livr xxiii, *of the Hiſtory of Hereſy,* pag. m. 134.

(14) Father Anſelme, Hiſt. des Offic. pag. 313.

(15) La Place, ubi ſupra, fol. 215, verſo.

(16) *This author did not know that they had five daughters.*

(17) Lib. xxviii, pag. m. 562.

(18) Hiſt de Charles IX, Tom. I, pag 61. *See the remarks of the article* SOUBISE (JOHN DE PARTHENAI).

(19) *Under the word* ROSIERS, *remark* [*B*].

(20) Frementе matre quæ Carlottam Longavillano duci uxorem deſtinaverat, & jam dum animadvertere ſibi videbatur ægre filiam in monaſticam vitam conſentire.

in the monaſtic life, to which they had been ſacrificed ; and one married the duke of Nevers's ſon (*d*) [*G*]. She had followed queen Elizabeth into Spain (*e*), who loved her entirely [*H*]. If Jaqueline had converted her huſband, ſhe had ſaved a great deal of Proteſtant blood, and a great deal of miſery to ſome of her own ſex ; for he uſed them with the utmoſt ſeverity, as we may read in Brantome (*f*). Their ſon, though a good Catholic, did not follow the leaguers. Had this lady only procured to France, a chancellor of ſo much merit, as Michael de l'Hoſpital [*I*], her memory ought to be bleſſed for it ; for it was not poſſible to make choice of a better ſubject than he, and no body could have ſo well ſupported the monarchy in ſo dangerous a conjuncture. The wiſdom and conſtancy of his counſels would have been the arm of Hector (*g*), to have maintained the public repoſe, if the deſtinies, more powerful than all the induſtry of man, had not permitted a froward generation to baffle all his deſigns, and oblige him at laſt to retire.

(*d*) Anſelme, ubi ſupra.

(*e*) Thuan. lib. xxviii. La Place, Etat. de la Relig. & Republ. livr. vi.

(*f*) Diſcours du Duc de Montpenſier, au Tom. III, de ſes Memoires. *See the article* BABELOT, *remark* [C].

(*g*) Si Pergama dextra Defendi poſſent, etiam hac defenſa fuiſſent.
Had not the gods determin'd to deſtroy,
This hand had ſav'd the threat'n'd walls of Troy.
Virgil. Æneid. lib. ii, ver. 291.

husband ; and that afterwards this Charlotte, being ſcarce a year old, was put into the convent of Joüare ; *Vix annicula in Jovarienſe Monaſterium conjecta.* If ſhe was but one year old, what has been ſaid of her inſtruction, and the marks of her repugnance, is falſe and impoſſible. Doubtleſs this Hiſtorian muſt have had ſome diſtraction of thought, which was not common to him, or what is more probable, he muſt have underſtood by *annicula* an age more advanced than one year. But can we find good authorities for this ſenſe of the word ?

[G] *One of her daughters married the duke of Nevers's ſon.*] He was called the count d'Eu. I do not find at what time he married ; but I diſtruſt Father Anſelme, who ſays (21), 'That Anne de Bourbon 'was married by contract the ſixth of September, 1561, 'to Francis (22) de Cleves the ſecond of the name, duke 'of Nevers, and that ſhe died without children, 'in 1572.' For what probability is there, that this princeſs was married eight or nine days after her mother's death ? I inſiſt not on what the preſident de la Place ſays (23), that the duke de Nivernois died a little after the marriage of Henry de Cleves, his ſon, with Anne de Bourbon ; from whence we muſt conclude, that this marriage preceded the death of the ducheſs of Montpenſier, if we did not take notice, that they who fix the duke of Nevers's death to the thirteenth of February 1561, followed the cuſtom, which was not aboliſhed at that time, of beginning the year at Eaſter (24). Now upon that foot it is plain, the duke died after Jaqueline de Longvic, and ſo the preſident de la Place does not contradict Father Anſelme. I had rather depend upon Brantome, who ſays, that the count d'Eu went into Spain to marry the princeſs Anne. 'He was, *ſays he* (25), in my opinion, the 'fineſt prince I ever ſaw, and the moſt affable and 'amiable ; we reckoned him ſo amongſt us, and when 'he went into Spain (26), to marry Madam, his wife, 'daughter to the duke of Montpenſier, he was there 'alſo as much eſteemed, both by the court, and all 'the country.' Whom ſhall we believe, Brantome, who ſays the princeſs was married in Spain, or Thuanus, and the preſident de la Place, who ſay, the former, that after her return from Spain, ſhe married Henry duke of Cleves ; the latter, that the ducheſs her mother recalled her from Spain, to marry her to this Henry ? Thuanus, who obſerves, that ſhe died a little after her marriage, might have ſaid as much of her husband, who was killed at the battle of Dreux by the going off of a piſtol of the duke of Guiſe's cornet. This is what Brantome ſays of it ; but d'Aubigné (27) tells it otherwiſe, and gives us to underſtand, that this young duke of Nevers had the knowledge of the truth. It is probably for that reaſon, that Jaqueline de Longvic was willing he ſhould marry her daughter. Beza ſpeaks of the death and religion of this duke ſomewhat at large (28) ; and obſerving, that the marquis of Iſles, his brother, and the marchioneſs, his wife, aſſiſted at the exerciſe of piety with him, and received the ſacrament all together on Eaſter-day the twenty ninth of March 1562 (29) ; obſerving this, I ſay, without ſaying a word of the ducheſs, we might conclude, that ſhe died a little after her marriage, as Thuanus has advanced, did we not ſee two authors againſt him ; one is Father Anſelme, affirming that this lady died in 1572 ; the other is Brantome, who ſpeaks of her as *the widow of the count d'Eu, afterwards duke of Nevers* (30), when he gives the liſt of the ladies of Catherine de Medicis's court.

(21) Ubi ſupra.

(22) The preſident de la Place and Thuanus call him Henry.

(23) Ubi ſupra.

(24) Mr le Laboureur is of this number, *Tom. II, pag.* 106, *of his Additions to Caſtelnau.* But Theodore Beza, *lib. v, pag* 749, expreſsly obſerves, that this duke died the fourteenth of February, 1562, computing the year from January.

(25) Apud le Laboureur, ibid.

(26) *In* 1561. Id. ibid pag. 107.

(27) Tom. I, pag. 237.

(28) Hiſt. Eccl. lib. vi, pag. 241.

(29) Idem, lib. v, pag. 748, 749.

[*H*] *Queen Elizabeth . . . . . loved her intirely.*] Brantome informs me (31), 'that this daughter to the 'duke de Montpenſier, a moſt prudent, moſt virtuous, 'and fine princeſs, and reckoned for ſuch in France and 'Spain, *had been* bred ſome time *in* Spain with queen 'Elizabeth of France, and had the place of her cup-'bearer, the queen being ſerved by her ladies and maids 'of honour, and each having a place.' This queen gave her a diamond worth between 1500 and 2000 crowns. A miſtreſs of count d'Eu, declaring a great deſire to have that ring, as ſhe ſaw it on the count's finger, eaſily obtained it, and wore it always for his ſake. The counteſs, whom her husband had made believe he had loſt or pawned his diamond, ſaw it in *the hands of this gentlewoman, whom ſhe knew to be her husband's miſtreſs, and turned her head aſide, and never ſaid a word of it to either of them.* Brantome has reaſon to praiſe her for it ; but what an inſtance of corruption is here ! This count lived but a ſhort time after his marriage, and yet was unfaithful to his wiſe.

[*I*] *She procured to France the chancellor . . . . de l'Hoſpital.*] Thuanus (32) acquaints us with that particular, after this manner : 'Id autem factum Jacobæ 'Lonvianæ Montpenſerii uxoris commendatione quæ 'in Catharinæ amicitia præcipuè florebat, excelſo in'genio mulier, & quæ creſcentem Guiſianorum po'tentiam ſuſpectam habebat. Illa Catharinam Guiſia'norum violentiam jam expertam proprio metu incen'debat, & ad imperium anhelanti certiſſimam viam 'oſtendebat, ſi aliquem deligeret cujus ſalutaribus 'monitis eorum perniciosa conſilia revinceret. —— '*That was done at the recommendation of Jaqueline de 'Longvic, who was chief favourite of Catherine de Me'dicis, a woman of a great genius, and who ſuſpected 'the encreaſing power of the Guiſes. This lady inſpired 'Catherine, who had already experienced the violence 'of the Guiſes, with her own fears, and ſhewed her the 'moſt infallible way to empire, if ſhe made choice of 'ſome perſon, by whoſe prudent counſels ſhe might tra'verſe their pernicious deſigns.*' See an ample paraphraſe of this Latin in Varillas's Life of Francis II (33), where we find alſo (34) how this ducheſs of Montpenſier contributed to ſave the prince of Condé's Life in the ſame reign. This hiſtorian is not ſo favourable to her, in Charles the ninth's Life. He makes her the cauſe of the king of Navarre's renouncing the regency, in favour of the queen-mother. 'The perſuaſions, '*ſays he* (35), of the ducheſs of Montpenſier, who 'was called the Siren, carried it above the remon'ſtrances of the Montmorenci's, the Chatillon's, the 'Calviniſts, and the moſt zealous Catholics . . . The 'eaſineſs of this prince was the cauſe or occaſion of 'all the miſeries that France ſo long groaned under.' But ſince he confeſſes, that the conſtable and the admiral, 'inſtead of diſſuading him from ſo ſcandalous an ac'quieſcence, confirmed him in it for this ſole reaſon '(36), that his inconſtancy would too much perplex 'them, and that they could more eaſily manage the 'queen, after having obliged her by a benefit ſo 'conſiderable, as was that of inducing the firſt 'prince of the blood to give up the regency to her,' there is not ſo much reaſon to exclaim againſt the negotiation of this ducheſs. Thuanus does not blame her (37).

(30) Brantome, Diſcours de Catherine de Medicis, *in the volume of* Dames Illuſtres.

(31) Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. 396.

(32) Lib. xxiv, ſub fin.

(33) Pag. 195, &c. Edit. Holl. *See alſo* pag. 264.

(34) Pag. 295.

(35) Tom. I, pag. 9, ad ann. 1560. *He cites the negotiation of the ducheſs of Montpenſier with the king of Navarre.*

(36) *Stolen from* Theod. Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. iv, pag. 406.

(37) Lib. xxv, pag. 525.

LONGUS, a Greek ſophiſt, author of a book intituled Ποιμενικὰ, that is to ſay, Paſtorals [*A*], which is a romance upon the amours of Daphnis and Chloe. Mr Huet (*a*) biſhop of Avranches, who was a great judge in moſt things, has ſpoken well enough of this book; but he obſerves ſeveral faults in it, the greateſt of which doubtleſs conſiſts, in the obſcenities that are found in it [*B*]. This is ſtill more remote from the politeneſs of our romances, than the conduct of Longus's ſhepherdeſs; ſhe loves too haſtily, and grants her kiſſes too ſoon [*C*]. Longus is thought to have introduced that ſilly idea of gallantry

[*A*] *He is author of a book, intituled* Ποιμενικὰ, *i. e.* Paſtorals.] The word *Paſtoralia*, which Mr Moreri read in Voſſius, made him think this book was in verſe; *Longus*, ſays he, *left four books of paſtoral verſe, or eclogues, which Godfrey Jungerman has tranſlated into Latin, with his notes upon them, and has dedicated this work to his couſin Lewis Camerarius.* Longus's paſtorals are in proſe: the Latin tranſlator's name is Godfrey Jungerman; and it was needleſs to obſerve, that he dedicated this book to Lewis Camerarius, his couſin. Voſſius, from whom Moreri has taken this particular, had reaſons for this clauſe in his book, taken from the time and place in which he writ; for this Mr Camerarius was well known in Holland, where he had been embaſſador from the king of Sweden: which Voſſius did not fail to add (1). Moreri, who had not the ſame reaſons, ought to have omitted that particular, or at leaſt have ſaid all that Voſſius did. Thus he would have given occaſion to his readers to form ſome idea of the perſon, to whom the tranſlation of Longus was dedicated. Greater men than Moreri have thought, that the paſtorals I ſpeak of were in verſe. Malincrotius was under this miſtake (2), as Mr Konig obſerves (3), who for his own part was ignorant, that before Jungerman's edition, (he calls him Jugerman) theſe paſtorals had appeared in Latin.

[*B*] . . . . . *the greateſt fault of which conſiſts in the obſcenities that are found in it.*] I believe it was on this account that Mr Huet did not finiſh the Latin tranſlation; for he tells us, that he began it in his youth, before he perfectly knew the character of the book, how much the reading it might corrupt young men, and how unfit it was for old. ‘Quum puer eſſem, hunc ‘autorem Latine interpretandum ſuſcepi, cum nondum ‘ſatis haberem exploratum, quid in eo laudabile eſſet, ‘quid vitioſum; & quantum ejus lectio pueritiæ dam‘noſa ſit, quam parum etiam ætati provectiori decora ‘(4).’ This reaſon hindered not a profeſſor of Franeker from tranſlating this romance, and publiſhing it with learned notes in 1660. He was apprehenſive of the cenſure of ſome, whoſe auſtere and moroſe humour cannot bear that any one ſhould publiſh adventures of a bad example. Obſerve how he is beforehand with them. His words deſerve relating, becauſe there are ſeveral authors, whoſe virtue and prudence might be conteſted, did we not oppoſe this buckler of Longus's tranſlator to the ſurly and malignant criticiſm of theſe pretended Cato's. ‘Dicam hic quod ſentio, *ſays he* (5), ‘Non feram judices noſtra in causâ, *Caperatâ fronte* ‘*Catones*, qui ſine dubio me altum ſtertere, aut cucur‘bitas pingere mallent, quàm tanto conatu, tam imma‘nes nugas agere, vitioque fortaſſe mihi vertent, quod ‘logos hoſce amatorios (quid enim quæſo eſt, quod ‘non vellicare malignitas poſſit?) haud tamen illepi‘dos, nec inficetos, latine converſos, grandior ætate, ‘*καὶ γεγονὼς μὲν ἡλικίας ἤδη πρόσω*, in lucem ‘edere ſategerim. O formidabilem cenſorum ſeverita‘tem! Quorum cenſura actum erit de Homero, ho‘mine ab ipſis gratiis ficto, venereos amores, adulte‘ria, inceſta, ſcelera prolixè deſcribente: quem tamen ‘Alexander tanti fecit, ut ſuo pulvillo noctibus ſingulis ‘ſubdiderit: Actum de Ariſtophane, quem nihilominus ‘Johannes ille Antiochenus, ſummorum Theologorum ‘lumen, qui propter aureum eloquentiæ flumen, Chry‘ſoſtomi cognomen obtinuet, nocturna diurnaque ver‘ſaſſe manu, à viris fide dignis memoriæ proditum eſt. ‘Nullum equidem poetarum invenias, quin multa mul‘torum ſcelera neſaria narret, non quidem ad bonos ‘labefactandos, corrumpendoſque mores; ſed potius ad ‘eoſdem emendandos, atque flagitia illa deteſtanda, a‘bominanda. Multo minus vitilitigatores, (quorum ‘ſeges in hoc ſeculo denſa eſt) homines, ut Plinius ait, ‘ad venena natos, qui nullum aliud abominati ſpiritus ‘præmium novere, quam odiſſe omnia: At potius re‘rum humanarum æquos mihi æſtimatores exopto. — ‘*I will here ſpeak what I think. I will not be judg‘ed by thoſe rigid cenſors, who, no doubt, had rather I* ‘*were faſt aſleep, or employed in the moſt trifling man‘ner, than that I ſhould take ſo much pains to play the* ‘*fool; and who will perhaps cenſure me (for what can‘not ill-nature find fault with?) for tranſlating into* ‘*Latin, and publiſhing, at my advanced age, theſe amo‘rous pieces, which yet they allow to be elegant and* ‘*witty. O the formidable ſeverity of theſe cenſors!* ‘*Even Homer muſt fall before them, a writer formed* ‘*by the Graces themſelves, but who deſcribes, at length,* ‘*intrigues, adulteries, inceſts, and baſe actions: whom* ‘*yet Alexander ſo eſteemed, that he laid his works every* ‘*night under his pillow. Nor can Ariſtophanes eſcape,* ‘*whom nevertheleſs Johannes Antiochenus, one of the* ‘*greateſt Divines, who, by the golden flow of his elo‘quence, obtained the ſirname of Chryſoſtom, was perpe‘tually converſant with, as credible authors relate.* ‘*You will find no Poet, who does not relate many in‘famous actions, not with the view of corrupting good* ‘*manners, but rather to amend them, and excite an* ‘*abhorrenee of ſuch actions. Much leſs will I be judg‘ed by cavillers, (of which there is a plentiful crop in* ‘*the preſent age) men, as Pliny ſays, born to poiſon,* ‘*who knew no other reward of an abominable diſpoſi‘tion, than to hate every thing. I rather chuſe to be* ‘*tried by impartial judges of human affairs.*’ This commentator ſaw himſelf indiſpenſibly obliged to touch upon Longus's impurities; but he did it with ſhewing his averſion to them. What could he do more? ‘O‘pus alioqui tam obſcenum eſt, (*as Mr Huet ſays*) (6), ‘ut qui ſine rubore legat eum Cynicum eſſe neceſſe ſit. ‘*A work otherwiſe ſo obſcene, that he, who can read it* ‘*without bluſhing, muſt neceſſarily be a Cynic.*’ This *otherwiſe* refers to a great fault he had before obſerved; *viz.* that Longus begins his book with the birth of his ſhepherd and ſhepherdeſs, and continues it to their marriages, their children, and old age (7), which is tranſgreſſing the rules of this kind of writing. They ought to wind up on the wedding-day, and ſay nothing of the conſequences of marriage. The heroine of a romance, with a big-belly, or lying-in, is a ſtrange image.

[*C*] *Longus's ſhepherdeſs grants her kiſſes too ſoon.*] You do not read above five or ſix pages, before you find Daphnis raviſhed with the pleaſure of a kiſs from his ſhepherdeſs. Τοῦτο φίλημα καινὸν, ſays he, ἐκπηδᾷ μου τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐξάλλεται ἡ καρδία, τήκεται ἡ ψυχὴ, καὶ ὅμως πάλιν φιλῆσαι θέλω, Hocce oſculum admirabile eſt; quippe ſpiritus meus exultat, cor exilit, anima liqueſcit: attamen iterum ſuaviari cudio (8). —— *This kiſs is admirable; for my ſpirit leaps up, my heart dances, my ſoul melts: yet I deſire to kiſs again.* A chaſm, in the ſame page, does not hinder our underſtanding the circumſtances of this kiſs. A little after, we find him handling his ſhepherdeſs's breaſts (9), without any coineſs on her ſide. This poor girl, ſeeing him ſtark naked melts with deſire: ſhe ſaw nothing but what was amiable in him; ſhe was ſo little ſtartled at this object, that ſhe boldly approached it, and having kiſſed her ſhepherd, helped him on with his cloaths. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ γυμνὸν ὁρῶσα Δάφνιν, ἐπανθοῦν ἐνέπιπτε τὸ κάλλος, καὶ ἐτήκετο, μηδὲν αὐτοῦ μέρος μέμψασθαι δυναμένη . . . . ἡ δὲ, τὴν ἐσθῆτα αὐτοῦ λουομένου καὶ γυμνωθέντος ἐνεδύετο, πρότερον καὶ αὐτὴ φιλήσασα. *Illa enim nudum conſpicata Daphnidem, effloreſcentem in ejus pulchritudinem incidit, atque contabuit, cum nullam ejus partem vilipendere poſſet* (10) . . . . *At illa viciſſim, dato oſculo, veſtem illius, jam loti atque denudati, induebat* (11). Theſe things would be monſtrous in the romances of our times. People will not forgive the marquis d'Urfé, the little favours he makes Celadon obtain. The pleaſure he procures him of ſeeing Aſtrea naked, is charged on him as an unpardonable crime. Here are the words of the accuſation, in which Aſtrea ſpeaks. ‘It is you, *ſays ſhe* (12), caſting her eyes upon ‘d'Urfé; it is you that are the author of the injury ‘I complain of; your raſh pen has made blots in my

---

(*a*) De l'Origine des Romans, pag. 65, 66. Edit. Latinæ.

(1) Operam ſuam dicavit conſobrino ſuo Ludovico Camerario tum Electori Palatino à Conſiliis, poſtea ſereniſſimi Sueciæ Regis Legato ad Fœderatos Belgas. *Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Græcis*, pag. 517.

(2) Longus Sophiſta ſcripſit Heroico carmine de amoribus Daphnidis & Chloes libris quatuor. - - *Longus, the Sophiſt, wrote in heroic verſe of the Loves of Daphnis and Chloe, in four books* Mallincr. Parallipomen de Hiſt. Græc. pag. 39.

(3) Bibliothec. pag. 480.

(4) Petrus Daniel Huetius, de Orig. Fabularum Romanenſium, interprete Guliel. Pyrrhone, pag. 67.

(5) Petrus Moll. Snecanus, J. U. D. & Gr. linguæ Profeſſor ordinarius in Acad. Franekerana, Epiſtola Dedicat. Longi Paſtoralium.

(6) Huet, ubi ſupra.

(7) Pejus etiam vitium eſt perverſa & præpoſtera operis œconomia. A paſtorum cunabulis inepte orditur, & vix in eorum nuptiis deſinit: ad eorum uſque liberos, imo & ſenectutem ſua narratione progreditur. *Id. ibid.*

(8) Longus, lib. i, pag. 12. Edit. Franeker in 4to.

(9) Καθῆκεν αὐτῆς εἰς τὰ στέρνα τὰς χεῖρας. Manu ſua pectori illius admota. *Ibid.* pag. 21.

(10) Ibid. pag. 18.

(11) Ibid. pag. 19.

(12) Parnaſſe Reformé, pag. 136. Edit Holl. *See*, ib. pag 187, *article* 18, *of the edict of Apollo.*

gallantry, which we meet with in ſome Romances: the ſhepherdeſs fills out drink, drinks a little firſt, and afterwards preſents the glaſs to the ſhepherd, in ſuch a manner, that he muſt apply his lips preciſely to the part, where ſhe had applied her's [*D*]. None of the antients mention Longus, which is the reaſon why we cannot tell when he lived. We have ſeveral editions and ſeveral tranſlations of his work [*E*].

ſtory, which wound me in the tendereſt part. I do not pretend to be more nice than others, *continues ſhe*; I excuſe amorous tranſports, when proceeding from a pure paſſion; a kiſs genteely ſnatched, never ſhocked my modeſty, and I know there are little privacies, which love inſpires, and reaſon does not condemn. But when I conſider, that I am one of the three ſhepherdeſſes, which you preſent ſtark naked before Celadon, with what face can I behold an adventure ſo injurious to my honour? And ought I not to believe, that you have an ill opinion of my virtue, or elſe took me for a ſlave, which you meant to ſell to this ſhepherd? I believe, without flattery to my beauty, that my face alone was ſufficient to make a conqueſt: there was fire enough in my eyes to melt a ſtubborn heart, and I can without vanity ſay, that my nakedneſs was not eſſentially neceſſary to my victory.’ This is too common a fault in the Greek romances (13). The women make the firſt advances, and the men are too reſerved. Mr Huet acknowledges, that this conduct of the men is commendable, according to the rules of morality; but juſtly maintains, that it is abſurd according to the law of romance. *Prior amat Hyſmina*, ſays he (14), ſpeaking of Euſtathius's book, where the hero anſwers nothing to a declaration of love made by his heroine: *Prior amorem & fatetur & offert ſine modeſtiâ, ſine pudore, ſine arte: Atque his blanditiis neque monetur Hyſminias, neque reſpondet. Laudabile id quidem eſt, ſi ad leges Moralis Philoſophiæ; ineptum ſi ad Romanenſia præcepta exigatur.* See, above (15), Theagines rallied for giving Chariclea a box on the ear, becauſe ſhe would kiſs him. We may ſay, that Madam de Scuderi is the firſt, who delivered romance from an œconomy, injurious to her ſex, and to decorum in general. She feared ſhe might be taxed with innovating, in giving her heroines a deal of modeſty, and her heroes the ſofteſt paſſions; and therefore thought herſelf obliged to give the reaſons of her conduct, in the preface to her Ibrahim, which is the firſt of her romances; theſe are her words (16): ‘You will ſee here, reader, if I miſtake not, the decorum of things and conditions exactly enough obſerved; for I have put nothing in my book, but what the ladies may read, without looking down and bluſhing. If you do not find my hero perſecuted by women, diſtractedly in love with him, it is not that he is leſs amiable or unworthy of their love, but it is that I might not treſpaſs againſt decency in the character of the ladies, and againſt probability in that of the gentlemen, who rarely act the cruel part, and cannot act it with a good grace. In fine, whether things ought to be thus, or whether I have judged of my hero by my own weakneſs; I was not willing to put his fidelity to that dangerous trial, and have contented myſelf not to make him an Hylas, without making him an Hippolytus.’

[*D*] *The ſhepherd applies his lips preciſely to the place, where the ſhepherdeſs had applied her's.*] Mr Huet's tranſlator explains this after the following manner (17). ‘Ab hoc (Longo) (18) Euſtathius ſumſiſſe videtur hoc elegans urbanitatis genus, quâ Hyſminam pocula miniſtrantem induxit, & qua parte poculi labra delibans labris ſuis ipſa tetigerat, eadem Hyſminiæ bibituro tangenda leniter offerentem. —— *Euſtathius ſeems to have taken from this Longus that politeneſs, with which he introduces Hyſmina ſerving the cup, and offering Hyſminias, who is about to drink, that ſide of the cup, which ſhe had juſt touched with her own lips.*’ Euſtathius might have traced this fine gallantry higher; for we find it in Lucian. This ſcoffer introduces Juno, reproaching Jupiter with drinking Ganymede's leavings, and applying his mouth preciſely to that part, which Ganymede touched with his. Ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ ἀπογευσάμενος μόνον, ἔδωκας ἐκείνῳ. καὶ πιόντος ἀπολαβὼν τὴν κύλικα, ὅσον ὑπόλοιπον ἐν αὐτῇ, πίνεις, ὅθην καὶ αὐτὸς ἔπιε, καὶ ἔνθα προσήρμοσε τὰ χείλη ἵνα καὶ πίνῃς ἅμα, καὶ φιλῇς. *Interdum autem ubi ſolum deguſtaſti, porrigis ipſi: deinde ipſo bibente calicem arripis, & quantum in ipſo reſtat, ebibis, qua parte ipſe bibit, & ubi labia applicuit, ut & bibas ſimul, & oſculeris* (19).

In Ovid's time, the ladies did not preſent the glaſs, out of which they had drank, but the galant endeavoured to take it from them, and applied his lips to the ſame place where they had applied theirs. It is a precept of Ovid.

Fac primus rapias illius tacta labellis
Pocula, quaque bibet parte puella bibas (20).

Be firſt to ſnatch the goblet from her lip,
And drink yourſelf, where you beheld her ſip.

I believe this is ſtill the faſhion in ſome countries. Moliere introduces the practice of it in one of the ſcenes of his *Etourdi* (*Blunderer*) (21).

St Jerome, deſcribing the impertinencies of lovers, ſays nothing of this; but he comes pretty near it; for he ſpeaks of eatables, which were preſented after they had been taſted (22); ‘Crebra munuſcula & ſudariola, & faſciolas, & veſtes ori applicitas, & oblatos & DEGUSTATOS cibos, blandaſque & dulces literulas ſanctus amor non habet. Mel meum, lumen meum, meum deſiderium, omnes delicias, & lepores & riſu dignas urbanitates, & cæteras ineptias amatorum in comœdiis erubſcimus. —— *Divine love has nothing to do with frequent preſents, handkerchiefs, garters, and garments kiſſed by the lover; with food offered, and* firſt taſted; *or with Billet-doux. We are aſhamed of* my honey, my light, my deſire, *and all the delicacies, the repartees, and ridiculous politeneſs, and other fooleries of lovers in comedies.*’ He ſays in another place (23), ‘ſpectabis aliena oſcula & PRAEGUSTATOS cibos, —— *You will ſee another's kiſſes, and food* firſt taſted.’ Here is the precept of Ovid.

Et quodcunque cibi digitis libaverit illa,
Tu pete: dumque petes, ſit tibi tacta manus (24).

Whate'er ſhe touches with her fingers, eat;
And bruſh her hand in reaching to the meat.

[*E*] *There are ſeveral editions, and ſeveral tranſlations of his work.*] This romance, tranſlated into French by Amiot, was printed at Paris in 1559. Laurence Gambara made a verſion of it, or rather a paraphraſe in Latin verſe, which is much blamed by Voſſius (25). He obſerves, that Gambara not only changes, adds, and retrenches, ſeveral things, but alſo frequently miſtakes Longus's meaning. Godfrey Jungerman's verſion in proſe is incomparably better. It was printed at Hanau with the Greek text, and notes, in 1605. There had been before this a verſion of it at Heidelberg, in 1601 (26); and before that, the work had been printed only in Greek at Florence, by Philip Juncta, in 1598, from the manuſcript of Lewis Alamanni's library, with Raphael Columbanus's notes. There is mentioned an 8vo edition, of it in Greek and Latin, by the Commelins in 1606. I have ſaid ſomething above (27), of the Franeker edition. I cannot comprehend what induced Voſſius to ſay, that Gambara had tranſlated Longus 170 years ago; for it would from thence follow, that it was of above two hundred years ſtanding now (28); and yet Thuanus places Gambara's death in the year 1586 (29). It is true he makes him ninety years of age; but it is ſo much the more impoſſible to adjuſt Voſſius's reckoning by this, as it is certain, that Gambara ſet about this work in his old age (30), and whilſt cardinal de Granvelle, to whom he had dedicated it, was viceroy of of Naples. Mr Teiſſier (31) does not mention Longus's tranſlation in the catalogue of Gambara's works.

---

(13) Compare what has been ſaid in the remark [*C*] of the article HYPSIPYLE.

(14) Huet. ubi ſupra, pag. 62.

(15) In the article HELIODORUS remark [*C*].

(16) Preface to Ibrahim Baſſa, *fol. iiii.* Note, that it is not ſhe, but Mr de Scuderi, her brother, who ſpeaks.

(17) Huet. ubi ſupra, pag. 64.

(18) Vide Longi Paſtoralia, lib. iii, pag. 75. Edit. Franeker.

(19) Lucianus, in Dialogo Deorum, pag. m. 129, Tom. I.

(20) Ovid. de Arte Amat. lib. i, ver. 575.

(21) *The fourth ſcene of the fourth act.*

(22) Hieronym. Epiſt. ii, ad Nepotian. pag. m. 213.

(23) Id. Epiſt. xlvii.

(24) Ovidius, ubi ſupra, ver. 577.

(25) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Græcis, pag 517.

(26) I ſay this on the credit of the Oxford Catalogue, where you find at the end of the 307th page, *& Gr. Lat. Heid.* 1601, 8*vo*.

(27) In the remark [*B*].

(28) I write this in 1694.

(29) Thuan. lib. lxxxiv, pag. 76.

(30) Obſtat Ingenium tenue, & jam feſſo in corpore vires. Ob longam ætatem invalidæ.

(31) Eloges taken from Thuanus, Tom. II, pag. 45.

LORME (Philibert de) one of the beſt architects of France, in the XVIth century, was a native of Lyons. He was almoner in ordinary to Henry II, and to Charles IX *(a)*, and abbot of St Eloi of Noion *(b)*; and of the ſaints Sergius and Bacchus of Angers (α). Thus his abbies are called *(c)*, by Antony Mizaldus, in the epiſtle dedicatory of the *Nova & mira artificia comparandorum fructuum*, dated at Paris the firſt of November 1564. He is called abbot of Livry in Ronſard's life, and it is added, that he had a quarrel with this great Poet [*A*], in which Catherine de Medicis ſaid he was to blame. He publiſhed ſeveral books of Architecture, the titles whereof you may ſee in la Croix du Maine.

[*a*] Du Verdier Vau Privas, Biblioth. Franç. pag. 949.

[*b*] And not near Noion, as is ſaid in Moreri, after la Croix du Maine.

[*c*] Ornatiſſimo viro ac Domino, D Philiberto ab Ulmo, S Eligii Noviom. & SS Sergii, & Bacchi Andegav Abbati.

[(§α) Du Chêne has, by miſtake, called this abbey St Serge; which, by the way, is without the walls of Angers *. The abbot Châtelain, in his *Vocabulaire Hagiologique*, ſays *St Sierge* and *St Bacq*; which is right. Rem. Crit.]

* Du Chêne, Antiq. des Villes de France, *&c.* chap. i, *of thoſe of Anjou.*

[*A*] *He had a quarrel with Ronſard,*] This Poet made a ſatire ‘ called *la Truelle croſſee, The trowel croſiered*, in which he blamed the king for giving benefices to Maſons and other mean perſons, in which he particularly taxes one de Lorme, architect of the Tuilleries, who had obtained the abbey of Livry, and of whom we have a tolerable book of Architecture. And it will not be unſeaſonable to obſerve here the malevolence of this abbot, who, to revenge himſelf, one day, cauſed the gate of the Tuilleries to be ſhut againſt Ronſard, who followed the queen mother; but Ronſard, who was ſatirical and biting when he pleaſed, immediately wrote with a pencil upon the door, which the Sieur de Sarlan cauſed preſently to be opened, theſe words in capital letters. FORT. REVERENT. HABE. The queen returning and ſeeing this writing, in the company of learned men, and of the abbot de Livri himſelf, would know what was the meaning of it. Ronſard, after de Lorme had complained, that this inſcription reflected on him, gave the interpretation; he owned, that by a harmleſs irony, he had made that inſcription for him, reading it in French *, but that it agreed better to him reading it in Latin; they being the firſt words curtailed of a Latin epigram of Auſonius, which begins *Fortunam reverenter habe*, cautioning him, by it, to look back to his firſt and vile fortune, and not ſhut the door againſt the muſes. The queen aſſiſted Ronſard in his revenge; for ſhe ſharply reprimanded the abbot de Livri, after ſome laughter, ſaying aloud, that the Tuilleries were dedicated to the muſes (1).’ Du Peyrat relates this ſtory, and adds a preamble to it, much to the prejudice of our de Lorme, and which perhaps is not well grounded; for the author of Ronſard's life has not made the like reflexion, though it might have ſerved as a farther juſtification to Ronſard. However, theſe are du Peyrat's words: ‘ as the modeſty of this chaplain to William the conqueror, king of England, procured him the honour of the biſhopric of Mans, and the praiſe of every body; the inſolence, on the contrary, and the pride of an eccleſiaſtic of the chapel of the queen-mother, Catherine de Medicis, expoſed him to the laughter of the court, and of this great princeſs: he was called Philebert de Lorme, who, having by his miſtreſs's favour obtained the abbey of Livri, utterly forgot his former condition; and his arrogance occaſioned the great Ronſard, the French Homer, to write a ſatire againſt him, called *la Truelle croſſée* (2). - - - *The trowel croſiered.* He gives the two verſes of Auſonius, whereof we have only the three firſt words in Ronſard's life. See the margin (3).

[*Fort reverend Abbé - - - *Moſt reverend Abbot.*]

(1) Binet's Life of Ronſard, pag. m. 144.

(2) Du Peyrat, Antiquitez de la Chapelle du Roi, pag. 204.

(3) Fortunam reverenter habe, quicunque repente Dives, ab exili progrediere loco. *Auſon.*

LORME (N. de) one of the moſt famous Phyſicians of France, towards the end of the XVIth century, and the beginning of the XVIIth, was of Moulins in the Bourbonnois. He was firſt Phyſician to queen Mary de Medicis, and after he had long followed the court, retired to Moulins on account of his old age, and there quietly enjoyed the glory he had acquired [*A*]. I do not know the time of his death, and I might have made this article longer, if Mr Patin had publiſhed the book he deſigned [*B*]. Our de Lorme left a ſon, whoſe reputation did not fall ſhort of his father's, in the profeſſion of Phyſic. He practiſed in Paris with great ſucceſs [*C*], and beſides did great honour to his art by his own long life. Being loaden with years, he ſtill found himſelf vigorous

[*A*] *He retired to Moulins, on account of his age, where he quietly enjoyed the glory he had acquired.*] The letter, which the Sieur Bachot writ to him, and publiſhed before his book of Vulgar Errors (1), contains as follows. ‘ If you like it, thoſe muſt be very nice, who will not like it; ſince our kings, queens, princes, and princeſſes of France and Lorrain, have for ſo long time had, and ſtill have, ſuch an eſteem for you, and your merit, that nothing had been able to withdraw you from their ordinary ſervice, but an inability to follow the court, which your great and happy old age, ſtill more loaden with honours than years, has brought you to. When you retired ſatisfied, and as it were ſatiated, with ſo many honours to your own houſe, and native country, every one ſaw the honour, which our moſt auguſt king Lewis the Juſt did you, in his victorious return from Languedoc in December 1622, together with the queen his mother, by taking their lodgings with you in the beginning of the year 1623, as a teſtimony of their benevolence.’

[*B*] *I could have made this article longer, if Mr Patin had publiſhed the book he deſigned.*] He would have inſerted in it the elogy of the Phyſician, who is the ſubject of this article. ‘ I formerly collected ſeveral memoirs for compoſing the Latin elogies of the French, who have been famous in their reſpective ſciences, in imitation of Scævola Sammarthanus, upon which I deſigned to work next winter evenings; but the great number of my patients make me fearful; for which reaſon I dare not give an abſolute promiſe. You would oblige me, if you would deſire Mr de Lorme, that he would be pleaſed to ſend me ſome memoirs concerning his father, whom I know to have been a great man, and of whom I have ſomething material, which I will boldly inſert, concerning the diſtemper of Mary de Medicis, in which Mr du Laurence diſapproved bleeding, being deceived by a paſſage of Hippocrates, who ſays, that we are not to bleed in a flux, *fluente alvo venam non ſecabis*; and, on the contrary, Mr de Lorme maintained, and preſſed phelebotomy (2).’ Patin adds, that three Phyſicians of Paris were conſulted, and confirmed Mr de Lorme's advice. *The queen-mother was let blood and recovered . . . . I deſign*, ſays he, *to make my elogies finer, and more curious, and hiſtorical, than thoſe of Sammarthanus, nor ſhall they be inferior to his, except in expreſſion* (3).’ It is a misfortune, that he did not execute, this good deſign.

[*C*] *His ſon . . . . practiſed in Paris with great ſucceſs.*] Bachot, in the letter above-cited, expreſſes himſelf thus, ſpeaking to M. de Lorme the father. *I give you an account of the ſubject of this work, which you have encouraged by your advice, if you pleaſe to look favourably on it; as alſo your ſon, one of the ſoundeſt and fineſt wits of his age, and of this century, in our profeſſion, as he is acknowledged by all the court, and by this populous city of Paris.* Bachot writ this in 1626. He prefixed to his work a letter,

(1) See concerning this book, the remark [*E*] of the article JOUBERT.

(2) Patin, Lettre cclxiii, pag. 85, Tom. III.

(3) Id. ibid. pag. 87.

vigorous enough to be willing to marry again [*D*]: This we find in Guy Patin's letters. I have heard ſay, that he actually did marry, and choſe a very young and pretty woman, and it was thought that this would ſerve to haſten his death; but on the contrary it only occaſioned the death of his young wife. She got a phthiſic by her good old man's ſide, and never could be cured of it [*E*]. This Mr de Lorme was a man of admirable converſation [*F*]. He had been Phyſician to Gaſton, of France, duke of Orleans, but did not keep that employment long (*a*). He was much longer Phyſician at the waters of Bourbon. We ſhall ſee below, that he died in 1678 [*G*].

letter, which de Lorme, the ſon, his relation, *Counſellor to the king, and his Phyſician in ordinary*, had written to him, ſending him a ſonnet of his making (4). Note, that he engaged Mr Gaulmyn, his couſin, to write Latin verſes in the praiſe of this treatiſe of Bachot. They are printed before the book.

[*D*] *Being loaden with years he found himſelf vigorous enough, to be willing to marry again.*] We ſhall cite a paſſage upon this, with all it's circumſtances. I take it from a letter of Guy Patin dated the eighteenth of June 1666. *When you told Mr de Lorme, that Mr Blondel would prove that Antimony was poiſon, you ſay he took a great leap. It is very well, if, at his age, he can leap ſo, and God be praiſed, that he ſtill is able to leap; but Antimony has made a great many fall, who will never get up again, nor leap more. God preſerve him, and bring him from Bourbon in good health; and ſince he has a mind to marry again, I wiſh him ſuch a wife, as he would chuſe. There is nothing like dying by a fine ſword. He muſt enter with honour into the holy ſynagogue* (5). In a letter of the twentieth of October, the ſame year, he ſpeaks thus (6); *I hear that Mr de Lorme is gone from Lyons, and is returning to Bourbon or Moulins, where he has a deſign to marry again. He does well, if it be for the health of his ſoul; for as for his body, I believe he has hardly any need of this piece of furniture.* This deſign was neither executed, nor quitted, when the ſame Patin writ the letter, in which are theſe words. 'I ſaw very lately Mr de Lorme, who was a little indiſpoſed, but with the ſame vigour of mind, as when in perfect health. So very old as he is, it is ſaid, he has a mind to marry again, and that ſome body encourages him in this folly, to bring him to the triumvirate, which will be a dangerous yoke to him, and perhaps fatal; I wiſh it may be for the good of his ſoul, and for the warmth of his feet (7).' He afterwards mentions the epigram of Stephen Paſquier, which we have ſeen above (8). This letter is dated from Paris the fourteenth of January 1670. It proves that Mr de Lorme lived then in that city, and that he had been twice married.

[*E*] *His wife got a phthiſic by her good old man's ſide, of which ſhe could never be cured*] Tho' upon the hopes of a large jointure, ſhe reſolved upon the condition of the Shunamite (9), yet ſhe had reaſon enough to afflict herſelf upon ſeeing the ill effects of this function, and how contagious an old man's bed is to a young woman. Several Phyſicians maintain, that it is good for a decrepit man to lie with a fat and plump child, but that it is dangerous to the child to have ſuch a bed-fellow. Nevertheleſs, the fate of our de Lorme's wife is what very ſeldom happens. And ſo the hopes ſhe might have entertained of being very ſoon a young, blooming, briſk, rich widow, had not been raſh and inconſiderate; as for him if he did not pay his tribute to old age by the decay of his memory (10) and of his learning, he paid it another way, that is by the folly of marrying again. So true it is, that old age is a toll, which admits no abſolute exemption: there are many reaſons to be urged *pro* and *con* upon the queſtion, whether ſuch marriages, as Mr de Lorme's, are worſe than thoſe of Publicius and Septicia, two very old perſons. Valerius Maximus tells us, that Auguſtus annulled Septicia's will by which ſhe left all her goods to Publicius, in prejudice of her children by a former huſband. And the ſame author extols the juſtice of this decree to the ſkies. 'Si ipſa æquitas hac de re cognoſceret, poſſetne juſtius aut gravius pronuntiare? Spernis quos genuiſti: nubis effœta; teſtamenti ordinem violento animo confundis: neque erubeſcis ei totum patrimonium addicere, cujus pollincto jam corpori marcidam ſenectutem tuam ſubſtraviſti (11). —— *If equity herſelf was to take cogniſance of this matter, could ſhe pronounce with more juſtice or weight? You deſpiſe thoſe you have given birth to: you marry, when paſt child-bearing you violently confound the order of your will; nor do you bluſh to bequeath your whole patrimony to him, whom you married in your old age.*' We ought perhaps, amongſt Chriſtians, to annul, more commonly than we do, thoſe matches, which join together, either two extreams of the ſame character, or two oppoſite ones, two decrepits, or old age with the flower of age.

[*F*] *Mr de Lorme was a man of admirable converſation.*] Two paſſages of Guy Patin ſhall ſerve for the preſent comment. *I yeſterday* (12) *viſited Mr de Lorme at his houſe: he received me very kindly, and we diſcourſed together a good hour, we were neither of us mute; he is admirable in his converſation, as well as in every thing elſe; he has a wonderful memory for his age of eighty five. I think he will die as he lived, with his Antimony in his heart and head, and yet what comforts me, is, that I hope he will never take any, having ſo little need of it* (13). Some weeks after, he paid him another viſit. *I yeſterday ſaw Mr de Lorme, whoſe underſtanding is ſtill clear, and memory prodigious; theſe two faculties he poſſeſſes in great perfection, and ſavour nothing of age; but I will not anſwer for the reſt.* Maximus eſt aretalogus. *I am told, he has no good hand at practice; notwithſtanding his pretended and myſtical Polypharmacy; he is of a powerful converſation; he knows a great many good things, and expreſſes them wonderfully well; and, which is more, he is very reſerved, when the queſtion is about the merits of ſeveral learned men, that have lived in France for this hundred years paſſed: he happily mixes his judgment with his charity;* nemini facit injuriam, nulli quidquam detrahit debitæ laudis: *Take him altogether, he is a great man, who for his perfections is greatly indebted to God and nature: I only wiſh he were not ſo great a romancer, when the point is to praiſe ſome, who do not altogether ſo well deſerve it; but I believe he does this on purpoſe that he may not be thought vain-glorious or ſlighting, and this in ſome reſpects is commendable* (14). From the firſt of theſe paſſages we may infer, that he was born in 1584.

[*G*] *He died in the year* 1687.] My proof ſhall be taken from a paſſage of the *Mercure Galant*. 'We have loſt a Phyſician, as old as he was famous; it is Mr de Lorme, who always did that which is paſſed into a proverb againſt the Phyſicians, and which never fails of being objected to them, *Phyſician cure thyſelf*. He brought into faſhion a Tiſan, which was called the *Bouillon-rouge*, (*red broth*), by which thouſands have found benefit. The great ſums he ſpent in experiments are tokens of the care he took not to be ignorant in any part of his profeſſion; he died at the houſe of the marſhal Crequy, where he lived, and was above an hundred years old; he was ſtill very lively, and I have ſeen ſome well turned verſes of his, which I am aſſured he made within theſe fifteen days (15).' I do not think he was above an hundred, and I rather adhere to Mr Patin's calculation, according to which he died in the ninety fourth year of his age.

(*a*) Patin, Lettre ccccxv, pag. 235 Tom. III.

(4) It is an acroſtic, and is to be ſeen before the Sieur Bachot's book, with another ſonnet of Mr de Lorme, the father.

(5) Patin, Lettre ccccvii, pag. 207, Tom. III.

(6) Idem, Lettre ccccxxi, pag. 251.

(7) Idem, Lettre cccccvi, pag. 490.

(8) Remark [*N*] of the article BEZA.

(9) See the article GULIELMA, remark [*A*].

(10) See the following remark.

(11) Valer. Maximus, lib. vii, cap. vii, n 4, pag. m. 645.

(12) That is to ſay, the ſixth of November 1669.

(13) Patin, Lettre cccccci, pag. 459.

(14) Idem, Lettre ccccciii, pag. 476. *It is dated the thirteenth of December* 1669.

(15) Mercure Galant, July, 1678, pag. 142, 143. Dutch Edit.

LORRAIN (CHARLES DE) cardinal and archbiſhop of Rheims, ſon to Claudius, firſt duke of Guiſe, was born in February 1525 (a). He was a perſon of very great abilities; but abuſed them to the great prejudice of France [A], in order to gratify his inſatiate thirſt of riches and preferments. He ſtept into a very ample ſucceſſion of benefices in 1550, by the death of cardinal John de Lorrain, his uncle [B], whoſe debts he never paid [C], though he had promiſed the creditors he would. At the ſame time he inſinuated himſelf, by ſordid condeſcenſions, into the favour of the ducheſs of Valentinois (b), and obtained ſo exorbitant an authority, as to raiſe to the nobleſt offices of the kingdom, the perſons, who were at his devotion. He did not always ſtay, till places were vacant, knowing very well how to diveſt the poſſeſſors. The firſt preſident of the parliament of Paris ſadly experienced it (c). This cardinal, who, in Henry the ſecond's reign, had an almoſt boundleſs power, found himſelf ſtill more powerful under Francis II, when he, and the duke of Guiſe, his brother, governed the whole kingdom at their pleaſure, under pretence, that they were uncles to the young queen Mary Stuart. He made a great figure at the conference of Poiſſi, by his eloquence and learning, and it is very probable that he conſented to the holding that aſſembly, only to have an opportunity of ſhewing his eloquence and wit [D]. He made a great figure likewiſe in the council of Trent; but
he

(a) Counting the year from January. Moreri, who makes him be born in 1519, is miſtaken His epitaph ſays, that he died *vii Kal. Jan* 1574, and that he lived *annos* 49, *menſes* 10, *dies* 8, *horas quatuor* — *forty nine years, ten months, eight days, and four hours.* See the *Nomenclator Cardinalium, pag.* 141.

(b) See the remark [C].

(c) See the article LIZET, remark [A].

[A] *He was a perſon of very great abilities, but abuſed them to the great prejudice of France.*] Here is the character Mr de Mezerai gives of him: ' The cardinal was a man made all of fire, always in action, ' and continually forming intrigues and factions for the ' raiſing his family; as capable of a quick invention of ' them, as his elder brother was of a prudent execution: extremely bent upon heaping up wealth, lofty ' in words, and vindictive; neverthelеſs cloſe, timorous, and diſſembling, except in the reſentment of ' injuries: as for the reſt, a man who by the help of ' the learning he had acquired, and by the charms of ' eloquence, which were natural to him, had that advantage of making himſelf heard by every body (1).' If you would have a copy of this character, read only what follows. ' This prince, whoſe name is ſo famous in hiſtory, and who had a mind extremely ' lively and penetrating; a temper ardent, impetuous, ' violent; a rare natural eloquence; much more learning than could be expected in a perſon of his quality; ' and which his eloquence made appear much greater ' ſtill than it really was; the boldeſt man in his cabinet, in imagining and enterpriſing great things and ' vaſt deſigns; but the moſt timerous and diſpirited, ' when he came to the execution, which he ſaw to be ' full of danger; he had all his life an unbounded paſſion for the greatneſs of his family (2).' Theſe words of Mr Maimbourg precede the paſſage, in which he relates, how this cardinal formed in the council of Trent the firſt plan of the league.

(1) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, Tom. III, pag. 2.

(2) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de la Ligue, livr. i, pag. 12. Dutch Edit.

[B] *He came to a very ample ſucceſſion of benefices in* 1550, *by the death of . . . . his uncle.*] *Cardinal John de Lorrain had ſought his eſtabliſhment in France, in imitation of the duke of Guiſe, his brother, and had made it in contempt of the ſacred canons, and the moſt antient laws of the church. He was at the ſame time archbiſhop of Lyons, Rheims, and Narbonne, biſhop of Metz, Toul, Verdun, Teroüane, Luçon, Alby, and Valence, and abbot of Gorze, Fécamp, Cluny, and Marmoutier* (3). His nephew did not ſucceed him in all theſe preferments, but he did in the greateſt part (4). The biſhopric of Metz was given to Robert de Lenoncourt, who not long after contributed greatly to the reducing this city under the power of France (5).

Cardinal John de Lorrain experienced, that his ſucceſſor would not wait till his death, to enjoy his ſpoils. Read what follows. ' O baſe and deteſtable ' ingratitude, not having patience, till the deceaſed ' cardinal de Lorrain, his uncle, by whoſe favour he ' came from the college of Navarre to court, a man, ' as to ambition, of a quite different temper from his ' nephews, ſhould enrich him with his ſpoils by his ' deceaſe; he (6) ceaſed not to draw every thing that was ' poſſible for him under his wing, by an importunity ' next a-kin to violence, and found a way of making ' him deſire to remove from court, furniſhed him ' with ſuch ſervants as he thought fit, and deprived ' him of others that were moſt faithful to him, under ' any pretence he pleaſed, and ſo managed matters, ' that it was not his fault that he was not ſtripped to ' his ſhirt, when at laſt a ſudden death carried him ' off in his return from the election of Pope Julius III (7).' This is taken from a remonſtrance addreſſed to the princes of the blood, and inſerted by Lewis de Reynier, Sieur de la Planche, in his Hiſtory of Francis II.

(3) Varillas, Hiſt. de François I, livr. vii, pag. 264, ad ann. 1536.

(4) See in the following remark, the words of Thuanus.

(5) Thuanus, lib. vi, pag. 122, ad ann. 1550.

(6) That is to ſay, Cardinal Charles de Lorrain.

(7) La Planche, Hiſt. de François II, pag. 433, 434.

[C] . . . . *whoſe debts he never paid.*] We muſt hear Thuanus. ' At Carolus Guiſianus, qui demum ' Lotaringus dici cæpit, cum patruo mortuo opulentiſſimorum ſacerdotiorum poſſeſſionem adeptus eſſet, nequaquam grande æs alienum exſolvit ſicuti receperat, ' quo ille merſus pleroſque creditores ſecum una merſit. Is in arctiorem Pictavienſis familiaritatem, quæ ' totum regis animum occupaverat, turpibus obſequiis ' cum ſe inſinuaviſſet, auctor illi fuit quo regni negotiorum adminiſtrationem penes ſe haberet, ut, &c ' (8). ——— *But Charles of Guiſe, who began then to ' take the title of Lorrain, having ſucceeded his deceaſed ' uncle in the poſſeſſion of the richeſt benefices, did not ' pay off the great debt, as he had promiſed, by which ' ſeveral of his uncle's creditors ſuffered greatly. Having, by ſervile compliances, inſinuated himſelf into ' the favour of the ducheſs of Valentinois, who was the ' king's ſole favourite, he perſuaded her, in order to ' get the management of affairs into his own hands, ' to, &c.*'

(8) Thuan. ubi ſupra.

[D] *He conſented to the holding that aſſembly, only that he might have an opportunity of ſhewing his eloquence and wit.*] Mr Varillas confeſſes, that this cardinal deſired it, *out of the too good opinion he had of his own eloquence, and a deſire of diſputing with thoſe, who had employed all their time in the ſtudy of controverſy* (9). Mr Maimbourg maintains, that *this is one of thoſe ill-natured conjectures, which have been ſo commonly made to the diſadvantage of this great prelate, whom they would on this occaſion tax with vanity. If he had had as much power*, adds he, *as he had in the preceding reign, he would doubtleſs have hindered the holding this conference* (10). I believe ſo to; for, in the preceding reign, he would never have ſuffered, that the Calviniſts ſhould have liberty to complain; but whatever change there was in his intereſt, he had ſtill credit enough to have broken off the conference, if it had diſpleaſed him. Had not he been the cauſe, by the remonſtrances he made to their majeſties at the head of the clergy (11), why they durſt not maintain the firſt edict of January (12), that was favourable to the Huguenots, and why they went in perſon, and ſat in the parliament of Paris to find out new expedients? Had not he been the cauſe, that the reſolutions, which were taken in this aſſembly, produced the edict of July, ſo terrible and ruinous to the Proteſtants? Had he not thereby triumphed over the queen-regent, ſupported by the prince of Condé, the admiral de Coligni, and the chancellor de l'Hoſpital? when a man could do all this, it could not be very difficult, methinks, to hinder the conference of Poiſſi. It is therefore probable, that the cardinal de Lorrain, proud of ſo fine an occaſion of diſplaying his learning and eloquence, contributed much to the holding this conference. Beſides that he was aſſured, the doctrine of the Calviniſts would be there condemned by the biſhops, which would adminiſter new arms to the zealous and perſecuting Catholics.

(9) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, Tom. I, pag. 55.

(10) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Calvin. pag. 212.

(11) Varillas, ibid. pag. 52.

(12) This edict of the twenty eighth of Jan. 1561, muſt not be confounded with that, which was iſſued in January 1562, revoking the edict of July.

They, who know this cardinal's vanity by the ſymptoms he diſcovered of it in the council of Trent, will doubtleſs blame Mr Maimbourg. At the concluding of the council, they were willing to imitate the cuſtom practiſed in the Eaſtern church of acclamation and
prayer,

he did not maintain the liberties of the Gallican church, with ſo much vigour, as the court of Rome apprehended (*d*) [*E*]. He found it more for the intereſt of his family to deal civilly with the Pope. His credit, which had ſuffered a ſhort eclipſe by the death of the duke of Guiſe, his brother, ſhone out again ſome time after [*F*]. He was looked upon as the principal author of the war of Italy, in which the duke of Guiſe had like to have loſt his whole reputation. I ſhall cite upon this occaſion a paſſage of Brantome, that deſerves to be read [*G*]. I ſhall cite another paſſage from him, which ſhews the vanity of this cardinal, that is to ſay, the haughtineſs with which he ſpoke to the ducheſs of

(*d*) See Father Paul's Hiſt. of the Council of Trent.

prayer, and the cardinal (13) *of Lorrain not only took the pains of compoſing theſe acclamations, but alſo of pronouncing them, which made him univerſally cenſured of vanity* (14), *that function, which had been fit for a deacon* (and which heretofore had been always performed by deacons) *ſeeming but little becoming a cardinal prince.* A man, that was capable of falling into ſo childiſh an oſtentation, in all probability deſired to enter the liſts with the miniſters, in preſence of all the court, in order to ſhew his wit and eloquence. He was ſo addicted to the government of the ſtate, and political intrigues, that he had reaſon to apprehend, he was thought a bad divine. Indeed he might believe, that the world would excuſe him for having forgot the notions he had learned at the ſchools; but the more probable it was, that his profound skill in politics made the world believe, that he was not well verſed in controverſial matters, the more he was perſuaded that it would be to his glory, to ſhew he underſtood them thoroughly, and that he could diſcourſe eloquently and learnedly upon them. Here then is the rock that his vanity ſplit upon, and, we may ſay that one vanity cured another; for if he had not had the ambition to have it ſaid, that he excelled even in things the moſt remote from his continual occupations, he would but too much have deſpiſed the rank and birth of the miniſters to have vouchſafed to enter into a regular diſpute with them. I wiſh Montagne had ſpoken of him in that chapter of his Eſſays (15), in which he obſerves, that ‘ it moſt ‘ frequently happens, that every one chuſes rather to ‘ diſcourſe on another's profeſſion than his own, looking upon that as ſo much new acquired reputation. ‘ Obſerve how Cæſar expatiates, in deſcribing to us ‘ his inventions of building bridges and contriving engines, and how ſhort he is, where he ſpeaks of the ‘ offices of his own profeſſion, of his valour and conduct as a general. His exploits prove him to be a ‘ very excellent general, but he would make himſelf appear an excellent engineer, an accompliſhment ſomewhat foreign.’ Divinity, you will tell me, is a cardinal's profeſſion: I anſwer, this admits too many exceptions, and if he be a cardinal prince, or a firſt miniſter of ſtate, Divinity is no more his profeſſion, than that of the general of an army.

[*E*] *He did not maintain, at the council of Trent, the liberties of the Gallican church, with ſo much vigour as the court of Rome apprehended.*] ‘ The cardinal of Lorrain arrived at Trent, attended by a great ‘ number of biſhops, and took upon him ſuch authority, that the Pope, growing jealous of him, called ‘ him, amongſt his friends, *the little Pope beyond the* ‘ *mountains*. He knew, that he came with an intention to act in concert with the Imperialiſts, to procure ſome ſatisfaction to the Lutherans, (whom he ‘ deſired to draw off from the Huguenots, he and his ‘ brother having to that purpoſe diſcourſed with the ‘ duke of Wirtemberg, and other princes of this faith ‘ at Saverne) for which reaſon he had taken care to ‘ fortify himſelf againſt him, by a great number of Italian biſhops, whom from all parts he ſent to Trent, ‘ before this cardinal arrived there. Some months after ‘ his arrival, two great pieces of news came to the ‘ council; one concerning the death of the king of ‘ Navarre, the other, at ſome months diſtance, of the ‘ winning the battle of Dreux: both which made the ‘ cardinal believe, that his brother would become maſter of France; and this conſideration much heightened his power in the council, and by conſequence that ‘ of the embaſſadors, with whom he had been well ‘ united from the beginning. They propoſed therefore, according to the commiſſion they had received, ‘ thirty four articles of reformation . . . . The cardinal ‘ of Lorrain had doubtleſs ſtrongly ſupported them, ‘ if the death of the duke of Guiſe had not happened; ‘ but as the good fortune of this brother had elevated ‘ his courage, the loſs of him infinitely caſt him down; ‘ he thought of nothing now but of compromiſing matters with the Pope, and abating of his great deſigns; he ‘ obliged all the biſhops of his faction to abate too. ‘ Thus the legates, and other creatures of the court of ‘ Rome, remained maſters of the council, and got a ‘ great many things to paſs according to their intentions (16).’

[*F*] *His credit . . . . ſhone out again ſome time after.*] Here is one ſign of it. ‘ The guards, deſigned for ‘ the ſecurity of the *cardinal of Lorrain*, had orders ‘ not only to attend him into the Louvre; but alſo not ‘ to leave him at the altar; thus to mingle the ſmell of ‘ gun-powder and match with the odour of the incenſe, ‘ and other ſacred perfumes (17).’ It was Charles IX, who granted him this favour, as Mr Auberi obſerves (18), ſpeaking of a privilege much like that granted to cardinal de Richelieu.

REFLEXIONS on the wars adviſed by churchmen.

[*G*] *I ſhall cite a paſſage of Brantome, upon the war of Italy, that deſerves to be read.*] ‘ Theſe two faults ‘ happened by the means of people, who would handle ‘ arms, whilſt they knew nothing of the profeſſion. ‘ And for this reaſon this great duke of Guiſe, after he ‘ had been very much diſappointed in his Italian expedition, frequently ſaid, I love indeed the church of God; ‘ but I will never undertake any conqueſts upon the ‘ word and faith of a prieſt. Deſigning hereby to reproach Pope Caraffa, called Paul IV, who had not ‘ made good what he had promiſed, by great and ‘ ſolemn aſſeverations; or elſe the cardinal his brother, who was gone to get intelligence, and to ‘ ſound matters, as far as Rome, and afterwards had ‘ very raſhly puſhed his brother upon it. It may be ‘ ſuppoſed, that my lord of Guiſe meant it of both; ‘ for as I have heard ſay, the duke frequently repeated ‘ ſuch ſayings before the cardinal, who, thinking it was ‘ a ſtone thrown into his garden, was enraged at it, ‘ and could hardly curb his paſſion (19).’ The two faults, Brantome ſpeaks of, are thoſe of Lewis king of Hungary, and Don Sebaſtian king of Portugal. ‘ Lewis ‘ died in a battle which he fought againſt the Turks, not ‘ ſo much out of any reaſon, as through the perſuaſion ‘ and obſtinacy of a cardinal, who governed him very ‘ much, alledging, that he ought not to diſtruſt the ‘ power of God, and his juſt cauſe; that though he ‘ ſhould have, as we may ſay, but ten thouſand Hungarians, being ſo good Chriſtians, and fighting in ‘ God's cauſe, he might expect to defeat a hundred ‘ thouſand Turks: and he ſo drove, and hurried him ‘ to this engagement, that he loſt the battle; and, ‘ attempting to retreat, he fell into a bog, and was ‘ ſmothered. The ſame happened to the laſt king of ‘ Portugal, Sebaſtian, who miſerably loſt his life, when, ‘ not having ſufficient forces, he hazarded a battle with ‘ the Moors, who were three times ſtronger than he, and ‘ this upon the perſuaſion, the preachings, and obſtinacy of ſome Jeſuits, who laid before him the power ‘ of God, who by his look alone was able to confound ‘ all the world, though they ſhould be armed againſt ‘ him; as doubtleſs it is a moſt true maxim; however we ought not to tempt nor abuſe his power; ‘ for he has ſecrets that we are ignorant of. Some ‘ have ſaid, that theſe Jeſuits did this, and ſaid it with ‘ a good intention, as it may be believed; others, ‘ that they had been ſuborned and bribed by the king ‘ of Spain, thus to deſtroy this young and courageous king, and full of fire, that he might the more ‘ eaſily ſeize his dominions, as he afterwards did (20).’ For one reader, who will blame me for having drawn out this remark to ſuch a length, by reciting theſe two particulars more than a hundred will thank me heartily: it is to oblige ſuch, that I ſometimes give a greater extent to my remarks, than the text requires; they experience with pleaſure, that they meet with more things by the way, than they expected.

[*H*] *The*

---

(13) See Father Paul, *book viii.* See alſo Mezerai, *Abrégé Chronol. Tom. V, pag.* 83.

(14) In the ſame hiſtory of Father Paul, among the things that this cardinal was blamed for in France, you will find this, *That he might very well have diſpenſed with compoſing the acclamations, and much more with pronouncing them. And thus it often falls out,* ſays the ſame hiſtorian, *that the vain-glorious, inſtead of the little honour which they hope to gain, loſe all at once, even that which they had acquired.*

(15) The ſixteenth of the firſt book.

(16) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom VI, pag. 420. *This is in the diſcourſe of the church affairs of the XVIth century*, ad ann. 1562, 1563. *See alſo pag.* 67, *Tom. V.*

(17) Auberi, Hiſtoire du Cardinal de Richelieu, livr. ii, pag. 87, Tom. I, Edit. Holland, 1666.

(18) Ibid.

(19) Brantome, Dames Galantes, Tom. II, pag. 88.

(20) Ib. pag 87.

of Savoy, kiſſing her by main force [*H*]. Note, that the kiſs, he ſtruggled for, was a kiſs of ceremony; he loved alſo other kiſſes [*I*], as Brantome informs us. I have elſewhere ſpoken (*e*) of his hatred to the Proteſtant religion, and the ſatirical writings he was expoſed to on this account. I might alſo have obſerved, that he was compared to Seneca in one of theſe ſatires [*K*]. He was turned into ridicule, for ſome time, on his receiving an high affront at Paris, from the mareſchal de Montmorenci [*L*]. He died the 26th

(*e*) In the remarks of the article **GUISE** (Francis).

[*H*] *The haughtineſs which the cardinal ſhewed to the ducheſs of Savoy, kiſſing her by main force.*] He had naturally a great reſpect for the ladies (21). *But he forgot this reſpect, and not without reaſon, towards the ducheſs of Savoy, Donna Beatrix of Portugal. Paſſing once through Piedmont, in his journey to Rome, for the ſervice of the king his maſter, he viſited the duke and ducheſs; after having diſcourſed ſome time with Monſieur the duke, he waited on the ducheſs in her chamber, intending to ſalute her, and, as he approached, ſhe, who was arrogance itſelf, offered him her hand to kiſs. The cardinal, reſenting this affront, advanced to kiſs her lips, and ſhe continued to run back, when loſing all patience, and coming up cloſer to her, he took her by the head, and, in ſpite of her, kiſſed her two or three times, and though ſhe ſcreamed, and cried out in the Spaniſh and Portugueſe way, ſhe was forced to ſubmit. How comes it,* ſays he, *that you uſe this behaviour to me? ſhall not I, who kiſs the queen my miſtreſs, the greateſt queen in the world, kiſs you, who are but a little dirty ducheſs? I would have you know, that I have lain with as fine ladies, and of as good families as yourſelf. Poſſibly he might ſay true. This princeſs was to blame in carrying it ſo high towards a prince of ſo great a houſe, or even to a cardinal, conſidering the high rank they bear in the church, and eſteem themſelves on a level with the greateſt princes in Chriſtendom.* The cardinal was to blame, in taking ſo harſh a revenge; but it is grievous to a noble and generous heart, of whatever profeſſion, to receive an affront.

(21) Ibid. pag. 364.

[*I*] *He alſo loved other kiſſes.*] The following paſſage is a piece of a comedy, which the people of the world act: by the people of the world, I mean ſome princes of the church, as well as the moſt worldly laymen. Let us hear Brantome ſpeak: he will tell us, that the cardinal de Lorrain was no leſs liberal in point of charity, than galantry: ‘ Moſt liberal, *ſays he* (22), I may call him, ſince he had not his equal ‘ in his time; his expences, his gifts, and bounties, ‘ have teſtified it, eſpecially his charity towards the ‘ poor; he generally carried a great bag, which his ‘ valet de chambre, who kept his money for his little ‘ pleaſures, failed not to fill every morning with three ‘ or four hundred crowns; and as often as he met ‘ with any poor body, he put his hand in the bag, ‘ and what he took out at adventure he gave, without ‘ picking or chuſing. It was of him, that a poor blind ‘ man ſaid, (when paſſing thro' Rome, and being asked ‘ an alms, he, according to his cuſtom, threw the ‘ beggar a handful of gold) crying out aloud, *O tu* ‘ *ſei Chriſto, O veramente el Cardinal di Lorrenna*: that ‘ is, *Either thou art undoubtedly Chriſt, or the cardinal* ‘ *de Lorrain.* If he was an alms-giver, and charitable ‘ that way, he was alſo very liberal to other perſons, ‘ and eſpecially towards the ladies, whom he eaſily ‘ caught with this bait; for money was not ſo plen- ‘ tiful in thoſe times, as it is at preſent; and for their ‘ part, they were more fond of junketing and fine ‘ cloaths. I have heard ſay, that when any new maid ‘ came to court, or lady that was handſome, he pre- ‘ ſently came and accoſted her, telling her he himſelf ‘ would have the managing of her. A fine manager in- ‘ deed! I believe the trouble was not near ſo great, as ‘ managing a wild filly: for at that time it was ſaid, there ‘ was hardly a lady or maid of any ſtanding at court, or ‘ newly arrived, that was not kiſſed, and caught by the ‘ magnificence of the cardinal; and few or none left this ‘ court, either women or maids, with unſpotted honour. ‘ Their coffers and large wardrobes were then to be ‘ ſeen crouded with more gowns, petticoats, gold and ‘ ſilver, and ſilk, than thoſe of the queens and princeſſes ‘ of this time. I ſpeak from my own knowledge of ‘ two or three, who had gained all this by their bo- ‘ dies, their fathers, mothers, and husbands, having ‘ never been able to furniſh them with ſuch ſtore.' The ſame Brantome affirms (23), that the baſtard daughter of this cardinal, called Arne (§ α), followed the princeſs Elizabeth, daughter to Henry II, and wife to Philip II, into Spain, and was married to Beſme, he who aſſaſſinated the admiral.

(22) Ibid. pag. 361, & ſeq.

(23) In his Diſcourſe on Admiral de Coligni, page 174, of the third Tome of his Memoirs.

[(§ α) Perhaps an error of the preſs for Anne. Rem. Crit.]

[*K*] *He was compared to Seneca in a ſatire.*] We need not wonder at it, when we know, that the author of the *Parallel* took this Philoſopher for a wicked man. Let us cite Montagne's words: they are worthy of his good taſte: ‘ Among a thouſand little books, ‘ *ſays he* (24), diſperſed by thoſe of the pretended ‘ Reformed religion, in defence of their cauſe, which ‘ now and then came from a good hand, and which it ‘ is great pity was not employed on a better ſubject, ‘ I have formerly ſeen one, which, to lengthen and ‘ fill up the ſimilitude, he pretends to find between ‘ the government of our poor deceaſed king Charles IX, ‘ and that of Nero, draws a parallel between the de- ‘ ceaſed cardinal of Lorrain and Seneca, and com- ‘ pares their fortunes, they having been both the ‘ firſt in the government of their prince, as alſo their ‘ morals, conditions, and deportment. In my opinion ‘ he does great honour to the cardinal; for though ‘ I am one of thoſe, who greatly eſteemed his wit, ‘ his eloquence, his zeal for religion, and the ſervice ‘ of his king, and his good fortune in having been ‘ born in an age, in which it was ſo new a thing, ‘ ſo rare, and withal ſo neceſſary to the public good, ‘ to have an eccleſiaſtical perſon, of ſuch extraction ‘ and dignity, capable of, and ſufficient for his poſt; ‘ yet, to confeſs the truth, I reckon his capacity ‘ nothing near ſo great, nor his virtue ſo clean and ‘ entire, nor ſo unſhaken, as that of Seneca. Now ‘ this book, I ſpeak of, to obtain it's end, gives a ‘ very injurious deſcription of Seneca, borrowing theſe ‘ reproaches from Dion the Hiſtorian, on whoſe teſti- ‘ mony I in no wiſe depend.'

(24) Montagne's Eſſays, book ii, chap xxxii, pag. m. 702, 703.

[*L*] *He received an high affront from the mareſchal de Montmorenci.*] Though Charles IX had forbad the wearing of arms, yet the cardinal de Lorrain came to Paris with a great retinue of armed men, and pretended to enter the city with this guard. ‘ He had a ‘ permiſſion, ſealed with the great ſeal, for riding with ‘ armed guards (25). The mareſchal de Montmorenci, ‘ governor of Paris, knew it very well; but expected, ‘ that the cardinal ſhould have made him a compli- ‘ ment upon it; and he ſent to him an order, by ‘ the provoſt of the mareſchals, to command his ‘ people to lay down their arms. The cardinal, neg- ‘ lecting it, ſtill rode on. The mareſchal, well at- ‘ tended, went to meet him, and attacked him in ‘ St Denis's ſtreet. . . . . . The cardinal's attendants ‘ diſperſed here and there, and he himſelf eſcaped ‘ into a ſhop with his nephew (26). In the evening, ‘ they all came together to Clugny-houſe, which was ‘ the cardinal's lodging. The next day, the mareſ- ‘ chal paſſed backwards and forwards in a kind of bra- ‘ vado before his gates. . . . . . The provoſt of the ‘ merchants, in behalf of the parliament, accommoda- ‘ ted this affair: he obtained of the cardinal, that he ‘ would quit the town, and of the mareſchal, that he ‘ would ſuffer this prince to have armed guards, ac- ‘ cording to the permiſſion of the king, of which he ‘ ſhewed him the copy (27).' The reader will be better pleaſed with Mr le Laboureur's account of it (28). ‘ He ordered that the cardinal ſhould be civilly told, ‘ that he would not receive him in that warlike equi- ‘ page, and the contempt ſhewn to the meſſage, obli- ‘ ged him the more to come to extreams, which was ‘ to repel force by force, and do his duty in putting ‘ his guard to the ſword, unleſs they diſarmed; and ‘ this was done without any other loſs, than that of ‘ one of the cardinal's men, who put himſelf in a ‘ poſture of defence, upon which the cardinal, who ‘ not being ſo valiant, though more violent than his ‘ brothers, was ſo frighted, that he ran and hid himſelf ‘ in a ſhop in Iron-ſtreet, near which the skirmiſh happen- ‘ ed. He was afterwards conducted to his houſe, which ‘ was Clugny-Houſe, where he remained ſome days, ‘ without ſhewing himſelf, and at laſt retired by night

(25) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. V, pag. 86.

(26) The duke of Guiſe.

(27) This happened in January 1565. See Thuanus, *lib. xxxvi*, *pag.* 743.

(28) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Mémoires de Caſtelnau, Tom. II, pag. 37.

26th of December, 1574. You will find very curious things concerning his death, in the Journal of Henry III (*f*). The queen of Scotland, his niece, was politic enough to elude the deſign he had of keeping her jewels [*M*]. I forgot to obſerve, that he was the principal promoter of an edict, which made the parliament of Paris of half a year's continuance [*N*]. This laſted not long. We are told, that the prediction of an Aſtrologer gave him frequent fears, and contributed much to the pains he took to get the wearing of arms prohibited, in the reign of Francis II. The paſſage, I ſhall alledge on this occaſion,

‘ to his archbiſhopric of Rheims, to meditate more ſecurely his deſigns of revenge, not public, as his friends hoped, but ſecret and cloſeted, ſuch as are the reſentments of thoſe of his condition, when they can make their particular quarrel an affair of ſtate. This adventure was publiſhed throughout Europe, and the Huguenots forgot it not in their libels, and particularly in a complaint they put in the cardinal's mouth, of the little aſſiſtance that was lent him for the execution of his deſigns, wherein he ſpeaks thus :

Meſmes Paris entier, duquel le Comperage
Envers mon ſere & moy obligeoit le courage,
Me delaiſſe du tout. Je le puis voir ainſi
Quand pres St Innocent me fit Montmorency
Deſcendre de viſteſſe, & gagner une porte,
Ma garde deſarma, & mit à pied ; de ſorte
Qu'elle ainſi me miſe en blanc grand deſhonneur en a
Et. . . . .
Ah ! que j'ay de dépit qu'en abaiſſant ma corne
Il me fit en public recevoir telle eſcorne,
Sans que de ſe mouvoir nul homme fit ſemblant
En toute la Cité, & que d'un cœur tremblant
A luy le lendemain j'envoyay me ſoumettre,
Le requerant vouloir octroyer & permettre,
Me retirer armé, de crainte des Mutins.
Ce que de luy encor tant brave je n'obtins,
Ains m'en allay de nuit, emmenant un bon nombre
Des miens ; ſi qu'en fuyant avois peur de mon ombre.
Oh ! quel eſtois je lors, ô combien different
Eſtoit Charles nouveau, de ce Charles Parent
De l'eſpouſe à François ! Oh que cette nuit coye
Differoit du plein jour auquel remply de joye,
Je condamnay en Roy, inique & déloyal,
A la cruelle mort le juſte Sang Royal.

E'en Paris caſt me off, that once reſpected
Me and my brother. Then I found it ſo,
When Montmorency, near St Innocent's,
Made me diſmount in haſte, and to a ſhop,
For refuge fly ; my guard, unhors'd,
And ignominiouſly threw down their arms.
. . . .
How did it gall me, thus to be affronted,
In public too, and not a citizen
Stir to my aid ; nay to be forc'd, next day,
With trembling heart to ſend a low ſubmiſſion,
And humbly to entreat his worſhip's leave,
Arm'd to retire, for fear of mutineers :
Yet this he haughtily refus'd to grant.
So that I fled by night, my ſervants with me,
So ſcar'd, that my own ſhadow frighted me.
What was I then ? alas ! how different
From Charles, related to king Francis' queen !
A night how different from that full day,
When joyous, like a king, unjuſt, diſloyal,
I ſat in judgment on the royal blood,
And ſentenc'd many to a cruel death.

Immediately there came out a letter (29), which was preſently confuted (§ β). This letter was deſigned to juſtify the cardinal, and contained ſeveral reproaches againſt the houſe of Montmorency, and the admiral de Coligni. The anſwer was very ſmart ; it proceeded from a better pen than that of the cardinal's apologiſt. Thuanus makes mention of ſeveral pieces publiſhed *pro* and *con*, upon this affair, and which had been multiplied *ad infinitum*, if the parliament of Paris had not forbidden the ſale of ſuch books. The ſame Hiſtorian obſerves, that Lewis Reynier, Sieur de la Planche, was reckoned the author of the firſt piece that appeared, which was a relation of the fact in favour of the mareſchal. He obſerves alſo, that this mareſchal had not acted like a good Politician, ſince he choſe rather to provoke a moſt powerful enemy, by a great, but not very prejudicial affront, than ruin him entirely. *Momorantii prudentiam plerique tunc requirebant, qui potentes inimicos leviſſimo damno irritare, quam perdere cùm poſſet, maluerit.* The prince of Condé blamed him for this conduct (30), and often ſaid, that if Montmorency only meant to divert himſelf, he did too much ; and if he was in earneſt he did too little (31). Perhaps this prince would not have been ſorry, whilſt he had no hand in it, to have been rid at once of ſo formidable a family.

The ſame year the cardinal of Lorrain involved himſelf in a controverſy, in which he did not ſucceed. The ſcene of this quarrel was the Pais Meſſin, where Salcede, who was bailiff of it, vigorouſly oppoſed the enterprizes of the cardinal. This was called the cardinal's war, of which there was ſpeedily printed a relation.

[(§ β) It was printed at Antwerp, by William Richman, in 8vo, and containing but 27 pages. It is dated from Paris, the ſecond of April, 1564, before Eaſter. The anſwer to it is intituled, *A reply to the Letter of Charles de Vaudemont, Cardinal of Lorrain, whileome imaginary prince of the kingdoms of Jeruſalem and Naples, duke and earl, by fancy, of Anjou and Provence, and at preſent a meer gentleman of Hainault*, 1565, in 8vo. It is extreamly full of ſpirit, and contains very curious things, eſpecially in relation to the genealogy of the Chatillons and Lorrains, and touching the cauſes of the hatred between admiral de Coligni, and the duke of Guiſe. It is a pity the author of this piece is unknown : perhaps it is the Sieur de la Planche's, whom Mr BAYLE ſpeaks of a little after ; but be the author who he will, he was certainly a good writer. I only wiſh he had not highly approved and commended the aſſaſſination of Poltrot. ‘ Are you comparable, *ſays he to the cardinal* *, for counſel, reſolution, authority, conduct, experience, and bravery, to the tyrant Francis, your brother ? Meray †, our deliverer, has left us a noble and divine example to follow. I know very well, that he need not be as cruel as you are ; but I deny, that it is cruelty to do juſtice on a tyrant, who had neither pity nor humanity.’ What have the moſt furious leaguers ſaid more in favour of the Jaüreguys, and the Clements ? does not this ſhew that paſſion blinded the writers of both parties ? the title of this anſwer is very particular, and perhaps Mr du Bouchet copied after it, when he made this : *An Anſwer to the petition, which Mr de Pranzac, imaginary prince of the blood, fancies he preſented to the king* ; Paris, Jaquin, 1667, in folio. REM. CRIT.]

[*M*] *The queen of Scotland eluded the deſign he had of keeping her jewels.*] Mary Stuart, after the death of Francis II, her huſband, went over to Scotland. The cardinal of Lorrain, her uncle, was of opinion, that it was her beſt way to depoſit her jewels with him, till fortune had decided the ſucceſs of her voyage ; but ſhe knowing very well his intentions, anſwered him, that whilſt ſhe hazarded herſelf to all the dangers of the ſea, ſhe ſhould be to blame, in being more concerned for her jewels than her perſon. See in the margin Thuanus's words (32).

[*N*] *He was the principal promoter of an edict, which made the parliament of Paris, of half a year's continuance.*] Thuanus ſpeaks of it under the year 1554, and obſerves, that John Daurat, preceptor at that time to the king's pages, made verſes a little too bold, to flatter the cardinal of Lorrain. He compared the parliament to Plato's Androgynus. ‘ In eam rem Joan. Auratus, tunc aulicorum puerorum præceptor & mox

(*f*) Journal d'Henri III, ad ann. 1574.

(29) *This piece is intituled*, Lettre d'un Seigneur du pays de Haynaut envoyée à un ſien voiſin & amy ſuyvant la Cour d'Eſpagne.

(30) Certe Condæus . . . factum improbavit, ſubinde dictitans Momorantium ſi quidem joco ageret plus quam debuerit, ſi ſerio minus quam oportuit feciſſe. *Thuanus, ubi ſupra, pag.* 744.

(31) *This was the ſaying of a Turk upon the Tournaments. See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Novemb. 1684, Art IX, pag. 957.

* Fol. 151, verſo.

† John Poltrot-Merai. *See* Mezerai, Abr. Chronol. Tom. V, pag. 73.

(32) Diſcedenti Reginæ conſilium dederat Lotaringus Cardinalis, ut ſuppellectilem, mundumque muliebrem magni pretii, quem in Gallia lucrifecerat, velut in alium orbem tranſitura, apud ſe deponeret, donec de ſui itineris eventu fortuna ſtatuiſſet : verum illa quæ avunculi ingenium probe noſſet, argute reſpondit, cum ſe maris periculo committeret, non videre, cur mundo magis quam ſibi caveret. *Thuan. lib xxix, circa init. pag. m.* 580, *ad ann.* 1561.

occaſion, will inform us, that the inſult he received in coming out of a courtezan's houſe [*O*], obliged him to bring back the court to St Germains, in contempt of an antient cuſtom. Let us not forget, that he preached on ſeveral occaſions; but good God! in a ſtrain how remote from the ſpirit of the goſpel. He handled things according to the tenor of the Alcoran, as a true ſucceſſor of Mahomet, and not of the Apoſtles; he preached nothing but war, and the effuſion of blood [*P*]; but while he expreſſed this barbarous zeal againſt the Proteſtants of France, he gave penſions to ſome Proteſtants in Germany [*Q*]. A new farce!

'profeſſor regius, vir divini ingenii, carmen elegantiſſimum, ſed petulanti libertate, in gratiam Cardinalis Lotaringi, qui negotium illud urgebat, conſcripſit, quo ampliſſ. ordinem Androgyno Platonico comparat (33).' Note, that Paſquier obſerves, that things were *reduced to their former condition at three years end* (34). Thuanus ſays the ſame.

[*O*] *The paſſage I ſhall alledge on this occaſion, will inform us, ... the inſult he received in coming out of a courtezan's houſe.*] The cardinal 'going very early out of the houſe of the handſome Romania, a renowned courtezan in Henry's time, who lodged in St Catherine's-ſtreet, had like to have been handled very roughly by ſome ruffians, who generally wait for ſuch adventures. At which his ſanctity being alarmed, and perſuading himſelf, and giving out, that the Heretics laid ambuſhes for him, he led the court to St Germains, and cauſed the queen-mother, who would not on any account leave the king, her ſon, for ever ſo little a time, to break the cuſtom hitherto inviolable, which obliged the queens, upon their huſband's deceaſe, not to ſtir out of their chamber for forty days, nor ſee the light of the ſun or the moon till he was buried. Preſently after, when the ſtrangers were gone, he put out an edict, forbidding the carrying any arms, and eſpecially piſtols and arquebuſſes, under great penalties, revoking all particular and preceding permiſſions, to whomſoever granted, unleſs they were newly confirmed by the king, ſo that only the Guiſes, and their friends remained armed. Beſides, ſuſpecting the cloaths that were then in faſhion, as long cloaks (35), and large breeches (and indeed they were too exceſſive; for the cloak reached below the calf of the leg, and without ſleeves, and the breeches were an ell and a half large or five quarters) (36) they induced the privy-council to forbid the wearing them, foraſmuch as arms might be eaſily concealed under them. And it was ſaid, that the cardinal took that matter more to heart upon the account of a necromancer, who had prognoſticated to him at Rome, that he ſhould be killed by an arquebuſs, out of envy, and by the enemies he ſhould have in France, upon his being exalted to the higheſt degree of honour, which gave him, great trouble and uneaſineſs (the true wages of thoſe, who go to conjurers,) even while all things bowed and ſubmitted to him (37).' The hiſtorian who furniſhes me with this narrative, ſays, that the Guiſes did not appear at the magnificent entrance of Francis II at Orleans, the eighteenth of October, 1560. *And it was ſaid it was for fear of meeting with ſome deſperate fellow; becauſe a Magician (as we have ſaid) had foretold to the cardinal at Rome, that his brother and he ſhould die a violent death and be killed by arquebuſſes, ſo that to avoid this, they were afraid of ſuch aſſemblies, though they had forbidden the wearing any piſtols and arquebuſſes, upon pain of death* (38). Note, that the magician's prediction proved falſe, for the cardinal did not die a violent death.

[*P*] *He preached nothing but war and effuſion of blood.*] The witneſs I ſhall produce, is neither a libeller, nor a Huguenot, but the famous Stephen Paſquier. 'Becauſe, *ſays he* (39), the miniſters gained the people before, by ſermons and exhortations, ſo the cardinal of Lorrain, thought to do the like amongſt us. He firſt preached in the church of Notre-Dame, to an incredible affluence of auditors, and afterwards in the church of St Germain de l'Auxerrois. All the holy-days and octaves of Corpus-Chriſti-day, every other turn, he preaching one day, and the Minime (40), of whom I have ſpoken above; admoniſhing the people above all things, rather to die, and to ſpill the laſt drop of their blood, than engage againſt the honour of God and his church, to ſuffer any other religion to prevail in France, beſides that which our anceſtors ſo ſtrictly and religiouſly obſerved. I thought it as great a novelty to ſee a cardinal preach, as a miniſter a little before. He has very much animated the people to arms. The pens even of the poets engaged in the ſame. In ſhort, there is nothing trumpeted but fire, war, murther, and deſolation.' If you would ſee what were the fruits of theſe ſanguinary ſermons, conſult the ſame Paſquier (41). *It would be impoſſible to tell you what barbarous cruelties are committed on both ſides; where the Huguenots are maſters, they deſtroy all the images, (the antient bulwark of the common peoples devotion) demoliſh ſepulchres and tombs, and even paſſing through Clery, have not ſpared that of Lewis XI; plunder all the goods conſecrated and devoted to churches. By way of retaliation the Catholics kill, murther, drown all that they know to be of this ſect, and the rivers overflow with them. Not but that amidſt this, ſome execute their private revenges upon their enemies, on pretence of the public quarrel. And tho' the heads ſeem not to approve ſuch actions, yet they let them paſs by connivance and diſſimulation. Peace is better than war.*' Though at preſent the readers ſee theſe things only at a diſtance, they cannot chuſe but conceive ſome indignation againſt this barbarous ſermon-monger, and eſpecially when they conſider his character. He was a great cardinal, who run no risk in kindling a civil-war in all the corners of the kingdom. He was certain always to follow the court ſecure from any danger or trouble: and that whilſt the provinces were a theatre of bloodſhed, he could wallow in pleaſures; that his luxury, his pomp, his feaſting, his love intrigues, would ſuffer no interruption. This is a ſubject of ſcandal, which muſt prodigiouſly encreaſe the horror ſuch an incendiary-preacher gives all truly Chriſtian ſouls; a trumpeter of war, of torments and butchery; a man who, properly ſpeaking, is not of Jeſus Chriſt's religion, but of Saturn, and who indeed practiſes the ſame which the prieſts of Carthage did antiently to the honour of this falſe god. They ſacrificed men to him, and imagined, that their religion required ſuch victims (42).

[*Q*] *He gave penſions to ſome Proteſtants in Germany.*] The names of them were found in the book of accounts of this cardinal's ſteward. A book of Zanchius proves it. 'Certum mihi eſt, quod jam dicam coram Deo; Audivi ex viro harum rerum perito, & fide digno, ſe in libro Theſaurarii illius cardinalis Lotharingi, paucis ante annis vita defuncti, nonnullorum Germanorum Theologiæ Doctorum & Paſtorum nomina vidiſſe: quibus penſiones annuæ, ex Archiepiſcopatu præſertim Metenſi aſſignabantur. In quem vero finem non fuiſſe ſcriptum (43). —— *This I am certain of, which I declare in the preſence of God; I have heard from a a man perfectly verſed in theſe matters, and one worthy of credit, that he had ſeen in the accounts of the treaſurer of this cardinal of Lorrain, a few years before his death, the names of ſome German divines and miniſters, who had annual penſions aſſigned them out of the revenues chiefly of the archbiſhopric of Metz, but on what account was not ſet down.*' There is no doubt but the cardinal propoſed to himſelf to keep up the diviſion betwixt the Lutherans of Germany, and the doctors of Geneva; but this was however but an ill way of maintaining his own religion. It was pure Machiaveliſm. Compare with this what I have ſaid in another place (44).

I have mentioned ſome ſermons of this cardinal: Languet's letters inform us, that they were not diſapproved by the Proteſtants, and that this cardinal was ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm. It was in the year 1561, that he preached them at Rheims, in Lent. 'Cardinalis Lotharingicus à rigidioribus Pontificiis accuſatur Lutheraniſmi. Per hanc Quadrageſimam concionatus eſt Rhemis cum non parva laude. Utinam nihil aliud unquam egiſſet (45).' He had already ſhewn that he wiſhed for the reformation of a great

(33) Id. lib. xiii, ſub fin. pag. m. 278.

(34) Paſquier, Recherch. livr. ii, chap. iv, pag. m. 65.

(35) See Henry Stephens, at the 208th page of his Dialogue, concerning the new French Language Italianized.

(36) This mode came again in 1660.

(37) Louïs Reinier Sieur de la Planche, Hiſt. de François II, pag. 28, & 29.

(38) Louïs Reynier, ibid. pag. 618.

(39) Paſquier, Lettre, livr. iv, p. 231, Tom I.

(40) This was brother John de Hans, a native of St Quentin. Paſquier ſpeaks of him, *ibid. pag.* 203.

(41) Paſquier, ubi ſupra, pag 232, 233.

(42) *See Lactantius*, lib. i, cap. xxi.

(43) Hieron. Zanchius, Reſponſ. ad Wilhelm Holderum, ann. 1566, pag. 20. Hoornb. ſumma Controv. pag. m. 271.

(44) Above, remark [*A*], of the article GUISE (FRANCIS duke of).

(45) Languet, Epiſt. xliv, lib. ii, pag. 112. *See alſo* Epiſt. xlv, pag. 116.

many things, but this was only a blind, as Languet well foretold: ‘ Cum preſertim Cardinalis Lotharingicus, Jam pulchre ſimulet ſe omnino expetere, ‘ ut fiat aliqua emendatio in religione & fatetur hoc ‘ eſſe plane neceſſarium. Ego ſane in ea re ipſi non ‘ credo ſed exiſtimo, ipſum hoc ideo facere, quia videt ‘ adverſando ſe nihil poſſe proficere, & ſperat ſe ſic agendo poſſe plura impedire, ſed tamen parum proficit (46). ‘ *Although at preſent the cardinal of Lorrain very* ‘ *plauſibly expreſſes his deſire that ſome reformation* ‘ *ſhould be made in religion, acknowledging that it is a* ‘ *thing abſolutely neceſſary. Yet for my part I can-* ‘ *not credit him in this matter, but am of opinion,* ‘ *that he does this becauſe he perceives nothing could* ‘ *be brought about by a contrary behaviour; whereas by* ‘ *thus ſeeming to comply, he hopes more effectually to* ‘ *hinder things from going on, but in this he has little ſucceſs.*’ What is ſaid in a letter dated from Paris the twenty ſixth of November 1561, is more poſitive: for the writer of that letter having ſpoken of the public converſion of the biſhop of Troies adds, that the cardinal of Lorrain made a ſhew, as if he would do the ſame; for adds he, he preaches at Rheims in ſuch a manner, that he does not ſeem very far from Lutheraniſm (47).

(46) Id. Epiſt. xlviii, pag 120.

(47) Cardinalis Lotharingicus videtur ſimulare ſe aliquid tale Cogitare: nam Rhemis ita concionatur, ut videatur non multum à noſtris diſſentire. Sed viderint alii quantum huic ſit fidendum *Id. Epiſt. lxiii, pag.* 155.

LOTICHIUS (Peter) abbot of the convent of Solitar, in the county of Hanaw (*a*) in Germany, was born in the year 1501. He quited the ſchools of Leipſic at ſixteen years of age, in order to devote himſelf to a monaſtic life in the convent of Solitar. He received prieſts orders in 1523, and peaceably performed the functions of it till 1524, that is, till the peaſants war forced him to take ſanctuary with his abbot and fraternity, under the counts of Hanaw. The abbot bringing back his ſociety to the monaſtery, after theſe furious troubles were appeaſed, committed the care of his church to Lotichius (*b*); who having read Luther and Melanchthon's books, found himſelf capable of preaching, and doing all the other functions of his place better than before. The abbot died in 1534, and Lotichius, who ſucceeded him, thinking in good earneſt to reform that abbey, opened a ſchool in it, in which a great number of young people were inſtructed, ſeveral of whom became miniſters of the Goſpel, after having continued their ſtudies at Wittemberg and Marpurg. He openly eſtabliſhed the Proteſtant religion in his monaſtery, and in all the places depending upon it, in 1543, and wrote a fine Latin letter to the abbot of Fulda, to juſtify his conduct. He was the principal cauſe of the couragious reſolution, which the neighbouring miniſters took to reject the *Interim* in 1549. The reſt of his life anſwered his great zeal by acts of piety and charity. His church, his ſchool, and ſeveral learned men, experienced the effects of his liberal temper. He died at the count of Hanaw's, the twenty-third of June 1567. His body was buried two days after, in the abbey of Solitar (*c*).

(*a*) *In the* Jugemens des Sçavans ſur les Poëtes, Tom. III, pag. 272, *there is* Naſſau *for* Hanaw, *which is probably an error of the preſs.*

(*b*) Eccleſiæ Solitarienſi ut inſpectorem præfecit. *Paul Freb. Theatro, pag.* 213.

(*c*) *Taken from the* Theatre *of Paul Freberus,* pag. 213. *Freberus cites the* Bibliotheca Poëtica, *of John-Peter Lotichius.*

LOTICHIUS (Peter) nephew to the former, took the ſirname *Secundus*, that he might not be miſtaken for his uncle. He was born at Solitar the ſecond of November 1528. His father (*a*), though he was only an honeſt country man, deſigned him for a ſcholar; and we need not wonder at it, conſidering what we have ſaid of the abbot Lotichius. This uncle having obſerved, by the progreſs his nephew made at Solitar ſchool, that he was very well qualified for the Sciences, reſolved to take a very particular care of him, and ſent him to Frankfort, where Micyllus taught the *Belles Lettres* with great reputation. After having learnt there a great deal of Latin and Greek, and much better the rules of Poetry, to which his genius ſtrongly inclined him; he was ſent to Marpurg in 1544, and afterwards to Wittemberg, whither Melanchthon and Camerarius drew a great reſort. The young Lotichius quickly gained the friendſhip of theſe two famous profeſſors, as alſo that of George Sabinus, a celebrated poet, and of ſeveral other learned men. The war which broke out in Saxony in 1546, obliged Melanchthon and his colleagues to quit Wittemberg. The firſt retired to Magdeburg (*b*), and was followed thither by our Lotichius; but when he left that place to ſeek a better retreat, Lotichius, inſtead of following him, took up arms. This kind of life did not intirely break off his commerce with the Muſes, nor did it laſt long [*A*]; for we know that in the year 1548, he lived peaceably among his books at Erfort. A little after he returned to Wittemberg, whither the peace had permitted Melanchthon to go and continue his function. He there finiſhed his ſtudies of philoſophy, and afterwards went into France, in quality of governor to the nephews of Daniel Stibar, dean of the chapter of Wirtzburg, a man of great merit, and an intimate friend of Joachim Camerarius. It was in the year 1550 that he began this journey, which laſted near four years [*B*]. He made a long ſtay at Montpellier; and probably he and his pupils would

(*a*) *He was called Lewis Loticius. Melancthon changed this word into Lotichius, which ſeemed to him emphatical, for the ſake of Peter Lotichius Secundus, his ſcholar.*

(*b*) *The* Theatre *of Freberus,* pag. 1249, *ſays Marpurg.*

[*A*] *He took up arms; this kind of life did not entirely break off his commerce with the Muſes, nor did it laſt long.*] Let us hear what he himſelf ſays of it addreſſing his diſcourſe to them (1).

Vos quoque ſum lituos inter veneratus & enſes,
  Quodque fuit vacuum tempus ab hoſte dedi.
Deque tot amiſſis etiam nunc pauca ſuperſunt
  Carmina militiæ tempore facta meæ.

You, amidſt arms, were my delight,
  My vacant hours for you reſerv'd;
I, even in camps, could poems write,
  Of which a few are ſtill preſerv'd.

For the reſt, he did not make much more than one campaign, ſo that the author, cited by Mr Baillet, had no reaſon to ſay in general, *that what is remarkable is, that Lotichius compoſed his verſes in the tumult of a camp, and under arms* (2).

[*B*] *His journey to France . . . . . laſted near four years.*] This was the whole time of the journey (3). Now as they firſt ſaw Paris, Rouen, Diepe, Lyons, and went for the moſt part on foot (4), having but one horſe among eleven of them to carry their cloaths; it is certain they ſtaid not at Montpellier four years, as an ingenious man has ſaid (5). They lived there above two years. *Cum biennio jam atque eo amplius forte in Academia Mompeliana vixiſſent*, ſays Hagius in the 47th page.

[*C*] . . . *Lotichius*

(1) Eleg. x, lib. i.

(2) Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, Tom. III, pag. 273.

(3) Revertentes tandem igitur poſt exactum jam ferme quadriennium ex Galliis. *Hagius, in Vita Lotichii, pag.* 56.

(4) Idem, pag. 42, 44.

(5) Teiſſier, Addit. aux Elog. Tom. I, pag. 207.

would have ſuffered ſeveral inſults (*c*), for having eaten meat in Lent, if Cluſius, who lodged at Rondelet's, had not interceded for them with a Dominican, who performed the office of inquiſitor. They were diſcharged for a ſum of money. He was ſcarce returned into Germany but he thought of travelling into Italy. He made this journey, as he had done that to France, at the expence of Daniel Stibar; but he had the misfortune of getting acquainted with too many people. He lodged at Bologna, with a young canon of Munich, who though he had a complaiſant landlady at home, made love abroad (*d*). The landlady being deſperately in love, and alſo jealous, prepared a philtre for him; but by misfortune Lotichius finding his ſoop too fat, changed it for that of the canon [*C*], and grew immediately mad upon it. He was relieved by vomiting up a part of the potion, which however threw him into a malignant fever that made his nails fall off, and had like to have coſt him his life. Hubert Languet, his good friend, travelling into Italy, found him in this miſerable condition at Bologna. The poiſon operated ſo violently upon Lotichius, that every year he had ſome returns of his firſt malady, till at laſt he died of it. Before he left Italy, he took his degree of doctor of Phyſic at Padua. Some time after his return into Germany, he was invited to Heidelberg to be profeſſor in that faculty; he accepted of this invitation, and went to Heidelberg in 1557. He there got the eſteem and favour of the elector Palatine, Otho-Henry, and of every body elſe; and as he had all manner of reaſon to be ſatisfied with his employment, he refuſed the offers that were made him at Marpurg, of a place of profeſſor of Phyſic or Poetry. He did not long enjoy that pleaſant ſtate; being attacked with his old diſtemper in the beginning of November 1560, and died the ſeventh of the ſame month, he was a man of admirable converſation, and was candor and ſincerity it ſelf (*e*) [*D*]. A collection of his poems were publiſhed in 1561 [*E*]. It contains ſo many love-verſes, that it was thought the author wanted ſome apology on that account. Hagius undertook it [*F*]. The fourth elegy of the ſecond book has ſomething

(*c*) *They threatened to oblige them to make the* amende honorable.

(*d*) Tum forte (ut fit) amare foris, quod domi habebat, ut ait Terentius. Id. impatientius ferens hoſpita juvenis formoſiſſimi amore capta, &c. *Hagius, in Vita Lotichii, pag.* 63. *Edit.* 1609.

(*e*) *Taken from his Life, compoſed by John Hagius, his good friend, and publiſhed twenty five years after the death of Lotichius. Melchior Adam,* in Vitis Medicorum, pag. 112, *has given a full Abridgment of that Life.*

[*C*] *Lotichius . . . . . . changed his ſoop for that of the canon*] According to Hagius's manner of relating the thing, this philtre was given in a ſoop; but he is ſtrangely miſtaken in imagining, as he ſeems to do, that the Italians give the name *Mineſtra* to theſe enchanting potions, which the Greeks call *philtron*. *Jus parare*, ſays he (6), *neſcio quod malè temperatum ac conciliatum Circæum, Itali mineſtram illud, hoc philtron Græci vocant*. The Italians by *Mineſtra*, or *Meneſtra*, barely underſtand pottage or ſoop.

(6) Hagius, ubi ſupra, pag. 63.

[*D*] . . . . *he was candor and ſincerity itſelf.*] His Hiſtorian gives a moſt remarkable proof of it. He might, if he pleaſed, have married very advantageouſly; but becauſe he believed he ſhould ſoon die, he could not think of deceiving the woman; and therefore refuſed all the matches that were propoſed to him. *Quod ſe ſciret ſupremi diei ſui nec vitæ longioris conſcium fallere puellam ingenuam ullam, fæmineumve genus, aut lactare ſpe connubii fortunæque ſtabilioris nolle* (7).

(7) Id. ibid.

[*E*] *A collection of Lotichius's poems were publiſhed in* 1561.] Joachim Camerarius wrote the Epiſtle Dedicatory, in which he gives Lotichius the character of the beſt Poet, that his age, and Germany had ſeen. After this edition, many others were made with the addition of ſeveral poems. Thuanus (8), who has put three years betwixt Lotichius's death, and the publication of his poems by Camerarius, is two years miſtaken in his reckoning. Moreri has copied this fault, and has added a little anachroniſm of his own on the day of his death, which happened not as he ſays, on the twenty fourth of October, but on the ſeventh of November. Thuanus, who has placed his death on the firſt of November, is not without fault. Freherus (9) alſo reckons three years betwixt Lotichius's death, and the edition of his poems. Thuanus (10) has placed this Poet below Eobanus Heſſus. Camerarius pretends, that if the latter was alive, he would have owned himſelf inferior to Lotichius. ‘Sed & Eobanus & Sabi-‘nus, ſi viverent, cum omnia in Lotichii ſcriptis mag-‘nopere probarent, tum elegantia & ſuavitate atque ‘exprimendi vetuſtatis ſimilitudinem contentione, ſe ‘ab hoc alicubi ſuperari non negarent (11). ——— ‘*But Eobanus and Sabinus both, if they were now li-‘ving, as they were great admirers of Lotichius's wri-‘tings, ſo they would not deny that in elegancy and ſoft-‘neſs of expreſſion, as alſo in a happy manner of imita-‘ting the Antients, they were each of them excelled by ‘him.*’ Hagius affirms, that the greateſt Poets of Germany have publickly acknowledged the particular eſteem they had for Lotichius's verſes; and pretends, that, in the common opinion, Lotichius equalled the moſt excellent Poets, both antient and modern, and was preferable perhaps to ſome of the Antients; he cites Paul Meliſſus's verſes, in which the ſuperiority is given to Lotichius, above all the German Poets, with reſpect to elegy. Melchior Adam (12) is ſomewhat unexact in his abridgment of this place, ſince he makes Hagius ſay, that the greateſt men, and particularly George Sabinus, John Stigelius, George Fabricius, Poſthius, and Meliſſus, have given Lotichius the ſuperiority with reſpect to elegiac verſe. Hagius at the moſt makes only Poſthius and Meliſſus give him this ſuperiority; he ſays nothing of the other three, either expreſly or implicitly that can relate to this matter.

(8) Thuanus, lib. xxvi, ſub fin.

(9) Theatr. pag. 1250.

(10) Thuan. ubi ſupra.

(11) Camerarius, in Epiſt. Dedicatoria Operum Petri Lotichii.

(12) In Vita Philoſoph. pag. 210.

I thought that the edition of Lotichius's poems procured by Camerarius in 1561, was the firſt; but Mr Kortholt (13) has been pleaſed to inform me, that there was printed at Paris in 1551, by Vaſcoſan, *Petri Lotichii ſecundi elegiarum liber, & ejuſdem carminum libellus ad D. Danielem Stibarum equitem Francum*. The letter he writ me thereupon is ſo miſlaid among my papers, that when I was reviſing this article, I could not find it; however I remember he gave me ſeveral paticulars of this edition, and told me, among other things, that the dream I ſhall ſpeak of below (14), is not found in it. Mr Kortholt acquainted me alſo that he had inſerted ſeveral things concerning our Peter Lotichius in his diſſertation *de enthuſiaſmo poetico*, printed at Kiel in 1696.

(13) *Sebaſtian, mentioned above, remark* [*C*] *of the article* KORTHOLT.

(14) *In the remark* [*G*].

[*F*] *Hagius undertook the apology of his love-verſes.*] He confeſſes (15) that being very young he made frequent reflexions with ſome ſort of ſurprize, on the perpetual complaints with which the Poets fill their verſes; as that they burn with love, that they are pierced with Cupid's darts, and that they find no remedy for theſe conſuming flames.

(15) In Vita Lotichii.

Mille fatigatus rerum diſcrimina vici,
  Sæpe graves æſtus, frigora ſæpe tuli:
Unius haud poſſum ſuperare Cupidinis ignes,
  Nec deſideriis fortior eſſe meis.

A thouſand changes I have born,
  And colds, and heats, I have endur'd,
Yet Cupid doth my courage ſcorn,
  Nor are his flames by patience cur'd.

After theſe verſes of Lotichius, he cites three of Virgil's.

Aſpice aratra jugo referunt ſuſpenſa juvenci,
Et ſol creſcentes decedens duplicat umbras.
Me tamen urit amor, quis enim modus adſit amori?

Releas'd from toil the ſteers brought home the plows,
The ſetting ſun the length'n'd ſhadow ſhows,
Me love ſtill burns for love no limit knows.

ſomething ſurprizing in it; it turns upon a dream, which ſeems to be a prediction of the ſacking of Magdeburg [G]. I ſhall make ſeveral remarks on this ſubject, which yet

He adds, that having aſked ſome Poets the meaning of theſe things, Lotichius anſwered him, that it was the fire of divine, and not venereal, love, that burnt the Poets.

Cur vatum pars magna ſuos decantet amores
Miraris, Hagi candide, & cauſſam rogas?
Accipe, non illos Veneris fax improba, verum
Æterni amor generoſus urit numinis.

That of their loves ſo many Poets ſung,
You wonder, Hagius, and demand the cauſe.
They were not by a luſtful paſſion ſtung,
But love divine unto their verſe gave laws.

This anſwer is ridiculous; it was treating Hagius as a child. He does not ſpeak of it as he ought to do; for he only ſays, that Meliſſus explained to him all the myſtery much better (16). Meliſſus repreſented to him, that if any thing was capable of attracting hearts, and conveying invincible charms into the very marrow, it is the love that is kindled by a modeſt and chaſt object. The pureſt heaven, adds he, formed this love, and aſſigned it inflamed hearts for it's throne (17). The ſtars take care to keep up this fire; and as the Poets receive the influences from heaven, which inſpire their Poetry, we need not wonder that they have ſo lively a ſenſe of the fire of love; for theſe influences having the ſame origin as love (18), both kindle and keep it up.

Sic propagare laborat
Indita naturæ ſemina quiſque ſuæ.

Each but endeavours to make thoſe things grow,
The ſeeds of which kind nature did beſtow.

To reduce this explication to plain human language, and to it's juſt ſimplicity, we muſt ſuppoſe that Meliſſus meant, that the ſame complexion which diſpoſes a man to Poetry, diſpoſes him to love. This propoſition is not eaſy to be made out; for beſides that there are many perſons, who have a talent at Poetry without being of an amorous conſtitution, it is certain there are innumerable people who cannot make a verſe, and yet are more furiouſly tormented with the fire of love than thoſe whoſe poems are the moſt amorous. How many love-verſes are printed, which are only witty conceits? A Poet never ſo little touched, appropriates to himſelf whatever he finds in the moſt paſſionate elegies; he tries even to carry things higher than what he has read; he invents new turns, and ſtudies the moſt mournful characters. His deſign is to make his verſes admired; to exerciſe his vein upon thoughts, which at once give a reputation to his poetical wit, and flatter the object of his paſſion. There are even ſome who are free from love, when they compoſe this kind of verſes. Beza was one of them. ‘ Iſtos bonos viros non pudet quicquid de poeticæ Candidæ amoribus luſi, (luſi autem certè pleraque, veteres illos imitatus, priuſquam etiam per ætatem, quid iſtud rei eſſet intelligerem) ad caſtiſſimam & lectiſſimam, fœminam accommodare. Id autem non aliter ſe habere quàm dico, non ii tantum teſtari poſſunt quibuſcum per id tempus vixi, verum etiam res ipſa declarat: quum nullos unquam liberos ex uxore ſuſceperim, in meis autem illis carminibus, Candidam pregnantem ſuperis commendem: quod tum mihi nimirum illud fictitium argumentum, ut alia ſubinde multa, occurreret (19). ——— *Thoſe good men are not aſhamed to apply to a moſt chaſt and excellent woman, what I have ludicrouſly written on Candida; for certainly I ſaid moſt of thoſe things in jeſt, and in imitation of the antients, being at that time ſo young, as not to know what the thing meant. That what I ſay is really true, I can not only prove by the teſtimony of thoſe with whom I lived at that time; but I can appeal to thoſe very verſes, for the thing ſpeaks itſelf. I never had any children by my wife, and yet in theſe verſes I recommend the pregnant Candida to the favour of heaven, becauſe that fictitious ſubject then ſtruck my mind as many others have done at other times.*’ You have in theſe laſt words an inſtance of the conduct of Poets; they give themſelves imaginary ſubjects, that they may have an opportunity of ſaying witty things. But let us come to Lotichius's apology.

He had four miſtreſſes ſucceſſively; for whom he made a great many verſes (20): he never propoſed, as they ſay, to obtain any criminal favours from them, but it is only from himſelf, a witneſs in his own cauſe, that we know this. ‘ Non fecit id non honeſte, quia & caſte amavit Lotichius & ſine crimine ac ſcelere: ſi modo caſtiſſimi Poetæ verbis verſibuſque dignamur aliquam habere non dubiam fidem, ſic etenim ipſemet de amoribus ſuis canit, & Claudia ſua.

Feliciter arſi
Inque meo nullum crimen amore fuit.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Non ego te, mea lux, deceptam fraude reliqui,
Non ſpolium rapto turpe pudore tuli.
Dî mihi ſunt teſtes, ſi mentior, æquore vaſto
Obruar, & mutis piſcibus eſca natem (21).

‘ *There was nothing of diſhoneſty in this, for Lotichius loved chaſtly, and without crime or guilt, if we allow the words and verſes of a moſt chaſt Poet credit, when they are expreſs, for thus himſelf writes of his paſſion, and of his Claudia.*

My boſom burns with no diſhoneſt love,
But happily a virtuous paſſion prove.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
From thee, my love, I ne'er did perjur'd fly,
Nor bore thy honour or good name away.
This witneſs, heaven, or plunge me, if I lie,
In boundleſs ſeas to hungry fiſh a prey.

The apologiſt obſerves, that the privileges of Poetry allowed Lotichius to exerciſe his muſe upon earthly beauties, it being an art which is exerciſed in the contemplation, and explication of all that is beautiful in the univerſe. ‘ Fecit Lotichius id primum jure poetices optimo, ad quam ſcilicet rerum omnium pulcherrimarum quæ magna hac univerſitate orbis continentur, cœleſtium terreſtriumque ſpectabilium formarum contemplatio, commentatioque rite pertinet.’ Moreover, as he was civil and polite, he applied himſelf to write love-verſes, and would not deprive himſelf of this piece of galantry, which alſo was uſeful towards poliſhing his muſe. ‘ Ex quo illud ſaltem conſecutus eſt commodi, ut molles amores cantando mollius carmen deduceret.’ In fine, he wanted this agreeable diverſion to baniſh the melancholy thoughts with which he was diſturbed (22).

[G] *The fourth elegy of the ſecond book . . . . . turns upon a dream, which ſeems to be a prediction of the ſacking of Magdeburg.*] That is, of the dreadful ſacking which this town ſuffered in 1631, being taken by the Imperial forces. Mr Morhof has made the following obſervation. ‘ Illud ſingulare in hoc viro & propemodum divinum eſt, ac plus quam Poeticum ἐνϑουσιασμὸν arguit, quod in *Elegia* 4. *lib.* 2. ad Joachimum Camerarium ſcriptâ triſtiſſima obſidionis & expugnationis Magdeburgenſis fata integro ſeculo prædixerit. Res omnino notatu digna, ac elegia illa pulcherrima eſt. Hæc ille aurea carmina, quod mireris, inter armorum ſtrepitus ipſe miles ſcribebat (23). ——— *This was certainly ſingular in the man of whom we are ſpeaking, and ſhews ſomething in him divine, at leaſt far beyond a poetic enthuſiaſm, that in the fourth elegy of his ſecond book, addreſſed to Joachim Camerarius, he predicted the unfortunate ſiege and hapleſs taking of Magdeburg, a whole age before it came to paſs. A thing juſtly deſerving notice, the elegy it ſelf being alſo very beautiful. Theſe golden verſes he compoſed while a ſoldier, and incommoded with the din of arms which is alſo ſomewhat ſtrange.*’ Lotichius in a dream ſaw a great town beſieged, and a young woman, who called herſelf the protectreſs of the place, complaining of the cruelties that ſhould lay it waſte, and reduce it to a heap of yet are rather conjectures, than an explication which fully ſatisfies me. It was thought ſtrange

---

(16) Quam rem non paulo & copioſius, & luculentius nobis enucleavit Meliſſus.

(17) Purior hanc æther olim generavit & intra Succenſas juſſit regna tenere fibras.

(18) Habent alimenta calores Vivida ſidereis ſola perenne focis.

(19) Beza, in Epiſtola Dedicatoria Poëmat.

(20) Puellas quoque facile amavit bellas ac bonas formas mortales, ac Claudiam quidem primum ſuam multo carmine celebratam, mihi vero non incognitam, ſubfuſcam, non informem nec inamabilem puellam: deinde Callirhoen, alteram Celtiberam tunicatam, formoſam: hinc pecoris cuſtodem, religioſam nimis Italam Panaridem: ac poſtremum non vero nomine dictam Phyllida pulchram Nicrogenam. - - - *He was inclined to love pretty women; firſt of all his Claudia, whom he celebrates ſo much in his verſes, one not unknown to me, and who, though ſhe was brown, was for all that no unlikely, nor unlovely woman: afterwards Callirhoe, another Aragonian beauty: then an Italian ſhepherdeſs, a little too religious: and laſtly, under the name of Phillis, the lovely Nicrogena.* Hagius, ubi ſupra.

(21) Id. ibid.

(22) Oblectationem eam animi honeſtam ad leniendas animi curas, moleſtias, ægritudines duceret maximam. Quod poëta ipſe de ſeſe noſter profitetur.
Mollia ſæpe quidem deducere carmina tento,
Non tamen ut puris auribus illa probem.
Sat mihi ſit rigidas interdum fallere curas,
Solamenque mali præmia magna voco.

(23) Morhofius, Polyhiſt. lib. i, cap. xix, pag. 226.

of aſhes. He does not name this town, nor know whether it was upon the Rhine, or the Danube, or the Elbe, but he believes it was upon the Elbe. However, he muſt have characteriſed Magdeburg, ſince this elegy is intituled, *De obſidione urbis Magdeburgenſis*. There is doubtleſs ſomething ſurpriſing in this, though it muſt be owned, that the condition the Poet was then in, diminiſhes the wonder. He was in the army of the league of Smalcald (24), probably rather expecting the good ſucceſſes of Charles V, than thoſe of that league. His imagination extended itſelf to all the poſſible conſequences of Charles the fifth's victory (25). Perhaps this ſuppoſition might have intermixed with his dream, that the emperor would ſeverely chaſtiſe Magdeburg, if the confederate army was beaten. The Poet immediately prepared to deplore the miſeries of a ſtormed town; and one of his fictions was, that the tutelar goddeſs makes her complaints, &c (26). When we awake, we eaſily confound the images, becauſe we forget their order: thoſe eſcape us which were the bond of connexion; and hence we imagine, that the ideas, which we ourſelves have linked to one another, came all at once by inſpiration. It is almoſt as eaſy to form ſyſtems about general affairs ſleeping as waking; abundance of people having read great news in a Gazette, draw an admirable plan of the conſequences it will produce. In a quarter of an hour, they conduct the victors to the capital city of the vanquiſhed; they fancy to themſelves thrones overturned, and all Europe changing it's face at once; and if they are Poets or Orators, they add to all this the ſketches of a fine poem, or of an eloquent oration; they have the figures ready in their heads, and repreſent to themſelves the very mien and words of the deputies, who come to deliver up the keys of the towns. We may be certain, that at every hour of the day, ſuch things as theſe are rolling in ſome peoples brains: the ſoul, when they ſleep, is no leſs exerciſed with reſpect to theſe chimeras; it draws imaginary ſchemes. Such was perhaps the caſe of Lotichius that night. I have given the reaſon why, when he awaked, he could not perceive that he was the author of this train of viſions, as they who build caſtles in the air whilſt awake, know and perceive themſelves to be the true authors of them, without the aſſiſtance of any foreign intelligence ſtriking in with them to reveal futurities; which is alſo the reaſon why they draw no preſages from them.

This is an obſervation that might be made upon admitting Mr Morhof's ſuppoſition, namely, that Lotichius had this dream before the battle of Mulberg, in which the confederate army was beaten by Charles V. But this ſuppoſition having no foundation, I ſhall chuſe rather to ſay, that Lotichius dreamed thus, during the ſiege of Magdeburg, in the year 1550, or 1551. It was eaſy to imagine that Maurice, elector of Saxony, who commanded the ſiege for the emperor, would take the town, and treat it cruelly. Lotichius poſſeſſed with this fear, imagined the ſacking of the town in a dream, and fell into poetic fictions. He failed not to introduce the tutelar goddeſs, who made proteſtations of her innocence and fidelity, tho' the emperor expelled her from her habitation, &c. The next day he found this ſubject ſo fit to be handled in verſe, that he made an elegy upon it, which he himſelf intituled, *De obſidione urbis Magdeburgenſis*. I believe indeed, he imagined there was ſomething prophetical in this dream, which proceeded from his not remembering the beginning of it, and not knowing that he had tacked all theſe viſions himſelf, as the newſmongers do theirs, in ſtarting all the conſequences they are pleaſed to ſuppoſe to ſieges and battles (27). Now as the ſiege of Magdeburg, was terminated, not by taking of the town, but by a treaty of peace, Lotichius doubtleſs undeceived himſelf; he diſcovered the falſity of his dreams, but his verſes were preſerved and publiſhed after his death. But who knows whether he did not feign that he dreamed this? Do not poets daily give themſelves this liberty? after having well conſidered this, I think it more probable, that he did not dream what he related; but, like other poets, feigned he dreamed thus.

Since the firſt edition of this work, I have been informed by a letter from Mr Kortholt (28), of ſome particulars, which oblige me to conſider this matter over again. In the firſt place, it is certain, that the elegy *De obſidione urbis Magdeburgenſis*, is not found in the collection of poems, which Lotichius cauſed to be printed at Paris by Vaſcoſan, the epiſtle dedicatory whereof, is dated from Paris the thirteenth of February 1551. If he dated it according to the ſtile at that time received in France, it was in February 1552. He knew then, that the town of Magdeburg was no longer in fear; being delivered from the ſiege by a treaty of peace in November 1551 (29). If he dated it beginning the year with January, the ſiege of Magdeburg ſtill continued, and was far from being ended. Whatever ſtile he made uſe of, it is plain, he ought not to have publiſhed the poem in diſpute at that time; the elegy, I ſay, in which he is ſuppoſed to ſpeak of the ſacking and burning of Magdeburg; and though we ſhould be certain, that he had already compoſed it, we ſhould yet believe he would have been very cautious of inſerting it in the edition of his Latin poems. In the ſecond place, Mr Kortholt, who underſtands poetry very well, and who has collated the ſeveral editions of Lotichius's poems, finds a great difference betwixt that of Paris 1551, and thoſe that followed the death of the author. He finds Lotichius but a mean Poet in the Paris edition of his poems (30), compared to what they are after they had been corrected, and in compariſon of the new poems added to Camerarius's edition. In a word, he finds, that Lotichius in 1551, was not capable of compoſing ſo excellent an elegy as that *de Obſidione Urbis Magdeburgenſis*. We muſt conclude then, that it was made when this town was out of danger, and therefore the dream that threatned it with an entire deſtruction, cannot be explained by the hypotheſis I have alledged. It is a matter which has relation to the time to come, and conſequently to the ſacking of Magdeburg in 1631, as Mr Morhof pretends. To this I have two replies to make.

I. Firſt I ſay, that whether Lotichius writ this elegy whilſt he bore arms, or compoſed it during the ſiege of Magdeburg, and that either in conſequence of a dream, or under the fiction of a pretended dream, he ought not to have inſerted it amongſt the pieces which he publiſhed at Paris in 1551. I have given the reaſons for this already. But he was not obliged to burn it; he therefore probably preſerved it, and having afterwards given it ſome new touches, and poliſhed it over and over, he worked it to that perfection which he was not able to give it when his poems were firſt printed. Age, ſtudy, and labour, had improved his muſe; he changed into an excellent elegy, what at firſt was but an indifferent poem. It was found among his papers after his death as he had perfected it by his corrections, and it was ſent to his friend Camerarius to be printed with his other writings (31). Theſe are very probable conjectures, and therefore thoſe I propoſed in my firſt edition, loſe nothing of their due weight. Poets, naturally fond of their own works, would not willingly deſtroy what they have once writ; but carefully preſerve it, even when the occaſion is paſſed; eſpecially when they perſuade themſelves, that they have treated a ſubject well, and that it was very capable of ornaments. Mr Menage having heard that Mr Corneille was dead, compoſed an epitaph for him, which he thought a good one, and would not loſe the public honour of it, even after he knew that Mr Corneille was not dead. He preſerved this piece ſo carefully, as to inſert it in the editions of his poems, and even after his enemy Cotin had ſeverely rallied him for it. Here follows his raillery, which I believe contains a falſe ſuppoſition; for I am perſuaded, the news of Mr Corneille's death was actually ſpread abroad. *It is above ten years ago*, ſays Cotin (32), *ſince Menage made Corneille's epitaph, though Corneille be not yet dead, having collected out of the Greek and Latin poets, abundance of thoughts upon the death of a great Poet, he killed his good friend to exhauſt his common place, he made him die of a Peripneumony.* Let it be obſerved, that the ſubject of Lotichius's elegy was very proper to inſpire the author with compaſſion; it is favourable to the poetic art, and therefore the preſervation of Magdeburg was not likely to make him ſuppreſs that piece of poetry.

II. But let us grant, that Lotichius had written nothing like this, when this great town was out of trouble, and the peace of Paſſau had ſecured the Proteſtants

(24) I ſpeak according to the ſuppoſition of Mr Morhof, which is not certain.

(25) *Mark well his fifth verſe*, Somnia ſunt CURAS hæc imitata meas.

(26) See what ſhall be cited from Balzac, in the remark [*K*] of the article THOMAS (PAUL), on occaſion of a wood cut down.

(27) See the deſcription which Mr de la Bruyere, *Charactêres de ce Siecle*, in the chapter of the *Sovereign. pag. m.* 378, & *ſeq.* has given us of the character of theſe gentlemen, whether in an over ſanguine, or a deſponding diſpoſition.

(28) Sebaſtian, of which above, citat. (13).

(29) See David Chytræus. *in Saxonia, lib. xvii, pag. m.* 441.

(30) Employ this againſt the complaint of Mr Morhof, in remark [*H*].

(31) Conſult the laſt letter of the fifth book of Joachim Camerarius.

(32) Cotin Menagerie, pag. 31. Hague Edit. 1666.

ſtrange, that Julius Cæſar Scaliger ſhould no where praiſe Lotichius [H]. We ſhould have more reaſon to wonder at it, had not Lotichius's reputation been chiefly founded upon the works that were not printed till after Scaliger's death; but this critic's ſilence is not ſurprizing, ſince the firſt editions of Lotichius's poems (*f*) are much inferior to that which it was impoſſible for him to have any knowledge of (*g*).

teſtants of Germany; yet muſt we however in the ſecond place ſay, that the dream of the author has nothing extraordinary in it. We muſt remember one thing, which cannot well be called into queſtion, which is, that Poets frequently work upon ſubjects of pure invention; they deſcribe ſhipwrecks which they have not ſeen, and which never were; they feign, as they think fit, times, places, conſequences, and incidents. They do the ſame with reſpect to the taking of towns. Theſe are ſubjects, which can exerciſe their talents to advantage; they make choice of them, not only when they are awake, but alſo when they ſleep. If their nocturnal viſions lead them to a beſieged town, they fancy a general aſſault, the beſieged forced to give ground; the town carried, plundered, burnt *&c.* If it be a town, which they are greatly concerned for, their poetical fancy is heated; they deplore the misfortune, they form the draught of a poem; and when wearied with the dream, they awake, and know not whether it be a natural, or an extraordinary one; however they take pen in hand, and give a poetical deſcription of the viſion. It ſometimes happens, that they have ſuch ſort of viſions, only becauſe the day before, they had meditated upon the deſcription of the ſacking of a town. Experience informs us, that thoſe objects which poſſeſs our thoughts in the day time, commonly preſent themſelves to our minds the night following, and there are thoſe who ſooner light on a fine turn of poetic thought, whilſt they ſleep, than when they are awake. Their dreams are vehement, and move and agitate the ſpirits with a prodigious force. They find themſelves, as they awake, in a commotion which aſtoniſhes them, they perceive ſomething wonderful in it, which they think deſerves cultivating, and immediately fall to verſifying. If you examine all theſe things well, you will find a foundation for conjectures upon the natural cauſes of Lotichius's elegy. Apply to this what Lucretius ſays,

Et quo quiſque fere ſtudio devinctus adhæret,
Aut quibus in rebus multum ſumus ante morati
Atque in qua ratione fuit contenta magis mens,
In ſomnis eadem plerumque videmur obire:
Cauſidici cauſas agere, &c. . . . . (33).

Whatever moſt employs our waking thought,
Back to the mind in midnight dreams is brought.
Then Lawyers plead . . . . .

Le us go on with our conjectures. There are few who have not obſerved, that they have often dreamed of the ſame thing; as that they were attacked by robbers, that lightning fell into their chamber, that a mutiny happened in a town, *&c.* The return of the ſame dreams is more common, when the objects make a lively impreſſion, and when the conſtitution of the brain gives way to their making well-purſued and deep-printed tracks. It is probable, that during the ſiege of Magdeburg, Lotichius had a dream that repreſented the ſacking this town, and, purſuant to it, fell to making verſes the next day, or a few days after. If the town had been taken and ſacked, he had publiſhed them doubtleſs at the ſame time; but hearing in his travels the news of the peace, he laid by his poem. We may ſuppoſe at three or four years end, the ſame dream returned; the traces it had left the firſt time, formed a channel, the mouth of which was open'd by the tumultuous and irregular agitation of the animal ſpirits; but this irregularity hindered not their running along the ſame tracks; and thus the view of the ſacking of Magdeburg was renewed. Lotichius thinking it perhaps myſterious, new-poliſhed his verſes, amplified them, and put them in the condition in which the public has ſeen them. I do not know but he might have been afraid, from his love for Magdeburg, that this new dream was prophetical and ſupernatural; but, in my opinion, he ought not to have thought it more ſo now than at the firſt time, where, according to the uſual courſe of dreams, he might fancy the burning of a town which was actually beſieged. Should a Poet, out of a witty conceit, make an elegy at this time, reſembling that of Lotichius, it might well enough happen before eighty years come about, that the town he ſung of to divert himſelf, may be bombarded and ruined.

[H] *It was thought ſtrange that Julius Cæſar Scaliger has not praiſed Lotichius.*] You will find at the end of the text to this article, the reaſons why we are not to wonder at Scaliger's ſilence. However, let us hear Mr Morhof's complaint. ‘Fuit Phœnix Poetarum Germaniæ Lotichius, omnibus exteris ſi non ſuperior, certe æqualis. Hujus tamen vel ipſis Germanis pene ignotum nomen eſt: exteri nullam ejus mentionem faciunt. J. C. Scaliger cum cenſuram Poëtarum Germanorum inſtituit in Hypercritico ſuo ne verbulum quidem de hoc noſtro, qui tamen omnibus cæteris erat anteferendus (34). —— *Lotichius was the Phœnix of the German Poets, and as to the foreign ones, if he does not excel them all, he is at the leaſt equal to any. Yet the Germans themſelves ſcarce know any thing of him; ſtrangers have never mentioned him. Julius Cæſar Scaliger, in the cenſure of the German Poets, contained in his Hypercitic, ſays not one word of our author, notwithſtanding that he ought to have been preferred to them all.*’

LOTICHIUS (CHRISTIAN) younger brother to the preceding, diſcovered in his infancy no leſs diſpoſitions to ſtudy, than he. Therefore his uncle, the abbot, having firſt cauſed him to be diligently inſtructed in his ſchool of Solitar, ſent him afterwards to Wittemberg, to ſtudy Philoſophy there, and eſpecially Divinity. It was not in this univerſity, but in that of Heidelberg that he took his maſter of arts degree in 1549, after which his uncle gave him the charge of his church and college. Whilſt he was thus Vicar to the abbey, he was deſired by ſeveral learned men, to collect all the poems of Lotichius Secundus, and publiſh them, with an exact hiſtory of the life and ſtudies of this illuſtrious brother. He was working upon it, when the death of the abbot Lotichius, his uncle, interrupted that work in 1567. It was in his power to ſucceed him in his abbey; for they who had the right to elect, declared for him; but he rather choſe to reſign his pretenſions to his brother in-law Sigefridus Hettenus, miniſter of the church of Groningen. He could not have long enjoyed the dignity of abbot, if he had accepted it, for he died in 1568. He made verſes with pretty good ſucceſs. A collection of his poems was printed in 1602 (*a*), by the care of John Peter Lotichius, his grandſon, who joined them with his own. I have not found in Freherus, who furniſhes me with this article, that the poems of Lotichius Secundus, and our Chriſtian Lotichius were ever printed together (*b*).

(*f*) That of Paris 1551, in 8vo, and that of Leipſic, 1552.

(*g*) *See citat* (30).

(33) Lucretius, lib. iv, ver. 959.

(34) Morhof. ubi ſupra, pag. 225.

(*a*) Draudius, Biblioth. pag. 1573. Edit. 1625.

(*b*) Yet Moreri's Dictionary, printed in Holland, affirms this, and cites Freherus for it.

LOTICHIUS (John Peter), grandſon to the former, made himſelf known by a great number of books which he publiſhed both in verſe and proſe. He was a Phyſician by profeſſion, and well verſed in Human Literature. The commentary upon Petronius, which he publiſhed at Frankfort in 1629, anſwers theſe two qualities [*A*]. The reward he received for the dedication of his epigrams, was very ſlender [*B*]. He was invited to Rintell, to be profeſſor of Phyſic (*a*).

(*a*) See the epiſtle dedicatory of his Petronius.

[*A*] *The commentary which he publiſhed on Petronius anſwers theſe two qualities.*] For he there explains by itſelf, whatever is in Petronius, relating to Phyſic; and afterwards, in another part, gives critical and philoſophical notes upon the ſame author. He appears to have more reading, and memory, than penetration and judgment. See what an opinion Goldaſt had of this commentary: ‘Mitto tibi Lotichii commentaria in Petronium cum aliorum notis . . . . vides quantum abs tuo inſtituto ac judicio Lotichius diſſideat. Volebam hominem amicum hac occaſione ad lectionem veterum Medicorum deducere, quorum illum prorſus expertem & negligentem eſſe advertebam. Sed judicio deſtitutus nec in bonis auctoribus verſatus, nobis undiquaque compilavit quæ ad grandiendum librum convaſare ex Cornucopia, Calepino, Textoris officina, Eraſmi Chiliadibus & conſimilibus ſcriptis poterat, ut tandem monſtroſum, horrendum, & inſanum magnum iſtud commentum pareret. Adeo ſibi philautia placet, ut etiam ſordes ſuas putet mera olere cinnama (1). ——— *I ſend you Lotichius's commentary on Petronius, with the notes of others . . . . You ſee how far Lotichius falls below you in knowledge, and judgment; I would have adviſed this man, as a friend, to take this occaſion to make himſelf acquainted with the ancient Phyſicians, becauſe to me he appears to have been very negligent in that reſpect; but wanting judgment, and being not at all verſed in good authors, he raked together whatever might fill his book, from the Cornucopia, Calepine, Textor's Officina, the Chiliads of Eraſmus, and ſuch like authors, by which means his commentary is rendred of a monſtrous and frightful ſize. In fine, he is ſo full of himſelf that he thinks nothing nauſeous can come from him.*’ This judgment is very ſevere, but I think it more reaſonable than that of Guy Patin, and I admire that a man, who was incomparably more inclined to deſpiſe authors than eſteem them, ſhould ſpeak ſo much to the advantage of this commentary on Petronius. ‘Lotichius, formerly a Phyſician, and at preſent a Hiſtoriographer, has wrote two volumes in folio, *Rerum Germanicarum*, and perhaps the third is alſo printed; if you have them, ſend them to me. Let me know likewiſe if he has reprinted his Petronius, in folio, much enlarged, as he deſigned long ago. This laſt is an excellent book, and the author a very learned man. He had deſigned to have reprinted it here, with all his additions, in folio; but I anſwered him it was impoſſible, there being too many Monks, Jeſuits, and others, enemies to good letters in this place, who would think that they had merited heaven if they had hindered ſuch an impreſſion (2).

[*B*] *The reward he received for the dedication of his epigrams was very ſlender.*] He not only dedicated them to Maurice, landgrave of Heſſe, but alſo gave him a copy of them with his own hand. The prince thanked him by an epigram (3), and that was all the preſent he made him. This was imitating a great emperor (4). He who furniſhes me with this particular, ſays alſo, that he dedicated a great number of books to princes and republics, without ever getting a penny for them.

(1) Goldaſtus, Epiſtola ad Hofmannum, inter Richterianas, pag. 555.

(2) Guy Patin, Lettre cxii, Tom I, pag. 433. *It is dated the firſt of April*, 1657.

(3) Nuper Doctor Lotichius ſua epigrammata Illuſtriſſimo Mauritio Haſſiæ Landgravio inſcripſit, & in præſentiarum obtulit, qui ei epigramma Euchariſticon honorarii loco redonavit *Goldaſtus, Epiſt. ad Hoſman inter Richterianas, pag.* 561.

(4) See what Macrobius. *Saturnal lib ii, cap. iv, ſub fin.* ſays of Auguſtus.

LOUDUN, in the upper Poictou [*A*], in the confines of Anjou and Touraine, and the dioceſe of Poitiers, is a very antient town, though we muſt not give too much credit to the opinion of the common people, who aſcribe the founding of it to Julius Cæſar (*a*). It became conſiderable in the civil wars of the XVIth century [*B*], as well on account of its caſtle, which Lewis XIII demoliſhed in 1633 (*b*), as for its ſituation. The duke of Anjou in vain attempted to make himſelf maſter of it in 1569 (*c*), but the king of Navarre reduced it twenty years after with the greateſt eaſe (*d*). There are ſeveral convents in it: that of the Carmelites is the rendezvous of ſeveral devout perſons, who go thither on pilgrimages to our Lady of *Recouvrance* (*e*). That of the Urſulines became extreamly famous, when, in 1633 and 1634, there was ſo much talk of the poſſeſſion of ſeveral of theſe Nuns [*C*]. The Proteſtants about this time loſt the college

(*a*) See Sammarthanus, *in Elog. Macrini.*

(*b*) Mercure François, Tom. XX, pag. 768.

(*c*) D'Aubigné, Tom. III, pag. 223.

(*d*) Du Cheſne, Antiq. des Villes.

(*e*) Id ibid.

[*A*] *In the upper Poictou.*] Coulon, in the index of his book of the rivers of France, places Loudun in Touraine. Mr de Marolles is in the ſame error, when he ſays (1) that Loudun *is part of Touraine, tho' the Loudunois be in the dioceſe of Poitiers.* He ought to have ſaid, that Loudun was alſo in this dioceſe. The truth of the matter is, that the election of Loudun depends on the generality of Tours.

[*B*] *It became conſiderable in the civil wars of the XVIth century.*] Here is a little ſtory that does honour to this town: d'Aubigné relates (2), that in 1569, Pluviaut, at the head of a company of ſixty lances, being in ſight of Anville, where the duke of Anjou was quartered, ‘ſaw eighty horſemen come forth, who were the braveſt of the court, as the Guiſes, Briſſac, Pompadour, Fervaques, Lanſſac, Jerſſai, Fontaine, and others. He reſolutely ſtood them, the fight was obſtinate, and twice renewed; but not one of Pluviaut's men quitted his poſt. D'Andelot appearing with twelve troops of horſe, obliged the courtiers to retire, leaving two of their men dead upon the ſpot, and carrying off ſeveral wounded. They had a mind to know who they were that they had fought with. La Curée-Jerſaut, who with Clermond, la Barbée, and other bold adventurers, gloried in following this captain on extraordinary occaſions; inſtead of naming theſe gentlemen, anſwered, it was the company of Pluviaud; and Lanſſac replying, *What the Sieurs of Loudun?* moſt of them being of this place, and of quality. The duke of Guiſe cried out, *Let us change this diſcourſe, they are all true gentlemen.*’

[*C*] *The poſſeſſion of ſeveral Nuns of Loudun.*] I have ſpoke amply of them in another place (3); but I did not then know a thing which I have read a few days ago, and which I ſhall mention, after having occaſionally taken notice of a fault of Father Labbe. He ſays (4), that in 1566, ‘the poſſeſſed Nuns of Loudun, ſo famous, was diſpoſſeſſed by the holy Euchariſt, in preſence of above ten thouſand men, and among others, of Florimond de Remond, who ſoon after, of a Huguenot became a Catholic.’ Inſtead of Loudun, he ſhould have ſaid Laon, which is an epiſcopal town in Picardy: it was there that Florimond de Remond ſaw this famous poſſeſſed perſon, as he relates in two places of his works (5). Spondanus (6) relates this fact, and uſes the word *Laudunum*, which probably led Father Labbe to believe, that this adventure happened at Loudun. Mr Moreri has committed the ſame fault in the article of FLORIMOND DE REMOND.

It is affirmed in Mr d'Artagnan's Memoirs, that Grandier was one of cardinal Richelieu's *unhappy Victims.* ‘Some body had perſuaded him that Grandier was a Sorcerer, and had poſſeſſed the Nuns of Loudun with a legion of devils. Upon this accuſation the Sieur de Lauberdamont, at the head of his delegates, againſt the opinion of a great many of his judges, had him condemned to be burnt alive. He frankly told them, to oblige them to ſubſcribe to ſo unjuſt

(1) In the liſt of thoſe who had made him preſents of their books at the word *Chevreau.*

(2) Hiſtoire Univerſelle, Tom. I, pag. 392.

(3) In the article GRANDIER.

(4) Labbe, Chronolog. Françoiſe, Tom. V, pag. 783.

(5) In his book of Antichriſt, and in the work of the Birth and Growth of Hereſy, book ii, chap. xii.

(6 Spondanus, Annal Eccleſ. ad ann. 1566, n. 31.

college which they had there [*D*]. The laſt national ſynod was held in this Town, from the tenth of November, 1659, to the tenth of January, 1660. Loudun has been the birth-place of ſeveral learned men, as Salmon Macrinus, Scevola Sammarthanus, Julius Cæſar Bulengerus, Iſmael Bulialdus, Urbanus Chevreau, *&c.* Some call it *Juliodunum* in Latin; but that is not it's true name [*E*]. The Geographer du Val (*f*) was in the wrong, to ſay, That it has the title of a duchy; if he had conſulted Moreri, he would not have expreſſed himſelf in the preſent tenſe. That lady of the family of Rohan, in whoſe favour Moreri ſays, the duchy was erected, is the lady de la Garnache, of whom I have ſpoken in her place.

‘ unjuſt a ſentence, that if they oppoſed it ſo vigorouſly as men of honour ought to do, they ſhould have commiſſaries appointed to try them, who would ſoon convict them of being accomplices in his witchcrafts, ſince he was no more a Sorcerer than they might be. He was much more in the right in talking to them after this manner, than in reſolving to put an innocent man to death. All poor Grandier's crime was his debauching theſe Nuns; and if he had poſſeſſed their bodies with any devil, it could be no other than that of impunity (7). Now as theſe judges had been to ſee theſe Nuns as well as he, and might as eaſily have lain with them, for they were very far from being veſtals, they heſitated for ſome time what they had beſt do; but being at laſt prevailed upon, they choſe to ſhew themſelves unjuſt in condemning an innocent perſon, rather than put themſelves in his place by endeavouring to ſave him; for after all, they might have been accuſed of Sorcery as well as he, and no one knows what might have happened, his eminence being abſolute as he was (8).’ I am far from warranting the truth of this, nor can I perſuade myſelf that Laubardemont ſpoke thus to the judges. He was a wicked man, you will tell me; *tranſeat*, be it ſo; but that had not ſufficed cardinal Richelieu, he muſt have had ſenſe and addreſs beſides; but what can be more improbable than to ſay, that a preſident of a commiſſion is ingenious in wickedneſs, and yet ſpeaks as this man is made to ſpeak in d'Artagnan's Memoirs. This, in my opinion, is foiſted in, either by him who has put theſe Memoirs in order, or rather by the corrector of the preſs (9). Be it how it will, Mr d'Artagnan would give no great credit to the ſtory; for at the time of this poſſeſſion at Loudun, the figure he made, and the places he frequented, could only afford him the moſt uncertain and popular reports in this matter. But let us not loſe time in apologizing for ſo brave a man as he was. He does not want it: the Memoirs that have been publiſhed under his name are ſuppoſititious from the beginning to the end; they come from the ſame author who publiſhed the *Memoirs of Mr L. C. D. R.* of which I ſhall ſpeak in another place (10).

A CONFIRMATION of what has been ſaid of a pretended apparition of the confeſſor of the nuns of Loudun.

I have in another place (11) ſaid a thing that ſeemed incredible to ſome people, which is, that the prieſt Grandier might have appeared in the chamber of a Nun, as a ſpectre reſembling the deceaſed confeſſor of the Urſulines, I muſt now add a word or two, to make my opinion more credible. Nothing can be more proper for my purpoſe, than the abjuration made at Rome within theſe two years (12), by a bare-footed Auguſtine-Frier, who had been guilty of Molinoſiſm. He was convicted of having deceived Father Benignus by counterfeit revelations: he endeavoured to perſuade him, that the things he had told him on ſeveral occaſions, were true and holy, and that he was a ſaint greater than any in heaven. For this he referred himſelf to the teſtimony of St Gaetan, and ſhewed himſelf to Father Benignus, in the figure of this ſaint. He alſo contrived falſe apparitions of the Holy Virgin, and made uſe of artificial illuminations, and many changes in the tone of his voice. Let us ſet down the words of his abjuration: ‘ Confeſſaſti che le Viſioni ſuccedenti erano opere tue, e parimente le Revelationi del Padre Benigno, mentre tu gl' appariſti con l'habito di S. Gaetano, con un belliſſimo e candidiſſimo giglio in mano, e barba poſticcia. Il tutto faceſti e operaſti per far gli credere che le coſe dette da te in piu e diverſi occaſioni erano veridiche e ſante, e che tu eri un ſanto maggior di tutti i ſanti che ſtanno in cielo. Faceſti apparire la Beatiſſima Vergine à forza di lume contraſacendo la voce hora in un modo, e hora nell' altro, e per queſti tuoi e altri miſteri il ſudetto Padre Benigno credeva fermamente a queſte tue viſioni, e viſitationi celeſti, e che dio non le concedeva ſe non a te puramente.’ Dr Silveſtre (13) returning from Rome, communicated to me a manuſcript copy of the act of the Inquiſition, in which are theſe words; it is intituled, *Riſtretto de l'Abjura ſemipublica ſeguita nel' ſant' Officio in perſona di Fra Pietro Paulo di S. Gio: Evangeliſta Romano al Sacello di Caſa Graniſi, in eta d'anni quaranta, inquiſito altre volte nella Cita di Napoli, e in quella di Spoleti.* I paſs over the infamies this Monk was convicted of as a Quietiſt, and the abominable impurities he confeſſed he had committed with his female votaries. They make one's hair ſtand an end, and ſhew at the ſame time, that ſince the Inquiſition was ſatisfied with condemning a bare-footed Auguſtine Frier, only to perpetual impriſonment, it ought to be acknowledged, on ſome occaſions, a tribunal of extraordinary clemency and gentleneſs. But leaving theſe reflexions, I content myſelf to ſay, that by facts undoubted and judicially atteſted, we know that the ſecret of repreſenting the dead, and counterfeiting apparitions of the Holy Virgin, is a thing known and practiſed in the monaſteries. Why then ſhould we deny that the curate of Loudun appeared to a Nun, as her deceaſed confeſſor? I could never perſuade myſelf, that all the ſtories of the apparitions of the Holy Virgin, with which abundance of books are ſtuffed, are either fictions or meer illuſions; there is a great deal of reality in theſe ſtories. The impoſtors perſonally enter the chambers, and actually pronounce words in what name and figure they pleaſe: vapours and fits of the mother, do not make the Nuns ſee and hear this or that. Their ſenſes are really affected by the objects; all the deception conſiſts in their attributing to the divine favour, what only depends on human artifice. The engaſtrimythes, thoſe who ſpeak from their bellies, and who ſo well manage the air in their lungs, that their voice ſeems to proceed from a cave or a garret, are very fit for theſe little myſteries; they are very ſerviceable people; and by their means many are made to believe, that the dead ſuffer much in purgatory, and come to deſire their heirs to cauſe maſſes to be ſaid for them. Obſerve the exceptions which I mention in the marginal note (14).

[*D*] *The preſidents loſt the college which they had there.*] The Hiſtorian of the Edict of Nantes relates (15), *That the Reformed of Loudun had loſt their college in the year* 1635, *and that Laubardemont had lodged the pretended poſſeſſed Nuns there. After that they were never able to get their poſſeſſions reſtored, nor to recover the money it had coſt them. But the court being at Loudun, in* 1650, *they applied themſelves to the preſident Molé, who was then keeper of the ſeals.* The reſult was, that at the deſire of the queen, *they were contented with a ſum much below the price of their college, which was offered them in the name of the Urſulines. This ſum pretty nearly equalled the fourth part of the value of the buildings,* and was not one half of the intereſt. See in the ſame author (16), the treachery made uſe of to endeavour to deprive them of the exerciſe of their religion.

[*E*] *Some call it in Latin* Juliodunum (§ α), *but that is not it's true name.*] Mr Valois the younger, ſays (17) that Macrinus and Scevola Sammarthanus, were the firſt, or two of the firſt, who by a poetical licence called Loudun *Juliodunum*, to make their country participate in the glory of Julius Cæſar. According to him, it's name is *Caſtrum Lanſdunum*, that of *Loſdunum* is later. Some have alſo given it the name of *Laucidunum*, *Laudunum*, and *Lodunum*. William le Breton has given it this laſt name, in the eighth book of his *Philipeis*.

[(§ α) Fauchet, book iv, chap. xiv, of his *Antiquities*, thinks that *Loudun* might be a certain place of Touraine, which was, *ſays he*, antiently called *Caſtrum Julicenſe*. And he alſo obſerves, that this place was cal-

---

(*f*) *In his treatiſe of France, pag.* 144.

(7) An error of the preſs for impurity or lewdneſs.

(8) Memoires d'Artagnan, pag. 160, & ſeq. Edit. 1700.

(9) Note, That there are ſome correctors of the preſs, who at the deſire of the Bookſellers, examine whether a MS. deſerves to be printed, and leave out, or add to it, what they think fit.

(10) In the remark [*A*] of the article SCHOMBERG (CHARLES DE).

(11) In the remark [*K*] of the article GRANDIER.

(12) I write this in 1700.

(13) Compare this with citat. (1) of the article LAZRARELLI.

(14) That is, they are not always the cauſe; for on the whole I do not deny but they may be ſo ſometimes, and that the bare impreſſion which the little relation or reading of ſtories of apparitions, or an artificial apparition makes, may produce the perſuaſion of other apparitions, in which there is no artifice at all.

(15) Hiſt. de l'Edit. de Nantes, Tom. III, livr. iii, pag. 145.

(16) Tom III, Part. II, pag. 758, & ſeq. ad ann. 1684, 1685.

(17) Hadrian. Valeſius, Notit. Galliar. pag. 265, & 450.

led *Loviodunum*, by Idacius, or Fredegarius; and was called *Juliodunum* by Marcinus, to do honour to Loudun his country; as if that town had been founded by Julius Cæſar. REM. CRIT.]

LOUET (GEORGE) a counſellor of the parliament of Paris, made a collection of arrets, which was printed at Paris after his death. Sieur de Rochemaillet took care of that edition in the year 1609 in 4to, and dedicated it to Anthony Seguier, who had given the manuſcript, and who was preſident of the parliament of Paris.

LOYER (PETER LE) counſeller in the preſidial court at Angers, was born in the village of Huillé, in Anjou, the twenty-fourth of November 1540 (*a*). He was one of the moſt learned men of his age [*A*], and at the ſame time one of the greateſt viſionaries that ever lived. He perfectly underſtood the Oriental tongues, but was ſo infatuated with Hebrew etymologies, that he made himſelf ridiculous [*B*]. He alſo pretended to find, in Homer, whatever he had a mind to [*C*]. He found in him the village of his birth, and his own name; and, for fear he ſhould be taxed with boaſting of an extraordinary knowledge, he declared it was the grace of God, that wrought in his mind all theſe wonderful effects. We ſee, in his book of Spectres, a prodigious reading; but, as learned as he was, and that with ſo great a mixture of madneſs, he was entirely unknown to Voſſius and Colomiés [*D*]. The latter has not inſerted him in

---

[*A*] *He was one of the moſt learned men of his age.*] This is what Mr Menage ſays of him. ‘Erat quidem ‘Loerius Græcè, & Latinè, Hebraïcè, Arabicè, & ‘Chaldaïcè doctiſſimus, ſed Juris in quo verſabatur, ‘planè ignarus (1). —— *Loyer was indeed moſt learned ‘in the Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldee ‘tongues; but in Law, which was his profeſſion, quite ‘ignorant.*’ There are abundance of people of this character: they are ignorant of nothing, but of what they ought to know beſt. A counſellor, as he was, ought to have underſtood the Law, and had nothing to do with Hebrew or Arabic; and yet he was ignorant in the Law, and deeply learned in the Oriental tongues. Let us go on with the praiſes Mr Menage has given him (2). ‘Excepting theſe viſions, Peter le Loyer ‘was a great man. He was one of the beſt read men ‘in the world, as his works declare, his Colonies, his ‘Spectres, his Paraphraſe on the Magnificat. He like‘wiſe had a taſte for the *Belles Lettres*. He wrote ‘Greek, Latin, and French verſes: when he ſtudied ‘the Law at Toulouſe, he carried the Eglantine gar‘land in the Floral games (3). He made a comedy in ‘French verſe, called *La Néphélococugie*, upon which ‘Ronſard made this ſtanza.

LOYER, ta docte Muſe n'erre
De batir une Ville en l'air,
Où les Cocus puiſſent voler:
Pour eux trop petite eſt la terre.

You build a town for cuckolds in the air,
'Cauſe earth's too little to contain 'em here.

See la Croix du Maine, and du Verdier Vau-Privas, in their French Bibliotheques.

[*B*] *He was ſo infatuated with Hebrew etymologies, that he made himſelf ridiculous.*] In his books of the ‘Idumean Colonies (4). . . . he derives from the He‘brew or Chaldee tongues, not only the names of the ‘cities of France, but even thoſe of the villages of ‘Anjou; of the hamlets, houſes, barns, fields, and ‘meadows. *I ſhall therefore ſay*, theſe are his words, ‘at pag. 217, *that the village of* Huillé (his birth-place) ‘*is derived from* Ahalé, *or* Oholé *of Ezekiel, which is* ‘Ada, *or* Gada, *the wife of Eſau, and mother of Eli‘phaz. Near* Huillé, *about half a mile on the river* ‘*Loire, there is, on a hill, a little hamlet, called* Baſſe‘tas, *which I derive from* Baſſemath, *and* Baſſemtis, ‘*another wife of Eſau, and mother of Raguel, grand‘mother to Jerah, and great-grand-mother to Job* (5).’ Mr Menage, having given three or four other inſtances of the ſame ſtamp, adds, ‘all the book is filled with ‘ſuch obſervations; which makes me boldly ſay, that ‘we are not much the worſe for the loſs of ten or ‘twelve volumes of other books of Colonies of the ſame ‘author (6).’ I do not know but Mr Bochart wiſhed that the loſs had been more general.

[*C*] *He pretended to find, in Homer, whatever he had a mind to.*] ‘(7) This Peter le Loyer found every ‘thing in Homer. He found in one ſingle verſe his ‘own Chriſtian name, the name of his family, the ‘name of the village where he was born, the name of ‘the province in which this village lay, and the name ‘of the kingdom which contained this province. In ‘a thing ſo incredible as this I ſpeak of, I am obliged ‘to give here his own words in his Idumean Colonies.’ “After this great prophecy, which is wholly owing to “me, Homer comes to ſpeak this verſe *, addreſſing “himſelf to Ulyſſes:

Σὸν δ᾽ οὔπω τις ἔχει καλὸν γέρασι ἀλλὰ
ἕκηλος.

“And no body, *ſays Anticlea's ſhade to her ſon U“lyſſes*, has yet thy (Loyer) reward, in all reſpects “happily repoſed; and what follows, which bears “another meaning. In all this long verſe you will “exactly find,

Πέτρος Λωέειος, Ἀνδένκαος, Γάλλος, Ὑλεὶν.

“That is to ſay, *Peter Loyer, Angevin, Gaullois, “d'Huillé.* There is neither more nor leſs in it; let “who will make the trial. This I offer to defend to “all that read me; and why ſhould not I defend what “is notoriouſly my own in Homer? there is no ſatiſ“faction in a thing, which is not one's own, or doubted “to be one's own. Now Homer attributes this verſe to “me, and by ſo doing he makes it mine, and not ano“ther's. And whatever way we turn this verſe in Ho“mer, it will ſtill be mine; and I can claim it for my “own. There are three letters, which remain in this “whole verſe, which perhaps may be ſaid to be ſuper“fluous, but they are not ſo. Theſe are the numeral “Greek letters, α, χ, κ, which denote the time when “the name ſhould be revealed, which is contained in “this verſe of Homer, to wit, the year of Chriſt 1620. “And what is there leſs ſuperfluous? Now this is ſuf“ficient, as to what concerns my ſelf; which I do not “relate for the glory I hope from it; but rather be“cauſe I cannot and ought not to be ſilent as to what “has been revealed to Homer concerning me. This “will ſerve moreover to ſtrengthen my work con“cerning the originals, migrations, and colonies of “people, which had been reſerved for me. Homer “in vain concealed the origin of many nations, under “the cover of fables; ſince there was to be one, in fu“ture ages, who ſhould diſcover what he had attempt“ed to conceal. I do not boaſt, for all this, to know “more than other men. But who will withſtand the “grace of God, co-operating in me? This is what Ho“mer diſcovered, even to the naming the little village “where I ſhould receive my birth, that I might not “glory in my weakneſs and meanneſs, but rather in “God, who makes me what I am, and renders me “ſo potent and vigorous, in that he comforts me “(8).” Nothing could be left out of this long paſſage, where every thing ſhews ſo learned and ſingular a madneſs.

[*D*] *He was unknown to Voſſius.*] I have read, in one of his letters (9) a conjecture, which fully diſcovers his ignorance in this point. He believes that *Loerius de Spectris* had been ſaid, inſtead of *Lavaterus*.

[*E*] *The*

(*a*) Menage, Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayrault, pag. 168.

(1) Menag. in Vita Petri Ærodii, pag. 20.

(2) Remarques ſur la Vie de Pierre Ayrault, pag. 168.

(3) This happened in the year 1572, according to la Croix du Maine, pag. 403.

(4) Printed at Paris, in 1620, in 8vo.

(5) Menag. ibid. pag. 166, 167.

(6) Menage, ibid. pag. 167.

(7) Ibid.

* Verſe 183, of the Odyſſey. A.

(8) Compare with this, what Montagne, in the third book and tenth chapter of his Eſſays, ſays of a Counſellor of his acquaintance. His words have been applied in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, Novemb. 1686, *pag.* 1286. See alſo Gonſalez de Salas, *de Duplici Viventium Terra.*

(9) It is the cccccxxxth, pag. m. 439.

in his *Gallia Orientalis*. Peter le Loyer died at Angers, 1634, in the eighty fourth year of his age (§ α).

Gabriel Naudé, doing him juſtice, as to his reading and knowledge, openly laughs at his notion about Orpheus, *the greateſt Sorcerer that ever lived*, ſaid he, *and the greateſt Necromancer, whoſe writings were only ſtuffed with the praiſes of devils, as particularly of Jupiter Alaſtor, the revenging and exterminating devil.* See alſo the Chevræana, page 30. of the ſecond part.

I had forgot to ſay, that the verſes, which he made in his youth, did not preſage that he would be one day what he became. They did not threaten him with the fate of Poſtel and Cahier, *learned men and fools* (*b*). They were ſprightly, genteel, ingenious, and pleaſant [*E*], and by this one would have conjectured, that, if he applied himſelf diligently to learning, he would have acquired a literature polite and ſeaſoned with agreeableneſs, and not a moroſe pedantic knowledge. That kind of genius, which immediately inclines to ſport and toy with the Muſes, is generally a preſervative againſt the ill effects of too ſtrong an application to ſtudy. It ſpreads a politeneſs over the learning a man acquires, be it ever ſo profound, and prevents a great and extenſive reading from ſtifling and oppreſſing with it's weight natural vivacity and reaſon. Our Loyer was an exception to this general rule. He ſpoiled by his ſtudies the good fund of wit nature had given him, if Greek ſhook his brain, Hebrew compleated it's overthrow.

[(§ α) He was born then in 1550, and not in 1540, as Mr Bayle ſays. REM. CRIT.]

[*E*] *The verſes he compoſed in his youth . . . . were ſprightly . . . . ingenious, and pleaſant.*] The pieces, which we find in a book intituled (10) *The Works and Poetical Miſcellanies of Peter le Loyer of Anjou. Together with the comedy Nephelococugy, or* CLOUD OF CUCKOLDS, *no leſs learned than facetious*, are theſe: the Loves of Flora: ſome Odes: ſome Idylls: firſt and ſecond grove of the Art of Love: Sonnets political or miſcellaneous: the Dumb mad, a comedy: the comedy Nephelococugy: the Sports and Paſtimes of youth. There are ſome Greek and Latin poems in this collection, but not many. The *Elegia Virginis vetulæ*, fol. 250, is very diverting. The author dedicated his book to Mr de la Valette the younger (11), gentleman in ordinary of the king's bed-chamber: the Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from Paris the ninth of September, 1578, and informs us, that it was the firſt time the author publiſhed his poems. *Ayant pieça dans Tholoſe à la pourſuite de mes eſtudes* . . . . in the printed copy, to *a eſté de ce monde* (12) incluſive; and again to (13) *Et puis que celuy* excluſive. . . . . *Ainſi quelque temps, j'allay ſupprimant & cachant* . . in the printed copy, to *Le ſujet lequel y eſt* excluſive.

I know not how to reconcile this either with La Croix du Maine (14), or with Du Verdier Vau-Privas, the one of whom affirms, that Peter le Loyer publiſhed, *at Paris, in* 1576, *a work of his in French verſe*, intituled, *Erotopegnia*, or *Love's Paſs-time*. The other, after having particularized the pieces contained in the collection above-mentioned, adds theſe words; *he had before ſent into the world part of the ſaid compoſitions under the title of Erotopegme* (15), *or Love's Paſs-time, in 8vo, printed by Abel l'Angelier* 1576 (16). If theſe two authors are not miſtaken, Peter le Loyer was very bold, or rather very impudent, ſince he dared to ſay, that he deferred the publication of his poems till 1578. Could he well imagine, that Mr de la Valette, a lover of Poetry, knew nothing of the edition of 1576? Du Verdier Vau-Privas has inſerted in his work (17) three ſonnets of Peter le Loyer, four epigrams, ſeveral tetraſtichs of the grove of the Art of Love, and ſeveral fragments of the Cloud of Cuckolds. Theſe fragments are portraits, in which the character of ſeveral ſorts of perſons is ſatirically repreſented. I am ſurprized he did not make choice of the epigram in the 121ſt leaf. The reader will excuſe me, if I recite it, ſince it is an imitation, or tranſlation, of the Latin verſes which I have cited in the article LYCURGUS (18).

Epigram on a lady unfortunate in a husband.

En mes bas ans . . . .

in the printed copy, to (19) *alluſions*, excluſive.

There are ſome coarſe expreſſions in the paſſage, which Du Verdier has taken from the Nephelococugy; but as inſupportable as they appear at preſent, they are honey in compariſon of ſeveral other paſſages of the ſame comedy, which are frightfully obſcene. Le Loyer juſtifies himſelf the beſt he can in his preface. He ſays, that his friends have aſſured him, that *the learned and benevolent reader* will eaſily excuſe *a little polite ſmut mixed with learned and ſerious matters*. . . . in the printed copy, to *Comique* (20) incluſive.

He confeſſes, that Plutarch . . . . . (*in the book of the compariſon of Menander and Ariſtophanes*) has compared the comedies of the latter to *the wanton loves of a ſhameleſs harlot*; but he appeals from this ſentence, and, after having ſpoken of the merit of Ariſtophanes, he goes on thus (21): *If any Cato's will cenſure my book*. . . . .
in the printed copy, to *Continuant ainſi*, excluſive.
To *idcirco veniſti*, citation (22), and in the margin.

Theſe excuſes do not juſtify his having followed to exceſs the cuſtom of his time. His comedy, which is full of invention, and ſeaſoned with a good deal of ſprightlineſs and wit (23), would without doubt be better, if there was leſs obſcenity in it, and if all the deſcriptions or portraits reſembled the following, in which there is nothing offenſive to chaſt ears:

Le cruel Mars eſmouvant les Courages
Aux fiers combats - - - - - -

The cruel mars rouzing their courages
To combats fierce.

in the printed copy, to (24) *Or maintenant que*, excluſive.

Note, that all the poems of du Loyer are very obſcene. He had a ſiſter who wrote four very ſenſible verſes, which ſhe prefixed to his poetical works:

Si vos amours ſont du tout vrayes,
Vous eſtes malheureux vray'ment,
Mais ſi elles ſont pures bayes,
Que ſert feindre tant de tourment?

If your amours are real quite,
In truth you are a wretched wight;
But if they're ſhams, and nothing more,
Why feign you pains, you never bore?

LOYOLA (IGNATIUS) founder of the Jeſuits, was born in 1491, in the province of Guipuſcoa, in Spain. He was educated at the court of Ferdinand and Iſabella; and, as ſoon as his age permitted him to bear arms, he ſought occaſions of ſignalizing himſelf. He gave ſufficient proofs of his courage at the ſiege of Pampelona (*a*), and was

---

(*b*) Epiſtle Dedicatory of the Catholic Confeſſion of Sancy.

(10) It is a volume in 12mo, of 256 leaves, which was printed at Paris, for John Poupy, the ſeventh of September 1578, the title has 1579. Du Verdier affirms, that the book was printed by Abel l'Angelier.

(11) He, who was afterwards duke d'Epernon.

(12) It was in 1573, that this Mr de la Valette died. See Father Anſelme, *Hiſt. des Grands Offic.* pag. 388.

(13) Le Loyer, Epiſt. Dedicat. of his poetical works.

(14) La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 403; and obſerve, that he knows nothing of the edition of 1578.

(15) An error of the preſs for *Erotopignia*.

(16) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franç. pag. 1018.

(17) *See his* Biblioth. Franç. pag. 1018, &c.

(18) See in the rem. [*G*] of the article LYCURGUS, the Law-giver, the paſſage of the *Suite du Menagiana*.

(19) Le Loyer, Oeuvres Poetiq. fol. 121, verſo.

(20) Ib. fol. 162.

(21) Id. fol. 164. verſo.

(22) See the remark [*B*] of the firſt article FLORA, citat. (9).

(23) See, in the remark [*A*] the verſes of Ronſard. They are prefixed to the poetical works of Peter le Loyer, with ſeveral others, which the author's friends wrote in his praiſe.

(24) Le Loyer, Oeuvres Poetiq. fol. 222.

(*a*) This was the ſiege, which the French laid to it in 1521, and which was followed by the ſurrender of the place.

was there wounded by a canon ſhot, which broke his right leg. During the cure of this wound, he formed the reſolution of renouncing the vanities of the world, of going to Jeruſalem, and afterwards leading a very particular ſort of life. As ſoon as he was cured, he took his way towards our Lady of Montſerrat (*b*); and being arrived there, he hung up his arms over the altar of the holy Virgin, and conſecrated himſelf to her ſervice, the night of the twenty-fourth of March, 1522. He imitated as much as he could the rules of antient chivalry (*c*) [*A*]; in liſting himſelf under the ſtandards of this ſpiritual warfare. He parted before day, dreſſed himſelf like a pilgrim, and bent his courſe towards Manreſa, where he ſojourned about a year amongſt the poor of the hoſpital, and in the practice of all kinds of mortification. There it was that he writ his book of ſpiritual exerciſes [*B*]. Having embarked at Barcelona, for his voyage to Jeruſalem, he arrived at Cajeta in five days, and, being unwilling to continue his enterprize, without receiving the

(*b*) In Catalonia, about a days journey from Barcelona.

(*c*) Cum autem in profanis libris legiſſet ritum quo novi milites olim inaugurabantur, ut ejus ritus imaginem quamdam ſpiritualiter in ſe repræſentaret, novis contra diabolum armis accinctus, &c. — *Having read in profane books the ceremony, with which new ſoldiers were formerly initiated, that he might in ſome manner ſpiritually repreſent that ceremony in himſelf, being furniſhed with new arms againſt the Devil, &c.* Ribadeneira, in Vita Ignatii, lib. i, cap. iv, pag. m 32.

[*A*] *He imitated, as near as poſſible, the laws of antient chivalry.*] One of the learnedeſt men of this age has jeſted upon this, in a manner worth the relating. ‘The firſt thing to be obſerved in him (1), *ſays he* (2), ‘is, that he was converted by reading the legends of ‘the ſaints, as Don Quixot was to knight-errantry, by ‘the reading of old romances . . . . . His countryman ‘was never more touched with the adventures of the ‘firſt knights, than Ignatius with the hiſtories of St ‘Dominic and St Francis *. For theſe were they, ‘which affected him moſt; and before he would take ‘a fixed reſolution of running through the world, as a ‘religious knight-errant, he repreſented to himſelf the ‘difficult adventures of theſe two illuſtrious heroes, ‘and found he had courage enough to undergo the like. ‘Thus in a fit of zeal †, he leaped one night out of ‘bed, and fell on his knees before the image of the bleſſed ‘Virgin, and in that poſture vowed himſelf her knight; ‘which is ſo conſiderable a circumſtance, that I wonder Maffæus has omitted it, together with the ſtrange ‘noiſe which was heard in the houſe, the rocking of ‘the chamber, and the clattering of all the glaſs-windows, which happened at that time; a ſure ſign, ‘ſays Orlandinus, that the devil bad him then farewel. ‘After this, the Virgin appeared to him, with great ‘glory, holding her ſon in her boſom, which ſo encouraged him in his firſt deſign, that, a little after he ‘took his journey to Monſerrat, a place of great devotion to the Virgin. In his journey thither, he ‘had like to have begun his firſt adventure by fighting with a Moor, who confeſſing, that the bleſſed ‘Virgin remained a Virgin, till her child-birth, denied, that ſhe continued ſo afterwards. For St Ignatius, reflecting whoſe knight he was, grew ſo enraged, that he thought himſelf abſolutely obliged to ‘revenge upon the Moor, the affront he had done his ‘miſtreſs; but conſidering a little what was beſt to be ‘done, and the Moor taking another road, he left the ‘affair to the judgment of his mule; and throwing ‘the bridle upon her neck, reſolved to be the death ‘of the offender, if at the firſt croſs-way ſhe took the ‘road which he had taken. The good mule, knowing full well her maſter's intention, turned out of the ‘great road, and took that of Monſerrat; where, as ‘ſoon as he was arrived, he performed a remarkable ‘ceremony, which was this. Ignatius, as Orlandinus ‘and Maffæus ⸸ expreſsly ſay, having read in books ‘of Chivalry, that the antient knights taking upon ‘them that honourable employ, were wont to watch ‘all night in their arms, thought himſelf obliged to ‘begin in the ſame manner: he hung up his ſword ‘and bayonet before the altar of the Virgin, put on ‘his accoutrements, and, inſtead of glittering armour, ‘took a long robe, of very coarſe cloth, girding it about him with a thick cord, to which he faſtened a ‘water bottle; inſtead of a lance, he took a plain ſtaff, ‘walking with an oſier ſhoe on one foot, and the other naked, without making uſe of a head-piece ‘that he might be expoſed to the injuries of the weather. Before he entered the town, he faſtened all his ‘veſtments, which he had procured by the way, to ‘the pummel of his ſaddle, ſays Maffæus ‡, for fear ‘the people ſhould think him in his right ſenſes, and ‘did not put them on, till he came to the place, ‘where, by the laws of Chivalry he was to watch, ‘thus accoutred. Being come to the appointed place, ‘he put them on, and watched, ſay they, ſometimes ‘ſtanding, and ſometimes on his knees, thus conſecrating himſelf, with all his might, to the ſervice of the ‘bleſſed Virgin. This done, he departed early in ‘the morning, which is a neceſſary circumſtance to ‘knight-errants, and came to Monreſa, where he ‘lodged in the hoſpital of the town, letting his hair ‘and nails grow, begging from door to door, faſting ‘always ſix days a week, diſciplining himſelf thrice a ‘day, being ſeven hours a day in vocal prayers and ‘ſleeping on the bare ground, the better to prepare ‘himſelf for all adventures in his expedition to Jeruſalem.’

[*B*] *His book of Spiritual Exerciſes.*] He compoſed it in Spain, in 1522, and publiſhed it at Rome in 1548, tranſlated into Latin by Andrew Fruſius, and with the approbation of Paul III. They, who wonder how he could read the lives of the ſaints, during the cure of his broken leg, foraſmuch as *he had ſcarce learned his A. B. C.* (3), may with much more reaſon wonder, how he could compoſe the book of exerciſes, in the time of his ignorance, did they not know, what Lewis du Ponte affirms, that God revealed theſe exerciſes, to St Ignatius, and that the holy Virgin helped him to compoſe them. ‘Refert Ludovicus de Ponte, vir omni exceptione Major, in vita P. Balthaſaris Alvarez, c. 43. fidâ traditione inde uſque à P. Jocobo Lainio, altero Societatis Jeſu Præpoſito Generali, acceptum haberi, ‘*Deum hæc exercitia Sancto Patri Noſtro revelaſſe: ‘imo per Gabrielem Archangelum non nemini fuiſſe ‘à Deipara Virgine ſignificatum, ſe patronam eorum, ‘fundatricem, atque adjutricem fuiſſe, docuiſſeque Ignatium, ut ea ſic conciperet; quo nomine ſe huic operi dediſſe initium* (4). ——— *Lewis de Pont, a man ‘of unqueſtionable credit, relates, in the life of Balthaſar Alvarez, ch.* 43, *that it was handed down ‘by faithful tradition by Father James Lainez, the ‘other general of the order of Jeſus,* that God revealed theſe exerciſes to our holy father; and that ‘the archangel Gabriel had ſignified to a certain ‘perſon from the Virgin Mother of God, that ſhe ‘had been their partoneſs, ſounder, and helper; and ‘that Ignatius had begun to compoſe them by her aſſiſtance.’ About an age after, an indictment of theft was publickly brought againſt the founder of the Jeſuits on occaſion of this work (5): it was maintained, that he was not the author of it. The accuſer was a Benedictin. This was an affront to Paul III, and to the congregation of rites; for this Pope expreſsly affirms the contrary in his approbation of the book; and when the cardinal Francis Mari del Monte reported, before Gregory XV, the proceedings of this congregation, with reſpect to the canonization of St Ignatius, he declared, that the book of Spiritual Exerciſes was the work of him whom they were about to canonize. The Benedictins, of the congregation of Monte Caſſino condemned, in a general aſſembly (6), the book, in which St Ignatius was accuſed of plagiariſm (7). Innocent X, put the matter out of doubt, as Father Southwell pretends: for this Pope inſerted, in the Roman breviary, a preciſe teſtimony, that Ignatius was author of the exerciſes. ‘Nunc extra omnem Controverſiam Catholicis certa eſſe debet (*ea ‘res*) poſtquam in Breviarium Romanum eſt relata ‘atque in lectionibus toti Eccleſiæ propoſitis auctoritate Innocentii X. Pont. Max. in feſto S. Ignatii ‘diſerte tradita his verbis, *quo tempore homo literarum ‘plane rudis admirabilem illum compoſuit Exercitiorum librum S. Apoſtolicæ ſedis judicio & omnium ‘utilitate comprobatum* (8). —— *The Catholics ought ‘no longer to doubt of this matter, ſince it has been ‘inſerted in the Roman breviary, and expreſsly delivered in the leſſons, propoſed to the whole church, ‘by the authority of Pope Innocent X, on the feſtival ‘of St Ignatius, in theſe words:* at which time this ‘man,

(1) That is to ſay, Ignatius Loyola.

(2) Stillingfleet, of the Fanaticiſm of the church of Rome, pag. 288.

* Ribadeneira, Vit Ignat. cap. i

† Ribadeneira, cap. i, Orlandin. Hiſt. lib. i, n. 12.

⸸ Orlandin. Hiſt. lib. i. n. 18. Maffæus, lib. i, cap. iv.

‡ Maffæus, lib. i, cap. iii.

(3) Stillingfleet, ibid. pag. 289, ex Maffeio. in Vita Ignat. lib i, cap. i.

(4) Alegambe, Bibl Societatis Jeſu, pag. 1.

(5) *See* Alegambe & Sotuel Bibl. Societ init

(6) Held at Ravenna in the year 1644.

(7) Sotuel, Bibl. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 1, col. 2.

(8) Id ibid.

the Pope's benediction, he came to Rome (d), from whence, after he had paid his reſpects to Hadrian VI, he took his way to Venice. Here he imbarked, the fourteenth of July 1523, and arrived at Joppa the laſt of Auguſt, and at Jeruſalem the fourth of September, the ſame year. Having ſatisfied, in this country, his devout curioſity, he returned to Venice, from whence he parted, to go on board at Genoa, in his return to Barcelona, where he fixed his abode for ſome time, as a moſt convenient place, for the deſign he had of ſtudying the Latin Tongue. I ſay nothing of the miraculous adventures of his voyage [C]; I ſhould never have done, ſhould I copy his hiſtorian on this head. He began the rudiments of Grammar in 1524, and finding, that the reading a book of Eraſmus cooled his devotion [D], he would no longer hear that writer mentioned;

‘man, without any learning, compoſed that admirable book of exerciſes, approved by the judgment of the Apoſtolic ſee, and by it's general uſefulneſs.’ Alexander VII confirmed the ſame thing by a brief of the twelfth of October, 1657, wherein he grants a plenary indulgence to all who ſhall make uſe of St Ignatius's ſpiritual exerciſes (9).

The two Bibliographers of the ſociety have not done the Benedictin the honour to name him; but we know from other hands, that he was called Conſtantinus Caetanus. He pretended, that a Benedictin, called Garcias Ciſneros, was the true author of the ſpiritual exerciſes, which have paſſed under the founder of the Jeſuits name, and that three monks of Monte Caſſino gave the ſame St Ignatius the book of conſtitutions of the ſociety of Jeſus, when he went to them, whilſt he was meditating the deſign of a new order. This Benedictin, who thus brings St Ignatius into the number of Plagiaries, backs his proof with the teſtimony of a famous Jeſuit, whoſe ſenſe he has miſtaken: for this Jeſuit only ſays, that the founder of the Benedictins aſſiſted St Ignatius with his divine illuminations, for the forming the conſtitutions of the ſociety. Is this ſaying, that three monks of St Benedict dictated theſe conſtitutions to Ignatius, as to an amanuenſis; ‘Dixi Societatem JESU videri charam S. Benedicto, in cujus ſinu Lutetiæ primùm delineata ſit; & poſtmodùm Caſſini ſancto fundatori illuc digreſſo, Sanctiſſimus Patriarcha illius loci præſes, multa lumina & cœleſtes afflatus exoraſſe viſus eſt. Hoc Caëtanus ad exceptas inibi per S. Ignatium à tribus Monachis Conſtitutiones Societatis JESU traxit; quaſi quod dixi, S. Benedictum, (ut pium eſt arbitrari,) cœleſtem lucem, hærenti in æde ſua S. Ignatio eſſe apprecatum, idem ſonet, quòd tres Monachos nigros dictaſſe S. Ignatio, velut amanuenſi, ſuas Conſtitutiones (10). —— *I ſaid, that the ſocieey of Jeſus was favoured by St Benedict, in whoſe boſom it was firſt planned, at Paris; and afterwards at Monte Caſſino, the moſt holy Patriarch of that place, prayed for much illumination and heavenly inſpiration on the holy founder, who was come thither. This, Caetanus pretends, implies, that St Ignatius received there the book of conſtitutions of the ſociety of Jeſus from three Monks; as if my ſaying, that St Benedict (as we ought piouſly to ſuppoſe) prayed for cæleſtial light on St Ignatius, reſiding in his houſe, was the ſame thing, as if I had ſaid, that three Monks dictated to St Ignatius, as to an amanuenſis, his conſtitutions.*’ Note by the way (11), that the ſame Benedictin maintains, that the Jeſuit, he cites, committed a mortal ſin in putting any other name than his own in the title page of his book (12). A Jeſuit, called John Rowe, has treated this accuſer of Ignatius very roughly. It remains, that I ſay ſomething concerning the book of exerciſes. They tried to get it condemned in Spain, in 1553. Melchior Canus was very active in it, and the archbiſhop of Toledo would not have been ſorry that it had ſucceeded; but the doctor, he conſulted, was of another opinion. This is what the Jeſuits ſay: but who knows whether they ſpeak truth? ‘Inventi ſunt qui .... anno 1553 eum librum non allatrarent modo, ſed & morderent, Thomas quidam Pedrovius, alienæ ea in re voluntatis adminiſter, & Melchior Canus, cujus ſuggillationes, & obelos, cum Paſchali Mantio Ord. Prædicatorum, Complutenſi Theologo primario, exhibuiſſet Joannes Siliceus Præſul Toletanus, qui librum illum cupiebat ab eo improbari, reſponſum retulit, nihil eſſe in ſic diſpuncto libro damnatione dignum, præter Cani diſpunctiones, & ſuggillationes, ut ad illum annum recitat Orlandinus, addito pergravi Bartholomæi Torris, poſtea Canarienſis Præſulis elogio eorumdem exercitiorum (13). —— *Some there were, who, in the year 1553, vented their ſpleen againſt that book; among theſe, one Thomas Pedrovius, employed in that affair by ſome other perſon, and Melchior Canus, whoſe cavils againſt it, when John Siliceus, Archbiſhop of Toledo, who was pleaſed that he diſapproved that book, had ſhewn to Paſchalis Mantius, of the order of preaching Fryars, and a divine of the firſt rank at Complutum, he received for anſwer, that there was nothing worthy to be condemned, in this ſo much cenſured book, but the cenſures and cavils of Canus; as Orlandinus relates under that year, adding the weighty encomium of Bartholomew Torres, afterwards biſhop of the Canaries, on thoſe exerciſes.*’

Some other works are attributed to the ſame author, a letter *de religioſa obedientia ad Luſitaniæ ſocios ac filios*, written from Rome the twenty ſixth of March, 1553: it has been inſerted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. A letter *de religioſa perfectione ad Hiſpaniæ ſocios*, written the fourth of March 1547, was printed in Latin, in the collection of the letters of the generals of the Jeſuits. There is another Latin verſion of them (14) printed at Cracow, in 1607, in the collection intituled, *Theſaurus ſpiritualium rerum ad Societatem Jeſu pertinentium*. A letter to Claudius king of Æthiopia, dated the twenty ſecond of February, 1555. It is found in the Hiſtory of the Jeſuits, written by Orlandinus, and elſewhere. He had written a book upon the Trinity before he began to ſtudy. It is not known how this book came to be loſt. No body doubts but he is the author of a book, called *Conſtitutiones Societatis Jeſu decem in partes diſtributæ*. But ſome believe, that James Lainez is the author of the declarations that are joined to it. Father Southwell confutes this opinion (15). This book of Conſtitutions, &c. was printed firſt at Rome by the Jeſuits, in 1558, in 8vo, It has ſince been publiſhed in the ſame place, in Latin, and in Spaniſh, in folio, 1606. The Latin verſion was made by John Polancus, ſecretary to the author (16).

[C] *I ſay nothing of the miraculous adventures of his voyage.*] The bare recital of his extatic viſions would make a very long remark, did I trouble my ſelf to relate all that are found in his hiſtory. See Dr Stillingfleet (17), who draws from thence a good proof, that the Inſtitution of the Jeſuits, as well as other monks, is founded on Fanaticiſm. He cites Melchior Canus, who ſays that Loyola fled from Spain for fear the inquiſition, which ſuſpected him of the hereſy of the illuminate, ſhould impriſon him (18). Melchior Canus adds, that Loyola told him a thouſand impertinent things concerning his virtues, and his revelations, and ſpoke of one of his comrades as a great ſaint. This pretended ſaint, being interrogated by Melchior Canus, vented ſeveral hereſies through meer ignorance. Loyola, to excuſe him, alledged, that he was not a Heretic, but a Lunatic, who had his lucid intervals, and who at that time, by reaſon of the new-moon, was not a good Catholic: ‘Cum aliquando Romæ eſſem, Innicum iſtum videre mihi libuit: qui in ſermone ſine ulla occaſione cœpit ſuam commemorare juſtitiam, & perſecutionem, quam paſſus eſſet in Hiſpania nullo ſuo merito. Multa etiam & magna prædicabat de revelationibus, quas divinitus habuiſſet, idque nulla ejus rei neceſſitate: quæ fuit occaſio, cur eum pro homine vano haberem, nec de revelationibus ſuis quicquam ei crederem .... (19). Quendam ſociorum pro ſancto prædicare cœpit, qui cum accitus veniſſet, illico hominis non ſatis incolumi capite mihi ſuſpicionem movit: cumque de rebus divinis eum percunctatus eſſem, multa hæretica reſpondit, quippe qui idiota, planeque rudis & indoctus eſſet. Innicus ejus cauſa confuſus, iſte, inquit, non eſt hæreticus, ſed fatuus, credoque eum lucida habere intervalla, jamque adeo propter conjunctionem Lunæ non eſſe uſquequaque Catholicum (20).’

[D] *He found, that the reading of a book of Eraſmus cooled his devotion.*] This book is his *Enchiridion*

(d) *He arrived there on Palm-Sunday*, 1523.

(9) Conceſſa indulgentia peccatorum plenaria omnibus Chriſti fidelibus, exercitia ſpiritualia à S. Ignatio inſtituta peragentibus octidui ſpatio in domibus Societatis. *Sotuel, ibid.*

(10) Theophil. Rayn. Hoploth. Sect. II, Serie II, cap. xii, pag. m. 256.

(11) Ibid.

(12) *This is the treatiſe* De æquivocatione, *againſt John Barnes.*

(13) Theophil. Raynaud. de malis & bonis libris, n. 514, pag. m. 293.

(14) *Intituled*, De fervore ſpiritûs rite in nobis excitando.

(15) *This is that of* Theophilus Raynaud; Tom. XVIII, Tractatu contra Clementem Scotum.

(16) *Taken from the ſame Southwell*, pag. 1, 2.

(17) Ubi ſupra.

(18) Melchior Canus, in Judicio de Societate Innici Loyolæ, anno 1548, literis conſignato. *Scioppius cites him*, Infam. Famiani Stradæ. pag. 62. *Alphonſo de Vargas cites him alſo*, Relat. cap i. *See the Caſes of the Relations of Janſenius*, pag. 327, Tom. VIII, de la Morale Pratiq.

(19) Melch. Canus, apud Scioppium, ibid.

(20) Idem, apud eumdem, pag. 63.

tioned; but betook himſelf to Thomas à Kempis. At two years end, he was thought to have made a ſufficient progreſs, to be admitted to lectures of Philoſophy; accordingly he parted for Complutum in 1526. His mendicant life, his equipage, and that of his four companions, who had already eſpouſed his fortune, together with the inſtructions he gave the people, who crouded about him, obliged the inquiſition to examine what he meant. The matter went ſo far, that he was caſt into priſon [*E*], from whence he was not releaſed, but upon condition, that he would forbear venting his opinions for four years (*e*). This injunction was no way ſuitable to his deſign; not willing therefore to ſubmit to it, he retired to Salamanca, where he continued to diſcourſe upon matters of devotion. He was impriſoned afreſh, and ſet at liberty again on the ſame conditions, as at Complutum. Then he determined to go to Paris. He arrived there in the beginning of February 1528, with a firm reſolution to ſtudy hard; but the miſery, he was reduced to, having obliged him to beg his bread in the ſtreets, and put himſelf into St James's hoſpital, extreamly croſſed his deſign. He tried ſeveral expedients to remove all theſe obſtacles; but as faſt as he got clear of one difficulty, he was involved in others; for it was obſerved, that the zeal, with which he exhorted young people to ſpirituality, made them betake themſelves to a very odd way of life. He was accuſed before the inquiſitor of the faith; and narrowly eſcaped being whipped in the college of St Barbara [*F*]. All theſe difficulties did not diſcourage him; he went through his courſe of Philoſophy, and Divinity, and gained over a certain number of companions, who engaged themſelves by vow to a new life. This they did in the church

(*e*) Ribaden. ubi ſupra, cap. xiv, pag. 73.

Militis Chriſtiani. It is univerſally looked upon as a piece, in which purity of ſtile is joined with the beſt rules of Chriſtian morality. However, Loyola did not reliſh it; it was an ice that damped his fire of divine love; he took an averſion to it. and would never read this author's writings; nor was he willing his diſciples ſhould read them. Ribadeneira tells us this particular. ‘ In hac ſtudiorum palæſtra verſanti, ‘ pii quidam ac docti viri conſilium dederunt, ut ‘ Eraſmi Roterodami, qui eo tempore bonæ Latinitatis auctor habebatur, libellum de milite Chriſtiano ‘ legeret, ut ſermonis ſcilicet elegantiam cum pietate ‘ conjungeret. Cujus conſilii Confeſſarius etiam ad ‘ reliquos auctor acceſſit. Quod cùm Ignatius ſimpliciter feciſſet, obſervavit illius libelli lectione refrigeſcere in ſe ſpiritum Dei, & devotionis ſenſim ‘ ardorem reſtingui. Qua re animadverſa, librum de ‘ manibus omnino abjecit, & ita eſt averſatus, ut nec ‘ ipſe amplius legerit illius auctoris libros, & paſſim in ‘ Societate noſtra legi vetuerit (21).’

[*E*] *The matter went ſo far, that he was caſt into priſon.*] Before it came to this, enquiry had been made about his life and doctrine, and he had only been enjoined to wear ſhoes and ſtockings, and not oblige his companions to go barefoot. But when it was obſerved, that a widow and her daughter had undertaken a pilgrimage on foot, and begging, Ignatius, who had been their caſuiſt, was much exclaimed againſt. Hereupon he was impriſoned. I do not wonder the alarm was taken, when people reflected on the great aſcendant this man had gained over the fair ſex. People continued to flock about him in his priſon, to hear him diſcourſe; and there were a great many perſons of quality of both ſexes (22), who offered him their good offices; but he thankfully refuſed them. Being asked, whether he had adviſed the widow's pilgrimage, he anſwered, that, on the contrary, he had diſſuaded her from it, fearing that the young woman, who was very handſome, might be expoſed, during theſe travels, to ſome accident (23). The ſentence was pronounced the forty ſecond day of his impriſonment, and he was diſcharged (24). He was treated more ſeverely at Salamanca (25).

[*F*] *He narrowly eſcaped being whipped in the college of St Barbara.*] Mind this account of Mr Jurieu (26). ‘ He came to Paris in 1528, and, being conſcious of his ignorance, he entered himſelf in Montaigu college; he there began again his ſtudies, put ‘ himſelf into the ſixth claſs, to learn his Grammar a ‘ ſecond time, and deſired his maſter to ſet him a task, ‘ and whip him, as he did the other ſcholars, when ‘ he could not ſay his leſſon. He was then thirty ſeven years old: a pretty ſight, to ſee this venerable ‘ ſaint's ſhirt taken up amidſt a company of boys, who ‘ were ſpectators of the comedy . . . . (27). We ‘ have already ſeen, how, after this, at thirty ſeven ‘ years of age, he cauſed himſelf to be whipped ‘ in Montaigu college, before the little boys.’ Here are two thing affirmed; one, that Ignatius not only deſired his maſter to whip him, but that he was actually whipped; the other, that this paſſed at Paris, in Montaigu college. I think here is a miſtake as to both theſe facts, and that it is better to keep to the following narrative. ‘ Being returned to Barcelona, ‘ he began his Grammar at thirty years of age (28); ‘ but, as Maffæus ſays *, he could ſcarce ſay *amo*, but ‘ his mind was wandering I know not where, and ‘ always filled with ſo many viſions, that he could ‘ not remember one ſingle word of what he learned. ‘ This obliged him, with great humility, to beg his ‘ maſter on his knees . . . . . that he † would pleaſe ‘ punctually to keep him to a leſſon, as he did the ‘ other ſcholars, and whip him ſoundly, if he did not ‘ give a good account of it (29).’ You ſee, that all is reduced to a bare reſolution of ſuffering the laſh, in caſe he did not learn his leſſon, and that this paſſed at Barcelona, when he was but thirty three years of age, and not at Paris, when he was thirty ſeven. I know indeed, that, at Paris alſo, Ignatius was willing to ſubmit to the laſh; but this was after he had underſtood, that the principal of the college (30) had reſolved it ſhould be given him: and he felt ſome ſtruggles between the fleſh and the ſpirit, before he could reſolve to ſuffer that ignominy (31). Beſides, it was not at Montaigu college, but at St Barbara's that they reſolved to whip him, and the reaſon was, not for any neglect of his leſſon, but becauſe there were ſcholars, who renounced their exerciſes, to practiſe the counſels of Spirituality, with which he infatuated them. Now the principal of the college was ſo far from executing his reſolution, that, on the contrary, upon his hearing Ignatius ſpeak, he caſt himſelf at his feet, to beg his pardon. ‘ Quid multa? prehenſa manu Goveanus, ad cœnationem Ignatium adduxit; hic repente ſe, omnibus inſpectantibus, illi ad pedes abjicit; lachrymis veniam petit: ‘ ſe nimis credulum, illum virum ſanctum clamat, ‘ qui non intentati cruciatus terrore, ſed Dei tantum honore tangatur (32). —— *In ſhort, Govea took* ‘ *Ignatius by the hand, and led him to ſupper: then* ‘ *in the ſight of the whole company, he fell at his* ‘ *feet, and begged pardon with tears, calling himſelf* ‘ *over credulous, and Loyola a holy man, who was* ‘ *not touched with the dread of threatened puniſhment,* ‘ *but only with the honour of God.*’ Note, that Ignatius ſtudied the Latin tonge in Montaigu college (33), but I have not read, that he went through all his claſſes, beginning at the ſixth, as Mr Jurieu affirms. It is true, it would be excuſable to infer this from theſe words of Maffæus, ‘ Igitur ad montis acuti ‘ Collegium itare quotidie, atque inter procacium ‘ puerorum greges matura jam ætate vir Grammatica rudimenta repetere non dedignatus eſt (34). —— ‘ *Therefore he condeſcended to go daily to Montaigu* ‘ *college, and, tho' advanced in years, to begin again* ‘ *the rudiments of Grammar among a parcel of unlucky* ‘ *boys.*’ See Paſquier, who pleaſantly ridicules Loyola's ſtudies and ignorance (35). Little did he then imagine, that this man would ſoon be invoked: he expoſed himſelf to the fault of *Non putaram* (36). I will make a reflexion hereupon in the remark [*Y*].

(21) Ribadeneira, in Vita Ignatii, lib. i, cap. xiii, pag. 69.

(22) *Among others, Tereſa de Cardenas, and Eleonora Maſcarena, who was afterwards governeſs to Philippe II.* Ribaden. ubi ſupra, cap. xiv, pag. 73.

(23) Nihil certe minus: immo hoc tibi affirmo percurſationes ejuſmodi in univerſum illis diſſuaſiſſe me, ne filia ea ætate ac forma in cujuſquam petulantiam incurreret. *Id. ibid. pag.* 74.

(24) Ex Ribadeneira, lib. i, cap. xiv.

(25) Id. ibid. cap. xv.

(26) Jurieu, Apolog. pour la Reformation, Part. I, chap. i, pag. 50.

(27) Ibid. pag. 51, 52.

(28) *He ſhould have ſaid at thirty three years of age.*

* Maff. lib. i, cap. xvi.

† Orlandin. Hiſt. lib. i, n. 47.

(29) Stillingfleet, ubi ſupra.

(30) *He was called James Govea.*

(31) *See Ribadeneira*, lib. ii, cap. iii.

(32) Ribaden. ibid. pag 98.

(33) Lutetiæ primum in Montis Acuti Gymnaſio ſe bonis Latinitatis præceptoribus reformandum tradidit, in eoque ſtudio biennium fere conſumpſit. *Id. ibid. chap. i, pag.* 87.

(34) Maff. in Vita Ignatii, lib. i, cap. xviii.

(35) Paſquier, Catechiſme des Jeſuites, livr. i, chap. xi.

(36) *See* Cicero, de Offic. lib. i, cap. xxiii.

[*G*] *Where*

church of Montmartre, the fifteenth of Auguſt 1534; and they renewed their engagement twice ſucceſſively in the ſame place, and on the ſame day, and with the ſame ceremonies. At firſt there were only ſeven, reckoning Loyola himſelf among them; but afterwards they became ten. It was determined among them, that Ignatius ſhould return into Spain, to regulate ſome affairs there; that afterwards he ſhould go to Venice; and that they ſhould leave Paris the twenty fifth of January 1537, to go and meet him. He came into Spain in 1535, where he preached repentance [*G*], and was followed by prodigious crowds of hearers. He remembered the affairs his companions had recommended to him, and in due time paſſed by ſea to Genoa, and from thence travelled to Venice, where they all met him on the eighth of January 1537 (*f*). During the time that he waited for them, he was not idle: he gained ſouls, and got acquainted with John Peter Caraffa [*H*], who was afterwards Pope. Being engaged by vow to make a voyage to Jeruſalem, they prepared to go thither; but they were deſirous before all things to ſalute the Pope, and obtain his benediction and permiſſion. They went therefore to Rome, and obtained their deſire. Being returned to Venice with a deſign to go on board, they found no opportunity: the war with the Porte had put an entire ſtop to the tranſportation of pilgrims. Hereupon, rather than be idle, they reſolved to diſperſe themſelves in the towns under the Venetians juriſdiction. They preached in the ſtreets, and afterwards went into the univerſities, to gain the ſcholars; and at laſt returned to Rome. There it was that Ignatius formed the plan of a new ſociety, which Pope Paul III confirmed in the year 1540, with ſome limitations, and in the year 1543 without limitations. He was created general of this new order in 1541, and fixed his head quarters at Rome, whilſt his companions diſperſed themſelves throughout the earth. Here he applied himſelf to ſeveral things, as in converting the Jews [*I*], reforming the women of a bad life [*K*], or the care of orphans. He found himſelf ſoon expoſed to the moſt

(*f*) *They parted from Paris the fifth of November, 1536, and did not wait till the time which they had agreed upon.*

[*G*] *Where he preached repentance.*] He exclaimed, among other things, againſt the concubinage of the prieſts, which was hardly looked upon as ſhameful at that time; for their ſervant maids confidently aſſumed the head-dreſs of married women, and behaved themſelves to them, as if they had been their lawful huſbands. Ignatius got very ſevere laws made againſt this corruption. 'Quibus quidem operibus & vitæ exemplo, prudentiaque tantum apud illos homines profecit, ut errores multos corrigeret; vitia, quæ in ſacerdotum etiam mores irrepſerant, & longa jam conſuetudine honeſtatis nomen obſederant, emendare non deſtitit: multaque conſtituit, quæ ad hominum mores conformandos, pietatemque augendam pertinerent. In his ſeveræ leges fuerunt ejus opera latæ à magiſtratibus, de alea, de concubinatu ſacerdotum. Nam cum patrio more Virgines, quoad viro traderentur, capite aperto eſſent, peſſimo exemplo multæ, cum apud clericos turpiter viverent, perinde caput obnubebant, ac ſi legitimo eis matrimonio junctæ fuiſſent: quibus fidem, quaſi maritis, præſtabant. Quod nefarium inſtitutum, ac ſacrilegum, funditus tollendum curavit (37). —— *By which works, and the example of his life, and his prudence, he ſo gained upon thoſe men, that he corrected many errors; nor did he ceaſe to amend the vices, which had crept even into the morals of the clergy, and through long cuſtom bad, as it were, ceaſed to be ſcandalous: he likewiſe made many regulations, tending to the well ordering their manners, and the encreaſe of piety. Among theſe, the magiſtrates, at his inſtigation, publiſhed ſevere laws, concerning gaming, and the concubinage of the clergy. For it being the cuſtom of the country for maidens, till they were married, to have their heads uncovered, many, who lived in criminal converſation with clergymen, veiled themſelves, as if they were lawfully married to them, thus ſetting a moſt ſcandalous example. This wicked and ſacrilegious practice he took care to put a ſtop to.*'

[*H*] *He got acquainted with John Peter Caraffa.*] Who was Pope under the name of Paul IV, and who had then joined himſelf with ſome other votaries (38), to form the congregation called the Theatins. Theſe, in this laſt age, have had a great quarrel with the Jeſuits. See the uſe Mr Arnaud makes of it. 'One may judge, *ſays he* (39), *ſpeaking to the Jeſuits*, how little touchy you are, by that ſharp and harſh way, wherewith your writers (40), have treated the Theatins, for having ſaid, in the Life of the bleſſed Cajetan, *that St Ignatius, four or five years before the eſtabliſhment of your ſociety, living with the Theatins at Venice, when he came thither from Spain, in the year 1536, was ſo edified, and affected with the ſanctity of his hoſts, that he deſired to be received among them: but that the bleſſed Cajetan would not grant his requeſt, becauſe God had acquainted him, that he would found another order, more given to action.* Be this true or falſe, could it be a juſt ground for flying into ſuch a paſſion, and continuing ſo hot a war for near thirty years together; were it true, that you are ſo little ſenſible, as you ſay, of what only affects the reputation of your ſociety?' Spondanus (41) obſerves, that John Sleidan, and ſome others after him, have falſly ſaid, that the Jeſuits were founded by this John Peter Caraffa. The truth, adds he, is, that as the Jeſuits came into the world a little after the Theatins, and almoſt in the ſame habit, they were called Theatins, which name they ſtill retain in Spain and Italy. If, in requital, the name of the Jeſuits was given the Theatins, we might leſs wonder at Sleiden's aſſertion. The author, I have ſo often cited, acknowledges, that theſe two orders of regular clergy came ſo ſoon after one another, and were alike in ſo many things, that the name of Theatins was often given to the Jeſuits. 'A quibus vulgi errore falſa Theatinorum in nos eſt appellatio, cognomenque tranſfuſum. Nam cùm ordo uterque, noſter & illorum, clericorum Regularium ſint, eodemque fermè tempore nati, neque habitu valde diſſimiles, populus rudis externa ſpecie deceptus, alienum nomen noſtris impoſuit, Romæ primùm; unde in alias deinde urbes influxit, & in remotas etiam provincias penetravit (42).'

[*I*] *He . . . employed himſelf . . . in converting the Jews.*] He entertained in the houſe of the Jeſuits ſome Jews, who had been baptized, and, by his earneſt ſollicitations, obtained, that all Jews, who embraced the true faith, ſhould be entertained in a certain houſe appointed for that purpoſe. At his requeſt, Pope Paul III decreed, that they ſhould preſerve all their goods, and that, if they were children, who were converted without their fathers and mothers conſent, they ſhould have the whole patrimony (43). And as to goods acquired by uſury, the true owner of which was not known, it was ordered, that they ſhould be given to the converted Jews. Julius III, and Paul IV, added a new order, which was, that all the ſynagogues of Italy ſhould be taxed every year in a certain ſum, to be applied to the maintenance of theſe proſelytes (44). The French converters have imitated part of theſe orders in our days.

[*K*] . . . *reforming the women of a bad life.*] 'Magna Romæ mulierculaṛum earum viſebatur multitudo, quæ ex proſtituta pudicitia quæſtum faciebant (major enim per id tempus, morum in urbe licentia, qua ſanctiſſimorum Pontificum vigilantia, ſeveris poſtea legibus compreſſa eſt) & urbs ipſa meretriciis ſordibus obſoleſcebat (45). —— *A great number of theſe women were to be ſeen in Rome, who gained their living*

(37) Ribadeneira, ibid cap v, pag. 105.

(38) Idem, lib. ii, cap. vi, pag. 109.

(39) Morale Pratique des Jeſuites, Tom. III, pag. 279.

(40) Joannes Rho. *Mr Arnaud might have added Franciſcus Sacchinus, who has joined to the firſt part of the Hiſtory of the Jeſuits compoſed by Orlandinus, a preface, and a treatiſe,* cujus ſit auctoritatis quod in B. Cajetani Thienæi Vita de S. Ignatio traditur à Joanne Baptiſta Caſtaldo, inſtitiſſe ipſum ut in Theatinorum Ordinem admitteretur. *Sotuel,* in Bibliotb. pag. 251.

(41) Spondanus, ad ann. 1555. n. 8. *He cites Sleidan,* lib xxvi.

(42) Ribadeneira, ibid. pag. 109.

(43) Imo vero Judæorum liberis ad Chriſtum contra parentum voluntatem venientibus, bona ipſorum omnia integra omnino eſſent. *Ribaden. lib* iii, *cap ix, pag.* 213.

(44) *Taken from Ribadeneira,* ibid.

(45) Id. ibid.

moſt outragious calumnies [*L*], which did not however hinder his purſuing whatever might contribute to the glory and eſtabliſhment of his order. There were thoſe of the other ſex, who were willing to ſubmit to his diſcipline [*M*]; but the trouble, which the direction

‘*ving by proſtitution, (for, at that time, there was a greater licentiouſneſs of manners in the city, which, through the vigilance of the holy Pontiffs, was afterwards ſuppreſſed by ſevere laws) and the city itſelf was become a neſt of whores.*’ At that time their number was prodigious: they, who would quit this infamous way of life, were received into the convent of the Magdalenes, provided they obliged themſelves to a perpetual cloiſter, and to the vows of the order. This condition, which was ſomewhat hard, retarded the fruits, that might be expected from the inſtitution of this convent; it excluded all married women, and all maids and widows, who would willingly have quitted their wicked courſe of life, but could not ſubmit to the laws of a long penance. There were therefore two ſorts of debauched women, which were to be taken care of. They, who feared the reſentment of their husbands, had need of a place of retreat, where they might be in ſafety, till they had made their peace with them. They, who would quit criminal, without renouncing honeſt pleaſures, had need alſo of ſome place that was not a convent, where they might have a ſubſiſtence, when they gave over the trade of a courtezan. For which reaſon, Ignatius cauſed appartments to be built in the church of St Martha, in which a new ſociety was founded for this kind of penitents (46). ‘Permultæ ex iis nuptæ ſunt, quæ hoc perfugio excluduntur: quibus tamen locus aliquis dandus eſt, quo ſe recipiant, dum maritis reconciliantur, ut à vitæ honeſtate, quam petunt, abſit periculum. Porro aliæ emergere quidem ex fæcibus illis vellent, ſed non continuo ſe diuturnæ pœnitentiæ dedere: neque ſi ut peſſima fugiant paratæ ſunt, ſectari idcirco optima concupiſcunt: quibus receptum ad tempus dari Cœnobii illius (47) leges non ſinunt. Ignatius igitur, ut omnium ſaluti conſuleret: & ne qua eſſet, quæ victus quærendi difficultatem ſuæ turpitudini prætexeret, locum peropportunum inſtituendum curavit, quod omnium eſſet commune perſugium (48).’ He was the firſt bountiful contributer to this building: his example was followed by ſeveral, and eſpecially by Leonora Oſoria, wife to John Vega, embaſſador of Charles V. It was a very edifying ſight, to ſee the general of the Jeſuits, at the head of a band of whores, leading them either to St Martha's church, or to women of qualities houſes, who undertook to have them inſtructed. ‘In hoc autem divæ Marthæ Cœnobium, mulierculas à turpi quæſtu abductas ipſemet ſæpenumero, ne perirent, vel in matronæ alicujus honeſtæ domum, inſtituendas ad virtutis ſtudium, id ætatis vir, & Generalis Præpoſitus deducebat (49).’ When he was told, that the pains he took, to convert theſe proſtitutes, was loſt labour, ſince they were hardened in ſin, and would quickly return to their vomit, he anſwered, that he ſhould think all the labour of his life well employed, if he could cauſe theſe creatures to abſtain only one night from offending God; and though he was perſuaded, that the next day they would fall again into their infamous practices, yet he would not ceaſe to labour with all his might to ſave that ſmall ſpace of time (50). ‘Cum autem Ignatio objiceretur, in curandis hujuſmodi mulierculis malè operam poni, quippe quæ in vitiis jam occalluiſſent, facileque reverterentur ad vomitum: Minimè ſanè, inquit Ignatius: ſed ſi omnibus meæ vitæ curis, atque laboribus id poſſim efficere, ut vel unam noctem peccato vacuam præterire iſtarum aliqua velit; omnes ego quidem nervos contendam, ut vel illo tam exiguo tempore Deus ac Dominus noſter non offendatur: etiam ſi ſciam illam ſtatim ad ingenium redituram (51).’ As he was careful to remedy the paſſed, he did not forget to prevent the evil to come. He knew, that the honour of many maids is in danger, either becauſe they are poor, or becauſe their mothers take not ſufficient care, or even turn procureſſes for them: he therefore got a convent built, whither the young women ſhould be removed, who were in this danger. ‘Illud etiam excogitavit, in lubrico verſanti virginum pudicitiæ qua ratione ſuccurreret: ne videlicet puellaris caſtitas, aut matrum turpitudine incuriave defloreſceret, aut paupertate. Quamobrem præclarum, omnique laude dignum Cœnobium conſtructum eſt, Sanctæ Catherinæ, ut vulgo vocant, de funariis: in quod, tanquam in aſylum arcemque transferuntur adoleſcentulæ, quæ in periculo pudicitiæ verſantur (52).’

[*L*] *He found himſelf expoſed to the moſt outrageous calumnies.*] Ribadeneira does not enter into particulars, and I do not think there is any book extant, in which theſe calumnies are particularly related. I ſhall only ſay, with this Hiſtorian, that Ignatius having cauſed a married woman to be put into the hoſpital of St Martha, who had ſuffered herſelf to be carried off by her galant, expoſed himſelf to the indignation of this raviſher, who, being a very paſſionate man, was not content to throw ſtones all night at the houſe, where his miſtreſs was ſhut up, but moreover defamed the Jeſuits all over the city, and diſperſed a hundred Paſquils againſt them. He accuſed them of all ſorts of diſorders, and of the moſt impious and filthy crimes. He ſo prejudiced the city of Rome againſt them, that they durſt hardly ſhew themſelves; for they every where met with thoſe, who inſulted and curſed them. I ſhall ſet down Ribadeneira's words, that I may not be thought to amplify. ‘Ut erat vir acer, ac ferox, & in ipſum Sanctæ Marthæ Cœnobium furere nocturnis lapidationibus cœpit, & in noſtros iniquis criminationibus debacchari: multaque in vulgus ſpargere, quæ non ſolùm falſa eſſent, ſed dictu etiam turpiſſima. Eoque proceſſit (gratia fortaſſe, qua valebat plurimum, & autoritate fretus) ut Ignatii nomen publicè inſectaretur, & laceraret: & ea noſtris per ſe, & ſuos coram objiceret, quæ honeſtè audire non poſſent. Famoſos præterea libellos confecit, & vulgo jactavit, quibus multa nefaria, & impura, multa impia, & ſcelerata continebantur: ut noſtris vix in publicum prodire, vix cum hominibus de ipſorum ſalute agere liceret: ita aut conviciis ab improbiſſimo quoque, aut maledictis excipiebantur (53).’ Ignatius petitioned the Pope to name commiſſioners for examining theſe accuſations. They were examined by the governor and by the vicar of Rome, who, in their ſentence, given the tenth of Auguſt, 1543, declared, that they were all calumnies. There was a prieſt at Rome, who terribly blackened the reputation of the Jeſuits. He accuſed them of Hereſy, and of revealing the ſecrets of confeſſions, and of committing things not fit to be named, and which made Ignatius deſerve to be burnt. See in the margin Ribadeneira's words (54), who obſerves, that this prieſt was ſuſpended, and deprived of his benefices, and condemned to perpetual impriſonment, for crimes which time at laſt revealed. As for his accuſations, the Jeſuits did not complain of them, but ſuffered them to drop unanſwered.

[*M*] *There were ſome of the other ſex, who were willing to ſubmit to his diſcipline.*] You will hardly find any order of Monks, but what has convents for maids; and I queſtion, whether you can name a founder, who in his life-time had not female votaries, who conſtantly attended him. Ignatius had his; but he did not conſent to the forming nunneries, which ſhould embarraſs his rules. Iſabella Roſella, his benefactreſs, was ſo deſirous to ſee him again, that ſhe came from Spain to Rome, to put herſelf under his diſcipline. She, and ſome others, obtained leave of the Pope to make the ſame vows as the Jeſuits (55). Ignatius did not oppoſe it, till he had experienced the prodigious trouble they gave him. Perceiving then, that this would only incommode his ſociety, he repreſented his reaſons ſo urgently to the Pope, as to get a diſcharge from this burden. ‘Mirum eſt trium mulierculararum gubernatio, quantum illi moleſtiæ & occupationis paucis diebus attulerit. Ergo Pontificem Maximum docet, quanto ea res impedimento Societati ſit futura: orat, obſecratque Pontificem, ut ſe præſenti moleſtia, Societatem metu perpetuo liberet: neque permittat noſtros homines, aliis in rebus magnis, utilibus, neceſſariis occupatos, hac mulierum cura minus neceſſaria implicari. Quod utique Pontifex, rationes Ignatii probans, Societati dedit: literaſque Apoſtolicas ſcribi juſſit, quibus noſtri in perpetuum ab onere Monialium eximuntur, & quarumcunque mulierum cura ſub obedientia noſtrorum in communi, vel alias vivere volentium, anno 1547 13. Kalend. Junii. Quo non contentus Ignatius, ut locum hunc maxime periculoſum

(46) *It was called the Community of the Grace of the Holy Virgin.*

(47) *That is to ſay, the convent of the Magdalenes.*

(48) Ribadeneir. pag. 214.

(49) Idem, ibid. pag. 215.

(50) Ribad. ubi ſupra, pag. 215.

(51) Father de la Mainferme, in Clypeo naſcent. Fontebrald. Ordinis Diſſert. IV, pag. 219, *has made uſe of this example to juſtify Robert d'Arbriſſel's great care of the common women. See the remark* [*D*], *of he article* FONTEVRAUD.

(52) Ribaden. ibid. pag. 216.

(53) Idem, lib. iii, cap. xiii, pag. 228.

(54) Invidiæ ſtimulis incitatus ita exarſit, ut falſis illum odioſiſque criminationibus in invidiam vocare, noſtroſque infamiæ labe aſpergere conaretur. Nam & hæreſis calumniam, & auditarum confeſſionum ſacratiſſima jura violata, & alia, quæ honeſte dici non poſſunt non eſt verecundatus objicere, & Ignatium ipſum vivum flammis cremandum jactare. *Ribaden. ibid. pag.* 229.

(55) Id ibid. cap xiv, pag. 230.

direction of three women had given him, obliged him to deliver his ſociety for ever from this incumbrance. Having gotten his order confirmed by Pope Julius III, in 1550, he had a mind to lay down his generalſhip; but the Jeſuits would by no means conſent to it. So he kept that poſt to his death, which happened on the laſt day of July 1556 *(g)*. The author, whom I cite, having honeſtly owned, That his St Ignatius had not the gift of miracles, and having even prevented the objections, which were to be feared on this head, had no doubt a hint given him, that he had gone too far, and that it was not prudent to make ſuch conceſſions in the face of the World. However it be, he retracted it in a new book, and mentioned I know not how many miracles wrought by the Founder of his order [*N*]. They are gone ſo far as to pretend, that the

loſum communiret, omneſque aditus obſtrueret, illud etiam anno 1549, ab eodem Paulo III. impetravit, ne curam Monialium, ſeu Religioſarum quarumlibet perſonarum recipere teneamur, per literas Apoſtolicas impetratas, vel in poſterum impetrandas: niſi de indulto illo, & ordine noſtro, expreſſam facientes mentionem (56). ——— *It is ſtrange, what uneaſineſs and trouble the governing of three women gave him a few days. He therefore acquaints the Pope, what an incumbrance that affair was like to prove to the ſociety: he begs and intreats the Pope to free him from the preſent trouble, and the ſociety from perpetual fear; and that he would not permit our brethren, employed in other matters of great and neceſſary importance, to be taken up with the leſs neceſſary care of women. The Pope, approving Ignatius's reaſons, granted the ſociety this favour, and ordered apoſtolical letters to be written, exempting us for ever from the burden of Nuns, and the care of any women, who might be willing to ſubmit to our diſcipline in common, or to live elſewhere, in the year* 1547. *May the* 20*th. But Ignatius, not ſatisfied with this, that he might entirely guard againſt this danger, obtained the ſame grant from the ſame Paul III, in the year* 1549; *that we might not be obliged to undertake the care of any Nuns, or religious women whatever, by apoſtolical letters obtained, or hereafter to be obtained; unleſs making expreſs mention of that indulgence, and of our order.*'

For the reſt, it was not by way of precaution, in point of chaſtity, that he was willing to be rid of this ſex; for if we believe Hiſtorians, the holy Virgin granted him the gift of continence to ſuch a degree, that from the time he became her knight, to his death, he felt not the leaſt ſymptom of an immodeſt temptation. He might therefore ſafely converſe with the women, and preſerve himſelf as untouched in the midſt of all theſe flames, as the three Jews in the Babylonian furnace. His greateſt intimacies with the ſex would not have been a matter that could juſtify one's telling him,

Periculoſæ plenum opus aleæ
Tractas, & incedis per ignes
Suppoſitos cineri doloſo (57).

The task is dang'rous, and you tread
On fire, with flatt'ring aſhes over-ſpread.

In that reſpect he had the gift of the Hirpæ (58). What is ſaid of ſome enchanted ſoldiers, that they are in no danger, though expoſed to a furious ſtorm of musket-ſhot, is an image of Loyola's continence. The moſt laſcivious oglings, the moſt tender careſſes, and in general, all the artillery woman could employ againſt his virtue, would have found it impenetrable: always provided that we refer ourſelves to Maffæus's words (59): I have read a parallel of Luther and Loyola (60), in which it is obſerved, that Luther, without any extraordinary grace, lived in a chaſt celibacy to forty two years of age, and, being afterwards married, neither blemiſhed his modeſty, nor piety; and that, after all, Loyola's chaſtity deſerved no commendation, ſince there is no virtue, but what proceeds from a victory diſputed with the paſſions (61).

[*N*] *He retracted it . . . . and mentions I know not how many miracles of the founder of his order.*] The thirteenth chapter of the fifth book of St Ignatius's Life, written by the Jeſuit Ribadeneira is very remarkable: he begins with this objection (62). 'If all you have been ſaying be true, whence comes it that Loyola's ſanctity was not confirmed by miracles, like thoſe of ſo many other ſaints? The author anſwers, Who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counſellor? God alone works wonderful things, and as it is he alone performs them, he alone knows the proper time, and place, in which miracles ought to be wrought, and by whoſe prayers. *Ut ſolus ille hæc poteſt efficere, ita ille ſolus novit quo loco, quo tempore miracula & quorum precibus facienda ſunt* (63).' He adds, that all ſaints have not had the gift of miracles, and that thoſe, who have been moſt eminent for the greatneſs, or number of their miracles, have not, for all that, excelled the others in holineſs of life. For it is not by miraculous, but charitable actions, that we are to judge of a perſon's ſanctity. This he proves from the authority of St Gregory, from reaſons drawn from Scripture, and from example. 'Neque omnes ſancti viri miraculis excelluerunt: neque qui illorum aut magnitudine præſtiterunt, aut copia, idcirco reliquos ſanctitate ſuperarunt. Non enim ſanctitate cujuſque ſignis, ſed charitate æſtimanda eſt (64).' He makes it appear by Scripture, that the gift of miracles is granted ſometimes to falſe teachers, and in a very few words expoſes to view the ſtrength of whatever the Proteſtants can urge againſt thoſe, who upbraid them, becauſe Luther and Calvin had not this gift. I ſay not this, adds he, to extenuate this virtue, but to let the prudent reader underſtand, that all this muſt be referred to the good providence of God, who diſtributes his gifts according to his own good pleaſure. He afterwards aſſigns ſome reaſons, for which God might think fit, and that even in favour of the Jeſuits, to deny their founder this gift of miracles. We muſt hear himſelf. 'Hæc dixerim non ut miraculorum vim elevem, ſed ut prudens lector intelligat, rem totam Deo committendam: qui dona ſua unicuique diſtribuit, prout vult. Potuit ille, pro ſua occulta ſapientia, noſtræ hoc imbecillitati dare, ne miracula unquam jactare poſſemus. Potuit utilitati, ut authore inſtituti noſtri minus illuſtri, à *Jeſu* potius, quam ab illo, nomen traheremus: & noſtra nos appellatio ſacra moneret, ne ab illo oculos unquam dimoveremus: quem non ſolum, ut communem humani generis liberatorem ac Principem, ſed etiam, ut præcipuum Ducem colere, atque imitari debemus, minimam hanc Societatem ſui nominis glorioſo titulo decorantem. Potuit hoc etiam tribuere temporibus, quibus hæc miracula neceſſaria non ſunt (65). —— *I ſay this, not to leſſen the efficacy of miracles, but that the prudent reader may underſtand, that the whole matter is to be referred to God, who diſtributes his gifts to every one as he pleaſes. He might, of his unſearchable wiſdom, deſign to put it out of the power of our weakneſs to boaſt of miracles. He might in this conſult our profit, that, the founder of our order being the leſs illuſtrious, we might take our name from Jeſus, rather than from him; and that our ſacred appellation might put us in mind, never to turn our eyes away from him, whom we ought to worſhip and imitate, not only as the common Saviour of mankind, but as the chief God, who vouchſafes to adorn our humble ſociety with the glorious title of his name. He might likewiſe in this conſult the times, in which theſe miracles are not neceſſary.*' Laſtly, he ſays (66), that the manner of the inſtitution of the ſociety of the Jeſuits, it's prodigious growth, and the miracles wrought by ſome of it's members, are a convincing proof, that it is the work of God, and is a ſufficient ground for aſcribing the glory of miracles to the life of it's founder. Thus the antient fathers have obſerved, that the ſpeedy propagation of the Goſpel throughout the world, though the inſtruments God made uſe of had nothing conſiderable in them, according to the world, and though it met with the moſt violent oppoſition, is ſo bright a miracle, as would alone be ſufficient to prove the divine original of Chriſtianity. The Proteſtants alledge the ſame thing, when they are asked, what miracles

---

(g) Taken from the Life of Ignatius Loyola, written by Ribadeneira.

(56) Id. ibid. pag. 231.

(57) Horat. Ode I, lib. ii.

(58) *See the remarks of the article HIRPI.*

(59) Virginis beneficio impetravit, ut ab illo die uſque ad ultimum vitæ omnis libidinis ſenſu caruerit. . . . *He obtained, by the favour of the Virgin, from that day to his death, a freedom from all ſenſe of luſt.* Seckendorf. Hiſt. Lutheran. lib. iii, pag. 315, ex Maffeio, in Vita Ignat. Loyolæ.

(60) Apud Seckendorf. ibid.

(61) Hac quidem aſſertione caſtitatis laus deſtruitur, quæ non eſt virtus quando cupiditatibus non exercetur quas vincat. *Id ibid. See the article JUNGERMAN, citat. (a).*

(62) Sed dicat aliquis, ſi hæc vera ſunt, ut profecto ſunt, quid cauſæ eſt quamobrem illius ſanctitas minus eſt teſtata miraculis? &, ut multorum ſanctorum vita, ſignis declarata, virtutumque operationibus inſignita? *Ribaden. lib. v. cap. xiii,* pag. 539.

(63) Ribaden. ibid. pag. 540.

(64) Ibid.

(65) Ibid. pag. 542, 543.

(66) Tantum abeſt ut ad Vitam Ignatii illuſtrandam miracula deeſſe videantur, ut multa, eaque præſtantiſſima, judicem in media luce verſari. . . . Nam ſive initia hujus Societatis, ſive inſtitutum ſpectemus, ſive propagationem, conſecutaſque ex ea utilitates, miracula certe nulla deſiderabimus: cum tam multa iis rebus miracula ineſſe deprehendamus, per quæ Deus, & hoc opus ſuum eſſe, & radicis naturam, ex trunco oſtendit, & fructu. *Ibid. pag.* 543.

the words of Virgil had, in his mouth, the power of diſmaying devils, and forcing them to cry out for quarter [O]. You will find, in Moreri, that Pope Paul V canonized Ignatius in the year 1609 (b), and that Gregory XV inſerted him in the catalogue

miracles Luther and Calvin wrought to ſupport their miſſion. Let us once more cite Ribadeneira. ‘ Quid admirabilius, *ſays he* (67), quam militarem hominem, ferro & caſtris aſſuetum, à ſpiritu Dei alienum, ita immutatum, ut non ſolum ipſe Chriſto militaret, ſed ſacræ militiæ anteſignanus eſſet, & princeps? Quid inuſitatius, quam tot homines ingenio, ſtudio, ætate florentes, ab Ignatio egeno ac deſpicato, nulla magna vel literarum ſcientia, vel ſermonis elegantia & copia, huc adduci potuiſſe, inſtitutum ut vitæ curſum abrumperent, ſpes ſuas prodigerent, paupertatis, dedecoris, atque ignominiæ ſeſe telis objicerent, & tot laborum periculorumque offerent incurſibus? —— *What can be more wonderful, than that a military man, accuſtomed to arms and camps, and a ſtranger to the Spirit of God, ſhould be ſo changed, as not only to fight under Chriſt's banner, but himſelf to become the leader and head of the ſacred warfare? what more uncommon, than that ſo many men, famous for wit and learning, and in the flower of their youth, could be prevailed upon by Ignatius, a poor, deſpiſed wretch, with no great learning, and as little eloquence, to break off their courſe of life, give up all their hopes, expoſe themſelves to the darts of poverty, diſgrace, and ignominy, and voluntarily ſubmit to ſo many labours and dangers.*’ He has forgot one circumſtance, which in ſome reſpects, does exceedingly heighten the wonder, to wit, that there appeared in Loyola's life, from his travels to Monſerrat, till the time of his fixing at Rome, ſo many marks of extravagance, and ſo many ſymptoms of a mind diſordered, ſtupified, overwhelmed by fanaticiſm, that it is ſtrange, men of ſolid ſenſe, ſuch as Lainez and Salmeron, ſhould have adhered to him, and that his order ſhould ſo ſoon have over-topped all the reſt. But if we turn the perſpective, we perceive, that this very thing leſſens the wonder; for nothing is ſo likely to deceive, as that which appears ſupernatural in madneſs, extravagancy, and foolery. However it be, we have here a famous Jeſuit, his cotemporary (68), who plainly confeſſes, that his founder wrought no miracles, but he did not maintain this opinion till his death: for he changed his note in another book (69). It is true, moſt of the miracles he relates were wrought by Ignatius after his death: thus he ſpeaks (70). ‘ Quia vero poſtremo quinti libri capite de miraculis breviter egimus quaſi nulla feciſſet, aut ad demonſtrandam ejus ſanctitatem neceſſaria non eſſent, ſtatui nunc ea paullo fuſius exponere, non omnia quidem (res enim nimis in longum excurreret) ſed partem duntaxat eorum quæ Deus efficere per ſervum ſuum dignatus eſt. Quamvis enim, cum anno 1572. primum vitam ejus latine ſcriberem, alia nonnulla miracula ab eo facta noviſſem, tamen adeo mihi certa & explorata non erant, ut in vulgus edenda mihi perſuaderem; poſtea vero, queſtionibus de ejus in divos relatione publice habitis, gravibus & idoneis teſtibus fuerunt comprobata. Enimvero Deus ut ſervum ſuum extollat in terris tam frequentibus eum in dies miraculis dignatur, ut mearum partium eſſe ducam litteris hic mandare nonnulla è publicis actionibus ſumta. —— *Becauſe, in the laſt chapter of the fifth book, I have briefly treated of miracles, ſuppoſing that he did none, or that they were not neceſſary to demonſtrate his ſanctity, I have determined, in this place, to treat more at large of them, not of all (for it would be too tedious) but part only of thoſe, which God vouchſafed to perform by his ſervant. For though, in the year* 1572, *when I firſt wrote his Life in Latin, I knew that he had performed ſome other miracles, yet I was not ſo fully informed concerning them, that I could perſuade myſelf to publiſh them: but afterwards, when his canonization was publickly talked of, they were confirmed by ſufficient witneſſes. And indeed God granted his ſervant to perform ſo many miracles, to exalt him in the earth, that they think it incumbent on me to commit to writing ſome few of his public actions.*’ Note, that he ſpeaks only of the firſt edition, which was of the year 1572, and ſays nothing of the ſecond, which was of the year 1587, and which was much enlarged by him. He added ſeveral particulars, which he had learned afterwards, either from the teſtimony of ſome perſons of great authority, intimate friends of Ignatius, or the certainty whereof he had diſcovered by a ſevere examination, though he had looked upon them as doubtful before. ‘ Multa mihi neceſſario addenda judicavi. Primùm nova quædam, quæ poſt libellum excuſum, graviſſimi viri, & Ignatio valde familiares, & ante Societatem conditam intimi neceſſarii, quaſi teſtes oculati de ipſo Ignatio nobis retulerunt. Tum alia, quæ dubia antea mihi erant, & diligenti poſtea inquiſitione inveſtigata, certa eſſe comperi (71).’ Hence we conclude, that St Ignatius's miracles were things, of which his friends had not informed Ribadeneira, during the fifteen years, which paſſed between the two editions, nor what the author could clear from uncertainty in that interval of time. Nevertheleſs he aſſures us, that, in the year 1572, he was informed of ſome miracles wrought by this founder, but not with all the certainty neceſſary to publiſh them. Amongſt the things, of which he was not at that time perfectly aſſured, there were undoubtedly none, the certainty whereof he ſought after more diligently, than that of the miracles of his apoſtle: ſince therefore he continued to ſay, in the edition of 1587, that the bleſſed Ignatius had wrought no miracles, it neceſſarily follows, that his ſtricteſt ſearch had afforded him nothing certain upon that head; for if it had afforded him any certainty, he would, in the ſecond edition, have added this grand article with more concern, than thoſe other things, which he did add, only becauſe, of uncertain, as they had been before, they were now become certain, by the exact care he took to be informed about them. Farther, would a Jeſuit, who had known, in the year 1572, that his founder had wrought miracles, and who only forbore inſerting them in a public work, becauſe his intelligence in that point was not ſo ſure as it ought to be; would he have plainly owned, I ſay, that his founder wrought no miracles? would he have argued with ſo much concern upon it? would he have anſwered objections againſt it ſo elaborately? his duty doubtleſs had been to be ſilent, till he was fully informed, and there is great probability, that Ribadeneira would have taken that method, and that all he has ſaid, by an after-game, is inſincere and full of ſhifts; nor ſhould it be omitted, that nothing was ſo capable of being ſet in a full light during the interval of time between thoſe two editions, as Loyola's miracles, ſurprizing facts, which make a deeper impreſſion than any others, and ſpread from place to place with greater noiſe. Would the intimate friends, the inſeparable companions of Ignatius, have ſaid nothing of them to Ribadeneira, they, who told him ſo many other things, of which he was not informed in the year 1572; and which he added to his book in 1587? This, to ſay no worſe of it, makes all the miracles ſuſpected, which have been publiſhed, and pretended to have been wrought by Ignatius, before the ſecond edition of Ribadeneira. The other miracles of the ſame ſaint are very numerous, if we take the word of his good friends. See the two following remarks.

[O] *It is pretended, that the words of Virgil, in his mouth, had the power of diſmaying devils, and forcing them to cry out for quarter.*] The ſtory goes, that Ignatius Loyola had no ſooner repeated the place in Virgil, where it is ſaid, that Æneas and Dido entered into a cave, but the poſſeſſed woman, who prayed him to ſuccour her, was thrown upon the ground, the devil leaving her, and begging the favour not to be ſhut up in the eternal cave. He obtained leave to ramble where he pleaſed, provided he would never poſſeſs any man or woman more. ‘ Haſenmüllerus enim *in Hiſtor. Jeſuit. cap.* 8. *pag.* 296. ex Turriano refert, quod aliquando Romæ ſœmina quædam à Diabolo obſeſſa Ignatium Lojolam ſecuta ſit, & clamarit: Tu ſolus me liberare & juvare potes. Tunc Lojolam recitaſſe verſum Virgilii: *Speluncam Dido, Dux & Trojanus eandem.* Qua voce audita Dæmonem mulierem proſtraviſſe ac egredientem clamaſſe: O fili Lojola, tu ceu Leo me ad ſpeluncam inferni abire cogis, ſed rogo te, ne me æternæ ſpeluncæ injicias. Poſtea Ignatium illi dixiſſe. Vade quocunque volueris, modo nullum amplius hominem obſideas; ac ſtatim Dæmonium magno cum ſtrepitu egreſſum

---

(b) *And not* 1605, *as Southwell affirms,* Biblioth. Societat. Jeſu, pag. 2.

(67) Ibid.

(68) Cujus ego viri hiſtoriam quoniam à puero ſanctiſſimæ ipſius vitæ SPECTATOR atque admirator fui, pleniorem ac majori rerum fide ſcribere potero. *Ribaden. in Præfat.*

(69) In the Abridgment of the Life of Ignatius, which he publiſhed, when informations were taking in order to his canonization.

(70) Ribadeneira, in Vita Ignatii, in Compendium Redacta, cap. xviii, pag 121, Edit. Iprenſis 1612.

(71) Idem, in Præfatione, Edit. 1587.

catalogue of the Saints in the year 1622. Innocent X, and Clement IX, increaſed the honours of this new ſaint [*P*]. But let them do what they will for him, nothing will be ſo wonderful in his hiſtory as the prodigious growth of his order in ſo few years, both in the old world and in the new, in ſpite of the ſtrongeſt oppoſition of it's adverſaries. I believe never any ſociety had ſo many enemies, within and without, as the Jeſuits have had, and ſtill have; and yet their authority, which is ſo ſuddenly grown to a very high pitch, ſeems rather to increaſe daily, than decline. The books, that have been publiſhed againſt them, would make a large library of themſelves. They may well ſay, that a great many condemn them out of meer prejudice [*Q*]; nor do they fail to make the

‘ ſum eſſe (72). —— *For Haſenmüllerus, in his* Hiſtory of the Jeſuits, chap. 8. pag. 296, *relates, out of Turrianus, that once, at Rome, a certain woman, poſſeſſed by the devil, followed Ignatius Loyola, and cried out: You alone can ſet me free, and help me: that Loyola then repeated the verſe of Virgil,* Speluncam Dido, &c. *which words the devil hearing, threw the woman on the ground, and, coming out of her, cried out; O ſon Loyola, as a lion you force me to depart to the cave of hell; but I beſeech thee not to throw me into the eternal cave: then Ignatius ſaid to him; go where you will, only never more poſſeſs any man; and then the devil immediately left the woman, with a great noiſe.*’

[*P*] *Innocent X, and Clement IX, increaſed the honours of this new ſaint.*] I ſhall make uſe of the words of Father Nathaniel Southwell. ‘ Eundem *(Ignatium)* Officio Eccleſiaſtico ubique terrarum coli juſſit Innocentius X. P. M. ſub ritu ſemiduplice die 29 Octobris anno 1644. Auxit cultum Clemens IX. P. M. & ad ritum duplicem evexit die 11 Octobris 1667 (73). ——— *Pope Innocent X ordered, that Ignatius ſhould be honoured with eccleſiaſtical ſervice, all over the world, under the ſemi-double rite, on the twenty ninth of October,* 1644. *Pope Clement IX encreaſed the worſhip paid to him, and raiſed it to the double rite, the eleventh of October,* 1667.’ This author adds, that Ignatius had already more than fifty churches conſecrated to him in ſeveral parts of the world (74); that the miracles, performed by this ſaint, during his life, and after his death, are ſo numerous and ſo eminent, that they might fill a volume; for beſides thoſe, mentioned in his Life, and in the bull of canonization; Father Bartoli relates a hundred, that are well atteſted. Alphonſus de Andrada mentions ſeveral others, which were wrought at Munebrega, in Arragon, where they worſhip a miraculous image of St Ignatius (75). A paper image of the ſame ſaint has bled very lately at one of the fingers, in a town of Sicily. We have a book upon it, printed at Palermo, in 1668. ‘ His conſimilia narrantur contigiſſe in Sicilia Regalbuti Dioceſ. Catanenſis, ubi Imago papyracea S. Ignatii anno Dom. 1666. è digito fudit prodigioſe ſanguinem, & hæc omnia examinata accurate, atque ab Epiſcopo loci illuſtriſſimo D. Fr. Michaele Angelo Bonadies, olim Generali Seraph. Ordinis S. Franciſci de obſervantia approbata, & mandata typis Panormi 1668 (76). ——— *Something like this is ſaid to have happened in Sicily at Regalbuto, in the dioceſe of Catanea, where a paper image of St Ignatius, in the year* 1666, *bled prodigiouſly at the finger; and that the affair was carefully enquired into, and approved by the moſt illuſtrious Michael Angelo Bonadies, biſhop of the place, and formerly general of the Franciſcans, and publiſhed at Panermo.*’ See the remark, where I ſhall ſpeak of three Sermons.

[*Q*] *They may well ſay, that a great many condemn them out of meer prejudice.*] It is certain, that whatſoever is publiſhed againſt them, is almoſt equally believed by their enemies, both Catholics and Proteſtants. It is alſo true, that the accuſations are renewed againſt them, as often as occaſion offers in any new book. In the mean time, they, who examine with any ſort of equity, the innumerable apologies, publiſhed by the Jeſuits, find, as to ſome facts, ſufficient juſtifications, to make a reaſonable enemy drop the charge. I will give an inſtance of this.

In 1610, there came out a very ſevere book againſt the Jeſuits (77), in which it was affirmed (78), that the abbot du Bois had maintained, and would prove it to Father Coton's face, that *ſentence had been given againſt him at Avignon, for getting a nun with child.* Father Coton, anſwering this libel, produced (79) the following letter. *I, whoſe name is underwritten, do certify, that I was in Avignon all the time the R. Father Coton, of the ſociety of Jeſus, lived there, and that I never heard any one ſay, that he had committed any thing contrary to the dignity and quality of his profeſſion; and in particular as to what the Anti-Coton charges upon him. In which Anti-Coton, ſince I am made the author of a manifeſt calumny, wherewith the R. Father Coton is charged: I frankly aver, that I know nothing of it, and that I have always looked upon the ſaid R. Father Coton as a venerable and worthy man. In teſtimony whereof, I have written and ſigned this preſent depoſition. From Paris, in my ſtudy, the eve of St Denys the martyr,* 1610. OLIVIER ABBOT DU BOIS. *And I have ſealed it with my ſeal.* Beſides this he produced four certificates (80), *ſeen and acknowledged for authentic, true, and legal, by the royal notaries of the city of Paris.* The firſt was ſigned Lewis Beau, *prothonotary of the holy apoſtolic ſee, and ſealed with his ſeal, and with thoſe of two ſubſequent archbiſhops in the metropolitan city of Avignon,* whoſe *vicar-general he had been all the time of Father Coton's ſojourning in Avignon.* The ſecond was ſigned by fifteen perſons, *who compoſed and repreſented all the clergy of Avignon.* The third was ſigned by the two conſuls of Avignon, and their acceſſor, and ſealed with the ſeal of the conſular houſe. The fourth was given by the biſhop of Orange. Theſe four atteſtations concur, not only in contradicting the author of the Anti-Coton, as an infamous calumniator; but alſo in extolling Father Coton's good and pious conduct. *Beſides theſe certificates, the magiſtrates of Avignon writ to* this Jeſuit *in theſe terms* (81). ‘ If theſe teſtimonies of prelates and conſuls are not ſufficient, we can produce the certificates of the greateſt part of the gentlemen, doctors, citizens, merchants, and others of the town.’ I know not what could be produced of greater force, to juſty the accuſed. And yet there are a great many, who ſtill believed, the nun was got with child, and that ſentence had been paſſed upon Father Coton. They gave more credit to the Anti-Coton, who brought no proof, nor any authentic evidence, than to Father Coton, who produced all that the moſt exact judicial procedings could require. This could be nothing but the effect of an extravagant prejudice.

The fate of the Jeſuits, and that of Catiline, is much the ſame. Several accuſations were given in againſt Catiline, without any proof; but they met with credit upon this general argument; *ſince he has done ſuch a thing, he is very capable of having done this, or that, and it is very probable he has done the reſt.* The hiſtorian Salluſt has judiciouſly obſerved this illuſion, which is not a ſophiſm of the ſchools, but of the town. ‘ Scio fuiſſe nonnullos qui ita exiſtimarent, juventutem quæ domum Catilinæ frequentabat parum honeſte pudicitiam habuiſſe: ſed ex aliis rebus magis quam quod cuiquam id compertum foret, hæc fama valebat (82). *I know there were ſome, who looked upon the young perſons, who frequented Catiline's houſe, as men of ill fame; but it was not a knowledge of them, but ſome thing elſe, that gave riſe to this opinion.*’ There was publiſhed at the Hague, about eleven years ago, a book intituled, the *Religion of the Jeſuits.* The author confeſſes, that the prejudice againſt theſe gentlemen is ſo general, that whatever atteſtations of innocence they fortify themſelves with, it is impoſſible to undeceive the world. ‘ We muſt know, *ſays he* (83), that nothing ſo horrible can be ſaid againſt the Jeſuits, though ever ſo doubtful, but what becomes probable from their character, and the conſideration of what they are capable of.’ He gives two examples of this: One is, ‘ the report ſpread, not only at Heidelburg, but through all Europe, that they had ſuborned a falſe ſpirit from the other world, who cried every night in the ears of the old

(72) Joannes Chriſtianus Frommann, de Faſcinat. lib. iii, Part IX, cap. iv, n. 15, pag. m. 949.

(73) Sotuel, in Biblioth. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 2.

(74) Amplius quinquaginta templa in variis orbis regionibus modo numerantur in illius honorem dedicata. *Id. ibid. This book of Southwell was printed in* 1675.

(75) Refert centum ex authenticis deſumpta documentis noſter Daniel Bartolus de Vita S. Ignat. lib. v, & permulta recenſet noſter Alphonſus de Andrada, opere de miraculis patratis Munebregæ in Aragonia, ubi pie colitur Imago admirabilis Sancti Ignatii. *Id. ibid.*

(76) Idem, pag. 2, 3.

(77) *Intituled,* Anticoton.

(78) Anticoton, pag. m. 63.

(79) Réponſe Apologetique à l'Anticot. pag. 199.

(80) Réponſe à l'Anticot. pag. 200.

(81) Ib pag. 206.

(82) Salluſt in Bello Catilin. pag. m. 33.

(83) Religion des Jeſuites, pag. 77. Edit. Hague, 1689. *See* Bernegg. Tuba Pacis, pag. 122.

‘ duke

the moſt of this plea, that without being at the pains of anſwering particularly to all the charges of their enemies, they may be furniſhed with one general common-place, to invalidate the accuſations [*R*]. But it is certain, there are thoſe, who, without appearing prejudiced, maintain, that ſeveral things have juſtly rendered this ſociety odious. They have not acquired ſo great a power, ſay they, nor preſerved it ſo long, without the

'duke, that there was no ſalvation for him, unleſs he would exterminate Hereſy and Heretics out of his new dominions, according to the counſel of the Fathers Jeſuits: the duke, tired with theſe viſions, reſolved to enquire into the matter. He declared himſelf to one of his officers, who engaged to conjure the ſpirit moſt effectually, without either prayers or holy water. The officer hid himſelf under the prince's bed, and when the ſpirit came, he ſo hacked and hewed him with his hanger, that it is ſaid he died of his wounds. The officer who had done the exploit, had the indiſcretion to tell his wife of it, againſt the duke's expreſs commands. The wife was no more retentive than the husband. And thus the thing was divulged. The Jeſuits have tried all manner of ways to clear themſelves. The duke has iſſued rigorous injunctions in his eſtates, againſt ſpeaking of it. The Jeſuits have procured certificates under the hands of the Proteſtants themſelves, concerning the falſity of the ſtory. But all to no purpoſe. They will never deſtroy the ſuſpicions, which theſe ſtories, whether true or falſe, have imprinted in the people's minds, becauſe they are known to be capable of this juggle, by others of the ſame ſtamp.' He mentions ſome of them in general, I mean without circumſtances of time, and and place, and perſons: and after having adviſed us to reject their certificates from the Palatinate, he concludes thus (84): 'However, be this little ſtory true, or be it falſe, we know what they can do, and that is enough to make the thing probable.' The other example is, that the Jeſuits had 'plotted to poiſon the emperor in the ſacrament (85).' This prince was cautioned of it, 'and would not communicate the next day, but forced the Jeſuit to take the poiſoned Hoſt, of which he died. The emperor and court of Vienna, according to it's devotion, ordered, under terrible penalties, the few perſons, that were privy to it, to keep the thing a ſecret. It was not however well kept; or at leaſt it ſpread a little, and a gentleman of honour (86) ſwore, that the thing happened for certain in Vienna . . . (87), We do not give this for a truth, *purſues the author*, and, indeed to ſay all, we are not much inclined to believe it: but be it ever ſo falſe, the Jeſuits will never be able to deſtroy the ſuſpicion of it, becauſe of the character of the ſociety, which is known all the world over' He adds ſeveral reflexions tending to perſuade his readers, that this ſtory of Vienna is certain; and then proceeds (88): 'The thing, after all may be falſe; but it will ever be thought probable, conſidering the ordinary conduct of theſe good fathers . . . . (89). They, who believe the ſtory of Vienna falſe, will however believe it probable. If it be falſe, it will at leaſt ſerve to juſtify what I have juſt now ſaid, that the hatred againſt the ſociety is extream even in the church of Rome.' See the margin (90).

Without ſo many repetitions, we might eaſily have taken his thought. He means, that a man need only confidently publiſh whatever he pleaſes againſt the Jeſuits, to be aſſured, that abundence of people will believe it. I believe him in the right; at leaſt, that in this he will prove a good prophet. It was doubtleſs on this preſumption, that he publiſhed the ſtory of Vienna, though he believed it falſe. But if other authors have taken the ſame method, what will become of all the facts, which the enemies of the Jeſuits have publiſhed? Should we not have reaſon to believe, that they have divulged ſeveral, which they knew to be falſe, or doubtful, and which nevertheleſs would in their reckoning appear as certain, and be received by the public as undoubted truths? I cannot think the rules of morality will allow the making ſo ill a uſe of public prejudice: They command us to be equitable towards all, and never to repreſent people worſe than they are. I own to this author, that the readineſs, wherewith the public ſwallows all that is ſaid againſt the Jeſuits, is *a ſign of an exceſſive averſion to the ſociety* (91), and I deny not but this averſion affords moſt reaſonable conſequences, which blaſt their reputation (92). He has reaſon to add (93), 'that the good fathers would not do amiſs to explain to us this riddle; how it comes to paſs, that, being ſo good, ſo officious, and ſo amiable, they are notwithſtanding ſo terribly hated, whilſt the Janſeniſts and Jacobins are not ſo cried down in the world, as the Jeſuits are (94).' But he might perhaps be embarraſſed, ſhould we require of him the explication of another riddle: how it comes to paſs, that there are miniſters, accompliſhed in all kinds of virtues, as they pretend, who are hated as a peſt in all the communions different from their own, and who have innumerable enemies in their own, and of whom nothing could be publiſhed, but what would appear probable, whilſt Mr Daillé, and Mr Claude, are every where in good reputation? Be it how it will, I queſtion whether this writer had all the prudence of a nice diſputant, when he inſiſted ſo much upon this great diſpoſition of the public to believe whatever is printed againſt the Jeſuits. This is more proper, than he imagines, to keep their own friends faſt to them, who will eaſily believe, that this prejudice has been made too much uſe of, in publiſhing the moſt ill grounded ſtories. And as, at the bottom, it is a great fault, to be ready to believe whatever is ſaid to the diſadvantage of our enemies, true or falſe, doubtful or certain, ſo there is more indiſcretion, than ſincerity, in revealing this prepoſſeſſion. Would a cunning enemy diſcover this weak place? But, in point of indiſcretion, this author has not his fellow. Does not he ſay in the ſame book (95), that the *Eſprit de Mr Arnaud* was ſuppreſſed in Holland, only becauſe of the FEAR, 'the country was in at that time, of quarelling with the Engliſh?' Does he not tell the public (96), 'that this prohibition hindred not the book's being ſold quietly, and without any other precaution, than that of not expoſing it in a bookſeller's ſhop? The fine, *adds he* (97), impoſed on the Printer was neither demanded, nor paid; it was only a formality to ſtop the mouth of the court of England; and they themſelves, who had forbidden it, would have been very ſorry, if it had not been ſold. Nor did this prohibition hinder it's being re-printed in this country. He, who was reckoned the author of the book, was not a jot the worſe received for it at court, and every where elſe.' Is it not to ſpeak with the utmoſt contempt of his ſovereign, to repreſent Holland ſo very much afraid of England. Tho' this pretended fear were true, would not a good ſubject have concealed it? Would he have revealed it to the public? Would he confeſs, that the edicts of the State, againſt a book, were only a vain formality, which the Bookſellers laughed at? I omit what may be ſaid more: it is an abyſs, which prudence adviſes to ſtop at the brink of; my indiſcretion would be a hundred times more blameable, than that of this author, if I did not draw a veil over what he has had the raſhneſs to boaſt of, and if I did not cry out, *Procul hinc, procul eſſe profani*. He has ſacrificed to a paternal affection, the things he ought to have had the moſt reſpect for; for no body doubts that the author of the *Eſprit de Mr Arnaud*, and the author of the *Religion of the Jeſuits*, is one and the ſame perſon. Nothing is more eaſily diſcovered; for the elogies, he beſtows on the firſt of theſe books, in the latter, can proceed only from the affection of a father, who idolizes his own offspring, and is ſtruck with a ſingular fondneſs for the *Eſprit de Mr Arnaud*, the child of his own brain, on a double account, firſt, as it is made according to *his own image and ſimilitude; next, as it contains his own true character* (98).

[*R*] . . . . *They fail not to make the moſt of this plea . . . . that they may be furniſhed with one general common-place to invalidate the accuſations.*] Heretofore they uſed to anſwer all the books that were written againſt them; at laſt they are weary of it. The reaſon they alledge for their ſilence is, that they are no more obliged to confute the ſatires of their enemies, than the king of France is to anſwer the Gazettes of Amſterdam. 'Why ſho ld not he allow, 'it

---

(84) Religion des Jeſuites, pag. 79.

(85) Ib. pag. 80.

(86) *The ſame whom the author ſpeaks of in theſe terms, pag.* 79. A gentleman, who is perfectly a man of honour, who is in the ſervice of a great prince of Germany, returned from Vienna ſome months ago, and told as a thing true and unconteſted, the account which follows: *to wit, that there was a deſign to poiſon the emperor in the ſacrament.*

(87) Ib. pag 81.

(88) Ib pag 82.

(89) Ib. pag 83.

(90) *Wee ſhall ſee, in the remark* [*BB*], *towards the end, that there has been another falſe report ſpread ſince that time, of a jeſuitical conſpiracy againſt the emperor.*

(91) Relig. des Jeſuites, pag. 84.

(92) *See the Diſſertation of* Fortunius Galindus Cantaber de cauſis publici erga Jeſuitas odii. *It is inſerted in a collection of pieces publiſhed at Geneva in* 1630, *under the title of* Arcana Societat. Jeſu

(93) Ubi ſupra, pag. 84.

(94) Ib. pag. 76.

(95) Ib. pag. 44.

(96) Ib. pag. 46.

(97) Ibid.

(98) *In the ſeventy ſecond page of the* Religion of the Jeſnits, *you will find theſe words:* To judge equitably, ſay they, of the ſpirit of Mr Arnaud, ſuch as the ſatyrical authors paint him, and of the ſpirit of this author, ſuch as he has diſcovered himſelf in his books, it muſt be owned, that no two things are more like than theſe two ſpirits, and that one may, without being deceived, take the picture of one, for that of the other. *Mr Arnaud's Apologetic Letter is cited.*

the aſſiſtance of the moſt refined human policy. Now does not this take in the whole compaſs of ill morals, as to ſpiritual ſins? Beſides, the Jeſuits are the men, who have carried fartheſt, and with the greateſt eagerneſs, the conſequences of ſeveral doctrines, which were hatched before their time, and which expoſe kings to continual revolutions [*S*], Proteſtants to butchery, and Chriſtian morality to the moſt deplorable relaxation

‘ *it is Father Tellier who ſpeaks* (99), the Jeſuits to neglect anſwering libels, which in their opinion are no leſs fabulous and contemptible, than the Gazettes of Amſterdam, and the hiſtorical or prophetical Syſtems of Mr Jurieu? Ought they to be more tender in point of reputation, that the powers whom God has placed over us? Ought they not, or, at leaſt may they not, be permitted, after theſe great examples, to deſpiſe what only touches their particular honour.’ Here are more reaſons of theirs, taken from the inſignificancy of their anſwers, and the diſpoſition of one part of the public to take for truth, whatever is ſaid againſt them (100). ‘ We no ſooner anſwer one of their ſatires, but they have half a dozen more ready to be publiſhed. They keep magazines full of them, they have them remitted from all parts of the world. Thoſe that were refuted a hundred years ago, or which the world laughed at, though they were not refuted, they revive again at preſent, with the ſame confidence, as if they were new pieces, or had remained unanſwered. And the generation, that ſhall come after them forty or fifty years hence, will do the ſame with thoſe ſatires invented in our days, as deſpicable, and as deſpiſed as they are. What uſe will it be, for inſtance, to the Jeſuits of China, to have been the firſt, and almoſt the only men, who ſubmitted, without the leaſt reſiſtance, to the apoſtolical vicars, in 1684, when this has not hindered their enemies from publiſhing, the laſt ſummer, by the pen of their ſecretary, the Holland Gazetteer, that the holy father was extreamly provoked againſt the Jeſuits, becauſe they would not acknowledge the biſhops he had ſent to China. Can it be doubted, that, ſome years hence, this lye will come again upon the ſtage? In like manner, what advantage will it be to the Jeſuits of Germany, to have had an atteſtation, ſigned by four of the principal counſellors of the Elector Palatine, all Proteſtants, in which they declare, that the ſtory of a Jeſuit, counterfeiting a voice from heaven to deceive this prince, and to excite him to the deſtruction of hereſy, is a pure fable? Will this act hereafter hinder any good Proteſtant, who ſhall continue the Hiſtory of the Jeſuits, from making a chapter of this chimerical adventure, upon the credit of the Holland Gazetteer? Why ſhould we not expect this, when we ſee the graveſt authors of the party ſeriouſly tell us the ſtory of the packers of Amiens, with all the circumſtances that are capable of making a ſtory ridiculous . . . . After this, let not the Holland Gazetteer repent his publiſhing, for example, that it was the Jeſuits, who by their avarice and wicked councils, engaged the emperor in the laſt Hungarian war; that the people of Vienna, enraged againſt them on this account, maſſacred ſeveral of them, when they would have eſcaped upon the approach of the Ottoman army: that it was they, who burnt Stockholm the laſt year, (a little before, it was four diſguiſed Turks that did it) *&c.* Let him not repent his publiſhing theſe follies, and an hundred more of the ſame nature, nor let him change his ſtile for the future. If they are at preſent deſpiſed, at leaſt he may aſſure himſelf, that the time will come, when they ſhall be very good memoirs for him who ſhall write the twentieth, or the thirtieth Tome of the *Practical Morality* (101). You ſee with how much artifice they take advantage of the prejudice of their enemies; and how they verify the maxim, *misfortune is good for ſomething*. They turn the hatred of the world againſt them to their advantage, *Fruuntur Diis iratis*. It is certain, their enemies would hurt them more, if they obſerved ſome meaſure in the blows they give them; for whilſt they promiſcuouſly heap on well-grounded accuſations with thoſe that are otherwiſe, they favour the accuſed; they give him a handle for rendring thoſe ſuſpected, which are really true. A man muſt be very blind, not to foreſee, that ſeveral libels, which daily appear againſt the ſociety (102), will put weapons into their hands. Did they pay the authors for publiſhing ſuch ſtories, they might be ſaid to employ their money well. See the remark I have made upon the art of ſlandering (103). Note, that the Janſeniſts (104) politickly boaſt, they are not ſo credulous, with regard to the Jeſuits, as the Proteſtants are.

[*S*] *The Jeſuits . . . . have carried far . . . . the conſequences of ſeveral doctrines, which were hatched before their time, and which expoſe kings to continual revolutions.*] The opinion, that the authority of kings is inferior to that of the people, and that they may by puniſhed by the people, in certain caſes, has been taught and practiſed in all countries, in all ages, and in all Chriſtian communions, that have made any figure in the world. Hiſtory affords us inſtances every where of kings depoſed at the inſtigation, or with the approbation of the clergy. The opinion, that ſovereigns have received the ſword from God, to puniſh Heretics, is yet more univerſal, than the former, and has been reduced to practice among Chriſtians, from the days of Conſtantine to ours, in all the Chriſtian communions, that have had the power in their hands; and a man dares ſcarce write in Holland againſt ſuch an opinion. Theſe two doctrines therefore were not invented by the Jeſuits; but they have drawn the moſt odious conſequences from them, and ſuch as are moſt prejudicial to public peace: for, from the conjunction of theſe two principles, they have concluded, and that, as they think, by conſequential reaſoning, that an heretical prince ought to be depoſed, and Hereſy extirpated by fire and ſword, if it cannot be done any other way. If ſovereigns have received the ſword to puniſh Heretics, it is evident, that the people, the true ſovereign of their monarchs, according to the firſt principle, ought to puniſh them, when they perſiſt in Hereſy. But the gentleſt puniſhment, that can be inflicted on a Heretic, is, doubtleſs impriſonment, baniſhment, confiſcation of goods; and conſeqently an heretical king ought at leaſt to be dethroned by the people, his ſovereign, and ſuperiour; ſince, according to the firſt principle, monarchs are only delegates to whom the people, not being able to exerciſe it's ſovereignty in perſon, recommend the functions and exerciſe of it, with reſtrictions, and an inalienable right of reſuming them, when they acquit themſelves ill. Now there is no caſe, in which they ought more reaſonably to be diveſted of them, than when they deſerve the puniſhment, which the ſovereign, according to the ſecond principle, is ordered by God to inflict on Heretics. But as it is not ordinarily poſſible by judicial proceſſes to take from them the goods, which they have fairly forfeited by virtue of the laws, which God will have eſtabliſhed againſt Hereſy: as, I ſay, they have moſt commonly power enough in their hands to maintain themſelves in the exerciſe of royalty; an exerciſe, which is nothing but uſurpation, as long as they are Heretics; it follows, that recourſe muſt be had to artifice, in order to bring them to the puniſhments, which they have rightfully incurred; that is to ſay, conſpiracies may be formed againſt their perſons; ſince, otherwiſe, God would have given the ſword to the people, as a true ſovereign, for the puniſhment of Heretics, in vain. On the other hand, if ſovereigns have received the ſword, to puniſh the breakers of the two tables of the Decalogue, it follows, that they ought to proceed with greater ſeverity againſt Heretics, who violate the firſt table, than againſt murderers and thieves, who only violate the ſecond; for the infractions of the firſt are immediate treaſon againſt the divine majeſty, and affront God directly: whereas the infractions of the ſecond offend him only in an indirect manner. It is therefore the duty of eccleſiaſtics to excite ſovereigns to the puniſhment of Heretics, violators of the firſt table of the commandments; and if princes are negligent in this part, that negligence deſerves more to be exclaimed againſt, than a neglect in puniſhing murderers and robbers. It ought alſo to be repreſented, that if the inevitable danger of ruining the ſtate, obliges them to grant Heretics a toleration, they are bound to keep their word no longer than the tion that can be imagined [*T*]. To return to Loyola, I ought to mention that the houſe, in which he was born, is at preſent called *Santa Caſa*, and that the queen dowager of Spain has made a grant of it to the Jeſuits [*U*]; that three ſermons were preached upon

---

(99) Defenſe des Nouveaux Chreſtiens, Part. I, pag. 27, *printed at Paris in* 1687. I have already cited part of this paſſage in the article BELLARMIN, citat. (17). See alſo the remark [*E*] of the article BERTELIER.

(100) Ib. pag. 28.

(101) Defenſe des Nouveaux Chreſtiens, Part. I, pag. 31. *See, on this, the anſwers of Mr Arnaud, in the third volume of the* Morale Pratique (*Practical Morality*), chap. xi, & xii.

(102) *For example, that intituled* Les Jeſuites de la Maiſon profeſſe de Paris en belle humeur, *printed in* 1695. *Compare what has been ſaid in the article ANNAT, remark* [*B*].

(103) *In the remark* [*B*] *of the article ANNAT, and in the remark* [*E*] *of the article BELLARMIN. See alſo the article GREGORY VII, remark* [*P*], *towards the end.*

(104) Arnaud, Morale Pratique, Tom. III, pag. ult.

danger laſts; and this danger ceaſing, they ought to reſume the ſword for the extirpation of Hereſy, juſt as they would reſume it againſt robbers and murderers, when the danger which forced them to make a truce with theſe, is once over. In a word, if God has given the ſword into the ſovereign's hand for the puniſhment of Hereſy, the granting it impunity will render them as criminal before God, as the granting impunity to theft, adultery, and murder; and the only thing that can excuſe them, would be, that for the avoiding a greater evil, the infallible ruin of the ſtate and church, they were forced to promiſe the ſuſpenſion of the penal laws; whence it follows, that they are obliged to their firſt engagement as ſoon as that danger is paſſed; for every oath that engages to the diſobedience of the laws of God, is eſſentially null. Thus you ſee upon what foundations the Jeſuits have built a ſyſtem, which hath rendered them ſo odious, and which has given ſo juſt a horror for the maxims that ſeveral among them have vented. They have built upon a foundation, which they found ready to their hands; they have raiſed conſequence upon conſequence, quite out of ſight, without being aſtoniſhed at the hideouſneſs of the objects; they have believed on one hand, that this would turn to the advantage of the church; and on the other, that they did nothing againſt the art of right reaſoning. I ſhall not examine, whether Logic in effect did not lead them through all theſe conſequences; the matter would be too odious. I content my ſelf with ſaying, that France, having ſeen two of her kings ſucceſſively murdered, under the pernicious pretence, that they were favourers of Heretics, thought ſhe could no better ruin this wretched gradation of conſequences, than by overturning the firſt principle it depends upon. For this reaſon the third eſtate of the kingdom (105) reſolved to condemn as pernicious all doctrines, which make the authority of monarchs depend on any thing beſides God. I add to this an obſervation of Mr Jurieu: he cannot be ſuſpected of partiality to the Jeſuits, and yet it is certain, he praiſed this reaſoning, *viz. princes may put Heretics to death, therefore they ought to put them to death*; and laughed at a man, who neither blamed thoſe, who do put them to death, nor thoſe, who do not put them to death. Let us ſee Mr Jurieu's words (106).

‘*I explain my ſelf* (107), *and ſay, that I am for thoſe, who do not put Heretics to death; and it is my opinion, that their example ought to be followed. But as I believe on the other hand, that it is lawful to puniſh Heretics capitally, I condemn not thoſe, who do it: both do well in my judgment.* Mr Ferrand adds this laſt period to explain his thought, as he ſays. It had not been amiſs, if he had added two, or three, or more, to explain it farther. For they, who have any penetration, will be hard put to it, to unfold this author's notion. They will think, he has hit on a very odd medium. He is of opinion, that it is lawful, and conſequently very juſt, to burn the Calviniſts; but yet the beſt way is not to do it: ſome troubleſome diſputant will urge thus: It is never permitted to put any to death, but thoſe who deſerve it. If it be permitted to put the Calviniſts to death, they certainly deſerve it. Now how can reaſon, juſtice, and equity permit us to ſuffer thoſe to live in public ſociety who deſerve death? I know very well, that a ſovereign may, without any crime, give a murderer his life, or a robber, or a rebel, who deſerved death: but it is ſuppoſed, that they repent; and that, having once fallen into a crime, they now forſake it, and reſolve never to return to it more; there is mercy for every ſin. But there is nothing like this, in the caſe of letting Heretics live, who deſerve death on account of their Hereſy, and who perſevere however, and declare their reſolution to perſevere in it. I ſhould chuſe in the ſame manner to ſay, that it is juſt to put robbers, murderers, and ſorcerers to death, who proteſt they will rob, kill, and poiſon all they can, as long as they are ſuffered to live.’

Mr Jurieu reaſons as well in this paſſage, as he reaſons ill in an other book (108), where he maintains, that magiſtrates are obliged to puniſh Idolaters, but yet does not blame the impunity, which the States of Holland ſuffer them to enjoy, for whole ages together. Note, that, in ſaying he reaſons well, I have ſupplied, by my imagination, a clauſe that is moſt eſſential to his diſcourſe, and which he has omitted. The laſt period is abſurd, unleſs this be added to it, or ſomething equivalent; *and nevertheleſs, I am for thoſe, who do not put them to death, and it is my opinion their example ought to be followed.*

[*T*] . . . . *and Chriſtian morality to the moſt deplorable relaxation.*] It was not the Jeſuits, who invented the mental reſervations, nor the other opinions, that Mr Paſcal has charged upon them (109), nor even the philoſophical ſin (110). They found all this in other authors, either expreſsly, or in ſuch a manner, as a doctrine is in the principle, that produces it by conſequences. But as we have ſeen in their ſociety a greater number of patrons of theſe opinions, than in other communities, and that in their hands, the looſe maxims grew daily more fruitful, by the earneſtneſs with which they diſputed on theſe points, they have been formally and expreſsly impleaded. Wretched fruits of diſputation! their method of ſtudying has had at leaſt as great a ſhare in it, as the corruption of the heart. Before they come to read moral Divinity, they have dictated one or more courſes of Philoſophy; they have accuſtomed themſelves to cavil upon every thing; they have wrangled a thouſand times upon the *ens rationis*; they have heard as often the queſtions maintained *pro* and *con* about univerſals, and many other things of the ſame nature; their heads are ſo turned to objection and diſtinction, that, when they come to handle matters of morality, they find themſelves wholly diſpoſed to perplex them. Diſtinctions offer to them in ſhoals; arguments *ad hominem*, oblige you to fortify your ſelf on every hand, and to abate one thing to day, another thing to morrow. All this is very dangerous. Diſpute as long as you pleaſe upon logical queſtions; but in morality be content with good ſenſe, and with that light, which the reading of the Goſpel ſheds on your mind. If you go about to diſpute after a ſcholaſtic manner, you will not readily find a clew to the labyrinth. It was a very good ſaying of a certain perſon, that the books of the Caſuiſts are nothing but the art of cavilling with God (111). Theſe advocates in the court of conſcience find out more diſtinctions and ſubtilties, than the Lawyers in the civil courts. They make the tribunal of conſcience a ſort of moral laboratory, in which the moſt ſolid truths evaporate into ſmoak, volatile ſalts, and vapour. What Cicero ſaid of the ſubtilties of Logic, admirably agrees with thoſe of the Caſuiſts. ‘Dialectici ad extremum ipſi ſe compungunt ſuis acuminibus, & multa quærendo reperiunt non modo ea quæ jam non poſſint ipſi diſſolvere, ſed etiam quibus ante exorſa & potius detexta prope retexantur (112). —— *The Logicians at laſt wound themſelves with their own edge, and, by enquiring after many things, find not only what they cannot themſelves give a ſolution of, but what overthrows all they have before been raiſing.*’ A man is caught in webs of his own ſpinning; he is loſt, and knows not how to turn himſelf; nor has he any way to diſengage, but by relaxing in almoſt every article. They, who have read Father Pirot's book (113) will own, that it is eaſier to cenſure it, and perceive, that it contains dangerous doctrines, than anſwer his objections.

On the whole, tho' the Jeſuits are not the authors of the relaxed opinions, and tho' they are daily maintained by others, yet they ought not to think it hard, that they are charged with them; whilſt we go upon a principle, which they themſelves approve, with regard to the verſion of Mons (114).

[*U*] *The queen . . . . of Spain has made a grant to the Jeſuits of the houſe, in which Ignatius was born.*] The particulars of this affair are to be found in a book, printed at Salamanca in 1689. It is intituled *Averiguaciones de las Antiguedades de Cantabria* (115). The author calls himſelf Gabriel de Henao, a name that has appeared in the title page of ſeveral books in folio, and among others of a book which might be called a *Curious Account of Paradice*. Gabriel de Henao, is a Jeſuit, profeſſor of Divinity in the royal college of the ſociety at Salamanca. He has endeavoured to bring to light the antiquities of Cantabria, only becauſe it was the

(105) *In the year* 1615.

(106) Vrai, Syſtême de l'Egliſe, pag. 638.

(107) The words of this paſſage, printed in Italic, are taken out of a book of Mr Ferrand, intituled, *Reponſe à l'Apologie pour la Reformation.*

(108) In the eighth letter of the *Tableau du Socinianiſme.*

(109) In the *Lettres Provinciales.*

(110) This doctrine is almoſt an unavoidable conſequence of the definition of liberty, by which it is aſſerted, that, to the end any action be free, the agent muſt have a power of determining himſelf to the right or left, without being neceſſitated by any foreign cauſe. Now this definition is that, which is moſt commonly received in the church of Rome.

(111) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, March 30, 1665, pag. m 240, *and what Mr Bernier*, Abrégé de Gaſſendi, Tom. VII, livr ii, chap. viii, pag. m. 520, *relates of the firſt preſident de Lamoignon.*

(112) Cicero, de Oratore, lib. ii, cap. xxxviii.

(113) *Intituled*, L'Apologie des Caſuiſtes.

(114) See the obſervations of Father le Tellier on the Defence of the French Verſion of the New Teſtament, printed at Mons, *pag.* 377, *& ſeq.*

(115) *See the* Journal of Leipſic, in the Supplement, *Tom. I, Sect X, pag.* 525, 526.

upon his beatification, which were highly cenſured by the Sorbonne [*X*], and which doubtleſs

the country, in which Ignatius was born. He ſays, that, at preſent, this province takes in Guipuſcoa, Biſcay, and the country of Alava. Theſe two laſt countries produced Ignatius's anceſtors. The firſt gave him birth in the territory of Azpeytia; for the caſtle of Loyola is ſituated in this territory. The fonts of the church of St Sebaſtian d'Azpeytia, in which Ignatius was baptized, are a continual object of devotion. Women with child flock thither, and paſſionately deſire their children may be chriſtened at them, and take the name of Ignatius, or Ignatia as an omen of good fortune. The caſtle of Loyola, where this ſaint was born, is ſtanding to this day, and is called *la Santa Caſa*. Lewis Henry de Cabrera, and Tereſa Henrietta Velaſca de Loyola, marquis and marchioneſs of Alcanizas and Oropeſa, laſt proprietors of this caſtle, made a ſolemn grant of it, in the year 1681, to Marianna of Auſtria, mother to the preſent king of Spain (116). This princeſs gave it the year following to the Jeſuits, for the founding a college for their ſociety, and only reſerved the right of patronage to herſelf, during her life, and, after her death, to her ſon the king, and the ſucceeding kings of Spain. But ſhe impoſed upon the donataries the ſame condition, that was annexed to the ceſſion made to herſelf of it; which was that they ſhould not be permitted to demoliſh any part of the caſtle wall, but content themſelves with building by it (117).

RASH conjectures on the happineſs of Paradice.

Should I only mention a curious book of Gabriel Henao, without giving any account of it, I might be complained of for having impertinently provoked the reader's curioſity. I ſhall ſay then, that this Jeſuit publiſhed a volume in folio, in the year 1652, intituled, *Empyreologia, ſeu Philoſophia Chriſtiana de Empyreo cælo*, in which he ſo particularly deſcribes the bleſſedneſs of Paradice, as to ſay (118) *there will be muſic in heaven, with material inſtruments, as on earth.* But his account, if I miſtake not, is not comparable to that of Lewis Henricus, his brother Jeſuit, who affirms (119); *that there will be a ſovereign pleaſure in kiſſing and embracing the bodies of the bleſſed; that they ſhall bathe in the ſight of one another, for which there ſhall be moſt delicious baths; that they ſhall ſwim in them like fiſhes; and ſing as harmonious as larks and nightingales. That the angels ſhall be dreſſed like women, and ſhall appear to the ſaints in the habits of ladies, their hair curled, their petty-coats fardingaled, and in the richeſt linnen. That men and women ſhall divert themſelves with maſquerades, feaſts, and balls. That the women ſhall ſing more agreeably than the men, to make the pleaſure greater; that they ſhall riſe again with longer hair, and ſhall be decked with ribands and head-dreſſes, as they are in this world. That married people ſhall kiſs one other, as in this life, and their pretty ſweet children, which will be no ſmall pleaſure.*

[*X*] *Three ſermons, preached upon his beatification, were cenſured by the Sorbonne.*] Paul V having beatified Ignatius in the year 1609, the Jeſuits ‘ kept a ſolemn feſtival in all their houſes, colleges, and noviciates, where they made choice of, and deſired ſome of the greateſt divines who were not of their order, to make his panegyric (120).’ Valderrama, prior of the Auguſtines of Seville, preached the ſermon, the thirty firſt of July 1610. Peter Deza, dominican of Valentia, preached another, the twenty ſixth of January 1610. James Rebulloſa, dominican of Barcelona, preached a third the fourth ſunday of Advent 1609. A Jeſuit of Limoſin, called Francis Solier, tranſlated theſe three ſermons out of Spaniſh into French, and publiſhed them at Poitiers in 1611. In theſe ſermons were found four articles, which the Faculty of Divinity at Paris, aſſembled in the Sorbonne, the firſt of October 1611, thundered againſt in a terrible manner,

‘ *The firſt is in the firſt ſermon of brother P. de Valderama, pag.* 54, *and* 55. We know indeed, that Moſes, carrying his rod in his hand, did very great miracles in the air, in the earth, in the water, in the ſtones, and in every thing he pleaſed, ſo far as to drown Pharoah and his army in the Red-Sea; but it was the ineffable name of God, which, as the learned Toſtat, biſhop of Avilla, ſays, was engraven on this wand or rod, which worked theſe wonders. It was not ſo great a matter, that the creatures, ſeeing the commands of God, their ſovereign king and lord, ſubſcribed with his own name, ſhould pay him their homage and obedience. Nor was it any great wonder, that the apoſtles ſhould work miracles, ſince it was in the name of God, by the virtue and power which he had given them; ſigning it with his ſignet, In nomine meo dæmonia ejicient, linguis loquentur novis, *&c.* —— *In my name they ſhall caſt out devils, they ſhall ſpeak with new tongues.* But that Ignatius, with his own name written in paper, ſhould work more miracles than Moſes, and as many as the apoſtles; that his ſignet ſhould have ſo much authority over the creatures, as that they ſhould immediately obey him; this is what renders him exceedingly admirable. *The ſecond is in page* 91. *of the ſame ſermon.* As long as Ignatius lived, his life and morals were ſo grave, ſo holy, and ſo exalted, even in the opinion of heaven, that there were only ſome Popes, as St Peter; ſome empereſſes as the mother of God; ſome ſovereign monarch, as God the Father and his holy Son, who had the happineſs to ſee it (121). *The third is in brother Peter Deza's ſermon, pag.* 111, 112. Doubtleſs the other founders of religious orders were ſent in favour of the church, *&c.* Noviſſime autem diebus iſtis loquutus eſt nobis in filio ſuo Ignatio, quem conſtituit hæredem univerſorum. —— *But in theſe laſt days he hath ſpoken unto us, by his ſon Ignatius, whom he hath appointed heir of all things*: to which there is no other article of praiſe wanting than *per quem fecit Sæcula.* —— *By whom he made the worlds. The fourth is in brother James Rebulloſa's ſermon, pag.* 207. The martyr Ignatius bore a moſt particular affection to the holy father and Pope of Rome, as to the lawful ſucceſſor of Jeſus Chriſt, and his vicar on earth (122).’

The Faculty ‘ voted and reſolved on the firſt article, that that form of ſpeech, by which the name of the creature is equalled with the name of Almighty God; the miracles done in the name of God are depreciated; and finally, the miracles, which were not as yet certain, are preferred before thoſe, which we are obliged to believe with a Catholic, indubitable faith, is ſcandalous, erroneous, blaſphemous, and impious. As to the ſecond, that aſſertion, which pretends, that God received any good from the viſion of the creature is of it ſelf deteſtable, falſe, and a notorious Hereſy. As to the third, which appropriates the text of St Paul, *Noviſſime autem*, &c. to any other than Jeſus Chriſt, it is execrable, and blaſphemous, and impious. As to the laſt article, it has two contrary parts, one of which deſtroys the other: the laſt indeed is Catholic, and approved; namely, that the Pope is the vicar of Jeſus Chriſt on earth; but the firſt, *viz.* that the Pope is the lawful ſucceſſor of Jeſus Chriſt, is a propoſition manifeſtly falſe, and altogether heretical. Signed C. Petit Jan curate of St Peter (123).’

Father Solier publiſhed a very bold and threatning apology for them (124). in which he ſays, amongſt other things, that it ought to be remembered, that one ſpeaks after a popular manner *in ſermons and declamations, and chiefly in that ſtile, which they call* demonſtrative and encomiaſtic, *which more eaſily admits amplifications than the* deliberative and judicial kind (125), and that it is eaſy to diſcover when the preacher advances *a conception rather to delight the ear*, than ſeriouſly to inſtruct the auditors (126). He ſhewed that Lewis de Grenade, St Antoninus, and St Bernard, have made as bold applications of ſcripture, and even bolder than thoſe complained of. He cites many ſcripture-paſſages (127), to juſtify this thought of Valderrama; ‘ as long as Ignatius lived, his life and his manners were not univerſally known: none but God the Father, and his Son, having the happineſs to ſee it; but as ſoon as he was dead, all the courtiers of the king eternal ran to ſee him (128).’ He asks (129), if, ‘ when the Holy Ghoſt ſays, in the canticles, to a choſen ſoul, *oſtende mihi faciem tuam, ſonet vox tua in auribus meis, vox enim tua dulcis & facies tua decora*; it would be ill tranſlating, or blaſpheming, or paraphraſing, this paſſage, to ſay, *my dove, let me ſee thy face, and hear thy voice; foraſmuch as thy voice is ſweet, and thy countenance beautiful.*’ He anſwers nothing concerning the fourth propoſition, which was cenſured, and ſeems to be ignorant that it was condemned.

---

(116) I write this the twenty third of November, 1695.

(117) Ne ſcilicet ullum pro futuri collegii fabrica parietem demoliri fas eſſet, ſed antiquis hujuſce domus muris ob vetuſtatis venerationem illibatis, contigua modo ædificia adjungere & excitare liceret. *Acta Eruditor. Lipſ. ubi ſupra, pag.* 527.

(118) *See the firſt volume of the* Morale Pratique, pag. 273.

(119) *In his book intituled*, Occupation des Saints dans le Ciel. *See the* Morale Pratique, ibid. pag. 274.

(120) Mercure François, Tom. II, pag. m. 264, ad ann. 1611.

(121) *Hoſpinian, at the eleventh page of his* Hiſtor. Jeſuitica, *gives theſe words a turn altogether ridiculous; he tranſlates them thus;* Denique Monarchæ ſupremo Deo Patri ejuſque ſanctiſſimo Filio, eos intueri & videre tanquam ex ſingulari gratia fuerit conceſſum.

(122) Mercure François, ibid. pag 265. *See alſo the firſt Tome of the* Morale Pratique, pag. 22.

(123) Idem, pag. 266.

(124) The writers of the Bibliotheque of the Jeſuits do not ſpeak of this, nor of the tranſlation of theſe three ſermons.

(125) Mercure François, ubi ſupra, pag. 267.

(126) Ibid. pag. 271.

(127) *Among others, that of the Proverbs, chap. viii, ver.* 31, Delitiæ meæ eſſe cum filiis hominum. —— *My delights were with the ſons of men.*

(128) Mercure François, ibid. pag. 267.

(129) Ibid. pag. 268.

doubtleſs were a freſh acceſſion to Stephen Paſquier's diſcontent [Y]. Some differences aroſe

condemned. Not but he undertook to juſtify the four articles; but he ſuppoſes, that the fourth was this: *that only the order of St Francis, works miracles in matter of voluntary poverty* (130). ‘For a lay-brother of his order, *ſays he*, with the cord, which ſerves him for a girdle, in his hand, works more miracles, than ever the rod of Moſes did; becauſe the latter only drew water from a rock; but this extracts bread, wine, fleſh, and whatever he has need off, from hearts harder than flint.’ He excuſes this two ways; firſt, by ſaying it is one of thoſe notions a preacher advances, not as a ſerious doctrine, but to tickle the ears of his auditors: Secondly, by maintaining that, even literally, the propoſition is true. *But*, ſays he, *though we ſhould take it in ſtrict ſpeaking, and with all the rigours of the ſchool, is it not true, that it is a greater work to mollify an heart ſteeled by ſinful habits, and hardened in iniquity, than to make living water ſpring out of a rock? Has not St Bernard ſaid in this ſenſe, that Jeſus Chriſt worked a greater miracle in the converſion of Mary Magdalen, than in raiſing her brother Lazarus from the dead?* He had better have confined himſelf to the firſt reaſon, which was only to repreſent, that there is an indulgence due to the ſallies of an orator, and the eloquence of the pulpit, eſpecially amongſt Monks; and that the day of the panegyric is in poſſeſſion of almoſt an unlimited licence. But this hinders not, that ſometimes the enthuſiaſms of this licence ought to be cenſured; as the archbiſhop of Rheims has lately done (131). I forget not, that Scioppius (132) has been very merry upon a place of this Peter Deza's ſermon. It is that, where the preacher exhibits, as a great miracle, the happineſs the Jeſuits have had in obtaining whatever they deſired in an age ſo covetous, ſo hard-hearted, and void of charity.

Hoſpinian, ſpeaking of this matter, has ſaid a thing which, no doubt, he has perſuaded a great many of, and which notwithſtanding ſeems to be very falſe. He ſays, that the Jeſuits themſelves compoſed theſe three ſermons; but that, for the greater honour of their St Jgnatius, they gave out that the Spaniſh dominicans had preached them. He adds, that this fraud was diſcovered (133). Common ſenſe revolts againſt this accuſation; for ſuppoſe the Jeſuits as wicked as you pleaſe, it will not do; you muſt farther ſuppoſe them ſtupid, and as fooliſh as children; ſince none but blockheads could poſſibly imagine, but that, in two months at fartheſt, they ſhould be expoſed in the face of the world, if they ventured to print, that ſuch and ſuch Monks, diſtinguiſhed by their place of reſidence, their dignities and names, had preached ſuch and ſuch things, ſuch a day, in ſuch a town. Such falſehoods cannot fail of being preſently confuted by a public and judicial contradiction, which renders the lyar the eternal ſubject of his enemies deriſion. If none but fools could foreſee this imminent mortification, nothing but a brutal ſtupidity would, upon ſuch a foreſight, have expoſed itſelf to the hazard; ſo that there is all kind of probability to make us believe, that the Jeſuits, who are very jealous of the honour of their order, and very tender of their intereſts, and narrowly obſerved by vigilant enemies, have not falſly fathered the three ſermons, which Francis Solier printed at Poictiers; and ſince the Janſeniſts (134) attribute only the French tranſlation to the Jeſuits, it is an evident proof, that Hoſpinian is miſtaken. This brings to my mind a charge of forgery, which proved unfortunate to the Capuchins of Paris. They pretended, that the approbation of one of their fathers, prefixed to a book of Amadæus Guimenius, was fictitious. *We declare*, ſaid they, *that not any one of us approved that book, and farther, that there neither has been, nor is in our congregation any provincial monk*, who is called Luiſius of Valentia, who has been twice provincial miniſter of the Frier minors of St Francis, Capuchins of the province of the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, in the kingdoms of Valencia and Murcia, Maſter of Arts, firſt profeſſor, and Jubilate reader of ſacred Divinity, and counſellor qualificator of the Inquiſition of both kingdoms; and *that we have not in Spain any province ſo called. We proteſt alſo that theſe pompous titles, wherewith the author of this forged approbation is adorned, are very remote from the ſimplicity we profeſs. We declare theſe things upon the teſtimony of our moſt reverend father general, who having underſtood, that this book was publiſhed with this approbation, has teſtified what we have ſaid.* This declaration of forgery was confuted in all it's parts by authentic acts, attended with all the formalities, that the moſt judicial procedure could require (135). What did the good Capuchins of Paris think of? Could they imagine, that practiſed forgers would ſpecify ſo many characters, proper names, titles of dignity, places of reſidence, if they had a falſe approbation to produce? Would not this be pointing out the track to their enemies, to take the hare in it's form? Would not this be leading by the hand to the diſcovery of the impoſture? The Janſeniſts have publickly acknowledged, that the certificate of the Capuchins of Paris contains a falſe allegation (136).

Note, by the way, that the proper names are wretchedly diſguiſed in this relation of Hoſpinian; probably by the negligence of the correctors. You find Valderanna, and Vualderanna, inſtead of Valderrama; Doza inſtead of Deza; Teſtatus inſtead of Toſtatus; Tileſac inſtead of Fileſac (137); Ducal inead of Du Val (138).

[Y] . . . *which doubtleſs were a freſh acceſſion to Stephen Paſquier's diſcontent.*] The news of Ignatius's beatification could not but be diſagreable to this writer, a great enemy to the Jeſuits, and who had but lately ridiculed their founder in a public work (139) ſo as to preſage, in ſome meaſure, that the artifices made uſe of at Rome, to get him canonized, would come to nothing (140). We may therefore believe, that his diſpleaſure increaſed in proportion to the noiſe the pomp of this beatification made all over Europe: I cannot conceive a ſeverer mortification, than his ſeeing a perſon beatified, of whom he had ſpoken very ill. If he had been a Proteſtant, he would have laughed at the judgment of the court of Rome; but he profeſſed himſelf a Roman Catholic: he could not therefore deny but that his ſlanders had been confuted in the moſt authentic manner poſſible, and himſelf condemned by the whole church of Rome, which acquieſced in the Pope's decree. It was a wretched come-off, to ſay, as his children did in their anſwer to Garaſſe, that he did not believe the founder of the Jeſuits would one day be beatified. It is an unlucky inconvenience in the Roman communion, that a man runs the risk of ſeeing himſelf forced to keep the feaſts of thoſe perſons devoutly, and to invoke them, whom he formerly ſatirized. This ſhould make critical authors more circumſpect. I attack a man, they ought to ſay to themſelves, who perhaps may get into the litanies before I die: let us be cautious of every thing, and conſider what may come to paſs. It is true, Lewis XII did not think a king of France obliged to revenge the injuries offered to a duke of Orleans; but how do we know whether the beatified are of this humour? Do not the country curates ſay, a thouſand and a thouſand times over, that the ſaints ſend plagues and famines, *&c.* to puniſh the neglect of their chapels and images? If the fault of theſe indevout people is chaſtiſed by a public diſaſter, which falls even on the innocent, has not this particular cenſor, author of the Jeſuits Catechiſm, reaſon to fear St Ignatius's reſentment.

- - - - - ſæpe Dieſpiter
Neglectus inceſto addidit integrum (141).

Neglected Jove oft, in one puniſhment
Involves the guilty, and the innocent.

The poets adviſe us to be ſparing of our encomiums.

Qualem commendes etiam atque etiam aſpice, ne mox
Incutiant aliena tibi peccata pudorem (142).

Conſider well on whom you praiſe beſtow,
Leſt, by imaginary worth miſled,
You bluſh hereafter for another's faults.

And it ſeems, that, to follow their counſel exactly, we ſhould ſuſpend our praiſes of any perſon, till death

has

---

(130) Ibid. pag. 271. *Deza is the perſon who makes uſe of this thought*, pag. 151.

(131) *See the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, Auguſt 1695, pag. 555. *and remark* [*N*] *of the article* *FRANCIS of Aſſiſi.*

(132) Scioppius, Infam. Famiani Stradæ, pag. 159.

(133) Fraus ſuboluit tandem, & deprehenſum eſt, tres has conciones à Jeſuitis conſcriptas; habitas & publicatas fuiſſe *Hoſpinian. Hiſtoria Jeſuit. lib. i, pag.* 11. *Edit.* 1681.

(134) *In the firſt Tome of the* Morale Pratique des Jeſuites, pag. 20.

(135) *See the book, intituled*, Mala fides & calumniæ auctoris anonymi, *&c.* per Danielem Campfordum, *printed at Colegn in* 1682.

(136) See the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned for the month of January 1688, pag. 140.

(137) He demanded a cenſure of the four articles extracted out of the three ſermons.

(138) He oppoſed the cenſure, and there was no regard had to his remonſtrances.

(139) See his Catechiſm of the Jeſuits, printed in 1602, chap. xi, and the following of the firſt book.

(140) See the ſame Catechiſm, chap. xv, of the firſt book, pag. 137, and the following.

(141) Horat. Od. ii, lib iii. ver. 29.

(142) Horat. Epiſt. xviii, lib. i, ver. 76.

aroſe in France about the day of his feſtival [Z], after Pope Urban VIII had publiſhed the bull of his canonization.

His Life has been written by near twenty authors: one of them calls himſelf John Euſebius of Nieremberg: his work was ſeverely cenſured, if we believe Father Baron [*AA*]. I need not add, that the Jeſuit Bouhours is one of his patriarch's Hiſtorians; it being a thing notorious enough. What Grotius has ſaid of Loyola, and the Jeſuits, is not the leaſt beautiful part of his hiſtory (*i*). His expreſſions are well choſen, grave and noble. There is nothing in it that ſavours of invective; but all beſpeaks a ſoul ſedately poſſeſſing it ſelf, and able to hold the ballance *in equilibrio*. But the more he ſhews himſelf exempt from paſſion and partiality, the more capable he is of perſuading a thing, which, to ſay no worſe of it, has no certainty. He maintains, that the profeſſion of a Jeſuit does not exclude marriage [*BB*]; that a man, when he is of the ſociety, may

has ſecured him from the danger of inconſtancy. Have you praiſed a man, who dextrouſly hid his faults? He loſes his art, is univerſally cried down, and you are cenſured for your incenſe. Perhaps too he becomes your enemy, and your furious perſecutor; this has opened your eyes; you have ſeen him to the bottom, and have turned your encomiums into ſatire; for which you are expoſed, as at variance with your ſelf. Theſe inconveniencies would not have happened, if you had not been overhaſty in dealing out your praiſes. Beſides, men of merit have not always the gift of perſeverance; they loſe themſelves in proſperity, or in other conjunctures, which the general courſe of affairs produces. You are aſhamed to have been the herald of their praiſes; your ears being ſtunned with ungrateful reproaches on that account. We might avoid all this, would we wait as long, before we pronounced a man praiſe-worthy, as Solon did to pronounce him happy.

. . . . dicique beatus
Ante obitum nemo, ſupremaque funera debet (143).

None happy call in this uncertain ſtate;
Death only ſets us ſafe beyond the reach of fate.

But as to cenſure, and criticiſm, you are not ſecure, though you wait till the perſon is dead: there ſhall ariſe, it may be, a Pope, who will enroll among the ſaints the man whom you have treated ill, and bid you, *adora quod incendiſti, recommend yourſelf to the interceſſion of him, whom you have offended.* I do not know but the French, who have abuſed Innocent XI, both in his life-time, and ſince his death (144), may experience this unlucky fate. It reſembles thoſe decrees of parliament, which force a man to marry the woman he has diſhonoured.

[Z] *Some differences aroſe in France about the day of his feſtival.*] Mr Heidegger relates, that the Pope, having aſſigned for St Ignatius's feſtival the ſame day which by antient preſcription had belonged to St Germain (145), the Jeſuits raized the name of St Germain out of the Calendar, to put their Founder's name in it's place (146). The French took offence at this by reaſon of their great veneration for St Germain. The prince of Condé, a patron of the Jeſuits, affirmed that St Ignatius appeared to him, the day they were celebrating his feaſt at Rome. The cauſe being brought to Rome was determined in the following manner. The Pope decreed, that the feaſt of St Germain, and St Ignatius ſhould be kept the ſame day; but if they could not agree together, Ignatius as being the junior, ſhould be obliged to ſtay till leap-year, when he ſhould have the intercalated day wholly to himſelf. ‘ *Lis ad Pontificem delata ridicule ita* ‘ *deciſa eſt*, ut eodem die ſimul Germanus & Ignatius celebretur: quòd ſi ſimul ſtare nolle videren‘tur, expectaret Ignatius, ceu recentior, annum biſ‘ſextilem, & diem, qui tum intercalatur, ſibi eximium ‘ haberet (147).’ I wiſh Mr Heidegger had cited ſome good author; for I do not find all this in the letter to a counſellor of parliament on a writing of Father Annat. We find this letter in the firſt Tome of the collection of pieces concerning the New-Teſtament of Mons, and this is what we read at the 593d page: ‘ Who knows not, that, as ſoon St Igna‘tius was canonized, the Jeſuits ſubſtituted him in ‘ the place of St Germain biſhop of Auxerre, whom ‘ they inſolently razed out of the Calendar; where ‘ we ſhould have no more ſeen this great name ſo ve‘nerable to all France, had it not been reſtored by ‘ a decree of the parliament of Paris, paſſed upon an ‘ excellent diſcourſe of the advocate-general.’ Mr Heidegger might have cited John Lætus (148), or rather James Rævius (149), cited by John Lætus, but what good would this have done?

[*AA*] *The Life of St Ignatius by John Euſebius of Nieremberg was ſeverely cenſured, if we believe Father Baron.*] This dominican aſſures us, that the cenſor, who was commiſſioned to examine this Life, reported to the judges that he found it ſo full of faults that it deſerved to be expunged from beginning to end. *Adeo mendoſum librum ut eſſet inemendabilis, & à capite ad calcem ſpongia delendus; nonnulla etiam notavit quæ ſtomachum & indignationem audientibus moverunt* (150). Father Papebroch, (151) anſwering a Carmelite, who alledged this paſſage, has obſerved, that Vincent Baron is not to be credited upon this ſubject, and that the condemnation of the book of Nieremberg concerns only the ſecond edition (152), and is moderated by a *donec corrigatur*. He adds, that the third edition, enlarged with the Life of Francis Xavier, went off without any oppoſition.

[*BB*] *Grotius maintains, that a Jeſuit's vow does not exclude marriage.*] His words are theſe: ‘ Tranſ‘greſſi in morem non una habitant omnes. Angu‘ſtum videbatur Societatis incrementa parietibus in‘cludere: DANT NOMINA ET CONJUGES (153). —— ‘ *They do not all dwell together. It ſeemed narrow,* ‘ *to confine the increaſe of the ſociety within walls:* ‘ THEY GIVE NAMES AND WIVES.’ Paſquier, pleading againſt the Jeſuits in the year 1564, affirmed (154), that their ſociety ‘ was compoſed of two ſorts ‘ of men, the firſt whereof, ſay they are of the great ‘ obſervance, and the others of the leſs. Thoſe of ‘ the great obſervance are obliged to four vows; for, ‘ beſides the three ordinary ones of obedience, poverty, ‘ and chaſtity, they make one particularly in favour of ‘ the Pope. . . . Thoſe, who are of the leſſer obſervance, ‘ are obliged to no more than two vows, one reſpect‘ing the fidelity they promiſe to the Pope, and the ‘ other obedience towards their ſuperiors and miniſters. ‘ Theſe latter do not vow poverty; but it is lawful ‘ for them to hold benefices without diſpenſation, to ‘ ſucceed their fathers and mothers, to acquire lands ‘ and poſſeſſions, as if they were not obliged to any ‘ religious vow. . . . . . . (155) This ſame ordinance ‘ makes it poſſible for all people to be of this order. ‘ For as, in this leſſer obſervance, there are no vows ‘ made, either of virginity, or poverty, ſo it indiffe‘rently takes in prieſts and laymen, married or un‘married, ſince they are not obliged to reſide, with ‘ the great obſervancers. But they may inhabit with ‘ the reſt of the people, provided that, on certain and ‘ prefixed days, they appear at the houſe common to ‘ them all, to participate in their grimaces.’ But let us ſee what was anſwered him by the Jeſuit Richeome (156). The fifth lie ‘ is in the ſame plead‘ing, where, having diſcourſed like a dotard upon ‘ the rule of the Jeſuits, and told a great many pi‘tiful and ſilly lies, at laſt he adds one of a larger ‘ ſize, big with many others, ſaying, this ſame ordi‘nance makes it poſſible for all people, &c. . . . . . ‘ And after having fooled ſufficiently, he faſtens the ‘ tail to his chimera, and concludes. *So that follow‘ing this law and rule, it is no abſurdity to ſee a whole* ‘ *town of Jeſuits.* This lie ought not to be reckoned ‘ a ſingle one; for it contains as many as there are ‘ words. I have been a member of this ſociety above ‘ twenty years, and have carefully read it's conſtitutions,

---

(*i*) Grotius, Hiſtor. lib iii, pag. m. 273, & ſeq.

(143) Ovidius, Metam. lib iii, ver. 136. *It is the ſubſtance of the anſwer Solon makes to Crœſus,* in Herodotus, lib i, cap. xxxii, pag. m. 13.

(144) See the remark [*G*], of the article INNOCENT XI.

(145) To wit, the thirty firſt of July.

(146) Eo impudentiæ . . . provecti ſunt, ut ex faſtis & Calendario ipſo Romano, eraſo nomine S. Germani, qui eum ſibi diem hactenus vendicaverat, Ignatium ſuum ſubſtituerent. *Heidegg. Hiſt. Papatus, pag.* 357.

(147) Id. ibid.

(148) In Compendio Hiſtoriæ Univerſalis, pag. m. 524.

(149) In Hiſtor. Pontific. Roman. pag m. 313.

(150) Vincent. Baronius, apud Sebaſtianum à Sancto Paulo Carmelitam in libello ſupplici.

(151) Daniel Papebroch. Reſponſ. ad exhibitionem Errorum, pag. 286.

(152) It is that of Madrid, 1631.

(153) Grotius, Hiſtor. lib. iii, pag. m. 274.

(154) Paſquier, Recherch. de la France. livr. iii, chap. xliii, pag. m. 323.

(155) Paſquier, ubi ſupra, pag. 324.

(156) Reſponſe de René de la Fon pour les Religieux de la Compagnie de Jeſus, chap. xlii, pag. m. 202. Alegambe, pag. 318, *informs us, that Richeome diſguiſed himſelf under the title of* René de la Fon.

may live where he pleaſes, and cohabit with his wife. Paſquier had ſaid the ſame thing, and was publickly charged with a falſehood. I have not found, that he anſwered the adverſary, who treated him as a downright ſlanderer. Grotius was to be pitied, if he had no other warrant, than Paſquier.

‘ tions, but never heard of the leſſer or greater obſer‘ vance among the Jeſuits; nor have I ever read one ‘ word of it, either in their books, or in their bulls ‘ expedited by the Popes for their eſtabliſhment. And ‘ to one and all, the vows of chaſtity, poverty, and ‘ obedience, are ſo expreſs, that no body can doubt of ‘ them: beſides, who ever ſaw a married Jeſuit among ‘ them? or rather, who ever heard any one ſpeak of ‘ it, beſides Paſquier?’

Perhaps Grotius might found himſelf upon the bare teſtimony of Paſquier, looking on it as inconteſtable, ſince it was not probable, that a man would venture to utter a falſity of this nature, in full parliament, and in ſo ſolemn a cauſe; but the ſureſt way is to miſtruſt appearances, and never to judge upon the report of one of the parties. *Audi & alteram partem*; *keep one ear for the accuſed*; *inform yourſelf of the anſwer of each party*; is a rule that ought never to be forgotten. The lie, that was given to this advocate, is found in a work printed in 1599. Paſquier, two or three years after, publiſhed his Catechiſm of the Jeſuits, in which he repeated many of the things he had advanced before, and maintained them againſt the apologiſts for the ſociety. He inſiſts (157) chiefly on an examination of the ſimple vows, which the Jeſuits are obliged to make: but does not reply one word about the two kinds of Jeſuits, which he had informed the world of, one married, the other unmarried. This makes me believe, that he diſcovered his error. The Janſeniſt, who, in 1688, publiſhed an apology for the cenſures of Louvain and Douay, ſuppoſes (158), ***that there are concealed Jeſuits, who without wearing the habit, are yet of the ſociety, and are left in the world for it's intereſts***; but he does not ſay, that they are permitted to marry. In vain ſhall we endeavour to excuſe Grotius by the teſtimony of an anonymous writer, who printed a little book in 1682, intituled, ***The Emperor and Empire betrayed, how, and by whom.*** This author advances the ſame thing as Paſquier, and ſuſpects even the emperor to be a Jeſuit of the ſecond claſs. ‘ My ‘ jealouſy, *ſays he* (159), of his Imperial majeſty, en‘ creaſes the more, becauſe it is notorious, that there ‘ are ſeveral ſorts of religious among the Jeſuits; ſome ‘ who are diſpenſed with, not only as to the habit, but ‘ who are even allowed to marry, and to be inveſted ‘ with all ſorts of offices and dignities; that if his Im‘ perial majeſty, through too great a zeal for his re‘ ligion, was, in his younger years, unfortunately en‘ gaged in this order, under the aforeſaid diſpenſations, ‘ we need no longer wonder at any part of his be‘ haviour to the Proteſtants; for though he were only ‘ of the leſſer order, in which it is permitted to ‘ marry, and to poſſeſs all ſorts of offices and digni‘ ties, it is however true, that in every thing elſe, ‘ and particularly in matters of religion, he would be ‘ under the obedience of the general of the Jeſuits, and ‘ conſequently obliged to make peace and war, juſt as ‘ the general of the ſociety ſhould think fit for the inte‘ reſts of the Papal court, and the ſociety. The war ‘ he perpetually makes againſt the Proteſtants of the ‘ Upper Hungary, ... his immenſe preſents to ‘ the ſociety . . . . . with the ſcandalous and diſ‘ graceful ſigning of the laſt peace (160) . . . . . . ‘ All this ſmells ſtrong of an obedience, which knows ‘ no other duty, nor rule of juſtice and piety, than ‘ the abſolute command of his ſuperior: and I ſee ‘ nothing in the conduct of this prince, whether in ‘ his way of living, and his perpetual applications to ‘ Jeſuitical comedies, muſic, or pilgrimages, ſome‘ times to one relic, ſometimes to another, together ‘ with whatever may diſcover his natural or habitual ‘ inclinations, that contradicts this opinion.’ Yet once more, it would be impertinent, in favour of Grotius, to alledge ſuch a libeller, who dares ſo inſolently and diſreſpectfully ſpeak of his Imperial majeſty. Theſe writers would be too obligingly treated, ſhould we ſay to them; *I expected proof, and you bring me vulgar ſtories* (161). For they moſt commonly vent, not only what they have heard themſelves, but what they have forged in the mint of their own brain. He, whom I have cited, and Mr Jerieu, would afford matter of laughter to all the world; the one maintains, that the Jeſuits betrayed the houſe of Auſtria in favour of France, and the other, that they would be always diſpoſed to betray France, in favour of the houſe of Auſtria (162). That which is certain is, that the Imperial court has obſerved ſuch a conduct for above theſe twelve years paſt (163), as is an invincible proof, either that the Jeſuits have no credit there; or that their councils are adapted to the temporal intereſts of the emperor, preferable to the advantages of the Catholic religion in general; and if the author of the libel had underſtood politics, he might eaſily have ſeen, that the ſigning of the peace of Nimeguen was the beſt and nobleſt reſolution the houſe of Auſtria could take, conſidering the poſture of affairs, after the particular peace of France with the United-Provinces. But this author did not conſider it ſo cloſely; and, if he had been alive in 1697, I doubt not but he had been the promoter of news, not unlike what we have ſeen above (164). The Hiſtorical Letters of October, that year, have this in them. ‘ It ‘ has been for ſome time reported, that the Jeſuits ‘ had formed a conſpiracy againſt the emperor and the ‘ king of the Romans, and that one of them had already ‘ been executed. They write from Vienna, that this ‘ is a meer calumny; ſo that the emperor, to unde‘ ceive the public, has ordered his council of regency ‘ to publiſh an act in High-Dutch upon this ſub‘ ject (165).’ The author of the Hiſtorical Letters gives a French tranſlation of this Imperial act.

(157) Book ii, chap ix, & ſeq.

(158) Apologie Hiſtor. des deux Cenſures de Louvain & de Douai ſur la matiere de la Grace, pag. 155. *See alſo the* Queſtion curieuſe ſi Mr Arnauld eſt Hérétique? pag. 92, 93. *of the ſecond Edit.*

(159) Pag. 158, *&c.*

(160) *That of Nimeguen, in* 1678.

(161) Rumoribus mecum pugnas: ego autem à te rationes requiro. *Cicero, de Nat. Deor. lib. iii, cap. v.* See citation (73) of the article LAUNOI (JOHN DE).

(162) See Mr Arnauld in his ninth chapter of the firſt part of his Apology for the Catholics.

(163) I write this in 1700.

(164) In the remark [Q], citat. 85.

(165) Lettres Hiſtoriques, October, 1697, pag. 461.

LUBBERT, (SIBRAND) profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker, was born at Longoworde in Friſeland, about the year 1556. He went through his claſſical learning in the college of Bremen, and ſtudied afterwards in the univerſity of Wittemberg, where he learned Hebrew to a great perfection, under the profeſſor Valentine Scindlerus, after which he went to Geneva, and diligently attended the lectures of Beza, Caſaubon, and Francis Portus *(a)*. He went afterwards to Neuſtadt, whither prince Caſimir had removed the Calviniſtical profeſſors. He chiefly frequented the lecture of Zachary Urſinus, and inſinuated himſelf into his intimacy and favour. He was one day praiſed by him, in ſuch a manner as was at the ſame time a good proof of this profeſſor's modeſty [*A*]. Our Lubbert had an offer of being ſubſtitute to Urſinus in the Logic profeſſorſhip,

(*a*) He was then explaining Apollonius Rhodius.

[*A*] *He was one day praiſed by him in ſuch a manner, as was a good proof of this profeſſor's modeſty.*] He had miſ-quoted David Kimchi in a public lecture, and being told of it by our Sibrand, he acknowledged his fault in the next lecture, and pointed out the perſon who had ſet him right. You will find a larger account of this in the following Latin: ‘ Accidit aliquando, ut ‘ *D. Urſinus* in lectione publica Kimchium citaret, ‘ quem noſter quoque antea ad eundem locum conſu‘ luerat. Deprehendebat adoleſcens, *D. Urſinum*, ‘ Kimchii authoritatem, ſive errore μνημονικῷ, ſive ‘ quod locum obiter inſpexiſſet, malè allegaſſe. Mo‘ nuit hac de re præceptorem modeſtè & verecunde. ‘ Is miratus juvenis in Ebraïſmo peritiam, introduxit ‘ eum in Muſæum, inſpectoque Kimchii Commentario, ‘ rem ſeſe ad eum modum habere deprehendit. Tan‘ tum abeſt ut offenderit clariſſimum Theologorum ‘ hæc diſcipuli libertas, ut poſtridie in lectione publica ‘ errorem illum ſuum retractaverit, monſtrato *D. Sibrando*, quem ſibi ejus indicium feciſſe profiteba‘ tur.

feſſorſhip, with the promiſe of a better imployment, in due time; but he modeſtly anſwered, that he did not think himſelf qualified to fill a place, in which this illuſtrious profeſſor had acquired ſo much glory. Nevertheleſs, Urſinus had found none amongſt his diſciples beſides him, fit to be recommended to this place. It was given to Fortunatus Crellius. As ſoon as Lubbert found himſelf qualified to be promoted to the miniſtry; he had a call from the Reformed church of Bruſſels, and from that of Embden; he preferred the latter, by the advice of Zachary Urſinus. He was called into Frieſland in 1584 to be preacher to the governor and deputies of the States of the province, and to read Divinity lectures in the univerſity of Franeker, the foundation whereof was reſolved on at that time. He had for his colleagues in the Divinity profeſſorſhip, Martin Lydius, and Henry Antonides Nerdenus; and though they were older than he, he far excelled them. He took his doctor of Divinity's degree at Heidelberg, when he ſaw himſelf honoured with a profeſſorſhip in that faculty at Franeker. He exerciſed this imployment about forty years, and in this long interval, was ſeveral times imployed in important affairs [*B*]. He was one of the deputies at the ſynod of Dort; and one of the beſt heads in the aſſembly. His great induſtry and ſtrong conſtitution, gave him opportunities of compoſing ſeveral books [*C*], which were much eſteemed. He preached with great zeal, and was very fervent in cenſuring vice [*D*], and

' tur. Eâ etiam occaſione *D. Urſinus* juventuti ſacra Ebraïſmi ſtudia, paremque diligentiam commendabat.

Pulcrum eſt digito monſtrari & dicier, hic eſt (1).

It was more glorious to Urſinus thus to acknowledge his fault, than to Lubbert to be praiſed for diſcovering it.

[*B*] *He was ſeveral times employed in important affairs.*] Count William of Naſſau, governor of Frieſland, and the deputies of the States of the Province frequently admitted him into their council; and when in the year 1594, the town of Groningen and the Ommelandes were added to the body of the United-Provinces, he was one of the three miniſters (2) who founded a church at Groningen, and drew up the ſtatutes of it. Some time after, a quarrel aroſe between the miniſters of Leuwarden, which was carried on with ſo much paſſion and obſtinacy, that the only means of reſtoring peace, was to diſmiſs them all; whereupon Sibrand Lubbert, Lydius, Nerdenus, and John Arcerius, were ſent to ſerve that church, and continued in it till theſe diſſentions were ended. He was deputed to the Hague, in the year 1606, to aſſiſt in a preliminary aſſembly, *ad conventum præparatorium*; and in the year 1618, the States of Frieſland deputed him to the ſynod of Dort (3). One of the Engliſh divines, wno aſſiſted at that ſynod obſerves, that this Frieſland deputy grew hot, and flew into a paſſion, and contributed much more to perplex things, and to foment diviſions, than to compoſe them (4). I have ſpoken elſewhere (5) of his quarrel with Maccovius; and I add here, that he had ſome differences with his colleague, the learned Druſius (6).

[*C*] *His great induſtry and ſtrong conſtitution, gave him opportunities of compoſing many books.*] He generally roſe a three at clock in the morning or ſooner, neither winter nor old age interrupted this cuſtom; and nothing afflicted him more in his maladies, than to be deprived of the ſatisfaction of ſtudying. He was ſcarce ever ſick till the laſt years of his life, his good conſtitution having all along held out againſt the ill effects of violent ſtudy. *Robuſtâ & qualis paucis obtingit, valetudine ſemper uſus fuerat, magno Dei beneficio, in tantis adeoque aſſiduis laboribus. Poſtremis annis dolores nephritici ex aſſiduis ſtudiis contracti & catarrhi frequentiores per intervalla eum exercuere* (7). He publiſhed books againſt Bellarmin, upon the controverſies concerning the ſcripture, the Pope, the church, and councils, and replied to Gretſerus, who had anſwered for Bellarmin. He had the laſt in this diſpute, for Gretſerus did not reply. Theſe works of Lubbert, procured him ſeveral letters filled with praiſes; and he was forced to publiſh them, as a buckler to the blows of one of his adverſaries. *Quanti autem hos μακαρίτȣ labores fecerit Eccleſia, liquere poteſt ex præclaris & honorificis Elogiis Præſtantiſſimorum ejus luminum,* * *quorum aliquot evulgationem effrænis adverſarii maledicentia modeſtiſſimæ animæ expreſſit* (8). Having obſerved, that the Socinian hereſy began to appear in the Low-Countries, he publiſhed a book againſt Socinus *de Chriſto Salvatore* (9). He wrote alſo againſt Arminius's letter *ad H. à Collibus*, and againſt Peter Bertius, who had ingaged in the defence of this letter. Afterwards he wrote againſt Vorſtius, and againſt a book which Grotius intituled *Pietas Ordinum Hollandiæ*. Having thus declared himſelf an ardent champion of the Contra-Remonſtrants cauſe, he was often obliged to take pen in hand; but the author of his funeral oration, did not think it proper to inſiſt on this. He declared on the contrary, that he wiſhed all theſe things might be buried for ever, in the grave of oblivion. *De iis quæ poſtea ſubſecuta ſunt, malo tacere, quàm τὸ δάκρυον ἔνδον ἐγείρειν. Optem enim ex animo, quod ipſa quoque Synodus vovet, infauſta illa factionum nomina, quæ mihi hic cum cordolio & horrore uſurpanda eſſent, æternâ oblivione ſepulta eſſe. Si volumus coire Eccleſiæ vulnera & cicatricem ducere, cavendum ſedulo eſt, ne invectivarum unguibus imprudenti zelo refodiantur* (10). The laſt book that Lubbert publiſhed, is his commentary upon the Catechiſm of the Palatinate. He left an Anti-Bellarminus compleat, which had coſt him infinite labour, and it was thought he had ſome reaſons to deſire, that this important compoſition ſhould not be printed in his life-time (11).

[*D*] *He preached with great zeal, and was very fervent in cenſuring vice.*] He had the courage to deſpiſe the unjuſt reſentment of thoſe, who were ſenſible that he aimed at them in his cenſures, and he always went on his own way. The word of God was ſo powerful in his mouth, that when he pleaſed, he drew tears from thoſe, who were moſt hardened in their crimes. He did not ſtand in his ſermons ſo much to confute Popery, as to reform the depravation of manners, drunkenneſs, luxury, *&c.* Let us hear the author of his Funeral Oration. ' Nec enim id ſolum agebat, ut Pontificias ſuperſtitiones in animis hominum veritatis flammâ exureret, ſed illud vel maximè, ut qui ſe Evangelicos profitebantur, ab ebrietate, luxu, aliiſque flagitiis avulſi, diſcerent *piè, ſobriè & juſtè vivere* ‡. Explevit autem omnes ſanctiſſimi muneris partes in utraque Friſia, ea libertate, ut multorum malorum odia hoc ſolum nomine ſibi conciliaverit. Quæ tamen animoſus ille Chriſti pugil, ſanctiſſimi propoſiti mutatione neutiquam placanda cenſuit. Quin contra audientior ibat, publicè peccantes, Tros Rutuluſve eſſet, nullò diſcrimine publicitus arguens. Adſuit huic libertati (Deo laboribus ejus inſigniter benedicente) admirabilis efficacia. Qui eum concionantem audivêre, ſuperſunt autem adhuc plurimi, ajunt eum vel pertinaciſſimis & deploratiſſimis hominibus lacrimas, quoties volebat, expreſſiſſe. Devotæ autem & contritæ animæ vix unquam ſiccis oculis eum audivêre (12). ——— *Nor was it his only care to purge out of the minds of men Popiſh ſuperſtitions by the force of truth, but he was alſo particularly ſtudious in endeavouring to make thoſe, who profeſſed themſelves of the evangelic faith, to abſtain from drunkenneſs, luxury, and other vices, that they might learn to live,* piouſly, ſoberly, and juſtly. *He exerciſed the duties of the miniſtry in both the Frieſlands with ſuch boldneſs, that he drew upon himſelf the ill will of many evil doers; yet ſuch was the heroic conſtancy of this champion of Chriſt, that nothing could affright or move him from his holy reſolution. On the contrary, he behaved with greater ſeverity, reproving publickly*

' *notorious*

(1) Sixtin. Amama, in Orat. Funebri, Sibrandi Lubberti, fol. C 2, verſo.

(2) Menſo Alting and Martin Lydius, were the two others.

(3) Ex Sixtino Amama, in Orat. Funebri.

(4) *See the* Præſtant. ac Eruditor. Virorum Epiſtolæ Eccleſ. & Theolog. pag. 549, 565, 568, & alibi, Edit. in fol. 1684.

(5) *In the article MAKOWSKI, remark* [*C*].

(6) *See the* Præſt. ac Eruditor. Viror. Epiſt. pag. 415.

(7) Amama, in Orat. Funebri.

* Epiſtolas D. Bezæ, Rainoldi, Marnixii, Paræi, P. Baronis, Goulartii, vide Repl. Chriſt. Dogm. pag. 8, & ſeq.

(8) Amama, in Orat. Funebri, fol. D 2.

(9) *Druſius, his colleague, diſapproved of that book. See remark* [O] *of the article* SOCINUS (FAUSTUS).

(10) Amama, ubi ſupra, folio D 2, verſo.

(11) Id. ibid.

‡ Tit. ii, 12.

(12) Amama, ubi ſupra, folio C 3.

and a ſevere obſerver of the ſtatutes; he ſometimes refuſed the dignity of rector, becauſe he feared he could not effectually reform the debauched ſcholars [*E*]. He refuſed a chair of Divinity, which was offered him in the Palatinate, and was become vacant by the death of Kimedontius profeſſor at Heidelberg (*b*). The governors of the univerſity of Franeker oppoſed that invitation; and his wife being unwilling to leave her own country, he thanked his electoral highneſs Frederic IV. He died at Franeker the twenty firſt of January 1625 (*c*). Scaliger himſelf owned him to be a learned man. A letter has been lately publiſhed, which informs us, that he was much in king James's eſteem [*F*].

(*b*) He died in 1596.

(*c*) Taken from his Funeral Oration, by Sixtinus Amama, printed at Franeker in 1625.

‘ *notorious offenders let their rank be what it would.* ‘ *From this liberty of ſpeech (God in a ſingular manner* ‘ *bleſſing his labours) there followed wonderful effects.* ‘ *Thoſe who heard him preach, and there are many ſuch* ‘ *alive at this day, affirm, that when he pleaſed he* ‘ *could draw tears from men who were the moſt harden-* ‘ *ed and profligate. As for the pious and the devout* ‘ *they ſeldom or never heard him with dry eyes.*’

[*E*] *He ſometimes refuſed the dignity of rector, becauſe he feared he could not effectually reform the debauched ſcholars.*] He even deſired to be excuſed aſſiſting at the univerſity aſſemblies, and upon that condition obliged himſelf to lectures extraordinary (13), his reaſon was, becauſe he could not connive at the relaxation of diſcipline (14). He was grave, and uſed no complaiſance to get the love of the ſcholars. He ſeverely reprimanded thoſe who took wrong courſes. They were angry with him; but the time came, when ſeveral of them acknowledged, that they were infinitely obliged to him. ‘ In omnibus actionibus erat ſerius ‘ & gravis. Gratiam favoremque juventutis non alia ‘ ratione, quam privata publicaque induſtriâ, nec non ‘ ſalutaribus ad pietatem & diligentiam adhortationibus, ‘ captare didicerat. Qua ratione etſi ſubindè petulan- ‘ tes adoleſcentes, ut ea ætas ſolet monitoribus eſſe ‘ aſpera, offenderit, eorum tamen pleroſque, jam vi- ‘ ros, eo nomine ſibi arctius habuit obligatos (15).’ Could he have hoped that the antient diſcipline would have been re-eſtabliſhed, he would not have forſaken the univerſity aſſemblies, he would have taken his ſhare of the government; but he choſe rather wholly to abſent himſelf, whilſt he deſpaired of a reformation. ‘ Malebat à publico abſtinere, quam illud committere, ‘ palam ut fieret, quibus flagitiis coërcendis impar eſ- ‘ ſet. Ajebat ſe boni publici causâ nullas offenſas un- ‘ quam ſubterfugiſſe, ſed inanes irritaſque quæ nec ſibi ‘ nec collegio uſui futuræ eſſent, conſtanter deprecaba- ‘ tur (16).’ A year before his death he was prevailed upon by powerful ſollicitations, to accept of the dignity of rector; and there was then a probability, that the authority of the ſovereign would intervene, to introduce good diſcipline amongſt the young ſtudents at Franeker. He began the exerciſe of his office, with the invocation of the name of God, and with an excellent oration, in which he declaimed againſt the drunkards and diſſolute ſcholars, and againſt the debaucheries of the univerſities, the ſource of the ill ſtate of the churches; and he menaced thoſe with the ſevereſt treatment, who ſhould deſerve it: ‘ In Ebrietatem, ‘ juventutis irreverentiam, & qui diſſolutis Academia- ‘ rum moribus natales ſuos debet, miſerum Eccleſiarum ‘ ſtatum graviter dicebat. Diſciplinæ neceſſitatem ner- ‘ vosè oſtendebat, illudque tandem profitebatur ſine ‘ ambagibus; ſe bonis fore Rectorem humaniſſimum, ‘ at malos ſeveriorem præ ſe non deſideraturos.’ Here is an example fit to be recommended to all who have offices in univerſities.

(13) *On Ariſtotle's Logic and Ethics.*

(14) Amama, ibid. fol. D 3.

(15) Id. ibid.

(16) Id. ibid. verſo.

[*F*] *Scaliger himſelf owned he was a learned man; a letter has been lately publiſhed, which informs us, that he was much in king James's eſteem.*] ‘ Sibrandus Lubbertus, who is learned, and a good writer, ‘ is very ugly and ruſtical in his perſon. He is cove- ‘ tous but rich (17); he ſells his apples himſelf, and ‘ walks without a cloak, as Felix of Niſmes told me. ‘ I want his book *de Conciliis* (18).’ The letter I ſpeak of, is Caſaubon's; you will find it at the beginning of a book publiſhed in 1699, by a famous profeſſor of Franeker (19).

(17) *Compare with this theſe words of his Funeral Oration,* Authoritatem, quam & canities & famæ celebritas ei conciliaverant, augebat vita, in lautiſſima re, frugalis, abſtinens, & ſobria.

(18) Scaligerana, pag. m. 145.

(19) *Mr Vander Wayen, profeſſor in Divinity. See his* Diſcuſſio Limborgianæ Reſponſionis, *before the treatiſe of* Rittangelius de Veritate Religionis Chriſtianæ.

LUBIENIETZKI (STANISLAUS) in Latin *Lubieniecius*, a Poliſh gentleman, was one of the moſt famous miniſters the Socinians had in the XVIIth century. He was born at Racow the twenty third of Auguſt 1623. He was educated with a particular care by his father, who was miniſter of Racow, and who not only ſent him to the ſchools, but alſo took care that he ſhould ſee the diets of Poland, in order to introduce him to the grandees, and inſtruct him in all things agreeable to his birth [*A*]. He afterwards ſent him to Thorn, where the young man ſettled for two years, and joined himſelf to two Socinian deputies (*a*) during the conference that was held in this city in the year 1644, for the re-union of religions. He drew up an account of this conference. Being made governor to the young count of Niemirycz, he travelled with him into Holland, and afterwards into France, where he acquired the eſteem of ſeveral learned men, with whom he conferred upon points of religion, without ever diſſembling his own, or neglecting any opportunities of maintaining it. He loſt his father in the year 1648, and returned into Poland. He married in 1652, the daughter of a zealous Socinian, and was made coadjutor to John Ciachovius, miniſter of Siedliſki; and as he quickly gave great proofs of his prudence and learning, the ſynod of Czarcow received him miniſter, and made him paſtor of a church of this name. The irruption of the Swedes made him quit it in 1655, and obliged him to retire to Cracow with his family, the 6th of April 1656. He

there

(*a*) Jonæ Slichtingio & Martino Ruaro, qui eò Eccleſiæ nomine venerant, adfuit. *Vita Staniſlaii Lubieniecii, in limine Hiſtoriæ Reform. Polonicæ, fol. 2, verſo.*

[*A*] *Agreeable to his birth.*] The family of Lubienietzki is very noble. The perſon we ſpeak of, was related in the fourth degree to the houſe of Sobieski, which at preſent reigns glorioufly in Poland (1). ‘ Secum ſolebat ad Comitia alioſque conventus Regni ‘ Nobilium ducere, vel mittere; notitiæquæ virorum ‘ in patria inſignium tradere, omnibus iis imbuere quæ ‘ & Chriſtianum & Poloniæ Regni indigenam decebant ‘ Nobilem, quippe qui ad Sereniſſimi Regis Poloniæ, ‘ qui hodie tanta cum gloria regnat, familiam quarto ‘ conſanguinitatis gradu remotus, pertinuerit (2). —— ‘ *He was wont either to carry him, or to ſend him to* ‘ *the diets and other meetings of the nobility, that he* ‘ *might gain the acquaintance of perſons of the firſt* ‘ *rank, and receive an early tincture of every kind of* ‘ *knowledge, becoming a Chriſtian and a nobleman of* ‘ *Poland. His family was ſo illuſtrious as to ſtand re-* ‘ *lated in the fourth degree to the king, who at this* ‘ *day ſways the Poliſh ſceptre with ſo much glory.*’ Andrew Lubienietzki appeared much at court, when having imbibed the doctrine of the Unitarians, he reſolved to ſacrifice his fortune to the profeſſion of this ſect. He engaged in it in ſuch a manner, that having exerciſed the office of deacon, he took upon him that of miniſter, which he exerciſed in ſeveral places at his own expence. He died in 1623, about ſeventy two years of age (3). He had two brothers who followed his example; they renounced the favour of their prince to be Socinian miniſters. One was called Staniſlaus, and the other Chriſtopher. The former died

in

(1) *I write this in 1695.*

(2) Vita Staniſl. Lubieniecii, pag. 1.

(3) Bibliotheca Antitrinitar. pag. 89.

there employed his time in faſting, and prayer, and preaching (b). The town falling again into the hands of the Poles in the year 1657, he followed the Swediſh garriſon, together with two other Socinians, to ſupplicate the king of Sweden that the Unitarians, who had put themſelves under his protection, might be comprehended in the amneſty, by the peace that ſhould be concluded with Poland. He arrived at Volgaſt the ſeventh of October, 1657, and was very well received by the king of Sweden. He eat at his majeſty's table; an honour this prince had done him before at Cracow. He obtained the acquaintance of ſome Swediſh lords, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of the Divines [B], and explained his religion on ſeveral occaſions. It is even ſaid, that he was favoured with a ſignal revelation, during the ſiege of Stetin [C]. He happened to be at Oliva while the treaty of peace was carrying on there, and had the mortification to ſee the Unitarians excluded out of the amneſty granted to others who were not Catholics. Seeing himſelf thus deprived of the hopes of returning into Poland, he bent his courſe towards Copenhagen; he arrived there the twenty eighth of November, 1660, and endeavoured to obtain of the king a place of retreat for his brethren, who had been baniſhed out of Poland. This prince expreſſed a great reſpect for him [D], but as this could not produce an eſtabliſhment for that ſect, he returned into Pomerania (c), and there uſed all the endeavours he could in favour of his party. His adverſaries continually diſturbing

(b) Totum tempus Cracovianæ commorationis noſter cum reliquis Miniſtris prædicatione verbi divini, frequentibus jejuniis, precibuſque tranſigebat, ipſeque præterea in gratiam Unitariorum Ungarorum, qui cum Principe Rakoci Cracoviam venerant, Latinè concionabatur, ſacramque Euchariſtiam adminiſtrabat. *Ibid. fol.* 3.

(c) *He arrived at Stetin, the eleventh of June,* 1661.

in 1633, having lived about ſeventy five years (4); the other died at Racow, in 1624, and left a ſon called Chriſtopher, who was a Socinian miniſter at Racow and at Lublin (5), and died in the year 1648 (6). He was the father of him who is the ſubject of this article.

[B] *He obtained the acquaintance of ſome Swediſh lords, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of the Divines.*] It is no wonder that the Swediſh lords had more complaiſance for our Socinian miniſter, than the miniſters of the Confeſſion of Augsburg; for it is their buſineſs, and not that of courtiers, to take care that Hereſy does not ſpread it's poiſon, *ne quid Religio detrimenti capiat.* It was therefore a natural conſequence that Lubienietzki ſhould be oppoſed by the miniſters of the Confeſſion of Augsburg, whilſt perſons of quality paid him civilities. 'Cum in Pomeraniâ commoraretur Tractatus pacis expectans, in Magnatum Sueciæ familiaritatem facile venit, aliorum antea contractam amicitiam renovavit, confirmavit, commercium cum iis literarum habuit, ubique teſtimonium veritati, Rege Principibuſque ultro laceſſentibus, perhibuit. Non defuerunt præſertim Stetini Lubieniecio adverſarii, quorum odia Theologica expertus eſt, illaque Concionatores, etiam ad rudem plebeculam, propagare conabantur, inter quos primarius fuit Johannes Micrælius Vir Stetini celebris. Similia quoque Stralſundi expertus eſt noſter, ſimilia tamen ubique veritati dare teſtimonia non neglexit (7). —— *While he waited in Pomerania for the treaty of peace, he eaſily contracted a friendſhip with the Swediſh nobility, his former acquaintance with ſome of them he renewed, and confirmed by correſponding with them by letters, every where giving his teſtimony to the truth, being encouraged ſo to do, by the king and the chiefs of the nobility. At Stetin Lubienietzski met with new enemies, whoſe theological malice he experienced, moſt of theſe were preachers who endeavoured to irritate the people againſt him, among theſe was John Micrælius, a man at that time in high reputation in Stetin. At Stralſund this good man met with the like uſage, yet he never omitted giving his teſtimony to the truth wherever he came.*'

[C] *It is ſaid . . . he was favoured with a ſignal revelation during the ſiege of Stetin.*] There is no ſect but, in ſome meaſure, aſcribes to itſelf extraordinary and miraculous graces. Here is an example of it: our Lubienietzki was at Elbing, while the troops of the emperor and Brandenburg beſieged Stetin. Two weighty reaſons induced him to pray earneſtly to God, that the ſiege might be raiſed; for his wife and children were in Stetin; and a Swediſh count had promiſed to turn Socinian, if Lubienietzki could by his prayers obtain, that this town ſhould not be taken. This miniſter, moved by the intereſt of his family, and by the hopes of gaining an illuſtrious proſelyte, ſpent three weeks in faſting and prayer, after which he went to wait upon the count, and aſſured him, that the town ſhould not be taken. The count, and they who were with him, looked on it as the effects of a delirium, ſince Lubienietzki had no ſooner left them, but he fell ſick; but when at ſix days end it was known that the ſiege was really raiſed, the count was much ſurprized; for no body could tell Lubienietzki the good news he had foretold. The count was challenged upon his promiſe, but he anſwered, that having enquired of God, whether he ſhould do well to embrace this miniſter's religion; God had confirmed him in the Confeſſion of Augsburg. That the reader may ſee whether I have been a faithful tranſlator, or have heightened the ſtory, I will ſet down the words of the original: 'Accidit . . . . ut Comes Slippenbachius polliceretur Staniſlai noſtri Religionem amplecti, modò id à Deo precibus obtineret, ut Stetinum urbs non ſatis munita nec rebus ad obſidionem tolerandam neceſſariis inſtructa, de cujus liberatione propterea deſperabant, liberaretur ab hoſtibus. Lubieniecius imprimis ſuorum miſeriâ motus, tribus hebdomadibus & precibus ad Deum ardentibus & jejunio frequenti conſumptis, veniens ad Comitem, urbem extra periculum eſſe affirmavit, bonoque eos eſſe animo juſſit. Comes adſtanteſque inſanire eum putabant, præſertim quod ab iis reverſus, in morbum inciderit. Ejus vero aſſertio poſt ſex dies litteris Stetino liberato datis confirmata, graviter perterrefecit Comitem. Id enim temporis Lubieniecius à nemine certus hac de re fieri potuit. Promiſſum cum Lubieniecius, pro ſua cum Comite familiaritate, aliquando repoſceret, dixit ille, ſeſe in genua procubuiſſe, Deumque oraſſe patefaceret ſibi num Religio Lubieniecii ſuſcipienda eſſet, nec ne, ſed à Deo in confeſſione Anguſtanâ confirmatum eſſe (8).'

[D] The king of Denmark *expreſſed a great reſpect for him.*] Lubienietzki kept a great correſpondence by letters, which was a ſingular advantage to him, to introduce him into the favour of great men, who were glad to know by his means private news relating to other countries. The king of Denmark, to whom ſome of his accounts had been read, was ſo pleaſed with them, that he beſtowed a place upon Lubienietzki (9), which was to copy for his majeſty the letters he received, for which he was to have an annual penſion (10). This prince declared to him in private, that he could do no leſs than grant the Unitarians a ſettlement at Altena by connivance. He never ſaw him at court, but he called to him, to hear him diſcourſe of matters of religion; which expoſed the Poliſh miniſter to envy, it being feared that the king of Denmark would embrace Arianiſm. 'Solebat Rex, quotieſcunque Lubieniecium in Aulâ conſpexit, relictis cæteris, eum propius ut accederet compellare, & de religionis capitibus imprimis colloqui. Quæ res invidiam etiam creavit Lubieniecio, timentibus Theologis, ne Rex fieret Arianus (11).' This prince ordered his confeſſor and our Lubienietzki to diſpute, and was preſent. 'Cum M. Eryco Gravio Aulico concionatore & confeſſionario ſuo Rex eum commiſit, ipſeque diſputationi adfuit (12).' He endeavoured to prevail with the magiſtrates of Hamburgh, to let him be quiet; but his interceſſion was not potent enough. 'Cum iterum iterumque inſtaret, ut antea fecerat, Magiſtratus, urbeque per nuntios Lubieniecio interdiceret, fuſtra Secretariatum Regis Poloniæ obtendenti, nihilque proficientibus ejuſdem Regis interceſſoriis, in lethalem incidit morbum (13).' His friends had obtained for him the title of ſecretary to the king of Poland, becauſe they hoped that that would oblige the magiſtrates of Hamburgh, not to diſturb him; but their hopes were fruſtrated.

(4) Ibid.

(5) Ib. pag. 90.

(6) Ib. pag. 142.

(7) Vita Lubieniecii, fol 3, verſo.

(8) Ibid. fol. 4.

(9) Quæ etiam (*relationes rariores*) Regi non ſemel lectæ, officium illas Regi perſcribendi ipſi pepererunt. *Ibid. fol.* 4, *verſo.*

(10) Oblatum eſt à Rege honorarium, rogatuſque ut quæ in Europa geruntur per litteras aulæ regiæ referret, certus de annuo Regis ſalario. *Ibidem.*

(11) Vita Lubieniecii, ibid.

(12) Ibid. fol. 5.

(13) Ibid. fol. penult.

diſturbing him, he was obliged to quit Stetin, and betake himſelf to Hamburg, whither he ordered his family the year following (*d*). He there frequently diſcourſed with queen Chriſtina, on matters of religion, in the preſence of ſome princes. The ſecond voyage he made to the court of Denmark was favourable enough to him: the magiſtrates of Fridericksburg conſented that the Unitarians ſhould reſide in their town, and have the domeſtic exerciſe of their religion. But by the endeavours of a Lutheran ſuperintendant, the duke of Holſtein gave them orders, ſome time after, to depart. Lubienietzki ſtruggled a long time with the Hamburg miniſters [*E*]: at laſt the magiſtrates gave him punctual orders to depart. He was then ſick, and promiſed to obey them; but he died ſome days after

[*E*] *He ſtruggled a long time with the Hamburgh miniſters.*] They ſo frequently and inſtantly ſollicited the magiſtrates to make Lubienietzkidepart, that he received frequent orders to retire; and it was in vain to ſay, that his Daniſh majeſty honoured him with his protection, or that he was innocent; for he was forced to yield to the ſtorm (14). However ſome years after, he returned to Hamburgh, thinking they would no more take notice of him; but he was miſtaken: a licentiate in Divinity was ſo vigilant and vehement, as to cauſe new inſtances to be made to the magiſtrates againſt Lubienietzki; and the clergy had ſo exaſperated the people, by repreſenting Lubienietzki as a public peſt, that he durſt hardly ſtir out of his lodgings. ‘Poſt annos aliquot conſilio amicorum, credentium jam de furore remiſiſſe adverſarios, ob commoditatem dirigendarum litterarum Hamburgum ſe contulit cum familia, ſed nimis vigilantem expertus eſt Dominum Edſardii Licentiatum Theologiæ, qui indefeſſo ſtudio id egit, ut cum collegis ſuis magiſtratum incitaret ut Lubieniecius urbe ejiceretur. Dignus qui hic nominetur, gloriatur enim, ſe authore Lubieniecium cum familia urbe exactum. Imo propter Miniſtrorum zelum, qui etiam ex cathedrâ in templo cum abſente Lubieniecio diſputabant, eumque hæreticum, teterrimamque civitatis peſtem proclamabant; ut ex Lubieniecii manuſcripto colligi poteſt, quod jam fecerant cùm primâ vice per Hamburgum Hafniam tranſiret anno 1667. Lubieniecio ante migrationem, domo exire non ſemper tutum fuit (15). —— *Some years after, by the advice of his friends, who imagined that the rage of his enemies was by this time ſomewhat abated, he removed with his family to Hamburgh, for the conveniency of his epiſtolary correſpondence; but Mr Edſard, a licentiate in Theology, was ſo vigilant, that by his own intereſt, and that of his colleagues, he wearied the magiſtrates till they baniſhed Lubienietzki the city. It is fit this man's name ſhould here be recorded, becauſe he made it his boaſt, that it was by his means, that Lubienietzki, with his family, were expelled the city. Yea ſuch was the zeal of the clergy, that they diſputed in the church againſt the abſent Lubienietzki, declaring him a Heretic, and a very plague to the city; as may be collected from a manuſcript of Lubienietzki's, and they did this even the firſt time that he paſſed thro' that city in his way to Copenhagen in* 1667. *Before he left the place, it was not ſafe for him to ſtir out of doors.*’ What the Sieur Edſardius did in this town, was practiſed at Fridericksburg by John Reinboht, who excited the duke of Holſtein to baniſh the Socinian refugees. ‘His pactis diſceſſit Hafniâ, venitque Fridericopolim, ibique à Magiſtratu urbis obtinuit ut exules in communionem & ſacram & civilem reciperentur, privatumque in ædibus more Polono exercitium Religionis peragéretur; quod etiam per literas Fratribus ſignificavit. Lubieniecius in id laboravit, nec ſumptibus pepercit & damnum rei familiaris ſubiit, quo poſſet eò fratres deducere, deductis ſuccurrere, donec ex urbe ſecedere juſſi ſunt à Principe Holſatiæ, quod debent partim Domino Superintendenti Lutherano Joanni Rembotto (16). —— *Theſe things being ſettled, he quitted Copenhagen, and went to Friderickſtadt, where he obtained the conſent of the magiſtrates, that the exiles ſhould be received into all the rights of the city, ſacred and civil, and that they ſhould be permitted to celebrate divine ſervice in private houſes after the Poliſh manner; which by letters he ſignified to the brethren. Lubienietzki laboured in this matter without ſparing coſt, and even to the detriment of his own affairs, that he might draw the brethren together, and relieve them when they came to him, till they were obliged to leave the city by the command of the duke of Holſtein, in ſome meaſure partly procured by the Lutheran ſuperintendant John Reinboht.*’ Mr Mollerus affirms the ſame thing. ‘Socinianis, *ſays he* (17), ab oppidi Fridrichſtadienſis Magiſtratu, & incolendi iſtud poteſtatem, & ſacrorum exercitii libertatem, a. 1662. obtinuit Staniſl. Lubienitzius, promachus ſectæ iſtius non incelebris, ſed incaſſum. Sereniſſ. enim Dux Holſato-Gottorpienſis, quo ignaro hæc erant geſta, edicto publico, ſuaſu Johan. Reinbohtii, Theologi aulici, promulgato, & civitate iſta, & ditionibus ſuis univerſis, non multo poſt iiſdem interdixit *. Lubienitzius ipſe, quem ſingulari Rex Daniæ, Frid. III. favore dignabatur, urbe, quam per aliquot luſtra, connivente Magiſtratu, incoluerat, Humburgenſi a. 1675. Edzardi & Paſtorum ordinariorum inſtinctu, juſſus excedere, antequam obſequi Senatui poſſet, veneno, cibis ipſius immixto, cum biga filiarum d. 18. Maji periit. —— *Staniſlaus Lubienietzki, the famous champion of that ſect, procured from the magiſtrates of Friderickſtadt, in the year* 1662, *that the Socinians ſhould not only be allowed to inhabit this place, but alſo to have divine ſervice, after their manner, celebrated therein, but in vain. For his moſt ſerene highneſs, the duke of Holſtein-Gottorp, without whoſe knowledge this had been tranſacted, did, by the perſuaſion of John Reinboht, a Divine of his court, publiſh an edict, whereby he commanded him to quit that city, and every other part of his dominions. As for Lubienietzki being favoured in a particular manner by Friderick III, king of Denmark, after living ſome time, by connivance of the magiſtrates, at Hamburgh in* 1675, *through the interpoſition of Edſard, and other miniſters, he was ordered to withdraw; but before he could obey the injunction of the ſenate, he, with two of his daughters, were deſtroyed with poiſon given them in their food on the eighteenth of May.*’ There is hardly any perſon among the Catholics, or Proteſtants, but will praiſe this conduct of the Lutheran miniſters. If you alledge to them, that it is expreſſing too much diffidence of their cauſe, they have good anſwers ready. They will tell you, that diffidence is the mother of ſecurity, and when Jeſus Chriſt promiſed his church, that the gates of hell ſhould not prevail againſt it, he meant not to exclude humane means, which are moſt proper to preſerve orthodoxy: I mean the edicts of princes, which ſtop the mouth of the heterodox, and ſtifle the knowledge of objections, which might be made againſt the ſound doctrine: if you reply, that, after all, they behave themſelves as if they had not read the book of Eſdras (18), in which the force of truth is repreſented ſuperior to all others, whether that of wine, or a king, or of women; and that, on the contrary, they believe it unable to ſubſiſt in the places where it ſways, if it be left expoſed to the attacks of three or four fugitives (19); they will anſwer you, that the heart of man is more inclined to evil than good, and that therefore error is more capable of ſeducing him, than truth of undeceiving him; ſo that Chriſtian prudence does not ſuffer us to allow Heretics the propoſing their arguments. I queſtion whether there ever was any ſubject more fruitful in anſwers and replies; it may be turned ſeveral ways in every ſenſe; and hence an author will maintain to you to day, that truth need only ſhew itſelf to confound hereſy; and to-morrow, that if hereſy be ſuffered to expoſe it's ſubtilties, it will quickly corrupt all the inhabitants. One day you ſhall have truth repreſented as an immoveable rock, another you ſhall be told, that it ought not to be put to the hazard of a diſpute, as being a rencounter in which it would daſh itſelf in pieces with reſpect to the hearers. What are we to do in this volubility of reaſonings (20)? There are ſome who preſerve truth as they do a piece of China-ware, and ſeem to be convinced, that *as it has the tranſparency, ſo it has the brittleneſs of cryſtal* (21).

[*F*] *He*

(*d*) *In the year* 1662.

(14) Magiſtratus Hamburgenſis ad importunam Sacerdotum inſtantiam ut urbe excederet denunciavit, idque Magiſtratu ſæpius repetente, Lubieniecio fruſtra innocentiam ſuam & Regis protectionem opponente, ad Regem profectus eſt Hafniam. *Ibid. fol.* 6.

(15) Ibid.

(16) Ibid. fol. 5, verſo.

(17) Mollerus; Iſagoge ad Hiſtor. Cherſonneſi Cimbricæ, Part. III, pag. 105.

* V. Vitam Lubienitzii, ejus Hiſtoriæ Reformationis Polonicæ Freiſtadii, ann. 1685, excuſæ præfixam, & Ant. Heimreichii Hiſt. Eccl. Sleſv lib iv, cap iii, pag. 227, 228.

(18) *Third book of Eſdras, chap. iii, iv.*

(19) *See, above, remark* [*Q*] *of the article* HADRIAN.

(20) Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo. *Horat. Epiſt. i, lib. i, ver.* 90.

(21) *See the Philoſophical Commentary on the text,* Compel them to come in, *in the Supplement, pag.* 303, 304; *and ſee, above, remark* [*B*] *of the article* ACOSTA.

after very devoutly [*F*]. He was poiſoned. His two daughters died of the ſame poiſon the ſixteenth of May, 1675. He had time to lament them in verſe; for he died not till the eighteenth of the ſame month. He was buried at Altena, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of the Lutheran miniſters (*e*) [*G*]. I ſhall ſay ſomething of his writings [*H*]. He had a great correſpondence by letters all over Europe (*f*). I forgot to ſay that he obtained a retreat for his brethren at Manheim, a town of the elector Palatine (*g*), the moſt Latitudinarian prince in the world.

[*F*] *He died very devoutly.*] Theſe are the words of his Hiſtorian: ‘ Commendato ſpiritu in manus ‘ Jeſu ſalvatoris ſui, cui fideliter ſervierat, exceſſit è ‘ vita: toto tempore ægrotationis ad extremum ferè ‘ halitum, ſermones habuit plenos in Deum fiduciæ ‘ & interni gaudii, domeſticorum benedictionis, admoni‘ tionis, nominis Divini invocationis (22). —— ‘ *He departed this life recommending his ſpirit to* ‘ *Jeſus, his Saviour, whom he had faithfully ſerved:* ‘ *during his ſickneſs, even almoſt to his laſt gaſp, his* ‘ *diſcourſes were full of confidence in God, and of in*‘ *ward joy; he bleſſed his domeſtics, admoniſhed* ‘ *them, and invoked God's holy name.*’ It is not ſaid how he was poiſoned, but it is denied that his domeſtics were guilty of that action; and a Divine is complained of for blackening them, and imputing this accident to Lubienietzki's hereſies. ‘ Cau‘ ſa morbi fuit venenum, ignotum ubi infuſum (23), ‘ non ut confidenter affirmat ad denigrandos Lubienie‘ cii domeſticos adverſarius ejus Edſardius, (qui hujus ‘ infortunii ſeriem occaſione datâ enarrare voluit,) ‘ quod vitio religionis Lubieniecii adſcribit, non co‘ gitans multos tam ex Lutheranis Reformatiſque ‘ quam Pontificiis pejori, non tantum ſimili, fato ani‘ mam exhalaſſe, quaſi hujus cladis ipſa conjux fi‘ liæque occaſionem per imprudentiam dediſſent. Sed ‘ nimis injurius eſt veritati. Venenum enim ambas ‘ filias confecit. Uxor etiam quod tantillum de cibo ‘ ſumſiſſet vix à limine mortis revocata (24). —— ‘ *The cauſe of his ſickneſs was poiſon, but how it was* ‘ *given is unknown, not by any of his domeſtics, as* ‘ *his adverſary Edſard has confidently affirmed, in* ‘ *order to blacken them, who thought fit to give an ac*‘ *count of the whole ſeries of this unfortunate buſi*‘ *neſs; nor, as he ſuggeſts, as a judgment on him for* ‘ *his religion, ſince ſeveral of the Lutherans, Reformed,* ‘ *and Papiſts have died in a worſe, or in a like way;* ‘ *neither did the imprudence of his wife, and daugh*‘ *ters, (as he intimates) contribute any way thereto.* ‘ *This being a flagrant injury to truth: two of his* ‘ *daughters dying of the ſame poiſon, and his wife,* ‘ *who taſted but little of the victuals, being with dif*‘ *ficulty reprieved from death.*’ Note, that a Socinian author confeſſes that Lubienietzki was poiſoned by his ſervant-maid (25).

[*G*] *He was buried at Altena, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of the Lutheran miniſters.*] We have been juſt conſidering the practice of the eſtabliſhed religions, for they have their ſtate-politics, as well as temporal princes. One of the aphoriſms of eccleſiaſtical policy, is always to find ſome mark of God's wrath in the death of Heretics (26). Tho' it be never ſo true, that the ſame kind of death has been common to them, and ſome orthodox; yet that ſignifies nothing, it muſt nevertheleſs be ſaid, that God has maniſeſted a moſt particular judgment in the cataſtrophe of their lives (27). The reflexions that are built on this foundation, fortify the perſuaſion of the orthodox, and give them a greater averſion to the hereſy. This is well worth the trouble that is taken in it. Another aphoriſm, or ſtate-policy, is to brand a Heretic's corpſe with ſome infamy. The Hamburgh Divines did not forget this; tho' they could not prevent this Unitarian miniſter's being buried in Altena church, they at leaſt hindered the ſchoolmaſters, attended with their ſcholars, from aſſiſting, according to cuſtom, at the funeral. ‘ Funus Altenaviam Ham‘ burgo deductum legitimo prohibuiſſent Concionatores ‘ ſepulchro, niſi jam in templo Altenavienſi emptum ‘ fuiſſet; nihil tamen omiſerunt quo impedire poſſent, ‘ quod potuerunt effecerunt, ne, ut ibi moris eſt, ‘ in exſequiis Scholarum Rectores cum diſcipulis fu‘ nus comitarentur. Sit ipſis benignior Deus quam ‘ illi fuerint proximo ſuo, ob Religionem duntaxat ‘ & Conſcientiam graviſſimè vexato (28). The two aphoriſms before mentioned, and ſome others which might be added to them, are of ſo great uſe, that we cannot but praiſe the prudence of thoſe who employ them. They are means ſo proper to cheriſh the faith of the people, and prevent them from falling off from the body, that the beſt managed arguments, and ſubtileſt books of controverſy have not ſo much virtue. They muſt ſuit the taſte and capacity of the vulgar; that is to ſay, have recourſe to thoſe mechanical impreſſions, which excite the paſſions. If all men were Philoſophers, they would only uſe good arguments; but in the ſtate ſocieties are in, ſomething elſe beſides reaſon is neceſſary to maintain them, and to preſerve the preheminence they have already acquired.

[*H*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of his writings.*] He wrote ſeveral books, but moſt of them were never printed. You will find the titles of them in the *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum* (29), the moſt conſiderable of thoſe that have been publiſhed is his Theatrum Cometicum (30), *divided into three parts*, quarum prima continet communicationes de cometis anno 1664 & 1665 cum viris per Europam clariſſimis habitas, eorumque Obſervationes tabulis æneis expreſſas. Secunda eſt hiſtoria Cometarum à diluvio ad annum Chriſti 1665, Hiſtoriæ Univerſalis ſynopſim quandam continens. Tertia agit de ſignificationibus Cometarum ſcitis quorundam amicorum objectionibus, reſponſionibus autoris, & judiciis virorum clariſſimorum. *Theatrum Cometicum*, divided into three parts, *of which the firſt contained deſcriptions of the Comets, ſeen in* 1664 *and* 1665, *communicated to the moſt learned men in Europe, together with their obſervations engraved on copper-plates. The ſecond a hiſtory of Comets from the deluge to the year* 1665, *containing a kind of ſynopſis, of univerſal hiſtory. The third treated of the ſignification of Comets, the objections of the author's friends, his anſwers, and the ſentiments of moſt learned men on that ſubject.* The editors of it played ſome knaviſh tricks, which obliged the author to take a journey into Holland (31). He was writing the Hiſtory of the Reformation of Poland; but died before the book was finiſhed. What was found of it among his papers, was printed in Holland, in 1685, in 8vo. The Printers have committed ſeveral faults in that work, and few things are found in it, which beſpeak the laſt hand of the author.

(*e*) *Taken from his Life, prefixed to his* Hiſtoria Reformationis Polonicæ, *printed in* 1685.

(*f*) *See the remark* [*D*].

(*g*) Vita Lubieniecii, fol. 5, verſo.

(22) Vita Lubieniecii, fol. 6, verſo.

(23) *A little lower the ſame author ſays,* Quis autor mortis fuerit non facile divinare, imo ne cui fiat injuria; nec divinare licet.

(24) Vita Lubien. fol. 6, verſo.

(25) Veneno ab ancilla ſubornata à nefariis hominibus è medio ſublatus. *Hiſtor. Reformat. Polonic. lib. iii, cap. xvii, pag.* 278.

(26) *This is not always done out of Policy; ſeveral are perſuaded of what they publiſh on that account.*

(27) *This is what had been publiſhed of Luther, Calvin,* &c.

(28) Vita Lubieniecii, ſub fin.

(20) Bibliotheca Antitrinitar. pag. 165, & ſeq.

(30) *Printed at Amſterdam,* 1667, *in fol.*

(31) Eodem anno Hollandiam abire coactus eſt, ob iniquitatem & verſutiam eorum per quos Theatrum Cometicum imprimi curavit. *Vita Lubien. fol.* 6.

LUBIN (EILHARD) born at Weſterſted, in Ammerland, in the county of Oldenburg, the twenty fourth of March, 1565, and ſon to the miniſter of the place, ſtudied with very great ſucceſs at Leipſic, Cologn, Helmſtadt, Straſburg, Iëna, Marpurg, and Roſtoc. He became very learned in the Greek tongue, could make Latin verſes, was an Orator, Mathematician, and Divine. He was made profeſſor of Poetry, in the univerſity of Roſtoc, in the year 1595, and profeſſor of Divinity ten years after (*a*). He publiſhed ſeveral books [*A*]; and one amongſt the reſt, in which he pretended to

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] Theſe are the titles of the chief of them: *Antiquarius, ſive priſcorum & minus uſitatorum vocabulorum brevis & dilucida interpretatio, ordine alphabetico digeſta*, in 12mo and in 8vo. *Clavis Græcæ linguæ, ſive vocabula Latino-Græca*, in 12mo and in 8vo. He publiſhed Anacreon, Juvenal, and Perſius, with notes; Horace and Juvenal with a paraphraſe; the *Anthologiæ* with his Latin verſion; and the *Epiſtolæ veterum Græcorum Græcè & Latinè cum Methodo conſcribendarum Epiſtolarum Græcè & Latinè.* Commentaries upon St Paul's principal Epiſtles. *Monoteſſaron, ſive Hiſtoria Evangelica ex* 4. *Evangeliſtis in unum corpus redacta* (1). The *Dionyſiaca* of Nonnus in Greek and Latin (2)

(*a*) Freher. in Theatro, pag. 410.

(1) *Taken from* Paul. Freher in Theatro, pag. 410.

(2) *He is the author of the Latin tranſlation.*

explain the origin of ſin by a new hypotheſis [*B*]. He was attacked upon it by ſome Divines [*C*]. He married twice [*D*], and died the ſecond of June, 1621, after having been ten months ſick of a quartan ague (*b*).

(*b*) Id. ibid.

at Frankfort 1605, 8vo. His Latin verſes are in the third tome of the *Delitiæ Poëtarum Germanorum.* We ſhall find in the following remark the title of ſome other of his works.

[*B*] ...... *and one among the reſt, in which he pretended to explain the origin of ſin by a new hypotheſis.*] He eſtabliſhed two co-eternal principles, not body and vacuum, as Epicurus, but God and nothing; God as a good principle, and nothing as an evil principle. He added, that ſin was only a tendency towards this nothing, and that ſin had been neceſſary, that the nature of good might be known. He applied to this nothing, all that Ariſtotle had ſaid of the firſt matter (3). One may eaſily ſee that all this is chimerical, and wholly unable to leſſen the difficulties about the origin of evil; for who is ſo ſtupid as not to ſee, that nothing is not capable of producing any thing, either as an efficient cauſe or as a paſſive ſubject, and it is as impoſſible for ſin to proceed from nothing, as it is for the ſinner: conſequently it is as neceſſary to aſſign a poſitive cauſe to ſin as the ſinner. It is no wonder then, that this hypotheſis of Lubin ſhould not paſs. The profeſſor Grawerus, who confuted it, had no hard taſk of it. He had the ſuffrages of Mylius, Hutterus, Piſcator (4), Schluſſelburgius, Major, and Petræus, and many others (5).

[*C*] . . . *He was attacked upon it by ſome Divines.*] I will give Mr Baillet's account of it (6). ‘Eilhard Lubin . . . . had compoſed a book, more than metaphyſical, upon the origin and nature of ſin, in which he ſufficiently diſcovered himſelf to be of the number of the Lutherans of the old ſtamp, concerning election, reprobation, juſtification, human liberty *&c.* His book was printed at Roſtoc, in the duchy of Mecklenburg, in 1596, and re-printed in the ſame town four years after, in 8vo and in 12mo, with the title of *Phoſphorus, de prima cauſa, & natura mali Tractatus Hypermetaphyſicus, in quo multorum graviſſimæ dubitationes tolluntur & errores deteguntur*. Grawer . . . exclaimed at Lubin's Phoſphorus, as if it had been a comet. He accuſed him of running into the moſt exorbitant paradoxes, and wrote againſt him a little after. Lubin anſwered him, to let him ſee that his accuſations were pure calumnies, and printed a new book at Roſtoc, in the year 1600, with the title of *Apologeticus quo Alb. Graw. Calumniis reſpond.* &c. which was re-printed in 1605, in 4to, in the ſame town. Grawer hereupon was obliged to defend himſelf in his turn, which he did in the Anti-Lubin, printed at Magdeburg in 1606, in 4to, with the title of *Anti-Lubinus*, ſive *Elenchus Paradoxorum Lubini, & Emblematum Calviniſticorum*, &c. *De prima cauſa, & natura mali*. This was only an anſwer to Lubin's Phoſphorus, but Grawer made another to it for his Apologetic, which was printed by way of appendix, with the Anti-Lubin, under the title of *Reſponſio ad elumbem Lubini Apologeticum*. I do not know whether Lubin appealed to the Divines of the confeſſion of Augsburg, againſt Grawer's ill uſage, and whether with that intention he writ the book intituled *Tractatio Theologica de cauſa peccati, ad Theologos Auguſtanæ Confeſſionis in Germania*, which he publiſhed the year following at Roſtoc, in 4to; but I can affirm that all theſe works have not hindered poſterity from believing him a better Humaniſt than Divine.’

[*D*] *He married twice.*] His firſt wife, widow to James Backmeiſter, profeſſor of the Hebrew tongue at Roſtoc, lived ſeven years with him, and bore him no children. The ſecond bore him nine. She was daughter to William Lauremberg, a famous Phyſician (7).

(3) *Taken from the* Memorabilia Eccleſiaſtica ſæculi XVII, lib. i, cap. xxxii, pag. 109, 110.

(4) *Profeſſor at Jena, and quite a different man from Piſcator, who taught at Herborn.*

(5) Memorabal. Eccleſ. ubi ſupra. *The author cites* Hieronymus Kromajer in Hiſt. Eccl. 1649. it. Theologia poſitivo polemica, pag. 296.

(6) Baillet, Anti, Tom I, pag. 397, & ſeq.

(7) Ex Frehero, ubi ſupra.

LUCIDUS (JOHN) ſirnamed *Samotheus*, or *Samoſatheus*, lived in the XVIth century. A book of Chronology, which he publiſhed at Venice in 1537 in 4to, gave him reputation [*A*]. It is ſaid that the name which he took was not his true name [*B*]. David Blondel did not know the time in which this author flouriſhed, for he places him in the year 1510, among ſuch as have ſpoken of Pope Joan (*a*).

(*a*) David. Blondellus, Examen Quæſt. de Papa fœmina, *circa init.*

[*A*] *A book of Chronology . . . . gave him reputation.*] Voſſius witneſſes this in the following words: ‘Anno CIↃ IↃ XXXVII facilè locum ſuum tuebatur Joannes Lucidus Samoſatheus: qui anno eo Venetiis * labores ſuos Chronologicos, non ſine eruditæ caveæ applauſu, diffundebat. In iis ſunt iſta: Emendationes temporum ab orbe condito; canones in perpetuam temporum tabulam; de vero die Paſſionis Chriſti; Epitome emendationis Calendarii Romani (1). ——— *In the year* 1537, *John Lucidus Samoſatheus eaſily held his place, who this year publiſhed at Venice, not without great applauſe, his Chronological labours. In theſe are contained the emendation of times from the beginning of the world; Chronological Canons; of the true day of Chriſt's ſuffering; Epitome of the emendation of the Roman Calendar.*’ The account here given us of the pieces contained in the work of Lucidus, is taken, word for word, from the Bibliotheque of Geſner. Voſſius might have ſaid, that Lucidus publiſhed a new edition of this book, in the year 1546, wherein he gives us to underſtand, that he was writing in the year 1545, and that he looked upon that year as extreamly proper for the reformation of the Calendar. ‘Hoc igitur anno Domini 1545, *ſays he* (2), maxime convenit, ut emendetur Calendarium Romanum in hoc generali Concilio, poſtquam reformata fuerit Eccleſia, in eis quæ pertinent ad fidem, atque ad bonos mores, quæ magis neceſſaria ſunt. Hæc enim oportet facere, & illa non omittere, ſicut Dominus nos in Evangelio admonet. ——— *In this year* 1545, *it would be very proper to amend the Roman Calendar, by the authority of the preſent general council, after the church had been reformed in things relating to faith and good manners, which are more neceſſary. Theſe ought to be done, and thoſe ought not to be omitted, as our Lord admoniſhes us in the Goſpel.*’ He had given the reaſon why the year 1545 ought to have been choſen. It was 1590 years after the reformation made in the Calendar by Julius Cæſar, and conſequently the equinoxes were advanced fifteen days preciſely; for he ſuppoſed, with Albategni, that every 106 years occaſions the difference of a day, between the ſolar and the Julian year.

Lucidus's performance was continued to the year 1575, by Jerom Bardi, a Monk of the order of Camaldoli.

[*B*] *The name which he took was not his true name.*] This particular is to be found in Florimond de Remond. He had been reproached that he had objected *nothing to John Lucidus, who had maintained the truth of this fact* (3), *but that he was too late a writer to prove any thing*; to this he anſwers; ‘This Proteſtant is to be pardoned for what he ſays, for he has thought this Lucidus was ſome honeſt man of the old times, but he is miſtaken, for he wrote in the year 1537, neither did he write in defence of the truth of the ſtory, but only uſed theſe words: *Joan, an Engliſh woman, two years one month. During theſe two years we may ſay the ſee of Rome was vacant, becauſe a woman is not qualified for the pontificate.* This is all that he ſays. John Lucidus is an aſſumed name, as I was informed by a very learned perſon, who aſſured me that he heard Poſtel ſay, that he was acquainted with that author, who concealed his true name under that of Lucidus, thereby to intimate, that he had brought new light to Chronology (4).’ The firſt part of this paſſage does not appear to be neceſſary, but yet it is not altogether uſeleſs, in as much as we learn therefrom, what Lucidus ſaid concerning Pope Joan.

* Apud Luc. Ant. Juntam.

(1) Voſſius, de Scient Mathem. pag. 358.

(2) Joannes Lucidus, Emend. Calend cap. i. *See* Matth. Beroald. in Chronic. lib. i, cap. vii, pag. m. 89.

(3) *The ſtory of Pope Joan.*

(4) Florimond de Remond, *at the end of the* Anti-Papeſſe, pag. 452.

LUCILIUS.

LUCILIUS (Caïus) a Roman knight, and Latin poet, was born at Sueſſa in the country of the Arunci in Italy, towards the beginning of the VIIth century of Rome [*A*]. He bore arms under Scipio Africanus in the Numantine war [*B*], and had a great ſhare in the friendſhip of this famous general, and in that of Lælius [*C*]. He compoſed thirty books of Satires, in which he ſeverely cenſured, even by name, ſeveral perſons of quality [*D*]. Some learned men ſay that he was the firſt author of this ſort of Peotry [*E*]; but others are of a different opinion. He uſed to ſay, that he wiſhed to meet with readers who were neither ignorant, nor very learned [*F*]. It is not

probable

[*A*] *He was born at Sueſſa, in the country of the Arunci, towards the beginning of the VIIth century of Rome.*] Euſebius's Chronicle places the birth of Lucilius in the firſt year of the CLVIIIth Olympiad, which is the DCVth of Rome (1). Auſonius points out this poet, when he ſays,

Rudes Camœnas qui Sueſſæ prævenis (2).

For thou com'ſt up to the rude Sueſſian verſe.

Juvenal alſo hints at him in this verſe:

Per quem magnus equos Auruncæ flexit alumnus (3).

The road in which the great Aruntian drove.

And therefore that is Lucilius's country which I give him, and not *Sueſſa Pometia*, as Father Briet will have it. 'C. Lucilius, *ſays he*, Romanus Eques ex Sueſſa 'Pometia urbe Aruncorum non procul à Pomptina 'palude ortus fuit (4). —— *Caïus Lucilius, a Roman 'knight, was of Sueſſa Pometia, a city of the Arunci, 'ſituated not far from the Pomptin lake.*' If he had conſulted Cluverius, he would have found Sueſſa Pometia was in the country of the Volſci, and not in the country of the Aurunci. Cluverius diſtinguiſhes two towns called Sueſſa; one, with the epithet Pometia, was in the country of the Volſci, the other, with the epithet Aurunca, was in Campania, beyond the Liris (5). Some commentators on Juvenal (6), by a notable blunder, ſay, that Lucilius was born at Arunca, or Aurunca, a town of the Rutuli. The time has been worſe miſtaken than the place of his birth, by Father Briet. 'Natus, '*ſays he*, Olymp. CXXXVIII. obiit Olymp. CXLIX. 'ætatis 46 Neapoli publico elatus funere, ut ſcribit 'Hieronymus. —— *He was born in the CXXXVIIIth, 'and died in the CXLIX Olympiad, being forty ſix 'years old. He was honoured at Naples with a public 'funeral, as Jerome writes.*' St Jerome does not ſay this; and if he had, this Jeſuit ſhould either have confuted, or rejected him, ſince, according to him, the Poet Lucilius bore arms in the Numantine war (7), fifty years later than the CXLIXth Olympiad.

[*B*] *He bore arms . . . . . in the Numantine war.*] Valleius Paterculus tells us this. 'Celebre, *ſays 'he* (8), & Lucilii nomen fuit, qui ſub P. Africano 'Nûmantino bello eques militaverat. Quo quidem 'tempore juvenis adhuc Jugurtha ac Marius ſub eodem Africano militantes in iiſdem caſtris didicere 'quæ poſtea in contrariis facerent. —— *The name of 'Lucilius was famous, who ſerved under Publius Africanus in the Numantine war, at which time Jugurtha and Marius, both young men, ſerved likewiſe 'under Africanus, and learned in the ſame camp, 'thoſe arts which they afterwards practiſed againſt 'each other.*' It muſt be confeſſed, that this does not well agree with Euſebius's Chronicle; for when Scipio made war with the Numantines. Lucilius, by this Chronicle, was but fifteen years old. Did any one liſt in the cavalry before he took on the *Toga Virilis?* Scaliger obſerves (9), that the fathers ſometimes brought their ſons to the army, before the taking this garment; but this was not what they called *militare equitem*. Yet this is what Paterculus affirms of our Lucilius.

[*C*] *He had a great ſhare in the friendſhip of Scipio and Lælius.*] They honoured him with ſuch a familiarity, as to droll and toy with him. See Horace's ſcholiaſt upon theſe words of the firſt ſatire of the ſecond book.

Quin, ubi ſe à vulgo, & ſcena, in ſecreta remorant
Virtus Scipiadæ, & mitis ſapientia Læli:
Nugari cum illo, & diſcincti ludere, donec
Decoqueretur olus, ſoliti . . . . (10).

Did Lælius, or did Scipio hate his muſe?
Or ſtorm when he Mettellus did abuſe?
The great ones and the crowd did diſcommend,
And valu'd virtue only and her friend?
No, no, they treated him, and thought him good,
And when remov'd from bus'neſs and the crowd,
Would keep him company, would laugh and jeſt,
And ſport until their little meat was dreſt.

Creech.

[*D*] *He compoſed thirty books of ſatires, in which he cenſured by name . . . . . . ſeveral perſons of quality.*] Let us hear what Horace had juſt ſaid of him.

Quid cum eſt Lucilius auſus
Primus in hunc operis componere carmina morem,
Detrahere & pellem, nitidus qua quiſque per ora
Cederet, introrſum turpis? num Lælius, aut, qui
Duxit ab oppreſſa meritum Carthagine nomen,
Ingenio offenſi? aut læſo doluere Metello?
Famoſiſque Lupo cooperto verſibus? atqui
Primores populi arripuit, populumque tributim,
Scilicet uni æquus virtuti, atque ejus amicis (11).

How, Sir, Lucilius that did firſt engage
In writing ſatires, and that laſh'd the age,
And ſtripp'd our fopplings of their lion's skin,
In which they look'd ſo gay, all foul within. &c.

Creech.

Perſius ſays the ſame thing in fewer words (12). See Juvenal, who relates how Lucilius made the guilty tremble with his pen, as much as if he had purſued them with ſword in hand.

Enſe velut ſtricto, quoties Lucilius ardens
Infremuit, rubet auditor cui frigida mens eſt
Criminibus, tacita ſudant præcordia culpa (13).

Sharp as a ſword, Lucilius drew his pen,
And ſtruck, with pannic terror, guilty men;
At his juſt ſtrokes, the hard'ned wretch would ſtart,
Feel the cold ſweat, and tremble at the heart.

[*E*] *Some learned men ſay that he was the firſt author of ſatire; others are of a different opinion.*] They who make him him the inventer of it, ground themſelves on theſe words of Horace:

Quid cum eſt Lucilius auſus
PRIMUS in hunc operis, componere carmina morem (14)?

Was it not Lucilius who firſt attempted to write in this way.

They alledge alſo a paſſage of Quintilian, and theſe words of Pliny: 'Si hoc Lucilius qui PRIMUS 'condidit ſtyli naſum, dicendum ſibi putavit (15). '—— *If Lucilius, who firſt introduced the ſatiric 'ſtile, thought proper to ſay this.*' Quintilian's teſtimony is this: 'Satira quidem tota noſtra eſt, in qua 'PRIMUS inſignem laudem adeptus eſt Lucili'us (16). —— *Satire is indeed entirely our own, and 'Lucilius is the firſt that gained praiſe therein.*' But notwithſtanding theſe authorities, Mr Dacier has maintained, with greater probability, that Lucilius had only given this kind of poetry a juſter turn, and ſeaſoned it with more wit and delicacy than his predeceſſors Ennius and Pacuvius (17).

[*F*] *He wiſhed neither ignorant nor very learned readers.*] There is ſomething in this wiſh, that diſcovers probable he died at forty ſix years of age [*G*], as ſome affirm. Of all his works we have only ſome fragments of his Satires remaining [*H*]. It is a misfortune; for if we had all his works, we ſhould learn a great many things by them. Cicero has contradicted himſelf

---

(1) *Conſult the remark* [*B*].

(2) Auſon Epiſt. xv, ver. ix, pag. m. 626.

(3) Juvenal. Sat. I, ver. 20.

(4) Briet. de Poëtis Latin pag. 6. *He was miſled by Voſſius*, de Poët. Lat. pag. 12.

(5) Cluver Ital. Antiq. lib iii, cap. viii, pag. 589. Epitomes Bunonis.

(6) Britannicus, Farnabius.

(7) Militavit ſub juniore Africano bello Numantino. *Briet ubi ſupra, pag.* 6.

(8) Vell. Paterc. lib ii, cap ix.

(9) Scalig. Animadverſ. in Euſebium, n. 1914, pag. m. 149.

(10) Scipio Africanus & Lælius feruntur tam fuiſſe familiares & amici Lucilio, ut quodam tempore Lælio circum lectos triclinii fugienti, Lucilius ſuperveniens eum obtorta mappa quaſi feriturus ſequeretur. *Vetus Commentat. Horatii.*

(11) Horat. Sat. I, lib. ij, ver. 62.

(12) Secuit Lucilius urbem Te Lupe, te Muti, & genuinum fregit in illis. *Perſ. Sat. I, ver.* 115.

(13) Juven. Sat. I, ver. 165.

(14) Horat. ubi ſupra, ver. 48.

(15) Plinius, in Præfat.

(16) Quintil. Inſtit. Orat. lib. x, cap. i.

(17) *See the preface to the ſixth Tome of Mr Dacier's Horace.*

a deal of good ſenſe. Theſe two kind of readers, are ſometimes equally formidable; the former ſee not enough, and the latter ſee too much; the one have not ſenſe enough to underſtand what is good, there is no juſtice to be expected from them; and there is no concealing from the others what is imperfect. One of Cicero's interlocutors, in the ſecond book of the Orator, mentions this thought of Lucilius, and approves it, and applies it to himſelf; I mean, he wiſhes the ſame thing. Here is what he ſays. 'Quod addidiſti tertium vos 'eos eſſe qui vitam inſuavem ſine his ſtudiis putaretis; 'id me non modo non hortatur ad diſputandum, ſed 'etiam deterret. Nam ut Cajus Lucilius homo doctus, '& perurbanus dicere ſolebat, ea quæ ſcriberet, neque ab indoctiſſimis, neque ab doctiſſimis legi velle, 'quod alteri nihil intelligerent, alteri plus fortaſſe quàm 'ipſe de ſe, quo etiam ſcripſit: Perſium non curo legere. Hic enim fuit, ut noramus, omnium fere noſtrorum hominum doctiſſimus. Lælium Decimum 'volo, quem cognovimus virum bonum & non illiterarum, ſed nihil ad Perſium. Sic ego, ſi jam mihi 'diſputandum ſit de his noſtris ſtudiis, nolim equidem 'apud ruſticos, ſed multo minus apud vos. Malo 'enim non intelligi orationem meam, quàm reprehendi (18). —— *What you add in the third place, that 'you are of the number of thoſe, who, without theſe 'ſtudies, think life unpleaſant, not only hinders me from 'diſputing at preſent, but alſo utterly deters me from 'it; for as Caius Lucilius, a learned and very polite 'man, uſed to ſay, that he did not deſire that his 'writings ſhould be read by the moſt ignorant, nor by 'the moſt learned, becauſe the former knew nothing of 'the matter, and the later perhaps more than he who 'wrote it; ſo I do not care to read Perſius. For he 'was, as we all know, one of the moſt learned of our 'writers. I like Lucius Decimus very well, whom we 'knew to be a good man, and not illiterate, but nothing 'when compared to Perſius. So were I to diſpute on 'the ſubject of our ſtudies, I ſhould not care to do it 'among clowns, but much leſs among you. For I had 'rather my diſcourſe ſhould not be underſtood, than be 'cenſured.*' Cicero, in another book, where he ſpeaks in his own name, declares himſelf to be far from this wiſh of Lucilius; he requires the moſt penetrating readers, and fears no colours. 'Nec enim, *ſays he* (19), 'ut noſter Lucilius, recuſabo quo minus omnes mea 'legant. Utinam eſſet ille Perſius. Scipio vero, & 'Rutilius multo etiam magis, quorum ille judicium 'reformidans, Tarentinis ait ſe, & Conſentinis, & Siculis ſcribere: facete is quidem ſicut alias, ſed neque 'tam docti tunc erant ad quorum judicium elaboraret, & ſunt illius ſcripta leviora, ut urbanitas ſumma appareat, doctrina mediocris. Ego autem quem 'timeam lectorem, quum ad te (20) ne Græcis quidem 'cedentem, in philoſophia audeam ſcribere?' He had in another book mentioned this thought of Lucilius, and approved and adopted it, as appears from Pliny's preface, who, after ſo great an example, doth himſelf an honour to eſpouſe it. 'Præterea eſt quædam pu-'blica etiam eruditorum rejectio. Utitur illa & M. 'Tullius, extra omnem ingenii aleam poſitus, & (quod 'miremur) per advocatum defenditur. *Nec doctiſſimis: Manium Perſium hæc legere nolo, Junium Congum volo.* Quod ſi hoc Lucilius, qui primus condi-'dit ſtyli naſum, dicendum ſibi putavit: ſi Cicero mutuandum, præſertim cum de Republica ſcriberet; 'quanto nos cauſatius ab aliquo Judice defendimus?' Father Hardouin has expunged *Lælium Decimum* out of this paſſage of Pliny, to inſert *Junium Congum*, agreeably to the manuſcripts. He obſerves, that Lucilius more than once made uſe of this thought, and named one while ſome perſons, and another while others; and therefore it is a miſtake to pretend, that it was *Lælius Decimus* in Pliny, becauſe this name is found in Cicero's ſecond book, *de Oratore*. Pliny had not this paſſage of Cicero in view, but another in his book *de Republica*. See the margin (21).

[*G*] *It is not probable that he died at forty ſix years of age.*] Euſebius's Chronicle does not make him older; it places his birth in the firſt year of the CLVIIIth Olympiad, and his death in the ſecond year of the CLXIXth Olympiad (22), which is the DCLIſt of Rome. Glandorpius ought not to be accuſed of making him ſixty four years old; it is an error of the preſs, which tranſpoſing the figures, gives 64 for 46. Such errors are common. To prove that Euſebius is miſtaken, we need only conſider, that Lucilius has mentioned the Licinian law, made againſt the expences of feaſts in the 656th year of Rome, or thereabouts. *Lex deinde Licinia rogata eſt . . . . . Hujus legis Lævius Poëta meminit. . . . . . . Lucilius quoque legis iſtius meminit in his verbis*, Legem citemus Licini (23). He therefore lived five or ſix years after the year it is pretended he died at Naples; and if, on the other hand, we conſider that he muſt be born before the 605th year of Rome, ſince he bore arms before Numantia, in the year 620, we ſhall find, that Horace might well call him an old man, literally, and without a figure. It is in the place where he ſays Lucilius committed all his ſecrets to his books, ſo that we find in them his life, as in a votive table.

- - - - me pedibus delectat claudere verba
Lucili ritu, noſtrum melioris utroque.
Ille velut fidis arcana ſodalibus, olim
Credebat libris: neque, ſi male geſſerat uſquam
Decurrens aliò, neque ſi bene, quo fit, ut omnis
Votiva pateat veluti deſcripta tabella
Vita SENIS.

I love to rhyme, and have a railing wit,
And chuſe the way that wiſe Lucilius writ:
He did to's books, as to a truſty friend,
His ſecret virtues, and his faults commend.
And when a good or faulty deed was done,
He truſted them with that, and them alone,
And hence his books do all his life explain,
As if we ſaw him live it o'er again.

CREECH.

Theſe words of Horace are in the firſt ſatire, verſe 28, of the ſecond book.

[*H*] *Of all his works we have only ſome fragments of his ſatires remaining.*] For five or ſix words, which remain of his other pieces (24), deſerve not our notice, beſides, it is not agreed theſe pieces were his. See Douza the ſon's notes upon Lucilius's fragments, at the 99th page. Some ſay, that he wrote the Life of the ſame Scipio Africanus, whoſe victories were celebrated by Ennius. Douza denies it, for a reaſon which I think very weak; he takes it from Scipio and Lucilius's living at different times, a very bad proof; for may not a Poet, who ſhall live an hundred years hence, write the private life of the prince of Condé, or the mareſchal de Turrenne. However, I believe, with Douza, that Lucilius wrote the Life of that Scipio Africanus, with whom he intimately converſed. 'Ejuſdem 'Scipionis (*it is Douza the ſon who ſpeaks in his notes 'upon the fragments of our Poet, at the 98th page*) vi-'tam privatam poſtea deſcripſit, in quo Pſeudoporphyrionem manifeſti erroris convincit Parens meus, qui '*Lucilium vitam privatam Scipionis, Ennium verò bella 'deſcripſiſſe* annotat: ubi male nomina Scipionum inter 'ſe confuſa. Ennium enim Scipionis majoris res geſtas ceciniſſe conſtat. Lucilius autem ut ejuſdem vi-'tam privatam deſcripſerit, ratio temporum plane ve-'tat. —— *Of the ſame Scipio, he wrote the private 'Life; in reſpect of which my father convicted the falſe 'Porphyry of a manifeſt error, who obſerved, that* 'Lucilius wrote the private Life of Scipio, as Ennius 'recorded his wars; *wherein he confounds the Scipios 'one with another, for it is agreed, that Ennius ſung 'the exploits of the elder Scipio, but that Lucilius wrote 'his private Life, is a thing inconſiſtent with Chronology.*' Mr Dacier muſt have believed this argument to be good, ſince he ſpeaks thus: 'Lucilius, beſides 'his ſatires, wrote a particular book, concerning the 'life of the young Scipio Africanus, ſon to Paulus Æmilius, in which he ſpoke of his juſtice and valour. 'Such as have thought, that Lucilius wrote the hiſtory 'of

(18) Cicero, de Oratore, lib. ii, cap. vi.

(19) Id lib. I. de Finib. cap. iii.

(20) *He ſpeaks to Brutus.*

(21) Videntur porro hæc afferri ex præfatione Ciceronis in libros ſuos de Republica, quos Plinius reſpicere ſe plane mox ſignificat. Inde Luciliani verſus, qui trochaïcus eſt, finis citatur, *Nec doctiſſimis*, ut ſubintelligatur, hæc ſcribo: Quem alter trochaïcus integer mox ſequatur, *Manium Perſium hæc legere nolo, Junium Congum volo* Ubi metri cauſa in Manio Perſioque iota coït. *Harduin. Not. in lib. i, Plinii, n.* 4, *pag.* 14.

(22) Cajus Lucilius ſatyrarum ſcriptor Neapoli moritur, ac publico funere effertur, anno ætatis 46. *Euſeb. in Chron. ad ann.* 2, *Olymp.* 169.

(23) A. Gellius, lib. ii, cap. xxiv.

(24) *Nonius* voce Eugium, *cites the* Ecodos Hymnos *of Lucilius He cites alſo his comedy intituled,* Nummularia. *See Voſſius*, de Poët. Latin. pag. 12.

himſelf concerning Lucilius's learning [*I*]. I do not think Horace was reaſonably blamed for the judgment he made of this Satiriſt [*K*]. Pompey, by the mother's ſide, was grandſon,

' of the great Scipio, and that it is he whom Horace men-' tions here, confound Chronology. The great Scipio ' was dead above thirty five years before Lucilius was ' born (25).' If Lucilius had died before Scipio was born, this had been an invincible confutation of thoſe who attributed to him the hiſtory of this Roman general: but to go and confute them by this reaſon, that he was born thirty five years after the death of this hero, muſt proceed from want of attention. It is not only poſſible, that this Poet might write the hiſtory of Scipio Africanus the elder, but very probable that he has done it; and that at the requeſt of Scipio Africanus, the younger, his good friend, who might furniſh him with many good materials. I do not, however, retract what I have advanced; how many things are not true, which are yet moſt probable (26)? for the reſt, Lucilius's fragments were collected with great care by Francis Douza, and publiſhed (27) at Leyden with notes, in the year 1597. They ſtand greatly in need of being better illuſtrated by ſome learned critic.

[*I*] *Cicero has contradicted himſelf concerning Lucilius's learning.*] In his firſt book *De Oratore*, he acknowledges that Lucilius was a learned man; his words are worth reciting. ' Sed ut ſolebat C. Lucilius ſæpe ' dicere homo tibi ſubiratus (28), mihi propter eam ' ipſam cauſam minus quam volebat familiaris, ſed tamen & doctus & perurbanus, ſic ſentio neminem eſſe ' in oratorum numero habendum, qui non ſit omnibus ' iis artibus quæ ſunt libero homine dignæ perpolitus (29). —— *But as Caius Lucilius, a man who did ' not like you, and who therefore was leſs intimate with ' me than otherwiſe he would have been, but yet a ' very learned and polite man, was wont to ſay, ſo think ' I, that no one ought to be taken into the liſt of orators, who is deficient in any thing it becomes a free man ' to know.*' He gives him the ſame praiſe of a learned man, in the ſecond book of the ſame work (30), but takes that praiſe from him in the firſt book *De Finibus* (31). Quintilian gives it him, without ever retracting. I will cite him in the following remark.

[*K*] *I do not think Horace could reaſonably be blamed for the judgment he gave of Lucilius.*] The critics murmured, and he juſtified himſelf. Let us ſee his words; we will begin with the criticiſm, and end with the apology.

Eupolis, atque Cratinus, Ariſtophaneſque poëtæ,
Atque alii, quorum comœdia priſca virorum eſt:
Si quis erat dignus deſcribi, quòd malus, aut fur;
Quòd mœchus foret, aut ſicarius, aut alioqui
Famoſus: multa cum libertate notabant.
Hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hoſce ſecutus:
Mutatis tantùm pedibus, numeriſque facetus:
Emunctæ naris, durus componere verſus.
Nam fuit hoc vitioſus: in hora ſæpe ducentos,
Ut magnum, verſus dictabat ſtans pede in uno:
Cùm flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles:
Garrulus, atque piger ſcribendi ferre laborem:
Scribendi recte: nam ut multum, nil moror (32).

Cratin, and Eupolis, that laſh'd the age,
Thoſe old comedian furies of the ſtage;
If they were to deſcribe a vile, unjuſt,
And cheating knave, or ſcourge a lawleſs luſt;
Or other crimes; regardleſs of his fame
They ſhow'd the man, and boldly told his name.
This is Lucilius's way, he follows thoſe:
His wit the ſame, but other numbers choſe;
I grant he was a ſharp and ready wit,
But rude and uncorrect in all he writ:
This was his fault, he haſtily wou'd rhyme,
(As if 'twere ſuch a wond'rous thing in him)
Two hundred tedious lines in one hour's time:
Yet when with force his muddy fancy flow'd,
Some few pure ſtreams appear'd amongſt the mud:
In writing much 'tis true his parts excel,
Too lazy for the task of writing well.

CREECH.

Now we ſhall ſee how Horace juſtifies himſelf.

Nempe incompoſito dixi pede currere verſus
Lucili: quis tam Lucili fautor ineptè eſt,
Ut non hoc fateatur? at idem, quòd ſale multo
Urbem defricuit, charta laudatur eadem.
Nec tamen hoc tribuens, dederim quoque cætera,
  nam ſic
Et Laberi mimos, ut pulchra poëmata, mirer (33).

Well Sir, I grant, I ſaid, Lucilius' muſe
Is uncorrect, his way of writing looſe,
And who admires him ſo, what friend of his
So blindly dotes as to deny me this?
And yet in the ſame page I freely own
His wit as ſharp as ever laſh'd the town;
But this one ſort of excellence allow'd,
Doth not infer that all the reſt is good:
For on the ſame account I might admit
Laberius farce, for poems and for wit.

CREECH.

He afterwards anſwers Lucilius's admirers concerning the mixing Greek with Latin words, and profeſſes he does not deſign to rob him of the crown ſo juſtly due to him.

Hoc erat, experto fruſtrà Varrone Atacino,
Atque quibuſdam aliis, melius quod ſcribere poſſem,
Inventore minor: neque ego illi detrahere auſim
Hærentem capiti multa cum laude coronam (34).

In ſatires I, with Varro try'd in vain,
And others too may have a happy ſtrain.
Yet thou, Lucilius, leſs, I freely own,
I would not ſtrive to blaſt his juſt renown,
He wears, and beſt deſerves to wear, the crown.

CREECH.

He demands the ſame liberty with reſpect to Lucilius, which every one takes with reſpect to the greateſt Poets, and which Lucilius himſelf took with reſpect to Ennius; and maintains, that if the author he cenſured were alive, he would correct his own works, and write with greater exactneſs.

At dixi fluere hunc lutulentum, ſæpe ferentem
Plura quidem tollenda relinquendis, age, quæſo,
Tu nihil in magno doctus reprehendis Homero?
Nil comis Tragici mutat Lucilius Atti?
Non ridet verſus Enni gravitate minores,
Cùm de ſe loquitur, non ut majore reprenſis?
Quid vetat, & noſmet Lucili ſcripta legenteis
Quærere, num illius, num rerum dura negarit
Verſiculos natura magis factos, & eunteis
Mollius (35)? - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
  - - - - - fuerit Lucilius, inquam,
Comis & urbanus: fuerit limatior idem,
Quàm rudis, & Græci intacti carminis auctor,
Quamque Poëtarum ſeniorum turba: ſed ille,
Si foret hoc noſtrum fato dilatus in ævum:
Detereret ſibi multa: recideret omne, quod ultra
Perfectum traheretur & in verſu faciendo
Sæpe caput ſcaberet: vivos & roderet ungueis (36).

Ay, but I ſaid his fancy muddy flow'd,
And faulty lines did oft exceed the good.
Well Sir, and is e'en Homer all correct?
Is he, Sir Critic, free from all defect?
Doth not Lucilius Accius rhymes accuſe?
And blame our Ennius's correcter muſe?
For too much lightneſs oft his rhymes deride,
And when he talks of his own verſe, for pride?

---

(25) *Dacier,* Tom. VII, pag. 21, *commenting theſe words of Horace, Sat. I, lib. ii, ver.* 16. Attamen & juſtum poteras & ſcribere fortem Scipiadem ut ſapiens Lucilius.

(26) Sunt plurima vera quidem, ſed parum credibilia; ſicut falſa quoque frequenter veriſimilia. *Quintil. lib. iv, cap. ii, pag. m.* 182.

(27) *With the Horace of Cruquius.*

(28) *That is to ſay, to Mutius Scævola. The reaſon which the author of a Commentary,* in uſum Delphini, *gives for this anger is to be ſeen in the article ALBUTIUS,* citat. (23).

(29) Cicero, de Orator. lib. i, cap. xvi.

(30) *See the remark* [*F*], *citat.* (18).

(31) *See the remar* [*F*], *citat.* (19).

(32) Horat. Sat. IV, lib. i.

(33) Horat. Sat. X, lib. i, ver. 1, & ſeq.

(34) Ib. ver 46.

(35) Ib. ver. 50.

(36) Ib. ver. 64.

ſon, or rather great nephew, to Lucilius [*L*]. I ſhall obſerve the faults of Mr Moreri [*M*], and of ſome other writers [*N*], and particularly an anachroniſm of Stephen Paſquier [*O*]. There are antient verſes extant, which ſhew they expoſed themſelves to a great

Then what's the reaſon that his friend repines,
That when I read Lucilius' looſer lines,
I try if 'tis his ſubject won't permit,
More even verſe, or if 'tis want of wit?
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Well then ſuppoſe Lucilius was a wit,
His virtue's more than faults in what he writ.
Correcter than the older writers own,
And that we ſatire owe to him alone,
Satire a poem to the Greeks unknown.
Yet did he now again new life commence,
He would correct, he would retrench his ſenſe,
And pare off all that was not excellence;
Take pains, and often when he verſes made,
Would bite his nails to th' quick, and ſcratch his head.
CREECH.

I thought my ſelf obliged to ſet down all theſe long paſſages, becauſe they acquaint my reader with Lucilius's character, and it is diſagreeable to be diverted by references, in reading the life of a famous man. Mr Dacier never gave a better proof of his judgment, than when he declared himſelf (37) for Horace againſt Quintilian; it is ſtrange, that learned Rhetorician ſhould not applaud this Poet's judgment. His words will let us ſee the prodigious prejudice of many in Lucilius's favour. ' Satira quidem tota noſtra eſt, in qua ' primus inſignem laudem adeptus eſt Lucilius, qui ' quoſdam ita deditos ſibi adhuc habet amatores, ut ' eum non ejuſdem modò operis autoribus, ſed omnibus poëtis præferre non dubitent. Ego quantum ab ' illis, tantum ab Horatio diſſentio, qui Lucilium fluere ' lutulentum, & eſſe aliquid quod tollere poſſis, putat. ' Nam & eruditio in eo mira, & libertas, atque inde ' acerbitas, & abundè ſalis (38). —— *Satire indeed is* ' *wholly ours, and Lucilius was the firſt who acquired* ' *any reputation therein, to whoſe work ſome are ſo biggotted, that they ſtick not to prefer him not only to* ' *all Satiriſts, but to all Poets. For my part, I differ* ' *as much from them as from Horace, who thought Lucilius raked too much in mud, and ſaid many things* ' *which might have been as well let alone. For his* ' *learning is certainly wonderful. He writes with a* ' *great freedom, ſmartneſs, and ſparkling ſtrokes of* ' *wit.*'

[*L*] *Pompey . . . . was grandſon, or rather great nephew, to Lucilius.*] Porphyrion, upon theſe words of Horace,

- - - - quidquid ſum ego, quamvis
Infra Lucili cenſum ingeniumque (39).

Whate'er I am, altho' I muſt ſubmit,
To wiſe Lucilius, in eſtate and wit.

obſerves, that Lucilius was brother to Pompey's grandmother, and conſequently his great uncle by the mother's ſide. Acron (40), another old interpreter of Horace, ſays that Lucilius was Pompey's grandfather. This opinion is leſs probable than the former, for if Lucilia, Pompey's mother, had been Lucilius's daughter (41), I do not think that Velleius Paterculus would have forgotten to mention it. We muſt therefore believe ſhe was daughter to a brother of Lucilius, and conſequently, that Porphyrion miſtakes the true ground of the relation. Thus the learned Antonius Auguſtinus (42), and Francis Douza reaſon and conjecture.

[*M*] *I ſhall obſerve the faults of Mr Moreri.*] I. Lucilius was not a native of Sueſſa Pometia. II. This town was not in the country of the Aurunci. III. It is not certain, that *he was the firſt who wrote ſatires in Latin verſe.* Mr Dacier ſhews the contrary: ſee, above, the remark [*E*]. IV. However it be, he ſhould not have pretended, that beſides this, he was *the author of a kind of verſe unknown to the Greeks*; *from* Græcis intacti carminis auctor; for if theſe words of Horace (43) did concern Lucilius, they would only aſcribe to him the invention of ſatire. V. But the beſt critics (44) have long ſince obſerved, that theſe words relate to Ennius, and not to Lucilius. VI. It is not true, that the CLXIXth Olympiad falls in the 651ſt year of Rome: an Olympiad includes four years.

[*N*] . . . . *and the faults of ſome other authors.*] See above (45) thoſe of Father Briet. Geſner's abridger is groſsly miſtaken about the age of Lucilius, or Lucillius, as he calls him; *Floruit*, ſays he (46), *ſecundi belli Punici temporibus.* Glandorp (47) was of opinion, that he whom Cicero ſpeaks of, as an author, who deſired neither ignorant nor very learned readers, is not the ſame Lucilius, who compoſed the ſatires. It is an error. Charles Stephens has committed the ſame fault: Lloyd and Hoſman have adopted it, and moreover pretended, that our Lucilius was born in the LIIId Olympiad, and that he died in the LXIXth, being forty ſix years of age: an abſurdity which is manifeſt. They cite Quintilian 17. 21. which is a chimerical citation.

[*O*] . . . . *and an anachroniſm of Stephen Paſquier.*] His words are theſe. ' With this it was (48) that the ' advocates of Rome ſported moſt, when they had a ' mind to awake their judges. See this piece of Cicero in his oration for Milo: *Eſt enim hæc, Judices,* ' *non ſcripta, ſed nata lex,* &c. You will find it equals ' the fineſt verſes of all antiquity; which afterwards ' grew into ſuch an affectation and abuſe, that Lucilius, a ſatirical Poet ridiculed it very handſomely ' in one of his ſatires whoſe verſes Aulus Gellius relates ' in the thirteenth book of his *Noctes Atticæ* (49).' Garaſſe has not pardoned him this miſtake; let us hear him. ' Wherein, I ſay, Mr Paſquier has very handſomely expoſed himſelf to the laughter of all men, ' moderately verſed in Chronology; for how could Lucilius, who lived about an hundred years before Cicero, ridicule what was done an hundred years after ' his death? It is juſt as if I ſhould ſay, ſpeaking of ' that nice, poliſhed, and accurate poetry, which was ' introduced by Berthaud and Malherbe, that Marot ' and St Gelais were diſguſted ſo much with it, as to ' ridicule and ſatirize it in their writings. Such was ' the ſufficiency of that old dotard mentioned by Severinus Boëtius in his book *de Diſciplina Scholarium,* ' who asked whether Æneas was not Julius Cæſar's ' wife. Such was the impertinence of that miniſter ' noted by Horace Dolabella, in the ſixth chapter of ' his Apology, who being asked, Uter fuerit prior ſecundum Annales Eccleſiæ Conſtantinus an Nero? ' —— *Who, according to the annals of the church, lived* ' *firſt, Conſtantine or Nero?* came off very ingeniouſly ' by theſe words of our Saviour, Non eſt veſtrum noſſe ' tempora vel momenta. —— *It is not for you to know* ' *the times, or the ſeaſons.* Acts i. 7. And yet I ' believe theſe men, tho' very ignorant, if they had ' ſeen the difference of ſtile, between Lucilius and Cicero, would never have called in queſtion, whether ' Lucilius had been before Cicero; as a man need not ' be very much verſed in Chronology, to be able to ' ſay a hundred years hence whether Alain Charretier, ' Froiſſard, and Monſtrelet, were before Monſieur ' du Vair; and it would be a horrid ignorance ' to ſay, that Alain Charretier, or Monſtrelet, improved the ſtile, the diction, and figures of Amiot, or du Vair (50).' It was difficult to make a good anſwer to this cenſure; and therefore we find, that the learned Paſquier's ſons defended him but ill upon this point: here is what they anſwer, ' Garaſſe ſays that Lucilius was an hundred years before Cicero, which is falſe, for Cicero and Pompey ' lived at the ſame time; but Lucilius was Pompey's ' uncle: ſo that it is eaſy to judge, that our calumniator is much miſtaken in his computation. In the ' ſecond place he ſays, *this might be known by the dif-* ' *ference of ſtile.* This ignorance is more inſupportable ' than the former; for Pliny expreſsly obſerves, that ' *primus fuit Lucilius qui ſtylum acuiſſe dicitur.* Horace calls him *emunctæ naris,* and ſays he made two ' hundred verſes in an hour, and Quintilian calls him ' *principem Satyricorum,* inſomuch, that Adrian the emperor preferred him before Virgil. Obſerve, I pray, ' into how many abſurdities a man ſometimes runs by ' the itch of criticizing (51).' There is nothing good in this reply, but the remark on the hundred years Garaſſe puts betwixt Cicero and Lucilius. This Jeſuit pretending to criticize one fault in Chronology, falls into another; for it is not true, *that Lucilius was an hundred years before Cicero,* he died ſome years after Cicero

(37) *On Horace,* Sat. IV, lib. i, Tom. VII, pag. 311.

(38) Quintil. lib. x, cap. i, pag. m. 472.

(39) Horat. Sat. I, lib. ii, ver. 74.

(40) Apud Franciſcum Douzam, notis in Reliquias Lucilii, pag. 97, col. 2.

(41) Fuit hic (Pompeius) genitus matre Lucilia ſtirpis ſenatoriæ. *Paterculus, lib. ii, cap. xxix.*

(42) In libro de Familiis Roman. apud Douzam, ubi ſupra.

(43) Sat. X, lib. i, ver. 66.

(44) Caſaubon & Theodore Marſius, *cited by Dacier on Horace,* Tom. VI, pag. 649.

(45) *In the remark* [*A*].

(46) Epit. Bibl. Geſneri, pag 550, Edit 1583.

(47) Onomaſt. pag 552.

(48) *That is to ſay, the* ὁμοιοτέλευτα, ſimiliter deſinentia.

(49) Paſquier, Recherches de la France, livr. vii, chap. i, pag. m. 595.

(50) Garaſſe, Recherche des Recherches, pag. 505.

(51) Defenſe pour Etienne Paſquier contre les Impoſtures & Calomnies de François Garaſſe, pag. 791, 792.

great danger, who ventured to ſpeak ill of Lucilius's poems [*P*].

Cicero was born. It was eaſy for Paſquier's apologiſts to juſtify this; but inſtead of good proofs, they only alledged, that Lucilius was Pompey's uncle, Cicero's cotemporary. They were miſtaken; Lucilius is accounted the grandfather, or great uncle, to Pompey (52). They are very much in the wrong, to pretend that there is no diſtinction to be obſerved betwixt Lucilius and Cicero's ſtile; there is a greater difference between the ſtile of Cicero and that of Lucilius, than between the ſtile of Mr Flechier, and that of Clement Marot. To be ſoon convinced of it, we need only caſt an eye with ſome judgment on the fragments of the Latin ſatiriſt, and on the works of Cicero at the bare opening his book. To oppoſe to Father Garaſſe the words of Pliny ill cited (53), and thoſe of Quintilian ill cited (54), is to pretend that becauſe Regnier is the firſt who writ good French ſatires, his ſtile differs not from that of Mr Patru, or Mr Boileau. The *emunctæ naris* of Horace proves nothing; this might be ſaid of Clement Marot, and Regnier, with a great deal of juſtice, and yet what difference is there between their ſtile, and that of Patru and Boileau? Conſider Horace's whole verſe,

(52) *See the remark* [*L*].

(53) *Pliny ſaid*, primus condidit ſtyli naſum, *and not* primus fuit Lucilius qui ſtylum acuiſſe dicitur.

(54) *Quintilian ſays*, in *ſatyra* primus inſignem laudem adeptus eſt Lucilius, *and not* fuit princeps ſatyricorum.

Emunctæ naris DURUS componere Verſus.

Have they not been forced miſerably to mutilate his teſtimony, that they might be able to make uſe of it? If they had given it intire, would they not have furniſhed arms to their adverſary? But that proof from Horace is much leſs ridiculous than that which follows, and is taken from the ſame author, *Lucilius*, as Horace ſays, *made two hundred verſes in an hour*, therefore he writ as well as Cicero. What a monſtrous conſequence is here, and more amazing ſtill, when we conſider that Horace mentions this as a fault of Lucilius, and immediately compares this author's poems to muddy ſtreams:

Nam fuit hoc vitioſus in hora ſæpe ducentos,
Ut magnum verſus dictabat, ſtans pede in uno.
Quum flueret LUTULENTUS .... (55).

(55) Horat. Sat. IV, lib. i, ver. 9.

The laſt proof which Stephen Paſquier's apologiſts bring, is no better than the others. It is founded on a falſe fact, the conſequence whereof would make againſt them, if it were true. It is not to Lucilius, but to Ennius, that Adrian gave the preference before Virgil; and all that this proves, is, that Ennius's ſtile was more ruſty and mouldy; for this was Hadrian's taſte, as his Hiſtorian obſerves. 'Amavit Præterea 'genus dicendi vetuſtum ... Ciceroni Catonem, Vir'gilio Ennium, Salluſtio Cœlium prætulit (56). —— '*Beſides he loved the old manner of ſpeaking* ... *He* '*preferred Cato to Cicero, Ennius to Virgil, Cælius to* '*Salluſt*.'

(56) Spartian. in Hadriano, cap. xvi, pag. m. 158, Tom. I.

[*P*] *They expoſed themſelves to a great danger, who ventured to ſpeak ill of Lucilius's poems.*] It is a long time time ago ſince I read what I am going to tranſcribe. 'Our little doctor does much the ſame (57). 'And indeed a man of that humour, is in a fair way 'of being beaten (I mean with the tongue and pen) 'for we do not live in an age ſo licentious, as was 'that of theſe young Romans of quality, who walked 'the ſtreets all day, concealing long whips under their 'gowns, to chaſtiſe the inſolence of thoſe who did 'not approve the Poet Lucilius, if they had the miſ'fortune to be in their way (58).' I believed when I read this, that ſince Coſtar cited no body, he did not know who firſt ſaid it, and I put myſelf upon the enquiry. I found it in ſome verſes which have paſſed for Horace's, and have been prefixed to one of his ſatires (59) in ſome editions. Mr Dacier has inſerted them in his notes upon this Poet; I will tranſcribe all he has ſaid upon it; by which we ſhall ſee, that Coſtar magnifies objects, and that his embroidery is too high.

(57) *That is to ſay, Girac, like Diogenes, acts in every thing contrary to the people.*

(58) Coſtar, Suite de la Deſenſe de Voiture, pag. 40.

(59) *The tenth of the firſt book.*

'We may ſay of Lucilius, that he had the good 'fortune of ſome women, who with very little beauty 'have created violent paſſions. Among his partiſans, 'there were ſome ſo extravagant as to run along the 'ſtreets, with whips under their gowns, to laſh ſuch 'as durſt ſpeak ill of Lucilius's verſes.

Lucili, quam ſis mendoſus, teſte Catone
Defenſore tuo pervincam, qui male factos
Emendare parat verſus. Hoc lenius ille
Eſt quo vir melior. Longe ſubtilior ille
Qui multum puer & loris & funibus udis
Exornatus ut eſſet opem qui ferre Poëtis
Antiquis poſſet contra faſtidia noſtra,
Grammaticorum Equitum doctiſſimus.

'*I will ſhew you, Lucilius, how full of faults you are,* '*even by the teſtimony of Cato, your great patron. He has* '*a deſign to poliſh your ill turned verſes. As he is a* '*better man than moſt others, he has taken the gentleſt* '*and ſofteſt method. But he is not ſo ſubtil as that* '*learned knight, who armed himſelf with good ſtrops* '*and moiſtened cords, to revenge our diſlikes of the an*'*tient Poets.*

'Theſe verſes had been prefixed to this ſatire, as if 'they were written by Horace, and were the beginning 'of it. Canterus and Lilius Gyraldus, have been 'deceived by it. Though they are not Horace's, 'yet they are not bad, and they ſerve to ſhew, that 'Lucilius's verſes were not always univerſally eſteem'ed (60).'

(60) *Dacier on the tenth Satire of the firſt book of Horace, page* 603 *of the ſixth Tome.*

LUCRETIA, a Roman lady, famous for her beauty and noble extraction [*A*], but much more for her virtue, was married to Collatinus, a relation to Tarquin king of Rome. Every one knows the reaſon that induced her to kill herſelf. I ſhall however relate the circumſtances of that tragical hiſtory. Tarquin not being able to make himſelf maſter of the town of Ardea, as ſoon as he expected, reſolved on a formal ſiege. The ſiege continued a long time, and did not hinder the young princes from entertaining one another pretty often. Sextus having invited to ſupper his two brothers and Collatinus, the diſcourſe turned upon the fair ſex; and a diſpute aroſe, not about the beauty of their miſtreſſes, as it would in our age, but upon the beauty of their wives. Each maintained

[*A*] *For her ... noble extraction.*] Lucretia's family was doubtleſs Patrician, ſince we find conſuls in it, at a time when the Plebeians were not admitted unto the conſulſhip. It made a noble figure in the reign of Tarquinius Superbus; for this prince gave the government of Rome to SPURIUS LUCRETIUS Tricipitinus, father to our Lucretia, married to a prince of the blood (1). Some authors ſay (2), that Numa Pompilius, being choſen king of Rome, married a lady called Lucretia. If ſhe was of the family I here ſpeak of, as it is probable ſhe was, what proofs ſhould we deſire greater of the famous antiquity of this houſe? Spurius Lucretius, after his daughter's death, was created *Interrex*, and he named Brutus, and his ſon-in-law Collatinus, to the conſulſhip (3). The later was ſoon after forced to reſign his office, and retire to Lanuvium (4), where he ſpent the reſt of his life, which was very long. Valerius being choſen in his room, took Spurius Lucretius for his colleague (5), after Brutus had been killed; but this colleague died in a few days (6). I find a TITUS LUCRETIUS, who was conſul the following year, and a few years after (7); and a PUBLIUS LUCRETIUS, colleague to Valerius, when he was conſul the third time (8). This Titus Lucretius is thought to be the father of LUCIUS LUCRETIUS Tricipitinus, conſul in the year of Rome 291 (9). I paſs over ſeveral Lucretii, who enjoyed afterwards the principal poſts in the government, before it was determined, that the Plebeians ſhould be admitted to them

(1) Livius, lib. i, cap. lix.

(2) *See* Plutarch. in Numa, pag. 74. A.

(3) Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib. iv, cap. lxxx.

(4) Id. lib. v, cap. xii.

(5) Id. ibid. cap. xiii.

(6) Ib. cap. xix.

(7) Livius, lib. ii, cap. viii, & xvi.

(8) Ibid. cap. xv.

(9) *See Sigonius*, in Faſtis, ad ann. 245.

maintained that his was handſomeſt; the controverſy growing hot, Collatinus propoſed a means of deciding it. Why ſo many words, ſaid he, we may in a little time have viſible proofs of my Lucretia's pre-eminence; let us take horſe, and go and ſurprize our wives; the determination of the queſtion will by this means be eaſier, than if they were prepared to receive us. Wine having heated them, they readily embraced the propoſition, and rode to Rome full ſpeed. They found Tarquin's daughters-in-law at table, regaling themſelves with ſome perſons of their own age. They afterwards went to Collatia; and, though it was very late, they found Lucretia, in the midſt of her maids, working with her hands upon wool (*a*). They agreed, that ſhe excelled all the others and returned to the camp. Sextus, tranſported with a violent paſſion for her, returned a few days after to Collatia, without ſaying a word to any perſon. He was received with all the civility, that was due to a near relation, who was the king's eldeſt ſon, and who was not ſuſpected of the leaſt diſhoneſt thought. After he had ſupped, he was conducted to the chamber deſigned for him. He did not ſleep, but when he thought the family were quiet, he ſtole, with his ſword in his hand, into Lucretia's chamber, and threatning to kill her if ſhe made the leaſt noiſe, he declared his paſſion to her; he uſed all the tendereſt entreaties, and the moſt terrible threats, and all imaginable artifices that can touch a woman's heart. It was all to no purpoſe, Lucretia continued firm; the fear of death did not ſhake her, but ſhe could not reſiſt the menace that Sextus made of expoſing her to the laſt degree of infamy. He declared, that after having killed her, he would kill one of her ſlaves, and lay him in her bed, and make it be believed, that both the murders were the puniſhment of the adultery, in which he had ſurprized her. Having thus accompliſhed his infamous deſign, he retired as content and proud of his conqueſt, as if it had been fairly obtained, and according to the niceſt laws of galantry. The lady, ſeized with the deepeſt melancholy, ſent to entreat her father, who was at Rome, and her huſband, who was at the ſiege of Ardea, to come immediately to her. They did ſo: ſhe acquainted them with her misfortune, and conjured them to revenge her. They promiſed they would, and ſaid all they could think of to comfort her; ſhe would by no means be comforted, but drawing out a dagger, ſhe had hid in her cloaths, ſtruck it into her heart. Brutus, who was preſent at this ſpectacle, found the occaſion he had long ſought for of delivering Rome from Tarquin's tyranny, and ſo far improved this occaſion, that the kingly power was aboliſhed (*b*): thus Lucretia's death was the cauſe of the liberty of the Roman people, which has given a great luſtre to the immortal memory of this lady. Hiſtorians relate her adventure differently [*B*]. The epitaph

(*a*) Pergunt inde Collatiam: ubi Lucretiam haudquaquam ut regias nurus, quas in convivio luxuque cum æqualibus viderant, tempus terentes, ſed nocte ſera deditam lanæ inter lucubrantes ancillas in medio ædium ſedentem inveniunt. *T. Livius, lib. i, cap. lvii.*

(*b*) *Taken from Livy, at the end of the firſt book,* cap. lvii, & ſeq.

them. But there is no need of all theſe particulars to prove, that the Lucretii Tricipitini were of a Patrician family. What I have ſaid is ſufficient. It is not certain that this can be ſaid of the Lucretii ſirnamed Veſpillo, or Ofella, or of thoſe of any other ſirname: There are even ſome Lucretii, whoſe ſirname we are ignorant of, who were of a Plebeian family; for we ſee a MARCUS LUCRETIUS, tribune of the people in the ſecond Punic war (10). Note, that QUINTUS LUCRETIUS, the firſt who was ſirnamed Veſpillo, had this ſirname for caſting Tiberius Gracchus's body into the Tiber: *Cujus Corpus Lucretii Ædilis manu in Tiberim miſſum; unde ille Veſpillo dictus* (11). Cicero (12) ſpeaks honourably of one QUINTUS LUCRETIUS Veſpillo, a good Lawyer and good Advocate. There was one QUINTUS LUCRETIUS Veſpillo, a ſenator, who followed Pompey's party (13), and whom the fidelity of his wife preſerved from the fury of the Triumviri, who had proſcribed him (14). This is probably the ſame who obtained the conſulſhip in the 734th year of Rome (15). Cicero ſpeaks of LUCRETIUS Ofella, as an orator, who was better at making harangues to the people, than at pleading cauſes: *Aptior concionibus quam judiciis* (16). Moreri has wretchedly tranſlated this. *He was fitter*, ſays he, *to make ſpeeches than pronounce judgments.* Another (17) affirms, that Cicero repreſents him *fitter to be a judge than a great orator.* It is believed (18), that this Lucretius Ofella, is the ſame who quitted Marius's party, and joined Sylla, and retook Præneſte, where he forced Marius the younger to kill himſelf. This piece of ſervice hindered not Sylla's putting him to death in the midſt of the Forum, becauſe he had demanded the conſulſhip againſt Sylla's intention (19).

[*B*] *Hiſtorians relate Lucretia's adventure differently*] Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, and Livy, have given the largeſt deſcriptions of it. They lived at the ſame time, and exactly conſulted the preceeding authors. Neverthele ſs, they agree but in three or four general facts: I. That Sextus entered by night into Lucretia's chamber. II. That this lady, after having reſiſted the menaces of death, intreaties, and promiſes, yielded at laſt, when ſhe was threatened with infamy. III. That ſhe killed herſelf the next day. IV. That Brutus laid hold of this occaſion to change the government. The firſt of theſe two Hiſtorians gives a more particular and large account than the other: as for inſtance, he particularizes that Sextus promiſed Lucretia to marry her; by which means ſhe would immediately be queen of the Gabii, and afterwards of Rome, upon Tarquin's death, whoſe ſucceſſor he would infallibly be, as being his eldeſt ſon (20). Livy contents himſelf with theſe general expreſſions. ‘ Stricto gladio ad dormientem Lucretiam venit, ſiniſtraque manu mulieris pectore oppreſſo, Tace Lucretia, inquit, Sex. Tarquinius ſum, ferrum in manu eſt: moriêre, ſi emiſeris vocem. Cùm pavida è ſomno mulier nullam opem, propè mortem imminentem videret; Tum Tarquinius fateri amorem, orare: miſcere precibus minas: verſare in omnes partes muliebrem animum (21). ——— *With his drawn ſword in his hand, he approached the ſleeping Lucretia, he put his left hand upon her breaſt, be ſilent, ſaid he, Lucretia, I am Sextus Tarquinius, my ſword is in my hand, and if you ſpeak a word you die. The woman, awaking in a fright, perceived no help nigh, and that ſhe was in danger of immediate death; then Tarquin declared his paſſion, beſought her, mingled threatenings with prayers, and uſed all the arts capable of prevailing on a woman.*’ But to know the difference between theſe two Hiſtorians, we need only remember, that Livy relates the ſtory, as we find it in the text of this article; and at the ſame time take notice of the following particulars: I take them from Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus. Sextus being ſent to Collatia by king Tarquin, upon affairs relating to the ſiege of Ardea, lodged at the houſe of Collatinus, his relation, who was then at the camp, and found a proper opportunity to ſatisfy the paſſion he had conceived for Lucretia in a former viſit. The Hiſtorian does not ſpeak of the diſpute of the young princes, concerning the beauty of their wives, which obliged them to go to Rome and to Collatia, to end the difference. This circumſtance, however, was ſingular enough to deſerve a place in Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus's account; and was an incident very capable of embelliſhing the narration. Lucretia, over-whelmed with melancholy, took coach at break of day, as ſoon as Sextus was withdrawn: ſhe took

(10) Livius, lib. xxvii, cap v.

(11) Aurelius Victor, de Viris illuſtr. cap. lxiv.

(12) Cicero, in Bruto, cap xlviii,

(13) Cæſar, de Bello Civili, lib i, pag m. 237, & lib. iii, pag. 307.

(14) Valer. Maxim. lib. vi, cap. vii.

(15) Dio, lib. liv.

(16) Cicero, ubi ſupra.

(17) *The baron des Couteures in his Life of Lucretia.*

(18) *See the* Onomaſticon *of Glandorpius, pag.* 5 7.

(19) *See Livy,* in Epit. lib. lxxxviii, & lxxxix, & Paterculus, lib. ii, cap. xxvii.

(20) Dionyſ. Halic. lib. iv, cap. lxxiii. *Note, that he obſerves, that Sextus joined oaths to his promiſes and menaces.*

(21) Titus, Livius. lib. i, cap. lviii.

epitaph which is ſeen in Italy, and is pretended to have been compoſed by Collatinus her huſband [*C*], is doubtleſs, a ſuppoſititious piece. Her raviſher was not long expoſed to the remorſes of his conſcience, or the ſevere reproaches of his family, whoſe total ruin he had occaſioned. He retired to a town of the Gabii, where he had formerly commanded, and there periſhed a little after (*c*). The reflexions which have been made by ſome writers, are not only falſe wit, but vain cavelling ſophiſtry [*D*]. It has been ſaid in another

took a mourning habit, and a dagger under her robe, and went to Rome with a dejected countenance, and all in tears, without ſaying any thing to thoſe who asked her the cauſe of her affliction. When ſhe came to her father's houſe, ſhe threw herſelf upon her knees; ſhe cryed without ſaying a word, and at laſt deſired him to ſend for her relations and friends: as ſoon as they were come together, ſhe told them her adventure; prayed the gods to take her quickly out of this world (22), and ſtabbed herſelf. Valerius was immediately diſpatched to the camp, to carry this news to Collatinus, and to join with him in raiſing an inſurrection among the ſoldiers. He met Collatinus and Brutus not far from Rome, who had heard nothing of what had happened. Thus you ſee variations ſomewhat ſurprizing; and which prove, that the firſt Hiſtorians, the ſources of Livy and Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, did not take the neceſſary care to have an exact information.

Here are more variations. Servius calls him Aruns who violated Lucretia; other Hiſtorians call him Sextus, and give the name of Aruns to another ſon of Tarquin (23). The ſame Servius ſuppoſes, that, in order to determine the diſpute, they went firſt to Lucretia at Collatia, and then to Rome, and ſays, that the ſlave he took with him into Lucretia's chamber, was an Ethiopian (24). I ſay nothing of Ovid, who has related (25) Lucretia's misfortune with ſeveral circumſtances of which no Hiſtorian makes mention. He uſed a Poetical licence, and has invented what he thought moſt proper to adorn his ſtory. Nay, he has inſerted what the Greeks ſaid of Polyxena (26), that ſhe took care ſo to ſettle her cloaths, that, as ſhe fell, nothing might be ſeen that modeſty would have concealed.

Nec mora, celato figit ſua pectora ferro:
  Et cadit in Patrios ſanguinolenta pedes.
Tunc quoque, jam moriens, ne non procumbat honeſtè,
  Reſpicit: hæc etiam cura cadentis erat (27).

This ſaid, her fatal dagger pierc'd her ſide,
And at her father's feet ſhe fell and dy'd.
Yet as ſhe fell, her dying thoughts contriv'd,
To fall as modeſtly as ſhe had liv'd.

But as it would be no embelliſhment to his account, to ſay that the raviſher of this lady was Tarquin's youngeſt ſon, we muſt believe that in this he followed ſome tradition; and conſequently that the Hiſtorians were divided on this particular point: moſt ſaid that the raviſher was eldeſt ſon to that prince, and ſome took him for the youngeſt.

[*C*] *The epitaph that is . . . . . pretended to have been compoſed by Collatinus her huſband.*] Theſe are the words of it: ‘Collatinus Tarquinius dulciſſimæ conjugi & incomparabili, pudicitiæ decori, mulierum gloriæ, vixit annis XXII. menſ. III. d. VI. proh dolor, quæ fuit cariſſima (28). —— *Collatinus Tarquinius to his moſt dear and incomparable wife, honour of chaſtity, glory of women. She lived twenty two years, three months, ſix days, who was moſt dear to me!*’ It is ſaid, that this inſcription is ſeen at Rome, and in the dioceſe of Viterbo (29).

[*D*] *The reflexions . . . . . of ſome writers are not only falſe wit, but vain cavilling ſophiſtry.*] A modern author, fancied himſelf, no doubt, very witty in obſerving that Lucretia killed herſelf too late; and that, if ſhe reſolved upon parting with her life, it was not till ſhe had taſted the forbidden fruit (30). This is the falſeſt raillery in the world; and there is no reaſonable man, but will agree, that, on ſuch a ſubject as this, to quit gravity, and in any wiſe to aim at jeſting, is not only a raſh audaciouſneſs, but alſo ſtupidity and brutiſhneſs. Lucretia's action ſhould only excite the ſenſe of compaſſion and admiration. Her conduct was exempt from any mixture of impurity; ſhe was a bright ſacrifice to the love of virtue and glory: and it would be as ridiculous to ſay, that he is guilty of prodigality, who throws away his cloaths to ſave his life by ſwimming, as to ſay there was any thing of leudneſs in Lucretia's patience; for this illuſtrious lady was patient only to ſave her reputation. But if you would ſee the efforts of cavilling, read this long paſſage of Henry Stephens (31). ‘And yet the poor Lucretia did not paſs a right judgment on herſelf, when, being thus violated, ſhe ſaid ſhe had loſt her chaſtity; ſince it is certain, virtue cannot be raviſhed by any human force: and therefore what ſhe adds, that her body was violated, but that her thought (or her mind) was not culpable, contradicts what ſhe had been ſaying, namely, that ſhe had loſt her chaſtity, it being certain, that the ſeat of it is the mind, and not the body; which yet the Heathens ſeem not well to have conſidered, who have not only excuſed this woman's act, in being her own murderer, but have taken occaſion from it to extol her to the ſkies, as being a woman of courage, and of a great ſoul, in that ſhe revenged, by her death, the outrage done to her chaſtity. However, before I anſwer them, as to the outrage they pretend was done her chaſtity, I would deſire them to tell me, what they mean by the word revenge; becauſe to me it ſeems a thing againſt all reaſon, that the injury ſhould be revenged, by the death of the perſon who received it, and not by the death of him that gave it. Whereupon I ſhould alledge to them, that ſhe herſelf did not ſay, *Mors ultrix erit*, or *vindex*, my death ſhall revenge it; but *Mors teſtis erit*, that is, my death ſhall witneſs it: as if ſhe had ſaid, my death ſhall witneſs to the eyes of the world, what I cannot diſcover, it being a ſecret in my own conſcience; to wit, that pleaſure was ſo far from making me conſent to ſuch an act, that my life is hateful to me for having committed it. But, to come to the anſwer of the other point, I ſay, that ſuppoſing this death to import revenge, it muſt be the revenge of an outrage done to the body, and not to the mind, the ſeat of chaſtity. Which a certain author (whoſe name St Auguſtin has thought fit to conceal) conſidering in a declamation, has this fine ſentence, concerning Lucretia's misfortune: a wonderful thing! here are two perſons, and only one commits adultery. But St Auguſtin afterwards argues thus; if it is not impudicity to have to do with a man againſt her will, ſhe is unjuſtly puniſhed, ſince ſhe is chaſte. For it is certain, that the more the adultery is excuſed, the more the murder is heightened; and the more the adultery is cenſured, the more the murder is excuſed: (It being once ſuppoſed lawful for a perſon to kill himſelf.) And the ſame St Auguſtin, who praiſes this Rhetorician's ſaying, ſeems alſo to have ſucceeded well in that other argument (if it be his) *Si adultera, cur laudata? Si pudica, cur occiſa?* That is, if ſhe be an adultereſs, why is ſhe praiſed? if chaſte, why was ſhe killed? Upon which words, a friend of mine (32), a learned man, whom God has bleſſed with many graces, the fruits whereof are ſcattered in many parts of Chriſtendom, has lately made an epigram, with which I am willing to gratify the reader. It is this:

Si tibi fortè fuit Lucretia gratus adulter,
  Immerito ex merita præmia cæde petis:
Sin potius caſto vis eſt allata pudori,
  Quis furor eſt hoſtis crimine velle mori?
Fruſtra igitur laudem captas Lucretia: namque
  Vel furioſa ruis, vel ſcelerata cadis.

If thou wert pleas'd with the adulterous deed,
With juſtice then did thy foul boſom bleed.
If guiltleſs you did with the monſter lye,
Why for an enemy would you thus die?
In vain, Lucretia, thus you ſeek a name,
Rage or Remorſe can never lead to fame.

Lewis

(*c*) Sext. Tarquinius Gabios tanquam in ſuum regnum profectus, ab ultoribus veterum ſimultatum quas ſibi ipſe cædibus rapiniſque conciverat, eſt interfectus. *Livius*, *lib. i*, *cap. ult.*

(22) Θεοῖς τε καὶ δαίμοσιν εὐξαμένη ταχεῖαν αὐτῇ δȣ̃ναι τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν τȣ̃ βίȣ. Comprecataque deos & dæmonas ut ſe cito è vita eximerent. *Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib. iv, pag.* 263.

(23) *Take notice however, that Florus*, lib. i, cap x, *ſeems to call him* Aruns.

(24) Ex Servio, in Æneid. lib. viii, ver. 646.

(25) *In the ſecond book of the* Faſti.

(26) *See the remark* [*H*] *of the article* OLYMPIAS.

(27) Ovid Faſtor. lib. ii, ver. 831, & ſeq.

(28) Glandorp. Onomaſt. pag. 555.

(29) Id. ibid.

(30) *What ſhall we think of Lucretia, but what Mr de Charleval has judged of her . . . . that ſhe killed herſelf too late. Saraſin's* Dialogue whether a man ſhould be in love, pag. m. 182. *See alſo* Menagiana, pag. 281, Dutch Edit.

(31) *Henry Stephens's Apology for Herodotus*, chap xv, pag. m. 135, 136.

(32) *This is* Renatus Laurent de la Barre. *Theſe verſes may be ſeen in his Notes on Turtullian's book* ad Martyres. *Moreri calls him* Renatus Laurens, *but he ſhould have ſaid*, Renatus Laurent de la Barre.

ther place, that religion had no ſhare in this action of Lucretia. A learned man has oppoſed

Lewis Guyon (33) ſtole all theſe things from Henry Stephens, without the leaſt alteration; and without citing him; which plagiariſm is cuſtomary with him (34). A Spaniſh Jeſuit has amuſed himſelf with the ſame cavilling: but, as we ſhall ſee in the following remark, he has mixed ſome good things with it. He approves the Latin verſes we have ſeen above; and maintains, that Lucretia ſhewed neither chaſtity nor courage, and, from a cowardly ſpirit, feared her huſband's knife more thanher own. ‘ Ni deſcubrio lo uno ni lo otro: no lo primero, pues conſintio: y como dize Sant Ambroſio a otra de ſu manera †: *Facilius oportuit ſanguinem cum ſpiritu fundere, quam perdere caſtitatem.* Ni tampoco moſtro lo ſegundo, pues por flaqueza de animo temio mas el cuchillo de Colatino, que el ſuyo propio: y por eſto ſe mato con deſeſperacion, la qual ‡ pone Santo Thomas por hija dela luxuria (35). —— *She ſhewed neither the one nor the other: not the firſt, ſince ſhe conſented, when as St Ambroſe ſays, ſhe ought rather to have loſt her life than her chaſtity. Nor the ſecond, ſince, thro' a cowardly ſpirit, ſhe was more afraid of Collatinus's knife, than of her own: and for that reaſon ſhe killed herſelf out of deſpair, which according to St Thomas, is the daughter of Luxury.*’ All this is falſe and unjuſt: ſhe manifeſted both a great love for chaſtity, and a great courage. When a man has the courage to take away his own liſe, to ſecure his reputation, does not he chuſe to die, rather than loſe his good name? And is there in this the leaſt ſign of cowardice? If this is acting againſt the rules of true religion, it is at leaſt conforming to the ideas of Heathen heroiſm. But let us conſider a little Henry Stephens's words. He accuſes Lucretia of contradiction and ignorance: She did not know the true name of things, ſince ſhe believed ſhe had loſt her chaſtity, notwithſtanding the reſiſtance of her will. She contradicted herſelf, becauſe ſhe immediately added, that her body only had been violated. ‘ Quid ſalvi eſt mulieri amiſſa pudicitia? *Theſe are her words*; Veſtigia viri alieni Collatine in lecto ſunt tuo. Cæterùm corpus eſt tantum violatum, animus inſons: mors teſtis erit: ſed date dextras fidemque, haud impunè adultero fore (36). —— *What is left to a woman who has left her honour? The print of another man, O! Collatine, is viſible in thy bed. But it was my body only was violated, my ſoul is pure, death ſhall witneſs this, but give me your right hand, and pledge me your faith, that the adulterer ſhall not eſcape unpuniſhed.*’ I am ſurprized, that Henry Stephens, who was ſo good a Grammarian, had ſo little conſidered, that, in the uſage of all languages, the ſame words, without any impropriety, are taken in different ſenſes, more or leſs comprehenſive. Did he think he could inſtruct Livy on the ſignification of the word *pudicitia?* I ſay Livy: for it is he to whom our Lucretia's expreſſions belong. The Latin that was ſpoke at Rome, when this lady was alive was not like the Latin of this eloquent hiſtorian: and there is no probability, that he any where had found the very words which Lucretia uſed; each hiſtorian turned them to his own way of ſpeaking; the moſt exact were content to retain the ſenſe and force of them. It is probable ſhe complained, ſhe had loſt her honour; that ſhe had been diſhonoured, or that Sextus had violated her honour, *&c.* There is no impropriety in thoſe expreſſions. Thus an Engliſh woman would expreſs herſelf in the ſame caſe, though ſhe perfectly underſtood the language; and though, notwithſtanding her affliction, ſhe took care not to break thro' through the rules of grammar. They who ſteal away a maid, and enjoy her by force, are reckoned raviſhers of her honour: and if the parents confined their proſecutions to the forcing him to marry her, the proceſs is moſt properly called a proceſs in reparation of honour. The ſame phraſes would be uſed, though the violence had not been ſo extreme; I mean, in caſe the raviſher had obtained ſome ſort of conſent (37); becauſe having propoſed to her choice, either the yielding to his paſſion, or death, or the rack, or famine, or ſome other pain, able to intimidate the moſt reſolute, ſhe had choſen the firſt part of the alternative, without any kind of inward approbation. Now, if Lucretia could properly ſay, her honour was loſt, ſhe might very well uſe words equivalent to *pudicitia amiſſa.* Note, That Ovid uſes the words *pudor raptus* to ſignify the forced enjoyment of a maid (38), and Plautus expreſſes deflowering, by the words *pudicitia pulſa* (39). Thus the pretended contradiction, imputed to Lucretia, falls to the ground; for thoſe maids or wives, who ſhould at this day complain of having been violated, diſhonoured, or robbed of their honour, in the ſacking of a town, or otherwiſe, might add, without contradicting themſelves, that their ſoul had no ſhare in that ſtain.

Henry Stephens underſtands not what he ſays, when he affirms, that the Heathens praiſed Lucretia, *for having revenged, by her death, the outrage done to her chaſtity.* It is falſe, that they gave this turn to their praiſes: all therefore that he advances to confute them is a deception, a fallacy, which is called *ignoratio elenchi.* The Heathens, who praiſe Lucretia, grounded their panegyrics upon her extream ſenſe of glory, and the reputation of a chaſt wiſe, and her great delicacy as to this point of honour; which was ſo very great, as not to permit her to ſurvive the affront that had been offered her. What our critic borrows from St Auguſtin, whoſe meaning he has not rightly taken, is ſubject to the ſame cenſure: it is ſtill the falſe ſuppoſition, that Lucretia killed herſelf to puniſh herſelf for the crime. It is an ignorance of the ſtate of the queſtion. This lady knew herſelf innocent, and yet would die, that no leud woman ſhould have the face to live, under pretence, that Lucretia had the cowardice to ſurvive her rape (40).

THE EXAMINATION of an objection of St Auguſtin.

One of the moſt reaſonable objections of St Auguſtin, is, that ſelf-murther is a crime; and he ſtrengthens his argument by the encomiums that are given to Lucretia. He reaſons *ad hominem*, againſt the Heathens, and alledges to them the laws of their own tribunals. Theſe laws would have obliged them to puniſh a man, who had killed Lucretia. You would therefore be obliged, continues he, to puniſh her, if ſhe was accuſed before you, of having killed herſelf. But if ye anſwer, that it is impoſſible to puniſh her, ſince ſhe is not in being, why do you accumulate ſo many praiſes upon the murtherer of a virtuous perſon? ‘ Sed quid eſt hoc, quòd in eam graviùs vindicatur, quæ adulteriùm non admiſit? Nam ille patriâ cum patre pulſus eſt: hæc ſummo eſt mactata ſupplicio. Si non eſt illa impudicitia, qua invita opprimitur; non eſt hæc juſtitia, qua caſta punitur. Vos appello, Leges judiceſque Romani. Nempe poſt perpetrata facinora, nec quemquam ſceleſtum indemnatum impunè voluiſtis occidi. Si ergo ad veſtrum judicium quiſquam deferret hoc crimen, vobiſque probaretur, non ſolùm indemnatam, verùm etiam caſtam & innocentem interfectam eſſe mulierem; nonne eum qui id feciſſet, ſeveritate congrua plecteretis? Hoc fecit illa Lucretia, illa, illa ſic prædicata Lucretia innocentem, caſtam, vim perpeſſam Lucretiam inſuper interemit. Proferte ſententiam. Quòd ſi propterea non poteſtis, quia non adſtat quam punire poſſitis, cur interfectricem innocentis & caſtæ tanta prædicatione laudatis (41)? I do not pretend to juſtify thoſe who would ſay, in favour of this lady, that St Auguſtin has condemned her by principles ſhe did not know; for ſhe was ignorant of the axioms of the Chriſtian religion, which forbid the attempting upon our own lives: She might therefore have compained of being brought before ſuch a tribunal: ſhe might have declined the juriſdiction, and appealed to her natural judges, to thoſe ideas of grandeur and heroical glory, which have perſuaded ſo many people, that it is better to die, than to live in diſgrace. But, as I have already ſaid, this is an anſwer which I ſhall not concern myſelf with; I chuſe rather this other reflexion. The Roman magiſtrates, whom St Auguſtin ſpeaks to, and demands for judges of the queſtion, might have quickly undeceived him, by ſhewing that, the laws, which gave no authority to private perſons over one anothers lives, debar not any one the privilege of diſpoſing of his own. Do not you know, they might have ſaid, in what admiration the Cato's, the Brutus's, the Caſſius's, and ſo many other illuſtrious Romans, have ever been, who preferred death to a life, that would have made them witneſſes of the oppreſſion of liberty, or expoſed them to

(33) Louis Guyon, Diverſes Leçons, Tom. III, livr. iv, chap. xiv.

(34) *See, above, remark [B] of the article* LEOVITIUS.

† S. Ambr. ad virg. lapſam, cap. v.

‡ S. Tho. ad Coloſſ. cap. iii, lect. i.

(35) Juan de Torres, Philoſophia Moral de Principes, lib. xix, cap. viii, pag 577.

(36) Livius, lib. i, cap. lviii.

(37) *Note*, That this would not prevent his action being conſtrued a true rape, and puniſhable according to the rigour of the laws made againſt the raviſhers of the ſex.

(38) Tenuitque fugam rapuitque pudorem. *Ovid. Metam. lib.* i, *ver.* 600.

(39) Plane hic ille eſt qui mihi in Epidauro primus pudicitiam perpulit. *Plaut. in Epidico, Act. IV, Sc. I. ver.* 14.

(40) Ego me, etſi peccato abſolvo, ſupplicio non libero. Nec ulla deinde impudica exemplo Lucretiæ vivet. *Livius, ubi ſupra.*

(41) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. i, cap. xix, pag. m. 68.

to the diſcretion of their enemies, or a languiſhing condition? Are you ignorant with what elogies that courage of Porcia (42), and Arria (43), have been crowned? Are you ignorant, that we have ſeen, with ſome diſpleaſure, that Cleopatra, who had diſhonoured herſelf by her debaucheries, ſhould have the glory ſhe did not deſerve of preferring death before the diſgrace of being led in triumph?

> \- - - - Quæ generoſiùs
> Perire quærens, nec muliebriter
> Expavit enſem, nec latentes
> Claſſe citâ reparavit oras.
> Auſa & jacentem viſere regiam
> Vultu ſereno fortis, & aſperas
> Tractare ſerpentes, ut atrum
> Corpore combiberet venenum,
> Deliberatâ morte ferocior:
> Sævis Liburnis ſcilicet invidens,
> Privata deduci ſuperbo
> Non humilis mulier triumpho (44).

> *But ſhe deſign'd a nobler fate,*
> *And falling would appear as great*
> *As when ſhe ſingly fill'd the throne,*
> *No fears betray'd,*
> *Nor fled to coaſts unknown,*
> *To live ſecure, or meanly beg for aid:*
> *Her falling throne with ſmiling look*
> *She boldly ſaw; ſhe dar'd provoke*
> *Fierce ſerpents rough with poyſ'nous trains*
> *To dart their tongues,*
> *And fill her dying veins;*
> *Grown furious now, on death reſolv'd ſo long:*
> *The ſtout Liburnian ſhips, the fame,*
> *And laſting glory of her ſhame,*
> *She envy'd: ſhe a ſoul too proud,*
> *Too haughty to be ſeen*
> *Amongſt the private crowd*
> *And grace a triumph leſs than Egypt's queen.*
>
> CREECH.

In a word, are you ignorant how the reſolution of private perſons has been admired, or even of whole towns, of periſhing by precipice or fire, rather than to fall into their enemies hands? the nation, whom you look upon as the favourite people of the true God, blamed not Saul, it's firſt king, and one of the valianteſt princes of his age, for having prevented, by killing himſelf, the diſgrace of falling into the hands of the conqueror (45). His ſucceſſor, one of your greateſt prophets, did nevertheleſs give him the greateſt praiſes (46). Do not the books of the ſame nation give the ſame praiſes to a heroe, who imitated the action of king Saul (47)? And after this, will you tell us, *whoever ſhould have killed Lucretia, would have been puniſhable; and therefore ſhe is puniſhable for having killed herſelf?* Learn to reaſon better, and remember, that the maxims of the nobleſt and moſt auguſt ſect that ever was among the Greeks (48), favour this lady's proceeding.

It is certain St Auguſtin took a wrong method in recurring to the maxims of the Heathens, as a rule for the condemnation of Lucretia. I know well enough, that they were not all of the opinion of the Stoics, and there were ſome great Philoſophers, who condemned ſelf murder. I know alſo, that it has been ſaid, that it was rather cowardice, than a proof of courage, to forego life, to be rid of trouble and pain; and that a man, who reſolves to ſtruggle long with his ill fortune, diſcovers as much firmneſs as he who kills himſelf, ſhews weakneſs. I know, I ſay, there have been many among the Heathens, who have been of this opinion; but they wanted on their ſide glory and luſtre: they were only conſidered as the populace: the other faction was the nobility, the diſtinguiſhed party, the ſchool of heroiſm; and it might be repreſented to them, that, like counterfeit bravoes, they aſſumed honourable names, and gave the names of conſtancy and intrepidity to an exceſſive love of life, and an exceſſive fear of death. They were ſo fond of life, that nothing was able to give them a diſguſt of it: diſhonour, poverty, the moſt ſtinking dungeons, the moſt inveterate diſeaſes, did not disfigure it in their eyes (49); It appeared to them amiable even in this equipage. Death was not able to put on any diſguiſe that could conceal the leaſt feature of it's ugly face. This, might they ſay, was the principle of that great courage of which they gloried, and which made them conſider the action of Lucretia, as the effect of cowardice: *Flaqueza de animo*, ſaid the Jeſuit, John de Torres in the paſſage above cited.

A CONFUTATION of St Auguſtin's dilemma.

Let us now examine St Auſtin's dilemma. 'Ita hæc cauſſa ex utroque latere coarctatur, ut ſi extenuatur homicidium, adulterium confirmetur; ſi purgatur adulterium, homicidium cumuletur: nec omnino invenitur exitus, ubi dicitur, Si adulterata, cur laudata? ſi pudica, cur occiſa (50)?—— *This caſe has it's difficulties on each ſide, ſo that if the murder be extenuated the adultery is confirmed; if we acquit her of adultery, ſhe muſt be charged with murder: nor can we any way anſwer this charge, viz. If ſhe was an adultereſs, why is ſhe praiſed? if chaſt, why did ſhe kill herſelf.*' He pretends, that this lady's murder cannot be extenuated, without aggravating the adultery, nor her adultery extenuated, without aggravating her murder. But to ſhew that he had not diligently examined this matter, it ſuffices to ſay, that his argument proves too much; for by a like reaſoning, we ought to blame a perſon, who deſerves great praiſes. It ſometimes happened, that in the firſt ages, very pious young women, who were conſecrated to celibacy, for the ſervice of God, were violated. This is but too common a caſe at preſent; and we daily hear the ſtory of an abbeſs, who, with her Nuns, had paſſed thro' the hands of an Iriſh company in Piedmont, and who made her complaints to Monſieur de Catinat. Let us ſuppoſe, that a Nun ſhould, in this caſe, contract ſuch a melancholy, as might bring upon her a mortal diſtemper. Let us ſuppoſe that the teſtimony of her conſcience, fortified with the ſtrongeſt conſolations that a Divine could give, were unable to relieve her. Let us ſuppoſe ſhe had conceived ſuch a value for the purity of body and mind, that the bare idea of the moſt involuntary defilement, ſhould caſt her into an inſupportable affliction of which ſhe ſhould die: would not this be a convincing proof of an exquiſite chaſtity? Would not her innocence and virtue ſtand in a clear light? Whereas, if we follow St Auguſtin's dilemma, as much as you give to her affliction, you take from her chaſtity, *ſi pudica, cur mortua?* You ſee then, that there is more ſubtilty, than ſolidity, in this Father's argument: and thus you ſee Lucretia perfectly ſcreened from St Auguſtin's attacks, except in reſpect of the murder; for if ſhe had died of grief only, both he, and the other fathers of the church, had, by this kind of death, confirmed the praiſes of her incomparable chaſtity.

One of the odd conceits, which Balzac attributes to his Barbon, is this. 'Another word, miſunderſtood in the hiſtory of Dion, made him calumniate Lucretia's chaſtity, that is, throw dirt on the fineſt flower of antiquity, and ſully the chief ornament of riſing Rome. And although the reputation of ſo honeſt a lady had come down pure to our times, this accuſer of virtue had the impudence to oppoſe his ſingle judgment to the teſtimony of all ages: and to diſpute that heroin the poſſeſſion of her glory, by an impertinent accuſation. He pretends, that Tarquin began indeed by force, but ended by perſuaſion; that Lucretia would not give her conſent to the crime, but ſhewed ſome reſpect to his quality; and that, after ſhe was vanquiſhed ſhe was won, and the remorſe of conſcience, for the ſin ſhe had committed, as much as a reſentment of the affront, made her reſolve not to ſurvive her diſhonour (51).'

The pretence, which the hiſtorian Dion might furniſh theſe ill-natured people with, conſiſts in his ſaying Lucretia, was worked upon to ſuffer voluntarily Tarquin's enjoying her. Ἠνάγκασεν αὐτὴν ἑκοῦσαν ὑβρισθῆναι: *Coegit eam* NON INVITAM *ſtuprum pati* . . . . (52). Διὰ μὲν οὖν ταῦτ' οὐκ ἄκουσα δὴ ἐμοιχεύθη. *Eam igitur ob Cauſam* NON INVITA *adultero ceſſit* (53). The learned critic, who has publiſhed ſeveral fine fragments of Dion, blames him for offering ſo cruel an injury to Lucretia, as ſaying, that ſhe was not diſhonoured againſt her will (54); he pretends that this is ruining all that was ſerious and grave in the narration of this adventure: and that ſuch a fact, having brought on a famous re-oppoſed this opinion by ſome remarks, which will deſerve to be diſcuſſed [*E*]. Father le

---

(42) *See* Valer. Maximus, lib. iv, cap. vi, n. 5.

(43) *See Pliny*, Epiſt. xvi, lib. iii.

(44) Horat. Od. xxxvii, lib. i.

(45) 1 Sam. xxxi, 4.

(46) 2 Sam. i.

(47) 2 Maccab. xiv. 42. *See alſo in Joſephus*, de Bello Jud. lib. vii, cap. xxxiv, xxxv *the ſpeech of Eleazar, and it's effect.*

(48) *That of the Stoics.*

(49) *See the verſes of Mecænas*, in Seneca, Epiſt. ci, pag. m. 414.

(50) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. i, cap. xix, pag. 69.

(51) Balzac, pag. m. 88, 89, *of the* Barbon.

(52) Dio, in Excerptis à Valeſio editis, pag. 574.

(53) Id. ibid. pag. 576.

(54) Graviſſima injuria Lucretiam afficit Dio qui eam minime invitam cum adultero commixtam eſſe ſcribit. *Valeſius, Not. in Excerpta Dionis, pag.* 81.

volution in Rome; and being, as it were, the hinge on which the hiſtory of the Roman people turns, it ought to have been treated in a very ſerious way, that it might appear, that the Romans, who had lived under a kingly government ever ſince the foundation of their city, did not aboliſh that form of government without a very juſt provocation. So that he ſhould not have ſaid, that Lucretia voluntarily ſuffered Sextus to ſatisfy himſelf, for this was next door to the crime (55); but that ſhe was forced, by a dagger at her breaſt. This critic adviſes us to compare the narrative of Dion with that of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, which he thinks much inferior to that of Diodorus Siculus (56); but, he adds, the beſt of all is that of Livy.

Whatever admiration I may have for the profound learning and judgment that appears in the writings of Henry Valeſius, I cannot here be of his opinion. It ſeems to me that nothing is wanting in Dion's relation, as to the point of gravity; and I think Lucretia's chaſtity is as well ſet forth there as in any other hiſtorian, and in all the circumſtances that can raiſe our idea of it. The words, ἑκοῦσα, οὐκ ἄκουσα, ſignify nothing but what Livy and Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus and others give us clearly to underſtand. They only ſerve to ſhow a circumſtance which no hiſtorian has omitted, *viz.* that Sextus did not make uſe of direct force, as when a woman defends herſelf as much as ſhe can with her hands, and feet, and teeth, *&c.* But Dion gives us nevertheleſs to underſtand, that there was ſomething voluntary in Lucretia's patience, juſt as the moſt covetous man throws his merchandizes into the ſea voluntarily, when there is no other way of ſaving his life, which is ſtill more precious to him than his riches. All the world judges, that he who enjoys a woman after he has threatned to kill her, or to put her to the rack, or to ſome other terrible puniſhment, has effectually forced her; and that he ought to be puniſhed as a raviſher; and no body can ſay, that this woman ſuffered this willingly: Her conſent is like that of a man who walks, but only does it, becauſe they hold a ſword to his breaſt, and are ready to kill him, or to drag him along with a rope about his neck, if he does not walk. I am perſuaded that Dion would have uſed the ſame words ἑκοῦσα οὐκ ἄκουσα, *non invita.* If he had deſigned to expreſs what difference there is between a woman who chuſes to walk rather than to ſuffer herſelf to be dragged along, and a woman who rather chuſes to be dragged along than to walk. Let them no more therefore ſay this Hiſtorian has injured Lucretia.

[*E*] *It has been ſaid ..... that religion had no ſhare in this action of Lucretia. A learned man has oppoſed this opinion by ſome remarks, which deſerve to be diſcuſſed.*] Three obſervations have been made in the *Miſcellaneous Thoughts upon Comets.* I. That *for the three firſt ages of antient Rome, the modeſty, frugality, and chaſtity of women* were very remarkable; and there were ſome who manifeſted a very lively ſenſe of honour (57). II. That this ſenſe of honour *could not be inſpired into the Roman women by the religion they profeſſed; ſince it was neceſſary, to that end, that their religion ſhould teach them, that immodeſty was diſpleaſing to the gods: but far from that it taught them the contrary, that the gods themſelves were exceſſively leud* (58). III. That, *if Lucretia had loved chaſtity from a principle of religion; or, which is the ſame thing, if ſhe had loved it in obedience to God, ſhe would never have conſented to Sextus's deſires; but have rather choſen to abandon her reputation to calumny, than her body to adultery. However this ſhe did not do. She couragiouſly reſiſted this prince's purſuit, though he threatned to kill her. But when he threatned to expoſe her reputation to eternal infamy, ſhe granted his deſires, and afterwards killed herſelf. This is an evident proof, that ſhe loved nothing in virtue, but the glory that attended it; and that ſhe had not in view the pleaſing of her gods; for they who would pleaſe God, would chuſe rather to be reckoned infamous by men, than commit a crime. It muſt therefore neceſſarily be confeſſed, that Lucretia's religion contributed nothing to her chaſtity; and that, in that reſpect, ſhe had been the very ſame as ſhe was, tho' ſhe had never heard there was any gods at all* (59).

Mr du Rondel publiſhed in 1685, ſome reflexions upon a chapter of Theophraſtus (60), which I have read over and over again with great pleaſure. The place, where he makes the elogy and apology for Lucretia, chiefly charmed me, as having always been an admirer of this illuſtrious lady: and if the ſubject could have ſuffered it, I would have pleaded her cauſe no leſs in the *Miſcellaneous Thoughts on Comets,* than in the preceding remark. I therefore heartily applaud all that Mr du Rondel alledges in her juſtification, except what relates to the motives of religion. He makes two learned reflexions upon this point; one (61), ‘that the leud gods were not thoſe who were worſhipped (62) in antient Rome;’ the other, that ‘if Lucretia (63) was willing for ſome moments, to ſurvive her honour, it was, becauſe ſhe was forced to it by her religion, and was accountable for her reputation, before the Eumenides (64). She could not diſcharge her duty without calling her huſband, her father, and the reſt of her relations, and expoſing her miſfortune to them to the leaſt circumſtances; and then killing herſelf before them, in confirmation of the truth of what ſhe had ſaid. A Poet, whoſe name is not known, has hit upon this thought:

Quum foderet ferro caſtum Lucretia pectus,
  Sanguinis & torrens egrederetur, ait:
Accedant teſtes, me non faviſſe tyranno
  Ante virum ſanguis, ſpiritus ante Deos.
Quàm benè, producti pro me poſt fata, loquentur;
  Alter apud Manes, alter apud Superos.

When chaſt Lucretia pierc'd her tender ſide,
Thus ſhe exclaim'd, while flow'd the purple tide;
That no conſent my ſpotleſs mind did know,
To men, my blood, to heaven, my ſoul ſhall ſhow;
Thus my ſad fate my innocence ſhall prove,
To late poſterity and powers above.

‘But I muſt here illuſtrate what I ſay, concerning the tribunal of the Eumenides. This is the account of it. According to the antient Theologiſts, man was compoſed of a ſoul, a body, and a ſhade. At death the ſoul was reſtored to heaven, where the thoughts were examined before the Diræ; the body was reſtored to the earth, where the actions were examined before the Furiæ; and the ſhade was reſtored to hell, where the reports that had been ſpread of us were to be accounted for, and that before the Eumenides. Ne Lucretia, *ſays an antient author* (65), Caſtitatis famam deperderet, quippe quam ſine Purgatione futuram eſſe cernebat, invita turpibus imperiis paruit. *Lucretia, fearing ſhe ſhould loſe the reputation of her chaſtity, which ſhe ſaw would happen unleſs ſhe juſtified herſelf, ſubmitted therefore, tho' againſt her will, to his baſe deſires.*’ It was neceſſary there ſhould be witneſſes, and blood, to be cleared from calumny, and to appear with impunity before the Eumenides; or reſolve to be damned to all the ſerpents of infamy, which was one of theſe goddeſſes, *tertia Pœnarum Infamia.* Thus, Sir, Lucretia has ſatisfied her religion, and is more commendable than has hitherto been imagined; ſince, with the ſtab of the dagger, ſhe made an expiatory ſacrifice, which ſtopped the mouth of ſlander, and cleared her a glorious way to the Elyſian fields.’

Nothing can be more properly alledged, to confirm the firſt of theſe obſervations, than what is found in Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, concerning the laws of Romulus. This prince, the founder of Rome, borrowed from the Greeks the beſt inſtitutions they had for divine ſervice, but rejected the fables, the Antients had divulged concerning the crimes of their gods, and ſuffered not any thing to be aſcribed to thoſe divine natures unbecoming the ſupreme felicity. Τοὺς δὲ παραδεδομένους περὶ αὐτῶν μύθους, ἐν οἷς βλασφημίαι τινές εἰσὶ κατ' αὐτῶν ἢ κατηγορίαι, πονηροὺς καὶ ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ ἀσχήμονας ὑπολαβὼν εἶναι, καὶ οὐχ ὅτι θεῶν ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγαθῶν ἀξίους, ἅπαντας ἐξέβαλε, καὶ παρεσκεύασε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους κράτιστα περὶ θεῶν λέγειν τε καὶ φρονεῖν, μηδὲν αὐτοῖς προσάπτοντας ἀνάξιον ἐπιτήδευμα τῆς μακαρίας φύσεως.

Ceterum

(55) Hoc enim proximum culpæ eſt. *Id. ibid.*

(56) Diodorus Siculus, in iiſdem excerptis, pag. 253.

(57) Penſées diverſes, ſur les Cometes, chap clxxx, pag. 557.

(58) Ib. pag. 559.

(59) Ib. pag. 560.

(60) *See the abſtract of it in the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Decemb. 1685, Art. V, pag. 1341, & ſeq.

(61) Du Rondel, Reflexions upon a chapter of Theophraſtus, pag. 94, & ſeq.

(62) Ib. pag 96.

(63) Ib. pag. 97.

(64) Ib. pag. 99.

(65) Servius, in Virgil. Æneid. lib. viii, ver. 646.

le Moyne will furniſh me with ſome thing. He is one of thoſe who have made an apology for

Ceterum fabulas de ipſis a majoribus traditas, probra eorum continentes ac crimina, improbas cenſuit, inutileſque ac indecentes, & ne probis quidem viris dignas, nedum diis ſuperis : repudiatiſque his ominibus, ad bene ac præclare de diis ſentiendum & loquendum cives ſuos induxit, nihil eis affingi paſſus quod beatæ illi naturæ parum eſſet conſentaneum (66). He expreſsly obſerves, that the Romans did not teach, that Cœlus was caſtrated by his children, or that Saturn devoured his; or that Jupiter, having dethroned Saturn, threw him into Tartarus, or that the gods had been at wars, or had been wounded in them, or that they had been ſlaves among men. This whole paſſage of the Hiſtorian is very remarkable: we ſee in it, that Romulus eſtabliſhed a religion, not as a man educated among ſhepherds, but as an excellent Philoſopher, and a thouſand times a better Theologiſt, than the magiſtrates of Greece. Nevertheleſs, the other Hiſtorians, even they, who, like Livy, were more intereſted than Dionyſius, in Romulus's glory, have been ſilent upon this article; which ſilence is ſurpriſing and unaccountable. But let us obſerve, that this author, who particularizes ſo many things, rejected by the firſt king of the Romans, does not take notice that he had baniſhed what concerned the adulteries of the gods. Let us alſo ſay, that he falſly advances, that they did not ſpeak of the caſtration of Cœlus, or the dethroning of Saturn, *&c.* How durſt he affirm things ſo falſe ? Did he not know, that the Romans had adopted all the chimeras of the Greek Mythology (67)? Why did he not content himſelf with ſaying, that, during the firſt ages of Rome, they gave no credit to them ? Be it how it will, though we grant what he ſays of Romulus, we cannot thence infer, that our Lucretia was perſuaded, that the gods were very chaſt.

The tradition, that Romulus was the ſon of Mars, and of the veſtal Sylvia, was, doubtleſs, very antient in Tarquin's time; for this veſtal had declared, when ſhe was with child, that a god was the father of it (68). It was Romulus's intereſt that this fable ſhould be believed, in order to ſcreen the honour of his mother, and give himſelf a cœleſtial origin. This was moreover well ſuited to the temporal intereſts of the city he had built; which is probably the reaſon why he, rejecting the other fables of the Greeks, did not intimate, that the amours of the gods were to be excluded. Let us then be perſuaded, that, in Lucretia's time, one of the articles of the faith of the Roman people, was, that Mars got Sylvia with child, when ſhe went to fetch water, for the divine ſervice, to the wood conſecrated to this god (69). So that Lucretia far from fearing to offend the gods, ſuppoſing ſhe ſhould commit adultery, ought to fear the being alone in ſome conſecrated wood, and imagine that her honour would run a great risk there, the god of the place being very likely to fall in love with her, and to force her, with ſo much the leſs ſcruple, as ſhe had never been a veſtal (70), as the mother of Romulus had. Note, that during the wars that Tarquin made with the Romans they built a temple to Caſtor and Pollux (71); that is, to two baſtards of the ſame Jupiter, whom they worſhipped in the Capitol; which is a juſtification, even in reſpect of antient Rome, of what is ſaid in the *Miſcellaneous Thoughts on Comets*, that religion did not teach, that leudneſs was diſpleaſing to the gods. Note alſo, that the firſt king of Rome, by forbidding to aſcribe to the gods what Greece imputed to them, intimated, that there were evil reports concerning their conduct. This, doubtleſs, would occaſion at leaſt the curioſity of informing themſelves what theſe ſlanders were: and we know, that in Tarquin's time, the oracle of Delphi was very well known at Rome (72). They had therefore an account of the religion of the Greeks; they knew the ſtories concerning the love-intrigues of the gods; and, as people eaſily believe what gratifies their paſſions, they eaſily gave credit to theſe diſcourſes, authorized by a learned and ingenious nation; and which furniſhed diſſolute men with ſo many apologies. We only imitate the gods, ſaid they privately, in the beginning; they were bolder afterwards, as the law of Romulus grew obſolete. We know, from the experience of the later ages, that the forbidding a book, wherein the amours and corruptions of a court are expoſed, prevents indeed the inhabitants of the country from diſperſing theſe ſcandalous ſtories, but not from thinking of them and believing them any more than before. Apply this to the ſubjects of Romulus, with reſpect to the proſcribing the Grecian fables: add too, that the building of the temple of Caſtor and Pollux, was, as it were, an authentic declaration of Jupiter's adulteries, and derogatory to Romulus's law (73). The husband to the mother (74) of theſe two deities, was, by this edifice, as ſolemnly declared a cuckold, as by a decree of the Amphictyones, or of the ſenate. Whence we muſt conclude, that the virtue and good morals, ſo conſpicuous among the Romans for the three or four firſt centuries, did not depend on the religion of the Heathens, but only on natural religion, *&c.*

But here is a dilemma. The religion, eſtabliſhed by Romulus, and which repreſented God as a moſt perfect being, either ſubſiſted intire in Lucretia's time, or was already corrupted by the fables of Greece. In the firſt caſe, Lucretia did not govern herſelf by the principles of her religion, ſince ſhe ſtood more in fear of what the world would ſay (75), than of God himſelf. In the ſecond caſe, ſhe governed herſelf by the ideas of virtue, and the love of chaſtity, which the notion of her gods did not give her. Let us now ſee what relates to the ſecond obſervation of our learned friend.

He muſt give me leave to ſay, that the learning he has ſhewn upon the diſtinction of the Diræ, the Furiæ, and the Eumenides, and ſo on, was above the comprehenſion of Lucretia, and all the other women of Rome or Athens. It was a piece of the moſt myſtical Theology then in being: the women had nothing to do with it; the Initiates did not come near it: only the old Adepti were to be inſtructed in this article. I queſtion whether Varro, the moſt learned of the Romans, and the Pontifex Caius Cotta (76), penetrated ſo far. But moſt certainly Lucretia did not know, that her acquitting herſelf in heaven and earth, before the Diræ and the Furiæ, was to no purpoſe, unleſs ſhe was furniſhed with the certificates, which the Eumenides demanded in hell. She did not therefore die, to provide herſelf with an anſwer to an examination, which ſhe had no idea of. The bare intereſt of her reputation, without the leaſt regard to religion, induced her to kill herſelf, as has been ſaid in the *Thoughts upon Comets*.

St Auguſtin underſtood very well this truth, and hath juſtly concluded, that Lucretia's conduct does not equal that of Chriſtian women, who, having ſubmitted to a like violence, comfort themſelves in God, the witneſs of their inward purity; and are far from refuting the ſuſpicions of men, by tranſgreſſing the laws of God. ‘ Quòd ſeipſam, quoniam adulterum pertulit, etiam non adulterata occidit, non eſt pudicitiæ caritas, ſed pudoris infirmitas. Puduit enim eam turpitudinis alienæ in ſe commiſſæ, etiam ſi non ſecum: & Romana mulier laudis avida nimiùm verita eſt, ne putaretur, quod violenter eſt paſſa cùm viveret, libenter paſſa ſi viveret. Unde ad oculos hominum mentis ſuæ teſtem illam pœnam adhibendam putavit, quibus conſcientiam demonſtrare non potuit. Sociam quippe facti ſe credi erubuit, ſi quod alius in ea fecerat turpiter, ferret ipſa patienter. Non hoc fecerunt Feminæ Chriſtianæ, quæ paſſæ ſimilia vivunt. Tamen nec in ſe ultæ ſunt crimen alienum, ne aliorum ſceleribus adderent ſua; ſi, quoniam hoſtes in eis concupiſcendo ſtupra commiſerant, illæ in ſe ipſis homicidia erubeſcendo committerent. Habent quippe intus gloriam caſtitatis, teſtimonium conſcientiæ: habent autem coram oculis Dei ſui; nec requirunt amplius, ubi quid rectè faciant, non amplius habent, ne devient ab auctoritate legis divinæ, cùm malè devitant offenſionem ſuſpicionis humanæ (77). —— *That tho' ſhe ſubmitted to the adulterer, yet without being an adultereſs, afterwards ſlew herſelf, was not the effect of her regard to chaſtity, but through a fear of ſhame. She could not endure the thoughts of a man's baſeneſs towards her, tho' ſhe was not baſe with him, and this Roman lady, too covetous of praiſe, was afraid, leaſt that violence which ſhe had ſuffered when alive, would be thought to be voluntary if ſhe ſtill lived; therefore ſhe reſolved to render that evident to the eyes of men by her death, which otherwiſe ſhe could never have made manifeſt to their minds, dreading to be thought an accomplice in the fact, if having been baſely uſed ſhe had*

(66) Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib. ii, cap. xviii, pag. 90.

(67) *See* Cicero, de Natura Deor.

(68) Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib. i, cap. lxxviii, pag m. 61.

(69) Id. ibid

(70) That is to ſay, a maid who had conſecrated her virginity to the goddeſs Veſta.

(71) Florus, lib. i, cap. xi.

(72) Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib. iv, cap. lxxv, pag. 2,4.

(73) I ſpeak thus to accommodate myſelf to thoſe, who might pretend that that law comprehended the article which Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus has not mentioned.

(74) Leda the wife of Tyndarus.

(75) Succubuit famæ victa puella metu. *Ovid. Faſtor. lib. ii, ver.* 810.

(76) One of Cicero's Interlocutors in his books *de Natura Deorum.*

(77) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. i, cap. xix, pag. 69.

for this lady, and he ſays, ſhe ſurpaſſed her own deities [*F*]. Let us not forget to obſerve, that as ſoon as Sextus was ſenſible of his paſſion for Lucretia, he reſolved to make uſe of force (*d*). This ſhews, either that, in thoſe times, married women were not uſed to be cajoled, or that the virtue of Lucretia ſhone ſo in her face and conduct that no body durſt hope for any favour (*e*). This ſhews alſo how the times change: for at preſent, princes, great lords, and all galants in general, think firſt of declaring their paſſion, and begin by cajoling. They think on nothing leſs than offering violence, as imagining they ſhall have no need of it. And if the worſt come to the worſt, this is their

‘ *patiently ſuſtained it. But Chriſtian women have not acted like her, for having ſuffered what ſhe did they are yet alive, deſiring not to revenge on their own bodies the crimes of others, nor to add new crimes to theirs, which they muſt have done, if, becauſe the enemies in the heat of their luſt had abuſed them, they had for ſhame murdered themſelves. For they enjoy within the glory of chaſtity from the teſtimony of their conſciences. They have this alſo in the ſight of God; neither do they require any more; but chooſe to act ſo as not to offend againſt the divine law, rather than to do evil to avoid the ſuſpicions of men.*’ If inſtead of following the Roman genius, which thirſted after the praiſe of men (78), ſhe had conformed to the precepts of ſound religion, ſhe had choſen to die by the hand of Sextus, rather than ſuffered him to do what he did. She cannot therefore be juſtified at the bar of religion? but if ſhe is judged at the tribunal of human glory, there ſhe will come off with flying colours. For if, on one hand, life was leſs dear to her than chaſtity; ſhe ſacrificed, on the other, to a fair reputation, what ſhe preferred before life itſelf. All this centered in ſelf-love; but had ſhe been a Chriſtian, I ſay, a thorough Chriſtian, ſhe would have acted otherwiſe, and from a principle of divine love. The Spaniſh Jeſuit, above-cited, ſtates her duty aright, and oppoſes to her the anſwer of Lucia, a Chriſtian woman. ‘ Mal ſe eganno Lucrecia, y ſi tuviera tanto valor de animo como hermoſura, con el primero reparara el danno que la hizo la ſegunda. No ſon violadas, dize Sant Baſilio *, hablando de las virgines: *Quæ vim paſſæ ſunt non conſentiente ad voluptatem anima, imo integram atque incorruptam ſponſo ſuo & fide & virginitate inclytam, majori cum gloria & laude obtulerunt.* Eſto no ſabia Lucrecia, y ſi lo entendia, cegoſe con el puntillo de la honra, y todo lo perdio. De manera, que por medio de la muerte, quedo muerta: y por temor de la honra quedo deſhonrada . . . . . . Quanto mas, que reſpondio muy bien otra no Lucrecia Romana, ſino Lucia Chriſtiana, al Preſidente Paſchaſio, que ſobre el meſmo punto dixo, la pondria en el lugar de las mugeres rameras, para quæ qualquiera la infamaſſe, y el Eſpiritu divino de que ſe preciava la deſamparaſſe: *Si invitam juſſeris violari, caſtitas mihi duplicabitur ad coronam* (79). ——— *Lucretia was much miſtaken, and if ſhe valued herſelf as much for her courage as for her beauty, with the firſt ſhe repaired the miſchief which was cauſed by the ſecond.* They are not defiled (*ſays St Baſil, ſpeaking of the virgins*) who have ſuffered violence when their ſoul did not conſent to the luſt; on the contrary, they have offered themſelves with greater glory and praiſe, like pure and faithful virgins to their ſpouſe. *Lucretia was ignorant of this, and if ſhe knew it, ſhe was blinded by the point of honour, and loſt both her life and honour. How much more to the purpoſe was the anſwer not of the Roman Lucretia, but of the Chriſtian Lucia to the preſident Paſchaſius, who, in the ſame caſe, ſaid, he would ſend her among the moſt abandoned women that any one might defile her, and the holy ſpirit on which ſhe valued herſelf ſhould forſake her:* If you order violence to be offered me againſt my own conſent, my chaſtity will merit a double crown.’ There is one thing more, in which the Chriſtian women St Auguſtin ſpeaks of, excelled her. She had her choice of death or conſenting: they were not allowed this option (80). Tyrants, perſecutors, and ſoldiers, made uſe of violence, without propoſing the alternative. Being reduced to this condition, all the defence they had was a denial of conſent, and repugnance of will; for what would the reſiſtance of arms and hands have ſignified? As for the reſt, we muſt preſume as much in favour of Lucretia, as in favour of them, that is, reject the ſurmiſes St Auguſtin has ſuggeſted concerning this Heathen lady. Who knows, ſays he, but ſhe was conſcious of ſome kind of conſent, which might be the reaſon of her killing herſelf? ‘ Quid ſi enim, (quod ipſa tantummodo noſſe poterat), quamvis juveni violenter irruenti, etiam ſua libidine illecta conſenſit, idque in ſe puniens ita doluit, ut morte putaret expiandum? Quamquam nec ſic quidem occidere ſe debuit, ſi fructuoſam poſſet apud deos falſos agere pœnitentiam. Verumtamen ſi fortè ita eſt, falſumque eſt illud, quod duo fuerunt, & adulterium unus admiſit, ſed potius ambo adulterium commiſerunt, unus manifeſta invaſione, altera latente conſenſione, non ſe occidit inſontem (81). —— *But ſuppoſing (which ſhe herſelf only could know) that tho' the youth committed violence on her, yet through her own luſt ſhe conſented, for which afterwards grieving ſhe thought it could be expiated only by death? Yet in this caſe ſhe ought not to have put herſelf to death, if by any penitence her falſe gods might in her opinion have been appeaſed. But if this be true, then the other notion is falſe, that though two were concerned in the crime, one only committed adultery, rather both committed adultery, one by open force, the other by ſecret conſent, in this caſe ſhe did not kill herſelf without guilt.*’ Theſe are unreaſonable ſuſpicions. We ought to believe, that her ſoul loſt nothing of it's purity; and that ſhe was violently robbed of an immaculate chaſtity (82), according to the litteral meaning of Brutus's words in Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus. Note, that we may reaſonably ſuppoſe, no body had ever known young Tarquin's exploit, if Lucretia had not revealed it.

[*F*] *Father le Moyne . . . . has made an apology for this lady, in which he ſays ſhe ſurpaſſed her own deities.*] I have ſeen, ſays he (83), the action brought againſt her memory, ‘ and the ſentence which is annexed to it in St Auguſtin's books *de Civitate Dei*. I have ſometimes heard, in declamations, that one of the moſt heroic and ſtrict ladies of her ſex (84) had pleaded againſt her; and I confeſs, that if ſhe were to be judged by the Chriſtian law, and the rules of the goſpel, ſhe would find it very difficult to juſtify her innocence . . But if ſhe be removed from this ſevere tribunal, where Pagan virtue finds no footing, ſhe is out of danger of being condemned: if ſhe is judged by the laws of her own country, and the religion of her time ſhe will be found to be the chaſteſt of thoſe who then lived, and the moſt reſolute of all the Heathens. The noble and virtuous Philoſopher, who accuſes her ſo often, would pardon her misfortune, and reconcile himſelf to her, and every body muſt confeſs, that her crime was leſs her fault, than the imperfection of the Roman law, which had not regulated it rightly, and the ſcandals of her religion, which had only given her ill examples: and truly the law of that country, in thoſe times, was only ſuperficial and out-ſide . . . As for the Roman religion which exalted ladies of pleaſure to the rank of goddeſſes, and offered ſacrifices to adulterers, it could not be expected that it ſhould keep women virtuous or chaſt. In this, Lucretia, nay, the raviſhed Lucretia, was better than the gods of Rome. It was not the love of pleaſure, or the fear of death, that made her tranſgreſs: It was the love of honour, and her extreme apprehenſion, that ſhe ſhould loſe it. And if ſhe had not the reſolution of Suſannah, who neither yielded under the fear of death, or infamy; it is ſufficient to ſay in her excuſe, that ſhe did not believe in Suſannah's God: and the miracle had been too great, if a Pagan had equalled one of the ſublimeſt virtues of the faithful. Were it not for the law and grace, what could the faithful do? We need not therefore ſcruple to praiſe Lucretia . . . . . Not being able with her hands to reſiſt an armed force, ſhe repulſed it in thought, and her ſoul raiſed itſelf as much as poſſible to avoid the ſtain of impurity, with which her body was defiled (85).’

(*d*) Ibi Sextum Tarquinium mala libido Lucretiæ PER VIM ſtuprandæ capit. *Liv. lib. i, cap. lvii.*

(*e*) *Confer above, citat.* (10) *of the article* JUDITH.

(78) Vincet amor patriæ laudumque immenſa cupido. *Virgil. Æneid. lib. vi, ver.* 824.

* S. Baſil. lib. de Ver. Virg.

(79) Juan de Torres Philoſophia Moral de Principes, lib. xix, cap. viii, pag. 577.

(80) Chriſtianis fœminis in captivitate compreſſis alieni ab omni cogitatione ſanctitatis inſultant. *Auguſt. ubi ſupra.*

(81) Ib. pag. 68.

(82) Τὴν ἀμίαντον ἀφαιρεθεῖσα αἰδῶ μετὰ βίας. Impolluta pudicitia per vim ſpoliata *Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib. iv, cap. lxxxvi, pag.* 274. Theſe words confute the criticiſm of Henry Stephens.

(83) Father le Moyne Galerie des Femmes Fortes, pag. 188, 189. Dutch Edit. 1660.

(84) I ſhould be glad to know who this perſon is that Father le Moyne means here.

(85) Ib. pag. 290.

their laſt ſhift; whereas it was the only one of the eldeſt ſon of Tarquin, a potent king at that time. He made his firſt declaration of love, with a ſword in his hand, and with the threats of death in his mouth.

LUCRETIUS, commonly called, *Titus Lucretius Carus* [*A*], was one of the beſt poets of his age. He was born, according to Euſebius's Chronicle, in the ſecond year of the CLXXIſt olympiad [*B*], and killed himſelf in the forty fourth year of his age; that is, he killed himſelf in the 702d year of Rome. He had a philtre given him, which threw him into a phrenzy. During this madneſs he had ſome lucid intervals, in which

[*A*] *Titus Lucretius Carus.*] Lambinus conjectures, that our Poet was either of the family of the Lucretii ſirnamed Veſpillo, or of the family of the Lucretii ſirnamed Ofella; and that the ſirname Carus was a fourth title, denoting either his admirable genius, or the ſweetneſs of his temper, or ſomething of this kind (1). He produces ſome inſtances of other perſons, who had two ſirnames. The baron des Coutures goes farther (2), and affirms, as an undoubted fact, that *Lucretius was ſirnamed Veſpillo, or Ofella; becauſe, in all appearance, he derived his pedigree from one of theſe two families.* The ſame Lambinus conjectures, that Lucretius was either brother, or couſin-german, to the two orators, Cicero ſpeaks of, one ſirnamed Veſpillo, and the other Ofella; or elſe to Lucretius Veſpillo, mentioned by Julius Cæſar. This laſt Lucretius was a ſenator, but that hinders not but he might be a near relation to our Poet; for there were families, in which ſome raiſed themſelves to the ſenatorial dignity, whilſt others remained in the rank of knights. To prove this, Lambinus makes uſe of a falſe ſuppoſition: he ſays, that if Cicero's brother had not aſpired to great employments, there would have been an inſtance of two brothers, one of which was a ſenator, the other only a knight; but he owns, that this was not the caſe of Cicero's brother. 'Finge ex his duobus fratribus alterum ſe ad honorespetendos, & Remp. gerendam contuliſſe: alterum luce populari carere, ſuum negotium agere, intra pelliculam ſe continere voluiſſe (quod tamen ſecus factum eſt) ſed finge ita eveniſſe, procul dubio is qui ædilitatem majorem, præturam, conſulatum adeptus eſſet, ut Marcus, Senatorii ordinis factus eſſet: ille alter qui nullum Magiſtratum geſſiſſet, in equeſtri ordine manſiſſet (3).' The baron des Coutures goes ſtill further, and affirms, that our Lucretius *always continued in the Equeſtrian order; and that Cicero, who enjoyed the moſt conſiderable dignities of the republic, had a brother, Quintus Tullius, who never roſe higher than the degree of a knight.*

[*B*] *He was born in the ſecond year of the CLXXIſt Olympiad.*] It is a pretty current opinion (4), that Lucretius was born twelve years after Cicero, in the conſulſhip of Lucius Licinius Craſſus, and Quintus Mutius Scævola, in the 658th year of Rome. The baron des Coutures (5) is the firſt I know of, who places the birth of Cicero twelve years later than that of Lucretius: and yet he places the birth of each under the conſulſhips fixed upon by other writers. Here Lambinus falls into three errors. He ſays that Euſebius has placed Lucretius's birth in the CLXXIſt Olympiad; that is, in the conſulſhip of Cn. Domitius Ænobarbus, and Caius Caſſius Longinus, in the 657th year of Rome; and that others place it in the CLXXIId Olympiad; that is, in the conſulſhip of L. Licinius Craſſus, and Q. Mutius Scævola, in the year 658: from whence it follows, *ſays he*, that this Poet was twelve or eleven years younger than Cicero, who was born in the conſulſhip of Q. Servilius Cepio, and C. Attilius Seranus. I. Euſebius places Lucretius's birth in the ſecond year of the CLXXIſt Olympiad. Now Domitius Ænobarbus, and Caſſius Longinus, were conſuls the year before. II. Their conſulſhip, and that of Licinius Craſſus, and Mutius Scævola, do not belong to the CLXXIId, but to the CLXXIſt Olympiad. It is ſomewhat ſtrange, that Lambinus ſhould ſo careleſsly determine the Olympiads CLXXI and CLXXII, by the years 657 and 658 of Rome. III. Since the conſulſhip, in which Cicero was born, falls in with the 647th year of Rome, he ought to have ſaid, that Lucretius was ten or twelve years younger than Cicero, and not twelve or eleven. Gifanius, and his copyer, Daniel Pareus (6), placing Lucretius birth in the 658th year, are in the wrong to make him precede Cicero by twelve years.

I have reckoned up eight faults in eight lines of Father Briet (7). He will have Lucretius born in the ſecond year of the CLXXVth Olympiad, and that year to be the 543d of Rome. He will have Lucretius die in the 584th year of Rome, at thirty ſix years of age, or rather forty, in the conſulſhip of Pompey and Craſſus; and that this was the year, in which Virgil aſſumed the *Toga Virilis*: laſtly, he pretends that St Jerome ſays, that Lucretius killed himſelf at forty years of age. Let us ſum up his faults. I. He ſhould have placed the birth of Lucretius in the CLXXIſt Olympiad, and not in the CLXXVth. II. The Olympic year he mentions, anſwers to the 674th year of Rome, and not to the 543d. III. It is abſurd to ſay, that a man who was born in the year 543, and died in 584, died at thirty ſix years of age; this, I ſay, is abſurd, though he corrects it by theſe words, *or rather at the age of forty*; for beſides that, he ſhould have ſaid forty one, and not forty, ſuch a disjunctive ought never to be uſed, *as at thirty ſix or forty*, when it is certain that the firſt part of the propoſition is falſe. This is Father Briet's caſe. He poſitively fixes Lucretius's birth to the 543d year of Rome, and his death to the 584th: he ought not therefore to have advanced two different opinions concerning his term of life. IV. As Craſſus and Pompey were twice conſuls together, it is a fault, ſimply, to obſerve, that ſuch a thing happened in the conſulſhip of theſe two men: he ſhould have ſpecified under which conſulſhip. V. Craſſus and Pompey were conſuls the firſt time in the 683d year of Rome, and not in 584. VI. He ſhould either not have mentioned Virgil at all, or have ſaid, as Donatus does, that this Poet took the *Toga Virilis* the ſame day that Lucretius died. The point of ſingularity conſiſts in the ſameneſs of the day: and this Father Briet enervates, by barely obſerving, that Virgil took the *Toga Virilis* the ſame year Lucretius died. VII. It was in the ſecond conſulſhip of Craſſus and Pompey, that Virgil took this robe, and in the 698th year of Rome (8); he ought not therefore to have placed Lucretius's death in the 584th year. VIII. St Jerome has plainly ſaid, that Lucretius killed himſelf in the forty fourth year of his age. *Propria ſe manu interfecit anno ætatis quadrageſimo quarto* (9). Add to theſe eight faults, that which Father Briet has committed a little after, in ſaying, that Ovid gave Lucretius the epithet divine.

> Carmina divini tunc ſunt peritura Lucreti,
> Exitio terras cum dabit una dies.

> *Sublime Lucretius wrote with ſo much fire,*
> *That his bright work ſhall with the world expire.*

It is *ſublimis*, and not *divini*, in Ovid (10). Gaſſendus was ſtrangely miſtaken about the paſſage of St Jerome: he thought the year of the death of Lucretius had been ſpecified in it, and not that, of his birth; which made him conclude, that Lucretius was older than Zeno the Epicurean, whoſe auditors Cicero and Atticus had been (11). Mr Creech has placed Lucretius's birth in the 659th year, and his death in the 702d; and pretends, that Virgil was born the ſame day Lucretius died; which would make a Pythagorean believe, that Lucretius's ſoul tranſmigrated into Virgil's body. *Vix abſoluto opere moritur, eo ipſo die quo natus eſt* Virgilius; *& aliquis* Pythagoreus *credat* Lucretii *animam in* Maronis *corpus tranſiiſſe, ibique longo uſu & multo ſtudio exercitatam Poëtam evaſiſſe* (12). This is a conſiderable fault; for we muſt hence conclude, that Virgil wrote his Ecloges at eight or nine years of age. Thus you ſee how the moſt learned men confound their ideas. They change the day that Virgil took his *Toga*

Virilis,

---

(1) Cum ad commune totius familiæ cognomen aut Veſpillonis, aut Ofellæ, cognomen Cari acceſſiſſet, vel propter ingenii magnitudinem ac præſtantiam, vel propter morum ſuavitatem, & comitatem, vel propter aliquid tale. *Lambinus, in Vita Lucretii.*

(2) In the Life of Lucretius, prefixed to his French tranſlation of this Poet, printed at Paris, 1685.

(3) Lambinus, ubi ſupra.

(4) *Lambinus, Giſanius, Daniel Pareus*, in Vita Lucretii, *approve it.*

(5) In the Life of Lucretius.

(6) The Dauphin's commentator, having printed before his Lucretius, the Life of this Poet by Daniel Pareus, ought to have known, that, bating ſome few defalcations, it is word for word, that which was compoſed by Giſanius.

(7) De Poëtis Latinis, pag. 9.

(8) Decimo ſeptimo anno ætatis virilem togam cepit, illis Conſulibus iterum quibus natus erat. Evenitque ut eo ipſo die Lucretius poëta diſcederet. *Donatus, in Vita Virgilii.*

(9) In Chronic. Euſebii.

(10) Ovid. Amor. lib. i. Eleg xv, ver. 23.

(11) Aliquanto Vetuſtior, ſed Romæ fuit T. Lucretius Carus; obiit enim juxta Euſebium Olympiade CLXXI. cum ageret annum ætatis quadrageſimum tertium. *Gaſſend. de Vita Epicuri, lib. ii, cap. vi.*

(12) Thom. Creech, in Præf. Lucretii.

which he compoſed his ſix books *de Rerum Natura* [*C*], where he learnedly explains Epicurus's Phyſics. The ſame Chronicle informs us, that this work was corrected by Cicero after the death of the author [*D*]. Never any man denied the Divine providence with more boldneſs [*E*] than this Poet; and yet he has acknowledged ſome I do not know what cauſe which delights in the overthrow of human greatneſs [*F*].

And

Virilis, into that of his birth. Lambinus made the ſame blunder (13).

If we judged by the ſtyle, we might eaſily conclude, that Lucretius was older than Cicero; but that rule would be fallacious. How many authors have we younger than Balzac, who wrote in old French, whilſt Balzac wrote eloquently and politely? however, I have read in ſome Moderns, that Lucretius preceded Cicero. ' Paulo antiquior fuit, Terentio Varrone, & ' M. Tullio, ut quidam ſcripſerunt. —— *He lived ſome* ' *time before Terentius Varro, and Cicero, as ſome have* ' *wrote*.' Theſe are the words of Crinitus (14). Charles Stephens, Lloyd, and Hofman, have exactly copied him; but Decimator, copying him without well-placing the commas, has uttered a groſs falſhood. ' Lucretius, *ſays he* (15), Poëta latinus paulo antiquior ' Terentio, Varrone & M. Tullio. —— *Lucretius, the* ' *Latin Poet, was a little older than Terence, Varro,* ' *and Cicero*.' In another book (16) he had barely ſaid, that Lucretius was more antient than Terence and Cicero. A famous Engliſhman (17), whom I frequently cite, will have Lucretius to be cotemporary with Cicero and Varro, but ſomewhat older. He puts in the margin, that Lucretius flouriſhed 105 years before Jeſus Chriſt. Now, according to him, the birth of Jeſus Chriſt falls in the 751ſt year of Rome (18), he believes therefore, that our Lucretius flouriſhed in the 646th year of Rome. He muſt therefore fix his birth about the year 620. In which he deviates far from the common opinion, and from that of St Jerom. Lambinus's Life of Lucretius, in the edition I make uſe of (19), imports, that he died in the forty third year of his age, in the third conſulſhip of Pompey, in the 751ſt year of Rome, the day that Virgil was born. Of the two faults, which are notorious in this account, one is, doubtleſs, a fault of the preſs (20), and the other of the author. Lambinus, inſtead of the day that Virgil took the *Toga Virilis*, has put his birth-day; and, though we ſhould rectify him thus far, yet we could not clear him of an error, for it was in Pompey's ſecond conſulſhip that Virgil took the *Toga Virilis*, in the year 698 (21).

[*C*] *During this madneſs, he had ſome lucid intervals, in which he compoſed his ſix books* de Rerum Natura.] They who ſhall read in Thuanus (22), that Taſſo was ſubject to great fits of madneſs, which hindered not his writing excellent verſes, will not think incredible what we here ſay of Lucretius. ' Amatorio po- ' culo in furorem verſus, quum aliquot libros per in- ' tervalla inſaniæ conſcripſiſſet (23). —— *Falling mad* ' *by taking a love potion, he compoſed ſome books in* ' *his lucid intervals*.' Some believe, that Statius alluded to this madneſs, when he ſaid *& docti furor arduus Lucreti* (24); but others think, that he only meant his Poetic Enthuſiaſm, and that he alluded to theſe words of Lucretius's firſt book: *ſed acri Percuſſit thyrſo laudis ſpes magna meum cor*. See Barthius upon theſe words of Statius.

[*D*] *Euſebius informs us, that this work was corrected by Cicero, after the death of the author*.] Father Briet ſeems to believe it, ſince he uſes theſe words: ' In ſuis verſibus, duris quidem, ſed valde Latinis, & ' Tullii lima digniſſimis. —— *His verſes are difficult* ' *indeed, but his Latin is pure, and worthy the re-* ' *viſal of Cicero*.' Some think (25), he only meant, that Lucretius's poems *had need of Cicero's file*; but others believe his meaning is, that they do honour to Cicero, by whom they were corrected; or that it plainly appears, they received the finiſhing ſtroke from this great man.

[*E*] *Never any man denied the divine providence with more boldneſs*.] He ſets out with this impious exordium.

Omnis enim per ſe Divûm natura neceſſe eſt
Immortali ævo ſumma cum pace fruatur,
Semota à noſtris rebus, ſejunctaque longè.
Nam privata dolore omni, privata periclis,
Ipſa ſuis pollens opibus; nihil indiga noſtri,
Nec bene promeritis capitur, nec tangitur ira (26).

For whatſoe'er's divine muſt live in peace,
In undiſturb'd and everlaſting eaſe:
Not care for us, from fears and dangers free,
Sufficient to it's own felicity:
Nought here below, nought in our pow'r it needs;
Ne'er ſmiles at good, ne'er frowns at wicked deeds.

CREECH.

He goes on, with giving infinite praiſes to Epicurus, who courageouſly attacked religion, and triumphed over it.

Humana ante oculos fœdè cum vita jaceret
In terris oppreſſa gravi ſub relligione:
Quæ caput à cœli regionibus oſtendebat,
Horribili ſuper adſpectu mortalibus inſtans:
Primum Grajus homo mortaleis tollere contrà
Eſt oculos auſus, primuſque obſiſtere contra:
Quem nec fama Deum, nec fulmina, nec minitanti
Murmure compreſſit cœlum: ſed eo magis acrem
Virtutem inritat animi, confringere ut arcta
Naturæ primus portarum clauſtra cupiret.
. . . .
Quare relligio pedibus ſubjecta viciſſim
Obteritur; nos exæquat victoria cœlo (27).

Long time men lay oppreſs'd with ſlaviſh fear,
Religious tyranny did domineer,
Which, being plac'd in heav'n, look'd proudly down,
And frighted abject ſpirits with her frown.
At laſt a mighty one of Greece began
T' aſſert the nat'ral liberty of man,
By ſenſeleſs terrors, and vain fancies, led
To ſlavery; ſtrait the conquer'd fantom fled.
Not the fam'd ſtories of the Deity,
Not all the thunder of the threat'ning sky,
Could ſtop his riſing ſoul, thro' all he paſt,
The ſtrongeſt bounds that pow'rful nature caſt:
His vigorous and active mind was hurl'd
Beyond the flaming limits of this world,
Into the mighty ſpace, and there did ſee
How things begin, what can, what cannot be:
. . . .
Thus by his conqueſt we our right regain;
Religion he ſubdu'd, and we now reign.

CREECH.

He ſays, in the ſame book, that one of the things that moſt encouraged him, was the praiſe he hoped to deſerve, in treating of a ſubject quite new, and in breaking the fetters of religion.

Primum quod magnis doceo de rebus & arctis,
Relligionum animos nodis exſolvere pergo (28).

[*F*] *He has acknowledged ſome, I do not know what cauſe, which delights in the overthrow of human greatneſs*.] Having deſcribed the fear which ſeizes admirals at the approach of a tempeſt, he adds, that their vows are all in vain. So true it is, that a hidden force ſeems to ſport with the dignities of the earth.

Summa etiam cùm vis violenti per mare venti
Induperatorem claſſis ſuper æquora verrit,
Cum validis pariter Legionibus, atque Elephantis:
Non Divûm pacem votis adit? ac prece quæſit
Ventorum pavidas paces, animaſque ſecundas?
Nequicquam: quoniam violento turbine ſæpe
Correptus nihilo fertur minùs ad vada lethi:

Uſque

---

(13) See the end of this remark.

(14) De Poëtis Latinis, lib. ii, pag. m. 657.

(15) In Theſauro linguarum voce Lucretius.

(16) In Parte II, Sylvæ Vocabulorum, *printed at Francfort, in 8vo, in* 1591.

(17) Pope Blount, Cenſura Authorum, pag. 39.

(18) See what he ſays of the death of Cicero, pag. 40.

(19) It is that of the Dauphin's Commentator on Lucretius.

(20) 751 inſtead of 701. the Francfort edition of 1583, has 651.

(21) Donatus, in Vita Virgilii.

(22) Thuan. Hiſt. lib. cxiii, pag. 686, ad ann. 1595.

(23) Chron. Euſebii.

(24) Stat. Silv. VII, lib. ii, ver. 76.

(25) *See Baillet*, Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, Tom. II, pag. 89.

(26) Lucret lib. i, ver. 59.

(27) Ib. ver. 64.

(28) Ibid. pag. m. 30, ver. 930.

Uſque adeo res humanas VIS ABDITA quædam
Obterit, & pulchros Faſceis, ſævaſque Secureis
Proculcare, ac LUDIBRIO SIBI HABERE videtur (29).

Beſides, when winds grow high, when ſtorms increaſe,
And ſcatter war-like navies thro' the ſeas;
When men for battle arm'd, muſt now engage
A ſtronger foe, and fight the water's rage:
Doth not the trembling gen'ral proſtrate fall?
And beg a calm of th' gods, or proſp'rous gale?
In vain, the ſtorms drive on, no off'ring ſaves;
All, ſhipwreck'd, drink cold death amongſt the waves.
And hence we fancy unſeen pow'rs in things,
Whoſe force, and will, ſuch ſtrange confuſion brings,
And ſpurns and overthrows our greateſt kings.

CREECH.

See here a Philoſopher, who, though he obſtinately denies a providence, and the power of fortune (30), and attributes all things to the neceſſary motions of atoms; a cauſe which knows not whither it tends, nor what it does: yet is forced, by experience, to acknowledge, in the courſe of events, a particular affectation of over-turning thoſe exalted dignities which appear among men. It is hardly poſſible not to diſcover this affectation, when we attentively ſtudy Hiſtory, or only the tranſactions of the countries within our own knowledge. A life, of any moderate length, ſuffices to ſhew us, how perſons, raiſed to the higheſt ſtations, by a ſwift courſe of good ſucceſſes, fell back again into their primitive nothing, by a like courſe of unproſperous events. All proſpered with them formerly, but nothing at preſent: they are daſhed by a thouſand ſtorms, which ſpare moderate conditions, though ſtanding, as we may ſay, in the ſame road with them. It is againſt them that fortune ſeems exaſperated; it is their ruin ſhe ſeems to have conſpired, whilſt ſhe ſuffers others to eſcape. I do not wonder then, that Lucretius perceived ſuch an affectation as this, inexplicable by his principles, and very hard to be explained by any other ſyſtem. For it muſt be confeſſed, that the phænomena, in the hiſtory of man, caſt the Philoſophers into no leſs perplexity, than thoſe in the hiſtory of nature. That which is moſt conſpicuous in the hiſtory of man, is that viciſſitude of exaltation and abaſement (31), I elſewhere ſpoke of (32), and which, as Æſop ſays, is the ordinary exerciſe of providence. How ſhall we reconcile this with the ideas of a God, infinitely good, infinitely wiſe, and director of all things? can the infinitely perfect being delight in raiſing a creature to the higheſt pitch of glory, on purpoſe to hurl it, ſome time after, to the loweſt degree of infamy? would not this conduct reſemble that of children, who no ſooner have built a caſtle of cards, but they undo and over-throw it again? this, you will ſay, is neceſſary, becauſe men abuſing their proſperity, grow ſo inſolent, that their fall muſt be a puniſhment for the ill uſe they have made of the favours of Heaven, a conſolation to the miſerable, and a leſſon to thoſe whom God ſhall favour hereafter. But were not it better, will another ſay, to mix with ſo many favours, the grace of not abuſing them? inſtead of ſix great ſucceſſes, only give four; and add, as a compenſation for the two others, the ability to uſe them well. It will no longer be neceſſary either to puniſh the inſolent, or comfort the miſerable, or inſtruct the man deſigned for exaltation. The firſt thing a father would do, if it were in his power, would be to ſupply his children with the gift of rightly uſing all the goods he ſhould beſtow on them; for without this, the other gifts are rather a ſnare than a favour, when it is conſidered, that they ſhall produce a conduct, the puniſhment whereof muſt be exemplary to others: beſides that, the uſefulneſs of theſe examples is not ſeen: all generations hitherto have had need of this leſſon; and there is no probability that future ages ſhould be more exempt from this viciſſitude, which Æſop ſpoke of, than the preceding ones. Thus this viciſſitude of good and evil, bears not the character of a being, infinitely good, wiſe, and immutable. I know a thouſand reaſons may be thought on to ſolve theſe difficulties, but as many replies may be invented: the mind of man is more fruitful in objections, than anſwers: ſo that it muſt be acknowledged, that, without the lights of revelation, Philoſophy cannot unravel the doubts that are drawn from the hiſtory of man. It is the province of Divines, and not of Philoſophers, to explain this. The Heathen Poets had recourſe to an hypotheſis, which paſſed very well with the people: They pretended, that among that multitude of deities who had a ſhare in the government of the world, there were ſome envied the happineſs of men; and who, to aſſuage the gnawing of this envy, left no ſtone unturned to ruin thoſe men. Hence Paganiſm was particularly careful to appeaſe theſe envious gods; and the goddeſs Nemeſis, who was repreſented at the head of them, had as great a ſhare as any other deity, in the worſhip and honours of religion: and even when a man was thought to be humbled, as much as theſe envious powers could wiſh, he ſtill moſt humbly beſought them to ceaſe their perſecution.

Vos quoque Pergameæ jam fas eſt parcere genti,
Diique Deæque omnes, quibus obſtitit Ilium & ingens
Gloria Dardaniæ (33).

Let it ſuffice that deſtiny thus far
Has perſecuted Troy: and all ye gods,
And goddeſſes, to whom the Dardan ſtate
And glory ſhone obnoxious . . . .

TRAPP.

If this hypotheſis were once admitted, it might eaſily be explained, how human grandeur is more expoſed to the inſults of fortune, than moderate conditions; and every one might underſtand the cauſe of that affectation, which Lucretius himſelf could not deny. Now, of all the ſyſtems of Philoſophy, there is none ſo irrecoverably over-whelmed with the difficulties I ſpeak of, as that of Epicurus. Lucretius did not know what to fix upon; he could neither employ the hypotheſis of the Poets, nor any kind of morality; for he allowed not the gods any ſhare in the government of the univerſe, nor acknowledged in our world any inviſible being, which knew or willed any thing; conſequently his *vis abdita quædam* is a convincing argument againſt himſelf. By it he overthrew his own principles.

I ſhall obſerve, by the way, that it had been very eaſy for him to reconcile the exiſtence of what people called, *Fortune, Nemeſis*, good and evil genii with his own ſyſtem. He might have left the gods in the ſtate, in which he conceived them, content with their own condition, and enjoying a ſupreme felicity, without concerning themſelves with our affairs, without puniſhing evil, or rewarding good, *&c.* but he might ſuppoſe, that certain collections of atoms, to which he had given what names he pleaſed, were capable of jealouſy, with reſpect to man; as alſo of labouring inviſibly in ruining exalted fortunes. I have often wondered, that neither Epicurus, nor any of his followers, ſhould conſider, that the atoms which form a noſe, two eyes, ſeveral nerves, a brain, have nothing more excellent in them, than thoſe which go to the making a ſtone (34): and therefore it is very abſurd to ſuppoſe, that every collection of atoms, which makes not a man or a beaſt, ſhould be diſtitute of knowledge. He who denies the ſoul of man to be a ſubſtance diſtinct from matter, reaſons childiſhly, unleſs he ſuppoſes, that all the univerſe is animated; and that there are every where ſome particular thinking beings; and that, as there are ſome, which do not equal men, ſo there are others which exceed them. On this ſuppoſition, plants and ſtones, would be thinking ſubſtances. It is not neceſſary, they ſhould have a ſenſation of colours, ſounds, ſmells, *&c.* but it is neceſſary, they ſhould have another ſort of knowledge: and, as theſe would be ridiculous to deny there were any ſuch beings as men, who do them a deal of miſchief, who pluck them up by the roots, who cut and break them in pieces; as, I ſay, they would be ridiculous to deny this, under pretence that they do not ſee the arm or ax which ſmote them; ſo the Epicureans are moſt ridiculous, in denying, that there are beings in the air, or elſewhere, who know us, who do

EPICURUS ſhould have allowed ſpirits, if he had reaſoned conſequentially.

---

(29) Idem, lib. v, ver. 1225.

(30) You muſt underſtand here by Fortune, a deity which acts with knowledge, but is whimſical, malicious, unjuſt, imprudent, *&c.*

(31) Quidquid in altum Fortuna tulit ruitura levat modicis rebus longius ævum eſt. *Seneca, in Agam.* The *Polyanthea* at the word *Fortuna*, is full of ſuch ſentences.

(32) In the article ÆSOP, remark [*I*].

(33) Virgil. Æneid. lib. vi, ver. 63.

(34) Compare this with what has been ſaid in the article HOBBS, remark [*N*].

morals [*G*]. Had he as attentively conſidered the accidents which befel private perſons, as he did thoſe which happen to the great, he might perhaps have diſcovered ſome I do not know

us ſometimes evil, ſometimes good; or who are inclined, ſome to deſtroy, others to protect us: I ſay, the Epicureans would be very ridiculous to deny this, under pretence, that we ſee no ſuch beings. They have no good reaſon to deny Witchcraft, Magic, the Larvæ, the Spectres, the Lemures, Hobgoblins, familiars, and other things of this nature. It is more allowable in thoſe who believe the ſoul to be diſtinct from matter, to deny them; and yet I know not by what prepoſterous turn of mind, they who believe the ſoul of man to be corporeal, are the readieſt to deny the exiſtence of demons.

[*G*] *His work is intermixed with ſeveral fine maxims againſt ill morals.*] A learned critic, who has laboured to explain this poem, as much as any man whatever, gives it this teſtimony: ‘ Ambitionem etiam ſuæ ætatis graviſſimis verſibus libro tertio & quincto reprehendit (*Lucretius*). Quam ſanctis denique fuerit moribus Poëta teſtis eſt locupletiſſimus opus graviſſimum, multiſque præclaris ad bonos mores conformandos adhortationibus illuminatum (35). —— *The pride and ambition reigning in his age, he* (*Lucretius*) *reproves in the moſt ſevere verſes in his third and fifth books. In fine, to what a ſanctity of manners our Poet attained, his excellent work is a ſufficient teſtimony, every where abounding with the moſt elegant exhortations to a moral life.*’ So that we know not what to think of that Jeſuit, who durſt affirm, that all the world is agreed, concerning Lucretius's ill morals, which, adds he, are but too manifeſtly expoſed in his book (36). Upon the teſtimony of this Jeſuit, Mr Baillet had reaſon to ſay (37), ‘ that ſome have found fault with Lucretius for not diſſembling, more than he did, his own corrupt morals, and ſo much the more, as he had leſs need to expoſe them.’ But it is certain this Jeſuit is in an error; and that there is nothing in the poem *de Rerum Natura,* whence it may be reaſonably inferred, that the author was a man of a diſſolute life; ſo far is he from glorying in the corruption of his own morals. I confeſs, he explains ſome things, concerning generation, in very obſcene terms: but do not our moſt eſteemed and moſt virtuous Phyſicians do the ſame, in the books where they treat of theſe matters, and ſeveral others? Read Mr Menjot's diſſertations, who was a Proteſtant, and a perfectly honeſt man: read, I ſay, his diſſertation *de Sterilitate,* where you will find Lucretius's verſes, preceded by an explication, which, to ſay no worſe, comes not behind the verſes themſelves. ‘ Cauſis etiam ſterilitatis annumeratur incompoſitus inter coeundum motus, dùm ſcilicet clunibus & coxendicibus ſublevatis lumborum criſpitudine fluctuat, ſivè, ut dixit Martialis †, *vibrat ſine fine pruriens laſcivos docili tremore lumbos* fœmina *οἰφόλις* (Latini criſſare, Græci πτερυγίζειν appellant) unde belluæ à naturâ edoctæ in congreſſu citrà *σόβησιν* quietæ perſtant. Lucretius ‡, quem neſcias utrumne inter Poetas an inter Philoſophos numeres, hanc rationem reddit,

Nec molles opu' ſunt motus uxeribus hilum,
Nam mulier prohibet ſe concipere atquè repugnat,
Clunibus ipſa viri Venerem ſi lata retractet
Atquè exoſſatô ciet omni pectore fluctus.
Ejicit enim ſulci rectâ regione viâque
Vomerem, atque locis avertit ſeminis ictum.
Idque ſuâ causâ conſuerunt ſcorta moveri
Nè complerentur crebrò, gravidæque jacerent (38).

There is a great difference betwixt the Poets, who publiſh obſcenities in the way of Catullus and Ovid, and thoſe who are forced to uſe obſcene words, in explaining the effects of nature. Lucretius muſt be reckoned in this laſt claſs; and conſequently his expreſſions cannot be brought as a proof againſt his morals. The caſe is quite different as to Catullus, and ſuch as he, who publiſh obſcenities only to give the hiſtory of their amours, or excite people to the moſt filthy debaucheries. In a word, Lucretius is a Poet who was a Natural Philoſopher, and the others are the authors of verſes on galantry: it is lawful for him to make uſe of the Phyſicians ſtile. But obſcenity is intolerable in love-verſes. I mention not the poem, in which the abbot Quillet *gives rules for getting handſome children* (39). I am not ignorant how Mr Baillet blames him (40); therefore I forbear ſaying, that, if a Chriſtian Poet, a Poet who is an eccleſiaſtic (41), is not excluded from the number of men of probity, on account of the deſcriptions he has given *upon the ſubject of generation* (42), Lucretius ought not to be excluded.

I will not take advantage of Dionyſius Lambinus's teſtimony. He is an author, who, deſigning to prove by examples, the modeſty wherewith the antient Poets deſcribed what concerns the venereal exerciſe (43), alledges, amongſt other paſſages, that of Lucretius above-cited (44). ‘ Ad genera verecundiora redeo. Pindarus Apollinis cum Cyrena concubitum narrans, ita tectis verbis utitur, ut ne virginales quidem aures eis offendi poſſe videantur hoc modo, ἦρα καὶ ἐκ λεχέων κεῖρεν μελινδέα ποίαν, *&c.* id eſt, licet ne ex ejus cubili ſuavem herbam tondêre? & ibid. de Antei filia, quam pater optimè currenti præmium propoſuerat. Χρυσοςεφάνυ δὲ οἱ ἥβας καρπὸν ἀνθήσαντ' ἀποδρέψαι ἤθελον; id eſt, curſores autem florentem ei pubertatis aureæ fructum decerpere volebant. Lucret. lib. 4. in extr. de muliere motum adhibente in concubitu, *Ejicit enim ſulci recta regione, viaque Vomerem, atque locis avertit ſeminis ictum* (45). — *I return to the chaſter Poets. Pindar, deſcribing the commerce between Apollo and Cyrena, uſes ſuch words as might inoffenſively touch even a virgin's ear, thus: Is it not lawful to gather a fragrant herb out of it's bed. The ſame Poet, telling us, that Anteus, offering his daughter as a prize to the man who overcame in the race, ſpeaks thus of the deſires of thoſe who contended on this occaſion, the young men who run deſired to pluck the fruit of her golden youth. Lucretius, in his fourth book, deſcribing the motion of a woman in the act of love, ſays,* that by diverting the plow ſhe ſometimes cauſes the grain to fall in an improper place.’ The reaſon which hinders me from taking advantage of this teſtimony, is, that Lambinus had no very nice taſte upon this ſubject: for at preſent we ſhould think ſuch expreſſions, as he cites to be very groſs. One of Pindar's examples; contained in the words I have copied, anſwers to this Engliſh expreſſion; *they would rob her of the flower of her virginity.* The inſtances he cites from Homer (46) are for the moſt part as ſtrong as the expreſſions of *carnal copulation,* and *cohabitation*; which the country notaries do now make a ſcruple of inſerting, in the contracts for marriage, as was done heretofore. He moreover alledges theſe words of Horace, *Inachiam ter nocte potes*; where, ſays he, *verbum, in quo turpitudo & obſcænitas ineſt, tacetur.* — (*The verb in which the obſcenity lies is ſuppreſſed.* But tho' two Poets, natives of Vire in Normandy (47), have uſed the like ſuppreſſion, as Horace, in tranſlating theſe words, yet is the tranſlation obſcene. I omit to ſay, that the ode, whence Lambinus has taken this example of a modeſt conduct, furniſhes us with a quite contrary inſtance preſently after.

Inachiâ langues minûs, ac me.
Inachiam ter nocte potes: mihi ſemper ad unum
Mollis opus: pereat malè, quæ te
Lesbia, quærenti taurum, monſtravit inertem!
Cùm mihi Cous adeſſet Amyntas,
Cujus in indomito conſtantior inguine nervus,
Quàm nova collibus arbor inhæret (48).

We ſhall not therefore truſt to Lambinus, as not being a competent judge. What he calls chaſt and modeſt expreſſions, are intolerable, at preſent, in love-verſes, in a book of wit, in a ſermon, or a ſpeech. None but Phyſicians, or Advocates, or Hiſtorians, or Dictionary writers, *&c.* can juſtifiably employ them.

Let us conclude with a fine encomium, which an excellent commentator on Lucretius has lately given him. Nothing can better prove what I have affirmed in the text of this remark. ‘ Huic calumniæ ita profligatæ ſuccedit alia elatior aſpectu, & voce truculentior; clamitans veſanum eſſe, immodeſtum, impium, voluptatis magiſtrum, omni denique ſpurcitie, quæ decet porcum ex *Epicuri* grege, inquinatum: Ego verò nunquam animum meum inducere potui ut

‘ credam

---

(35) Giſanius, in Vita Lucretii.

(36) Sed de vitæ hujus annis ſcriptores minus conveniunt, de inſania omnes & turpiſſimis moribus, quos nimis prodidit in ſuis verſibus. *Philippus Brietius de Poët. Latinis, pag.* 10.

(37) Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, Tom. II, pag. 95.

† 5. Epigr. 79.

‡ Lib. iv.

(38) Antonius Menjotius, Diſſertat. Pathologicarum, Part. III, pag. 41. *See alſo his Diſſertation* de Furore uterino.

(39) *See Mr Baillet,* Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, Tom. V, pag. 61. *This poem of the abbot Quillet is intituled,* Callipædia.

(40) Ibid. & pag. 62.

(41) This is according to the ſuppoſition of Mr Baillet *See the article* QUILLET.

(42) Baillet, ubi ſupra, pag. 61.

(43) Libet huc annotare quam verecunde quam lectis verbis ſoleant poëtæ rei venereæ turpitudinem ſignificare. *Lambinus, in Horat. Ode V, lib. ii.*

(44) Citat. (38). It is in the fourth book, ver. 1263.

(45) Lambin ubi ſupra, pag. m. 128, 129.

(46) Εὐνῇ δ' οὔποτ' ἔμικτο. Lecto cum eæ nunquam commiſcebatur Μίγη φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ. Cum eo lectum habuit communem. *Lambin. ibid.*

(47) Robert and Antony le Chevalier d'Agneaux, brothers.

(48) Horat Epod. XII.

know what, which delight in moleſting meaner conditions; but perhaps he would alſo have rejected this hypotheſis [*H*], and have undertaken to explain this matter phyſically. They

'credam, *Pomponii Attici*, caſtiſſimi viri familiarem, utriuſque *Ciceronis* delicias, & eximium ſuæ ætatis ornamentum tot vitiis (de impietate aptior erit dicendi locus) fœdatum: Teſtes igitur quæro, ſed nullibi inveniam; ſcripta evolvo, at in illis omnia longe diſſimilia; multa adverſus metum fortiter, intemperantiam ſeverè, libidinem caſtè diſputantur, quæ hortari ad virtutes, ab avaritia, ambitione, luxuria poſſint deterrere plurima: & qui ad illius præcepta vitam moreſque componit, illum privati habebunt integerrimum amicum, civem Reſpublica (49). —— *To this profligate calumny, ſucceeds another higher in it's nature, and couched in ſeverer terms, he is clamorouſly ſaid to have been mad, immodeſt, impious, immerſed in pleaſure: in fine, to have been polluted with all the filth which might be expected on a ſwine out of Epirus's herd: for my part, I could never bring myſelf to believe, that the intimate friend of ſo chaſt a man as Pomponius Atticus, one who was the delight of both the Cicero's, and the ornament of the age in which he lived, could be covered with ſuch a multitude of vices, for as to his impiety, we ſhall find a properer place to ſpeak of it. I therefore enquired for witneſſes, but I could find none; I turned over his writings, in which every thing is of a contrary caſt; many fine things are ſaid to remove fear, many ſevere things againſt intemperance, he chaſtly diſputes againſt luſt, and as to what may exhort men to virtues, and deter them from avarice, ambition, and luxury, with ſuch paſſages his book abounds; and if any perſon conform himſelf to the precepts he gives for the regulation of life, private perſons will find in ſuch a one a valuable friend, and the public a good citizen.*'

The Jeſuit Poſſevin, full, as he is, of ſcruples, and as earneſt as he has been, in adviſing not to ſuffer ſtudents to read ſome places of Lucretius (50), is yet of opinion, that they ought to be ſhewn the fine precepts of morality, which are in this Poet, upon the contempt of death; the avoiding of love, and upon the means of bridling the paſſions, and of procuring the tranquillity of the ſoul. 'Non negaverim perlegi poſſe in Lucretio quæ de morte contemnenda, de amore fugiendo, de coercendis cupiditatibus, de ſedandis animorum motibus, de mentis tranquillitate comparanda .... diſputat (51).'

[*H*] *He might perhaps have diſcovered ſome, I do not know what, which took a pleaſure in moleſting meaner conditions; but perhaps he would alſo have rejected this hypotheſis.*] There are very few who have not taken notice that the world generally complains, that infirmity and death, ſeize the perſons that are deareſt to them, more commonly than indifferent or hated people. See ſuch a one, ſay they, he loved his wife and had good reaſon for it; he loſt her the ſecond year of their marriage, and is not to be comforted: and, while he laments this diſmal ſeparation, many huſbands have panted after a ſtate of widowhood for twenty years together, and are ſtill threatened with the long life of their wives. Obſerve this widow, how ſhe mourns night and day her good huſband, which was carried off by death in the flower of his age: a hundred other huſbands enjoy a perfect health for a great many years together, and ſhall live on ſeveral years longer, and perſiſt in abuſing their wives without cauſe. Should they happen to die, patience would be no longer neceſſary in their houſes: comfort, repoſe, and good houſewifery would there agreeably reign together; and therefore we ought to believe they will live long. A child is lately buried, an only ſon, the delight of his father and mother's heart: he was a youth of promiſing hopes, and worthy to ſucceed to the great eſtate he was born to; death has ſingled him out, amidſt a hundred others, whom ſhe has ſpared, and who are a burthen to their families. That worthy man, who made ſo good uſe of his parts, and riches, is lately dead. His life was very ſhort; he never enjoyed a day of health; and, if his conſtitution had been ſtronger, he would have done more ſervice to the world than he has done. He is dead, and twenty others in the neighbourhood are perfectly well, and never knew what ſickneſs is, who ſeek only to diſturb all the world beſides, and who abuſe their health, their wit, and their riches, to the oppreſſing of innocence, and ſcandalizing the public by a wicked life. Obſerve yon rogue, a vagabond, and profligate; he fell from the third ſtory, and never hurt himſelf. A gentleman's ſon, an only ſon, an honeſt man, would have broken his bones with a much leſs fall. My readers will all own, that ſuch complaints are daily heard: and it is even a common ſaying, that the wiſhes of the public, for a wicked man's death, have a particular virtue to prolong his life. It would be eaſy to explain this, by the hypotheſis of theſe jealous, envious, and malignant deities, which the Heathens admitted. Sound Divinity may reaſon ſolidly hereupon; but what could Lucretius have ſaid.

If there were really deities, who repined at the proſperities of men, and delighted to mortify them, they would doubtleſs affect to deſtroy an only ſon in the flower of his age, a huſband tenderly beloved, a wife, who was the happineſs of her huſband; and, preſerve the life of a villain, who was a heart-breaking to his father and mother, and preſerve a huſband and wife, who were plagues to one another. Were they to put a family in mourning, they would chuſe out a child of the greateſt hopes, and moſt beloved; and were they to perſecute a pariſh, they would afflict ſuch as were the ſupport of it, by their charity and prudence; they would conſign them to the bed of ſickneſs, and afterwards to the grave; and protect the life of the wicked from all harm and danger. They would delight in mortifying the public, by preſerving the objects of their curſes, and ſpeedily deſtroying the objects of their hopes, the delights of mankind, the Marcellus's and Germanicus's. Conſider what Tacitus ſays, in deſcribing Germanicus's triumph, and the diſturbance that glorious day bred in the minds of thoſe, who remembered, that the favour of the Roman people brought ill luck. 'Augebat intuentium viſus eximia ipſius (*Germanici*) ſpecies, curruſque quinque liberis onuſtus: ſed ſuberat occulta formido reputantibus, haud proſperum in Druſo patre ejus favorem vulgi, avunculum ejuſdem Marcellum flagrantibus plebis ſtudiis intra juventam ereptum, breves & infauſtos populi Romani amores (52). —— *The ſight was enobled by the beauty of his (Germanicus's) perſon, and the appearance of his chariot with five children; but they were ſtruck with a ſecret fear, remembring that the favour of the people had been fatal to his father Druſus, that his uncle Marcellus was cut off immaturely on the ſame account, whence they inferred, that the love of the Romans was ſhort and ominous.*' Every one knows Virgil's reflexion, that Marcellus died young, that fate did but juſt ſhew him to the world, becauſe the gods thought, that Rome would be too potent, if it enjoyed him a long time.

Oſtendent terris hunc tantum fata; neque ultra
Eſſe ſinent: nimium vobis Romana propago
Viſa potens Superi, propria hæc ſi dona fuiſſent (53).

This wonder to the world muſt be but ſhown,
The Roman race had too much greatneſs known;
Had not the powers divine reſum'd their own.

It is very probable, that Virgil had in view the jealouſy attributed to the gods; but our divines reaſon in a manner infinitely more ſolid. They do not deny in general the diſtinctions, which a prophane and impious Heathen would have called an affectation to vex men, a reſpect of perſons, or even pure malice, and envy of fate: they find in theſe diſtinctions, a providence full of goodneſs, wiſdom, and juſtice. God ſeparates us from thoſe whom we love moſt tenderly: he does it with a deſign to diſ-unite us from the earth, and to teach us, that the true happineſs ought to be ſought in heaven. He ſuffers us to be long expoſed to domeſtic miſeries, in order to prove our patience, and to purify us in this crucible. He lengthens out the days of the wicked, in order to puniſh the ſins of men. They are the ſcourges of his juſtice; and no body ſuffers more than he has deſerved. Thus ſound Divinity finds nothing difficult in all this; but neither Lucretius nor Epicurus could have eaſily ſolved the difficulty. They might perhaps have denied the fact, and maintained, that the authors of the murmurs, complaints, and obſervations, we have ſeen above, compute wrong. It is cuſtomary for men not to reckon enough on one hand, and to reckon too much on

(49) Thomas Creech, in Præfatione Lucretii, Oxonii editi è Theatro Sheldoniano, 1695, in 8vo.

(50) Poſſevin. Biblioth. ſelecta, Tom. II, lib. xvii, cap. xxiii, pag. 432.

(51) Id. ibid. pag 433.

(52) Tacitus, Annal, lib. ii, cap. xli.

(53) Virgil. Æn. lib. vi, ver. 870.

They who have written his life affirm, that he was a very honeſt man (*a*). Some pretend that the invocation at the beginning of his poem [*I*] may afford us a proof of his contradicting

on the other. Let a wicked man, or a wicked husband die ſoon; this is preſently obſerved, but a man quickly forgets his reflexion upon it. But if an honeſt man, or a good husband, be nipped in the bud; this is attentively conſidered, and never forgotten, the memory being then a faithful regiſter. Perhaps as many children die, according to the wiſhes of their parents, as only idolized ſons. The death of the former makes no noiſe, it is but lightly reflected on; but the death of the other raiſes a thouſand out-cries and reflexions. Beſides this, we muſt know, that men are naturally more inclined to complain of their deſtiny, than commend it; and falſly imagine, on a thouſand occaſions, that their neighbours proſperity exceeds their own (54). There are ſome ſo ungrateful, and impertinent, as to ſay, *My ſon is dead of his wound; if he had been another man's ſon, he would have recovered.* Add, that Lucretius would have recourſe to his Natural Philoſophy. Wonder not, he would have ſaid, that a ſon, tenderly beloved, ſhould die ſooner than another, who had lived unregarded; the later grows robuſt, he hardens himſelf in all weathers; the other is ſoftened by his effeminate education, and the leaſt indiſpoſition carries him off. A young man of extraordinary parts is ſickly, and dies before he is thirty years old: a fool, a booby is never ſick, or at leaſt recovers from the violenteſt diſtemper, and lives to be very old. Have you kept a regiſter, would Lucretius anſwer, of all the learned of the firſt rank, who have lived to eighty; and of all the blockheads who have not attained to the age of man? reſume your counters, and calculate better, you will find your accounts are wrong. But after all, what wonder is it, that a great wit ſhould not be of a ſtrong conſtitution. His contexture is of a finer web of atoms, and therefore his reſiſtance to extraneous bodies muſt be very feeble. A clumſy peaſant is compounded of more maſſy and ſtrong wrought parts; and therefore muſt laſt the longer. If the atoms of the imagination are in a very rapid motion, they diſorder and ſhake the parts of the brain, opening breaches, by which there evaporates abundance of atoms, which are neceſſary to the maintaining of the organs. The machine muſt therefore neceſſarily wear itſelf out, and the principles of life quickly corrupt. Here is the explication of the axiom,

Immodicis brevis eſt ætas, & rara ſenectus (55).

Great wits, have ſeldom ſcap'd a ſudden fate,
And rarely age doth on their honours wait.

Telle eſt la loi du Ciel, nul excés n'eſt durable;
S'il paſſe le commun il paſſe promptement (56).

Such is the law of heaven, no exceſs
Endures, when once the common bounds it breaks.

Theſe anſwers, which I ſuppoſe Lucretius would have given, are far from accounting for all that is contained in the beginning of this remark.

[*I*] *The invocation at the beginning of his poem.*] The baron des Coutures obſerves (57), that ‘this invocation has ſurprized a great many of the learned, as being contrary to Epicurus's doctrine. Lambinus, *adds he,* cites a Florentine, who pretends to have found the reaſon of it, becauſe this Philoſopher, having maintained, that our crimes provoked not the anger of the gods, nor our good actions procured to us their favours. admitted however of prayers, and owned, that they heard thoſe of men.’ I do not examine, whether, from Epicurus's profeſſing to honour the gods, we may be allowed to conclude, that he profeſſed alſo to invoke them, and to expect they would hear his prayers. There is no conſequence between theſe two things. We may eſteem, reſpect, and venerate a being on the account of the perfection of it's nature, without addreſſing our prayers to it; for we might be perſuaded, that it concerned itſelf with nothing, and diſpenſed neither good nor evil. Nor yet do I trouble myſelf to enquire, whether Epicurus might not pretend to honour the Deity, only to ſecure himſelf from the puniſhments eſtabliſhed againſt Atheiſm. I refer my reader to a treatiſe of the learned Mr du Rondel (58). But I venture to affirm, that Lucretius did not invoke the goddeſs Venus, to conform himſelf to the principles this Florentine aſcribes to Epicurus, that the gods are worthy of our prayers, though they do not govern the world. ‘I am not of Lambinus's opinion, *(it is the baron des Coutures that ſpeaks)* (59) who applauds this Florentine; nor does he himſelf explain the thing better, by adding, that Lucretius, perhaps only addreſſed himſelf to Venus, according to the cuſtom of the Poets: and that it was not as a Philoſopher that he pretended her charms could obtain of Mars the peace which the Romans deſired; or perhaps that Epicurus, placing the ſupreme good in the abſence of pain, addreſſed himſelf to the miſtreſs of pleaſures; or, laſtly, becauſe ſhe was the mother of Æneas, from whom deſcended the founder of Rome: for my part, I maintain, that Lucretius did not depart from the notion of Epicurus, in the invocation of Venus, it being neither a Poetical flight, nor a Roman gratitude, but a Philoſophical reflexion. He did not look upon the miſtreſs of Mars to be a goddeſs, ſince he himſelf in the ſecond book ſays, that Bacchus and wine, Ceres and corn, are the ſame thing: nor did he any more imagine, that Mars was a god; but, as he had written a poem concerning the nature of things, could he better addreſs himſelf, than to generation, which he means by the mother of love; and whom all the Naturaliſts have acknowledged for that ſecret appetite, which is given to every ſpecies for it's propagation.’ This removes not the difficulty; for it is certain Lucretius conſidered Venus according to the ideas of thoſe, who took her for a goddeſs. He does not conſider her as the natural paſſion, which induces ſexes to unite: for in that notion, Venus is no more the mother of Æneas, than of Epicurus, and yet he firſt characterizes her by the epithet of *Æneadum genitrix.* That which, in my opinion, is moſt reaſonable to believe, is, that all this is only a piece of wit. Lucretius ſeeing all the Poets invoke the Muſes at the beginning of any great work, was not willing his Poem ſhould be deſtitute of an ornament of this kind: he therefore ſets out with an invocation of Venus, as the propereſt Deity for a Naturaliſt. But he no ways pretended, that this was an act of religion; or that Venus, whom he celebrates with ſo many praiſes, was an intelligent being: thus he has in another place invoked the Muſe Calliope (60), without pretending that he addreſſed himſelf to an intelligent being: he has not therefore acted againſt his own principles. I ſhould ſooner accuſe Lipſius, of committing an act of Heathen idolatry in the verſes he addreſſes to the planet Venus, in behalf of his garden (61), than aſcribe to our Lucretius an act of religion, from the prayer he addreſſes to the mother of Æneas. Note, that abundance of Chriſtian Poets, infinitely greater enemies to the Heathen gods, than Lucretius was, ſolemnly invoke the Muſes, or Bacchus, in their poems. This is imitating the Antients, and not performing an act of religion; for they have not a thought of invoking the deity. Note alſo, that this invocation of *Lipſius ad ſtellam Venerem*, and Lucretius's invocation have been compared, with a deſign to convict Lipſius of an impiety (62); but this it cannot be, unleſs we ſuppoſe his prayer was not a piece of wit (63). But it was no more.

For the reſt, the Florentine, mentioned by the baron des Coutures, is the learned Peter Victorius. Mr Minutoli acquainted me with it in 1693. Here are his words ſomewhat more at large than I gave them in the article EPICURUS (64). ‘There is in the ſame collection (65) at the 19th page, a letter of Petrus Victorius, to John della Caſa, archbiſhop of Benevento, which turns upon the queſtion, whether the Poet Lucretius, who, in the beginning of his poem, invokes Venus, does not in that contradict the doctrine of his patron Epicurus; and whether this is conſiſtent with the inactivity aſcribed to the gods, by this Philoſopher. Doth Mr du Rondel, whoſe work I have not read, and who endeavours to make an apology for Epicurus in this reſpect, mention this difficulty, or cite that letter?’ Tycho Brahe was conſulted upon this queſtion by Iſaac Pontanus, in

---

(*a*) *See the remark* [*G*].

(54) Fertilior ſeges eſt alienis ſemper in agris, Vicinumque pecus grandius uber habet. *Ovid de arte amandi, lib. i, ver.* 349.

(55) Martial. lib. vi, Epigr. xxix.

(56) *See the Letters of Buſſi Rabutin, Part. IV, Letter ccclxix, pag.* 479, *Dutch Edit.*

(57) *Remarks on the firſt book of Lucretius, at the beginning, pag.* 340.

(58) Jacob Rondellus, de Vita & Moribus Epicuri, Amſtelod. 1693, in 12mo. *See the article EPICURUS, remark* [*L*].

(59) *Remarks on the firſt book of Lucretius*, ubi ſupra, pag. 343.

(60) Tu mihi ſupremæ præſcripta ad candida calcis Currenti ſpatium præmonſtra callida muſa, Calliope, requies hominum, divumque voluptas; Te duce ut inſigni capiam cum laude coronam. *Lucret. lib. vi, ver.* 91.

(61) *You will find them at the end of the twenty ſeventh Letter of the firſt Miſcellaneous Century.*

(62) Georgius Thomſon, in Vindice Veritatis, pag. 3.

(63) Aut ergo tu ludis in precibus, & votis ad Venerem: aut Venus eſt tibi verus Deus. *Id. ibid, pag.* 2.

(64) *Citation* (117).

(65) *This is the volume of the Letters collected by John Michael Brutus.*

contradicting himſelf, and forſaking his ſyſtem in the very firſt line of his book. They would be in the right, if this invocation were any thing more than a poetical flight [*K*], by which he was willing to accommodate himſelf, in ſome ſort, to cuſtom. It may eaſily be ſhowed that he has, on ſeveral occaſions, adapted his ſtyle to the common way of

in the year 1596, and gave this judicious anſwer. ‘ Ad queſtionem illam jocoſam, *ſays he* (66), & nonnihil Criticam antiqui Lucretii, cum is ſectam Philoſophorum Deos eorumque providentiam inficiantium profiteretur, Venerem nihilominus, Æneadum genitricem, primordio ſui operis, ejuſque opem imploret, non habeo ſerio dicere, quomodo hæc reſolvenda ſit, ſi quidem non ad Veneris ſidus cœleſte, quod nos una cum ceteris ſubinde ſcrutamur, ſed ad terreſtrem illam Venerem, Æneadum, uti fingebant Poëtæ, matrem, & aliorum quoque hominum genitricem pertineat . . . . . . (67) Si quid tamen in his noſtri valent luſus, crediderim Lucretium ad imitationem aliorum Poëtarum ſic exorſum eſſe, non quod revera aliquam Deam, quæ Venus appellaretur, aut ulla alia numina ſtatueret. Ideoque ſub hoc nomine voluptatem corpoream, quam etiam Deum ſubinde nuncupare non veretur, intellexiſſe arbitror. ——— *As to that jocoſe, and in ſome meaſure critical, queſtion, concerning Lucretius, why he, who followed that ſect of Philoſophers, that deny the providence of the gods, invoked, notwithſtanding, the aid of Venus, the mother of Æneas in the beginning of his work. I know not what to ſay, ſeriouſly, in as much as it cannot be applied to the celeſtial planet Venus, which we, as well as others, obſerve, but to that earthly Venus, who, as the Poets feign, was the mother of Æneas, and of other men. . . . . However, if one may be allowed to offer ſomewhat in a ludicrous way, I ſhould think that Lucretius did this rather to imitate other Poets in his exordium, than that he believed Venus in reality to be a goddeſs, or that he allowed any other deities, I am therefore of opinion, that hereby he intended cenſual pleaſure, which elſewhere he does not heſitate to ſtyle a God.*’

[*K*] *They would be in the right, if . . . . . this invocation were any thing more than a poetical flight.*] Before we quit this ſubject, we muſt ſay, that had Lucretius invoked either Venus or Calliope, being perſuaded, that his prayer would procure him any aſſiſtance, he would have contradicted himſelf in a manner not only unworthy of a Philoſopher, but even of a man any way capable of reaſoning. For he ſcarce has finiſhed this pretended invocation to Mars's miſtreſs,

Nam tu ſola potes tranquilla pace juvare
Mortaleis : quoniam belli fera mœnera Mavors
Armipotens regit : in gremium qui ſæpe tuum ſe
Reficit, æterno devinctus vulnere amoris (68).

Peace is thy gift alone, for furious Mars,
The only governor and god of wars,
When tir'd with heat and toil, doth oft reſort
To taſte the pleaſures of the Paphian court ;
Where on thy boſom he ſupinely lies,
And greedily drinks love at both his eyes.
CREECH.

WHETHER Epicurus could poſſibly have reconciled his ſyſtem to the public worſhip, and deceived the Athenians.

When he lays down as a principle, that the gods concern not themſelves, nor intermeddle with any kind of affair (69) ; and throughout his whole book, he makes it his chief buſineſs to explain the phœnomena of nature, by the motion of atoms, and to confute thoſe who aſcribe them to the operation of the gods. It cannot be hence inferred, either that he did not believe their exiſtence, or had no reſpect and veneration for them : for, according to his principles, it is not abſurd, that beings ſhould have been formed much more perfect than man, content with their own conditions, and no way curious either of knowing or reforming the actions and affairs of others : and as it is moſt certain, that we admire, with great veneration, the merit of ſome great men, though we never received any benefit from them, nor expect any favour, nor fear any evil office, nothing hinders, but that Epicurus's followers might have had an actual veneration for the gods. But it may very well be inferred from Lucretius's ſyſtem, that he could not invoke them ; and that he muſt have looked upon all the religious worſhip, practiſed at Rome, the vows, ſacrifices, feaſts, &c. as wholly inſignificant. A reflexion offers here upon the conduct of the Athenian prieſts, with reſpect to Epicurus. They had ſeveral times brought to puniſhment the Philoſophers, whom they accuſed of Atheiſm, and they vigorouſly proſecuted Anaxagoras for one ſimple act of profanation. ‘ Miror cur Anaxagoras reus factus ſit quia ſolem eſſe dixit lapidem ardentem, negans utique Deum, cum in eadem civitate gloria floruerit Epicurus, vixeritque ſecurus, non ſolum ſolem vel ullum ſyderum Deum eſſe non credens, ſed nec Jovem nec ullum deorum omnino in mundo habitare contendens, ad quem preces hominum ſupplicationeſque perveniant (70). ——— *I wonder that Anaxagoras ſhould be declared guilty of a capital offence, for aſſerting the ſun to be only a burning ſtone, and ſo denying it to be a god, when Epicurus flouriſhed in the ſame city with glory, and lived in quiet, who not only denied the ſun, or any other ſtar to be a divinity, but alſo aſſerted, that neither Jupiter, nor any other of the gods, dwelt within the ſphere of this world, or were capable of hearing the prayers and petitions of men.*’ How comes it then that they did not ſeize Epicurus ? was it becauſe he had no quarrel with them, either on account of ſome perſonal intereſt or perſonal offence, as perhaps thoſe they proſecuted had, and whom perhaps they would not have accuſed of irreligion, if it had not been to gratify their private paſſions, under the cloak of piety ? or was it becauſe Epicurus politickly conformed to the public worſhip, and openly approved it ? I believe indeed they were capable of being ſatisfied with the exterior, as they do at preſent, without ſearching into the thoughts : but was it not neceſſary, as at preſent, that this exterior ſhould be obſerved, even in books and lectures ? would they ſuffer a man to dogmatize in this ſchool, contrary to what he profeſſed in the ſtreets and temples ? it is hard to imagine this. And yet Epicurus's ſyſtem was contrary to the worſhip of the gods, as practiſed by the Athenians : it could only allow the eſteem, and reſpect, the praiſes of the gods ; but not the prayers, ſacrifices, and acts of repentance. Thus all the inconveniencies, that were to be feared from Atheiſm, the deſtruction of our confidence in the protection of heaven, the ruin of our hopes of happineſs by living well, and of our fears of miſery by living ill : all theſe inconveniencies, I ſay, without one exception, flowed as naturally, and as neceſſarily from Epicurus's doctrine, as from that of the Atheiſts. The leaſt diſcerning may very eaſily comprehend, that all the practices of religion are founded not upon the doctrine of the exiſtence of God, but upon that of his providence : ſince therefore Epicurus was tolerated in a city, which puniſhed Atheiſts, it follows, that there was with them, reſpect of perſons, and that they had double weights and double meaſures : or elſe, that the Athenians, ſo ſubtle and ingenious in other reſpects, were very ſtupid in point of religion. They ſuffered themſelves to be plaid upon like children ; not perceiving, that in dogmatizing, like Epicurus, a man mocked them, if he proteſted, that he approved the uſe of ſacrifices, and prayers, and all the other parts of public worſhip. This reaſon would appear to me very ſtrong to prove, that this Philoſopher taught the providence of God, as Mr du Rondel pretends ; it would appear to me, I ſay, very ſtrong, did I not ſee Lucretius manifeſtly combating providence, without any ſubterfuge or equivocation, or leaving any room for ſuch apologies, as are made for Epicurus, and yet living in an entire tranquillity at Rome, a city no leſs jealous of religion, nor leſs ſevere againſt impious men, than the people of Athens. Note, by the way, that the good morals of a man, who owns, with Lucretius, the exiſtence, holineſs, goodneſs, immortality, of God, without acknowledging his providence, are as good proof of this poſition, *Atheiſm is not neceſſarily joined with bad morals*, as the proof drawn from the good life of thoſe, who ſhould deny the providence of God, and his exiſtence all at once : for it is plain, that the belief of the exiſtence, without the belief of a providence, can be no motive to virtue, nor reſtraint to vice.

---

(66) *See the Letters publiſhed by Mr Matthæus, at Leyden, in* 1695, *in* 8*vo*, *pag.* 162.

(67) Ibid pag. 163.

(68) Lucret. lib. i, ver 32.

(69) *See the remark* [*E*], *citat.* (26).

(70) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. xviii, cap. xli.

of ſpeaking, and to the opinions, which he accounted vulgar errors [*L*]. It is pretended, that he was a diſciple of Zeno. They who have criticized this, have not ſucceeded very well [*M*]. When we confute Mr Moreri [*N*], and ſome other writers

[*L*] *He has adapted his ſtile to the common language, and to the opinions which he accounted vulgar errors.*] I will give two inſtances of it. He believed, that heaven and earth would not laſt for ever; and he declares to him to whom he dedicated his book, that the deſtruction of this world might perhaps happen in their days; and adds, may fortune, which governs all things, avert this evil far from us.

- - - - dictis dabit ipſa fidem res
Forſitan, & graviter terrarum motibus orbis
Omnia conquaſſari in parvo tempore cernes:
QUOD PROCUL A NOBIS FLECTAT FORTUNA (71) GUBERNANS:
Et ratio potiùs, quàm res perſuadeat ipſa,
Succidere horriſono poſſe omnia victa fragore (72).

And yet I'll ſing: perchance the following fall
Will prove my words, and ſhew 'tis reaſon all:
Perhaps thou ſoon ſhalt ſee the ſinking world,
With ſtrong convulſions to confuſion hurl'd.
When ev'ry rebel atom breaks the chain,
And all to prim'tive night, return again,
But chance avert it! rather let reaſon ſhew
The world may fall, than ſenſe ſhould prove it true.
CREECH.

It is plain, that the vow or wiſh, or prayer, he puts up here, proceeded only from a habit he had got of ſpeaking like other men. He daily converſed with people, whoſe language was filled with parentheſes, which might have been called religious, if they had not been an effect of cuſtom rather than an act of reflexion. His wife, his maid, his friends, and all the Romans in general, were accuſtomed to bring in a ſolemn wiſh or prayer, in the mentioning an ill preſage, or ſad accident. *Deus avertat, God forbid,* ſaid they; if any misfortune ſhould happen, *quod abominor, which God avert.* Authors likewiſe made uſe of theſe ways of ſpeech,

Di, prohibete minas, Di, talem avertite caſum (73).

May heaven prohibit, gods avert ſuch ill.

I make no doubt, that Lucretius, being uſed from his childhood to theſe forms of diſcourſe, uſed them in familiar converſation, either without any ſalvo, or only ſubſtituting the term *natura*, or *fortuna*, in the room of *Deus*. Thus the Proteſtants have ſubſtituted the parentheſis, *God receive his ſoul,* inſtead of that, *God abſolve him.* The Roman Catholics uſe the later, when they mention their deceaſed relations; but as this could not agree with thoſe who denied a purgatory, the Proteſtants have not admitted it; but however have accommodated themſelves to cuſtom by a phraſe placed like the other, and turned according to the maxims of their own religion. Lucretius being accuſtomed by his reading and converſation to this kind of parentheſis, inſerted the prayer or wiſh we have ſeen above. Nothing was more vain than this in the hypotheſis he maintained; and it cannot be pretended, that he was ignorant of the inconſiſtency of ſuch a wiſh, with the doctrine of atoms: he very well knew, that that nature, or fortune, which ſhoved them on, was unable to change or ſuſpend their courſe, or even to hear the deſires of men. If the train of their motion were ſuch as muſt ſpeedily bring on the diſſolution of the world; this diſſolution was inevitable; the devouteſt prayers of mankind, their ſacrifices and proceſſions, could not give it the leaſt delay. How then comes Lucretius in ſome ſort, to invoke nature or fortune, to put off to another time the deſtruction of the earth? it was becauſe he ſometimes ſpoke according to the language of the vulgar. Note, that the doctrine of fatality did not exclude all wiſhes; for, without departing from his principles, Epicurus might very well wiſh, that the diſpoſition of atoms might be favourable to his health. He could not have deſired that it ſhould alter, but only have wiſhed, that their nature might incline them to ſuch or ſuch purpoſes. Lucretius goes farther, as appears by his expreſſions. This is the firſt inſtance that I will give.

The ſecond is not very far different from it, ſince immediately after the ſix verſes, I have recited, we find theſe:

Qua priùs aggrediar quàm de re fundere fata
Sanctiùs, & multo certa ratione magis, quàm
Pythia, quæ tripode è Phœbi lauroque profatur;
Multa tibi expediam doctis ſolatia dictis (74).

But now before I teach theſe truths, more pure
And certain oracles, and far more ſure
Than what from trembling Pythia reach'd our ears,
I'll firſt propoſe ſome cure againſt thy fears.
CREECH.

Here he promiſes oracles, much more certain than thoſe of Delphi, and he made uſe of the ſame compariſon in another place, to heighten the importance of the doctrine of the antient Grecian Philoſophers.

Quamquam multa bene ac divinitus invenientes
Ex adyto tamquam cordis reſponſa dedêre
Sanctiùs, & multo certa ratione magis, quàm
Pythia, quæ tripode ex Phœbi, lauroque profatur (75).

Which they have left as oracles, more ſure
Than from the Tripod ſpoke, and leſs obſcure
Than thoſe the Antients from the Pythia heard. . . .
CREECH.

Who ſees not that, in both theſe paſſages, he expreſſes himſelf, according to the ideas of the people, and not according to the principles of his ſect? for, according to him, the anſwers of Apollo's prieſteſs could only be the dreams of a diſtempered brain; or of an ignorant impoſtor. He acknowledged no Divinity in the oracles: It was not therefore giving the higheſt idea of a philoſophical Doctrine, to affirm it excelled the Delphic oracles. It is as much as if we ſhould now ſay, that Des Cartes's notions deſerve more attention, than the prophecies of your ſtrolling gypſies, and fortune-tellers. It is plain then, that Lucretius adapted his language to popular opinions: and it would be ridiculous cavilling to maintain, that the force of truth ſometimes drew expreſſions from him, which overturned his ſyſtem, and convicted him of groſs contradiction; for example, where he owns in two places of his Poems, that there was ſomething divine, inſpired, ſupernatural, and prophetical, in the oracles of Apollo.

[*M*] *It is pretended he was a diſciple of Zeno. They who have criticiſed this, have not ſucceeded very well.*] If we once admit their opinion, who ſay, that Lucretius was ſent to Athens to ſtudy, it can hardly be queſtioned, but he was one of Zeno's diſciples, the chief of Epicurus's ſchool at that time. Accordingly we ſee, that Lambinus and Giſanius joined theſe two opinions together. 'Credibile eſt Lucretium . . . . ſeſe Athenas contuliſſe ibique Zenonem illum Epicuræorum Coryphæum audiviſſe (76). *It is probable that Lucretius . . . . went to Athens, and there heard Zeno, the great leader of the Epicureans.*' This is what Lambinus ſays: the following words are Giſanius's (77). 'Præerant hortis eo tempore Zeno acriculus ille ſenex, & Phædrus, homo, ut Cicero ait, humaniſſimus, itaque his videtur uſus præceptoribus Titus, quos etiam Atticus paulo licet hoc poeta grandior audivit. —— *The gardens were at that time under the direction of Zeno, a ſhrewd old man; and Phædrus, whom Cicero mentions as a perſon of the greateſt humanity, theſe therefore were, in all probability, the maſters of Titus, as, a little before, they had been to Atticus, who was ſomething older than that Poet.*' The Baron des Coutures has trod in the ſame ſteps. *It is probable,* ſays he (78) *that Lucretius went to Athens, where Zeno, who was the honour of the Epicurean ſect, had acquired a general eſteem.* A letter has been inſerted in the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* (79), containing ſome critical obſervations on the baron's opinion. The laſt

(71) *Some manuſcripts have* Natura: *It is the ſame thing as to the ſenſe. See the Commentary of Lambinus,* in hunc locum, pag. m. 593.

(72) Lucret. lib. v, ver. 105, pag. m. 255.

(73) Virgil Æn. lib. iii, ver. 265.

(74) Lucret. ubi ſupra, ver. 111.

(75) Ibid. lib. i, ver. 737, pag. 40, 41.

(76) Lambinus, in Vita Epicuri.

(77) In Vita Epicuri.

(78) *In the Life of Lucretius.*

(79) Tom. XXII, pag. 185, 186.

writers [*O*], we ſhall ſay ſeveral things concerning Lucretius. They who deſire to know the elogies that have been given him, need only conſult the authors, whom Barthius points out to us (*b*). Mr Creech who, in 1695, put out an edition of this poet (*c*), with an excellent paraphraſe, and fine notes, had before publiſhed an Engliſh tranſlation of it. It is pity ſo good an author had not a longer life (*d*), and that his end was, in ſome meaſure, like that of the Roman author, whom he had tranſlated and paraphraſed. I am certain, that the abbot de Marolles's French tranſlation would not have met with the fate it did [*P*], had it been as good as this Engliſh verſion.

It

laſt is this: *laſtly, the fifth blunder is, that Zeno is ſaid to have been the honour of the Epicurean ſect, whereas he is acknowledged to be the head of the Stoics.* The critic did not obſerve, that there were more Zeno's than one: He thought the founder of the Stoics was meant, and upon this foot he ſhould have found in the words he cenſured a notable fault in chronology, which he does not mention. Zeno, the chief of the Stoics, died the firſt year of the CXXIXth Olympiad: ſo that his death muſt have preceded the birth of Lucretius above 160 years. He ought therefore to have ſuſpected, that the author he cenſured, had a Zeno in view, different from the founder of the Stoics: and if this ſuſpicion had put him upon making ſome inquiries he would probably have found, that there was a famous Epicurean, named Zeno (80), who taught at Athens in Lucretius's time.

[*N*] *We confute Mr Moreri.*] I. He ought not to have ſaid, that our Poet was called T. Carus Lucretius. Carus was not his name, but his fir-name, *Cognomen.* II. By theſe words, Roman by nation, Moreri doubtleſs meant, that Lucretius was born at Rome. This is expreſſing his thought ill; for where is the author ſo exact as to ſcruple to ſay, that Cicero and Livy were Romans by nation, as Demoſthenes and Thucydides were Greeks by nation? III. We have no proof that Lucretius was born at Rome: Mr Moreri therefore ought not peremptorily to have given him this birth-place. IV. Much leſs ought he to have ſaid that Lucretius himſelf declares, he was a native of Rome: I have found in Lucretius but one paſſage, which may give ground to ſay, that he makes it his native city; but that paſſage is of no force. It is this,

Funde, petens placidam Romanis incluta pacem,
Nam neque nos agere hoc patriaï tempore iniquo
Poſſumus æquo animo (81).

Careſs with all the ſubtil arts, become
A flatterer, and beg a peace for Rome.
For midſt rough wars, how can verſe ſmoothly flow;
Or midſt ſuch ſtorms, the learned laurel grow?
CREECH.

Cicero, Livy, Florus, Seneca, who were all born out of Rome, would not have ſpoken otherwiſe. All the inhabitants of a country might ſay, in the time of a Civil-war, that their country is afflicted, though the particular place of their birth were exempt from that public calamity. Learned men, more learned than Moreri (82) have affirmed what he affirms. Mr Morhof, ſomewhat wiſer, you will ſay, than the reſt, has uſed the particle, *perhaps*: but it is certain, that his *forte* relates to another doubt: therefore we may reckon him among thoſe who poſitively ſay, Lucretius was born in Rome (83). V. He ſhould not have affirmed, that Lucretius's *relations ſent him to ſtudy at Athens.* This is, I confeſs, very probable, but yet, ſince there is no proof of it, he ſhould have mentioned this by way of conjecture; or at moſt only ſay, as Giſanius has done, that no one doubted it. ‘Adoleſcentulus autem, *ſays he*, quin à parentibus, ſeu propinquis, conſiderata ejus ad bonas artes nata pænè divina indole, Athenas more patrio ſit miſſus, Athenas non ita pridem à P. Sulla crudeliter vaſtatas, non dubito, poſtulat hoc Romanorum conſuetudo, ac doctrinæ ratio (84). —— *That a lad, either by his parents or by his relations, led by the conſideration of his pregnant, and almoſt Divine, parts, was ſent according to the cuſtom of thoſe times to Athens, a little before cruelly treated by Publius Sulla, I make no queſtion, the cuſtom of the Romans, and the mode of education in thoſe days, obliged me to own it.*’ VI. It is not true, that Velleius Paterculus and Cicero have ſaid, that Lucretius's eloquence *rendered him the ſublimeſt of all the Poets of his time.* Cicero ſpeaks of him but once; nor is it certainly known whether the praiſes he gives him, are great or moderate; for the learned are divided about the reading of his paſſage (85): ſome (86) underſtand it, that there was not much wit in Lucretius's poem, though there was a great deal of art: others (87) underſtand it, that this work ſparkled with a great many bright thoughts, and that, nevertheleſs, a great deal of art appeared in it. Take the moſt favourable reading you pleaſe, Cicero will not be found to ſay, what Moreri aſcribes to him. As for Velleius Paterculus, he is content to place Lucretius in the liſt of great wits; *eminentium ingeniorum notare tempora* (88). He has ſaid nothing particular of him. VII. It is no ſmall fault to ſay, that *a woman, named Lucilia,* gave Lucretius a love-philtre, which threw him into a ſtrange phrenzy. This is omitting one capital circumſtance, to wit, that Lucilia is ſaid to be Lucretius's wife (89). VIII. It is not true that Cicero ſays, that Lucretius Offella was fitter to make orations than to pronounce judgments (90). IX. Cicero, Velleius Paterculus, and Cæſar, do not *ſpeak of another, who was probably brother or uncle to the poet.* It is very true, that he whom Cicero and Cæſar ſpeaks of, the former in his letter to Atticus (91), the latter in the civil-war, is the ſame man; but he whom Velleius Paterculus ſpeaks of, is another, and probably the ſame who harangued better than he pleaded.

[*O*] . . . . . *and ſome other writers.*] See above, the remark [*B*]. The baron des Coutures makes Lambinus ſay, that Lucretius's elocution is preferable to that of Cæſar or Cicero. He muſt have uſed a different edition from that I have conſulted, where I have found theſe words. ‘Hoc non dubitanter affirmabo nullum in tota lingua latina ſcriptorem Lucretio latine melius eſſe locutum: non M. Tullii, non C. Cæſaris orationem eſſe puriorem (92). —— *I will not heſitate to affirm, that none of the Roman writers, deſerve to take place of Lucretius in point of Latinity; the ſtyle of Cicero, or of Cæſar, is not more pure.*’ Something like this might be imputed to Peter Victorius; for he boldly preferred Lucretius before Virgil (93). It is ſurpriſing, after the foregoing paſſage, to find Lambinus accuſed of ſaying that Lucretius's Latin was bad. ‘Quo reſpexit forte Dionyſius Lambinus cum Lucretium malum latinitatis autorem vocat, qua tamen cum ſententia ille minime audiendus eſt (94). —— *To this perhaps Dionyſius Lambinus had regard, when he ſaid that Lucretius wrote bad Latin, in which however he deſerves no credit.*’ Borrichius ſuppoſes, that Cicero, Aulus Gellius, and Scaliger, have praiſed Lucretius for writing the pureſt Latin. ‘Certe puriſſimæ latinitatis eſſe omnia in confeſſo eſt . . . . laudaturque hoc nomine *Ciceroni, Gellio, Scaligero,* aliis (95). —— *Certainly in purity of Latin ſtile his merit is generally confeſſed . . . . having on this account, been praiſed by Cicero, Gellius, Scaliger, and others.*’ We have ſeen above that Cicero's elogy, had no relation to the purity of ſtile. Glandorpius is miſtaken (96) in ſuppoſing, that Lucretius followed Empedocles's opinions: if he had conſidered the firſt book *de rerum Natura,* where Empedocles is confuted he would not have ſaid this.

[*P*] *The abbot de Marolles's tranſlation would not have met with the fate it did.*] Queen Chriſtina would have thanked him for the dedication of ſo fine a book. Her ſilence, doubtleſs, mortified the abbot, who nevertheleſs continued well ſatisfied with his performance. Let us hear what he himſelf ſays (97): ‘When my verſion of Lucretius was printed, the worthy Mr du Morhier, for whom I have always had a great eſteem, adviſed me to make a preſent of it to Chriſtina queen of Sweden (98): But this produced nothing; nor do I ſo much as know

---

(*b*) Comment. in Statium, Tom. I, pag. 261.

(*c*) *Printed at Oxford, in* 8*vo.*

(*d*) *He died in* 1700, *before he was full forty. See the* Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres, Sept. 1700, pag. 331.

(80) *He was ſon of Sidon. See* Jonſius. de Script Hiſtor. Philoſoph. pag. 112.

(81) Lucret. lib. i, ver. 41.

(82) Lambinus & Giſanius, in Vita Lucretii. Thom. Creech, Præfat. Lucretii, Oxonii editi, 1695.

(83) Ecquos ergo in tota hac aurea ætatis claſſe qua potiſſimum hæc cenſeri debebat urbanitas, Romanos habebimus præter duos forte Lucretium & J. Cæſarem. *Morhofius, de Patavinitate Liviana, p. clvi.*

(84) In Vita Lucretii.

(85) Lucretii poëmata, ut ſcribis, lita ſunt multis luminibus ingenii, multæ tamen artis. *Cicero, ad Quinctum Fratrem, lib. ii, Epiſt. xi.* Some pretend it ſhould be *non ita,* and not *lita.*

(86) Charles Stephens, Glandorp, Lloyd, Hofman, Baillet, Pope Blount, *&c.*

(87) Tanaquill. Faber, the baron des Coutures, *&c.*

(88) Lib. ii, cap. xxxvi.

(89) *It is to her theſe words are applied.* Livia virum ſuum occidit quem nimis oderat, Lucilia ſuum, quem nimis amaverat. - - - *Livia murdured her huſband becauſe ſhe hated him exceſſively, and Lucilia murdered her's becauſe ſhe exceſſively loved him.* Lloyd aſcribes them to Seneca but wrongfully.

(90) *See, above, the article* LUCRETIA, *remark* [*A*].

(91) Epiſt. iv, lib. viii.

(92) Lambinus, in Vita Lucretii, ſub fin. *See alſo his Notes on Horace,* Ode V, lib. ii.

(93) Paſſing through Florence I happened to meet with a commentary of Victorius, on a book of Ariſtotle; in which this peeviſh Commentator taxes Virgil, good God! what a raſhneſs! what an attempt! with miſtaking one word for another, and with being leſs pure and genuine, in his diction, than Lucretius. *Balzac, Defenſe III à Menandre, pag. m.* 405, of the *Oeuvres Diverſes.*

(94) Morhof. de Patavin. Liviana, pag. 156.

(95) Borrichius, de Poët. Lat. pag. 45.

(96) Onomaſt. pag. 557.

(97) Marolles, Memoires, pag. 186, 187, ad ann. 1650.

(98) *That is to ſay, that I ſhould dedicate it to her.*

It will not be improper to examine a falſe reaſoning and a contradiction, that Lucretius is reproached with. The falſe reaſoning relates to one of the arguments he has uſed to ſhew, that death was to be deſpiſed. Epicurus had employed it before, but in ſuch a manner that Plutarch ſeverely cenſured him for it [Q]. The contradiction relates to Lucretius's

whether ever ſhe received the book, which Mr Herauld, who managed her affairs here with ſo much care and fidelity, aſſured me he had ſent her. At leaſt I received no anſwer, contrary to the cuſtom of this princeſs, who was then liberal of her compliments to men of letters. However it be, the book has not failed of a good reception from the public: and ſome learned men, the count de Pagan, the late Mr le Pailleur, the learned Mr d' Aviſſon, Mr de la Courvée, Phyſician to the queen of Poland, and ſome others, have given me thanks, in the name of the public, for having, in ſome meaſure, ſolved the difficulties that might be raiſed from the doctrine of this Poet, in his third volume, where he treats of the nature of the ſoul. I have ſince very much corrected it, and put it in a better ſtate for a ſecond edition.' The abbot de Marolles did not underſtand the Latin tongue, or Epicurus's phyſics enough to ſucceed in ſuch a verſion. Yet it has bore two editions, the firſt in the year 1650, dedicated to the queen of Sweden; the ſecond in the year 1663, to which was added the tranſlation of the tenth book of Diogenes Laërtius, and dedicated to the firſt preſident.

[Q] *Plutarch ſeverely cenſured Epicurus.*] To comment theſe words regularly, we muſt firſt ſet forth the deſign of Epicurus and Lucretius. They propoſed to prove, that death is not to be feared, that death is nothing, that we are not intereſted nor concerned in it.

Nil igitur mors eſt, ad nos neque pertinet hilum (99).

Their proof was taken from hence, that things diſſolved, or ſeparated, have no ſenſe; and that things which have no ſenſe are nothing with regard to us. Epicurus's words are theſe. Ὁ θάνατος οὐδὲν ϖρὸς ἡμᾶς, τὸ γὰρ διαλυθὲν ἀναισθητεῖ, τὸ δὲ ἀναισθητοῦν οὐδὲν ϖρὸς ἡμᾶς (100). Plutarch (101) pretended, that this Philoſopher argued wrong here, and that there was a neceſſary propoſition wanting in his ſyllogiſm; namely this, death is the ſeparation of the body and ſoul: Ὁ θάνατος ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος διάλυσις. Aulus Gellius, taking Epicurus's part, agrees, that the ſyllogiſm, to be in form, ought to contain this propoſition: but he maintains, that Epicurus, having not undertaken to reduce his reaſoning to ſyllogiſtical rules, ſuppreſſed it on purpoſe, as being ſufficiently ſelf-evident. And it ſhould not be thought ſtrange, that the concluſion was placed not at the end, but at the beginning of the argument; the Philoſopher Plato, frequently arguing after the ſame manner; that is, inverting the order of the propoſitions of a ſyllogiſm. This is what Aulus Gellius anſwers to Plutarch's cenſure: he miſtook the point, and has been ſeverely criticized in the XVIth century. He has been accuſed of having betrayed his own folly by endeavouring to cover that of another, and even of not underſtanding the ſtate of the queſtion. 'Nactus autem eſt patronum (*Epicurus*) tali prorſus cliente dignum Gellium: qui dum alienam ſtultitiam tegere vult, prodit, ſuam. Tantum enim abeſt ab eo defendendo, ut ne intellexiſſe quidem videatur, quid in eo reprehenderetur (102). It might have been added, that he did not know in general, what a ſyllogiſm was; for he ſuppoſes, that of Epicurus is really conformable to the rules, and that to be in form there is nothing wanting, but the propoſition ſub-underſtood by the author. Now let us ſee what this ſyllogiſm would be, by adding what Epicurus has ſub-underſtood.

Death is the diſſolution of body and ſoul,
That which is diſſolved is inſenſible, and what is inſenſible does not affect us:
Therefore death does not affect us.

This ſyllogiſm is fallacious, as manifeſtly conſiſting of four terms (103). We muſt therefore believe, that Plutarch's objection was not founded on the ſuppreſſion of the major, as Aulus Gellius pretends, but upon this that the major, which was ſub-underſtood, was not a principle from whence the concluſion could be deduced. This is aſſuredly the caſe of this principle; and you clearly ſee, that after having granted the major and the minor of the ſyllogiſm, juſt now produced, the conſequence may ſtill be denied. Muretus is very angry with Epicurus hereupon, and treats him as an impertinent Logician. 'Illius artis (*Dialectices*) ignoratione ruebat in dicendo: ſæpeque aliquid probare aggreſſus, ea ſumebat, quibus datis ac conceſſis, id tamen quod probare inſtituerat, non concluderetur. Quale eſt, quod cum docere vellet, mortem nihil ad nos pertinere, ita ratiocinabatur: Ὁ θάνατος οὐδὲν ϖρὸς ἡμᾶς. τὸ γὰρ διαλυθὲν ἀναισθητεῖ. τὸ δὲ ἀναισθητοῦν οὐδὲν ϖρὸς ἡμᾶς. Neque enim ſequitur, ſi id quod diſſolutum eſt ſenſu vacat; idcirco ipſam quoque diſſolutionem non ſentiri. Neque mors eſt το διαλυθὲν, ἀλλὰ αὐτὴ ἡ διάλυσις. Meritoque Plutarchus ſecundo librorum, quos de Homero compoſuit, imperfecte, atque præpoſtere, atque inſcite ſyllogiſmo uſum eſſe eum dixerat: non quod prætermiſiſſet illud λῆμμα, ὁ θάνατος ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος διάλυσις: quo addito, nihilo magis efficietur, quod ipſe voluit: ſed quod, ſtupiditate quadam, & craſſitudine ingenii, non pervidiſſet, quantum inter id, quod diſſolutum eſt, & ipſam diſſolutionem intereſſet (104). —— *Being ignorant of the Art of Logic, he made frequent miſtakes: for when he undertook to prove ſomething, he laid down ſuch propoſitions, which tho' they were granted, would nevertheleſs have concluded nothing, in favour of what he intended to prove. For example, when he endeavoured to prove that death no way concerns us, he reaſoned thus:* Death is nothing to us, for what is diſſolved, becomes inſenſible, and what is inſenſible is nothing to us. *For it does not follow, that if what is diſſolved, be inſenſible, therefore diſſolution itſelf, cannot be felt; nor is death the thing diſſolved, but the diſſolution itſelf. And Plutarch ſays very rightly, in his ſecond book upon Homer, that he uſed this ſyllogiſm in a manner imperfect, prepoſterous, and which ſhewed that he had no ſkill in arguing. Not meerly for leaving out this lemma,* Death is the diſſolution of ſoul and body: *Which being added makes nothing in favour of what he intended to prove, but that thro' a certain ſtupidity and groſſneſs of underſtanding he could not ſee the difference between the thing diſſolved, and the diſſolution itſelf.*' And to convince us that the fault Plutarch has taxed Epicurus with, conſiſts not in barely ſuppreſſing the major; he produces a paſſage of Alexander Aphrodiſeus (105); in which Epicurus's argument is cenſured juſt as he ſuppoſes Plutarch had criticiſed it. I cannot think Plutarch would have troubled himſelf to cenſure that which the beſt Logicians might have done. Nothing hinders their employing an enthymema, which is a ſyllogiſm wanting either the *major* or *minor*. It is ſtill uſed in the ſchools, while the greateſt ſlaves to the formalities of diſputation have nothing to ſay againſt it, provided the propoſition underſtood be right: but what hiſſing would they make, if it was found to be as defective as this before us? Let us diſcover the fallacy.

Epicurus and Lucretius ſuppoſe, that death is a thing that does not concern us, and in which we are not at all intereſted. They conclude this from the ſuppoſition that the ſoul is mortal, and conſequently that the man is inſenſible, after the ſeparation of the ſoul and body.

Nil igitur Mors eſt, ad nos neque pertinet hilum,
Quandoquidem natura Animi mortalis habetur:
Et velut anteacto nil tempore ſenſimus ægri,
Ad confligendum venientibus undique Pœnis;
Omnia cum belli trepido concuſſa tumultu
Horrida contemuere ſub altis ætheris auris:
In dubioque fuit ſub utrorum regna cadendum
Omnibus humanis eſſet, terraque marique:
Sic ubi non erimus, cum Corporis, atque Animaï
Diſcidium fuerit, quibus è ſumus uniter apti

Scilicet

---

(99) Lucret. lib. iii, ver. 842, pag. m. 172.

(100) Diog. Laërt lib x, n. 139. Aul. Gell. lib. ii, cap. viii, pag m 55.

(101) Plut lib ii, de Homero apud Gellium, ibid.

(102) Muretus, Variar. Lect. lib. xi, cap. xvi, pag. m. 1080.

(103) *See, in Gaſſendus's notes on the tenth book of Diogenes Laërtius,* Oper. Tom. V, pag. 131, *what turn might be given to this argument of Epicurus?*

(104) Muretus, ubi ſupra, lib. xi cap. xvi, pag. 1079.

(105) Ex Commentario in primum Topicorum.

Lucretius's doctrine concerning the nature of the ſoul of man. He maintains, that this ſoul dies with the body; and yet he obſerves, that it returns to heaven when the man dies.

Scilicet haud Nobis quidquam, qui non erimus tum,
Accidere omnino poterit, ſenſumque movere:
Non ſi terra mari miſcebitur, & mare cœlo (106).

(106) Lucret. lib. iii, ver. 842, pag. 172.

Well then, what's death to us, ſince ſouls can dye?
For as we neither knew, nor felt thoſe harms,
When dreadful Carthage frighted Rome with arms,
And all the world was ſhook with fierce alarms;
Whilſt undecided yet, which part ſhould fall,
Which nation riſe the glorious lord of all:
So after death, when we ſhall be no more,
What tho' the ſeas forſake their uſual ſhore,
And riſe to heav'n? What tho' ſtars drop from thence?
Yet how can this diſturb our periſh'd ſenſe?

CREECH.

They are in the right to ſay, that nothing concerns a man, which happens to him in a ſtate of inſenſibility: for it is the ſame thing to the ſtatue of Socrates, whether it be broken to pieces, or the ſtatue of Cæſar. Since therefore the breaking of Cæſar's ſtatue, does in no wiſe concern the ſtatue of Socrates, the latter is no way intereſted in it's own deſtruction: it neither ſees it nor feels any thing of it any more than it would the burning of a tree under the ſouth pole. But ſtill they fall into a fallacy two ways: they cannot deny, but that death happens, whilſt a man is yet endued with ſenſe; it is therefore a thing which concerns a man. And from the inſenſibility of the ſeparate parts, they are in the wrong to infer, that the accident, which ſeparates them, is imperceptible. ‘ Epicurus . . . . . negavit mortem ad nos pertinere, quod enim diſſolvitur, inquit, ſenſu caret, & quod ſenſu caret nihil ad nos. Diſſolvitur autem & caret ſenſu non ipſa mors, ſed homo qui eam patitur. At ille ei dedit paſſionem cujus eſt actio. Quod ſi hominis eſt pati mortem, diſſolutionem corporis & peremptionem ſenſus, quàm ineptum, ut tanta vis ad hominem non pertinere dicatur? (107) —— *Epicurus . . . denied, that death any way concerns us, for,* ſaid he, *that which is diſſolved, wants ſenſe, and that which wants ſenſe, can be nothing to us. But that which is diſſolved, and wants ſenſe is not death itſelf, but the man who ſuffers it. So that he attributed paſſion to that which is the action. But if it be the part of man to ſuffer death, the diſſolution of the body, and the loſs of ſenſe, how ridiculous is it to ſay, that this great change concerns him not.*’ Thus their firſt inconſequence conſiſts in their concluding from the parts ſeparated to the ſeparation itſelf; as the latter, may be painful, and attended with a thouſand ſorts of troubleſome ſenſations, it is an evil which properly and really belongs to man, and that even in virtue of their own principle, that if the dead are not at all intereſted in their condition, it is becauſe they feel nothing. The ſecond defect of theſe Philoſophers reaſoning, is their ſuppoſing, that man only fears death, becauſe he imagines it attended with a great poſitive miſery. They are miſtaken, and afford no remedy to ſuch as look on the bare loſs of life, as a great evil. The love of life is deeply rooted in the heart of man; and this is a ſign that it is conſidered as a very great good: from whence it follows, that death is feared as a very great evil, merely for robbing us of this good. What ſignifies it, againſt this fear, to ſay, *You will feel nothing after you are dead?* Will you not quickly be anſwered, *It is enough to be deprived of a life I love ſo well; and if the union of my body and ſoul is a ſtate which belongs to me, and which I paſſionately deſire to preſerve, it cannot be pretended, that death, which breaks this union, is a thing which does not concern me.* Let us conclude, that Epicurus and Lucretius's argument was not juſt, and could only be concluſive againſt the fear of pain in another world. There was another ſort of fear, which they ought to have removed; to wit, the fear of the deprivation of the pleaſures of this life. They might ſay, that, taking all together, the inſenſibility of the dead is a gain rather than a loſs, as being a deliverance from the evils of this life. Now whether theſe evils ſurpaſs the goods, as many have believed, or whether they only equal them, it is an advantage to be inſenſible; for there is no man who rightly underſtands his own intereſt, but would prefer four hours of good ſleep, before two hours of pleaſure, and two hours of pain, ſuppoſing them equal in degree (108).

(107) Turtull. de Anima.

(108) *See Lucret.* lib. iii, ver. 913, & ſeq. *where he has recourſe to the compariſon of ſleep to confute thoſe who alledge the good which death deprives us of. He alſo very well confutes the other reaſons of thoſe who grieve, that they muſt die.*

Let us ſee another paralogiſm of Lucretius. He pretends, that death would not concern us, even tho' ſenſation ſhould remain in the ſeparate parts, or tho' chance ſhould again in time produce a re-union of ſoul and body. His reaſon is, that we are compounded of a ſoul and body; and therefore nothing concerns us, but what belongs to us, as we are this compound. As therefore the ſoul, ſeparate from the body, is not the man, it's ſenſations in that ſtate would not be thoſe of the man; and it would not be true to ſay, that Scipio would be unhappy, under pretence that Scipio's ſoul was unhappy after Scipio's death. I make uſe of this example, though it is not contained in theſe words of Lucretius.

Et ſi jam noſtro ſentit de Corpore, poſtquam
Diſtracta'ſt Animi natura, Animæque poteſtas:
Nil tamen hoc ad nos, qui cœtu, conjugioque
Corporis atque Animæ conſiſtimus uniter apti (109).

(109) Lucret. ubi ſupra, ver. 855. pag. m. 173.

But now ſuppoſe the ſoul, when ſeparate,
Could live, and think, in a divided ſtate:
Yet what is that to us, who are the whole,
A frame compoſ'd of body join'd with ſoul?

CREECH.

He thinks it poſſible, that the ſame atoms a man is compoſed of, and which are diſperſed by death, may take, in time, the ſame ſituation, and produce a man again: but he will not allow, that the events which happen to this new man, ſhould any way concern the former. The interruption of life, adds he, hinders our having any intereſt in what ſhall happen hereafter, in caſe the ages to come ſhould reſtore to us the human nature we had before. The ſtate we were formerly in, is at preſent a thing entirely indifferent to us; and we may ſay the ſame of the ſtates we may arrive to, in the time to come.

Nec, ſi materiam noſtram conlegerit ætas
Poſt obitum, rurſumque redegerit, ut ſita nunc eſt;
Atque iterum Nobis fuerint data lumina vitæ,
Pertineat quidquam tamen ad Nos id quoque factum,
Interrupta ſemel cùm ſit repetentia noſtra
Et nunc nil ad Nos de Nobis attinet, antè
Qui fuimus, nec jam de illis Nos afficit angor,
Quos de materia noſtra nova proferet ætas:
Nam cùm reſpicias immenſi temporis omne
Præteritum ſpatium, tum motus Materiaï
Multimodi quàm ſint; facilè hoc adcredere poſſis,
Semina ſæpe in eodem, ut nunc ſunt, ordine poſta:
Nec memori tamen id quimus deprendere mente.
Inter enim jecta'ſt vitaï pauſa, vagéque
Deerrarunt paſſim motus ab Senſibus omnes (110).

(110) Id. ibid. ver. 859.

Nay, grant the ſcatter'd aſhes of our urn
Be join'd again, and life and ſenſe return;
Yet how can that concern us when 'tis done;
Since all the mem'ry of paſs'd life is gone?
Now we ne'er joy, nor grieve, to think that we
Were heretofore, nor what thoſe things will be,
Which fram'd from us the following age ſhall ſee.
When we revolve, how num'rous years have run,
How oft the eaſt beheld the riſing ſun,
E'er we began, and how the atoms move,
How the unthinking ſeeds for ever ſtrove;
'Tis probable, and reaſon's laws allow,
Thoſe ſeeds of ours were once combin'd as now:
Yet now who minds, who knows his former ſtate?
The interim of death, the band of fate,

dies. They who pretended that he could not ſay this without contradicting himſelf were but little acquainted with his work, or had not well conſidered his opinion [*R*]. This objection

Or ſtopp'd the ſeeds, or made them all commence
Such motions, as deſtroy'd the former ſenſe.

CREECH.

A CONFUTATION of Lucretius, as to what he ſays of the ſenſe which might remain after death.

If Lucretius expected to convince of theſe two points of Phyſics, ſuch as know how to go the bottom of a queſtion, he made little uſe of his reaſon. Here is an inſtance that will ſet this matter in a clear light, tho' I ſuppoſe it at pleaſure. Let us fancy to ourſelves a watch, and let us ſuppoſe it to be animated, to be ſenſible, and capable of underſtanding what the maker ſays to it. Let us after this ſuppoſe, that he tells it, he is going to take it to pieces; that he will not leave two wheels of it together; that all the pieces ſhall be ſeparated, and laid each a-part in a box; that the ſenſe ſhall remain, notwithſtanding this diſſolution; and that the ſoul or principle of life ſhall retain it's faculties, as to grief and joy, *&c.* Is it not certain, on this ſuppoſition, that the watch will intereſt itſelf in theſe ſenſations, which it is told the diſperſion of it's parts will not put an end to? It will be no longer affected as a watch: but it is ſufficient, for it's miſery, that, as a ſenſitive ſubſtance, it ſhall ſtill feel heat, cold, pain, trouble, *&c.* It will certainly be the ſame ſubſtance, which had been expoſed to theſe evils in the watch; and the evil it ſhall ſuffer after the deſtruction of the compound will only be a continuation of the evil it had ſuffered, whilſt the compound ſubſiſted. Apply this to our ſoul, and you ſhall ſee, that, if it remain ſenſible after our death, it would be moſt true to ſay, that the ſame nature which had ſuffered hunger, and cold, the fever, and ſtone, *&c.* in a human body, ſuffers other things out of the human body; and that Lucretius's conſolation is chimerical and ridiculous. What ſignifies it, ſays he, if your ſoul be miſerable after your death, you are a man; the ſoul will not be a man in a ſeparate ſtate; and conſequently the miſeries of the ſoul will not belong to you. A ſilly conſequence! It is as if Pythagoras had ſaid to a man, at the point of death, your ſoul ſhall go into the body of an ox; which ſhall be almoſt all it's life yoaked to the plough, and ſuffered to die of hunger when it is old; but that ſuffering will not concern you, ſince an ox is not a man. Would not this be a wonderful comfort? People do not ſufficiently attend to this poſition, that the ſubject of the accidents remains always numerically the ſame, in all the transformations of bodies. The ſame atoms that compoſe water, are in the ice, in the vapours, in the clouds, in the hail, and in the ſnow: thoſe which compoſe the wheat paſs into the meal, the paſte, the bread, the blood, the fleſh, the bones, *&c.* If they were miſerable under the form of water, and under that of ice, it is the ſame numerical ſubſtance, that is to be pitied in both theſe eſtates; conſequently all the diſaſters that are to be feared, under the form of meal, concern the atoms which compoſe the wheat: and nothing ought ſo much to intereſt itſelf about the lot and condition of the meal as the atoms of wheat, though they are not to ſuffer in the ſtate and compoſition of wheat.

A CONFUTATION of Lucretius, as to what he ſays concerning the production of the ſame man

Let us now confute another fallacy of Lucretius, and reſume the example of a watch. If the watchmaker ſhould ſay to it, *I will keep your parts diſperſed for three or four years, but at that period of time I will re-join them, and make you up again. During the ſeparation, no part ſhall feel any pain; they ſhall all be in a perfect ſleep, but as ſoon as they are reſtored to their former ſituation, their labour, their conſtraint, and ſtate of ſuffering, ſhall return.* Would not a watch, that ſhould give credit to theſe words, be fully perſuaded, that itſelf and no other ſhould be the watch, that he would put in order again at three or four years end? It would have the greateſt reaſon in the world to believe it, and to intereſt itſelf in this new watch's fate and deſtiny, as it's own. And yet it's firſt life would have been interrupted. Let us ſay then, that Lucretius too lightly examined this matter, when he affirmed, that death putting a long interval between the firſt and ſecond life of the ſame atoms of a human body, would cauſe this firſt and ſecond life to belong to different men. I know indeed, that, though we ſuppoſe this kind of reſurrection, yet we might ſay, that the miſeries we had ſuffered at Rome in Marius and Sylla's time, do not at all contribute to our preſent fortune. A total oblivion ſeparates us from thoſe times; nevertheleſs we ſhould have been thoſe miſerable perſons: and we ſhould be the ſame men, who had formerly undergone ſo many misfortunes: from whence it reſults, that if we ſhould return again into the world a thouſand years hence, all the miſeries we were to ſuffer in that new life would properly belong to us; and the certain knowledge of ſuch a futurity muſt neceſſarily give us a diſturbance. Lucretius therefore has not reaſoned juſtly. There are but two ways a man can take to calm, in a reaſonable manner, the fears of another life. One is to promiſe the happineſs of heaven; the other is to promiſe a privation of all kind of ſenſe. Note, that the Spinoziſts had no pretence to either of theſe two conſolations. All their refuge conſiſts in preparing themſelves for a perpetual and infinite circulation of forms, ever accompanied with thought, but without knowing whether they ſhall be more happy or more miſerable than under the human form.

[*R*] *They who pretended that he could not ſay this without contradicting himſelf, have . . . . not well conſidered his opinion.*] Lactantius charges this contradiction upon him, and imagines, that the force of truth overpowered him, and inſinuated itſelf into his ſoul without being perceived. 'Denique idem Lucretius oblitus quid aſſereret, & quod dogma defenderet, hos 'verſus poſuit;

Cedit item retro de terra quod fuit ante
In terram, ſed quod miſſum eſt ex ætheris oris
Id rurſus Cœli fulgentia templa receptant.

'Quod ejus non erat dicere, qui perire animas cum 'corporibus diſſerebat; ſed victus eſt veritate, & imprudenti ratio vera ſurrepſit (111). —— *In fine, Lucretius forgetting what he had aſſerted, and what doctrines he hath defended, hath left us theſe verſes;*

Whatever is from the earth's entrails born,
Doth ſoon, or late, unto that earth return,
But what deſcends from the etherial ſkies,
From earth releas'd, to heav'n again will riſe.

'*Which ſurely was not fit for him to ſay, who had maintained that the ſouls periſhed with the bodies; but he was overcome by truth, and theſe words eſcaped him unawares.*' A Dominican, who has lately written concerning the Chineſe idolatry, perfectly approves this obſervation of Lactantius, and makes uſe of it to corroborate his proofs againſt the Jeſuits (112). 'It would be no wonder that the Chineſe ſhould contradict themſelves, ſince Lucretius, one of the learnedeſt Philoſophers of the Epicurean ſect, who durſt openly attack the doctrine of the ſoul's immortality, confeſſed, notwithſtanding, that if it diſperſed itſelf after death, it was becauſe the groſſer parts were loſt in the earth, and the more ſubtil and cœleſtial parts re-aſcended into the third region of the air, or into heaven. Thus, ſays Lactantius, he fell into a manifeſt contradiction upon the ſubject of the ſoul . . . . (113). The notion of the learned of China, upon this point, perfectly reſembles that of Lucretius, and they explain themſelves much as he did. This Philoſopher maintains, that the ſoul periſhes with the body: nevertheleſs he confeſſes, that it's ſubtileſt parts aſcend and re-unite in heaven, from whence they came. He contradicts himſelf, though he was a very ingenious man: and you object to us *, as a great abſurdity, that the Chineſe who are a people of a very mean underſtanding, without ſubtilty, penetration, and almoſt without principles, as you declare in your Memoirs, ſhould contradict themſelves, if they believed, that the pictures of the dead were the ſeats of their ſouls.' If the contradiction of the Chineſe be no groſſer than that which Lucretius is accuſed of, the adverſaries of the Jeſuits will get little by it; for it is certain Lactantius had no reaſon to believe, that Lucretius contradicted himſelf. See the verſes I have cited in the remark [*G*] of the article JUPITER (114). They immediately precede thoſe recited by Lactantius, and ſignify no more than this, that the

(111) Lactant. lib. vii, cap. xii, pag. m. 480.

(112) Lettre d'un Docteur de l'Ordre de S. Dominique ſur les Ceremonies de la Chine, au R. P. le Comte, de la Compagnie de Jeſus, pag. 43, 44, Edit. Cologne, 1700.

(113) *The author ſets down here the words of Lactantius, which we have ſeen above, citat.* (111).

* Memoires of P. le Comte, Lett. viii.

(114) *Cit.* (58).

objection would have given him no trouble: he would have been infinitely harder put to it, to maintain the attributes of his gods [*S*]. For he himſelf furniſhes arms to thoſe who

the earth, impregnated with atoms which fall from heaven along with the rain, produces plants, and beaſts, and men. Lucretius would prove in this place, that two kinds of inſenſible matter may compoſe one entire ſenſible being. The earth is inſenſible, the ſeeds it receives into it's boſom, and which drop from heaven, are inſenſible; and yet the earth, impregnated by thoſe ſeeds, produces and nouriſhes bodies that have life and ſenſe. Death diſunites the parts of theſe bodies, but deſtroys nothing of their ſubſtance. Thoſe that the earth ſupplied are reſtored to the earth; and thoſe which deſcended from the region of the æther aſcend thither again. This manifeſtly means, that the ſubtil parts which compoſe the ſoul, according to Epicurus's ſyſtem, evaporate, and exhale, when the man dies, and diſperſe themſelves in the air, juſt as we ſee bodies do in the chymical analyſis of compounds, when the ſpirituous parts gain the top, and the earthy remain at the bottom of the veſſel. Lucretius does not pretend, as the Dominican ſuppoſes that the parts of the ſoul, *go, and reunite in heaven from whence they came*; ſo as to perſevere in a ſtate of a ſoul, and a thinking ſubſtance. He ſuppoſes them diſſipated, and inſenſible, as they were before the life of the animal (115); and therefore does not believe, that the ſoul, as a ſoul, ſurvives the man: there is therefore no contradiction in his doctrine, and he cannot be alledged for an example of the contradictions which the Chineſe would fall into, if they affirmed, on one hand, that the ſoul is nothing but the *ſubtileſt parts of* thi-kie *or matter*; and pretended on the other, that it deſcends *into the pictures of the dead from the uppermoſt region of the air, where it had reaſcended* (116).

[*S*] *He would have been infinitely harder put to it, to maintain the attributes of his gods.*] A perfect tranquillity, and compleat happineſs, were the principal qualities which he attributed to the gods (117). He maintained, on the other hand, that the nature of things contained nothing but vacuum and body;

Omnis, ut eſt, igitur, per ſe, Natura, duabus
Conſiſtit rebus; nam corpora ſunt, & inane (118).

This All conſiſts of body and of ſpace,
That moves, and this affords the motion place.

He aſſigns his reaſons and then concludes,

Ergo præter Inane, & Corpora, tertia per ſe
Nulla poteſt rerum in numero natura relinqui;
Nec, quæ ſub ſenſus cadat ullo tempore noſtros,
Nec, ratione animi quam quiſquam poſſit apiſci.
Nam, quæcunque cluent, aut his conjuncta duabus
Rebus ea invenies: aut horum eventa videbis (119).

Well then a different third in vain is ſought,
And not to be diſcover'd by ſenſe, or thought,
For whatſo'er may ſeem of more degrees,
Are the events, or properties of theſe.
While to explain we call thoſe properties,
Which never part except the ſubject dies;
Body and ſpace make up this mighty frame,
And all we ſee is but made up of them.

CREECH.

Without an extraordinary penetration one may eaſily perceive, that theſe two doctrines of Lucretius are inconſiſtent. I might therefore have diſcovered the difficulty, which we ſhall ſee by and by; but I had not the leiſure to conſider it; I have found it, ready to my hand, in a book of the Sieur Cotin, before I had conſidered this ſubject. And, as it is but juſt to give every one his due, I ſhall make uſe of the words of this writer. The gods ‘have bodies, or ſomething like bodies, ſince beſides vacuum and body, and what reſults from their union, we cannot ſo much as conceive any other nature. This Epicurus poſitively teaches;

This All conſiſts of body and of ſpace.

ſays the interpreter of this Philoſopher, who alſo believes, that, if the ſoul were incorporeal, it could neither do nor ſuffer any thing. What felicity then would the gods have, if they were incorporeal (120)? . . . . . *Their bodies* are compoſed of atoms . . . . and there is a vacuum betwixt the parts which compoſe theſe divine bodies . . . . . ſince vacuum and atoms are the principles of all things. Every body . . . . may be reſolved into the parts which compoſe it; and the heap of atoms . . . . cannot eternally ſubſiſt in the ſame manner; they are too volatile, and moveable to remain always at reſt (121).’ Cotin inſers from all this, ‘that Epicurus's gods, though diſcharged from human affairs, are not ſo happy and quiet as he imagines: they are not without apprehenſion and fear of the laſt ſeparation of atoms, which being once diſperſed thro' the vacuum, will never unite again. Thus, ſays this Philoſopher, the particles which compoſe the ſoul being once diſperſed, can never reunite throughout all ages: otherwiſe we might be, after we had ceaſed to be; that is to ſay, the reſurrection would be naturally poſſible. An hypotheſis, however, which may be inferred from Epicuriſm (122): for why may not the ſame chance, which had once united the little bodies, that compoſed Pythocles and Metrodorus, be able to re-unite them once again? . . . . . Beſides . . . . . the Epicurean gods having ſettled their manſions amidſt thoſe innumerable worlds, which overthrow one another, and make a dreadful craſh, how can they bear, without extream diſturbance, ſo many ponderous maſſes falling round about them, and perhaps upon their heads? For chance knows them not, and conſequently can pay them no reſpect (123).’ Note, that this writer obſerves (124), that moſt of the Epicureans have ſaid, that the *gods . . . are not compoſed of atoms*. What I offer hereupon may be ſeen in the remark [*F*] of the article EPICURUS (125). They perceived, that eternal felicity, which they attributed to the gods, was not conſiſtent with the contexture of atoms. It was neceſſary therefore to give them another nature; but hereby they ruined the fundamental article of their ſyſtem, that capital principle which is the baſis of their Phyſics, *viz.* that atoms and vacuum are the principles of all things. I do not think Lucretius could ever get clear of this difficulty. He muſt either have given up the bleſſed eternity of his deities, or his two principles, for it is not poſſible to retain both theſe doctrines at the ſame time. Hence we may judge, that the hypotheſis of the exiſtence of the gods; which is the richeſt jewel in the ſyſtem of Anaxagoras, and ſome other Philoſophers, and the nobleſt and moſt excellent piece of the whole machine, is the weakeſt part of the Epicurean ſyſtem. Their founder, having delivered himſelf from all fear, with reſpect to the divine juſtice, found himſelf, in other reſpects, more embaraſſed with his gods, than if he had aſcribed to them a providence. He durſt not deny their exiſtence, and yet he knew not what to do with them, or where to place them. Whatever he could ſay of them, made a breach in his ſyſtem, and expoſed him to invincible objections. See how Cicero has turned him into ridicule, as well upon the ſubtilty of the bodies of the gods (126), as their human ſhape (127), *&c.*

WHETHER Epicurus owned a Providence.

The Sieur Cotin taxes him with a palpable contradiction, with reſpect to divine providence. ‘What will you ſay, if I ſhew you, by a preciſe and formal paſſage of Epicurus, that he not only believed a Deity, but alſo owned his providence? . . . . . This paſſage is in his epiſtle to Meneceus *; it is certain there are gods: but we muſt have a care of attributing to God, *mark this*, who is an immortal and moſt happy being, any quality repugnant to his immutable felicity. No, he is not impious, who does not believe that croud of gods, which the greateſt part of men imagine and never ſaw, but he who believes things too mean and unworthy of them. The gods ſend to theſe prophane wretches, who diſhonour them by their falſe opinions, innumerable calamities; and, on the contrary, heap their benefits upon the wiſe and good. The reaſon whereof is, becauſe they love their like, and think that what is not agreeable to virtue, is not agreeable to their nature. Seneca, Epictetus, and Plato, could not

(115) Et Nebula ac Fumus quoniam diſcedit in auras: Crede Animam quoque diffundi, multoque perire Ocius, & citiùs diſſolvi corpora prima, Cum ſemel omnibus è membris ablata receſſit, *&c.* *Lucret. lib. iii, ver* 437, *pag.* 155.

(116) Lettre d'un Docteur . . . au Pere le Comte, ubi ſupra, pag. 43.

(117) *See the remark* [*E*], *at the beginning.*

(118) Lucret. lib. i, ver. 420.

(119) Id. ibid. ver. 446.

(120) Cotin Theoclée, ou la vraye Philoſophie des Principes du Monde, Dialog. III, pag. 54.

(121) Id. ibid. pag. 56.

(122) *We have ſeen, above, citat* (110), *that Lucretius plainly acknowledges this poſſibility.*

(123) Cotin, ubi ſupra, pag. 57.

(124) Id. ibid. pag. 58.

(125) *Citat.* (81), *and following.*

(126) Cicero, de Natura Deor. lib. i, ſect. lxviii, pag. 95, & lib. ii, ſect. lix, pag. 313.

(127) Id. ibid. lib. i, ſect. xci, pag. 132.

* Diog. Laert. *in the Life of Epicurus.*

who would attack them; and in this, his ſyſtem does not appear to be the production of a man who can reaſon conſiſtently.

‘ ſpeak more divinely. Epicurus, thou, at the bottom of thy ſoul, art religious, becauſe nature cannot wholly deny itſelf: the misfortune is, that thou canſt not ſay what thou ſayeſt, without contradicting thyſelf (128).’ Here you ſee a flight and a moral reflexion, which the author would have placed better, if he had brought them into one of his ſermons. But wherever he had placed them, they would have been ill grounded; for it is not true that Epicurus ever wrote to Meneceus, what Cotin attributes to him. Let us ſee the Greek words, with the learned Gaſſendus's Latin tranſlation, which will clearly ſhew, that Epicurus's notion is as remote from Cotin's ſenſe, as heaven from earth. Ἀσεβὴς δὲ οὐχ᾽ ὁ τοὺς τῶν πολλῶν Θεοὺς ἀναιρῶν, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ τὰς τῶν πολλῶν δόξας Θεοῖς προσάπτων. Οὐ γὰρ προλήψεις εἰσὶν, ἀλλ᾽ ὑπολήψεις ψευδεῖς αἱ τῶν πολλῶν ὑπὲρ Θεῶν ἀποφάσεις. Ἔνθεν καὶ μεγίστας βλάβας οἴονται, τοῖς κακοῖς ἐκ Θεῶν ἐπάγεσθαι, καὶ ὠφελείας τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς. Ταῖς γὰρ ἰδίαις οἰκειούμενοι διὰ παντὸς τοὺς ὁμοίους ἀποδέχονται, πᾶν τὸ μὴ τοιοῦτον, ὡς ἀλλότριον νομίζοντες. Impius eſt proinde, non is, qui *vulgareis* multitudinis Deos tollit; ſed is, qui multitudinis opiniones Diis adhibet. Non enim *germanæ* prænotiones ſunt, ſed ſuſpiciones falſæ, ea, quæ de Diis ab hominibus è vulgo traduntur. Arbitrantur quippe & malis detrimenta maxima; & bonis præſidia à Diis advenire: ſiquidem propriis virtutibus, ſeu affectibus innutriti, ſimileis ſui *Deos* admittunt, & quicquid affectuum ſuorum non eſt, id exiſtimant ab ipſis alienum (129). —— *He therefore is not impious who denies the gods of the vulgar, but he who attributes the notions of the vulgar to the gods. For the ſentiments of the vulgar concerning the gods, are not true and certain, but falſe and ſuppoſititious only; for they imagine, that great misfortunes befall the wicked; and bleſſings are beſtowed upon good men, by the direction of the gods, aſcribing to them their own paſſions and inclinations, and excluding from them, whatever they feel not in themſelves.*

However, this contradiction does not concern Lucretius; and, if I have mentioned it, it is only to ſhew the beſt and the worſt ſide of his cenſure.

(128) Cotin, ubi ſupra, pag. 59.

(129) Diog. Laërt. lib. x, (n. 123, 124.) pag. 46, Tom V, Oper. Gaſſendi.

LUGO (FRANCIS DE) elder brother to the cardinal of that name, of whom I ſpeak below, was born at Madrid in 1580, and became a Jeſuit at Salamanca in 1600. He took ſo much pleaſure in humbling himſelf, that, after having taught Philoſophy, he begged of his ſuperiors the employ of explaining the rudiments of Grammar, and obtained it. Having afterwards taught Divinity, he deſired he might be ſent to the Indies, to teach the Infidels their Catechiſm and Grammar. But they employed him to to higher purpoſes: they gave him a profeſſorſhip of Divinity in the cities of Mexico and Santa Fe. Finding that the employment given him in this country did not agree with that humility in which he deſigned to live, he deſired to be re-called to Spain. In his return he loſt the greateſt part of his commentaries upon Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologica* [*A*]. He was deputed to Rome by the province of Caſtile, to aſſiſt at the eighth general aſſembly of the Jeſuits, and ſtayed there after the breaking up of this aſſembly to exerciſe two offices, *viz.* that of cenſor to the books publiſhed by the Jeſuits, and that of Theologiſt to the general: but finding his reputation encreaſe daily, after his brother was made a cardinal, he returned into Spain, where he was choſen rector of two colleges. He died the ſeventeenth of December 1652 (*a*). He is the author of ſeveral books [*B*]. If any one refuſes to believe what I have been ſaying of this Jeſuit's humility, I ſhall not charge him with incredulity.

(*a*) *Taken from* Nathan. Southwell, Bibl. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 255.

[*A*] *The greateſt part of his commentaries upon Thomas Aquinas's* Summa Theologica.] He himſelf was in danger to be taken by the Hollanders. ‘ Dum renavigat in Hiſpaniam claſſe ab Hollandis intercepta, ipſe quidem in terram evaſit in Inſula Cubæ, ſed maximæ partis commentariorum ſuorum in totam Summam Theologicam Sancti Thomæ jacturam fecit (1). —— *Sailing back into Spain, he was taken by a Dutch ſquadron; however, he got ſafe aſhore in the iſle of Cuba, but the greateſt part of his commentary upon the* Summa Theologica *of St Thomas was loſt.*’

(1) Nathan. Southwell, Bibl. Societ. Jeſu, pag. 255.

[*B*] *He is the author of ſeveral books.*] The titles are as follows, and ſhew, that he wrote upon the ſame things as his brother. *Commentarii in primam partem S. Thomæ de Deo, Trinitate, & Angelis*, at Lyons, in 1647, two volumes in folio. *De Sacramentis in genere, baptiſmo, confirmatione, & Sacra Euchariſtia*, at Venice, in 1652, in 4to. *Diſcurſus prævius ad Theologiam moralem, ſive de principiis moralibus actuum humanorum*, at Madrid, 1643, in 4to. *Quæſtiones morales de Sacramentis*, at Grenada, in 1644, in 4to (2).

(2) *Taken from Southwell*, ibid.

LUGO (JOHN DE) a Spaniſh Jeſuit and cardinal, was born at Madrid the twenty fifth of November 1583; but he always wrote himſelf of Seville, becauſe his father kept his ordinary reſidence there [*A*]. He diſcovered his parts when he was but three years old, for he could read printed books and manuſcripts. He maintained ſome theſes at fourteen, and was ſent ſoon after to Salamanca to ſtudy the Civil-law, in imitation of his elder brother, and notwithſtanding the oppoſitions of his father, he became a Jeſuit the ſixth of July 1603. He finiſhed his courſe of Philoſophy with the Jeſuits at Pampelona, and ſtudied Divinity at Salamanca. After the death of his father, he

[*A*] *Becauſe his father kept his ordinary reſidence at Seville.*] He had a very honourable employment there: I would name it, if I knew how it is called in Spaniſh (1): but not knowing it, I ſhall uſe the Latin words of Don Nicolas Antonio (2). *Joannes de Lugo, Joannis filius civis & Jurati (quomodo ſecundi ſubſellii decuriones vocant) Hiſpalenſis.* The ſtates of the kingdom being called to Madrid, he aſſiſted there as deputy of his country (3): he married in the ſame city Tereſa de Quiroga, and had the ſon by her, who is the ſubject of this article (4). This ſon might have been more rightly ſirnamed *Hiſpalenſis*, than *Madritenſis*; for when a woman lyes-in, in a journey, it is not uſual to make that the child's birth-place where he is born, but where his parents live. This is the caſe of children of embaſſadors, born in the places of their embaſſy. They are reckoned natives of the places where their father would reſide, were they not embaſſadors: and becauſe they are abſent upon public affairs, *Republicæ Cauſa*, their children have the ſame priviledges as thoſe who are born at home. Thus it was with cardinal de Lugo's father; he only reſided at Madrid, as deputy of Seville to the aſſembly of the States of the kingdom.

(1) I believe thoſe who enjoy this employment are called *Jurados*, as the conſuls of Bourdeaux are called *Jurats*; but theſe conſuls are choſen every year.

(2) Bibl. Script. Hiſpan. Tom. I, pag. 556.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) Nath. Southwell, Bibl. Script. Societat. pag. 471.

[*B*] *He*

he was ſent by his ſuperiors to Seville, to take poſſeſſion of his patrimony which was very conſiderable. He divided it with his brother's conſent betwixt the Jeſuits of Seville and thoſe of Salamanca. He taught Philoſophy for five years (*a*), and afterwards was made profeſſor of Divinity at Valladolid. The ſucceſs with which he diſcharged this employment, made him eſteemed worthy of a more eminent chair: accordingly in the fifth year of his profeſſorſhip he received orders to go to Rome, to teach Divinity there. He ſet out in March 1621; and, having eſcaped ſeveral dangers in croſſing the provinces of France, he arrived at Rome in the beginning of June the ſame year. He profeſſed Divinity there twenty years, with a great reputation; for he thoroughly underſtood ſchool Divinity: He made a good choice (*b*) of the opinions he defended, and was admirable for joining brevity with perſpicuity. He minded only his own buſineſs, without loſing time in making his court to the cardinals, or frequenting ambaſſadors houſes. He never affected to be an author, but having received a command to publiſh ſome of his works, his vow of obedience did not permit him to diſpenſe with it. He printed ſeven large volumes in folio [*B*]; the fourth of which he dedicated to Urban VIII. This Pope made him a cardinal the fourteenth of December 1643. Some very ſingular things are related, which ſhow how free from ambition this Jeſuit was [*C*]. While he was cardinal, he ſhewed himſelf very charitable to the poor: he liberally diſtributed the bark to ſuch as were afflicted with agues [*D*]. He died the twentieth of Auguſt 1660, leaving all his eſtate to the Jeſuits of the profeſſed college at Rome, and would be buried at the feet of Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the order (*c*). He invented the hypotheſis of turgid points [*E*], to ſolve the unſurmountable objections, both againſt the diviſibility of parts *ad infinitum*, and againſt Mathematical points. A fragment of one

(*a*) *Nicolas Antonio*, Biblioth. Scriptor. Hiſpan. Tom. I, pag. 556, *ſays, that de Lugo taught Philoſophy at Medina del Campo.*

(*b*) Erat quippe in ſeligendis melioribus ſententiis præſtantis judicii, in explicandis iiſdem eximiæ claritatis, & cum perſpicuitate, quod rarum eſt, conjungebat congruam brevitatem. *Nat. Sotuel. Biblioth. Scripter. Societ. Jeſu*, pag. 471, 472.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

[*B*] *He printed ſeven large volumes in folio.*] The firſt treats *de Incarnatione Dominica*, and was printed at Lyons, in 1633, and 1653. The ſecond, *de Sacramentis in genere & de ven. Euchariſtiæ ſacramento & ſacrificio*, at Lyons, 1636. The third, *de Virtute & Sacramento Pœnitentiæ*, at Lyons, 1638, 1644, and 1651. The fourth, and fifth, *de Juſtitia & Jure*, at Lyons, 1642, and 1652. The ſixth, *de Virtute Divinæ fidei*, at Lyons, 1646, and 1656. The ſeventh is a collection *Reſponſorum Moralium*, at Lyons, 1651, and 1660. Beſides this, he wrote notes, *in privilegia vivæ vocis oraculo conceſſa ſocietati*, printed at Rome, in 1645, in 12mo; and he tranſlated the Life of the bleſſed Lewis de Gonzaga out of Italian into Spaniſh (5). The fourth of theſe volumes was dedicated to Pope Urban VIII. The author hereupon was obliged to go and pay his reſpects to this Pope, to whom he had never ſpoke (6). He was favourably received by him; and from that time Urban employed him on ſeveral occaſions, and expreſſed a particular affection for him. De Lugo ſeeing himſelf obliged to be an author, employed no amanuenſis, or any other perſon, to fit his manuſcripts for the preſs. He himſelf underwent all this great labour (7). Father Maimbourg has made uſe of a thought of this cardinal; which the reader will perhaps be glad to find here, and may give him ſome notion of the principles of this Spaniſh doctor. 'The church, *ſays Father Maimbourg* (8), 'has not yet thought it neceſſary to determine any 'thing concerning the *immaculate conception of the Holy Virgin.* It has not uſed this method concerning her exemption from venial ſin, having decided 'that point as being an appurtenance of faith . . . . . 'She has ſearched the ſcriptures and apoſtolical tradition, and the ſenſe of the holy fathers, upon the quality of the mother of God, to diſcover the whole extent of it. And † as afterwards ſhe found the exemption from venial ſin to be comprized in this ſupreme dignity, as a neceſſary conſequence in it's 'principle, ſhe has defined it as a point of faith ⸸, 'revealed in the word of God, which contains it. 'This is the remark of the learned and ſubtle cardinal 'de Lugo ‡, in his excellent treatiſe concerning faith, 'which I had the honour to receive from him at Rome, 'when I was his diſciple.'

[*C*] *Some very ſingular things are related, which ſhew how free from ambition this Jeſuit was.*] He was created a cardinal without his knowledge, or the leaſt thought that the Pope had any ſuch deſign. Hearing the news of his creation, he was almoſt confounded; and did not give the meſſenger, who brought the news, the preſent due to him on ſuch occaſions: the reaſon he gave for it was, that this news was diſagreeable to him; and he would not ſuffer the college of Jeſuits to give any teſtimony of joy, or play-days to the ſcholars. He looked on the coach, that cardinal Francis Barberini ſent him, as if it had been his coffin; and, when he was in the Pope's palace, he declared to the officers, who were preparing to put on his cardinal's robes, that he firſt deſired to repreſent to his Holineſs, that the vows he made, as a Jeſuit, forbad him to accept the cardinal's cap. He was anſwered, that the Pope diſpenſed with thoſe vows: *Diſpenſations*, replied he, *leave a man to his natural liberty, which if I am permitted to enjoy, I ſhall always refuſe the cardinalſhip.* They were therefore obliged to introduce him to the Pope: to whom he told his reaſons, and asked him, whether his Holineſs commanded him, in virtue of holy obedience, to accept this dignity: the Pope anſwered he did; whereupon de Lugo humbly acquieſced, and ſtooped to receive the hat. The purple did not hinder his retaining a Jeſuit conſtantly near him, as a perpetual witneſs of his actions: he continued to dreſs and undreſs himſelf, without the aſſiſtance of any of his domeſtics. He would have no tapeſtries in his palace; and he ſettled ſuch regular orders in it, that it was a kind of ſeminary. This is a good part of Father Southwell's account (9): every one may believe of it what he pleaſes.

[*D*] *He liberally diſtributed the bark to ſuch as were afflicted with agues.*] This febrifuge came from Peru. It was brought to Rome in 1650, by the Jeſuits; from whence it is called in ſome places *Jeſuits Powder*. There was an attempt to diſcredit it, which made Father Fabri publiſh a book at Rome, in the year 1655, intituled, *Pulvis Peruvinus Febrifugus vindicatus* (10). This powder was then very dear, as Southwell affirms. By this he heightens the cardinal's charity. *Quibuſque* (pauperibus) *corticem Peruanum non levis pretii contra febres benigne & liberaliter diſtribuebat* (11). It is obſerved, in Furetiere's Dictionary, at the word *Quinquina*, that this febrifuge was called *at firſt, cardinal de Lugo's powder.*

[*E*] *He invented the hypotheſis of turgid points.*] To ſpeak more exactly, I think it ought to be ſaid, that finding this hypotheſis almoſt dropped, he adopted it, and brought it into credit. It does not remedy the difficulties that are propoſed againſt Mathematical points: and beſides it manifeſtly includes an incomprehenſible abſurdity; which is, that a corpuſcle, which in itſelf has neither parts nor extenſion, ſhould ſwell at ſuch a rate, as to fill ſeveral parts of ſpace. The ordinary doctrine of the ſchool-men, concerning rarefaction, gave occaſion to John de Lugo to evade the great inconveniencies of this ſtrange abſurdity. The ſchool-men teach, that a rarefied body takes up more ſpace than it did before, without acquiring any new parts of matter; the ſame body, ſay they, ſometimes fills a greater ſpace, and ſometimes a leſſer: but as this doctrine is abſolutely incomprehenſible, and contradictory, it could be but of very ſmall advantage to this Jeſuit. See how Arriaga confutes him without naming him (12).

[*F*] *A fragrant*

(5) *Taken from Southwell*, ubi ſupra, pag. 471, 472.

(6) Ea occaſione neceſſe habuit adire ſuam Sanctitatem, quam nunquam antea fuerat allocutus. *Id ibid.* pag. 472.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) Maimbourg, Methode Pacifique, pag. 60, *of the third edition*, 1682.

† Aug. lib. de Nat. & Grat. cap. xxxvi.

⸸ Conc. Trid.

‡ Diſp. III, ſect. v, n. 73.

(9) *Southwell*, ubi ſupra, *Nicolas Antonio*, ubi ſupra, *ſays, in general, the ſame things.*

(10) *He diſguiſed himſelf in the title-page of this book, under the name of* Antimus Coningius. *Southwell*, ubi ſupra, pag. 350. *I believe that inſtead of* Coningius, *he ought to ſay* Conygius, *a name derived from the Greek, to ſignify a healthful powder*

(11) Id. ibid. pag. 472.

(12) Roder de Arriaga, Diſput. xvi, Phyſicæ, ſect. ix, pag. 421, & ſeq. Edit. Pariſ. 1639.

one of his letters has diſcovered a pretty curious myſtery [*F*]; which is, that there is ſometimes a nice piece of policy in the devotion to the holy Virgin.

He is ſaid to be the firſt author of the diſcovery of the Philoſophical Sin [*G*].

[*F*] *A fragment of one of his letters has diſcovered a pretty curious myſtery.*] The Jeſuits teach the immaculate conception not out of piety, but out of hatred to the Dominicans, and to render them odious to the people. The cardinal du Lugo, a Jeſuit, wrote this letter to one of their fathers at Madrid. 'I deſire your reverence may be pleaſed to take care, that your ſociety diligently apply themſelves in your quarters, to enforce the devotion of the conception, for which the people of Spain, have a great affection, to ſee if, by that means, we can give a diverſion to the Dominicans, who preſs us hard here in defending St Auguſtin: and, I believe, if we cannot oblige them to employ themſelves upon ſome other ſubject, they will overcome us in the principal points *de auxiliis* (13).

[*G*] *He is ſaid to be the firſt author of the diſcovery of the philoſophical ſin.*] See the book intituled, *The Philoſophiſm of the Jeſuits of Marſeilles*, there you will find the following words (14). That which embaraſſes de Lugo, 'in admitting actual ſins purely philoſophical in a ſavage, at leaſt during the ſhort time in which he ſuppoſes and maintains, that he may be inculpably ignorant of God, is, that this ſavage may poſſibly die, within this ſmall time, in his philoſophical ſins; and that he does not know what God may think fit to do with, nor what judgment he may paſs upon ſuch a ſinner, nor in what rank he may place, him for eternity. Some other Jeſuits ſend him to the limbo of ſtill born infants after a temporal puniſhment, proportioned to the philoſophical ſin, of what nature ſoever it be, whether parricide, inceſt, &c. But de Lugo chuſes rather to eſtabliſh a new order of providence.... In this new order *, God, rather than baniſh out of this world the philoſophical ſin, which is ſo neceſſary in it, and not to be embaraſſed what to do in the next, with this ſort of ſinners, will work a miracle rather than let them die in this ſtate. He will give them, before they leave this world, as much knowledge of the true God, as ſhall be neceſſary to qualify them for ſinning theologically, or at leaſt as muſt light as may be neceſſary to create a doubt in their minds that there may be a God, and wait and prolong their life till they have committed, with this knowledge or under this doubt, ſome ſin which he may proceed againſt as a mortal ſin, and puniſh it eternally in hell; for that doubt alone which he would neglect to remove would render his ſin eternally puniſhable, becauſe, that, by ſinning in this ſtate, he would expoſe himſelf to the danger of offending him, who is the author of his being. The thought is wholly new, and worthy of him, who appears to be the firſt Jeſuit, who made the diſcovery of the philoſophical ſin.' We may, eaſily perceive, that the author, who thus ſets forth the doctrine of this Jeſuit, mixes ſome touches of raillery in what he ſays: but after all, it is not ſtrange, that a doctor ſhould be embaraſſed, when he endeavours to reconcile the eternal damnation of man with the natural ideas, which clearly diſcover to us, that, in order to an action's having a character of morality, it is indiſpenſably neceſſary, that a perſon, committing this action, know whether it be good or bad, or be ignorant of it through his own fault. It is an eaſy matter to ſtumble in ſuch way, ſince we can hardly avoid making ſome falſe ſteps, even when we propoſe to acquit the judgments of God, of whatever ſeemingly makes them appear leſs equitable The ſuppoſition of our de Lugo does not tend to diminiſh the number of the damned, but to render them more notoriouſly to deſerve damnation.

LUPERCALIA, a feaſt celebrated by the Romans, on the fifteenth of February. Romulus was not the inventer of it (*a*), but Evander, who introduced it into Italy (*b*), whither he retired ſixty years before the Trojan war. As Pan was the great Divinity of Arcadia, Evander, a native of that country appointed the feaſt of the Lupercalia in honour of this god (*c*), to be celebrated in the place where he built houſes for the colony he brought with him; that is, upon the Palatin Mount. He there built a temple (*d*) to the god Pan; and ordained a ſolemn feaſt, which was celebrated by ſacrifices offered to that god; and by the races of naked people, with whips in their hands, wherewith they laſhed all they met in their way. Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus cites Ælius Tubero, whoſe exactneſs he commends. He cites him I ſay, to ſhew, that this feaſt was celebrated, according to Evander's inſtitution, before Romulus and Remus thought of building Rome. But, as it was pretended, that they were nurſed by a wolf, in the very place which Evander had conſecrated to the god Pan, no doubt this determined Romulus to continue the feaſt of the Lupercalia, and to render it more famous. The LUPERCI (which was the name of the prieſts, who officiated in this particular worſhip of Pan) were divided into two ſocieties; one of which bore the name of Quintilii, the other that of Fabii (*e*), to perpetuate, as is ſaid, the memory of one Quintilius and of one Fabius, who had been the heads, the one of the party of Romulus, and the other of the party of Remus. A long time after was added to them the college or ſociety of Julii, in honour of Julius Cæſar (*f*). Marc Antony entered himſelf into this ſociety [*A*]. Though the celebration of the Lupercalia ſerved only to diſgrace religion, yet Auguſtus perceiving, that it had been diſcontinued for ſome years, gave orders for the re-eſtabliſhing

[*A*] *Marc Antony entered himſelf to this ſociety.*] Cicero, in the ſecond Philippic, tells him, 'Ita eras Lupercus, ut te conſulem eſſe meminiſſe deberes. *Though you were one of the Luperci, you ought alſo to remember you was a conſul.*' Whence we may reaſonably conclude, that he was one of the Julii Luperci; for ſo great a flatterer of Julius Cæſar, as he, would have been far from entering into either of the two antient ſocieties, whilſt there was a new one eſtabliſhed in honour of Julius Cæſar. But, without drawing inferences, we find the fact clearly in Cicero's oration againſt Marc Antony, as Dion Caſſius relates it (1). Τὰ γὰρ λυκαῖα ἦν καὶ ἐπὶ τȣ͂ ἑταιρικȣ͂ τȣ͂ Ἰȣλίȣ ἐτέτακτο; that is, according to Xilander's tranſlation, *Nimirum agenda ei erant Lupercalia uni ex Collegio Julio.* Father Abram (2) has tranſlated this Greek more exactly, thus, *Lupercalia enim erant, & ipſe in ſodalitate Julia erat conſtitutus. —— It was in the time of the Lupercalia, and he was one of the ſociety of the Julii.* After Julius Cæſar's death, the revenues were taken away from the Luperci, which he had beſtowed upon them. Marc Anthony complains of it, in his letter to Hirtius and Octavius, which is ſo exactly confuted by Cicero in the thirteenth Philippic. Manutius reading thus the paſſage, *Vectigalia Juliana Lupercis ademiſtis*, is in pain (3) to know whether Cæſar's liberality extended to all the colleges of the Luperci, or only to that which was conſecrated to himſelf; but Father Abram (4) is in no doubt, ſince he follows this reading, *Vectigalia Julianis Lupercis ademiſtis. — You have deprived the Julii Luperci of their income.* See Nonius's (5) citation of Cicero's letter to the young Cæſar.

---

(13) Morale Pratique des Jeſuites, Tom. I, pag. 270.

(14) *At Pag.* 119, 120.

* Dices ſaltem illo brevi tempore, quo ſine culpa ignoretur Deus, poſſet aliquis mori ante cognitionem Dei. Quid igitur fieret de illo adulto ſine peccato mortali? reſpondeo facilè ... in noſtro caſu dicendum, pertinere ad eandem providentiam Dei, ut nullus infidelis adultus moriatur, donec vel cognoſcat Deum, vel ſaltem dubitet, & culpabiliter omittat ejus inquiſitionem, vel, non obſtante illo dubio, committat alia peccata gravia: quæ quidem jam erunt omnino mortalia, cum opponat ſe periculo offendendi illum Conditorem, de quo dubitat an ſit. *De Lugo Tract. de Incarnat.*

(*a*) *Valerius Maximus*, lib. ii, cap. ii, *goes no higher than Romulus.*

(*b*) Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, lib. i.

(*c*) In hujus (*montis Palatini*) radicibus templum Lyceo quem Græci Pana, Romani Lupercum appellant conſtituit. (*Evander*) Ipſum Dei ſimulacrum nudum caprina pelle amictum eſt, quo habitu nunc Romæ Lupercalibus decurritur. *Juſtinus, lib. xliii, cap. i.*

(*d*) *Called* Lupercal.

(*e*) *See Ovid.* Faſtor. lib ii.

(*f*) *Dion. lib xliv*, (Hofman cites 24) *Sueton. in Cæſar. cap. lxxvi.*

(1) Lib. xlv.

(2) Commentar. in Philipp. II, pag. 704.

(3) In Philipp. XIII.

(4) In Philipp. XIII, pag. 703.

(5) Voce Conſtat. *The letter cited is in the ſecond book.*

ing it (*g*) [*B*]. This is infinitely leſs ſtrange, than to ſee it continued under Chriſtian emperors, and to find, that when, at laſt, Pope Gelaſus, in the year 496, would tolerate it no longer (*h*), there were Chriſtians found amongſt the ſenators themſelves, who endeavoured to maintain it, as appears by the apology which the Pope writ againſt them (*i*). Not only the Luperci ran like mad men along the ſtreets, during the Lupercalia, having only a little girdle to cover their *pudenda*; but ſeveral young people of quality, and even ſome of the principal magiſtrates [*C*], ran along with them in the ſame poſture (*k*), anointed with oil of olives [*D*], and like them laſhed the people who came in their way. In Auguſtus's time, no beardleſs youth was permitted to run with the Luperci (*l*). The women were ſo far from fearing theſe ſtripes, that, on the contrary, they voluntarily expoſed themſelves to them, in hopes of becoming fruitful, if barren, or being more eaſily delivered, if with child (*m*): but I much doubt the truth of what Pope Gelaſus ſays, *viz.* that the Roman ladies were glad to be publickly whipped ſtark naked on theſe occaſions (*n*); I believe they only ſtretched out their hands [*E*], as a boy

(*g*) Sueton. in Auguſt. cap. xxxi.

(*h*) *See* Baronius, Tom. VI, ad ann. 496, n. 28, & ſeq.

(*i*) Baronius, *ubi ſupra*, gives it entire.

(*k*) Plutarch, in the Life of Cæſar, and in that of Marc Antony. See alſo Feſtus, *in voce* Crepi.

(*l*) Lupercalibus vetuit currere imberbes. *Sueton. ubi ſupra.*

(*m*) Plut. in Cæſare & in Romulo.

(*n*) Apud illos nobiles ipſi currebant & matronæ nudato publice corpore, vapulabant. *Apud Baron. ubi ſupra*, *n.* 38.

[*B*] *Auguſtus . . . . gave orders for the re-eſtabliſhing it.*] Moreri makes Suetonius ſay, that Auguſtus reſtored the three ſocieties of the Luperci. This ſuppoſes they had been all ſuppreſſed, but Suetonius has no ſuch thing: He only ſays, that Auguſtus re-eſtabliſhed the Lupercalian ceremonies, *ſacrum Lupercale*, which had been by degrees aboliſhed. How many eccleſiaſtical or civil cuſtoms are there, which fall inſenſibly into diſuſe, though the bodies or ſocieties, which ought to practiſe them, ſubſiſt with all their incomes? does not Cicero ſay ſomewhere (6), that the ancient cuſtom of the auſpices was hardly any longer obſerved? And yet the colleges of the augurs, pontiffs, *&c.* ſubſiſted as before.

[*C*] *And even ſome of the principal magiſtrates.*] This we learn from Plutarch: Διαθέουσι δὲ, ſays he (7), τῶν εὐγενῶν νέοι πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων. Diſcurrunt autem & ex nobilibus juvenes multi & ex Magiſtratibus. —— *Some noble young men, ran as well as ſome magiſtrates.* He ſays the ſame in another place (8), and uſes the word, ἀρχόντων, they who tranſlate it, *thoſe who are the chief magiſtrates for that year*, or who are *then in the magiſtracy*, are, in my opinion, not amiſs: for a parentheſis, which Plutarch uſes in another place (9), clearly ſhews, that he believed the conſuls were obliged to run naked with the Luperci. Ἀντώνιος δὲ τῶν θεόντων τὸν ἱερὸν δρόμον εἷς ἦν (καὶ γὰρ ὑπάτευεν). Antonius autem unus eorum erat qui ſacrum curſum peragebant (gerebat enim Conſulatum). —— *Antony was one that ran the ſacred race, for he was then conſul.* But it is very probable, that Plutarch impoſes upon his readers; for if 'the cuſtom was ſuch (*I will ſet down* '*his own words* (10) *as they are in our Engliſh tran*'*ſlation*) that on this day, there were many young 'noblemen, and even thoſe who were the principal 'magiſtrates that year, who ran ſtark naked through the 'city, anointed with oil of olives, *&c.* If (11) An'tony was one of thoſe that ran this ſacred race '(*of the Lupercalia*) as being then conſul,' how is it that Cicero ventured to ſay, in a full ſenate (12), that, from the foundation of Rome, not only no conſul, but no prætor, no tribune of the people, no ædile, ever did what Mark Antony ventured to do? Now what was that action of his? It was this, that, being conſul, he went naked, and anointed, to the public place, under pretence of the Lupercalia, got into the pulpit, and harangued the people. Marc Antony endeavoured to juſtify this conduct by his being Lupercus: but he was anſwered, that the quality of conſul, which he then bore, ought to take place of that of Lupercus; and that every body knew, that the conſulſhip was a dignity of the whole people, whoſe majeſty ought ever to be preſerved, and not expoſed or rendered contemptible in any reſpect whatſoever. Let no body tell me, that Cicero does not blame this conſul, for his haranguing the people naked; for beſides, that the contrary appears from the citations before-mentioned, we muſt know that Cicero made uſe of a figure, which manifeſtly contains this maxim, *The Lupercalia might be celebrated according to all the ceremonies belonging to them, without the conſul's diſhonouring the whole city, by his nakedneſs, and by his poſtures.* It is certain therefore, that Plutarch is miſtaken. For Cicero, more worthy of credit than he, in what concerns the dignity of the conſulſhip, takes it for granted, that the Lupercalian races were inconſiſtent with this dignity; and that never any conſul, or any of the principal magiſtrates of Rome, were concerned in them before Marc Antony; but Plutarch pretends, that the conſul, and the other magiſtrates, were always concerned in them.

Who would not be ſurprized to find Father Abram (13) draw this conſequence from the principles and reaſoning of Cicero, *that one and the ſame perſon at the ſame time was to be conſul and Lupercus*; *unum & eundem & conſulem & Lupercum fieri debuiſſe.* It was eaſy for him to confute this conſequence by the words in which Plutarch affirms, as we have already ſeen, that the young Roman nobility and magiſtrates ran the races in the Lupercalia. He adds, in confirmation, the paſſage of the ſame hiſtorian, in which it is ſaid, that becauſe Marc Anthony was conſul, he was one of theſe runners; and thence concludes that Plutarch would inſinuate, that they who were not magiſtrates were excluded from theſe races. A man would almoſt adviſe the renouncing ſtudy when he ſees learned men entangle themſelves in ſuch abſurdities, upon things as clear as the ſun. Abram ought at leaſt to have refuted Plutarch, by the long paſſage of Dion, which he has partly cited, and partly referred to.

Britannicus (14) affirms, that it was lawful for all, whether men or women, to celebrate this feaſt: whence Plutarch writes, that Marc Antony, in celebrating it, was carried along the ſtreets ſtark naked in a coach, by women and maids ſtark naked (15). This commentator has but ill expreſſed his own meaning; for how could a man, that was carried by women, ride in a coach through the city? But this is not the worſt of it; it is hardly to be doubted, but he has erroneouſly fathered this upon Plutarch; and that at bottom, it is falſe. Were it true, Cicero's Philippics, which do not mention it, would, doubtleſs, have thundered againſt Antony.

[*D*] *Anointed with oil of olives.*] I have followed the tranſlation of Xylander. Others tranſlate Plutarch's Greek, ἀλειλημμένοι λίπα, by *unguento delibuti*, -- *beſmeared with ointment.* The difference is ſmall; Cicero (16) ſpeaking of the Lupercalia of Marc Antony, makes uſe of the words *unguentis oblitus.* Dion mentioning the oration of Cicero againſt Marc Antony, uſes twice on the ſame ſubject of the Lupercalia the word μεμυρισμένος, *unguentis delibutus.* Lloyd fancies he ſays a thing but little known, when he tells us, that he had learnt from a paſſage of Appian, that the Luperci anointed their bodies. *Nudum etiam corpus tunc illis unctum neſcio an vulgo notum ſit ſed eruo ex Appian. lib. 2. Bell. Civil.* He neither cites Plutarch, nor Dion, nor Cicero; but Appian, who has only copied Plutarch, except the parentheſis which may be ſeen in the margin, where it is expreſly obſerved, that this unction was a cuſtomary thing (17).

[*E*] *I believe they only ſtretched out their hands.*] I do not pretend to deny, what Charles Stephens, and ſeveral of his tranſcribers or his originals ſay, *viz.* that the Luperci, running naked through the city, laſhed the women on their hands and bellies: *Nudi per urbem curſitabant mulierum palmas uteroſque caprina pelle ferientes.* But I ſay, that this does not juſtify Pope Gelaſus; for it muſt be, undoubtedly, ſuppoſed, that the blows upon the belly were given upon the cloaths. As for the ſtory which Ovid tells, and which ſeems to make againſt me, I anſwer, I. that it only relates to the particular time, in which the oracle was given; and

(6) De Divinat. lib. ii, fol. m. 318, verſo.

(7) In vita Antonii.

(8) In vita Cæſar.

(9) Ibid.

(10) In vita Antonii.

(11) In vita Cæſar.

(12) Apud Dion. lib. xlv.

(13) In Philipp. II, pag. 704.

(14) Britannicus, in Juvenal. Sat. II, ver. 142, pag. 83, Edit. Pariſ. 1613, in 4to.

(15) Præter Sacerdotes licebat omnibus tam viris quam mulieribus ludos celebrare, unde ſcribit Plut. M. Antonium nudum in Lupercalibus curru per urbem fuiſſe vectum à matronis & virginibus omnia membra nudatis. *Id. ibid.*

(16) Philipp. XIII.

(17) Ἀντώνιος ὑπατεύων σὺν αὐτῷ Καίσαρι καὶ διαθέων τότε γυμνὸς ἀληλειμμένος (ὥσπερ εἰώθασιν οἱ τῆς ἑορτῆς ἱερέες) ἐπὶ τὰ ἔμβολα ἀναδραμὼν ἐςεφάνωσε διαδήματι. *Lloyd*, voce Lupercalia. *This paſſage of Appian may be thus rendered*, Antonius ipſius in Conſulatu Collega diſcurrens nudus & unctus (ut mos eſt per id ſolemne Lupercis) conſcendenſque roſtra diadema capiti ejus impoſuit.

boy does (*o*), who receives the ferula from his maſter (*p*). As to the ceremonies the Luperci were to obſerve in ſacrificing (which were, doubtleſs, very ſingular, ſince, amongſt other things, there were to be two boys preſent who laughed aloud) ſee Plutarch in the life of Romulus. And as for the reaſons why theſe prieſts were naked, during the divine ſervice, and when they ran along the ſtreets, ſee Ovid, who gives a great many of them, in his ſecond book of Faſti. One is taken from the ill ſucceſs of Pan's amours, which is pleaſant enough; and which hath been very ill related by Du Boulai [*F*].

and that it muſt not be believed, that any women, but thoſe who were then married, and at the age of Child-bearing, ſubmitted to the ſentence of the oracle. I ſay, II. that Ovid doe snot tell us how or by whom they were laſhed; whether naked, or in their cloaths; whether by their husbands, or the Luperci. What way ſoever it was done we do not find in it the proof of Pope Gelaſus's aſſertion; for their husbands were far from whipping them publickly, ſince the oracle did not command it; or from ſuffering the Luperci to whip them, otherwiſe than in private, and as the high-prieſt whipped the veſtals, who had ſuffered the ſacred fire to go out (18). This manner of execution fullfilled the ſenſe of the oracle; and it is to be believed, that the husbands went no farther, and, perhaps too, ſtood ready at hand to prevent the Luperci's uſing one ſort of inſtrument for another.

Ovid's ſtory is this. He ſays (19), that in Romulus's time, women became ſo barren, that this prince ſaid, it had been much better they had never ſtole them (20). They had recourſe to prayers; husbands and wives proſtrated themſelves in a wood conſecrated to Juno. The goddeſſes anſwer threw them into a a violent anxiety; for theſe words were diſtinctly heard: *That an ugly old goat ſhould leap the Roman wives. Italidas matres, inquit, caper hirtus inito.* By good luck an augur that was preſent, put them out of pain: he ſacrificed a goat, and ordered, that the skin ſhould be employed to whip the women (21); which they conſenting to, failed not to lie-in in ten months time. Thomas Bartholin (22), who has adapted to his ſubject the general cuſtom of their ſubmitting to be whipped by the Luperci, which Meibomius had forgotten (23), would have found his account better in the particular adventure I have related.

[*F*] *Ovid . . . . gives . . . . a reaſon pleaſant enough, which has been very ill told by Du Boulai.*] As Du Boulai (24) has told it with ſeveral interpolations, I think myſelf obliged to give a faithful account of it here, in order to inſpire my readers with a juſt miſtruſt of writers, who tranſcribe one another, without recurring to the original (25): the ſtory is thus. Hercules travelling with Omphale, was ſeen by Faunus (26), who immediately fell in love with the fair one, and ſought an opportunity to enjoy her. Hercules and Omphale lodged that night in a cave, where, whilſt ſupper was getting ready, Omphale amuſed herſelf with changing cloaths with Hercules, dreſſing him in her petticoats, and trinkets, and putting on herſelf, inſtead of them, the lion's skin, the club, and the quiver. They ſupped in this equipage, and went to ſleep in it. They were to lie a-part that night, becauſe in the morning they were to ſacrifice to Bacchus, an act of religion which required continence the preceding night. Faunus, who had purſued his beloved object, ſtole into the cave, in the dark, whilſt the domeſtics were in a deep ſleep; not without hopes that Hercules and his miſtreſs were as faſt aſleep as they; and that, by this means he might perform his exploit. He groped about ſometimes on one ſide, and ſometimes on the other, till at laſt he found Omphale's bed: but he no ſooner touched the lion's skin, but he ſtarted back in a great fright. A little after, feeling about, he found Hercules's bed, and judging, by the fineneſs and ſoftneſs of the cloaths, that it was Omphale, he laid himſelf along, and with great eagerneſs began to take up her coats; and without being diſcouraged by the briſtly legs (27), thought to accompliſh his deſign. Hereupon the hero, giving him a thruſt with his elbow, threw him out of the bed (28). This awakened Omphale; ſhe calls up the people, a candle is brought, Faunus is found ſprawling on the ground, hardly able to riſe, and is made the laughing-ſtock to the company. Ovid pretends, that this is one of the reaſons of the nakedneſs of the Luperci: Faunus, taking an averſion for the habits which had thus deceived him, would not ſuffer his prieſts to wear any at all, during the ceremonies of his worſhip.

Let us now reckon up the faults, which Mr du Boulai has committed in the ſpace of twenty one lines. I. He ſays, that Hercules was paſſing through mount Palatin, when Faunus was ſmitten with his wife: but if he had read Ovid (29), he would have found that Hercules was then in Lydia. II. He does not know whether the wife that attended Hercules, was Iole or Omphale. Ovid's text, without leaving room for a doubt, fixes us to Omphale. III. He ſays, that Hercules retired into a foreſt, to avoid the ſcorching heat of the ſun. Ovid makes him retire into a cave, and only when it was late. IV. He ſays, that Omphale *going to bed, as being the more chilly and timorous, took the lion's skin, which her husband wore, to cover her, and the club to defend her from the wild beaſts.* There is not one word in Ovid concerning any of theſe motives: and beſides, what incoherence! that, on one hand, the ſeaſon, ſhould be ſo vehemently hot, as to oblige them to retire into a foreſt; and, on the other, the nights ſhould be ſo cold, that a young woman muſt cover herſelf with a lion's skin to keep herſelf from being ſtarved? V. He ſays, that Faunus obſerved every thing, except the change of the cloaths: Ovid makes him take notice of nothing, nor does he ſend him into the cave till mid-night, when all the ſervants, and Hercules, were aſleep. VI. He ſays, that *Hercules awaked his wife, and ordered a fire to be lighted, whilſt he held this impudent fellow.* In Ovid it is Omphale who cries out, and commands not that a fire ſhould be lighted, (this not being what is ſaid on ſuch occaſions) but that a light ſhould be brought (30). Beſides, Hercules only puſhed this impudent fellow out of bed; he did not hold him. VII. He ſays, that Faunus was *ſoundly thraſhed*: of which Ovid ſays not one word. VIII. He ſays, that this adventure was the reaſon of Hercules's riſing quite naked: but, on the contrary, as Ovid tells the ſtory, he had lain all night in Omphale's cloaths. What likelihood is there that he ſhould be undreſſed to riſe upon ſuch an occaſion as this? IX. He ſays, that *Hercules guarded his wife from violence.* This is falſe; for the ſpark, taking the husband for the wife, made no attempt at all upon her. X. He ſays, that becauſe Hercules roſe quite naked, and had ſecured his wife from violence, *he added the ceremony of nakedneſs to the others, which were practiſed at the feaſt of this god, to appeaſe him for the treatment he had given him.* All this is falſe and abſurd: the two cauſes of adding ceremonies are chimerical, as we have ſeen; and it was not Hercules, but Faunus, or Pan, that eſtabliſhed the ceremony of nakedneſs.

LUTHER (*Martin*) a reformer of the church in the XVIth century. His Hiſtory is ſo well known, and is found in ſo many books, and particularly in Moreri (*a*), that I ſhall not trouble my ſelf to repeat it. I ſhall principally inſiſt on the falſhoods which have been publiſhed concerning him. No regard has been had in this either to probability, or to the rules of the art of ſlandering: and the authors of them have aſſumed all the confidence of thoſe who fully believe, that the public will blindly adopt all their ſtories, be they ever ſo abſurd. They have dared to publiſh, that an Incubus

---

(*o*) Plut. in Cæſar.

(*p*) *Hence comes the expreſſion of Juvenal,* Nil prodeſt agili palmas præbere Luperco. *Sat. II, ver.* 142.

(18) Note, That this way of whipping the veſtals was not then in uſe at Rome, ſince it was Numa, and not Romulus, who inſtituted them. *See Dion. Halicarn. lib. ii, cap. lxvi.*

(19) Ovid. Faſtor. lib. ii, ver. 441.

(20) Utilius fuerat non habuiſſe nurus. *Id. ibid. ver.* 434.

(21) Ille caprum mactat: juſſa ſua terga maritæ Pellibus exſectis percutienda dabant. *Id. ibid. ver.* 445.

(22) In his treatiſe *De Flagrorum uſu medico, pag.* 22, where he quotes from Juvenal's Scholiaſt a paſſage quite unintellegible.

(23) *In the treatiſe* De flagrorum uſu in re Venerea.

(24) Threſor des Antiquitez Romaines, pag. 237.

(25) That is to ſay, Ovid, *Faſtor. lib ii.*

(26) Here Faunus is the ſame deity with Pan.

(27) Conſult the article HERCULES, remark [*F*].

(28) Aſcendit, ſpondaque ſibi propiora recumbit:
Et rigido cornu durius inguen erat.
Interea tunicas orâ ſubducit ab ima,
Horrebant denſis aſpera crura pilis.
Cætera tentantem cubito Tirynthius Heros
Reppulit: è ſumma decidit ille toro.

(20) Jam Bacchæa nemus Tmoli vineta tenebat.

(30) Inclamat comites, & lumina poſcit Mæonis, illatis ignibus acta patent.

(*a*) It is an eaſy matter for every body to ſeparate the wheat from the chaff in it: therefore I do not examine the faults which this author may have committed in the article LUTHER.

Incubus begat him [*A*]; and have even falſified the day of his birth, in order to frame a ſcheme of his nativity tohis diſadvantage [*B*]. They accuſe him of having confeſſed, that after ſtruggling for ten years together with his conſcience, he at laſt became perfectly maſter of it, and fell into Atheiſm [*C*]. They add, that he frequently ſaid, he would renounce his portion in Heaven, provided God would allow him a pleaſant life for a hundred years

[*A*] *They have dared to publiſh that an Incubus begat him.*] Father Maimbourg has been ſo equitable as to reject this ridiculous ſtory. 'He was born, *ſays he* (1), at Iſleben in the county of Mansfeld, in the year 1483, not of an Incubus, as ſome, to render him more odious, have written, without any appearance of truth, but as other men are born, a thing never called in queſtion till he became an Hereſiarch, which he might eaſily be, without any need of ſubſtituting a devil in the place of his father, John Luder, or diſgracing his mother, Margaret Linderman (2), by ſo infamous a birth.' Such fables are hardly to be pardoned in thoſe who mention them only as witty conceits. This is what an Italian Theatin (3) has done in a poem, in which he ſuppoſes, that Luther, born of Megera, one of the furies, was ſent from hell into Germany. This is more monkiſh than poetical.

[*B*] *They have falſified the day of his birth, in order to frame a ſcheme of his nativity to his diſadvantage.*] Martin Luther was born the tenth of November, betwixt eleven and twelve of the clock at night, at Iſleben, whither his mother was come on account of the fair, not thinking ſhe was ſo near her time: for we muſt know, that her husband, a man of mean condition, and who worked in the mines, did not then live at Iſleben, but in the village of Meza (4). The good woman, being examined by Melancthon, concerning the year ſhe was brought to bed of Martin Luther, anſwered, that ſhe did not very well remember it; ſhe only knew the day and the hour (5). It is thereſore out of pure malice, that Florimond de Remond places his birth on the twenty ſecond of October. He thought thereby to confirm the aſtrological predictions of Junctinus, who, by the horoſcope of this day, has defamed Martin Luther, as much as he could. This Aſtrologer was ſtrongly confuted by a profeſſor of Straſburg, who ſhewed, that, by the rules of Aſtrology, Luther was to be a great man. 'Nihilominus Ræmundus *diem* 22. *Octobris* præfert, ut malitioſæ Aſtrologi cujuſdam *Junctini* calumniæ fidem conciliaret, qui ex horoſcopo illius diei ingenium Lutheri miris modis infamare voluit. Hunc *Iſaacus Malleolus* Profeſſor. Mathem. Argentoratenſis anno 1617, edita diſſertatione *de genitura Lutheri* refutavit (6). —— *However, Florimond de Remond has fixed upon the twenty ſecond of October, that he might give credit to the malicious inſinuations of one Junctinus, an Aſtrologer, who, from the horoſcope of that day, endeavoured to throw the moſt ſcandalous reflexions on the abilities of Luther. Iſaac Malleolus, profeſſor of the Mathematics at Strasburg in the year* 1617, *refuted all that this man advanced in a diſſertation on the birth of Luther.*'

To illuſtrate theſe words of Mr Seckendorf, I ought to ſay, that Florimond de Remond followed Cardan's hypotheſis more than Junctinus's. He mentions both the dates, that of the twenty ſecond of October, and that of the tenth of November. He prefers the firſt, which is that of Cardan, and inſinuates, that Junctinus followed the latter. 'Luther, *ſays he* (7), was born at Iſleben .... in the year 1483, the twenty ſecond of October, in the afternoon at eleven of the clock, thirty ſix minutes .... Several authors ſay he was born the tenth of November, on St Martin's eve, which made his parents name him Martin: this, perhaps, has occaſioned that variation; for it is not probable, that Cardan and Junctinus, who with ſo much curioſity have calculated his nativity, ſhould be both miſ-informed. But Cardan ſays, he was born the twenty ſecond of October; this is Luther's true birth day: the ſame ſays Junctinus. And, though there be ſome variation between theſe two Aſtrologers, about Luther's horoſcope, yet it is ſo ſmall that it deſerves not to be conſidered. For in both, the planets are ſituate in the ſame houſes; the moon, in both, is in the twelfth; Jupiter, Venus, and Mars, in the third; the Sun, Saturn, and Mercury, in the fourth.' The variation of theſe two famous Aſtrologers, was not ſo great as that of ſome others, who differ a whole year with reſpect to the birth-day of Martin Luther. I ſhall cite my author (8). 'There will be as many themes or figures (9) as there are ſpectators at different hours; and each Aſtrologer, by that means, will make his own different from the reſt .... They will hower agree, notwithſtanding all this; as heretofore two of theſe gentlemen did in Germany, who, in making Luther's horoſcope, who was born the tenth of November 1483, agreed as to all the events of his life, and his perſonal qualities, though they differed as to the day of his birth a whole year: ſo true it is, that this noble ſcience never fails to diſcover all events.' The difference between Gauricus and Cardan, is a compleat year, bating ſome few hours. Gauricus places Luther's birth the twenty ſecond of October 1484, one of the clock, ten minutes in the afternoon, and he finds by this horoſcope the ſame abominations as Cardan. 'Hæc mira ſatiſque horrenda. 5. Planetarum coitio ſub Scorpii aſteriſmo in nona cœli ſtatione quam Arabes religioni deputabant, effecit ipſum ſacrilegum hereticum, Chriſtianæ religionis hoſtem acerrimum, atque prophanum. Ex horoſcopi directione ad Martis coitum religioſiſſimus obiit. Ejus Anima ſceleſtiſſima ad Inferos navigavit, ab Alecto, Tiſiphone, & Megera flagellis igneis cruciata perenniter (10). —— *This is ſtrange, indeed terrible, five planets being in conjunction in Scorpio, in the ninth houſe which the Arabians allotted to religion, made him a ſacrilegious Heretic, a moſt bitter and moſt prophane enemy to the Chriſtian faith. It appears from the horoſcope directed to the conjunction of Mars, that he died without any ſenſe of religion, his ſoul ſteeped in guilt ſailed to hell, there to be laſhed with the fiery whips of Alecto, Tiſiphone, and Megera thro' endleſs ages.*' Can any body now ſay, that the Aſtrologers have not a great zeal for the religion they profeſs. But note, that this laſt was a prelate.

[*C*] *They accuſe him of having confeſſed, that having ſtruggled for ten years together with his conſcience, he was .... fallen into Atheiſm.*] 'Martin Luther, who had made ſuch progreſs, as to arrive at the perfection of Atheiſm, confeſſes, nevertheleſs, that he had ſtruggled for ten years together with himſelf, to ſtifle or blunt that piercing ſting of conſcience, which his Atheiſm fixed in the inmoſt receſſes of his miſerable ſoul (11).' Such an accuſation required a citation of Martin Luther's own words; and yet Garaſſe has given none, he does not ſo much as cite this author's works in an indefinite manner: but in the 968th page of his book, he has not ſo far forgot his duty; he has cited ſomething: this is what he ſays, 'Luther, who was a perfect Atheiſt, ſays, in his Table-Talk, related by Rebenſtok, that he had lain ten years before his conſcience, as the Greeks lay before the city of Troy; for that was his compariſon: But that by his diligence, he had maſtered it, and reduced his mind to ſuch a ſtate, as to entertain no farther ſcruples. He might, in my opinion, apply the whole ſtory, and the taking of Troy, to the taking of his conſcience: for, as Troy was taken by means of a wooden horſe, ſo it was by a wooden horſe that Luther took his own conſcience, and ſtifled all that vermin of ſcruples: for from that time he became a horſe, if there ever was an horſe in the world: and his diſciple, Aurifaber, depoſes, as an ear-witneſs, that he had learned it from Luther's mouth from the pulpit, that, thanks be to God, he felt no longer any diſturbance of his conſcience; and that he began to ſee the fruits of his goſpel amongſt his diſciples; *Nam poſt revelatum Evangelium meum*, ſaid he, *Virtus eſt occiſa, juſtitia oppreſſa, temperantia ligata, veritas lacerata, fides clauda, nequitia quotidiana, devotio pulſa, hæreſis relicta.* I have fought with ſuch ſucceſs that I have ſtifled the ſeeds of virtue, oppreſſed juſtice, extinguiſhed ſobriety, rent truth to pieces, broken the pillars of faith, made villany familiar, baniſhed devotion, and introduced Hereſy.' There is no need to obſerve here, that all this is perverted; the thing ſpeaks itſelf: and I am certain, there is no honeſt man, whatever religion he is of, but will deteſt or pity the extravagace of ſuch a ſlanderer.

[*D*] *They*

(1) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de Lutheran. livr. i, pag. 23, 24. *See alſo* Spondani Annal. ad ann. 1517, n. 13.

(2) Seckendorf, *Hiſtor. Lutheran. lib. i, pag.* 20, *col.* 2, owns, that this is the true name of Luther's mother.

(3) Cajetanus Vieich, *Thienidos, lib. i.* See the Journal of Leipſic, 1686, pag. 573, in the extract of the *Sacer Helicon* of this author. Thomas de Vio, firnamed Cajetan, is taken, in this Extract, for the founder of the Theatins, and for the ſame with Cajetan Thiene. This is an error.

(4) Seckendorf, ubi ſupra.

(5) Id. ibid.

(6) Seckendorf, ubi ſupra. *See alſo a book (of John Frideric von der Straſs, miniſter near Straſburg) intituled*, Memoria Thaumaſiandri Lutheri renovata.

(7) Florimond de Remond, Hiſt. de l'Hereſ. livr. i, chap. v, pag. m. 25.

(8) Petit, Diſſer. ſur les Cometes, pag. 104, 105.

(9) That is to ſay, of the hour of the firſt appearing of a comet.

(10) Lucas Gauricus, in Tractatu Aſtrologico de præteritis multorum hominum accidentibus per genituras examinatis, fol. 60, verſo, Edit. 1552.

(11) Garaſſe, Doctrine curieuſe, pag. 214.

years in this world [*D*]. They impudently maintain, that he denied the immortality of the ſoul [*E*]. They charge him with having groſs and carnal ideas of heaven [*F*], and with compoſing hymns in honour of drunkenneſs, a vice to which they make him much

[*D*] *They add, that he frequently ſaid he would renounce his portion in heaven, provided God would allow him a pleaſant life for a hundred years in this world.*] This accuſation comes from the ſame hand as the former (12). ‘ Quirinus Cnoglerus has obſerved, in his Lutheran Creed, that he had ſeen a little German book written in praiſe of SAINT MARTIN LUTHER, which contained at large the legend of this new ſaint, canonized by the miniſters of Germany, in which he had particularly read the following paſſage. Compoſiti ſunt duo verſus in honorem cariſſimi noſtri præceptoris SANCTI LUTHERI, debentque omnes Papiſtæ ferre, velint, nolint, ut veri verſus, & pia carmina ſint & maneant: ſunt autem hujuſmodi:

IN VITA ÆTERNA.

Chriſtus habet primas, habeas tibi Paule ſecundas,
At loca poſt illos tertia, LUTHER habet.

‘ *Two verſes have been made in honour of our dear maſter SAINT LUTHER, which, whether the Papiſts will allow it or no, ſhall always be acknowledged to contain true and pious praiſes: they are theſe*:

IN LIFE ETERNAL.

Chriſt's place is firſt, Paul to the next preferr'd,
Who will deny, that LUTHER claims the third.

You will find in the margin the ſequel of this paſſage (13).

[*E*] *They impudently maintain, that he denied the immortality of the ſoul.*] ‘ Martin Luther, who was a man wholly carnal, and compoſed of fat and greaſe, teaches, in ſeveral places, that the immortality of the ſoul is a meer chimera: for behold his own words in the ſecond tome of his works of the Wittemberg edition, in the year MDLI, in the twenty ſeventh article of his aſſertions. Quos Leo Pontifex definivit articuli fidei, de immortalite animæ, portenta ſunt. —— *That is a monſtrous doctrine which Pope Leo aſſerted, concerning the immortality of the ſoul.* And in the ſame tome of the edition of the year MDLII, in the articles XXXI and XLI, he plainly ſays; Nihil eſt quod dicitur, Anima rationalis creando infunditur, & infundendo creatur: meliùs hac in re ratio decernit & Poeta dicens, Patrem ſequitur ſua proles. —— *It is idle talk to ſay, that the rational ſoul is infuſed in it's creation, or created in it's infuſion: reaſon determining this much better, as alſo the Poet who ſays, the offspring from it's ſire derives itſelf.*’ It is better to believe, ſays this groſs blockhead, what the Poet ſays, than what the church teaches: thus you ſee from what fountain this reformer drew his articles of faith; from the leud Poets, who have acknowledged no other deity than Venus, nor any other pleaſure than ſenſuality (14).’ The firſt of theſe two paſſages is ſo mutilated, that no judgment can be paſſed upon it. It is no ſtrange thing for a moſt orthodox man to call thoſe thoughts chimeras, which another entertains concerning the immortality of the ſoul. He would not call the doctrine of the immortality itſelf thus, but the abſurd reaſons they would build it upon, and the extravagant conſequences they would deduce from it. As to the ſecond paſſage, what can be more abſurd than to pretend, that a man teaches the mortality of the ſoul, upon pretence, that he ſuppoſes it produced by another ſoul? may he not be perſuaded, with ſome fathers of the church, that the ſoul is immortal, and produced by way of propagation, *ex traduce?* but, what do I ſtand on? a man would be as ridiculous to take pains to prove, that Luther believed the immortality of the ſoul, as he who accuſes him of believing it mortal.

But, to ſhew what ſtreſs is to be laid upon Garaſſe's citations from Martin Luther's Table-Talk, let me here obſerve how he cites Prateolus. *Calvin's doctrine*, ſays he (15), *holds, and muſt hold, the mortality of the ſoul, if it will be at all conſiſtent, and Prateolus very well perceived this in his book of Hereſies*, verbo Athei; *for he there obſerves, that a general aſſembly being held at Geneva, of all the States, to deliberate concerning Purgatory, one of the moſt ingenious, and moſt conſiderable, ſaid expreſsly, when it came to his turn to give his vote*, Purgatorium cum Miſſâ & Romano Pontifice melius abolere non poſſumus, quàm ſi dicamus, ſimul animam cum corpore extingui; - - - *We can never find out a better way to aboliſh Purgatory, the Maſs, and the Roman Pontiff, than by ſaying, that ſoul and body died together. Such was the opinion of this gentleman. And then afterwards, to confirm this doctrine, came out public theſes, printed and diſputed in Geneva, in the year MDLXVIII, wherein were theſe words:* Quicquid de animarum habetur immortalitate, ab Antichriſto ad ſtatuendam ſuam culinam excogitatum eſt. *All that is ſaid concerning the immortality of the ſoul, ſaid this proponent, is nothing elſe, but an invention of Antichriſt, to make his pot boil.* Prateolus (16) has only cited Lindanus, who ſaid, that the Italian Proteſtants, who fled to Geneva, deliberating one day concerning the means of aboliſhing Purgatory, the Papacy, and other doctrines of the Catholic church; one of them gave his opinion, that the beſt way was to ſay, that the ſoul died with the body. By this means, *ſaid he*, we ſhall deſtroy Purgatory, the Maſs, and the Pope, all at once. Lindanus (17) cites the acts of Valentine Gentilius's trial. It is a book wherein the Calviniſts complain of ſome members of the Italian church of Geneva, who were infected with Arianiſm, and were expelled for their errors. Judge if this be proper to ſtain the Calviniſts, or fix any blot upon the orthodoxy of the Geneveſe. But eſpecially admire Father Garaſſe's raſhneſs, who has converted a meeting of ten or twelve Italians, into a general aſſembly of all the States; and an opinion advanced by ſome inconſiderable perſons in a chamber, into theſes publickly defended (18). If this Jeſuit makes ſuch ill uſe of Prateolus's authority, what credit can we give him, when he cites Martin Luther's Table-talk? I ſhall only confute him in this general way; for having not the book itſelf, I cannot confront the words with Garaſſe's citations. I add, that he has related a thing quite otherwiſe than one of his fraternity has done. ‘ Articulus ille, *ſays an Iriſh Jeſuit* (19), quo creditur *animam eſſe immortalem*, Luthero judice *eſt portentum in Romano ſterquilinio Decretorum quod Papa condidit ſibi & ſuis fidelibus.* —— *This article, by which* the immortality of the ſoul is ſettled, *ought, in the opinion of Luther*, to be thrown on the dunghil of the Pope's decrees, whereby he eſtabliſhed his own faith, and that of his followers.’ To have juſt ſuſpicions that this is ill cited, we need only caſt an eye upon the reſt of this Jeſuit's diſcourſe. ‘ Si dubites, *continues he*, an fortè contagio hujus portentoſi Paradoxi alios è Reformatione afflaverit, Reſpondet Joannes Brentius *: *Etſi inter nos nulla ſit publica profeſſio quod anima ſimul cum corpore intereat, & quod non ſit mortuorum reſurrectio: tamen impuriſſima & profaniſſima illa vita quam maxima pars hominum ſectatur, perſpicuè indicat quod non ſentiant eſſe vitam poſt hanc. Nonnullis etiam tales voces tam ebriis inter pocula excidunt, quàm ſobriis in familiaribus colloquiis.* Quibus declarat, licet non publica, ſaltem privata perſuaſione, & licentia vitæ, hanc invaluiſſe ſententiam, eamque vel ipſos ſobrios profiteri.’ Can any thing be more aſtoniſhing? a paſtor deplores the corruption of his flock. *Though there be not among us*, ſays he, *any formulary of public faith, by which we declare that the ſoul dies with the body, and that the dead riſe not again; yet the impure and profane life that moſt people lead, is a manifeſt ſign, that they believe not the immortality of the ſoul. Some even drop ſuch diſcourſes not only when they are drunk, but when they are ſober, in common converſation with their friends.* Hereupon they accuſe a whole church of diſ-believing the immortality of the ſoul, and repreſent them as only forbearing to make it an expreſs article of their confeſſion of faith. Who can bear conſequences, in which the blindneſs of paſſion, is ſo ſcandalous? See the margin (20).

[*F*] *They charge him with having groſs and carnal ideas of heaven.*] Let us ſtill cite Father Garaſſe. *Luther* much addicted [*G*]. They affirm, that he utered a thouſand blaſphemies againſt the holy Scripture, and particularly againſt Moſes [*H*]. They go ſo far as to maintain, that

---

(12) Id. ibid. pag. 889, 890.

(13) *Having diſcovered too late an omiſſion of the Printers I inſert here the moſt neceſſary part of this paſſage of Garaſſe:* To this I anſwer, *ſays he*, that the Lutherans are much in the wrong . . . becauſe Luther often proteſted, as Rebenſtok informs us, in his Table-Talk, that he would freely renounce all his pretenſions, and that provided God would be pleaſed to grant him a hundred years of good living in this world, he would give him an acquittance for his ſhare of Paradiſe.

(14) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra, pag. 877, 878.

(15) Ibid. pag. 879.

(16) Iſtiuſmodi complures eſſe Genevæ in Eccleſia, quam dicunt, Italica, unum illud ſatis ſuperque arguit, quòd cum iſti Calviniſtæ de abolendo ſemel Pontificatu Romano, Purgatorio extinguendo, aliiſque Catholicæ Dei Eccleſiæ dogmatibus, delendis inter ſe conſultarent, unus præ cæteris eximie ſui magiſtri mendaciorum patris afflatu raptus: Dicamus animam, inquit, una cum corpore extingui, ſic Purgatorium cum Miſſa & Romano Pontifice ſemel abolebimus. . . . Hæc Lindanus. *Prateolus, in Elencho Hæreſ. voce* Athei, *pag.* m. 72.

(17) In Dubitantio, Dial. ii, pag. m. 247, 248.

(18) See, below, citat. (20).

(10) Henricus Fitz Simon, in Britannomachia Miniſtrorum, lib. i, cap xii, pag. 112.

* Brentius, Homil. 35, in cap. xx, Lucæ.

(20) Not having the acts of the tryal of Valentin Gentilis by me at this time, I cannot tell whether Lindanus has faithfully quoted what he alledges from it; or whether there really was any Italian, who believed as Lindanus ſays.

Luther, ſays he (21), *being arrived to perfect Atheiſm, was ſtill more ridiculous, for having deviſed intolerable fooleries, according to the confeſſion of his diſciple Rebenſtock; for he one day preached publickly, that God, to pleaſure his elect, was reſolved to create, after the laſt judgment, little cats, and lap-dogs*, Quorum cutis erit aurea, & pili de lapidibus pretioſis, i. e. *Whoſe skin ſhould be of gold, and their hair of precious ſtones, and beſtow them on the bleſſed to uſe them for play-things, as the ladies do who put them in their muffs. He adds, that there will be ſerpents, toads, and caterpillars, in heaven, but that they ſhall be of the fineſt ducat gold; and which is more, there ſhall be*, ſays he, *piſmires, lice, fleas, and bugs, in heaven, but they ſhall be all of precious ſtones, and ſhall all ſmell much better than civet* (22); *for theſe are his very words*; Ibi formicæ, cyniphes & omnia fœtida, & male olentia animalia, meræ delitiæ erunt, & optimum odorem ſpirabunt. *All the excuſe I can make to cover the impiety of this groſs man, is, that when he ſaid and wrote theſe things, he was drunk, for it was*, In Sermonibus CONVIVIALIBUS titulo de vitâ æterna, pag. 454.

[G] . . . . . *and with compoſing hymns in honour of drunkenneſs, a vice to which they make him much addicted.*] ‘ Martin Luther, in the firſt Tome of his works, in the chapter of Drunkenneſs, after having authorized this vice, and ſhewn, as well as he could, that it was incident to all the great peſons that ever were, at laſt remembering the eccleſiaſtical hymns, he was wont to chant in the cloyſters, made one in honour of drunkenneſs, which conſiſts of two ſtanza's; the firſt whereof is this:

Si vino te impleveris
Dormire ſtatim poteris,
Eſt poſt ſomnum, ventriculum
Vino implere iterum,
Nam Alexandri regula
Præſcribit hæc remedia (23).

If you will drink but deep,
You preſently will ſleep,
And then your belly will
Be fit again to fill,
Great Alexander's rule
(And ſure he was no fool)
To keep a man at eaſe,
From care or from diſeaſe.

. . . . . we ſee in a book called *Concordia Proteſtantium*, that Luther is honoured with thoſe elogies, *Divus Lutherus zelo plenus*: and, as the Painters repreſent our ſaints with their perſonal ſigns, St Jerome with a lion, (though this be a fault of the Painters, authorized by antient cuſtom, for it is not St Jerome, but St Geraſimus, that ought to be repreſented with a Lyon) St Ambroſe with a bee-hive, St Auguſtine with a young child, St Gregory with a white pigeon; ſo it is a cuſtom, throughout all Germany, to paint this new ſaint of the pretended Reformed religion, with his ſpecific mark; namely, a great glaſs full of wine; which, as I have ſhewn before, and related from Rebenſtok, he called *Poculum Catechiſticum*: ſuch are Luther's arms; and John Matheſius adds, that he boaſted no body could drink off his glaſs in a breath but himſelf; as no body could manage Hercules's club (24) but himſelf (25).’ The paſſage Garaſſe refers us to, concerning the catechiſtical goblet, is in the 59th page of his book: thus: ‘ The moſt frolickſome of all was Martin Luther, as Rebenſtock, and Matheſius relate in his life; for this groſs blockhead being at table, uſed to have his great goblet brought him, which he called *Poculum Catechiſticum*, which held about two pints, and which he ſwallowed at a draught, boaſting that no body could do it but himſelf: as Ulyſſes, *ſaid he*, had a bow, which no body could bend and draw up to the arrows point but himſelf. Now when he was heated with wine, having three or four times conſulted his catechiſtical goblet, he told the pleaſanteſt ſtories in the world; for, falling upon the antient doctors, he uſed to draw them in very fine colours.’ Let us alſo recite what we find in Fitz Simon's book. I inſert his authorities in the margin: ‘ Ait de ſe Lutherus, *nihil ſingulare in vita mea eminet. Poſſum jocari, potare, frontem exporrigere, ridere, ſumque commodus & facetus convivator, cumque unum biræ, ſive cerviſiæ cantharum teneo* (verbi gratia vitrum illud monſtrum, horrendum, informe, ingens, ex Apoſtolorum ſymbolo, Dominica oratione, & decem præceptis conſtans, quod uno hauſtu Lutherus exhaurire conſuevit). *Statim dolium ipſum totum concupiſco, ſæpiuſque bene bonum hauſtum facio in Dei gloriam. Pro ea itaque quod prius macerabam corpus meum, mox cum mortuus & in capulo repoſitus fuero, vermibus ventricoſum beneque craſſum Doctorem eſcam dabo* *. Ventricoſum itaque & benè craſſum Doctorem Diſcipuli Reformati, Evangeliſtamque jocoſum, bibacem, commodum & facetum convivatorem, proprii oris confeſſione Evangelici noſtri Reformatores nacti ſunt (26). —— *Thus ſpeaks Luther of himſelf*; there is nothing ſingular in my life; I can joke, drink, be merry, laugh, and be a facetious companion at a feaſt, when I take my tankard of beer or ale *(he means his monſtrous goblet of ſuch an enormous bigneſs, that it held the Apoſtle's Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments: and yet the whole contents of it Luther could drink off at a draught.*) I then wiſh for the whole hogſhead, and drink many a good draught to the glory of God. And whereas I formerly uſed to macerate my body, now as ſoon as I am dead I ſhall afford the worms a good feaſt out of a jolly tunbellied doctor. *Therefore the reformed diſciples have a jolly tunbellied doctor, and our evangelical reformed an evangeliſt, merry, ſmiling, complaiſant, and a facetious feaſter, as appears from his own words.*’ In another place of his book (27) we find theſe words: ‘ Quaſi vero Lutherus in immani ſuo vitro catechiſtico, quod ſolus ille exhaurire potuit, unam aquæ guttulam inſtillari tulerit? —— *As if Luther would ever have ſuffered a drop of water to be put into that monſtrous catechiſtical glaſs, on which he valued himſelf for being the only one capable of drinking it up at a draught.*’ Mr Juncker, at page 193, and 220 of his *Vita D. Martini Lutheri Nummis atque Iconibus illuſtrata*, maintains, that all that is ſaid of this pretended catechiſtical rummer, is an impoſture and groſs fiction; and he cites two or three books, which prove, that we ought not to take any notice of what is found concerning it in the *Colloquia Menſalia*. This book of Mr Juncker is very curious, and ſhews, that the author applied himſelf, with great diligence and ſucceſs, to a re-ſearch into every thing that was fit to illuſtrate the matter which he was upon.

[*H*] *And particularly againſt Moſes.*] ‘ Martin Luther had hardly any thing oftener in his mouth, particularly in his cups, than that the commandments of the decalogue, were the ſource and fountain of all the villanies in the world, as Rebenſtock has related in his Colloquies, in page CCCLXIX, and in the ſecond tome of his works of the Witemberg edition, page 112, he makes a vow to God, almoſt of the ſame nature of that of the miſerable Theophilus, in the firſt ſonnet of the ſatirical Parnaſſus; for his part, he ſolemnly and devoutly promiſes never to keep any of the ten commandments: and in fine, being in the extaſy of his devotions, he ſays, *Tollantur è medio omnia Dei præcepta & ceſſabunt omnes Hæreſes.* To ſuppreſs Hereſies, talk not to me of diſputes, nor conferences, nor war, nor the command of princes: I know a ſhorter expedient than all this; which is, to throw the decalogue into the fire, and there will be no more Hereſies in the world (28) . . . . But if you would more clearly underſtand and diſcover Luther's opinion concerning the decalogue, and the law of Moſes, obſerve how he ſpeaks of them in the firſt tome of his works of the Witemberg edition MDL, page CCXV. *Vide ut ſis prudens, & Moſem cum ſui lege, quam longiſſime amoliri, & in malam rem abire jubeas; neque quicquam illius terrore ac minis movearis, ſed ſuſpectum eum habeto, ut peſſimum hæreticum anathematizatum & damnatum hominem, mutoque deteriorem Papa & Diabolo.* Be prudent, ſays that he got *Amadis de Gaule* tranſlated into good French [*I*], to put people out of conceit with the Scripture, and all books of devotion. They obſerved ſo little meaſures in the calumnies they publiſhed againſt him, as to accuſe him of having ſaid, that he believed nothing of what he preached [*K*]; and that he was very glad to hear that other miniſters reſembled him in this. Moſt of theſe calumnies are grounded upon ſome words in a certain book publiſhed by Luther's friends [*L*]; to which they give a very malicious interpretation, and very remote from this miniſter's thoughts. Not but it muſt be confeſſed, that it was a very great imprudence to publiſh ſuch a collection. It was the effect

---

(21) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra, pag. 320.

(22) Compare what has been ſaid in the article LOYOLA, remark [*U*].

(23) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra, pag. 772.

(24) I wonder that Garaſſe, ſince he was ſpeaking of HERCULES, did not allude here to the cup of that hero. See remark [*D*] of his article, and remark [*N*] of the article GOULU (JOHN).

(25) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra, pag. 773.

* Luther. in Colloq. Francof. 1571, fol. 445. Mateneſius de ritu bibendi ſuper ſanitate, lib. i, cap. ix.

(26) Fitz-Simon, Britannomachia, lib. i, cap. xi, pag. 95, 96.

(27) Fitz-Simon, ubi ſupra, lib. iii, cap. ii, pag. 270. *He cites* Joann. Fredericus Matenef. de ritu bibendi ſuper Sanitate, pag. 76.

(28) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra, pag. 561.

‘he, and ſtand upon your guard; and when the queſtion ſhall be about Moſes, ſend him to the devil, with all his Old Teſtament, and not be concerned at his menaces; for as much as he is an heretical miſcreant, an excommunicated wretch, and a damned ſoul. In a word, a wicked man more curſed than the Pope, and the devil (29).’ Garaſſe had ſaid before (30), that Luther ‘having, by his great induſtry, arrived to Atheiſm, held alſo the like diſcourſe, as Rebenſtock relates, in his Table-Talk. *Ego non pluris facio ſexcenta loca Scripturæ, quam putridam nucem*, I value ſix hundred places of the Bible, if they ſhould be urged to me no more than a rotten nut.’ Laſtly, he pretends (31) that Luther uſed to ſay after dinner, ‘that he knew a good way to prevent ſinning mortally againſt God; which is, ſaid he, to throw the decalogue and the Bible into the fire.’

[*I*] *They go ſo far as to maintain, that he got* Amadis de Gaule *tranſlated into good French.*] This egregious lie is found in the book (32) of an Italian Dominican, called Brother Angelo Paciuchelli. His book, written in the Italian tongue, has been tranſlated into Latin by Charles de Marimont, a Lorraine Theatin. The Leipſic Journal mentions it, in which I have found the following paſſage. ‘A veritate maxime alienum eſt, quod Lectione ſtatim prima, qua S. Scripturæ & Aſceticorum librorum neceſſitatem & utilitatem commendat, de B. Luthero traditur: ſceleratum ſcilicet illum virum, cum Germaniam execrabili hæreſi contaminare decreviſſet, profanis eam libris corrupiſſe, curaviſſeque ut lingua Gallica liber quidam donaretur, *Amadis* dictus, & quidem omni elegantia exornatus per Principum aulas ſpargeretur; ſicque paulatim ſacrarum paginarum ſpiritualiumque librorum nauſea curioſorum aulicorum animis inſtillaretur. Cujus ineptiſſimæ calumniæ, quæ nobis quidem non indignationem ſed riſum movet, non poterit non cordatiores ex Romano-Catholicis pudere, quos minime fugit quanto zelo ad ſacræ Scripturæ, quæ, ipſi tunc clero tantum non ſordebat, laicorum vero manibus extorta plane erat, frequentiſſimam lectionem, omne hominum genus, ſummos, medioximos, infimos Lutherus noſter revocaverit, ſacris in eum finem Bibliis (non Amadiſo) in vernaculam linguam incredibili labore atque ſtudio traductis (33). —— *It is very wide of truth, what in the firſt ſection concerning the neceſſity and uſefulneſs of reading the holy Scriptures and myſtic books is reported of Luther,* viz. *that this moſt abominable man, when he had determined to corrupt all Germany with his deteſtable Hereſy, took care to have a book called* Amadis *put into new and elegant French, and brought into the courts of the princes, that by degrees he might inſtil into the minds of people of rank, a contempt for the ſacred writings, and of all pious books in general, whichridiculous calumny cannot excite in us indignation but laughter, for the honeſt Catholics themſelves muſt be aſhamed of it. For they cannot be ignorant that by the indefatigable pains of Luther, the ſacred writings were once more put not only into the hands of the clergy, but into thoſe of the middle rank, nay, even of thoſe of the meaneſt ſort. He having for that purpoſe tranſlated into the vulgar tongue, with incredible ſtudy and toil, not* Amadis *but the holy Bible.*’ What is not a man capable of in point of groſs calumnies, and diametrically oppoſite to all probability, when there are thoſe who dare affirm, that Luther deſired to bring the Scriptures into diſcredit: Luther, I ſay, who had no greater reproach to bear, with all the reformers, than that of too much recommending to lay-men the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue?

[*K*] *They . . . . accuſe him of having ſaid that he believed nothing of what he preached.*] ‘There are a great many Chriſtians, who are Chriſtians in appearance, who make an outward profeſſion of believing in God, in a perfunctory manner, and by way of compliment, that they may not be thought Atheiſts. Sturmius reproached Beza with being of this claſs, and applied to him the ſaying of Socrates, *Hoc unum me ſcire ſcio, quod nihil ſcio. — I only know this, that I know nothing*; he applied it to Theodore Beza by this gentle parody, *Hoc unum me credere credo, quod nil credo. — I think I only believe this, that I believe nothing.* Of this humour was the fat mortal, Martin Luther, who thanked God, that he was not ſingular in his fraternity: for I believe nothing, ſaid he, of what I preach; and, God be bleſſed, there are many who are infected with the ſame diſtemper amongſt our miniſters; as John Matheſius has written in his life: this is what I call, believing in God in appearance, and theſe are the Chriſtians in appearance, who believe in God by way of compliment, *Ne nihil credere videantur. — Leſt they ſhould be thought to believe nothing* (34).’ Compare this with Matheſius's Latin, cited by Henry Fitz-Simon, you will find how Garaſſe has amplified it. ‘Joannes Matheſius in vitam Lutheri plures conciones compoſuit, quas tandem in lucem emiſit. In earum vero duodecima ſic ait: *Magiſter Joannes Muſa Prædicans Rochlizenſis narravit mihi, ſe quodam tempore admodum dolenter Luthero queſtum eſſe, quod ipſemet ea credere non poſſet quæ aliis prædicabat. Tum reſpondiſſe Lutherum: Benedictus ergo ſit Deus, cum idem aliis quod mihi uſu venit. Adhuc enim mihi ſoli id uſu venire credidi* (35). —— *John Matheſius compoſed ſeveral ſermons on the Life of Luther which at laſt he publiſhed. In the twelfth ſermon he has theſe words.* Maſter John Muſa, miniſter at Rochlitz informed me, that having once complained to Luther with great concern, that he found it impoſſible for him to believe what he preached to others: Luther anſwered, I bleſs God that this has fallen out to another as well as to me; for hitherto I thought that I alone had this misfortune.’

[*L*] *A certain book publiſhed by Luther's friends.*] According to the preſent mode, it would have been called *Lutheriana* or *Lutherana*. But the title that was given it of *Sermones Menſales*, or *Colloquia Menſalia*, is better; for Luther's Table-Talk is the ſubject of the book. It was publiſhed in 1571, by Henry Peter Rebenſtock, miniſter of Eiſcherheim. Andrew Rivetus, if I miſtake not, ſays ſomewhere, that this book is ſuppoſititious: but Gisbert Voëtius (36), at leaſt as zealous againſt Popery as he, acknowledges the contrary. Mr Seckendorf *has not attempted to prove* this book ſuppoſititious, he only obſerves that theſe Table-Diſcourſes *were collected with indiſcretion, and raſhly printed by a perſon . . . . who impudently idolized Luther* (37). The controverſiſts of the other ſide took advantage of it, as appears by Garaſſe's paſſages above-cited, and by the notes of Feuardentius upon St Irenæus (38). They have made the ſame uſe of Luther's Letters, publiſhed with little diſcretion and prudence. See Mr Gaſtineau's Controverſial Letters, who cites ſeveral pieces from them, not very honourable to the memory of the author. See what Mr Saldenus has anſwered to Bellarmine, who would prove, from Luther's table-talk, that he diſcarded Job out of the canon of ſcripture. ‘Impegit *Luthero* quod *Jobi* etiam Libro divinam authoritatem detraxerit, argumento è *convivalibus* ejus *Sermonibus* deprompto, at ludicro plane & calumnioſo; cum neque Libri illius Autor unquam fuerit Lutherus, neque eo vivente vel approbante editus ſit (39). —— *He objects to Luther, that he had detracted from the divine authority of the book of Job, citing in ſupport of what he ſays, ſomewhat taken out of Luther's Table-Talk, but this is idle and ſcandalous, ſince it is well known, that Luther was not the author of that book, nor was it publiſhed in his life-time, or ever had his approbation.*’ See the margin (40).

[*M*] *It*

(29) Ibid. pag. 562.

(30) Ibid. pag. 237.

(31) Ibid. pag. 881.

(32) *Intituled,* Lectiones Morales in Jonam Prophetam. *It is three volumes in folio, printed at Antwerp, the two firſt in* 1680, *the laſt in* 1683. *See the Journal of Leipſic,* Oct. 1684, *pag.* 443.

(33) *Journal of Leipſic,* ibid. pag. 444.

(34) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra, pag. 109, 110.

(35) Fitz-Simon, ubi ſupra, lib. i, cap. xi, pag. 100. *He cites* Joan. Matheſ. de Vita Luth. Conc. 12. fol. 147.

(36) Voët Diſp. Theolog. Tom. IV, pag. 658.

(37) Seckendorf, apud Beauval, Hiſt. des Ouvrag. des Sçavans, Febr. 1692, pag. 262. *The words of Seckendorf,* Hiſtor. Lutheran. lib. iii, pag. 643, *are theſe,* Libro Colloquiorum menſalium *minus quidem caute compoſito & vulgato.*

(38) Lib. iii, cap. xx. *You there find ſeveral paſſages of the collection of Rebenſtock, as Garaſſe obſerves,* ubi ſupra, pag. 60. *You find ſome alſo in the* Theomachia Calviniſtica *of the ſame Feuardentius.*

(39) Salden. in otiis Theolog. pag. 489. *He cites* Bellarm. de Verbo Dei, lib. i, cap. v, vii.

(40) *Mr Juncker,* pag. 193, 194, *of the Life of Luther* nummis illuſtrata, *refers us to two or three writers who have lately examined what ſtreſs we are to lay on theſe* Sermones Conviviales.

effect of an inconſiderate zeal [*M*], or rather of an exceſſive prepoſſeſſion, which hindered their diſcerning the faults of this great man. It cannot be denied, but the impetuous heat of his temper forced from him ſuch ſayings, as deſerve to be condemned, as when he declared his opinion upon the Epiſtle of St James [*N*]. There were ſome Proteſtants, who maintained, that he had not ſpoken ſo harſhly as was pretended; and at the

[*M*] *It was the effect of an inconſiderate zeal.*] Voiture's apologiſt makes uſe of a thought which may be properly applied in this place: I ſhall recite the paſſage at large, as containing ſeveral curious particulars (41). ‘ It were to be wiſhed, that the public had received from Mr Voiture's own hands the preſent that has been made it of his verſes and letters. He would, doubtleſs, have retrenched ſome things to have made it perfect. . . . . He would not have appeared before the world as he has done in ſome of his letters, in diſorder, in a diſhabille, in his morning-gown; he would have put on his court-cloaths, or even a ceremonial and feſtival habit. He would have kept up in all points to the ſtricteſt laws of Decorum; with the rules of which he thought he might lawfully diſpenſe, in a free ſecret correſpondence with his friends and confidents. They who have publiſhed his works . . . . are fallen into a fault, which is ſeldom avoided on the like occaſions, having choſen to employ their diligence in collecting the ſcattered pieces of our author, rather than the judgment in making a good choice of them. And indeed, it is no wonder, that ingenious men, of ever ſo fine and delicate a taſte, ſhould be miſtaken in this manner. That beloved freed man of Cicero, whom he ſomewhere calls the *reformer and rule of his writings*; and who, particularly by the beauty of his wit, had merited his tendereſt affections, did ſomething ſtill worſe than this. After the death of his maſter, he publiſhed a collection of his jeſts, wherein, through an exceſs of paſſion and zeal, not having courage to leave out any thing, he inſerted many ſo cold and inſipid, that Quintilian, a ſupreme judge of theſe matters, thinks them unworthy of ſo famous an orator. The meaning of which, Sir, is, that as piety conſecrates the vileſt things, when they have touched the bodies of ſaints, or only their bones and aſhes; ſo love and admiration idolize whatever bears the name of thoſe extraordinary men, who have been ſnatched from their admirers; and as if every one was capable of the ſame devotion and worſhip, they propoſe them to the veneration of all the earth, and of all ages. The leaſt important and moſt neglected billets or letters, are, by their paſſionate admirers, looked upon, as precious relics of theſe great wits, worthy to be engraved on braſs and marble, and to be handed down to lateſt poſterity . . . For the reſt theſe, whatever may be ſaid of them, are not vitious extreams (42); for, proceeding from the violence of a friendſhip nobly placed, this ſort of exceſs is more to be eſteemed, than the moderation of other virtues; and deſerves not only excuſe, but commendation. Your ridiculous curioſities are juſtly condemned; ſuch as that of the Greek, who bought Epictetus's earthen lamp, which he uſed in his lucubrations, at the price of three thouſand drachmas; or of that extravagant prince, who gave I know not how many talents for the Poet Æſchylus's Table-Book; or that other who corrupted the prieſts of Delphi, to get Orpheus's lyre out of their hands, though he knew not how to touch it, or even to put it in tune.’ I have ſeen in an edition of the Scaligerana (43); a preface which contains the ſame thoughts in fewer words. ‘ Ea plerumque eſt in iſtos literatorum heroas præpoſtera vulgi religio & quædam velut idolomania, ut ne verbulum quidem illis excidere patiatur quod non avide colligat, & inter pretioſiſſima κειμήλια ſedulo recondat. Pœne quomodo hodierni ἁγιολάτραι divorum cineres, ungues, pilos, oſſium fragmenta, veſtium fimbrias aut lacinias, & cætera quæ reliquiarum nomine cenſent venerabundi ſervant. Sic Virgilii ſpeculum, & quidem inter ſacra monumenta, Dionyſiani in agro Pariſienſi Monachi non ſine riſu viſendum præbent. Sic Italos Petrarchæ ſui non modo tumulum ædeſque, ſed & urceum & ſedile, imo & domeſticæ felis ſceleton cadaver aliaſque neſcio quot ejuſdem farinæ quiſquilias magna pompa peregrinantibus oſtentare refert Jo. Philippus Thomaſinus, libro quem de divini poetæ rebus compoſuit. —— *Such for the moſt part, is the ridiculous veneration, and almoſt idolatrous regard, which the vulgar pay to thoſe heroes in literature, that they cannot ſuffer ſo much as a word to eſcape them without greedily ſeizing it, and laying it up among their moſt precious curioſities. As our modern ſaint-ſervers preſerve the aſhes, nails, hair, pieces of bones, hems, or bits of garments; and whatever elſe goes under the name of relics, with the higheſt reverence. So the Monks of St Dennis at Paris, ſhew, not without expoſing themſelves to juſt contempt, the loooking-glaſs of Virgil, among the reſt of their ſacred treaſures. And the Italians, as we are informed by John Philip Thomaſino, in his Life of Petrarch, not only ſhew the houſe and tomb of that divine Poet, but alſo his pitcher and his ſtool, nay, the very skeleton of his cat; and I know not what beſides.*’ Theſe things fairly repreſent to you the caſe of the compilers of Martin Luther's diſcourſes.

[*N*] *His opinion upon the epiſtle of St James.*] He called it a work of ſtraw, in compariſon of the epiſtles of St Paul and St Peter. The Catholic controverſiſts have hereupon made a thouſand outcries, without being aſſured, by their own eyes, that ever Luther ſaid ſo. Edmund Campian's adventure is remarkable; he had accuſed Luther of uſing this expreſſion: he had the lie given him, and afterwards the confuſion of not being able to make good what he had ſaid, though he was furniſhed with the books he cited (44). This, which in reality was but a vain and imaginary triumph, was, however, a ſubſtantial one, on account of the ſhame it gave the Jeſuit, and the joy it occaſioned among the Proteſtants. The learned Whitaker, if we believe Mr Daillé (45), enjoyed a great ſatisfaction from it all his life long: he maintained, that Luther had not ſpoken in that manner, and that Campian ſlandered him. Let Mr Daillé ſpeak. ‘ Mr Cottiby taxes Luther with ſaying, that this epiſtle is a *work of ſtraw*; but he he does not ſhew the book, nor place of Luther where theſe words are found; which makes me ſuſpect, that, without having ſeen them, he truſted to Edmund Campian the Jeſuit, or ſome ſuch author, who hurried on by a furious hatred againſt our religion, makes no ſcruple to impute to us whatever comes in their head, be it ever ſo falſe or incredible. I will not undertake to read Luther's ſeven or eight great tomes, to know whether he writ theſe words, which your diſciple charges upon him. I will only tell you, that reading over again what William Whitaker †, a grave and learned man, anſwered to your Campian, who ſaid the ſame thing of Luther, I have found, that he accuſes him of a great falſity; and ſays, that having carefully ſought for the preface of Luther to this epiſtle, from whence Campian cited theſe words, he had at laſt found it, and that it began thus: “ Tho' this epiſtle of St James has been rejected by the antients, yet for my part I praiſe it, and look upon it to be uſeful and advantageous.” He adds, that the ſame perſon in the book, concerning the Babyloniſh captivity, ſpeaks of it farther in theſe words: “ I omit, *ſays he*, what many affirm, with great probability, that this epiſtle is not the apoſtle St James's, nor worthy of the ſpirit of an apoſtle. But for *this work of ſtraw*, of which your Father Campian, and your new diſciple ſpeak, he proteſts he has no where met with it in Luther (46).’ It is, nevertheleſs, true, that this is found in a preface of this Reformer. Let us hear further what Mr Daillé ſays. “ Afterwards Mr Rivet anſwering the Jeſuit Sylveſter de Petra Sancta, who alſo advanced the ſame calumny, adds,” that ſome have diſcovered to our people, that Luther had written in a German preface upon the firſt edition of the Bible, that St James's epiſtle, as to it's worth, cannot be parallelled with thoſe of St Paul, and St Peter, and that, in compariſon of theſe, it is an epiſtle of ſtraw. We do not approve (ſays Mr Rivet ‡) this judgment of Luther; and it is certain, that he himſelf afterwards condemned it. Theſe words being not to be found in any of the editions made after the

‘ year

---

(41) Coſtar, Defenſe des Ouvr. de Voiture, pag. 10, & ſeq.

(42) Coſtar is miſtaken, they are vicious almoſt always.

(43) It is aſcribed to Mr Daillé, and I think, not without ground, I have ſeen ſome who atribute it to Mr le Moyne. This edition is of Cologn (as the title imports, but I believe it is of Roan) in 1667.

(44) Qua fronte id auſus es abſolute aſſerere, poſtquam ante multos annos, Edmundus Campianus è ſecta tua pſeudomartyr, ſuper ea re falſi convictus fuiſſet in Anglia, ubi cum id objeciſſet, prolatis libris, nihil unquam tale reperire potuit? *Rivetus, Caſtigat. Notar. in Epiſt. ad Balzac. cap. ix, n. 6, Oper. Tom. III, pag.* 524.

(45) We ſhall ſee in the following remark that we ought not to rely on him.

† Whitaker, Reſpon. at Rat. Camp. ad I, pag. 7, col. 2.

(46) Daillé, Replique à Adam & à Cottiby, Part. III, cap. xxiii, pag. m. 295.

‡ A. Rivet. Jeſ. Vapul. cap. ix, §. vi, pag. 188.

the bottom they were in the right, but they denied ſomething which they ought to have granted [*O*]. If he actually ſaid all the things he is accuſed of uttering againſt this Epiſtle

'year 1526 (47).' To ſhew how authors copy one another, without conſulting the originals, I will obſerve, that Fitz-Simon, renewing the accuſation which his brother-Jeſuit Campian could not prove, cites the ſame preface (48) which Campian had cited. *Idem dico de Epiſtola Sancti Jacobi quam Lutherus non tantum ut dubiam, ſed ut* contentioſam, tumidam, aridam, ſtramineam, & apoſtolico ſpiritu indignam appellavit (49). The biſhop of Meaux does not ſpeak of this epithet *ſtraminea (of ſtraw)*, nor cite any of theſe prefaces, but another book of Luther. 'The bold reformer retrenched from the canon of the ſcripture, whatever did not agree with his notions; and it is on occaſion of this unction, that he writes *in the captivity of Babylon*, without any teſtimony of antiquity, that this epiſtle ‡ *does not ſeem to be St James's, nor worthy of the apoſtolic ſpirit* (50).' Fitz-Simon has ſaid, in another place, that Luther rejected the three firſt evangeliſts. 'Judicare quoque oportet ejus (*Lutheri*) animum erga vetus teſtamentum, ex odio erga præcipuam partem novi teſtamenti in his verbis expreſſam. *Non immerito igitur admonui* (inquit *) *in prologo novi teſtamenti lectores, ut hanc falſam aboleant opinionem, quod ſcilicet quatuor ſint evangelia, & quatuor tantum Evangeliſtæ. Dixi autem Joannis evangelium eſſe unicum, pulchrum, verum ac principale evangelium, aliiſque tribus longè ac longè præferendum, ac anteponendum: adeò ut etiam Pauli ac Petri epiſtolæ longe præcedant tria illa evangelia, Matthæi, Marci, ac Lucæ.* Delevit ergo ** Lutherus pro virili tria ſimul integra evangelia, ut aſcititia, deformia, falſa, vilipendenda (51). —— *We ought to judge of Luther's ſentiments in reſpect of the Old Teſtament, by the averſion he expreſſed againſt the greateſt part of the new, which I ſhall prove from his own words.* Not without reaſon, therefore, *ſays he*, I have admoniſhed my readers, in my prologue to the New Teſtament, that they ſhould lay aſide that falſe opinion, viz. that there are only four Goſpels, and four Evangeliſts. I have ſaid that the Goſpel of St John, is a true and excellent Goſpel, and therefore to be eſteemed the principal, being by far ſuperior to the other three; nay, that the Epiſtles of Paul, and Peter, ought likewiſe to be in higher eſteem, than the three Goſpels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. *Thus Luther, as far as it was in his power, has aboliſhed three entire Goſpels, by repreſenting them, as counterfeit, ill wrote, falſe, and of little worth.*'

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary, I have diſcovered, that Mr Daillé and Mr Rivet have not traced Campian and Whitaker's diſpute, ſo exactly as I thought they had done. I imagined, that theſe two French miniſters, who were both men of prodigious reading, had ſaid all that could be ſaid upon the ſubject; but I was in the wrong to think ſo. This we ſhall ſee in the following remark, with a ſmall cenſure of the paſſage of the biſhop of Meaux.

[*O*] . . . . . . *The Proteſtants denied ſomething which they ought to have granted.*] Campian's accuſation was contained in theſe words: *Quid Luthero* (cauſæ fuit) *ut Epiſtolam Jacobi contentioſam, tumidam, aridam, ſtramineam*, flagitioſus Apoſtata nominaret, & indignam ſpiritu cenſeret Apoſtolico? Deſperatio (52). He pretended then, that Luther ſaid, that St James's epiſtle was contentious, bombaſtic, dry, and of ſtraw, and unworthy of the apoſtolic ſpirit. This was one of the firſt points that was diſcuſſed in the verbal diſpute, which Campian maintained in the Tower of London (53). He was furniſhed with Luther's works that he had cited; he was required to find out the words of his accuſation; he did ſeek, and found only this, 'Affirmant nonnulli epiſtolam Jacobi Apoſtolico ſpiritu indignam (54) — *Some affirm, that the epiſtle of St James is not worthy of the apoſtolical ſpirit.*' He had asked leave to ſend to Germany for the editions, publiſhed by Luther himſelf: he proteſted, that he had read the words in queſtion in Luther; and that before him ſeveral famous writers, ſome of whom he named had accuſed Luther of the ſame crime. But he was laughed at, as a man who would ſend to Germany for an advocate in a deſperate cauſe (55). Whitaker, ſome time after, took pen in hand againſt this Jeſuit, and treated him as a liar, as we have ſeen in the preceding remark, in the firſt paſſage of Mr Daillé. But he afterwards owned, there was ſomething of truth in the accuſation; for obſerve his reply to John Duræus, a Scotch Jeſuit, who had written in defence of Campian: 'Cum viderem accuſatum à Campiano Lutherum, ut ego putabam, injuſtè, licuit mihi falſum crimen verbo notare. Itaque Jacobi epiſtolam eſſe his contumeliis, quas Campianus commemorat, à Luthero affectam negavi, quia in Lutheri libris nihil tale potui reperire. Tu jam verba ipſa profers, quæ tamen nec vidi unquam, nec qui ſe vidiſſe diceret, conveni. Utcunque ſe res habet non magni refert. Nobis enim Lutheri quæque dicta minimè præſtanda ſunt. Quanquam mihi planè ſuſpectam eſſe fidem tuam profiteor, & te aliorum fictis auditionibus nimiùm tribuiſſe ſuſpicor. Primùm enim vidi quandam Lutheri præfationem antiquiſſimam, editam anno 1525 Wittembergæ, in qua Jacobi epiſtolam præ Petri ac Pauli epiſtolis ſtramineam vocat. Sed hoc cum tuis conferendum non eſt. Deinde cùm alii pontificii volunt oſtendere Jacobi epiſtolam à Luthero ſtramineam eſſe dictam, hanc ipſam præfationem, atque hæc verba proferunt, de tuis nullam mentionem faciunt. Denique cùm videam in quadam præfatione hanc epiſtolam præ alteris ſtramineam dici, non exiſtimo in eadem præfatione ἁπλῶς, & tumidam & aridam, & contentioſam, & ſtramineam, & ſpiritu Apoſtolico indignam nominari. Quare dum novam hanc editionem tuam video, ἐπέχειν malo, quàm aliquid temerè in alterutram partem affirmare (56). —— *When I ſaw that Campian had accuſed Luther in a manner, which to me ſeemed unjuſt, I thought my ſelf at liberty to take notice of that falſe charge. I therefore denied that Luther had treated St James's Epiſtle ſo contumeliouſly, as Campian has reproached him with; becauſe in all Luther's writings, I could not find any ſuch thing. You now produce the words themſelves, with I never ſaw my ſelf nor could ever meet with any man that had ſeen them. However it be, this matter is of no great importance, ſince all Luther's opinions are not of equal weight with us. However I cannot help ſaying, that I ſuſpect what you affirm, and am afraid you have been deceived, by giving credit to the too bold aſſertions of others. For firſt, I have ſeen Luther's preface, a very antient piece, printed in the year 1525, at Wittemberg, in which he ſays, that the epiſtle of James, compared with thoſe of Peter and Paul, is an epiſtle of ſtraw; but this is nothing to what you advance; yet when other Popiſh writers have attempted to prove, that the epiſtle of James was called by Luther an epiſtle of ſtraw, they quote this very preface, and theſe words, but they ſay nothing of the words you mention. Laſtly, when in a certain preface I obſerve, that the epiſtle in queſtion is ſaid to be an epiſtle of ſtraw, in reſpect to others, I cannot think it ſhould in the ſame preface be called, without any reſtriction, angry, bombaſtic, dry, contentious, an epiſtle of ſtraw, and unworthy the apoſtolic ſpirit; therefore, till I ſee this new edition of your's, I will ſuſpend my judgment, and not affirm any thing raſhly on either ſide.*' Obſerve, he confeſſes, that, ſince the publication of his book againſt Campian's reaſons, he had found a preface of Luther, printed at Wittemberg in 1525; in which it was ſaid, that St James's Epiſtle, is an Epiſtle of ſtraw, compared with the Epiſtles of St Peter and St Paul; but that not finding the Epithets *contentioſa, tumida, arida, indigna Apoſtolico ſpiritu*, alledged by Campian, and repeated by Duræus, he will not grant the truth of the citations, till the copy be produced, that contains them. He declares that, in the mean time, he will ſuſpend his judgment betwixt the affirmative and negative. Campian's apologiſts got ſome ground by this confeſſion of Whitaker; but, to have juſtified him perfectly, they ſhould have produced to the public, a work in which the epithets of *contentioſa, tumida*, &c. were contained. It does not appear, that they were able to do it; and therefore Whitaker, in anſwering a new antagoniſt, maintained, that Campian ſtill lay under the charge of a ſlanderer, ſince nothing more could be proved than the epithet *ſtraminea.*

Conſider

---

(47) Daillé, ubi ſupra, pag. 296.

(48) That of Luther on the Epiſtle of St James.

(49) Fitz-Simon, ubi ſupra, pag. 135.

‡ De Capt. Babylon. T. II, 86.

(50) Hiſt. des Variat. livr. iii, n. 48. pag. m. 129.

* Luth. in 2. Proœmio Novi Teſt. 1. Edit.

** Vide Sixt. Senenſ. Præf. in Biblioth Sanct.

(51) Fitz Simon, ibid. pag. 132.

(52) Campian. Ratione I, init. *He cites* Lutherus, Præfat. in Epiſt. Jac. vide etiam li. de Capti. Babi. cap. de extr. unct. Cent II, Magdeb. pag. 58.

(53) See the Jeſuit Paul Bombinus, in the Life of Campian, chap. xlvi.

(54) Vita Campiani, cap xlvi, pag. 260, Antwerp. Edit. 1618.

(55) Hic vero quaſi deſperatæ jam cauſæ Campianus ſerum patronum inde uſque à Germania advocaret, effuſi in petulantem riſum Miniſtri dicentem adhuc illudere *Ibid. pag.* 258.

(56) Whitak. *in* Reſponſ. ad Rationes Campiani Defenſione contra Confutationem Duræi, pag. 21, 22. Edit Londin. 1583.

Epiſtle, it was doubtleſs, before the year 1525 [*P*]. I ſhall give ſome reaſons for it below

Conſider well the following paſſage, in which Whitaker talks to his adverſary William Rainolds: ‘Cum copioſam & amplam hujus rei defenſionem ſuſceperis, quare in ea re maximè deficis, ad quam maximè auxilio tuo opus eſt? Nam quod affers de *ſtramine*, antea fatebamur totum illud, quod verum fuit: tuæ itaque partes fuiſſent copioſiùs confirmaſſe, *Lutherum* etiam Epiſtolam illam vocaſſe *contentioſam, tumidam, aridam indignam ſpiritu Apoſtolico*; quorum omnium eo in loco illum Campianus accuſavit. Sed cum nihil ad hanc rem probandam afferre poſſis, coactus es fateri *Campianum* graviùs Lutherum, quàm meritus eſt, de hac Epiſtola accuſaſſe: ita ut ſi uno aliquo verbo Jeſuitæ tui, cujus cauſam agis, exiſtimationem defenderis; pluribus tamen eum verbis condemnaſti; quæ tu interim veteratoriè omittis, quaſi nec ea unquam dixiſſet Campianus, nec tua res ageretur. Fateor ſanè parum referre, quid de *Luthero Campianus* finxerit nequiter: at qui eum defendendum ſuſcepiſti, ne putes te officio tuo ſatisfeciſſe, ſi ex multis, quæ ille protulit, in una aliqua re eum defenderis, & in pluribus defeceris. Quare vel deſine tandem de uno iſto verbo litem movere, vel reliqua teſtimoniis confirma (57). —— *Since you undertook a full defence of this matter, why do you moſt fail in that wherein your aid was moſt wanted? for as to what you ſay about ſtraw, that has been admitted and acknowledged to be true, but it is your buſineſs to prove at large that Luther has called that epiſtle,* contentious, bombaſtic, dry, unworthy of the apoſtolic ſpirit; *of all which Campian in the ſame place accuſes him. But when you are able to bring nothing to ſupport this, you are forced to confeſs, that Campian has cenſured Luther, with reſpect to that Epiſtle, more ſeverely than he deſerved. Thus though you think you have made good one, of the words cited by the Jeſuit, whoſe cauſe you maintain, yet you have condemned him as to many more of which however you take no manner of notice, as if they had never been ſaid by Campian, or you had never undertaken his defence. I do acknowledge, that it is not of very great importance, what Campian has wickedly feigned to have been ſaid by Luther, but as you undertook his defence, you ought not to think your work done when you only ſupport him in one part of his charge, and give him up in the reſt. Therefore let us hear no more of this ſingle word, or elſe come with your proofs, as to the reſt of his charge.*’ Let us cite another paſſage, in which he tells us, that he had not ſuppreſſed the diſcovery he had made ſince the publication of his anſwer to Campian's ten reaſons. He examined, with all poſſible care, as many copies as he could find, whether German or Latin, of this reformer's works, and having at laſt met with that which concerns the epithet *ſtraminea*; he publiſhed it in a preface to his anſwer to a tract of Sanders. ‘Si *Lutherus* hoc ſcripſerit, iniquè ego *Campianum* falſi reum peregi: ſi non ſcripſerit, turpiſſimè *Lutherum Campianus* inſimulavit. Ut veritatem iſtius rei cognoſcerem in omnibus exemplaribus, quæ comparare potui, tàm Germanicis quàm Latinis examinandis ſummam induſtriam collocavi: cum autem nulla verba ejuſcemodi, ſed diverſa potiùs, invenirem; credebam, optimâ impulſus ratione totum iſtud excogitatum fuiſſe; itaque falſiſſimum eſſe pronuntiavi. Evenit verò poſtea, ut in vetus Germanicum Teſtamentum à *Luthero* converſum inciderem præfixis ipſius præfationibus, in quibus inveni quiddam, quod aliqua ex parte referret illud quod objecerat Campianus. Cum autem illud legiſſem, non rem diſſimulavi, ſed fatebar in reſponſione mea ad *Gregorium Martinum*. In illa quidem præfatione ſcribit *Lutherus, S. Jacobi Epiſtolam non poſſe dignitate certare cum Epiſtolis S. Petri & Pauli, ſed Epiſtolam ſtramineam eſſe, ſi cum illis comparetur*. Quam ejus ſententiam non probo; atque in recentioribus editionibus cum omiſſa ſint illa verba, opinor ipſum poſtea Lutherum hanc ſuam ſententiam improbaſſe. Non profectò dubito, quin æquus lector fatebitur inter hoc, quod ſcribit Lutherus, atque illud, quod ei objicit *Campianus*, diſcrepantiam eſſe. Etenim aliud eſt loqui *planè* & *ἁπλῶς*, aliud uti *comparatione*. *Lutherus*, inquit *Campianus*, *Epiſtolam S. Jacobi ſtramineam vocavit. Lutherus ait præ Pauli & Petri Epiſtolis ſtramineam eſſe* (58). —— *If Luther really wrote this, then it was wrong in me to charge Campian with falſely accuſing him; but if he did not write it, then Campian moſt baſely traduced Luther. In order to come at the truth of this matter, I diligently compared all the copies I could meet with, either in German or in Latin; but when I could find no ſuch words, but rather things of a contrary nature in them, I, on good ground, believed the whole to be a fiction, and pronounced it falſe. But afterwards, when, in an old German Teſtament, I found a preface written by Luther, wherein ſomething was contained of what had been objected by Campian againſt him, I did not diſſemble this matter, but confeſſed it freely in my anſwer to Gregory Martin. In this preface Luther writes thus,* The epiſtle of St James is by no means of equal dignity with the epiſtles of Peter and Paul, but is an epiſtle of ſtraw, if compared with them. *This opinion of his I do not approve, and as theſe words are omitted in later editions, I am of opinion, that Luther himſelf diſapproved it. However, a candid reader will, I doubt not, eaſily diſcern that there is a wide difference between what Luther wrote and what is objected to him by Campian; for it is one thing to uſe an expreſſion abſolutely and ſimply, and another to apply it by compariſon. Luther, ſays Campian,* calls the epiſtle of St James, an epiſtle of ſtraw, *but Luther himſelf ſays, that* it is an epiſtle of ſtraw in compariſon of thoſe of Peter and Paul.’ By all this it appears, that Mr Daillé and Mr Rivet were ignorant of a great many things relating to this controverſy. They did not know, that Whitaker retracted part of what he had advanced; nor that he himſelf found out the preface which informed him of Luther's bold expreſſion. The Jeſuits have not been ignorant of this; they boaſted of it, and exaggerated the thing, pretending, that he owned that the whole accuſation brought againſt Luther was well grounded. We ſhall cite the author of Campian's life, in the place where he gives us the hiſtory of the conference held in the tower of London. ‘Is matutini certaminis ordo exituſque fuit, viſique hæretici eo lætiores è certamine abſcedere, quòd Lutherum calumnia ſuo judicio exemiſſent: quamquam id quoque gaudium ut vanum ita non diuturnum fuit: paulo poſt ad inquiſitionem tantæ rei omnium ſtudiis converſis, incorrupti Lutheri codices inſpecti, inque iis inventa ipſa, quæ carpſerat hominis Apoſtatæ Campianus verba. Et quoniam res aperta erat, ipſi hæreſis magiſtri, inter quos Whitakerus fuit, Lutheri inſanas illas voces in vetuſtis exemplaribus legi palàm faſſi; perſonam triumphanti penè jam mendacio, vel inviti ſuis ipſi manibus detraxere (59). —— *This was the method and iſſue of the morning diſpute, and the heretics ſeemed to go off with joy, becauſe they thought they had vindicated Luther from theſe calumnies; but as this joy was ill founded, ſo it continued not long, for people being now turned to the ſearch of this point, Luther's uncorrupted copies were examined, and in them the very words were found with which Campian had charged that apoſtate. And as the thing was now notorious, even the arch-heretics, among whom we may reckon Whitaker, publickly acknowledged, that they had read theſe ſenſeleſs expreſſions of Luther in ſome old copies; and thus they themſelves pulled off the mask from a lie, which had like to have triumphed over truth.*’ The more we examine, theſe things, the more we find it an Herculean labour, to diſcover truth in the midſt of ſo many diſguiſes and juggles.

What I have to ſay againſt the biſhop of Meaux will not detain my readers long. He affirms (60), that Luther, *without any teſtimony from antiquity*, has written, that this epiſtle *appears not to be St James's, nor worthy of the apoſtolical ſpirit*. This obſervation is falſe; you need only compare it with theſe words of Mr Daillé: ‘Origen †, many ages before Luther, writ, that ſome rejected this epiſtle, which Euſebius ⸸ alſo teſtifies, and ſays, there were but few of the antients who had mentioned it; and St Jerome ‡ after him ſays, that it was affirmed, *That it was not the apoſtle himſelf, but ſome other perſons, who had writ it under his name, tho' by little and little, in tract of time, it had been received*, and authorized (61).’ Whitaker, in his anſwer to Duræus, proves at large, that St James's epiſtle was ſuſpected by a great many in the antient church.

[*P*] . . . . *it was, doubtleſs, before the year* 1525.] We have ſeen (62), that the epithet, *ſtraminea*, is below (*b*). The world was long ignorant of the fault he had been guilty of in conſenting, that the landgrave of Heſſe ſhould have two wives at the ſame time [*Q*]. But at laſt it

---

(57) Whitaker, Reſpon. ad Rainoldi Refutationem, pag. 105, 106.

(58) Id. ibid. pag. 103, 104.

(59) Vita Campiani, ubi ſupra, pag 261, 262.

(60) *See, above, citat.* (50).

† Orig. in Joann. Tract. XXI, pag. 372.

⸸ Euſeb. Hiſt. lib. ii.

‡ Hieron. de Script. Eccleſ. in Jacob.

(61) Daillé, Réponſe à a Cottibi, Part. III, pag. 296.

(62) *In citat.* (56).

became

found in a preface printed that year. But it is certain he had been leſs circumſpect ſome years before. We may therefore preſume, that, growing moderate by degrees, he ſoftened and tempered, in 1525, what he had advanced too ſhocking, the paſſage, for inſtance, which Campian, Duræus, Fitz-Simon, *&c.* charge him with, and which was entirely left out in the editions after the year 1525. I have obſerved, that Cochlæus, in the year 1522, accuſes him of having publiſhed injurious prefaces, with reſpect to ſome books of the canon of the ſcripture. ‘Optimis quibuſque videbatur Lutherus, nimis malitioſè graſſari in ſacras literas novi Teſtamenti. E quorum Canone, audaci cenſura rejiciebat Epiſtolam ad Hæbreos, Epiſtolam Jacobi, Epiſtolam Judæ, & Apocalyſim Joannis. Quas ſane & atrocibus infamabat calumniis in ſuis præfationibus. In præfatione vero generali, etiam in ſacratiſſima Evangelia audaciſſime manum mittebat: volens in primis repudiandam eſſe vetuſtiſſimam hanc & omnibus Chriſtianis notam ac receptam opnionem & ſententiam, Eſſe ſcilicet Quatuor tantum Evangelia, totidemque Evangeliſtas (63). —— *Luther, in the opinion of the beſt of men, is thought to have treated the ſacred writings of the New Teſtament with too malicious a boldneſs. Out of the canon of which, by his audacious cenſure, he has rejected the epiſtle to the Hebrews, the epiſtle of James, the epiſtle of Jude, and the revelation of John, defaming them in his prefaces. But in his general preface, he has audaciouſly injured even the moſt ſacred goſpels, endeavouring to deſtroy, and to reject that moſt antient, and univerſally received, notion amongſt Chriſtians, that there are only four goſpels, and as many evangeliſts.*’ Be pleaſed to remember, that this Cochlæus had been one of his moſt violent adverſaries: But, after all, ſince it cannot be denied but that the *ſtraminea* ſubſiſts, it is probable, that Campian's whole paſſage was in ſome antient preface: For, in reality, the other epithets are not more, nor indeed ſo injurious as this. Whitaker, like a ſkilful man, took advantage of this Jeſuit's apologiſt's not being able to produce the edition they wanted. He made good uſe of this advantage, and profited by Luther's reſtriction, tho' it has not all the force that is imagined, and be only a palliative remedy: For whoever ſays, that St James's epiſtle is an epiſtle of ſtraw, in compariſon of St Paul's, really ſays, that it is not canonical, or the production of an inſpired writer. It would be abſurd to pretend, that writers, inſpired by God have not an equal authority, or that ſome are more credible than others. Would not this be to ſay, that the Holy Spirit neglected ſome of them, and left them to their particular opinions, true or falſe? This cannot be admitted; and conſequently there is a neceſſity of ſaying, they are all, as to us, of equal authority; ſo that when a man affirms, that a writing, compared with St Paul's epiſtles, is a writing of ſtraw, he can conſider it no otherwiſe than as a human writing. And upon this foot he thinks it lawful to paſs ſuch a judgment on it, as the laws of criticiſm require; and to take to task the ſtyle, the turn, the thoughts, as if he were judging of the works of Tertullian, or Arnobius. This, however, does not excuſe Campian's not mentioning Luther's reſtriction, if he found it in the edition, upon which he grounded his charge; otherwiſe he fell into the ſophiſm, *a dicto ſecundum quid, ad dictum ſimpliciter*. Still reſerving a liberty to ſay, that on ſuch occaſions, reſtrictions are only an appearance of reſerve; ſince St James's epiſtle ſtill remained actually and fully degarded from it's canonical character, as a work divinely inſpired.

(*Q*) *He conſented that the landgrave of Heſſe ſhould have two wives at the ſame time.*] Mr Varillas has ſpoken of this matter at large. ‘Philip, landgrave of Heſſe, was of ſo vigorous a conſtitution, that one wife was not ſufficient for him; and the Surgeons, who opened him after his death, found a natural cauſe for it, which the modeſty of our tongue will not permit me to explain * . . . . He perſuaded himſelf, that his infirmity diſpenſed with the goſpel rigour, and permitted him to have two wives at the ſame time. Nothing diſturbed him in the notion he had conceived of it, but the novelty of the thing: But he ſuppoſed, that the approbation of Luther, and others of the moſt famous divines of his ſect, would juſtify his action. He aſſembled them at Wittemberg, in form of a council, in the year 1539. The affair was there examined with all the precautions that were thought neceſſary to prevent their deciſions being turned into ridicule. They foreſaw the troubleſome conſequences of what they were going to do; But, at laſt, the fear of diſobliging the landgrave, carried it in Luther's opinion, and his chief diſciples, againſt the law of Jeſus Chriſt, conſcience, reputation, and all other human and divine conſiderations. The reſult of the aſſembly of Wittemberg, was written with Melancthon's own hand, and ſigned by Luther, and by the other moſt famous divines of their ſect. It was expreſſed in ſo ſtrong terms, that it could leave no doubt, or ambiguity, and was ſent to the landgrave in the following form (64).’ Mr Varillas gives the act intire in Latin and French. We there find an expreſs permiſſion granted to this landgrave to marry a ſecond wiſe, provided, that only a few perſons were made privy to it. We there alſo find, that in certain caſes of neceſſity, any other man might marry again in his wiſe's life-time; and two of theſe caſes of neceſſity are ſpecified by theſe doctors, *viz.* I. If a man being a captive, in a foreign country, cannot preſerve, or recover his health, without the uſe of a woman. II. If a man be married to a leprous woman. ‘Certis tamen caſibus locus eſt diſpenſationi, ſi quis apud exteras nationes captivus ad curam corporis & ſanitatem inibi alteram uxorem ſuperinduceret, vel ſi quis haberet leproſam; his caſibus alteram ducere cum conſilio ſui Paſtoris, non intentione novam legem inducendi, ſed ſuæ neceſſitati conſulendi, hunc neſcimus, qua ratione damnare liceret (65).’ Mr Varillas ſets down in Latin and French the landgrave's contract of marriage with Margaret de Saal; to which marriage this prince's firſt wife gave her conſent. This hiſtorian makes many reflexions thereupon, tending to ſhew, that the reaſons of theſe Caſuiſts open a very large door to polygamy, and obſerves, that the two acts, inſerted in his hiſtory (66), *have been faithfully tranſcribed and collated by the Imperial Notaries with the originals, which are preſerved in the archives of Ziegenhain, belonging equally to the branch of Heſſe-Caſſel, and to that of Heſſe-Darmſtadt* (67).

But after him came a more artful controverſiſt (68), who has drawn another piece out of the ſame place, and has made many ſubtle reflexions upon this matter. This other piece is the inſtruction the landgrave gave to Martin Bucer. In this we find, on one hand, the reaſons which induced this prince to a ſecond marriage; and, on the other, thoſe by which he would induce the Divines to conſent to it. He ſhews, that he never loved the princeſs, his wife; and that ſhe was ſo diſagreeable, and ſo ſubject to drunkenneſs, that he neither could, nor ever would abſtain from other women, whilſt he had no other wife but her; and that, nevertheleſs, he would not incur the penalties, which the ſcripture denounces to fornicators and adulterers. *Cum videam quod ab hoc agendi modo penes modernam uxorem meam nec poſſim nec velim abſtinere* (69). The Phyſicians, adds he, know the ſtrength of my conſtitution; beſides, I am often obliged to aſſiſt at the diets; they laſt a long time, and we have rich tables there; how then can I preſerve my continence? For I cannot always take my wife along with me, with her great retinue. ‘Primo quod initio, quo eam duxi, nec animo, nec deſiderio eam complexus fuerim. Quali ipſa quoque complexione, amabilitate, & odore ſit, & quomodo interdum ſe ſuperfluo potu gerat, hoc ſciunt ipſius aulæ Præfecti; & Virgines; aliique plures: cumque ad ea deſcribenda difficultatem habeam, Bucero tamen omnia declaravi. Secundò, quia valida complexione, ut Medici ſciunt, ſum, & ſæpe contingit ut in fœderum & imperii comitiis diu verſer, ubi lautè vivitur & corpus curatur; quomodo me ibi gerere queam abſque uxore, cùm non ſemper magnum Gynæceum mecum ducere poſſim, facile eſt conjicere & conſiderare (70).’ He adds to all this I know not how many threats and promiſes, which much embarraſſed his Caſuiſts; for it is highly probable, that if a private gentleman had conſulted them upon the like caſe, he would have obtained nothing from them. It may therefore reaſonably be imagined, that they were men of little faith;

they

(*b*) *In the remark* [*P*].

(63) Joannes Cochlæus, de Actis & Scriptis Lutheri, fol. m. 83.

* *Thuan. lib. xli, ad ann.* 1567. Addam, quod pleriſque riſu dignum mihi ſilentio minime prætermittendum viſum eſt, ipſum tam inexhauſti ad venereos uſus ſucci fuiſſe, ut cùm uxore ſola uteretur, & illa toties illum admittere non poſſet, vir alioqui caſtus quique vagis libidinibus minime oblectabatur ex ejus permiſſu, negotio cum Paſtoribus communicato, concubinam unam ſuperinduxerit, cujus conſuetudine ardore aliquantum perdomito, parcius ac moderatius cum uxore verſaretur. Tandem hoc anno, qui illi climactericus fuit, poſtridie Paſchæ mortalitatem exuit. Inſpecto à Medicis corpore triorches repertus eſt. - - - *I will add what many thought deſerved only to be laughed at, but what to me appears unfit to be paſſed over in ſilence, that he was a man ſo redundant in what ſtimulates men to venereal pleaſures, that while he kept himſelf to his wife alone, ſhe was unable to ſuſtain him; and therefore he being otherwiſe a chaſte man, not inclining to converſe with various women, with her conſent, and by the advice of the paſtors, he took to him a concubine with whom having blunted his amorous ardor, he afterwards converſed more ſparingly and moderately with his wife. At laſt, in this year, which was his climacteric, he, the day after Eaſter, departed this life. His body being opened by Phyſicians, he was found to have three teſticles.*

(64) Varillas, Hiſt. de l'Hereſie, livr. xii, pag. m. 87.

(65) Apud Varillas, ibid. pag. 93.

(66) The conſultation of the Divines, and the contract of marriage.

(67) Varillas, ubi ſupra, pag. 86, 87.

(68) Mr de Meaux, Hiſt. des Variations, livr. vi, n. 1, & ſeq.

(69) Ibid. pag. m. 259.

(70) Ibid.

became public: the Roman Catholics exclaimed very much about it; and ſome miniſters, have not had all the neceſſary prudence in anſwering for Luther [*R*]. They have advanced

they had not a due confidence in the promiſes of Jeſus Chriſt: They believed, that if the reformation of Germany was not maintained by the princes who profeſſed it, it would ſoon be extinguiſhed. The experience of the time paſt made them timorous; they ſaw, that the violence of perſecutions, and the violence, employed by Catholic princes againſt thoſe who had left the Romiſh communion, had ever deſtroyed thoſe reformations in the birth. It was natural to fear a like fate, unleſs force were repelled by force. However it be, it cannot be denied, generally ſpeaking, but Luther's book contained ſeveral things favourable to polygamy (71). Lyſerus gives ſeveral inſtances of it (72). See the Remark [*U*]. I will conclude this with the words of the biſhop of Meaux, 'At preſent, *ſays he* (73), all this myſtery of iniquity is diſcovered by the pieces, which the elector Palatine, Charles Lewis, (who died laſt) (74), has cauſed to be printed; and whereof, the prince, Erneſt of Heſſe, one of Philip's deſcendants, has revealed a part, ſince he turned Catholic. The Book, which the prince Palatine cauſed to be printed, is intituled, *Conſcientious Conſiderations upon Marriage, with an Explication of Queſtions hitherto diſcuſſed, concerning Adultery, Divorce, and Polygamy.* The book came out in high Dutch in 1679, under the borrowed name of Daphnæus Arcuarius, under which was concealed that of Laurentius Bæger, one of this prince's counſellors.'

It muſt here be obſerved, that Thuanus was ill informed of the circumſtances of this affair. The landgrave, according to him, was, on one hand, ſo vigorous in the conjugal exerciſe, that his wife could not admit his embraces as often as he deſired; and, on the other, ſo chaſte, that he did not love to take his pleaſure abroad: And therefore the princeſs conſented to the diverſion which a concubine might give to the vigour of her huſband. And the thing having been communicated to the miniſters, they gave the landgrave a concubine, who might tame him a little, and oblige him to be more moderate towards his wife (75). This was not the caſe; he had never loved her; he married her againſt his inclination: and beginning three weeks after his marriage to make uſe of other women, he continued the ſame courſe till his ſecond marriage. 'Initio quo eam duxi, nec animo nec deſiderio eam complexus fuerim . . . . Si porro diceretur quare meam uxorem duxerim, vere imprudens homo tunc temporis fui, & ab aliquibus meorum conſiliariorum, quorum potior pars defuncta eſt, ad id perſuaſus ſum. Matrimonium meum ultra tres ſeptimanas non ſervavi, & ſic conſtanter perrexi (76). —— *When I firſt married her, I had no inclination for her . . . . If it be asked, why then did I make her my wife? I own frankly, that I was at that time, an imprudent man, and that ſome of my counſellors, moſt of whom are now dead, perſuaded me thereto. I did not keep my marriage above three weeks, and ſo I have gone on.*' It is very probable, that ſhe was ignorant of his vigour, or knew it only by hear-ſay. Away with theſe fooliſh jeſters, who might be able to criticize Thuanus, on his ſuppoſing, that the princeſs, finding herſelf unable to bear ſo frequent attacks, called in a concubine to her aſſiſtance. Montagne might have rallied this Hiſtorian upon it, but his authority is ſuſpected. See here a paſſage of his Eſſays. 'We have farther read of a difference that happened in Catalonia, between a woman, complaining of the too conſtant efforts of her huſband (not that, in my opinion, ſhe was ſo much incommoded by them; for I believe no miracles, except in faith; as under this pretence, which is the fundamental action of marriage, to re-trench and bridle the authority of huſbands over their wives; and to ſhew, that their luſt and naughtineſs paſs beyond the nuptial-bed, and trample under foot the charms and pleaſures of Venus): To which complaint, a man truly brutal, and unnatural, anſwered, that even on faſting days, he could not diſpenſe with leſs than ten times. From whence proceeded that notable decree of the queen of Arragon; by which, after mature deliberation of the council, this good queen to give a rule and example to all ages of the moderation and modeſty required in a juſt marriage, determined, for the legitimate and neceſſary bounds, ſix times a day; abating and quitting much of the occaſions and deſires of her ſex, to eſtabiſh, as ſhe ſaid, an eaſy form, and by conſequence permanent and immutable. Whereupon the doctors cry out, what muſt be a woman's appetite and concupiſcence, ſince their reaſon, their reformation, and their virtue is defined at this rate (77)?'

See the remark [*D*] of the article GLEICHEN, and remember that abundance of authors, who relate the ſame thing as Montagne, and make their jeſts upon it, do this rather to exerciſe their wit, than to expreſs their thoughts. Some of them are at leaſt perſuaded, that they have been told ſincerely, that is enough.

Claudite jam rivos, pueri, ſat prata biberunt (78).

Swains, ſtop your ſtreams, the meads have drank enough.

[*R*] *Some miniſters, have not had all the neceſſary prudence in anſwering for Luther.*] The only anſwer that ſhould have been given the biſhop of Meaux, was to ſay, as Mr Baſnage has prudently done (79): I. *That Luther ought not to have granted the landgrave of Heſſe the permiſſion to marry a ſecond wife, whilſt his firſt was alive; and that the biſhop of Meaux did juſtly condemn him upon that article.* II. That the Popes have run into much more criminal exceſſes; from whence it follows, that Luther's fault, cenſured by the Papiſts, has no weight; for if this fault hindered him from being an inſtrument in the hand of God to declare the truth, and reform the church, the Roman Catholics are to blame in believing that the Popes, who have been guilty of more crying ſins than this, were, however, living oracles to the church, and the vicars of Jeſus Chriſt. It is certain, the Catholics can infer nothing from this action of the reformers, nor from any other to invalidate the reformation, without deſtroying a principle abſolutely neceſſary for their own ſupport; to wit, that *the greateſt crimes do not hinder the Pope pronouncing* ex cathedra, *from declaring a truth, the belief of which is obliging on all the faithful.*

Had the author of the Paſtoral Letters been as judicious as Mr Baſnage, he would not have expoſed his cauſe to objections, which he could never get over. Firſt, he would have confeſſed the fact; for if it be permitted to doubt of the acts, which the elector Palatine, Charles Lewis, cauſed to be publiſhed, with the atteſtation of a Public Notary, declaring they were copied from the original, in the archives of the houſe of Heſſe, there will be no poſſibility of proving facts: the moſt authentic declarations of ſovereign courts, the privy-ſeal, the great-ſeal, and all the moſt valid teſtimonies imaginable, will be a feeble barrier againſt the obſtinacy of a diſputer. Therefore prudence required, that it ſhould not be called in queſtion, whether the landgrave Philip obtained of Luther, and ſome other miniſters, a diſpenſation to marry two wives. I ſay this further: the reſpect that is due to the moſt illuſtrious houſe of Heſſe, and to the memory of a reformed elector, does not ſuffer us to doubt of it: nevertheleſs, the author of the Paſtoral Letters has very plainly declared he doubts of it (80). But his great fault lies here, that, to extenuate the complaiſance of theſe miniſters, he diſplays every thing, that can ſhew the law of marriage, of one with one, to be ſubject to a thouſand exceptions; he would particularly have it ſacrificed to the imperious power of a laſcivious conſtitution. 'There is no manner of compariſon, *ſays he* (81), betwixt thoſe two evils; to wit, the having recourſe to the unhappy remedy of a ſecond marriage, and the launching out into a thouſand impurities; which are the neceſſary conſequences of celibacy in perſons, whoſe complexion is not turned to continency.' This created him adverſaries, both among the Catholics and Proteſtants. The author of the Hiſtory of the Variations told him, that this principle would carry us too far. 'The perpetual indiſpoſition of a huſband or a wife, is as invincible an impediment, as abſence, or captivity itſelf: the married couple therefore muſt unmercifully leave one another in theſe ſad circumſtances; but an unſuitableneſs of humour, one of the moſt incurable diſtempers, will be a no leſs neceſſary impediment (82).' This miniſter found, in his own communion, many adverſaries both lay-men and divines. The biſhop of Meaux advanced principles manifeſtly pernicious: And the moſt tolerable of what they offer is of ſuch a nature, that they had much better have ſaid nothing [*S*]. Mr Claude's manner of ſpeaking of this great reformer is very judicious [*T*]. He has juſtified him among

---

(71) Luthero erroris hujus dicam ſcripſit Bellarminus haud *uno* loco. At patrocinium Luthero præſtare conatus eſt Johannes Gerardi, etiamſi (ne quid diſſimulem) maculam illam tam plene eluere non potuerit, quin concedendum ſit, Virum illum magnum imprudentiuſcule nonnunquam de materia hac locutum eſſe. *Saldenus, in Otiis Theolog. pag.* 363.

(72) Polygamia triumphatrix.

(73) Hiſt des Variat livr vi, n. 1, pag. m. 227.

(74) It is a miſtake; the ſon and ſucceſſor of Charles Lewis was dead when the biſhop of Meaux wrote this.

(75) *See, above, after* (63), *the marginal citat. from Thuanus.*

(76) Apud Hiſt. des Variat. livr. vi, pag. 259.

(77) Montagne, Eſſais, livr. iii, chap. v, pag. m. 121, 122.

(78) Virgil. Eclog. III, ver. ult.

(79) Baſnage, Hiſt. de la Religion des Egliſes Reformées, Tom. I, pag. 443.

(80) *See the ſeventh Paſtoral Letter of the year* 1688, *pag.* 166, *in* 12*mo, and the ſixth Letter of the* Tableau du Socinianiſme, pag. 302.

(81) *The eighth Paſtoral Letter of* 1688, *pag.* 176, *in* 12*mo.*

(82) *Mr de Meaux*, IV Avertiſſement, pag. 131, Dutch Edit.

Meaux produces him (83) a letter from another miniſter, ‘who bluſhes for his brother, on account of theſe neceſſities, alledged againſt the goſpel, *and theſe inevitable impurities* . . and who perceives the inconvenience of this impure doctrine, which would introduce divorce, and even polygamy, whenever either of the parties ſhould labour under diſtempers, I ſay not, incurable, but long; or where any other impediment may be found, which ſhould oblige them to live ſeparately.’ This miniſter is not named; but another has openly impeached this doctrine, in order to have it cenſured; and, has publiſhed, that it is a principle naturally productive of this concluſion, that a man, who has a ſick wife, may marry a ſecond (84). ‘There is nothing more certain, *adds he*, an equal neceſſity gives an equal privilege; and if an husband is as much hindered from cohabiting with his wife, by having a dead palſy, as by his own captivity among Barbarians, he is equally at liberty to ſeek a remedy to his incontinence, in a ſecond marriage.’ Mr de Beauval, among the lay-men, has urged this ſtill more ſtrongly (85). Another lay-man has maintained, that this maxim ‘(86) opens a gate to the ſtrangeſt diſorders; it authorizes an incontinent perſon, whoſe wife is long ſick, to marry another; and then another and another, without end, if providence pleaſes to render them all unhealthy. Thus you ſee a Turkiſh polygamy breaking in by this gap, into Chriſtianity, and filling it with it's brutal luſts: beſides, you ſee in Chriſtianity, that which was never ſeen in antient Paganiſm, nor is, at this day, to be ſeen in Mahometiſm; to wit, women authorized to have ſeveral husbands at the ſame time, when not having the gift of continency, they happen to be joined to a diſtempered husband: for it were ridiculous to pretend, that it is a leſs evil in them, to give way to promiſcuous luſts, which are, according to this miniſter, the infallible conſequence of celibacy in ſome conſtitutions, than to recur to the remedy of a ſecond husband. We ſee therefore that his maxim is a ſource of the moſt ſcandalous and filthy licentiouſneſs, that ever was ſeen in the world; and that nothing will expoſe our communion to more mortifying reproaches, than this doctrine of Mr Jurieu, unleſs our ſynods condemn it. All the laws which decency and the prudence of magiſtrates have introduced to hinder widows from marrying again, before a certain time, fall to the ground, or are only a tyrannical impoſition, which makes thoſe of a certain complexion launch into a thouſand impurities.’ The author of the Paſtoral Letters finds a hundred expedients (87) to bring himſelf off, with reſpect to ſome other difficulties that were propoſed to him concerning divorce, and ſecond marriages; but it was utterly impoſſible for him to diſ engage himſelf from this. All he could do was to calumniate his accuſer; for it is a calumny for a man to complain, that he has been accuſed of a thing, of which he has not been accuſed (88). Thus you ſee how much it concerns thoſe who anſwer a book of controverſy not to be haſty; for if they give way to the impetuous raſhneſs of their own thoughts and temper, they ſpoil the beſt cauſe.

What I have ſaid of the *reſpect due to the moſt illuſtrious houſe of Heſſe, and to the memory of the reformed elector*, would not be underſtood by every body, if I did not explain it. The acts of this ſecond marriage were taken *from the archives of Ziegenhain, common to the branch of Heſſe-Caſſel, and to that of Heſſe-Darmſtadt* (89). Prince Erneſt of Heſſe Rhinfelds, having embraced the Romiſh religion, was glad at their being publiſhed, becauſe he thought this would fix a blemiſh on the church he had quitted (90); and it is manifeſt, they are a great diſgrace to Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, *&c.* There is therefore no likelihood, that the landgraves of Heſſe-Caſſel, and the landgraves of Heſſe-Darmſtadt, the former Calviniſts, and the later Lutherans, would have been ſilent, if there had been any ſuſpicion, that theſe acts were forged. Theſe great princes could not be ſufficiently blamed, if, having any ſuſpicion of this, they had done nothing to oppoſe the deſign of the landgrave, Erneſt, a Catholic proſelyte. It is therefore denying them their due reſpect to doubt, whether theſe acts be genuine; it is inſinuating that they ſuffer under the authority of their archives, the reformers to be publickly aſperſed, and moſt unjuſtly ſlandered, and a diſhonour brought upon the Proteſtant church. As they are not capable of a lukewarmneſs, ſo injurious, it is moſt certain their ſilence clearly proves the validity of theſe acts. And as for the elector Palatine, how ſhameful would it be, ſhould it be proved, that he ordered one of his counſellors to publiſh falſe acts of this nature? I know indeed, that it was his intereſt they ſhould be moſt genuine, becauſe he did all that was poſſible to legitimate his marriage with a lady he had kept, whilſt his electreſs was alive; which occaſioned this princeſs's leaving him, and refuſing to be called his wife any longer: but, however, he had too much honour and prudence, to go about to juſtify himſelf by a ſuppoſititious fact, the falſeneſs whereof might have eaſily been proved by the electreſs's relations (91).

[*S*] . . . . *they had much better have ſaid nothing.*] The author of the Paſtoral Letters has much enlarged upon the practice of ſome ſtates (92). This was giving a handle for three new objections: for, I. his adverſaries (93) failed not to take the advantage of it, as if the civil laws of Proteſtants left a man too great a latitude in matrimonial caſes; and, as if only a ſmall number of private perſons had diſapproved it, whilſt he had the general practice on his ſide. II. All the examples he produces, or could produce, are of a different kind from the matter in debate; they being not marriages of a man with two wives in the ſame houſe at the ſame time, as were thoſe of the landgrave. III. Laſtly, a caſuiſt ought not to regulate himſelf upon a practice tolerated by princes. Who is ignorant what extreme abuſes civil laws have authorized or tolerated in Chriſtianity for many ages together, with reſpect to marriage (94)? The church has ſtood out, and by it's oppoſition, has at laſt cauſed thoſe things to be changed, which were not reconcileable with the goſpel. What a fine caſe ſhould we be in, if the caſuiſts would approve of all that princes permit? Do they not almoſt every where ſuffer fornication to go unpuniſhed (95)? If any ſuit happens betwixt a young woman and him who has got her with child, the moſt ſhe has to fear, is, that the man will not be condemned to pay her a ſum of money (96): as for cenſures or other penalties, ſhe need not be afraid of them. The judges refer all this to her confeſſor, her relations, or her conſiſtory. And are not plays not only tolerated, but even protected by the prince? Have not the Actors of operas at Paris a guard allowed them, detached from the troops of the king's houſhold? Nevertheleſs, do the preachers ceaſe to exclaim againſt theſe diverſions? And if any eccleſiaſtical author dares to write in favour of plays, is he not immediately overwhelmed with oppoſite writings, and forced to recant (97)? So that a good moraliſt will not regulate his opinions by the practice of the civil law, in a point concerning relaxation of manners.

Whoever would ſee as good an anſwer as could be given to the biſhop of Meaux, concerning the marriage of the landgrave, will do well to read Mr Seckendorf (98).

[*T*] *Mr Claude's manner of ſpeaking of Luther is very judicious.*] Theſe are his words. ‘I confeſs it were to be wiſhed, that Luther had been more temperate in his way of writing; and that with his great and invincible courage, with his ardent zeal for the truth, with that unſhaken conſtancy he ever manifeſted, he could have ſhowed a greater reſerve and moderation. But theſe faults, which are moſt commonly complexional, prevent not our eſteem of men, when, in other reſpects, we perceive in them a good fund of piety, and virtues perfectly heroic, ſuch as were ſeen to ſhine in Luther. For we cannot refuſe to praiſe the zeal of Luciſer, biſhop of Cagliari, or to admire the great qualities of St Jerome, though we diſcover too much keenneſs and paſſion in their ſtile. And perhaps too, there was ſome particular neceſſity at the time of the reformation, to employ the ſtrongeſt expreſſions, the better to awaken men from that profound ſlumber, in which they had lain ſo long. However, I grant, that Luther ought to have been more reſerved in his writings; and that if the author of among other things upon a point, which has given occaſion to ſeveral writings; that is to ſay the diſpute with the devil concerning private maſſes [*U*]. Luther died the eighteenth

---

(83) Ibid. pag. 136.

(84) *See the book of Elias Saurin, paſtor of the Walloon church at Utrecht, intituled,* Examen de la Theologie de Mr Jurieu, pag. 801.

(85) *See his anſwer to the* Avis.

(86) *See a pamphlet, intituled,* Declaration de Mr Bayle, pag. 18.

(87) *See the ſixth letter of the* Tableau du Socinianiſme, pag. 300, & ſeq.

(88) *See Saurin,* ubi ſupra.

(89) Varillas, ubi ſupra, pag. 87.

(90) *See Varillas,* ibid. & Mr de Meaux, Hiſt. des Variat. livr. vi, n. 1, ſub fin.

(91) *She was of the houſe of Heſſe.*

(92) *See the ſixth Letter of the* Tableau du Socinianiſme, pag. 303, & ſeq.

(93) Mr de Meaux, Defenſe de l'Hiſt. des Variations.

(94) See the article LAMBERT, remark [*A*].

(95) See the remark [*D*] of the article ALES.

(96) I do not ſpeak of thoſe who are got with child upon promiſe of marriage by perſons of their own quality: Theſe often obtain decrees, which condemn the man to marry them.

(97) This happened at Paris, in 1694, on occaſion of a book in favour of comedy, which Father Francis Caffaro was ſuppoſed to be the author of. *See the Journal of Hamburg,* 1694, *pag.* 24, 62, 65.

(98) Hiſtor. Lutheran. lib. iii. n. 79. Addit. 3.

‘ of the Prejudices would have contented himſelf to ‘ complain of the acrimony of his ſtile, we ſhould have ‘ been content, as a full anſwer, to deſire him, for the ‘ future, not to imitate himſelf what he condemned in ‘ another (99).’ All this is good and ſolid. I ſhall only obſerve, that a general method of juſtifying people from hence, that their temper was very proper, conſidering the poſture of affairs, to produce good effects, is a great ſource of illuſion. No body doubts, that providence knows how to chuſe the moſt effectual means to arrive at it's ends: but as the ill qualities of men are, at ſome ſeaſons, more proper than their brighteſt virtues, to execute God's decrees, it would be very ill reaſoning to conclude, that violence and paſſion are commendable upon pretence, that the corruption of the world needs the harſheſt treatment. The wiſdom of God, I confeſs, is eminent in employing ſuch inſtruments; but the inſtruments may very well be extremely vitious. I have obſerved above (100), that Cardinal Palavicini has excuſed Julius II, upon the need the church then had of a war-like Pope.

[*U*] *He has juſtified him . . . . npon the diſpute with the devil, concerning private maſſes.*] There are ſome objections, which the great controverſiſts leave to the diſputants of the lower forms; but there are others which are employed by all authors, great and ſmall (101), by thoſe who preach controverſy from a bulk in the ſtreets, and thoſe who dictate from the higheſt pulpits: the objection I ſpeak of, is of this number. The meaneſt country miſſionary has not failed to urge it; Mr Nicolle has oppoſed it with a very grave air. ‘ Never any one, *ſays he* (102), but Luther durſt boaſt, ‘ in a printed book, that he had had a long conference ‘ with the devil; that he had been convinced, by his ‘ reaſons, that private maſſes were an abuſe; and that ‘ this was the motive which induced him to aboliſh ‘ them. But common ſenſe has ever made all others ‘ conclude . . . . that it was an exceſs of extravagance, ‘ to take the devil for the maſter of truth, and become ‘ his diſciple.’ Mr Claude anſwered this objection very well (103). This is one of the four places of his book, to which the Janſeniſt replied, in a book intituled, *A Confutation of the Anſwer of a Lutheran miniſter, concerning the conference of Luther with the devil.* And they failed not to inſert this part of their reply in the ſecond edition of the Prejudices (104). To ſee a compleat anſwer to this objection, we need only read a tract, an extract whereof has been given in the News from the Republic of Letters, in the month of January 1687. This tract (105) is a ſolid confutation of a little book of the abbot de Cordemoi. The biſhop of Meaux (106) forgot not this reproach againſt Luther; but ſee how Mr Baſnage anſwered him (107).

The advantages the Roman controverſiſts pretend to draw hence are, doubtleſs, imaginary; but there is no probable reaſon for taking this ſtory of Martin Luther as a kind of figure or parable, as Mr Claude pretends. For Luther owns, in ſeveral places of his works, that he knows very well the devil's way of diſputing; and that it had coſt him many a bitter night: *Multas noctes mihi ſatis amarulentas & acerbas reddere ille novit* (108). He diſputes, ſays he, with that force, that it is ſudden death to a man; he believes this was the fate of Oecolampadius and Emſerus. The only pleaſure, according to him, that is found in theſe diſputes, is, that the devil quickly diſpatches them, and ſuffers them not to be ſpun out to any length, when he finds a man alone in his houſe. ‘ Diabolus ſua argumenta fortiter figere & urgere novit. Voce quoque gravi & forti utiter. Nec longis & multis meditationibus diſputationes ejuſmodi tranſiguntur, ſed ‘ momento uno & queſtio & reſponſio abſolvitur. Senſi ‘ equidem & probè expertus ſum, quam ob cauſam illud nonnunquam evenire ſoleat, ut ſub auroram quidam mortui in ſtratis ſuis inveniantur. Corpus ille ‘ perimere vel jugulare poteſt: Nec id modò, verùm ‘ & animam diſputationibus ſuis ita urgere, & in anguſtum coarctare novit, ut in momento quoque illi excedendum ſit, quo ſanè me quoque non ſemel tantum ‘ non perpulit . . . . Credo equidem quod Emſerus & ‘ Oecolampadius, aliique horum ſimiles, iſtiuſmodi ignitis Satanæ telis & haſtis confoſſi ſubitaneâ morte perierint. Nemo enim mortalium citrà ſingulare Dei ‘ auxilium ac robur illas ſuſtinere & perferre poteſt. ‘ Jucundum equidem ſeſe diſputando præbet, ſcilicet. ‘ Brevibus enim tranſigit omnia, nec diu moras nectit, ‘ ſiquidem virum ſolitarium domi ſuæ invenerit (109). ‘ —— *The devil knows how to urge and apply his arguments with great force. He uſes a ſtrong and grave* ‘ *voice: nor are ſuch diſputes tranſacted in long or many* ‘ *meditations; but in a moment the queſtion and it's anſwer are diſpatched. I know, and am well aſſured,* ‘ *that from this cauſe ſome have been found about break* ‘ *of day dead in their beds. For he is able to ſqueeze* ‘ *and ſtrangle the body, and not ſo only, but in theſe diſputes to preſs the ſoul and reduce it to ſuch ſtreights* ‘ *as in a moment to drive it out, to which extremity he* ‘ *has more than once reduced me . . . . . I verily believe* ‘ *that Emſerus and Oecolampadius, and other ſuch men* ‘ *ſtruck by theſe fiery darts and javelins of Satan, have* ‘ *periſhed by a ſudden death; for no mortal, without* ‘ *the ſingular aid and aſſiſtance of God, has ſtrength to* ‘ *ſuſtain and reſiſt them. It is true his way of diſputing* ‘ *is very agreeable; for it is ſhort and not tedious, eſpecially if he meets with a ſolitary man at home.*’ Add to this theſe words of Luther's ſeventh tome at page 230 of the Wittemberg edition. ‘ Urget (*Satan*) in ‘ immenſum corda, nec deſinit niſi repulſus verbo Dei: ‘ & ego plane perſuaſus ſum, Empſerum & Oecolampadium & ſimiles, his ictibus horribilibus & quaſſationibus ſubito extinctos eſſe; nec enim humanum cor ‘ horrendum hunc & ineffabilem impetum, niſi Deus ‘ illi adſit, perferre poteſt, *&c.* —— *Satan ſtrongly urges* ‘ *the heart, nor deſiſts unleſs repulſed by the word of* ‘ *God: and I am fully perſuaded that Empſerus and* ‘ *Oecolampadius and others have been ſuddenly deſtroyed* ‘ *by theſe horrible ſhocks, neither can any human heart* ‘ *ſuſtain theſe terrible and inexpreſſible attacks unleſs* ‘ *God aſſiſts it.*’ See the ſecond edition of Mr Nicolle's Prejudices, page 366. It is pretended, that Luther ſaid, that if the Sacramentarians underſtand not the ſcripture, it is becauſe they do not diſpute with the devil, the beſt opponent in the world: and that, without carrying him, hung about one's neck, as he had done, a man could be nothing more than a ſpeculative Divine. ‘ Quod Sacramentarii (*inquit Lutherus*) ‘ ſacram Scripturam non intelligunt, hæc cauſa eſt, ‘ quia verum opponentem, nempe diabolum non habent, qui demum benè docere eos ſolet. *Subdit*: ‘ Quando diabolum ejuſmodi collo non habemus affixum, nihil niſi ſpeculativi Theologi ſumus (110). ‘ . . . . . Ego Diabolum intus & in cute novi, quippe ‘ quocum plus uno ſalis modio comederim (111). . . . . ‘ Diabolus multo frequentius & propius mihi in lecto ‘ accubares ſolet, ſeu condormit, quam mea Catherina. ‘ Mecum in dormitorio deambulare ſolet . . . . . . Ego ‘ Diabolum collo meo affixum habui (112). —— ‘ *That the Sacramentarians,* ſays Luther, *do not underſtand the holy Scriptures, the true cauſe is this, becauſe they have not the true antagoniſt, that is to ſay,* ‘ *the devil, who in the end is wont to teach them right.* ‘ He adds, *when we have not the devil thus hung about* ‘ *our neck, we are no more than ſpeculative Divines. . . .* ‘ *I know the devil intimately, having eat more than one* ‘ *buſhel of ſalt with him . . . . . The devil much oftner* ‘ *ſleeps with me, and lies nearer to me in bed than my* ‘ *Catherine. He uſes to walk with me in my bed-chamber . . . I have had the devil hung about my neck.*’ ‘ *&c.*’ Hence I conclude, that Mr Claude ought not to have ſuſpected that this diſpute of Luther was only a parable.

He has anſwered another objection of the author of the Prejudices, founded upon this, that Luther *ſeems to have animated his ſect to ſlaughter.* Mr Nicolle accuſes him of it, but Mr Claude juſtifies him. I thought he had repelled another attack; to wit, that, founded on the famous words, *Si nolit uxor, veniat ancilla*; but having haſtily run over his Defence of the Reformation, and the book of the Prejudices, I met with nothing relating to it. The biſhop of Meaux has not omitted this reproach of the miſſionaries. His words are theſe: ‘ (113) I have always been afraid to ſpeak of thoſe ‘ *inevitable neceſſities*, which he diſcovered in the union ‘ of the two ſexes, and of the ſcandalous ſermon he ‘ preached at Wittemberg upon marriage: but ſince ‘ the ſequel of this ſtory has once obliged me to break ‘ through the reſtraint that modeſty had impoſed, ‘ I can no longer diſſemble what is found printed eighteenth of February 1546. A thouſand fables have been invented concerning his death [*X*]. Nor did they forbear publiſhing lyes, upon this ſubject, till he had left this world

---

(99) Claude, Défenſe de la Réformation, Part. II, chap. v, pag. 331. Dutch Edit. in 12mo.

(100) *See, above, remark*]*K*] *of the article* JULIUS II, *citat.* (42).

(101) *One might here apply Juvenal's thought:* Exſpectes eadem à ſummo minimoque poëta. *Sat. I, ver.* 12.

(102) Prejugez légitimes contre les Calviniſtes, chap. ii, pag. 17. Edit. Bruſſels, 1682. *He cites Luther*, Tom. VI, vide Hoſpin. Part. ult. fol. 131.

(103) Claude, Défenſe de la Réformation, ubi ſupra, pag. 333, & ſeq.

(104) *That of* 1682; *the title-page ſays it is printed at Bruſſels by Eug. Henry Frix.*

(105) *Mr Seckendorf is the author of it. See the Index of the ten firſt Tomes of the Journal of Leipſic, and the eighth Tome, pag.* 70.

(106) Hiſt. des Variat. livr. iv, n. 17.

(107) Baſnage, Hiſt. des Egliſes, Reform. Tom. I, pag. 431, & ſeq

(108) Luther, ubi infra, apud Hoſpinianum, ubi infra.

(109) Lutherus, de Miſſa privata, Tom. VI, Jen. fol 81, apud Hoſpinianum Hiſt. Sacrament. Part. II, fol. 220, Edit. 1681.

(110) Fitz-Simon, in Britannomachia Miniſtror pag. 90. *He cites* Luth in Colloquiis Iſleb. de Verbo Dei, fol. 23, in Colloq. Francofurt. fol. 18.

(111) Idem, Fitz Simon, ibid. pag. 353. *He cites* Emſerus & Cocleus de Luth. Conc. Dom. reminiſcere inter 27. conciones Witebergæ & Argentinæ impreſſas, in 4to. fol. 19.

(112) Fitz-Simon, ibid. pag. 353, 354. *He cites the* Colloquia Menſalia.

(113) Hiſtor des Variat. livr. vi, n. 11, pag. 235.

‘ in Luther's works. It is true then, that in a ſermon that he preached at Wittemberg for the reformation of marriage, he was not aſhamed to ſpeak theſe infamous and ſcandalous words †: *If they are ſo obſtinate*, he ſpeaks of wives, *it is fit their husbands ſhould tell them, If you will not another will: If the miſtreſs will not come, let the maid be called* . . . However, the husband ought firſt to bring his wife before the church, and admoniſh her two or three times; after that divorce her, and take Eſther inſtead of Vaſhti.’ The biſhop of Meaux expreſſes himſelf thus in another place: ‘ Luther explained himſelf againſt monaſtic vows, in a terrible manner, ſo far as to ſay of that of continence (ſtop your ears, chaſt ſouls) that it was as impoſſible to keep it, as to diveſt ones ſelf of his ſex ‡. It would put modeſty out of countenance, ſhould I repeat the words he uſes, in ſeveral places upon this ſubject, and ſhew how he explains the impoſſibility of continence: I cannot imagine how he can reconcile this to that liſe, which he ſaid he had led, without reproach, all the time of his celibacy, till he was forty five years old (114).’ He is accuſed of having preached, that it is lucky, if five maids, and as many men, be found in a whole city, who have preſerved their chaſtity to twenty years of age; and that this would exceed the purity of the apoſtolic ages, and the ages of the martyrs; and that a man, who lives, without a wife, as much tranſcends the powers of nature, as if he lived without eating (115). Theſe are things which we muſt not attempt to juſtify. They are exceſſes, and firſt motions, which Luther, doubtleſs, retracted before his death. What can be ſaid more ſatirical againſt the laws canonical and civil, which force no body to marry, and which prohibit marrying any more than one wife? Theſe principles of Luther are inconſiſtent with monogamy. I doubt not but theſe ſallies of his zeal, againſt monaſtic vows, gave grounds to the accuſation that was formed againſt him. George duke of Saxony, complained, that ſo many adulteries had never been known, as ſince Luther's teaching that a woman, who conceived not by her husband, might apply to another man; and that if ſhe happened to be pregnant, her husband was to take care of the child, whilſt a husband, whoſe wife was barren, might uſe the ſame privilege. This prince charged this on Luther himſelf (116), in a letter he wrote to him in the year 1526. ‘ Quando tam numeroſa perpetrata ſunt adulteria quam poſtea quam tu ſcribere non dubitaſti: ſi mulier è viro ſuo concipere nequeat, ut ad alium ſe transferat à quo poſſit fœcundari, & maritus prolem inde natam alere teneatur: Itidemque vir faciat (117). This was carrying the point higher than Lycurgus.

[*X*] *A thouſand fables have been invented concerning his death.*] Some have ſaid, that he died a ſudden death: others that he killed himſelf; others that the devil ſtrangled him; others that his corps ſtunk ſo abominably, that they were forced to leave it in the way as they were carrying it to be interred. Nor are they people of mean figure and credit, who vent theſe calumnies, but the moſt famous writers; which reflects on the whole body of Popery; for ſuch fables ought not to paſs the preſs: the cenſors of books ought to expunge them, unleſs they ſaw them judicially proved. We ſhall ſee who theſe authors are, that have publiſhed theſe impertinences. ‘ Pontificii . . . . aſſerunt mortem Lutheri fuiſſe malam & infelicem, ſed de mortis genere non unam eandemque fovent ſententiam. Quidam contendunt, Lutherum *ſibi ipſi violentas manus intuliſſe*, ita Luthero αὐτοχειρίαν tribuit Thomas Bozius *de Signis Eccleſiæ Tom. 2. lib. 23. c.* 8. *Quem locum etiam adducit Cornelius à Lapide, qui ad cap 2. poſt Epiſt. Petri* ſcribit, *Lutherum cum veſpere lautè cænaſſet, noctu deſperatione & furiis Dæmonum actum ſibi injecto laqueo necem intuliſſe, aſſeruit ejus famulus poſtea ad orthodoxam fidem converſus. Quidam calumniantur, Lutherum morte repentinâ obiiſſe. Ita* Bellarminus, *l.* 4. *de Eccleſ. c.* 17. § *Lutherus*, ex Cochlæo de vita Lutheri hæc adducit: *Lutherus morte repentinâ ſublatus eſt. Nam cum veſpere opiparam Cænam ſumſiſſet, lætus & ſanus, & facetiis ſuis omnes ad riſum provocaſſet eadem nocte mortuus eſt.* Quidam eò impudentiæ progrediuntur, ut *eum à Cacodæmone ſublatum fuiſſe* calumnientur. Ita Gulielmus Beſſæus Jeſuita Gallus *in Concept. Theol. Sabbath. Poſt cineres, p.* 102. de morte Lutheri diſſerit: *Lutherus benè potus, & cibis diſtentus abſque ullo Pietatis ſigno cubitum ſecedens apud inferos pernoctavit.* Unde & Coſterus in venenato ſuo carmine de morte Lutheri ita canit:

Infelix ex alvo animam diffudit Arius:
 Hunc ſequeris nimio, vane Luthere, mero.

‘ His omnibus pollicem premit Fabianus Juſtinianus, qui in *Comment. in cap. VI.* Tobiæ ita ſcribit: *Ipſummet Lutherum ſubitaneâ & improviſâ morte à ſuo Cacodæmone ſublatum, peremtumque plurimi cenſent, quòd vocati ad eum Medici morbum vel ignorare ſe faterentur, vel apoplexiam fingerent.* . . . Extat hiſtoria de morte Lutheri à viris fide dignis, qui ipſi agonizanti adſtiterunt, deſcripta videlicet à Juſto Jona, Michaele Cælio, Johan. Aurifabro Vinarienſi, qui coram Deo & in conſpectu Chriſti teſtantur, quòd ſanctâ fide & bonâ conſcientiâ hiſtoriam obitûs Lutheri referant, quæ habetur *Tom.* 8. *Jenenſ. Germ.* quam videat lector veritatis amans eique addat B. M. Johan. Matheſii concionem *XIV. de vita Lutheri.* Sleiden. *l.* 16. *Comment.* imò ipſum Jacob. Auguſt. Thuanum Hiſtoricum Pontificium, *l.* 2. *Hiſt. p.* 30. Quæ omnia Pontificiorum, mendacia de morte Lutheri affuſa, facili negotio diſſipare, & in jugulum calumniantium redigere poſſunt . . . Mortuo Luthero nondum quieſcunt Pontificii, ſed denuò fluctus irarum ſuarum evomunt, & cœno calumniæ poſt mortem ipſius corpus adſpergunt. Fabulantur enim, *corpus* electi Dei organi *ob intolerabilem fætorem in itinere fuiſſe relictum* (118). —— *The Papiſts aſſert, that Luther died an ill and an unhappy death, but they do not agree about the manner of it. Some contend, that* Luther laid violent hands upon himſelf; *this was the opinion of Thomas Bozius, who, in ſupport thereof, cites theſe words from Cornelius à Lapide.* Luther, when he had ſupped heartily, being in the night preſſed by deſpair, and diabolical fury, diſpatched himſelf by the help of a rope, as is aſſerted by his ſervants, ſince converted to the orthodox Faith. *Others, as Bellarmin, falſly ſuggeſt, that Luther* died ſuddenly, *for which he quotes a paſſage out of Cochlæus's Life of Luther, which runs thus:* Luther was taken off by a ſudden death, for having in the evening ſupped ſplendidly, and being merry in good health, and having made all the company laugh at his facetious ſtories, he the ſame night died. *Again, ſome have impudently proceeded ſo far as to give out that he was* taken away by the devil. *Thus William Beſſæus a French Jeſuit writes,* Luther having drank heartily, and being well ſtuffed with meat, without the leaſt ſign of piety, went to his bed, but paſſed the night in hell, with the devils. *Hence Coſterus, in his envenomed poem, on the death of Luther, ſays,*

As impious Arius, did his bowels void,
So Luther died with wine, and eating cloy'd.

‘ *Fabianus Juſtinian gives his approbation to all theſe ſtories in the following words:* many are of opinion that Luther himſelf was taken away by a ſudden and unprovided death by the agency of his own evil ſpirit, becauſe the Phyſicians, when called to him either knew not what to make of his diſeaſe or pretended it was an apoplexy. . . . . *There is an account of Luther's death, by perſons worthy of credit, and who were eye-witneſſes thereof, ſuch as Juſtus Jonas, Michael Cælius, John Aurifaber of Wiemar, who, before God, and in the preſence of Chriſt, teſtify, that a true and faithful account of the death of Luther, is given in the eighth volume of his works, wherein the curious reader may be largely informed of that matter, as well as from Mattheſius Sleidan, and Thuanus, a Roman Cathotholic . . . All which lies of the Papiſts, concerning the death of Luther, may be eaſily diſproved, and*

‘ *thruſt*

---

† Tom. V, Serm. de Matrim. fol. 123.

‡ Ep. ad Wolf. Tom VII, fol. 505, &c.

(114) Hiſt. des Variat. livr. iii, n. 49, pag. 130.

(115) Benè cum Republica agi, ſi in aliqua una civitate vel quinque virgines & quinque mares annum vigeſimum caſti attigerint: idque plus eſſe quàm tempore Apoſtolorum, & Martyrum acciderit. . . . Demum non minus vires naturæ tranſgredi hominem cœlibem, quàm ſi nihil omnino comederet vel biberet. *Luther. Serm. de Tribus Regibus, pag.* 198. *Colmariæ ann.* 1523, *apud Fitz Simon, ubi ſupra, pag.* 155.

(116) *It was groundleſs: See Seckendorf,* Hiſt. Luther. lib. ii, pag. 39.

(117) Surius, Commentar. pag. 195.

(118) Joh. Adamus Oſiander, in Tractatu Theologico de Magia, pag. 271, & ſeq.

world [*Y*]. I have ſaid nothing of his marriage, becauſe I ſpeak largely of it in another place [Z]. His greateſt enemies cannot deny, but that he had eminent qualities, and hiſtory affords nothing more ſurpriſing than what he has done : for a ſimple Monk to be able to give Popery ſo rude a ſhock [*AA*], that there needed but ſuch another intirely to

'*thruſt down the throat of theſe calumniators. . . . . Even now that Luther is dead, the Papiſts cannot let him reſt, but ſhew their hatred to him, and invent new lies concerning him. For they pretend, that the body of this choſen inſtrument of God, was* left in the high way, becauſe, of it's intolerable ſtench.' Some have publiſhed, that Luther died like Arius. Theſe are Simon Fontain's words (119). 'Some Catholic's who had opportunities to know how the the thing truly happened, have written, that, riſing to eaſe nature, he fell down dead.' Father Maimbourg has rejected all theſe fooliſh ſtories, but he has been miſtaken in a notable fact. 'The elector of Saxony, *ſays he* (120), cauſed his body to be conveyed with a moſt magnificent pomp to Wittemberg, where he erected for him a monument of white marble, ſurrounded with the ſtatues of the twelve apoſtles, as if he had been the thirteenth, with reſpect to Germany.' Mr Seckendorf has ſhewn, that this monument, and theſe ſtatues, are chimera's (121).

I ſhall here ſet down a paſſage of a Paris Divine, who reproached the Lutherans with acting contrary to their principles. 'They had always condemned, *ſays he* (122), the pomp with which the Catholics buried their dead in paying them the laſt honour of ſepulture, blaming the ſermons that were preached in honour of the deceaſed, and ſaying, that it were much better to have charitably beſtowed on the poor what was thus ſpent in theſe funeral pomps and honours. On the whole, that it was all one, and equally Chriſtian, to be buried in a dunghill and without tapers, as to be depoſited in holy ground, with all this pomp. If what they ſaid was before true, why did they employ ſuch expence and coſt to lay their Luther in his grave ? Why did they not give this money to the poor, which was ſpent in conducting him from Iſleben to Wittemberg ? Which could not be done for a ſmall ſum. Why did they not bury him in a dunghill, where he might have rotted as well as at Wittemberg ? In ſhort, if this veneration is condemned by the holy ſcriptures (as they falſly think) why have they uſed it ?' It is certain that they who reform do not always conſider, that there are ſome abuſes, which ſhould not be ſpoken againſt for fear of condemning themſelves beforehand; theſe being things into which people quickly relapſe.

[*Y*] *Nor did they forbear publiſhing lyes, upon this ſubject, till he had left this world.*] A pamphlet was publiſhed at Naples, and in other places ; the ſubſtance whereof was this. Luther, being dangerouſly ſick, deſired to communicate, and died as ſoon as he had received the viaticum. As he was dying, he deſired that his body might be laid upon the altar to be adored ; but that requeſt being neglected, he was buried. There aroſe a furious tempeſt at his interrment as if the end of the world was at hand. The terror was univerſal. They who lifted up their eyes to heaven, perceived, that the hoſt, which the deceaſed had preſumed to take, was ſuſpended in the air. It was gathered up with great veneration, and laid in a ſacred place, and the tempeſt ceaſed. It returned the night following with ſtill greater fury, and filled all the town with conſternation. The next day Luther's ſepulchre was opened, and found empty, and a ſulphureous ſtench proceeded from it, which no body could bear. The aſſiſtants fell ſick of it, and many of them repented, and returned into the pale of the Catholic church (123). This pamphlet was written in Italian, and it was ſaid in it, with an air of triumph, that it contained a miracle in honour of Jeſus Chriſt, for the terror of the wicked, and the conſolation of good people ; and that this event was known by letters from the French embaſſador (124). Luther, having read this pamphlet the twenty-firſt of March 1545, cauſed it to be printed, and added a poſtſcript to it. Some Roman Catholics, being aſhamed of this impoſture, endeavoured to ward off the infamy, by another fraud. They endeavoured to perſuade the world, that Luther, or ſome of his friends, were the authors of this romance ; but there are very authentic proofs to the contrary. 'Fuerunt ex adverſa parte, quos protervi figmenti puduit, & ideo inventorem ejus ipſum *Lutherum* ſubſtituere voluerunt, vel aliquem ex ſuis; impudenter utique & vene. Extant enim . . . literæ Landgravii ad electorem Saxoniæ d. 12. Mart. authenticæ, in quibus ei relationem iſtam Italicam miſit, ſignificans, ſe eam ab Auguſtano quodam, cujus literas etiam adjunxit, accepiſſe, ex quibus percipitur typis excuſam ſchedam illum Neapoli & multis aliis locis fuiſſe (125).' What a ſcandal is it to thoſe who underſtand the nature of ſcandal, to find ſuch effects of a falſe zeal for religion?

[Z] *I ſpeak largely of Luther's marriage in another place.*] To wit, in the article BORE. I have but one obſervation more to make, and it is deſigned for the correcting a fault of the famous Joſeph Hall, biſhop of Exeter. He ſays, that a malicious apoſtate † affirms, that 'Luther had been the day before a monk, the next day betrothed, the day after a huſband, and the next day after a father (126). *My informer* (127), *continues he*, maintains this laſt by the teſtimony of Eraſmus ‡, who, in one of his letters to his friend, Daniel Mauchius of Ulm, mentions the ſame ſtory more at large. Pray, reader, look over all this vaſt volume of Eraſmus's Epiſtles, *Refut. p.* 28, 29. and if there be no ſuch perſon, (as indeed there is none) nor any ſuch letter ; judge you what we are to think of the veracity of theſe people.' He is to blame to cenſure the perſon, who alledged Eraſmus's teſtimony ; and he would not have cenſured him, if he had known what is found in the 278th page of Chytræus's annals. We there find that Luther's adverſaries alledged a certain letter of Eraſmus (128), not printed ; wherein he makes mention of the too haſty lying-in of Luther's wife (129). So that Joſeph Hall ought not to have inſiſted on this Letter's not appearing in the vaſt volume of Eraſmus's letters. If he had treated it as a forgery, he had been much to blame. See above (130) the ſame fact, in another letter of this author. That which might be very juſtly ſaid, is, that Eraſmus had acknowledged the falſity of this news (131). From hence we may learn how hard a taſk it is to confute a man on matters of fact: for we muſt know almoſt an infinite number of them to oppoſe with ſafety any thing that an adverſary affirms or denies.

[*A A*] *We cannot ſufficiently admire that a ſimple monk ſhould be able to give Popery ſo rude a ſhock.*] How many ſtates and nations did he induce, in a little time, to ſeparate from the Romiſh communion ? This was repreſented very happily, though in ſomewhat a burleſque manner on a piece of tapeſtry. Read this paſſage, taken from a letter of Coſtar. 'The laſt time the king was at Chalons, a very rich piece of tapeſtry was hung in his chamber, which came from the late queen of Navarre; in which were repreſented Luther and Calvin, who gave the Pope a clyſter, which put the good man into ſuch commotion, that he was ſeen in another place taken with a great vomiting and looſeneſs, and evacuating abundance of kingdoms and ſovereignties, Denmark, Sweden, the duchy of Saxony, *&c.*' Wickliff, John Huſs, and ſeveral others had attempted the ſame thing, but did not ſucceed. This was, you will ſay, becauſe they were not favoured with a concurrence of circumſtances: they had no leſs merit nor abilities than Luther; but they undertook the cure of the diſeaſe before the criſis ; and, as we may ſay, in the increaſe of the moon. Luther, on the contrary, attacked it at a critical time, when it was arrived to the higheſt pitch ; when it was impoſſible it ſhould grow worſe; and therefore, according to the courſe of nature, muſt either ceaſe or diminiſh: for when things are arrived to the higheſt point of their aſcenſion, they commonly begin to decline (132). He ſowed in the full moon, when the wane was juſt drawing on: he had the ſame good fortune, as thoſe remedies have which are employed laſt, and which carry away the glory of the cure, becauſe applied, when to over-throw the Romiſh church, is what we cannot ſufficiently admire. Some attribute the revolution, brought about by his miniſtry, to certain poſitions of the ſtars [*BB*]. It is not true, as ſome affirm, that his enterprize has inſpired ſeveral people with a contempt for the Chriſtian religion [*CC*]. He, who would be throughly acquainted with the hiſtory

---

(119) Hiſt. Catholique, livr. xvii, fol. 230.

(120) Maimb. Hiſt. du Luther. livr. iii, Tom. I, pag. 301, 302, Dutch Edit.

(121) *See Seckendorf*, Hiſt. Lutheran. lib. iii, pag. 645.

(122) Simon Fontaine, Hiſt. Catholique, livr. xvii, fol. 232.

(123) Seckend. Hiſt. Luther. lib. iii, pag. 580.

(124) Nata forte hinc eſt immanis illa de ejus obitu fabula, quæ *Tom. VIII. Alt. fol.* 415, *& ſeq.* lingua Italica, & in Germanicam verſa, legitur Scribunt autem cum magna quidem exultatione & gratulatione, tanquam de miraculo *à Deo, in honorem Chriſti, terrorem malorum, & ſolatium bonorum*, ut impie nugantur, *edito*, ex Legati Regis Galliæ literis innotuiſſe, quod Lutherus periculoſe ægrotans, *&c. Seckendorf, ubi ſupra, pag.* 580, *col.* 1.

(125) Id ibid. col. 2.

† *Juſtus Baronius, before called Calvinus.*

(126) *Joſeph Hall's Apology for the Marriage of Eccleſiaſtics, pag.* 48.

(127) *That is, he who had wrote againſt Joſeph Hall.*

‡ Tom. II, Lat. Colloq. Tit de morbis Lutheri.

(128) *See* Seckendorf, Hiſt. Lutheran. lib. ii, pag. 18.

(129) *See above, citat.* (22). *of the article* BORE.

(130) *See the remark* [*L*] *of the article* BORE.

(131) *Above, citat.* (23) *of the article* BORE.

(132) Invida fatorum ſeries, ſummiſque negatum
Stare diu, nimioque graves ſub pondere lapſus,
Nec ſe Roma ferens. *Lucan. lib. i, ver.* 71.

when the diſtemper has diſcharged it's malignity. You may, if you pleaſe, add, that the concurrence of Francis I, and Charles V, was fatal in this affair. I anſwer, that all this notwithſtanding, there muſt have been eminent gifts in Luther to produce ſuch a revolution as he has done. Here is an excellent thought of Father Paul (133). ‘If there was any thing, in the ſetting up of this novelty (134), that gave ſcandal as I ſhall relate it, yet it is well known, that Leo's predeceſſors made many like conceſſions, and from leſs honeſt motives, and had carried their avarice and extortions farther. But frequently good opportunities of doing great things are loſt for want of knowing them [‡], or knowing how to make uſe of them. Beſides, that, we muſt wait the time, that God has appointed to puniſh the faults and corruptions of men. And all this concurred under Leo's pontificate, of whom we ſpeak at preſent.’ It muſt be acknowledged, that ſeveral circumſtances concurred to favour Luther: Learning flouriſhed among the laity, whilſt church-men would not renounce their barbariſm, and perſecuted the learned and ſcandalized all the world, by an unbridled luſt. See the margin (135). It was ſaid, with reaſon, that Eraſmus, by his railleries, prepared the way for Luther. He was his St John Baptiſt, his forerunner. Simon Fontaine complains, that *occaſionally Eraſmus did more miſchief than Luther, becauſe Luther did only open the door wider, after Eraſmus had picked the lock, and half opened it* (136).

[*BB*] *Some attribute the revolution brought about by his miniſtry, to certain poſitions of the ſtars.*] Paul Jovius goes ſo much into this profane thought, as to impute to a malignant conſtellation, not only what happened in Germany, by means of Luther, but alſo the converſion of the Indians in the eaſt and weſt: and when he conſiders, that the faith of people changed almoſt at the ſame time, in the four parts of the world, ſome embracing Mahometiſm others Chriſtianity, and others Lutheraniſm, he cannot believe but the influences of the ſtars had brought this about by their occult and pernicious qualities. ‘Nec multo poſt exarſit in Germania, *ſays he* (137), authore Luthero dira hæreſis, quæ populis, ut in Perſide acciderat, ad inſaniam verſis, Chriſtiani dogmatis placita, & veteris ſacrorum ritus vehementiſſimè conturbavit. Ita ut facilè crediderim ab oculta cœli poteſtate, malignoque ſyderum concurſu proveniſſe, ut religiones toto terrarum orbe enatis factionibus uno tempore ſcinderentur, quando non Mahometani modo Chriſtianique, ſed & remotiſſimæ gentes idololatræ, aut ſydera aut portenta pro Diis venerantes, cum in India quæ ad Orientem vergit, tum in Novo orbe ad Occiduam plagam reperto, novas ſacrorum opiniones induerint.’ Florimond de Remond ſeems to applaud this notion: he gives it in French, and complains of a Proteſtant tranſlator, who had omitted that paſſage. ‘Almoſt at the ſame time, ſays Jovius, that Iſmael ſeized upon the empire of the Perſians, and changed the religion, blending it with the new Mahometan ſuperſtition, there aroſe in Germany, under Luther's authority, that monſtrous Hereſy, which endeavoured to deſtroy the Catholic religion, and all that antiquity had received; as the people, enraged and bigotted with their new follies and ſuperſtitions, had done in Perſia: by which means, *ſays he*, I willingly admit, that, by a ſecret power of heaven, and a malignant influence of the ſtars, all the religions in the univerſe began to change; ſince not only Mahometans, but alſo Chriſtians, nay idolatrous nations, the moſt remote, who worſhipped idols, both in the Eaſt-Indies and in the new world towards the Weſt, fell into new religions and opinions at the ſame time. This is what the Latin of Jovius ſays. But in his French tranſlation, the reformed ſincerity, the ſcrupulous conſcience of his tranſlator is remarkable, who paſſes over all that Jovius ſays of this change of religions, and this monſtrous Lutheran Hereſy ſprung up in Saxony: this grieved him at the heart. With what fidelity do they handle holy and ſacred books, when they thus impudently mutilate the preſent Hiſtorians to ſuppreſs a ſentence relating to Luther (138).’ The delicacy of ſuch tranſlators cannot be approved. If there be zeal in their conduct, it is a zeal ſo blind, ſo ſuperſtitious, ſo mean and childiſh, that it deſerves to be given up to their adverſaries indignation. Note, that Lipſius attributed alſo to the ſtars the fondneſs of the XVIth century for diſputes in religion (139). *Fatalis iſta eſt ingeniorum ſcabies, ut omnes diſputare malint, quam vivere* .... (140). *Ita loquor, quia velut à cœlo, &, ut dixerim, aſtro aliquo eſt hæc peſtis. Atque ut corporum quidam morbi certis temporibus interveniunt: ſic nunc iſte animorum. Viri, fœminæ, ſenes, pueri, quæſtiunculis ludunt & laſciviunt: eoque ventum, ut pro parum ſano ſit, qui non ſic inſanit. Myſterium Theologia erat, facta eſt populare oblectamentum.* He pretends, that the ſoul is ſubject, as the body, to ſome diſtempers, which return from time to time; and he reckons, in the number of theſe diſeaſes of the ſoul, the ſpirit of diſputing, and the change of religion, which reigned at that time. He relates a paſſage of Nicephorus Gregoras, containing a deſcription of the like ſtate. All places rang with Theological diſputes; even they who knew not what was to be believed, nor what they themſelves pretended to believe, talked of nothing, but of Theology, in the markets and theatres (141). ‘*Vis imaginem claram horum temporum? Nicephori Gregoræ iſta lege.* [*] Apud nos etiam opificibus effuſa ſunt arcana Theologiæ, atque ita omnes inhiant ratiocinatiunculis & ſermonibus ſyllogiſticis, ut herbæ & paſcuis armenta. Et illi, qui de rectâ fide ambigui ſunt, & qui nec quomodo credendum ſit ſciunt, nec quid ſit illud quod credere ſe dicunt; illi inquam & fora & porticus & theatra omnia Theologiâ compleverunt.’ Without recurring to conſtellations, the ordinary ſanctuary of ignorance, ſecond cauſes might have been diſcovered on earth, which God made uſe of to effect the change that happened in Germany in the XVIth century.

[*CC*] *It is not true .... that his enterprize has inſpired ſeveral people with contempt of the Chriſtian religion.*] If Coëffeteau had ſaid, that Luther made abundance of people damn themſelves by the profeſſion of Hereſy, he would have ſpoken according to his prejudices, and we ſhould have pardoned him; but this is not the evil he deplores. Let us hear him. ‘Mean time, *ſays he* (142), inſtead of repreſenting to us here the ſallies of this furious ſpirit of Luther, whoſe inſolence has diſpleaſed the Calviniſts themſelves, the Sieur du Pleſſis, ought to have meditated on the horrour of his crime, and repreſented to himſelf the great loſs of ſouls, with which he is chargeable before God and his angels, for having been the author of all the diſputes that are ariſen in Chriſtendom. God ordained in the antient law [**], that if it happened, that any having a controverſy with another, ſhould ſtrike a woman with child, ſo as to deſtroy her fruit, his life ſhould go for the life of the child. What then will the divine juſtice appoint againſt thoſe, who, by their ambition, and by the diſputes, which they have excited in the church, have occaſioned the death of ſo many millions of ſouls, who are diſguſted at the Chriſtian religion, to ſee thoſe, who profeſs themſelves miniſters of it, ſo ill agreed upon the principal points of the holy Goſpel.’ We may affirm, that the number of thoſe who were lukewarm, indifferent, or diſguſted with Chriſtianity, diminiſhed much more than it increaſed by the diſturbances Europe felt on occaſion of Luther. Every one choſe his ſide with warmth; ſome remained in the Romiſh communion, others embraced the Proteſtant: the former conceived a greater zeal for their religion than they had before; the later had an ardent zeal for their new belief. No body can ſhow thoſe who, as Coëffeteau ſays, rejected Chriſtianity, upon account of ſo many diſputes. Had he ſaid, that the diviſions of Chriſtians, and their conduct towards one another, after having formed themſelves into ſects, are moſt proper to bring the goſpel into diſcredit, and the people into unbelief, I ſhould have agreed with him; but he muſt have ſuppoſed, at the ſame time, a thing which very few practiſe. He muſt have ſuppoſed, that there are a great many without double weights; that is, who

RELIGIOUS controverſies make but few Sceptics.

(133) Fra. Paolo, Hiſt. du Concile de Trente, livr. i, pag. 4.

(134) *That is to ſay the indulgences of Leo X.*

[‡] Opportunos magnis conatibus tranſitus rerum, *ſays Tacitus, Hiſt.* 1.

(135) Add to this the falſe ſteps that Popery made in this conjuncture. I ſhall ſpeak of them in the laſt remark.

(136) Simon Fontaine, doctor of Divinity at Paris, *Hiſtoire Catholique de Nôtre Tems, livr. vii, fol.* 91, *Edit. Paris* 1562.

(137) Jovius. Hiſtor. lib xiii, fol m. 239, verſ.

(138) Florim. de Remond, Hiſt. de l'Hereſie livr. i, chap. iv, pag. m. 24.

(139) Lipſius, Civil. Doctrinæ, lib. iv, cap. iii, pag. m. 65, Oper. Tom. IV.

(140) Idem, adverſus Dialogiſtam, pag 310, ejuſd. Tomi.

(141) Id. ibid.

[*] Hiſtor. lib. xi.

(142) Coëffeteau, Reſponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, pag. 1237.

[**] Exod. xxiii.

hiſtory of this great man need only read Mr de Seckendorf's large volume (c). It is, in its kind, one of the beſt books that have appeared for a long time. I ſhould adviſe him alſo to read the *Lutherus Defenſus* of a Hamburgh miniſter (d); for there all the perſonal reproaches are anſwered.

I was amazed to find, that cardinal du Perron durſt ſay, that Luther believed the mortality of the ſoul [DD]. Should Francis Garaſſe vent a thouſand ſuch calumnies (e), I ſhould not wonder at it; and if I had found it in Luther's life, publiſhed at Paris in 1577, by the Monk Noel Talepied (f), or in Nicole Grenier's book, of which we ſhall ſee a long paſſage below [EE], or in the books of ſuch like writers, who have no reputation to loſe, I ſhould not have been ſurprized: but I could not but think it ſtrange, that a cardinal, of ſo great a name, ſhould be guilty of ſo much raſhneſs. The curious will not be diſpleaſed to hear of a ſmall ruffle which was given Mr Arnauld on occaſion of

(c) Hiſtoria Lutheraniſmi. *See the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, Febr. 1692. Art. XIII.

(d) *Called* John Mullerus.

(e) *See the remark* [E].

(f) *A Franciſcan of Pontoiſe.*

examine, without prejudice, what happens at home and abroad. But where are theſe to be met with? Where are thoſe, who, by the force of cuſtom, do not judge the ſame things to be moſt juſt, when they make others ſuffer them, and moſt unjuſt when they ſuffer them themſelves? In ſuch a diſpoſition as this there is no danger that the multiplicity of ſects ſhould create many Sceptics: let what will happen, every one will ſtick faſt by the party he has choſen. The antiperiſtaſis, which the new Philoſophers have baniſhed from nature, takes place in religion. Zeal cools, when we are not taken notice of, nor ſurrounded with another ſect, and rekindles when we are. We may here apply the verſes that were made upon Menelaus (143), and ſay, that Coëffeteau has miſtaken the matter: he has taken that for a real fact, which muſt happen only in caſe men reaſoned after a certain manner.

(143) He was weary of Helena while he had her in an undiſturbed poſſeſſion, and was all on fire when ſhe was taken away from him. See, above, citat. (42), of the article HELENA.

[DD] *I was amazed to find that cardinal Perron durſt ſay, that Luther believed the mortality of the ſoul.*] See in what words he affirms it (144): ‘Luther denied the immortality of the ſoul, and ſaid, that it died with the body; and that God afterwards raiſed both again: ſo that, in his opinion, no one enjoyed the viſible preſence of God; whence he drew an argument againſt praying to ſaints, ſhewing, that the ſaints hear not our prayers. The church believes that the ſouls of the ſaints, and of the bleſſed enjoy the preſence of God as ſoon as they are dead; and Luther reckons this among the impieties of the Romiſh church, that ſhe believes the immortality of the ſoul.’ You ſee he is not charged with abſolutely denying the puniſhments and rewards of another life, but only with deferring them, till after the final reſurrection of all men. This is leſſening very much the heinouſneſs of the accuſation, which others had brought againſt him; but this is not avoiding the crime of lying and ſlandering. It is a common ſaying, that all romances are founded upon ſome hiſtory: I have therefore ſuſpected, that cardinal du Perron built this fable upon ſome words of Luther, ill underſtood, and found in quotations; and I, having not the leiſure to turn over all the great volumes of this miniſter, have conſulted a Divine of the Confeſſion of Augsburg, and deſired him to inform me if there were any pretext that could occaſion this cardinal's ſpeaking thus. The ſubſtance of the anſwer, he was pleaſed to make me, is as follows: Luther never taught that the ſoul died with the body, and was to riſe again with the body. It can never be proved by his works that he was of this opinion; and he has very clearly ſhewn, that he believed quite contrary. Conſult what he has written upon the eighth verſe of the fourth chapter of Geneſis, where he ſpeaks of the death of Abel. The origin of the calumny is in a letter he writ to Amſdorf in the year 1522; in which he appears much inclined to believe, that the ſouls of the juſt ſleep to the day of judgment, without knowing where they are, &c. He does not pretend to ſay, that they are dead in this interval, but only lay in a profound reſt and ſleep; in which opinion he followed many fathers of the antient church ‡. He rectified this opinion, in proceſs of time; and though he ſeems in his later writings to attribute reſt to the ſouls of the predeſtinate, he does not mean thereby a reſt which is a profound ſleep, and deprives them of the viſion and converſation of God and the Angels. See his commentary upon the twenty fourth chapter of Geneſis, where he ſpeaks very largely of the ſtate of ſouls departed.

(144) Perroniana, *at the word* Luther, pag. 202, Edit. 1669.

‡ Origen, St Chyſoſtome, and Theodoret, among the Greeks: Tertullian and Lactantius, among the Latins.

[EE] *In Nicole Grenier's book, whereof we ſhall ſee a long paſſage.*] This book is intituled, *The Shield of Faith, by way of dialogue, extracted from the holy Scriptures, and holy Fathers, and moſt antient doctors of the church.* The author, a regular canon of St Victor, dedicated it to Henry II. I cannot tell in what year he publiſhed it the firſt time. La Croix du Maine, and du Verdier Vau-Privas, mention only the edition of Paris 1566, and 1567. They ſay nothing of that of Avignon 1549, which I uſe, and which is not the firſt; for the title imports, that the book *was reviſed and enlarged by the author.* The edition mentioned by du Verdier Vau-Privas contains *an apology againſt the Lutheran bound, which attempted to gnaw the* Shield of Faith. I ſuppoſe he means Bartholomew Cauſſe, miniſter of Geneva, author of a book intituled, *The true Shield of the Chriſtian Faith; in ſeveral dialogues, demonſtrating, from holy Scripture, the errors and falſe allegations of a book intituled,* The Shield of Faith; *formerly written by a monk of St Victor at Paris, calling himſelf the* Bienallant (*well-going*). My edition is of Geneva 1563, reviſed and very much enlarged. Let this be ſaid in favour of Bibliographers. Let us now come to the point, and relate what the canon of St Victor ſays of Luther. ‘Luther's ambition, and deſire of glory and honour, was ſo great, that, tho' he was but a meer Presbyter, and an Auguſtine, an Apoſtate, and an uncowled Monk, yet he took upon him the epiſcopal office and dignity. For being once in the city of Liſbon (145), he preſumed to ordain two presbyters in St Andrew's church, impoſing hands upon them, and ſinging the anthem *Veni Sancte Spiritus.* Moreover he cauſed himſelf to be carried in a pompous chariot, or litter, as a great prince, ſurrounded and attended with gentlemen and guards. And, in his entry into towns, there were vollies of ſhot, and firing of cannons. This was not imitating Jeſus Chriſt, his Apoſtles, and the holy Doctors of the church, who, by their preaching and example recommended humility and ſimplicity. Very different is the life of true Chriſtians, and heretical Antichriſts. The Life of the Apoſtles, and holy Doctors of the church was humble, ſober, chaſte, modeſt, and devout: but the life of the falſe Doctor and Apoſtate, Luther, was proud, gluttonous, laſcivious, infamous, and ſenſual: for it is notorious and evident to all, that, having violated his religious vows, and eccleſiaſtical continence, he took for his wife, or whore, a nun, by whom he had three baſtards and illegitimates. His gluttony was the cauſe of his great incontinence; for, as St Jerome ſays, *Venter mero æſtuans, facile deſpumat in libidinem.* ——— *The ſcum of luſt eaſily riſes in a ſtomach boiling with wine.* And, to ſpeak the truth, Luther ought rather to be called the prince and doctor of drunkards and gluttons, than of Saxons and Germans. He was a ſecond Epicurus, or Sardanapalus, ſince it is commonly ſaid of him, that, at every dinner and ſupper, he drank two gallons of luſcious rich wine; and eat of the moſt exquiſite and delicate diſhes; which he continued to the laſt: for he died ſuddenly, full glutted, after having ſupped plentifully, and ſtuffed his paunch. But let us leave this wretch (146).’ It is for the intereſt of the Lutherans, and all Proteſtants in general, to re-publiſh the fabulous impertinences their adverſaries publiſhed againſt the reformers of the XVIth century. They ſhew, that they were wholly conducted by a blind prejudice; a prejudice which is to their reproach and diſadvantage. Here you have a canon of St Victor of ſo little judgment, as to employ an objection, which overthrows Pope, cardinals, and all the prelacy, whoſe train and pompous equipages are diametrically oppoſite to the life of the Apoſtles.

(145) The author, if I miſtake not, would ſay Iſleben, but by an inexcuſable negligence, he did not well inform himſelf of the true names of towns, and fell into a ridiculous miſtake, there being in Portugal the city of Liſbon, where Luther never was

(146) Nicole Grenier, Bouclier de la Foi, pag. 784, & ſeq.

of a citation from Luther [*FF*]. It was impoſſible for him to verify it by the original books. This leads me to make this obſervation, that nothing would be more convenient for thoſe who are accuſed of miſ-quoting this reformer, than the liberty of the moſt curious library of prince Rodolphus Auguſtus, duke of Brunſwic [*GG*]. Luther's life, in medals (*g*), publiſhed in the year 1699, contains an infinite number of particulars (*h*), and points out an infinite number of authors, who have ſpoken of this illuſtrious perſon. We find, in the Preface to the reader, a liſt of all thoſe who have compoſed either his elogy or his hiſtory. We there likewiſe find a confutation of the falſhoods of an anonymous author, whoſe dialogues were printed in the year 1694, with the title of *Lucien en belle humeur*. I only mention this circumſtance to have an opportunity of ſaying, that there is no ground to think, that Mr Fontenelle is the author of theſe dialogues (*i*). They might poſitively affirm, that he is not; and that he is not capable of ſo imperfect a performance. In the Vatican library at Rome is ſhewn (*k*) a Bible, which is ſaid to be of *Luther*'s *tranſlating, and written with his own Hand. But this is not probable, conſidering the extravagant prayer* (*l*) *at the end of it, and which appears to be of the ſame hand with the reſt.* Whilſt the troops of Charles V quartered at Wittemberg in the year 1547, a ſoldier gave Martin Luther's effigies in the church of the caſtle two ſtabs with his dagger (*m*). The emperor did a very generous action at that time: He would not ſuffer the tomb of this pretended hereſiarch to be demoliſhed; and he forbid the attempting any thing of that nature upon pain of death [*HH*]. Luther had made a great progreſs in ſcholaſtic learning, and had even followed the ſect of the Nominals; which ſpun the thread fineſt in all abſtract queſtions; yet no one inveighed ſo much as he againſt the method of philoſophizing uſed at that time; nor was any man more vehemently bent againſt the great Ariſtotle. You will ſee the proofs of this in the extracts I ſhall give of an invective of Father Gretſer [*II*], where the Jeſuit endeavours to make out

[*FF*] *A ſmall ruffle was given Mr Arnauld, on occaſion of a citation from Luther.*] Mr le Fevre, doctor of Divinity, of the Faculty of Paris, has publiſhed what follows, in a book printed at the Hague (147) in 1685. *Does not he remember*, ſays he (148), ſpeaking of Mr Arnauld, *that about four years ago, a miniſter having writ to him, that he had falſly cited ſome paſſages from Luther to ſhew that he denied the neceſſity of good works, and amongſt others this*; let us beware of ſin; but, above all, let us beware of the law and good works, and fix only on the promiſe of God and faith: *words which he cited as from a ſermon of Luther, upon a text in the New Teſtament; he found himſelf obliged to take the trouble of ſearching for this paſſage in all the works of Luther that were to be met with at Paris, and not finding it could give no other anſwer to the miniſter, who had writ to him, than confeſſing he had taken, this paſſage from Bellarmine, and at the ſame time inſiſting on this cardinal's fidelity.*

[*GG*] *The moſt curious library of prince Rodolphus Auguſtus, duke of Brunſwic.*] This prince, who has joined the love of letters, to all other qualities worthy his illuſtrious family, was not ſatisfied with the magnificent library of Wolfenbuttle; he ſet up another private one, which he ſtored with a very great number of ſcarce books. Here we find all the writings that Luther publiſhed from the year 1517 to his death: the editions, I ſay, which he publiſhed and corrected himſelf, and which are preferable to the original manuſcripts, becauſe in reviſing the proofs he corrected many things that had eſcaped him. It is a much ſafer way to have recourſe to theſe editions, than to thoſe, in which all his works have been reduced into a body; for they who collected them took the liberty to mend, and change, what they thought fit (149): and this is, doubtleſs, the reaſon why the citations from Luther, upon which any controverſy ariſes, are ſo hard to be verified. We can hardly have any recourſe now, except to the volumes in folio publiſhed ſince his death. The compleat editions of all his works have cauſed the particular editions of his tracts to be neglected; and hereby almoſt all the copies of theſe particular editions are loſt, which is a misfortune. 'Libelli à Luthero 'ipſo editi diligentius quam factum eſt, aſſervari debuiſſent, non tantum, quod commodius legi poterant, 'quam in magnis, in quos, poſtmodum redacti ſunt, 'voluminibus, ſed & quia genuini & ab interpolatione 'aut incuria, quæ compilatoribus tomorum dudum imputata eſt, ſecuri erant (150).' The prince I ſpeak of, employed a Profeſſor of Helmſtadt (151) to publiſh an account of his library. See the book intituled, *Antiqua Literarum monumenta, autographa Lutheri aliorumque celebrium virorum ab an.* 1517, *uſque ad annum* 1546 *reformationis ætatem & hiſtoriam egregie illuſtrantia*, &c. The firſt tome of it was printed at Brunſwic, in 1690 (152), and the ſecond in 1691 (153). The overſeers even of public libraries, which are the beſt endowed, ſometimes uſe a blamable œconomy. They part with the particular tracts, when they have once all the works of an author reduced into a body: And thus it comes to paſs, that there is no verifying from theſe great libraries, whether an author, who has cited paſſages, from the firſt editions, which differ from the latter, hath acted ſincerely.

[*HH*] *Charles V would not ſuffer Luther's tomb to be demoliſhed, and forbad the attempting any thing of that nature upon pain of death.*] The Spaniards earneſtly ſollicited him to pull it down, and even deſired his bones ſhould be dug up and burnt: But the Emperor very wiſely anſwered, I have nothing farther to do with Luther; he has henceforth another judge, whoſe juriſdiction it is not lawful for me to uſurp: Know that I make war, not with the dead, but with the living, who ſtill make war againſt me. 'Violari autem *ſepulchrum* vetuit Carolus V, Imperator, Wittebergam expugnatam armis miniſque ingreſſus, contra quam urgebant Hiſpani omnes, eo uſque inſenſi, 'Luthero, ut & oſſibus ejus inviderent quietem, eaque 'perinde, ut huſſo factum fuerat vivo, mallent cremari; 'quos laudatiſſimus tamen Imperator graviſſimo ſermone caſtigavit, quando dixit: *Nihil mihi ultra 'cum Luthero, alium ille judicem jam habet, cujus 'Juriſdictionem invadere noſtrum non eſt, neque mihi 'cum mortuis bellum eſſe ſciatis, ſed cum ſuperſtitibus 'in nos armatis.* Cumque animadvertiſſet, Hiſpanos 'duci Albano & Epiſcopo Atrebatenſi, ſuadentibus ejus 'Indignitatem facti, conſentire, ſevere tandem atque 'etiam vitæ capitiſque periculo ſanxit, inviolatum Lutheri ſepulchrum ut eſſet (154).'

[*II*] *The extracts I ſhall give of an invective of Father Gretſer.*] I do not believe I am miſtaken in aſcribing to him the harangues (155) which were pronounced in the academy of Ingolſtat, the 14th of November 1606, when he preſented two licentaties in Divinity for their degrees. One of them made a long declamation, intituled, *Utrum Lutherus fuerit Scholaſticus Theologus*, wherein he undertook to prove the negative, and ſomething more. 'Lutherum non modo non fuiſſe Theologum Scholaſticum, ſed omnium ſubtiliorum ſcientiarum hoſtem '& calumniatorem impudentiſſimum. —— *Luther 'was not only no ſcholaſtic Divine, but alſo an outrageous enemy, and calumniator of all kinds of ſubtile 'ſcience.*' The proof of the firſt part of this theſis was reduced to a ſyllogiſm, which the candidate pronounced with a very audible voice; 'Ut autem, *ſaid 'he* (156), rem ipſam ſtatim, cunctis ambagibus omiſſis aggrediar, elata voce proclamo; *Scholaſticus non 'eſt, qui craſſiſſimos, ſtupidiſſimos, &, ut ſic appellem, 'decumanos, prorſuſque aſininos contra Theologiam & 'Philoſophiam*

(*g*) *The author's name is Chriſtian Juncker.*

(*h*) *See, above, remark* [*G*], *at the end.*

(*i*) Num ſit & hujus auctor *de Fontenelle* qui *les Nouveaux Dialogues des Morts* publicavit Pariſiis . . . non habeo affirmare. *Juncker in Vita Lutheri Nummis illuſtrata, in Præfat.* § *XVII.* One Mr de Ternan, who publiſhed *Nouveaux Dialogues des Dieux*, at Amſterdam, in 1684, in 12mo, aſcribed in the preface the *Nouveaux Dialogues des Morts*, to Mr Prechac.

(*k*) Miſſon. Voiage d'Italie, Tom. II, pag. 134. Edit. 1698.

(*l*) *Mr Miſſon*, ibid. *recites it in High Dutch, and in French.*

(*m*) Andreas Sennertus, in Athenis Wittenbergenſib. apud Junckerum, in Vita Lutheri nummis illuſtrata, pag 216.

(147) And not at Liſle, as is ſaid in the title-page.

(148) Le Fevre, Replique à Mr Arnauld, pour la Defenſe du livre des Motifs Invincibiles, cap. xviii. *The pages are not figured; it is in the laſt leaf of the ſheet* h.

(149) See the following citation.

(150) Acta Erud. Lipſienſ. 1690, pag. 627.

(151) Mr von der Hardt.

(152) See the Journal of Leipſic, for Decemb. 1690, pag. 625 (wrong figured 601), & *ſeq.*

(153) See the ſame Journal for Septemb. 1691, pag. 422.

(154) Chriſtianus Junckerus, in Vita Lutheri, nummis illuſtrata, pag. 218, 219. *He cites* Joh. Sleidanus, de Statu Religionis & Reipublicæ in Germania lib. xix, pag. 665, & 668, *and* Mich. Piccartus, in Obſervationibus Hiſtorico-Politicis, Decad. VI, cap vi. *I have found nothing like it in the nineteenth book of Sleidan.*

(155) They are aſcribed to him in the *Bibliotheca* of Alegambe, pag. 200, col. 2.

(156) Gretſer, Inaugurat. Doctor. pag. 3.

out this propoſition, *Luther does not underſtand ſcholaſtic Divinity.* One of the arguments made uſe of to prove this, is his teaching that one and the ſame doctrine is falſe and true at

Philoſophiam, commiſit errores. Lutherus tales errores commiſit; non eſt igitur Lutherus Scholaſticus. —— *But that without dwelling on unneceſſary circumſtances, I may come to the point itſelf, I, with a loud voice, proclaim,* He is no ſcholaſtic, who commits, groſs, ſtupid, and, if I may ſo call them, aſs-like errors, againſt the principles of Divinity and Philoſophy. Luther hath committed ſuch errors; therefore Luther is no ſchoolman.' He afterwards went upon the proof of the *minor*, for the *major* was ſelf-evident. He had already obſerved, that Luther boaſts of a thorough knowledge of all the ſecrets of the niceſt ſchool-divinity; and that Melanchthon hereupon has beſtowed great encomiums on him (157). ‘ Lutherus non ſemel teſtatur, omnia Scholaſticæ Theologiæ myſteria ſibi probè eſſe cognita: omnia adyta perluſtrata: omnes excuſſos angulos. *Credatis fortiter Magiſtri noſtri eximii* (ſic loquitur Lutherus Doctores Lovanienſes & Colonienſes compellans) *. *Luthero eſſe notam Philoſophiam & Theologiam veſtram, in qua non peſſimo ingenio, nec ultima ſocordia verſatus ſit plus duodecim annis, interque Sympalæſtritas veſtros detritus.* Et ne ignoraremus in quam Scholaſticæ Theologiæ familiam nomen dederit, alibi nobis exponit cùm dicit, ſe † *Occami* caſtra ſecutum; cujus ſectatores, tempore Lutheri, vulgò TERMINISTÆ audiebant, longeque ac latè in ſcholis regnabant, teſte ipſo Luthero; qui palam ſcribit: ſe ⸸ *Occanicæ ſeu Modernorum* ſectæ placita & dogmata non tantùm a limine ſalutaſſe, aut primoribus labris ſolummodò deguſtaſſe; ſed *penitus imbibita tenere*; his enim verbis ſuam in Scholaſtica Theologia peritiam decantat Lutherus; de qua etiam perpetuus Lutheri encomiaſtes Melanchthon ‡: *Gabrielem & Cameracenſem* (duos inſignes ex Occami gymnaſio Theologos) *pænè ad verbum memoriter recitare poterat Lutherus. Diu multumque legit ſcripta Occami. Hujus acumen præferebat Thomæ & Scoto.* —— *Luther has more than once affirmed, that all the myſteries of ſcholaſtic Divinity were well known to him, that he had ſearched it's moſt hidden parts, and had penetrated even it's obſcureſt corners. You may* ſafely believe, moſt excellent maſters, (*theſe are the words of Luther to the doctors of Louvain and Cologn*) that your Philoſophy and Divinity is well known to Luther, in which, neither with the dulleſt wit, nor with the leaſt pains, he, for twelve years together, contended with your champions. *And that we may not be ignorant of what tribe of the ſcholaſtic Divines he was, he elſewhere informs us, that he fought under the banner of Occam, whoſe followers, in the time of Luther, were commonly called* Terminiſts, *who then reigned in the ſchools, as Luther himſelf witneſſes, and declares, that he had not only ſome knowledge of the doctrine of Occam, but underſtood it perfectly; for theſe are Luther's own words, in which he ſets out his great skill in ſcholaſtic Divinity. To the ſame purpoſe Melanchthon, the conſtant panegyriſt of Luther, ſays, that* Luther could almoſt repeat word for word the writings of Gabriel and Cameracenſis, (*two famous Divines in the ſchool of Occam*) and that he had ſtudied, with great aſſiduity, the works of Occam, and preferred the penetration of this doctor to that of Thomas Aquinas, and Scotus.' The firſt proof of the *minor* is taken from Luther's having maintained, that this propoſition, *The word was made fleſh*, is true in Divinity, and abſolutely impoſſible and abſurd in Philoſophy. ‘ Omne verum vero conſonat. Tamen idem non eſt verum in diverſis profeſſionibus. In Theologia verum eſt, Verbum eſſe carnem factum. In Philoſophia ſimpliciter impoſſibile & abſurdum (158). —— *Truth is always conſonant to truth, but the ſame thing is not true in different ſciences. In Theology, it is true, the word was made fleſh; in Philoſophy, it is impoſſible and abſurd.*' The author diſplays here the common diſtinction of Divines, to maintain, that the philoſophical arguments, which Luther alledges do not oppugn the myſtery of the Trinity and Incarnation; and adds, ‘ Simili ſtoliditate dicit (*Lutherus*) *Syllogiſmos prædictos non eſſe malos vitio formæ ſyllogiſticæ; ſed virtute & majeſtate materiæ, quæ in anguſtias rationis ſeu ſyllogiſmorum includi non poſſit.* Quaſi verò nullus ſyllogiſmus & forma & materia probus formari queat de re Cœleſti & Theologica; & divinitus nobis revelata (159). —— *With like ſtupidity he* (Luther) *affirms*, ſuch ſyllogiſms are not bad thro' any defect in the ſyllogiſtic form, but becauſe of the excellency and majeſty of the matter, which cannot be pent up within the narrow bounds of reaſon or ſyllogiſm. *As if no ſyllogiſm, regular both in form and matter, could be framed with reſpect to heavenly and theological matters, or ſuch as have been communicated to us by divine revelation.*' He forgets not that maxim of Luther, That Divinity claſhes with the rules of Philoſophy; but that Philoſophy, in it's turn, claſhes much more with the rules of Divinity: ‘ Impingit Theologia in Philoſophiæ regulas, *inquit Lutherus*, ſed ipſa viciſſim magis in Theologiæ regulas (160)!' He takes notice of Luther's indignation at the Sorbonne, which had defined, that what was true in Philoſophy, was alſo true in Divinity; and he declares, he muſt be a beaſt, who diſapproves this determination. ‘ Vehementiſſimè ſtomachatur ſcholaſticus noſter in Pariſienſem Theologorum Scholam, quam *Sorbonam* vocant. Qua de cauſſa? *Sorbona, mater errorum, peſſimè definivit, idem eſſe verum in Philoſophia & Theologia.* Non tantùm Sorbona optimè & ſanctiſſimè hoc definivit; ſed & Concilium Lateranenſe ſub Leone X. Et certe tam eſt hoc evidens, ut fungum eſſe oporteat, qui diſſentiat: Nam ut album eſt album, ubicunque ponatur; & aqua eſt aqua, ubicunque collocetur; ita & verum eſt verum ubicunque conſtituatur, ſive in Theologia, ſive in Philoſophia (161). —— *Our ſchoolman moſt virulently rails againſt that college of Divines in Paris*, called the Sorbon: *For what reaſon? Why*, this Sorbon, the mother of errors, has fooliſhly determined, that the ſame thing is true in both Philoſophy and Divinity. *Not only the Sorbon has wiſely and religiouſly determined this, but alſo the Lateran council, under* Leo X. *Nay, it is ſo evident, that a man muſt be a a very blockhead who denies it; for as white is white, wherever it be placed; and water is water wherever it is found; ſo truth is truth wherever it is eſtabliſhed, whether in Divinity or Philoſophy.*' What the cenſor affirms, concerning the doctrine itſelf, I think unqueſtionable (162); but he is to blame to look upon the contrary opinion, as ſtupidity of mind; for there have been very ſubtile and ſagacious Divines (163), who maintained Luther's notion in this matter. ‘ Conſidera & hoc ſtuporis Lutherani indicium, (*adds this critic* 164), *Aliquid eſt verum in una parte philoſophiæ, quod tamen falſum eſt in alia parte philoſophiæ.* Nimirum naturam eſſe principium motus & quietis, verum erit in Phyſica: falſum in Metaphyſica & Ethica. *Humor humectat*, inquit Lutherus, *eſt veritas in Sphæra aëris, ſed manifeſta hæreſis in Sphæra ignis.* Forte propterea, quia in Sphæra ignis concreſcit in glaciem. Nam ſi non congelaretur; quomodo non madefaceret Lutherum, ſi integro aquæ dolio perfunderetur? —— *Conſider this mark of Luther's ſtupidity.* Something is true in one part of Philoſophy which is falſe in another; *for example, that nature is the principle of motion and reſt, will be true in Phyſics, but falſe in Metaphyſics and Ethics.* That humidity moiſtens, *ſays Luther*, is true in the ſphere of the air, but a manifeſt hereſy in the ſphere of fire. *Becauſe, perhaps, in the ſphere of fire, it hardens into ice: for if it did not congeal, why ſhould it not wet Luther if a tub of water was poured on him?*' If the Jeſuit had been a good Natural Philoſopher, he would have been more equitable in this laſt cenſure; he would only have ſaid, that Luther had not clearly enough explained his thought. I believe Luther had a glimpſe of what the new Philoſophers have a clear and diſtinct notion of. They ſhew, that what the Peripatetics call humidity, one of the four elementary qualities, ought to be called liquidity (165). And, in this ſenſe, Luther ſaid rightly, that humidity wets in the air, but not in the fire; for flame is a liquid body, and does not wet; conſequently it is true, that the liquid moiſtens in the elementary air, and not in the elementary fire. I know this example, at bottom, makes nothing at all for Luther's hypotheſis; but we may, however, believe, that his thought was not well underſtood. I meddle not with the other proofs of the *minor* of the ſyllogiſm.

Here

---

(157) Id ibid. pag. 1, 2.

* Luther. in Reſponſ. ad Articulos à Lovanienſ. & Colon. Theologis damnatos, Tom. II, Lat. Wittemb.

† Luther Colloq. Sympoſiacis tit. de Scholaſticis Theologis.

⸸ Luther. contra Lovan. & Colon.

‡ Melan. Præfat. in ſecundum Tom lat. Witebergenſ.

(158) Gretſer. ubi ſupra, pag. 4, 5. *He cites* Luth. Tom. I, Lat. Witeber.

(159) Id. ibid. pag. 11.

(160) Ib. pag. 12.

(161) Ib. pag. 13.

(162) See, above, remark [*C*], of the article HOFMAN, (DANIEL).

(163) See the ſame remark.

(164) Gretſer. Inaugur. Doctor. pag. 14.

(165) *See* Gaſſendi, *at the firſt ſection of his Phyſics*, lib. vi, cap. vii, pag. 402, Tom. I, Oper.

at the ſame time, falſe in Philoſophy, and true in Divinity [*KK*]; falſe in Natural Philoſophy, and true in Morality, *&c.* Their next argument was Luther's invectives againſt

Here follows a long ſcroll of reproaches againſt Ariſtotle (166). ‘Niſi caro fuiſſet Ariſtoteles, *inquit Lutherus* (†), vere diabolum eum fuiſſe, non puderet aſſerere. *Eidem Luthero eſt Ariſtoteles*, Proteus, hiſtrio, qui Græca larva Eccleſiam luſit, vaſerrimus ingeniorum illuſor, calumnioſiſſimus calumniator, ſycophanta impiiſſimus, princeps tenebrarum, triceps Cerberus, tricorpor Geryon, vere ἀπολλύων, ⸸ id eſt, perdens, & vaſtator Eccleſiæ; merus logodædalus, & logomachus, vaſtator piæ doctrinæ, beſtia, caligo hominum, & quidem teterrima. Momus, imo Momus Momorum ‡. Beſtia gentilis ſimilis hydræ in Lerna. In quo fere nihil eſt Philoſophiæ. Impiiſſimus eſt. Publicus veritatis, & ex profeſſo hoſtis. Gentilis animarum carnifex. Hircus, vel potius hircocervus. Bis ſacerrimus Ariſtoteles. In cute perfectus Epicurus. Non mihi perſuadebitis, *inquit Lutherus*, Philoſophiam eſſe garrulitatem illam de materia, motu, infinito, loco, vacuo, tempore, quæ fere in Ariſtotele ſola diſcimus: talia quæ nec intellectum, nec affectum, nec communes hominum mores quidquam juvent: tantùm contentionibus ſerendis, ſeminandiſque idonea. Quod ſi maxime quid valerent, tot tamen opinionibus confuſa ſunt, ut, quo quis certius aliquod ſequi propoſuerit, hoc incertior feratur, & faces Euboïcas ſectetur; & ſerò tandem cum Proteo ſibi fuiſſe negotium, pœniteat.——*If Ariſtotle had not been fleſh, ſays Luther, I ſhould make no difficulty to affirm, that he was a true devil. To the ſame Luther, Ariſtole appeared a Proteus, a Buffoon, who, in a Greek maſk, deceived the church; a crafty deluder of minds, a moſt outrageous calumniator, a moſt impious ſycophant, a prince of darkneſs, a three headed Cerberus, a three bodied Geryon, a true Apollyon, that is, deſtroyer, and ſpoiler, of the church, a very juggler in words, a prater, a ſubverter of pious doctrine, a beaſt, and a moſt terrible deceiver of men, a Momus, yea, the Momus of Momus's, a heathen brute, like the hydra in Lerna, in whom there is hardly any thing of Philoſophy, a moſt impious perſon, a public and profeſſed enemy of truth, a heathen murtherer of ſouls, a buck goat, doubly wicked Ariſtotle, a perfect Epicure. You ſhall never perſuade me, ſays Luther, that Philoſophy conſiſts in prating about matter, motion, infinite, ſpace, void, time, which are almoſt the only things we learn in Ariſtotle, which neither improve the underſtanding, nor the inclinations, or common manners of men, ſerving only to ſow and nouriſh contentions: which granting them to be neceſſary, yet the many opinions about them are ſo confuſed, that whoever propoſes to attain certainty by purſuing them, becomes but the more uncertain, following an Eubœan torch, and repenting, at laſt, that ever he had any thing to do with this Proteus.*’ It cannot be ſaid, that he was ſo incenſed againſt the head of the Peripatetics, only after he had quarelled with Popery; for it may be proved, that he was of the ſame mind before he had done any thing to diſpleaſe the court of Rome. Read this paſſage of Gretſer: ‘Neque unquam bene erga Ariſtotelem affectus fuit; quod diſces ex his, quæ anno Domini 1516, ad Langum Auguſtinianum prius ſcripſit, quàm aperte inſaniret *: *Mitto has literas ad eximium D. Jodocum Iſenacenſem, plenas quæſtionum adverſus Logicam, & Philoſophiam, & Theologiam, id eſt, blaſphemiarum, & maledictionum contra Ariſtotelem, Porphyrium, Sententiarios, perdita ſcilicet ſtudia noſtri ſeculi. Sic enim interpretabuntur, quibus decretum eſt, non quinquennio cum Pythagoricis, ſed perpetuò, & in æternum cum mortuis ſilentium tenere, omnia credere, ſemper auſcultare, nec unquam ſaltem levi præludio contra Ariſtotelem, & Sententias velitari, & muſſitare. Quid enim non credant, qui Ariſtoteli crediderunt, vera eſſe, quæ ipſe calumnioſiſſimus calumniator aliis affingit & imponit tam abſurda, ut aſinus* (Lutherus) *& lapis non poſſint tacere ad illa? Nihil ita ardet animus, quàm hiſtrionem illum* (Ariſtotelem) *qui tam vera Græca larva Eccleſiam luſit, multis revelare, ignominiamque ejus cunctis oſtendere, ſi ocium eſſet. Habeo in manus commentariolos in* 1. *Phyſicorum, quibus fabulam Ariſtei denuò agere ſtatui in meum iſtum Protea* (Ariſtotelem). *Pars crucis meæ vel maxima eſt, quod videre cogor fratrum optima ingenia, bonis ſtudiis nata, in iſtis cœnis vitam agere, & operam perdere* (167)——Neither was he ever well affected to Ariſtotle, as you may ſee from what he wrote in the year 1516, to Langus Auguſtinianus, before he publickly ſhewed his folly. *I ſend theſe letters to the illuſtrious Jodocus of Eiſenach, full of objections againſt Logic, Philoſophy, and Divinity, that is, of blaſphemies and curſes againſt Ariſtotle, Porphyry, the Sententiarians, thoſe deſtructive ſtudies of our age: for ſo they will determine, to whom not only a Pythagorean ſilence of five years, but even a perpetual and everlaſting one, like that of the dead, is enjoined, and to hear, and believe, without daring ſo much as to whiſper, or hint the leaſt doubt of what is delivered by Ariſtotle, or in the ſentences. What will they not believe, who believe Ariſtotle a moſt outrageous calumniator, who impoſes upon others ſuch abſurdities, as an aſs,* (Luther) *or a ſtone, would ſcarce bear without ſpeaking. There is nothing I ſo much deſire, as to expoſe this buffoon* (Ariſtotle) *who, in a Greek maſque, deceives the church, and to make him juſtly odious to all, if I had but time. I have a commentary by me, on the firſt book of his Phyſics, in which the ſtory of Ariſteus ſhall be re-acted upon this Proteus of mine* (Ariſtotle). *My greateſt vexation is, to ſee my brethren, who have excellent talents, and ſeem born for the improvement of learning, toiling at ſuch ſtuff, and loſing all their time.*’ This Jeſuit produces a great many other paſſages, injurious to Ariſtotle, taken from Luther's writings.

[*KK*] *Luther taught that one and the ſame doctrine is falſe . . . in Philoſophy, and true in Divinity.*] I have ſpoken of this in the foregoing remark: but here I add, that the moſt rigid followers of Luther have deſerted him upon this article; and have with ſo much force, oppoſed their brethren, who revived this notion that they have obliged them to retract it (168). Let us ſay alſo, that ſome miſunderſtanding may mix in this diſpute, and much controverſy about words; and that Luther's doctrine would be wrongfully blamed, if he had expreſſed himſelf after this manner, *the ſame doctrines which appear falſe and impoſſible, when we judge of them by natural light, are true and certain when we judge of them by the light of the word of God.* But to pretend, that even after revelation has ſhewed us that a doctrine is true, it continues to be falſe in Philoſophy, is a groſs miſtake. It is much more reaſonable to own, that philoſophical light, whoſe evidence hath ſeemed to be a ſure guide to us in our judgments of things, was fallacious and illuſive; and that it muſt be rectified by the new knowledge communicated to us by revelation. Affirm, as long as you pleaſe, according to the notions which Logic teaches us, in the chapter *de oppoſitis*, that a man is not a ſtone; but beware of affirming, as Ariſtotle would have done, that it is impoſſible a man ſhould be a ſtone: would not Ariſtotle have affirmed, that it is impoſſible God ſhould be born of a woman; that God ſhould ſuffer cold and heat; that God ſhould die: in a word, that God is man? And would he not be miſtaken in theſe aſſertions? Now ſince we know that the oppoſition betwixt the idea of God, and the idea of man, hinders not that one of theſe beings may be truly affirmed of the other, ought we not to ſay that nothing hinders but a man and a ſtone may be one the ſubject, and the other the predicate, of an affirmative, and móſt true propoſition? Let us ſay then, that the Jeſuit, who exclaimed ſo much againſt Luther, perplexes himſelf wretchedly, and is angry without reaſon. One would think he affirms it abſolutely impoſſible for two created natures to be united hypoſtatically; and does he not ſee, that, if this be once allowed impoſſible, the ſame may be concluded againſt the myſtery of the incarnation; for which he is ſo angry with Luther? ‘Audite, *ſays he* (169), & obſtupeſcite, vel potius execramini; non tantùm imperitiam, ſed & intolerabilem blaſphemiam. *Nec minus*, inquit Lutherus, *imo magis diſparata eſt prædicatio; Deus eſt homo; quam ſi dicas, homo eſt aſinus.* An non hæc Lutheri impia theſis totum incarnationis myſterium ex imis fundamentis evertit? Si magis diſparata eſt illa, *Deus eſt homo*; quàm iſta,

---

(166) Gretſer. ubi ſupra, pag. 43.

† Luther. Tom. I, Epiſt. IX.

⸸ Luther. Tom. I, Epiſt. XXXIII.

‡ Hæc omnia ſumpta ſunt ex Luthero in Explicat. Oct. Præcepti, Tom I, lat. Witeb & in Reſponſ. ad Condemnat. Lovanien. & Colon. Tom. II, lat contra. Obeliſcos Eckij. Tom. I, lat. Witeb. lib. contr. Lat. Diſp. Deum ſimpliciſſimè eſſe unum.

* Luther. Tom. I, Epiſt. Lat. Epiſt. VIII.

(167) Gretſer, ibid. pag. 44.

(168) See, above, remark [*C*] of the article HOFMAN (DANIEL).

(169) Gretſer, ubi ſupra, pag. 6, 7.

againſt the univerſities, and the burleſque expreſſions he made uſe of to turn them and their doctors into ridicule [*LL*]. This bantering way of his, might, doubtleſs, be cenſured,

iſta, *Homo eſt aſinus*; tunc magis erat falſa illa, *Deus eſt homo*, quàm iſta, *Homo eſt aſinus*; quæ ſimpliciter falſa eſt: cujus falſitas oritur ex disjunctione *Prædicati* à *Subjecto*; quia enim nullus penitus nexus eſt *Prædicati* cum *Subjecto*; fit, ut *Prædicatum* non niſi mendaciter de *Subjecto* affirmetur. Si igitur in illa; *Deus eſt homo:* tanta, imò major, eſt *Subjecti* à *Prædicato*, & vice verſa, disjunctio, &, ut ſic loquar, diſparatio; falſa erit illa propoſitio; *Deus eſt homo*; ſic ut & hæc; *Homo eſt aſinus*; quia diſparata non poſſunt de ſe mutuò affirmari, quamdiu nullo communi nexu copulantur. Si autem ſubjectum & Prædicatum illius Propoſitionis, *Deus eſt homo*, vero, reali, ſubſtantiali & hypoſtatico vinculo colligantur; ſequitur, mentiri Lutherum cùm *Subjectum* & *Prædicatum* ejus æquè, imò magis, ac *Subjectum* & *Prædicatum* hujus, *Homo eſt aſinus*; diſtare & diſparari pronuntiat. Qualis ergo Lutherus Scholaſticus Theologus; qui ſtupiditate & fatuitate ſua totam divini verbi œconomiam ſubruit & proſternit; imò Turcice prorſus, inficiatur; & inficiari volentibus non rimam, ſed ipſas fores latiſſimè aperit? —— *Hear, and be ſtunned, or rather execrate not only the ignorance, but alſo the intolerable blaſphemy.* There is no leſs, *ſays Luther*, yea, there is greater diſparity in this poſition, God is man, than if you ſhould ſay, man is an aſs, *Does not this impious aſſertion of Luther, ſubvert the very foundation of the myſtery of the incarnation? If there is more diſparity in ſaying*, God is man, *than in affirming*, man is an aſs, *then it is more falſe that* God is man, *than that* man is an aſs, *which yet is ſimply falſe, which falſehood ariſes from the disjunction of the* predicate *from the* ſubject, *becauſe there being no connection between the* predicate *and the* ſubject, *it follows that, without lying, the* predicate *cannot be affirmed of the* ſubject. *If then in that propoſition*, God is man; *there is as great, nay, greater disjunction of the* ſubject, *from the* predicate, *and* vice verſa, *then that propoſition*, God is man, *is falſe, as is this* man is an aſs, *becauſe diſparities, cannot be affirmed of one another, as long as they are not connected by a common band. But if the ſubject, and predicate of this propoſition*, God is man, *are connected by a true, real, ſubſtantial, and hypoſtatic bond, then it follows that Luther lied, when he affirmed that the* ſubject *and* predicate *of that propoſition, was equally, nay, more diſtant, and diſproportionate, than the* ſubject *and* predicate *in this*, man is an aſs. *What ſort of a Scholaſtic Divine then was Luther? who, through his own ſtupidity, and ſottiſhneſs, overturns and deſtroys the oeconomy of the holy Scripture; nay, like a very Turk he denies it; and to all who have a mind to deny it ſhews not only a hole, but opens a a large breach.*’ We need only conſider this paſſage to ſee the unfairneſs and blind paſſion of that writer.

[*LL*] *The burleſque expreſſions he made uſe of to turn the univerſities and their doctors into ridicule.*] He jeſted upon their titles, and the badges of their doctorſhips. ‘Habent Doctores in Academiis, ritu veteri, certa quædam inſignia & digmata: Habent titulos & ſuas quaſdam appellationes, honoris & reverentiæ cauſſa. Vocantur *Magiſtri noſtri*; itemque *eximii Magiſtri noſtri*. In certam facultatem, velut in tribum quandam collecti ſunt, ſuos habent loquendi modos; ſuas formulas & voces. Hinc arrepta ſcurrandi occaſione Theologica facultas eſt Luthero *Fecultas* à fece & *Vaccultas* à vacca. Doctores facultatis Theologicæ **. *Magiſtrolli, noſtrolli*, ſeparatim, conjunctim, *Magiſtrolli noſtrolli*, *Theologiſtæ*, *Theologaſtri*, *Liripipiati*, *Magiſtrolliter*, *Liripipia*, qui tria habent Sacramenta *Magiſtrollica*, *Birretum*, *Talarem*, *Liripipium*, ſeu *relipendium* . . . Sed recitemus ipſa, *Lucianica* prorſus in Scholaſticos ſcommata ex ludo Lutheri †† à Sorbona damnati, cujus proculdubio auctor Melanchthon, ut intelligas quam leves, futiles & ſcurriles fuerint Lutherus & Philippus; & quàm ab omni gravitate Scholaſtica averſi. *Decanus noſter almæ Facultatis*, inquit leviſſimus ille Ludio, *eſt Sanctus Petrus in alma Facultate. Et ipſe habet tria ſigna, quæ cogunt eum ſic ſentire, ut non poſſit errare; quæ ſunt, Regiſtrum, Sigillum, & Almutium. Unde patet quod valde arroganter, & frontoſe ſcripſit iſte hæreticus contra almam Facultatem. Communia autem ſigna ſunt hæc. Et ſit ſic . . . . Signum autem eorum primum, & maximum, eſt Liripipium, ſeu, ut eruditi dicunt, Relipendium, quod eſt evidentiſſimum, & notiſſimum ſignum, per quod concluditur ſic: Iſte habet Liripipium, ergo eſt Magiſter noſter in fide illuminatus; ergò habet Spiritum Sanctum. Aliud ſignum eſt, quod ſedent in ſuperiore cathedra, quando diſputant, & legunt. Per hoc ſignum arguitur ſic: Chriſtus dicit; Super Cathedram Moſis ſederunt quæcunque dixerint, ſervate. Ergo quæcunque dixerint, ſunt vera. Sed illi ſedent in Cathedra, & docent ſic; ergo, non poſſunt errare. Aliud ſignum eſt quod comprehendit multa. Et ſunt inſignia illa Doctoralia; annulus, pyrrhetum, liber, oſculum, chirothecæ, & pyrrheta diſtributa in aula Doctorali: etiam candelæ ardentes; & ſuper omnia; Te Deum Laudamus, quod in fine canitur. Ultimo egregium convivium Doctorale. Ultimum & fortiſſimum ſignum eſt intriotus Domini Decani in Sorbona, quando Bedelli cum ſceptris præcedunt, & voce magna clamant: Tranſeat ſpectabilis, & eximius Magiſter noſter, Dominus Decanus almæ Facultatis Theologicæ cum magiſtris noſtris eximiis. Tranſeat ille, tranſeat. Et hoc ſignum eſt valdè bene maſticandum; quia formaliter concludit; Magiſtros noſtros non poſſe errare*, &c. Pudet pigetque plura referre; adeò vana, profana, & Lucianica ſunt, ut quidvis iſtos potius fuiſſe ſuſpicer, quàm Scholaſticos: quos, ut magis Lutherus irriſui exponeret, vocabula quædam ad eorum imitationem finxit, & ſcriptis ſuis, ut ſcurras ſuos oblectaret, inſeruit. Cujuſmodi ſunt Diſſolutio ⸸⸸ *Cathariniſſima & Romaniſſima, Thomiſtitates, Italitates, magiſteria noſtraliſſima; magiſtraliſſimæ determinationes, ſylveſtraliter, Thomiſtraliter, Colonialiter, Lovanialiter, Catharinaliter, Latomialiter. Thomiſticiſſimè, Thomaſticiſſimè, Henriciſſimè* (170). —— *The doctors in the univerſities, according to antient cuſtom, have certain marks and diſtinctions among themſelves; they have alſo certain titles appropriated to them as marks of honour and reſpect. They are called* our maſters, *and* our excellent maſters. *They are diſtinguiſhed into certain faculties, as into tribes which have their ways of ſpeaking, their forms and partilar words. Hence Luther took an occaſion of ſcurrilouſly calling the Theologic faculty*, fecultas *from* feces, *dregs; and* vaccultas, *from* vacca, *a cow, &c.*

Francis Garaſſe has diverted himſelf with this facetious humour of Luther. ‘This fat fellow, *ſays he* (171), writing againſt the ſacred faculty of Divinity, in the ſecond Tome of his works, ſuppoſes certain concluſions againſt the faculty, and then condemns them, as in the name of the whole univerſity, impertinently playing upon a thing of conſequence. The title of the tract is this. ‘*Apologia Philippi Melanchthonis adverſûs furioſum decretum Theologaſtrorum pro Luthero*, &c. The three firſt concluſions are theſe: *In Libro Joannis Majoris ſunt PLAUSTRA nugarum*. The ſecond, *Quondam fuerunt ſtrenui Mileſii*. The third, *Spectabilis Domine Decane vos eſtis iratus*. To theſe three propoſitions he anſwers in the name of all the Divines of France. As to the firſt, which ſays, that in Major's books, there are cart-loads of fooleries. *Hæc Propoſitio eſt ſtultè aſſerta, in eo quod intendit nugas plauſtris vehi: cùm nugæ ſint res ſpirituales & Plauſtra res corporales*. Having formed this chimera out of his own brain, he combates it, to obtain a falſe triumph, like that of Caligula. To the the ſecond, which ſays, that the French Divines were formerly as brave, as the Mileſians; but that they have degenerated; he makes our Divines anſwer, *Hæc propoſitio eſt ſuſpecta, quia ſcriptura eſt Græca: & Græci ſunt heretici: Hoc eſt noſtrum ſentimentum*. To the third, which ſays, venerable dean of the faculty, you are angry: he makes all the Divines anſwer. *Hæc propoſitio eſt deriſoria & ſcandaloſa in eo quod dicit, vos eſtis iratus, eſt enim incongrua ſicut ego currit, & à nobis olim damnata: & in eo quòd dicit Decane vos eſtis, intendendo quòd ſumus ex cane nati, eſt contumelioſa.*’

** Lut lib. de miſſa privata abrog. Tom. II, Lat. Witeb.

†† Tom. II, Lat. Witeb.

⸸⸸ Luther. cont. Cathar. Lat. Reg. Angl. Sylveſt. & in libr. de Miſſa privata abrog.

(170) Gretſer. Inaugurat. Doctor. pag. 38, & ſeq.

(171) Garaſſe, Doctr. curieuſe, pag. 520, 521.

ſured, but it was not unuſeful at that time; and we know it has been ſaid, that Eraſmus, by his railleries, ſerved for a fore-runner to Martin Luther (*m*). But if it be true, that Eraſmus prepared the way, it is alſo true, that this way was more and more enlarged, and laid open by the wrong meaſures, that were taken with this reformer. Eraſmus obſerved ſeven great faults in thoſe meaſures [*MM*]. See the book of the Sieur Richard, prior of Beaulieu St Avoye (*n*), a Catholic author.

It is certain, that a grave and elaborate anſwer, would not have been ſo proper, as theſe burleſque pieces, to expoſe the univerſities of that time to the laſt contempt, with a great number of people. But it might be queſtioned, whether it became Luther and Melanchthon, thus to divert and amuſe themſelves with jeſts and banters. They ought, you will ſay, to have been wholly taken up with the important affair they had undertaken; and if they had well weighed the great characters of their miſſion, they would not have had leiſure for banter. They knew what perſecutions their cauſe was expoſed to in other countries: they ought therefore ſo to have laid it to heart, as to have no deſire to make merry by humorous and burleſque compoſitions. I do not offer theſe as ſtrong and weighty objections, and am perſuaded, that they whoſe intereſt it is to find them weak, will eaſily anſwer them. For which reaſon I ſhall not ſtand to diſpute about them. I ſhall only ſay, there are a great many perſons who have not diſapproved the reflexions, which they found at the end of a book of Mr Brueys. 'In truth, ſays he (172), I cannot believe, that the Proteſtants of this kingdom, who are truly pious whatever eſteem they have for Mr Jurieu's wit and learning, can approve that a miniſter, who has forſaken them, and fled into a foreign country, affects in all his works the character of an humouriſt and droller, whilſt he daily hears at a diſtance, of the ruin and deſolation of his party. Methinks if we conſider the diſpoſition which becomes a perſon of his character, the joy he expreſſes in all his writings, at his being out of the reach of the danger his ſect is expoſed to, is not very natural nor warrantable. It ill becomes him, in my opinion, to be merry in ſecurity, whilſt thoſe he has deſerted groan under the juſt chaſtiſements, which the church, as a good mother, mixes with the kindneſſes and benefits ſhe employs to bring them back into her boſom: in my opinion it is acting contrary to the goſpel, to laugh with thoſe who weep; and I think the works of this author, how fine and delicate ſoever in other reſpects, ought at leaſt to have ſome taſte of the bitterneſs of his ſoul if he were really more affected with the affliction of his brethren, than with the tranquillity which he himſelf enjoys. We may therefore ſay, that as the calumnies and reproaches with which this author's works are filled, may induce the Catholics to believe, that a man, whoſe thoughts are ſo remote from charity, cannot be a good Chriſtian, though he ſpoke with the tongue of angels; ſo that ill-natured joy, which he manifeſts in his writings, thoſe ſtrokes of raillery and ridicule, by which all the world immediately diſcovers the productions of his pen, ought to perſuade all the pretended Reformed, who have any judgment, that it is impoſſible for him, who ſo miſ-times his raillery, whatever zeal he expreſſes in their defence, to be a good Proteſtant.'

[*M M*] *Eraſmus obſerved ſeven great faults in the meaſures taken againſt Luther.*] I have mentioned the book, in which there is a large account of this matter; and it is a book that may be eaſily had at the Bookſellers; ſo that I ſhall be very ſhort on this head, and only ſhew in groſs the capital point of each of theſe faults. The firſt conſiſted in their ſuffering a quarrel to ariſe about the gatherings among the mendicant Friars, and the *Theſes of indulgencies, to be diſcuſſed before the people in ſermons* (173). The ſecond, in their oppoſing to Luther only ſome mendicant Friars, who were no more than declaimers and organs of ſlander (174). The third, that they did not impoſe ſilence on the preachers of both parties, and chuſe out *prudent, learned, and peaceable perſons, who might have inſtructed the people, without any contention, and inclined them to peace and the love of the goſpel* (175). The fourth, that they would abate nothing on either ſide (176). The fifth, that *cruelty was exerciſed againſt the Lutherans, at the inſtigation of ſome mendicant Friars* (177). The ſixth; that the biſhops of Germany, who were MILITARY MEN for the MOST PART, *did not do their duty* (178). The ſeventh, that they did not take care to *appeaſe the wrath of God by public prayers, and by a converſion, truly penitent and ſincere* (179). The catalogue of faults of the Romiſh party might, perhaps, be enlarged: but that we leave to the ſpeculative, and content ourſelves with ſaying, that moſt of theſe, ſpecified by Eraſmus, could not well be avoided, conſidering the poſture of affairs the church was then in. Hence it may be concluded, that Luther's deſign was brought forth in a favourable juncture of time. The prudence of the court of Rome plaid it's part well enough; but it could not prevent the marring the affair in ſeveral inſtances, by a defect in it's inſtruments; and I am certain, numbers of Proteſtants are convinced, that their party maintained itſelf by the falſe meaſures of the oppoſite ſide, as much as by the goodneſs of it's cauſe. On the other hand, a great many fancy, that there were ſeveral faults committed on the part of the reformation, and that theſe were incidents favourable to popery. Thus great quarrels are generally fed and fomented; each party makes falſe ſteps, which reciprocally ſerves to balance and ſupport the other (180).

(*m*) See the remark [*X*], towards the end.

(*n*) Intituled, *Sentimens d'Eraſme*, and printed in 1688. See page 248, & *ſeq.* where you will find ſeveral things curious and ſolid.

(172) Brueys, Defenſe du culte exterieur de l'Egliſe Catholiq. pag. 340, & ſeq. Dutch Edit.

(173) Sentimens d'Eraſme, pag. 251.

(174) Ibid. pag. 258.

(175) Ibid pag. 274.

(176) Ibid. pag. 277.

(177) Ibid. pag. 285.

(178) Ibid. pag. 287.

(179) Ibid. pag. 293.

(180) See in the *Penſées ſur les Cometes (Miſcellaneous Thoughts on Comets)*, pag. 793, a fine paſſage from the Memoirs of the duke de la Rochefoucaut.

LUTORIUS PRISCUS (Caïus) a Roman knight, was puniſhed with death, for an offence that can hardly be thought capital [*A*]. After having received a good reward of Tiberius, for a poem he had made upon the death of Germanicus, he was accuſed

[*A*] *He was puniſhed with death for an offence that can hardly be thought capital.*] It is not eaſy to fix the ſpecies of this action. Some ingenious men (1) believe, that Lutorius's crime conſiſted in 'deceiving Tiberius, by preſenting him an elegy on the death of Germanicus, which had been made before for the death of Druſus, who had recovered from a diſtemper, which it was thought he would die of.' Others believe, that he had made a ſatire upon Druſus. This is the opinion of Theophilus Raynaud: 'Ex ea item lege (2), *ſays he* (3), Lutorius Priſcus apud Dionem, *lib.* 57. quod in Druſi ægrotantis mortem, famoſum carmen ſcripſiſſet, mori juſſus eſt Senatus decreto.' Theſe two opinions I think are falſe, and ſhould chuſe rather to ſay, that Lutorius was accuſed of having had *the audaciouſneſs of accounting Tiberius's ſon as dead, and even compoſing verſes upon it before the time.* The author of the News from the Republic of Letters, from whom I borrow theſe words, immediately adds (4): 'It is certain, a man expoſes himſelf to the rigour of the law, who dares declare, on ſome occaſions, the finiſter judgment which people paſs upon the ſickneſs of kings. The Phyſician, du Val, was ſent to the gallies, becauſe there was found in his cloſet a paper, in which he had predicted, that Lewis XIII would die before the dog-days, in the year 1631.' This particular is found in certain memoirs of the duke of Orleans, which came out in the year 1685.' The words of Manius Lepidus do not oppoſe the opinion I eſtabliſh, ſo much as is imagined: for in an age of flattery no difficulty is made of advancing, that a Poet who inſtead of making vows, and confiding in the fortune of the republic, whilſt the preſumptive heir to the crown is ſick, ſings the death of that prince, and communicates to his friends the black and diſmal ideas of ſo lamentable a ſtate, not yet arrived; that ſuch a Poet, I ſay, is poſſeſſed with an execrable thought, and poſſeſſes his hearers with

(1) Amelot de la Houſſaie, Morale de Tacite, de la Flaterie, n. 17, pag. m. 30, 31. *He has changed his opinion in his verſion of the Annals of Tacitus.*

(2) *That is ſay, the law* in famoſos libellos.

(3) Theoph. Raynaudus, de malis & bonis libris, n. 113. pag. m. 72, 73.

(4) *For June* 1686, *pag.* 633.

accuſed of having compoſed another, on the death of Druſus, while this prince was ſick (*a*); and it was affirmed, that he kept this poem ready to be produced, with hopes of a greater recompence, in caſe Druſus ſhould die (*b*). The prince's recovery ſhould have obliged this Poet to ſuppreſs his work; but he could not deny himſelf the glory of it. He read it to ſome ladies; all of whom except one, durſt not deny the fact (*c*). All his judges, except two, condemned him to death. Tiberius, who was then abſent (*d*), practiſed his uſual artifices [*B*], when he underſtood that the ſentence was executed, and made ſome regulations for the time to come. Manius Lepidus, who voted only for his baniſhment, gave a very ingenious turn to his opinion [*C*]. We ſhall ſee how

with the like. ‘ Si, patres conſcripti, unum id ſpectamus quam nefaria voce Lutorius Priſcus mentem ‘ ſuam & aures hominum polluerit, neque carcer, neque laqueus, ne ſerviles quidem cruciatus in eum ‘ ſuffecerint (5). —— *Conſcript Fathers, if we conſider ‘ only with how wicked a ſpeech, Lutorius Priſcus ‘ has defiled his own ſoul, and the ears of all men; neither priſon nor halter, nor indeed the puniſhments peculiar to ſlaves are equal to his crime.*’ Theſe are the words of Manius Lepidus. Let us therefore conclude that the crime this Poet was accuſed of, was anticipating, in his poem, the death of Druſus, the emperor's ſon. There was, doubtleſs, more imprudence than crime in this action.

IT is a crime to inquire the future events of the life of the prince.

I deny not but the laws have treated thoſe as guilty of a capital crime, who conſult the future events of the prince's life: ‘ Capitale eſt de ſalute principis ‘ vel de ſumma Reip. reſpondere aut conſulere (6). ‘ *It is a capital crime to anſwer or to enquire of ‘ the health of the prince, or of the fate of the government.*’ I know ſeveral perſons have ſuffered death for ſuch a curioſity ‘ Valens imperator ſub ‘ uno proloquio juſſit occidi omnes qui de ſuo ſucceſſore ſpiritus conſuluerant, nec modo qui conſuluerant, ſed omnes qui aliquid ea de re inaudierant, ‘ nec ad ſe detulerant (7). —— *The emperor Valens, ‘ by a ſingle warrant, ordered all to be put to death, ‘ who had conſulted ſpirits to know who ſhould be his ‘ ſucceſſor, and not only ſuch as conſulted, but all who ‘ had ſo much as heard any thing of the matter, and ‘ had not informed him.*’ The emperor Julianus Didius, cauſed all thoſe to be burnt, who conſulted the diviners upon the emperor's fortune (8). The canon laws have excommunicated thoſe who engage in intrigues about the ſucceſſion in a prince's life-time. This is what the learned John Beloi repreſented to the leaguers in Henry the third's reign. ‘ By theſe means ‘ they ſeem to conſpire his death, which, in effect, ‘ is revolting againſt nature, good manners, Chriſtian ‘ piety, and the love we owe to our king; for whom we ‘ are conſtantly obliged to pray, to wiſh, and preſage ‘ well: ſo that to act upon the preſumption of any ‘ unluckly accident or misfortune to him, would be ‘ againſt all laws, civil and natural; and therefore ‘ good people cannot approve, that, againſt their king's ‘ deſire, and in his life-time, his ſucceſſion ſhould be ‘ diſputed, and called in queſtion, which is a thing ‘ not in being as long as it pleaſes God to continue ‘ him in the world. Therefore, by a decree in the ‘ fifth council of Toledo in Spain, which was held in ‘ Honorius the firſt's time †, about the year 622, in ‘ the reigns of Heraclius the emperor, and Chintillius king of Spain, all thoſe were excommunicated, who inquired, or preſumed to be ſollicitous ‘ and inquiſitive, who ſhould be their king, after him ‘ who holds the ſcepter. “ Therefore, *ſays the text* “ becauſe it is contrary to piety, and dangerous for “ men to think of future things, of a forbidden nature, and to inform themſelves about the accidents of princes, or to provide for the future, “ with relation to them, foraſmuch as it is written, “ it is not for you to know the times or the ſeaſons, “ which God has reſerved in his own power: we “ ordain by this decree, that if there be any enquirer about theſe things found, who, in the king's “ life-time, looks upon another from a proſpect of “ his ſucceeding to the kingdom, or draws others “ to him on that account, he ſhall be expelled the “ ſociety of Catholics by the ſentence of excommunication ‡.” The ſame decree was repeated in the ‘ ſixth council, held in the ſame city of Toledo; to ‘ which is added a moſt pertinent reaſon, by which ‘ the authors of theſe diſcourſes are blamed, as aiming at the knowledge of futurity, which God perhaps will never ſuffer them to arrive at (9).’ I have read in the French Mercury, a ſtory I am going to relate: ‘ Noel Leon Morgard, *an Almanackmaker* . . . . . *affirmed in his Almanack, for the ‘ year* 1614, that the ſtate of France would change, ‘ and reflected on the perſon of the king, and ſhewed ‘ the time, the months, and places, in which he ſpoke ‘ of ſeveral great princes, whom he denoted, only ‘ tranſpoſing the letters of their names. This Almanack ‘ being ſold the firſt day of the year, there was an ‘ extraordinary demand for it among the curious, ‘ who ſaid, it was a prophecy: and that which gave ‘ vogue to it was, that Morgard, having ſaid in the ‘ firſt quarter of January, that a marſhal ſhould play ‘ his ſon an unlucky trick, it happened, that a man, ‘ in years, in the ſuburbs of St Germain, and who ‘ had formerly been a ſoldier, killed his ſon, deſigning to kill a woman he kept. The noiſe that ‘ theſe new predictions cauſed among the people, coming to the ears of their majeſties, and the council, ‘ Morgard was, on the eighth of January, carried to ‘ the Baſtile, by the archers of the grand provoſt. Nine ‘ days after he was removed to the common goal; the ‘ tenth of January, he was condemned by a decree of ‘ the court, for nine years to the gallies; and the ‘ ninth of February he was put in chains, to be carried to Marſeilles, where he tugs at the oar in the ‘ king's ſervice (10).’

Every one may have read ſeveral things of this nature, but I venture to ſay, that this was not Lutorius's caſe. All the enquirers into futurity have no other end but to raiſe conſpiracies, or diſturb the public tranquillity; or, in general, they are ill-affected perſons as Tertullian obſerves. ‘ Cui enim opus perſcrutari ſuper Cæſaris ſalute niſi à quo aliquid adverſus illum cogitatur, vel optatur, aut poſt illam ſperatur ‘ & ſuſtinetur? non enim ea mente de caris conſulitur ‘ qua de dominis (11).’ Now what is there like this in a Poet's impatience, who, during his prince's ſickneſs, prepares a copy of verſes to produce them in caſe the prince ſhall die? there was nothing in the conduct of Lutorius, but a great deal of indiſcretion and vanity. He ought not to have read his poem: he ſhould not have entertained the ladies with it, to be entertained in his turn by their commendations.

[*B*] *Tiberius . . . made uſe of his uſual artifices.*] He praiſed the zeal the ſenate had expreſſed in puniſhing ſeverely the leaſt offence committed againſt the emperor, but deſired they would not be ſo haſty in puniſhing them. He praiſed Lepidus, and did not blame Agrippa. The latter was conſul deſigned, and voted for death, Lepidus only for baniſhment. It was reſolved, for the future, that the decrees of death ſhould not be executed till the tenth day after ſentence. *Id Tiberius ſolitis ſibi ambagibus apud ſenatum incuſavit, cum extolleret* pietatem, quamvis modicas principis injurias, acriter ulciſcentium; *deprecaretur* tam præcipites verborum pœnas: *Laudaret Lepidum, neque Aggrippam argueret. Igitur factum S. C.* ne decreta patrum ante diem decimum ad ærarium deferrentur; idque vitæ ſpatium damnatis prorogaretur (12). Some (13) attribute all this to Tiberius's ambition; they pretend, that he was diſpleaſed not that they had put Lutorius to death, but that they had condemned him to death without his advice. They add, that, to make himſelf maſter of all ſentences of this nature, even in his abſence, he got a decree paſſed, that the execution ſhould be deferred.

[*C*] *Manius Lepidus . . . . gave a very ingenious turn to his opinion.*] I have already recited (14) the beginning of his diſcourſe; here is another piece of it. ‘ Vita Lutorii in integro eſt, qui neque ſervatus in periculum Reipub. neque interfectus in exemplum ibit. ‘ Studia illi ut plena vecordiæ, ita inania & fluxa ſunt: ‘ nec quidquam grave ac ſerium ex eo metuas, qui ‘ ſuorum ipſe flagitiorum proditor, non virorum ani-

‘ mis

(*a*) Tacitus, Annal. lib. iii, cap. xlix, ad ann. 774.

(*b*) Corripuit delator, objectans ægro Druſo compoſuiſſe, quod ſi extinctus foret, majore præmio vulgaretur *Tacitus, ibid.*

(*c*) Ut delator exſtitit, ceteris ad dicendum teſtimonium exterritis, ſola Vitellia nihil ſe audiviſſe adſeveravit. *Id. ibid.*

(*d*) Dion, lib. lvii, pag. m. 707.

(5) Tacitus, Annal. lib. iii, cap. l.

(6) Jul. Paullus V. Sentent. 21, apud Forſtnerum in Tacit. Annal. lib. ii.

(7) Forſtnerus, ibid. *citing* Ammian Marcellin. lib. xxix.

(8) Libanius, Orat XII, apud Harduinum Not. in Themiſtium, pag. 490.

† II Tom. Conc. cap. iv, fol. 739.

‡ Idem, cap. xvii, fol. 74.

(9) Beloi, Apolog. Catholiq. Part. I, fol. 12, verſo.

(10) Mercure François, Tom. III, pag. 304.

(11) Tertull. apud Lipſium, in Tacit. Annal. lib. iii, pag. m. 140.

(12) Tacit. Annal. lib iii, cap. li.

(13) Dion, lib. lvii, pag. 707.

(14) In the remark [*A*], citat. (5).

how the advocate Arnauld, who employed it in pleading againſt the Jeſuits, was reflected on by Father Richeome [*D*]. Mr Moreri has committed ſome faults [*E*].

‘ mis, ſed muliercularum adrepit: cedat tamen urbe, & bonis amiſſis aqua & igni arceatur (15). —— *The life of Lutorius is ſtill untouched: to ſave it, will no wiſe endanger the ſtate; nor will the taking it away have any influence upon others. His ſtudies, as they are full of wildneſs, are likewiſe empty and periſhing: neither is ought important or terrible to be apprehended from one who thus betrays his own follies, and makes his court not to the minds of men, but the imaginations of women: let him however be expelled Rome, interdicted from fire and water, and his eſtate be forfeited.*’ There is nothing to be feared, ſaid he, by ſuffering Lutorius to live; nor will the taking away his life be any great example. He is an idle fellow, who ſpends his time in trifles; all his ambition is to get into the womens good graces: we need not fear any ſerious enterprize, or any thing conſiderable from him.

(15) Tacit. ubi ſupra.

[*D*] *The advocate Arnauld . . . . was reflected on by Father Richeome.*] Arnauld, pleading againſt the Jeſuits in the year 1594, amongſt other things has this (16); they ſay, ‘ that they came into France for our great advantage; experience has ſhewn, that they have cauſed our ruin. What need of any longer trial? Let them go and advantage our enemies the ſame way: there is to this purpoſe an excellent paſſage in Tacitus, Si, patres conſcripti, unum id ſpectamus quàm neſaria voce aures hominum polluerint, neque carcer, neque laqueus ſufficiant: eſt locus ſententiæ, per quam neque impune illis ſit, & vos ſeveritatis ſimul ac clementiæ non pœniteat: aqua & igni arceantur. —— *If, conſcript fathers, we do but conſider how wickedly they have defiled the ears of men, neither dungeon nor halter can puniſh them ſufficiently: but there is room for a ſentence by which neither they ſhall eſcape unpuniſhed, nor will you have cauſe to repent of your ſeverity or indulgence, let them be forbid fire and water.* There you have the Jeſuit's ſentence.’ Some years after he employed the ſame thought in a tract called, *Le franc & veritable Diſcours* (17): ‘ Gentlemen, if ye conſider the horrid wickedneſs of theſe people, hanging will not be ſufficient for them; but I know a means, by which you will never repent of, having been either too gentle, or too ſevere; baniſh them all.’ Richeome anſwers (18), that theſe words are not ſo in Tacitus; and that therefore this diſcourſer is ‘ a wonderful bold forger, writing to his prince . . . . With theſe words then he condemns us, in mercy, to baniſhment . . . . more cruel and deceitful, by half, than the Heathen who firſt ſpoke them. For in this place of Tacitus, Marcus Lepidus, a Roman general, adviſed the ſenate to clemency towards Lutorius a knight, convicted of many great crimes. Whereas this man metamorphoſes his words into an exhortation to cruelty, to perſuade the ruin of many innocent perſons.’ After this he gives a tranſlation of the paſſage of Tacitus, cut off with an *& cætera*; and complains of Arnauld's confidence in producing it egregiouſly diſguiſed (19), and oppoſes the innocence of the Jeſuits, to Lutorius's abominable crimes. He commits two faults at leaſt; for his complaint of the pretended falſification of the paſſage of Tacitus is ill-grounded; and he ought not to have ſuppoſed, that Lutorius was actually *a deſperate criminal, guilty of abominable and numberleſs crimes.* He ſhould have regulated himſelf, not by the phraſes of the ſenator Lepidus, but by the real nature of the fact. He might have found the quality of the offence in the very words of this ſenator, I mean in thoſe he ſuppreſſed by his *Et cætera.*

(16) Plaidoié d'Arnauld, pag. m. 57.

(17) See, above, remark [C] of the article ARNAULD (ANTONY) Advocate.

(18) Richeome, Plainte Apologetique, n. 48, pag. 180.

(19) Id. ibid. n. 48. pag. 181.

[*E*] *Mr Moreri has committed ſome faults.*] He has only conſulted Dion, who has too much abridged the matter, not in the twenty ſeventh book, as Moreri affirms, but in the fifty ſeventh. Tacitus ſhould have been conſulted, whoſe narrative is larger and more exact. But Moreri's great fault lies in ſaying, that Lutorius was accuſed of having written a poem againſt Druſus. Would he have ſaid this, if he had known, that this Poet was accuſed of deſigning to publiſh this poem, in caſe Druſus ſhould die, and believing he ſhould receive a greater reward for it, than for that he had made upon Germanicus's death.

LUXEMBURG, the capital city of the province of that name (*a*), was only a caſtle in the time of the emperor Otho the Great (*b*). Gilbert, ſon to Ricuin of Ardenne, having obtained it of the abbot of St Maximin, enlarged it, and founded the county of Luxemburg, with the conſent of Bruno, duke of Lorrain, brother to the emperor Otho the Great. This county was made a duchy, by the emperor Charles IV (*c*), for Venceſlaus, his uncle (*d*). The town of Luxemburg is very ſtrong. It is not true that it was never taken by the French, before the year 1684 [*A*]. Hither *the miraculous image of our Lady of Conſolation, patroneſs of the duchy of Luxemburg, and county of Chini*, was brought as to a place of ſecurity; but it was carried back to her chapel the twentieth of May 1685. The public has ſeen the advice that was given to the Jeſuits about the proceſſion, they made that day (*e*). They find many Roman antiquities in this province [*B*], which makes all the curious earneſtly deſire the publication

(*a*) This is one of the ſeventeen provinces of the Low-Countries.

(*b*) His reign begins from the year 936.

(*c*) His reign begins in 1346.

(*d*) Taken from the *Itinerarium per nonnullas Galliæ Belgicæ partes* of Abraham Ortelius, and John Vivianus, *pag* 36, *Edit.* 1584.

(*e*) *See the* Nouvelles de la Repub des Lettres, Octob. 1685, Art. X.

[*A*] *It is not true that it was never taken . . . . before the year* 1684.] When the French beſieged it in 1684, I heard ſeveral perſons ſay, that it was then a virgin, a name vulgarly given to towns that were never taken. It was not hard to undeceive them; for we find in hiſtory, that the French took Luxemburg in 1542, and that being recovered by the emperor's arms, they retook it in 1543. They loſt it the year following. Note, that they blocked it up in 1682; they bombarded it in 1683; and took it in 1684 (1). They reſtored it by the treaty of Ryſwick in 1697.

(1) *See the dates of all this in Father du Londel's* Faſtes des Rois de la Maiſon d'Orleans & de celle de Bourbon.

[*B*] *They find many foot-ſteps of Roman antiquities in this province.*] The inhabitants of the duchy of Luxemburg believe, that each planet had a particular place conſecrated to it in this country; and that antiently in the town of Arlon there was an altar of the moon. Several images of the falſe gods have been found there, and ſeveral medals and inſcriptions (2). Peter Erneſt, count of Mansfeld, removed them to Luxemburg, to adorn a fountain he conſecrated to the memory of his wife. He cauſed a magnificent houſe to be built near it. The inſcription of this fountain will, perhaps, not be unacceptable here. It is a notable monument of conjugal affection (3). ‘ Porticus in primis amplas mirabamur, quas . . . . ſe ad id deſtinaſſe dicebat ut in eis reponeret, quæcunque nanciſci poſſet antiquitatis monumenta, quorum magnam jam habet copiam, ex diverſis locis, & Arlunio in primis . . . . petitam . . . . Sunt autem maxima ex parte ſimulacra deorum gentilium, & epitaphia, quæ in crepidine fontis illius pulcherrimi, ac claritudinis eximiæ, quo dilectæ quondam conjugis Mariæ de Montmorenci memoriam ſancte conſervat, crebrò ad Mariæ fontem, (ſic eum nuncupavit) adventando ſic ſunt . . . . diſpoſita ut . . . . Ipſam prius inſcriptionem, qua Illuſtriſſ. princeps fontem hunc ſuum decoravit, audiamus.

‘ *Quiſquis huc accedis ſi te æſtus ſitiſve urget. Hic æſtum quietus vitato. Sitim pronus extinguito. Aquam manu haurito. Os lavato. At pede ne turbato. Nudo corpore ne polluito. Quieſcentibus enim cariſſimæ uxoris manibus tranquillam undam ſacravit. Mariæ de nomine Mariæ fontem nuncupavit. Æterni ſui amoris teſtes latentes vaſta ſub rupe lymphas erui. Vivo lapide cingi. Æternaſque fluere juſſit.*

P. E. C. M.

(2) Itinerar. Abrah. Ortelii, & Joh. Viviani, pag. 32.

(3) Ibid. pag. 33, 34.

publication of Father Wiltheim's book (*f*).

(*f*) See the remark [*B*], at the end.

‘ *Firſt we admired the noble porticoes which . . . he informed he deſigned for the reception of ſuch monuments of antiquity as he could any where procure, of which he had already a large collection from many places, and eſpecially from Arlon . . . They conſiſt, for the moſt part, of images of the Heathen deities, and of epitaphs round the border of that beautiful fountain, which he carefully preſerves in memory of his beloved wife, Mary of Montmorenci, often going to Mary's fountain (ſo called by him) . . . . But let us firſt hear the inſcription with which this illuſtrious prince has adorned his fountain :*

‘ Whoever thou art that comeſt hither to avoid the heat, or to quench thy thirſt. Thou mayeſt be refreſhed here agreeably, undiſturbed. Take up the water with thy hand. Waſh thy mouth. Trouble it not with thy feet. Nor pollute it with thy naked body. For he has conſecrated theſe gentle waters to the peaceful manes of his moſt dear wiſe. And from her name Mary, called it Mary's fountain. He cauſed theſe limpid ſtreams, the latent witneſſes of his eternal love, to ruſh from yonder rock. Encloſed them in native ſtone, and bid them for ever flow.

Peace be to the aſhes of Mary.

This is taken from a relation dated at Antwerp, the ſeventh of October 1575 (4). Mr Baudelot informs us (5) that Mr de Ballonſfeaux, nephew to Father Wiltheim, ſhewed him, in manuſcript, the antiquities of Luxemburg, written by this Father.

(4) It was printed by Plantin, in 1584, in 8vo, the edition of Leyden, which is the third, was printed in 1667, in 12mo.

(5) In his Diſſertation on Ptolomæus Auletes.

LYCOPHRON, the ſon of Periander, king of Corinth, had a very odd deſtiny. He was ſeventeen years old, when Meliſa his mother was killed by Periander, and had a brother (*a*) a year elder than he. Procles, their grandfather by the mother's ſide, king of Epidaurus, invited them to his court, and, when he ſent them back to their father, he told them they ought not to forget who it was that killed their mother. Lycophron was ſo ſtruck at this ſaying, that being returned to Corinth, he took up a ſtubborn reſolution not to ſpeak to his father, either to aſk him, or to anſwer him a queſtion. Periander, enraged at his carriage, expelled him his houſe, and underſtanding from his eldeſt ſon, what Procles had ſaid to them, he forbad thoſe, who had received Lycophron into their houſes, to entertain him any longer. The young man, being forced to depart, found a reception elſewhere, for ſome days ; but as ſoon as his lodgings were known, orders were ſent to his landlord to turn him out of doors ; at laſt, a decree was publiſhed, impoſing a fine at diſcretion, to be paid to Apollo, on any who either lodged, or vouchſafed to ſpeak to him. This order was obeyed, and Lycophron lay four days and four nights in the ſtreets, without eating or drinking. Periander, touched with compaſſion, went then to ſpeak to him, and tenderly repreſented, how much better it were for him to ſucceed to his riches and crown, than make himſelf miſerable by a miſtaken reſentment. All the anſwer he could get from him was, that he ought to pay the fine, ſince he had ſpoken himſelf to his ſon. Periander, finding the diſeaſe incurable, ſent Lycophron away to Corfou, and there left him, without ever once thinking of him, till he found old age coming on, and rendring him incapable of diſcharging his kingly functions. The incapacity of his other ſon obliged him to ſend and offer Lycophron the government. He ſlighted the propoſition, and would not vouchſafe, ſo much as to ſpeak to the meſſenger. His ſiſter was diſpatched to him, and in vain repreſented all the ſweets of ſovereign authority. At laſt a propoſal was made, that he ſhould come and reign at Corinth, and his father would reign at Corfou. He accepted the condition ; but the inhabitants of Corfou ſlew him, to prevent a change, which they did not approve of. This, in my opinion, is ſuch an abridgment as ought to be made of Herodotus's narrative (*b*) [*A*].

(*a*) Diog. Laërt. in Vita Periandri, *calls him Cypſelus.*

(*b*) *Taken from* Herodot lib iii, cap. l, & ſeq.

[*A*] *This is the abridgment I think ought to be made of Herodotus's narrrative.*] Diogenes Laërtius (1) has mangled this narration. Mr Moreri, not content to mutilate and falſify it, has perplexed it with an obſcure jargon. What he ſays of Lycophron's conſtantly refuſing to return to Corinth, is expreſsly contradicted by Herodotus. Mr Hoffman is in the ſame error.

(1) Diog. Laërt. in Vita Periandri.

LYCOPHRON, a Greek Poet. You will find, in Moreri, what country he was of, and when he lived. The poem, which we have of his is a very obſcure piece [*A*]; but

[*A*] *The poem, which we have of his, is a very obſcure piece.*] It is intituled *Alexandra*, and contains a long train of predictions. The author ſuppoſes, that Caſſandra, daughter of Priam, is the oracle, which foretold all theſe things ; but however, it is not ſhe that ſpeaks, but a man, who gives a faithful account to Priam of all Caſſandra's prophecies (1). Dection, Orus, and Theon, had written notes upon this poem, which are loſt (2). Tzetzes's commentary is ſtill in being. Amongſt the modern critics, William Canterus, and John Meurſius have learnedly employed themſelves on Lycophron's *Alexandra*. Meurſius's edition is accompanied with a Latin tranſlation, compoſed by Joſeph Scaliger, and ſuited to the character of the original, as being very difficult to be underſtood, and thick ſet with barbarous terms.

The beſt edition of this Poet, is that which was publiſhed at Oxford, in 1697, in folio. Mr Potter who procured it, has done all that was proper to recommend it. He has corrected the Greek text ; and over againſt each verſe of Lycophron, he has ſet down William Canterus's Latin tranſlation, which is in proſe ; under it the commentary of Iſaac Tzetzes, with the corrections and various readings. He has given Scaliger's verſion, which is in Iambic verſe, by itſelf, and then the notes of Canterus, the commentary of Meurſius, and his own, which is very learned. To all this are added ſeveral exact and commodious indexes. Mr de Boiſſieu aſſures us (3) that his father, who was well verſed in ſeveral languages, and as famous for learning as for arms, had written a commentary on Lycophron ; but he does not tell us, whether this work was ever printed. For the reſt, we muſt not forget, that Bernard Bertrand, native of Riez, in Provence, is the firſt, who tranſlated this poem of Lycophron into Latin. He tranſlated likewiſe the commentary of Tzetzes. Both theſe verſions were printed together at Baſil in 1558. Canterus (4) has mentioned this work with a pretty deal of contempt. No notice is taken of it in the abridgment of Geſner's Bibliotheque, printed at Zurich in the year 1583. Lycophron is there ſpoken of on the footing of an author, ſome of whoſe works, in manuſcript, are found in the library of Vienna (5) ; and when Bernard Bertrand is ſpoken of, mention is

(1) *See* Canterus, Not. in Lycophr. init.

(2) *See* Voſſius, de Poët Græcis, pag. 64.

(3) Dionyſius Salvagnius, Boëſſius, Not. ad Ovidium in Ibin. ver. 389, pag 77. Edit. 1633, in 4to.

(4) Canter. Pref. in Lycophron.

(5) Note, That theſe words of the Abridgment of Geſner, at the word *Lycophron, pag.* 558, *in Bibliotheca Impreſſ. Viennæ*, are faulty ; for, inſtead of *Impreſſ.* it ſhould be *Imperat.*

but, in my opinion, he muſt have had not only a great deal of learning, but a great deal of wit, to compoſe ſuch a book. You will find in Mr le Fevre (a), a great many learned and ingenious thoughts on the obſcurities of it. I know not why he ſhould ſay, that Suidas has preſerved the names of twelve or thirteen tragedies written by Lycophron; for we find, in Suidas, the titles of twenty. This Poet was killed by an arrow; and Ovid is the only author, who informs us of this particular [B].

only made of his tranſlation of Euſtathius on *Dionyſius Afer de Situ Orbis*, printed at Baſil by Oporin, and his verſion of a book of Galen *de humoribus*, printed at Straſburg in 1558. I would have them print *the interlineary gloſs and Greek notes*, which Mr Nicolle *wrote with his own hand on the Greek text of Lycophron* (6). *It is a very excellent manuſcript*, as the abbot Faydit aſſures us (7), to whom Mr de Beſſat, maſter of accounts, and nephew of the abbot de Bourzeis, lent it.

[B] *He was killed by an arrow; Ovid is the only author who informs us of this particular* (8).] Valerius Andreas Deſſelius (9) who pretends, that Theoderet mentions it, is miſtaken, as the learned Mr de Boiſſieu obſerves (10). He ſhews, that Theodoret does not ſpeak of Lycophron's death, nor even of the place of his ſepulture. For inſtead of *Lycophrone*, it ought to be read *Leucophryne*; as appears by this paſſage of Arnobius (11): 'Leucophrynæ monumentum in fano apud Magneſiam Dianæ eſſe, Myndius profitetur ac memorat Zeno. —— *Zeno, the Myndian, records, that there is a monument of Leucophryne in the temple of Diana at Magneſia.*' Theſe are Mr de Boiſſieu's words: 'De obitu Lycophronis ne verbum quidem apud illum (*Theodoretum*) reperitur: deinde Theodoreti locus (12) . . . . ubi ex Zenone, Lycophronem in Dianæ Magneſiæ templo conditum eſſe refert, plane depravatus eſt, & pro *Lycophrone*, reponendum eſt *Leucophryne*, cujus monumentum erat apud Magnetes in Dianæ templo, ut ex eodem Zenone tradit Arnobius —— *There is not a word in Theodoret of the death of Lycophron: then the paſſage of Theodoret. . . in which he relates, out of Zeno, that Lycophron was buried in the temple of Diana of Magneſia is manifeſtly corrupted, and for* Lycophrone, *we muſt reſtore* Leucophryne, *whoſe monument was among the Magneſians, in the temple of Diana, as Arnobius relates from the ſame Zeno.*' I wonder Mr le Fevre has not mentioned this paſſage of Ovid.

LYCORIS. It is the name Virgil gives a famous courtezan, whom other authors call Cytheris. He ſpeaks of her in his tenth Eclogue, in order to comfort a friend [A] of his in deſpair on her preferring Marc Antony before him. We have ſpoken at large elſewhere (a) of Marc Antony's fondneſs for Cytheris, but have not given the hiſtory of this woman fully enough. Let us ſay then, that ſhe was a famous Comedian, whom Volumnius fell in love with, and made free [B]. This was the reaſon of her taking the name

[A.] *Virgil . . . . ſpeaks of her . . . . . to comfort a friend of his.*] This friend, if we believe Servius, (1), was the orator Caius Aſinius Gallus, the ſon of Aſinius Pollio. But, as Servius adds, that this Gallus is the firſt, who was made governor of Ægypt, the learned ſuſpect his commentary; for it is manifeſt he has confounded the Poet Cornelius Gallus with the Orator Aſinius Gallus (2). The firſt, who obtained of Auguſtus the government of Ægypt, immediately after the conqueſt of this kingdom, was the Poet Cornelius Gallus. It is probably to him, that Virgil addreſſes his eclogue of Conſolation, on the barbarous infidelities of the courtezan Cytheris. The perſon, to whom the Poet inſcribes it, compoſed four books of poems upon his own amours (3). There are ſome fragments of them extant, if we believe the critics.

[B] *She was a Comedian . . . . whom Volumnius fell in love with, and made free.*] Servius ſays, that Virgil's Lycoris was the courtezan Cytheris, whom Volumnius had made free: *Hic autem Gallus amavit Cytheridem meretricem libertam Volumnii* (4). He does not ſay ſhe was a Comedian; but, that we learn elſewhere. We know that the courtezan Cytheris, Marc Antony's miſtreſs cauſed herſelf to be called Volumnia. 'Vehebatur in eſſedo Trib. plebis: lictores laureati antecedebant, inter quos apertâ lecticâ MIMA portabatur, quam ex oppidis municipales homines honeſti obviam neceſſario prodeuntes, non vero illo & mimico nomine, ſed VOLUMNIAM conſalutabant (5) — *The tribune of the people was drawn in a chariot: laurelled Lictors went before, among whom an Actreſs was carried in an open litter, whom the honeſt burgeſſes of the ſeveral towns, being obliged to meet her, ſaluted, not by her true theatrical name, but by that of* VOLUMNIA.' For what reaſon, if not becauſe Volumnius had made her free? Now Marc Antony's Cytheris was a Comedian; and therefore ſhe, that Servius ſpeaks of, muſt have been ſo too. The only thing to be proved, is, that Volumnius loved her. This proof I take from one of Cicero's epiſtles (6): 'Accubueram hora nona . . . . apud Volumnium Eutrapelum, & quidem ſupra me Atticus, infra Verrius . . . . infra Eutrapelum Cytheris accubuit. In eo igitur, inquis, convivio Cicero ille quem adſpectabant, cujus ob os Graji ora obvertebant ſua? non; me Hercule ſuſpicatus ſum illam affore: ſed tamen ne Ariſtippus quidem ille Socraticus erubuit cum eſſet objectum habere eum Laïda: habeo, inquit, non habeor à Laïde —— *I ſat down to table . . . . at the houſe of Volumnius Eutrapelus, between Atticus and Verrius . . . . below Eutrapelus ſat Cytheris. You will ſay, it did not become me to be preſent at ſuch a banquet: I profeſs I had no ſuſpicion that ſhe would be preſent: yet Ariſtippus, the Socratic, did not bluſh, when it was objected to him, that he had Lais: I have her, ſays he, but ſhe has not me.*' It is plain, that Cytheris is here a courtezan, whom Volumnius entertained at bed and board. This epiſtle of Cicero is ſaid to be written in the 703d year of Rome. He wrote another (7) to Volumnius the ſame year, but without ſaying a word of the courtezan. Father Abram, who imagines the contrary, had not well conſidered it: 'ad hunc amorem, l. 7. ep. 32. alludit ſcribens ad eundem Volumnium, *Ut nihil ſit tam ἀκύθηρον quod non alicui venuſtum eſſe videatur* (8). —— *To this intrigue, book 7. ep. 32, he alludes, writing to the ſame Volumnius,* nothing is ſo barren of wit, but it will pleaſe ſome body' This entirely relates to an ill reliſh for jeſts. Cicero's meaning is, that there is no jeſt ſo flat or inſipid but one or other is pleaſed with. For the reſt, we do not learn which way Cytheris came to be turned over from Volumnius to Marc Antony, whether by gift, or thro' the natural inconſtancy and ingratitude of the miſtreſs. I ſhould rather believe the firſt, it being certain that Volumnius was one of Marc Antony's good friends.

SOME particulars concerning Volumnius.

This appears from the following paſſage of Cicero (9): 'Scripſi ad Antonium de legatione, ne ſi ad Dolabellam ſolum ſcripſiſſem iracundus homo commoveretur: quod autem aditus ad eum difficilior eſſe dicitur, ſcripſi ad Eutrapelum, ut is ei meas litteras redderet, legatione mihi opus eſſe. —— *I wrote to Antony concerning the lieutenantſhip left, if I had written only to Dolabella, the choleric gentleman might have reſented it: but knowing that he was difficult of acceſs, I wrote to Eutrapelus, to give him my letters, informing him that I ſtood in need of the lieutenantſhip.*' This he wrote to Atticus a few months after the death of Julius Cæſar. It is the ſame Volumnius, if I miſtake not, that Cicero means in the thirteenth Philippic, giving a liſt of Marc Antony's gaming companions (10). Cornelius Nepos tells us, that Volumnius, Marc Antony's intimate friend, had name Volumnia, in her travels with Marc Antony through the towns of Italy. Marc Antony cauſed great honours to be paid her, carried her about in an open litter, and made his mother's equipage follow, as it were to make up the train of this courtezan (*b*). It was upon this occaſion, that lions were yoked in Marc Antony's chariot [*C*].

(a) Lives of the Greek Poets, pag. m. 13 , & ſeq.

(6) See the abbot Faydit's preface to the *Telemacomanie*.

(7) Ibid.

(8) Utque cothurnatum periiſſe Lycophrona, narrant, Hæreat in fibris miſſa ſagitta tuis. *May'ſt thou, like buſkin'd Lycophron, be ſlain, And thy heart's blood the feather'd arrow ſtain.* Ovid. in Ibin, ver. 533.

(9) Not. in Ibin Ovidii, apud Boiſſieu, pag. 107.

(10) Comment. in Ibin. pag. 107.

(11) Arnob. lib. vi, pag. m. 193.

(12) Theodoret. lib. viii, de Græc. affect. curat.

(a) In the article FULVIA, remark [L].

(1) In Eclogam X. Virgilii.

(2) *See* Scaliger, in Euſebii Chron. n. 1990, pag. 167.

(3) Amorum ſuorum de Cytheride libros ſcripſit quatuor. *Servius, ubi ſupra.*

(4) Ibid.

(5) Cicer Philipp. II, cap. xxiv. *In the eleventh Letter of the tenth book to Atticus, he calls Cytheris that player, whom Marc Antony carried about with him.* Plutarch, in Antonio, pag. 920, *calls her* Cytheris.

(6) Epiſt. xxvi, lib. ix, ad Famil.

(7) *The thirty ſecond of book vii,* ad Famil.

(8) Abram, in Cicer. Orat. Tom. II, pag. 645.

(9) Epiſt. viii, lib. xv, ad Attic.

(10) Addite Antonii colluſores & ſodales Eutrapelum, Melam, Cœlium, &c. — *Add to theſe Antony's gaming companions, Eutrapelus, Mela, Cœlius, &c.* Philipp. XIII, circa init.

Another

had a conſiderable poſt in his army. ‘Familiares ejus (*M. Antonii*) ex urbe profugientes quantum potuit texit (*Atticus*), quibus rebus indiguerunt adjuvit: P. vero Volumnio ea tribuit ut plura à parente proficiſci non potuerint . . . (11). L. Julium Calidium . . . . propter magnas ejus Africanas poſſeſſiones in proſcriptorum numerum à P. Volumnio præfecto, fabrum Antonii, abſentem relatum, expedivit (12). —— *Atticus gave ſhelter to Marc Antony's exiled friends, and ſupplied their wants: a father could not be more bountiful than he was to P. Volumnius . . . . He cleared L. Julius Calidius, Antony's craftſman, who, in his abſence, had been put, by P. Volumnius, the prefect, in the number of the proſcribed, on account of his large poſſeſſions in Africa.*' This Volumnius's houſe was a ſanctuary to Pomponius Atticus, during the rage of the triumviral proſcriptions (13). It is impoſſible, I think, to determine, whether our Volumnius is the ſame, who was killed in cold blood by Brutus's men (14). The grounds for doubting it are, I. that Plutarch calls him, who was killed by Brutus's party, a Comedian. Ἦν δέ τις Βολούμνιος Μῖμος καὶ Σακκουλίων γελωτοποιὸς ἡλωκότες, οὓς ἐν οὐδενὶ λόγῳ τιθεμένου τοῦ Βρούτου, προσάγοντες οἱ φίλοι κατηγόρουν, ὡς οὐδὲ νῦν τοῦ λέγειν καὶ σκώπτειν πρὸς ὕβριν αὐτῶν ἀπεχομένους. Erat quidam Volumnius mimus & Sacculio Sannio capti. Hos Brutus quum contemneret, adductos ad eum accuſaverunt amici ejus ne tunc quidem à dicteriis & contumeliis in ipſos jaciendis temperare (15). —— *One Volumnius, and Sacculio a buffoon, were taken: theſe Brutus deſpiſed; but his friends brought them before him, and accuſed them of not refraining even then from jeſting upon them.* II. That he joins him to a buffoon. And III. that he obſerves, that Brutus deſpiſed them both. This does not agree with the Volumnius mentioned by Cornelius Nepos. But, on the other hand, the drolling humour perfectly ſuits him; that itch of witticiſm, which Plutarch's Volumnius was ſo over-run with, that he could not forbear jeſting even on thoſe, who kept him in a priſon. One of Cicero's Epiſtles, which I have before-cited (16), ſhews, that *Volumnius Eutrapelus* (17) was full of witty ſayings. Cicero feared no man but him in this way, and recommends two things to him; one, that he would not ſuffer the ſilly quibbles, ridiculous puns, and pitiful rebus's, which went about in his name, during his abſence from Rome, to be aſcribed to him; the other, that he would aſſert the rights of polite converſation againſt the fatal encroachments of uncourtly buffoonry. Is not this repreſenting Volumnius as a wit? ‘Quibus in litteris omnia mihi perjucunda fuerunt, præter illud, quod parum diligenter poſſeſſio ſalinarum mearum à te procuratore defenditur. Ais enim, ut ego diſceſſerim, omnia omnium, dicta, in his etiam Seſtiana, in me conferri. Quid? tu id pateris? nonne defendis? non reſiſtis? equidem ſperabam, it notata me reliquiſſe genera dictorum meorum, ut cognoſci ſua ſponte poſſent (18). —— *In which letters every thing pleaſed me, excepting that you neglect to defend the poſſeſſion of my ſalt-pits. For you ſay, that, no ſooner is my back turned, but every one's ſayings, even Seſtius's, are aſcribed to me. What! do you ſuffer it? do you not defend me? do you make no reſiſtance? I thought my words might eaſily be diſtinguiſhed from thoſe of others.*' After theſe words, Cicero gives him a juſt ſtandard of his own ſayings, and deſires Volumnius to vouch even upon oath (19), that whatever would not bear ſuch a teſt never came from his mint. ‘Urbanitatis poſſeſſionem, amabo, quibuſvis interdictis defendamus: in qua te unum metuo, contemno ceteros (20). —— *I beſeech you, let us defend, at any rate, the poſſeſſion of politeneſs, in which I fear you alone, and deſpiſe others.*' Here is another very great elogy: ‘Opus eſt hinc limatulo & polito tuo judicio, & illis interioribus litteris meis quibus ſæpe verecundiorem me in loquendo facis (21). —— *There is need of your exact and polite judgment, and thoſe middle parts of my letters, in which you often make me expreſs my ſelf more modeſtly.*' Can a man of this merit and character be the Comedian mentioned by Plutarch? Is it not more probable, that this Comedian was a man made free by Volumnius, and that, like Cytheris, he took the name of his maſter, to whom he owed his liberty? I determine nothing. I believe Plutarch might be miſtaken, for the following reaſons. Volumnius, according to all appearance, gave a full ſwing to his rallying and jocoſe humour, and had no more regard to decorum, or his own quality, than a profeſſed Comedian. This was almoſt unavoidable in a man, who, like him, had a talent for witty ſayings, and an intimate acquaintance with Marc Antony, the moſt liberal man in the world to thoſe, who knew how to divert him, and to the Comedians in particular, with whom his houſe was always crouded. ‘Agrum Campanum, qui cum de vectigalibus eximebatur ut militibus daretur, tamen infligi magnutm Reip. vulnus putabamus: hunc tu compranſoribus uis & colluſoribus dividebas: mimos dico & mimas P. C. in agro Campano collocatos (22). —— *When your Campanian farm was exempted from taxes, to be given to the ſoldiers, we thought the commonwealth greatly wounded: this you divided among your bottle companions, and fellow-gameſters; I mean thoſe Actors and Actreſſes, who frequented that ſeat.*' We have ſeen above (23), that Volumnius was one of his jeſters: the paſſage, I have cited, gives the ſame title to the Comedians of both ſexes. It happened then, perhaps, that Volumnius, mixing daily with this ſort of people at Marc Antony's, and drolling and playing the buffoon as much as they, came to be treated as a Comedian, ſo that Plutarch honeſtly miſtook him for a man of that profeſſion. A learned critic (24), aſſures us, that Plutarch's Volumnius, is the ſame with Cicero's, I ſhall not venture to join with him, and chuſe rather to ſay *non liquet*: tho' I own this critic's opinion ſeems much more probable, than that of any one, who ſhould affirm the contrary. I muſt further obſerve, concerning our Volumnius, that it is of him Horace is ſuppoſed to ſpeak when he ſays, that Eutrapelus gave fine cloaths to ſuch as he deſigned a miſchief to. This doubtleſs was founded on one of his common-places, in which he explains by what degrees vanity betrays men into the vileſt practices.

Eutrapelus, cuicunque nocere volebat,
Veſtimenta dabat pretioſa: beatus enim jam
Cum pulchris tunicis ſumet nova conſilia & ſpes:
Dormiet in lucem: ſcorto poſtponet honeſtum
Officium: nummos alienos paſcet: ad imum
Thrax erit, aut olitoris aget mercede caballum (25).

Eutrapelus . . . . . .
Beſtow'd fine cloaths on thoſe he meant to hurt,
Thus reaſoning, that the rich attire would give
A different turn to the gay wearer's mind.
He'll ſleep till noon, drink, whore, and run in debt;
Till, beggar'd quite, he's forc'd to earn his bread,
And drive an herb-man's cart for wretched hire.

[C] *Lions were yoked in Marc Antony's chariot.*] He was the firſt among the Romans who put them to this kind of ſervice. ‘Jugo ſubdidit eos primuſque Romæ ad currum junxit M. Antonius, & quidem civili bello cum dimicatum eſſet in Pharſalicis campis, non ſine quodam oſtento temporum generoſos ſpiritus jugum ſubire illo prodigio ſignificante: nam quod ita vectus eſt cum Mima Cytheride ſupra monſtra etiam illarum calamitatum fuit (26). —— *Marc Antony was the firſt at Rome who yoked them to his chariot, and that during the civil war, and at the time of the battle of Pharſalia; which was looked upon as a kind of prodigy, importing, that generous ſpirits now ſubmitted to the yoke; for that he was thus carried about with the Actreſs Cytheris was beyond all the prodigies of thoſe calamitous times.*' According to theſe words of Pliny, this ſight had never been ſeen in Italy, till after the battle of Pharſalia: and yet Cicero ſeems to ſay the contrary in one of his epiſtles (27) to Atticus, before this famous battle; ‘Tu Antonii

---

(*b*) See the article FULVIA, remark [*L*].

(11) Corn. Nepos, in Vita Attici, cap. ix.

(12) Ibid. cap. xii.

(13) Ibid. cap. x.

(14) Plutarch. in Bruto, pag. 1005.

(15) Id. ibid.

(16) *The thirty ſecond of the ſeventh book* ad Famil.

(17) He was probably ſo called, becauſe of his facetious humour. See the article ERASMUS, citat (23).

(18) Cicero, Epiſt. xxxii, lib. vii, ad Famil.

(19) Ut ſacramento contendas mea non eſſe. *Ibid.*

(20) Ibid.

(21) Cicero, ad Volumnium, Epiſt. xxxiii, lib. vii, ad Famil.

(22) Idem, Philipp. II, cap. xxxix.

(23) *At citat.* (10).

(24) *Petrus Victorius, in the Cicero of Grævius*, Epiſt. ad Familiar. Tom. I, pag. 434.

(25) Horat Epiſt. xviii, lib. i, ver. 31.

(26) Plinius, lib. viii, cap. xvi, pag. m. 161.

(27) *The thirteenth of the tenth book.*

Another author ſays no more, than that Cytheris's train was not inferior to that of her galant's mother [*D*]. He would have ſaid ſomething more probable, had he affirmed, that they, who expected favours from Marc Antony, made their court more ſubmiſſively to his miſtreſs, than his mother. Servius would have obliged us, if he had marked with more exactneſs, the time when this courtezan followed Marc Antony to the army [*E*]. I do not think ſhe followed him into Aſia after the battle of Philippi

'tonii leones pertimeſcas cave: nihil eſt illo homine 'jucundius. —— *Never fear Antony's lions: he is the 'pleaſanteſt man alive.*' He means, I think, that Atticus ought not to be afraid, becauſe Cæſar's lieutenant had his chariot drawn by lions. He affirmed this more clearly, if Victorius's conjecture be right. This learned critic (28) will have it read *leonibus*, inſtead of *lenonibus*, in the paſſage of the ſecond Philippic, which I cite in the margin (29). His reaſons are ſpecious, and I could eaſily believe him in the right, with Father Abram (30). In this caſe Plutarch (31) and Pliny would not have been faithful Hiſtorians; for it is certain that the words of the ſecond Philippic relate to Marc Antony's progreſs through the towns of Italy, in honour of the Comedian Cytheris, whilſt Cæſar made war in Spain againſt Pompey's lieutenants, a year before the battle of Pharſalia. At worſt, I venture to ſay, without any regard to Cicero's words, that Andrew Alciatus is guilty of a groſs falſhood in ſuppoſing Marc Antony did not harneſs a ſet of lions, till after he had put to death the ſather of eloquence.

Romanum poſtquam eloquium, Cicerone perempto
  Perdiderat patriæ peſtis acerba ſuæ,
Inſcendit currus victor, junxitque leones,
  Compulit & durum colla ſubire jugum;
Magnanimos ceſſiſſe ſuis Antonius armis
  Ambage hac cupiens ſignificare duces (32).

That is,

After that this dire plague of his country, by killing Cicero, had given the laſt blow to the Roman eloquence, he mounted his car victorious, drawn by lions, whom he compelled to bear the yoke; thus emblematically ſignifying his victory over great commanders.

This falſity (33) is the more inexcuſable, as the author has founded on it an elogy on Cicero, and ſome moral reflexions.

[*D*] *Cytheris's train was not inferior to that of her galant's mother.*] Plutarch's making the two equipages equal, extreamly weakens Cicero's ideas; 'Rejecta 'mater amicam impuri filii tanquam nurum ſequebatur '(34). —— *The mother came after, following the mi-'ſtreſs of her debauched ſon, as if ſhe had been her 'daughter-in-law.*' Theſe are the ideas Cicero gives us; and the following are Plutarch's (35): Ὁ δὲ καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἐπιὼν ἐν φορείῳ περιήγετο, καὶ τὸ φορεῖον οὐκ ἐλάττους ἢ τὸ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ περιέποντες ἠκολούθουν. Hanc urbes peragrans cicumducebat lectica; lecticam ejus non minor comitatus quam matris ipſius ſequebatur. —— *In his progreſs through the towns, he carried this Actreſs with him in a litter, with an equipage not leſs than that of his mother.* Neither he nor Cicero ſpeak of Marc Antony's wiſe, which is a ſign he was not then married. See the article FULVIA (36).

[*E*] *The time when this courtezan followed Marc Antony to the army.*] We know ſhe followed him beyond the Alps.

Galle quid inſanis? inquit: tua cura Lycoris
Perque nives alium, perque horrida caſtra ſecuta
  eſt (37).

Gallus, what frenzy this? thy care Lycoris
Follows another thro' rough camps and ſnows.

TRAPP.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Nunc inſanus amor duri me Martis in armis
Tela inter media atque adverſos detinet hoſtes.
Tu procul à patria (ne ſit mihi credere) tantum,
Alpinas, ah dura, nives, & frigora Rheni
Me ſine ſola vides: ah te ne frigora lædant:
Ah tibi ne teneras glacies ſecet aſpera plantas (38).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Now frantic love amidſt thick darts and foes
Detains me in the rigid toil of arms;
While thou, (but can I yet believe it ſo?)
Far from thy native ſoil art wand'ring o'er
The Alpine ſnows, or near the frozen Rhine,
Ah cruel! not with me. Ah! how I fear,
Leſt the ſharp cold ſhou'd pierce thee, or the ice
On the rough mountains tear thy tender feet!

Idem.

But did ſhe follow Marc Antony, when he went to ſerve in Gaul (39) under Julius Cæſar, or when he retired thither, after he was beaten at Modena? I ſhould chuſe the latter opinion; otherwiſe Virgil applied a plaiſter to a very old wound; he comforted the man ten years after Lycoris had jilted him. Virgil's Bucolics were written after the death of Julius Cæſar; and conſequently, if Lycoris had forſaken Gallus, to go into Gaul with Marc Antony, whilſt Cæſar was making war there, Virgil muſt have exerciſed his muſe on a ſuperannuated intrigue of infidelity. But ſuppoſing the other part of the alternative, Gallus's wound muſt have been freſh, and Virgil's verſes might come in a proper time. According to this laſt ſuppoſition, Marc Antony appears not to have been a man of his word. He had promiſed Fulvia, in the year 709, to part for ever with his dear Comedian (40). He quitted her probably for a time, and in that interval Gallus took poſſeſſion of Cytheris. If he had not time for the writing his four books of verſes, before the war of Modena had debauched her away, he employed the following years; for it is not neceſſary to ſuppoſe, that there were not a great many ſharp reproaches of her peſidiouſneſs in ſuch a number of verſes. I have obſerved above, that the letter, in which Cicero excuſes his being at an entertainment with Cytheris, is ſuppoſed to have been written in the year 703. This is an objection againſt thoſe, who ſay, that Cytheris went into Gaul with Marc Antony, before the rupture between Cæſarand Pompey. See the marginal note. I confeſs, I ſee nothing to induce me to believe, that the date of this letter is rightly fixed. However, the opinion I follow has been eſtabliſhed by Servius himſelf (41), though with leſs exactneſs than I could wiſh. Add theſe words to thoſe in the margin (42). 'Hic Gallus amavit Cytheridem meretricem libertam 'Volumnii, quæ, eo ſpreto, euntem Antonium ad 'Gallias eſt ſecuta: propter quod dolorem Galli nunc 'videtur conſolari Virgilius. Nec nos debet movere, 'quod cum mutaverit partem quarti Georgicorum, 'hanc Eclogam ſic reliquit. Nam licet conſoletur in 'ea Gallum, tamen altiùs intenuenti vituperatio eſt. 'Nam & in Gallo impatientia turpis amoris oſtenditur, & aperte hic Antonius carpitur inimicus Auguſti, 'quem contra Romanum morem Cytheris eſt in caſtra 'comitata. —— *This Gallus was in love with the 'courtezan Cytheris, the freed woman of Volumnius, 'who deſpiſing him, followed Antony in his expedition 'into Gaul: on which account Virgil now ſeems to comfort Gallus in his grief: nor ought it to move us, that 'when he changed part of the fourth Georgic, he left 'this Eclogue as it is. For tho' in it he comforts Gallus, yet whoever examines it more narrowly, will find 'that he is blamed. For in Gallus is ſhewn the impatience of unchaſte love, and Antony, the enemy 'of Auguſtus, is here plainly laſhed, whom Cytheris, 'contrary to the Roman cuſtom, followed to the wars.*' We will end with this remark of the ſame Commentator: there were three famous ladies of pleaſure at the ſame time, Cytheris, Origo, and Arbuſcula. The two latter are found in Horace's verſes (43) under the notion of Comedians; they therefore all three were Players.

---

(28) Grævius's Cicero, Epiſt. ad Atticum, Tom. II, pag. 181.

(29) Vehebatur in eſſedo Tribunus plebis: Lictores laureati antecedebant, inter quos aperta lectica mima portabatur. - - - Sequebatur rheda cum lenonibus comites nequiſſimi.

(30) Abram in Cicer. Orat. Tom. II, pag. 645.

(31) *He refers to the time after the battle of Pharſalia the* λέοντες ἅρμασιν ὑποζευγμένοι, leonibus juncti currus, *in Antonio*, *pag.* 920. *B.*

(32) Alciat. Emblem XXIX.

(33) It has been remarked by the Commentators on the Emblems, and by Father Abram, *ubi ſupra*.

(34) Philipp. II, cap. xxiv.

(35) In Antonio, pag. 920. *A.*

(36) In remark [*L*].

(37) Virgil. Eclog. X, ver. 22.

(38) Ib. ver. 44.

(39) He went thither twice: 1. after his return from Ægypt, where he had ſerved, in 698, under Gabinius: 2. after he had been made quæſtor. *See Cicero, Philipp. II, cap. xix. xx.* He was quæſtor in Gaul under Cæſar, *anno* 703, as we are informed by Hirtius.

(40) *See the article FULVIA, remark* [*L*], *citat.* (81).

(41) *On theſe words of Virgil*, Perque horrida caſtra ſecuta eſt, *he ſays*, Horrida ſemper, nunc propter bella civilia, & ſubtiliter hic tangit Antonium, ut ſupra dictum eſt. - - - *Always horrid, now on account of the civil wars; and he artfully laſhes Antony, as is ſaid above.* This ſhews, that Lycoris went a progreſs into Gaul with Marc Antony during the civil war, which was kindled betwixt Octavius and him, under the conſulate of Hirtius and Panſa.

(42) Servius, in Eclog. X, init.

(43) Sat. II, & ultima, lib. i.

Philippi [*F*]. When Ovid obſerves, that the name of Lycoris was famous from Eaſt to Weſt *(c)*, I do not doubt, but he had in view Gallus's verſes on this courtezan. Cicero mentions a piece of raillery, in which Fulvia perhaps was leſs concerned than Lycoris [*G*].

[*F*] *I do not think ſhe followed him into Aſia after the battle of Philippi.*] And yet an ingenious author is of this opinion (44). ‘ Marc Antony was betwiched to the Comedian Cytheris *(it is the anſwer he ſuppoſes Fulvia gave Helena to the queſtion, whether ſhe inſtiſtigated Marc Antony to make war with Auguſtus)* and, to be revenged on him, I would fain have had Auguſtus fall in love with me, but Auguſtus was nice in his miſtreſſes. He neither thought me young, nor handſome enough; and tho' I let him underſtand, that he was like to be involved in a civil war for want of ſome regard for me, yet I never could drag him to one act of complaiſance. I will repeat you too, if you pleaſe, ſome verſes (45) he made upon that evaſion, and which are not the moſt to my honour. They are theſe.

Parce qu'Antoine eſt charmé de Glaphire (46)
Fulvie à ſes beaux yeux me veut aſſujettir.
Antoine eſt infidele. Hé bien donc? eſt-ce à dire
Que des fautes d'Antoine on me ſera patir?
  Qui? moi? que je ſerve Fulvie?
  Suffit-il, qu'elle en ait envie?
A ce compte on verroit ſe retirer vers moi,
  Mille épouſes mal ſatisfaites.
Aime-moi, me dit-elle, ou combatons. Mais quoi?
Elle eſt bien laide! Allons, ſonnez trompettes.

That is,

Becauſe Antony is in love with Glaphyra, therefore Fulvia would fain captivate me. Antony's falſe: what then? Muſt I pay off Antony's ſcores? Muſt I be Fulvia's galant, only becauſe ſhe deſires it? At this rate every jealous wife will have recourſe to me. Either love me, ſays ſhe, *or fight with me. She is very ugly; therefore ſound to arms.*

Take notice that theſe verſes relate to the year after the battle of Philippi, in which Brutus and Caſſius fell. Auguſtus was then in Italy, and Marc Antony in Aſia. We have ſeen, in the article of GLAPHYRA, that ſhe was accounted a lady of pleaſure, who had gained the affections of Marc Antony, and it does not appear that Cytheris was with him at that time. I believe then, the name in Auguſtus's Epigram is not diſguiſed. It was not on account of Cytheris, but of Glaphyra, that Fulvia deſired Auguſtus to revenge her. Beſides, her menaces were not that ſhe would, in caſe of refuſal, excite Marc Antony to make war on Auguſtus, but that ſhe would take up arms herſelf: and we have ſeen in her article, that ſhe actually did ſo, and that, without the concurrence of her husband, ſhe put all Italy in combuſtion; for which Marc Antony chid her ſeverely the next time he ſaw her.

[*G*] *Cicero mentions a piece of raillery, in which Fulvia, perhaps, was leſs concerned than Lycoris.*] Marc Antony is upbraided, in the ſecond Philippic, with a trick he ſerved his wife. He rode into town by night, as a courier diſpatched by Marc Antony; and gave Fulvia a letter, in which her husband ſaid the tendereſt things to her in the world (47). He had diſguiſed his face, that he might not be known in preſenting Fulvia the letter; but whilſt ſhe read it, he diſcovered himſelf, and threw himſelf on her neck. He was asked, why he would take ſuch a method, which alarmed the whole city? He anſwered, He was come about an affair of his own. This gave occaſion to a jeſt on him. Let us cite Cicero's words (48). ‘ O hominem nequam! . . , . . Ergo ut te catamitum nec opinato cum oſtendiſſes, præter ſpem mulier adſpiceret, idcirco urbem terrore nocturno, Italiam multorum dierum metu perturbaſti? Et domi quidem cauſſam amoris habuit, foris etiam turpiorem, ne L. Plancus prædes ſuos venderet. Productus in concionem à Trib. Pleb. cum reſpondiſſes, te rei tuæ cauſſa veniſſe, populum etiam dicacem in te reddidiſti. ——*Infamous man!* . . . *Becauſe your wife diſcovered your pederaſtic intentions, therefore have you diſturbed the quiet of Rome, and of all Italy? At home, indeed, the pretence was love; abroad, a more ſcandalous one, leſt L. Plancus ſhould ſell his farms. When you anſwered before the tribune of the people, that your affairs brought you to town, you gave the populace a handle to jeſt upon you.*' Manutius hath made a note upon this, which is more indeterminate than that of Valeſius the younger. ‘ Ex ambiguo ſenſu, *ſays Manutius,* illorum verborum, *rei tuæ cauſſa*: quod referri etiam ad concubitum poteſt. —— *The words* rei tuæ cauſa *are equivocal, and may ſignify* lying with a woman.' But ſee the other note: it is in the Valeſiana (49).

Cuſtodes, lectica, Ciniflones, Paraſitæ,
Ad talos ſtola demiſſa, & circumdata palla
Plurima, quæ invideant pure apparere tibi *rem* (50).

‘ Id eſt *cunnum*. Quod noto primus, ut apud Ciceronem Philippica II. . . . . O hominem nequam! ergo ut te catamitum, *&c.* (51) cum reſpondiſſes te *rei tuæ cauſa* veniſſe populum in te dicacem etiam reddidiſti. Scil. populus luſit in nomine rei, & quod Antonius dixerat ſe *rei ſuæ*, id eſt *rerum ſuarum* cauſa in urbem veniſſe, populus, ut eſt dicax, eum *cunni uxoris* cauſa veniſſe dixit, & dicacitatis materiam invenit in eo verbo.

The envious litter, and ſurrounding guards,
The flowing robe, and garment girt, conſpire
From your too prying eyes to hide th' affair.

‘ i. e. *the . . . . which I firſt remark, as in Cicero, Philipp. II.* . . . . . . Infamous man! *&c.* when you anſwered, that your affairs brought you to town, you expoſed yourſelf to the jeſts of the populace. *That is, the people jeſted upon the word* affair; *and, Antony ſaying that his* affairs *brought him to town, the people, who love a jeſt, ſaid that he came for his wife's* affair.' You will find what follows in the 71ſt page of the ſame book. ‘ Probavi alibi ex Cicerone in Philippica II. de Marco Antonio, qui *rei ſuæ* causâ ſe veniſſe dicebat, populumque his verbis dicacem reddidit; & ex Horatio, plurima quæ impediunt pure apparere tibi rem, & ex aliis *rem* aliquando *cunnum* ſignificare. Sic Martialis:

Parce tuis *igitur dare maſcula nomina* rebus.

‘ Id eſt, *podici* tuo & cunno, ô uxor (52). —— *I have proved elſewhere, out of Cicero, Philipp. II, concerning Marc Antony, who ſaid he came upon his* affairs, *and gave the people opportunity for a jeſt; as alſo from Horace, who ſpeaks of the many things, which hide the* affair; *and from other authors, that the word* res, (affair *or* thing) *ſignifies* cun . . . . . *Martial uſes it in the ſame ſenſe.*' Valeſius indirectly cenſures Scaliger, *qui in Priapeia ex Arnobii neſcio quibus locis & ex verſione carminum Orphei ait* mentulam rem *vocari*. I do not think Scaliger is miſtaken: the word *res* had doubtleſs as extenſive a ſignification among the Latins, as the word *affaire* among the French, or the word *thing* in Engliſh. Now it is certain, that the word *affaire* ſometimes ſignifies the natural parts of either ſex. This is ſo true, that even they, who know but little of the French tongue, are acquainted with this ſignification. I have heard ſome young Dutch gentlemen make a great many jeſts on the ſermon of a Monk, who preached at Spa. His ſubject was the importance of ſalvation; he ſhewed them, that it was the grand *affaire* of man, the *affaire*, by way of excellence; and reckoning up all the ways of ſin, he ſhewed, that they ruined their *affaire*: *gentlemen and ladies,* ſaid he. *take heed to yourſelves, if you do this, or that, you will ſpoil your* affair. The too frequent repetition of this term led ſeveral of his hearers into the groſs and burleſque ſenſe of the word *affaire*; ſo that it became the ſubject of jeſt for a long time. We read in the Chevræana (53), ‘ that a gentleman, coming to wait on a prince, to thank him for his kindneſs in recommending his intereſts to a lady of great virtue, expreſſed himſelf thus; *That it was happy for him, that his highneſs had got his affair*

(c) Veſper & Eoæ novere Lycorida terræ. - - - *Ovid. lib. iii, ver.* 537, *de Arte Amandi.*

(44) The New Dialogues of the Dead, Part. II, pag. m. 28.

(45) You will find the Latin lines in Martial, *lib. xi, epigr. XXI.* Conſult alſo the article of the firſt GLAPHYRA, remark [*C*].

(46) Thus this author calls Cytheris.

(47) See the article FULVIA, remark [*L*], citat. (81).

(48) Cicero, Philipic. II, cap. xxxi.

(49) At the 121ſt page of the Holland edition.

(50) Horat. Sat. II, lib. i, ver. 98.

(51) See, above, in citat. (48), what is wanting here.

(52) Valeſiana, pag. 121.

(53) Chevræana, Part. I, pag. 57, Edit. Holland.

*‘ to paſs thro’ the channel of Madam * * *.’* The whole company burſt out a laughing. I have another remark to make againſt Valeſius. In Horace’s verſes, quoted by him, the word *res* ought to ſignify, in general, *merchandiſe*: the Poet does not confine himſelf to that part which Valeſius names in Latin; but extends to all the reſt, which the clothes cover. The preceding and following words manifeſt this ſenſe. Here are thoſe that follow.

Altera, nil obſtat: Cois tibi pœne videre eſt
Ut nudam: ne crure malo, ne ſit pede turpi:
Metiri poſſis oculo latus: an tibi mavis
Inſidias fieri pretiumque avellier, ante
Quam MERCEM oſtendi?

With Catia, ’tis not ſo: ſhe ſtands confeſt;
The ſilken garb permits the curious eye
To pry, and meaſure each minute defect.
You wou’d not, ſurely, buy a pig in poke,
And pay the price before you ſee the goods.

I believe then, that they, who gave Marc Antony’s words ſuch a malicious turn, had at leaſt as much regard to Scaliger’s ſenſe, as to Valeſius’s: and as it is the nature of ſcandal to rub the ſoreſt part, I do not doubt but it was meant by Marc Antony, with reſpect to his miſtreſs the Comedian Cytheris, rather than his wife; for ſince he promiſes, in his letter, to part with his Comedian, it is a ſign that the Roman people were ſtill perſuaded he ſaw her. Thus you have the whole commentary belonging to the text of this remark.

LYCURGUS, the legiſlator of Lacedæmon, lived I know not when. The diverſity of opinions is too great and too perplexed upon this head (*a*), to fix upon any thing certain. He gave extraordinary proofs of his generoſity, by the care he took to ſecure the crown to the perſon who had the rightful title to it, when he might have eaſily ſeized it himſelf, had he taken advantage of the occaſions offered him (*b*). You will find this in Moreri’s Dictionary, with ſeveral other facts, which I avoid repeating. I ſhall inſiſt upon one thing, which this author has not touched. Lycurgus’s regulations againſt luxury are moſt admirable. He wiſely judged, that the way to prevent the degeneracy of the courage of the Lacedæmonians, was to keep them from pleaſure; and that, to this end, he ought to baniſh from among them all thoughts of growing rich, and deprive them of all opportunities of it. His method of training up their children was very proper to make them good ſoldiers; but he carried it too far, ſince he would have the young girls perform the ſame exerciſes as the boys, and dance naked before them, ridiculing, or praiſing them, according as they acquitted themſelves [*A*]. Note, that the boys danced naked before them. Was not this the way to make both ſexes impudent? And is it any wonder after this, that Lacedæmonian girls had ſo bad a character [*B*]. I queſtion whether he judged right in ſaying, that theſe practices would excite

(*a*) *See Scaliger,* Animadverſ. in Euſebium, n. 1132, pag. 63.

(*b*) See Plutarch in the Life of Lycurgus.

[*A*] *He would have the young girls perform the ſame exerciſes as the boys, and dance naked before them.*] I ſhall cite Plutarch’s words (1). ‘He (2) looked upon the education of children as the greateſt and moſt important affair of a legiſlator, and therefore made an early proviſion for it, by regulating whatever concerned marriages and births; for we muſt not believe what Ariſtotle ſays, that, having endeavoured to regulate, and reform the women, he gave it over, finding it impoſſible to reſtrain their unbridled licentiouſneſs, and the too great aſcendant they had got over their huſbands, who, by reaſon of their frequent warlike expeditions, were obliged to leave them to their own conduct, and, to prevent their abuſing this liberty, were forced to flatter them, and ſooth them, by calling them their ladies and miſtreſſes. On the contrary, he took all the care of them that was poſſible. In effect, whilſt they were maids, he hardened their bodies, by exerciſing them at running, wreſtling, pitching the coit, and darting the javelin, that the fruit they ſhould afterwards conceive, finding a ſtrong and vigorous body, might take ſtronger root in it, and that they themſelves, made robuſt by theſe exerciſes, might, with greater eaſe, ſtrength, and courage, undergo the pains of child-birth. To retrench all kind of delicacy, and effeminacy, he accuſtomed them to appear ſtark-naked in public, and dance in that poſture at ſolemn feaſts, ſinging witty ſongs, in which they ſeaſonably intermixed ſome ſharp touches of raillery on thoſe, who had done amiſs, and praiſe to ſuch as had acquitted themſelves worthily. By this means, they fired the youth with the love of glory and virtue, and kindled in them a noble emulation. For he, whoſe brave actions were ſo much extolled, and who ſaw his name celebrated by theſe young laſſes, returned proud of the praiſes he had received, whilſt their ſcoffs and railleries touched the undeſerving more ſenſibly, than the ſevereſt remonſtrances and harſheſt corrections; the more, as all this paſſed in the preſence of the whole body of the people, citizens, ſenate, and even the kings themſelves.’

[*B*] *Is it any wonder after this, that the Lacedæmonian maids had a bad character.*] They were called *bare-buttocks*, and furious for a male: ſlanders, which, by Plutarch’s own confeſſion, were founded on the too great liberty Lycurgus allowed them. I ſpeak thus of Plutarch, becauſe he has made an apology for that great legiſlator on this head; Ἡ δὲ γύμνωσις *ſays he,* (3) τῶν παρθένων οὐδὲν αἰσχρὸν εἶχεν αἰδοῦς μὲν παρούσης, ἀκρασίας δὲ ἀπούσης· ἀλλ’ ἐθισμὸν ἀφελῆ καὶ ζῆλον εὐεξίας ἐνειργάζετο, καὶ φρόνημα τὸ θῆλυ παρέγευεν ἐκ ἀγεννοῦς, ὡς μηδὲν ἧττον αὐτῷ καὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας μετουσίαν οὖσαν. That is, *And as to thoſe laſſes, who ſhewed themſelves thus ſtark naked, there was nothing ſhameful in it, Sparta being the throne of modeſty* (4), *and diſſoluteneſs not ſo much as known there. This did only accuſtom them to a ſimplicity of manners, gave them a wonderful emulation, who ſhould have the ſtrongeſt and robuſteſt conſtitution of body, and at the ſame time raiſe their courage, by letting them underſtand, that they ought to participate in glory with the men, and aſpire to the ſame principles of honour and virtue.* Plutarch, forgetting this apology, thirty pages after, confeſſes, that Numa Pompilius acted much wiſer, in reſtrainig maids to the decency of their ſex, and that the liberties Lycurgus allowed, expoſed them to poetical ſatires. Ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον ἡ περὶ τας παρθένους φυλακὴ καθέςαλται τῷ Νουμᾷ πρὸς τὸ θῆλυ καὶ κόσμιον. ἡ δὲ τοῦ Λυκούργου, παντάπασιν ἀναπεπταμένη καὶ θῆλυς ἐσα, τοῖς ποιηταῖς λόγον παρέσχησε. Φαινομηρίδας τε γὰρ αὐτὰς ἀποκαλοῦσιν, ὡς Ἴβυκος. καὶ ἀνδρομανεῖς λοιδοροῦσιν, ὡς Εὐριπίδης. *Præterea curam puellarum reſtrinxit ad pudorem muliebrem & verecundiam Numa arctius: Lycurgi ſoluta prorſus & fluxa in jocos incurrit poëtarum.* φαινομηρίδας *enim vocant eas, velut Ibicus,* quòd inceſſu coxas retegerent: & ἀνδρομανεῖς, quaſi viroſas & in viros inſano ardentes amore, ut Euripides (5). The two verſes of Euripides cited by Plutarch, do not ſufficiently prove my aſſertion. I ſhall therefore ſet down that paſſage of this Poet at length, by which we ſhall ſee, that the appearing naked, and exerciſing promiſcuouſly with the boys, was reckoned the true cauſe of the immodeſty of the Lacedæmonian maids.

- - - - - (6) Οὐδ’ ἂν εἰ βούλοιτό τις,
Σώφρων γένοιτο Σπαρτιατίδων κόρη,
Ἃι ξὺν νέοισιν ἐξερημοῦσαι (7) δόμους,
Γυμνοῖσι μηροῖς καὶ πέπλοις ἀνειμένοις,
Δρόμους παλαίςρας τ’ οὐκ ἀνασχετοὺς ἐμοὶ,

Κοινὰς

(1) In Lycurgo, pag m. 47.

(2) That is Lycurgus.

(3) In Lycurgo, pag. 48.

(4) I believe Plutarch only means that the nakedneſs of theſe girls did not exclude modeſty, and was not attended with wanton paſſions.

(5) Plutarch. in Parall. Lycurgi & Numæ Pompilii, pag. 76.

(6) Euripides, in Andromacha, ver. 595, pag. m. 519.

(7) In Plutarch, *Parall. Lycurgi & Numæ, pag,* 76, there is ἐξερημοῦσιν, which the tranſlator has ill rendered by *vaſtant*; for the Poet does not mean, that they plunder the houſe, but that they go out of it, that they forſake it.

excite the young folks to marry [*C*]. The great deſire he had to have ſtrong bodied Spartans induced him to make ſome regulations about marriage, which deſerve to be condemned

Κοινὰς ἔχουσι· κᾆτα θαυμάζειν χρεὼν,
Εἰ μὴ γυναῖκας σώφρονας παιδεύετε.

- - - - - Neque ſi velit aliqua,
Puella Spartana, poſſit eſſe caſta:
Quæ relinquentes domos, cum juvenibus
Nudis femoribus, & tunicis laxatis,
Curſus, & palæſtras non tolerandas mihi,
Communes habent, deinde an mirari oportet,
Si non educatis mulieres caſtas.

The readers will not be diſpleaſed to find here the tranſlation of this paſſage of Plutarch. ‘The carriage of maids, who were married according to the ordinance of Numa, was ſtricter and more becoming the honour of the ſex; that of Lycurgus, being too free and licentious, occaſioned ſatires upon them, and ſcandalous nick-names. Ibycus calls them Phænomeridas, that is to ſay, bare buttocks; and Andromanes, that is to ſay, mad for man; and Euripides ſays alſo of them,

In vain the Spartan virgin would be chaſt:
With flowing robe, and naked limbs expos'd,
They mix with boys in exerciſe robuſt:
And is it ſtrange a Spartan woman's lewd?

‘And indeed the ſkirts of their petticoats were not tacked at bottom, ſo that, as they walked, they ſhewed their naked thighs; which Sophocles very plainly declares in theſe verſes:

You ſing the maſculine Hermione
Whoſe op'ning coats diſcloſe her naked thighs.

‘However, they ſay, they were daring, maſculine, and ſtout, even to their huſbands themſelves in the firſt place (8).’ We need not wonder at Euripides's ſaying, that it was impoſſible for the women of Lacedæmon to be honeſt with ſuch an education. Maids thus dreſſed, who went abroad with the young fellows, had their ears accuſtomed betimes to all kind of obſcene language. Such converſation muſt needs have been a ſchool of impudence; I leave you to judge, whether young fellows, who, leſt they ſhould be thought ſtupid (9), imagine they muſt do more than cuſtom permits, ever let their hands or tongues reſt in the company of ſuch maids. Beſides that, they were allowed to diſcover their nakedneſs, only in order to get a huſband; for when once they were married, they covered themſelves decently. This we learn from Plutarch. Πυνθανομένου δέ τινος διὰ τί τὰς μὲν κόρας ἀκαλύπτους, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας ἐγκεκαλυμμένας εἰς τοὐμφανὲς ἄγουσιν, Ὅτι (ἔφη) τὰς μὲν κόρας, ἄνδρας εὑρεῖν δεῖ, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας, σώζειν τοὺς ἔχοντας. *Quærenti cur Spartani virgines detectas, mulieres velatas in publicum emitterent; Quia, inquit, virginibus quærendi ſunt viri, mulieribus opera danda ut ſervent maritos* (10). I paſs over this touch of Martial,

Aut libidinoſæ Ledæas Lacedæmonis paleſtras (11).

I have a ſtronger proof than the obloquy of the Poets. The Lacedæmonians being employed for ten years in a ſiege, and being called home by the complaints of their wives, who could not bear ſo long a widowhood (12), ſent back to Lacedæmon the youngeſt of their ſoldiers, and gave them leave to lie indifferently with as many of their wives as they pleaſed. Theſe youths were very well received; an evident ſign, that the women of Lacedæmon had no virtue. The children, that ſprung from theſe embraces, ſounded a colony at Tarentum. Not one of them knew who was his father. ‘Itaque legunt juvenes ex eo genere militum, qui poſt jusjurandum in ſupplementum venerant, quibus Spartam remiſſis promiſcuos omnium ſœminarum concubitus permiſere; maturiorem futuram conceptionem rati, ſi eam ſingulæ per plures viros experientur. Ex his nati, ob notam materni pudoris, Partheniæ vocati. Qui cum ad annos xxx perveniſſent, metu inopiæ (nulli enim pater exiſtebat, &c (13).’ I do not take notice here of the laſcivious impudence theſe girls might have contracted, by ſeeing the boys naked, becauſe I am to ſpeak of it in the following remark.

A father of the church, amongſt other enormities, reproaches the oracle of Apollo with it's praiſing the Lacedæmonian women; women, adds he, who ſatisfied nature with whatever man they liked. Οὗτος καὶ τὰς Λακεδαιμονίων ἐπαινεῖ γυναῖκας ἀδέως οἷς ἂν ἐθέλωσι μιγνυμένας. *Hic idem & Lacænas mulieres laudat, licenter ſe cum quibuſlibet viris commiſcentes* (14).

[*C*] *He pretended, that theſe practices would excite the young folks to marry.*] We learn from Plutarch that Lycurgus preſcribed this kind of education, and ordered the maids to appear naked, that they might excite love in the young men. Ἦν μὲν οὖν καὶ ταῦτα παρορμητικὰ πρὸς γάμον. λέγω δὲ τὰς πομπὰς τῶν παρθένων. καὶ τὰς ἀποδύσεις, καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐν ὄψει τῶν νέων, ἀγομένων οὐ γεωμετρικαῖς, ἀλλ' ἐρωτικαῖς (ὥς φησὶν ὁ Πλάτων) ἀνάγκαις. Et quanquam hi quoque ad nuptias erant ſtimuli, pompas dico virginum veſtium detractionem, certamina, quæ inſpectantibus adoleſcentibus peragebant, non geometricis ſed amatoriis (ut ait Plato) coactibus (15). —— *It was moreover*, ſays he, *an attractive to marriage; I ſpeak of thoſe dances and wreſtlings, in which the young maids, thus naked, exerciſed themſelves before the young men, who were drawn, as Plato ſays, not by a geometrical neceſſity, but by one much ſtronger, and which proceeds from the force of love.* Lycurgus conſidered perhaps, that the number of beautiful women, being generally very ſmall, in compariſon of thoſe, who are otherwiſe; and they, who are not handſome, very often receiving from nature a notable recompence in the parts concealed, it was thought neceſſary to give the girls an opportunity of diſplaying all their charms. Probably he believed, they, who could not kindle love by a handſome face, might happen to diſcover charms elſewhere to touch the heart of ſome young man. See, in Athenæus, the good fortune of two country-women, who cauſed a temple to be built (16). On the the other hand, the young fellows, who were clumſy, and againſt whom the maids let fly their ſcornful railleries, might, by the help of their nakedneſs, prevail, and ſubdue the heart of a laſs, without the aſſiſtance of any higher ſtar, by Juvenal's favour.

- - - - fatum eſt & partibus illis
Quas ſinus abſcondit, nam ſi tibi ſidera ceſſent,
Nil faciet, &c (17).

Even in the parts conceal'd a fate appears,
And nothing's to be done without the ſtars.

Thus they found out a counterbalance to deformity, and ordered it ſo, that no one ſhould eſcape the darts of love, or complain of being prejudiced in his market, by not having the liberty of ſeeing the commodity he was to buy. But was not this to introduce into common life, where modeſty ought to reign, the pretended advantage of the ſtews, ſo much celebrated by Horace?

Regibus hic mos eſt, ubi equos mercantur, apertos
Inſpiciunt: ne, ſi facies (ut ſæpè) decora
Molli fulta pede eſt, emtorem inducat hiantem,
Quòd pulchræ clunes, breve quòd caput, ardua cervix.
Hoc illi rectè, ne corporis optima Lynceis
Contemplêre oculis: Hypſeâ cæcior, illa,
Quæ mala ſunt, ſpectes: ô crus, ô brachia, verùm
Depygis, naſuta, brevi latere, ac pede longo eſt.
Matronæ præter faciem nil cernere poſſis,
Cætera, ni Catia eſt, demiſsâ veſte tegentis.
Si interdicta petes, vallo circumdata (nam te
Hoc facit inſanum) multæ tibi tùm officient res:
Cuſtodes, lectica, Ciniflones, paraſitæ,
Ad talos ſtola demiſsâ, & circumdata palla,

(8) Τῷ γὰρ ὄντι τοῦ παρθενικοῦ χιτῶνος αἱ πτέρυγες οὐκ ἦσαν ἀνεῤῥαμμέναι κάτωθεν, ἀλλ' ἀνεπτύσσοντο καὶ συνανεγύμνουν ὅλον ἐν τῷ βαδίζειν τὸν μηρόν· καὶ σαφέστατα τὸ γινόμενον εἴρηκεν Σοφοκλῆς ἐν τούτοις. Καὶ τὰν νεοργὸν ἄσετ' ἄστολος χιτὼν θυραῖον ἀμφὶ μηρὸν, πτύσσεται Ἑρμιόναν· διὸ καὶ θρασύτεραι λέγονται γίνεσθαι καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πρῶτον ἀνδρώδεις τοὺς ἄνδρας. Sane virginum tunicæ imæ non habebant pinnas conſutas, ſed explicabantur, & toto inceſſu aperiebant femur: id quod clariſſime hiſce verſibus oſtendit Sophocles: *Stola caret, tunicam induens Hermione Dilabidam retegit femur juvencula.* Unde procaciores dicuntur fuiſſe, & primum adverſus ipſos viriles viros. *Plutarch. in Parall. Lycurgi & Numæ Pompilii, pag.* 77.

(9) M. M... went into Bretany with the marchioneſs of Lavardin, to pay a viſit to Madame de Sevigny. He was in the marchioneſs's coach, and upon the road, *per non parer troppo coglione*, not to appear too inſipid, uſed ſeveral flattering expreſſions to her, and took her hands to kiſs them. The marchioneſs ſaid to him ſmiling, Sir, you are practiſing them for Madame de S....? *Menagiana, pag.* 378, *Dutch Edit.*

(10) Plutarch. in Apophth. Lacon. pag 232.

(11) Epigr. lv, lib. iv.

(12) Cum .... querelis uxorum poſt tam longam viduitatem revocarentur. *Juſtin. lib. iii, cap. iv.*

(13) Id. ibid.

(14) Theodor. de Græc. affect. Serm. X, pag. 630.

(15) Plutarch. in Lycurgo, pag. 48.

(16) To Venus with the lovely buttocks Καλλιπύγῳ Ἀφροδίτῃ *Athen. lib xii, ſub fin.* Coſtar has related this paſſage with ſeveral alterations, as we ſhall ſhew perhaps in ſome article or other.

(17) Juven. Sat. IX, ver. 32.

condemned. He would have the huſbands not approach their wives but by ſtealth, and riſe from this table with an appetite [*D*]. Let that paſs; but as for old men, who had young wives, he ſuffered them to impart them to handſome young men [*E*], and allowed the

Plurima, quæ invideant purè apparere tibi rem.
Altera, nil obſtat: Cois tibi penè videre eſt
Ut nudam: ne crure malo, ne ſit pede turpi:
Metiri poſſis oculo latus; an tibi mavis
Inſidias fieri, pretiumpue avellier ante,
Quàm mercem oſtendi - - - - - - (18)?

Great men, who purchaſe courſers for the race,
View well each ſteed, leſt, beauteous to the eye,
It prove at length a jade. The caution's good.
Dwell not on beauties with an eagle's eye,
And, blinder than a beetle, paſs o'er faults:
What legs, and arms! True, but her ſhape's too ſhort;
Her noſe, and foot, too long: a matron ſhews,
Nought but her face, the reſt her dreſs conceals.
If parts forbidden you deſire to view,
A thouſand things obſtruct the curious eye:
The envious litter, and ſurrounding guards,
The flowing robe, and garment girt forbid,
Too nice inſpection of the modeſt fair.
With Catia *'tis not ſo: ſhe ſtands confeſt;*
The ſilken robe permits the curious eye
To ſcan and meaſure each minute defect.
You wou'd not, ſurely, buy a pig in poke,
And pay the price, before you ſee the goods.

Was it not begetting in theſe girls the impudence of the eye, which is worſe than that of the ear? It was a means, ſay they, of blunting the edge of a curioſity, which is very keen. But this pretended reaſon has not hindered civilized nations from inſtilling into the ſex a horror for nudities even in a picture; and here is a legiſlator of Lacedæmon, who permits young girls to view nudities in the original. He ſhould be ſent to the ſchool of the Romans.

Nil dictu fœdum viſuque hæc limina tangat,
Intra quæ puer eſt (19). - - - - - -

Far hence be objects and ev'n words obſcene,
Where youth reſides - - - - -

The curioſity I ſpeak of has been delicately touched by Mr de la Bruyere: 'Every one knows that long bank, which bounds and ſhuts in the channel of the Seine, on that ſide where it enters Paris along with the Marne, which it has but newly received. Men bathe themſelves here during the dog-days; people ſee them, at a good diſtance, throw themſelves into the water, and ſee them come out again; it is an amuſement; before this ſeaſon's come, the women of the city never walk out that way; and when it is paſt, they quit that walk (20).' Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus praiſes the Romans for having conſtantly made the champions wear girdles: ancient Greece did the ſame; he proves it from ſome paſſages of Homer, and ſays, that the Lacedæmonians were the firſt, who aboliſhed this wiſe cuſtom; and he names the Lacedæmonian, who firſt appeared naked at the Olympic games, in the fifteenth Olympiad (21). It is a remark, which leaves a blot upon that nation. We muſt add, that the wreſtlers appearing naked was doubtleſs the cauſe of making laws which condemned all the women, who had the curioſity or confidence to be ſpectators at the Olympic games, to be thrown headlong from the top of a rock (22).

[*D*] *He would have husbands not approach their wives, but by ſtealth, and that they ſhould riſe from this table with an appetite.*] Thus Plutarch ſpeaks. 'When they had a mind to marry, their courtſhip was a ſort of rape upon the perſons whom they had a fancy for, and thoſe they choſe were neither too little nor too young, but in the flower of their age, and full ripe for a husband: after this, ſhe, who managed the wedding, came and ſhaved cloſe the hair of the bride, dreſſed her up compleatly in man's clothes, and laid her upon a matreſs; this done, in came the bridegroom, in his every day cloaths, ſober and compoſed, as having ſupped at his ordinary, and ſtole in as privately as he could into the room where the bride lay, untied her virgin zone, and took her into his embraces; and ſo having ſtayed ſome time together, he returned as ſecretly as he could to his apartment with the reſt of his comrades, with whom he ſpent all the day and good part of the night too, unleſs he ſtole a ſhort viſit to his bride, and that with a great deal of circumſpection and fear of being diſcovered; nor was ſhe wanting (as may be ſuppoſed) on her part, to uſe her woman's wit in watching the moſt favourable opportunities for their meeting and making appointments, when company was moſt out of the way. In this manner they lived a long time inſomuch that they frequently had children by their wives, before ever they ſaw their faces by day-light. Their interview being thus difficult and rare, ſerved not only for a continual exerciſe of their temperance, and furthered very much the ends and intention of marriage; but beſides, theſe ſhort abſences kept their paſſion ſtill alive, which *flaggs*, and *decays*, and *dies* at laſt by too eaſy acceſs and long continuance with the beloved object; they always parted with regret, contriving when they ſhould come together again, and thought minutes hours till the next meeting (23).' Modern authors have deſcanted upon this order and here is what Lewis Guyon ſays of it (24). 'Lycurgus the legiſlator of Lacedæmon, willing and deſiring that the married couple ſhould receive a perfect and laſting pleaſure and ſatisfaction in marriage, and beget robuſt children, forbad the husband and wife to lie together; but, if they met by day in ſome ſecret place, then to embrace; for a ſhort pleaſure, and a little at a time, is beſt reliſhed; by this means the married pair are kept in heart, and even rendred more brisk and gay; whereas their lying conſtantly together makes the wife ſlighted, and other women deſired, and, which is commonly ſeen, makes the woman deſirous of another man: ſo that intermitting their matrimonial converſation ſerved to reinvigorate their love. And for this cauſe, the boys and girls, begot in theſe marriages, were ſtrong and luſty; whereas they, who abuſe the the female commerce, often beget maimed or weak children (25). In the mean time, he ordered, that children who diſobeyed their fathers and mothers, ſhould be put into a ſack, and caſt into the ſea (26).

[*E*] *As for old men, who had young wives, he ſuffered them to impart them to handſome young men.*] Plutarch continues his narration thus (27). 'Having thus ſet modeſty as a centinel over the marriage-bed, he next bethought himſelf of a remedy for that wild and womaniſh paſſion, jealouſy: and this he thought the beſt expedient; to allow men the freedom of imparting the uſe of their wives to thoſe, whom they ſhould think fit, that ſo they might have children by them; and this he would needs make a very commendable piece of liberality, and laughed at thoſe, who think the violation of their bed ſuch an inſupportable affront, that they revenge it by murthers often, and ſometimes by cruel wars. Lycurgus thought a man not to be blamed, who, being advanced in years, and having a young wife, ſhould recommend ſome virtuous handſome young man, that ſhe might have a child by him, who might inherit the good qualities of ſuch a father; and this child the good man loved as tenderly as if he had been of his own begetting: on the other ſide, an honeſt man, who had a love for a married woman upon the account of her modeſty, and the well favouredneſs of her children, might, without formality, beg of her husband a night's lodging, that he might have a ſlip of ſo goodly a tree, which he might tranſplant into his own garden. And indeed, Lycurgus was perſuaded, that children were not ſo much the property of their parents, as of the whole commonwealth. And therefore he would not have them begot by firſt comers, but

'by

(18) Horat. Sat. II, lib. i, ver. 85.

(19) Juvenal, Sat. XIV, ver. 44.

(20) La Bruyere, Caractères ou Mœurs de ce Siecle, pag. 268, 269, *eighth Edit. of Paris*, 1694.

(21) Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib. vii, cap. lxvi.

(22) Pauſan. lib. v, cap. vi.

(23) Plutarch, in Lycurgo.

(24) Lewis Guyon, Diverſes Leçons, Tom. III, pag. 551.

(25) Compare what Joubert ſays above, at the article HERLICIUS, remark [*H*], citat. (24) and (25).

(26) I do not remember I have ever read this law of Lycurgus.

(27) Plutarch. ibid.

the latter to beget children for a neighbour, upon agreeing with the huſbands. This was all wrong; it was authorizing adultery, and even making the huſbands pimps to their wives. From the ſame policy came the barbarous law againſt infants, who at their birth did not promiſe a robuſt body, and good ſhape. Lycurgus would have them made away with [*F*]. Was not this a cruel injuſtice? The impious Vanini would not have agreed to it (*c*). Lycurgus's laws are liable to cenſure in other points (*d*). But one there is, in which he is more to be commended than Numa Pompilius: it is that of not permitting maids to marry too young [*G*]. Ariſtotle deſcants largely on this head, and it is eaſy to

by the beſt men that could be found: the laws of other nations ſeemed to him very defective and incongruous, they were very ſollicitous about the breed of their dogs and horſes, and ſent a great way, and were at no ſmall charges to get the beſt ſtallions; and yet kept their wives under lock and key, for fear of other men, whereas themſelves were crazy, old, or infirm, and more fit to propagate diſeaſes than their ſpecies: if they had made the leaſt reflexion in the world, they would have taken notice, that the honour and diſhonour of children (who generally derive their good or ill qualities from thoſe that beget them) doth chiefly redound to thoſe, who have the charge of their education; and if they prove ill, they firſt feel the ſmart of it.'

The baniſhing jealouſy from a married ſtate is doubtleſs delivering it from a great plague; yet Lycurgus was much to blame in healing it by a remedy worſe than the diſeaſe. It is at bottom but a phyſical evil, which has it's uſes in the world (28); for it contributes more than is imagined to the preſervation of modeſty, and the preventing infinite ſcandals, whereas lewdneſs and adultery are moral evils. Now, according to good morality, a phyſical evil ought never to be remedied by a crime. Mr Dacier (29) juſtly blames Lycurgus *for ſacrificing all ſort of honour and decorum to chimerical notions of the public utility, as if what was ſhameful could ever be uſeful.* It may even be ſaid, that this great legiſlator baniſhed all ſort of good breeding, by permitting the women to grow impudent; for it is certain, if the fair ſex preſerved not the modeſty and honour, which is kept up in civilized nations, mankind would univerſally ſink into a filthy and brutal leudneſs.

For the reſt, Plutarch pretends, that Numa Pompilius in ſome meaſure imitated Lycurgus. 'By the community of women and children, *ſays he* (30), they both deſigned to baniſh from marriage all kind of jealouſy; but they did not purſue the ſame methods, for the Roman huſband, who had children enough and deſired no more, gave his wife to him that had none, and who deſired her of him; and he was at liberty, either to leave her with this ſecond huſband or take her again. Whereas the Lacedæmonian, when any one deſired his wife to have children by her, lent her without quitting her, and his marriage ſtill continued undiſſolved; and very often, as we have ſaid, if he ſaw a handſome man, from whom he might expect a good and generous race, he intreated him to get him children, and conducted him to his wife. *Mr Dacier's marginal note deſerves to be ſet down.* This is true of Lycurgus, *ſays he*, but it no where appears, that Numa had the ſame deſign; and it were eaſy to prove, that this community of women began not at Rome, under Numa, but much later, and that it was not general.' To be ſatisfied of this, we need no other witneſs than Plutarch himſelf. See the diſcourſe he puts into Hortenſius's mouth. I have mentioned it elſewhere (31). Bodin, whom I have confuted, is ignorant of what Plutarch imputes to Numa; if he had known it, his criticiſms would not have ſo much deſerved to be criticiſed. It is difficult for an author, who has written ſo many books as Plutarch, not to contradict himſelf frequently.

[*F*] *Children, who did not promiſe . . . to be . . . robuſt, Lycurgus would have them made away with.*] 'Nor was it in the power of the father to diſpoſe of the child as he thought fit, but he was obliged to bring it before the examiners, who were ſome of the graveſt men of the tribe to which the child belonged: their buſineſs was carefully to view the infant, and, if they found it luſty and well-favoured, they gave order for it's education, and allotted it one of the nine thouſand ſhares of land abovementioned for it's maintenance; but if they found it deformed, and of an ill complexion, they ordered it to be caſt into a deep cavern in the earth, near the mountain Taygetus, as thinking it neither for the good of the child itſelf, nor for the public intereſt, that it ſhould be brought up, ſince nature had denied it the means of happineſs in it's own particular, by not giving it health nor ſtrength ſufficient to make it ſerviceable to the public: upon the ſame account the women did not bathe the new-born children with water, as is the cuſtom in all other countries, but with wine, to prove the temper and complexion of their bodies; for they had a conceit, that weakly children would fall into fits, or immediately faint, upon their being thus bathed; on the contrary, thoſe who were of a ſtrong and vigorous habit, would acquire a greater degree of firmneſs by it, and get a temper in proportion, like ſteel in the quenching (32).'

[*G*] *He did not allow maids to marry too young.*] Let us hear Plutarch. 'Now the time which both (33) ordained, either in relation to virgins or married women, were anſwerable to the manner of their education: for Lycurgus eſteeming the procreation of children to be the principal end of marriage, would fix no ſet term of age, when men or women ſhould be eſteemed capable of giving their conſents to each other in marriage; for he thought that nature, being the principle guide in that matter, ſhould not be reſtrained with violence, which produces hatred and fear; but rather being gently indulged, when youth, and love, and kindneſs, move, the coition might be more ſatisfactory, and conſequently the children become more robuſt, ſtrong, and healthful (34). But the Romans, deſigning, in the firſt place, to deliver the bodies of their daughters pure and undefiled into the embraces and poſſeſſion of the huſband, made it lawful for fathers to marry their daughters at twelve years of age, or under: which firſt way of Lycurgus ſeems more agreeable to the deſires of nature, which only reſpects the procreation of children; but the other is better adapted to make a conjugal life comfortable, and calculated for the rules of moral living.'

The diſtinction Plutarch here makes between the two legiſlators does not ſeem juſt, nor obliging to the ſex. This author diſcovers in Lycurgus's laws a phyſical, and in thoſe of Numa a moral good. Is not this inſinuating that, after the age of twelve, a man has reaſon to ſuſpect in his conſort the want of purity both in mind and in body (35)? Is not this a ſatire on the fair ſex? He ſhould have given all the advantage to the laws of Lacedæmon; for thoſe of the Romans were, on one hand, very apt to ſpoil morality, and, on the other, prejudicial to the ſtrength of the children, and the lives of the mothers. Ariſtotle gives upon this topic ſome well argued precepts. He would not (36) have maids marry till eighteen, nor men till thirty ſeven. He obſerves, that the inhabitants of all the towns, where marriages are contracted too early, are infirm and ſmall of ſtature, and that immature marriages make the child-bed the death-bed of ſeveral women. He mentions 'a famous oracular anſwer given to the Trezenians, the meaning whereof was, that they died becauſe they eat their fruits too green, and which was interpreted, as if the oracle had ſaid, that they died becauſe they married too young, and not becauſe they gathered their fruits before they were ripe (37).' Ariſtotle obſerves, that children, who are not much younger than thoſe who gave them being, have but little reſpect for them, from whence ariſe innumerable domeſtic jars. This is one moral inconvenience: he touches on another of the ſame claſs, which concerns chaſtity. Ἔτι δὲ καὶ πρὸς σωφροσύνην συμφέρει τὰς ἐκδόσεις ποιεῖσθαι πρεσβυτέραις. ἀκολαστότεραι γὰρ εἶναι δοκοῦσι νέαι

(*c*) *See the article* DEJOTARUS, *remark* [*F*].

(*d*) *See the remarks of Mr Dacier, on the Life of Lycurgus, which he has tranſlated from the Greek of Plutarch.*

(28) See the *New Letters againſt Maimbourg's Calviniſm*, pag. 557, and the following.

(29) Remarques ſur la Vie de Lycurgue, pag. 289.

(30) In Parall. Lycurgi & Numæ, pag. 76.

(31) In the article HORTENSIUS, citation (52).

(32) Plut. in Lycurgo, p. 49. Mr Dacier, in his remarks on this place, produces a paſſage from the eighth book of Ariſtotle's *Politics*, in which this *deteſtable law* of Lycurgus is approved.

(33) *That is, Lycurgus and Numa.*

(34) Τοῦ μὲν Λυκούργου πεπείρους καὶ ὀργώσας νυμφεύοντος, ὅπως ἥτε ὁμιλία δεομένης ἤδη τῆς φύσεως χάριτος ᾖ καὶ φιλίας ἀρχὴ μᾶλλον ἢ μίσους καὶ φόβου παρὰ φύσιν βιαζομένων· καὶ τὰ σώματα ῥώμην ἔχῃ πρὸς τὸ τὰς κυήσεις ἀναφέρειν καὶ τὰς ὠδῖνας, ὡς ἐπ' οὐδὲν ἄλλο γαμουμένων ἢ τὸ τῆς τεκνόσεως ἔργον. Lycurgus maturas & viri appetentes elocat, quo ea conſociatio impellente jam natura benevolentiæ & amoris potius quàm odii & timoris contra naturam coactarum eſſet ingreſſio, corporaque firmiora eſſent ad uterum ferendum atque enitendum, velut ad nihil aliud nuberent, quam ad pariendum. *Plutarch. in Numa*, *p.* 77. C.

(35) Οὕτω γὰρ ἂν μάλιστα καὶ τὸ σῶμα, καὶ τὸ ἦθος καθαρὸν καὶ ἄθικτον ἐπὶ τῷ γαμοῦντι γενέσθαι. Ita potiſſimum corpus & mores puros illibatoſque in manum viri cenſentes perventuros. *Plut. ibid.*

(36) Ariſtotel. lib. 7. de Republica. c. 16.

(37) *See Dacier*, Remarks on Numa, *p.* 411.

to judge, that his remarks are judicious, and are not very different from the motives, which induced the Greeks not to let their women be preſent at aſſemblies, where the converſation

χρησάμεναι ταῖς συνουσίαις. Præterea vero & ad temperantiam adjuvat elocare paulo ætate grandiores, videntur enim eſſe intemperantiores ac libidinoſiores eæ quæ valde puellæ rebus venereis uſæ ſunt. —— *Beſides, it conduces to temperance to marry a girl at a little more advanced age; for thoſe, who are accuſtomed to venery very young, are found to be more intemperate and luſtful.* It is the Phyſicians buſineſs to reaſon upon theſe words: but without going ſo far, and departing out of the road of converſation, every body may affirm, that an immature marriage does not ſuffer modeſty to take root deep enough. The reſpect we have for the ſex, and the care we take, not to uſe too free diſcourſes before them, is not half ſo great towards thoſe, who, either have, or have had an husband. We look upon them as initiated perſons, from whom the myſteries are not to be concealed; ſo that the maids, who are married very young, have not time to uſe themſelves to a grave exterior, which has greater influence than is imagined upon the interior. The Romans were ſo perſuaded of the ill effects of looſe diſcourſes, that they would not ſuffer the young maids (38) to be preſent at feaſts (39). They ſuppoſed their ears were ſtopped againſt obſcenity, till little boys came and unſtopped them on their wedding-day. *Pueri obſcœnis verbis novæ nuptæ aures returant* (40). Horace's advice ought to be a law every where, as well as in Lacedæmon. It is this.

Nondum ſubacta ferre jugum valet
Cervice; nondum munia comparis
Æquare, nec tauri ruentis
In venerem tolerare pondus.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - Tolle cupidinem
Immitis uvæ: jam tibi lividos
Diſtinguet autumnus racemos
Purpureo varius colore (41).

Not yet her tender neck can bear
The yoke's too preſſing weight;
Not yet ſhe can ſupport the ſteer,
Or meet in luſt her mate.
- - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - -
The grape's unripe; reſtrain this haſte,
And moderate deſire;
Soon autumn will exalt it's taſte,
And raiſe it's juices higher.

Reaſons of ſtate oblige princes to diſpenſe with this law: witneſs the conduct of Charles V towards Margaret, his natural daughter. 'She was but ten years of age 'when he promiſed her to Alexander de Medicis, in 'order to draw off Pope Clement VII from the intereſt of France; and the marriage was conſummated 'before ſhe was twelve (42).' By the way, I ſhall add, that this emperor did violence to nature in a quite contrary manner in Margaret's ſecond marriage. 'The young widow was not re-married for a long 'time, becauſe Charles, who had gained his point by 'her firſt marriage, ſought a new advantage by her 'ſecond. She deſired in vain to be given to Coſmo 'de Medicis Alexander's ſucceſſor, who ſought her 'the more importunately, becauſe thereby he would 'neither have dowry to pay, nor portion to reſtore. 'The match was agreeable: but Charles pretended to 'purchaſe by his daughter's ſecond marriage the friendſhip of Pope Paul III, as he had by the firſt that 'of Clement VII. And he beſtowed her on Octavian Farneſe, who was but twelve years of age, 'which gave occaſion to a Poet of Anjou * to make 'one of the fineſt epigrams, which has been ſeen in 'this laſt century (43).' There needs no great change in the epigram of the Menagiana, to make us believe it the ſame that Mr Varillas meant. 'I know not 'whoſe the following epigram is; but it is very elegant, 'and the ſubject finely treated.

Impubes nupſi valido, nunc firmior annis,
Ex ſucco & molli ſum ſatiata viro.
Ille fatigavit teneram, hic ætate valentem
Intactam tota nocte jacere ſinit.
Dum licuit, nolui; nunc dum volo non licet uti.
O Hymen! aut annos, aut mihi redde virum (44).

Strong was my husband, in my tender years;
Now, older grown, my bed a fumbler ſhares.
The firſt fatigu'd my tender frame too much;
This lets me ſleep all night, nor cares to touch.
I might, when I cou'd not; I may not, now I can;
Hymen! or give me years, or give me man.

Mr Menage might have read in Sammarthanus (45), that James Bouju, preſident in the parliament of Bretagne, and native of Chateauneuf in Anjou, is author of this epigram; but he ought to have corrected the *ſatiata* in the ſecond verſe, and put it *ſociata*, and have read in the fifth verſe, *dum nollem, licuit*, Mr Varillas is miſtaken in ſaying du Bois was the author. A like epigram was made in French (46). This is not my only ſupplement to the remark [G] of this article, in the ſecond edition. Here is another ſomewhat larger and which refers to the obſervation I have made upon the ill effects of free diſcourſe.

Muretus obſerves, that the antient Greeks very prudently forbad women to be preſent at feaſts; for the men being uſed to talk more freely there, it was hard for them to forbear now and then a ſmutty jeſt. They muſt therefore have offended the chaſt ears of the ſex, or, by being more reſerved, have loſt a great part of the mirth that belongs to ſuch entertainments. For theſe reaſons they introduced this cuſtom. If any woman appeared at a public feaſt, ſhe was reckoned thorough paced, and declared thereby, that ſhe was not only content to hear whatever was ſaid, but alſo to ſuffer what they pleaſed. 'Neque ulla in virorum 'ſympoſiis accumbebat mulier, niſi quæ quidvis non 'audire modo, verum etiam perpeti poſſet (47).' Muretus cites two or three paſſages. He alledges the anſwer Thais makes in Terence to the ſpark, who deſired that young Pamphila might be at the feaſt (48). He alledges what Cicero relates of Rubrius's impudence, for whom Verres had procured a lodging at Philodamus's, a burgher of Lampſacus, for a leud deſign. The burgher, one of the chief men of the place, would never ſuffer his daughter to come into the feaſt room, as Rubrius deſired. 'Poſteaquam ſatis ca'lere res Rubrio viſa eſt: Quæſo, inquit, Philodame, 'cur ad nos filiam tuam non intro vocari jubes? homo, 'qui & ſumma gravitate, & jam id ætatis, & parens 'eſſet, obſtupuit hominis improbi dicto; inſtare Ru'brius; tum ille, ut aliquid reſponderet, negavit moris 'eſſe Græcorum, ut in convivio virorum accumberent 'mulieres (49). —— *As the gueſts grew warm, ſays 'Rubrius, prithee, Philodamas, why do you not order 'your daughter to be called in? Philodamus, who was 'a grave, elderly, man, and a father, was ſurprized 'at Rubrius's unreaſonable requeſt: Rubrius perſiſted; 'then the other, by way of anſwer, ſaid, that it was 'not the cuſtom of the Greeks to admit women to their 'banquets.*' You ſee Philodamus alledges for his reaſon it's being contrary to the Grecian cuſtom. Some learned men believe that this was an invented excuſe. But Muretus oppoſes the teſtimony of a great Orator (50), and he might have confirmed it by the words of Cornelius Nepos, which are to be found above (51), and by thoſe in the tenth chapter of the ſixth book of Vitruvius. He might have urged, that, even at the court of Macedon, the princeſſes were not admitted to the feaſts given to ſtrangers, and that the complaiſance ſhewn to the king of Perſia's embaſſadors had conſequences, which proved that the refuſal of their requeſt had been more prudent; for when at their entreaty the ladies were introduced, they took ſuch liberties, as it was neceſſary to put a ſtop to with the ſword's point. 'Legati benigne excepti, inter epulas ebrietate cre'ſcente, rogant Amyntam, ut apparatui epularum ad'jiciat jus familiaritatis, adhibitis in convivium ſuis ac 'filii uxoribus, id apud Perſas haberi pignus ac fœdus 'hoſpitii. Quæ ut venerunt, petulantius Perſis eas con'trectantibus, filius Amyntæ Alexander rogat patrem, 'reſpectu ætatis ac gravitatis ſuæ abiret convivio, pol'licitus ſe hoſpitum temperaturum jocos, &c (52).

—— *The*

---

(38) Virgo de convivio abdicatur ideo quod majores noſtri virginis acerbæ aures venereis vocabulis imbui noluerunt. *Varro in Agathone, apud Nonium Marcellum, voce* acerbum, *p. m.* 247.

(39) Compare what St Cyprian ſays hereupon, article GUARINI, citat. (17).

(40) Varro ibid. apud eumdem, voce *returare*, p. m. 167.

(41) Horat. Od. V. lib. ii.

(42) Varillas, Hiſt. de François I, livr. xiii, pag. m. 387.

* Du Bois.

(43) Id. ib.

(44) Suite du Menagiana, pag. 197. Edit. of Holland.

(45) Sammarth. Elog. l. 3. p. 10. Edit. 1696: *he calls him* Bugius.

(46) You will find it in the remark [E] of the article LOYER.

(47) Muretus, Variar. Lect. lib. vii. c. ii. p. m. 990.

(48) Terent. Eunuch. Act. 4. Sc. 1.

(49) Cicero in Verrem, lib. I. cap. xxvi.

(50) *Called* Iſæus.

(51) Article HIPPARCHIA, citation (6).

(52) Juſtin. lib. vii. c. iii. p. m. 172, 173.

converſation was too free. I have ſomething to obſerve againſt the author of old and new Lacedæmon [*H*]. He is too much a gentleman to be diſturbed at it.

'—— *The embaſſadors being kindly received, and at* '*a banquet growing warm with wine, deſire Amyntas* '*to ſend for his own, and his ſon's wives to grace the* '*entertainment, and plead, that, among the Perſians,* '*it was looked on as a pledge of hoſpitality. When they* '*were introduced, the Perſians began to be too free with* '*them; whereupon Alexander, the ſon of Amyntas, de-*'*ſires his father, in reſpect to his age and dignity, to* '*leave the banquet, promiſing to reſtrain the mirth of* '*his gueſts.*' Laſtly, Muretus obſerves, that the Romans contented themſelves with forbidding maids the liberty of going to feaſts. I have in another place (53) obſerved with what ſeverity they prohibited women the uſe of wine; but, in Seneca's time, that cuſtom was loſt: their manners were ſo corrupted, that they got drunk as much as the men. 'Non mutata fœminarum 'natura, *ſays he* (54), ſed vita eſt. Nam cum virorum 'licentiam æquaverint, corporum quoque virilium vi-'tia æquaverunt. Non minus pervigilant, non minus 'potant, & oleo & mero viros provocant: æque invitis 'ingeſta viſceribus per os reddunt, & vinum omne vo-'mitu remetiuntur: æquè nivem rodunt, ſolatium ſto-'machi æſtuantis. — *The nature of women is not changed,* '*but their way of life. For, by taking the ſame liber-*'*ties as men, they have equalled their vices. They ſit* '*up as late, drink as much, and challenge the men in* '*luxury: they get drunk and ſpew, they ſwallow ſnow* '*to cool their ſtomachs, no leſs than the men.*' The change is as great in France, if we may believe travellers. They had no laws prohibiting women the uſe of wine; and yet, in the days of our fathers, they drank hardly any thing but water; but we are told that, for ſome time paſt, they indulge themſelves with the beſt wines and ſtrongeſt liquors, and it is to be feared they will fall by degrees, or even all at once, into the exceſſes of the Flemiſh girls (55). Read theſe words. 'Who would have thought that the women . . . . . 'would have added tobacco, and brandy to ſo many 'other vices they have gloried in for above thirty years 'paſt? They carry as yet but runlets of brandy at 'their ſide; who knows but that in time they will 'carry barrels?' This is what a Phyſician of Paris (56) has publiſhed in a book printed in 1696 (57). If Ovid, the eaſieſt of Caſuiſts, be the director theſe tipplers have made choice of, they ought, at leaſt, to keep within the bounds he has preſcribed; he would indeed have women drink, but not to exceſs. He diſcourages them by the threats of a puniſhment, which muſt be worſe than a bare diſgrace, otherwiſe the perſons, he ſpeaks to, would not have regarded the evil denounced as very terrible.

Aptius eſt, deceatque magis potare puellas,
    Cum Veneris puero non male, Bacche, facis.
Hoc quoque, qua patiens caput eſt; animuſque pe-
        deſque,
    Conſtent; nec, quæ ſint ſingula, bina vide.
Turpe jacens mulier multo madefacta Lyæo:
    Digna eſt concubitus quoſlibet illa pati.
Nec ſomnis poſitâ tutum ſuccumbere menſâ:
    Per ſomnos fieri multa pudenda ſolent (58).

To drink her glaſs the fair one may be free:
Bacchus and Cytherea's ſon agree.
Yet let the nymph this caution take along;
To bear the liquor, let her head be ſtrong;
Leſt mounting fumes her giddy brain ſurprize,
And double objects to her ſwimming eyes.
A drunken woman is a monſtrous thing,
Prepar'd to meet whatever chance may bring,
Her womanhood in public to diſgrace,
And ſuffer every leacher's foul embrace.
Nor let her, when the banquet's ta'en away,
Retire to ſleep; for ſlumbers oft betray
Th' unthinking fair, to acts that ſhame the day.

I have loſt ſight of my ſubject, but I ſhall come up with it again by the help of a citation, proving what I have ſaid concerning the diminution of reſpect to married woman. The chevalier d'Her . . . writing to one of his kinſwomen, who made a ſcruple of marrying clandeſtinely, expatiates upon the advantages ſhe may find in the condition of a wife, whilſt ſhe paſſes for a maid. 'You will be, Madam de la F . . . *ſays* '*he* (59), and you will be called Mademoiſelle d'Her '. . . you will ſtill be free of the charming tribe of 'maiden ladies, who will ſeem to be all like you, 'and perhaps really are. You may pretend not to 'underſtand ſome things, which indiſcreet people may 'ſay, and you will be allowed to bluſh at them. 'whereas if your marriage be once declared, you muſt 'aſſume an air ſomewhat leſs innocent, and more know-'ing; in fine, you will have a right to give yourſelf 'all the little affected airs of a meer maid; and can 'any thing be prettier? for naturally modeſty loves 'theſe little affectations; and why not? ſince it is be-'lieved ſhe commonly owes her all to them. You 'may practiſe them upon Monſieur de la F . . . him-'ſelf; you will be a demi-virgin even to him; and as 'long as you do not bear his name, you will have a 'right to be ſomewhat more coy, and more reſerved 'in your carriage to him.' Note, that he rallies her thus (60), becauſe ſhe would have 'the banns thrice 'openly and audibly publiſhed, the contract made 'in form, and a wedding afterwards, where all the 'relations might come, and talk over their fooleries (61).'

[*H*] *I have ſomething to obſerve againſt the author of Old and New Lacedæmon.*] I have only three things to object to him.

In the firſt place I could wiſh he had not attempted to apologize for the nakedneſs of the Lacedæmonian maids. Mr Dacier had a much better taſte: he openly declared againſt that cuſtom; he ſaw, that Lycurgus had ſacrificed the laws of decency, and the impreſſions of modeſty, to a falſe notion of politics.

In the ſecond place, I do not think the apology founded on good reaſons. This I am now to examine Mr Guillet's words are theſe (62): 'The Spartan 'maids danced ſtark-naked in public; and few people 'are perſuaded, that this was a modeſt ſight. Yet I 'cannot but think, that the Lacedæmonians had their 'reaſons for it, and that the thing, being very com-'mon, made no dangerous or ſinful impreſſions on 'their minds. There grows a familiarity betwixt the 'eye and the object, which diſpoſes to inſenſibility, 'and expels the foul deſires of imagination. The emo-'tion proceeds only from the novelty of the thing. A 'perpetual cuſtom cloys the eye more than it tempts; 'and if you conſider the integrity of that nation's morals, 'you will acknowledge the truth of this ſentence; *The* '*maids of Sparta were not naked; the public honeſty was* '*a covering to them.* I ſhall not ſay, that, generally 'ſpeaking, their excuſe would be any excuſe among 'us: but in ſhort, there are ſeveral countries in North 'America at this time, where the women always ap-'pear in the dreſs of theſe Spartan dancers, and yet 'our travellers affirm, that they are abſolutely exempt 'from crime. But, tho' I ſhould be ten whole years in 'pleading the cauſe of the maids of Sparta; I foreſee 'I ſhould never give you a good opinion of their 'modeſty. You will rather believe the biting ſatires of 'the Athenians, and even of Ariſtotle himſelf, who, 'as much a Macedonian as he was, had lived too 'long at Athens, to be untainted with that general 'hate, which reigned there againſt the Spartans. Ob-'ſerve what he has ſaid of the Lacedemonians in the 'ſecond book of his Politics. When Lycurgus un-'dertook to introduce conſtancy and patience into 'Sparta, it is evident, that, as to the men, he did 'ſucceed; but he was more remiſs as to the women; 'for they lived there in a general ſoftneſs and diſſolute-'neſs. He adds, that Lycurgus vainly attempted to 'reform them; in which he is contradicted by Plu-'tarch.' What we are told of this familiarity between the eye and the object, which diſpoſes to inſenſibility, is good and ſolid, generally ſpeaking, and is one of Balzac's reflexions againſt the famous ſonnet of Job. The Author of the ſonnet (63) was charged with contradicting himſelf (64); and thus they endeavoured to convict him: 'He is afraid his lady will not be 'moved by an object worthy of compaſſion, and im-'mediately after, deſires ſhe would accuſtom herſelf 'to ſee this object. Conſequently he deſires what he 'fears. The cuſtom of ſeeing, tending to cure his 'lady of all emotion, it is plain, he deſires what he 'has declared he ſhould be ſorry were the caſe.

Let

(53) Above, article EREMITA, citat. (49).

(54) Seneca, Epiſt. 95. p. m. 394.

(55) See, above, the article EREMITA, citation (55).

(56) Mr Bernier, a native of Blois.

(57) *It is intituled*, Reflexions, Penſées, & Bons Mots anecdotes, par le Sieur Pepincourt. *conſult it at p.* 83.

(58) Ovid. de arte amator. lib. iii. v, 761.

(59) Lettres du Chevalier d'Her . . . . Part 2. Lettr. 42. pag. 215. Edit. of Holland.

(60) Id. ib. pag. 213.

(61) Compare citation (17) of the article GUARINI.

(62) Lacedemone ancienne & nouvelle, p. 167, Edit. of Holl.

(63) Benſerade.

(64) *In theſe words,*
Il craint
Que vous n'en ſoiez pas emue
. . . .
Accoutumez vous à la vuë
D'un homme qui ſouffre & ſe plaint.

'Let him, if he pleaſes, reconcile this, and remember this old maxim, with which the univerſities ring; *Ab aſſuetis non fit paſſio.* The ſoul receiving the emotion only by the inlet of the eyes, when once theſe are hardened, all ſurprize ceaſes. When the eyes have once contracted an acquaintance and familiarity with the ſtrangeſt objects, theſe, how terrible ſo ever at firſt, grow tractable by degrees, and, entring the ſoul as friends, raiſe no longer any diſturbance, nor cauſe the leaſt emotion. The cuſtom of ſeeing monſters, makes them ceaſe to be ſuch to the eyes which are uſed to them. Even the ſight of ſpectres and furies, armed with their torches and ſerpents, would loſe it's force and horror, in our imaginations, by a long acquaintance with them. By a ſtronger reaſon, *&c.* (65).' But as ſolid as this doctrine may be, I queſtion whether it can be applied in our caſe, ſince the maids of Lacedæmon appeared naked only on certain ſolemn days; and, at other times, wore a habit, which only ſhewed their thighs. This was a ſure way of irritating concupiſcence, and not diſpoſing to inſenſibility by a perpetual cuſtom. Beſides, there is a great difference betwixt Lycurgus and thoſe ſavage nations. Theſe have ever gone naked; but Lycurgus introduced the cuſtom into a town, where it had not been known before, and whilſt all the neighbouring nations obſerved the rules of decency. He cannot therefore be excuſed. Laſtly, the virtue of the Americans, if what travellers ſay be true, is no juſtification of this legiſlator; for the event has ſhewn, that Lacedæmon was not a place where ſuch novelties could innocently be introduced. In vain is Ariſtotle's teſtimony attempted to be invalidated. Nothing is more grave and rational, than the book, in which this Philoſopher ſpeaks ſo ill of the Lacedæmonian women. Ὅλην γὰρ τὴν πόλιν ὁ νομοθέτης εἶναι βουλόμενος καρτερικὴν, κατὰ μὲν τοὺς ἄνδρας φανερός ἐστι τοιοῦτος ὤν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐξημέληκε. ζῶσι γὰρ ἀκολάστως πρὸς ἅπασαν ἀκολασίαν, καὶ τρυφερῶς. Nam cum totam civitatem lator legum vellet ad tolerandos & perferendos labores eſſe fortem ac robuſtam, in viris quidem perſpicue quod volebat aſſecutus eſt: in mulieribus vero negligentem ſe præbuit. Vivunt enim intemperanter & luxurioſe, ad omne ſcilicet intemperantiæ genus ſolutæ atque effuſæ (66).—*For the lawgiver being willing the whole people ſhould be ſtrong, and enured to toil, gained his point with the men, but took no care of the women; for they live intemperately and luxuriouſly.* The ſpirit of partiality does not appear in this work; ſo that, inſtead of ſaying, that the ſlanders of Poets made an impreſſion on this Philoſopher, we muſt on the contrary ſay, that his authority juſtifies their reproaches. For the reſt, it is not true, that Plutarch hath contradicted Ariſtotle in the matter in queſtion. It is plain, if we conſider it, that this Philoſopher ſpoke only of a cuſtom among the Lacedæmonian wives of governing their husbands. Lycurgus would reform this abuſe, and retrench their empire; but ſeeing no likelihood of ſucceſs, he deſiſted from his eterprize, but however made ſeveral regulations relating to the ſex, which qualified them for producing ſtrong children Τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας φασὶ μὲν ἄγειν ἐπιχειρῆσαι τὸν Λυκοῦργον ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους· ὡς δ' ἀντέκρουον, ἀποστῆναι πάλιν. *Fœminas autem ajunt Lycurgum ſub legum jugum adducere conatum, cum illæ reclamarent, & contra niterentur, ab incœpto deſtitiſſe* (67). It is on account of theſe regulations, that Plutarch has contradicted Ariſtotle; but he is fallen into the fallacy, which they call *ignoratio elenchi*; he knew not the point in queſtion. 'Lycurgus, *ſays he*, (68), at firſt regulated all that related to marriage and births; for we muſt not believe, what Ariſtotle ſays, that having attempted to regulate and reform the women, he gave it over, not being able to put a ſtop to their unbridled licentiouſneſs, and the too great authority they had uſurped over their husbands.' It is plain, that Plutarch reaſons ill; a legiſlator, who gives over the attempt of bringing the wives into ſubjection to their husbands, does not thereby abandon all care relating to the education of maids, to their marriages, *&c.* and yet Plutarch here, to ſhew that Ariſtotle had no reaſon to ſay, that Lycurgus renounced the deſign of reſtraining the power of the women, alledges the regulations of Lycurgus, which tended only to the provoking of the men to marriage, and begetting luſty children. Thouſands of ſuch fallacies might be found in Plutarch, if we took the pains to trace them. He mentions, in the following page, an anſwer, which manifeſtly ſuppoſes the truth of this fact, that the Lacedemonian husbands were governed by their wives. A ſign that Lycurgus did not reform this abuſe: Note, that Ariſtotle acknowledges, in the ſame place, that Lycurgus made laws relating to the multiplying of children. Βουλόμενος γὰρ ὁ νομοθέτης ὡς πλείστους εἶναι τοὺς Σπαρτιάτας, προάγεται τοὺς πολίτας ὅτι πλείστους ποιεῖσθαι παῖδας. Nam cum vellet lator legis quamplurimos eſſe Spartiatas, invitavit atque allexit civeis ad quamplurimos liberos procreandos (69).— *For the law-giver, willing to multiply the Spartans, invited, and inticed the citizens to get children.*

My third remark concerns theſe words of Mr Guillet. 'I venture not, *ſays he* (70), to deſcribe the habits of the maids of ancient Lacedæmon. Sophocles will acquaint you with it, if you obſerve how he has deſcribed that of Hermione, in a fragment cited by Plutarch; it was ſo ſhort, that the Poet Ibycus, laughing at them, called them Phænomerides.' It is certain, I. That we do not find, in this fragment of Sophocles, the deſcription of an habit; for this Poet only ſays, that Hermione's petticoat was ſlit from her hips downwards, and ſhewed her thighs. II. Ibycus's calling the Lacedæmonian maids Phænomerides, was not from their wearing a very ſhort habit, but from their habits being ſlit on each ſide, and ſhewing their thighs. Plutarch moſt clearly gives us this reaſon of Ibycus's raillery (71). I wonder Cragius could commit the following fault. 'Eæ *(mulieres)* inſtituto veteri veſtes ſupra genua decurtatas deferebant. Unde φαινομερίδες dictæ ſunt ab Ibyco Poëta, ut teſtatur Plutarchus, tanquam quæ ſemora nuda oſtenderint (72).—*Theſe women, following the old cuſtom, wore ſhort garments, that reached no lower than their knees. Whence they are called* naked thighs *by Ibycus the Poet, as Plutarch witneſſes.*' Can a habit which reaches only to the knees, leave the thighs naked? Do not the breeches, which men have worn for ſo many ages, prove the contrary in all the variations the faſhion paſſes through? III. It is not true, generally ſpeaking, that the Lacedæmonian habit was ſhort. The authority of Clemens Alexandrinus is ill alledged. Cragius has not taken it by the right handle. Οὐδὲ γὰρ, ſays this Father (73) ὑπὲρ γόνυ καθάπερ τὰς Λακαίνας φασὶ παρθένους ἐστολίσθαι καλὸν· οὐδὲν γὰρ μέρος ὁτιοῦν ἀπογυμνοῦσθαι γυναικὸς εὐπρεπές. That is, *It is not becoming to wear ſuch garments as reach only to the knees, as is ſaid of thoſe of the Lacedæmonian maids; for decency ſuffers not a woman to ſhew any part of her body naked.* Firſt, we ſee, Clemens Alexandrinus does not pretend that the Lacedæmonian habit expoſed the thighs; he only blames them for ſhewing their feet and legs. Cragius ought to have ſtopped there. I add, that all the neceſſary truths may be preſerved to this paſſage, without ſuppoſing, that Clemens Alexandrinus pretended, that the Lacedæmonian maids went always thus habited; it ſuffices that they were in this dreſs, when they went a hunting, or to wreſtle, or performed any other exerciſe. Now this does not prove, that their habit was very ſhort, but only that they tucked it up above the knee, that they might not be incommoded by it. This muſt neceſſarily be ſuppoſed, unleſs we accuſe Virgil of groſs ignorance; for he has given the maids of Lacedæmon a long and flowing habit, but tied up above the knee, when they hunted:

> Cui mater media ſeſe tulit obvia ſilva
> Virginis os habitumque gerens, & virginis arma
> SPARTANÆ . . . . .
> . . . .
> Namque humeris de more habilem ſuſpenderat arcum
> Venatrix, dederatque comam diffundere ventis
> NUDA GENU, NODOQUE SINUS
> COLLECTA PLUENTES (74).

> *Whom in the wood's receſs his mother meets,*
> *A Spartan virgin's mien, and dreſs, and arms,*
> *Diſſembling.* - - - - - -
> *For (huntreſs-like) ſhe on her ſhoulders hung*
> *A light, commodious, bow, and gave the winds*
> *To wanton in her treſſes; bare her knee,*
> *And in a knot her flowing folds confin'd.*
>
> TRAPP.

The deſcription, Pollux has left us of the habit of the Spartan maids, leaves no room to doubt, that it was long,

---

(65) Balzac, at the end of his *Chriſtian Socrates*, p. m. 142.

(66) Ariſtoteles, lib ii de Republ. cap. ix, p. m. 246.

(67) Id. Ib. pag. 247.

(68) Plutarch. in Lycurgo, pag. 47.

(69) Ariſtot. ubi ſupra, pag. 247, G.

(70) Ubi ſupra, p. 172.

(71) See, above, the words of Plutarch, remark [*B*], citation (8).

(72) Cragius, de Republ. Lacedæm. l. 3. c. 9. p. m. 155.

(73) Clem. Alexandr. in Pædagogo, l. ii. c. x. pag. 204.

(74) Virgil. Æneid. lib. 1. ver. 314.

long; for he ſays, that, when they unlaced themſelves to a certain point, they ſhewed from their feet upwards to their thighs. This is his way of expreſſing it. Ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ ὁ τῶν παρθένων οὕτω χιτωνίσκος, ὃ παραλύσαντες ἄχει τινὸς τὰς πτέρυγας, ἐκ τῆς κάτω πτέρνης παρέφαινον τοὺς μηροὺς μάλιστα αἱ Σπαρτιάτιδες, ἃς διὰ τοῦτο φαινομηρίδας ὠνόμαζον. *Ita autem dicebatur etiam virginum tunicula; cujus poſtquam aliquo uſque pinnas ſolviſſent, à malleolo inferiore pedis femora oſtendebant, maxime Spartanæ, quas idcirco phænomeridas appellabant* (75). We may take it for granted then, as to the fact, that Cragius, and thoſe who follow him, are miſtaken; but ſomething may be ſaid in their favour, as to their reaſoning, founded upon the fact. An habit might be ſo ſhort, as to leave the thighs naked. See theſe words of Martial:

Dimidiaſque nates Gallica palla tegit (76);

And half the buttock's by the garment hid.

And what Dubravius obſerves of the modes which a king of Bohemia (77) brought from France. 'He 'let his hair grow very long; he wore round-toed 'ſhoes; and dreſſed himſelf in a ſhort cloak, which 'reached only to his hips. *Inerat ei perigrinus habitus 'in neutriendis comis, in calceandis pedibus roſtratis 'calceis, in veſtiendo corpore palliolis vix dimidias nates 'tegentibus* (78).' But ſtill I maintain, the nakedneſs of the thighs, which the Lacedemonian women were reproached with, proceeded not from the ſhortneſs of their petticoats; for if they had reſembled our pages breeches, or the habits mentioned by Martial and Dubravius, it would not have been enough to have called them Phænomerides. There is no body but eaſily underſtands, that, if their petticoats, which were ſlit on both ſides, without being ſewed at the bottom, came but little lower than their breech, they had done much worſe than ſhew their thighs in walking; ſo that the Poets, who took a greater liberty than they do at preſent, and expreſſed themſelves more groſsly, would have given them a much ſtronger epithet than that of Phænomerides, or *naked thighs*. I need not explain this thought more at large.

For the reſt, the faſhion of ſhort habits was carried to a great exceſs in the court of France, if what we read in an Italian Author, who lived towards the end of the XVth century, be true. He ſuppoſes, that an Italian would not travel into France (§ *α*), as well becauſe the French were ignorant, as becauſe their very king wore a habit ſo ſhort, as not to cover the nameleſs parts. 'Cur obſecro trans Alpes non profectus? Quod 'ſcirem Gallos maximè ſtolidos eſſe, corpuſque curare 'magis quam animum colere: regemque eorum quam'vis ſpledidiſſimum tam brevi tamen veſtitu incedere, 'ut pudenda non velet, ac ſi Cynicorum ſectator ſit 'inſtitutorum (79).'

[§ (*α*) The faſhion of ſhort habits had reigned in France, at leaſt from the year 1346: [and Gaguin, on the time of the battle of Creſſy, book 8th of his Hiſtory, ſpeaks in this manner, both of this faſhion, and of the inconſtancy of the French nation in point of dreſs: 'Fuiſſe per id tempus per Franciam veſtimen'torum nimiam deformitatem, Scriptores tradunt: 'ita ut joculatoriam vitam agere Francos à veſtibus ju'dicares. Crediderim non defuiſſe illis & laſciviam atque 'ſuperbiam, quotidiana gentis mala. Itaque vel anguſtia, 'vel laxitate: item brevitate, ſeu longitudine veſtimento'rum, Galli ſemper peccant—*Writers tell us, that dreſs 'was at that time too much deformed in France; inſomuch 'that you would judge the French lived a merry life from 'their garb. I ſuppoſe they were both wanton and proud, 'the daily evils of the nation. Therefore the French 'always dreſs in extremes: their cloaths being either 'too ſtrait or too looſe, too ſhort or too long.*' Probably, as Gaguin inſinuates, they were ſoon tired of theſe ſhort habits; but, however it be, they appeared again, and more than ever 120 years after, ſince king Charles V was obliged to baniſh that faſhion, and others no leſs ridiculous, by edicts mentioned by Mezerai, in the year 1365: and yet, ſo true is Gaguin's remark, the ſame faſhion of ſhort cloaths was anew in France, and even in truth on the throne, towards the end of the XVth century; according to Jovian Pontanus, who was an eye-witneſs of it. REM. CRIT.]

(75) Jul. Pollux, apud Meurſ. Miſcell. Laconic. lib. i, cap. xix, pag. 85.

(76) Martial. Epigram. xciii, lib. i.

(77) John of the houſe of Luxemburg.

(78) Dubravius, Hiſtor. Bohem. lib. xx. apud Valeſiana, pag. m. 61.

(79) Jovian. Pontanus, in dialogo *Antonius*, pag. m. 1251.

LYCURGUS, an Athenian Orator, ſon of Lycophron, and grandſon to another Lycurgus, whom the thirty tyrants put to death, flouriſhed at the ſame time with Demoſthenes. He firſt ſtudied Philoſophy under Plato; but afterwards betook himſelf to Oratory under Iſocrates, and advanced himſelf to public employments (*a*). He was a ſevere judge, and fit to be compared with the Prætor Caſſius [*A*]. He is ſpoken of pretty fully in the Supplement to Moreri, but not without ſome miſtakes [*B*]. He is ſometimes

(*a*) Plutarchus, *in* Vitis decem Rhetorum, *pag.* 841.

[*A*] *He was a ſevere judge, and fit to be compared with the Prætor Caſſius.*] This is evident from theſe words of Ammianus Marcellinus. 'Verum ille, *he 'ſpeaks of the Emperor Julian*, judicibus Caſſiis triſtior '& Lycurgis cauſarum momenta æquo jure perpen'dens, ſuum cuique tribuebat, nuſquam à vero ab'ductus, acrius in calumniatores exſurgens quos ode'rat, multorum hujuſmodi petulantem ſæpe demen'tiam aduſque diſcrimen expertus, dum eſſet adhuc 'humilis & privatus (1) —— *But he, a more rigid 'judge than the Caſſii and Lycurgi, weighed cauſes equi'tably, and diſtributed juſtice to every one, never de'viating from the right; the ſcourge of calumniators, 'whom he hated, having had frequent experience of 'their malice, when in a private ſtation.*' Plutarch obſerves, that it was ſaid of this Lycurgus, that he dipped his pen in death; a thought which well enough agrees with the reproach made to Draco, that he writ his laws, not with ink, but in blood (2). Ἔσχε δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἄστεος τὴν φυλακὴν, καὶ τῶν κακούργων τὴν σύλληψιν, οὓς ἐξήλασεν ἅπαντας, ὥς καὶ τῶν σοφιστῶν ἐνίους λέγειν, Λυκοῦργον οὐ μέλανι ἀλλὰ θανάτῳ χρίοντα τὸν κάλαμον κατὰ τῶν πονηρῶν, οὕτω συγγράφειν. *Urbis etiam cuſtodia ei mandata fuit, & maleficorum comprehenſio. Quos quidem omnes expulit: adeò ut ſophiſtarum quidam dicerent, Lycurgum ita contra malos ſcribere, ut qui calamum non atramento ſed morte imbueret* (3). Diodorus Siculus repreſents him as a violent accuſer (4). Add to this theſe words of Cicero. 'Noſmetipſi, qui Lycurgei à principio fuiſſe'mus, quotidie demitigamur (5).——*We who at firſt, 'had the ſeverity of Lycurgus, grew milder every day.*' See the following remark, at the place concerning Ibis.

[*B*] *Not without ſome miſtakes.*] I. He ſhould have ſaid in general, that he baniſhed all malefactors (6), and not ſimply *all loiterers and vagabonds.* II. I do not find he excelled in exerciſes, or *was commonly victor in the public games.* III. He ſhould not have ſaid, that, when *he made himſelf be carried to the ſenate, there publickly to give an account of all his actions, they were applauded by all the people*: he ſhould not have ſaid this, without obſerving, that an accuſer appeared againſt him, whoſe calumnies he confuted (7); nor ſhould he have paſſed over in ſilence, that he was ſeveral times accuſed (8). IV. The Athenians, if we may credit the ſupplement, regarding him as a perſon, who had ſomething divine in him, conſecrated, after his death, an Ibis to him (an Egyptian bird much like a ſtork), as the owl had been conſecrated to Xenophon. This is miſunderſtanding Plutarch's words. Amiot tranſlated them thus: *Lycurgus was ſirnamed Ibis, which is a Black Stork, and it was commonly ſaid, to Lycurgus the Ibis, to Xenophon the Owl.* This paſſage of Plutarch (9) is much corrupted; but it is eaſy to ſee, that it does not ſignify what is pretended in the Supplement. The learned Henry Valeſius will help us to underſtand it. 'Unde, (10) *ſays he*, etiam Ibis cogno'minatus eſſe videtur, quòd ſcilicet ut Ibis angues, ſic 'ipſe noxios cives & peregrinos expelleret. Ariſto'phanes in Avibus:

Ἶβις Λυκούργῳ, χαιρεφῶντι νυκτερίς.

'Quanquam ſcio Scholiaſtem ejus cognominis aliam 'afferre cauſam, quòd ſcilicet Ægypto oriundus, aut 'quòd longis cruribus eſſet Lycurgus. Sed noſtram 'ſententiam

(1) Amm. Marcellin. lib. xxii, cap. xix, pag. m. 321.

(2) Δημάδης ὕστερον εὐδοκίμησεν, εἰπὼν ὅτι δι' αἵματος οὐ διὰ μέλανος τοὺς νόμους ὁ Δράκων ἔγραψεν. Poſtmodum lepide ait Demades ſanguine Draconem non atramento ſcripſiſſe leges. *Plutarch. in Solone. p.* 87. *E.*

(3) Plut. in vitis decem Rhetorum, p. 841.

(4) Ἦν δὲ πικρότατος ἐν τοῖς λόγοις κατήγορος. Diodor. Siculus, lib. xvi. *See alſo* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, in Cenſura vet. ſcriptor. pag. m. 192, 193.

(5) Cicero ad. Attic. Epiſt. xiii, lib. i.

(6) Plutarch, ubi ſupra, *uſes the word* κακοῦργος, *maleficus.*

(7) Plut. ibid. pag. 842. E.

(8) Id. ib.

(9) Ibid. pag. 843. D.

(10) That is, becauſe he proſecuted offenders with bitterneſs and violence.

ſometimes confounded with Lycurgus, the Lacedæmonian Legiſlator (*b*).

(*b*) Lindenbroch in Ammian. Marcellin. *Lib. XXII, Cap. IX,* & Corradus in Cicer. ad Atticum, *Lib. I,* Epiſt. XIII, *miſtake Lycurgus of Lacedæmon, for Lycurgus the Athenian Orator.*

‘ ſententiam confirmare videtur Plutarchus in Lycurgi Rhetoris vita: ubi & verſum illum Ariſtophanis adducit, ſed mendoſum (11). —— *Whence he ſeems to have been ſirnamed Ibis, becauſe, as the Ibis deſtroys ſerpents, ſo he drove out miſchievous citizens, and foreigners. Ariſtophanes, in his* birds, *ſays ;* To Lycurgus the Ibis, to Chærephon the owl : *tho' I am aware, that his ſcholiaſt gives another reaſon of that ſirname, to wit, either becauſe Lycurgus was a native of Egypt, or becauſe he had long legs. But Plutarch ſeems to confirm my opinion, in his life of Lycurgus the Orator ; in which he alledges that verſe of Ariſtophanes, but incorrect.*’ A ſmall doubt comes into my head. This Comedy of Ariſtophanes was acted in the ſecond year of the XCIſt Olympiad (12); and Lycurgus was not only alive, in the ſecond year of the CXIth Olympiad, but he was one of the famous Orators whom the Athenians refuſed to deliver up to Alexander (13). Of what an age then muſt he have been, when he died, if he be the ſame that Ariſtophanes ſpoke of in this Comedy ? Did this Poet mention perſons of obſcure condition ? V. When it is ſaid, *that, upon Demoſthenes's teſtimony, Lycurgus's ſons were preſently ſet at liberty,* it is plainly intimated, that Demoſthenes aſſerted their innocence ; but this is falſe. Demoſthenes was then in exile, and he wrote to the Athenians, that they were blamed for the treatment they gave Lycurgus's ſons (14). Hereupon they were releaſed. It was not becauſe, on the teſtimony of Demoſthenes, it was believed they had been unjuſtly accuſed. VI. He ought not to have cited Herodotus, who being dead, before Lycurgus was born, could ſay nothing of him. The citing Pauſanias is more pardonable, tho' he has ſaid (15) but a ſmall part of what is aſcribed to him ; but the not citing Plutarch, is an unpardonable omiſſion.

(11) Henric. Valeſius, in Ammian. Marcellin. lib. xxii, cap. ix, pag. m. 321.

(12) Vide Sam. Petiti Miſcellanea, lib. i, cap. x.

(13) Diod. Sicul. lib. xvii, cap. 15.

(14) Plut ubi ſupra, p. 842. D.

(15) Pauſan. lib. i, pag. 29.

LYDIAT (Thomas) an Engliſhman, publiſhed ſome books in the beginning of the XVIIth century, in which he attacked the opinions of Scaliger, and thoſe of Ariſtotle, *&c* [*A*]. Scaliger was very angry with him, and confuted him with a deal of haughtineſs. See the Prolegomena to his Chronological Canons. He inſerted in it a Greek epigram (*a*), which is very injurious to Lydiat. The latter wrote a-freſh againſt Scaliger, and took in ſome other matters [*B*], and died the third of April, 1646, at ſeventy four years of age (*b*).

(*a*) *Voſſius found the Latin verſion of it in Scaliger's copy, and publiſhed it. See the remark* [*O*] *of the article* HOSPITAL (MICHAEL DE L').

(*b*) *Witte in Diar. Biograph.*

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome writings . . . . in which he attacked the opinions of Scaliger, and thoſe of Ariſtotle.*] He publiſhed at London, in 1605, a treatiſe *De variis annorum formis*, in which he confutes Clavius, and the Mathematicians of the college of Rome, and Joſeph Scaliger. See here a paſſage of the Scaligerana, which charges him with not underſtanding what he cenſures in Clavius : ‘ Lydiat eſt melancholicus, Æquinoctium mirum ſtatuit 36 diebus poſt ſolitum, & dicit à veteribus ſic obſervatum. Reprehendit Clavium, & illum non capit (1). —— *Lydiat has the ſpleen : he makes the æquinox 36 days later than uſual, and ſays the antients ſo obſerved it : he finds fault with Clavius, without underſtanding him.*’ Mr Konig makes mention of this work of Lydiat, and of that *De annis miniſterii Chriſti*, printed in the year 1613 ; but he does not ſpeak of this other work of his ; ‘ Prælectio aſtronomica de natura cœli & conditionibus elementorum : tum autem de cauſis præcipuorum motuum cœli & ſtellarum. Item diſquiſitio phyſiologica de origine fontium perennium frigidorum & calidorum : eaque occaſione de ortu & cauſis plerorumque omnium ſubterraneorum, atque etiam æſtus & ſalſedinis maris, nec non diluvii univerſalis. Quibus duabus commentatiunculis adumbratur conſtitutio univerſi : ita ut receptæ à multis hodiè Philoſophorum Peripateticorum opiniones de quinta cœli eſſentiâ immutabili, & de elementorum proportionibus ſituque refutentur ; naturalis autem hiſtoria ſacrarum literarum de aquâ ſupercœleſti atque igne ſubteraneo juxta genuinam antiquitùs receptam earum ſententiam confirmetur. Auctore Thoma Lydiat.’ It was printed at London in 1605, in 8vo. The author, in his advertiſement to the reader, declares he could not bear, that people ſhould be deafened with Ariſtotle's authority, as to the pretended difference betwixt the celeſtial and elementary matter, or that this ſilly reaſon ſhould be alledged, that there are things true in Philoſophy, which are falſe in Divinity (2). He maintains that this is making Divinity the ſport of Atheiſts. ‘ Haudquaquam ratus oportere me contentum eſſe eo quod vulgo ſolitum eſſet reſponderi ad hujuſmodi dogmata Ariſtotelica ſententiæ ſacrorum bibliorum contraria, ſcilicet verum eſt Phyſicè non Theologicè, quandoquidem hoc videretur nihil aliud quam Theologiam exponere ludibrio hominum atheorum . . . . Igitur his duabus exercitationibus Philoſophicis . . . . conatus ſum, refutatis præſertim Ariſtotelis Opinionibus de natura cœli & elementorum, reddere rationes Phyſicas illius conſtitutionis univerſi . . . . . quæ ſacris ſcripturis videretur eſſe tradita . . . . id præcipue operam dans ut demonſtrarem idem eſſe verum Phyſicè ac Theologicè.’ Note, that he aſcribes the original of fountains, and abundance of other things, to ſubterraneous fires.

[*B*] *He wrote a-freſh againſt Scaliger, and took in ſome other matters.*] This will appear by the catalogue I am going to give ; and of which no footſtep is to be ſeen in the Sieur Konig's Bibliotheque. ‘ *Defenſio tractatus de variis annorum formis, contra Joſ. Scaligerum, una cum examine Canonum Chronologiæ Iſagogicorum*, at London, 1607, in 8vo. *Emendatio temporum ab orbe condito huc uſque contra Scaligerum & alios*, at the ſame place 1609, in 8vo. *Solis & Lunæ periodus, ſeu annus magnus*, at the ſame place 1620, in 8vo. *Epiſtola aſtronomica de anni ſolaris menſura*, at the ſame place 1621, in 8vo. *De numero aureo. De altaribus in Eccleſiis Chriſtianis collocandis*, &c.

(1) Scaliger. voce *Lydiat*.

(2) Confer quæ ſupra, remark [C] of the article HOFMAN (DANIEL).

LYDIUS (Martin) miniſter of the Goſpel, having quitted the Palatinate on account of the perſecution, retired into the Low-Countries, in 1576, and was made profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker. He was a native of Lubec, and had been principal of the *Collegium Sapientiæ*, at Heidelberg, in conjunction with Zachary Urſin (*a*). He left two ſons, who were miniſters. Balthasar Lydius, the eldeſt, began the exerciſe of his miniſtry at Dort, about the year 1603, and died in 1629 (*b*). He compoſed ſome books [*A*], and had four ſons, who were all miniſters. The eldeſt was called Isaac,

(*a*) *Taken from the Life of David Pareus, pag. m.* 15.

(*b*) *Henn. Witte, Diar. Biograph. Part ii, p.* 36.

[*A*] *Balthaſar Lydius compoſed ſome books.*] He publiſhed two volumes, in 8vo, intituled *Waldenſia, id eſt, conſervatio veræ Eccleſiæ demonſtrata ex confeſſionibus Taboritarum & Bohemorum.* The firſt tome

Isaac, and died miniſter at Dort, leaving a ſon named Matthew, who died a miniſter about the year 1685, and had a good library. James Lydius, Balthaſar's ſecond ſon, was miniſter of Dort, and wrote ſeveral books [*B*]. The other ſon of Martin Lydius was called John. He exerciſed his miniſtry at Oudewater in Holland, and publiſhed ſeveral books [*C*]. His two ſons were miniſters. No one family perhaps has furniſhed more miniſters than this.

was printed at Rotterdam, in 1616, and the other at Dort, the year following. This author's other works are, *Facula accenſa hiſtoriæ Waldenſium. Novus orbis ſeu navigationes primæ in Americam* (1).

[*B*] *James Lydius wrote ſeveral books.*] I do not mention ſeveral poems he publiſhed in Flanders, nor his *Roomſchen Uylenſpiegel* (2) printed at Dort, in 1671, in 8vo; but here are two or three books, which ſhew he was verſed in the *Belles Lettres*. I. *Sermonum convivalium libri duo, quibus variarum gentium mores ac ritus in uxore expetenda, ſponſalibus contrahendis, nuptiiſque faciendis ac perficiendis enarrantur.* They were printed at Dort in 1643, in 4to. They were printed afterwards in 12mo. II. *Agoniſtica ſacra. III. Florum ſparſio ad hiſtoriam paſſionis Jeſu Chriſti.* He wrote a book alſo intituled *Belgium Glorioſum*, and a dialogue *De cœna Domini.*

His heirs have ſome works of his in their hands, which he did not publiſh. Mr Van Til, miniſter and profeſſor at Dort, having ſeen the manuſcript of the *Syntagma Sacrum de re militari*, and that of the diſſertation *De Juramento*, judged them worthy to be publiſhed, and adviſed a Bookſeller to do it. This advice was followed, as appears by the volume printed at Dort, in 4to, 1698, and called, *Jacobi Lydii Syntagma ſacrum de re militari: nec non de Jurejurando diſſertatio Philologica: Opus Poſthumum & multa eruditione commendatum, cum figuris æneis elegantiſſime inciſis, quod nunc primum ex tenebris eruit, notiſque illuſtravit Salomon Van Til Theologus Dordracenus.* See the Journal of Utrecht (3), and that of Leipſic (4).

[*C*] *JOHN LYDIUS publiſhed ſeveral books.*] He printed at Leyden, in 1610, a book of Prateolus, intituled, *Concilia Eccleſiæ Chriſtianæ*, with his criticiſms on it. Five years after he put out the lives of the Popes, written by Robert Barnes and John Bale, and continued it to his own time. He was author of that continuation. He had given an edition of Nicolas de Clemangis, in 1613, with notes, and a gloſſary.

(1) Witte, Diar. Biograph. Part. ii, pag. 36.

(2) That is to ſay, the abſurdities of the Papiſts.

(3) Menſe Octob. 1697, pag. 488. & ſeq.

(4) Menſe Junio, 1698, pag. 249.

LYNDE (Sir Humphrey) a knight, born at London (*a*), publiſhed there two books of controverſy, one in 1628, the other in 1630. They ſold very well, and were tranſlated out of Engliſh into French by John de la Montagne. I will ſpeak of them below [*A*]. Sir Humphrey Lynde had conſiderable employments: he was a juſtice of the peace, and member of parliament (*b*). He died the fourteenth of June 1636, aged fifty ſeven (*c*).

(a) Witte, in Diar. Biogr. ad ann. 1636.

(b) Id. ib.

(c) Id. ib.

[*A*] *His two books of controverſy . . . . were tranſlated into French by John de la Montagne. I will ſpeak of them below.*] The French tranſlation of the firſt of theſe works, made from the ſixth Engliſh edition is intituled; La Voye ſeure, &c. —— *The ſafe 'way, conducting each Chriſtian, by the teſtimonies and 'confeſſions of our moſt learned adverſaries to the 'true antient Catholic faith, which is at this time 'profeſſed in the church of England, and other Re'formed churches* (1). That of the ſecond treatiſe is intituled, 'La Voye eſgarée, &c. —— *The wrong 'way, making weak and tottering minds ſtumble in 'the dangerous paths of error, by the plauſible colours 'of the apocryphal ſcriptures, unwritten traditions, 'doubtful fathers, uncertain councils, and a pretended 'Catholic church.'* Sir Humphry Lynde was engaged in this work by a challenge ſent him by a Jeſuit in theſe words. 'Let Sir Humphrey Lynde, 'or thoſe of his party, prove, from good authors, 'that the Proteſtant church was viſible in all ages, and 'principally in the ages before Luther (2).' He was a man of great reading; and he gave a very good turn to his anſwer, and quoted a great many remarkable paſſages. I make no queſtion but the Jeſuit, who ſent him the challenge, was the ſame, who anſwered his Safe Way, He was an Engliſhman, and his name was Robert Jeniſon: his anſwer was printed in Engliſh at Roüen in 1631, in 8vo (3).

(1) I make uſe of the Paris edition, by Lewis Vandoſme 1647, in 8vo, it is the ſecond edition. I ſay the ſame as to the tranſlation of the following treatiſe.

(2) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his *Safe way.*

(3) See Alegambe, p. 412.

LYSERUS (Polycarp), a famous Divine of the Augſburg confeſſion, was born at Winenden, in the country of Wirtemberg, the eighteenth of March 1552. He was but two years old when his father (*a*) died; however his mother, marrying a ſecond huſband (*b*), gave him a father-in-law, who took great care of his education. The progreſs he made in his childhood recommended him as worthy to be educated in the college of Tubingen, at the charge of the prince of Wirtemberg. He employed his time ſo well, that he was ordained miniſter in 1573, and commenced doctor of Divinity in 1576. His reputation ſpread into all parts, ſo that Auguſtus, elector of Saxony, called him to be miniſter of the church of Wirtemberg in 1577. He had no ſooner diſcovered his great abilities in that church, but he was added to the number of Divinity Profeſſors. He was one of the principal directors for drawing up the book of Concord, and vigorouſly diſcharged the office of a miſſionary [*A*], in order to get it ſigned by

(*a*) Paſtor and ſuperintendant of Winenden.

(b) Luke Oſiander, a famous Divine.

[*A*] *He vigorouſly exerciſed the charge of a miſſionary.*] I make uſe of this term on account of the journies he was obliged to take from town to town, to exact ſubſcriptions, and degrade the nonconformiſts. See the remark [*C*] of the article HUNNIUS, and conſider theſe words of a German Divine: 'Incide'rant Miniſterii ipſius Wittebergenſis primitiæ in il'lud ipſum tempus, quo ingenti cura maximiſque im'penſis Electoris Saxon. Augusti liber Chriſtianæ 'Concordiæ Collectus, conſcriptus & plurimarum Ec'cleſiarum calculo approbatus fuerat. In hoc ergo 'opere feliciter promovendo partes minimè poſtre'mas ſuſtinuit Polycarpus, dum de mandato ac vo'luntate Electoris, una cum reliquis ad hanc rem de'putatis Nobilibus & Theologis, non Wittebergæ modo 'ſed & Torgæ, Lipſiæ, Miſenæ & alibi ſubſcriptiones ab 'illis expoſcere neceſſe habuit, qui publicis docendi 'muneribus vel in Eccleſiis vel in Scholis tum erant 'præfecti. Tanto autem tamque arduo labore ſuperato '&c. (1) —— *He began his miniſtry at Wittemberg 'at that very time, when the book of* Chriſtian Uni'ty *was compiled with great care, and at the great 'expence*

(1) Spizelius, in Templo honoris reſerato, pag. 12.

by all who were in employments. He aſſiſted at all the aſſemblies, which were held about this book, or about the re-union of the Calviniſts and Lutherans, negotiated by the agents of the king of Navarre. Chriſtian, elector of Saxony, who ſucceeded *(c)* to the dignity of his father, but not to his rigid Lutheraniſm, was overjoyed at Lyſerus's communicating to him the advantageous conditions offered him at Brunſwic [*B*]. He diſmiſſed him with all his heart, but to the great regret of his ſubjects. Lyſerus was at firſt only coadjutor at Brunſwic, but became afterwards intendant. He was recalled to Wittemberg, after the death of Chriſtian; and was made miniſter of the court of Dreſden in 1594. He ſtayed there all the reſt of his life, and employed his time not only in the functions of the miniſtry, but alſo in the education of the young princes, and in writing books [*C*]. He died the twenty ſecond of February 1601, a father of thirteen children [*D*], and grand-father to three grandſons and one grand-daughter. His will was an evidence of his charity to the poor, and to neceſſitous ſtudents [*E*]. He had had a great many quarrels upon his hands *(d)* [*F*].

(c) In the year 1586.

(d) Taken from his life, compoſed by Melch. Adam, who has taken it almoſt all out of his funeral oration, ſpoken by Leon. Hutterus.

‘ *expence of* Augustus, *elector of Saxony, and received the approbation of ſeveral churches. Polycarp contributed not the leaſt to the ſucceſs of this undertaking, whilſt, in obedience to the command and will of the elector, together with the reſt of the nobles and Divines deputed for this purpoſe, he was obliged to require ſubſcriptions, not only at Wittemberg, but at Torgau, Leipſic, Meiſſen, and in other places, of thoſe, who were public teachers in the churches or ſchools. Having performed this great and difficult task*, &c.

[*B*] *Chriſtian . . . . . was overjoyed at Lyſerus's communicating to him the advantageous conditions which were offered him at Brunſwic*] The accepting them was the leaſt of his thoughts; but he believed that the propoſal might gain him the advantage of being retained, with uſeful teſtimonies of the high eſteem they had for him. How aſtoniſhed muſt Lyſerus be, when he heard the elector's anſwer; for there was no way left of handſomely refuſing the gentlemen of Brunſwic: he was under a neceſſity of accepting their offer. This was a thunder-ſtroke to the zealots; their reiterated remonſtrances to the court were all in vain. See here the words of Melchior Adam (2): ‘ Cum aliud agens *Lyſerus*, conditionis opimæ occaſionem apud *Brunſuicenſes* ſibi obtingere, datis ad aulam literis, oſtendiſſet: reſponſum plane ἀπροσδόκητον tulit: *ut frueretur, quam ſibi oblatum putaret, felicitate: eccleſiæ Wittembergenſi de alio paſtore proſpectum iri.* Hoc reſponſo ordines conſternati non literis modo, ſed & legatis ad aulam Electoralem miſſis, cauſas plane ſonticas, expoſuerunt, ob quas de retinendo *Lyſero* ſint ſolliciti: verum irrito plane conatu. —— *Lyſerus having ſignified to the court by letter, that he had received advantageous offers from Brunſwic, was unexpectedly anſwered,* that he might enjoy the happineſs, he thought was offered him, and that the church of Wittemberg, muſt ſeek another paſtor. *This anſwer thunderſtruck the aſſemblies, who, not only by letter, but by their agents, repreſented to the electoral court the juſt reaſons they had to be ſollicitous to retain Lyſerus; but to no purpoſe.*’

[C] *He ſpent his time in writing books.*] The chief of them are: *Hiſtoria paſſionis Dominicæ ſecundum IV Evangelia*, at Leipſic 1605, in 4to. *Hiſtoria reſurrectionis & aſcenſionis Dominicæ, & miſſionis Spiritus ſancti homiliis aliquot explicata*, Leipſic 1610, 4to. *Schola Babylonica ex cap. 1. Danielis, quam ſubſequuntur Coloſſus Babylonicus, Fornax Babylonica, Cedrus Babylonica, Epulum Babylonicum, & Aula Perſica. Commentariorum in Geneſim Tomi VI.* the firſt upon Adam; the ſecond upon Noah; the third upon Abraham; the fourth upon Iſaac; the fifth upon Jacob; the ſixth upon Joſeph. *Harmoniæ Evangelicæ, à Martino Chemnitio inchoatæ, continuatio, ſeu vitæ Jeſu Chriſti ſecundum quatuor Evangeliſtas expoſitæ libri tres.* I have elſewhere obſerved (3), that he publiſhed a book of Haſenmullerus: this occaſioned a diſpute betwixt him and the Jeſuit James Gretſer, which he broke off after the ſecond reply (4); he ſaw no end of it, if he would have gone on with his anſwers; he therefore choſe to ſound a retreat. But as to the diſpute between him and a Swiſs miniſter (5), who taught that God had elected all men to eternal life, it was much more obſtinate; for it laſted ſeventeen years. *Cum iſto, inquam, totis annis ſeptendecim pugnavit* (6). I paſs over ſeveral books, which our Lyſerus publiſhed in High-Dutch (7).

[*D*] *He was father of thirteen children.*] Among others, of Polycarp and William, who lived to enjoy ſeveral eccleſiaſtical and academical employs, and publiſhed ſeveral books. POLYCARP LYSERUS, born at Wittemberg the twentieth of November 1586, was miniſter and profeſſor at Leipſic, *&c.* He died the fifteenth of January 1633, leaving ſeveral children. You will find the catalogue of his books in the 452d and 453d pages of Paul Freher's Theatre. WILLIAM LYSERUS, his brother, was born at Dreſden the twenty ſixth of October 1592. He was profeſſor of Divinity at Wittemberg, *&c.* and died the eighth of February 1649, leaving ſeveral children of both ſexes. In the 542d, and 543d pages of the ſame Theatre, you will find the catalogue of his books. Note that his *Syſtema Thetico-Exegeticum* was not printed till 1699. In the Leipſic Journal of October, the ſame year, at the 473d, and 474th pages, you will find the names and qualities of ſome perſons of this family.

[*E*] *His will is a proof of his charity to the poor, and to neceſſitous ſtudents.*] Theſe are Melchior Adam's words. ‘ Teſtamento cavit, ut quotannis in die Polycarpi & Eliſabethæ, certa quædam pecuniæ ſumma impenderetur, in lautiorem victum eorum, qui communi menſa uterentur (8).’ This author tells us a thing here (9) which perhaps needs ſome reformation. The miniſters would be more reſpected in Germany than they are, if the ſtudents in Divinity were not often in ſuch a condition as he ſpeaks of.

[*F*] *He had a great many quarrels upon his hands.*] Refer hither what I have ſaid above (10), and add to it another thing not mentioned by Melchior Adam. There was a Poet called John Major, who wrote verſes againſt the methods uſed to procure ſubſcriptions to the Formulary, and which particularly abuſed the Divines of Wittemberg. Lyſerus took this John Major to task with ſo much vigour, that he never let him reſt till he got him expelled the univerſity. He made himſelf many enemies by this victory; and, in his turn, fell under their aſſaults, loſing all the preferments he had at Wittemberg. So true it is, that, on ſome occaſions, it is better to be contented with a moderate advantage over an adverſary, than drive things to extremities. But where are thoſe, who can moderate themſelves, when they have ſo proſperous a gale, and the governing faction permits them to revenge themſelves? ‘ Sub initium anni 86 ſupra ſeſquimilleſimum turbas Collegio Theologico Wittebergenſi dari cœpit Joannes Major Poeta, homo deſperatæ levitatis, qui editis in publicum carminibus, Religionis ſinceritatem, & bonorum Virorum Theologorum cum primis famam vellicare haud dubitaverat, cujus improbis conatibus, cum Polycarpus tum publicè tum privatim magno ſpiritu ſe oppoſuiſſet, tandemque effeciſſet, ut Poeta Wittebergenſi Academia, ſit proſcriptus; dici non poteſt quos quantoſque crabrones tunc excitaverit tam in Aula quam in Academia, quantamque invidiam ſibi apud multos attraxerit; quæ poſtea non ſine gravi Eccleſiæ ſcandalo in nervum ita erupit, ut Polycarpus tota Eccleſia, & Academia reclamante functione ſua exciderit (11).’ His retirement did not ſecure him from calumny (12). If we had a full account of this matter, we ſhould find, perhaps, that our Lyſerus was partly in the wrong.

(2) Melch. Adam. in vitis Theolog. pag. 800. *See alſo* Spizelius, ubi ſupra, pag. 13.

(3) In the article JARRIGE, citation (21).

(4) Cum Jeſuita Ingolſtadienſi Jacobo Gretſero, ob publicatam hiſtoriam Haſenmullerianam, publicum ei interceſſit certamen: in quo poſt unam atque alteram velitationem illud Poëtæ uſurpandum ſibi ſtatuit: *Cede repugnanti: cedendo victor abibis.* Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra, pag. 801.

(5) Samuel Huberus. See the article HUNNIUS, remark [*E*].

(6) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra.

(7) Spizelius gives a liſt of them, pag. 16.

(8) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra, pag. 802.

(9) *He had juſt ſaid*, Cum ſingulari quodam amoris affectu *Wittembergam* & tenuioris cum primis fortunæ ſtudioſos, quales plerumque eſſe ſolent, ſtudiis Theologicis qui ſe manciparunt, proſequeretur; teſtamento cavit, *&c.* —— *Having a ſingular affection for Wittemberg, and for ſtudents of narrow fortunes, as thoſe who apply themſelves to Divinity generally are, he provided by his will*, &c.

(10) In the remark [*C*].

(11) Spizelius, ubi ſupra, p. 12.

(12) Neque vero in hac quantumvis ſplendidæ ſtatione conſtitutus, falſorum fratrum venenatos morſus effugere potuit. *Ib. pag.* 13.

LYSERUS (JOHN) author of ſeveral writings concerning Polygamy. See the news from the Republic of Letters (*a*), and add to it what follows. He had an elder brother, ſuperintendant of the church of Magdeburg. He was reduced to extream poverty at Amſterdam, when he printed his laſt book (*b*), for which the Bookſeller gave him but twenty ducatoons; and in his laſt ſickneſs was lodged in a garret juſt joining to the roof (*c*). This I have from one of his friends, who frequently viſited him.

I muſt not forget, that the book *de Polygamia*, which he publiſhed under the name of *Theophilus Alethæus* in 1676, in 8vo, was condemned by an arrèt of Chriſtian V, king of Denmark, and that the author was baniſhed from all the dominions of his Daniſh majeſty. He there ſerved in quality of miniſter to the army. A Daniſh Divine, named John Brunſman, refuted this book by another, which he intituled *Monogamia victrix*, and which was printed at Francfort in 1679, in 8vo. Lyſerus had publiſhed in high Dutch a Polygamic treatiſe intituled, *das Konigliche Marc aller Lander* (*d*).

(*a*) *For April* 1685. *Art.* I, *p.* 370, *and the following. See alſo the article* LAMECH, *remark* [*A*].

(*b*) *It was printed in* 1682, *under the title of* Polygamia triumphatrix, 4to.

(*c*) Quem tegula ſola tuetur
A pluvia, molles ubi reddunt ova columbæ.
Whom the roofs only ſhelter from the rain,
Where pigeons breed . . . .
Juven. Sat. iii, ver. 201.

(*d*) Taken from the fifth volume of the *Obſervat. Selecta*, printed at Hall in 1702, Pag. 42.

LYSIMACHUS, tutor to Alexander. I ſhould have ſaid nothing of this perſon, if Amiot had faithfully tranſlated Plutarch's account of him [*A*].

[*A*] *If Amiot had well tranſlated what Plutarch ſays of him.*] Theſe are his words (1): 'Now there 'were about Alexander, as we may ſuppoſe, ſeveral 'perſons appointed to inſtruct and educate him, as 'governours, chamberlains, maſters, and tutors: but 'Leonidas was the perſon, who had the ſuperintendence of all the reſt; a man of an auſtere temper, 'and related to queen Olympias; but as for his part, 'he hated the name of maſter, or præceptor, altho' 'it be a fine and honourable employment; for which 'reaſon, ſome called him Alexander's governour and 'conductor, out of regard to the dignity of his 'perſon, and his relation to the prince: but he who 'had the place and title of maſter, was one Lyſimachus, a native of the country of Arcania (2), who 'had nothing good or genteel in him; yet, becauſe 'he was called Phœnix, and Alexander was called 'Achilles, and Philip was called Peleus, he held the 'ſecond place after the governour.' The fault of this verſion conſiſts in this: Amiot ſays, that Lyſimachus held the ſecond place, becauſe he was called Phœnix, and Alexander was called Achilles, and Philip was called Peleus. This is abſurd; Plutarch had too much ſenſe to aſſign ſuch reaſons. But his meaning is this; he ſays, that Lyſimachus, a man otherwiſe void of politeneſs, made himſelf agreeable by the new names, with which he adorned his employment, and which he borrowed from Homer. The king, *ſaid he*, is Peleus, the prince his ſon is Achilles, and I am Phœnix. This was likely enough to tickle Alexander, and pleaſe king Philip: This was awakening in him great and ſublime ideas. This invention made him be loved, and gave him the firſt place after Leonidas in the young prince's family. I have in another place (3) touched upon the diſtinction of a governour and a tutor; you will find it plainly enough in Plutarch's words, which I muſt copy, that my readers may perceive Amiot's error. Λεωνίδας . . . μὲν οὖν φεύγων τὸ τῆς παιδαγωγίας ὄνομα, καλὸν ἔργον ἐχούσης καὶ λαμπρὸν, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων, διὰ τὸ ἀξίωμα καὶ τὴν οἰκειότητα, τροφεὺς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ καθηγητὴς καλούμενος, ὁ δὲ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν ὑποποιούμενος ἦν Λυσίμαχος, τῷ γένει Ἀκαρνάν. ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν ἦχων ἀστεῖον, ὅτι δ' ἑαυτὸν μὲν ὠνόμαζεν φοίνικα, τὸν δὲ Ἀλέξανδρον, Ἀχιλλέα, Πηλέα δὲ, τὸν Φίλιππον, ἠγαπᾶτο, καὶ δευτέραν εἶχε χώραν. *Leonidas . . . . pædagogi nomen cum honeſto & ſpecioſo conjunctum officio repudiabat, atque ab aliis dignitatis & neceſſitudinis cauſa nutritius Alexandri & rector vocabatur: ille qui ſpeciem pædagogi & vocabulum ſumebat Lyſimachus, natione Acarnan, urbanitate nulla præditus erat alia, ſed, quod Phœniceen nominaret ſe, Alexandrum Achillem, & Philippum Pelea, ideo gratus erat, & ſecundum locum tenebat* (4).

(1) Amiot's tranſlation of Plutarch's Life of Alexander. ch. ii. pag. 142. of the Paris edition for Peter Gaillard 1615, in 8vo.

(2) It is ſo in my edition; but without doubt Amiot wrote *Acarnania*.

(3) In the article ACHILLES, remark [C].

(4) Plutarch. in Alex. p. 667. B.

The End of the Third Volume.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM